

VIEWPOINT

Viewpoint provides a forum for theological debate, for readers' reactions to published articles, for expressions of views and for reports on current issues facing church and school. Responses and contributions, restricted to about five hundred words, should be sent to the Editor.

Another Look at the Text of 1 Corinthians 14:33–35

I am so pleased to see from the pages of this journal (see *LTJ* 31/1, 1997, 31–39) that a pastor has tried to keep informed about the manuscripts and textual matters relating to the Greek New Testament. I congratulate David Bryce for his interest. However, several points need to be made in regard to his article.

1. It is misleading to quote **p66** and **p75** in support of the supposed superiority of the Alexandrian text type when neither papyrus has the text of 1 Corinthians. The article also reflects a confusion between the Greek uncials **E**, (**07** and **08** of the eighth and sixth century respectively) which does not contain 1 Corinthians 14, and the Old Latin **e Sangermanensis** (ninth century), which does contain it.
2. The earliest text known to us is the so-called Western text (Epp and Fee: 94). The text was very widespread and is attested by most of the early Patristic witnesses (Justin Martyr, Tatian, Marcion, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian). It is chiefly the Western texts that place verses 34,35 after verse 40 in 1 Corinthians 14. However, verses 34,35 follow verse 40 also in at least some non-Western text type manuscripts such as miniscule **88** of the twelfth century (see below). Unfortunately the Western text has suffered from a bad press. However, it is increasingly being given the recognition due to it.
3. While arguments from silence by themselves are not convincing, taken together with other evidence they should be noted. These verses may have been absent from early manuscripts. No Apostolic Father cites verses 34,35, although Athenagoras (died 177) cites both verse 32 and verse 37. Also Clement of Alexandria (died 215) omits citing verses 34,35 but does cite 1 Corinthians 14:9–11,13,20. He calls on both men and women, without distinction, to maintain silence in the church (Payne 1998: 155). It would be strange for him to speak this way if he had verses 34,35 in his text. Tertullian (died 240) is the first to cite verses 34,35 (Payne 1995).
4. **p46**, an important text for David Bryce's case, always needs to be used with caution. Although dated around 200 and our earliest Pauline manuscript, the text was produced by a copyist who is usually acknowledged as having worked from a good exemplar but was rather careless. Note from the Greek New Testament footnotes how often **p46** is the non-preferred reading!
5. The most fatal weakness in David Bryce's argument is the methodology he follows. He appears to use the old genealogical method. Such phrases as, 'the manuscripts can be traced with some certainty', 'is a direct copy of', 'the theory of a single common archetype', 'a shared common origin' and similar expressions indicate this method. It is surprising that Antionette Wire, whom he quotes

favourably, is still apparently using this method. 'The genealogical method . . . which established a stemma for the manuscript transmission . . . has been almost entirely abandoned by New Testament textual critics' (Epp and Fee' 114). The quantitative method of textual analysis (below) has brought about its demise.

6. In the quantitative method, carefully defined variation units over a set passage of Scripture are identified. These variation units are then compared over a large range of manuscripts, with the resultant agreements being tabulated and percentages of agreements between manuscripts established. The use of this method over the last thirty years or more has shown not only that there can be much variation within a manuscript but also that manuscripts previously regarded as Alexandrian can be in parts closer to the majority text of the Western text types. For example, **Sinaiticus** in John 1:1 – 8:38 is Western in character. Miniscule **33** is close to the majority text type in Acts 1–11, but close to the Alexandrian text type in Acts 12–28 (Ehrman and Holmes: 262). **Vaticanus** is regarded very highly in the gospels but is regarded as an 'also ran' elsewhere. As a result of findings from the quantitative method, scholars speak of text groupings with the Alexandrian group on one side and the Western on another, with many variations of manuscripts in between before about the fifth century. For our purposes, this new approach has dealt a knockdown, if not a knockout, blow to the old genealogical method.
7. David Bryce's article pays little if any attention to the internal evidence for reading verses 34,35 after verse 40 or for seeing them as an interpolation. Whereas one would not support a thoroughgoing eclecticism where the text is chosen variant by

variant, using the principles of critical judgment without regard to the age of the manuscripts, as Kilpatrick, Elliot and their school do, we must admit these scholars have greatly influenced New Testament textual criticism. Note the introductions to the most recent editions of the Greek New Testament (Nestle-Aland 27th ed 1993; UBS 4th ed 1993), where the compilers acknowledge their use of the eclectic method in choosing the text. Peter Lockwood's article on 1 Corinthians 14:33–35 (*LTJ* 30/1, 1966, 30–38), and the work of Payne and others have shown the strength of the internal evidence in determining this text.

8. The evidence for interpolation cannot easily be disregarded. Contrary to David Bryce, one would expect the interpolated text (1 Cor 14:34, 35) to show the variety it does, and the text from which the interpolation comes (1 Tim 2:11–14) to be without textual variation. Further, 1 Corinthians 14:34,35 has vocabulary suggestive of 1 Timothy 2:12 and its surrounding verses. Also, since interpolations written in the margin eventually found their way into the text, it makes sense that verses 34,35 are in different places. The evidence of the early copies must also be noted. **Vaticanus** marks verses 34,35, with two dots and a dash. It does this twenty-seven times where the text is suspect (Elliot: 95). As Elliott points out, 'when a text appears in different positions in the manuscript tradition its originality is often questionable'. Also, verses 34,35 are indented or written as a distinct paragraph by **p46**, Origen, **Sinaiticus**, **Alexandrinus**, **Claramontanus (Dp)**, **33** and most other Greek manuscripts (Payne: 95). This indicates that the copyists believed the text did not belong with verse 33 and suggests that they suspected interpolation. Note in this list the Alexandrian type texts used by David Bryce for his argument.

9. Many scholars believe that by about AD 200 all of the significant textual variants were in circulation. Contrary to Peter Lockwood's opinion, this seems to have been because the text was not yet regarded as sacred and inalterable. Scribes felt free to 'express more clearly' what they copied or to bring out the meaning with comments. Evidence that the text was not yet sacred can be seen from a comparison with Old Testament Greek texts copied at this time. The Old Testament was regarded as sacred, so variant readings are much reduced. Also, when the New Testament texts gained 'sanctity', as reflected in the later Koine or Byzantine texts, variants are much reduced. Further, what later orthodoxy called heterodoxy in the second century was not so evident at the time. Heterodox groups (eg Marcion), even Tatian's Diatessaron, show how easily texts were shaped by one's view. Hence, interpolations should not surprise us.
10. David Bryce draws attention to the Latin copy, **Fuldensis**. Bishop Victor of Capua was a keen scholar of texts, with acute judgments, and must have regarded verses 34,35 as an interpolation. Payne (1995) has made a strong case against Metzger, suggesting that Victor had manuscripts without verses 34,35 and also manuscripts with them. Hence the odd way the text is set out by Victor with marginal inserts. A photo of the text is given in the article. Apparently Payne pointed this out to Metzger, who acknowledged that he had not checked the original text for his 1971 textual commentary. David Bryce, who quotes favourably Metzger's 1971 position, seems unaware of Metzger's admission of error. Metzger reflects this corrected outlook in his 1994 revision, where he asks, 'Does the scribe (of Fuldensis), without actually deleting v. 34,35 from the text, intend the liturgist to omit them when reading the lesson?' (499, 500).
- The non-Western manuscript **88** of the twelfth century poses the question how such a late manuscript would place verses 34,35 after verse 40 when it was so well established as following verse 33 in the Byzantine tradition, when the last known Western texts **F** and **G** were three hundred years older than ms **88**, and the Western text was at this time regarded as an inferior text. Payne (1998), taking a position opposed to Wire, has argued that the scribe of ms **88** had a text without verses 34,35 as his exemplar, knew well verses 34,35 from the tradition, but had already written verse 36 immediately following verse 33 when he 'woke up'. Hence he placed it at the next logical place, after verse 40, but put a mark after verse 33 (as shown on Payne's photocopy of text) to draw attention to the traditional place of verse 34,35.
11. The suggested Marcionite origin for the textual variation is at best interesting. David Bryce quotes Tertullian as saying that Marcion 'used the knife, not a pen'. As Marcion had such little difficulty deleting entirely other parts of Luke and St Paul with which he did not agree, he would most likely simply have used the knife and removed verses 34,35 entirely. A Gnostic or Montanist seems just as likely.
12. On the basis of external evidence alone, the manuscript tradition is very evenly balanced between a post-verse 33 and a post-verse 40 position for verses 34,35. When one adds to the external evidence the arguments of the internal evidence, noting the tension verses 34,35 create for 1 Corinthians 11:5 and other parts of Paul's argument (see Lockwood), plus the argument for interpolation, the case for the original position of verses 34,35 after verse 40 and/or the view that the verses are an interpolation is most persuasive.

References

- Ehrman, Bart D. and Michael W. Holmes (eds)
 1995 *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*, Studies and Documents 46, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1995.
- Elliot, K. and I. Moir
 1995 *Manuscripts and the Text of the New Testament*, T.&T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1995.
- Epp, E. J. and G. D. Fee (eds)
 1993 *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*, Studies and Documents 45, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1993.
- Metzger, Bruce M.
 1994 *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, UBS, Stuttgart, 1971: rev 1994.
- Payne, Philip B.
 1995 'Fuldensis, Sigla variants in Vaticanus and 1 Cor 14.34–35', *New Testament Studies* 41, 240–262.
 1996 'Ms. 88 as Evidence for a Text without 1 Cor 14.34–35', *New Testament Studies* 44, 152–158.

RAY R. SCHULZ
Naracoorte SA

Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification – Personal Observations

During a recent visit to Geneva I participated as a former senior staff member in the meeting of the Council of the Lutheran World Federation. I also represented the Lutheran Church of Australia at this meeting, held 8–17 June 1998.

The work of the council is done through a number of committees that work for four days, after an opening plenary meeting lasting two days. The committees then report back to the full council of forty-eight persons, including the president, for final action. All council members are appointed to specific committees immediately after an assembly of the LWF and serve in that capacity until the next assembly—usually for six to seven years.

Being in Geneva again enabled me to meet old friends and colleagues in Lutheran World Service (LWS), where I had worked for some four decades. I deliberately did not attend the meetings of the Committee on World Service, preferring to participate in the work of the

committee that worked on the Joint Declaration on Justification, that is, the Committee on Ecumenical Affairs, and also the Committee on International Affairs. Nonetheless, former colleagues briefed me on the current work of LWS. The agency is challenged with finding new ways of working, envisaging a more pro-active role on the part of member churches. This approach has yet to be fully defined and understood by the member churches but will be relevant to such events as the recent catastrophes of famine and tidal wave in Papua New Guinea. It will mean that initiative for action will lie more with the relevant member churches rather than with the staff of LWS.

LWS is also grappling with redefining the role of the Auguste Victoria Hospital in Jerusalem. New tasks lie ahead for this venerable institution, which was the main referral hospital for Palestine refugees in Jerusalem and the West Bank for more than four decades.

The most significant event at this meeting of the LWF Council was the acceptance of the Joint Declaration of the Catholic