

## TEXTUAL CRITICISM ON THE GREEK TEXT OF THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES: A BIBLIOGRAPHY

W. L. RICHARDS  
Andrews University

Speaking of the Catholic Epistles, Jean Duplacy wrote in 1958, "Ni l'histoire du *corpus* ni celle du texte n'ont été très étudiées."<sup>1</sup> But it now appears that at long last the Catholic Epistles will take their deserved place in the field of textual criticism. The most notable evidence of this is the extensive energy presently being devoted to the Greek text of the Catholics at the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung in Münster. Nothing anywhere today can equal the efforts that are being made there.

The past neglect of the Catholic Epistles so far as textual criticism is concerned is readily made evident by a look at the two major bibliographical works on textual criticism.<sup>2</sup> Other than relatively recent developments and the work of von Soden over 60 years ago, the only text critical work done in this section of the NT has been on single pericopes. As already indicated, the scene is now changing, however. In addition to the activity in Münster, two doctoral dissertations have been written in the past ten years on the Greek text, at least one other is now being written,<sup>3</sup> and some major studies on the Greek lectionaries and versions have been done.

In view of the prominence now being given to these NT books, it is the purpose of this article to provide a bibliographical picture of what has been done in text critical studies on the Greek text of the Catholics. Two further articles are planned for future issues of *AUSS*, one which will deal with textual criticism on the Catholic Epistles in the versions, in the Greek lectionaries, and in

<sup>1</sup>*Où en est la critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament?* (Paris, 1959), p. 64.

<sup>2</sup>Those of Bruce M. Metzger and Jean Duplacy. See entries under "Bibliographies."

<sup>3</sup>See entries under "Books and Dissertations."

the quotations in the church fathers; and another which will deal with text critical aids for the Catholic Epistles. The bibliographical references in the present article appear under four headings in the order of the date of publication: (1) Bibliographies, (2) Articles, (3) Books and Dissertations, and (4) Commentaries.

### I. BIBLIOGRAPHIES

Bruce M. Metzger compiled a bibliography on the text critical studies that were produced during the years 1914-1939;<sup>4</sup> and Jean Duplacy has been periodically providing reports from 1940 to the present, first in *Recherches de Science Religieuse*,<sup>5</sup> and from 1968 in *Biblica* with the assistance of C. M. Martini. Both Metzger and Duplacy cover a wide range of text critical studies and tools: handbooks on textual criticism, catalogs, Greek MSS, versions, citations in the church fathers, classification of MSS, studies on specific passages, etc. The work of these text critics has been a valuable source for locating much of the material given below.<sup>6</sup>

1. Bruce M. Metzger, *Annotated Bibliography of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament 1914-39*. Vol. 16 of *Studies and Documents*, eds. Silva Lake and Carsten Hoeg (Copenhagen: E. Munksgaard, 1955).

#### 2. Jean Duplacy

- (a) *Où en est la critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament?* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1959). This book brings three articles together that originally appeared in *RechSR* 45 (1957), 419-441; 46 (1958), 270-313, 431-462.
- (b) "Bulletin de critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament, I" *RechSR* 50 (1962), 242-263, 564-598; 51 (1963), 432-463.
- (c) "Bulletin de critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament, II" *RechSR* 53 (1965), 257-284; 54 (1966), 426-476.
- (d) "Bulletin de critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament, III" *Bib* 49 (1968), 515-551; 51 (1970), 84-129.
- (e) "Bulletin de critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament, IV" *Bib* 52 (1971), 79-113; 53 (1972), 245-278.

<sup>4</sup>This work covers the same period of time as Werner Georg Kümmel's "Textkritik und Textgeschichte des Neuen Testaments 1914-1937," in *TRu*, N.F. 10 (1938), 206-221, 292-327; 11 (1939), 84-107.

<sup>5</sup>Hereinafter: *RechSR*.

<sup>6</sup>To indicate Metzger's entry numbers and to indicate a comment that has been taken from Duplacy's notation, the name of the text critic is given in parenthesis at the end of an entry.

## II. ARTICLES

There are eleven entries in Metzger's *Annotated Bibliography* on 1 Jn 5:7 which are not cited here: the entries are 1090-1098, 1002 and 1180. Duplacy also refers to several studies on 1 Jn 5:7 on page 64 of *Où en est. . .* Most of these articles are on the Latin text.

1. Wilhelm Bousset, "Neues Testament: Textkritik," *TRu* 17 (1914), 143-154, 187-206. "An interpretative survey of the literature from 1908-1913" (Metzger).
2. Adolf von Harnack, "Zur Textkritik und Christologie der Schriften des Johannes." *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1915, pp. 534-573 (Metzger, 879).
3. J. Belser, "Zur Textkritik der Schriften des Johannes," *TQ* 98 (1916), 145-184. A critique of Harnack's article above (Metzger, 842).
4. J. Rendel Harris, "Emendations to the Greek of the New Testament," No. 12 of *The After Glow Essays* (London, 1935). Passages: 1 Pe 1:12 and 3:19 (Metzger, 886).
5. I. A. Herkel, "Konjekturen zu einigen Stellen des neutestamentlichen Textes," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 106 (1935), 314-317. Passage: 1 Pe 3:4 (Metzger, 890).
6. E. Klostermann, "Zum Texte des Jakobusbriefes," in *Verbum Dei Manet in Aeternum*, Festschrift O. Schmitz, ed. W. Foerster (Witten: Luther Verlag, 1953).
7. D. Hemmerdinger-Iliadou, "II Pierre, II, 18 d'après l'Éphrem Grec," *RB* 64 (1957), 399-401. C preserves the best text in the passage and the reading in B at this point is corrupt.
8. F. W. Beare, "The Text of I Peter in Papyrus 72," *JBL* 80 (1961), 253-260. The manuscript is not the work of a careful scribe, but the underlying text seems to be of good quality. Two lists given: (1) singular readings, (2) readings which relate to known variants, with a table of agreements/disagreements P<sup>72</sup> has with B ❧ A C ψ sah, and Stephanus.
9. Hellmut Lenhard, "Ein Beitrag zur Übersetzung von II Ptr 3:10d," *ZNW* 52 (1961), 128-129. Contextually and grammatically the text should read "Aber die Erde (=Menschheit) und die auf (in) ihr geschehenen Taten werden (vor Gottes Gericht) offenbar werden" (see no. 11 below).
10. Floyd V. Filson, "More Bodmer Papyri," *BA* 25 (1962), 50-57. General discussion of the Bodmer Papyri; P<sup>72</sup> indicates that the text of the Catholic Epistles was rather well preserved.
11. Frederick Danker, "II Peter 3:10 and the Psalms of Solomon 17:10," *ZNW* 53 (1962), 82-86. Publication of P<sup>72</sup> is occasion for re-examining 2 Pe 3:10. Writer argues for an alternate text and sees clarification in a Psalm of Solomon; the new reading: "The earth shall be judged according to the deeds done in it." The reading of B and ❧ is corrupt.

12. E. Massaux. "Le texte de l'Épître de Jude du Papyrus Bodmer VII (P<sup>72</sup>)," *Scrinium Lovaniense. Mélanges historiques Étienne van Couwenbergh* (Louvain: University of Louvain, 1961), pp. 108-125. P<sup>72</sup> essentially belongs to the "Hesychian" text and is also a witness to the "wild texts."
13. E. Massaux, "Le texte de la I<sup>a</sup> Petri du Papyrus Bodmer VIII (P<sup>72</sup>)," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 39 (1963), 616-671. P<sup>72</sup> in I Pe is closer to the minuscule witnesses of the "Hesychian" group, and because it agrees at times with witnesses from other groups, Massaux concludes that it is a "témoin de ces textes sauvages qu'il devait encore en circuler au IIIe siècle" (p. 671).
14. J. N. Birdsall, "The Text of Jude in P<sup>72</sup>," *JTS* 14 (1963), 394-399. In response to E. Massaux, the antiquity and widespread attestation of P<sup>72</sup> is defended.
15. Marchant A. King, "Notes on the Bodmer Manuscript," *BS* 121 (1964), 54-57. King looks at unique readings and concludes that the Alexandrian text is the basis of this papyrus and that although not of first rank among NT papyri, it is a good witness.
16. Jerome D. Quinn, "Notes on the Text of the P<sup>72</sup> 1 Peter 2:3; 5:14; and 5:9," *CBQ* 27 (1965), 241-249. Quinn selects these three passages to illustrate the contribution P<sup>72</sup> can make to textual criticism.
17. M. M. Carder, "A Caesarean Text in the Catholic Epistles?" *NTS* 16 (1970), 252-270. An article based on her Th.D. dissertation. She uses Colwell's method and concludes that Gregory 1243 is not Byzantine in Catholic Epistles, but has high proportion of Alexandrian and Western readings, and since Caesarean is the only text with this ratio the MS could be Caesarean.
18. Jean Duplacy, "Le texte occidental des Épîtres Catholiques," *NTS* 16 (1970), 397-399. Author summarizes opinions of a seminar held in Frankfurt which concluded that the problem of a Western Text in the Catholic Epistles is unsolved and perhaps even more difficult than in the Gospels (because Bezae does not contain Catholic Epistles). Any solution will require more research.
19. J. T. Gallagher, "A Study of von Soden's H-Text in the Catholic Epistles," *AUSS* 8 (1970): 97-119. He uses a modified form of Colwell's method, and concludes that von Soden was wrong to exclude 1739 from the H-text of James, but was correct in including P in the H-text.
20. Kurt Aland, "Bemerkungen zu den gegenwärtigen Möglichkeiten textkritischer Arbeit aus Anlass einer Untersuchung zum Cäsarea-Text der Katholischen Briefe," *NTS* 17 (1970), 1-9. The person who takes into account all of the recent developments in textual criticism may only accept the following with certainty: the existence of Egyptian, Byzantine, and D texts; even the early text was not uniform. Strong criticism of Carder's article (see no. 17 above). Only those MSS which can be brought into congruence either with Origen or Eusebius in the critical places can claim the title *Caesarean*.

## III. BOOKS AND DISSERTATIONS

1. H. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt*. I Teil: Untersuchungen, III Abteilung: die Textformen, B. der Apostolos mit Apokalypse (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1911). The section on the Catholic Epistles is covered on pages 1840-1898 and represents the only classification ever done on the Greek text of the Catholic Epistles until the 1960s. See entries 7 and 9 for subsequent studies on classification in terms of his work, and also under *Articles*, entry 19.
2. M.-J. Lagrange, *Critique Textuelle II, La Critique Rationnelle* 2nd ed. (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1935). Von Soden's work is discussed and questioned, e.g. the problem of von Soden's formation of sub-groups on the basis of incomplete collations; existence of the I-text has not been proved, much less can it be a representative of the D-text. Many citations from Jas are used to illustrate the problems noted and to illustrate the characteristics of the B-type.
3. Sakae Kubo, "A Comparative Study of P<sup>72</sup> and the Codex Vaticanus" (University of Chicago Ph.D. dissertation, 1964). First major investigation into the Greek text of the Catholics since von Soden. In the appendix the question of MS classification for the Catholic Epistles was reopened. See next entry.
4. Sakae Kubo, *P<sup>72</sup> and the Codex Vaticanus*. Vol. 27 of *Studies and Documents*, ed. Jacob Geerlings (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1965). Essentially the work mentioned in number 3 above without the appendix. The text of P<sup>72</sup> is compared with B and then evaluated. With singular readings excluded, P<sup>72</sup> emerges as a text superior to that of B. B is not as free from improvements as has been previously thought. Methodology of Zuntz was used. Collation provided from page 155 on.
5. Sergio Daris, *Un nuovo frammento della Prima Lettera di Pietro (1 Petr. 2,20-3,12)* in *Papyrologica Castroctavina Studio et Textus*, 2 (Barcelona, 1967). P<sup>81</sup> contains with lacunae the portion of 1 Pe mentioned in the title. Confidently dated in the fourth century (Duplacy).
6. J. Harold Greenlee, *Nine Uncial Palimpsests of the Greek N.T.* Vol 39. of *Studies and Documents*, ed. Jacob Geerlings (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968). Four of the nine uncial contain portions of the Catholic Epistles: 0209, fragments of 2 Pe 1 and 2; 0245: fragments of 1 Jn 3 and 4; 0246: fragments of Jas 1; 0247: fragments of 1 Pe 5 and 2 Pe 1; 0247: a few words from 2 Pe 1. MSS are collated, 0209 has a few important non-Byzantine readings; the other Catholic Epistles uncial are either Byzantine, or it is impossible to identify the textual affinity.
7. M. M. Carder, "An Inquiry into the Textual Transmission of the Catholic Epistles" (Victoria University [Toronto] Th.D. dissertation 1968). Deals with 1 Pe and 1-3 Jn. The MSS used in the dissertation are discussed "according to von Soden's classifications," although only a few of the 25 MSS used were actually classified by von Soden. In ch. 2 the textual characteristics which are identified as Alexandrian and those which are

identified as Alexandrian and those which are identified as Byzantine are set forth. A delineation of textual groupings (using Colwell's method) is given in ch. 3, and then in ch. 4 the question is asked, "Was von Soden's classification correct?"

8. Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1971). Metzger writes in the preface: "One of the chief purposes of the commentary is to set forth the reasons that led the committee, or a majority of the members of the committee, to adopt certain variant readings for inclusion in the text and to relegate certain other readings to the apparatus." The commentary on the Catholic Epistles is on pages 679-730.
9. W. L. Richards, "The Textual Relationships of the Greek Manuscripts of the Johannine Epistles: Establishment and Classification of the Manuscript Groupings" (Northwestern University Ph.D. dissertation, 1974). Classification is based on the analysis of 82 fully collated MSS. Selection of MSS insured that a minimum of three MSS were used from the only previously named groups, those of von Soden. Analysis was aided by a computer.
10. Books on textual criticism. Although the authors of these books draw most of their examples from the Gospels, some have cited passages from the Catholic Epistles. Westcott and Hort (*The New Testament in the Original Greek*, 1881) cite 1 Pe seven times, 2 Pe three times, 1 Jn four times, 2 Jn once, and Jude five times. Lagrange cites Jas many times and a few others (see no. 2 above). Greenlee (*Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*, 1964) cites 1 Jn 3:1. Metzger (*The Text of the New Testament*, 1964) cites 1 Pe 3:19 and 1 Jn 5:7. V. Taylor (*Text of the New Testament*, 1964) gives none.

#### IV. COMMENTARIES WITH GREEK TEXT

The commentaries listed here are not only based on the Greek text, but are commentaries which have said something about the text beyond a mere listing of variants and their support.<sup>7</sup> The judgments made about the quality of a witness often reflect the influence of Westcott and Hort.

##### *General*

1. Bernhard Weiss, *Die Katholischen Briefe* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1892). Around 90 pages devoted to the nature of the Greek text under four headings: (1) Representatives of the later uncial

<sup>7</sup>This means that such commentaries as the following are not listed, even though they used the Greek text: H. von Soden, *Hebräerbrief, Briefe des Petrus, Jacobus, Judas*, 1892; F. J. A. Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter 1:1-2:17*, 1898; E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, 1946; Rudolf Bultmann, *Die drei Johannesbriefe*, 1967; etc.

- manuscripts, K L P; quality of these manuscripts is inferior (pp. 2-23). (2) Representatives of the older uncials,  $\aleph$  A C; their strengths and weaknesses are discussed (pp. 24-56). (3) Relationships between these first two groups K L P /  $\aleph$  A C separately and collectively (pp. 57-79). (4) A comparison of B with the other codices (pp. 88-91).
2. W. Robertson Nicoll, ed. *The Expositor's Greek Testament* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910). Vols. 4, 5 include the Catholic Epistles.
    - (a) W. E. Oesterley on Jas. Brief section on text; after listing 7 uncials, author states that the cursives are cited by their numbers, but only when they offer interesting readings (4:414).
    - (b) J. H. A. Hart on 1 Pe; no separate section on the Greek text, but witnesses are cited in the commentary with evaluative remarks, e.g. "the three great uncials" or "MSS of secondary importance."
    - (c) R. H. Strachan on 2 Pe; author cites variants and lists the MS support both of the Greek and of the versions and the editors of published NT Greek texts.
    - (d) David Smith on 1-3 Jn. Text used is 1560 Stephanus: "Constructed from a few late and inferior MSS . . . , it is far from satisfactory; and the principal variants are presented in the critical notes" (5:165). Nestle's text "is probably a very close approximation to the sacred autographs" (5:165). Lists major uncials and mentions that there are more than 200 minuscules (5:165-166).

### James

1. Joseph B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. James* (London: Macmillan, 1913). Uncials are listed with a discussion of the quality of B and  $\aleph$ . Mayor mentions that there are 416 minuscules and lists 13 which he considers to be "of most value"; he uses Westcott and Hort, Alford and Tregelles, Tischendorf and others for his *Apparatus Criticus*. Rather extensive discussion of variants in the commentary.
2. James H. Ropes, *Epistle of James*. Vol. 40 of ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1916; reprint 1954). Gives the MSS containing James by century and mentions along with the commonly cited uncials 3 papyri MSS (Oxyrhynchus 1171 [P<sup>21</sup>]; Oxy 1229, Oxy frag *papiri greci e latini*, i, 1912, No. 5). Lists 33 and 69 and states that there are ca. 475 medieval MSS in Gregory's and von Soden's lists. K L P S have no distinctive readings which commend themselves as originals (p. 85). Although B is not free from error, it should be followed where internal evidence of readings is not decisive (p. 85). Cites witnesses for support of variant readings in the commentary.

### Petrine Epistles and Jude

1. Ernst Köhl, *Die Briefe Petri und Judae*, of the Meyer's *Kommentar*, 6th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1897). Variants are given in footnotes where Köhl often speaks of the judgments of his contemporaries in textual criticism and why he has accepted or rejected a particular reading.

2. Charles Bigg, *Epistles of St. Peter and Jude*. Vol. 41 of the ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902). Discusses variants and lists their support.
3. J. B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter* (London: Macmillan, 1907; reprint 1965). Mayor presents in ch. 12 the textual problems he is concerned with from both books. In those instances where B is either unsupported by other uncials, or by just one or two others, Mayor indicates those he has accepted and those he has either rejected or about which he has a question (pp. cci-ccii). The textual problems in Jude are greater than in any other NT book (p. 245).
4. G. Wohlenberg, *Der erste und zweite Petrusbrief und der Judasbrief*. Vol. 14 of *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, ed. T. Zahn (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Werner Scholl, 1915). Seven uncials are mentioned, their content and their von Soden classification. "Die etwa zu berücksichtigenden Minuskeln werden jeweilig, wo es not ist, kurz charakterisiert werden" (p. 1). Supporting evidence for readings given in the footnotes.
5. F. W. Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes*. 2d ed. rev. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958). In the first chapter Beare lists the nine uncial MSS which contain these epistles and singles out four minuscules which "are of exceptional interest" (p. 1). He mentions his own evaluations of the various MSS, speaking highly of B among the uncials, and of 1739 among the minuscules. In his commentary the witnesses are often cited where variants are involved.
6. Karl Hermann Schelkle, *Die Petrusbriefe, Der Judasbrief*, 3d ed. in Herder's *Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, eds. Alfred Wikenhauser and Anton Vögtle (Basel: Herder, 1970). Schelkle lists the nine uncials and categorizes them into two text-types, Egyptian and Byzantine (p. 16), and mentions several of the key minuscules (out of 500 containing these Epistles). P<sup>72</sup> is Egyptian and often agrees with B A and 1739 (pp. 16, 17).

### *Johannine Epistles*

1. Brooke Foss Westcott, *The Epistles of St. John*, 3d ed. (London: Macmillan, 1892). Westcott lists in chapter one the "primary" and "secondary" uncials and refers to "more than 200" cursives, including several he singles out. He gives a list of 59 readings he has adopted against the TR; and as might be expected, all 59 are supported by B. His disdain for the minuscule MSS and high regard for the "ancient uncials" is apparent in several remarks as well as in his comments in the text where variants appear.
2. Bernhard Weiss, *Handbuch über die drei Briefe des Apostel Johannes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1888). The Greek text is not given as such—detailed comments on Greek including variants.
3. A. E. Brooke, *Johannine Epistles*. Vol. 42 of ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1912; reprint 1948). Brooke begins with a list of "most of the older

and more important MSS . . ." (p. lxii). Good summary account of von Soden's assignment of variants for his different groups: I-H-K readings, uncertain readings and *Sonderlesarten* from von Soden's various categories (pp. lxxv-lxxix). In the commentary itself Brooke lists many variants with the MS support.

4. Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Die Johannesbriefe*. Vol. 13 of Herder's *Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, eds. Alfred Wikenhauser & Anton Vögtle, 2nd ed. rev. (Freiburg: Herder, 1963). The most important witnesses for the Johannine Epistles are representatives of the Egyptian text; minuscule representatives of this text are 6, 33, 81, 104, 323, 326, 1175 and, of special value, 1739. K L S and most of the minuscules represent the Koine-Text. The uncertainties of the early textual history require one to decide on the merits of a reading separately. The problem of the "Comma Johanneum" is not a problem for the Greek MS tradition, but rather it is a concern that belongs to the history of the Latin text of the Bible (p. 45).

(To be continued)