

~~⊗~~ ~~⊗~~ → on the strength of internal criticism

TEXTUAL CRITICISM ON PROBLEM FOUND IN EPHESIANS 1:14.

A. External Evidence, Presentation Of;

1. List of Variants;

- a. ~~⊗~~ → Masculine relative pronoun.
- b. ~~⊗~~ → Neuter relative pronoun.

2. Translation of Variants in Context;

- a. Reading No. 1: "...in whom having believed, you were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, WHICH is a pledge of your inheritance."
- b. Reading No. 2: "...in whom having believed, you were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, WHO is a pledge of your inheritance."

3. Classification of the Evidence;

For this information, please see pages 2 and 3.

4. Evaluation of External Evidence;

a. Date and Character;

The 1st reading is supported by the early occurrence of the variant in p<sup>46</sup>, B, A, and two significant Fathers (Origen and Athanasius) and two less significant ones. It is also supported by two general groupings of other writings; Alexandrian (9th to 13th cents.) and Western (9th to 12th cents.). However, the second reading is noticeably supported by X, the Gothic version, the Vulgate, and the significant Fathers Chrysostom and Theodoret, all coming in the 4th to 5th centuries. The second reading is also represented noticeably in the Byzantine Text-type, as well as that of the Western.

posit dates!

b. Geographical Distribution;

The first reading is primarily represented by the Alexandrian witnesses (with a few Western references), and the second reading is found scattered fairly evenly

Neil - this is not the format specified in the packet or model papers. You need to deal with each first.

#	BYZANTINE	ALEXANDRIAN	WESTERN	OTHERS
Papyri		P <sup>46</sup> II-III		
Uncials	L IX	ABP V IV IX	G F IX IX	
Minuscules		81 104 326 1739 1044 1087 XII X 6 1175 XIII XI	181 I XII	1877 1881 1962 XIV XIV XI 2495 365 XIV/XV ?
Lect.				
Versions			it <sup>d, e, g</sup> V IX IX b, d	sy <sup>r</sup> al
Church Fathers	Ephraem <sup>d.</sup> 373 Chrysostom <sup>text</sup> 407	Origen <sup>d.</sup> 254 Athanasius <sup>3rd Lat</sup> 373 Didymus 398 Cyril 444		



Papyri				
Uncials	K IX <del>Byz. IX-XVI</del>	X Ψ IV VIII/IX	D V/VI	
Minuscules	451 629 XIV XIV <b>Byz</b>	33 1241 IX XII	88 XII	330 436 614 630 XII XI XIII XIV 1984 1985 2127 2492 XIV XVI XII XIII
Lect.	Lect IX-XVI			
Versions	goth IV	vg IV/V	it ar, c, dem, f, r, x, z IX XII/III XIII VII VIII GIVE RARE IX VII-XVI	sy <sup>r</sup> ph VI
Church Fathers	Chrysostom d. 407 Theodoret 466 John-Damascus 749 Theophylact 1077	Didymus <sup>3rd Lat</sup> d. 390	Victorinus-Rome/4362	Photius (acc. to Ps. Oecumenius)

# CHRONOLOGICAL GROUPING OF VARIANTS

1st READING -- '6

Century	Byzantine	Alexandrian	Western	Other
2		P <sup>46</sup>		
3		Origen		
4	Ephraem	B, Athanasius, Didymus		
5	Chrysostom txt	A, Cyril	it <sup>d</sup>	
6				
7				
8				
9	L	P	G, F, it <sup>e, g</sup>	
10		1739		
11		81, 104, 1175		1962
12		326	181	
13		6		
14				1877, 1881, 2495
15				
?				365

28 = no. of variants

2nd READING -- '6s

Century	Byzantine	Alexandrian	Western	Other
2				
3				
4	goth	N, Didymus <sup>gr, lat</sup>	Victorinus-Rome	
5	Chrysostom, Theodoret	vg		
6	Byz.		D	
7			it <sup>r1</sup>	
8	John-Damascus		it <sup>z</sup>	
9	K	V <sup>33</sup>	it <sup>ar, f, x</sup>	
10				
11	Lect Theophylact			
12		1241	88, it <sup>c</sup>	330, 2127
13			it <sup>dem</sup>	614, 2492
14	451, 629			630, 1984, 1985
15				
?				Photius (acc. to oecumenius)

34 = no. of variants

1 that there were only two variants.

— relative groupings.

— earliest witnesses.

A.4.b

across the Byzantine, Alexandrian and Western regions. Therefore the second reading is more universally found in terms of geography.

*Does the principle apply?  
Cf. p. 32 of NITC.  
almost exclusively*

c. Genealogical Solidarity:

*the point?*

- 1. Byzantine: The second reading is largely favored, with only minor support for the first reading.
- 2. Alexandrian: The witnesses within this text-type are fairly well split, with the 1st supported by strongly by p<sup>46</sup>, B and A and several Fathers. However, the 2nd reading in this type includes X, and the Vulgate, which may even the scales. In addition, it is significant that the Alexandrian witnesses given for the 2nd reading stand in concurrence with the witnesses of the vast majority of Byzantine variants.
- 3. Western: Manuscript evidence for this text-type is fairly evenly split, with a little more representation with the second reading.

d. Conclusion:

The second reading is favored by the general universality of geographical distribution, and the general concurrence between text-types, particularly between the Byzantine and Alexandrian.

B. Internal Evidence:

*two lines to have for each variant.*

ΕΠ ΑΓΓΕΛΙΑ ΤΩ ΑΓΙΩ Ο ΕΣΤΙΝ ΑΡΡΑΒΩΝ  
 ΕΠ ΑΓΓΕΛΙΑ ΤΩ ΑΓΙΩ Ο ΕΣΤΙΝ ΑΡΡΑΒΩΝ

## B.1. Examination of the Transcriptional Evidence:

## a. Unintentional Errors:

## 1. Errors of Sight--

- a. Wrong word division-- not likely.
- b. Confusion of letters-- possibly, since OEC could have been seen for OCE or OCEC.
- c. Homoioteleuton-- conceivable. } elaborate...
- d. Metathesis-- possible (since EC could have been written for CE ), but this isn't likely.

- 2. Errors of Hearing-- possibly, 'o might sound like 'os without the most careful of hearing. wax in the ears,
- 3. Errors of Memory-- possibly, since the matter of the exact article here might have slipped the scribe's mind in the presence of such weighty context. eh?

## 4. Errors of Judgement-- not likely.

## b. Intentional Changes:

- 1. Grammatical Changes--the neuter 'o may be preferable due to the antecedent. What about this → needs much elaboration. → appd BWV ?
- 2. Spelling changes-- possible, but not likely since going from one to the other with this pronoun entertains meaning as well as spelling changes.
- 3. Historical changes-- not likely.
- 4. Harmonistic changes-- no.
- 5. Conflations-- no.
- 6. Supposed Discrepancy Elimination-- no.
- 7. Doctrinal changes-- this variation entails no significant doctrinal difference.

Summary ?

## 2. Intrinsic Evidence:

Here, it would have to be shown that Paul characteristically mentions the Holy Spirit with a more personalistic nuance, or with a more functional nuance ('o, WHICH), either of which <sup>could</sup> be true. Or both. Therefore the intrinsic factor here is not bearing on the problem.

C. Summary of Preference:

As noted, the external evidence seems to weigh slightly in favor of the second reading, 'os. Coupled with very possible errors of sight in transcription, or even errors of hearing or memory, which would seem to lend to the deletion of a sigma ~~ra~~(in small favor of simplification), the preference is for the ~~sec~~second reading, 'os.

*Handwritten notes:*  
Davenport of Hill C.  
204 A.D.  
10/1/18  
Box 828 / 20