

“Sed quis custodiet ipsos Custodes ?”. Reflexions on maintaining the accuracy of the apparatus

Most of those present will know why the IGNTP is a matter central to my life and career, but I will briefly sketch my involvement for the benefit of those who do not. There are two links. My first research on Photius was suggested by Casey and Kilpatrick not only as a subject for a doctoral thesis, but also to provide data for the critical apparatus which the IGNTP had just begun to construct. The data from Photius never appeared in the Lukan apparatus since a date-limit for patristic material was later set at AD 500, which ruled him out. After publishing my results, I went on to several different textual topics in Greek and Georgian.

Nearly twenty years later, shortly after being invited to join the British committee, I was asked to become executive editor of the edition of Luke, a task which occupied me for the next six years. It was by no means straightforward. Work which should have been done had not been done, while other work was found to contain a high incidence of mistakes of all kinds. In due course, through the constant worry of these concerns, which changed very little, I became chronically ill. Some lasting organic damage was done me so that I had to retire from the work, shortly afterwards resigning from the committee. But concern for the project has knawed at my heart like longing for a child I had been forced to abandon. I am very grateful to be permitted to take part in this symposium, the first recognition for twenty years of my involvement in the work.

I see the function of a critical apparatus as presenting with clarity and accuracy the data for the attestation of a text. It serves as the basis for the establishment of that text in all the phases of its transmission. For this, absolute accuracy is essential. Without it, it seems to me, it would be better if the apparatus were not constructed. The editorial work is the last line of defence against inaccuracy.

In this paper, I wish to draw your attention to a number of types of problem which I encountered, and which my successors will encounter or will have already encountered. My main thrust is, in answer to the Juvenalian question of my title, that the guards themselves must guard themselves and one another. My experience was (except towards the end) that the editor's task is very lonely. I hope that my suggestions will stimulate all working in the project, from basic collation upwards, to cooperate in the discernment and correction of errors. Additionally I suggest the inclusion in the collations and apparatus of other data not previously recorded. These do not alter the text but reflect options of understanding its transmission or its meaning.

In his work “Four Quartets”, T.S. Eliot wrestles to depict the grasping of eternal truth amidst temporal change. Amongst the many analogies and images upon which he draws is his own experience as a poet trying to encapsulate insights into Truth and Eternity in words which by their very nature move and change. In the final movement of the first “Quartet”, entitled “Burnt Norton” (1936), he describes the poet's dilemma in the following words : -

“Words strain

Crack and sometimes break, under the burden,
Under the tension, slip, slide, perish,
Decay with imprecision, will not stay in place,
Will not stay still. Shrieking voices
Scolding, mocking, or merely chattering,
Always assail them. The Word in the desert
Is most attacked by voices of temptation,
The crying shadow in the funeral dance,
The loud lament of the disconsolate chimera”.¹

Textual scholars too encounter and struggle against this property of words. We see it as soon as we begin to look at questions of copy and transmission, of quotation and translation, the objects of our study. It is a disappointing surprise to find the problem in our own research too. It may have been checked many times, but we suddenly hear from the wilderness our mistakes “scolding” and “mocking” us. Our desolation increases when we next discover that scholars we have been taught to revere can commit remarkable mistakes.

I first had this experience in respect of Kirsopp Lake. I had been introduced to New Testament Textual Criticism through his booklet, and devoured much of his work. His analyses of the minuscule families and of the Caesarean text witnesses fascinated me in themselves and became my pattern for the analysis of the data from Photius. It was in my next study, of 1739 and its allies, that I found words “decaying with imprecision”. Bauernfeind (in his study of Origen’s Text of Romans), acknowledges a report on the text of 1908 made for him by Lake. On that basis he gives on pg.56 the text of Romans 9.28, allegedly as found in 1908. In the text there is a short and long reading. 1908 at that point gives a shorter reading as its text and a longer marginally. Lake had transmitted a collation in which there is additionally variation of the active participles *συντελων και συντεμνων* common to both forms of text. These participles are given as prefixed by the preposition *απο*, instead of the preposition *συν*. Bauernfeind noted the discrepancy of this report with that of Tregelles. I myself discovered on checking, that this reading is not found in the manuscript itself, nor does it appear elsewhere.

Somewhere in Lake’s work one reads the advice that every collation should be checked at least three times. He clearly did not do so here, and I have lately found comments which suggest that inaccuracy has been discovered not infrequently in his work.²

Lake came under scrutiny again in connection with the work on IGNTP Luke, but not directly by me. When I had prepared five chapters ready for the press, Theodore Skeat proposed that the Greek manuscript evidence be checked by the British committee. The work was divided amongst the members, each using one or

¹ Four Quartets by T.S.Eliot. London 1946 pg.12

² Only recently have I encountered a comment of Canart and Leroy concerning a transcription by Lake : “celle-ci est due à K.Lake, ce qui n’est malheureusement pas une garantie d’exactitude” (La paléographie grecque et byzantine, Paris, 1977, pg.257, fn.63)

more previously published record of evidence ranging from collations of single manuscripts to full apparatus criticos. The results were astonishing and disturbing. In the five chapters, there were five hundred differences between the apparatus and the printed sources. The Münster Institute placed its microfilms at my disposal. Collating the microfilms, I found that in fifty of these cases the earlier records were correct and our apparatus at fault. It also came to light through Skeat's own collation of Lake's edition of "Codex 1 and its allies" that Lake could be inaccurate and had been in that famous edition !

I hope that no such shocks await those who are working on John, but I would counsel that such a check be done in penultimate stages of the preparation. I believe that that next stage is a volume on fragmentary uncials, parallel to that on papyrus texts. Such a test might be instituted before that goes to press. It should be done if possible by those who have had no active share in the work of collation and analysis. In that way, one would hope, the greatest objectivity would be ensured. It would also be a "trial run" to test the logistics and personnel requirements of this kind of process.

Many errors will be oversights, originating at an early stage of collation and overlooked. It is easy to see what we expect to see. If collators are inexperienced, there is perhaps another danger. It can happen that the text has a rare word. An instance of this is the variant within the Cry of Jubilation in Luke 10.21, the basis for my contribution to the Baarda Festschrift. This is the substitution of $\omicron\upsilon\acute{\alpha}$ for $\nu\alpha\iota$. In the IGNTP apparatus this has become $\omicron\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\iota$. This will have arisen from the relative rarity of $\omicron\upsilon\acute{\alpha}$ and the contrasting relative frequency of $\omicron\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\iota$ in Biblical Greek. It will also have been assisted by the ending of $\nu\alpha\iota$ standing in the lemma.

Another area of error is palaeography. I suppose that many palaeographers in the Biblical field are to a large extent self-taught. This should not excuse us from acquainting ourselves with the basic manuals and repertoria, and constantly extending our range. Otherwise we shall fall into such a mistake as confusion over the minuscule ligature for double-tau read as tau-gamma. This is found in published work of Geerlings and was also in the draft of Luke which I received. I dealt with the ligature and the mis-reading of it in one of my "Two notes of Biblical palaeography" (JThS ns xxvi -1975- pp.373f.)

In view of the fact that the large majority of those who learn Greek today, at least in this country, begin its study relatively late in the course of their education, we must accordingly supervise the more closely the purely linguistic aspect of the work of those we encourage to engage in these studies and to undertake collation for the Project. The ultimate objective must be to create in the collator a capacity of self-criticism. A structure of report must be erected in order to eliminate error at the earliest point in the duration of the work. The marks of failure to do this at an early stage of the work on Luke are still in some parts of the published apparatus.

Two instances of this are in my mind. Firstly, towards the end of Luke are instances where in quotations the constructions of oratio obliqua are recorded as variants, clearly by a collator who had not previously encountered the construction.

More recently in perusing the apparatus for the text of Luke chapter 13, verse 1, I observed that the spelling of the participle ἀπαγγελλοντες varies in a number of witnesses, in which one lambda is written for the two in the lemma. As it stands, such a form is a vox nihili. It is a problem to know why this form was retained. The policy in the Lucan volume was that a variant with meaning should be kept, even if nonsensical in context, but this form has no meaning. It cannot be parsed. We should check carefully and remove all such errors.

This orthographical error has given rise to a further perplexity if we look at the lectionary index at the beginning of the chapter. This, as you will know, gives the incipit in its various forms for whatever group of verses form a pericope within the system. There are five groupings, four of them alternatives for the fifth day of the eighth week of Luke. (The fifth appears to have no allocation given in the one manuscript from which attestation is given). The problem related to the misspelling meet us covertly in that the incipit recorded for the first two groups is exactly the same in every particular. In both cases it runs τῷ καιρῷ ἐκεῖνῳ (i.e. first standard incipit) παρησαν τινες ἀπαγγελλοντες τῷ ἰησοῦ περι. The participle is correctly given in both instances. But this creates an ostensible distinction between two groups with identical incipit, which must surely be an incorrect record unless it has come about through other data here hidden from the user. If it is an error, how has it come about ?

I suggest that it has arisen from the presence of the erroneous ἀπαγγελλοντες with a single lambda in a number of lectionaries. This error has been corrected at an earlier stage than the compilation of the full Greek apparatus, and through oversight the grouping based on that error has maintained its identity in spite of the tautology of the incipit. The error of course may be a Leitfehler and indicate distinctiveness in the group thus identified. (If so, it should not have been corrected). Unfortunately, Bray's monograph on the weekday Lucan readings gives his results only partially in lists of readings, and there is no reference to the spelling at all. We can pursue the hypothesis no further. My view would be that such variation should not have been recorded and the two groups with identical incipit should have been treated as one.

In the light of the long investigation occasioned by this one haplography, I suggest that in making the checks I propose, we must not only collate against published work as Skeat led us to do. We must make a beginning by reading the apparatus in draft, line by line and word by word, asking ourselves what it means in itself and what the implications of each point specified may be. Things otherwise unnoticed will thus come to light and the repetition of meaningless nonsense will be excluded.

We leave suggestions related to Greek text manuscripts and move to the patristic index, in my opinion one of the most significant contributions to information made by the IGNTF. It relates not only to study of the New Testament, but of patristics and the history of exegesis and doctrine. In the form in which we have in the Lucan volumes, it avoided distant allusions but otherwise was intended to give maximum coverage up to the date AD 500. Only Latin writers quoting from

Old Latin sources were quoted. I introduced coverage of Afrahat and Ephraim, the latter only from the Commentary on the Diatessaron and the quotations otherwise collected by Leloir. I also introduced collations of the Arabic and Persian Diatessarons. Quotation of Greek was the area most severely affected by the problem of levels of knowledge of Greek already alluded to. I do not know the present situation in respect of the patristic index to John. When in 1971, I alerted the American committee to the problems of the apparatus, they replied that they could make no corrections to this since their preparation had passed from Luke to John. Perhaps therefore the apparatus to John is ready. If so, does it include the patristic index? In that case, I suggest that it is a matter of importance that it be checked.

In many aspects we must trust our colleagues who establish the patristic text. We must use the best editions. But we must not remain heedless that the production of new editions may incidentally create new problems. One instance intrigued me from my first sight of chapter 1 of Luke. There quotations of verses 28-33 are found in two anti-Manichaean writings with exactly the same extent, and the same variants displayed. Similar phenomena are also found in chapters 10, 11 and 12. This had come about in the following way.

The *Contra Manichaeos* of Serapion of Thmuis is followed by the identically named writing of Titus of Bostra in the manuscript tradition. Before the edition of Serapion by R.P. Casey (used for the Luke volume), earlier editions of Serapion's work had derived their text from a family with a Genovese archetype. In that ms., a misplaced folium containing part of Serapion had been bound into the part containing the work of Titus. Thus that manuscript and its descendants lack part of Serapion at the correct point, which stands incognito as part of Titus. Casey corrected the text of Serapion from a Vatopedi manuscript unrelated to the rest. Titus however has not even yet been newly edited. In the printed editions available to the modern collator, the error due to misplacement of Serapion's text still stands. So misplaced Serapion was treated in error as Titus, even though for Serapion we were quoting Casey's edition where the problem is delineated and resolved. It is a nice point to determine whether we should be blamed for that. It is corrected in vol. 2 of the edition of Luke. The textual importance is that the variants are Serapion's alone in which Titus did not share. The whole scenario suggests that we need a scholar with interests in the text of the fathers to keep watch over possible sources of error of this kind.

About this kind of development, we can only be vigilant, and update when necessary. In other ways we are a little less the hostages of fortune and can make our own checks in the Patristic Index. We can use for this a work which we should consider our own patrimony, I mean the eighth edition of Tischendorf. Again and again I found that the whole of the draft apparatus including the patristic index could be supplemented from Tischendorf's observations. (Incidentally, it must be asked why, in a period when a great deal of dubious stuff has been reprinted, Tischendorf's *Editio Octava Critica Maior* has not been. Cannot a plea to publishers be made, as a matter of urgency? Even when our work and that of Münster is complete, and with the volumes of *Bibliographia Patristica*, I think a need for

Tischendorf 8a will still be found).

One or two examples can be given of the change in balance given to the apparatus of Luke by these means. The incident of the sweat of blood and the strengthening angel in Luke ch.22.43 & 44 is necessarily of great interest. In the IGNTP, by comparison even with some modern hand editions, we find the attestation of these verses by some early fathers absent. By comparison with Tischendorf, we find that Justin martyr is tucked away as an adaptation, while Hippolytus and Pseudo-Dionysius are absentees. The underlying problem here is whether or not to retain what appears to be an allusion, an adaptation by rather distant paraphrase. Justin however specifically gives the words ἰδρῶς ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι. Only the verb (κατεχέιτο "flowed down") differs from the text of the gospel, but the quotation is preceded by the assertion that this is found in the Apostolic memoirs. Its full importance for the attestation of the sweat of blood has thus not been exploited by IGNTP at all.

Hippolytus should be present, classified as an adaptation. He makes clear reference to both the sweat of blood and the empowering angel, but with some variation of the vocabulary. His references should certainly have figured as attestation of the incident's early circulation. As the argument about the identity of Hippolytus and the possibility that two authors are covered by that name is unresolved, we must continue simply to give our information under that single name. Thus, a reference from Contra Noetum reveals a text which is apparently present in a slightly adapted form in Theodoret's Florilegium called Eranistes, but is ascribed to a work on the Second Psalm. In the GCS edition by Bonwetsch it is found twice, once under each of these titles. I think we shall do well to keep to this³. (Perhaps we need an expert not only to watch the progress of critical work on the fathers, but also to comment on the significance for textual history of changes of opinion on date, authorship and so on).

There is also a reference to the episode of the sweat of blood in the work of the pseudo-Dionysius "Concerning the Heavenly Hierarchy" Chapter 4, section 4. It has simply the form of a titlos, "you know about the angel who strengthened him". This contains the verb of the text, and should have found a place. It shows textual knowledge of the pericope, and adds materially to the information available about the date and circulation of the passage in the early church.

Examination of this same passage drew attention to data in manuscripts not recorded in the Lucan volume. The IGNTP apparatus records the presence of obeloi found beside this passage in certain manuscripts. In addition, from Tischendorf and Tregelles we learn also of manuscripts with asterisks in this position. These are not mentioned in IGNTP. (Tischendorf also gives this information concerning the uncial E for Lk 23.34, which gives Jesus's prayer of forgiveness). The use of these diacritical signs is significant. Obelization

³ (As I generally speak highly of Tischendorf's accuracy, I should mention that his edition misleadingly ascribes the Theodoret reference to this verse, to "Hipp in ps 52". As he quotes an edition in four volumes this must be the seventeenth century edition of Jacques Sirmond. The error may go back to that editor, or simply have originated in the printing).

recommends excision. Asterisks indicate inclusion from an authoritative source. They thus indicate opposite critical activities, namely recommending excision or defending inclusion. I have not previously sought to gather instances of these, and have no others, apart from the very well known cases of the endings of Mark and the Pericope Adulterae. We should consider including such data when they are to hand, since they too have importance for the history of the criticism and constitution of the text. We should then cite not only the evidence for obeloi but also that for asteriskoi. One or other reference will relate to the text of the lemma found in manuscripts which by our conventions are not specified, but are assumed to attest the lemma since they are not otherwise cited. We shall have to create a means of referring in the apparatus to diacritics in such witnesses. This could be done by citing exceptionally such information from manuscripts immediately after a lemma which they attest with such signs and before any variants to it which are to be recorded.

A Johannine passage where there lurk patristic references which we must not neglect is chapter 1, verse 13. There we find a single Latin ms. which, reading a singular in place of a plural verb provides the form, which abbreviated runs qui ... ex deo natus est. The whole verse in fact reads with this change in reference to the Incarnation of the Word, not to the spiritual birth of those who believe in him. We may make a beginning with the apparatus of Tischendorf, which may be supplemented by more recent surveys, by F.-M. Braun in a F/S for M. Goguel with that Latin as title, and another by M.-E. Boismard in the early 1950s.

We may now turn to the editor's task faced with materials from the versions. The first point I mention in this area was, as so often, found by chance when recently looking at the synoptic parallels of Mark 4.10-12. There is variation in the number of "mysterion" in all three gospels in Greek witnesses and several versions. In checking the data, I looked into the IGNTP apparatus of Luke. The Georgian evidence there is given throughout as divided into three main strata. At Lk. 8.10, the second and third strata support the reading of the singular number for "mysterion", but the earliest stratum is given as omitting this noun altogether! This reading cannot be a Georgian rendering of the Greek of the lemma or of any other Greek. It cannot be construed as Georgian. How does it come about that the reading of the oldest Georgian is thus reported, and what does it signify?

The earliest stratum of Georgian gospel translation is preserved, apart from fragments, in a single manuscript, the Adysh manuscript (This verse is not in any fragment). We have a photographic facsimile (1916) and two printed editions of this manuscript (Paris 1928 [Luke, 1955] and Tbilisi 1945). I have not had access to the facsimile. In the printed editions we see that the editors have supplied the equivalent of "mysterion". A synopsis of the Georgian shows that this is reasonable, as the singular stands everywhere else in the Georgian tradition in all gospels. The error of the Adysh scribe results from an instance of that combination of features, phonetic or orthographic, to which A.C. Clark gave the useful name of hom. In the three word phrase "mystery of the kingdom of God", the first two begin with the syllable sa, while the first and third end with a morpheme which we represent by y. A glance at the diplomatic apparatus provided by Blake in the Paris edition shows

that the Adysh scribe is somewhat careless.

That problem is not difficult to resolve. Shanidze had supplied the missing word in his text, and Brière who had taken over the edition after Blake's death followed Shanidze in this.⁴ The unresolved problem, we might even say "mystery", is why Brière, as it seems must have been the case, sent a collation to the editor of IGNTP in which he gave omission of the crucial word as a variant reading. It is not. It is an error which should stand in a diplomatic edition or be reported in an apparatus for that manuscript, but it has no textual significance. The contradiction between the action of Brière as editor and as collator is very hard to comprehend.

By his own admission Brière received from Blake's estate a collation of the gospel against the Greek Textus Receptus. In spite of this, he made his collation for the Project in the form of Latin against Latin, if I remember rightly. In this, he conveyed this inaccurate and impossible "reading". This should not have been done and it was left to the editor to make a decision. The emendation of the text was part of the work of the géorgisant, and the restored text should have been given without further reference.

I would derive from this a principle that where there are transmission problems in the versions we collate, the collators who are the experts should make decisions. They should establish a text and apparatus, and not transmit the responsibility of judgement to the editors. Editors cannot have too many languages but will never have all that are needed. It follows that, as versional material is being ingrafted, there must be constant interchange between the editor and the collators, wherever there is any matter of doubt or perplexity. The same applies with all quotations. We cannot view our task as purely mechanical, and may rightly ask for elucidation. The collator nevertheless has final judgement of the version for which he is responsible in diplomatic and philological matters.

In any version, even from Greek to Latin, languages fairly closely related one to another, there will be points where it may prove impossible to determine the Greek text before the original translator, because the form of the receptor language cannot convey the nuance of the original. Perhaps we should find a means of intimating in the apparatus where this is so, but it is very frequent and might encumber the apparatus too much.

The interpretation of the Greek text is an area in which the evidence of the versions is potentially of great interest and importance. Where there are latent in the Greek various possibilities of syntax or of the specific meaning of some word, the translator has to choose. In John in Georgian there are not, I think, any such striking examples of the kind which I have found for instance in the Pauline epistles. There are nevertheless a number of places where the Greek text leaves open the understanding of the mood of a verb or has within it two possibilities of the structure of connection between two sentences. The Georgian translators have chosen. The apparatus will be the poorer and will fail in one part of its objective if

⁴ This is in fact a little more complicated. R.P. Blake died while editing the Luke and John volumes. Brière took over the work. The decision to follow Shanidze may have been Blake's.

we do not include these categories of information. A policy should be determined for a way to bring this type of information before our users.

This matter will overlap in our record with the data of the patristic index. In a remarkable case, that of Jesus's saying in John 7.37,38, there is no Greek manuscript evidence for one of the two alternative possibilities of punctuation. Some versional evidence is given greater force by a patristic muster in its support. In some statements the catalogue of names is made rather more impressive than it should be so far as I can judge, yet clearly Hippolytus, Cyprian and the author of *De Rebaptismate* read the verses so that the reference of verse 38 is to the issue of the Spirit from Christ not from those who believe in Him.

In summary then, I wish to counsel all the team at work on the presentation of the apparatus criticus to the gospel according to St. John to make careful plans for the checking of all the evidence right up to the last moments when the book must "go to bed". I have also, allowing my memory to guide me, observed a number of issues which it has not been the wont of textual experts to display in their apparatus or others which were not included within the remit of the editors of the Lucan volume. We must accordingly review the objectives of a critical apparatus and, if necessary, extend our materials and modes of presentation in the light of that review.

Finally, I wish to strike a note not generally sounded in textual criticism but which may reflect sentiments which are not mine alone. Writing of the Bollandists in his collection entitled "Great Historical Enterprises", Dom David Knowles wrote of Papebroch, "he saw historic truth as a Dominican sees theological truth, as a reflection of Truth itself perceptible by the intellect, and as something to be freed from and defended against every attempt to cloud or to confuse it." This evokes an echo in my heart. Although I had never defined the relation of my area of research and learning to my faith in quite this way before I read those words by Dom David, I find upon examination that his words encapsulate what at heart I have been trying to do.

Eliot depicts his struggle for precise expression as poet not only as personal to himself or to his fellows, but as in some sort a sharing of the experience of the Incarnate Word in the desert. Jesus has been driven there by the spirit to discover his true identity and destiny. Eliot through his poetic strivings is seeking to know Truth about himself and about eternal reality. I hope that we may find our textual work both motivation and reward in such a quest, so that our constant wrestling with words, questioning their original form and the mechanics of their change, becomes an integral part of the spiritual life, where however often mocked by "the disconsolate chimera", we find at moments, as the poet says in his closing lines, Truth bursting in upon us "sudden in a shaft of sunlight".

J.Neville Birdsall