

1 Corintians 14.34-35 : the significance of the evidence of Ms.88

The textual variation with which this paper deals is the differing position within chapter 14 of 1 Corinthians of the verses 34 & 35, often alluded to in the literature by the initial words of their first main sentence in the Latin versions, "Mulieres taceant". In all Greek evidence with one notable exception and in all versions with the exception of some Latin manuscripts and perhaps additionally Armenian witness, the verses stand in the sequence which the numeral indication of the verses suggests. The presence of the words of the verses 34 & 35 after verse 40 is the variation to which these exceptions give testimony. Evidence of this sequence is also found in the commentaries of some Latin authors. Where the words of verse 34 are found in this later position, the words "as in all the gatherings of the saints" are treated as part of verse 33. The pericope now begins with the words "hai gynaiques" or its equivalent.

There are four groups of evidence. Firstly in the family of related mss. which give us a Greek text of St. Paul's epistles with Latin renderings, the mss. Claromontanus, Augiensis and Boernerianus. Of these the first and second named give the texts facing one another, the third gives the Latin text as an interlinear above the Greek. Two copies made from Claromontanus have also been preserved but while they supply lacunae etc. they have no importance for the study of this pericope. The Latin commentators in whose work the variant is known are the Ambrosiaster and Sedulius Scottus. Two manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Book of Armagh and the commentary manuscript of Budapest also have this order, and one ninth century Vulgate manuscript. The fourth source of attestation is a Greek manuscript of the twelfth century.

The Latin and Greek attestation is named by all critical studies and apparatus. An additional reference is given in the hand edition of Augustin Merk SJ who appears to be followed by GDKilpatrick. (Kilpatrick as I discovered in reviewing his edition of the Greek NT, culled additions to the versional evidence from various sources recently published at the the time of that edition.) It is Armenian evidence to which Merk made reference. This evidence is not drawn from Zohrab's edition. Merk in his introduction indicates that (in addition to Zohrab) he has drawn on a fragmentary ms. in the library of the Mechitarists and from a ms. in the Royal Library in Copenhagen. This latter will be the source of this information as it contains the Paulines complete (Rhodes 56), the former (apparently) I cannot identify. So far as I can ascertain this collation has not been published. To confirm this conjectural identification is a remaining task. It may be added from my own experience that whereas Merk's references do not always command confidence, I have found those from Armenian trustworthy.

The section or pericope in chapter 14 clearly interrupts the thought of its context. It has been moved to the end to correct this problem, but that this is an attempted correction is shown by the fact that the original opening words "as in all the assemblies - or, churches - of the saints" have been left behind, rather awkwardly. They make sense neither with verse 33 nor with verse 36. The addition doceo / διδασκω in part of the Latin tradition is an evident attempt to smoothe this

in places

This / SVET

if use a
for
after
further
identity etc

?

difficulty. Recent scholarship has generally reached the conclusion that the section not an original part of Paul's composition, but is to be regarded as an early interpolation, probably reflecting some later situation. There are however many inconcinnities in the epistles, and these have often attracted inner emendation which we perceive as variants. Perhaps we might explore an examination of the question in the context of such emendation. I am myself not sure whether the hypothesis of a later gloss is fact resolves the problem, but it seems the best that textual critics and exegetes as a body can do at present.

My attention was drawn to this crux criticorum by the article of Philip Payne in NTS for 1978. (The author of this article would make a good forward in the game of rugby football, so far as his approach to a matter in hand is concerned. He comes out ready to fight and makes straight for the ball.) An earlier article also dealt with the question, and brought in other evidence. (This may be considered in terms of my metaphor the "first half") I must confine myself to his second appearance (on the field. No finesse hides his objective) He tells us in his title what he intends to do and proceeds in his own way to do it. I do not think that he can succeed. (Taking on the role of coach) I shall myself indicate the weaknesses and false arguments which doom his attempt to defeat.

(In the course of study I also perused the work of Professor Antoinette Wire, to which Mr. Payne makes reference. I am sorry that I have not had sufficient time to submit her work to detailed criticism. She appears to have a sounder philological formation than Payne, but is evidently not a specialist in textual criticism).

The article to which I refer needs a corrective since its author has given himself an impossible task. He wishes to prove from the data that the exemplar of the Greek ms. 88 presented a text in which the passage 34-35 was completely absent. Its scribe apparently was unaware of this until he had written as far as verse 40. (I am not sure whether this is given any explanation).

This whole approach to the question, ingenious as it is, casts light upon the author's psychology. He is far from the theological viewpoint sometimes called "fundamentalist". Yet he shares a common feature of thinking with fundamentalism. (Perhaps he is an "exile" from a church of that type.) To put it very simply, just as the fundamentalist reposes complete and unsophisticated confidence in objective printed or written documents, trusting what is written down, Payne seeks to convince his readers by such an appeal to objectivity. This takes the form of a attempted demonstration that ms. 88 was copied, in the immediate direct line of its ancestry, from a text in which this pericope was not to be found. While in agreement with the majority of modern critics on the spurious status of the pericope, he evidently cannot accept the process of conjecture, feeling it to be a weakness, but seeks concrete evidence by such an attempt at reconstruction of the scribe's procedures. He has worked industriously, and has some knowledge of textual data, but he shows nevertheless great weaknesses in a number of germane matters.

In my presentation of the issues, I shall not follow Payne's order, but shall deal with the manuscript 88 in its own right. I hope that it will be found that all his

procedures and hypotheses are covered by this .

The manuscript numbered 88 in the Gregory-Aland list is a minuscule dateable in the twelfth century, preserved in the Biblioteca Nazionale of Napoli, with call mark II.A.7. I have been able to do a certain amount of preliminary work, although various (personal) matters (including a recent surgical operation) have prevented my pursuing everything as far as it must eventually be taken. I believe that the whole text of the manuscript must be studied but have not yet obtained photographs. Mr. Payne in his article has reproduced in reduced facsimile the folium (64, scil. recto) where this passage of 1 Corinthians is found, and a full size reproduction of half the right-hand column of that folium where it is specifically located. This has enabled me to do the work I present today. I am very grateful to my friend Nigel Wilson of Lincoln College, Oxford, who examined the material in NTS and made some helpful comments.

He identified it at once as a manuscript of South Italian provenance although he took the specification no further than this. My own investigations, using primarily the monograph of Devreesse, suggest to me that it is to be placed in the sub-category of mss. originating in the school of Rossano. Neither the ms. itself nor the history of the library where it now resides give us any further help. The contents of the ms. are the praxapostolos followed by the Apocalypse. It is unfortunately mutilated by the loss of a number of folia at the end, the Apocalypse extending no further than the end of ch.3, vs.13. If any colophon or other such informative material stood at its end, we no longer have it. Nor does its location help us. While there had been a royal library at Naples at an earlier stage of the region's history, it had been dispersed before the establishment of the present institution, which dates from no earlier than the fifteenth century. This was not first collected in Naples, but elsewhere in Italy. I have not yet been able to make contact with the library authorities who may have further data in their files. (I have taken these data from Lake & Lake, Indices [1945] who appear simply to repeat the information of Gardthausen as given in 1903).

Payne is perplexed that a Greek manuscript with the pericope in this position should have been prepared. He writes as if it must have needed a bilingual as its source of this order. I presume that his term "Western manuscript" must bear this significance, which creates yet another misuse for Griesbach's term, misleading since it first was coined. His perplexity seems to stem from the fact that we know of no such manuscript nor of manuscript with Greek text alone - the model has disappeared. That it may have been a manuscript with Greek text only is not stated by him. The naiveté of his view is astonishing in one so interested in manuscripts and the habits of their scribes, so far as he can discern them, in this matter at least. (He seems to have little bibliography in the field, in which) a number of facts are unknown to him.

Firstly, a large number of manuscripts have been destroyed over the centuries. The sack of Constantinople by the Franks of the so-called fourth Crusade is a signal example on a grand scale of what was happening throughout the world of those days. It took place when the exemplar of ms.88 might still have been extant

Calabria
per papyrus
mt

misuse

date:

2
this
to prove it

which should be taken into account

for

and relatives of that text too may have perished then. Sicily and South Italy had been, and were to be, ravaged by many an invasion and many a campaign. Some of us have seen it yet again in our lifetime. Monasteries and palaces were plundered and destroyed. The wonder is not that we have no evident links or ancestry for this or any other particular manuscript or form of text. It is that anything survived at all, and that products of a time of peace, become the plunder of a succeeding time of war, or gifts of diplomacy, could find safe homes and be here for the twentieth century for us to discuss. Events in our lifetime should make us all alert to this scenario. Our own wars have caused manuscripts to perish, while in the same conflicts others from past ages have been unearthed.

From pre-Roman times, there were strong Greek settlements in Southern Italy and Sicily. As cultural centres they survived until the end of the Middle Ages, and a few villages in South Italy still have had Greek as the local dialect and perhaps still do. There were varying fortunes for that culture. The Normans restored Greek monasteries, the Angevin rulers of a later period neglected them. At no time during the medieval period was Italy without some production of Greek manuscripts. In the centuries following that in which ms.88 was copied, Greek manuscripts from South Italy and teachers of Greek could be brought to the West, for example to England for Robert Grosseteste. Some we still have, others again have disappeared. We do not know the codicology of the ancestors of ms.88. (But we have a solid survey by Devreesse to name a basic survey which) shows us that a number of centres of Greek copy existed in South Italy from the ninth to the fourteenth century. In the same areas there were also centres of Latin manuscript production. Interaction of two scriptural traditions is not ruled out at any point.

LP

in the early part of this century

positive

work

But it is not only in that direction that we should look to explain the data that perplex Payne. The ultimate ancestor of the Greek text of the bilinguals which we have were authentic Greek products. They were not necessarily "Western" in origin in a geographical sense. (Souter suggested that some exegeses of Ambrose and the Ambrosiaster might be found in catena comments derived from Chrysostom and Theodoret, and he pointed to a recent edition of a catena manuscript.) This suggestion has not been followed up. Before it can be, the editing of Chrysostom and Theodoret must be advanced further than at present. Whether this would bring new data to bear on our problem is not known but we have no reason to believe that the text of ms.88 should be traced to any but a purely Greek ancestry.

even

will be reasonable from

We can begin this part of the enquiry by examining the one page of text which the photograph gives us, and see what its textual nature is. In the light even of this meagre base of evidence we can, as I consider, perceive something about the origin of the marginal annotations that relate to verses 34 & 35. We shall do well as we make this examination and extend it when we can, to bear in mind a frequent emphasis of Zuntz. He stressed throughout his monograph on the text of the epistles that the concurrence of the so-called Western and Byzantine traditions seen in the attestation of a number of Pauline variants does not betoken the borrowing of variants proper to a Western tradition in the creation of the Byzantine text. It rather demonstrates that these two traditions have preserved a common

H do this

* from place at Crown or 2 in Adam for a copy of the ms edited in the exhibition - no comment on this part journal

ancient stratum of text, dating back to before the date at which they began to diverge. It is this which we see in these few verses, and which I think we can anticipate may extend throughout the text of this ms., at least for the Pauine corpus.

The text visible in this photograph extends from verse 16 of ch. 14 to verse 1 of ch.15. There are a number of orthographical errors, and a few singular readings. Collations made (one against NA26, one against TR as reproduced for the IGNTP) show a text which is basically Byzantine. In vss.18, 26, 37, 34 & 35, readings are found which are shared by Byzantine witnesses and the Ambrosiaster, with occasional support also from Ambrose or Pelagius. I consider that it is significant that the same basic type of text and affiliations should be found in the verses 34 & 35 as in the rest of the chapter. This would not have been impossible to conceive if the "mulier taceat" had been added by the scribe as an afterthought as Payne thinks, but would remain a remarkable coincidence. If the exemplar had no trace of that passage, one might have anticipated that the main body of the text would be of a complexion which reflected more primitive characteristics. *But this is in the main Byzantine throughout with a number of NW readings*

The alleged Armenian witness will remain highly uncertain until a check can be made on the Copenhagen ms. If that proves to give the reading as Merk appears to say, the origin of the text known in ms.88 could plausibly be considered to have arisen in a purely Greek setting whence it came to enjoy dissemination in the East though less extensively than in the West.

There are two marginal signs in column 1. I cannot decipher the first of these, opposite line 5. The syllable $\epsilon\nu$ can certainly be made out but the rest is unclear to me. I believe that I may have identified the compend as an abbreviation of $\omega\iota$, but this has been done only on the basis of Gardthausen's transcription from a single manuscript. The second is an indication that in other manuscripts a variant is found. The text reads $\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \nu\omicron\sigma\varsigma\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \lambda\alpha\lambda\eta\sigma\alpha\iota$; the margin gives the note $\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omega\ \nu\omicron\iota\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \lambda\alpha\lambda\eta\sigma\alpha\iota$. This contrast is that referred to by Zuntz ["Text" pg.230] in connexion with early corruption in Marcion's text. The presence of this note seems to indicate that a diorthosis has been carried out.

The remaining marginal notes are those which appear to Mr. Payne with considerable likelihood to relate to the variant position of "Mulieres taceant". The photograph is obscure at some points here. Mr. Payne points out the two occurrences of diagonal parallel strokes which he calls by the ugly term "slashes". I shall term them "diagonals". The higher is in the text, between the end of vs.33 and the beginning of verse 36. The lower is in the margin, parallel to the end of verse 40 and the beginning of verse 34. On these Mr. Payne places great weight.

There are also two other signs in the margin, in line with the diagonals. Only the higher of these is completely visible. I was grateful that Mr. Wilson deciphered this as the three letters epsilon sigma chi. The lower reveals epsilon chi, but differently arranged. It would appear from the photographs that there are other signs, partially erased or rendered obscure by some other means. These stand roughly in line with the others at their respective locations. Wilson had never

previously encountered such signs or abbreviations, and with customary caution would not hazard an interpretation. He suggested that I might approach Bishop Kallistos Ware enquiring whether the signs might have a liturgical significance. Eight months afterwards, no reply has been vouchsafed my enquiry.

Opposite the points where the parallels are the signs made up of alphabetical letters. My suggestion is that the superior of these may be interpreted as the first syllable of eschat(on) or (-ōs). An acute accent stands above the sign. The inferior presents more difficulties in the photograph and presumably in the manuscript itself. It is preceded in any case by other letters which under magnification seem to be certainly pi and probably nu. An accent stands over this sign. I think that Mr. Payne is very probably correct in associating the parallels with the position of the passages, but I think that these abbreviations must also be part of the scribe's guidance to his readers. Furthermore, in the light of the correction in the prior column, and one or two indecipherable marks in margin and text, I think that all of this goes back to an act of diorthosis.

The superior abbreviation appears to be from the root signifying "last". It might indicate that the words of the passage beginning where the parallels are placed introduce the final pericope in the chapter. But to resolve the actual word or form indicated by the abbreviation, I have not yet succeeded. Palaeographical handbooks have failed to help. Two avenues which remain to be explored are a perusal of scholia in manuscripts of various types of literature for appropriate terminology, and further perusal of collections of facsimiles for mss. of this period. I have made a beginning in Erbse's collection of the scholia to the Iliad. What I have gathered there does not ^{yet} encourage me with any parallel usage.

Handwritten note: L^t margin of Abbreviations L

The inferior abbreviation needs to be pursued in a similar fashion, tentative reconstruction of word or words indicated, and use in manuscript sources of various kinds.. We can probably do no more until the decipherment is assured.

The interpretation of the wider textual implications is another outstanding matter. My reconstruction is that we have here a copy from an earlier purely Greek manuscript, corrected after copying by diorthosis to a norm containing some ancient readings. In this the pericope "mulieres taceant" stood in the position otherwise known only in Latin and Greco-Latin sources. From this sprang the rectification of order with which we have been concerned.

Handwritten note: The examples appear to be

Handwritten note: remains the diorthosis in which the p. was in the position found in the other mss SK

My investigations are incomplete. I believe that the textual complexion of the excerpt we are able to study at present makes it unlikely that Mr. Payne's hypothesis can stand as proven. The signs on which he has placed emphasis can be readily understood as related to the normal processes of checking to which manuscripts were subjected, either immediately after copying or at some later stage (say with a change of ownership). That textual complexion raises a number of questions. The text in ms. 88 has the complexion which Zuntz termed W Omega. Does the inclusion or the transposition date to the stage before the texts showing such readings differentiated into Western and Byzantine texts? Is there a link of this variation with such variants as the place of the doxology ?

Handwritten note: // not M. it is the sample of 88