

2nd draft, 30-3-2000

last one (June 2000)
on WP

The variant reading ΑΥΕΙ in 1 John 4.3.

(an alternative title: Two variant readings bearing on early Christology)
or "Two textual variants in "a poor man's Christology"

L^o

20

(alternative opening: In his interesting paper, etc., G. makes reference to two pints where textual data are significant. In both instances he appears to rely upon the critical apparatus of a much used current hand edition. In this he is in company with the majority of New Testament scholars, I shall attempt to demonstrate that it would have been desirable to have recourse to larger collections of material. These reveal the complexity of the textual data which are known to us, and should warn us against reliance on over-simplified presentations. It is much to be desired that our colleagues should realize and put into practice the maxim that text-and-apparatus are the basic evidence. To base ourselves on anything less is to ignore the opportunity to uncover from the sometimes subtle changes of the text, materials for the history of Christian thought in the early centuries. This would balance in the research of Professor G., the careful weighing to which he subjects patristic materials.

Habingtons K.S.

the first of these is found in a discussion of the account given by Epiphanius of the Hebrew Gospel of the Ebionites. This is said by Epiphanius to be a form of the Gospel according to Matthew. Germane to the theme of Goulder is the account of Jesus's baptism in this document. In dealing with this, he also adduces the account of Irenaeus. The Greek of this has been passed down to us by Hippolytus, and we can control this by both Latin and Armenian versions. Goulder has noted that there is common ground between the two accounts. He does not mention the agreed conclusion that Epiphanius is dependent on Irenaeus, and probably knows the Hippolytan version too. We are in fact dealing in the baptism account with one ancient document in two slightly different transmitted forms.

of

The point which he stresses is the wording of the Ebionite Gospel as given by Epiph. τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐν εἶδει περιστεῖρας κατελθούσης καὶ εἰσελθούσης εἰς αὐτόν. He then draws attention to the "careful contrast in Matthew and Luke who write ἐπ'αὐτόν". But the textual situation in Matthew and Luke is not so simple and we are not justified in following uncritically a text which reads ἐπ'αὐτόν. And what has happened to the gospel of Mark? In that gospel, εἰς is read in all modern critical editions with the attestation of B D fam13 pc Lvt. It is attested as a variant reading in Matthew in D 21 299 Eus (on Psalms) Iren, while in Luke (in the hands of D & Luke)

Act

In his interesting paper "A Poor Man's Christology", Professor Goulder¹ makes a short excursion into textual criticism with reference to the variant reading ΑΥΕΙ at 1 John 4.3. About his general thesis in that paper I make no comment at this point although it may be that examination of this one footnote and the variant to which he alludes will bear upon that thesis. In footnote 28², however, I am much perplexed by his approach. Considering that the manner and tone of his remarks will obscure the state of affairs for most readers at a time when text-critical method is a closed book to most students of the New Testament, I feel compelled to set out

¹ NTS 45 (1999) 332-48

² op.cit., pg. 342

the data, expanding his laconic references, introducing data of which I suspect that he is unaware and discussing the problems which he raises.

Since I shall frequently refer to the details of the footnote, it must be quoted in full. It runs as follows: "A minority reading $\lambda\upsilon\epsilon\iota$ / solvit is found in Irenaeus, Clement, Origen and a number of Latin Fathers and MSS, in place of the (grammatically surprizing) $\mu\eta$ $\omicron\mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota$. $\lambda\upsilon\epsilon\iota$ is difficult to translate, and the usual rendering *destroy* (Schnackenburg) is not well supported by 3.8 'destroy the works of the devil'. More likely it is a retranslation of the Latin *solvit* , itself an explanation of the mysterious 'does not confess Jesus'. The majority reading seems to be implied by Polyarp 7.1."

Within this note lie latent many questions of fact and method, in various aspects of Handschriftkunde, in the problems of patristic quotations of scripture, in the lexicography of more than one language and in general principles of textual criticism. I do not think that any of these questions should be left without a full answer. Professor Goulder deals with great concern for the details of heresiological data and subtleties of exegesis. He should not have neglected to treat the text of the primary witnesses with equal care.

I am unhappy from the start in the description of the reading $\lambda\upsilon\epsilon\iota$ as a "minority reading". It cannot be denied that its attestation is numerically slight in contrast to the support of $\mu\eta$ $\omicron\mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota$ in Greek manuscripts and most versions. But if we apply the adage "weigh, not count, the attestation", we shall see that this variant carries considerable weight, is very ancient and well worthy of acceptance as original.

I think that the apparatus from which the evidence has been taken is The Bible Societies' "The Greek New Testament" in its fourth revised edition³. Nestle-Aland ed.27 give the attestation for $\lambda\upsilon\epsilon\iota$ as "vg Iren (1739mg) Cl (1739mg) Or (1739mg) Lcf". Goulder summarizes the evidence known to him as "Irenaeus, Clement and Origen and a number of Latin Fathers and MSS." When I first saw it I wrote "This is fair enough, but it lacks exactitude. It sounds amazingly dismissive of the Latin versions and also misses the significance of the reference to the tenth century minuscule 1739, the Codex von der Goltz". This reaction was due to my habitual use of Nestlé-Aland ed.27 as my working reference edition. On looking at the "Greek New Testament" I perceived that Goulder is only at fault in using that apparatus and not in his summary. Its presentation is quite distinct, running as follows :

$\lambda\upsilon\epsilon\iota$ it (ar.z) vg Irenaeus (lat and acc.to 1739mg) Clement *and* Origen
(gr.acc.to 1739mg) Origen lat2/3 mss (acc to Socrates) Tertullian
Lucifer Priscillian1/3 Tyconius1/3 Fulgentius1/2

It is not surprizing that Goulder laid stress on the Latin tradition since that is the effect of this presentation (unless the user knows the arcanum that Socrates

³ Stuttgart 1993 & '94. Should the editor expand his policy to ask his contributors to indicate this, as not only apparatus but text may be affected by the choice ?

John White on UBS (expanded)

[Scholasticus] was a Greek writer talking about Greek mss.). In fact, if we look at N/A ed.26, we see the attestation given there as λυει 1739mg vg Iren lat Lcf. There may be seen between these two apparatus in successive editions of Nestlé-Aland an increasing neglect of 1739, and I find that this is also the case between the Greek New Testament Third edition (revised) and the latest quoted above on which Goulder appears to rely. My first remarks then are as much critical of the work of the editors of these apparatus each in two editions as of Professor Goulder.

This manuscript⁴ is one of the most remarkable finds of the young co-workers of Hermann Freiherr von Soden at the beginning of the twentieth century. It is a manuscript of the ¹Laura on Mount Athos, written by a Constantinopolitan scribe of the tenth century, Ephraem the Monk. He has copied an exemplar with a valuable apparatus, in which particular interest attaches to the prooemium to the Paulines. This gives us a glimpse of a yet earlier period when a scholar of late antiquity, at work sometime after the fourth century, investigated the witness of the fathers to both the text and the meaning of scripture. In the Pauline epistles he especially concentrated on the works of Origen, using in addition to that father's works a very ancient manuscript which he found to be in textual congruence with Origen's lemmata. He also utilized the Commentary of Origen upon "Romans" from which he excerpted important comments and interesting variant readings.. Elsewhere in the praxapostolos, he cites from a wider group of fathers ranging from Irenaeus to Basil of Caesarea. In this part of his surviving work, comprising Acts and the Catholic epistles, we do not know from any words of his the nature of his exemplar or other sources. It is from this part of his critical work that the reading discussed here derives. At one time, the manuscript also contained the Apocalypse with the commentary of Andreas of Caesarea, but all that of that now remains are traces of a list of chapter headings on its last surviving page.

At 1 John ch.4 vs.3, μη ομολογει τον ιησουν stands in the text of 1739. A small diacritical point is superimposed. In the margin stands the reading ο λυει του ι (ησου) ν written in minuscule with the nomen sacrum in abbreviation. This is a record of a variant reading to that in the text. It should also be noted that the text reads τον ιησουν without any honorific additions. Below the note in minuscule, in the "semi-uncial" generally used in this manuscript for quotations and comments in the margin, stands a notice of the attestation of this word by Irenaeus in the third book of "Against the Heresies", by Origen in the eighth book of the Exegetika on "Romans", and by Clement the "Stromateus" in the "Discourse about the Pasch". Reasonably precise references are given but no quotation. The transmission history of the contents of this manuscript has been worked out by a succession of scholars from the editio princeps by Eduard Freiherr von der Goltz. Accepting this, we may state that we have in this annotation and marginal note we have here a record of a third century text probably made in the fifth century. MS.1739 is a descendant of this manuscript through one intermediary. Can we check the reliability of the notes thus preserved ? We find that the enquiry meets with

⁴ Kirsopp Lake and Silva New. Six Collations of New Testament Manuscripts (Harvard Theological Studies XVII. Cambridge, Mss., 1932) pp.141-219 and Plates IV, V & VI. V. Codex 1739 (Kirsopp Lake, J.de Zwaan, Morton S.Enslin) ; G.Zuntz. The Text of the Epistles (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1946) 1953 pp.68-84 & passim ; J.N.Birdsall. A Study of Ms. 1739 ... and its relationship to Mss. 6, 424, 1908 and M (unpublished Ph.D.thesis, Nottingham 1959).

considerable although partial success.

In the case of Clement, fragments of his work concerning the Pasch are known, and are collected in the third volume of the Berlin Corpus edition. The quotation or allusion to 1 John however is unknown from any other source than the Codex von der Goltz. This reference has simply become another item in the list of testimonia. The greater success which we shall find in the case of the other references may give us confidence that even in the case of Clement, the manuscript records a reliable observation.

A possible influence of the text with $\lambda\upsilon\epsilon\iota$ in a comment of Clement on 2 John 7 has been noted by Harnack⁵. This is found in the Latin "Adumbrationes" in which alone the Hypotyposes of Clement survive. The passage runs "astruit in hac epistola perfectionem fidei extare caritatem et ut nemo dividat Iesum Christum sed unum credat Iesum Christum venisse in carne (He declares in this epistle that perfection of faith establishes love and that no-one should divide Jesus Christ but should believe that [a single] Jesus Christ has come [as one] in the flesh)". "Dividat" is the verb in point.

The case of Origen is more complex. His commentary on Romans is extant only in the Latin translation of Rufinus. This work is edited by the translator. No quotation from 1 John is found in Book 8. However, an allusion to the passage here under discussion is found in Book 1,7⁶. Discussing the term "spirit of holiness" in Rom. 1. 4, Origen as rendered by Rufinus wrote "ita ergo etiam nunc sciens de anima Iesu quae sociata Domino et cohaerens et unus ipso facta sit spiritus sanctificationis non eam nominavit extrinsecus ne solueret Iesum". Such an allusion so pertinent to the exposition comes from the pen of a writer who knows scripture intimately. He is not quoting. The words of the epistle as he knows them have become part of his phraseology, in this case perhaps because of the vivid metaphor latent already in the vocabulary. We have evidence from another work of Origen preserved in Latin that he knew the reading in this form. He quotes it verbatim in the Commentariorum Series of expositions of St. Matthew's gospel, Section 65. There it runs "omnis spiritus qui solvit Iesum non est ex deo".

Can we be sure that this is Origen and not Rufinus? Here perhaps belongs the point rather obscurely put by Goulder that "solvit", the form in which he discusses the variant, is a retranslation of the Latin. (He cannot mean in ms. 1739, of which he appears to know nothing). But "solvit" rendering $\lambda\upsilon\epsilon\iota$ is not Rufinus's own. It renders that Greek verb in this passage from Tertullian to the Vulgate⁷, and not only in this passage but earlier in the epistle at 1.3 & 8. "destruere" is another verb used by other versions or translators to render $\lambda\upsilon\omega$ at these points. Schackenburg, whom Goulder appears to take to task for such a translation in his

⁵ A. von Harnack Studien z. Geschichte d. Neuen Testaments u. der alten Kirche 1. Zur neutestamentlichen Textkritik (AKG 19) Berlin u. a. 1931 pg. 133 fn. 7

⁶ Caroline P. Hammond Bammel. Der Römerbriefkommentar des Origenes. Kritische Ausgabe der Übersetzung Rufins. Buch 1-3 (AGLB 16, Freiburg 1990) pg. 59 linn. 54-6

⁷ Walther Thiele. Wortschatzuntersuchungen zu den lateinischen Texten der Johannesbriefe (AGLB 2, Freiburg, 1958) pg. 19.

commentary, has antecedents ! The modern Greek lexicographers (e.g. LSJ, Bauer ed.6, Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich-Danker) include the definition "destroy" amongst others, as well as "break up" "dissolve", etc.

A further testimony to the harder reading is given by Tregelles in the final posthumous fascicle of his edition of the Greek New Testament⁸. This was published by his widow after his death, with the help of F.J.A.Hort and A.W.Streane. The incompleteness of the datum to which we refer is no doubt due to the difficulties of this labour of friendship. In the fasc.VII on pg.1061, with reference to pp.654,655, ch.4 vs.3 (lines 11 & 49), we read the following:

χαρακτηριστικὸν λέγει τοῦ ἀντιχριστοῦ τὸ λύειν τὸν ἰησοῦν ἐν τῷ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν αὐτὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι schol. (? Orig.).

No information is given of the original place of publication or editor. No one has repeated it in any study I have seen. It is clearly an exegesis, albeit rather prosaic, but of which form of text ? It might be of such as we deem to have been original, introducing phrases from the preceding verse or from 2 John 7. It might even lie at the base of the development of the complex textual situation set out above. But until some colleague in patristics or catena studies can make an identification of its author on grounds of style or vocabulary we shall remain in conjecture.

We do however have a certainly Origenian passage in which λύω τὸν ἰησοῦν is found. It is in the Commentary on Matthew (T. XVI, 8) preserved in Greek. Harnack⁹ drew attention to it but it seems to have fallen out of view more recently. The phraseology occurs in a context of reference to the unity of the person of Jesus. It reveals as surely as the passage on Romans 1.4 that Origen knew the passage with the reading of 1739 and that it was in the repertoire of scriptural phraseology in his style.

This puts paid to Goulder's hypothesis of a retranslation from the Latin. In the brevity of a footnote he gives no justification of such a notion. It would appear¹⁰ to have its ancestry in an attempt of Westcott to explain away the evidence of Socrates Scholasticus for the reading λυει in ancient manuscripts. That conjecture apart, it is difficult to imagine within what picture of the transmission of the New Testament text Goulder can envisage a retranslation from Latin into Greek so early that Irenaeus can quote it

For it is the Irenaeus passage which makes us quite sure that λυει stood in an early Greek patristic text. We have a Latin rendering of Irenaeus on which we had to rely, but now in addition have known for more than a century of an Armenian rendering of Books 4 & 5 in full. Of this rendering, more and more fragments from the first three books have continued to come to light. We are fortunate that the passage in Book 3 is amongst those recently identified and published. It has apparently escaped the attention of the compilers of the apparatus of "the Greek New Testament" quoted above who give only the "Latin" Irenaeus as witness to

⁸ 1879

⁹ Studien 1. no. 6.4 pg.134 fn.1

¹⁰ Harnack op.cit. loc.cit. & fn.2

λυει. Professor Goulder cannot be blamed, I suppose, for not knowing about this datum, but the textual critics whose names as given as editors should have known about it and publicized it to the advantage of their colleagues who do not deign to walk in such byways.

In the Latin version (Book 3, 16, 8) 1 Jn 4 vss.1-3 are quoted. Verse 3 (a) is found in the following form "et omnis spiritus qui solvit Iesum non est ex Deo sed ex Antichristo est". New fragments of Irenaeus "Against the Heresies" were published in 1977 by Charles Renoux¹¹. Excerpts from a florilegium, they prove to originate from the same version as we already know for Books 4 & 5. This was the product of the Hellenophile school of translators, whose work followed the Greek slavishly. Like other such translation methods in late Judaism and the Eastern churches, this is detrimental to the receptor language, but helpful to the modern philologist. Fragment 17 in Renoux's edition is taken from Adversus Haereses Bk 3, 16, 8-9 and *id.* 18, 2. The quotation from 1 John is given in Latin translation based on the version now published in Sources Chrétiennes. In the presentation of the Armenian, this Latin is so used as to show precisely where there is identity of text, and where the two renderings differ. The same extent of text from 1 John is found in the Armenian as in the Latin. Verse 3 is rendered by Renoux as follows: "et omnis spiritus qui solvit Iesum non-est ex-Deo, hic est qui ex Antichristo (+n) est" (the hyphenated phrases and the note in parentheses relate to orthographical or morphological features of Armenian). This quotation confirms that λυει stood in the original, thus before the seventh decade of the second century. We may note that as in the Latin tradition, so in the rendering of Irenaeus into Armenian, a verb meaning "to destroy" is also amongst those used in some cases to render λυω (although not in 1 John 4.3). As we have noted above, this is a well supported signification of the verb. To the meaning rendered by "solvere" in the Latin tradition, we shall revert in a moment.

The evidence for λυει in the Greek textual tradition is proven by the examination of the patristic evidence adduced by the ancient Christian scholar whose work is preserved in the minuscule 1739. The evidence which we can bring from Irenaeus is particularly significant. There can be no doubt that the text of 1 John 4 known to Irenaeus and quoted by him had this laconic reading, which is attested in the totality of the tradition of his work.

Irenaeus was from Asia. His work was directed against the theological aberrations against which he had to wrestle in Gaul, but the rich catena and florilegium traditions of his work, as well as papyrus fragments, show that this was known throughout the Greek world. It was translated in the West very early into Latin and in the fifth century into Armenian. The marginal note of 1739 reveals that the reading λυει was not only current in Asia whence Irenaeus and the Greek Christians of Gaul had it, but in Egypt too. It was so familiar to Origen that he could use its succinct terminology allusively as well as quoting it explicitly. Allusive use is also attested by Clement. It stood in the Greek from which Tertullian possibly translated (as seems to have been his wont) and in the earliest strata of the Old

¹¹ Patrologia Orientalis XXXIX.1 (Turnhout, 1978) Irénée de Lyon. Nouveaux Fragments Arméniens de l'Adversus Haereses et de l'Epideixis ... par Charles Renoux. Fragment 17 (pp.54-61) spec. pp.54f.

Latin Bible to which quotations give us access. As a note in Tischendorf already shows us, it survived in East and West for a long time.

The reading of 1739 Iren et al. meets the basic criteria for serious consideration as original. It has very early attestation in quotation and allusion in Christian writers. It is the shorter and the more difficult reading, and the one most likely to be changed. On internal grounds as well as external, therefore, we may argue its priority. We note WH placed it in their margin (scil. as noteworthy) although they did not discuss it elsewhere.

We may set out this understanding of the data of 1 John 4.3 in a summary apparatus, placing as the lemma the reading deemed to be original :

λυει : 1739 marg. mss. graec. antiq. ap. Socratea scholasticum (saec. 5)
Hist. eccl. 7.32 Lvt Lvg Iren Clem Orig Tert Cyp Lucif
Aug patr. latt. al. ;

μη ομολογει : mss. graec. rell.

+τον ιησουν + τον ιησουν χριστον +τον ιησουν
χριστον εν σαρκι εληλυθοτα

mean
A brief exposition may be in place. We follow the principle that the original reading is that which explains the origin of the other readings". My teacher R.P. Casey put in his lectures a vivid phrase; "where the variants cluster, there is a lesion in the text. The variants congregate like corpuscles at that point". This crux illustrates this well. The epistoler writes a pregnant metaphor which evokes not only the true force of *ιησουν χριστον εν σαρκι εληλυθοτα* of the preceding verse (of which we may observe there is no textual variation attested, a grammatical change of participle to infinitive apart). It also shows by the choice of the verb *λυει* the devastating effect of the error he is seeking to combat, a verb which has the basic meaning of "dissolve" or "disintegrate" and the extended application of "destroy". It is the type of reading to which M.-J. Lagrange gave the name of "leçon expressive". Its rich complexity of nuance is too great to be maintained and it gives way to a "leçon banale" merely transferring with negative particle the verb from the previous verse. That that verb is used by the author elsewhere (2 John 7) is an added incentive to use it here.¹²
would have been

Again, the object of the verb is expanded from the simple *τον ιησουν* (which partakes of the conciseness and richness of the original verb) to a lengthier phrase taken from the previous verse. This is made up of theological honorifics. It appears in a number of allomorphs, which are typical of the expansion of the simple name of Jesus throughout the New Testament tradition. Only a few manuscripts and other witnesses of the epistle have escaped this expansion. Here "The Greek New Testament" seems to give the clearest statement, adducing two majuscules (A

¹² To explain away the harder reading as a product of second century polemic against gnosticism, as the "Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament" does in both its editions, meets with no support in the entry *λύω* in the Patristic Greek Lexicon.

and B) seven minuscules and a little Old Latin and Bohairic support. The apparatus critici, both Tischendorf (still a constant and necessary standby) and the two hand editions to which we refer above, give the impression that the verse is not much quoted in later ecclesiastical writings. This is borne out by Biblia Patristica as far as it reaches into post-Nicene fathers. For the longest form only the late catena of Theophylaktos is given by Tischendorf. However the majority of Greek manuscripts including the Lectionary tradition according to TGNT gives the longest form.

Those well versed in this field will not be surprized that not every piece of evidence brought to light fits precisely into a chronological framework, but it is evident that the overall progression from "expressive" to "banale", from "more difficult" to "less difficult", from "shorter" to "longer" moves with the centuries. The patristic evidence brought before us by 1739 and the evidence of the earliest Latin strata strikingly support the judgement of the originality of the reading attested by them.

I suspect that Professor Goulder is well aware of all this. I shall be astonished if he declares that he was not. It is for the sake of others that I have set this out. It is the same with the final matter in the footnote. Goulder says that the "majority reading seems to be implied by Polycarp 7.1". In this he appears to be in company with all who have studied the links of passages in the apostolic Fathers with New Testament passages which their style, vocabulary and content appear to resemble.

We must accordingly now turn to this passage of the Letter of Polycarp of Smyrna to the Philippians. Its evidence is the only barrier to full acceptance of the originality of the reading of the margin of 1739 and the other evidence which we have reviewed. If Polycarp knew the verse in question with μη ομολογει then we may have earlier evidence for that reading than for the other. This need not mean that the longer reading is necessarily original but it does make the tracing of the development of the two readings much more complex. The matter cannot be assumed to be as simple as Goulder and many others have expressed it (e.g. the Oxford Committee of a century ago which produced "The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers").

In all use of quotations in patristic and other ancient Christian writings we must take note of the transmission of their text, but this is especially so in the case of the Apostolic Fathers. Their transmission has often been secret and tortuous and their text may show signs of accidental damage in the course of time. In some instances early translations or early papyri recently come to light may help the modern scholar, but this is not the case with the text of Polycarp.¹³ We have no earlier manuscript than one of the eleventh century (Vat.graec.859). This belongs to a group of 8 or 9 manuscripts, three of which are its descendants. We do not have the archetype of the whole group. The textual unity is shown by a lacuna in the latter part of the Letter of Polycarp and the beginning chapters of the epistle of

¹³ The data are collected by A. Harnack. Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius 2te Aufl. (1958) Leipzig. Teil 1. Der Überlieferung u. der Bestand. 1. Halbband. pp.58f., 70, 78 (sub nominibus Barnabas, Polycarp, Ignatius).

Barnabas. More recently discovered manuscripts have enabled the text of Barnabas to be restored by recent editors but Polycarp has experienced no such aid. Apart from words restored in chapters 9 and 13 from quotation by Eusebius the missing part must depend for its restoration on the Latin translation which is found in 13 manuscripts. It is dated as VI / VII century by Funk-Bihlmeyer, given simply as "alte Übersetzung" in *Vetus Latina*.¹⁴

(It is interesting that this manuscript reads the indicative. The subjunctive of critical texts is apparently derived from later minuscules.)

Lightfoot¹⁵ gives a lengthy list of testimonia for Polycarp. Most of these are concerned with his martyrdom. We learn however that Irenaeus knew and commended the epistle, but gives no quotation. Chapter 9 and part of 13 are quoted by Eusebius in the *Ecclesiastical History* but other quotations appear in fact to be rare. Lightfoot gives excerpts in Syriac, one from Severus of Antioch, and two from florilegia, one a translation of the compilation of Timothy Aelurus, one anonymous from an eleventh century manuscript. The passage from Timothy includes our passage with the scriptural adaptation in a more paraphrastic form. Lightfoot closes his list in the ninth century, when Photius gives a general assessment of the epistle without quotation. Many of the works surveyed by Photius in the *Bibliotheca* appear to have been rare in his day and this may have so with Polycarp, although nothing in the notice specifies this.

Assuming that this list is reasonably full, we may suggest that Polycarp, although much honoured as a martyr throughout Christendom, was not widely known as an author through his writings. This would seem to be borne out by the fact that his work has been transmitted in a single line of transmission from a mutilated archetype, which suggests its rarity, and otherwise only in one version. It might be the case that the text of the epistle has not escaped some change in the course of time. However all scholars who have worked on the epistle appear confident that it is authentic. No one appears to have examined whether such a slender transmission may leave open the possibility of corruption within its text.

(The easiest point at which to check this would be in scriptural quotations of whose variant forms we have a relatively fixed chronology of development.)

The epistle in any case presents a problem to the interpreter. In chapter 9, the writer speaks of Ignatius along with Paul and others being "in the place which is their due", after enduring suffering. Towards the end of the epistle, in chapter 13, he asks that news of Ignatius be sent him by the Philippians. P.N.Harrison in 1936 set out a proposed solution¹⁶. The text transmitted as one document is the conflation of two. Chapter 13 is of early date shortly after Ignatius had passed through Smyrna. It enquired of him from the Philippians. This would be dated about AD

¹⁴ H.J.Frede. *Kirchen-schriftsteller. Verzeichnis u. Sigel. Aktualisierungsheft 1999. Compléments 1999* par Roger Gryson (Freiburg) pg.106 s.s.*POL.

¹⁵ J.B.Lightfoot. *The Apostolic Fathers. Part II.S.Ignatius.S.Polycarp.* (2nd. ed. London & New York 1889) Vol.1 pp.552-77.

¹⁶ P.N.Harrison. *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians* (Cambridge) 1936.

110. The main body of the letter as we have it, chapters 1-12, will be of later date when Polycarp had collected the Ignatian letters. Harrison proposed the date of about AD135. Chapter 14 might be the postscript of either letter. While there continues to be debate, Harrison's analysis appears to carry majority assent and most scholars would date the main letter as he did, from about AD135.

We must now give the text of the beginning of chapter 7, for we need to make a detailed study of it before the question of the original text of 1 John 4.3 can be brought to a close.

πας γαρ ος αν μη ομολογηι ιησουν χριστον εν σαρκι εληλυθεναι
αντιχριστος εστιν και ος αν μη ομολογηι το μαρτυριον του σταυρου εκ
του διαβολου εστιν και ος αν μεθοδευη τα λογια του κυριου προς τας
ιδιας επιθυμιας και λεγηι μητε αναστασιν μητε κρισιν ουτος πρωτοτοκος
εστιν του σατανα.

Most scholars and editors identify the first of these three coordinate clauses as 1 John 4.3. For the moment we will accept that definition. It need not conflict with the prior conclusion that λυει is the original. We have early attestation pointing to that conclusion as well as good grounds of intrinsic probability. The reading in Polycarp may be the result of corruption of the text. The change of λυει to μη ομολογει with the addition of honorifics to ιησουν takes place in the tradition by the third century. Our earliest evidence for the phrase in Polycarp is found in the quotation of this passage in the anonymous Syriac catena which must date from after AD 521, the date of the death of Jacob of Serug who is quoted in it. Another possibility to be mooted is that while the original text was being transmitted and was still known in Egypt, Africa and Gaul, change had already taken place in the circles of Polycarp by AD 135. The change from indicative¹⁷ to subjunctive and the addition of αν might be part of the tendency to correction of style linked with the Atticizing movement, to which Kilpatrick and Elliott have drawn attention.

We consider however that more probably the judgement of those who say "1 John 4,3 is quoted here" is wrong. To discuss this we have given the verse in all its three clauses. This is in fact a cento revealing major influences on Polycarp's style of which the Johannine letters were one of the strongest. Harrison¹⁸ indicates two other fairly long passages where such a cento had been made by Polycarp using the Johannine epistles as the main source of phraseology with Paul as a secondary influence. A similar analysis is given by F.-M. Braun¹⁹. In each case, and in a number of shorter phrases, several verses not necessarily from passages adjacent one to another have been laid under contribution. In such a case, in text-critical analysis, we should term such information about a New Testament text an adaptation, not a quotation. (This terminology is that of the apparatus criticus to the

¹⁷ Goulder justifiably refers to the indicative mood of ομολογει (1 Jn.4,3) as surprising. The oldest Greek ms. of Polycarp however also reads the indicative in all four verbs. Grammarians see this as standard Hellenistic usage e.g. Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf 14 Aufl. (1975) para. 428.4 & fn.4; H. Reinhold De graecitate patrum apostolicorum (Halle 1898) pg. 107 (para. 22.2).

¹⁸ op. cit. pp. 300-01.

¹⁹ F.- M. Braun Jean le Théologien et son évangile dans l'église ancienne (Études Bibliques, Paris) 1959 pg. 286.

International Greek New Testament Project's edition of Luke.) Not every word can be collated against the base, and due note must be taken of all parallel passages which have an equal claim to be the source of the wording. 100 B

Thus, the words in Polycarp related to 1 John 4.3 when viewed in totality are such an adaptation. It is only the initial clause (πᾶσ ... ἐστίν 1: Funk-Bihlmeyer pg.117 lines 9,10) which can be directly related to 1 John 4.3 but even so only single words or phrases can be used as means of textual identification or affiliation. The sentence as a whole cannot be so used since in 4.3 there are a number of variables, whereas in the preceding verse there is none. At any stage of the transmission therefore 1 Jn.4.2 could be the source of the opening phrase in Polycarp while that is not the case with 1 Jn.4.3. (REVISE the following a little) Moreover, we must take account in our analysis that within the composition of such a period, the author is drawing upon several different loci in his sources; in this case, we may see the influence of 1 John 4.2; 3,17 and 2 John 7.

(We may suggest that the cento of Johannine phrases, mingled with τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ σταυροῦ of Pauline flavour, is his. The opening phrase is taken from 2 John 7. The reference to "spirit" is dropped to make a generalized condemnation).

This passage was accordingly in existence by that date. Half a century on in Irenaeus, who claimed that when he was himself young he knew Polycarp, by then an old man. Irenaeus reads λυεῖ. Does the sum of these data indicate that the text was always found enigmatic. Was this why Polycarp, or the scribe of the Biblical manuscript which was his source, for that reason had adopted the μη ομολογεῖ from the previous verse as a substitute? The shorter reading was understood by the earliest translators into Latin to mean "to obliterate" or "to destroy". This understanding of the stem is found in the translation of some compounds as well as of the simple verb.

This judgement of the author implies the prior existence, if not of the gospel of John, at least such an explicit understanding of the gospel of Jesus as we read in that gospel. (Does Goulder wish to dismiss the reading / can G. not tolerate the originality of λυεῖ) since it might imply the existence of such a Logos christology or its expression in writing before an answer to the Cerinthians was needed? It may be so for it would certainly disturb the balance of his hypothesis if we accept the reading and understand in this way.

(What does this do for our understanding of the passage? If we accept this harder text, the simple verb will imply an antithesis to the confession of Jesus as one who has come in the flesh, i.e. a being of another order living within the human order.) (not now in its original place)

Notes :

A. Note that grammar is brought into line in the Polycarp ref. (a textual question - see below)

B. reff. for the problem of μη with indicative may be found in the following:

Schwyzler-Debrunner Gr.Gramm. Bd.2 pp.594-6 & fn. 596.1

JHMoulton Prolegomena pp.169-171. Specific ref. pg.171
Burton Moods and tenses para 470 pg.180

Moulton-Turner pg.284 ch.19.3 cp. Rev. 14.4 (scil. p47)

H.Reinhold De graecitate patrum apostolicorum (Halle 1898) pg.107

Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf 14e Aufl. 1975 para.428.4 and fn.

C. (Perhaps in the light of the following later observation these questions need not be addressed.)

Has the text of Polycarp been changed to "correct" grammar either by the author himself (check for style) or in the course of centuries? Erect hypotheses for (a) text with λυει (b) text already altered to give the same verb in either part of sentence.

D. Note 1 John 4.15 for a subjunctive of the verb ομολογειν with εαν.

E. NB the problem of εληλυθειναι remains. It is known in the ms. tradition however - ?1 ms.

F. In IGNTP terminology, the words in Polycarp related to 1 John 4.3 are viewed in totality an adaptation not a quotation. Only the initial sentence (πασ ... εστιν 1: Funk-Bihlmeyer pg.117 lines 9,10) can be directly related to 1 John 4.3. Even so, they are given in a textual form which appears to be harmonized to 2 John 7.

The attestation of 1 John 4.3 (as in NA27) appears to show that λυει was changed to μη ομολογει to give the form of text known in the whole Greek tradition apart from the patristic evidence under consideration. An addition of εν σαρκι εληλυθοτα is found in the majority of witnesses, the earliest Greek evidence being apparently the Codex Sinaiticus and the earliest versional evidence in Cyprian. The assimilation of Attic syntax in the mood of the verb and the addition of αν is attested only in this passage of Polycarp. Grammarians see the use of the indicative here as standard for Hellenistic Greek of this period. This then must be an amelioration of the text and is likely to be later than the author himself.

Recapitulation: luei on internal grounds is original. Its only attestation apart from the margin of 1739 is patristic to which the same ms. directs us. The reading of Polycarp militates against this, by all appearances, and Goulder quotes it in that sense. Is there a convincing reason to do so? We must look beneath the surface of such a phenomenon, doing which shows incidentally the complexity of determining the significance of the data of quotations.

The "quotation" is a cento from Johannine and Pauline phrases. Note its basic structures. The imbalance of the lengthy first member.

The various readings in 1 John I.c. need analysis and the absence of variation in 2 John. (note that the addition "come in the flesh" is required to make "confess Jesus Christ" coherent in this doctrinal rather than fideist setting - see below). (query: what is the resolution of the variation between the participle and the infinitive of erchomai?)

The transmission of Polycarp to the Philippians shows little use beyond the sixth century and the stemma of the manuscript tradition shows a weak line of descent in that the Greek text which has come down to us is derived from a corrupt archetype. The passage under consideration - and doubtless others (which investigate) - may have been corrupted. "Come in the flesh" is likely to have been added from a tradition within the New Testament transmission which appears to date from no earlier than the early fourth century (see above).

luei could have been early changed and P., belonging to the first or second generation after the evangelist / letter-writer, may have known the substitute which is read in the Polycarp tradition (this assumes that the wording of the cento depends on 1 Jn.4.3 ; but its distinctive features could derive from verse 2 or from 2 Jn.7). But it would be more likely that the change of Polycarp's text of the phrase in this cento happened at the time when the change to the NT text was made, that is, probably in the fourth century, or at a later time.