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Abstract

This thesis presents a new paradigm for understanding the Western non-interpolations. It argues that when Luke originally wrote his Gospel it did not contain 22:19b–20; 24:3b, 6a, 12, 36b, 40, 51b and 52a. However, at a later time, around the time Luke wrote Acts, he returned to his Gospel creating a second edition which contained these readings.

My thesis makes the case that the paradigm of scribal interpolation is problematic. Working under this paradigm the results of external and internal evidence appear conflicting and scholars are generally forced to give greater preference to one set of evidence over the other. However, a balanced weighting of the external and internal evidence points us towards the notion that Luke was responsible for both the absence and the inclusion of 22:19b–20; 24:3b, 6a, 12, 36b, 40, 51b and 52a.

Chapter one introduces the Western non-interpolations. It also makes the case that the quest for the original text of Luke’s Gospel should not be abandoned. Chapter two is on the history, theory and methodology of the Western non-interpolations. It begins with an overview of the text-critical scholarship emerging during the nineteenth century, particularly the influence of Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort. It also covers the period after Westcott and Hort to the present. Chapter three begins by describing the sources available for the study of the Western non-interpolations. Marcion’s Evangelion is an important witness for the study of the Western non-interpolations, particularly in regards to dating the short variant readings. Therefore one finds in this chapter a thorough discussion of Marcion and his Evangelion. Chapter three also includes an analysis of the external evidence for each variant reading. In a similar way, chapter four analyses the internal evidence for each of
the Western non-interpolations. From these two chapters we learn that the evidence makes better sense if we attribute the variant readings to Luke's editorial revision.

Chapter five provides evidence for Luke writing more than one edition of his Gospel. Discussed thoroughly is Luke 1–2 as it provides evidence for Luke re-editing his Gospel. The conclusion of chapter five is that Luke first wrote an edition of the Gospel which did not have Luke 1–2; 22:19b–20; 24:3b, 6a, 12, 36b, 40, 51b and 52a and later wrote another which did. He wrote the second edition some years after the first edition, shortly after the writing of Acts. Chapter six summarises and concludes the thesis. It also briefly discusses whether other variant readings can be identified as coming from different Lukan Gospel editions.
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1. Introduction

The autographs of the twenty-seven New Testament books are no longer with us. They are either lost, awaiting some incredible future discovery, or were destroyed due to the rigours of time and place. In any case, the autographs of the New Testament books are beyond our reach and cannot be examined.


Importantly, analysis of these extant manuscripts reveals that textually, no two manuscripts are exactly the same. For one reason or another, variants exist. Determining which variant should be included in our modern editions of the New Testament is no simple task. Unfortunately, there are a number of variants that still cause scholars headaches. The Western non-interpolations are a group of variants that fall within this category.

---

1 Here, the term “autographs” refers to the original documents composed by the original writers of the New Testament books.
3 To date, there are approximately 6,000 extant Greek New Testament manuscripts, a number of which are fragments.
4 This excludes those very small fragmentary Greek New Testament manuscripts such as P52.
In the late nineteenth century, Brooke Foss Westcott (1825-1901) and Fenton John Anthony Hort (1828-1892) published a two-volume book that was to change the way we would think of the New Testament. Their first volume, titled *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, appeared in 1881. It was Westcott and Hort’s critical edition of the Greek New Testament. This edition challenged certain assumptions surrounding a number of variant readings commonly used in Greek New Testament editions leading up to this time.

The second volume appeared the following year. It included an *Introduction* and *Appendix* and served as a companion to the first volume. The *Introduction* gave a thorough explanation of the methodology and reasons for selecting the variants for their critical edition. The *Appendix* discussed selected variant readings, including those that came to be described as Western non-interpolations.

The term Western non-interpolation is a peculiar one. It highlights what Westcott and Hort thought of the Western text. Believing that the Western text was riddled with interpolations and therefore inferior to their beloved Neutral text, Westcott and Hort came to the conclusion that on some occasions this was not the case. Rather than defame the Neutral text by speaking of Neutral interpolations, they chose what they believed to be a more suitable title, Western non-interpolations.

Westcott and Hort identified twenty-seven Western non-interpolations, eighteen of which were considered as “possible” Western non-interpolations and nine as “true”

---

6 Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction and Appendix* (Cambridge/London: Macmillan, 1882). Though this volume has Westcott’s name attached to it, it was written by Hort and gives an adequate account of the position of both men.
Western non-interpolations. Today, eight of these continue to cause controversy.

Western non-interpolations are variant readings not found in the Western text, but found in all other non-Western texts. Interestingly, eight Western non-interpolations are found towards the end of Luke’s Gospel and all but one can be found in the Resurrection and Ascension narratives. The eight controversial variant readings are:

1. **Luke 22:19b–20:**
   
   τὸ ὑπέρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 
   καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δείπνησαι, λέγων· τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἔν τῷ αἵματί μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.

   19b Which is being given for you; do this for my memory. 20 And the cup in the same way after supper, saying, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood which is being shed for you.”

2. **Luke 24:3b:**
   
   τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.

   Of the Lord Jesus.

3. **Luke 24:6a:**
   
   οὐκ ἔστιν ὑδὲ, ἀλλ’ ἡγέρθη.

   He is not here, but was raised.

4. **Luke 24:12:**
   
   Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἀναστὰς ἔδραμεν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει τὰ ὀθόνια μόνα, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός.

   But Peter, having risen, ran to the tomb and after stooping down he sees the linen wrappings alone, and he left wondering to himself what had happened.

---

7 A discussion of the twenty-seven Western non-interpolations is found in chapter two.
8 The other Western non-interpolation is found at Matt 27:49. This variant reading holds a unique status among the Western non-interpolations. It is the only one outside of Luke’s Gospel and it is the least controversial of the nine as an overwhelming number of scholars agree that the long variant reading is a scribal interpolation. Its status as a “true” Western non-interpolation no longer holds. For more on Matt 27:49 see the excursus in chapter two, pages 44-45.
9 A more detailed understanding of Western text, Neutral text and Alexandrian text is given in chapter two.
10 All translations throughout this thesis are mine unless otherwise noted.
11 In Luke, the construction πρὸς + pronoun + participle (πρὸς ἑαυτὸν θαυμάζων) is typical. See John Muddiman, “A Note on Reading Luke XXIV. 12,” ETL 48 (1972): 542-53. As such, the translation “and he
Luke 24:36b:
καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν.
And he says to them, “Peace to you.”

Luke 24:40:
καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας.
And when he had said this, he showed them his hands and feet.

Luke 24:51b:
καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.
And was carried up into heaven.

Luke 24:52a:
προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν.
After worshipping him.

As already mentioned, the title Western non-interpolation can be confusing. This title is in reference to those variant readings which appear in the Western text, but in no other type of text. When we speak of a Western non-interpolation we should have in mind those variant readings which do not have the words in question. For example, the Western non-interpolation of Luke 24:52a is that variant reading which does not have the words προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν. However, as is often the case in the relevant literature, when a Western non-interpolation is referenced, it is those words which appear in the non-Western texts which are cited. Of course there is good reason for this, for how is left wondering to himself what had happened” for the words καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός is legitimate. It appears that Luke has adapted the phrase in a manner that is consistent with his style. Interestingly, in Martin M. Culy, Mikeal C. Parsons and Joshua J Stigall, Luke: A Handbook on the Greek Text, Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2010), 739, it is accepted that πρὸς ἑαυτὸν could modify θαυμάζων, though the writers prefer to follow the parallel in John 20:10 and use the translation “to their home.” In regards to the parallel in John 20:10 we find that the words πρὸς αὐτούς have no complement. Therefore, the translation “to their homes” for πρὸς αὐτούς is a satisfactory one for John 20:10. However, C. K. Barrett believes that the translation “went to their own homes” in John 20:10 “seems impossible.” For Barrett’s reasons see C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text, 2nd ed. (London: SPCK, 1978), 564. For an explanation for a translation of John 20:10 see Leon Morris, The Gospel According to John, The New International Commentary on the New Testament, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 738, n. 27. Interestingly, J. Ramsey Michaels translates John 20:10 as “Then the disciples went away again to themselves.” However, in his comments he interprets πρὸς αὐτούς as meaning “went home.” J. Ramsey Michaels, The Gospel of John, NICT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 985, 993-94.
one to reference missing words? Westcott and Hort would have served us better if they
chose the title Neutral interpolation. But as it is, we are left with the title Western non-
interpolation.

In order to avoid the confusion that the title Western non-interpolation might
cause, I use the terms short variant reading and long variant reading. Therefore, if I refer
to the variant reading in which the words in question are absent, I use the term short
variant reading. If I am speaking of the variant reading in which the words appear, I
speak of the long variant reading.

These terms have the added benefit of making no presumptions as to whether the
Western text or Alexandrian text is responsible for having an altered reading. The
current-day scholarly preference for the Alexandrian text can lead to an uncritical bias as
to which type of text presents the better reading. By using the terms short variant
reading and long variant reading it is hoped that any potential bias for a particular type
of text is eliminated and that each variant reading is judged by its merits, not by the type
of text it is said to belong.

It is time to revisit the Western non-interpolations. This may come as a surprise
to a number of scholars. In a short, informal discussion with a well-respected textual
critic, I received a surprised look when I mentioned that my thesis topic is on the
Western non-interpolations. I was told, in no uncertain terms, that there is nothing else
that can be said about the Western non-interpolations. For this scholar, the topic of the
Western non-interpolations is a closed case.

For many, the 1950’s discovery of Papyrus Bodmer XIV (P75) signalled the death
of Westcott and Hort’s theory of the Western non-interpolations. We can observe the
change of heart surrounding eight Western non-interpolations in the Gospel of Luke when we look at the last few editions of the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece*. In the 1963, twenty-fifth edition of Nestle-Aland’s *Novum Testamentum Graece*, the eight long variant readings of Luke 22:19b–20; 24:3b, 6a, 12, 36b, 40, 51b and 52a were either omitted from this critical edition, or enclosed in square brackets. The square bracket is a symbol which brings into question the variant reading’s authenticity. In the following edition of 1979 the variant readings were accepted as part of the critical edition. They were not omitted from the text and there was no square bracket questioning their authenticity. These variant readings came only with an accompanying footnote that revealed their textual history. We are able to trace the same fate for these long variant readings with the United Bible Societies *Greek New Testament* editions and with many of our popular English translations.¹²

The 1960's and 1970's also saw an increasing number of publications arguing for the abandonment of Westcott and Hort’s theory of the Western non-interpolations. It was not long after this that any discussion surrounding the Western non-interpolations was considered out-of-date. It appeared that the topic of the Western non-interpolations was to become little more than a footnote in the annals of text-critical history. For those scholars discussing the variants historically known as Western non-interpolations, there was no longer any dispute. The status of the Western non-interpolations was a *fait accompli*. It is no wonder I received a surprised look when I mentioned in my discussion with a textual critic that I was looking into the Western non-interpolations. What more can I add?

¹² More will be said about these editions in chapter two.
In recent years, the status of the Western non-interpolations has once again come into question. Particularly in the case of the eight Lukan Western non-interpolations Mikeal Parsons,13 Bart Ehrman,14 David Parker,15 and Michael Wade Martin,16 have supported Westcott and Hort’s theory that the short variant readings are the earliest. A recent commentary of Luke’s Gospel by John Carroll also defends the status of the short variant readings.17 Others have felt the need to address Westcott and Hort’s theory when analysing passages that fall under the category of Western non-interpolation. Here I have in mind Mark Matson,18 Bradly Billings19 and James Royse,20 to name only some.

After reading the various positions of recent scholars on this issue I have become unsatisfied with a number of their conclusions. This is not to say that I have not found great value in their work. Quite the contrary! Our contemporary scholars have moved the discussion in what I believe to be a positive direction. However, what I have realised is that despite the novel insights and contributions of these scholars, there appears to be little progress made into dealing with the weaknesses of each representative view. There is, I believe, a good reason for this.

Since the birth of Westcott and Hort’s theory of the Western non-interpolations

---

in the 1880’s, scholars have been working under one paradigm: the paradigm of scribal behaviour and interference. There have been two prevailing views: either a scribe was responsible for omitting several passages from Luke’s Gospel, therefore creating a short text, or, a scribe was responsible for adding several passages into Luke’s Gospel, therefore creating a long text. In these two senses, the scribe was more than a copyist, the scribe was an editor.21

The paradigm of scribal interference has often compelled scholars to give preference to one form of evidence over the other. In other words, the opportunity to give a balanced weighting to both the internal and external evidence is sacrificed so as to uphold the paradigm of scribal interference. Those who give priority to the long variant readings have a great number of extant manuscripts on their side as the majority are witnesses to these variants. Those who give priority to the short variant readings often struggle to adequately explain why, if original, the short variant readings are found in only a handful of Western manuscripts dated generations after the composition of Luke. Alternatively, those who give priority to the long variant readings have a tendency to not adequately explain the complexities created by the thought, language, wording and style of these readings. They are also generally quiet in offering sound historical reasons for the existence of both the short and long variant readings, though of late, some have attempted to rectify this deficiency. Those who give priority to the short variant readings usually come up with a number of possible reasons for the existence of both the long variant readings and short variant readings. They also have a tendency to put forth a

number of arguments for the peculiarities of the thought, language, wording and style of the long variant readings. In other words, those who favour the long variant readings often favour the findings of the external evidence, while those who favour the short variant readings are often found favouring the internal evidence. Due to this, what we tend to find in most of the literature is an unbalanced assessment of the evidence, and by unbalanced assessment of the evidence I mean the acceptance of the strengths of one form of evidence at the expense of the other.

In this thesis it is argued that a balanced assessment of the evidence, that is, accepting the strengths of the external evidence and internal evidence regardless of how contradictory they may at first appear, reveals that the author of both the short variant readings and long variant readings is Luke. In fact, the strengths of the external evidence and internal evidence only appear contradictory because they have only ever been interpreted under the paradigm of scribal interpolation. However, if we allow for the proposition that Luke was the author of the short variant readings and the long variant readings, then we find there are no contradictions. Therefore, by determining what can be deduced from the external evidence and internal evidence and by accepting that the external evidence carries no greater weight than the internal evidence, and vice versa, we find that it is reasonable to conclude that Luke was the author of both sets of variant readings.

My thesis is that the Western non-interpolations are evidence that Luke re-edited his Gospel at some later stage. When Luke first wrote his Gospel it contained the short

---

22 To refer to the author of the Gospel of Luke as “Luke,” is not an affirmation on my part that the author was truly the Luke ascribed by tradition. As far as we can tell, the Gospel was written anonymously and we can not be certain in regards to the name of the author. The use of the name “Luke” is only for simplicity and convenience sake.
variant readings. At a later time Luke returned to update his Gospel, adding the long variant readings. The aim of this thesis, then, is to offer a new theory for the origin of the Lukan Western non-interpolations. As we shall come to see, both external and internal evidence point us towards this direction.

This thesis presupposes that it is possible to determine the original text of Luke’s Gospel. I believe that this can be achieved even though there is little chance “that any Christian book of the late first and second century would survive,” and despite the time between the autographs and the earliest extant manuscripts having been “the period in which the most serious corruptions occur[red].”

In regards to this period of corruption Ehrman says that “the earliest scribes were by and large private individuals, not paid professionals, and in many instances their copies were not double-checked for accuracy.” He continues by saying that scribes “were warm-blooded Christians, living in the world of wide-ranging theological debates; most scribes were surely cognizant of these debates, and many were surely participants.” Due to factors as these one can understand David Parker’s sentiments when he writes that “there is no original text. There are just different stages of production.”

Not surprisingly, such scepticism has influenced many to abandon the quest for the original text. Eldon Epp recognises the challenge that textual critics face and is right to assert that the quest for the original text is not the only task or goal for the textual

critic. However, this should not automatically translate into the notion that the search for the original text should be abandoned. Charles Hill and Michael Kruger rightly state that “while the complexities in recovering the original text need to be acknowledged, that is a separate question from whether the concept of an original text is incoherent and should therefore be abandoned as a goal of the discipline.” Recent thorough analysis into the extant manuscripts has yielded positive results. For example, James Royse’s analysis of the early Christian papyri has been able to reveal particular scribal habits in the copying process. With information such as this we are in a better position to make informed judgements as to whether a particular variant reading was the product of the scribe or inherited by him. Hill and Kruger write:

While absolute determination about which changes came from the individual scribe and which ones the scribe inherited may be impossible, some believe they can distinguish at least some of the textual phenomena attributable to the scribe of an individual manuscript. This, in turn, allows a glimpse of an even earlier text.

In regards to the unprofessionalism of the early Christian scribes, this position can often be overstated. For Andreas Köstenberger and Michael Kruger, “the fact that a number of early Christian manuscripts contained an impressive amount of punctuation and readers’ aids—which are rare even in literary papyri—suggests that early Christian scribes were more in tune with professional book production than often realized.” If we

30 Hill and Kruger, “Introduction,” 14. They list several areas of enquiry occurring in the area of textual criticism which could be helpful in determining what the original text may have looked like.
31 Andreas J. Köstenberger and Michael J. Kruger, The Heresy of Orthodoxy: How Contemporary Culture’s Fascination with Diversity Has Reshaped Our Understanding of Early Christianity (Wheaton, IL:
also consider the usage of nomina sacra and staurogram in our earliest extant manuscripts,\textsuperscript{32} and the reference to the scribe Tertius in Rom 16:22,\textsuperscript{33} then “there are reasons to think Christians would have had ready access to professional scribal assistance, either by way of hiring scribes to do work, by using slaves who were scribes owned by well-to-do Christians, or by using scribes who had converted to Christianity and were willing to provide secretarial assistance.”\textsuperscript{34}

Craig Evans argues for the likelihood of the New Testament autographs being in use for the first one hundred years or more.\textsuperscript{35} If we consider the discovery of a library on the outskirts of Oxyrhynchus which contained manuscripts older than the library itself, with anecdotal evidence in the ancient literature in which autographs were said to be viewed by some at a much later date,\textsuperscript{36} including the reverence given to sacred writings in the ancient world, it is not impossible, then, to believe that some of our extant New Testament manuscripts may have been copied from the autographs themselves. As Evans says, “Autographs and first copies may well have remained in circulation until the end of the second century, even the beginning of the third century.”\textsuperscript{37}

Finally, for Holger Strutwolf the quest for the original text is not obsolete. He has analysed and used as examples Luke 11:2–3 and Matt 19:17 to show that one can

\textsuperscript{32} Nomina sacra are abbreviations of sacred names while a staurogram is a monogram in which two Greek letters are superimposed upon the other, normally the \(\rho\) upon the \(\tau\), to symbolise the crucifixion. See the discussion in Larry W. Hurtado, The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 95-134 for nomina sacra and 135-54 for staurogram.

\textsuperscript{33} Multifunctional private scribes who knew their trade well were often mentioned by name in the early Greco-Roman world.

\textsuperscript{34} Köstenberger and Hill, Heresy of Orthodoxy, 189.


\textsuperscript{36} Evans (“How Long,” 28) has noted Pliny the Elder, who claimed to have seen the autograph of a work two hundred years old.

\textsuperscript{37} Evans, “How Long,” 35.
determine confidently what the original text once read. His optimism is expressed in the following way:

In most cases we can get back to the beginning of our manuscript tradition . . . As long as we have no evidence that suggests a radical break in the textual transmission between the author’s text and the initial text of our tradition, the best hypothesis concerning the original text still remains the reconstructed archetype to which our manuscript tradition and the evidence of early translations and the citations point. In most cases we are able to produce a valid and stable hypothesis about the original text where there are variant readings in the text of the Greek New Testament.38

The quest to determine the original text of the New Testament autographs should not be abandoned. It is still possible to make some comment on how the autographs may once have looked. This is precisely what I am attempting to do with this thesis. I am arguing that Luke’s Gospel originally contained the short variant readings and that at a later time the same author returned to his work and updated it by adding the long variant readings.

The remaining chapters of this thesis set out to achieve the above goal. Chapter two covers the history, theory and methodology behind the Western non-interpolations. It covers the period from the nineteenth century to the present time. Chapter two also discusses the contributions made by textual critics, exegetes and editors of the Greek New Testament editions since the time of Westcott and Hort. It is important to keep in mind that the intent of this chapter is not only to give an historical overview of the Western non-interpolations, but to understand the relevant arguments and methodology.

The following two chapters closely examine the external and internal evidence.

Chapter three deals exclusively with the external evidence. In this chapter the focus is upon what can be learnt about our variant readings from the surviving historical data.

Chapter four exclusively deals with the internal evidence. This chapter focuses primarily upon the language, style and thought of the variant readings.

Chapter five provides evidence for a two-stage composition for the Gospel of Luke. Evidence of a two-stage composition for Luke’s Gospel is found in two places. First, it is found by comparing the text of the Infancy Narrative of Luke (1:5–2:52) with the rest of the Gospel. Second, it is found through an examination of the external evidence relating to the Third Gospel. In this chapter, the argument put forth is that the long variant readings and the Infancy Narrative were added by the author several years after the first edition of the Gospel of Luke and shortly after the writing of Acts. Therefore, there is some evidence for a two-stage composition for Luke’s Gospel.

Chapter six is the final chapter of this thesis. In this chapter all the relevant findings from the previous chapters are drawn together. There is also a comment on whether other variant readings might be included as evidence of a two-stage composition for Luke’s Gospel.
2. The Western Non-interpolations: History, Theory and Methodology

This chapter covers the history, theory and methodology of the Western non-interpolations. The insights gained in this chapter, particularly in the area of methodology, set the course of action for the remainder of this thesis.

To begin, I discuss the emerging scholarship in the years prior to Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort. The attitudes towards the biblical text and the methodology which was developing in this period had a significant impact upon the work of both these scholars. This first section, titled Before Westcott and Hort, introduces the text-critical scholarship which was emerging before Westcott and Hort introduced their theory of the Western non-interpolations. Their attitudes towards the biblical text, including the methodology they employed, owed much to these prior years.

The next section, titled Westcott and Hort's Western Non-interpolations, consists of an analysis of Westcott and Hort’s theory and methodology. Here we learn of their reasons for isolating eight Lukan variant readings into a class termed Western non-interpolations and the methodology they employed. Following this is a look at a period in which Westcott and Hort’s theory was debated and challenged. I refer to this section as The Transition Period: 1881-1900.

Following the Transition Period we enter The Age of Acceptance: 1901-1971. I use this title for the simple reason that the years 1901 to 1971 was a period of widespread acceptance of Westcott and Hort’s theory. However, this acceptance was not lasting. A time came when much of the theological establishment abandoned Westcott and Hort’s theory. This leads to the next section titled From 1971 to the Present. As the
title suggests, it is a period of widespread rejection of Westcott and Hort's theory. However, as we shall learn, though Westcott and Hort's theory was rejected by many, it still has some supporters.

It is important to note that the years that serve as boundary markers are little more than guiding estimates. We are not to think that as soon as the calendar year moved from 1900 to 1901 that all debates over Westcott and Hort’s theory ceased and that all gave their approval. Nor are we to think that there was no growing acceptance of Westcott and Hort’s theory during the transition period. It did not happen this way. I have chosen the years 1901 and 1971 as boundary markers because of two important publications which accepted Westcott and Hort’s theory. But as we see in the discussion of the period in which Westcott and Hort’s theory was out of vogue, 1971 to the present, serious challenges to their theory were occurring much earlier, particularly during the 1960’s. With this in mind, we begin with the period prior to the publication of Westcott and Hort’s influential work, a time in which textual criticism was undergoing some serious changes.

**Before Westcott and Hort**

Westcott and Hort were not the first to bring into question some of the variant readings that came to be labelled Western non-interpolations. Textual critics Karl Lachmann, Samuel Prideaux Tregelles and Constantin von Tischendorf predate Westcott and Hort and had important things to say about several of these variants. It is these scholars who are discussed in this section of the chapter.

It is clear that text-critical methodology was undergoing significant development in the years prior to Westcott and Hort. In the eighteenth century Johann Albrecht
Bengel was the first to classify manuscripts into families. He identified two: the Asiatic and the African. Johann Salomo Semler carried on with Bengel's work and was the first to use the word “recension.” He identified two recensions, the Oriental or Lucian and the Western or Egypto-Palestinian. Johann Jakob Griesbach, a student of Semler, classified the New Testament manuscripts into three families: Western, Alexandrian and Constantinopolitan. The early nineteenth century saw Johann Leonhard Hug identify three recensions. He believed that Origen, Hesychius and Lucian were responsible for each of these. Hug’s student Johann Martin Augustin Scholz accepted the Alexandrian and Constantinopolitan texts, giving priority to the latter. Scholz also stressed the importance of identifying the geographical locations of several manuscripts.\(^1\) Despite their innovative work, none of these scholars were willing to deviate far from the *Textus Receptus.*\(^2\) Karl Lachmann was different. It is with him we begin.


\(^2\) *Textus Receptus*, or *Received Text* in English, is the name given to the Greek text that served as the base text for the translations that existed between the sixteenth century and the end of the nineteenth century. The name was first coined by the publishers Bonaventure and Abraham Elzevir in their *Preface* to the 1633 second edition of the Greek New Testament. The *Preface* reads, *textum ergo habes, nunc ab omnibus receptum, in quo nihil immutatum aut corruptum damus.* It is translated, “Therefore, you have the text, now received by all, in which we give nothing altered or corrupt.” See J. Keith Elliott, “The Text of the New Testament,” in *A History of Biblical Interpretation, Vol 2: The Medieval Through the Reformation Periods,* ed. Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 227-53. The Elzevir text follows in the tradition of Desiderius Erasmus who published the first Greek New Testament in 1516. This was followed by Robert Estienne (Stephanus) who published four editions between 1546 and 1551. The text of the *Textus Receptus* resembles that of the Byzantine text (or Majority text). Both the *Textus Receptus* and Byzantine text rely heavily upon the late minuscules. However, the *Textus Receptus* should not be confused with that of the Byzantine text, for as Daniel Wallace has noted, the *Textus Receptus* and Byzantine text diverge in up to 2,000 places. Daniel B. Wallace, “Some Second Thoughts on the Majority Text,” *BSac* 146 (1989): 270-90.
**Karl Lachmann (1793-1851)**

Karl Lachmann was a noted philologist and textual critic in both religious and secular contexts. He is well known for developing “a theoretical base for the dismemberment of the [Homeric] poems into their constituent parts.”

Lachmann argued that many oral layers (eighteen to be exact) were to be found in Homer’s *Iliad*. He was also involved in critical editorial work on Middle High German poets and Latin poets such as Lucretius. Lachmann was at the forefront of an emerging science in which new and developing analytical principles were applied to critical editions of ancient texts. He eventually turned his interests towards the Greek New Testament, applying principles he learnt in his research on Homer and Middle High German poets.

Lachmann believed that it was important to create a *stemma*, that is, a family tree of manuscripts. Though not the first to do so, he did popularise the use of the *stemma* in the area of biblical textual criticism, using the results extensively. Borrowing from what he had learnt in the area of philology, Lachmann observed which manuscripts contained the same errors. Known as *indicative errors* (*Leitfehler* in German), he identified common agreements in error in two or more manuscripts that could not have been made on more than one occasion. As David Parker notes, Lachmann looked for “agreement in error as an indicator of a relationship between manuscripts.”

Lachmann came to accept three families of manuscripts. For him, these were the Alexandrian, Western and Eastern, the last of which is known today as Byzantine. Once the text of each family was known, Lachmann believed that it was possible to recreate an

---


archetype, that is, the direct ancestor from which each family descended.5

Lachmann rejected any use of internal evidence, using only evidence that could be derived from the manuscripts themselves. This did not mean that he was counting manuscripts to determine the most acceptable readings. Rather, it was important for Lachmann to focus upon the regions in which the manuscripts were believed to have risen so as to determine the type of text of that region.6

It is fair to say that Lachmann’s work on the Greek New Testament was groundbreaking even though it was not revered by all. The animosity that surrounded Lachmann’s work was based upon his abandonment of the Textus Receptus. He was the first to do so on such a large scale and received the ire of those unwilling to break from tradition.

In 1831 Lachmann published a small critical edition of the Greek New Testament.7 This edition offered alternative variant readings to those of the influential Elzevir 1550 edition of the Textus Receptus, which was the common text of the time. However, it was his second edition, published in two volumes, which proved to be of lasting significance.8 Volume one, published in 1842, contained the four canonical Gospels. Volume two, published in 1850, contained the remainder of the New Testament books.

---

5 Parker, Introduction, 161.
7 Karl Lachmann, Novum Testamentum Graece (Berlin: Reimer, 1831).
8 Karl Lachmann, Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine, 2 vols (Berlin: Reimer, 1842 and 1850).
Lachmann’s second edition contained a text different to that of the 1831 edition. It made use of the earliest witnesses available to him at the time. These witnesses included Codices Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus and fragments of Codices Guelferbytanus, Borgianus and Dublinensis. He also made use of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis and consulted Old Latin witnesses, Jerome’s Vulgate, and the testimonies of Irenaeus, Origen, Cyprian, Hilary and Lucifer of Cagliari. In the second edition, Lachmann was willing to give a little more consideration to Western readings.

Lachmann’s intention was to restore the most ancient New Testament text in Eastern Christendom during the fourth century. He believed that the most ancient reading of the biblical text during the fourth century of Eastern Christendom was only found in those manuscripts that could be classified as Alexandrian. If manuscripts within this textual family disagreed Lachmann would then consult those manuscripts of the Western family to help break the deadlock. This is why he held codices such as Alexandrinus, Vaticanus and Ephraemi on a higher level than Codex Bezae, which contained Western readings.

In his critical edition of 1842, Lachmann cited Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Vaticanus, Old Latin witness c and Elzevir’s Textus Receptus as witnesses to the long variant reading of Luke 24:12. Codex Vaticanus is an Alexandrian witness. The Old Latin witness c is mixed with “traces of African readings.” The Gospels of Codex

---

Alexandrinus and the *Textus Receptus* are representatives of the Byzantine family. The *Textus Receptus* relies heavily on the late minuscules of the Byzantine period. Lachmann cited Codex Bezae, Old Latin witnesses *a* and *b* and Eusebius as witnesses for the short variant reading of Luke 24:12.

Lachmann included the long variant reading of Luke 24:12 in his critical Greek New Testament edition of 1842. It is, however, enclosed in square brackets. The enclosed brackets signify some doubt in regards to the authenticity of the passage. Therefore, the use of the enclosed brackets is an example of Lachmann giving some credence to the Western text, as the short variant reading is found only in Western sources.

From Lachmann, then, we find a methodology that utilises the external evidence. The Alexandrian text is given priority, though at times the Western text is preferred. Of our Western non-interpolations only Luke 24:12 came under some scrutiny, as is seen by the bracketing of the long variant reading.

Lachmann was the first to break away from the *Textus Receptus*. He recognised that the earliest text of the Christian Scriptures could be found in sources other than those utilised in the *Textus Receptus*. Lachmann advanced a way of thinking of the biblical text that was novel for the time.

**Samuel Prideaux Tregelles (1813-1875)**

Samuel Prideaux Tregelles was another textual critic who began to distance himself from the traditions of the past. He published one edition of the Greek New Testament in

---

12 Though the Gospels of Codex Alexandrinus are an example of the Byzantine text, the rest of the Codex is representative of the Alexandrian text.
seven volumes between 1857 and 1879. His Greek New Testament is credited for “drawing British preference away from the Textus Receptus.” Tregelles made his intention clear when he said that his objective was:

1st. – To form a text on the authority of ancient copies without allowing the ‘received text’ any prescriptive rights.
2nd. – To give to the ancient versions a determining voice, as to the insertion or non-insertion of clauses, etc.; letting the order of words, etc., rest wholly upon MSS.
3rd. – To give the authorities for the text, and for the various readings, clearly and accurately, so that the reader might at once see what rests upon ancient evidence.

Like Lachmann, Tregelles deviated from the Textus Receptus. This, however, was not their only similarity. Tregelles also gave priority to external evidence, though he came to this conclusion independently of Lachmann. It was because of his own study of the extant manuscripts that Tregelles preferred the evidence of the manuscripts. He wrote:

In the course of my studies, I was of necessity led to become more accurately acquainted with the ancient versions; and thus I knew their value to be much greater, in all points of evidence, than I had at first supposed. For, so far from their being merely witnesses to the insertion or non-insertion of clauses, I learned that they were continually explicit in their testimony as to minute points.

For Tregelles, if a reading is unanimously attested in the manuscript tradition then one can be confident of the validity of that reading. Alternatively, if a variant reading is singularly attested or found in only a small number of manuscripts then one

---

13 The sixth volume of 1872, containing the book of Revelation, was not written by him alone. Tregelles had fallen seriously ill due to a stroke in 1870 and sought the assistance of Benjamin Wills Newton. Metzger and Ehrman, Text of the New Testament, 174.
16 Tregelles, Account of the printed text, 154.
cannot be confident of its validity. If the evidence is equally divided then various external principles need to be applied to split the difference.\footnote{A discussion of these principles are found in S. P. Tregelles, \textit{The Greek New Testament: Introductory Notices of the Six Editions, Including the Prolegomena, Addenda and Corrigenda}, vol. 1 (London: Bagster, 1857), ii-iii.} For Tregelles these principles are to be applied to detect an amplified reading, harmonisation and other scribal alterations.

Interestingly, Tregelles accepted that at times it is possible to support a reading which is attested by a very small quantity of manuscripts. He wrote that “it is quite true, that, at times, it may be very doubtful whether the quantity of direct evidence may not overbalance all modes of procedure derived from the application of a principle, and as to which of two seemingly conflicting considerations ought to have most weight.”\footnote{Tregelles, \textit{Greek New Testament}, vol. 1, ii.} An example of giving some credence to a small quantity of manuscripts is seen in the presentation of the long variant readings of Luke 24:12 and 40. These variant readings are enclosed in square brackets, indicating some doubt as to their authenticity. Tregelles used a greater number of witnesses than Lachmann to produce his critical edition of the \textit{Greek New Testament}. Codex Bezae, a handful of Old Latin witnesses and a smaller number of versions are cited as witnesses to the short variant readings, while the greater number of manuscripts testified to the long variant reading. It appears that in regards to Luke 24:12 and 40 Tregelles was somewhat suspicious of the priority handed to the long variant readings.

To summarise, Tregelles moved away from the \textit{Textus Receptus}. He gave much weight to the external evidence, particularly that which was believed to exhibit an Alexandrian text. However, in regards to Luke 24:12 and 40 Tregelles questioned, at
least to some degree, the priority handed to the long variant readings. Lachmann and
Tregelles had similar approaches as to how the New Testament text should be
established. However, their work was overshadowed by that of Constantin von
Tischendorf.

**Constantin von Tischendorf (1815-1874)**

A giant among textual critics, Tischendorf “sought out and published more manuscripts
and produced more critical editions of the Greek Bible than any other single scholar.”
Between 1841 and 1872 Tischendorf produced eight critical editions of the Greek New
Testament. The one he is most remembered for is his two-volume, eighth edition
Novum Testamentum Graece of 1869-1872. This work is better known as the editio
octava critica maior. The first volume of 1869 contained the Gospels, while the second
volume contained the remaining New Testament books. A third volume in three parts
was published between 1884 and 1894. This work, a Prolegomena, was prepared and
completed by Caspar René Gregory after Tischendorf’s death. It contained information
pertaining to Tischendorf’s editio octava critica maior. Importantly, we find in the
Prolegomena information on the sources used by Tischendorf and an explanation of his
methodology.

Tischendorf’s editio octava critica maior was a monumental work, not least for its

---

20 Constantin Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece: ad antiquissimos testes denuo recensuit
apparatum criticum omni studio perfectum commentionem isagogicam, editio octava critica maior*,
vol. 1 (Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869).
21 Constantin Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece: ad antiquissimos testes denuo recensuit
apparatum criticum omni studio perfectum commentionem isagogicam, editio octava critica maior*,
vol. 2 (Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1872).
22 Constantin Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece: ad antiquissimos testes denuo recensuit
apparatum criticum apposuit Constantinus Tischendorf, editio octava critica maior, Prolegomena*, vol. 3,
ed. Caspar René Gregory (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1884, 1890 and 1894).
departure from the *Textus Receptus*. The distancing of the *editio octava critica maior* from the *Textus Receptus* was more prevalent than Tischendorf's previous seven editions. For example, Frederick Henry Ambrose Scrivener said that the *editio octava critica maior* differs from the seventh edition in 3369 places. Two decades later Eberhard Nestle wrote that the *editio octava critica maior* differs from the seventh edition in 3572 places. Whichever the correct amount, it is clear that Tischendorf extensively revised his *Novum Testamentum Graece* and that this revised text, the *editio octava critica maior*, broke traditional ties with the *Textus Receptus*.

There were two important factors that contributed to the revision of the *editio octava critica maior*. First, in the *editio octava critica maior* we see a heavy reliance upon Codex Sinaiticus, a manuscript discovered by Tischendorf himself. Second, Tischendorf made greater use of Codex Vaticanus. As Caspar René Gregory noted, Tischendorf gained a “more accurate and full knowledge of the text of the Codex Vaticanus.” With Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus Tischendorf believed that he could recreate a text that was reflective of the second century.

Tischendorf outlined a methodology that was different to that of Lachmann and Tregelles. Whereas Lachmann and Tregelles made sole use of external evidence, Tischendorf made use of both external and internal evidence. For Tischendorf, the oldest manuscripts carried greater authority. However, as he incorporated internal evidence, he still relied on both external and internal sources.

---

26 Tischendorf did have his detractors. For example, Scrivener believed that Tischendorf's reliance upon Codex Sinaiticus was “excessive and irrational.” Scrivener, *Plain Introduction*, 528.
evidence into his methodology, it was inevitable that conflict would arise. It was impossible for Tischendorf to always rely on the testimony of the manuscripts. Eldon Epp explains the dilemma Tischendorf faced.

The combination in Tischendorf of a dominant external criterion – the oldest Greek MSS are the most authoritative – and of further, intermingled external and internal criteria means that the basic reliance on the oldest witnesses cannot be carried through consistently, for the further internal criteria force the modification of the basic principle at point after point and thwart its comprehensive application; the result is that at numerous points the “balance of probabilities” formula must be invoked.  

We see examples in Tischendorf’s text of where the “reliance on the oldest witnesses cannot be carried through consistently” due to the invocation of internal principles. The long variant readings of Luke 24:12, 36b, 40, 51b and 52a were omitted from Tischendorf’s text despite being found in the majority of the oldest witnesses. Here internal evidence took precedence over external evidence. The long variant readings of Luke 22:19b–20, 24:3b and 6a were retained.

Tischendorf’s removal of five of the long variant readings went beyond both Lachmann and Tregelles. His application of internal evidence was the catalyst for their removal. The interplay between external and internal evidence and the consequence it had upon the eight variants under discussion was to reach a new level with the work of Westcott and Hort. Their insights and application of the external and internal evidence surrounding these variants have caused scholars frustration, a frustration that still exists to this day.

Westcott and Hort’s Western Non-interpolations

The scholarly world was introduced to the theory of the Western non-interpolations with the publication of Westcott and Hort’s two-volume work, *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (1881-1882). Their Greek text enclosed nine variant readings within double square brackets [〚〛], indicating their inauthenticity. Eight of these variant readings were found in Luke’s Gospel and one was found in Matthew’s Gospel. Volume two, *Introduction and Appendix*, included an explanation as to why these nine variant readings were thought to be inauthentic. Following is a summary account of Westcott and Hort’s position as presented in their *Introduction*.

Westcott and Hort thought highly of what they termed the Neutral text. For them the Neutral text preserved a purer form of text. They considered this type of text to be the closest representation of the autographs and, as such, the earliest recoverable type of text.

---


30 It should be noted that the text in double square brackets were kept in Westcott and Hort’s critical edition because of traditional value and not because they believed that these variant readings were originally part of the autographs.

31 See Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, 126-30. Westcott and Hort spoke of four types of text. These were the Neutral text, Western text, Alexandrian text and Syrian text. Only the Neutral and Western texts concern us in our analysis. However, it should be noted that Westcott and Hort’s Neutral text is nowadays understood as forming part of the Alexandrian text-type. As this part of the study is explaining Westcott and Hort’s theory, I shall continue to make reference to the Neutral text at the appropriate places.

32 After World War II the term “type of text” was replaced by the terms “text-type,” and more recently “textual clusters.” These latter terms were not in use during the time of Westcott and Hort. They used the phrase “type of text” or “text,” and therefore these terms will be employed when discussing the Western non-interpolations. See Eldon Jay Epp, “Textual Clusters: Their Past and Future in New Testament Textual Criticism,” in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 519-77. The terms
Traditionally, the Neutral text has been associated with Alexandria, as it appears to have been prevalent in this area. This at least was the understanding of Westcott and Hort. However, though there is some evidence to suggest that such a type of text was at one time circulating in Alexandria, it was by no means confined to it.

During the time of Westcott and Hort, when most extant manuscripts attesting to the Neutral type of text were dated from the fourth century onwards, it was the witness of Fathers such as Origen and Clement of Alexandria that made a second-century date of the aforementioned type of text possible. These Patristic authors showed knowledge of readings consistent with that found in the Neutral type of text. The result of this was that the Neutral type of text should be thought of as one of the earliest types of text, if not the earliest type of text, of the New Testament. For Westcott and Hort, this translated into the notion that the Neutral type of text represented not only the earliest text but also the most reliable text of the New Testament.

text-type, type of text, textual clusters, or simply text, refer to the classification of manuscripts into families. Manuscripts within each family display some type of textual relationship to one another. Such terms are most often used in reference to the Gospels.

A similar view is held today about the Alexandrian text. The following quote highlights a general standard belief: “It is widely agreed that the Alexandrian text was prepared by skilful editors, trained in the scholarly traditions of Alexandria. The text on which they relied must have already been ancient in all important points.” Metzger and Ehrman, Text of the New Testament, 312. Therefore, though such a type of text can be found circulating in Alexandria, it is wrong to think that it was not found anywhere else or that its origin was Alexandria.

Nowadays, there is a growing tendency among scholars to abandon the idea of type of text. Much of the
According to Westcott and Hort, the most important witness to the Neutral type of text is Codex Vaticanus (B, 02). From Hort we read that Codex Vaticanus “very far exceeds all other documents in neutrality of text . . . being in fact always or nearly always neutral, with the exception of the Western element . . . as virtually confined to the Pauline epistles.” Elsewhere we read that Codex Vaticanus “must be regarded as having preserved not only a very ancient text, but a very pure line of very ancient text, and that with comparatively small depravation either by scattered ancient corruptions otherwise attested or by individualisms of the scribe himself.”

Next in line of importance for the Neutral type of text are Codex Sinaiticus (א, 01) which contains the complete Bible; codices Ephraemi Rescriptus (C, 04) and Dublinensis (Z, 035) for Matthew’s Gospel; codices Regius (Lc, 019), 33 and Sangallensis (Δ, 037) for Mark’s Gospel; codices Zacynthius (Ξ, 040) and Nitriensis (R, 027) for Luke’s Gospel; and codices Borgianus (T, 029) and Guelferbytanus B (Q, 026) for both Luke and John’s Gospel.

reason has to do with the discovery of the numerous papyri in the twentieth-century as well as the mixture found in the many extant sources. For a discussion see Kurt Aland, “The Significance of the Papyri for Progress in New Testament Research,” in The Bible in Modern Scholarship, ed. J. P. Hyatt (New York: Abingdon, 1965), 325-46; Parker, Introduction, 171-74; and Robert Hull, The Story of the New Testament Text: Movers, Materials, Motives, Methods and Models (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), 141-42. More will be said of this in chapter three. For discussion of the papyri and their significance, particularly P75, see pages 65-69.

37 Codex Vaticanus dates to the fourth century. It is one of the better preserved Greek New Testament manuscripts, as well as the oldest extant Greek manuscript of the Septuagint. Unfortunately, some parts did not survive, as it is missing 1-4 Maccabees, the Prayer of Manasseh, most of Genesis, Pss 105:27–137:6b and several verses of 2 Kings. Sometime during the fifteenth century a scribe replaced the missing parts of Genesis and the Psalms. See Henry Barclay Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902), 126-28; and Ernst Würtwein, The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica, 2nd ed., trans. Erroll F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 73.

38 Westcott and Hort, Introduction, 171.


40 For the story surrounding Codex Sinaiticus see David C. Parker, Codex Sinaiticus: The Story of the World’s Oldest Bible (London: Hendrickson, 2010).

41 Westcott and Hort, Introduction, 171. For background information on these manuscripts see Philip Comfort, Encountering the Manuscripts: An Introduction to New Testament Paleography and Textual
In regards to codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus Westcott and Hort believed that if both manuscripts agreed on a particular variant reading, then the evidence is considered influential. Only internal evidence of a “strong” nature could override the testimony of codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. Hort wrote:

It is our belief (1) that readings of $\text{א}$B should be accepted as the true readings until strong internal evidence is found to the contrary, and (2) that no readings of $\text{א}$B can safely be rejected absolutely, though it is sometimes right to place them only on an alternative footing, especially where they receive no support from Versions or Fathers.42

Though Codex Vaticanus was regarded highly by Westcott and Hort, they did acknowledge the possibility of scribal corruption within this codex. Hort gave this caution, “To take [Codex Vaticanus] as the sole authority except where it contains self-betraying errors . . . is an unwarrantable abandonment of criticism, and in our opinion inevitably leads to erroneous results.”43

Westcott and Hort’s critical analysis of Codex Vaticanus, including the Neutral type of text, revealed nine problematic readings. These were:

Matt 27:49b:

\[
\text{ἄλλος δὲ λαβὼν λόγχην ἔνυξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευράν, καὶ ἔξηλθεν ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα.}
\]
And another took a spear and pierced his side, and out came water and blood.

Luke 22:19b–20:

\[
\begin{align*}
19b & \text{τὸ ύπερ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τούτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.} \\
20 & \text{καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δείπνησαι, λέγων· τούτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου τὸ ύπερ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.}
\end{align*}
\]


42 Westcott and Hort, Introduction, 225.

43 Westcott and Hort, Introduction, 251.
Which is being given for you; do this for my memory. And the cup in the same way after supper, saying, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood which is being shed for you.”

*Luke 24:3b:*
toú kuriou Ἰησοῦ.

Of the Lord Jesus.

*Luke 24:6a:*
οὐκ ἔστιν ὑδὲ, ἀλλ’ ἡγέρθη.

He is not here, but was raised.

*Luke 24:12:*
Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἀναστὰς ἔδραμεν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει τὰ ὀθόνια μόνα, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός.

But Peter, having risen, ran to the tomb and after stooping down he sees the linen wrappings alone, and he left wondering to himself what had happened.

*Luke 24:36b:*
καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν.

And he says to them, “Peace to you.”

*Luke 24:40:*
καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας.

And when he had said this, he showed them his hands and feet.

*Luke 24:51b:*
καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν.

And was carried up into heaven.

*Luke 24:52a:*
προσκυνήσαντες αὐτὸν.

After worshipping him.

Westcott and Hort observed that the above variant readings, though part of the Neutral type of text, were not part of the Western type of text. To understand why this would cause a problem for Westcott and Hort, we turn to their understanding of the Western type of text.

Manuscripts of the Western type of text were believed to have been common in
the Western Roman Empire, though certainly not confined to this area.\textsuperscript{44} At the time of Westcott and Hort, the leading manuscripts which were witnesses to the Western text were “Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (D 05), the chief Old Latin MSS and Fathers, the Old Syriac, and the Greek Ante-Nicene Fathers, those of Alexandria partially accepted.”\textsuperscript{45} On a lesser scale, other manuscripts, in certain parts, gave some support to Western readings of the Gospels, such as Codices Sinaiticus, Monacensis (X, 033) and Tischendorfianus IV (Γ, 036), the families of minuscules f1 and f13, minuscules 22, 28 and 157, Latin Vulgate, the Thebaic, Ethiopic, Armenian and Gothic Versions.\textsuperscript{46}

For Westcott and Hort, Codex Bezae held a unique prominence amongst those witnesses listed as representative of the Western type of text. Codex Bezae is a bilingual manuscript in Greek and Latin of the Gospels, Acts and fragments of 3 John.\textsuperscript{47} For them, though Codex Bezae was a source to be dated sometime in the sixth century, “it is, to the best of our belief, substantially a Western text of Cent. II, with occasional readings

\textsuperscript{44} Sinaitic Old Syrian and Coptic Versions provide evidence that the Western text was known in the East. The citation of Western passages in Clement of Alexandria would seem to suggest that the Western text was known in Alexandria. Swanson, for instance, argues that Clement’s Lukan Gospel citations show knowledge of the Western text. Reuben J. Swanson, “The Gospel Text of Clement of Alexandria” (PhD diss., Yale University, 1956). Alternatively, Streeter argued that Clement’s Western citations are not evidence that a Western text was prevalent in Alexandria, for Clement was not a native of Alexandria. Rather, Clement spent most of his time in Southern Italy where the Western text was used and therefore became accustomed to these readings whilst there. Streeter, \textit{Four Gospels}, 56-57. In any case, the mixture of Alexandrian and Western readings in the patristic writings does highlight that it is difficult to limit types of texts to one geographical location. As Frederic Kenyon noted early in the twentieth century, “The [Western]-text is earlier in date and more universally disseminated in the Christian world of the second century than had previously been realised.” Frederic G. Kenyon, \textit{Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament} (London: Macmillan, 1912), 341. Having said this, I concur with the statement in relation to all types of texts, “When the designation continues to be used by textual critics, it is more as a proper name than as a geographical term.” Metzger and Ehrman, \textit{Text of the New Testament}, 307.

\textsuperscript{45} Westcott and Hort, \textit{Introduction}, 165. As can be seen from this list, only one major extant source is of the Greek Bible. Other sources are from versions and the Fathers. Compared to the extant sources of the Neutral type of text there are far fewer sources for the Western type of text. This discrepancy continues today, even after the discovery of a number of manuscripts in the twentieth century.

\textsuperscript{46} Westcott and Hort, \textit{Introduction}, 165.

\textsuperscript{47} For more about this Codex see David C. Parker, \textit{Codex Bezae: An Early Manuscript and Its Text} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
probably due to Cent. IV.”

Second-century Church Fathers who appear to have knowledge of the Western text include Cyprian, Tertullian and Irenaeus. For Westcott and Hort, the witness of Fathers such as these placed the date of the Western text well into the second century. Therefore, in conjunction with the Neutral type of text, the Western type of text is one of the earliest known type of text.

Westcott and Hort’s position for the inferiority of the Western type of text was based upon the identification of four peculiar characteristics. The first and most prominent of these was the “love of paraphrase.” Westcott and Hort noted that “words, clauses, and even whole sentences were changed, omitted, and inserted with astonishing freedom, wherever it seemed that the meaning could be brought out with greater force and definiteness.” The second peculiar characteristic was alterations or additions from non-biblical sources so as to enrich the text. The third characteristic included

---

48 Westcott and Hort, Introduction, 148. Though it is accepted that some form of Western text was known in the second century, it is important to note that a number of scholars nowadays do not support Westcott and Hort’s position of identifying Codex Bezae “with any [specific] entity of the second century.” This issue is discussed in chapter three. J. Neville Birdsall, “The Western Text in the Second Century,” in Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text and Transmission, ed. William L. Petersen (Notre Dame, London: University of Notre Dame, 1989), 3-17.

49 Frederick Henry Ambrose Scrivener, though a contemporary of Westcott and Hort and unsupportive of their position, was able to claim that “critics of every school agree in admitting the primitive existence of this Western recension.” Scrivener, Plain Introduction, 532. Today, the earliest extant Greek New Testament manuscripts that are considered to give a Western reading are P38, P48 and 0171. All date approximately from the third century, with the last possibly in the fourth century. P38 and P48 are fragments of Acts while 0171 contains fragments of Matt 10:17–23, 25–32 and Luke 22:44–56, 61–64. None of these witnesses are relevant for a discussion of the Western non-interpolations. As for patristic witnesses Alexander Souter argued that Justin Martyr (ca. 150 CE) made use of a Western type of text of Matthew. Alexander Souter, The Text and the Canon of the New Testament (London: Duckworth, 1912), 77. Helmut Koester has also defended this view. Helmut Koester, “The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century,” in Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text and Transmission, ed. William L. Petersen (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 1989), 19-37. For an analysis of the various witnesses for a second-century Western text, see Birdsall, “Western Text,” 3-17.

50 Westcott and Hort, Introduction, 122-27. Examples of the four peculiar characteristics can be found within the aforementioned pages.

51 Westcott and Hort, Introduction, 122.
grammatical changes, such as a greater tendency for genitive pronouns, insertion of objects, genitive, dative or accusative after absolute verbs, insertion of conjunctions and so on. Finally, Westcott and Hort argued that the Western text showed a liking for assimilation so as to eliminate any perceived discrepancy. According to Westcott and Hort, a harmonising tendency is evident within the Western text.

Though these “peculiar” characteristics identified the unique tendencies found within the Western type of text, there was a group of variant readings, twenty-seven to be exact, that did not exhibit characteristics typical of this type of text. These twenty-seven variant readings were divided into two classes: an intermediate class, which was further divided into two groups; and another class known as Western non-interpolations.

The intermediate class consists of eighteen variant readings. Westcott and Hort identified these as Matt (6:15, 25); 9:34; (13:33); 21:44; (23:26); Mark 2:22; (10:2); 14:39; Luke 5:39; 10:41f; 12:19; 12:21; 12:39; 22:62; (24:9); John 3:32 and 4:9. They believed that the internal evidence allowed for some doubt to the authenticity of these passages.52 The twelve passages Westcott and Hort did not enclose in brackets represented for them those variant readings of the Western text thought possibly to represent the original text, though not probably. In other words, for Westcott and Hort, the twelve short variant readings of the intermediate groups may be non-interpolations, but they were not so confident. The short variant readings of the remaining six passages, those passages above which they did enclose in brackets, were considered by Westcott and Hort as unlikely to represent the original text; that is, less likely than the other twelve of

52 Westcott and Hort, Introduction, 176.
the intermediate class. In their critical edition of the Greek New Testament text Westcott
and Hort identified the intermediate variant readings by placing the longer variant
readings within single square brackets [ ].53 This indicated some doubt, though not to
the level of those enclosed in double square brackets. With this intermediate class,
Westcott and Hort preferred to speak of them as “Western omissions proper.”54

Below is the list of the intermediate variant readings. What I have termed
Intermediate Group A consists of those twelve variant readings considered possibly
original, though not probably. The second group, which I have termed Intermediate
Group B, consists of those six variant readings considered unlikely to represent the
original text.

Table 2.1: Westcott and Hort’s Intermediate Western Variant Readings

| Intermediate Group A         | Matt 9:34                      | But the Pharisees said, “By the
|                             | οἱ δὲ φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν | ruler of the demons he casts
|                             | δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια       | out the demons
|                             | Matt 21:44                     | And the one falling on this
|                             | καὶ ὁ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὸν λίθον τούτον | stone will be broken to pieces;
|                             | συνθλασθῆσεται ἐφ’ ὃν δὲ ἂν πέσῃ | but on whomever it falls, it
|                             | λικμῆσει αὐτὸν                  | will crush him
|                             | Mark 2:22                      | But new wine into fresh
|                             | ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοὺς καινοὺς     | wineskins
|                             | Mark 14:39                     | Saying the same word
|                             | τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπών           | No one having drunk old
|                             | οὐδεὶς πιὼν παλαιὸν δέλει νέον λέγει γάρ | he says, “The old is good”
|                             | ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν          | [wine] desires new [wine]; for

53 There were three exceptions to this. Luke 10:41f; 12:39 and John 3:32 were not enclosed in square
brackets. See Table 2.1.
54 Westcott and Hort, Introduction, 294.
| Luke 10:41-42* | 41μεριμνᾷς καὶ θορυβάζῃ περὶ πολλά 42διόγων δὲ ἐστὶν χρεία ἢ ἐνός· Μαριάμ γάρ | 41You worry and are disturbed about many things 42but there is need of few things or [of] one; for Mary |
| Luke 12:19 | κείμενα εἰς ἑτη πολλά· ἀναπάυου, φάγε, πίε | Laid up for many years; rest, eat, drink |
| Luke 12:21 | οὕτως ὁ δησαυρίζων ἐαυτῷ καὶ μὴ εἰς θεόν πλουτῶν | So the one storing treasures for himself but not being rich towards God |
| Luke 12:39* | ἕγρηγόρησεν ἂν καὶ οὐκ ἄφηκεν διορυχθῆναι τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ | He would have kept awake and not allowed his house to be broken into |
| Luke 22:62 | καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐξω ἐκλάυσεν πικρῶς | And going outside he wept bitterly |
| John 3:32* | ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν· ὃ ἑώρακεν καὶ ἤκουσεν τοῦτο | Is over all; that which he has seen and heard |
| John 4:9 | οὐ γὰρ συγχρῶνται Ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρείταις | For Jews do not associate with Samaritans |

**Intermediate Group B**

| Matt 6:15 | τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν | Your trespasses |
| Matt 6:25 | ἢ τί πίησε | Or what you may drink |
| Matt 13:33 | ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς | He spoke to them |
| Matt 23:26 | καὶ τῆς παροψίδος | And of the plate |
| Mark 10:2 | Προσελθόντες Φαρισαίοι | Pharisees approaching |
| Luke 24:9 | ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου | From the tomb |

Intermediate Group A: Possibly original, though not probably; Intermediate Group B: unlikely original. The symbol * indicates that these variant readings were not enclosed in square brackets.

For Westcott and Hort, the eighteen intermediate variant readings were considered to be the product of scribes. This remains the general consensus today.55 As

---

for the nine Western non-interpolations, these have been the cause of controversy; the
eight Lukan passages more so than Matt 27:49b.⁵⁶

Westcott and Hort identified nine Western readings which they believed to go
back to the evangelists. They classified them as Western non-interpolations. The nine
variants are found at Matt 27:49b; Luke 22:19b–20; 24:3b, 6a, 12, 36b, 40, 51b and 52a.
These Western variant readings, which did not include the longer reading, were thought
by Westcott and Hort to represent the original text. As noted earlier, the longer nine
variant readings were enclosed in double square brackets [ ] suggesting they were not
part of the autographs of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke.

So why did Westcott and Hort decide to refer to each of these nine variant
readings as a Western non-interpolation? As mentioned in chapter one, Westcott and
Hort had such a high opinion of the Neutral type of text that they could not come to
terms with the idea that a type of text with such exalted status could be contaminated
with scribal interpolations. It was more appropriate for Westcott and Hort to highlight
the unstable nature of the Western type of text than to highlight some of the deficiencies
of the Neutral type of text. As such, they preferred to not call the nine longer variant
readings Neutral interpolations, a more apt name, but rather, decided upon the term
Western non-interpolations.

Westcott and Hort’s approach began with an independent analysis of each extant
variant reading. The intent was to discover which variant reading gave rise to the other
or others. Hort said that “the most rudimentary form of criticism consists in dealing

⁵⁶ For a discussion of this variant reading see the Excursus on pages 44-45.
with each variation independently, and adopting at once in each case out of two or more variants that which looks most probable.”

To achieve this Westcott and Hort began by considering the internal evidence of readings, of which two kinds were identified. The first was known as intrinsic probability. The focus here was upon the assumed author of a particular New Testament book. The task was to determine what the composer of the autograph was likely to have written. Hort explained how he thought this could be achieved. He wrote:

The decision [between the extant variant readings] may be made either by an immediate and as it were intuitive judgement, or by weighing cautiously various elements which go to make up what is called sense, such as conformity to grammar and congruity to the purport of the rest of the sentence and of the larger context; to which may rightly be added congruity to the usual style of the author and to his matter in other passages.

Here, Hort had in mind the fine art of exegesis. He acknowledged that it is important to understand the language of the relevant writer, such as vocabulary and linguistic structures. In addition, the importance of considering the immediate and broader context in which the variant reading is found, is acknowledged. The reason for this is to recognise whether a variant reading resembles the writer’s style or whether it appears foreign to it. On a sophisticated level, Hort’s approach consisted of taking into consideration the structure of the passage in which the variant is found so as to provide clues to its authenticity. It consisted of understanding the form of the relevant book as a whole and of the passage itself. In other words, is the variant reading a dialogue, sermon, parable, proverb, or so on? When Hort mentioned the author’s “matter in other

57 Westcott and Hort, Introduction, 19.
58 See Westcott and Hort, Introduction, 20-23 for a discussion of intrinsic probability.
passages,” he had in view the intention of the writer. In other words, is the variant reading theologically consistent with what is written elsewhere, or does it divert attention away to another theme and/or topic, particularly one which is foreign to the writer?

The strength of the principle of intrinsic probability is that it helps to identify which variant reading is worthy of further analysis. Its weakness is that it rarely determines the preferable variant reading. This is because it allows for too many presumptions based upon the critic’s subjective preference. Hort provided the following caution:

There is much literature, ancient no less than modern, in which it is needful to remember that authors are not always grammatical, or clear, or consistent, or felicitous; so that not seldom an ordinary reader finds it easy to replace a feeble or half-appropriate word or phrase by an effective substitute; and thus the best words to express an author’s meaning need not in all cases be those which he actually employed.60

The next step of inquiry is termed transcriptional probability. The focus here is on the activity of the scribe.61 Here, one seeks to determine whether or not a scribe has made an alteration to the text. In the words of Hort, transcriptional probability is where “we ask what the copyists are likely to have made him [the original writer] seem to write.”62 It is important here for the researcher to be able to explain the possible existence of each variant reading, including if one gave rise to another.63 Hort wrote:

For every rival reading is a fact which has to be accounted for, and no acceptance for any one reading as original can be satisfactory which leaves any other variant incapable of being traced to some known cause or causes

of variation.\textsuperscript{64}

It is difficult to believe that the intention of a scribe was to purposely introduce a worse reading. A scribe, when making an intentional alteration to the text, was doing so in order to improve the text. An intentional variation was based upon the notion that the text required improving in some way and for some purpose. These intentional changes were carefully planned and made the scribe more than a copyist. They made the scribe an editor and even a composer. For example, where a reading appeared to be unclear, a scribe may have been lured to adjust a reading in an attempt to clarify it. An implication of this is that a variant reading which appears to be “less clear” is likely to be closer to the original, but only if unintentional variations can be ruled out.\textsuperscript{65} Sometimes a scribe was confronted with more than one variant reading and was unsure which should be included in the text. Here the scribe would have to make a decision as to which variant reading to use. At other times the scribe would conflate the text (creatively combining the different variant readings together) and create a new variant reading.

When working with \textit{transcriptional probability} one attempts to get into the mind of the scribe, attempting to understand the scribe’s thought patterns. This in itself is a dubious task. Much depends upon the scanty evidence available and the creative mind using such evidence. As with \textit{intrinsic probability}, \textit{transcriptional probability} is a subjective guiding principle. A less subjective principle was required and Westcott and Hort found such a principle through the \textit{internal evidence of documents}.

With \textit{internal evidence of documents} a variant reading’s worth is measured

\textsuperscript{64} Westcott and Hort, \textit{Introduction}, 23.

\textsuperscript{65} Unintentional variations were not planned. These were errors caused by misreading, mishearing, fatigue and so on.
against the document in which it is found. Here, an analysis of the manuscript in which each variant reading is found becomes a necessity. If one manuscript is found to be more “trustworthy” than the other, then the reading of the “trustworthy” manuscript is preferred. The important principle advocated by Westcott and Hort is that “knowledge of documents should precede final judgement upon readings.”

What makes a manuscript trustworthy? What “knowledge” of a manuscript does one require so as to place its reading above all others? For Westcott and Hort, “the most prominent fact known about a manuscript is its date.” Here, palaeography is of great assistance, as are scribal notes, which are found in a number of extant manuscripts.

Knowledge of a manuscript’s characteristics is paramount. Understanding the characteristics of a manuscript will help determine the extent of a manuscript’s reliability. If one manuscript contains a significant number of favourable readings and the alternative manuscript less favourable readings, then the former manuscript can be judged to be a more reliable witness.

Though Westcott and Hort often followed the aforementioned principle, they could not always follow it consistently. A manuscript judged highly may at times give less favourable and incorrect readings. This was the judgement of Westcott and Hort in relation to the Western non-interpolations. Their highly favoured Codex Vaticanus gave them an inferior reading when compared to the less highly rated Codex Bezae. This is because Westcott and Hort understood that manuscripts are not independent documents and have a complex history. To understand this complex history, they sought

---

to create a genealogical history of the extant manuscripts.

Genealogical evidence allows for the grouping of manuscripts into types of texts, or families, so that each group can be examined as a whole. It was the belief of Westcott and Hort that the manuscripts within each family were somehow historically related to one another.\(^69\) It is from this principle that Westcott and Hort came to a particular understanding of the Neutral type of text and the Western type of text. With respect to our purpose, the Neutral type of text contained long variant readings at Matt 27:49b; Luke 22:19b–20; 24:3b, 6a, 12, 36b, 40, 51b and 52a, whereas the Western type of text contained short variant readings at these points.

Once the manuscripts could be grouped into types of text, Westcott and Hort could proceed to the final stage of the process, the internal evidence of groups. This principle sought to understand the characteristics of the various types of text in order to determine which were more reliable. It is from this principle that Westcott and Hort were able to claim that the Neutral type of text, for the most part, exhibited a more reliable, that is, a more primitive form of text. On the other hand, the Western type of text, with its peculiar characteristics of paraphrase, alterations, additions, grammatical changes and assimilation, exhibited an inferior form of text, the anomaly being those variant readings termed Western non-interpolations. According to Westcott and Hort, the eight Lukan short variant readings appeared to be contrary to what one would expect from the Western type of text.

In regards to Luke 22:19b–20; 24:3b, 6a, 12, 36b, 40, 51b and 52a, Westcott and Hort encountered conflicting results when applying the aforementioned principles. To

them, the principle of genealogical evidence revealed that the long variant readings were part of the Neutral type of text. On the other hand, the short variant readings were part of the Western type of text. Based on this principle it would be easy to presume that the long variant readings should take priority over the short variant readings. In addition, as the long variant readings were found in codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, one should be confident of the priority of these readings. However, the principles of internal evidence of documents and internal evidence of groups do reveal an anomaly; that being, the short variant readings are uncharacteristic of what one would expect to find in Codex Bezae and, more broadly, the Western type of text. Characteristic of both Codex Bezae and the Western type of text is embellishment, particularly additions, the opposite of what we find with our eight Lukan readings.

Appeal to the internal evidence of readings confirmed their suspicion that the short variant readings should be thought of as the “original text.” For Westcott and Hort, the Lukan Western non-interpolations show non-Lukan characteristics. This suggests that a later scribe or scribes, working under the knowledge of other canonical works, supplemented the text. So for example, Westcott and Hort argued that Luke 22:19b–20 was composed in light of 1 Cor 11:23–27; Luke 24:6a was composed in light of Matt 28:6; Luke 24:12 was composed in light of John 20:3–10; Luke 24:36b was composed in light of John 20:19; Luke 24:40 was composed in light of John 20:20 and Luke 24:52a was composed in light of Matt 28:9 and 17. For Luke 24:3b, τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ is a phrase peculiar to the Gospels and may have been inserted, they thought, through

---

70 Westcott and Hort, Introduction, 175.
71 Westcott and Hort, Introduction, 176.
72 For their treatment of the eight Lukan variant readings, see the Appendix section of Westcott and Hort’s Introduction, 63-64, 71-73.
knowledge of the longer ending of Mark 16:19, itself a later interpolation. For Luke 24:51b, Westcott and Hort saw a need for the Gospel to conclude with an ascension narrative to explain the separation of Jesus from the disciples.

Westcott and Hort’s methodology allowed them to conclude that the long variant readings of the Neutral type of text were due to scribal interpolation. As such, the short variant readings of the Western type of text should be accepted. Though the methodology and conclusion of Westcott and Hort had some detractors it did have a significant influence in the following years.

**Excursus: Matt 27:49b**

At this point of my discussion, a word is required about the status of Matt 27:49b. This variant reading is similar to John 19:34 as can be seen below.

**Matt 27:49b:** ἄλλος δὲ λαβὼν λόγχην ἐνυξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευράν, καὶ ἔξηλθεν ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα.

And another took a spear [and] pierced his side, and out came water and blood.

**John 19:34:** ἀλλ’ εἷς τῶν στρατιωτῶν λόγχῃ αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευράν ἐνυξεν, καὶ ἔξηλθεν εὐθὺς αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ.

But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and immediately there came out blood and water.

This variant reading is absent from many extant sources, including those sources not representative of the Western text. The short variant reading is found in a number of manuscripts of the Byzantine period. The twenty-eighth edition of Nestle-Aland’s *Novum Testamentum Graece* gives the following apparatus for Matt 27:49b: the long variant reading is found in א B C L Γ vg mss mae; the short variant reading is found in A
With so many non-Western witnesses for the short variant reading it cannot be thought of as a true Western non-interpolation.

Nowadays, it is often agreed that the short variant reading of Matt 27:49b is closer to the original. As Bruce Metzger has said, “It is probable that the Johannine passage was written by some reader in the margin of Matthew from memory (there are several minor differences, such as the sequence of ‘water and blood’), and a later copyist awkwardly introduced it into the text.” Due to the overwhelming acceptance of the short variant reading of Matt 27:49b, and that the focus of this thesis is upon Luke’s editorial revision of his Gospel, the Matthean passage will not form part of the larger discussion.

The Transition Period: 1881-1900

With Westcott and Hort a new era in New Testament textual criticism emerged. Their method for critically analysing the text of the New Testament was to make an impact upon subsequent generations. No longer would a variant reading’s worth be judged solely upon the number of witnesses in which it was found, or by the tradition that accompanied it. Westcott and Hort were willing to give greater weight to the internal evidence if they thought it was justified. This was unlike many of their predecessors who

---


74 However, see Stephen Pennells, “The Spear Thrust: (Mt. 27.49, v.1./Jn. 19.34),” JSNT 19 (1983): 99-115. Pennells argues that the long variant reading is more likely to be original.

were willing to give priority to the external evidence. Their approach to the New Testament text was eventually to cause the final blow to the popular and influential Textus Receptus. The complete abandonment of the Textus Receptus, however, was not to be realised until the twentieth century.

The period between the publication of Westcott and Hort’s two-volume work and the beginning of the twentieth century saw a mixed reception to their findings. One only needs to consider the response of the British New Testament Company, of which Westcott and Hort were both members, to recognise this.

The British New Testament Company was working on a new revised English translation of the Bible during the time the research of Westcott and Hort was coming into fruition. Metzger says that Westcott and Hort were passing on “confidential advance copies of the Greek text they were editing . . . for the use of the revisers in England and America.”76 Though Westcott and Hort held some influence within the committee, they were unable to convince the British and American revisers to adopt a number of their changes, particularly the Western non-interpolations.77

Proposals to deviate from the Textus Receptus were not only handled with caution, but also with scepticism. Among those of the British New Testament Company revisers leading the charge against Westcott and Hort was the eminent New Testament scholar Frederick Scrivener.

For Scrivener, many of Westcott and Hort’s proposals were based upon

---

77 For brief but informative introductions to the British New Testament Company’s Revised Version of 1881-85 see Metzger, Bible in Translation, 99-104; and Paul D. Wegner, The Journey from Texts to Translations: The Origin and Development of the Bible (Grand Rapids: Bridge Point Books, 1999), 313-16.
“ingenious conjecture.” The first and foremost problem for Scrivener was Westcott and Hort’s primary dependence on the Neutral type of text. Scrivener was a supporter of the Syrian type of text (better known today as the Byzantine text-type or Majority text-type). The overwhelming number of extant manuscripts was said to display the Syrian type of text. This was in contrary to Westcott and Hort’s Neutral type of text in which support was scant. Scrivener said that by favouring a type of text with such negligible manuscript support, Hort had made “a clean sweep of all critical materials, Fathers, versions, manuscripts, uncial or cursive, which did not correspond with his preconceived opinion of what a correct text ought to be.” Favouring a type of text that had the support of a greater number of manuscripts did not mean that Scrivener simply counted manuscripts to determine the text. He was first and foremost a critical scholar. However, for Scrivener, if one were to go against the testimony of the great number of manuscripts in regards to a particular variant reading, one required good reason to do so. His view is best expressed in the following quote:

That mere numbers should decide a question of sacred criticism never ought to have been asserted by any one; never has been asserted by a respectable scholar . . . But I must say that the counter-proposition, that numbers have “no determining voice,” is to my mind full as unreasonable, and rather more startling . . . The reading of the majority is so far preferable. Not that a bare majority shall always prevail, but that numerical preponderance, especially where it is marked and constant, is an important element in the investigation of the genuine readings of Holy Scripture.

---

78 Scrivener, Plain Introduction, 531.
79 For Hort’s view of the Syrian text see Westcott and Hort, Introduction, 132-45.
80 Scrivener, Plain Introduction, 534.
It is fair to say that Scrivener’s preference for the “reading of the majority” was often based upon scepticism about the principle of internal evidence. It is not that Scrivener had no interest for internal evidence; rather, he saw limitations in the use of this principle. He wrote:

If I have hitherto said nothing on the important head of internal evidence, it is from no wish to disparage its temperate and legitimate use. Yet how difficult it is to hinder its degenerating, even in skilful hands, into vague and arbitrary conjecture!  

Scrivener’s position towards internal evidence was one that he adopted early in his career. As early as 1845, at the age of 32, he believed that the application of internal evidence was based upon nothing more but the creative involvement of “ingenious speculation.” This, for him, was unlike external evidence, which was objective and “positive” in testimony. He wrote:

At the same time we cannot be too much on our guard against substituting ingenious speculation [here a reference to internal evidence] in the place of positive testimony [a reference to the external evidence], and treating as a co-ordinate power what is useful only in the character of a subject-ally.

It is important to note that Scrivener did not always abandon the use of internal evidence. In his discussion of the Pericope Adulterae (Jn 7:53–8:11) Scrivener wrote:

It (Jn 7:53–8:11) is absent from too many excellent copies not to have been wanting in some of the very earliest; while the arguments in its favour, internal even more than external, are so powerful, that we can scarcely be brought to think it an unauthorised appendage to the writings of one, who in another of his inspired books deprecated so solemnly the adding to or taking away from the blessed testimony he was commissioned to bear (Apoc. xxii. 18, 19).  

82 Scrivener, Exact Transcript, xx, n. 1.
84 Scrivener, Plain Introduction, 610.
This quote reveals when Scrivener would use and favour internal evidence. Among the many manuscripts known to Scrivener, John 7:53–8:11 was either not found, contained a short version (7:53–8:2), was located elsewhere, was placed in the margins or showed signs of being added by a scribe. For Scrivener, it was the fifth-century Codex Bezae which was the earliest New Testament manuscript to contain the pericope. Therefore, external evidence gave cause for suspicion in regards to the pericope’s authenticity. However, it appears that for Scrivener internal evidence confirmed the notion that the Pericope Adulterae was a later appendage. For him, external evidence opened the way for the questioning of the pericope, while internal evidence confirmed his suspicion. Yet, one wonders whether Scrivener would have confidently favoured the “powerful” arguments of internal evidence if the external evidence were not so forthcoming? One imagines not.

How does all this relate to the Western non-interpolations? Scrivener was a defender of the eight long Lukan readings, though he accepted that the long variant reading of Matt 27:49b was a later interpolation. He did not believe that the internal evidence surrounding the Lukan passages carried much weight. For Scrivener, just as Codex Bezae displays a proneness to additions, it also displays “a proneness to omissions.” Therefore, according to Scrivener, there is little reason to regard the eight short Lukan variant readings as earlier. For him, it was best to consider the short variant readings as the product of scribal interference.

85 Scrivener concluded that the Pericope Adulterae was added by the Fourth Evangelist in a revised and updated second edition.
86 Scrivener, Plain Introduction, 555.
Despite Scrivener’s criticism, there were scholars which looked favourably towards Westcott and Hort’s critical approach. So much was Westcott and Hort’s critical approach beginning to make an impact that the year 1897 saw an important debate take place between supporters and opponents of Westcott and Hort.

The Oxford Debate at New College on May 6, 1897, on the textual criticism of the New Testament, was instigated by Edward Miller (1825-1901), a staunch critic of Westcott and Hort. Miller’s intent was to defend the “Traditional Text.” For him, the Traditional Text was that Greek text in which readings were supported by the greater number of extant manuscripts.

Miller was a disciple of John William Burgon (1813-1888). At the Oxford Debate Miller championed the ideas and theories of his mentor. For both men, the Traditional Text had the support “of the Fathers in the first four centuries, and of the Syriac and Latin versions.” As for Westcott and Hort’s Neutral type of text, it “was mainly superseded before the end of the century of its emergence by the Traditional Text.” For both Burgon and Miller the Traditional Text reached back in an unbroken line to the time of the Evangelists. The same could not be said about the Neutral text. Burgon and Miller wrote, “We do not recognize the ‘Neutral’ at all, believing it to be a Caesarean combination or recension, made from previous texts or readings of a corrupt nature.”

---

87 For the speeches made at the debate see Edward Miller, *The Oxford Debate on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, held at New College on May 6, 1897* (London: Bell, 1897).
89 Burgon, *Revision Revised*, 111.
At the debate Miller proposed five principles to establish the Traditional Text.\textsuperscript{91} In essence the principles placed great emphasis upon external evidence. If a variant reading was found in the greater number of manuscripts then that variant should be the text of choice. The first principle in particular makes mention of this and becomes the basis for the following four principles.\textsuperscript{92}

Miller did not gain many supporters at the debate. Two decades later Souter was able to comment that Burgon and Miller “left few, if any successors.”\textsuperscript{93} By contrast, support for Westcott and Hort was on the increase. It appeared that the strongest point for Scrivener, Burgon and Miller was the weight of manuscript evidence. Internal evidence was thought of suspiciously. For the opponents of Westcott and Hort it allowed for too much subjective interpretation. External evidence caused no such problem. However, the growing consensus among many scholars was that external evidence did not tell the full story. Alone, it was not an adequate guide to determining the most ancient text.

\textsuperscript{91} The principles can be found in Miller, \textit{Oxford Debate}, xii.

\textsuperscript{92} In regards to the first principle, Miller (\textit{Oxford Debate}, xii) wrote that “It [the ‘true text’] must be grounded upon an exhaustive view of the evidence of Greek copies in manuscript in the first place; and in all cases where they differ so as to afford doubt, of Versions or Translations into other languages, and of Quotations from the New Testament made by Fathers and other early writers.”

\textsuperscript{93} Souter, \textit{Text and Canon}, 102. For an assessment of the Oxford debate see J. L. North, “The Oxford Debate on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, Held at New College on May 6, 1897: An End, Not a Beginning for the Textus Receptus,” in \textit{Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts: The Papers of the First Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament}, ed. D. G. K. Taylor (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999), 1-25. As history stands there were some who followed Burgon and Miller, such as Edward F. Mills (1912-1981), though none were able to make any significant impact. Today we have seen an interest, albeit minor, in the preference of the Majority or Byzantine text. This movement has the support of some reputable scholars and has a methodology which is more developed than that of Burgon and Miller. However, it is still regarded a minority view with little impact upon the scholarly world. For a defence of the Byzantine text see the Appendix in Maurice A. Robinson, “The Case for Byzantine Priority,” in \textit{The New Testament in the Original Greek: Byzantine Textform 2005}, ed. Maurice A. Robinson and William G. Pierpont (Southborough, MA: Chilton, 2005), 533-86. A shorter version can be found in idem, “The Case for Byzantine Priority,” in \textit{Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism}, ed. David Alan Black (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 125-39.
Opposition towards Westcott and Hort was mostly centred upon their methodology and their approval of the Neutral type of text. In regards to their methodology, the criticism against Westcott and Hort was in regards to their acceptance and application of internal evidence. By their critics, internal evidence was considered a subjective principle and as such, could not be applied in a reliable manner. In regards to Westcott and Hort’s support of the Neutral type of text, this went against the evidence of the majority of extant witnesses. Despite these criticisms, support for Westcott and Hort’s methodology and the Neutral type of text was growing. The age of the *Textus Receptus* was coming to an end and a new age of acceptance of Wescott and Hort’s theory was dawning upon the scholarly world. To this age we now turn.

**The Age of Acceptance: 1901-1971**

We gain an understanding of what twentieth-century scholarship thought of Westcott and Hort’s Western non-interpolation theory through the published critical Greek New Testament editions, the subsequent Bible translations, the commentaries and other forms of academic writings of the time. This section, though thorough, will not be exhaustive. However, it will give a good understanding of the prominent view in the years 1901 to 1971. The years serve as our boundary markers for reasons which will become apparent.

The first English translation to adopt the findings of Westcott and Hort was *The Twentieth Century New Testament*. It was published in three parts in the years 1898,

---

94 Anonymous, eds., *The Twentieth Century New Testament: A Translation into Modern English Made from the Original Greek (Westcott and Hort’s Text)* (London: Marshall/New York: Revell, 1901). The title page states that the edition was made “by a company of about twenty scholars, representing the various sections of the Christian Church.”
1900 and 1901. The 1901 edition contained all three parts but “was identified as a ‘Tentative Edition,’ in which criticisms and suggestions were welcomed.”\textsuperscript{95} A revised edition was published in 1904.\textsuperscript{96} This edition took on board criticisms received of the “Tentative Edition.” The Preface to the 1904 edition reads:

This Revision of our translation, rendered necessary by the large demand for our ‘Tentative Edition’ in every part of the English-speaking world, amounts practically to a careful re-translation made in the light of experience derived from our previous attempts, and of the many valuable criticisms that have been received.\textsuperscript{97}

\textit{The Twentieth Century New Testament} used Westcott and Hort’s 1881 Greek text as its base text. The committee of this translation placed all eight longer Lukan variant readings within square brackets to support the premise that the longer readings were later editions to the text.\textsuperscript{98} \textit{The Twentieth Century New Testament} stands as the first English translation to extensively follow the findings of Westcott and Hort.

Eberhard Nestle’s \textit{Novum Testamentum Graece} was issued by the Württemberg Bible Institute in 1898.\textsuperscript{99} The text was based upon a comparison of Constantin von Tischendorf’s \textit{Novum Testamentum Graece}\textsuperscript{100} and Westcott and Hort’s \textit{New Testament in the Original Greek}. In regards to the Gospels, when these two editions gave conflicting results, Nestle consulted Richard Francis Weymouth’s second edition of

\textsuperscript{95} Metzger, \textit{Bible in Translation}, 106. The 1898 edition contained the Gospels and Acts; the 1900 edition contained the epistles and Revelation. The 1901 edition combined the 1898 and 1900 into one volume.


\textsuperscript{97} Anonymous, \textit{Twentieth Century New Testament}, vi.

\textsuperscript{98} This edition has in total fourteen square-bracketed passages. According to the translators the three most important of these are the shorter and longer endings of Mark 16 and John 7:53–8:11. See the “Preface” of Anonymous, \textit{Twentieth Century New Testament}, v.

\textsuperscript{99} Eberhard Nestle, ed., \textit{Novum Testamentum Graece cum apparatu critico ex editionibus et libris manuscriptis collecto} (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1898).

Resultant Greek Testament. In the third edition of 1901, Nestle abandoned Weymouth's text for Bernhard Weiss’ Greek text which was published in three volumes between the years 1894-1900.

It was not long before the British and Foreign Bible Society moved to adopt Nestle’s Novum Testamentum Graece as its base text. The popularity of the Textus Receptus was in decline and the British and Foreign Bible Society wanted for its translation a base text that represented the scholarship of the day. Nestle’s fourth edition provided such a text. This move helped to increase the popularity of Nestle’s Novum Testamentum Graece. It signalled the end of the reign of the Textus Receptus. Nestle’s critical text stood close to that of Westcott and Hort, closer than any other text of the day. In regards to the Western non-interpolations, Nestle accepted five of the short variant readings and three of the long variant readings. The long variant readings of Luke 22:19b–20; 24:3b and 6a were still accepted, following Tischendorf here (see Table 2.2 below). In any case, it was through Nestle’s influence that Westcott and Hort’s theory and text grew in popularity and it would not be much longer before the short variant readings of Luke 22:19b–20; 24:3b and 6a would become widely accepted among

---


biblical scholars.

Table 2.2: Nestle's 4th Edition Western Non-interpolation Choices Versus His Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22:19b–20</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:3b</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:6a</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:12</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:36b</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:40</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:51b</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:52a</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LVR: The long variant reading is included; SVR: The short variant reading is included.

With the thirteenth edition of Nestle's text in 1927\textsuperscript{105} we find preference for nearly all of the short variant readings. In this edition the short variant reading of Luke 24:12, 36b, 40, 51b and 52a is preferred. Luke 22:19b–20 and 24:6a are retained but enclosed in brackets, whilst the phrase τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ of Luke 24:3b is included in the text with a siglum explaining that the short variant reading is omitted in some witnesses. This preference remained consistent, though with minor changes, until the twenty-fifth edition of Nestle-Aland’s 1963 \textit{Novum Testamentum Graece} (NA25).\textsuperscript{106}

\textsuperscript{105} Erwin Nestle, ed., \textit{Novum Testamentum Graece cum apparatu critico curavit Eberhard Nestle novis curis elaboravit Erwin Nestle}, 13th ed. (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1927). Following the death of Eberhard in 1913 responsibility was handed over to his son Erwin. Erwin was responsible for the publication of the tenth edition in 1914. Aland notes that the “thirteenth edition of the Nestle text in 1927 marked the beginning of a new period in the edition’s history. In this edition Erwin Nestle (1883-1972) did not merely review the text once more. He finally made it conform in fact to the majority principle . . . [this is where] all the significant variants cited were supplied with their supporting evidence among the Greek manuscripts, the early versions, and the Church Fathers.” Aland and Aland, \textit{Text of the New Testament}, 20.

During the years 1901 to 1971 other critical Greek editions were influenced, in various degrees, by Westcott and Hort’s theory. Some of the better-known editions of the time reflected this as Table 2.3 shows.

**Table 2.3: Greek New Testament Critical Editions During the Age of Acceptance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24:3b</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>[LVR]</td>
<td>[LVR]</td>
<td>[LVR]</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>[LVR]</td>
<td>[LVR]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:6a</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>[LVR]</td>
<td>[LVR]</td>
<td>[LVR]</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>[LVR]</td>
<td>LVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:12</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>[LVR]</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>[LVR]</td>
<td>LVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:36b</td>
<td>[LVR]</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>[LVR]</td>
<td>LVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:40</td>
<td>[LVR]</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>[LVR]</td>
<td>LVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:51b</td>
<td>[LVR]</td>
<td>[LVR]</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>[LVR]</td>
<td>LVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:52a</td>
<td>[LVR]</td>
<td>[LVR]</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>[LVR]</td>
<td>LVR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LVR: The long variant reading is included; [LVR]: The long variant reading is disputed; [LVR]: The long variant reading is a later addition but included in the text because of its antiquity and its importance to the textual tradition; SVR: The short variant reading is included.

Table 2.3 shows that a number of editions doubted, if not all, then at least some of the long variant readings. The differences between the editions had to do with how the various editors would weigh the external and internal evidence. In regards to Tasker, internal evidence was a prominent factor in accepting the short variant readings. For

---

107 Other editions than those mentioned here did appear during the period under consideration, but a number of these were influenced by the Textus Receptus or the Latin Vulgate. See Aland and Aland, Text of the New Testament, 25.
example, the Appendix of his edition, which contains notes on variant readings, lists
various linguistic features as the determining factor for accepting the short variant
reading of Luke 22:19b–20. Similar types of internal arguments are appealed to in
reference to the other Western non-interpolations. Compare this to Kilpatrick who
What is interesting to observe is Kilpatrick's acceptance of the long variant reading of
dition is the only one to do so. What makes this interesting is the wide acceptance that
Luke 24:51b and 52a should be treated as a single unit. Treating these variant readings
as a single unit means that either the long variant readings are accepted for verses 51b
and 52a, or they are not. To my knowledge, this is not only consistent with all other
critical editions of the Greek New Testament, but is also consistent with the bulk of
extant ancient witnesses to Luke's Gospel. Kilpatrick was influenced by the external
evidence for Luke 24:51b and the internal evidence for Luke 24:52a. Here is one of
several instances among these editions where it is not always clear why an editor would
choose one set of evidence at the expense of the other.

Though it was not uncommon to see long variant readings omitted in a number
of critical editions of Luke's Gospel, there were critical editions which appeared between

---

115 In order to explain the cause for the omission of the long variant reading Kilpatrick has argued that the
short variant reading was due to Hellenistic influences. For him the long variant reading was purposely
omitted by a scribe of a Christian mystery cult who wished to preserve the knowledge contained in this
116 This issue is discussed in the following two chapters under the variant readings of Luke 24:51b and
52a.
117 Observe how Vogels and NA25 occasionally have a mixture of long variant readings and short variant
readings and how some of the other editions in Table 2.3 place some variant readings in brackets (single
and double), but not others.
1901 and 1971 that did keep the long variant readings. The critical editions by Alexander Souter,\(^{118}\) Augustin Merk\(^{119}\) and José Maria Bover\(^{120}\) included all of the eight long variant readings under review. Such acceptance for the long variant readings is understandable for Souter. Souter’s “edition was merely an adaptation of the Textus Receptus to a reconstruction of the original text that presumably underlay the English Revised Version of 1881.”\(^{121}\) As for the editions of Merk and Bover, their Greek text contains predominantly Koine readings as they rely heavily upon the work of von Soden.\(^{122}\)

Von Soden devised a new classification system to categorise the extant manuscripts. The manuscripts were categorised in relation to age, content and type of manuscript.\(^{123}\) Von Soden formulated three main categories: Jerusalem (I), Hesychian (H) and Koine (K). He believed that these three categories, representing three major recensions, went back to a lost archetype, the I-H-K text. For him, this lost archetype became corrupt in the second century.\(^{124}\)

The I text was identified by von Soden as having mixed characteristics, though he thought that one of its seventeen subgroups, P, was a representative of the Western text. The H text is recognised today as the Alexandrian text, while the K text is today recognised as the Byzantine text. For von Soden, if the corruptions contained in I-H-K could be identified, the original text could be established. Von Soden gave precedence to the K text and it is the readings of this type of text which is constantly found in the

\(^{120}\) José Maria Bover, ed. Novi Testamenti Biblia Graeca et Latina (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1943).
\(^{123}\) Metzger and Ehrman, Text of the New Testament, 186.
editions of Merk and Bover.\textsuperscript{125} It is little wonder that their editions contain the long variant readings.

Though some of the critical editions of the Greek New Testament of the 1960’s mostly reflect an acceptance of Westcott and Hort’s theory, it is clear that this decade was a period of transition. This is reflected by the comparison of NA25 and the first two editions of the United Bible Societies \textit{Greek New Testament}. The decline of popularity of Westcott and Hort’s theory had much to do with the discovery of a manuscript known to us today as P75. Regarded as the oldest extant manuscript of Luke’s Gospel, P75 has all of the long variant readings as part of its text.\textsuperscript{126}

Kurt Aland, in particular, considered the find of P75 important. Aland was a prominent committee member of the first edition of the United Bible Societies \textit{Greek New Testament} (UBS1).\textsuperscript{127} UBS1 was based upon NA25 with minor exceptions.\textsuperscript{128} The committee of UBS1 gave ratings for the more significant variants of the Greek text. A rating of \{A\} signified that the committee members of the UBS1 were confident in the originality of the variant; a rating of \{B\} signified some degree of doubt in the variant; a rating of \{C\} signified a considerable degree of doubt in the variant; whereas a rating of \{D\} indicated a very high degree of doubt in regards to the passage in question. How did the Western non-interpolations fare? The seven longer readings in Luke 24 received a \{D\} rating. The short variant reading in Luke 22 received a \{B\} rating.

A significant change in opinion from NA25 to UBS1 and then to UBS2 is seen in

\begin{footnotes}
\item[126] More will be said of this in the following section, \textit{From 1971 to the Present}.
\item[127] Other committee members included Matthew Black, Bruce M. Metzger, Allen Wikgren and Arthur Vööbus.
\item[128] The exceptions are not important to this thesis and do not impact upon the results.
\end{footnotes}
the presentation of Luke 24:12, 36b, 40, 51b and 52a. In NA 25 the short variant reading was preferred. UBS1 had all eight of the long readings enclosed in brackets. Only two years later UBS2 kept the long variant readings, alluding to their history with a note in the apparatus.

The publication of UBS2 not only reflected the developing trend of the time, but also established how future generations of biblical scholars would come to perceive the Western non-interpolations. In UBS2 the long variant readings were no longer enclosed in square brackets as in the first edition, with Luke 24:3b being the exception. Westcott and Hort’s theory was finally abandoned. No doubt, this was due to the influence of Aland and the importance he placed on P75. Surprisingly, the ratings of each variant reading did not change between the two editions. This probably because not all editors of UBS2 were convinced. Aland himself said that he “had urged consistently in personal discussion and also in numerous essays” for the acceptance of the longer readings. As history will show, Aland eventually prevailed. His persistence directed the course of how the Western non-interpolations were to be perceived and treated.

Bible translators of this period had to make a decision about the Western non-interpolations. As Table 2.4 shows, up until the second edition of the Revised Standard Version of 1971, Westcott and Hort’s theory was well received among popular translations.

---

129 Table 2.6, found on page 64, lists the ratings according to the five UBS editions to date.
Table 2.4: Popular English Translations: 1901-1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22:19b–20</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:3b</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:6a</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:12</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:36b</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:40</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:51b</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:52a</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Finally, a number of commentators on the Gospel of Luke accepted Westcott and Hort’s theory during the first period of the twentieth century. Most of the support was due to the acceptance of the internal arguments. However, this did not mean that external evidence was neglected. Some commentators appealed to the uncharacteristic nature of the Western text of Luke 22 and 24. These commentators often liked to point out that the Western text shows signs of expansion, but not in Luke 22 and 24. Frederic Kenyon wrote that “a notable series of such omissions occurs in the last chapters of St. Luke; and the non-appearance of these passages in the Western authorities seems to indicate that they were absent from the original work, and have found their way into all

---

131 The New Testament of the first edition of the Revised Standard Version was published in 1946. In 1952, the Old Testament (Protestant canon) was released.

other authorities from some other source.” In a similar fashion, Alfred Plummer’s major defence for the short readings was in reference to the uncharacteristic nature of the Western text in Luke 22 and 24.

This is not to say that all scholars favoured Westcott and Hort’s theory of the Western non-interpolations. Robert Hull lists several commentators during the period under consideration who resisted the trend, including William Hatch, S. C. E. Legg and Pierre Benoit. Despite this, it is fair to say that acceptance of Westcott and Hort’s theory was at its peak in the years 1901 to 1971.

To summarise, the years between 1901 and 1971 saw wide acceptance for Westcott and Hort’s theory. This was reflected among the popular critical editions of the Greek New Testament, English Bible translations and a number of commentaries. Much support for the short variant readings was due to the acceptance of the internal evidence. When responding to the external evidence, appeal was made to the short form of the Western text in Luke 22 and 24, something which was uncharacteristic for this type of text. However, the 1960’s saw a transition taking place. In droves, scholars were abandoning Westcott and Hort’s theory concerning the Western non-interpolations. This ushered in a new period to which we now turn.

**From 1971 to the Present**

The year 1971 marked the close of the first period. It was the year that the second edition of the Revised Standard Version was published. It was the last major publication

---

of a bible that presented many of the short variant readings. But this type of presentation was short lived and not without debate. As we saw in Table 2.4 above, the Catholic Edition of the Revised Standard Version of 1965 adopted all but one of the long variant readings. In 1973 the New International Version began a trend which was to be typical of all future English translations: the acceptance of the long variant readings. The Revised English Bible, following Tasker’s edition, included the short variant reading on all occasions except for Luke 24:3b. Interestingly the New Revised Standard Version accepted the short variant reading for Luke 24:3b, contrary to the common trend (see Table 2.5). Today, for many English Bible readers, except for those that prefer to read the Revised English Bible of course, Westcott and Hort’s theory is long gone.

**Table 2.5: Popular English Translations: 1973-2001**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22:19b–20</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:3b</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:6a</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:12</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:36b</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:40</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:51b</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:52a</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>SVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
<td>LVR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The United Bible Societies *Greek New Testament* made a significant shift in the way it regarded the Western non-interpolations. This shift occurred with UBS2 of 1968 in which the long variant readings were no longer enclosed in square brackets. This
continued with UBS3 (see Table 2.6 below). The surprising thing about UBS3 was the ratings the committee gave to the long variant readings. The seven passages in Luke 24 were rated {D} with Luke 22:19b–20 rated {C}. In other words, the ratings were unchanged since UBS1. Of the ratings in UBS3 Joseph Fitzmyer wrote that “what is puzzling is the grade of reading that has been assigned to these texts in the third edition of the UBS text; in my opinion, most of them merit at least a B reading.” One would presume that Fitzmyer would be pleased to see that the ratings changed in UBS4.

Table 2.6: United Bible Societies *Greek New Testament*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22:19b–20</td>
<td>[LVR] [B]*</td>
<td>LVR {C}</td>
<td>LVR {C}</td>
<td>LVR {B}</td>
<td>LVR {B}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:3b</td>
<td>[LVR] [D]</td>
<td>LVR {D}</td>
<td>LVR {D}</td>
<td>LVR {B}</td>
<td>LVR {B}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:6a</td>
<td>[LVR] [D]</td>
<td>LVR {D}</td>
<td>LVR {D}</td>
<td>LVR {B}</td>
<td>LVR {B}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:12</td>
<td>[LVR] [D]</td>
<td>LVR {D}</td>
<td>LVR {D}</td>
<td>LVR {B}</td>
<td>LVR {B}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:36b</td>
<td>[LVR] [D]</td>
<td>LVR {D}</td>
<td>LVR {D}</td>
<td>LVR {B}</td>
<td>LVR {B}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:40</td>
<td>[LVR] [D]</td>
<td>LVR {D}</td>
<td>LVR {D}</td>
<td>LVR {B}</td>
<td>LVR {B}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:51b</td>
<td>[LVR] [D]</td>
<td>LVR {D}</td>
<td>LVR {D}</td>
<td>LVR {B}</td>
<td>LVR {B}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:52a</td>
<td>[LVR] [D]</td>
<td>LVR {D}</td>
<td>LVR {D}</td>
<td>LVR {B}</td>
<td>LVR {B}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LVR: The long variant reading is included; [LVR]: The long variant reading is disputed; [LVR]: The long variant reading is a later addition but included in the text because of its antiquity and its importance to the textual tradition; SVR: The short variant reading is included. The asterix at {B}* means that the UBS committee gave the variant reading 22:17–19a, 21 a B rating signifying some degree of doubt. See below for discussion of ratings. {C}: UBS committee gave the variant a C rating signifying a considerable degree of doubt; {D}: UBS committee gave the variant a D rating signifying a very high degree of doubt.

---


For the above table the ratings of the United Bible Societies *Greek New Testament* should be interpreted as follows: for UBS1 to UBS3 cor. ed. a rating of {B} means that the UBS committee had some degree of doubt in regards to the variant reading. A rating of {C} means that the UBS committee had a considerable degree of doubt in regards to the variant reading, and a {D} means that UBS committee had a very high degree of doubt. For UBS4 and UBS5 the ratings were redefined. There a rating of {B} means that for the UBS committee, the text is almost certain to be the earliest. What this means is that “the original ratings, defined on the basis of their ‘relative degrees of certainty,’ have been redefined on the basis of their ‘degree of doubt’.”140 What this means in real terms is that the ratings have been “redefined one step higher.”141

As noted earlier, the movement away from Westcott and Hort’s theory was due to the discovery and publication of the Bodmer Papyri XIV, commonly known as P75.142 Discovered in 1952, P75 contained the gospels of Luke and John.143 It was published in two volumes in 1961 with the first volume containing Luke’s Gospel (Papyrus Bodmer...
XIV) and the second volume John’s Gospel (Papyrus Bodmer XV).\(^{144}\) It is estimated that P75 originally was made up of 72 folios. Today, some 51 folios survive with a number of pages in fragments.\(^{145}\) Fortunately, Luke 24 survives in its entirety, though Luke 22 in fragmentary form. However, enough survives of Luke 22 to indicate that the long variant reading of the Last Supper was part of its text. Likewise, the long variant readings of Luke 24 are found in the text of P75.

The editors of P75, Victor Martin and Rudolphe Kasser, dated this manuscript 175-225 CE.\(^{146}\) The early date of P75 and its witness to the long variant readings greatly influenced Aland’s understanding of the Western non-interpolations. Aland wrote:

> Scholars should then have begun to be more aware of the change which these papyri had introduced in the field of textual criticism. One of the important results of this change has been, for instance, that Westcott and Hort’s so-called “Western non-interpolations” have been, so to speak, stripped of their original nimbus and that, although interesting, they are no longer regarded, or should no longer be regarded, as authoritative.\(^{147}\)

Westcott and Hort knew of no papyri when working on their two-volume work.\(^{148}\) Aland, on the other hand, was working under different conditions. By the 1960’s he knew of 78 papyri.\(^{149}\) Privileged to be living during a time that provided access

---


\(^{147}\) Aland, “Significance of the Papyri,” 334.


\(^{149}\) Aland, “Significance of the Papyri,” 328. Aland adds that he had at his disposal some 5,000 Greek manuscripts to Westcott and Hort’s 1,500 (p. 329). Furthermore, Aland knew of 63 manuscripts dated prior to the sixth century compared to Westcott and Hort’s 6 manuscripts (p. 331).
to a greater number of earlier sources, Aland felt that he was in the position to make better informed decisions about the New Testament text.\textsuperscript{150} The acceptance of the long variant readings was one of those decisions.

Aland was not alone in abandoning Westcott and Hort’s theory based upon the testimony of P75. Kenneth Clark also saw P75 bringing the debate surrounding the Western non-interpolation theory to an end. For him, P75 had proved that Hort was wrong.\textsuperscript{151} In like manner, impressed with P75, Carlo Maria Martini wrote, “\textit{In particulae relatae ad ‘Western non-interpolations’ (v.g. Lc 24.1–53) eorum praesentia in textu saeculo II existente nunc extra omne dubium ponitur.”}\textsuperscript{152}

Despite the trend away from Westcott and Hort’s theory during the 1960’s, a notable defender of the theory was the eminent scholar Ernest Colwell. In 1968, the year UBS2 was published, Colwell, who thought of Westcott and Hort’s Greek New Testament text as “the best edition . . . that we possess,”\textsuperscript{153} made this important observation:

Professor Aland . . . has in his actual practice followed Lachmann by a naïve acceptance of documents of early date. The clearest example of this lies in his deference to P75. In readings for Nestle\textsuperscript{26}, and explicitly in a recent article (as also in the United Bible Societies’ edition), he reverses Westcott and Hort on the Western non-interpolations because P75 disagrees with them in agreeing with Codex Vaticanus. But there is nothing in that agreement that is novel to Hort’s theory. Hort did not possess P75, but he imagined it. He insisted that there was a very early ancestor of his Neutral text, that the common ancestor of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus was a remote ancestor, not a close ancestor. P75 validates Hort’s


\textsuperscript{152} Carlo M. Martini, “Problema recensionalitatis codicis B in luce papyri Bodmer XIV (P75),” \textit{VD} 44 (1966): 192-196. “In relation to the ‘Western non-interpolations’ (e.g. Lk 24:1–53), their presence in the text existing in the second century is now placed beyond all doubt.” Translation mine.

reconstruction of the history, but *P75 does not add a new argument* for or against that theory.\(^{154}\)

Colwell’s criticism was to make little impact. Not only is this seen in later editions of UBS and Nestle-Aland, but also in the many commentaries and writings that were to be published. The discovery of *P75* was enough to sway popular opinion. External evidence had now cemented itself as carrying the greatest weight in future discussions. The weight given to external evidence can be seen in the following quote by Klyne Snodgrass. He remarked that, “from the standpoint of external evidence, the Western readings have no chance for adoption.”\(^{155}\) *P75* had settled the debate.

Fitzmyer gave primary importance to *P75*. Though Fitzmyer was translating from Nestle-Aland 25, which favoured the short variant readings (see Table 2.3 above), the find of *P75* was enough for him to include the long variant readings in his translation. Fitzmyer wrote that “the reasons for the new trend are the realization of the importance of the papyrus text *P75*, a codex that was only published in 1961 and hence was unknown to Westcott and Hort, and an even greater awareness of the rather arbitrary decisions made by those editors.”\(^{156}\) For Fitzmyer, *P75* rendered Westcott and Hort’s theory null and void. This was in complete contrast to Colwell who saw nothing new added to the debate by the discovery of *P75*.

Even though the external evidence was enough to persuade many that the long variant readings should have priority, internal evidence could not always be left without

---

\(^{154}\) Ibid., 156. Emphasis his. Colwell’s reference to Nestle-Aland 26 was based upon the understanding that UBS2 and Nestle-Aland’s *Novum Testamentum Graece* 26\(^{th}\) edition (NA26) were to have the same text. Nestle-Aland 26 was not published until 1979. The delay of the publication of Nestle-Aland 26 had to do with the work surrounding the apparatus not the text itself. See Aland and Aland, *Text of the New Testament*, 34.


comment. Snodgrass, who was persuaded by the significance of P75, understood the
omissions as scribal accident (Lk 24:12); a scribal attempt to clear confusion or
contradiction (Lk 22:19b–20; 24:6a, 51b and 52a); to rectify redundancy (Lk 24:3b, 6a
and 40); and “diminish the extreme reaction of the apostles” (Lk 24:36b).\textsuperscript{157} On the other
hand, the United Bible Societies committee did not always feel compelled to address the
internal evidence. There was no explanation given for the origin of the short variant
readings for Luke 24:6, 12 and 36. However, for Luke 22:19b–20 it was argued that a
cause for the short variant reading was “to protect the Eucharist from profanation”; the
shorter text of Luke 24:3b was considered to be influenced by 24:23; the position for the
omission of 24:40 was “because it seemed superfluous after v. 39”; for the shorter text of
Luke 24:51b appeal was made to homoeoarcton,\textsuperscript{158} to remove any possible contradiction
with Acts 1:3–11, particularly in reference to the time of the ascension, or to remove
from the Gospel any reference of the ascension so it is found only in Acts; finally, the
majority of the committee thought that the short text of Luke 24:52a was due to scribal
accident or to harmonise with the short variant reading with the short text of verse 51.\textsuperscript{159}

By not providing any internal arguments for the existence of some short variant
readings, the United Bible Societies committee showed how strongly they relied upon
the external evidence. In relation to those internal arguments for the existence of the
short variant readings, such as presented by the United Bible Societies committee and
Snodgrass, it appears that these arguments were subject to what the external evidence
was believed to reveal.\textsuperscript{160} In other words, as the external evidence was interpreted as

\textsuperscript{157} See Snodgrass, “Western Non-Interpolations, 374-76.
\textsuperscript{158} Homoeoarcton is when the eye skips over to another word with a similar beginning.
\textsuperscript{159} See Metzger, Textual Commentary, 176, 183-84, 186-87 and 189-90.
\textsuperscript{160} The United Bible Societies committee and Snodgrass were not the only ones to subordinate the internal
supporting the long variant readings, the internal arguments selected as the most probable were those that explained the omission of the long variant readings. But what of those equally strong arguments that indicate that the short variant readings came first and that the long variant readings were a later addition? These do not appear to have received an equal hearing.

Research into the Western non-interpolations was to take a new direction in the 1980’s with the work of Mikeal Parsons. In 1986 Parsons published a critique of P75.161 In this publication he argued that because no manuscript was free from scribal tampering, one should not presume that P75 was reliable in all variants it presented. In regards to P75 Parsons identified what he believed to be fourteen variants which show a Christological Tendenz.162 He concluded that “a theological tendency stands behind, and even motivates, the alterations in the [P75] text.”163 To cite one example, Parsons argued that the use of ἐγέρθη rather than πορευθῇ at Luke 16:30, 31 and John 11:12 suggests that a scribe, motivated by Christological concerns, introduced a familiar term for the resurrection.164

What were these Christological concerns? As P75 was discovered in Egypt, close to Nag Hammadi, Parsons thought it possible that the scribe of P75 “employed [the Gospel of] Luke to refute the heretical tendencies of Gnosticism.”165 For Parsons, the long variant readings were important to address such Christological concerns.166 What

---

162 These variant readings are from both Luke and John. See Parsons, “Christological Tendency,” 472-76.
163 Parsons, “Christological Tendency,” 470.
164 Parsons, “Christological Tendency,” 472.
165 Parsons, “Christological Tendency,” 475.
166 Parsons (“Christological Tendency,” 475-76) writes that “to claim that the scribe of P75 was concerned
this meant for him was that P75, or at least a close ancestor of P75, was the originator of the long variant readings.\textsuperscript{167}

Parsons did not get many supporters. Bart Ehrman did not regard P75 as the originator of the long variant readings. In response to Parsons, Ehrman says:

I doubt seriously whether we can think in terms of a solitary surviving manuscript as the actual source of corruption for virtually the entire manuscript tradition of the Greek New Testament. P75 was one of hundreds (thousands?) of manuscripts of its age. It survives \textit{purely} by accident. Are we to think that it just happens to be the smoking gun?\textsuperscript{168}

More recently, James Royse has provided a convincing rebuttal of Parsons’ theory. His thorough textual analysis of P75 shows that there is no evidence that the scribe of P75 indulged in “establishing a theological tendency.”\textsuperscript{169} For example, for Luke 16:30–31 and John 11:12, Royse concludes that the use of \textit{ἐγέρθη} is due to harmonisation, not a Christological defence against Gnosticism.\textsuperscript{170} According to him, the scribe of P75 was prone to harmonisation, particularly to the immediate context. Furthermore, Royse discovered that adding to the text was not a strong characteristic of the scribe of P75, as the scribe preferred to omit from the text (up to three times more), than add. If we add to this the seemingly careful copying attribute of the scribe, it is difficult to believe that P75 is the “smoking gun” that Parsons believes it to be.\textsuperscript{171}

---

\textsuperscript{167} In his 1986 journal publication Parsons argued that the scribe of P75 was responsible for the long variant readings. A year later, in \textit{Departure of Jesus}, he allowed for the possibility that the long variant readings were the product of a close ancestor.

\textsuperscript{168} Ehrman, \textit{Orthodox Corruption}, 256, n. 145. Emphasis his.

\textsuperscript{169} Royse, \textit{Scribal Habits}, 703.

\textsuperscript{170} Royse, \textit{Scribal Habits}, 701.

\textsuperscript{171} Royse summarises his findings on \textit{Scribal Habits}, 704.
Ehrman understands the long variant readings as a proto-orthodox polemic against docetic Christology.\textsuperscript{172} For him, proto-orthodox scribes “modified texts that may have served their opponents well as proof texts.”\textsuperscript{173} They were opposing the docetic view that Jesus did not come in physical form and only appeared to physically die and physically rise. For Ehrman, proto-orthodox scribes added to the text of Luke’s Gospel passages that could prove otherwise. Ehrman believes that the eight long variant readings of Luke served such purpose.

Michael Wade Martin agrees with Ehrman that the long variant readings were the product of a proto-orthodox polemic.\textsuperscript{174} His disagreement with Ehrman is in relation to the target group. He does not see the long readings as being a polemic against docetism. Rather, for him, the polemic was against separationists. Separationists were those Christians who believed that the Christ entered into Jesus at his baptism and departed from him prior to his death on the cross. According to Martin, the longer readings were included to show that there was no departure of the Christ prior to the death of Jesus. Jesus died as the Christ.

Parsons, Ehrman and Martin do not arrive at the same conclusion in regards to the historical context of the long variant readings. However, they do recognise the need to give an explanation of the historical context in which the long variant readings arose. Those who believe the short variant readings are secondary often struggle to come up

\textsuperscript{172} For Ehrman’s discussion of docetism, including how the Western non-interpolations fit into this schema, see Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 181-261. Chapter four discusses Ehrman’s position in regards to each of the variant readings.

\textsuperscript{173} Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 164.

\textsuperscript{174} Michael Wade Martin, “Defending the ‘Western Non-Interpolations’: The Case for an Anti-Separationist Tendenz in the Longer Alexandrian Readings,” *JBL* 124 (205): 269-94. We learn more of Martin’s position in the following two chapters.
with such explanations. For this group external evidence is still an important factor.

Mark Matson attempts to fill this void, particularly in his discussion of Luke 24:12, 36b and 40. In regards to these three passages, Matson regards the long variant readings as authentic. For him, the reason for their deletion is the close affinity these passages have with the Gospel of John. Luke 24:12, 36b and 40 are closely related to John 20:3–10, 19–21 and 26. The proto-orthodox group wanted to distance themselves from the Montanists because they believed that a personal revelation from the Holy Spirit could displace the authority of Jesus or Paul. The main source of the theology of the Montanist Christians was the Gospel of John. Matson argues that Luke 24:12, 36b and 40 were deleted at a time when a number of proto-orthodox groups were unsure of the authoritative status of the Gospel of John.

Matson offers an historical solution for three of the eight Lukan Western non-interpolations. He also accepts Ehrman’s position that Luke 22:19b–20 was deleted by proto-orthodox scribes due to a debate with docetists. It is difficult to find too many others who have offered historical solutions in the line of Parsons, Ehrman, Martin and Matson.

The latter part of the twentieth century has seen, for the most part, the abandonment of Westcott and Hort’s theory of the Western non-interpolations. This period has seen a return to the priority given to the external evidence. In order to combat this emergence some have turned their attention to historical arguments. By and

---


176 In regards to Luke 22:19b–20 Joachim Jeremias, Klyne Snodgrass and Bradley Billings are exceptions. Their theories will be discussed in chapter four.
large, these historical arguments seek to address the motive behind the origin of the long variant readings. Though those who have proposed historical arguments have won some supporters, particularly in the case of Ehrman’s position, many scholars continue to remain sceptical of these conclusions.

Conclusion

In this chapter we have looked at the history, theory and methodology surrounding Westcott and Hort’s Western non-interpolations. We began by looking at the years prior to Westcott and Hort. It was a period where a move away from the Textus Receptus occurred. This period was dominated by the development and acceptance of external evidence for the text of the Bible. We then looked at Westcott and Hort’s theory of the Western non-interpolations. Their theory and methodology were to have a lasting influence upon subsequent generations. While not abandoning the importance of the external evidence, Westcott and Hort recognised the importance of internal evidence. This caused controversy among some, particularly in the early stages. We looked at some of the controversy in our section titled The Transition Period: 1881-1900. Some during this period were disturbed by the emphasis on the internal evidence and called for a return to the authority of the external evidence. We then looked at the twentieth century, which was divided into two periods. The years 1901 to 1971 marked the first period. It was a period which saw a large acceptance of Westcott and Hort’s theory. Internal evidence was an influential factor during this period. However, as the 1960’s approached, the acceptance of Westcott and Hort’s theory was in decline. Much had to do with the discovery of P75. The 1960’s saw a shift occurring, but this shift did not take full effect until the 1970’s. The second period of the twentieth century, from 1971 to the
present, saw the abandonment of Westcott and Hort’s theory. External evidence was an influential factor during this period. In recognition that the acceptance of the internal evidence was in decline, some scholars moved their attention towards historical arguments for the existence of the Western non-interpolations. The arguments mostly centred upon polemical debates in the second century.

This chapter has provided a direction in which to proceed. Three forms of arguments have been identified: external, internal and historical arguments. Often, historical arguments are treated within internal arguments, specifically, transcriptional probability. This is a valid way to treat historical arguments as much of this discussion is concerned with the findings of the internal arguments and flows naturally from them. This said, I begin with the external evidence.
3. The External Evidence

When evaluating the relevant evidence for a variant reading it is best to begin with external evidence. This is because external evidence provides concrete data. It reveals the variant readings which exist and require serious consideration. Often, the determining factor for considering the importance of a variant reading is the witness or witnesses in which it is found. This chapter, then, presents a list of witnesses that support the long variant readings and short variant readings. Also included is a discussion of important issues that pertain to the manuscript evidence.

This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section is called A Preliminary Discussion. Here I describe what constitutes external evidence. I discuss the types of witnesses useful in the study of the Western non-interpolations, such as papyri, majuscules, minuscules, versions, early Christian writings and lectionaries. Also included in this section is a discussion of specific witnesses important in determining the status of a variant reading, in particular P75, Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Bezae and Marcion.

The next section is titled Collecting and Explaining the Evidence. Presented here are the resources that I have consulted to create a list of witnesses for our variant readings. In the field of textual criticism a witness may be represented by a number, letter, sign and/or abbreviation. Therefore, this section includes tables that assist in the quick identification of witnesses by these means. These tables should be consulted if one wishes to be informed of the date and lacunae of a particular witness. The tables work best in conjunction with the next section, which lists the external evidence for each variant reading.
The third section of the chapter is titled *The Variants*. This section not only lists the external evidence for each of the variant readings, but also includes a *Comment* subsection which, as the title suggests, provides a commentary on the evidence for each individual variant reading. The final section of the chapter is titled *Conclusion: Interpreting the Evidence*. This last section is a collective interpretation of the evidence presented in *The Variants* section. It is argued that the external evidence supports the thesis that Luke wrote two editions of the Gospel, the first of which contained the short variant readings, the second the long variant readings.

**A Preliminary Discussion**

The term “external evidence” pertains to the many extant artefacts that can be used as witnesses to the variant reading in question. The artefacts may come in the form of a manuscript, document, ostracon, talisman, or any other object that contains a written text or inscription. For the Western non-interpolations the most important of the artefacts are the Greek manuscripts of Luke’s Gospel.

The earliest New Testament books were written on papyrus and many of them are dated prior to the fourth century. Dated a little later than the papyrus manuscripts are those written on parchment. These manuscripts are dated from the fourth century onwards. The earliest papyri and parchment Greek New Testament manuscripts were written in majuscule continuous script.¹

In regards to Luke’s Gospel, six pre-fourth-century papyri witnesses are extant.²

---

¹ Datings of extant manuscripts have been assigned on palaeographical grounds and should be recognised as being approximate.
These are P4, P7, P45, P69, P75 and P111. None of these contain the complete text of Luke's Gospel, as they survive in fragmentary form. Of these, only P75, which was written sometime during the late second century or early third century, is relevant for the study of the Western non-interpolations. Fortunately, in P75, Luke 24 survives intact. On the other hand, Luke 22, which is found on leaf 42, recto, survives as a fragment. A careful analysis of leaf 42, recto, shows that there is good reason to believe that P75 did originally have the long variant reading of Luke 22:19b–20. The editors of P75 have transcribed the state of Luke 22:19–20 in the following way:


\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Lacunae of Luke 22:19–20 in leaf 42, recto, of P75}^3 & \\
\text{19a[καί]} & \\
\lambda\alpha\beta[\text{ὡν} \text{ἄρτον} \text{εὐ}]\chiας[\text{ιστήσας} \text{ἐκλάσεν}] & \\
\text{xai} [\text{εἴ]δωξι} \text{en αὐ} \text{τοίς λέγων} [\text{τούτό}] & \\
\text{ἐστὶ} \text{ν} \text{τὸ} \text{σῶ[μά] μου} \text{19bτὸ ύπερ} \text{ὑ[μῶν} & \\
\text{δι {[δημενοπ}} [\text{ν} \text{τὸ} \text{ποιεῖτε} \text{εἰς} [\text{τὴν} & \\
\text{ἐμ[πρ} \text{άμαρι} \text{νησιν}] & \\
\text{20xai} \text{τ[δ ι π[στή[ριον} \text{ώ} & \\
\text{σαύ]τως} \text{με}[\text{τὰ} \text{τὸ} \text{δὲ} \text{πρ[ষαὶ, λ[έγων} [\text{ν} & \\
\text{τοῦτο}] \text{τὸ} \text{π[οτήριον} \text{ν} \text{η} \text{α[πρίν}] \text{δι} [a & \\
\text{βήκη ἐν} \text{τῷ} \text{αἴματί} \text{μου} \text{τ[ού ύπερ} \text{ὑ} & \\
\text{μῶν} \text{ἐκχυννόμενον}
\end{align*}
\]

The letters enclosed in square brackets indicate where there is a lacuna. The bold font which is underlined indicates that the letter partially appears in P75. Normal font letters are those which appear clearly. There are enough visible letters, spaced appropriately, to indicate that verses 19b–20 were originally part of the P75 text.

Manuscripts written on parchment outnumber those written on papyri. There have been three important parchment manuscripts that have influenced many editors of our popular critical editions of the Greek New Testament. The most influential is the

---

fourth-century manuscript Codex Vaticanus (B, 03). Its contents are that of the Hebrew Scriptures (Septuagint)⁴ and the New Testament. The provenance of Codex Vaticanus is unknown.⁵

Codex Sinaiticus (א, 01) is also dated to the fourth century. It is the earliest and most complete extant Bible of the Hebrew Scriptures (Septuagint) and the New Testament. It was discovered by Constantin von Tischendorf in the middle of the nineteenth century. It is a manuscript written in four columns. Tischendorf was heavily influenced by Codex Sinaiticus during the production of his critical editions. However, according to Kurt Aland, Codex Sinaiticus is inferior to Codex Vaticanus and Tischendorf overrated its value.⁶

Also of importance is Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (D, 05) which is dated to the fifth century. Codex Bezae is a bilingual parchment manuscript, with the left hand page written in Greek and the right hand page written in Latin. It contains four Gospels and Acts, although the order of the Gospels appears in the “Western” order of Matthew, John, Luke and Mark. The Latin translation in Codex Bezae is the Old Latin version it⁴.

Of Codex Bezae, Aland says that it is “the most controversial of the New Testament.”

⁴ The Septuagint is the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible.
⁵ Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism, 2nd ed., trans. Erroll F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1989), 109. The first known recorded mention of Codex Vaticanus is from the sixteenth century. David Parker says that “Codex Vaticanus is first mentioned in a letter to Erasmus by Bombasius, Prefect of the Vatican Library, in 1521. But it was to be another two and a half centuries before more than a small part of its readings were to become available.” David C. Parker, “The Majuscule Manuscripts of the New Testament,” in Manuscripts, Texts, Theology: Collected Papers 1977-2007 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 37. We do not have any other information about Codex Vaticanus prior to the sixteenth century. This makes it difficult to say anything with certainty about its provenance.
Testament uncial witnesses the principal witness of the text called ‘Western’.” The term “Western” is an ambiguous one. When Westcott and Hort used the term “Western” they did not mean for it to indicate a type of text that arose in, and was confined to, Western Christendom. They did say that the Western type of text may have arisen “in North-western Syria or Asia Minor, and that it was soon carried to Rome, and thence spread in different directions to North Africa and most countries of Europe.” Westcott and Hort acknowledged that this was only based upon speculation.

In regards to the Western type of text, a problem greater than locating its provenance exists. Westcott and Hort accepted the view that the Western readings were of early origin. For them, the Western readings could be dated as early as the second century. This of course included the Western readings of Codex Bezae. Nowadays such a premise is questionable. After analysing a series of relevant variant readings of Codex Bezae, J. Neville Birdsall makes the following conclusion:

I share common ground with the recent critics of Westcott and Hort, that the text of Codex Bezae cannot be identified with any entity of the second century tout simple: if “Western Text” means “the text of the Codex Bezae,” then it is not to be found in the second century.

David Parker, who does not abandon the view that Codex Bezae is derived from a Greek base text from the “second-to-third-century,” agrees that there are unresolved
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difficulties among those manuscripts considered Western. He writes that “it has long been said, the main thing that the manuscripts of this [Western] type have in common is that while they differ from those of other types, they differ from each other almost as much.” Parker observes the lack of consistency among the manuscripts designated Western. Therefore, we should be cautious in automatically presuming that a Western variant reading either originated, or if earlier, was circulating, during the second century. Some variant readings may have been present as early as the second century, but as to which ones, we cannot always be sure.

For this thesis of mine to have any credibility it must be shown that the short variant readings were in existence during the second century, at the very least. The long variant readings can be said to be circulating during the second century thanks to P75. In regards to the short variant readings the fifth-century Codex Bezae is the only known Greek manuscript that is witness to all eight. Of the several Old Latin manuscripts which are witnesses to the short variant reading, the earliest is Codex Vercellensis (ita) which is dated to the fourth century. True, the Old Latin Version is believed to have originated in the second century, and it may be a surviving witness to it. However, like Codex Bezae, this does not prove that all variant readings associated with this manuscript, or any other related Old Latin Version for that matter, such as itb. d. e. ff². l. r¹, derive from the second century. As has been argued by Birdsall, associating variant readings of Codex Bezae with the Western text is not enough to prove a second-century

---

14 See Table 3.3 on page 103.
date. The same can be said of the Old Latin Versions.15

Fortunately we do not have to rely upon the theories of the Western text and its association with Codex Bezae and that of the Old Latin manuscripts to prove that the short variant readings were circulating during the second century. Birdsall may be correct that many of the Western readings of Codex Bezae show no evidence of a second century date. However, he would not be correct to place the eight short variant readings within this category. In regards to the eight short variant readings Birdsall has missed an important witness, or as he likes to call it, entity, that can corroborate a second-century date for the eight short variant readings of Codex Bezae and the Old Latin manuscripts. This corroborating witness, or entity, is Marcion.

Marcion is one of several witnesses from the patristic period who is cited in this thesis.16 Marcion was born at Sinope, in the Pontus region of Asia Minor (today's North-eastern Turkey). Scholars have given a date range for his birth somewhere between the late first century and early second century.17 He was active in Rome sometime during the mid-second century. Christoph Markschies says that Marcion joined the Christian

16 When I speak of the patristic period I have in mind the second century to mid-fifth century.
community in Rome around the year 140 CE, a date supported by Adolf von Harnack.\textsuperscript{18} Sebastian Moll suggests a date of ca. 144/145 CE.\textsuperscript{19}

It is clear that Marcion split from the proto-orthodox church while in Rome. According to Tertullian, when in Rome, Marcion donated a sum of 200,000 sesterces to the Roman church. Once his theological views were understood and rejected by the Roman church, the money was returned in full.\textsuperscript{20} Tertullian’s view seems to have some credibility. The Marcionites regarded the split between Marcion and the Roman church as the birth of their church. They counted this split as occurring 115 years and 6½ months from Christ’s crucifixion and resurrection.\textsuperscript{21} This places the split in the fifth decade of the second century.\textsuperscript{22} It also supports the notion that Marcion’s activity in Rome was in the 140’s.

Marcion believed that there was an irreconcilable dichotomy between law and grace. Of Marcion, Tertullian said \textit{separatio legis et euangelii proprium et principale opus est Marcionis} (“the separation of Law and Gospel is the actual and principal work of Marcion”).\textsuperscript{23} For Marcion the Hebrew Scriptures revealed a creator and law-giving God. In addition to this “legalistic” God of the Jews, Marcion believed there was another God hidden from all humanity. It was Jesus who made known this hidden, divine being

\textsuperscript{19} For his arguments see Moll, \textit{Arch-Heretic}, 31-35.
\textsuperscript{20} Tertullian, \textit{De praescriptione haereticorum}, 30.2.
\textsuperscript{21} See Harnack, \textit{Alien God}, 19; and Moll, \textit{Arch-Heretic}, 34-35.
\textsuperscript{22} Based upon these figures Harnack gives the exact date of July, 144 CE for the split. Harnack, \textit{Alien God}, 19. So do Markschies, \textit{Gnosis}, 86; and E. C. Blackman, \textit{Marcion and His Influence} (London: SPCK, 1948), 3. However, it appears that Markschies and Blackman are both following Harnack with little critical reflection.
Marcion understood this God of Jesus to be superior to the God of the Jews. The logical consequence of this was that the created order, the product of the Hebrew God, was inferior to the spiritual concept of grace as revealed by Jesus. Marcion was accused of being a literalist when it came to biblical interpretation. According to Tertullian, Marcion believed that Jesus was the Messiah of the hidden God, based upon a literal interpretation of Luke 9:20. Whether Marcion consistently interpreted his bible in a literal way is unclear. What is clear is that his bible greatly influenced his belief. As Moll says, the bible of Marcion was “the source and at the same time the result of his doctrine.”

The bible which Marcion accepted as authoritative was instrumental for his theological views. Marcion’s bible was composed of one Gospel (Evangelion) and ten Pauline letters (Apostolikon). The order of the books of the Apostolikon was Galatians, First Corinthians, Second Corinthians, Romans, First Thessalonians, Second Thessalonians, Ephesians (known to Marcion as Laodiceans), Colossians, Philippians and Philemon. With Paul’s focus on grace, it is no wonder that Marcion was especially concerned with the relationship between law and grace.

It is the Evangelion which is important for this thesis. Even though Marcion did
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25 Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, 4.21.7. Luke 9:20 has the phrase τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ (“the Christ of God”). According to Tertullian Marcion took these words to literally mean that Jesus was the Christ/Messiah of God.
not give a name to his *Evangelion*, the second-century heresiologist Irenaeus recognised it as a mutilated version of Luke’s Gospel. Irenaeus wrote:

\[
Vnde et Marcion et qui ab eo sunt ad intercidendas conuersi sunt Scripturas; quasdam quidem in totum non cognoscentes, secundum Lucam autem Euangelium et epistulas Pauli decurtantes, haec sola legitima dicunt esse quae ipsi minoruerunt.\]

Wherefore, Marcion, as well as his followers, have occupied themselves with cutting up the Scriptures. They disown some books entirely; [then] they mutilate the Gospel of Luke and the letters of Paul and assert that these alone, in their shortened form, are genuine.

Marcion and his followers were accused of mutilating and creating a shortened form of the Gospel of Luke. According to the heresiologist Tertullian, the motivation behind this mutilation was theological. That is, Marcion wanted to emphasize the dichotomy between law and grace. Tertullian wrote:

\[
Certe enim totum quod elaborauit, etiam Antithesis praestruendo, in hoc cogit, ut ueteris et noui testamenti diuersitate[m] constituat proinde Christum suum a creatore separatum, ut dei alterius, ut alienum legis et prophetarum. Certe propterea contraria quaeque sententiae suae erasit, conspirantia cum creatore, quasi assertoribus eius intexta, competentia autem sententiae suae reseruauit.
\]

Certainly the whole of the work he has done [creating his own version of the Gospel] including the prefixing of his Antithesis, he directs to the one purpose of setting up opposition between the Old Testament and the New, and thereby putting his Christ in separation from the Creator, as belonging to another god, and having no connection with law and prophets. Certainly, that is why he has expunged all the things that oppose his view, that are in accord with the Creator, on the plea that they

---


have been woven in by his partisans; but has retained those that accord with his opinion.\textsuperscript{32}

Among critical scholars, the view that Marcion’s \textit{Evangelion} was a mutilated version of Luke’s Gospel has been defended by Brooke Foss Westcott,\textsuperscript{33} Adolf von Harnack\textsuperscript{34} and Burnett Hillman Streeter,\textsuperscript{35} to name a few.\textsuperscript{36} Much of this has to do with the rather uncritical acceptance of the testimony of Irenaeus and Tertullian. The obvious consequence of this traditional view is that Luke’s Gospel predates the \textit{Evangelion} and is its source.

A number of modern-day scholars have been critical of the traditional view. Matthias Klinghardt proposes that the \textit{Evangelion} predates Luke’s Gospel.\textsuperscript{37} For him, the \textit{Evangelion} was originally a major source for the Gospel of Luke. Klinghardt is clear on this point. He says that “Luke does not have the Matthean additions to Mark, because his main source was neither Mark nor Matthew, but Mcn [Marcion].”\textsuperscript{38} Luke’s Gospel, then, is understood to be an expansion of the \textit{Evangelion}.

Klinghardt was not the first to take this view. A view like it was first proposed by Albert Schwengler in the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{39} It is also found in the writings of Albert

\textsuperscript{32} Translation by Evans, \textit{Adversus Marcionem, IV-V}, 275.
\textsuperscript{34} Harnack, \textit{Alien God}, 28-29.
\textsuperscript{38} Klinghardt, “Marcionite Gospel,” 12.
\textsuperscript{39} F. C. Albert Schwengler, \textit{Das nachapostolische Zeitalter in den Hauptmomenten seiner Entwicklung}, vol. 1 (Tübingen: Ludwig Friedrich Fues., 1846), 260-84.
Ritschl\textsuperscript{40} and Ferdinand Christian Baur.\textsuperscript{41} Markus Vinzent has a variation of the view that Marcion’s \textit{Evangelion} is a source for Luke’s Gospel. Not only does Vinzent accept that the \textit{Evangelion} is a source for the Gospel of Luke, but he is also of the opinion that “Marcion was the foundation of the later Synoptic Gospels and not only the basis for the fourfold Gospel concept.”\textsuperscript{42} Vinzent gives priority to Marcion and consequently pushes the writing of the Synoptic Gospels to a much later date. Vinzent offers a date of 138-144 CE for the writing of the Synoptic Gospels.

The eighteenth-century scholar Johann Salomo Semler argued that the \textit{Evangelion} and the Gospel of Luke were independently derived from Proto-Luke.\textsuperscript{43} In a similar manner, Knox believed that the \textit{Evangelion} and the Gospel of Luke were independently derived from another source. After an analysis and comparison of the words of the \textit{Evangelion} and Luke’s Gospel Knox concluded that the \textit{Evangelion}, “as we are able to reconstruct it, does not show enough of the literary character we have learned to associate with [canonical] Luke–Acts to establish its homogeneity with that work.”\textsuperscript{44}

Based upon Harnack’s reconstruction of Marcion’s Gospel, Knox classified the \textit{Evangelion} passages into three groups.\textsuperscript{45} The intent of this task was to observe which

\textsuperscript{40} Albert Ritschl, \textit{Das Evangelium Marcions und das kanonische Evangelium des Lucas} (Tübingen: Osiander'sche Buchhandlung, 1846), v.


\textsuperscript{42} Markus Vinzent, \textit{Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels}, StPatrSup 2 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 259.

\textsuperscript{43} Johann Salomo Semler, \textit{Neuer Versuch, die gemeinnützige Auslegung und Anwendung des Neuen Testaments zu befördern} (Halle: Hemmerdeschen Buchhandlung, 1786), 162-63.


passages in the *Evangelion* had a Synoptic parallel and which did not. Knox came to the conclusion that the majority of special Lukan material was not found in the *Evangelion*.

Joseph Tyson has continued in the work of his mentor John Knox. He, like Knox, used Harnack’s reconstruction to see which verses in the *Evangelion* had a Synoptic parallel. He checked to see which words in the *Evangelion* had a Synoptic parallel. In regards to the verses Tyson concludes that approximately 71.7 percent of verses which had a Synoptic parallel were found in the *Evangelion*, while for the special Lukan material the number was 40.9 percent. As for the words, Tyson concludes that approximately 12 percent of words with Synoptic parallels were absent in the *Evangelion*, compared to 41-43 percent of the special Lukan material.46

Tyson argues that there were three possible explanations for the large absence of special Lukan material.47 His first two explanations allow for the proposition that Marcion knew which material was unique to Luke’s Gospel and omitted them accordingly. In regards to the first explanation, Marcion may have recognised the distinctive Lukan verses and words and believed it was untenable to have them part of the text. The second explanation is that Marcion might have found much of the special Lukan material highly offensive from a theological viewpoint and omitted these passages accordingly. Tyson rightly notes that these two explanations are problematic. In regards to the first explanation, which describes the omissions as being due to their non-
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46 Joseph B. Tyson, *Marcion and Luke–Acts: A Defining Struggle* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2006), 86-87. It may be asked that if there is little special Lukan material in the *Evangelion*, why not suppose that it is closely related to Matthew’s Gospel rather than Luke’s Gospel? To this the reply is that the early Church writers argued that the *Evangelion* was related to Luke’s Gospel; when they quote or reference Marcion’s Gospel text it is closer to Luke’s version, not Matthew’s; finally, some special Lukan material is still considered part of the *Evangelion*, not special Matthew material. For issues surrounding Marcion’s text see discussion below.

47 What follows is a summary of Tyson, *Defining Struggle*, 88-89.
accordance with the Synoptic parallels, Tyson asks how Marcion could delete such material if he did not know the Synoptics and if he did, why he would choose Luke’s Gospel instead of Mark’s and Matthew’s. The second view, that Marcion deleted the Special Lukan material because he found it theologically offensive, does not explain the theologically offensive material which was part of the Synoptic material, yet found in the Evangelion. Even Tertullian was surprised how Marcion’s Evangelion contained passages which were in conflict with his Christology.48

Tyson does offer what he believes to be a satisfactory explanation for the high absence of special Lukan material. According to him, Marcion received the Evangelion in its shortened form and was not responsible for the omissions. For Tyson, “Marcion’s omissions may be just as well understood as additions made by the final editor of canonical Luke.”49

Unfortunately, Marcion’s Evangelion does not survive, nor do copies of it. We get some understanding of the content of his Evangelion through the works of others. There are three major sources that are helpful. The first is from the second century. This is Tertullian’s Adversus Marcionem, particularly books 4 and 5. The second source is from the fourth century. This is Epiphanius’ Panarion, particularly book 42 and the seventy-eight σχόλια and ἔλεγχοι. The third source has been dated somewhere between the late-third to mid-fourth century.50 This is Pseudo-Origen’s Adamantius Dialogue, particularly 3.7; 5.14 and 22.

48 Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem, 4.43.7.
49 Tyson, Defining Struggle, 90.
50 Moll prefers a date of 350-360 CE, whereas Jason BeDuhn prefers a late third-century to early fourth-century date. See Moll, Arch-Heretic, 53, particularly footnote 36. For BeDuhn’s date, see Jason David BeDuhn, The First New Testament: Marcion’s Scriptural Canon (Salem, OR: Polebridge, 2013), 38.
Tertullian’s *Adversus Marcionem* is the earliest extant source for the reconstruction of Marcion’s *Evangelion*. Harnack argued that Tertullian used a Latin translation of Marcion’s *Evangelion* when composing his *Adversus Marcionem*.\(^{51}\) Harnack’s view has been challenged. Recent scholars have put forth the view that Tertullian did use a Greek text of the *Evangelion*.\(^{52}\) Others cannot be sure if Tertullian had before him the *Evangelion* in Greek, or a Latin translation. In any case, it is generally accepted that Tertullian did have a copy of the *Evangelion* (either in Greek or Latin), and as such, his testimony should be taken seriously. As Jason BeDuhn says, “because it is evident that Tertullian had an actual copy of Marcion’s New Testament in front of him as he worked, modern researchers universally rate his evidence very highly, and have turned to close readings of his quotations to reconstruct the exact wording of Marcion’s text.”\(^{53}\)

Regardless of whether Tertullian had before him a Greek copy of the *Evangelion*, we must proceed carefully when using him as a source. Tertullian wrote in Latin. His references to the *Evangelion* are in Latin. What we have with Tertullian is a Latin translation of Marcion’s *Evangelion*. In addition, Tertullian did not always quote his sources verbatim. When it came to quoting the Bible, Tertullian would often quote it “loosely, sometimes from memory, sometimes paraphrased.”\(^{54}\) There is no reason to
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53 BeDuhn, *First New Testament*, 34-35. BeDuhn is non-committal as to whether Tertullian’s version of the *Evangelion* was in Greek or Latin.
believe that Tertullian altered his way of referencing when discussing Marcion’s Evangelion. Therefore, though Tertullian is a useful source for reconstructing the Evangelion, we cannot always be certain that he provides us with a reliable transmission of its text.

Epiphanius’ Panarion is another independent witness to Marcion’s Evangelion.55 Epiphanius claimed to have had access to the Evangelion. The Panarion does include quotes of the Evangelion in Greek. Whether this was the same Evangelion that Marcion used or a later corrupted version, we cannot be sure. In any case, it is this version before Epiphanius which is used in his refutation of Marcion. Epiphanius said, “I wrote a sort of outline for a treatise, arranging the points in order, and numbering each one saying one, two, three, (and so on). And in this way I went through all of the passages.”56 These points of order are presented as σχόλια and ἔλεγχοι. Epiphanius first presented the σχόλια. This is a list of seventy-eight passages of the Evangelion, all of which find a parallel in Luke’s Gospel. He then presented the ἔλεγχοι. Each of the ἔλεγχοι comments (really polemicizes) upon each σχόλιον. In the ἔλεγχοι we find Epiphanius’ refutation of Marcion’s theology. The main intent of this section is to show that Marcion has misused Scripture.57

Problems arise when using Tertullian and Epiphanius to reconstruct the Evangelion. David Salter Williams lists several of these. First, the fact that Tertullian wrote in Latin and Epiphanius in Greek makes comparing the two sources problematic.

56 Epiphanius, Panarion, 42.10.2-3. Translated by Frank Williams, ed., The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis: Book I (Sects 1-46), 2nd ed., revised and expanded, NHS 63 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 302-03.
57 Epiphanius, Panarion, 42.11.6 lists the σχόλια individually, while both the σχόλια and the ἔλεγχοι can be found in 42.11.17.
Tertullian’s Latin version does not always correspond to the Greek of Epiphanius, or even Luke’s Gospel, for that matter. Second, Tertullian and Epiphanius only mentioned passages from the *Evangelion* that were relevant to their arguments. This makes it difficult to ascertain the exact content of Marcion’s text. Third, Tertullian’s writings show a number of variant quotations of the same passage in the *Evangelion*. This may be due to Tertullian’s paraphrasing technique, or it may be due to scribal textual changes in the work of Tertullian. One cannot discount the possibility that Epiphanius’ writings also went “under the knife,” so to speak. Fourth, since Tertullian was prone to giving indirect quotations, we need to be wary when relying on him as a source, particularly if Epiphanius cannot be used as a corroborating witness. Fifth, at times, Tertullian accused Marcion of deleting passages that did not appear in Luke’s Gospel at all. This is puzzling, considering that Tertullian identified the *Evangelion* as a version of Luke’s Gospel. Finally, it is probable that Marcion’s *Evangelion* underwent textual changes by the time it reached Tertullian and Epiphanius. The *Evangelion* would have been prone to intentional and unintentional changes just as any other early Christian text. Even Tertullian recognises that something like this happened. The culprits for him, however, were Marcion’s disciples. Therefore, despite their usefulness, one should proceed with caution when using Tertullian and Epiphanius as witnesses to the *Evangelion*.

The third major source often appealed to for a reconstruction of the *Evangelion* is Pseudo-Origen, *Adamantius Dialogue*, particularly 3.7; 5.14 and 22. In this work
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58 Williams, “Reconsidering Marcion’s Gospel,” 478-480. Williams notes an example where Tertullian (*Adversus Marcionem* 4.19) claims to quote the *Evangelion*, yet the passage he is quoting is not found in Luke’s Gospel at all, but found in Matt 12:48 and Mark 3:33 (p. 479).
60 Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, 4.5.7.
Adamantius debates two Marcionites, Megethius and Marcus. The accuracy of the
Adamantius Dialogue is often debated. Harnack and Roth see Adamantius as an
important source for the reconstruction of the Evangelion. Ulrich Schmid considers it
useless for a reconstruction of the Evangelion, while BeDuhn is sceptical in regard to its
value. Even if the use of Adamantius as a source can be thought of as reliable, its use is
limited for there are only a handful of references to the Evangelion.

Other lesser sources which are of some use include: Pseudo-Ephrem A, a
manuscript dated 1195 CE; Acts of Archelaus 44-45, from the early fourth century;
Papyrus 69 (P69), a third-century fragment from Oxyrhynchus in Egypt; and Latin
prologues to Paul’s letters, found in a number of Vulgate biblical manuscripts. Other
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61 See Harnack, Alien God, 60-63; and Roth, “Towards a New Reconstruction,” 40.
63 The relevance of this manuscript is questioned in the work by George Egan, An Analysis of the Biblical
Quotations of Ephrem in ‘An Exposition of the Gospel’ (Armenian Version) (Louvain: Peeters, 1983). It is
looked upon more favourably by BeDuhn (First New Testament, 40-41).
64 BeDuhn says that “its content can be traced back to Marcion’s Antitheses more confidently than can
other Manichaean anti-theological biblical arguments.” BeDuhn, First New Testament, 41. For a discussion of
the relationship between the Acts of Archelaus and Marcion’s Antitheses see also Jason D. BeDuhn,
65 P69 is a fragment that contains Luke 22:41, 45-48, 58-61. It has been suggested that P69 may be an
extant fragment of Marcion’s Evangelion. See Claire Clivaz, “The Angel and the Sweat Like ‘Drops of
allows for this possibility. However, the scarcity of the extant verses in P69 should caution one not to
make too many conclusions from this fragment. Outside of P69 there is no witness that suggests that
Marcion knew of these verses, the exception being Luke 22:47-48, which according to Tertullian Marcion
did know (Adversus Marcionem, 4,41.2).
66 It has been suggested that the prologues to Paul’s letters were created within a Marcionite context. See
Karl Th. Schäfer, “Marcion und die ältesten Prologue zu den Paulusbriefen,” in Kyriakon - Festschrift
and BeDuhn, First New Testament, 42-43. For a non-Marcionite context of the prologues see Wilhelm
A Textual History of the Letter to the Romans, SD 42 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 111-13; Nils A.
sources for consultation, but limited, include Origen (third century), Ephrem (fourth century), Eznik of Kolb (fifth century) and the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies and Recognitions* (ca. fourth century).

The problems that arise with our main sources, and the limited amount of benefits we gain from our lesser sources, suggest that we may never be able to reconstruct Marcion’s *Evangelion* in its entirety. However, I do believe that we are able to gain some picture of his *Evangelion*, particularly in regards to those passages that are relevant to us. Here I am in agreement with Matthias Klinghardt, who says that “although no copy of [Marcion] has survived, the ancient accounts of this gospel produce a sufficiently clear picture of its contents, its narrative shape and, in a number of passages, even its wording.”

I have spent considerable time on Marcion’s *Evangelion* because it plays a significant role in this thesis. There are, however, other patristic writers who will be mentioned. The majority of the time these early writers favour the long variant readings. The exceptions are Augustine, who is a witness to the short variant reading at Luke 24:52a, and Gregory of Nyssa, who is a witness to the short variant reading at Luke 24:6a.

There are other types of witnesses important for this study, such as manuscripts in minuscule script. These manuscripts eventually replaced majuscule script, but this did not occur until sometime around the eighth or ninth century. The earliest surviving
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67 Though two admirable attempts to do so have been recently provided by BeDuhn, *First New Testament* and Dieter T. Roth, *The Text of Marcion’s Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 2015).
69 See Table 3.4 on page 104.
minuscule Greek manuscript of the Gospels bears a date of 7 May 6343 (835 CE). In regards to the Western non-interpolations minuscules should not be regarded as being on the same level as our papyri and parchment majuscule manuscripts for they are dated much later and add very little to the discussion. Even if they may represent an earlier text, they offer very little new information in regard to the topic at hand. What these manuscripts do confirm, however, is that the long variant readings became part of a well-established tradition, taking priority over the short variant readings.

Versions, particularly the Old Latin and the Old Syriac, are important for an analysis of the Western non-interpolations. Though a number of the extant manuscripts of the Old Latin and Old Syriac date several centuries after the first century, it is believed that the texts of both these versions originated sometime between the second and fourth centuries. Other versions that are useful are the Latin Vulgate, the Diatessaron, Armenian, Coptic, Ethiopic, Georgian, Old Church Slavonic, Syriac Harklensis, Syriac Palestinian and Syriac Peshitta. Some of these versions do have an early date, such as the Diatessaron which dates back to the second century. At the other end of the ledger, the Old Church Slavonic version is dated to the ninth century. When using these witnesses one needs to be mindful that they are translations of a Greek text.

In this thesis Lectionaries will only be cited when they concur with the short variant reading or provide an alternative reading considered important. Otherwise it is to be presumed that the majority of lectionaries which refer to the passages in question support the long variant reading.

---

71 See the discussions in Aland and Aland, Text of the New Testament, 52; Metzger and Ehrman, Text of the New Testament, 100-01; and Parker, Introduction, 326.
The witnesses provide us with concrete evidence for the existence of a particular variant reading, which often means eliminating the need for conjecture. The objective of this chapter is to gather together the external evidence and interpret the data. Before we move to this task, however, explanation as to how the data is presented requires some attention.

Collecting and Explaining the Evidence

This section lists the relevant manuscripts for each variant reading under analysis. Here I describe how the manuscript data is presented. I have consulted several resources to achieve this. These are found below. The square brackets indicate how these sources will be referred to for the remainder of this chapter.


---

The apparatus for the variants stem from the sources referenced above. My primary source is UBS5. I have consulted the other sources to verify and consider other witnesses that UBS5 has chosen not to cite. Fortunately the above sources are largely compatible in the data they present. Differences between the sources are usually in regards to the number of witnesses cited. Therefore, any disparity with what is found between UBS5 and the citation of witnesses in this chapter is mostly in relation to number of witnesses. For example, for all the long variant readings I cite Λ Π and Ω as witnesses when these are not mentioned in UBS5. These are from CNTTS.

Another difference is that of the citation of Marcion. Most critical editions do not cite Marcion, and if they do, they do so sparingly. For example, UBS5 only cites Marcion as a witness for the short variant reading at Luke 24:6a. There is no other Marcion citation for either the short variant readings or long variant readings. This may reflect the complexity for citing Marcion.

Witnesses for the short variant readings are fewer than those of the long variant readings. As this is the case I have cited all possible known witnesses for the short variant readings. I have not done this for the long variant readings as I do not believe it is necessary to do so. The citation of witnesses for the long variant readings may not be exhaustive but it is thorough. All the major sources that support the long variant
readings are cited, including many lesser sources. For the majuscules I have chosen to cite only those witnesses that have a letter assigned to them, be it in English, Greek or in the case of Codex Sinaiticus, Hebrew. This is in keeping with the Johann Jakob Wettstein system. The exception is Codex Sinaiticus. Constantin von Tischendorf assigned the Hebrew aleph (א) to this manuscript and it still is widely used. Any witnesses that are normally cited with a number prefixed with a 0 (the Gregory-Aland system) are not cited. For minuscules I only cite those from UBS5. Omitting some witness for the long variant readings does not give a distorted view of the overall evidence, nor does it alter the conclusions.

The tables below provide a list of all the witnesses cited. Included is the full name of each manuscript with its conventional numbering system. A few words need to be said about this. The conventional numbering system used to identify the manuscripts is the Gregory-Aland system. This system divides the manuscripts into papyri, majuscules, minuscule, versions and lectionaries. Historically, the papyri were each assigned the black-letter, Old English font P, with a superscript number (eg. $\text{P}^{75}$). For clarity I have adopted the “increasingly common . . . plain roman upper-case,” letter P with conventional numbering (e.g. P75).73

Minuscles are cited by number (eg. 579), while families are cited with a $\text{f}$ followed by a superscript number (eg. $\text{f}^{13}$). All the minuscules are from the Byzantine period. They represent a Byzantine type of text and are predominantly witnesses for the long variant readings.

The table of versions (3.3) includes, where appropriate, single manuscripts that

---

73 This citation method is supported by Parker, *Introduction*, 137.
are representative of these versions. Dates are included for all versions. Dates are taken from the sources quoted above. All versions are cited in a manner consistent with UBS5 and NA28. On some occasions a version will have next to it \(^{(ms)}\) or \(^{(mss)}\). The singular \(^{(ms)}\) indicates that one manuscript of a particular version supports the variant reading in question. The plural \(^{(mss)}\) indicates that more than one manuscript of a particular version supports the variant reading in question.

Lectionaries are only cited if they support a short variant reading or present an alternative variant. Otherwise, relevant lectionaries should be presumed to support the long variant readings. This method is employed here so as to reduce the number of citations. The majority of lectionaries are of a date much later than our most important and reliable manuscripts. The earliest extant lectionary is dated to the fifth century. Lectionaries are identified by an \(l\) with an accompanying number (e.g. \(l\ 1016\)). All lectionaries come from the Byzantine period and as such are representative of the Byzantine text, hence the wide support for the long variant readings. If one wishes to know which lectionaries are relevant to the passages under discussion, I advise consultation with IGNTP, CNTTS, NA28 and/or Swanson.

Witnesses of the patristic period are cited in the same manner as UBS5 and NA28. The dates of these witnesses are taken from UBS5, which states, “the dates shown are generally of the author’s death; when not precisely known, it is an inferred date” (p. 38). Witnesses of the patristic period are only cited if their support for either the long or short variant readings can be confidently determined.

Tables 3.1 and 3.2 below, include a lacuna column. If a manuscript contains a lacuna in one of our disputed passages and it cannot be determined what the text was, it
is noted in this column. P75, codices C and T are partially lacunate at 22:19b–20.

Despite this, there is enough present in the text to show that the long variant reading once formed part of the text. As such, these witnesses are cited as supporting the long variant reading.
### Table 3.1: Papyri and Majuscules Cited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Date, CE</th>
<th>Lacuna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P75 Papyrus Bodmer XIV</td>
<td>II/III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κ (01) Codex Sinaiticus</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (02) Codex Alexandrinus</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (03) Codex Vaticanus</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (04) Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>24:12, 36, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (05) Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (07) Codex Basiliensis</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>24:51, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (09) Codex Boreelianus</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>24:36, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G (011) Codex Seidelianus I</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>24:51, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H (013) Codex Seidelianus II</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (017) Codex Cyprius</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L (019) Codex Regius</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (021) Codex Campianus</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (022) Codex Purpureus Petropolitanus</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>24:3, 6, 12, 36, 51, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (024) Codex Guelferbytanus A</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>22:19b–20; 24:6, 12, 36, 40, 51, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (028) Codex Vaticanus 354</td>
<td></td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T (029) Codex Borgianus</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>24:3, 6, 12, 36, 40, 51, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U (030) Codex Nanianus</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W (032) Codex Freerianus</td>
<td>IV/V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y (034) Codex Macedoniensis</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ (037) Codex Sangallensis</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θ (038) Codex Koridethi</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λ (039) Codex Tischendorfianus III</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Π (041) Codex Petropolitanus</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψ (044) Codex Athous Lavrensis</td>
<td>IX/X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ω (045)</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td>Date, CE</td>
<td>Lacuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>XI/XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>22:19b–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>22:19b–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>ca. 1122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>597</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>892</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1071</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1241</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1243</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1292</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1342</td>
<td>XII/XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1424</td>
<td>IX/X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1505</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ƒ¹ (Family 1) (mss. 1 118 131 209 1582 etc.)

ƒ¹³ (Family 13) (mss. 13 69 124 174 230 346 543 788 826 828 983 1689 1709 etc.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Versions and their Manuscripts</th>
<th>Date, CE</th>
<th>Lacuna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old Latin Version: it</strong></td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a (Codex Vercellensis)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aur (Codex Aureus Holmiensis)</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Codex Veronensis</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Codex Colbertinus</td>
<td>XII/XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Codex Bezae</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Codex Palatinus</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>22:19b–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Codex Brixianus Purpureus</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff² Codex Corbeiensis</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i Codex Vindobonensis</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>24:3, 6, 12, 36, 40, 51, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l Codex Rehdigeranus</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q Codex Monacensis</td>
<td>VI/VII</td>
<td>24:12, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r¹ Codex Usserianus</td>
<td>VI/VII</td>
<td>24:52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Armenian Version: arm</strong></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coptic Version: co</strong></td>
<td>III/IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bo (Boharic)</td>
<td>III/IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sa (Sahidic)</td>
<td>III/IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethiopic Version: eth</strong></td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diatessaron</strong></td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Georgian Version: geo</strong></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Vulgate: vg</td>
<td>IV/V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old Church Slavonic Version: slav</strong></td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old Syriac Version: syr</strong></td>
<td>III/IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c (Curetonian)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>24:51, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s (Sinaic)</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syriac Harklensis: syrh</strong></td>
<td>616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syriac Palestinian: syrpal</strong></td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syriac Peshitta: syr²</strong></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4: Writers of the Patristic Period and Lectionaries Cited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patristic Writers</th>
<th>Date, CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambrose</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonius-Alexandria</td>
<td>V/VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphilochius</td>
<td>after 394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athanasius of Alexandria</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Chrysostom</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyril of Alexandria</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory-Nyssa</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesychius of Jerusalem</td>
<td>after 450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John-Damascus</td>
<td>before 754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcion</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severian</td>
<td>after 408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lectionaries**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ℓ 253</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ℓ 1016</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Variants**

This section presents the variant readings and their witnesses. On certain occasions some witnesses offer an alternative variant reading to the text, such as at Luke 22:19b–20; 24:3b and 6a. I list the more important of these. The alternative variant reading with its witnesses is cited under the subsection titled *Alternative Variant Reading*. It is sometimes not clear whether the alternate variant reading should be thought of as supporting the long variant reading, the short variant reading, or an altogether unrelated variant reading. All the alternative variant readings that I have considered have been found to support either the long variant reading or short variant reading, and therefore
should not be thought of as independent variant readings. As such, the witnesses to
these alternative variant readings are also cited and enclosed in square brackets with the
witnesses of the long variant reading or short variant reading, depending upon my
decision. The Comment subsection evaluates the data and explains my conclusions. The
evaluation is based upon what can be deduced from the manuscript evidence.

Though discussion of internal arguments are left for the next chapter, there are
times when it is necessary to deal with internal issues. This is necessary as it provides
greater clarity to the data that we gather from the witnesses. Therefore, discussion of the
internal evidence is given to provide further clarification into the status of the variant
readings.


Long Variant Reading

19b τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον τούτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 20 καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσάυτως μετὰ τὸ δείπνησαι, λέγων· τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ ἁλματί μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.

19b Which is being given for you; do this for my memory. 20 And the cup in the same way after supper, saying, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood which is being shed for you.”

P75 א B C E G H K L M N S T U W X Y Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ Ω 2 157 180 205 565 579 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1505 ƒ 1 ƒ 13 iasco. c. f. q. i arm Cop bo sa Diatessaron eth geo vg slav syr h. p. pal Eusebius Augustine

Short Variant Reading

—

D it a. b. d. e. ff2. i. l Marcion [syr c. s]

Alternative Variant Readings

19b τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τούτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν
19b Which is for you; do this for my memory

syr c
Which is being given for you; do this for my memory. And after supper [v. 17] . . . this is my blood, the new covenant

Comment

The long variant reading has the largest support among the witnesses. It has the privilege of having the support of P75 and B, two highly regarded manuscripts. Many versions also show support for the long variant reading, including the Old Latin manuscripts aur c f q and r1. The list of witnesses, which includes the second-century Diatessaron, suggests that the long variant reading is of early origin.

The short variant reading has support from only one Greek witness, Codex Bezae (D); seven Old Latin manuscripts a b d e ff2 i and l; and Marcion. These witnesses are often categorised as Western text witnesses. There are two Old Syriac manuscripts (c and s), which I believe are witnesses to the short variant reading. I have come to this conclusion after a close analysis of the alternative variant readings (see below). What is interesting to note, and as we shall see as we progress through this thesis, is that the list of manuscripts supporting all the short variant readings remains consistent.

Two Old Latin witnesses, b and e, not only testify to the short variant reading, but also alter the sequence of the Supper narrative text. The verse sequence of Luke’s Supper narrative in itb and itc is as follows: 15, 16, 19a, 17, 18, 21 and 22.

We have two possible explanations for this verse sequence in itb and itc. The verse sequence may have been created to improve the flow of the narrative, something that

---

74 The bracketed verse [v. 17] indicates that verse 17 is found between verses 20a and 20b in syr4.
75 There is a minor variant in Codex Vaticanus (B). Originally it did not have εἰς at verse 19b. This was later corrected.
was necessary due to the absence of verses 19b–20. Or it can be understood as the editorial work of a scribe who wanted to harmonise the Supper narrative with Mark 14:22–24; Matt 26:26–28; and 1 Cor 11:23–26, all of which have a bread-cup sequence.

In regards to the verse sequence being an improvement to the flow of the Supper narrative, Joachim Jeremias says that by placing verse 19a between verses 16 and 17, we avoid “the very difficult transition from v. 19a to 21.” In verse 18 Jesus says that he would no longer “drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes.” In verse 21 Jesus brings to light the coming betrayal at the hands of one of his apostles. Therefore, verse 21 qualifies the statement of verse 18. On the other hand, if verse 21 were to immediately follow verse 19a, revelation of Jesus’ betrayal would follow the breaking of bread and the identification of it with the body of Jesus. This, for Jeremias at least, makes for a more difficult transition.

Whether verse 18 makes for a better transition into verse 21, as against verse 19a, is debatable. The talk of betrayal in verse 21 follows equally as well after the breaking of bread which symbolises the body of Jesus in verse 19a, for it clarifies why Jesus understood the broken bread as his body: because he was going to be betrayed unto death. Therefore, it is difficult to accept the view that the change of verse order was based upon the need to create a better transition, for both options work well.

A better explanation is to understand the verse sequence as a form of harmonisation to Mark, Matthew and 1 Corinthians so as to create a bread-cup sequence. The desire to create a bread-cup sequence highlights the prevailing attitude of

---

the time itb and ite was composed (ca. fifth century). By the fifth century a bread-cup sequence appears to have been the standard liturgical sequence of the church. The few centuries prior to this were somewhat different. Liturgical practice was diverse among early believers. The bread-cup sequence was never sanctioned as the only way to distribute the elements during the first few centuries of the early Church. As such, a cup-bread sequence was perfectly legitimate. As is argued by both Paul Bradshaw and Andrew McGowan, a cup-bread sequence was well attested among first-generation believers.77 Prior to the fifth century the liturgy was freely recited because the early Christians did not understand the Scriptures as providing a set liturgical structure that could not be deviated from. Paul Bradshaw tells us that:

There has been a growing conviction in recent decades among liturgical scholars . . . that the narratives were not so used [as part of a liturgy], chiefly because there is a complete absence of evidence for them being employed in this way until several centuries later, when they appear to be innovations in eucharistic prayers rather than the continuation of an ancient tradition.78

Therefore, it is quite possible that the Old Latin witnesses b and e altered the verse sequence to create a bread-cup sequence to fit a fifth-century context, in which this liturgical structure was becoming the norm.

There are two alternate variant readings of note from the Old Syriac tradition. The Old Syriac witness c includes verse 19b, though it does not have the verb διδόμενον (“being given”). This verb is also missing in 1 Cor 11:24.79 This may suggest that the

79 In several extant manuscripts of 1 Corinthians scribes have attempted to fill in the details of the Supper passage by adding various words, with the verb διδόμενον being one of them. The Latin Vulgate, Coptic and Ethiopic versions are examples of this. However, it is clear that these are later scribal additions.
source of verse 19b in syrε was 1 Cor 11:23–27. There is some likelihood in this proposition if we consider that Luke 22:20 is not in syrε. The absence of verse 20 in syrε may be explained by asserting that the scribe of this version did not know Luke 22:20. In addition, syrε alters the verse order of the pericope to create a verse sequence of 15, 16, 19ab, 17 and 18. This verse sequence creates a bread-cup sequence.

Syrς has the verse sequence of 19ab, 20a, 17, 20b and 18. This creates a bread-cup sequence. In fact, by placing verse 17 between verses 20a and 20b, and verse 18 after 20b, discussion of the cup is kept together. Syrς has a variant of verses 19b–20. Verse 20a does not have the words τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως (“likewise the cup”) and verse 20b has the variant reading τὸτούτο ἐστιν τὸ αἷμα μου ἡ διαθήκη ἡ καινὴ (“this is my blood, the new covenant”). The wording of verse 19b is consistent with the long variant reading under review.

On face value it may appear that the alternative variant readings of syrε and syrς are evidence for the long variant reading. Each of these witnesses includes verse 19b. Verse 20, however, is a little more complex to account for. The witness syrε does not have verse 20 and syrς has a variant of it, with verse 17 sandwiched in-between. Here, I am in agreement with Jeremias that despite some similarity with the long variant reading, both syrε and syrς are best understood as being witnesses for the short variant reading.

There is, I believe, good reason for this position. Jeremias has based his conclusion upon three pertinent observations.80 First, the verse sequences of syrε and syrς reflect those of itb and itc, both of which are witnesses to the short variant reading. A

---

80 Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 143.
comparison of the sequences reveals this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>v. 15</th>
<th>v. 16</th>
<th>v. 19a</th>
<th>v. 17</th>
<th>v. 18</th>
<th>v. 21</th>
<th>v. 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>it</td>
<td>v. 15</td>
<td>v. 16</td>
<td>v. 19a</td>
<td>v. 17</td>
<td>v. 18</td>
<td>v. 21</td>
<td>v. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ite</td>
<td>v. 15</td>
<td>v. 16</td>
<td>v. 19a</td>
<td>v. 17</td>
<td>v. 18</td>
<td>v. 21</td>
<td>v. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syrc</td>
<td>v. 15</td>
<td>v. 16</td>
<td>v. 19ab</td>
<td>v. 17</td>
<td>v. 18</td>
<td>v. 21</td>
<td>v. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syrs</td>
<td>v. 15</td>
<td>v. 16</td>
<td>v. 19ab, 20a</td>
<td>v. 17, 20b</td>
<td>v. 18</td>
<td>v. 21</td>
<td>v. 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All four witnesses have the same verse sequence of 15, 16, 19a, 17 and 18. This verse sequence suggests some type of relationship between the four witnesses, even though syrc and syrs includes verse 19b and syrs includes verses 20a and 20b. Not only is a relationship between the two Old Syriac witnesses observed through the sharing of the same verse sequence, but both also have verse 19b at the same place in the narrative. Furthermore, both syrc and syrs do not have καὶ before διαμερίσατε (“divide”) at verse 17 and both are missing τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ (“to the man”) in verse 22. As already mentioned, the absence of verse 20 in syrc may be evidence that Luke 22:20 was not known.

In regards to syrs, verse 20 is very different to that of the majority of Lukan witnesses which have the verse. The brevity of verse 20 in syrs (καὶ μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι [verse 17 is found here] τὸτὸ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμα μου ἡ διαθήκη ἡ καινή) suggests little knowledge of Luke 22:20. That the words καὶ μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι (verse 20a) come after verse 19b can suggest knowledge of 1 Cor 11:24–25, in which the same order of wording occurs. That fact that verse 17 is placed between verses 20a and 20b, and that verse 20 does not replicate the wording of Luke 22:20 in its entirety, seems to support the notion that Luke 22:20 was not the source.

What of verse 19b in syrs? This verse replicates the wording of Luke 22:19b in its entirety. Though from this one may perhaps conclude that Luke 22:19b was its source, it

---

is not the only possibility. There is good reason to suggest that Luke 22:19b was not the source of syr. The reason is linked to the difference in wording of Luke 22:20 in syr. As we have seen above, the wording in Luke 22:20 of syr is not an exact match to the long variant reading as found in the majority of witnesses. In fact, 22:20 of syr shows a closer relationship to 1 Cor 11:24–25 than Luke 22:20. In regards to the syr version of Luke 22:19b, the only difference it has with 1 Cor 11:24 is the verb διδόμενον. It is quite possible that the scribe of syr did not know Luke 22:19b but knew 1 Cor 11:24 and inserted the verb because he was more familiar with an oral tradition that utilised the verb. In other words, verse 19b in syr may be a combination of 1 Cor 11:24 and oral tradition. This would explain why verse 20 of syr is so different to Luke 22:20: because there was no direct knowledge of Luke 22:19b–20. The pertinent points of verse sequence and the close relationship between verse 19b and 20 of syr and 1 Cor 11:24–25 allow for this proposition. With these factors in mind, I agree with Jeremias’ observation that the Old Syriac versions should be regarded as witnesses for the shorter variant reading.

Marcion should be cited as a witness for the short variant reading. According to BeDuhn\(^\text{82}\) the Evangelion here reads:

\begin{quote}
19\textsuperscript{a}This is my body 19\textsuperscript{b}which is being given on your behalf . . . 20And the cup likewise, saying, “This cup is the covenant in my blood . . .
\end{quote}

The notable absences for this passage are the words: “Do this in remembrance of me” of verse 19b and “that is poured out for you” of verse 20.

The major source for this reconstruction is Tertullian, \textit{Adversus Marcionem},

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item [\textsuperscript{82}] BeDuhn, \textit{First New Testament}, 124.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
4.40.3-4. BeDuhn also cites Epiphanius, Panarion, 42.11.17 (ἔλεγχος 61) as a possible witness to Luke 22:20. However, Roth is sceptical about Epiphanius as a witness to this text as he believes it is not clear that Epiphanius is here referring to Marcion’s Evangelion.

Here, I agree with Roth. The passage in Epiphanius reads, μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι λαβὼν τάδε καὶ τάδε, [καὶ] εἶπεν, τούτο ἐστι τάδε καὶ τάδε, “After supper he took such and such [or “certain things”] and said, ‘this is such and such’.” This reference does not suggest that Luke 22:20 was part of Marcion’s Evangelion. Epiphanius, Panarion 42.11.6 lists 78 passages that are in the Evangelion. In this section no text of Luke 22:19b–20 is mentioned. Panarion 42.11.17 then discusses each of the 78 passages. When we get to ἔλεγχος 61, this corresponds with the 61st listed passage of Panarion 42.11.6, which is a reference to Luke 22:8. Here we read καὶ εἶπεν τῷ Πέτρῳ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς· ἀπελθόντες ἑτοιμάσατε ἵνα φάγωμεν τὸ Πάσχα (“And he said unto Peter and the rest, ‘Go and prepare that we may eat the Passover’”). Therefore, the passage that Epiphanius cites as appearing in the Evangelion is Luke 22:8 not 22:20. The words at ἔλεγχος 61 may easily be a reference to 1 Cor 11:25 or, if a reference to Luke 22:20, may simply be part of a larger rebuke to Marcion’s understanding of Luke 22:8. Tertullian, therefore, remains the more reliable source for this passage.

In Tertullian we find the words tradere pro nobis (Adversus Marcionem 4.40.3), which is literally translated as “to hand over for us.” According to BeDuhn and Roth, these words, at best a paraphrase, are evidence that the clause “which is being given on
your behalf" of verse 19b was present in the *Evangelion*.

It is true that the words *tradere pro nobis* follow *hoc est corpus meum* (“this is my body”), a reference to Luke 22:19a. However, they do not follow immediately. Between the words *hoc est corpus meum* and *tradere pro nobis* is a polemical discourse. Here, Tertullian wants to show that Marcion’s belief in Jesus being a phantom is erroneous. He argues that it is impossible to believe that Jesus was a phantom if he identified his body with bread. According to Tertullian, Marcion believed that Jesus pretended that the bread was his body. For him, the logical conclusion of Marcion’s position was that the bread was crucified and not the body of Jesus as only the bread was offered up for us. For Tertullian, this was a nonsensical understanding. Tertullian wrote:

\[
\text{Aut si propterea panem corpus sibi finxit, quia corporis carebat ueritate, ergo panem debuit tradere pro nobis.}^{87}
\]

Or else, if you suppose he formed bread into a body for himself because he felt the lack of a veritable body, then it was bread he ought to have delivered up for us.\(^{88}\)

As can be seen by the quote, the phrase *tradere pro nobis* appears in the context of a polemical refutation of Marcion’s position. These three words should be thought of as being a part of that polemic and not a direct translation of what appears in Marcion’s *Evangelion*. In addition, the remainder of verse 19b (“do this in remembrance of me”) finds no attestation in any surviving witnesses to Marcion’s *Evangelion*. One requires more evidence to affirm the position that verse 19b was in the *Evangelion*. Both BeDuhn and Roth believe that Luke 22:20 was in the *Evangelion*. The

\(^{88}\) Translated by Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, IV-V, 493. An alternate translation reads, “He pretended the bread was His body, because He lacked the truth of bodily substance, it follows that He must have given bread for us.” Peter Holmes, “The Five Books Against Marcion,” in *Ante-Nicene Fathers, Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A. D. 325*, vol. 3, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Buffalo: Christian Literature Publishing Company, 1885), 384-730.
presence of the phrase “And the cup likewise, saying, ‘This cup is the covenant in my blood,’” or some form of it, is based upon the words *sanguine suo* (“in his blood”), found in Tertullian’s *Adversus Marcionem* 4.40.4. The larger context in which the words *sanguine suo* are found is as follows:

*Itaque inluminator antiquitatum quid tunc uoluerit significasse panem, satis declaravit corpus suum uocans panem. Sic et in calicis mentione testamentum constituens sanguine suo obsignatum substantiam corporis confirmavit. Nullius enim corporis sanguis potest esse nisi carnis. Nam et si qua corporis qualitas non carnea opponetur nobis, certe sanguinem nisi carnea non habebit.*

So Christ, who throws light upon ancient things, has made it quite clear what on that earlier occasion he meant by bread, when here he calls bread his own body. So also at the reference to the cup, when establishing the covenant sealed with his own blood, he affirmed the reality of his body: for there can be no blood except from a body which is flesh. For even if our adversaries suggest some sort of body which is not of flesh, certainly it can have no blood in it if it is not of flesh.

As the quote shows, there is mention of the *testamentum* (“covenant”). However, it is not referred to as the *novum testamentum* (“new covenant”) as one would expect if Luke 22:20 was in mind. The question then is whether the words *sanguine suo* be regarded as evidence for the presence of verse 20 in Marcion’s *Evangelion*? I believe not.

Again, as before, this Tertullian passage should be thought of as a polemical refutation of Marcion’s position that Jesus had no flesh and blood, not as evidence that the passage appeared in his *Evangelion*. I argue this position because the larger context of the passage demands this. According to Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, 4.40.3, Marcion knew Luke 22:19a. In this verse Jesus takes bread and identifies it with his own

---

89 Hans Lietzmann says the *Evangelion* originally had the words “This cup is the covenant in my blood” or a form similar to that found in Mark’s Gospel, “This is my blood in the covenant.” See Hans Lietzmann, *Mass and Lord’s Supper: A Study in the History of Liturgy*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 251.

90 Latin text from Moreschini and Braun, eds., *Tertullien*, 500.

91 Translation by Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, IV-V, 494-95.
body with the words *hoc est corpus meum* ("this is my body"). Tertullian argues that Marcion could not affirm this if he considered Jesus to be a *phantasma* ("phantom").

This was the cue for Tertullian’s refutation of Marcion. Tertullian begins by appealing to the image of bread. For Tertullian, *panis* ("bread") is an appropriate representation of a physical body. He appeals to the Hebrew Scriptures, particularly citing Jer 11:19 (LXX) to prove the antiquity of the fleshly presence of the Christ. This is somewhat odd, for the Hebrew Scriptures did not hold great authority for Marcion as they were considered by him as the holy text of the "evil" God of the Jews, not the previously unknown "good" God of Jesus. We can see with this example that Tertullian is not concerned with which text Marcion finds authoritative. The use of this example is for those who accept the authority of the Hebrew prophets. Tertullian appears to be instructing his readers.

This is further recognised with the reference to Isa 63:1 and Gen 49:11 within the same, but larger context (*Adversus Marcionem*, 4.40.5-6). Such texts do not prove that Marcion should have known better because he thought them to be authoritative. Rather, these examples are there for those who give authority to the Hebrew writings.92 Wedged between these examples of Jeremiah, Isaiah and Genesis is the reference to the covenant being sealed by *sanguine suo*. One should not presume that such words existed in Marcion’s *Evangelion*. The aim in this context is to show why Marcion is wrong, not what his text contained. In fact, it is possible that Tertullian may have had 1 Cor 11:25 in mind rather than Luke 22:20. He does not mention the cup which was "poured out for you" as in Luke 22:20. It is odd that Tertullian did not appeal to this phrase if he had

---

92 This can also be seen with the phrase *inluminator antiquitatum* (lit. “illuminator of antiquities,” whom Evans glosses as “the Christ”). See the above translation of *Adversus Marcionem*, 4.40.4. The phrase *inluminator antiquitatum* points towards the sayings of the Hebrew prophets.
Luke’s Gospel in mind, for it would have heightened the importance of Jesus’ humanity. Therefore, it is not clear that Tertullian was alluding to Luke 22:20, let alone to this verse as appearing in the Evangelion.

There is no strong evidence to say that Tertullian is a witness to Marcion’s Evangelion containing Luke 22:19b–20. The parts that may suggest some knowledge of the Lukan passage are not referred to in full and may in fact derive from 1 Corinthians. The overall context is that of a polemical refutation to Marcion’s position. More evidence than what we find in Tertullian would be needed to suggest that Luke 22:19b–20 formed part of Marcion’s Evangelion.

This analysis of the external evidence has discovered that the greater number of witnesses testify to the long variant reading. Only one Greek New Testament manuscript is a witness to the short variant reading, while there are seven Old Latin versions that are witnesses to it. Two Old Syriac versions alter the sequence of Luke’s Supper narrative and have variants of Luke 22:19b–20. The sequence of these two Old Syriac versions resembles that of it\textsuperscript{b} and it\textsuperscript{e} which are witnesses to the short variant reading. It is best to think of syr\textsuperscript{c} and syr\textsuperscript{a} as witnesses to the short variant reading, rather than the long variant reading. Marcion should also be regarded as a witness to the short variant reading. If we accept Marcion as a witness then there is evidence that the short variant reading is of very early origin. The long variant reading should also be thought of as a very early variant due to the support it receives from P75, B and the Diatessaron. The fact that the majority of extant witnesses testify to the long variant reading suggests that this variant reading was popular among early Christians.
Luke 24:3b

Long Variant Reading

τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ
Of the Lord Jesus

P75 Α B C E F G H K L M P S U W Y Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω 2 28 33 157 180 205 565 597 700 892 1006 1010 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 f f 13 itaur. c. f. q arm cop bo sa eth pp geo vg slav syr h pal Eusebius.

Short Variant Reading

D it a. b. d. e. ef² l. r l Eusebius? Marcion [579 1071 1241 t 1016 cop bo(1 ms)] Diatessaron syr c s p

Alternative Variant Reading

τοῦ Ἰησοῦ
Of Jesus

579 1071 1241 t 1016 cop bo(1 ms) Diatessaron syr c s p

Comment

The witnesses give overwhelming support to the long variant reading, with the testimony of P75 and B being influential for many textual critics. Bruce Metzger notes that a majority of the United Bible Societies committee members were “impressed by the weight” of the external evidence. For these committee members, the short variant reading was influenced by verse 23 which has the words τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ (“his body”). It is clear that the long variant reading stems from a very early and reliable tradition.

The witnesses that give support to the short variant reading are almost identical to those of Luke 22:19b–20. There are, however, two exceptions. First, it l, which is a witness to the long variant reading at Luke 22:19b–20, here supports the short variant reading.

93 A question mark is placed next to Eusebius here and in the apparatus for the short variant reading because according to UBS5, in one instance Eusebius shows no knowledge of the long variant reading and on another occasion he does. Therefore, he is cited as a witness for both in the apparatus.

reading. Second, it¹, which is a witness to the short variant reading at 22:19b–20, cannot
be used as support for either the short variant reading or long variant reading at 24:3b
due to a lacuna after Luke 23:10.⁹⁵

There is an important alternative variant τοῦ Ἰησοῦ found in three Greek
minuscules, four versions, one lectionary and the *Diatessaron*. It is difficult to ascertain
why these witnesses do not have κυρίου. It could be that a scribe accidentally missed
κυρίου in the copying of the text. If this was the case the variant τοῦ Ἰησοῦ should be
thought of as a witness to the long variant reading. Yet, this is not the best or only
explanation for the alternative variant.

In regard to the alternative variant reading, Metzger says that the words τοῦ Ἰησοῦ
were “due to assimilation to Mt 27.58 or Mk 15.43.”⁹⁶ This position suggests one of two
things. Either a scribe purposely deleted κυρίου to make it conform to Matthew or Mark,
or a scribe added the words τοῦ Ἰησοῦ because the passage ended at τὸ σῶμα. Even
though one should not entirely discount the possibility that a scribe purposely deleted
κυρίου, one does wonder if this is the best option. At first, one is a little surprised that a
scribe would miss an important title, but more importantly, if we take into account
Markan priority, one would not expect the title κυρίου in this passage.

However, one should not discount the real possibility that a scribe did not add
the words τοῦ Ἰησοῦ to the text. Other than in our disputed passage, the first time we
find the name Jesus in the resurrection narrative is in Luke 24:15. Here, the resurrected
Jesus walks and talks with Cleopas and another unnamed disciple who do not recognise

---

⁹⁵ Due to a lacuna after 23:10, it¹ cannot be used as a witness in the study of the Western non-
him. Prior to this, the last mention of the name of Jesus is in Luke 23:52. Here, Joseph of Arimathea goes to Pilate and makes a request for the crucified “body of Jesus” (τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ). His intent is to lay it in a tomb before the commencement of the Sabbath. In Luke 24 we move to the resurrection narrative. Women followers of Jesus “who had come with him from Galilee” (συνεληλυθυῖαι ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, 23:55), go to the tomb to embalm the corpse of Jesus with spices they had prepared earlier (24:1). When they arrive at the tomb, the stone covering the entrance is rolled away (24:2). As they enter the tomb they notice that “the body” (τὸ σῶμα) is missing (24:3). The context makes it clear that the missing body is that of Jesus. However, up to this point in the resurrection narrative Jesus has not yet been identified by name. The words τὸ σῶμα at Luke 24:3 would have provided an opportune time to introduce the name Jesus in the resurrection narrative. The addition of the name would not only replicate the phrase found in 23:52, but would also make it clear that the Jesus who was crucified and lay dead in the tomb was the same as the one who was resurrected.

The position that the short variant reading stems from at least the second century finds support from Marcion. Tertullian tells us that Marcion’s Evangelion had the words corpore autem non inuento (“but the body was not found”).97 The missing words “of the Lord Jesus” are not cited. It appears the long variant reading was missing in the Evangelion.

To conclude, a great number of witnesses testify to the long variant reading. The strength of the witnesses, in number, quality and date, should not be easily dismissed.

---

97 Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem, 4.43.2. For the Latin see Moreschini and Braun, eds., Tertullien, 520. Translation mine.
The phrase τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ appears to stem from an early and reliable tradition. For the short variant reading, the manuscript tradition suggests that it too originated from an early tradition with Marcion being our earliest witness.98

Luke 24:6a

Long Variant Reading

οὐκ ἔστιν ᾧδε, ἀλλ’ ἡγέρθη

He is not here, but was raised

P75 Α B C E F G H K L M S U W (ἀνέστη instead of ἡγέρθη) Υ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ Ω 2 28 33 157 180 205 565 579 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 f1 f13 itaur. f q arm ms copbo sa Diatessaron geo ms vg slav syr c. s. h. pal Amphilochius Augustine Cyril Eusebius [C* itc copbo ms eth syr §]

Short Variant Reading

—

D ita. b. d. e. ff². l. rl arm ms geo ms Marcion

Alternative Variant Readings

ἡγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν

Raised from [the] dead

itc

οὐχ ἔστιν ᾧδε ἡγέρθη

He is not here, he is raised

C* copbo ms syrp Gregory-Nyssa

ἡγέρθη οὐχ ἔστιν ᾧδε

He is raised, he is not here

eth

Comment

The long variant reading is supported by the majority of the witnesses. There is a slight

---

98 If one accepts the conclusion that the Diatessaron should be regarded as a witness to the short variant reading then we have another source from the second century.
variation with manuscript W. In this witness ἡγέρθη, the aorist of ἐγείρω, is replaced by ἀνέστη, the aorist of ἀνίστημι, whose meaning is similar.

The Greek and Old Latin witnesses that support the short variant reading remain consistent with the witnesses of the short variant reading of Luke 22:19b–20 and 24:3b. Versions which support the short variant reading are some manuscripts of the Armenian version and one Georgian manuscript. There is also support from Marcion. Marcion receives greater treatment below. Metzger says that some members of the United Bible Societies committee favoured the short variant reading. The reason given was that the long variant reading was an interpolation influenced by Matt 28:6 and Mark 16:6.99

The phrase ἡγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν in itc is common when speaking of the resurrection. This phrase, or a slight variation of it, can be found in Matthew, John and Acts. In John, it is found in 2:22; 12:1, 9, 17 and 21:14. Matthew uses the phrase ἡγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν in 14:2; 27:64 and 28:7 and Luke uses the phrase, or at least a variant of it, in Acts 3:15; 4:10 and 13:30.

The phrase ἡγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν (Latin: resurrexit a mortuis) is best thought as a harmonisation to accord with a popular and clear resurrection statement as found in Matthew, John and Acts. It is likely that the words οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἀλλὰ ἡγέρθη (Latin: non est hic, sed surrexit) were replaced by a scribe so as to create this harmonisation. This is based upon the observation that the words ἡγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν are found in the same place where οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἀλλὰ ἡγέρθη might otherwise be. Therefore, the simplest explanation is that a scribe replaced the long variant reading with words he thought more appropriate.

99 Metzger, Textual Commentary, 157.
There are two options for the origin of the second alternative variant reading listed, οὐκ ἐστὶν ὡδὲ ήγέρθη. It is found in Matt 28:6, a parallel of Luke 24:6. It is possible that a scribe consulted Matthew when editing Luke’s Gospel at this point. However, this alternative variant reading may be explained as being due to an accidental omission of ἀλλ’.

The third alternative variant reading Ἦγερθη οὐκ ἐστὶν ὡδὲ gives an exact replication of Mark 16:6. The writer of this Lukan variant reading may have consulted Mark’s parallel passage when editing Luke’s Gospel and may have chosen to complete the passage with the same words as in Mark.

The above examples of the alternative readings need not suggest that the long variant reading was missing in the copies used by the relevant scribes and that these scribes sought to fill the passage by borrowing a phrase from one of the parallel passages. It is likely that the phrase οὐκ ἐστὶν ὡδὲ, ἀλλ’ ήγέρθη was known to the scribes of the alternative variant readings and the changes were an attempt to harmonise the phrase with the other works they knew, whether Matthew’s Gospel, Mark’s Gospel, John’s Gospel or even Acts. As such, the alternative variant readings should be regarded as indirect witnesses to the long variant reading, albeit variants of it.

Marcion appears to be a witness to the short variant reading. When Epiphanius quotes the Evangelion (Panarion, 42.11.6, σχόλιον 76), he only records the word Ἦγερθη (“he is risen”). This is in agreement with Mark 16:6. There is no indication that Epiphanius’ edition of the Evangelion had ἀλλ’ and οὐκ ἐστὶν ὡδὲ. As Epiphanius records

---

100 A scribe may have been familiar with the rendering of the phrase in Luke’s second volume and used this rendering to keep it consistent between the two volumes. This would be even more likely if the scribe had the various alternative readings before him and was undecided which to use.
a statement of Jesus being risen with only the word ἠγέρθη, as in Mark, it is quite possible that Epiphanius received a copy of the Evangelion that at some stage had been harmonised with Mark’s Gospel. It is not likely that Marcion’s Evangelion had the long variant reading of Luke 24:6a.

The witnesses for the long variant reading and short variant reading are represented in a manner consistent with that of Luke 22:19b–20 and 24:3b. What we observe is that there are witnesses from the second century for both the long and the short variant readings.

**Luke 24:12**

**Long Variant Reading**

Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἀναστὰς ἔδραμεν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει τὰ ὀθόνια μόνα, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός.

But Peter, having risen, ran to the tomb and after stooping down he sees the linen wrappings alone, and he left wondering to himself what had happened.

P75 Α Β Ε Φ Γ Η Κ Λ Μ Σ Τ Υ Μ Δ Μ Ψ Ω 2 28 33 157 180 205 565 579 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1424 1505 f1 f'13
d. a. f. fr g arm [cop bo sa] eth geo vg slav syr [s. p. h. pal [both syr c. s have Σιμων instead of Πετρος]]102 Ammonius-Alexandra Amphilochius Augustine Hesychius

**Short Variant Reading**

—

D ita. b. d. e. l. r. Diatessaron Marcion

---

101 The scribe who added the word ἠγέρθη may have been a Marcionite, for Marcionites believed that Jesus did spiritually rise from the dead. The word ἠγέρθη need not imply a physical resurrection. A spiritual resurrection could be in mind. See pages 191-93. On the other hand, the scribe may have been a proto-orthodox scribe who misrepresented Marcion by wanting to show that Marcion was in error. The scribe may have believed that the addition of ἠγέρθη would have served this function.

102 In regards to the name Σιμων instead of Πετρος in syr and syr Jeremias notes that this is evidence that verse 12 was never part of these versions. This is because only here “in the entire gospel of Luke do syr render Πετρος by Σιμων.” Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 149, n. 5.
Comment

The long variant reading is widely supported among the extant witnesses. The discovery of P75 has been influential in the acceptance of the long variant reading into the text of Luke’s Gospel. The witnesses for the short variant reading remain consistent with those of the short variant readings already discussed. The main exception is the Old Latin ff² which is a witness to the long variant reading. Both the Diatessaron and Marcion are witnesses to the short variant reading. In the case of Marcion, there is no evidence from the sources that verse 12 was ever in his Evangelion. Therefore, if one were to rely on the dates of the extant witnesses to determine which variant reading to choose, one would find it difficult to come to any conclusive position, as both variant readings date to the early second century.

In speaking not only of Luke 24:12, but also of the other six long variants of Luke 24, John Nolland says that the long variant readings were deleted because “it did not strike the scribe as essential.” This position is very doubtful, for Luke 24:12 has Peter, an important leader in the early church, as a witness to the empty tomb. In fact, he becomes the first of the twelve apostles to see the empty tomb.

A number of witnesses have the participle κείμενα (“lying”) in the long variant reading. The participle κείμενα is found in A K L Δ Ψ f¹ f¹³ 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 syrh. p and copbo. Some of these witnesses have κείμενα but not μόνα (“alone”).

---

103 See Joseph B. Tyson, Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2006), 104. Furthermore, internal evidence provides good reasons as to why this verse may never have been part of the Evangelion. See the following chapter for a discussion of this.
105 In regards to the other long variant readings addressed by Nolland (Luke 24:3b, 6a, 36b, 40, 51b and 52a), there are Christological implications if these passages form no part of the text. This issue is addressed in the following chapter under the appropriate variant reading.
106 In the majority of these witnesses κείμενα precedes μόνα, though there are exceptions, such as Codex L, which reverses the word order. See Swanson, Luke, 409.
These include A K and 579. The combination of κείμενα and μόνα accentuates that the linen wrappings of Jesus were “lying alone” upon Peter’s visitation.

A number of early and reliable witnesses such as P75 and B do not have the participle κείμενα and as such, the tendency nowadays is to omit it from the text. The participle κείμενα was probably added by a later scribe to bring the passage closer to that of John 20:5–6.107

A majority of the members of the United Bible Societies committee believed that the similarities are best explained by the sharing of a common tradition by Luke and John.108 This is not the only option. Luke 24:12 does appear to be a shortened summary of John 20:1–10. A scribe may have chosen to include a summary account of John 20:1–10. On the other hand, if there is a way in which we can accept that Luke used John as a source some time during the composition of his Gospel, then it is highly possible that Luke used John as a source in the writing of Luke 24:12. As we proceed further into this thesis I will argue that there is good reason to suggest that Luke did have access to John’s Gospel when writing an updated version of his Gospel. This occurred towards the end of the first century.109

The manuscript tradition reveals that both the long and short variant readings have an early origin. It is this early origin of both variant traditions that provides us with a clue in regards to the manner in which Luke’s Gospel was written. Luke 24:12 shows

108 Metzger, Textual Commentary, 158.
109 See the discussion of Luke 24:12 in the next chapter.
some relationship with John 20:1–10, which suggests to some that Luke and John are following a common tradition. Another possible explanation is that Luke used John as a source, but this cannot be fully explained until the discussion of internal evidence.

Luke 24:36b

Long Variant Reading

καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν
And he says to them, “Peace to you.”

Short Variant Reading

D ita. b. d. e. ff². l. r¹

Comment

The overwhelming external evidence supports the long variant reading. Metzger says that the phrase εἰρήνη ὑμῖν is a common Semitic greeting and therefore should be expected here. Luke Timothy Johnson also understands the greeting as traditional. He lists several passages of the Hebrew Scriptures where the greeting is found. These include Judg 6:23; 8:35; 18:6; 19:20; 1 Sam 16:5; 29:7; 1 Kgs 2:13 and 2 Kgs 9:11. Nolland comments that the greeting is used in the Hebrew Scriptures for “encounters

110 There are a number of witnesses to the long variant reading that include the words μὴ φοβεῖσθε (“do not be afraid”). These are G 1241 itaur. c. f arm copbo Diatessaron eth geo vg slav vgsms syrh. pal. p. Manuscripts W and 579 have μὴ φοβεῖσθαι. The majority of witness place μὴ φοβεῖσθαι (μὴ φοβεῖσθαι for W) before ἐγὼ εἰμι except for 579 which places the words μὴ φοβεῖσθαι after ἐγὼ εἰμι. Metzger (Textual Commentary, 160) says that the words μὴ φοβεῖσθε were probably added by a scribe after consulting John 6:20. The Johannine passage reads ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς· ἐγὼ εἰμι· μὴ φοβεῖσθε (“But he says to them, ‘I am he; do not be afraid’”). This is also the position of I. Howard Marshall, The Gospel of Luke, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans/Paternoster, 1978), 901.

111 Metzger, Textual Commentary, 160.

with angelic figures.” Therefore, finding a greeting such as this should not be considered unusual.

The majority of the United Bible Societies committee considered the possibility of Luke and John (cf. John 20:19b, 21a and 26b) sharing a common tradition. Metzger pointed out that most of the United Bible Societies committee members “were impressed by the presence of numerous points of contact between Luke and John.” In the end, though, it was the large quantity of external witnesses which persuaded the committee to accept the long variant reading as part of the text. Metzger gives no indication as to whether the committee members accepted the notion that Luke and John shared a common tradition. The fact that the majority of committee members sided in favour of the long variant reading suggests that they were willing to accept this notion.

The short variant reading finds support in D and the same group of seven Old Latin Witnesses as in previous passages. Marcion cannot be used as supporting either the short variant reading or long variant reading.

From the manuscript evidence we recognise that both the long variant reading and the short variant reading have an early origin. What is striking is that though the witnesses for the short variant reading are small in number, they remain consistent with the short variant readings already discussed.

114 Metzger, Textual Commentary, 160.
Luke 24:40

**Long Variant Reading**

καὶ τούτο εἰπὼν ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας

And when he had said this, he showed them his hands and feet.

P75 א B E G H K L M N S U W Y Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ Ω 2 28 33 157 180 205 565 579 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 ƒ 1 ƒ 13 itaur. c. f. q arm copbo. sa Diatessaron eth geo vg slav syrh. pal. p Amphilochius Athanasius Augustine Chrysostom Cyril Eusebius John-Damascus

**Short Variant Reading**

—

D ita. b. d. e. ff². l. r¹ syrc. s Marcion

**Comment**

The long variant reading is found in the majority of extant witnesses. The short variant reading is found in Codex D; seven Old Latin manuscripts; the Old Syriac manuscripts c and s; and Marcion. There is little reason to think that Marcion had verse 40 as part of his *Evangelion).*

There are similarities between the long variant reading and John 20:20. The Johannine passage has the phrase καὶ τούτο εἰπών ἔδειξεν τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὴν πλευράν αὐτοῖς (“And after saying this he showed his hands and side to them”). It is almost identical to Luke 24:40, a major difference being that in John 20:20 Jesus shows to his disciples his “side” (τὴν πλευράν) and not his “feet” (τοὺς πόδας) as in Luke.*

The choice of τοὺς πόδας in Luke is consistent with what we read in Luke 24:39. In verse 39 Jesus shows his “hands” and “feet,” so a reference to “the side” in verse 40

---

*See BeDuhn, *First New Testament*, 197; Roth, “Towards a New Reconstruction,” 62; and Bart D. Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 217-18. Ehrman regards the long variant reading as an anti-Marcionite polemic and as of consequence not part of the *Evangelion*.  
*A minor difference is the position of αὐτοῖς. In John it is at the end of the phrase, while in Luke it is before the mention of “hands and feet.”*
would be inconsistent with this. According to Metzger, the United Bible Societies committee agreed that if the passage was added by a later scribe, it would make reference to “the side” and not “the feet.” Jeremias, favouring the long variant reading, suggests that the omission of verse 40 by a scribe could be seen as an attempt to avoid what can be construed as a contradiction when compared to John. These views are doubtful, however, for one would think that a scribe could amend the variant of verse 40, or even verse 39, so as to make the variant fit the context and harmonise with John. One could also imagine that changing two words (πόδας to πλευράν in verses 39 and 40) would be a better option than deleting a whole phrase of ten words.

Finally, as there is no mention of τὴν πλευράν in Luke 24:39 it is perfectly reasonable to suggest that verse 39 was written earlier and without John in mind. The close verbal connection with John 20:20 at Luke 24:40, with the absence of τὴν πλευράν, suggests that verse 40 was written later and as such, had to be adapted to fit the Lukan context that was established in verse 39. Obviously, thinking of the origin of verse 40 in this way means that the addition of this verse could only have happened if the editor had consulted John’s Gospel. The candidates for this are a scribe or Luke. I prefer the latter, for reasons which will be seen in the next chapter.

118 Metzger, Textual Commentary, 161.
119 Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 151.
Luke 24:51b

**Long Variant Reading**

καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν

And was carried up into heaven

P75 κ Α Β Ρ Φ Ε Κ Λ Μ Σ Υ Υ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ Ω 2 28 33 157 180 205 565
579 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1505 f¹ f¹³
itaur. c. f. q. r¹ arm cop bo. sa Diatessaron eth geo mss vgl slav syr² h. pal. p
Augustine²¹² Severian

**Short Variant Reading**

—

κ* D itᵃ b. d. e. ff² l geo mss syr³ Augustine?

**Comment**

The manuscript tradition continues to show that the long variant reading has the highest attestation. Codex D and the Old Latin manuscripts a b d e ff² and l testify to the short variant reading. The Old Latin manuscript r¹ has the long variant reading. The only other time that this manuscript is a witness to a long variant reading is at 22:19–20. Of the other versions, the Old Syriac s and some Georgian manuscripts are witnesses to the short variant reading. There is a lacuna in syrᵉ at this point, and therefore it cannot be determined which variant reading this version supports. According to the critical sources for Marcion it is unclear as to which variant reading the Evangelion contained.¹²¹

Codex Sinaiticus (κ*) is a witness to the short variant reading. It appears that upon reflection this variant reading was not acceptable to a later scribe as there is a “correction” to the text, that being the inclusion of the long variant reading. Corrections

¹²⁰ According to the apparatus of this passage in UBS5, in one instance Augustine shows no knowledge of the long variant reading and on two other occasions he does. Therefore, he is cited as a witness for both in the apparatus. One should proceed with caution when citing Augustine as a witness here.

are not unusual among the many extant manuscripts, particularly Codex Sinaiticus. Parker says that it is approximated that Codex Sinaiticus has “27,305 places where the text has been altered” by a later scribal hand and that it “is unique among manuscripts in the number of its corrections.”\textsuperscript{122} It is possible, then, that the absence of the phrase was one of many scribal errors.

This belief is reinforced when we observe the text that comes before and after the phrase καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. Immediately prior to this phrase we have the pronoun αὐτῶν. It is the last letter of this pronoun, the $ν$, which is of interest. If we combine this letter with the first four letters of the phrase, the scribe would have seen in his Vorlage the letters ΝΚΑΙΑ. If we transfer our eyes to the last letter of the text in combination with the four letters which immediately follow, we again have the letters ΝΚΑΙΑ. So as to visualise a little more clearly what the Vorlage of the scribe may have looked like, I reproduce what appears to have been the sequence of letters visible to the scribe. The reproduction includes the two words prior to the text under consideration and the two words following this. The letters that are of interest to us are highlighted.

ΑΠΑΥΤΩΝΚΑΙΑΝΕΦΕΡΕΤΟΕΙΣΤΟΝΟΥΡΑΝΟΝΚΑΙΑΥΤΟΙ

It is reasonable to believe that a scribe, when copying from his Vorlage, misdirected his eyes from the $N$ of the first sequence of ΝΚΑΙΑ to the $N$ of the second sequence of ΝΚΑΙΑ. This phenomenon, known as parablepsis, was not uncommon within the manuscript tradition. It is reasonable to suppose that this caused the omission of the long variant reading in Codex Sinaiticus.

This idea is strengthened if we accept the notion that the long variant readings of

\textsuperscript{122} Parker, \textit{Codex Sinaiticus}, 79.
Luke 24:51b and 52a should be thought of as a single unit. As we shall see, then, ascension into heaven and “worshipping” (προσκυνήσαντες) of Jesus (24:52a) appear linked.\textsuperscript{123} We gain an understanding that this is the case when we consider the witnesses to the short variant readings. All witnesses that have the short variant reading at Luke 24:52a also have the short variant reading at 24:51b.\textsuperscript{124} Based upon the testimony of these witnesses, it appears that the worship of Jesus is dependent upon his ascent into heaven. At least this is how our witnesses present the two concepts. Therefore, as Codex Sinaiticus has the long variant reading of verse 52a, this becomes a good indication that the absence of verse 51b in Codex Sinaiticus was due to parablepsis.

The external evidence gives overwhelming support to the long variant reading. The witnesses to the short variant are consistent with what we have found with the previous short variant readings. The manuscript tradition reveals that both sets of variant readings have an early origin. Furthermore, based upon the external evidence, there is good reason to suggest that Luke 24:51b and 52a form a single unit.

**Luke 24:52a**

*Long Variant Reading*

\[\pi\rho\sigma\kappa\nu\nu'\lambda\sigma\tau\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\ \alpha'\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\]\n
After worshipping him

P75 K A B C F H K L M S U W Y Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ Ω 2 28 33 157 180 205 565
579 597 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 f 13 it\textsuperscript{aur.} f q
arm cop bo sa Diatessaron eth geo\textsuperscript{mss} vg\textsuperscript{mss} slav syrh pal p 700 it\textsuperscript{e} vg\textsuperscript{mss} t 253


\textsuperscript{124} It is not clear whether Augustine should be cited as witness for the long variant reading or the short variant reading. He can be used as a witness for both. Works of early Christian writers were prone to scribal changes as much as were biblical books. The fact that there is conflicting evidence in Augustine might be due to scribal interpolation, though we cannot discount a free form of referencing that often happens with a number of writers.
**Short Variant Reading**

D ita. b. d. e. ff². l geo\textsuperscript{mss} syr\textsuperscript{a} Augustine

**Alternative Variant Reading**

\[\textit{προσκυνήσαντες}\]

After worshipping

700 it² vg\textsuperscript{mss} t 253

**Comment**

The majority of extant witnesses have \textit{προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν} as part of their text. Codex D, six Old Latin manuscripts and syr\textsuperscript{a} are witnesses to the short variant reading. The Old Latin witness r\textsuperscript{1} has a lacuna in this point of the passage, as does the Old Syrian witness c. Some manuscripts of the Georgian version are witnesses to the short variant reading, but not all. Augustine is a witness to the short variant reading.

It is not clear that the long variant reading was deliberately omitted so as to accord with the short variant reading of verse 51b. One would expect some witnesses to have kept the long variant reading at 52a and the short variant reading at 51b because the topic is the worship of Jesus, but no such witnesses exist. Augustine may be an exception. However, we cannot be certain if he should be considered as a witness to the long variant reading or short variant reading in Luke 24:51b.\textsuperscript{125} If he can be cited as a witness to the short variant reading at verse 51b, then he provides further evidence that verses 51b and 52a were always known as a single unit.\textsuperscript{126}

Some witnesses have an alternative variant reading. This reading has the word \textit{προσκυνήσαντες} but not the pronoun αὐτόν. Since the witnesses that attest to this variant

\textsuperscript{125} See a discussion of this under Luke 24:51b.
\textsuperscript{126} See Table 3.5 below for a summary of witnesses for the short variant readings.
reading have the long variant reading in verse 51b, and it is best to think of verses 51b and 52a as a single unit, scribal accident appears the likely explanation. In addition, the participle προσκυνήσαντες requires a pronoun such as αὐτόν. For these reasons the alternative variant reading is best seen as evidence for the long variant reading.

In regards to Luke 24:52a we learn from the manuscript evidence that the greater number of manuscripts favour the long variant reading and that many of these manuscripts have an early tradition. In addition, the small amount of manuscripts that favour the short variant reading remain the same as those of the short variant readings of the previous seven passages under discussion. The short variant reading is also of an early period.

**Conclusion: Interpreting the Evidence**

Presented below is a table listing all witnesses that support the short variant readings, even if only once. All the witnesses supporting a particular short variant reading have a ✓ in the appropriate column. When they do not give support to the short variant reading but favour the long variant reading, a × will be placed in the appropriate column. For those witnesses which have a lacuna, a ? is found. In addition, for those witnesses that give an alternative variant reading but have been judged to support the short variant reading, the two symbols ✓? are found. Similarly, for witnesses that give an alternative variant reading but have been judged to support the long variant reading, the two symbols ×? are found. Where a version is supported by one but not all manuscripts the superscript m{s is found. The superscript mss indicates more than one manuscript. For patristic writers and lectionaries which cannot be used to support either a long variant reading or short variant reading because of no clear reference, a – will be
found. Augustine and Eusebius have ×? in Luke 24:51b and 3b respectively. This indicates that it is not certain which variant reading they are witnesses to, for their works show evidence of being witnesses to both.

**Table 3.5: Cited Witnesses for the Short Variant Readings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>א</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×?</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓?</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1071</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓?</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1241</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓?</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itа</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itб</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itд</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itе</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itф</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itл</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>itм</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arm</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓ mss</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copбо</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓ mss</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diatessaron</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geo</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓ mss</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✗ mss</td>
<td>✓ mss</td>
<td>✓ mss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syрс</td>
<td>✓?</td>
<td>✓?</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syрh</td>
<td>✓?</td>
<td>✓?</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syрp</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓?</td>
<td>×?</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×?</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✗?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×✓?</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg-Nyssa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>×?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcion</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With only a few minor exceptions, the shorter variant readings are consistently found in the same group of witnesses. Key observations are:

All eight short variant readings are found in D ita. b. d. e. l. Marcion is found to support five of the eight short variant readings. Marcion cannot be used to support either the long variant reading or the short variant reading for Luke 24:36b, 51b and 52a. Codex D is the only Greek manuscript to contain all eight short variant readings. Manuscripts 579, 1071 and 1241 have the short variant reading at Luke 24:3b. The original reading of Codex Sinaiticus (א*) in Luke 24:51b is witness to the short variant reading. However, it was “corrected” by a later hand to include the long variant reading.

One Old Latin witness, r', has the long variant reading at Luke 22:19b–20 and 24:51b and the short variant reading at Luke 24:3b, 6a, 12, 36b and 40. It has a lacuna at verse 52a.


One Old Latin witness, ff2, is a witness to all short variant readings except at Luke 24:12 where it is a witness for the long variant reading.

Syrre and syra agree as to which passages contain the short variant readings and long variant readings. The exception is syra at 24:51b and 52a due to lacunae. Syrr is witness to the long variant readings except at Luke 24:3b.

One manuscript of the Bohairic Coptic version (copbo), is a witness to the short variant reading at Luke 24:3b. Some manuscripts of the Georgian version are witnesses to the short variant readings at Luke 24:6a, 51b and 52a. However, the Coptic and Georgian versions are mostly witnesses to the long variant readings.

The Diatessaron is a witness to the short variant reading at Luke 24:3b and 12. Otherwise it gives its support to the long variant readings.

Writers of the patristic period are mostly witnesses to the long variant readings. Gregory of Nyssa in Luke 24:6a is a possible exception. Augustine in Luke 24:52a and Eusebius in Luke 24:3b may be witnesses to the short variant reading, though we cannot be sure. Marcion, can confidently be cited as a witness for five out of the eight short variant readings.

If we accept the antiquity of the long variant readings, we then have two forms of variant readings, which, according to the evidence, are of very early origin. The long variant readings are found in a large number of extant witnesses, while the short variant
readings are found in a small number of extant witnesses. The data show that the short variant readings are not randomly dispersed among a large variety of manuscripts. In fact, there is very little evidence to suggest this was ever the case. The witnesses that testify to the short variant readings remain relatively stable.

In addition, if we take the commonly accepted position that Luke composed his Gospel in the last quarter of the first century, what we discover is that our eight long variant readings were either added to the Lukan text at a very early time, or were omitted from the Lukan text at a very early time. As the testimony of Marcion and P75 indicates, there was very little time for the eight variant readings, either short or long, to have been added to or omitted from the Lukan text independently. The dating of our witnesses suggests that the omissions or additions occurred collectively. As Michael Wade Martin has said, “the variant readings must derive from a very early and narrow window of time in the manuscript tradition.”

For Martin both forms of variant readings originated “from a time after the Western and Alexandrian textual traditions began to divide.” He says that it was Luke who created a text that had the short variant readings. At a later time, around when the textual traditions began to divide, a scribe added the long variant readings. These long variant readings belong to the Alexandrian text-type. But these variants were not exclusive to the Alexandrian textual tradition, as is evident by the survival of these variants within certain Western manuscripts. The short variant readings survived only in the Western tradition, albeit in only a small number of Western manuscripts.

---

128 Martin, “Defending the ‘Western Non-Interpolations’,” 276.
The findings of this chapter reveal that all eight short variant readings are found in approximately the same witnesses. This means that for the most part the short variant readings or long variant readings are collectively found together. In other words, the long variant readings come as a single unit and the short variant readings come as a single unit. Both sets of variant readings are of very early origin. They are found to have been circulating during the second century. The earliest extant witness to the long variant readings is P75. For the short variant readings, the earliest witness is Marcion.

It is possible to make sense of why the short variant readings survive in only a handful of witnesses if we accept the notion that Luke wrote more than one edition of his Gospel. Luke’s Gospel, first written sometime in the last quarter of the second century, contained the short variant readings. Several years later Luke returned to update his Gospel. The first edition of the Gospel was superseded by the second edition. When the Christian community realised another edition of Luke’s Gospel was circulating, it was this second edition that was widely copied. This did not prevent the copying of the first edition. However, as this first edition was the shorter of the two, preference was given to the larger second edition, presumably because it addressed significant issues of the time.  

At times, scribes had access to both editions of Luke’s Gospel and had to make a decision about which variant to add. The long variant reading was often chosen because scribes often preferred the longer explanation, particularly if it was consistent with their theological position.

129 Just what these significant issues might have been are addressed in the following chapter.
130 This is consistent with the principle lectio brevior in which the short text is often preferred over the long text. Ehrman has commented that scribes often expanded the text because they were interpreters, not just copiers. Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 30-31. If a scribe had access to more than one edition of a work, he would presumably choose the text with the longer reading, particularly if it was consistent with his theological view and clarified controversial issues.
Marcion’s *Evangelion* is the earliest known witness for Luke 22:19b–20; 24:3b, 6a, 12 and 40. Later witnesses which include the short variant readings probably derive from a similar lineage to that of the *Evangelion*. However, centuries later, when witnesses such as Codex Bezae and several Old Latin manuscripts were written, changes had occurred to Luke’s text. There was no longer any knowledge of a first and second edition of Luke’s Gospel. Rather, variations of certain Lukan passages existed in the witnesses of the time and a scribe would copy a version of Luke which was more commonly known to him and/or his Christian community.

What I propose does not mean that the *Evangelion*, at least in its entirety, is closest to Luke’s first edition. Marcion’s *Evangelion* would have been corrupted by later copyists like any other work of the early Christian period. The theory I do propose, however, is that the *Evangelion* is closest to Luke’s first edition in regards to the short variant readings under review.

External evidence cannot tell us with certainty who wrote both sets of variant readings. Historically, scholars have claimed that one set was written by Luke and the other set by scribes. In order to assess the validity of these propositions we turn to the internal evidence.
4. The Internal Evidence

This chapter looks closely at the internal evidence relevant to the study of the Western non-interpolations. Internal evidence is concerned with two types of probabilities. The two types are intrinsic probability and transcriptional probability.¹

Intrinsic probability seeks to determine what the author is likely to have written. It is concerned with the analysis of a variant reading’s language, style and thought. Once these aspects are adequately assessed one is in a better position to make an informed judgement as to whether the variant reading is in harmony with what the author has written elsewhere, or whether it is an aberration.

In regards to the author’s language, analysis of the vocabulary of the variant reading is undertaken. For our purposes it is important to determine whether or not the vocabulary and linguistic structures are consistent with the vocabulary and linguistic structures of those passages recognised as Lukan.

When inquiring into the style of a variant reading we are observing the contextual structure that is created by the variant reading and asking whether or not this structure is typical of what we read elsewhere. In other words, style relates to how the

variant reading functions within its immediate context. Does the variant reading create fluency or brokenness within its immediate context? In turn, is such fluency or brokenness typical or atypical of what the author has written elsewhere?

When inquiring into the “thought” of a variant reading we are attempting to discover the theology and ideology that the variant reading conveys. When looking into the theology and ideology that the variant reading seemingly unveils, we ask whether or not the variant reading is harmonious and consistent with the overall thought of the author.

Transcriptional probability seeks to determine which variant reading a scribe is likely to have written. The intent is to discover features that reveal a particular pattern of scribal behaviour. There were two ways in which scribes regularly interfered with the text. These two ways were intentionally and unintentionally.

For intentional scribal changes, the scribe may have sought to harmonise the passage with another parallel passage known to him. Alternatively, the scribe may have sought to improve the text by altering the passage. This could be done by omitting, adding or replacing a word or series of words.

For unintentional scribal changes, the variant reading may have been due to parablepsis. This is where the scribe, when copying a passage, diverts his eyes to the wrong place in the Vorlage and creates a new but unintentional reading. This oversight often came in two forms, homoioteleuton and homoioarcton. Homoioteleuton is an omission caused by two words or phrases that end similarly. Homoioarcton is an
omission caused by words or phrases that begin similarly.² Fatigue and audio attentiveness often played a part in creating errors. In regards to fatigue, a scribe may have grown tired, affecting his concentration. Lack of audio attentiveness relates to those times a scribe was producing the text via dictation. Here errors may have occurred due to a mishearing or misunderstanding of what was spoken.³

It is also necessary to assess whether a variant reading can be placed within a particular period of time and geographical region. If a variant reading betrays knowledge of a particular age and/or geographical region one is in a better position to assess the status of the variant reading. However, a word of warning in regards to this. One can easily fall into conjecture when assessing the age and geographical region of a variant reading. This is due to the current limitations we have in regards to understanding the history of the first four hundred years of the Christian period.

Taking such considerations into account, it is often the case that textual critics prefer the more difficult variant reading (lectio difficilior potior) as long as the reading makes sense. This is because the less difficult variant reading suggests that a scribe had ventured to improve the passage by making it read clearly.⁴ In addition, when it comes to choosing between a short variant reading and long variant reading, there are textual critics who favour the short variant reading (lectio brevior). This is based upon the working assumption that scribes were more likely to add material to a text than omit it.

³ For more about the various types of errors that scribes were prone to commit, see Wegner, A Student’s Guide, 44-55.
⁴ Scribal improvements should often be thought of as perceived scribal improvements. The scribe sometimes made a personal judgement to improve the text, in which case the scribe became more than a copyist; but also an editor and/or author.
It should be kept in mind that it is best to consider the short variant reading only if other factors can be ruled out, such as unintentional error. For example, a scribe could create a short variant reading due to parablepsis or because of the belief, rightly or wrongly, that the text was already an interpolation and that by omitting material from the text would create a correction.

Trusting *lectio brevior* alone is cautioned by James Royse, whose analysis of New Testament Papyri P45, P46, P47, P66, P72, and P75 found that “the evidence from the papyri and other early manuscripts should not to tempt us into making the inference that all scribes at all times, or even all the scribes engaged in copying the New Testament, tended to shorten the text.” Royse found that the scribes of P46 and P75 omitted material from the text approximately three times as often as they added to it. The scribes of P47 and P45 omitted the material from the text approximately two times as often as they added to it. The scribes of P66 and P72 omit material from the text approximately one-and-a-half times more than they add to it. *Lectio brevior*, therefore, is only an option to consider once other reasons for the short text can be ruled out.

The task of the textual critic, then, is to apply those principles that reveal the likely origin of a variant reading. It is imperative for a critic to be able to distinguish between what an author is likely to have written and what a later scribe is likely to have written. If this cannot be adequately achieved, then it is very difficult to come to a satisfactory conclusion in regards to the status of a variant reading.

---

A Balancing Act: Internal Evidence versus External Evidence

Internal evidence is often treated as subordinate to external evidence. For instance, this is observed in the United Bible Societies comments on Luke 22:19b–20. In his *Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, Bruce Metzger lists three internal arguments that are favourable to the short variant reading. These are the text-critical preference for the shorter reading (*lectio brevior*), the similarity of the long variant reading to 1 Cor 11:24b–25, suggesting it was the source for the long variant reading, and the non-Lukan linguistic features of the long variant reading, suggesting that it was written by someone other than Luke.7 In regards to internal arguments that are favourable to the long variant reading, Metzger says that there is a possibility that the long variant reading was omitted to protect the Eucharist from profanation (*disciplina arcana*). Metzger writes that “one or more copies of the Gospel according to Luke, prepared for circulation among non-Christian readers, omitted the sacramental formula after the beginning words.”8 The majority of committee members, however, felt that the short variant reading was the product of scribal accident or misunderstanding.

The reason for the committee's preference for scribal accident or misunderstanding has little to do with the strength of internal arguments. The majority of committee members gave preference to the long variant reading because they were overwhelmed by the external evidence. Metzger says:

> The weight of these considerations [those of the external and internal evidence] was estimated differently by different members of the Committee. A minority preferred the shorter text as a Western non-interpolation . . . The majority, on the other hand, impressed by the

---

7 Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 150.
8 Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 150.
overwhelming preponderance of external evidence supporting the longer form, explained the origin of the shorter form as due to some scribal accident or misunderstanding.\textsuperscript{9}

It is not as if external evidence is always given precedence over the internal evidence even if there is “overwhelming preponderance” of external evidence for a text.

For example, in Mark 13:33 the fifth edition of the United Bible Societies \textit{Greek New Testament} reads:

\begin{verbatim}
βλέπετε, ἀγρυπνεῖτε· ὥσ πότε ὁ καιρὸς ἔστιν.
\end{verbatim}

Watch, be alert; for you do not know when the time is.\textsuperscript{10}

Some manuscripts have the variant reading \textit{ἀγρυπνεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε} (“be alert and pray”), rather than just \textit{ἀγρυπνεῖτε} (“be alert”). Witnesses for the variant reading \textit{ἀγρυπνεῖτε} are codices B and D, four Old Latin versions a c d and k and one Coptic version cop\textsuperscript{fav}.\textsuperscript{11} For the variant reading \textit{ἀγρυπνεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε} the following witnesses are cited: א A C L W Δ Ψ 0233 ℓ 157 180 205 579 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 Byz [E F G H Σ] Lect (ℓ 773 omit καὶ) it\textsuperscript{aur. f. ff². i. l. q. r¹ vg syr\textsuperscript{e. p. h} cop\textsuperscript{ho(pt)} arm eth slav Diatessaron\textsuperscript{arm} Augustine. Recognising the overwhelming preponderance of the external evidence, Metzger says:

\begin{verbatim}
The Committee [of the United Bible Societies] regarded the reading καὶ προσεύχεσθε as a natural addition (derived perhaps from [Mark] 14:38) that many copyists were likely to make independently of one another. If the words had been present originally, it is difficult to account for their
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{9} Metzger, \textit{Textual Commentary}, 150.


\textsuperscript{11} The Greek minuscule 2427, also known as “Archaic Mark,” was included as a witness in the fourth edition of the United Bible Societies \textit{Greek New Testament}, but has been omitted in the fifth edition. This is because it has now been proven to be a forgery, produced sometime in the nineteenth century. See Stephen C. Carlson, “Archaic Mark’ (MS 2427) and the Finding of a Manuscript Fake,” \textit{Society of Biblical Literature Forum} (August 2006, n.p.). http://www.sbl-site.org/publications/article.aspx?articleId=577. This paper was presented at the 2006 Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature.
omission in B D 2427 itᵃ. c. d. k copfay. ¹²

What is important to recognise here is that the committee adopted a reading found in the smaller number of witnesses, the majority of which are classified as Western, with the exception being Codex B. Their choice was not motivated by the external evidence, in other words not by the overwhelming preponderance of the longer reading in the manuscript tradition. Their decision was influenced by the internal evidence. Though, one presumes that the combination of Western witnesses with Codex B would have made the decision easier for the committee.

We observe a similar thing with John 7:8. The passage reads:

ὑμεῖς ἀνάβητε εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν· ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀναβαίνω εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν ταύτην, ὅτι ὁ ἐμὸς καιρὸς οὔπω πεπλήρωται.

You go up to the feast; I am not going up to this feast, because my time has not yet been fulfilled.

The word preceding ἀναβαίνω, οὐκ, is favoured over the variant οὔπω. Witnesses for οὐκ include א D 1071 1241 ℓ672 ℓ673 ℓ813 ℓ950 ℓ1223 itᵃ. aur. b. c. d. e. ff² vg syr c s copbo arm eth geo slav Diatessaron Porphyry acc. to Jerome Epiphanius Chrysostom Cyril Ambrosiaster and Augustine. Witnesses for οὔπω are P⁶⁶ B L T W Δ Θ Ψ 070 0105 0141 0250 ƒ¹ ƒ¹³ 28 33 157 180 205 597 700 892 1006 1010 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 Byz [E F G H N] Lect itᶜ⁻⁷⁻⁹

¹² Metzger, Textual Commentary, 95. In Metzger’s first edition of Textual Commentary minuscule 2427 was not cited, though in subsequent editions it was. The Textual Commentary, all editions, was published prior to Carlson’s findings that 2427 was a forgery (see note above). Manuscripts of the Coptic Fayyumic version (copfay) date mostly from the fifth to ninth centuries. Many of these manuscripts are in fragmentary form and as such, difficult to classify with respect to text-type. For more on the Coptic Fayyumic version see Frederik Wisse, “The Coptic Versions of the New Testament,” in The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 131-41. For the direction of current Coptic studies see Christian Askeland, “The Coptic Versions of the New Testament,” in The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 2nd ed. (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2013), 201-29.
The variant oὐκ is found in a host of Western manuscripts, whereas oὕτως is found in the well-received papyrus manuscripts P66 and P75, as well as Codex B, and a host of non-Western Greek manuscripts. As for the choice of oὐκ over oὕτως, Metzger says that “the reading oὕτως was introduced at an early date (it is attested by P66, 75) in order to alleviate the inconsistency between ver. 8 and ver. 10.”

Metzger’s explanation does make sense. If oὕτως (“not yet”) is used in verse 8, one would find it hard to explain the secrecy of Jesus’ attendance at the feast in verse 10. What we have, then, is a decision influenced by internal evidence.

The examples of Mark 13:33 and John 7:8 show that the United Bible Societies committee were willing to favour internal evidence at the expense of external evidence even if the latter showed a preponderance of witnesses and reliable ones at that. So the question is, why would the committee not do the same for Luke 22:19b–20, or for any of the other Western non-interpolations for that matter?

The “better” external arguments and the “better” internal arguments often appear conflicting. This is because of the paradigm of scribal interpolation scholars often work under. Working under this paradigm often forces scholars to show favouritism to either the external evidence or internal evidence. If, however, scholars allow for a different paradigm, particularly for the Western non-interpolations, one need not show favouritism to either form of evidence. In fact, the external evidence and the “better” internal evidence allow for the proposition that Luke was responsible for both the long variant readings and the short variant readings. But what is this “better” internal evidence?

---

13 The NIV is also listed as a modern translation which agrees with this textual decision.
14 Metzger, Textual Commentary, 185.
15 By “better” I mean that evidence which appears to have the argument in its favour, particularly if we judge it solely on its own merits and without influence from the other form of evidence.
evidence? To this we now turn.

The Variants

The remainder of this chapter will look at the internal evidence for the eight Western non-interpolations of Luke’s Gospel. As with the previous chapter, each variant reading will be assessed individually. It is the long variant reading which will be cited. One needs to keep in mind that the absence of the cited words is the short variant reading.

Following the citation of the long variant reading is an introductory remark. This will be followed by discussions of the intrinsic and transcriptional probabilities of each variant reading. On completion of the discussion of the internal evidence there will be an interpretation and evaluation of the evidence with an overall conclusion.


19bWhich is being given for you; do this for my memory. 20And the cup in the same way after supper, saying, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood which is being shed for you.”

Arguments for and against the long variant reading and short variant reading of Luke 22:19b–20 are complex and extensive. After reviewing the relevant literature I have discovered four important issues that require discussion under intrinsic probability. The first issue is in regards to the structure of the Supper narrative. This has to do with how the structure of the Supper narrative, beginning from Luke 22:15, is affected by the inclusion and exclusion of verses 19b–20. The second issue is in regards to the theology of the long variant reading and whether it is consistent with Luke’s overall theology. Another issue is in relation to grammar
and vocabulary. Here, words and phrases of our passage are analysed in order to assess whether they are consistent with Luke’s style of writing. The final issue is in regards to the source of 22:19b–20. Can the likely source of the long variant reading be determined, and if so, does it allow us to provide a date as to when it was written?

As for transcriptional probability, various theories have been offered in the last four decades. Here, I review the major theories regarding the possible context of and motivation for Luke 22:19b–20. Much of the discussion has focused upon scribal misunderstanding and early Christological controversies.

**Intrinsic Probability**

The inclusion of the long variant reading in Luke’s Supper narrative creates an awkward cup-bread-cup sequence. In Luke 22:17 Jesus gives thanks over the cup. In verse 19a Jesus gives thanks over the bread and breaks it. In verse 20 the cup is made mention of once again. Here Jesus takes the cup in the “same way” (ὡσαύτως) as the bread. With verse 20 we have a second mentioning of the cup. From a narrative perspective the cup-bread-cup sequence comes across as problematic. The idea that Jesus would offer the cup a second time appears odd.

J. H. Petzer does not believe that the long variant reading does damage to the structure of the Supper narrative. For him Luke 22:19b–20 is important for the structure of the Supper narrative. Petzer says that the parallel institution narratives of Matt 26:26–30, Mark 14:22–25 and 1 Cor 11:23–26 contain a sign-explanation sequence. In these Supper narratives we find the signs of bread/eating and cup/drinking. Each of

---

these signs is immediately followed by an explanation. The explanations reveal the significance behind eating the bread and drinking the cup. The bread/eating sign is explained as the offering of Jesus’ body. The cup/drinking sign is explained as the pouring out of Jesus’ blood on behalf of many. It represents the sign of the covenant. Paul makes it clear that it represents a *new* covenant (1 Cor 11:25). The sign-explanation sequence is intended to instruct the readers of the significance of Jesus’ sacrifice. In Matthew and Mark there is an eschatological significance to Jesus’ sacrifice as seen by the reference to the kingdom of God. In Paul there is no reference to the kingdom of God, though there still is an eschatological focus. Paul “explains that both the bread and cup are witnesses to the death of Christ until his second coming (1 Cor 11:26).”

Petzer summarises the sign-explanation sequence in Matthew, Mark and Paul as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>ἄρτον</th>
<th>sign</th>
<th>bread/eating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>τὸ σῶμά μου</td>
<td>explanation</td>
<td>body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>a’</th>
<th>ποτήριον</th>
<th>sign</th>
<th>cup/drinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b’</td>
<td>τὸ αἷμά μου</td>
<td>explanation</td>
<td>blood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| C | c | ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ | eschatology | kingdom |

Petzer understands Luke 22:15–20 as containing the same idea but structured differently. For him, Luke has presented his Supper narrative in two distinct units. The first unit is that of verses 15–18. These verses have a *sign-eschatology* sequence. Petzer summarises this sequence as follows:

---

19 Matt 26:26a; Mark 14:22a; 1 Cor 11:23.
20 Matt 26:26b; Mark 14:22b; 1 Cor 11:24.
21 Matt 26:27; Mark 14:23; 1 Cor 11:25a.
22 Matt 26:28; Mark 14:24; 1 Cor 11:25b.
23 Matt 26:29; Mark 14:25. 1 Cor 11:26 contains an eschatological statement though not about the kingdom of God.
A a τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν sign eating (Luke 22:15)
B a’ τὸ ποτήριον, πίω sign cup/drinking (Luke 22:17, 18)
b’ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ελθῇ eschatology [kingdom] (Luke 22:18)

What is missing in verses 15–18 is the explanation. According to Petzer the explanation is found in verses 19–20. The sign-explanation sequence is presented by him as follows:25

A a ἄρτον sign bread (Luke 22:19a)
b τὸ σῶμά μου explanation body (Luke 22:19b)
B a’ ποτήριον sign cup (Luke 22:20a)
b’ τὸ αἷμά μου explanation blood (Luke 22:20b)

For Petzer, then, Luke was thinking along the same lines as Mark, Matthew and Paul. Luke, however, chose to present it differently. According to Petzer, a later scribe, not recognizing this mode of presentation, but noticing the awkward cup-bread-cup sequence, deleted the passage from Luke’s Gospel.26

Ehrman agrees with Petzer that verses 15–18 should be thought of as a self-contained unit.27 He disagrees, however, that verses 19–20 are another self-contained unit. For Ehrman, verse 19a makes a smooth transition into verses 21–22, while verses 19b–20 disturb the structure. Based on Ehrman’s position, the second unit of Luke’s Supper narrative has the verses 19a, 21–22. The focus of this second unit is on the betrayer and impending death of Jesus.

For Ehrman, each unit can be distinguished by a series of contrasts. In the first unit there are two contrasts, each of which is identified by the words λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν (“for

---

I say to you”). The first occurs after Jesus declares his desire to eat the Passover meal with his disciples (verse 15). Here the passage reads, “For I say to you (λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν) I will not eat it until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God” (verse 16). The second occurs after Jesus has given thanks over the cup (verse 17). Here Jesus says, “For I say to you (λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν), that from now on I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes” (verse 18). Each contrast has in mind the future consummation of the kingdom of God.

Ehrman says that the second unit (verses 19a, 21–22) should be understood in a similar way to the first unit. The difference is that the contrast is introduced by the conjunction πλὴν (“but”). Therefore, after Jesus has given thanks over the bread in verse 19a we read, “But (πλὴν) see, the one who betrays me is with me, and his hand is on the table” (verse 21). The breaking of the bread (verse 19a) is contrasted with the revelation that the betrayer is at the table with Jesus and the disciples, and that the fate of the Son of Man is determined (verses 21–22).

An assessment of both Petzer’s and Ehrman’s argument is required. There is a problem with Petzer’s notion that a scribe deleted verses 19b–20 because he did not understand Luke’s structure. One would presume that a scribe coming across Luke 22:15–20 and being concerned with a cup-bread-cup sequence would delete the reference to the first cup so as to create a bread-cup sequence which would bring it in harmony with Mark, Matthew and Paul. In addition to this, one also wonders why Luke would create two units (a sign-eschatology unit and a sign-explanation unit) in the first place. His source Mark did not present the Supper narrative in this way.

Ehrman’s position provides a reasonable explanation for the preference of the
short variant reading. His view that Luke has structured his Supper narrative in a series of contrasts does comfortably allow for the notion that verses 19b–20 were not originally part of the narrative. One might respond to Ehrman by saying that the contrast of 22:21 would work just as well after mentioning the cup in 22:20 as it does after mentioning of bread in 22:19a. However, it would seem odd for Luke to introduce a contrast after the cup in 22:20 when a contrast after the cup has already occurred in 22:18.

Therefore, the structure of the Supper narrative without verses 19b–20 presents well. There is no cup-bread-cup sequence and there are a series of three contrasts. One contrast occurs after Jesus declares his desire to eat a Passover meal with his disciples and another contrast occurs after the presentation of the cup. The final contrast occurs after the presentation of the bread. Based upon these observations, it is reasonable to consider verses 19b–20 as an afterthought.

From a Lukan theological perspective the long variant reading appears problematic. For Ehrman, in Luke 22:20 we read of the “salvific efficacy of Christ’s blood.” It is a message that describes the death of Jesus as one which will atone for sins. This, at least, is what is indicated by the words “for you” (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν). Here, Jesus’ sacrifice is described as the “new covenant” (καινὴ διαθήκη). The words καινὴ διαθήκη recall Jeremiah’s promise (Jer 31:31–34) and create a point of contact with Paul (1 Cor 11:25). This contact with Paul is important for we know that he understood Jesus’ death as one which atones for sin. Mark (14:24) and Matthew (26:28) prefer to speak of τῆς διαθήκης (“the covenant”). Outside of our disputed passage Luke never describes

28 Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 197.
30 See, for example, Rom 3:23–26; 5:1–11; and 2 Cor 5:14–6:2.
Jesus’ death as one which atones for sins.31 In Ehrman’s words, “never in his two volumes does Luke say that Jesus died ‘for your sins’ or ‘for you’ (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν).”32 Furthermore, Luke regularly portrays Jesus’ death as that “of a righteous martyr who has suffered from miscarried justice, whose innocence is vindicated by God at the resurrection.”33 In the long variant reading, the theological explanation of Jesus’ impending death as a sacrifice is contrary to what we read from Luke elsewhere.

Other than in our disputed text of Luke 22:19b–20, the closest we get in regards to an atonement explanation of Jesus’ death in Luke’s writings is in Acts 20:28, which reads:

προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς καὶ παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ, ἐν οἷς ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἣν περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ιδίου.

Pay attention to yourselves and to all the flock in which the Holy Spirit has made you guardians to shepherd the church of God, which he acquired through the blood of his own one [i.e. son].34


32 Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 199.

33 Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 201.

34 There is a translational problem with this passage. In this passage it is not entirely clear who is the subject of τοῦ ιδίου. The majority of scholars understand the genitive of these two words unconnected to the genitive τοῦ θεοῦ. In this case the word “son” is often supplied to the phrase ἣν περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ιδίου, creating the translation, “which he acquired through the blood of his own son.” See for example, Ernst Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary, trans. Bernard Noble and Gerald Shinn (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 589; Metzger, Textual Commentary, 426; Hans Conzelmann, Acts of the Apostles, trans. James Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel and Donald H. Juel, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 175; Duke T. Johnson, The Acts of the Apostles, Sacra Pagina 5 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992), 363; and Charles H. Talbert, Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles (New York: Crossroad, 1997), 187. However, another interpretation is possible, as was recognised by early scribes. The words ἣν περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ιδίου can be translated, “as which he acquired through his own blood.” In this case ιδίου is understood as an adjective which agrees with αἵματος. This means ιδίου must be the subject of περιεποιήσατο which is in fact τοῦ θεοῦ. This allows for a Patripassian interpretation. Patripassianism is the belief that God the Father, Jesus the Christ and the Holy Spirit are three different modes or aspects of the one God, not three distinct persons. It requires the belief that God the Father became the Christ, in which case it could be
At first glance it would be easy to think that the words ἥν περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου (“which he acquired through his own blood”) supports the view that the death of Jesus did atone for the sins of the church. But this passage does not make this concept clear. There is no mention of atonement in Acts 20:28. To presume that atonement is the theme behind the verse is to read into the passage more than what it says. The passage tells us that blood acquired the church, but it does not tell us that blood redeemed the church.

For Ehrman, there are two passages important for understanding Acts 20:28. The first is Acts 8 where Luke stops short his citation of Isaiah 53, therefore eliminating any possible reference to an atonement theology. He writes:

Somewhat remarkably, however, when Luke cites the [Isaiah] passage, he includes not a word about the Servant of the Lord being “wounded for our transgressions” ( Isa 53:5), being “bruised for our iniquities” ( Isa 53:5), or making himself “an offering for sin” (53:10). Luke has instead crafted his quotation to affirm his own view of Jesus’ passion: he died as an innocent victim who was then vindicated (Acts 8:32–33).

For Ehrman, another important passage for understanding Acts 20:28 is Acts 73 said that the Father suffered on the cross and that his blood acquired the church. Some scribes, wanting to avoid such an interpretation, changed θεοῦ with κυρίου, as in P74 A C* D E Ψ 33 36 453 945 1739 and 1891. See C. S. C. Williams, A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles (London: Black, 1957), 234. Witnesses supporting θεοῦ as against κυρίου include Β 614 1175 and 1505 and several versions. A number of witnesses include both κυρίου and θεοῦ (τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ), such as C* H L P 049 1 69 etc. One witness, 1837, has τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησου καὶ θεοῦ.

35 See the thorough explanation on this issue by Walter E. Pilgrim, “The Death of Christ in Lukan Soteriology” (Th.D. diss.; Princeton Theological Seminary, 1971), 172-77.

36 Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 202. Acts 20:28 is about God’s commitment in acquiring the church. The passage should not be understood doctrinally, but pastorally, as the greater context suggests (Acts 20:17-38). We gain a deeper understanding of this when we recognise the close analogy with Ps 74:2 (LXX 73:2). This Psalm is a lament by God’s people in exile. In verse 2 the Psalmist reminds God of his congregation (or synagogue, τῆς συναγωγῆς), which he “acquired from the beginning” (ἐκτήσω ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς). It was this congregation which God “redeemed” (ἐλυτρώσω). Therefore, the Psalmist is communicating the close relationship that exists between God and his people. Acts 20:28 should be understood in a similar way. As Conzelmann (Acts of the Apostles, 175) says, the context of Acts 20:28 is one of practical “pastoral admonition to church leaders.”

37 Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 200.
5:28–31. In this unit we have the only other time when Luke refers to “the blood” (τὸ ἀἷμα) of Jesus (verse 28). The context makes it clear that the blood of Jesus should not be interpreted as teaching an atonement sacrifice. In verse 30 Peter accuses the high priest and his council for Jesus’ death. In verse 31 Peter proclaims that Jesus has been exalted to God’s right hand “as leader and saviour that he might give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins.” In reference to this verse Ehrman says that “the blood of Jesus produces the church because it brings the cognizance of guilt that leads to repentance.” Therefore, other than in Luke 22:19b–20, it appears that Luke understands Christ’s blood as acquiring the church. Luke 22:19b–20 is foreign to what Luke has written elsewhere. There is good reason then, to think of Luke 22:19b–20 as an afterthought.

A close analysis of the language also allows for the conclusion that the long variant reading was an afterthought, with Paul as a source. The closest parallel to Luke 22:19b–20 is 1 Cor 11:24–25, with Mark’s Supper narrative sharing some similarities to Luke 22:20b. Table 4.1 compares the Supper narratives in Luke, Paul and Mark. The underlined words indicate the same words in Luke and Mark. The words in bold indicate the same words in Luke and Paul. Bold words in Mark indicate that they are also found in Paul. Relevant text critical signs are also included, indicating variant readings. The comparison will also include Luke 22:19a, a point of discussion further below.

---

38 Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 202.
Table 4.1: Comparison of Paul, Luke, and Mark’s Supper Narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23ελαβεν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα</td>
<td>19καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδώκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου</td>
<td>22καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδώκεν αὐτοῖς τοῦτο ἐστίν τὸ σῶμά μου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24ἐλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα μου</td>
<td>19καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδώκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων τοῦτο ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα μου</td>
<td>23καὶ λαβὼν τοῦτο ὑπὲρ υμῶν διδόμενον τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 20καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὑπὲρ υμῶν διδόμενον τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 20τὸ ποτήριον ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον τὸ ἅμα μου τῆς διαθήκης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25γὰρ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον ἐυλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδώκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων ἃ ἐστιν ἐν τῷ ἤματι μου</td>
<td>19καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὑπὲρ υμῶν διδόμενον τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 20τὸ ποτήριον ὑπὲρ υμῶν διδόμενον τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 20καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὑπὲρ υμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον τὸ ἅμα μου τῆς διαθήκης</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδώκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων τοῦτο ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου</td>
<td>19καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδώκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων τοῦτο ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα μου</td>
<td>24τὸ ποτήριον ὑπὲρ υμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον τὸ ἅμα μου τῆς διαθήκης</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As already discussed throughout this thesis, there are manuscripts which do not include Luke 22:19b—20. This is represented by the markings □ \ in the above table.

However, other variants exist in the Lukan Supper narrative and its parallels. The above table reveals the following: First, except for διδόμενον (“being given”), all other words in Luke 22:19b are found in 1 Cor 11:24b. Some manuscripts containing 1 Cor 11:24b (א C D3 E1 F G K L P Ψ 81 365 630 1175 1241 1505 1739mg 1881 2464 מ1 sy) include the variant κλώμενον where Luke 22:19b has διδόμενον. Second, Paul’s version has ἐστίν (“is”) and ἐμῷ (“my”) in 1 Cor 11:25a, though some manuscripts (P46 A C P 33 365 1175 1241) replace these words with ἁματί μου which reflects Luke 22:20a. All other words of Luke 22:20a are found in 1 Cor 11:25a. Third, there is a reordering of words between Luke 22:20a and 1 Cor 11:25a. Luke has ωσαύτως (“likewise”) after ποτήριον (“cup”)
whereas Paul places it before the words καὶ τὸ ποτήριον (“and the cup”). However, the variant ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον is found in a number of manuscripts of Luke, such as A K N W Γ Δ Θ Ψ f1 565 700 892 1424 2542 / 844 Μ lat syh. This corresponds to the reading of 1 Cor 11:25a. P46 and some Latin manuscripts reorder the words μοῦ ἐστιν at 1 Cor 11:24a so the phrase now reads τοῦτο ἐστιν μοῦ τὸ σῶμα. This is closer to what is found in Luke 22:19a and Mark 14:22, though μοῦ is found at the end of the phrase in the latter two passages. Fourth, Luke 22:20b does not have the last part of Paul’s sentence (1 Cor 11:25b). Here, Luke 22:20b is closer to Mark 14:24b, though a number of manuscripts of Mark include the variation ὑπὲρ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον (D W Δ Θ f13 565 579 syh) or περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον (A K P Γ f13 28 700 1241 1424 2542 Μ syh).

Some other variants exist. In 1 Cor 11:24a, manuscripts C3 K L P Ψ 81c 365 1505 Μ t vgcl sy have the variant ἔλαβετε φάγετε. This corresponds with those manuscripts of Mark 14:22 (Γ f13 28 1241 2542 Μ f2 bo) which includes ἔφαγεν after λάβετε, though one manuscript (k) omits ἔλαβετε altogether. In addition, some manuscripts (A K P Γ 1241 Μ) of Mark 14:23, 24a includes the article τὸ before ποτήριον (v. 23) and the word καινῆς before διαθήκης (v. 24a). This creates a parallel with Luke 22:20a and 1 Cor 11:25a. The article τὸ is not found in P46.

Four other variants are found in Mark 14:22. A number of manuscripts include ὁ Ἰησοῦς prior to ἄρτον (א C K L P Γ Δ Θ Ψ f1 28 579 700 892 1241 1424 2542 Μ lat syh bo). A handful of manuscripts of Mark replace ἔδωκεν with ἔδιδον (W f1 13 2542). The Latin variant et manducaverunt ex illo omnes (“and they did eat of it”) is found before τὰς in one manuscript k. Finally, ἐστίν is not found in W.

Variants aside, of the thirty-two words in Luke 22:19b–20, all but six are found in
1 Cor 11:24b–25. As just over 80% of the words of our disputed passage are found in Paul, it allows one to take seriously the proposition that Luke used Paul as a source here.\(^{39}\) However, Luke’s usage of Paul is problematic. On many occasions, what we find is that Luke’s second volume Acts does not accord well with what we read in Paul’s letters. This is reflected in comparing some accounts in Acts to those in Paul’s letters. In Gal 1:18–24 Paul wrote that he was in Damascus for three years before he went to Jerusalem. In Acts 9:19b–30 it says Paul was there for several days. In Gal 2:2 Paul wrote that his second return to Jerusalem was in response to a revelation whereas in Acts 15 it was in response to a direction by Christian leaders in Jerusalem. These are just two of several examples where Acts does not seem to correlate well with what we read in Paul’s letters.

There is wide support for the position that there are differences between what we read in Acts and Paul’s letters. For example, Dennis Duling and Norman Perrin say “that Paul’s speeches in Acts differ in some important points from what is known about Paul’s theological beliefs as expressed in the Pauline letters.”\(^{40}\) According to Joseph Fitzmyer, the reason for the differences between Acts and the Pauline letters is lack of knowledge of the letters. Fitzmyer says that “there is, indeed, no evidence that Luke had ever read any of Paul’s letters.”\(^{41}\) Finally, Günther Bornkamm offers an explanation for the differences between Acts and the Pauline letters. He writes:

Luke’s history is to be understood primarily as a document of his own

---

39 I take the commonly accepted view that 1 Corinthians was written by Paul at least two decades prior to Luke’s Gospel. As such, the direction can only go one way: from Paul to Luke. Another possibility is that Luke and Paul used a common source. This is discussed shortly.


time, the post-apostolic age. It was during, and for, this time that Luke wrote, at the earliest toward the end of the first century, more than forty years after Paul's letters were written . . . The conditions and events, the controversies and conflicting views, of the earlier period, to which Paul's letters bear ample testimony, were already quite alien to the age of Acts. By the time Acts was written, all these matters were largely things of the past, settled and forgotten; accurate memory of them had faded, some of the tradition been suppressed, and in many respects the earlier conception of the gospel of salvation, of Christian faith, of the church and its relationship to the world, had given way to new questions, new views, new tasks.42

If Luke did not have access to Paul's letters during the writing of Acts, then it stands to reason that the verbal similarity between Luke 22:19b–20 and 1 Cor 11:24b–25 is best attributed to either a common source, or Luke's use of Paul at a time after the writing of Acts.

It is clear the words and phrases of Luke 22:19b–20 have a Pauline flavour. There is no mention of ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη (“the new covenant”) in the Supper narratives of Mark or Matthew, but there is in Paul. Also, the noun διαθήκη and its cognates are frequently found in the Pauline literature but are uncommon in Luke. George Kilpatrick says that the use of ἐμὴν in Luke 22:19b is not Lucan for it is an attribute adjective. When Luke uses ἐμός and its cognates he does so predicatively and pronominally.43 In addition, ὑπέρ is uncommon in Luke. Outside of our disputed text, where it is used two times, it is found in 6:40; 9:50 and 16:8. In 6:40 it is from Q (cf. Matt 24) and in 9:50 from Mark 9:40. Luke 16:8 has no known parallel, but we cannot discount the possibility that Luke used ὑπέρ because it was found in his Special L source. On the other hand, the word is found frequently in the Pauline literature, as it is used one hundred and one times. The

adverb ὡσαύτως (22:20) is also uncommon in Luke. It is found at two other occasions, 13:5 and 20:31. However, in regards to 13:5, a high number of manuscripts (P75 A D W Θ Ψ 070 f¹³ Α) have the variant ὁμολογ. As for the other canonical New Testament books, Matthew has the adverb four times, Mark two times, and John does not use the word. We find the adverb in the Pauline literature eight times.

J. H. Petzer gives the following list of words and phrases that appear in Luke 22:19b–20 but are uncommon in Luke’s writing: ὑπὲρ plus genitive (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν), μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον, as well as the words ἐμός, ἀνάμνησις, ποτήριον, ὡσαύτως, δειπνέω, καίνος, ἐκχέω and the omission of the copula. To this list we can also add διαθήκη. Of these, ὑπὲρ plus genitive, μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι, ἐμός, ἀνάμνησις, ποτήριον, ὡσαύτως, δειπνέω, καίνος and διαθήκη are also found in 1 Cor 11:23–26. The phrase τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, including the use of ἐκχέω, finds a parallel at Mark 14:24 (τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ) and Luke may have taken it from there. However, as Petzer notes, the verb ἐκχέω is not entirely foreign to Luke, as it is also found in Luke 5:37 and 11:50. In regards to Luke 5:37, Luke has added it into his text, as his Markan source (2:22) did not have it, and in regards to 11:50, it comes from Q (cf. Matt 18:35). The verb is also found in Acts 1:18; 2:17, 18, 33; 10:45 and 22:20.

The phrase τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν is grammatically odd in Luke 22:20b. The word ἐκχυννόμενον (“being shed,” or as some translations have it, “being poured out”) corresponds semantically with τῷ αἵματι, but, ἐκχυννόμενον is in the nominative and τῷ

---


45 Petzer, “Style and Text,” 120.
αἵματι is in the dative. The NRSV (1989) translates strictly according to the grammar: “This cup that is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood.” The word ἐκχυννόμενον is made to correspond to “this cup” (τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον). However, this does not seem to be the best option. Eduard Schweizer says that though ἐκχυννόμενον should modify τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον, “a cup is not poured,” and therefore the two do not relate well with one another. Importantly, François Bovon has pointed out that making ἐκχυννόμενον correspond with τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον creates a tension with verses 17–18. The cup in verses 17–18 is linked to an eschatological promise. In verse 20 it makes more sense to keep this eschatological link by having “this cup” correspond with the “new covenant” (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη). As Bovon says:

In spite of the waves this anacoluthon raises, the meaning is clear. The cup here constitutes the new covenant that is established in the blood of Jesus, and this blood has been shed for you.

A simple solution to this grammatical dilemma is to understand τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον as having come from Mark. After observing the absence of the phrase in 1 Cor 11:23–26, the writer apparently chose to supplement it with Mark’s expression, even at the expense of sacrificing grammar.

---

46 J. H. Petzer (“Style and Text,” 119-20) says that some think it uncharacteristic of Luke to write it in the nominative.
50 Nolland (Luke 18:35–24:53, 1054) understands this “ungrammatical product” as “the meeting of liturgical innovation with liturgical conservatism.” Schweizer (Luke, 332) says that “two traditional formulas are in conflict here.” These two positions are dependent upon the idea that a fixed liturgical formula was in existence in the late first century.
Luke 22:20 does not have the copula ἐστίν in the phrase τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη, despite the parallels of 1 Cor 11:25a and Mark 14:24a having it. The addition of a copula in this phrase would be consistent with Lukan style. Petzer notes that on nine other occasions Luke supplies a copula “where his sources omit it.”⁵² This suggests to some that Luke is not the author.⁵³ However, 1 Cor 11:25a and Mark 14:24a do include a copula: τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστίν and τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ ἀἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης, respectively. Therefore, it is not a matter of supplying a copula when what appears to be the source omits it, but rather, omitting a copula when the source has supplied it.

Jeremias lists four other occasions when Luke omits the copula when his source supplies it (Luke 9:8, 19; 18:27; and 20:24). He also lists four more occasions when this probably happened (3:22; 7:25; 17:35; and 22:42).⁵⁴ The absence of the copula in this phrase is not discordant with what we read of Luke elsewhere and may be evidence that Luke was the writer.

Interestingly, the participle διδόμενον (“being given”) appears only here in the entire New Testament. However, δίδωμι and its cognates are quite common in Luke, appearing seventy-four times. What we have, then, is a word in verse 19b that does not appear in the parallel 1 Cor 11:24 and is a common Lukan word.

If Luke 22:19b–20 is worded very closely to what we find in 1 Cor 11:24–25 and if Acts suggests that Luke probably did not have access to Paul’s letters, then one can easily presume that Luke and Paul shared a similar source or tradition. This is the

verdict of numerous scholars. For example, Jeremias writes that “it is more natural to explain the agreement between Luke and Paul by church tradition.”\textsuperscript{55} This, then, explains why there are a high number of non-Lukan characteristics in the long variant reading, for Luke is “following his Vorlage . . . therefore Lukan style is not to be expected in the case of the words of the institution.”\textsuperscript{56} Likewise for Bovon, Luke 22:19–20 stems from the same liturgical tradition as 1 Cor 11:24–25.\textsuperscript{57} Similarly, Nolland writes that “for vv 19-20 Luke clearly draws on a tradition that has a family likeness to that which we find in 1 Cor 11:23–26.”\textsuperscript{58}

The problem with this position is that it relies upon a notion that in the first century there was a fixed liturgy which was commonly used among Christian communities. However, there is no evidence that the institution narratives formed the basis of Eucharistic prayers until late into the fourth century.\textsuperscript{59} We do not see a fixed form of liturgical words until then.

In regards to Eucharistic prayers Paul Bradshaw writes that “Christians generally do not seem to have written down their prayers but preferred oral transmission and improvisation.”\textsuperscript{60} When we do find early writings in relation to the Eucharist it is not to instruct in the “correct” method of distribution of the elements, or mandate the “proper”

\textsuperscript{55} Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 156.
\textsuperscript{56} Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 155.
\textsuperscript{59} Paul F. Bradshaw, Eucharistic Origins (London: SPCK, 2004), 140. This is also the position of Andrew McGowan. McGowan writes that “this liturgical assumption about the tradition faces a serious historical problem. Students of early liturgy have long had to struggle with the fact that, leaving aside the NT texts, the earliest eucharistic prayers might not have included the institution narratives at all.” Andrew McGowan, “Is There a Liturgical Text in This Gospel? The Institution Narratives and Their Early Interpretative Communities,” JBL 118 (1999): 73-87.
\textsuperscript{60} Bradshaw, Eucharistic Origins, 38.
words one is to recite over them, but rather it is for catechetical purposes. For example, when speaking of the Eucharist Justin Martyr does not mention the breaking of bread.61 His reference to the Eucharist “is composed almost entirely of a mixture of words and phrases that can be paralleled in the narratives of both Matthew and Luke [which sounds] like a formulary regularly used in catechesis rather than an ad hoc composition by Justin.”62 With this in mind it is reasonable to conclude that Luke 22:19b–20 was written to explain and instruct the hearers and readers of the Gospel about the significance of Jesus’ last supper. In other words, it was written for catechetical purposes.

But we should not presume that there was a standard catechetical source which was commonly shared among early Christians. Though Bradshaw’s quote above allows for the proposition that there was a catechetical formulary source that could be utilised, this does not seem to be the case for the period under consideration: the late first century and early second century. It is not likely that Luke and Paul shared a common catechetical source. First, there are no known catechetical sources from the time period we are considering. Second, a fixed and standardised catechetical source so early in the Christian era does not reflect the diversity of Christian experience that we have come to understand as existing during this time. Third, if a writer wanted to give a specific teaching in his book, it is more likely that he did so by consulting other written works and being influenced by them, not by consulting a standard reference source, written or

61 Justin Martyr, First Apology, 66.3.
62 Bradshaw, Eucharistic Origins, 15. Bradshaw is here summarising the observation of E. C. Ratcliff. Justin Martyr is not the only example of this catechetical style in regards to the Eucharist. Bradshaw’s Eucharistic Origins covers the major Christian sources that reference the Eucharist in the first three centuries. All of these examples are best understood as being composed for catechetical purposes. The shift towards formal prayer seems to occur during the fourth century.
oral. This is clearly seen in the example of the long variant reading before us. As mentioned earlier, Luke’s understanding of Jesus’ death is different to Paul. Paul teaches a propitiatory death in which reconciliation to God occurs through the blood of Jesus (Rom 3:24–25). For Luke, Jesus’ death is a miscarriage of justice, though he is eventually vindicated at the resurrection. Both Luke and Paul show no example of consulting a standard catechetical source when explaining the significance of Jesus’ death. It would be odd to think that Luke, particularly during the writing of his first edition, and Paul, had access to such a source yet interpreted the death of Jesus so differently.

Catechetical instruction appears to be based upon identifying a communal problem and utilising other known sources that can assist in clarifying an issue. It does not appear to be based upon referencing a standard catechetical work with a specific formula. Catechetical writing was freer than this. It is easier to believe that the long variant reading was added later. Furthermore, as no standardised liturgical tradition or catechetical tradition can be said to exist during the late first century and there is a close verbal parallel with 1 Cor 11:24–25, this suggests that the writer of Luke 22:19b–20 had contact with Paul’s letter at some stage. In addition to this, there is little reason to dispute the position that it was Luke who wrote the long variant reading as some Lukan stylistic features are evident in the long variant reading. Therefore, if Luke did not have knowledge of Paul’s letters, as is made evident by Acts, when did he write the words of our disputed passage? The logical conclusion is that the long variant reading must have been added after Acts was written.

Obviously Luke knew about Paul, as a great portion of Acts is about him. But as

---

63 Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 200.
Acts reveals, Luke did not know the content of Paul’s letters, at least not all of Paul’s letters. Luke probably did not know Paul’s letters because his letters were not easily accessible during the time Luke wrote Acts. It is clear that Paul’s letters were prominently circulating during the early second century. Marcion had a collection of ten Pauline letters. W. G. Kümmel notes, “there was a collection of Pauline letters that was known in Asia Minor [at the beginning of the second century], and it is very probable that this collection already contained all ten letters of the letters that stood in the canon of Marcion.”

There is also evidence that a number of Paul’s letters were available earlier than this. In particular, *1 Clement*, written in Rome, probably sometime during the reign of the emperor Domitian (81-96 C.E.) or a little later (96-110 C.E.), not only shows knowledge of Romans (*1 Clem. 35.5f*), but also quotes from 1 Corinthians (*1 Clem. 37:5; 47:1-3 and 49:5*). Col 4:16 also mentions a letter, that is now lost, sent by Paul to the church in Laodicea.

None of this should be taken to mean that Paul’s letters were accessible to all Christians soon after Paul wrote his letters. As Harry Gamble says, “Paul’s letters were practical expedients of his missionary work: addressed to specific churches, they are narrowly particular in substance and purpose and make no pretence of general interest or timeless relevance.” This means that not all Christian communities would have seen

---

66 Bart D. Ehrman, *Lost Scriptures: Books that Did Not Make It into the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 166. Although Colossians is a disputed Pauline letter, it may be giving accurate information on this issue. See also 1 Cor 5:9 and 2 Cor 2:4 which speak of Paul’s letters we no longer have access to.
the value of collecting or reading Paul’s letters, at least not all of them. Finally, H. M. Schenke has put forth the case that the collection of the Pauline letters was the work of the later Pauline school and was preserved best among communities which were influenced by this school. This would suggest that when Acts was written, collections of Paul’s letters were not well known outside the Pauline communities.68

It appears that during the writing of the first edition of his Gospel and the writing of Acts, Luke did not have access to Paul’s letters. However, shortly after completing Acts, Luke came into contact with at least 1 Corinthians. This is argued because there is little to convincingly dispute the idea that the source for Luke 22:19b–20 was 1 Corinthians.

Luke 22:19a requires some explanation. Some have thought that verse 19a was, with verses 19b–20, not part of Luke’s autograph.69 An important reason for this is the seemingly abrupt ending at the end of verse 19a with the words τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.70 This view finds little support among the majority of scholars, mostly because all extant manuscript witnesses have verse 19a.71

It is true that the parallels between Luke 22:19a and 1 Cor 11:23c–24 are close. Nine of the fourteen words in Luke 22:19a are found in the Pauline passage. In particular

---

69 Joachim Jeremias lists Loeschcke, Wellhausen, Bertram, Schmidt, Bate and Huber as supporting this view. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 157, n.3. Following Burton Scott Easton we can also add Klostermann to this list. Burton Scott Easton, The Gospel According to St. Luke: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1926), 322. Both Easton and Jeremias find the notion that verse 19a was never part of the original Gospel as unconvincing, with Jeremias calling it “an outrageous and inadmissible act.” Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 157.
Luke uses εὐχαριστήσας (“having given thanks”), which is also found in 1 Cor 11:24. This is in contrast to Mark, who uses εὐλογήσας (“having blessed”) in 14:22. But even so, Mark does have εὐχαριστήσας at 14:23 and therefore, one cannot eliminate influence from Mark.

The parallel of Luke 22:19a with Mark’s account is equally striking and should not go unmissed. Of the fourteen words in Luke 22:19a, twelve are found in Mark 14:22. As already mentioned, Mark 14:23 also has εὐχαριστήσας, and if we include this word, thirteen of the fourteen words in Luke 22:19a have a parallel in the Markan passage. If Luke was using Mark as a source at this point, it is entirely possible that Luke moved the word. Finally, the word order of τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου conforms to that of Mark’s. Paul’s word order is different (τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα).

Mark 14:22–23 is best thought of as the source for Luke 22:19a. There is no reason to suppose that Luke 22:19a was not written during the initial stages of Luke’s composition. Furthermore, it is perfectly reasonable to think that Luke 22:19b–20 was written later.

Our discussion of intrinsic probability has centred upon four areas. These are structure, theology, wording and source criticism. The discussion of structure has shown that Luke 22:19b–20 is best understood as an afterthought. The long variant reading creates an awkward cup-bread-cup sequence. The fact that a sign-eschatology unit is

---

separated from a *sign-explanation* unit suggests that the long variant reading was written after further reflection, probably motivated when the writer came into contact with Paul's first letter to the Corinthians. That an atonement soteriology does not suit Luke's theology further establishes the position that the long variant reading was included at a later date.

Verses 19b–20 has words and phrases which are uncharacteristic of what Luke has written elsewhere. This points towards the use of 1 Corinthians and Mark as sources. Luke 22:19b–20a is so similar in wording to 1 Cor 11:24–25, and Luke 22:20b to Mark 14:24b, that it is almost impossible to identify any Lukan characteristics. However, there are two differences between the long variant reading and the parallels, both of which have Lukan characteristics; these are the absence of ἐστίν and the inclusion of διδόμενον. Also, since Mark was a source used widely by Luke, and there are some words which are in accord with what Luke has used elsewhere, it is premature to exclude the possibility that the author of verses 19b–20 was not Luke. Therefore, I propose that Luke originally wrote the short variant reading and then at a later time added the long variant reading. If this position is acceptable, then we should see some indicators of this when discussing transcriptional probability.

*Transcriptional Probability*

Transcriptional probability is focused upon discovering what a scribe is likely to have written and why. In this section we deal with a number of possible scenarios that have been suggested. When scholars defend the antiquity of the long variant reading at Luke 22:19b–20, they normally appeal to scribal accident, scribal misunderstanding or protection from misuse as the cause for its absence. For those scholars that defend the
antiquity of the short variant reading here, appeal of late has been to Christological controversies of the time.

Metzger says that the United Bible Societies committee attributed the omission of the long variant reading to “some scribal accident or misunderstanding.”73 Though scribal accident is a possibility, it is not the only, or even the best, explanation when we consider that the words are very close to 1 Cor 11:24–25 and Mark 14:24b, and that the flow of the institution narrative is not disturbed without verses 19b–20. There remains a seamless flow from verse 19a to verse 21, suggesting that something more than accidental scribal omission is the cause for the short variant reading.

Klyne Snodgrass74 and Craig Evans75 have appealed to the awkward cup-bread-cup sequence as a reason for scribal deletion of 22:19b–20. According to Snodgrass and Evans, the cup-bread-cup sequence would have caused confusion and a scribe sought to omit reference to it. As early as 1881 Hort explained why this theory is problematic. Hort asked why a scribe would omit the more familiar words of verses 19b–20 that have a parallel in 1 Cor 11:23–25 and keep the “less familiar words” of verses 17–18.76 In agreement with Hort, Ehrman notes that one would expect a scribe to have omitted the first reference to the cup (verses 17–18) rather than the second reference (verse 20). Deleting the reference to the first cup creates a more familiar bread-cup sequence. As Ehrman asks, “Why did the alleged scribe, concerned to eliminate the second cup, take away with it the words of institution over the bread?”77 Scribal misunderstanding does

73 Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 150.
76 Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, 63.
not appear to provide a satisfactory response as to why a scribe would have omitted Luke 22:19b–20.

Jeremias argues that a scribe omitted verses 19b–20 “in order to protect the Eucharist from profanation,” when “a pagan, around the middle of the second century requested a copy of the gospel of Luke.”78 Similarly, Bradly Billings believes that the long text was omitted “to resist accusations of ‘shameful practices’ and ‘disgraceful acts’ (flagitia).”79 The meal practices of Christians, with language and imagery that could be construed as cannibalistic80 and easily overheard by outsiders,81 could be misinterpreted as a flagitium. This misunderstanding could potentially cause persecution. Billings suggests that Christian persecution in Gaul ca. 177 CE is a plausible context for the deletion of verses 19b–20.82

The proposals of Jeremias and Billings are problematic. In response to Jeremias, Ehrman asks, if verses 19b–20 were so problematic and a scribe was fearful that these words could be misused, why was not verse 19a also deleted?83 This argument also applies for Billings. The words of verse 19a are equally problematic in regards to being interpreted as cannibalistic.84 Ehrman again asks, “Why was the same motivation not

78 Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, 158-59. Jeremias does mention that the protection of the Eucharistic words from profanation and misuse can be detected as early as the first century (pp. 132-36).
81 Billings discusses how “overcrowding, narrow streets, and a density of housing and population” were typical of Greco-Roman cities, making it easy for outsiders to overhear in-house conversations. Billings, “The Disputed Words,” 519-20.
83 Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 208.
84 Billings writes that “it is quite reasonable that a scribe working in this environment [that of Gaul in 177 C.E.] might omit the problematic words from the Last Supper narrative in Luke, leaving τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου as a cue for the initiated (baptized) who would have been quite familiar with the well-established liturgical formula and capable of then supplying the missing sentences.” Billings, “The Disputed Words,” 525. The words τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου, however, are more than just “a cue.” They can easily be
operative in the transmission histories of Matthew, Mark and 1 Corinthians, where the texts are liable to precisely the same abuse but nonetheless survived the penknives of the second-century scribes unscathed?85 In relation to Billings’ hypothesis, the Gospel of Luke was not the only Christian text circulating in Gaul during the second half of the second century. Why are we not noticing more “penknives” in the corresponding Gospel texts and 1 Corinthians?86

Another problem with the suggestions of Jeremias and Billings is the dating of the omission of verses 19b–20. Both place the omission during the second half of the second century. An edition of Luke’s Gospel without verses 19b–20 was circulating earlier than this, as Marcion’s Evangelion indicates.87 If we accept the notion that the Western text did not originally contain verses 19b–20 and was circulating during the first half of the second century, then we have another witness for an early Lukan edition without the short variant readings.88

Finally, the theories of Jeremias and Billings do not correspond well with what we know about liturgical practice in the early Church. As already discussed,89 there is no evidence that the institution narratives formed the basis of Eucharistic prayers until late into the fourth century. Liturgical recitation was free during the second century. It is not likely that scribes would feel the need to delete such passages so as to protect from

85 Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 208.
86 Irenaeus, who was Bishop of Lugdunum in Gaul during this period, shows knowledge of the four canonical Gospels and 1 Corinthians. For a couple of examples of his knowledge of 1 Corinthians see Adversus haereses 5.2, cf. 1 Cor 10:16; and Adversus haereses 5.3, cf. 1 Cor 15:53.
87 See chapter three, pages 111-16 for a discussion of this.
88 Hort identified the Western text in the writings of many of the second-century Church Fathers, such as Justin Martyr, Tatian and Irenaeus, as well as in the text of Marcion. Westcott and Hort, Introduction, 112.
89 See pages 164-66.
profanation or *flagitia*. Of late, several scholars who have defended the antiquity of the short variant reading have argued that the origin of the long variant reading should be seen in relation to the Christological controversies of the time. However, though these scholars might be united on this idea, they are not united in regards to which controversy was the governing factor.

Mikeal Parsons says that the scribe of P75 was responsible for the long variant reading. He put forward the thesis that there are a number of variants in P75 that a scribe added in order to contest Gnostic thought. For Parsons, not only is Luke 22:19b–20 one of these variants, but the long variant readings of Luke 24:3b, 6a, 12, 36b, 40, 51b and 52a also form part of an anti-Gnostic polemic. Following James Royse’s thorough analysis of the scribal habits of P75, this theory can now be put to rest. Royse focuses entirely upon singular readings, observing features such as conflations, harmonisations and theological changes, just to name a few. Royse concludes by stating that “in all examples, then, Parsons’s supposed evidence is of no value in establishing a theological tendency on the part of the scribe of P75.” It cannot be demonstrated that there was a Christological tendency in P75 and that the scribe was responsible for the long variant reading.

---

90 John T. Carroll suggests that the long variant reading was added “probably early in the second century, under the influence of widely dispersed liturgical traditions, particularly the tradition in 1 Cor 11:23–25.” Carroll goes on to say that “Luke 22:19b–20 was inserted to fill out the seemingly incomplete words of institution of the Lord’s Supper.” John T. Carroll, *Luke: A Commentary*, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012), 433. I partly agree with his position. I agree that it was added “to fill out the seemingly incomplete words of institution of the Lord’s Supper.” However, it was not for liturgical purposes. Instead, the motivation was catechetical. Furthermore, it probably did not occur in the second century. It occurred in the late first century.


readings. Rather, the evidence points towards a faithful copying of the scribe’s Vorlage, particularly in relation to theology. Royse’s analysis has implications not only for Parsons’ theory in regards to Luke 22:19b–20, but also for the other seven variant readings under review. Therefore, as Parsons’ theory stands or falls on the position that the scribe of P75 exhibits a Christological tendency, a position that cannot be adequately demonstrated, no more mention will be made of Parsons’ theory for the remainder of this chapter.

Similarly to Parsons, Ehrman has argued that the long variant reading was motivated by an early Christological controversy. However, Ehrman does not recognise P75 as the smoking gun, or Gnosticism as the motivating factor. For him, the motivating factor was docetic Christology. Ehrman argues that a proto-orthodox scribe inserted verses 19b–20 to combat a belief which did not recognise Jesus as a full flesh-and-blood human. For such a scribe, a passage like Luke 22:19b–20 would have been beneficial, for it identifies Jesus’ body and blood in a materialistic way (where the bread represents the body of Jesus and the cup his blood).

Ehrman references Tertullian as one who used the institution narrative of 1 Cor 11 to refute Marcion’s view that Jesus was a phantom and not human (Adversus Marcionem 4.40; and De Anima, 17). Likewise, Irenaeus invoked the institution narrative in his response to unnamed docetists who refused to confess that Christ’s real

---

94 Royse does find that the scribe of P75 has made errors of orthography, creating a number of nonsense readings. However, the scribe has a low frequency of additions, something one would not expect if the scribe was responsible for the long variant readings. For a summary of the conclusions, see Royse, Scribal Habits, 704.
95 Ehrman’s position has won some support. Particularly note Parker’s assessment. Parker confesses, “I am delighted that a doughty champion has now sprung to the aid of the shorter text. Its defence by Ehrman in The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture is brilliant.” Parker, Living Text, 155.
96 Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 209.
blood and real flesh is what brings salvation (Adversus haereses 4.33.2; 5.2.2). With this in mind, Ehrman suggests that Luke 22:19b–20 may have been added by a scribe to deter readers of Luke’s Gospel away from docetic beliefs.

Ehrman may be correct that the inclusion of the long variant reading 22:19b–20 was motivated by the desire to combat docetic Christology. My difference with Ehrman has to do with who the writer of the passage was, not so much the motivation behind it. Ehrman holds that it was a scribe who changed the passage. I am putting forth the argument that it was Luke himself who added the passage when he chose to update his work at a later time. It is possible that the motivating factor was a response to docetic-type Christology. Luke may have wished to instruct his readers against such belief, choosing to add 22:19b–20 as a means to accomplish this. It is clear that a docetic-type Christology was present during the first century. 1 John, a letter written shortly after the Gospel of John, indicates the presence and influence of certain people who denied that Jesus came “in the flesh” (1 John 4:2–3). Ignatius of Antioch (ca. 37 CE – ca. 107 CE) writes of those whom he calls “unbelievers” (ἀπιστοί) for they maintain that “he [Jesus] only seemed to have suffered” (τὸ δοκεῖν αὐτὸν πεπονθέναι), a reference to those sharing a docetic-type Christology (Letter to the Smyrnaeans, 2.1). The period of these concerns by John and Ignatius coincides with the period when Luke would have re-edited his Gospel, that is, the late first century.

Those who attempt to offer reasons why the long variant reading was deleted by a scribe have yet to provide any convincing solution. Among those who have offered reasons why the long variant reading was added later, only Ehrman has so far offered a

---

97 Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 209.
solution that can be considered plausible. However, his docetic theory need not imply that a scribe was the only possible candidate for having added 22:19b–20. The Christological debate was prevalent during the late first century. If we take into consideration when 1 John may have been written (ca. 100 CE), as well as when Ignatius was active (turn of the second century), then we can be reasonably confident as to the time when Luke may have updated his Gospel.

**Concluding Comment**

The analysis of intrinsic probability reveals that the long variant reading was an afterthought, and as such, was added after Luke first wrote his Gospel. However, there is no need to infer from this that the passage was written by a scribe. That the long variant reading creates a *sign-explanation* unit indicates a desire to update the Supper narrative at a later time so as to provide further instruction. Luke 22:19b–20 shows knowledge of Mark, a major source for Luke, and there are two strong Lukan stylistic characteristics (the inclusion of διδόμενον and omission of ἐστίν). These features allow for the real possibility that it was Luke himself who updated his narrative.

The analysis of transcriptional probability reveals that it is no easy task to determine the reason why the long variant reading was either omitted or inserted. For the position that the long variant reading was omitted, no good reason has yet been offered. Scribal unintentional change is the less satisfactory explanation for the omission of the long variant reading. For the position that the long variant reading was inserted at a later time, Ehrman’s anti-docetic explanation is attractive. This controversy did exist in the early period of the Church’s existence and the significance of the passage in question could be understood as a polemical response. However, whereas Ehrman attributes the
inclusion of the long variant reading to a scribe, there is no reason to suggest that it could not have been Luke, for such a controversy was in existence during the late first century, therefore providing a motive for Luke to update his Supper narrative. To conclude, the results of both intrinsic probability and transcriptional probability provide good reasons to promote the thesis that Luke added the long variant reading of 22:19b–20 at a time after he first wrote his Gospel.

Luke 24:3b

τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ
Of the Lord Jesus

In regards to this variant reading, intrinsic probability focuses upon understanding the phrase τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ within the larger context of Luke’s Gospel and Acts. For transcriptional probability, discussion surrounds parablepsis and the motive for either the omission or addition of the phrase. Both intrinsic probability and transcriptional probability show that it is reasonable to conclude that Luke added the long variant reading at a later time.

**Intrinsic Probability**

Other than our disputed passage of Luke 24:3b the phrase τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ is not found in any of the four canonical Gospels.98 As it is a phrase that is uncommon in the

---

98 Mark 16:19 is an exception. However, the overwhelming consensus is that Mark 16:9–20 was not part of the autograph, but rather a later interpolation. In reference to Mark 16:9–20 Craig Evans writes that “almost all [scholars] regard both the so-called Long Ending (i.e., vv 9–20) and the Short Ending as textually spurious.” Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, WBC 34B (Nashville: Nelson, 2001), 545. See also the discussion in Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 102-07. However, William Farmer believes that the status of Mark 16:9–20 should still be regarded as open. William R. Farmer, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*, SNTSMS 25 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 109.
canonical Gospels some authorities still consider it an interpolation.99

In Acts, the phrase is more prominent as it occurs seventeen times.100 Therefore, though the phrase may not be found in Luke’s Gospel other than in our disputed text, it is still quite prominent in Acts and can still be considered Lukan. The questions, then, are whether the phrase is used in Luke 24:3b in a manner that is consistent with Acts and whether there is any indication that the phrase was added after the completion of the first edition of Luke’s Gospel?

In Acts, Ehrman understands the phrase ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς “as an expression of belief in the resurrected Jesus.”101 However, in regards to Luke 24:3b, Ehrman does not regard the phrase as having the same meaning. This is because “the women [who have visited the tomb] have yet to learn from the heavenly witnesses that Jesus has been raised.”102 Ehrman’s assessment is reasonable. In Acts 1:21 Jesus is identified as ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς for the first time. This is a confessional phrase about the risen Lord in light of the resurrection. In the Gospel the phrase does not function as an expression of belief as it does in Acts. As such, it is reasonable to argue that τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ in Luke 24:3b is used in a manner differently to Acts.

C. Kavin Rowe believes that the long variant reading does play an important function. Rowe regards the phrase τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ as a “chain-link” between the two

---

99 For example, the popular NRSV Bible of 1989 does not include the phrase.
102 Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 219.
Lukan works.\textsuperscript{103} For him, the phrase points forward towards Acts.\textsuperscript{104} If the phrase were omitted, the link is broken.

Unfortunately, in regards to intrinsic probability, we do not have much more to go by. However, the fact that τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ does not function as an expression of belief in Luke as in Acts suggests that it may have been written at a later time. There was ample opportunity after Luke 24:3 to use the phrase in the same sense as Acts. Luke 24:23 may have been an appropriate time. Here we read καὶ μὴ εὑροῦσαι τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ (“and they did not find his body”). It occurs after the words of Luke 24:7: τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστήναι (“on the third day rise again”). The addition of τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ rather than αὐτοῦ in verse 23 would have been in keeping with what we read in Acts. However, possibly the best place to add the phrase would have been Luke 24:34. Here we have the phrase ἠγέρθη ὁ κύριος (“the Lord has risen”). Adding Ἰησοῦς to this statement would have been appropriate as it would have made it clear that it was the “Lord Jesus” who was raised.

On another level it is also odd to think that Luke wished to use the phrase as a chain-link, yet left a clear discrepancy in regards to the time of the ascension at the end of the Gospel with the start of Acts. This suggests that when Luke first wrote his Gospel he did not have Acts in mind and there was probably some gap between the writing of the two. One only need to think of how there is no evidence to suggest Luke and Acts circulated together as a single Luke–Acts edition, to recognise the possibility of this position. Canonically, the two works have always been separated and have never been


\textsuperscript{104} Rowe, \textit{Early Narrative Christology}, 186.
found to be, or understood by the early Church fathers, as a single two-volume work.\textsuperscript{105} Placing τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ early in the resurrection narrative does not provide an appropriate chain-link as Rowe supposes.

Having argued that it is acceptable to view τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ as being added after the writing of the Gospel, we turn to the notion of scribal interference. Though the phrase is one that Luke could have written, especially if we take Acts into account, can we dispel the notion of scribal interpolation? I believe so, as the discussion on transcriptional probability reveals.

**Transcriptional Probability**

It is difficult to find a reason as to why a scribe would have intentionally omitted the phrase τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. Accidental omission, due to parablepsis, does not seem to comfortably account for it. The phrase is a short one and on first observation it may seem possible that a scribe could pass over it. Even more so if one considers that a scribe may have seen a *nomen sacrum* ΤΟΥΚ̅Υ̅Ι̅Υ̅, which makes the phrase even shorter in appearance.\textsuperscript{106} However, it was a literary symbol of devotion that was visually distinctive and as such, presumably hard to miss. It is difficult to imagine that a scribe would not be especially careful in a part of a text that contained a *nomen sacrum*. Neither is there any possibility of appealing to homoioteleuton or homoioarcton for the omission. As


\textsuperscript{106} For a discussion of *nomina sacra* see Larry W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 95-134. Hurtado (p. 101) says that “the Christian *nomina sacra* . . . were adapted from pre/non-Christian techniques of abbreviation.” He also says that “the evidence indicates that Ἰησοῦς, Κυρίος, Θεός and Χριστὸς were treated as *nomina sacra* much more consistently, and probably earlier, than any other words in question” (p. 120).
such, parablepsis is not the best explanation for its absence.

Ehrman argues that there is good reason as to why a scribe would want to add a phrase like τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. For him, the phrase is a proto-orthodox scribal interpolation to bring about the “belief that the ‘body of the Lord Jesus’ that was placed in the tomb was also the body that left it.” According to Ehrman, τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ would assist in quenching the belief that Jesus did not rise from the dead in a full physical body. Particularly, it would assist in countering the claim of docetists who believed Jesus was only a phantom and as such his resurrection could never be physical. This is because the words τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ appear to accentuate the idea that Jesus’ body was missing from the tomb. For Ehrman then, the phrase stands as a witness to important Christological controversies of the time. The Sitz im Leben of the phrase is the early docetic debate.

It is difficult to understand how having the expression “the Lord Jesus” attached to the genitive “the body” would have caused much trouble for docetists, even within the context of a buried Jesus whose body rises and leaves the tomb empty. Docetists could speak of the body in spiritual terms. Also, identifying Jesus as Lord was not a problem for them. As for Christ’s suffering and death, for many docetists this was little more than an outward appearance. Neither was the resurrection denied by docetists. For them, it was the interpretation that mattered. Docetists did not believe in a physical

107 Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 219.
108 Ignatius, The Epistle of Ignatius to the Trallians, ix, x.
109 The fact that Marcion’s canon was predominantly made up of Paul’s letters, which had much to say about the resurrection, highlights that the topic of resurrection still had an influential place in some docetic thought. See the thesis of Markus Vincent, Christ’s Resurrection in Early Christianity and the Making of the New Testament (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011) who has argued that outside Paul the topic of the resurrection was not very prevalent and it was left to Marcion to revive the writings and tradition of Paul.
resurrection, but they did believe that it could be understood and interpreted in a spiritual and/or symbolic manner. Therefore, it is unlikely that docetists would have been concerned in reading “that ‘the body of the Lord Jesus’ that was placed in the tomb was also the body that left it.”

Michael Wade Martin understands the phrase as a response to the early separationist debates. During the early stages of the Christian church certain Christian groups believed that the Christ entered into Jesus at his baptism. This same Christ was said to depart just prior to his crucifixion. As such, it was difficult for some Christians to call Jesus Lord shortly after his crucifixion. Martin cites Irenaeus as someone speaking against some Valentinian Gnostics who held onto a separationist Christology. These Valentinian Gnostics refused to call Jesus Lord (Adversus haereses, 1.1.13). According to Irenaeus, some even outwardly confessed the unity of Jesus and the Christ but did not really believe it (Adversus haereses, 3.16.3). According to Martin, then, the phrase τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ “is best seen as affirming both the postresurrection unity and materiality of the divine ‘Lord’ and the human ‘Jesus’.”

That such a Christology was circulating in the late first century, around the time Luke composed his Gospel, is not beyond probability. Cerinthus was one person who was active and who lived in Asia Minor at the turn of the first century. He held the

---

111 In summarising the position of docetists Kirsopp Lake says that for them “the Christ before the Resurrection was of the same physical nature as the Christ after the Resurrection, and it started by regarding the latter as the norm.” Kirsopp Lake, The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ (London: Williams & Norgate, 1907), 222.
113 Martin, “Defending the ‘Western Non-Interpolations’,“ 292.
114 Asia Minor is a possible location for the production of Luke’s Gospel, but this is not certain.
view that the Christ, a spiritual being, descended upon Jesus from the true God at his baptism, and that this Christ left Jesus before the crucifixion. The belief that the Christ left Jesus before the crucifixion is based upon the notion that the Christ could not suffer.\textsuperscript{115} Epiphanius wrote that Cerinthus was one of the false prophets who taught against circumcision. He identified Cerinthus as a Judaistic Gnostic.\textsuperscript{116} Epiphanius went even further, associating Cerinthus with the Ebionites, a late first-century movement, which taught that the Christ descended upon Jesus at his baptism.\textsuperscript{117} Therefore, if the Ebionites, or a group with similar Christological beliefs to them, were active during the late first century, then we find a motive for the inclusion of the phrase during this period.


\textsuperscript{116} Matti Myllykoski, “Cerinthus,” in \textit{A Companion to Second-Century Christian “Heretics,”} ed. Antii Marjanen and Petri Luomanen, VC (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2005), 213-46. Epiphanius also identified Cerinthus as one of Paul’s opponents, whom the evangelist described in his letter to the Galatians. See Epiphanius, \textit{Panarion}, 28.1-8. This is clearly an error for Galatians was written much earlier than the late first century. It appears that Epiphanius has confused his dates. He possibly thought that a Christology similar to that of Cerinthus was circulating during Paul’s time and presumed that it was Cerinthus himself who was active then.

\textsuperscript{117} Myllykoski, “Cerinthus,” 220. What is interesting with this association is that it has been thought by many that the Ebionites were the earliest, if not the genuine, successors of the first-century Jewish-Christian community. Defenders of this view include Ferdinand Christian Baur, \textit{Das Christentum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte} (Tübingen: Fues, 1860), 174, n. 1; Gerd Lüdemann, \textit{Heretics: The Other Side of Early Christianity}, trans. John Bowden (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 52-56; and Michael Goulder, \textit{St. Paul Versus St. Peter: A Tale of Two Missions} (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 107-13. This view, however, has been challenged by Ray A. Pritz, \textit{Nazarene Jewish Christianity: From the End of the New Testament Period until its Disappearance in the Fourth Century} (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 28, 82, 108-10; Richard Bauckham “The Origin of the Ebionites,” in \textit{The Image of the Judaeeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature}, ed. Peter J. Tomson and Doris Lambers-Petry (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 162-81; and Joan E. Taylor, “The Phenomenon of Early Jewish-Christianity: Reality or Scholarly Invention?” \textit{VC} 44 (1990): 313-34. Both Pritz and Bauckham understand the Nazarenes as true descendents of the early Jewish Christian Community, with the Ebionites being a breakaway faction. Regardless of which position is correct, there is wide support for the notion that the Ebionites were active very early in the history of the church. There is reasonable evidence to suggest a first-century Christology with separationist tendencies circulating during the late first century.
As yet, no good reason for the absence of the phrase τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ has been offered. Transcriptional probability appears to support the position that it was a later addition, motivated by Christological controversies of the late first century.

**Concluding Comment**

The phrase τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ can be considered a common Lukan phrase if we allow ourselves to take Acts as a witness. The position that a scribe omitted the phrase is not convincing. In the Gospel the phrase is not used as an expression of belief as it is in Acts. This, therefore, calls for some suspicion in regards to when it was added. It is also unlikely that the phrase was used as a chain-link to Acts. Rather, the motive for its inclusion best fits a separationist debate which was prevalent during the late first century. It was added to highlight that Jesus, despite dying on the cross, remained Lord and that the Christ did not depart from him at the crucifixion. This time period fits well for when Luke could have updated his Gospel. Therefore, there is no convincing reason to think that Luke could not have added the phrase τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ after he first wrote the Gospel.

**Luke 24:6a**

οὐκ ἔστιν ὑδε, ἀλλὰ ἠγέρθη

He is not here, but was raised

In regards to intrinsic probability, discussion concerning Luke 24:6a rests upon analysing the context of Luke’s resurrection narrative and comparing it with Mark 16:6 and Matt 28:6. As for transcriptional probability, two arguments are often considered as a possible option for the omission of the long variant reading. These are parablepsis and the recognition that the long variant reading creates a superfluous text. Importantly,
identifying a Christological controversy to which the long variant reading could be seen as a response is critical in regards to making a conclusion about the variant’s origin.

**Intrinsic Probability**

For those who defend the long variant reading, context becomes an important factor. This is the case for Snodgrass, who has argued that without the long variant reading the testimony of the women, which is reported in Luke 24:22–23, would make little sense.


In Luke 24:23 Cleopas gives a summary of the events of verses 3–7. We read the following:

\[Καὶ \ μὴ \ εὑροῦσαι \ τὸ \ σῶμα \ αὐτοῦ \ Ἰησοῦ \ λέγουσαι \ καὶ \ ὅπτασιν \ ἀγγέλων \ ἑωρακέναι, \ οἱ \ λέγουσιν \ αὐτὸν \ ζῆν.\]

And not having found his [Jesus’] body they [the women] came saying that they had also seen a vision of angels, who say he is alive.

The key word here is ζῆν (“alive”). The word ζῆν is thought to reflect back to verse 6a where the angel declares that Jesus “was raised” (ἠγέρθη). But is the link between these two words really justified?

Ehrman argues that verse 23 has little to do with the disputed words of verse 6a “because its summary of the angelic message states that Jesus ‘lives’ [ζῆν] not that he has ‘been raised’ [ἠγέρθη], suggesting that it alludes to the question of verse 5 (‘Why do you seek the living [τὸν ζῶντα] among the dead’) rather than the disputed statement of verse 6.”119 Therefore, Luke 24:23 is not dependent upon verse 6a, but rather on verse 5.

In fact, Luke 24:3a, 5 and 7 serve well as a reference point for verse 23. Verse 3a clearly states that the women “did not find the body” (οὐκ εὗρον τὸ σῶμα) of Jesus. In

118 Snodgrass, “Western Non-Interpolations,” 375.
119 Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 220.
verse 5 the question is asked, “Why do you seek the living among the dead?” (τί ζητεῖτε τὸν ζῶντα μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν;). Verse 7 mentions how “on the third day” (τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ) the Son of Man was “to rise again” (ἀναστῆναι). These verses do satisfy the summary of verse 23. Verse 3 satisfies the summary of the missing body of verse 23 (μὴ εὑροῦσαι τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ) and verses 5 and 7 satisfy the recollection of the angels informing the women that Jesus is alive. In other words, the information of verse 6a is not very significant for what we read in verse 23.

The long variant reading of Luke 24:6a has parallels in Mark 16:6 and Matt 28:6. Each of these is shown here:

- Luke 24:6a: οὐκ ἐστὶν ὑδ�数, ἀλλ' ἠγέρθη
- Mark 16:6: ἠγέρθη, οὐκ ἐστὶν ὑδ�数
- Matt 28:6: οὐκ ἐστὶν ὑδ�数, ἠγέρθη γάρ

Though the phrase is very similar across the three Gospels, there are some differences. Mark’s sequence differs from that of Luke and Matthew. Mark begins the phrase with the aorist passive ἠγέρθη. This announces the resurrection of Jesus. Both Matthew and Luke begin the phrase with a clause that announces the absence of the body of Jesus (οὐκ ἐστὶν ὑδ�数). Nolland regards the Lukan (and Matthean) sequence as more satisfying than that of Mark. Mark’s sequence of resurrection then bodily disappearance moves in a chronological order, whereas the sequence of Luke and Matthew (bodily disappearance then resurrection) highlights the step of the logical inference.

---

Both Luke and Matthew also include a conjunction, unlike Mark. For Luke the conjunction is ἀλλὰ (“but”). For Matthew it is γὰρ (“for”). Matthew’s choice of conjunction is in accordance with the evangelist’s stylistic preference and is probably the result of his editorial revision to improve on Mark’s version, for it creates a smooth link between the two clauses. Luke’s conjunction ἀλλὰ creates a dramatic climax to the passage. It accentuates the contrast between the expectation of the women and the message of the two angelic men in the tomb. The question arises as to whether Luke could have used Matthew as a source for 24:6a. To this topic we turn.

Though much of Luke 24 appears to utilise special Lukan material rather than Markan material, Luke 23:56b–24:11 does show some relationship with Mark 16:1–8. Vincent Taylor has calculated the verbal agreement between Luke 23:56b–24:11 and Mark 16:1–8 at approximately 20 per cent. A comparison of these Lukan and Markan units shows some agreement in narrative events. For example, women go to the tomb on the first day of the week bringing spices (Mark 16:1–2; cf. Luke 24:1); the women find the stone of the tomb rolled away (Mark 16:3; cf. Luke 24:2); both Mark and Luke speak of the person or persons in the tomb as men, unlike Matthew who states it as an angel.

---

122 The conjunction ἀλλὰ acts as an adversative. It introduces a clause that is in contrast to the expectation of the main characters of the narrative. See Martin M. Culy, Mikeal C. Parsons and Joshua J. Stigall, Luke: A Handbook on the Greek Text (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2010), 50-51.

123 Matthew uses γὰρ approximately 120 times.

124 Grundy, Matthew, 588.


127 Vincent Taylor, Behind the Third Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis (Oxford: Clarendon, 1926), 64. With the long variant readings, Taylor calculates the verbal agreement with Mark at approximately 23 per cent. If the disputed texts of the Lukan section are omitted (such as the long variant reading of Luke 24:6a), then the agreement is approximately 20 per cent. For Taylor these numbers are enough to show that Luke has some knowledge of Mark. For a synoptic observation of the verbal parallel between Luke and Mark see Frans Neirynck, The Minor Agreements in a Horizontal-Line Synopsis (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1991), 90-91.
(Mark 16:5; Luke 24:4; cf. Matt 28:2); and both Luke and Mark are specific in regards to who the two Marys are, unlike Matthew (Mark 16:1; Luke 24:10; cf. Matt 28:1).

As for the differences, in Mark 16:1 Salome is mentioned as one of the women bringing spices to the tomb, whereas in Luke 24:10 it is Joanna. In Mark we have the presence of one young man dressed in white sitting in the empty tomb (Mark 16:5), whereas in Luke there are two men (Luke 24:4). The words spoken to the women are quite different between the two traditions. For example, in Mark the women are told to tell the disciples and Peter that they will meet Jesus in Galilee (Mark 16:7). This instruction is omitted in Luke. In Luke, the reference to Galilee recalls the words Jesus spoke to the disciples in Luke 24:6 (cf. 9:22). In Mark the women are “amazed” (ἐκθαμβεῖσθε) at the presence of the man in the tomb (Mark 16:6), whereas in Luke they are in “fear” (ἐμφόβων) when they see the two men in the tomb (Luke 24:5).

One should not discount the idea that Luke used Mark’s version of the resurrection sparingly, supplementing it with other traditions. However, as there are many differences, particularly omissions, between the Markan and Lukan accounts, it is possible that Luke did not choose to add the phrase οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἀλλὰ ἠγέρθη. Other than our disputed text there is no other verbal parallel between Luke and Mark in the resurrection narrative, which causes suspicion in relation to Luke 24:6a being included in Luke’s first edition. The lack of verbal parallel between Luke and Mark in the resurrection narrative also leads one to ask whether Luke 24:6a was added later on, in

---

128 Mark has νεανίσκον (“young man”), Luke ἄνδρες δύο (“two men”), and Matthew ἄγγελος (“angel”).
129 Mark’s resurrection passage is quite short and the ending may have been seen as problematic. Luke, therefore, may have preferred to use other traditions that he believed gave a better account of the events.
light of Matt 28:6. I suggest yes.\textsuperscript{130}

The similarities between Luke 24:6a and Matt 28:6 are striking. As already noted, Luke and Matthew have the same sequence, beginning with the words \textit{οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε} and concluding with mention of a raising (\textit{ἠγέρθη}). Mark, on the other hand, reverses this order. Both Luke and Matthew include a conjunction, whereas Mark does not. At no other place in the resurrection narrative do Luke and Matthew agree against Mark as they do in Luke 24:6a and Matt 28:6. The similarities between Luke and Matthew allow for the possibility that the long variant reading was added in light of Matthew. If so, the best explanation is that verse 6a was added at a later time, when Luke had access to Matthew’s Gospel.


\textit{Transcriptional Probability}

The absence of the phrase cannot be adequately explained by homoioteleuton or homoioarcton. Though there is some possibility that a scribe could have accidently missed the phrase completely, this does not appear to be the most likely explanation as

\textsuperscript{130} This view is found as early as Westcott and Hort in the late nineteenth century. See Westcott and Hort, \textit{Introduction: Appendix}, 71.
the flow of the passage is not disturbed with its omission. This suggests that greater thought went into the creation of both the long and short variant readings.

Snodgrass says that the phrase may have been omitted by a scribe because it is “superfluous and could seem out of place in that it answers the question before the answer given at the end of vs. 7.”\textsuperscript{131} For argument’s sake, if we were to agree that the long variant reading makes verses 6b and 7 superfluous, is this still reason enough to believe that a scribe, presumably a proto-orthodox scribe, omitted such important words? Scribes were prone to give emphasis to something they thought important and one should not think that the risk of being superfluous was a deterrence.

Ehrman understands the \textit{Sitz im Leben} of the long variant in relation to the docetic controversy of the time. Ehrman argues that the phrase heightens the emphasis on the physical resurrection of Jesus.\textsuperscript{132} The statement \textit{οὐκ ἔστιν ὥδε} does point to the idea that the tomb is empty. The second clause of the phrase \textit{ἀλλ’ ἠγέρθη} makes it clear that the body is not in the tomb because it has been raised by God.\textsuperscript{133} This would dispel any suggestion that the body is not in the tomb because someone has stolen it\textsuperscript{134} and it would also dismiss the suggestion that the raising was a spiritual one.\textsuperscript{135}

Whether this phrase would dispel the myth of a spiritual resurrection, particularly against docetists, is questionable. We learn from Hippolytus and Tertullian

\textsuperscript{131} Snodgrass, “Western Non-Interpolations,” 375.
\textsuperscript{132} Ehrman, \textit{Orthodox Corruption}, 219.
\textsuperscript{134} Without a qualifier like Luke 24:6a, the words \textit{οὐκ εὗρον τὸ σῶμα} of Luke 24:3 could give this impression.
\textsuperscript{135} Likewise, without a qualifier like Luke 24:6a, the words \textit{τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι} of verse 7 leave open the idea that the raising of Jesus was a spiritual one, not a physical one.
that Marcion, who held onto a docetic Christology, not only believed Jesus to be phantom-like, but he also seemed to suffer, seemed to die and seemed to have risen.\textsuperscript{136} If Marcion did understand Jesus acting this way, then an empty tomb would not have caused much concern for him. Therefore, there is little reason to suppose that Marcion did not believe in an empty tomb and as a consequence there is little reason to suppose that the phrase \textit{οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἀλλὰ ἠγέρθη} would have caused him much angst.

Martin has suggested another motive for the addition of the long variant reading. He suggests the phrase came to be included in Luke’s Gospel as a response to a separationist Christology. As we have noted in the discussion of Luke 24:3b above, separationists believed that the divine Christ entered Jesus at his baptism, only to depart before his passion and crucifixion. The one to have died and suffered was the Christless Jesus. However, it does appear that many leading separationists did believe that Jesus rose from the dead, despite the departure of the Christ before his death. According to Irenaeus, separationists like Cerinthus believed that “Jesus indeed suffered and rose again from the dead, but Christ remained impassable, since he was spiritual.”\textsuperscript{137} If so, how can Luke 24:6a be considered an anti-separationist polemic?

It is important to remember that Martin’s hypothesis rests upon the notion that all the Western non-interpolations stand or fall together. In addition, for many

\textsuperscript{136} Hippolytus, \textit{Refutatio omnium haeresium}, 10.15 and Tertullian, \textit{Adversus Marcionem}, 1.24.5 and 3.8.2-7. Tertullian says, “Also, now that it is found to be a lie that Christ [was made] flesh, it follows that all things that were done by means of Christ’s flesh were done by a lie, his meetings with people, his touching them, his partaking in food, his miracles besides.” Further he writes, “They [Marcionites] are also false witnesses of God, because they have borne witness that he had raised up Christ, whom he has not raised up” (3.8.7). Translation by Ernest Evans, ed., \textit{Tertullian: Adversus Marcionem: Books IV-V}; OECT (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), 193.

separationists, after the crucifixion it was difficult to call Jesus Lord. Keeping these two factors in mind, we begin to understand how Luke 24:6a can be seen as an anti-separationist polemic. The statement of verse 6a, that the tomb is empty because “he (Jesus) has been raised,” makes it clear that the Jesus who has been raised is in fact the Lord Jesus of verse 3b. Therefore, Martin understands verses 3b and 6a as a unit in its refutation of separationist Christology. The same Lord in the tomb is the same Lord who is raised. In other words, without Luke 24:3b, verse 6a would not create a problem. Separationists like Cerinthus believed that the physical body of Jesus rose from the dead. However, taken together, verses 3b and 6a highlight the continuity of the earthly and resurrected Lord Jesus, a continuity that was not broken at the time of Jesus’ passion and death. This would be an appropriate response to separationists.

In regards to transcriptional probability we learn that the phrase οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἀλλὰ ἠγέρθη can be considered as a polemical response towards those with a separationist tendency, particularly if thought of as a unit with Luke 24:3b. Scribal omission as an explanation for the short variant is not the best explanation.

Concluding Comment

The findings presented in the analysis of intrinsic probability and transcriptional probability point towards the thesis that Luke added the phrase οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἀλλὰ

---

138 In regards to this point, Martin, in responding to Ehrman, writes: “His [Ehrman’s] evidence shows, in fact, that in some Gnostic circles the title ‘Lord’ functioned as the clearest designation for the divine being who separated from the human Jesus prior to his passion.” Martin also cites the ending of Acts of John, a passage he believes is separationist in nature, to reveal the preference for “Lord” over “Christ.” See Martin, “Defending the ‘Western Non-Interpolations’, 292.
139 Martin, “Defending the ‘Western Non-Interpolations’, 292.
140 Interestingly, Robert Tannehill understands the phrase οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἀλλὰ ἠγέρθη to be a rebuke. See Robert C. Tannehill, Luke: ANTC (Nashville: Abingdon, 1996), 349. Tannehill appears to be correct. However, the words are a rebuke towards those who hold to a separationist Christology.
at a time after he first wrote his Gospel. He did so in light of Matthew’s Gospel, possibly as a response to a Christology that denied that the same Lord who was crucified was also raised. We learn this from the undisturbed flow of the narrative when the long variant reading is missing; from the close parallel Luke 24:6a has with Matt 28:6; and through the ability to identify a Christological dispute during the late first century to which the disputed phrase would serve as an appropriate response.

Luke 24:12

Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἀναστὰς ἔδραμεν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει τὰ ὀθόνια μόνα, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός.

But Peter, having risen, ran to the tomb and after stooping down he sees the linen wrappings alone, and he left wondering to himself what had happened.

Intrinsic probability is focused upon a comparison between Luke 24:12 and John 20. In this section there is an analysis of the words and expressions of Luke and John. As discovered, Luke 24:12 is unique in that it shows a number of parallels with John but still displays Lukan characteristics. In the discussion of transcriptional probability focus is upon the time period in which Luke 24:12 was added. Was it during the first stage of Luke writing his Gospel or at a later stage?

Intrinsic Probability

When we place Luke 24:12 and John 20:3–10 side-by-side our comparison becomes most interesting. Both Luke 24:12 and John 20:3–10 report Peter running to the tomb. Both mention Peter looking in and seeing linen wrappings, but no body. Both conclude the narrative with Peter leaving the tomb and returning to where he came. However, there are differences. In John’s account the name is “Simon Peter” (Σίμων Πέτρος), not just “Peter” (Πέτρος) as in Luke. In John, Simon Peter runs to the tomb with an unnamed
disciple, described in John 20:2 this disciple is known as ὃν ἐφίλει ὁ Ἰησοῦς “[the] one whom Jesus loved.” In Luke, Peter runs to the tomb alone. In John, the unnamed disciple reaches the tomb first. It is this unnamed disciple who stoops down (παρακύψας) to peer into the tomb, not Peter as in Luke. Peter, then, simply enters the tomb. The unnamed disciple enters in shortly after Peter (20:8). In John, Peter not only sees the linen wrappings, but also “the face cloth” (τὸ σουδάριον). In Luke, it is only the linen wrappings that Peter sees. Finally, Luke reports Peter leaving “wondering” or “amazed” (θαυμάζων) at what had happened. In John, there is no mention of Peter or the unnamed disciple leaving with such wonderment. They simply went “to their homes” (πρὸς αὐτούς).

There are verbal similarities between Luke 24:12 and John 20:3, 5 and 10. The following table highlights these verbal similarities. The words in bold font indicate those words Luke and John share in common. The underlined words indicate the same word, though in a different form. The comparison reveals that ten words in Luke 24:12 are found in John 20:3, 5 and 10. On one occasion Luke and John show a slight difference. Luke uses the singular ἀπῆλθεν, for in his version Peter alone runs to the tomb. John uses the plural ἀπῆλθον, for in his version Peter runs to the tomb accompanied by another disciple.

---

141 The translation issue is discussed on page 3, footnote 11 and pages 199-200.
Table 4.2: Comparison of Luke 24:12 and John 20:3, 5 and 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Luke 24:12</th>
<th>John 20:3, 5 and 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δὲ Πέτρος ἀναστάς ἔδραμεν</td>
<td>ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Πέτρος καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής καὶ ἤρχοντο εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει τὰ θόντα μόνα, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτὸνθαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός</td>
<td>καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει κείμενα τὰ θόντα, οὐ μέντοι εἰσῆλθεν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 3</td>
<td>v. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπῆλθον οὖν πάλιν πρὸς αὐτοὺς οἱ μαθηταί</td>
<td>v. 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two questions immediately arise after viewing the two versions. Was Luke 24:12 the product of Luke or a later scribe? Were Luke 24:12 and John 20:3, 5 and 10 the result of a common source or was one account dependent upon the other? To answer these questions an analysis of the words of Luke 24:12 is required.

If Luke 24:12 was written by Luke then it stands to reason that we should discover distinct Lukan idioms in the verse. There are three distinct Lukan terms that are found. The verb ἀνίστημι (“to raise up”), from which the participle ἀναστάς is derived, is common in Luke’s Gospel. Other than in our disputed passage it appears in the Gospel of Luke twenty-seven times and in Acts forty-six times. In the other canonical Gospels it is found in Matthew five times, Mark sixteen times and in John eight times. The Pauline letters show evidence of the verb five times. It is clear that the author of Luke–Acts had a preference for the verb ἀνίστημι.

However, though ἀναστάς is typically Lukan, its usage in verse 12 is inconsistent with what we find elsewhere in the Gospel. According to Kirsopp Lake, other than in Luke 24:12, when the participle ἀναστάς is used in Luke–Acts the author “always makes it precede the name of the person referred to, instead of following it, as in the present
The participle of ἀνίστημι is found in Luke 1:39; Acts 1:15; 5:36–37; 9:39; 10:13; 11:7; 13:16, 33 and 15:7. In all these cases the participle precedes the name associated with it. Therefore, although ἀναστάς is a common Lukan term, in Luke 24:12 it is not presented in a typical Lukan manner.

Matson, arguing in favor for the authenticity of Luke 24:12, points out that the participle ἀναστάς functions as a pleonastic verb; that is, a superfluous verb. For him, one should not be surprised to find a proper noun preceding a pleonastic verb as there is a precedent for this in the Third Gospel. Matson cites Luke 9:20 as an example. Here the pleonastic verb ἀποκρίθεις ("answering") follows the proper noun Πέτρος, despite the fact that on all other occasions the reverse happens. According to Matson, one would be acting in haste in excluding ἀνίστημι as Lukan.

There are two points that should be made to Matson’s thesis. First, ἀναστάς in Luke 24:12 functions as a pleonastic verb in a way similar to ἀναστᾶσα in Luke 1:39 and ἀναστάς in Acts 9:39. A comparison of these three passages makes this clear.

Luke 24:12: ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἀναστάς ἔδραμεν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον
Luke 1:39: ἀναστᾶσα δὲ Μαριὰμ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὴν ὀρεινὴν
Acts 9:39: ἀναστάς δὲ Πέτρος συνῆλθεν αὐτοῖς

In each of these examples the participle ἀνίστημι is found with a verb, be it ἔδραμεν ("ran") in Luke 24:12, ἐπορεύθη ("went") in Luke 1:39, or συνῆλθεν ("went with") in Acts 9:39. But in Luke 1:39 and Acts 9:39, the proper noun comes second. This shows that Matson’s argument is quite weak at this point.

---

142 Lake, Historical Evidence, 95.
143 Matson, Dialogue, 189, n. 64. According to Sang-II Lee the participle helps create a dynamic reading of the passage which is quite common in Greek. See Sang-II Lee, Jesus and Gospel Traditions in Bilingual Contexts: A Study in the Interdirectionality of Language (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012), 259.
144 Matson, Dialogue, 189, n.64.
Second, there is a textual problem that surrounds Luke 9:20. In this passage, where Peter (Πέτρος) declares Jesus as “the Christ of God” (τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ), the proper noun Πέτρος does come first in important witnesses such as P75 and Codex Vaticanus, but the majority of witnesses have the opposite word order (ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος). It is possible that the word order participle-noun, as found in the majority of witnesses, was created to harmonise the reading to Mark 8:29, which reads ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος. A scribe may have seen Mark’s version and changed it accordingly. However, if Mark’s text was the source for Luke here, perhaps Luke did write the participle before the proper noun, only for it to be changed by a later scribe. This is a realistic proposition, for elsewhere in Luke’s Gospel, when ἀποκρίνομαι is used as a participle, it always precedes the proper noun. Matson’s argument that a pleonastic verb justifies the position of noun-participle is not convincing. It is possible to affirm, then, that the participle ἀναστάς of Luke 24:12 is a common Lukan term used in a not so common Lukan way. This evidence may suggest that Luke wrote the phrase but at a time when his style had changed. Of course it may also mean that someone attempting to mimic Luke’s style wrote the long variant reading, but as we proceed it will become clear that this is not the preferred option.

The verb θαυμάζω is another common Lukan word. Of the fifty-three occurrences of this word in the New Testament, thirteen are found in the Gospel of Luke and five in Acts. The accusative τὸ γεγονός comes after θαυμάζων. Jeremias argues that this word...

---

145 Witnesses which attest to this reading include A K U Π and Μ. For a more extensive list of witnesses which have the verb before the noun see Reuben Swanson, ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: Luke* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995), 164. The Byzantine/Majority text places the participle first and the proper noun second.

order is characteristic of Luke.\textsuperscript{147} Therefore, not only is the word common in Luke, but the manner in which it is used is in keeping with Lukan style.

Though a common Lukan term, \textit{θαυμάζω} still appears some thirty-five times in the New Testament outside Luke–Acts. Furthermore, the verb is well attested outside the New Testament.\textsuperscript{148} Due to the sheer number of times the verb \textit{θαυμάζω} is used by Luke and found elsewhere throughout the New Testament and other writings of the period, counting the verb does not provide a clear indication that Luke wrote the passage, but it may be a good indicator if we consider that it was used in a manner consistent with Luke.


The phrase \textit{ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτόν} is occasionally called into question. The verb \textit{ἀπέρχομαι} (“go away, leave”) followed by the preposition \textit{πρὸς} (“to”) plus the accusative is not common in Luke–Acts. In John 20:10 we find \textit{ἀπῆλθον οὖν πάλιν πρὸς αὐτοὺς οἱ μαθηταί} (“Then the disciples went again to their homes”). If Luke has used John as a

\textsuperscript{147} Jeremias, \textit{Eucharistic Words}, 150.
\textsuperscript{149} Bauer, \textit{Lexicon}, 352.
source here, then he has edited the passage to suit his own purpose. John Muddiman says that:

The combination of ἀπέρχομαι with specifically πρὸς ἑαυτόν for “to go home” is no less exceptional in Jn. than in Lk., but the ambivalent construction in which πρὸς ἑαυτόν may also be taken with θαυμάζων, “wondering in himself,” is rather characteristic of Luke.¹⁵⁰

According to Muddiman, θαυμάζων can be thought as the complement to πρὸς ἑαυτόν. This is reasonable enough. On a number of occasions Luke uses πρὸς + pronoun + participle. It is possible that the phrase is taken from John but adapted to a typical Lukan style. The similar wording Luke 24:12 has with John 20:3, 5 and 10 does not preclude the possibility that Luke used John somewhat freely in this verse.¹⁵¹

The accusative τὸ γεγονός (“what had happened”) has been used to support the notion that verse 12 is from the author of the Third Gospel.¹⁵² Leaving Luke 24:12 aside, τὸ γεγονός is found in Luke 2:15; 8:34, 35, 56; Acts 4:21; 5:7; and 13:12. Elsewhere, in the New Testament it is found only in Mark 5:14. The phrase is found in the Septuagint in the following places: 1 Esdr 1:10; Jdth 15:1; 1 Macc 4:20; and 2 Macc 10:21. It is also found in writings such as Josephus, Antiquities judaicae, 14.292; Diodorus Siculus, Bibliotheca historica, 12.49.4; and Appian, Bella civilia, 2.18 §496.¹⁵³

In regards to Luke’s Gospel, the words τὸ γεγονός of Luke 8:35 appear to be taken from Mark 5:14, which suggests that the author was influenced by Mark here. However, the fact Luke uses τὸ γεγονός twice in Luke 8:34–35 does suggest some preference for the

¹⁵¹ See also page 3, footnote 11 for the rationale for the translation adopted in this thesis.
¹⁵³ Bauer, Lexicon, 158.
phrase by the author. This preference is also observed in Luke 8:56 where τὸ γεγονός is preferred over Mark’s γνῶι of 5:43. But what these examples show is that Luke used τὸ γεγονός when the Markan parallel allowed for it, for it appears that Luke came to favour the term once noticing it in Mark.

This would leave Luke 2:15 as the only time when τὸ γεγονός was not influenced by Mark. There is no reason to suggest that Luke did not use the phrase here. What is interesting about this phrase is the time it was written. It has been suggested that Luke 1–2 was not written at the same time as the main body of Luke, but a little later, possibly shortly after Acts was written.154 If this view is accepted, and it is a view I defend in the following chapter, then it is possible that Luke 2:15 was written around the same time as Luke 24:12 and Acts.

So far in this analysis there is no overwhelming reason to suggest that Luke could not have written 24:12. The words ἀναστάς, θαυμάζων and τὸ γεγονός allow for the proposition that Luke was the author. The phrase ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτόν is not common in Luke but if we consider θαυμάζω connected to πρὸς ἑαυτόν we notice a style that is typically Lukan. However, as we have observed earlier, there are some words that seem to suggest that Luke 24:12 had John 20 as its source. This may call into question Lukan authorship as it is generally accepted that Luke did not know John. If it can be shown that John 20 was a source for Luke and if we accept that the passage shows some compatibility to Lukas style, then there is little reason to suggest anything other than

---


Appeal to a non-Lukan composition centres upon a comparison with the parallel narrative of John 20:3–10. There are similarities and differences between the two passages. The question is whether the similarities are enough to argue for dependency upon the Johannine text. If so, we should at least find some examples of Johannine idioms in Luke 24:12 that can be explained by reliance upon John’s version of the story. There are three so-called Johannine idioms in Luke 24:12 worthy of consideration.

The expression τὰ ὀθόνια (“the linen wrappings”) appears three times in the parallel passage of John 20:3–10. It is found in John 20:5, 6 and 7. The word ὀθόνια is also found in John 19:40, though without the article. In all these instances ὀθόνια describes the linen cloths for Jesus’ body. In Luke’s Gospel, τὰ ὀθόνια is not found outside Luke 24:12, though, a closely-related word is found two times in Acts (10:11; and 11:5), both of which refer to the cloth (ὁθόνην) in Peter’s vision.

As τὰ ὀθόνια appears more often in John, some have thought that a later scribe inserted verse 12 after consultation with John’s Gospel. This is the opinion of the majority of critics who give priority to the short variant reading over the long variant reading. This hypothesis is further strengthened when one recognises that Luke had another word at his disposal, the word σινδών. In Luke 23:53 we read that Joseph of Arimathea wraps the body of Jesus in a single linen cloth (σινδόνι). However, when we read Luke 24:12, Peter discovers “linen cloths” (τὰ ὀθόνια). The singular σινδόνι of Luke 23:53 is replaced with the plural τὰ ὀθόνια in Luke 24:12.

It is possible that what we have before us is an example of a typical Lukan linguistic characteristic. Cadbury writes:
[Luke] likes to vary his word in the same context . . . [in addition] similar expressions in distant contexts so often show variation that the habit must be deemed a trait of the writer's style.\textsuperscript{155}

We see an example of this in the pericope of the miraculous catch of fish in Luke 5:1–11. In this pericope companions of Peter are referred to in two different ways. In verse 7 they are called \textit{μετόχος} ("partner/partaker"). In verse 10 they are called \textit{κοινωνός} ("partner/sharer"). Another example is in the pericope of the rich man and Lazarus. In Luke 16:22, when speaking of Abraham's bosom we have the singular \textit{εἰς τὸν κόλπον} ("into the bosom"). When Abraham's bosom is referred to again in the following verse we find the plural \textit{ἐν τοῖς κόλποις} ("in the bosoms").\textsuperscript{156} Citing other examples Cadbury writes:

Thus in one passage (Luke 5:17ff.), a bed is called both \textit{κλίνη} and \textit{κλινίδιον} and also \textit{ἐφ' ὃ κατέκειτο}; in another (5:25), clothing is indifferently \textit{ἱματια} and \textit{ἱματισμός}; in a third (22:50–51), the ear is both \textit{ὠς} and \textit{ὠτίον}.\textsuperscript{157}

These examples show that Luke freely chooses to vary the vocabulary, even within the same context. Therefore, to some degree, the change from \textit{σινδόν} to \textit{τὰ ὀθόνια} should not appear strange. However, what does appear suspicious is that Luke 24:12 is the only time \textit{τὰ ὀθόνια} appears in Luke's Gospel and this in a verse which has a parallel that also has \textit{τὰ ὀθόνια}. It could very well be that Luke took the expression \textit{τὰ ὀθόνια} from John without feeling that it compromised the word \textit{σινδόν} of Luke 23:53.

Luke 24:12 includes the historic present \textit{βλέπει} ("he sees"). The historic present is not common in Luke. Jeremias says that in the Markan parallels Luke avoids the historic

\textsuperscript{156} Cadbury lists a number of other examples in Cadbury, "Four Features of Lucan Style," 93-95.
\textsuperscript{157} Cadbury, "Four Features of Lucan Style," 87-102.
present ninety-two times. In Luke–Acts we find a combined total of twenty-four historic presents, while in John there are one hundred and sixty-two. Furthermore, the majority of historic presents in Luke are verbs of saying, such as λέγει ("he says"). Other than for verbs of saying, it is clear that Luke makes little use of the historic present.

There is, however, an example in Luke’s Gospel where an historic present, other than a verb of saying, is used. This is in Luke 16:23. The verb is ὁρᾷ, another verb for seeing, and it comes from the special source L. This suggests that Luke, on occasion, will use the historic present.

The verb παρακύψας is rarely used in the New Testament. It is found in John 20:5 and 11, with the latter likely being an imitation of verse 5. It is also found in Jas 1:25 and 1 Pet 1:12. Ehrman argues that παρακύψας is evidence that a later scribe, while reproducing Luke’s Gospel, inserted verse 12 after consulting John’s Gospel. For Ehrman the best explanation is that a scribe inserted the passage, because in his view Luke did not use John as a source. But as we have seen so far, there is little against the notion that Luke could not have written verse 12. This is perfectly consistent with the position that Luke wrote 24:12 during the editorial revision of his work, sometime in the last decade of the first century.

If we accept the general consensus that Luke’s Gospel was written before John’s Gospel, then Luke could not have used John as a source. In regards to Luke being written prior to John, Kümmel writes that “the assumption that Jn was written probably

---

159 John Muddiman, "Note," 543.
160 Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 214.
in the last decade of the first century is today almost universally accepted."161 George Beasley-Murray echoes Kümmel's conclusion by stating that “traditionally the Gospel [of John] has been viewed as the last of the canonical Gospels, and this has remained the general opinion of most scholars to this day.”162 In addition, though John wrote his Gospel last, it is doubtful that he used Luke as a source. There are a number of differences between the two and not enough strong links to suggest that Luke, particularly in the written form as we know it, was utilised as a source. Furthermore, we would expect to find some Lukanisms in John’s version if Luke 24:12 were indeed a source for John 20, but this is not forthcoming.163 In addressing the lack of definitive links between John and the Synoptic Gospels John Painter says that “it is true that if Jn makes use of the Synoptics his treatment indicates some degree of dissatisfaction, even disagreement with them.”164 Therefore, if we allow for the possibility that Luke did update his Gospel at a later date when he had access to John’s Gospel, the similarities

161 Kümmel, Introduction, 246.
163 However, see for example Frans Neirynck, “ΠΑΡΑΚΥΨΑ ΒΛΕΠΕΙ: Lc 24,12 et Jn 20,5,” ETL 53 (1977): 113-52 who argues that that the mention of the beloved disciple in John 20 (that is, τὸν ἄλλον μαθητὴν ὃν ἐφίλει ὁ Ἰησοῦς, “the other disciple whom Jesus loved”) provides evidence that John 20 was not only written later but is an embellishment of Luke 24:12, a significant source for John here.
164 John Painter, The Quest for the Messiah: The History, Literature and Theology of the Johannine Community (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 103. The view that John did not know any of the Synoptics and that the contents of his Gospel derive from an independent tradition was influenced by the following work: P. Gardner-Smith, Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938). This view continues to have many supporters. Others have reached a modified view such as that John did not know any of the Synoptics but did know of some of the traditions, possibly orally, that were preserved in the Synoptics. Defenders of this view include Rudolf Bultmann and Raymond Brown. See Rudolf Bultmann, The Gospel of John: A Commentary, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 6-7; and Raymond E. Brown, An Introduction to the New Testament (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 365. Some have suggested that John used Luke 24:12 as a source. This is based upon the notion that mention of the beloved disciple was a later insertion in John. See for example Neirynck, “ΠΑΡΑΚΥΨΑ ΒΛΕΠΕΙ,” 140. However, as there are no apparent Lukanisms in John's version and that the theme of the beloved disciple only shows that John added to his source, with Luke not being the necessary source, the movement of Luke to John is not the most attractive explanation.
between Luke 24:12 and John 20 make sense.

To summarise, the expression τὰ θόνια, the historic present βλέπει and the verb παρακύψας are not common in Luke’s Gospel. That they all appear in one verse in Luke suggests a source not readily used by Luke. However, these features do not abolish the idea that Luke could not have written them. They are found among other words and expressions common to Luke, such as ἀναστάς, πρὸς ἑαυτὸν θαυμάζων and τὸ γεγονός. This allows for the reasonable notion that Luke composed the verse.

The above analysis reveals that there is little compelling evidence to suggest that Luke could not have produced our contested passage. In regards to whether Luke used John as a source, the evidence allows for this position. We have Johannine words that appear in a Lukan passage that has a parallel in John. If we add to the discussion the parallels between Luke 24:36, 40 and John 20 (an analysis of these comparisons are to follow) and the lack of Lukanisms in these Johannine passages, it is reasonable to suggest that Luke used John as a source for Luke 24:12.

TRANSCRIPTIONAL PROBABILITY

Snodgrass suggests two possible reasons as to why a scribe may have omitted the verse. It may have been due to “scribal accident” or the “attempt to do away with the minor divergence from the Johannine tradition (where Peter was accompanied by another disciple).”165 As to the verse being omitted in some manuscripts “due to scribal accident,” this is not the most preferable explanation. The absence of verse 12 does no damage to the context and flow of the passage. In fact, the long variant reading creates a greater disturbance to the context, for the mention of Peter in verse 12 interferes with

---

165 Snodgrass, “Western Non-Interpolations,” 373.
the mentioning of the δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν (“two of them”) in verse 13.

As for the reason that it was an “attempt to do away with the minor divergence from the Johannine tradition,” one may ask why a scribe would omit verse 12 rather than alter it so as to make it better conform to the Johannine passage. There would be little stopping a scribe from altering the text so as to mention Peter going to the tomb accompanied by another and not alone, particularly if the option was between deleting a passage or slightly altering it.166 This would likewise be the case if a scribe thought that there was a discrepancy with Luke 24:24. In this verse it is mentioned that “some of those with us” (τινες τῶν σὺν ὑμῖν), not Peter alone, found the tomb as the women described. This account appears to be a contradiction with verse 12. As such, one would think it more appropriate for a scribe to alter either verse 12 or 24, so as to better conform one to the other, not omit verse 12 entirely and therefore omit a tradition of Peter as witness to the empty tomb.167

Walter Grundmann understands the short variant reading as a deliberate scribal omission due to a perceived contradiction to verse 34.168 Luke 24:34 speaks of how the Lord appeared to Simon.169 However, in verse 12 there is no appearance of the risen Lord to Simon. But another supposed contradiction is that verse 12 uses the name “Peter” and verse 34 the name “Simon.” Gérard Claudel argues that Luke uses the name Simon when using the expression “the eleven” or “the

166 Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 215.
167 This is also the position of Ehrman (Orthodox Corruption, 215) who writes:
If a scribe were to find a discrepancy with verse 12 when he copied verse 24, he would more likely have changed verse 24 (the one he copied second), for example, by making it say that “one” of us or “Peter” verified the women’s story. Even if a scribe were to change verse 12, it would surely have been simpler for him to add someone else’s name to the text (to explain “some of our number”) than to erase the story altogether. When do scribes ever obliterate their sacred traditions when they can so easily “correct” them?
168 Grundmann says “er in einigen Handschriften getilgt worden ist, weil er keine Ersterscheinung vor Petrus im Sinne von 24,34 – vgl. 1 Kor. 15,5 – darstellte.” (“It [verse 12] has been eradicated in some manuscripts because he [the scribe] finds no first appearance to Peter in the sense of 24,34 – cf. 1 Cor 15:5 – represented”). Translation mine. Walter Grundmann, Das Evangelium nach Lukas, THNT (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1966), 440.
169 Another supposed contradiction is that verse 12 uses the name “Peter” and verse 34 the name “Simon.” Gérard Claudel argues that Luke uses the name Simon when using the expression “the eleven” or “the
Jesus, only a visit to the empty tomb. The same question asked of Snodgrass can be asked of Grundmann. Why would a scribe omit an important tradition of Peter at the empty tomb when an option would be to slightly alter it so as to avoid a possible contradiction with verse 34? In addition, one would think that a scribe would alter or delete the passage that comes second, in this case verse 34, once the perceived contradiction was noticed, rather than the passage that comes first.

According to Matson verse 12 was omitted because of its close resemblance to John 20. Matson points out that during the late second and early third centuries there was “significant opposition from within the orthodox church to the Johannine literature, especially the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse.” For him this opposition was connected to the Montanist sect, which came into prominence during the second half of the second century. John’s Gospel was popular amongst Montanists and many Christian Gnostic groups. Due to the favourable regard of John’s Gospel by such “heretical” sects, a number of proto-orthodox Christians shunned this Gospel. Therefore, Matson argues that any passage that appeared to be Johannine was looked upon with suspicion. As such, (proto-)orthodox Christians omitted verse 12 because they believed it to be a heretical interpolation, most probably by Montanists.


170 Matson, Dialogue, 200. Current scholarship does not tend to recognise the Apocalypse of John as forming part of the Johannine literature. For the early church, however, this was not always the case.


A problem with Matson’s theory surrounds the dating. Following Matson’s thesis, if we allow for the emergence of the Montanist sect, its influence and the need for response by proto-orthodox scribes, the deletion of verse 12 would be dated late second century, at the earliest. This is a rather late date for the omission of verse 12. The absence of verse 12 from Luke’s Gospel can be dated in the first half of the second century. If we accept that the Western text did not contain verse 12 and was in circulation in the first half of the second century, then Matson’s date is too late.

Importantly, Marcion, who was prominent in the first half of the second century, appears not to have had the verse in his Evangelion, a gospel whose content closely resembled Luke’s Gospel.\textsuperscript{173} In addition, Tatian’s Diatessaron, which was written sometime during the mid-second century,\textsuperscript{174} does not contain Luke 24:12. It is likely that Tatian inherited a version of Luke’s Gospel that did not contain this verse.\textsuperscript{175} This would suggest that the date for the absence of verse 12 was much earlier than Matson suggests. Therefore, if we take into account the early date of the Western text, the content of Marcion’s Evangelion and Tatian’s Diatessaron, there is very good reason to believe that verse 12 was missing from Luke’s Gospel earlier than the Montanist controversy.

Matson is correct that certain Christians within proto-orthodox circles rejected John’s Gospel. However, the inference made, that proto-orthodox Christians deleted

\textsuperscript{173} Tertullian and Epiphanius show no knowledge of this passage being in the Evangelion.

\textsuperscript{174} Tatian died sometime around 180 CE. Therefore, his Diatessaron obviously had to have been completed before this. A date between 150-175 C.E. is normally given for the composition of this work. See J. Hamlyn Hill, The Earliest Life of Christ Ever Compiled from the Four Gospels Being the Diatessaron of Tatian (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1910), ix. For issues relating to dating this work see William L. Petersen, Tatian’s Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship, VCSup 25 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 9-34. Petersen has preference for a 170 C.E. date. William L. Petersen, “Diatessaron,” in ABD 2 (New York Doubleday, 1992), 189-90.

\textsuperscript{175} Interestingly, Harnack presents the idea that Tatian’s Diatessaron was written as a response to Marcion’s Gospel. See Harnack, Marcion, 72-73.
Johannine-type passages in Luke because they believed these passages to be heretical interpolations, becomes questionable when we observe other quasi-Johannine passages in Luke’s Gospel which are free from textual tampering. So, for example, the Johannine-sounding verse Luke 24:36. The disputed words καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς εἰρήνη ὑμῖν are preceded by ἔστη ἐν μέσῳ (“stood in [the] midst”). This closely resembles ἔστη εἰς τὸ μέσον of John 20:19b and 26b. In both cases in John, ἔστη εἰς τὸ μέσον is followed by the disputed words καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν of Luke 24:36b, which according to Matson were excised by scribes from Luke. If scribes were careful in deleting Johannine-sounding passages from their version of Luke’s Gospel, why did they not delete ἔστη ἐν μέσῳ? Also, in Luke 7:36–50 a woman wets Jesus’ feet with her tears and then wipes them with her hair. She then begins to anoint his feet with ointment (verse 38). The closest parallel to this narrative is John 12:1–8. In John’s version Mary anoints Jesus’ feet and wipes them with her hair (verse 3). If Matson’s theory is correct, then one would expect some scribal tampering in Luke’s version, particularly at Luke 7:38, but this is not the case. Therefore, Matson’s theory, which argues that Luke 24:12, as well as verses 36 and 40, were excised from Luke’s Gospel because of their Johannine style, is highly questionable and probably not the best explanation.

It is clear that it is difficult to explain why verse 12 might have been omitted.

The question is whether there is the same difficulty for the argument that verse 12 was a

176 In Matt 26:6–13 and Mark 14:3–9 a woman pours ointment over Jesus’ hair. There is no mention of washing Jesus’ feet and then wiping them with her hair.
177 Another passage which is close to John but has a stable textual tradition is Luke 22:67–68; cf. John 18:23. The argument presented here against Matson’s Montanist theory is also relevant for his position on Luke 24:36 and 40. Matson’s theory, therefore, requires no further rebuttal for the following verses.
178 Such is the admission of Marshall, who favours the long variant reading. See Marshall, Luke, 888.
scribal interpolation.

Ehrman is clear as to why verse 12 could have been interpolated into Luke’s Gospel. For him, verse 12 was added by a later scribe so as to testify that Peter, “the chief of the disciples,” discovered the empty tomb. According to Ehrman this was important for early Christians as it provided apostolic witness for Jesus’ bodily resurrection. Ehrman writes:

Proto-orthodox Christians insisted that Christ experienced a particular mode of resurrection (the body that died was itself revived; i.e., the resurrection was not ‘spiritual’ but ‘physical’) and claimed that the leaders of the early (orthodox) Christian movement, especially Peter, were the first to embrace such a view.

For Ehrman, then, the addition of verse 12 would counter the claim of those upholding a Christology that did not allow of a bodily, physical resurrection. This view was expressed by Marcion and docetists alike. As Ehrman notes, verse 12 stresses “the orthodox notion that the real body of Jesus that was buried was the real body that was raised, that this has always been the correct understanding of the faithful, beginning with Peter, head of the apostles.”

The discussion of Luke 24:6 above mentions that Marcion believed Jesus only seemed to die on the cross, was buried and rose from the dead. Therefore, if understood as a testimony for an empty tomb, verse 12 would have made little impact upon Marcion.

But Ehrman has touched upon another point in regards to why verse 12 may be

---

179 Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 216.
180 Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 216.
181 Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 217.
182 According to Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem, 4.42.7-8; Epiphanius, Σχόλιον, 74 and Adamantius, 5.12, Marcion’s Evangelion did have a variant of Luke 24:50–53. The variant reading makes it clear that a man named Joseph took the body (of Jesus) and wrapped it up, placing it in a tomb.
thought of as a polemic against Marcion. This relates to the authority attributed to Peter.

It is true that the discovery of the empty tomb by Peter, the chief of the apostles, would have caused some angst to Marcion. Marcion did have a preference for Paul over Peter. His canon shows a strong preference for the writings of Paul.\(^{183}\) In these writings Marcion was influenced by Paul’s emphasis on grace. Ehrman says:

Marcion was especially struck by the writings of the apostle Paul, and in particular the distinction that Paul drew in Galatians and elsewhere between the Law of the Jews and the gospel of Christ. . . . Paul claimed that a person is made right with God by faith in Christ, not by doing the words of the Law. This distinction became fundamental to Marcion, and he made it absolute.\(^{184}\)

Furthermore, there is a record of a conflict between Paul and Peter (Gal 2:11–14).\(^{185}\) In light of this, it would not be surprising to find Marcion having some dislike for Peter. There is credible support, then, for the hypothesis that Marcion’s animosity towards Peter compelled proto-orthodox scribes to add verse 12 so as to show that Peter and Paul were closer in thought than Marcion presumed and that his rejection of Peter was wrong.\(^{186}\) As Martin has also noted, verse 12 gives Peter the pre-eminent position of being an early witness of the bodily resurrection.\(^{187}\) Even though Marcion would not have necessarily interpreted verse 12 as indicating a bodily resurrection, the thought of Peter being an early witness to the tomb, suggesting a status above Paul, may have caused some concern for Marcion. Therefore, adding verse 12 could be thought of as an

\(^{183}\) In addition to the *Evangelion*, Marcion’s canon contained the Pauline letters of Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Laodiceans (known to us as Ephesians), Colossians, Philippians and Philemon.


\(^{185}\) The Galatians passage shows that Peter had difficulty in breaking away from a law-abiding Judaizing faction. It also reveals that Paul was quite outspoken about it.

\(^{186}\) This is also the view of Tyson, *Marcion and Luke–Acts*, 61.

\(^{187}\) Martin, “Defending the ‘Western Non-Interpolations’,” 284.
appropriate polemic against Marcion.

However, one should not discount the possibility that Marcion's dislike for Peter may have compelled him to delete the verse himself. According to Tertullian, Marcion was known for deleting passages of his canonical books.188 Luke 24:12 may have been one of those passages. But can Tertullian be trusted on this matter? His accusation against Marcion's editorial work may have been ill-informed. As David Salter Williams says, “several times Tertullian charges Marcion with omitting material which does not appear in Luke at all”189 as well as suggesting “Marcion’s rationale for his presumed omission.”190 This point is picked up by BeDuhn. Tertullian was writing three generations after Marcion, a time when certain Scriptures were becoming “universally recognised as authoritative.”191 Yet Marcion did not live in this environment. It was he who first gathered a collection of Christian writings. There is no evidence to say that other Christian communities were doing what he was doing. During the first half of the second century there is no evidence that early Christian communities outside Marcion’s community held Christian Scripture texts to the same level as Marcion.192 It seems then that Marcion had a reverence for his texts, a reverence that could possibly have precluded him from altering them, at least significantly. Therefore, it is quite possible that Marcion received a Gospel that did not contain verse 12.193

---

188 Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem, 4.43.6-7.
190 Williams, “Reconsidering Marcion’s Gospel.” Williams lists several other problems involved in the reconstruction of Marcion’s text. See pages 478-481 for a discussion of these problems.
192 This becomes clear when we read the words of Papias, who says, “For I did not consider that I got so much profit from the contents of books as from utterances of a living and abiding voice.” Henry Bettenson, ed., Documents of the Christian Church (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963), 27. See also the informative discussion on this matter in BeDuhn, The First New Testament, 30-33.
193 One should not discount the possibility that Marcion or a predecessor may have been at times privy to
There is another reason that suggests that verse 12 was added later. Martin says that it was added by proto-orthodox scribes “to vindicate the women’s report of an empty tomb.”\(^\text{194}\) In the ancient world, women were not always considered as credible witnesses. We get a hint of this in Luke 24:11 where we read that the words of the women seemed to the disciples as “nonsense” (ληρος).\(^\text{195}\) Out of concern that the women’s testimony was not credible, the passage may have been included at a later time so as to give the account credibility through the witness of an important male figure.

For both Ehrman and Martin, proto-orthodox scribes added verse 12. However, there is little reason not to think that it was Luke who added the verse. The controversy surrounding Peter and Paul that Ehrman speaks of, including the issue surrounding a woman’s testimony as Martin mentions, comfortably fits a late-first-century context. It is reasonable to believe that Luke had knowledge of these issues.

In regards to the relationship of Peter and Paul, it is clear that in Acts Luke “wants to bring [them], the two great heroes of early Christianity, into essential agreement with each other.”\(^\text{196}\) Peter plays a prominent part in Acts. It is he who inaugurates the mission to the Gentiles (Acts 9:32–11:18). He also defends this mission

---

\(^{194}\) Martin, “Defending the ‘Western Non-Interpolations’,” 284.

\(^{195}\) A similar attitude is recounted in the parallel narrative in the second-century apocryphal work Epistula Apostolorum, 10. See the discussion in Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, “Word, Spirit and Power: Women in Early Christian Communities,” in Women of Spirit: Female Leadership in the Jewish and Christian Traditions, eds. Rosemary Ruether and Eleanor McLaughlin (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1979), 29-70. N. T. Wright makes the same case, writing that “women were simply not acceptable as legal witnesses.” N. T. Wright, The Resurrection of the Son of God, Christian Origins and the Question of God, vol. 3 (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 607. See also p. 607, n. 55 where Wright lists several ancient Jewish sources where this position is articulated.

at the council of Jerusalem and it is Paul who takes responsibility for this mission (Acts 13–28). Peter is clearly seen as a leader in Acts and what better way for his credentials to be confirmed but to be a witness to the empty tomb?197

Not only does the addition of Luke 24:12 provide credentials for Peter but it vindicates the testimony of the women. Some early Christians reading the account of the empty tomb without verse 12 may have doubted the women’s testimony. By adding verse 12 Luke was intending to show that the women’s testimony of the empty tomb is reliable. Therefore, the addition of Luke 24:12 simply informs readers of the Gospel that Peter, an early leader of the church, was a witness to the empty tomb. As such, anyone doubting the women’s testimony was no longer justified. In addition, anyone person or group who taught that Paul had greater authority than Peter was in error. The fact that Marcion was one person known to hold this position should not rule out that some others before him likewise did. It is possible that Luke identified such concerns and as such made the addition. In other words, with the addition of verse 12, Luke was able to kill two birds with one stone.

Transcriptional probability appears to be on the side of a later addition for verse 12. Issues surrounding the inclusion of the verse need not suggest that a scribe was responsible for the inclusion, as the possible issues identified in these pages were prevalent during Luke’s time. The finding of transcriptional probability is consistent with that of intrinsic probability, in that it points towards Luke’s authorship.

---

197 Michael Goulder argues for two conflicting movements arising in the early church. These are a Petrine movement and a Pauline movement. It is not clear that the conflict was extensive as Goulder postulates, but it is undeniable that some conflict did exist. See Michael Goulder, St. Paul versus St. Peter: A Tale of Two Missions (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994).
**Concluding Comment**

The findings of our analysis of Luke 24:12 reveal the following. First, there is no compelling reason to suggest that Luke could not have written the passage in question. Luke 24:12 includes words favoured by the author of the Third Gospel. Second, the simplest explanation is that Luke received the tradition from John 20:3–10, and therefore Luke 24:12 is an abridged version of John’s account. There are words which Luke rarely, if ever, uses and which are in keeping with John’s style. Third, Luke 24:12 is not necessary for the larger context of Luke 24. For example, it does not disturb the flow of the resurrection narrative. Fourth, there are good historical reasons why the passage may have been inserted but not why it may have been omitted. Therefore, it is concluded that verse 12 was written at a date later than much of Luke 24, and that it was written by Luke.

**Luke 24:36b**

καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν.

And he says to them, “Peace be to you.”

Intrinsic probability compares Luke 24:36b with John 20:19b, 21a and 26b. The findings of the analysis are consistent with the position that Luke used John as a source. For transcriptional probability the issue of docetism will be explored. Here it will be found that docetic Christology on its own does not account for the inclusion of the phrase. The motivation behind the phrase appears to be a general concern, not a specific controversy.

**Intrinsic Probability**

There is a close relationship between Luke 24:36b and John 20:19b, 21a, 26b, as is seen in the following table. The underlined words highlight the verbal similarities between
Luke and John. In both accounts the resurrected Jesus stands among his disciples and greets them with the words, \( \varepsilon \iota \rho \eta \varepsilon \ ή \mu \iota \nu \) (“Peace to you”). The questions are: whether Luke or a scribe used John as a source here, or the passages in Luke and John can be explained as originating from a common source; and if there is any way to determine that Luke or a scribe wrote the long variant reading.

Table 4.3: Comparison of Luke 24:36b and John 20:19b, 21a and 26b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ λέγει(^{198}) αὐτοῖς</td>
<td>καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς</td>
<td>εἶπεν σὺν αὐτοῖς [ὁ Ἰησοῦς] (^{200}) πάλιν</td>
<td>καὶ εἶπεν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varepsilon \iota \rho \eta \varepsilon \ ή \mu \iota \nu )(^{199})</td>
<td>( \varepsilon \iota \rho \eta \varepsilon \ ή \mu \iota \nu )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon \iota \rho \eta \varepsilon \ ή \mu \iota \nu )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon \iota \rho \eta \varepsilon \ ή \mu \iota \nu )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Luke 24:36b includes the historic present \( \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \varepsilon \). As discussed under Luke 24:12, the historic present is not common in Luke, though words of saying in the historic present, such as \( \phi \zeta \sigma \nu \) and \( \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \varepsilon \), do appear often enough to suggest that Luke could have used it. Outside our contested passage \( \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \varepsilon \) appears thirteen times in the Gospel and eleven times in Acts, far less than the other three canonical Gospels.\(^{201}\) Even though Luke does use verbs in the historic present on occasion, it has caused some to question whether Luke is the person responsible for the phrase in Luke 24:36b.\(^{202}\)

---

\(^{198}\) Minuscule 28 replaces \( \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \varepsilon \) with \( \varepsilon \iota \pi \varepsilon \nu \). This may be a harmonisation with John 20:26b. Alternatively, a scribe may have thought that changing the present verb \( \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \varepsilon \) to the aorist verb \( \varepsilon \iota \pi \varepsilon \nu \) was an improvement to the text. The former view is a real possibility as the scribe does not make the same changes elsewhere when the opportunity arises. See, for example, Minuscule 28 at Luke 11:45; 13:8; 16:29 and 19:22.

\(^{199}\) Several manuscripts add the phrase \( \epsilon \gamma \omega \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota \mu \iota \mu \iota \mu \varepsilon \phi \zeta \beta \varepsilon \varepsilon \beta \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \) (“It is I, do not be afraid”) to the end of this verse. These manuscripts include A G P R Λ* 579. The effect of this phrase is to calm the nerves of the disciples in anticipation of verse 37 (where the disciples become frightened because they think they are seeing a spirit). Bovon says this phrase should be rejected as “it may be explained by the influence of Tatian’s \( \Delta \iota \epsilon \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha \rho \alpha \)on the disciple’s anticipation of verse 37 (where the disciples become frightened because they think they are seeing a spirit). Bovon says this phrase should be rejected as “it may be explained by the influence of Tatian’s \( \Delta \iota \epsilon \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha \rho \alpha \)on the disciple’s expectation of verse 37 (where the disciples become frightened because they think they are seeing a spirit).” Bovon, Luke 19:28–24:53, 390.

\(^{200}\) The words \( δ \ Ησούς \) are omitted in some manuscripts, giving rise to some suspicion over their inclusion.

\(^{201}\) Matthew has \( \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \varepsilon \) fifty-four times; Mark sixty-two times; John one hundred and twenty-three times.

It is not just the historic present but also the salutation εἰρήνη υμῖν that has caused some to question Lukan authorship here. Bovon notes that Luke more commonly prefers χαῖρε (“greetings”) as a salutation.²⁰³ K. Peter G. Curtis says that the salutation εἰρήνη υμῖν appears nowhere else in Luke–Acts, though there is a salutation within the context of visitors entering a house in Luke 10:5. Here the noun εἰρήνη is found with the dative τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ (“peace to this house”).²⁰⁴ In John’s Gospel, the only times the greeting εἰρήνη υμῖν is found are in John 20:19b, 21a, 26b. However, John 14:27 does have two variants of the phrase εἰρήνη υμῖν. The passage reads εἰρήνην ἀφίημι υμῖν, εἰρήνην τὴν ἐμὴν δίδωμι υμῖν (“Peace I leave to you, my peace I give to you”).

According to Craig Keener, in John’s Gospel, the words εἰρήνη υμῖν are an allusion to the fulfilment of peace (14:27; 20:19, 21).²⁰⁵ For R. H. Lightfoot:

The repetition of the words [εἰρήνη υμῖν] at 20:21, in closest connexion with the commission now granted to the disciples by the risen Lord, recall to the reader that at 14:27 the Lord bequeathed His peace as a parting gift to His disciples, and that therefore His words, at any rate in 20:21, may be designed to remind them of this gift.²⁰⁶

John has a context for the phrase καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς εἰρήνη υμῖν. It connects with what is said previously, to remind the reader of the gift that Jesus has promised to his disciples. Luke has no such context for this phrase. In Luke there is no previous recall as in John. The salutation is not a typical Lukan one. Furthermore, all the words of Luke 24:36b are found in the exact same manner in John 20:19b. This is precisely what one would expect to find if John is the source.

Snodgrass has put forth the suggestion that a scribe omitted the phrase καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς εἰρήνη ὑμῖν so as to “diminish the extreme reaction of the apostles” (verse 37). In verse 37 the disciples are “startled” (πτοηθέντες) and “terrified” (ἐμφοβοι) as they think they are seeing a “spirit” (πνεῦμα).

One wonders, though, if the absence of verse 36b actually does diminish the extreme reaction of the disciples. One would think that if a scribe wished to create such an effect it would have been better achieved by the removal of the actual reaction of verse 37, not verse 36b.

Ehrman says that the fear of the disciples is based upon the notion that they have seen an apparition (24:36a). For him, it would be strange that the disciples would still have this fear if Jesus spoke the words, “Peace to you.” This indicates that the phrase καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς εἰρήνη ὑμῖν is an addition to the text.

As to the reason for its addition, Ehrman suggests that it was due to a proto-orthodox scribal response to a docetic Christology. In regards to this verse he writes:

It clearly functions to identify the resurrected Jesus with the one whom the disciples knew to have been crucified (“It is I”), and so may be accounted for as a scribal attempt to emphasize that resurrection.

One wonders whether Ehrman’s point works well. For docetists, the fact that Jesus could speak would not disprove the notion that Jesus was a phantasmal being. For

---

207 Snodgrass, “Western Non-Interpolations,” 375.
208 Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 220.
209 “It is I” (ἐγώ εἰμί) is a variant found in some manuscripts. Of these words Ehrman (Orthodox Corruption, 220) says, “Given the versional support for the reading and its presence in two of the secondary Alexandrian manuscripts (579 1241), it may well date back to the period of our concern.”
210 Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 220.
instance, docetists, like Marcion, had as part of their Gospel verse 39, where Jesus said, “look at my hands and feet.”\textsuperscript{211} If this verse did not create a problem for a docetist like Marcion, it is difficult to see how verse 36b would have been problematic. In fact, one would presume that if Jesus could utter words such $\varepsilon\iota\rho\nu\eta\upsilon \upsilon\mu\omicron\nu\upsilon$ after the resurrection, this would make a person even more terrified, for an audible voice would confirm what the visual senses had detected. It would confirm that the eyes were not playing a trick on the observer. The audible voice would make the experience more real and more startling.

A possible motivation for the inclusion of the words $\varepsilon\iota\rho\nu\eta\upsilon \upsilon\mu\omicron\nu\upsilon$ may have been the disputes that were emerging in the latter part of the first century. As indicated already, separationist and docetic Christologies were already well known during the last decade of the first century and the long variant readings of Luke 22:19b–20; 24:3b, 6a and 12 may reflect these controversies. The long variant reading of 24:36b may have been included to encourage the Lukan community to live in peace. It was a word of encouragement by their Lord (Luke 24:3b) to the disciples that they were to live in peace despite the conflict that was emerging and present within the Christian community.

As far as Luke 24:36b is concerned, from the perspective of transcriptional probability, the motivation for the inclusion may have been the surrounding Christological debates that were occurring during the last first century. The words do not seem to focus on a specific type of Christology. However, if we are to accept that some of the other long variant readings under discussion were motivated by Christological debates occurring at the time (for example, separationism and docetism) then it makes sense as to why the call for peace was an important addition.

\textsuperscript{211} This is also addressed in chapter five.
**Concluding Comment**

Intrinsic probability points to the position that the long variant reading was added in light of John’s Gospel. The phrase is not typically Lukan. It is not a salutation that is typical to Luke and the words do not recall previous promises of Jesus as in John’s Gospel. The words replicate in their entirety the words found in John 20:19b. This is odd as Luke does not replicate Johannine words elsewhere in the Gospel (our disputed texts excluded, of course). From the perspective of transcriptional probability we are able to come to a conclusion for the motivation behind the inclusion of the long variant reading, but we struggle to find a motivation for its omission. The words appear to be included to encourage the community to live in peace during a period in which controversy was high. Neither intrinsic probability nor transcriptional probability makes it clear that Luke was the author. However, because transcriptional probability allows for a late-first-century inclusion of the long variant reading, the probability of Luke writing the verse remains. In addition, if Luke 24:36b, with 22:19b–20; 24:3b, 6a and 12, be thought of as a unit, then it is possible to surmise that Luke was the author.

**Luke 24:40**

καὶ τὸῦτο εἶπὼν ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας.

And when he had said this, he showed them his hands and feet.

Intrinsic probability shows that the long variant reading shares a close relationship to John 20:20. Furthermore, there is no good reason to explain the excision of the long variant reading from the passage. Rather, evidence suggests that the long variant reading was a later addition. Unfortunately, with transcriptional probability, the discussion will show that there is no good reason for one position over the other. Once all the
information is laid out before us we will realise that a position on the status of each
variant reading is based upon what can be determined by intrinsic probability.

**Intrinsic Probability**

This is the third and the last of the Johannine-type passages of the Western non-
interpolations. The verse has a close parallel in John 20:20, which reads:

καὶ τὸῦτο εἶπὼν ἔδειξεν τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὴν πλευρὰν αὐτοῖς
And when he had said this, he showed his hands and side to them.

Jesus shows the disciples his feet (τοὺς πόδας). In John 20:20 Jesus shows the disciples his
verse 39, which reads ἴδετε τὰς χεῖρὰς μου καὶ τοὺς πόδας μου (“See my hands and my
feet”).

If Luke was influenced by the Johannine account then the change can be easily
explained by what is established in verse 39.

The second difference has to do with the personal pronoun αὐτοῖς. In Luke the
personal pronoun comes in the middle of the phrase, whereas in John it is at the end of
the phrase. This difference appears to be stylistic.

It is clear that the disputed phrase does little more than emphasise what was
stated in verse 39 and offers nothing new to the account. Due to this redundancy,
Nolland thinks that it “formed no part of the most original form of this account.”
However, Aland believes that such redundancy is the reason why a scribe would want to
omit the passage. So, who is correct? Is it Nolland or Aland? Here I side with Nolland,

---

for it is not likely that scribes would excise a text, particularly if this emphasises an important point, in this case, the corporeal body of the resurrected Jesus.


The phrase καὶ τοῦτο εἶπὼν ("and when he had said this") is more typical of John. The phrase is not found anywhere else in Luke’s Gospel and appears only one time in Acts at 7:60. On the other hand, it is commonly found in John’s Gospel: 9:6; 11:28; 13:21; 18:1, 22, 38; 20:14, 20, 22 and 21:19.

Our discussion of intrinsic probability has revealed that the phrase καὶ τοῦτο εἶπὼν and the verb δείκνυμι have strong Johannine characteristics. Luke rarely uses the phrase καὶ τοῦτο εἶπὼν and the verb δείκνυμι is more often used by Luke if his source allows for it. The addition of τοὺς πόδας at the expense of τὴν πλευράν is due to keeping with the overall Lukan context.

---

Transcriptional Probability

Metzger says that the majority of United Bible Societies committee members found that if the verse was interpolated the copyist would likely have retained a trace of τὴν πλευράν either here at verse 40, or in verse 39. This argument is reasonable. If a scribe wished to harmonise the passage to John one would presume that τὴν πλευράν would also be introduced. Without these words the passage is not a true harmonisation. However, the scribe may have felt restricted because of what he read in verse 39 and may therefore have edited the text accordingly, though one wonders what would have prevented the scribe from inserting τὴν πλευράν along with τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας. Rather than altering the Johannine text to suit the context of the Lukan passage, it is just as easy to slightly extend the Lukan text at verse 39 to harmonise with John so as to keep in context. Harmonisation offers no conclusive result.

Ehrman understands verse 40 as another case of where a proto-orthodox scribe has added a passage to heighten the emphasis on a physical resurrection. According to Ehrman this was done in response to a docetist Christology.

As mentioned in our discussion of transcriptional probability of Luke 24:36b, Marcion was familiar with verse 39. Tertullian derided Marcion for having verse 39 as part of his Evangelion. Tertullian claimed that Marcion interpreted the words Spiritus ossa non habet, sicut me uidetis habentem (“A spirit has not bones as you see me having;” cf. Luke 24:39) in a way that violated the intended sense of the passage; that is,

---

216 Metzger, Textual Commentary, 160-61.
217 Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 218.
to prove that Jesus was a spirit-being. Furthermore, Luke 24:41–43 speaks of Jesus eating, which emphasises the reality of his corporeal body. Marcion’s *Evangelion* did contain these words.\(^{219}\) One can easily interpret these passages as anti-docetic despite their existence in Marcion’s *Evangelion*. Therefore it is not clear how Luke 24:40 would function within this debate.\(^ {220}\)

A solution to this is that Luke may have not entirely understood the docetic argument. He may have believed that a passage like verse 40 was enough to show that it was a physical Jesus who was crucified, not a phantom-like Christ. However, this conclusion does little more than fill in some of the gaps in our current incomplete understanding.

It is difficult to find a good explanation for the omission or addition of verse 40 to the Lukan text. This is because it is difficult to see how Luke 24:40 would add anything more significant to the text than Luke 24:39 and 41–43. There is no satisfactory explanation, from the perspective of transcriptional probability, as to why the verse would have been omitted. Unfortunately, to date, transcriptional probability offers little for either the inclusion or exclusion of the long variant reading. It creates an emphasis, yes, but for what specific reason, we are currently left in the dark.

**Concluding Comment**

As transcriptional probability offers little to go by, we are left with intrinsic probability to determine the status of the long variant reading and short variant reading. If we take

---

\(^{219}\) Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, 4.43.8.

\(^{220}\) Martin’s anti-separationist polemic is no less problematic. Luke 24:39 would appear sufficient to refute the separationist position that the Christ, in Jesus, continued materially after the resurrection. It is difficult to see how Luke 24:40 would add any more to the debate. See Martin, “Defending the ‘Western Non-Interpolations’,” 290.
Luke 24:40 collectively with Luke 24:12 and 36 and recognise the close affinity that these passages share with John 20 it is reasonable to suppose that the long variant reading was a later interpolation. The close likeness to John 20, particularly in wording, is clear and obvious. Nowhere else in Luke’s Gospel do we find such similarity in wording with John’s Gospel as in Luke 24:12, 36b and 40. Adding to this the arguments which show that there is no real reason to deny that Luke write these variant readings and no real reason to suggest that Luke could not have used John as a source, then we must seriously rethink our traditional theories concerning Luke 24:12, 36b and 40.

**Luke 24:51b**

καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.

And was carried up into heaven.

With intrinsic probability the structure of the ascension narrative comes under review. Attention is also given to understanding the choice of verbs in Luke 24:51a (διήτησεν), Luke 24:51b (ἀναφέρω) and Acts 1:2 (ἀναλαμβάνω). The analysis of these verbs is important as it helps one to understand the connection between the ending of Luke and the beginning of Acts. It also helps in determining a date for the inclusion of the long variant reading. Transcriptional probability looks at possible theories for the emergence of both the short variant reading and the long variant reading. There is some overlap here with our discussion of the external evidence in chapter three. This is necessary and unavoidable. Scribal accidental omission and scribal intentional omission as theories for the existence of the short variant reading are also tied to the variant of Luke 24:52a. Therefore, there is also some overlap with the discussion in Luke 24:52a. Reference to chapter three and Luke 24:52a, though brief, is necessary, for it assists in clarifying the
arguments presented.

**Intrinsic Probability**

The majority of members of the United Bible Societies committee favoured the long variant reading καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. They observed that “the rhythm of the sentence seems to require the presence of such a clause.” Luke 24:50 reads:

εξήγαγεν δὲ αὐτοὺς [ἐξω] ἔως πρὸς Βηθανίαν, καὶ ἔπαρας τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς

Then he led them out as far as Bethany, and lifting up his hands, he blessed them

This passage has two coordinate clauses joined by the conjunction καί. Therefore, when we read verse 50 and verse 51, with our long variant reading, we find a consistent pattern. Including the long variant reading, verse 51 reads:

καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν αὐτούς διέστη ἀπ’ αὐτῶν καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν

And it came to pass, while he was blessing them, he parted from them and was carried up into heaven

The disputed variant reading gives verse 51 its second coordinate clause connected by the conjunction καί. The same can be said to occur in verses 52–53, where the two coordinated clauses are connected by the conjunction καί.

However, if we omit the long variant reading of verse 51b, together with the disputed long variant reading of verse 52a, we see another possible stylistic pattern. Verse 50a is a travel passage in which Jesus leads his disciples to Bethany. Verse 50b is a blessing where Jesus lifts his hands and blesses his disciples. In verse 51a Jesus departs.

---

221 Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 162.
223 Treating verses 51b and 52a as a unit is a position that is defended below.
This verse serves as a transition from the activity of Jesus to the activity of the disciples. In verse 52b we have another travel passage where the disciples, who were led to Bethany, return to Jerusalem. In verse 53, we have another blessing, but this time by the disciples and directed towards God. The structure is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>travel to Bethany</th>
<th>ἐξάγω (v.50a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>blessing</td>
<td>εὐλογέω (v.50b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>departure</td>
<td>διΐστημι (v.51a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>transition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>travel to Jerusalem</td>
<td>ὑποστρέφω (v.52b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a’</td>
<td>blessing</td>
<td>εὐλογέω (v.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What we observe is an A B A chiastic structure. Section A involves a travel and blessing subsection, with a departure (section B) sandwiched in-between. Each travel, blessing and departure subsection begins with a conjunction. Verse 50a, the travel to Bethany, has the conjunction δέ, which introduces a new unit. The remaining subsections begin with the conjunction καί. The structure of verses 50–53 works just as well with or without the long variant readings of verses 51b and 52a.

The United Bible Societies committee also favoured the long variant reading because the beginning of Acts implies that some reference to the ascension of Jesus was made in the Gospel. Luke begins Acts by reminding Theophilus of what was recorded in his first volume (Acts 1:1–2). This includes the ascension, as is evident in the use of the verb ἀνελήμφθη (“he was taken up,” Acts 1:2). For the committee, if the disputed passage of Luke 24:51b is missing, then there is no mention of the ascension near the end of Luke. This makes the opening of Acts confusing and unconnected to the Gospel.

In regards to this it is important to note that the two verbs that are said to refer to the ascension in Luke 24:51b and Acts 1:2 differ from one another. In Luke 24:51b

---

224 Metzger, Textual Commentary, 162.
ἀνεφέρετο is the imperfect passive of ἀναφέρω, whilst in Acts 1:2 ἀνελήμφθη is the aorist passive of ἀναλαμβάνω. This is no reason to think that Luke did not write these two passages, for as mentioned earlier in the chapter, Luke is known for varying his words within the same context.225

However, nowhere else in his two-volume work does Luke use the verb ἀναφέρω. In fact, Matson notes that where Luke has the opportunity to use the word he avoids it. The verb appears only once in Mark’s Gospel (9:2) and once in Matthew’s Gospel (17:1), both of which are parallels to Luke 9:28. In Luke 9:28, however, the verb ἀνέβη (“went up”) is used to describe Jesus taking his disciples up the mountain.226

In the New Testament itself, the verb is rare. Though uncommon in the New Testament, the verb ἀναφέρω is common in both Hellenistic and Jewish accounts that describe a journey to heaven. Outside the New Testament, the verb ἀναφέρω often describes the heavenly ascent of humans. In Plutarch’s Numa, 2.3, Romulus is said to be ἀνεφέρετο eἰς τὸν οὐρανόν (“taken up into heaven”). This is the exact same phrase that we read in Luke 24:51b. This event is meant to provide evidence that Romulus had received divine status and honour (see 2:1–4). The verb is also found in Hesychius Fragment 148, as well as in Apollonius of Rhodes, Scholia, 4.57 and 58 to describe the heavenly ascent of Endymion.227

225 See pages 202-03.
226 Matson, Dialogue, 214. The verb is rarely used elsewhere in the New Testament and when it is used it is often in the sense of “offering up” sacrifice. See for example, Heb 7:27; 9:28 and 1 Pet 2:5.
In speaking of the ascension in Luke–Acts it is clear that Luke favours ἀναλαμβάνω (see Acts 1:2, 11 and 23), though ἐπαίρω is used in Acts 1:9 and πορεύομαι in Acts 1:10 and 11. These verbs are found elsewhere in Luke–Acts, suggesting Luke had preference for these words. One asks, then, why did Luke use the uncommon ἀναφέρω in Luke 24:51b when Acts prefers other words to describe the ascension?

Before I answer this question, it is important to note that διΐστημι is a word that Luke knows and has used elsewhere. Not only is it found in Luke 24:51a (διέστη) to describe the “departure” of Jesus, but it is also found in Luke 22:59 and Acts 27:28, though on neither of these two occasions is the verb used in reference to the ascension. Luke is the only New Testament writer to use διΐστημι. Interestingly, he supplies the word when his source, Mark 14:70, does not. Therefore, there is little reason to doubt that Luke did not write this word, particularly during the first stage of his composition.

It is quite possible that when Luke first wrote verse 51a with the word διέστη he had the ascension of Jesus in mind. It is not uncommon for Luke to use a word similar to διΐστημι to describe an ascent into heaven. For example, Luke describes an angel’s ascent into heaven with the word ἀπέρχομαι, which can also be translated to mean “to depart.” Luke 2:15 reads as follows:

καὶ ἐγένετο ως ἀπῆλθον ἀπ’ αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν οἱ ἄγγελοι
And it came to pass when the angels departed from them into heaven.

---


229 The word διΐστημι has a well-established tradition as it is found in the majority of manuscripts. A minor variation is found in Codex Bezae, which replaces διΐστημι with ἀπέστη.

230 See also the similar usage of ἀπέρχομαι in Luke 1:38; Acts 10:7 and 12:10.
With this in mind, the choice of διέστη in Luke 24:51a and ἀνελήμφθη in Acts 1:2 may also be an example of Luke’s variation style. Therefore, there is little reason to doubt that Luke had the ascension in mind when he wrote verse 51a. However, because there is no definitive evidence of Luke and Acts circulating as a single volume in the early years of the Christian church, and because of the ambiguity of the word διέστη in describing an ascent into heaven, the idea of the ascension may have been lost to Luke’s audience. It is possible that Luke, wanting to leave no ambiguity as to what he meant in 24:51a, later added verse 51b, choosing the word ἀνεφέρετο to clarify what was meant by διέστη. This explains why Luke also added εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, words not found with ἀνελήμφθη in Acts: to clarify an ascent “into heaven.”

The choice of ἀνεφέρετο over ἀνελήμφθη makes sense when we remind ourselves that the former word was used in other Hellenistic ascension stories. One presumes that the word ἀνεφέρετο would leave no ambiguity to the meaning of the story, particularly if it is true that Luke wrote to a predominantly Gentile Christian audience. Luke possibly hoped that the word ἀνεφέρετο would eliminate any further misunderstanding that verse 51a evidently created: that is, a simple departure as against an ascent into heaven. Therefore, Luke 24:51b should be understood as a clarification of a passage that

---


was being interpreted in a manner that Luke was not happy with.

**Transcriptional Probability**

Discussion of transcriptional probability rests upon some of the observations made previously with respect to external evidence. In the discussion of Luke 24:51b in chapter three it was argued that the omission of the long variant reading in the original, non-corrected edition of Codex Sinaiticus was due to parablepsis.²³³ Parablepsis is a reasonable explanation for the omission of the long variant reading for Codex Sinaiticus, particularly when we consider that this manuscript has an extremely high amount of scribal alterations.²³⁴ But this does not work so well as an explanation for the origin of the short variant reading. As Ehrman says, “the same accidental error would have to have been made independently by the ancestors of both Codex Bezae (and its Western allies) and Codex Sinaiticus, unless it be thought here, unlike the rest of Luke 24, these traditions happen to go back to the same corrupt exemplar.”²³⁵

In addition, it was mentioned in chapter three that Luke 24:51b and 52a should be thought of as a single sense unit. One reason for this position is that the witnesses suggest this. Other than the original, non-corrected edition of Codex Sinaiticus, all witnesses for these two verses present either the long variant readings as a unit or the short variant readings as a unit. In fact, as the external evidence predominantly shows, the worship of Jesus in verse 52b is always linked to his ascent into heaven in verse 51b.²³⁶ Therefore, if one were to postulate the absence of verse 51b to scribal error, one

---

²³³ See chapter three, pages 131-32.
²³⁴ Recall Parker (*Codex Sinaiticus*, 79) who numbers the alterations at 27,035.
²³⁵ Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 230.
²³⁶ See Table 3.5 in chapter three, page 135.
would also need to presume that scribal error was responsible for the absence of verse 52a. Ehrman seems to agree. He says:

It hardly seems accidental that the omission comprises a complete sense unit, that the sense unit is absolutely vital to the interpretation of the passage as a whole, and that, perhaps most tellingly of all, each of the witnesses that attests the shorter text of verse 52 (a text that cannot be explained on such grounds) also attests the shorter text here.\textsuperscript{237}

Similarly Matson writes:

While mechanical error is always possible, it would appear that text in 24:51 must be taken together with 24:52; the long text of προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν in 24:52 fits only with the long text in 24:51, while the shorter text in 24:51 coheres only with the shorter text in 24:52. While the similar beginnings καὶα ... καὶα might explain the omission of the phrase in 24:51, they hardly explain the omission of προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν in 24:52. And while a similar explanation can be offered for 24:52, the probability that both omissions arose from different mechanical errors is very low.\textsuperscript{238}

Therefore, though parablepsis might be able to explain the omission of verse 51b, it does not adequately explain the omission of verse 52a. In fact, parablepsis does not work well for verse 52a when we observe that the letter immediately before the long variant reading and the last letter of the long variant reading differ.\textsuperscript{239} This fact creates a problem for those wanting to attribute the absence of the long variant reading to unintentional scribal error.

Therefore, accepting the position that a scribe did not accidentally omit the long variant reading in verse 51b is dependent upon the acceptance of three propositions. First, it is based upon the acceptance that each of the long variant readings functions as a sense unit, as does the short variant reading. Second, it is based upon the recognition that the omission of verse 52a cannot be explained by unintentional scribal error.

\textsuperscript{237} Ehrman, \textit{Orthodox Corruption}, 230.
\textsuperscript{238} Matson, \textit{Dialogue}, 218.
\textsuperscript{239} See discussion of transcriptional probability of Luke 24:52a below.
Finally, it is based upon the observation that all of the witnesses that attest the short variant reading in verse 52 also attest the short variant reading in verse 51. In other words, the manuscript evidence reveals that Jesus is worshipped because he is said to be “carried up into heaven,” not that he simply departed.

If accidental scribal omission does not give a satisfactory explanation for the origin of the short variant reading in verse 51, what about intentional scribal omission? It has been suggested that a scribe omitted the long variant reading due to a perceived contradiction with Acts 1:2–11.240 In Luke’s Gospel the ascension would seem to occur on the day of the resurrection, whereas in Acts we are told that it occurred forty days later. For Matson this discrepancy is only perceived and not real because the events of Luke 24:44–53 should not be seen as having occurred immediately after 24:43. Matson understands the textual unit of Luke 24:44–53 to be recapitulative and anticipatory. On this point Matson writes:

Preaching of forgiveness is to begin in Jerusalem (24:47), the disciples are to wait until they receive power (24:49), Jesus is taken up (24:51), and the disciples spend their time in the temple continually praising God (24:53).241

A scribe not understanding the passage in this way may have sought to omit reference to it, so as to draw attention away from any possible discrepancy. There are two responses to this. First, a natural reading of the textual unit 24:44–53 does not comfortably lend itself to Matson’s position. The conjunction δέ, which is found in both Luke 24:44 and 50, does suggest a continuity of time in regards to the words spoken by

---


241 Matson, Dialogue, 216.
Jesus and the accompanying events. The words and events that follow in Luke 24:44–53 may be in the form of recapitulation and anticipation, but they do not suggest an interruption in time of at least forty days.

Second, as Ehrman says, “there is almost no evidence to suggest that scribes typically, if ever, harmonized texts of the New Testament by excising their contradictions, despite the popularity of the charge in modern treatments.”242 This point was addressed by Streeter at an earlier time. In regards to adding the phrase καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν so as to rectify a discrepancy between the Gospel and Acts, Streeter calls such an attempt one “of an incredibly unskilful kind.”243 For him, if a scribe wished to harmonize the ending of Luke to the beginning of Acts, he would have clarified that the ascension occurred forty days after the resurrection and not immediately after the resurrection.244

The long variant reading and even the short variant reading do little to rectify the contradiction of the time of the ascension into heaven between the end of the Gospel and the beginning of Acts. Regardless which variant reading one wishes to accept, the problem does not go away. In regards to the short variant reading, as I mentioned in the discussion under intrinsic probability, the verb διέστη satisfies the requirement of ascension, even if it is ambiguously stated. The short variant reading does little to rectify the time period of Jesus’ departure.

The clue as to when the long variant reading was written resides in the comparison of the word ἀνεφέρετο in Luke 24:51b and ἀνελήμφθη in Acts 1:2. Though

242 Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 230.
243 Streeter, Four Gospels, 142.
244 The position of Streeter (Four Gospels, 143) is that a contradiction between the end of the Gospel and the beginning of Acts occurred after an interval of time when Luke came “across a fresh cycle of tradition.”
there is little reason to think that Luke did not know of the ascension when writing the conclusion of his Gospel, he does appear to have developed his ascension narrative when writing Acts. This is based upon the observation that in Acts the ascension is clearly described, unlike in the shorter text of Luke 24:50–53. The choice of words to describe the ascension, therefore, seems to have shifted from διέστη to ἀνελήμφη to ἀνεφέρετο. Luke first used διέστη, which could describe an ascent to heaven, much like ἀπέρχομαι. In Acts the ascension narrative becomes more developed, as seen by the verb ἀναλαμβάνω in Acts 1:2, 11 and 23. This verb was a common one to describe the heavenly ascent of individuals.245 However, as διέστη is an ambiguous word and does not necessarily describe a departure into heaven, Luke, concerned with this possible misunderstanding, returned to update the end of his Gospel. Rather than using ἀναλαμβάνω, Luke chose the word ἀνεφέρετο to dispel any ambiguity. But why did he choose ἀναφέρω and not ἀναλαμβάνω? It is possible that the audience that Luke had in mind when updating his Gospel was familiar with Hellenistic ascension stories. As the verb ἀναφέρω is more common to the Hellenistic writings of the time, this may have seemed the best choice. The fact that it differs from the other verbs Luke used should not be considered a problem for as we know, Luke liked to vary his words, even within the same context.

Concluding Comment

The analysis of Luke 24:51b reveals that the short variant reading does not do damage to the overall structure of the passage. In fact, with the short variant readings of verses 51b

245 This use of this verb to describe the heavenly ascent of individuals was emerging in the late first century. See 1 Tim 3:16; Mark 16:19; and 1 Clem. 5:7. Catherine Anne Playoust, “Lifted Up From the Earth: The Ascension of Jesus and the Heavenly Ascents of Early Christians,” (Th.D. diss.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 2006), 39-40.
and 52a we have an A B A chiastic structure. In addition, the absence of the long variant reading does not rule out that the ascension was in mind. The verb διέστη allows for the notion of an ascension, even though it is ambiguously stated. However, the long variant reading, with the words ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, clarifies that Luke was thinking of the ascension. These words were added to help those familiar with Hellenistic ascension stories to understand what Luke had meant.

**Luke 24:52a**

προσκυνήσαντες αὐτὸν

After worshipping him

Discussion of intrinsic probability is centred upon the verb προσκυνέω. An analysis of this verb suggests that it is linked with the variant reading of Luke 24:51b. In regards to transcriptional probability a separationist Christology is identified as the motive for the insertion of the long variant reading.

**Intrinsic Probability**

Other than in our disputed reading, the verb προσκυνέω appears only two times in Luke, both instances being in 4:7–8. On neither occasion is it in reference to worshipping Jesus. Rather, it is within the context of the Devil’s temptation of Jesus.

Luke 4:7–8 says:

7Σὺ οὖν ἐὰν προσκυνήσῃς ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ, ἔσται σοῦ πᾶσα. 8καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔπειτα αὐτῷ· γέγραπται· κῦριον τὸν θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις.

7“If you [Jesus], then, worship before me [the Devil], it will all be yours.”

8And answering him Jesus said, “It is written, ‘The Lord your God you will worship and him alone you will serve.’”

The verb προσκυνέω comes from Q, being found in Matt 4:9–10. Jesus’ response in Luke
4:8 recalls the words of Deut 6:13 and 10:20 (LXX). However, the Septuagint passages reflect the Hebrew, which has “fear” (φοβέομαι) and not “worship” (προσκυνέω). The use of προσκυνέω in Luke 4:8 corresponds to the Devil’s tempting words of 4:7. Therefore, the use of προσκυνέω in 4:8 may be seen as a Q redaction.

If Luke did re-edit his Gospel at a later stage, at a time when he had knowledge of Matthew’s Gospel, then Matt 28:9 and 17 may have been the source for the long variant reading. It was argued earlier that Matt 28:6 was a possible source for Luke 24:6a. This suggests Luke came into contact with Matthew’s Gospel at a later stage. This position is reinforced when we observe that in Matt 28:9 and 17 Jesus is “worshipped” (προσεκύνησαν) after the resurrection. Luke, after observing the worship of Jesus in Matthew’s Gospel, may have been persuaded to add it into his Gospel. But as Luke goes further than Matthew by adding an ascension narrative, he sought to place it here, and there is good reason for this.

Gerhard Lohfink believes that προσκυνέω in Luke 24:52a was influenced by Hellenistic thought. In Hellenistic literature the worship of a human being is often given to one who is believed to have some claim “to a superhuman realm.” For this reason, it seems appropriate for Luke to add the worship of Jesus immediately after his ascent into heaven. Therefore, it is possible that Luke, after familiarising himself with Hellenistic thought and after reading Matthew’s Gospel, re-edited his ascension narrative to instruct his readers that Jesus did ascend into heaven and therefore entered

---

246 Matt 28:9 and 17 are not part of Q. Matthew uses προσκυνέω often, though when he does, it often conveys a gesture of respect and not necessarily an act of religious devotion. For Matthew’s other uses of the verb see 2:2, 8, 11; 4:9, 10, 8:2; 9:18; 14:33; 15:25; 18:26 and 20:20.
247 See pages 188-89.
248 Lohfink, Die Himmelfahrt, 171-74.
249 Bauer, Lexicon, 716.
a superhuman realm. As such, this Jesus deserves the worship of his followers.

To conclude, the verb προσκυνέω may have been influenced by Matt 28:9, 17 and in part by Hellenistic thought. It was important for Luke to make clear that Jesus was worshipped, the impetus being his ascent into heaven (24:51b).

Transcriptional Probability

Metzger says that the majority of the United Bible Societies committee agreed that the omission of the long variant reading was either accidental (where the eye of the scribe passed from ΑΥΤΟΙ to ΑΥΤΟΝ), or deliberate (to accord with the short variant reading of verse 51b). In regards to accidental omission, the words προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν are preceded by καὶ αὐτοί (“and they”). This would mean that the scribe passed from the last letter of αὐτοί, which is –ι, to the last letter of αὐτόν, which is –ν. This does not seem to be the preferred explanation for the omission of the long variant reading.

An added problem with this notion is the complex reading that parablepsis would create. Passing from ΑΥΤΟΙ to ΑΥΤΟΝ would produce a reading ΚΑΙΑΥΤΟΝΥΠΕΤΡΕΨΑΝ (καὶ αὐτὸν ὑπέστρεψαν), a variant reading found in no witnesses. Furthermore, it would create an awkward reading, for αὐτόν is a singular pronoun while ὑπέστρεψαν is a plural indicative aorist.

The worship of Jesus may have caused some concerns among those Christians who believed that the Christ departed from Jesus just prior to the crucifixion. In other words, the worship of Jesus may have been a concern to those who held onto a separationist Christology.

We see a separationist understanding of Jesus’ resurrection recorded (as a

250 Metzger, Textual Commentary, 163.
heretical belief) in the writings of Irenaeus. He wrote:

Non autem oblitum suum Christum, sed misisse desuper uirtutem quandam in eum, quae excitauit eum in corpore. Quod et corpus animale et spirital e vocant: mundialia enim remississe eum in mundo . . . remoratum autem eum post resurrectionem XVIII mensibus.251

The anointed (Christ) was not unmindful of its own, but sent down into him a certain power, which raised him up in a (kind of) body that they call animate and spiritual, for he let the worldly parts return to the world . . . Now after his resurrection he [Jesus] remained (on earth) for eighteen months.252

As was argued above, there is good reason to think that a separationist Christology such as that recorded by Irenaeus was circulating during the late first century.253 Luke 24:52a serves as a fitting polemic against those Christians who did not find the worship of Jesus appropriate.

Concluding Comment

After coming into contact with Matthew’s Gospel, which included the worship of the resurrected Jesus (Matt 28:9 and 17), Luke recognised how the ending of Matthew’s Gospel could serve a useful purpose for the conclusion of his Gospel. Bridging Matthew’s idea with a concept found in Hellenistic thought, that is, the worship of a human being who lays claim to a superhuman realm (this is made clear when understood in conjunction with verse 51b which describes Jesus’ ascent into heaven), Luke 24:52a can be understood as a response against those who did not recognise the worship of Jesus. Those who held on to a separationist Christology best fit this context. For those who had such a Christology, the belief was that the Christ departed from Jesus

253 For more on separationist beliefs and the years in which such beliefs can be dated (late first century), see pages 183-84 and 192-93.
just prior to his crucifixion. However, due to his obedience, Jesus was rewarded with a physical resurrection. But the idea that Jesus possessed some claim to the superhuman world and as such should be worshipped was for them too big a step to take. Luke 24:52a should be seen as a response to this.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has thoroughly discussed the issues surrounding the internal evidence of our disputed texts. I have made a case that all eight short variant readings formed part of the earliest Lukan tradition. At a subsequent time Luke expanded his first edition by inserting the long variant readings. The internal evidence supports this theory.

A brief summary of the results of this chapter is as follows:

Luke 22:19b–20: The long variant reading was added after the writing of Acts when Luke came into contact with 1 Corinthians. It was added as a response to docetic Christology.

Luke 24:3b: The long variant reading was added by Luke in response to a separationist Christology.

Luke 24:6a: The long variant reading was added by Luke in response to a separationist Christology. It was possibly influenced by Matthew’s Gospel.

Luke 24:12: The long variant reading was added by Luke after consultation with John’s Gospel, possibly to combat opposition towards Peter and/or to give credence to the women’s testimony.


Luke 24:40: The long variant reading was added by Luke after consultation with John’s Gospel, but it is not clear why it was added. It may have been added to give further emphasis to what was said in verse 39.

Luke 24:51b: the long variant reading was added to clarify Jesus’ ascent into heaven. The long variant reading was possibly inspired by Hellenistic ascension stories.

Luke 24:52a: the long variant reading was added to show that the Jesus who ascended deserved the worship of his followers. It may have been
influenced by Matthew’s Gospel and/or Hellenistic ascension stories. It was a response to a separationist Christology.

The motivation behind the changes to the Lukan text was to deal with misunderstandings and disputes that were occurring during the late first century. It was not one specific dispute that caused Luke to make alterations, but certain details in his text that could have left his audience confused. Therefore, after coming into contact with more sources Luke felt the need to update his work so as to eliminate further misunderstandings. Internal evidence, then, supports the notion that Luke re-edited his work at a later date by inserting the long variant readings. What now follows is a discussion of the evidence that suggests that Luke wrote more than one edition of his Gospel.
5. The Case for Luke Re-editing His Gospel

In the previous two chapters I argued that the external evidence and internal evidence allow for the reasonable conclusion that both the long and the short variant readings were the product of the same writer. This writer, I have proposed, is the Third Evangelist, the person commonly referred to as Luke. The logical direction of the variant readings is from the short variant readings to the long variant readings, not vice versa. Luke added the long variant readings as a response to what he believed to be unsatisfactory interpretations of his Gospel by emerging Christian groups. Therefore, Luke wrote one Gospel edition which contained the short variant readings and then wrote another which contained the long variant readings. The task that remains is to ascertain whether there is evidence for Luke writing more than one edition of his Gospel. This chapter is dedicated to this task.

When I speak of multiple Lukan editions, I do not use the term “edition” as a reference to the number of relevant extant manuscripts with all their variants. Though we can speak of these extant manuscripts and the printed critical works of the various books of the Scriptures as “editions,” for the purpose of this study, I shall use the term “first edition” to refer to the earliest recoverable Gospel believed to have come directly from Luke and “second edition” as a reference to the notable re-editing of the first edition.

---

This chapter will begin by exploring the various theories of multiple Lukan editions. It will then proceed by building a case for the position that the Gospel of Luke shows at least two stages of development. Pertinent to this case is the Infancy Narrative, Luke 1:5–2:52. The argument made is that the Infancy Narrative did not appear in the first edition of Luke’s Gospel, but rather was added by the evangelist at a later time. This can be shown by a literary analysis of the Infancy Narrative and through an historical investigation into the circulation of the Gospel of Luke. Once the evidence is presented I will conclude by explaining how the finding that the Infancy Narrative was a later inclusion is relevant to our discussion of the Western non-interpolations.

**Theories of Multiple Lukan Editions**

When an examination of the theories of multiple Lukan editions is undertaken, it is almost inevitable that discussion will converge on the Proto-Luke hypothesis. It is no different here. Burnett Hillman Streeter and Vincent Taylor are two scholars who have done much in popularising the theory of Proto-Luke. In this section their contribution will not go amiss. However, the genesis of the Proto-Luke hypothesis comes from an earlier time and it is here we begin.

In the late nineteenth century Paul Feine published a work that argued that Luke’s Gospel exhibited two distinct strands of tradition: a Jewish strand and a Gentile...
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2 Friedrich Blass prefers the term “copy” to “edition.” However, I do not see the term “copy” to be any more adequate than the term “edition.” The term “copy” can easily be thought to mean those manuscript editions copied by later scribes. See Friedrich Blass, *Philology of the Gospels* (London: Macmillan, 1898), 100.
strand.³ He believed that the Jewish strand came from a much older source than that of the Gentile strand.⁴ For Feine, the content of the Jewish strand contributed to most of the special material of Luke. He gave the year 67 CE as the date of the Jewish strand.⁵ According to Feine, at a subsequent time Luke came in contact with a Gentile strand and combined this with the Jewish strand. The combination of these two strands gave us a Gospel which closely resembles the canonical Gospel of Luke we use today.

Feine’s hypothesis was positively received by others and developed over subsequent years.⁶ However, it was not until Streeter that the term Proto-Luke came into usage. Streeter’s contribution was significant. He articulated the idea that it was the evangelist Luke who composed Proto-Luke and then subsequently rewrote his earlier edition to produce what is now understood to be canonical Luke. Streeter wrote:

I suggest that the author of Proto-Luke – the person, I mean, who combined together in one document Q and the bulk of the material peculiar to the Third Gospel – was no other than Luke the companion of Paul. And I suggest that this same Luke some years afterwards expanded his own early work by prefixing the stories of the Infancy and by inserting extracts from Mark—no doubt at the same time making certain minor alterations and additions.⁷

³ Paul Feine, Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas in Evangelium und Apostelgeschichte: eine Untersuchung (Gotha: Perthes, 1891). It is difficult to confidently say whether others earlier than Feine were proposing a similar view. However, see the discussion in Joseph Verheyden, “Proto-Luke, and What Can Possibly Be Made of It,” in New Studies in the Synoptic Problem, Oxford Conference, April 2008: Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett, ed. P. Foster, et al. BETL 139 (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 617-23.
⁴ Feine, Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas, iv.
⁵ Feine, Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas, 151.
Streeter found an able and distinguished ally in Vincent Taylor. Taylor came to be the most prominent defender of the Proto-Luke hypothesis.\(^8\) Like Streeter, Taylor favoured the position that Luke was the author of Proto-Luke. He wrote:

If, then, we are right in affirming the existence of Proto-Luke, we must think of the Evangelist as in the full sense of the term the author of that work. Whether we look at the style of Proto-Luke, its characteristic ideas, the connexions between its sections, or the implications of St. Luke’s Preface, the probabilities of the case point in this direction.\(^9\)

Taylor drew attention to features that for him were strong indications that Luke authored Proto-Luke. The features which were important to him were style, characteristic ideas, connections between sections and the implications of the Preface. For Taylor, all these features of Proto-Luke were consistent with what is known about Luke elsewhere.\(^10\) As such, Taylor saw no reason to posit an author other than Luke for Proto-Luke. He concluded that, at a subsequent time, Luke expanded his “Proto-Luke” Gospel by adding his Markan source to it. So, for example, after his analysis of Luke 22–24, Taylor comes to the following conclusion:

[There are] strong reasons for thinking that the substance of Lk. xxii.–xxiv. was put together independently of Mk., and that it existed as a document before St. Luke had seen Mk. At a later time the Third Evangelist expanded the Passion narrative by inserting extracts from Mk.\(^11\)

The foundations that Streeter and Taylor laid for subsequent scholars in the field of Proto-Luke research were important.\(^12\) However, it has not always been the goal of

---

\(^8\) Unfortunately Streeter’s untimely and tragic death cut short his reflections upon the Proto-Luke hypothesis, leaving the mantle to Taylor.


\(^10\) A number of these features are discussed in the section concerning the internal evidence for the later inclusion of the Infancy Narrative on pages 251-70.


Proto-Luke scholars to come to a decision in regards to the author of Proto-Luke. Most modern studies of Proto-Luke have focussed upon literary issues rather than historical issues. So, for instance, Thomas Brodie writes:

It is not immediately clear, nor is it very important in a study that is literary rather than historical, whether the author of Proto-Luke is identical to the author of canonical Luke-Acts. For practical purposes the authorship of both texts may be attributed to ‘Luke’, but sometimes it is useful to distinguish ‘Proto-Luke’ from ‘canonical Luke.’

What we do have, then, particularly from early Proto-Luke proponents, is the conviction that Luke created a first edition of his Gospel which he then expanded into a second edition. Proto-Luke theorists saw enough in the literary text of canonical Luke to indicate that such a thing did occur.

Defenders of the Proto-Luke hypothesis have not been the only ones to argue for multiple Lukan editions. Although more notably for Acts than the Gospel, the controversy surrounding the text of the two Lukan works has provided scholars with much to speculate about. When it comes to the text of Luke-Acts one can speak of two competing texts: the Alexandrian text and the Western text. As far back as the seventeenth century Joannes Clericus (a.k.a. Jean Leclerc) advanced the hypothesis that Luke originally wrote a rougher long text only for it to be later polished into a smoother

---

Writings (Sheffield: Phoenix, 2004); and M.-E. Boismard, En Quête du Proto-Luc, EBib 37 (Paris: Gabalda, 1997).

13 Brodie, Birthing, 88.

short text. A view like this also found support in the work of Friedrich Blass. He wrote:

One copy of the Gospel was that sent to Theophilus; but when Luke afterwards came to Rome, he would of course be requested by the Roman Christians, who heard of his having written a Gospel, to give to them, too, a copy of it, and he would write out that copy in the course of perhaps a month and give it to them. That fresh copy would not exactly agree with the former, for the writer was entirely at liberty to shorten where he liked, or to insert what he thought suitable for these new readers, or to make improvements in style, or what he would choose to do; and he would naturally desire to do something of that kind, as we usually do, when we write the same essay a second time.

Blass considered the Western text of the Gospel of Luke as coming second.

Concerning the Western text of the Gospel he wrote that:

The second copy [the Western text] was written for new readers, who did not know the first. I should think that in this case the second copy would not at all be enlarged, but rather abridged, the work becoming somewhat tedious for the author, or at least losing something of its freshness for him, so that he was naturally disposed to omit many unessential circumstances and details, which he formerly had given.

For Blass, it is the text that we today call Alexandrian which closely resembles the first edition of Luke’s Gospel. He thought of the Western text as an editorial revision by the evangelist Luke. More recently, Blass’s hypothesis has been revived. Like Blass, Edouard Delebecque has argued that for the Gospel of Luke, the Alexandrian text is the earliest. For him, the Western text came later, but it was also the work of Luke. There is

---


17 Blass, *Philology*, 100-01.

a difference of opinion between Blass and Delebecque in relation to Acts. Blass believed that the Western text of Acts was earlier. For Delebecque the Western text of Acts came second and represented the editorial revision of Luke. Despite this difference, both agreed Luke wrote two editions of the Gospel and Acts.19

Another theory of multiple Lukan editions is dependent upon an analysis of the Lukan Infancy Narrative. A number of scholars have argued that Luke 3:1 originally served as the beginning of the Gospel and that the Infancy Narrative was added later.

The position that the Infancy Narrative was a later addition has a long history. Fitzmyer notes that “F. C. Conybeare pointed out that a note in the commentary of Ephraem of Syria on Tatian’s Diatessaron . . . regards Lk 1:5–2:52 as a later insert into the Lucan Gospel.”20 If we can use Marcion’s Evangelion as an example, and I believe we can, then we have another early witness for Luke’s Gospel beginning at 3:1.21

A number of twentieth-century scholars have argued that the Gospel of Luke originally began at 3:1. One such scholar is Stephen Benko. For him, the addition of Luke 1–2 was due to “an emerging interest of Christians in the nativity and childhood of Jesus, coupled with a simple Christology that began to ask questions about the ‘How’ of


21 Marcion’s Evangelion as evidence for the absence of the Infancy Narrative is discussed on pages 270-76. In this chapter I also present the case that the Gospel of the Ebionites can be used as evidence that an early version of Luke’s Gospel did not have the Infancy Narrative. See pages 276-81. For the status of Luke’s prologue see pages 282-85.
the incarnation.”

For W. G. Kümmel, the stylistic differences between the Infancy Narrative and Luke 3–24 reveal that they were composed at different times. He finds that “the few linguistic deviations between Lk 1–2 and Lk 3–24 can perhaps be traced back . . . to the fact that the prehistory [that is, the Infancy Narrative] was written later than the rest of the Gospel.” When Joseph Fitzmyer says that “it seems obvious that [Luke] 3:1–2 was at one time a formal introduction to the work,” he is referring to his belief that these verses closely resemble the Prologue (1:1–4) and that the topic of John the Baptist serves as an appropriate beginning.

For Raymond E. Brown, Luke 1–2 was written by Luke but added at a later stage, soon after the composition of Acts. It is Brown's literary and narrative analysis of the opening of Luke’s Gospel that points him towards this direction. The distinctive style in the Infancy Narrative is what is important for him. Brown has argued that the Infancy Narrative displays a strong Jewish orientation which sets it apart from the rest of the Gospel. In addition, Brown has argued that the Infancy Narrative went through more than one stage of writing before it was incorporated into the Gospel.

Brown said that the three hymns in Luke's Infancy Narrative – the Magnificat, Benedictus and Nunc Dimittis – were not from a Semitic source as Streeter proposed, but rather, they arose from within a Jewish-Christian setting. When Luke discovered

26 This should not be understood in the same way as Streeter's hypothesis which asserts that Luke utilized a Hebrew source when writing the Infancy Narrative. Cf. Streeter, Four Gospels, 266-67.
these hymns, he added them into the Infancy Narrative. For Brown, this two-stage composition of the Infancy Narrative becomes clear when we see that the “neat pattern of diptych” between John the Baptist and Jesus is disturbed and becomes “unbalanced” with the addition of the hymns.27

The survey of the last several pages reveals that the theory of multiple Lukan editions is not new. Furthermore, the discussion surrounding this theory often concerns itself with the status of the Infancy Narrative. To this narrative we shall now turn.

**Internal Evidence for the Later Inclusion of the Infancy Narrative**

What follows is the internal evidence for the position that the Infancy Narrative of Luke 1:5–2:52 was added after Luke 3–24 was completed. The position taken here is that the Infancy Narrative was written approximately at the same time as Acts, possibly a little later. Brown’s arguments will serve as the catalyst for the presentation of this position.28

First, Brown notes the lack of influence that the Infancy Narrative has had upon the remainder of Luke–Acts. He says that “if the first two chapters had been lost, we could never have suspected their existence.”29 John Nolland appears to agree with Brown on this point. Nolland says that “none of the insights gained by participants in the infancy narratives play any role in the story line from this point [Luke 3] forward.”30 The participants of the Infancy Narrative and their role within that narrative appear all but
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forgotten, or maybe more accurately, unknown, when we get to Luke 3. Following are some examples.

In Luke 3:1–6 John the Baptist is introduced as if it were for the first time. There are parallels with the introduction to John the Baptist in 1:5–25 and 57–80. In the Infancy Narrative we read of his naming and learn that his father is Zechariah (1:13 and 59). In Luke 3:2 John is again introduced as “John son of Zechariah” (Ἰωάννη τὸν Ζαχαρίου υίόν). In the Infancy Narrative we are given some understanding of John’s ministry. We read that he will be a prophet of God (1:15–17 and 76) and he will prepare God’s people for the coming Lord (1:17 and 77). In other words, he is the precursor to the coming saviour. This is what we learn in Luke 3:1–6, where the prophecy of Isaiah is applied to him. For Fitzmyer, the information given in 3:1–6 is redundant. As Fitzmyer says, it is “as if we had not learned in the infancy narrative that he [John] is the precursor of Jesus.”

Luke 1:36 makes it clear that Jesus and John are related. Their mothers Mary and Elizabeth, respectively, are relatives and it appears that they are close relatives as Mary stayed with Elizabeth for three months (1:56). It would be odd if both Jesus and John did not know of the extraordinary events surrounding their own births and that of the other. One might presume that at some stage Mary and Elizabeth shared with their sons the stories surrounding these events. Yet, in Luke 7:19–23 there is no indication that John was familiar with their mothers’ birth stories. In fact, John asks his disciples to inquire as to whether Jesus is the one whom he is to expect, or whether there is another (7:19). There is no indication that John knows that Jesus is the messiah.

---

In Luke 4:16 there is mention of where Jesus was brought up: καὶ ἠλθὲν εἰς Ναζαράν ὅπου ἦν θεραμμένος (“He came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up”). Luke’s source for this, Mark 6:1, makes no mention of Nazareth. It states only that Jesus ἔρχεται εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ (“came to his hometown”). Mark does not need to mention that Nazareth is Jesus’ hometown because he informed his readers earlier in the Gospel (1:9). In Luke’s Infancy Narrative we learn that Nazareth is Jesus’ hometown (Luke 1:26; 2:4, 39–40 and 51). However, if we take away the Infancy Narrative, Luke 4:16 becomes the first time Nazareth is mentioned as Jesus’ hometown. Therefore, it is understandable why Luke would redact Mark by adding Nazareth in 4:16. Alternatively, if the Infancy Narrative were originally part of the first edition of the Gospel, the details provided in Luke 4:16 would be redundant. Luke 4:16 suggests no knowledge of the Infancy Narrative.

If we did not have Luke’s Infancy Narrative there would be no mention of Mary at all in the Gospel of Luke. In 4:22, Luke replaces the name of Mary with Joseph (cf. Mark 6:3). There is one reference to Jesus’ mother in Luke 8:19–21, but here she is not mentioned by name. Rather, the narrative unit tells us that Jesus’ mother and brothers go to him, only to be brushed aside by him. Jesus does this by saying, “My mother and my brothers are those who hear the word of God and do it” (8:21). Also, there is no reference to Mary in the crucifixion or resurrection narratives, though other women followers are mentioned. When there is a chance to mention Mary, Luke chooses not to. One must ask then, why does Mary, who is such a prominent figure in the Infancy Narrative.

---

32 The same can be said of Matthew, who does not mention Nazareth for the same reason as Mark (Matt 13:54).
Narrative (she is mentioned twelve times), play no significant role in Luke 3–24? I propose that the likely reason for this is that Luke came into contact with traditions about Mary sometime after he completed his first Gospel edition.

Second, Luke 3 appears to be an appropriate starting point for the Gospel. There is a close correlation between Mark 1 and Luke 3. After a short prologue which introduces Jesus as the Son of God (Mark 1:1), Mark gives an account of the ministry of John the Baptist (Mark 1:2–8). Likewise, Luke 3 opens with an account of the ministry of John the Baptist.33 If we accept the theory of Markan priority, it would make sense to think that Luke’s Gospel began at 3:1.

In addition, Luke 3:1–2 begins in a way similar to the opening of Jeremiah, Hosea, Joel, Micah, Zephaniah, Haggai and Zechariah in the Septuagint. For example, compare how the opening of these books introduces the prophet to how Luke 3:2 introduces John:

Luke 3:2: ἐγένετο ῥῆμα θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν Ζαχαρίου υἱόν

The word of God came to John son of Zechariah

Jer 1:1: τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ ὃ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ Ἱερεμίαν τὸν τοῦ Χελκίου

The word of God which came upon Jeremiah the son of Hilkiah

Hos 1:1: λογος κυρίου δς ἐγενήθη πρὸς Ὀσηὲ τὸν του Βεηρεὶ

The word of the Lord which came to Hosea the son of Beeri

33 Despite the fact that Mark and Luke narrate John’s ministry differently, there are some parallels between the two. Both Mark and Luke record that John undertook the task of “preaching a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins” (κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, Mark 1:4–5, cf. Luke 3:2–3). If we accept Markan priority as the most credible of the hypotheses, then it is highly likely that Luke was dependent upon Mark here. However, differences between Mark and Luke are present. For example, Mark records that people from “all the country of Judea and all the people of Jerusalem” went to be baptized by John “in the river Jordan” (Mark 1:5). Luke, however, is not specific about the regions from which the people came. He only records that the people came from “all the region about the Jordan” (πᾶσαν τὴν περιχώρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, Luke 3:3). Hans Conzelmann looks upon this difference as a Lukan redaction to bring out the “relation between desert and water.” Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, trans. G. Buswell (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1960; reprint, 1987), 19. This would have the benefit of “establish[ing] a connection between the temptation and the baptism, later on in Luke 4:1.” See Fitzmyer, Luke I–IX, 513.
Joel 1:1: λόγος κυρίου ὃς ἐγενήθη πρὸς Ἰωὴλ τὸν του Βαδουήλ
The word of the Lord which came to Joel the son of Pethuel

Mic 1:1: καὶ ἔγενετο λόγος κυρίου πρὸς Μιχαίαν τὸν του Μωρασθεὶ
And the word of the Lord came to Micah the son of Moresheth

Zeph 1:1: λόγος κυρίου ὃς ἐγενήθη πρὸς Σοφονίαν τὸν του Χουσι
The word of the Lord which came to Zephaniah the son of Cushi

Hag 1:1: ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου ἐν χειρὶ Ἀγγαίου τοῦ προφήτου
The word of the Lord came by the hand of the prophet Haggai

Zech 1:1: ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου πρὸς Ζαχαρίαν τὸν του Βαραχίου
The word of the Lord came to Zachariah son of Berechiah

In these examples it is the word of God or of the Lord which is said to come upon the prophets. Included is information about their lineage. In addition, we are given the time when the word came upon these prophetic people.

In the fifteenth year of the rule of Emperor Tiberius . . .

Jer 1:2: ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἰωσία υἱοῦ Ἀμὼς βασιλέως Ἰούδα, ἔτους τρισκαιδεκάτου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ
In the days of Josiah son of Amos king of Judah, in the thirteenth year of his reign

Hos 1:1: ἐν ἡμέραις Ὀζίου, καὶ Ἰωάθαμ, καὶ Ἀχαζ, καὶ Ἐζεκίου βασιλέων Ἰούδα, καὶ ἐν ἡμέραις Ἱεροβοὰμ υἱοῦ Ἰωὰς βασιλέως Ἰσραήλ
In the days of Uzziah, and Jotham, and Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam son of Joash, king of Israel

Mic 1:1: ἐν ἡμέραις Ἰωάθαμ, καὶ Ἀχαζ, καὶ Ἐζεκίου βασιλέων Ἰούδα
In the days of Jotham, and Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah

Zeph 1:1: ἐν ἡμέραις Ἰωσίου υἱοῦ Ἀμὼν βασιλέως Ἰούδα
In the days of Josiah son of Amon, king of Judah

34 In Hag 1:1 we also learn that Haggai is τὸν του Σαλαθιήλ (“the son of Shealtiel”).
35 Joel is an exception.
Hag 1:1: ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ ἔτει ἐπὶ Δαρείου τοῦ βασιλέως
In the second year of Darius the king

Zech 1:1: ἐν τῷ ὀγδόῳ μηνὶ, ἐτους δευτέρου ἐπὶ Δαρείου
In the eighth month, of the second year [of the reign] of Darius

As can be seen, there are striking similarities between Luke 3:1–2 and the introductory passages of several Septuagint books, similarities not found with the opening of Mark’s Gospel, which has the words Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ (“The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ”). Therefore, the manner in which Luke has constructed 3:1–2 suggests that Luke modelled these verses on the Septuagint. Luke 3:1–2 serves as an appropriate introduction to the Gospel of Luke.

Brown also understands Acts 1:22 and 10:37, which describe the beginning of Jesus’ ministry at the time of John’s baptism, as further evidence that the starting point of the Gospel was Luke 3.36 Nowhere in Acts is Jesus’ birth referenced. Yet twice we are told that Jesus started his ministry “beginning” (ἀρξάμενος) from the time of John’s baptism. Acts 10:38 is also worthy of note. Here, Luke writes that at Jesus’ baptism, “God anointed [him] with the Holy Spirit and with power.” This would have been a good opportunity to recall the events of the Infancy Narrative where the angel, at Jesus’ conception, announced to Mary that the child within her was to be given “the throne of his ancestor David” (1:32) and be “holy” and “called son of God” (1:35). At his birth he was announced as “saviour . . . the Messiah, the Lord” (2:11). Yet no references to these events have been made when the opportunity arose.

To summarise this second argument, Brown understands the parallel between Mark 1 and Luke 3 and the references of Acts 1:22 and 10:37 as evidence that Luke’s

---

Gospel began at Luke 3. In addition, when there was an opportunity to refer to Jesus’ birth, it did not occur. The consequence of this appears to be that Luke 1–2 was not part of the first edition of Luke’s Gospel as there seems to be no knowledge of the events. Furthermore, it suggests that the Infancy Narrative was added slightly after Acts was written, as Acts also shows ignorance of the details of the Infancy Narrative. However, there are stylistic characteristics that Acts and Luke 1:5–2:52 share and that Luke 3–24 does not. To this third point I shall now turn.

For Brown “the Infancy Narrative [Luke 1:5–2:52] is closer in spirit to the stories in Acts than to the Gospel material which Luke took from Mark and Q.”37 This “closeness in spirit” would not be too surprising if one were to accept that the Infancy Narrative was written approximately the same time as Acts. Brown has identified five examples to show a close connection between the Infancy Narrative and Acts:


2. The speeches of Acts and the hymns of the Infancy Narrative are both compositions reflecting older material. For example, Peter’s speech in Acts 2:14–36 contains many quotations from the Scriptures (particularly 2:16–21, 25–31, 34–35), as does Stephen’s speech (Acts 7:2–53) which has numerous allusions and references to the Scriptures. Similarly, both the Magnificat (Luke 1:46–55) and Benedictus (Luke 1:67–79) are heavily reliant upon the Hebrew Scriptures.


37 Brown, Birth, 243. The five examples listed below are taken from here.
4. In Luke 2:11 angels give the infant Jesus the title “Messiah Lord.” This echoes the Christology of the post-resurrection speeches in Acts 2:36.

5. The parallelism that is established between John the Baptist and Jesus in the Infancy Narrative resembles the parallelism of Peter and Paul in Acts.

A close examination of these five points is required to ascertain whether Brown is correct in asserting that the Infancy Narrative is closer in spirit to the stories of Acts than Luke 3–24. As for point one, it is true that the influence of the Holy Spirit is more common in Acts and is also a regular occurrence in Luke 1–2. Brown cites Luke 1:67 and 2:25–27 as examples. In Luke 1:67 Zechariah is filled with the Holy Spirit; in Luke 2:25–27 it is Simeon who is filled with the Holy Spirit. On both occasions the Holy Spirit enables Zechariah and Simeon to prophesy. The theme of being filled with the Holy Spirit is not lost in Luke 1:15 and 41, where we learn that John and Elizabeth are filled or will be filled with the Holy Spirit. In Luke 1:80, we also learn that John became strong in the Spirit, enabling him to prepare for his ministry.

These examples are similar to what we read in Acts. The Spirit came upon those gathered in the house during the time of Pentecost (Acts 2:1–4). When Peter addresses the crowd at Pentecost he declares that the Spirit of God will be poured out “upon all flesh,” enabling them to prophesy (Acts 2:17–18). Stephen was empowered with the Spirit, speaking with wisdom and performing great signs and wonders (Acts 6:8–10). It was God’s Spirit that directed Philip to go to the Ethiopian eunuch to interpret the Isaiah passage (Acts 8:26–38) and this same Spirit “snatched Philip away” (Acts 8:39). As for other examples, the Spirit has a dramatic influence upon Peter (Acts 10:19; 11:1–18); Agabus prophesies in the Spirit (Acts 11:27–30); and Paul is directed by the Spirit not to speak the word in Asia (Acts 16:6–10), though at a later time he is resolved in the Spirit.

In Luke 3–24 we do not read of the influence of the Spirit to the same extent as in Luke 1–2 and Acts. There are only a handful of examples in these chapters. In Luke 3:22 the Spirit speaks the words, “You are my son, the beloved; with you I am well pleased” at the baptism of Jesus. In Luke 4:1 Jesus is led by the Spirit into the wilderness and 4:14–19 informs us that Jesus, filled with the Spirit, goes to Galilee, enters the synagogue and prophetically reads from the scroll of Isaiah. Finally, we read that Jesus rejoices in the Holy Spirit in Luke 10:21.

The small number of references to the Holy Spirit in a large body of work such as Luke 3–24 is striking when compared to references to the Holy Spirit in Luke 1–2 and Acts. The role of the Holy Spirit, in Luke 1–2 and Acts is clearly heightened. Whereas in Luke 3–24 it is Jesus only who is influenced by the Holy Spirit in Luke 1–2 and Acts the Holy Spirit has an impact upon Zechariah, Elizabeth, Simeon, John the Baptist, Peter, Stephen, Philip, Agabus and Paul. Interestingly, we do not hear of the Holy Spirit being an active influence in John’s ministry in Luke 3–24, even though this is mentioned in Luke 1–2. Brown appears correct when he claims that the outpouring of the prophetic spirit upon individuals in Luke 1–2 closely resembles the post-Pentecostal outpouring of the prophetic spirit of Acts.38

As for point two, Brown notes that the speeches of Acts and hymns of the Infancy Narrative (Luke 1:46–55, 68–79 and 2:29) are both compositions reflecting the Scriptures. He writes that the three canticles “have their closest parallel in the Jewish
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38 Brown, Birth, 243.
hymns and psalms attested in the literature from 200 BC to AD 100.” Brown adds, “it is not only a parallelism in style . . . but also in religious outlook.”


[Luke’s] own style is more obvious at some times than at others, but it is never so totally wanting as to prove alien origin for a passage, and it is never so pervasive as to exclude the possibility that a written source existed, although the source be no longer capable of detection by any residual difference in style.

Further on, Cadbury adds, “In the main, we must be content to rest ignorant of the scope and of the language of each of the sources from which Luke drew.” Therefore, we cannot say that Luke 3–24 is not reflecting the Scriptures. There are enough

---

39 Brown, Birth, 349.
42 Cadbury, Making, 75.
examples in Luke 3–24 to show that Luke is in fact doing this. Therefore, the speeches of Acts and the hymns of the Infancy Narrative are not the only compositions reflecting older material as Brown suggests. There are speeches in Luke 3–24 which also seem to do this. What all this does point towards is that the Infancy Narrative, as with Luke 3–24, has characteristics which reveal that the author was the person we refer to as Luke.

As for point three, we do notice angelic parallels between Luke 1–2 and Acts. In Luke 1:11 Zechariah sees an angel “standing at the right side of the altar of incense.” In Luke 1:26 God sends the angel Gabriel to Nazareth. In Luke 2:9 an angel stands before the shepherds. In Acts 5:19 the apostles are arrested under the authority of the high priest, but an angel opens the prison door allowing them to escape. We read in Acts 8:26 that an angel commands Philip to go “to the road that goes down from Jerusalem.” An angel enters the house of Cornelius in Acts 10:3. An angel appears in Peter’s cell, tapping him on the shoulder and waking him up. Finally, in Acts 27:23 Paul recounts how an angel stood by him. The angelic appearances in Luke 1–2 and Acts are quite similar to one another.

However, though not as common as in Luke 1–2 and Acts, angelic appearances in Luke 3–24 are not entirely absent. In the resurrection narrative there is what most commentators interpret as an angelic appearance. In Luke 24:4–7, when the women return to Jesus’ burial place, they not only discover that the stone has been rolled away from the tomb and that his body is missing, but they also find “two men” (ἀνδρες δύо, Luke 24:4). That these “men” are supernatural beings is suggested by the garments they wear (they are wearing “shining clothes,” ἡσθητι ἀστραπτούσῃ, suggesting a heavenly

There is another angelic appearance in the main body of Luke, the textually disputed passage of Luke 22:43–44. Here, when Jesus is praying at the Mount of Olives, an angel appears to Jesus, giving him strength for the coming trial that he must endure. It is debated whether Luke 22:43–44 was written by Luke.44 If it is found to be an authentic Lukan passage, then we have two examples of angelic appearances in the main body of Luke’s Gospel. In any case, the fairly high number of angelic appearances in a short narrative like Luke 1–2 suggests the acceptance of a motif akin to that of Acts. Luke 3–24, although a large body of writing, produces, at best, no more than two angelic appearances.

As for point four Brown notes that the title “Messiah Lord” (χριστὸς κύριος, Luke 2:11) echoes the Christology of the post-resurrection speeches in Acts 2:36. It is true that the coupling of χριστὸς and κύριος does not appear in the body of Luke. The joining of these two words makes χριστὸς κύριος an “honorable” title,45 a title we do not encounter until after the resurrection. The use of the title in the Infancy Narrative and Acts may

---

43 The term ἀγγέλος can simply mean “messenger” and need not be in reference to a heavenly figure. However, as the ἄγγελον are said to wear ἐσθῆτι ἀστραπτούσῃ one can presume that heavenly beings (“angels”) are in mind.


suggest that these bodies of work were written around the same time. It appears that this is Brown's position.

Finally, in point five Brown refers to a parallelism between John the Baptist and Jesus in the Infancy Narrative that resembles a parallelism between Peter and Paul in Acts. Brown observes that Peter and Paul both preach “kerygmatic sermons and perform the same type of miracles.” Brown is given the greater role in the first part of Acts (Acts 1–12) and Paul receives the greater attention in the second part (Acts 13–28). Both Peter and Paul do appear in Acts 15 but then Peter is not mentioned again. In a similar way, John the Baptist appears in Luke 1 as does Jesus. Jesus receives the prominent role in Luke 2 and John the Baptist is not mentioned.

A further parallelism is observed by the Spirit-filled commissioning of each of the four characters. In Luke 1:15 we learn that John the Baptist will be filled with the Holy Spirit. We learn that he will go out “with the spirit and power of Elijah” (Luke 1:17, cf. 1:80). Likewise, in the Infancy Narrative, Jesus will be someone special for he is going to be “filled with wisdom and God’s grace” (Luke 2:40). This becomes clear while a young boy. At the age of twelve years Jesus is among teachers who are amazed at his understanding, questions and answers (Luke 2:46–47). In a similar tone, we read in Acts 2 of the coming of the Holy Spirit upon the disciples, including Peter. Not only does this Pentecost event allow Peter to speak in tongues, but it empowers him to address the crowd boldly (Acts 2:14–36). Here we see the birth of his ministry. In a
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46 Brown, Birth, 243, n. 28.
47 Brown (Birth, 244, n. 28) also notes that both John the Baptist and Jesus appear in Luke 3, though from Luke 3:20 John the Baptist is removed from the narrative with Jesus taking the centre role.
48 Though it is not explicitly stated in these passages that Jesus is Spirit-filled, it is clear that the concept is there. The ability to amaze people with understanding and dialogue is a sign of being Spirit-filled. See the examples of Peter and Paul.
similar way, Acts 9 describes Paul’s conversion. The Holy Spirit comes to him (Acts 9:18). It empowers him to speak boldly in the synagogues (Acts 9:19–23). Again, as with Peter, the Holy Spirit empowers Paul so that he may begin his ministry. It seems that Luke has established a literary parallelism where all four characters are Spirit-filled and where the ministries of John the Baptist and Peter fall into the background as the significance of the ministries of Jesus and Paul comes into the foreground. The parallelism that is established between John the Baptist and Jesus in the Infancy Narrative does appear to resemble the parallelism of Peter and Paul in Acts.

It is possible, then, that the larger and more thorough development of the relationship between Peter and Paul influenced the smaller reflection on the relationship between John the Baptist and Jesus. The motive of being Spirit-filled, which is more characteristic of Acts, suggests that Luke 1–2 and Acts were written around the same time.

It appears that points one, three, four and five describe similarities between Luke 1–2 and Acts that are not as evident in Luke 3–24. In regards to point two, I am not convinced that this is the case. To sum up each of the five points, beginning with point one, there does appear to be a parallel between Luke 1–2 and Acts in the manner in which the Spirit moves people to act and speak. In Luke 1–2 individuals are inspired by the Spirit, suggesting a post-Pentecost reflection, hence the similarity with Acts. The few cases in Luke 3–24 are all in relation to Jesus. His experience was the prelude to what was to come. As for point two, I am not entirely convinced that the speeches of Acts and hymns of the Infancy Narrative show a closer relationship between one another compared to other speeches in the main body of the Gospel. Point two may not give a
satisfactory indication that Luke 1–2 and Acts are uniquely related, but it does support the idea that the author of the Infancy Narrative was Luke. Point three reflects upon the angelic appearances. These appearances suggest a similarity between Luke 1–2 and Acts, which is largely absent in Luke 3–24. We can be sure of only one angelic appearance within the main body of the Gospel that finds some parallel with Luke 1–2 and Acts, and that at the empty tomb of Jesus. As for point four, the title “Messiah Lord” is unique to Luke 1–2 and Acts. It does not appear anywhere in Luke 3–24. Point five speaks of a forerunner motive between John the Baptist and Jesus in Luke 1–2 which resembles that of Peter and Paul in Acts. Coupled with a motive of being Spirit-filled, there does appear to be a relationship between Luke 1–2 and Acts. Therefore, points one, three, four and five show that there are shared characteristics between the Infancy Narrative and Acts. These findings point towards the notion that the Infancy Narrative was written around the same time as Acts, by the author known to us as Luke.

So far we have analysed three important issues. The first has to do with the lack of influence the Infancy Narrative has on Luke 3–24. The second is in relation to Luke 3 being an appropriate beginning for the Gospel. The third is in regards to the similarities between the Infancy Narrative and Acts. The fourth important issue is in relation to the genealogy in Luke 3:23–38. If the Infancy Narrative was originally part of Luke’s Gospel, one must ask why the genealogy of Jesus is within the context of his ministry and not within the context of his birth. In Luke’s Gospel, the genealogy of Jesus appears to be in an odd place. This, for Brown, is another indicator that the genealogy of Jesus was part of the Gospel before the Infancy Narrative was prefixed.49

One can compare the placement of Jesus’ genealogy in Luke with Matthew. Matthew’s genealogy of Jesus is found at the beginning of the Gospel and stands as an introduction to both his Gospel and the Infancy Narrative (Matt 1:1–17). Likewise, in Genesis, Abram is introduced with a genealogy (Gen 11:10–26). Here, there is no birth or infancy narrative of Abram, so the genealogy serves as an appropriate introduction to him. Therefore, it was not unheard to use a genealogy to introduce a character.

In a similar manner, Luke places the genealogy of Jesus after his baptism (Luke 3:23–38). This is an appropriate place to put the genealogy if we accept the notion that Luke’s Gospel originally began at 3:1, for it comes immediately after the first mention of Jesus (3:21). In the baptism unit of Luke 3:21–22 we learn that Jesus is baptised by John the Baptist. We also discover that as Jesus was praying, the Holy Spirit descended upon him and a voice from heaven, presumably God, declared him as “Son.” However, if this is the first time we are introduced to Jesus we immediately ask who is this Jesus? What is his background? Placing a genealogy immediately after the baptism account helps answer these questions. In other words, since the genealogy is so close to the first mention of Jesus in Luke 3, it does serve as an appropriate introduction to him.

On the other hand, it is odd to have a genealogy that informs the audience of the background of Jesus so far into the Gospel if we already have an Infancy Narrative which provides such information. Furthermore, that the genealogy of Jesus does not mention Mary despite the fact she plays such a prominent role in the Infancy Narrative, supports the notion that when Luke wrote the genealogy of Jesus he did not have the Infancy Narrative in mind. It appears that the Infancy Narrative and genealogy were written at
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50 Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 209.
two separate times.

The parenthesis ὡς ἐνομίζετο (“as was thought”) at Luke 3:23 is interesting.\(^{51}\) The parenthesis indicates an inaccurate assumption that Joseph was the father of Jesus.\(^{52}\) This could be taken to mean that the Infancy Narrative, with its view of the virginal conception, was in mind, if not written, when Luke composed the genealogy. However, Brown has said that the parenthesis only proves that the virginal conception was already associated with the birth of Jesus, not necessarily that the Infancy Narrative was written.\(^{53}\) As Fitzmyer has suggested, the parenthetical phrase ὡς ἐνομίζετο can be understood as “bring[ing] in the minds of the people” a concept that was already known to Luke’s community, in this case, the virginal conception. It does not need to be understood as meaning that the virginal conception was narrated in the Gospel.\(^{54}\) The phrase ὡς ἐνομίζετο does not do damage to the notion that the genealogy was added at Luke 3:23–38, because Luke had not yet written the Infancy Narrative.

A fifth reason that Brown finds for the assertion that the Infancy Narrative was a later addition to the Gospel is its higher and more developed Christology.\(^{55}\) In Acts Jesus is recognised as Messiah and the Son of God because of the resurrection (2:32, 36 and 13:32–35). God has vindicated Jesus, placing him at his right hand (5:31). Simply, it is a status that Jesus has received from God. This is in contrast to Luke 3–24 where the

\(^{51}\) The context of the parenthesis is as follows: δὲν γίνο, ὡς ἐνομίζετο, Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ Ἠλί (Jesus “being the son, as was thought, of Joseph [son] of Eli”).
\(^{54}\) See Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, 488-89. One cannot discount the possibility that the parenthetical phrase was added at the same time as the genealogy, a possibility that Fitzmyer allows for. Though possible, it is difficult to prove. Even more difficult to prove is the notion that the genealogy was added at the same time as the Infancy Narrative, a notion that Fitzmyer also allows for (p. 489). If Luke did decide to add the genealogy at the same time as the Infancy Narrative, one wonders why Luke did not place the genealogy into the Infancy Narrative, a more logical and easier option.
identification of Jesus as Messiah and Son of God is based upon his lowly ministry. Jesus is confirmed as God’s Son at his baptism (Luke 3:21–22). In the synagogue at Nazareth he reveals that he is the Messiah (4:16–18). However, it is not because of his glorified state that Jesus should be recognised as Messiah and Son of God, it is because of his earthly ministry of lowliness. During his earthly ministry Jesus ministers to sinners, the poor, non-Jewish ethnic groups and women, in other words, all those from the lower strata of society. As Bruce Malina says, Jesus extended himself beyond “socially proper attitudes and behaviour in the area where the three lines of power, gender status, and religion intersect.”

Therefore, the recognition of Jesus as Messiah and Son of God in Acts and Luke 3–24 is a status that God has endowed upon him.

In Luke 1–2, when the angels announce to Mary that she is with child (1:26–38) we read that Jesus will be called “great . . . son of the Most High” and will be given “the throne of David” (1:32). We learn that “He [Jesus] will reign over the house of Jacob forever and of his kingdom there will be no end” (1:33). Furthermore, “The child will be holy . . . called son of God” (1:35). The Christological language in Luke 1–2 is well developed. It is connected to his miraculous birth. In the Infancy Narrative the suggestion seems to be that Jesus is Messiah and Son of God by virtue of his nature. In Luke 3–24 and Acts this does not come out so clearly. The impression one gets when reading Luke 3–24 and Acts is that Jesus is Messiah and Son of God not so much because of the virtue of his nature but because he has been granted with such a status by God.

---

Therefore, in Luke 1–2 messiahship and sonship is closely connected to his miraculous conception and birth. In Luke 3–24 it is closely connected to his ministry. In Acts it is related to God’s vindication. Based upon this reasoning it can be said that Luke 1–2 exhibits a higher Christology to that of Luke 3–24 and Acts. That such a higher Christology is evident in the first two chapters of the Gospel suggests that it was written at a later time than Luke 3–24 and Acts. Luke 1–2 appears to have been written after further reflection on the ministry of Jesus and the resurrection experience of his disciples.

I have used Brown’s arguments as the catalyst to discover whether or not there are good reasons to believe that the Infancy Narrative was written at a later stage, possibly around the same time as Acts. Of all five main arguments presented, I have come to the conclusion that there is good reason to believe that the Infancy Narrative was a later inclusion, written and added by Luke. Argument one presents the case that the Infancy Narrative had no influence upon the rest of Luke–Acts. Brown is correct to conclude that “if the first two chapters had been lost, we could never have suspected their existence.” Also, Luke 3 also appears an appropriate place to begin the Gospel (argument two). Markan priority and the language of Acts 1:22 and 10:37–38 suggest Luke 3 was once the starting point of the Gospel. There are also some characteristics in the Infancy Narrative that closely parallel Acts (argument three). These include: the influence of the Holy Spirit upon individuals other than Jesus, the angelic appearances, the title Messiah Lord and the parallelism between John the Baptist and Jesus with that of Peter and Paul. As for the use of the Hebrew Scriptures to link Luke 1–2 with Acts, there is no convincing evidence. It does, however, highlight that the author of the
Infancy Narrative and that of Luke 3–24 and Acts could well have been the same. The
genealogy (argument four) suggests that the Infancy Narrative was an afterthought and
as such, not part of the first edition of Luke. Finally, one finds a higher Christology in
the Infancy Narrative (argument five), more so than Luke 3–24, suggesting that it was
written at a later time. These arguments point towards the notion that Luke added the
Infancy Narrative sometime after the writing of Luke 3–24, possibly after the
composition of Acts.

External Evidence for the Later Inclusion of the Infancy Narrative

When we look at all the available and relevant manuscripts of Luke’s Gospel, Greek or
otherwise, we find that they are witnesses to the Infancy Narrative.57 Surprising as this
may sound, this does not mean that there is no external evidence for the absence of Luke
1–2. Our external evidence rests heavily with Marcion’s Evangelion and the Gospel of
the Ebionites.

In chapter three I gave a thorough account of Marcion and his Evangelion. I
discussed how the Evangelion shared a close literary relationship to Luke’s Gospel. Even
David Salter Williams, after his minimalist reconstruction of the Evangelion, admitted
that “Marcion’s Gospel appears to have been based on a text that was similar to Luke.”58
However, we also read how Marcion was accused of deleting from his Gospel passages
that he thought offensive. These accusations were made by Irenaeus, Tertullian and

57 In its current state P75 does not have Luke 1–2. However, the editors of this manuscript note that P75
was originally made of 72 folios of which only 51 have survived. Therefore, it originally did contain the
Infancy Narrative, though the opening pages of the Gospel of Luke are now lost. Today, P75 begins at
Epiphanius. It became the prevalent view of a number of Marcion scholars for a considerable time.

Nowadays, the view that Marcion was responsible from excising passages from his Gospel has been questioned, and rightly so. As Jason BeDuhn reminds us, today there is a greater recognition that the heresiologists operated with “an anti-Marcionite bias [which shaped] their assumptions.”

The heresiologists were writing from a later period. They were working under the assumption that the content of Luke’s Gospel was stable and knowable and that they themselves possessed and followed the correct text. For them, any deviation from this “correct” Lukan text, such as the Evangelion, was an intentional redaction on the part of the heretic. The heresiologists concluded that Marcion purposefully excised passages from Luke’s Gospel so as to make it conform to his theology.

A reason to doubt the accusations of the heresiologists stems from their own contradictory notion that Marcion excised passages contrary to his Christology, but not always. Stating that Marcion deleted passages from Luke’s Gospel, Irenaeus wrote:

\begin{quote}
Et super haec, id quod est secundum Lucam Evangelium circumcididens et omnia quae sunt de generatione Domini conscripta auferens, et de doctrina sermonum Domini multa auferens, in quibus manifestissime Conditorem huius uniuersitatis suum Patrem confitens Dominus conscriptus est, semetipsum ueraciorem esse quam sunt hi qui Evangelium tradiderunt apostoli suasit discipulis suis, non Evangelium, sed particulam Evangelii tradens eis.
\end{quote}

Besides all this, he [Marcion] mutilated the Gospel according to Luke, and discarding also many of the Lord’s discourses containing teaching in which it is most clearly written that the Lord confessed His Father as the Maker of the universe. Marcion persuaded his disciples that he was more

---


truthful than the apostles who handed down the Gospel, though he gave them not the Gospel, but only a portion of the Gospel.\textsuperscript{61}

Tertullian not only shared the same sentiments as Irenaeus, but was perplexed that Marcion did not delete everything that was in apparent conflict with his Christology. According to Tertullian, Marcion’s \textit{Evangelion} contained the words, “Look at my [Jesus’] hands and feet; see that is I myself. Touch me and see; for a ghost [spirit] does not have flesh and bones as you see that I have” (cf. Luke 24:39).\textsuperscript{62} It is to be remembered that Marcion believed that Jesus was a spirit being, without flesh and bones. As such, Tertullian understood these words as contradictory to Marcion’s Christology. In order to explain why Marcion deleted some passages, but not all, Tertullian wrote:

\begin{quote}
\textit{De corporis autem ueritate quid potest clarius? Cum haesitantibus eis ne phantasma esset, immo phantasma credentibus: «Quid turbati estis? Et quid cogitationes subeunt in corda uestra? Videte manus meas et pedes, quia ipse ego sum, quoniam spiritus ossa non habet, sicut me habentem uidetis.» Et Marcion quaedam contraria sibi illa, credo, industria eradere de euangelio suo noluit, ut ex his quae eradere potuit nec erasit illa quae erasit aut negetur erasisse aut merito erasisse dicatur.}\textsuperscript{63}
\end{quote}

Now concerning the verity of his body, what could be clearer? When they were in doubt whether he were not a phantasm, or even supposed that he was a phantasm. He said to them, “\textit{Why are ye troubled, and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and feet, that it is I myself: for a spirit hath not bones, as ye see me having.}” Now here Marcion, on purpose I believe, has abstained from crossing out of his gospel certain matters opposed to him, hoping that in view of these which he might have crossed out and has not, he may be thought not to have crossed out those which he has crossed out, or even crossed them out with

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{62} Tertullian, \textit{Adversus Marcionem}, 4.43.6-7.
\end{flushright}
good reason.\textsuperscript{64}

For Tertullian, Marcion abstained from deleting some passages of his Gospel in order to prove that the missing passages were not removed by him, or that if he were responsible for their excision, he had good reason to do it.

Another reason for questioning the notion that Marcion was responsible for deleting passages from his Gospel is based upon the observation that at times Marcion’s \textit{Evangelion} corresponds to the Western text. Judith Lieu has said, “the affinities of Marcion’s text with the Western tradition [of Luke’s Gospel] have long been recognised.”\textsuperscript{65} We observe an example where the \textit{Evangelion} has the same variant reading as Codex Bezae. According to BeDuhn, the likely variant reading of the \textit{Evangelion} 4:16 (cf. Luke 4:16) is:

\begin{quote}
And he [Jesus] came to Nazara, where he was (οὗ ἦν or ὅπου ἦν) in the synagogue, in accord with the custom (κατὰ τὸ εἰωθός) on the Sabbath days.\textsuperscript{66}
\end{quote}

There are two notable words missing in this text. The first is τεθραμμένος (“having been brought up”). In the majority of manuscripts this verb follows οὗ ἦν (“where he was”). Therefore, the more common reading is οὗ ἦν τεθραμμένος (“where he had been brought up”).\textsuperscript{67} The second notable missing word is the pronoun αὐτῷ (“for him”). This pronoun usually follows the word κατὰ τὸ εἰωθός (“according to the custom”). Therefore, the reading would be κατὰ τὸ εἰωθός αὐτῷ (“according to the custom for him”).

\begin{footnotes}
\item[66] BeDuhn, \textit{First New Testament}, 99. This is based upon the testimony of Tertullian, \textit{Adversus Marcionem}, 4.8.2.
\item[67] Codex Bezae has ὅπου instead of οὗ.
\end{footnotes}
These omissions are important. When the verb τεθραμμένος is not present, there is no longer any mention of Jesus having been brought up in Nazareth. When the pronoun αὐτῷ is not included, attending the synagogue is no longer a custom of Jesus. In other words, in the reading of Evangelion 4:16, Jesus’ humanity and Jewishness is deemphasised.

Tertullian accused Marcion of deleting any mention of Jesus having been brought up in Nazareth. Apparently, thinking of Jesus being “brought up” was considered by Marcion as a testimony to his humanity, a view he rejected. In addition, Marcion believed that Jesus came directly from heaven to the synagogue at Nazareth. Marcion did not wish to make a connection between Jesus and Nazareth because to do so would expose Jesus as Jewish, an association he did not accept. But having come to Nazareth where he was according to the custom on the day of the Sabbath, into the Synagogue, and he stood up to read.

A later scribe did add τεθραμμένος εἰσῆλθεν after ἦν, but this is clearly a scribal interpolation. Codex Bezae has plenty of scribal interpolations over a period of several centuries. It is presumptuous to think that the variant reading of Luke 4:16 was the

---

68 Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem, 4.8.1-3. From Tertullian we learn that the Evangelion did make mention of Jesus’ preaching in Nazareth.

result of a deliberate excision by Marcion. It is possible that the *Evangelion* Marcion inherited lacked these words.

Marcion was accused of deleting the Infancy Narrative. Epiphanius wrote that:

εὐθὺς μὲν ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ πάντα τὰ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς τῷ Λουκᾶ πεπραγματευμένα τοιούτου ὡς λέγει, ἐπειδὴ ἄλλοι ἐπεχείρησαν, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς καὶ τὰ περὶ τῆς Ἐλισάβετ καὶ τοῦ ἀγγέλου εὐαγγελισμένου Μαρίαν τὴν παρθένον, Ἰωάννου τε καὶ Ζαχαρίου καὶ τῆς ἐν Βηθλεέμ γεννήσεως, γενεαλογίας καὶ τῆς τοῦ βαπτίσματος ὑποθέσεως – ταῦτα πάντα περικόψας ἀπεπήδησεν καὶ ἀρχὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐταξίζε ταύτην, ἐν τῷ πεντεκαιδέκατῳ ἐτεὶ Τιβερίου Καίσαρος, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς.

At the very beginning he [Marcion] excised all of Luke’s original discussion – his “inasmuch as many have taken in hand,” and so forth – and the material about Elizabeth and the angel’s annunciation to the virgin Mary, John and Zacharias and the birth of Bethlehem, the genealogy and the subject of the baptism. All this he took out and turned his back on, and made this the beginning of the Gospel, ‘In the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar,’ and so forth.70

It is a view that is also found in Irenaeus,71 Tertullian72 and Hippolytus.73 As BeDuhn says, “our sources unanimously report that the Evangelion opened with wording corresponding to 3.1 in Luke, and lacked any of the content found in Luke 1.1–2.52.”74

Again we cannot be certain that it was Marcion who was responsible for deleting the Infancy Narrative. Earlier in this chapter I argued that there is good internal evidence to suggest that the Infancy Narrative was an afterthought and added to Luke’s Gospel at a later time. The *Evangelion* may just be that external witness that testifies to the position that Luke’s Gospel did not originally contain the Infancy Narrative.

---


71 Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, 1.27.2.

72 Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, 4.7.1.

73 Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium*, 7.31.5.

It is interesting to discover that there was another Christian movement with a Christology very different to that of Marcion, which knew Luke's Gospel and arguably showed no signs of knowing the Infancy Narrative. The Christians of this movement are referred to as Ebionites. The Ebionites were active during the late first century and early second century.

From Irenaeus we learn that the Ebionites continued the Jewish practice of circumcision, followed the Torah and worshipped in Jerusalem. Whereas Marcion believed that Jesus was a phantom-like creature who descended directly from heaven in adult-like form, the Ebionites believed that Jesus experienced a natural birth. For them, this made Jesus fully human and not a divine being.

Irenaeus said that the Ebionites held on to “the same opinion as Cerinthus and Carpocrates.” This “same opinion” is in reference to the denial of the virgin birth. The

---

75 Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, 1.26.2. The word “Ebionite” is based upon the Hebrew term ʻebyôn, which means “poor.” The term can refer to those Israelites who were oppressed by wealthy fellow compatriots. As such, they were dependent upon the Lord for eschatological salvation. It is clear that a number of groups used this term for themselves. However, when Irenaeus uses the word “Ebionite,” he has in mind a distinct second-century group of Jesus-followers with a distinct Christology. Later heresiologists continue with this usage in the same manner as Irenaeus. I will use the word “Ebionite” as reference to an early Christian group who accept a Christology as has been described in this paper. For a full definition and usage of the term see Oskar Skarsaune, “The Ebionites,” in *Jewish Believers in Jesus*, ed., Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007), 419-25; Richard Bauckham, “The Origin of the Ebionites,” in *The Image of the Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. Peter J. Tomson and Doris Lambers-Petry (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 178-80; and Stephen Goranson, “Ebionites,” in *ABD 2*, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 260-61.

76 Irenaeus is our earliest extant source for the Ebionites and probably the most reliable. Although some mention of the Ebionites is made by other early heresiologists (such as Hippolytus, Tertullian, Origen and Eusebius) we do not learn a great deal more about them. Epiphanius does give quite a bit of information about the Ebionites. However, it is clear that most of his information is derived from the writings of the aforementioned heresiologists. For more on this see Petri Luomanen, “Ebionites and Nazarenes,” in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. Matt Jackson-McCabe (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 81-118; and Joseph Verheyden, “Epiphanius on the Ebionites,” in *The Image of the Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. Peter J. Tomson and Doris Lambers-Petry (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 182-207. Epiphanius is particularly helpful in the reconstruction of the Ebionite Gospel, for unlike others, he claims to quote this now lost Gospel.

77 The Latin reads, *Similiter ut Cerinthus et Carpocrates*. Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, 1.26.2. English translation by Unger, *Irenaeus*, 90. There is some debate as to whether the Irenaeus phrase should begin with the negative *non*, which would read *non similiter ut Cerinthus et Carpocrates* ("not the same opinion"
Ebionites, Cerinthus and Carpocrates taught that the Christ descended upon Jesus at his baptism, only to leave at the crucifixion. For them it was Jesus who suffered at the crucifixion, not the Christ, as the Christ had already departed.\textsuperscript{78} The Infancy Narrative played no part in a Christology which could be interpreted as separationist.

According to Irenaeus, the Ebionites used only one Gospel, the Gospel of Matthew.\textsuperscript{79} Epiphanius reported that the Ebionites called their Gospel the Gospel of the Hebrews, which according to him was the Gospel of Matthew. Epiphanius also noted that this Ebionite version of the Gospel of Matthew had been altered.\textsuperscript{80} However, a close look into the content of the Ebionite Gospel has led many scholars to draw the conclusion that the Synoptic Gospels, not Matthew alone, were the source of the Ebionite Gospel.

Dieter Lührmann says that the text of the Gospel of the Ebionites contained

\begin{quote}
\textit{as Cerinthus and Carpocrates}). This would make the passage mean that the Ebionites did not possess similar opinions to Cerinthus and Carpocrates. Hippolytus (\textit{Refutatio omnium haeresium}, 7.22 and 10:18), who quotes Irenaeus, does not have the word \textit{non} in the phrase. According to Oskar Skarsaune, Hippolytus' opinion is important as his writing \textit{“is a prime witness to Irenaeus’s (now lost) Greek text.”} Skarsaune has also said that the context of Irenaeus' passage makes little sense if \textit{non} is included. See Skarsaune, \textit{“The Ebionites,”} 434. Irenaeus (\textit{Adversus haereses}, 1.26.1) says that Cerinthus did not believe that the universe was made by the \textit{“Supreme God” (primo Deo)}, nor that Jesus was born of a virgin. Irenaeus also notes that the Ebionites are correct in their understanding of God the Father, as they, unlike Cerinthus and Carpocrates do believe that the world was made by God (also see Irenaeus, \textit{Adversus haereses}, 1.25.1). Therefore, if the Ebionites are correct in regards to God the Father, why would Irenaeus make mention of the Ebionites at all, if their opinions in regards to Jesus are not similar to both Cerinthus and Carpocrates? Irenaeus appears to be pointing out that the Ebionites do not teach as Cerinthus and Carpocrates in regards to God the Father, though their Christology is similar. This is further supported by the addition of the word \textit{“but” (autem)} to introduce the statement that concerns Jesus in \textit{Adversus haereses}, 1.26.2. The passage then reads, \textit{“but (autem) in regard to the Lord they hold the same opinion as Cerinthus and Carpocrates.”} Why would Irenaeus use the word \textit{autem} if he did not wish to make a contrast? See Skarsaune, \textit{“Ebionites,”} 428. For an opposing view see A. F. J. Klijn and G. J. Reinink, \textit{Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects}, Supplements to NTSup 36 (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 20. Unfortunately, Klijn and Reinink do not give an explanation of the significance of \textit{autem} in their defence for the inclusion of \textit{non}. Rousseau and Doutreleau, \textit{(Irénée de Lyon}, 346) also prefer to have \textit{non} at the beginning of the phrase.

\textsuperscript{78} Compare Irenaeus, \textit{Adversus haereses}. 1.25.1-6 with 1.26.1.
\textsuperscript{79} Irenaeus, \textit{Adversus haereses}, 1.26.2.
\textsuperscript{80} Epiphanius, \textit{Panarion}, 30.13.1.

William Petersen is unsure “which if any of the canonical gospels provides the framework for the *Gospel of the Ebionites*.” He observes that the Ebionite Gospel appears to be a harmonisation “woven from traditions found in the Synoptic Gospels (Matthew, Mark and Luke).” In a similar way to Petersen, Ehrman understands the Gospel of the Ebionites as a “kind of harmony of the Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke.”

In two places in his *Panarion* Epiphanius refers to the opening of the Gospel of the Ebionites. Epiphanius’ citations are as follows:

**Citation 1: Epiphanius, Panarion, 30.13.6**

Ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρῴδου βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας <lacuna> ἠλθεν Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων βάπτισμα μετανοίας ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, ὃς ἐλέγετο εἶναι ἐκ γένους Λααρών τοῦ Ιερέως παῖς Ζαχαρίου καὶ Ἐλισάβετ καὶ ἔξηρχουντο πρὸς αὐτόν πάντες.

It came to pass, in the days of Herod, king of Judea <lacuna> John came baptising with a baptism of repentance in the Jordan River and he was said to be from the lineage of Aaron the priest, son of Zachariah and Elizabeth, and all went out to him.

---

Citation 2: Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 30.14.3

Ἐγένετο, φησίν, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρῴδου βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Καϊάφα, ἦλθεν τις Ἰωάννης ὄνοματι βαπτίζων βάπτισμα μετανοίας ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ.

It came to pass, he says, in the days of Herod, king of Judea, during the high-priesthood of Caiaphas, there came a certain man named John, baptising with a baptism of repentance in the Jordan River.84

Both citations have the words Ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρῴδου βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας (“It came to pass, in the days of Herod, king of Judea”). These words are also found in Luke 1:5a. In the first citation we have a lacuna. Frank Williams says that the words of the lacuna were likely to be ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Καϊάφα, which are the same as in the second citation. The lacuna is only large enough to fit a handful of words, so this appears correct.85 Also in the first citation Zechariah and Elizabeth are said to be John’s parents and Zechariah is said to be of the lineage of Aaron. In Luke 3:2 only Zechariah is mentioned. However, Luke 1:5 does say that Zechariah and Elizabeth are the parents of John and that Zechariah is a descendant of Aaron. In the second citation the words ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Καϊάφα are close to Luke 3:2, the difference being the missing words Ἄννα καὶ. Citations one and two speak of John the Baptist who came “baptising with a baptism of repentance in the Jordan River” (βαπτίζων βάπτισμα μετανοίας ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ).

These words closely resemble Luke 3:3 as is seen with the reference to the Jordan and the mention of John’s “baptism of repentance.” However, while both citations refer to the “Jordan river” (τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ), Luke 3:3 refers to “the region around the Jordan” (περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου).86

---

84 Both translations are mine.
85 Williams, *Panarion*, 142.
86 Mark 1:4 also speaks of a “baptism of repentance” and refers to the “Jordan river.” The same idea is found in Matt 3:13.
It is clear that the opening of the Gospel of the Ebionites finds a parallel with Luke 1:5a and 3:2–3. In the Gospel of the Ebionites the phrase \( \text{ἐγένετο \ ἐν \ ταῖς \ ἡμέραις} \) \( \text{Ἡρῴδου \ βασιλέως \ τῆς \ Ἰουδαίας} \) is an exact replica of Luke 1:5a. It serves as an introduction to the ministry of John the Baptist. However, in the Gospel of Luke the phrase serves as an introduction to the birth of John the Baptist. In relation to the Gospel of the Ebionites this creates a dating problem. King Herod died ca. 4 BCE, a date too early for the beginning of John’s ministry. In addition, Caiaphas was high priest from 18 to 36 CE, and therefore not during the time of King Herod as the second citation indicates.

There are two possible explanations to account for the historical error. First, the words \( \text{ἐγένετο \ ἐν \ ταῖς \ ἡμέραις} \) was a common introductory formula. For example, Jer 1:3 (LXX) has the phrase \( \text{ἐγένετο \ ἐν \ ταῖς \ ἡμέραις \ Ἰωακεὶμ} \) (“It came to pass in the days of Joakim”) to introduce and provide context to the prophet Jeremiah. This formula is also used in Judg 19:1.\(^{87}\) Therefore, the redactor of the Gospel of the Ebionites, or an earlier redactor, may have used a formula he was familiar with to provide context to John the Baptist, not because his Gospel edition of Luke had the Infancy Narrative. This position suggests that the redactor was privy to a tradition which, unknowingly to him, was incomplete for there was no reference to the Infancy Narrative. This is why Herod serves as the context for John the Baptist’s ministry. The second possible explanation is that the redactor of the Gospel of the Ebionites, or an earlier redactor, is responsible for excising the Infancy Narrative. This redactor chose to keep Luke 1:5a to provide a context for John the Baptist. If this were the case then one must ask why would a redactor create

\(^{87}\) See also pages 254-56 for similar types of introductions.
and allow for such an error if the source he was working with showed clearly that John the Baptist's ministry did not commence during “the days of Herod, king of Judea”? To purposely create such a reading had the potential to discredit any movement. It is easier to believe that the redactor unknowingly made the historical error by using a formula he was familiar with.

Of course the first position allows for a coincidence in wording between the introduction to the Gospel of the Ebionites and Luke 1:5a. But if we consider that the phrase ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις was common and simple enough, the redactor would only have needed to make the error of thinking that John the Baptist was active during the time of Herod to create a wording that was the same as another source. In other words, the coincidence in wording between the introduction to the Gospel of the Ebionites and Luke 1:5a is not spectacular.

There are two early witnesses which had knowledge of an edition of Luke’s Gospel which did not have the Infancy Narrative. Marcion’s Evangelion and the Gospel of the Ebionites are these two early external witnesses. What is interesting is that the Christology of Marcion and the Ebionites are diametrically opposite. For Marcion Jesus was a phantom-like creature. For the Ebionites Jesus was fully human. When we consider that the internal evidence points towards the Infancy Narrative being a later addition to Luke’s text, it is possible to surmise that the Evangelion and the Gospel of the Ebionites derive from the same source. It is likely that this source did not have the Infancy Narrative.
The Prologue of Luke

We have discussed the Infancy Narrative but not the prologue (Luke 1:1–4). If there is good evidence that the Infancy Narrative was a later inclusion, what about the prologue?

It is not unheard to have a prologue that covers a two-volume work. An example of affixing a Prologue to the first volume of a two-volume work is Josephus’ Against Apion 1.1-5. Indeed, there is some similarity in how the prologue of Josephus and that of Luke read. In Josephus the prologue addresses the “most excellent Epaphroditus” (κράτιστε ἁνδρῶν Επαφρόδιτε).88 Luke 1:3 addresses the “most excellent Theophilus” (κράτιστε Θεόφιλε). After mentioning that others before him have also written on the subject at hand, Josephus wrote that “I shall further endeavour to set out the various reasons” (πειράσομαι δὲ καὶ τὰς αἰτίας ἀποδοῦναι).89 This recalls Luke 1:1 and 3, where Luke mentions that others “took in hand to draw up a narrative” (ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν) with the statement that he decided “to accurately write an orderly narrative to you, most excellent Theophilus” (ἀκριβῶς καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι, κράτιστε Θεόφιλε).

In addition, the second volume of Against Apion includes a prologue that recap the contents of the first volume, much in the same way as Luke. Compare the opening of each of the second volumes:

Acts 1:1: τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιησάμην περὶ πάντων, οὐ Θεόφιλε, ὃν ἠρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν

In the first book, Theophilus, I wrote about all that Jesus did and taught

from the beginning. (NRSV)

Against Apion 2:1: διὰ μὲν οὖν τοῦ προτέρου βιβλίου, τιμιώτατέ μοι Ἐπαφρόδιτε, περὶ τῆς ἀρχαιότητος ἡμῶν ἐπέδειξα τοῖς Φοινίκων καὶ Χαλδαιῶν καὶ Αἰγυπτίων γράμμασι πιστωσάμενος τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν Ἑλλήνων συγγραφεῖς παρασχόμενος μάρτυρας

In the first volume of this work, my most esteemed Epaphroditus, I demonstrated the antiquity of our race, corroborating my statements by the writings of the Phoenicians, Chaldeans, and Egyptians, besides citing as witnesses numerous Greek historians.90

These similarities do not constitute as proof that Luke wrote his first volume with the prologue and with Acts in mind. This is suggested by a comparison of the endings of Josephus and Luke. Josephus tells his audience that he is writing a second volume. We read:

ἀλλ’ ἐπειδή σύμμετρον ἦδη τὸ βιβλίον εἶληφε μέγεθος, ἐτέραν ποιησάμενος ἁρχὴν τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν εἰς τὸ προκείμενον πειράσομαι προσαποδοῦναι.91

This book, however, having already run to a suitable length, I propose at this point to begin a second, in which I shall endeavour to supply the remaining portion of my subject.92

Luke does not say anything about writing another book.93 As Mikeal Parsons and Richard Pervo write:

Lukas shows no indication of completing a second volume. Lukas does not mark the end of the book with any sort of marker or device to indicate to the reader that the end of volume 1 (Luke) has arrived. Rather, he goes to great lengths to provide a sense of closure to this story about Jesus.94

Furthermore, if we take into consideration that there is no record of Luke and Acts circulating together in one volume during the early stages of the Christian movement,

90 Thackery, Josephus, 292-93.
91 Josephus, Against Apion, 1.320.
92 Josephus, Against Apion, 1.320. Thackery Josephus, 290-91.
94 Mikeal C. Parsons and Richard I. Pervo, Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 62. Parsons and Pervo use the name Lukas to distinguish it from “the implied author from the gospel he produced” (p. 8, n. 31). Parsons and Pervo (p. 63) also mention the ending of Philo’s Life of Moses, vol. 1, (1.334), as having an ending that indicates a second volume will be written.
then it makes sense that volume two (Acts) was not in mind when the Gospel was written. This explains the ending of the Gospel of Luke, which does not mention a coming second volume. It may also explain the time discrepancy of the ascension narratives in Luke 24:50–53 and Acts 1:6–11.

It is possible that Luke wrote his Gospel first, beginning with the ministry of John the Baptist (3:1), and then, after deciding to write Acts, chose to prefix a prologue to the Gospel. There is good reason to believe this may have been the case. That the Prologue had Acts in mind may be seen in the words τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων (“the events that have been fulfilled among us,” Luke 1:1). If one accepts a post 70 CE date for the composition of Luke–Acts then these words seem more applicable to the events of Acts than the Gospel. Of course this does not discount the possibility that the events of the Gospel, particularly those of Luke 3–24, also occurred during Luke’s lifetime, the recipient’s (Theophilus’) lifetime, as well as the lifetime of other unknown recipients.95 Nor should this phrasing exclude the events of the Infancy Narrative, even if it refers to a time that was at least 70 years earlier. However, the stylistic nature of the narrative, with its legendary details, scriptural ideas and literary embellishment, does suggest that Luke struggled to gather a substantial amount of historical data about the birth of Jesus.96

95 Green says that one cannot discount the possibility that Luke had a wider audience in mind when writing his two-volume work. Green, Luke, 44-45. For Nolland the prologue should be understood in direct reference to the Gospel “and only in a derived and secondary sense” to Acts. Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 12.
96 Fitzmyer, Luke I–IX, 305. Fitzmyer writes the following:

Though biographical concern was scarcely responsible for the formation of the rest of the gospel tradition, it eventually emerged in that tradition and is responsible (in part) at least for the accretion to it of stories about the origins of Jesus and his identity. Mark used the baptism scene to identify Jesus to his readers, but he had no interest in Jesus’ origins and does not even mention Joseph’s name. The biographical concern yielded in its turn to curiosity, as is seen in the tradition that eventually developed into the apocryphal
The position taken here, then, is that the Prologue was added at the same time as the Infancy Narrative. These additions, however, should be thought of having occurred with the second edition of the Gospel.

**Conclusion**

The hypothesis that Luke wrote more than one edition of his Gospel is not a new one. It has been a part of biblical scholarship for some time. While the hypothesis of multiple Lukian editions has wide support, there have been different ways in which scholars have approached the subject. Some have spoken of Proto-Luke, others have compared the Western text with the Alexandrian text, while others have placed much attention on the Infancy Narrative. In this chapter it is argued that the Infancy Narrative provides the clearest evidence that a shortened edition of Luke’s Gospel was circulating in the early stages of the Christian era.

There are many good internal reasons to suggest that the Infancy Narrative was written at a later time. These include the lack of influence Luke 1–2 has upon Luke 3–24, the signs that Luke 3 shows of having been the beginning of a book, the similarities between Luke 1–2 and Acts, the position of the genealogy, and the high Christology of the Infancy Narrative.

---

infancy Gospels . . . Yet that biographical concern must not be understood in terms of modern historical biography. Early tradition tended to take to itself legendary details, literary embellishment, folklore, astrology, and the interpretation of the OT. These are known features in much ancient tracing of origins, where the sophisticated modern use of genealogical and historical records was unknown.

See also Brodie, *Birthing*, 284. Brodie says that “Luke’s infancy narrative (Lk 1.5–2.52) reflects the Old Testament both through a web of diverse allusions to the past, and through the systematic use of specific texts.” For Brodie, important to Luke’s Infancy Narrative are “the beginning of the Elijah-Elisha narrative, the beginnings of the two longest judge narratives (concerning Gideon and Samson, Judg 6–8 and 13–17), and the extended beginning of the books of Chronicles.” He continues by stating that “all three kinds of Old Testament beginnings have been filtered and woven together to form the foundation of a new infancy narrative.”
External evidence reveals that two early and opposing Christian movements, which had some knowledge of an edition of Luke’s Gospel, did not have the Infancy Narrative. If we accept as credible the note in the commentary of Ephraem of Syria on Tatian’s *Diatessaron* (see page 249), then the *Diatessaron* is a third external witness.

Importantly, the best example we have of an edition of Luke’s Gospel circulating without the Infancy Narrative, Marcion’s *Evangelion*, also lacked the long readings of the Western non-interpolations. Therefore, when Luke wrote his first edition, he wrote it without the Infancy Narrative and the long variant readings of Luke 22:19b–20; 24:3b, 6a, 12, 36b, 40, 51b and 52a. At a later stage, around the time he was writing Acts, possibly shortly after, Luke added the Infancy Narrative as well as the eight long variant readings. When we add the Gospel of the Ebionites as testimony for a Gospel of Luke that lacked the Infancy Narrative, then we have two contesting Christian movements that knew Luke’s Gospel but not the Infancy Narrative.

Though I have said more than once that Luke wrote his second edition around the time he was writing Acts, on occasion I have been more specific and have suggested that it was shortly after Acts. Some get some indication of this through internal evidence. Acts shows no knowledge of and no reliance upon the Infancy Narrative. The Infancy Narrative also works with themes and ideas found in Acts. The prologue suggests that the events of Acts were in mind despite the fact that the ending of the Gospel does not allude to a second edition and that there is a discrepancy between the times of the ascension in the two volumes. All this evidence is consistent with the internal evidence of Luke 22:19b–20 which suggests that it was written in the light of 1 Corinthians despite Acts showing no knowledge of Paul’s letters.
To conclude, while not much direct evidence survives of Luke’s earlier and shorter edition, this is probably because it was soon superseded by his second edition. There would not have been a long time-span between the writing of the first edition and that of the second edition. Some editions of his first edition circulated and found their way to certain Christian groups, such as the Marcionites and the Ebionites. However, the updated second edition became the popular one, and those people who were unaware that Luke wrote more than one edition believed that the shorter edition was a corrupt one. Because of the small number of first editions copied and the status given to them by the heresiologists, copies of this edition no longer survive. Only through an analysis of the internal evidence and external evidence of Luke’s Gospel and an historical investigation into the writings of the early Church Fathers do we get a glimpse into the editorial process of Luke’s Gospel.
6. Conclusion

In this thesis I have argued that the Western non-interpolations have nothing to do with scribal interference. Rather, the external evidence and internal evidence suggest that it was Luke who was responsible for both the long variant readings and the short variant readings. This calls for a new paradigm in understanding the Western non-interpolations.

When working under the traditional paradigm of scribal interpolation, one is usually forced to show favouritism to one set of evidence over the other. For example, favouring the external evidence has led many to give priority to the long variant readings. Alternatively, many accept the short variant readings based upon the results of the internal evidence. Therefore, the judgement one makes in regards to the external evidence and internal evidence influences the position one takes in regards to the Western non-interpolations.

We recognise that this has usually been the case when we look back over the history of the Western non-interpolations. In chapter two we observed that the more we apply and accept the principles of internal evidence, the more likely we are to give priority to the short variant readings. This was the case for textual critics prior to Westcott and Hort. Even though Constantin von Tischendorf was heavily influenced by the external evidence, he applied the principles of internal evidence more than his predecessors Karl Lachmann and Samuel Prideaux Tregelles did. Allowing internal evidence to have greater influence enabled Tischendorf to give preference to the short variant readings of Luke 24:12, 36b, 40, 51b and 52a in his *editio octava critica maior*. Lachmann and Tregelles were more reluctant to be influenced by the internal evidence,
though Tregelles, who was a little more open to it than Lachmann, did question Luke 24:12 and 40, whereas Lachmann only had some doubt in regards to Luke 24:12.

Westcott and Hort clearly utilised the principles of internal evidence more than their predecessors had. This resulted in the rejection of the long variant readings Luke 22:19b–20; 24:3b, 6a, 12, 36b, 40, 51b and 52a. Opposition to Westcott and Hort was directed towards their methodology. Their critics were concerned about Westcott and Hort’s overreliance on internal evidence. They rightly noted that if one were to favour internal evidence over external evidence, readings traditionally accepted as part of a text could be set aside. In regards to the eight Lukan long variant readings, this was the case. In fact, this is what we see for the major part of the twentieth century.

The wide acceptance of the short variant readings for much of the twentieth century (I give the dates 1901–1971 as boundary markers) was primarily owing to the influence of the internal evidence.

In the earlier years, opposition to Westcott and Hort was based upon the notion that the external evidence carried greater weight. In more recent years (I give the dates 1971 to the present as boundary markers), the same reasoning has been evident.

Preference to the long variant readings is justified primarily by the overwhelming external evidence. For adherents of this position, the type of internal evidence accepted is related to what the external evidence reveals. For example, the United Bible Societies committee entertained the possibility that the long variant reading of Luke 24:52a (προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν) was due to parablepsis. Parablepsis was an option because it explained how a scribe could omit the long variant reading. Suggesting that parablepsis is an option, or even the most preferred conclusion of internal evidence, was influenced
by the United Bible Societies committee’s acceptance of the external evidence. In other words, parablepsis was chosen as a possible explanation for the omission of the long variant reading of Luke 24:52a not because of the strength of this argument, but because it supported the conclusion drawn from the external evidence. However, parablepsis is problematic, as the last letter before the disputed phrase is –ι whereas the last letter of the disputed phrase is –ν.¹ Therefore, what we learn in chapter two is that there is an imbalance in weighting given to one of the two forms of evidence.

In chapters three and four we discover that the external evidence and internal evidence support the proposition that Luke is responsible for both the long variant readings and the short variant readings. In chapter three we learn that the long variant readings are found in the majority of witnesses. Only in a small, select number of witnesses do we find the short variant readings. Also, external evidence shows that there is good reason to suppose that each set of variant readings originally came as a unit. This is based upon two pertinent observations. First, nearly all the witnesses relevant to the study of the Western non-interpolations have either all eight long variant readings or all eight short variant readings. Second, both the long variant readings and short variant readings are of early origin. From the extant witnesses, it appears that both sets of variant readings are from the early second century, at the latest. This means that it is unlikely that there was enough time for each individual variant reading, either long or short, to have arisen independently from one another and from different scribes. However, external evidence does not tell us that Luke wrote both sets of variant readings, though it does seem to suggest that Luke, at the very least, was responsible for

¹ For a discussion of this see chapter four, page 239.
one of the two sets of variant readings. It is not until we get to chapter four in our discussion of internal evidence that we can address the question of Lukan composition.

Chapter four reveals that Luke could have written both sets of variant readings. In fact, we learn that the long variant readings reveal enough of Luke’s characteristic style to suggest that he did compose these readings. Yet, at the same time, a number of the long variant readings exhibit, in certain aspects, an uncharacteristic Lukan style or ideology which appears to come from sources not commonly used in the undisputed parts of Luke’s Gospel (Luke 3–24) and Acts. The best way to resolve this dilemma is to propose that Luke composed the long variant readings at a time after the writing of the Gospel and Acts. This view makes perfectly good sense when we take into account that the flow of the narrative is not damaged by the short variant readings. That is, the narrative still makes perfectly good sense without the long variant readings. It also makes sense of the external evidence, which shows that both sets of variant readings are of very early origin and came as a unit at a very early time.

Chapter five reveals that there is evidence that Luke returned to update his Gospel at a later stage. An analysis of the Infancy Narrative allows for this suggestion. The text of the Infancy Narrative can be seen as a later insertion by the author of Luke 3–24 and Acts, that is, Luke. If we can accept and agree that Luke added the Infancy Narrative at a later time, then it is quite possible that he also added the long variant readings at the same time. Interestingly, Marcion’s Evangelion is an important early witness to another edition of Luke’s Gospel which was circulating at an early time. Significantly, the Evangelion is witness to the short variant readings as well as the absence of the Infancy Narrative. In a similar way, the Gospel of the Ebionites seems to
have begun at Luke 3, showing no knowledge of Luke's Infancy Narrative. There is also some evidence that the Prologue to Luke's Gospel (Luke 1:1–4) may not have been written until Acts had been composed. Therefore, the proposition that Luke re-edited his Gospel at a later time does have some internal and external support.

Based upon the results of this thesis, an historical reconstruction would look something like this. Luke wrote a short edition of his Gospel which included the short variant readings. After several years he wrote Acts and when this was completed he returned to his Gospel, re-editing it by adding the long variant readings and also the Infancy Narrative. He did so after gaining access to other sources, such as 1 Corinthians, the gospels of John and Matthew, and Hellenistic ascension stories. It also appears that some long variant readings were written in light of Acts. The motivation behind Luke re-editing his Gospel was his concern about emerging Christian groups which shared a different Christology to his and possibly were creating some disharmony among the Christian community to whom he was writing. Presumably, these Christian groups used a version of Luke’s Gospel which resembled the first edition. Luke, using his new-found sources, was able to address his concerns by adding to his previous edition. Once Luke’s new Gospel edition was written, it became the predominant edition. It was this edition which was widely produced, superseding the first edition in most places. This explains why the external evidence overwhelmingly testifies to the long variant readings. It also provides a reasonable explanation as to why both the long variant readings and the short variant readings are consistently found in the same witnesses: both sets of variant readings circulated as a collective from the earliest time. It appears that Luke re-edited his Gospel sometime in the late first century, approximately 95-100 CE.
It is appropriate to ask whether there are any other passages outside of the long variant readings, the Infancy Narrative and the Prologue which were not part of the first edition but were added by Luke in his second edition. Admittedly, this is difficult to answer. There may certainly be other passages which Luke added into his second edition. Westcott and Hort listed a number of other Western variant readings and some of these may have been added by Luke when updating his Gospel. There may also be other variant readings outside these Western variant readings. However, even if there are, they will not be as easily discovered. This is because unlike the Western non-interpolations which have survived as a unit up to this day, other variant readings, if they do still exist in our witnesses, appear to have detached themselves from this unit. Finally, the wording of many of the long variant readings suggests a style that is found in other known works, in particular 1 Corinthians, the Gospel of John and Acts. Despite this, the long variant readings show enough Lukan characteristics to suggest that Luke was the author. Therefore, to determine whether Luke added a variant reading at a later stage it is helpful to first identify a variant reading which shows characteristics of a source that is normally dated at a time after that of the Gospel, but still displays Lukan characteristics.

Working within a paradigm that has nothing to do with scribal interpolation encourages one to rethink the Western non-interpolations. It encourages one to revisit the evidence and understand it in a different light. The conclusion of this thesis is that the variant readings that come to make up the Western non-interpolations, both the long variant readings and the short variant readings, are best understood as representing

---

2 Table 2.1 in chapter two, pages 35-36, lists these variant readings.
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