

TEXTUAL AFFINITIES OF PAPYRUS BODMER XIV (P⁷⁵)

by JOHN E. HARTLEY

MR. HARTLEY is a graduate of Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, Kentucky, where he studied under Dr. J. Harold Greenlee, a distinguished authority on New Testament textual criticism. We are glad to publish here an article based on his B.D. thesis which he prepared under Dr. Greenlee's direction.

THE Bodmer Library has published, among other things, the text of a papyrus codex containing the Gospel of Luke and John, with an introduction and facsimiles.¹ This papyrus is designated Papyrus Bodmer XIV for Luke and Papyrus Bodmer XV for John. Professor Kurt Aland of Munster has assigned this codex the official siglum P⁷⁵.

Papyrus Bodmer XIV is the oldest extant copy of Luke; it is dated about 200 A.D.² The text of Luke 8: 5-28; 10: 8-17: 29, and 22: 37-24: 53 is preserved almost entirely, along with fragments of Luke 3: 18-22; 3: 33-4: 2; 4: 34-5: 10.

The purpose of the present article is to summarize the results of a Bachelor of Divinity thesis³ in which the text of Papyrus Bodmer XIV was examined in order to determine its textual affinities.

The first step in analyzing the textual affinities of Bodmer XIV was to collate it against the *Textus Receptus*. Supporting evidence for the variants against the *Textus Receptus* was then gathered from the textual apparatuses of Nestle,⁴ Souter,⁵ Merk,⁶ von

¹ For a concise description of the salient features of P⁷⁵ see Bruce M. Metzger, "The Bodmer Papyrus of Luke and John", *The Expository Times* lxxiii (April 1962), 201-203, and Joseph A. Fitzmyer "Papyrus Bodmer XIV: Some Features of Our Oldest Text of Luke", *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* xxiv (April 1962), 170-179.

² Victor Martin and Rodolphe Kasser (edd.), *Papyrus Bodmer XIV* (Cologne-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961), 10.

³ John E. Hartley, "Textual Affinities of Papyrus Bodmer XIV (P⁷⁵)" (unpublished Bachelor of Divinity thesis, Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, Kentucky, 1965).

⁴ Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland (edd.), *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 23rd ed. (Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1957).

⁵ Alexander Souter (ed.), *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Editio altera (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962).

⁶ Augustinus Merk (ed.), *Novum Testamentum*, Editio octava (Rome: Sumptibus Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1957).

Soden,⁷ and Tischendorf.⁸ In addition, the variants were collated against the texts of P⁴⁵⁹ and Codex Θ.¹⁰ The text-type assigned to each witness was, in general, the same as that found in the tables in Greenlee's *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*¹¹ and Streeter's *Four Gospels*.¹²

The following tables summarize the results of the investigation:

TABLE I

<i>Total Variants</i>	855
Singular	61
Corrected Total	794

TABLE II

<i>Total Support by Text-types</i>	
Alexandrian	443
Western	172
Caesarean	71
Byzantine	6

TABLE III

<i>Text Combinations</i>	
Alexandrian	274
Alexandrian-Caesarean	31
Alexandrian-Western	112
Alexandrian-Caesarean-Western	24
Alexandrian-Caesarean-Byzantine	1
Alexandrian-Western-Byzantine	1
Western	32
Western-Caesarean	2
Western-Byzantine	1
Caesarean	13
Byzantine	3

⁷ Hermann Freiherr von Soden (ed.), *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1913).

⁸ Constantinus Tischendorf (ed.) *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Editio octava critica major, Vol. I (Leipzig: Giesecke and Devrient, 1896).

⁹ Frederic G. Kenyon (ed.), *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible, Fasciculus II: The Gospels and Acts* (London: Emery Walker Limited, 1933).

¹⁰ Gustav Beermann and Caspar René Gregory (edd.), *Die Koridethi Evangelien* (Θ, 038) (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1913).

¹¹ J. Harold Greenlee, *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 117.

¹² Burnett Hillman Streeter, *The Four Gospels* (London: Macmillan and Company Limited, 1951), 108.

The Above Combinations Arranged in Numerical Order

Alexandrian	274
Alexandrian-Western	112
Western	32
Alexandrian-Caesarean	31
Alexandrian-Caesarean-Western	24
Caesarean	13
Byzantine	3
Caesarean-Western	2
Alexandrian-Caesarean-Byzantine	1
Alexandrian-Western-Byzantine	1
Western-Byzantine	1

TABLE IV

Major Supporting Witnesses¹³

B	685
ⲛ	530
L	505
D	358
Bohairic	274
Ⲑ	238
Itala	195
X	192
157	188

Table I shows a total of 855 variants of Papyrus Bodmer XIV against the Textus Receptus.¹⁴ Sixty-one of these are singular, i.e. having no known attestation. This leaves a total of 794 variants for consideration. Tables II and III indicate that only 494 of the 794 variants have sufficient support as to be clearly identified with one or more text-types. Table IV presents the number of times individual manuscripts are in agreement with the variants studied.

Papyrus Bodmer XIV shows close affinity to the Alexandrian text-type (see Table II), since 443 of the 794 variants have good Alexandrian support. This equals 56 per cent of the total variants, or 90 per cent of the variants which are clearly supported by a text-type (see Tables II and III). In addition to this large amount of support in various text combinations, 274 (55 per cent) of the variants are supported by the Alexandrian text-type alone.

¹³ The support of most minuscules cannot be determined accurately because they are generally inadequately cited in textual apparatuses.

¹⁴ The total does not include singular variants due to orthographic peculiarities of the scribe or other obvious mistakes for which one would not expect to find any supporting witnesses.

The Western text-type supports 172 variants. This is equal to 22 per cent of the total variants or 35 per cent of the variants that are supported by at least one text-type. In combination, only 32 have support by the Western text-type alone. The small number of readings with Western support alone, plus the lack of support by P⁷⁵ for significant Western readings,¹⁵ clearly indicates that P⁷⁵ is not a member of the Western text-type.

Caesarean support is found for only 71 of the 794 variants. This is equal to about 9 per cent of the total variants or 14 per cent of the variants supported by at least one text-type. There are only 13 readings attested by the Caesarean text-type alone.

It is therefore evident that the closest affinity of the text of Papyrus Bodmer XIV is with the Alexandrian text-type.¹⁶ This is followed by the Western and Caesarean text-types respectively. When the evidence is considered for combinations of text-types, variants supported by the Alexandrian text-type alone far outnumber all other combinations, with 274 variants. Next are Alexandrian-Western readings, with a total of 112. The support for other combinations is small: Western alone, 32; Alexandrian-Caesarean, 31; Alexandrian-Caesarean-Western, 24; Caesarean alone, 13; Byzantine alone, 3; Caesarean-Western, 2; Alexandrian-Caesarean-Byzantine, 1; Alexandrian-Western-Byzantine, 1; and Western-Byzantine, 1.

Support by individual manuscripts shows that B, T, κ , and L agree with Papyrus Bodmer XIV far more than do any other manuscripts. Codex Vaticanus (B) agrees with Bodmer XIV in 685 out of 794 variants; this is equal to 86 per cent of the total variants. The closeness of this affinity is further emphasized by the fact that while B supports 86 per cent of the total variants, the Alexandrian text-type—to which B is a superior witness—supports only 56 per cent of the total variants.

The support of Codex Borgianus (T) is likewise worth noting. Cod. T is extant for Luke 22: 20-23: 20. For the 83 variants of

¹⁵ Westcott and Hort placed important Western non-interpolations in double brackets in their text, including Luke 22: 19-20; 24: 3, 6, 12, 36, 40, 51, 52. P⁷⁵ agrees with the Alexandrian text by including all of these readings. It also omits the additions of D in Luke 6: 4; 9: 55; and 11: 2. Conversely, other significant instances in which D omits a reading included by P⁷⁵ are Luke 5: 39; 7: 7a; 10: 41-42; 11: 35-36; 12: 19. See Fitzmyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 174-175.

¹⁶ The Alexandrian characteristics are further emphasized by the fact that P⁷⁵ is frequently shorter than the *Textus Receptus* and seldom longer. Of the 855 variants studied, 253 are the result of omissions while only 73 are additions. Some important omissions beside those discussed in footnote 15 are found at Luke 8: 16; 8: 25; 13: 34; 14: 27; 22: 43-44.

Bodmer XIV where Cod. T is extant, T supports Bodmer XIV in 75, or 90 per cent. In these same variants B supports P⁷⁵ 74 times, \aleph 60 times, and L 56 times. In other words, where T is extant in Luke, T supports P⁷⁵ as frequently as B. Thus the closest affinity of P⁷⁵ may be with T as much as or possibly slightly more than with B.

Following Codices B and T, Codex Sinaiticus (\aleph) shows close affinity with Bodmer XIV by supporting 530 of the 794 variants (67 per cent). Next is Codex Regius (L) which supports 505 of the 794 variants (64 per cent).

Interestingly, William J. Woodruff has found that the major supporting manuscript for Papyrus Bodmer XV (P⁷⁵ in John) is B, followed by L, P⁶⁶, and \aleph .¹⁷ This concurs with the results of the present study.

Codex Bezae (D) is the major Western witness in support of Bodmer XIV. Of the 794 variants D reads 385, or 48 per cent. The major Byzantine witness in support of Bodmer XIV is Codex Alexandrinus (A), which reads 174 of the 794 variants, or 22 per cent.

The major Caesarean witness in support of Bodmer XIV is P⁴⁵. Although P⁴⁵ is more fragmentary in Luke than P⁷⁵, they can be compared at 217 places where P⁷⁵ varies from the Textus Receptus. Here P⁴⁵ agrees with P⁷⁵ 122 times, or 56 per cent. This is understandable, for Frederic G. Kenyon found that P⁴⁵ has its closest affinities to B and L in Luke. He also states that P⁴⁵ is approximately equidistant between the Neutral (Alexandrian) and the Western families, closer to the former and lacking the peculiar readings characteristic of the latter.¹⁸

Many manuscripts may support more of P⁷⁵'s readings in Luke than the tables indicate, for often they are not consistently cited by the major critical editions. An example of this is a comparison of the times Θ is cited to support P⁷⁵'s variants against the Textus Receptus with the number of times Θ actually supports these same variants as determined by a collation of the printed text of Θ with these variants. Codex Θ agrees with P⁷⁵ 238 times; however, only 98 of these were found in the textual apparatuses used in this study. This demonstrates the fact that the textual affinity of many witnesses is very inaccurately indicated by their citations in critical apparatuses.

¹⁷ William J. Woodruff, "Textual Affinities of Papyrus Bodmer XV (P⁷⁵)" (unpublished Master of Theology thesis, Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, Kentucky, 1964), p. 120.

¹⁸ Kenyon, *op. cit.*, p. xvi.

Among the versions, the Bohairic, Itala, and Sahidic provide the greatest agreement with Bodmer XIV. The best support among the church fathers comes from Origen, Basil, and Eusebius.

The conclusions of the present study are as follows:

1. Papyrus Bodmer XIV is a strong Alexandrian witness.
2. Papyrus Bodmer XIV agrees most frequently with Codex Vaticanus (B), and with equal proportionate frequency with Codex Borgianus (T).

3. Codex Sinaiticus (S) and Codex Regius (L) also provide good support for Papyrus Bodmer XIV.

Wilmore, Kentucky.