

# THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

Wilbur N. Pickering<sup>1</sup>

Once upon a time I was led to believe that von Soden's work was basically reliable. This was important because his work is basic to both the Hodges-Farstad and Robinson-Pierpont editions of the Majority Text. However, the *Text und Textwert* (TuT)<sup>2</sup> collations demonstrate objectively that not infrequently Soden is seriously off the mark. Maurice Robinson's collations of the *Pericope Adulterae*<sup>3</sup> demonstrate objectively that Soden is very seriously wrong there. With reference to Soden's treatment of codex 223 K.W. Clark says, "Furthermore, our collation has revealed sixty-two errors in 229 readings treated by von Soden."<sup>4</sup> 27% in error (62 ÷ 229) is altogether too much, and what is true of MS 223 may be true of other MSS as well. Hoskier was not entirely mistaken in his evaluation. For myself, I must reconsider the evidence for the whole NT.

Herewith a new Greek Text and critical apparatus for the Pastoral Epistles. As explained elsewhere, I now use  $\mathfrak{f}^{35}$  instead of  $\mathbf{K}^r$ . I further insist that  $\mathfrak{f}^{35}$  should be factored out of the broad Byzantine tradition and be presented separately, because I now believe that  $\mathfrak{f}^{35}$  is earlier than  $\mathbf{K}^x$ , etc., being the base from which the others departed.<sup>5</sup>

In the statements of evidence I have included the percentage of manuscript attestation for each variant within either ( ) or [ ]. I have used ( ) for the evidence taken from TuT, which I take to be reasonably precise. For the variant sets that are not covered there I had to revert to von Soden<sup>6</sup> and the apparatus of N-A<sup>27</sup>, supplementing from other sources where possible (Scrivener and Tischendorf)—the percentages offered, I have used [ ] for these; are extrapolations based on a comparison of these sources. I have determined the reading of  $\mathfrak{f}^{35}$  on the basis of cursives 18, 35, 201, 204 and 2723. For 201 I used Scrivener's collation; all the rest I collated myself. I hope to acquire and collate copies of a number of further representatives of the family, so as to identify its profile with greater confidence.

I venture to predict, if complete collations ever become available, that for any non-Byzantine variants listed with 5 to 1% support (in my apparatus) the margin of error should not exceed  $\pm 1\%$ ; for non-Byzantine variants listed with 10 to 6% support the margin of error should hardly exceed  $\pm 3\%$ ; where there is some division among the Byzantine witnesses the margin of error should rarely exceed  $\pm 15\%$ , but I do not have the same level of confidence here as in the Generals (no ECM).

I have included six published editions in the apparatus—RP, HF, OC, TR, CP, NU.<sup>7</sup> I wish to emphasize that in the Pastoral Epistles we have been well served by the Majority Text (HF, RP, OC) and the *Textus Receptus*.<sup>8</sup> Their variations make little difference in the meaning. Even the eclectic text (NU), easily the worst of them, offers few real problems (but see the introduction to each book), most of its variants having to do with style. So how do I justify this new text and apparatus? Well, just the critical apparatus justifies the edition, being by far the most informative with reference to the large Byzantine majority and to  $\mathfrak{f}^{35}$ , which is both ancient and independent of the rest of the tradition. Also, the percentages enable the reader to see at a glance the actual support for a given variant. But more important, from my point of view, I have retrieved from the 'attic' of neglect a fair number of readings that are probably original. I mention these in the introduction to each book.

<sup>1</sup> Both the Text and the notes are the responsibility of Wilbur N. Pickering, ThM PhD.

<sup>2</sup> *Text und Textwert der Griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Ed. Kurt Aland, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1991), volume 19. They collated some 750 MSS for a selected number of variant sets—9 such sets in 1 Timothy, 5 in 2 Timothy, 3 in Titus and 4 in Philemon.

<sup>3</sup> So far as I know, this material has not yet been published; Robinson gave me the opportunity of working with a private copy of his collation pages.

<sup>4</sup> *Eight American Praxapostoloi* (Kenneth W. Clark, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1941, p. 12).

<sup>5</sup> "The Dating of  $\mathbf{K}^r$  (alias  $\mathfrak{f}^{35}$ , nee  $\mathfrak{f}^{18}$ ) Revisited", "When is a Recension?", "Early Uncial Support for  $\mathfrak{f}^{35}$  in the General Epistles" and "The Divine Preservation of the Original Wording of the General Epistles". (See also "Concerning the Text of the *Pericope Adulterae*" and "My Pilgrimage toward  $\mathfrak{f}^{35} = \mathbf{K}^r = \mathbf{M}^7$  in the PA and  $\mathbf{M}^c$  in Revelation".)

<sup>6</sup> *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt* (Hermann von Soden, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1911-1913).

<sup>7</sup> RP = Robinson-Pierpont (1991), HF = Hodges-Farstad, OC = the Greek Text of the Greek Orthodox Church (also used by other Orthodox Churches), TR = *Textus Receptus*, CP = Complutensian Polyglot, NU = N-A<sup>26</sup>/UBS<sup>3</sup> (N-A<sup>27</sup>/UBS<sup>4</sup> offer changes in the critical apparatus, not in the text; the text is still that of N-A<sup>26</sup>/UBS<sup>3</sup>).

<sup>8</sup> Throughout the four books my text differs from RP and OC 23 times, from HF 24 times, from TR 29 times, from CP 61 times and from NU 144 times.

A word of explanation about my use of accents and punctuation: 1) since the accents are unnecessary, for the most part (especially for silent reading) [and presumably were not part of the Original], I use them only with monosyllabic words to avoid ambiguity; 2) on the other hand, aspiration or 'rough breathing' is phonemic, having the value of a letter, and needs to be written (but not the so-called 'smooth breathing'); 3) all punctuation marks are as in English, except that in place of the semi-colon I use the raised dot (so as not to confuse those who would take it as a question mark). Also, I have arbitrarily included the movable-*nu* in the Text, as well as the full form of οὐρανός, at all points.<sup>1</sup>

As an arbitrary decision, I have limited the citation of individual MSS to those dated to the 5<sup>th</sup> century or earlier (with the exception of *ƒ*<sup>35</sup> representatives, as noted below); the same holds for the sporadic citation of early versions. Also, I arbitrarily set at least 10% as the threshold for inclusion in the apparatus (where the six printed editions agree). I use *re//* to indicate that the reading is supported by all other witnesses, and printed editions (of the six included in the apparatus), compared to the other reading.

The Greek font used is Bwgrkl and may be downloaded free from <http://www.bibleworks.com/fonts.html> .

Dr. Wilbur Pickering  
Brasília, 12-29-2005

---

<sup>1</sup> Anyone who wishes to apply a numeric code to this text should keep that in mind.