APPENDIX D
Conflation or Confusion?¹

Conflation is the theory that when a scribe or editor had before him two or more manuscripts that at a given point had different readings that might “properly” be combined to produce a more “full” reading, he might do so. The result would be called “conflation” according to Hort.

When evaluating a putative example of conflation, due consideration should be given to the possibility that the differences may have come about because of the accidental (or intentional) omission of different parts of a “complete” original reading.

The list that follows comprises possible examples of conflation found to date from all sources. (There may be quite a few more discoverable by a sharp eye.) These are presented to the reader for his own evaluation and decision. They range from cases of obvious conflation and obvious omission to cases of sheer confusion where it is highly doubtful that the mechanism “conflation” was at work. Accordingly, the examples are classified into two sets of two groups each:

1. True, or simple “conflation”:
   a) Simple addition or telescoping of readings, or omission;
   b) Addition plus simple coupling links, or omission.
2. Marginal “conflation” or confusion:
   a) Complicated by substitution, transposition or moderate internal changes, or omissions;
   b) Substantial differences—“conflation” dubious.

The full extent of the confusion that exists will not be apparent to the reader since for most of the examples there are one or more further variations not included here because they are not relevant to the possible instances of conflation.

The symbols in the critical apparatus are essentially those in general use. The abbreviations pc, al, pm and rell have the same meanings as in the Nestle editions. I have represented f¹ and f¹³ by the numbers only. Only one text-type symbol is used, Byz, which stands for the “Byzantine” manuscript tradition. I have used parentheses in two ways—enclosing a papyrus they mean there is doubt as to what reading is exhibited, enclosing any other kinds of witnesses they mean the witness(es) has a slight variation from the reading of the witness(es) not so enclosed. The reader cannot fail to note that the completeness of the apparatus varies considerably from example to example—this is a reflection of the sources that were available to me.

Group 1. a) Simple addition or telescoping of readings, or omission.

1. Matt. 3:12 ἀυτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην Byz Ν C K ∆ 0233 1 pm lat cop
   ἐνίτω τῆς ἀποθήκης αὐτοῦ L 892 αl b ff g sy th
   αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην αὐτοῦ B W pc

   (This would appear to be a conflation on the part of B and W. Since Hort did not follow B here, he must have been of a similar opinion.)

2. Matt. 16:11 προσέχειν Byz D W X pm sy th
   προσέχετε D Θ 13 124 pc lat sy
   προσέχετε δε ∆ B C L 1 pc cop
   προσέχειν προσέχετε δε C 33 237 al q

   (An evident conflation on the part of some later MSS, building on the “Byzantine” and “Alexandrian/ Western” readings.)

¹ The title and basic format for this appendix I owe to William G. Pierpont and use with his permission. I have, however, almost tripled the number of examples and the editorial comments are mine. The principal sources for the added examples are H.A. Sturz (The Byzantine Text-Type) and Maurice A. Robinson (unpublished paper). Peter J. Johnston has contributed significantly to the statements of evidence.
3. Matt. 17:25 ὁτε εἰσῆλθεν ὁ Βυζαντινός Β 1
εἰσῆλθον ὁ Ν
εἰσῆλθον τον Θ 13
εἰσῆλθοντι ο Β

(Might this be a conflation on the part of Ν, with “Caesarean” and “Western” embellishments?)

4. Matt. 20:21 δὲ δὲν σου . . . εὐωνυμων Β 1 pc lat
δὲν σου . . . εὐωνυμων σου Ν B
δὲν σου . . . εὐωνυμων σου Byz C L N W Z 085 13 pm syρ,h

(Is this a “Byzantine” conflation of the “Western” and “Alexandrian” readings, or are the latter independent simplifications of the former? It should be noted that Ν and B are alone in omitting the first σου.)

5. Matt. 23:25 ἀκρασίας Ν B D L Α Π 1 13 33 al it syρ
ἀδίκιας Byz C Κ Γ pm f syρ

(It seems clear that Codex W here conflates the “Alexandrian” and “Byzantine” readings.)

6. Matt. 24:38 ἐκεῖναις πρὸ D 253 pc itρ pc pm syρ,ρ αλ
ταῖς πρὸ Byz Ν L W θ 067 0133 1 19 pl pm vg bo

(This would appear to be a conflation on the part of B. Since Hort used brackets here, he must have tended to a similar opinion.)

7. Matt. 26:22 εἰς εκαστὸς Ν B C L Z 0281 33 pc sa
εἰς εκαστὸς αὐτῶν Byz Πρ,64(P45) A W Γ Δ Π Σ ψ 074 1 19 pl pm syρ

(This would appear to be a “Western” conflation of “Byzantine” and “Alexandrian” elements. A recent meeting of papyrologists dated Pρ in the first century [!] and confirmed that it supports the Byzantine reading.)

8. Matt. 26:36 οὐ Byz B E F G 067 pm
οὐ Δ K L W Δ Θ 074 1 69 al
οὐ αὐτὸν Pρ53 Α pc

(Before the advent of Pρ53 presumably all would agree that A has here conflated the “Byzantine” and “Western” readings. Although the papyrus antedates any extant witness to these two “text-types”, I suggest that the proper conclusion is that the conflation is a very early one.)

9. Matt. 26:70 αὐτῶν K al
παντὸν Byz A C W Γ Δ 0133 1 pm

(Shall we say that the “Byzantine” text has a conflation based on a handful of late MSS on the one hand and the combined “Alexandrian-Western” text-types on the other? It seems more probable that K etc. have simplified the “Byzantine” reading, an easy instance of homoioiteleuton. In that event the “Alexandrian-Western” reading is best explained as a separate simplification of the original reading, a bit of parablepsis.)

10. Matt. 27:55 ἐκδικεῖ Byz B C pl lat
καὶ D 56 aur d
ἐκδικεῖ καὶ Byz F K L Π 13 pm syρ,ρ αλ
καὶ Byz (syρ)
(Here we seem to have varied witnesses conflating the “Byzantine-Alexandrian” and “Western” readings.)

11. Mark 1:4  ο βαπτιζων εν τη ερηµω  B 33 pc
βαπτιζων εν τη ερηµω και  Byz A K P W Π 1 13 pl f sy\(^{h,pal}\)
ο βαπτιζων εν τη ερηµω και  L Δ pc bo
(εν τη ερηµω βαπτιζων και)  D Θ pc lat sy\(^{p}\)

(Here we have “Alexandrian” witnesses conflating the “Byzantine” reading and that of Codex B. Although there has been no accretion of new evidence, UBS\(^{3}\) seems to espouse this obvious conflation whereas UBS\(^{1}\) did not.)

12. Mark 1:28  ευθυς  Byz A D E G H K M U V Y Γ Δ Π Σ Φ Ω 0104 pm lat sy\(^{p,h}\)
πανταχου  W 579 pc b e q
ευθυς πανταχου  Ν Β C L 0133 13 pc
(omit)  Ν Θ 1 al c ff\(^{1}\) r\(^{1}\) sy\(^{p}\)

(Is this not an obvious “Alexandrian” conflation? Yet the UBS text adopts it without giving any indication that there are other readings.)

13. Mark 1:40  κυριε  C L W Θ pc e c ff sy\(^{pal}\)
οτι  Byz Ν A pl sy\(^{h}\)
κυριε οτι  B

(This appears to be a clear conflation on the part of B. Since Hort did not follow B here he presumably tended to the same opinion.)

14. Mark 5:42  εξεστησαν  Byz P\(^{46}\) A K W Θ Π 0133 1 13 pl e sy\(^{p,h}\)
eξεστησαν ευθυς  Ν Β C L Λ 33 892 pc bo
eξεστησαν παντες  D it sa

(If the producers of the “Syrian” text followed a policy of conflation, why did they neglect this fine opportunity? Note that Hort’s “late Syrian” reading now has the earliest attestation.)

15. John 4:29  παντα οσα  Byz P\(^{66,75}\) A D L W Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ 086 1 13 pl lat sy\(^{h}\)
παντα α  Ν Β C e a d q sy\(^{p}\) cop
παντα οσα α  579

(This is an obvious conflation in one late MS. Note the strong early attestation for the “Byzantine” reading.)

16. John 5:37  εκεινος  μεμαρτυρηκεν  P\(^{75}\) Ν B L W 213 pc a ff\(^{p}\) j sy\(^{p,h}\)
αυτος μεμαρτυρηκεν  Byz P\(^{66}\) A Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ 063 1 13 pl lat
εκεινος αυτος μαρτυρει  D a b c l q

(This appears to be a case of “Western” conflation. Note that Hort’s “late Syrian” reading now has very early attestation.)

17. John 7:39  πνευµα  Byz P\(^{66,75}\) K N T Θ Π Ψ pc bo
πνευµα αγιον  Byz P\(^{66}\) L W X Γ Δ Λ 0105 1 13 pl
πνευµα δεδοµενον  lat sy\(^{p,h}\) Eusebius
πνευµα αγιον δεδοµενον  B 053 pc e q sy\(^{pal,h}\)
(το πνευµα το αγιον επ αυτοις)  D d f

(It would appear that B here conflates “Byzantine” and “Western” elements. Since Hort did not follow B here he must have tended to the same opinion. Note that Hort’s “late Syrian” reading now has very early attestation.)
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18. John 10:19

σχισµα ουν

σχισµα παλιν

σχισµα ουν παλιν

D 1241 sy²

P⁴⁵ / P⁷⁵ / B L W X 33 pc lat sy² sa

Byz P⁶⁶ A Γ Δ Θ Π Ψ 1 13 565 pl sy²

(A century ago this could have been interpreted as a “Syrian” conflation, but now we can scarcely say that P⁶⁶ conflated P⁷⁵ and D. The possibility must at least be considered that Hort’s “late Syrian” reading is in fact the earliest, the original.)

19. John 10:31

εβαστασαν

εβαστασαν ουν

εβαστασαν παλιν

εβαστασαν ουν παλιν

D 28 1780 pc lat sy² bo

(P⁷⁵) B L W 33 pc sy²

Byz P⁶⁶ A X Π Ψ 1 13 565 pl f sy²

(A century ago this could have been interpreted as a “Syrian” conflation, but now we can hardly say that P⁶⁶ conflated P⁷⁵ and D. The possibility must be entertained that Hort’s “late Syrian” reading is in fact the earliest. All three words end in nu, so both [or all three] shorter readings could be the result of homoioteleuton.)

20. John 11:22

αλλα

και 1780

αλλα και

B L pc lat

W 1010

P⁶⁶,66 Byz P⁴⁵,66,66 A C D L W Θ Ψ Ω 0250 13 pl lat sy²

(It seems obvious that the “Byzantine” reading cannot be a conflation of the “Alexandrian” reading and that of one late MS. 1780 has dropped part of the “Byzantine” reading. I suggest the same explanation for the “Alexandrian” reading. Observe that the “Byzantine” reading now has very early attestation.)

21. John 12:9

οχλος πολυς

ο χλος πολυς

ο οχλος ο πολυς

B L pc lat

W 1010

P⁶⁶c

Conflation or confusion? Did P⁶⁶c conflate B and W? Or should we say that P⁶⁶c has the original reading that everyone else [including P⁶⁶!] simplified? Note that Hort’s “late Syrian” reading now has the earliest attestation, with a vengeance!

22. John 14:14

τουτο

εγω Byz

A B L Ψ 065 1 33 pl (cop)

Byz P⁶⁶ Θ D E G Ω X Γ Δ Π pm it sy²

(This is an instructive conflation on the part of P⁶⁶c. Note the early attestation for the “Byzantine” reading.)

23. John 16:4

αυτων μνηµονευητε

μνηµονευητε αυτων

μνηµονευητε

Ν° L 13 al lat

Byz K Γ Δ Ψ 054 1 pm fr² sy²

A B Θ Π 33 al sy²

D a sy² cop

(This would appear to be a not very felicitous conflation on the part of B, etc.)

24. John 17:23

και γινωσκη Byz

A B Ψ 054 13 pm f q sy²

(Conflation or confusion? Did P⁶⁶ conflated B and W? Or should we say that P⁶⁶c has the original reading that everyone else [including P⁶⁶!] simplified? Note that Hort’s “late Syrian” reading now has the earliest attestation, with a vengeance!)
25. John 18:40  
παλιν  
P⁵⁶  B L W X 0109 pc  
pantes  
G K N Ψ 1 13 33 al it sy⁶, pal cop  
palin pantes  
Byz (P⁶) A Γ Δ Θ 054 0250 pm vg sy⁵  
pantes  
D

(This could be a “Byzantine” conflation, but it could just as easily be the case that the two shorter readings are independent simplifications of the longer one; homoioarcton perhaps. Is the “Western” reading a conflation or simply a reversal of the word order?)

26. Acts 7:16  
tou  
Συχεµ  
Byz P⁷⁴ D Ψ 049 056 0142 pm lat  
ev  
Συχεµ  
B C al cop  
tou ev  
Συχεµ  
A E

(This is presumably a conflation of the “Byzantine” and “Alexandrian” readings.)

27. Acts 10:48  
tou  
κυριου  
Byz H L P 049 056 pm  
Ιησου Χριστου  
P⁷⁴  A B E 33 al cop  
tou  
κυριου  
Ιησου  
Lect. al  
tou  
κυριου  
Ιησου Χριστου  
D 81 d p

(This would appear to be a “Western” conflation of the “Byzantine” and “Alexandrian” readings.)

28. Acts 14:15  
ton  
θεον  
ζοντα  
D pc  
θεον  
τον  
ζοντα  
A  
ton  
θεον  
τον  
ζοντα  
Byz P⁴⁵ H L P pm  
θεον  
ζοντα  
P⁷⁴ B C E 33 al

(A century ago this might have been interpreted as a “Syrian” conflation, but now we can hardly say that P⁴⁵ conflated Aleph and D. Why not say that Hort’s “late Syrian” reading is not only the earliest but also the best? I would say that the “Alexandrian” reading is decidedly inferior in terms of the discourse structure of the text, the sort of thing that would appeal to scribes without native speaker control of Koine Greek.)

tois  
προφηταις  
Byz Ν A pm syr bo  
en  
tois  
προφηταις  
B C D al  
tois en  
tois  
προφηταις  
E

(This seems to be a clear conflation on the part of Aleph.)

touto  
Byz pm  
ατοπον  
A B C E 33 al lat  
touto  
ατοπον  
Ψ 69 614 al syr bo

(This would appear to be a conflation of the “Byzantine” and “Alexandrian” readings.)

31. 1 Cor. 7:34  
η αγαµος και η παρθενος  
P¹⁵ B P al cop  
και η παρθενος η αγαµος  
Byz D F G K L Ψ pm it syr  
η αγαµος και η παρθενος η αγαµος  
P⁵⁶  A 33 pc

(Although unquestionably early, this really does appear to be a conflation on the part of P⁶, etc.)

32. Phil. 1:18  
πλην  
Byz D E K L pm  
oτι  
B sy⁶  
πλην oτi  
P⁶  A F G P 048 33 pc sa

---

Modern editors have tended to regard the long reading as original, but now that we know that the “Byzantine” text goes back at least to the second century we should reconsider the possibility that P₄₆, etc. have a conflation. In the example above they have demonstrated this ability.

33. Col. 2:2  

του Θεου και Πατρος και του Χριστου  

Byz Dᵇ K pm Lect

του Θεου και Πατρος και του Χριστου  

Νᵇ, ψ pc sy

του Θεου Πατρος και του Χριστου  

0208 1908 sy

του Θεου Πατρος του Χριστου  

A C itᵃ saᵃᵇ bo

του Θεου Πατρος  

Χριστου  

Ν 048

του Θεου  

Χριστου  

P₄₆ B (alone of MSS)

(least seven further variations)

(The editors of the UBS text make the reading of B their first choice, and that of the “Byzantine” text their last choice! They must consider the “Byzantine” reading to be a prime illustration of “conflation”, but how did it come about? Did Syrian editors borrow the two καις from ψ and 0208 respectively, or did these drop parts of the longer reading? Was Πατρος borrowed from Aleph, A, C or did these drop still other parts of the original? Presumably the UBS editors feel that H omitted part of B, but B could easily show the result of omission also, a not very difficult case of homoioteleuton [four words end in -ου]. I submit that the reading which best explains the rise of all the others is precisely that of the “Byzantine” text.)

34. Col. 3:17  

Κυριου Ιησου  

Byz P₄₆ B (ψ) pl

Ιησου Χριστου  

A C D F G

Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου  

Dᵇ 365 1175 pc

(Aleph conflates, presumably. Note the early attestation for the “Byzantine” reading.)

35. 1 Thess. 5:27  

τοις αγιοις  

103 1984 1985

τοις αδελφοις  

Β D E F G pc d e f g sa

τοις αγιοις αδελφοις  

Byz (P₄₆) Νᶜ A K L P ψ pl it syr bo

(The “Byzantine” reading can scarcely be a conflation based on 103, so 103 must have a simplification of the “Byzantine” reading. I suggest the same explanation for the “Alexandrian-Western” reading. Both short forms could easily be the result of homoioteleuton [3 x -οις].)

36. Heb 7:22  

και  

920

κρειττονος  

Byz P₄₆ Νᶜ A C D E K L P ψ pl lat syr cop

και κρειττονος  

Ν B C 33 pc

(It is clear that B could not have a conflation based on 920, unless it is the sole survivor of a very early tradition, but neither may we say that P₄₆ is simplifying B. Note that here it is the “Alexandrian” text that has the “fuller, smoother” reading.)

37. Rev. 6:1/2  

και ιδε  

και ιδου  

Mᵃᵇ,ept

και ειδον και ιδου  

Mᶜᵈ,ept (A C)

και ιδε και ειδον και ιδου  

Ν (alone)

(Here Aleph conflates the readings of two groups of minuscule MSS. It follows that though these MSS are much later in date than Aleph they reflect an earlier form of the text. In 6:3/4 Aleph repeats this reading in a clear case of assimilation. The statement of evidence in examples 37, 38, 39 and 49 is taken from The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text [Thomas Nelson, 1982].)

38. Rev. 6:5  

και ιδε  

και ιδου  

Mᵃᵇ

και ειδον και ιδου  

Mᶜᵈ,ept (A)

και ιδε και ειδον και ιδου  

Ν (alone)

(Aleph repeats the conflation.)
39. Rev. 6:7/8 καὶ ἰδέ· καὶ ἰδοὺ· καὶ ἰδον· καὶ ἰδοῦ· καὶ ιδέ· καὶ ιδον· καὶ ιδοῦ· καὶ ιδε· καὶ ιδον· καὶ ιδοῦ· καὶ ιδε· καὶ ιδον· καὶ ιδοῦ· *M* a,b,ept
καὶ ειδον· καὶ ιδου· Α (C) Ν (alone)

(Aleph repeats the conflation again.)

**Group 1.** b) Addition plus simple coupling links, or omission.

40. Matt. 4:3 αὐτῷ ὁ πειράζων εἶπεν **Byz** C L P Θ 0233 pm k syʰ
ο πειράζων εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ν Β W 1 13 33 al vg syʰ bo
αὐτῷ ὁ πειράζων καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ D it sy c,s,pal

(Here we presumably have a “Western” conflation of the “Byzantine” and “Alexandrian” readings.)

41. Matt. 9:18 εἰς ἐλθὼν/εἰσελθὼν **Byz** Ν 2 C D E K M N S V W X Θ 1 33 pm d f
προσελθὼν Ν 69 157 pc q syʰ
eis proselthon Ν 1 B lat pc
tis proselthon L 13 al k
tis elthon Γ al

(Codex B appears to have a conflation, an opinion with which the editors of the UBS texts evidently concur.)

42. Matt. 27:41 καὶ πρεσβυτέρων καὶ λειψανοῦντες **Byz** A B L Θ 1 13 pl 33 al itªl vg sa
καὶ πρεσβυτέρων καὶ λειψανοῦντες A B L Θ 1 13 pl 33 al itªl vg sa
καὶ πρεσβυτέρων καὶ λειψανοῦντες Α C D E Ψ 063 1 13 pl itªl vg s,pal Diat.

(Here, at last, we seem to have a clear “Byzantine” conflation, albeit dating from the second century. The whole clause in the “Byzantine” text reads like this: οι αρχιερεις εµπαιξοντες μετα των γραµµατεων και πρεσβυτερων και φαρισαιων ελεγον. It really seems to be a bit too full; so much so that editors trained at Alexandria might well have been tempted to improve the style by shortening it. Might the “Western” reading be the result of parablepsis? In fact, both short forms could easily be the result of homoioteleuton.)

43. Luke 24:53 αἰνοῦντες καὶ εὐλογοῦντες **Byz** Ν B C L cop sy s,pal
αἰνοῦντες καὶ εὐλογοῦντες A B C D E Ψ 063 1 13 pl itªl vg s,pal Diat.

(This is one of Hort’s eight “Syrian conflations”. According to Hort’s own judgment Codex D has omitted 329 words from the genuine text of the last three chapters of Luke, plus adding 173, substituting 146, and transposing 243. Since the producer of D was on something of an omitting spree in these chapters, it is not unreasonable to suggest that D has simply dropped “and blessing” from the original reading, an easy instance of homoioteleuton. Nor is it hard to imagine that editors trained at Alexandria might reduce the longer reading to the proportions exhibited by the “Alexandrian” text-type. Note that once more the “Byzantine” reading has second century attestation.)

44. Acts 20:28 του κυριου του κυριου και θεου του κυριου και θεου **Byz** L P pm 049

(Here we have a fine candidate for a “Byzantine” conflation, provided that the opposite interpretation is rejected. The reading of A could easily be a case of homoioteleuton and that of B the result of parablepsis or stylistic revision.)
45. Acts 25:6  πλείους η δέκα  Byz Ψ pm
          οκτώ η δέκα  2147 pc syr
          πλείους οκτώ η δέκα  E al
          ου πλείους οκτώ η δέκα  (P74 ℅) A B C 33 pc lat bo

(Is this an “Alexandrian” conflation?)

46. 2 Cor. 11:3  της απλοτηπος  Byz Χ K P Ψ 0121 0243 pm vg syr
               της αγνοτηπος  five early fathers
               της απλοτηπος και της αγνοτηπος  P46 ℅ B G 33 pc it cop
               της αγνοτηπος και της απλοτηπος  D

(It appears that the “Alexandrian” and “Western” texts have separate conflations. From their use of brackets we may conclude that the editors of both the Nestle and UBS editions recognize the possibility.)

47. Eph. 2:5  τοις παραπτωµασιν  Byz Χ A D 2 pl cop
              ταις αµαρτιας  D (G) lat
              τοις παραπτωµασιν και ταις αµαρτιας  Ψ
              εν τοις παραπτωµασιν και ταις επιθυµιαις  B

(Here we have separate conflations on the part of Ψ and B. Since Hort did not follow B here he must have tended to the same opinion. The editors of the Nestle and UBS editions evidently agree as well.)

48. Col. 1:12  τω καλεσαντι  D G 33 pc it sa
                τω       ικανωσαντι  Byz P46.(61) ℅ A C D E K L P Ψ pl syr bo
                τω καλεσαντι και ικανωσαντι  B

(This obvious conflation on the part of Codex B was acknowledged by Hort [p. 240], a judgment with which the editors of the Nestle and UBS editions are in full agreement.)

49. Rev. 17:4  της πορνειας αυτης  M b,c,d,e A
                της γης  M a
                της πορνειας αυτης και της γης  ℅ (alone)

(This would appear to be a clear conflation on the part of Aleph.)

Before going on to examples where the required phenomena for possible conflations are less clear, it will be well to pause and see what instruction may be gained from these clear possible examples. Ignoring probabilities for the moment, I will tabulate the “possible” conflations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western text-type</td>
<td>4 7, 16, 27, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codex D</td>
<td>3 3, 25, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandrian text-type</td>
<td>8 11, 12, 23, 31, 32, 36, 45, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codex B</td>
<td>7 1, 6, 13, 17, 41, 47, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codex Aleph</td>
<td>7 3, 29, 34, 37, 38, 39, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantine text-type</td>
<td>13 4, 9, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 28, 33, 35, 42, 43, 44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the Western “conflations” has early papyrus support, and I believe there is general agreement among scholars that all seven of the “Western” instances are in fact conflations (or secondary readings). None of the B or Aleph “conflations” has early papyrus support. I believe there
is general agreement among scholars that all 14 B and Aleph instances are in fact conflations (or secondary readings). (Since Hort was evidently aware of these conflations in B, it is difficult to understand how he could affirm that to the best of his knowledge there were no “Neutral” conflations.) Three of the “Alexandrian” instances (31, 32, 46) have early papyrus attestation. Modern editors have tended to include all eight “Alexandrian” readings in their texts, although some express doubt about 36 and 46. One cannot help but suspect that they are still wearing Hortian blinders, to use Colwell’s phrase.

Six of the “Byzantine” instances (18, 19, 20, 25?, 28, 35?) now have early papyrus attestation (another two are attested by the Diatessaron). It follows that although modern editors continue to reject these readings, it can no longer be argued that they are late. If they are conflations then they happened in the second century. It is significant that in fully 35 of the 49 examples given, the “Byzantine” text is possibly being conflated by other witnesses, not vice versa.

It is evident that all “text-types” have possible conflations and that “Western” and “Alexandrian” witnesses have actual conflations. I would argue that all the “Byzantine” instances are original, but in any case it should be clear that “conflation” may not responsibly be used to argue for a late “Byzantine” text-type. On the contrary, examples like 8, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22, 31, 32, 36, 42, 43, and 46 might reasonably be used to argue for a rather early “Byzantine” text-type.

**Group 2. a) Complicated by substitution, transposition, moderate internal changes, or omissions.**

50. Matt. 7:10  η και ιχθυν αιτησει  Ν B C (1) 33 pc  
και εαν ιχθυν αιτηση  Byz (L W) Θ al sy p,h  
η εαν ιχθυν αιτηση  lat sy  
η και εαν ιχθυν αιτηση  Κ 13 al  

(This could be either a “Western” or an “Alexandrian” conflation, but presumably not a “Byzantine”.)

51. Matt. 7:18  ποιειν . . . ενεγκειν  Ν (alone of MSS)  
ενεγκειν . . . ποιειν  B (alone of MSS)  
ποιειν . . . ποιειν  Byz Ν C K L X Z Δ Π Π0250 1 13 33 pl lat syr cop  

(The editors of the UBS editions evidently agree that the “Byzantine” reading here is genuine.)

52. Matt. 8:1  καταβαντι δε αυτο  Byz K L (Δ) pm (lat sy p,h)  
και καταβαντος αυτου  Z sy c,pa  
καταβαντος δε αυτου  B C W Θ 33 (lat sy p,h) cop  
καταβαντι δε αυτου  Ν  

(If anyone has conflated it would seem to be the “Alexandrians”. Aleph certainly has a conflation.)

53. Matt. 9:2  σου αι αμαρτιαι  Ν B C W Δ 1 33 pc  
σοι αι αμαρτιαι  D Δ,pc k  
σοι αι αμαρτιαι σου  Byz L Θ 0233* 13 pm lat syr  
σου αι αμαρτιαι σου  M  

(Codex M has evidently conflated, but should we say the same of the “Byzantine” text? Or are the “Alexandrian” and “Western” readings independent simplifications?)

54. Matt. 10:3  Θαδδαιος  Ν  
και Θαδδαιος  B pc vg cop  
και Λεββαιος  D 122 d k  
και Λεββαιος ο επικληθεις Θαδδαιος  Byz C Ν K L W X Δ Π 1 pl syr  

(The “Byzantine” reading does not really present the phenomena of a conflation. The reading of Aleph is clearly wrong. The “Western” reading could easily have resulted from homoioteleuton. It is not difficult to imagine that editors trained at Alexandria might prefer a shorter reading.)
55. Matt. 10:13  
ει δε µηγη  D sy²
εαν δε µη η αξια  Byz Ν B pl lat sy¹h
ει δε µη η αξια  L

(This appears to be a conflation on the part of Codex L.)

56. Matt. 12:4  
εφαγεν ους  Byz (P70) C K L Δ Θ Π 0233 1 33 pl vg sy¹ cop
εφαγον o  B 481
εφαγεν o  D W 13 it sy¹(c)
εφαγον ους  №

(Aleph and the “Western” text appear to have separate conflations of the “Byzantine” reading and that of B. P70 has εφαγεν but no pronoun [the papyrus is broken]—thus the “Byzantine” form of the verb has the earliest attestation.)

57. Matt. 12:46  
ετι αυτου λαλουντος  № B 33 pc lat
λαλουντος δε αυτου  D L Z 892 sy¹
ετι δε αυτου λαλουντος  Byz C W Θ 1 13 pm sy¹h

(Is this a “Byzantine” conflation or are the other two readings independent simplifications?)

58. Matt. 13:28  
oi de αυτω λεγουσιν  B 157 pc cop
oi de doulois eisoun autou  Byz L W Θ 1 13 pm vg sy¹h
oi de doulois autou λεγουσιν  C
λεγουσιν ou theou o doulois  D it (sy¹c,p)
oi de doulois λεγουσιν autou  №

(Conflation or confusion? Both C and Aleph appear to have conflations, both based on the “Byzantine” reading plus B and D respectively. Surprisingly, the UBS text follows Aleph, without comment, while Nestle²⁴ follows C. The reading of B would seem to be a clear error.)

59. Matt. 14:6  
γενεσιων δε αγοµενων  Byz W 0119 0136 13 pm ft¹ sy¹h mg
γενεσιοις δε γενοµενοις  № B D L Z pc (syr)
geneσiοις δε γενοµενοις  1 pc
geneσιοις δε γενοµενοις  C K Ν Θ al (syr)

(Codex C and ft¹ appear to have separate conflations of the “Byzantine” and “Alexandrian” readings.)

60. Matt. 14:34  
επι την γην Γεννησαρετ  C N 13 al sy¹pal
επι την γην Γεννησαρετ  Byz L 1 pm lat sy¹³p(c,x)
επι την γην εις Γεννησαρετ  № B W Δ 0119 33 pc sy¹h
επι την γην εις Γεννησαρ  D 700

(Might this be an “Alexandrian/Western” conflation?)

61. Matt. 15:14  
oδηγοι εισιν τυφλοι τυφλον  Byz C W X Δ Π 0106 pm q
οδηγοι εισιν τυφλοι  № cop sy¹
οδηγοι εισιν τυφλοι  K pc sy¹
τυφλοι εισιν οδηγοι  B D 0237
τυφλοι εισιν οδηγοi τυφλον  № C L Z 1 13 33 al lat sy¹³h

(The “Alexandrian” reading appears to be a conflation of the “Byzantine” and “Western” readings. Codices Aleph and K appear to have separate reductions of the “Byzantine” reading, due to homoioarcton.)
62. Matt. 17:7 προσελθὼν . . . ἡψατο αὐτῶν καὶ εἶπεν Byz C L W 1 pm sy\textsuperscript{h}

63. Matt. 19:9 µη επι πορ. καὶ γαμ. αλλήν µοιχάται Byz Ν C K L N (W) Z Δ Θ Π 078 pm vg sy\textsuperscript{p,h}

64. Matt. 20:10 ελθοντες δε Byz L W Z 1 pm bo

65. Matt. 22:13 αρατε αυτον ποδων κ. χειρων καὶ β. α Byz Ν C L W 13 33 pc e sy\textsuperscript{p,s,p}

66. Mark 4:5 και οτι Byz Ν Α pl vg sy\textsuperscript{p,h}

67. Mark 7:35 διηνοιχθησαν Byz Π 45 A N X Γ Π 0131 13 pm lat sy

68. Mark 9:49 πας γαρ πυρι αλισθησεται Byz ΑΕΚΝΠΣ (C Χ Θ Ψ) pm ι f i q vg sy\textsuperscript{p,h} Diat\textsuperscript{45,p,s,p} (This is another of Hort’s “Syrian conflations”. But the “Alexandrian” reading could easily be the result of homoioteleuton, and a different bit of parablepsis could have given rise to the “Western” reading. Does not the presence of the article with “salt” at the beginning of vs. 50 suggest that “salt” has already been introduced in the prior context? In any case, the “Byzantine” reading has early attestation and may not be dismissed as “late Syrian”.)

(An evident conflation on the part of B.)

(An assortment of witnesses conflate the “Byzantine” and “Alexandrian” readings.)

(The “Western” text and Codex C have independent conflations of the “Byzantine” and “Alexandrian” readings.)

(Is this really a “Byzantine” conflation? The longest reading is perfectly reasonable as it stands; perhaps a bit too ‘full’ for editors trained at Alexandria, but just right for a Jew speaking Aramaic. Might the “Western” reading be a Latin revision?)

(Has P\textsuperscript{45} conflated L and W, or have these managed independent conflations of the “Byzantine” and “Alexandrian” readings? Note that Hort’s “late Syrian” reading now has the earliest attestation.)

(The “Western” and “Caesarean” readings appear to be separate conflations of the “Byzantine” and “Alexandrian” readings.)
(Who is conflating whom? It seems more likely that Theta has simplified the “Western” reading than that the latter builds on the former. But the “Western” reading may well be a conflation of the “Byzantine” and “Alexandrian” readings. It seems clear that P cannot have conflated W and B, but might these have separate simplifications of the “Byzantine” reading? Note that Hort’s “late Syrian” reading now has the earliest attestation.)

(This would appear to be a “Western” conflation.)

(Should we say that “Syrian” editors conflated the “Alexandrian” and “Western” readings, or is Hort’s “late Syrian” reading really the original?)

(Conflation or confusion? Note that Hort’s “late Syrian” reading now has very early attestation.)

(Did P conflate B and 69? Note that Hort’s “late Syrian” reading now has the earliest attestation.)

(Codex W appears to have a conflation involving the “Byzantine” and “Alexandrian” readings. Note that the “Byzantine” reading, which Hort tentatively rejected in spite of B, now has strong early attestation. The “Western” departure is based on the “Byzantine” reading, presumably the original.)

(Why are these readings conflated? It seems more likely that P has simplified the “Western” reading than that the latter builds on the former. But the “Western” reading may well be a conflation of the “Byzantine” and “Alexandrian” readings. It seems clear that did not confound W and B, but might these have separate simplifications of the “Byzantine” reading? Note that Hort’s “late Syrian” reading now has the earliest attestation.)
(An instructive conflation on the part of P^66.)

77. John 7:41 ἀλλοι ἔλεγον Byz P^66* D W Γ Δ Π Ψ 0105 13 pm syr Οι δὲ ἔλεγον P^66c,75 B L N T X Θ 33 al lat αλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον 1 pc e bo

(Is this a “Caesarean” conflation? Note that the corrector of P^66 has taken a “Byzantine” reading and changed it to an “Alexandrian”—since he did that sort of thing repeatedly it would appear that there were exemplars of each type in the scriptorium, the more so in that he frequently did the opposite as well, i.e. changed an “Alexandrian” reading to a “Byzantine”. This in A.D. 200!)

78. John 9:6 επεθήκεν B pc εχρισεν 66 Byz P^66,75* A C D K L W Δ Θ Π Ψ 0124 0216 1 13 pl lat syr cop επεχρισεν (Presumably no one would wish to suggest that the “Byzantine” reading is a conflation of B and 661, even before the advent of P^66,75*! And yet, Hort followed B. . . . . .)

79. John 9:8 τυφλος ην Byz C^3 Γ Δ pm προσαιτης ην P^66,75* B C D al lat cop sy, p, h τυφλος ην και προσαιτης 69 pc e sy χρ (An evident conflation on the part of a few MSS.)

80. John 11:44 αὐτοῖς ο Ιησους Byz P^45,66* A C^2 D X Γ Δ Θ Δ Π Ψ 0250 1 13 pl it αυτοις 157 o Ιησους 700 sy Ιησους αυτοις L W Ιησους αυτοις P^75 B C cop (157 and 700 have separate simplifications of the “Byzantine” reading. I suggest the same explanation for the “Alexandrian” reading—the editors of the UBS text evidently agree, whereas Hort did not.)

81. John 13:24 πωθεσθαι τις αν ειη π. ου λεγει Byz P^66 Α (D) K W Γ Δ Θ Δ Π Φ 0133 1 13 pl syr cop και λεγει αυτω εις τις εστιν π. ου λεγει B C I L Χ 068 33 pc πωθεσθαι τις αν ειη π. ου ελεγεν και λεγει αυτω εις τις εστιν π. ου λεγει N (This would appear to be an unusually blatant conflation on the part of Aleph, based on the “Byzantine” and “Alexandrian” readings.)

82. John 13:36 απεκριθη Byz P^66* A C^3 K W X Γ Δ Θ Δ Π Ψ 0133 1 13 pl απεκριθη αυτω D λεγει αυτω Byz P^66* A C^3 K W X Γ Δ Θ Δ Π Ψ 0133 1 13 pl (A century ago this mighty have been interpreted as a “Syrian” conflation of the “Alexandrian” and “Western” readings, but now the presence of P^66* rather encourages the opposite conclusion.)

83. Acts 11:7 ηκουσα δε Byz L P pm και ηκουσα D pc sy ηκουσα δε και A B E al cop (Might this be an “Alexandrian” conflation?)

84. Acts 23:9 τινες Byz pm oi γραμματεις P^74 B C 33 pc bo τινες των γραμματεων A B E al sa (Might this be an “Alexandrian” conflation?)
85. Rom. 6:12  αυτη ταις επιθυµιαις αυτου
αυτη εν ταις επιθυµιαις αυτου
P^46 D E F G d f g m
Α B C al lat cop
Byz K L P Ψ pm

(Here is another fine candidate for a “Byzantine” conflation, unless the other two readings are independent simplifications. If the “Western” reading were original, however could the “Alexandrian” reading have come into being, and vice versa? But if the “Byzantine” reading is original the other two are easily explained.)

86. 1 Cor. 9:21  κερδησω ανοµους
κερδανω τους ανοµους
τους ανοµους κερδησω
Byz Λ K L Ψ ρ pl
Α B C P 33 pc
Byz P^46 Λ K L Ψ ρ pc lat cop
Byz P^46 Λ K L Ψ ρ pc lat cop

(Might this case involve a “Western” conflation, or perhaps two of them? Note that P^46 supports the “Byzantine” form of the verb—if it has a conflation then the “Byzantine” and “Alexandrian” components already existed in AD 200.)

87. 2 Cor. 7:14  επι τιτου αληθεια
η προς τιτον αληθεια
η επι τιτου αληθεια
Byz K L Ψ pc
C K L Ψ pl syr cop
Byz P^46 Λ K L Ψ pc 0243 pl

(A century ago this might have been interpreted as a “Syrian” conflation, but P^46 now makes the “Byzantine” reading the earliest and enhances its claim to be the original—a claim with which the editors of the UBS text evidently concur.)

88. 1 Thess. 3:2  και διακονον του Θεου και συνεργον ηµων
και διακονον του Θεου
και συνεργον του Θεου και συνεργον του Θεου
Byz K pl syr
Α P Ψ pc lat cop
B 1962
D 33 b d e mon
G f g

(Both “Alexandrian” readings could be the result of homoioarcton [2 x και], or did B simplify the “Western” reading? Codex G evidently has a conflation and Codex D might be said to have one. Is the “Byzantine” reading a conflation, or is it the original with which all the others have tampered in one way or another?)

89. 2 Thess 3:4  και εποιησατε και ποιειτε
και ποιειτε και ποιησετε
και ποιειτε και ποιησετε
και εποιησατε και ποιειτε και ποιησετε
G Λ D ρ pl
Λ A pc
D
B sa

(This would appear to be a not very elegant conflation on the part of B, which is abandoned by both the Nestle and UBS texts. Codex D appears to have a separate conflation.)

90. Heb 9:10  και δικαιοµασιν
δικαιοµατα
δικαιοµατα
D^2 K L 056 075 0142 0150 0209 0220 (532 MSS = 94%) ^1 a vg sy
P^46 Λ A I P 0278 (24 MSS = 5%) b sa
B (8 MSS = 1%)
D (alone)

(An evident conflation on the part of B, building on the “Byzantine” and “Alexandrian” readings. Note that 0220 is III century, giving the “Byzantine” reading overt early attestation.)

**Group 2.** b) Substantial differences—conflation dubious.

---

^1 This statement of evidence is based on the series *Text und Textwert*, ed. K. Aland. It represents an almost complete collation of extant MSS.
91. Matt. 10:23  φευγετε εις την αλλην  

(The “Western” reading here seems to include a conflation of the “Byzantine” and “Alexandrian” readings.)

92. Matt. 27:23  ο δε εφη  

(Conflation or confusion?)

93. Mark 6:33  ε. και προηλθον αυτους και συνηλθον προς αυτον  

(This is another of Hort’s eight “Syrian conflations”, but unless one is prepared to argue that the “Byzantine” reading is based on 33 it does not meet the requirements for a conflation and may properly be viewed as the original that all the others have simplified. Hort’s discussion of this case had been thought by some to be especially impressive, but I would say that he simply misunderstood the basic meaning of the text. In vs. 34 Jesus came out of the boat, not some secluded spot on land. The folks in Egypt could have had the same difficulty as Hort and produced the “Alexandrian” reading. The “Western” reading [and the “Alexandrian”] could be the result of a bit of parablepsis [homoioarcton—2 x και]. The reading of 33 is evidently secondary, however it came about.)

94. Mark 8:26  μηδε εις την κωµην εισελθης µηδε ειπης τινι εν τη κωµη  

(This is another of Hort’s “Syrian conflations”, but the “Byzantine” reading does not meet the requirements for a conflation and may reasonably be viewed as the original—the folks in Egypt may have felt that it was redundant, reducing it to the “Alexandrian” reading, although the latter could also be the result of homoioteleuton [ΜΗ∆ΕΕΙ]. The “Western” text rewrites the material, as it often does. The “Caesarean” reading evidently involves a conflation.)

95. Mark 9:38  ος ουκ ακολουθει ηµιν και εκωλυσαµεν αυτον οτι ουκ ακολουθει ηµιν  

(Here is yet another of Hort’s “Syrian conflations”. If this is a “Byzantine” conflation, it is built on the lesser “Western” and “Alexandrian” witnesses, and in that event where did D and B get their readings? Is it not more reasonable to regard the “Byzantine” reading as the original that the others have variously simplified? Nestle 24 seems to reflect essentially this opinion. In fact the “Western” reading could easily have resulted from homoioteleuton or a stylistic deletion of the third clause as being redundant. A glance at Luke 9:49 suggests that the Alexandrians harmonized Mark with Luke.)
96. Luke 9:10
topon erēmōn polēas kaloumenēs Βηθσαιδαν
Byz A C W (1) 13 pm sy(h)

97. Luke 9:34
ekineous eisēlēthein
Byz P45 A D P R W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ 1 13 pl sa
eisēlēthein
P75 Σ

eisēlēthein auτous
& B L pc bo

98. Luke 11:54
παντα τα γενηµατα µου και τα αγαθα µου
Byz A Q W Θ Ψ pm aur f vg sy(h)
παντα τα γενηµατα µου
& D it (sy(h)

αρξαµενον
Byz P75 A F H K M U V W Γ Δ Λ Π 063 1 13 pm syr

100. Luke 24:47
αρξαµενοι
& B C L N X 33 pc cop

101. John 2:15
ανετρεψεν
P66 B W X Θ 0162 pc

102. John 11:21
αδελφος µου ουκ αν ετεθνηκει
Byz E G U Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ω 13 pm

This is still another of Hort’s eight “Syrian conflations”, but the “Byzantine” reading does not meet the requirements for a conflation and may reasonably be viewed as the original. Αleph omitted and B and D have separate revisions—the idea of “a deserted place belonging to a town” apparently gave them difficulty. Θ eta appears to have conflated elements from all four of the other readings!

This is another of Hort’s eight “Syrian conflation”, but clearly it does not meet the requirements for a conflation. The solution of this problem is linked to textual choices in verse 53, but I submit that the “Byzantine” reading here is a serious candidate for the original. The loss of the last clause in the Alexandrian MSS could be an easy instance of homoioteleuton, or they could have felt it was redundant, which could also have been the motivation for deleting the second participle. Codex D simply rewrote the material.

This is the last of Hort’s eight “Syrian conflation”. The “Western” reading could easily have arisen through homoioiteleuton [2 x AMOY] and the “Alexandrian” reading be the result of a stylistic retouching.

This is another of Hort’s eight “Syrian conflation”, but clearly it does not meet the requirements for a conflation. The solution of this problem is linked to textual choices in verse 53, but I submit that the “Byzantine” reading here is a serious candidate for the original. The loss of the last clause in the Alexandrian MSS could be an easy instance of homoioteleuton, or they could have felt it was redundant, which could also have been the motivation for deleting the second participle. Codex D simply rewrote the material.

This is another of Hort’s eight “Syrian conflation”, but clearly it does not meet the requirements for a conflation. The solution of this problem is linked to textual choices in verse 53, but I submit that the “Byzantine” reading here is a serious candidate for the original. The loss of the last clause in the Alexandrian MSS could be an easy instance of homoioteleuton, or they could have felt it was redundant, which could also have been the motivation for deleting the second participle. Codex D simply rewrote the material.

This is another of Hort’s eight “Syrian conflation”, but clearly it does not meet the requirements for a conflation. The solution of this problem is linked to textual choices in verse 53, but I submit that the “Byzantine” reading here is a serious candidate for the original. The loss of the last clause in the Alexandrian MSS could be an easy instance of homoioteleuton, or they could have felt it was redundant, which could also have been the motivation for deleting the second participle. Codex D simply rewrote the material.

This is another of Hort’s eight “Syrian conflation”, but clearly it does not meet the requirements for a conflation. The solution of this problem is linked to textual choices in verse 53, but I submit that the “Byzantine” reading here is a serious candidate for the original. The loss of the last clause in the Alexandrian MSS could be an easy instance of homoioteleuton, or they could have felt it was redundant, which could also have been the motivation for deleting the second participle. Codex D simply rewrote the material.

This is still another of Hort’s eight “Syrian conflations”, but the “Byzantine” reading does not meet the requirements for a conflation and may reasonably be viewed as the original. Αleph omitted and B and D have separate revisions—the idea of “a deserted place belonging to a town” apparently gave them difficulty. Θ eta appears to have conflated elements from all four of the other readings!
(Conflation or confusion? Note that Hort’s “late Syrian” word order now has very early attestation. Might \(P^{45,66}\) have a conflation, albeit early?)

103. John 11:32  
\[
\text{απεθανεν µου ο αδελφος} \quad \text{Byz} \quad P^{45} A E G K S X \Gamma \Lambda \Pi 1 \text{ pl}
\]
\[
\muου \text{απεθανεν ο αδελφος} \quad p^{66,75} \nonumber \quad \mathbf{\mathbf{\text{Η}}} \quad \text{B C L W} \Delta \Theta \Lambda 33 \text{ pc}
\]
\[
\text{απεθανεν ο αδελφος µου} \quad 66 \text{ lat}
\]
\[
\text{µου ο αδελφος απεθανεν} \quad \text{D}
\]

(Conflation or confusion? Note that Hort’s “late Syrian” reading now has very early attestation.)

104. John 13:26  
\[
\text{και εµβαψας} \quad \text{Byz} \quad P^{66c} A K W \Gamma \Delta \Theta \Lambda \Pi \Psi 1 13 \text{ pl syr cop}
\]
\[
\text{βαψας ουν} \quad \nonumber \quad B C L X 33 \text{ pc}
\]
\[
\text{και βαψας} \quad D \text{ pc}
\]

(Is this a “Western” conflation? Note that the “Byzantine” reading now has the earliest attestation.)

105. John 14:5  
\[
\text{δυναµεθα την οδον ειδεναι} \quad \text{Byz} \quad P^{66} A L N Q W X \Gamma \Delta \Theta \Lambda \Pi \Psi 1 13 \text{ pl lat syr cop}
\]
\[
\text{την οδον ειδεναι δυναµεθα} \quad \nonumber \quad K
\]
\[
\text{την οδον οιδαµεν} \quad D
\]
\[
\text{οιδαµεν την οδον} \quad B C a b e
\]

(Is B based on D, or did D conflate B and the rest? Note that the “Byzantine” reading now has the earliest attestation. The editors of the UBS text evidently agree that it is original.)

106. 1 Pet. 5:8  
\[
\text{τινα καταπιη} \quad \text{Byz} \quad P^{72} A 056 (33) \text{ pm lat syr}
\]
\[
\text{τινα καταπιν} \quad \nonumber \quad K
\]
\[
\text{τινα καταπιει} \quad 0142 \text{ pc}
\]
\[
\text{καταπιειν} \quad B \Psi 0206 1175 \text{ pc}
\]
\[
\text{τινα καταπιειν} \quad \nonumber \quad K L P 049 \text{ al bo}
\]

(Line 5 could be a conflation of 1 and 4. Line 2 is probably a misspelling of 1—\(H\) became \(N\)—while 3 is also a misspelling of 1. Note that the “Byzantine” reading now has the earliest attestation.)

Although many of the examples in Group 2 scarcely offer the required phenomena for possible conflation, others do, to a greater or lesser extent. I will make some observations and draw some conclusions while recognizing that the evidence is not as clear as in the first section.

Ignoring probabilities for the moment, I will tabulate the “possible” conflations (many of which are entirely improbable).

None of the Western “conflations” has early papyrus support, and I believe there is general agreement among scholars that none of the “Western” instances, except 88, is original, whether or not the mechanism that gave rise to the readings was actually conflation in every case.

None of the Alexandrian “conflations” (including those of B and Aleph) has early papyrus support. I believe that all of B’s instances and most of Aleph’s are universally rejected (the UBS text follows Aleph in 58). Modern editors continue to adopt the “Alexandrian” instances.
Nine of the Byzantine “conflations” have early papyrological attestation (and in only five of the instances do any of the other readings have such support), so they may not be used to argue for a late “Byzantine” text-type. Of the fifteen cases without early papyrological attestation, in only four of them do any others have such support (85, 96, 98, 99). I submit that in at least five instances (I think 88 and 92 should also be included) the “Byzantine” reading does not exhibit the required phenomena for a conflation. Most of these are among Hort’s eight “Syrian conflations”, so I felt obliged to include them lest I be accused of suppressing unfavorable evidence. With reference to the remaining eight instances that may fairly be described as possible conflations, I believe they are most reasonably explained as being the original readings (see the comments under each one). It is significant that in thirty-two of the examples given in Group 2 the “Byzantine” text is being possibly conflated by other witnesses and in twenty-five examples (not necessarily the same ones) the “Byzantine” reading has early papyrological support—in three further cases some significant feature of the “Byzantine” reading has early papyrological support, and in yet another case support from the Diatessaron (2nd cent.). Of the possible “Byzantine conflations” there is general agreement that 51, 80 and 87 are the original reading.

**Conclusion**

The evidence presented in this appendix justifies the following statements:

1) “Western” witnesses have clear, undoubted conflations;
2) “Alexandrian” witnesses have clear, undoubted conflations;
3) many putative conflations build upon “Byzantine” readings;
4) numerous readings that were once thought to be late “Syrian conflations” now have overt early attestation;
5) it follows that Hort’s statement and use of “conflation” are erroneous.

It has been customary to refer to the “Byzantine” text as “the later, conflated text,”¹ as if “conflation” were a pervading characteristic of this text. The evidence presented above scarcely supports such a characterization since in fully sixty percent of the examples the “Byzantine” text is being built upon and not vice versa. Reference has already been made to Hutton’s *Atlas* (on p. 31) which provides evidence that there are over eight hundred places where the producers of the “Byzantine” text could have conflated “Western” and “Alexandrian” readings (following Hort’s hypothesis) but did not.

I trust that the reader will not judge me to be unreasonable if I express the hope that all concerned will loyally concede that the specter of “Syrian conflation” has been laid to rest. Henceforth no one

---

¹ Metzger, *The Text*, p. 136. To my astonishment, D.A. Carson appears to still be of this opinion so recently as 1979. In his critique of the first edition of this book (*The King James Version Debate*, Grand Rapids: Baker, “Appendix”) he declares that “textual scholars hold that a primary feature of the Byzantine text-type is its tendency to conflate readings” (p. 110) and speaks of “the Byzantine tradition in its mature conflated form” (p. 112). The reader is now in some position to form his own opinion on this subject.
may reasonably or responsibly characterize the “Byzantine” text-type as being “conflate” nor argue therefrom that it must be late.¹

¹ I am aware that the mechanism at work, especially in the Gospels, was probably harmonization in many/most cases rather than conflation. Since both mechanisms produce secondary readings the basic thrust of this appendix is not altered by a choice between them. I am also aware that I cannot prove conflation or harmonization in any instance, but then, of course, neither could Hort, and neither can anyone else.