

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 f^1 and f^{13} 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 *αυτου εις την αποθηκην* *Byz* \aleph C K Δ 0233 1 *pm* lat cop
εις την αποθηκην αυτου L 892 *al* b ff¹ g¹ sy^{p,h}
αυτου εις την αποθηκην αυτου 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 *προσεχειν* *Byz* D^c W X *pm* sy^{c,s,h}
προσεχετε D Θ 13 124 *pc* lat sy^p
προσεχετε δε \aleph B C L 1 *pc* cop
προσεχειν προσεχετε δε C^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 οτε εισηλθεν *Byz* E F G K L W Y Π
 ελθοντα B 1
 εισελθοντα Ξ
 εισελθοντων Θ 13
 εισελθοντι D

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

4. Matt. 20:21 δεξιων σου . . . ευωνυμων D Θ 1 *pc lat*
 δεξιων . . . ευωνυμων σου Ξ B
 δεξιων σου . . . ευωνυμων σου *Byz* C L N W Z 085 13 *pm sy^{p,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 Ξ and B are alone in omitting the first σου.)

5. Matt. 23:25 ακρασιας Ξ B D L Δ Θ Π 1 13 33 *al it sy^h*
 αδικιας *Byz* C K Γ *pm f sy^p*
 ακρασιας αδικιας W

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

6. Matt. 24:38 εκειναις προ D 253 *pc it^{pt} sy^{h,pal}*
 ταις προ *Byz* Ξ L W Θ 067 0133 1 13 *pl it^{pt} vg bo*
 εκειναις ταις προ B

(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 εις εκαστος Ξ B C L Z 0281 33 *pc sa*
 εκαστος αυτων *Byz* P^{37,64} (P⁴⁵) A W Γ Δ Π Σ Ψ 074 1 13 *pl sy^p*
 εις εκαστος αυτων (P⁴⁵) D M Θ 69 *pc bo*

(This would appear to be a “Western” conflation of “Byzantine” and “Alexandrian” elements. A recent meeting of papyrologists dated P⁶⁴ in the first century [!] and confirmed that it supports the Byzantine reading.)

8. Matt. 26:36 ου *Byz* B E F G 067 *pm*
 αυ D K L W Δ Θ 074 1 69 *al*
 ου αυ P⁵³ A *pc*

(Before the advent of P⁵³ 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 αυτων K *al*
 παντων Ξ B D E G L Z Θ 090 13 33 *al lat sy^{p,h}*
 αυτων παντων *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 homoioteleuton. 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 εκει *Byz* B C *pl lat*
 και D 56 *aur d*
 εκει και F K L Π 33 *sy^{h,pal}*
 κακει Ξ (*sy^p*)

(Here we seem to have varied witnesses conflating the “Byzantine-Alexandrian” and “Western” readings.)

11. Mark 1:4 ο βαπτίζων εν τη ερημω B 33 *pc*
 βαπτίζων εν τη ερημω και Byz A K P W Π 1 13 *pl f sy*^{h,pal}
 ο βαπτίζων εν τη ερημω και S L Δ *pc bo*
 (εν τη ερημω βαπτίζων 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, UBS³ seems to espouse this obvious conflation whereas UBS¹ 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 S^c B C L 0133 13 *pc*
 (omit) S Θ 1 *a/c ff² r¹ sy*^s

(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 S 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 P⁴⁵ A K W Θ Π 0133 1 13 *pl e sy*^{p,h}
 εξεστησαν ευθυς S B C L Δ 33 892 *pc bo*
 εξεστησαν 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 S B 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 P⁷⁵ S B L W 213 *pc a ff^a j sy*^{p,h}
 αυτος μεμαρτυρηκεν Byz P⁶⁶ 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 P^{66c,75} S K N T Θ Π Ψ *pc bo*
 πνευμα αγιον Byz P⁶⁶ L W X Γ Δ Λ 0105 1 13 *pl*
 πνευμα δεδομενον lat *sy*^{c,s,p} 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 toward the same opinion. Note that Hort’s “late Syrian” reading now has very early attestation.)

18. John 10:19 σχισμα ουν D 1241 sy^s
 σχισμα παλιν P⁽⁴⁵⁾⁷⁵ ⋈ B L W X 33 pc lat sy^p sa
 σχιμα ουν παλιν Byz P⁶⁶ A Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ 1 13 pl sy^h

(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 P⁴⁵ Θ
 εβαστασαν ουν D 28 1780 pc lat sy^s bo
 εβαστασαν παλιν (P⁷⁵) ⋈ B L W 33 pc sy^p
 εβαστασαν ουν παλιν Byz P⁶⁶ A X Π Ψ 1 13 565 pl f sy^h

(A century ago this could have been interpreted as a “Syrian” conflation, but now we can hardly say that P⁶⁶ conflated B 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 1780
 και P⁷⁵ ⋈ B C X 1 33 pc it^{pt}
 αλλα και Byz P^{45,66} ⋈² A C³ D L W Θ Ψ Ω 0250 13 pl lat sy^{p,h} cop

(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 Byz P^{66,75} A B² I Q X Θ Ψ 065 1 33 pl (cop)
 ο οχλος πολυς ⋈ B L pc lat
 οχλος ο πολυς W 1010
 ο οχλος ο πολυς P^{66c}

(Conflation or confusion? Did P^{66c} conflate B and W? Or should we say that P^{66c} 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 P⁷⁵ A B L Ψ 060 33 al c vg cop
 εγω Byz P⁶⁶ ⋈ D E G Q X Γ Δ Π pm it sy^{p,h}
 τουτο εγω P^{66c}

(This is an instructive conflation on the part of P^{66c}. Note the early attestation for the “Byzantine” reading.)

23. John 16:4 αυτων μνημονευητε ⋈^c L 13 al lat
 μνημονευητε αυτων Byz K Γ Δ Ψ 054 1 pm ff² sy^{pal}
 αυτων μνημονευητε αυτων A B Θ Π 33 al sy^{p,h}
 μνημονευητε ⋈ D a sy^s cop

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

24. John 17:23 και γινωσκη P⁶⁶ ⋈ W 1 pc lat
 ινα γινωσκη B C D L 33 pc a e sy^s
 και ινα γινωσκη Byz A Θ Ψ 054 13 pm f q sy^{p,h}

(This could be a “Byzantine” conflation, but the first two readings could just as easily be independent simplifications of the longer reading.)

25. John 18:40	παλιν	P ⁶⁰ ⋈ B L W X 0109 <i>pc</i>
	παντες	G K N Ψ 1 13 33 <i>al</i> it sy ^{p,pal} cop
	παλιν παντες	Byz (P ⁶⁶) A Γ Δ Θ 054 0250 <i>pm</i> vg sy ^h
	παντες παλιν	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	του Συχεμ	Byz P ⁷⁴ D Ψ 049 056 0142 <i>pm</i> lat
	εν Συχεμ	⋈ B C <i>al</i> cop
	του εν Συχεμ	⋈ ^c A E

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

27. Acts 10:48	του κυριου	Byz H L P 049 056 <i>pm</i>
	Ιησου Χριστου	P ⁷⁴ ⋈ A B E 33 <i>al</i> cop
	του κυριου Ιησου	Lect. <i>al</i>
	του 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	τον θεον ζωντα	D <i>pc</i>
	θεον τον ζωντα	⋈
	τον θεον τον ζωντα	Byz P ⁴⁵ H L P <i>pm</i>
	θεον ζωντα	P ⁷⁴ B C E 33 <i>al</i>

(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.¹)

29. Acts 24:14	τοις προφηταις	Byz ⋈ ^c A <i>pm</i> syr bo
	εν τοις προφηταις	B C D <i>al</i>
	τοις εν τοις προφηταις	⋈ E

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

30. Acts 25:5	τουτω	Byz <i>pm</i>
	ατοπον	⋈ A B C E 33 <i>al</i> lat
	τουτω ατοπον	Ψ 69 614 <i>al</i> 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	P ¹⁵ B P <i>al</i> cop
	και η παρθενος η αγαμος	Byz D F G K L Ψ <i>pm</i> it syr
	η αγαμος και η παρθενος η αγαμος	P ⁴⁶ ⋈ A 33 <i>pc</i>

(Although unquestionably early, this really does appear to be a conflation on the part of P⁴⁶, etc.)

32. Phil. 1:18	πλην	Byz D E K L <i>pm</i>
	οτι	B sy ^p
	πλην οτι	P ⁴⁶ ⋈ A F G P 048 33 <i>pc</i> sa

¹ For a complete statement of what I mean by “discourse structure”, see my book, *A Framework for Discourse Analysis* (Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and University of Texas at Arlington, 1980).

(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 του Θεου και Πατρος του Χριστου του Θεου Πατρος και του Χριστου του Θεου Πατρος του Χριστου του Θεου Πατρος Χριστου του Θεου Χριστου του Θεου	Byz D ^c K pm Lect Σ ^b Ψ pc sy ^h 0208 1908 sy ^p A C it ^{pt} sa ^{pt} bo Σ 048 P ⁴⁶ B (alone of MSS) D ^b H P 436 1881 sa ^{pt}
--------------	---	---

(at 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 Ιησου Χριστου Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου	Byz P ⁴⁶ B (Ψ) pl A C D F G Σ D ² 365 1175 pc
---------------	---	---

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

35. 1 Thess. 5:27	τοις αγιοις τοις αδελφοις τοις αγιοις αδελφοις	103 1984 1985 Σ B D E F G pc d e f g sa Byz (P ⁴⁶) Σ ^c A K L P Ψ 33 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 κρειττονος και κρειττονος	920 Byz P ⁴⁶ Σ ^c A C ^c D E K L P Ψ pl lat syr cop Σ 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 και ειδον και ιδου και ιδε και ειδον και ιδου	M ^{a,b,ept} M ^{c,d,ept} (A C) Σ (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 και ειδον και ιδου και ιδε και ειδον και ιδου	M ^{a,b} M ^{c,d,ept} C (A) Σ (alone)
--------------	--	---

(Aleph repeats the conflation.)

39. Rev. 6:7/8	και ιδε	και ιδου	M ^{a,b,ept}
		και ειδον και ιδου	M ^{c,d,ept}
		και ιδον και ιδου	A (C)
	και ιδε και ιδον και ιδου		ℵ (alone)

(Aleph repeats the conflation again.)

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

40. Matt. 4:3	αυτω ο πειραζων	ειπεν	Byz C L P Θ 0233 pm k sy ^h
	ο πειραζων	ειπεν αυτω	ℵ B W 1 13 33 al vg sy ^p bo
	αυτω ο πειραζων και ειπεν αυτω		D it sy ^{c,s,pal}

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

41. Matt. 9:18	εις ελθων/εισελθων		Byz ℵ ² C D E K M N S V W X Θ 1 33 pm d f
	προσελθων		ℵ 69 157 pc q sy ^p
	εις προσελθων		ℵ ¹ B lat pc
	τις προσελθων		L 13 al k
	τις ελθων		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	και πρεσβυτερων		A B L Θ 1 13 ^{pt} 33 al it ^{pt} vg sa
	και	Φαρισαιων	D W pc it ^{pt} sy ^s
	και πρεσβυτερων και Φαρισαιων		Byz Δ Φ 13 ^{pt} pm sy ^{p,h} bo Diatessaron

(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	αινουντες		D it ^{pt}
	ευλογουντες		P ⁷⁵ ℵ B C L cop sy ^{s,pal}
	αινουντες και ευλογουντες		Byz A C ² K W X Δ Θ Π Ψ 063 1 13 pl it ^{pt} vg sy ^{p,h} 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		P ⁷⁴ A C D E Ψ 33 al cop
	του	θεου	ℵ B 056 0142 al syr
	του κυριου και θεου		Byz L P 049 pm

(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.)

is general agreement among scholars that all 14 B and Aleph instances are in fact confections (or secondary readings). (Since Hort was evidently aware of these confections in B, it is difficult to understand how he could affirm that to the best of his knowledge there were no “Neutral” confections.) 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 confections 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 confections and that “Western” and “Alexandrian” witnesses have actual confections. 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, 37, 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 ιχθυον αιτησει και εαν ιχθυον αιτηση η εαν ιχθυον αιτηση η και εαν ιχθυον αιτηση	⋈ B C (1) 33 <i>pc</i> <i>Byz</i> (L W) Θ <i>al sy</i> ^{p,h} <i>lat sy</i> ^c <i>K</i> ^c 13 <i>al</i>
----------------	---	--

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

51. Matt. 7:18	ποιειν . . . ενεγκειν ενεγκειν . . . ποιειν ποιειν . . . ποιειν	⋈ (alone of MSS) B (alone of MSS) <i>Byz</i> ⋈ ^c C K L W X Z Δ Θ Π 0250 1 13 33 <i>p/lat syr cop</i>
----------------	---	---

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

52. Matt. 8:1	καταβαντι δε αυτω και καταβαντος αυτου καταβαντος δε αυτου καταβαντι δε αυτου	<i>Byz</i> K L (Δ) <i>pm</i> (<i>lat sy</i> ^{p,h}) Z <i>sy</i> ^{c,pal} B C W Θ 33 (<i>lat sy</i> ^{p,h}) <i>cop</i> ⋈
---------------	--	--

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

53. Matt. 9:2	σου αι αμαρτια σοι αι αμαρτια σοι αι αμαρτια σου σου αι αμαρτια σου	⋈ B C W Δ 1 33 <i>pc</i> D Δ ^c <i>pc k</i> <i>Byz</i> L Θ 0233 ^v 13 <i>pm lat syr</i> 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	και και Λεββαιος και Λεββαιος ο επικληθεις	Θαδδαιος ⋈ Θαδδαιος B <i>pc vg cop</i> D 122 d k <i>Byz</i> C ² K L W X Δ Θ Π 1 <i>p/lat syr</i>
----------------	--	--

(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 sy^s
 εαν δε μη η αξια Byz ℵ B pl lat sy^{p,h}
 ει δε μη 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 sy^h cop
 εφαγον ο B 481
 εφαγεν ο D W 13 it sy^{p,(c)}
 εφαγον ους ℵ

(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. Mat. 12:46 ετι αυτου λαλουντος ℵ B 33 pc lat
 λαλουντος δε αυτου D L Z 892 sy^p
 ετι δε αυτου λαλουντος Byz C W Θ 1 13 pm sy^h

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

58. Matt. 13:28 οι δε αυτω λεγουσιν B 157 pc cop
 οι δε δουλοι ειπον αυτω Byz L W Θ 1 13 pm vg sy^h
 οι δε δουλοι αυτω λεγουσιν C
 λεγουσιν ουτω οι δουλοι D it (sy^{c,s,p})
 οι δε δουλοι λεγουσιν αυτω ℵ

(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 ff¹ sy^{h mg}
 γενεσιους δε γενομενοις ℵ B D L Z pc (syr)
 γενεσιους δε αγομενοις 1 pc
 γενεσιων δε γενομενων C K N Θ al (syr)

(Codex C and f¹ appear to have separate conflations of the “Byzantine” and “Alexandrian” readings.)

60. Matt. 14:34 επι την γην Γεννησαρετ C N 13 al sy^{pal}
 εις την γην Γεννησαρετ Byz L 1 pm lat sy^{p,(c,s)}
 επι την γην εις Γεννησαρετ ℵ B W Δ 0119 33 pc sy^h
 επι την γην εις Γεννησαρ D 700

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

61. Matt. 15:14 οδηγοι εισιν τυφλοι τυφλων Byz C W X Δ Π 0106 pm q
 οδηγοι εισιν τυφλοι ℵ cop sy^c
 οδηγοι εισιν τυφλων K pc sy^s
 τυφλοι εισιν οδηγοι B D 0237
 τυφλοι εισιν οδηγοι τυφλων ℵ^c L Z Θ 1 13 33 al lat sy^{p,h}

(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 homoiarcton.)

69. Mark 12:17	και αποκριθεις ο δε Ιησους και αποκριθεις ο Ιησους αποκριθεις δε ο Ιησους αποκριθεις δε	W 258 <i>al</i> Σ B C L Δ Ψ 33 <i>pc sy</i> ^(p) <i>cop</i> <i>Byz</i> P ⁴⁵ A N X Γ Π Φ 1 13 <i>pm sy</i> ^{(s),h} D 700 <i>pc lat</i> Θ 565
----------------	---	---

(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 P⁴⁵ 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.)

70. Luke 9:57	και πορευομενων εγενετο δε πορευομενων και εγενετο πορευομενων	P ^{45,75} Σ B C L Θ Ξ 33 <i>pc sy</i> ^{c,s,p} <i>bo</i> <i>Byz</i> A W Ψ 1 <i>pm lat sy</i> ^h D 13 a c e r ¹
---------------	--	--

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

71. Luke 10:42	ενος δε εστιν χρεια ολιγων δε χρεια εστιν η ενος ολιγων δε εστιν χρεια η ενος ολιγων δε εστιν η ενος	<i>Byz</i> P ^{45,75} A C K P W Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ 13 <i>pl lat sy</i> ^{c,p,h} <i>sa</i> B P ³ L C ² 1 33 <i>pc sy</i> ^{hmg} <i>bo</i> Σ
----------------	---	--

(The MSS usually associated with the “Alexandrian” text-type are rather scattered here. Codex L and company might be said to conflate the “Byzantine” reading and that of B. Note that Hort’s “late Syrian” reading now has the earliest attestation, with a vengeance.)

72. Luke 11:12	η και εαν δε και η και εαν	P ⁷⁵ Σ B L 1 13 33 <i>cop</i> D <i>Byz</i> P ⁴⁵ R W X Γ Δ Θ Π Ψ <i>pl sy</i> ^h
----------------	----------------------------------	---

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

73. Luke 12:30	ζητει επιζητουσιν επιζητει	D <i>it</i> P ⁷⁵ Σ B L X 070 13 33 <i>pc</i> <i>Byz</i> P ⁴⁵ A Q W Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ 1 <i>pl</i>
----------------	----------------------------------	--

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

74. Luke 13:2	οτι ταυτα τα τοιαυτα οτι τοιαυτα	Σ B D L <i>pc d e r</i> ¹ 69 <i>pc</i> <i>Byz</i> P ⁷⁵ A W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ 070 1 <i>pm lat sy</i>
---------------	--	---

(Did P⁷⁵ conflate B and 69? Note that Hort’s “late Syrian” reading now has the earliest attestation.)

75. John 5:15	ανηγγειλεν ειπεν ανηγγειλεν και ειπεν αυτοις απηγγειλεν	<i>Byz</i> P ^{66,75} A B Γ Θ Λ Π Ψ 063 1 <i>pm sa (lat sy)</i> ^h Σ C L <i>pc e q sy</i> ^{c,s,p} <i>bo</i> W D K U Δ 13 33 <i>al (lat sy)</i> ^h
---------------	--	---

(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.)

76. John 6:69	ο αγιος του Θεου ο Χριστος ο υιος του Θεου ο Χριστος ο αγιος του Θεου	P ⁷⁵ Σ B C D L W <i>Byz</i> K Π Ψ 0250 13 (Δ Θ 1 33) <i>pl lat sy</i> <i>Diat</i> P ⁶⁶ <i>cop</i>
---------------	---	---

85. Rom. 6:12	αυτη ταις επιθυμiais αυτου αυτη εν ταις επιθυμiais αυτου	P ⁴⁶ D E F G d f g m Σ A B C <i>al</i> lat cop <i>Byz</i> K L P Ψ <i>pm</i>
---------------	--	--

(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 κερδησω τους ανομους κερδανω ανομους τους ανομους κερδησω	<i>Byz</i> Σ ^c K L Ψ <i>pl</i> Σ A B C P 33 <i>pc</i> P ⁴⁶ F G D E
-----------------	--	--

(Might this case involve a “Western” conflation, or perhaps two of them? Note that P⁴⁶ 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	Σ B <i>pc</i> D E F G P Ψ <i>pc</i> lat syr cop <i>Byz</i> P ⁴⁶ Σ ^c C K L 0243 <i>pl</i>
-----------------	--	--

(A century ago this might have been interpreted as a “Syrian” conflation, but P⁴⁶ 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 και συνεργον του Θεου διακονον και συνεργον του Θεου	<i>Byz</i> K <i>pl</i> syr Σ A P Ψ <i>pc</i> 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 ποιειτε και ποιησετε ποιειτε και ποιησατε και εποιησατε και ποιειτε και ποιησετε	G <i>Byz</i> Σ ^c D ^c Ψ <i>pl</i> Σ A <i>pc</i> 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 δικαιωματα και δικαιοματα δικαιωμα	D ² K L 056 075 0142 0150 0151 0209 0220 (532 MSS = 94%) ¹ a vg sy ^h P ⁴⁶ Σ A I P 0278 (24 MSS = 5%) b sa Σ ² 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.

(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 απεθανεν μου ο αδελφος Byz P⁴⁵ A E G K S X Γ Λ Π 1 *p*
 μου απεθανεν ο αδελφος P^{66,75} ⋈ B C L W Δ Θ 33 *pc*
 απεθανεν ο αδελφος μου 66 *lat*
 μου ο αδελφος απεθανεν D

(Conflation or confusion? Note that Hort's "late Syrian" reading now has very early attestation.)

104. John 13:26 και εμβαψας Byz P^{66c} A K W Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ 1 13 *p*/ *lat syr cop*
 βαψας ουν ⋈ B C L X 33 *pc*
 και βαψας D *pc*

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

105. John 14:5
 δυναμεθα την οδον ειδεναι Byz P⁶⁶ A L N Q W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ 1 13 *p*/ *lat syr cop*
 την οδον ειδεναι δυναμεθα ⋈ K
 την οδον οιδαμεν D
 οιδαμεν την οδον 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 τινα καταπιη Byz P⁷² A 056 (33) *pm lat syr*
 τινα καταπιν ⋈
 τινα καταπιει 0142 *pc*
 καταπιειν B Ψ 0206 1175 *pc*
 τινα καταπιειν ⋈^c K L P 049 *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.

	Total	Examples
Western text-type	15	50, 56, 60, 62, 63, 64, 69, 70, 86, 88, 89, 91, 93, 104, 105
Alexandrian text-type	8	50, 52, 60, 61, 71, 83, 84, 110
Codex B	3	66, 89, 90
Codex Aleph	4	52, 56, 58, 81
Byzantine text-type	24	
with early attestation	9	69, 72, 73, 74, 78, 80, 82, 87, 101
lacking phenomena	5	54, 93, 94, 96, 98
really "possible"	10	51, 53, 57, 65, 68, 85, 88?, 92?, 95, 99

Nine of the Byzantine "conflations" have early papyrus 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 papyrus 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 papyrus support—in three further cases some significant feature of the "Byzantine" reading has early papyrus 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.

