An Evaluation of the Use of the Peshitta as a Textual Witness to Romans

P.J. Williams
Tyndale House, Cambridge

1. In recent investigations I have demonstrated a number of deficiencies in the representation of Syriac evidence within scholarly editions of biblical texts.[1] These deficiencies stem from the time-honoured scholarly practices of assuming that Syriac translators sought to represent their *Vorlage* literally and of neglecting to observe ways in which the contrast between Syriac biblical texts and their Hebrew or Greek *Vorlagen* is consistent. While my previous investigations have been arranged according to the observation of particular phenomena of translation and have not dealt exhaustively with any particular corpus of the Syriac Bible, I here seek to investigate all the references to the Peshitta (P) made in the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece* 27th edition (NA27) within the Epistle to the Romans. The new elements in this investigation will be (a) that the evaluation of *Vorlage* by examination of translation technique will be applied to a new type of literature, an epistle, (b) that it will be possible to get a realistic impression of the overall accuracy of the references to P within NA27, and (c) that it will be possible to draw more reliable conclusions about the textual affinity of the *Vorlage* of P.

2. The method used to establish the accuracy or inaccuracy of a textual note is the same as I have followed elsewhere and accords with the statement of NA27 that 'versions are cited only where their underlying Greek text can be determined with confidence' (p. *63). If on a number of occasions, when similar conditions recur, there is a consistent formal divergence between P and attested Greek readings the divergence is likely to result from the translation process. Though it cannot be proved to be so in any individual case it is inappropriate to record such divergences in a textual apparatus that seeks to align versional witnesses with their probable *Vorlage*. Although all 150 variants for which NA27 cites P in Romans have been investigated I only discuss below the cases where the interpretation of the evidence is not straightforward or where I maintain that NA27's citation of P is questionable or wrong. Each variant is given under a heading that describes the evaluation of the evidence as NA27 gives it.[2]

---

[1] P. J. Williams, '"According to All" in MT and the Peshitta', *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 12 (1999), pp. 107–9; idem, *Studies in the Syntax of the Peshitta of 1 Kings* (MPIL 12; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2001), pp. 85–93; 97–8; idem, 'Bread and the Peshitta in Matthew 16:11–12 and 12:4', *NovT* 48 (2001), pp. 331–3; idem, 'Some Problems in Determining the *Vorlage* of Early Syriac Versions of the NT', *NTS* 47 (2001), pp. 537–43; idem, *Early Syriac Translation Technique and the Textual Criticism of the Greek Gospels* (Texts and Studies III, 2; Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2004).

[2] The editions on which this investigation is based are, for the Gospels, G. A. Kiraz, *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels: Aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshîttâ & Ḥarklean Versions* (4 vols.; NTTS 21; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996), for Acts, the Syriac Bible produced by the United Bible Societies, 1979 [which for that book is a reprint of J. Pinkerton and R. Kilgour, *The New Testament in Syriac*, London, 1920]), for other parts of the Peshitta, B. Aland and A. Juckel, *Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung*, I. *Die grossen*

NA27 Textual Notes

1:1 P supports Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ rather than Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

3. NA27 gives 16 occurrences of Ἰησοῦς Χριστός in its main text of Romans and 14 occurrences of Χριστός Ἰησοῦς. All but one of these are represented in P by the order ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ 'Jesus Christ'. The one exception, Rom. 8:34, seems to be where the Syriac just uses ܡܫܝܚܐ to represent a variant Greek text with Χριστός rather than Χριστός Ἰησοῦς. The data are simple to analyze. Syriac has maintained the order 'Jesus Christ' that fits Aramaic idiom and is widely attested as preferred in Syriac documents. It seems, thus, that P is translating Greek texts which read Χριστός Ἰησοῦς and those which read Ἰησοῦς Χριστός and representing them in the same way. This leads to the identification of at least eighteen misleading notes in NA27: Rom. 1:1; 2:16; 8:11; 15:5; 1 Cor. 1:1; 2 Cor. 1:19; 13:5; Gal. 2:16 *bis*; 3:14, 26; Eph. 1:1; Phil. 1:6; 2:21; 1 Tim. 1:16; 6:13; 2 Tim. 1:10; Tit. 2:13, and a further three that need to be reconsidered: 1 Tim. 5:21; 2 Tim. 1:2; Tit. 1:4.[3] The correspondence of Ignatius provides further support for the view that the Greek order Χριστός Ἰησοῦς is represented in Syriac by ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ. Although the relationship between the shorter and longer Greek recensions and the text of the three epistles preserved in Syriac (*ad Ephesios*, *ad Romanos* and *ad Polycarpum*) is not obvious, we note that there are two cases where the order Χριστός Ἰησοῦς in both recensions contrasts to the Syriac order ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ (*ad Romanos* 1 and 2).[4] There are no examples of an alternative Syriac order ܡܫܝܚܐ ܝܫܘܥ, though there is some variation between the two Greek recensions in other passages.

1:3 P supports γεννωμένου rather than γενομένου.

4. The main other support for γεννωμένου is the first hand of the sixteenth century ms 61. It is not at all clear that P comes from the *Vorlage* suggested by NA27. The whole verse in P reads ܥܠ ܒܪܗ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ ܒܒܣܪ ܡܢ ܙܪܥܐ ܕܒܝܬ ܕܘܝܕ 'concerning his son, the one who was born in [the] flesh from the seed of the house of David'. The translation brings ܒܒܣܪ 'in [the] flesh', corresponding to κατὰ σάρκα at the end of the verse, into close association with the verb and may therefore invite reference to 'birth'. Whether such a note is appropriate for an apparatus will depend on the degree of certainty that the apparatus claims for itself.

---

katholischen Briefe, II. *Die Paulinischen Briefe*, 1. *Römer- und 1. Korintherbrief*, 2. *2. Korintherbrief, Galaterbrief, Epheserbrief, Philipperbrief und Kolosserbrief*, 3. *1./2. Thessalonicherbrief, 1./2. Timotheusbrief, Titusbrief, Philemonbrief und Hebräerbrief* (4 vols.; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986, 1991, 1995, 2002). Use has been made of R. Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus: Romans* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 2001) to consider variation in the Greek tradition of Romans.

[3] See also 2 Thess. 3:12 and Philm 6.

[4] W. Cureton, *Corpus Ignatianum* (London: Francis & John Rivington, 1849), pp. 39–40, 43–4.

1:7 P supports εἰρήνη καὶ χάρις ὑμῖν *rather than* χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη.

5. P is the only witness for this variant. What makes it unlikely that the word order in P represents a true Greek variant is that a number of Syriac texts are found frequently to reverse the order of paired items. This has been documented for the Old Testament Peshitta,[5] and for the Old Syriac and Peshitta Gospels.[6] In the absence of Greek support for the *Vorlage* it is simplest to understand the variant as translational. NA27's note would be correct if it were making a statement simply about the order in which the Syriac terms appeared. However, in light of NA27's Introduction it must be understood as making a claim about the Greek from which the Syriac was translated. See also on 14:9.

1:24 P lacks καί *after* διό.

6. This note, like the similar note alleging the omission of καί after διό in Rom. 4:22, is illegitimate since it fails to observe that P frequently does not represent καί after διό. This seems to occur in Luke 1:35; Acts 10:29; Rom. 15:22;[7] 2 Cor. 1:20;[8] Heb. 11:12. On other occasions the καί is represented formally in Syriac: Acts 24:26; 2 Cor. 4:13 *bis*; Phil. 2:9; Heb. 13:12.

2:16 P supports Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *rather than* Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

7. This note is illegitimate. See on 1:1.

---

[5] A. Gelston, *The Peshiṭta of the Twelve Prophets* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), p. 71; R. A. Taylor, *The Peshiṭta of Daniel* (MPIL 7; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), pp. 320–1; M. D. Koster, *The Peshiṭta of Exodus*, pp. 55–6, 583 n. 374; P. J. Williams, *Studies in the Syntax of the Peshitta of 1 Kings* (MPIL 12: Leiden: Brill, 2001), p. 155; G. Greenberg, *Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Jeremiah* (MPIL 13; Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 30, 49, 52–4, 60; 140–1, 168; 181–2; D. Shepherd, 'Rendering "Flesh and Bones": Pair Reversal and the Peshitta of Job 2.5', *Aramaic Studies* 3 (2005) 205–13.

[6] I. Wichelhaus, *De Novi Testamenti Versione Syriaca Antiqua quam Peschitho Vocant, Libri Quattuor* (Halle: Orphanotropheum, 1850), p. 254; Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, pp. 204–35. This provides fifty examples where Syriac Gospel texts have the reverse order of that supported by all extant Greek witnesses.

[7] καί is missing from ms 2147.

[8] The absence of an equivalent of καί in P makes NA27 only cite P in parentheses alongside other witnesses in favour of διὸ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ.

3:7 P supports γάρ rather than δέ.

8. Falla suggests that P uses ܓܝܪ to represent δέ in at least Matt. 23:12; Luke 2:44; 4:25; 12:48.[9] Though it is likely that Syriac ܓܝܪ is in most cases a representation of Greek γάρ, certainty cannot be reached in individual cases. The appropriateness of such a citation therefore depends on the level of certainty that the apparatus claims for itself. Kiraz's concordance shows 1051 occurrences of ܓܝܪ in the 22 books of the NT canon of P. This compares with 1006 occurrences of γάρ in the text of *NTG* for these books. Evidently correspondence is not absolute.

3:26 P supports Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ rather than Ἰησοῦ.

9. Although Ἰησοῦς Χριστός is frequently rendered by ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ and Ἰησοῦς by simple ܝܫܘܥ, the data do not allow us to infer Ἰησοῦς Χριστός from Syriac ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ. There are too many occasions within the Pauline corpus where Syriac ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ or even ܡܪܢ ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ contrasts with Greek witnesses with simple Ἰησοῦς, and where Χριστός is not well attested or not attested at all: Rom. 4:24; 8:11a; 1 Cor. 5:4b; 2 Cor. 1:14; 11:31; Eph. 1:15; 1 Thess. 2:15; 3:11, 13; 2 Thess. 1:7 (P mss), 8. While a few of these may have been rendered from *Vorlagen* which contained Ἰησοῦς Χριστός it is simpler to suppose that Syriac tended to move toward fuller expressions such as ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ and ܡܪܢ ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ. The note is therefore illegitimate. Other occasions where NA27 uses P to support Ἰησοῦς Χριστός as opposed to Ἰησοῦς are Rom. 5:11; 13:14; 16:20; 1 Cor. 5:4a, 5;[10] 16:23; 2 Thess. 1:12.[11] None of these cases reaches the level of certainty required for citation in the apparatus.

4:15 P supports γάρ rather than δέ.

10. See on 3:7.

---

[9] T. C. Falla, *A Key to the Peshitta Gospels, Volume One: ʾĀlaph–Dālath* (NTTS 14; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991), p. 110. Further questions about such citation are found in J. T. Clemons, 'Some Questions on the Syriac Support for Variant Greek Readings', *NovT* 10 (1968), pp. 29–30. For these particles in the Syriac Gospels, see S. P. Brock, 'The Treatment of Greek Particles in the Old Syriac Gospels, with Special Reference to Luke', in J. K. Elliott, ed., *Studies in New Testament Language and Text* (NovTSupp 44; Leiden: Brill, 1976), pp. 81–4.

[10] Note that in P 1 Cor. 5:4–5 contains the sequence 'our Lord Jesus Christ' three times, a pattern not found in Greek texts.

[11] In 2 Tim. 4:22 NA27 cites P for the sequence κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. This is probably appropriate because ܡܪܢ ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ is not a characteristic expansion of κύριος in P.

4:19 P lacks ἤδη.

11. It has already been shown with respect to the Gospels that it is problematic to use Syriac witnesses to attest the omission of ἤδη.[12]

4:22 P lacks καί after διό.

12. This note is illegitimate. See on 1:24.

4:23 P supports the inclusion of εἰς δικαιοσύνην after ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ.

13. Fuller consideration of the verse brings the citation into question. NA27 reads οὐκ ἐγράφη δὲ δι᾽ αὐτὸν μόνον ὅτι ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ, to which certain witnesses add εἰς δικαιοσύνην. The Syriac, however, reads ܐܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܛܠܬܗ ܒܠܚܘܕ ܐܬܟܬܒܬ ܗܕܐ ܕܐܬܚܫܒܬ ܗܝܡܢܘܬܗ ܠܟܐܢܘ 'And it was not because of him alone [that] this was written—that his faith was reckoned for righteousness'. The Syriac adds 'this' and then 'his faith' where no Greek witness has equivalents. It is most likely that the Syriac translation is simply trying to clarify the rather elliptic ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ. This is at least as probable as that P was translated from one of the very few texts with εἰς δικαιοσύνην, since such texts are scarce indeed (NA27 only explicitly cites D² and ms 1241). The presence of a few Greek witnesses supporting the addition is only to be expected; it was almost inevitable that in some part of the Greek tradition the wording of v. 23 would be assimilated to that of v. 22. Moreover, the few Vulgate texts that include the addition *ad iustitiam* in v. 23 have most likely arisen by assimilation within the Latin transmission process. If any edition does decide to cite P in support of the addition it must at least include its witness in parentheses to reflect the difference in its wording.

5:6 P has εἰ δέ for txt's ἔτι γάρ and (P) is said to read as txt except for the omission of ἔτι before κατὰ καιρόν.

14. The note is rather difficult to understand since at first it might appear that the apparatus simultaneously uses P as a witness for and against ἔτι γάρ. This problem is resolved if we suppose that the apparatus is merely meaning to suggest that P has εἰ δέ for txt's ἔτι γάρ and lacks ἔτι before κατὰ καιρόν. The parentheses might be taken to mark that P does not support ἔτι γάρ. Though ἔτι is not always represented in P,[13] it is probable that in this context P would represent ἔτι at least once if it occurred twice in its *Vorlage*. Moreover, the conditional structure in P supports εἰ rather than ἔτι at the beginning of the sentence. The use of P as a support for δέ is problematic since it is the only witness for this reading. The other Greek texts supporting εἰ contain γέ. This particle could be ignored in Syriac translation as occurs in the combination εἰ γέ in Eph. 3:2; Col. 1:23. However, it may be that in Gal. 3:4 Syriac ܕܝܢ represents γέ after εἰ. It is probably best to cite P in parentheses in support of the reading εἰ γέ.

---

[12] Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, pp. 165–7.

[13] See Rom. 5:8; Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, pp. 163–4.

5:11 P supports Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *rather than* Ἰησοῦ.

15. This note is illegitimate. See on 3:26.

5:15 P omits καί *after* οὕτως.

16. The problem with this note is that whereas Greek texts generally contain οὕτως καί in four verses in the context (5:15, 18, 19, 21) only in 5:19 does P have a formal equivalent of καί. It seems best therefore to suppose that the omission is translational. P is cited in 5:15 but not in 5:18 and 5:21 because the omission in 5:15 has Greek support from Codex Vaticanus. It is probable that the reading of Vaticanus is a truly singular reading that was not widely spread among Greek witnesses. It is also at least as probable as not that P was produced from a *Vorlage* containing καί.

5:16 P supports δι᾽ ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήματος *rather than* δι᾽ ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος.

17. Many modern translations, though undoubtedly basing themselves on the latter reading, produce renderings that could equally have been produced from the former reading: 'And again, the gift of God is not to be compared in its effect with that one man's sin' (NEB; similarly NIV, NLT second edition, NRSV). There should at least therefore be a presumption that an ancient translator may have adopted the same procedure, particularly given the obvious difficulties that would be caused by a literal rendering and the lack of a past participle in Syriac. The Syriac rendering ܐܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܣܘܪܚܢܐ ܕܚܕ ܗܘ ܗܟܢܐ ܡܘܗܒܬܐ 'and not as the sinful act of one, thus [is] the gift' already establishes itself as a paraphrase by its restructuring: omission of an equivalent of διά and addition of ܗܟܢܐ 'thus'. It is therefore hard to say with certainty that P supports ἁμαρτήματος.

6:4 P omits οὖν *after* συνετάφημεν.

18. Metzger seems to suggest that the omission occurred in translation,[14] though if that is the case the principles of NA27 imply that the variant should not occur in the apparatus.

6:19 (P) twice supports δουλεύειν *rather than* δοῦλα. *It omits* εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν.

19. Most Greek witnesses read ὥσπερ γὰρ παρεστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἀνομίᾳ εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν οὕτω[ς] νῦν παραστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγιασμόν. P reads:

ܐܝܟܢܐ ܓܝܪ ܕܛܝܒܬܘܢ ܗܕܡܝܟܘܢ ܠܥܒܕܘܬܐ ܕܛܢܦܘܬܐ ܘܕܥܘܠܐ
ܗܟܢܐ ܐܦ ܗܫܐ ܛܝܒܘ ܗܕܡܝܟܘܢ ܠܥܒܕܘܬܐ ܕܟܐܢܘܬܐ
ܘܠܩܕܝܫܘܬܐ

---

[14] B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (2nd edn; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), p. 453.

'just as you prepared your limbs for the service of uncleanness and iniquity, so also now prepare your limbs for the service of righteousness and of holiness'. All three notes in NA27 in this verse are dubious. P twice has the abstract noun ܥܲܒ̣ܕ݁ܘܼܬ݂ܵܐ 'service' where other witnesses have the nominal neuter adjective δοῦλα or the infinitive δουλεύειν. Since it formally follows neither Greek texts with δοῦλα, nor those with δουλεύειν, it is difficult to see how it can be used to support one rather than the other. Moreover, this abstract noun twice enters into a genitive relationship with the following noun. A clear analogy for the translation of the term 'slave' by an abstract occurs in 6:16 where ᾧ παριστάνετε ἑαυτοὺς δούλους εἰς ὑπακοήν is rendered ܠܡܲܢ ܕܲܡܫܲܥܒ̇ܕ݂ܝܼܢ ܐܲܢ̱ܬ̇ܘܿܢ ܢܲܦ̣ܫܟ݂ܘܿܢ ܕܬܸܫܬܲܡܥܘܼܢ ܠܹܗ ܠܥܲܒ̣ܕ݁ܘܼܬ݂ܵܐ 'to whomever you prepare yourself that you should obey him for service'. This suggests that P's reading in 6:19 could have been produced from the *Vorlage* with δοῦλα. The citation of P for the omission of εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν is also unjustified, for, although it is not formally represented an adequate reason for its omission can be given. The Syriac translation produces a balance between the two halves of the comparison. In both halves ܥܲܒ̣ܕ݁ܘܼܬ݂ܵܐ comes into a genitive relationship with two following abstract nouns. This involves the representation of τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγιασμόν by two coordinated nouns. In both halves of the sentence all Greek datival function (whether expressed by the dative case or by the preposition εἰς) is converted into a Syriac genitive relationship. If we assume that τῇ ἀνομίᾳ was notionally restructured in the same way as τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ in the second half of the sentence and that εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν was notionally restructured in the same way as εἰς ἁγιασμόν in the second half of the sentence then both τῇ ἀνομίᾳ 'for lawlessness' and εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν 'for lawlessness' would have ended up as genitives following ܥܲܒ̣ܕ݁ܘܼܬ݂ܵܐ. They would thus be translated identically and redundant repetition would be avoided. In this way ܕܥܵܘܠܵܐ can be seen to be the equivalent both of τῇ ἀνομίᾳ and of εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν.[15]

7:8 P supports the addition of ἦν after χωρὶς γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία νεκρά.

20. The implication of the note seems to be that if there is a verbless clause in Greek, Syriac will not introduce the verb 'to be' in the past tense to represent it. There are, however, plenty of cases of verbless clauses in the Greek being rendered by verbal clauses in the Syriac. This, in fact, must be considered the normal procedure. Naturally, when the context suggests, P will use the past tense of the verb 'to be'. See Rom. 4:13; 5:16 *bis*, 18, etc.

8:1 P omits νῦν after ἄρα.

21. This is uncertain. The sequence ἄρα νῦν is unique in the NT and it is not therefore possible to know how it would be translated by P. We can say that when νῦν occurs with the inferential particle οὖν generally only one equivalent is used for both words. In Acts 15:10; 16:36; 23:15 it

---

[15] For further illustration of how, when two Greek words or phrases both naturally require the same Syriac equivalent, the translator's solution is to represent them only once see Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, pp. 257–9, 265–72.

is probable that the sequence νῦν οὖν is translated ܘܟܝ 'and now' (cf. John 16:22 with variant readings).[16]

8:11 P attests Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν rather than (a) Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐκ νεκρῶν, (b) ἐκ νεκρῶν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, (c) τὸν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, or (d) Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.

22. P reads ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܡܢ ܒܝܬ ܡܝܬܐ 'Jesus Christ from the place of the dead'. As noted on 1:1, Syriac cannot be used to distinguish the order Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς from the order Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, and we cannot therefore preclude that P was produced from variant (a). What makes (b) different from (a) is that ἐκ νεκρῶν precedes the object. However, this variant cannot be excluded as the *Vorlage* of P since there is ample evidence that in P the equivalents of ἐκ νεκρῶν tend to be placed at the end of the clause, even in contrast to the Greek structure. Despite some Greek textual variants it is likely that this occurred in the following texts: Matt. 17:9; Mark 9:9, 10; 12:25; John 20:9; Rom. 7:4; 10:7; 1 Cor. 15:12; cf. also the moving of the nouns 'Jesus' and 'God' in 1 Thess. 1:10 and Heb. 11:19, respectively. Finally, readings (c) and (d) cannot be eliminated as possible *Vorlagen* for P since it is likely that P sometimes expanded 'Christ' into 'Jesus Christ'. See Rom. 6:4.

8:16 (P) supports D's addition of ὥστε at the beginning of the clause.

23. It seems that the only reason that P is cited in support of this variant is that it begins the clause with *waw* 'and' rather than with asyndeton. However, P frequently inserts *waw* without Greek support (8:29, 32), and elsewhere inferences built on Syriac *waw* have been shown to be untenable.[17]

8:26 P supports τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ rather than, inter alia, ταῖς ἀσθενείαις.

24. This is a probable inference, though we should note that it is probable that in Heb. 4:15 a Greek plural is represented in vocalised texts of P by the same singular word as is used here.

8:26 P supports the addition of ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν after ὑπερεντυγχάνει.

25. Although it is certainly an obvious conclusion that ܪܘܚܐ ܗܝ ܓܝܪ ܡܨܠܝܐ ܚܠܦܝܢ 'the spirit prays on behalf of us' was a representation of τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, it is hard to agree that ܪܘܚܐ ܡܨܠܝܐ 'the spirit prays' would, on its own, be an adequate representation of τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει. This is because the verbal prefix ὑπερ- would be unrepresented. Since Syriac has no ready adverbial equivalent of ὑπερ- that does not take pronominal suffixes it is likely that Syriac might also represent ὑπερεντυγχάνει by 'prays on behalf of us'. However, since this is the only case in the NT where the verbal prefix ὑπερ- means

---

[16] For a treatment of ἄρα in the Old Syriac of Luke see Brock, 'The Treatment of Greek Particles', pp. 80–1.

[17] Williams, *Studies in the Syntax of the Peshitta of 1 Kings*, pp. 85–93; idem, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, pp. 149–60.

'on behalf of' it is not possible to adduce direct parallels to illustrate how the Syriac might have added a pronominal element.[18] At any rate the evidence is ambiguous and the note therefore illegitimate.

8:32 (P) supports ὅς οὐδὲ τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ ἐφείσατο *rather than* ὅς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο.

26. P reads ܘܐܢ ܠܐ ܥܠ ܒܪܗ ܚܣ 'and if on his son he did not take pity'. Whereas οὐδέ probably emphasizes what follows it and γέ what precedes it, the Syriac contains no clearly emphatic structures. We do not have any information that would allow us to infer which of the two readings would have been more likely to provoke the Syriac conditional structure, but it seems reasonable to conclude that P's reading could have resulted from either *Vorlage*.

8:35 P attests the presence of ἤ *between nouns in a list.*

27. This note is questionable since it is well attested that Syriac may seek full coordination of elements within lists (e.g. Matt. 19:18–19; 1 Ki. 8:37).[19] P can at least be shown not to regard the use of 'and' or 'or' as a matter for literal fidelity in that it is willing to represent ἤ by *waw* 'and' (e.g. Col. 2:16).

8:39 P supports the omission of τις *before* κτίσις ἑτέρα.

28. This note is illegitimate because P does not necessarily represent τις alongside ἕτερος. The closest NT parallel is καὶ εἴ τις ἑτέρα ἐντολή (Rom. 13:9), which is translated ܘܐܢ ܐܝܬ ܦܘܩܕܢܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ 'and if there is another commandment'—without formal representation of τις. Similarly, in Acts 27:1, it is likely that τινας ἑτέρους δεσμώτας is represented simply by ܐܣܝ̈ܪܐ ܐܚܪ̈ܢܐ 'other prisoners'.

9:6 P omits ὅτι *after* οὐχ οἷον δέ.

29. The phrase is unique in the Pauline corpus, though it is closely paralleled by the verbless clause οὐχ ὅτι in 2 Cor. 1:24; 3:5; Phil. 3:12; 4:11, 17; 2 Thess. 3:9, in which ὅτι similarly means 'that'. Although most of these instances display a formal equivalent of ὅτι, in Phil. 3:12 οὐχ ὅτι ἤδη ἔλαβον is translated by ܠܐ ܗܘܐ ܡܢ ܟܕܘ ܢܣܒܬ 'it is not [that] I have already taken', which lacks a formal representation of ὅτι. Other, less similar, constructions also show that ὅτι need not be represented. See, for example, Rom. 8:29; 1 Cor. 15:5 (cf. perhaps 1 Cor. 10:20; 15:4 with Syriac *v.l.*). The note is therefore open to doubt.

---

[18] For the necessity of the addition in Syriac of pronominal elements in such situations see Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, p. 265.

[19] For the addition of *waw* 'and' in Syriac lists see Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, pp. 157–8.

9:22–23 (P) omits ἤνεγκεν, inserts εἰς before σκεύη, and replaces δόξης with χρηστότητος.

30. The parentheses clearly mark qualification to P's support for these readings. To assess these notes we must consider the whole context. 9:22–23 in NA27 read εἰ δὲ θέλων ὁ θεὸς ἐνδείξασθαι τὴν ὀργὴν καὶ γνωρίσαι τὸ δυνατὸν αὐτοῦ ἤνεγκεν ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σκεύη ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν καὶ ἵνα γνωρίσῃ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σκεύη ἐλέους ἃ προητοίμασεν εἰς δόξαν; The Syriac text reads

ܐ ܕܝܢ ... ܐܠܗܐ ܕܢܚܘܐ ܪܘܓܙܗ ܘܢܘܕܥ ܚܝܠܗ ܐܝܬܝ ...

'now if God wanted to show his anger and make known his power [and] brought in much longsuffering anger on the vessels of anger that were completed for destruction, and poured out his mercy on the vessels of mercy that were prepared by God for glory'. Clearly this involves a number of points of paraphrase. For instance, there is a third reference to 'anger', there is no representation of ἵνα γνωρίσῃ, the verb 'poured out' seems to try to represent the abundance of τὸν πλοῦτον, προητοίμασεν is translated by a plural passive, and a second nominal reference to God is added. In such a rephrased sentence it is probably not appropriate to make detailed inferences about *Vorlage*. One presumes that the parentheses round P in the first note are because it *does* have an equivalent of ἤνεγκεν, namely the verb ܐܝܬܝ 'he brought'. The note probably intends to mark that P contains an equivalent of εἰς before σκεύη because the Syriac reads ܠܥ ܡܐܢܐ 'upon [the] vessels'. However, if the *Vorlage* both contained ἤνεγκεν and added εἰς it would make no sense. The uncials F and G lack ἤνεγκεν but contain εἰς, but this leads to the reasonably intelligible: εἰ δὲ θέλων ὁ θ̅ς̅ ἐνδίξασθαι τὴν ὀργὴν καὶ γνωρείσαι τὸ δυνατὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ εἰς σκεύη ὀργῆς. Whereas F G have 'to make his power known *to* [εἰς]' P reads 'he brought anger *upon* [ܠܥ]'. Any similarity between the Greek and Syriac prepositions is completely outweighed by the contrast between the phrases in which they are used. Moreover, the suggestion that (P) supports χρηστότητος as opposed to δόξης has problems with the fact that the context is paraphrastic and that ܪܚܡܐ is never elsewhere an equivalent of χρηστότης. It seems therefore that both notes in NA27 are illegitimate.

9:33 P supports the omission of πᾶς before ὁ πιστεύων.

31. However, in the only other place in Romans where Greek texts have πᾶς ὁ followed by a participle (2:1), the Syriac does not formally represent πᾶς. Although πᾶς in such circumstances *is* generally represented the occasions where the Syriac omits an equivalent preclude certainty about its text-critical use (see 1 John 2:23; 3:4).

11:6 P supports οὐκ not οὐκέτι.

32. This note is illegitimate. Just as ἔτι is sometimes not represented in Syriac,[20] so οὐκέτι is often rendered in Syriac by a simple negative. This occurs more often than not in Romans

---

[20] See Rom. 5:8; Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, pp. 163–4.

(almost certainly in 6:9b; 7:17, 20; 14:15) with only one counter example (6:9a). Not including the present example in 11:6a, twice in this very verse οὐκέτι is rendered by a simple negative.

11:7 P supports ἐπεζήτει rather than ἐπιζητεῖ.

33. This note is questionable. The Greek present tense is closely linked with a following aorist. There is no reason why Syriac should necessarily preserve the present tense rather than represent it by a past tense. Compare in the nearby context P's translation of ἐντυγχάνει (11:2) and γίνεται (11:6).[21]

11:13 P lacks μέν or μὲν οὖν.

34. This note is illegitimate. μὲν οὖν has no fixed equivalent in the Peshitta NT and it is quite normal for it to be omitted in translation (John 19:24; Acts 1:18; Phil. 2:23). A favourite equivalent in Syriac is ܕ,[22] but this particle has already been used by P earlier in the verse and it would probably not have been idiomatic to repeat it.

11:25 P and Latt support caecitas for πώρωσις.

35. This is an interesting note, but is irrelevant to the question of *Vorlage*. The Syriac translations show considerable variation in translating πώρωσις. In Eph. 4:18 P opted for ܥܘܝܪܘܬܐ 'blindness' as here. On both occasions the Harclean follows the same interpretation, showing that this was presumably understood to be the literal translation. In Mark 3:5 P uses the equivalent ܩܫܝܘܬܐ 'hardness'. Given the evident difficulty with the term it may be that ܡܝܬܘܬܐ 'deadness' in the Sinaitic Syriac manuscript (S) to Mark 3:5 was not taken directly from the Bezan reading νεκρώσει. The verb πωρόω is taken in the sense 'blind' by S in Mark 6:52; 8:17, and so also by P and the Harclean in Rom. 11:7; 2 Cor. 3:14. It is taken in the sense of 'darkened' in John 12:40 (S and P). The matter therefore is entirely translational. What has motivated NA27 to give us this note here seems to be the agreement between the Latin and the Syriac. However, that specific agreement is not unique to this text. Latin support for the interpretation 'blind' can be found, for instance, in the Vulgate to Mark 3:5; 6:52; 8:17; Rom. 11:7; Eph. 4:18. Evidently this was a widespread interpretation of the πωρ- words, but it is doubtful whether such lexical information should be in the critical apparatus. The translational equivalence of πωρόω and a Hebrew term for sight impairment is independently established by Job 17:7 LXX.

---

[21] See further the translation of ἀποτολμᾷ (10:20) and λέγει (11:4).

[22] Luke 3:18; John 20:30; Acts 1:6; 8:25; 11:19; 15:30; Heb. 9:1; see also Mark 16:19; Acts 19:32; 1 Cor. 9:25.

12:2 P attests the addition of ὑμῶν.

36. This note is illegitimate because the possessive occurs with the noun 'mind', which in this context is an inalienable or inherent possession. Syriac rules for possessives make the presence of a possessive here obligatory.[23]

12:9 P supports μισοῦντες rather than ἀποστυγοῦντες.

37. Since ἀποστυγέω is an NT hapaxlegomenon it is difficult to judge how the Syriac translations ought to render it. It is perhaps a stronger term than μισέω, but broadly speaking it falls close to it semantically. It would not be unreasonable for Syriac translations to render it with ܣܢܐ 'hate', as P does here. It is not necessary to suppose that either P or the Harclean had a *Vorlage* other than ἀποστυγοῦντες. Latin texts may have used a similar rendering for the word. It is then possible that the reading μισοῦντες, whose only Greek witnesses are the Latin–Greek bilinguals F and G, resulted from a retranslation of the Latin into Greek. Whether or not this is the case the Syriac support for μισοῦντες is more than doubtful.

12:15 P attests the presence of καί.

38. This note is illegitimate. Since the Syriac conditions for asyndeton are not met, *waw* between the clauses is necessary.[24]

13:12 P supports καὶ ἐνδυσώμεθα not ἐνδυσώμεθα δέ.

39. This note is doubtful since the verb is coordinated with a preceding verb. Verbs are normally coordinated in Syriac by *waw* 'and', and therefore the use of this form of coordination cannot be used to argue for καί. It would have been unusual in Syriac to use ܕܝܢ here.

13:14 P supports τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν not (a) τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, (b) τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν, or (c) Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν.

40. Although neither reading (b) nor (c) appears to have been widespread in the manuscript tradition we cannot rule out the possibility that P was produced from one of them. P has its regular phrase ܡܪܢ ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ 'our Lord Jesus Christ', which would almost certainly be the equivalent of (c). (b) might have received the addition of 'Christ' (see notes on 3:26; 5:11; 8:11).

---

[23] Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, pp. 69–87.

[24] Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, pp. 150–4.

14:9 (P) supports ἀνέστη καὶ ἔζησεν *rather than* ἀνέστη *or* ἔζησεν.

41. P has the opposite order of the longer Greek text, and reads ܘܩܡ ܚܝܐ 'he came to life and rose'. This may be connected with a tendency in Syriac to reverse pairs of items (see on 1:7).[25] The note is legitimate.

15:2 P supports ἡμῶν *not* ὑμῶν.

42. This note is probably legitimate. P, however, may change second person exhortation into first person as has just occurred in 14:21 where ὁ ἀδελφός σου is rendered 'our brother'.

15:4 P supports ἐγράφη *rather than* προεγράφη *for the second reference to writing in this verse.*

43. This note is illegitimate since it suggests that P must give a formal equivalent of the semantic element προ- 'previously'. This element is not rendered when προγράφω is used in Eph. 3:3,[26] and, arguably, is unnecessary in Rom. 15:4b precisely because it has been represented previously in the verse. Syriac has some difficulty representing προ- when it is a temporal prefix to a verb, rendering it either with an additional verb or an adverbial phrase. P therefore often lacks a formal equivalent when it is unnecessary for the overall sense. This occurs with NT uses of προαμαρτάνω (2 Cor. 12:21; 13:2),[27] and προβιβάζω (Matt. 14:8, Old Syriac and P).

15:5 P supports Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν *rather than* Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν.

44. This note is illegitimate. See on 1:1.

15:14 P attests μου *after* ἀδελφοί.

45. This note is illegitimate since it is usual for P to add a possessive with kinship terms.[28] That P will render ἀδελφοί by the Syriac equivalent ܐܚܝ 'my brothers' is adequately shown by Rom.

---

[25] This pair reversal adds to the list of cases where one half of the pair is missing in part of the manuscript tradition. See Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, p. 217.

[26] The only other NT occurrences of προγράφω are Gal. 3:1, where προ- is not temporal, and Jude 4, which is among the NT books not contained in P.

[27] In 2 Cor. 13:2 P does not render the προ- of προαμαρτάνω, but twice renders the προ- of προλέγω. It may be that the translator felt that to render προ- formally three times in this verse was excessive. It must be allowed that the same avoidance of consistent equivalence may have occurred in Rom. 15:4.

[28] Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, pp. 87–101. It is a little surprising that NA27 holds that ܐܚܝ attests the Greek possessive in 15:14, but can be used as unqualified support for the form *without* the possessive in 15:15, 30.

1:13; 7:1; 8:12; 10:1; 11:25; 16:17, and probably also by 12:1; 15:15, 30. Even the Harclean, which is generally seen as a hyper-literal translation, could not resist the rendering ܟܢܬ in 7:1, 8:12; 10:1, although the likelihood that there was a possessive in the *Vorlage* of the Harclean in all of these cases must be considered rather low.[29]

15:26 P supports Μακεδόνες *rather than* Μακεδονία.

46. This note is questionable since it is possible that P could personalize geographical references that are used by metonymy for their inhabitants. The Greek text is extant in two main forms: εὐδόκησαν γὰρ Μακεδονία καὶ Ἀχαΐα and the form of Greek–Latin witnesses F G (with further Latin support), which read Μακαιδόνες for Μακεδονία. P represents both nouns personally: ܟܡ ܢ ܚܠܡ ܕܬܡܣܘܐ ܟܘܣܐ ܘܐܟܐ 'For those who are in Macedonia and in Achaia wanted'. If Ἀχαΐα can be personalized it is reasonable to suppose that Μακεδονία could be too.

16:3 P supports Πρίσκιλλαν *rather than* Πρίσκαν.

47. This note is illegitimate since P renders all six NT references to this individual identically with the form ܦܪܝܣܩܠܐ. It is not likely that Πρίσκιλλα was the *Vorlage* for all three cases where the short form Πρίσκα is reasonably well attested in Greek manuscripts (Rom. 16:3; 1 Cor. 16:19; 2 Tim. 4:19). The tendency for P not to distinguish the various Greek forms of proper names has already been observed in the case of names for Peter and for Satan.[30]

16:20 P supports Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *rather than* Ἰησοῦ.

48. This note is illegitimate. See on 3:26.

---

[29] Consequently, of course, we must also reject NA27's conclusion that the Harclean attests μου in Romans 15:14. Aland and Juckel, *Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung*, II. *Die Paulinischen Briefe*, 1. *Römer- und 1. Korintherbrief*, pp. 567, 568, 571, in their *Rückübersetzung* of the Harclean into Greek accept that in Rom. 7:1; 8:12; 10:1 the Harclean added a possessive. However, they wish to use the Harclean to attest the possessive in 15:14 (see p. 577). It would be better to acknowledge uncertainty in 15:14 and to accept that the Harclean may paraphrase.

[30] Clemons, 'Some Questions on the Syriac Support for Variant Greek Readings', pp. 27–9; S. P. Brock, 'Limitations of Syriac in Representing Greek', in B. M. Metzger, ed., *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission and Limitations* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977), pp. 88–9; Williams, 'Some Problems in Determining the *Vorlage* of Early Syriac Versions of the NT', pp. 541–2.

16:27 P lacks ᾧ.

49. This note is illegitimate. P has somewhat restructured the doxology of 16:25–27. The term 'God' has been moved from v. 27 to the beginning of v. 25. It is only with the initial *lamadh* in v. 25 that P marks the dativity of the divine recipient of praise. Thus the representation of μόνῳ σοφῷ at the beginning of v. 27 does not contain a further *lamadh*. The failure to represent ᾧ can adequately be explained on the grounds that the overall structure of the doxology in P only required an equivalent of a dative at the beginning of v. 25.

16:27 P attests τῶν αἰώνων after εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

50. This note is illegitimate in the light of the fact that P regularly uses ܠܥܠܡ ܥܠܡܝܢ 'to the age of the ages' where almost all Greek texts have just εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας (Rom. 1:25; 9:5; 11:36; 2 Cor. 11:31). It is likely therefore that ܠܥܠܡܥܠܡܝܢ in Rom. 16:27 could have been produced from either a longer or shorter Greek reading. It should be borne in mind that, whichever *Vorlage* the Syriac had in the various texts expressing future continuity, it did not render them literally since it uses the singular ܥܠܡ, where Greek texts have a plural. By idiom Syriac uses a singular for the first occurrence of ܥܠܡܐ and a plural for the second. Consequently, on some occasions it will seem that the singular first member of the Syriac construction contrasts with a plural in the Greek, and at others it may seem that the plural second member of the Syriac construction contrasts with a singular in the possible Greek *Vorlage* (e.g. εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος in Heb. 1:8).[31]

Conclusions

51. In surveying the 150 variants in Romans for which NA27 cites P it emerges that around 42 (28%) of the citations are sufficiently dubious as to be illegitimate, while others admit significant degrees of uncertainty. This is an important conclusion because it may give us an indication of the reliability of the notes about P throughout the whole of NA27. While NA27's apparatus has not proved as reliable as might be desired—though no mistakes were detected in the apparatus of chapters 10 or 14—it must be remembered that it is still considerably more accurate than previous critical editions of the Greek NT that have used Syriac evidence (for instance, those of Von Soden or Vogels), and that the primary research focus of those preparing the Syriac of NA27, namely, identifying and collating manuscripts of the Syriac NT, is in no way criticised here. For obvious reasons the Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung has judged the collection and collation of the Syriac witnesses to be methodologically prior to its systematic evaluation by studies in translation technique. That said, thanks to the editions of the Peshitta epistles produced under the auspices of the Institut we are now in a position to evaluate and refine the use of the Syriac witnesses presented to us in the apparatus of NA27.

52. In some ways it may seem that the focus here on the ambiguity of the evidence of P must inevitably lead to greater uncertainty about its textual character. However, while we are less

---

[31] As a consequence of this discussion NA27's use of P to attest τῶν αἰώνων in 1 Pet. 5:11 must also be rejected.

certain about the witness of P in a number of individual readings we are able to reach some conclusions as to its textual character.

53. First, as a consequence of this investigation, P seems to have fewer demonstrable readings where there is no Greek support (see on 1:7; 5:6; 6:4; 11:25). Secondly, P contains fewer demonstrable readings attested by only a few Greek witnesses (see on 1:3; 4:23; 5:6; 6:19; 7:8; 8:1, 11, 16, 32; 9:6, 22, 23; 12:9; 15:26).[32] Thirdly, P contains fewer textual agreements with 'Western' witnesses that require a genetic explanation (see, for instance, on 5:16; 6:19; 11:25; 12:9; 15:26). Thus, though certainty about the *Vorlage* in *individual* cases may be decreased, taken together these indicators make it probable that P's *Vorlage* does not show *strong* 'Western' tendencies and does not contain a significant number of readings not contained in extant Greek manuscripts. While the *Vorlage* may not correspond closely to the text of any individual Greek witnesses extant today, its readings are not individually distinctive.

54. Finally, it is worth observing that, since this sort of analysis has not been carried out to any significant degree on other parts of the Peshitta epistles or on Acts it is likely that such analysis would reveal similar types of error in those texts. To the extent that translation technique studies have also not been sufficiently applied to the Coptic and Latin versions of the NT there may also be a significant number of errors in those.[33] The removal of overconfident reconstructions of the *Vorlagen* of the versions from the critical apparatus has the potential to shift significantly the balance of textual evidence in numbers of cases.

---

[32] It may be noted that in some cases the 'few' witnesses are weighty, e.g. Vaticanus in 6:19, and in other cases the witnesses are not held to be highly significant of themselves, e.g. ms 61* in 1:3. In both types of example the Greek witnesses may present us with a scribal error that was not widely circulated in manuscripts and which agrees with P only by coincidence.

[33] I also show some deficiencies in the representation of Coptic evidence in 'On the Representation of Sahidic within the Apparatus of the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece*', *Journal of Coptic Studies* 8 (2006) 123–25.