

CHAPTER SIX

THE SCRIBE OF Ψ47

Ψ47 is a codex dating from the latter part of the third century,1 which once contained the entire book of Revelation.2 Fairly well preserved portions of ten folios have survived, and are now in Dublin as Chester Beatty Papyrus III.3 The contents include most of Rev 9:10–17:2. On its provenance see the remarks in connection with Ψ45 in chapter 4.

There have been remarkably few studies devoted to Ψ47, and most of the attention given to it has concentrated on its textual relationships. Kenyon was able to say, in fact, only that Ψ47 sided with the majuscules Ρ A C P, being “closest to Ρ and C, with P next, and A rather further away.”4 On the basis of the comprehensive study by Schmid, however, a more precise characterization is possible. Schmid isolates four main branches of the textual tradition of Revelation: A C, Ψ47 Ρ, Av (the commentary

---

1 The datings in Aland’s *Repertorium*, 277, are, besides Kenyon’s, “III” and “III E.” Kenyon’s date is cited as “III E—IV,” but this seems not quite accurate, since Kenyon says (Pauline Epistles and Revelation, Text, xii): “There is nothing in the hand to suggest a later date than the third century, but it is likely to be late in the century.” Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 198 (no. 565) cites the datings of Kenyon and Wilcken. See also Comfort and Barrett, 335, and Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, 67–68 and 176–177.

2 The extant leaves cover almost exactly the middle third of Revelation. Kenyon suggests that we have either the middle part of a single-quire codex, or the second quire of a three-quire codex (Pauline Epistles and Revelation, Text, xi).

3 Ibid., and Aland, *Repertorium*, 277.

4 Pauline Epistles and Revelation, Text, xiii. In an early article, Henry A. Sanders, “The Beatty Papyrus of Revelation and Hoskier’s Edition,” *JBL* 53 (1934) 371–380, investigated the relationship of Ψ47 to various minuscules and groups cited by Hoskier. Incidentally, we may note some errors in his citations on p. 379. At 9:20 Sanders cites Ψ47 2322 (Hoskier’s 201) as alone among Greek manuscripts in reading κουνεα for κουςα; but Ρ reads κουςα (see Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece* 313000), which is just an itacistic variation of κουνεα, and thus this reading does not occur in our list. At 10:4 Sanders seems to cite 1841 (Hoskier’s 130) as bo as supporting Ψ47’s addition of ανεα, although he notes that they add it in a different place. And at 14:19 Sanders follows Kenyon’s text and apparatus in citing Ψ47 680 (Hoskier’s 104) as being alone in omitting ο before αργελος; but the plate shows clearly that the article is there in Ψ47, as now cited also by Comfort and Barrett. Sanders also cites ten readings of Ψ47 with no Greek support but the support of one version; these are our 9:11, 9:20a, 10:4a, 11:7b, 11:16, 11:27a, 13:6b (Sanders takes this as an omission of κα τους), 13:11b, 14:7, 14:8. And on p. 380 Sanders incorrectly takes Ψ47 as having ιδον before ιηνινη at 15:5.

See also José M. Bover, “¿El código 1841 (= 127) es el mejor representante del Apocalipsis?” *EstEcI* 18 (1944) 169–173, on the textual relations, using Kenyon’s figures. At 174–177 he compares Ψ47 and minuscules in selected passages, finding the highest agreement with 1841 (his 127); see further 179–180 on the relation.
of Andreas), and K (the Koine).\(^5\) Besides thus separating \(\text{P}^{47}\) and \(\text{X}\) from the other manuscripts, Schmid also aligns these two with the testimony of Origen, thus speaking of “Der Text von \(\text{P}^{47}\) S und Origenes.”\(^6\) Indeed, Schmid provides a list of 36 readings where \(\text{P}^{47}\) and \(\text{X}\) agree against the other three chief branches.\(^7\) On the basis of the support from less important witnesses for readings in this list, Schmid also finds “Zeugen zweiten und dritten Ranges” for \(\text{P}^{47}-\text{X}\), namely, family 1006 and 2344, as well as family 1678, 1611, 1854, and co.\(^8\) Schmid does not devote much attention to the versional evidence,\(^9\) but Coptic support for the text found in an Egyptian papyrus, Codex Sinaiticus, and Origen, seems reasonable enough.\(^10\) Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland characterize it as having a “normal” text.\(^11\)


\(^6\) Studien, Die alten Stämme, 109–110; “Der Apokalyptext,” 88–89. As cited by Schmid, Bousset had already noted the connection between \(\text{X}\) (for which Schmid uses “S”) and Origen; and Tasker, “The Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Apocalypse of John,” JTS 50 (1949) 66–67, also comments on the relation between \(\text{P}^{47}\) and Origen.

\(^7\) Studien, Die alten Stämme, 111–112. As Schmid notes, such readings would total about 100 if \(\text{P}^{47}\) were extant for the whole book.

\(^8\) Ibid., 113. For the Coptic see “Der Apokalyptext,” 88, and the list on 89–93; for the agreements with minuscules see 107 n. 2: “An einigen Stellen trifft \(\text{P}^{47}\) mit bestimmten Minuskeln gegen alle Majuskeln zusammen. Doch sind diese Lesarten sowohl der Zahl wie dem Charakter nach nicht bedeutsam genug, um ein engeres Verwandtschaftsverhältnis dieser Minuskeln mit \(\text{P}^{47}\) wahrscheinlich zu machen.”

\(^9\) Cf. Studien, Die alten Stämme, X–XI.

\(^10\) Tasker’s earlier (and less comprehensive) study concluded (“The Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Apocalypse of John,” 67) that \(\text{P}^{47}\) reflects an early revision of the original text of the Apocalypse, similar to that reflected in the text used by Origen, and less thorough than that which eventually became standardized and resulted finally in the textus receptus,” and also (68) confirmed Kenyon’s view that \(\text{P}^{47}\) stands close to \(\text{X}\). Tasker adds (68): “There seem to be no cases where the papyrus has claims to have preserved the original reading to the exclusion of all other manuscripts. . . .”

I note as a curiosity that at 9:16 \(\text{P}^{47}\) has δυο μυριαδες μυριαδων, the reading of the Textus Receptus, which Tischendorf cites from only a few manuscripts (2015 2036 2814* and “alfr”), and for which Nestle-Aland cites merely “\(\text{P}^{47}\) bo.” (See also BDF, § 63.) Yet Hoskier, citing only differences from the Textus Receptus, seems to imply that some dozen manuscripts support this reading. I confirmed from the manuscripts for 296, 2015, and 2047, and by microfilm for the others that \(\text{P}^{47}\) is indeed supported by 296 1668 2014 2015 2034 2036 2038 2047 2072 2074 2814. (Hoskier cites 2814 for δι, implying that 2814 reads δυο, as Tischendorf reports; the microfilm of 2814 shows merely the original δι and that some correction has been made.) Hoskier’s collation also implies that 699 (his 89) has this reading, since he does not cite 699 as omitting δυο. However, Hoskier (Text of the Apocalypse 1:281) refers to Scrivener’s collation of this manuscript in Adversaria critica sacra, 143–162, where in fact Scrivener (149) does cite 699 (his δ) as omitting δυο, as I confirmed from the manuscript. Thus, one might expect that Nestle-Aland would cite “\(\text{P}^{47}\) pc bo” (if not “\(\text{P}^{47}\) al bo”) for this reading.

\(^11\) The Text of the New Testament, 99 (and see 93–95); see chapter 1, n. 52.