After Lk. 24:42 μέρος many witnesses add καὶ ἄπο μελισσίου κηρίου. These words are lacking in P\textsuperscript{75} S A B D L W II 579 1079 L de S s, and since Westcott and Hort it has been assumed with few exceptions that that the shorter text is right and the longer text is wrong (Exceptions are to be found in A. Merx, Die vier kanonischen Evangelien ... II/2, Markus und Lukas, Berlin, 1905, pp. 540-3, in Hastings, Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, I [1906], pp. 1746 f., and in A. Pott, Der Text des Neuen Testaments, Leipzig/Berlin, 1919\textsuperscript{2}, pp. 78 f.).

Recently however the maxim, lectio breuior potior, has been called in question. Where some witnesses present a shorter text and others a longer we have to find reasons why one or other is to be preferred. For example in Lk. 24:9 the words ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου are absent from D L a b c d e ff\textsuperscript{2} 1 r\textsuperscript{1} Arm and are bracketed by Westcott and Hort (cf. vol. II, Introduction, 176), but we have a repetition of the same letters at the point of variation ΑΠΟΣΟΜΝΗΜΗΜΕΙΟΝΑΠΗΓΓΕΙΛΑΝ. This repetition of letters may explain the variation at Lk. 24:51. The words καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν ὀφρανόν are absent from S\* D L a b d e ff\textsuperscript{2} 1 Ps-Aug S s Geo (1) but again we notice a repetition of letters at the point of variation αὐτῶνΝΚΑΙΑΝΕΦΕΡΕΤΟΕΙΣΤΟΝΟΥΡΑΝΟΝΚΑΙΑΝΤΟΙ.

We may notice a similar repetition (hom.) at 24:42 μέρος ΚΑΙΑΠΟΜΕΛΙΣΣΗΟΝ ΚΗΡΙΟΥ ΚΑΙΛΑΒΟΝ. We may argue that the longer text is right here too and that the shorter text is the product of hom., but we may ask ourselves whether the longer text is appropriate.

In John’s resurrection story Jesus partakes of food, 21:13, cf. 15. In Luke the disciples become fearful and think that they are seeing a spirit. Jesus in reply shows the disciples his hands and feet (v. 39) and goes on to ask for something to eat. According to the longer text they give him a piece of broiled fish and part of a honey comb.
We can find a parallel for the broiled fish in Mark’s feeding of the multitude, 6:38 cf. Lk. 9:13 and 6:41 cf. Lk. 9:16.

This passage in Mark may serve to explain the reference to fish in Lk. 24:42, but what are we to make of the mention of a honeycomb? At Ps. 117:12 (LXX) we have ἐκυψάλωμαν με ὠσεὶ μέλισσαι χηρίον which is referred to Jesus in Ep. Barn. 6.6. The Hebrew text has no equivalent of χηρίον, but we may connect the passage in Lk. 24 with a mention of a honeycomb in Joseph and Aseneth. Fitzmyer in the Anchor Bible ad loc. refers to E. Nestle, Exp. Tim. xxii. (1911) 567 f. Nestle had noted a similarity with Joseph and Aseneth, but had ascribed this to the fourth century AD following Batiffol.

The date of Joseph and Aseneth is important. The treatise seems to be entirely free from Christian influence and to belong to the first century BC or AD. In one episode the honeycomb plays an important part, in xvi, a miraculous part which adds to our problems. However at one point in the story the angelic visitor says: τὸ μέλι τοῦ πεποίηκασιν αὐτῷ μέλισσαι τοῦ παραθείσου τῆς τρυφῆς, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐσθίουσι, καὶ πᾶς ὁς φάγεται ἐξ αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἀποθανεῖται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. In other words the honeycomb is the food of immortality.

The food of immortality is an ancient theme which I have discussed in connexion with the interpretation of Jn. 6 in The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy (1983), 55 f. The passage in Joseph and Aseneth xvi suggests that the partaking by Jesus in the honeycomb in Lk. 24 may be connected with his resurrection. If we read Lk. 24:30 f. carefully the evangelist does not say that Jesus at this point partook of food, and the first occasion when Jesus takes food is 24:42. If we accept these implications we can understand the text with the longer reading in this passage.1 We can see how the shorter text suggests an interpretation of Lk. 24 which accords with another text from Jewish authority.

In v. 43 after ἔφαγεν add καὶ τὰ ἐπίλοιπὰ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ΚΠ* f13 (pt) C b (mss) L Aug. Similar readings occur in Θ 713 L pt etc. They may provide a longer text, but does it have any claim to be

---

1 The authenticity of the longer text was also defended by Ludwig Koehler, Kleine Lichter ... (Zwingli-Bücherei, 47), Zürich 1945, pp. 86-90: '23. Fisch mit Honig'. His argument, however, was: '... diese Vereinigung [of fish and honey] beruht auf eine Speisetheorie' (p. 89).