

Abilene Christian University

Digital Commons @ ACU

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

5-2020

Translation Technique and Versional Evidence: The Syriac Peshitta Version of Colossians as a Witness to Its Greek Text

Ryne Alan Parrish
rap12b@acu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), and the [Language Interpretation and Translation Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Parrish, Ryne Alan, "Translation Technique and Versional Evidence: The Syriac Peshitta Version of Colossians as a Witness to Its Greek Text" (2020). Digital Commons @ ACU, *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 217.

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Electronic Theses and Dissertations at Digital Commons @ ACU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ACU.

ABSTRACT

The Syriac Peshitta version of the New Testament holds great potential for NT textual criticism, but its value to this field is partially dependent upon the ability to deduce the particularities of the Greek text from which it was translated. To assess this ability, a thorough understanding of translation technique in each NT book is required. Toward such an end, this thesis provides a detailed study of the translation technique of Peshitta Colossians (PCol) and an evaluation thereof as a witness to its Greek *Vorlage*. I argue that the translation technique of PCol does not consistently allow confident conclusions to be reached about the specifics of its underlying Greek text, but rather that the Syriac of PCol sometimes may have been made from a range of possible Greek readings. This is not always recognized when editors of Greek NT editions cite PCol in the critical apparatus as a witness to certain readings. I demonstrate this by a systematic study of the citations of PCol in the 28th revised edition of the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece* (NA28), in which I conclude that no fewer than eleven citations in the NA28 are illegitimate on translational grounds, with several more requiring further clarification.

Chapter I contains a review of the pertinent literature and an overview of the project. In Chapter II, I lay out the three methodologies implemented in this study. Chapter III is a detailed presentation of the translation technique in PCol. In Chapter IV, I apply the conclusions about translation technique to an evaluation of PCol as a witness to its Greek source text and I analyze each citation of PCol in the NA28 critical apparatus.

Finally, Chapter V contains conclusions about suggested changes to citations of PCol in critical apparatuses as well as how this study should affect the implementation of versional evidence in NT textual criticism. The arguments I advance in this Thesis stand to improve upon the approach to employing versions as witnesses to their Greek texts and to clarify the place of the Peshitta in the critical apparatus of future editions of the Greek text of Colossians.

Translation Technique and Versional Evidence: The Syriac Peshitta Version of
Colossians as a Witness to Its Greek Text

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Graduate School of Theology

Abilene Christian University

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

By

Ryne Alan Parrish

May 2020

This thesis, directed and approved by the committee for the thesis candidate Ryne Parrish, has been accepted by the Office of Graduate Programs of Abilene Christian University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

Master of Arts in New Testament

Donnie Snider

Assistant Provost for Graduate Programs

Date

30 April 2020

Thesis Committee

Jeff W. Childers

Dr. Jeff Childers, Chair

Larry Curt Niccum

Dr. Curt Niccum

Richard A Wright

Dr. Richard Wright

For Sarah, who makes it easy to abide by Colossians 3:19

בְּחַיֵּי אִשְׁתִּי שָׂרָה

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project stands on the shoulders of many people who have helped me in various ways throughout the process. First and foremost, to my wonderful wife, Sarah, I cannot thank you enough. Without your patience, persistent encouragement, and the multitude of other ways you have supported me in this undertaking, I could have never finished. Many thanks are also in order for my advisor, Dr. Jeff Childers. Your mentorship from the inception of the project to its completion, as well as your careful reading and rereading of my work, have been invaluable. Thank you as well to the other members of my committee, Dr. Curt Niccum and Dr. Richard Wright. Your constructive criticisms were a great help in refining the focus and method of this study.

To my parents and two older sisters, thank you for raising me in an environment where learning and scholarship were highly valued, and for the support you have offered me over the years. To the members of Blanket Church of Christ, though you may never read my work or know how your encouragement helped me along the way, thank you. To the faculty and my colleagues in the Graduate School of Theology, thank you for so often asking about my research and for feigning interest as I droned on about Syriac translation technique. To my grandparents, my parents-in-law, and grandparents-in-law, thank you for your encouragement and for being proud of me. All persons mentioned here, and many others, were more important to this Thesis than they realize.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	iii
I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW	1
Review of Literature	2
The Use of the Versions for New Testament Textual Criticism.....	2
The Peshitta New Testament	9
Greek-Syriac Translation Technique	13
Overview.....	18
II. METHODOLOGY	21
Translation Technique Analysis	22
Developing Criteria for Evaluating a Version's Witness to the Greek Text	26
Evaluating a Version's Witness in General.....	27
Evaluating a Version's Witness to Specific Readings	31
Evaluating Peshitta Colossians as a Witness to Its Greek Text.....	33
III. TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE ANALYSIS.....	35
Macroanalysis	37
Translation Unit and Consciousness of Context and Meaning.....	37
Word Order	49
Degree of Literalness	51
Microanalysis.....	57
Verbs.....	57

	Pronouns	65
	Prepositions.....	71
	Conjunctions	77
	Vocabulary	80
	Conclusion: The Translation Technique of Peshitta Colossians.....	85
IV.	PESHITTA COLOSSIANS AS A WITNESS TO ITS GREEK TEXT.....	87
	The Translation Technique’s Bearing on PCol’s Witness to Its Greek Text.....	87
	Macroanalysis	87
	Microanalysis.....	90
	Evaluation of Citations of P in NA28.....	98
	Conclusion: The Witness of PCol to its Greek <i>Vorlage</i>	126
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND PATHS FORWARD	129
	Impacts on the Critical Apparatus of Colossians.....	131
	Suggested Changes to Critical Apparatus Citations of PCol.....	131
	Citations Requiring Further Clarification.....	134
	For Further Research.....	136
	Paths Forward in the Field of New Testament Textual Criticism	139
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	142
	APPENDIX A: Table of Evaluations Regarding Citations of P in NA28 Critical Apparatus	146

3.21 Greek forms translated by ϵ_1 78

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Sebastian Brock asserts that “the citing of the Syriac-Versional evidence in a Greek apparatus must accordingly go hand in hand with a study of the translation technique of each individual version in the book concerned.”¹ Haar Romeny and Morrison note that “continued research into the character of the NT Peshitta as a translation remains a desideratum.”² The Thesis at hand responds to both of these appeals in an analysis of the Syriac Peshitta version of Colossians (PCol), which was chosen in an attempt to contribute to the upcoming revised critical edition of Colossians in the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung’s *Editio Critica Maior*. This study will answer two basic questions: What is the nature of the Syriac translation technique in PCol? And given this translation technique, how can PCol witness to its underlying Greek text? The results presented here demonstrate that the translation technique of PCol produces a text that is a less reliable witness to its *Vorlage* than citations thereof in critical apparatuses would indicate. This research ultimately serves the purposes of NT textual criticism by clarifying the place of P in the textual apparatus of future critical editions of the Greek text of Colossians and by advancing the conversation surrounding the use of versional

1. Sebastian P. Brock, “Limitations of Syriac Representing Greek,” in *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations*, by Bruce M. Metzger (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977), 97.

2. R. B. ter Haar Romeny and C. E. Morrison, “Peshitta,” *Gorgias Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Syriac Heritage* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2012), 326–31.

evidence. More generally, it contributes to knowledge of the Syriac version of the Pauline corpus as well as the study of Greek-Syriac translation technique.

This introductory chapter includes a review of the pertinent literature and an overview of the project. The following fields of scholarship are surveyed here: the use of versions in NT textual criticism, the history and nature of the Peshitta New Testament (PNT), and the study of translation technique from Greek into Syriac.

Review of Literature

The Use of the Versions for New Testament Textual Criticism

Two related questions drive scholarship on this topic: How important are the versions for NT textual criticism? And under what circumstances may a version be reliably employed as a witness to its underlying Greek text? These questions, especially the latter, are critical for the present study as well. The literature concerning them is reviewed in two parts: first, regarding the use of versions in general, and second, regarding the use of the Syriac versions (especially P) specifically.

The Use of Versions in General

Barbara and Kurt Aland asserted that the value of the versions had been “considerably overrated,”³ but perhaps a better way to say it is that they have been considerably under-qualified. The versions are still valuable for NT textual criticism but only when accompanied by certain qualifiers. Parker sums up the caution with which textual critics are approaching the use of the versions, saying “it is now beginning to be more fully recognized that a variant might have arisen within the textual tradition of the

3. Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*, trans. Erroll F. Rhodes, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 185.

version, that the form of words might be due to the grammar and morphology of the version, or that there might be more than one possible reconstruction of the Greek from which it was derived.”⁴ As such, careful attention must be applied when employing versions as witnesses to the Greek text.

The textual critic must first take care to understand the translation itself. Childers argues this point, saying:

A thorough analysis of the translator’s methods is very helpful for dating a translation, but it is also prerequisite to any attempt to relate a version to its hypothetical source text. Without a detailed understanding of the translator’s methods, it is not possible responsibly to understand apparent correspondences and divergences between the version and its source text.⁵

Williams expands upon this idea in his essay on the use of the Syriac version (though it is equally applicable to versions in general), saying that the textual critic needs to “understand [the version’s] method of translation, the degree of consistency or inconsistency within the translation, and the extent of textual revision within the history of the version itself.”⁶ The use of a version for NT textual criticism thus necessitates a thorough understanding of its translation and transmission.

The scholarly rigor required to employ versions for NT textual criticism is nevertheless worthwhile because of the potential value of a version’s witness to the Greek text. This is especially the case for those versions that are early and definitely

4. D. C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 119.

5. Jeff Childers, “Patristic Citations and Versional Evidence: The Syriac Versions of Chrysostom’s Homilies on Matthew and the Old Syriac Text,” *Mus* 115 (2002): 135-36.

6. Peter J. Williams, “The Syriac Versions of the New Testament,” in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 156. For further discussion of the importance of understanding the translation of a version, cf. Allen Wikgren, “The Use of the Versions in New Testament Textual Criticism,” *JBL* 67 (1948): 135-42.

translated directly from the Greek—Latin, Syriac, Coptic, and Ethiopic.⁷ When these versions have been sufficiently studied and reliably employed, they can “provide diversified evidence concerning the geographical spread of individual readings as well as the boundaries of textual families.”⁸

Lastly, the introductions to major critical editions of the GNT are important for their methodological approach to employing versions in the textual apparatus. After affirming the value of the versions, the introduction to NA28 says:

The versions are cited only where their underlying Greek text can be determined with confidence. They are generally cited only where their readings are also attested by some other Greek or independent versional evidence. Only in rare instances do they appear as the sole support for a Greek reading. Differences in linguistic structure between Greek and the languages of the versions must be carefully noted. Variant readings reflecting idiomatic or stylistic differences are ignored. On the whole, the versions can only reveal with more or less precision the particular details of their Greek base. In instances where the witness of a version is doubtful, it is not noted. . . . Their value for scholarship today in comparison with earlier generations has been modified by the great number of Greek manuscripts on papyrus and parchment discovered in the twentieth century.”⁹

This is worth quoting in full because the introduction to the other critical hand edition in view here varies only slightly from these basic ideas. The UBS edition claims that it cites versions “only in instances where their underlying Greek text may be determined with

7. Barbara Aland et al., eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 28th rev. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012), 67*; Barbara Aland et al., eds., *Novum Testamentum Graecum: Editio Critica Maior*, 2nd rev., Vol. IV, *Catholic Letters: Part 1: Text* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2013), 23*; Holger Strutwolf et al., eds., *Novum Testamentum Graecum: Editio Critica Maior*, Vol. III, *Acts of the Apostles: Part 1.1: Text: Chapter 1-14* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2017), 20*.

8. Bruce M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977), vii.

9. Aland et al., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 67*-68*. Williams takes issue with the phrase “cited only where their underlying Greek text can be determined with confidence,” in Peter J. Williams, “Some Problems in Determining the Vorlage of Early Syriac Versions of the NT,” *NTS* 47 (2001): 537–43.

certainty or with a high degree of probability. In the latter case the citation of the version is qualified by a question mark.”¹⁰

The editors of the *Editio Critica Maior* (ECM) for both the Catholic Letters and Acts seek to “retrotranslate” versions with the result that “their underlying text . . . has been reconstructed to the extent possible.”¹¹ Both editions make space in the apparatus for the possibility that a version could be associated with more than one Greek variant, and both also indicate when a version’s translation style is too paraphrastic to reconstruct its underlying Greek text. The editors of the ECM of Acts break the precedent set by the prior Catholic Letters edition by including “apparatus notes for versional evidence only where it can possibly contribute to establishing the Greek text or its history.”¹² In this Acts edition, versional evidence was solicited only for a set number of select passages based on these two criteria: “(1) The passage features variants which have significant manuscript support and exhibit translatable linguistic differences. (2) In the versional or Greek patristic traditions there are variants which very probably go back to the Greek but are not preserved in the extant Greek manuscript traditions.”¹³ The second criterion is important, because there the editors acknowledge the possibility that a version may witness to a Greek variant no longer extant in the Greek manuscript tradition. Thus it may be summarized that the versions are valuable for NT textual criticism insofar as their

10. Barbara Aland et al., eds., *The Greek New Testament*, 4th rev. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2002), 23*. Emphasis added where differing from NA28.

11. Aland et al., *Novum Testamentum Graecum*, 23*; Strutwolf et al., *Novum Testamentum Graecum*, 23*.

12. Strutwolf et al., *Novum Testamentum Graecum*, 20*.

13. Strutwolf et al., *Novum Testamentum Graecum*, 20*.

translation and transmission are understood well enough to determine their underlying Greek text, to the extent that they might even witness to readings not present in any other Greek manuscript.

The Use of Syriac Versions—With Special Regard for the Peshitta

The main issues pertinent specifically to the Syriac versions are the relative values of the different Syriac translations and the limitations of Syriac in representing Greek. The consensus is that the Syriac versions are important witnesses to the early Greek text but that they must be employed only after a thorough understanding of their translation technique has been achieved.

Tatian's harmony of the four Gospels, the *Diatessaron*, is perhaps the oldest Syriac witness to the GNT (scholarship is divided over whether it was composed in Syriac), but its text survives mainly in patristic quotations. The oldest extant Syriac witnesses to the GNT are two fifth-century Gospel manuscripts, the Sinaitic and the Curetonian. The texts of these, along with two fragments from the same manuscript discovered among the new finds at St. Catharine's Monastery at Sinai, are referred to as the Old Syriac (OS).¹⁴ The Peshitta (P) is a late fourth- or fifth-century revision of OS, the Philoxenian (Ph) is a sixth-century revision of P, and the Harklean (H) is a seventh-century revision on the basis of Ph. The value of each is relative to its antiquity and its translation technique. This creates a dilemma because the earlier translations are more free while the later ones are progressively more literal, "[t]hus, while earlier translations are generally of greater textual significance, their witness is also harder to evaluate in

14. Jean-Claude Haelewyck, "The Old Syriac Versions of the Gospels: A Status Quaestionis (From 1842 to the Present Day)," *BABELAO* 8 (2019): 141-79.

many instances.”¹⁵ The introduction to NA28 summarizes it in this way: The Syriac versions

are characterized by different translation principles, from a very free, idiomatically correct rendering at the beginning, to a degree of fidelity to the Greek text so extreme that it violates natural Syriac idiom. Any evaluation of these versions as witnesses to the Greek text must bear this in mind. The later versions, with their literal and formal parallelism, are most frequently cited because their translation base is most easily determined.¹⁶

The necessity of understanding the translation technique for the earlier Syriac versions, therefore, cannot be overstated. Lyon, for example, asks: “How can we be certain that word order, the use of a particle, certain types of additions or omissions, etc., are really variants based on Greek texts unless we have some confidence in our knowledge of how the translator operated?”¹⁷ This is especially relevant regarding OS and P, which exhibit dynamic translation styles that make it much more difficult to be certain of their underlying Greek text than H, which features a more wooden technique that strictly adheres to the wording of its *Vorlage*.¹⁸ Moreover, because P is likely the work of more than one person,¹⁹ a study of the translation technique in the Gospels (such

15. Williams, “Syriac Versions,” 144.

16. Aland et al., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 70*.

17. Jeffrey P. Lyon, *Syriac Gospel Translations: A Comparison of the Language and Translation Method Used in the Old Syriac, the Diatessaron, and the Peshitto*, CSCO 548 (Leuven: Peeters, 1994), 18.

18. Holger Strutwolf et al., eds., *Novum Testamentum Graecum: Editio Critica Maior, vol. III Acts of the Apostles: Part 2: Supplementary Material* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2017), 174-75.

19. Metzger, *Early Versions of the New Testament*, 60. Williams makes this same argument within the Pauline corpus (perhaps one for Romans, one for 1 Corinthians, and one for the rest of the corpus) based on the inconsistent rendering of κύριος: Williams, “Syriac Versions,” 151. Cf. Alain G Martin, “La Traduction de Κύριος en Syriaque,” *Filologia Neotestamentaria*. 12.23–24 (1999): 25–54.

as the works of Lyon and Williams) cannot necessarily be extrapolated to the Pauline corpus; each book must be analyzed individually.²⁰

Most of the discussion of the literature on Syriac translation technique is reserved for below, but here something must be said regarding how an understanding of translation technique aids in employing the Syriac versions as witnesses to the Greek text.

Williams's works on the early Syriac versions deal thoroughly with this topic. The main reason an understanding of translation technique is necessary is that "mere correspondence between a Syriac and Greek variant does not prove that the Syriac was made from that Greek text. It might also arise from an independent occurrence of the Syriac and Greek, since not all agreement is due to genetic relationship."²¹ In other words, Syriac may appear to witness to a certain Greek term or phrase that actually was not in the translator's *Vorlage*. A grasp of Syriac translation technique, however, allows the textual critic to judge whether the agreement may legitimately reflect a particular Greek reading or is due to some preference of the language or translator. In order to make such discernments, one must be aware of translational patterns evident in the version and the consistency with which the translator employs them.²² Williams insists that the only

20. Brock, "Limitations of Syriac Representing Greek," 97.

21. Peter J. Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique and the Textual Criticism of the Greek Gospels* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2004), 5.

22. E.g., "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." (Peter J. Williams, "An Evaluation of the Use of the Peshitta as a Textual Witness to Romans," *TC: A Journal Biblical Textual Criticism* 13 [2008]: 1).

way to acquire this awareness is by the use of a concordance for extensive (if not exhaustive) examinations of parallels.²³

The Peshitta New Testament

History of the Peshitta

The history of the early Syriac versions is complicated by the almost simultaneous circulation of the Diatessaron, OS, and P. For the purposes of this Thesis, an understanding of P is paramount, which necessitates as well a grasp of how it emerged as it did from the Syriac versional milieu. The later H and Ph will receive less attention, being useful here mainly as a point of comparison for understanding the P translation against the backdrop of their more literal renderings of the GNT.

F. C. Burkitt attributed P's rise to prominence over the Diatessaron and OS to Rabbula, a mid-fifth-century bishop in Edessa. Rabbula's ancient biographer said of him, "Now he translated in the wisdom of God that was in him the New Testament from Greek into Syriac, because of its variations, exactly as it was."²⁴ About this, Burkitt says:

These words I believe to be an account of the first publication of the Syriac Vulgate [i.e., the Peshitta]. To bring the Syriac-speaking congregations into line with Greek thought and Greek praxis it was necessary to get rid of the Diatessaron . . . The *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe* [the "Separated Gospel," i.e., the OS] was therefore revised by him into greater conformity with the text current in Antioch at the beginning of the 5th century, and the use of this revised *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe* was enjoined by him. His efforts were eminently successful in this as in all his other undertakings. The Diatessaron was suppressed and the revised text of the Four Gospels soon attained a position of unassailable supremacy.²⁵

23. Williams, "Some Problems in Determining the Vorlage," 537-38; Williams, "Syriac Versions," 157-58.

24. Quoted from Burkitt's translation in F. Crawford Burkitt, *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe: The Curetonian Version of the Four Gospels, with the Readings of the Sinai Palimpsest and the Early Syriac Patristic Evidence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904), 2.161.

25. Burkitt, *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe*, 2.161-62.

Furthermore, Burkitt argues, based on patristic evidence from the fourth and fifth centuries, that OS was not widely used in the Syrian church; therefore, the Diatessaron was the rival text that Rabbula's revision replaced.²⁶

Burkitt's view of P's origin was accepted as valid for most of the first half of the twentieth century until the studies of Matthew Black and Arthur Vööbus. Black agrees that Rabbula played some role in the revision of the OS, but maintains that this work was a gradual one that possibly began before Rabbula's time and continued well after it. Black finds evidence of OS in use after the time Rabbula, and thus refutes Burkitt's assertion that P reigned supreme immediately after his revision.²⁷ Further, because of P's circulation among both the eastern dyophysites ("Nestorians") and western miaphysites ("Monophysites")—rival sides of the fifth-century Christological controversies—Black proposes a *terminus ad quem* of 489 AD for the concretization of P's text and therefore claims that "the Edessan revision attributed to Rabbula can have been a kind of half-way house only between the Old Syriac and our Peshitta, at any rate, certainly not the final stage in the history of the version."²⁸

On the other hand, Vööbus shows, based on the study of a manuscript dated to the year 411 CE, that P "was in circulation among learned circles in Mesopotamia during the second half of the 4th century, certainly already before Rabbula was converted to the Christian faith and before he saw any of the New Testament writings."²⁹ To Black's

26. Burkitt, *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe*, 2.163–64.

27. Matthew Black, "The New Testament Peshitta and Its Predecessors," *Bulletin of the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas* 1 (1950): 54–55.

28. Black, "New Testament Peshitta," 62.

29. Arthur Vööbus, "The Oldest Extant Traces of the Syriac Peshitta," *Mus* 63 (1950): 204.

arguments against the possibility of Rabbula's authorship of P, Vööbus adds the early character of P's canon (which mirrors that in the patriarchate of Antioch) and the lack of literary evidence attributing P's creation to Rabbula.³⁰ Instead, Vööbus argues that P rose to prominence due to increasing levels of Greek influence in the Syrian Church. This influence, with its characteristically Antiochene interest in the Greek text, is what originally shifted the preeminence of the Diatessaron toward the Evangelion da-Mepharreshe and eventually resulted in the revision of OS that would become P.³¹

Nature of the Peshitta

For this study, the character of P as a translation is more important than its history. Two themes from the literature are worth mentioning: the transmissional constancy of the P text and its character as a revision or translation. Regarding transmission, it is universally acknowledged that the text of P is very reliable. Vööbus, for instance, points out that Gwilliam's edition of the Gospels uses forty-two manuscripts, the oldest of which dates from the fifth century, yet does not differ from the much earlier and less thorough editions of Schaaf and Widmanstadt.³² Metzger claims that "a remarkable accord exists among the manuscripts of every age, there being on the average scarcely more than one important variant per chapter."³³

30. Vööbus, *Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac*, CSCO 128 (Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1951), 48-50.

31. Vööbus, *Early Versions of the New Testament; Manuscript Studies*. (Stockholm: Estonian Theological Society in Exile, 1954), 70-92. H.S. Pelsler would later attempt to nuance Vööbus's arguments here, suggesting instead that the Greek-speaking exiles in Syria created P in the third or fourth century since they would not have tolerated the "more Syrian-oriented" OS, which he argues must have originated from the same tradition as the Diatessaron. H. S. Pelsler, "The Origin of the Ancient Syriac New Testament Texts-A Historical Study," in *De Fructu Oris Sui: Essays in Honour of Adrianus Van Selms*, ed. I. H. Eybers et al. (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 152-63.

32. Vööbus, *Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac*, 55.

33. Metzger, *Early Versions of the New Testament*, 49.

The consensus is that P is a revision of OS rather than a fresh translation of the Greek, at least in the Gospels. Hope Broome Downs argues that there is considerable agreement between the two versions in places where the Syriac translation would not be an obvious choice to represent the underlying Greek, and that therefore the Gospels in OS and P “are basically the same text with variants rather than two individual texts with points of contact.”³⁴ But even though P is a revision it can be thought of as a translation as well since it surely was revised on some (perhaps implicit) translation technique. Juckel argues this based on variants in the Pauline corpus, which he claims “are the result of (stylistic) improvement and correction according to the Greek. Variants are certainly due to Greek influence, they correspond with Greek variants or reduce the idiomatic colour of the Syriac in favour of the imitation of the Greek.”³⁵

One cannot assume that a comparison in the Pauline corpus like that done by Broome Downs in the Gospels, if possible, would render comparable results. This is due to the fact that, as multiple scholars have pointed out, the evident revision/translation technique is not the same throughout P. Rather, “the presence of a diversity of mannerisms and style in the Peshitta Gospels and Apostolos suggests that the revision of the Old Syriac was not homogenous, but the work of several hands.”³⁶ Thus the nature of the revision in the Pauline corpus may not be the same as that in the Gospels. Nevertheless, although the Pauline corpus in P has not yet been studied extensively, and

34. Hope Broome Downs, “The Peshitto as a Revision: Its Background in Syriac and Greek Texts of Mark,” *JBL* 63.2 (1944): 152.

35. Andreas Juckel, “The Peshitta Version of the New Testament: Towards a Critical Edition of St. Paul’s Letters,” *JECS*. 56.1–4 (2004): 99.

36. Metzger, *Early Versions of the New Testament*, 60. Cf. Vööbus, *Early Versions of the New Testament*, 98–99; Vööbus, *Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac*, 54.

although broad statements fall short of complete accuracy due to the diversity of the revision, we may echo Vööbus in characterizing P as a revision whose “face is decidedly turned toward the Greek form.”³⁷

Greek-Syriac Translation Technique

Although Syriac translations of a multitude of Greek literature exist, this review focuses on the translation of biblical and Christian materials. The first matter of concern is a diachronic view of Greek-Syriac translation in the middle of the first millennium and the general tendencies of translation technique. Next is a discussion of the literature regarding translation technique in the PNT, and third is a review of some pertinent literature regarding Greek-Syriac translation technique in non-biblical Christian texts.

History of Greek-Syriac Translation Technique

Brock characterizes the history of Greek-Syriac translation technique in the first millennium by identifying a shift from a “reader-oriented approach to translation, to an approach that is essentially text-oriented. It is a move from dynamic to formal renderings, where the unit of translation steadily decreases in size from the sentence (or more) to the phrase, and then to the single word (or even, bound morpheme). This atomizing approach reaches its peak in the seventh century.”³⁸ This is true especially for the Syriac NT versions, of which the earliest (OS and P) are relatively free translations (though P is considerably less so than OS), whereas the later versions (Ph and H) are more strictly

37. Vööbus, *Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac*, 55; Vööbus, *Early Versions of the New Testament*, 97.

38. Brock, “Changing Fashions in Syriac Translation Technique: The Background to Syriac Translations under the Abbassids,” *Journal of the Canadian Society of Syriac Studies* 4 (2004): 5-6.

literal translations.³⁹ With this general arc of translation technique in view, I will now discuss the attitudes underlying these developments.

Brock maintains that “the character of a translation will always depend very much on the attitude of the translator (and his readers) to the source text, and this in turn will depend, in a general way, on the respective prestige of the two languages involved, and, in particular, on the nature and authority of the text in question.”⁴⁰ The translators and readers of both the earlier and later Syriac NT versions held the text in high esteem, but the increasing prestige of the Greek language and the need for precise wording in theological controversies precipitated the shift toward more literal translation techniques. In Syriac translations of Greek patristic literature, for example, the habit of earlier translators was to adapt biblical quotations to the form of the Syriac Bible, whereas later translators rendered the quotations as they appeared in the Greek regardless of its similarity to the Syriac Bible.⁴¹ The importance of precise wording for the purposes of sound theology is made explicit by Philoxenos, who argued that P was unreliable because “for someone who is concerned to translate the truth, it is not right to choose phrases that are appropriate to each individual language, but rather to seek out what are the very words that have been uttered by God or by the Spirit through the prophets and the

39. Brock, “Toward a History of Syriac Translation Technique,” in *III Symposium Syriacum, 1980*, ed. R. Lavenant, OrChrAn 221 (Rome: Pontificio Instituto Orientale, 1983), 10–12. The language of “free” and “literal” is taken up in ch. III, where it is argued that the translation technique of P has both free and literal tendencies.

40. Brock, “Toward a History,” 4. Cf. Sebastian P. Brock, “Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity,” *Greek Roman Byzantine Stud.* 20.1 (1979): 73.

41. Brock, “Aspects of Translation Technique,” 74–75.

apostles.”⁴² The later versions, one translated by Philoxenos and the other by Thomas of Harkel, strive for formal equivalence and thus exhibit more calques, neologisms, imitation of word order even in violation of natural Syriac style, and transliteration of words for which Syriac has no equivalent.⁴³

Translation Technique in the Peshitta New Testament

On this diachronic continuum of Greek-Syriac translation technique, P generally represents something of a middle ground—a less free revision of OS toward the Greek,⁴⁴ but not nearly as strictly literal as Ph and H. Several studies on translation technique in P support this general statement. For translation technique in the Gospels, the works of Williams and Lyon are invaluable. Relatively less work has been done on the Pauline corpus in Syriac, but a few pertinent studies are reviewed here.

Lyon conducted a seminal study comparing the translation techniques in the early Syriac versions of the Gospels, in which he insists on the importance of knowing a translator’s style for citing Syriac evidence as a witness to the Greek.⁴⁵ According to this study, “P often revises a) in the direction of Greek text, b) for the sake of more acceptable

42. Quoted from Brock, “Hebrews 2:9b in Syriac Tradition,” *NovT* 27 (1985): 236–44. See also Sebastian P. Brock, “Translation, Greek and Syriac,” in *A History of the Greek Language: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, ed. A. F. Christidis (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 939; Daniel King, *The Syriac Versions of the Writings of Cyril of Alexandria: A Study in Translation Technique* (Louvain: Peeters, 2008), 15–16.

43. Brock, “Aspects of Translation Technique,” 81–87; Brock, “Toward a History,” 7; Cf. Lyon, *Syriac Gospel Translations*, 38. These aspects make ultra-literal translations such as H “verge on being unintelligible without knowledge of Greek” (Brock, “Aspects of Translation Technique,” 74). This is because of the significant linguistic differences between Syriac and Greek, which severely limit the ability of natural Syriac prose to formally represent many characteristics of Greek grammar and syntax. For an extensive study on this matter—and one that will contribute greatly to this thesis—see Brock, “Limitations of Syriac Representing Greek,” 83–98.

44. Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 10; 288–89.

45. Lyon, *Syriac Gospel Translations*, 3–8.

Edessan idiom, or c) to preserve a diatessaronic reading.”⁴⁶ Williams also takes up the study of translation technique in the Syriac Gospels, describing the goal of his work as “positively, to formulate new guidelines about the use of Syriac witnesses to attest Greek variants, and negatively, to show that early Syriac witnesses of the Gospels do not support many of the Greek variants they have been claimed to support.”⁴⁷ He argues that textual critics have too often assumed that a biblical translation is an exact representation of its underlying text rather than recognizing the possibility “that formal alterations were made in the process of translation.”⁴⁸ Regarding P, Williams concludes that it “is more literal than OS, i.e., it has a greater level of formal correspondence with its *Vorlage*. Nevertheless, this is only a generalization, and it is important to note the occasional aspects in which P is less literal.”⁴⁹

Although some attention has been given to the Syriac translation of the Pauline corpus, the pertinent literature has markedly different goals from those of this Thesis. Much of the work on the Pauline corpus is concerned with detecting traces of an older tradition underlying the P text. Kerschensteiner, for example, analyzed patristic citations to demonstrate that there was an OS text for Paul like there was for the Gospels.⁵⁰ Knappe conducted a similar study on the captivity letters in Syriac, critically comparing P

46. Lyon, *Syriac Gospel Translations*, 45; 195-96.

47. Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 1.

48. Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 2.

49. Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 288-89.

50. Josef Kerschensteiner, *Der Altsyrische Paulustext*, CSCO 315 (Louvain: Secretariat du Corpus SCO, 1970). Though Kerschensteiner’s work may shed light on some of the readings of Colossians discussed below, its goal of identifying an OS text for Paul is outside the scope of this study. Therefore, we will not interact with his work further.

with quotations from Syriac Fathers.⁵¹ This study includes analyses of several verses from Colossians that may indicate an earlier tradition but is nowhere near exhaustive. Clemons set out to establish a critical text of P Galatians, accompanied by a study of the translation technique of the letter.⁵² In his approach, Clemons sought to “determine the degree of regularity [the translator] used in translating the same words and phrases” and therefore listed and counted each Greek word in Galatians and its corresponding Syriac word.⁵³ Several other dissertations employed similar methods for studying small portions of the Pauline corpus in Syriac.⁵⁴ Lastly, Williams applied his method from *Early Syriac Translation Technique* in a study of the NA27’s citation of P in Romans, in which he evaluates each citation of P in the critical apparatus and indicates places where the editors have been overconfident in P’s witness to its underlying Greek.⁵⁵

Greek-Syriac Translation Technique in Non-Biblical Christian Texts

Two studies of Syriac translation technique in patristic texts are pertinent to this study primarily for their methodological examples. King studies the Syriac translations of Cyril of Alexandria from the fifth to the seventh centuries for the purposes of understanding “how the issue of translation relates also to the widening cultural divide

51. Wolf D. Knappe, “The Captivity Letters in the Syriac Tradition” (PhD diss., Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, 1977).

52. James T. Clemons, “Studies in the Syriac Text of Galatians” (PhD diss., Duke University, 1963).

53. Clemons, “Studies in the Syriac Text of Galatians,” 138-39.

54. Erwin Buck, “Manuscript Studies in the Syriac Versions of Romans” (PhD diss., Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, 1978); Walter Freitag, “Studies on First Corinthians in Syriac” (PhD diss., Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, 1971); Michael E. Gudorf, “Research on the Early Syriac Text of the Epistle of the Hebrews” (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1992); Arthur M. Ross, “Studies in the Thessalonian Epistles in Syriac” (PhD diss., Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, 1978).

55. Williams, “An Evaluation,” 1–16.

between Christological positions and the increasing auto-motivation of the Syrian church.”⁵⁶ For analyzing the translation techniques of these works—which is where the value of this study lies for the present Thesis—King evaluates them based on size of translation units, syntactical variations in smaller translation units such as word order and formal equivalence, and lexical matters such as the use of loan words and neologisms.⁵⁷

In his study of Syriac translations of Chrysostom’s NT homilies, Childers “attempt[s] to put the translation techniques into the framework of the development of Syriac method, which in turn helps date the translations and clarify the role of the Syriac as a witness to the Greek.”⁵⁸ These homilies were created between the mid-fifth and mid-sixth centuries—around the time or shortly after the completion of P. Childers’s analyses are concerned “with broadly perceived patterns and general principles of technique”⁵⁹ and are discussed on the macro level (regarding the tendencies of the translation in matters of style, size of translation unit, and faithfulness to Greek word order) and the micro level (tendencies only evident in single words or phrases). This strategy heavily influences the proposed methodology for this Thesis detailed below.

Overview

The study of PCol taken up in this Thesis draws on and contributes to each of the fields of scholarship just reviewed. The project is based, first of all, on the recognition of

56. King, *The Syriac Versions of the Writings of Cyril of Alexandria*, 25.

57. King, *The Syriac Versions of the Writings of Cyril of Alexandria*, 83–174.

58. Childers, “Studies in the Syriac Versions of St. John Chrysostom’s Homilies on the New Testament: With Special Reference to Homilies 6, 20, 22, 23, 37, 62, 83, and 84 on John” (DPhil, University of Oxford, 1996), 62.

59. Childers, “Studies in the Syriac Versions of St. John Chrysostom’s Homilies on the New Testament,” 62.

the importance of understanding translation technique for employing versional evidence in NT textual criticism. Then, the analysis of the translation technique of PCol here assumes the established constancy of the P text, for without this constancy one could hardly speak of the translation technique of PCol without first identifying the earliest and most reliable text thereof. Further, this analysis depends heavily upon proven strategies for studying Syriac translation and often references and builds upon established knowledge in the area of Greek-Syriac translation. In turn, this Thesis adds to the body of scholarship on Syriac translation technique in P, contributes to the conversation about versional evidence in NT text criticism, and ultimately offers suggestions for concrete improvements to the way P is cited as a witness to its Greek *Vorlage* in critical apparatuses of the GNT.

The project proceeds as follows. Chapter II details the methodologies employed here for analyzing the translation technique of PCol, developing criteria for evaluating the version's witness to its Greek text based upon its translation technique, and for the systematic evaluation of PCol's witness to its *Vorlage*. Chapter III presents the results of the translation technique analysis on a macro level (the general shape of the translation as a whole) and a micro level (the specific tendencies of the translator in particular grammatical categories). Chapter IV evaluates PCol as a witness to its *Vorlage* by first discerning how each aspect of the translation technique affects the ability to deduce the underlying Greek text and, second, providing detailed critiques of each citation of P in the critical apparatus of NA28. Chapter V concludes the Thesis by recommending specific changes to the citation of P in future critical apparatuses, reflecting on

contributions to the use of versional evidence for NT textual criticism and suggesting next steps for the field moving forward.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The process of conducting a study of translation technique in which neither the original source text nor the original translation is available may be conceived of as a spiral. At the broadest level, I use a hypothesized source text to gather data about the translation. I then circle back with the data in an effort to sharpen an understanding of the translation's relationship to the hypothesized source text. Finally, this understanding is employed in specific instances to discern how the hypothesized source text differs from or resembles what must have been the real *Vorlage* used by the translator. Sometimes this spiral comes to a *definite point* at which we can deduce the nature of the source text with a high level of confidence. At other times, the narrowest turn in the spiral is only able to define a *range* within which the specificities of the source text may lie, or in rare cases is still so broad that little or nothing about the *Vorlage* can be reliably established. For the use of versions as witnesses in NT textual criticism, the hope is that this spiral would come to a definite point. But even when it does not, a small range of possibilities may still be useful. In the course of this study, however, I demonstrate that the narrowest turn is often wider than has previously been presumed. The purpose of this thesis, then, is to assess that final turn in this spiral for the specific instances in which PCol may be a helpful witness to its Greek *Vorlage* and to determine how confidently the particularities of its source text may be deduced in those cases.

This project employs three distinct methodologies that make up the turns in this spiral. The first is the widest turn in the spiral: analysis of translation technique. This involves a verse-by-verse comparison of the Greek and the Syriac, consultation of a concordance to compare the Syriac translation of similar words or phrases in the rest of the GNT, the use of *Das Neue Testament in Syrischer Überlieferung* (NTSU)¹ to compare P with H in select instances, and the categorical presentation of the evidence. The second methodology serves to tighten the spiral by developing criteria for evaluating a version's witness to its underlying Greek text. This primarily involves the discernment of patterns within a translation and judgments regarding a version's consistency in its translation technique. Third is the final attempt to define the narrowest turn in the spiral, in which we evaluate PCol as a witness to the Greek text. Here the criteria developed for evaluating a version's witness to the Greek text are employed to draw general conclusions about the value of PCol as a witness to the Greek text, and to specifically assess NA28's citation of P in its textual apparatus.

Translation Technique Analysis

The heavy lifting of this project is done in the verse-by-verse analysis of the P translation of Colossians. For this process, the Greek text has been taken from NA28 while the BFBS Peshitta² and NTSU are consulted for the Syriac.³ I must pause here to explain the choice of NA28—an eclectic text that, by definition, never existed in an

1. Barbara Aland and Andreas Juckel, eds., *Das Neue Testament in Syrischer Überlieferung: II. Die Paulinischen Briefe. Teil 2: 2. Korintherbrief, Galaterbrief, Epheserbrief, Philipperbrief und Kolosserbrief*, ANTF 23 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995).

2. *The Syriac New Testament* (London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1920).

3. Ideally, the first step in a project such as this would rightfully be to do the work of establishing the Greek and/or Syriac Peshitta text of Colossians. However, for the purposes of this Thesis, the work of the scholars who have already been able to devote the time and energy to this task will have to be trusted.

ancient manuscript—as the base text against which the translation is compared. A translation analysis requires a base text, but the trouble here lies in the very problem we are trying to solve: we do not know the exact nature of the Greek text from which P was translated. So we must use a hypothesized source text for comparison and work backwards from there to determine where the translation’s actual *Vorlage* likely differed from the hypothesized one. Necessary for this process is the assumption that either the *Vorlage* will not have differed significantly from the hypothesized text used for comparison or that any such significant differences will be plainly discernible. The identification of differences is addressed below, but for now it suffices to say that the eclectic text of NA28 should not differ greatly from whatever manuscript the translator of P used. Now, whereas the text of NA28 is suitable as a hypothesized source text for this study, because it is a hand edition its apparatus is not as thorough as that of Tischendorf or von Soden.⁴ To make up for this gap, the critical apparatuses of Tischendorf and von Soden were regularly consulted, especially later as reference points for the evaluation of citations in NA28.⁵ Finally, using NA28 as the hypothesized source text for the translation technique analysis was sensible because its readily accessible critical apparatus could be checked immediately for other possible readings that may have been

4. See Constantin von Tischendorf, Caspar René Gregory, and Ezra Abbot, *Novum Testamentum Graece: Ad Antiquissimos Testes Denuo Recensuit* (Lipsiae: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869); Hermann F. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in Ihrer Ältesten Erreichbaren Textgestalt Hergestellt auf Grund Ihrer Textgeschichte*, Vol. II. Teil: Text mit Apparat (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913).

5. If the scope of this project was, e.g., evaluating the textual affinity of PCol, then the more complete apparatuses of Tischendorf and von Soden would need to factor into our consideration more prominently. However, since our aim is to evaluate the relationship of PCol to its Greek text, the NA28 apparatus—though not as thorough in its listing of *witnesses* as are Tischendorf and von Soden—is sufficient for indicating the possible *readings* that may have occurred in PCol’s source text.

behind the Syriac translation, and also because this is the apparatus we seek to evaluate here.

During the verse-by-verse comparison of P to the hypothesized source text of NA28, extensive notes were made in accordance with the various categories chosen to characterize the translation technique (see below). Furthermore, the textual apparatus of NA28 was checked along the way to compile a list of places where editors may have been over- or under-confident in the P's witness to its underlying Greek text. This analysis of the P translation of Colossians is presented in categories that have been adapted from the works of Childers,⁶ King,⁷ and Williams.⁸ Two broad categories—macro level analysis and micro level analysis—serve as headings under which more specific topics are discussed. Macro level analysis considers the shape of the translation as a whole, including conclusions about the size of the translation unit, word order, and the degree of the translation's literalness. Evidence supporting these conclusions is presented in the form of representative passages from the Greek and Syriac texts, accompanied by commentary elucidating elements of the translation technique.

The micro level analysis focuses on the tendencies of the translation in specific words and phrases. Each verse has been studied with the following grammatical and lexical categories in mind: methods for translating Greek verbs; representation of demonstrative, relative, reflexive, and possessive pronouns; prepositional phrases; representation of particles and conjunctions; representation of Greek compound words;

6. Childers, "Studies in the Syriac Versions of St. John Chrysostom's Homilies on the New Testament."

7. Daniel King, *The Syriac Versions of the Writings of Cyril of Alexandria*, 63-174.

8. Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*.

and consistency in lexical choices. As the analysis proceeded, the various translation decisions within each of these categories were tracked and tabulated in order to assess the level of consistency demonstrated by the translator. For example, every instance of the preposition -ܐ in the Syriac text was noted, and the various Greek prepositions it rendered were counted.

Alongside this verse-by-verse analysis, a concordance is consulted to compare the rendering of certain words or phrases elsewhere in Syriac, especially those that appeared only a few times in Colossians.⁹ For this process, texts are grouped together according to their usefulness for comparison to PCol. The first level of comparison consists of the shorter Pauline Epistles (Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon) whenever this section contains sufficient occurrences of the word or phrase in question. The next level of comparison is the whole of the Pauline corpus since its epistolary style lends itself to similar methods of translation, even considering the probability of more than one translator within this grouping. The remaining portions of the PNT are consulted only when a given term or phrase does not occur frequently enough in the Pauline corpus for a judgment about translational consistency to be made.

NTSU is also consulted where comparisons of P and H are helpful. During the work of the translation analysis, this was done for every verse. However, these comparisons do not appear in the write-up in any systematic way, but only occasionally as a point of comparison for translation techniques. As a revision of P that consistently

7. All concordance checks for this study were done using “Dukhrana Analytical Lexicon of the Syriac New Testament,” <http://www.dukhrana.com/lexicon/index.php>. This website uses the Syriac Electronic Data Retrieval Archive (SEDRA) by Dr. George A. Kiraz, distributed by the Syriac Computing Institute.

employs a smaller unit of translation and strictly conforms to the Greek word order, H offers a sort of signpost for the extreme boundary of literal translation technique, which helps relativize the degree of P’s literalness in certain examples.¹⁰

The results of this micro level analysis are presented categorically in the following chapter, according to those categories listed above. Each is illustrated by representative examples, including the Greek of NA28, the Syriac of BFBS, and commentary on the pertinent matters of translation. Finally, the micro level analysis is shown to uphold and clarify the macro level conclusions made about the translation as a whole.

Developing Criteria for Evaluating a Version’s Witness to the Greek Text

In order to ultimately make conclusions about PCol’s witness to the Greek text, criteria must be developed for evaluating a version’s witness to its *Vorlage*. Two sets of criteria are needed: one for evaluating the version’s witness in general and another for evaluating its witness to specific readings. The development of the first set of criteria is primarily concerned with the consistency of the translation. For the second set, guidelines must be developed for using the consistency of the translation to make judgments in specific cases. If “certainty” or “confidence” is the standard for citing versional evidence in the critical apparatus of the GNT—as the editors of NA28, UBS, and ECM assert—then insofar as a citation hinges on translational matters,¹¹ the consistency of the

10. If OS were extant for the Pauline corpus, which is a freer translation in the Gospels and would assumedly be so here as well, it would be used alongside H to place P on a spectrum of translation technique between them. Unfortunately, although Knappe attempts to detect traces of OS underneath P in the Pauline captivity letters [Wolf D. Knappe, “The Captivity Letters in the Syriac Tradition”], his findings do not produce a complete (or certain) enough OS text for the kind of systematic comparison that would be useful here.

11. It is possible that a version may witness a given reading “with certainty” even where its translation lacks consistency. If, e.g., the question is whether a version’s *Vorlage* contained a longer

translation technique and its applicability in specific cases must be substantial in order to meet this standard.

Evaluating a Version's Witness in General

If certainty is to be attained in a specific situation, there usually must first be established a high degree of general consistency about the translator's method in rendering the word, phrase, or grammatical construction at hand. The concern here is to determine how confident the textual critic can be in a simple retroversion of a translation to its base text without regard to the Greek manuscript tradition or any other conventional criteria used to make text critical decisions.¹² To accomplish this, the following—admittedly simplified—model has been developed, with the understanding that the assessment of a version's witness to its base text in specific cases will require a more thorough process.

If the translator employs x in the target language to represent each of a , b , and c in the source language, then the textual critic cannot determine with any degree of certainty the underlying source text to which the translation x witnesses. However, if the translator renders a in the source language variously by x , y , and z in the target language, any of x , y , or z still may reliably witness to a if it can be shown that they are not also employed to translate other things from the source text in similar contexts. Therefore, consistency in using x to translate a is of no value in determining the *Vorlage* if x is also used to

passage such as the *Pericope Adulterae*, this could be ascertained without regard for translation technique. Another potential example is a nonsense reading that has worked its way into a version because the scribe misread his source text or because the source text itself had a nonsense reading that the scribe was forced to handle. So when citations of P in the critical apparatus are analyzed here, consideration is given to such non-translational factors that may affect the judgment of the reading. But in accordance with the focus of this thesis, matters of translation technique are the primary concern.

12. Consideration of such matters is reserved for the evaluation of a version's witness in specific cases, discussed below.

translate *b* and *c*. The type of consistency that lends itself to reliably deducing the *Vorlage* is when *x* consistently translates *a* and does not (or very rarely, or only in predictable contexts) translate *b* or *c* (even if *y* and *z* are also used to render *a*).

Context must be considered in this model, for even if *x* is equally employed to translate both *a* and *b*, it may yet be a reliable witness to both if it is used differently in predictable contexts. For example, of the ninety-four occurrences of the Syriac word ܩܠܘܬܐ in the Pauline corpus in P, it is used to render forms of εἰρήνη (“peace”) forty-six times and ἀσπασμός (“greeting”) forty-eight times.¹³ Although this seems at first to be an inconsistency, one can easily discern by context—either an explicit greeting, or not—which of the two Greek words is the *Vorlage* in any given case.

This model may be used to measure the general consistency of a version’s translation by calculating the percentage of decisions made by the translator for each of the grammatical and lexical categories from above (i.e., *x* translates *a* 75% of the time). “Consistency” is a relative term, so quantifying it is arbitrary but useful. Since the standard for citing versional evidence is so high, for the purposes of this study I consider 90% to be a soft threshold for “consistency.”¹⁴ It is important to note that this number does not function here as a strict rule, but rather as a relative indicator of which aspects of the translation merit further inquisition into their potential for providing reliable witness to the underlying source text, and which do not.

13. In 2 Cor 13:13, NA28 has χάρις (“grace”) instead of εἰρήνη, but the text critic may be confident that the translator had εἰρήνη in mind when he employed ܩܠܘܬܐ, either because it was in his *Vorlage* or perhaps because of the two forms of εἰρήνη that occur two verses prior. Also, one instance that was counted for ἀσπασμός is implied in the Greek (Rom 16:5).

14. This number and this particular method of quantifying consistency appear to be unique to this project, but are useful for providing hard data that can be implemented as supporting evidence for judgments on the validity of versional citations.

Thus for example, if *x* occurs one hundred times in P, translating *a* sixty times and *b* forty times, we can assume that this level of inconsistency is not a result of differences in the *Vorlage* but of translation style—the translator apparently employs *x* variously to represent both *a* and *b*. However, if *x* translates *a* eighty times and *b* twenty times, this approaches the 90% threshold and therefore needs to be investigated further. In such cases, we can entertain the idea that *x* only *appears* to translate *b* because the *Vorlage* actually differed in those instances from the hypothesized source text against which the translation was compared. Thus the 90% number helps at an early stage to separate the wheat from the chaff, as it were. Those points of translation falling well short of this standard may be categorized as inconsistent (and therefore of little value in providing reliable witness to the *Vorlage*), and those nearing this standard qualify for further examination as potentially reliable witnesses to the source text.¹⁵

In general then, if the translation of a given grammatical category does not come near to 90% consistency, it should be considered unreliable for witnessing to its underlying Greek text in such instances. There are, however, three qualifiers to this standard. The first is the aforementioned matter of context. If a word or form is employed to translate multiple Greek words or forms in different but predictable contexts, then this must be taken into account.

The second qualifier is the number of instances for a given word or form in the NT book in view. If it contains numerous instances of, for example, aorist participles, then the consistency or inconsistency of the translation of that book in rendering aorist

15. In accordance with the maxim that textual criticism is both a science and an art, this 90% number is not the final decider of translational consistency. Instead, as will be clear in the evaluation of the citations of P in NA28's critical apparatus below, other factors are regularly considered and often influence my conclusions about PCol's witness to its Greek *Vorlage*.

participles into the target language should suffice for a judgment on its reliability. If, however, a given book does not contain a sufficient number of instances of a certain grammatical category, this is when the concordance should be consulted to determine the degree of consistency in handling such categories, first in the NT subgroup to which the book belongs (Pauline corpus, Catholic Epistles, etc.) and then in the NT as a whole.

The third qualifier is the role that textual variants play. Since I am deducing translation technique from a hypothesized rather than a known source text, it is imperative to recognize the possibility that the actual *Vorlage* differs from the hypothesized one to which it is compared. For example, if x word in the target language translates a Greek word in the hypothesized source text 80% of the time and b Greek word 20%, it may be the case in some instances within that 20% that the translator actually has a in the *Vorlage* rather than b . Therefore, in appraising the consistency of a version in translating a given category, the textual critic must take into account the possibility that the translation appears inconsistent only because its deviations are actually witnessing to a different underlying Greek text. This is applicable only in grammatical categories for which the percentage nears the 90% standard. If a version is significantly inconsistent in numerous instances for a category, its inconsistency can be considered a matter of translation style rather than a witness to varying underlying Greek texts.

Speaking in terms of a Greek word and x word in the target language is clearly an oversimplification meant to aid in the understanding of the approach to this study. Most of the translation categories to be evaluated here cannot be reduced to simple $a=x$ correlation, but necessitate more complex and detailed analysis. In the evaluation of the

translation's consistency, these complexities are expected and allowed for in their various potential forms.

Evaluating a Version's Witness to Specific Readings

In specific cases, the textual critic is usually trying to determine whether a version is or is not a witness to a certain reading. In such cases, the translation's consistency is often prerequisite to considering a version a reliable witness but is not the only factor considered. In all categories for which a version is deemed significantly inconsistent (i.e., not nearing the 90% threshold) and for which translation technique is the criterion by which its witness to its Greek source text is to be judged, no further criteria are necessary. But if a specific case involves a category in which the version is consistent, two further questions need to be asked to determine whether the version's underlying Greek text there is "certain." First, is there Greek manuscript evidence supporting the reading? Second, is there a better explanation for the version's translation than a direct genetic relationship with the reading in question?

If there is manuscript evidence to support the reading to which the version appears to attest, this strengthens the confidence the textual critic may have in the version's witness to that Greek text. Still, one must be sure that there is not also manuscript evidence for another possible retroversion of the translation. If x is used to translate both a and b in the context at hand, it cannot witness to either one against the other. In this situation, the translation x can, however, attest to a against c or even a or b against c .

If there is no evidence for the reading to which the translation apparently witnesses, the version still may reliably witness to a Greek text no longer extant in the

manuscript tradition. It would be futile to explore this possibility in every instance that a versional reading may attest to a Greek reading not extant, so here we consider this only for instances in which the version exhibits exceptional consistency. Moreover, this is explored only if a reason can be offered to posit that the reading could have occurred in the version's Greek *Vorlage*.

Regarding the second question, Williams reasons (with respect to Syriac, but also applicable to versions generally), "mere correspondence between a Syriac and a Greek variant does not prove that the Syriac was made from that Greek text. It might also arise from an independent occurrence of the Syriac and Greek, since not all agreement is due to genetic relationship," but such agreement may "be independent if an adequate reason internal to Syriac or the method of a translator may be given."¹⁶ So although a version may appear on the surface to witness to a certain reading, there may be a better explanation for the translation to have arisen independently of that reading. Williams also cautions that "[s]uch explanations must not be given in an *ad hoc* way, but must be shown repeatedly to be able to explain the features of the translation."¹⁷ Therefore, in order to determine the best explanation for the apparent agreement between a version and a given reading, the study of the translation's overall consistency must be consulted.

Here I follow the reasoning of Williams: "If on a number of occasions, when similar conditions recur, there is a consistent formal divergence between [a version] and attested Greek readings the divergence is likely to result from the translation process."¹⁸

16. Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 4-5.

17. Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 5.

18. Williams, "An Evaluation," 1. This statement is made specifically in regard to P, but may be applied to versions generally.

So if the apparent agreement between the version and the Greek variant in question occurs in such an instance, it should not be considered a reliable witness to its source text because there can be no confidence that the agreement reflects something in the *Vorlage* rather than a matter of translational style. Conversely, if the translation analysis indicates a consistent formal agreement between P and the Greek for a given form, then any divergence from this is likely to be a reflection of a differing form in the *Vorlage*. In this case, P may be considered a reliable witness to a Greek reading.

Thus if for a given reading 1) the version's translation technique is consistent for the word, phrase, or grammatical construction in the context at hand; 2) supporting evidence is found in the Greek manuscript tradition, or if not, a plausible explanation can be offered for the reading to have appeared in the version's Greek *Vorlage*; and 3) the agreement between the version and the reading is likely genetic (i.e., there is no better explanation available for the agreement to have occurred independently as a result of the translation process), then a version may be considered a reliable witness to its underlying Greek text.

Evaluating Peshitta Colossians as a Witness to Its Greek Text

The final step of drawing conclusions about the value of PCol as a witness to its Greek text is a straightforward matter of applying the methodology developed above to this specific version. First, general observations are made about the value of PCol as a witness to its Greek text, taking into consideration the technique and level of consistency evident from the translation analysis. Second, an appraisal is offered of the place of P in the critical apparatus of NA28 involving a critical examination of each time the apparatus cites P, either for a variant reading or for the printed text. For each citation I render a

judgment regarding PCol's reliability as a witness to the reading for which it is claimed and explain the judgment with commentary on pertinent matters of translation technique and textual criticism.¹⁹ In the concluding chapter, I offer a list of proposed amendments to future critical apparatuses, including the removal or clarification of certain citations.

19. For a similar approach (though with less in-depth commentary than will appear in this thesis), see Williams, "An Evaluation," 1–16.

CHAPTER III

TRANSLATION TECHNIQUE ANALYSIS

The first methodology developed in the previous chapter has been employed to analyze the translation of PCol. This chapter presents the results of that analysis under the two broad categories of macroanalysis and microanalysis, each of which contains several more specific categories used to investigate the technique of the translator.

The Greek comparison text used here is that of NA28. The problem, of course—the one that is the driving force of this entire project—is the frequent difficulty (or perhaps impossibility) of knowing with certainty whether the Syriac translator is working from a Greek text matching that used for comparison. Standing at a distance, one may say with confidence that this work in Syriac is indeed a translation of the Greek text of Colossians or even that this specific Syriac verse is certainly a translation of that Greek verse. But at close range, where variants occur—the level at which most NT textual criticism operates—it can be difficult to assert definitively that this Syriac phrase or word is (or is not) a translation of that exact Greek phrase or word.

Where the translation differs at this level, whether lexically, syntactically, morphologically, or otherwise, from the text of NA28, it is possible that this reflects a difference in its *Vorlage*. So every description of the translation technique offered below comes with the implicit caveat that it is only accurate if and insofar as the Greek text with which it is compared was, in fact, the very text read by the translator. But at the same time, since it is not good practice to frivolously hypothesize Greek readings from the

Syriac translation alone,¹ it also cannot be assumed that every difference at this level in the Syriac has arisen because the translator had a different Greek text than that of NA28.

So on an isolated case by case basis from this close range, the translation reveals very little detail about the specifics of its *Vorlage*. The goal here, therefore, is to garner a thorough understanding of the translation technique as it is employed throughout the letter, and to use that understanding to minimize the caveats where possible. The data collected in this translation technique analysis, then, yields the information necessary to determine whether anything about the source text can be reliably deduced from the translation in a given instance.

But before such conclusions can be drawn about the translation's witness to its *Vorlage*, a hypothesized source text must be used as the beginning point for comparison. In order to avoid the endless caveats that rightly accompany comparison of a translation to a hypothetical source text, the presupposition in operation here is that translational variance should be assumed to result from the translation processes (not from a different Greek *Vorlage*) in cases where there is 1) no supporting evidence from the Greek manuscript tradition and 2) no reason to think that the translation is more likely to have arisen from a Greek text no longer extant than from the Greek text(s) extant in the manuscript tradition. Therefore the examples below are selected, as far as possible, from texts that have little to no variance in the Greek manuscript tradition, and any exceptions are indicated as such.

1. Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 4; Childers, "Studies in the Syriac Versions of St. John Chrysostom's Homilies on the New Testament," 103.

Macroanalysis

The macroanalysis is concerned with the shape of the translation as a whole, attending to items on a large in scale. Three categories are presented here: the size of the translation unit, the translation's faithfulness to the Greek word order, and the general degree of the translation's literalness. These analyses will help draw some general conclusions about the basic style employed by the translator of PCol.

Translation Unit and Consciousness of Context and Meaning

The translator of PCol typically takes the Greek word or phrase as his² translation unit. Three representative examples are provided below to demonstrate this tendency. The Greek and Syriac texts are set side by side, and the length of each line is governed by semantic correspondence.

Colossians 1:7

καθὼς ἐμάθετε	ܩܘܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܩܪܐ
ἀπὸ	ܥܘܩܪܐ
Ἐπαφρᾶ	ܩܘܕܥܘܠܐ
τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ συνδούλου ἡμῶν	ܩܘܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܩܪܐ
ὃς	ܩܘܕܥܘܠܐ
ἐστίν	ܩܘܕܥܘܠܐ
πιστὸς ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διάκονος	ܩܘܕܥܘܠܐ ܩܘܕܥܘܠܐ ܩܘܕܥܘܠܐ
τοῦ Χριστοῦ	ܩܘܕܥܘܠܐ

Colossians 1:9-10

Διὰ τοῦτο.....	ܩܘܕܥܘܠܐ
καί	ܩܘܕܥܘܠܐ
ἡμεῖς	ܩܘܕܥܘܠܐ
ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκούσαμεν.....	ܩܘܕܥܘܠܐ ܩܘܕܥܘܠܐ ܩܘܕܥܘܠܐ
οὐ πανόμεθα.....	ܩܘܕܥܘܠܐ ܩܘܕܥܘܠܐ
ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι	ܩܘܕܥܘܠܐ ܩܘܕܥܘܠܐ ܩܘܕܥܘܠܐ
καὶ αἰτούμενοι.....	ܩܘܕܥܘܠܐ

2. Although the use of an exclusively masculine pronoun for an anonymous translator is regrettable, it is probably historically accurate and is the simplest approach with respect to writing style.

ἵνα πληρωθῆτε..... ܐܠܚܝܬܝ
 τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν ܟܬܝܬܝ
 τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ܟܬܝܬܝ ܡܡܥܝܢ
 ἐν πάσῃ ܟܬܝܬܝ
 σοφία ܟܬܝܬܝ
 καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ ܡܝܝܬܝ ܟܬܝܬܝ
 περιπατῆσαι ܐܠܚܝܬܝ
 ἀξίως τοῦ κυρίου εἰς πᾶσαν ἀρεσκείαν.... ܟܬܝܬܝ ܐܝܬܝܟܝܢ ܡܝܝܬܝ ܡܡܥܝܢ
 ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ ܟܬܝܬܝ ܟܬܝܬܝ
 καρποφοροῦντες ܟܬܝܬܝ ܐܠܚܝܬܝ
 καὶ αὐξανόμενοι ܐܠܚܝܬܝ
 τῇ ἐπιγνώσει..... ܟܬܝܬܝ
 τοῦ θεοῦ ܟܬܝܬܝ

Colossians 4:1

Οἱ κύριοι ܟܬܝܬܝ
 τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὴν ἰσότητα τοῖς δούλοις παρέχεσθε ... ܐܠܚܝܬܝ ܕܝܠ ܟܬܝܬܝܢ ܟܬܝܬܝܢ ܡܝܬܝܢ
 εἰδότες ܟܬܝܬܝ ܐܠܚܝܬܝ
 ὅτι καὶ ܐܠܚܝܬܝ
 ὑμεῖς ἔχετε ܡܝܬܝܢ ܟܬܝܬܝ
 κύριον ܟܬܝܬܝ
 ἐν οὐρανῷ ܟܬܝܬܝ

These examples contain some of the larger translation units in PCol. The longer units in 1:7 both occur because of the translator’s preference for the more natural Syriac ordering of attributive adjectives following the noun they describe.³ In 1:9, the longest unit is the result of the differing methods for employing a relative pronoun in each language. The longest unit in 1:10 is a byproduct of the translator’s scheme to slightly alter the reading of this whole passage (see below on Col 1:9-12). And in 4:1, one of the longest translation units in the entire work is necessitated by the Syriac language’s lack of a case system. While the Greek text has two direct objects and an indirect object preceding the verb, the translator transposes the verb to the beginning of the clause to

3. For a similar example, see p. 49.

make it more easily understood in Syriac.⁴ Aside from these longer examples, however, it is evident that the translator usually employs a translation unit of a single word or isolated phrase.

However, it must be noted that the smallness of the translation unit does not mean that the translator read and worked only at this granular level. On the contrary, there is evidence to suggest that the translator was reading and understanding his source text in a larger frame and that his consciousness of the broader context and its meaning influenced translation decisions even in these smaller units. This is apparent in two types of cases: 1) instances in which the translator makes a formal alteration in order to produce a more desirable style or to make the meaning of a sentence or phrase more explicit and 2) instances in which the translator makes interpretive choices and corresponding formal changes in order to disambiguate between potential meanings. The distinguishing factor between the two, as they are conceived of here, is that the former clarifies or emphasizes something that is implicit in the Greek syntax, while the latter takes a stand either on one of multiple interpretive possibilities or on an interpretation that is not self-evident at the syntactical level in the Greek. Several examples of each are provided below. Each example includes the Greek text of NA28, the corresponding Syriac text of BFBS, along with a literal English translation of the Syriac.

Formal Changes for Purposes of Style or Clarity

Colossians 1:9-12

Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἀφ’ ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκούσαμεν, οὐ παυόμεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι, ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ, περιπατῆσαι ἀξίως τοῦ κυρίου εἰς πᾶσαν ἀρεσκείαν, ἐν παντί ἔργῳ

4. The H translator adheres to the Greek word order here, producing this clumsier clause (that necessitates the use of punctuation for clarification): ܐܘܡ ܪܥܘܘܘܢܐ ܪܥܘܘܘܢܐ

ἀγαθῶ καρποφοροῦντες καὶ αὐξανόμενοι τῇ ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει
 δυναμούμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ εἰς πᾶσαν ὑπομονὴν καὶ μακροθυμίαν.
 Μετὰ χαρᾶς εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ πατρὶ τῷ ἱκανώσαντι ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κλήρου
 τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτί·

ⲙⲉⲧⲁ ⲭⲁⲣⲁⲥ ⲉὐⲭⲁⲣⲓⲥⲧⲟῦⲛⲧⲉⲥ ⲧῶ ⲡⲁⲧⲣⲓ ⲧῶ ⲓⲕⲁⲛῶⲥⲁⲛⲧⲓ ὕⲙⲁⲥ ⲉἰⲥ τὴν ⲙⲉⲣⲓⲃⲁ
 ⲧⲟῦ ⲕⲗῆⲣⲟⲩ ⲧῶⲛ ἁγίⲟⲩⲛ ⲉ̅ⲛ ⲧῶ ⲡⲱⲧⲓ·

Because of this even we, from the day that we heard, we have not stopped praying concerning you, and asking that you be filled with the knowledge of the will of God in all wisdom and in all understanding of spirit, so that you may walk as is right, and please God in all good works, and bear fruit, and increase in the knowledge of God, and with all power you be empowered according to the greatness of his glory, in all patience and in longsuffering of spirit, and in joy give thanks to God the Father, who has made us worthy for the portion of the inheritance of the saints in light.

This passage contains several instances in which the translator adds or alters syntactical elements in order to make the translation more readable. When translating the Greek phrase ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῆ, the translator duplicates the expression ⲥⲁ (“in all,” translating ἐν πάσῃ) to clarify that “in all” applies to both “wisdom” and “spiritual understanding.” The translator does effectively the same thing later in the passage, adding -ⲉⲟ (“and in”) before the second item in a list in which both Greek nouns are governed by an initial εἰς.

Next, the translator groups ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῶ with the preceding clause rather than the succeeding participle, even though the Greek syntax suggests the latter.⁵ The translator accomplishes this by adding -ⲁ (“and”) before ⲁⲗⲗⲁ, thus separating the verb from the preceding phrase. This indicates the translator’s sensitivity to how various clauses fit together in his source text.

5. See Constantine R. Campbell, *Colossians and Philemon: A Handbook on the Greek Text* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2013), 8.

Moreover, the translator strings together a sequence of imperfect verbs with a repeated -α, even where no και is present in the Greek (...ⲗⲏⲃⲏⲁ ...ⲗⲓⲛⲉⲃⲏⲁ ...ⲗⲁⲗⲏⲁⲓ ⲗⲓⲛⲉⲃⲏⲁ ...ⲗⲓⲛⲉⲃⲏⲁ ⲗⲓⲛⲉⲃⲏⲁ ...ⲗⲁⲗⲏⲁⲓ).⁶ In P, each of these verbs are finite and in the imperfect tense, despite the fact that in Greek the first verb in this sequence is an infinitive while the rest are participles. This localized standardization of the Syriac verbs in type and tense along with the added conjunctions combine to indicate that the translator has intentionally created this repetition so that all of these verbs would be understood to be the result of the initial clause, ⲗⲁ ⲗⲁⲗⲏⲁⲓ ⲗⲓⲛⲉⲃⲏⲁ ⲗⲓⲛⲉⲃⲏⲁ ⲗⲓⲛⲉⲃⲏⲁ ⲗⲓⲛⲉⲃⲏⲁ ⲗⲓⲛⲉⲃⲏⲁ ⲗⲓⲛⲉⲃⲏⲁ (“that you be filled with the knowledge of the will of God in all wisdom and in all understanding of spirit”).

Colossians 2:1

Θέλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναί ἡλίκον ἀγῶνα ἔχω ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ καὶ ὅσοι οὐχ ἑώρακαν τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἐν σαρκί

ⲉⲃⲱⲗⲟ ⲗⲁⲣ ὑⲙⲁⲥ εἰδέⲛⲁⲓ ἡλίⲗⲟⲛ ἀγῶⲛⲁ ἔϣⲟ ὑⲡⲉⲣ ὑⲙῶⲛ ⲗⲁⲓ τῶⲛ ἐⲛ Λⲁⲟⲃⲓⲗⲏⲁⲓ ⲗⲁⲓ ὅⲥⲟⲓ οὐϣ ἑῶⲣⲁⲗⲁⲛ τὸ πⲣῶⲥⲱⲡῶⲛ ⲙⲟⲩ ἐⲛ ϣⲁⲣϣⲓ

But I want you to know what struggle I have on your behalf, and on behalf of those who (are) in Laodicea, and on behalf of the rest who my face have not seen in the flesh.

Here the translator repeats the preposition ⲗⲁ twice, making explicit that the latter two nouns in this list of three (ⲗⲁⲗⲏⲁⲓ...ⲗⲁⲗⲏⲁⲓ ⲗⲓⲛⲉⲃⲏⲁ; “those who [are] in Laodicea... the rest”) are also objects of the same preposition. Evidently, the translator is concerned with properly representing the meaning of the whole phrase, even if that

6. This is an example of an instance in which one cannot be certain that none of These “added” και’s were present in the translator’s source text. But they are here considered translational additions because of the lack of evidence for them in the Greek manuscript tradition and because of the translator’s inconsistency in including such conjunctions in lists (e.g., 3:5, where each item in a list is separated by -α, whereas the parallel list in 3:8 does not separate the items with any conjunction). For more on the translator’s usage of conjunctions, see pp. 77-78.

οἰκτιρμοῦ χρηστότητα ταπεινοφροσύνην πραύτητα μακροθυμίαν, ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων
καὶ χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς ἕαν τις πρὸς τινα ἔχη μομφήν· καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐχαρίσατο
ὑμῖν, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς·

אָסוֹת רַבּוֹת לְעַלְעֵל כַּסְיָהּ רְחִימֵי רְחִימֵי רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת אִי לֶמֶת לְעַלְעֵל אָסוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת
דִּוְדָרִי רְחִימֵי אָסוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת
רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת
רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת
רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת
רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת רַבּוֹת

But now put off from yourselves all of these: anger, wrath, evil, blasphemy, unclean
speech, and do not lie one to another but take off the old person with all of its ways, and
put on the new, which is made new in knowledge by the image of its creator, where there
is not Jew and Aramaean, nor circumcision and uncircumcision, nor Greek and
Barbarian, nor slave and freeman, but Christ is all and in all. Put on, therefore, as the
chosen of God, holy and beloved: mercy and tenderness and gentleness and humility of
mind and quietness and long suffering of spirit, and endure one to another and forgive
one to another, and if a person has a complaint against their friend, just as Christ forgave
you, thus also you forgive.

The translator’s consciousness of meaning in this extended passage is evident in
two ways. First, in v. 11 the translator adds רַבּוֹת (“nor”) between each of the successive
pairs. These additions indicate the translator’s concern for producing a translation that
accurately conveys the meaning of a whole sentence since the added conjunctions help
the reader make sense of what would otherwise be an unbroken stream of nouns (as it
appears in Greek).

Second, there is also a more overarching example of the translator’s
consciousness of meaning in this passage. The Greek begins with an aorist imperative,
and the translator latches onto that imperatival sense for the next several verses. Every
verb that is directed toward the letter’s recipients in this passage is translated
imperatively, even those that are not formally imperatives in Greek. Those in the aorist
tense are rendered finite imperatives: ἀπόθεσθε → אָסוֹת (“put off”); ἀπεκδυσάμενοι →

,ⲧⲁⲛⲁⲗⲉ (“take off”); ἐνδυσάμενοι→ⲁⲃⲗ (“put on”); ἐνδύσασθε→ⲁⲃⲗ (“put on”). Those in the present tense are translated with the imperatival force of ⲕⲉⲛ + a participle: μὴ ψεύδεσθε→ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲕⲉⲛⲧⲁⲗⲉⲛⲁ (“and do not lie”); ἀνεχόμενοι...καὶ χαριζόμενοι→ⲕⲉⲛⲉⲛⲁ...ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲁ (“and endure... and forgive,” in which the initial ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁ governs both successive participles). Moreover, the translator adds a final imperative at the end of v. 13 (ⲁⲛⲁⲃⲗ, “forgive”) to make explicit the implicit command to forgive one another. So the translator’s perception of the imperatival tone of this passage has worked its way into his translation in the form of Syriac imperatives used to render even those Greek verbs that are not formally imperative.

Colossians 3:17

καὶ πᾶν ὃ τι ἐὰν ποιῆτε ἐν λόγῳ ἢ ἐν ἔργῳ, πάντα ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ θεῷ πατρὶ δι’ αὐτοῦ.

ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲁ ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲁ ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲁ ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲁ ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲁ ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲁ
ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲁ ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲁ ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲁ ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲁ ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲁ ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲁ

And everything that you do, in word and in work, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ work, and give thanks through him to God the Father.

Here the translator adds a verb in Syriac to make explicit what is implicit in the Greek. The clause πάντα ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου Ἰησοῦ has an implied imperative, ποιεῖτε.⁸

The P translator adds an imperatival construction, ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲁ (“work”), to ensure that the implicit meaning of the sentence is explicitly understood in his translation.

Colossians 4:5

Ἐν σοφίᾳ περιπατεῖτε πρὸς τοὺς ἔξω τὸν καιρὸν ἐξαγοραζόμενοι

ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲁ ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲁ ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲁ ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲁ ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲁ ⲕⲉⲛⲁⲛⲁⲧⲁ

8. Campbell, *Colossians and Philemon*, 61.

In wisdom walk toward those outside, and buy your opportunity.

In this example, the translator’s concern for comprehension and style once again indicates that he is not attempting to represent the text at a word-by-word level. The translator of H provides a more literal rendering of the final participial phrase: **ܘܚܘܒ ܗܘܢܐ ܗܘܪܝܢܐ** (“while you are buying the time”). The P translator goes a different way, choosing to translate the verb imperatively and opting to translate **καιρόν** more idiomatically with **ܘܚܘܒܟܝܢܐ** (“your opportunity”). In so doing, the P translator avoids both redundancy and the potential confusion between the verb **ܘܚܘܒ** (“to buy”) and the noun **ܗܘܪܝܢܐ** (“time”).

Interpretive Choices

Colossians 1:19

ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι

ܘܚܘܒ ܗܘܢܐ ܗܘܪܝܢܐ ܘܚܘܒܟܝܢܐ

That in him, he willed all the fullness to dwell.

In this phrase the translator adds the pronoun **ܗܘܢܐ** (“he”) to clarify the subject of the verb. Because **πλήρωμα** is formally ambiguous—it could be in either the nominative or accusative case—a reader may understand it as either the subject of **εὐδόκησεν** or the subject of the following infinitive, **κατοικῆσαι**.⁹ The translator takes the latter approach and formalizes his interpretation in the translation. Knappe argues, “apparently [the translators] were not satisfied with **πλήρωμα** as a subject, but would rather make it the object of the sentence. Peshitta seems to emphasize this by adding **ܗܘܢܐ** = he = God. It was

9. Campbell, *Colossians and Philemon*, 16.

God’s will that all the fullness should dwell in him (= Christ).”¹⁰ It may be an overstatement to suggest that the translator was not “satisfied with πλήρωμα as a subject” because the translator may have simply understood it as the object (and subject of the subsequent infinitive) without giving a thought to the interpretive implications of it all. But in any case, the addition of a pronoun to clarify the subject of this phrase is a good example of the translator’s willingness to resolve ambiguities from the source text.

Colossians 2:17

ἃ ἔστιν σκιά τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ

ἃῃ ἔστιν σκιά τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ

These that are the shadows of what are coming, but the body is Christ.

Here the translator adds a word to make the sense of the Greek explicit and thereby makes a subtle interpretive decision. By adding the enclitic ἃῃ at the end of the final clause, the translator makes the implicit verb in Greek explicit in the translation. Also, by choosing not to make ἔστιν (“Christ”) genitival in any way, as H does by rendering Χριστοῦ with ἔστιν (“of Christ”), a shift in meaning occurs. Rather than reading “but the body belongs to Christ,” P reads “but the body *is* Christ.” Again the translator demonstrates the willingness to formally express his own interpretation of the text in his translation.

Colossians 2:19

καὶ οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἐξ ὧν πᾶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν ἁφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον αὐξεῖ τὴν αὐξησιν τοῦ θεοῦ

καὶ οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἐξ ὧν πᾶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν ἁφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον αὐξεῖ τὴν αὐξησιν τοῦ θεοῦ

10. Knappe, “Captivity Letters,” 232–33.

But not holding the head, from which the whole body is built and stands by the joints and by the limbs, and grows [in] the growth of God.

Of note in this phrase is a single lexical choice that sheds light on how the translator’s sensitivity to the context influences his translation decisions. The P translator renders συνδέσμων by ܠܘܡܐ (“limbs”) whereas the H translator uses ܠܘܝܢܐ (“bonds”). This comparison with H is useful because it gives a sense of the lexical possibilities for translating σύνδεσμος into Syriac. The Greek word means “bond” but can be used figuratively—as it is here—in an anatomical sense to mean “sinew.”¹¹ The H translator renders σύνδεσμος with a literal Syriac equivalent here, as he does later in a different context in Col 3:14 (σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος → ܠܠܘܝܢܐ ܕܠܘܝܢܐ, “bond of perfection”). P has a similar literal equivalent for the word in 3:14 (ܠܘܡܐ, “band”), but here the translator opts for a more specifically anatomical word in ܠܘܡܐ, which means “a limb, member, part of the body.”¹² This is evidence, then, that the translator of P is sensitive to the broader context even as he translates individual words.

Colossians 4:3b-4

...λαλῆσαι τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ...ἵνα φανερώσω αὐτὸ ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι

ܕܠܠܘܝܢܐ ܠܘܝܢܐ ܕܠܘܝܢܐ ܕܠܘܝܢܐ . . . ܠܘܝܢܐ ܠܘܝܢܐ ܠܘܝܢܐ . . .

...to speak the mystery of Christ...that I might reveal it and speak it as is fitting for me

The P translator makes the interpretive decision in v. 4 to make both verbs ܠܘܝܢܐ (“to reveal”) and ܠܘܝܢܐ (“to speak”) refer explicitly to ܠܘܝܢܐ ܠܘܝܢܐ (“the mystery of

11. Frederick W. Danker and Walter Bauer, eds., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 966.

12. J. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary: Founded upon the Thesaurus Syriacus of R. Payne Smith, D.D.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1902), 100.

Christ”). In Greek, only the verb φανερώσω has αὐτό as its direct object, the antecedent of which is μυστήριον. The verb of speaking (λαλῆσαι) is an infinitive complementary to the verb δεῖ and has no direct object. But in order to represent his interpretation, the translator reorders the phrase, renders both verbs finite in form, and adds an objective pronominal suffix (-σα-) to each one. Thus the P translator is willing to slightly rework phrases from his source text in order to elicit a meaning that is not formally reflected in the Greek.

Translation Unit and Consciousness of Context and Meaning—Conclusion

The translator of PCol uses single Greek words or small phrases as his translation units, occasionally stretching to longer phrases to accommodate differences between the language systems. Usually these longer translation units occur when the translator sacrifices formal equivalence for the sake of maintaining proper Syriac idiom, as in the ordering of attributive adjectives or verbal phrases. But despite the size of his translation unit, the translator is clearly reading the text in a broader scope and allowing his understanding of the context and meaning to influence his smaller translation decisions. This is evident in the instances examined above where the translator diverges from the syntax of the Greek in order to produce a translation that is more readable in Syriac, to clarify implicit meaning, or to formalize interpretive choices. These tendencies, although often affecting only single words or phrases in the translation, reveal that the translator of PCol is not only working on the granular level but is rather translating with the broader context of the passage and its meaning in mind.¹³

13. In addition to helping describe the translator’s style, these conclusions also reinforce the impression that the translator is striving for a relatively literal degree of correspondence in rendering the Greek. For more on this, see pp. 51-57.

P—where this formulaic phrase appears in the Pauline Epistles, only twice is the order reversed as it is here (Rom 1:7; Eph 1:2), while the other ten instances reproduce the order of the Greek (1 Cor 1:3; 2 Cor 1:2; Gal 1:3; Phil 1:2; 1 Thess 1:1; 2 Thess 1:2; 1 Tim 1:1; 2 Tim 1:2; Titus 1:4; Phlm 1:3).¹⁵ Therefore the translator of PCol here shows his willingness not only to adjust word order to his liking but even to break convention in doing so.

Colossians 1:6 and 1:28

...καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἐστὶν καρποφορούμενον καὶ αὐξανόμενον...

... ܠܝܟܘܢ ܕܥܡܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܡܠܝܩܬܐ ܕܥܡܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ...

...just as also to the whole world, and it is growing and bearing fruit...

ὃν ἡμεῖς καταγγέλλομεν νουθετοῦντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον καὶ διδάσκοντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον...

... ܕܥܡܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܡܠܝܩܬܐ ܕܥܡܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ...

Which we proclaim, also teaching and explaining to every person...

These two verses contain examples of a common occurrence in Syriac translation: the reversal of paired items.¹⁶ In both of these cases, the translator has reversed the order of two successive verbs. In v. 6, the Greek has καρποφορούμενον καὶ αὐξανόμενον while the Syriac has ܠܝܟܘܢ ܕܥܡܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ (“also growing and bearing fruit”). In v. 28 the Greek has νουθετοῦντες καὶ διδάσκοντες while the Syriac has ܕܥܡܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܡܠܝܩܬܐ (“teaching and explaining”). Since there is no evidence in the Greek manuscript tradition for the reversal of either of these pairs, and it is a known phenomenon in early Syriac translation, the

15. Notably, Tischendorf does not indicate any variance in the Greek manuscript tradition regarding the order of any of these formulaic greetings in Paul.

16. See discussion of this phenomenon in the Gospels in Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 204–35.

most likely explanation is that the translator made this change either intentionally or by accident.

Colossians 3:1

...οὗ ὁ Χριστός ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενος·

ܩܘܠܘܨܝܐ ܩܘܠܘܨܝܐ ܕܥܕܝܐ ܩܘܠܘܨܝܐ ܝܕܝܐ...

...where Christ sits at the right hand of God

Here the translator relocates a verb from the end of a clause to the beginning of it.

In Greek, καθήμενος follows ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ, but the P translator locates the corresponding participle ܥܕܝܐ (“is seated”) at the beginning of the phrase. This may be a misunderstanding of ἐστὶν...καθήμενος as a periphrastic participle, but even so the translator was clearly willing to move the verb around to make his translation read more smoothly.

In general, the translator arranges words and phrases to parallel the order of his Greek source text. However, the translator occasionally demonstrates that he is not beholden to the Greek word order by shifting certain words or reversing paired items. In most instances Syriac syntax warrants such reordering, but the reversal of paired verbs exhibited above may have been a matter of mere preference or even a simple mistake in the reproduction of the phrase. Still, whether variances in word order are intentional or not, the translator’s tendency to do this indicates that exact imitation of the Greek syntax is not a higher priority than readable Syriac style.

Degree of Literalness

Translations are often described as either “free” or “literal,” but this dichotomy is not nuanced enough to adequately describe the process of biblical translation in the ancient world. Instead, as Barr claims, “there are different ways of being literal and of

being free, so that a translation can be literal and free at the same time but in different modes or on different levels.”¹⁷ Barr therefore provides a three-tiered schematization of literalism that includes the following types:

- (a) “free” renderings which state more or less correctly the general purport of the original text
- (b) Literal renderings which also give an adequate semantic rendering of the original
- (c) Literal renderings which, while their semantic indication is far from being an adequate indication of the meaning of the original, nevertheless show a close and understandable relation to the form of the original.¹⁸

To assist in typing a given translation, Barr formulates six modes by which one may judge the literalness of a translation, of which the following four are useful here:

1. The division into elements or segments, and the sequence in which these elements are represented.
2. The quantitative addition or subtraction of elements.
3. Consistency or non-consistency in the rendering, i.e., the degree to which a particular versional term is used for all (or most) cases of a particular term of the original.
4. Accuracy and level of semantic information, especially in cases of metaphor and idiom.¹⁹

Under these criteria for evaluating a translation’s degree of literalness, PCol generally falls under Barr’s type *b*, but occasionally leans toward *a*.²⁰

By the first criterion, PCol tends toward literalness, but not to the most extreme degree. When operating in the highest degree of literalism in this mode, “with the context

17. James Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*, NAWG Philologisch-Historische Klasse 11 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 280.

18. Barr, *Typology of Literalism*, 289.

19. Barr, *Typology of Literalism*, 294. The other two are more relevant for evaluating a translation from Hebrew into Greek, which is Barr’s primary concern in the paper.

20. Barr may be referenced exclusively in this section because of the lasting quality of this work. While others have cited Barr in translation studies similar to this thesis, no one (to my knowledge) has challenged Barr’s categories or expanded upon them.

taken into account at least to some degree, [the translator] then proceeded to *express* the results in a manner that as far as possible gave representation to each word or element as a separate unit of meaning for the purpose of translation.”²¹ The representative examples in the previous two sections demonstrate that even though the translator of PCol takes a wide view of the context into account, he tends toward this sort of literalness by generally attempting to maintain word order and consistently representing each phrase from his source text. As is clear from the word order section above, however, the translator does not constantly maintain this strictness, sometimes choosing to slightly rework the order of his translation at the level of individual words.

By the second criterion, the translator of PCol tends to work less literally. According to Barr, “a literal translation will express only the linguistic elements that are present in the original, and will express all of them.”²² As for expressing only the linguistic elements present in the source text, the examples above suffice to show that the translator of PCol is more than willing to make additions where he sees fit, as in the provision of extra conjunctions or prepositions.²³ Regarding the expression of all of the elements present in the original, the translator of PCol is outpaced by his later and more literal successor H.

An example will serve to put P’s lower degree of literalness here in perspective. The H translator operates literally to such an extent that he insists on representing Greek possessive pronouns as separate words, while the P translator is content to render them

21. Barr, *Typology of Literalism*, 297.

22. Barr, *Typology of Literalism*, 304.

23. See above, e.g., on Col 1:9-12; 2:1.

more naturally as pronominal suffixes (e.g., in 1:7, Gk: συνδούλου ἡμῶν, P: ܘܨܘܠܐ [“our companion”], H: ܘܨܘܠܐ ܕܗܡܘܢ [“our own companion”]). For several other examples, cf. 1:9, 13, 16, 20, 22, 24).²⁴ In this sense, PCol is less literal (but not quite free) because of its tendencies occasionally to add elements and not to express certain elements as explicitly as possible.²⁵

By the third criterion, PCol can be characterized as both free in some areas and more literal in others. The vocabulary section of the microanalysis below indicates that the translator is consistent in his rendering of most nouns and verbs throughout the letter. However, the translator does occasionally use multiple Syriac words to represent one Greek word, or one Syriac word to represent multiple Greek words. Moreover, the microanalysis shows that the translator is even less consistent in his translation of conjunctions and prepositions. Therefore PCol is variously literal and free by this criterion.

By the fourth criterion, PCol can be both free and literal. Here the concern is not with the reproduction of equivalent words, but with a correct *semantic* representation.²⁶ As such, a free translation by this criterion is one that does not result in the same meaning of the source text, while a “literal” translation is one that accurately represents the meaning even at the expense of strict formal equivalence. One of the examples above shows PCol’s literalness in this regard. In 2:19 συνδέσμων refers to “sinews” in its

24. In only one instance does the translator of PCol employ the form -ܕܢܝܘܢܐ: 4:18, ܩܝܝܡܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܗܡܘܢ (→ ܘܨܘܠܐ ܕܗܡܘܢ (“by my own hand”).

25. For another example of this tendency, see the translation of compound Greek words (p. 81) in the microanalysis below.

26. Barr, *Typology of Literalism*, 314-15.

metaphorical anatomical context, and the translator makes an attempt to literally represent this meaning by employing the word ܠܡܝܬܐ (“limb”). Another example is the translator’s tendency to translate νεκρῶν with the Syriac idiom ܠܒܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ (“house of the dead”), rather than the more straightforward ܡܝܬܐ (“the dead”) as H does (1:18; 2:12). A contrasting example can be found in 2:13, where the Greek has the metaphor ἀκροβυστία τῆς σαρκός (“uncircumcision of the flesh”), and P simply reproduces the phrase ܕܠܠܝܘܬܐ ܕܠܝܚܬܐ (“uncircumcision of your flesh”) rather than attempting to give an interpretation of its meaning.²⁷

Finally, Barr discusses one more way of evaluating the literalness of a translation that will be useful in characterizing PCol. He argues that “if a text is really difficult and obscure to the translator, he may opt for free translation, making a general estimate of the total meaning, or simply guessing at it, and ignoring the details; but he may also do the opposite, and decide to give a precise impression in [the target language] of the detailed form of the” source language.²⁸ In Col 2:18 the translator apparently struggles to understand the Greek and consequently displays his freer tendencies in the translation he produces. For this example, a translation is given for both the Greek and the Syriac to highlight the differences.

μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβραβεύετω θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἃ ἔώρακεν ἐμβατεύων, εἰκῆ φυσιοῦμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ νοῦς τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ

24. While the translator does not make a habit of being theologically interpretive—as one would expect an interpretation of the phrase “uncircumcision of the flesh” to be—he does not refrain from it entirely. See above, on the change of subject in 1:19 and the translation of “but the body is Christ” in 2:17 (p. 44).

28. Barr, *Typology of Literalism*, 290.

Let no one disqualify you, delighting in²⁹ humility and the worship of angels, prying into things he has not seen, puffed up in vain by the mind of his flesh.

هل لا يهينكم احدكم بسبب تواضعكم وعبادة الملائكة وفضولكم في ما لم يره وبتواخيخكم بقلوبكم
بمخيلكم

No one should wish, by humility of mind, to condemn you that you should submit to the service of angels, by intruding upon something that he has not seen and vainly puffed up by the mind of his flesh.

The translator seems to have difficulty with the first verbal clause and the subsequent participial phrase. He nevertheless makes an attempt at representing the meaning, although his rendering of the verbs does not quite line up with the Greek syntax. The translator puts the imperatival force on *ك* *ي* (“wish”) and represents *καταβραβεύετω* (a third-person imperative) as an infinitive *ل* *ي* *ك* (“to condemn you”) complementary to *ك* *ي*. Moreover, he adds the word *ل* *ي* *ك* (“that you should submit,” or “be subjugated”) in an attempt to clarify the relationship between the imagined opponent and “the worship of angels.” This is an indication of the translator’s willingness to be free in translation, making an effort to approximate the meaning of a difficult text without also trying to imitate the form of the original syntax.

PCol may therefore be characterized, according to Barr’s typology, as *b* with some *a* tendencies—preferring to translate literally and accurately represent the meaning of the source text, while sometimes tending toward a freer approach that prioritizes semantic accuracy over imitation of the Greek form. This is evident first in that the translator is willing to diverge from precise formal equivalence to convey meaning in context. Second, the translator’s approach to word order supports this conclusion, as he generally adheres to the order of the Greek—especially at the level of the phrase—but

29. For translating *θέλων ἐν* as “delighting in,” see Campbell, *Colossians and Philemon*, 44.

sometimes does not keep to this strictly. Lastly, PCol is never literal to the highest degree by any of Barr's criteria, tending instead to be somewhat literal but also exhibiting some freer habits.

Microanalysis

The results of the microanalysis, which was conducted according to the methodology developed in the previous chapter, are presented here. Five broad categories are addressed: verbs, pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions and particles, and vocabulary. The focus of the examination of these categories is the consistency with which the translator operates. The standard for "consistency," as indicated in the methodology, is whether each word or grammatical construction is represented the same way in at least 90% of all occurrences in PCol (or in a broader sampling of texts, in cases for which PCol does not contain enough occurrences to reach a conclusion).

Verbs

The translation does not meet the standard for consistency in representing any verbs other than substantives. The following treatment is categorized by verbal form, demonstrating the rate at which each Syriac form (perfect, imperfect, participial, infinitive, and imperative) represents various Greek tenses (present, imperfect, future, aorist, perfect) and moods (indicative, infinitive, imperative, and participial). This approach indicates the wide range with which the translator of PCol employs verbal forms to render the Greek verbs he is reading.

Participles

Tables 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 display the number of times the Syriac participle is used to translate each Greek form indicated.

Table 3.1 Greek verbal forms translated by Syriac participles

Gk Tense Gk Mood	Present			Perfect		Aorist	Future
	Part.	Ind.	Subj.	Part.	Ind.	Subj.	Ind.
Times transl. by participle	26	19	2	3	2	2	2
%	32.1	23.46	2.47	3.7	2.47	2.47	2.47

Table 3.2 Greek verbal forms translated by Syriac participles + ܩܘܡܐ

Greek Tense Greek Mood	Present			Perfect		Impf.
	Part.	Impv.	Subj.	Part.	Inf.	Ind.
Times transl. by participle + ܩܘܡܐ	6	3	2	2	1	1
%	7.41	3.7	2.47	2.47	1.23	1.23

Table 3.3 Greek non-verbs translated by Syriac participles

Greek Form	Adj.	N.	Prep. Phrase	Pred + Nom.	Total
Times transl. by participle	5	3	1	1	81
%	6.17	3.7	1.23	1.23	100

The participle is the most common verbal form employed by the translator and has, by far, the widest range of use.³⁰ On its own, a participle translates Greek present-tense verbs in the participial, indicative, and subjunctive moods; perfect verbs in the participial and indicative moods; aorist subjunctives; future indicatives; and a single imperfect indicative. When combined with a form of ܩܘܡܐ, Syriac participles represent Greek present-tense verbs in the participial, imperatival, and subjunctive moods as well as perfect verbs in the participial and infinitival moods. The Syriac participle is also employed several times to represent non-verbs in Greek—adjectives, nouns, a prepositional phrase and a predicate-nominative combination. A list of examples follows.

1:28 διδάσκοντες (present participle) → ܡܠܩܡܝܢܝܢ

30. Brock's generalization that the Syriac participle can represent the Greek present, imperfect, and future tenses is accurate but does not quite capture the full picture of the range of the Syriac participle as employed in PCol. Brock, "Limitations of Syriac Representing Greek," 90.

- 1:24 χαίρω (present indicative) → ܕܪܚܡܢܐ
- 3:17 ποιήτε (present subjunctive) → ܕܪܡܢܐ ܢܦܥܥܐ
- 2:7 ἐρριζωμένοι (perfect participle) → ܕܪܡܢܐ ܠܝܘܟܥܢܐ
- 1:17 συνέστηκεν (perfect indicative) → ܕܪܡܢܐ
- 3:4 φανερωθή (aorist subjunctive) → ܕܪܡܢܐ ܕܥܘܟܐ
- 3:25 κομίσεται (future indicative) → ܕܪܡܢܐ ܕܥܘܟܐ
- 3:7 ἐζήτε (imperfect indicative) → ܕܪܡܢܐ ܕܥܘܟܐ ܕܥܘܟܐ
- 3:16 διδάσκοντες (present participle) → ܕܪܡܢܐ ܕܥܘܟܐ ܕܥܘܟܐ
- 4:18 μνημονεύετε (present imperative) → ܕܪܡܢܐ ܕܥܘܟܐ ܕܥܘܟܐ
- 2:4 παραλογίζηται (present subjunctive) → ܕܪܡܢܐ ܕܥܘܟܐ ܕܥܘܟܐ
- 4:1 εἰδότες (perfect participle) → ܕܪܡܢܐ ܕܥܘܟܐ ܕܥܘܟܐ
- 4:6 ειδέναι (perfect infinitive) → ܕܪܡܢܐ ܕܥܘܟܐ ܕܥܘܟܐ
- 1:15 ἀοράτου (adjective) → ܕܪܡܢܐ ܕܥܘܟܐ
- 4:2 εὐχαριστία (noun) → ܕܪܡܢܐ
- 2:22 εἰς φθοράν (prepositional phrase) → ܕܪܡܢܐ ܕܥܘܟܐ
- 2:3 εἰσιν... ἀπόκρυφοι (predicate nominative) → ܕܪܡܢܐ ܕܥܘܟܐ

Perfect Verbs

Table 3.4 displays the number of times a Syriac perfect verb is used to translate each of the indicated Greek forms.

Table 3.4 Greek forms translated by Syriac perfect verbs

Greek Tense	Aorist			Pres.	Pf.	-	-	
Greek Mood	Ind.	Part.	Subj.	Part.	Ind.	Noun	Implicit	Total
Times transl. by perfect	32	12	1	3	3	1	1	53
%	60.38	22.64	1.89	5.66	5.66	1.89	1.89	100

After the participle, the next most common Syriac verb form is the perfect, which also exhibits a considerable range of representation. Perfect Syriac verbs are most likely to translate aorist-tense Greek verbs.³¹ Otherwise, a perfect verb represents present indicatives, perfect indicatives, a noun once, and is once added to represent an implicit Greek verb. A list of examples follows.

1:6 ἠκούσατε (aorist indicative) → ܐܘܕܝܢܬܘܢ

1:8 δηλώσας (aorist participle) → ܥܘܠܡܐ

1:6 παρόντος (present participle) → ܐܘܕܝܢܬܘܢ

4:16 ἀναγνωσθῆ (aorist subjunctive) → ܕܘܕܝܢܬܘܢ

2:1 ἔώρακαν (perfect indicative) → ܐܘܘܪܘܢ

4:11 συνεργοί (noun) → ܥܘܠܡܐ

4:16 καὶ τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας → ܐܘܘܪܘܢ ܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܠܐܘܕܝܩܝܐ (‘‘and the one that was written from Laodicea’’)

Imperfect Verbs

Table 3.5 displays the number of times each Greek form is translated by a Syriac imperfect verb.

Table 3.5 Greek verb forms translated by Syriac imperfect verbs

Gk Tense	Aorist			Present			Future	Perfect		Total
	Subj.	Inf.	Part	Part	Impv.	Ind.	Subj.	Ind.	Inf.	
Transl. by imperfect	12	5	1	7	4	1	1	4	1	36
%	31.59	13.16	2.63	18.42	10.52	2.63	2.63	10.52	2.63	94.74

Though employed less often than the perfect, the imperfect verb has a considerably wider range of use. In addition to those listed in the table above, one

31. This is consistent with Brock's generalization that the Syriac perfect verb is most often used to represent the Greek aorist tense. Brock, ‘‘Limitations of Syriac Representing Greek,’’ 90.

imperfect verb is added to the translation (2.63%), and another is used to translate a noun (2.63%). A list of examples follows.

1:28 παραστήσωμεν (aorist subjunctive) → ܡܘܨܘܢ

1:22 παραστήσαι (aorist infinitive) → ܡܘܨܘܝܢ

2:2 συμβιβασθέντες (aorist participle) → ܡܘܨܘܝܢܘܬܝܢ

2:7 περισσεύοντες (present participle) → ܡܘܨܘܝܢܘܬܝܢ

3:15 βραβεύετω (present imperative) → ܘܒܪܘܚܝܢ

1:23 ἐπιμένετε (present indicative) → ܡܘܨܘܝܢܘܬܝܢ

3:21 ἄθυμῶσιν (present subjunctive) → ܡܘܨܘܝܢܘܬܝܢ

4:9 γνωρίσουσιν (future indicative) → ܡܘܨܘܝܢܘܬܝܢ

2:1 εἰδέναι (perfect infinitive) → ܡܘܨܘܝܢܘܬܝܢ

1:10 ἀρεσκείαν (noun) → ܡܘܨܘܝܢܘܬܝܢ

2:18 καὶ θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων → ܡܘܨܘܝܢܘܬܝܢ ܡܘܨܘܝܢܘܬܝܢ (‘‘you should submit to the service of angels’’)

Imperative Verbs

Table 3.6 displays the number of times a Syriac imperative is employed to translate each of the indicated forms.

Table 3.6 Greek verb forms translated by Syriac imperatives

Greek Tense	[All]	Aorist	Perfect	Present	[Implicit in		
Greek Mood	Impv.	Part.	Subj.	Part	Part	syntax]	Total
Times transl. by imperative	19	2	1	1	1	1	25
%	76	8	4	4	4	4	100

Since the tense systems of the two languages are so different from one another, in this category it was not as important to record the Greek tense of each verb as it was to

note whether it was in the imperatival mood. Of all the verb forms (aside from the substantives), this one maintains the highest degree of consistency. Even so, in several instances the translator employed an imperative where the Greek verb was in a different mood and in one instance where the imperative was only implicit in the syntax—a list of these exceptions follows.

3:9 ἀπεκδυσάμενοι (aorist participle) → ܡܫܘܠܘܥ

3:10 ἐνδυσάμενοι (aorist participle) → ܘܥܠ

4:16 ἀναγνῶτε (aorist subjunctive) → ܡܫܘܠܘܥ

4:5 ἐξαγοραζόμενοι (present participle) → ܘܥܠ

3:24 εἰδότες (perfect participle) → ܘܥܠ

3:13 οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς → ܘܥܠܘܟܘܢ ܘܥܠܘܟܘܢ ܘܥܠܘܟܘܢ (“also you must forgive”)

Infinitives

Table 3.7 displays the number of instances in which a Syriac infinitive is used to translate each of the indicated Greek forms.

Table 3.7 Greek forms translated by Syriac infinitives

Greek Tense	[all]	Present		Total
		Infinitive	Participle	
Greek Mood				
Times transl. by infinitive	4	2	1	7
%	57.14	28.57	14.39	100

For this category it was again less important to focus on tense than mood. As such, Syriac infinitives represented Greek infinitives more often than not, but only slightly. A list of all the infinitives follows.

1:19 κατοικῆσαι (aorist infinitive) → ܘܥܠܘܟܘܢ

1:20 ἀποκαταλλάξαι (aorist infinitive) → ܘܥܠܘܟܘܢ

4:3 λαλῆσαι (aorist infinitive) → ܘܥܠܘܟܘܢ

4:6 ἀποκρίνεσθαι (present infinitive) → ܐܘܬܘܒܐܠܐ

1:9 προσευχόμενοι (present participle) → ܠܚܝܘܬܐܠܐ

1:9 αἰτούμενοι (Present Participle) → ܕܠܚܝܘܬܐܠܐ

2:18 καταβραβευέτω (present imperative) → ܠܚܝܘܬܐܠܐ

Substantives – Enclitic Forms and ܐܘܪ

Tables 3.8, 3.9, and 3.10 display the number of times the word ܐܘܪ and an enclitic form, respectively, represent the Greek forms indicated

Table 3.8 Greek substantives translated by ܐܘܪ with a pronominal suffix

Type of Greek substantive	Present	Imperfect	Participial	Total
Times transl. by ܐܘܪ	10	1	1	12
%	83.33	8.33	8.33	100

Table 3.9 Greek forms of εἶπω translated by -ܕܐܘܪ

Greek mood of εἶπω	Indicative	Subjunctive	Total
Times transl. by -ܕܐܘܪ	4	1	5
%	80%	20%	100

Table 3.10 Greek forms translated by a Syriac enclitic form

Greek form	Substantive verb	Implicit substantive	Participle (with adj.)	Total
Times transl. by enclitic	7	1	1	9
%	77.78	11.11	11.11	100

The translator is consistent with his representation of Greek substantives. Even though he varies between using ܐܘܪ and an enclitic form, together these two represent a form of the substantive verb present in NA28 Greek text about 90% of the time (nineteen out of twenty-one occurrences). Similarly, the - ܕܐܘܪ construction represents a form of εἶπω every time it appears in PCol. In the Pauline corpus, - ܕܐܘܪ + pronominal suffix

translates ἔχω 87.5% of the time (forty-two of forty-eight occurrences). A list of examples follows.

1:7 ἐστιν (present substantive) → ,ܡܳܘܕܳܐܳܠܳܐ

2:14 ἦν (imperfect substantive) → ܪܳܘܳܡܳܐܳܠܳܐ

4:11 ὄντες (participial substantive) → ܠܳܘܳܡܳܐܳܠܳܐ

2:1 ἔχω (indicative) → ܕܳܐܳܠܳܐ

3:13 ἐάν τις... ἔχη (subjunctive) → ܡܳܠܳܐܳܠܳܐ ܠܳܠܳܐ

1:15 ἐστιν (present substantive) → ܠܳܘܳܡܳܐܳܠܳܐ

3:11 πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν Χριστός → ܳܡܳܘܳܠܳܐܳܠܳܐ ܡܳܠܳܐܳܠܳܐ ܕܳܠܳܐ

2:20 ζῶντες (participle) → ܠܳܘܳܡܳܐܳܠܳܐ ܠܳܠܳܐ

Non-Verbs Translating Verbs, Greek Verbs Left Untranslated, and Interpretive

Additions

In several instances, the translator employs non-verbs to represent Greek verbs. Four times an adjective translates a participle (e.g., 1:18 πρωτεύων → ܡܳܠܳܐܳܠܳܐ), and twice a noun does the same (3:10 τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν [“of the one who created you”] → ܡܳܠܳܐܳܠܳܐ [“of your creator”], cf. 3:22). In 2:23, the translator’s interpretation of the phrase ἄτινά ἐστιν λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας causes him to add the verb ܠܳܘܳܠܳܐܳܠܳܐ (“and it *seems*”), and to represent λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας by eliminating the verb and saying simply ܪܳܘܳܡܳܐܳܠܳܐ ܠܳܠܳܐ (“a word *of* wisdom”).

Verbs—Conclusion

The translation of verbs in PCol is significantly inconsistent. No single Syriac form meets the standard of consistency aside from the forms used to represent substantival verbs. Of course, it may be the case that some of the apparent inconsistency

is due to the translator's *Vorlage* occasionally containing differing verb forms no longer attested in the manuscript tradition. However, the wide range of use for most of the Syriac verb forms in PCol would make it difficult to deduce with any accuracy where the translation might witness to a specific tense and mood.

Pronouns

Syriac pronominal forms are widely employed to represent a range of Greek forms. Since several Syriac pronominal constructions are used to translate multiple Greek phenomena, there is no consistency in the usage of specific forms—with the exception of the translation of Greek reflexive and reciprocal pronouns. Moreover, the translator occasionally leaves Greek pronouns untranslated or adds pronominal forms in his translation.

Pronominal Suffixes

The most common way Greek pronouns are represented in PCol is by pronominal suffixes. However, Syriac idiom calls for an abundance of pronominal suffixes. They tend to be used to represent things that are implied in the Greek text, such as genitival relationships or the inherent possession of things such as body parts.³² Therefore, the discussion here focuses on the consistency with which the translator employs pronominal suffixes to represent pronouns actually present in the Greek text as well as how often they match the text of NA28 in person and number.³³ The results indicate that the translation's usage of pronominal suffixes falls just short of the standard for consistency. Table 3.11

32. E.g., the Greek might have simply κύριος, but the Syriac will nearly always have ܐܘܪܝܘܬܐ or ܐܘܪܝܘܬܐ ("our Lord," "my Lord"). See Brock, "Limitations of Syriac Representing Greek," 95–96; Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 67–121.

33. This discussion does not include the use of pronominal suffixes that do not represent a pronominal relationship, such as proleptic suffixes.

displays the number of times the Syriac pronominal suffix represents explicit and implicit pronouns in the text.

Table 3.11 Usage of the Syriac Pronominal Suffix

Element from Greek Text	Pronoun explicit in the text	Pronoun implicit in the text	Outlier: ܗܝܢ ܕܥܚܪܝܬܝܢ	Total
Times transl. by Syriac pronominal suffix	115	26	1	142
%	80.99	18.31	.7	100

Pronominal suffixes very often are employed to represent a Greek pronoun explicitly present in the text (e.g., 1:2 πατὴρ ἡμῶν → ܡܘܬܪ [“our father”]; 1:3 περὶ ὑμῶν → ܡܘܬܪܝܢ [“concerning you”]; δηλώσας ἡμῖν → ܡܘܬܪܝܢ [“he made known to us”]). However, in a significant number of instances a pronominal suffix represents something that is only implicit in the Greek text (e.g., 3:5 τὰ μέλη → ܡܘܬܪܝܢ [“your members”]; 3:23 ἐκ ψυχῆς → ܡܘܬܪܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܘܬܪܝܢ [“from all of your soul”]; 4:5 τὸν καιρὸν → ܡܘܬܪܝܢ [“your opportunity”; added in 3:18-20, 22; 4:1 to represent household relationships). In a single outlier a pronominal suffix is used in a paraphrastic simplification of the Greek text (1:4 τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔχετε [“the love that you have”] → ܡܘܬܪܝܢ [“your love”]). In two further instances, the person and number of a pronominal suffix do not match the pronoun in the printed NA28 text (1:12 τῷ ἰκανώσαντι ὑμᾶς → ܡܘܬܪܝܢ [“who makes us worthy”]; 3:4 ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν → ܡܘܬܪܝܢ [“our life”]).³⁴ Thus pronominal suffixes in PCol approach but do not meet the standard for consistency.

34. In both of these instances, P is cited in the apparatus of NA28 as a witness to a variant. Pronominal variation in such phrases commonly occurs in the Greek, so it is quite possible that these do reflect the variant for which they are cited. Each of these citations is evaluated in the following chapter.

Independent Pronouns

The independent pronoun is used in PCol far less commonly than the pronominal suffix but is less consistent. It is most often (eleven of sixteen times, or 68.75%) accurately employed to represent a pronoun explicitly present in the Greek text (e.g., 1:9 ἡμεῖς → ܐܡܢܘܥܝܟܝܘܢ [“we”]; 1:17, 18 καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστὶν → ܘܥܡܡܘܢܝܘܬܐ [“and he is”]; 1:23 ἐγὼ → ܐܢܝܢ [“I”]). Twice, however, an independent pronoun is added to the translation (1:19 εὐδόκησεν → ܐܘܕܘܟܝܘܬܐܝܢ [“he will”]; 4:9 γνῶρισουσιν → ܕܥܪܟܝܘܬܐܝܢ ܕܥܠܡܐ [“they will make known to you”]). Moreover, there are two instances in which an independent pronoun in Greek is left completely unrepresented in the translation (1:18 αὐτός; 1:29 αὐτοῦ). The usage of independent pronouns in PCol thus falls short of the standard for consistency.

Relative and Reflexive Pronouns

The translator employs a plethora of forms to represent the Greek relative pronoun (-ܐܘܬܐܘܪܐ and -ܐܘܬܐܘܪܐܘܬܐ; -ܐܘܬܐܘܪܐܘܬܐ; -ܐܘܬܐܘܪܐܘܬܐܘܬܐ; -ܐܘܬܐܘܪܐܘܬܐܘܬܐ; -ܐܘܬܐܘܪܐܘܬܐܘܬܐܘܬܐ; -ܐܘܬܐܘܪܐܘܬܐܘܬܐܘܬܐܘܬܐ; -ܐܘܬܐܘܪܐܘܬܐܘܬܐܘܬܐܘܬܐ; -ܐܘܬܐܘܪܐܘܬܐܘܬܐܘܬܐܘܬܐ; -ܐܘܬܐܘܪܐܘܬܐܘܬܐܘܬܐܘܬܐܘܬܐ; -ܐܘܬܐܘܪܐܘܬܐܘܬܐܘܬܐܘܬܐܘܬܐܘܬܐ; -ܐܘܬܐܘܪܐܘܬܐܘܬܐܘܬܐܘܬܐܘܬܐܘܬܐܘܬܐ); therefore, there is no consistency regarding the use of specific forms. More important for this study, however, is whether Syriac relatives—in whatever form they appear—consistently represent something that is explicitly present in the Greek text. In this regard, the translation approaches the standard for consistency but does not quite achieve it. Table 3.12 displays the number of times a Syriac relative form is employed to represent explicit and implicit Greek elements in the text.

Table 3.12 Representation of the Greek relative pronoun

Element from Greek text	Relative pronoun explicit in the text	Relative pronoun implicit in the text	Not formally relative, explicit in the text	Total
Times transl. by Syriac relative form	33	7	7	47
%	70.21	14.89	14.89	100

When one of these forms appears in PCol, it represents something explicitly present in the Greek text about 85% of the time. Most of these instances are translations of Greek relative pronouns (e.g., 2:3 ἐν ᾧ εἰσιν → ܡܢ ܐܡܝ ["which in him"]; 3:5 ἥτις → ܡܢ ["which"]; 3:6 δι' ἧ → ܠܗ ܕܗܗܘܢ ["because of these"]), but some are used to represent substantivizing articles (e.g., 4:11 Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰουῆτος → ܕܝܫܘܥ ܕܡܘܨܘܪܐ ["Jesus, who is called Justus"]; 4:13 τῶν ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ → ܕܗܘܢ ܕܒܠܕܝܥܝܐ ["those who are in Laodiceia"]). However, relative forms are also occasionally employed when a relative is only implicit in Greek (e.g., 3:22 ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι ["as people-pleasers"] → ܕܗܘܢ ܕܡܫܘܒܝܢ ܕܥܡܝ ["as those who please people"]). Moreover, there are two instances in which a relative pronoun is explicit in the Greek text but not formally represented in the translation (1:13 ὃς ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς ["who saved us"] → ܕܗܘܐ ܕܥܡܝ ["and he saved us"]; 2:23 αἰτινά is not translated). So the implementation of relative pronouns in PCol does not quite meet the standard for consistency in either the usage of specific forms or the representation of elements explicitly present in the Greek text.

Only four Greek reflexive or reciprocal pronouns appear in Colossians. A form of ἑαυτοῦ is once rendered ܕܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ ("one to another," 3:13) and once ܕܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ ("your soul," 3:16). A form of ἀλλήλων is once translated ܕܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ ("one with another," 3:9) and once ܕܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ ("one to another," 3:13). Another case that merits mention here is the translation in 3:3 of ἀπεθάνετε as ܕܗܘܐ ܕܗܘܐ ("you have died to yourselves"). Although there is no

reflexive pronoun in the Greek (or the Greek manuscript tradition), the addition of ܠܗ in the translation makes this phrase reflexive in Syriac.³⁵

Since there are not a sufficient number of instances of reflexive pronouns within PCol to establish consistency, the concordance was consulted to check the usage of each in the PNT as a whole. The translation ܠܠܗ ܐܘ meets the standard for consistency in the NT, with forty-one of forty-five (91%) occurrences rendering a form of ἀλλήλων.³⁶ Similarly, ܠܗ ܘܗ renders a form of ἀλλήλων in five of six occurrences.³⁷ The word ܠܘܢܗܘܢ is used to translate a form of ἑαυτοῦ in twenty of twenty-five occurrences (80%), but the usage of this word can be considered consistent if one takes into account the fact that in four of the remaining instances the word is obviously representing something else that is explicit in the Greek.³⁸

Demonstrative Pronouns

Only seven demonstrative pronouns appear in PCol. Five represent a Greek demonstrative pronoun in the text (e.g., 2:4 τοῦτο → ܠܗܘܐ; 4:11 οὗτοι → ܠܗܘܢ). Two are added to the translation (4:16 ἡ ἐπιστολή → ܠܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܗܘܢ [“this letter”]; 4:18 ὁ ἄσπασμός → ܠܗܘܐ ܠܗܘܢ [“this greeting”]). Since these Syriac forms are also regularly

35. Knappe indicates that this translation may be influenced by inexact parallels in Rom 6:2 (ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ → ܠܗܘܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܗܘܢ [“we have died to sin”]) and Rom 14:7 (οὐδεὶς ἑαυτῷ ἀποθνήσκει → ܠܗܘܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܗܘܢ [“no person to himself dies”]), but perhaps also Rom 6:11 (λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς νεκροὺς → ܠܗܘܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܗܘܢ [“consider yourselves as though you are dead”]). Knappe, “Captivity Letters,” 248.

36. The four divergences from this pattern are John 12:19 ἑαυτοῦς, Col 3:13 ἑαυτοῖς, 1 Thess 5:11 εἶς τὸν ἕνα, and 1 Pet 3:8 φιλάδελφοι.

37. The one divergence is in Acts 23:7, where P adds ܠܗܘܢ ܐܘ to its translation of εἰπόντος.

38. In one instance ܠܘܢܗܘܢ is used to make the reflexivity of a reflexive verb explicit (2 Pet 3:17 φυλάσσεσθε), and in another it is employed to literally render ψυχὰς ὑμῶν (Luke 21:19). Then, in Col 3:23 it is used to translate ψυχῆς. Finally, in Eph 6:7 it has no explicit referent in the Greek text, but its inclusion may be explained by influence exerted by the roughly parallel phrase in Col 3:23.

employed to represent Greek relative pronouns (see above), their usage does not meet the standard for consistency.

Indefinite Pronouns

The Greek text of Colossians contains five indefinite pronouns, and the translator of PCol renders them inconsistently. Two appear in 3:13, ἐάν τις πρός τινα ἔχη μομφήν, which is translated ܘܢܘܐܝ ܡܘܦܗܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܐܢܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܐܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܐܝܢܐ (“and if a person has a complaint against his friend”). In 2:8 and 2:16 τις is also rendered ܘܢܘܐܢ (“person”). In 3:23, the indefinite τι is translated ܡܘܚܘܢ (“something”). The same is true in 3:17, where καὶ πᾶν ὅ τι ἐὰν ποιῆτε is translated ܘܥܘܠܘܢ ܥܘܠܘܢܐ ܡܘܚܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܐܢܘܢ (“and everything that you do”). A concordance check makes it clear that ܘܢܘܐܢ is employed too widely to consistently witness to this indefinite pronoun (e.g., Rom 11:32 πάντα, 1 Cor 2:11 οὐδεὶς, 1 Cor 3:18 μηδεὶς, 1 Cor 4:6 εἷς and ἑτέρου, 1 Cor 7:2 ἕκαστος). Similarly, since ܡܘܚܘܢ is also employed to represent relative pronouns (see above), it also fails to meet the standard for consistency.

Pronouns—Conclusion

In this category, consistency can only be established for the representation of the Greek pronominal forms of ἀλλήλων and ἑαυτοῦ. When these are present in the Greek text, they are both consistently present in the translation of PCol and are consistently represented by the same Syriac forms. The translation’s representation of relative pronouns falls just short of the standard for consistency in its inclusion of those elements that are explicitly present in the Greek. Otherwise, the translator of PCol is not consistent in his usage of pronominal forms.

Prepositions

Like the pronominal forms, Syriac prepositions are employed too broadly to attain consistency in the representation of their *Vorlage*. With the exception of ܐܘܪܝܘܿܬܐ and ܐܘܪܝܘܿܬܐ, the translator of PCol regularly employs specific Syriac prepositions to render various Greek forms. Thus the usage of prepositions in PCol is almost never consistent.

The Use of -ܐ

Tables 3.13 and 3.14 display the number of instances in which -ܐ is used to render each of the Greek prepositions and constructions listed.

Table 3.13 Greek prepositions translated by -ܐ

Greek Preposition	ἐν	διά	εἰς	κατά	ἐπί	μετά	ὑπο
Times transl. by -ܐ	75	9	8	5	4	1	1
%	60	7.2	6.4	4	3.2	.8	.8

Table 3.14 Other Greek forms translated by -ܐ

Greek form	Dative Noun	Genitival Phrase	[absent in Greek]	Total
Times transl. by -ܐ	16	1	5	125
%	12.8	.8	4	100

The most prolific of the prepositions employed by the translator of PCol is -ܐ, which is used to represent a wide range of Greek prepositions. Most often it straightforwardly translates ἐν, but the translator also demonstrates the tendency to use -ܐ to translate a broad range of prepositional and grammatical forms. It also is employed several times in the translation of a Greek dative noun,³⁹ once to represent a genitival phrase, and is added in the translation where absent in the Greek multiple times. Because

39. This is due, of course, to the fact that Syriac has no way of formally representing the Greek dative case except by prepositions. Thus the Syriac preposition would not be useful in distinguishing between, e.g., τῆ σαρκί and ἐν τῆ σαρκί, both of which would be translated ܐܘܪܝܘܿܬܐ (“in the flesh”).

of its wide range of translation, the use of -ܣ does not meet the standard for consistency in PCol. A list of examples of the less common phenomena follows.

1:20 καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ → ܡܢ ܟܝܘܢ (lit., “and by his hand”)⁴⁰

1:20 διὰ τοῦ αἵματος → ܟܝܘܢ

1:20 τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς → ܟܝܘܢ

1:1 μετὰ χαρᾶς → ܟܝܘܢ

1:29 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ → ܟܝܘܢ

2:18 ὑπο τοῦ νοός → ܟܝܘܢ

2:5 τῆ σαρκὶ... τῷ πνεύματι → ܟܝܘܢ ...ܝܘܢ

3:24 τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν τῆς κληρονομίας → ܟܝܘܢ ܟܝܘܢ

2:19 διὰ τῶν ἀφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων → ܟܝܘܢ ܟܝܘܢ (second -ܣ added for parallelism)

The Use of ܟܝܘܢ and ܡܢ

Table 3.15 displays the number of times ܟܝܘܢ is employed to translate each of the Greek prepositions listed.

Table 3.15 Greek prepositions translated by ܟܝܘܢ

Greek Preposition	ἀπό	ἐκ / ἐξ	[with ܡܢ] πρό	Total
Times transl. by ܟܝܘܢ	10	10	2	22
%	45.45	45.45	9.09	100

Since Syriac is unable to represent the subtle difference between ἀπό and ἐκ,⁴¹ the translator consistently employs ܟܝܘܢ to render both of these. Twice this preposition is combined with ܡܢ to represent the Greek preposition πρό (which is consistent with the

40. This is a common prepositional phrase employed in Syriac to translate διά. See Brock, “Limitations of Syriac Representing Greek,” 94.

41. Brock, “Limitations of Syriac Representing Greek,” 94.

usage of the phrase in the rest of the Pauline corpus, where only once [Rom 15:23] in ten occurrences is it used to represent something other than πρό). Since ܦܪܘܢ is used only to represent ἀπό, ἐκ and (with ܦܪܘܢ) πρό, it meets the standard for consistency in representing these prepositions (though it would be unable to witness to ἀπό or ἐκ against the other). On its own, ܦܪܘܢ is employed once to translate κατενώπιον (1:22) and once to translate ἐν (3:20). This preposition is used too broadly (e.g., Rom 2:13 παρά, Rom 3:18 απέναντι, Rom 12:17 ἐνώπιον) to meet the standard for consistency. A list of examples follows.

1:26 ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων → ܦܪܘܢ ܦܪܘܢ

4:16 ἐκ Λαοδικείας → ܦܪܘܢ ܕܠܘܕܝܩܝܝܐ

1:17 πρὸ πάντων → ܦܪܘܢ ܦܪܘܢ ܦܪܘܢ

The Use of -Δ and ܕܐܠ

Tables 3.16 and 3.17 display the number of times -Δ and ܕܐܠ, respectively, are employed to translate the Greek forms and constructions indicated.

Table 3.16 Greek forms translated by -Δ

Greek forms	Dative noun	εἰς	ἐν	Complimentary to δεῖ	Total
Times transl. by -Δ	10	7	2	2	21
%	47.62	33.33	9.52	9.52	100

Table 3.17 Greek forms translated by ܕܐܠ

Greek form	πρὸς	εἰς	κατά	παρά	περί	Dative noun	τα ὧδε	Total
Times transl. by ܕܐܠ	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	9
%	33.33	11.11	11.11	11.11	11.11	11.11	11.11	100

The preposition -Δ is actually used to represent a noun in the dative case more often than a Greek preposition. It is also employed to translate εἰς and ἐν as well as in conjunction with the Syriac verb ܕܠܐ (which translates δεῖ). The preposition ܕܐܠ is used

to translate an even wider range of Greek prepositions as well as a dative in one case and the adverb ὧδε in another. Since both of these prepositions are employed to represent such a variety of Greek words and constructions, neither can be considered consistent. A list of examples follows.

1:2 τοῖς ἐν Κολοσσαῖς → 𐤀𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤃 𐤁𐤏𐤏𐤁 𐤀𐤏𐤏𐤁

1:12 εἰς τὴν μερίδα → 𐤏𐤃𐤁𐤏𐤁

1:29 ἐν ἐμοί → 𐤁

4:4 δεῖ με → 𐤁 𐤏𐤁𐤎

4:8 πρὸς ὑμᾶς → 𐤏𐤏𐤃𐤁𐤏𐤁

4:8 τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν → 𐤏𐤏𐤃𐤁𐤏𐤁 𐤏𐤏

1:4 εἰς πάντα → 𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤁 𐤃𐤏𐤁

4:7 τὰ κατ' ἐμέ → 𐤃𐤁𐤏𐤁 𐤏𐤏𐤏

4:16 παρ' ὑμῖν → 𐤏𐤏𐤃𐤁𐤏𐤁

4:1 τοῖς δούλοις → 𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏 𐤃𐤏𐤁

4:9 τὰ ὧδε → 𐤏𐤃𐤁𐤏𐤁 𐤏𐤏𐤏

The Use of 𐤁

Table 3.18 displays the number of times 𐤁 is employed to translate each Greek form indicated.

Table 3.18 Greek forms translated by 𐤁

Greek form	περί	πρὸς	ὑπερ	εἰς	ἐν	ἐπί	[absent]	Total
Times transl. by 𐤁	3	2	2	1	1	1	3	13
%	23.08	15.38	15.38	7.69	7.69	7.69	23.08	100

The preposition 𐤁 is employed to translate several different Greek prepositions.

In addition to these translations, 𐤁 is also added in three instances where no correlating

element is present in the Greek text. Because of its varied implementation and tendency to be added to the translation, the use of 𐤃 does not meet the standard for consistency. A list of examples follows.

1:2 *περὶ ὑμῶν* → 𐤃𐤍𐤁𐤏𐤃

1:9 *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* → 𐤃𐤍𐤁𐤏𐤃

3:13 *τις πρὸς τινα* → 𐤍𐤁𐤏𐤃 𐤃 𐤍𐤏𐤃𐤁 𐤁𐤏𐤃

3:6 *ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱούς* → 𐤍𐤁𐤏𐤃 𐤃

4:8 *εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο* 𐤏𐤓𐤃 𐤃 𐤍𐤁𐤏𐤃

3:1 *ἐν δεξιᾷ* → 𐤏𐤍𐤁𐤏𐤃 𐤃

4:13 *μαρτυρῶ γὰρ αὐτῷ* → 𐤍𐤁𐤏𐤃 𐤃𐤏 𐤏𐤓𐤃

The Use of 𐤃

Table 3.19 displays the number of instances in which 𐤃 is employed to translate each of the Greek forms indicated.

Table 3.19 Greek forms translated by 𐤃

Greek forms	σύν	ἐπί	μετά	Dative noun	Total
Times transl. by 𐤃	7	1	1	3	12
%	58.33	8.33	8.33	25	100

In PCol, 𐤃 often represents the Greek preposition σύν. When 𐤃 is used in the translation of a compound word including συν-, its referent in the Greek is ambiguous. In cases where the compound συν- word is accompanied by a dative noun in the Greek, 𐤃 has been considered a representation of the dative. But where such a word is not explicitly accompanied by a dative noun, the 𐤃 used in its translation has been counted as representing the συν- component of the word (see representative examples below).

Furthermore, a concordance check reveals a propensity for 𐤃 to translate multiple Greek

words and forms (e.g., ἐπί, μετά, and dative nouns) with a high enough frequency to prevent it from representing any one form at a 90% consistency. A list of examples from PCol follows.

2:5 σὺν ὑμῖν →

2:12 συνταφέντες αὐτῶ... συνηγέρθητε →

4:10 συναιχμάλωτός μου →

1:2 ὑμῖν →

3:14 ἐπὶ πᾶσιν δὲ τούτοις →

4:18 ἡ χάρις μεθ' ὑμῶν →

The Use of , , , , and , and Prepositions Not Translated

Each of these prepositions is used scarcely enough in PCol to not necessitate graphic representation. The preposition is employed eight times, five of which translate ὑπέρ (1:7, 24; 2:1; 4:12, 13), and the other three of which are repetitions that represent an implicit ὑπέρ (2:1[2x]; 4:13). Although is employed only to translate ὑπέρ and implicit repetitions thereof in PCol, in the Pauline corpus as a whole translates ὑπέρ and its implicit repetitions only about 75% of the time (fifty-two of sixty-nine instances). The preposition is also employed to translate περί, ἀντί, and μᾶλλον, so it does not meet the standard of consistency for witnessing to ὑπέρ.

The preposition translates κατά five times in PCol (1:11, 25; 2:8 [3x]). However, since this word is also employed to represent other Greek forms (see conjunctions and particles below), it does not meet the standard of consistency for witnessing to κατά. In one instance, is employed to represent διά (2:12), but due to the

particle's considerable diversity of implementation, it cannot be considered a consistent witness here.

Finally, it should be noted that the following prepositions are not formally represented in the translation: κατά (2:14, 22), εις (2:22), ἐν (3:15; 4:2).

Prepositions—Conclusion

Due to the significant difference between Greek and Syriac prepositions and to the willingness of the translator to employ prepositions to render multiple Greek forms and constructions, almost none of the prepositions in PCol meet the standard for consistently witnessing to their source text. Only ܐܘܢ and ܡܝܢ ܐܘܢ can be considered consistent. Otherwise, the implementation of prepositions in PCol is generally inconsistent in nature.

Conjunctions

In similar fashion to the use of prepositions discussed above, the translator of PCol does not consistently employ conjunctions in the translation, with only one exception. The translator displays a tendency to add conjunctions to the translation where they are not apparently present in the Greek text. Moreover, he occasionally uses them somewhat unpredictably to render multiple Greek forms. Therefore, the translation of PCol is generally inconsistent in its implementation of conjunctions.

The Use of -ܐ and ܐܘܢ

Table 3.20 displays the number of times that -ܐ is employed to translate καί and other forms.

Table 3.20 Greek forms translated by -ܐ

Greek form	καί	(with ܐܘܢ) εἴτε	ἢ	ὅτι	νύν	δέ	[absent]	Total
Times transl. by -ܐ	74	4	3	1	1	1	63	147
%	50.34	2.72	2.04	.68	.68	.68	42.86	100

The Syriac conjunction -ܐ most often represents a καί that is present in the Greek text, but it also is added where none is apparently present in Greek almost as often. This is typical of Syriac translations of Greek, and it would be ridiculous to assume that all of these added conjunctions reliably witness to a καί in the *Vorlage*—and perhaps more ridiculous to attempt to determine whether any single instance is such a witness. Moreover, with its demonstrable ability to also represent other Greek forms, the conjunction -ܐ does not come close to the standard for consistency.⁴²

On the other hand, ܐܪ represents a καί explicitly present in the Greek text all twelve times it appears in PCol. In a broader sampling of the Pauline corpus, ܐܪ represents a καί explicitly present in the Greek text a total of forty-seven out of fifty-two occurrences (90%) in Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians.⁴³ Thus the word ܐܪ may be considered a consistent translation of καί.

Particles ܐܪ and ܐܘܪ

Table 3.21 displays the number of times ܐܪ is used to translate the Greek forms indicated.

Table 3.21 Greek forms translated by ܐܪ

Greek form	δέ	γάρ	[absent]	Total
Times transl. by ܐܪ	3	2	2	7
%	42.86	28.57	28.57	100

42. The instances in which the conjunction ܐܘܪ represents an explicit καὶ οὐ in the Greek text as well as those in which no other conjunction was present in the Greek text (e.g., 3:2 μή → ܐܘܪ) were counted in the total for -ܐ, whether as representing a καί or an addition, respectively. The two instances in which ܐܘܪ was used to render μηδέ, however, were not included in this tabulation.

43. This considers καὶ γάρ (Eph 1:15) and καί περ (Phil 3:4) forms of καί. Also of note, the apparatus at Eph 5:21 indicates a variant inclusion of καί, which is witnessed by the Syriac.

The usage of this conjunction is relatively unpredictable in PCol. More often than not it is employed either where there is no conjunction apparently present in the Greek text, or to translate γάρ rather than δέ. Therefore PCol does not meet the standard for consistency in its implementation of ܐܘܢ. The conjunction ܘܢ is similarly inconsistent, as it is as likely to appear where there is no conjunction in the Greek as it is to represent γάρ (four times each).⁴⁴

The Use of ܘܢ and ܘܢܘܢ

The word ܘܢ is employed to translate the conjunction ὡς three times (2:20; 3:12, 18, 22, 23), καθὼς twice (1:6, 7), and is added in the translation where absent in Greek three times (3:23, 25; 4:6). As mentioned above, this word’s flexibility in representing multiple Greek forms precludes it from attaining the standard for consistency. Similarly, the word ܘܢܘܢ is used to render ὡς twice (2:6; 4:4), καθὼς twice (1:6; 3:13), and πῶς once (4:6). Again, this word’s range of representation as well as its tendency to be added in the translation where absent in Greek (cf. Eph 6:11, Phil 1:20) do not allow it to achieve the standard for consistency.

The Use of -ܐ, ܐܘܢ, ܘܢܘܢ, ܘܢ, and ܘܢܘܢܐ

The particle -ܐ is employed to render the Greek conjunction ἵνα ten times and ὅτι five times. Of course, because of the many various functions of this particle in Syriac syntax, it cannot be considered a consistent witness to any one Greek word or form. The conjunction ܐܘܢ translates the Greek ἄλλά three times and is added to the translation

44. It must be noted that the perceived inconsistency in the usage of these two particles is not at all surprising or exceptional. For a detailed treatment of these, in which the authors track the varied usage of each particle in the Gospels and Pastoral Epistles, see Wido van Peursen and Terry C. Falla, “The Particles ܘܢ and ܐܘܢ in Classical Syntactic and Semantic Aspects,” in *Foundations for Syriac Lexicography II: Colloquia of the International Syriac Language Project*, Perspectives on Syriac Linguistics 3 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2009), 63–98.

where absent in Greek twice. The tendency for this word to be added in translation or to represent other forms (e.g., Eph 4:9 $\epsilon\iota\ \mu\eta$), means that the usage of ܠܕܠܐ cannot be considered consistent. The word ܕܡܝܢ only translates the Greek preposition $\text{o}\ddot{\upsilon}\nu$ in PCol (five times), but because of its propensity to be added where this referent is absent and to translate other forms (e.g., Gal 3:24 $\acute{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon$, Gal 4:31 $\delta\iota\acute{\omicron}$), it does not meet the standard for consistency. Finally, the words ܐܘܪ (translating η in 2:1) and ܕܡܝܢ (translating $\acute{\omicron}\tau\alpha\nu$ in 3:4) are used only once each in PCol and do not merit further inquiry.

Conjunctions—Conclusion

In almost every case, the translator of PCol is inconsistent in his use of conjunctions. The one exception to this is his implementation of ܐܘܪ , which aligns with a broader sample of the Pauline corpus in consistently representing καί . Aside from this, conjunctions are so often added to the translation and employed to render various Greek forms that they cannot meet the standard for consistency.

Vocabulary

The focus of this section is to assess the consistency that can be expected in the translation of select nouns and verbs. Although the translator maintains a standard of consistency for most of the recurring vocabulary in the letter,⁴⁵ the discussions below

45. This is an important caveat because it should not be thought that the translator's lexical choices are always—or even usually—unpredictable. Excluding proper names (and the titles “Lord,” and “Christ,” to be dealt with below), there are just over one hundred unique Syriac words in PCol that appear twice or more. Over 60% of those words are consistently employed to represent the same Greek word (or a Greek word with the same root) each time they appear. Moreover, some of the inconsistencies can be easily discerned by context (see the example provided in the previous chapter about the use of ܥܠܡܐ). It is not necessary here to list every Syriac word that appears multiple times alongside the Greek word(s) it translates, so what follow are instead representative examples. The consistency of the translator's usage of other words will be discussed in depth where applicable to inquiries about P's witness to its Greek source text in the subsequent chapter.

demonstrate that he is nevertheless prone to both a) render certain Greek words differently in multiple instances and b) employ certain Syriac words to translate various Greek words. The translator is therefore apparently not overly concerned with maintaining a strict lexical consistency throughout his work.

εὐαγγέλιον

The Greek word εὐαγγέλιον appears twice in Colossians, translated in PCol once as ܐܘܘܢܘܢܐ (1:5) and once as ܐܘܘܢܘܢܐܐ (1:23). In the wider context of the Pauline corpus, it appears that these two words are basically interchangeable in P for translating εὐαγγέλιον. Of fifty-three occurrences, it is rendered ܐܘܘܢܘܢܐ twenty-eight times,⁴⁶ ܐܘܘܢܘܢܐܐ twenty-four times, and once ܐܘܘܢܘܢܐܐܐ ܐܘܘܢܘܢܐܐ (Rom 10:16). Of the Pauline epistles that contain multiple occurrences of εὐαγγέλιον, seven employ both translations (Rom-Col), two use only ܐܘܘܢܘܢܐ (1 & 2 Thess), and one uses only ܐܘܘܢܘܢܐܐ (2 Tim). PCol therefore aligns with most of the rest of the Pauline corpus in using both of these two translations.

κύριος / Ἰησοῦς / Χριστός

As in the rest of the PNT, the translations of κύριος, Ἰησοῦς, Χριστός, and combinations thereof, are very inconsistent.⁴⁷ When κύριος appears alone in Colossians, it is translated ܐܘܢܘܢܐ (“our lord”) four times (3:20, 23, 24, 4:17), ܐܘܢܘܢܐܐ (“The Lord,”

46. Included in this total are two instances in which εὐαγγέλιον is translated as ܐܘܘܢܘܢܐܐܐ in 1 Thess 1:5 and 2 Thess 2:14.

47. For a treatment of the translation of κύριος as well as a list of all the ways it is translated in the Syriac NT, see Martin, “La Traduction de Κύριος en Syriacque.” See also Williams’s discussion of the name ‘Jesus’ in the Syriac Gospels: Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 23–37.

singular or plural) three times (3:22 [2x]; 4:1)⁴⁸ and ܠܗܘܐ (“lord,” 4:1). Twice it is translated ܕܡܫܝܚܐ (“Christ,” 3:13, 18)⁴⁹ and once ܐܠܗܐ (“God,” 1:10). It once appears as κύριος Ἰησοῦς and is there translated ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܥܝܠܐ ܩܝܡܐ (“our lord Jesus Christ,” 3:17) and once as κύριος Χριστός where it is translated ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܠܗܘܐ (“the Lord Christ,” 3:24).

The phrase Χριστός Ἰησοῦς (without κύριος) appears three times in Colossians. Twice it is translated ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܥܝܠܐ (“Jesus Christ,” 1:1, 4), and once it is translated with only ܕܡܫܝܚܐ (4:12). It may be that Syriac translators were reticent to replicate the order Χριστός Ἰησοῦς; the order ܕܥܝܠܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ is found only four times in all of P (1 Cor 16:24; 2 Cor 4:5; 1 Tim 1:1, 2). The word Χριστός appears on its own nineteen times in Colossians. Sixteen of these instances are translated simply ܕܡܫܝܚܐ (1:7, 24, 27; 2:2, 5, 8, 11, 17, 20; 3:1 (2x), 3, 4, 11, 15; 4:3), two are translated ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܥܝܠܐ (1:2, 28), and one is only represented by a pronominal suffix (3:16). Also, ܕܡܫܝܚܐ is once added where none of κύριος, Ἰησοῦς, or Χριστός are apparently present in the Greek text (3:15).

The combination of all three of these words appears twice in Colossians. In 1:3, κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is translated ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܥܝܠܐ ܩܝܡܐ. In 2:6, Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον is rendered ܩܝܡܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܥܝܠܐ.

It is clear, therefore, that the translator of PCol is inconsistent in his representation of κύριος, Ἰησοῦς, Χριστός, and their combinations. It must be noted that titles for Christ vary throughout the manuscript tradition, in Greek and other versions, making this a rather distinctive category. But according to the criteria used in this analysis, the

48. Two of these three occurrences refer to human masters (3:22a; 4:1). Curiously, ܠܗܘܐ is also used in 3:22b, where the Greek is ostensibly referencing the divine Lord. See variant citation in 3:22, p. 120.

49. These two instances, as it turns out, are very likely *not* translations of κύριος. See pp. 119, 139.

2:4 ἐν πιθανολογία → ܠܗܘܢ ܠܘܥܒܘܬܐ (“in persuasiveness of words”)

2:11 ἀχειροποιήτω → ܠܘܟܘܢ ܠܘܢܐ (“that is not by hands”)

The next list gives representative examples of the translator rendering a compound word with a semantic equivalent rather than formally representing each component part. This strategy sometimes causes the Syriac translation to miss out on the emphasis of repetition that is achieved in the Greek (see especially 2:13, 3:1, 16).

1:7 συνδούλου ἡμῶν → ܠܗܘܢ (“our companion”) (cf. 4:7)

2:13 συνεζοποίησεν ὑμᾶς σὺν αὐτῷ → ܡܠܟܐ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܘܥܒܘܬܐ (“he made you alive with him”)

3:1 συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ → ܠܗܘܢ ܡܠܟܐ ܠܘܥܒܘܬܐ (“you rose with Christ”)

3:16 ἐνοικεῖτω ἐν ὑμῖν → ܠܗܘܢ ܠܘܥܒܘܬܐ (“[his word] will dwell in you”)

4:10 ὁ συναιχμάλωτός μου (“my fellow captive”) → ܠܗܘܢ ܠܘܥܒܘܬܐ (“the captive who is with me”)

The translator of PCol is sometimes content to render compound verbs with rough semantic equivalents, even at the cost of fully representing the emphasis of the Greek syntax. It might be supposed that a translator more committed to strict literalism would choose to consistently translate compounds by carefully replicating each component part. A mitigating factor to this supposition, however, is that H shares similar readings with P in all of the examples above—even those where a semantic equivalent is substituted for meticulous representation of each element in the compound. So it may be the case that the translator’s handling of compound Greek words in PCol is more indicative of the linguistic limits at play than of the translator’s technique.

Vocabulary—Conclusion

Although the translator of PCol is consistent in the translation of many verbs and nouns, he does not maintain a strict lexical consistency throughout the letter. Instead, he occasionally translates a particular Greek word with different Syriac words and often employs a single Syriac word to translate multiple Greek words. Moreover, he varies in his handling of Greek compound words and is significantly inconsistent in his translation of κύριος, Ἰησοῦς, and Χριστός.

Conclusion: The Translation Technique of Peshitta Colossians

This chapter has served to answer the question: What is the nature of the translation technique in PCol? The macroanalysis indicates that the translator of PCol is generally committed to conveying the meaning of the text accurately, prefers a literal approach, but also frequently displays freer tendencies. Though the translator works from a relatively small translation unit, he is apparently reading and understanding the text in a larger frame and is willing to sacrifice formal equivalence at the granular level in order to make his translation make sense in its broader context. The translator's literal approach is evident mainly in the fact that he makes an effort to represent every Greek phrase in the order it appears. The freer tendencies apparent in this translation, however, indicate that the translator is by no means committed to a strictly literal approach.

As is evident in the microanalysis, the translator is occasionally consistent in only a few grammatical and lexical matters, specifically in the translation of substantives, the reflexive pronouns ἀλλήλων and ἑαυτοῦ, and the usage of ܐܢܝ, ܕܢܝܐ ܐܢܝ, and ܐܢܝܐ. The translation, however, is more often inconsistent in every one of the categories examined. Thus the conclusion from the macroanalysis—that the translator is generally less concerned with maintaining formal equivalence than with conveying the meaning of the

source text in a readable way—is upheld by the evidence in the microanalysis, which indicates a relatively low rate of formal consistency in the translation strategy. Therefore it may be concluded that the translation technique employed in PCol does not prioritize a consistent rigid imitation of its source text’s syntax and form, but rather seeks to produce a translation that both is readable and conveys the translator’s understanding of the text.

This chapter has represented the widest turn in the translation technique spiral—as much data as possible has been collected by comparing the translation of PCol to the hypothesized source text of NA28. In the following chapter, the data gathered here is employed to tighten the spiral, to see how close one may come to landing on the real source text that lies behind a given point in the translation.

CHAPTER IV

PESHITTA COLOSSIANS AS A WITNESS TO ITS GREEK TEXT

The aspects of translation technique studied in the previous chapter are here employed to evaluate the reliability of PCol as a witness to its underlying Greek text. First, we discuss how the translation technique of PCol influences the ability to cite it as a witness to its *Vorlage*. Each category from the macro- and micro-analyses in the previous chapter is covered. Second, we use the translation technique as a lens through which to scrutinize the use of P in the critical apparatus of the GNT. There, each citation of P in the critical apparatus of NA28 is analyzed according to the appropriate aspect(s) of the translation technique described in the previous chapter.

The Translation Technique's Bearing on PCol's Witness to Its Greek Text

In this section, each category from the macro- and micro-analyses in the previous chapter are examined to understand how the translator's technique shapes the witness of PCol to its *Vorlage*. From the macroanalysis, we discuss the general shape of the translation in light of how the translator's broader techniques affect the ability to ascertain the underlying Greek. Then the calculated consistency from the microanalysis is evaluated in order to determine the confidence with which the textual critic may cite PCol as a witness within each of these categories.

Macroanalysis

The macroanalysis involved the consideration of three categories—translation unit and consciousness of context and meaning, word order, and degree of literalness—

each of which has a bearing on the textual critic's ability to get at the source text behind the translation. In the first category, the relatively small size of the translation unit employed in PCol is beneficial to the effort of discerning the translation's *Vorlage*. Since the translator is never paraphrasing full sentences and is rarely stretching his rendition to the length of full clauses, it is usually quite simple to tell which word or short phrase in the Greek text is represented by a corresponding word or phrase in Syriac. Moreover, the longer translation units generally occur because some element of the Greek syntax is not easily transferrable to Syriac, which makes it easy to decipher the correspondence between the Greek and Syriac elements even within these longer phrases.

Since the translator generally adheres to the Greek word order, this aspect of the translation technique can, in some instances, positively contribute to the ability to discern the underlying Greek text. Most of the deviations from the Greek word order predictably arise out of a preference for Syriac syntax—these, of course, should not be cited as evidence for that word order in the Greek source text. However, when a variation in word order cannot be explained syntactically, it may indeed reliably witness to the word order of its *Vorlage*, especially where there is evidence of such an order in the Greek manuscript tradition. One caveat to this is the reversal of paired items. In such cases, even if these pairs were reversed in some Greek manuscripts, the tendency for this to happen in Syriac translation—and in PCol, specifically—means that the Syriac would not necessarily be a reliable witness to a *Vorlage* with the same reversal. Moreover, in the absence of explicit Greek evidence, such reversals cannot be reliably read as testifying to a source text having the same order. Therefore, in light of the translator's technique and the caveat just mentioned, a textual critic knowledgeable in both Greek and Syriac syntax

should usually be able to determine whether the Syriac word order may be taken to reflect the word order of the Greek or is simply the result of syntactical inequities between the two languages.

Running PCol through Barr's typology for degrees of literalness, however, reveals some of the difficulties the translation technique poses for those trying to determine the Greek source text. As was concluded above, the translator of PCol is not extremely literal, but displays some freer tendencies in the prioritization of semantic accuracy over strict formal imitation of the Greek. These freer tendencies are evident in the examination of both the translation unit and word order. First, although the translation unit is generally small, the translator's consciousness of broader context and meaning leads him to abandon a strictly literal approach in some cases. Second, regarding word order, the tendency to reverse paired items indicates that the translator is not slavishly devoted to maintaining precise imitation of his source text.

Thus the macro level translation technique evident in PCol reinforces what has been considered generally true about the use of versions in NT textual criticism: one must take translation technique into account when deciding whether a version witnesses to specific readings. The nature of the translation of PCol positively contributes to the discernment of its underlying Greek text in its general tendency toward small units of translation and the predictability with which it deviates from the Greek word order for Syriac syntactical reasons. However, the lack of consistency with which the translator maintains these translational commitments confounds the ability to confidently identify the *Vorlage* without examining each case at the micro level and understanding it in the context of the translator's broader approach.

Microanalysis

Here the results of the microanalysis are examined for their possible implications for the witness of PCol to its Greek *Vorlage*. Integral to the arguments advanced here is the concept of the level of specificity to which the translation may reliably witness. In rare cases, the translation is consistent enough that its source text may be deduced down to the precise Greek form it represents. More often, however, the translation is not consistent enough to be helpful on this level, but it may still hold value for clarifying the nature of its *Vorlage* if the level of specificity to which it is asked to witness is reduced. This involves discerning the levels of specificity to which each subcategory may be cited as a witness (e.g., the tense and mood of Greek verb vs. the tense or mood alone), as certain forms may approach or attain the standard for consistency at a broader level than they were divided into in the microanalysis. Importantly, this is where the possibility that PCol's *Vorlage* differs from NA28 (the text with which it was compared in the microanalysis) is taken into consideration, especially where outliers occur. With that said, detailed considerations of specific cases are reserved for the evaluation of citations of P in the critical apparatus, which follows this section.

It should be noted that many of the conclusions reached about the relationship of PCol to its *Vorlage* will not be applicable in the evaluation of the citations of P in the critical apparatus of NA28 below. Not all of the categories discussed in the translation technique analysis above have corresponding instances of citation in the Greek text of Colossians. Nevertheless, I examine each grammatical category in order to develop a full understanding of the translation technique, which may in turn be of value in future studies of a Syriac version as a witness to its source text.

Verbs

The microanalysis found the translator's usage of verbal forms to be widely inconsistent but not to the degree that Syriac verbal forms are altogether unusable as witnesses to their *Vorlage*. The employment of Syriac participles, in particular, offers the textual critic little aid in deducing, with any level of confidence, the form of the underlying Greek. When compared to the Greek text of NA28, the participle represents fourteen unique Greek forms, including five Greek verb tenses and four nonverbal forms. Nine of these fourteen unique forms are represented by participles rarely enough (three times or fewer) that one may consider the possibility that PCol's *Vorlage* differed from the text to which it was here compared. However, the fact that no unique form is represented by a participle in more than 33% of its occurrences in PCol means that a Syriac participle would not serve reliably as a witness to any of these unique forms against another.

Decreasing the level of specificity in the Greek form to which a Syriac participle may witness is the only way to attain a higher level of confidence. Of the eighty-one occurrences of the participle in PCol, fifty-eight (71.6%) translate present-tense verbs. This percentage increases to 81.69% when only the participles that represent verbal forms are considered. This is still not consistent enough to warrant a conjectured reading absent of supporting evidence. But in one of those instances where a participle appears to translate another Greek verbal tense, if there is Greek manuscript evidence for a present verb, PCol could be considered a possible witness to that variant.

By the same logic, the perfect Syriac verb in PCol also merits a closer examination. Though it variously represents no less than seven unique forms in PCol, the

usage of the perfect verb approaches the standard for consistency in its representation of Greek verbal tense. In that case, the Syriac perfect verb translates an aorist-tense verb forty-five out of fifty-three occurrences (84.9%), which increases to 88.24% when we disregard the two instances in which the perfect verb does not represent a verb in the Greek text. Thus it is feasible that, unless some aspect of the broader context has influenced the translator's choice of verb tense, a perfect verb may be considered a witness to an aorist verb in its *Vorlage*.

Similarly, the usage of imperatives in PCol has some possibility for aiding in the determination of its source text. Of the twenty-five occurrences of Syriac imperatives, nineteen represent Greek imperatives (76%). Two of the remaining six Syriac imperatives represent aorist participles, but it has been demonstrated that these were translated this way as part of a broader stylistic decision.¹ Furthermore, one of the other Syriac imperatives occurs where there is an implicit imperative in the Greek syntax—if there were Greek manuscript evidence of an imperative there, PCol could be cited as a witness, but otherwise it is not out of character for the translator to make it explicit in this way. If these three instances are not considered, the percentage of Syriac imperatives translating Greek imperatives rises to 86.36%. Thus there are sufficient grounds to cite P as a witness in the remaining outliers if an imperative should be found in the Greek manuscript tradition. And, of course, in the instances in which PCol employs an imperative to translate a Greek imperative, P could be cited as a witness to an imperative against a variant verbal mood.

1. See pp. 42-44.

The translator's usage of substantive verbs is so consistent that there are no real outliers. Between ܘܢܘܢ and enclitic forms, nineteen out of twenty-one occurrences (90.4%) translate Greek substantive forms. One of the remaining two adds a substantive where it is implicit in Greek, and the other represents ζῶντες ("living") with ܘܢܘܢ ܘܢܘܢܘܢ ("you are alive"). Neither of these can be considered instances in which PCol witnesses to a variant. There is not enough consistency in the type of Greek substantive (present, imperfect, or participial) represented by Syriac substantives for PCol to witness to one type against the other. With that said, the presence of each substantive in PCol could be cited as a witness against a variant nonsubstantive verb should that occur. Moreover, the translator's usage of -ܘܢܘܢ to translate ἔχω is sufficiently consistent to cite P as a witness to ἔχω against other verbs when -ܘܢܘܢ occurs, though it would not be able to witness for one tense or mood of this verb against another.²

Finally, the translator employs imperfect and infinitive verbs too inconsistently to be of use in witnessing to the specific verbal character of the source text. Imperfect verbs translate aorist subjunctives and present participles in PCol more often than anything else combined (nineteen of thirty-six occurrences), but the remaining are spread out over seven distinct forms (aorist infinitive, aorist participle, present imperative, present indicative, present subjunctive, future indicative, and perfect infinitive). Thus even decreasing the level of specificity to the Greek verb tense is not sufficient for discernible patterns to arise, so the imperfect verb could not be used to witness reliably to any of

2. This construction translates ἔχω 87.5% of the time in the Pauline corpus (42 of 48 occurrences). The Syriac construction does not vary based on the tense or mood of ἔχω. In one of the six instances that it does not appear to represent a form of ἔχω, the translation picks up on a form of ἔχω in the previous verse (Rom 12:6-7), and in other instances it is used to represent a dative construction (as in 2 Cor 7:4, πολλή μοι καύχησας ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν [cf. Phil 1:22; 2:1]).

these forms against any other. The same is true for infinitives, which are almost as likely to be employed in PCol to translate Greek infinitives as they are for other verbal forms.

Pronouns

In this category, the only area in which the translation of PCol is a consistently reliable witness to its *Vorlage* is its representation of the Greek pronouns ἀλλήλων and ἑαυτοῦ. These occur only twice each in the Greek text of Colossians, but they are translated consistently by P in the broader Pauline corpus by ܐܠܠ ܐܠܐ (or ܐܠܐ ܐܠܐ) and ܐܘܪܘܟܐܘܢ respectively.³ Thus these two Syriac forms may be considered reliable witnesses to these two Greek pronouns.

The usage of pronominal suffixes to represent pronominal forms⁴ approaches the mark for consistency and therefore deserves closer examination. The microanalysis found that such pronominal suffixes represent a Greek pronoun explicit in the text in 115 out of 142 occurrences (80.99%). Many of the instances in which a pronominal suffix does not appear to have a correlating Greek pronoun explicitly present in the text may be disregarded for this discussion, however, due to the demonstrable tendency for Syriac translators to add pronominal suffixes in contexts of inherent possession (e.g., body parts) or relationship (e.g., familial relations).⁵ In such contexts, P should not be considered as a witness to the presence of a pronoun in its Greek source text. With these set aside, the usage of pronominal suffixes in PCol rises to a level of consistency that provides sufficient grounds for the citation of P as a witness to the presence of a Greek pronoun in

3. For complete data, see pp. 68-69.

4. As in the microanalysis, the discussion here intentionally excludes the use of pronominal suffixes that do not represent a pronominal relationship, such as proleptic suffixes.

5. This has been demonstrated by Williams to be prevalent in the Gospels. See Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 67–121.

its *Vorlage*, provided there is supporting evidence in the Greek manuscript tradition and there is no better contextual explanation for the Syriac pronominal suffix.

Independent pronouns occur less frequently than pronominal suffixes and with less consistency. These often represent a Greek pronoun explicitly in the text, but can also be added where none is apparently present in the Greek. Moreover, some Greek pronouns are left out of the translation altogether (1:18 αὐτός; 1:29 αὐτοῦ). Thus independent pronouns in PCol should not necessarily be considered reliable witnesses to the *Vorlage*.

The trouble with the rest of the Syriac pronominal forms is that many of them are very flexible in usage. Several forms used to represent relative pronouns are also used as demonstrative (e.g., ܐܘܪܐܘܢ and ܐܘܪܐܘܢܐ) and indefinite (e.g., ܕܘܪܐܘܢ) pronouns. This undermines the ability of PCol to reliably witness to its *Vorlage* in its employment of both demonstrative and indefinite pronouns. Relative pronouns approach the standard for consistency, not for representing specific forms but for representing some element—relative or otherwise—explicitly present in the Greek text. Where these occur they may witness to the presence of some Greek pronoun in the *Vorlage*, but they could not witness to one pronominal form against another.

Prepositions

Since the translator often employs prepositions to translate a wide range of Greek prepositions (not to mention dative constructions), the usage of prepositions in PCol is simply too broad and varied to be able to reliably witness to the *Vorlage* in almost every case. The prepositions ܐܘܪܐܘܢ and ܕܘܪܐܘܢ ܐܘܪܐܘܢ are the only ones that may offer any support in discerning their underlying Greek text. ܐܘܪܐܘܢ is employed exclusively to translate ἀπὸ and ἐκ

in PCol, so it may witness to either one of these, but not one against the other. **לְפָנַי** is consistently used in the Pauline corpus to translate **πρό**, so it may witness to the presence of this preposition. Any other preposition in PCol could at most be considered a witness to any of its range of referents, but would be unable to offer a more specific witness to one of those forms against another.

Conjunctions

Similarly, the microanalysis revealed that the use of conjunctions in PCol is widely inconsistent and thus provides little to no assistance in the discernment of its *Vorlage*. Only the conjunction **וְ** may be considered a reliable witness to a specific form in its underlying Greek text. Quite unlike the usage of **–α**, the translator does not demonstrate the propensity to add **וְ** unpredictably. Instead, **וְ** consistently translates a **καί** that is explicitly present in the Greek text—twelve of twelve occurrences in PCol, and forty-seven out of fifty-two (90%) occurrences in Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians together. Thus **וְ** should be considered a reliable witness to the presence of **καί**. Every other conjunction is employed too inconsistently, and too often added where there is no apparent referent, to be used as a witness to PCol's *Vorlage*. In some cases, however, a conjunction's usage in the broader PNT reveals that it may reliably witness to the presence of some particle in its Greek source text, just not to one specific particle against another.⁶

Vocabulary

The microanalysis indicated that the translator of PCol does not maintain strict lexical equivalency throughout the letter but is by no means unpredictable in his lexical

6. See citation in 2:4 (p. 108) below.

choices. It was noted that over 60% of the Syriac words that appear twice or more in PCol consistently represent the same Greek word or root at each occurrence. That leaves a significant number of Syriac words that the translator employs inconsistently, using them to translate more than one Greek term. Thus the translation analysis indicates that PCol may be a reliable witness to its *Vorlage* in lexical matters but not without further comparative work. If a Syriac word is consistently employed in PCol (and/or in a broader section of the PNT) to translate the same Greek word, or if it represents different words but in predictable contexts, PCol may be cited as a witness to that Greek word. But if the Syriac word is used to translate multiple similar Greek words, it cannot be considered a reliable witness to any of them against another.

One set of words for which PCol likely cannot be a reliable witness in any situation is κύριος, Ἰησοῦς, and Χριστός. These words vary considerably in the Greek manuscript tradition, and the microanalysis demonstrated that their translations in the Syriac appear to as well. Most notably, the translator displays the tendency to add the first-person pronominal suffix to ܠܘܕܐ when translating κύριος (ܠܘܕܐ = our Lord), and to prefer the order ܠܘܕܐ ܕܘܠܗܐ to ܕܘܠܗܐ ܠܘܕܐ, both of which are common in Greek. It may also be the case that the translator is willing to add any of these three elements where it is not present in the Greek, though this is difficult to determine with confidence since there are often multiple variants in the Greek manuscript tradition at these places as well. Therefore it may be that PCol's *Vorlage* contains the precise equivalents represented in its translation (ܠܘܕܐ = κύριος; ܠܘܕܐ ܕܘܠܗܐ = κύριος ἡμῶν; ܕܘܠܗܐ = Ἰησοῦς; ܠܘܕܐ ܕܘܠܗܐ = Χριστός), but the variance in the Greek manuscript tradition and in the Syriac translation of these words makes it difficult to conclude with any level of certainty.

The microanalysis also identified other areas of lexical inconsistency, specifically related to the representation of compound words. Rather than examining each word individually here, the main concern is to reiterate the importance of consulting the concordance any time a lexical variant is in question. There is enough lexical consistency in PCol to warrant such a search in most cases. But the translator of PCol is not nearly consistent enough to cite as a witness without checking to ensure that the usage of the Syriac word in question is predictable elsewhere.

Evaluation of Citations of P in NA28

The translation technique of PCol is now taken into consideration in order to evaluate the citations of P in the critical apparatus of NA28.⁷ Each citation is listed here with a heading that describes the reading to which P is claimed as a witness, an examination of PCol’s ability to reliably witness to this reading in light of the translation technique elucidated above, and a judgment on the validity of the citation based on a close adherence to the standard for versional evidence in NA28’s introduction—“versions are cited only where their underlying Greek text *can be determined with confidence*.”⁸ In these examinations and judgments, the reasoning of Williams is followed:

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*.⁹

7. A table summarizing the citations and evaluations thereof is provided in appendix A.

8. Aland et al., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 67*. Emphasis added.

9. Williams, “An Evaluation,” 1.

It must be noted that translation technique will not always be the deciding factor in whether a citation of P is valid—sometimes it will come down to other text critical matters, such as transmission history or scribal conventions. Any such cases will be listed, but a judgment will not be offered.

1:2 NA28 cites sy in support of Κολασσαῖς against Κολοσσαῖς

Although transcriptional matters were not addressed in the translation analysis, they certainly may be studied through the lens of translation technique. The Syriac here is ܡܠܠܐܘܢ. One might expect ܡܠܠܐܘܢ (note the added *alaph*) if the *Vorlage* read Κολασσαῖς, if not for Brock’s observation that “very often an interconsonantal Greek vowel will not be represented at all in the Syriac transcription.”¹⁰ This seems to be the strategy for the translator of PCol, given that his transcription of Λαοδικεία does not formally represent either of the first two interconsonantal vowels: ܠܐܘܕܝܟܝܐ (notice the absence of a formal equivalent for the -ao- in Λαοδικεία).

Comparison with transcriptions of other place names in P is necessary here. Elsewhere in the Pauline corpus, P translators consistently represent Greek ω and o vowels in place name transcriptions and consistently leave α without formal representation. For example, Θεσσαλονίκη = ܠܝܘܢܝܟܝܐ (Phil 4:12; 2 Tim 4:10; cf. Θεσσαλονικέων = ܠܝܘܢܝܟܝܐ in 1 Thess 1:1; 2 Thess 1:1); Κόρινθος = ܟܘܪܝܢܝܘܬܐ (1 Cor 1:2; 2 Cor 1:1, 23; 2 Tim 4:20).¹¹ Although the Syriac version of Colossians itself does

10. Brock, “Limitations of Syriac Representing Greek,” 87.

11. One exception to this is Τρῶας = ܡܪܘܨܝܐ (2 Cor 2:12; 2 Tim 4:13), likely caused by the desire to represent both sounds in -ωα-. Also, Ἀντιόχεια is variously transliterated ܐܢܬܝܘܚܝܐ (Gal 2:11) and ܐܢܬܝܘܚܝܐ (2 Tim 3:11), both of which are present in Acts (cf. 6:5; 11:9, 20). Places such as Jerusalem and Damascus are not considered here because of the tendency for Syriac translations to use the Semitic form of Semitic names rather than transliterating them (see Brock, “Limitations of Syriac Representing Greek,” 85).

not provide sufficient evidence, the evidence in the Pauline corpus overall suggests we can be reasonably confident that the reading in PCol would be $\omega\omega\lambda\lambda\omega$ if its *Vorlage* had Κολοσσαῖς , so the reading $\omega\omega\lambda\lambda\omega$ may be considered a reliable witness to Κολοσσαῖς .

1:2 NA28 cites (sy^p) in support of Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ against Χριστῷ

Here PCol reads ܕܝܫܘܥܝܫܘܥ (“Jesus Christ”), thus the editors cite P in support of the addition of Ἰησοῦ . The order of this phrase in Syriac presents no problem, as I have already shown that the translators of P generally prefer this order even when the *Vorlage* reads Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς . If the source text here did read Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ , it is likely that the translator would have rendered it in the preferred order ܕܝܫܘܥܝܫܘܥ .

This citation is problematic, however, for two reasons. First, as has been discussed, the significant variance in both the Greek manuscript tradition and Syriac translation in these titular phrases obscures the ability to establish a reliable relationship between P and its *Vorlage* in such occurrences. An illustration of this variance is that PCol is cited four times in support of a reading of some variation of κύριος, Ἰησοῦς , and Χριστός (1:2, 28; 3:17; 4:12), but no major early Greek witness agrees with PCol in more than two of these instances.¹²

The second reason to question this citation is the demonstrable tendency in P for translators to expand upon these titles.¹³ This is evidenced in a handful of instances where each of the following three criteria is met: the Greek text contains only one or two of these titular elements (κύριος, Ἰησοῦς , or Χριστός), there is little or no variation in the Greek manuscript tradition supporting an expanded title, and yet P contains an expanded

12. D* and D¹, respectively, agree in 1:2 and 1:28. κ^2 and κ , respectively, agree in 1:28 and 3:17. K and Ψ both agree in 1:28 and 4:12.

13. See Williams, “An Evaluation,” 8.

title. For example, in Rom 3:26 NA28 lists only one fourteenth-century minuscule (629) in support of the expanded title Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, yet P reads ~~ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ~~. Similarly, NA28 indicates no variants for the phrase Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν in Rom 4:24, but P reads ~~ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ~~ ~~ΚΑΙ~~.¹⁴ Therefore, the citation of P in support of an expanded title in Col 1:2 is spurious because the translation is as likely to have arisen out of either the variant for which it is cited or the text against which the editors claim it witnesses.

1:2 NA28 cites sy^p against the variant inclusion of καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ or καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν

On translational grounds, this note should probably be considered accurate. While P translators tend to expand titles related to Jesus (see prior citation), there is no reason to suspect that any phrase of this length—let alone an extended title for Jesus—would have dropped from the text of PCol as a result of the translation process. It is not impossible, however, that such an error could have occurred due to haplography (a scribe’s eyes may have skipped from the ἡμῶν preceding this phrase to the ἡμῶν at the end of it). There is no way to know, of course, whether such an error would have been made by the translator while reading the Greek text or by the copyist who produced the manuscript our translator eventually read. Thus it is simplest to assume that this phrase was not included in the *Vorlage* of PCol.

14. Each of the following instances in the Pauline corpus is an example in which NA28 cites no variation in the Greek manuscript tradition, yet P has expanded the title in some way. Rom 6:4 (Χριστός; ~~ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ~~); 8:11 (Ἰησοῦν; ~~ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ~~ ~~ΚΑΙ~~); 15:8 (Χριστόν; ~~ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ~~); 16:18 (κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Χριστῷ; ~~ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ~~ ~~ΚΑΙ~~); 1 Cor 9:1 (Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν; ~~ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ~~); 2 Cor 1:14 (κυρίου [ἡμῶν] Ἰησοῦ; ~~ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ~~ ~~ΚΑΙ~~); 11:31 (κυρίου Ἰησοῦ; ~~ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ~~ ~~ΚΑΙ~~); Gal 2:17 (Χριστός; ~~ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ~~); Eph 1:15 (κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ; ~~ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ~~ ~~ΚΑΙ~~); 1 Thess 2:15 (κύριον... Ἰησοῦν; ~~ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ~~ ~~ΚΑΙ~~); 3:11 (κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς; ~~ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ~~ ~~ΚΑΙ~~), 13 (κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ; ~~ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ~~ ~~ΚΑΙ~~); 2 Thess 1:7 (κυρίου Ἰησοῦ; ~~ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ~~ ~~ΚΑΙ~~), 8 (κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ; ~~ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ~~ ~~ΚΑΙ~~); Heb 3:1 (Ἰησοῦν; ~~ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ~~); 4:14 (Ἰησοῦν; ~~ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ~~).

1:6 NA28 cites sy for inclusion of καὶ

As the microanalysis indicated, the use of -α is too unpredictable in PCol (indeed, in P generally) to reliably witness to the presence of καὶ in the *Vorlage*. This citation is doubtful on those grounds alone, but two further observations about the Syriac here strengthen the case against it. First, it is clear that the translator of PCol is inclined to employ extra conjunctions in contexts of lists.¹⁵ While the text here is not a list of nouns unbroken by conjunctions in Greek, it does involve a set of verbs separated by a conjunction, with the whole phrase bookended by expanded conjunctions: καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἐστὶν καρποφορούμενον καὶ αὐξανόμενον καθὼς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν. It is not at all unlikely that the translator—who shares with the rest of the P translators the propensity to add conjunctions—would be influenced by the abundance of Greek conjunctions in the immediate context to include another conjunction in his translation.

Second, this likelihood is increased by the fact that the translator has made a syntactical choice that differs from the Greek sentence at hand. The Greek syntax suggests that καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἐστὶν καρποφορούμενον καὶ αὐξανόμενον is a unit distinct from the one that comes before, τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς.¹⁶ The translator of PCol, however, divides it differently: ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܪܝܢ ܩܪܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܠܗ ܕܝܘܨܕܝܟܘܢ ܡܡܫܝ ܕܝܦܪܩܘܣܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܝܘܢܐ ܕܘܕܝܝܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܝܘܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܝܘܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܝܘܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܝܘܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܝܘܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܝܘܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܝܘܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܝܘܢܐ ܕܩܘܪܕܝܘܢܐ (‘‘which was proclaimed to you as also to the whole world // and it is growing and bearing fruit’’).¹⁷ This division could be a result of the presence of

15. See citations in 3:11, 16 (pp. 115, 117).

16. See Campbell, *Colossians and Philemon*, 2–5. Campbell’s translation of the Greek text accentuates the distinction claimed here: ‘‘the gospel that has come to you. Just as it is bearing fruit and growing all over the world, so also among you. . .’’

17. In the text of P here, the punctuation indicated in NTSU is used. In the translation provided, the double-backslash is included to emphasize the break in the syntax.

καὶ at this point in the translator's *Vorlage*. However, because P translators are known to include additional conjunctions it is equally as likely to have arisen as a result of the syntactical strategy of the translation as to have been present in the *Vorlage*. Therefore, the evidence weighs against the reliability of this citation.

1:7 NA28 cites sy^p for καθὼς ἐμάθετε against καθὼς καὶ ἐμάθετε

This citation is valid. In instances where the Greek text reads καθὼς καί, one would expect the translator to render it אַרְי אָר or אַרְי אַרְי (as it appears in the previous verse). H reflects this here in its translation אַרְי אָר. As the translation analysis indicated, the usage of אַר in translating καί is strikingly consistent in P, so the fact that it is absent here means the *Vorlage* likely did not read καθὼς καὶ ἐμάθετε.

1:7 NA28 cites sy for ὑμῶν against ἡμῶν

On translational grounds, it is reasonable to suspect that the *Vorlage* of PCol read ὑμῶν here. There is no discernible tendency in PCol to alter the person or number of pronouns in this way, nor does translation technique offer a reason for this translation other than that this was the reading in the source text. This citation is valid.

1:12 NA28 cites sy^p for τῷ θεῷ πατρί against τῷ πατρί

This note is valid. In the Pauline corpus, P contains some variation of the phrase אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ (“God the Father”) in thirty-four instances.¹⁸ In the twenty-nine occurrences outside of Colossians, not a single time has P obviously expanded πατρός to אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ (in other words, there is no case in which the Greek manuscript tradition exclusively supports a reading of πατρός by itself where P reads אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָנוּ). Unlike the translational

18. Rom 1:7; 15:6; 1 Cor 1:3; 8:6; 15:24; 2 Cor 1:2, 3; 11:31; Gal 1:1, 3, 4; Eph 1:2, 3; 4:6; 5:20; 6:23; Phil 1:2; 2:11; Col 1:2, 3, 12; 2:2; 3:17; 1 Thess 1:1, 3; 3:11, 13; 2 Thess 1:1, 2; 2:16; 1 Tim 1:2; 2 Tim 1:2; Titus 1:4; Phlm 1:3.

tendency regarding titles of Jesus, there is no evidence to suggest that P translators are prone to expand πατρός to ܡܪܝܢܘܢ. Thus it is reasonable to assume that the *Vorlage* here did read τῷ θεῷ πατρί.

1:12 NA28 cites sy for ικανώσαντι against καλέσαντι or καλέσαντι καὶ ικανώσαντι

On translational grounds this note is valid. The Syriac word ܦܘܥܪܝܢܐ (“who made us worthy”) clearly translates ικανώσαντι. As above in 1:2, haplography could be in play here—if the source text read καλέσαντι καὶ ικανώσαντι, the translator’s eyes may have skipped from the –σαντι endings in each word and thus translated only the second of the two. But the translator of PCol is not obviously prone to such an error. So this note may be considered accurate.

1:12 NA28 cites sy for ἡμᾶς against ὑμᾶς

Such a citation may be called into question if there were a demonstrable tendency to shift pronouns in one direction or the other (changing second-person plural pronouns to first-person plurals, or *vice versa*). No such pattern is evident.¹⁹ This note is legitimate.

1:14 addition of διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ

NA28 does not cite P here, but it is worth noting that one manuscript of P may witness to this variant. According to NTSU, *Ms Sin. syr. 5* reads ܡܠܝܢ ܕܗܘܐ ܡܘܨܝܘܢ ܕܡܘܨܝܘܢ ܕܡܘܨܝܘܢ ܕܡܘܨܝܘܢ (“who in him we have redemption, and in his blood forgiveness of our sins”).²⁰ The reading in H—which is cited in NA28 as a witness to this variant—is a more straightforward translation of διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ in which the translator understands that this phrase modifies ἀπολύτρωσιν: ܡܠܝܢ ܕܗܘܐ ܡܘܨܝܘܢ ܕܡܘܨܝܘܢ ܕܡܘܨܝܘܢ (“in

19. See citations in 1:7; 3:4.

20. Aland and Juckel, eds., *Das Neue Testament in Syrischer Überlieferung*, 399.

him we have redemption by his own blood”). The translation preserved in *Ms. Sin. syr. 5* renders *διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ* as a modifier of *τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*, but despite this syntactical misunderstanding it is likely that the scribe of this manuscript knew of the reading with *διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ*. Although this is not the united witness of P, the reading in this manuscript is perhaps deserving of a notation in future critical editions.

1:20 NA28 cites sy for δι’αὐτοῦ against its exclusion

This phrase makes no sense in the Greek syntax.²¹ When the translator of PCol appears to adjust the syntax of the Greek in his translation, it is usually motivated by a desire to produce a more understandable Syriac sentence. Since the Syriac syntax is just as convoluted by this phrase as the Greek is, there is no reason to suspect that the translator did not have *δι’αὐτοῦ* in his *Vorlage*. In fact, it is somewhat surprising that this made it into the translation at all—perhaps the translator was so confused by it that he decided not to alter it. Here P reads ܘܥܡܘܘܢ (lit., “by his hands”), contrary to the translation of the same phrase earlier in the verse as ܘܥܡܘܢ (lit., “by his hand”), but there is no semantic difference between the two and the phrase in question may have been translated thusly in an attempt to avoid awkward repetition of the Greek.

1:22 NA28 cites sy for ἀποκατήλλαξεν against ἀποκατηλλάγητε / ἀποκαταλλάγεντες / ἀποκατήλλακται / ἀπήλλαξεν

The Syriac evidence here is peculiar because of the lexical choice. Whereas a form of ἀποκαταλλάσσω was translated with a form of ܠܘܟܝܢܝܐ (“reconcile”) in 1:20 (so also in the only other occurrence of this verb in the GNT, Eph 2:16), here the Syriac has a form of ܠܘܟܝܢܝܐ. This verb (ܠܘܟܝܢܝܐ) was also used to translate εἰρηνοποιήσας in 1:20. Elsewhere

21. See discussions in Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 554; Campbell, *Colossians and Philemon*, 17.

in P, the verb 𐤒𐤓𐤕𐤓 translates καταλλάσσω (Rom 5:10; 1 Cor 7:11; 2 Cor 5:18, 19, 20) and διαλλάσσω (Matt 5:24). On the other hand, 𐤒𐤓 elsewhere translates συναλύνω (Acts 7:26) and εἰρηνεύετε (1 Thess 5:13). Although 𐤒𐤓𐤕𐤓 would seem to be the more natural choice to translate a form of ἀποκαταλλάσσω, it should not be thought that 𐤒𐤓 here witnesses to a different form altogether. Apparently, these two verbs overlap to some degree in usage. Also, the fact that both are employed in the immediate context of this verse means that the choice of 𐤒𐤓 here is probably a result of a stylistic decision by the translator rather than a reflection of a different word altogether—one not evidenced by the Greek manuscript tradition.

Formally, 𐤒𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤓 (“he has reconciled you”) is perfect, active, third-person singular, with a second-person plural objective pronominal suffix. The objective pronominal suffix is the best indicator for determining the *Vorlage*. It rules out ἀποκατηλλάγητε and ἀποκαταλλάγεντες because they both assume a plural subject, while 𐤒𐤓𐤕𐤓 so clearly represents a singular subject and plural object that, absent a misunderstanding, it could not have been used to translate one of these. The syntax here is certainly confounding enough for a misunderstanding to be in play;²² however, it is evident that the P translator has caught on to the verb’s antecedent object, ὑμᾶς, in v. 21. There the translator indicates the pronoun’s syntactical function by prefixing an objective -𐤓 and then reinforces it by adding the second-person plural objective suffix onto the verb. The translator clearly has not misunderstood the Greek syntax; therefore, PCol’s *Vorlage* must contain a third-person singular verb here. Since there is no consistency in

22. See discussions in Eduard Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon*, trans. William R. Poehlmann and Robert J. Karris, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 64; Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 554–55.

the usage of ܦܘܼ, P should be considered a potential witness to either ἀποκατήλλαξεν or ἀπήλλαξεν.²³

1:22 NA28 cites sy^p for inclusion of αὐτοῦ

This citation is questionable. As discussed above, pronominal suffixes in PCol fall just short of the standard for consistency in representing Greek pronouns explicitly present in the text. Plenty of manuscripts support this reading, but there is evidence that suggests this particular translation may have arisen from a *Vorlage* other than that to which it is claimed to witness.

In five of the other eight relevant²⁴ occurrences of the word ܡܠܘܼܬܐ (“his death”) in P, the Greek text reliably reads θανάτος αὐτοῦ (John 11:13; Rom 6:3, 5; 1 Cor 11:26; Phil 3:10). However, two of the remaining three appear where there is no Greek manuscript evidence for αὐτοῦ (Heb 2:14; 9:15) and one where only two manuscripts add αὐτοῦ (Heb 2:9).²⁵ Further, it has already been shown that Syriac translators tend to add pronominal suffixes in contexts of inherent possession or relationship. This sort of tendency may affect contexts such as this as well, where the “death” in view is not just death generally but specifically the salvific death of Jesus. Moreover, the translator may have added the third-person pronominal suffix here because of the influence of the near parallelism with the previous phrase τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ → ܡܝܘܼܬܐܼܢܐܼ (“of his flesh”). In sum, the evidence does not conclusively demand that this citation be determined illegitimate.

23. While ἀποκατάλλακται is perfect-tense and third-person singular, it could not be PCol’s *Vorlage* because it is passive and could not account for the Syriac’s objective pronominal suffix.

24. Not considered here are two instances in Revelation, one instance in which the pronominal suffix is proleptic (Matt 2:15), and instances in Matt 27:37 and Mark 15:26 where ܡܠܘܼܬܐܼ ܕܡܝܘܼܬܐܼ (“reason for his death”) is idiomatically translating αἰτία.

25. At Heb 2:9 von Soden lists two mss. witnessing to an additional αὐτοῦ: 049 and 623.

But it is quite possible—if not plausible—that the correlation of the Syriac and Greek readings here is incidental rather than genetic.

1:28 NA28 cites (sy^p) for exclusion of πάντα ἄνθρωπον

This note is somewhat misleading because the editors do not elaborate in the apparatus on the “slight variation from the Greek reading indicated.”²⁶ The Greek text of NA28 reads, ὃν ἡμεῖς καταγγέλλομεν νουθετοῦντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον καὶ διδάσκοντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον, in which the second πάντα ἄνθρωπον is the one in question in the citation. P reads, however, ܘܢ ܗܡܝܥܝܢ ܕܘܚܘܬܝܢ ܘܢܘܬܝܢܘܢ ܘܕܝܕܘܫܘܢܝܢ ܘܢܘܬܝܢܘܢ ܘܕܝܕܘܫܘܢܝܢ ܘܢܘܬܝܢܘܢ ܘܕܝܕܘܫܘܢܝܢ (“which we proclaim and we teach and make all people understand”). This translation is unexpected because it misses the order of the Greek verbs, apparently switching ܘܕܝܕܘܫܘܢܝܢ (“we teach,” which would translate διδάσκοντες) and ܘܢܘܬܝܢܘܢ (“make understand,” which would translate νουθετοῦντες). Although the order is different, the Syriac (or its *Vorlage*) appears to leave out the second πάντα ἄνθρωπον.

The question becomes whether the variation in the translation negatively affects its reliability as a witness to its *Vorlage* here. The case could be made that in the process of reordering the sequence of the verbs, the translator was—accidentally or intentionally—misrepresenting his source text; therefore, the resultant translation should not be considered a reliable witness. The tendency for Syriac translators to switch paired items has already been mentioned, and it is possible that this sort of mistake could happen within longer sequences as well. It is also possible that πάντα ἄνθρωπον is not witnessed in P for the same reasons it likely dropped out of other manuscripts—the translator may have thought it redundant or may have simply read over it by accident in the context of

26. Aland et al., eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 73*.

realm of conjunctions evidenced in the microanalysis also weighs against the reliability of PCol as a witness to its *Vorlage* in contexts such as this. While this citation is not conclusively illegitimate, it is questionable on the grounds of the irregularity with which the translator of PCol handles conjunctions from his source text and deploys them in his translation.

2:2 NA28 cites (sy^p) for τοῦ θεοῦ πατρός τοῦ Χριστοῦ against τοῦ θεοῦ Χριστοῦ

This citation is probably valid by virtue of its placement in parenthesis signifying a slight variation from the Greek reading. Here P reads ܠܘܚܕܘܟܐܘܢ ܠܘܠܘܠܘܟܠܘܠܐ (‘‘of God the father, and of Christ’’). Although the Syriac does not reflect the genitival relationship of πατρός τοῦ Χριστοῦ, it is nevertheless likely that the translator’s source text included all of θεοῦ, πατρός, and Χριστοῦ. Of all the occurrences of ܠܘܠܘܠܘܟܠܘܠܐ in the Pauline corpus in P, there is no evidence to suggest that P translators expanded θεός to ܠܘܠܘܠܘܟܠܘܠܐ ܠܘܠܘܠܘܟܠܘܠܐ.³⁰ It may be that the *Vorlage* of PCol read something like τοῦ θεοῦ πατρός καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, but the translator may also have added the conjunction to produce a reading more desirable to his interpretive sensibilities. Thus a citation in parenthesis as NA28 has here is appropriate because even if the *Vorlage* included an additional καί, it surely had all three of θεοῦ, πατρός, and Χριστοῦ.

2:4 NA28 cites sy for inclusion of δὲ

This citation is probably valid in spite of the inconsistency of the usage of ܘܢܐܘܢܐ to translate δέ. The microanalysis found that the usage of ܘܢܐܘܢܐ in PCol was inconsistent because it was sometimes used to translate γάρ and sometimes included where no such conjunction was apparently present in Greek. Van Peursen and Falla conducted a

30. See above, on citation of sy^p for τῷ θεῷ πατρὶ against τῷ πατρὶ in 1:12 (p. 100).

comprehensive study of this particle and argued: “Neither translationally, nor semantically, nor lexically are we justified in presenting وَلٰكِنْ and $\text{وَ}^{\text{ا}}$ in a manner that suggests that they are respectively to be equated with $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ and $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$.”³¹ Indeed, $\text{وَ}^{\text{ا}}$ is used in P to translate a variety of particles and therefore should not be considered a witness to $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ against $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$, οὐν , or even καί .³² However, in the case of this citation, P is not claimed as a witness to $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ against another particle but simply to the presence of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in the text. Decreasing the specificity to which we ask P to witness in this way means that this citation is, in fact, valid.

A concordance check indicates that where P reads $\text{وَ}^{\text{ا}}$, it is likely a reliable witness to the presence of some particle in the Greek text—usually $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, but others as well. Of 166 occurrences of $\text{وَ}^{\text{ا}}$ (not counting the one in question) in the shorter Pauline epistles (Gal-Phlm) in P, it correlates to a particle explicitly present in the Greek text 146 times, compared to only twenty instances in which it has no apparent corollary in the text of NA28.³³ Within that, $\text{وَ}^{\text{ا}}$ correlates with $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ twelve times, and οὐν and καί twice each.³⁴ So although $\text{وَ}^{\text{ا}}$ may translate various particles, its representation of some particle explicitly present in the Greek text approaches the standard for consistency (87.95%) and thus may be considered a reliable witness as long as there is Greek manuscript evidence supporting it. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the *Vorlage* had some particle

31. Van Peursen and Falla, “The Particles وَلٰكِنْ and $\text{وَ}^{\text{ا}}$,” 78.

32. Van Peursen and Falla, “The Particles وَلٰكِنْ and $\text{وَ}^{\text{ا}}$,” 87.

33. The list of the twenty instances (exclusive of the one in question) in which $\text{وَ}^{\text{ا}}$ has no apparent corollary is as follows: Gal 2:1; 2:6 (2x); 3:13; 4:24; 5:12; Phil 4:11; 4:2; Col 4:7; 1 Tim 6:3, 5; 2 Tim 2:12, 17, 19; 4:13, 15; Titus 2:7; 3:13; Phlm 1:9, 12.

34. $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$: Gal 1:11; 3:18; 5:13; Eph 5:5; Phil 3:20; Col 2:1; 3:25; 1 Thess 2:14; 4:15; 1 Tim 6:10; Phlm 1:15. οὐν : Eph 4:17; 1 Tim 3:2. καί : Gal 1:8; 3:4.

here, and since there is considerable manuscript evidence supporting δέ, the citation of the Syriac as a witness to δέ is legitimate.

2:4 NA28 cites sy for μή τις against μηδείς

This citation is baffling; there is no reason to believe that the Syriac ܡܝܢ ܐܘܕܝܢܐ could witness to μή τις against μηδείς. In eleven other instances of ܡܝܢ ܐܘܕܝܢܐ in the Pauline corpus,³⁵ it translates μή τις three times (1 Cor 1:15; 2 Cor 8:20; Eph 2:9), μηδείς six times (1 Cor 3:21; 10:24; 1 Thess 3:3; 4:12; Titus 2:8, 15), and οὐδείς twice (2 Tim 2:4, 4:16). Thus ܡܝܢ ܐܘܕܝܢܐ should not be considered a witness to any of these against another, so this citation is illegitimate.

2:7 NA28 cites sy for ἐν αὐτῇ ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ against ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ

This citation is valid. The Syriac of PCol reads ܐܘܕܝܢܐ ܩܝܡܝܢܐ ܩܝܡܝܢܐ ܩܝܡܝܢܐ (“that in it, you might abound in thanksgiving”). One might suspect that the pronominal suffix on ܩܝܡܝܢܐ is proleptic since ܐܘܕܝܢܐ also has the prefixed preposition -ܐܘܕܝܢܐ, but in its placement before the verb and separation from ܐܘܕܝܢܐ the translator is likely indicating that ܩܝܡܝܢܐ is referring to a distinct syntactical element. Therefore, the claim that the Syriac witnesses to ἐν αὐτῇ is legitimate.

35. Not included in this count are the following three instances in which ܡܝܢ ܐܘܕܝܢܐ translates something other than μή τις, μηδείς, or οὐδείς: Phil 2:4, μή τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστος → ܡܝܢ ܡܝܢ ܐܘܕܝܢܐ; Titus 2:5, ἵνα μή ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ βλασφημηταί → ܐܘܕܝܢܐ ܡܝܢ ܐܘܕܝܢܐ ܐܘܕܝܢܐ; Heb 11:6, χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως ἀδύνατον εὐαρεστῆσαι → ܐܘܕܝܢܐ ܐܘܕܝܢܐ ܡܝܢ ܐܘܕܝܢܐ ܐܘܕܝܢܐ.

And there seems to be in them a word of wisdom, in the appearance of humility and fear of God [i.e., religion, piety], and of not sparing concerning the body, not in something of value but in that which is useful for the flesh.

The translator makes his interpretation of this difficult Greek explicit in his translation, rendering the terse ἔχοντα (“having”) with “and there *seems* to be in them” (ܐܘܢ ܕܠܝܗܘܢ ܐܘܢܘܢܐ) and the unqualified ταπεινοφροσύνη (“humility”) with “in the *appearance* of humility” (ܐܘܢܘܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܢܐ). Such an interpretive translation combined with the translator’s broadly inconsistent representation of καί should weigh against the certainty with which PCol can be cited for the variant inclusion of καί here.

However, the translation here—interpretive as it may be—does indicate that its *Vorlage* most likely did include the καί in question. The key to this conclusion is in the transposition of the order of the three items in the list. The Greek has ἐθελοθηρσικία, ταπεινοφροσύνη, ἀφειδία σώματος, but PCol reverses the order of the first two: ܐܘܢܘܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܢܐ ܐܘܢܘܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܢܐ (“in the appearance of humility and piety and of not sparing of the body”). As previously discussed, the reversal of paired items is not uncommon in Syriac translation. But in this instance, if the translator read ταπεινοφροσύνη ἀφειδία σώματος—and understood these to be a grammatical unit—one would expect ܐܘܢܘܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܢܐ and ܐܘܢܘܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܢܐ to have remained together in the translation. Since this is not the case, one must conclude that either a) the *Vorlage* read ἐθελοθηρσικία καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνη ἀφειδία σώματος and the translator decided to split the last phrase to produce a list of three,³⁷ or b) the *Vorlage* included the second καί and thus the translator felt no special need to keep ܐܘܢܘܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܢܐ and ܐܘܢܘܢܐ ܕܘܢܘܢܐ together in his translation,

37. As, perhaps, some Greek copyists did when this variant was introduced, inserting “καί on the assumption that ἀφειδία was the third in a series of datives after ἐν, rather than an instrumental dative qualifying the previous prepositional phrase.” Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 556.

resulting in the reversal of the first two items in the list and the inclusion of a -α before the final item. The latter option is the simpler reading of the evidence, so although this case is quite convoluted it is most likely that, indeed, PCol's *Vorlage* included this καί.

3:4 NA28 cites sy for ἡμῶν against ὁμῶν

There is no discernible tendency in PCol to alter the person or number of pronouns in this way, and the translation technique does not offer an explanation for this reading. So it is reasonable to assume that the *Vorlage* of PCol did read ἡμῶν here. This citation is valid.³⁸

3:5 NA28 cites sy for inclusion of ὁμῶν

This citation is probably valid. One might suppose that, as elsewhere, this is a case of “inherent possession” and therefore a Syriac translator would be likely to add a pronominal suffix here even if the source text did not have a possessive pronoun. However, the translation of μέλος with ܡܘܠܘܫ is consistent in P and does not indicate any tendency to add a pronominal suffix where a possessive pronoun is not present in the *Vorlage*. In all eleven other instances that P reads ܡܘܠܘܫ with a pronominal suffix (as it does here), there is a corresponding possessive pronoun in the Greek.³⁹ Conversely, in all of the twenty-one instances in which μέλος appears without a pronoun, P also reads ܡܘܠܘܫ without a pronominal suffix.⁴⁰ It must be noted that the apparent agreement between P and this Greek reading could be incidental rather than genetic. The second person

38. See citations in 1:7, 12 (pp. 100, 101).

39. Matt 5:29, 30; Rom 6:13 (2x), 19 (2x); 7:5, 23 (2x); James 3:6; 4:1.

40. Rom 12:4 (2x), 5; 1 Cor 6:15 (3x); 12:12 (2x), 14, 18, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26 (3x), 27; Eph 4:25; 5:30; James 3:5. There are five other instances in which P reads ܡܘܠܘܫ (all without a pronominal suffix), but the Greek does not have μέλος: 1 Cor 12:24 (2x); Eph 4:16; Col 2:19; Heb 2:13.

imperative ܘܕܡܘܬ (“put to death”) may account for the corresponding pronominal suffix on ܘܕܡܘܬܝܢ, which means that the translator may have produced this phrase whether or not ὑμῶν was in the *Vorlage*. However, since the presence or absence of a pronominal suffix with ܡܘܬܝܢ in P consistently correlates with the presence or absence of a pronoun with μέλος, we may conclude that the *Vorlage* most likely included ὑμῶν here.

3:6 NA28 cites sy^p for ταῦτα γάρ against ἄ

This citation is valid. The Syriac ܐܘܬܝܢ should here be considered a reliable witness to ταῦτα against ἄ. The microanalysis indicated that ܐܘܬܝܢ was used to represent a range of Greek forms, such that it did not meet the standard for consistency. However, a concordance check of the usage of ܐܘܬܝܢ in the entire Pauline corpus reveals a pattern: when ܐܘܬܝܢ represents a Greek relative pronoun (fourteen of ninety-four occurrences⁴¹), it almost always occurs with the relativizing particle -ܝܢ.⁴² So although ܐܘܬܝܢ represents a number of Greek forms, the lack of a relativizing -ܝܢ in this instance renders it highly improbable that the *Vorlage* had a relative pronoun. Thus PCol could be considered a witness against ἄ here.

Regarding its witness to γάρ, it must not be assumed that ܐܘܬܝܢ is used in P as an equivalent to the Greek γάρ. As with the particle ܐܝܢ (see citation in 2:4), van Peursen and Falla have shown that ܐܘܬܝܢ is employed to translate a wide variety of Greek particles and that therefore the Syriac should not be considered a witness to γάρ against other particles

41. Rom 16:4; 1 Cor 14:37; Gal 1:20; 4:24; Eph 5:4; Phil 3:7; 4:7; Col 2:17, 22; 3:7; 1 Tim 1:4, 20; 2 Tim 2:18; Heb 13:4.

42. The only instances in which this is not the case are Gal 4:24 (ἄτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγοροῦμενα → ܐܘܬܝܢܝܢ ܐܘܬܝܢܝܢ) and Col 3:7, in which ἐν οἷς → ܐܘܬܝܢܝܢ may be a result of parallelism with ܐܘܬܝܢ in v. 6.

such as δέ, ὅτι, or ἀλλά.⁴³ However (again, as with ܩܐ in the citation in 2:4 above), in this instance P is not cited as a witness against any other particle, but simply as a witness to the presence of γάρ in its *Vorlage*. With the level of specificity decreased in this way, this may be considered a legitimate citation. The usage of ܘܘܢ in a broader sampling of the Pauline corpus validates this: in 141 occurrences in Galatians-Philemon (excluding the one in question), ܘܘܢ represents some particle explicitly present in the Greek text between 122 and 126 times, or 86.52 – 89.36% (the difference takes into account four instances in which a variant γάρ is cited in NA28 apparatus).⁴⁴ Thus the usage of ܘܘܢ in representing some Greek particle is near enough to the standard for consistency that it may be considered a witness to the presence of a particle in its *Vorlage* when corroborated by other Greek witnesses (as it is in this case).⁴⁵ So PCol is a valid witness to both ταῦτα and γάρ in this instance.

3:6 NA28 cites sy for inclusion of ἐπὶ τοὺς υἰοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας

There is no reason to suspect the Syriac ܥܘܡܡܐܘܠܐܕܘܢ ܩܠܐ ܡܢܬܘܢ ܘܢ (“upon the sons of disobedience”) could have arisen unless its *Vorlage* read ἐπὶ τοὺς υἰοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας. This citation is valid.

43. van Peursen and Falla, “The Particles ܘܘܢ and ܩܐ,” 78–86.

44. The fifteen instances in which there is no apparent Greek equivalent for ܘܘܢ occur in Gal 2:15; Eph 5:4; 5:28; Phil 1:7; 3:4; Col 1:29; 1 Thess 1:4; 2 Thess 2:9, 14; 1 Tim 1:19; 6:21; 2 Tim 2:23; 3:14; Titus 1:11; Phlm 1:13.

45. The caveat of evidence in the Greek manuscript tradition is particularly important here because of the various semantic functions ܘܘܢ may serve in translation (see van Peursen and Falla, “The Particles ܘܘܢ and ܩܐ in Classical Syntactic and Semantic Aspects,” 83–86). When ܘܘܢ has no corresponding particle in the Greek manuscript tradition, it is more likely that a translator has added it to fill some semantic purpose than that it is witnessing to a no longer extant reading.

3:7 NA28 cites sy^p for αὐτοῖς against τούτοις

This citation is probably valid. One aspect of the translation casts doubt on this conclusion: the translator has already used the formally demonstrative pronoun אלה (“in these”) at the beginning of this verse to represent the Greek phrase ἐν οὗτοις. One could suspect that the translator would avoid a second demonstrative pronoun in short succession, thus choosing to represent ἐν τούτοις with אלה rather than the expected demonstrative pronoun. However, there are no other instances in PCol in which a pronominal suffix is used to translate a demonstrative pronoun, and it was concluded above that the usage of pronominal suffixes in PCol is sufficiently consistent to reliably witness to the presence of a Greek pronoun in its *Vorlage*. Moreover, where the phrase אלה appears elsewhere in the PNT, it translates a regular Greek pronoun (Rom 10:5; Gal 3:12; 1 Tim 1:18) or a relative pronoun (Heb 6:18; 13:9), but never a demonstrative. Therefore it is best to conclude that the *Vorlage* here read αὐτοῖς rather than τούτοις.

3:11 NA28 cites sy^p for the inclusion of καί

As has been discussed (and demonstrated in the microanalysis), the usage of the conjunction -א in P is too unpredictable to be considered a certain witness to the presence of καί in the *Vorlage* in most cases. This is no exception. The Greek here contains four pairs, the items in the first two of which are separated by καί and the last is cited for a variant inclusion of καί: Ἕλλην καὶ Ἰουδαῖος, περιτομὴ καὶ ἀκροβυστία, βάρβαρος, Σκύθης, δούλος [καὶ] ἐλεύθερος. P, however, separates all four pairs with אלה and separates each item in each pair with -א: אלה אלה אלה אלה אלה אלה אלה אלה אלה אלה אלה אלה (“Jew and Aramaean, nor circumcised and uncircumcised, nor Greek and Barbarian, nor slave and free”). Clearly the translator is prone to add

conjunctions in this context, as evidenced by the three $\kappa\alpha\iota$ (“and not” or “nor”) with no Greek correspondent, as well as the $-\alpha$ separating the third pair which has no Greek evidence listed in NA28. Thus it is less likely that there were equivalent conjunctions in the *Vorlage* for each one present in P than that the translator added each of those conjunctions for aesthetic purposes in separating out the list. Therefore although the source text may have had $\kappa\alpha\iota$ here, it is equally as likely that the translator added the conjunction of his own accord, so PCol should not be considered a reliable witness to this variant.

3:13 NA28 cites sy for Χριστός against κύριος

This citation is valid. Despite the inconsistency with which the translator renders titles relating to Jesus, P translators do not employ $\kappa\upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ to translate κύριος. In fact, of 581 occurrences of the word $\kappa\upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ in the PNT, this and one or two other instances would be the only examples of $\kappa\upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ translating κύριος.⁴⁶ This 99.48% consistency on its own would be enough to cite P in favor of Χριστός here, and the plethora of evidence from the Greek manuscript tradition further supports this conclusion.

3:15 NA28 cites sy for Χριστοῦ against θεοῦ

This citation is likely valid. While the translator is inconsistent in his rendering of titles related to Jesus, he (along with the rest of the P translators of the Pauline corpus) does not display the same inconsistency when rendering θεός. Only once in the Pauline Epistles does a translator apparently render θεός with $\kappa\upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$: 1 Thess 2:2, in which

46. The other such instances are in Acts 4:33 and Col 3:18 (but see p. 139). The witness of P at Acts 4:33 is admittedly difficult to determine because the most important Greek witnesses there read κυρίου Ἰησοῦ (though with a considerable amount of variation in the Greek manuscript tradition), while P reads $\kappa\upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma \sigma\alpha\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ (without $\kappa\upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$). Nevertheless, whether this is a third instance in which $\kappa\upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ appears to be translating κύριος, it would still have a statistically negligible effect.

εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ is translated ܕܥܘܢܓܠܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܡܝܘܬܐ with no corroborating Greek manuscript evidence. Here, however, there is no dearth of Greek evidence supporting Χριστοῦ. This, combined with the translator’s usual consistency in rendering θεός, allows the textual critic to be quite sure that the *Vorlage* did read Χριστοῦ, not θεοῦ.

3:16 NA28 cites sy^p for Χριστοῦ against κυρίου and θεοῦ

This citation is valid. As noted above, it is highly unlikely that the translator would have rendered either θεός or κυρίως with ܥܘܢܓܠܝܘܢ. The slight variation indicated by the parenthesis requires some further explanation. The Syriac of 3:15b-16a reads:

ܕܥܘܢܓܠܝܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܡܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܝܘܬܐ (“and be thankful to Christ, whose word dwells in you abundantly”). This is likely the result of either a misreading or interpretive translation of καὶ εὐχάριστοι γίνεσθε ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐνοικεῖτω ἐν ὑμῖν πλουσίως, in which the translator renders Christ as the object of thankfulness and changes the imperative verb to an indicative.

3:16 NA28 cites sy^p for inclusion of two καί’s

This citation is spurious because of the noted tendency for the translator to add conjunctions in the context of a list. Aside from the two covered above (1:6, 3:11), another example of this phenomenon occurs in 3:5. There the translator of PCol separates each item in a list with -ܐ (ܥܘܠܡܝܘܬܐ ܥܘܠܡܝܘܬܐ ܥܘܠܡܝܘܬܐ ܥܘܠܡܝܘܬܐ ܥܘܠܡܝܘܬܐ), even though the Greek has each word in apposition. Similarly in the instance in question, the Greek has three words apparently in apposition: ψαλμοῖς ὕμνοις ᾠδαῖς. In turn, P has two conjunctions in the middle of this list: ܕܥܘܠܡܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܝܘܬܐ. Although there is considerable evidence in the Greek manuscript tradition for this list to be separated with two καί’s, P still must not be considered a reliable witness to the presence of these

conjunctions in its *Vorlage* because of the demonstrable tendency for the translator to add conjunctions in similar contexts.

3:16 NA28 cites sy for ταῖς καρδίαις against τῇ καρδίᾳ

In the Pauline corpus, when the noun καρδία appears with a plural possessive pronoun (as it does here: ταῖς καρδίαις υμῶν), the noun can be either singular or plural in number. The translation of such phrases in P does not consistently represent the number of καρδία as it appears in the Greek. When in such phrases the translation in P exhibits a singular ܐܢ, it is in agreement with the Greek number in only three of eight instances.⁴⁷

However, when P has a plural ܐܢ in these phrases, it is in agreement with the Greek number in nineteen or twenty of twenty-one instances.⁴⁸ So when the Syriac has a plural form of ܐܢ as it does here, it is most likely that its *Vorlage* had a plural form of καρδία.⁴⁹ Therefore this citation may be considered valid.

3:17 NA28 cites (sy^p) for κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ against κυρίου Ἰησοῦ

This citation is illegitimate because of the translator's propensity to expand titles related to Jesus. See citation in 1:2.

3:17 NA28 cites sy^p for θεῷ πατρί against θεῷ καὶ πατρί

To begin with, this citation is questionable because of the translator's inconsistent handling of conjunctions and propensity to leave them out even where they are explicitly

47. Instances of agreement: 2 Cor 3:15; 6:11; Eph 4:18. Instances of disagreement: Rom 1:21, 24; 2:15; 2 Cor 3:2; 7:3.

48. Instances of agreement: Rom 5:5; 2 Cor 1:22; 2 Cor 4:6; Gal 4:6; Eph 3:17; 6:22; Phil 4:7; Col 2:2; 3:15; 4:8; 1 Thess 2:4; 3:13; 2 Thess 2:17; 3:5; Heb 3:8, 15; 4:7; 8:10; 10:16. Instance of disagreement: Eph 1:18. In Eph 5:19, there is significant Greek evidence for both the singular and plural forms of καρδία.

49. One may suspect that the plural form of ܐܢ here has been influenced by the same plural form in the preceding verse. This line of argument, however, should not be used against the legitimacy of a citation such as this because there is no way to know whether such a mistake—if it occurred—was made by the translator or by the copyist of the translator's *Vorlage*.

present in the *Vorlage*.⁵⁰ Moreover, of the fifteen other instances in the NT of a form of θεὸς καὶ πατήρ,⁵¹ fourteen are translated in P without the conjunction -α.⁵² In fact, the phrase ܘܕܘܫܘܐ ܘܒܘܠܘܬܐ (“God and father,” which would be the expected translation of θεὸς καὶ πατήρ) does not appear anywhere in P besides Rev 1:6. Therefore, the absence of the conjunction here must not be considered evidence for the absence of καί in the *Vorlage* since the resultant translation would likely be the same for either θεῶ πατρί or θεῶ καὶ πατρί.

3:18 NA28 cites sy^p, and 3:19 NA28 cites sy for inclusion of ὁμῶν

These two illegitimate citations may be handled together. Here P is cited as a witness to the inclusion of ὁμῶν after ἀνδράσιw and γυναικας, respectively. The Syriac does have second-person pronominal suffixes in both of these places: (ܘܠܘܬܘܟܘܢ and ܘܠܘܬܘܟܘܢܝܘܢ). However, it also includes one in the next verse where none is apparently present in Greek, reading ܘܠܘܬܘܟܘܢܝܘܢ ܘܠܘܬܘܟܘܢܝܘܢ ܘܠܘܬܘܟܘܢܝܘܢ (“children, obey your parents”). The critical apparatus makes no mention of this in v. 20, presumably because of the lack of corresponding evidence in the Greek manuscript tradition. One could argue that this third pronominal suffix was added by the translator (intentionally or accidentally) to parallel the first two. However, due to the tendency in the Peshitta to add possessive pronominal suffixes in instances of implicit familial relationships,⁵³ one cannot assume that a

50. See citation in 2:2 (p. 107).

51. Rom 15:6; 1 Cor 15:24; 2 Cor 1:3; 11:31; Gal 1:4; Eph 1:3; 4:6; 5:20; Phil 4:20; 1 Thess 1:3; 3:11, 13; James 1:27; 1 Pet 1:3; Rev 1:6.

52. The only exception is in Rev 1:6. This can be discounted for our purposes because Revelation was not translated into Syriac as early as the texts in view here, as it was originally excluded from the canon of P. Thus its translation technique is not a useful point of comparison.

53. Cf. Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique*, 67–121.

pronominal suffix in such a context is necessarily indicative of a corresponding pronoun in the *Vorlage*. That P adds a pronominal suffix in the same context in v. 20 without any Greek manuscript evidence lends credence to this. Thus these two citations for the inclusion of ὑμῶν are both illegitimate, because the translator is likely to have added the pronominal suffixes in these contexts even if they were not present in his *Vorlage*.

3:22 NA28 cites sy for κύριον against θεόν

Since the translation analysis did not indicate that ܠܗܘܐ (“lord”) is a usual translation for θεός, this citation is probably valid. A potential difficulty is that one could reasonably suspect in this context that the translator of PCol might not translate θεός by the normal ܠܗܘܐ. The phrase ܠܗܘܐ ܕܠܗܘܐ (lit., “fear of God”) is used idiomatically to mean “religion” or “piety.”⁵⁴ So the translator may have rendered φοβούμενοι τὸν θεὸν with ܠܗܘܐ ܕܠܗܘܐܘܢ (“and in fear of the lord”) rather than the expected ܠܗܘܐ ܕܠܗܘܐܘܢ (lit., “and in fear of God”) in order to avoid producing an idiomatic translation with a slightly different meaning.

The choice of ܠܗܘܐ here instead of ܠܗܘܐ or ܠܗܘܐ is curious but probably serves to validate the citation of P in support of κύριον against θεόν. The only other two times ܠܗܘܐ is used in PCol are both in reference to human masters of slaves (3:22a; 4:1).⁵⁵ In the immediate context, κύριος is translated ܠܗܘܐ in v. 23, when the text is clearly referencing the divine Lord in contrast to mere humans. It appears, then, that the translator has taken κύριον in v. 22b to reference the “masters according to the flesh” in v. 22a rather than the divine Lord. Ultimately, this translation decision substantiates the

54. Payne-Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*, 89.

55. Cf. Eph 6:5-9. There κύριος is translated with ܠܗܘܐ in vv. 5 and 9a, both in reference to human masters. It is translated with ܠܗܘܐ in v. 7 and with ܠܗܘܐ in v. 9b, both in reference to the divine Lord.

claim that the *Vorlage* read κύριον because the translator likely would not have used the form ܟܘܪܝܘܢ to translate θεόν.

4:8 NA28 cites sy for $\gamma\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\omega}$ τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν against $\gamma\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\omega}\tau\epsilon$ τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν

This citation is valid. Hypothetically, it could be that the translation ܟܘܪܝܘܢ ܟܘܪܝܘܢ (“that he might know the things concerning you”) arose through the series of scribal errors that Metzger describes as having produced this variant in the Greek manuscript tradition.⁵⁶ But nothing from the translation technique of PCol would afford solid support to this conjecture, so it is best to assume that the *Vorlage* read $\gamma\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\omega}$ τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν and that the translator rendered it faithfully.

4:12 NA28 cites sy for *Χριστοῦ* against *Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*

This citation is likely valid from a translational standpoint. It was shown above that P translators tended to expand titles relating to Jesus.⁵⁷ However, there is no evidence to suggest that the opposite is also true—that P translators tended to condense such titles. This, coupled with the translator of PCol’s demonstrated consistency in representing each element present in his Greek text, means that the *Vorlage* here probably did read *Χριστοῦ* rather than *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*.

4:12 NA28 cites sy for *πεπληρωμένοι* against *πεπληροφορημένοι*

This citation is valid. Every other time in PCol that the root word ܩܠܘܡܐ appears (1:9, 19, 24, 25; 2:9, 10; 4:17), it renders some form of πληρώω, πλήρης, or πλήρωμα.

56. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 559. “Through inadvertence copyists produced nonsense either by substituting ὑμῶν for ἡμῶν (“that you may know how you are”...) or by accidentally dropping -τε before τὰ (“that he may know how we are”...). The reading $\gamma\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\omega}$ τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν ... was produced when copyists tried to make sense of ἵνα $\gamma\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\omega}\tau\epsilon$ τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν (*a*) by taking it as ἵνα $\gamma\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\omega}$ τε τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν and then (*b*) omitting τε as awkward and superfluous.”

57. See citation of (sy^p) in 1:2 in support of *Χριστῶ Ἰησοῦ* against *Χριστῶ* (p. 97).

Moreover, every occurrence of the Greek verb πληροφορέω is translated in P by either ܡܘܫܐ (Luke 1:1), ܝܒ (Rom 4:21; 14:5) or ܡܠܟ (2 Tim 4:5, 17). So it is reasonable to conclude that ܡܠܟܘܬܐ here is indeed a translation of πεπληρωμένοι instead of πεπληροφορημένοι.

4:13 NA28 cites sy for ζῆλον πολὺν

This citation is valid, though it should be clarified that the Syriac could not witness to this word order against πολὺν ζῆλον. The translation ܡܠܟܘܬܐ ܡܠܟܘܬܐ surely arose from a combination of the words ζῆλον and πολὺν,⁵⁸ but the preference in Syriac for an attributive adjective to follow its noun (which is demonstrated by the translator of PCol⁵⁹) means that this translation could have come from either ordering. It would be best to clearly indicate in the critical apparatus that P could witness to either ζῆλον πολὺν or πολὺν ζῆλον.

4:15 NA28 cites sy^p for αὐτοῦ against αὐτῆς

This citation is probably valid. The translation here involves a pronominal suffix: ܡܠܟܘܬܐܐ (“that is in his house”). In Syriac, the only distinguishing factor between the masculine and the feminine pronominal suffix in early forms of the script is the presence of a diacritical point over the suffixed ܡ. Thus if the translation had been feminine, it would be: ܡܠܟܘܬܐܐ. One can imagine how easy it would be for such a small dot to become illegible in a manuscript or to be missed by even a careful scribe. But without access to the manuscripts, the editors of NTSU must be trusted in the text they present. Therefore,

58. Of the other eleven instances of the word ܡܠܟܘܬܐ in the PNT (John 2:17; Rom 10:2; 11:1; 2 Cor 7:7, 11; 9:2; 11:2; Gal 5:20; Phil 3:6; Heb 10:27; James 4:5), only once is it used to translate a word other than a form of ζῆλος (James 4:5, ἐπιποθεῖ).

59. See pp. 38, 49.

the reading in PCol is indeed masculine, and there is no reason to suspect that it arose from anything other than a masculine pronoun in the *Vorlage*.

4:15 NA28 cites sy for inclusion of ἀμήν

Each Pauline Epistle in P concludes with ܐܡܝܢ (“amen”) except, curiously, 1 Corinthians. Unfortunately, because this is a single word used on its own in such contexts, it is impossible to determine on translational grounds whether its inclusion at the end of these epistles is an actual representation of the Greek source text or merely a formulaic conclusion added by Syriac translators. One might wonder whether such a citation should be included in the apparatus at all since it is entirely possible that versional translators had their own conventions for concluding biblical books irrespective of the conventions employed by the scribe who produced the Greek manuscript from which they translate. If citations of versional evidence are meant to be an indication of their underlying Greek, then it may not make sense to cite versions in instances such as this in which there is no way to be certain about the presence or absence of the reading in a version’s source text. Ultimately this is an editorial decision, but it would be wrong to suggest that PCol is a reliable witness to the presence of ἀμήν in its *Vorlage*.

Conclusion: The Witness of PCol to its Greek *Vorlage*

The analysis above has made it clear that this translation may not be considered a one-to-one representative of its source text. In rare instances the translation in PCol may be so consistent that it can be cited as a witness to something specific in its source text without further questioning, but this is the exception rather than the rule. Instead, even for those cases in which the translation appears to correlate directly with its source text, the apparent correspondence must be checked against the broader context of the translation

technique. Doing this for PCol has resulted in a clearer understanding of its *Vorlage* by informing the degree of confidence we may have in establishing the Greek text from which the Syriac was translated.

Without a clear grasp of the translation technique exhibited in PCol (and, in some cases, bolstered by broader samplings of the PNT), one might assume that any apparent grammatical or formal correlation between the Syriac and Greek texts is indicative of the translator's *Vorlage*. This chapter has challenged that assumption by showing that the Syriac version of PCol alone actually provides less specific information about its source text than previously thought. PCol lends itself to the discernment of its *Vorlage* in its small translation units and the predictability with which it deviates from the shape of the Greek syntax. However, recurring inconsistencies in its translational program mean that no point of the translation can be claimed as a witness to its source text without the support of a rigorous evaluation that both takes place at the granular level and is compared against the context of the whole translation. In other words, we cannot reliably claim any word or phrase from PCol as a witness to its underlying Greek without an in-depth examination thereof in its immediate context nor without reference to the translation technique of similar cases throughout the text in question. The foregoing analysis establishes that the specifics of PCol's *Vorlage* are often simply unknowable.

However, it is not the case that nothing can be known about the *Vorlage* of PCol. With a proper respect for translation technique, we are often able to establish some aspect of the source text. Sometimes this entails adjusting the level of specificity to which the translation is asked to witness. We explored the value of this practice in the abstract here by applying it to the grammatical categories from the microanalysis. When the level of

specificity is decreased, even inconsistent aspects of the translation are capable of witnessing to some aspect of underlying Greek—the tense of a verb, perhaps, though not its fully parsed form, or a range of possible referents, but not one Greek word against another. Then, concretely, this practice proved valuable in the evaluation of citations, such as in the cases of ⲛⲏ and ⲛⲏⲛ as reliable witnesses to the presence of some Greek particle even though they could not be claimed as a witness to one particle against another. Thus PCol is not an unhelpful witness to its Greek *Vorlage* as it is often consistent enough at some level of specificity to reliably witness to some aspect of its source text.

Returning to the image of the study of translation technique as a spiral, this chapter has sought to define the narrowest turn in the spiral. The data gathered in the broad sweep of the previous chapter has here been examined in order to determine how closely the translation of PCol can witness to a presumed Greek source text. In many instances, the spiral does not come to a definite point—the translation is simply not consistent enough to indicate the specific nature of its source text in every detail. In these cases, the narrowest turn in the spiral must be defined in order to determine what, if anything, we can deduce about the *Vorlage*. Sometimes that turn was too broad to be of use in witnessing to specific Greek readings. But often we found it to have been narrow enough that within its range was valuable information about the underlying Greek text, thus supporting the purposes of NT textual criticism. In the concluding chapter the value of this study to the field of textual criticism is discussed further, both in the concrete ways that it may reshape the critical apparatuses of forthcoming GNT editions and in the influence it may have on the conversation about versional evidence moving forward.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND PATHS FORWARD

This Thesis set out to answer two questions: What is the nature of the Syriac translation technique in PCol? And given this translation technique, how can PCol witness to its underlying Greek text? I have described the translation technique of PCol as variously consistent and inconsistent—consistent in its prioritization of readability and the accurate conveying of meaning, but inconsistent in the formal imitation of its source text. The translator’s most literal quality is his effort to represent all elements of the Greek text in the general order they appear. But he is not interested in maintaining any semblance of formal equivalence, as evidenced in the microanalysis by the inconsistencies in almost every grammatical category in the translation. Rather, the translator is more concerned with producing a good, readable Syriac edition and is consistently willing to sacrifice strict imitation of the source text to accomplish this.

Such a translation technique has a somewhat negative effect on the ability to establish the *Vorlage* from which it was made. Whereas, for example, the Harklean version’s strictly literal approach to translation lends itself to relatively easy and confident retroversion to the source text, the matter is not usually as simple with PCol. Confidence in establishing PCol’s *Vorlage* required a rigorous process of case-by-case evaluation that involved analyzing the immediate syntactical context as well as a thorough understanding of the consistency of the broader translation technique. Sometimes—perhaps more often than has been expected—this resulted in a necessary

admission of the inability to confidently establish the specificities of PCol's *Vorlage*. Not that there are instances where we know nothing whatsoever about the source text, but quite often we can only specify a range of possibilities.

This range is usually small enough that PCol can be a useful witness to its *Vorlage* for the purposes of NT textual criticism. Often only one possibility in a range is plausible in the Greek syntax or present in the Greek manuscript tradition, and we can say with relative confidence that the *Vorlage* must have contained this reading. Other times, multiple Greek readings fall within this range such that the source text must have contained one of them, though which one in particular we cannot say. But occasionally, the range of possibilities is too broad or ambiguous to make any specific claim about the *Vorlage* because the inconsistency of the translation technique has obscured our ability to establish its source text with certainty.

Thus we have until now seen an overconfidence in the reliability of PCol as a witness to its Greek *Vorlage*. This much is clear from the number of citations of P in the critical apparatus of NA28 that I have demonstrated to be illegitimate on translational grounds. Although in each of the debunked citations the text of PCol seemed to correspond with the Greek reading, the translation technique indicated that a genetic relation between the texts (i.e., that this translation *a* arose from that Greek reading *x*) was not a necessary conclusion. Instead we saw how some renderings could have arisen from varying Greek readings and thus concluded that we must not claim certainty where none can be established. This study, then, should affect how PCol—and perhaps versions in general—are employed in NT textual criticism. The remainder of this chapter is

devoted to the discussion of various concrete and conceptual impacts this Thesis could have on the field moving forward.

Impacts on the Critical Apparatus of Colossians

Suggested Changes to Critical Apparatus Citations of PCol

As a result of this study, several citations of P in the critical apparatus of Colossians in NA28 have been called into question, and the evidence demands that some of them be altered or struck altogether in future critical apparatuses. It must be noted that the claim here is never that the *Vorlage* definitely did not contain the reading for which it has been cited but rather that the translation is too inconsistent in this regard to be certain. In other words, these suggested changes are usually necessary because the translation in P is as likely to have been made from a Greek reading(s) other than that for which it has been claimed as a witness. With the standard of citing versional witnesses to the Greek text so high, P should not be cited anywhere that the translation technique impedes upon the ability to be certain about the *Vorlage*. The proposed changes are listed here with a description of the citation as it appears in the critical apparatus of NA28, followed by a brief explanation of why and how the citation should be changed.

Citations in support of Ἰησοῦς + Χριστός at 1:2, 28; 3:17

PCol should not be considered a witness to Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ against Χριστῷ in 1:2, 28 or to κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ against κυρίου Ἰησοῦ in 3:17. Since P translators exhibit a demonstrable tendency to expand titles related to Jesus, an instance of Ⲛⲏⲥⲟⲩⲥ ⲛⲁⲩⲉⲥ (“Jesus Christ”) in P could plausibly have arisen from either Ἰησοῦς or Ἰησοῦς Χριστός in its *Vorlage*. Therefore, P should not be cited in support of one of those readings against the other.

Citations in support of καί at 1:6; 3:11, 16

PCol should not be considered a reliable witness to the presence of καί in its *Vorlage* in any of these instances. Not only is the use of -α widely inconsistent in PCol (and in P generally); each of these cases occur in the context of some form of a list in which the translator is especially prone to add conjunctions—as evidenced by the plethora of added conjunctions in these lists and others (cf. 3:5) for which PCol is not cited, presumably because of the lack of supporting evidence in the Greek manuscript tradition. However, even considering the corroborating readings in Greek manuscripts, there is no way to conclude that PCol’s *Vorlage* definitely did read καί in all these instances. As such, P should not be cited as a witness to the presence of these conjunctions in its *Vorlage*.

Citation in support of ἀποκατήλλαξεν against ἀπήλλαξεν and others at 1:22

In this case, PCol should be considered a potential witness to either ἀποκατήλλαξεν or ἀπήλλαξεν but not the other possibilities listed in the critical apparatus of NA28. The Syriac verb and syntax rule out those readings with plural subjects (ἀποκατηλλάγητε and ἀποκαταλλάγεντες) and the passive voice (ἀποκατήλλακται). However, the usage of the verb ܐܘܢܝܢ is neither consistent nor nuanced enough to distinguish between ἀποκατήλλαξεν and ἀπήλλαξεν. One may conclude on the basis of external evidence that ἀπήλλαξεν would be an unlikely *Vorlage* for P since it appears in only the eleventh-century minuscule 104. But such considerations are outside the purview of the present Thesis, and on translational grounds ἀπήλλαξεν is certainly as likely a *Vorlage* for P as is ἀποκατήλλαξεν.

Citation in support of μή τις against μηδείς at 2:4

PCol cannot be considered a witness to either of these against the other. The Syriac ܡܝܢ ܠܐ is employed elsewhere in the Pauline corpus to translate all of μή τις, μηδείς, and οὐδείς. This lack of nuance, then, precludes P from being a reliable witness to any of these against the others.

Citation in support of θεῷ πατρί against θεῷ καὶ πατρί at 3:17

PCol should not be considered a witness to θεῷ πατρί against θεῷ καὶ πατρί. Aside from the translator's inconsistent handling of conjunctions, there is significant evidence to suggest that the Syriac would read ܠܘܕܝܘܣܐܘܠܐ ("to God the Father") whether the *Vorlage* read θεῷ πατρί or θεῷ καὶ πατρί. Excluding one instance in Revelation (which may be discarded from consideration here because of its much later translation and addition to P), every other occurrence of θεὸς καὶ πατήρ in the NT is translated in P without the expected conjunction -α; in fact, the phrase ܠܘܕܝܘܣܐܘܠܐ ("God and father") does not appear anywhere in P besides the aforementioned instance in Revelation. Therefore, PCol's *Vorlage* could very well have contained either of these readings and resulted in the same translation.

Citations supporting inclusions of ὑμῶν at 3:18, 19

PCol should not be considered a witness to the presence of ὑμῶν in its *Vorlage* in these instances. The tendency of P translators to add possessive pronouns in contexts of familial relationships means that the possessive pronominal suffixes present in these verses are not necessarily an indication of corresponding pronouns in the *Vorlage*. Moreover, the pronominal suffix in the same context in v. 20—without corroborating evidence in the Greek manuscript tradition—further demonstrates the translator's

willingness to add such elements in these contexts. So since the translation could have arisen from a *Vorlage* with or without the claimed pronouns, PCol should not be considered a reliable witness to them.

Citations Requiring Further Clarification

In addition to the citations above, the deficiencies of which require significant revision, this study also identified a number of citations in NA28 that need more nuanced clarifications in the critical apparatus. Admittedly, the status of NA28 as a hand edition precludes an overly detailed apparatus, so some of the following suggestions may be difficult or impossible to implement in such a system. These are nevertheless worth noting in the interest of future critical editions that undertake a more thorough critical apparatus, such as the *Editio Critica Maior*.

Addition of διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ at 1:14

Although NA28 does not cite P at this variant, it has been shown that one manuscript—*Ms Sin. syr. 5*—likely knew of the reading with διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ. This may be worth noting in future critical editions.

Citation in support of αὐτοῦ at 1:22

This citation is questionable because the pronominal suffix on ܡܠܘܬܐ (“his death”) may be an incidental—rather than genetic—agreement with the proposed reading αὐτοῦ. There are other instances in P where ܡܠܘܬܐ appears with little or no evidence of a corresponding αὐτοῦ in the Greek (Heb 2:9, 14; 9:15). Moreover, it was suggested that the tendency to add pronominal suffixes in instances of inherit possession or relationship may apply here since the “death” in view is specifically the salvific death of Jesus. So

although there is not enough evidence to suggest that this citation be struck from future critical apparatuses, it may be worthy of some notation indicating its uncertainty.¹

Citation in support of the exclusion of καί at 2:2

This citation is questionable because of the general irregularity with which the translator handles conjunctions and because of the several other instances in PCol in which καί is present in the Greek text of NA28 but is not formally represented in the translation. This may be worthy of notation indicating the uncertainty of the Syriac evidence in P.

Citation in support of τοῦ σώματος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τῆς σαρκός against τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός at 2:11

This citation is valid insofar as the translation reliably witnesses to the presence of τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν in its *Vorlage*. However, P reads ܩܘܡܘܢܐ ܩܝܡܐ (“the flesh of sins”) rather than the expected ܩܝܡܘܢܐ ܩܘܡܘܢܐ ܩܝܘܢܐ (“the body of sins of the flesh”) as H has, perhaps because of a conflation of σώματος and σαρκός. NA28 cites this with “sy”, which indicates that the whole Syriac tradition witnesses to this reading. Some indication needs to be made, however, that alerts the reader to a variation in the reading in P—this would be accomplished in the NA apparatus with “sy^(P)”.

Citation in support of ζῆλον πολὺν at 4:13

The Syriac certainly attests to these words, but the NA28 apparatus is misleading because it claims the Syriac tradition as a witness to this but not to πολὺν ζῆλον. Syriac syntax prefers an attributive adjective to follow its noun, so the translation ܩܘܡܘܢܐ ܩܝܘܢܐ ܩܝܘܢܐ

1. The introduction to NA28 notes that “the rare instances where a decision is not completely certain are marked with the sign ?” (Aland et al., eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 68*) Although that sign is not employed for this citation (or any citation of Syriac evidence in Colossians), it should probably be used a good deal more.

(“great zeal”) could have arisen from either ordering. Therefore, a critical apparatus needs to clearly indicate that the *Vorlage* of P here could be either ζῆλον πολὺν or πολὺν ζῆλον.

For Further Research

In the course of the translation analysis, several instances were noted in which PCol was not listed as a witness in the critical apparatus of NA28 but may be worth including in future editions. Most of these Tischendorf cited in his apparatus; he was much freer in his usage of versional evidence and many of his citations of P are therefore illegitimate, but occasionally he claims P as a witness in places where NA28 may have missed it. Unfortunately, I am unable here to examine these cases in enough depth to make confident conclusions about their place in future critical apparatuses. Instead, each of the identified instances is listed here along with a brief explanation about its potential as a witness to the *Vorlage*.

1:11 Reading μετὰ χαρᾶς with what follows

The editors of NA28 have a paragraph break in 1:11 immediately preceding μετὰ χαρᾶς, thus making the assertion that it should be read as the beginning of the sentence that continues in 1:12 rather than the end of the previous sentence. Though they provide no explanation for this interpretation, Tischendorf actually cites evidence, including P, for this reading. Punctuation in a manuscript would be valid evidence to support such a conclusion, but in the case of PCol there is also translational evidence that lends credence to this reading. The translator adds -α before ἡδονῆς (“with joy”), which may function as an indication that this should be read with the subsequent grammatical unit rather than the prior one.

2:1 Support for ὑπέρ against περί

Although P is not listed in the critical apparatus for this citation, the translation ܘܠܐ may be a witness to ὑπέρ against περί. Here, evidence must be garnered from outside PCol: in sixty-nine occurrences of ܘܠܐ in the Pauline corpus, forty-eight translate ὑπέρ in NA28 (69.57%),² ten translate περί, four translate ἀντί, and seven are added without a Greek variant listed. That is not consistent enough for consideration as a reliable witness, but a closer look may help us attain a higher level of confidence in P's witness to ὑπέρ.

First, we can disregard the seven occurrences at which ܘܠܐ clearly does not correspond to any preposition in the Greek text³ since at Col 2:1 it clearly does. Then, for the purposes of this count, we can disregard the four times it translates ἀντί since this preposition is not a variant option at Col 2:1. At this point, ܘܠܐ translates ὑπέρ in forty-eight of fifty-seven occurrences (82.76%). Furthermore, two of the instances in which ܘܠܐ appears to translate περί occur within a quotation of Ps 40:8 in Heb 10:6, 8—these need not be included in this count because ܘܠܐ here is more likely a reflection of the Peshitta OT than an actual translation of περί.⁴ Twice more ܘܠܐ appears to translate περί but is immediately followed by ܘܠܐ translating ἐπί (1 Cor 1:4; 1 Thess 3:9), but the choice

2. This includes two instances (Rom 8:26; 1 Cor 5:7) where P is considered a witness for a variant addition of ὑπέρ.

3. Five of these are commonplace repetitions of the Syriac preposition in the context of lists (Col 2:1 (2x); 4:13; Heb 7:27; 9:7), and the other two are added where no Greek preposition occurs in the near vicinity (Eph 5:4; Heb 7:19).

4. Brock, *The Bible in Syriac Tradition*, Gorgias Handbooks 7 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2006), 33. Here Brock notes that the translator of the Old Syriac “clearly felt that the Syriac Old Testament (Peshitta) had greater authority for his readers than the Greek New Testament, for he adapts Old Testament quotations in the Gospels to the Wording of the Peshitta Old testament in a number of cases where this differs from the form of the quotation found in the Greek New Testament. This is in fact a practice adopted by many early Syriac translators of Greek Patristic writings, and it is only from about AD 500 that translators change their attitude and prefer to translate biblical quotations in the form in which they find them in their Greek text...” Whereas P imitates the Peshitta OT with ܘܠܐ here, H has ܘܠܐ.

of 𐤀𐤋 there may be more influenced by the undesirability of using 𐤁 to translate both περί and ἐπί in short succession. With these four removed from the count, we are left with 𐤀𐤋 translating ὑπέρ in forty-eight of fifty-three occurrences, or 90.57%. Thus P may indeed be consistent enough for 𐤀𐤋 to witness to ὑπέρ against περί here.

2:13 τὰ παραπτώματα + ἡμῶν

Tischendorf cites P among other versions as evidence of an added pronoun at the end of 2:13. NA28 has no such citation here, but PCol does include the first-person plural pronominal suffix in 𐤀𐤋𐤍𐤏𐤍 (“our sins”). The pronominal suffix in PCol is a reliable witness to the presence of pronoun in its *Vorlage* in most cases.⁵ The questions here are 1) whether the translator was influenced by the preceding pronoun (ἡμῶν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα) to add a corresponding suffix at the end and 2) whether the pronominal suffix is a reflection of a pronoun in the *Vorlage* or is a case of “implicit ownership” attracting a pronominal suffix.

3:13 Potential Witness to ἀλλήλων against ἑαυτοῖς

In 3:13, ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων καὶ χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς is translated 𐤀𐤋𐤍𐤏𐤍 𐤀𐤋𐤍𐤏𐤍. This is one of only four instances in the NT—and the only instance in the Pauline corpus—in which 𐤀𐤋𐤍𐤏𐤍 apparently translates ἑαυτοῖς. In the translation technique analysis, I found 𐤀𐤋𐤍𐤏𐤍 to be consistent in representing ἀλλήλων and 𐤀𐤋𐤍𐤏𐤍 to consistently translate a form of ἑαυτοῦ.⁶ It may be that the translator preferred (consciously or subconsciously) the repetition of 𐤀𐤋𐤍𐤏𐤍, but P’s level of

5. See p. 94.

6. See p. 68-69.

consistency in translating both ἀλλήλων and ἑαυτοῖς weighs in favor of the conclusion that PCol's *Vorlage* had ἀλλήλων instead of ἑαυτοῖς here.

3:18 Χριστῶ against κυρίῳ

Here the Greek reads ἐν κυρίῳ, with no apparent noteworthy variation in the Greek manuscript tradition,⁷ yet P reads ܡܫܝܚܐ. As observed above, this would be one of only three potential instances in which ܡܫܝܚܐ translates κύριος in 581 occurrences of the word in the PNT. This 99.48% consistency led me to approve the instance in Col 3:13 as a witness to the much-attested variant reading Χριστός, but even without corroborating Greek evidence this level of consistency is substantial enough to stand on its own. Thus it is highly likely that PCol preserves a reading here that is nowhere else extant in the Greek manuscript tradition.

4:7 Addition of δέ

Tischendorf cites P alongside Codex Sinaiticus and the Armenian version as the sole witnesses to an additional δέ in 4:7. As noted above, the usage of ܕܝܢ in P approaches the standard for consistency in representing a particle explicitly present in the Greek text. With support from the Greek manuscript tradition, PCol may therefore provide reliable witness to the presence of δέ in its *Vorlage* here.

Paths Forward in the Field of New Testament Textual Criticism

In closing, we now may briefly reflect on how this study might have a conceptual impact on the way versional evidence is handled in NT textual criticism. For one, I have emphasized the importance of not claiming more than we can be certain about when citing versions as a witness to their *Vorlage*. This idea is, of course, neither new nor

7. Neither NA28, Tischendorf, nor von Soden list any Greek variants.

unique but nevertheless merits restatement. If a version's translation technique does not provide sufficient grounds to claim that its *Vorlage* definitely contained a certain reading, then it should not be cited as a witness to that reading. If a version's witness is ambiguous, it should be clearly indicated as such. We should be more willing to employ the "?" symbol in the critical apparatus than to cite a version for a reading that may not have been in its *Vorlage*.

Moreover, the possibility that a translation may have plausibly arisen from multiple Greek readings—and therefore cannot witness to one against the other—deserves more attention. Again, this idea is neither new nor unique, but this possibility is either ignored or not recognized multiple times in NA28's citations of PCol alone. If this is true here, it is likely the case for the rest of the Syriac evidence in the rest of the NT and may be so for other versions as well. The ECM, however, in acknowledging this important possibility,⁸ is hopefully setting a precedent for the future of the field. When citing versional evidence, it is not enough to assume that simple correspondence between a versional reading and Greek reading is an indication of that reading in the version's *Vorlage*. Instead we must remain open to—and look for!—the possibility that a translation could be a potential witness to more than one Greek reading.

Finally, in thinking about the future of scholarship on versional evidence in the field of NT textual criticism, more studies of this nature may be needed. At least, that is, if the role of versional evidence in the critical apparatus is meant to be a witness to the Greek from which the version was translated, especially if the standard is to be "certainty." Such a standard is unattainable without a thorough understanding of each

8. Cf. Aland et al., *Novum Testamentum Graecum*, 23*; Strutwolf et al., *Novum Testamentum Graecum*, 23*.

version's translation technique. But here, with this analysis of the translation technique of PCol and the evaluation of its witness to its Greek *Vorlage* through that lens, we are now in better position to establish the place of P in the critical apparatus of the Greek text of Colossians. Furthermore, the data gathered and the insights garnered about Syriac translation technique here will be useful as a point of comparison in evaluating the textual witness of other books in the PNT. As the field of NT textual criticism progresses and as critical editions of the GNT continue to improve, translation technique studies such as this can make important contributions to critical apparatuses and our methodological approaches to versional evidence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aland, Barbara, et al., eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28th revised. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.
- , eds. *The Greek New Testament*. 4th revised. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2002.
- Aland, Barbara, et al., eds. *Novum Testamentum Graecum: Editio Critica Maior. 2nd Revised*. Vol. IV Catholic Letters: Part 1: Text. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2013.
- Aland, Barbara, and Andreas Juckel, eds. *Das Neue Testament in Syrischer Überlieferung: II. Die Paulinischen Briefe*. Teil 2:2. Korintherbrief, Galaterbrief, Epheserbrief, Philipperbrief und Kolosserbrief. ANTF 23. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995.
- Aland, Kurt, and Barbara Aland. *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.
- Barr, James. *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*. NAWG Philologisch-Historische Klasse 11. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- Black, Matthew. “The New Testament Peshitta and Its Predecessors.” *Bulletin of the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas* 1 (1950): 51–62.
- Brock, Sebastian P. “Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity.” *GRBS* 20.1 (1979): 69–87.
- . *The Bible in Syriac Tradition*. Gorgias Handbooks 7. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2006.
- . “Changing Fashions in Syriac Translation Technique: The Background to Syriac Translations under the Abbassids.” *Journal of the Canadian Society for Syriac Studies* 4 (2004): 3–14.
- . “Hebrews 2:9b in Syriac Tradition.” *NovT* 27 (1985): 236–44.
- . “Limitations of Syriac Representing Greek.” Pages 83-98 in *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations*. By Bruce M. Metzger. Oxford: Clarendon, 1977.

- . “Toward a History of Syriac Translation Technique.” Pages 1–14 in *III Symposium Syriacum, 1980*. Edited by R. Lavenant. OrChrAn 221. Rome: Pontificio Instituto Orientale, 1983.
- . “Translation, Greek and Syriac.” Pages 935–46, 957–59 in *A History of the Greek Language: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*. Edited by A. F. Christidis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Broome Downs, Hope. “The Peshitto as a Revision: Its Background in Syriac and Greek Texts of Mark.” *JBL* 63.2 (1944): 141–59.
- Buck, Erwin. “Manuscript Studies in the Syriac Versions of Romans.” PhD diss., Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, 1978.
- Burkitt, F. Crawford. *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe: The Curetonian Version of the Four Gospels, with the Readings of the Sinai Palimpsest and the Early Syriac Patristic Evidence: Volume II: Introduction and Notes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904.
- Campbell, Constantine R. *Colossians and Philemon: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2013.
- Childers, Jeff W. “Patristic Citations and Versional Evidence: The Syriac Versions of Chrysostom’s Homilies on Matthew and the Old Syriac Text.” *Mus* 115 (2002): 129–56.
- Childers, Jeffrey Wayne. “Studies in the Syriac Versions of St. John Chrysostom’s Homilies on the New Testament : With Special Reference to Homilies 6, 20, 22, 23, 37, 62, 83, and 84 on John.” DPhil, University of Oxford, 1996.
- Clemons, James T. “Studies in the Syriac Text of Galatians.” PhD diss. Duke University, 1963.
- Danker, Frederick W., and Walter Bauer, eds. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- “Dukhrana Analytical Lexicon of the Syriac New Testament,”
<http://www.dukhrana.com/lexicon/index.php>.
- Freitag, Walter. “Studies on First Corinthians in Syriac.” PhD diss., Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, 1971.
- Gudorf, Michael E. “Research on the Early Syriac Text of the Epistle to the Hebrews.” PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1992.

- Haar Romeny, R. B. ter, and C. E. Morrison. "Peshitta." *Gorgias Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Syriac Heritage*, Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2012. 326–31.
- Haelewyck, Jean-Claude. "The Old Syriac Versions of the Gospels: A Status Quaestionis (From 1842 to the Present Day)." *BABELAO* 8 (2019): 141-79
- Juckel, Andreas. "The Peshitta Version of the New Testament: Towards a Critical Edition of St. Paul's Letters." *The Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 56.1–4 (2004): 95–103.
- Kerschensteiner, Josef. *Der Altsyrische Paulustext*. CSCO 315. Louvain: Secretariat du Corpus SCO, 1970.
- King, Daniel. *The Syriac Versions of the Writings of Cyril of Alexandria : A Study in Translation Technique / by Daniel King*. Louvain: Peeters, 2008.
- Knappe, Wolf D. "The Captivity Letters in the Syriac Tradition." PhD diss., Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, 1977.
- Lohse, Eduard. *Colossians and Philemon*. Translated by William R. Poehlmann and Robert J. Karris. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- Lyon, Jeffrey P. *Syriac Gospel Translations : A Comparison of the Language and Translation Method Used in the Old Syriac, the Diatessaron, and the Peshitto*. CSCO 548. Leuven: Peeters, 1994.
- Martin, Alain G. "La Traduction de Κύριος en Syriaque." *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 12.23–24 (1999): 25–54.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- . *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1977.
- Parker, D. C. *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Pelser, H. S. "The Origin of the Ancient Syriac New Testament Texts—A Historical Study." Pages 152–63 in *De Fructu Oris Sui: Essays in Honour of Adrianus Van Selms*. Edited by I. H. Eybers, F. C. Fensham, C. J. LaBuschagne, W. C. Van Wyk, and A. H. Van Zyl. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Ross, Michael M. "Studies in the Thessalonian Epistles in Syriac." PhD diss., Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, 1978.
- Smith, J. Payne. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary: Founded upon the Thesaurus Syriacus of R. Payne Smith, D.D.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1902.

- Strutwolf, Holger, George Gabel, Annette Huffmeier, Gerd Mink, and Klaus Wachtel, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graecum: Editio Critica Maior*. Vol. III Acts of the Apostles: Part 1.1: Text: Chapter 1-14. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2017.
- , eds. *Novum Testamentum Graecum: Editio Critica Maior*. Vol. III Acts of the Apostles: Part 2: Supplementary Material. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2017.
- The Syriac New Testament*. London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1920.
- Tischendorf, Constantin von, Caspar René Gregory, and Ezra Abbot. *Novum Testamentum Graece: Ad Antiquissimos Testes Denuo Recensuit*. Lipsiae: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869.
- van Peursen, Wido, and Terry C. Falla. “The Particles ܘܢܝܘܢ and ܘܢܝܘܢ in Classical Syntactic and Semantic Aspects.” Pages 63–98 in *Foundations for Syriac Lexicography II: Colloquia of the International Syriac Language Project*. Perspectives on Syriac Linguistics 3. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2009.
- von Soden, Hermann F. *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in Ihrer Ältesten Erreichbaren Textgestalt Hergestellt auf Grund Ihrer Textgeschichte*. Vol. II. Teil: Text mit Apparat. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913.
- Vööbus, Arthur. *Early Versions of the New Testament; Manuscript Studies*. Stockholm: Estonian Theological Society in Exile, 1954.
- . “The Oldest Extant Traces of the Syriac Peshitta.” *Mus* 63 (1950): 191–204.
- . *Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac*. CSCO 128. Louvain: L Durbecq, 1951.
- Wikgren, Allen. “The Use of the Versions in New Testament Textual Criticism.” *JBL* 67 (1948): 135–42.
- Williams, Peter J. “An Evaluation of the Use of the Peshitta as a Textual Witness to Romans.” *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 13 (2008): 1–16.
- . *Early Syriac Translation Technique and the Textual Criticism of the Greek Gospels*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2004.
- . “The Syriac Versions of the New Testament.” Pages 143–66 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- . “Some Problems in Determining the *Vorlage* of Early Syriac Versions of the NT.” *NTS* 47 (2001): 537–43.

APPENDIX A

Table of Evaluations regarding Citations of P in NA28 Critical Apparatus

Reference	Citation	Description	Evaluation
1:2	sy	Κολασσαῖς against Κολοσσαῖς	Legitimate
1:2	(sy ^p)	Χριστῶ Ἰησοῦ against Χριστῶ	Illegitimate
1:2	sy ^p	ΟΜ καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ or καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν	Legitimate
1:6	sy	ADD καί	Illegitimate
1:7	sy ^p	καθὼς ἐμάθετε against καθὼς καὶ ἐμάθετε	Legitimate
1:7	sy	ὑμῶν against ἡμῶν	Legitimate
1:12	sy ^p	τῷ θεῷ πατρὶ against τῷ πατρὶ	Legitimate
1:12	sy	ἰκανώσαντι against καλέσαντι or καλέσαντι καὶ ἰκανώσαντι	Legitimate
1:12	sy	ἡμᾶς against ὑμᾶς	Legitimate
1:20	sy	δι' αὐτοῦ against its exclusion	Legitimate
1:22	sy	ἀποκατήλλαξεν against ἀποκατηλλάγητε / ἀποκαταλλάγεντες / ἀποκατήλλακται / ἀπήλλαξεν	Legit., w/ Revisions ¹
1:22	sy ^p	ADD αὐτοῦ	Questionable
1:28	(sy ^p)	ΟΜ πάντα ἄνθρωπον	Legitimate
1:28	sy ^(p)	Χριστῶ Ἰησοῦ against Χριστῶ	Illegitimate
2:2	sy ^p	ΟΜ καί	Questionable
2:2	(sy ^p)	τοῦ θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ against τοῦ θεοῦ Χριστοῦ	Legitimate
2:4	sy	ADD δέ	Legitimate
2:4	sy	μή τις against μηδεῖς	Illegitimate
2:7	sy	ἐν αὐτῇ ἐν εὐχαριστία against ἐν εὐχαριστία	Legitimate
2:11	sy	τοῦ σώματος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τῆς σαρκός against τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός	Legit., w/ Revisions ²
2:23	sy	ADD καί	Legitimate
3:4	sy	ἡμῶν against ὑμῶν	Legitimate
3:5	sy	ADD ὑμῶν	Legitimate
3:6	sy ^p	ταῦτα γάρ against ἄ	Legitimate
3:6	sy	ADD ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας	Legitimate

1. See p. 132.

2. See p. 135.

Reference	Citation	Description	Evaluation
3:7	sy ^P	αὐτοῖς against τούτοις	Legitimate
3:11	sy ^P	ADD καί	Illegitimate
3:13	sy	Χριστὸς against κύριος	Legitimate
3:15	sy	Χριστοῦ against θεοῦ	Legitimate
3:16	sy ^(P)	Χριστοῦ against κυρίου and θεοῦ	Legitimate
3:16	sy ^P	ADD two καί's	Illegitimate
3:16	sy	ταῖς καρδίαις against τῇ καρδία	Legitimate
3:17	(sy ^P)	κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ against κυρίου Ἰησοῦ	Illegitimate
3:17	sy ^P	θεῶ πατρί against θεῶ καί πατρί	Illegitimate
3:18	sy ^P	ADD ὑμῶν	Illegitimate
3:19	sy	ADD ὑμῶν	Illegitimate
3:22	sy	κύριον against θεόν	Legitimate
4:8	sy	γνῶ τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν against γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν	Legitimate
4:12	sy	Χριστοῦ against Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ	Legitimate
4:12	sy	πεπληρωμένοι against πεπληροφορημένοι	Legitimate
4:13	sy	ζῆλον πολύν	Legit., w/ Revisions ³
4:15	sy ^P	αὐτοῦ against αὐτῆς	Legitimate
4:15	sy	ADD ἀμήν	Inconclusive (not translational)

3. See p. 135.