# A Textual-Critical Study of Luke and Verbal Aspect

Hojoon J. Ahn

Sungkyul University, Anyang-si, South Korea

**Abstract**: Among 421 variants in the Gospel of Luke revealed from a comparative analysis between TD8 and NA28, this study attempts a textual-critical analysis of five tense-form variants (Luke 7:20, 24, 25, 26; 22:52) in terms of verbal aspect theory. First, concerning their age, geographical features, and genealogical features, the aorist readings (ἀπέστειλεν, ἐξήλθατε) can probably be regarded as superior to the perfect readings (ἀπέσταλκεν, ἐξεληλύθατε). Second, considering the internal evidence revealed via verbal aspect theory, the aorist readings have more weight than the perfect readings. Regarding the reason why Tischendorf chose the perfect tense-form reading even though important MSS (e.g., P75 ℵ B) support the aorist reading, this study suggests that, via Georg B. Winer who was his teacher, Tischendorf had a tense-centered Greek understanding. In addition, concentrating on the perfect tense-form reading of the 4–5c MSS such as A (02) and W (032), this study suggests that the variations involved here may have helped to initiate the change from the reading based on the verbal aspect to a tense-centered reading in the 4c. This study reveals the need for, and significance of, verbal aspect theory for NT textual criticism. (Article)

## 1. *Introduction*

Via the discovery of Codex Sinaiticus ℵ (01) and by constructing his Greek Bible edition on the basis of Alexandrian witnesses including ℵ (01), Constantine Tischendorf ascended to the place of being a major contributor in a shift away from readings centered on the Textus Receptus and toward generally more

accurate text constructions. In this article, I will compare Tischendorf's *Novum Testamentum Graece* 8th edition (TD8) with the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece* 28th edition (NA28) with respect to the Gospel of Luke, seeking to find some reasons for their different readings.[1] This study will arrange their variants for the entire Gospel of Luke according to 21 categories and then select some key examples for analysis. Although there are many crucial components of these divergent readings that need to be analyzed, I will focus on verbal-aspectual variants.

To be more specific, this study will mainly deal with five variants between TD8 and NA28 in terms of the issue of "verbal aspect": Luke 7:20, 7:24, 7:25, 7:26, and 22:52. The issue of which reading is closer to the original text will be dealt with; however, my fundamental question concerning these passages is this: *What is the reason that Tischendorf chose the perfect tense-form reading in these five examples, where several important witnesses such as Codexes Sinaiticus and Vaticanus support an aorist tense-form reading?* If we were to approach the five aorist-tense readings with a tense-centered Greek grammar, we might be left with unanswered questions. An approach informed by verbal aspect, however, can potentially explain the differences between TD8 and NA28. Specifically, if Tischendorf had a Greek verbal understanding centered on tense, he might have thought that it would be better to opt for ἀπέσταλκεν rather than ἀπέστειλεν, even though it is not supported by important manuscripts (MSS) like ℵ (01) and Codex Vaticanus B (03). Verbal aspect also supplies an explanation for the variant readings themselves. Specifically, there is a possibility that, at a

---

1.　As Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts point out, "the Nestle text of the NT was based upon comparison of three published editions, including the Westcott and Hort edition and Tischendorf's 8th edition." See *Fundamentals*, 59. Thus there are lots of coincident elements between TD8 and NA28, but there are also considerable variants among them. Although NA27 gives us the "Editionum Differentiae," that is, comparative analysis among Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort, von Soden, Vogels, Merk, Bover, and NA25 (NA27, 751–71), these analytic results are very inconvenient to see and to analyze according to their variant sorts such as addition, omission, substitution, order/structure.

particular time (4c C.E.) in which a tense-centered Greek understanding affected the church members (especially leaders and scribes), there may have been an attempt to change verb forms accordingly. In other words, the reason for the perfect tense-form in several MSS (e.g., Codex Alexandrinus [A 02], comparatively later than Papyrus 75 [P75], ℵ [01], and B [03]), can be found in a grammatical change from a verbal aspect-centered understanding into a tense-centered one.[2]

## 2. *Background*

### 2.1 *Constantine Tischendorf's Achievements*

Stanley E. Porter says that Constantine Tischendorf was a "scholar who roamed the world in search of the Bible's earliest manuscripts—out of a sense of pious devotion to God's word and belief that discovery of the earliest manuscripts would confirm its textual reliability."[3] Porter and Andrew W. Pitts say this regarding Tischendorf's importance:

> [T]he major turning point away from the Textus Receptus was marked by the discovery of Codex Sinaiticus by Constantine Tischendorf (1815–1874) and the comprehensive editions of the NT that he diligently compiled, especially the 8th edition, which used Sinaiticus. Tischendorf understood this Alexandrian witness as the most important available witness to the early text of the NT and symbolized its priority in textual criticism by using the first letter of the Hebrew alphabet (ℵ, *aleph*) as its symbol.[4]

---

2. Given a tense-centered Greek grammar, the five cases with aorist verbs seem especially strange. First, the tense-centered understanding of three instances of ἐξήλθατε in 7:24, 25, 26 is somewhat unnatural. The main verb tense of Jesus' question, "What did you go out into the wilderness to behold?" seems to make it appropriate to choose not the aorist tense-form but the present or perfect tense-form. Second, the main verbs in 7:20, 22:52 are much more understandable when you change them into the perfect tense-form. RSV translates these parts as follows: "John the Baptist *has sent* us to you (7:20); "*Have* you *come* out as against a robber, with swords and clubs?" (Luke 22:52).

3. Porter, *Tischendorf,* vii.

4. Porter and Pitts, *Fundamentals*, 75.

As this comment notes, it is said that Tischendorf's two major contributions are the discovery of (01 א)[5] and the construction of the NT editions including the 8th edition. To be more specific, the major contributor to the shift from readings centered on the Textus Receptus is Tischendorf, who constructed his Greek Bible edition on the basis of the Alexandrian witness including א (01) and B (03).[6] Particularly, although it is said that Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort "really set the trajectory for the high priority placed upon the Alexandrian text in contemporary NT textual criticism,"[7] the importance of Tischendorf's edition cannot be weakened because his "eighth edition of the Greek New Testament still constitutes one of the most important sources of text-critical information in its textual apparatus."[8] However, we also need to listen to Ernest C. Colwell's comment: "Tischendorf had no confidence in the accuracy of groupings, and he relied on the internal evidence of

5.    He is also the first discoverer of NT papyrus P11. See Epp, "Papyrus," 2.

6.    Porter comments that "this eighth edition is certainly closer to the two major codexes than any of his previous editions." See *Tischendorf*, 57. In the introduction of the translation of TD8, Samuel Davidson comments on the reason for Tischendorf's reliance to the two codexes as follows. "Von Tischendorf's principle is substantially that of Bentley and Lachmann, viz., to seek the most ancient text in the oldest MSS., versions, and Fathers, and to reproduce it as accurately as possible. For this purpose he has relied on Alexandrine and Latin rather than Asiatic and Byzantine materials; first of all on the two oldest MSS. א and B, with the Curetonian Syriac and the MSS. of the old Latin having an unrevised text; besides Origen and Tertullian; next on A, C, D, the Vulgate, Peshito, and others." See Tischendorf, *New Testament*, xi–xii.

7.    Porter and Pitts, *Fundamentals*, 75.

8.    Porter, *How We Got the New Testament*, 14. In addition, it is a very surprising fact that "it was the work of a single man whose death [occurred] in his fifty-ninth year (his first stroke came when he was fifty-eight and was rapidly followed by others)." See Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 39.

readings for the reconstruction of his text."[9] Of course, Tischendorf did his best to construct a critical text based on important external evidences such as א (01) and B (03), but according to Colwell, he emphasized the value of internal evidence. His comment seems especially meaningful since Tischendorf's interest in internal evidence can give us the crucial clues we need regarding the study of his unique reading style.

## 3. *Methodology*

### 3.1 *Textual Criticism*

D. C. Parker defines textual criticism as follows: "Textual critic-ism is the analysis of variant readings in order to determine in what sequence they arose."[10] According to Porter and Pitts, there have been two broad directions regarding textual criticism, that is, "the traditional model" and "the sociohistorical model," and they have their distinct purposes.[11] Without wishing to ignore the importance or contributions of the latter model, this study will focus on the traditional interest in textual criticism in order to "produce a text as close as possible to the original,"[12] although it is probably impossible to determine the perfect text that would be the same as the original one.

Porter and Pitts explain the two types of evidence to deal with the problem of variant readings as follows. "*External evidence* deals with the manuscripts that support a given reading. It is external in the sense that it considers external witnesses to the text. *Internal evidence* . . . deals with both scribal and authorial

---

9.   Colwell, *Methodology*, 5.

10.   Parker, *Manuscripts*, 159.

11.   Porter and Pitts, *Fundamentals*, 1. They present the goals of the two ways as follows: "Textual criticism is traditionally seen as the science and art of reconstructing the original Greek autographs as closely as possible. More recent scholars, however, tend to perceive textual criticism as a means of tracking the history of textual transmission in order to gain insight into the social history of early Christianity, especially as Christianity and its texts developed in the second century" (*Fundamentals,* 1).

12.   Maas, *Textual Criticism*, 1.

tendencies."[13] This study will perform textual criticism via these two methodological approaches.

### 3.2 *External Evidence*

The first type of evidence regarding textual criticism is the external evidence. This type of evidence is very important because "[o]ur knowledge of the text of the twenty-seven New Testament books is ultimately dependent on the manuscript copies that have a chance to survive."[14] Porter and Pitts suggest a three-fold series of steps for dealing with external evidence as follows.[15]

| | |
|---|---|
| Step 1 | Check the date of the witness and the date of the type of text that it embodies. |
| Step 2 | Check the geographical distribution of the witness that endorses a particular variant. |
| Step 3 | Check the genealogical relationship of texts and families. If the number of texts supporting a reading is large, but they all originate in the same type (or even the same earlier text), the evidence is weaker than if there were fewer manuscripts from several text-types or locations. |

Table 1. Three Steps regarding External Evidence

According to this model, this study will analyze the external evidence of several passages, focusing on date, geographic features, and geographical relationships. Thus, we can conclude that "the *strongest readings* will be the ones *supported by the oldest manuscripts representing the widest geographical spread and having no evident genealogical relationship*."[16]

The following table shows the date, text type, and area of the MSS concerning 7:20, 7:24, 7:25, 7:26, and 22:52.

---

13. Porter and Pitts, *Fundamentals*, 100 (emphases original, here and throughout).

14. Elliott, *The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles*, 14.

15. Porter and Pitts, *Fundamentals*, 104–8.

16. Porter and Pitts, *Fundamentals*, 108.

| MSS | Date | Text Type[17] | Area[18] |
|---|---|---|---|
| P75 | 2–3c | Alexandrian | Jabal Abu Mana |
| א | 4c | Alexandrian | the monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai |
| A | 5c | Byzantine (?)[19] Missing pagination | Alexandria |
| B | 4c | Alexandrian | disputed. 1. Egypt; 2. southern Italy; 3. Rome; 4. Caesarea |
| D | 5c | Western | disputed. 1. southern France; 2. northern Italy; 3. southern Italy |
| K | 9c | Byzantine | ? |
| L | 9c | Alexandrian | Egypt |
| T | 5c | Alexandrian | ? |
| W | 4/5c | Alexandrian or Byzantine[20] | ? |
| Γ | 10c | Byzantine | ? |
| Δ | 9c | Byzantine | ? |

17.   The text-type information is constructed from these sources: Porter and Pitts, *Fundamentals*, 75–78; cf. Porter, *How We Got the New Testament*, 57–64; Aland and Aland, *The Text*, 101–37; Metzger and Ehrman, *New Testament*, 58–91.

18.   Regarding the geographical distribution of the witnesses, the geographical aspect is generally associated with its origin; however, sometimes, it is not easy to fix it precisely. The area information is from Fredric Kenyon's *Handbook*, 48–103.

19.   As noted earlier, Porter and Pitts assess that A (02) has a vague text type (*Fundamentals*, 60), but Comfort regards A (02) as "a witness to the Byzantine text type in the Gospels" (Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, 79).

20.   According to Sanders, Comfort regards W (32) in Luke 1:1–8:12 as Alexandrian; however, he admits that the other parts of Gospels are considerably mixed with Byzantine, Alexandrian, Western, and Caesarean (*Encountering the Manuscripts*, 84). Porter and Pitts say W (032) seems to be mixed because it represents the earliest Byzantine text-type (*Fundamentals*, 60). Although Sanders suggested Luke 1:1–8:12 as following the Alexandrian text-type, it seems to be affected by the Byzantine considerably.

| Θ | 9c | Byzantine[21] | ? |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ξ | 6c | Byzantine | ? |
| Ψ | 9/10c | Byzantine[22] | Alexandria[23] |
| ƒ1 | 10–14c[24] | Caesarean | ? |
| ƒ13 | 11–15c[25] | Caesarean | ? |
| 0102 | 7c | ? | ? |
| 33. | 9c | ? | ? |
| 565. | 9c | ? | ? |
| 579. | 13c | Alexandrian | ? |
| 700. | 11c | ? | ? |
| 892. | 9c | Alexandrian | ? |
| 1241. | 12c | ? | ? |
| 1424. | 9/10 | Caesarean | ? |
| 2542. | 13c | ? | ? |

Table 2. Date, Text Type, and Area of Manuscripts

### 3.3 *Internal Evidence*

The second type of evidence regarding textual criticism is internal evidence, and it can be divided into two sets of criteria: transcriptional probabilities and intrinsic probabilities. Porter and Pitts explain this division as follows: "*Transcriptional probabili-*

---

21. Comfort regards Θ in Luke as Byzantine along with Matthew and John. He considers Θ in Mark as Caesarean (*Encountering the Manuscripts*, 85).

22. Ψ (044) is generally considered as Byzantine text although other types' influence (Western and Alexandrian) is found in Mark (Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, 86).

23. Kenyon, *Handbook*, 103. According to Kenyon, this is K. Lake's assertion.

24. The minuscule family ƒ1 includes the following minuscules: 1 (12c), 118 (13c), 131 (14c), 209 (14), 1582 (948), *et al*. See Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum*, 62*. 10c–14c is the average date agreed upon.

25. The minuscule family ƒ13 includes the following minuscules: 13 (13c), 69 (15c), 174 (1052), 230 (1013), 346 (12c), 828 (12c), et al. See Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum*, 62*. 11c–15c is the average date.

*ties* involve determining the probability of a variant-unit being due to established scribal tendencies. *Intrinsic probabilities* involve determinations of how likely a given variant-unit is in light of what an author is more likely to have written."[26] This study will focus on one aspect of intrinsic probabilities, that is, verbal aspect usage.

### 3.4 *Porter's Verbal Aspect Theory and Tense-Centered Verbal Understanding*

Since I will analyze the verbal-aspectual variants between TD8 and NA28 via Porter's verbal aspect theory, it will be helpful here to describe the approach in short. In his doctoral dissertation, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament*, Porter attempts a more appropriate grammatical model regarding verbal aspect than those offered in previous Greek verbal interpretations.[27] His results were reflected in his revised grammar book, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. This book shows us that, when a verb has a tense-form, it does not indicate a temporal meaning but an aspectual meaning (perfective aspect, imperfective aspect, or stative aspect); a selection of a particular tense-form by a New Testament author presents a perspective on an action. The three verbal aspects are linked to the three major tense-forms as in Table 3.[28]

---

26. Porter and Pitts, *Fundamentals*, 110.

27. This monograph was a revolutionary book, because before Porter's assertion, most scholars believed that Greek's verbal tense-form should be interpreted as tense itself. However, in this dissertation, Porter argues that their understanding of verbal tense-form has a lot of problems because there are so many examples which do not align with what might be supposed to be their grammatical frame. They have tried to explain these things as exceptions; however, Porter thinks that we should not regard these as exceptions but instead make a new paradigm (aspect-centered form) for understanding the Greek verbal system. These words show us his major assertion: "the category of synthetic verbal aspect—a morphologically-based semantic category which grammaticalizes the author/speaker's reasoned subjective choice of conception of a process—provides a suggestive and workable linguistic model for explaining the range of uses of the tense forms in Greek" (*Verbal Aspect*, xi).

28. Porter, *Idioms*, 21–22.

| Aspect Type | Tense-Form | The language user conceives of the action as... |
|---|---|---|
| Perfective | Aorist | a complete and undifferentiated process |
| Imperfective | Present/ Imperfect | being in progress |
| Stative | Perfect/ Pluperfect | reflecting a given (often complex) state of affairs |

Table 3. Rearrangement of Porter's Three Verbal Aspects

Porter elucidates three verbal aspects according to the extent of their markedness: the stative aspect is most weighted, the next is imperfective aspect, and the least weighted is the perfective aspect.[29] Porter's verbal aspectual framework can be used to examine the New Testament, "to see how the choice of verbal aspect is used by the author to shape the discourse and indicate a number of important features of the text."[30] In this sense, we can say that some aspectual choices contain greater "prominence" than others.[31] Due to such utility, Porter's verbal aspect theory can be used effectively for analyzing verbal-aspectual variants. As such, Porter's verbal aspect theory will be used as one of the internal methodologies in terms of selecting the more natural readings and understandings in context below.

In addition, Porter's verbal aspect theory also has another crucial facet in terms of the analysis of internal evidence along with external evidence. In *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament*, Porter reveals the transition of ancient Greek in terms of Homer, Plato, and Aristotle as follows: "Whereas the earliest Greek writers had a fundamental understanding of time, they took much longer to formulate a theory of temporality. They were slower yet in their formulations of grammatical theory."[32] For evidence of his assertion, Porter presents Dionysius Thrax (c. 120 BCE), known as the first Greek grammarian. Porter comments on Dionysius' grammar as follows: "Dionysius does

29. Porter, *Idioms*, 22.
30. Porter, "Discourse Function," 127.
31. Porter, "Prominence," 58–59.
32. Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 18.

not make clear whether his temporal categories correspond to particular verbal forms, though the forms he selects as labels seem to argue against this."[33] His framework of Greek verbs contains several connections among tense-forms: (1) present-imperfect; (2) perfect-pluperfect; (3) aorist-future.[34] Although Dionysius's explanation regarding the temporal features of Greek verbs was rather vague, his scheme seems clearly "temporally oriented,"[35] and it influenced later, tense-centered grammarians.

The other trend of Greek to compare with Dionysius is the "Stoic grammars." As Porter says, "the Stoics do not set out a purely temporal paradigm but work from tense-form oppositions, defining tenses according to both temporal distinctions and kind of action."[36] Uniquely, they regard the Present as "the present incomplete" and the Imperfect as "the past incomplete."[37] The relationship between the Present and the Imperfect can be found in the feature being "without complete."[38] Such relationship, centered on the action involved, extends to the Perfect and Pluperfect in terms of completed event. And the Aorist and the Future share the common feature of "indefiniteness,"[39] that is, a sort of state waiting for completion of a certain action. Although they did not reach a complete system and were not clear in defining grammatical terms,[40] the Stoic grammarians' collective

---

33. Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 19.

34. Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 19. These three divisions probably became the foundation of Porter's three-fold aspect system, that is, imperfective, stative, and perfective aspect.

35. Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 20.

36. Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 20. For example, N. E. Collinge comments, regarding the Stoics' understanding of Greek verbs, as follows. "The best defense of triadism here is the suggestion that the aorist and future lie outside the quadrant of 'presentive' tense/aspect values for independent reasons, the aorist by positive indifference or deliberate contradistinction and the future because it simply lacks all relevant temporal information." See "Greek References in Language Categories," 18.

37. Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 20.

38. Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 20.

39. Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 21.

40. Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 21.

work probably gives a hint as to the subsequent generations of grammarians in terms of a verbal scheme expressing action (regarding completion/incompletion/indefiniteness) with tense form. Porter assesses the combined influence and effect of Dionysius and the Stoics as follows: "their efforts at describing their own language were, unfortunately, rudimentary and even in places misleading."[41]

Concerning the Hellenistic age and its perception in the nineteenth century, there were several important scholars such as F. C. Scalinger, Samuel Clarke, and Jacob Harris.[42] And also around the nineteenth century, two branches of grammarians formed: 1. the heirs of Dionysius (J. N. Madvig [1873], K. W. Krüger [1861], W. E. Jelf [1851], et al.); 2. the heirs of the Stoics (P. Buttmann [1837, 1863], A. N. Jannaris [1897], et al.).[43] According to Porter, Madvig and Krüger both understand tense forms as "absolutely temporally based."[44] Jelf also supports a verbal scheme based on temporal relationships.[45] In contrast, "Buttmann identifies incomplete, momentary and resultive characters of the Present, Aorist and Perfect," "despite his temporal dependence for the Indicative."[46] Jannaris's verbal

---

41.  Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 22.

42.  Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 22.

43.  Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 23–24. The number in [] is the published year of their most important books. In chronological order, they are the following: P. Buttmann, *A Catalogue of Irregular Greek Verbs,* trans. J. R. Fishlake (London: John Murray, 1837) [1st ed. c. 1800]; P. Buttmann, *Griechische Grammatic*, 21st ed., ed. A. Buttmann (Berlin: Ferdinand Dümmler, 1863); W. E. Jelf, *A Grammar of the Greek Language Chiefly from the German of R. Kühner*, 2 vols., 2nd ed. (Oxford: James Henry Parker, 1851); K. W. Krüger, *Griechische Sprachlehre für Schulen* (Berlin: K. W. Krüger, 1861); J. N. Madvig, *Syntax of the Greek Language, Especially of the Attic Dialect,* trans. H. Browne, rev. T. K. Arnold, 2nd ed. (London: Rivingtons, 1873); A. N. Jannaris, *A Historical Greek Grammar Chiefly of the Attic Dialect* (London: Macmillan, 1879). See Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 501, 517, 519, 523.

44.  Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 23.

45.  Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 23.

46.  Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 24.

system "initially follows from a temporal view of verbal action" including non-indicative moods.[47]

Although there are more scholars who could represent these two groups, the above survey suffices for the present study regarding Tischendorf. My question is this: what sort of verbal understanding affects Tischendorf—a tense-centered scheme or a verbal aspect scheme? Although it is probably not easy to get the exact answer, we can speculate it with a crucial clue. Concerning Tischendorf's Greek verb understanding, we can consider the influence of his Greek teacher, Georg Winer.[48] In his Greek grammar book, *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Winer explains the meaning of the verbal tense-forms as follows.

> The *aorist* refers to *the past simply* (the simple occurrence of an event at some past time, considered as a momentary act), and is the ordinary tense of narration; the *imperfect* and the *pluperfect* always have *reference of time*, with the principal event (as relative tenses); and lastly, the *perfect* brings *the past into connexion with the present time*, and represents an action as a *completed* one, *in relation to the present time*.[49]

Via this comment, we can conclude Winer's Greek verbal understanding was thoroughly constructed in a tense-centered way. And it is probable that Winer's understanding of the Greek verbs affected Tischendorf. I expect that, via the following study, we can more evidently verify Tischendorf's Greek verbal understanding and how it affects his reading of the MSS.

3.5 *Overall Text Variant Analysis Framework*

The overall framework of presenting the variants suggested by Porter and Pitts is a three-fold model: (1) addition/omission; (2) substitution; (3) order/structure.[50] My modified model, based on the previous one, is as follows.

---

47.  Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 24.
48.  Porter, *Tischendorf*, 13.
49.  Winer, *Grammar,* 330–31 (italics mine).
50.  Porter and Pitts, *Fundamentals*, 84.

The first type of variant is an addition. The added part can be a word, phrase, or clause. If we divide the added part considering these elements, it can be expressed as follows: (1) adjective; (2) article; (3) noun; (4) particle (i.e., an adverb, conjunction, or preposition); (5) pronoun; (6) verb; and (7) phrase or clause.[51] Each of them will be marked accordingly as 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 1-5, 1-6, 1-7. The second type of variant, omission, will follow the same marking: 2-1, 2-2, 2-3, 2-4, 2-5, 2-6, 2-7.

The third type of variant is a substitution. It can be divided into four categories in terms of the characteristic patterns: (1) alteration of alphabet(s); (2) alteration of verbal aspect (perfective, imperfective, stative) or mood (indicative, subjunctive, optative, imperative); (3) alteration of voice, person, or number; (4) alteration of a word itself; and (5) alteration of word divisions (i.e. tokenization).[52] Each of them will be marked as 3-1, 3-2, 3-3, 3-4, 3-5.

The fourth type of variant is order/structure. It includes two cases: (1) alteration of word arrangement; and (2) alteration of sentence arrangement. Each of these will be marked as 4-1, 4-2.

The total number of these variant types is 21. As mentioned before, the datum point will be TD8, with its focus on א (01) and B (03). I will find variant parts between TD8 and NA28 by using the modified variant types.[53]

### 4. *Analyses of Variants between TD 8th and NA 28th*

The numerical result of the analysis of variants between TD8 and NA28 can be arranged as follows according to the divided sections.

---

51. This division came from the word class table of Porter, Reed, and O'Donnell. See *Greek*, xvi.

52. In the case of participles, 3-2 and 3-3 can be mixed.

53. There are several variants that this study does not deal with. First, the difference of marks such as period (.), comma (,), etc. will not be dealt with. Second, in the first part of one sentence, TD8 starts with the minuscule, but NA28 starts with the majuscule.

| Addition | Omission | Substitution | Order/Structure |
|----------|----------|--------------|-----------------|
| 80 | 84 | 216 | 41 |
| Total: 421 | | | |

Table 4. Frequencies of Variant Types

As we can see via this table, the most frequent type of variant in the comparison between TD8 and NA28 is substitution, followed by omission, addition, and order/structure. The more specific analytic result regarding substitution variants between TD8 and NA28 unfolds as follows.

| Substitution Analysis | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 3-1 | 3-2 | 3-3 | 3-4 | 3-5 |
| 124 | 23 | 18 | 40 | 11 |

Table 5. Frequencies of Substitution Types

In this table, the main interest in this study is focused on the part labeled "3-2." Among the 23 cases in 3-2, 14 cases are verbal-aspectual (or tense) variants (1:78; 5:2, 13; 7:20, 24, 25, 26, 38; 8:29; 9:49; 10:19; 11:50; 13:5; 22:52). Each case can be analyzed in terms of their verbal-aspectual differences as follows.

| Verse | TD8 | NA28 | Tense-form Variants |
|-------|-----|------|---------------------|
| 1:78 | ἐπεσκέψατο | ἐπισκέψεται | aorist / future of ἐπισκέπτομαι |
| 5:2 | ἔπλυναν | ἔπλυνον | aorist / imperfect of πλύνω |
| 5:13 | εἰπών | λέγων | aorist / present of λέγω |
| 7:20 | ἀπέσταλκεν | ἀπέστειλεν | *perfect / aorist* of ἀποστέλλω |
| 7:24 | ἐξεληλύθατε | ἐξήλθατε | *perfect / aorist* of ἐξέρχομαι |
| 7:25 | ἐξεληλύθατε | ἐξήλθατε | *perfect / aorist* of ἐξέρχομαι |
| 7:26 | ἐξεληλύθατε | ἐξήλθατε | *perfect / aorist* of ἐξέρχομαι |
| 7:38 | ἐξέμαξεν | ἐξέμασσεν | aorist / imperfect of ἐκμάσσω |
| 8:29 | παρήγγελλεν | παρήγγειλεν | imperfect / aorist of παραγγέλλω |
| 9:49 | ἐκωλύσαμεν | ἐκωλύομεν | aorist / imperfect of κωλύω |
| 10:19 | ἀδικήσει | ἀδικήσῃ | future / aorist of ἀδικέω |
| 11:50 | ἐκχυννόμενον | ἐκκεχυμένον | present / perfect of ἐκχέω |

| 13:5 | μετανοήσητε | μετανοῆτε | aorist / present of μετανοέω |
| 22:52 | ἐξεληλύθατε | ἐξήλθατε | *perfect / aorist* of ἐξέρχομαι |

Table 6. Tense-form Variants between TD8 and NA28

Among these, two instances have a difference between future and aorist tense-form (1:78; 10:19); four have a difference between aorist and imperfect tense-form (5:2; 7:38; 8:29; 9:49); one has a difference between present and perfect tense-form (11:50); and two have a difference between aorist and present tense-form (5:13; 13:5). The remaining five instances (in italic lettering) seem to have a more important issue in terms of verbal aspect theory: a difference between aorist and perfect tense-form (7:20, 24, 25, 26; 22:52). As mentioned above, according to Porter's verbal aspect theory, the perfect tense form has the stative aspect, and it can be regarded as the most prominent part intended by the author, but the aorist tense-form just has the perfective aspect, which is usually used within a narrative account, that is, without the apparent emphasis of the author. Interestingly, in these five instances of variation between TD8 and NA28, TD8 supports only perfect tense-form readings whereas NA28 supports only aorist tense-form readings. This study will explore these five variant passages to consider the external and internal evidence, with a view towards Porter's verbal aspect theory in particular. In this process, my focus will be concentrated on finding the reason why several witnesses (and Tischendorf) chose the perfect tense-form reading.

## 5. *Textual Criticism on Luke 7:20, 24, 26, 22:52*[54]

### 5.1 *Luke 7:20*
5.1.1 External Evidence. Step 1: Check the date of the witness and the date of the type of text that it embodies. The text

---

54.  For reference, the parallels of these passages in the Synoptic Gospels are as follows. Luke 7:20 has no parallel passage. Luke 7:24, 25, 26 are in parallel with Matt 11:7, 8, 9, but the latter has no textual variants. Luke 22:52 is in parallel with Matt 26:55 and Mark 14:48, but Matt and Mark have no textual variants. In the five instances, only Luke has textual variants.

witnesses supporting ἀπέσταλκεν and ἀπέστειλεν in Luke 7:20 can be presented in the following table.

| Text | The Witnesses of ἀπέσταλκεν (TD8) | The Witnesses of ἀπέστειλεν (NA28) |
|---|---|---|
| 7:20 | A D K L Γ Δ Θ Ξ Ψ 33. 565. 579. 700. 892. ƒ1 ƒ13 M[55] | P75 ℵ B W 0102 1241. 1424. |

Table 7. Witnesses of ἀπέσταλκεν and ἀπέστειλεν

The witnesses of ἀπέστειλεν include the early (4c) witnesses such as ℵ (01) and B (03). As mentioned before, ℵ (01) has been focused on by many scholars for several reasons: it contains the entire Christian Canon; it is also the earliest manuscript extant as a complete collection. Although B (03) does not have the entire NT, it shares the earliest age with ℵ (01) in this table. Overall, considering the early MSS (3–4c) such as P75, ℵ (01), and B (03), the reading ἀπέστειλεν probably has more weight than the reading of ἀπέσταλκεν.

Step 2: Check the geographical distribution of the witnesses that endorse a particular variant. The geographical information of B (03) is vague, and the cases of K (017) seem difficult to fix. D (05) is also disputed; however, its area can be broadly regarded as western. Concerning the geographical distribution of A (02), D (05), K (017), L (020), Ξ (040), Ψ (044), the witnesses of ἀπέσταλκεν would be stronger than those for ἀπέστειλεν since "consistency across a broad range of locales increases the probability that the agreement among manuscripts goes back to the original."[56]

Step 3: Check the genealogical relationships of texts and families. Considering step 3, it is important to find out which text is more supported by different text-types. The reading ἀπέσταλκεν is supported by all text-types, that is, Alexandrian,

---

55. This initial means *Majority text*, including the Byzantine (Syrian) text-type texts. See Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum*, 59*; Porter and Pitts, *Fundamentals*, 154. Aland and Aland present the age of Byzantine type majuscules as 9–17c and later.

56. Porter and Pitts, *Fundamentals*, 105.

Western, Caesarean and Byzantine, and thus it seems superior to the reading of ἀπέστειλεν. Nevertheless, when all three steps in the examination of external evidence are considered, including the age and support of the reliable MSS (P75 א B), ἀπέστειλεν can be regarded as superior to ἀπέσταλκεν. The internal evidence, especially as regards verbal-aspectual analysis, will be dealt with next.

5.1.2 Internal Evidence
A verbal-aspectual reading of Luke 7:20, including ἀπέστειλεν, can be presented as follows.[57]

| 7:20 | παραγενόμενοι δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἄνδρες εἶπαν· <br> Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστὴς <u>ἀπέστειλεν</u> ἡμᾶς πρὸς σὲ <br> <u>λέγων</u>· σὺ εἶ ὁ <u>ἐρχόμενος</u> ἢ ἄλλον <u>προσδοκῶμεν</u>. |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Table 8. Greek Text of Luke 7:20 (NA28)

The sentence including ἀπέστειλεν (aorist active) is not a narrative text but a spoken text of John's disciples. Via verbal aspect theory, we can understand that this sentence, Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστὴς ἀπέστειλεν ἡμᾶς πρὸς σὲ λέγων, functions as a "background" of the disciples' question. The tense can be understood as "past," but that is not the point of the author.[58] Of course, the fact that *John the Baptist* himself sent them can be meaningful in this context, but his "sending" itself is not the crucial point. The more important point is put in John's *wording* (λέγων; present participle) via the first usage of the imperfective aspect. And the following question is emphasized by additional uses of the imperfective aspect as a foreground: σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἢ ἄλλον προσδοκῶμεν ("Are you *the one who is to come*, or *shall*

57. The imperfective aspect is double-underlined, and the perfective aspect is underlined. Only the object of textual criticism and the imperfect aspect will be dealt with. The analyses of the remaining four passages (7:24, 25, 26; 22:52) will follow in the same way.

58. In the New Korean Revised Version (2004), ἀπέστειλεν is translated into 보내어. In English, it is close to the participle "sending." In other words, in this Korean version, the tense itself is not emphasized.

*we look for* another?). It seems natural to stress the two words, ἐρχόμενος (present participle) and προσδοκῶμεν (present active), since these probably reveal the object of waiting and their eagerness in waiting.[59] However, if we insert ἀπέσταλκεν (perfect active) instead of ἀπέστειλεν, the author's emphasis will be put not on "the main question" but on the "introduction" for the question. In addition, if so, the event of "sending" itself becomes more important than John's "wording." Thus, in this sense, ἀπέστειλεν is probably to be regarded as a superior reading over ἀπέσταλκεν.

If we focus, however, on a tense-centered verb understanding, the matter is more complex. The typical examples of translation of Luke 7:20 regarding the reading of ἀπέσταλκεν and ἀπέστειλεν are as follows.

| Version | Translation |
|---------|-------------|
| NIV (cf. NA28) | When the men came to Jesus, they said, "<u>John the Baptist *sent* us to you to ask</u>, 'Are you the one who is to come, or should we expect someone else?'" |
| Davidson's Translation for TD8 | And the men came unto him, and said, <u>John the Baptist *has sent* us unto thee</u>, saying, Art thou the coming one, or must we look for another?[60] |

Table 9. Translation Comparison of NIV (NA28) and
Davidson's Translation for TD8

The NIV translates the aorist verb ἀπέστειλεν into "sent." And Davidson translates the perfect verb ἀπέσταλκεν as "has sent" in the light of a tense-centered viewpoint. However, it needs to be noticed that many translated Bible versions (e.g. RSV, NRSV, NASV, NAV, etc.) translate ἀπέστειλεν into the perfect verb form, that is, "has sent," since this translation looks more natural to the contextual stream. In other words, in English when we say something to other people about a fact not far/long from now, it is probably more appropriate to use the perfect tense than the

---

59. In John's question, we can sense his eagerness like this: "I will wait until I meet the one who is to come."
60. Tischendorf, *New Testament*, 113.

aorist tense.[61] In this sense, the original form was probably ἀπέστειλεν since it is not easy to assume the transformation from the natural reading to the unnatural reading. As mentioned above (footnote 50), Tischendorf was probably influenced by his Greek teacher (Winer). If Tischendorf had his Greek verbal knowledge centered on tense,[62] he probably has thought that it would be better to read as the perfect tense-form (ἀπέσταλκεν) than the aorist tense-form (ἀπέστειλεν), even though it is not supported by important MSS like ℵ (01), B (03). In this sense, Colwell's assessment of Tischendorf's emphasis on internal evidence seems persuasive.

### 5.2 *Luke 7:24 / 7:25 / 7:26*

The analyses of external and internal evidence regarding Luke 7:24, 25, 26 will be dealt with together since their variants are equivalent (ἐξεληλύθατε, ἐξήλθατε) although they have different text witnesses. Many of the materials in the previous analysis on Luke 7:20 will be used here and thus omitted from further comment.

---

61.   Here we have an example of an author not using the aorist tense form just for tense-centered meaning. In order to solve this problem, Atkinson asserts that the aorist-form verb can include perfect-tense meaning (*Greek Language*, 144), though this does not seem a solution.

62.   In his Greek grammar book published in 1846, Raphael Kühner deals with the perfect tense-form verb with a tense-centered understanding. See *Elementary Grammar*, 74–82. He lived and worked in a similar period as Tischendorf, thus Kühner may have affected Tischendorf. For reference, Herbert Lederer explains that German past tense describes "an event or a situation which took place entirely in the past and has no direct relation to the present" (*Reference Grammar*, 93). In comparison, the German present perfect tense form can describe the following four cases: (1) a situation which ended at or just before the beginning of the present; (2) a situation which began in the past and continues in the present; (3) the customary conversational form for past events, especially in colloquial usage; (4) a situation that will end at a given time in the future (*Reference Grammar*, 94–95). In terms of a tense-centered Greek/German understanding, Tischendorf's understanding of Luke 7:20 may be the first, and it has a similar aspect with the perfect-tense usage of 22:52.

5.2.1 External Evidence. Step 1: Check the date of the witness and the date of the type of text that it embodies. The witnesses supporting ἐξεληλύθατε and ἐξήλθατε in Luke 7:24, 25, 26 can be presented in the following table.

| Text | The Witnesses of ἐξεληλύθατε (TD8) | The Witnesses of ἐξήλθατε (NA28) |
|------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 7:24 | Γ Δ Θ Ψ 33. 700. M | P75vid ℵ A B D K L W Ξ ƒ1 ƒ13 565. 579. 892. 1241. 1424. 2542 |
| 7:25 | Γ Δ Θ Ψ M | P75vid ℵ A B D K L W Ξ ƒ1 ƒ13 33. 565. 579. 700. 892. 1241. 1424. 2542 |
| 7:26 | A K W Γ Δ Θ Ψ 33. 700. 2542. M | P75 ℵ B D L Ξ ƒ1 ƒ13 565. 579. 892. 1241. 1424 |

Table 10. Analysis of the Witnesses of ἐξεληλύθατε and
ἐξήλθατε in Luke 7:24, 25, 26

Since 7:24, 25, 26 share common text witnesses, we can use the above table to analyze dates for all three verses. Although 7:26 has three early text witnesses such as A (02), K (017), and W (032), the age of the text witnesses having ἐξήλθατε in 7:24, 25, 26 is superior to those of ἐξεληλύθατε.

Step 2: Check the geographical distribution of the witnesses that endorse a particular variant. Except for the insertion of 33 and 700 in Luke 7:24, vv. 24 and 25 share the same MSS. The geographical distribution of the witnesses of ἐξήλθατε in these two verses (P75vid ℵ A B D K L) is much superior to that of the witnesses of ἐξεληλύθατε, since the latter witnesses have scarcely any accessible information for the area. There are more witnesses of ἐξεληλύθατε in v. 26 (A K W 2542.); however, the witnesses of ἐξήλθατε (P75 ℵ B D L) are still stronger than the former in terms of the geographical dimension. Thus 7:26 probably has the same result as with 7:24, 25.

Step 3: Check the genealogical relationships of texts and families. The reading ἐξήλθατε in 7:24, 25 is supported by all text-types, that is, the Alexandrian, Western, Caesarean, and Byzantine, thus it seems superior to the reading of ἐξεληλύθατε which is only supported by the Byzantine. Therefore, concerning the age, geographical, and genealogical features, ἐξήλθατε in

7:24, 25 is likely superior to ἐξεληλύθατε. There are two Byzantine witnesses of ἐξεληλύθατε in v. 26 in A (02) and K (017); however, the reading probably cannot overcome the strong witnesses of ἐξήλθατε, including the Alexandrian, Western, and Caesarean. Thus, concerning age, geographical, and genealogical features, ἐξήλθατε seems preferable to ἐξεληλύθατε.

Before going on to the internal evidence analysis, let us consider the variants in the light of verbal aspect theory.[63] The distribution of text witnesses for these three verses varies considerably. The manuscripts that use a consist verbal form across all three verses are as follows: (1) ἐξεληλύθατε: Γ Δ Θ Ψ; (2) ἐξήλθατε: P75(vid) ℵ B D L Ξ ƒ1 ƒ13 565. 579. 892. 1241. 1424. By comparison, A (02), K (017), W (032), 33, 700, and 2542 contain different forms. A (02), K (017), W (032), and 2542 contain two aorist tense-forms (7:24, 25) and one perfect tense-form (7:26), but 33 and 700 contain two perfect tense-forms (7:24, 26) and one aorist tense-form (7:25).

Focusing on the relatively early MSS A (02) and W (032), which contain a perfect tense-form with an aorist tense-form, we can formulate the following question: Why did A (02) and W (032) not sustain the same tense across all three verbs? Did they receive this trend from another previous manuscript, or change it by themselves? It is an enigmatic question, but we can perhaps assume the reason regarding such changes based on the previous observation regarding the influence of a time-centered Greek understanding. The aorist reading sustained until 2–4c by P75, ℵ (01), and A (02) might have been changed in 4–5c by W (032) and A (02) or another manuscript.[64] If so, probably the reason is that the aorist reading felt unnatural due to their time-centered verbal understanding.[65] If the given change was started by A (02)

---

63. This external evidence analysis centered on verbal aspect is omitted in the external analysis on 7:20 and 22:52 since they share very similar trend with 7:26.

64. It is possible that such a reading was formed by an undiscovered manuscript in 4–5c.

65. If we analyze the aorist verb with a verbal aspect scheme, the verb

or W (032), we could call it a *transition period* due to the mixed reading (aorist and perfect). In the reading of A (02) and W (032), it seems significant that only the last verb (ἐξεληλύθατε in 7:26) has a perfect tense-form, unlike the preceding verbs (ἐξήλθατε in 7:24, 25). Possibly they changed the last verb's tense form due to the awkwardness of the preceding verbs, on purpose.[66] This new reading then possibly affected the later MSS, reflected as two perfect readings (33, 700) and three perfect readings (Γ Δ Θ Ψ).[67]

5.2.2 Internal Evidence

The verbal-aspectual reading of Luke 7:24, 25, 26, ἐξήλθατε included, can be presented as follows.

| | |
|---|---|
| 7:24 | Ἀπελθόντων δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων Ἰωάννου ἤρξατο λέγειν πρὸς τοὺς ὄχλους περὶ Ἰωάννου· <br> τί ἐξήλθατε εἰς τὴν ἔρημον θεάσασθαι; <br> κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου σαλευόμενον; |
| 7:25 | ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθατε ἰδεῖν; <br> ἄνθρωπον ἐν μαλακοῖς ἱματίοις ἠμφιεσμένον;[68] <br> ἰδοὺ οἱ ἐν ἱματισμῷ ἐνδόξῳ καὶ τρυφῇ ὑπάρχοντες ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις εἰσίν. |
| 7:26 | ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθατε ἰδεῖν; <br> προφήτην; <br> ναὶ λέγω ὑμῖν, <br> καὶ περισσότερον προφήτου. |

can be understood as a normal narrative without unique emphasis. However, if one observes it with a tense-centered scheme, it might feel a bit awkward in comparison with the perfect tense verb.

66. The omission of the article, or the changing order, can be regarded as the scribe's mistake; however, a changing verbal tense-form cannot be considered a mistake without intention, because it reflects not only changing the number of letters but also considerable change to the letters themselves.

67. The reason that the comparatively later MSS such as K (9c) and 2542 (13c) have the same pattern as A (02) and W (032) is probably that they follow the reading tradition of A (02) or W (032).

68. This perfect tense-form usage is highlighted by underline and overline for discrimination due to the stative aspect.

Table 11. Greek Text of Luke 7:24, 25, 26 (NA28)

The three passages including ἐξήλθατε (aorist active), are quotations, as was 7:20, but these are all Jesus' words. After giving an answer to John via the core elements of his ministry reflecting on Luke 4:18 (esp. "good news to the poor" and "recovery of sight to the blind"), Jesus supplies three similar questions: τί ἐξήλθατε εἰς τὴν ἔρημον θεάσασθαι; (what did you go out into the wilderness to look at?), τί ἐξήλθατε ἰδεῖν; (what did you go out to see?) (x2). Like the previous case of 7:20, this question itself probably has no special emphasis. It seems a sort of rhetorical question, expecting the audience's answer, not just an answer from those in the narrative. The important elements are the following examples: (1) a reed shaken by the wind; (2) a man clothed in soft garments; (3) a prophet, more than a prophet. These are stressed by the following four verbal words used for the answers: σαλευόμενον (present participle), ἠμφιεσμένον (perfect participle), ὑπάρχοντες (present participle), and λέγω (present indicative). The most important emphasis is probably given to the last indicative word, that is, λέγω. If people go to the wilderness, they go there not for seeing a reed shaken meaninglessly or for seeing a pretentious millionaire, but for seeing a shabby, genuine prophet, John. Considering two emphases in 7:25 via stative and imperfect aspect usage, possibly Jesus' message regarding "good news to the poor" (4:18; 7:22) is meant to receive special emphasis. However, if ἐξεληλύθατε is inserted instead of ἐξήλθατε, the author's most vivid stress will be situated in the rhetorical questions rather than on Jesus' message itself.

However, like the instance in 7:20, if we employ a tense-centered verb understanding, the matter becomes more complicated. The representative examples of translation for Luke 7:24, 25, 26 regarding the readings ἐξήλθατε and ἐξεληλύθατε are as follows.

| Version | Translation |
|---------|-------------|
| NRSV (cf. NA28) | 24 When John's messengers had gone, Jesus began to speak to the crowds about John: "What *did you go out* into the wilderness to look at? A reed shaken by the wind? 25 What then *did you go out* to see? Someone dressed in soft robes? Look, those who put on fine clothing and live in luxury are in royal palaces. 26 What then *did you go out* to see? A prophet? Yes, I tell you, and more than a prophet." |
| Davidson's Translation for TD8 | 24 And when the messengers of John departed, he began to say unto the multitudes concerning John, What *have ye gone out* into the wilderness to behold? a reed shaken with the wind? 25 But what *have ye gone out* to see? a man clothed in soft garments? Behold, they who are gorgeously appareled and live delicately, are in king's palaces. 26 But what *have ye gone out* to see? A prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and more than a prophet.[69] |

Table 12. Translation Comparison of NRSV (NA28) and
Davidson's Translation for TD8

Unlike the former instance (7:20), many Bible translations follow the NRSV (e.g. RSV, NASV, NAB, NIV, etc.). They all translate ἐξήλθατε into "did you go out." Of course, Davidson translates ἐξεληλύθατε into "have ye (you) gone out." However, interestingly, we can find several German translations following Davidson's translation, such as the Zücker Bible (2008) and Einheitsübersetzung der Heiligen Schrift (1980).[70] Thus either rendering is possible in light of the tense-centered reading. However, we need to find the reason why Tischendorf chose ἐξεληλύθατε even though important MSS such as (01) ℵ, B (03), and D (05) support ἐξήλθατε. As stated above (footnote 50), Tischendorf was probably influenced by Winer. Among the German verbal understandings (footnote 62), Tischendorf possibly preferred the perfect reading in terms of "a situation

---

69. Tischendorf, *New Testament*, 114.

70. Their translations for τί ἐξήλθατε ἰδεῖν are as follows: (1) Zücker Bible: *was habt ihr zu sehen gehofft* (Lk 7:25); (2) Einheitsübersetzung der Heiligen Schrift: *was habt ihr sehen wollen*.

which began in the past and continues in the present" with a tense-centered understanding of Greek.

### 5.3 *Luke 22:52*

The variants of Luke 22:52 are ἐξήλθατε and ἐξεληλύθατε, much like Luke 7:24, 25, 26. However, I deal with it separately due to its different context.

5.3.1 External Evidence. Step 1: Check the date of the witness and the date of the type of text that it embodies. Luke 22:52 includes the same words as with 7:24, 25, 26, that is, ἐξεληλύθατε and ἐξήλθατε. The witnesses supporting these two words in Luke 22:52 are presented in Table 13.

| Text | The Witnesses of ἐξεληλύθατε (TD8) | The Witnesses of ἐξήλθατε (NA28) |
|---|---|---|
| 22:52 | A W Γ Δ 565. 700. M | P75 ℵ B D L T etc.[71] |

Table 13. Analysis of the Witnesses for ἐξεληλύθατε and ἐξήλθατε in Luke 22:52

Although there are not many MSS, the textual variant of 22:52 is very similar to 7:26, centered on the majuscules. To be more specific, with the exception of 565, 22:52 has the same major MSS as 7:26 (A W Γ Δ + 700.), and except for T (029), it includes the same crucial witnesses as 7:26 (P75 ℵ B D L). Therefore, we can conclude that the analysis of external evidence of 22:52 is equivalent to 7:26: concerning the age, geographical features, and genealogical features, ἐξήλθατε is likely superior to ἐξεληλύθατε.

Step 2: Check the geographical distribution of the witnesses that endorse a particular variant. Except for some omissions (K Θ Ξ Ψ *f*1 *f*13 33. 579. 892. 1241. 1424. 2542.), addition (T), and transmission of 700 (ἐξήλθατε→ἐξεληλύθατε), 22:52 shares the same MSS with 7:26. Like the case of 7:26, the witnesses of

---

71. NA28 does not mention the text witness of ἐξήλθατε. Concerning this analysis, see Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 698; Comfort and Barrett, eds., *The Complete Text*, 549.

ἐξήλθατε (P75 א B D L) are stronger than the former in terms of their geographical distribution.

Step 3: Check the genealogical relationships of texts and families. Luke 22:52 has several Byzantine witnesses of ἐξεληλύθατε, including A (02); however, they probably cannot defeat the strong witnesses of ἐξήλθατε, including the Alexandrian and Western witnesses. Thus, concerning age, geographical, and genealogical features, ἐξήλθατε seems preferable to ἐξεληλύθατε.

5.3.2 Internal Evidence
A verbal-aspectual reading of Luke 22:52, 53, ἐξήλθατε included, can be presented as follows.

| 22:52 | Εἶπεν δὲ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς τοὺς παραγενομένους ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ στρατηγοὺς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ πρεσβυτέρους· ὡς ἐπὶ λῃστὴν <u>ἐξήλθατε</u> μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων; |
|---|---|
| 22:53 | καθ' ἡμέραν <u>ὄντος</u> μου μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ οὐκ ἐξετείνατε τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' ἐμέ, ἀλλ' αὕτη <u>ἐστὶν</u> ὑμῶν ἡ ὥρα καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους. |

Table 14. Greek Text of Luke 22:52–53 (NA28)

Here 22:52 represents Jesus' speech just like 7:24, 25, 26. After explanation of two aorist verbs in εἶπεν (aorist narrative) and παραγενομένους (aorist participle), Jesus asks this question: ὡς ἐπὶ λῃστὴν ἐξεληλύθατε μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων· 'Have you come out as against a robber, with swords and clubs?' Like the previous instances in 7:20, 24, 25, 26, this question itself probably has no special stress. It seems just a report regarding the circumstances. Of course, considering Jesus' wording ὡς ἐπὶ λῃστήν (as against a robber), it can carry the meaning of objurgation, but it is difficult to find his stress here. Jesus' crucial point is revealed in the following passage (22:53). Via this wording, Jesus reveals his will to follow God's plan; then he walks the way of suffering (22:54ff.). Likewise, the evident emphasis is situated not in 22:52 but in 22:53. However, if ἐξεληλύθατε is inserted instead of ἐξήλθατε, the emphasis will be situated in the event report rather than on Jesus' obedience.

The representative examples of translation of Luke 22:52 regarding the reading of ἐξήλθατε and ἐξεληλύθατε are as follows.

| Version | Translation |
|---------|-------------|
| NRSV (cf. NA28) | Then Jesus said to the chief priests, the officers of the temple police, and the elders who had come for him, "*Have you come out* with swords and clubs as if I were a bandit?" |
| Davidson's Translation for TD8 | And Jesus said unto the chief priests, and captains of the temple, and elders who came to him Ye *have come out*, as against a robber, with swords and staves:[72] |

Table 15. Translation Comparison of NRSV (NA28) and
Davidson's Translation for TD8

The comparative analysis of the translation of 22:52 in terms of the verbal tense-form is very similar to that of 7:20. The only difference is that we could find one translation based on the aorist tense-form in the previous case of 7:20 (NIV); however, it is hard to find one example like that in the translations of 22:52. The NIV, RSV, NRSV, and NASV all follow the perfect tense-form (i.e., "have come out"). As it makes for a natural and smooth translation, many later MSS and Tischendorf himself chose this reading. As mentioned above (footnote 50), it is probable that Tischendorf was influenced by his teacher (Winer). Because of the similarity of analysis between 7:20 and 22:52, I will not attempt a detailed discussion about the verbal-aspectual issue with 22:52.

## 6. *Conclusion*

Among 421 variants revealed from a comparative analysis between TD8 and NA28, I have attempted textual criticism for five tense-form variants (7:20, 24, 25, 26; 22:52) in terms of verbal aspect theory. First, concerning age, geographical features, and genealogical features, the aorist readings (ἀπέστειλεν, ἐξήλθατε) can probably be regarded as superior to the perfect readings (ἀπέσταλκεν, ἐξεληλύθατε). Second,

---

72.  Tischendorf, *New Testament*, 152.

considering the internal evidence revealed via verbal aspect theory, the aorist readings have more weight than the perfect readings. Regarding the reason why Tischendorf chose the perfect tense-form reading even though important MSS (e.g., P75 ℵ B) support the aorist reading, I suggest that, via Winer who was Tischendorf's teacher, he had a tense-centered Greek understanding, and thus he focused on the internal evidence in terms of a tense-centered reading. Via this study, I have begun to realize the need for, and meaning of, verbal aspect theory for textual criticism. More study with regard to this subject should be undertaken in the future concerning this and other NT texts where such comparative analysis can be similarly revealing.

## *Bibliography*

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. Leiden: Brill, 1989.

Atkinson, B. F. C. *The Greek Language*. 2nd ed. London: Faber & Faber, 1933.

Collinge, N. E. "Greek (and Some Roman) Preferences in Language Categories." In *Studies in the History of Western Linguistics in Honour of R. H. Robins*, edited by Theodora Bynon et al., 11–22. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Colwell, Ernest C. *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. NTTS 9. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969.

Comfort, Philip W. *Encountering the Manuscripts: An Introduction to New Testament Paleography and Textual Criticism*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2005.

Comfort, Philip W., and David P. Barrett, eds. *The Complete Text of the Earliest New Testament Manuscripts*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999.

Elliott, J. K. *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles*. NovTSup 137. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Epp, E. J. "The Papyrus Manuscripts of the New Testament." In *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*, edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 1–39. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Kenyon, Fredric G. *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. New York: Macmillan, 1901.

Kühner, Raphael. *Elementary Grammar of the Greek Language*. Translated by Samuel H. Taylor. London: Wiley & Putnam, 1846.

Lederer, Herbert, ed. *Reference Grammar of the German Language*. Based on *Grammatic Der Deutschen Sprache* by Dora Schulz Goethe Institute, Munich and Heinz Griesbach Bad Reichenhall. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969.

Maas, Paul. *Textual Criticism*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1958.

Metzger, B. M., and B. D. Ehrman. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Parker, D. C. *New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Porter, Stanley E. *Constantine Tischendorf: The Life and Work of a 19th Century Bible Hunter Including Constantine Tischendorf's When Were Our Gospels Written?* London: Bloomsbury T. & T. Clark, 2015.

———. *How We Got the New Testament: Text, Transmission, Translation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013.

———. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Biblical Languages Greek 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.

———. "Prominence: An Overview." In *The Linguist as Pedagogue: Trends in the Teaching and Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Matthew Brook O'Donnell, 45–74. NTM 11. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.

———. *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood.* SBG 1. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.

Porter, Stanley E., and Andrew W. Pitts. *Fundamentals of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.

Porter, Stanley E., et al. *Fundamentals of New Testament Greek*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Tischendorf, C. *The New Testament: Translated from the Critical Text of von Tischendorf; with an Introduction on the Criticism, Translation, and Interpretation of the Book.* Translated by Samuel Davidson. 2nd ed. London: Henry S. King, 1976.

———. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Vol 1. Repr., Graz: Akademische Druck, 1965.

Winer, Georg B. *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek, regarded as a Sure Basis for New Testament Exegesis*. Translated by W. F. Moulton. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1877.