

Cornelia Mayer / Peter Arzt-Grabner (eds)

Galatians

Papyrologische Kommentare
zum Neuen Testament

Galatians

Papyrologische Kommentare zum Neuen Testament

Edited by

Peter Arzt-Grabner (*Salzburg*)
John S. Kloppenborg (*Toronto*)
and Mauro Pesce (*Bologna*)

VOLUME 5

Galatians

Edited by

Cornelia Mayer and Peter Arzt-Grabner

VANDENHOECK & RUPRECHT

ISBN 978-3-525-50278-5

ISBN 978-3-647-50278-6 (PDF)

ISBN 978-3-666-50278-1 (ELIBRARY)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666502781>

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <https://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2026 Brill Deutschland GmbH, Robert-Bosch-Breite 10, 37079 Göttingen, Deutschland

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher. Text and datamining for commercial purposes requires the publisher's permission.

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht and Brill Deutschland GmbH are part of De Gruyter Brill.
www.degruyterbrill.com

Questions about General Product Safety Regulation: productsafety@degruyterbrill.com

Printing: Elanders Waiblingen, Waiblingen

Contents

	Preface	VII
	Abbreviations	IX
	Introduction	1
	<i>Peter Arzt-Grabner and Cornelia Mayer</i>	
1	The Role of Artistic Judgement in Translation	8
	<i>Emily Williamson</i>	
2	Whispers of the Past: Languages and Literacy in Galatia	22
	<i>Aubrey Martin</i>	
3	Galatians as a Letter	42
	<i>Peter Arzt-Grabner</i>	
4	Family Terminology in Paul's Letter to the Galatians and Its Metaphorical Use	87
	<i>Marianna Thoma</i>	
5	True Words about False Teachers: Using Documentary Papyri to Understand Paul's Language about His Galatian Opponents	111
	<i>Michael Dormandy</i>	
6	"We Who Are Jews by Nature" (Gal 2:15): The Papyrological Context of Ἰουδαῖος and Ἰουδαϊκός in Galatians	134
	<i>Dorota Hartman</i>	
7	The "Proscribed" Christ: A Re-evaluation of Gal 3:1	165
	<i>Fabrizio Marcello</i>	
8	Could It Be Magic? Curses and Magical Metaphors in Galatians	181
	<i>Cornelia Mayer</i>	
9	Gal 3:15 and the Revocation of Wills in First- and Second-Century Roman Egypt as Attested in the Papyri	216
	<i>Maria Nowak</i>	

- 10 Heirs According to Promise: The Mechanics of Inheritance in the
Documentary Papyri and in Galatians 229
John K. Goodrich
 - 11 God's Adopted Slaves: Paul's Metaphor on the Transition from Slavery to
Sonship in Papyrological Perspective 251
Afetame Alabi
 - 12 The Deeper Meaning of Paul's "Birth Pangs" (Gal 4:19) 277
Astrid Wimmer
 - 13 The Burden of Love (Gal 6:2): Some Papyrological Insights 290
Fabrizio Marcello
 - 14 The Use of a Secretary and Paul's Handwriting 302
Peter Arzt-Grabner
 - 15 Some Notes on the Material Features of the Greek Papyri and Parchments
of Galatians 316
Marco Stroppa
- Bibliography 337
Glossary 383
Index 385

Preface

When I first started engaging with papyri, I had just finished writing a philosophy thesis which addressed Ludwig Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Investigations*. This work had started to impact not only my philosophical beliefs but the way I approached life. In the *Investigations*, the core of Wittgenstein's late work, he famously dispenses with the logical rigidity of his early work and ingeniously leads the reader to fundamental insights about language and thought. While this is not the place to go into detail, one of Wittgenstein's core conclusions is captured by the slogan *Meaning is Use*, which I believe to this day. Wittgenstein argued that language is inherently social—hence the impossibility of a private language—and thus to reveal the meaning of an expression, we must look at the way this expression is used by a linguistic community.

Drawing conclusions about the New Testament from the way people actually spoke (or rather wrote) at the time is the main focus of the PKNT series. Nothing could have made more sense to me against my Wittgensteinian background. Of course, scholars want to discover facts about the intended meanings of New Testament authors. But arguably today's linguistic community is not the same as that of Paul and others. So, what better way to investigate the meaning of the expressions Paul uses than to investigate the use of those expressions in his linguistic community, broadly construed? And papyri provide one of the best available means to gain insight into the linguistic community that New Testament authors were a part of.

Since these early stages of the project, a lot has happened. A lot of hours were spent behind books and screens, a lot of espressos drunk, and a lot of heated debates were had, both in person as well as on Zoom, for the pandemic hit us pretty quickly. Amidst the chaos, we realized—at this point years into the project—that the volume's structure needed to be changed dramatically, or else we weren't going to have a book we could stand behind. Things looked bleak. We needed a plan B, and the idea was born to organize an international meeting on Galatians and publish the papers presented by scholars from both papyrology and New Testament studies. The detailed discussions that followed these presentations, conducted in an atmosphere of mutual respect, were incorporated into articles. It is the collection of these articles that we proudly present today.

As goes for any longer project, of course none of this would have been possible without the support of a variety of people. We are very grateful to the Austrian Science Fund FWF for funding this project in the first place but even more so for continuing to believe in it even after the dramatic shift just mentioned. The opportunity to finance the aforementioned conference from the project budget was a tremendous support in bringing the project to a conclusion in what we believe to

be an even more valuable form. Similarly, all contributors to this volume demonstrated not only their expertise but also flexibility and enthusiasm in enabling said shift. Members of Salzburg's Department of Biblical Studies and Ecclesiastical History deserve our warm thanks, especially Dietmar W. Winkler, Christine Hofer-Ranftl, Kathrin Innerberger, Waltraud Winkler, and Claudia Aigner. Aubrey Martin's and Astrid Wimmer's work behind the scenes has been invaluable. Emily Williamson not only lent us thorough support proof-reading our English but also personally made my time in Salzburg so much more enjoyable, with evening hikes and gyozas. However, I am most indebted to my co-editor Peter Arzt-Grabner, who fostered my passion for scientific research from the very beginning, continuously pushed me to improve, and simply always had my back – I still remember vividly one cold afternoon in January 2022, two days before my PhD applications in the US were due. I was deeply worried, because I had been waiting for months to receive a philosophy professor's letter of recommendation, and so I decided to reach out to Peter. Within that same afternoon, he informed me the schools had received his recommendation letter.

This project has seen my development from the philosophy bachelor's student to the PhD candidate, and I am convinced I have become a better researcher through it. Thank you, Peter, and everyone else who made this possible.

Cornelia Mayer

Thanksgiving 2025

Abbreviations

Papyrological and Epigraphical Abbreviations

Abbreviations of papyrological editions follow J. F. Oates et al., eds. 2001, *Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*, 5th ed., BASPSup 9 (Oakville: Oxbow), online version: Joshua D. Sosin et al., eds., *Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic, and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca, and Tablets*: papyri.info/docs/checklist. Epigraphical abbreviations follow those of *GrEpiAbbr* (*List of Abbreviations of Editions and Works of Reference for Alphabetic Greek Epigraphy* (available online at <https://aiegl.org/grepiabbr.html>).

Abbreviations used in this volume but not yet entered into the lists mentioned are:

- P.Erbststreit* (2017) Vandorpe, Katelijjn, and Sven P. Vleeming. *The Erbstreit Papyri: A Bilingual Dossier from Pathyris of the Second Century BC*. *Studia Demotica* 13. Leuven: Peeters, 2017.
- PNT* 1 Arzt-Grabner, Peter, John S. Kloppenborg, and Christina M. Kreinecker. *More Light from the Ancient East: Understanding the New Testament through Papyri*. With a contribution by Gregg Schwendner. *Papyri and the New Testament* 1. Paderborn: Brill Schöningh, 2023.
- PNT* 2 Arzt-Grabner, Peter. *Letters and Letter Writing*. *Papyri and the New Testament* 2. Paderborn: Brill Schöningh, 2023.
- T.Audollent* Audollent, Auguste. *Defixionum tabellae quotquot innotuerunt tam in Graecis Orientis quam in totius Occidentis partibus praeter Atticas in Corpore inscriptionum Atticarum editas*. Paris: Fontemoing, 1904. Repr., Frankfurt a. M.: Minerva 1967.
- T.Dana* Dana, Madalina. *La correspondance grecque privée sur plomb et sur tesson: Corpus épigraphique et commentaire historique*. *Vestigia: Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte* 73. Munich: Beck, 2021.
- TheDefix* *Thesaurus Defixionum*: thedefix.uni-hamburg.de.

Other Ancient Texts

Biblical texts and Pseudepigrapha as well as works of Greek and Latin authors are abbreviated in accordance with *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Biblical Studies and Related Disciplines* 2014, 2nd ed. (Atlanta, GA: SBL Press), 4.1.8 and 8.3.1–4 and 8.3.14.

Introduction

Peter Arzt-Grabner and Cornelia Mayer

Outline of This Volume

The first four volumes of the series *Papyrologische Kommentare zum Neuen Testament* (PKNT) were structured along the lines of traditional commentaries (i.e., with an introduction, several excursuses, and, for the most part, a verse-by-verse and word-by-word commentary). However, the editors of the series have long been aware that it would not be expedient to devote every future volume to a single writing of the New Testament and simply work through the entire text verse by verse and word by word. Otherwise, the terms to be dealt with would be repeated more and more frequently, and the various genres would have been covered within a short period of time.

Right at the start of the series, it was the brilliant idea of Arndt Ruprecht, who was responsible for the entire biblical program at Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht at the time, not to use the singular form “Kommentar” (commentary) in the title of the series but rather the plural “Kommentare” (commentaries),¹ in order to express that the publisher and editors are free to decide how they want to structure the series and its volumes. As regards the program on the Gospels, for example, special volumes on *Miracle Stories*, *Parables*, or the *Passion Narratives* are already in preparation.² In other words, the format of the PKNT series is not limited to volumes dealing with the continuous text of a single New Testament writing but has been expanded to include volumes dealing only with one or several sections of a New Testament writing or with subjects and genres relevant to several texts.³

Galatians is, in this sense, only the first of several volumes in the PKNT series that, while devoted to an entire New Testament writing, do not contain a continuous verse-by-verse and word-by-word commentary but rather a collection of contributions on topics and passages for which the background and context of documentary papyri is particularly fruitful. As such, the volume contains the contributions from the international conference *Documentary Papyri and Paul's Letter to the Galatians*, which was held at the University of Salzburg (20–21 July 2023), as well as a few additional articles.

¹ Contrary to the established tradition to use the singular; cf., e.g., *International Critical Commentary* (ICC), *New International Greek Testament Commentary* (NIGTC).

² A regularly updated list of forthcoming volumes can be found at <https://www.plus.ac.at/bibelwissenschaft-und-kirchengeschichte/forschung/publikationen/pknt/>.

³ With volume 5 (Williams, *Secretaries in Ancient Letter Writing*), the series includes the first volume devoted to a more general topic relevant for all New Testament letters.

For readers interested in using the volume as a reference work, the indexes in this volume, as in volumes 3 and 4, contain a list of the annotated Greek terms and names that are used in Galatians, referring not only to the relevant pages in this volume but also to comments in the previous volumes. Similar to earlier volumes and in synopsis with them, this volume thus represents the first comprehensive papyrological study of the entire Letter to the Galatians.

Comparing Documentary Papyri with New Testament Texts

As demonstrated by A. Deissmann more than 100 years ago,⁴ Paul from Tarsus, the evangelists, and the other authors of the New Testament spoke the language of their time. In other words, they communicated to their contemporaries with the language used by the people. During the decades following Deissmann, J. H. Moulton, G. Milligan,⁵ A. Robertson,⁶ and a few others, New Testament scholars mainly, cited and copied from the works of these pioneers and rarely dealt directly with the documentary material of papyri, ostraca, and waxed or wooden tablets. It was only in the 1970s that direct comparative studies on the papyrological material were resumed, especially by J. White from the USA on epistolography⁷ and G. Horsley from Australia, the initiator and first editor of *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity (New Docs.)*⁸ and later on also of the *New Moulton and Milligan Project*.⁹

In 1981, E. Judge calculated that “[a]lready five times as many papyrus documents have been published as were available then,”¹⁰ that is, at the time of Deissmann, Moulton, and Milligan. This estimate might be too optimistic for 1981, because as of July 2025, according to our calculations, we have about six times as many documentary papyri, ostraca, and tablets available in editions.¹¹ Neverthe-

4 Deissmann's fourth and final edition of *Licht vom Osten*, his pioneering study on the—at that time recently—discovered papyri from the Greco-Roman World and their significance for interpreting the texts of the New Testament, was published in 1923 (its English translation *Light from the Ancient East* in 1927).

5 Especially Moulton and Milligan's magnum opus, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources* (1929; abbreviated as MM).

6 See Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (1923).

7 See White, *The Form and Function of the Body; Light*; “Introductory Formulae”; “Epistolary Formulas”; “The Greek Documentary Letter Tradition”; “New Testament Epistolary Literature.”

8 Horsley himself edited vols. 1–5 (1981–1989).

9 Only two articles with interim entries have been published so far: Horsley and Lee, “A Lexicon of the New Testament”; Lee and Horsley, “A Lexicon of the New Testament.”

10 E. Judge in *New Docs.* 1 (1981), p. iv.

11 At the end of 1922, when Deissmann wrote the preface to the fourth edition of *Licht vom Osten*, more than 13,000 papyri and ostraca had already been published; as of July 18, 2025, a total of

less, G. Horsley was absolutely right when he stated in 1989 that, on the basis of papyrus editions from 1976–1979 (covered in *New Docs.* 1–4),

the conclusion is inescapable that the volume and character of the new material published since the first two or three decades of this [that is, the 20th] century is such that NT and early Christian studies have lost both linguistic and historical opportunities of importance from the neglect of continuing research of the Deissmann type.¹²

The PKNT series has become a leading international research series that aims at remedying this neglect and exploring the significance of papyrological sources for the interpretation of the New Testament in accordance with the latest research findings and methodological standards of papyrology.¹³

At the heart of our approach is always the question of how potential contemporary readers of a New Testament text might have understood this text, given their mode of expression and way of thinking, for which contemporary documentary papyri, ostraca, and tablets offer the most direct and therefore authentic source. The early “average reader” of a New Testament writing like Galatians can, of course, not be identified clearly or uniformly. After all, the papyri originate from people with very different levels of literacy. At one end of the scale, we find individuals who could only write short notes with poor grammar and spelling skills and clumsy handwriting, and at the other end, we encounter, albeit rarely, highly educated authors whose style and ability to write more extensive texts of various genres is quite comparable to letter writers such as Cicero, Seneca, or Paul of Tarsus.¹⁴ We therefore avoid the term “average reader” and prefer “potential readers,” which in our sense does not refer to a specific group with a specific social and educational level, but to people with different levels of education and social status. By comparing the linguistic and religious issues as well as the social, historical, and legal aspects of Galatians with those documented in the papyri, this New Testament letter can be read as it would most likely have been read and understood by more or less contemporary readers.

80,870 Greek and Latin papyri, ostraca, and tablets are searchable in DDBDP (<https://papyri.info>).

12 G. H. R. Horsley in *New Docs.* 5 (1989), p. 2.

13 Next to monographs like Kloppenborg's *The Tenants in the Vineyard* (2006), Bazzana's *Kingdom of Bureaucracy* (2015), Hubing's *Crucifixion and New Creation* (2015), or Huebner's *Papyri and the Social World of the New Testament* (2019).

14 Cf., e.g., Arzt-Grabner, 2. *Korinther*, 54–71; *Letters*, 11–15.

The methodological criteria for comparing both text corpora, which have formed the basis of this series from the outset, remain valid and can be outlined as follows:¹⁵

- a) Both texts, the New Testament text and the documentary text, must be part of a similar historical context without being dependent on or influenced by each other, from which it follows that only non-Christian (or pre-Christian) papyri can serve as independent analogies to New Testament texts. Only by observing this criterion can we assess which of Paul's statements, thoughts, and ideas were more or less commonly known and which were truly new to his audience. This does not necessarily mean that Christian papyri are irrelevant to research into early Christianity; however, they cannot serve as sources for approaching the possible understanding of non-Christian readers, in particular during the first two centuries CE, but rather for evaluating the later Christian reception history of the text.
- b) Both texts must have been written at around the same time or within a similar period, particularly during the first and second centuries CE.¹⁶ Earlier papyrological evidence for a particular term, clause, genre, or topic is almost as valuable, as it can explain their development. Sometimes an earlier reference can also explain a change in meaning or a particular usage. Examples from a later period may demonstrate the continuity of a tradition; however, these should be treated with caution, especially if no earlier references are available. Due to the increasing influence of Christianity, documents from a later period than the late third/early fourth century CE do not provide any insight into the situation of early Christ groups, but they would be excellent sources for a reception history (cf. a).
- c) Both documentary papyri and New Testament texts must have a similar geographical origin and, at the same time, exhibit similar cultural, legal, and social conditions with regard to their composition. These aspects correspond with each other insofar as geographical similarity is only a valuable criterion if the geographical unity is identical with a cultural, legal, and social unity. For the time of Galatians, this is generally the Roman Empire, more specifically its eastern provinces. In recent decades in particular, papyrology has proven that the information obtained from Egyptian papyri also serves to illustrate various aspects of Roman administration and society in other

15 Cf. Arzt-Grabner, Kloppenborg, and Kreinecker, *More Light from the Ancient East*, XXXIII–XXXV (with bibliography).

16 In relation to Paul, the time frame of the first and second centuries CE also includes the editing of the texts up to their publication in the second century. Cf. Vinzent, *Von Paulus zu Saulus* (English edition: *From Paul to Saul*).

parts of the Empire. Although most documentary papyri and ostraca still originate from Ptolemaic, Roman, and Byzantine Egypt, papyri, ostraca, and tablets have now also been found in various locations outside Egypt: in Israel, Jordan, Syria, Iran, Afghanistan, Libya, Crete, Romania, Italy, Switzerland, and Great Britain. Some papyri and tablets were originally written in Asia Minor, Syria, Rhodes, or Italy and then sent to Egypt, where they were found in modern times. It is only natural that unique local and regional characteristics can be found throughout Rome, in the Egyptian nomes, and in the provinces of Asia Minor, but documentary evidence from various parts of the empire proves that the general structures of Roman administration and the way in which legal, commercial, and even private matters were handled were more or less the same in the eastern provinces and sometimes also in Italy and other parts.

Despite the extensive comparable material and the clear criteria for comparison, it is important to be aware of two limitations:

1. Documentary papyri and related material will not by themselves provide better meanings or interpretations than other sources or approaches. Instead, these documents offer supplements, and these supplementary findings should, at least, be dealt with in future exegesis. Understandably, theological ideas or questions are not addressed in private letters or economic and administrative documents, but that does not mean that theological matters of Galatians are neglected, as the papyri at least offer insights into the means of theological expression.
2. Only those issues, epistolary formulae as well as conventions, phrases, and terms that are already well represented in the papyri, ostraca, and tablets can be employed. If there are any terms or phrases from Galatians that are not attested in the papyri, this does not necessarily mean that they did not exist in the texts of everyday life; it rather means simply that they have not been preserved or identified so far. Papyrology is a living field of research, and papyrus excavations and editions are ongoing, which means that new discoveries and insights are to be expected on a regular basis. The results of our text comparisons can therefore only refer to the current state of research and thus remain potentially open to future updates.

Explanation of Diacritical Sigla

- () Resolution of an abbreviation or a symbol; e.g., “(ἔτους)” means that the scribe used the symbol for ἔτους (i.e., L), Καίσαρ(ος) means that the scribe wrote Καίσαρ as an abbreviation for Καίσαρος.

- [] A break (lacuna) in the text; “[αβγ]” would mean that αβγ is not preserved but can be reconstructed, “[...]” means that the lost text cannot be reconstructed.
- < > Letters omitted erroneously by the scribe; e.g., “<άλλά>” means that άλλα was omitted by mistake and therefore added by the modern editor. These diacritical sigla are to be distinguished from deliberate abbreviations (see above).
- { } Superfluous letters written erroneously by the scribe; e.g., “προσαγορεύω {ι}” means that the last letter is redundant and has to be deleted.
- [[]] Letters written, then deleted, by the scribe; “[αβγ]” were deleted (i.e., scrubbed off or crossed out) by the scribe but are still visible, whereas “[...]” would mean that the deleted text cannot be reconstructed.
- αβγ Letters (in this example αβγ) are not completely preserved but reconstructible with high plausibility.
- ... Traces of letters are preserved but illegible.
- \αβγ/ Addition integrated into the line by the editor at the place desired by the scribe, who added these letters (in this example αβγ) above a line or between two lines, sometimes also above a crossed-out word or form corrected by the scribe.

A Note on Reprints and Corrections

The tradition still maintained in many papyrological publications of indicating certain reprints (especially from *M.Chr.*, *W.Chr.*, *Sel.Pap.*, *Jur.Pap.*, *CPJ*) is based on the fact that these (mostly early) reprints often contain corrections or important comments that were not all included in the *BL* volumes (cf. *BL Konkordanz* VIII n. 2). A reference to these reprints (instead of the *BL*) is therefore only relevant if they contain new or additional information that cannot be found in the *BL* volumes. Such information is, of course, taken into account and referred to in the PKNT volumes, directly at the point where the corresponding papyrus text is quoted or commented on. A general reference to the new or reprinted editions is therefore not necessary. Readers interested in the reprints are referred to the relevant databases (in particular TM Texts and papyri.info).

A Note on Translations and Technical Terms

For the translations of the Greek and Latin texts quoted in this volume, the translations of the editions, if available, have been taken into account without this being mentioned explicitly. Other translations are referred to in certain cases. All trans-

lations have been checked and, where necessary, updated by the respective author of an article. Many texts have been translated into English for the first time. The responsibility for any translation therefore lies with the respective author.

A large number of technical terms used in ancient administration, trade, and agriculture are printed in italics. Brief explanations of these terms can be found in the glossary (pp. 383–84).

CHAPTER 1

The Role of Artistic Judgement in Translation

Emily Williamson

Introduction

Translation is not a straightforward task. Not only does it require high-grained specialized knowledge of multiple languages, but there are also many factors to consider when deciding how to translate. In this paper, I will attempt to spell out the nature and importance of one such decision. That is, the question of how literally to translate a passage. I call a translation that favors the literal a “scientific” translation and contrast it with “artistic” translation. Deciding between the two is a question of artistic judgement on behalf of the translator and will be determined by the goals and intentions of the translator, concerning the purpose of her translation and the audience she is trying to reach with it. By using the term “artistic” I do not intend to suggest that such a translation would be beautiful, lyrical or particularly liberal. I use the terms merely as placeholders for the extreme ends of a spectrum of translation where, at the scientific end, the translator translates the linguistic content as literally as possible and, at the artistic end, the translator aims to capture the meaningful content as well as possible. Each translator must—considering her goals, her audience, and the nature of the text itself—decide where on the spectrum her translation will fall.

In order to demonstrate the role and importance of this decision, I consider translation to be an act of re-creation (that is, of creating something again) and will compare it to other such acts—such as putting on a play or a concert that was written by someone else. It seems that there is a bias to consider the “scientific” form of re-creation to be superior and I will argue, in contrast to this assumption, that these two forms of translation are equally justifiable so long as the decision is consciously recognized and is made according to the goals of the work. After examining re-creation and translation in general, these ideas are applied to the translation of documentary papyri and, in doing so, I suggest that both artistic and scientific translations of documentary papyri may be useful. Furthermore, I argue that whilst a scientific translation may be the goal for the majority (if not all) of documentary papyri, it may not actually be possible to reach the extreme end of the spectrum. As such, as some degree of artistic input will be necessary from the translator, it is important for this to be recognized and for the translation not to be presented as a scientific and purely objective translation. In exegesis, the translator can make use of commentary to make clear where, when and why her artistic

input came, effectively dissolving the tension between the scientific and artistic pulls.

Whilst this question of how best to re-create applies to works that are shared across both space and time, I will focus, for the sake of ease, on those that are shared across time. That is, those works that were created in the past and are being re-created for a modern audience. Most, if not all, of my account can also be applied to contemporary works that are being shared via re-creation across space. That is, being brought to an audience of a different contemporary culture (such as happens with the translation of contemporary books, the dubbing or subtitling of contemporary films and so on). However, the translation of contemporary works has the added factor, which could be either a complicating or easing factor, of the original creator still being alive and being able to give some input or guidance as to how best the work ought to be re-created. Here, I will set these problems aside and focus exclusively on the re-creation of works from past times, as this is most relevant to the question of what is going on in the translation of documentary papyri. As such, the examples that I use to illustrate my argument will be examples of artistic works from history being re-created in various ways for a modern audience.

Authorial Intention

It seems that a good translation is a translation that best captures and re-creates the original work. The question of what exactly this means or how exactly this is done brings up questions of authorial intention. What it means to re-create the original works hangs on what the original work is and, relatedly, what the author intended it to be. In this section I delve into questions of authorial intention. First, I consider the problem of the opacity of authorial intention and go on to draw a distinction between narrow and broad intentions, suggesting that broad intentions may be more opaque than narrow intentions.

Can an Author's Intentions Be Known?

Just as it must be considered when re-creating other artworks, such as music, theatre or dance performances, there is the question with translation of how literally to translate. Similarly to these other works of art, in pieces of writing (whether artistic literary pieces or factual informative pieces), much is left unspecified. One question to consider is whether to try to solely follow the author's intentions or whether there is some place for the translator to modify the work according to her own artistic judgements. Although the author's intentions seem, intuitively, to be definitive of the way a work ought to be critically engaged with, W. Wimsatt and

M. Beardsley have famously argued that the intentions of an author are neither accessible to the reader nor would they be a good standard for aesthetic judgement even if they were accessible.¹ Nevertheless, I will focus in this paper on forms of translation that try to discover and represent authorial intentions. This is because, although translation involves (as I will argue) some degree of artistic judgement, translation is primarily an act of re-creating and transmitting a work, not one of judging a work to be good or bad. In re-creating the work, then, the translator is something of an accomplice to the author and the most faithful translation would thus seem to be the one that best preserves the author's intent. This sort of intentional view prioritizes the artist rather than the audience and is defended by philosophers such as N. Wolterstorff.² It is also in line with one of the overarching goals of exegetical practice: to discover the true meaning of the author and thus better understand what life was like at a given time.

Even so, Wimsatt and Beardsley's argument about the unavailability of the author's intentions still holds. It is not always clear what the intentions of the author were. Furthermore, as time passes, various intentions of the author may come into conflict with one another. Not only is it difficult to decipher the intentions of a long-dead author but there are also multiple ways of considering intentionality—ought we to guess at what the intentions of the author actually were at the time, or should we try to construct what the author's intentions would be were the author living today? This question is of particular importance considering the fact that intentions are often tied to a time and a place. It is safe to say that many, if not all, creators (I use this term to refer to writers, painters, musicians, and so on—any agent who creates something that will be taken in and interpreted by others) create with an audience in mind, and this audience is that which is present and current to them, not some far off audience of whom they know nothing. An author's writing is therefore informed by her expectations of who her audience is and what their knowledge base is. That is, an author is likely to take certain things for granted as common knowledge among her audience. Thus, the role of the modern-day translator, in relating works from a distant time or place to a new audience, is not easy.

If the translator's chief aim, then, is to preserve, as far as possible, the intentions of the author, it is unclear what this entails. In some strict sense, if we are to respect the intentions of the author, we may not be permitted to translate anything at all. Even in the case that an author might expect or imagine that her works might one day be translated, it can hardly be said that she writes with the intention of being translated. Although there are cases of ancient writings being translated into

1 Wimsatt and Beardsley "Intentional Fallacy."

2 Wolterstorff, *Works*.

multiple languages at the time in which they were written,³ as well as instances of bilingual texts ranging from poetry to legal documents, this cannot be used to suggest that authors wrote expecting or intending for their works to be translated. This is particularly the case when the works being translated are not public works but private letters or contracts. Further, it certainly is not the case that ancient writers wrote with the intention of being translated into unknown future languages, to be read by unknown and unimaginable future readers.

How, then, are we to think of authorial intentions? If intentions are understood as being reader-directed, and the author had no knowledge of any future readership, is it even possible to conceptualize authorial intentions with regard to modern readership? Perhaps we can consider some kind of analogue to authorial intentions, for example, considering the possible intentions of the author were she to know the task that we were undertaking. Of course, it is impossible to hypothesize about just what these intentions could be. But, despite the fact that our hypothesis may never be wholly successful, it may be the closest we can come to achieving a notion of what it means to re-create a work faithfully.

Broad and Narrow Intentions

Even with this new and difficult goal of imagining what the intentions of the author would be for a modern audience, further complications arise. There seem to be (at least) two layers to authorial intention: the broad intention, which is the intention of how the work is received and the effect that it has on the audience, and the narrow intention, which is the intention to use a certain word or phrase. The narrow intention is in service of the broad intention. That is, the author chooses a certain phrasing or a certain structure with the broad intention in mind. Whilst the two intentions seem to go hand in hand, the passage of time can be seen to pull them apart and set them in tension with one another. Translating literally (and thereby preserving the narrow intention) often makes the work obscure and inaccessible to a modern audience and thus flouts the broad intention (if the broad intention is for the meaningful content of the work to move the audience in some way). In other words, if an author has the broad intention of having her work be easily understood, a literal translation (preserving the narrow intentions) may flout this by making use of outdated grammatical structures or terms that make the text difficult for a modern audience to understand. In this way, a scientific translation can be roughly seen as fulfilling the narrow intentions of the author, whilst an artistic translation would aim to fulfill the broad intentions.

I suggest that there is a general bias in favor of following the narrow intentions of an artist, particularly in translation. This can be seen in S. Gorelick's introduction

3 Cf. Zellmann-Rohrer and Love, *Traditions*.

to her translation of Mallarmé's *The Book*. She notes here that she worked to avoid the mistake of supplanting the author's intentions in order to make a work intelligible. In asserting this, Gorelick reveals her underlying normative assumption that this is a mistake in translation rather than an overt and acceptable decision based on the broad (rather than narrow) authorial intentions. Indeed, making the work of an author accessible may be fulfilling the most basic of the author's broad intentions (although I must admit that Mallarmé's work is certainly not an example of this). To better illustrate the decoupling of broad and narrow intentions, I turn to a musical analogy.

Consider an orchestra getting ready to perform a classical concert. There are many stylistic decisions for the conductor to make: how many instruments to have, where to perform, which pieces to perform and in what order, and, of course, how exactly to perform the music—with what level of energy, with which emotional tone, and so on. A musical score leaves much unspecified and it is up to the conductor and the musicians to decide exactly how to carry out the concert. Some may favor a performance that sticks as closely as possible to the intentions of the composer, although interpretations of what the composer intended may vary. Some may choose to make greater use of their own artistic license. No matter where on the spectrum of being "true" to the composer one may fall, there are still many decisions to be made. No re-creation of a piece of music will be exactly what the composer intended. The composer was making music for an audience of a certain time, who would be presumed to have certain musical knowledge, social knowledge and so on. This cannot be re-created today, as a modern audience will necessarily have a different set of knowledge and assumptions. Furthermore, the instruments used will be different, the musical knowledge and skill of the musicians will be different and the knowledge and interpretation of the score will be different.

In light of these insurmountable differences, perhaps it would be better for the conductor to take greater artistic license, rather than trying to force his concert into something it can never be—that is, a true re-creation of the past. Whilst the issue may be more obvious in the case of re-creating a historical piece of music, many of these questions apply to translation. These questions pertain whether one is translating a contemporary piece of work into a foreign language or an ancient piece of work so that it can be understood by modern readers; whether the work in question is a legal document or poetry; whether the audience seeks to use the translation to learn a language or to learn about a culture or simply to enjoy a piece of writing.

As was demonstrated in the above analogy, the conductor who chooses to try to re-create the past as exactly as possible fulfills the narrow intentions of the composer. I take this to be analogous to a scientific translation. By contrast, the composer who adapts the concert, making it more different from a performance in the

past, with the intention of evoking some specific effect in the audience, could be interpreted as fulfilling the broad intentions of the composer. This is analogous to an artistic translation. This terminology captures the fact that both forms of translation or re-creation are based in some way on the author's intentions. This is in contrast to terminology that has been used previously, such as Bar-Elli's "intentional" and "autonomous" analysis of musical performances,⁴ which roughly correspond to my "scientific" and "artistic" respectively. Bar-Elli's analysis fails to recognize the role of broad intentions and implies that artistic (for her, "autonomous") re-creations are not informed by an interpretation of the intentions of the original creator. The "artistic"/"scientific" terminology hopefully captures the greater freedom of the artistic form whilst still recognizing the restrictive role of broad authorial intentions even on these artistic re-creations.

Translating Transparently

The translation of papyri also pulls us in these two different directions. On the one hand, there is the scientific pull, perhaps the chief focus for those who wish to learn and represent the intricacies of the language. On the other hand, there is the artistic pull, which can be seen as that which focuses more on conveying the meaning and intentions of the work. Both the scientific and artistic methods of translation are valid depending on the goals of the translator. For any pursuits concerning the language itself—such as linguistic analysis or language learning—the scientific form of translation is clearly favorable, as it preserves the linguistic content of the work. By contrast, for pursuits concerning the content, an artistic form of translation is, arguably, more effective. Despite the benefits of each option, there are also limitations to the extent to which each end of the spectrum can be properly fulfilled.

The Limits of Artistic Translation

One caveat to keep in mind when it comes to artistic translation is that attempting to fulfill the broad intentions of a writer is much more difficult than fulfilling the narrow intentions. The problem of trying to determine authorial intentions (as was spelled out above) is more prominent when it comes to broad intentions. Whilst it is clear, in the case of narrow intentions, which words or grammatical structures an author was intending to use, it is much harder to determine what the end goal of the writing was. Thus, whilst it is certainly worthwhile to attempt to fulfill the broad intentions of an author through an artistic translation, it is also a trickier

4 Bar-Elli, "Aesthetic Value," 91.

task as the broad intentions of an author are harder to determine. Furthermore, there is the question of how far a re-creation can diverge from the narrow intentions of the original work under the aim of fulfilling the broad intentions. As such, artistic re-creations are more likely to face scrutiny in terms of whether it can still be considered an instance of the same work, raising the much-discussed question of aesthetic identity.⁵ That is to say, if the conductor considered in the example above decided to reduce an orchestral score to a string quartet, one may ask if it can still be considered to be a re-creation of the same piece of music or whether the identity of the music itself has changed. Similarly, in the case of translation, straying too far from the narrow intentions of the author in an attempt to fulfil the broad intentions may lead to the translation being considered to be a modern retelling of the work (which is now itself a new piece of work) rather than being a translation (which would be a new instantiation of the same work).

Another example will make the distinction between scientific and artistic re-creation clearer. This example will demonstrate the scope of the spectrum of scientific to artistic re-creation and raise the question of what can fall under the notion of artistic re-creation. In doing so, I further probe the question of whether these ought to be considered new works entirely rather than new instantiations of an old work. The question of the extreme end of scientific re-creation will be raised in the next section.

Whilst some directors may choose to re-create a Shakespeare play as “authentically” as possible—refusing to perform anywhere other than the Globe Theatre, hiring an all-male cast, using props and costumes that are equivalent to those that would have been available in the 1500s, and so on—there are also those who may choose to preserve the themes of the play whilst setting them in a modern context, to make them as accessible as possible, as can be seen in the 1999 romantic comedy film *10 Things I Hate About You*,⁶ which is based on *The Taming of the Shrew* (1590–1592).⁷ There is no clear-cut way to say which of these two—the authentic or the contemporary—is a better re-creation of *The Taming of the Shrew*. Whilst the former is more authentic in terms of recreating what the play would have been like in Shakespearian times, it is equally possible to argue that the latter is more authentic in terms of giving the play an equivalent role today to that that it would have had in Shakespearian times. That is, a widely accessible and easily understood comedy that provides light entertainment for the average person. The question is not which is better or worse but what they are trying to achieve. Each re-creation is a good re-creation respective to what it is trying to achieve.

5 See, e.g., Davies, *Musical Works*; Levinson, *Music*.

6 Directed by Gill Junger, written by Karen McCullah and Kirsten Smith.

7 Shakespeare, *The Taming of the Shrew*.

The former re-creation (the play that tries to keep many elements identical to how it would have been in the original play) preserves Shakespeare's narrow intentions and is therefore similar to the scientific approach to translation. The latter (the modernized film that tries to give the re-creation the same functional role that the original play would have had) tries to re-create Shakespeare's broad intentions and is similar to the artistic approach to translation. ¹⁰ *Things I Hate About You* is an extreme example and therefore aptly poses the question as to whether it is a re-creation of *The Taming of the Shrew* or if it is a new work entirely, only loosely based on the original play. How much artistic license does a re-creator have before her re-creation is considered a new work in its own right? It seems that the extreme artistic end of the spectrum bleeds into the category of new works that are based on or inspired by previous ones.

The Limits of Scientific Translation

In order to decide whether to translate in the artistic or scientific mode, the translator must make some judgement about authorial intention. One could then ask whether this sort of consideration is more required for artistic or scientific translation. The intuitive answer is that this is more required for artistic translation, as the way in which and degree to which the writing is changed depends wholly on the translator's interpretation of the author's intentions. Perhaps this is why scientific translation is typically favored: it gives the subjective judgement of the translator a lesser role. The translator has less artistic license and is rather following quite a strict set of rules (hence the term "scientific"). Whilst the greater role of judgement about intentions in artistic translation should be taken seriously, it should not, I think, be a deterrent.

Furthermore, the translator who opts for scientific translation should not fall into the trap of thinking that this is the "default" method of translation and certainly should not think that she is escaping the tricky problem of judging the creator's intentions altogether. It is important to recognize the role that judgement plays in translation—not only the judgement at play when one is deciding between scientific and artistic translation—but also the judgement about what exactly it means to fulfill this form of translation once one has been decided upon. In other words, the translator must first decide whether she will translate scientifically or artistically (although, I will note that this is not a binary decision and may be better thought of as what emphasis the translator will put on each of these goals, whilst still, to some extent, taking both into account). Once she has made this judgement, she must then use her expertise—in her understanding of the work, the original author, the context and the languages—to make some judgement about what the author's intentions (both narrow and broad) actually were. This judgement then feeds back into the translator's judgements about how best to