

## TRANSCRIPTION NOTES

These notes relate to the transcriptions of primary witnesses that are given on disk. Some of the notes are more significant than others. Even though a large number of them focus on minor features, they are necessary. Had they been omitted, the reader may have been left wondering about particular features of my transcriptions. I apologise for their repetitive nature, but there are only so many ways of saying the same thing. I have edited out some notes that seem unimportant in hindsight. I would be happy to supply the complete versions to anyone who requires them. Points of uncertainty remain at certain places that are identified in the notes. Examination of high definition facsimiles of the manuscripts will help to resolve some of these uncertainties

The introduction to each set of transcription notes specifies the source upon which the corresponding transcription is based. General notes on the manuscript, its orthography, correctors, date, and provenance are included as required. Dates are only mentioned on a few occasions. Otherwise, they are understood to be as given in appendix 1 of NA27 or Kurt Aland's *Kurzgefasste Liste* (1994). Provenance information is derived from printed editions. I believe that my spelling maps provide clues to provenance, but these maps have *not* influenced the provenances given in these notes. As far as the papyri are concerned, all are assumed to have been copied in Egypt.

Any one of these transcriptions may require revision. Nearly all of them have been verified by letter-for-letter comparison with the sources from which they were transcribed. Unfortunately, I am not completely sure which ones I have neglected to verify. I am fairly certain that the only transcriptions that have not been verified are those of U56, U75, and U142. (I have a sneaking suspicion that I have verified the last one.)

The transcriptions of U1, U1s, U75, and U75s definitely need their corrector tags revised. This is because my initial strategy was to treat scribes who had copied supplementary sections as correctors. At the collation stage, I discovered that this strategy created difficulties that could only be overcome by treating the supplementary sections as separate entities. Rather than changing the transcriptions and performing

all of the collation and map production again, I have settled for having a missing corrector in the U1 and U75 transcriptions. Anyone who uses these transcriptions should perform the necessary revisions before going any further.

A separate bibliography of works that are specific to the transcription in question is provided for manuscripts that have already been edited. The following bibliography contains referenced works of more general scope.

## References

- Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger (eds.). 1993. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Nestle-Aland, 27th ed. Stuttgart. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger (eds.). 1993. *The Greek New Testament*. United Bible Societies, 4th rev. ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies.
- Aland, Kurt. 1994. *Kurzgefasste Liste der Griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*. 2nd ed. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Aland, Kurt and Barbara. 1989. *The text of the New Testament: an introduction to the critical editions and to the theory and practice of modern textual criticism*. 2nd rev. and enlarged ed. Trans. Erroll F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Elliott, J. Keith. 1989. *A bibliography of Greek New Testament manuscripts*. Society for New Testament Studies monograph series, 62. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gardthausen, V. 1913. *Griechische Palaeographie*. Vol. 2. *Die Schrift, Unterschriften und Chronologie im Alterum und im Byzantinischen Mittelalter*. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Veit. Repr. 1978. Berlin: Nationales Druckhaus.
- Gignac, Francis Thomas. [1975]. *A grammar of the Greek papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods*. Vol. 1. *Phonology*. Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità, 55-1. Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino - La Goliardica. (The date is that given in the preface.)
- Guillemette, Pierre. 1986. *The Greek New Testament analysed*. Kitchener: Herald Press.

- Kenyon, Frederic G. 1950. *The text of the Greek Bible: a student's handbook*. Studies in theology, 38. Rev. ed. London: Gerald Duckworth.
- Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott. 1968. *A Greek-English lexicon*. Rev. and augmented ed. with a supplement. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Metzger, Bruce M. 1981. *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: an introduction to Greek palaeography*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Metzger, Bruce M. 1992. *The text of the New Testament: its transmission, corruption, and restoration*. 3rd enlarged ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ropes, James Hardy. 1926. *The beginnings of Christianity*. Part 1. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Vol. 3. *The text of Acts*. Ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. London: Macmillan. Repr. 1979. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- Souter, Alexander. 1954. *The text and canon of the New Testament*. Studies in theology, 25. 2nd ed., rev. C. S. C. Williams. London: Gerald Duckworth.
- Tischendorf, Konstantin von (ed.). 1872. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Vol. 2. 8th major critical ed. Leipzig: Giesecke and Devrient. Repr. 1965. Graz: Akademischen Druck.
- Wachtel, Klaus and Klaus Witte. 1994. *Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus*. Vol. 2. *Die Paulinischen Briefe*. Part 2. *Gal, Eph, Phil, Kol, 1 u. 2 Thess, 1 u. 2 Tim, Tit, Phlm, Hebr*. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung, 22. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.



## P12

P. Amherst 3b. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, pap. Gr. 3.

Transcribed and verified by reference to a facsimile in Grenfell and Hunt (1901, plate 25).

P12 is a late third or early fourth century copy of part of the first verse of Hebrews. It written in the top margin of a letter from Rome to 'inhabitants of the Arsinoite nome', which was probably written between 250 and 285 CE (Grenfell and Hunt, 1900, 28 and 30).

<ch 1><v 1> POL[di]U[di]MERWS:

The diaeresis consists of a single point above the *upsilon*.

<ch 1><v 1> LALH[ut]S[ut][rt]AS TOIS[rt]:

According to the transcriptions of both Grenfell and Hunt (1900, 31) and Schofield (1936, 154), the final *sigma* of LALHSAS is legible.

<ch 1><v 1> [rt]HMMW[rt][ut]N[ut]:

Grenfell and Hunt (1900, 31) and Schofield (1936, 154) regard the *eta* and *mu* as legible. Remnants of what appear to be two letters exist before a lacuna which could accommodate one or two letters. Whereas it is possible that these remnants are from an *eta* followed by a *mu*, I have transcribed them as reconstructed text due to their high degree of uncertainty. Another remnant, which may be from a *nu*, survives after the lacuna.

<ch 1><v 1> PR[ut]O[ut][rt]F[rt][ut]HTA[ut][rt]I[rt][ut]S[ut]:

Even though I can see the cross stroke of a *tau*, the top of an *alpha* and part of the final *sigma*, I can see none of the *eta*.

## References

Grenfell, Bernard P. and Arthur S. Hunt (eds.). 1900. *The Amherst papyri: being an account of the Greek papyri in the collection of the Right Hon. Lord Amherst of Hackney, F.S.A. at Didlington Hall, Norfolk*. Part 1. *The ascension of Isaiah, and other theological fragments*. London: Oxford University Press. Repr. 1975. Milan:

Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino - La Goliardica.

Grenfell, Bernard P. and Arthur S. Hunt (eds.). 1901. *The Amherst papyri: being an account of the Greek papyri in the collection of the Right Hon. Lord Amherst of Hackney, F.S.A. at Diddington Hall, Norfolk. Part 2. Classical fragments and documents of the Ptolemaic Roman and Byzantine periods.* London: Oxford University Press. Repr. 1975. Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino - La Goliardica.

Schofield, E. M. 1936. 'The papyrus fragments of the Greek New Testament'. Dissertation (PhD). Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

### **P13**

P. Oxy. 657. London, British Library, inv. 1532v; Florence, Bibl. Laurenziana, PSI 1292.

Transcribed and verified by reference to the manuscript itself for those parts held in the British Library. This part of the transcription has also been compared with the transcriptions of Grenfell and Hunt (1904) and Schofield (1936). The fragment designated PSI 1292 has been transcribed from Bartoletti and Norsa (1951) and compared with photographs held at the Institute for New Testament Textual Research in Münster. A fresh examination of the fragment designated PSI 1292 is in order. A number of letters from the right-hand edge of column XA are visible but are not included in Bartoletti and Norsa's edition.

This manuscript is unusual because it is part of a roll instead of a codex. The biblical text is written on the verso side (papyrus strips running vertically) of a copy of the new epitome of Livy (Grenfell and Hunt, 1904, 36).

Ellipses (...) have been inserted to signify sense pauses where there are unusually large spaces between words. There are nearly always spaces preceding and following *nomina sacra*. These have not been included unless I regard them as coinciding with pauses in sense. The choice of whether or not a space warrants being marked as a sense-pause is highly subjective. In addition, some spaces may be due to the scribe avoiding faults in the papyrus. As a result, there is often a significant degree of uncertainty connected with my placement of ellipses.

#### *Correctors*

The page numbering appears to be in a different hand and ink to the rest of the manuscript. The style of lettering for the numbers is similar to that of P46. Grenfell and Hunt (1904, 37) write, 'There is no sign anywhere of a second hand, and such corrections as occur are due to the first hand, who is responsible for occasional lection signs and the punctuation by means of a double point inserted somewhat freely and not always accurately'. Although I hesitate to differ from Grenfell and Hunt, I regard a number of corrections as by a second hand.

<ch 3><v 6> [d1]CAUCH[rt]MA[rt]/[d1] [c1]KAUCH[rt]MA[rt]/[c1]:

The form of the K is not that of the original hand. The ink is slightly darker and broader.

<ch 3><v 10> [dx]PROSWK[ut]T[ut]EISA[/dx] [cx]PROSWKQEISA[/cx]:

This alteration was not noticed during transcription. It has been included in deference to Grenfell and Hunt (1904, 46). The manuscript should be consulted to determine which corrector made the change.

<ch 3><v 13> A[ut]L[ut]/[rt]LA PARA[/rt]KALESATE:

In this and the following three lines, Schofield (1936, 162) transcribes some letters which are now missing from the papyrus.

<ch 3><v 13> ARMATIAS:

Misspelling.

<ch 4><v 3> [rt]KATAPA[/rt]USIN:

Grenfell and Hunt's reconstruction is followed here. They write (1904, 46), 'thn was certainly omitted before katapa<sup>o</sup>usin'.

<ch 4><v 9> [rt]S[/rt]A[ut]M[ut]/[rt]M[rt]/[ut]A[ut]TISMOS:

Grenfell and Hunt (1904, 40) transcribe this as <sup>a</sup>s<sup>o</sup>ab<sup>≥</sup>batismo". A fragment of the letter following the first *alpha* remains. It does not appear to be from a *beta*, but could be from a *mu*. The reconstructed *mu* is entirely hypothetical. The *mu* preceding OS appears to have been retraced.

<ch 4><v 11> [d0]PE[ut]T[ut]H[/d0] [c0]PESH[/c0]:

This alteration was not noticed during transcription. It has been included in view of the following note by Grenfell and Hunt (1904, 46): 's of pesh was converted from t.' The papyrus should be consulted to determine whether the first hand made the change.

<ch 4><v 16> EURWMEN:

Grenfell and Hunt's reconstruction is followed here. They write (1904, 46), 'It is almost certain that the papyrus read eurwmén, since without this word the line would be unaccountably short'.

<ch 5><v 1> DWRA:

Grenfell and Hunt's reconstruction is followed again. They write (1904, 46), 'The line is sufficiently long without *te* after *dwra* ..., and in view of the tendency of the papyrus the omission is probable.'

<ch 5><v 1> QU[rt]S[ut]IAS...[ut] U[rt]PER:

There appears to sufficient space for a sense pause here.

NOS... [di]U[di]PO TOU [ns][rt]QU[rt]/[ns] <ch 5><v 5> [rt]OUTWS KAI O [ns]CS[ns] OUC EAUTON EDO[rt]=:

The usual reading, which includes *kaqwsper kai Aarwn* after *upo tou q—u—*, appears to be too long for the available space (Grenfell and Hunt, 1904, 46-47) . It is possible that P13 had the same reading as U18 and U151, which include *kaqwsper kai Aarwn* but omit *outw" kai o c—"* (Wachtel and Witte, 1994, 278).

<ch 10><v 8> - <ch 10><v 21>:

Parts of these verses are preserved on the fragment of the papyrus which is identified as PSI 1292. The fragment includes the right-hand edge of column XA and the first third of column XB. My transcription follows Bartoletti and Norsa's edition of the fragment, except where my examination of a photograph at the Institute for New Testament Textual Research suggested that changes be made.

With statistics obtained from the surviving columns, the following may be expected for column XA. (The expected values correspond to the mean values plus or minus two standard deviations. For a normal distribution, there is a probability of 95% that the actual value will be within the given range.)

<i>Quantity</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Mean</i>
No. of lines	23 - 27	25
Letters per line	32 - 46	39
Total letters	800 - 1150	975

Based on the expected total number of letters, the letter N which survives

at the end of the first line of column XA is probably from a word located somewhere within Heb 9.24 to 9.27.

In my reconstruction of this column, the UBS3 text was altered by replacing CRISTOS and QEOS with their *nomina sacra* abbreviations. In accordance with the scribe's usual practice, OURANON (Heb 9.24) was not contracted. The first THS of 9.26 was omitted due to its bracketed status in NA27. Two changes were made where P46 and U6 agreed, as these have a similar text to P13. OLOKAUTWMATA (Heb 10.6) was replaced with OLOKAUTWMA, and GAR was inserted after GEGRAPTAI (Heb 10.7).

<ch 10><v 8> AMARTI[rt][ut]AS[/ut]:

My transcription differs from Bartoletti and Norsa's edition here. The last two letters of this word seem to be visible in the photograph examined at the Institute for New Testament Textual Research.

<ch 10><v 11> [rt]KAI PAS MEN ARC[/rt]=:

The line-length conforms better to adjacent line-lengths if the letters ARC are included.

<ch 10><v 11> [d0]LITOU[rt]RGWN[/rt]/[d0] [c0]L[st]E[/st]ITOU[rt]RGWN[/rt] [/c0]:

The breadth, colour, and style of the inserted *epsilon* are consistent with the first hand.

<ch 10><v 11> O[ut]U[/ut][rt]DEPO[/rt]TAI... DUN[ut]AN[/ut]TAI:

Two of the letters of DUNANTAI have been given the status of uncertain text. They appeared to be indistinct in the photograph.

<ch 10><v 12> AMARTIW[ut]N...[/ut]:

There appears to be a trace of the first vertical stroke of the N.

<ch 10><v 12> [dx]PROSE[ut]N[/ut]E[ut]I[/ut]KAS[/dx] [cx]PROSENE[ut]N[/ut] KAS[/cx]:

This alteration was not noticed during transcription. According to Grenfell and Hunt (1904, 47), 'The second n, if it be n, in prosenenkas

was converted from i or u. The previous n also seems to have been altered.' The manuscript should be consulted in order to confirm the veracity of this transcription and to ascribe the alteration to a particular corrector, if possible. Perhaps the former letter was a *gamma*?

<ch 10><v 12> EKAQISEN... [ut]E[/ut][rt]N DEXIA[/rt]:

The lacuna can accommodate the letters N DEXIA. The photograph shows that what appears to be a blank space after EKAQISEN is followed by a horizontal stroke consistent with an E.

<ch 10><v 15> ME[rt]T[/rt]A:

The photograph shows that there is a lacuna where the *tau* would be expected.

<ch 10><v 16> THN:

The *nu* is unambiguous when the two fragments are placed together.

<ch 10><v 16> [ut]A[/ut]:

There appears to be a deletion stroke through this letter. Grenfell and Hunt (1904, 47) write, 'The scribe apparently began to write *autous* before *epigraysw*, but that the *a* was meant to be deleted is not certain and its partial effacement may be accidental.'

<ch 10><v 17> MI MNHSQHS[ut]O[/ut]MAI:

One would expect the reading *mh*; *mnhsqhvsomai* here. The manuscript appears to have an *iota* rather than an *eta*. If so, there are two possibilities: either *mhv* has been spelled *mi*, or it has dropped out and *mimnhçqhçomai* has been written instead of *mnhsqhvsomai*. The first option has been adopted here as Gignac (1975, 236) lists *miv* as a variant spelling of *mhv*. Judging by the photograph, the *theta* is quite indistinct and the letter transcribed as an *omicron* could be an *omega*.

<ch 10><v 19> [d0]ECONT[ut]A[/ut]S[/d0] [c0]ECONTES[/c0]:

This alteration was not noticed during transcription. Grenfell and Hunt (1904, 47) write, 'The second *e* of *econtes* has been altered from *a*.'

<ch 10><v 19> PAR[ut]H[/ut]SIAN:

There does not appear to be enough space for two *rhos* and an *eta*.

<ch 10><v 20> HN ENE[ut]KE[/ut]NISEN:

There may be enough space for a *gamma* before the *kappa*.

<ch 10><v 21> TON:

The *tau* is unambiguous when both fragments are considered together.

<ch 10><v 33> TOUTO (second occurrence):

There is a space between TOU and TO.

<ch 10><v 34> DES=[rt]MIOI[/rt]S:

Grenfell and Hunt's reconstruction is followed here. They write (1904, 47), 'We cannot be sure that the papyrus did not have *desmois*, but the absence of *mou* is the important thing and is much in favour of *desmiois*.'

<ch 10><v 35> MISQAPODOSIA[rt]N[/rt]...:

There may not be a final *nu* here.

<ch 10><v 36> [di]U[/di]POMONHS:

The final *sigma* looks like a *nu*. P46 has YPOMONHN here.

<ch 10><v 37> [ut]HX[/ut]E[ut]I[/ut]:

Schofield (1936, 165) has EXEI whereas Grenfell and Hunt have HXEI (1904, 42). My transcription follows that of Wachtel and Witte (1994). (Dr Maurice Robinson kindly checked this word for me while he was at the Institute for New Testament Textual Research.)

<ch 11><v 3> [d1]FENOMENWN[/d1] [c1]F[st]AI[/st]NOMENWN[/c1]:

This has been ascribed to the second hand rather than the first hand because the lower left part of the A is rounded and not pointed.

<ch 11><v 4> [d1]PROSHNE[ut]K[/ut]KEN[/d1] [c1]PROSHNENKEN[/c1]:

What may have been a *kappa* has been changed to a *nu*. (Perhaps the former letter was a *gamma*?) This *nu* has been attributed to the second



hand as its ink differs from that of the rest of the word.

<ch 11><v 5> [d1][ut]H[/ut]UH[ut]R[/ut][rt]ESTHKE=[/rt]NAI[/d1] [c1]EUH[ut]R  
[/ut][rt]ESTHKE=[/rt]NAI[/c1]:

This correction has been ascribed to the second hand because of a very slight difference in the darkness and width of the E compared with the U and H which follow.

<ch 11><v 11> H[ut]L[/ut][rt]IKIAS EPEI:

Grenfell and Hunt (1904, 48) write, 'It is practically certain that the papyrus did not read **eteken** after **hlikias**'.

<ch 11><v 13> LABONTES:

Some manuscripts have **komiçamenoi** instead of **labonteç**. According to Grenfell and Hunt (1904, 48), **komiçamenoi** fits the space better than **labonteç**. This line has 45 letters with **komiçamenoi** or 42 with **labonteç**. The average line length for the page is 43 letters per line. The preceding line has 45 letters and the following one 40. Going by the average line length of the whole page (43) and the average of the preceding and following lines (42.5), the shorter line with **labonteç** is slightly more probable.

<ch 11><v 13> IDONTES:

Grenfell and Hunt (1904, 48) write, 'The papyrus evidently omitted **kai peisqontes** [after **idontes**]'.

<ch 11><v 32> [d1]DAUID[/d1] [d2][c1]DAU[st]E[/st]ID[/c1][[/d2] [c2]DAUID  
[/c2]:

Although the ink is the same colour, the form of the E is not consistent with the first hand. It appears to have been struck through E with a sloping stroke.

<ch 11><v 33> [rt]HRGASANTO[/rt]:

Grenfell and Hunt (1904, 44) and Schofield (1936, 166) print **hrgaçanto** in the reconstructed part of line 9 of column XZ. This may have been

spelled eirgaçanto.

<ch 12><v 10> [d1]M[ut]H O[/ut]/[d1] [c1]MEN[/c1]:

The last two letters of this word appear to have been corrected. The letter underlying the E may have been an I, H or, G, and the letter underlying the N may have been a R or O. The correction has been ascribed to the second hand because the broad and dark ink strokes of the N differ from the surrounding letters.

<ch 12><v 10> AGIOTATHS:

According to Grenfell and Hunt (1904, 48), 'agiotaths is a graphical error for agiothtos'.

<ch 12><v 11> [d1][ut]H[/ut]RHNIKON[/d1] [c1]EIRHNIKON[/c1]:

The letters *epsilon* and *iota* have been written over another letter which could be an *eta*. It is difficult to determine which scribe did this. The form of the *epsilon* is not consistent with the first hand. The ink of this correction has a similar appearance to the ink of another correction in the same line, AUTOU/AUTHS. Even so, it is possible that the first hand made this correction. The darkness of the ink of the following word, TOIS, is similar to that of the correction as well.

<ch 12><v 11> [d1]AUTO[ut]U[/ut]S[/d1] [c1]AUTHS[/c1]:

The underlying O is readily discernible; the U is less so. The bent appearance of the second vertical stroke of the H suggests that the underlying letter is an U. The appearance of the ink suggests that this is a later correction, so it has been ascribed to the second hand. Grenfell and Hunt (1904, 48) thought that the H was altered from O or Ol.

## References

- Bartoletti V. and M. Norsa. 1951. *Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana (papyri Greci e Latini)*. Vol. 12, 209-210.
- Grenfell, Bernard P. and Arthur S. Hunt (eds.). 1904. '657. Epistle to the Hebrews'. *The Oxyrhynchus papyri*. Part 4. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 36-48.

Schofield, E. M. 1936. 'The papyrus fragments of the Greek New Testament'. Dissertation (PhD). Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 161-167.

## P17

P. Oxy. 1078. Cambridge, University Library, Add. 5893.

Transcribed and verified by reference to photographs.

<ch 9><v 14> [rt]P[/rt]O[ut]S[/ut][rt]W[/rt]:

A mark above the *sigma* is a correction is from POSW to POLLW according to Hunt (1911, 13). I have not included this correction as I cannot read the corresponding letters.

<ch 9><v 14> [ns][ut]P[/ut]N[rt]S[/rt][ns] [rt]AIWN[/rt][ut]I[/ut]OU [rt]EAUTON PROSHNEG[/rt]:

There is a space of approximately 40 mm between the N of PNEUMATOS and the I of AIWNIOU. There is a *nomina sacra* superscript, indicating that the contraction PNS has been employed. If so, the space taken by the intervening reconstructed letters (S, A, I, W and N) would be about 13 mm (SA, cf. line 5) plus 3 mm (I, cf. KAI, line 4) plus 15 mm (WN, cf. TAURWN, line 4), which sums to about 31 mm. Apparently, there is a space of about 9 mm between the end of the contracted form of PNEUMATOS and AIWNIOU. Replacing AIWNIOU with AGIOU would result in an even larger space.

It is difficult to tell what would have been in the space. To make matters worse, the trace of the letter following PN does not seem to be consistent with an A. It does not seem likely that the scribe would write PNEUMATOS in full then add a *nomina sacra* superscript. Perhaps the scribe used an unusual contraction such as PNATOS. Then again, the space might have been due to a fault in the papyrus.

<ch 9><v 15> [rt]KLHRONOMIAS[/rt]...:

This punctuation mark appears to consist of two points bisected by a line. The line may be part of the preceding *sigma*.

<ch 9><v 19> [rt]KOKKINOU KAI[/rt] [ut][di]U[/di][ut]S[ut]S[/ut][rt]WPOU[/rt] AU[rt]TO TE TO[/rt]:

Considerations of space indicate that there is a gap between USSWPOU and AUTO.

<ch 9><v 19> PANTA:

The trace of a letter at the bottom left-hand extremity of the papyrus may be from the *tau* of this word.

## References

- Hunt, Arthur S. (ed.). 1911. '1078. Epistle to the Hebrews ix.' *The Oxyrhynchus papyri*. Part 8. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 11-13.
- Schofield, E. M. 1936. 'The papyrus fragments of the Greek New Testament'. Dissertation (PhD). Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 181.

## **P46**

Dublin, P. Chester Beatty II; University of Michigan, inv. 6238.

Transcribed and verified by reference to facsimiles in Kenyon (1937).

Due to space considerations, I have modified Kenyon's reconstructions of the following pages: 23 verso, 28 verso, 29 verso, 29 recto, 30 recto, 31 verso, 32 recto, 34 verso, 34 recto, and 36 verso.

There are numerous spaces between words and within them. Some of these coincide with pauses in sense:

Pauses in sense are occasionally indicated by slight space-intervals between words. Prof. Sanders has indicated a large number of such intervals, but most of them have, I think, no significance. Some are due to flaws in the papyrus (as at junctions of *kollhvmata*), some to the scribe's habit of leaving a slight space after an abbreviation, some seem to be purely accidental or hardly perceptible. I have thought it best to indicate them only when they are plainly intentional and denote a pause in the sense. Only an examination of the facsimile will show exactly what the facts are. They suggest at any rate some perception by the scribe of the sense of what he was writing. (Kenyon, 1936, xiv).

I have followed Kenyon's identification of sense-pauses. Each one is marked by an ellipsis (...). In addition, I have supplied sense-pauses in a few places where Kenyon appears to have overlooked them.

### *Correctors*

P46 has been corrected by a number of scribes. My identification scheme for correctors who have worked on Hebrews is given below.

The second hand (Kenyon's second hand) used very black ink and a broad stylus. Zuntz (1953, 253) describes this scribe as the *ex officio* corrector, implying that P46 is the product of a scriptorium. If so, this hand should be dated to the same time period as the first hand.

The third hand used a lighter ink, a narrow stylus, and a cursive hand. An example of the script is found between lines 11 and 12 of folio 33 recto

(Heb 11.12b). The *stichoi* are written in cursive script as well. Comparing the writing found between lines 11 and 12 of folio 33 recto with the *stichos* on page 38 verso shows a similarity in formation of the S, T and l, if not the C. In view of these similarities, I have attributed the *stichos* statement at the end of Hebrews to the third hand. (In this respect I differ from Zuntz (1953, 253), who attributes the *stichoi* to the second hand.) Zuntz (1953, 253-254) follows C. H. Roberts in dating this corrector to the late third century. Kenyon (1936, xii) estimates a date of the early third century.

The fourth hand is characterised by a broad stylus and ink which is subject to fading. This corrector is responsible for the numerous reading marks. According to Kenyon (1936, xiv), these marks 'have been added by another hand, perhaps that which has inserted the page-numeration.' Zuntz attributes the marks to the second hand (1953, 253 and n. 3), with some reservation.

There are a number of places where reading marks, page numbering, and alterations by the second hand appear in close proximity. The three sets of work have differing ink characteristics at some of these places, including folio 32 recto. The reading marks therefore seem to be by a fourth hand who is not the second hand or the scribe responsible for page numbering (i.e., the fifth hand). The fourth hand may be responsible for the additions of EN at 13.18 and 13.21.

I have ascribed the page numbering to a fifth hand. As already mentioned, there is reason for attributing the reading marks and page numbering to different scribes. Zuntz (1953, 253) attributes the page numbering to the second hand. This is an attractive proposition because there is a similarity of style that can be seen by comparing the second hand's HMWN with the page number MA on folio 21 recto. Nevertheless, differences in style for letters such as B and E have led me to regard the page numbers as the work of another scribe, whom I have designated the fifth hand.

It is possible that the work I attribute to five individuals is due to a lesser number of scribes. Differences of ink characteristics may be due to re-inking the pen or the use of different inks by the same scribe. Where two

sets of work being compared are on different pages, apparent differences in ink might be due to differing states of preservation for the respective pages.

The ink of the high points used to delete words indicates that they are by the first hand. Kenyon and Zuntz usually ascribe such deletions to the second hand. An illustrative case is found at Heb 11.21, where AUTOU is deleted and IWSHF added. The A and U of AUTOU are deleted with broad horizontal strokes, whereas the other three letters are deleted with high points. The dark, broad ink of the horizontal strokes is the same as in the word IWSHF, suggesting that the second hand was responsible for this part of the change. The facsimile shows that there is a difference between the ink in these corrections and the ink of the high points above the T, O, and U. The latter ink appears to belong to the first hand. A reasonable conclusion is that the first hand deleted AUTOU with high points. The addition of IWSHF by the second hand obliterated the high points above the A and U, so the corrector placed deletion strokes through these two letters. This lends support to my view that the first hand is responsible for deletions that employ high points.

Y. K. Kim (1988, fig. 2) provides a classification of added hands in P46. I was not aware of this when I made this transcription. It is possible that some of my corrector ascriptions will need to be revised in the light of Kim's work.

#### *Date and provenance*

According to Epp (1989, 272),

Carl Schmidt ... reports that a Fayumic dealer told him in early 1933 that the manuscripts were found in a pot at Atfih, that is, ancient Aphroditopolis in the Fayum, about two-thirds of the way up the Nile from Alexandria to Oxyrhynchus.

Y. K. Kim (1988, 248) suggests a date of the late first century. I am not qualified to see whether the accepted date of about 200 CE should be revised downwards. Metzger (1992, 265-6) is not inclined to agree with Kim's dating.



<ch 1><v 4> TOSOUTWN:

By error for TOSOUTW (Kenyon, 1936, 21).

<ch 1><v 6> [rt]AGAG[/rt][ut]H[/ut]:

There is insufficient space for EISAGAGH (Kenyon, 1936, 22).

<ch 1><v 9> [c1]SOU[/c1]:

Zuntz (1953, 256) attributes this to the second hand.

<ch 2><v 1> MHPOTE:

Kenyon has MH POTE.

<ch 2><v 4> [d0]SUNEPI MARTU ROUNTES[/d0] [c0]

SUNEPI MARTU ROUNTOS[/c0]:

The second *epsilon* has been altered to *omicron* by the first hand (Sanders, 1935, 60).

<ch 2><v 8> UPETAXAS:

Kenyon has a diaeresis mark over the U but I cannot see it in the facsimile.

<ch 2><v 18> [dx]PE[ut]P[/ut]OQ[fn]E[/fn][dx] [cx]PE[ut]P[/ut]O[st][ut]N[/ut]  
[st]Q[fn]E[/fn][cx]:

By error for PEPONQEN (Kenyon, 1936, 24). There may be a correction in the form of a N above the E with the final N stroke. If there is, it would most probably be due to the first hand or second hand.

<ch 3><v 2> E[rt]N T[/rt]W O[ut]I[/ut][rt]KW:

It seems that OLW has been omitted. OLW OIKW may have been written instead of TW OIKW (Sanders, 1935, 61).

<ch 3><v 3> [rt]TOU OIKOU[/rt] ECEI:

The usual word order appears to be transposed (Kenyon, 1936, 24).

<ch 3><v 6> [d0]MEN[/d0] [c0][st]ES[/st]MEN[/c0]:

According to Sanders (1935, 62), the first hand wrote MEN and the second hand added ES above it. Kenyon (1936, 24) agrees. It seems to

me that the ink, pen-width, and style are more consistent with the first hand.

<ch 3><v 7> [d0]MOU[/d0]:

MOU was added by the first hand. It has been deleted by both the first hand and the third hand (Sanders, 1935, 62). Zuntz (1953, 256, n. 1) writes, 'It is probable that the first pronoun [i.e., mou], for which there is no other evidence and which is palpably impossible, was not in the *Vorlage* but was penned by the scribe in a moment of absent-mindedness and that he himself deleted it immediately afterwards.' There may be remnants of an erased letter in the space following MOU.

<ch 4><v 15> PEPEIRA[rt]S[/rt]MENON:

The S may be missing altogether.

<ch 5><v 3> PRO[ut]S[/ut]FEREI:

By error for PROSFEREIN (Kenyon, 1936, 27).

<ch 5><v 6> [d1]EPEUX[/d1] [c1][st][di]I[/di]EREUS[/st]/[c1]:

The first hand wrote EPEUX, above which the second hand wrote JEREUS (Sanders, 1935, 65). This prompted Zuntz (1953, 253, n. 1) to write the following:

Was the scribe used to Latin P and mixed it up with Greek R? He uses a X which could be mistaken for S, and the initial I of IEREUS could be swallowed up into the final *iota* of the preceding EI. Thus one might account for this *error mirus*.

<ch 5><v 11> [c1]O[/c1]:

This was added by the second hand (Sanders, 1935, 66).

<ch 6><v 1> [d0]FERWNEQA[/d0][c3]'[/c3] [c0]FERW[st]M[/st]EQA[/c0]:

The *nu* was added above the *mu* by the second hand (Sanders, 1935, 66). The form of *mu* is consistent with the second hand, but the ink and pen-width suggest the first hand. I have ascribed this to the first hand in agreement with Zuntz (1953, 252, n. 5) and Royse (1981, 291, n. 32).

<ch 6><v 2> [d1][rt]N[/rt]E[/rt]K[/rt]RWN[/d1] [c1]NEKRWN[/c1][c3]'/[c3]:

The N and K appear to have been retraced by the second hand.

<ch 6><v 5> RHMATOS:

By error for RHMA (Kenyon, 1936, 29).

<ch 6><v 6> [d1]EAUTOUS[/d1] [c1]EAUTOS[/c1]:

The *upsilon* has been crossed out. Both Sanders (1935, 67) and Kenyon (1936, 29) attribute this alteration to the second hand and indicate that an *iota* has been added above the second *upsilon*. I cannot see this *iota* in the facsimile edition. (Wachtel and Witte (1994) place a dot beneath the *iota*.) Perhaps the scribe saw the nominative ending of the preceding word (which is erroneous) and made the alteration to *eautoç* in a mindless attempt to produce agreement in case.

<ch 6><v 7> OIS:

By error for OUS (Kenyon, 1935, 29).

<ch 6><v 13> KAKE EAUTOU:

Apparently by error.

<ch 6><v 16> PERAS:

There is an acute accent above the *epsilon*.

<ch 7><v 1> [d1]SAMOUHL[/d1] [c1]SA[st]L[/st]HM[/c1]:

Sanders (1935, 68) attributes this alteration to the third hand, whereas Kenyon (1936, 30) and Zuntz (1953, 253) ascribe it to the second. The ink and pen-width are consistent with the second hand. The corrector's *mu* does have an uncharacteristic shape, but this is due to its being formed from the existing *lambda*.

<ch 7><v 1> [d1]TW[/d1]:

TW has been deleted by the second and third hands (Sanders, 1935, 68).

There are deletion points above the word as well as strokes through it by another hand. The points are similar to the reading marks found throughout the manuscript, whereas the strokes are similar to ones drawn through SAMOUHL at 7.1. I have settled for the second hand in

accordance with Kenyon and Sanders. Royse (1981, 290, n. 29) notes that Sanders and Kenyon give no justification for the ascribing this to second hand.

<ch 7><v 2> [d1]SAMOUHL[/d1] [c1]SA[st]L[/st]HM[/c1]:

Sanders (1935, 68) attributes this to the third hand, whereas Kenyon (1936, 31) and Zuntz (1953, 253) attribute it to the second. There are numerous differences between this alteration and the corresponding one at 7.1. Deletion strokes are employed at 7.1 whereas deletion points (some of them elongated) are used at 7.2. The same letters (*lambda* and *mu*) are added in both alterations, but they have differing forms. All that can be said with confidence in this case is that the added *mu* is consistent with the second hand.

<ch 7><v 4> AKROTINIW[ut]N[/ut][c3]'[/c3]:

By error for AKROQINIWN (Kenyon, 1936, 31).

<ch 7><v 11> [d0]ARWN[/d0] [c0]AARWN[/c0]:

Arwn was written by the first hand and altered to Aarwn by the same scribe (Sanders, 1935, 69).

<ch 7><v 14> EK IOUDA:

By error for EX IOUDA (Kenyon, 1936, 32).

<ch 7><v 15> ANISTASQAI:

By error for ANISTATAI (Kenyon, 1936, 32).

<ch 7><v 16> OU:

By error for OS OU (Kenyon, 1936, 32).

<ch 7><v 19> KRIT<sup>˘</sup>TONOS:

This replaces Kenyon's KREITTONOS. It is in keeping with the scribe's usual practice.

<ch 7><v 25> [c1][st][kc]K[/kc][st][c1]:

This was added above the line by the second hand (Sanders, 1935, 70). Kenyon (1936, 33) also attributes it to the second hand.

<ch 7><v 28> O NOMOS GAR KAKISTHSIN ANQRWPOUS [di]l/[di]  
EREIS ECONTAS:

The following is the reconstruction of lines 23 to 25 of folio 28 verso supplied by Kenyon (1936, 33):

23 eauton anenegka"V o nomo<sup>a</sup>" gar kaqi  
24 sthsin arcieri" anqrw<sup>o</sup>p≥ou" <sup>a</sup>econta"  
25 <sup>a</sup>asqeneian o logo" de th" orkwmosia"<sup>o</sup>

Examination of the facsimile shows that the letter following the last four letters of ANQRWPOUS on line 24 is visible. It appears to be an J instead of the E given in Kenyon's reconstruction. The following reconstruction is therefore proposed:

23 eauton anenegka"V o nomo<sup>a</sup>" gar ka  
24 qisthsin anqrw<sup>o</sup>p≥ou" i>e≥<sup>a</sup>rei" econta"  
25 <sup>a</sup>asqeneian o logo" de th" orkwmosia"<sup>o</sup>

To illustrate further reasons for preferring this reconstruction, the letters of this section of text are presented in a manner better approximating their disposition in the manuscript. Ordinary *sigmas* are replaced with lunate *sigmas*, underlined letters signify lacunae, and the line of spaces corresponds to a vertical split in the manuscript.

23 eautonanenegk a<sup>ç</sup>onomo<sup>ç</sup>garka  
24 q<sup>ç</sup>i<sup>ç</sup>th<sup>ç</sup>in<sup>ç</sup>anqrw p≥ou<sup>ç</sup>i>e<sup>ç</sup>re<sup>ç</sup>ice<sup>ç</sup>onta<sup>ç</sup>  
25 a<sup>ç</sup>qeneianolog o<sup>ç</sup>deth<sup>ç</sup>corkwmo<sup>ç</sup>ia<sup>ç</sup>

This may be compared with Kenyon's reconstruction, presented in a corresponding way:

23 eautonanenegk a<sup>ç</sup>onomo<sup>ç</sup>garka<sup>ç</sup>qi  
24 <sup>ç</sup>th<sup>ç</sup>in<sup>ç</sup>arcieri<sup>ç</sup>anqrw p≥ou<sup>ç</sup>e<sup>ç</sup>conta<sup>ç</sup>  
25 a<sup>ç</sup>qeneianolog o<sup>ç</sup>deth<sup>ç</sup>corkwmo<sup>ç</sup>ia<sup>ç</sup>

In the facsimile, the letters  $\rho\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  of  $\alpha\eta\eta\rho\omega\upsilon\pi\omicron\upsilon$ " (line 24) are situated immediately beneath the letters  $\alpha\eta\omicron\eta$  of the words  $\alpha\eta\eta\epsilon\nu\gamma\kappa\alpha$ "  $\omicron\eta$   $\eta\omicron\nu\mu\omicron$ " (line 23). The proposed reconstruction complies with this situation better than Kenyon's reconstruction.

Placing the first two letters of  $\kappa\alpha\eta\iota\nu\sigma\theta\eta\varsigma\iota\eta$  on line 23 results in the number of letters preceding the vertical split being thirteen, compared with twenty in Kenyon's reconstruction. The average number of letters preceding the split for lines 19 to 23 is 13.8, making the proposed reconstruction more likely than Kenyon's reconstruction.

There is no manuscript support for the exact reading of the proposed reconstruction. The first hand of U6 has O NOMOS GAR KAQISTHSIN JEREIS ANQRWPOUS ECONTAS ASQENEIAN, which is the same as the proposed reconstruction, except for the transposition of IEREIS and ANQRWPOUS.

<ch 8><v 2> [d1]ANQRWPOIS[/d1][c3]/[c3] [c1]ANQRWPOS[/c1]:

The second hand deleted the *iota* (Sanders, 1935, 71).

<ch 8><v 5> MWUSH:

By error for MWUSHS (Kenyon, 1936, 34).

<ch 8><v 5> [d1]GRA FHSEI[/d1] [c1]GAR FHSI[st]N[/st]/[c1]:

The first hand wrote GRAFHSEI. Sanders (1935, 71), Kenyon (1936, 34), and Zuntz (1953, 18) agree that GRA is a corruption of GAR. Kenyon and Zuntz agree that the correction to  $\gamma\alpha\rho$  is by the second hand, whereas Sanders attributes it to the third hand. In my opinion, the ink is consistent with the second hand. According to Kenyon, the second hand is also responsible for altering  $\eta\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota$  to  $\eta\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota\eta$ . Sanders agrees that the second hand performed this alteration, but gives the result as  $\eta\eta\sigma\iota\eta$ . I agree with Sanders as there does seem to be a deletion stroke through the *epsilon*.

<ch 8><v 6> [d1]NUN[/d1] [c1]NUNI[/c1]:

An *iota* has been added by the second hand (Sanders, 1935, 71; cf.

Zuntz, 1953, 257).

<ch 8><v 6> DIAFWRWTERAS:

By error for DIAFORWTERAS (Kenyon, 1936, 34).

<ch 8><v 8> LEGEI:

There is an omission at this place due to *homoioteleuton* (Kenyon, 1936, 34). Immediately following LEGEI, the second hand has drawn an arrow that once functioned as a pointer to a marginal reference (Sanders, 1935, 71). Similar pointers to marginal corrections (which have been lost along with the bottom margins) are found at 9.14 and 12.6 as well. Sanders, Kenyon, Zuntz (1953, 253, n. 8), and Royse (1981, 237) attribute these additions to the second hand. I think that they were inserted by the first hand for the following reasons. The second hand appears to have retraced the existing pointer at 8.8, thereby implying that it was originally inserted by the first hand. The appearance of the ink at 9.14 indicates that this pointer was written by the first hand. At 12.6, the vertical stroke of the pointer is drawn in ink that has faded in a manner consistent with the ink of the first but not the second hand. (The top part of that sign may have been retraced by the second hand.)

<ch 8><v 10> EC[ut]E[/ut]IN[ut]A[/ut]S:

Kenyon (1936, 34) transcribes this word as EKEINAS, which is the expected spelling.

<ch 8><v 11> [rt]LEGWN[/rt]:

The manuscripts usually have either ADELTON LEGWN GNWQI TON KURION or ADELTON AUTOU LEGWN GNWQI TON KURION. Even though the word following ADELTON on line 14 is unreadable, it is unlikely to be AUTOU. This is because the inclusion of AUTOU and LEGWN would make the line longer than average.

<ch 8><v 11> GNW[ut]QI[/ut]:

The facsimile shows that the fourth and fifth letters of line 15 could be an A and U, rather than a Q and I. If these are the actual letters, the resulting reading is KAI EKASTOS TON ADELTON LEGWN GNW AUTON KURION which may be translated as '...and each [will teach his] brother saying, 'I may have known him Lord' or '...and each [will teach his]

brother saying, 'He may have known him Lord'. This reading does not make sense, mainly because AUTON and KURION are both accusative. The only other places in the New Testament where AUTON and KURION occur in conjunction are Matt 22.45 and Mark 12.37: 'If David calls him Lord', and 'David himself calls him Lord'. The verbs in these clauses are parsed as follows (Guillemette, 1986, 81, 220, 255):

Heb 8.11	GNW	1p sg sbj ao2 a or 3p sg sbj ao2 a
Matt 22.45	KALEI	3p sg ind pr a
Mark 12.37	LEGEI	3p sg ind pr a

The unusual construction adds to the difficulty of reading GNW AUTON. Consequently, I have retained the letters supplied by Kenyon.

<ch 8><v 12> ETI[c3]'/[c3]:

Kenyon regards this as a high-point punctuation mark. The ink suggests that this mark is by the the fourth hand (see the reading mark after KAINHN on the same line).

<ch 9><v 3> - <ch 9><v 4> ANA CRUSOUN:

The scribe has written ANA by error for AGIA (Kenyon, 1936, 35). The verse division is placed between ANA and CRUSOUN because verse 4 usually begins between AGIA and CRUSOUN,

<ch 9><v 5> [d1]KATASKEU=AZON[/d1] [d2][c1]KATASK[st]I[/st]=AZON[/c1] [d2] [c2]KATASK[st]I[/st]=AZON[st]TA[/st]I[/c2]:

Kenyon (1936, 35) attributes this alteration to the second hand. The addition of *iota* and deletion of *epsilon* and *upsilon* are consistent with this scribe, but the the *tau* and *alpha* appear to have been added by the third hand. (Similar scribal characteristics are seen in the addition of *nu* and *eta* at the top of folio 32 verso (Heb 10.22). I have attributed this correction to the third hand as well.)

<ch 9><v 6> [d1][ut]I[/ut]SASIN[/d1] [c1]E[di]I[/di]S[st][di]I[/di]I[/st]ASIN[/c1]:

The added initial *epsilon* and presumably retraced *iota* (with diaeresis, it seems) are consistent with the second hand. The same goes for the superscript *iota*, except that its ink is lighter than expected. An unusually large gap between the initial *iota* and the first *sigma* of ISASIN raises



some doubt concerning whether there was an initial *iota* at first. There is a noun *sh'si*", -ew", hJ = *sifting*, spelled *sa'si*" in the Doric dialect (Liddell and Scott, 1968, 1595), of which the accusative singular would be *sa'sin*. However, the sentence requires a verb here, and not a noun.

<ch 9><v 8> [d1]MHPWS[/d1] [c1]MHPW[/c1]:

Although I have followed Kenyon (1936, 35) in attributing this alteration to the second hand, it could be by the first hand.

<ch 9><v 8> [d1]OT[ut]I[/ut]/[d1] [c1][st]E[/st]T[ut]I[/ut]/[c1]:

Kenyon (1936, 35) and Royse (1981, 236) attribute this correction to the first hand. I think that the ink and style of the added *epsilon* are more consistent with the second hand.

<ch 9><v 9> [ut]S[/ut]U[ut]NI[/ut]/[rt]DHSIN[/rt]:

I have divided this word between lines differently to Kenyon, placing SUNI on line 25. This is consistent with both the facsimile and the scribe's tendency to hyphenate words between a vowel and consonant.

<ch 9><v 12> AIWNIA:

By error for AIWNIAN (Kenyon, 1936, 36).

<ch 9><v 14> [d1][ns][ut]PN[/ut]A[/ns]/[d1] [c1][ns]AIMA[/ns]/[c1]:

This word has been altered by a subsequent scribe, possibly the second hand. The form of the M is peculiar, with some similarity to that found in the correction made on the following page at 9.22 (AIMATI). The reading of the first hand follows that given in Wachtel and Witte (1994).

<ch 9><v 14> [d0]TW ZWNTI[/d0] [c0][rt]KAQARIEI THN SUNEIDHSIN  
HMWN APO NEKRWN ERGWN EIS TO LATREUEIN QEW ZWNTI[/rt]  
[/c0]:

'tw zwnti has been deleted by the second hand. The third hand drew a symbol above the line that points to a marginal reference, where the omitted part seems to have been added' (Sanders, 1935, 72). Kenyon (1936, 36) writes, 'the second hand deleted tw zwnti and added the pointer symbol which, without doubt, referred to the lower margin where the omitted words would have been added.'

In my opinion, the appearance of the ink in both the deletion points and the pointer symbol indicates that the first hand made these alterations. I have added the missing portion as reconstructed text on the assumption that the marginal supplement made good the omission.

<ch 9><v 15> TOUTOU:

By error for TOUTO (Kenyon, 1936, 36).

<ch 9><v 15> KEK[ut]L[/ut]HME[ut]M[/ut]OI:

The scribe appears to have written a *mu* instead of a *nu*.

<ch 9><v 20> [c1][st]O [ns]QS[/ns][st]/[c1]:

This has been added by the second hand (Sanders, 1935, 73).

<ch 9><v 22> [d1]N[ut]E[/ut][rt]K[/rt][ut]R[/ut]W[/d1] [c1][st]AIMATI[/st]/[c1]:

According to Sanders (1935, 73), the first hand wrote *nekrw* then wrote *aimati* above it. Kenyon (1936, 37) agrees that the first hand wrote *nekrw* but attributes *aimati* to the second hand. The characteristics of the correction are consistent with the second hand, in my opinion. There appears to be an *epsilon* where the *kappa* of *nekrw* once stood. This could be the right-hand part of a *kappa* with a deletion stroke drawn through it.

<ch 9><v 22> [d0]KAI SCEDON[/d0]:

Sanders (1935, 73) and Kenyon (1936, 37) attribute this deletion to the second hand. Royse (1981, 290, n. 24) has reservations:

There appears to be no feature of the points above this word which would justify such an ascription. Indeed, even if the points were in a different colored ink, one could hardly infer with confidence that the scribe could not have written them.

In my opinion, the deletion marks are more consistent with the first hand. Other possible instances of deletion by the same scribe are found at 3.7 and 9.14.

<ch 9><v 24> [d0]PROSWPOU[/d0] [c0]PROSWPW[st]W[/st]/[c0]:

Sanders (1935, 73) and Kenyon (1936, 37) attribute this correction to the second hand. I do not agree as the characteristics of the *omega* are consistent with the first hand. According to Kenyon, *proçwpou* is an error.

<ch 9><v 25> [c0][st]EN[/st]/[c0]:

Sanders (1935, 73) and Kenyon (1936, 37) attribute this correction to the second hand. I regard the ink, pen-width, and style as being consistent with the first hand.

<ch 9><v 26> KOSMOU:

I have placed all of this reconstructed word on the second last line of the page. This arrangement eliminates the hyphenation and conforms better with respect to line lengths.

<ch 10><v 1> [ut]K[/ut]AI THN:

By error for OUK AUTHN THN (Kenyon, 1936, 38).

<ch 10><v 1> [c1][st]AS[/st]/[c1]:

Zuntz (1953, 258) and Kenyon (1936, 38) ascribe this to the second hand.

<ch 10><v 1> OUDEPOTE:

The downward stroke of the T appears to have been traced over by the second hand.

<ch 10><v 7> [rt]SOU[/rt]:

A superscript letter, possibly a S, appears to have been written here.

<ch 10><v 7> - <ch 10><v 8>:

Three lines of this page are lost according to Kenyon (1936, 38). My reconstruction adds OTI QUSIAS after LEGWN on line 25. It requires only two lines and conforms to the line lengths of the preceding lines.

<ch 10><v 10> [d1]PROS[/d1]... [c1]PROSFORAS[/c1]:

The second hand wrote FORAS in a space that the first hand left after

PROS. According to Zuntz (1953, 256), 'the scribe had jibbed, for unknown reasons, and had left it to the corrector to fill in the second half of the word.'

<ch 10><v 10> [d1][ns]IHS[/ns] [ns]CRS[/ns]/[d1] [c1][ns]IHU CRU[/ns]/[c1]:  
The appearance of the ink suggests that this is the work of the second hand.

<ch 10><v 12> DIHNEGKES:  
By error for DIHNEKES (Kenyon, 1936, 39).

<ch 10><v 16> AUTH:  
A mark above the A could be a rough breathing.

<ch 10><v 22> [dx][rt]PROSER[/rt]COMEQA[/dx] [cx][rt]PROSER[/rt]C[st][ut]W[/ut]/[st]MEQA[/cx]:  
It is not clear which corrector made this correction. Kenyon (1936, 39) ascribes it to the second hand. In my view, the ink characteristics do not support such an ascription.

<ch 10><v 22> [d0]GAR[/d0]:  
The appearance of the ink indicates that the deletion marks are the work of the first hand.

<ch 10><v 22> [d2]ALHQEIAS[/d2] [c2]ALHQEI[st]NH[/st]S[/c2]:  
Kenyon (1936, 39) attributes this to the second hand. I have followed Zuntz (1953, 252, n. 3) in ascribing it to the third hand. In fact, Zuntz draws attention to this alteration and the one at line 10 of the same page to show that more than one corrector worked on P46.

<ch 10><v 24> [d1]KATANOWMEN[/d1] [c1]KATANO[st]H[/st][ut]S[/ut]WMEN [c1]:  
According to Kenyon (1936, 40), the first hand wrote *katanowmen* then the second hand inserted *iota* and wrote *eta* above it. Wachtel and Witte (1994) read a *sigma* instead of an *iota*, thereby making a word.

<ch 10><v 25> [d0]EPISUNAGWGHN[/d0] [c0]SUNAGWGHN[/c0]:

Kenyon (1936, 40) notes that the deletion appears to have been made by the second hand. In my opinion, the appearance of the ink is more consistent with the first hand.

<ch 10><v 25> [c1][st]KAQWS[/st]/[c1] EQOS [d1]TI[/d1] [c1]TI[st]SIN[/st]  
/[c1]:

The first hand wrote EQOS TI by error. This was later corrected by the second hand (Kenyon, 1936, 40). Zuntz (1953, 253) also attributes the correction to the second hand.

<ch 10><v 34> [d0]HMWN[/d0] [c0][st]U[/st]MWN[/c0]:

This correction is by the first hand (Kenyon, 1936, 41).

<ch 10><v 34> [d1]PROSEXASQE[/d1] [c1]PROS[st]E[/st]DEXASQE[/c1]:

This correction is by the second hand (Kenyon, 1936, 41).

<ch 10><v 36> [d1][di]U[/di]POMONHN[/d1] [c1][di]U[/di]POMONH[st]S[/st]  
/[c1]:

Kenyon (1936, 41) assigns this to the second hand. Wachtel and Witte (1994) appear to have interpreted the superscript *sigma* as a reading mark. Their apparatus correctly identifies uJpomoh'n as a reading of the first hand alone. There is no reading mark associated with this word.

<ch 10><v 37> [c1][st]OSON[/st]/[c1]:

Zuntz (1953, 253) and Kenyon (1936, 41) attribute this to the second hand.

<ch 10><v 38> [d1]KAN[/d1] [c1]KAI [st]EA[/st]N[/c1]:

Kenyon (1936, 41) attribute this to the second hand.

<ch 11><v 4> Kenyon reconstructs lines 28 and 29 as follows:

TOBLEPOMENONGEGONENAIPISTEI  
PLEIONAQUSIANABELPARAKAINPROSHNEGKETWQW

Kilpatrick (1941, 68) proposed this reconstruction:

TOBLEPOMENONGEGONENAIPISTIPLEI  
ONAQUSIANABELPARAKAINPROSHNEGKE

This is preferable to Kenyon's reconstruction. The average line-length over the preceding ten lines (lines 18 to 27 of page XG) is 29.6 letters, with a standard deviation of 2.2 letters. Based on the ten-line average, other line-lengths will fall within the range of 23 to 36 letters in 99.7% of cases, provided that line-lengths are normally distributed. The last line of Kenyon's reconstruction contains 39 letters, a line-length that is expected to occur in less than 0.3% of cases.

The first hand of P46 regularly uses the spelling PISTI and tends not to drop final *nus*. There is not one example of a word ending in KE in Hebrews, whereas many words end in KEN. Modifying Kenyon's proposed text by retaining the final *nu* of PROSHNEGKEN, placing a line division between PLEIONA and QUSIAN, and using the spelling PISTI, results in the following reconstruction in which both lines contain 33 letters:

TOBLEPOMENONGEGONENAIPISTIPLEIONA  
QUSIANABELPARAKAINPROSHNEGKENTWQW

Modifying Kilpatrick's reconstruction to retain the final *nu* of PROSHNEGKEN and placing the line division between the *omicron* and *nu* of PLEIONA results in both lines having 31 letters:

TOBLEPOMENONGEGONENAIPISTIPLEIO  
NAQUSIANABELPARAKAINPROSHNEGKEN

The latter reconstruction better conforms to the average line-length of 29.6 letters. That is, a reconstruction that omits TW QW is preferable on the grounds of probability. However, this is not a compelling argument because the probability of two lines of 33 letters is not too much less than the probability of two lines with 31 letters.

R. W. Lyons warns of the risks associated with placing too much confidence in a conjectural reconstruction (1959, 265):

The reconstructed text often easily becomes the 'cited' text even though it is without real justification. This type of error may be illustrated by the problem of the text of Π46 in Heb xi. 4. The two lost lines, as reconstructed by Kenyon, clearly contain more letters than were originally written in the text, Kenyon himself suggested *para kain* might have been omitted, but G. D. Kilpatrick prefers to believe that the papyrus, with Π13, omitted *tw q—w—*. Without passing judgment now as to whether Kenyon's or Kilpatrick's suggestion is to be preferred, is it correct for an editor to include this conjecture ... in an apparatus criticus, since it is really no more than a conjecture? Any number of blunders or singular readings may have been written in these missing lines. Though reservations (such as the question-mark, *videtur*, or some other means) are expressly stated in citing the manuscript, that citation is bound to have some influence in the choice of the primitive reading.

With this warning in mind, I have left TW QW in my reconstruction of these lines.

<ch 11><v 5> QANATON ~ :

There is a mark following QANATON that resembles a high dot punctuation mark. Kenyon (1936, 42) transcribes it as a colon. No colons occur anywhere else in Hebrews whereas a high point punctuation mark is found at 12.19. Even though the facsimile (1937, f. 33 v.) shows what may be a very feint trace of the lower part of a colon, I have transcribed the punctuation as a high point in view of the lack of antecedents for a colon.

<ch 11><v 7> BLEPOMENWN... EULABHQEIS:

I have inserted a sense-pause marker (...) between these two words. There is a space between them and a pause in sense: the two conditions Kenyon (1936, xiv) considers necessary for a sense-pause.

<ch 11><v 7> [d1]TO[ut]S[/ut]/[d1] [c1]TON[/c1]:

Kenyon (1936, 42) does not note this correction. The characteristics are consistent with the second hand.

<ch 11><v 9> [di]I[/di]SAK:

The scribe uses this spelling consistently (cf. Heb 11.17, 18, and 20).

<ch 11><v 10> [d0]DHMOURGOS[/d0][c3]'/[c3] [c0]DHM[st]I[/st]OURGOS  
[/c0]:

Kenyon (1937, preface) attributes this to the second hand. I do not agree. The consistency of the ink does not decide convincingly for either corrector, but the form of the *iota* belongs to the first hand.

<ch 11><v 10> [ns]QS[/ns]...:

I have inserted a sense-pause here as there is a space between words and a pause in sense.

<ch 11><v 12> [c2][st]H PARA TO CEI[ut]L[/ut]OS[/st][[/c2]:

Kenyon (1936, 43) attributes this to the second hand. However, it is clearly the work of another scribe who wrote with a cursive style: that is, the third hand. Kenyon did not go beyond the first and second hands in accounting for corrections, but Sanders did. Zuntz (1953, 252, n. 3) writes, 'Kenyon's apparatus criticus distinguishes 'man. 1' and 'man. 2'. H. A. Sanders ... sporadically quotes 'man. 3'; his introduction, though, does not account for this.'

<ch 11><v 13> [d0]TAUTAS[/d0] [c0]AUTAS[/c0]:

Apparently corrected by the first hand (Kenyon, 1936, 43).

<ch 11><v 15> MNHMONEOUSIN:

Spelled as shown (instead of MNHMONOUSIN) (Kenyon, 1936, 43).

<ch 11><v 15> EICA[ut]N[/ut]:

By error for EICON AN (Kenyon, 1936, 43).

<ch 11><v 16> [ns]QS[/ns]...:

I have inserted a sense-pause as the space between words coincides with a pause in sense.

<ch 11><v 19> EKOMISATO:

There may be an erased letter between the A and T.

<ch 11><v 21> PISTEI:

The scribe uses the spelling PISTI up until this point, then changes to



PISTEI. To be more precise, from 11.1 to 11.20, PISTi occurs 9 times and PISTEI does not occur. From 11.21 to 11.31, PISTi occurs once (at 11.22) and PISTEI occurs 7 times. Apparently, the scribe adopted the new spelling while copying this passage.

<ch 11><v 21> [d0]AUTOU[/d0] [c1][st][di]I[/di]WSHF[/st][[/c1]:

Zuntz (1953, 253) and Kenyon (1936, 44) attribute the deletion of AUTOU and addition of IWSHF to the second hand. In my opinion, the first hand deleted AUTOU with high points. The second hand obliterated the high points above the A and U of AUTOU in the process of adding IWSHF. The same scribe then drew deletion strokes through the A and U.

<ch 11><v 22> [d0]OSTWN[/d0] [c0]OST[st]E[/st]WN[/c0]:

This correction seems to be by the first hand according to Kenyon (1936, 44). Royse (1981, 236) agrees.

<ch 11><v 23> PATERWN AUTOU:

There may be an erased letter between these two words.

<ch 11><v 26> My reconstruction differs from Kenyon's. I have:

25 PLOUTON HGHSAMENOS TWN AI=  
26 GUPTOU QHSAURWN' TON ONEIDI=  
27 SMON TOU CRU APEBLEPEN GAR

Kenyon (1936, 44) has:

25 PLOUTON HGHSAMENOS TWN AIGU=  
26 PTOU QHSAURWN TON ONEI=  
27 DISMON TOU CRU APEBLEPEN GAR

The change in division between lines of AIGUPTOU has been made because inspection of the facsimile shows that only the letters ...N AI could be added to line 25 before it became longer than the lines preceding it. The change in division of ONEIDISMON between lines 26 and 27 has been made to keep the corresponding line-lengths closer to the lengths of the preceding lines. The final *nu* of APEBLEPEN has been

added as the first hand was not in the habit of omitting final *nus*.

<ch 11><v 29> [c1]HS[/c1]:

Kenyon (1936, 44) is not sure whether this is the work of the first hand or the second hand. The ink and form of the S are consistent with the second hand (cf. IWSHF, 11.21).

<ch 11><v 32> [d1][di]l[/di][ut]E[/ut]QAE[/d1] [c1][di]l[/di][ut]E[/ut][st]F[/st]QAE  
[/c1]:

Royse (1981, 290, n. 28) notes that Kenyon's transcription (i>fqae) is incorrect: 'the plate clearly shows that the scribe first wrote ieqae, and then added f'. I regard the ink and style of the added *phi* to be more consistent with the second hand.

<ch 11><v 34> [d0]EPI[/d0] [c0][st]A[/st]PO[/c0]:

Attributed to the first hand by Zuntz (1953, 253, n. 2) and Kenyon (1936, 45).

<ch 11><v 35> [d1]APOLUSIN[/d1] [c1]APOLU[st]TRW[/st]SIN[/c1]:

Attributed to the second hand by Zuntz (1953, 253) and Kenyon (1936, 45).

<ch 11><v 36> FULAKAIS:

By error for FULAKHS (Kenyon, 1936, 45).

<ch 11><v 40> PROSBLEYAMENOI:

By error for PROSBLEYAMENOU (Kenyon, 1936, 46).

<ch 12><v 1> O[ut]G[/ut]KWN:

By error for OGKON (Kenyon, 1936, 46).

<ch 12><v 1> TO:

By error for TON (Kenyon, 1936, 46).

<ch 12><v 4> [d1]OPOU[/d1] [c1]O[st]U[/st]P[st]W[/st][[/c1]:

Zuntz (1953, 253, n. 2) attributes this to the first hand. Kenyon (1936, 46) ascribes it to the second hand. In my opinion, the horizontal deletion

mark and the style of the added U and W indicate that this is by the second hand.

<ch 12><v 4> [d0]ANTIKATESTH[ut]S[/ut]EN[/d0] [c0]ANTIKATESTHKEN  
[/c0]:

So ascribed by Kenyon (1936, 46).

<ch 12><v 5> [di]U[/di]MEIN:

Kenyon has not transcribed the diaeresis.

<ch 12><v 5> U[di]l[/di]OIS:

Kenyon (1936, 46) transcribes this word as U[di]l[/di]OUS, then notes that UIOUS is a mistake of the first hand and should read UIOIS. In my opinion, the fourth letter of this word is an *iota*. If so, Kenyon's transcription is incorrect and the associated note is unnecessary.

<ch 12><v 5> PAIDEIA:

By error for PAIDEIAS (Kenyon, 1936, 46).

<ch 12><v 6> [c0][rt]MASTIGOI DE PANTA UION ON PARADECETAI[/rt]  
[/c0] <ch 12><v 7> [c0][rt]EIS PAIDEIAN UPOMENETE WS UIOIS UMIN  
PROSFERETAI O [ns]QS[/ns] TIS GAR UIOS ON OU PAIDEUEI[/rt][c0]:

The words MASTIGOI ... PAIDEUEI have been omitted through *homoioleuton*. An omission sign indicates that the words have been added in the lower margin (Kenyon, 1936, 47).

The vertical stroke of the pointer is faded. The upper part is darker, possibly having been retraced by the second hand. The faded vertical suggests to me that the sign was originally inserted by the first hand.

I have supplied the missing portion as reconstructed text under the assumption that the marginal supplement corrected the omission.

<ch 12><v 8> [d1]OIS[/d1] [c1]HS[/c1]:

Kenyon (1936, 47) ascribes this correction to the second hand and notes that the original word may have been either EIS or OIS. The form of the first deleted letter indicates that it was an O, in my opinion.

<ch 12><v 10> [c1][st]GAR[/st]/[c1]:

So ascribed by Zuntz (1953, 253).

<ch 12><v 10> EAUTOIS:

Kenyon mistakenly transcribes this word as AUTOIS.

<ch 12><v 10> METABALEIN:

By error for METALABEIN (Kenyon, 1936, 47).

<ch 12><v 13> [d1]E[ut]N[/ut]TRAPH[/d1][c3]'/[c3] [c1]EKTRAPH[/c1]:

The second hand has superimposed a *kappa* on what appears to be a *nu*.

<ch 12><v 14> [d1]OU[/d1] [c1][rb]O[/rb]U[/c1]:

This symbol appears to be a rough breathing mark. A similar mark appears above line 26 of the plate of P75 reproduced in Metzger's *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible* (1981, 69). The darkness of the ink suggests that it is by the second hand. For comparison, two rough breathing marks that appear to be by the first hand are found at 1 Cor 10.17 (f. 50 v., line 18).

<ch 12><v 14> [d1]OUDEI[/d1] [c1]OUDEIS[/c1] OYETAI [ns]KS[/ns] <ch 12><v 15> EPISKOPOUNTAS[c3]'/[c3]:

This wording is peculiar to P46. Kenyon (1936, 47) assigns the alteration to the second hand.

<ch 12><v 15> EN C[ut]O[/ut]LH:

Kenyon transcribes this as ENC[ut]H[/ut]LH. The uncertain letter does not appear to be an *eta* but could quite possibly be an *omicron* or an *iota*. P. Katz has conjectured ejn colh' for ejnoclh', based on Deut 29.17 of the LXX (BAGD, 1979, 883).

<ch 12><v 19> [d1]FWNHN[/d1] [c1]FWNH[/c1]:

A mark occurs above the *nu*. Kenyon (1936, 48) regards this as a high dot deletion mark. I have attributed this mark to the second hand because of its similarity with deletion marks used by the second hand at 7.2.

<ch 12><v 19> RHMATWN ~ :

This is an example of the high dot punctuation mark mentioned by Kenyon (1936, xiv) in the introduction to his transcription.

<ch 12><v 23> [c1][st]PANTWN[/st]/[c1]:

So ascribed by Zuntz (1953, 253) and Kenyon (1936, 48).

<ch 12><v 25> [d1]TON[/d1] ... [c1][st]TON[/st]/[c1]:

Thus attributed by Zuntz (1953, 258) and Kenyon (1936, 48).

<ch 12><v 26> [d1]EI[/d1]:

So ascribed by Zuntz (1953, 258) and Kenyon (1936, 48).

<ch 12><v 28> [d0]ECOMEN[/d0] [c0]ECWMEN[/c0]:

So ascribed by Zuntz (1953, 252, n. 5) and Kenyon (1936, 49).

<ch 13><v 5> [d1]ARKOUMENO[ut]l[/ut]/[d1] [c1]ARKOUMENOS[/c1]:

This correction is not noted by Kenyon. The darker ink of the S indicates that the second hand inserted this letter. There appears to be an l underneath.

<ch 13><v 6> [d0]LEGEI[/d0] [c0]LEGEI[st]N[/st]/[c0]:

So ascribed by Kenyon (1936, 49).

<ch 13><v 7> MNHMONEUETE [ut]T[/ut]WN:

The facsimile shows that the T could also be an l, making MNHMONEUETE[ut]l[/ut] WN a possible alternative. However, the ending -ETEI is not a legal form. This transcription therefore retains the T.

<ch 13><v 7> WS:

By error for WN (Kenyon, 1936, 49).

<ch 13><v 8> [c1]KAI[/c1]:

It is difficult to say whether the additions of kai here and in the next verse are due to the first or second hand (cf. Zuntz, 1953, 252, n. 4; Royse, 1981, 291, n. 30). It seems unlikely that they would be by different hands. I am inclined to attribute them to the second hand on

grounds of style.

<ch 13><v 9> [c1]KAI[/c1]:

See the comment at <ch 13><v 8>.

<ch 13><v 11> [d1][rt]KAIENTAI[/rt]/[d1] [c1][st]KATA[/st][rt]KAIENTAI[/rt]/[c1]:

This reconstruction is speculative. Only KATA is visible. Kenyon (1936, 50) attributes the correction to the second hand.

<ch 13><v 17> APODWSONTAS:

By error for APODWSONTES (Kenyon, 1936, 51).

<ch 13><v 18> [d0]KAL=HN[/d0] [c0]KA=LHN[/c0]:

The scribe changed his mind about how to divide this word (Royse, 1981, 236).

<ch 13><v 18> [cx][st][ut]EN[/ut]/[st]/[cx]:

Kenyon (1936, 51) attributes this to the second hand, along with a similar addition of EN at 13.21. I disagree with this assignment. In both cases, the ink has a slightly different appearance to that of the adjacent lines, being less distinct. This tends to rule out the first hand. In addition, the ink does not seem dark enough for the second hand or fine enough for the third hand. If anything, the ink is reminiscent of the numerous reading marks, which are attributed to a fourth hand in this transcription. It is difficult to attribute this correction and the similar one at 13.21 to a particular corrector with a reasonable level of confidence. As a result, these corrections are ascribed to the anonymous category (i.e., [cx]).

<ch 13><v 19> APO[ut]KATA[/ut][rt]S[/rt][ut]Q[/ut]W:

Not APOKATASTAQW, as in Kenyon (1936, 51).

<ch 13><v 21> [cx][st][ut]EN[/ut]/[st]/[cx]:

See the note concerning EN at 13.18.

<ch 13><v 21> [d1][ns]H[ut]S[/ut]/[ns]/[d1] [c1][ns]HU[/ns]/[c1] [d1][ns]CRS  
[ns]/[d1] [c1][ns]CRU[/ns]/[c1]:

This correction is not noted by Kenyon. The consistency of the ink indicates that it is by the second hand.

<ch 13><v 22> [d0]APESTEILA[/d0] [c0]EPESTEILA[/c0]:

Apparently, this correction is by the first hand (Kenyon, 1936, 51).

<ch 13><v 23> [d0]APO[/d0] [c0]APOLELU[st][sc][ut]MENON[/ut]/[sc]/[st]  
[/c0]:

According to Kenyon (1936, 51), 'The letters *lelu*<sup>m</sup> seem to have been added by the first hand.' I have taken the symbol drawn above the *upsilon* to represent -MENON.

<ch 13><v 24> [di]U[/di]M[fn]W[/fn]:

The serif at the base of the *upsilon* is not characteristic of the first hand. The second hand might be considered to be responsible because of the ink and upright style. However, comparison with the following correction by the second hand makes this ascription seem unlikely. On balance, I think that the first hand is a more likely to be responsible for this word.

<ch 13><v 24> [c1]KAI PANTAS TOUS AGIOUS[/c1]:

The second hand has added this between lines written by the first hand.

<ch 13><v 25> [d1][di]U[/di]/[d1] [c1][di]U[/di]MWN[/c1]:

The first hand wrote only the first letter of UMW<sup>N</sup>, while the second hand supplied the missing letters (Zuntz, 1953, 253). It is possible that the diaeresis was not added by the first hand. A horizontal stroke, apparently by the first hand, extends from the *upsilon* into the right-hand margin. Another stroke by the same hand is drawn below this last line of text in Hebrews, and extends from the left-hand margin to the middle of the column.

subscription: [c2]STI[st][sc]COI[/sc]/[st] Y[/c2]:

That is, 700. This *stichos* note is written in large, cursive script. The hand seems to be the same one that made the alteration above line 12 of f. 33 r.

## References

Kenyon, Frederic G. (ed.). 1936. *The Chester Beatty biblical papyri: descriptions and texts of twelve manuscripts on papyrus of the*

*Greek Bible. Fasciculus 3 supplement. Pauline epistles: text.*  
London: Emery Walker.

Kenyon, Frederic G. (ed.). 1937. *The Chester Beatty biblical papyri: descriptions and texts of twelve manuscripts on papyrus of the Greek Bible. Fasciculus 3 supplement. Pauline epistles: plates.*  
London: Emery Walker.

Kilpatrick, George D. 1941. 'The Chester Beatty papyrus Π<sup>46</sup> and Hebrews xi. 4'. *Journal of theological studies* 42, 68-69.

Kim, Young Kyu. 1988. 'Palaeographical dating of P<sup>46</sup> to the later first century'. *Biblica* 69, 248-57.

Royse, James Ronald. 1981. 'Scribal habits in early Greek New Testament papyri'. Dissertation (ThD). Graduate Theological Union.

Sanders, Henry A. (ed.). 1935. *A third-century papyrus codex of the epistles of Paul.* Ann Arbor. University of Michigan Press.

Zuntz, Günther. 1953. *The text of the epistles: a disquisition upon the corpus Paulinum.* Schweich Lectures of 1946. London: British Academy.



## P79

Berlin, Staatl. Mus., inv. 6774.

Transcribed and verified by reference to photographs.

Reading marks similar to those found in P46 are found in this papyrus. Nearly all of them appear to have been written by a corrector. Diaeresis consists of a single line. Three examples occur: IEREUS (10.11), MWUSEWS (10.28), and ENUBRISAS (10.29). It is possible that the line above MWUSEWS is a *nomen sacrum* superscript.

### *Correctors*

A second hand appears to have made a correction at Heb 10.10.

<ch 10><v 10> HGIASMENOI:

Portions of letters which probably belong to this word are visible. They are too poorly preserved to be read.

<ch 10><v 10> [d1]EFAPA[rt]X[rt]/[d1] [c1]EFAPAX"/[c1]:

The X appears to have been retraced and the two strokes added by the second hand.

<ch 10><v 11> GWN[c1]"/[c1] K[ut]A[/ut][rt]I TAS AUTAS[/rt]:

The expected reading of this line (GWN KAI TAS AUTAS POLLAKIS) is too long. It has a length of 22 letters, whereas the average line-length for the this side of this papyrus is 14.1 letters, with a standard deviation 1.25 letters. It follows that one or more of the words TAS AUTAS POLLAKIS are likely to have been absent from the papyrus. Two possible reconstructions, both of fourteen letters, are:

GWN" K[ut]A[/ut][rt]I POLLAKIS[/rt]

GWN" K[ut]A[/ut][rt]I TAS AUTAS[/rt]

I opt for the latter reconstruction because I suppose that the omission of the adverb would be more likely.

<ch 10><v 28> [rt]AQETH[/rt][ut]SAS[/ut]:

Some letters of the preceding word (UPENANTIOUS) may be visible.

## References

Treu, Kurt. 1966. 'Neue neutestamentliche Fragmente'. *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 18, 37-38.

Horsley, G. H. R. 1982. *New documents illustrating early Christianity*. Vol. 2. Sydney: Macquarie University, 139.

## **P89**

Florence, Bibl. Laurenziana, PL III/292.

Transcribed and verified by reference to photographs.

I have arranged the reconstructed and extant text in a different way to Pinaudi (1981, 42-44). My arrangements attempt to do the following:

- (1) conform to the relative position of letters in consecutive lines of the extant text;
- (2) reduce the number of reconstructed words that must be divided between lines; and
- (3) approximately match the number of reconstructed letters *preceding* the extant text on one side of the fragment with the number of letters *following* the extant text on the opposite side.

The first two constraints take priority over the third, which is weakened by the potential for variation in the number of letters per line of text.

### *Date*

According to Pickering (1991, 6), 'The editor assigned the hand to the second half of IV, preferably towards the end of the century'.

<ch 6><v 7> POLLAKIS TON EP AUTHS ERKOMENON:

This variation of word order is also found in U44.

<ch 6><v 9> AG[ut][rt]APHTOI:

This word may be ADELFOI, as found in U44. The uncertain letter is more probably a G than a D, as may be seen by comparing it with the G in EULOGIAS at 6.7.

<ch 6><v 17> Q[rt]EOS[rt]:

There does not appear to be a *nomen sacrum* superscript here.

## **References**

Pickering, S. R. 1991. *Recently published New Testament papyri: P89 - P95*. Papyrology and historical perspectives, 2. Sydney: Macquarie University, 6-10.

Pintaudi, Rosario. 1981. 'N.T. Ad Hebraeos, VI, 7-9; 15-17 (PL III/92)'.  
*Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 42, 42-44.

## U

Codex Sinaiticus (Å). London, British Library, add. 43725.

Transcribed and verified by reference to Tischendorf's pseudo-facsimile edition (1862),. Compared against a Xerox copy of Lake's photographic facsimile (1911).

Tischendorf's edition has been followed where my Xerox copy of Lake's facsimile is not readable. Consequently, there is no uncertain or reconstructed text in my transcription. Any errors in Tischendorf's edition that occur in the unreadable parts of my Xerox copy will have been carried over into my transcription.

This is a beautifully written manuscript. Some think that it may be one of the fifty Bibles ordered from Eusebius of Caesarea by Constantine. Constantine specified that the Bibles should be copied by calligraphers. Female calligraphers copied Origen's works while he was in Caesarea. I would not be surprised if Codex Sinaiticus was copied by female calligraphers as well. Its fourth century date precedes the time when monasteries began to dominate manuscript production. As far as orthography is concerned, one noticeable feature is that *kaiv* compendia only occur at line-ends.

### *Correctors*

Tischendorf identified four scribes of Codex Sinaiticus: A, B, C, and D. Following discussion of various characteristics of the scribes, Milne and Skeat (1938, 29) conclude that Sinaiticus was copied by three scribes, being Tischendorf's A, B, and D. That is, all of scribe C's work can be attributed to these three. Apart from folio 91 (Heb 4.16 to 8.1), Hebrews was copied by scribe A. Scribe D is responsible for folio 91, which frequently contains filling marks (>) at line-ends. According to Scrivener (1867, xvii-xviii, n. 4), 'this mark is never met with in the N.T. at the end of a line for the mere purpose of filling up a blank space ... except in the leaves assigned to D, *on every one of which it repeatedly occurs...*' Milne and Skeat (1938, 60, 64) give scribes A, B, and D a *terminus post quem* of 300-340, and a *terminus ante quem* of about 360.

Tischendorf postulated a number of correctors that were divided into the

chronological groups A, B, C, D, and E (Milne and Skeat, 1938, 40). According to Milne and Skeat (1938, 41), scribes A and D account for the corrections which Tischendorf attributed to the A and B groups of correctors:

Since we have already concluded from the evidence of the supplementary apparatus ... that both A and D, in addition to copying the text, were engaged in the further equipment of the manuscript, we may expect to find both among the correctors. Further examination has not only confirmed this surmise, but has enabled us to apportion the entire body of 'A' and 'B' corrections to these two scribes, although to distinguish between them is not always possible.

Concerning group C, Milne and Skeat (1938, 65) write:

The C correctors have been assigned by some to the fifth, by others to the seventh century, and lack of comparative material enforces caution upon whoever would decide between the two dates.

In the section of his notes which covers Hebrews (1862, 39\*, 40), Tischendorf only mentions alterations by the first hand and by the A and C groups of correctors. (I will refer to these groups as correctors A and C from now on.) According to Milne and Skeat, Tischendorf's group A correctors are always one of the scribes who copied Hebrews in the first place (i.e., scribe A or D). If every correction that Tischendorf ascribed to corrector A were by the first hands, they would all be auto-corrections. That is, alterations which Tischendorf ascribed to the first hand would be merged with ones he thought were by subsequent hands. I do not think that Tischendorf would have confused corrections by the first hand with those of subsequent hands. For this reason, I attribute to scribe D all those corrections that Tischendorf ascribes to corrector A. This table summarises the correspondence between my labels and the scribes and correctors of Codex Sinaiticus:

<i>Label</i>	<i>Tischendorf</i>	<i>Milne &amp; Skeat</i>	<i>NA27</i>	<i>Date (C.)</i>
[c0]/[d0]	scribe A	scribe A	Å*	4
[c2]/[d2]	corrector A	scribe D	Å <sup>l</sup>	4
[c3]/[d3]	corrector C	corrector C	Å <sup>2</sup>	6

The correspondence with NA27 was obtained from the *Synopsis of sigla for correctors in manuscripts* found in Aland and Aland (1989, 108). All of the text of folio 91 (4.16 to 8.1), except for corrections, is attributed to scribe D.

I assign a sixth century date to corrector C on the strength of the following statement by Lake (1911, xvii-xviii):

On the whole the C hands so closely resemble each other, and can with such little confidence be much separated in date, that there is considerable force in the suggestion that they all come from the scriptorium at Caesarea, and represent a thoroughgoing attempt to accommodate the Codex Sinaiticus to a model which in the fifth and sixth century was more fashionable than the original text.

The first corrector (i.e., [c1]/[d1]) seems to be absent from the table. This is because I began by treating scribe D as the first corrector. Unfortunately, this scheme caused major problems at the collation stage because scribe D is the first hand in one part and the second hand in another part of Hebrews. To avoid the problems, I now treat the folio copied by scribe D as a separate entity, U1s.

I have retained the existing scheme in order to avoid having to repeat the entire collation and mapping exercise. Therefore, the corrector designated U1-2 is, in fact, the first corrector (i.e., second hand), and U1-3 is the second corrector of Codex Sinaiticus.

In the following notes, my translations of Tischendorf's Latin notes are enclosed in single quotation marks. Tischendorf refers to correctors A and C by these letters.

#### *Date and provenance*

Milne and Skeat (1938, 60-65) arrive at a probable date of mid-fourth century. Concerning place, J. H. Ropes (1926, xlvii-xlviii) writes that 'the palaeographical and linguistic phenomena present ... no objection to the conclusion to which the textual relations clearly point, namely, that Å was written in Egypt.' After some discussion Milne and Skeat (69) decide that

the case for Egyptian origin is weakened, and suggest that the manuscript came from 'Caesarea, or at least Palestine.'

<ch 1><v 1> POLUMERWS:

'A new paragraph is indicated by extending the initial letter ... slightly into the left-hand margin; the preceding line is often not filled out to the right-hand margin.' (Metzger, 1981, 76).

<ch 1><v 1> [d0]??[d0] [c0]PATRASIN[/c0]:

'PAT has been superimposed on an erasure.' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 89\*-9). This has been taken as an auto-correction by the first hand. The erased letters are not legible. Perhaps they were from a contraction such as PRN.

<ch 1><v 1> TOIS (2nd):

A correction may have been made here. Possibly, the first two letters of PROFHTAIS were written then erased when the beginning of the word was moved to the next line.

<ch 1><v 2> [d3]ELALHSEN[/d3] [c3]ELALHSE [ut][kc]K[/kc][[/ut]][/c3]:

The N appears to have been changed into a *kaiv* compendium. I have ascribed this alteration to corrector C because the omission of final *nu* is a later phenomenon. This correction has not been noted by Tischendorf or Wachtel and Witte (1994).

<ch 1><v 3> [c3][it]HMWN[/it][[/c3]:

'umwn added by C' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 89\*-10). This word is erroneously transcribed in Tischendorf's edition and is actually HMWN.

<ch 1><v 5> [c2][st]AUTW[/st][[/c2]:

'autw: written above by A' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 89\*-11).

<ch 1><v 8> [c2][it]RABDOS THS EUQUTHOS[/it][[/c2]:

'supplied by A' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, nn. 90-1,2).

<ch 1><v 12> [d3]ALLAXEIS[/d3] [c3]EILIXEIS[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 90-3).



<ch 1><v 12> [d0]KAI[/d0]:

'marked by the first hand' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 90-4).

<ch 2><v 1> [d3]AKOUSQISI[/d3] [c3]AKOUSQISI[st]N[st]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 90-5).

<ch 2><v 3> ARCHN:

HN ligature.

<ch 2><v 4> [d2]QERISMOIS[/d2] [c2][st]M[/st]ERISMOIS[/c2]:

'm substituted for q by A' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 90-6).

<ch 2><v 7> [d3]ESTEFANW??? ??TON[/d3] [c3]ESTEFANWSAS AUTON  
[/c3]:

'C has painted on sas auto, although there is a chance that the first hand himself has rewritten it' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 90-7). The underlying writing is not legible.

<ch 2><v 8> [d0][di]U[/di]PETAXA[/d0] [c0][di]U[/di]PETAXA[st]S[/st]/[c0]:

'perhaps the writer himself supplied s' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 90-8).

<ch 2><v 18> [c3][it]PIRASQIS[/it]/[c3]:

'C has added pirasqis' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 90-9).

<ch 3><v 6> [ns][rb]U[/rb]S[/ns]:

Apparently, the rough breathing mark functions as a *nomen sacrum* superscript as well.

<ch 3><v 6> [d0]KAN[/d0] [d3][c0][st]E[/st]AN[/c0]/[d3] [c3][st]E[/st]AN[st]  
PER[/st]/[c3]:

'The first hand has written k above the e. C has eanper for ean' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 90\*-1).

<ch 3><v 9> [c3][st]ME[/st]/[c3]:

'C has added me' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 90\*-2).

<ch 3><v 9> [d3]EN DOKIMASIA[d3] [c3]EDOKIMASA[st]N ME[/st]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, nn. 90\*-3,4).

<ch 4><v 6> [d3]APISTIAN[/d3] [c3]API[st]Q[/st]IAN[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 90\*-5).

<ch 4><v 7> [d3]ORIZEI TINA[/d3] [c3]TINA ORIZEI[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, nn. 90\*-6,7).

<ch 4><v 7> MH:

MH ligature.

<ch 4><v 9> [c2][it]ARA APOLIPETAI SABBATISMOS TW LAW TOU [ns] QU[/ns]/[it]/[c2]:

Tischendorf (1862, 40, n. 90\*-8) attributes this insertion to corrector A. The pointed arrow heads associated with the insertion are consistent with scribe D (see Milne and Skeat, 1938, 41-42).

<ch 4><v 10> [d3]T[fn]W[/fn]/[d3] [dx][c3][st]PA[/st][rt]N[/rt]T[fn]W[/fn]/[c3]/[dx] [cx]T[fn]W[/fn]/[cx]:

'above tw—the letters pa are blotted out. C began to add pantwn, but changed his mind' Tischendorf (1862, 40, n. 90\*-9). In order to collate this alteration, it has been transcribed as a change from TWN to PANTWN by corrector C (with the non-existent first *nu* of PANTWN supplied as reconstructed text), and the change back to TWN has been ascribed to a later, unidentified corrector.

<ch 4><v 11> EINA:

Variant spelling of INA.

<ch 4><v 11> [c3][st]TIS[/st]/[c3]:

'C has added tis' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 90\*-10).

<ch 4><v 12> [c0][st]YUCHS[/st]/[c0]:

'yuchs seems to have been supplied by the first hand' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 90\*-11).

<ch 4><v 14> DIELHLUQA:

'remains untouched' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 90\*-12).

|f 91r|-|f 91v|:

Folio 91 recto and verso (Heb 4.16 - 8.1) are by scribe D, who is designated U1s in my nomenclature. The transcription notes for this folio are found under the heading of U1s.

<ch 8><v 2> [c3][st][kc]K[/kc][st][c3]:

Tischendorf has not noted this correction. I have followed Wachtel and Witte (1994) in assigning it to corrector C.

<ch 8><v 3> QUSIAS:

The final S cannot be seen in the Xerox copy of Lake's facsimile.

<ch 8><v 3> [cx][st][kc]K[/kc][st][cx]:

Tischendorf (1862, 40, n. 92-1) notes that this 'has been supplied by the first hand or corrector A'. According to Milne and Skeat (1938, 42 and fig. 13), the angular form of the *kaiv* compendium is characteristic of scribe A, who would be the first hand here. My transcription reflects Tischendorf's uncertainty by ascribing the insertion to the category of unidentified corrections.

<ch 8><v 4> [c3]T[fn]O[/fn][c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 92-2).

<ch 8><v 6> [d3]TETUCE[/d3] [c3]TETEUCE[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 92-3).

<ch 8><v 6> [d2]KREITTONOSIN[/d2] [c2]KREITTONO [it]DIAQHKHS  
ESTIN MESEITHS HTIS EPI KRITTO[/it]SIN[/c2]:

According to Tischendorf (1862, 40, n. 92-4 and 1872, 805, n. 6), corrector A supplied this text which the first hand had overlooked. The insertion point is marked with a caret, the word KATW (*below*), and an upward pointing arrow in the left margin. The supplement is found in the lower margin with another caret, the word ANW (*above*), and a downward

pointing arrow. The absence of the final *sigma* of KREITTONOS in the corrected version is due its absence in the inserted text. The spelling with *epsilon* is unusual for the first hand.

<ch 8><v 8> [d3]AUTOUS[/d3] [c3]AUTOIS[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 92-5).

<ch 8><v 8> [d3]OI[/d3] [c3]OIK[fn]O[/fn]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 92-6).

<ch 8><v 9> EN H:

NH ligature.

<ch 8><v 10> [d3]KARDIAN[/d3] [c3]KARDIA[st]S[/st]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 92-7).

<ch 8><v 10> [d2]MOU[/d2] [c2]MOI[/c2]:

'the I has been made out of an U, by the first hand so it seems' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 92-8).

<ch 8><v 12> [c3][it][kc]K[/kc] TWN ANOMIWN AUTWN[it]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 92-9). The insertion point and the insertion, which is located in the lower margin, have associated upward pointing, sloping arrows.

<ch 8><v 12> MNHSQW:

NH ligature.

<ch 9><v 2> EN H: NH ligature.

<ch 9><v 3> [d3]AGIA AGIWN[/d3] [c3][st]T[/st]A AGIA [st]TWN[/st] AGIWN[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, nn. 92-10,11).

<ch 9><v 5> [dx]EN[/dx]:

Tischendorf (1862, 40, n. 92-12) writes 'en has been erased'. In the absence of any means of identification, this erasure is ascribed to the

category of unidentified correctors.

<ch 9><v 9> SUN[di][di]DHSIN:

This diaeresis, which is probably the work of a later corrector, has not been transcribed in Tischendorf's edition.

<ch 9><v 10> [c3][st][kc]K[/kc][st][c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 92-13).

<ch 9><v 12> [d2]EIS TA AGIA[/d2]:

'A has rejected [this]' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, nn. 92-14,15). In addition to hooks there are superscript points, suggesting that corrector C approved of the deletion.

<ch 9><v 14> [d3]AIWNIOU[/d3] [c3][it]AGIOU[/it][c3]:

Tischendorf (1862, 40, n. 92-16) lists this as a deletion and corresponding insertion by corrector C. No deletion marks are visible in my Xerox copy of Lake's facsimile. However, a lack of deletion marks does not imply that C did not intend this to be understood as a deletion. Milne and Skeat (1938, 46) write the following in regard to one of the C group of correctors (C<sup>a</sup>):

Smaller corrections, amounting to a few letters only, are entered above the lines in the text, and often there is nothing but the context to show whether they represent additions to, or substitutions for, the words or letters over which they stand.

<ch 9><v 17> [d3]MH TOTE[/d3] [c3]MHPOTE[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 92\*-1).

<ch 9><v 19> [c3][st]T[fn]O[/fn][st][c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 92\*-2).

<ch 9><v 19> [d3]KAI TWN TRAGWN[/d3]:

'rejected by C' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 92\*-3). These words are deleted by superscript points and surrounding hooks. Milne and Skeat (1938, fig. 17) attribute an example of this mode of deletion to corrector C<sup>a</sup>.

<ch 9><v 25> [di]l[/di]NA:

There appears to be diaeresis above the l. This is not transcribed in Tischendorf's edition.

<ch 9><v 25> [c3][it]TWN AGIWN[/it][[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 92\*-4).

<ch 9><v 26> NUN[di]l[/di]:

This diaeresis has not been transcribed in Tischendorf's edition.

<ch 10><v 2> SUN[di]l[/di]DHSIN:

This diaeresis has not been transcribed in Tischendorf's edition.

<ch 10><v 4> [d0]AFELIN[/d0] [c0]AFERIN[/c0]:

'r has been made out of l it seems, yet by the first hand himself' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 92\*-5). Evidently, Tischendorf was surprised that the first hand would make such a change himself. The alteration could be an orthographical *rho/lambda* interchange. It might also be a change from a spelling variant of AFELEIN, which is found in U20 and some other manuscripts, to a spelling variant of AFAIREIN. Both possibilities are plausible yet puzzling. The *rho/lambda* interchange is not terribly common. On the other hand, textual alterations by the first hand are unusual as well. Nevertheless, on a balance of probabilities, I am inclined to classify this as a textual variant.

It is possible that the alteration is not by the first hand. The original *lambda* appears to have been erased before being superimposed with a *rho* which has a significantly different form to the usual one. Even so, the tone and width of the ink are consistent with the first hand.

<ch 10><v 7> [c2][st]HKW[/st][[/c2]:

Corrector A (Tischendorf, 1862 40, n. 92\*-6).

<ch 10><v 8> [d3]QUSIAS[/d3] [c3]QUSIA[st]N[/st][[/c3] KAI [d3]

PROSFORAS[/d3] [c3]PROSFORA[st]N[/st][[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, nn. 92\*-7,8).

<ch 10><v 9> [di][di]DOU:

This diaeresis has not been transcribed in Tischendorf's edition.

<ch 10><v 9> [c3][st]O [ns]QS[ns][st][c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 92\*-9).

<ch 10><v 11> [d3]LITOURGWN KAQ HMERAN[/d3] [c3]KAQ HMERAN  
LITOURGWN[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, nn. 92\*-10,11,12).

<ch 10><v 12> [d3]EK[/d3] [c3]E[st]N[/st][c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 92\*-13).

<ch 10><v 17> MNHSQWHSOMAI:

NH ligature.

<ch 10><v 17> [d3]MNHSQHSOMAI[/d3] [c3]MNHSQW[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93-1).

<ch 10><v 18> [d0]AFEIS[/d0] [c0]AFE[st]S[/st]IS[/c0]:

's had already been supplied before C, perhaps by the first hand'  
(Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93-2).

<ch 10><v 18> [c3][st]TOUTWN[/st][c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93-2).

<ch 10><v 22> [d3]RERANTISMENOI[/d3] [c3]ERRANTISMENOI[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93-3).

<ch 10><v 23> [d3]HM[fn]W[/fn][d3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93-4).

<ch 10><v 25> [d3]AUT[fn]W[/fn][d3] [c3][st]E[/st]AUT[fn]W[/fn][c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93-5).

<ch 10><v 25> [dx]TOSOUT[fn]W[/fn][dx] [cx]TOSOUTW[/cx]:

There appears to be the remnant of a final *nu* superscript at the end of

this word. As it is not mentioned by Tischendorf, I have ascribed the alteration to the category of unidentified correctors.

<ch 10><v 25> [d3]OSON[/d3] [c3]OS[st]W[/st][c3]:  
Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93-6).

<ch 10><v 26> [d3]THS[/d3] [c3]THN[/c3]:  
Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93-7).

<ch 10><v 26> [d2]EPIGNWSIAN[/d2] [c2]EPIGNWSIN[/c2]:  
Tischendorf (1862, 40, n. 93-8) writes 'the a has been erased, having already been marked by A'.

<ch 10><v 30> [c3][it]LEGI [ns]KS[/ns][it][c3]:  
Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93-9).

<ch 10><v 30> [d3]KRINEI [ns]KS[/ns][d3] [c3][ns]KS[/ns] KRINEI[/c3]:  
Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, nn. 93-10).

<ch 10><v 32> [d3]ANAMIMNHSKESQE[/d3] [c3]ANAMIMNHSKESQAI[/c3]:  
Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93-11).

<ch 10><v 32> [d2]AMARTIAS[/d2] [c2][st]H[/st]M[st]E[/st]RAS[/c2]:  
'A and C have hmeras' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93-12).

<ch 10><v 32> [d3][di]U[/di]MWN[/d3]:  
Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93-12).

<ch 10><v 34> GINWSK[fn]O[/fn]:  
Tischendorf (1862, 40, n. 93-13) notes that this escaped correction. (The usual reading is ginwvskonte".)

<ch 10><v 34> [c3][it]EN OURANOIS[/it][c3]:  
Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93-14).

<ch 10><v 36> [d3]CRIAN ECETE[/d3] [c3]ECETE CRIAN[/c3]:  
Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, nn. 93-15,16).



<ch 10><v 36> KOMISASQAI:

'not changed' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93-17).

<ch 10><v 37> [d3]CRONISEI[/d3] [c3]CRONIEI[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93-18).

<ch 10><v 39> HMEIS DE OUK ESM[fn]E[/fn] [di]U[/di]POSTOLHS EIS

[d2]A= PWLIAS[/d2] [d3][c2]APWLIA[st]N[/st]/[c2]/[d3] [c3]APWLIA[/c3]:

'A and C have *apwlian*' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93-12). The N is also struck through by a deletion mark characteristic of corrector C.

<ch 11><v 3> [d2]FAIN[/d2] [c2]FAINOMEN[fn]W[/fn]/[c2]:

Corrector A (Tischendorf, 1862 40, n. 93-20).

<ch 11><v 4> [d3]TW [ns]QW[/ns]/[d3] [c3]T[st]OU[/st] [ns]QU[/ns]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93-21).

<ch 11><v 5> PISTEI:

The usual spelling is *PISTI*.

<ch 11><v 5> [d2]OTI[/d2] [c2][st]DI[/st]OTI[/c2]:

'both A and C have *dioti*' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93-22).

<ch 11><v 5> [d2]METETEQHKEN[/d2] [c2]METEQHKEN[/c2]:

'C and A already have *meteqhken*, so it seems' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93-23).

<ch 11><v 5> [c3][it]AUTOU[/it]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93-24).

<ch 11><v 6> [c3][st]TW[/st]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93-25).

<ch 11><v 8> [c3]TON[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93\*-1).

<ch 11><v 8> [d3][c0][st]EIS[/st]/[c0] KLHRONOMIAN LAMBANIN[/d3] [c3]  
LAMBANIN [st]EIS[/st] KLHRONOMIAN[/c3]:

Tischendorf writes 'eis has perhaps been supplied by the first hand himself.' He attributes the transposition to corrector C (1862, 40, nn. 93\*-2,3,4).

<ch 11><v 9> [d2]EPAGGELIAS AUTHS[/d2] [d3][c2]AUTHS EPAGGELIAS  
[/c2]/[d3] [c3]EPAGGELIAS THS AUTHS[/c3]:

'A has aut. epagg., while C, taking no notice of the [transposition] signs, has epagg. ths auths' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, nn. 93\*-5,6).

<ch 11><v 11> [c3][it]ETEKEN[/it]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93\*-7).

<ch 11><v 13> [d3]MH KOMISAMENOI[/d3] [c3][it]MH LABONTES[/it]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93\*-8).

<ch 11><v 15> [d3]MNHMONEUOUSIN[/d3] [c3][st]E[/st]MNHMONEUON  
[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, nn. 93\*-9,10,11).

<ch 11><v 15> [d3]EXEBHSAN[/d3] [c3]EXHLQ[fn]O[/fn]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, nn. 93\*-9,10,11).

<ch 11><v 17> MONOGENH: NH ligature.

<ch 11><v 20> [d3][c2][di]l[/di]SAK[/c2]/[d3] [c3][di]l[/di]SA[st]A[/st]K[/c3]:

'A has supplied i>sak; C has i>saak' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93\*-12).

<ch 11><v 26> THN: HN ligature.

<ch 11><v 30> [d3]EPESAN[/d3] [c3]EPES[st]E[/st]N[/c3]:

Tischendorf has not noted this correction. The form of the added E is like that found in examples of corrections which Milne and Skeat (1938, figure 15) attribute to corrector C<sup>a</sup>. A similar correction, which Tischendorf attributes to C, occurs at 11.34.

<ch 11><v 30> KUKLWQENTA EPI EPTA: There may be deletion points above these letters. P46 has KUKLOQEN at this place.

<ch 11><v 31> [d3]EPILEGOMENH[/d3]:  
'rejected by C' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, nn. 93\*-13,14).

<ch 11><v 33> [d3]HRGASANTO[/d3] [c3]EIRGASANTO[/c3]:  
Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93\*-15).

<ch 11><v 34> [d3]EDUNAMWQHSA[N]/[d3] [c3]E[st]NE[/st]  
DUNAMWQHSA[N]/[c3]:  
Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93\*-16).

<ch 11><v 35> [d3]GUNAİKAS[/d3] [c3]GUNAİK[st]E[/st]S[/c3]:  
Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 93\*-16).

<ch 12><v 1> [d3]THLIKOUTON[/d3] [c3]T[st]OS[/st]OUTON[/c3]:  
Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94-1).

<ch 12><v 3> [d3]EAUTOUS[/d3] [c3]AUTOUS[/c3]:  
Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94-2).

<ch 12><v 4> [d2]ANTAGWNIZOMENOI[/d2] [c2]ANTAGW[st]N[/st]  
IZOMENOI[/c2]:

'agw has been painted on and n written above by A, although the text does not differ from that of the first hand' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94-3). There does not appear to be sufficient room for the former text to have accommodated AGWN.

<ch 12><v 7> [c3][it]ESTIN[/it]/[c3]:  
Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94-4).

<ch 12><v 9> [c3]DE[/c3]:  
Added by C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94-5).

<ch 12><v 10> [d3]O[/d3] [c3]O[st]I[/st]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94-6).

<ch 12><v 10> [dx]EPEDEUON[/dx] [cx]PEDEUON[/cx]:

Deletion marks above the first *epsilon* have not been noted by Tischendorf. The alteration has not been ascribed to a particular corrector because the deletion marks differ from the hooks of corrector A and the points of corrector C. PEDEUON might be a spelling variation of the neuter, singular participle *paivdeuon*. This is unlikely as the phrase no longer makes sense if this word is read.

<ch 12><v 10> [c3][st]EIS TO[/st]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94-7).

<ch 12><v 11> [d3]MEN[/d3] [c3][st]D[/st]E[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94-8).

<ch 12><v 13> [d3]POIEITE[/d3] [c3]POIHSATE[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, nn. 94-9,10).

<ch 12><v 16> [d3]EAUTOU[/d3] [c3]AUTOU[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94-11).

<ch 12><v 18> [d3]ZOFW[/d3] [c3][st]SK[/st]O[st]T[/st]W[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94-12).

<ch 12><v 19> [c3][st]MH[/st]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94-13).

<ch 12><v 20> [d0]QUK[/d0] [c0]OUK[/c0]:

'o has been made out of q, it seems' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94-14). Tischendorf does not state which corrector was responsible for this. The inclusion of OUK in his transcription implies that he regarded the first hand as responsible.

<ch 12><v 21> [d3]OUTW[/d3] [c3]OUTW[st]S[/st]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94-15).

<ch 12><v 21> [d3]H[/d3] [c3]H[st]N[/st]/[c3]:

Tischendorf has not noted this correction. The form of the corrector's N is similar to that found in a number of corrections which Tischendorf attributes to C.

<ch 12><v 21> [c3][st]EIMI[/st]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94-16).

<ch 12><v 22> l[ns]HL[/ns]M:

Appears as shown.

<ch 12><v 23> [d3][ns]PN[/ns]ASI[/d3] [c3][ns]PN[/ns]ASI[st]N[/st]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94-17).

<ch 12><v 23> [d3]TELIWN DEDIKAIWMENOIS[/d3] [c3]DIKAIWN [it]TETELIWMENWN[/it]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, nn. 94-17,18).

<ch 12><v 25> [d3]EXEFUGON[/d3] [c3]EFUGON [st]TON[/st]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94-19).

<ch 12><v 25> [d3]TON[/d3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94-20).

<ch 12><v 27> [c3][st]THN[/st]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94\*-1).

<ch 12><v 27> MINH: NH ligature.

<ch 12><v 28> [dx][d3]DEOUS[/d3] [c3][st]AI[/st]DOUS[/c3]/[dx] [cx]DEOUS [cx]:

'C has aidous, but deous has been restored' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94\*-2). The restoration has been ascribed to an unidentified subsequent corrector in order to enable it to be collated.

<ch 13><v 2> [d3]THN FILOXENIAN[/d3] [c3]TH[st]S[/st] FILOXENIA[st]S [st]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, nn. 94\*-3,4).

<ch 13><v 6> [c3][kc]K[/kc]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94\*-5).

<ch 13><v 9> MH:

MH ligature.

<ch 13><v 9> [d3]PERIPATOUNTES[/d3] [c3]PERIPAT[st]HSA[/st]NTES  
[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94\*-6).

<ch 13><v 12> [c3][it]EPAQEN[/it]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94\*-7).

<ch 13><v 14> WDE:

The W has an elongated central stroke. Milne and Skeat devote a number of pages to the discussion of this form of W (1938, 24-27).

<ch 13><v 15> [c3][st]OUN[/st]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94\*-8).

<ch 13><v 17> [d3]AUTOI[/d3] [c3]AUTOIS AUTOI[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, nn. 94\*-9,10).

<ch 13><v 18> [d3]OTI KAL[fn]H[/fn]≥ QA[/d3] [c3][st]PEPOI[/st]QA[st]MEN  
[st]/[c3]:

Tischendorf (1862, 40, nn. 94\*-11,12) attributes this alteration to corrector C. He writes (1872, 837), 'Å\* has oti kalhnqa gar oti kalhn for peiqome-'. There appears to be a medial point between kalhn and qa, which Wachtel and Witte (1994) print as separate words.

<ch 13><v 21> [d3]AUTW[/d3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94\*-13).

<ch 13><v 22> [c3]GAR[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94\*-14).

<ch 13><v 23> [d3]HMWN[/d3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94\*-15).

<ch 13><v 23> [d3]ERCHSQE[/d3] [c3]ERCHTAI[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, nn. 94\*-16,17).

<ch 13><v 25> [c3]AMHN[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 94\*-18).

subscription: STICOI YN:

That is, 750 (see Metzger, 1981, 9).

## References

Tischendorf, Konstantin von (ed.). 1862. *Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus*. Vol. 4. *Novum Testamentum cum Barnaba et Pastore*. Repr. 1969. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

Lake, Helen and Kirsopp. 1911. *Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus: the New Testament: the epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas*. Photographic facsimile with an introduction by Kirsopp Lake. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Milne, H. J. M. and T. C. Skeat. 1938. *Scribes and correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Scrivener, Frederick H. 1867. *A full collation of the Codex Sinaiticus with the received text of the New Testament*. 2nd rev. ed. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co.

## U1s

These notes relate to folio 91 of Codex Sinaiticus (Heb 4.16 to 8.1), which was copied by scribe D. As Milne and Skeat (1938, 62) regard scribe D to be a contemporary of scribes A and B, I have assigned U1s the same date and provenance as U1. It is worth noting that Milne and Skeat would have judged scribe D to be a half century later than A and B, had they not known otherwise. Scribe D is regarded as having better spelling than the other scribes of Sinaiticus (Metzger, 1981, 77).

<ch 4><v 16> BOHQEIAN...:

A space after this word coincides with a pause in sense.

<ch 5><v 4> [d3]KAQWSPER[/d3] [c3]KAQ[st]A[/st]PER[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 91-1).

<ch 5><v 5> U[di]l[/di]OS:

This diaeresis is not transcribed by Tischendorf.

<ch 5><v 5> GEGENNHKA:

NH ligature.

<ch 5><v 6> MELCISEDEK': The reading mark following this word is not transcribed by Tischendorf. Similar marks occur at 7.1, 7.5, and 7.10.

<ch 5><v 12> [c3][kc]K[/kc]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 91-2).

<ch 5><v 13> DIKAIOSUNHS:

NH ligature.

<ch 6><v 9> [d3]ADELFOI[/d3] [c3]A[st]GAPHT[/st]OI[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 91-3).

<ch 6><v 18> [d3]TON[/d3]:

'rejected by C' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 91-4).

<ch 6><v 19> EISERCOMEN[fn]H/[fn]:



NH ligature.

<ch 6><v 20> MELCEISEDEK:

This unusual spelling occurs at 7.1 and 7.15 as well. Scribe D is apparently inconsistent in the spelling of this word.

<ch 7><v 5> [kc]K[/kc]PER:

The KAI in KAIPER is in the form of a compendium.

<ch 7><v 6> [c3][st]TON[/st]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 91\*-1).

<ch 7><v 9> [d3]LEUEI[/d3] [c3]LEUEI[st]S[/st]/[c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 91\*-2).

<ch 7><v 10> [c0][st]ETI GAR[/st]/[c0]:

According to Tischendorf, 'the writer himself supplied eti gar' (1862, 40, n. 91\*-3).

<ch 7><v 12> IERWSUNHS:

NH ligature.

<ch 7><v 14> [di]I[/di]OUDA:

Tischendorf has not transcribed this diaeresis.

<ch 7><v 14> [d3]MWUSHS OUDEN[/d3] [c3]OUDEN MWUSHS[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, nn. 91\*-4,5).

<ch 7><v 21> [d3]META[/d3] [c3]MET'[/c3]:

Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 91\*-6).

<ch 7><v 21> [it][c3]EIS TON AIWNA KATA THN TAXIN MELCISEDEK'[/c3]/[it]:

'C has added [this] (having deleted the note which he had commenced against the same line) in the margin below' (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 91\*-7).

<ch 7><v 22> [d3]TOSOUTO KAI[/d3] [c3]TOSOUTO[st]N[/st]/[c3]:  
Corrector C (Tischendorf, 1862, 40, n. 91\*-8).

<ch 7><v 28> ARC[di]l[/di]EREIS:  
Tischendorf has not transcribed this diaeresis.

## U2

Codex Alexandrinus (A). London, British Library, Royal 1 D. VIII.

Transcribed and verified by reference to facsimiles in Kenyon (1909). Compared with Thompson (1883) in a few places.

My transcription was made from a copy of Kenyon's facsimile (1909) kindly loaned for the purpose by the State Library of Victoria. A few places (Heb 1.12, 6.11, 7.15, 9.7, 10.1, 10.8, 12.22) were subsequently re-examined against E. Maunde Thompson's full-sized *Facsimile of the Codex Alexandrinus* (1883) while visiting the manuscripts reading room of the British Library.

My transcription follows the page numbering added by Patrick Young, Librarian to Charles I (Thompson, 1883, Introduction). The leaf following 141 has been assigned the number 141A as it was not numbered by Young. The text of Hebrews begins on folio 139 recto and ends on folio 144 recto (which would have been 145 recto if not for the missed sheet.) Original quire numbers are visible on some folios: f. 33 = PQ (89), f. 135 = RB (102), f. 142 = RG? (103), f. 150 = RD? (104), f. 158 = RE (105). In the original page numbering, Hebrews would have started on folio WIG (813) and ended on folio WIQ (819). This calculation is based on the following equation:

$$\text{no. of 1st folio in quire} = 8 \times (\text{quire no.} - 1) + 1$$

Diaeresis marks consist of a single point. They tend to be displaced to the right, as do final *nu* superscripts. *Nomina sacra* superscripts are sometimes divided into a number of segments.

The reduced size of the facsimile edition made it difficult to distinguish between high and medial points. My transcription of these points is subject, therefore, to a degree of uncertainty.

### *Correctors*

According to Ropes (1926, liii), 'The codex has received various corrections; A<sup>1</sup> was probably the original scribe, A<sup>a</sup> perhaps a diorthotes of the scriptorium.' The distinct hand that copied Luke 1 to 1 Cor 10.8

(Thompson, 1883, Introduction) may have been responsible for some of the alterations in the rest of the manuscript, including here in Hebrews. Wachtel and Witte (1994) and Tischendorf (1872) have been consulted to assist in corrector assignments.

### *Provenance*

Ropes (1926, li-liii) summarises what is known of the manuscript's history. There is a tradition that it was copied by an Egyptian noble woman named Thecla. Notes found in the codex suggest an Alexandrian origin as well. On the other hand, Wettstein was informed that the codex was procured by Cyril Lucar while on a visit to Athos in 1612-13 (lii). Whereas palaeographical and orthographical considerations supports an Egyptian origin, the mixed textual character of Alexandrinus might be more easily accounted for if it came from Constantinople (liii). On balance, I think that it is not unreasonable to suspect that Alexandrinus hails from Alexandria.

<ch 1><v 1> PROFHTAIS:

There is a blank space following this word which indicates that a paragraph break is intended. The first letter of the first word on the following line is not enlarged, as would normally be expected.

<ch 1><v 12> [dx]E[ut]G[/ut]KLEIYOUSIN[/dx] [cx]EKLEIYOUSIN[/cx]:

Tischendorf (1872, 783) notes that A\* has egkleiyousin. This alteration is not ascribed to a particular scribe because it is an erasure.

<ch 1><v 13> SOU:

There is a large blank space following this word which indicates that a pause in sense is intended. The first letter of the first word on the following line is not enlarged.

<ch 2><v 12> EM:

Apparently by error for EN.

<ch 3><v 8> [rt]PEI[/rt]RASMOU:

The spelling of the reconstructed portion of this word conforms to the scribe's usual practice.

<ch 4><v 3> [c1]WS[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1872, 791) notes that A\* appears to have omitted ws.

<ch 4><v 4>:

The words ejn th/ hJmera/ th/ eJbdomh/ are absent.

<ch 4><v 7> KQWS:

A hyphenation marker (') follows the *theta*.

<ch 4><v 8> KATEPAUSEN:

A hyphenation marker (') follows the *tau*.

<ch 4><v 14> MEG[fn]A[/fn]:

The final *nu* superscript above the A is very faint.

<ch 5><v 7> PROSENEGKAS[ut] ~ [/ut]:

A mark which follows this word obscures what appears to be a high point punctuation mark.

<ch 6><v 11> [d1][rt]MECRI TELOUS[/rt]/[d1] [c1]ACRI TELOUS[/c1]:

These words appear to be written by a different hand. The reconstruction is entirely speculative and is based solely on *mecri* being found in two minuscules (Tischendorf's 73 and 80 = Gregory numbers 441 (or 442) and 436).

<ch 7><v 2> ERMHNEUOMENOS, EPEITA:

The parchment has a fault in the vicinity of these words.

<ch 7><v 2> EIRHNHS:

There is a blank space following this word which indicates that a paragraph break is intended. The first letter on the following line is not enlarged.

<ch 7><v 5> [di]UI[/di]WN:

There may not be diaeresis above these two letters.

<ch 7><v 5> LEU[di]I[/di]:

This diaeresis mark consists of a single point.

<ch 7><v 11> MELC[ut]l[ut]SDEK:

By error for MELCISEDEK.

<ch 7><v 14> FUL[fn]H[fn]:

There may not be a final *nu* superscript here.

<ch 7><v 15> KATAD[ut]EI[ut]LON:

This word may be KATADHLON.

<ch 7><v 15> [d1]ANI=[ut]S[ut][rt]T[rt]AI[/d1] [c1]ANISTA=TAI[/c1]:

The letters STA appear to have been added after ANI by a corrector. The A of the addition has a long tail that is not characteristic of the first hand. The first letter on the following line, T, is darker and larger than usual, and is displaced to the right. Just preceding it is a remnant of an erased letter, possibly S.

Perhaps the first hand wrote ANI=STAI by mistake ('=' signifies the position of line-division). The corrector then added STA on the first line, erased ST on the second line, and rewrote T. I do not think that the first hand wrote ANISTASQAI (cf. P46) because (1) there is no sign of a previous Q beneath the rewritten T, and (2) the letters STA seem to be a subsequent addition.

<ch 7><v 21> WRKWMOSIAS:

Spelled thus.

<ch 8><v 3> [ut]P[ut][rt]ROSFEREIN[/rt]:

The reconstructed part of this word is longer than preceding line-lengths (5 or 6 letters) would suggest. No variants on this word are recorded in Tischendorf (1872). It is probable that the last few letters were written in smaller text. A final *nu* superscript may have been employed as well.

<ch 8><v 4> PROSF[rt]ERONTWN[/rt]:

Once again, the reconstructed part of this word is longer than preceding line-lengths would suggest.

<ch 8><v 6> HTIS EPI:

These words appear to be written in a slightly different style and may be the work of a corrector.

<ch 8><v 6> NENOMOQETHAI:

There is a blank space following this word which indicates that a paragraph break is intended. The first letter of the first word on the following line is not enlarged.

<ch 8><v 11> AUT[ut]W[/ut][rt]N[/rt]:

This word straddles a fault in the parchment. The last visible letter appears to be an W followed by a vertical stroke which may be part of a N.

[f 141br]:

The page following 141 is not numbered. I have assigned it the number 141b.

<ch 8><v 13> PR[/rt][ut]W[/ut]THN, AFANISMOU:

There may be paragraphs after these words. The first letters of the following lines are missing.

<ch 9><v 7> [c0][st]O[/st][c0]:

Tischendorf (1872, 808) notes that the article O has been added above the line, apparently by the first hand.

<ch 9><v 17> [di]l[/di]SCUI:

There may be diaeresis above the second l.

<ch 10><v 1> [d2][rt]OUDE[/rt]POTE[/d2] [c2]AI OUDEPOTE[/c2]:

The letters AI OUDE have been added by a corrector. The underlying letters have been erased and are not visible in the facsimile. The space would have accommodated two to four letters. According to Tischendorf (1872, 813), the alteration is by A\*\*, the third hand. A number of features distinguish it from the work of the second hand, particularly the round loop of the A and the form of the E.

<ch 10><v 8> LE[ut]GWN[/ut]:

Tischendorf (1872, 814) notes that *wn* has been written by a corrector. According to Wachtel and Witte (1994), the original word seems to be *legei*. Examination of Thompson's facsimile (1883) gave me no reason to doubt that this is a faded *LEGWN* that was written by the first hand.

<ch 10><v 8> AMARTIAS:

The *R* is unusual. Perhaps this word has been corrected.

<ch 11><v 4> PARA:

This word may be the work of a corrector. The horizontal stroke of the *P* extends beyond the vertical strokes. The other letters are finer and lighter than usual.

<ch 11><v 5> METAQEWS:

By error for *metaqevsew*". (I thank Dr Maurice Robinson for checking this word against photographs held at the Institute for New Testament Textual Research.)

<ch 11><v 7> KATESKEUASEN, KATEKRINEN:

The marks following the suffix *KAT* of both of these words have been taken to be hyphenation marks rather than apostrophes.

<ch 11><v 16> KREITTONOS:

There may be an apostrophe between the two *taus*.

<ch 11><v 23> D[ut][[/ut][rt]ATAGMA[/rt]:

According to Tischendorf (1872, 824), this word may be *DOGMA*.

<ch 11><v 24> FARA[rt]W[/rt]:

The apparent lengths of the preceding and following lines suggest that this word is followed by a space which could accomodate a punctuation mark.

<ch 11><v 26> ONIDISMON:

A spot above the first *I* may be diaeresis.



<ch 11><v 35> [ut]K[/ut][rt]RIT[/rt]TONOS:

The reconstructed portion of this word uses the usual spelling of this manuscript.

<ch 11><v 37> [rt]EPEI[/rt]RASQHSAN:

The reconstructed portion of this word uses the usual spelling for derivatives of PEIRAZW found in this manuscript. Two examples are found at 2.18.

<ch 11><v 37> [rt][di]U[/di]ST[/rt]EROUMENOI:

There is a spot above the second U. It is unlikely that diaeresis is intended as this U is part of a diphthong.

<ch 12><v 8> ESTAI:

A paragraph break is probably not intended here. If it was, the first letter of the following line, T, would be enlarged, and the next letter, O, would not be indented.

<ch 12><v 22> [dx]EPOU=RANIWN[/dx] [cx]EPOU=RANIW[/cx]:

Tischendorf (1872, 832) notes that A\* has -raniwn. Even though an *iota* subscript appears to have been added below the W, there is insufficient evidence to ascribe this alteration to a particular corrector.

<ch 12><v 27>:

The words iJna meinh/ ta mh saleuomena are absent.

<ch 13><v 11> KATAKEETAI:

This unusual spelling results from an A/E spelling variation.

<ch 13><v 12> AGIA[ut]S[/ut][rt]H[/rt]:

There may be a *nomen sacrum* superscript above this word.

<ch 13><v 21> POIW[rt]N[/rt]:

There may be a final *nu* superscript here.

<ch 13><v 23> [rt]GEIN[/rt]WSKETE:

This reconstruction uses the usual spelling for derivatives of GINOMAI found in this manuscript. An example is found at 10.34.

<ch 13><v 23> [di]U[/di]MAS:

A paragraph break probably stood here because the disposition of the remaining letters of the following word indicate that its first letter was enlarged and indented to the left. The same goes for AGIOUS in the following verse

<ch 13><v 24> ASPAZONT[ut][sc]AI[/sc][[/ut]:

There appears to be a tail extending from the T. I have taken this to be a scribal contraction of the letters A and I.

## References

Kenyon. Frederic G. (ed.). 1909. *The Codex Alexandrinus (Royal ms. 1 D v-viii) in reduced photographic facsimile*. London: British Museum.

Thompson, E. Maunde. 1883. *Facsimile of the Codex Alexandrinus*. Vol. 4. *New Testament and Clementine epistles*. London: British Museum.

## UB

Codex Vaticanus (B). Rome, Vatican Library, Gr. 1209.

Transcribed and verified by reference to facsimiles in Martini (1968).

This transcription was made from a Xerox copy of the 1968 facsimile edition of the New Testament part of Codex Vaticanus. The facsimile itself was consulted in cases of uncertainty and where scribal alterations have been made.

The writing is in three columns and has been retraced by a later scribe dated to the tenth-eleventh century by Martini (1968, xii). Page numbers are written in the top margin in Arabic numerals. The uncial portion of the epistle to the Hebrews (Heb 1.1 to 9.14) occupies pages 1512 to 1518. The minuscule part is a more recent addition which Martini (1968, note 8) attributes to a fifteenth century scribe. The minuscule part is not transcribed here.

Punctuation and diaereses are included in case they belong to the first hand. Accents and breathings are ignored because they were probably added by the tenth-eleventh century scribe mentioned before (Martini, 1968, xii). A hyphenation symbol (˘) often occurs where a word is divided between two lines. See, for example, EQHKEN at Heb 1.2.

Three section numbering sequences occur in the margins. The first runs from nq (59) to XD (64). The second runs from A to E. The third marks modern chapter numbers in Arabic numerals. All three sequences coincide at the beginning of chapter 3 (in the forms x, B, 3) and may once have coincided at the beginning of the book.

### *Correctors*

The retracing increases the difficulty of identifying correctors. According to Martini (1968, xii), alterations may be attributed to the first and second hands but 'determining which hands thereafter amended the codex or adorned it with various notes still needs further investigation.' Martini (1968, note 8) also writes:

Tischendorf distinguished two principal correctors, [one of whom]

amended the whole work at the time of writing, and a third hand in the Middle Ages, who may be identical with the one who rewrote the whole codex in the tenth-eleventh century.

In assigning alterations to correctors, I have referred to Tischendorf's edition of Vaticanus (1867), his 8th major critical edition (1872), and Wachtel and Witte (1994). The following table gives the correspondence of corrector labels in my transcription with the correctors identified in these editions. The correspondence was deduced with the aid of the editions themselves and the *Synopsis of sigla for correctors in manuscripts* found in the Alands' *Text of the New Testament* (1989, 108):

<i>Label</i>	<i>Tisch. (1867)</i>	<i>Tisch. (1872)</i>	<i>W&amp;W (1994)</i>	<i>Date (C.)</i>
U3-0	-	B*	B*	4
U3-1	B <sup>2</sup> , B <sup>2</sup> & B <sup>3</sup>	B <sup>b</sup> , B <sup>b</sup> & B <sup>c</sup>	B <sup>1</sup>	4
U3-2	B <sup>3</sup>	B <sup>c</sup> , B <sup>3</sup>	B <sup>2</sup>	6/7
U3-3	-	-	-	10/11
U3-x	-	-	-	-

In Hebrews, the alterations Tischendorf attributes to B<sup>2</sup> (e.g., the additions of tivs at 5.4, and hvs at 8.11) are accented and consist of poorly formed, sloping uncial letters. However, those he attributes to B<sup>3</sup> (e.g., the additions at 1.7, 1.9, 1.12, and 2.1) are usually unaccented, upright, and well formed. Perhaps the order of Tischendorf's B<sup>2</sup> and B<sup>3</sup> should be reversed? He identified another corrector, B<sup>1</sup>, but has not ascribed any of the corrections in Hebrews to this scribe. Ropes (1926, xl) writes:

The designations are to be regarded as referring to groups of correctors, rather than to individuals. The earliest corrections (B<sup>1</sup> and in part B<sup>2</sup>), are doubtless those of the diothotes, added before the the codex was sent out from the scriptorium.

The accents and style of the B<sup>2</sup> corrections are not consistent with a diorqwthv" who was contemporary with the first hand. I think that the B<sup>2</sup> corrections may even be later than the B<sup>3</sup> corrections. Despite this, my transcription retains the order proposed by Tischendorf.

I have created a separate category for alterations that can be attributed to the scribe who retraced the manuscript in the tenth or eleventh century. Words in which letters have been left untraced are treated as alterations by the fourth hand. This is at variance with Tischendorf, who groups such cases with more conventional alterations by the third hand. Tischendorf uses the labels  $B^b$  et  $c$  or  $B^2$  et  $B^3$  for any place where an alteration by the second hand is confirmed by the third. My adoption of a separate category for the retracing scribe means that such labels could be interpreted as alterations by the second hand that are confirmed by the fourth hand.

As the untraced letters usually relate to spelling rather than textual changes, spelling alterations that Tischendorf attributed to the third hand are generally ascribed to the fourth hand in my transcription. An example of this is EMEISHSAS / EMISHSAS at Heb 1.9. Tischendorf (1867, 278) ascribes this to the third hand ( $B^3 = U3-2$ ), while I ascribe it to the fourth hand ( $U3-3$ ). These spelling changes usually consist of omission of final *nu* where the next word begins with a consonant, and omission of *epsilon* in *epsilon iota* pairs. My transcription follows Tischendorf 1867 edition with respect to where these changes occur. Tischendorf may have been wrong on a few occasions. One example is *wmosen* at p. 1517, column b, line 8. The facsimile shows that the final *nu* has been retraced, whereas Tischendorf indicates that it has been left untouched.

There is potential for confusion among the various corrector identification schemes employed by the reference editions. In order to make the following transcription notes more clear in this respect, I give my renditions of corrector labels in brackets, along with the corresponding labels employed in the reference editions. This is not done where my corrector identification differs from Tischendorf's, as when the tenth-eleventh century scribe has not retraced letters.

As already mentioned, there are questions concerning the number and order of correctors of Codex Vaticanus. A fresh examination of the scribes and correctors of Codex Vaticanus of the type made by Milne and Skeat for Codex Sinaiticus would be most worthwhile. Ropes (1926, xl), Skeat himself (1984, 465), and Martini (1968, xii) have already called for such a study.

### *Date and provenance*

Concerning date, 'the first half of the fourth century is generally accepted' (Kenyon, 1949, 86). Ropes (1926, xxxiv-xxxvi) lists a number of factors that suggest an Egyptian provenance for Codex Vaticanus. To add to this, Skeat (1984, 454, n. 2) quotes the following from Hatch:

Codex Vaticanus was written in Upper Egypt. This view is suggested by the position of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the archetype of the Vatican MS, and is strongly supported by certain textual and palaeographical arguments.

### *Text-critical symbols?*

David Payne (1995) has suggested that Codex Vaticanus contains text-critical sigla which he describes as 'bar-umlauts' because, so he says, they consist of a double point and bar. He notes that they are often associated with an unusual gap in the text at the place where the variation occurs: 'the first hand of Vaticanus included these bar-umlauts and was aware of the precise position of these text-critical variants' (251-2). The bars and gaps may mark paragraph or section divisions rather than textual variations, although Payne does not think so (255).

If Payne's thesis is correct then the first hand of Codex Vaticanus was aware of textual variants. Payne's suggestions may be tested against the evidence of Codex Vaticanus in Hebrews. All of the clear examples of double-point sigla occur in the margins to the left of the relevant columns. The following table gives the locations (page, column, line, chapter, and verse) where these occur in Hebrews. It also shows whether textual variations affect the marked lines, as determined by reference to Wachtel and Witte (1994). (I have included in brackets the variation I regard as the most likely to be indicated by a particular double-point. Orthographical variations are not counted.) The third column shows whether I have classified a nearby bar as related to a double-point. (I classify a bar as related to a double-point if the bar can be reasonably associated with a variation that might be marked by the double-point.) The fourth column shows whether there is an unusual gap between words where there is a variation that might be marked by an adjacent double-point.

## Double-point sigla vs. textual variations in Hebrews

<i>Location</i>	<i>Variant?</i>	<i>Bar?</i>	<i>Gap?</i>
1514, a, 10 (3.10)	yes (tauth / ekeinh)	no	no
1514, b, 12 (3.19)	yes (di / dia)	no	no
1515, b, 20 (5.8)	yes (wn / on)	no	no
1516, a, 16 (6.10)	yes (+ tou kopou)	no	no
1517, a, 21 (7.14)	yes (transposition)	no	no
1517, b, 23 (7.25)	no	no	no
1517, c, 36 (8.5-6)	yes (nun / nuni)	no	no
1518, a, 37 (8.11)	no	no	no
1518, b, 16 (9.3)	no	no	no
1518, c, 40 (9.14)	yes (aiwniou / agiou)	no	no

The table reveals that bars and gaps do not appear to be associated with double-points. A glance at the manuscript shows that bars are often found in conjunction with gaps in the text. This is consistent with each bar being a *paragraphos* that marks textual division.

The table also shows that seven out of ten double-points mark lines in which variants occur. (The scribe may have been aware of variation at the other three places as well. However, these variations are unknown to us.) In order to get a sense of whether this level of association is significant, the tenth lines of ten columns of Hebrews were examined to obtain a random sample for comparison. (If lines selected in this way were marked with a double-point, they were not included in the sample.) Only four out of ten lines in the resultant sample coincided with known variations.

A chi-squared test shows that such a difference can be expected from two samples of a single population in only 18% of cases. In other words, there probably is an association between places marked with a double-point and places of textual variation. In order to be more certain of the association, a statistical test of the kind used here could be applied to the whole codex.

<ch 1><v 2> [d3]E=QHKEN[/d3] [c3]E=QHKE[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 278). Accordingly, this transcription treats it as an alteration by the fourth hand.

<ch 1><v 2> [d3]EPOI=HSEN[/d3] [c3]EPOI=HSE[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 278).

<ch 1><v 3> [d1]FANERWN[/d1] [d3][c1]FERWN[/c1]/[d3] [c3]FANERWN  
[c3]:

Tischendorf (1867, xxxix) writes, 'The first hand wrote *fanerwn* in its entirety. The third hand — in fact the accent proves him to have been the amender — by erasing the letters *an* replaced it with *fevrwn*. After about the 13th century, which becomes clear from the form of writing which marks it, the letters *an* have been rewritten ..., the acute above the *e* erased, and the *w* marked with a circumflex.' According to Tischendorf (1867, 278), the same scribe wrote the following comment in the column: '*ajmaqevstate kai; kakev, a[fes to; palaiovñ: mh; metapoivei.*' (Tischendorf's transcription should read *a[fes to;ñ palaiovñ*. This may be translated as, 'Bad and ignorant scribe! Leave the old. Don't change it.')

Tischendorf associates stages of alteration with correctors in a different manner to Wachtel and Witte:

	<i>Tisch. (1867)</i>	<i>W&amp;W (1994)</i>
fanerwn	B* = [c0]	B* = [c0]
fevrwn	B <sup>3</sup> = [c2] or [c3]	B <sup>1</sup> = [c1]
fanerw'n	later hand	B <sup>2</sup> = [c2]

Tischendorf's reference to the third hand could refer to either the third or fourth hands of my transcription. (This is because I adopted a separate category for alterations by the tenth-eleventh century retracing scribe.) Normally, the third-hand categories of Tischendorf (B<sup>3</sup>) and Wachtel and Witte (B<sup>2</sup>) are equivalent, but not in this instance. Further, whereas the ink of the restored *alpha* and *nu* and the added acute accent appear to be consistent with the retracing scribe, Tischendorf states that the acute



accent was erased by the scribe who restored the *alpha* and *nu*. In order to resolve these conflicts, I propose the following sequence:

fanerwn	first hand [c0]
fevrwn	second hand [c1]
fanevrwn	fourth hand [c3] (retracing scribe)
fanerw'n	later hand

In my opinion, the second hand made the change from *fanerwn* to *fevrwn*. This scribe normally adds accents to alterations. The restoration of the *alpha* and *nu* along with the retracing of the second hand's acute accent (which is only appropriate for *fevrwn*) are ascribed to the fourth hand. Finally, I attribute the circumflex over the *omega* and the light-coloured deletion strokes through the accent to yet another scribe, who wrote the rebuke as well. (This last hand is not included in my transcription.)

<ch 1><v 5> [d3]EIPEN[/d3] [c3]EIPE[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 278).

<ch 1><v 5> AGGELWN UIOS MOU EI:

Quotation markers (>) are placed in the left-hand column adjacent to this and the following five lines.

<ch 1><v 7> [d2]LITOURGOUS[/d2] [c2]L[st]E[/st]ITOURGOUS[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1867, 278) attributes this alteration to the third hand (B<sup>3</sup> = [c2]).

<ch 1><v 9> [d3]EMEISHSAS[/d3] [c3]EMISHSAS[/c3]:

The *epsilon* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 278).

<ch 1><v 9> [d3]ECREISEN[/d3] [c3]ECRISE[/c3]:

The *epsilon* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 278). Neither has the final *nu*, but Tischendorf has not noted this.

<ch 1><v 9> [d2]ELEON[/d2] [c2]EL[st]AI[/st]ON[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1867, 278) attributes this alteration to the third hand (B<sup>3</sup> =

[c2]).

<ch 1><v 12> [d2]EKLIYOUSIN[/d2] [d3][c2]EKL[st]E[/st]IYOUSIN[/c2]/[d3]  
[c3]EKL[st]E[/st]IYOUSI[/c3]:

Tischendorf (1867, 278) attributes the superscript *epsilon* to the third hand ( $B^3 = [c2]$ ). As the final *nu* has not retraced, my transcription treats it as omitted by the fourth hand.

<ch 1><v 13> [d3]EIRHKEN[/d3] [c3]EIRHKE[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 278).

<ch 1><v 14> SWTHRIAN:

What may be a medial point following this word has been obscured by the chapter division symbol.

<ch 2><v 1> DIA:

A symbol indicating chapter division precedes this word. The number '2' is placed in the left-hand column adjacent to the line.

<ch 2><v 1> [d2]PRO[ut]S[/ut]=ECEIN[/d2] [c2]PRO=SECEIN[/c2]:

A *sigma* which intrudes into the left-hand margin has been added. There appears to have been a miniature *sigma* following the original letters PRO. This alteration appears to be more consistent with the third hand than the second hand, who uses less well formed letters. (See the alterations at 5.4 and 9.4 for examples.)

<ch 2><v 1> [d3]AKOU=SQEISIN[/d3] [c3]AKOU=SQEISI[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 278).

<ch 2><v 1> [d2]PARARUWMEN[/d2] [c2]PARA[st]R[/st]RUWMEN[/c2]:

This alteration has been ascribed to the third hand in accordance with Wachtel and Witte (1994) ( $B^2 = [c2]$ ) and Tischendorf (1872, 783) ( $B^3 = [c2]$ ). (Tischendorf has retained the label of his 1867 edition in his 1872 edition.)

<ch 2><v 4> [d2]SUNMARTUROUTOS[/d2] [c2]SU[st]M[/st]  
MARTUROUTOS[/c2]:

This alteration has been ascribed to the third hand in accordance with Wachtel and Witte (1994) ( $B^2 = [c2]$ ) and Tischendorf (1872, 784) ( $B^c = [c2]$ ).

<ch 2><v 4> [d3]TERASIN[/d3] [c3]TERASI[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 279).

<ch 2><v 4> [d3]DUNAMES[fn]I[/fn]/[d3] [c3]DUNAMESI[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 279). There is no sign of a letter following the *iota*, so I have assumed that Tischendorf could see the remnant of a final *nu* superscript.

<ch 2><v 5> [d3][di]U[/di]PETAXEN[/d3] [c3][di]U[/di]PETAXE[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 279).

<ch 2><v 6> TI ESTIN ANQRWPOS O=:

A quotation marker (>) is placed in the left-hand column adjacent to this line.

<ch 2><v 7> [d3]TEIMH[/d3] [c3]TIMH[/c3]:

The *epsilon* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 279).

<ch 2><v 8> TW TWN PODWN AUTOU:

A quotation marker (>) is placed in the left-hand column adjacent to this line.

<ch 2><v 9> BRA[ut]CU[/ut]:

The last two letters of this word have not been retraced. They have not been transcribed as an alteration by the fourth hand because the resultant reading would not make sense.

<ch 2><v 9> [d3]TEIMH[/d3] [c3]TIMH[/c3]:

The *epsilon* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 279).

<ch 2><v 10> [d3]EPREPEN[/d3] [c3]EPREPE[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 279).

<ch 2><v 14> [d3]METESCEN[/d3] [c3]METESCE[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 279).

<ch 2><v 17> [d3]WFEILEN[/d3] [c3]WFEILE[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 279).

<ch 2><v 17> [d3]EILASKESQAI[/d3] [c3]ILASKESQAI[/c3]:

The *epsilon* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 279).

QHSAI ~ ... <ch 3><v 1> OQEN ADEL=:

The section markers B, x, and 3 are located adjacent to this line. A symbol indicating chapter division precedes OQEN. A *paragraphos* is drawn beneath the Q.

<ch 3><v 3> [d3]TEIM[fn]H[/fn]/[d3] [c3]TIM[fn]H[/fn]/[c3]:

The *epsilon* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 279).

TASCWMEN ~ ... <ch 3><v 7> DIO KAQWS:

A *paragraphos* is drawn beneath the T.

<ch 3><v 7> AG[ut]I[/ut]ON:

The I is barely visible in the facsimile and does not appear to have been retraced. I have not treated it as an alteration.

<ch 3><v 10> [d2]TESS[ut]E[/ut]RAK[fn]O[/fn]=TA[/d2] [c2]TESS[st]A[/st]RAK  
[fn]O[/fn]=TA[/c2]:

This alteration has been ascribed to the third hand in accordance with Wachtel and Witte (1994) ( $B^2 = [c2]$ ) and Tischendorf (1872, 788) ( $B^c = [c2]$ ).

<ch 3><v 10> SA TH GENE TAUTH [kc]K[/kc]:

This line is marked by a double-point. (See the introduction.)

<ch 3><v 14> [d3][di]U[/di]POS[rt]T[/rt]A=SEWS[/d3] [c3][di]U[/di]  
POSGA=SEWS[/c3]:

The letter which has been erroneously retraced as a G may originally have been a T. It is not possible to tell whether this is so from the facsimile.

<ch 3><v 17> [d3]TISIN[/d3] [c3]TISI[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 280).

<ch 3><v 17> [d3]PROSWCQIS[fn]E[/fn]/[d3] [c3]PROSWCQISE[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 280). There is no sign of a letter following the *epsilon*, so I have assumed that Tischendorf could see the remnant of a final *nu* superscript.

<ch 3><v 17> [d2]TESSERAKONTA[/d2] [c2]TESS[st]A[/st]RAKONTA[/c2]:

This alteration has been ascribed to the third hand in accordance with Wachtel and Witte (1994) ( $B^2 = [c2]$ ) and Tischendorf (1872, 790) ( $B^c = [c2]$ ).

<ch 3><v 17> EPESEN:

The first E is cursive.

<ch 3><v 18> [d3]TISIN[/d3] [c3]TISI[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 280).

<ch 3><v 18> [d3]WMO=SEN[/d3] [c3]WMO=SE[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 280).

<ch 3><v 18> [d3]APEI=QHSASIN[/d3] [c3]APEI=QHSASI[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 280).

<ch 3><v 19> EISELQEIN DI' APISTI[fn]A[/fn]:

This line is marked by a double-point.

<ch 4><v 1> FOBHQWMEN OUN MH:

The number '4' is written in the left-hand column adjacent to this line. The line also contains a chapter division symbol.

<ch 4><v 1> [d2]EIS=ELQEIN[/d2] [c2]EI=SELQEIN[/c2]:

This alteration is consistent with the third hand (cf. 2.1, PROSECEIN).

<ch 4><v 2> [d2]SUNKEKERASMENOUS[/d2] [c2]SU[st]G[/st]

KEKERASMENOUS[/c2]:

This alteration has been ascribed to the third hand in accordance with Wachtel and Witte (1994) ( $B^2 = [c2]$ ) and Tischendorf (1872, 790) ( $B^c = [c2]$ ).

<ch 4><v 3> [d3]EIRHKEN[/d3] [c3]EIRHKE[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 280).

<ch 4><v 4> [d3]OUTWS[/d3] [c3]OUTW[/c3]:

The final *sigma* does not appear to have been retraced. Wachtel and Witte (1994) ascribe this to the second rather than the fourth hand. Tischendorf does not note this alteration.

<ch 4><v 4> [d2]AUTOU ~ [/d2] [c2]AUTOU[ut]S[/ut]/[c2]:

A corrector appears to have added a *sigma* in place of the punctuation following this word. The addition seems to be more consistent with alterations by the third hand than with those of the other correctors.

<ch 4><v 7> TINA:

The acute accent on the *iota* is by the third hand (Tischendorf, 1867, 280) ( $B^3 = [c2]$ ).

<ch 4><v 7> [d3]PROEIRHKEN[/d3] [c3]PROEIRHKE[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 280).

<ch 4><v 9> APOLEITAI:

The accent on the *epsilon* has been added by the third hand (Tischendorf, 1867, 280) ( $B^3 = [c2]$ ).

<ch 4><v 10> [di]l[/di]DIWN:

A *paragraphos* is drawn below the l.

<ch 4><v 12> [d3]KRI=TIKO[ut]S[/ut]/[d3] [c3]KRI=TIKOO[/c3]:

The fourth hand has mistakenly traced an *omicron* over what was probably a *sigma*.

<ch 4><v 13> [d3]ESTIN[/d3] [c3]ESTI[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 280).

O LOGOS ~ ... <ch 4><v 14> ECONTES:

The section markers G and xa are written in the left-hand column. A *paragraphos* is drawn beneath the O.

<ch 4><v 15> [d2]SUNPAQHSAI[/d2] [c2]SU[st]M[/st]PAQHSAI[/c2]:

This alteration has been ascribed to the third hand in accordance with Tischendorf (1872, 793) ( $B^c = [c2]$ ).

AN ~ <ch 5><v 1> PAS GAR ARCIEREUS:

A chapter division symbol precedes PAS. The number '5' is written in the left-hand column adjacent to this line. A *paragraphos* is drawn beneath the A.

<ch 5><v 1> [ut]U[/ut]PER (2nd occurrence):

The U is difficult to read. Apart from a small portion in the upper right-hand part, it does not appear to have been retraced .

<ch 5><v 2> [d3]AGNOOUSIN[/d3] [c3]AGNOOUSI[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 281).

<ch 5><v 2> ASQENEIAN:

A mark that resembles an l follows the first E of this word. It is probably ink that has run through from a K located on the reverse side of the sheet.

<ch 5><v 3> [d2]OFIEI[/d2] [c2]OF[st][ut]E[/ut]/[st]ILEI[/c2]:

According to Tischendorf (1867, 281), the third hand has *ofeilei*. There is a mark above the *phi*. I cannot tell whether it is an *epsilon*.

<ch 5><v 4> [c1][st]TIS[/st]/[c1]:

This has been supplied by the second hand (Tischendorf, 1872, 794) ( $B^b$  et  $c = [c1]$ ).

<ch 5><v 4> [d3]TEIMHN[/d3] [c3]TIMHN[/c3]:

The *epsilon* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 281).

<ch 5><v 5> [d3]EDOXASEN[/d3] [c3]EDOXASE[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 281).

<ch 5><v 7> [d2]DEHSIS[/d2] [c2]DEHS[st]E[/st]I[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1867, 281) attributes this alteration to the third hand ( $B^3 = [c2]$ ).

<ch 5><v 8> PER WN UIOS EMAQEN:

This line is marked by a double-point.

<ch 5><v 8> [d2]AP[/d2] [c2]A[st]F[/st]/[c2]:

Tischendorf (1867, 281) attributes this alteration to the third hand ( $B^3 = [c2]$ ).

<ch 5><v 8> [d3]EPAQEN[/d3] [c3]EPAQE[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 281).

<ch 5><v 9> [d3]PASIN[/d3] [c3]PASI[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 281).

<ch 5><v 12> [d2]KAI[/d2]:

This alteration has been ascribed to the third hand in accordance with Wachtel and Witte (1994) ( $B^2 = [c2]$ ) and Tischendorf (1872, 796) ( $B^3 = [c2]$ ). Tischendorf adds that the second hand may already have made the change.

<ch 5><v 13> [d3]E=STIN[/d3] [c3]E=STI[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 281).

<ch 5><v 14> [d3]EST[fn]I[/fn]/[d3] [c3]ESTI[/c3]:

The final *nu* superscript does not appear to have been retraced.

<ch 5><v 14> [d2]ESQH=THRIA[/d2] [c2][st]AI[/st]SQH=THRIA[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1867, 281) attributes this alteration to the third hand ( $B^3 = [c2]$ ).

<ch 6><v 1> DIO AFENTES TON THS:



A chapter-division symbol precedes DIO. The number '6' is written in the right-hand column.

<ch 6><v 6> [d2]ANASTARO[fn]U[/fn]TAS[/d2] [c2]ANASTA[st]U[/st]RO[fn]U[/fn]TAS[/c2]:

This alteration is consistent with the third hand.

TIZONTAS ~ <ch 6><v 7> GH GAR H PI:

A *paragraphos* is drawn beneath the T.

<ch 6><v 7> [d2]AUTHS[/d2] [c2]AUTH[st]N[/st][[/c2]:

This alteration has been ascribed to the third hand in accordance with Wachtel and Witte (1994) ( $B^2 = [c2]$ ) and Tischendorf (1872, 797) ( $B^3 = [c2]$ ).

KAUSIN:... <ch 6><v 9> PEPEISME:

The section marker *xb* is written in the left-hand column. A *paragraphos* is drawn beneath the K.

<ch 6><v 9> PERI:

A small mark located above the *rho* resembles a *phi*. This mark probably is the result of ink running through from the word OIKON on p. 1518 (column a, line 9).

<ch 6><v 10> ERGOU [di]U[/di]MWN KAI THS:

This line is marked by a double-point.

<ch 6><v 10> [d2]HS[/d2] [c2]H[st]N[/st][[/c2]:

This alteration has been ascribed to the third hand in accordance with Wachtel and Witte (1994) ( $B^2 = [c2]$ ) and Tischendorf (1872, 797) ( $B^3 = [c2]$ ). Tischendorf has retained the label of his 1867 edition.

<ch 6><v 12> [d3]MEIMHTAI[/d3] [c3]MIMHTAI[/c3]:

The *epsilon* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 282).

<ch 6><v 13> [d3]EICEN[/d3] [c3]EICE[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 282).

<ch 6><v 13> [d3]WMOS[fn]E[/fn]/[d3] [c3]WMOSE[/c3]:

The final *nu* superscript has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 282).

<ch 6><v 15> [d3]EPETUCEN[/d3] [c3]EPETUCE[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 282).

EPAGGELIAS ~ <ch 6><v 16> ANQRWPOI:

A *paragraphos* is drawn beneath the E.

<ch 6><v 16> [d3]OMNUOUSIN[/d3] [c3]OMNUOUSI[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 282).

<ch 6><v 17> [d3]EMESEITEUSEN[/d3] [c3]EMESITEUSEN[/c3]:

The *epsilon* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 282).

<ch 6><v 19> [ut]K[/ut]ATAPETASMATOS:

The first letter has the appearance of a *chi*. Tischendorf (1867, xxxix) writes, 'Mico wrongly has *catapet*. He seems to have been led into error by the acute above ο{pou which touches the K.'

<ch 6><v 20> PRO:

The apostrophe following this word is unusually large, suggesting that it is by a later hand.

EIS TON AIWNA... <ch 7><v 1> OUTOS:

A chapter division symbol precedes OUTOS. The number '7' is written in the left-hand column, and a *paragraphos* is drawn under the E.

<ch 7><v 1> [d3]MELCEISEDEK[/d3] [c3]MELCISEDEK[/c3]:

The *epsilon* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 282).

<ch 7><v 2> [d3]ESTIN[/d3] [c3]ESTI[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 282).

<ch 7><v 4> [d3]A=KROQINEIWN[/d3] [c3]A=KROQINIWN[/c3]:

The *epsilon* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 282).

<ch 7><v 5> [c2][it]TOUTESTIN[/it]/[c2]:

This alteration has been ascribed to the third hand in accordance with Tischendorf (1872, 797) ( $B^3 = [c2]$ ). The addition is not divided between TOUT and ESTIN.

<ch 7><v 6> [d3]EULOGHK[fn]E[/fn]/[d3] [c3]EULOGHKE[/c3]:

The final *nu* superscript has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 282).

<ch 7><v 10> SEN AUTW MELCISEDEK:

A *paragraphos* is drawn under the S.

<ch 7><v 11> EI MEN OUN [d2]TELIWSIS[/d2] [c2]TEL[st]E[/st]IWSIS[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1867, 283) attributes this alteration to the third hand ( $B^3 = [c2]$ ). The section marker D is written in the left-hand column adjacent to this line.

<ch 7><v 12> [d3]GEINETAI[/d3] [c3]GINETAI[/c3]:

The *epsilon* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 283).

<ch 7><v 13> [d2]PROS=ESCHKEN[/d2] [d3][c2]PRO=SESKHEN[/c2]/[d3]  
[c3]PRO=SESKHE[/c3]:

The small *sigma* of the first hand has been replaced by a larger *sigma* which is consistent with the third hand (cf. 2.1 and 4.1). The second *sigma* has been retraced and the the first may have been as well. According to Tischendorf (1867, 283), the final *nu* has not been retraced.

<ch 7><v 14> HN FULHN PERI [di]I[/di]ERE[fn]W[/fn]:

This line is marked with a double-point.

SEN ~ <ch 7><v 15> KAI PERISSOTER[fn]O[/fn]:

A *paragraphos* is drawn under the S.

<ch 7><v 16> [d2]ENTO=LH [ut]K[/ut]ARKINHS[/d2] [d3][c2]ENTO=LH [st]S  
[/st]ARKINHS[/c2]/[d3] [c3]ENTO=LHS [st]S[/st]ARKINHS[/c3]:

What appears to be a *kappa* originally followed the *eta*. This was erased and a superscript *sigma*, which is consistent with the third hand, was

added. Finally, another *sigma* was added where the erased letter had been, probably by the scribe who retraced the letters.

<ch 7><v 17> [d3]MEL=CEISEDEK[/d3] [c3]MEL=CISEDEK[/c3]:

The *epsilon* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 283).

<ch 7><v 18> [d3]GEINETAI[/d3] [c3]GINETAI[/c3]:

The *epsilon* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 283).

KAI ANWFELES ~ <ch 7><v 19> OUD[fn]E[/fn]:

The section marker **xg** is written in the left-hand column. A *paragraphos* is drawn beneath the K.

<ch 7><v 20> EISIN:

The first *iota* has not been retraced. I have not treated this as an alteration by the fourth hand.

<ch 7><v 20> GEGONOTES:

What appears to be a stroke above the second O is an adherence from the P of PERAS at 6.15 on the facing leaf.

<ch 7><v 21> [d2]MET[/d2] [c2]ME[st]Q[/st]/[c2]:

This alteration has been ascribed to the third hand in accordance with Wachtel and Witte (1994) ( $B^2 = [c2]$ ) and Tischendorf (1872, 803) ( $B^c = [c2]$ ).

<ch 7><v 21> [d3]WMOSEN[/d3] [c3]WMOSE[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 283).

<ch 7><v 21> METAMELHQHSETAI:

What appears to be a M above this word is an adherence from the the previous page. Tischendorf (1867, xxxix) writes '... the m is nothing but a stain, or to state it more accurately, an inverted letter from the facing writing. In that place (i.e., p. 1516, col. 2, lines 8 and 9) is:

o q—s—epideixai tois klh

ronomois ths epag (Heb 6,17)

The M in klhronomois has adhered, in inverted form to be sure, to page 1517...'

GEGONEN EGGUOS [ns]IS[/ns] ~ <ch 7><v 23> KAI:

A *paragraphos* is drawn beneath the G.

<ch 7><v 23> [d3]EIS[fn]I[/fn]/[d3] [c3]EISI[/c3]:

The final *nu* superscript has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 283).

<ch 7><v 25> PROSERCOMENOUS DI':

This line is marked with a double-point.

TELEIWMENON ~ <ch 8><v 1> KEFA=:

A chapter division symbol precedes KEFALAION. The number '8' is written in the right-hand column and a *paragraphos* is drawn beneath the T.

<ch 8><v 2> [d2]LITOURGOS[/d2] [c2]L[st]E[/st]ITOURGOS[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1867, 283) attributes this alteration to the third hand (B<sup>3</sup> = [c2]).

<ch 8><v 2> O [ns]KS[/ns] OUK ANQRWPOS:

A *paragraphos* is drawn beneath the O.

PROSENEGKH ~ ... <ch 8><v 4> EI MEN:

A *paragraphos* is drawn beneath the P.

<ch 8><v 5> [d3]LATREUOUSIN[/d3] [c3]LATREUOUSI[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 283).

<ch 8><v 5> [d3]FHSIN[/d3] [c3]FHSI[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 283).

OREI ~ <ch 8><v 6> NUN DE DIAFORW:

This line is marked with a double-point.

<ch 8><v 6> [d3]TETEUCEN[/d3] [c3]TETEUCE[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 283).

<ch 8><v 6> [d2]LITOURGIAS[/d2] [c2]L[st]E[/st]ITOURGIAS[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1867, 283) attributes this alteration to the third hand ( $B^3 = [c2]$ ).

<ch 8><v 6> [d3]ESTIN[/d3] [c3]ESTI[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 283).

<ch 8><v 6> [d3]MESEITHS[/d3] [c3]MESITHS[/c3]:

The *epsilon* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 283).

<ch 8><v 7> AMEMPTOS:

There is a mark situated between the last two letters of AMEMPTOS. It may be due to ink running through from a *rho* on the other side of the leaf.

<ch 8><v 7> [d2]ETERAS[/d2] [c2][st]DEU[/st]TERAS[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1867, 284) attributes this alteration to the third hand ( $B^3 = [c2]$ ).

<ch 8><v 8> TOIS LEGEI [di]I[/di]DOU HME=:

Quotation markers (>) are placed in the left-hand column adjacent to this and the following 37 lines.

<ch 8><v 10> KARDIA EAUTWN:

Tischendorf (1867, 284) notes that the reading of the first hand has not been changed. He also writes (1867, xxxix) ' $B^3$  has merely added a breathing... The reading itself, as is plain to see, results from a confusion of S and E.'

<ch 8><v 11> [d3]POLEITHN[/d3] [c3]POLITHN[/c3]:

The *epsilon* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 284).

[d1]EIDOUSIN[/d1] [d3][c1]EID[st]HS[/st]OUSIN[/c1][[/d3] [c3]EID[st]HS[/st]  
OUSI[/c3] ME APO [d3]MEI=:

This line is marked with a double-point.

<ch 8><v 11> [d1]EIDOUSIN[/d1] [d3][c1]EID[st]HS[/st]OUSIN[/c1]/[d3] [c3]EID[st]HS[/st]OUSI[/c3]:

Tischendorf (1867, 284) notes that the second hand ( $B^2 = [c1]$ ), so it seems, has added *hs*, and that the final *nu* has not been retraced.

<ch 8><v 11> [d3]MEI=KROU[/d3] [c3]MI=KROU[/c3]:

The *epsilon* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 284).

<ch 8><v 12> [d3]EILEWS[/d3] [c3]ILEWS[/c3]:

The *epsilon* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 284).

<ch 8><v 12> [d3]ADIKEIAIS[/d3] [c3]ADIKIAIS[/c3]:

The *epsilon* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 284).

<ch 8><v 12> TWN OU MH MNHSQW ETI:

A *paragraphos* is drawn beneath the T.

<ch 8><v 13> [d3]PEPALAIWKEN[/d3] [c3]PEPALAIWKE[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 284).

AFANISMOU ~ <ch 9><v 1> EICE M[fn]E[/fn]:

A chapter division symbol precedes EICE. The number '9' is written in the right-hand column and the section marker E is written in the left-hand column. A *paragraphos* is drawn beneath the A.

<ch 9><v 3> KATAPETASMA. SKHNH:

This line is marked with a double-point.

<ch 9><v 4> [d1]COUSA[/d1] [c1][st]E[/st]COUSA[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1867, 284) notes that this is due to the third hand ( $B^3$ ). However, the added *epsilon* is more consistent with the second hand. Indeed, one of the researchers at the Institute for New Testament Textual Research in Münster has changed the note in their copy of Tischendorf's 1867 edition so that the alteration is now attributed to  $B^2$ .

<ch 9><v 5> [d3]EILASTH=RION[/d3] [c3]ILASGH=RION[/c3]:

The *epsilon* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 284). Also, the *tau* has only been partially retraced to produce a *gamma*. A rough breathing over the *iota*, a lack of agreement in gender, and the fact that the resulting phrase is nonsense, rules out the possibility that this could be divided as i[la" ghvreion *thistledown bands* or i[la" ghraiovn *aged bands*.

<ch 9><v 5> ESTI:

There is no sign of a final *nu* superscript here.

<ch 9><v 8> SKHNNHS:

NH ligature.

<ch 9><v 10> [d3]BRWMASIN[/d3] [c3]BRWMASI[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 284).

<ch 9><v 10> [d3]PO=MASIN[/d3] [c3]PO=MASI[/c3]:

The final *nu* has not been retraced (Tischendorf, 1867, 284).

EPIKEIMENA ~ ... <ch 9><v 11> [ns]CS[/ns] DE:

The section marker *xd* is written in the left-hand margin and a *paragraphos* is drawn beneath the E.

<ch 9><v 12> [d3]TRAG[fn]W[/fn]/[d3] [c3]TRAGW[/c3]:

The final *nu* superscript has not been retraced.

<ch 9><v 14> PNEUMATOS AIWNIOU:

This line is marked with a double-point.

<ch 9><v 14> KAQA=[rt]PIEI[/rt]:

The uncial writing ends half way through *kaqariei'*. A few words are reconstructed after this point to assist machine-collation. Subsequent leaves of the codex contain the remainder of Hebrews written in minuscule script.

## References



Martini, Carlo M. (ed.). 1968. *Novum Testamentum e Codice Vaticano Graeco 1209 (Codex B)*. Trans. David Barry. Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana.

Payne, Philip B. 1995. 'Fuldensis, Vaticanus, and 1 Cor 14.34-5'. *New Testament studies* 41/2, 240-262.

Skeat, T. C. 1984. 'The Codex Vaticanus in the fifteenth century'. *Journal of theological studies* 35/2, 454-465.

Tischendorf, Konstantin von (ed.). 1867. *Novum Testamentum Vaticanum*. Leipzig: Giesecke and Devrient.

#### U4

Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus (C). Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 9.

Transcribed and verified by reference to Tischendorf (1845) and Lyon (1958).

A close examination of photographs of the first few folios of Hebrews was made at the Institute for New Testament Textual Research in Münster. Microfilm copies of this manuscript are virtually unreadable because it is a palimpsest. Nevertheless, a Xerox print from microfilm has been employed in certain places. Consequently, there are occasions when this transcription differs from the editions of both Tischendorf and Lyon. Where these editors disagree over the reading of the manuscript, the views of both have been taken into account in arriving at the resultant transcription.

While some parts of the folios were quite clear, other parts proved difficult to read. Often, the fine horizontal and diagonal strokes of H, Q, N and P were not visible. Some letters were made more difficult to read when the biblical text was obscured by Ephraem's text or the lines ruled to receive Ephraem's text.

Diaeresis consists of a straight line rather than points (Lyon, 1958, 8). These lines are very fine, and, like the horizontal strokes of H, Q and P, are often not visible in the photographs. This transcription includes instances of diaeresis where they have been detected. However, it is probable that many instances have been overlooked. The same goes for *nomina sacra* and final *nu* superscripts.

Rough breathings have not been transcribed. Lyon (1958, 8) does not regard accents or breathings as the work of the first hand. There are frequent cross marks (+) by a corrector. Sometimes, places where a punctuation mark may once have been are now obscured, either by a later cross mark or Ephraem's text.

All points transcribed by Tischendorf or Lyon are included as high points here. Lyon's transcription consistently employs full stops rather than high points. Substitution of the high point is justified by Lyon's comment

(1958, 8) that 'we can ... accept the conclusions [*sic*] of Tischendorf that the first scribe used only one punctuation mark, namely, the high period.' Presumably, Lyon was limited by the capabilities of his typewriter.

Parts of the epistle to the Hebrews survive in the following folios:

<i>Section</i>	<i>Folio</i>
2.4-3.3	37v.
3.3-4.3	37r.
4.3-5.2	45r.
5.2-6.7	45v.
6.8-7.5	116r.
7.5-7.26	116v.
9.15-10.3	136r.
10.3-10.24	136v.
12.16-13.7	131r.
13.7-13.25	131v.

Comments from Tischendorf's edition are my translations of the Latin. Page numbers are not given in references to the editions of Tischendorf or Lyon because chapter and verse numbers are sufficient to locate the relevant places. (Lyon does not have page numbers in the transcription section of his thesis.)

### *Correctors*

Both Tischendorf and Lyon identified three correctors. The following table shows the correspondence between their corrector labels and the labels used in my transcription. The dates are taken from the Alands' *Synopsis of sigla for correctors in manuscripts* (1989, 108).

<i>Label</i>	<i>Tisch. (1845)</i>	<i>Tisch. (1872)</i>	<i>Lyon (1958)</i>	<i>Date (C.)</i>
[c0]/[d0]	A	C**	A	5
[c1]/[d1]	B	C <sup>2</sup>	B	6?
[c2]/[d2]	C	C <sup>3</sup>	C	9?

### *Provenance*

I have not given a provenance for this manuscript. As Lyon (1958, 19) writes, 'Critics have generally voiced their hesitancy to locate Codex C.'

Milne and Skeat (1938, 67) note that the spelling *tetraarch*", which is found six out of seven times in U4, implies an Egyptian origin. However, Ropes (1926, lv) writes that, 'There seems to be no sufficient reason for any confident assertion that it is of Egyptian origin.' Tischendorf thought that the manuscript may have been in Constantinople when it was pulled apart so that its parchment could be used again (Ropes, 1926, lv).

<ch 2><v 4> MERISMOIS ~ :

Lyon (1958) places a point here but Tischendorf (1845) does not.

<ch 2><v 4> QELHSIN ~ :

Neither Lyon (1958) nor Tischendorf (1845) places a point here.

<ch 2><v 6> [d1]TIS[/d1] [c1]TI[/c1]:

'A corrector reads TI for TIS before ESTIN; for he erases S' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Lyon (1958, 376) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 2><v 6> AUTOU ~ :

Tischendorf (1845) places a point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 2><v 9> QANATOU ~ ¶:

This seems to be the best place to put a paragraph-division. It is required because of the enlarged and indented letter beginning the following line.

<ch 2><v 10> AUTW ~ :

Tischendorf (1845) places a point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 2><v 11> O TE GAR AGIAZWN KAI OI AGIAZOMENOI ≥ EX ENOS PANTES ≥ DI [fn]H[/fn]:

A later hand has written in the right-hand column adjacent to this line:

\*\*\*TO\*DEH

\*SELMON

\*\*\*EPAU

RIONTON

CUGENON

(Asterices indicate illegible letters.) A possible reconstruction is TOUTOS DE H PSELMON THN EPAURION TON CRISTOUGENON, that is, 'this is the song for the day after Christmas'.

According to Lyon (1958, 401) the *nomen sacrum* superscript found here belongs to the third hand. It has the following appearance: ' .

<ch 2><v 13> PALIN ~ :

Lyon (1958) places a point here but Tischendorf (1845) does not.

<ch 2><v 13> [d1]E[rt]P AUTON[/rt][[/d1] [c1]E[ut]N[/ut] AUTW[/c1]:


'B has rewritten P AUTW, nearly fitting the space. Perhaps A had written EN AUTW or EP AUTON' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Lyon (1958, 376) writes, 'The room is not sufficient for ep auton. But it cannot be asserted that A wrote en. We have no reason to believe that B would erase n autw simply to change n to p. I have no suggestion to offer.'

The photographs shows that the letters P AUTON could fit in the available space. Indeed, there appear to be two points which may be the lower ends of erased vertical strokes from the N of an original AUTON. These points may be seen below the middle stroke and right-hand side of the inserted W. Consequently, this transcription has included the letters P AUTON as a reconstruction of the underlying text. The reading EP AUTON is also found in M2815. While Lyon and Tischendorf agree that second hand wrote EP, the photographs seem to show that the correction has EN.

<ch 2><v 13> [d0]PAIDIA EDW[/d0] [c0]PAIDIA MOI EDWKEN[/c0]:

'PAIDI has A written above it, whereby it becomes PAIDIA.' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Lyon attributes this alteration to the second hand. He writes (1958, 376), 'Tischendorf said the first hand wrote paidi moi and that the corrector wrote paidia moi. Several letters have been rewritten by A. Under the present moi the letters edw are seen. Tischendorf failed to note this. The first hand, therefore, omitted moi, erased edw, and then wrote paidia moi. None of the letters are crowded as they would be if a

was added later. In the 1845 edition Tischendorf changed this note and acknowledged that A wrote paidia moi; but he also said B inserted a to read paidia a moi. I do not believe B has changed this reading in any way. Some small mark can be seen between paidia and moi, but if it is an a, it has probably been inserted by C.'

My transcription follows Lyon's judgement regarding the original text but not regarding which scribe made the alteration. The superimposed text matches the first hand's style. The mark between PAIDIA and MOI appears to be a caret with the following form . The presence of this caret raises the possibility of another correction phase, perhaps being the insertion of an *alpha*. There may be a matching caret above the first letter of EDWKEN.

<ch 2><v 15> ZHN ~ :

Neither Lyon (1958) nor Tischendorf (1845) places a point here.

<ch 2><v 17> WFEILEN ~ :

Neither Lyon (1958) nor Tischendorf (1845) places a point here.

<ch 2><v 17> LAOU ~ :

Lyon (1958) records an interrogation mark (;) after this word, whereas Tischendorf (1845) has a high point. This is probably an error in Lyon's transcription. He agrees with Tischendorf that the only punctuation the first hand used was the high point (Lyon, 1958, 8.)

<ch 2><v 18> PEPONQEN ≥ AUTOS PEIRASQEIS:

Two sloping strokes above the U of AUTOS may be transposition markers or diaeresis. There is at least one similar stroke drawn above the last two letters of PEIRASQEIS. (AUTOS and PEPONQEN are transposed in U6.) Similar strokes which do not seem to be associated with transpositions occur elsewhere in this manuscript.

<ch 3><v 1> ARCIEREA[ut]N[/ut]:

Lyon (1959, 271) transcribes a *nu* at the end of this word but Tischendorf does not. There does appear to be a trace of a *nu* in the photograph. There may be diaeresis above the *iota*.

<ch 3><v 1> [c2][ns]CN[/ns][c2]:

'After IN a corrector (and, indeed, the second hand, unless I am mistaken, because it may also be the third) has introduced, of style, CN' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Lyon (1958, 401) writes, 'Tischendorf thought (and stated so in T8) that this addition might have been by B. But the writing is that of C and the horizontal line for the nomina sacra is his also (i.e., ' ).'

<ch 3><v 2> MWUSHS ~ :

Neither Lyon (1958) nor Tischendorf (1845) places a point here.

<ch 3><v 4> OIKOS ~ :

Neither Lyon (1958) nor Tischendorf (1845) places a point here.

<ch 3><v 4> [c2][st]TA[/st][c2]:

'TA has been added before PANTA by the other hand, unless I am mistaken.' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Lyon (1958, 401) attributes this to the third hand. The form of the *alpha* shows that this is the work of the same scribe who wrote in the left-hand column further down the page.

<ch 3><v 5> QE=RAPWN ~ :

Neither Lyon (1958) nor Tischendorf (1845) places a point here.

NHS AUTOU AKOUSHTE <ch 3><v 8> MH SKLHRUNHTE TAS  
KARDIAS U=:

quotation markers (>) occur in the left-hand margin adjacent to this and the following seven lines.

<ch 3><v 8> PEIRASMOU ~ :

Neither Lyon (1958) nor Tischendorf (1845) places a point here.

<ch 3><v 11> EIS THN KATAP AUSIN MOU ≥ ¶:

There is writing in the left-hand column adjacent to this line. It incorporates a number of symbols, including the special superscript line which Lyon (1958, 401) attributes to the third hand. (See 3.1, above, for a representation of this line.) This may be a lectionary reference. The form of the writing indicates that this was written by the same scribe that

added TA at 3.4.

<ch 3><v 12> [d1]EST[rt]AI TINAS U[/rt]MWN[/d1] [c1]ESTAI EN TINI  
UMWN[/c1]:

'[The letters] AI EN TINI UMWN have been rewritten by B. Perhaps EN was missing before' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Lyon (1958, 376) attributes this alteration to the second hand and writes, 'add en before tini umwn.' The space left by the erasure appears to be too large for AI TINI UMWN alone. There appear to be slight traces of the letters A and S underneath the last two letters of the present TINI, suggesting that the original text was ESTAI TINAS UMWN.

<ch 3><v 12> PONHRA:

There may be punctuation following this word.

<ch 3><v 13> KAQ':

Neither Lyon (1958) nor Tischendorf (1845) includes this apostrophe.

<ch 3><v 14> [d1][di]U[/di]POSTAS[rt]S[/rt]EWS[/d1] [c1][di]U[/di]  
POSTASEWS[/c1]:

'B has rewritten SE in UPOSTASEWS. Formerly [there were] three letters.' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Lyon (1958, 376) attributes this alteration to the second hand and writes, 'upostasews for upostasews.' The underlying S and E are visible and there is a space between them that would accommodate another S.

<ch 3><v 14> TELOUS:

There may be punctuation following this word.

<ch 3><v 15> AKOU=SHTE ˘ :

Neither Lyon (1958) nor Tischendorf (1845) includes this high point.

<ch 3><v 16> MW[di]U[/di]SEWS:

A contraction of TELOS (Ϡ) follows this word.

<ch 3><v 17> ERWMW:

Spelled thus by Lyon and Tischendorf. They do not note any corrections.



<ch 4><v 1> EISELQEIN:

Lyon (1958) has transcribed this word incorrectly.

<ch 4><v 2> [d1]PARESMEN[/d1] [c1][ut]G[/ut]AR ESMEN[/c1]:

'G, it seems, has been made from the P in PAR, whereby it becomes GAR.' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). This may be the result of the washing in preparation for Ephraem's text. Lyon (1958, 376) attributes the alteration to the second hand.

<ch 4><v 2> LO=GOS ~ :

Neither Lyon (1958) nor Tischendorf (1845) includes this high point.

<ch 4><v 3> [d2]H[/d2] [c2]EI[/c2]:

'A corrector has made EI out of the H following MOU.' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Lyon ascribes this correction to the third hand.

<ch 4><v 3> [d1]K[rt]AITOI TWN ERG[fn]W[/fn][[/rt]]/[d1] [c1]MOU KAITOI TWN ERG[fn]W[/fn][[/c1]]:

'MOU KAI TOI TWN ERGW has been rewritten by B, so something may have been missing before. Perhaps MOU had been omitted, since the erasure starts here' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Lyon (1958, 377) agrees that the second hand added MOU. This correction was made by erasing the first hand's text. Traces of a few of the former letters remain. The last letters of the corrector's text are difficult to see.

<ch 4><v 6> [d1]EUHGGELISQENTES[/d1] [c1]EUAGGELISQENTES[/c1]:

Lyon (1958, 326) and Tischendorf, (1845, 355) agree that the *eta* in EUHGGELISQENTES has been changed to an *alpha*. Lyon (who records this as a variant in verse 7) attributes this correction to the first hand. The photograph of this page that I examined at the Institute for New Testament Textual Research shows the vertical strokes of a possible *eta* and a faint loop which may belong to a corrector's *alpha*. I do not believe that the first hand made this change because the light shade of ink in the *alpha* is more consistent with alterations made by the second hand. The shape of the loop is not consistent with the third hand, whose characteristic *alpha* is similar to a *delta* (cf. the addition of TA at 3.4). Consequently, this correction has been ascribed to the second hand.

<ch 4><v 7> PROEIRHTAI ~ :

Neither Lyon (1958) nor Tischendorf (1845) includes this high point.

<ch 4><v 8> MET AUTA:

Lyon (1958) transcribes this as a single word.

<ch 4><v 10> AUTOU ~ (second occurrence):

Tischendorf (1845, 271) places a point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 4><v 11> KA=TAP AUSIN ~ :

Tischendorf (1845, 271) places a point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 4><v 12> [d1]ENQUMHSEW[rt]S[/rt]/[d1] [c1]ENQUMHSEWN[/c1]:

Lyon (1958, 377) and Tischendorf (1845, 355) agree that the second hand changed ENQUMHSEWS to ENQUMHSEWN. The photograph examined at the Institute shows the slightest trace of what may be a S. It has been transcribed as reconstructed text due to its very uncertain status.

<ch 4><v 13> AUTOU ~ :

Tischendorf (1845, 271) places a point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 4><v 13> LOGOS ~ :

Tischendorf (1845, 271) places a point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 4><v 14> [c2][ut]ADELFOI[/ut]/[c2]:

According to Tischendorf (1872, 793), the third hand has added ADELFOI before ECONTES, thereby conforming the text to the beginning of the church lectionary (when taken together with the omission of the following OUN). Lyon (1958) does not make any reference to such an addition and neither does Tischendorf in his 1845 edition. Due to its questionable status, I have included it as uncertain text.

<ch 4><v 14> [d2]OUN[/d2]:

'OUN has been deleted by points above and below. In this way, C transformed it for church lectionary use' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Lyon (1958, 401) agrees that the third hand deleted OUN.

<ch 4><v 14> MEGAN ˇ :

Tischendorf (1845, 271) places a point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 4><v 14> OU=RANOUS ˇ :

Neither Lyon (1958) nor Tischendorf (1845) includes this high point.

<ch 4><v 14> OMOLOGI=AS ˇ :

Tischendorf (1845, 271) places a point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 4><v 15> ARCIEREA ˇ :

Neither Lyon (1958) nor Tischendorf (1845) includes this high point.

<ch 4><v 15> SUNPA=QHSAI ˇ :

Neither Lyon (1958) nor Tischendorf (1845) includes this high point.

<ch 4><v 15> HMWN ˇ :

Tischendorf (1845, 271) places a high point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 4><v 16> PARRHSIAS ˇ :

Neither Lyon (1958) nor Tischendorf (1845) includes this high point.

<ch 4><v 16> [d1]ELEOS[/d1] [c1]ELEON[/c1] ˇ :

'B, so it seems, has corrected S in ELEOS to N (whereby it becomes ELEON). In fact, S has been written above the line, restoring [the former reading]' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Lyon (1958, 377) agrees that the second hand has altered ELEOS to ELEON. As Tischendorf notes, there is a small *sigma* above the correction. This may be part of Ephraem's text rather than a second correction from ELEON back to ELEOS. Lyon does not mention a second alteration. Therefore, I have not been incorporated one into my transcription. Neither Lyon (1958) nor Tischendorf (1845) includes the high point.

<ch 4><v 16> EU=RWMEN ˇ :

Neither Lyon (1958) nor Tischendorf (1845) includes this high point.

<ch 5><v 1> ARCIEREUS ˇ :

Neither Lyon (1958) nor Tischendorf (1845) includes this high point.

<ch 5><v 1> [ns]QN[/ns] ~ :

Neither Lyon (1958) nor Tischendorf (1845) includes this high point.

<ch 5><v 2> ASQENEIAN ~ :

Neither Lyon (1958) nor Tischendorf (1845) includes this high point.

<ch 5><v 3> [d2]DI AUTHN[/d2] [c2]DI[st]A T[/st]AUTHN[/c2]:

Lyon (1958, 402) and Tischendorf (1845, 355) agree that the third hand has changed the reading from DI AUTHN to DIA TAUTHN.

<ch 5><v 3> OFEILEI ~ :

Neither Lyon (1958) nor Tischendorf (1845) includes this high point.

<ch 5><v 3> [d2]PERI[/d2] [c2][st]U[/st]PER'[/c2]:

Lyon (1958, 402) and Tischendorf (1845, 355) agree that the third hand has changed the reading from PERI to UPER. The third hand added an apostrophe after UPER.

<ch 5><v 4> [d1]ALLA[/d1] [c1]ALL O[/c1]:

'The final A in ALLA has been made into an O by B' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Lyon (1958, 377) agrees. Remnants of the erased letter are consistent with an A.

<ch 5><v 4> [d1]KAQWS [ut]KAI[/ut] AARWN[/d1] [c1]KAQAPER KAI O AARWN[/c1]:

'The second hand rewrote APER KAI. The first seems to have had KAQWS KAI for KAQAPER KAI. The article O, which is clearly written before AARWN, was also left out by the first hand, it seems' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Later, he wrote that the first hand may have had kaqwsper aarwn or kaqws kai aarwn (1872, 794). Therefore, the original KAI has been transcribed as uncertain text. Neither Lyon (1958, 377) nor (strangely enough) Tischendorf's eighth edition (1872, 794) mentions the addition of the article before AARWN.

<ch 5><v 5> ARCIEREA ~ :

Tischendorf (1845, 272) places a high point here but Lyon (1958) does

not.

<ch 5><v 10> MELCISEDEK ~ :

Tischendorf (1845, 272) places a high point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 5><v 11> LEGEIN ~ :

Tischendorf (1845, 272) places a high point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 6><v 4> EPOURANIOU ~ :

Tischendorf (1845, 272) places a high point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 6><v 8> [d0]TR[ut]E[/ut]BOLOUS[/d0] [c0]TRIBOLOUS[/c0]:

'Under I (in TRIBOLOUS), which, perhaps, the first hand itself rewrote, E or, preferably, H lies hidden' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). According to Lyon (1958, 326), 'The scribe wrote trebolous and then corrected it to read trib.' He attributes this alteration to the first hand. The underlying letter has been given an uncertain status because Tischendorf was not sure whether it was an *epsilon* or *eta*.

<ch 6><v 9> SWTHRIAS ~ :

Lyon (1958) places a high point here but Tischendorf (1845, 273) does not.

<ch 6><v 9> [d1][rt]EI I[/rt]AI[/d1] [c1]EI KAI[/c1]:

'EI K have been rewritten. The space is nearly right' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Lyon (1958, 377) assigns this to the second hand and writes, 'ei for, perhaps, ei. The space is slightly more than A would have needed of [*sic*] ei and k of kai.'

<ch 6><v 11> [d2]ENDEIGNU=SQAI[/d2] [c2]ENDEIKNU=SQAI[/c2]:

'For G in ENDEIGNUSQAI a corrector reinstated K' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). According to Lyon (1958, 402) this is a simple alteration from *gamma* to *kappa* by the third hand, not a restoration of a former *kappa*. Lyon's view is adopted here.

<ch 6><v 12> GENHSQE ˘ :

Tischendorf (1845, 273) places a high point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 6><v 13> OMOSAI ˘ :

Tischendorf (1845, 273) places a high point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 6><v 19> [d1][rt]KAI ERCOMENHN EIS[rt]/[d1] [c1]KAI  
EISERCOMENHN EIS[/c1]:

'B rewrote KAI EISERCOMENHN EIS. There seems to have been a little less writing before' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Lyon (1958, 377) writes, 'eisercomenhn for, perhaps, ercomenhn. This fits the space well.' In his transcription, Lyon has ercomenhs for the first hand's text, not ercomenhn. My transcription has ERCOMENHN.

<ch 6><v 19> [d2]SWTERON[/d2] [c2]ESWTERON[/c2]:

'The E at the beginning of line 26 has been so unskillfully added that I must attribute it to the third hand. Consequently, it had been overlooked by not only A, but B as well. Certainly, the preceding TO that one would regard as having been rewritten with KAI EISERCOMENHN EIS is, without doubt, by the first hand' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Lyon (1958, 402) also attributes this to the third hand.

<ch 7><v 1> [d2]O[/d2] [c2]O[st]S[/st]/[c2]:

'The O preceding SUNANTHSAS has S written above it by B, so it seems. The corrector therefore wrote OS SUNANTHSAS' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Lyon (1958, 402) attributes this to the third hand.

<ch 7><v 4> [d1]AKROQ[rt]INIW[/rt]N[/d1] [c1]AKROQHNIWN[/c1]:

'B rewrote QHNIWN. It seems to have been erased ineptly by the first hand' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Later, Tischendorf wrote that the underlying text was 'hidden' (1872, 800). Lyon (1958, 377) writes, 'akroqhniwn for, probably, akroqiniwn. That A wrote qin cannot be doubted. It fits the space well. One must not concur with Tischendorf that the original text was "inepte". The letters INIW are given here as

reconstructed text in accordance with Lyon's transcription. Tischendorf did not say that the original text was inept. Rather, he said that it was ineptly erased.

<ch 7><v 9> [d2]EIPEN[/d2] [c2]EIPE[st]I[/st]N[/c2]:

'EIPEN has been corrected to EIPEIN. Actually, I is written above [the line]' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Lyon (1958, 402) assigns this to the third hand.

<ch 7><v 9> [dx]LEUEIS[/dx] [cx]LEUEI[/cx]:

'The final S in LEUEIS has been erased' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Lyon (1958, 377) writes, 'leuei for leueis. (?)' The question mark 'follows an omission by the second hand to indicate that nothing is written to prove the identity of the second hand' (Lyon, 1958, 321). My transcription does not attribute the erasure to a particular corrector because of the lack of evidence on which to base an assignment.

<ch 7><v 10> [d1]SUNTHSEN[/d1] [c1]SUN[st]HN[/st]THSEN[/c1]:

The first hand has omitted the *eta* and *nu*, probably through haplography. Tischendorf (1845, 355) writes, 'SUNTHSEN has HN written above it by the third hand, it seems, by which it might become SUNHNTHSEN.' Lyon (1958, 377) differs in assigning the alteration to the second hand. Without examining the manuscript itself, I am inclined to follow Lyon. I believe that such an obvious error would be more likely to be corrected sooner than later. (Against this view, see SWTERON at 6.19 above, where Tischendorf notes another obvious error which has escaped the earlier correctors.)

<ch 7><v 10> [c2]O[/c2]:

Lyon (1958, 402) attributes this to the third hand and writes, 'add o before melcisedek.' Tischendorf's edition (1845, 355) has an obelisk adjacent to this line, but there is no corresponding comment.

<ch 7><v 11> [d1]LEUITI[/rt]KHS IERWSUNHS HN[/rt] [/d1] [c1]LEUITIKHS IERWSUNHS HN[/c1]:

'B rewrote KHS IERWSUNHS HN' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Lyon (1958, 377) also attributes this to the second hand and writes, 'The end of

leuitikhs might possibly have been omitted.'

<ch 7><v 14> [d2]IEREWN[/d2] [c2]IERWSUNHS[/c2]:

'C has written IERWSUNHS for IEREWN' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Lyon (1958, 402) agrees.

<ch 7><v 16> [d2]SARKINHS[/d2] [c2]SARKI[st]K[/st]HS[/c2]:

'The N in SARKINHS has K written above it by C, so it seems. The N itself has not been erased' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Lyon (1958, 402) also assigns this to the third hand.

<ch 7><v 21> ORKWMOSIAS ~ :

Tischendorf (1845, 274) places a high point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 7><v 21> [d1][rt]METAMELHSETAI[/rt]/[d1] [c1]METAMELHQHSETAI ~  
[c1]:

'METAMELHQHSETAI has been rewritten by B. It is probable that the first hand incorrectly wrote it as METAMELHSETAI, or something like that' (Tischendorf, 1845, 355). Lyon (1958, 377) assigns this to the second hand and writes, 'metamelhqhsetai for, perhaps, metamelhsetai. This is the conjecture of Tischendorf: it fits the space well.'

<ch 7><v 22> [dx]KAI[/dx]:

'KAI has been erased, but I can see through to it sufficiently' (Tischendorf, 1845, 356). Lyon (1958, 377) tentatively attributes this to the second hand. My transcription leaves it unascribed because it is an erasure.

<ch 9><v 24> [c2]O[/c2]:

'A corrector, and indeed the third hand, so it seems, had put O before CS' (Tischendorf, 1845, 356). Lyon (1958, 402) agrees.

<ch 9><v 25> WSPER ~ :

Lyon (1958) places a high point here but Tischendorf (1845, 275) does not.

<ch 9><v 28> [dx]APEKDECOMENOI[/dx] [cx]APEKDECOMENOI[ut][st]S[/st]



[/ut]/[cx]:

'APEKDECOMENOI definitely seems to have S added above, by which it becomes APEKDECOMENOIS' (Tischendorf, 1845, 356). Lyon (1958, 402) does not see any indication of such a change to the original text. As a consequence, my transcription gives the addition an uncertain status. No corrector assignment is made because Tischendorf does not give one.

<ch 10><v 1> DIHNEKES ~ :

Tischendorf (1845, 275) places a high point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 10><v 7> GEGRAPTAI:

Lyon (1958) has wrongly transposed the *alpha* and *pi*, producing *gegrpatai*.

<ch 10><v 9> E[ut]I[/ut]RH=KEN:

Lyon (1958) has transcribed this word as *erhken* whereas Tischendorf (1845, 276) has *eirhken*. Examination of a Xerox print of a microfilm image shows that Tischendorf may be right, even though Lyon (1958, 412) lists this as an error in Tischendorf's edition.

<ch 10><v 15> [ns]PNA[/ns]:

Lyon (1958) has transcribed this word as *pna* whereas Tischendorf (1845, 276) has *pneuma*. The Xerox print shows that Lyon is right.

<ch 10><v 17> AMARTIWN ~ :

Tischendorf (1845, 276) places a high point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 10><v 22> MET[ut]A[/ut]:

Tischendorf (1845, 276) has *met* but Lyon (1958) has *meta*. The Xerox print does not help to decide between the two. I have therefore transcribed the *alpha* as uncertain text.

<ch 10><v 22> [d1]LELOU=MENOI[/d1] [c1]LELOU[ut]S[/ut]=MENOI[/c1]:

Lyon (1958, 377) writes, 'I am not certain but I think a corrector wrote

lelousmenoi for leloumenoi. I studied this place several times, at first thinking A had written lelous. I am certain he did not, but I think B did.' The *sigma*, if it exists, may be at the beginning of the new line rather than at the end of the preceding one.

<ch 10><v 23> EP[ut]AG[/ut]=GEILAMENOS ~ :

Lyon (1958) has placed an opening round bracket after the *pi*. However, there is no closing bracket to match. Lyon uses round brackets to mark places where text is missing but the vellum is intact (1958, 26). The Xerox print shows that the portion of this word which begins the new line (-geilamenos) is visible. Consequently, it has been assumed that Lyon meant to place the closing bracket at the end of the preceding line (ep(ag)-). Tischendorf (1845, 276) does not indicate that the *alpha* and *gamma* are uncertain.

<ch 12><v 18> RHMATWN ~ :

Tischendorf (1845, 277) places a high point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 12><v 19> [c1]PA=RHTHSANTO[/c1] [d1]PARHTHSAN[/d1]:

'The second hand wrote PARHTHSANTO. Previously, there was nothing where PA is now. Without doubt slightly fewer letters were written by the first hand' (Tischendorf, 1845, 356). Lyon (1958, 377) also attributes this to the second hand and writes, 'parhthsanto for -san.'

<ch 12><v 25> [rt]LA[/rt]LALOUNTA:

Lyon (1958) has lalalounta whereas Tischendorf (1845, 277) has lalounta. The microfilm shows that there is a space between ton and lalounta which could accommodate a *lambda* and *alpha*. If lalalounta is the reading of the manuscript, it is probably an instance of scribal error through dittography.

<ch 12><v 28> PARALAMBANONTES ~ :

Lyon (1958) places a high point here but Tischendorf (1845, 277) does not.

<ch 12><v 28> [c1]CAR[fn]I[/fn] ~ [/c1]:

'CARI has been added, by B it seems; the same hand rewrote DI HS [filling the space up to] META EU. I do not doubt that something was deficient before. The L following the erasure has been placed under the N in ONTES; just as we published' (Tischendorf, 1845, 356).

<ch 12><v 28> [c1]CAR[fn]I[/fn] ~ [/c1] [d1]CARIN [rt]DI HS LATREUWMEN  
[/rt] TW [ns]QW[/ns] META EULABEIAS[/d1] [c1]DI HS LATREUWMEN  
EUARESTWS TW [ns]QW[/ns] META EULABEIAS[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1845, 277) shows that a corrector has added *carin* at the end of one line and rewritten a substantial part of the following line. He does not speculate about the original text, apart from saying that 'something was deficient before' (1845, 356). Lyon (1958, 377) attributes this to the second hand. He gives the beginning of the partially replaced original line as *carin* (*di hs latreuwmen*), where the text in round brackets is his reconstruction. This fits the space quite well.

<ch 12><v 28> DEOUS ~ :

Tischendorf (1845, 277) places a high point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 12><v 29> KATANALI[ut]S[/ut]KON:

Lyon (1958) has *katanalikon* whereas Tischendorf (1845, 277) has *katanaliskon*. The Xerox print does not help to decide between the two. Therefore, I have transcribed the *sigma* as uncertain text.

<ch 13><v 5> PAROUSIN ~ :

Tischendorf (1845, 277) places a high point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 13><v 5> [d2]EIRHKEN[/d2] [c2]EFH[/c2]:

'EFH seems to have been made out of EIRHKEN by a corrector' (Tischendorf, 1845, 356). Lyon (1958, 402) attributes this to the third hand and writes, 'efh for eirhken'.

<ch 13><v 5> ANW:

Lyon (1958) places a *nomen sacrum* superscript line above this word but Tischendorf (1845, 277) does not. The Xerox print does not seem to show a superscript.

<ch 13><v 6> [d2]QARROUNT[ut]E[/ut]S[/d2] [c2]QARROUNTAS[/c2]:

Lyon (1958, 402) attributes this to the third hand and writes, 'garrountas for -tes. Tischendorf did not note this correction. The a is quite clear; the e much less so.'

<ch 13><v 6> [c1]KAI[/c1]:

'The second hand added KAI. Therefore it was left out by the first hand' (Tischendorf, 1845, 356). Lyon (1958, 377) agrees.

<ch 13><v 7> ANAQEWROUNTES:

Tischendorf (1845, 277) wrongly has ANAQEWRHSANTES.

<ch 13><v 7> [d2]MEMEISQE[/d2] [c2]M[ut]E[/ut][st]I[/st]MEISQE[/c2]:

'MEMEISQE has I written above it, by which it becomes MEIMEISQE or MIMEISQE' (Tischendorf, 1845, 356). Lyon (1958, 402) attributes this to the third hand and writes, 'meimeisqe for memeisqe.' The first E is given as uncertain text because Tischendorf was unsure whether it should be included in the corrected word.

<ch 13><v 8> [d2]ECQES[/d2] [c2]CQES[/c2]:

'The first E in ECQES is transfixied by a little line and in this way C has rejected it' (Tischendorf, 1845, 356). Lyon (1958, 402) also attributes this to the third hand.

<ch 13><v 9> PARAFERESQE ~ :

Tischendorf (1845, 278) places a high point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 13><v 11> [d2]EIS TA AGIA PERI AMARTIAS DIA TOU  
ARCIEREWS[/d2] [c2][it]PERH AMARTIAS HS TA AGIA DHA TOU  
ARCIEREOS[/it]/[c2]:

'C wrote thus: PERH AMARTIAS HS TA AGIA DHA TOU ARCIEREOS. It has been clearly written in this way in the margin' (Tischendorf, 1845,

356). Lyon (1958, 402) attributes this to the third hand as well. He does not mention the peculiar spelling. (An extreme case of itacism?)

<ch 13><v 17> [d1]POIWSI[/d1] [c1]POIWSI[st]N[/st]/[c1]:

'POIWSIN has been made from POIWSI by a corrector writing N above it' (Tischendorf, 1845, 356). Lyon (1958, 377) attributes this to the second hand.

<ch 13><v 18> [d2]PEIQOMEQA[/d2] [c2]PEP[ut]W[/ut]QAMEN[/c2]:

'C has written PEPQAMEN for PEIQOMEQA' (Tischendorf, 1845, 356). Lyon (1958, 402) also attributes this to the third hand but writes, 'pepwqamen for peiqomeqa.' My transcription follows Lyon's proposal that there is an *omega* rather than an *upsilon* in the corrected word. The letter is uncertain due to the disagreement between the editors.

<ch 13><v 18> [d1]PASI[/d1] [c1]PASIN[/c1]:

'A corrector, and indeed, B, so it seems, has made PASIN out of PASI' (Tischendorf, 1845, 356). Lyon (1958, 377) agrees.

<ch 13><v 18>ANASTRE=FESQAI ~ :

Tischendorf (1845, 278) places a high point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 13><v 21> [d2]AUTW[/d2]:

'AUTW (thus in fact it is written, not AUTOS which I read has been seen by Wetstein [*sic*]) has been rejected by C through use of superior points' (Tischendorf, 1845, 356). Lyon misses this deletion.

<ch 13><v 21> [d2]TWN AIWN[ut]AS[/ut]/[d2]:

'C has rejected TWN AIWNWN by points' (Tischendorf, 1845, 356). Lyon (1958, 402) also attributes this to the third hand but writes, 'omit twn aiwnas (not aiwnwn as Tischendorf's edition has)'.

<ch 13><v 23> ERCHTAI ~ :

Tischendorf (1845, 278) places a high point here but Lyon (1958) does not.

<ch 13><v 24> ASPASASQE:

Tischendorf (1845, 278) has ASPSASQE, which is incorrect.

## References

Lyon, Robert W. [1958]. 'A re-examination of Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus'. Dissertation (PhD). University of St Andrews. (Date deduced from the preface.)

Lyon, Robert W. 1959. 'A re-examination of Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus'. *New Testament studies* 5/4, 260-72.

Tischendorf, Konstantin von (ed.). 1845. *Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus sive fragmenta utriusque Testamenti e codice Graeco Parisiensi celeberrimo quinti ut videtur post Christum seculi*. Leipzig: Bernh. Tauchnitz Jun.

## U6

Codex Claromontanus (DP). Paris, Bibl. Nat., Gr. 107, 107 AB.

Transcribed and verified by reference to Xerox copies of microfilm. Compared with Tischendorf (1852).

This transcription is made from a Xerox print of microfilm obtained from the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center in Claremont, California. The prints are not very clear, making certain features difficult to see. Consequently, there are numerous places where access to a better quality facsimile would improve my transcription's accuracy, especially with respect to punctuation marks.

Accents and breathings, though present, have not been transcribed. Even though apostrophes may sometimes be the work of a later scribe, they are still transcribed. Diaeresis appears to consist of a single point which is displaced to the right.

The position of line-division is significant in this manuscript: it often coincides with pauses in sense. The ¶ symbol marks places where the first letter of the second line is indented into the left margin. Old Testament quotations are indented to the right in this manuscript.

Information concerning corrections has been gleaned from the appendix to Tischendorf 1852 edition and the notes in his major critical edition of 1872. The correspondence between Tischendorf's corrector labels and the ones employed in my transcription is set out below. Dates are taken from the Alands' *Synopsis of sigla for correctors in manuscripts* (1989, 108).

<i>Label</i>	<i>Tisch. (1852)</i>	<i>Tisch. (1872)</i>	<i>Date (C.)</i>
[c0]/[d0]	-	-	6
[c1]/[d1]	D**, D** et D***	D <sup>b</sup> , D <sup>b</sup> et c	7?
[c2]/[d2]	D***	D <sup>c</sup>	9?
[c3]/[d3]	D <sup>nov</sup>	D <sup>nov</sup>	Unknown

Tischendorf often has D\*\* et D\*\*\* (or D<sup>b</sup> et D<sup>c</sup>) in his notes. This corresponds to places where the third hand does not change the second hand's correction. In my transcription, such corrections are labelled as

belonging to the second hand alone.

Tischendorf's comments indicate that he could see more writing than is visible in my Xerox prints. If Tischendorf gives specific details of a correction, they are transferred to my transcription even if the correction is not visible in the Xerox prints. The same goes for text that appears to be hidden by the codex binding.

The page numbering in my transcription differs from that of Tischendorf's 1852 edition. I have numbered Greek pages, which are always the left-hand sheets, as versos. Therefore, my page number 469 verso corresponds to Tischendorf's page 470, my 470 verso corresponds to his 471, and so forth.

#### *Date and provenance*

The similarity of the Latin text of this diglot to the text employed by Lucifer of Cagliari led Souter (1954, 26) to conjecture that the manuscript was from Sardinia. UBS4 (1993, 907) gives its date as fifth or sixth century. Kenyon (1950, 96) thinks the difference between the dates of this manuscript and Lucifer (†370) somewhat weakens Souter's argument.

<ch 1><v 2> [d1]EPOIHSEN TOUS AIWNAS[/d1] [d2][c1]TOUS AIWNAS EPOIHSEN[/c1][[/d2] [c2]EPOIHSEN TOUS AIWNAS[/c2]:

'D\*\* wanted TOUS AIWNAS to be placed before EPOIHSEN; but D\*\*\* has deleted the transposition marks' (Tischendorf, 1852, 589).

<ch 1><v 3> [d1]DI' AUTOU[/d1] [c2]DI' EAUTOU[/c2]:

'D\*\* has marked DI AUTOU as a deletion. D\*\*\* has definitely written DI EAUTOU' (Tischendorf, 1852, 589).

<ch 1><v 3> [c2][it]HMWN[/it][[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has inserted HMWN. D\*\* inserted the symbol' (Tischendorf, 1852, 589). Interestingly, Tischendorf notes that the caret marking the insertion point was added by the second hand, whereas the corresponding insertion was added by the third hand. The carets at the insertion point and adjacent to the correction do appear to be slightly different.



<ch 1><v 4> [d2]KRITTW[/d2] [c2]KREITTW[/c2]:

'Sic' (Tischendorf, 1852, 589).

<ch 1><v 5> [d1]TWN AGGELWN POTE[/d1] [c1]POTE TWN AGGELWN  
[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have indicated that POTE should be placed after EIPEN'  
(Tischendorf, 1852, 589).

<ch 1><v 5> [d1]ESTE[/d1] [c1]ESTAI[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have ESTAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 589).

<ch 1><v 7> [d2]AUTOU[/d2]:

'AUTOU has been deleted by D\*\*\*' (Tischendorf, 1852, 589).

<ch 1><v 7> [d2]LITOURGOUS[/d2] [c2]LEITOURGOUS[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has LEITOURGOUS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 589).

<ch 1><v 8> [d2]KAI[/d2]:

'D\*\*\* has deleted this' (Tischendorf, 1852, 589).

<ch 1><v 8> [d1]BASILIAS[/d1] [c1]BASIL[st]E[/st]IAS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -LEIAS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 589).

<ch 1><v 9> [d2]ANOMIAS[/d2] [c2]ANOMIAN[/c2]:

'ANOMIAS: D\*\*\* ANOMIAN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 589).

<ch 1><v 9> [d1]ECRISEN[/d1] [d2][c1]ECR[st]E[/st]ISEN[/c1][[/d2] [c2]  
ECRISEN[/c2]:

'D\*\* had ECREISEN, D\*\*\* changed it back to ECRISEN' (Tischendorf,  
1852, 589).

<ch 1><v 9> [d1]ELEOS[/d1] [c1]ELAION[/c1]:

'ELEOS: D\*\* and D\*\*\* ELAION' (Tischendorf, 1852, 589).

<ch 1><v 11> [d1]DIAMENIS[/d1] [c1]DIAMENEIS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have DIAMENEIS with a circumflex as well' (Tischendorf,  
1852, 589).

<ch 1><v 11> [d1]EIMATION[/d1] [c1]IMATION[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have IMATION' (Tischendorf, 1852, 589).

<ch 1><v 12> [c1][it]EI[/it]/[c1]:

'WS: D\*\* and D\*\*\* WSEI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 589). There is a smooth breathing on the E, indicating that the corrector intended WS EI and not WSEI, as per Tischendorf.

<ch 1><v 12> [d1]ALLAXIS[/d1] [d2][c1]ALLAXEIS[/c1]/[d2] [c2]ELIXEIS[/c2]:

'ALLAXIS: D\*\* -XEIS, D\*\*\* ELIXEIS. Yet D\*\* already marked the first A, wanting the same amendment as D\*\*\*, it seems' (Tischendorf, 1852, 589).

<ch 1><v 12> [c1]KAI[/c1] [d1]WS EIMATION[/d1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have rejected WS EIMATION and have written KAI in its place' (Tischendorf, 1852, 589).

<ch 1><v 12> ALLAGHSONTAI:

According to Tischendorf (1872, 783, n. 12), D\* has ALLHGHSONTAI, but he makes no mention of this in his 1852 edition. The Xerox print does not seem to show an H lying under the second A.

<ch 1><v 12> [d1]EKLIYOUS[fn]l[/fn]/[d1] [c1]EKLEIYOUS[fn]l[/fn]/[c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have EI for I' (Tischendorf, 1852, 589).

<ch 1><v 13> [c1][it]AN[/it]/[c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have added AN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 589).

<ch 1><v 14> [d1]LEITOURGIKA[/d1] [d2][c1]LITOURGIKA[/c1]/[d2] [c2]LEITOURGIKA[/c2]:

'D\*\* has LITOUG., but D\*\*\* changes it back to LEITOURG' (Tischendorf, 1852, 589).

<ch 1><v 14> [d1]KLHRONOMIN[/d1] [c1]KLHRONOMEIN[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -MEIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 2><v 1> DIA TOUTO [d1]DI[/d1] [c1]DEI[/c1] PERISSOTERWS:  
'Cap. II.' is written in the left-hand column adjacent to this line.

<ch 2><v 1> DIA TOUTO [d1]DI[/d1] [c1]DEI[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have DEI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 2><v 1> [d1]AKOUSQISIN[/d1] [c1]AKOUSQEISIN[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -SQEISIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 2><v 1> [d2]PARARUWMEN[/d2] [c2]PARARRUWMEN[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has PARARRUWMEN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 2><v 2> [d1]LALHQIS[/d1] [c1]LALHQ[st]E[/st]IS[/c1]:  
'D\*\* has -QEIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 2><v 3> [d1]HMIS[/d1] [c1]HM[st]E[/st]IS[/c1]:  
'D\*\* has HMEIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 2><v 4> [d1]SHMIOIS[/d1] [c1]SHM[st]E[/st]IOIS[/c1]:  
'D\*\* has SHMEIOIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 2><v 4> [d2]TOU [ns]QU[/ns]/[d2] [c2]AUTOU[/c2]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 590) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 2><v 7> [d2]ELATTWSAS[/d2] [c2]HLATTWSAS[/c2]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 590) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 2><v 7> [d2]KAI KATESTHSAS AUTON EPI TA ERGA TWN  
CEIRWN SOU[/d2]:  
'D\*\*\* has deleted this. He has gone back and deleted the same accents that he had just included. Furthermore, the copyist has written line 17 itself over an erasure. He himself, therefore, also seems to have omitted both lines before' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 2><v 8> [d2]TW[/d2]:  
It seems that this has been obelised, then freed from the marks by the same person. If this is so, D\*\*\* made an error and has corrected it

himself' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590). My transcription retains the deletion.

<ch 2><v 9> [dx]TI[rt]NA[/rt]/[dx] [cx]TI[/cx]:

'The two letters after TI are deep erasures' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590). Tischendorf suggests that these letters may be NA. There are no hints as to which corrector erased them.

<ch 2><v 9> [d1]TEIMH[/d1] [c1]TIMH[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have TIMH' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 2><v 9> [d2]GEUSETAI[/d2] [c2]GEUSHTAI[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 590) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 2><v 11> [d1]EPESCUNETAI[/d1] [c1]EPAISCUNETAI[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have EPAISC' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 2><v 11> [d1]KALIN[/d1] [c1]KAL[st]E[/st]IN[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 590) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 2><v 14> [d1]EPI[/d1] [c1]EP[st]E[/st]I[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 590) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 2><v 14> [d1]PAQHMAT[fn]W[/fn]/[d1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have rejected this' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 2><v 14> [d1]QANATON[/d1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have rejected this' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 2><v 15> [d1]DOULIAS[/d1] [c1]DOUL[st]E[/st]IAS[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 590) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 2><v 16> [d1]EPILAMBANETE[/d1] [c1]EPILAMBANETAI[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -TAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 2><v 16> [dx]EPILANBANE[rt]TAI[/rt]/[dx] [cx]EPILA[rt]M[/rt]BANE[rt]TAI  
[/rt]/[cx]:

'TAI is hidden by the codex binding. The first N is put to flight by a

corrector' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590). This transcription supplies a *mu* for the erased *nu*, and follows Tischendorf in not attributing the alteration to a particular corrector.

<ch 2><v 17> [d1]GENHTE[/d1] [c1]GENHTAI[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 590) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 2><v 17> [dx]EILASKESQAI[/dx] [cx]ILASKESQAI[/cx]:

'The first E has been deleted' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590). No hint is given of which corrector made this alteration.

<ch 2><v 18> [d1]PIRASQIS[/d1] [c1]P[st]E[/st]IRASQ[st]E[/st]IS[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 590) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 3><v 1> OQEN ADELFOI AGIOI:

'Cap. III.' is written in the left-hand column adjacent to this line.

<ch 3><v 1> [d1]KATANOHSETE[/d1] [c1]KATANOHSATAI[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -SATE' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590). Tischendorf has not noted that the last E has been changed to AI. This alteration is similar to GENHTE -> GENHTAI (<ch 2><v 17>). That correction is attributed to the second hand.

<ch 3><v 1> [c2][ns]CN[/ns]/[c2]:

'D\*\*\* has added CN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 3><v 3> [d1]PLIONOS[/d1] [c1]PLEIONOS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have PLEIONOS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 3><v 3> [d1]MWUSEWS[/d1] [c1]MWSHN[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -SHN. U has been erased as well, perhaps by D\*\*\* alone. At [477v], line 6 below, the U has been saved by the corrector' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 3><v 3> [d1]PLIONA[/d1] [c1]PL[st]E[/st]IONA[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 590) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 3><v 4> [d1]KATASKEUAZETE[/d1] [c1]KATASKEUAZETAI[/c1]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 590) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 3><v 4> [c2][it]TA[/it]/[c2]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 590) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 3><v 6> [d1]OS[/d1] [c1]OU[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have OU' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 3><v 6> [d2]HMIS[/d2] [c2]HMEIS[/c2], [d2]EAN[/d2] [c2]EANPER[/c2],  
[d2]PARHSIAN[/d2] [c2]PARRHSIAN[/c2]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 590) attributes these changes to the third hand.

<ch 3><v 8> [d1]PIRASMOU[/d1] [c1]P[st]E[/st]IRASMOU[/c1]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 590) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 3><v 9> [d1]OPOU[/d1] [c1]OU[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have OU' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 3><v 9> [c2][it]ME[/it]/[c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has added ME' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 3><v 9> [di]U[/di]MWN:  
This diaeresis is unusual. It may be the work of a corrector. (See also UMWN at 3.12.)

<ch 3><v 9> [d2]EN DOKIMASIA[/d2] [c2]ENDOKIMASAN ME[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has EDOKIMASAN ME, but has not extinguished N through neglect' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590). This transcription retains the N despite Tischendorf's contention that the third hand intended that it be deleted.

<ch 3><v 10> [ns]M[/ns]≥:  
The M (i.e., 40) has a superscript line and is followed by a medial point. (Cf. 3.17.)

<ch 3><v 10> [d1]PROSWCQISA[/d1] [c1]PROSWCQ[st]E[/st]ISA[/c1]:  
'D\*\* has -QEISA, and D\*\*\* does not seem to have changed it'

(Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 3><v 10> [d1]TAUTH[/d1] [c1]EKEINH[/c1]:

'D\*\*\* has offered EKEINH for TAUTH' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 3><v 10> [d1]EIPAN[/d1] [d2][c1]EIPA[/c1]/[d2] [c2]EIPON[/c2]:

'EIPAN has been written by the first hand, from which the corrector seems to have wished to make EIPA. The N itself has been deeply erased... D\*\*\* has definitely written EIPON' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 3><v 12> [d1]ESTE[/d1] [c1]ESTAI[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 590) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 3><v 13> TO[rt]N[/rt]:

'This letter, which has been utterly erased, seems to have been a N or S' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 3><v 13> [d1]AMARTIAIS[/d1] [c1]THS AMARTIAS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have THS AMARTIAS' Tischendorf (1852, 590).

<ch 3><v 15> [d2]SKLHRUNETE[/d2] [c2]SKLHRUNHTE[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* alone has SKLHRUNHTE, so it seems' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 3><v 18> [d1]APIQHSASIN[/d1] [c1]AP[st]E[/st]IQHSASIN[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 590) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 3><v 19> HDUNHQHSAN [d1]EISELQIN[/d1] [c1]EISELQEIN[/c1]:

These words are hidden by the codex binding. Tischendorf must have been able to see them as he notes that the second hand has altered EISELQIN to EISELQEIN (1852, 590).

<ch 3><v 19> [d2]DI[/d2] [c2]DIA[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 590) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 4><v 1> FOBHQWMEN OUN MHPOTE:

'Cap. IV.' is written in the left-hand column adjacent to this line.

<ch 4><v 1> [d2]KATALIPOMENHS[/d2] [c2]KATALEIPOMENHS[/c2] [d2]THS[/d2]:

'D\*\*\* has EI for I. The same corrector has deleted THS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 4><v 1> [d1]EISELQIN[/d1] [c1]EISELQ[st]E[/st]IN[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 590) attributes this alteration to the second hand. In my opinion, the added E is different to the one usually employed by this corrector.

<ch 4><v 2> K[<sub>sb</sub>]A[/<sub>sb</sub>]KEINOI:

I have used smooth breathing labels for this crasis marker. It is located between the first *kappa* and the *alpha*.

<ch 4><v 2> [d1]SUNKEKERASMENOUS[/d1] [d2][c1]SUGKEKERASMENOUS[/c1][[/d2] [c2]SUNKEKRAMENOUS[/c2]:

The end of this word is hidden by the codex binding. Tischendorf (1852, 590) writes, 'D\*\*\* has -KEKRAMENOUS. Besides this, SUG has been made from SUN, but definitely has been changed back to SUN.' I have ascribed the earlier correction (from SUN to SUG) to the second hand.

<ch 4><v 2> [d1]PISTI[/d1] [c1]PIST[st]E[/st]I[/c1] [d2]TWN AKOUSANTWN[/d2] [c2]TOIS AKOUSASIN[/c2]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have PISTEI. Further on, D\*\*\* has TOIS AKOUSASIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 4><v 3> [c1][st]THN[/st][[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have added THN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 590).

<ch 4><v 3> [d1]ISELEUSONTAI[/d1] [c1]EISELEUSONTAI[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 591) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 4><v 5> [d0]KAI EN[/d0] [c1]EI[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 591) comments that the first and third hands place EI before EISELEUSONTAI and that the same place holds KAI EN beneath it. My transcription ascribes the KAI EN to the first hand. This scribe seems to have repeated the beginning of the previous line, then to have erased



the repeated text.

<ch 4><v 6> [d1]EPI[/d1] [c1]EP[st]E[/st]I[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 591) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 4><v 6> [d1]APOLIPETE[/d1] [d2][c1]APOLIPETAI[/c1]/[d2] [c2]  
APOLEIPETAI[/c2]:

'D\*\* has -TAI, D\*\*\* also has EI for I' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 4><v 6> [d1]EISELQIN[/d1] [c1]EISELQ[st]E[/st]IN[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -QEIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 4><v 6> [d1]ISHLQON[/d1] [c1]EISHLQON[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have EISHLQON' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 4><v 6> [d1]APIQIAN[/d1] [c1]AP[st]E[/st]IQIAN[/c1]:

'A corrector, and indeed D\*\* already, so it seems, has APEIQIAN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 4><v 7> [dx]DAUEID[/dx] [cx]DAUID[/cx]:

'E has been erased' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591). No hint is given of which corrector made this alteration.

<ch 4><v 7> [d2]PROEIRHTAI[/d2] [c2]EIRHTAI[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 591) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 4><v 8> [d2][ns]IS[/ns]/[d2] [c2]IHSOUS[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has written IHSOUS in full' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 4><v 9> [d2]APOLIPETAI[/d2] [c2]APOLEIPETAI[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 591) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 4><v 10> [d2]PANTWN[/d2]:

'D\*\*\* has rejected this. He had carelessly entered an obelisk in the following TWN, but has retracted the deletion by adding a circumflex' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 4><v 11> [d1]EISELQIN[/d1] [c1]EISELQ[st]E[/st]IN[/c1] [d2]ADELFOI  
[d2]:

'D\*\* has -QEIN. D\*\*\* definitely has deleted the following ADELFOI'  
(Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 4><v 11> [d1]EKINHN[/d1] [c1]EK[st]E[/st]INHN[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 591) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 4><v 11> [d1]ALHQIAS[/d1] [d2][c1]APEIQEIAS[/c1]/[d2] [c2]APEIQIAS  
[c2]:

'D\*\* has APEIQEIAS, [while] D\*\*\* has APEIQIAS' (Tischendorf, 1852,  
591).

<ch 4><v 12> [d1]DEIKNUMENOS[/d1] [c1]DI[di]I[/di]KNOUMENOS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have DIIKNOUMENOS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 4><v 12> KRITIKOS:

There appears to have been a correction in the vicinity of the S (possibly  
an original U has been erased). However, Tischendorf does not mention  
it.

<ch 4><v 12> [d1]ENQUMHSEWS[/d1] [c1]ENQUMHSEWN[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -SEWN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 4><v 12> [d2][c1][kc]K[/kc]/[c1]/[d2] [c2]KAI[/c2] ENNOIWN [d1]TE[/d1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have KAI ENNOIWN for ENNOIWN TE' (Tischendorf, 1852,  
591). A kaiv compendium is visible beneath the third hand's KAI.

<ch 4><v 13> [d1]KRISIS[/d1] [c1]KTISIS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have KTISIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 4><v 14> ARCIEREA:

There may be a diaeresis mark above the l.

<ch 4><v 15> [d2]SUNPAQHSAI[/d2] [c2]SUMP AQHSAI[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 591) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 4><v 15> [d2]PEPIRASMENON[/d2] [c2]PEPEIRASMENON[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 591) does not note this alteration. A hand-written note in the Institute for New Testament Textual Research's copy of Tischendorf's 1852 edition has 'PEPIRASM-: D\*\*\* PEPEIRASM-'. The added E is quite clear in the Xerox print.

<ch 4><v 16> [d2]ELEOS[/d2] [c2]ELEON[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 591) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 4><v 16> [d2][c1][it][rt]EIS[/rt]/[it]/[c1]/[/d2] [c2][it]EIS[/it]/[c2]:

'D\*\*\* has placed EIS before EUKAIIRON. D\*\* had already inserted a caret' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591). This transcription includes a reconstructed EIS as the text which was associated with the second hand's caret. It may have been located beneath the EIS written in the margin by the third hand.

<ch 5><v 1> PAS GAR ARCIEREUS:

'Cap. V' is written in the left-hand column adjacent to this line.

<ch 5><v 1> PROSFERH [d1]TE[/d1] DWRA [c2][st]TE[/st]/[c2] KAI:

'D\*\* has PROSFERH DWRA KAI and D\*\*\* has PROSFERH DWRA TE KAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 5><v 2> [d1]METRIOPAQIN[/d1] [c1]METRIOPAQ[st]E[/st]IN[/c1]:

'D\*\* has -QEIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 5><v 2> [d2]KAI GAR[/d2] [d3][c2]EPEI KAI[/c2]/[d3] [c3]EPEI KAI GAR[/c3], [d1]PERIKITAI[/d1] [c1]PERIK[st]E[/st]ITAI[/c1] [d1]ASQENIAN[/d1] [c1]ASQEN[st]E[/st]IAN[/c1]:

'D\*\*\* has EPEI KAI. D<sup>nov</sup> worked with dedication at restoring the prior readings, yet ineptly. Further on D\*\* has PERIKEITAI ASQENEIAN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 5><v 3> [d2]DI AUTHN[/d2] [c2]DIA TAUTHN[/c2], [d2]OFILEI[/d2] [c2]OFEILEI[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 591) attributes these alterations to the third hand.

<ch 5><v 3> [d2]AUTOU[/d2] [c2]EAUTOU[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 591) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 5><v 3> [d2]PERI[/d2] [c2][di]U[/di]PER[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 591) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 5><v 4> [d2]OUK[/d2] [c2]OUC[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has OUC' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 5><v 4> [d1]EA[ut]U[/ut]TW[/d1] [c1]EA[ut]U[/ut]TW[/c1]:

The A and U appear to have been retraced. The writing is more consistent with the second hand.

<ch 5><v 4> [d1]LAMBANI[/d1] [c1]LAMBAN[st]E[/st]I[/c1]:

'D\*\* has LAMBANEI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 5><v 4> [d2]KAQWSPER[/d2] [c2]KAQAPER KAI[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has KAQAPER KAI. Perhaps D\*\* already has this' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 5><v 5> d1]GENNHQHNAI[/d1] [c1]GENHQHNAI[/c1]:

'D\*\* has GENHQ., D\*\*\* agrees' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 5><v 6> [d2]PALIN[/d2]:

'D\*\*\* deleted this, even though he had already added an accent to it' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 5><v 7> [d2]WN[/d2] [c3]WN[/c3]:

'D\*\*\* has deleted this. Perhaps, D\*\* has already rejected it. D<sup>nov</sup> has reinstated it' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 5><v 7> [d1]DEHSIS[/d1] [c1]DEHSEIS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -SEIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 5><v 7> [d1]AKOUSQIS[/d1] [d2][c1][st]EIS[/st]AKOUSQ[st]E[/st]IS[/c1]  
[/d2] [c2][it]EIS[/it]AKOUSQ[st]E[/st]IS[/c2]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have EISAKOUSQEIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 5><v 7> [d1]EULABIAS[/d1] [c1]EULAB[st]E[/st]IAS[/c1]:  
'D\*\* has -BEIAS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 5><v 8> [d2]AP[/d2] [c2]AF[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* (and perhaps D\*\* already) has AF' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 5><v 9> [d1]TELIWQIS[/d1] [c1]TELIWQ[st]E[/st]IS[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -QEIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 5><v 9> [di]U[/di]PAKOUOUSIN:  
There may have been an alteration in the vicinity of the initial U.

<ch 5><v 10> [d1]PROSAGOREUQIS[/d1] [c1]PROSAGOREUQ[st]E[/st]IS  
[/c1]:  
'D\*\* has -QEIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 5><v 11> [d1]KAI[/d1]:  
'Rejected by D\*\* and D\*\*\*' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 5><v 11> [c2]O[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has O LOGOS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 5><v 11> [d1]EPI[/d1] [c1]EP[st]E[/st]I[/c1]:  
'D\*\* has EPEI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 5><v 12> [d2]OFILONTES[/d2] [c2]OFEILONTES[/c2]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 591) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 5><v 12> [d1]CRIAN[/d1] [c1]CR[st]E[/st]IAN[/c1]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 591) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 5><v 12> [d1]DIDASKIN[/d1] [c1]DIDASK[st]E[/st]IN[/c1]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 591) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 5><v 12> [d2]STOICIA[/d2] [c2]STOICEIA[/c2]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 591) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 5><v 12> [d1]LOGWN[/d1] [c1]LOG[st]l[/st]WN[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have LOGIWN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 5><v 12> [d1]CRIAN[/d1] [c1]CR[st]E[/st]IAN[/c1]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 591) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 5><v 13> [d1]APIROS[/d1] [c1]AP[st]E[/st]IROS[/c1]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 591) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 5><v 13> [d2]ESTIN[/d2]:  
'D\*\*\* has rejected this' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 5><v 13> [d2]AKMHN[/d2]:  
'D\*\*\* has rejected this' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 5><v 14> [d2]TELIWN[/d2] [c2]TELEIWN[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has TELEIWN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 6><v 1> DI' O AFENTES:  
'Cap. VI.' is written in the left-hand column adjacent to this line.

<ch 6><v 1> [d2]TELIOTHTA FEROMEQA[/d2] [c2]TELEIOTHTA  
FERWMEQA[/c2]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 591) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 6><v 2> [d2]BAPTISMON[/d2] [c2]BAPTISMWN[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has -SMWN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 6><v 2> [c2][st]TE[/st]/[c2] [d2][ut]C[/ut]EIRWN[/d2] [c2]NEKRWN[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has added TE. Besides this, the letters N and K in NEKRWN are replacements. CEIRWN seems to have been written there before. This may already have been corrected by the first hand' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 6><v 5> [d2]DUNAMIS[/d2] [c2]DUNAMEIS[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has DUNAMEIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 591).

<ch 6><v 6> [d1]PARAPESONTOS[/d1] [c1]PARAPESONT[st]A[/st]S[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -NTAS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 6> [d1]ANAKENIZEIN[/d1] [c1]ANAKA[st]I[/st]NIZEIN[/c1]:  
'D\*\* has AI for E' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 6> [dx][rt][kc]K[/kc][rt][dx]:  
'A letter (N? H? K?) has been erased before ANA, the outermost A of which lies hidden by the codex binding. The N seems to be wholly sound: had it not been I would think that the first hand had KAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592). The erased letter is not visible in my microfilm print. I have assumed that the erased letter that Tischendorf refers to was actually a *kaiv* compendium. Tischendorf does not say which corrector made the alteration.

<ch 6><v 6> AN[rt]A[/rt]=STAUROUNTAS:  
It is most unusual for words to be divided across lines in this codex. Tischendorf could see an alteration before the *ana-* prefix. (See the preceding comment.) Perhaps the scribe originally wrote two words (*kan çtaurountaç?*).

<ch 6><v 6> [d2]PARADIGMATIZONTES[/d2] [c2]PARADEIGMATIZONTES  
[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has PARADEIGM., but has not touched -NTES' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 7> [d1]GEWRGEITE[/d1] [c1][it]KAI[/it] GEWRGEITAI[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have KAI GEWRGEITAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 7> [d1]METALAMBANI[/d1] [c1]METALAMBAN[st]E[/st]I[/c1]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 591) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 6><v 7> [c2][st]T[sc]OU[/sc][st][c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has placed TOU before QU' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 9> [d2]PEPISMEQA[/d2] [c2]PEPEISMEQA[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 591) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 6><v 9> [d2]KRITTONA[/d2] [c2]KREISSONA[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 591) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 6><v 10> [c2][kc]K[/kc] TOU KOPOU[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has added KAI TOU KOPOU' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 10> [d2]KAI[/d2]:

'D\*\*\* has deleted KAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 10> [d1]ENEDIXASQAI[/d1] [c1]ENEDEIXASQE[/c1]:

'ENEDIXASQAI:

D\*\* and D\*\*\* have ENEDEIXASQE' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 10> DIAKONHSANTES TOIS:

The final *sigmas* of both these words may have been deleted.

<ch 6><v 10> [d2]DIAKOUONTES[/d2] [c2]DIKONOUNTES[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has DIAKONOUNTES. D\*\* furnishes nothing concerning this' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 11> [d1]ENDIKNUSQAI[/d1] [c1]END[st]E[/st]IKNUSQAI[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have ENDEIKN.' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 11> SPOUD[fn]H[/fn]:

There may be diaeresis above the U. (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 12> [d1]GENHSQAI[/d1] [c1]GENHSQE[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -SQE' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 12> [d2]THS[/d2]:

'D\*\*\* has deleted THS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 12> [d1]MAKROQUMOUNTAS[/d1] [c1]MAKROQUMIAS[/c1]:

According to Tischendorf (1852, 592), the first hand wrote MAKROQUMOUNTAS, while D\*\* and D\*\*\* have MAKROQUMIAS. Later,



he notes that the original reading was inept (1872, 798). It seems that this word is an accidental creation of the first hand who leapt forward to the *mu* of the following *klhronomouvntwn* and inserted -ount- before jumping back to the end of *makroqumiva*".

<ch 6><v 12> KLHRONOMOUNTWN:

There may be strokes through the last two *nus* of this word.

<ch 6><v 13> [d1]EPAGGILAMENOS[/d1] [c1]EPAGG[st]E[/st]ILAMENOS  
[/c1], [d1]EPI[/d1] [c1]EP[st]E[/st]I[/c1], [d1]MIZONOS[/d1] [c1]M[st]E[/st]  
IZONOS[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 591) attributes these alterations to the second hand.

<ch 6><v 13> [d1]WMOSE[/d1] [c1]WMOSEN[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have WMOSEN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 14> [d1]MHN[/d1] [c1]MH[/c1]:

'D\*\* has rejected the N by the imposition of two points. I do not know whether D\*\*\* takes the points away' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 15> [d1]EPETUCE[/d1] [c1]EPETUCEN[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have EPETUCEN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 16> [c2][it]MEN[/it]/[c2]:

'D\*\*\* has added MEN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 16> [d1]MIZONOS[/d1] [c1]MEIZONOS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have MEIZONOS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 16> [d1]ANTILOGIAS AUTOIS[/d1] [d2][c1]AUTOIS ANTILOGIAS  
[/c1]/[d2] [c2]ANTILOGIAS AUTOIS[/c2]:

'D\*\* wanted AUTOIS placed before ANTILOGIAS, but D\*\*\* has taken away the transposition signs' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 17> [d1]TW[/d1] [c1]W[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have W' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 18> [d1]META[/d1] [d3][c1][st]DI[/st]A[/c1][[/d3] [c3]META[/c3]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have DIA. D<sup>nov</sup> restores the previous reading'  
(Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 18> KATAFUGONTES:  
There may be a medial dot punctuation mark following this word.

<ch 6><v 18> [d1]PROKIMENHS[/d1] [c1]PROK[st]E[/st]IMENHS[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have EI for I' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 19> ECWMEN:  
'Thus; it has not been corrected' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 19> [d1]ASFALHN[/d1] [c1]ASFALH[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have ASFALH' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 6><v 20> [d2][ns]CS[/ns][[/d2]:  
'D\*\*\* has deleted CS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 7><v 1> OUTOS GAR O MELCISEDEK BASILEUS SAL[fn]H[/fn]:  
'Cap. VII.' is written in the left-hand column adjacent to this line. Only the first two letters of SAL[fn]H[/fn] are visible in my Xerox print. Therefore, I cannot confirm whether the scribe wrote SALHN instead of SALHM, as is indicated by Tischendorf's transcription (1852, 491).

<ch 7><v 1> [d1]KAI ABRAAM EULOGHQIS [di]U[/di]P AUTOU[/d1]:  
'These words are rejected by each corrector' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 7><v 2> [d1]O[/d1] [c1]W[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have W KAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 7><v 2> [c1][it]APO[/it][[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* place APO before PANTWN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 7><v 2> [d1][rt]AUTW[/rt][[/d1] [c1]ABRAAM[/c1]:  
'What might have been written after EMERISEN by the first hand hardly can be said. The first letter, at least, seems to have been an O. Wetstein

has suggested AUTW, to which the Latin text is a satisfactory response. D\*\* and D\*\*\* have written ABRAAM in its place' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592). This transcription includes Wettstein's conjecture as reconstructed text.

<ch 7><v 2> [d1]EPITA[/d1] [c1]EP[st]E[/st]ITA[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 592) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 7><v 3> [d1]MENI[/d1] [c1]MEN[st]E[/st]I[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 592) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 7><v 4> [d1]QEWRITE[/d1] [c1]QEWREITE[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have QEWREITE' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 7><v 4> [d2]HLIKOS[/d2] [c2]PHLIKOS [it]OUTOS[/it]/[c2], [c2][st]KAI  
[/st]/[c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 592) attributes these alterations to the third hand.

<ch 7><v 5> [d1]LEUEI[/d1] [c1]LEUI[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have LEUI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 7><v 5> [d1]APODEKATOIN[/d1] [c1]APODEKATOUN[/c1]:

'APEDEKATOIN:

D\*\* and D\*\*\* -TOUN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592). This should read  
APODEKATOIN.

<ch 7><v 5> [dx]OSFRUOS[/dx] [cx]OSFUOS[/cx]:

'R has been erased' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592). No indication is given of  
which corrector made this alteration.

<ch 7><v 6> [c1][st]TON[/st]/[c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have placed TON before ABRAAM' (Tischendorf, 1852,  
592).

<ch 7><v 6> [d2]HULOGHKEN[/d2] [c2]EULOGHKEN[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 592) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 7><v 7> [d2]KRITTONOS[/d2] [c2]KREITTONOS[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has EI for I' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 7><v 7> [d1]EULOGITE[/d1] [c1]EULOGEITAI[/c1]:  
'EULOGITE:

D\*\* and D\*\*\* EULOGEITAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592). In my Xerox prints, the end of this word is hidden by the codex binding.

<ch 7><v 8> LAMBANOUS[fn]l[/fn]:  
The final *nu* superscript is hidden by the codex binding.

<ch 7><v 9> [d1]EIPEN[/d1] [c1]EIPEIN[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have EIPEIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 7><v 9> [d2]DI'[/d2] [c2]DIA[/c2]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 592) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 7><v 9> [d1]LEUEI[/d1] [c1]LEUI[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have LEUI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 7><v 10> [d1]OSFUEI[/d1] [c1]OSFUI[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have OSFUI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 7><v 10> [c2]O[/c2]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 592) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 7><v 11> [d2]TELIWSIS[/d2] [c2]TELEIWSIS[/c2]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 592) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 7><v 11> [d2]AUTHS[/d2] [c2]AUTH[/c2], [d2]NENOMOQETHTE[/d2]  
[c2]NENOMOQETHTO[/c2]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 592) attributes these alterations to the third hand.

<ch 7><v 11> [d2]TIS[/d2] [c2]HS[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has HS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 7><v 11> [d1]GAR[/d1]:

'D\*\* has already rejected GAR' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 7><v 11> [d2]CRIA[/d2] [c2]CREIA[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 592) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 7><v 12> [di]I[/di]EROSUNHS:

'Neither at this place nor before has O been corrected to W, as Wetstein has noted' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 7><v 13> [d1]LEGEI[/d1] [c1]LEGET[st]AI[/st]/[c1]:

'D\*\* already has LEGETAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 7><v 13> [d1]OUDIS[/d1] [c1]OUD[st]E[/st]IS[/c1]:

'D\*\* has -DEIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 7><v 14> [d1]PERI [di]I[/di]EREWN OUDEN[/d1] [d2][c1]PERI [di]I[/di]ERW[rt]SUNHS[/rt] OUDEN[/c1]/[d2] [c2][it]OUDEN PERI IERWSUNHS[/it]/[c2]:

'D\*\* has enclosed the letters EWN with signs which refer to a correction (-WSUNHS perhaps) given in the margin. However, to look would necessitate tearing, it would seem. D\*\*\* has OUDEN PERI IERWSUNHS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 7><v 16> [d2]SARKINHS[/d2] [d3][c2]SARKIKHS[/c2]/[d3] [c3]SARKINHS[/c3]:

'D\*\*\* and perhaps D\*\* already, have SARKIKHS. In the margin, D<sup>nov</sup> has signified reversion to the first reading' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 7><v 17> [d2]MARTUREITAI[/d2] [c2]MARTUREI[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 592) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 7><v 17> [c2][it]EI[/it]/[c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 592) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 7><v 18> [d1]PROSAGOUSHS[/d1] [c1]PROAGOUSHS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have PROAGOUSHS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 592).

<ch 7><v 19> [d2]ETELIWSEN[/d2] [c2]ETELEIWSEN[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 593) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 7><v 19> [d1]EPISAGWGHS[/d1] [c1]EPISAGWGH[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have deleted the final S' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 7><v 19> [d2]KRITTONOS[/d2] [c2]KREITTONOS[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 593) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 7><v 20> [c2][it]OI MEN GAR CWRIS ORKWMOSIAS[/it]/[c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 593) attributes this alteration to the third hand. He erroneously writes the final added word as ORKMMWSIAS.

<ch 7><v 20> [d1][di]I[/di]ERIS[/d1] [c1][di]I[/di]ER[st]E[/st]IS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have IEREIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 7><v 21> [c2][it]EI[/it]/[c2]:

'D\*\*\* has added EI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 7><v 22> [d2]TOSOUTW[/d2] [c2]TOSOUTON[/c2]:

'TOSOUTW:

thus; not -TO. D\*\*\* has TOSOUTON' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 7><v 22> [d2]KRITTONOS[/d2] [c2]KREITTONOS[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 593) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 7><v 23> [d1]PLIONES[/d1] [c1]PL[st]E[/st]IONES[/c1], [d1][di]I[/di]ERIS  
[/d1] [c1][di]I[/di]ER[st]E[/st]IS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have PLEIONES and IEREIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 7><v 24> [d1]MENIN[/d1] [c1]MEN[st]E[/st]IN[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 593) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 7><v 24> [d2]EIERATIAN[/d2] [c2][di]I[/di]ERWSUNHN[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* (and D\*\* already, perhaps) has IERWSUNHN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 7><v 25> [d1]ENTUNCANIN[/d1] [c1]ENTUNCAN[st]E[/st]IN[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -NEIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 7><v 27> [d1]O ARCIEREU[/d1] [c1]OI ARCIEREIS[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have OI ARCIEREIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 7><v 27> [d1]ANAFERIN[/d1] [c1]ANAFER[st]E[/st]IN[/c1], [d1]EPITA  
[/d1] [c1]EP[st]E[/st]ITA[/c1]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 593) attributes these alterations to the second hand.

<ch 7><v 28> [d2][di]I[/di]EREIS[/d2] [c2]ARCIEREIS[/c2]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 593) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 7><v 28> [d1]ASQENIAN[/d1] [c1]ASQEN[st]E[/st]IAN[/c1]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 593) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

TETELIWMENON <ch 8><v 1> KEFALAION DE:  
'Cap. VIII' is written in the left-hand column adjacent to this line. A  
vertical line marks the chapter division in the text (Tischendorf, 1852,  
593).

<ch 8><v 2> [d2]LITOURGOS[/d2] [c2]LEITOURGOS[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has EI for I' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 8><v 2> [c2][kc]K[/kc]/[c2]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 593) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 8><v 4> [d2]OUN[/d2] [d3][c2]GAR[/c2]/[d3] [c3]OUN[/c3]:  
'D\*\*\* has GAR. D<sup>nov</sup> restores the first reading' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 8><v 4> [c2][it]TWN [di]I[/di]EREWN[/it]/[c2]:  
'D\*\*\* adds TWN IEREWN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 8><v 5> [d2][di]U[/di]PODIGMATI[/d2] [c2][di]U[/di]PODEIGMATI[/c2]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 593) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 8><v 5> [d1]EPITELIN[/d1] [c1]EPITELEIN[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -LEIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 8><v 5> [d1]POIHSIS[/d1] [c1]POIHS[st]E[/st]IS[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 593) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 8><v 5> DEICQENTAN:

'This remains untouched' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 8><v 6> [d1]NUN[/d1] [c1]NUN[st]I[/st]/[c1], [d1]SOI[/d1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have NUN. The same [scribes] have deleted SOI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 8><v 6> [d2]TETUCEN LITOURGIAS[/d2] [c2]TETEUCE  
LEITOURGIAS[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 593) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 8><v 6> [d2][c1][st][kc]K[/kc]/[st]/[c1]/[d2] [c2][it]KAI[/it]/[c2]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* add KAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593). The second hand places a *kaiv* compendium above the insertion point. The third hand writes KAI in the margin and inserts carets as well.

<ch 8><v 6> [d2]KRITTONOS[/d2] [c2]KREITTONOS[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has EI for I' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 8><v 6> [d1]ESTI[/d1] [c1]ESTIN[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have ESTIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 8><v 6> [d1]MESEITHS[/d1] [c1]MESITHS[/c1]:

'D\*\* has deleted the second E' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 8><v 6> [d2]KRITTOSIN[/d2] [c2]KREITTOSIN[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 593) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 8><v 7> [d1]EMAPEDIA[/d1] [c1]AM[st]EM[/st]PTOS[/c1]:

'The first hand has written EMAPEDIA, which, though difficult to read, is not ANAITIA. Both D\*\* and D\*\*\* have altered this to AMEMPTOS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593). Wettstein thought that the first hand intended



to write ANAITIA (Tischendorf, 1872, 805). Wachtel and Witte (1994) read EMAPEAIA. I cannot see what the underlying word was.

<ch 8><v 8> [d2]AUTOUS[/d2] [c2]AUTOIS[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has AUTOIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 8><v 8> [c2][it]EPI[/it]/[c2]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 593) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 8><v 8> [d1]KENHN[/d1] [c1]K[st]AI[/st]NHN[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have KAINHN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 8><v 9> [d1]ENEMINAN[/d1] [c1]ENEM[st]E[/st]INAN[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -MEINAN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 8><v 11> [d2]DIDAXWSIN[/d2] [c2]DIDAXOUSIN[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has -XOUSIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 8><v 11> [d2]EAUTOU[/d2] [c2]AUTOU[/c2]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 593) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 8><v 11> [c2][it]AUTOU[/it]/[c2]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 593) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 8><v 11> GNWQEI:  
According to Tischendorf (1852, 593), the E has been deleted. There is no sign of such a deletion in my Xerox prints.

<ch 8><v 11> [d2]EIDESOUSIN[/d2] [c2]EIDHSOUSIN[/c2]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 593) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 8><v 11> [c2][it]AUTWN[/it]/[c2]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 593) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 8><v 12> [d1]EILEWS[/d1] [c1]ILEWS[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have ILEWS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 8><v 13> [d1]KENHN[/d1] [c1]KAINHN[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have KAINHN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 8><v 13> [d2]PELEWKEN[/d2] [c2]PE[st]PA[/st]LAIWKEN[/c2]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 593) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 8><v 13> [d1]TE[/d1] [c1]DE[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have DE' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 8><v 13> [d1]ENGUS[/d1] [c1]EGGUS[/c1]:  
'D\*\*\* and D\*\* (already, so it seems) have EGGUS. (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 9><v 1> EICEN MEN OUN KAI [c1]H[/c1] PRWTH DIKAIWMATA:  
'Cap. IX' is written in the left-hand column adjacent to this line.

<ch 9><v 1> [c1]H[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have H PRWTH' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 9><v 1> [d1]KAI[/d1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* delete KAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 9><v 1> [d2]LATRIAS[/d2] [c2]LATREIAS[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has -EIAS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 9><v 1> [d1]DE[/d1] [c1]TE[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have TE' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 9><v 2> [c1]H[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have EN H H TE' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 9><v 2> [d1]LEGETE[/d1] [c1]LEGETAI[/c1]:  
'D\*\* has -TAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 9><v 2> [d1]AGIWN[/d1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have rejected AGIWN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 9><v 3> [c2][it]TA[/it]/[c2], [c2][it]TWN[/it]/[c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 593) attributes these alterations to the third hand.

<ch 9><v 5> [d1]UPER[/d1] [c1]UPER[st]ANW[/st]/[c1]:

'D\*\* (according to a placement sign) and D\*\*\* have UPERANW' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 9><v 5> [d1]AUTHN[/d1] [c1]AUTHS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have AUTHS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 9><v 5> [d2]CEROUBIN[/d2] [c2]CEROUBEIN[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 593) attributes this alteration to the third hand.

<ch 9><v 5> [d1]KAI[/d1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* delete KAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 9><v 5> [dx]EILASTHRION[/dx] [cx]ILASTHRION[/cx]:

'The E has been deleted' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593). No indication is given of which corrector made this alteration.

<ch 9><v 6> [d1]LATRIAS[/d1] [c1]LATREIAS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -EIAS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 9><v 8> [d1]MHPWS[/d1] [c1]MHPW[/c1], [d1]PEFANERWSAI[/d1] [c1]PEFANERWSQAI[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have MHPW. The same [scribes] have PEFANERWSQAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 9><v 8> [d1]EPI[/d1] [c1]ETI[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have ETI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 9><v 9> [d2]PRWTH[/d2]:

'D\*\*\* has rejected PRWTH' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 9><v 9> [d2]HN[/d2] [c2]ON[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has ON' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 9><v 9> [d1]QUSIAN[/d1] [c1]QUSIA[st]I[/st]/[c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have QUSIAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 9><v 9> [d2]SUNIDHSIN[/d2] [c2]SUNEIDHSIN[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has SUNEIDHSIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 593).

<ch 9><v 9> [d2]TELIWSAI[/d2] [c2]TELEIWSAI[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has TELEIWSAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 10> [d2]BRWMASI[/d2] [c2]BRWMASIN[/c2], [d2]POMASI[/d2]  
[c2]POMASIN[/c2]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 594) attributes these alterations to the third hand.

<ch 9><v 10> [d2][c1][kc]K[/kc]/[c1]/[d2] [c2][it]KAI[/it]/[c2], [d1]DIKAIWMA  
[/d1] [c1]DIKAIWMA[it]SIN[/it]/[c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have KAI DIKAIWMASIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594). There  
is a *kaiv* compendium beneath the KAI added by the third hand.

<ch 9><v 10> [d2]MECRI[/d2] [c2]MECRIS[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has MECRIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 11> [d2]GENOMENWN[/d2] [c2]MELLONTWN[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has MELLONTWN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 11> [d1]MIZONOS[/d1] [c1]M[st]E[/st]IZONOS[/c1]:  
'D\*\* has MEIZONOS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 11> [d2]TELIOTERAS[/d2] [c2]TELEIOTERAS[/c2]:  
D\*\*\* has TELEIOTERAS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 12> [d2]EUROMENOS[/d2] [c2]EURAMENOS[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has EURAMENOS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 13> [d1]SPONDON[/d1] [c1]SPONDOS[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have SPODOS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594). Tischendorf has  
missed the N following the first O.

<ch 9><v 13> [d1]KEKOIMHMENOUS[/d1] [c1]KEKOINWMENOUS[/c1]:  
'Wetstein reads NH for MH, but the M is not in doubt. D\*\* and D\*\*\* have  
KEKOINWMENOUS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 14> [d2]AGIOU[/d2] [c2]AIWNIOU[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has AIWNIOU' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 14> [d2]PROSHNENKEN[/d2] [c2]PROSHNEGKEN[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has PROSHNEGKEN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 14> [d2]OS[/d2], [d2]SUNIDHSIN[/d2] [c2]SUNEIDHSIN[/c2], [d2]  
HMWN[/d2] [c2][di]U[/di]MWVN[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has deleted OS. The same scribe wrote SUNEIDHSIN UMWN'  
(Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 14> [d2]TW[/d2] [ns]QW[/ns] [d2]TW[/d2]:  
'D\*\*\* deletes both instances of TW' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 15> [d1]MESEITHS[/d1] [c1]MESITHS[/c1]:  
'D\*\* has MESITHS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 16> [d2]QANATOU[/d2] [c2]QANATON[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has QANATON' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 17> [d1]EPI[/d1] [c1]EP[st]E[/st]I[/c1]:  
'D\*\* has EPEI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 17> [d1]TOTE[/d1] [c1]POTE[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have POTE' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 18> [d1]ODEN[/d1] [c1]OQEN[/c1], [d1]OUDEN[/d1] [c1]OUDE  
[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have OQEN. The same [scribes] have OUDE for OUDEN'  
(Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 18> [d2]DIAQHKKH[/d2]:  
'D\*\*\* deletes DIAQHKKH' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 18> [d1]ENKEKAINISTAI[/d1] [d2][c1]ENKEKAIN[st]E[/st]ISTAI[/c1]  
[/d2] [c2]ENKEKAINISTAI[/c2]:

'D\*\* has -NEISTAI, but D\*\*\* reverts to -NISTAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 19> [d1]LALHQISHS[/d1] [c1]LALHQ[st]E[/st]ISHS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -QEISHS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 19> [d2]THS[/d2]:

'D\*\*\* deletes THS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 19> KATA [d2]TON[/d2] NOMON [c2][it][di]U[/di]PO[/it]/[c2]:

'D\*\*\* has KATA NOMON UPO' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 20> [d1]ENETILATO[/d1] [c1]ENET[st]E[/st]ILATO[/c1]:

'D\*\* has ENETEILATO' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 21> [d2]LITOURGIAS[/d2] [c2]LEITOURGIAS[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has LEITOURGIAS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 21> [d2]ERANTISEN[/d2] [c2]ERRANTISEN[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has ERRANTISEN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 22> [d1]KAQARIZETE[/d1] [c1]KAQARIZETAI[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -ZETAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 23> [d1]KAQARIZETE[/d1] [c1]KAQARIZETE[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -ZESQAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 23> [d2]KRITTOSI[/d2] [c2]KREITTOSIN[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has KREITTOSIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 23> [d1]TAUTHS[/d1] [c1]TAUTAS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have TAUTAS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 24> [c1]O[/c1] [ns]CS[/ns]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have O CS for CS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 24> [d1]ALHQINWN[/d1] [d2][c1]ALHQ[st]E[/st]INWN[/c1]/[d2] [c2]ALHQINWN[/c2]:

'D\*\* has -QEINWN, and D\*\*\* reverts to -QINWN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 24> [d1]IS[/d1] [c1][st]E[/st]IS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have EIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 24> [d2]ENFANISQHNAI[/d2] [c2]EMFANISQHNAI[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has EMFANISQHNAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 26> [d1]EPI[/d1] [c1]EP[st]E[/st]I[/c1]:

'D\*\* has EPEI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 26> [d1]POLLA[/d1] [c1]POLLA[st]KIS[/st]/[c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have POLLAKIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 26> [d1]PAQIN[/d1] [c1]PAQ[st]E[/st]IN[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have PAQEIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 26> [d1]SUNTELIA[/d1] [c1]SUNTEL[st]E[/st]IA[/c1]:

'D\*\* has SUNTELEIA' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 26> [d2]AMARTIWN[/d2] [c2]AMARTIAS[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has AMARTIAS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 26> [d1]PEFANERWTE[/d1] [c1]PEFANERWTAI[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -TAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 27> [d1]APOQANIN[/d1] [c1]APOQAN[st]E[/st]IN[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -NEIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 28> [d1]PROSENECQIS[/d1] [c1]PROSENECQ[st]E[/st]IS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -CQEIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 28> [d2]ANENENKEIN[/d2] [c2]ANENEGKEIN[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has ANENEGKEIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 9><v 28> [d1]EKDECOMENOIS[/d1] [c1][st]AP[/st]EKDECOMENOIS  
[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have APEKDEC.' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 1> SKIAN GAR ECWN O NOMOS:  
'Cap. X' is written in the left-hand margin adjacent to this line.  
(Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 1> [d2]AIS[/d2] [c2]AS[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has AS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 1> [d1]DUNATAI[/d1] [d2][c1]DUNA[st]N[/st]TAI[/c1][[/d2] [c2]  
DUNATAI[/c2]:  
D\*\* has DUNANTAI but D\*\*\* restores DUNATAI' (Tischendorf, 1852,  
594).

<ch 10><v 1> [d2]KAQARISAI[/d2] [c2][st]TELEWSAI[/st][[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has TELEWSAI, thus' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 2> [d1]EPI[/d1] [c1]EP[st]E[/st]I[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have EPEI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 2> [c2]ETI[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has added ETI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 2> [d2]SUNIDHSIN[/d2] [c2]SUNEIDHSIN[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has SUNEIDHSIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 2> [d2]DE[/d2]:  
'D\*\*\* has deleted DE' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 2> KEKAQARISMENOUS:  
'Wetstein has noted erroneously that this has been altered by a corrector'  
(Tischendorf, 1852, 594).



<ch 10><v 3> [d1]ANAMNHSEIS[/d1] [c1]ANAMNHSIS[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have ANAMNHSIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 3> [d2]GINETAI[/d2]:  
D\*\*\* has deleted GINETAI'. (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 6> [d2]HUDOKHSAS[/d2] [c2]EUDOKHSAS[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has EUDOKHSAS. (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 7> [d2]EGW[/d2]:  
'D\*\*\* has erased EGW; perhaps D\*\* has rejected it already'  
(Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 7> [d1]GAR[/d1] [c3]GAR[/c3]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have deleted GAR. D<sup>nov</sup> has restored it' (Tischendorf,  
1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 8> [d2]QUSIAS[/d2] [c2]QUSIAN[/c2], [d2]PROSFORAS[/d2] [c2]  
PROSFORAN[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has -SIAN and -RAN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 8> [d2]HUDOKHSAS[/d2] [c2]EUDOKHSAS[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has EUDOKHSAS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 10> [c2][it]OI[/it]/[c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has OI DIA' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 10> [d1]AIMATOS[/d1] [c1][st]SW[/st]MATOS[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have SWMATOS for AIMATOS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 11> [d2]LITOURGWN[/d2] [c2]LEITOURGWN[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has LEITOURGWN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 11> [c1][st][kc]K[/kc]/[st]/[c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* add KAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 11> [d1]PERIALEIN[/d1] [c1]PERIELEIN[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have PERIELEIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 12> [d2]OUTOS[/d2] [c2]AUTOS[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has AUTOS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 14> [d2]TETELIWKEN[/d2] [c2]TETELEIWKEN[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has TETELEIWKEN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 15> [d1]DE[/d1] [c1]GAR[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have GAR' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 16> [d1]DE[/d1] [c3][it]DE[/it]/[c3]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have rejected DE' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594). D<sup>nov</sup> has restored DE by a note in the margin.

<ch 10><v 16> [d1]THN DIANOIAN[/d1] [c1]TWN DIANOIWN[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have TWN DIANOIWN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 17> [c2]AUTWN[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has added AUTWN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 17> [d2]MNHSQHSOMAI[/d2] [c2]MNHSQ[st]W[/st]/[c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has MNHSQW' (Tischendorf, 1852, 594).

<ch 10><v 19> [d1]ISODON[/d1] [c1]EISODON[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have EISODON' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 20> [d1]ENEKENISEN[/d1] [c1]ENEKAINISEN[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have ENKAINISEN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 20> [c1][st][kc]K[/kc]/[st]/[c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have KAI ZWSAN for ZWSAN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 20> [d1]DIA[/d1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have deleted DIA' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 22> [d2]RERANTISMENOI[/d2] [c2]ERRANTISMENOI[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has ERRANTISM' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 22> [d2]LELOUSMENOI[/d2] [c2]LELOUMENOI[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has LELOUMENOI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 23> [d1]EPAGGILAMENOS[/d1] [c1]EPAGG[st]E[/st]ILAMENOS  
[/c1]:  
'D\*\* has EPAGGEILAMENOS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 25> [d1]KATALIPONTES[/d1] [d2][c1]KATAL[st]E[/st]IPONTES  
[/c1][d2] [c2][st]EG[/st]KATAL[st]E[/st]IPONTES[/c2]:  
'D\*\* has KATALEIPONTES, D\*\*\* has EGKATALEIPONTES' (Tischendorf,  
1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 25> [d2]ESTIN[/d2]:  
'D\*\*\* has deleted ESTIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 26> [d1]LABIN[/d1] [c1]LAB[st]E[/st]IN[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have LABEIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 26> [d2]PERILIPETAI[/d2] [c2][st]APO[/st]LEIPETAI[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has deleted APOLEIPETAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 26> [d2]QUSIAN[/d2] [c2]QUSIA[/c2], [d2]AMARTIAS[/d2] [c2]  
AMARTI[st]WN[/st][c2], [d2]PROSENENK[fn]I[/fn][d2]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 595) writes, 'D\*\*\* has QUSIA. The same scribe has  
AMARTIWN and deletes PROSENENKI.'

<ch 10><v 28> [d2]KAI DAKRU[fn]W[/fn][d2]:  
'D\*\*\* has rejected this' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 29> [d1]DOKEIDE[/d1] [c1]DOKEI[st]T[/st]E[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have DOKEITE' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595). It is possible  
that the first hand intended DOKEI DE, but the result does not make  
sense: 'Of how much sorer punishment, he supposes, shall the one who  
has trampled on the Son of God be counted worthy...' Consequently, the

first reading has been transcribed as a spelling variant of DOKEITE.

<ch 10><v 30> [c2]LEGEI [ns]KS[/ns]/[c2]:

'D\*\*\* adds LEGEI KURIOS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 30> KRINEI:

'D\*\*\* has added the final circumflex' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 31> [d2]ENPESEIN[/d2] [c2]EMPESEIN[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has EMPESEIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 32> [d1]ANAMIMNHSKESQAI[/d1] [c1]ANAMIMNHSKESQE[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -SQE' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 32> [d1]TAIS PROTERAIS HMERAS[/d1] [c1]TAS PROTERON HMERAS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have TAS PROTERAS HMERAS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595). The corrected reading is clearly PROTERON rather than PROTERAS.

<ch 10><v 32> [d1]UPEMINATE[/d1] [c1]UPEM[st]E[/st]INATE[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have EI for I' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 33> [d1]OUTO[/d1] [c1]TOUTO[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have TOUTO' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 33> [d2]ONIDISMOIS[/d2] [c2]ONEIDISMOIS[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has ONEIDISMOIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 33> [d2]ONIDIZOMENOI[/d2] [c2]QEATRIZOMENOI[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has QEATRIZOMENOI. The text of Sangermanensis is inept cf. Prolegg. p. XXVI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595). At this place he notes that Codex Sangermanensis (which is a copy of U6) has created the monstrous reading nidizomenoqeatrizomenoi.

<ch 10><v 34> [d2]DESMIOIS[/d2] [c2]DESMOIS [st]MOU[/st]/[c2]:

'D\*\*\* has DESMOIS MOU' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 34> [d1]PROSEDEXASQAI[/d1] [c1]PROSEDEXASQE[/c1], [d1]GEINWSKONTES[/d1] [c1]GINWSKONTES[/c1]:

'D\*\* has -SQE and GINWSK' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 34> [d2]KRITTONA[/d2] [c2]KREITTONA[/c2], [c2]EN [ns]OU [ns]N[ns]OI[/ns]S[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has KREITTONA. The same scribe adds EN OURANOIS after UPARXIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 35> [d1]APOLUHTE[/d1] ... [c2]APOBALHTE[/c2]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have APOBALHTE (D\*\* seems to have -BALETE)' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 36> [d1]CRIAN[/d1] [c1]CR[st]E[/st]IAN[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have CREIAN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 36> [d2]KOMISHSQAI[/d2] [c2]KOMISHSQE[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has -SQE' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 36> [d2]EPANGELIAN[/d2] [d3][c2]EPAGGELIAN[/c2]/[d3] [c3]EPANGELIAN[/c3]:

Tischendorf (1852, 595) writes 'N has been altered to G, which has been restored again to N. D\*\*\* has one, D<sup>nov</sup> has the other in accordance with his usual failure.'

<ch 10><v 37> [d1]ETEI[/d1] [c1]ETI[/c1], [d1]MEIKRON[/d1] [c1]MIKRON [c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have I for EI twice'. (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 37> [d2][c1][it][rt]OSON[/rt]/[it]/[c1]/[d2] [c2][it]OSON[/it]/[c2] [d1]OQEN[/d1] [c1]OSON O[/c1] ERCOMENOS:

'D\*\*\* has OSON OSON. D\*\* has already made one OSON from OQEN, and seems to indicate another OSON by placing a mark at the end of line 6. Each corrector definitely has O ERCOMENOS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 37> [d2]CRONISEI[/d2] [c2]CRONIEI[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has CRONIEI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 38> [d2]MOU[/d2]:  
'D\*\*\* has deleted MOU' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 38> [c0]KAI EAN[/c0] [d1][c0]UPOSTILHTE[/c0]/[d1] [c1]UPOST  
[st]E[/st]ILHTAI[/c1]:  
'This line had been omitted in each text, but has been supplied by the first  
hand himself. D\*\* and D\*\*\* have UPOSTEILHTAI for UPOSTILHTE'  
(Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 38> [d1]EUDOKI[/d1] [c1]EUDOKEI[/c1]:  
'D\*\* has -KEI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 38> [d1]MOU H YUCH[/d1] [d2][c1]H YUCH MOU[/c1]/[d2] [c2]  
MOU H YUCH[/c2]:  
'[D\*\*] has H YUCH MOU but D\*\*\* reverses this by removing the  
transposition signs' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 39> [d1]HMIS[/d1] [c1]HM[st]E[/st]IS[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have HMEIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 10><v 39> [d1]APWLIAN[/d1] [c1]APWL[st]E[/st]IAN[/c1]:  
'D\*\* has APWLEIAN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 11><v 1> ESTIN DE PISTIS ELPIZOMENWN:  
'Cap. XI' is written adjacent to this line.

<ch 11><v 1> [d1][di]U[/di]POSTASIN[/d1] [c1][di]U[/di]POSTASI[st]S[/st]/[c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -SIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 11><v 3> [d1]KATHRTISQAI[/d1] [d2][c1]KATHRT[st]E[/st]ISQAI[/c1]/[d2]  
[c2]KATHRTISQAI[/c2]:  
D\*\* has -TEISQAI, but D\*\*\* reverses this by deleting the inserted E'  
(Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 11><v 3> [d2]TO BLEPOMENON[/d2] [c2]TA BLEPOMENA[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has TA BLEPOMENA' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 11><v 4> [d1]PISTI PLIONA[/d1] [c1]PIST[st]E[/st]I PL[st]E[/st]IONA  
[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have PISTEI PLEIONA' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 11><v 4> [d1]KAEIN[/d1] [c1]KA[di]I[/di]N[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have KAIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 11><v 4> [d1]TW [ns]QW[/ns]/[d1] [c1]TOU [ns]QU[/ns]/[c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have TOU QU' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 11><v 4> [d2]DIA TAUTHS[/d2] [c2]DI' AUTHS[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has DI AUTHS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 11><v 5> {begin indented text} PISTEI [d1]AINWC[/d1] [c1]ENWC[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have ENWC' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 11><v 5> [d2]HURISKETO[/d2] [c2]EURISKETO[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has EURISKETO' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 11><v 5> [d1]METEQHKEN[/d1] [c1]ME[st]TE[/st]TEQHKEN[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have METETEQHKEN, thus' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 11><v 5> [d2][c1][it][rt]AUTOU[/rt]/[it]/[c1]/[d2] [c2]AUTOU[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* and D\*\* (already, according to an addition sign) added AUTOU'  
(Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 11><v 5> [d1]MEMARTURHTE[/d1] [c1]MEMARTURHTAI[/c1]:  
'D\*\* has -TAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 11><v 6> [d1]TW[/d1] [c2]TW[/c2]:  
'D\*\* has rejected TW by superior points; but D\*\*\*, having no regard for  
that, inserts a circumflex' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 11><v 7> [d1]PISTI CRHMATISQIS[/d1] [c1]PIST[st]E[/st]I

CRHMATISQ[st]E[/st]IS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -STEI and -SQEIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 595).

<ch 11><v 7> [d1]EULABHQIS[/d1] [c1]EULABHQ[st]E[/st]IS[/c1]:

'D\*\* has -QEIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 7> [d1]KEIBWT[fn]O[/fn]/[d1] [c1]KIBWT[fn]O[/fn]/[c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have KIBWTON' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 8> [d1]PISTI[/d1] [c1]PIST[st]E[/st]I[/c1] [d2]O[/d2]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have PISTEI. Furthermore, D\*\*\* has deleted the article O which follows' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 8> [c2][it]TON[/it]/[c2], [d2]EXELQIN[/d2] [c2]EXELQEIN[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* places TON before TOPON. The same scribe writes EXELQEIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 8> [d2]EMELLEN[/d2] [c2]HMELLEN[/c2], [d1]LAMBANIN[/d1]

[c1]LAMBAN[st]E[/st]IN[/c1]:

'D\*\*\* has HMELLEN. Also D\*\* has LAMBANEIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 9> [d2]KAI[/d2] [c2]PISTEI[/c2] PARWKHSEN [c2][it]ABRAAM[/it]  
[/c2] EIS [d2]THN[/d2]:

'D\*\*\* has PISTEI PARWKHSEN ABRAAM. Furthermore, the same scribe has marked THN by obelisk, even though he had added an accent' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 9> [d2]ISAK[/d2] [c2]ISAAK[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has ISAAK' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 9> [d2]AUTOU[/d2] [c2]THS AUTHS[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has THS AUTHS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 11> [d1]STIRA[/d1] [d2][c1][st]H[/st] ST[st]E[/st]IRA[/c1]/[d2] [dx]  
DUNAME[fn]I[/fn]/[dx] [cx]DUNAM[fn]I[/fn]/[cx]:

'D\*\* has H STEIRA. D\*\*\* has deleted the whole phrase. Furthermore, the



E in DUNAMEIN has been deleted' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596). No indication is given of which corrector altered DUNAMEIN.

<ch 11><v 11> [d2]EIS TO TEKNWSAI[/d2]:

'D\*\*\* has rejected this' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 11> [c2]KAI[/c2] PARA KAIRON HLIKIAS [c2]ETEKEN[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has KAI PARA. The same scribe has added ETEKEN after HLIKIAS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 11> [d1]EPI[/d1] [c1]EP[st]E[/st]I[/c1]:

'D\*\* has EPEI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 11> [d1]EPANGILAMENON[/d1] [d3][c1]EPAGG[st]E[/st] ILAMENON[/c1] [/d3] [c3]EPANGEILAMENON[/c3]:

'D\*\*\* has GG for NG, which D<sup>nov</sup> restores. Further on D\*\* and D\*\*\* have EI for I' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 12> [d1]EGENHQHSAN[/d1] [c1]EGENNHQHSAN[/c1]:

'D\*\*\* and, it seems, D\*\* already, have EGENNHQHSAN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 12> [d2]KAQWS[/d2] [c2]WS[/c2] H AMMOS [c2][it]H PARA TO CEILOS[/it] [/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has WS (which D\*\* may already have). Furthermore, D\*\*\* has added H PARA TO CEILOS after AMMOS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 13> [d1]EIDONTES[/d1] [c1][di]I[/di]DONTES[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have IDONTES' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 13> [d1]KAI PAROIKOI[/d1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have deleted this' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 14> OI GAR TOIAUTA LEGONTES [d2]ENFANIZOUSIN[/d2] [c2]EMFANIZOUSIN[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has EMF.' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 14> [d2]ZHTOUSIN[/d2] [c2][it]EPI[/it]ZHTOUSIN[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has EPIZHTOUSIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 15> [d2]MNHMONEUOU[rt]SIN[/rt]/[d2] [c2][st]E[/st]  
MNHMONEUON[/c2]:

'The ending lies hidden in the junction of the codex. D\*\*\* has EMNHMONEUON' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596). In his eighth critical edition, Tischendorf (1872, 823) gives the reading of the first hand as -ousin, but indicates that it may also be -ousan. The last three letters in question lie completely obscured. It is possible that Tischendorf mistook the remnant of an original *upsilon* for part of an original *alpha*.

<ch 11><v 15> [d2]EXEBHSAN[/d2] [c2]EX[st]HLQON[/st]/[c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has EXHLQON' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 15> [c1][st]AN[/st]/[c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* add AN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 15> [d1]ANAKANYAI[/d1] [c1]ANAKAMYAI[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -MYAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 16> [d1]KRITTONOS[/d1] [c1]KREITTONOS[/c1]:  
'D\*\*\* has KREITTONOS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 16> [d1]EPESCUNETAI[/d1] [c1]EPAISCUNETAI[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have EPAISC' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 16> [c2][ns]QS[/ns]/[c2] EPIKALEISQAI AUTWN [d2][ns]QS[/ns]  
[/d2]:  
'D\*\*\* places this before EPIKALEISQAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 17> [d1]PISTI[/d1] [c1]PIST[st]E[/st]/[c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have PISTEI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 17> [d2][di]I[/di]SAK[/d2] [c2][di]I[/di]SAAK[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has ISAAK' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 17> [d1]MONOGENHN[/d1] [c1]MONOGENH[/c1]:  
'D\*\*\* and, it seems, D\*\* already, have deleted the final N' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 18> [d2]EN [di]I[/di]SAK[/d2] [c2][it]OTI EN[/it] [di]I[/di]SAAK[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has OTI EN ISAAK' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 19> [d1]DUNATOS[/d1] [d2][c1]DUNATAI[/c1]/[d2] [c2]DUNATOS  
[/c2]:  
'D\*\* has DUNATAI but D\*\*\* has restored -TOS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 20> [d1]PISTI[/d1] [c1]PIST[st]E[/st]I[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have PISTEI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 20> [d2]KAI[/d2]:  
'D\*\*\* has deleted KAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 20> [d2][di]I[/di]SAK[/d2] [c2][di]I[/di]SAAK[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has ISAAK' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 21> [d1]PISTI[/d1] [c1]PIST[st]E[/st]I[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have PISTEI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 22> [d1]PISTI[/d1] [c1]PIST[st]E[/st]I[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have PISTEI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 23> [d1]PISTI[/d1] [c1]PIST[st]E[/st]I[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have PISTEI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 23> [d2]MWUSHS[/d2] [c2]MWSHS[/c2]:  
'The U has been erased by D\*\*\*, so it seems' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 23> [d1]GENNHQIS[/d1] [c1]GENNHQ[st]E[/st]IS[/c1]:  
'D\*\* has -QEIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 23> [d1]ASTION[/d1] [c1]AST[st]E[/st]ION[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have ASTEION' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 23> [d2][d1]PISTI[/d1] [c1]PIST[st]E[/st]I[/c1] MEGAS  
GENOMENOS [d1]MW[di]U[/di]SHS[/d1] [c1]MWSHS[/c1] [d1]ANILEN[/d1]  
[c1]AN[st]E[/st]ILEN[/c1] TON AIGUPTION KATANOWN THN TAPINWSIN  
TWN ADELFWN AUTOU[/d2]:

'D\*\* has PISTEI and ANEILEN. D\*\*\* has definitely signified that these four lines are to be deleted by not including any accenting instructions, and removing those which he had already placed on line five. Without doubt, the U in MWUSHS had already been obliterated' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 24> [d1]PISTI[/d1] [c1]PIST[st]E[/st]I[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* has PISTEI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 25> [d1]AILOMENOS[/d1] [c1]ELOMENOS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have ELOMENOS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 25> [d2]SUNKAKOUCESISQAI[/d2] [d3][c2]SUGKAKOUCESISQAI  
[/c2]/[d3] [c3]SUGKAKOUCESISQAI[/c3]:

'D\*\*\* has SUGK. D<sup>nov</sup> has restored SUNK' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 26> [d1]MIZONA[/d1] [c1]M[st]E[/st]IZONA[/c1], [d1]ONIDISMON  
[/d1] [c1]ON[st]E[/st]IDISMON[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 596) attributes these alterations to the second hand.

<ch 11><v 27> [d1]PISTI[/d1] [c1]PIST[st]E[/st]I[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 596) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 11><v 27> [d1]FOBHQIS[/d1] [c1]FOBHQ[st]E[/st]IS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -QEIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 27> [dx]??[/dx]:

'Two letters following ORWN have been deeply erased; but they do not appear to have been TA , as Wetstein conjectured' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596). No indication is given of which corrector made this deletion.

<ch 11><v 28> [d1]PISTI[/d1] [c1]PIST[st]E[/st]I[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 596) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 11><v 28> [d1]QIGH[/d1] [d2][c1]Q[st]E[/st]IGH[/c1]/[d2] [c2]QIGH[/c2]:  
'D\*\* has QEIGH, but D\*\*\* reverts to QIGH' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 29> [d1]PISTI[/d1] [c1]PIST[st]E[/st]/[c1]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 596) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 11><v 29> [d2]GHS[/d2]:  
'D\*\*\* has deleted GHS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 29> [d1]PIRAN[/d1] [c1]P[st]E[/st]IRAN[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have PEIRAN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 29> [d0][ut]E[/ut]GUPTIOI[/d0] [c0]AIGUPTIOI[/c0]:  
Tischendorf has not recorded this alteration. The style and ink is more consistent with the first hand than any other hands.

<ch 11><v 30> [d2]TICH[/d2] [c2]TEICH[/c2], [d2]EPESAN[/d2] [c2]EPESEN  
[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has TEICH. The same scribe (and D\*\* already?) has EPESEN'  
(Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 31> [d1]PISTI[/d1] [c1]PIST[st]E[/st]/[c1]:  
Tischendorf (1852, 596) attributes this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 11><v 31> [d1]APIQHSASIN[/d1] [c1]AP[st]E[/st]IQHSASIN[/c1]:  
'D\*\* has APEIQHSASIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 32> [c1][st]ETI[/st]/[c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have TI ETI for TI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 32> [d1]EPILHNYI ME GAR[/d1] [c1]EPILEIYEI GAR ME[/c1]:  
'D\*\*\* has EPILEIYEI GAR ME. However D\*\* already seems to have arrived at this' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 32> [d2]DE[/d2] GEDEWN [d2]KAI[/d2] BARAK [c2]TE[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has wiped out DE. At KAI BARAK D\*\*\* has added TE, by which he seems to replace KAI as he does not place an accent on it' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 32> [d2]SAMYW[/d2] [c2]SAMYWN[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has SAMYWN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 32> [d2]DAUEID[/d2] [c2]DAUID[/c2]:

'E (seemingly by D\*\*\* alone) has been erased' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 33> [d2]HRGASANTO[/d2] [c2]EIRGASANTO[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has EIRGASANTO' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 33> [d1]DIKAIOSUNH[/d1] [c1]DIKAIOSUN[fn]H[/fn]/[c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have DIKAIOSUNH' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 33> [d1]STOMA[/d1] [c1]STOMA[st]TA[/st]/[c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have STOMATA' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 34> [d2]MACAIRHS[/d2] [c2]MACAIR[st]A[/st]S[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has MACAIRAS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 34> [d1]EDUNAMWQHSA[N]/[d1] [c1]ENEDUNAMWQHSA[N]/[c1],  
[d1]ASQENIAS[/d1] [c1]ASQEN[st]E[/st]IAS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have ENEDUNAMWQHSA[N]. The same scribes have ASQENEIAS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 34> [d1]PARENBO[N]S[/d1] [c1]PAREMBO[N]S[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have PAREMBO[N]S' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 35> [d1]GUNA[K]S[/d1] [c1]GUNA[K][st]E[/st]S[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have GUNA[K]ES' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 35> [d1]APETUNPANISQHSAN[/d1] [d2][c1]ETUNPANISQHSAN  
[/c1]/[d2] [d3][c2]ETUMPANISQHSAN[/c2]/[d3] [c3]APETUMPANISQHSAN  
[/c3]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have deleted AP (which D<sup>nov</sup> has restored); also D\*\*\*

has written MP for NP' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 35> [d2]KRITTONOS[/d2] [c2]KREITTONOS[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has KREITT.' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 36> [d1]ENPEGMATWN[/d1] [d2][c1]ENP[st]AI[/st]GMWN[/c1]  
[/d2] [d3][c2]EMP[st]AI[/st]GMWN[/c2]/[/d3] [c3]EMPEGMATWN[/c3]:

'D\*\* has ENPAIGMWN, while D\*\*\* has EMPAIGMWN. D<sup>nov</sup> surrenders this work by restoring prior readings' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 37> [d1]EPIRASQHSAN[/d1] [c1]EPRISQHSAN[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have EPRISQHSAN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 37> [d1]EPIRASQHSAN[/d1] [c1]EP[st]E[/st]IRASQHSAN[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have EPEIRASQHSAN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 37> [d2]MACAIRHS[/d2] [c2]MACAIR[st]A[/st]S[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has MACAIRAS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 37> [d2]AIGIOIS[/d2] [c2]AIGEIOIS[/c2]:

Tischendorf has not noticed this. There may be a trace of a superscript E. If there is, the letter should be ascribed to the third hand.

<ch 11><v 37> [d2]KAKOUCOUMENOI[/d2] [c2]KAKOCOUMENOI[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* and, perhaps, D\*\* already, have KAKOCOUMENOI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 38> [d1]ORES[rt]E[/rt][ut]I[/ut]/[/d1] [d3][c1]ORES[ut]N[/ut]/[/c1]/[/d3]  
[c3]ORES[ut]N[/c3]:

'D\*\* has ORESIN, as does D\*\*\*. D<sup>nov</sup> attempted restoration to the former reading, but ineptly' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596). The *epsilon* of the original reading is not visible in my Xerox print.

<ch 11><v 39> [d1]EMISANTO[/d1] [c1]E[st]KO[/st]MISANTO[/c1]:

'This has already been corrected to EKOMISANTO prior to D\*\*\* who, in fact, added the breathing and accent. D\*\*<sup>c</sup> appears to have corrected it' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596). To avoid creating a new category for this lone

correction, my transcription ascribes it to the second hand. The Xerox print shows that Tischendorf is right in differentiating this corrector's work from that of the second hand.

<ch 11><v 40> [c2]PERI HMWN[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has added PERI HMWN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 40> [d2]KRITTON[/d2] [c2]KREITTON[/c2], [d2]PERI HMWN  
[/d2]:

'D\*\*\* has KREITTON. The same scribe has deleted PERI HMWN at this place' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 11><v 40> [d2]TELIWQWSIN[/d2] [c2]TELEIWQWSIN[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has TELEIWQWSIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 596).

<ch 12><v 1> TOIGAROUN KAI HMEIS:

'Cap. XII' is written in the column adjacent to this line.

<ch 12><v 1> [d2]ONKON[/d2] [d3][c2]OGKON[/c2]/[d3] [c3]ONKON[/c3]:

'D\*\*\* has OGKON. D<sup>nov</sup> restores the first reading' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 1> [d1]PROKIMENON[/d1] [c1]PROK[st]E[/st]IMENON[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have PROKEIMENON' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 2> [d2]TELIWTHN[/d2] [c2]TELEIWTHN[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has TELEIWTHN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 2> [d1][di]U[/di]PEMINE[/d1] [d2][c1][di]U[/di]PEM[st]E[/st]INAI[/c1]  
[/d2] [c2][di]U[/di]PEM[st]E[/st]INEN[/c2] [d1]TON[/d1] [c3]TON[/c3]:

'D\*\* has UPEMEINE. (The same scribe appears to have made the alteration to -NAI but to have restored -NE by error.) D\*\*\* has UPEMEINEN. D\*\* and D\*\*\* have deleted TON. D<sup>nov</sup> revokes this' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597). I have followed Tischendorf except that I have given the completed work of D\*\* to be UPEMEINAI instead of UPEMEINE. Otherwise, the fact that the ending of this word had at one stage been changed to -AI (and in a manner consistent with the second



hand) would be lost from the transcription.

<ch 12><v 3> [d1]ANALOGISASQAI[/d1] [c1]ANALOGISASQE[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -SQE' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 3> [d2][c1][it][rt]TON[/rt][/[it]/c1]/[d2] [c2]TON[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* and D\*\* already, according to a sign added at line 15, have TON TOIAUTHN for TOIAUTHN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 3> [d2]APO[/d2] [c2][di]U[/di]PO[/c2]:

D\*\*\* has UPO' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 3> [c2]EIS AUTON ANTILOGIAN[/c2] [d2]EIS EAUTOUS ANTILOGIAN[/d2]:

'D\*\*\* has rejected line 18 [i.e., EIS EAUTOUS ANTILOGIAN] and has added in its place EIS AUTON ANTILOGIAN at line 17' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 3> [d1]EKLELUMENOI[/d1] [d3][c1]EKLU[st]O[/st]MENOI[/c1]/[d3] [c3]EKLELUMENOI[/c3]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have EKLUOMENOI. D<sup>nov</sup> restores the previous reading' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 4> [d1]GAR[/d1] [d2]MECRI[/d2] [c2]MECRIS[/c2]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have deleted GAR. Furthermore D\*\*\* has written MECRIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 5> [d1]EKLELHSQAI[/d1] [c1]EKLELHSQE[/c1] [d1]PARA[/d1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -SQE. The same scribes have deleted PARA' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 5> [c2][st]MOU[/st]/[c2], [d1]OLIGWRI[/d1] [c1]OLIGWR[st]E[/st]/[c1], [d2]PAIDIAS[/d2] [c2]PAIDEIAS[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* adds MOU. For OLIGWRI PAIDIAS, D\*\* has -REI, D\*\*\* has -DEIAS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 7> [d2]PAIDIAN[/d2] [c2]PAIDEIAN[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has PAIDEIAN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 7> EIS [d2]PAIDIAN[/d2] [c2]PAIDEIAN[/c2] [d2]UPOMEINATE  
[/d2] [c2]UPOMENETE[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has UPOMENETE' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 8> [d1]ESTAI[/d1] [c1]ESTE[/c1]

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have ESTE' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 8> [d2]PAIDIAS[/d2] [c2]PAIDEIAS[/c2]:

Tischendorf (1852, 597) attributes this to the third hand. Tischendorf has PAIDIAS by error for PAIDEIAS.

<ch 12><v 8> [d1]KAI OUC UIOI ESTE[/d1] [d2][c1]ESTE KAI OUC UIOI  
[/c1]/[d2] [c2]KAI OUC UIOI ESTE[/c2]:

'D\*\* desired ESTE to be placed before KAI; D\*\*\* reverses this by deleting the transposition signs' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 9> [d2]POLU DE[/d2] [c2]POLLW[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* [makes] POLLW by deleting DE' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 10> [d1]PROS OLIGAS HMERAS EPAIDEUEN HMAS KAI TA  
DOKOUNTA AUTOIS[/d1] [c1]PROS OLIGAS HMERAS KATA [st]TO[/st]  
DOKOUN AUTOIS [d2]EPAIDEUEN[/d2] [c2]EPAIDEUON[/c2] [d2]HMAS  
[/d2]/[c1]:

'D\*\* wanted EPAIDEUEN HMAS to be placed after line 3 (after AUTOIS); also, D\*\*\* has left the transposition signs untouched. D\*\*\* definitely has corrected to EPAIDEUON and deleted HMAS. D\*\* and D\*\*\* [replace] KAI TA DOKOUNTA with KATA TO DOKOUN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 10> [d2]SUNFERON[/d2] [c2]SUMFERON[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has SUMF' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 10> [d1]METALABIN[/d1] [c1]METALAB[st]E[/st]IN[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -BEIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 11> [c2][st]DE[/st]/[c2] [d2]PAIDIA[/d2] [c2]PAIDEIA[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has PASA DE PAIDEIA' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 11> [d1]AUTOIS[/d1] [c1]AUTHS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have AUTHS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 12> [d1]PARIMENAS[/d1] [c1]PAR[st]E[/st]IMENAS[/c1]:

'D\*\* has PAREIMENAS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 14> [d1]OUDIS[/d1] [c1]OUD[st]E[/st]IS[/c1]:

'D\*\* has OUDEIS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 15> [d1]INA[/d1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have deleted INA' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 16> [c1][it]OS[/it]/[c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* add OS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 16> [d1]AUTOU[/d1] [c1][st]E[/st]AUTOU[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have EAUTOU' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 17> [d1]METEPITA[/d1] [c1]METEP[st]E[/st]ITA[/c1]:

'D\*\* has METEPEITA' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 17> [d1]LEGWN[/d1] [c1][st]Q[/st]ELWN[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have QELWN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 18> [c1][it]KAI[/it]/[c1] [d1]KEKALUMMENW[/d1] [c1]

KEKAUMENW[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have KAI KEKAUMENW' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 18> [d1]ZOFW[/d1] [c1]SKOTW[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have SKOTW' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 20> [d1]QIGH[/d1] [d2][c1]Q[st]E[/st]IGH[/c1]/[d2] [c2]QIGH[/c2]:

'D\*\* has QEIGH, D\*\*\* reverts to QIGH' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 21> [d1]OU[/d1] [c1]OU[st]TWS[/st]/[c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have OUTWS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 597).

<ch 12><v 21> [d2]EKTROMOS[/d2] [c2]ENTROMOS[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has ENTR. D\*\* is not sufficiently clear' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 12><v 22> [d1]SEIWN[/d1] [c1]SIWN[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have SIWN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 12><v 22> [c2]KAI[/c2] [d1]POLI[/d1] [c1]POL[st]E[/st]I[/c1]:

'D\*\* has POLI, D\*\*\* has KAI POLEI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 12><v 22> [d1]EPOURANIW [ns]IHM[/ns]/[d1] [d2][c1][ns]IHM[/ns]

EPOURANIW[/c1]/[d2] [c2]EPOURANIW [ns]IHM[/ns]/[c2]:

'D\*\* desired IHM to be placed before EPOURANIW; but D\*\*\* reverses this by taking away the transposition signs' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 12><v 22> [d1]MURIWN[/d1] [c1]MURI[st]A[/st]SIN[/c1] [d2]AGIWN[/d2]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have MURIASIN. Furthermore D\*\*\* has deleted AGIWN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 12><v 23> [d0]KRISH[/d0] [c0]KRI[st]T[/st]H[/c0]:

'The first hand himself has written T above the S. The S already has been deeply erased by a corrector' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 12><v 23> [d1][ns]PNI[/ns]/[d1] [c1][ns]PNA[/ns]SIN[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have PNASIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 12><v 23> [d1]TEQEMELIWMENWN[/d1] [d2][c1]TETELIWMENWN[/c1]

/[d2] [d3][c2]TETELIWMENWN[/c2]/[d3] [c3]TEQEMELEIWMENWN[/c3]:

'D\*\* has TETELIWMENWN, D\*\*\* has TETELIWMENWN. D<sup>nov</sup> restores the first reading' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 12><v 24> [d1]MESITHS[/d1] [c1]MESITH[/c1]:

'By deleting S, MESITH has been reinstated by D\*\* and D\*\*\*, so it seems' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 12><v 24> [d2]KRITTON[/d2] [c2]KREITTON[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has KREITTON' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 12><v 25> [d1]PARETHSHSQAI[/d1] [c1]PARETHSHSQE[/c1]:  
'D\*\* has -SQE' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 12><v 25> [d1]UMEIN[/d1] [d2][c1]UMIN[/c1]/[d2]:  
'D\*\* has UMIN. D\*\*\* has deleted this even though he had already added  
an accent' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 12><v 25> [d2]EFUGAN[/d2] [c2]EFUGON[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has EFUGON' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 12><v 25> [d2]PARETHSAMENOI[/d2] [c2]PARAITHSAMENOI[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has PARAIT' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 12><v 25> [d2]POLU[/d2] [c2]POLLW[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has POLLW' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 12><v 26> [d1]SIW[/d1] [c1]SEIW[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have SEIW' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 12><v 26> [d2]LEGEI[/d2]:  
'D\*\*\* has deleted LEGEI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 12><v 27> [c2][st]THN[/st]/[c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has placed THN before METAQESIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 12><v 27> [d1]MINH[/d1] [c1]M[st]E[/st]INH[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have MEINH' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 12><v 28> [d1]BASILIAN[/d1] [c1]BASIL[st]E[/st]IAN[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -LEIAN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 12><v 28> [d2]EUCARISTWS[/d2] [c2]EUARESTWS[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has EUARESTWS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 12><v 28> [d1]EULABIAS[/d1] [c1]EULAB[st]E[/st]IAS[/c1] KAI [d1]

DEOUS[/d1] [c1]AIDOUS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have EULABEIAS KAI AIDOUS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 12><v 29> [d1][ns]KS[/ns]/[d1] [c1]KAI[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have KAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 1> H FILADELFIA MENETW:

'Cap. XIII' is written adjacent to this line.

<ch 13><v 2> [d1]EPILANQANESQAI[/d1] [c1]EPILANQANESQE[/c1]:

'D\*\* has -SQE' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 3> [d1]DEDEMENWN[/d1] [c1]DESMIWN[/c1]:

'D\*\*\* and D\*\* already, so it seems, have DESMIWN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 3> [d2]KAKOUCOUMEN[/fn]W[/fn]/[d2] [c2]KAKOCOUMEN[/fn]W  
[/fn]/[c2]:

'D\*\*\* has KAKOCOUMENW' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 4> [d1]TEIMIOS[/d1] [c1]TIMIOS[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have TIMIOS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 4> [d2]GAR[/d2] [c2][st]DE[/st]/[c2] KAI MOICOUS [d1]KRINI  
[/d1] [c1]KRIN[st]E[/st]/[c1]:

'D\*\*\* has DE for GAR. Also D\*\* and D\*\*\* have KRINEI. D\*\*\* marks the end with a circumflex' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 5> [d2]ENKATALIPW[/d2] [c2]EGKATALEIPW[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has EGKATALEIPW' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 6> [d1]LEGIN[/d1] [c1]LEG[st]E[/st]IN[/c1]:

'D\*\* has LEGEIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 7> [d2]PROHGOUMEN[/fn]W[/fn]/[d2] [c2]HGOUMENWN[/c2] [c2]  
[it][di]U[/di]MWN[/it]/[c2]:

'D\*\*\* has HGOUMENWN UMWN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 7> [d1]MEIMISQAI[/d1] [c1]MIM[st]E[/st]ISQAI[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have MIMEISQAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 8> [d2]ECQES[/d2] [c2]CQES[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has CQES' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 8> [d2]AMHN[/d2]:  
'D\*\*\* has deleted this' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 9> [d1]PARAFERESQAI[/d1] [c1]PARAFERESQE[/c1]:  
'D\*\* has -SQE ' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 9> [d2]PERIPATOUNTES[/d2] [c2]PERIPATHSANTES[/c2]:  
'D\*\*\* has PERIPATHSANTES' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 10> [d1]FAGIN[/d1] [c1]FAG[st]E[/st]IN[/c1] OUK ECOUSIN [d2]  
[c1][it][rt]EXOUSIAN[/rt][it]/[c1]/[d2] [c2]EXOUSIAN[/c2]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have FAGEIN. D\*\*\* has added EXOUSIAN after ECOUSIN:  
D\*\* had already included a sign for this addition' (Tischendorf, 1852,  
598).

<ch 13><v 11> [d1]EISFERETE[/d1] [c1]EISFERETAI[/c1]:  
'D\*\* has EISFERETAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 11> [d1]ZWON[/d1] [c1]ZWWN[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have ZWWN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 11> [c2]KATAKAIETAI[/c2] [d1]KATANALISKONTAI[/d1] [d2][c1]  
KATAK[st]A[/st]IETAI[/c1]/[d2]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have KATAKAIETAI, which D\*\* has made from  
KATANALISKONTAI itself, and D\*\*\* has added to line 16, while marking  
line 17 with obelisks' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 11> [d1]PARENBOHLS[/d1] [c1]PAREMBOLHS[/c1]:  
'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have PAREMB.' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 13> [d1]ONIDISMON[/d1] [c1]ON[st]E[/st]IDISMON[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 598) attributes this to the third hand, however the position and style of the added E indicate that the second hand made this alteration.

<ch 13><v 14> [d0]ME[/d0]:

'ME has been deleted by D\*\* and D\*\*\*, but already seems to have been marked by the first hand himself' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 15> [c1][it]OUN[/it]/[c1]:

'D\*\*\* adds OUN. D\*\* has already placed a sign there' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 16> [d2]D[/d2] [c2]DE[/c2] EUPOI[di]I[/di]AS:

'D\*\*\* has DE EUPOIIAS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 16> [d2]THS[/d2]:

'D\*\*\* has rejected THS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 16> [d1]EPILANQANESQAI[/d1] [c1]EPILANQANESQE[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -SQE' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 16> [d1]EUARESTEITE[/d1] [c1]EUARESTEITAI[/c1]:

'D\*\* has EUARESTEITAI' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 17> [d1]PEIQESQAI[/d1] [c1]PEIQESQE[/c1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -SQE' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 17> [d2]WS[/d2]:

Tischendorf(1852, 598) has not noted this deletion. The third hand's deletion marks are quite clear in the Xerox print. The words of line 21 (i.e., WS LOGON APODWSONTES) are placed before those of line 20 (i.e., UPER TWN YUCWN UMWN) in some manuscripts. The deletion of WS could, perhaps, be part of an attempt by the third hand to transpose these lines. If so, an appropriate sign would be expected at line 20. I cannot see one, however.



<ch 13><v 17> [d1]APODWSONTAI[/d1] [c1]APODWSONT[st]ES[/st]/[c1]  
[d2]PERI [di]U[/di]M[fn]W[/fn]/[d2]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -SONTES. Furthermore, D\*\*\* has extinguished  
PERI UMW' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 18> [d1]PROSEUCESQAI[/d1] [c1]PROSEUCESQE[/c1] [d1]KAI  
[/d1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have -SQE. The same scribe deleted KAI' (Tischendorf,  
1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 18> [d1]PIQOMEQA[/d1] [d2][c1]P[st]E[/st]IQOMEQA[/c1]/[d2]  
[c2]PEPOIQAMEN[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* (and he alone, so it seems) has PEPOIQAMEN for PEIQOMEQA'  
(Tischendorf, 1852, 598). Tischendorf does not mention that the second  
hand appears to have added a superscript E.

<ch 13><v 18> [d2]SUNIDHSIN[/d2] [c2]SUNEIDHSIN[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has SUNEIDHSIN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 20> [d2]POIMHNA[/d2] [c2]POIMENA[/c2]:

'D\*\*\* has POIMENA. The work of D\*\* is not sufficiently clear'  
(Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 20> [d2][ns]CN[/ns]/[d2]:

'D\*\*\* has deleted CN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 21> [d1]HMAS[/d1] [c1][di]U[/di]MAS[/c1] EN PANTI [c2][st]  
ERGW[/st]/[c2]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have UMAS. D\*\*\* has added ERGW after PANTI'  
(Tischendorf, 1852, 598).

<ch 13><v 21> [d1]HMAS[/d1]:

'D\*\* and D\*\*\* have rejected HMAS' (Tischendorf, 1852, 599).

<ch 13><v 22> [d1]ANECESQAI[/d1] [c1]ANECESQE[/c1]:

'D\*\* has -SQE' (Tischendorf, 1852, 599).

<ch 13><v 22> [d1]APESTILA[/d1] [c1]APEST[st]E[/st]ILA[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1852, 599) attributes this to the third hand. However, the position and style of the added E indicate that the second hand made this alteration.

<ch 13><v 23> [d1]HMWN[/d1]:

'D\*\*\* has deleted this. D\*\* already seems to have rejected it' (Tischendorf, 1852, 599).

<ch 13><v 23> [d1]ERCHTE[/d1] [c1]ERCHTAI[/c1]:

'D\*\*\* and D\*\* already have -TAI, so it seems' (Tischendorf, 1852, 599).

<ch 13><v 25> [c2][di]U[/di]MWN[/c2] [d2]TWN AGIWN[/d2]:

'D\*\*\* has UMWN for TWN AGIWN' (Tischendorf, 1852, 599).

## References

Tischendorf, Konstantin von (ed.). 1852. *Codex Claromontanus sive epistulae Pauli omnes Graece et Latine ex codice Parisiensi celeberrimo nomine Claromontani plerumque dicto sexti ut videtur post Christum saeculi*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.

## U15

Codex HP. Moscow, Lenin Bibl., Gr. 166,1; Paris, Bibl. Nat., Coislin 202; Moscow, Hist. Mus., Vlad. 563; Paris, Bibl. Nat., suppl. Gr. 1074.

Transcribed and verified by reference to microfilm. Compared with Omont's edition (1890). Supplemented by reconstructions from Robinson (1895).

According to Elliott (1989, 46), Tischendorf dealt with this manuscript in the eighth volume of his *Monumenta Sacra Inedita*, vol. 8. Unfortunately, I have not been able to locate this volume.

The manuscript once resided at Athos. After becoming dilapidated, it was taken apart. The folios which survived are now distributed among a number of libraries, including the Lavra. The following table gives the locations and shelf numbers of the folios containing Hebrews. The present folio numbering of the remnants of the manuscript are given as well.

<i>Section</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Shelf no.</i>	<i>Folio no.</i>
1.3-5	Lenin Bibl.	Gr. 166,1	r.
1.5-8			v.
2.11-14	Bibl. Nat.	Coislin 202	6 r.
2.14-16			6 v.
3.13-15			7 r.
3.16-18			7 v.
4.12			8 r.
4.13-15			8 v.
10.1-3	Hist. Mus.	Vlad. 563	1 r.
10.3-7			1 v.
10.32-34			2 r.
10.35-38			2 v.
12.10-12	Bibl. Nat.	Suppl. Gr. 1074	5 r.
12.12-15			5 v.
13.24-25			6 r.

There are sixteen lines to the page and about sixteen letters per line. According to Omont (1890, 146) and Robinson (1895, 48), a later

hand retraced all of the letters with acidic ink. The same hand added breathings, accents, and punctuation signs. Some of the vellum has been destroyed by the chemical action of the ink. Consequently, only the outlines of some letters remain.

J. A. Robinson (1895, 48-62) deciphered imprints that the acidic ink from facing pages left on a number of the surviving ones. The resultant reconstructions have been incorporated into my transcription at Heb 2.9-10, 2.17-18, 12.16-18, and 13.21-24. Depending on the degree of legibility, Robinson gives the deciphered text in uncial, minuscule, or minuscule letters enclosed within brackets (1895, 49). Happily, these three categories coincide with my certain, uncertain, and reconstructed categories, respectively.

Besides the letters, I have transcribed only those features that are likely to belong to the first hand. As a consequence, punctuation and diaeresis marks are included but accents are not. Paragraph markers (§) are placed after the last letter preceding a line which is indented into the left-hand margin.

### *Correctors*

Omont (1890, 148) distinguishes two hands. He writes that, 'the corrections of the first hand are indicated by small superscript letters while the reviser's additions are placed in the margin and marked in the text by the small signs ⊕ or ✂ which are repeated at the beginning of the additions.'

Tischendorf (1872) and Wachtel and Witte (1994) have been consulted when ascribing alterations to these hands. The following table gives the correspondence between corrector labels:

<i>Label</i>	<i>Tisch. (1872)</i>	<i>W&amp;W (1994)</i>	<i>Date (C.)</i>
[c0]/[d0]	H*	H*	6
[c1]/[d1]	H**	H <sup>c</sup>	?

I have assumed that the scribe who retraced the manuscript is not one of these two hands. It is possible that the retracing scribe did make corrections, in which case a third category of corrections would be

required. In fact, all of the retraced text may be attributed to this third hand, including the sections of text deciphered by Robinson.

*Date and provenance*

According to Souter, 'The MS. dates from the latter half of the fifth or from the sixth century.' A colophon says that it was corrected against a copy of the scriptures held in the library of Caesarea and written by Pamphilus himself (Kenyon, 1950, 99). This suggests (but certainly does not prove) that the manuscript came from Caesarea.

<ch 1><v 3> [c1]DI' EAUTOU[/c1]:

Wachtel and Witte (1994) attribute this correction to the second hand.

<ch 1><v 3> [c1][st]TOU QRON[sc]OU[/sc]/[st]/[c1]:

There appears to be an insertion marker (+) above the last letter of DEXIA and another one preceding the insertion. The last two letters of QRONOU are contracted. The marker is shown by Omont (1890) but is not noted by Tischendorf (1872, 781). Wachtel and Witte (1994) attribute this correction to the second hand.

<ch 1><v 3> [d1]UYH??[/d1] [c1]UYHLOIS[/c1]:

The end of this word appears to have been erased and rewritten. The underlying letters are not visible. The handwriting is more consistent with the second hand than the first hand.

<ch 1><v 4> KR[ut]ITTON[/ut]:

Only the upper portion of the end of this word is visible. The remnant supports the reading KRITTON rather than KRITTWN.

<ch 1><v 5> [c1][st]EGW[/st]/[c1]:

This insertion is marked with a caret. There may be a corresponding symbol at the insertion point, but it is not visible in the microfilm. Neither Tischendorf (1872) nor Wachtel and Witte (1994) say which scribe made the alteration. I ascribe it to the second hand because the caret is characteristic of the reviser, according to Omont (1890, 148).

<ch 1><v 5> AUTO[ut]S[/ut]:

The end of this word runs over the edge of the sheet. It is possible that

there is a N superimposed between the O and the partially visible S. This could be an imprint from another part of the manuscript.

<ch 1><v 7> PNEUMATA≥:

The punctuation mark following this word may be a colon. I have followed Omont in placing a medial point here.

<ch 1><v 7> FLOGA:

Omont (1890, 170) sees a high point following this word.

<ch 2><v 12> SOU:

Omont (1890, 171) sees a medial point after this word.

<ch 2><v 12> MOU≥:

Omont (1890, 171) does not record this punctuation mark.

<ch 3><v 14> METOCOI GAR TOU [ns]CU[/ns] GEGO= NAMEN≥  
EANPER THN:

These two lines are taken directly from Omont's edition (1890, 172). I have not compared them with microfilm images.

<ch 3><v 17> AMARTHS[ut]A[/ut]SIN[c1] ~ [/c1], EPESEN[c1],[/c1], ERHMW  
[c1],[/c1]:

This punctuation has been ascribed to the second hand because the ink is too narrow for the first hand.

<ch 3><v 16> MW[di]U[/di]SEW[ut]S[/ut]:

Omont (1890, 172) records a high point after this word.

<ch 4><v 12> ARMWN:

A cross (+) is located above this word.

[f 8v]: The microfilm shows a narrow strip of letters on the right-hand side of this folio, above the first intact line. The strip is about two letters wide and consists of approximately nine lines. The letters are shown below. Underlined letters are uncertain. The final *alphas* of the second and third lines have acute accents.

.....KA...  
 .....RA...  
 .....NA...  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....S  
 .....NA...  
 .....IS...

<ch 4><v 14> [c1]ADELFOI[/c1]:

Tischendorf (1872, 793) and Wachtel and Witte (1994) ascribe this alteration to the second hand.

<ch 4><v 14> UION:

There may be diaeresis above the I.

<ch 4><v 14> O[ut]M[/ut]OLO[rt]GI[/rt]=AS ~ ¶:

The last two letters of this word occur first on an indented line. Usually, the first letters of an indented line begin a new paragraph. I have placed a paragraph marker immediately after these letters.

<ch 10><v 1> AGA=QWN:

Omont (1890, 174) records a comma after this word.

<ch 10><v 1> TELIW[ut]S[/ut]A[ut]I[/ut]:

Omont (1890, 174) records a high point after this word. His transcription erroneously has TELEIWSAI.

<ch 10><v 2> [d1][ut]OU[/ut][[/d1] [c1][ut]OU[/ut][rt][it]K AN[/it]/rt]/[/c1]:

There is a letter or symbol above OU. This may be one of the second hand's correction symbols. If so, then it is possible that the second hand inserted the letters KAN here, thereby producing OUK AN. Accordingly, my transcription supplies these letters as reconstructed text. This is at variance with Tischendorf (1872, 813), according to whom the first hand omitted OUK. Wachtel and Witte (1994) note that the first hand wrote OU, as transcribed here.

<ch 10><v 6> HUDOKH=S[ut]A[/ut]S[ut] ~ [/ut]¶:

The last three letters of this word begin an indented line. A mark located after HUDOKH on the preceding line may be due to an erasure, suggesting that a correction has been made here. As in 4.14 above, a paragraph marker has been placed immediately after these letters.

<ch 10><v 7> [rt][di]l[/di]D[/rt]OU:

There appears to be diaeresis above the lacuna where the l was located.

<ch 10><v 32> [ut]UPEM[/ut][rt]l[/rt][ut]N[/ut]A[rt]TE PA[/rt]QH[ut]M[/ut][rt]ATWN[/rt]:

According to Omont's transcription (1890, 175), the letters UPE are not visible. It is possible that the top parts of some of the last two letters of UPEMINATE and the first two letters of PAQHMATWN are visible. These letters may become more clear if the two parts of the vellum, which are separated along the lettering, are placed back together. The spelling UPEMINATE has been supplied as the lacuna does not appear to have sufficient room to accommodate an E before the l.

<ch 10><v 33> ON[/ut][rt]l[/rt][ut]D[/ut][rt]ISMOIS[/rt]:

There is only enough space for one letter between the remnants of the N and D. There is a mark on the parchment at this point which is more consistent with an l than an E.

<ch 10><v 33> [ut]Q[/ut][rt]EA[/rt]=TRIZOMENOI:

There is a trace of a letter at the edge of the parchment. It is consistent with a Q or an E . The location of the end of the previous word, QLIYESIN, is difficult to determine as its last few letters are indistinct. Therefore, it is difficult to say whether the trace should be from a Q or an E. I have opted for Q.

<ch 10><v 33> G[/ut]E[ut]NHQ[/ut][rt]ENTES[/rt]:

The E following the Q may be partially intact.

<ch 10><v 34> SUNEPAQHSATE KAI THN ARPAGHN TWN:

Omont (1890, 175) divides the lines between -QHSATE and KAI.



<ch 10><v 34> ECEIN:

The first E of this word may be partially preserved in the manuscript.

<ch 10><v 34> [c1][it]EN OU[ns]NOI[/ns]S[/it]/[c1]:

There appears to be a superscript insertion marker (+) before KAI and another one preceding the insertion. There is an insertion at Heb 1.3 which is marked by the cross sign (+). Omont (1890, 175) records a medial point after the insertion.

<ch 10><v 35> [rt]MH[/rt]:

This word may have been omitted by the first hand.

<ch 10><v 35> [ut]AP[/ut][rt]OB[/rt][ut]ALHTE OUN[/ut]:

A number of these letters might be more legible if the two halves of the parchment were placed back together.

<ch 10><v 35> UMWN:

Omont (1890, 175) records a medial point after this word.

<ch 10><v 37> [ut]O[/ut]S[/fn]O[/fn].:

The last O of this word is unusually narrow, suggesting that it may belong to a corrector.

<ch 12><v 10> |f 5r|:

Arabic numerals are written in the upper right-hand corners of the recto sides of these folios. There is a Greek number which is not quite legible in the bottom left-hand margin of this folium. According to Omont (1890, 176), the number is *mu digamma* (i.e., 46).

<ch 12><v 10> META[ut]L[/ut]ABEI[rt]N[/rt]:

A trace of the last letter of this word may be visible.

<ch 12><v 11> GEGUMNAS[ut]M[/ut][rt]E[/rt]=NOIS≥:

Omont (1890, 175) does not record a punctuation mark after this word.

<ch 12><v 11> [d1]DIKAIOSUNHS[/d1] [c1]DIKAIOSUN[ut]EI[/ut]S[/c1]:

What appears to be an E is superimposed on the original H. Apparently, the second hand wanted to change the spelling to EI. Omont (1890, 176)

records a high point after this word.

<ch 12><v 15> [rt]TH[/rt]S M[ut]IANQ[/ut]WS[rt]I[/rt][ut]N P[/ut]O[ut]L[/ut]  
LOI ~ :

There is what appears to be a fragmentary text following this line. In fact, it is the mirror-image imprint of the preceding lines.

<ch 13><v 24> HGOUME[ut]NOUS[/ut]:

Robinson's reconstruction (1895, 62) does not have UMWN following this word.

subscription: [c1]PAULOU APOSTOLOU EPISTOLH≥ PROS EBRAIOUS ~  
EGRAFH APO [di]I[/di]TALIAS≥ DIA TIMOQEOU≥ STIC[st]OI[/st] YG ~  
[/c1]:

This note appears to have been added by the second hand. The number of *stichoi* is YG (i.e., 703).

## References

Murphy, Harold S. 1959. 'On the text of codices H and 93'. *Journal of biblical literature* 78, 228-237.

Omont, M. H. 1890. 'Notice sur un très ancien manuscrit grec en onciales des Épîtres de Saint Paul'. In *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*. Vol. 33. Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 141-192.

Robinson, J. Armitage. 1895. *Euthaliana: studies of Euthalius, Codex H of the Pauline epistles, and the Armenian version*. Texts and studies, vol. 3, no. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Repr. 1967. Nendeln: Kraus Reprint.

## U16

Codex I. Washington, Smithsonian Inst., 06. 275.

Transcribed and verified by reference to Sanders (1918).

Manuscript page numbers are those given by Sanders. Letters enclosed by square brackets have been transcribed as reconstructed text. Those with sublinear points have been transcribed as uncertain text. I have not included punctuation that Sanders placed in reconstructed sections of text. Paragraph division is indicated by indenting the initial letters of the line following the place of division.

Sanders' edition employs pairs of rough and smooth breathing marks to represent what must be diaeresis marks in the manuscript. I transcribe these as diaeresis marks wherever they occur in Sanders' edition (i.e., Heb 6.2, 10.7, 10.27, 10.37, 11.22, 11.23, 12.7, 13.7, and 13.17).

### *Provenance*

According to Sanders (1918, 1), 'The four MSS were bought by Mr. Freer of an Arab dealer named Ali in Gizeh, near Cairo'. I presume that the manuscript was copied and lived its life in Egypt.

<ch 4><v 4> KATEPAUSEN:

Sanders (1918, 296) prints KATEUPASEN but does not note the supposed variation in his apparatus. I assume that this is a printing error.

<ch 4><v 6> [di]A[/di]POLEIPETAI:

Sanders (1918, 296) places a line representing diaeresis above the initial A. It is most unusual for an A to have diaeresis. Perhaps this should be a smooth breathing?

<ch 5><v 7> [ut]AUT[fn]O[/fn][[/ut]:

Sanders (1918, 296) writes: 'auton fortasse in marg. man sec.' That is, 'auton, perhaps, by the second hand, in the margin.' If the word was written in the margin by the second hand then it may have been to replace the auton in the text.

<ch 6><v 2> BAPTISQEN[ut]N[/ut]:

The manuscript has either BAPTISQENN or BAPTISQENH (Sanders, 1918, 297). BAPTISQENH can be resolved into BAPTISQEN and H, but the resulting sentence does not make sense.

AIWNIOU¶ <ch 6><v 3> [rt]KAI TO[/rt]=UTO:

The letters -UTO are indented. This indicates that the scribe's practice was to indent the line following the point of division, which probably follows AIWNIOU. Sanders does not see a punctuation mark there.

<ch 7><v 7> [rt]CWRIS DE PASHS ANTILOGIAS TO[/rt]:

The number KD is written adjacent to this line (Sanders, 1918, 298).

<ch 7><v 19> [d0]??[/d0] [c0]OUDEN[/c0]:

Sanders (1918, 298) writes, 'ouden, ou in ras man 1'. That is, the first hand has written OU over an erasure. There is no indication of what the erased letters might have been.

<ch 8><v 9> [rt]K[/rt][ut]AT[/ut][rt]A[/rt]:

Sanders' edition (1918, 299) has a sublinear dot beneath the square bracket following T. I have assumed this to be a printer's error whereby the sublinear dots meant for the first A and T have been shifted to the right.

<ch 9><v 16> DIATIQEMENOU:

This word stands at the end of a rather short line. This suggests that there was a paragraph division here.

<ch 10><v 8> [ut]H[/ut]BOULHQHS [ut]AN[/ut]:

Sanders (1918, 301) transcribes this as *hboulhqhsan*, which does not make sense. However, the reading does make sense if HBOULHQHS and AN are separated: *You expressed a [conditional] wish, above, saying that you neither desired nor took pleasure in sacrifices and offerings, burnt offerings, and sacrifices for sins.* (I owe this insight to my supervisor, Dr Moore.)

<ch 10><v 8> LEG[fn]W[/fn]:

Sanders' transcription (1918, 301) indicates that there is uncertainty concerning the final *nu* of this word.

<ch 10><v 18> TO[rt]UTWN[/rt]:

The second T is placed within square brackets and is marked by a sublinear dot in Sanders' edition (1918, 301). I assume that the sublinear dot is a printer's error.

<ch 10><v 36> [sb][[/sb]NA:

Whereas a rough breathing is expected, Sanders' edition (1918, 302) places a smooth breathing above the l. Perhaps the manuscript has diaeresis or an accent here?

|p 133|:

Folio number KE is written at the top of this page (Sanders, 1918, 304).

## References

Sanders, Henry A. (ed.). 1918. *The New Testament manuscripts in the Freer Collection*. Part 2. *The Washington manuscript of the epistles of Paul*. University of Michigan studies humanistic series, 9. New York: Macmillan.

## U18

Codex KP. Moscow, Hist. Mus., V. 93, S. 97.

Transcribed and verified by reference to photographs held at the Institute for New Testament Textual Research in Münster.

This manuscript is written in two columns with about 27 lines per column. After every few lines of biblical text, there is a commentary. The biblical text is written in uncial script, while the commentary is minuscule script. Normally, biblical text is preceded by a section number and followed by a colon and dash (:-). The first letter of a new section of biblical text is indented into the left-hand column in the manner often used to indicate paragraph divisions in other manuscripts. Where this occurs, a paragraph symbol (¶) is included in my transcription.

Each punctuation mark is transcribed by reference to its position within the horizontal band defined by all letters excepting those with long vertical strokes, such as U, F, and Y:

<i>Position</i>	<i>Form</i>	<i>Description</i>
Lower third	.	full-stop (.)
	,	comma (,)
Middle third	.	medial point ( $\geq$ )
	,	medial comma ( $\leq$ )
Upper third	.	high point ( $\sim$ )
	,	apostrophe (')

Paragraph division is sometimes indicated by a space in the line preceding indented initial letters. A sloping, superscript dash indicates hyphenation. Contractions and compendia are used extensively. Where a word ending with the letters OU or OS occurs at the end of a line, the letters are occasionally represented by ⵝ or ⵞ, respectively. The *kaiv* compendium is not usually employed if KAI is the first word in a sentence. Double *tau* is often written as a compendium that has the appearance of a *tau* followed by a cursive *gamma*. DIO is transcribed as DI O when there is an apostrophe following DI and a rough breathing above the O. In one instance, OTAN is transcribed as OT AN because an

apostrophe follows OT.

Quotations are occasionally marked by a marginal reference and quotation markers (>). There is sometimes a break for commentary where textual division is not expected (see, for example, PISTEI at Heb 11.29 and 11.31).


### *Correctors*

There appear to be corrections by the first and second hands. Commas appear to be finer than other the punctuation, suggesting that they were added by the second hand.


<ch 1><v 2> KLHRONOM[fn][ut]O[/ut]/[fn]:

There appears to be a minute O following the M at the end of this word.

<ch 1><v 2> [kc]K[/kc]:

The *kaiv* compendium is a cursive K with a tail:  .

<ch 1><v 6> PR[sc]OS[/sc]KUNHSATWSAN:

The compendium of O and S has the following appearance:  .

<ch 2><v 6> EPISKE[sc]PT[/sc]H:

The compendium of P and T has the following appearance:  .

<ch 2><v 7> HLATTWSAS:

The double *tau* is written in a cursive ligature which has the appearance of a *tau* followed by a *gamma*.

<ch 2><v 10> TA PANTA (second occurrence):

There may have been a correction involving the last letter of TA and the first letter of PANTA.

<ch 2><v 13> [kc]K[/kc]:

This *kaiv* compendium is in the form of a *digamma*.

<ch 3><v 8> EN:

The N looks like an U. As a consequence, the reader might see AUTW

instead of EN TW.

<ch 3><v 10> PROSWCQ[di]H[/di]SA:

Diaeresis on an H is unusual. It is possible that the scribe mistook the H for an I.

<ch 3><v 17> TISIN DE PROSWCQISEN:

The first letter is indented into the left-hand column, indicating the start of a new paragraph. This is the first occurrence in Hebrews of a new paragraph which is not associated with a break for the commentary.

<ch 4><v 2> KAKEINOI:

A smooth breathing indicates crasis.

<ch 4><v 4> P[sc]OU[/sc]:

The compendium of O and U has the following appearance: ⲟ̅.

<ch 4><v 7> EIRHTAI≥:

There is an asterisk (ì) following this word and an associated marginal comment preceded by another asterisk. The text of the marginal comment is transcribed below:

OU GAR EISHL  
QON EIS THN KA  
TAP<sup>A</sup>AUSIN AU  
TOU THN PISTI  
OU PROSHKAU  
MENOI +

<ch 4><v 11> KATAP<sup>A</sup>AUSIN:

There is a mark above the second A. It appears to be ink transferred from a smudge above a S in the fifth line of the facing page (i.e., 254 recto).

<ch 4><v 12> [kc]K[/kc] (first occurrence):

This kaiv compendium has the following form: ⲕ̅.

<ch 4><v 12> [kc]K[/kc] (fourth occurrence):



This kaiv compendium has the form of a *digamma*. The scribe employs three different forms of kaiv compendium in this verse!

<ch 4><v 14> EECONTES:

The scribe has accidentally written E twice: once at the end of one line, and again at the beginning of the following line.


<ch 5><v 7> [d0]EISAKOU[ut]Q[/ut]/[d0] [c0]EISAKOUSQEIS[/c0]:

The first hand appears to have written EISAKOUQ, erased the Q, then to have completed the word correctly with -SQEIS.

<ch 7><v 17> MARTUREI GAR.:

According to the punctuation, this clause ends with GAR.

<ch 8><v 2> [kc]K[/kc]:

This form of the kaiv compendium (  ) seems to be used with uncial text.

<ch 8><v 5> [d0][ut]K[/ut]/[d0] [c0]SKIA[/c0]:

The S has been written over another letter which begins with a vertical stroke. There appears to be a trace of one of the diagonal strokes of a K in the middle of the S, suggesting that the first hand began to write a K after missing the S, then superimposed a S to correct the mistake.

<ch 8><v 5> DEIQENTA:

Spelled thus. (I thank Dr Maurice Robinson for checking this word against photographs held at the Institute for New Testament Textual Research.)

POS ~ <ch 8><v 8> MEMFOMENOS:

The marginal reference JEREMION is written vertically in the right-hand column. It spans three lines, beginning with this line.

<ch 8><v 8> AUTOUS:

The acute accent above the second-last letter confirms that this is AUTOUS and not AUTOIS.

<ch 8><v 9> THS:

The vellum under this word is discoloured, possibly as the result of an erasure.

<ch 8><v 9> [d0]CEIRO[ut]T[/ut]/[d0] [c0]CEIROS[/c0]:

The first hand appears to have written T by error, then to have altered it to S.

<ch 8><v 9> KAGW:

A smooth breathing indicates crasis.

<ch 8><v 12> [d1][ut]E[/ut]LEOS[/d1] [c1][di]I[/di]LEOS[/c1]:

The first letter of this word, which may have been an E, has been erased and replaced with an I. The replacement letter does not appear to be consistent with the first hand, so it has been ascribed to the second hand.

<ch 9><v 4> [d1]RAB=DOS[/d1] [c1]RA=BDOS[/c1]:

An uncial *beta* at the end of the line has been deleted with a single, narrow stroke. A cursive *beta* has been inserted at the beginning of the following line. I assume that the second hand is responsible for this alteration.

<ch 9><v 4> [d0]A[ut]M[/ut]/[d0] [c0]AARWN[/c0]:

What appears to be the letter M has been corrected to A, seemingly by the first hand.

<ch 9><v 4> PLAKES:

There is a mark above this word which appears to be a misplaced smooth breathing.

<ch 9><v 11> MEZONOS:

This word is usually spelled MEIZONOS.

<ch 9><v 13> KAQAROTHTA:

The vellum under this word is discoloured, possibly as the result of an erasure.

<ch 9><v 19> KAI USSWPOU ≥ AUTO TE TO:

A marginal reference EXODOU is written vertically in the right-hand column.

<ch 10><v 3> ENIAUTON ~ :

What appears to be a corrected or deleted accent is located above the O.

<ch 10><v 5> LEGEI. QUSIAN KAI PROS=:

The marginal reference YALMOU LQ is written vertically in the left-hand column.

<ch 10><v 8> MARTIAS OU=:

This line is indented to the right, an unusual occurrence in this manuscript. The scribe may have accidentally omitted these letters, only to insert them later. If this omission occurred through *homoioteleuton* then the implied line-length for the exemplar is nine letters. This is rather short. The corresponding line of Codex Sinaiticus has fourteen letters. Another line which is indented to the right occurs at 11.27. It seems likely, therefore, that the scribe occasionally chose this format as a matter of style.

<ch 10><v 20> KATAPETASMATOS:

There seems to have been a correction involving the K. The superimposed text appears to be that of the first hand.

<ch 10><v 25> EGKATALEIPONTES:

What appears to be a corrected or deleted accent is located above the N.

<ch 10><v 38> EUDOKIEI:

This unusual spelling may be a scribal error.

<ch 11><v 7> [d0]EULAB[ut]E[/ut][[/d0] [c0]EULABHQEIS[/c0]:

A smudge above the H may be part of an erased E. The scribe appears to have written part of an E, only to erase its upper part, finally replacing it with an H.

<ch 11><v 16> POLIN ~ ¶:

The vellum beneath this word is discoloured, possibly as the result of an erasure.

<ch 11><v 24> GENOME[ut]N[/ut]OS:

The letter tagged as uncertain is smudged.

<ch 11><v 25> [d0]EC[ut]U[/ut]/[d0] [c0]ECEIN[/c0]:

The scribe appears to have written *upsilon* after the *chi*, then to have altered it to *epsilon*.

<ch 11><v 27> KATELIPEN:

The vellum beneath this word is discoloured, possibly as the result of an erasure.

<ch 11><v 27> BASILEWS:-¶:

This line is indented to the right (cf. 10.8).

<ch 11><v 28> [d1]QIGEL[/d1] [c1]QIG[st]H[/st]/[c1]:

A decision table gives an ambiguous result for this alteration:

<i>Corrector</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Ambiguous</i>
<i>Style</i>			<i>x</i>
<i>Size</i>			<i>x</i>
<i>Pen-width</i>	<i>x</i>		
<i>Shade</i>		<i>x</i>	

The alteration has been ascribed to the second hand because it is unlikely that the first hand would have changed his own spelling.

<ch 11><v 29> PISTEL:-¶:

This seems to be an unusual place to put a text division. Apparently, breaks for commentary do not always coincide with pauses in sense.

<ch 11><v 31> PISTEL:-¶:

This seems to be an unusual place to put a text division (cf. 11.29).

<ch 11><v 34> MACAIR[st][sc]AS[/sc]/[st]:

This scribal contraction has the following appearance: ✓. Gardthausen (1913, 335) lists this as a symbol for AS.

<ch 11><v 39> [d1]T[ut]A[ut][rt]S[rt] EPAGGELIA[rt]S[rt][d1] [c1]THN  
EPAGGELIAN[c1]:

A decision table gives an ambiguous result for this alteration:

<i>Corrector</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Style</i>	x	
<i>Size</i>	x	
<i>Pen-width</i>		x
<i>Shade</i>		x

I believe that a corrector is more likely to have changed the case.

<ch 12><v 10> METALABEIN:

The vellum beneath this word is discoloured, possibly as the result of an erasure.

<ch 12><v 14> EIRHNNH:

The vellum beneath this word is discoloured, possibly as the result of an erasure.

<ch 12><v 20> K' AN:

The apostrophe following K gives the reading K(AI) AN rather than KAN.

<ch 12><v 23> [d0]PNEUMA[ut]TWS[ut][d0] [c0]PNEUMASIN[c0]:

The scribe appears to have written PNEUMATWS. The W and S were then erased and the T was changed into a S.

<ch 12><v 23> TETELIWMENWN:

There is a smudge beneath the first T of this word. (The T is slightly smudged as well.) This may be due to a fault in the parchment. Alternatively, an erasure may have been made. The rest of the word is consistent with the first hand so I have not transcribed it as a correction.

<ch 12><v 24> TISMOU. KREITTON LALOUN=:

There are a number of marks along this line. They may be imprints from text on the facing page. Alternatively, they may be due to a corrector.

<ch 12><v 24> ABEL ~ :

There may be another letter after the L.

<ch 12><v 26> EPHGGELTAI LEGWN. ETI:

A reference to AGGAI is written in the left-hand column.

<ch 13><v 8> AUTOS:

The first letter of this word may have been corrected. The superimposed text appears to be of the first hand.

<ch 13><v 19> APOKATASTAQW:

The K shows evidence of having been corrected. The superimposed text appears to belong to the first hand. The original letter may have been part of a ST compendium, a M, or a N.

subscription: STICWN YG:

That is, 703. The same number is given in U15.

Transcribed and verified by reference to a Xerox copy.

This transcription was made from a Xerox copy kindly supplied by the Angelica Library in Rome. While being of adequate quality, the copy exhibits low definition in some places. Consequently, there are numerous instances where confusion between similar looking letters (e.g. H, N, P and E, O, S) is possible. Unless the Xerox copy gave me reason for pause, I transcribed such letters as certain. In this way, a great profusion of uncertainty tags has been avoided. As another consequence, my transcription probably omits some punctuation and diaeresis marks that may be visible in the manuscript itself. At the same time, some of the punctuation marks that appear in my transcription may be spurious. Ellipses (...) have been used to mark spaces where punctuation may reside as well as spaces associated with punctuation, provided that the spaces are not less than 2 mm in width.

The manuscript is written in two columns of twenty six lines each. Each leaf has dimensions of approximately 20 cm width by 34 cm height. Breathings and accents have not been transcribed because it is not clear whether the first hand or a corrector supplied them. Apostrophes are included even though they may not be by the first hand. Punctuation has been included as well. A medial stroke, which sometimes looks like a comma, occurs frequently. It has been transcribed as a medial point throughout. The scribe frequently employs a contraction of OU (Ϸ) (cf. Gardthausen, 1913, 339). It is transcribed as [sc]O[st]U[/st][[/sc]].

My punctuation classification rules divide punctuation into lower, medial, and upper points. These rules may cause a distinction between marks that were one and the same mark in the scribe's mind. This problem is exacerbated by the scribe's tendency to place punctuation at a height of two-thirds of the text height. Consequently, it often happens that punctuation is classified into different categories due to small differences in vertical position.

*Correctors*

At least three scribes appear to have worked on this manuscript. A second hand has added comments at the top of some pages and has included marginal comments, an example being TELOS TWN B at f. 176 r., line eight.

The upper corners of the folios have been repaired. A third hand has supplied the replacement text at these places. This text is transcribed as corresponding deletions and additions by the third hand. The text added by the third hand is assumed to be that of the first hand. To illustrate, Heb 1.1 has:

[d2][rt]TOIS PRO[/rt]FHTAIS[/d2] [c2]TOIS PROFHTAIS[/c2].

Here, the third hand has added the missing letters TOIS PRO. These letters are assumed to be the original text, which is reconstructed as [rt] TOIS PRO[/rt]FHTAIS. The third hand's text is obtained by deleting [rt] TOIS PRO[/rt]FHTAIS and adding TOIS PROFHTAIS. Examples of repaired sections of text are found at Heb 1.1, 2.2, 2.8, and regularly thereafter throughout Hebrews.

The order of correctors was deduced by examining a line of text at the top of f. 176 r., where the third hand completed part of a line of text by the second hand.

<ch 1><v 1> [d2][rt]TOIS PRO[/rt]FHTAIS[/d2] [c2]TOIS PROFHTAIS[/c2],  
[d2]ES[rt]C[/rt]ATOU[/d2] [c2]ESCATOU[/c2]:

The third hand has supplied text for a repaired section. Such additions are found regularly throughout this transcription.

<ch 1><v 2> EQHK[fn]E[/fn]:

The mark I have transcribed as a final *nu* superscript may be spurious.

<ch 1><v 3> TW RHMATI IHS:

This T is enlarged, perhaps indicating a sense-pause.

<ch 1><v 5> EIS [ns]PRA[/ns] ~ ... KAI AUTOS ESTAI:

Here is an example of quotation markers (>) employed by the first hand.



<ch 1><v 6> OTAN:

The initial O of this word is enlarged.

<ch 1><v 10> KAI (1st occurrence):

The initial K of this word is enlarged and indented, indicating a paragraph division.

|f 176r||c a|:

The following text is written at the top of the page:

TOU[ut]DO[/ut]CAGGELOUMICAHLADELFOI

It is written by the first scribe, with ADELFOI completed by the second scribe as part of a repair. This line shows the order in which the various hands worked on this manuscript.

<ch 1><v 12> KLEIYOUSIN ~ ¶:

TELOS TWN B has been written at the end of this line. This hand exhibits differences from the first hand and the scribe who supplied text for the repaired corners (i.e., the third hand). I regard this second hand as responsible for the titles written in the top margins. The word TELOS is contracted (τῆ).

<ch 2><v 1> [d1]AKOUSQHSIN[/d1] [c1]AKOUSQ[ut]E[/ut][rt]l[/rt]SIN[/c1]:

A corrector appears to have changed the spelling of this word. The H of the first hand has an E and, probably, an l superimposed. A decision table gives equal weight to the second and third hands:

<i>Corrector</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Style</i>			<i>x</i>
<i>Size</i>			<i>x</i>
<i>Pen-width</i>		<i>x</i>	
<i>Shade</i>		<i>x</i>	

I am inclined to ascribe this correction to the second hand because the shade and width of the ink are more characteristic of the second hand than the style and size are characteristic of the third hand. That is, the second hand is more likely to have used a slightly uncharacteristic size and style to suit the correction than the third hand is to have changed ink and pen, in my opinion.

<ch 2><v 8> [d1][sc]U[/sc]PETA[rt]XAS[/rt]/[d1] [d2][c1][st]U[/st]PETA[rt]XAS  
[rt]/[c1]/[d2]:

The first hand appears to have formed the initial U of UPETAXAS from the final A of PANTA and the P of UPETAXAS. A superscript U has been subsequently added, apparently by the second hand.

<ch 2><v 8> UP[ut]O[/ut]TAXAI:

The *omicron* is feint.

<ch 2><v 10> ARCIGON:

It is possible that the letters transcribed as IG are a ligature of H and G, in which case this word would have its usual spelling of ARCHGON. There is no sign of the horizontal of an H in the Xerox copy.

<ch 2><v 14> TON TO KRATOS E[ut]C[/ut]ON=:

This line begins with a small vertical stroke located where the first letter of the line normally would be expected.

<ch 2><v 17> ADELFOIS:

The letter F in this word is enlarged, suggesting that there is a paragraph-division in the previous line. There is no punctuation or spacing in that line.

<ch 2><v 18> [ut]E[/ut]N:

A smudge obscures the text here.

<ch 2><v 18> BOHQHSAI¶...:

A marker (¶), possibly by the first hand, occurs at the end of this line.

<ch 3><v 8> T[st][sc]OU[/sc]/[st]:

This contraction of TOU (ϑ) is not found in Gardthausen (1913).

<ch 3><v 10> [d2]EI[rt]PON:

The diaeresis above the I does not appear to be original. It may have been added by the third hand when the manuscript was repaired.

<ch 4><v 1> OUN MHPOTE

KATALEIPOME=:

There appears to be an erasure here. There is a trace of a K following MHPOTE. The first hand seems to have begun writing KATALEIPOMENHS after MHPOTE. According to Tischendorf (1872, 790), the variant KATALIPOMENHS occurs at this location in a number of manuscripts.

<ch 5><v 14> KALOU, KAKOU:

In both of these words, there is a mark above the U which may be an apostrophe.

<ch 6><v 2> EPIQESEWS:

The I may have been corrected.

<ch 6><v 8> EIS:

The I and S are spaced so as to accommodate the tail of a R from the preceding line.

<ch 6><v 9> PERI:

The letter P in this word is enlarged. There is a corresponding text division in the previous line.

<ch 6><v 13> OUDENOS:

There is a mark following this word which may be punctuation but which appears more likely to be an accent from the following line.

<ch 7><v 2> ABRAAM' ~ :

A reading mark and high point follow this word. The same occurs at 7.5 and 7.10 as well.

<ch 7><v 19> [d1]EPEISAGWGEI[/d1] [c1]EPEISAGWGH[/c1]:

A corrector appears to have altered EI to form an H. This correction has been ascribed to the second hand on the basis of the following decision table:

<i>Corrector</i>	0	1	2	<i>Ambiguous</i>
<i>Style</i>				<i>x</i>

<i>Size</i>		<i>x</i>
<i>Pen-width</i>	<i>x</i>	
<i>Shade</i>	<i>x</i>	

<ch 7><v 21> O:

This letter is enlarged, and the rough breathing is placed inside it.

<ch 7><v 23> [d1]PLEIONOS[/d1] [c1]PLEIONES[/c1]:

The O appears to have been changed into an E. This correction has been ascribed to the second hand on the basis of the following decision table:

<i>Corrector</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>Ambiguous</i>
<i>Style</i>				<i>x</i>
<i>Size</i>				<i>x</i>
<i>Pen-width</i>		<i>x</i>		
<i>Shade</i>				<i>x</i>

<ch 8><v 4> ONTWN:

This word has a space between ON and TWN.

<ch 8><v 5> MWUSHS:

What appears to be a rough breathing is located above the U. If anything, it should be a diaeresis mark.

<ch 8><v 5> OREI<sup>~</sup>:

There is a fault in the parchment following this word.

<ch 8><v 12> TIWN AUTWN<sup>≥</sup>:

There is a large gap in this line caused by a hole in the parchment.

<ch 8><v 12> [d2][rt]ETI[/rt]/[d2] [c2]T[di]!/[di]≥...[/c2]:

The third hand has written TI instead of the usual ETI. There is a space following TI, suggesting that there would have been room for an original ETI.

<ch 9><v 3> DEUTERON:

There is a space between the U and T.

<ch 9><v 3> LEGOMENH:

There is a space between the E and G.

<ch 9><v 4> PERIKEKALUMMENHN:

There is a space between the H and N.

<ch 9><v 4> CRUSIW:

There is a large gap in the middle of this word due to the hole in the parchment. The same hole is responsible for a similar gap at 8.12

<ch 9><v 7> [d1]AUTOU[/d1] [c1][st]E[/st]AUTOU[/d1]:

A corrector has inserted an E to produce EAUTOU. This has been ascribed to the second hand on the basis of the following decision table:

<i>Corrector</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>Ambiguous</i>
<i>Style</i>		<i>x</i>		
<i>Size</i>				<i>x</i>
<i>Pen-width</i>		<i>x</i>		
<i>Shade</i>				<i>x</i>

<ch 9><v 11> [d0]THSEWS[/d0] [c0][st]K[/st]THSEWS[/c0]:

A superscript *kappa* has been added, apparently by the first hand:

<i>Corrector</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>Ambiguous</i>
<i>Style</i>	<i>x</i>			
<i>Size</i>				<i>x</i>
<i>Pen-width</i>	<i>x</i>			
<i>Shade</i>	<i>x</i>			

<ch 9><v 14> LATREUEIN:

A fault in the parchment affects the T and R.

<ch 9><v 15> TOUTO:

There is a space between TOU and TO.

<ch 9><v 18> EGKAIKENISTAI:

There is a space between the E and N.

<ch 9><v 19> MWUSEWS:

A mark above the U may be diaeresis.

<ch 9><v 19> ERIOU/KOKKINO:

There is a mark in the space between ERIOU and KOKKINO which may be part of a K.

<ch 9><v 26> AIWNWN≥:

Instead of being punctuation, this mark may be part of a R from the preceding line.

<ch 10><v 1> [d2]PROSERCO[ut]M[/ut][rt]ENOUS[/rt]/[d2]:

There is a space located between the S and E.

<ch 10><v 3> [c2]ENIAUTON[/c2]≥:

The same applies as for 9.26, above.

<ch 10><v 4> AMARTIAS ~:

The same applies as for 9.26, above.

<ch 10><v 10> SWMATOS:

A vertical bar which resembles an *iota* follows the *alpha*. I think that it is spurious, possibly being due to ink that has seeped through from the reverse side.

<ch 10><v 14> [d0]AGIZOMENOUS[/d0] [c0]AGI[st]A[/st]ZOMENOUS[/c0]:

This correction has been ascribed to the first hand on the basis of the following decision table:

<i>Corrector</i>	0	1	2	<i>Ambiguous</i>
<i>Style</i>		<i>x</i>		
<i>Size</i>				<i>x</i>
<i>Pen-width</i>	<i>x</i>			
<i>Shade</i>	<i>x</i>			

The G and I appear to have a diagonal stroke between them, making ANAZOMENOUS possible. This is unlikely to be a N because the diagonal matches part of a D in the corresponding position on the facing page.

<ch 10><v 24> [c1][it]KAI[/it]/[c1]:

This correction has been ascribed to the second hand on the basis of the following decision table:

Corrector	0	1	2	Ambiguous
Style				<i>x</i>
Size				<i>x</i>
Pen-width		<i>x</i>		
Shade		<i>x</i>		

Carets (  ,  ) mark the insertion point and the correction. Curiously, the insertion point is located above the middle of AGAGHS.

<ch 10><v 34> KREITTONA:

There is a caret above this word but there does not appear to be a corresponding correction.

<ch 11><v 9> EIS GHN:

A symbol (  ) appears between these two words. It could represent THN, which is found here in other manuscripts. Gardthausen (1913) does not list this symbol.

<ch 11><v 18> KLHQHSETAI:

There is a space between E and T.

<ch 11><v 26> HG[ut]HSA[/ut]MEN[st][sc]OS[/sc]/[st]:

This scribal contraction of OS is a miniature, superscript *omicron* (see Gardthausen, 1913, 339).

<ch 11><v 33> DIKAIOSUN[fn]H[/fn]:

The letters N and H are written as a ligature.

<ch 12><v 4> ANTAGWNH[rt]ZOMENOI[/rt]:

Part of the original letter which followed the *eta* remains. At first sight, the remnant looks like a single vertical stroke. It may be part of a *zeta* in which the initial serif has merged with the lower part of the diagonal.

## U25

Codex PP. St. Petersburg, Russian National Library, Gr. 225.

Transcribed and verified by reference to Tischendorf (1865).

This transcription has been made directly from Tischendorf's edition as Xerox prints of microfilms are not readable. This is because the manuscript is a palimpsest. The superimposed text is minuscule 1834, a Euthalian manuscript. The underlying biblical text is written in one column with 24 lines per column.

The folio numbers in my transcription are those found in square brackets at the lower left-hand corner of alternate pages in Tischendorf's edition. Presumably, these are the folio numbers of the manuscript as it now stands. The original arrangement of folios was lost when the manuscript was taken apart, washed, and reassembled.

The number LA is written in the top right-hand corner of f. 17 r. (p. 293 of Tischendorf's edition). Going forward 16 pages, the number LB is found. Assuming that these are original quire numbers, the original folio numeration can be deduced. The usual number of sheets in a quire is four, giving eight folios or leaves. Each folio has two sides, so each quire of four sheets has 16 pages (Finegan, 1975, 30). If the quire number was written on the first sheet of each quire, the number A would appear on f. 1 r., B on f. 9 r., and so on. That is,

folio number (recto) = 8 x (quire number - 1) + 1

If each quire had four sheets (which is by no means certain), quire number LA (i.e., 31) should have been written on f. 241 r. This quire number appears on the the thirteenth page of Hebrews, so the first and last pages of Hebrews would have been f. 235 r. and f. 258 r., respectively. These correspond to pages 281 and 327 of Tischendorf's edition.

There appear to be a few typographical errors in Tischendorf's edition. Where these occur, Tischendorf's eighth major critical edition (1872, 779-839) has been consulted. If the words in question are not recorded



there, a note to that effect is placed in the associated transcription notes. The transcription itself is left as it appears in Tischendorf's 1865 transcription.

On other occasions partially formed letters are printed in Tischendorf's edition. These are given the status of uncertain text and transcribed as the usual letter found at that place. For example, what appear to be GE and GON are printed where TE and TON would be expected on page 301, lines 1 and 6, respectively. I transcribe these as [ut]T[/ut]E and [ut]T[/ut]ON.

Paragraph divisions are marked by a large space and an enlarged initial letter in the line following the point of division. Any large space (not less than 4 mm) is transcribed with an ellipsis (...). The same goes for a space located at the end of a line which also coincides with a paragraph division.

### *Correctors*

The few alterations have been attributed to the first hand.

<ch 1><v 3> WS:

This may be a typographical error in Tischendorf's edition. No such variant is recorded at the corresponding place in his major critical edition.

<ch 1><v 3> [d0]APAUGASAI[/d0] [c0]APAUGASMA[/c0]:

According to Wachtel and Witte (1994), the reading of P\* is APAUGASAI. The *gamma* of APAUGASMA is omitted in Tischendorf's edition. I have taken this to be a typographical error.

<ch 1><v 9> LIASEWS PARA TOUS METOCOUS SOU...:

A scribal symbol ( · ) occurs here and elsewhere.

<ch 1><v 12> S[ut]U[/ut]:

I assume that this partially formed letter is an *upsilon*.

<ch 1><v 14> [ns]PNA[/ns][ut]T[/ut]A:

This letter is printed as a G in Tischendorf's edition. I have taken it to be a T.

<ch 2><v 9> PAQI<sub>MA</sub>:

There are a number of instances of I/H interchange in this manuscript.

<ch 3><v 8> SKLHRUNHT[sc]AI[/sc]:

This contraction (  $\tau$  ) is not found in Gardthausen (1913, 335-341). The word is spelled -TAI at two other places in Hebrews.

TAP<sub>AUSIN</sub> MOU+...¶ <ch 3><v 12> BLEPETE A=:

I have transcribed marks of the kind that follows MOU (  $\cdot$  ) as crosses (+) throughout.

<ch 3><v 16> TINES:

Tischendorf (1865, 288) places a grave accent above the E.

[f 17r]:

The number LA (i.e., 31) is written in the top right-hand corner of f. 17 r. Going forward sixteen pages, the number LB (i.e., 32) is found. These may be original quire numbers. It was common to have sixteen pages in a quire (Finegan, 1975, 30).

<ch 6><v 1> KATABA<sub>LO</sub>MENOI:

This may be a typographical error in Tischendorf's edition. Usually, this word is spelled with a double *lambda*.

ORKOS  $\sim$  ¶ <ch 6><v 17> EN W PERISSOTERON. BOU=:

It is possible that the paragraph division should be located after PERISSOTERON.

<ch 8><v 3> [ut]T[/ut]E:

This letter is printed as a G in Tischendorf's edition. I take this to be a T. The same applies at 8.4 ([ut]T[/ut]ON) and 8.10 ([ut]T[/ut]AS).

[f 268r]:

What seems to be a quire number (LB) is written in the upper right-hand corner of this page.

<ch 10><v 22> SWMATI:

Tischendorf (1872, 817) lists this variant as SWMATI rather than SWMATI.

<ch 11><v 37> KAKOCOMENOI:

Spelled thus. The same use of KAKO- in place of KAKOU- occurs at 13.3 (KAKOCOUMENWN).

<ch 12><v 9> - <ch 12><v 10>:

The first six lines of f. 295 r. are given as points by Tischendorf (1865, 321), presumably because they are unreadable. My transcription supplies the text of UBS4 in its place.

AUTOU ~ ...¶ <ch 12><v 11> PASA MEN PAIDEIA ≥...:

There is a paragraph division somewhere in this line. The two possible places are following AUTOU and PAIDEIA. The space following AUTOU has been chosen as the more likely point of division because a high point is placed there, whereas a medial point is placed after PAIDEIA. Paragraph divisions are normally associated with high points in this manuscript.

<ch 12><v 18> QUELI:

Spelled thus in Tischendorf's edition (1865, 322).

<ch 12><v 26> [st][c0]GHN[/c0][[/st]:

Tischendorf (1872, 834) writes 'P (ipse\*) suppl. ghn supra lineam'. That is, 'the first hand himself has supplied ghn above the line'.

<ch 13><v 3> KAKOCOUMENWN:

See the note at 11.37.

[f 225r]:

What seems to be a quire number (LG) is written in the upper right-hand corner of this page.

[f 258r]:

According to my calculation of the original quire numbering, this page is numbered 258 r. in both the original and present configurations.

<ch 13><v 23> OYOM[sc]Al[/sc]:

The same contraction for Al was used at 3.8.

subscription: STICWN YN:

That is, 750. The same number is given in U1.

### **References:**

Tischendorf, Konstantin von (ed.). 1865. *Monumenta sacra inedita*.  
*Nova collectio*, 5. Leipzig: n.p., 281-327

## U44

Codex Y. Athos, Lavra, B' 52.

Transcribed and verified by reference to a Xerox copy of microfilm.

This transcription is made from Xerox copies of microfilm obtained from the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center. The copies are of poor clarity.

Accents and breathings have not been transcribed. Paragraph divisions have a space and an enlarged letter at the point of division. Usually, the first letter of the following line is enlarged as well. Some punctuation marks, including crosses (+) and triple commas ( § ), appear to be later additions, possibly related to the lectionary notes. Sometimes, these marks are written over earlier punctuation. My transcription uses ellipses to indicate places where I suspect that punctuation marks are present but are not visible in the Xerox copies or are hidden by subsequent marks. Punctuation marks which do not appear to be by the first hand have not been transcribed. Lectionary notes with associated contractions of the words ARCH and TELOS occur frequently within the manuscript. They are written in uncial script like that of the first hand, and may be this scribe's work.

### *Correctors*

Corrections appear to have been made by the first hand and two other correctors. The main feature used to distinguish between the second and third hands is the width of the ink strokes. The main basis of distinction between the first and second hands is style.

<ch 3><v 10> M[st][sc]OU[sc]/[st]:

This scribal contraction is difficult to see but appears to have the form of an *omicron*. It is written above the *mu*.

<ch 3><v 12> QU:

No *nomen sacrum* superscript is visible in the Xerox copy.

<ch 4><v 2> [d1][ut]E[ut]KEINOI[/d1] [c1][st]K[/st][ut]A[/ut]KEINOI[/c1]:

A *kappa* is inserted above what appears to be an *epsilon* that has been changed into an *alpha*. I ascribe this correction to the first hand on the

basis of the following decision table:

<i>Corrector</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>Ambiguous</i>
<i>Style</i>		<i>x</i>		
<i>Size</i>				<i>x</i>
<i>Pen-width</i>				<i>x</i>
<i>Shade</i>				<i>x</i>

<ch 4><v 14> UN:

I cannot see a *nomen sacrum* superscript in my Xerox copy.

<ch 6><v 1> [d1]KATA[/rt]BALOMENOI[/d1] [c1]KATA[/rt]BA[st]L[/st]LOMENOI[/c1]:

I ascribe this to the second hand on the basis of the following decision table:

<i>Corrector</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>Ambiguous</i>
<i>Style</i>		<i>x</i>		
<i>Size</i>				<i>x</i>
<i>Pen-width</i>				<i>x</i>
<i>Shade</i>				<i>x</i>

<ch 7><v 25> [d1]PROSERCOMENO[ut]U[/ut]S[/d1] [c1]PROSERCOMENOIS[/c1]:

I ascribe this to the second hand on the basis of the following decision table:

<i>Corrector</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>Ambiguous</i>
<i>Style</i>		<i>x</i>		
<i>Size</i>				<i>x</i>
<i>Pen-width</i>				<i>x</i>
<i>Shade</i>				<i>x</i>

<ch 8><v 10> [ut][sc]MOU[/sc][[/ut]:

What seems to be a scribal contraction of MOU (✱) occurs here.

<ch 8><v 11>:

A lacuna extends from 8.11 to 9.18. An entire sheet appears to be lost.

<ch 9><v 28> [d0]EKDECOMENOIS[/d0] [c0][st]AP[/st]EKDECOMENOIS  
[/c0]:

I have ascribed this to the first hand on the basis of the following decision table:

<i>Corrector</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>Ambiguous</i>
<i>Style</i>	<i>x</i>			
<i>Size</i>				<i>x</i>
<i>Pen-width</i>				<i>x</i>
<i>Shade</i>				<i>x</i>

<ch 10><v 16> TW[/rt][ut]N[/ut] DIANOIWN:

My reconstruction has TWN to agree with DIANOIWN.

<ch 10><v 25> [d2]EGKATALIPONTES[/d2] [c2]EGKATALEIPONTES[/c2]:

I have ascribed this to the third hand on the basis of the following decision table:

<i>Corrector</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>Ambiguous</i>
<i>Style</i>				<i>x</i>
<i>Size</i>				<i>x</i>
<i>Pen-width</i>			<i>x</i>	
<i>Shade</i>				<i>x</i>

<ch 12><v 3> TOIAUTHN:

A mark between the *omicron* and *iota* may be due to a corrector.

<ch 12><v 3> [d1]AUTO[ut]N[/ut][[/d1] [c1]AUTOUS[/c1]:

I have ascribed this to the second hand on the basis of the following decision table:

<i>Corrector</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>Ambiguous</i>
<i>Style</i>		<i>x</i>		
<i>Size</i>				<i>x</i>
<i>Pen-width</i>				<i>x</i>
<i>Shade</i>				<i>x</i>

<ch 12><v 5> [d0]EKLEL[ut]H[/ut]SQE[/d0] [c0]EKLEL[ut]U[/ut]SQE[/c0]:

I have ascribed this to the first hand on the basis of the following decision table:

<i>Corrector</i>	0	1	2	<i>Ambiguous</i>
<i>Style</i>	x			
<i>Size</i>				x
<i>Pen-width</i>				x
<i>Shade</i>				x

<ch 12><v 11> DE:

The parchment has an unusual appearance. Perhaps a correction has been made?

<ch 12><v 15> [d2]EN OU LH[/d2] [c2]ENOC LH[/c2]:

There is a smooth breathing above the *omicron*. The correction has been ascribed to the third hand on the basis of the following decision table:

<i>Corrector</i>	0	1	2	<i>Ambiguous</i>
<i>Style</i>				x
<i>Size</i>				x
<i>Pen-width</i>			x	
<i>Shade</i>			x	

<ch 12><v 22> [ut]I[/ut][ns]L[/ns][ns]HM[/ns]:

The *iota* may have been altered by a corrector.

<ch 12><v 25> [d2]POLW[/d2] [c2]POLLW[/c2]:

A second *lambda* appears to have been inserted into a space following the first *lambda*. The correction has been ascribed to the third hand on the basis of the following decision table:

<i>Corrector</i>	0	1	2	<i>Ambiguous</i>
<i>Style</i>			x	
<i>Size</i>				x
<i>Pen-width</i>			x	
<i>Shade</i>			x	



There may be an erasure beneath the inserted *lambda*. Alternatively, this may be a case of the scribe leaving a space when unsure of the correct reading (cf. Zuntz, 1953, 256).

<ch 13><v 6> WSTE QARROU[rt]NTAS[/rt]:

There does not appear to be sufficient space for HMAS at the end of the line. HMAS is omitted from P46 and U243.

<ch 13><v 9> [d1]BEB[ut]L[/ut]HSQ[rt]A[/rt]I[/d1] [c1]BEBAl[st][sc]OU[/sc][[/st]SQ[rt]A[/rt]I[/c1]:

I have ascribed this to the second hand. The first hand had BEBLE- according to Wachtel and Witte (1994). The *omicron* superimposed on the *eta* gives the impression of an *epsilon*, but I think that the *eta* was the first letter in this place.

<ch 13><v 11> AR[st]C[/st][di]I[/di]EREWS:

The *chi* is written above the *alpha* and *rho* in the same manner as found in contractions of ARCH associated with lectionary readings.

<ch 13><v 19> A[ut]POKA[/ut][rt]TASTA[/rt]QW:

The reconstructed part of this word does not seem sufficient to fill the space. A trace of the letter preceding *theta* does not seem to be consistent with an *alpha*.

## U48

Rome, Vatican Library, Gr. 2061.

Transcribed and verified by reference to Heath (1965).

This transcription has been made from Dale Heath's 1965 edition rather than from Xerox prints of a microfilm. This is because the manuscript is a palimpsest. The underlying text is virtually unreadable in the microfilm.

According to Heath (1965, 9), the pages measure about 30 cm by 27 cm. There are three columns per page and 40 or 41 lines per column. Each column of the single surviving folio of Hebrews (f. 299) consists of 40 lines.

Heath has transcribed final *nu* superscripts as *nus* (1965, 13). Therefore, no final *nu* superscripts are found in my transcription. Heath notes that there are no accent marks, with the exception of 'a tiny horizontal bar placed over initial *upsilon*' (1965, 12). He assumes that these are rough breathing marks. I have tagged them accordingly. There is a good chance, however, that they indicate diaeresis instead.

My transcription supplies the text of UBS4 in lacunae, unless there is reason to believe that an alternative reading would fit better. Where an alternative is supplied, a note to that effect is given below. Line divisions in the reconstructed text are made according to the disposition of surrounding text and conform to the normal scribal practice of dividing words between syllables. Where a reconstructed line is unusually short compared with the average line-length of a particular column, it follows that the line might have contained a blank space. In my transcription, likely spaces are transcribed as ellipses within reconstructed text (e.g., Heb 12.6).

<ch 11><v 32> ME:

Considerations of line-length call for the GAR that usually follows ME to be omitted. GAR is omitted in a few other manuscripts.

<ch 11><v 36> PERA[rt]N[/rt]:

The *Textus Receptus* should read PEIRAN instead of the PERAN given in Heath's collation (1965, 170).

<ch 11><v 38> [ut]ERH[/ut][rt]M[/rt]IAS:

Heath (1965, 171) has  $e \geq r \geq h \geq ^a \text{ } ^o ia$  but does not note the variant in his collation. It is possible, therefore, that this a typographical error and that the transcription should have  $e \geq r \geq h \geq ^a \text{ } ^o iai$ .

<ch 12><v 3> EAU[/rt]TOUS:

My reconstruction has EAUTOUS rather than AUTOUS. The resultant reconstruction is more consistent with the disposition of subsequent lines. Both readings find support among other manuscripts.

<ch 12><v 6> [rt]PA[/rt]RADECET[ut]A[/ut][rt]l...[/rt]:

The ellipsis indicates that there may have been a space at the end of this line. The partially reconstructed line contains 11 letters compared with the average line-length for this column of 15.9 letters.

<ch 12><v 7> [rt]EI:

My reconstruction has EI (supported by some minuscules) rather than EIS. The resultant disposition of the relevant line is closer to that of surrounding lines.

<ch 12><v 7> GAR[/rt]:

This manuscript probably omitted the ESTIN that follows GAR in a number of manuscripts. The number of letters in this line when ESTIN is omitted compares well with the average line-length of this column (15.9 letters).

<ch 12><v 16> [rt]AUT[/rt]OU:

My reconstruction has AUTOU (TR) rather than EAUTOU (UBS4). The number of letters missing from the beginning of the line seems more likely to be three than four.

<ch 12><v 18> PROELHLUQATAI:

The word is spelled thus. Heath has proelhlutatai in the associated footnote (1965, 175), presumably by error.

<ch 12><v 23> [rt]P[/rt][ut]RW[/ut]TOTOK[rt]WN...[/rt]:

There may have been a space at the end of this line, which is seemingly quite short (10 letters) by comparison with the expected length (14.5 letters for this column).

<ch 12><v 24> KREITON TI:

Heath (1965, 177) has kreitonti. This is not a word and should be divided into kreit(t)on and ti. The following reading results: *and to the sprinkled blood that speaks something better than Abel*. (Heath has joined kreitton and ti at 11.40 as well.)

<ch 12><v 28> PARALA[ut]B[/ut]ONTES:

Heath's transcription (1965, 179) actually has paralabonto". The associated footnote has paralabonte", which I have placed in my transcription.

<ch 12><v 29> QS:

Heath (1965, 179) does not have a *nomen sacrum* superscript.

## References

Heath, Dale Eldon. 1965. 'A transcription and description of Manuscript Vatican Greek 2061 (Gregory 048)'. Dissertation (PhD). Michigan State University.

## U56

Paris, National Library of France, Coislin Grec 26.

Transcribed by reference to a Xerox copy of microfilm.

This transcription has not been verified. As a consequence, it probably contains a higher proportion of transcription errors than those transcriptions which have been verified. The microfilm was obtained from the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center. The manuscript itself is held at the National Library of France where its designation is Coislin Grec 26.

The biblical text is marked by quotation markers (>) located in the left-hand column. It is written in small uncial script that resembles the script of U243. Biblical text alternates with large sections of commentary in minuscule script. The scribe sometimes confuses biblical text with commentary (e.g., Heb 8.10 and 10.5). Dative *iota* suffixes occur frequently (e.g., 3.8 THI ERHMI, 7.2 WI, and 7.10 THI, AUTWI), as do compendia, contractions, and ligatures:

### *Compendia*

ⲥ	KAI	1.7, 1.10, 11.32, 12.9, 13.24
ⲛ	PERI	10.26
ⲉ	FHSIN	8.5

### *Contractions*

ⲁⲥ	AS	7.5, 10.11, 10.16
ⲉⲓⲛ	EIN	8.3
ⲉⲛ	EN	4.8, 6.18, 12.2, 12.9
ⲉⲥ	ES	13.9
ⲛⲥ	HS	9.4, 11.10
ⲛⲉⲛ	HN	3.6, 4.6, 11.29
ⲉⲥⲓ	OS	2.14, 2.16, 2.17, 11.12
ⲉⲥⲓⲥ	OIS	12.13
ⲉⲥⲓⲛ	ON	2.14, 9.14, 10.3, 11.6, 12.1, 12.14, 13.20
ⲉⲥⲓⲛ	OU	2.4, 10.7
ⲉⲥ	OU	4.3

W	8.10, 10.38
WN	1.2, 3.15, 6.14

#### *Ligatures*

ST	9.18
EI	10.1

#### *Correctors*

Only one correction and a possible alteration is listed below. A number of folios have been copied by another hand.

inscription: UPOQESIS THS PROS EBRAIOUS EPISTOLHS:

This is actually the heading of the hypothesis.

<ch 1><v 1> |f 341r|:

Quire number RX (160) is written at the top of this folio.

<ch 1><v 4> KREITT[rt][st][sc]WN[/sc][st][rt]:

The ending of this word is tagged as reconstructed text because the scribal contraction signifying WN is not visible in the Xerox copy. The second T is the last letter of the line and is barely visible. The contraction would be expected to be above this letter.

<ch 1><v 8> [ut]Q[/ut]RONOS:

The uncertain letter may be a *chi*.

<ch 1><v 9> [rt]O[/rt]:

I cannot see the *omicron*. There is a vertical stroke which is matched by an identical mark on the reverse side. This suggests that the stroke is due to a fault in the parchment which ink from the *omicron* has emphasised.

<ch 2><v 11> DI:

I transcribe a mark above the *iota* as an apostrophe.

<ch 2><v 13> KAI PALIN:

Part of this verse has been omitted through *homoioteleuton*.

<ch 6><v 8> TRIBOLOUS, ADOKIMOS:

There are spaces within these words. What seems to be another *tau* follows the *tau* of tribolous. A corrector may have been active here.

<ch 6><v 10> TOU SKOPOU:

Other manuscripts have TOU KOPOU.

<ch 7><v 15> PERISSOTERON TERON:

-TERON has been repeated on either side of a page division.

<ch 7><v 20> ORKWMOSIAS:

A number of words from this and the following verse are absent due to *homoioleuton*.

<ch 8><v 10>:

The scribe has written part of the commentary in uncial script (LOGIZOU OUN KAI THN ENTEUQEN UPEROCHN).

<ch 8><v 11> [d1]M[ut]A[/ut]KROU[/d1] [c1]M[ut]H[/ut]KROU[/c1]:

This alteration has been ascribed to the second hand because the superimposed letter, which appears to be an *eta*, has an unusual shade and pen-width.

<ch 9><v 1> EIDE:

Dividing this into EI and DE results in nonsense. With EIDE (*it saw*), the sentence may be translated, *The first tabernacle therefore saw ordinances of service...*

[f 364v]:

The folio number seems to have a *sigma-tau* ligature instead of the expected *digamma*.

<ch 10><v 2> EPEI KAN:

What appears to be a rough breathing is located above the A.

<ch 10><v 4> H:

A smooth breathing and grave accent prove that the reading here is *tauvrwn h] travgwn* (i.e., *calves or goats*). The usual reading at this

place is tauvrwn kai; travgwn.

<ch 10><v 5> dio eijsercomeno" eij" ton kosmon legei:

The scribe has written this part of the biblical text in cursive script.

<ch 11><v 30> KU[st]K[/st]KLWQENTA:

The superscript K may have been inserted by a subsequent scribe.

<ch 12><v 4> OUTW:

Spelled thus.

<ch 12><v 24> [c1]PAR[st][ut]A[/ut][st] [st][sc]TON[/sc][st] AB[sc]EL[/sc]  
[c1]:

There are scribal contractions in place of TON (  $\tau\omicron\nu\varsigma$  ) and EL (  $\epsilon\lambda$  ). The ink is similar to that of the alteration at 8.11, which I have attributed to the second hand.

<ch 12><v 29> KATANISKON:

KATANISKON is not a word. The usual word in this place is KATANALISKON. The scribe seems to have overlooked *alpha* and *lambda*.

<ch 13><v 15> OMOLOGOU[ut]N[/ut]TWN:

The uncertain letter appears to be a cursive *nu*.

<ch 13><v 20> MEG[ut]A[/ut]N:

The uncertain letter consists of a curve linking the G and N (  $\Gamma\lambda$  ).



## U75

Athens, National Library, Gr. 100.

Transcribed by reference to the manuscript itself.

This transcription was made at the manuscript reading room of the National Library of Greece during a two week stay in Athens. I have not had the opportunity to verify the transcription.

The manuscript has about 31 lines per page and about 28 letters per line. Eight pages (i.e., folios 367r to 370v) copied by another scribe are treated under the heading of U75s. They contain Heb 10.1 to 10.35, but fail to include Heb 10.36 to 11.4.

Biblical text in uncial script alternates with commentary in minuscules script. There are places where biblical text has been written in cursive script. Nearly all of the biblical sections are numbered. I have supplied section numbers for the transcription where they are lacking in the manuscript.

Punctuation marks often consist of vertical strokes. My transcription represents these as commas or points depending on whether there is curvature in the strokes.

### *Correctors*

I distinguish two correctors. All of the corrections are attributed to the first hand ([c0]/[d0]) or the third hand ([c2]/[d2]). This is because the second hand ([c1]/[d1]) designation had been reserved for the scribe who copied the supplement. This strategy caused problems at the collation stage, and was abandoned as a consequence. The scribe responsible for the supplement is now treated separately (see U75s, below).

The manuscript has marginal notes that refer to variations at 8.11, 11.13, and 11.17. I now believe that I should have considered these to be corrections to the text. Unfortunately, I do not have facsimiles before me in order to pursue this further.

inscription:

The inscription is written in purple ink.

<ch 1><v 5> KAI PALIN EGW ESOMAI AUTW EIS P[ns]RA[/ns]: KAI AUTOS ESTAI MOI EIS U[ns]N[/ns] :

The scribe has written some of the biblical text in cursive script.

<ch 1><v 12> ALLAGHSONTAI ~ :

The last three letters of this word are written on their own at the end of the line. The style and ink are consistent with the first hand, although the ink is lighter than usual.

<ch 2><v 2> DI': This apostrophe is located between the D and I.

<ch 2><v 3> EKFEUXOMEQA:

It would be easy to mistake this for EISFEUX-.

<ch 2><v 7> HLATTWSA[ut]S[/ut]:

The final *sigma* looks like an *omicron*.

<ch 2><v 8> EN GAR TO UPOTAXAI AUTW TA PANTA≤ OUDEN AFHKEN AUTW ANUPOTAKTON ~ :

This section of text is written in cursive script.

<ch 2><v 10> DI':

(two instances) These marks may be accents.

<ch 2><v 10> [d0]AR[rt]K[/rt]HGON[/d0] [c0]ARCHGON[/c0]:

The C is written over a portion of vellum which is roughened, probably due to an erasure. The original letter, if there was one, is completely erased. The K included as reconstructed text is entirely speculative. The style and ink of the corrected letter are consistent with the first hand.

<ch 3><v 6> [d0]TI[/d0] [c0]TO[/c0]:

This correction has been ascribed to the first hand. The loop by which the I is changed into an O appears to be by the first hand, although the pen-width is somewhat narrower than expected for this scribe.

<ch 3><v 7> KAQ WS:

I have divided these words because there is a breathing mark above the W.

<ch 4><v 3> OUN:

There are small vertical and horizontal strokes in the upper left-hand part of the O. These could be the result of ink seeping through from the reverse side of the page where a cursive N has been written.

<ch 4><v 3> KAQ' WS:

The apostrophe shows that the scribe intended these words to be separated.

<ch 4><v 3> [d2]ESELEUSONTAI[/d2] [c2]EISELEUSONTAI[/c2]:

The I of EIS- is consistent with the third hand.

<ch 4><v 3> EIS (second occurrence):

The I appears to have been retraced by the first hand.

<ch 4><v 7> HM[st][sc]ERAN[/sc][[/st]:

This scribal contraction consists of an E written above the M. There is a diagonal stroke at the base of the right-hand vertical of the M as well.

<ch 4><v 10> APO TWN [di]I[/di]DIWN O [ns]QS[/ns]:

This section of text has been written in cursive script.

<ch 4><v 11> [d0][ut]S[/ut]UN[/d0] [c0]OUN[/c0]:

The first letter of this word appears to have begun as a S and to have been changed to an O by the first hand.

<ch 4><v 12> [d0]DI[di]I[/di]KN[rt]U[/rt][[/d0] [c0]DI[di]I[/di]KNOUMENOS[/c0]:

A rough spot in the parchment is consistent with an erasure. The original letter has been obliterated. The superimposed text is consistent with the first hand.

<ch 4><v 12> |s RK|, |s RKA|, |s RKB|:

These three section numbers have been corrected.

<ch 5><v 3> KAQ' WS:

The apostrophe following the Q shows that there is a word-division here.

<ch 5><v 6> KAQ WS:

There is a breathing mark above the W.

<ch 5><v 7> [di]l[/di]KETHRIAS PROS TON DUNAMENON:

This text is written in cursive script.

<ch 5><v 12> [d0]E[rt]K[/rt]/[d0] [c0]EC[st]E[/st]TE[/c0]:

The C is written on an erasure. The original letter has been obliterated.

The superimposed text is consistent with the first hand.

<ch 6><v 1> DI' O:

These words are divided because there is an apostrophe above the I.

There does not appear to be a breathing mark above the O.

<ch 6><v 13> TW GAR ABRAAM' EPAGGEILAMENOS O Q[ns]S[/ns] ~ :

This text is written in cursive script.

<ch 6><v 13> [d0]OMOSAI[/d0] [c0]WMOSAI[/c0]:

The first letter of this word appears to have been changed from an O into an W by the first hand.

<ch 6><v 17> |s 1| EMESITEUSEN ORKW ~ :

I have supplied the section number.

<ch 6><v 18> [dx]KATAF[ut]E[/ut]UGONTES[/dx] [cx]KATAFUGONTES[/cx]:

What appears to have been an E has been erased. There is no way to tell who made the erasure.

<ch 7><v 1> [di]l[/di]EREUS TOU Q[ns]U[/ns] TOU UYISTOU≥ O  
SUNANTHSAS ABRAAM:

This section of text is written in cursive script.

<ch 7><v 3> [di]l[/di]EREUS:

A mark above the I (~) has been transcribed as diaeresis.

<ch 7><v 4> EK TWN AKROQHNIWN O PATRIARCHS:

This text is written in cursive script.

<ch 7><v 5> NOMON≥¶:

A paragraph marker is placed here because the first letter of the following line is indented.

<ch 7><v 8> W DE:

A breathing mark and accent (w|) are located above the W.

<ch 7><v 15> [d0]MEC[/d0] [c0]MELCISEDEK[/c0]:

What appears to have been a C has been erased and replaced with a L. The L is consistent with the first hand.

<ch 7><v 16> OS,:

This punctuation mark may be an accent from the following line.

<ch 8><v 1,2> |s 1|:

I supplied this section number.

<ch 8><v 8> [d0][di]l[/di]??[/d0] [c0][di]l[/di][ns]HL[/ns][c0]:

The H and L are written on a rough patch of vellum. The original letters have been completely erased. The style and ink of the corrected letters are consistent with the first hand.

<ch 8><v 10> [d0]DIAQH[rt]??[/rt][d0] [c0]DIAQHKH HN[/c0]:

The letters -KH HN are written over a rough patch of vellum. Perhaps the scribe began to write DIAQHSOMAI then realised his mistake and corrected it. The style and ink of the corrected letters are consistent with the first hand.

<ch 8><v 11> POLITHN:

A marginal note alerts the reader to an alternative reading: EN TISI TON PLHSION ECEI. The insertion point and note are marked with carets (⤴).

<ch 8><v 12> [di]l[/di]L[ut]E[/ut]WS:

Part of the uncertain L has been rubbed off by contact with the facing page.

<ch 8><v 13> [d0]P?[/d0] [c0]PEPALAIWKE[/c0]:

A rough patch suggests that an erasure has been made. The ink and pen-width of the E are consistent with the first hand, although the style may not be.

<ch 8><v 13> EGGUS:

The E looks unusual. This is probably due to ink transferred from an W on the facing page.

<ch 9><v 6> [d0]DA[/d0] [c0]DIA[/c0]:

An I has been inserted between the D and A, apparently by the first hand.

<ch 9><v 9,10> |s 1|:

I supplied this section number.

<ch 9><v 12> LUTRWSIN:

Ink appears to have run under the W and S.

<ch 9><v 15> GEGONE GAR O QANATOS TOU C[ns]U[/ns]: *For the death of Christ has taken place.* This sentence is not found occur in other manuscripts.

<ch 9><v 17> DIAQHKH GAR EPI NEKROIS BEBAIA≥:

This text is written in cursive script.

<ch 9><v 18> OUDE':

This mark may be an accent rather than an apostrophe.

<ch 9><v 19> |s TKZ|:

This section number follows section TKE, meaning that one section has been overlooked. The omitted section probably included the biblical text META UDATOS KAI ERIOU KOKKINOY.

<ch 9><v 22> [d0]AIMAT[ut]O[/ut][rt]S[/rt]/[d0] [c0]AIMAT' EKCUSIAS[/c0]:

There seems to have been an O after the T. Nothing is left of the next letter. This correction seems to have been made by the first hand.

<ch 9><v 23> |s 1|:

I supplied this section number.

<ch 9><v 26> EIS AQETHSIN THS AMARTIAS:

This section of biblical text has been omitted but the associated commentary remains.

<ch 9><v 26> |s 1| DIA THS QUSIAS AUTOU PEFANERWTAI:

This biblical text is written in cursive script and has not been assigned a section number by the scribe. I supplied the section number.

<ch 11><v 6> EUARESTHSAI:

A mark following the U appears to be ink detached from another part of the manuscript.

<ch 11><v 6> GAR:

There is a stroke through the horizontal of the *gamma*.

<ch 11><v 7> CRHMATISQEIS NWE PERI TWN MH BLEPOMENWN.

PISTEI EULABHQEIS. KATESKEUASE KIBWTON≤:

This text of the commentary is very closely to the associated biblical text. Perhaps the scribe copied it again by error.

<ch 11><v 11> [d0]O??[/d0] [c0]OUSA[/c0]:

The erased letters have been completely obliterated.

<ch 11><v 11> |s 1|:

I supplied this section number.

<ch 11><v 12> KAQ WS:

There is a breathing mark above the W.

<ch 11><v 13> [di]I[/di]DONTES KAI ASPASAMENOI:

A marginal note and carets (⸱) refer to a variant reading, *peisqente*". A

few manuscripts have *kai peisqente*" after *ijdonte*".

<ch 11><v 16> DI' O:

This mark may be an accent.

<ch 11><v 17> DEXAMENOS[it]ANA[/it]:

Carets ( ^ ) alert the reader that the text should read *ajnadexameno*". Apparently, the marginal references to variants at 8.11, 11.13, and here should be treated as corrections.

<ch 11><v 21> [d0][di]l[/di]WSH?[/d0] [c0][di]l[/di]WSHF[/c0]:

The erased letter may have been an *l* with diaeresis. I have ascribed this to the first hand, although the style of the *F* and the ink do not seem to be consistent with this scribe.

<ch 11><v 23> [di]l[/di]DEN:

The word is spelled thus. A stroke drawn above the *iota* has been transcribed as diaeresis.

<ch 11><v 28> PISTEI:

The *S* of this word may have been corrected from an *E* by the first hand.

<ch 11><v 33> [d2]PISTEWS[/d2] [c2]PISTEWS[/c2]:

The *T* has been retraced. The ink is similar in colour to the *l* inserted at 4.3, suggesting that this is the work of the third hand.

<ch 11><v 37> AIGEI[ut]OIS[/ut]:

This word may end with *-SAN* rather than *-OIS*.



## U75s

These notes refer to the eight supplementary pages of Hebrews that were *not* copied by the first hand of U75 (i.e., folios 367r to 370v).

The writing in the biblical sections of the supplement is reminiscent of U243. The N and H are virtually indistinguishable. Colons are used to mark the end of biblical sections. The scribe who copied the other parts of Hebrews employed points for this purpose.

There are some notable scribal contractions:

𐤃	DE	10.15
𐤓	...ON	10.25
𐤒𐤕	...QH	10.29
𐤒𐤕	...TOS	10.31

### *Correctors*

A number of corrections in the supplement are ascribed to a fourth hand. This hand may be identical to the corrector who worked over the other parts of Hebrews. Then again, the scribe who copied this supplement could be that corrector. I cannot say whether either possibility is probable as I do not have facsimiles of this manuscript before me. (The comment at 10.7, below, favours the first possibility.)

### *Date*

Although I am not qualified to assign a date to the scribe who copied the supplement, I will hazard a guess. As already noted, the script has points of contact with the script of U243, which is a tenth century manuscript (NA27, 1993, 701). Such a date would make this scribe a contemporary of the one who copied the rest of Hebrews.

### *Missing text*

The text of Heb 10.36 to the beginning of 11.5 is missing from the manuscript as it now stands. The last page of the supplement (f. 370v.) ends with one and a half words of a commentary section. This suggests that there was another folio that contained the missing text. In fact, part of a leaf remains between 370v and 371r, the rest having been cut out.

Remnants of text on the recto side appear to be consistent with the scribe who copied the supplement.

<ch 10><v 1> |s 1|:

I supplied this section number.

<ch 10><v 2> [d3]EPAUSANT[ut]O[ut]/[d3] [c3]EPAUSANTO[/c3]:

The O has been retraced by a later scribe, here designated as the fourth hand.

<ch 10><v 2> [d3]AM[ut]A[/ut]RTI[st][sc]WN[/sc]/[st]/[d3] [c3]AMARTI[st][sc]WN[/sc]/[st]/[c3]:

The A and R following the M have been retraced, apparently by the scribe responsible for the preceding alteration.

<ch 10><v 2> - <ch 10><v 3> |s 1|:

I supplied this section number.

<ch 10><v 4> ADUN[ut]A[/ut]TON:

What appears to be an I following the U is actually part of the U. Another example of this is found in AUTH at 10.15.

<ch 10><v 7> [d2][rt]S[/rt]OU[/d2] [c2]SOU[/c2]:

The original letter has been completely erased. This alteration has similarities to the one by the third hand at 4.3.

<ch 10><v 13> AUTOU UPOPODION:

There is a section of commentary between these words. The scribe has written part of that commentary (TEQWSIN EIPEN) in uncial letters.

<ch 10><v 16> [kc]K[/kc]:

This kaiv compendium has the form of a digamma.

<ch 10><v 18> OUK':

This mark may be accent. The same applies for OUN' at 10.19.

<ch 10><v 20> |s 1|:

I supplied this section number.

<ch 10><v 22> [dx]ERANTISMENOI[/dx] [cx]E[st]R[/st]RANTISMENOI[/cx]:

There is a R written above the original E and R. The style and ink of this insertion are consistent with the scribe who copied these folios. In order to make this alteration appear in the collation, it has been assigned to the category of unascribed corrections.

<ch 10><v 22> T[ut]A[/ut]S:

This word could be misread as TOIS because of an imperfectly formed A.

## U122

St. Petersburg, Russian National Library, Gr. 32.

Transcribed and verified by reference to photographs.

The transcription was made from good quality black and white photographs kindly supplied by the National Library of Russia in St. Petersburg.

The following notes refer to f. 130, one of the two folios comprising U122. There are numerous punctuation marks, accents, and other marks. Most appear to have been added by later hands. I have transcribed only the punctuation marks. A frequently added punctuation mark is the cross (+). This mark appears to be due to the second hand. Sometimes, it is superimposed upon the first hand's high or medial point punctuation marks.

### *Correctors*

A number of scribes have worked on the manuscript. At the top of f. 130 r., there is a line in Roman and Cyrillic script identifying the manuscript as belonging to the museum of Petri Dubrowsky. The next line is written in uncial Greek with dark ink and a narrow stylus. Text with these characteristics is attributed to the second hand in my transcription. Following this is another line written in uncial Greek. It features a number of scribal contractions and is written in light ink with a medium-width stylus. Such text is attributed to the third hand. The uncial New Testament text of the first hand begins after these lines. It is written in two columns with dark ink and a broad stylus. Corrections in cursive writing have been attributed to a fourth hand.

<ch 5><v 10> ARCI[rt]E[/rt]REUS [rt][c1][it]EIS TON AIWNA[/it][c1][rt]≥:

A caret (⋈) follows ARCI[rt]E[/rt]REUS. There may have been a corresponding caret and text in the left-hand or lower margin. However, these margins have not survived. According to Tischendorf (1872, 795), a number of manuscripts add EIS TON AIWNA here. This addition has been included as reconstructed text in my transcription. The only clue to the identity of the corrector is the caret. Its narrow width and dark ink are suggestive of the second hand. Even so, it may be the work of the first

hand, who is also capable of fine strokes (cf. the *nomen sacrum* superscript on the preceding line). On balance, however, I regard the caret as more consistent with the second hand.

<ch 5><v 10> MELCIS[rt]E[/rt]DEK:

Pairs of hooks are drawn below the first and last letters, apparently by the second hand.

<ch 5><v 11> PERI:

What may be a scribal contraction of THS has been written above the cross (+) which precedes PERI, possibly by the third hand.

<ch 5><v 12> TINA:

A lunate symbol follows this word. A corresponding symbol is located at the top of a *scholium* located in the right-hand margin.

<ch 5><v 14> [d0]S[ut]T[/ut]RE[/d0] [c0]STEREA[/c0]:

Apparently, the first hand wrote STRE, erased TRE, then wrote TERE A on the following line.

<ch 6><v 1> [c3][it]LOIP[sc][st]ON[/st][sc][it]/[c3]:

The letters LOIP, with two dark slashes (/) above the P, are written in the left-hand margin. Gardthausen (1913, 339) records such slashes as a contraction of -ON. Codex L adds LOIPON as well (Tischendorf, 1872, 796). The writing is cursive and is therefore attributed to the fourth hand.

<ch 6><v 2> ANASTASEWS:

A mark that follows the letters STA appears to be due to a fault in the parchment.

<ch 6><v 2> ANASTASEWS TE NEKRWN:

Hooks bracket these words. These are not likely to be deletion marks because no such deletion is recorded in Tischendorf (1872) or Wachtel and Witte (1994).

<ch 6><v 3> KAI TOUTO POIHSOMEN:

Hooks bracket these words. Once again, no such deletion is recorded in Tischendorf (1872) or Wachtel and Witte (1994).

[f 130v][c b]:

This column is partially obscured by vellum which is folded back across the text.

<ch 6><v 7> [d3]POLA[ut]K[/ut][rt]IS[/rt]/[d3] [c3]POL[st]L[/st]A[ut]K[/ut][rt]IS  
[/rt]/[c3]:

This correction is ascribed to the fourth hand because of the cursive style of the inserted L.

<ch 6><v 7> EULOGIAS [ut]A[/ut][rt]PO [ns]QU[/ns]/[rt]:

The text of NA27 includes TOU after APO. My reconstruction omits TOU due to considerations of line-length. The average line-length for this column is 12.2 letters. None of the lines has a length of more than fifteen letters. The length of this line is thirteen letters without TOU or sixteen letters with TOU. A number of manuscripts omit TOU (Tischendorf, 1872, 797).

<ch 6><v 8> HS[c2],[/c2]:

A mark following this word appears to be a comma. Its light-coloured ink is suggestive of the third hand.

<ch 6><v 9> [d1][rt]OU[/rt]TWS LALO[ut]U[/ut][rt]MEN[/rt]/[d1] [d2][c1]OUTW  
ELALO[ut]U[/ut][rt]MEN[/rt]/[c1]/[d2] [c2]OUTW LALO[ut]U[/ut][rt]MEN[/rt]/[c2]:

The letter following OUTW appears to be an E with two fine lines of a lighter shade struck through it. The medial stroke is unlike the first hand's medial stroke for *epsilons*. This suggests the following sequence of readings:

<i>Hand</i>	<i>Reading</i>
first	OUTWS LALOUMEN
second	OUTW ELALOUMEN
third	OUTW LALOUMEN

## U142

Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl., Gr. 375.

Transcribed by reference to a Xerox copy of microfilm.

This scribe made extensive use of shorthand:

### *Compendia*

§	KAI	1.7, 1.10, ...
¶	PERI	13.18
£	FHSIN	8.5

### *Contractions*

—	AS	10.11, 13.22
-θ	EQA	2.3 (?)
—	EIN	
—	EN	2.8
—	ES	
—	HS	9.20
—	HN	5.10, 5.14
—	MENOS	8.8
—	OS	2.14, 6.5, ...
—	OIS	1.1
— —	ON	7.21, 9.22, ...
—	OU	1.8, 6.6, ...
—	OU	4.3, 4.5 (?), ...
—	WS	6.12
—	WN	1.13, 4.15, ...

### *Ligatures*

—	ST	1.3, 1.5, ...
—	EI	
—	PT	2.6, 8.7, ...
—	UI	1.1, 1.5, ...
—	UO	6.18

### *Correctors*

Four hands are evident:

(1) The first hand.

(2) The second hand uses upright and well-formed letters. When compared with the first hand, the pen-width is more narrow and the ink is lighter (e.g., Heb 2.3: f. 344 v., line 21; Heb 3.7: f. 348 v., line 13).

(3) Only one alteration in Hebrews is attributed to the third hand. It is located at Heb 3.19 (f. 349 v., line 20). The ink and pen-width are similar to the first hand, but the style of writing is different.

(4) The fourth hand tends towards minuscule forms (e.g., Heb 8.2: f. 360 v., line 13). The shade and width of ink vary between the alterations grouped under this corrector. This may be due to ink diffusion in erasures and the scribe's re-inking practices.

The first hand is dated to the tenth century (Aland, 1963, 49), and the other hands are subsequent to this hand. The given order of correctors does not necessarily reflect their relative antiquity. Rather, it is determined by the order in which corrections attributed to the respective correctors first appear in Hebrews.

A deletion by erasure cannot be associated with a particular corrector where there is no corresponding addition by which to ascribe responsibility. I ascribe such deletions to the category of unidentified alterations.

[f 344v]:

A quire number MG (i.e., 43) is written in the bottom right-hand corner of this page.

<ch 2><v 2> MISQAPODODOSIAN:

The scribe has written DO twice, apparently by error.

<ch 2><v 3> [d1]EKFEUXOMAI[/d1] [c1]EKFEUXOM[st][sc][rt]E[/rt]Q[rt]A[/rt]  
[/sc][rt]A[/rt]:

A *theta* with an extended medial stroke is taken to be an abbreviation of



-EQA. This alteration is taken to be characteristic of the second hand.

|f 345r|:

A quire number MD (i.e., 44) is written in the bottom left-hand corner. This probably marks the beginning of quire number 44, in which case the numbering obeys the normal rule for quires comprised of four sheets:

$$\text{folio no. (recto)} = 8 \times (\text{quire no.} - 1) + 1$$

<ch 2><v 18> PEIRAZOMENOIS:

A mark following the N may be due to a corrector.

<ch 3><v 4> [dx][ut]O[/ut][dx]:

There are no distinguishing marks by which to ascribe this erasure to a particular hand.

<ch 3><v 6> [dx]EAN[ut]P[/ut][rt]ER[/rt][dx] [cx]EAN[/cx]:

There are no distinguishing marks by which to ascribe this erasure to a particular hand.

<ch 3><v 7> [d1]AN[/d1] [c1][st]E[/st]AN[/c1]:

This alteration has been ascribed to the second hand on the basis of the following decision table:

<i>Scribe</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>Ambiguous</i>
<i>Style</i>		<i>x</i>			
<i>Size</i>		<i>x</i>			
<i>Pen-width</i>		<i>x</i>			
<i>Shade</i>		<i>x</i>			

<ch 3><v 19> [d2]ELQEIN[/d2] [c2][st]EIS[/st]ELQEIN[/c2]:

This alteration is taken to be characteristic of the third hand.

<ch 4><v 5> M[st][ut][sc]OU[/sc][ut][st]:

This symbol looks like the shorthand for OS (  $\frac{\sigma}{\omega}$  ).

<ch 4><v 15> ASQENEIAIS:

The first two letters of this word may have been altered.

<ch 5><v 9> AIWNIOU:

A mark above the A probably is a smooth breathing but looks like a diaeresis mark.

<ch 5><v 14> [dx][rt][kc]K[kc][rt][dx]:

A single letter (which might have been a *kaiv* compendium) once stood between KALOU and TE.

<ch 6><v 4> GENHQETAS:

The second *epsilon* has an acute accent. The *nu* which is expected to follow is missing.

<ch 6><v 8> ADOKIMOS:

There is a space between the final O and S.

<ch 6><v 12> [dx]TWN[/dx]:

There are no distinguishing marks by which to ascribe this erasure to a particular corrector.

<ch 7><v 20> O:

A space follows this word. There is no sign of an *iota*.

<ch 7><v 20> [c1][sc]O[st]U[/st][sc][c1]:

This alteration has the characteristics of the second hand.

<ch 7><v 20> ORKWMOSIAS:

A number of words from this and the following verse are absent due to *homoioleuton*.

<ch 8><v 2> [d3]AGGELIKHS[/d3] [c3]A[st]LH[ut]Q[/ut]IN[ut]H[/ut]S[/st][c3]:

This alteration is taken to be characteristic of the fourth hand.

<ch 8><v 11> [d3]P[ut]OL[/ut][rt][rt][ut]THN[/ut][d3] [c3]PL[ut]H[/ut]SION  
[c3]:

There are a number of points of contact between this alteration and the one found at Heb 8.2, which is ascribed to the fourth hand. In particular,

the letters *lambda*, *eta*, *nu*, and *sigma* correspond. The ink is thicker and darker than expected, but this may be due to writing on top of an erasure.

<ch 9><v 1> [d3]EI[rt]D[/rt]E[/d3] [c3]EICE[/c3]:

This alteration has been ascribed to the fourth hand. It has similar characteristics to the correction at Heb 8.11. My reconstruction is based on Wachtel and Witte's suggested reading (1994).

<ch 9><v 8> [d0]MHPOTE FANERWSQAI[/d0] [c0]MHPO  
PEFANERWSQAI[/c0]:

The *tau* of MHPOTE appears to have been changed to a *pi*, resulting in MHPO PEFANERWSQAI. The change consists of an added diagonal stroke that has characteristics similar to the first hand's. However, the resultant *pi* is not characteristic of the first hand. The spelling *mhvpo* is dubious, but allowable in view of the common O/W spelling interchange.

<ch 9><v 14> PROHNEGKEN:

Spelled thus.

<ch 10><v 5> DIO EISERCOMENOS EIS TON KOSMON LEGEI ~ ...:

This phrase is written in cursive script.

<ch 10><v 17> USTRERON LEGEI:

These words (meaning *afterwards it says*) occur in U56 as well.

<ch 10><v 28> [dx]APOQNHSKEI[ut]N[/ut][[/dx] [cx]APOQNHSKEI[/cx]:

There are no distinguishing marks by which to ascribe this erasure to a particular corrector.

<ch 10><v 29> [d1]DIAQHKOS[/d1] [c1]DIAQHKHS[/c1] KOINON  
HGHSAMENOS EN W HGIASQH KAI TO P[ns]NA[/ns] THS CARITOS  
ENUBRISAS:

The first hand appears to have skipped from DIAQHKHS to CARITOS, leaving out the intervening text and writing DIAQHKOS. In addition, the *omicron* has been corrected to *eta*. The shade and width of the ink indicate that the first hand made the correction. However, it seems strange that the first hand would correct the one word without noticing

the absence of the entire phrase. Consequently, the alteration has been ascribed to the second hand. This hand is characterised by a similar pen-width but a lighter ink when compared with the first hand.

<ch 10><v 34> PROSDexasQE:

There is a chance that an E once stood before the D, but that it has now been obliterated.

<ch 10><v 36> [d1]KOMIS[ut]Q[/ut]H[ut]T[/ut]E[/d1] [c1]KOMISHSQE[/c1]:

I have ascribed this alteration to the second hand on the basis of the similarity of this added *theta* and the one at 2.3.

<ch 11><v 22> UIWN I[ns]HL[/ns]:

A mark between these words may be a high point.

<ch 12><v 4> [d0]OUPW[ut]S[/ut][[/d0] [c0]OUPW[/c0]:

What appears to be a *sigma* or an *epsilon* has been deleted by a diagonal stroke. The width and shade of the ink in the deletion stroke are consistent with the first hand's writing.

<ch 12><v 4> [d1]ANTEKATESTHTE[/d1] [c1]ANT[st]l[/st]KATESTHTE[/c1]:

This alteration has been ascribed to the second hand on the basis of the following decision table:

<i>Scribe</i>	0	1	2	3	<i>Ambiguous</i>
<i>Style</i>					<i>x</i>
<i>Size</i>		<i>x</i>			
<i>Pen-width</i>		<i>x</i>			
<i>Shade</i>		<i>x</i>			

<ch 12><v 7> [dx]EIS[/dx] [cx]EI[/cx]:

There are no distinguishing marks by which to ascribe this erasure to a particular corrector.

<ch 12><v 10> [d1]SUMFURON[/d1] [c1]SUMFERON[/c1]:

This alteration has been ascribed to the second hand:

<i>Scribe</i>	0	1	2	3	<i>Ambiguous</i>
---------------	---	---	---	---	------------------

<i>Style</i>		<i>x</i>
<i>Size</i>	<i>x</i>	
<i>Pen-width</i>	<i>x</i>	
<i>Shade</i>	<i>x</i>	

<ch 12><v 11> [d0]PAIDEA[/d0] [c0]PAIDE[st]I[/st]A[/c0]:

This alteration has been ascribed to the original corrector:

<i>Scribe</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>Ambiguous</i>
<i>Style</i>					<i>x</i>
<i>Size</i>			<i>x</i>		
<i>Pen-width</i>			<i>x</i>		
<i>Shade</i>			<i>x</i>		

<ch 12><v 15> [d3]TI[/d3] [c3]TI[st]S[/st]/[c3]:

This has been ascribed to the fourth hand because the *sigma* is similar to the one found in the alteration at 8.2.

<ch 12><v 18> [d1]YHLAFWMENWI IREI[/d1] [c1]YHLAFWMENW OREI  
[c1]:

There are what appear to be two consecutive *iotas* after the final *omega*. It is difficult to say what the scribe might have been thinking of when he wrote this. There is a smooth breathing and acute accent above the second *iota*. This suggests that the first *iota* is an adscript and that the second one is the beginning of a word such as i[r]idi (i.e., *rainbow* or *halo*). The same diacritics rule out the possibility that the scribe was thinking of a word such as ijerw/. Putting aside these conjectures, it seems clear that irei (or iirei) was written by mistake because the first hand appears to have made the correction immediately.

<ch 12><v 23> [dx]EKKLHSIAN[/dx] [cx]EKKLHSIA[ut]I[/ut]/[cx]:

The *nu* has not been completely erased and the initial vertical is intact. This may be an intentional effort to preserve an *iota* adscript. This alteration has not been ascribed to a particular scribe as it is an erasure.

<ch 12><v 24> LALOUNTI ~ :

The phrase para ton Abel is absent. The word ekeinoi which follows

lalounti is written in uncial script. The absence of punctuation between ekeinoi and the following cursive text indicates that it belongs to the commentary.

<ch 13><v 21> POIHHSAI:

This might be more than a simple case of dittography because marks above the *etas* could both be diacritics. The second *eta* is clearly marked with a circumflex, as would be expected. The mark above the first *eta* is indistinct, but may be a deletion point.

## U150

Patmos, Ioannu, 61.

Transcribed and verified by reference to photographic prints.

This text was transcribed from microfilm-based photographic prints held at the Institute for New Testament Textual Research in Münster. Some of the prints were difficult to read, especially those of folios 127 v., 128 r., 129 v., 130 r., 133 v., and 134r. For this reason, my transcription is probably inaccurate in a few points of detail, particularly where punctuation is concerned.

The manuscript is written in one column, with about 34 lines per column. Uncial biblical text alternates with sections of minuscule commentary. Punctuation marks have been transcribed, but breathing marks have not. There are many instances where a punctuation mark transcribed as a high point could be a medial point, and vice versa. Occasionally, the letters following punctuation are written along a line which is vertically displaced relative to the line along which letters preceding the punctuation are written. An example of this occurs at the point of division between Heb 10.23 and 10.24.

Biblical sections are marked with the letters KEI and a superscript M, which may stand for KEIMAI. Commentary sections are similarly marked, but with the letters ER, presumably standing for ERMHNEIA. Quotation markers '>' and marginal references sometimes stand adjacent to Old Testament quotations.

### *Correctors*

Only one corrector appears to have worked on this manuscript.

inscription: PROS EBRAIOUS:

The title is preceded by a cross '+' and followed by an asterisk.

<ch 1><v 3> [d1]A[rt]U[/rt]TOU[/d1]:

There maybe an *epsilon* following the *alpha*. If so, there may have been consecutive alterations here, with AUTOU having been changed to EAUTOU. The second hand has been assumed to be responsible for the

erasure.

<ch 1><v 6> NHN LEGEI ~ KAI PROSKUNHSATWSAN AUTW PANTES  
AGGELOI:

Here is an example of quotation markers that regularly occur adjacent to biblical quotations.

<ch 1><v 8> PROS DE TON [st][ns]UN[/ns] ~ [/st]¶:

These words intrude into the right-hand margin. Similar intrusions, usually incorporating superscript text, are found at the ends of a number of sections in this manuscript. In general, these unusually long lines appear to have been written by the first hand. In the present case, however, this ascription is subject to a degree of doubt. The same goes for the intrusion at 7.9, below.

<ch 2><v 1> PERISSOTERWS:

The W appears to have been altered from an O by the first hand.

<ch 2><v 8> OUPW:

This W may have been altered from an O by the first hand.

<ch 2><v 9> [ns][di][di]N[/ns]:

A diaeresis mark also occurs in IHSOUS at 4.8.

<ch 2><v 10> [c1][st]GAR[/st]/[c1]:

This has been ascribed to the second hand on the basis of the following decision table:

<i>Corrector</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Ambiguous</i>
<i>Style</i>		<i>x</i>	
<i>Size</i>			<i>x</i>
<i>Pen-width</i>			<i>x</i>
<i>Shade</i>			<i>x</i>

<ch 2><v 14> TWN AUT[st]WN[/st]:

These words intrude into the right-hand margin. The last two letters are written above the line.



<ch 3><v 1> ARCIEREA:

What appears to be a cross (+) follows this word.

<ch 3><v 8> TW PARAPIKRASMW≥ KATA THN HMERAN TOU  
PEIRASMOU EN TH:

There is an asterisk-like symbol in the left-hand margin adjacent to this line.

<ch 3><v 16> MWUSEWS:

A mark above the U may be diaeresis.

<ch 4><v 8> [di]l[/di]HSOUS:

Diaeresis also occurs in IHSOUN at 2.9.

<ch 5><v 1> PROSFEREI TI:

U6 has PROSFERH TE.

<ch 5><v 4> TIMHN≥:

There may have been alteration in the vicinity of the N.

<ch 5><v 5> EDOXASEN HQHNAI:

This corruption of the usual EDOXASEN GENHQHNAI may be due to the similar appearance of -SEN and GEN-.

<ch 5><v 6> [it]EIS TON AIWNA[/it]:

The writing is consistent with the first hand.

<ch 5><v 7> [di]l[/di]KETHRIAS:

The letters KETH are minuscule.

<ch 5><v 14> EXIN': This may be a reading mark.

<ch 6><v 6> |s 1|:

Symbols are used to mark sections from 6.6 to 6.13. These symbols are replaced with Arabic numerals in my transcription.

<ch 6><v 13> [c1][st]GAR[/st]/[c1]:

This has been ascribed to the second hand on the basis of the following decision table:

<i>Corrector</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Ambiguous</i>
<i>Style</i>		<i>x</i>	
<i>Size</i>			<i>x</i>
<i>Pen-width</i>			<i>x</i>
<i>Shade</i>			<i>x</i>

<ch 6><v 14> PLHQUNWSAI:

This is one word (Wachtel and Witte, 1994).

<ch 7><v 11> [d1]LEUTIKHS[/d1] [c1]LEU[st][di]I[/di]/[st]TIKHS[/c1]:

This has been ascribed to the second hand on the basis of the following decision table:

<i>Corrector</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Ambiguous</i>
<i>Style</i>		<i>x</i>	
<i>Size</i>			<i>x</i>
<i>Pen-width</i>			<i>x</i>
<i>Shade</i>			<i>x</i>

<ch 7><v 16> ZWHS:

There is an asterisk above this word.

<ch 7><v 23> TO QATTON KWLUESQAI:

Thus.

|s A|:

Section numbering omits the initial R (i.e., 100) from this point forwards.

<ch 8><v 6> HTHS:

The accenting suggests that this is a spelling variation of HTIS rather than two words H THS. The first *eta* has a rough breathing and acute accent, and -THS has no accents.

<ch 8><v 12> [d1]ADIKIAIS[/d1] [c1]ADIK[ut]E[/ut]IAIS[/c1]:

The E appears to have been added later.

<ch 8><v 13> [d1]PALAIWKEN[/d1] [c1][st]PE[/st]PALAIWKEN[/c1]:

The style of the superscript E is consistent with the second hand.

<ch 9><v 22> KATA:

A mark above KATA resembles the word DE.

<ch 10><v 4> [d1]AF' EIREIN[/d1] [c1]AF' AIREIN[/c1]:

An A has been superimposed on the E. The ink and the form of the *alpha* suggest that the second hand is responsible.

<ch 10><v 16>:

Parts of this and the following verse are missing.

<ch 11><v 8> ABRAAM': A reading mark follows this word.

<ch 11><v 17> [d0]EPAGGELIAS[/d0] [c0]EPAGGEL[st]E[/st]IAS[/c0]:

An E has been added above the line, apparently by the second hand.

<ch 11><v 21> PROSEKUNHSEN...:

An asterisk follows this word.

<ch 11><v 28> T[st][sc]OU[/sc][st]:

This contraction may have been added by a corrector.

<ch 11><v 30> KUKLWQEN ≥ TA EPI:

A medial point is situated between KUKLWQEN and TA. P46 has KUKLOQEN EPI.

<ch 11><v 38> KOSMOS ≥ EN ERHMIAIS PLANOMENOI KAI ORESI:

A star symbol is drawn above KOSMOS and ORESI(N).

<ch 12><v 19> [dx]FWNH[/dx] [cx]FWNH[st]S[/st][cx]:

It is not clear which hand added what appears to be a *sigma* as a superscript. The first hand of P46 has FWNHN here.

<ch 12><v 21> MWUSHS:

There may be diaeresis above the U.

<ch 12><v 22> MURIASIN:

A space between the S and I appears to be due to a fault in the parchment.

<ch 13><v 7> [d1][ut]H[/ut]MWN[/d1] [c1]UMWN[/c1]:

This correction has been ascribed to the second hand on the basis of the following decision table:

<i>Corrector</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Ambiguous</i>
<i>Style</i>		<i>x</i>	
<i>Size</i>		<i>x</i>	
<i>Pen-width</i>		<i>x</i>	
<i>Shade</i>		<i>x</i>	

<ch 13><v 7> MIM[ut]E[/ut]SQAI:

The uncertain letter may be an H. There does not appear to be an I here.

<ch 13><v 24> HTALIAS:

The spelling ITALIAS is used in the subscription.

<ch 13><v 25> H CARIS META PANTWN UMWN, AMHN:

This section is marked by an asterisk.

subscription: STICWN YN:

That is, 750. This number is given in U1 and U25 as well.

## U151

Patmos, Ioannu, 62.

Transcribed and verified by reference to photographic prints.

This transcription was made from microfilm-based photographic prints held at the Institute for New Testament Textual Research in Münster.

The manuscript is written in two columns, with about 33 lines per column. The same commentary as found in U150 is given in this manuscript as well. Once again, the biblical text is in uncial script and the commentary is in minuscule script. It is easy to confuse the uncial *etas* with *nus*, and *epsilons* with *omegas*. The scribe was in the habit of writing what appears to be a *tau* followed by a cursive *gamma* for double *tau* (e.g., Heb 2.7, *hjlavttwsa*".)

Spaces occur between words, within words, and adjacent to punctuation. My transcription uses ellipses to represent spaces that occur between words and following punctuation, provided the spaces are not less than 2 mm in width. Spaces that occur between words or before punctuation are not recorded.

The choice of a 2 mm critical width for spaces is arbitrary. A set limit provides a convenient means of discrimination and significantly reduces the effort that must be devoted to deciding whether a space is intended to be a sense-pause. This simple method is not ideal, and allows some genuine sense-pauses to be omitted from the transcription.

As the letters are quite small, the three imaginary bands used to distinguish between low, medial, and high points are only about one millimetre wide. This makes it difficult to distinguish between these varieties. Punctuation occasionally consists of small arrow-heads (>). These are transcribed as commas. Sloping dashes at line-ends mark hyphenation. A number of scribal compendiums occur, usually at line-ends.

### *Correctors*

There are only a few corrections. These have been ascribed to the first

and second hands. Their writing is virtually indistinguishable. I have ascribed alterations according to the whether I believe the first hand would have been likely to make the given alteration.

inscription: PROS EBRAIOUS:

The inscription is preceded and followed by crosses (+).

<ch 1><v 5> TE TWN AGGELWN [ns]US[/ns] MOU EI:

One of the marginal references employed throughout the manuscript is adjacent to this line.

<ch 1><v 6> OTAN:

There may have been an erasure in the vicinity of the A.

<ch 1><v 6> PROSKUNHSATWSAN:

There may have been an erasure in the vicinity of the letters HSA.

<ch 2><v 5>:

The words THN MELLOUSAN are omitted, possibly through *homoioтелеuton*.

<ch 2><v 9> AGGEL[sc]OUS[/sc]:

Gardthausen (1913, 339-340) does not list this compendium (Ϟ) of OUS, but gives a comparable symbol for TOUS.

<ch 2><v 17> [di]l[/di]LASKESQ[sc]Al[/sc]:

This contraction (ϙ) is similar to one that Gardthausen (1913, 335) gives for Al. It could be mistaken for an E.

<ch 3><v 11> MOU (second occurrence):

What appears to be a T located above the M may be due to ink seeping through a fault in the parchment.

<ch 4><v 1> FOBHQWM[st][sc]EN[/sc][st]:

This contraction (Ϙ) is consistent with the symbol for EN given by Gardthausen (1913, 337).

<ch 4><v 8> ELAL[ut]H[/ut]:

The H may be EI.

<ch 5><v 5>:

The words OUTWS to CRISTOS are absent from this manuscript.

<ch 6><v 10> DIAKONOUNTES ~ :

The S appears to have the form of a cursive final S (").

<ch 6><v 19> THS:

A ligature of the T and H ( <sup>h</sup> ) is used here.

<ch 6><v 20> HM[st][sc]WN[/sc][[/st]:

This contraction ( <sup>h</sup> ) is also found in M2815.

<ch 7><v 3> U[ns]IW[/ns]:

This *nomen sacrum* superscript is located above an uncontracted word.

<ch 7><v 8> APOQNHSK[ut]O[/ut]NTES:

The uncertain letter looks like an W.

<ch 7><v 13> QU[sc]SIA[/sc]STHRIW:

This compendium ( <sup>h</sup> ) looks similar to an A but its loop has a vertical stroke.

<ch 7><v 25> ENTUGCANEIN:

The G is written in cursive script. The same occurs at 7.27 (ANAGKHN), 8.5 (DEIGM-), 9.13 (TRAGWN), and 9.16 (ANAGKH).

<ch 8><v 5> DEIGMAMATI:

The scribe has accidentally written MA at the end of one column and again at the beginning of the next column.

<ch 9><v 9> DUNAME[ut]N[/ut]AI:

The uncertain N appears to have an additional vertical stroke.

<ch 9><v 13> AGIAZE[ut]I[/ut]:

This letter is uncertain because of a fault in the microfilm print.


<ch 9><v 14> EIS TO LATREUEIN Q[ns]W[/ns] ZWNTI:

Parts of these words are written in cursive script.

<ch 9><v 15> DIAQHK[ut]H[/ut]:

The last *eta* looks like a *nu*.

<ch 9><v 19> [c1][st][sc]TE[/sc][st][c1]:

This scribal contraction (  ) has been ascribed to the second hand.

<ch 10><v 1> NOMOS:

The S is written in cursive script.

<ch 10><v 5> KATHRTISO:

Apparently from KATHRTISW by O/W interchange.

<ch 10><v 7> SOU:

The triple point that usually marks section-ends is very feint and may even be missing.

<ch 10><v 16> AUTWN:

The A and U are written as a ligature (  ).

<ch 10><v 33> ONEIDISMO[di]l[/di]S:

The marks transcribed as diaeresis may be accents.

<ch 11><v 7> CRHMATISQEIS:

The H and M are combined in a ligature.

<ch 11><v 21> IAKWB:

A mark above the I appears to be an accent but may be diaeresis.

<ch 11><v 23> PISTEI MW[di]U[/di]SHS GENNHQEIS:


These words are repeated before and after the commentary.

<ch 11><v 38> ORESI:




There may be a N at the end of this word.

<ch 11><v 39> [sc]AUT[/sc]HS:

This compendium has the following appearance: .

<ch 12><v 2> Al[sc]SC[/sc]UNHS:

This compendium has the following appearance: .


<ch 12><v 13> [d1]IAQEI[/d1] [c1]IAQH[/c1]:

The last part of this word appears to have begun as a cursive compendium of E and I and to have finished as an H. The order of alteration may be opposite to that indicated here.

<ch 12><v 16> H BEBHLOS WS HSAU:

Only part of the biblical text has been copied. Part of the preceding commentary is written in uncial script.

<ch 13><v 2> [sc]GAR[/sc]:

This compendium of GAR () is listed in Gardthausen (1913, 336).

<ch 13><v 4> [d0]KR[ut]E[/ut]NEI[/d0] [c0]KRINEI[/c0]:

This word appears to have been changed from KRENEI to KRINEI. The alteration may have been from KRINEI to KRENEI.

<ch 13><v 6> POIHSEI:

This E may be written over an erased O.

<ch 13><v 6> FOBHQHSOMAI ≤ TI POIHSEI MOI A[ns]NOS[/ns] ~ ¶:

It is possible that the paragraph division-marker should follow FOBHQHSOMAI.

<ch 13><v 9> [sc]GAR[/sc]:

The same compendium is used at 13.2.

<ch 13><v 17> UMWN:

There may have been an erasure in the vicinity of the U.

<ch 13><v 25> AMHN:

This word is followed by a cross (+).

subscription: STI[st]CC[/st] YG:

That is, 703. The same number is given in U15 and U18. The superscript letters are written above the letters T and I (𐤔𐤌).

## U227

Vienna, Austrian National Library, Pap. G. 26055.

Transcribed and verified by reference to photographs.

This transcription is made from photographs kindly supplied by the Austrian National Library. The photographs are of respective sides of an irregularly shaped piece of vellum. The writing is biblical uncial and is reminiscent of the writing in Codex Alexandrinus.

Approximately 760 letters would be expected between the extant sections of text. The average number of letters per line is 12.7 for the recto and 10.6 for the verso. It follows that the intervening text occupied somewhere between 60 and 72 lines. This implies that the manuscript was written in a number of columns, which is not surprising in the light of the small line-lengths. There appears to be a page number in the upper left-hand corner of the verso. If the page numbers were originally centred then would have been two columns per page. This means that the intervening text occupied three out of the four columns that originally lay on both sides of the leaf. Adding the number of lines in the first section (five) to the calculated number of intervening lines gives 65 to 77 lines to be divided into three columns. The result is about 24 (i.e.,  $72/3$ ) lines per column.

<ch 11><v 18> [di]l[/di]S[ut]A[/ut]AK': The mark transcribed as an apostrophe may be part of the K.

[f v]:

There appears to be a letter B above and to the left of the column of text. Another letter may precede the B. This letter (or letters) is probably part of a page number. It is accompanied by a trace of a superscript line.

<ch 11><v 29> [rt]GHS HS PE[/rt][ut]l[/ut]RAN:

The average number of letters per line in the extant part of this column (10.6), together with the position of the final part of this line relative to letters in the preceding line, indicate that this manuscript contained the word GHS.

## U228

Vienna, Austrian National Library, Pap. G. 26055.

Transcribed and verified by reference to photographs.

The text is written on a triangular fragment of vellum. The nine lines of text on the recto side are in far better condition than the ten barely readable lines on the verso side. The style of writing is biblical uncial.

There are seventeen or eighteen letters per line. This implies that there were about seven lines between the two surviving portions of text, giving a total of sixteen or seventeen lines per column in the original manuscript.

One rough breathing is found, and punctuation occurs twice. The punctuation mark is a colon in one instance and may be a colon or a high point in the other. There appears to be a *nomen sacrum* superscript above an uncertain N on the last line of the recto. This indicates that the manuscript contained a variant that is not otherwise known. (See the note at 12.21 below).

Transcribing the verso was challenging indeed. I took account of the positions of extant letters and the average line lengths implied by the better preserved portions. One weakness in the given reconstruction is that it seems to leave a space before PARA on the ninth line.

<ch 12><v 19> [rt]PROSQEINAI[/rt]:

This transcription is more consistent with the implied line length if PROSQEINAI (found in U2) is read instead of PROSTEQHNAI.

<ch 12><v 20> [d0][rt]DIASTELLOME[/rt]MON[/d0] [c0][rt]DIASTELLOME[/rt]NON[/c0]:

The M has been changed into a N, apparently by the first hand.

<ch 12><v 20> [rt]LIQOBOLHQH[/rt]SETAI[ut]:[/ut]:

This punctuation mark is identified as a colon rather than a high point, mainly because the other punctuation mark on this side of the fragment is a colon. There may be a remnant of the colon's lower point on the bottom

edge of the adjacent split in the vellum.

<ch 12><v 21> [rt]TON [ns]Q[/ns][rt][ns][ut]N[/ut][ns]:

There is a superscript line above the uncertain N. This suggests that a *nomen sacrum* in the accusative case stood here. The number of letters per line and the relative disposition of the surviving text suggest the following reconstruction of this line (underlining marks reconstructed text):

TWFOBERONTONQNTOFAN

'... so awesome [was] the apparition-making God...'

This reconstruction requires that HN be supplied by the reader and that its predicate be in the accusative instead of the grammatically required nominative case.

Another possible reconstruction is:

TWFOBERONHNQNTOFAN

'... so awesome was the divine apparition...'

While removing the necessity of supplying HN, this reconstruction still incorporates the ungrammatical accusative predicate. It also lacks a definite article before QN.

It is possible that the scribe mistook the letters HN for IHN, and placed a line above them without considering the context. Alternatively, the text that once occupied the lacuna may have been quite different to the usual text.

## U243

Formerly U121b. Hamburg, Univ. Bibl., Cod. 50 in scrin.

Transcribed and verified by reference to a Xerox copy of microfilm.

The manuscript is written in two columns. Ellipses mark spaces of not less than 3 mm that follow punctuation. As the letters are quite small, the criteria for certain text and uncertain text have been slightly relaxed. This avoids the tedium of marking a great number of letters as uncertain when they are probably clear in the manuscript itself. A check of the recto and verso of the first folio (corresponding to 1.1 to 4.3) that was made against photographs at the Institute for New Testament Textual Research showed that the transcription from Xerox prints was generally sound.

Scribal contractions are common. The following table sets out each contraction, the letters it represents, the place it occurs, and the page number of the corresponding reference in Gardthausen, if there is one. (Sometimes the reference to Gardthausen is for a related contraction.) Ligatures are included in the table as well.

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Represents</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Gardthausen (1913)</i>
Ⲭ	EU	12.28	
ϣ	OU	13.9, 13.13	
ϣ ϣ	(L)OUS, OUS	1.7	340 (TOUS)
ϣ ϣ̅	(D)OS, (T)OS	1.8, 2.14	339
Ⲙ	TW	1.13, 2.14	
Ⲙ	THN	12.26	

<ch 1><v 3> OS WN APAUGASMA THS DOXHS KAI CA=:

An example of a marginal section marker (B) is found here.

<ch 1><v 5> [ut]TW[/ut]N AGGELWN≥ UIOS MOU EI SU≥ EGW:

Examples of marginal quotation markers (>) are found here.

<ch 2><v 6> EPISKEPTH:

PT ligature.

<ch 2><v 9> BLEPOM[st][sc]E[ut]N[/ut][sc][st]:

An E is written above the M. EN is one of several possible meanings of a superscript E according to Gardthausen (1913, 336).

<ch 3><v 18> [dx]WM[ut]W[/ut]SEN[/dx] [cx]WMOSEN[/cx]:

An original *omega* has been changed to an *omicron*. I owe this observation to Wachtel and Witte (1994). It is difficult to tell from the Xerox copy whether this alteration was made by the first hand or another scribe.

<ch 13><v 11> KATAKAIET[rt]E[/rt]:

The reconstructed portion of this word has E rather than the usual AI as a single letter appears to be a better fit to the lacuna.

<ch 13><v 20> DIAQHK[sc][ut][st]H[/st]S[/ut][sc]:

This scribal contraction (ϙ) is not clear in the Xerox copy. It is not like any of the contractions of HS listed in Gardthausen (1913, 337).

<ch 13><v 23> TIMOQEON:

The *nu* is in minuscule script.

## U252

Barcelona, Fundació Sant Lluc Evang., P. Barc. 6.

Transcribed and verified by reference to photographs.

This fragment has text from Heb 6.2 to 6.4 on the recto, and from Hb 6.6 to 6.7 on the verso. Some of the letters that Roca-Puig (1964, 243-244) marked as uncertain are demoted to the status of reconstructed text in my transcription. At the same time, I have assigned the status of uncertain text to some letters that he transcribed as certain.

An estimated line length of between 11.7 and 12.0 results from my reconstructions of the disposition of text in the manuscript. The approximate number of letters between the fragments is about 150, once normal *nomina sacra* contractions are made. This corresponds to twelve or thirteen lines. The number of surviving lines in the fragments is twelve, so the number of lines per column in the original manuscript was 24 or 25. This agrees with Roca-Puig's estimate of 25 (1964, 241).

<ch 6><v 2> TE [ut]C[/ut][rt]EIRWN[/rt]:

A trace of ink follows TE at the edge of the fragment. It is at a level of about two-thirds of the height of the E. Whereas Roca-Puig (1964, 243) transcribes this remnant as  $\eta \geq$ , the mark does not appear to be consistent with a *nu*. The remnant is consistent with a *chi*. The first hand of U6 appears to have CEIRWN here.

<ch 6><v 3> POIHS[ut]W[/ut][rt]MEN[/rt]:

The remnant of the uncertain letter is more consistent with an W than an O.

<ch 6><v 6> ANASTAUROUNTAS:

The R and O of this word may be visible.

<ch 6><v 7> [rb]H[/rb]:

I have transcribed a mark located above the H as a rough breathing.

## References



Roca-Puig, R. 1965. 'Papyrus Barcinonensis, inv. no. 6 (Hebr. 6, 2-4, 6-7)'. *Helmantica* 16, 145-9.

## **M2815**

Formerly codex 2<sup>ap</sup>. Basel, Univ. Bibl., A. N. IV. 4.

Transcribed and verified by reference to a Xerox copy supplied by the University of Basel library.

I transcribed this manuscript as part of my honours thesis. At that time I thought that this was the manuscript that Erasmus had used for the Pauline epistles of his 1516 edition of the Greek New Testament. Whereas Erasmus did use Codex 2 of the Gospels, it seems that he used Codex 7P (now M2817) for the Pauline letters. Nevertheless, M2815 is a fairly good representative of the Byzantine Imperial text.

The text is minuscule with frequent contractions, compendia, and ligatures. Capitalised initial letters are difficult to see. This may be due to their being written in coloured (red?) ink.

<ch 2><v 2> [kc]K[/kc]:

This compendium has an unusual form.

<ch 2><v 11> OTE:

This has been transcribed as OTE rather than O TE because of the acute accent found above the O. An instance of OTE with the same accent is found at 9.17.

<ch 3><v 10> TESSARAKON[st]T[sc]A[/sc][[/st]]:

The scribal contraction here reconstructed as TA appears as T: in the manuscript. The colon is unlikely to be intended as punctuation because a medial dot punctuation mark occurs after the following word. Another example of this contraction occurs at 4.15 (PANTA).

<ch 3><v 12> ZWNT[st]O[sc]S[/sc][[/st]]:

This scribal contraction consists of a superscript O. Another example of this contraction occurs at 5.7 (PROS).

<ch 4><v 15> SUMPAQHSAI:

It is difficult to tell whether the third letter is a *mu* or *nu*.

<ch 5><v 1> LAMBANO[sc]MENOS[/sc] :

This contraction has the following appearance:  .

<ch 5><v 11> [rt]O[/rt]:

There is sufficient space to accommodate an *omicron*. However, the marks which occupy the space do not look like an *omicron*. They may be the remnants of an erased letter.

<ch 5><v 14> GEGUMNASMENA:

The *mu* and *nu* look similar.

<ch 7><v 1> BAS[di]l[/di]LEUS:

The *beta* is by a later hand. It seems to have been superimposed on a faded capital *beta*.

<ch 7><v 4> QEWREITE:

The *tau* may be by the later hand described at 7.1.

<ch 7><v 11> EI [rt]M[/rt]EN [sc]OUN[/sc]:

There is no trace of a *mu* in my Xerox copy. A grave accent implies that the scribe wrote *me;n* and not *ejn* or *e{n*. A small symbol representing *ou\*n is squeezed between *me;n* and *teleivwsi*".

<ch 7><v 13> QHS[di]l[/di]ASTHRIW:

Spelled thus.

<ch 10><v 7> [c0][st]O Q[ns]S[/ns][st]/[c0]:

This insertion appears to be by the first hand.

<ch 10><v 26> QUS[di]l[/di]A:

Lettering from the reverse side of the page makes it difficult to determine whether there is punctuation here.

<ch 10><v 35> APOBALHTE:

A later hand has added the *beta* in the left-hand column.

<ch 11><v 22> [d0]IELEUTWN[/d0] [c0]TELEUTWN[/c0]:

This alteration appears to be by the first hand.

<ch 11><v 24> F[ns]AR[/ns]AW:

Pharaoh receives a *nomen sacrum*!

[f 208v]:

Quire number *kappa digamma* (i.e., 26) is written in the lower margin.

[f 209r]:

Quire number *kappa zeta* (i.e., 27) is written in the lower margin.

<ch 12><v 20> H BOLID[di]l[/di] KATATOXEUQHSETAI:

This reading (which is translated, *or shot through with a dart*) is also in the *Textus Receptus*.

## SUPPLEMENTARY TEXTS

The texts of a number of witnesses have been constructed from secondary sources to provide additional reference points for the classical scaling maps. Nearly all of these supplementary texts have been generated by replacing the UBS4 text with the readings of witnesses given in its apparatus. Only 43 of the 44 variation units given by UBS4 for Hebrews are considered. One is excluded because it relates to accents alone (Heb 5.12). Only those witnesses which are specified for at least five variation units have been constructed.

The texts of two Church Fathers have been compiled from editions in the Society of Biblical Literature's *The New Testament in the Greek Fathers* series. Cyril of Jerusalem's text is taken from Mullen (1997, 262-272), while Gregory of Nyssa's text is taken from Brooks (1991, 241-252).

Three uncial manuscripts of Hebrews — U278, U280, and U285 — are from the 1975 find at Saint Catherine's Monastery. These have still not been published in full and I have not been able to gain access to photographs in order to make transcriptions. I have constructed the texts of U278 and U285 from the apparatus of Wachtel and Witte (1994). These constructs do not reflect the spelling of the actual manuscripts as the spellings in Wachtel and Witte are generally normalised. I could not find any secondary sources by which to reconstruct the text of U280.

The supplementary witnesses are tagged as reconstructed text everywhere except for the places where their readings are given. In other words, their texts are only treated as established where specifically cited in the secondary sources. If this strategy were not employed, each constructed witness would appear more similar to the UBS4 base text than it really is. (Each would always agree with the UBS4 text in variation units which are not listed in the UBS4 apparatus.) In contrast to this general strategy, I have assumed that the extant text of U278 conforms to the base text except as reported otherwise by Wachtel and Witte (1994). This is because appendix 1 of NA27 shows U278 to be free of lacunae in the portion of Hebrews for which it is extant, and because Wachtel and Witte give a comprehensive account of its variations from the base text.

### *Dates and provenances*

Date and provenance information is given when it can be established. Question marks indicate a degree of uncertainty. Each century-style date is converted to a year-style date by taking the midpoint of the given range, as these examples illustrate:

II/III	200?
early III	225?
III	250?
late III	275?

Manuscript dates are taken from NA27 (684-718) or UBS4 (903-908). Information concerning Church Fathers and versions is extracted from Aland and Aland (1989), Metzger (1977), Metzger (1992), and *The Oxford dictionary of the Christian church* (1997). Dates given for individuals are estimates of when each was active, as discerned from the references. Further details are given below:

Byzantine: The Alands (1989, 64) write,

In Antioch the early form [of the New Testament text] was polished stylistically, edited ecclesiastically, and expanded devotionally. This was the origin of what is called the Koine text, later to become the Byzantine Imperial text. Fourth-century tradition called it the text of Lucian.

Euthalian manuscripts: I have attributed the text represented by these manuscripts to Pamphilus. Zuntz (1945, 88) writes, 'the text edited by 'Euthalius' was a Caesarean text, more precisely, that of Pamphilus.' The given date corresponds to Pamphilus' imprisonment.

Armenian: The date of about 410 corresponds to the first edition. A revision was published about 433 based on 'correct' copies of the Greek Bible brought from Constantinople after the Council of Ephesus (431). Mesrop may have been at Etchmiadzin, which became the patriarchal see after about 390 (*Oxford dictionary of the Christian church*, 1997, 106-7, 1074-5).

Coptic: The dates given for the Coptic versions are tentative. Metzger (1992, 79) writes, 'About the beginning of the third century portions of the New Testament were translated into Sahidic, and within the following century most of the books of the New Testament became available in that dialect.' Metzger (1977, 127-132) provides a précis of an essay by Kasser that was published in *Biblica* 46 (1965). By Metzger's account, Kasser gives 200 CE as the beginning of the pre-classical Sahidic stage, and 300 CE as the beginning of the pre-classical Bohairic stage. My date for the Fayyumic version is based on the estimated date of its earliest manuscript, which is an early fourth century copy of the Gospel of John (Metzger, 1992, 81).

Ethiopic: According to Metzger (1977, 221), some Monophysites who had been condemned at the Council of Chalcedon (451 CE), fled to Ethiopia. Once there, they set about various missionary activities, including the translation of scripture into the local language. The UBS4 introduction (1993, 28\*) gives the date as 'about 500'.

Georgian-1: Metzger (1977, 184) writes, 'a careful induction of many strands of evidence has led most scholars to suppose that at least the Gospels and other parts of the New Testament were translated before the middle of the fifth century.'

Georgian-2: The date is taken from the Alands (1989, 205): 'This first translation (geo<sup>1</sup>) was followed by a revision (geo<sup>2</sup>) based on a Greek text which was made after the separation from the Armenian church in the early seventh century'.

Itala-d: The similarity of this text to that of Lucifer of Cagliari led Souter (1954, 26) to conjecture that it was from Sardinia. UBS4 (1993, 907) gives its date as fifth or sixth century. Kenyon (1950, 96) thinks the difference in date between the manuscript and Lucifer (†370) somewhat weakens Souter's provenance argument.

Slavonic: According to Metzger (1977, 403), Methodius and others completed the translation in 884. The location is tentative, based on Methodius' place of residence after Cyril's death in 869. (See Metzger, 1977, 400.)

Syriac-Harklean: This revision of the Philoxenian version was made in 616 CE by Thomas of Harkel at Enaton monastery near Alexandria (Zuntz, 1945, 7-8).

Syriac-Palestinian: It is not known when this translation was made, but 'most scholars think that it dates from about the fifth century' (Metzger, 1992, 71). The UBS4 introduction (1993, 27\*), however, gives a date of 'about the sixth Century'.

Syriac-Peshitta: Metzger (1992, 69) says that this version dates from 'about the beginning of the fifth century', while the UBS4 introduction (1993, 26\*) gives its date as the first half of the fifth century. Burkitt's theory that Rabbula was the editor of this version is now in doubt. This version's adoption by both Nestorian and Jacobite branches of the Syrian church suggest that it was current before the division of 431 CE (Metzger, 1977, 59-60).

Vulgate: Jerome completed his revision of the Latin Gospels in 384. As for the rest of the New Testament, no one knows who carried out the revision or where it was done. As Metzger (1977, 359) writes, 'the most that can be said with certainty is that the Vulgate text of St. Paul's epistles came into being in the closing years of the fourth century at the latest.'

Cassiodorus: The citations compiled for Cassiodorus include some that earlier critical editions of the New Testament attribute to Primasius. Souter (1954, 83) writes,

Pelagius on the Epistles was in wide use as an anonymous work... Cassiodorus, however, scented Pelagianism in it, and rewrote the Commentary on Romans, leaving the Commentaries on the other Epistles to be treated by his pupils in the same way. This anti-pelagianized Pelagius survives in print under the name Primasius.

Cassiodorus' school was located at Vivarium near Naples (*Oxford dictionary of the Christian church*, 1997, 296).



Gregory of Nyssa: According to Brooks (1991, 1), modern Nevsehir in Turkey is probably in the same location as ancient Nyssa.

Origen: I have given a tentative location for Origen's text as Caesarea. It might have come from Alexandria, instead.

Theodoret: Cyrrhus is on the Euphrates in upper Syria (Metzger, 1992, 89).

Theophylact: Theophylact was made archbishop of Ohrid around 1090 (*Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 1997, 1607).

### *Specific notes*

<ch 1><v 2> EP' ESCATWN TWN HMERWN:

One of Cyril of Jerusalem's citations includes gar after ejscatwn (Mullen, 1997, 262). I have not included this as it is probably a contextual modification (i.e., a change made in the biblical text to suit the surrounding commentary).

<ch 1><v 3>:

In this variation unit, I have followed Zuntz (1953, 43, note 4) for the text of Athanasius, and Souter for Origen's text.

<ch 2><v 7>:

UBS4 alone cites Chrysostom for the long reading after aujton and Theodoret for its omission. I have followed Tischendorf, Souter, and UBS3, which report the opposite. In my view, the transposition in the UBS4 apparatus makes its testimony suspicious on this occasion.

<ch 2><v 9>:

Tischendorf and Zuntz disagree on the reading of Eusebius. As Zuntz (1953, 34) appears to have obtained his citations from Tischendorf, the matrix entry follows Tischendorf's apparatus in this instance.

In the same variation unit, UBS4 differs from Tischendorf, Zuntz, and UBS3 for Pseudo-Oecumenius. I have followed UBS4 in this case. (Note that Pseudo-Oecumenius reported that the alternative cwri" qeou was

read by the Nestorians.)

<ch 4><v 2>:

I have followed UBS3 for Theodoret's text at this place.

<ch 4><v 3>:

Lucifer's testimony has not been entered for this variation unit (4.3a) because it is not clear which reading is supported by his Latin.

<ch 4><v 16> EIS EUKAIRON BOHQEIAN:

Mullen (1997, 264) precedes this with *mnhmoneuesqw de tauta para soi*, which, I presume, is not part of Cyril's New Testament text.

<ch 5><v 5> ARCIEREA:

This is spelled *ajrciera* in Mullen (1997, 264).

<ch 7><v 20> IEREIS:

This is spelled *iJeraï* in Mullen (1997, 265).

<ch 9><v 11> [ut]DE[/ut]:

Cyril has *gar* (Mullen, 1997, 266), but I have left *de* as it stands. The change is probably contextual.

In the same verse, UBS3 and Souter list Origen as supporting *genomenwn* whereas UBS4 has a Latin translation of his work supporting *mellontwn*. I have followed UBS3 and Souter.

<ch 9><v 13> TO AIMA TAURWN KAI TRAGWN:

Mullen (1997, 266) has *ta* for *to* and *kar* for *kai*.

<ch 9><v 14> POSW MALLON TO AIMA TOU CRISTOU:

Cyril ends his quotation with an interrogation mark after *cristou* (Mullen, 1997, 266).

<ch 9><v 26> EPI SUNTELEIA TWN AIWNWN:

Mullen (1997, 267) precedes this citation with *uio* men *gar* *Dabid*,

which I have taken to be Cyril's words.

<ch 11><v 6> CWRIS [ut]DE[/ut] PISTEWS ADUNATON ESTIN  
EUARESTHSAI:

Mullen (1997, 269) gives Cyril's text as *oti cwri" pistew" adunaton estin euaresthsai*. I have taken the initial changes to be contextual modifications rather than genuine textual variations.

<ch 11><v 18> [ut]EN ISAAK KLHQHSETAI SOI SPERMA[/ut]:

These words are bracketed in the edition of *Biblia Patristica* Mullen used as the basis for his list of Cyril's citations (Mullen, 1997, 269, note 129).

<ch 11><v 37>:

Zuntz (1953, 48, note 2) blames scribal error for the absence of *ejpeirasqhsan* from one of Ephraem's manuscripts.

UBS4 gives Acacius in support of *ejprisqhsan ejpeirasqhsan*. According to Tischendorf, Souter, and UBS3, he supports *ejprisqhsan*. I have followed UBS4.

UBS3 gives Jerome as supporting *ejprisqhsan*, whereas he supports *ejpeirasqhsan ejprisqhsan* according to UBS4. I have followed UBS4.

<ch 12><v 2> UPEMEINE STAURON, AISCUNHS KATAFRONHSAS:

One of Cyril's citations has *ton* before *stauron*. Mullen spells *stauron* as *saturon* in the other citation (1997, 270).

<ch 12><v 16> TA:

Mullen (1997, 271) has *to* for *ta*.

<ch 13><v 4> TIMIOS O GAMOS:

The given citation includes *gar* after *timio*" (Mullen, 1997, 272). I have not included this in the transcription as it is probably a contextual modification.

<ch 13><v 15>:

Souter has Origen in support of διὰ αὐτοῦ οὐκ, whereas he supports the omission of οὐκ according to UBS4. I have followed UBS4.

## References

Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger (eds.). 1993. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Nestle-Aland, 27th ed. Stuttgart. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger (eds.). 1993. *The Greek New Testament*. United Bible Societies, 4th rev. ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies.

Aland, Kurt and Barbara. 1989. *The text of the New Testament: an introduction to the critical editions and to the theory and practice of modern textual criticism*. 2nd rev. and enlarged ed. Trans. Erroll F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Aland, Kurt, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren (eds.). 1983. *The Greek New Testament*. United Bible Societies, 3rd corr. ed. New York: United Bible Societies.

Benduhn-Mertz, Annette, Gerd Mink, and Horst Bachmann. 1991. *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*. Part 2. *Die Paulinischen Briefe*. Vol. 4. *Kolosserbrief bis Hebräerbrief*. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung, 19. Ed. Kurt Aland. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Brooks, James A. 1991. *The New Testament text of Gregory of Nyssa*. Society of Biblical Literature: the New Testament in the Greek Fathers, 2. Ed. Gordon D. Fee. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Kenyon, Frederic G. 1950. *The text of the Greek Bible: a student's handbook*. Studies in theology, 38. Rev. ed. London: Gerald Duckworth.

Metzger, Bruce M. 1977. *The early versions of the New Testament: their origin, transmission, and limitations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Metzger, Bruce M. 1992. *The text of the New Testament: its transmission, corruption, and restoration*. 3rd enlarged ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mullen, Roderic L. 1997. *The New Testament text of Cyril of Jerusalem*. Society of Biblical Literature: the New Testament in the Greek Fathers, 7. Ed. Bart D. Ehrman. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Souter, Alexander (ed.). 1947. *Novvm Testamentvm Graece*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Souter, Alexander. 1954. *The text and canon of the New Testament*. Studies in theology, 25. 2nd ed., rev. C. S. C. Williams. London: Gerald Duckworth.

*The Oxford dictionary of the Christian Church*. 1997. 3rd ed. Ed. F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tischendorf, Konstantin von (ed.). 1872. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Vol. 2. 8th major critical ed. Leipzig: Giesecke and Devrient. Repr. 1965. Graz: Akademischen Druck.

Wachtel, Klaus and Klaus Witte. 1994. *Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus*. Vol. 2. *Die Paulinischen Briefe*. Part 2. *Gal, Eph, Phil, Kol, 1 u. 2 Thess, 1 u. 2 Tim, Tit, Phlm, Hebr*. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung, 22. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Zuntz, Günther. 1945. *The ancestry of the Harklean New Testament*. British Academy supplemental papers, 7. London: Oxford University Press.

Zuntz, Günther. 1953. *The text of the epistles: a disquisition upon the corpus Paulinum*. Schweich Lectures of 1946. London: British Academy.

## BASIS FOR CRITERIA DATA

The following is a record of authors' and editors' opinions which form the basis of entries in the criteria columns of the sample data matrix. There are also a few references relating to entries in the authors, editors, and Church Fathers columns. (The sample data matrix is included on the data disks.) In general, a view is only registered when it constitutes clear support for a reading according to one of the following criteria:

### *Internal criteria*

- (1) Authentic: Prefer the reading most likely to have been written by the author. (This is assumed to be the reading which is most appropriate to the context.)
- (2) Difficult: Prefer the more difficult reading.
- (3) Discordant: Prefer the reading which is not in harmony with a parallel passage.
- (4) Elemental: Prefer the reading which is not a conflation of alternative elemental readings.
- (5) Explanatory: Prefer the reading which explains the origin of the others.
- (6) Short: Prefer the shorter reading. (The reading which appears to be an interpolation is less likely to be original.)
- (7) Stable: Prefer the stable reading. That is, reject readings which are absent from some witnesses and have a variable position in the rest.

### *External criteria*

- (8) Diverse: Prefer the reading supported by diverse witnesses.
- (9) Early: Prefer the reading supported by earlier witnesses.
- (10) Manifold: Prefer the reading supported by the agreement of ancient groups of witnesses.
- (11) Prevalent: Prefer the reading found in the majority of manuscripts.
- (12) Reliable: Prefer the reading supported by reliable witnesses.

An author's preferred reading may still be noted when there are no classifiable reasons for the given preference (e.g., Bruce's comment at 2.8, below). In order to avoid frequent repetition of colourless statements such as 'Bover prefers reading x', references in support of such entries are not always given below.

Zuntz sometimes indicates the reading he regards as genuine with a '+' symbol. He may also append an interrogation mark '?' to indicate uncertainty in his evaluation (1953, 60). This can lead to a comment such as 'Zuntz ... regards this reading as genuine, but has reservations' (e.g., Heb 3.2, below, where Zuntz places '+' and '?' next to his preference).

As already stated, an entry is only made where the writer's preference is clear. One exception to this rule concerns Ellingworth, who presents full surveys of the opinions of other scholars, but has a tendency not to make his own preferences explicit. There are some places (e.g., 11.23) where I have assumed that he prefers the reading of NA26. (Ellingworth (1993, 85) states that his commentary is generally based on NA26.)

'The Committee' refers to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament editorial committee: Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren for the third edition (1975), and Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger for the fourth edition (1993).

### **Heb 1.3**

0: th''' dunavmew" aujtou', kaqarismovn

1: th''' dunavmew", di eJautou' kaqarismovn

Includes P46 (aujtou' for eJautou).

2: th''' dunavmew" aujtou', di eJautou' (or auJtou' or aujtou')  
kaqarismovn

For 0 (short, reliable, authentic):

... the shorter and better attested reading, can be compared with dia; th'''  
qusiva" aujtou' in Heb. 9:26 (Ellingworth, 1993, 101).

Against 0 (authentic, explanatory):

The middle voice poiḥcavmenoç ... could not by itself sufficiently express [the idea that Jesus made Himself the purifying victim], which

becomes unambiguous through the addition of *di eJautou'*. It was, however, only natural that in unpunctuated texts the trite combination *th'ç dunavmewç aujtou'* should come into being. There is a threefold stigma on this reading (1) it cannot account for the variant, or addition, *di eJautou'*; (2) the absence of the latter impairs the argument; and (3) the preceding clauses suggest that *aujtou'* refers to the Father, while the context requires that it must refer ... to the Son (Zuntz, 1953, 44-5).

#### For 1 (authentic, explanatory, elemental):

I submit that [*di eJautou'*] is the original reading, [*aujtou'*] an easy corruption, and [*aujtou', di eJautou'*] the conflation of the other two (Zuntz, 1953, 43).

The reader who takes the trouble to write out the whole elaborate period vv. 1-4 ... and to speak it, ... will realize that its very centre is spoiled by the omission of *di eJautou'* and that the *aujtou'* retained before it results in an unpleasant echo of the preceding colon (Zuntz, 1953, 45).

[This reading] results in a 4th paeon clausula [i.e. short short short long]... [This fact] supports the view that it is the original reading (Zuntz, 1953, 285).

While ... Blass was right in holding that the Byzantine longer reading ... results in a form characteristic of Hebrews, the shorter here fits uniquely the rhythmical pattern — and it has the prerogative of transcriptional probability and improved meaning (Zuntz, 1953, 286).

#### Against 1 (authentic):

... [the reading of P46] spoils the symmetry of the first two clauses of verse 3 (Attridge, 1989, 35).

#### Against 1 and 2 (explanatory, reliable, manifold):

On the whole the Committee thought it more likely that *di aujtou'* or *di eJautou'* (D<sup>c</sup> K L M 614 1739 Byz Lect *al*) was added in order to enhance the force of the middle voice of *poihsavmeno*", than that the phrase was



present originally and then omitted in good representatives of the Alexandrian text (ÅA B 33 81) as well as in Western witnesses (it<sup>81</sup> [*sic*] vg) (Metzger, 1994, 592).

The apparatus of *The Greek New Testament* (4th ed., 1993) lists it<sup>t</sup> and it<sup>v</sup> in this respect: 'it<sup>81</sup>' seems to be a typographical error in Metzger's *Textual Commentary* (2nd ed., 1994).

Zuntz's argument for δι εJautou' being authentic is strong and, I think, prevails over the combined opposition of Attridge and Ellingworth.

The Committee's argument that δι εJautou' may be explained as an insertion 'to enhance the force of the middle voice of poihsavmeno'" is not convincing. Zuntz preceded the Committee in speaking of the middle voice requiring enhancement, but to him this implied that the words in question were authentic! Due to this weakness in the Committee's position, the 'explanatory' criterion has been marked in accordance with Zuntz's view that the short reading is an easy corruption of δι εJautou'.

According to Brooks (1991, 242), Gregory of Nyssa's text has the reading th'" dunavmew" aujtou', kaqarismovn.

## **Heb 1.8**

0: sou

1: aujtou'

2: omit

For 0 (manifold, diverse, authentic):

... a majority of the Committee was more impressed (a) by the weight and variety of the external evidence supporting sou, and (b) by the internal difficulty of construing aujtou' (Metzger, 1994, 592-3).

This 'weight' of external evidence has been taken as support according to the 'manifold' criterion because Alexandrian, Western, and Byzantine

witnesses are represented in the associated list of citations supporting **SOU**.

Against 0 (discordant):

[**aujtu**'] is probably the true text here, the majority reading being the result of a very natural assimilation to the **LXX** (Bruce, 1990, 52).

For 1 (difficult, authentic, early, reliable, discordant):

[**aujtu**'] is so difficult as to be preferable on internal grounds, since it involves the double change of person: "your throne ... his kingdom ... you have loved." ... A similar change from second to third person in speaking of Christ was noted between vv. 5a and 5b. Such changes are also common in the OT (Ellingworth, 1993, 122).

... the reading **aujtu**', which has early and good support ( $\Pi^{46}$  Å B), may seem to be preferable because it differs from the reading of the Old Testament passage that is being quoted (Metzger, 1994, 592).

Zuntz (1953, 64) also regards **aujtu**' as the genuine reading.

Against 1 (explanatory):

... the variant reading "his" was probably occasioned by the ambiguity of the preposition used to introduce the citations [i.e. **prov**"] and the failure to construe the whole citation as an address (Attridge, 1989, 59).

**aujtu**' is apparently a transcriptional error (Lane, 1991a, 21).

Whereas the Committee disapproves of **aujtu** as inappropriate on the grounds of difficulty, Ellingworth shows that the change of person has precedents. Hence, this reading has been given the vote of the 'authentic' criterion.

**Heb 1.12a**

0: eJlivxei" (or eiJlivxei")

1: ajllavxei"

For 0 (discordant, explanatory, prevalent):

Both variants are attested for the Septuagint, but [ajllavxei"] is preponderant there; it alone suits the context of the psalm and its Hebrew wording; it is then original in the Septuagint. Consequently eJlivxeiç is original in Hebrews: otherwise this reading could not even have come into being, whereas in fact it is in the overwhelming majority of witnesses... [T]he original Septuagint reading was wrongly introduced into the minority text of Hebrews (Zuntz, 1953, 112-13).

According to Metzger (1994, 593), this reading is supported by the majority of witnesses.

Ellingworth (1993, 128-9) notes that the strong attestation for eJlivxei" makes it unlikely that Tischendorf was correct to regard it as a transcription error.

### **Heb 1.12b**

0: wJ" iJmavtion kaiv

Includes D\* (omit kaiv).

1: kaiv

For 0 (authentic, reliable, diverse, discordant):

The words are indeed meaningless and merely repeated from the preceding verse, but the writer of Hebrews found them in his copy of the Psalms and kept them (Zuntz, 1953, 173).

The words wJ" iJmavtion, strongly supported by Π<sup>46</sup> ÅA B (D\*) 1739 (it<sup>d</sup>) arm eth, appear to be original with the author of the Letter, who inserted them in his quotation from Ps 102.26 to show that the metaphor of the garment is continued. The absence of the words from most witnesses is the result of conformation to the text of the Septuagint (Metzger, 1994,

593).

The given list of witnesses has been taken as support according to the 'reliable' and 'diverse' criteria.

Against 0 (explanatory):

[wJ" iJmavtion] was considered a gloss by Tischendorf and Bleek (Ellingworth, 1993, 129).

## **Heb 2.7**

0: aujtovn

Includes 1319 (aujtouv").

1: aujtovn, kai; katevsthsa" aujto;n ejpi; ta; e[rga tw'n ceirw'n sou

For 0 (authentic):

[The psalm verse kai; katevsthsa"...] was at cross-purposes with the writer's argument (Zuntz, 1953, 172).

A [possible] explanation is that the author omits the line for the same reason that he omits the following lines ("all sheep and oxen ..."); namely, that his main concern in this passage is with human beings and their place in the "world to come," not with creation as a whole (Ellingworth, 1993, 149).

For 1 (early, prevalent, diverse):

... the psalm verse kai; katevsthsa"... is in almost all ancient (and in very many recent) manuscripts and in practically all versions (Zuntz, 1953, 172).

Against 1 (discordant, short):

... the Committee was impressed by the probability that the longer reading

may be the result of scribal enlargement of the quotation (Ps 8.7), and therefore preferred the shorter reading (Metzger, 1994, 594).

## Heb 2.8

0: *aujtw/*

1: omit

2: omit *ejn tw/* ... *ajnopvtakton*

For 0 (prevalent):

... the preponderant weight of external evidence might be thought to support *aujtw/* without question (Metzger, 1994, 594).

Against 0 (authentic):

Since Hebrews at this point refers to the text to be interpreted and that text does not have such a pronoun, it is probably a scribal addition (Attridge, 1989, 69).

The comment follows the quotation so closely that the first *aujtw/* is best omitted as a correct gloss (Ellingworth, 1993, 152).

For 1 (authentic, diverse, short, discordant, early):

The writer is unlikely to have himself effected this tedious tautology. The spuriousness of the additional words is suggested also by the fact that ... *aujtw/* is absent from B vulg<sup>KZ</sup> d v Ambr boh<sup>P</sup> arm (Ephr?), and obelized in sy<sup>harcl</sup>. The diagnosis is not certain, but the natural inference seems to be that the original, short text ... has been variously interpolated on the model of the preceding and following passages. (Zuntz, 1953, 32-3).

Zuntz refers to the phrase *aujtw/ ta; pavnta* and not just *aujtw/*. The given list of witnesses has been taken to support the omission of *aujtw/* according to the 'diverse' criterion.

In ¶<sup>46</sup> B and a few other authorities "to him" (*aujtw/*) is omitted,

probably rightly (Bruce, 1990, 70).

... the fact that the earliest Greek witnesses (Π<sup>46</sup> B), with support from several early versions, lack the word led the Committee to have some doubt as to whether αυjtw/' belongs in the text (Metzger, 1994, 594).

## Heb 2.9

0: cavriti qeou'

1: cwri;" qeou'

For 0 (authentic, prevalent, diverse, manifold):

cavriti qeou', which would be almost otiose here in relation to geuvshtai qanavtou alone, has special force as linking o{pw" and uJpe;r pantov" together (Westcott and Hort, 1881b, appendix, 129).

[Cavriti] is in almost all manuscripts and in most versions (Zuntz, 1953, 34).

"By the grace of God" makes excellent sense in context (Bruce, 1992, 28).

[Cavriti qeou'] is very strongly supported by good representatives of both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text (Metzger, 1994, 594).

Against 0 (authentic, explanatory):

If cavriti qeou' were original at He 2<sup>9</sup> this anarthrous usage would disagree not only with He 12<sup>15</sup> but with the other instances of hJ cavri" tou' qeou' (kurivou) in the rest of the New Testament, where these nouns are ... usually arthrous (Elliott, 1972, 340).

... it is difficult to see how cavriti could ever have been changed to cwriv" (Bruce, 1990, 70).

For 1 (difficult, prevalent, explanatory, authentic, diverse):

Transcriptional evidence is in its favour, as it was more likely to be perplexing to transcribers than **cavriti** (Westcott and Hort, 1881b, appendix, 129).

The patristic evidence ... is very rich... This leaves no doubt that this reading was predominant in the third century and that it lived on in the periphery of the Christian world. Neither through a scribe's confusion nor by intentional change could **cwrivç** have arisen from an original **cavriti**. The motive for the opposite change is self-evident: the suffering Saviour, it was felt, could not have been 'separated from God'. The altered wording, however, yields what can only be called a preposterous sense in stating that Jesus suffered 'through the grace of God'. The alternative reading agrees with the writer's notion of the passion; **cwrivç** is one of his favourite words, while **cavriç** with him has a connotation different from the one which it would have to bear in this passage (Zuntz, 1953, 34-5).

**cwriv**" is not a mere Nestorian emendation: it had a wide circulation not only in Greek MSS associated with Syria but appeared also in Latin as the quotations in the western Fathers indicate... **Cwri**;" **qeou'** is the *lectio difficilior*... It was an easy orthographical change to alter **CWRIS** to **CARITI** and one that avoided an apparently difficult phrase by replacing it with a common New Testament idea (Elliott, 1972, 341).

... it appears likely that an orthodox scribe might change **cwri**;" to **cavriti**, shocked at the difficult expression **cwri**;" **qeou'**, influenced by the early patristic emphasis on the atonement as an involvement of God himself in the human condition and perhaps even suspecting Marcionism in the phrase. Once **cavriti** was the reading even in one manuscript, the same motives would have worked even more powerfully for its preservation in subsequent copies (Garnet, 1985, 324).

According to Braun, '**cwriv**' suffered the fate of the Eli-saying in Mk. 15:34 D' (quoted in Ellingworth, 1993, 156). Ellingworth continues, 'it is possible to see the same tendency to attenuate references to Christ's desolation on the cross.'

Against 1 (authentic, explanatory, discordant):

Intrinsically [cwriiv"] will not bear close examination. To take it ... as qualifying uJpe;r pantov" ... is against the order of words: and the qualification would be too readily supplied by every reader to be thought to need expression. A better sense may be put upon it by connecting it directly with geuvstai qanavtou: but both the order of words and logical force of the clause (o{pw") shew the true connexion to be with uJpe;r pantov"... Cwriiv" probably arose from a confusion of letters which might easily take place in papyrus writing (Westcott and Hort, 1881b, appendix, 129).

[cwri;" qeou'] does not fit well in the context of the psalm that had spoken of God's concern for humanity (Attridge, 1989, 77).

[cwri;" qeou'] was first introduced, probably, as a marginal gloss against Heb 2:8, where Ps 8:6 is quoted to the effect that God has subjected everything to the "son of man" (Bruce, 1992, 28).

According to Bruce (1990, 71), Tischendorf thought cwri;" qeou' was a correction motivated by 1 Cor 15.27: pavnta ga;r uJpevtaxen uJpo; tou;" povda" aujtu'. o{tan de; ei[ph/ o{ti pavnta uJpotevtaktai, dh'lon o{ti ejkto; tou' uJpotavxanto" aujtw'/ ta; pavnta. 'For he put all things in subjection under his feet. But when it is said that all things have been put in subjection, it is clear that the one who put all things in subjection to him is excluded'. However, the relevant word here is ejktov", not cwriiv".

While a number of writers regard cavriti as better suited to the context, Elliott has shown that the use of cavri" without the article is peculiar and Zuntz regards the resultant statement as preposterous. As the opposing arguments all hold weight, the 'authentic' criterion has been left indeterminate. Indeed, Bruce (1992, 28) thinks both readings are secondary: cwriiv" having been introduced as a marginal gloss and later amended to cavriti. This is an attractive theory, although there is no direct evidence for the omission of both readings or for the origin of cwriiv" as a marginal gloss.



The strong support for *cwriv*" as explanatory of the other reading has been accepted despite the opposition from Westcott and Hort because an argument based on the similarity of the competing words supports one direction of change as much as the other. In any event, as Garnet (1985, 323) points out, '*cwri*;" neither looks nor sounds like *cavriti*'.

Both readings are supported by valid arguments according to the 'diverse' criterion, so it has been left indeterminate as well.

Zuntz supports both readings according to the 'prevalent' criterion. In my opinion, as an indication of originality, his observation that *cwriv*" was most prevalent in the third century is more significant than the fact that *cavriti* is found in the majority of witnesses.

## **Heb 3.2**

0: *o{lw/*

1: omit

For 0 (manifold):

*o{lw/* is read by a wide variety of text-types (Metzger, 1994, 594).

Zuntz (1953, 65) regards this reading as genuine, but has reservations.

Against 0 (discordant):

[*o{lw/*] is suspect as having been conformed to the text of ver. 5 and/or of Nu 12.17 LXX (Metzger, 1994, 594).

For 1 (early, reliable):

... several early and excellent witnesses ... lack *o{lw/* (Metzger, 1994, 594).

Against 1 (explanatory):

The omission may have been accidental, due to homoioteleuton (Attridge, 1989, 104).

[T]he omission may be a deliberate (Alexandrian?) emendation, introduced in order to render the Old Testament quotation more appropriate to the argument (in ver. 2 "whole" disturbs the parallelism between Moses and Jesus) (Metzger, 1994, 594).

Ellingworth (1993, 202) does not agree with this explanation:

arguments advanced ... for its being a deliberate omission fail to explain why ο{lw/ should not have been omitted in v. 5 also, where emphasis on Moses would seem even more out of place.

His preference seems to be for the omission.

### **Heb 3.6a**

0: ou|

Includes 2464 (ou| οJ).

1: οJ

2: ο{"

For 0 (early, diverse):

The reading ou| is more than sufficiently supported by early and diversified witnesses (Metzger, 1994, 595).

Against 0 (explanatory, difficult):

[ou|] cannot account for the emergence of the *lectio magis ardua* (Zuntz, 1953, 93).

[ou|] is an easier reading, probably produced by making the relative conform to αυ|του' (Attridge, 1989, 104).

For 2 (authentic, difficult):

"Οϙ, not ου|, is logically correct ... Its very harshness is a recommendation of this reading (Zuntz, 1953, 93).

Against 2 (authentic, explanatory):

Against [Οϙ] there is the valid argument that this construction, so normal in Latin, is not easily paralleled in Greek. (Zuntz, 1953, 93).

[Ο{"] is probably a scribal modification of ου|, introduced perhaps for the sake of logical exactitude (Christians are God's house, not Christ's house) (Metzger, 1994, 595).

Zuntz argues for the appropriateness of Ο{" and ου| but finally settles on Ο{" , so the 'authentic' criterion has been marked accordingly. There is no consensus over which reading is more likely to have been derived from the other, so the 'explanatory' criterion has been left indeterminate.

### **Heb 3.6b**

0: katavscwmen

1: mevcric tevlou" bebaivan katavscwmen

2: mevcric tevlou" bebaivw" katavscwmen

Includes Lect. 593 (bebaivw" katevcomen).

Against 1 (and 2) (short, discordant, authentic):

Mevcri tevlouϙ bebaivan ... was interpolated from ver. 14. The writer would not repeat himself in this way; besides, the feminine adjective is syntactically impossible (Zuntz, 1953, 33).

I have assumed that the readings with bebaivw" are derived from mevcric tevlou" bebaivan. Therefore, Zuntz's statement has been taken to oppose these as well.

### **Heb 4.2**

0: sugkek(e)ra(s)mevnou"

1: sugkekramevnh"

2: sugkek(e)ra(s)mevno"

3: sugkekrammevnoi

Translation:

0: 'they were not united with the hearers by faith'

2: 'the hearers did not combine [the message] with faith'

For 0 (authentic, prevalent, early, explanatory, diverse, manifold, difficult):

Lane (1991a, 93) discerns a reference to Joshua and Caleb in the accusative reading:

Understood in this light, the reference to the believing minority clarifies the source of the good news heard by Israel at Kadesh and anticipates v 8.

The majority reading is the earliest attested variant; it is, moreover, the reading which best explains the variants (Bruce, 1992, 30).

Sugkeravnnumi ... is used in classical Greek of mixing substances, such as colours, and figuratively of close friendship, or moral and spiritual union. The NA/UBS text ... has thus the advantage of implying a union of persons with persons, rather than the less natural though not impossible union of an object, God's message, with a group of persons (Ellingworth, 1993, 243).

[The reading] which best explains the origin of the others is sugkekerasmevnou". Supported by early and diverse testimony representing both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text ..., as the more difficult reading it would naturally have been altered to the easier nominative singular (Metzger, 1994, 595).

Against 0 (discordant):

Michel and others believe that [sugkekerasmevnou"] is an assimilation to ejkeivnou" (Ellingworth, 1993, 242).

(The context shows that Ellingworth actually means sugkekerasmevnou" rather than sugkekerasmevno" which is printed.)

For 2 (authentic):

... the original text [i.e. sugkekerasmevno"] may well have been restored by accident (Bruce, 1992, 30).

Against 2 (authentic, explanatory, difficult):

... the apparent simplicity of sunkekerasmevno" leads to no satisfactory result: it identifies ejkeivnou" with toi" ajkouvsasin, which thus becomes a superfluous and at the same time ambiguous repetition; and it obscures the purpose of the clause by expressing the cause of the inoperativeness of the Divine message in a neutral form (Hort, 1881b, appendix, 129-130).

(As Westcott and Hort only address readings 0 and 2, this statement may be taken as support for reading 0.):

The change from accusative to nominative may have been caused simply by the inadvertent omission of the upsilon in the participial ending. It could also represent an attempt — hardly successful, to be sure — to make a difficult phrase more comprehensible (Attridge, 1989, 122).

sugkekerasmevno" is probably a conjectural emendation (Bruce, 1992, 30).

The arguments of Ellingworth in favour of the accusative, and Westcott and Hort against the nominative, outweigh Bruce's preference for the nominative as more likely to be authentic.

Westcott and Hort (1881b, appendix, 129), and Zuntz (1953, 16) regard this passage as affected by a primitive corruption, with the possible

consequence that none of the readings are what the author intended.

### Heb 4.3a

0: eijsercovmeqa gavr

1: eijsercovmeqa ou\ñ

2: eijsercwvmeqa ou\ñ

For 0 (early, reliable, diverse, authentic):

Among the connectives **gavr** is to be preferred both because of early and good external evidence (Π<sup>13,46</sup> B D K P Y 33 614 it vg syr<sup>h</sup> cop<sup>sa</sup> eth) and because it suits the context (Metzger, 1994, 595).

Against 1 and 2 (discordant, explanatory):

Ou\ñ was suggested by [verses] 1, 11, 14, 16 (which also supplied the faulty subjunctive **eijsercwvmeqa** in A C 33) (Zuntz, 1953, 203).

[ou\ñ] probably arose in connection with the change to a subjunctive in the verb... The particle is regularly used with such subjunctives (4:1, 11, 16), while **gavr** is not (Attridge, 1989, 122).

Against 2 (discordant, authentic):

[Verse 16] supplied the faulty subjunctive **eijçercwvmeqa** (Zuntz, 1953, 203).

The hortatory subjunctive, **eijsercwvmeqa**, which is quite inappropriate with the following **oiJ pisteuvsante**", arose as a secondary development in connection with the misinterpretation that produced **ou\ñ** (Metzger, 1994, 596).

It is not clear which reading Bruce (1990, 104) prefers.

### Heb 4.3b

0: thvn

1: omit

For 1 (discordant, difficult):

Since elsewhere the article always precedes *katavpausin*, it probably should be omitted here as the harder reading (Ellingworth, 1993, 244).

Zuntz regards the omission as genuine but does not present any arguments in its favour (1953, 118).

Against 1 (explanatory):

The omission, if not a mechanical error, might have been due to the exegesis of "rest" in the following verses. What believers enter is "a rest" different from "the rest" of the land of Canaan (Attridge, 1989, 122).

## **Heb 6.2**

0: didach"

Includes Lect. 170 (didacai").

1: didachvn

For 0 (manifold):

*didach"* is strongly supported by good representatives of all the major types of text (Metzger, 1994, 596).

Against 0 (authentic, discordant, explanatory):

I submit that the genitive is inadmissible. It is stylistically bad in the midst of so many other genitives which are on a different level both logically and syntactically; besides it makes it impossible to construe the sentence... It was only natural that the solitary accusative *didachvn* should be early and widely adapted to the surrounding genitives (Zuntz, 1953, 93-4).

It is difficult to see why *didach*" should have been changed to *didachvn*, while the accusative might easily have changed to the genitive under the influence of adjacent genitives (Bruce, 1992, 31).

For 1 (early):

[*didachvn*] is early (Metzger, 1994, 596).

Against 1 (explanatory):

... a majority of the Committee regarded [*didachvn*] as a stylistic improvement introduced in order to avoid so many genitives (Metzger, 1994, 596).

Against this, Ellingworth (1993, 314) writes, 'This argument is not conclusive in itself, since the author could have written *didachvn* for the same reason (as he writes *rJh'ma* for *rJh'mato*" in v. 5)'. He does not settle upon either reading, maintaining that a final decision is impossible.

Zuntz and the Committee have opposing views as to which reading best explains the other. The Committee regards the genitive as original:

mh; pavlin qemevlion kataballovmenoi  
metanoiva" ajpo; nekrw'n e[rgwn, kai pivstew" ejpi; qeovn,  
**baptismw'n didach"**, ejpiqevsewv" te ceirw'n,  
ajnastavsewv" te nekrw'n, kai; krivmato" aijwnivou.

If so, the passage contains three pairs of coordinated phrases, with each pair made up of genitive noun phrases:

'of repentance from deadly works, and of faith in God,  
**of teaching concerning baptisms**, (and) laying on of hands, (and)  
of resurrection of [the] dead, and of judgement everlasting.'

This structure has the advantage of associating related concepts: repentance and faith (primary); baptismal teaching and laying on of hands (initiation); and resurrection and judgment (future) (Ellingworth,



1993, 313). On the other hand, the position of **baptismw'n** before **didach'** is puzzling in view of the otherwise consistent pattern of placing the qualifying nouns last. Besides this, the coordinating conjunctions have an awkward arrangement in as much as the second **te** breaks a pattern of not linking the phrases with conjunctions. Indeed, B D\* P 365 omit this particle, although B does not have the genitive reading.

The alternative reading also has points in its favour if a different structure is adopted:

mh; pavlin qemevlion kataballovmenoi  
metanoiva" ajpo; nekrw'n e[rgwn,  
kai pivstew" ejpi; qeovn,  
**baptismw'n didachvn**,  
ejpiqevsewv" te ceirw'n,  
ajnastavsewv" te nekrw'n,  
kai; krivmato" aijwnivou.

The accusative **didachvn** is now in apposition to the preceding **qemevlion**. The difficult word order remains, but is explicable for the following reasons: (1) it preserves a pattern of initial genitives; (2) the position of the accusative **didachvn** following the genitive **baptismw'n** parallels the genitive then accusative pattern of the preceding phrase; (3) it results in an alliterative series of phrases ending in *nu*. Also, by contrast to the previous alternative, there is no problem with either **te** standing where it does: the sequence **te ... te ... kai**; being used in a conventional manner to enumerate members of a list (BDF, 1961, §444 (4)).

I am inclined to agree with Zuntz that the accusative reading is more able to explain the origin of the genitive than vice versa. The string of genitives invites assimilation of the solitary accusative. Once this had occurred, the parallelism would have helped to ensure survival of the genitive reading, combining 'the appearance of improvement with the

absence of its reality' (Westcott and Hort, 1881b, 27).

### **Heb 6.3**

0: poihvsomen

1: poihvswmen

For 0 (authentic, reliable, diverse):

The general sense of the verse clearly favors the well attested (Π<sup>46</sup> ÅB I K L 0122 0252 *pm* lat sa<sup>mss</sup> bo) indicative (Attridge, 1989, 155-6).

Tou'to thus means ejpi; th;n teleiovthta fevresqai, and kaiv marks the small step from exhortation to reverent determination — a step ignored by those scribes who wrote poihvswmen (Ellingworth, 1993, 317).

The future tense poihvsomen is to be preferred on the basis of (a) the weight of external evidence ... as well as (b) its congruence with the following clause, "if God permits" (which is more appropriate with the future tense than with the exhortation "let us do this") (Metzger, 1994, 596-7).

Against 1 (explanatory, discordant):

The reading poihvswmen, if it is not merely the result of an orthographic confusion between o and w, probably arose from mechanical conformation with ferwvmeqa in ver. 1 (Metzger, 1994, 597).

### **Heb 7.21**

0: eij" to;n aijw'na

1: eij" to;n aijw'na kata; th;n tavxin Melcisevdek

2: omit

Against 0 (explanatory):

... the omission of the phrase kata; th;n tavxin Melcisevdek could be

explained if the eye of the scribe wandered from *kata*; to the *kata*; that follows Melcisevdek (Metzger, 1994, 597).

Against 1 (short, discordant, authentic):

According to Zuntz (1953, 163), this phrase is an interpolation made under the influence of v. 17.

Melchizedek does not ... figure in the argument at this point (Attridge, 1989, 206).

## **Heb 8.8**

0: *aujtov*"

1: *aujtoi*"

For 0 (prevalent, explanatory):

The accusative ... is well attested (Attridge, 1989, 225).

Observing the direction in which scribal corrections moved, a majority of the Committee preferred the reading *aujtov*" (Metzger, 1994, 597).

For 1 (prevalent, explanatory, difficult, authentic, early, reliable):

The preponderance of the manuscript evidence ... seems to favour the reading *aujtoi*" (Wolmarans, 1984, 141).

Wolmarans does not agree that the reading *aujtov*" gave rise to *aujtoi*" (although he mistakenly believes the Committee's reasoning to be based on supposed Atticist tendencies, not the direction of alteration observed within the listed manuscripts):

A more probable explanation would be that an ancient copyist changed *aujtoi*" into *aujtov*" simply to supply *mevmfesqai* with a grammatical object, or to remove the disturbing implication that something which God made was imperfect... *aujtoi*" is the more difficult reading and therefore

the original... The logical structure of the author's argument, as also the author's typological method of exegesis, corroborate [the choice of] *aujtoi*" (1984, 144).

[*aujtoi*"] enjoys early and impressive support (Lane, 1991a, 202).

Against 1 (explanatory):

The common idiom *levgein tini*, "to say to someone," probably caused the variant (Attridge, 1989, 225).

The tendency to take *aujtoi*" with *levgei* would have been an influence towards the dative, so *aujtoiv*" is probably to be preferred (Ellingworth, 1993, 415).

Both readings are alleged to have the more prevalent support. *The Greek New Testament* apparatus (1993, 755) shows that the accusative is read by more witnesses.

There is a lack of consensus over which reading better explains the origin of the other. The Committee appeals to manuscript evidence, which does show a correctional trend away from *aujtoiv*" in Å and D, thereby implying its originality. Wolmarans' depiction of scribal motives for the alteration of *aujtoi*" also has merit. The arguments of Attridge and Ellingworth finally tip the balance in favour of the accusative.

## **Heb 8.11**

0: *polivthn*

1: *plhsivon*

For 0 (authentic, prevalent, reliable, diverse):

In the present context the translators preferred *polivthn* found in most witnesses (Tasker, 1964, 441).

Despite strong external evidence for *plhsivon* in the LXX, *polivthn* is

preferred by LXX editors on internal grounds... [T]he author of Hebrews probably followed his LXX text (Ellingworth, 1993, 417).

[polivthn] is strongly supported by Π<sup>46</sup> Å A B D K L most minuscules it<sup>d</sup> syrP, h cop<sup>sa</sup>, bo, fay arm *al* (Metzger, 1994, 597).

#### Against 1 (discordant):

The reading plhsivon is found in some LXX witnesses, which may have produced the variant in this verse (Attridge, 1989, 225).

Plhsivon may have been influenced by Ps. 41:4 (Ellingworth, 1993, 417).

Bruce (1990, 187) puts 'neighbor' (from plhsivon) in his text, but seems to regard polivthn as original (cf. n. 44).

Attridge and Ellingworth appear to differ concerning the strength of Septuagint attestation for plhsivon. Rahlfs' pocket edition apparatus (1935, 2.722) has 'pol(e)ithn BS†] plhsion rel.', which means that Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and not more than one minuscule, support polivthn, and the rest support plhsivon. Whether or not plhsivon is the majority reading is not clear without knowing how many manuscripts besides Alexandrinus have been compared at this point. In any event, there are Septuagint parallels for both readings, so the 'discordant' criterion has not been marked.

### Heb 9.1

0: kaiv

1: omit

#### For 0 (authentic):

... it would be in character for the author to proceed from comparison to contrast ([cf.] 3:1-6), in which case one might translate, slightly modifying the REB: "The first covenant, too, had its ordinances governing divine service and its sanctuary, but it was an earthly sanctuary" (Ellingworth,

1993, 420).

Against 0 (explanatory, authentic, short):

The particle sounds natural — that is why it is so widely added — but it implies the very opposite of the writer's argument (Zuntz, 1953, 209).

Since [kaiv] implies just the opposite of what the pericope argues, namely, that the *new* covenant has "regulations for service" and a "worldly sanctuary," it is probably an interpolation (Attridge, 1989, 230).

Zuntz and Ellingworth give viable but opposed arguments concerning which reading is most likely to belong to the author. Hence, the 'authentic' criterion has been left indeterminate.

## **Heb 9.10**

0: baptis moi", dikaiwvmata

1: baptis moi", dikaiwvma

2: baptis moi" kai; dikaiwvmata

3: baptis moi" kai; dikaiwvmasin

Includes Lect. 884 (baptivsmasi).

For 0 (explanatory, early, reliable):

The reading that best explains the origin of the other readings is baptis moi", dikaiwvmata, which is supported by early and good witnesses (Metzger, 1994, 598).

Against 1 (explanatory):

The singular number dikaiwvma ... is a mere scribal oversight (Metzger, 1994, 598):

Against 2 (elemental, authentic):

baptis moi" kai; dikaiwvmata ..., which has the appearance of being a

conflation, provides no satisfactory sense (Metzger, 1994, 598).

Against 3 (explanatory):

It is more probable that, in view of the preceding datives, *dikaiwvmata* was changed into *dikaiwvmasin*, and joined to them by means of *kaiv*, than that *kai*; *dikaiwvmasin*, if it were original, was altered, on account of the concluding word *ejpikēivmena*, into *dikaiwvmata* (Metzger, 1994, 598).

As each alternative reading has significant support, the votes against *baptismoi*" *kai*; *dikaiwvmata* cannot be taken as support for another reading. For this reason, the 'elemental' and 'authentic' criteria have been left indeterminate.

## **Heb 9.11**

0: *genomevnwn*

Includes P46 (*genomevnwn*).

1: *mellovntwn*

For 0 (discordant, early, diverse, authentic):

In most witnesses [*genomevnwn*] has been altered on the model of x. 1; but the combination of the oldest Greek and Latin with the Syriac evidence is in itself almost irresistible (Zuntz, 1953, 119).

... the emphasis in the context appears to be on the reality of the present blessings made available through the high-priesthood of Christ (Tasker, 1964, 441).

This reading is ... favored by considerations intrinsic to style and context (Lane, 1991b, 229).

Against 0 (authentic, explanatory):

The main alternative view is to accept *mellovntwn* on contextual grounds,

and explain **genomevnwn** by parablepsis from **paragenovmeno**" (Ellingworth, 1993, 449).

For 1 (prevalent):

**mellovntwn** has majority support (Bruce, 1992, 31).

Against 1 (explanatory, difficult, discordant):

[**mellovntwn**] may have arisen from a misunderstanding of the relationship between the "present time" and the "time of correction" in vss 9-10 (Attridge, 1989, 244).

There are ... signs of a growing tendency to adopt **genomevnwn** as the harder reading and to explain **mellovntwn** by assimilation to 10:1, where the reading is firm (Ellingworth, 1993, 449).

With respect to the reading which best suits the context, Lane prefers **genomevnwn** and Ellingworth reports support for **mellovntwn**. Tasker's argument inclines the balance towards **genomevnwn**.

Valid arguments are given for both readings according to the 'explanatory' criterion, so it has not been marked.

## **Heb 9.14a**

0: **aijwnivou**

1: **aJgivou**

For 0 (difficult, explanatory):

It was no doubt to be expected that, confronted with the rather unexpected phrase **pnevmato** **aijwnivou**, copyists would replace the adjective with **aJgivou**, but there was no reason for their replacing **aJgivou** with **aijwnivou** (Metzger, 1994, 598-9).

Against 1 (discordant, authentic):



Some witnesses ... read *pnevmato* *aJgivou*, "holy spirit," no doubt influenced by common ecclesiastical terminology (Attridge, 1989, 244).

It is ... likely that the reference, at least implicitly, is to the Holy Spirit ..., in which case *dia; pnevmato* *aJgivou* ... would be a correct gloss (Ellingworth, 1993, 457).

## **Heb 9.14b**

0: *hJmw'n*

1: *uJmw'n*

For 0 (authentic):

[*hJmw'n*] was preferred because the author uses the direct address only in the hortatory sections of his Epistle (Metzger, 1994, 599).

The author probably included himself among those affected by Christ's death (Attridge, 1989, 244).

The immediate context gives no guidance, but cf. *hJmi'n* (7:26); *uJpe;r hJmw'n* (9:24) (Ellingworth, 1993, 458).

## **Heb 9.17**

0: *mhvpote*

1: *mh; tovtē*

Against 1 (authentic, prevalent):

Two witnesses ... read *mh; tovtē*, which would favor, and perhaps reflects, the awkward patristic construal of the clause as interrogative (Attridge, 1989, 253).

Instead of *mhvpote*, three Greek manuscripts ... read *mh; tovtē*, which then requires the reader to understand the sentence as a question... In all

three manuscripts a later hand has changed **tote** to **pote** (Metzger, 1994, 599).

If the Committee had used the direction of scribal correction to identify the original reading here, as it did at Heb 8.8, **mh**; **tovte** would be the preferred reading.

Bruce (1990. 219) assumes **mhvpote** to be correct (cf. n. 103) and construes it as an interrogative particle in accordance with BDF (1961, §428(5)): '**ejpei**; **mhvpote** ... is clearly interrogative'. By contrast, Lane (1991b, 232), after considering classical and later Greek usage, states that it is 'quite possible to take the clause as a negative statement of fact.'

BDF §428(5) points out that the Greek word corresponding to the contextually appropriate 'never' would be **mhdevpote**. Perhaps a primitive corruption has occurred here (**MHDEPOTE** Ø **MHPOTE**). Faced with the difficult resultant reading, the patristically supported alternative may have been introduced.

Ellingworth (1993, 464) does not make clear which reading he prefers.

## **Heb 9.19**

0: **movscwn kai; tw'n travgwn**

1: **travgwn kai; tw'n movscwn**

Includes Lect. 921 (omit **tw'n**).

2: **movscwn kai; travgwn**

3: **movscwn**

Against 2 and Lect. 921 (discordant):

The omission of the articles is probably influenced by v.12 (Ellingworth, 1993, 468).

Against 0, 1, and 2 (discordant, short, stable, authentic):

The words in question are spurious: they were added on the model of ver. 12. The interpolation is given away by the facts that its wording and its position vary, that it is absent from the Peshitta and the Harklean, and that it is omitted by Chrysostom (Zuntz, 1953, 54-5).

The offering of goats had no place in the sacrifice to which the passage refers (Lane, 1991b, 232).

For 3 (short, discordant, reliable, diverse):

Conformity to the LXX wording ... would suggest that the shorter text ... is to be preferred. In that case *kai; a'tw'n° travgwn* would be an addition made under the influence of Heb 9:12... [O]n balance (*me iudice*) there is a slight preponderance in favour of the shorter reading (Bruce, 1992, 32).

... the text without *kai; tw'n travgwn* is supported by an impressive combination of witnesses (Π<sup>46</sup> Å K L Y 181 1241 1739 syrP, h, pal Origen) (Metzger, 1994, 599).

Against 3 (prevalent, manifold, discordant, authentic, explanatory):

The interpolation has completely conquered both the B- and the D-text and has become the norm — as far as one can judge — also in Byzantium (Zuntz, 1953, 55).

If the longer reading is original, the shorter reading is easily explained by harmonisation with the LXX (Bruce, 1992, 32).

The author is probably generalising on the basis of what he had written in v. 12 ... [and] may add the reference to goats because his thinking is dominated by thoughts of the Day of Atonement (Ellingworth, 1993, 468).

... a majority of the Committee thought it probable that the words had been omitted either accidentally (through homoeoteleuton) or deliberately (to conform the statement to Ex 24.5) (Metzger, 1994, 599).

These last opinions relating to the 'explanatory', 'manifold', and

'prevalent' criteria cannot be recorded in the sample data matrix because they do not clearly support specific alternatives. The 'discordant' criterion has been left indeterminate because there are parallels for both the shorter and longer readings. With respect to the 'authentic' criterion, I regard Lane's argument as stronger than Ellingworth's, which has the ring of speculation.

Ellingworth (1993, 468) does not identify his preferred reading.

### **Heb 10.1a**

0: oujk aujthvn

1: ouj katav

2: ouj kata; th;n aujthvn

3: oujk aujtw'n

4: kaiv

For 0 (authentic, prevalent):

Since the relevant clause is to prepare the following, negative statement, this quality must have been negated. This is what we find in all manuscripts except P<sup>46</sup>... The majority text, then, is the true text (Zuntz, 1953, 21).

Against 1, 2, and 3 (explanatory):

The other readings, supported by individual minuscule manuscripts and the Armenian version, are scribal (or translational) idiosyncrasies (Metzger, 1994, 600).

For 4 (early):

The substitution of kaiv for oujk aujthvn in the earliest known copy of the epistle (Π<sup>46</sup>) has produced an interesting reading, but one that certainly cannot be original (Metzger, 1994, 599).

Against 4 (difficult, prevalent, authentic, explanatory):

If this plain and seemingly fitting reading [i.e. *kaiv*] had been in the text originally, there was no reason why anyone should put in its place the difficult one — it is not a scribal slip — which, moreover, has behind it the combined weight of the whole other evidence. The structure of the sentence as a whole likewise contradicts the wording in P<sup>46</sup>... By treating *eijkwvn* and *çkiav* as synonyms the papyrus wipes out this significant distinction. Thereby, and by the retention of the article, now redundant, before *eijkovna*, the wording in the papyrus is given away: it is a wilful alteration (Zuntz, 1953, 21-22).

The 'difficult' criterion vote against the reading of P<sup>46</sup> cannot be recorded as it does not favour a specific alternative.

### **Heb 10.1b**

0: *duvnatai*

1: *duvnantai*

For 0 (authentic):

... it seems possible to obtain a good sense by adopting the reading *duvnatai*, and placing a comma after *a}*" *prosfevrousin* (Westcott, 1881b, appendix, 131).

The *grammatikh*; *ajkrivbeia* (which the author of Hebrews would be the last to neglect) requires the singular (Zuntz, 1953, 131).

Against 0 (explanatory):

The singular could be an attempt to correct the awkward syntax (Attridge, 1989, 267).

For 1 (authentic, difficult, prevalent):

The analogies of ix 9; x 11 (the sacrifices) and x 10 (the Levitical priests, answering to the true High Priest) are in favour of *duvnantai* (Hort,

1881b, appendix, 131).

... the solecism would make *duvnantai* the harder reading, likely to be corrected to *duvnatai*... [The parallel with v.11] provides some evidence in favour of the reading *duvnantai*, which is best understood as an impersonal plural (Ellingworth, 1993, 491-2).

... the reading *duvnantai* (Å A C D<sup>b</sup> P 33 81 *al*) is strongly supported (Metzger, 1994, 600).

Against 1 (authentic, discordant):

If the plural is read, then *novmo*" is left as an awkward nominative absolute and the sentence is an anacolouthon (Attridge, 1989, 267).

[*duvnantai*] appears to have been introduced by copyists who were influenced by *prosfevrousin* (Metzger, 1994, 600).

Westcott and Attridge favour the singular as appropriate, whereas Hort and Ellingworth support the plural on the basis of parallels at verse 11 and elsewhere. Zuntz's point inclines the balance towards the singular as more likely to be authentic.

## **Heb 10.11**

0: *iJereuv*"

1: *ajrciereuv*"

For 0 (authentic, early, diverse):

Here *iJereuv*" is appropriate since the functions described are those of priests in general; also, perhaps because the author already has in mind Ps. 110 (LXX 109):1, *su; iJereu;" eij" to;n aijw'na* (Ellingworth, 1993, 507).

*iJereuv*" is well supported by early and diverse witnesses (Metzger, 1994, 600).

Against 1 (explanatory):

ajrciereuv" ... appears to be a correction introduced by copyists who recalled 5.1 or 8.3 (Metzger, 1994, 600).

### **Heb 10.34a**

0: desmivoi"

1: desmoi""

2: desmoi"" mou

3: desmoi"" aujtw'n

For 0 (explanatory, manifold, diverse, authentic):

The reading that best explains the origin of the others is **desmivoi"**, which is supported by good representatives of both the Alexandrian and Western types of text, as well as by several Eastern witnesses... The reading adopted for the text is confirmed by 13.3 (Metzger, 1994, 600-601).

For 2 (prevalent):

See the following statement by Bruce.

Against 1, 2, and 3 (discordant, explanatory):

The variants may simply be ... corrections influenced by Pauline language (Attridge, 1989, 297).

... attempts to make [toi"" desmoi"" ("on the bonds")] intelligible are found in ... d and e, which read "on their bonds," and in Å with the majority of manuscripts and Clement of Alexandria ..., which read toi"" desmoi"" mou ("on my bonds") — a reading which evidently originated in Alexandria under the influence of the belief that the writer was Paul (cf. Col. 4:18b) (Bruce, 1990, 267).

Through transcriptional oversight the first iota was omitted, resulting in

the reading *desmoi*"... Then, in order to improve the sense, copyists added a personal pronoun (Metzger, 1994, 600).

### **Heb 10.34b**

0: *eJautouv*"

1: *eJautoi*"

2: *ejn eJautoi*"

3: *uJma*"

4: omit

For 0 (reliable, manifold):

*eJautouv*" ... is strongly attested by such Alexandrian and Western witnesses as Π<sup>13</sup>, 46 Å Å H Y 33 81 1739 *it vg al* (Metzger, 1994, 601).

Against 1, 2 and 4 (explanatory):

The accusative *eJautouv*" ... must be construed as the subject of the infinitive *e[cein*. The use of the reflexive is unusual and an intensifying modifier of the subject of the infinitive should here be in the nominative case, since that subject is the same as the subject of the governing participle, *ginwvskonte*". Hence, many witnesses correct to the dative *eJautoi*", "you have for yourselves" ..., or *ejn eJautoi*", "in yourselves" ..., and the pronoun is entirely lacking in P (Attridge, 1989, 297).

[*eJautouv*] was first altered to the dative *eJautoi*" ..., and this in turn was strengthened by prefixing *ejn*... By a curious oversight the pronoun is entirely omitted in P (Metzger, 1994, 601).

### **Heb 10.38**

0: *divkaiov*" *mou ejk pivstew*"

1: *divkaio*" *ejk pivstewv*" *mou*

2: *divkaio*" *ejk pivstew*"



For 0 (authentic, reliable):

[divkaiov" mou] appears to underlie v. 39 (Ellingworth, 1993, 554).

In view of the strong external support, the Committee preferred the reading divkaiov" mou (Metzger, 1994, 601).

Against 1 (discordant):

D\* 1518 syr Euseb restore the Septuagint order (Zuntz, 1953, 173).

Against 2 (discordant):

P13, I, and the mass of later manuscripts, on the model of Rom. i. 17 and Gal. iii. 11, omit the pronoun (Zuntz, 1953, 173).

As both readings with mou are found in the Septuagint (Bruce, 1992, 34), mou ejk pivstew" should also be under suspicion of being an assimilation. As a consequence of all the readings having a parallel, the 'discordant' criterion has been left indeterminate. Zuntz may not have been aware that there is a Septuagint parallel for the reading of P46.

## **Heb 11.1**

0: uJpovstasi", pragmavtwn

Includes D\* (uJpovstasin); Armenian and Jerome (uJpovstasi" pragmavtwn,).

1: pragmavtwn ajnavstasi"

Includes P13 (apovstasi").

Against 1 (explanatory):

The scribe of P13 ... thoughtlessly wrote pragmavtwn ajnavstasi" (Metzger, 1994, 601).

*The Greek New Testament* (1993) wrongly cites P13 as reading

ajnavstasi". Metzger (1994, 601) notes that the papyrus actually reads ajposta<sup>a</sup>si"<sup>o</sup> , which does seem to be a thoughtless error. A few Latin witnesses support pragmatwn ajnavstasi".

## **Heb 11.11**

0: pivstei kai; aujth; Savrra stei'ra duvnamin

1: pivstei kai; aujth; Savrra hJ stei'ra duvnamin

Latin versions indeterminate (may or may not include hJ).

2: pivstei Savrra hJ stei'ra kai; aujth; duvnamin

3: pivstei kai; aujth; Savrra stei'ra ou\sa duvnamin

4: pivstei kai; aujth; Savrra duvnamin

Against 0, 1, 2, and 3 (authentic, prevalent, short):

There is no need to enlarge upon the spuriousness of [stei'ra] (Zuntz, 1953, 170).

stei'ra is omitted in the majority of texts (Bruce, 1992, 35).

[stei'ra] might have been added as an interpretative gloss (Metzger, 1994, 602).

Against 1, 2, and 3 (explanatory):

It was agreed that hJ ... and ou\sa ... are obviously secondary (Metzger, 1994, 602).

Against 4 (explanatory):

... a majority of the Committee regarded it as more likely that [stei'ra] dropped out through transcriptional oversight (Metzger, 1994, 602).

Ellingworth (1993, 587-8) regards the additions of hJ and ou\sa as secondary, but is ambivalent on the question of whether stei'ra is an addition or an omission. That is, he narrows the field but does not appear

to support one particular reading.

### **Heb 11.23**

0: basilevws.

1: basilevws. Pivstei mevga" genovmeno" Mwuüsh" ...

Against 0 (explanatory):

xi.24 begins with the same words as this passage and this would invite omission (Kilpatrick, 1980, 65).

Against 1 (short, authentic, explanatory, discordant):

Zuntz (1953, 164) regards the longer reading as an interpolation.

The slaying of the Egyptian is ... hardly a good example of the faithful endurance that the pericope as a whole inculcates (Attridge, 1989, 338).

Lane (1991b, 368), following D'Angelo, writes:

It is more probable ... that a corrector felt that the incident reported in Exod 2:11 preceded or explained Moses' rejection of his royal title in v 24.

The interpolation ... was probably inspired by Ac 7.24 and/or Ex 2.11-12 (Metzger, 1994, 603).

With respect to which reading better explains the origin of the other, I regard Kilpatrick's argument for the longer reading as stronger than D'Angelo's opposing point. I would add the following reasoning in support of this reading as well:

An Egyptian manuscript, P46, contains the earliest extant copy of the epistle to the Hebrews. The epistle was known to Clement of Rome but not, it seems, to Ignatius of Antioch or Polycarp of Smyrna. Perhaps Hebrews arrived in Egypt at a very early stage, possibly from Rome. Although not known by name, 'the author is evidently acquainted with the literature of Alexandrian Judaism' (Bruce, 1990, 12). This affinity

might have fostered the epistle's preservation in Alexandria. If a majority of the earliest copies of Hebrews were made in Egypt then the absence of this passage from all but a few Western witnesses is understandable: a native copyist could be forgiven for passing over the lines which recall Moses doing away with the Egyptian!

Ellingworth (1993, 610) makes the point that 'Stephen also referred to this incident (Acts 7.24)'. This, together with the hypothesis that the author of Hebrews was somehow connected with Stephen, would tend to favour the longer reading as well. There is little verbal correspondence between this reading and Acts 7.24, but there are points of contact with Ex 2.11 (LXX). I have assumed that Ellingworth favours the reading given in NA26, which is the shorter one.

### **Heb 11.37**

0: ejprivsqhsan

1: ejpeiravsqhsan

2: ejprivsqhsan, ejpeiravsqhsan

3: ejprhvsqhsan, ejpeiravsqhsan

4: ejpeiravsqhsan, ejprivsqhsan

5: ejpeiravsqhsan, ejpeiravsqhsan

For 0 (short, prevalent):

The original short wording had previously only been recorded from the minuscules 2 and 327... [There is evidence to suggest that] in the East it held the field to a considerable extent (Zuntz, 1953, 47-8).

Against 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 (short, explanatory, stable, authentic):

[ejpeiravsqhsan is] probably either a primitive interpolation or a primitive error for some other word (Westcott and Hort, 1881, 579).

... ejpeiravçqhçan is shown, both by its varying position and by its unsuitedness to the context, to be a corrupt dittography of the original ejprivçqhçan. The reference to the martyrdom of Isaiah was recognized

already by Origen and Jerome; it leaves no room for the idea of 'temptation' (Zuntz, 1953, 47).

The strength of the external evidence for **ejpeiravsqhsan** is reduced by the likelihood of dittography, and by its anticlimactic inappropriateness in a list of atrocities (Ellingworth, 1993, 631).

The presence in most manuscripts of the rather general statement **ejpeiravsqhsan** ("they were tempted") amid the author's enumeration of different kinds of violent death has long been regarded by commentators as strange and unexpected (Metzger, 1994, 603).

Against 3 (explanatory):

Of interest from the orthographical perspective, Bruce (1992, 36) writes:

The reading of  $\Upsilon^{\text{vid}}$  and 1923, **ejprhvsqhsan**, is an itacistic spelling of **ejprivsqhsan**, but as spelled it happens to make good sense ('they were burnt').

Against 5 (explanatory):

Several singular readings in individual manuscripts are due to carelessness and/or to itacistic confusion: thus  $D^{\text{gr}*}$  reads **ejpiravsqhsan**, **ejpiravsqhsan** (Metzger, 1994, 604).

## **Heb 12.1**

0: **eujperivstaton**

1: **eujperivspaston**

For 0 (authentic):

... the aptness of **eujperivstaton** to the context is defended by Simpson (Bruce, 1992, 37).

Against 0 (authentic, explanatory):

Meanings as uniquely suitable as this [i.e., that of *eujperivspaston*] do not originate from corruption. Corruption, however, could ensue easily: witness its recurrence in Evagrius... The corruption being in all other witnesses, it must have been in the, or in some of the, 'subarchetype(s)'; that is, in those early copies of the original from which the extant tradition derives (Zuntz, 1953, 28-29).

A serious problem with ... *eujperivstato*", is that the term is found nowhere else in the Gk. Bible nor in secular Gk., but only in Christian writings, most of which are dependent upon this place (Lane, 1991b, 398).

For 1 (authentic, early):

[*eujperivspaston*] suits the context of Hebrews supremely, or even uniquely, well: as *o[ḡkoç* is liable to hamper the Christian athlete, thus sin is liable to divert him from his goal. The meanings which can be attached to the rival reading are so far inferior to this as to make it justifiable, nay necessary, to regard the reading of P<sup>46</sup> as original. (Zuntz, 1953, 28).

... the only reason for giving serious consideration to the variant *eujperivspaston* 'easily distracting' is its appearance in the oldest extant witness (Bruce, 1992, 37).

Against 1 (prevalent, explanatory):

[*eujperivspaston*] would be attractive if the meaning or the reading were more widely attested (Ellingworth, 1993, 638).

... it was considered more probable that [*eujperivspaston*] was an early attempt to avoid the difficult *eujperivstato*n, which can be either active or passive in force and has been interpreted in many ways (Tasker, 1964, 442).

The reading *eujperivspaston* ("easily distracting"), which occurs in Π<sup>46</sup> and 1739 (and perhaps lies behind it<sup>d</sup>, Z), is either a palaeographical error or a deliberate modification of *eujperivstato*n, which is supported by all the other known witnesses (Metzger, 1994, 604).

Zuntz and Simpson (according to Bruce) differ over which reading is more suitable to the context. Without ready access to Simpson's work (Simpson, Edmund K., *Words worth weighing in the Greek New Testament*, London: Tyndale, 1946), I have not been able to compare their views. Suspending judgement between Zuntz and Simpson, Lane's point favours the selection of *eujperivspaston* according to the 'authentic' criterion.

Concerning the reading which best explains the other, I have followed Zuntz, who notes that the change from *eujperivspaston* to *eujperivstaton* also occurs in Evagrius, against the Committee which does not give any reasons in support of its assertion that '*eujperivspaston* ... is either a palaeographical error or a deliberate modification of *eujperivstaton*'.

### **Heb 12.3**

0: *eij" eJautovn* (sing.)

Includes Lect. 895 (*auJtovn*). Syr<sup>h</sup> indeterminate (*eJautovn* or *aujtovn*).

1: *eij" aujtovn* (sing.)

2: *eij" eJautouv"* (pl.)

Some Latin versions and Bohairic indeterminate (*eJautouv"* or *aujtovv"*).

3: *eij" aujtouv"* (pl.)

4: *ejn uJmi'n*

5: omit

For 0 (prevalent, reliable):

[The Committee chose] *eij" eJautovn* as the least inadequately supported reading (A P 104 326 1241 John-Damascus) (Metzger, 1994, 605).

The apparatus of *The Greek New Testament* (1993, 768) cites minuscule

263 here, not 326 which is cited at the corresponding place in the UBS third edition (1975, 773) and in the 27th edition of Nestle-Aland's *Novum Testamentum Graece* (1993, 583).

For 0 and 1 (authentic):

... the phrase εἰς ἐλαιοὺς or εἰς ἐλαιὸν is placed here in the attributive position and therefore is to be taken closely with ἀντιλογίαν. That being so, εἰς ἐλαιὸν yields the only tolerable sense in the context (Bruce, 1990, 333).

The singular is the only imaginable reading that fits the context (Zuntz, 1953, 120).

Against 0 and 1 (early, explanatory):

... there is no ancient evidence for [the singular]. It looks like a correct conjecture (Zuntz, 1953, 120).

Braun ... explains the singular reading as a correction of a primitive corruption (Ellingworth, 1993, 643).

For 2 and 3 (early, prevalent, diverse, reliable, difficult, explanatory, authentic):

The plural is established as being the oldest recoverable reading by the consensus of all the ancient witnesses and of most versions (Zuntz, 1953, 120).

... external evidence strongly favors either εἰς ἐλαιοὺς (A\* Dgr\* syrP Ephraem) or εἰς αἰתους (Π13, 46 A<sup>2</sup> Yc 048 33 1739\* Origen *al*) (Metzger, 1994, 604-5).

The plural is the qualitatively best supported and the more difficult (though meaningful) reading, and the one more likely to be altered. (Dissenting opinion of Allen Wikgren: Metzger, 1994, 605.)

Lane (1991b, 400) supports the plural as a suitable reading in view of



Heb 6.6, 'crucifying to themselves the Son of God', and Prov 8.36 LXX, 'Those who sin against me harm themselves.'

Against 2 and 3 (authentic):

The attempts at making sense of [the plural] only prove its absurdity (Zuntz, 1953, 120).

The notion that sinners harm only themselves is widespread... That notion, however, is foreign to the context. Hence the singular ... is to be preferred (Attridge, 1989, 353-4).

... the difficulty of making sense of the plural led a majority of the Committee to prefer the singular number (Metzger, 1994, 605).

Most of these statements cannot be taken as support for particular readings as they do not differentiate between forms with and without the initial *epsilon*, concerning which Zuntz (1953, 120, n. 1) writes: 'It is a mere matter of orthography whether the reflexive is expressed by the letter *ε* prefixed or not'. For this reason, it is not possible to record the preferences of Zuntz (who regards the passage as affected by a primitive corruption), Bruce, or Lane in the sample data matrix. The one specific statement (the Committee's support for *ε*ij" *ε*Jautovn) is opposed by another statement by the Committee in support of the plural forms. As a result, none of the criteria have an entry for this variation unit.

Ellingworth (1993, 643-4) does not make clear whether he supports the singular or plural.

## **Heb 12.18**

0: yhlafwmevnw/

1: yhlafwmevnw/ o[rei

Includes Y (ejyhlahfmevnw/).

2: o[rei yhlafwmevnw/

For 0 (authentic, reliable, diverse):

The author ... omits o[rei because his concern is not with the location itself, but with the fact that it is something material and palpable (Ellingworth, 1993, 672).

External evidence strongly supports the reading yhlafwmevnw/ without o [rei (Π<sup>46</sup> Å A C 048 33 (81) vg syrP cop<sup>sa</sup>, bo eth al) (Metzger, 1994, 605).

Against 1 and 2 (short, stable):

Zuntz (1953, 167) regards o[rei as a gloss.

The fact that o[rei is inserted in different places suggests that the word was not in the original but was thought necessary by various copyists to complete the sense, as it is in 22 (Ross, 1992, 153).

Bruce (1990, 352) places 'mountain' in his translation, but writes that it is understood from v. 22 and is not found in the best-attested Greek text. This indicates that he regards the omission of o[rei as genuine.

## **Heb 13.15**

0: di aujtou' ou\n

1: dia; tou'to ou\n

2: di aujtou'

For 0 (prevalent, explanatory, authentic):

The longer majority reading may be preferred, and the shorter reading explained by haplography from AUTOUOUNANA (Ellingworth, 1993, 720).

Zuntz (1953, 192) regards ou\n as conforming to the style of Hebrews.

Against 0 (explanatory):

It is difficult to decide whether copyists added [ou\̃n], which seems to be needed at this point, or whether it was accidentally omitted in transcription (Metzger, 1994, 605).

Against 1 (explanatory):

... a few witnesses ... read *dia; tou'to*, a simple mechanical error (Attridge, 1989, 390).

For 2 (early, reliable, diverse):

[ou\̃n] is absent from several early and important witnesses (Π<sup>46</sup> Å\* D\* P Y (it<sup>d</sup>) syrP) (Metzger, 1994, 605).

Against 2 (prevalent):

... most witnesses include *ou\̃n* (Metzger, 1994, 605).

Possible reasons for both the addition and omission of *ou\̃n* are given, but Ellingworth's argument for omission through haplography seems stronger. This implies that the readings which include *ou\̃n* are more likely to be the origin of the one which does not. As *dia; tou'to ou\̃n* has quite minor support, as well as the look of a secondary development, *di aujtou' ou\̃n* has been selected according to the 'explanatory' criterion.

### **Heb 13.21a**

0: *panti; ajgaqw'*

Includes P46 (*tw' ajgaqw'*).

1: *panti; e[rgw/ ajgaqw'*

Includes Armenian (omit *pantiv*).

2: *panti; e[rgw/ kai; lovgw/ ajgaqw'*

For 0 (short):

En pantí; ajgaqw' ... is preferable as the shorter reading (Ellingworth, 1993, 730).

For 1 (prevalent, diverse):

After pantiv the Textus Receptus, in company with C D<sup>c</sup> K M P almost all minuscules and syrP, <sup>h</sup> cop<sup>sa</sup> eth *al*, adds e[rgw] (Metzger, 1994, 605).

Against 1 and 2 (short, discordant, explanatory):

Zuntz (1953, 108) is confident that e[rgw] as a gloss.

... ajgaqovn in the NT is often collocated with verbs of working or doing (e.g. Rom. 2:10; 13:3; Eph. 4:28), so the expansion to pantí; e[rgw]/ajgaqw' ... is natural (Ellingworth, 1993, 730).

If [e[rgw]/] had been present originally, no good reason can account for its absence (Metzger, 1994, 605).

Against 2 (discordant):

The singular reading ... in codex A, is from 2 Th 2.17 (Metzger, 1994, 605).

## **Heb 13.21b**

0: hJmí'n

1: uJmí'n

For 0 (difficult, prevalent, reliable, diverse):

En hJmí'n ... should be considered the harder reading since it involves a change of person following uJma''' (Ellingworth, 1993, 730).

ejn hJmí'n [is] attested by Π<sup>46</sup> Å D K 0121b and the majority of MSS (Bruce, 1990, 387).

[hJmi'n] is strongly supported by  $\Pi^{46}$  ÅA Dgr K M 33 81 614 1739 syrP cop<sup>sa</sup>, bo arm *al* (Metzger, 1994, 606).

Against 1 (discordant):

In view of the preceding uJma'" it is easy to see why hJmi'n ... was altered to uJmi'n (Metzger, 1994, 606).

### Heb 13.21c

0: tw'n aijwvwnwn

1: omit

For 0 (discordant, prevalent, reliable):

The balance of probabilities between liturgical expansion and assimilation to v. 8 is difficult to assess; external evidence makes it hard to reject the longer reading in this case (Ellingworth, 1993, 731).

... because of the weight of such witnesses as ÅA (C\*) 33 614 1739 *al*, it was decided to retain the words tw'n aijwvwnwn (Metzger, 1994, 607).

Against 0 (discordant, short):

Attridge (1989, 404) describes tw'n aijwvwnwn as a 'liturgically inspired addition'.

[tw'n aijwvwnwn] might well be a gloss (Metzger, 1994, 607).

For 1 (short, authentic):

Zuntz surveys scribal tendencies with respect to other doxologies in the New Testament and concludes that the shorter form is more likely to be original here:

For there is no instance of an originally longer form being shortened in witnesses as numerous and ancient as here. But the expansion of an

originally shorter form, so far as it did occur at all, was characteristic of the older tradition... This result is confirmed by the fact that the writer of Hebrews ... kept the shorter form  $\epsilon\iota\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron;\nu\ \alpha\iota\iota\omega\nu\alpha$  in his four references to Melchizedek and that he used the shorter form also in the quasi-doxology in xiii. 8 (1953, 121).

#### Against 1 (discordant, authentic):

In He 5.6; 6.20; 7.17, and 21 ... we find the short form ..., as also in 2 Cor 9.9 and 1 Pe 1.25. None of these instances of the short form occurs in a doxology (Metzger, 1994, 606).

The implication in this statement that the author would not use the short reading as a doxology is weakened by the occurrence of the short form in the 'quasi-doxology' at Heb 13.8. Also, as Zuntz observes, the shorter form is used 'in the proper doxologies in Rom. xi. 36 and at the end of the same epistle' (1953, 121). This goes to show that it was appropriate for a first century author to use the shorter doxology. Consequently, the 'authentic' criterion has been taken to support the omission of  $\tau\omega\nu\ \alpha\iota\iota\omega\nu\nu\nu\nu$ .

Both of the readings have parallels to which they may have been assimilated, so the 'discordant' criterion has not been marked.

#### **Heb 13.25**

0:  $\rho\alpha\nu\nu\tau\omega\nu\ \upsilon\iota\mu\omega\nu$ .

1:  $\rho\alpha\nu\nu\tau\omega\nu\ \upsilon\iota\mu\omega\nu\ \alpha\iota\mu\eta\nu$ .

2:  $\rho\alpha\nu\nu\tau\omega\nu\ \eta\iota\mu\omega\nu\ \alpha\iota\mu\eta\nu$ .

3:  $\rho\alpha\nu\nu\tau\omega\nu\ \tau\omega\nu\ \alpha\iota\gamma\iota\omega\nu\ \alpha\iota\mu\eta\nu$ .

For 0 (reliable, diverse, short):

Several important witnesses ... including  $\Pi^{46}\ \text{A}^*\ \text{I}^{\text{vid}}\ 33\ \text{vg}^{\text{ms}}\ \text{cop}^{\text{sa}}\ \text{arm}$ , have resisted the intrusion (Metzger, 1994, 607).

Against 1, 2, and 3 (discordant):

The later liturgical use of the concluding words ("Grace be with all of you") must have made it difficult for scribes not to add *ajmhvn* when copying the epistle (Metzger, 1994, 607).

## References

- Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger (eds.). 1993. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Nestle-Aland, 27th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger (eds.). 1993. *The Greek New Testament*. United Bible Societies, 4th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Aland, Kurt, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren (eds.). 1979. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Nestle-Aland, 26th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Aland, Kurt, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren (eds.). 1983. *The Greek New Testament*. United Bible Societies, 3rd corr. ed. New York: United Bible Societies.
- Attridge, Harold, W. 1989. *The epistle to the Hebrews*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Bauer, Walter. 1979. *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature*. Trans. William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. 2nd rev. and augmented ed. Ed. F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick W. Danker. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Blass, Friedrich and Albert Debrunner. 1961. *A Greek grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian literature: a translation and revision of the ninth-tenth edition incorporating supplementary notes of A. Debrunner†*. Trans. and ed. Robert W. Funk. Chicago:

University of Chicago Press.

Brooks, James A. 1991. *The New Testament text of Gregory of Nyssa*. Society of Biblical Literature: the New Testament in the Greek Fathers, 2. Ed. Gordon D. Fee. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Bruce, F. F. 1990. *The epistle to the Hebrews*. The new international commentary on the New Testament. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Bruce, F. F. 1992. 'Textual problems in the epistle to the Hebrews'. In *Scribes and scripture: New Testament essays in honor of J. Harold Greenlee*. Ed. David Alan Black. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Ellingworth, Paul. 1993. *The epistle to the Hebrews: a commentary on the Greek text*. The new international Greek Testament commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Elliott, J. Keith. 1972. 'When Jesus was apart from God: an examination of Hebrews 2<sup>9</sup>'. *The expository times* 83/11, 339-341.

Garnet, Paul. 1985. 'Hebrews 2: 9: CARITI or CWRIS?'. *Studia Patristica* 18/1, 321-325.

Kilpatrick, George D. 1980. 'The text of the epistles: the contribution of Western witnesses'. In *Text – Wort – Glaube: Studien zur Überlieferung, Interpretation und Autorisierung biblischer Texte*. Festschrift in honour of Kurt Aland. Ed. Martin Brecht. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, 50. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 47-68.

Lane, William L. 1991a. *Hebrews 1-8*. Word biblical commentary, 47A. Dallas: Word Books.

Lane, William L. 1991b. *Hebrews 9-13*. Word biblical commentary, 47B. Dallas: Word Books.

Manson, William. 1951. *The epistle to the Hebrews: an historical and theological reconsideration*. Baird Lecture of 1949. London:



Hodder and Stoughton.

Metzger, Bruce M. 1994. *A textual commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Rahlfs, Alfred (ed.). 1935. *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. 2 vols. 9th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung.

Tasker, R. V. G. (ed.). 1964. *The Greek New Testament: being the text translated in The New English Bible 1961*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wolmarans, Johannes L. P. 1984. 'The text and translation of Hebrews 8 8'. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 75, 139-144.

Westcott, Brooke Foss and Fenton John Anthony Hort (eds.). 1881a. *The New Testament in the original Greek*. Vol. 1. *Text*. Cambridge: Macmillan. Repr. 1974. Graz: Akademische Druck.

Westcott, Brooke Foss and Fenton John Anthony Hort. 1881b. *The New Testament in the original Greek*. Vol. 2. *Introduction [and] Appendix*. Cambridge: Macmillan. Repr. 1974. Graz: Akademische Druck.

Zuntz, Günther. 1953. *The text of the epistles: a disquisition upon the corpus Paulinum*. Schweich Lectures of 1946. London: British Academy.

## SUMMARY OF CRITERIA DATA

The following is a tabular summary of the data contained in the appendix entitled *Basis for criteria data*.

### Key

- 0,1,2 Numerical labels for readings (i.e. nominal states).
- + A vote for a reading.
- A vote against a reading.
- ± Votes for and against the same reading.
- 2x Two of the same kind of vote.
- = Resultant vote.
- ? Indeterminate (equal opposition or no clearly implied alternative).
- \* Minor attestation (not considered in the voting process).

Two possible outcomes follow from situations where there are opposed views with respect to which reading is favoured by a criterion. Firstly, the arguments may be resolved in favour of a single reading, in which case a vote for the selected reading is registered in the corresponding criterion column. Alternatively, if the respective arguments are evenly poised, the corresponding criterion column is not marked. That is, its vote is left indeterminate.

*The entries in the criteria columns of the sample data matrix correspond exactly with the resultant votes of this summary.*

*Var. No. Auth. Diff. Disc. Elem. Expl. Short Stab. Div. Early Man. Prev. Rel.*

1.3	0	±			−	+				+
	1	±		+	±			−		−
	2							−		−
=		1			1	1	0		0	0

1.8	0	+		−			+		+	
	1	+	+	+		−		+		+
	2*									
=		1	1	1		0		0	1	0
										1

1.12a	0	+		+		+				+
	1									
=		0		0		0				0

1.12b	0	+		+		−		+		+
	1									
=		0		0		1		0		0

2.7	0	+								
	1			−		−		+	+	+
=		0		0		0		1	1	1

2.8	0	−								+
	1	+		+		+		+	+	
	2*									
=		1		1		1		1	1	0

2.9	0	±				−		+		+
	1	±	+	−		±		+		+
=		?	1	0		1		?	0	1

3.2	0			−					+	
	1					−			+	+
=				1		0			1	0
										1

3.6a	0		−			−		+	+	
	1*									
	2	±	+			−				
=		2	2			?		0	0	

3.6b	0									
	1	−		−		−				
	2	−		−		−				
=		0		0		0				

4.2	0	+	+	-		+		+	+	+	+
	1*										
	2	±	-			-					
	3*										
=		0	0	2		0		0	0	0	0

*Var. No. Auth. Diff. Disc. Elem. Expl. Short Stab. Div. Early Man. Prev. Rel.*

4.3a 0 + + +  
 1 - -  
 2 - -2x -  
 = 0 0 0 0 0 0

4.3b 0  
 1 + + -  
 = 1 1 0

6.2 0 - - - +  
 1 - +  
 = 1 1 1 1 0

6.3 0 + + +  
 1 - - -  
 = 0 0 0 0 0

7.21 0 - -  
 1 - - -  
 2\*  
 = 0 0 1 0

8.8 0 + + +  
 1 + + ± + +  
 = 1 1 0 1 0 1

8.11 0 + + +  
 1 - - -  
 = 0 ? 0 0 0

9.1 0 ± - -  
 1  
 = ? 1 1

9.10 0 + + +  
 1 - -  
 2 - -  
 3 -  
 = ? ? 0 0 0

9.11 0 ± + - + +  
 1 - - - +  
 = 0 0 0 ? 0 0 1

9.14a 0 + +

$$= \begin{array}{ccccccc} & 1 & & - & & - & \\ & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array}$$

$$9.14b \quad \begin{array}{cc} 0 & + \\ & \end{array}$$

$$= \begin{array}{cc} 1 & \\ & 0 \end{array}$$

*Var. No. Auth. Diff. Disc. Elem. Expl. Short Stab. Div. Early Man. Prev. Rel.*

9.17	0										
	1	—								—	
=		0								0	
9.19	0	—		—		—	—				
	1	—		—		—	—				
	2	—		— 2x		—	—				
	3	—		±	—	+		+	—	—	+
=		3		?	?	3	3	3	?	?	3
10.1a	0	+								+	
	1*				—						
	2*				—						
	3				—						
	4*	—	—		—			+		—	
=		0	?		0			4		0	
10.1b	0	+			—						
	1	±	+	—						+	
=		0	1	0	1					1	
10.11	0	+					+	+			
	1				—						
=		0			0		0	0			
10.34a	0	+			+		+		+		
	1			—	—						
	2			—	—					+	
	3			—	—						
=		0		0	0		0		0	2	
10.34b	0								+		+
	1				—						
	2				—						
	3*										
	4				—						
=					0				0		0
10.38	0	+									+
	1			—							
	2			—							
=		0		?							0
11.1	0										
	1				—						





*Var. No. Auth. Diff. Disc. Elem. Expl. Short Stab. Div. Early Man. Prev. Rel.*

11.23	0				—					
	1	—		—	—	—				
=		0		0	1	0				
11.37	0					+				+
	1	—			—	—	—			
	2	—			—	—	—			
	3	—			— 2x	—	—			
	4	—			—	—	—			
	5*	—			— 2x	—	—			
=		0			0	0	0			0
12.1	0	±			—					
	1	+			—			+		—
=		1			1			1		0
12.3	0	+			—			—		+
	1	+			—			—		+
	2	±	+		+			+	+	+
	3	±	+		+			+	+	+
	4									
	5									
=		?	?		?			?	?	?
12.18	0	+						+		+
	1					—	—			
	2					—	—			
=		0				0	0	0		0
13.15	0	+			±					+
	1				—					
	2							+	+	—
=		0			0			2	2	0
13.21a	0					+				
	1			—	—	—		+		+
	2*			— 2x	—	—				
=				0	0	0		1		1
13.21b	0		+					+		+
	1			—						
=			0	0				0		0
13.21c	0			±		—				+
	1	±		—		+				+

=	1	?	1	0	0
13.25	0		+	+	+
	1	—			
	2*	—			
	3*	—			
=		0	0	0	0