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Abstract. An Investigation into Textual Characteristics of the Early Greek Majuscule Pandects.
Michael Peter Dormandy.

In this thesis, I analyse the textual characteristics of the four Greek, majuscule pandects (01, 02, 03 and 04). By “textual characteristics”, I mean how these manuscripts vary from the initial text as we can best reconstruct it. The term is similar in meaning to “scribal habits”, but rather than referring to the habitual behaviour of the scribe of the manuscript under investigation, “textual characteristics” refers to all the ways in which the manuscript differs from the initial text, both those introduced by its own scribe and by the scribes of all its exemplars. I defend my focus on textual characteristics, rather than scribal habits, by arguing that it is difficult to determine which variant readings were introduced to a manuscript by its own scribe. Royse argues that singular readings were normally introduced by the scribe of the manuscript, but I present a number of arguments against his approach. I also consider the method of Min and Aland, who argue that we should examine textual characteristics by comparing manuscripts to a published critical text. This is likely to be circular, because critical texts are frequently produced using assumptions which favour particular manuscripts.

My own method works by attempting to reconstruct the initial text at a range of variation units, giving no weight to “good” manuscripts, just because they are favoured by scholars. I then consider how the manuscripts under investigation differ from this reconstructed initial text. I survey sample chapters in John, Romans, Revelation, Judges and Sirach. The discussion of specific variants in these various books forms the bulk of the thesis. I chose this range of books to be able to survey the wide range of types of literature represented in the pandects and see how textual characteristics varied between them. Working on Judges also allowed me to analyse the “new finds” of 01, which include several pages of text from Judges. In the portion of Judges which I surveyed, 01 and 03 not infrequently agree against all the rest of the B-group of Judges manuscripts, which suggests that they may be closely related. My observations of 04 sometimes challenge the generally accepted transcriptions by Lyon and Tischendorf.

In considering the history of the manuscripts, I argue that 01 and 03 may plausibly have been among the manuscripts made in response to the Imperial commissions by Constantine and Constans, recorded by Eusebius and Athanasius.

My research has yielded a number of interesting conclusions. In general, across all the manuscripts and for all the varying types of passage sampled, the pandects generally preserve the initial text well. For most pandects, in most books, the mean number of changes from the initial text per ten verses is comfortably below 10.0. Within the changes that can be observed, transcriptional and linguistic variations are more common than harmonisations or changes of content. The more precise profiles of each manuscript vary considerably between Biblical books. The pandects thus create bibliographic unity out of textual diversity. This underlines their significance in the history of the Christian Bible: they reflect in bibliographic form the important hermeneutical move to consider all the books of the Christian Bible as one corpus.
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Preliminary Notes

In chapters three to seven, I cite commentaries and editions by author’s name only. When no year or page is given, the reference is to the relevant passage in the relevant commentary or edition by that author. When Tischendorf is cited for 04 in the NT, I refer to his 1843 edition of 04. When he is cited for other manuscripts in the NT, I refer to the 1869-72 eighth edition of his NT. Full details are given in the bibliography.

Standard reference works are referred to using the abbreviations found in *The SBL Handbook of Style* (Collins et al 2014) with a full reference in the bibliography. When no page reference is given, it is to the relevant entry in that reference work.

Images of manuscripts are taken from the Codex Sinaiticus Project website (2009), the Vatican Library website (n.d.), the BnF website (n.d.) and the British Library website (n.d.), depending on which manuscript is captured. Multi-spectral images of 04 are taken from those held by the Kirchliche Hochschule, Wuppertal (© SCHRIFFT-BILDER.org). My sincere thanks to Martin Karrer for access and permission to use these images.

I use “LXX” to refer to the entire diverse tradition of the Jewish Scriptures in Greek and “Old Greek” (OG) to refer to the earliest translation of each book.
Introduction

The early Greek majuscule pandects are valued for their relevance to both book history and textual criticism, not to mention their aesthetic beauty. In this thesis I consider how and why they are valuable, by examining their textual characteristics. In this introduction, I briefly consider which manuscripts I consider to be early Greek majuscule pandects. In chapter 1, I discuss various methods for studying Greek Biblical manuscripts and outline and defend my own. In chapter 2, I briefly discuss the history and palaeography of the pandects, including defending the hypothesis that at least 01, and possibly 03, were commissioned by Roman Emperors. I then apply my method to Romans, John, Revelation, Sirach and Judges in the pandects.

The manuscripts examined in this thesis are, in GA nomenclature, 01, 02, 03 and 04. In referring to them as “pandects”, I do not claim that any were definitely originally single-volume codices, only that they were complete bibliographic units. The homogeneity of the hands, format and appearance of the pages of each pandect leave little room for doubt that their makers viewed them as unities.1 02 and 03 survive almost completely and enough of 01 survives to show that it almost certainly originally contained the whole NT and LXX. In 04, most of the NT and most of the LXX wisdom literature is preserved, but the manuscript has been palimpsested and the pages rearranged in a completely different order. It is therefore impossible to be certain either that all the leaves came from one manuscript or that the manuscript was originally a pandect (Parker 2008, 73-74). However, the format and hands seem very similar throughout, so it is highly likely that they came from a single bibliographic unit. Even if this unit contained no more of LXX than the wisdom literature, it contains all of the NT and a substantial portion of LXX, so it can be considered alongside the pandects as a bibliographic unit that unites the diverse corpora of the Christian Bible. From now on, I shall refer to it as a pandect.

1 Jongkind (2019a, 193) summarises the status quaestionis on how many volumes were originally used to bind each of the manuscripts, concluding “There is little debate that each of these codices were conceived and executed as complete manuscripts of the Christian Scriptures”. This refers to 01, 02 and 03, but he then adds “It is likely that in this early group of pandects we ought also to include Codex Ephraemi rescriptus.”
What about other possible pandects? Trobisch has argued that all or most of our surviving NT fragments originally came from bibliographic units containing the entire NT and if this is possible, surely some could also have come from pandects. However, as I have argued elsewhere, the evidence from work combinations in our extant manuscripts is against Trobisch’s conclusion (Dormandy 2018). 05 is a large codex, from a similar period to the four pandects considered here. The manuscript as we have it contains the Gospels, Acts and a small part of 3 John (Parker 1992, 8). It is impossible to be certain whether or not it once contained the rest of the NT or LXX, but it has no LXX material extant, so we cannot analyse it as manuscript containing both Testaments.

Our other pandects or possible pandects are considerably later. The lower, majuscule layer of 0250 may contain LXX material as well as NT², but this is eighth century (NTVMR n.d.). There are a number of minuscule pandects, which are all eighth-century or later (Jongkind 2019a). There is a large gap with no pandect production after 04; all the other pandects or possible pandects belong in a significantly different historical context. I therefore make the topic of this thesis 01, 02, 03 and 04.

---

² The LDAB (n.d.) records the manuscript as containing epitomes of the four Gospels; the Museum of the Bible (which now owns the manuscript) records it as containing “a mixture of classical and Biblical texts” without further details (Museum of the Bible website, n.d.). We eagerly await the findings of the project on this manuscript, sponsored by the Museum of the Bible.
In this chapter, I present the motivations and methods of my research. I interact mostly with NT scholarship but mutatis mutandis, similar things could be said for LXX.

Part 1. Scholarly Motivation of This Dissertation

Why do research on the pandects? The answer to this question depends on a more fundamental question: why study any Greek Biblical manuscript? I discuss various possible aims for such work and consider how the pandects might fit into them.

Traditionally, the aim of textual criticism has been easy to define and apply to the NT: textual criticism is the process by which scholars study manuscripts of a literary work, of which the autograph does not survive, to establish what the author originally wrote (e.g. Westcott and Hort 1882, 1:1, 3; in modern times Karrer 2012a, 44; Strutwolf 2011, 41). Recently, however, this approach has been challenged by so-called “new philology”. This approach originated in Medieval Studies (Nicholls 1990) and Norse Philology (Driscoll 2010), but has been championed in NT Studies by Parker. Parker (in particular 1997) argues that there is no reason, historical or theological, to privilege the original autograph and that that very concept may owe more to post-Reformation theological construals of “Scripture” than to the realities of early Christian book production. Parker argues that it is not possible to reconstruct with any certainty the text as it left the hands of its earliest authors. Instead, textual critics should investigate what manuscripts can tell us about the communities that made and used them. Parker’s approach takes greater interest than traditional philology in a manuscript’s para-textual content, such as punctuation and illustration; on Parker’s view, the changes scribes make to earlier forms of the text, far from polluting the pure textual stream, become valuable evidence for the thought and faith of the post-apostolic period (see also Haines-Eitzen 2000, Lin 2016 and Larsen 2017).

These two aims of textual criticism are not mutually exclusive and indeed they need each other. The traditionalist needs the new philologist to tell her what kinds of changes scribes typically
introduce, so that she can remove them. Likewise the new philologist needs the traditionalist to tell her what the earliest text probably was, so that scribal changes can be identified. As Strutwolf (2011, 32) puts it: “[Parker’s] approach proves how important the quest for the original text still is, because in order to find out how later generations wrote on Luke’s page, it is indispensable to know what was written on Luke’s page originally”.

I will now discuss the significance of the pandects for both construals of the text-critical enterprise.

1. a. The Pandects and the Traditional Aim

The pandects have historically been of great interest to traditional-aim textual critics. Kurt Aland gently mocks Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort for naively following 01 and 03 like guiding stars. He is right that such attachments must be questioned. Karrer (2012a, 71) warns scholars against “die nicht abschließend erreichte Klärung über die Wertung der Zeugen.” One of my aims in this dissertation is to investigate how reliably the pandects really do guide us to the initial text.

Many textual critics with traditional aims work by “reasoned eclecticism”. That is, they aim to balance internal and external evidence. They look at the kind of readings that various manuscripts have at different variation units and attempt to establish what kind of readings these manuscripts typically have. These results can then be used to form general conclusions about the value of these manuscripts, which can inform decisions about doubtful variation units. As Wasserman (2014, 580) says, although there is an obvious danger of circularity, “the ideal procedure should be described not as a circle, but as a spiral”. The critic moves from studying

---

3 For a traditional-aims textual critic making this point, see Strutwolf 2011, 32. For a new philologist, see Parker 2011, 19.
4 “Die Zeit der Leitsterne (B für Westcott-Hort, א für Tischendorf), die dem Textkritiker den direkten Weg zu seinem Ziel des “NT in the original Greek” wiesen, wie der Naivität, die dahinter steht, ist unwiederbringlich vorbei.” (Aland 1979, 11).
5 E.g. Fee 1993b; Holmes 2006, 2014; Metzger and Ehrman 2005, 205-26. It is a persistent theme in Epp’s work that reasoned eclecticism is a temporary expedient (e.g. 1993a; 1993b, 40-41; 1993c; 1993d, 98).
particular variants, to generalisations about manuscripts and then back to particular variants, but with greater knowledge than before. An investigation into the textual character of the pandects fits neatly with this approach. By assessing the textual character of each pandect at a variety of places of variation, we can begin to make general statements about their textual quality, which is essential to moving forward along Wasserman’s spiral.

1. b. The Pandects and “New Philology”

The pandects (particularly 01 and 03, which date to the fourth century) are a particularly important source for early Church history and Biblical reception. The early papyri have excited the interest of scholars, since they bring us tantalisingly close to the first-century autographs, but the pandects show us the beginning of Christianity after Nicaea, when a canonised NT and an established Church were novelties. Because the pandects seem to have originally contained approximately the same canon as today, they tell us not only about the reception of the Biblical books, but about the reception of those books as a unified collection with canonical status. Thus it is important for new philology to investigate exactly what the scribes were doing when they copied the pandects.

I now consider how to go about this research.

Part 2. Methodology: Different Ways To Investigate NT Manuscripts

Royse and Colwell influentially used singular readings to investigate the scribal habits of early papyri. I discuss this method and then consider an alternative that does not use singulars, but rather all instances of variation from a critical text, chosen by the scholar conducting the research. In the light of these, I offer my own approach.

---

6 For major studies on the papyri, see, e.g., Colwell 1969b; Head 1990, 2004; Aland 2002, 2003; Min 2005; Royse 2008; Malik 2016, 2017. For the significance of Nicaea and the establishment of the canon as turning points, see Aland and Aland 1989, 56; Fee 1993c, 188; Royse 2008, 20-31.
2. a. The Singular Readings Method

This approach was pioneered by Colwell (1969b) and developed by Royse (2008). They argue that singular readings in a manuscript are likely to have been created by its scribe. If a reading had been inherited by faithful copying of an exemplar, it would be likely that this exemplar had other descendants and the reading would turn up elsewhere in the tradition. They therefore carefully survey the manuscript under analysis, compare it with the most comprehensive apparatuses available and produce a list of its singular readings. This provides their dataset, which they then categorise and analyse to establish scribal habits. Royse (2008, 55) grants that not all singulars were necessarily created by the scribe of their manuscript, but argues that the large majority probably were. Royse (2008, 67) includes many “sub-singualrs”, readings that are singular when examined against the apparatus of Tischendorf’s eighth edition (1869-72), but have support elsewhere. He argues that while they may have some relevance to scribal habits, they are not as important as pure singulars.

In general, the singular-readings method has been warmly received by scholars. In particular, it has led textual critics to give less reverence to the lectio brevior canon. Many scholars have used the method with interesting results. Hurtado (1981) applied it to Mark in 032, writing before Royse, but citing Colwell. Wevers (1974; 1978; 1982; 1986; 1992) used the method, alongside alternatives, in his work on the Greek Pentateuch (also writing before Royse). Wayment (2006, 251-62) used a similar method on the Freer Pauline codex. Head (1990; 2004; 2008) applied it to various papyri and to Mark in 01. Hernández (2006) used it on Revelation in the Greek pandects, confirming Royse’s scepticism about lectio brevior and finding a possible anti-Arian scribal bias in 01. Malik’s (2017, 170-71) comprehensive study of 𝔓⁴⁷ also uses Royse’s technique, adapted to account for the versions. Most recently Paulson (2018) has applied it to Matthew in various early majuscules. Farnes (2019, 19) notes that the method has proved very popular in the US, less so in the UK and much less so in Germany.

---

7 E.g. Parker, who raises a number of questions about Royse’s method, nevertheless concludes his review of Royse 2008 by referring to it as “this remarkable book” (Parker 2009, 258). In a discussion of the book at the 2008 SBL Annual Meeting, later published, Head and Hernández particularly were fulsome in their praise (Hernández Jr. et al 2012).
2. b. Problems with the Singular Readings Method

A basic problem with this method is confidently establishing whether or not a reading is singular. Parker (2009, 256) cites a number of readings that Royse mistakenly identifies as singular. For example, in Jude 11, \( \Psi \) confuses Balaam and Balak. Royse appears to think this singular, but, according to Parker, 432* also attests this confusion. Along similar lines, Barbara Aland (2002, 1 n. 2) points out that new manuscript discoveries can lead to readings losing their singular status. Strutwolf (2005, 142-43) helpfully lists a number of readings, identified as singular by Royse in the 1981 dissertation which formed the basis of his 2008 book, which have since lost their singular status due to advances in scholarship. New witnesses sometimes emerge, giving additional testimony to readings that were previously regarded as singular. Only recently, Hixson 2018 revealed a number of previously unknown readings in 05. Put bluntly, a high number of singulars in a manuscript could mean that we are dealing with an idiosyncratic scribe, but it could also mean that we lack knowledge of related manuscripts.

Related to this is the problem of “near-singulars”. This is my term for singular readings where a very similar reading occurs elsewhere in the tradition. For example, in Rev 13:17, 01 has τοῦ Θεοῦ instead of Ἰησοῦ. Hernández (2006, 79 n. 194) lists this reading as singular. However this is misleading, because 522 has anarthrous θεοῦ here. 01 may be technically singular, but it is not the only manuscript to turn a mention of θεός into a mention of Ἰησοῦ. Similarly, at Rom 15:32, most manuscripts have διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ. 01 only changes θεοῦ to Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; 03 only has κύριου Ἰησοῦ and a number of witnesses traditionally thought of as “Western” have Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Once again, 01 and 03 are both strictly speaking singular, but neither are the only witnesses to change a mention of God to a mention of Jesus. Something similar can be observed with names of divine figures at Rom 8:35. What these examples all highlight is that a singular variant may be less than singular than it seems, because certain aspects of it are shared with other witnesses.

Fundamentally, however, the singular-reading method has two parallel weaknesses, well expressed by Jongkind (2007, 137): “Not all incorrect readings [i.e. incorrectly copied readings]

---

8 In the 2008 book, Royse no longer lists these readings as singular.
will show up among the singular readings...On the other hand, not all singular readings are created by the scribe”. Some incorrectly copied readings will not be singular and some singulars will not have been incorrectly copied.

Let us first consider the possibility of incorrectly copied readings which are not singular. Junack (1981, 294) influentially argued that most ancient copying was done by self-dictation, i.e. a scribe read an exemplar and then dictated it to herself as she wrote. Since this method was widespread, we would expect the same copying errors to be repeated, without genealogical connection, because the same process will result in the same errors. This means that we should actively expect inaccurately copied readings not to be singular, because scribes will commit the same errors independently. If three of the eight undergraduates in my beginners’ Greek class forget the same smooth breathing in a test, I do not take that as evidence that they have cheated by copying each other. I simply take it as confirmation that undergraduates are wont to forget smooth breathings. In this case, as in the case of many of the multiply attested variants in our manuscripts, coincidental inaccurate copying is a more likely explanation than accurate copying descended from a common source.⁹

Royse (2008, 42) himself concedes that there exist non-singulars that were created coincidentally by the scribes of several manuscripts. Colwell (1969a, 51) even has an example, in Rev 13:7, where a long phrase is omitted in \(\text{𝔓}^{47}, 02, 04\) and some Byzantine manuscripts. He argues this is coincidental agreement in transcriptional error. He originally published this work four years before Colwell 1969b, the paper explaining the singular-readings method, but they are now published without comment in the same collected volume (Colwell 1969c).

Because of this, the singular-readings method is ill-suited for deriving large scale generalisations about scribal behaviour. For example, it does not convincingly disprove the lectio brevior criterion, because this criterion is based on an assumption about what most scribes most of the time tend to do (viz. they add to the text more than they shorten it). However, the singular-readings method can logically tell us nothing about what most scribes most of the time

⁹ Gurry (2017, 11-19) makes this point without the Greek class illustration.
tend to do, because it ignores times when even two scribes do the same thing, let alone most scribes. As Strutwolf (2005, 146-47) says:

Gathering the general rules of the overall transmission from the evaluation of singular readings of single manuscripts is a category mistake...To verify, control, or improve the rules of inner textual criticism [i.e. the criteria for internal evidence] we have to establish the habits of textual history in general. This can only be done by evaluating the whole manuscript transmission, that is, all the readings of every single manuscript.10

Furthermore, some singular readings were probably accurately copied. Royse has four main arguments for assuming that singulars were created by the scribe of the manuscript, rather than accurately copied from an exemplar. The first is that “the New Testament has been transmitted by a tradition that is highly ‘contaminated’ and has left such vast quantities of manuscript evidence” (Royse 2008, 50). Royse (2008, 50) argues that therefore readings very rarely disappear entirely; most are copied again somewhere. This ignores the fact that our stock of NT manuscripts is likely much smaller than the total ever produced. It is entirely possible that an originally large manuscript family has only one survivor. Royse’s (2008, 50-51) second argument is that many obvious errors will have been quickly corrected by subsequent scribes. However, if correction by subsequent scribes removed significant numbers of copying errors, we would not have the wide textual variety that we do in NT manuscripts.11 I will discuss Royse’s third argument presently, but his fourth appeals to Occam’s razor: “if the singular readings can be adequately explained as the products of the one scribe, there is no reason to postulate a chain of hypothetical ones” (Royse 2008, 54). However, this is to mis-use Occam’s razor. The razor is an argumentative tool that forbids multiplying entities when we have no reason to think that they might exist. However, with NT manuscripts, we have every reason to think that more scribes might have been involved, since there are so many non-surviving manuscripts of which we have no knowledge. To make an assumption about the data they would have contained is not, with Occam, to follow the simplest hypothesis, it is arbitrarily to ignore the possibility of alternative explanations.

Let us now consider the third and most important of Royse’s four arguments for saying that singular readings are likely to have been introduced by the scribe. Here Royse subtly changes

---

10 Head makes a similar point at Hernàndez, Head, Jongkind and Royse 2012, 13.
11 As Jongkind puts it “[Royse’s view] begs the question of how any reading could come into existence” (Hernàndez, Head, Jongkind and Royse 2012, 14).
his thesis and admits that it is possible that singular readings were accurately copied from the exemplar. However, when a scribe makes copying errors that are then inherited by a child-manuscript, with the parent not surviving, the child’s singulars will be comprised of errors made by its own scribe and by that of its parent. As such, they will still be a good guide to the kind of changes scribes commonly made (Royse 2008, 51-56). The problem, however, is that Royse is in effect admitting that he is not only investigating the habits of particular scribes, but also of all the scribes in the tradition between that manuscript and the autograph. The result is an analysis not of the habits of the scribe but of the textual qualities of the manuscript. In this case, there seems no good reason to restrict his data to singulars. Jongkind puts this well:

If the purpose is to describe the tendencies as they exist in a manuscript, which is what Royse’s discussion in this section seems to imply, then there is no reason why one should exclude non-singular readings. If, on the other hand, one’s aim is to describe the copying technique and scribal habits of an individual scribe, one must make a better case for the notion of why the singular reading reflects the work of an individual. (Hernández, Head, Jongkind and Royse 2012, 15).

There are a number of ways to test Royse’s method objectively. Jongkind (2007) used the method to investigate Paul, Luke and Psalms in 01 and found that it revealed different scribal habits for parts of the text copied by different scribes (which Jongkind had already distinguished palaeographically). Jongkind (2007, 242) argued that this showed the method “works” for identifying the habits of particular scribes.

However, Jongkind also uncovered various features that are evidence against Royse. In 1 Thess 2:13-14, in 01, the scribe does a major dittography, losing her place after ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, in v.14, and resuming copying at παρ᾽ ἡμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ, in v.13, recopying the equivalent of about four lines of text in NA28. Fascinatingly, she repeats two singulars (omission of ἀλῆθῶς and ἡμῖν for ὑμῖν). This suggests that at least these particular singulars were in her exemplar, since she would be highly unlikely to make the same copying error twice. Jongkind (2007, 207-08, 220-21) argues that, on the contrary, it is probable that once a scribe has read something in a certain way, it would stick in her head and she would make the same error twice. However, this ignores the fact that the scribe must have looked at the exemplar again in order to commit the dittography and therefore almost certainly read the singulars out of the exemplar. She clearly had no conscious memory of the previous act of copying, because if she had, she would not have repeated it. She even makes a new singular error the second time, changing the spelling
of μιμηταί to μιμηθη. This is further evidence that she did not consciously remember the first time. Thus the two singulars she repeated were almost certainly in the exemplar. Of course, we cannot know what proportion of singulars were faithfully copied from exemplars, but the fact that two were likely faithfully copied here suggests that others were as well.

Similarly, in 1 Chronicles in 01, Jongkind (2007, 144-64, 262) argues that the scribe and the scriptorium corrector used the same exemplar. This means that, when the scriptorium corrector corrects the scribe, it is almost certainly because the scribe has not followed his exemplar accurately. For this particular part of 01, therefore, readings corrected in scriptorium will almost certainly be scribally created. There are ninety such readings and only seventy-seven of them, c.85.6%, are singular (using Brooke and McLean’s apparatus). Therefore almost 15% of scribally created readings would not be detected by the singular method. Moreover, Brooke and McLean’s apparatus includes twenty-five manuscripts with some portion of LXX 1 Chronicles. With the NT, the manuscript tradition is much larger and there is therefore a much greater chance that two or more scribes will independently create the same reading (Jongkind 2007, 144-64, 262).

Farnes (2019) has tested Royse’s method using Abschriften, i.e. manuscripts of which the exemplar survives. Such pairs of manuscripts make it easy to see which changes were introduced by the scribe of the Abschrift. Every singular reading will obviously have been created by the scribe, but there will be other scribally-created readings that are not singular. Among the manuscripts studied by Farnes, the singular method picks up between 40% and 92% of all scribally-created readings (Farnes 2019, 198). Royse’s method is thus of very uncertain accuracy. Farnes’ manuscripts are all later than the pandects (the earliest is ninth century), but this does not invalidate his results: his work proves that Royse’s method can give seriously misleading results and therefore can never be assumed to be accurate.

Hixson (2019) has done similar work, but using a family of three manuscripts that almost certainly had a common, lost but reconstructable, exemplar. Out of seventy-eight readings that were singular or shared only by the sibling-manuscripts, only twenty-three were scribally created. Out of one-hundred-and-twenty-nine scribally-created readings, only forty-six were
singular or shared only by other members of the family (Hixson 2019, 256). The work of Hixson and Farnes shows objectively that the singular method frequently produces misleading results.

2. c. Methods Based on Divergence from a Particular Critical Text

An alternative method is to use not only singulars, but any divergence from an established critical text, which is assumed to approximate the autograph text. Approaches of broadly this type are taken by Silva (1992), Barbara Aland (2002; 2003), Min (2005) and Malik (2016).

Barbara Aland assesses every variant from the published critical edition and judges whether or not it results from an error by the scribe of the manuscript. This allows her to investigate the habits of that manuscript’s particular scribe. Min and Silva aim at something slightly different. Min helpfully distinguishes between a manuscript’s “state of transmission” (Überlieferungsweise, by which Min means how carefully it was copied from its exemplar) and “textual characteristics” (Textqualität, by which he means how its text compares to the authorial or initial text). Min draws the crucial distinction between the habits of a manuscript’s individual scribe and the aggregate habits of all the scribes in the line of exemplars between it and the autograph, which together create its textual quality. The textual quality is measured, on Min’s method, by comparison to the published critical edition (Min 2005, 40). Silva’s (1992) approach is similar: he follows Royse in saying that singulars are a reliable guide to the scribe of the particular manuscript, but that divergence from a critical text is a better measure of overall textual quality, or, in his terms, “the general profile of the manuscript” (Silva 1992, 23).12

2. d. Problems with the Approach of Min, Aland and Silva

The significant problem is that these methods assume that the published critical text accurately reproduces the autograph. For example, Barbara Aland writes:

Das [The Nestle-Aland text] birgt Unsicherheiten in sich, wie ich mir wohl bewußt bin, es ist aber vernünftiger, sich die Erfahrung der Textforschung von 100 Jahren in der Konstitution

12 Epp (2005, 652) draws attention to this distinction between the approaches of Silva and Royse.
des Textes zunutze zu machen als, wie es sonst stets geschieht, mit beliebigen einzelnen Handschriften zu vergleichen. (Barbara Aland 2003, 20).

Min writes:

Grundsätzlich ist zu bemerken, dass als Variante immer das gilt, was vom konstituierten Text des NTG\textsuperscript{27} abweicht. Dieser Text, an dem Generationen von Textkritikern gearbeitet haben, und der sich bei der täglichen Arbeit mit dem Text des Neuen Testaments als zuverlässig, wenn auch selbstverständlich nicht fehlerfrei erweist, gilt uns hier als hypothetischer Ausgangstext der Überlieferung. (Min 2005, 5).

The problem here is not merely that the Nestle-Aland editors may err in reconstructing the text. Min and Barbara Aland both acknowledge this in the above quotes. The problem is more, as Malik (2016, 211) and Epp (2005, 662-63) note, one of circularity. Min and Barbara Aland are attempting to gauge the textual characteristics of early papyri. The Nestle-Aland editors reasonably argued that these papyri were likely to contain initial readings, because they are so early. Min and Aland are thus measuring against a standard that is biased towards the thing they are measuring. This circularity appears in statements like this, from Min:

Dabei ist darauf zu achten, ob ein Papyrus mit dem hypothetischen Ausgangstext der Überlieferung, dem konstituierten Text des NTG\textsuperscript{27}, übereinstimmt – eine solche Übereinstimmung würde sowohl den Text des NTG\textsuperscript{27} als auch die textkritische Qualität des Papyrus stützen. (Min 2005, 4).

Contra Min, if the critical text resembles the text of the papyrus, this does not reinforce either the textual quality of the papyrus or the critical judgement of the editors. Rather it merely proves they are similar and either equally far from the initial text or equally near. This is even more of a problem when investigating the pandects. Since the nineteenth century, editors have given great credence to 01 and 03, which means that modern critical texts bear a close resemblance to those manuscripts. Any comparison with a modern critical text will appear to reveal that these manuscripts have excellent textual quality, because the critical text was produced on that very premise.

Is it possible therefore to use a method which avoids both reliance on singulars and reliance on a critical text?

It is possible that the CBGM may be able to help resolve some of these methodological quandaries. Strutwolf (2005, 147) and Gurry (2017, 114, 119-20) both argue that, by using computers to compare the coherence of different manuscripts, the CBGM reveals more accurately than before which manuscripts are probably closely related to which. This in turn
will help us see, when two manuscripts have the same reading, whether this is likely to be because they are closely related or because both scribes co-incidently introduced the same change. This arguably allows us to hit more accurately the target at which the singular method aims. However there is also a degree of subjectivity in using the CBGM to estimate likelihoods of relationship: one must decide what percentage of coherence makes two witnesses likely to be related. Moreover, although the CBGM can help highlight non-singular readings, which are scribal, it does not help identify inherited readings, which are singular. Nevertheless, for scholars interested in the particular habits of the scribes of particular manuscripts, rather than a manuscript’s general textual quality, the CBGM has the potential to be a powerful tool.


I have argued that it is difficult to isolate the readings introduced by the scribe of an individual manuscript. I therefore submit that it is more helpful to investigate the manuscript’s broader textual characteristics, both those resulting from its scribe and all those it has inherited from all the scribes between it and the autograph. In Min’s terms, I focus on Textqualität rather than Überlieferungsweise. This means we learn less about the scribe of the manuscript than if I used the singular method, but we learn more about the manuscript as a whole and we can be more confident that what we learn about the manuscript as a whole is accurate.

Thus, I will not focus on singular readings. However, in order to avoid the circularity of Min and Aland, I will not treat NA$^{28}$ as the initial text. Rather, I will take every variation unit where any of the pandects differs from any of the others, or from NA$^{28}$, or Rahlfs-Hanhart’s (2005) LXX. In each case, I will make my own judgement concerning what the initial text was. I will then assess how the pandects differ from that initial reading. By “initial text”, I mean the earliest form of the text that we can reconstruct, given all our evidence. It is impossible to prove how close this is to the authorial text, but it is a logical consequence of my definition that it will be closer to the authorial text than any text we know about. Orthographic variations and itacisms are more part of the presentational features of the manuscript than its textual characteristics, so I do not consider them. I realise that some might take this approach to lean too heavily on my own text-critical judgements. However, it is also the only way to avoid the circularity of Min
and Aland, who conclude that certain manuscripts are valuable, because they are similar to a text whose editors also believed that they were valuable.

To avoid this circularity, I must avoid giving any manuscripts significant “weight” because they are “good” manuscripts. My decisions are therefore based significantly on internal criteria. This does not mean that I adopt thoroughgoing eclecticism: other things being equal, older manuscripts, like the pandects and the papyri, may arguably be more likely to preserve the earliest text because they are probably separated from it by fewer stages of copying. I therefore normally begin my analysis of each variation unit with a comment on the external evidence and normally give some weight to the reading with the majority of early continuous-text Greek witnesses. However, the internal criteria do assume significant importance. I will use the standard internal criteria, such as conformity to the standard language, style and theology of the author rather than of later periods and avoidance of harmonisation.\(^\text{13}\) I make extensive use of the lectio difficilior criterion because scribes would surely always tend to make a text easier to understand.

One particular criterion, lectio brevior, has been controversial since it was challenged by Royse and Colwell. However, I have already argued that Royse’s method measures not scribal habits in general, but the scribal habits of particular manuscripts. I therefore adopt neither lectio brevior nor lectio longior as universal rules. Rather, I reason on the basis that scribes are likely to make frequent small omissions, such as those due to homoeoteleuton or homoeoarcton, but that larger expansions are more likely to be copied than removed, because they are typically explanatory and therefore facilior. Jongkind puts this well:

\[
\text{Instead of formulating the canon in terms of the shorter reading, the term “expansionary” might be better. A reading which appears to be an expansion of an alternative reading should not be preferred, thus bringing the actual content of the extra words into play. (Hernández, Head, Jongkind and Royse 2012, 17).}
\]

Riley (2019) uses the term “explicit” to mean something similar to what Jongkind means by “expansionary”. He uses models drawn from pragmatics and relevance theory to explain how

\(^{\text{13}}\) For helpful lists of these criteria with discussion of how they are valid today, see Wasserman (2013) and Epp (2011).
scribes function as interpreters of their exemplars, and argues that such interpreters generally make the text they are dealing with more explicit, rather than less.

Complete certainty regarding text-critical judgements is impossible, but it is important to differentiate degrees of uncertainty. At each variant unit, I use a three-point scale: A means that we can be as certain as in any text-critical matter, B that there is some doubt, but nevertheless good reason to adopt the chosen reading, and C that we can have very little idea.

As discussed above, one reason for interest in the pandects particularly is their significance in the formation of the Christian Bible as a unified collection of books. For this reason, I will investigate and compare the textual characteristics of a number of different parts of the canon, taking samples from John, Romans, Revelation and LXX. I choose John and Romans, because of the significance of the Gospels and Paul, both in Christian theology and in the NT manuscript tradition. I choose Revelation because it is often observed that manuscripts have a different textual quality in that book – in particular, critics often regard 02 as preserving a “better” text in Revelation than in other books (e.g. Koester 2014, 145-46; Karrer and Labahn 2012, 11-15; Karrer 2009, 374; Cavallo 1967, 80; Weiss 1892, 147). In LXX, I examine Sirach and Judges. Judges allows me to explore the recently discovered leaves of 01 and see if they shed light on the bifurcation of Judges between 02 and 03. Sirach is the only LXX-book where all four pandects have certain chapters; it also allows me to investigate some (in Protestant terms) apocryphal material. Although Revelation is not extant in 03, nor is Judges in 04, the above reasons warrant investigating them. I aim to analyse roughly the same amount of verses in each of the three NT books and the LXX section, whilst balancing space in the thesis devoted to different books.

I shall work through the pandects in the relevant chapters, rather than rely on a published apparatus to tell me their readings. For 01, I use the new full-colour facsimile (Parker 2010a), supplemented by the images on the Codex Sinaiticus Project website (2009, henceforth CSP). For 02, I use the British Library website (n.d.) images for the NT and the full-size facsimile for LXX (Thompson 1879-83). For 03, I use the Vatican Library website (n.d.) images. For 04, I use the BnF website (n.d.) images supplemented by multi-spectral images of the NT. Multi-
spectral images of the LXX portion of 04 remains an urgent need. In no case do I use autopsy, because the images are of excellent quality and this is primarily a text-critical study, rather than a palaeographic one. The occasional places where a reading is doubtful are more due to the image being difficult to interpret or a corrector being difficult to assign, rather than its content being unclear. Even the notoriously difficult to read 04 would not particularly benefit from autopsy, because the problems occur when the over-writing entirely obscures the under-writing, which naked-eye autopsy would not solve.

At each variation unit, I place the reading of each pandect, which does not carry the initial text, into one of several categories:

1. Transcriptional error (henceforth TE).
2. Linguistic Improvement; i.e. change of the text which appears to make it more consistent with what we can know of standard Koine Greek language.
3. Linguistic Non-Improvement; i.e. change of the text which appears to make it less consistent with what we can know of standard Koine Greek language.
5. Content Change; i.e. change of the text in a way which alters the meaning in some way.

For my purposes, harmonisation is distinguished from TE as follows. TE is when scribes confuse words that look or sound similar, skip lines or add or omit minor words. Harmonisation is when the initial text is changed in order to fit better with the grammar or content of the surrounding words, or pericopes, or other works of literature. Linguistic non-improvement is something of a catch-all category for linguistic changes that appear not to be TEs or harmonisations, but do not conform to standard patterns of grammar or style and so cannot be called improvements. Examples include verbs that typically have second aorists being formed with first aorists.

No system of categories is perfect and in order to be useful in summarising the data, any system must occasionally oversimplify. Textual variants, like people, are all complex and unique, but nevertheless it is sometimes helpful for textual critics to classify variants by type, just as sociologists categorise people by everything from income-level to eye-colour. As Jongkind (2007, 142) says:
The order of the categories is deliberate. If in doubt, I place a variant farther up the list. If harmonisation or linguistic change will explain the problem, I do not posit a content change. If a TE will explain the problem, I do not posit harmonisation or linguistic change. In such cases of doubt, B and C ratings can also be used. I might here be accused of begging the question and assuming my conclusions about what kinds of change are common. However, as discussed above, for a system of categories to be useful in analysing data, it must be cruder than the differing details of individual cases and that means we need a principle on which to assign data points to categories consistently in doubtful cases. I have not included expansions or omissions as categories and I have no intention of contributing specifically to the debate on the brevior canon. This is because it is surely far too simplistic to say that scribes either generally add or generally omit: the question is when and why they do either. Therefore, I have classified variants by type, not by effect on the length of the text.

The four pandects each had several scribes and correctors and scholars disagree about the details. Is it meaningful therefore to compare the different textual characteristics of each codex in different parts of the Biblical corpus? I argue that my approach is valid because the scribes were clearly operating as a team. Although several scribes can be distinguished in each pandect, all four scribal teams achieved such uniformity of presentation that they clearly intended their work to be received as a unit. Much ink has been spilled distinguishing the scribes, but I submit that too little work has been done, which considers them as united teams. Thus by the phrase “the reading of 01”, I include a reading of an in scribendo correction or correction by another scribe in the scriptorium, but not a later correction, because in scriptorium correctors were part of the scribal team. In deciding whether correction was made in scriptorium, for 01, I consult CSP. For 03, I follow Versace (2018) if he discusses the relevant correction. For 04, I consult Tischendorf and Lyon. Much less palaeographic work has been done on 02 and 03, so I am forced to rely more on my own judgement, but fortunately, they are less heavily corrected.

14 “Scribes were not addicted to omission or addition or transposition or substitution as such” (Colwell 1969b, 109).
04 contains a number of erasures that are difficult to date, since no actual writing is involved in the correction (e.g. Rom 1:17; John 1:20). They are unlikely to be accidental damage, because they generally apply to complete words. Fortunately, John 17:19 has an example that is accompanied by a written correction. The verb, ὦσιν, is moved in the sentence by an erasure and then rewriting. Both Lyon (1958, 394) and Tischendorf (1863, 332) agree the hand is later. Erasures like this occur in 04 far more than in other manuscripts and it is unlikely that several correctors would have a noticeable proclivity to erase in this way, so I conclude that, other things being equal, all such erasures are the work of a late corrector.

In the remainder of this thesis, I will present my data and results, explaining the more complex variation units.
2: Historical Background to the Four Pandects

In this chapter, I argue that 01 and 03 can be connected with imperial commissions for pandects. This thesis places these manuscripts at the heart of church history. I also make further brief comments on the history and palaeography of the pandects.

01, 03 and the Imperial Commissions

Two imperial commissions, possibly for pandects, survive from the fourth century. One is by Constantine, recorded by Eusebius (Vit. Const. 4.36), and the other by Constans, recorded by Athanasius (Apol. Const. 4). Many scholars are sceptical either that these passages refer to pandects or that, if they do, that 01 and 03 are among the pandects referred to (Robertson 1891, 239 n. 7; Lake 1918; Robbins 1989; Parker 2010b; Edwards 2015; Gamble 2015; Francis Watson, personal discussion, September 2017). However, Zuntz (1995), Grafton and Williams (2006, 136-40, 220-23) and, famously, Skeat (2004a) argue that at least the Eusebius passage does refer to pandects and that at least 01 was among the pandects referred to. Wachtel (2019) also sympathises with this view.

In general, the wise historian resists the temptation to identify artefacts with objects referred to in literary sources (Birdsall 2003, 34). For every kind of artefact, there existed so many in antiquity, that it is highly unlikely that the particular one which survives is the one mentioned in the literary source. To take an extreme example, an enormous quantity of wood was used in antiquity so it is highly unlikely that any particular piece of wood, even if it seems to come from early first century Judaea, was once part of Christ’s cross. However, I will argue that ancient pandects are an exception to this principle, because pandects were very rare, such that there is a higher chance that a pandect mentioned in literature and one discovered today are the same (Skeat 2004a, 227-28). I will argue that the passages in Eusebius and Athanasius refer to pandects and will answer some objections to this reading. I will then finally argue that 01 matches up plausibly in time and place to Eusebius’ reference. It is less clear with 03, which could arguably be tied to Eusebius or Athanasius.
My first premise is that pandects were rare in antiquity. Only four Greek pandects have survived from prior to the sixth century (with possibly a fifth if 05 was originally a pandect) (Jongkind 2019a). Although it is of course possible that many of our early fragments of the Greek Bible came from pandects, the evidence in fact suggests that the majority of our surviving early NT manuscripts originally contained only single works (Dormandy 2018). Moreover, if pandects were common, one would expect roughly the same number of fragments to survive for each Biblical book, because if most manuscripts contained all the Bible, then there would originally have existed roughly equal numbers of copies of every part of the Bible and one would expect survival rates to reflect that. In fact, however, Matthew and John predominate heavily (Watson 2013, 411 n. 1). The only two literary references we have to pandects are the two orders under discussion. The cost of producing such books would be large: Grafton and Williams (2006, 216) suggest that one would require one thousand cows. In general, there is little evidence of any other, similarly large book. We know of the Hexapla and one early Homer codex that probably contained the whole Odyssey, due to its page numbers (M-P 1106; LDAB 2077; Haslam 1997, 60 n. 11). In the Latin Biblical tradition, pandects only begin to be produced under Cassiodorus in the sixth century (Houghton 2016, 58, 87). In general, such massive books seem to have been rare.

There is possible evidence for common pandect ownership in Chrysostom, Hom. Jo. 11.1: the famous preacher berates the congregation for not obtaining Gospel-books. However, he is clearly referring to Gospel books not pandects and, of course, he is criticising the congregation for not owning such books, so this passage is hardly evidence that they were commonly owned.

My second premise is that the relevant passages in Eusebius and Athanasius do refer to pandects. The Eusebius passage is a record of a letter which Eusebius received from Constantine. Eusebius (Vit. Const. 4.35-36) then appends his own comment:

"πρέπον γὰρ κατεφάνη τούτο δηλώσαι τῇ σῇ συνέσει, ὅπως ἂν πεντήκοντα σωμάτα ἐν δυσθέας ἐγκατασκεύασοι εὐανάγγειλά τε καὶ πρὸς τὴν χρήσιν εὔμετακόμιστα ὑπὸ τεχνίτων καλλιγράφων καὶ ἀκριβῶς τὴν τέχνην ἐπισταμένων γραφῆναι κελεύσεις, τῶν θείων δηλαδὴ γραφῶν, ἕως μάλιστα τὴν τ’ ἐπισκευὴν καὶ τὴν χρήσιν τῷ τῆς ἐκκλησίας λόγῳ ἄναγκαιαν εἶναι"

1 They nevertheless conclude that the Eusebius passage does refer to fifty pandects.
2 My thanks to James Cook for drawing my attention to this passage and helpfully discussing it.
For it was proper to indicate to your Intelligence to order fifty copies of the clearly sacred scriptures, in fine parchment, easily legible and conveniently portable, to be copied by skilled calligraphers, trained to the height of their art, the preparation and use of which you know to be necessary for the word of the church”...thus the Emperor ordered these things. Immediately, the work followed the word and we sent threes and fours in beautifully wrought bindings.

Similarly, Athanasius (Apol. Const. 4) writes to the Emperor, Constantius, explaining his conduct towards Constantius’ brother and rival, Constans. He notes that πυκτία τῶν θείων γραφῶν κελεύσαντος αὐτοῦ μοι κατασκευάσαι ταῦτα ποιήσας ἀπέστειλα, “with him commanding me to furnish copies of the divine scriptures, I made and sent them”. Do σωμάτια...τῶν θείων δηλαδή γραφῶν and πυκτία τῶν θείων γραφῶν refer to pandects?

The Eusebius passage is substantially more discussed in the secondary literature, but most arguments also work mutatis mutandis, for the Athanasius passage. Parker (2010b, 22) suggests that Constantine was in fact requesting ten sets of five books: a Pentateuch, a Psalter, a Prophets, a Gospel book and a codex of Paul’s letters.3 Whilst certainly possible, there seems no evidence for this. In particular, it is not clear how Eusebius, without further clarification, would know that this was what was intended. Gamble (2015, 10) and Robbins (1989, 97) argue that Constantine meant fifty Gospel books and present evidence that this was a standard meaning of γραφαί (and its Latin equivalent scripturae). However, all their evidence shows is that the Gospels were in the category of γραφαί or scripturae, not that these words, without qualification, could standardly refer to the four Gospels only.

Taking Constantine’s request at face value, he asks for πεντήκοτα σωμάτια...τῶν θείων δηλαδή γραφῶν. The definite article before θείων δηλαδή γραφῶν means that this phrase naturally means fifty copies of everything within the category of θείαι γραφαί, which by this time, would have included at least the OT, the Gospels, Acts and various letters. The same argument works for Athanasius’ πυκτία τῶν θείων γραφῶν, which also has the definite article. Even if both writers are translating documents that were originally in Latin, which has no article, the fact

---

3 Interestingly, earlier in his career, Parker (1997, 24, 195) seemed confident that Constantine meant fifty pandects.
that they translate it with the definite article shows that they understood the request in this way. This becomes even clearer when we note that, in the sentence immediately prior to Eusebius’ quotation of Constantine’s letter, Eusebius says that Constantine wrote περὶ τῆς τῶν θείων ἀναγνώσματων ἐπισκευής. The most natural reading of τὰ ἀναγνώσματα is the works which were regularly read in church. Justin Martyr (I Apol. 67.3) refers to both the prophets and the recollections of the disciples (i.e. presumably the Gospels) being read in church, some time before Eusebius, so it seems likely that Constantine was requesting copies of both Testaments.

A widespread argument against reading these passages as referring to pandects is that fifty pandects would have been an absurdly exorbitant request to make of any individual or scriptorium (Robbins 1989, 95; Parker 2010b, 52-53; Gamble 2015, 8). However, I do not claim that the request was practical, or indeed that it was ever entirely executed. I merely posit that a Roman Emperor made an extravagant demand and a loyal subject attempted to execute it. That hardly seems unrealistic. I make a similar response to Parker’s (2010b, 50) point that archaeology suggests that there were not fifty churches in Constantinople. Mango’s (1985, 35-36) detailed survey suggests that Constantine built considerably fewer. However, this is not a problem for my hypothesis. Constantine’s letter merely states the Emperor’s intention to build more churches, because the numbers of the faithful were growing. Constantine may have commissioned more than one Bible per church or, more probably, he may have had ambitions to build fifty churches, that were never realised. Such a large-scale Bible-commissioning is certainly consistent with his deluxe rebuilding of Constantinople and his desire to promote unity in the Church and the Empire would be furthered by giving every church a Bible.4

Constantine’s letter specifies that the manuscripts be εὖμετακόμιστα, easily portable. Robbins (1989, 95) objects that 01 is hardly that. However, given my arguments above that σωμάτα...τῶν θείων δηλαδή γραφῶν most probably does mean pandects, 01 is about as portable as any pandect could be and is certainly more conveniently portable than a whole range of different codices (let alone rolls) containing different Biblical books.

4 For the refitting of Constantinople, see Lenski 2005, 77. For the priority of unity, see Drake 2005 and Edwards 2005, 147-48.
It is important to consider the phrase, in the Eusebius passage, τρισσὰ καὶ τεσσαρὰ. Part of the problem is that there is a lacuna in all the manuscripts here, so we cannot tell what noun(s) the phrase modifies (Skeat 2004a, 220; Bleckmann and Schneider 2007, 452 n. 313). It is tempting to translate it “in three or four columns”, since 01 is in four columns and 03 in three. Lake offers an example of this meaning from Eusebius, HE 6.16.4, where ἐν τοῖς τετρασσοῖς is used to describe the Tetrapla.5

However, it is more likely that in Constantine’s letter, the phrase means “three or four at a time” (Devreesse 1954, 125; Barnes 1981, 345 n. 139; Skeat 2004a). Skeat offers numerous examples from documentary papyri where the phrase has that meaning (always with a noun, but since there is a lacuna, there was quite probably a noun there originally – conjectural emendation is much more methodologically admissible with a text like De Vita Constantini than for the NT, because we have far fewer manuscripts). For example, in P. Oxy. X.1278, we read concerning a legal document: κύριον τὸ ὀμολόγημα τρισσὸν γραφὲν πρ[ός] τὸ ἑκατ[τ]ὸν μέρος ἥξειν μ[ον]οχόν. 6 Skeat (2004a, 219-20) also argues that his reading makes most sense of the context. Eusebius says αὐτικα δ’ ἐργον ἐπηκολούθει τῷ λόγῳ. He wants to stress how obedient he was to the emperor. On the other hand, he could hardly have made fifty pandects with the rapidity these words imply, so he explains by saying that they were sent out three or four at a time, as each became ready.

My third premise is that the date and probable origins of the manuscripts match well. Let us begin with 01. Regarding dating, estimates range from the early to the mid-fourth century (Milne and Skeat 1938, 60-65; Cavallo 1967, 60-64; Zuntz 1995, 43). Nongbri (2020) suggests a range of 330-430. Many scholars now argue that palaeographic dating of manuscripts is fraught with uncertainty and should not be used to date manuscripts to a narrower time than a century (Askeland 2018; Orsini 2018), so it is entirely plausible that 01 was made at the right time for Constantine’s letter.

5 Lake 1918, 33-34. Lake argues convincingly that this is the authorial reading of Eusebius, despite some variation. The Loeb capitalises τετρασσοῖς but I do not, since it would beg my question.
6 An approximate translation would be “The three times written agreement, so that each party has autonomy, has legal power”.
Milne and Skeat (1938, 36, 60-64) argue that in 01 the Eusebian canon numbers were corrected by Scribe D and must therefore have been contemporaneous with the production of the manuscript. Therefore they reason that the manuscript must be later than 300-40. However, this assumes that Eusebius devised the canons late in his life. It is difficult to establish exactly when Eusebius devised the canons, so we should not make them a fixed point in the dating of 01 (Barnes 1981, 122). There is no reason not to date 01 to the early decades of the fourth century. On the dating of 03, Cavallo (1967, 53-55) stresses the similarities to 01 and suggests around 350 on palaeographic grounds. Given the uncertainties of palaeographic dating, a date any time in the fourth century seems conceivable. Nongbri (2020) argues that C-14 dating is likely to be particular effective with 01 and it is to be hoped that this will be possible soon.

Zuntz (1995, 43) argues that these date-ranges are consistent with the Eusebius passage. Constantine died in 337, Eusebius in 339-40. Constantinople was founded in place of the previous city on the site in 326 and made the imperial capital in 330 (in the letter to Eusebius, Constantine refers to τὴν ἐπώνυμον ἡμῖν πόλιν). Therefore the letter to Eusebius was probably sent in 330 or slightly earlier. Regarding the Athanasius passage, Constans reigned 337-350 (Hunt and Harries 2012), so again the dates are consistent.

The places of origin are also a reasonable match. 01 could plausibly have been produced in Caesarea, Eusebius’ base. Arguments for a manuscript’s origin based on palaeography or spelling are weak because we have little evidence for non-Egyptian palaeography and spelling (Skeat 2004a, 199). The climatic conditions of the Egyptian desert preserve papyri uniquely well and therefore we have a disproportionately large quantity of Egyptian manuscripts. This means that whilst it is often easy to prove that a particular form was common in Egypt, it is much more difficult to prove the negative, that it was not common elsewhere.

Arguments for or against a Caesarean provenance using textual affinities with the Hexapla are also unconvincing, because there were likely to have been many LXX manuscripts housed in
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7 Personal Communications, Jeremiah Coogan, October 2017 and December 2019 (though Dr. Coogan does not follow my larger argument here).
Caesarea, including ones with readings Origen rejected, and, if 01 was produced in a rush to answer Constantine’s edict, it is likely that every available manuscript was used as an exemplar.

What positive case can be made for Caesarea? Rahlfs (1932) has identified a number of apparent transcripational errors in 01’s text of 2 Esdras, which are fairly clearly the result of manuscripts of alternative translations, such as Symmachus and Theodotion, being incorporated into the text. This fits well with the codex being produced in a major centre of philological activity, like Caesarea. Arguably, Caesarean scribes are unlikely to have made this kind of foolish mistake, but this argument is much weaker if the manuscript was produced under considerable time pressure, as would happen in response to an imperial edict.

Milne and Skeat (1938, 67-68) famously noted several passages where the scribes appear to have made copying errors by unconsciously harmonising with local place names. Most famously, the first hand of 01 changes εἰς τὴν πατρίδα in Matt 13:54 to εἰς τὴν Ἀντιπατρίδα. Jongkind (2007, 253) however argues that these changes are typical of 01 and do not need a local connection to account for them. The scribe makes frequent errors of place-names in Chronicles. She may have intended to write ἀντιπέραν, meaning that Jesus had crossed to the other side. The place-name errors thus are weak evidence of a Caesarean origin.

Myshrall uses the so-called “Pamphilian” corrector to argue for a Caesarean provenance. The Pamphilian corrector is the name given to the author of two colophons, to Esther and 1 Esdras (Q36-f.5r and Q37-f.3r in the manuscript). The colophons both claim that the codex was collated against a manuscript, which had itself been corrected by Pamphilius and Antoninus the Confessor against Origen’s Hexapla. The second colophon adds that Pamphilius did his correcting work ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ. If these colophons are to be taken at face-value, they are fairly strong evidence of a link between 01 and Caesarea, since both Pamphilius and the Hexapla were both based there, so presumably a manuscript corrected by Pamphilius using the Hexapla would be there as well. Myshrall dates the colophons to the fifth-seventh century, which would mean that 01 can be linked to Caesarea relatively soon after its production. Tischendorf dates the colophons similarly, but both Lake and Milne and Skeat disagree. She puts forward a number of palaeographic arguments, but these must be considered tentative, since we have so little text in the colophons (Myshrall 2005, 90-91, 104-12, 104 for the views of other scholars).
However, even if the colophons were written later, they nevertheless remain an important link between 01 and Caesarea.

It is of course possible that 01 was moved between being written and being collated by the Pamphilian corrector, or that the Pamphilian manuscripts were moved after they were corrected against the Hexapla, or that the Pamphilian corrector is lying. The last possibility is unlikely, because if the Pamphilian corrector wanted to lie to exaggerate the importance of his work, by stressing his connection to a well-known Father, it is surely likely that he would have picked a more famous and earlier figure than Pamphilius (just as many were keen to attribute 02 to Thecla, Paul’s companion). The second colophon notes that Pamphilius worked ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ. This is entirely plausible. LSJ allows the translation “under protection” and it is possible that Pamphilius was working with the benefit of guards, in Caesarea. There is thus no particular reason to disbelieve the colophons.

It is also relatively unlikely that 01 moved, since it would have been such a massive codex (or at the time, probably, set of volumes). I do not claim that it would have been impossible to move, but it would have been laborious to move without good reason. Further, the Eusebian numbering is incomplete in 01, which suggests it was never finished and did not move from its place of creation for some time. It is possible the Pamphilian manuscript was moved, between Pamphilius correcting it and it being used to correct 01, but it is unlikely that such a valuable manuscript, with ties to Pamphilius and Origen, would be lightly removed from the library in Caesarea. These colophons are thus reasonable evidence, for a Caesarean origin.

Grafton and Williams (2006, 136-40, 220-23) argue for a Caesarean origin because of the artful “mise-en-page” of 01 and to some extent of 03, which they suggest would be typical of Eusebius. Eusebius was a pioneer of imaginative page-layouts: inspired by the Hexapla of his hero, Origen, Eusebius used tables and columns to produce his famous canon tables, his pinakes of the Psalms and most famously his Canon, the second part of his Chronicle, which is a complex tabulation of world history. 01 and 03 show a similar innovative page-layout: 01 is

---

8 For this whole argument, see Myshrall 2005, 90-91, 104-22. For the absence of the Eusebian numbering, see Skeat 2004a, 220-23.
unique in its four narrow columns and both use two columns for their poetic sections, giving one line of text to each colon of poetry.

Jongkind (2007, 253) argues against Caesarean origin for 01 because there are errors in the Eusebian numbering system: the fact that such errors have had time to enter the tradition suggests that 01 was produced at some remove from the system’s origin. However, it is plausible that the relevant mistakes could have occurred in the scriptorium, because the scribes were under great pressure to produce it quickly, in response to Constantine’s order.

We have certainly not proved that 01 came from Caesarea and it may, of course, be possible to explain all this data in other ways, but, given the evidence of the Pamphlian corrector, it is arguably more likely that 01 came from Caesarea than anywhere else.

Let us now consider the provenance of 03. There is little or no direct evidence to tie 03 to Caesarea, but there are a number of factors linking 03 to Egypt. It is arguable if the similarities of text, content and palaeography between 01 and 03 outweigh the differences or vice versa. To the extent that the two manuscripts are similar and that 01 can be linked to Caesarea, 03 can be linked to Caesarea as well. If 03 is tied to Egypt, it may also be linked to Athanasius, although Athanasius was in exile in Rome at the time of his correspondence with Constans.

Egypt has been a popular choice for the origin of 03, on grounds of textual affinity and orthographic practice. However, as I argued with 01, such arguments are weak because we have little evidence for what non-Egyptian manuscripts were like (see Elliott (2004, 291-92) for a textual version of this argument to parallel the palaeographic one made above).

Amphoux (2009) has argued that 03 was written in Rome, but under the Egyptian influence of Athanasius, during one of his periods of exile, which would be exactly the right time and place for the Bibles prepared for Constans. Amphoux (2009, 165-66) argues this because 03 appears

---

9 For this summary of the scholarship, see Birdsall 2003, 33. See also for an Egyptian connection Barnes 1993, 40.
to have an Egyptian canon with a Roman text, in that its content mirrors the canon list of Athanasius, but its text has Roman textual affinities, because it influenced Jerome’s Vulgate. I shall consider the canon point presently, but Amphoux’s textual point is arguably weakened by the fact he makes it using only three, apparently randomly chosen, examples.

Against these possible arguments linking 03 to Egypt, we must consider those which link it to 01 and therefore indirectly to Caesarea. Cavallo (1967, 54-55) suggested a common scriptorium on the basis of profound and obvious palaeographic similarities. Milne and Skeat (1938, 90) argued similarly, noting, for example, scribe D of 01 and scribe A of 03 having the same predilection for ἵσχυει not ἵσχυι. Later in life, Skeat (2004a, 214) found even stronger evidence: the colophon decoration to Deuteronomy in 03 is nearly identical to that of Mark in 01 (see images below).

![Figure 1 Colophon decoration to Deuteronomy in 03](image1)

![Figure 2 Colophon decoration to Mark in 01](image2)

Parker (2012, 73-74) resists the argument for a common origin from the similar colophon patterns. He argues that in fact the book titles are in different positions on the page and notes that in 03 the book title is on one line. This may be true, but the colophon decorations, as opposed to the colophon texts, remain remarkably similar.

Pisano (2009, 88) argues for the same provenance textually, listing five passages where 01 and 03 agree in a unique, or nearly unique, reading. For example, in Mark 1:27, they agree, uniquely in the NA\textsuperscript{28} apparatus, in omission of πρός. I will later argue in this dissertation that they have several striking and unique agreements in Judges. Parker (2012, 147) on the other hand points out that 01 and 03 differ from each other in James as much as 2423, a thirteenth century Byzantine minuscule, does from the initial text (by which I presume Parker means the ECM).
In general, assumptions that manuscripts from the same area normally have a similar text, such that geographical text-types can be identified, is losing favour among textual critics (championed not least by Parker; see Epp 2014). Therefore, all arguments from textual affinity must be counted lightly.

03 has a unique system of unit-delineation and numbering, which continues throughout the canon. This could be taken as an argument against its association with any other manuscript. However, Grenz (2018) has recently argued that these numbers are significantly later than the original production of 03. Moreover, as I argued with reference to 01, if both the Eusebian canons were a new system and 03 was produced under relative time pressure in response to Constantine’s order, then that would explain why they are not there.

In summary, there is no “smoking gun” evidence to tie 03 to Caesarea or Egypt (or anywhere else). However, the evidence we have is certainly consistent with the manuscript coming from either Caesarea or Egypt.

In addition to date and place, an important question for associating 01 and 03 with Athanasius and Eusebius is how their content relates to the canon lists of those Fathers. In order to assess this, I shall now give a table of the canon lists of Athanasius and Eusebius and the contents of 01 and 03. I also include the canon list of Origen, because Origen was an influential figure in the history of scholarship in Caesarea, whose work was presumably deeply respected by Eusebius. I use the list in Origen’s Homilies on Joshua as his canon (see Gallagher and Meade 2017, 83-99 and Gallagher 2016 for a defence of this methodology). A book is included in the table, even if only part of a book survives in the manuscript.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eusebius (HE 3.25.1-7)</th>
<th>Athanasius (Ep. Fest. 39)</th>
<th>Origen (Hom. Josh. 7.1)</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[No OT listed]</td>
<td>Pentateuch</td>
<td>Pentateuch (Exodus lacunose)</td>
<td>Pentateuch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historical books in the modern order</td>
<td>Historical books in the modern order (with various lacunae and transcriptional repetitions)</td>
<td>Historical books in the modern order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song of Songs</td>
<td>1 Maccabees</td>
<td>Song of Songs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>4 Maccabees</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Minor Prophets</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>Sirach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch</td>
<td>12 Minor Prophets (Hosea, Amos and Micah lacunose)</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>Tobit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistle of Jeremiah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sirach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song of Songs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom of Solomon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Epistle of Jeremiah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Gospels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Four Gospels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>Catholic epistles in a non-modern order(^{10})</td>
<td>Modern Pauline Corpus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of Paul (not named)</td>
<td>Modern set of catholic epistles</td>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 John</td>
<td>Modern Pauline Corpus up to 2 Thess</td>
<td>Fourteen Pauline letters, not named</td>
<td>Acts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Peter</td>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td>Modern set of catholic epistles</td>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelation</td>
<td>Pastorals and Philemon</td>
<td>Revelation</td>
<td>Rest of the manuscript is lacunose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barnabas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hermas</td>
<td>Possible more, since Hermas ends on a lacuna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{10}\) Two Petrine letters, James, Jude, John’s letters (no number specified).
Athanasius also lists Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, Esther, Judith, Tobit, Didache and Hermas as οὐ κανονιζόμενα μὲν, τετυπωμένα δὲ παρά τῶν πατέρων ἀναγινώσκεσθαι τοῖς ἁρτί προσερχομένοις καὶ βουλομένοις κατηχεῖσθαι τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγον, not canonised but set down by the fathers to be read to those newly initiated and wanting to be catechised in the word of godliness.\(^\text{11}\) Eusebius classifies the books listed in the table as ἐν ὁμολογουμένοις. He lists the following in a second category, called the ἀντιλεγόμενοι: James, Jude, 2 Peter and 2 and 3 John. He also uses a third category, νόθοι, which includes: the Acts of Paul, Hermas, the Apocalypse of Peter, the letter of Barnabas and the Didache. He notes that Revelation and the Gospel of the Hebrews may arguably belong in the ἀντιλεγόμενοι. Worse even than the νόθοι are the ἄτοπα πάντη καὶ δυσσεβῆ, which include the Gospels of Peter, Thomas and Matthias and the Acts of John and Andrew. Eusebius appears somewhat inconsistent in his uses of these various terms, however, and it seems they refer to overlapping, rather than precisely delineated categories (Gallagher 2016, 463-64).

The data in this table do not tightly connect 01 to either Father. There are some differences between 01 and Athanasius. In the OT, 01 differs somewhat from Athanasius’ list, in that it includes the apocryphal historical books after Chronicles and places Psalms-Job after the Prophets. The boundary between the Prophets and Psalms-Job and the boundary between 4 Maccabees and Isaiah both fall at the end of quires, so it is possible that in the original binding of the codex, the order was different. In the NT, Athanasius places the catholic epistles prior to the Paulines, but 01 does vice versa. These differences weaken the argument for a connection to Athanasius.

On the other hand, it is equally difficult to argue for a Eusebian connection on this basis. 01 has all three Johannine letters and both Petrine letters, which Eusebius terms ἀντιλεγόμενοι. This may not be especially strong evidence, since the ἀντιλεγόμενοι are the mildest category of disputed texts. Arguably, Eusebius would still have included ἀντιλεγόμενοι within a pandect.\(^\text{12}\) 01 also has Barnabas and Hermas, which Eusebius calls νόθοι. Ehrman (2013, 32) writes: “This term refers to a child born out of wedlock, and carries with it all the negative

---

\(^{11}\) Lefort 1965 lists Tobit twice in the Greek text in his edition (καὶ Ἰουδαῖο καὶ Τωβίας καὶ Τωβίας καὶ Διδαχή), but once in the French translation and in the Coptic text in the same edition. Joannou’s (1962-63, 75) edition has it only once, so I presume the double mention is a typographical error by Lefort.

\(^{12}\) For a mild reading of these terms in Eusebius, see Metzger 1987, 201-07.
the connotations of our term *bastard*” (italics original). A pandect produced in Eusebius’ scriptorium is hardly likely to contain works he placed in this category. This is especially persuasive, because Constantine’s letter specifies copies of τῶν θείων δήλοις γραφῶν, i.e. those texts which are clearly the holy Scriptures. Gamble (2015, 9) and Edwards (2015, 227) argue against a Eusebian origin for 01 on the basis of canon content.

On the other hand, it is dangerous to make assumptions about what a Father might include in a pandect, based on what he thought was canonical. It is of course possible that someone’s view on the (at the time) turbulent question of canon might change. Moreover, in the *Ad Marinum*, generally attributed to Eusebius, there is a (to modern minds) strange ambivalence about the canonical status of Mark 16:9-20. The author is answering questions about the alleged discrepancies between Matthew’s resurrection account and Mark’s. His initial response is to resolve the problem by suggesting that Mark 16:9-20 is not authoritative. However, he then gives a second answer, harmonising the two accounts, for the benefit of τις οὐδ’ ὁτιοῦν τολμῶν ἀθετεῖν τῶν ὑπόσχον ἐν τῇ τῶν εὐαγγελίων γραφὴς φερομένων, whosoever does not dare to set aside the things in anyway brought to us in the writing of the Gospels. When deciding what to comment on as Scripture, Eusebius seems to have the attitude “if in doubt, comment on it”. Kelhoffer, in editing *Ad Marinum*, notes that Jerome and Hesychius of Jerusalem took the same approach, rejecting the authenticity of the Longer Ending and yet including it in the Vulgate (Jerome) and commenting on it in a homily (Hesychius). In this context, it is plausible for Eusebius to include books in his codices, the authority of which he doubted. This is especially likely given that the contents are described as not merely γραφῶ, but ἀναγνώσματα, i.e. whatever is to be read in church. Therefore books which Eusebius himself doubted might be included if they were frequently used in public reading.

Regarding 03, it bears a striking resemblance to Athanasius’ canon. The only two major difference is the inclusion of Wisdom, Sirach, Esther, Judith and Tobit prior to the minor prophets. Arguably, this is not a significance difference, since Athanasius allows these books to be read by catechumens (Festal Letter 39.20). On the other hand, a massive codex, such as 03, would surely have been made for liturgical reading in church, rather than reading to a small

---

For the most modern critical edition of Kelhoffer 2001. The quotation is from p. 85, my translation with reference to Kelhoffer’s. For Hesychius and Jerome, see Kelhoffer 2001, 111.
gathering for catechesis. 03 is in tension with Eusebius’ canon, because it includes the full, modern set of catholic epistles and includes them before Paul. It is, however, relatively close to Origen.

As with date and place, the evidence from content is consistent with 01 and 03 being produced by Eusebius and Athanasius, though does not strongly push us to that conclusion.

We have thus established our three premises, that pandects are rare, that pandects are referred to in the passages from Eusebius and Athanasius and that both 01 and 03 could reasonably come from the right time, place and maker. The Pamphilian colophons provide reasonably strong evidence linking 01 to Caesarea, so it is probably among the pandects prepared by Eusebius for Constantine. With 03, the case is less clear-cut, but it is still reasonably likely that it is either one of Eusebius’ Bibles or one of Athanasius’.

As an additional argument, Skeat and Zuntz use their hypothesis that both 01 and 03 were among Constantine’s fifty to explain some peculiarities about these manuscripts. Skeat (2004a, 224-36) hypothesised that 01 is so large and unfinished because it was one of the first attempts. The scribes realised that it was too large, since the tanning industry was not especially active in Caesarea at the time. They then reduced size and (according to Skeat) 03 is a later example. The aim was that the fifty be approximately uniform, so 01 was never sent, so the canon numbers were never finished and it stayed in Caesarea, until it was used by the author of the Pamphilian colophon. Zuntz (1995, 44) argues that such a hypothesis also explains textual differences between 01 and 03: if the scriptorium was trying to produce fifty pandects as soon as possible, every available exemplar (“was Hand zur war”) would have to be pressed into service and scribes would use different ones.

Thus, although far from certain, it is highly plausible that 01, and possibly 03, were among the Bibles prepared for Constantine by Eusebius.
This demonstrates clearly the historical significance of these manuscripts. With the reign of Constantine, Christianity moves from being persecuted to being established. Constantine’s priority was the unity and good order of the Church as a support to the unity and good order of the Empire (Drake 2005). It is clear how the unity and good order of the Scriptures would be important to that end. It would be fascinating if, as seems probable, 01 gives us an opportunity to peer over the shoulders of Constantine and Eusebius as they sought to give such unity and order to the Scriptures read in the churches of Constantinople. If 03 comes from Athanasius, then it is in a sense even more interesting, since it would come from the politically and theologically opposite pole of Christendom.

**Palaeographical notes on 01**

This is not a palaeographic study, but a brief survey of palaeographic work on 01 is now appropriate. It is undoubtedly the most studied of our manuscripts in the modern era. The influential early-twentieth century study by Milne and Skeat (1938) has been followed in recent years by Myshrall’s doctoral thesis (2005), Jongkind’s detailed monograph (2007), a semi-popular volume by Parker (2010b) and a new edited volume, approaching the manuscript from a variety of disciplines (McKendrick et al 2015). The general consensus among palaeographers seems to be a team of scribes, but with some unity of purpose and subordination to the scribe normally referred to as Scribe D. Milne and Skeat (1938, 22-23) suggested three, A, B and D (they rejected Tischendorf’s suggestion of a fourth, C). Myshrall (2015) further suggests that Milne and Skeat’s B is actually two scribes, B1 and B2, but Batovici (2017) has challenged this.

**Palaeographic notes on 03**

Regarding the division into hands, Milne and Skeat (1938, 87-89) suggest two scribes and their work does not appear to have been challenged significantly. Grenz’s forthcoming PhD thesis is likely to move the discussion forward significantly.
Jongkind (2019b) has argued that the scribal team of 03 paid careful attention to several features of their copying which suggests they were deliberately and carefully shaping the copying process to approximate the earliest form of the text. Williams (2018) has observed that 03 shows considerable philological skill in consistently differentiating correctly between short and long i-vowels. Thus, the team that produced 03 show ability and effort in their textual and linguistic work.

**Palaeography and History of 02**

Much less can be said about 02 or 04 than 01 or 03, since there is less scholarly debate to engage with and far fewer clues within the codices as to their origins. 02 was presented to the British by Cyril Lucar, the Oecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople. Lincicum (2019) has found an *Abschrift* of the manuscript which was produced in circles associated with Lucar. The name, “Alexandrinus”, associating the codex with Alexandria, was first used in 1657, by Walton in the preface to his polyglot Bible. He explains that Lucar had previously been Patriarch of Alexandria, and had probably bought the codex from there. However, since the end of the tenth century the Patriarch of Alexandria had resided (and had his library) at Cairo, not Alexandria (McKendrick 2003, 3).

More significant than the name is the Arabic note at the bottom of the first page of Genesis, saying “Bound to the Patriarchal Cell in the Fortress of Alexandria. Whoever removes it thence shall be excommunicated and cut off. Written by Athanasius the Humble”.

14 Skeat (2004b, 120) argues that this is Athanasius II, partly on the basis of Fulton’s palaeographic dating of the Arabic and partly on the basis of Greek manuscripts with similar notes. However, from 1275 until 1305, Athanasius II was a refugee in Constantinople. There is another manuscript, also presented to Thomas Roe, the English diplomat who received the gift of 02, with a similar Arabic note, linking it to Athanasius the Humble. McKendrick (2003) states that this manuscript was copied near Ephesus in 1284–85. We know that Athanasius II visited Ephesus in 1289 and that refugees from there came to Constantinople in 1304. McKendrick further

14 I follow Fulton’s translation, which is found (together with a pointed transcription of the Arabic) in Skeat 1957, 2.
argues that 02 is unlikely to have been produced in Constantinople, since if it was, it would have been unlikely to survive the sack of 1204. Moreover, if it had been produced in Constantinople and remained there for some eight hundred years until Athanasius II, it is unlikely that the locals would easily let him remove such a revered treasure. It is on the other hand entirely likely that Ephesian refugees, without their own stable home, would be willing to entrust it to him. McKendrick further argues for the inherent plausibility of an Ephesian origin since Ephesus was a wealthy Christian centre in the fifth century. He concedes that we cannot of course prove it came from Ephesus, but that it does seem likely. Various fifth century dates have been proposed (Kenyon 1909, 8; Cavallo 1967, 77-81). Given the uncertainties of palaeographic dating, the best we can say is sometime in the fifth century.

Kenyon (1909, 9-10) distinguishes five scribes. Milne and Skeat (1938, 91-93) follow him for the OT. However, they argue that the three NT scribes may in fact be identical to Scribe I of the OT. Cavallo (1967, 77-78) argues for three hands. Smith (2014, 121) has a similar, though not identical, analysis to that of Kenyon. Since this is not a palaeographic study, I refrain from opining.

It is a beautifully produced pandect, probably produced for a liturgical setting, since, for an ancient manuscript, it is easy to read (insofar as we can tell what the ancients would have found easy to read) (Smith 2014, 251). Compared with 01 and 03, we have little grounds for speculation, let alone knowledge, about the maker’s motives. It is part of the burden of this project to add to our knowledge by examination of the manuscript’s text-quality. It certainly has a comprehensive content (including the Clementine epistles, Athanasius’ letter to Marcellinus and various other texts prefatory to the psalms) so its producers probably aimed to include everything they considered at least arguably canonical.
Palaeography and history of 04

04 is even less studied than 02. There is only Tischendorf’s nineteenth century edition (1843), Lyon’s unpublished doctoral thesis (1958) and a few pages in Cavallo 1967. There is also no facsimile.

Scholars offer different opinions on origin. Tischendorf (1843, 18) suggests Alexandria, on the basis of shared readings with the Alexandrian Fathers. Cavallo (1967, 90) similarly suggests Egypt, because this is where many of his comparanda originate. He also notes that it is likely to have been palimpised in an area, such as Egypt, where Ephraim was popular and that there is no reason to think it was moved before it was palimpised. All of these arguments are open to challenge. Very few scholars now believe text-types can be tied to geographical areas, so an agreement with Alexandrian fathers does not necessarily suggest an Alexandrian provenance (see Epp 2014). The fact that many of Cavallo’s comparanda originated in Egypt may, as argued above, simply be a function of the fact that most of our surviving ancient manuscripts are Egyptian. The fact Ephraim was popular in Egypt is more convincing, but this hardly proves that his poems could not have been copied elsewhere.

The question of dating is equally understudied and complex. Tischendorf (1843, 18-20) argued that 04 must be older than 02 and that 02 was fifth century. He further argued that the first corrector must be a century or two after the codex was made, because the text is so different but that this corrector must date to the sixth or seventh century. This all suggests some time in the fourth century. Lyon (1959, 16) suggests early fifth century, because the script is less developed than 02, but the single column format suggests it is later than 01 and 03. However, many early papyri have single columns however, so this is less convincing. Cavallo (1967, 87-93) argues for early sixth century on the basis of palaeographic comparanda. I have earlier noted the perils of palaeographic dating, so all we can say is somewhere between late fourth and early sixth century.
Lyon (1959) offers the most recent and thorough analysis of scribes, but even his is not comprehensive. He follows Tischendorf in suggesting the two Testaments had different scribes, but also argues that orthographic peculiarities could distinguish them within each Testament.

There are few internal clues to the purpose. Cavallo (1967, 89) suggests that the codex was produced not so much with an eye to aesthetic quality and value, but rather to propagate the text of the Bible as widely as possible, without particularly careful writing. However, this is unlikely, because, as I have argued, pandects were very rare and difficult to produce.

Conclusions

Pandects were rare, expensive and difficult to produce, but a number were made in the fourth-sixth century. They were so prized that Emperors arguably commissioned them, as part of a project to promote unity and order in the Church. This all tells us that the idea of a unified Bible was important to the Church in the Patristic period, even if practicalities prevented producing many actual examples. This shows the importance of studying the pandects and, in particular, how their textual characteristics vary across the canon.

With all the manuscripts, many of the studies on scribes, discussed in this chapter, have advanced our understanding of what distinguishes the scribes, perhaps causing scholars to neglect their unity. Jongkind (2007, 48–51) in particular has exposed organisational blunders within the 01 team, such as how tasks and spaces were divided between the final books. However, there is a difference between poor organisation and no organisation. Whilst on the one hand, the scribes can be differentiated, their unity is fundamentally more striking. Head (2015, 127) writes of the 01 team “their outstanding achievement [is] producing a strikingly coherent manuscript with a layout and lettering that from many perspectives looks so similar”. Given the extreme difficulties in making a book on the scale of a pandect, all four of our manuscripts exhibit a remarkable degree of palaeographic unity and this is a sound basis for examining their textual characteristics as whole manuscripts.
3: Analysis of Variants in Romans

Having outlined my method, justified the need for this project and discussed the historical background to the pandects, I will now present my data and analysis for test-chapters in the Pauline corpus. I begin with Paul, because his letters are arguably the most text-critically straightforward part of the Greek Bible. I analyse three sample chapters in Romans. I aim thereby to create a fairly accurate profile of the textual characteristics of the pandects in that book. This is arguably more helpful than taking small “soundings” from a number of letters. I use Romans as my sample book, because its authorship is undisputed, because it is long enough to yield several chapters which are reasonably spaced apart, giving some breadth to the sample, and because it is arguably the most influential and significant of Paul’s letters. Within Romans, I discuss chapters 1, 8 and 15, because these are from the beginning, middle and end (avoiding chapter 16, because the density of names makes it untypical). I follow Gamble’s (1977) arguments and assume that the letter in its present sixteen-chapter form is the Pauline original.

As noted in chapter 1, I discuss every variation unit where there is any disagreement between the pandects or when any of them disagrees with the text of NA²⁸, excluding orthographic variants. I also discuss any variation unit where the pandects agree with each other and with NA²⁸, but there is still a case to be made that they do not have the initial text. I categorise how each pandect differs from the initial text, according to the categories set out on p.18 (including abbreviating “transcriptional error” to “TE”). As discussed in chapter 1, I judge what the initial text is on the basis of internal and external evidence, not privileging the pandects because they are “good” manuscripts, but nevertheless according them appropriate weight based on their age. When assessing Pauline style, I focus on the seven undisputed letters, since even those who contend for Pauline authorship of the others must grant that, for whatever reason, they are written in rather different styles and so are unreliable guides for how Paul writes in Romans. Every judgment is graded on a three-point scale to indicate confidence, as outlined on pp. 17-19.
I do not include a full apparatus, but I list the readings of the manuscripts under investigation, the Majority text (M), \( \Xi^{46} \) and any other relevant witnesses. I rarely deem versions or citations to be relevant, since often we are dealing with niceties of grammar and syntax so subtle that they would likely be changed in the process of translation or adapting a citation to context (see Williams 2008; Coogan 2019; Blaski 2019). Whenever a manuscript is alone among Greek continuous manuscripts cited in NA\(^{28} \) in giving a reading, I state that specifically with the word “only”. This means that the reader can otherwise assume that a reading is supported by at least one or two late minuscules, as well as what is listed. On the other hand, the fact that there exist of course Greek manuscripts not included in NA\(^{28} \), including of course many not known to scholarship at all, means that the reader is cautioned not to take “only” too literally.

When there is only one reading (in addition to the lemma) under discussion, I give a negative apparatus, so that the reader can assume all my consistently cited witnesses (i.e. the pandects, M and, where extant \( \Xi^{46} \)), which do not support the variant, support the lemma. Lemmata are taken from NA\(^{28} \). Unless explicitly stated, the reading cited for a particular witness replaces exactly the words in the lemma.

As explained in chapter 1, this thesis is more concerned with textual characteristics than scribal ones and is therefore not concerned with orthography. I do not discuss purely orthographic variants, i.e. alternative standard ways to present or spell what is clearly the same word. Needless to say, I discuss cases where it is doubtful whether or not the variation is “purely orthographic”. I give the lemma with the orthography that is found in NA\(^{28} \) and print each variant with similar, easily-readable modern orthography (e.g. removing nomina sacra and modernizing spelling). My manuscript citations do not reflect, for example, nomina sacra, or spellings which are in modern terms non-standard. When discussing the words in a particular Greek passage or when citing variants, I generally accent Greek words as they would be accented when appearing in their context in the text (e.g. retaining final graves). When discussing the word in general, I accent it in isolation. When citing a nonsense TE, I do not include any breathings or accents. As explained on p.19, I count in scripitorium corrections, but not later ones, as the reading of the manuscript. I offer comments only on the more interesting variation units. If the comments are lengthy, I conclude with a summary of the categorisation.
Verse-by-Verse Analysis

Romans 1

Up to and including ἀυτοῦ, v. 3, missing in 04.

1:

Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ
01, 02, Ψ₂₆, Ζ: Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
03, Ψ¹⁰: text

The external evidence is evenly balanced here, but most commentators incline towards putting Χριστοῦ first (Cranfield, Dunn, Jewett, Longenecker, Moo), not least because this is Paul’s normal practice. In the non-Pauline parts of the NT, we find Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ to Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ forty-seven times to seven; in Paul the result is reversed, eighty times to twenty-five (Moo 1996, 41 n. 9). A number of these passages no doubt have textual uncertainties of their own, but these numbers are so significant that they are unlikely to reverse the general pattern. The trend is surely particularly significant in parallel contexts to the present, i.e. when Jesus Christ is a genitive, dependent on a noun describing Paul, when he introduces himself at the start of a letter. In the seven undisputed Paulines, 1 Corinthians shows similar textual uncertainty, Galatians and 1 Thessalonians do not have an analogous genitive construction and 2 Corinthians, Philippians and Philemon indisputably have Χριστοῦ first. This seems to be Paul’s general practice both in general and in this particular context. However, Jongkind has identified a trend of 03 in Romans to correct Ἰησοῦς Χριστός to Χριστός Ἰησοῦς. Of the eleven passages where there is variation in order of the names, 03 puts Χριστός first at nine, five times on its own or with only one other witness. It is thus likely that this is an editorial trend by 03 (Jongkind 2019b, 237-38). This means that we can give reduced weight to 03’s testimony here. This means in turn that the external evidence for 03’s reading is weak. Thus it is likely that 03 is a linguistic improvement, harmonising to Paul’s normal practice.

B
Cranfield notes that the phrase without δέ is much more common in the NT (e.g. Rom 7:18; 9:8; 10:6, 7, 8) and that the meanings are slightly different. Cranfield suggests the translation “that is to say” for the version without the δέ, such that the phrase equates the two things. The addition of the particle changes the meaning such that what comes after the phrase means something different and “complimentary” (Cranfield) to what was before. As anyone who has done church ministry will testify, there is mutual encouragement in seeking to strengthen the faith of others, but strengthening others is not the same as being encouraged oneself. The combination of greater external evidence and the fact that 02’s reading, though a much more common phrase, is actually inappropriate in the context, suggest that 02 is harmonising to the list of instances of τοῦτ’ ἐστίν given above.

02: harmonisation.

A

éν (1)
01 only: ἐνν
In 01, the epsilon falls last in its line and the nu is both added as a bar at the of the line and on the next line. This is a fairly obvious TE, rather than an orthographic variant, in that double nu is not a widely accepted alternative spelling for single nu.
01: TE (dittography).

A
13:

δὲ
04 only: γὰρ
01, 02, 03, מיד: text

The γὰρ has very limited external evidence and only makes sense with difficulty, since there is no causal relationship to the previous clause or sentence. Thus it is unlikely to be initial. The most likely reason for a scribe introducing it is either TE or a content change because she intended the γὰρ to connect v.13 to the whole of vv.11-12, so that Paul is restating and explaining why he longs to see the Romans. It is difficult to determine which is more likely, but there is no obvious trigger for a TE, so I suggest a content change.

B

16:

πρῶτον
03, 012, Sahidic and Marcion: omitted
01, 02, 04: text

Many commentators suggest that the omission is the result of Marcionite “anti-Semitic” (Cranfield, Jewett, Longenecker, Metzger, Sanday and Headlam). The external evidence is consistent with the longer reading and the use of similar language at 2:9-10 shows that the idea is Pauline (Cranfield). It is possible that in fact the word was added as a linguistic improvement, to avoid τε and καί in adjacent positions. However, such a construction is found, without variations, at 1:12, 14 and 10:12 (Weiss 1896, 102).

Lietzmann suggests that the shorter reading is consistent with Paul’s thought, because very similar language is found in 1 Cor 1:24. However, the exegetical contexts are subtly different: in 1 Cor 1, Paul is arguing that just as Jews and Greeks can equally, but for different reasons, fail to see the glory of Christ crucified, so Christ is equally the answer to what both groups truly desire. However, here he is making a different point: read in the context of the whole letter, especially chapters 9-11, πρῶτον
here refers to the fact that the salvation of Israel is logically prior to that of the Gentiles: Gentiles are saved because of the election and apostasy of Israel (e.g. 11:11-12, 30-31). God’s plan is to re-make the world through Abraham’s people and it is through Abraham’s people that blessing comes to the nations (passim in the work of Wright, see, e.g., 2009). In a sense, therefore, Paul believed that Jews and Gentiles were equal in status before God, but had different places in his plan. As Cranfield argues, the combination of τε and πρῶτον expresses this: the former expresses equality and the latter the difference. It seems clear then that the reading of 03 is an attempt to simplify what Paul has made subtle, probably influenced somewhere in its ancestry by Marcion. 03: content change.

A

17:

γὰρ
02 only: δὲ
01, 03, 04, Μ: text
This is a similar change to the one in v.13, but it is a different manuscript which substitutes δὲ for γὰρ. Once again, the external evidence is so overwhelming that 02 is highly unlikely to preserve the initial reading. The effect of the change is to make v.16b and v.17 co-ordinate: Paul has two reasons to be unashamed of the Gospel, it is both God’s power for salvation and it is how God’s righteousness is revealed. This serves to co-ordinate salvation and justification, rather than to make to make the one the consequence of the other. The γὰρ seems to fit slightly better with the general pattern of Pauline thought: justification typically refers to a present reality (passim in Rom 1-4, culminating in 5:1), which guarantees salvation, which is typically eschatological (e.g. Rom 13:11). It seems highly unlikely therefore that δὲ is initial. This is unlikely to have been a TE or harmonisation. 02 has a similar change at 1:27 and 8:18, 22. In 8:18, 22, as here, there is a chain of several statements, connected by γὰρ. It seems that the scribe of 02 or one of its ancestors found these chains repetitious and altered them. This seems to have been intended as a stylistic improvement. 02: linguistic improvement.

A
δίκαιος
04 only: δίκαιός μου

Both Tischendorf and Lyon note that the μου was originally there in 04, but now it appears to have been removed in a post-scriptorium erasure. There is no evidence of the reading prior to the erasure in either the standard or multi-spectral images. I can only presume the manuscript was clearer in the time of Tischendorf and Lyon, but I rate the variation unit as C.

Longenecker and Jewett suggest that the addition in 04 is due to harmonisation with OG Hab 2:4, which is being quoted here. The μου is not found in all LXX manuscripts.
and indeed editors disagree about including it (Rahlfs-Hanhart 2005 omitting and Ziegler 1943 including). However, its presence in even some parts of the tradition suggests that this is a reasonable explanation. There is also the possibility of harmonisation to Heb 10:38. At this passage, 01, 02 and \(\Psi^{46}\) include the pronoun and the passage is missing in 03 and 04. It is therefore at least plausible that it was in the initial text of Hebrews and may even have been the most common form of the text of Greek Habbakuk in the first century. Whether or not this is true, harmonisation is likely.

18:

\[\alpha\lambda\theta\epsilon\ı\alpha\nu\ \epsilon\nu\]

Sahidic, Armenian, Clementine Vulgate, Ambrosiaster: \[\alpha\lambda\theta\epsilon\ı\alpha\nu\ \tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\\omicron\\omicron\ \epsilon\nu\]^1

All Greek evidence: text

This is an interesting variation unit, because a number of different versions attest the longer reading and it is unlikely to be explained simply by differences that arise in translation, but there is no Greek evidence. It is unlikely that multiple translators would make the same change independently, so possibly this was a widespread Greek reading at the time of the versions, which means it may be initial. However, the total absence of the longer reading from the Greek tradition makes this unlikely. The longer reading is also more expansionary and as such less likely to be initial. Longenecker and Lietzmann also suggest it is influenced by 1:25.

21:

\[\epsiloni\]

02 only: omitted

TE (haplography – the following word begins with eta).

A

---

^1 NA²⁸ cites this reading in Greek, although there is no Greek evidence. I follow their retroversion.
Both Tischendorf and Lyon note that this word is added by the first post-scriptorium corrector, sometime in the sixth century. Tischendorf (1843, 345) argued that the first corrector erased the line beginning from where he thought it should have been and then rewrote the line with omitted word. Both agree that the word was included neither by the scribe nor any in scriptorium corrector. However, on examining the manuscript, the line appears normal, except that the ΟΘÇÈ of ὁ θεὸς ἐν appears fainter than the other words. This is unlikely to be a deliberate erasure as the letters are significantly easier to see than the erasures and no-one would erase only the first letter of ἐν. With respect to two great palaeographers, it seems most likely to me that there was no variation here, but that the manuscript was damaged slightly over time.

If Lyon and Tischendorf were right, it was almost certainly a TE, since no-one would deliberately delete θεὸς, without also deleting the article with it. To acknowledge the fact that I may be wrong about the palaeography, I record a grade C TE.

ἀκαθαρσίαν τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι
02 only: -αρσίαν τοῦ ἀτι- is squeezed on to the end of the line and possibly added later. It seems likely that the original scribe missed out the letters and they were added later. The hand is similar to the scribe of the rest of Romans, so it is most likely to be an in scriptorium corrector and thus irrelevant to this project, but it is difficult to be sure and
the correctors of 02 have not been studied comprehensively. There are possible slight traces of an erasure beneath the εἰς. Possibly, therefore, the scribe leapt by homoeoteleuton from the nu of ἀυτῶν to the nu of ἀκαθαρσίαν, noticed the mistake and had to erase, re-write and squash to correct it. I note a C-grade TE to acknowledge that the error may not have been corrected until after the scriptorium.

27:

τε
02 and various later witnesses: δέ
04: omitted
01, 03, various later witnesses: text
20 is divided here; NA²⁸ does not cite it; Hodges and Farstad cite that it is split between all three variants (though they print τε); Tischendorf (1869-72, 2.2.368) cites a wide range of evidence for both connecting words and less for the omission (mostly citational and versional evidence which is of very little value here, because this kind of variant could easily arise through the inevitable changes that occurred in ancient translation and citation).

It is unclear what is likely to be initial. The external evidence is against the absence of any word here, but on the other hand, if none was there, we would expect to see different ones added, which is exactly what we do see. The τε in v.26 means τε is also better here: the actions of the men and the women are strictly co-ordinated (Jewett). Weiss (1896, 66) however suggests that τε may thus be conforming to the context. In the end,
I opt for τε as initial, because of the weak external evidence for the short reading and the likelihood of a careless scribe being unaware of the τε in v.26 and so inappropriately changing τε to δὲ. However, the decision is marginal and the rating reflects that. The omission is presumably a TE, because it is the kind of short inconsequential word that is easily omitted. The δὲ is a linguistic non-improvement.

C

ἕαυτοῖς
03, 018, 104, 1506: αὐτοῖς
01, 02, 04, 20: text

The word is used with a clearly reflexive sense both with and without the initial epsilon almost interchangeably in the early manuscripts. I will consider the behaviour of our manuscripts on various occasions where similar variation occurs, to see if any has a tendency we should take into account.\(^2\) I include everything that can be considered Pauline for text-critical purposes, because I am here investigating the habits of our manuscripts, rather than of Paul.

---

\(^2\) For the list of Stellen, see Weiss 1896, 26.
04 has a much stronger predilection for alphas than 03, with the other two somewhere in the middle. Therefore both 03 and 04 go against their general behaviour. This does not make deciding on the variant any easier and so we are forced to follow the preponderance of early manuscripts, which is for ἑαυτοῖς. The internal arguments are not especially relevant, because the form without the epsilon can have a reflexive sense.

The reading of 03 is presumably a TE.

03: TE.

B

28:

ὀ θεὸς

02 and 0172 prior to correction alone: omitted

01, 02, 03, 20: text (in 01, the words are added by an in scriptorium corrector)

---

3 Percentage of the readings where either one is read, i.e. ignoring lacunas and the instance of ταύτης.
The commentators are almost all agreed in preferring the longer text and explaining the shorter as the scribes wanting to avoid repeating the word from earlier in the verse (Jewett, Lietzmann, Longenecker; Weiss 1896, 81). Incidentally, in a very similar place in 8:28, 02 is one of the manuscripts to include θεὸς, even though this involves repeating in the nominative a word that came up only shortly before in the accusative. Although this might normally suggest that, since the scribe has no consistent habit, she is reliably reproducing the initial text, here the external evidence against 02 is strong. 02: linguistic improvement.

29:

πονηρίᾳ πλεονεξίᾳ κακίᾳ
01, 02: πονηρίᾳ κακίᾳ πλεονεξίᾳ
04, various minuscules: κακίᾳ πονηρίᾳ πλεονεξίᾳ
03, some later evidence: text

It is clear, as the scholars seem almost unanimously to agree, that the addition of πορνείᾳ is not initial, since the external evidence is weak, it is easily confused with πονηρίᾳ, and, as we have already noted, expansionary readings are always less likely to be initial (Cranfield, Fitzmyer, Metzger and Sanday and Headlam). It is much less easy to draw conclusions about which of the pandect readings is initial, since there is little to choose between them, either on internal or external grounds (although the reading of 01 and 02 has no late support, it has two early manuscripts in its favour). Variation is, of course, natural for a scribe copying long lists of similar items (Moo). Weiss (1896, 136) argues for the reading of 03 because πλεονεξίᾳ is the more unusual, exotic term and therefore scribes seek to isolate it from the others, rather than placing it in the middle. It therefore moves naturally to the end of the list. In this case, 01, 02 and 04 are attempting a stylistic improvement by delaying the most expressive word to the end. Although rather speculative, there seems no obviously better argument for any of the options with reasonable external evidence. 01, 02, 04: linguistic improvement.
It is clear from the layout of the words what happened in 02:

φόνου has been squeezed onto the end of the line. It seems clear that the original scribe missed the word out by haplography and that it was later re-written slightly out of place. It does not matter if the correction was in scriptorium or later (though the next variant suggests the former): either way, the manuscript had a variant when it left the scriptorium, either the omission or displacement of φόνου, and this was due to TE, albeit possibly with an attempt to correct it.

02: TE.
A

δόλου
02 only: omitted
This is most likely a TE, possibly related to the previous variant: in correcting her error by adding φόνου, the scribe forgot δόλου. This raises the likelihood the previous omission was corrected in scriptorium.

B

31:

ἀνελεήμονας
04, 20 and later evidence: ἀσπόνδους ἀνελεήμονας
01, 02, 03 and later evidence: text
The commentators are generally agreed that the longer reading is the result of harmonisation to 2 Tim 3:3, where we find ἀστοργοτίς ἀσπονδότοι (admittedly with some textual uncertainty) in a similar vice-list (Cranfield, Lietzmann, Longenecker, Metzger, Moo and Sanday and Headlam).
The external evidence is clearly against the variants both in 03 and in the Latin tradition. The reason for the move to the present in 03 is likely because of the other present tense verbs and participles in the surrounding context (Jewett, Longenecker). Weiss (1896, 32) notes that in general, presents tend to be corrected to aorists, rather than vice versa, but here the other verbs and participles cause this trend to be reversed.

The external evidence is strongly against the reading with the participles, particularly because the versional and citational evidence is of minimal value here, because this is exactly the sort of minor syntactical variation which arises naturally when translating or citing (as we see from the fact that almost all English translations of the NT substantially reduce the number of participles). The participle reading may be the result of harmonisation with πράσσοντες (Longenecker, Sanday and Headlam, Westcott and Hort; Weiss 1896, 51) or even with πράσσοντες, which, despite looking like an indicative, is in fact a participle.

Lyon and Tischendorf agree that 04 has been heavily corrected in the end of Romans 7 and the beginning of Romans 8. According to Lyon’s reconstruction, the original scribe
seems to have skipped all and only 8:1-2. Whatever the exact details, it is fairly clear that 04 made a large omission that was not corrected in scriptorium. The most likely explanation is that the scribe or an ancestor skipped from the beginning of one paragraph to another, thus missing out a two verse paragraph. I do not cite 04 for vv.1-2.

04: TE.

A

1:

Ἰησοῦ
02, Μ, much late evidence: add μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν
The longer version is probably the result of the influence of v.4 (Cranfield, Fitzmyer, Jewett, Longenecker, Metzger, Moo, Sanday and Headlam, Westcott and Hort). It is also possible that the change was theological: a scribe baulked at the implication that it was possible to escape condemnation without any change in behaviour. However, the identical language to v.4 probably makes harmonisation the more significant factor.

02: harmonisation.

A

2:

σε
01, 03: text
02, Μ, much late and versional evidence: με
044, Methodius and Bohairic: ἡμᾶς
Origen and Armenian: omitted

Pace Barrett and Westcott and Hort, the external evidence surely rules out both ἡμᾶς and the complete omission of a pronoun (especially since the verb surely needs an object). The main argument in favour of σε is that με could be harmonisation to extensive use of that pronoun in chapter 7 (Weiss 1896, 27); the main argument in

---

4 This reading is not in the NA28 apparatus, but has the support, despite its minimal attestation, of Barrett and Westcott and Hort.
favour of με is that σε could result from dittography with the last syllable of ἐλευθέρωσεν (Sanday and Headlam). The latter argument does not account for why, after σε arose by dittography, με disappeared. It is of course possible that a scribe was confronted with both in his exemplar, because that exemplar had copied σε twice, and then chose σε for his own manuscript. However, this is unlikely, because με fits better in the context, because of its heavy use in chapter seven. It is surely much more likely that an initial σε would disappear through haplography (Moo) (possibly explaining the reading with no pronoun) and then scribes would supply the needed object with what seemed obvious from the context: με or ἡμᾶς (Cranfield).

It may seem implausible that Paul would speak, presumably to his readers, in the second person singular. A variety of explanations have been suggested. Fee (1994, 527 n. 138) argues that Paul is in dialogue with an imagined interlocutor and in chapter 7 refers to his dialogue partner in the first person, because he himself has experienced what he is ascribing to the inter-locutor. However, in chapter 8, Paul is discussing events on the other side of a conversion and therefore shares less of the experience of his imagined dialogue partner. The problem here is that surely Paul has also been converted. There is therefore no reason why he should cease to take ownership of the experience described in Rom 8:2, when he took ownership (on Fee’s reading) of chapter 7. Longenecker explains the change by suggesting that 8:2 is probably a quotation from some liturgical material. It is written in a balanced and memorable way and Paul often uses γάρ to introduce quotations (e.g. Rom 10:13, 11:34; 1 Cor 2:16, 10:26; 15:27). Longenecker adds that Paul probably would not use the word in both v.2 and v.3 with its explanatory sense, so the first could introduce a quotation. This is however rather speculative. V.2 contains classic Pauline language – virtually every content word is a Pauline Leitwort, such as νόμος, πνεῦμα, ἁμαρτία, θάνατος and ζωή. Although Paul does introduce quotations with γάρ, that conjunction serves many other purposes and he is certainly unafraid of long strings of explanatory usages of γάρ (e.g. 1:16-18; 8:18-20). Thus, we cannot convincingly explain σε, either by reference to an imaginary interlocutor or a liturgical quotation. However, in a sense, this strengthens the case for it: it is certainly difficilior and it is hard to imagine why a scribe would change με to σε. I therefore conclude that σε is initial and that the others were inserted to provide an object for the verb, after the σε disappeared by haplography. However, the matter is decidedly uncertain.
02: TE (haplography) and linguistic improvement.

C

3:

τὸ (1)
02 only: ο
TE.
A

7:

δύναται
01 only: ούναται.
TE (it is not clear why the in-scriptorium corrector did not notice this).
A

9:

ἐν (2)
04: ε
The nu is added by a corrector, which Lyon dates to post-scriptorium.
TE.
B (the lower rating reflects the hesitancy we must have over assigning correctors in 04).
οὐκ ἔχει οὗτος
04: there was complex reinking and correcting. Tischendorf and Lyon agree that the re-inking began with the kappa of οὐκ ἔχει οὗτος. Lyon argues that the positioning of the original letters suggest that the original scribe wrote something different, but this does not seem to be the case – if anything the underlying upsilon seems to allow less room for other letters. It is hard to tell exactly what happened, but it seems most likely that the original scribe left out a single letter by TE, because the underlying layer seems more spaced out, and that the corrector wrote everything again.
04: TE.

B

11:

τὸν Ἰησοῦν
04, 20, considerable later evidence: article omitted
The balance of early manuscripts favours including the article and Longenecker points out that the omission is a plausible attempt at stylistic improvement.
04: linguistic improvement.

B

Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν
01, 02: ἐκ νεκρῶν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν
04: ἐκ νεκρῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν
20: τὸν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν
03: text
Various other evidence attests various other permutations of the name and of the position.
External evidence is fairly evenly balanced between the various options. There are two different issues to be resolved: the order of the words and the form of the name. Regarding the word order, Weiss (1896, 135) argues that it is Paul’s standard pattern to connect an accusative closely to its verb. This means that the word for Jesus should come immediately after ἐγείρας, before ἐκ νεκρῶν. However, this word order is also used earlier in the verse (τοῦ ἐγείραντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦν ἐκ νεκρῶν), so Cranfield argues that this word order at this variation unit may be the result of harmonisation. Weiss’ pattern is surely not so strongly marked that it should overrule the principle of avoiding reconstructing harmonisation as initial, especially since the unharmonised reading arguably has the best of the external evidence.

Regarding the name for Jesus, there is minimal external evidence for Ἰησοῦν only. Of the various options represented in the variant readings the most characteristically Pauline way to refer to Jesus is the anarthrous Χριστός, so unless the external evidence is different or there is a reason for Paul to do differently in the context, we should assume that here. In one sense, the external evidence for this reading is early and therefore impressive: 03 and various witnesses in the Latin tradition including Irenaeus and Marcion according to Tertullian (NA²⁸) (though of course Latin witnesses are little help for the presence or absence of an article). Ἰησοῦς probably enters the tradition because of its use earlier in the verse.

When we combine my two judgements, arguing that the initial text placed ἐκ νεκρῶν before the word for Jesus and referred to Jesus with an anarthrous Χριστός, the resulting reading is ἐκ νεκρῶν Χριστόν. Although this combination is attested nowhere, this should not count against it, because it is only a conjecture as a combination and in this sense, any eclectic text is a conjecture.

03: harmonisation (putting the name first).
01, 02 and 04: harmonisation (adding Ἰησοῦν).
B
cαὶ
και
01, 02 and some late evidence: omitted.
Certainty on this point is elusive. The external evidence is evenly spread. Weiss suggests that the word is unlikely on internal grounds, because God raising Jesus and
making us alive are not parallel actions. However, this surely assumes the καὶ carries more weight than it normally does. It does not assert anything about the similarity or equality of the two conjuncts, it simply joins them. Grammatically, they are not coordinate here, but this simply means καὶ is to be translated “even, also” rather than “and”. The longer reading is not particularly “expansionary” in content, so there is no argument against it by that criterion. There is therefore perhaps reason to follow Royse’s longior argument and accept καὶ as initial. It is the type of short word easily lost by TE.
01, 02: TE.
C

τοῦ...πνεύματος

03, 20 and extensive later evidence: τὸ ἐνοικοῦν αὐτοῦ πνεύμα (i.e. make it accusative)
04 alone: τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος αὐτοῦ πνεύματος
01, 02 and later evidence: text
04’s αὐτοί makes no sense in context and is probably a TE. The more difficult choice is between the genitive and accusative forms of the indwelling Spirit. The accusative makes the Spirit in some sense the cause or basis of the believers’ resurrection, the genitive makes the Spirit the instrument. The external evidence mildly favours the genitive. As Fee (2006) argues, διὰ with verbs of resurrection normally takes the genitive, such as at 6:4 and 1 Cor 6:14. It would therefore be a natural change for scribes to make. Moreover, Fee argues that the accusative is very much in tune with Paul’s thought, when it is interpreted as expressing an epistemic rather than an effective cause: it expresses why we know that God will raise our bodies, rather than why God will actually do so. This sits well with the regular Pauline thought that the Spirit is God’s ἀρραβὼν, the guarantee of our resurrection (2 Cor 1:22; 5:5; Eph 1:14 (even if Paul did not write Ephesians, this idea was clearly recognised by one of his early disciples as Pauline)). This reading arguably causes the whole pericope to be more about the future eschatological resurrection than present moral resurrection. However, the context suggests that Paul has the present, moral resurrection in view: vv.7-9 explain how fleshly people cannot please God, but Paul’s Christian, Spirit-indwelled readers can; vv.10-11 then explain why this is true, so we are expecting a comment on the Spirit’s role in the believer’s present moral transformation. This makes the genitive better suited
to the context. However, of course the *difficilior* canon pushes against this, especially since the external evidence is indecisive. I therefore conclude that the accusative is probably initial, because it is *difficilior*, and that the genitive is an improvement motivated both by language and content, but I rate the variant to express the fact that doubt remains.

04: TE (A).
01, 02: linguistic improvement and content change (C).

**14:**

\[\text{υίοι θεοῦ} \text{ εἰσιν}\]

03 and later evidence, mostly Latin related: \[\text{υίοι} \text{ εἰσιν θεοῦ}\]

20, other later evidence: \[\text{εἰσιν υίοι θεοῦ}\]

01, 02, 04: text

The reading of NA²⁸ has the support of external evidence, since it is supported by three early manuscripts. Cranfield argues that internal arguments favour the reading of 03 because it places the emphasis on υίοι, which fits well with Paul’s argument in vv.14-17, where he is expanding on the theme of divine adoption. This is as good an explanation as any for the change. This increased emphasis could either be classified as a linguistic improvement or a content change, but since the difference is clearly one of emphasis rather than meaning, I take it as a linguistic improvement.

**18:**

\[\gammaάρ\]

02 only: ἄ

Although it is highly unlikely that this singular is original, it is difficult to say immediately what has motivated it. There is no obvious candidate for harmonisation. The change weakens the causal connection between vv.17 and 18, but it is difficult to see why a scribe would want to do that. V.18 is the consequence of v.17: the reason that, if we suffer, believers are not only children but also heirs is that our suffering is not worth comparing with future glory. This variation unit is similar to 1:17, 27 and
8:22 where 02 also inserts a δέ. In 1:17, as here, the γάρ is part of a long chain of explanatory uses of γάρ. It seems that the scribe of 02 or one of its ancestors found such long chains repetitive.

02: linguistic improvement.

21:

διότι
01, 06, 010, 012, 945: διότι
It seems clear that the δι either entered the tradition through dittography or disappeared through haplography (Metzger, Moo). The external evidence is clearly with διότι.
01: TE (dittography).

22:

γάρ
02 only: δέ
Here we see again 02’s love for this connector. There is no long causal chain with repeated γάρ, so the issue is not merely avoiding repetition. The scribe makes this change in many different places, so presumably the motive here is not to do with avoiding placing the two propositions in a causal relationship. Similarly, she is unlikely to make an identical TE so consistently. Rather the issue is more likely to be distaste, for whatever reason, for overuse of the conjunction.

02: linguistic improvement.

23:

ἡμεῖς καὶ αὐτοί
03, 104, Methodius and Latin evidence: καὶ αὐτοί
06, 010, 012, various Vulgate manuscripts: αὐτοί
20, other later evidence: various other rearrangements of the words

Cranfield and Weiss (1896, 94) apply the terse wisdom of traditional textual criticism: there would be no good reason to remove ἡμεῖς if it were initial (and, I add, many good reasons to add it) and it is found in several places, so it is almost certainly not initial. Dunn on the other hand argues that the readings with ἡμεῖς are difficilior, because the long string of nominatives is “tautologous and unnecessary”. However, the phrase is difficult to make clear sense of without ἡμεῖς, since it is not clear what αὐτοὶ refers to. This suggests that Cranfield and Weiss are correct: there is strong scribal motivation to add ἡμεῖς and it is added in several different places, which strongly suggests that it was not in the initial text. Of the readings without it, there is the reading of 03 and the bare αὐτοὶ of 06, 010, 012 and various Vulgate manuscripts. The reading of 03 has the advantage of one old, Greek manuscript in its favour. On the other hand, the καὶ could easily have been added to harmonise with καὶ αὐτοὶ earlier in the verse. The balance is tipped in favour of including the καὶ by the fact that the other pandects and Ψ⁴⁶ all include it, even though they also include the questionable ἡμεῖς, such that the external evidence for the καὶ is strong. It is therefore likely that the 03 reading, with καὶ but without ἡμεῖς, is initial. The others add the pronoun because, as Cranfield and Weiss observe, it makes the verse easier to understand.

01, 02, 04: linguistic improvement.

A

ψιθεσίαν

Ψ⁴⁶, various Latin-linked witnesses: omitted.

The inclusion is arguably difficilior, because it creates tension with v.15, where adoption is a present reality. This can be avoided by distinguishing adoption from the spirit of adoption, but this does not “work” exegetically, because, as Moo argues, the point of vv.14-17 is that adoption as sons is a present reality for the believer. Thus, there would be good reasons to remove the word and it is syntactically redundant, since ἀπεκδεχόμενοι already has an object. On the other hand, expansionary readings are always less likely to be initial and ψιθεσίαν is surely expansionary, since it adds a whole new idea to the verse. Ultimately, the matter must be decided by the external
evidence, which favours the longer reading, since it is found in all the early Greek manuscripts except \(\Psi\)^{46}.

24:

\[\tau\iota\varsigma\]

\(01, 1739: \tau\iota\varsigma \kappa\iota (or \tau\iota \kappa\iota; see discussion)\)

\(02, 04, M, \text{extensive later evidence: } \tau\iota \varsigma \kappa\iota\)

Later, mostly Latin-linked evidence: \(\tau\iota \varsigma \tau\iota\)

\(03, \Psi^{46}, \text{Bohairic and variant reading in 1739: text}\)

\(\tau\iota\) could have come or gone through approximate haplography (Weiss 1896, 126) or dittography, but since it is not exactly the same combination of letters written twice or once, this is not as convincing as it would be elsewhere. The argument from “which reading would plausibly lead to all the others” is helpful here. To make this clearer, I set out the various readings, with variations on punctuation and accentuation, and English translation:

1. \(\omicron\gamma\omicron\varphi\beta\lambda\acute{e}\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma\iota\epsilon ;\) For who hopes for what he sees?
2. \(\omicron\gamma\omicron\varphi\beta\lambda\acute{e}\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma\iota\epsilon \tau\iota \epsilon \lambda\lambda\acute{i}\zeta\iota\epsilon ;\) For that which someone sees, [for that] he hopes.
3. \(\omicron\gamma\omicron\varphi\beta\lambda\acute{e}\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma\iota \kappa\iota \epsilon \lambda\lambda\acute{i}\zeta\iota\epsilon \epsilon ;\) For that which someone sees, [for that] he also hopes.
4. \(\omicron\gamma\omicron\varphi\beta\lambda\acute{e}\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma\iota \kappa\iota \kappa\iota \epsilon \lambda\lambda\acute{i}\zeta\iota\epsilon ;\) For who also hopes for that which he sees?
5. \(\omicron\gamma\omicron\varphi\beta\lambda\acute{e}\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma\iota \tau\iota \epsilon \lambda\lambda\acute{i}\zeta\iota\epsilon ;\) For that which someone sees, why does he hope [for it]?
6. \(\omicron\gamma\omicron\varphi\beta\lambda\acute{e}\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma\iota \tau\iota \kappa\iota \kappa\iota \epsilon \lambda\lambda\acute{i}\zeta\iota\epsilon ;\) For that which someone sees, why does he also hope [for it]?

Reading 3, whilst possible grammatically, entirely goes against Paul’s argument. Reading 5 has weak external attestation. Readings 1 and 2 are different accentual and punctuational variation on a reading with good external evidence, but only reading 1 makes sense in the context of Paul’s argument. Readings 4 and 6 are exactly the changes one would expect a scribe to make if she came across reading 1 and misread it as reading 2 due to lack of punctuation and accents and then struggled to make sense of it within Paul’s argument. It is thus likely that reading 1/2 is initial and the others are various different attempts to clarify it (Weiss 1896, 126; Zuntz 1953, 80 n. 2).

01, 02, 04: linguistic improvement.

A
ἐλπίζει

There is early external evidence on both sides and the internal arguments are also open to debate. Cranfield, Dunn, Metzger and Moo suggest that a scribe introduced ὑπομένει to avoid overusing the ἐλπι- root. ἐλπίζω is arguably more natural, because it is clear that the object is a good thing, which is hoped for, rather than a bad thing, which must be patiently endured. Paul’s argument is also much clearer if ἐλπίζω is used, because the third clause follows validly from the second, because both are about ἐλπίς. I submit that it is more likely that a scribe attempt improve the style by reducing the repetition of the ἐλπι- root than Paul obscure his argument by changing root.

01, 02: linguistic improvement.

B

25:

ὅ

04 only: omitted.

The ὅ has been added above the line by a corrector. Lyon ascribes it to the second postscriptorium corrector and Tischendorf does not specify. It is obviously hard to be certain with a single omicron, but I have little choice but to follow Lyon and rate as doubtful. This means that the omission is relevant to this study. It might have been deliberate to improve the clarity, since the sentence reads well without it: we place a comma after βλέπομεν and a high point after ἐλπίζομεν, such that the whole verse is rendered: “If we do not see, [then] we hope; we wait with patience”. However, the οὐ immediately after ὅ creates such an easy dittography that this is surely more likely.

04: TE.

C

26:

ὑπερεντυγχάνει

04, 20, various later witnesses: ὑπερεντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν
The balance of external evidence seems to favour the shorter reading, since it has three early manuscripts in its favour. The Peshitta is sometimes adduced in favour of the longer text, but Williams (2008) notes that Syriac has no adverbial preposition that could translate ὑπὲρ, but rather the standard word for “on behalf of” requires a pronoun suffix. It is therefore difficult to say whether or not a Greek ὑπὲρ ημῶν is behind the Syriac. The longer reading is likely the result of harmonisation with vv. 27 and 34.

A 4: harmonisation.

28:

εἰς
02, 03, ℣46, 81, Sahidic: ὁ θεὸς εἰς

The external arguments are not decisive in either direction. Many scholars opt for the shorter reading because it seems likely it could obviously give rise to the longer: ὁ θεὸς is an improving addition, to clarify the subject of the verb (Lietzmann, Longenecker, Metzger, Moo; Black 1962). However, matters are not so simple. Some divine figure is clearly in some sense the implied actor. If ὁ θεὸς is not initial, then either the subject of συνεργεῖ is internal (such that it means “he works together”) or πάντα is the subject (such that it means “all things together work”), but, even in the latter case, God is the theologically implied subject, because vv.29-30 explain v.28 (hence ὅτι at the start of v.29): the only reason that the believer can have confidence in all things working for good is the pre-determined plan of God. Cranfield, who advocates the shorter reading, even argues this is why Paul does not name God: to highlight the fact that God’s sovereignty is such that “all things, even the actions of those who are disobedient and set themselves against Him, must subserve His will”.

Thus, it can reasonably be argued that the longer reading makes clearer what is already there by implication in the shorter. The shorter is thus less expansionary and difficilior and so probably initial. This is also probable because συνεργεῖ rarely takes a direct object (Moo) and it is unnatural to repeat θεὸς, nominative, only a few words after it has been used in the accusative (Cranfield, Jewett; Weiss 1896, 81).
Black (1962) argues that the subject is internal and that it is the Holy Spirit, carried over from vv.26-27. He even suggests conjecturally emending πάντα to πνεῦμα. He attests Patristic evidence for this interpretation (though not specifically for the textual emendation) and argues that Paul normally uses πνεῦμα rather than θεὸς to describe God’s activity in the world.

However, a number of points can be made in favour of the longer reading. The repetition of a noun in the accusative and then the nominative is not as implausible on stylistic grounds as is claimed: at 1:28 Paul does exactly the same and the noun even happens to be θεὸς. There is some textual variation (as I discuss above at 1:28), but this strengthens the case for the longer reading of 8:28: the fact that scribes arguably altered the repeated noun in both places suggests that in general they considered such writing stylistically unsatisfying. θεὸς comes in an unusual place for a nominative subject in v.28, near the end and after the verb, so if it was added by a scribe for clarity, it was added with remarkable ineptness. Moreover, everywhere else in Paul, an οἴδαμεν clause introducing an accepted belief or fact has a stated subject (Cranfield (who in the end supports the shorter reading)). Further, although συνεργῶ rarely takes a direct object, πάντα frequently functions as something like an adverbial accusative (notably in Paul 1 Cor 9:25; 10:33), such that the verse could mean “God works together in all things...” (Ross 1978).

This all demonstrates that the longer reading is as plausible as the shorter. Can we say it is more likely? In v.26, the stated subject of the verbs is clearly the Spirit; in v.29, the implied subject is God (because of υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ – Christ is not the Spirit’s son). Therefore, the subject must change somewhere between the verses; if there is no explicit change, the reader must think that the Spirit is the subject from v.26 and must encounter v.29 with confusion. V.27 has no stated nouns as subjects, but God seems to be the subject of v.27a and the Spirit of v.27b. Hence at the end of v.27, it is unclear what the next subject will be: an explicit subject is needed. Moreover, v.29 seems to follow directly from v.28 (because of the ὅτι). This means that if v.29 does not have a stated subject, it is presumably the same as that of v.28 (Ross 1978, 85). For all these reasons, either v.28 must state its subject explicitly or we must accuse Paul of profoundly unclear writing. Since there is reasonable external evidence for θεὸς as a
stated subject and a good explanation for its removal (not repeating the noun), we can take the longer reading as initial.

01, 04: linguistic improvement.

B

30:

προώρισεν
02 only: προέγνω.
Harmonisation to v.29 (Jewett, Longenecker).

A

οὖς δὲ ἐδικαίωσεν
02 only: καὶ οὖς ἐδικαίωσεν
Once again, we see 02’s fondness for changing particles/conjunctions (though unusually, here it removes δὲ). Presumably the motive is harmonising with other uses of καὶ (though elsewhere 02 explicitly changes γὰρ to δὲ to avoid repetition).

02: linguistic improvement.

A

34:

κατακρινόν
In some later witnesses, the word is accented κατακρίνων, making it present tense. This is noted in the NA\textsuperscript{28} apparatus, but irrelevant to us, because it is impossible to tell which was intended by the scribe of the majuscule pandects, because they lack accents. The exception to this is 03, which, according to Williams’ (2018) data, consistently spells a long i-vowel ει and a short i-vowel ι. However, Williams also demonstrates that this consistency is followed by no other early manuscript, so it is impossible to reconstruct the intended tense of the initial text.

Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς

𝔓\textsuperscript{46}, Armenian and Latin tradition: ἄμα δὲ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς

03, 20, various later witnesses: Χριστὸς
The external arguments do not support the ἅμα δὲ. The form of the name is more debatable. Moo points out that scribes normally add names more than they omit them: names are an example of where the “expansionary” criterion applies. Ehrman (1993, 151-52) suggests that Ἰησοῦς may have been added to prevent a Gnostic interpretation. The text without it is could be translated: “Is it Christ who died? No, rather he was raised”, suggesting “the Gnostic idea that the Christ departed from Jesus prior to his death” and that Jesus, but not Christ, actually died (Ehrman 1993, 151). However, one could equally make this case in the other way: the longer reading might be initial, because a Gnostic editor could have removed Ἰησοῦς, in order to make the Gnostic interpretation possible. In the end, four early manuscripts include the longer form of the name, so that is likely to be initial. Was the omission motivated by a desire to make the Gnostic interpretation possible? This is implausible, because Paul emphasises throughout Romans that Christ died (e.g. 3:24-25; 5:8; 6:1-11). If a Gnostic scribe wanted to avoid implying this, a minor change in 8:34 does not achieve it: such a scribe would be better off finding a different text to copy! The most likely explanation is TE by homoeoteleuton, which would be easy with nomina sacra.

03: TE

B

ἐγερθεὶς

01, 02, 04, various late evidence: ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν

03, M, P46, P27: text

The external arguments are unclear. Scholars as early as Sanday and Headlam suggest that the pattern of evidence distribution in this variation unit is the same as in the previous so there may be a connection. Ehrman (1993, 152) suggests, as he does in the previous variation unit, that the longer text guards against Gnosticism, since it makes clear that Christ rose from the dead, rather than ascending directly without dying first. However, as noted in the above variation unit, this is implausible because Paul emphasises so clearly in Romans that Christ died, so it is hard to imagine a scribe “tinkering” with odd verses to reduce this emphasis. Dunn points out that the longer phrase occurs 4:24; 6:4, 9; 7:4; 8:11; 10:9, so harmonisation is an obvious explanation.
for the longer reading. The longer reading is also clarificatory, and as such explicit or expansionary, which makes it less likely to be initial.

01, 02, 04: harmonisation

καὶ (1)

03, 20 late witnesses: omitted

Cranfield suggests that ὅς καὶ in the next clause might lead to harmonisation, but Weiss (1896, 111) argues the repetition of the phrase would motivate an omission. The majority of early manuscripts favour the longer reading, which suggest Weiss is right.

03: linguistic improvement.

A

τοῦ θεοῦ

03 only: θεοῦ

This singular reading is highly unlikely to be initial, nor is it plausible to read deep theological significance into it, given that it is not a regular habit of 03 to omit the article with θεοῦ. It is mostly likely a TE, such as could easily arise with a small and relatively contentless word.

03: transcription error.

A

35:

Χριστοῦ

01, later evidence, Sahidic: θεοῦ

03 only: θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ

02: lacunose

04, 20, copious later evidence: text

It is possible to attempt to reconstruct the reading of 02:
The next line begins ΘΛΙΨΙΣ. There is certainly not enough space for 03’s reading, but slightly more space than for any of the others. It is most likely that 02 originally read either ΘΥ or XY and the scribe left a small gap at the end of the line, rather than break a syllable.

03’s reading is unlikely on external grounds. It is likely the result of harmonisation to v.39. Although harmonisation to later text is less likely than harmonisation to earlier, v.39 is very memorable and so similar in language and content to this verse that confusion would be plausible. Many scholars make the same claim for θεοῦ (Cranfield, Fitzmyer, Longenecker, Metzger). There are also a number of positive arguments for Χριστοῦ as initial. Metzger suggests that Χριστοῦ is likely because it bridges v.34 and v.35. Lietzmann argues that it is difficilior because the reader expects God to be the agent of love, but Christ to be its instrument. Dunn argues that θεοῦ may have been introduced to avoid a high Christology – rather than speak of Jesus as God, simply speak of God. The only strong argument for θεοῦ as initial is found in Weiss (1896, 8), who suggests that v.34 is a nearer influence than v.39. However, this does not cancel out the many arguments just given for Χριστοῦ. It is difficult to be certain whether θεοῦ was introduced for theological reasons (to avoid a high Christology, as explained above) or as a harmonisation. As I have already discussed, minor “tinkering” with Paul’s text is a rather ineffective way to change the theology of an entire community, so harmonisation is more likely.

01, 03: harmonisation.
B
38:

ἀρχαὶ
04, various versional and Latin-linked witnesses: ἀρχαὶ οὔτε ἐξουσία (with variation in order).
01, 02, 03: text

The addition is clearly the result of harmonisation to elsewhere in the Pauline corpus, where ἀρχαὶ and ἐξουσίαν are frequently found together (e.g. Eph 1:21; 3:10; 6:12; Col 1:16, 2:10, 15) (Jewett, Moo).

04: harmonisation.

A

39:

τῷ κυρίῳ
02, 04 only: τοῦ κυρίου

Given the scant external evidence supporting 02 and 04, this is fairly clearly a TE, resulting from the genitive endings immediately before these words.

02, 04: TE.

A

Romans 15

Most of the beginning of the chapter in 04 is damaged.

4:

προεγράφη... ἐγράφη
03, Latin evidence, Clement of Alexandria: ἐγράφη... ἐγράφη

02, 20, many late witnesses: προεγράφη... προεγράφη

01, 04, 06, 010, 012, late witnesses: text
It is fairly clear that the initial reading is where harmonisation is avoided and the two different verbs are preserved. There is no evidence that the order of the verbs was ever reversed.

02, 03: harmonisation.

A

εἰς

03, 025, 044, 33: πάντα εἰς

01, 02, 04: text

The external evidence for the longer reading is fairly weak, so it can be regarded as “an improving elaboration” (Dunn; Cranfield agrees).

03: content change.

A

έχωμεν

03, Clement of Alexandria, Vulgate manuscripts: έχωμεν τῆς παρακλήσεως.

Commentators agree that the reading of 03 is not initial, since it is both expansionary and supported by little external evidence. It does not make particular sense in context, so the best explanation is probably that it arose through accidentally skipping back a line at a line break and then skipping forward two lines, thus meaning that τῆς παρακλήσεως from earlier in the verse was copied again (Cranfield, Dunn, Jewett, Lietzmann; Weiss 1896, 90).

03: TE.

A

5:

Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν

01, 02, 04, Latin, Syriac and other later evidence: Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν

03, 20, other late evidence: text

As noted above, Jongkind (2019b) has demonstrated that 03 habitually places Χριστός first, in order to reflect Paul’s own habitual order. 03 is, as it were, trying to be more
Pauline than Paul. Given the strong external evidence for Ἰσηοῦν first, this is the likely explanation.

03: linguistic improvement.

7:

ὑμᾶς

03 and various versional witnesses: ἰμᾶς

The external evidence seems mildly weighted towards ὑμᾶς, with three early manuscripts and a large number of later ones. It also fits better in the context, since it is part of the reason for an imperative, which fits better with a second person pronoun (the first person somehow blunts the force of the imperative – “you do something because something has happened to you” is more powerful than “you do something because something has happened to us”) (Cranfield, Dunn, Lietzmann, Longenecker, Metzger). What then lies behind the reading of 03? It is most likely to be harmonisation to the various first-person pronouns in vv.1-2 (Barrett, Moo). Cranfield suggests it may have come from liturgical use, which is possible, but somewhat speculative: there is no reason to posit harmonisation to a liturgy of which we have no evidence, when the issue could be explained by harmonisation to a known and nearby text.

03: harmonisation.

8:

γεγενήσθαι

03, 04, later evidence: γενέσθαι

01, 02, 20, considerable later evidence: text

In 04, the opening syllables of the previous verse, διάκονον, appear to have been written again by a corrector and there has been some correcting and rewriting, the details of which are not easy to parse. I follow Tischendorf and Lyon that the original reading was ΓΕΝΕΣΘΕ, an orthographic variant for γενέσθαι later corrected to ΓΕΓΕΝΗΣΘΕ, so the final reading of the scriptorium team was γενέσθαι.
Most scholars prefer the perfect both on external grounds and because it makes clear that Christ is still the servant, even in his glorified, exalted status (Barrett, Jewett, Longenecker, in varying degrees of detail). Intriguing though this theological explanation is, a transcriptional explanation seems easier: it is only haplography and a few changed vowel quantities that change the perfect to the aorist.

03, 04: TE.
A

11:

αἰνεῖτε

03 and some later evidence: λέγει αἰνεῖτε.

External evidence favours the shorter reading (Longenecker) and the longer reading makes the introduction of the quoted materials clearer (which would be important in manuscripts with less speech punctuation than modern books) (Dunn; Weiss 1896, 102).

03: linguistic improvement.
A

πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τὸν κύριον

04: τὸν κύριον πάντα τὰ ἔθνη
Even with the multi-spectral images, the line is hard to read in 04, but Tischendorf and Lyon agree on the variant. Moreover, the spacing before and after the letters we can see, ΠΑΝΤ and ΚΑΙ ΕΠΑΙΝ are consistent with the variant.

The reading of 04 is the same wording as in OG, so it is likely a harmonisation.

A

12:

Ἡσαῖας λέγει
01 only: λέγει Ἡσαῖας
TE.
A

ἀνιστάμενος
01 only: ἀνιστανόμενος
Linguistic non-improvement.
A

13:

πληρώσαι
03, 010, 012: πληροφορήσαι

03’s reading is unlikely on both external grounds (it has little support) and internal (πληροφορέω comes only six times in the NT and only once (2 Tim 4:5) in the active (Cranfield)). Weiss (1896, 31) argues that the reading of 03 is initial because it is significantly difficlior. Cranfield suggests that 03’s reading is the result of harmonisation to 14:5, but it is implausible that a scribe would want to harmonise to such a rare word. Indeed Cranfield’s argument has a certain inner tension here: it is difficult to argue that 03’s reading is not initial both because it is unusual and because it is a harmonisation. Dunn suggests that 03’s word emphasises the idea of fullness, but so surely does the alternative. In the end, external evidence must tell against 03. The explanations based on harmonisation or content have the problems I have noted, so presumably whoever made the change thought the word expressed some particular important nuance.

03: content change.

B

πάσης...εἰρήνης
03, 010, 012: ἐν πάσῃ χαρᾷ καὶ εἰρήνη

The pattern of attestation for the different case is the same as for the different verb, in the previous variant and they are almost certainly related. Those witnesses that have πληροφορέω changed the case of the noun to reflect that. For the purposes of counting the frequency of different types of variant, I do not therefore count this.

εἰς τὸ περισσεῖν
03, 945, 1505: omitted.

Almost certainly haplography occasioned by the previous articular infinitive.

03: TE.

A
The external evidence is strongly against 03 being initial. The semantic range of prepositions is notoriously difficult to define and therefore we would be foolish to speculate in detail about a content reason for the change. Presumably the scribe of this variant simply thought ὑπὲρ was better style here. As Weiss (1896, 58) points out, relatively arbitrary change of similar prepositions is very much in character for 03. 03: linguistic improvement.

The external evidence is relatively evenly divided and if anything favours the anarthous reading. It seems that the editors of NA²⁸ were guided by precisely the reverence for 01 and 03 that this thesis is questioning. The omission is a plausible TE. Further, the regular construction with πᾶς and an abstract noun is that the noun is anarthous (e.g. from across the NT, Matt 3:15 (with πληρῶ), Col 3:16, 1 Tim 5:2). With the article, we would have to envisage that Paul is referring to some specific knowledge and it is difficult to see why, in that case, he does not make that clearer. Thus it seems the article is not initial. 01, 03: TE.

The external evidence is in favour of the NA²⁸ reading, but not overwhelmingly so, given that two early manuscripts favour the other one. Blass, Debrunner and Funk (1961, 55) note that “Adverbs of manner in -ως which are formed from adjectives
sometimes have a comparative in -τέρως; however –τερον still preponderates in Attic”. This may suggest that the -ov reading is an Atticisation.\(^5\) Both here and at 2 Tim 1:17 (Weiss 1896, 59), it is the later witnesses that have the -ov, which might suggest it is a linguistic improvement from after the key period of Atticisation in the second century (see Kilpatrick 1990).

01, 04: linguistic improvement.

A

\(\text{ἀπὸ}\)

\(\text{𝔓46, } \text{𝔓20,}\) extensive late and versional evidence: \(\text{ἀδελφοὶ ἀπὸ}\)

Aasgard argues that the external evidence is fairly balanced here, because the versions favour the longer text and \(\text{𝔓46}\) is going against its general trend for shortened readings. This is also the type of variation unit where the versions are significant: the omission or inclusion of a content word is the kind of variant which, if present in a translation, was probably present in the Vorlage. The fact that \(\text{ἀδελφοί}\) also comes in the previous verse is an argument both for and against its inclusion here: Paul is presumably unlikely to have written it twice, but if he did later scribes would be very likely to correct it (Aasgard 2004, 317-18). Metzger and Longenencker suggest the longer reading may originate with the lectionary. In general, vocatives like this are more likely to be omitted than added, as Aasgard (2004, 310) argues, because they are rarely necessary to the syntax of their sentence, so drop out easily. This arguments tips the weight of evidence. It is easy to imagine the scribes removing the word, because it had been repeated earlier. 01, 02, 03, 04: linguistic improvement.

B

\(\text{ἐπαναμιμνήσκων}\)

03 only: \(\text{ἀναμιμνήσκων}\)

Probably a TE due to a new column beginning.

A

\(^5\) For a defence of the phenomenon of Atticisation in the NT copying tradition, see Kilpatrick 1990.
ὑπὸ
01, 03, 010: ἀπὸ

This is a difficult variation unit. Although the number of manuscripts obviously favours ὑπὸ, two early ones have ἀπὸ. ἀπὸ would express the place from which the grace originates and ὑπὸ the agent by whom it is given. ἀπὸ could plausibly have arisen by influence of the greeting formula (e.g. 1:7; 1 Cor 1:3; 2 Cor 1:2; Cranfield) and its use earlier in the verse. Certainty is impossible. In the end, the mass of external evidence decides the matter, with appropriate caution.

01, 03: harmonisation.

C

16:

eἰς τὰ ἔθνη
03: omitted

External evidence is overwhelmingly against 03. There is no particularly convincing explanation apart from TE. (Cranfield, Longenecker; Weiss 1896, 108).

A

γένηται
03, 1881: γενήθηνη

Weiss (1896, 47) suggests that 03 has the initial reading here, because these mood changes are common and the subjunctive may be due to the influence of 15:31. However this proves Weiss’ case to be possible, rather than likely. The external evidence is strongly against 03. Longenecker and Jewett suggest that the change to indicative may be because the success of Paul’s mission was a certain, past fact at the time the manuscripts were copied. This is as convincing a suggestion as any other.

03: linguistic improvement.

A
17:

τὴν καύχησιν

01, 02, much late evidence, M: καύχησιν

Lyon includes the article in his transcription of 04, but Tischendorf includes it only in his notes and with hesitation; I can see virtually nothing, even in the multi-spectral images. Sanday and Headlam comment: “C seems uncertain”. In the image, one can just see on the far left the EX of ἔχω. I follow Lyon’s greater experience of the manuscript, but the matter is doubtful.

The external evidence for the article is weak. However, it could easily be omitted by a transcriptional jump from the nu of οὖν to that of τίν. The sentence is also easier to understand with the article. The article picks a particular boast Paul has, which he then defines. This reflects how the definite article works in Greek: in English, the article tells the listener that the speaker is referring to something the listener already has knowledge of; in Greek, it tells the listener that the speaker is referring to something that the speaker already has knowledge of (Peters 2014, 180-81).

01, 02: TE.

B

18:

tολμήσω τι λαλεῖν

03: τολμῶ τι λαλεῖν

𝔓46: τι τολμήσω λαλεῖν

01, 02, 04: text

A wide range of other minor variations elsewhere in the tradition.
The issues are essentially the order of the words and the tense of the two verbs. Regarding the word order, the early manuscripts agree, apart from \( \Psi^{46} \). The significantly doubtful variant therefore is the tense of \( \tau \omicron \lambda \omicron \mu \eta \sigma \omega \). The future is better attested and is *difficilior*, because the context is more present (“I have now this boast, therefore I now dare to speak”) (Jewett, Longenecker). Weiss (1896, 41) observes that 03 does a similar change to conform tenses at 1 Cor 7:38 (though there the change is present to future).

03: harmonisation.

A

e\i\i\z

03: \( \lambda \omicron \gamma \omega \ \epsilon\i\i\z \)

The external evidence is clearly against 03. Jewett suggests the reason is to make clear that authority and power does not lie in Paul’s person and deeds (which were obviously unavailable in the time of 03), but in his words, which survive.

03: content change.

A

\( \upsilon \alpha \kappa \omicron \omicron \omicron \nu \)

03 alone: \( \acute \alpha \kappa \omicron \omicron \omicron \nu \)

The reading of 03 is clearly, on external grounds, not initial. There is no obvious source of TE through haplography or dittography and there are two possible harmonisations. Dunn suggests 10:16-17. This is a powerful and resonant harmonisation, since in that passage, Paul is discussing the need for Gospel-preachers to the nations. Here he talks about himself as a Gospel-preacher to the nations. A more remote possibility is OG 1 Sam 15:22, a memorable text saying that obedience is better than sacrifice, which could easily have lingered with the writer of 03.

03: harmonisation.

A

\( 19: \)

\( \pi \nu \epsilon \omicron \mu \mu \alpha \tau \omicron \zeta \theta \omicron \omicron \delta \)

03 alone: \( \pi \nu \epsilon \omicron \mu \mu \alpha \tau \omicron \zeta \)

83
02 and extensive late evidence: πνεῦματος ἁγίου
01, Ψ46, M and extensive late evidence: text

04: impossible to say. Lyon suggests ἁγίου and Tischendorf leaves five blank spaces, rather than four, but there is significantly more space that is needed for either. Tischendorf cites Wettstein saying ἁγίου with no note of doubt, so maybe it was clearer in his time. The relevant word would be on the right hand side of the image. The multispectral image begins with the AM of δυνάμει.

Several commentators opt for the reading of 03 (no additional word after πνεῦματος), since it is the least expansionary and most likely to lead to all the others, because the lack of a clarifying word would lead to two different ones being supplied (Cranfield, Jewett, Sanday and Headlam). On the other hand, the external evidence for 03’s reading is so weak that it is unlikely to be initial. Which of the other readings is more likely to be initial? ἁγίου has weaker external evidence (only 02 of early manuscripts, against Ψ46 and 01). It could also easily result from harmonisation to v.13 and standard liturgical ways of referring to God’s spirit.

03: TE.
02: harmonisation.
A

20:

φιλοτιμούμενον
Ψ46, 03, Latin-linked evidence: φιλοτιμούμαι

01, 02, many later witnesses, 20: text.
The participle both has greater external evidence and is *difficilior*. It is perfectly admissible syntax and is best taken as accusative, masculine, in apposition to με, not, as Cranfield does, as neuter. Either way, 03’s reading certainly makes it easier to read. 03: linguistic improvement.

**A**

In 04, this whole sub-section is almost completely illegible, even on the multi-spectral images, apart from in the gap between the columns of the over-writing. There we can see parts of εὐαγγέλιον and φιλοτιμούμενον. However, these words should be less than a line apart, if 04 had the same text as NA, so it seems likely that 04 had some textual peculiarity, but we cannot know what. I assume it was a TE, following my general policy when in doubt, but rate as C to express my uncertainty.

**21:**

οἶς...ὄψονται

03 and Ambrosiaster alone: ὄψονται οἶς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ (i.e. the verb is brought to the front)

Although 03’s reading has minimal external support, it enjoys the support of Cranfield and Jewett, because the other reading preserves the word order of OG. Weiss (1896, 135) adds that it also harmonises with the structure of the second line, which also has the verb at the end. Valid as these points are, they cannot overturn the weight of external evidence, especially given that our LXX manuscripts exhibit a similar range of variants to our NT ones and it is entirely plausible that 03 was harmonising to an LXX reading available to the scribe, but which has not made into our critical text. It is also possible that TE caused 03’s reading, if a scribe skipped a line to ὄψονται, realised the mistake and then copied the rest of the phrase. This is more likely that positing an LXX variant, which though plausible, has not in fact survived.

03: TE.

**B**
22:

τὰ πολλὰ
03, Ψ⁴⁶, Latin-linked evidence: πολλάκις

The external evidence is relatively evenly divided, given that πολλάκις has two early manuscripts. Dunn suggests that τὰ πολλὰ is difficilior, but Longenecker makes the same claim for the other reading. Cranfield and Weiss (1896, 66) note that πολλάκις is also used in 1:13, but this hardly proves that it is a harmonisation. The weight of external evidence for τὰ πολλὰ appears slightly greater – three early manuscripts and a range of later evidence. Presumably the scribe who wrote πολλάκις thought it was stylistically better. It is not a change easy to explain in any other way. The theory of harmonisation to 1:13 seems far-fetched – finding that a relatively common word is used both in a variant reading and somewhere else, fourteen chapters removed hardly proves, by itself, that the variant is a harmonisation.
03: linguistic improvement.
C

23:

τοῦ ἐλθεῖν
02: ἐλθεῖν
TE.
A

πολλῶν
03, 04, some later evidence: ικανῶν
01, 02, Ψ⁴⁶, 20, other later evidence: text

The external evidence is arguably with πολλῶν, but the alternative enjoys surprising support from the commentators: Barrett, Cranfield and Weiss all cite ικανῶν as original, since it is difficilior and (so Weiss 1896, 20) πολλῶν may have come from the influence of πολλὰ earlier. Metzger, Jewett and Longenecker suggest by contrast that ικανῶν is the more polished and well-written word and the alternative is difficilior. The uncertainty over the internal arguments means it is wisest to rely on external evidence
and prefer πολλῶν, which has three early witnesses. There is no obvious harmonisation or difference of content motivating the change and it is not a plausible TE, but it is a very plausible linguistic improvement, since, as Metzger, Jewett and Longenecker suggest, ἵκανος is a more elegant word.

03, 04: linguistic improvement.

B

24:

διαπορευόμενος

02, Ψ46 only: πορευόμενος

The external evidence is against 02 and Ψ46, but not decisively. Cranfield points out that 02’s reading may be the result of harmonisation to πορεύομαι, in the same verse.

02: harmonisation.

B

ἀφ’

Ψ46, 03, later evidence: ἠφ’

The external evidence is relatively even once again and the difference between the two readings is obviously a subtle one. The most plausible explanation is given by Dunn, who argues that ἠφ’ removes the implication that Paul needed the help of the Roman Christians, so that the phrase means “sent on from”, not “sent on by”.

03: content change.

B

25:

διακονόν

01 alone: διακονήσων

Ψ46, Latin-linked evidence: διακονήσαι

The NA28 reading has the best external evidence (02, 03, 04 and many late witnesses) and is also the least suitable in context, since either of the others could have the sense
of purpose which the context requires. This makes it very likely that the NA²⁸ reading is initial. The others represent two attempts to “tidy up” a difficult reading.

01: linguistic improvement.

A

26:

εὐδόκησαν

𝔓⁴⁶, 03, 1241, Speculum: εὐδόκησεν

The external evidence is marginally in favour of the plural and the singular is likely the result of harmonisation to the singular subject, Μακεδονία. Although the subject is in a sense plural, because Achaia is also included, in Koine Greek multiple singular nouns typically take a singular verb (e.g. John 20:3a; Acts 20:4, where a long list of names takes a singular verb) (Jewett, Longenecker).

03: harmonisation.

B

28:

σφραγισάμενος

01 only: σφραγισαμένοις

TE.

A

αὐτοῖς

03, Ψ⁴⁶, some Latin evidence: omitted

04: αὐτός

It is unclear what is the right solution here. The external evidence is relatively even, with a slight edge to including the pronoun. Such small, inconsequential words could easily be omitted by TE, but it could also be seen as an expansion, such that it is likely to be the result of scribal addition. Jewett suggests the word may be added by influence of v.27, but this is a weak argument for basic words which a writer must inevitably use often (we would scarcely argue for an article being omitted in the initial text on the
grounds that it was included in the previous words and therefore is probably a harmonisation!). 04’s singular pronoun is clearly a variant on the plural pronoun and therefore 04 is evidence for the presence of a pronoun of some kind in the initial text. This means there is only weak external evidence for a reading with no pronoun at all. Of the two possible forms of the pronoun, the plural has better external evidence. 04’s singular is a subtle content change, portraying Paul as emphasising his own role in his mission.

03: TE.
C
04: content change.
A

Σπανίαν
04: τὴν Σπανίαν
Linguistic improvement.
A

30:

ἀδελφοί

𝔓16, 03 only: omit

Although only two witnesses omit the word, it is nevertheless bracketed in NA28 and the omission has the support of Cranfield, Dunn and cautiously Sanday and Headlam. Aasgard (2004, 312-13) suggests the support for the omission “is clearly due to an overemphasis on the reliability of the two manuscripts”. I suggest that Aasgard is right and that this is an example of the danger of assuming too much about the value of particular, famous manuscripts. Aasgard identifies a standard Pauline request formula, involving παρακαλῶ, a connecting particle, ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, a prepositional phrase and then the actual request.6 Like any formula, there are variations where appropriate, but here we have all the elements with only the possible omission of the vocative and no reason in the rhetoric or structure of the sentence for Paul to omit it. This is a strong

---

6 For the precise formula: Rom 12:1, 1 Cor 1:10. For minor variations: Rom 16:17; 1 Cor 4:16; 16:15-16; 2 Cor 10:1; 1 Thess. 4:1, 10; 5:12, 14.
internal argument for including the word, which could easily have dropped by TE, since it is not essential to the syntax of the sentence.

03: TE.

B

31:

διακονία εἰς

03, Latin-linked evidence: δωροφορία ἐν

The external evidence is against δωροφορία, which is also substantially facilior. Metzger points out that διακονία εἰς is clumsy with a place name and δωροφορία does not occur elsewhere in the NT, so δωροφορία is likely to be a later gloss for clarity. Jewett adds that διακονία implies a subordination of Paul to Jerusalem, which later scribes, especially in the Latin, Roman tradition, might well have wanted to avoid. Thus either language or content could explain the change. In accordance with my methodology, in this case of doubt, I opt for language, but rate it B.

03: linguistic improvement.

B

32:

ἐν χαρᾷ ἐλθὼν

01 only: ἐλθὼν ἐν χαρᾷ

𝔓46, 03, M, late evidence: ἐν χαρᾷ ἐλθὼν

02, 04, some later witnesses: text

The external evidence is relatively even (taking 01 as evidence for the participle – the changed order is presumably merely transcriptional). The participle is perhaps difficilior because the syntax is more complicated (Metzger, Jewett). Weiss (1896, 50) however argues convincingly that the subjunctive is initial, because scribes tend to change finite verbs to participles. Cranfield connects this variant to the omission of συναναπάσωμαι ήμῖν, later in the verse. Ψ46 and 03 omit this phrase and this means they need to have a subjunctive verb after ἵνα, so they convert ἐλθὼν. This removes the significant early support for the subjunctive as initial.
01: TE.
03: linguistic improvement (to improve the language in the light of another variant).

B

θεοῦ
01 only: Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
03 only: κυρίου Ἰησοῦ
Latin-linked evidence: Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ
𝔓46, 02, 04, 20, later evidence: text

If θεοῦ was initial, it is hard to see from where so many early variant names for Jesus could have arisen. On the other hand, θελήμα belongs more often in Paul to God, than to Jesus (Rom 1:10; 1 Cor 1:1; 2 Cor 1:1; 8:5; Gal 1:4 (Lietzmann)), so this is likely to be initial. The best explanation available is that nomina sacra make TEs with divine names in the genitive very easy.

01, 03: TE.

C

συναναπάσωμαι ὑμῖν
𝔓46, 03 only: omitted

20 and late evidence: καὶ συναναπάσωμαι ὑμῖν
Various late witnesses: minor variations on the verb
𝔓118vid, 01, 02, 04: text

The verb is unusual – in the Greek Bible it occurs only here and at Isa 11:6, where it has a different meaning (Moo). This explains both the various attempts to alter and omit it (Jewett). It is certainly unlikely either that it would be added by more than one scribe independently or that it could spread as widely as it has done within the tradition if it was not in the initial text.

03: linguistic improvement.

A
33:

ἀμήν

02, Ψ^46, 010, 012: omitted

The fact that it would be so easy for a scribe, presumably saturated in monastic liturgy, to add an Amen to the end of a prayer, combined with the reasonable external evidence for the omission, suggests that the ἀμήν is not initial.

01, 02, 03: harmonisation (to liturgy).

B

So ends the analysis of each variation unit in Romans. I will tabulate and analyse the data at the end of entire thesis. For now, we can note that 02 has an interesting tendency to alter conjunctions and in particular to replace γάρ with δέ. This happens at 1:17; 8:18 and 8:22. 02 also changes τε to δέ at 1:27. It also omits δέ in 1:12 and 8:30. At 1:12, 02 does not replace δέ with another word, so the issue is not choice of conjunction, but at 8:30, 02 replaces δέ with καί. In other words, there is evidence for the careful thought about choice of connector in the text of 02. There is specifically mild evidence for the favouring of δέ. Possibly the text was thought to flow better with the milder connector. More significant findings must wait until the conclusion to the entire thesis.
In this chapter, I present my analysis for John, using the same format and methodology I used for Romans. Of the four Gospels, I have chosen John because we have a large number of early papyri, which means that we are more able to accurately reconstruct the earliest text of John than for the other Gospels. There are a number of papyri of Matthew as well, but most of Matthew is missing in 02. Within John, I have chosen 1:1-42 and all of chapters 17 and 20, since this gives roughly the right amount of text, gives material from the beginning, middle and end, maximises the amount of text where all four manuscripts are extant and gives a mixture of narrative and theological discourse (though the theological discourse is mostly in the form of the prayer in chapter 17).

The redaction history of the fourth Gospel is irrelevant to this thesis, since I am concerned with the pandects as tradents of the initial text, that is the text in the earliest possible form we can reconstruct it from our extant witnesses. It is irrelevant if this text was created using prior sources. Chapter 21 may arguably not be part of this initial text, because there is manuscript evidence that it was added after the rest of the work was complete (Nongbri 2018). This is why I do not analyse chapter 21, even though, other things being equal, it would be advantageous to take material from the beginning, middle and end of the Gospel. For convenience’s sake, I use the term “author” throughout this chapter to refer to the person who produced the initial text, even though some may argue that “final redactor” is more appropriate. I call this author “John”, also for convenience’s sake, without wishing to imply any views on his or her actual name or identity.
Verse-by-Verse Analysis

**John 1**

3:

οὐδὲ ἐν

𝔓66, 01, 05, Theodotus: οὐδέν

In 04, all that is visible is ΔΕΕΝ, but this is enough to prove that it is the longer reading.

Although the majority of early evidence is with the longer reading, the shorter has sufficiently early evidence to have a “place at the table”. Korting (1989) argues that the shorter reading is initial. He cites evidence from Origen and Hippolytus. He argues that οὐδὲν\(^1\) works well if the full-stop is placed after ὃ γέγονεν. He argues that the whole of v.3 has a chiastic structure such that ὃ γέγονεν parallels and has the same meaning as πάντα. οὐδὲν is adverbial, meaning “not at all, no way”. The whole of v.3 can be translated: “All things were made through him; [everything] that was made was in no way made without him.” Korting justifies the second, bracketed “everything” by noting that in LXX, πᾶς normally translates the Hebrew לֹכ. In poetry, לֹכ is often written in one line, but also governs the one after, e.g. Isa 18:3a. Importantly, Korting explains how the shorter reading leads to the longer: a scribe reading v.3 reaches οὐδὲν and, reasonably enough, thinks the sentence needs a noun subject and that οὐδὲν can serve as such. It then naturally enough becomes more emphatically and clearly a noun and is changed to οὐδὲ ἐν. It is then not obvious what to do with ὃ γέγονεν, so it becomes read as part of the next sentence.

If Korting is right, this is an ingenious argument for both his preferred punctuation in vv.3b-4a and οὐδὲν here. However herein lies the weakness of his hypothesis: he requires us to ignore the weight of external evidence in not one, but two, variation units. The strong external evidence is for οὐδὲ ἐν and the vast majority of early witnesses with punctuation and most Fathers place the full stop before ὃ γέγονεν. It is surely best to find an explanation, if possible, which admits both, rather than neither.

---

\(^1\) Accented grave, because Korting does not think it ends the sentence and I am explaining his view.
Scholars disagree about which form of the negative fits best with which punctuation in vv.3b-4a. Bultmann suggests that ουδὲ ἐν goes well with the later stop, but Barrett argues that ουδὲ ἐν could easily be the ending of a Greek sentence and so goes well with the earlier stop. Miller (1989, 20) points out that in fact either form of the negative is plausible on either punctuation. However we may solve the punctuation puzzle, the best external evidence for the form of the negative is with οὐδὲ ἐν. Simple haplography best explains the shorter negative. It is of course possible that 01 changed the negative, because the relevant scribe read the passage like Korting, but it is surely more likely to be simple haplography.

01: TE.

B

4:

كورونا (1)

01, 05, OL, Sahidic, some MSS of Origen: ἐστὶν

Boismard (1953, 24-25) argues that the present tense is initial, because it is attested by both what he sees as “Alexandrian” evidence (01, Origen) and what he sees as “Western” (05, OL). However this assumes a theory of text-types rejected by many today (see Epp 2014). He also argues that the present is preferable on internal grounds, because he favours placing the disputed full-stop in v.3 before ὃ γέγονεν. The present could easily have been changed to the past by harmonisation with the earlier past tenses of εἰμι. The problem here is that both instances of the verb “to be” in v.4 were presumably originally in the same tense, if the passage is to be coherent (Barrett, Bultmann, Beasley-Murray). Boismard answers this by arguing that the second instance was also originally past. There seems however to be nothing to motivate this conjecture. Given the unanimous external evidence for the second ἦν, the pressing external evidence for the first and the strong likelihood that both words were in the same tense in the initial text, it seems best to reconstruct two instances of ἦν.

Moreover, it is not difficult to explain the ἐστὶν. Many scholars agree that the present tense sits much better with the earlier full-stop in v.3 (Beasley-Murray, Bernard, Bultmann, Lagrange, Westcott and Hort; Vawter 1963, 402 n. 25). With a present tense
verb, it becomes possible to paraphrase vv.3b-4 like this: “That which was created in him is alive…”, i.e. the sentence affirms the current life of what was created in (or perhaps better “by”) the logos. Certainly, the most plausible explanation for ἐστιν is the influence of the earlier full-stop.

01: harmonisation.

A

tῶν ἀνθρώπων

03: these words are added in the margin, with an obelus to highlight them. Versace (2018, 135) is confident this was in scriptorium, so it is irrelevant to this project.

10: αὐτοῦ

01 only: αὐτόν

It is unlikely that 01 is initial, but what is the explanation for the change? Commenting on the second αὐτόν in the verse, Lagrange points out that John’s use of the masculine form makes it clear that John is referring once again to the logos, not the light (because φῶς is neuter). 01’s text makes this even clearer. However, given that it is clear even with one αὐτόν, this is hardly an adequate explanation for a second. It is also possible that 01 is intending a deliberate change of meaning: διὰ + genitive has a more instrumental sense than the more strictly causal διὰ + accusative. However, it is hard to see why 01 would want to express that, since the context of the prologue portrays the logos as instrumental (notably v.3). A simple TE caused by influence of the second αὐτόν, in a very similar context, is surely the simplest explanation.

12: ἔλαβον

03 only: appears to have originally been ἔλαβαν, i.e. an attempt to form the word as something like a first aorist. This is a not uncommon phenomenon that also happens at, e.g., the A-text of OG Judges 1:24 (interestingly, 03 has the regular, second aorist
form). This is corrected with a supra-linear omicron, but Tischendorf dates the corrector as post-scriptorium.

03: linguistic non-improvement.
A

13:

οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρός

03: Added in the margin by majuscule hand. Versace (2018, 134) argues the correction was in scriptorium and so it is not relevant.

ἐκ (3)
01 only: omitted
(03: in the omission above)
Probably TE, given the amount of similar language in the verse.
A

ἐγενήθησαν

02, 03*, Ψ75, 032: ἐγενήθησαν (i.e. one less nu)²

The second nu has been added by a corrector of 03, whom Tischendorf dates post-scriptorium.

² NA²⁸ does not include it. For apparatus data, see McHugh.
The shorter reading could be the aorist passive of γίνομαι (Moulton, Howard and Turner 1908-76, 2.232), but it is more likely to be simply a spelling variant of the aorist passive of γεννάω. None of the examples of γίνομαι in LSJ or BDAG, with the meaning “be born” are in the passive form, but all in the middle. Searching the TLG (n.d.) for examples of the form with the single nu meaning “be born” would not be especially helpful here, since the likely result would be a large number of instances where the verb could reasonably be parsed either as γίνομαι or as γεννάω spelled with a single nu. It is possible that the single nu form is the result of the influence of a number of instances of γίνομαι in the immediate context. However, given that spellings vary widely in ancient manuscripts, it is much more likely that we have here a variant spelling of an expected word than a highly unusual (in this context) word that is spelled “correctly” by modern standards.

Some parts of the Latin tradition (possibly supported by the Curetonian Syriac (McHugh)) render this word natus est, making the whole verse singular, such that it is translated something like “who was born, not of blood…”. Although this reading has generated a surprising amount of scholarly support (specifically McHugh, Zahn and Boismard 1950), it has no Greek manuscript support and is therefore highly unlikely to be initial.

14:

καὶ (4)

03: added by a corrector, whom Tischendorf dates post-scriptorium.

Without the καὶ, the phrase makes reasonable sense: ἀληθείας can be taken as a genitive of apposition, such that the whole phrase means “full of [the] grace of truth” or “full of..."
grace, that is truth”. However, it is more likely that it was a TE, because it is such a small change and occurs nowhere else in the tradition.

03: TE.
A

15:

ον εἰπὼν

01: ον εἰπὼν (see below for the accentuation)

03, 04, Origen: ο εἰπὼν (in 03, there has been correction to the text reading, but the original omega is visible and the correction appears to be by the re-inker; in 04 I follow Lyon’s assignment of correctors)

The participle reading is difficult here and is dismissed by Bultmann as impossible. It is also plausibly explained by the influence of λέγων, soon before. However, it does have significant early attestation and so deserves consideration. Westcott interprets it as roughly: “John witnessed concerning him and cried out saying (this man [i.e. John the Baptist] is the one who spoke) “the one coming after me became before me...””. Needless to say, the relative clause with the indicative is much more natural, but that, of course, may be an argument against it being initial. Michaels suggests a better rendering of the participle reading: “John testified concerning him and cried out saying – this was the one who said “he who comes after was in advance of me, because he was before me” – that from the fullness of his grace...”. The clause serves to introduce John the Baptist to the reader and it does so by noting how he voiced sentiments in tune with
the main theme of the Gospel. Moreover, if the indicative reading were initial, we would expect ἔστι for ἦν. Certainty on the point is impossible, but the participle reading has strong external evidence, is plausible internally on Michaels’ interpretation and is difficilior. The indicative reading (found in 02) makes the flow of the sentence superficially easier.

The situation in 01 is more complicated. According to CSP, the first scribe omitted the phrase entirely, an in scriptorium corrector added the participle version and then another changed ὦ to ὦν. It seems that the final in scriptorium corrector attempted to correct the participle reading to the indicative, but only got as far as changing the article into a relative pronoun. It seems sensible to classify this botched correction as a TE. 01: TE. 02: linguistic improvement.

B ἔμπροσθέν μου
01: ὦς ἔμπροσθέν μου
The first scribe of 01 omitted completely the clause discussed in the previous variation unit, which makes the sentence difficult to read. This problem is solved by the added ὦς. This suggests that the very first scribe was copying from a manuscript with a text otherwise unknown to us, which omitted the ὦν εἶπον variation unit in any form, but which compensated by adding a relative pronoun. When the in-scriptorium corrector added ὦν εἶπον, she omitted to remove the ὦς (Schnackenburg). The presence of the ὦς as compensation for the loss of ὦν εἶπον suggests that the omission of ὦν εἶπον was not a mere TE by the first scribe of 01. I classify the previous variation unit as a TE in 01, because there the corrector omitted to “follow through” his correction; this variant is more of a deliberate improvement, to make the text make sense without the ὦν εἶπον clause.
01: linguistic improvement.
16:

ὅτι
02, 20: καὶ
𝔓66,75, 01, 03, 04, 05: text

ὅτι clearly has the best of the external evidence here. Zahn argues καὶ is initial because he claims v.16 is not part of John the Baptist’s speech, because the Baptist would be too humble to be spokesman for all the apostles or prophets (whom Zahn takes to be the ἡμεῖς πάντες). However, even if v.16 is not part of the speech, there is no reason why the sentence should not start with ὅτι, meaning “because”. Although this is difficilior than the smoother καὶ (McHugh, Schnackenburg, Westcott), it is entirely admissible Greek. It is also consistent with our findings at previous variation units. The reading I proposed as initial in v.15, ὃ εἶπον for ὃν εἶπον, only works if we read ὅτι here. 02 most likely changed to καὶ because it reads more smoothly.

02: linguistic improvement.

A

17:

Χριστοῦ
01 only: omitted

The only other time John uses the double name, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, is in 17:3, at the climactic point in Jesus’ high-priestly prayer (where 01 preserves both names). Thus, this variant may be harmonisation to Johannine style. However, omission due to homoeoteleuton is more likely, because nomina sacra would make this easy.

01: TE.

A

18:

μονογενῆς θεός
𝔓75, early corrector of 01: ὃ μονογενῆς θεός
02, ὁ ἡμοιογενής υἱὸς
Late corrections to 032: εἰ μὴ ὁ ἡμοιογενής υἱὸς
𝔓66, 01, 03, 04: text

Before resolving this variation unit, we must consider the meaning of μονογενής. Winter (1953) and Pendrick (1995) both separately present evidence that by John’s time, the word has no “parental” implications. It simply means “unique, peerless”. It is used of sole surviving children, whose siblings have died, who are unique but not only-born or only-begotten.

As will become clear, the strong consensus is for the NA 28 reading. The external evidence is clearly with μονογενής θεὸς. It commands all the early manuscripts, with the exception of Ψ 75, which has a minor variation. Abbott (1888a, 1888b) argues in favour of an initial υἱὸς on the basis of extensive Patristic testimony. He argues that when Fathers write μονογενής θεὸς, they are not citing this verse, but rather using a non-Biblical phrase in general use by theologians (like “Trinity” today). However, it is also possible that when a Father writes μονογενής υἱὸς, he is quoting John 3:16. These uncertainties simply demonstrate the ambiguities which surround citational evidence (see Fee 1993d, Blaski 2019).

It could be argued that θεὸς is the result of the influence of θεὸν immediately before, but in fact surely the θεὸν would cause a scribe to avoid θεὸς. Using the same noun twice almost introduces a contradiction to the sentence: no-one has seen God, but God has yet made himself known. θεὸς is also difficilior for theological reasons. To describe the λόγος, clearly separate from the πατὴρ as μονογενής θεὸς is to make a shocking statement to a Jewish monotheist, which would have caused controversy in the earliest period of copying (Lagrange, Michaels, Wengst, Westcott, Zahn; Hort 1876; Mastin 1976; McReynolds 1981; Fennema 1985). Moreover, υἱὸς is facilior, because it goes better both with μονογενής (since they are used together at 3:16, 18; 1 John 4:9; Brown) and with πατρὸς (Barrett). There would therefore be many reasons to change θεὸς to υἱὸς. The article then would naturally be added to υἱὸς after the change, so θεὸς best explains both the other major readings (Westcott).
There are also subtle internal arguments for θεός. Ross (1973-74) argues that in chapter 1, John is predicating a number of different titles to Jesus and delaying ιηής until later in the chapter. Fenema (1985, 129) points out that θεός is generally anarthrous in the Johannine prologue, so we could reasonably expect that here. Hort subtly analyses the inner movements of the prologue: in v.1 the logos is θεός; in v.14 he is μονογενής; in v.18 the two come together. The phrase is unusual and unique in the NT, but that is the whole point. The Johannine Jesus-logos, portrayed in the prologue, is a unique being and, as the prologue extolling his uniqueness reaches its climax, we should expect unusual language (Hort 1876, 13-16).

Given all these strong arguments for an initial θεός, it is unusual that Elliott (2010) characterises this variation unit as a “stalemate”. However, a number of scholars have argued for an initial ιηής. Ehrman (1993, 78-82) argues that this passage is an “orthodox corruption” and that θεός was introduced to combat an adoptionist Christology. However, he rejects the external evidence for θεός because he believes this evidence is restricted to manuscripts with the “Alexandrian” text – he is using the text-type-model which is increasingly questioned today (see Epp 2014). Moreover, the variant with θεός does sometimes appear in Gnostic, Valentinian and Arian texts so it is implausible that these groups would consider it necessary to change the word. Bultmann argues, without detailed explanation, that ιηής goes better with the participle phrase and that the change is either a dictation error or a mistranslation of an Aramaic original. The Aramaic argument is speculative and it is unclear why ιηής should go better with the participle. Lindars, citing a number of other scholars, suggests that ὁ μονογενὴς led to ὃς μονογενὴς, which led to θεός μονογενὴς, which led to μονογενὴς θεός by a series of TEs, which would have been easy in majuscules with nomina sacra. Although plausible, Lindars’ reconstruction is scarcely probable enough to overturn the arguments for μονογενὴς θεός.

For all these reasons, it seems reasonable to conclude that μονογενὴς θεός, the reading of NA28, is initial. From the discussion above, it will be clear that the reading of 02 seems to have had a variety of motives: the change to ιηής may have been prompted by harmonisation with 3:16 and 18 and an aversion to such a high Christology. Since these

---

3 Brown for the Arians. For the others, Mastin 1976, 40.
are complimentary, rather than competing, explanations, I will record both here. The addition of the article is a linguistic improvement, given the change to υἱὸς because it makes clear the text is talking about a single, definite son.

02: content change, harmonisation and linguistic improvement.

B

19:

πρὸς αὐτὸν
₽66*,75, 01, 20: omitted
₽66 corrector, 02: moved to after Λευίτας
03, 04: text

The external evidence here is evenly balanced. Regarding internal arguments, Zahn suggests that the phrase is “leichter zugesetz als fortgelassen” and McHugh concurs. This is reasonable, since it is a clarifying phrase that it would be hard to think of a reason to take out. On the other hand, it could be omitted by homoeoteleuton in its NA\textsuperscript{28} position. The fact that the shorter reading is in general difficilior perhaps just “tips the scales” in its favour. The motive for the addition is clearly increased clarity.

02, 03, 04: content change.

B

ἐρωτήσωσιν
01 only: ἐπερωτήσωσιν
₽75: ἐρωτήσουσιν

The indicative reading of ₪75 has little strong external evidence and is a very plausible scribal change. The compound verb of 01 also has too little evidence to be a serious contender for the initial text. LSJ defines ἐπερωτάω as “consult, enquire of”. It is used in OG Judg 18:5 (both texts), where it refers to enquiring of the Lord, and 2 Sam 11:7, where David enquires after the wellbeing of Joab. If anything, this seems slightly better suited to the context than the simple verb. Given that the word is used in this way in LXX, it would almost certainly have been familiar to the scribes of 01. It is a content change for clarity.

01: content change.
καὶ ὠμολόγησεν
01: omitted
Early post-scriptorium corrector of 04 (Tischendorf), OL: omit καὶ
It is of course entirely natural for a scribe to want avoid repetition, but, on the other hand, repetition is a Johannine device ‘(Zahn). The longer reading thus has both better external evidence and is difficilior. Since there has been no attempt to change the meaning, but merely to express it better, I classify the change as linguistic. Interestingly, 01 makes the same omission of a pleonastic verb of speaking at 1:32. 01: linguistic improvement.

αὐτὸν
01 only: omitted
TE. A

Before the question beginning τί...
01, OL, Peshitta: adds πάλιν
This is arguably the kind of variant where the versions are reliable, because it is easy to track the additions of content words, even across languages. However, its weak attestation in Greek means that ultimately the external evidence is against it. This is especially true given that it could plausibly have been added independently by multiple scribes or translators, because it is an obvious clarification, since the delegation have already asked the same question of John the Baptist in v.19. 01: content change. A
τί οὖν; σὺ Ἡλίας εἶ;
01: σὺ omitted
02, 20: τί οὖν; Ἡλίας εἶ σὺ;
03 only: σὺ οὖν τί; Ἡλείας εἶ;
𝔓66: τίς οὖν; σὺ Ἡλίας εἶ;
032 correction: τί οὖν; σὺ εἶ Ἡλίας;
Latin and Coptic evidence: Ἡλίας εἶ σὺ;
𝔓75, 04, Origen: text
The Greek external evidence strongly favours at least this general shape:
τίς/τί οὖν; [σὺ] Ἡλίας εἶ;
This approximate shape is given by Ψ66, 75, 01, 04 and Origen. This then raises the question of whether or not the σὺ is initial. Barrett and Bernard both suggest that it may have been added with reference to the surrounding context. It also adds vividness and clarity. There are thus more reasons to add it than to remove it, so the initial reading is probably one with the word order of 01, 04 and the early papyri, but without the σὺ. This is found in 01. 02 and 04 have both added the σὺ, which, as I say, gives vividness and clarity. 03 has not only added the σὺ, but delayed the τί to the end of the clause. It is difficult to see how this improves the language, so I classify it as a linguistic non-improvement.
02, 04: linguistic improvement.
03: linguistic non-improvement.
B
καί (2)
01: omitted
TE.
A
ό
01 only: omitted
It is possible that this is a content change, such that the delegation is now asking “are you a prophet?”. It is hard to see what would motivate this, however, apart from a Gentile scribe wanting to make the Gospel accessible to Gentile readers, unfamiliar
with the Jewish tradition of the great, eschatological prophet. However, there is no strong evidence of this happening generally in 01, so it is probably unlikely.

01: TE.
B

22:

ἐἶπαν
01, 02: εἶπον
03, 04: text
01, 02: linguistic improvement.
A

24:

ἀπεσταλμένοι
02, 20: οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι
𝔓66, 75, 01, 03, 04, 029, 086: text

Tischendorf (1869-72) and NA28 assign the 02 reading to a corrector, but this is far from obvious. Although there may have been some alteration, there is no indication that the lay-out or positioning of any letters have changed. The second line clearly started ΣΤΑΛΜΕΝΟΙ and there is no trace of an ΑΠΕ where the ΟΙ is now. I take the reading with οἱ as the reading of 02, but rate it appropriately cautiously.
The addition of the article makes it clear that the whole delegation was from the Pharisees. It improves the language, because the aorist participle with the past of εἰμι (a periphrastic passive) is unusual. Moreover, it makes the text less historically plausible, because it associates priests and Levites with Pharisees (Schnackenburg, Wengst). This makes it highly likely to have been a later addition, added to improve the language, but without knowledge of late second temple Judaism.

02: linguistic improvement.

C

25:

καὶ...αὐτὸν
01: omitted
Linguistic improvement, to remove pleonastic repetition of verbs of saying.

A

εἶπαν
01, 02: εἶπον
03, 04: text
01, 02: linguistic improvement.

A

26:

ὁ
02 only: omitted
02 also omits the article with John the Baptist’s name at v.28, so possibly this is a general habit, but on the other hand, 02 includes the article with the Baptist’s name, against 03, at v.35, so it is probably just a TE.
A

ὦδατι
01 only: τὸ ὦδατι
Whilst an addition by TE is possible, it is surely more likely that the change was introduced to highlight the river Jordan specifically, rather than any other water, since 01 does the same at v.33.
01: content change.
A

μέσος ὑμὸν
02, early post-scriptorium corrector of 04, 20: μέσος δὲ ὑμὸν
𝔓59, 66, 75, 120, 01, 03, 04: 083: text
Ruckstuhl and Dschulnigg (1991, 71) list passages in John where there is textual variation concerning a connecting particle. The reading without one will generally be difficultior and therefore probably initial. It seems scribes quite frequently added them to “tidy up” John’s prose.
02: linguistic improvement.
A

ἔστηκεν
01: ἔστήκει
03, 83: στήκει
𝔓75, 120 (vid): εἰστήκει
02, 04, 029vid, 20: text
The text reading is the perfect of ἔστημι. 03’s reading is present of στήκω (Metzger; Blass, Debrunner and Funk 1961, 40). It is not clear what is intended by the other readings, since they have present endings, but also augments. εἰστήκει may be some sort of compound of εἰς and στήκω, but it is not clear what this would mean. They seem to be linguistic non-improvements. The present may work better syntactically in the
context; on the other hand, the perfect may have theological force (“has taken his stand”) (Metzger). The majority of Greek evidence seem to suggest some sort of form with an augment and a kappa, which surely suggests that the perfect is initial. 01 is a common orthographic variation on the perfect, which, according to the TLG (n.d.) is found from Homer to Chrysostom. The only one of our manuscripts relevantly varying from the initial text is therefore 03, which has presumably opted for the present as a linguistic improvement, because the syntax is better.

A

27:

ὁ ὀπίσω μου
01, 03: ὀπίσω μου
02, M: αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ὀπίσω μου
𝔓66, 75, 120, 04, 029, 083: text

Bernard argues that the longer reading arose because scribes did not understand that v.27 is in apposition to the unstated subject of v.26b. He further argues that the omission of ὁ is clearly explicable by haplography (also Haenchen).

02: linguistic improvement.
01, 03: TE.
A

ὁ δὲ ὑπὸ
02, M: δὲ ἐμπροσθέν μου γένονεν, ὁδ
𝔓5, 66, 75, 119 (vid), 01, 03, 04, 029, 083: text

The longer reading is clearly influenced v.15 and makes the sentence much easier to read (Bernard, McHugh, Michaels), but the shorter is both difficilior and has the external evidence.

02: linguistic improvement.
A

οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγώ
𝔓66*, 75, 120, 01, 04: οὐκ εἰμὶ
02, Ἡ: ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμί
𝔓66c, 119, 03, 029, 083: text
Zahn argues that οὐκ εἰμί is almost certainly initial, because ἐγὼ is found in many different places. Moreover, it has plentiful external evidence and there would be more reason to add it than to omit, since it lends rhetorical force to the contrast.
02, 03: linguistic improvement.
A

28:

τάδε ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐγένετο
𝔓66, 01: τάδε ἐγένετο ἐν Βηθανίᾳ
There is little to choose between these readings. Levinsohn (2000, 17) argues that the verb nearer the beginning of the sentence is more regular syntax and that moving other elements before the verb has the effect of emphasising them. 01’s reading thus adds more emphasis and content to the passage, so it is expansionary. NA28’s reading also arguably has the external evidence. 01’s reading appears to improve the syntax and so is a linguistic improvement.
B

Βηθανίᾳ
Early post-scriptorium corrector of 04, 029, 083, some Ἡ witnesses, Origen: Βηθάβαρᾳ
Late corrector of 01: Βηθάβαρᾳ
The external evidence is clearly with Βηθανίᾳ. Origen is no real exception to this, because, although he favours Βηθάβαρᾳ, he is not governed by modern text-critical reasoning, but makes his decision because Βηθάβαρᾳ means “house of preparation” and John the Baptist is one who prepares (Lagrange 1895; Clapp 1907; Chin 2006). Βηθανίᾳ is also difficilior because Bethabara is a more reasonable site for the events of this passage than Bethany, because it is about the right distance from other places mentioned in the narrative. (Barrett, McHugh, Metzger, Michaels; Lagrange 1895; Clapp 1907; Burkitt 1908).
Of course, this reasoning is only valid if some possible explanation can be found for Βηθανία. Krieger (1954) suggests that the place mentioned here is purely fictional and that John coined the name for its theological significance. It is a place beyond the Jordan because it is beyond Judaism. McHugh suggests that Wadi el-Kharrar may once have had a name related to Βηθανία. Brown and Parker (1955) suggest that the events described did not take place at Bethany, but that the whole phrase means “Bethany, which is across the Jordan from where John had been baptising”. This is possible because ὅπου is generally used in John to locate events in relation to previous significant and widely known events. Brownlee (1991) and Riesner (1987) argue that the Bethany of this verse is Batanaea, which is about the right distance from the right places and has a Hebrew name plausibly rendered in Greek as Βηθανία. Riesner suggests that John chooses to call the place Βηθανία, even though other Greek forms of the name are possible, because it is the same name as the town of Mary, Martha and Lazarus, so Jesus’ ministry in John 1-11 can symbolically run from Bethany to Bethany. He sacrifices geographical clarity for literary and theological resonance. The similar textual confusion about Βηθζαθά, 5:2, may even indicate he generally did this with place names.

Thus Βηθανία is plausible, difficilior and has strong external evidence.

Ἰορδάνου

01 only: Ἰορδάνου ποταμοῦ

Clearly an attempt to clarify the geographical reference by explaining what the Jordan is. This is consistent with my argument that 01 was produced by Eusebius in Palestine for a non-Palestinian user, Constantine.

01: content change.

Α

ὁ Ἰωάννης

02, 029, 20: article omitted

𝔓66, 75, 01, 03, 04: text

See the same variant, v.26.

02: TE.
A

βαπτίζων
04 only: βαπτίζων τὸ πρῶτον

The best way to explain this addition seems to be clarification. The scribe of this variant seems to be aware of the problem discussed above, of the baptism-site and the referent of Βηθανία. It makes the sentence mean something like “where John was baptising for the first time”, implying that there was another baptism-site subsequently. This may be because, like Origen, the scribe is aware of Bethabara as a possible site for Jesus’ baptism, but it is arguably less speculative to explain the variant with reference to 3:23, where John baptises in Aenon.

04: harmonisation.

A

30:

ὑπὲρ
02, 20: περὶ

The early evidence is decidedly with ὑπὲρ. περὶ has a lexical meaning which may fit better here (“about whom I spoke”), but in fact λέγειν ὑπέρ is frequently used in Classical Greek with the force of λέγειν περὶ and ὑπέρ means “concerning” in 2 Cor 8:23 (Bernard). It is also one of John’s favourite prepositions, though with the meaning of “on behalf of”. It is thus plausible, better attested externally and difficilior. 02 seems to be trying to say the same thing with a more apt word.

02: linguistic improvement.

A

31:

ἦλθον ἐγὼ
04 only: ἐγὼ ἦλθον

It is clear from the external evidence that ἦλθον ἐγὼ is initial. The best explanation for 04’s change of order is that it is more normal syntax to have the subject before the verb. Of course, there are exceptions to this pattern (including in the verse immediately prior to this one), but a linguistic improvement to follow such a pattern is still the most plausible explanation of 04’s reading.

A

οδατι
02, Μ: τῷ οδατι
𝔓55 (vid), 66, 75, 01, 03, 04, 029, 0260: text

Similar variation occurs at 1:26, but with a very different pattern of witnesses. As there, presumably it reflects the fact that the Baptist came baptising in the specific water of the Jordan, which is a content change, because it demonstrates that the particular water is important.
02: content change.
A

32:

λέγων
01 only: omitted
This is clearly a linguistic improvement, to avoid the pleonastic repetition of verbs of speaking. 01 makes a similar omission at 1:20.
A

καταβαίνον ὡς περιστερὰν
01 only: ὡς περιστερὰν καταβαίνον
𝔓66, some Μ witnesses: καταβαίνον ὧσεὶ περιστερὰν

The external evidence is clearly with the NA28 reading. The 01 reading could imply that the Spirit did not actually descend physically: the Spirit was like a descending dove, rather than descending like a dove. This might reflect fourth century debates about the divinity of the Spirit. However, this is such a subtle difference that a TE is surely more likely.
ἐξ οὐρανοῦ
01 only: ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
It seems more likely that this is a linguistic improvement than a deep theological point about the nature of the definiteness of heaven.
A

ἔμεινεν
01: μένον
04: ἔμεινεν (Lyon, verifiable only by multi-spectral images)

The participle reads much more easily than the indicative, thus making the indicative difficilior. It also has strong external evidence. Although I argued that an earlier variant about the Spirit, in this verse, had a theological motive, and although the mode in which the Spirit remains has implications for pneumatology, it is hard to see anything of particular theological significance here.
01: linguistic improvement.
A
33:

uddedi
𝔓66, 01: τῷ ὑdatoi
02, 03, 04: text
See on the same variant, v.26.
01: content change.
A

οὗτος
02: αὐτός
04: text (Lyon; verifiable only by multi-spectral images – a round letter is just visible after the -tóv).

01, 03: text
οὗτος is the grammatically “better” reading here, since αὐτός is not typically used as a nominative pronoun meaning “he” or “this”. However, John breaks this rule at least seven times (2:12, 25b; 4:53; 5:20; 7:4; 9). I say “at least” because, whilst I attempt to exclude from this list occasions where αὐτός arguably has its emphatic meaning “-self”, the distinction is sometimes a difficult one. The external evidence is so against 02, that it is unlikely to preserve the initial reading. It is tempting to suggest that 02 is harmonising to John’s occasional use of αὐτός as a stand-alone pronoun, but John also regularly uses οὗτος (e.g. 1:41; 3:2, 26; 6:52; 18:30), so οὗτος would be equally Johannine. Moreover, John has never used αὐτός in this manner so far in the Gospel, but has several times used οὗτος (1:2, 7, 15), so the scribe’s recent memory would have been οὗτος. Although it is possible that vv.1-18 had a different original author to the rest of the Gospel, there is no evidence that anyone in fifth century or earlier thought that, so we can assume that ancient scribes built their impressions of Johannine style on the whole Gospel. Thus, it is highly unlikely that αὐτός is an attempt at Johannine style, so we must simply classify it as a linguistic non-improvement.
ἀγίῳ

𝔓⁷5 (vid), 04: ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί


A

34:

υἱὸς

01, Latin evidence, OS, Sahidic: ἐκλεκτός

This is an interesting variation unit, because internal and external criteria appear to push in different directions (Lincoln). In fact however, the external evidence may be more even than is often accepted. Ψ⁵ is extant here, but there is a lacuna at this precise word. McHugh argues it is the right size and shape for ἐκλεκτός, but the NTVMR (n.d.) transcription disagrees. If the reading was ἐκλεκτός, the line would be longer than average for the manuscript and if the reading was υἱὸς it would be shorter. This manuscript contains more spaces between words than most do, which further makes this sort of reasoning complex. Whatever the case with Ψ⁵, the versional evidence for ἐκλεκτός is telling (Barrett), because this is the kind of variant, which translates unambiguously between languages. Thus the external evidence may be considered to be balanced. If υἱὸς is initial, it is unclear why so many early versions have ἐκλεκτός. If ἐκλεκτός is initial, it is unclear why it is so rare in the early Greek evidence.

What of the internal arguments? There are many more reasons to change υἱὸς to ἐκλεκτός than vice versa, so arguably the internal considerations favour ἐκλεκτός. A Christian scribe would be unlikely to change υἱὸς to ἐκλεκτός, but might do the reverse, because the latter arguably weakens the tie between Jesus and God and lowers the Christology (Brown, McHugh). υἱὸς is also likely to be harmonisation to the synoptic accounts of Jesus’ baptism (McHugh) and indeed to the many important synoptic passages where υἱὸς θεοῦ occurs. There is no witness, for any of the Synoptic Gospels, where ἐκλεκτός appears in place of υἱὸς at Jesus’ baptism, Peter’s confession at Caesarea Philippi, or the centurion’s confession at the foot of the Cross, but υἱὸς is
found in some or all witnesses at all those key passages in all three synoptics, apart from Luke’s account of the centurion’s confession. Although ἐκλεκτὸς appears at Luke 23:35 and Isa 42:1, this hardly outweighs the weight of reasons to harmonise to ὕιός (Barrett, Schnackenburg).

It is thus likely that ἐκλεκτὸς is initial. The manuscripts other than 01 are either harmonising to the synoptics or raising the Christology. These would both be sufficient reasons why ὕιός became so popular in the Greek tradition. The fact that the change is so widespread suggests it happened early, probably before the great Christological debates of the fourth century, so harmonisation is more likely.

02, 03, 04: harmonisation.

B

35:

ὁ Ἰωάννης

𝔓75, 03: article omitted

02 has earlier omitted the article with John the Baptist and here 03 does so. Presumably the scribe thought the sentence read better without it.

03: linguistic improvement.

A

36:

At end of verse:

𝔓66*, 04: add ὁ αὕρων τὴν ἀμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου

04: harmonisation (to v.29).

A

37:

καὶ (1)

01: omitted

TE.
The external evidence is evenly balanced. McHugh argues that the text reading is initial, because in it, the reference of αὐτοῦ is ambiguous and the other two are attempts to clarify by moving αὐτοῦ. The sentence clearly means “His two disciples heard him speaking”. The αὐτοῦ either modifies the disciples or is the object of the hearing (i.e. it is translated either by the “him” or the “his” in my English translation) and the other idea is implied rather than stated. The variants move αὐτοῦ to clarify which it means.

The OS resolves the problem by using John’s name (Zahn). These are clearly different attempts to improve a difficult reading.

02, 04: linguistic improvement.

A

38:

λέγει

𝔓66: αὐτῷ λέγει

Lyon reads 04 as having the pronoun and NA28 follows him (presumably using his data). Tischendorf did not include the pronoun and it is listed by Lyon (1959, 348) as a possible error in Tischendorf.

The latter part of the line is very difficult to read. ἀκολουθοῦντας is reasonably clear and one can just see the ΛΕ of λέγει, immediately after it, some distance before the line finishes. This means that the αὐτῷ cannot have been there. The ΓΕΙ of λέγει is visible somewhat later on the next line, so the scribe must have made a TE in the middle of writing λέγει, which was then deleted and corrected in some way. It is possible that in this correction, the scribe added αὐτῷ, but there is no evidence for this. Importantly, there is neither a gap nor an αὐτῷ between ἀκολουθοῦντας and the ΛΕ of λέγει, so the
scribe cannot have initially written αὐτῷ there. I thus submit that it is incorrect of the NA^{28} apparatus to cite 04 as including the αὐτῷ.

Images are the line from the ΔΟΥΘ of ἀκολουθοῦντας and the arrow indicates the ΔΕ:

Assuming my reconstruction, rather than NA^{28}’s, only Ψ^{66} has the pronoun, so it is unlikely to be initial.

αὐτοῖς
01 only: omitted
TE.
A

εἰπαν
01, 02: εἶπον
03, 04: text
01, 02: linguistic improvement (second aorist).
A

λέγεται μεθερμηνευόμενον
01, 024, 2Θ: λέγεται ἐρμηνευόμενον
f^{1}, OL: ἐρμηνεύεται
Ψ^{66, 75}, 02, 03, 04: text

The weight of external evidence is clearly with NA^{28}’s reading. Presumably the scribe thought 01’s reading was “crisper” and shorter.
01: linguistic improvement.
39:

δψεσθε
01, 02, 024, 20: ἠδετε
𝔓5,66,75, 03, 04, 083: text

ἠδετε is harmonisation to v.46 and 11:34 (Zahn).

ἦλθαν
01, 02: θῆλθον
03, 04: text
01, 02: linguistic improvement (second aorist).

εἴδαν
01, 02: εἴδον
03: εἴδαν
04: εἴδαν
01, 02: linguistic improvement (second aorist).

δεκάτη
02 only: ἐκτη
This change may be influenced by 19:14 (Zahn) or, more likely, it may be a harmonisation to the immediate context: if the event takes place earlier in the day, it makes more sense that Jesus remains with them for the whole day.

02: harmonisation.
Ἀνδρέας
02 only: δὲ Ἀνδρέας
We noted in the chapter on Romans that the 02 text is fond of δὲ. It also improves the style to add a connector.
02: linguistic improvement.
A

τὸν ἀκουσάντων
01 only: ἀκουσάντων
It is probably marginal whether or not 01’s reading could be called a linguistic improvement. It could certainly have arisen as a TE and it is my methodological assumption to assume this is most likely. I rate the variant cautiously however.
01: TE.
C

04 lacunose for the rest of chapter 1.

41:

πρῶτον
01, 20: πρῶτος
Isolated Latin and Syriac evidence: πρῶ (conjectured from Latin mane)
Curetonian Syriac: omitted
𝔓66, 75, 02, 03, 083: text
The external evidence is broadly with the accusative, but scholars continue to debate the reading. Part of the problem is that “first” implies that something else was second and a convincing interpretation of the verse must explain what that was (Zahn).

πρῶ would mean there does not need to be a “second”. It attracts support from McHugh, who notes that if the time is specified as early in the morning, then an extra day is added, meaning the wedding at Cana happens on the seventh day. However, like all
neat internal arguments this “cuts both ways” – this would be a good reason for a scribe or translator to change the text to πρῶτον. Bernard argues πρῶτον is plausible in context, because, according to v.39, they arrive at 4:00 and stay the whole day. They would therefore leave early the next morning. It could easily become the accusative reading by this process:

ΠΡΩΤΟΝΑΔΕΛΦΟΝ (understood as πρῶτον ἀδελφὸν) >
ΠΡΩΤΟΝΑΔΕΛΦΟΝ (understood as πρῶτον ἀδελφὸν) >
ΠΡΩΤΟΝΤΟΝΑΔΕΛΦΟΝ.

John also uses πρῶτον at 18:28 and 20:1, so it is a plausible retroversion of mane. However, πρῶτον is an equally possible retroversion, indeed, it is more likely since most OL manuscripts have primum. It is thus most likely that the Vorlage of the OL was πρῶτον, translated as primum, but changed in some cases to mane, which appealed to scribes in the Latin tradition for all the reasons it appeals to McHugh. On this understanding, the versional reading is evidence for πρῶτον.

Von Wahlde defends πρῶτον over πρῶτος on complex redactional grounds: v.43a (up to Γαλιλαίαν) was not originally there. Originally, Andrew fetched Peter “first” and then Philip second. He argues this because Philip and Andrew are associated at 6:5-9 and 12:20-22. The redactor introduced v.43a to move the setting to Cana for chapter 2. After its addition it reads as if Jesus fetches Philip. This is certainly ingenious, but, like many source-critical hypotheses, demands the question why the redactor did not edit the final product to tidy up these marks of “clunky” redaction.

The external evidence is with the adverbial accusative πρῶτον, which requires no stated “second” because it is adverbial. It is also plausible that the influence of οὖτος caused the final nu to become sigma (Holtzmann). Of course, this transcriptional argument works the other way around and the surrounding -τος endings could turn the sigma into nu (Turner 1965, 135-37), but the external evidence is with the accusative.

01: TE (nu to sigma).
We have noted the propensity of 02 to add δέ. This is a similar phenomenon. “Good” Greek requires connecting words and vv.40-42 have none, resulting in rather “flat” Greek.

02: linguistic improvement.

ἈἸωάννου

02, 03 re-inker, Μ: Ἰωάνα (the re-inker has only covered certain letters)

038: Ἰωάννα

The text reading has much better external attestation. Ἰωάνα is a likely harmonisation to Matt 16:17 (Metzger). Ἰωάνα is also otherwise unattested as a personal name until the fourth century CE, apart from as a name for the prophet Jonah. In OG, 4 Kgdm 25:23 and 1 Chr 26:3 both attest the form Ἰωάννα (McHugh). This suggests that there would be two reasons to introduce the shorter form in the fourth century CE.

02: harmonisation and linguistic improvement.

Ἀ

δ

02 only: δς

Presumably, the masculine was thought to be some form of linguistic improvement, either because the name is masculine or because λόγος is masculine.

Ἀ
This chapter contains many variants in which there is doubt between an aorist and a perfect (often of δίδωμι). To provide an overall picture, which will help us evaluate particular variation units, I tabulate them here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, λαλέω</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, δίδωμι</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, δίδωμι (1)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, δίδωμι (2)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, τηρέω</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, γινώσκω</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, δίδωμι</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, δίδωμι</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, δίδωμι</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, δίδωμι</td>
<td>Verb omitted</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22, δίδωμι (1)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22, δίδωμι (2)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24, δίδωμι (1)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24, δίδωμι (2)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Aorist</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures show a strong preference for the perfect in 03 and 04, meaning aorists in 03 and 04 will be significant. Averaging across the pandects, almost 50% of verses in chapter 17 contain this kind of tense variation. It seems likely that John’s initial text contained a variety of tenses, presumably for literary and theological reasons, but the subtleties of this confused scribes for many generations, leading to many variations. Therefore I am cautious in making decisions about any particular variation unit. In general, I will follow the weight of external evidence in these variation units (acknowledging that an aorist in 03 or 04 “bucks the trend” and weighs heavier). If the external evidence is evenly balanced, I will assume the aorist is the later variant and the perfect initial, because the aorist is the “default” tense. Since these changes are so easily made by TE, I will assume that that is the explanation, unless there is other good reason.
ἐλάλησεν  
01 only: λελάληκεν  
Harmonisation (to the previous verse, 16:33) (Schnackenburg).

A

Ἰησοῦς

𝔓⁶⁰(vid): 02, 04, 05, 032, 20: ὁ Ἰησοῦς

01, 03: text

The weight of ancient evidence is with the article. Presumably, 01 and 03 had linguistic reasons for omitting it. Nevius (1965, 83) points out that 03 often omits the article at the first mention of Jesus in one of its divisions, which this is.

01, 03: linguistic improvement.

B

ἐπάρας… εἶπεν

02, some 20 witnesses: ἔπηρεν… καὶ εἶπεν (i.e. makes the participle into a co-ordinate indicative)

Although the external evidence for 02’s reading is weak, the double indicative is clearly difficilior and so probably initial. Could 02 and the Byzantine manuscripts be harmonising to John’s occasional use of double indicatives (e.g. 1:20)? This is unlikely given that the Byzantine tradition generally makes the Greek more “polished”, but the B rating reflects this possibility.

01, 03, 04: linguistic improvement.

B

ὁ υἱὸς

02, 05: ὁ υἱὸς σου

𝔓¹⁰⁷ (not in NA²⁸ but see Jones 2013), 04: καὶ ὁ υἱὸς

20: καὶ ὁ υἱὸς σου

01, 03, 032, 0109, 0301: text
There has been fairly extensive correction here in 04, but both Tischendorf and Lyon agree that the original reading was text. However, to me there is very little to indicate that the καὶ comes from the hand of a corrector. I therefore suggest that it is the first hand (and once again depart from the NA\textsuperscript{28} apparatus). The images show from ἵνα.

The external evidence favours the shortest possible reading (Metzger). One could argue that the additions add clarity, but also that they clutter. Lincoln suggests that 02’s σου is harmonising to near instances of the word, which seems reasonable. 04’s addition creates a nice balance and symmetry between the persons of the Trinity, such that it is appropriate to call it a content change. I grade it low to account for the palaeographic uncertainties.

02: harmonisation.

B

04: content change.

C

2:

δῶσῃ (the regular Attic parsing of this would be 2s, fut, indic, middle\textsuperscript{5}, but Harris suggests 3s, aorist, subjun, active)

01, 0109: δῶσω (1s, fut, indic, active, or 1s, aorist, subjun, active)

\textsuperscript{5} Boas et al (2019, 163, 238) note the future indicative, δῶσω and an aorist subjunctive δῶ (δῶς, δῶ etc).
03, 0301, 20: δόσει (either an orthographic variant on the text reading or 3s, fut, indic, active)
𝔓107, 032: δῶς (2s, aor, subj, active)
05: ἔχῃ (2s, pres, subj, middle; 3s, aor, subj, act; 3s, pres, subj, middle – such that it means “that he may hold fast eternal life for all those you have given him” or “that you may hold fast eternal life for all those you have given him”)
02, 04: text

In John, ἰκα rarely takes a future indicative (Bernard). This makes it likely that δῶσῃ and δόσει are orthographic variations on the aorist subjunctive, as Harris suggests. Taking all this evidence together, this aorist subjunctive reading has considerable external authority. The aorist also arguably suits the content: John presents Jesus’ gift of eternal life to his people as both timeless and punctiliar. It occurs at least both at the Cross and at the Parousia, but it is never a process.⁶ 01’s first person is natural in context, because Jesus is speaking about himself. The third person has a certain detached, unreal air and it is unsurprising that 01 or an ancestor scribe changed it (Barrett).

01: linguistic improvement.
03: only an orthographic variation on the initial text.

A

αὐτοῖς
𝔓107, 01, 032, 0109: αὐτῷ
05: omitted
02, 03, 04, 20: text

External evidence is evenly weighted. The singular agrees with the earlier singular, ὦ δέδωκας, so is for that reason arguably facilior. 01 is therefore probably harmonising.

B

⁶ For the aorist having an entirely aspectual, rather than temporal, sense in purpose clauses, see Boas et al 2019, 436-437.
3:

γινώσκωσιν
02, 05, 032, 0109, 0301: γινώσκουσιν
The external evidence is evenly balanced and the subjunctive appears grammatically more sophisticated, making the indicative *difficilior*. The pattern of evidence is rather different to the similar variation unit in v.2, suggesting that a pattern is unlikely.
01, 03, 04: linguistic improvement.
A

4:

δέδωκάς
04 only: ἔδωκάς
The external evidence is strongly with the perfect, despite 04 “bucking its trend”. By the general reasoning outlined above for this kind of variation unit…
04: TE.
B

μοι
01 only: με
This seems an implausible change for transcriptional accident, but it can hardly be described as a linguistic improvement.
01: linguistic non-improvement.
A

5:

πάτερ
05, 0109: πατήρ
Blass, Debrunner and Funk (1961, 81-82) note that the nominative with the article is a reasonably common replacement for the vocative, but, as Bernard also notes, the nominative without the article, having vocative force is unusual. This means that the nominative reading has weak external evidence but is *difficilior*. Given that the two
would have looked and sounded so similar, they are likely to have been confused early in the history of the text and then altered many times, through TE and correction. Therefore it is likely that neither has an unbroken line of descent from the initial text. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that the initial text had the form which corresponds most to standard language use, given that there is no article, i.e. the vocative.

ἣ
01: ἤν
The NA[^28] reading has the strongest external evidence. The 01 reading puts the relative in its “rightful” grammatical case, rather than attracting it to the antecedent.
01: linguistic improvement.

6:

δεδωκάς (bis)
04, 0109, 20: δεδωκάς
01, 02, 03, 05, 032: text[^7]
The external evidence inclines to the aorist, especially because 03 has the aorist, going against its general habit. The two instances of the word are presumably in the same tense, because they describe the same action and no major witness has them in different tenses. Since the tense issue comes up twice, it is presumably not a TE. I conclude therefore that the change was made because the scribe thought the perfect expressed the meaning better.
04: linguistic improvement.

C

τετήρηκαν
01: ἔτηρησαν
02, 04: τετηρήκασιν

[^7]: Only the first is recorded in the NA[^28] apparatus, but the variation pattern is largely the same. For the second, for 05, see NTVMR n.d.; for 032, see Sanders 1912; and for 20, see Hodges and Farstad.
The weight of external evidence is behind one of the perfect forms. The reading of 02 and 04 is the more regular perfect form. The text reading is an alternative form of the perfect (Holtzmann, Lagrange). It is clearly *difficilior.*

01, 02, 04: linguistic improvement (either changing the tense or forming it in a more standard manner).

A

7:

ĕγνωκαν
01 only: ἔγνων
02, 032: ἔγνωκα
04: ἔγνωσαν
03, 05, 20: text

For 02, NA²⁸ gives text (i.e. with the nu) as the vid reading. There is no sign of a nu bar, however. Tischendorf cites Woidius as having observed it very faintly.

The balance of ancient evidence appears to favour some form of perfect. In 01 and 04, the aorist is probably the result of harmonisation to the surrounding context. The third person has better external evidence and, in the perfect tense, the first person could very easily arise from the third through a scribe not noticing a final nu bar (Barrett, Metzger). The aorist first person (as in 01) could then easily have arisen from that. Bernard and Brown suggest the first person may be harmonisation to vv.4 or 6, but this is unlikely given that there are so many third person verbs in the context as well.

04: harmonisation.

01: harmonisation and TE.
02: TE (the change to first person; I rate as C, because of the possibility there is a nu
bar).
02: δέδωκάς
03: δδωκές
Most other early evidence: text
02, 03: TE.
A

εἰσιν
02, 20: ἔστιν
𝔓84, 01, 03, 04, 032, 0109: text
02 is clearly trying to conform to the principle of regular Greek grammar that neuter
plurals take singular verbs.
02: linguistic improvement.
A

8:

ἔδωκας
01, 0109, 20: δέδωκας
03: ὑδωκές
02, 04, 05: text
The early external evidence is strongly with the aorist, especially given 03’s normal
preference for the perfect. 03 appears to be a TE for the normally-formed aorist. At
most of the variation-units here, 01 has opted for the aorist, so the scribe or an ancestor-
scribe seemed to want to set the whole discourse in that tense on linguistic grounds.
01: linguistic improvement.
03: TE.
A
καὶ ἐγνώσαν

01, 02, 05, 032: omitted
The external evidence is evenly balanced. Lagrange suggests that the phrase contradicts 6:69 and therefore was omitted, but it is unclear why he thinks there is a contradiction. Myshrall (2005, 568) suggests that the phrase was considered “redundant”. On the other hand, the phrase does make the sentence easier to understand. Without it, the reader has little clue to take λαμβάνω in its cognitive sense of “understand, agree with”. On the one hand, the shorter reading is arguably difficilior, on the other hand, the longer reading may be so pleonastic we would expect scribes to shorten it. However, if scribes shortened an initial doublet on account of pleonasm, one would surely expect there to be some manuscripts with the other one of the verbs removed (i.e. without ἔλαβον) and indeed, one would expect most witnesses to omit ἔλαβον, because that is the less clear of the two. I therefore conclude that the initial was simply ἔλαβον and that καὶ ἐγνώσαν was a later addition for clarification.

03, 04: linguistic improvement.

B

ἐπίστευσαν
01 only: ἐπίστευσας

TE.

A

10:

τα ἐμα...σα ἐμα
01 only: ἐμοὶ αὐτοῦς ἐδωκας
Harmonisation (vv.5-6).

A

11:

ἐἰμὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ
02 only: ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ εἰμὶ

TE.
The external evidence is fairly evenly balanced, but \( \text{αὐτῷ} \) is difficilior, because it is not regular grammar to have \( \text{αὐτός} \) without a noun, as a nominative pronoun (although, as discussed on p.116, John sometimes does so). 02, 04: linguistic improvement.

The longer reading has a strikingly large amount of early external evidence. Bernard and Barrett argue it is merely a TE, due to so much similar language in the context. However, the fact that it has penetrated to a number of witnesses, including in Latin, means a number of thoughtful early readers must have thought it belonged to the text. The versions are important here: a Greek scribe may accidentally write nonsense and another Greek scribe, with his mind elsewhere, might even copy it, but it is highly unlikely that a translator would render the nonsense into Latin, because translation requires too much mental engagement. A number of commentators attempt to explain the longer reading by suggesting that vv.11-13 portray Jesus as both in the world and not in the world and that, at the time of praying this prayer, he is at a liminal stage, in the process of leaving the world (Brown, Michaels, Schnackenburg). Given that the weight of external evidence is against the longer reading, what seems likely is that it entered the Greek tradition originally as a TE (which is very plausible, given how often this language comes up) and some later editor of the Latin tradition found a rationale for it to be part of the text and so included it.
See at v.5.

TE.

B

dδδωκας
𝔓66(vid), 01, 032: ἔδωκας
𝔓60, 02, 03, 04, 05, 20: text

Both readings have impressive external evidence. Brown and Bernard both argue that the perfect makes better sense in context. This combined with the slight majority of external evidence for the perfect makes it more likely that it is initial. Given the suitability of the perfect to the context, TE is a more likely explanation for the aorist than linguistic improvement.

01: TE.

C

ἡμεῖς
𝔓107, 03: καὶ ἡμεῖς

The longer reading has very much the “feel” of a clarificatory addition and has moderately weaker external evidence.

03: linguistic improvement.

A

12:

ἡμην
03: ἡμεν
04: μην
01, 02: text

03 is much more likely an orthographic variation than a TE, let alone a genuine attempt to express the plural. Likewise 04 is much more likely a TE for the text reading than the particle μήν.

04: TE.

A
The early external evidence is securely with the shorter reading. The longer is not an obvious harmonisation, since this particular phrase does not occur much elsewhere within the chapter, nor is it an easy TE. The motivation is presumably to resolve the tension of vv.11-12: v.11 says that Jesus is not in the world, but the disciples are in the world, but v.12 says Jesus is with the disciples.

02: content change.

A

σου

01: κσου

𝔓66*: μου

565, Latin witnesses: omitted

01: TE.

A

ὤ δέδωκάς μοι

𝔓66*, 01: omitted

02, 05, WARDS: οὐς δέδωκάς μοι

Reconstructing 04 is difficult here. Tischendorf and Lyon agree on ὦ δέδωκας μοι. The images shows from the beginning of ὀνόματι το μοι.

The matter is far from clear, but I follow Lyon and Tischendorf.

Late corrector of 01: δ δέδωκας μοι

Late corrector of 03: οὐς δεδοκάς μοι

𝔓66 corrector(vid), 03, 032: text
Despite Bultmann’s suggestion that the phrase “is a pedantic supplementation out of v.11”, the external evidence seems opposed to completely omitting it. The complete omission is difficult to explain as anything other than a TE. The dative pronoun is *difficilior* and has better external evidence; the accusative of 02 makes the sentence easier to read. Regarding the tense, the external evidence favours the perfect, despite 04 going against its normal tendency; 04 is likely to be a TE.

01, 04: TE.
02: linguistic improvement.

B

καὶ (1)
02, 05, 20: omitted
𝔓66, 01, 03, 032: text
04: text. καὶ not visible now, but there is a clear gap for it and Lyon and Tischendorf suggest that it was deleted by a corrector. Some traces of a kappa, which presumably had a καί-ligature, are arguably visible. Such erasures in 04 are generally post-scriptorium (see p.20).
The external evidence strongly favours the inclusion, so I submit that 02 omitted it by TE by omission of small words.

A

ἐφύλαξα

01 only: ἐφύλασον

Linguistic improvement (imperfect tense to show ongoing action).

A

13:

πεπληρομένην

01 only: πεπληρωκενην

A nonsense TE, since it combines active and passive forms.

A

ἐν ἑαυτοῖς

𝔓66, 05, \(\mathfrak{N}\): ἐν αὐτοῖς

\(\text{13}^{\text{f}}\): ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς

04: ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν

01, 02, 03, 032: text

In 04, the key word καρδίαις is fortunately fairly certain even in the standard images. Only the tau of ταῖς is clear, but the rest is a reasonable conjecture.

There is a gap prior to ΑΥΤΩΝ, which could take two letters, but where there is no trace of any letters today. Lyon offers σεαυτῶν and Tischendorf ἐαυτῶν. However, I suggest that this was most probably a post-scriptorium erasure. Presumably, the final in scriptorium reading was either σεαυτῶν or ἐαυτῶν and the latter is close to ἑαυτοῖς, which is evidenced by a number of other early manuscripts.

The images show the ἐν ταῖς and then the next line with the rest of the phrase. Each image has an appropriate multi-spectral image of the same place.
The external evidence is clearly with the NA²⁸ reading. 04 is a paraphrase to make the meaning clearer.
04: content change.

A

14:

ἐγὼ (2)
01 only: omitted
TE.
A
15:

After the first ς, there is fairly significant corruption to 03, but Versace (2018) argues it was entirely corrected to the text reading in scripturn.

17:

τῇ ἀληθείᾳ
03 only: ἀληθείᾳ
03 also adds the article to ἀλήθεια at the end of the verse. I take them as one variation unit. The external evidence is against 03, but the deliberate way in which the article has been moved implies this is not a mere TE. It is a plausible linguistic improvement. 03’s reading is arguably where the article “should” be, since the noun is anarthrous on first occurrence and then, when “activated” it takes the article. 03 could be translated: “sanctify them in truth, your word is the truth [i.e. your word is the particular truth in which they must be sanctified]” (see Levinsohn 2000, 148-63).

03: linguistic improvement.
A

ὀ...ἀλήθεια
01 only: omitted
TE.
A

18:

καγ...κόσμον
03: repeated
𝔓66(vid): omitted
03: TE (dittography).
A
19:

ἐγὼ
01, 02, 03: omitted
External evidence is evenly distributed. John commonly uses personal pronouns in this
discourse and it is arguably more Johannine to include it. Of course this also makes it
difficilior, so I grade my decision for the longer reading as uncertain. The best
explanation for the omission is TE.
C

21:

ἐν
04 only: omitted
TE.
A

πάτερ
03, 05, 03: πατήρ
01, 02, 04, 20: text
Here, the external evidence is more balanced than elsewhere and therefore it is likely
that the difficilior form, that is the anarthrous nominative, is initial. The other form is a
linguistic improvement.
A

ὦσιν (2)
01, 02, 20: ἔν ὦσιν
𝔓66(vid), 03, 04, 05: text
Although there is strong evidence for the addition, most commentators follow the
shorter reading, on the grounds that the longer harmonises to the first half of the verse
and to vv.11, 22 (in varying details, Bernard, Bultmann, Holtzmann, Lagrange, Lincoln,
Lindars, Metzger, Michaels and Westcott and Hort). Brown suggests that the ἵνα
clauses in vv.22-23 both have ἔν, so we should expect that in this double ἵνα clause, but
there is no reason why this should follow. The word could easily have been omitted by TE. Michaels argues further that the shorter reading has better attestation and the stress in the verse is on indwelling rather than unity, so it is more likely that the longer reading is due to harmonisation.

01, 02: harmonisation.

B

πιστεύη

𝔓60, 02, 05, 20: πιστεύσῃ

𝔓66, 01, 03, 04, 032: text

The external evidence is relatively evenly balanced between present and aorist. Fee (2001, 33-35) has used Hendriksen’s data to analyse general patterns relating to this change in John: of 159 ἵνα-clauses, only sixteen have variants in the verb. Fee notes that five of these sixteen involve πιστεύω. This all suggests that, in general, tense variants in ἵνα-clauses are rare, but when they happen, they often involve πιστεύω. This in turn suggests that scribes thought carefully which tense they would use with πιστεύω.

This in turn suggests that the distinction in aspect or Aktionsart was more important with this verb than others. Fee argues that changes of tense between present and aorist subjunctive were much more likely made from present to aorist than vice versa. This interpretation of the data is based partly on a general trust in 01 and 03 as “Alexandrian” or “Egyptian” manuscripts, which it is the role of this dissertation to question. However Fee also convincingly argues that, because the aorist is the default or most common tense for subjunctives, aorists would rarely be corrected to presents without good reason.

It is debatable which tense is favoured here by the context. Brown suggests that the κόσμος in John is, almost by definition, a group which needs to believe decisively, for the first time, not to carry on believing. Fee suggests that the present is original and expresses the hope that the world will believe in an on-going sense that God sent Jesus (something which Fee seems to want to distinguish from “coming to faith in Christ” in a single, decisive sense). Carson (2005, 706) suggests that the present is original and that the idea is that the world will “practice faith as a process”, i.e. will become Christians and then carry on as Christians, a double action which is well expressed by
the present. A better explanation for the present than either of these is surely that Jesus is praying for believers after the time of the disciples gathered around him. The prayer is that, over this continuous period, a steady stream of individuals within the κόσμος will believe in Jesus. Each individual’s conversion might be punctiliar, but the conversion of the κόσμος will be slow, iterative and individual-by-individual.

In summary therefore, the change is probably deliberate and expresses a different meaning to the initial text, but it is unclear which is initial and which is the change. Two points gently “tip the scales” for a change to aorist: the aorist is the default or most common tense for subjunctives and the most obvious understanding of believing that the Father sent the Son is punctiliar. It would be natural therefore to assume that the present was a mistake in need of correction. The manuscripts with aorist are therefore expressing a content change.

02: content change.

B

22:

δέδωκάς

02, 05, 032: ἔδωκάς

I follow the principles stated at the start of the analysis of John 17.

02: TE.

C

δέδωκα

01, 02: ἔδωκα

The external evidence favours the perfect.

01, 02: TE.

B

ἐν (2)

01 only: omitted

It is at the end of a page, indeed a folium, in 01, so it would be very easy to drop a word by TE.
End of verse:
02, 20: adds ἔσμεν
𝔓60, 66, 01 (but see above), 03, 04, 05, 032: text
The external evidence clearly favours the shorter reading, as does the principle of difficilior. 02 is clearly clarifying.
02: linguistic improvement.

23:
εἰς
04 only: εἰς εἰς
The original scribe evidently made a dittographic error, which has been corrected, by erasing the CEI in the middle. I follow my standard practice of assuming the correction was post-scriptorium, grading B to reflect uncertainty.
The external evidence is split evenly between the two shorter readings. One can imagine good style prompting scribes to opt for καὶ to avoid repeating ἰνα. However, as Schnackenburg argues, ἰνα is better logically, in the context: the unity of the church causes the conversion of the world. 02 is a conflation, presumably motivated by an attempt to lose the meaning of neither reading.

01: linguistic improvement.

02: content change.

A

24:

πάτερ

02, 03: πατήρ

01, 04, 05, 032, 𝔓: text

See discussion at v.5.

02, 03: TE.

B

δ

02, 04, 𝔓: οῶς

𝔓60, 01, 03, 05, 032: text

The singular has better external evidence and is difficilior, because ἐκεῖνοι would naturally suggest a plural relative pronoun. The plural is a clarification (Barrett, Beasley-Murray, Metzger, Schnackenburg).

02, 04: linguistic improvement.

A
δέδωκάς (1)
02 only: ἐδωκάς
The external evidence is against 02. By the principles outlined on p.124, I class this variation unit as an A-class TE by 02.

δέδωκάς (2)
𝔓108(vid), 03: ἐδωκάς
The external evidence here inclines to the perfect, but 03 is “bucking its trend” by giving an aorist. As often, in these perfect/aorist variation units, the aorist is marginally more likely to be the change, because it was the default tense.
03: TE.

Πρὸ
In 03, we have a bigger gap than is needed for πρὸ. It seems there were one or two extra letters there and the re-inker chose to not re-ink any of the word. It is difficult to make out now what may have been, but it is likely that there was a longer word here, most probably a TE.

Πάτερ
02, 03: πατήρ
𝔓59(vid), 01, 04, 05, 032, 20: text
By the same reasoning as at v.5.
02, 03: TE.
σε (2)
02 only: omitted
TE jumping from epsilon to epsilon.
A

26:

με
01 only: αὐτοῦς
It is tempting to dismiss this as a harmonisation to many parts of αὐτός in the context. However, there are no actual instances of αὐτοῦς. It is therefore likely that 01 intends a different meaning: that believers would know, within them, the love the Father has for them.
01: content change.
B

John 20

Up to v.25 is missing in 04.

In 05, up to v.13 is in a ninth-century supplementary hand and therefore cited less regularly.

1:

Μαρία
01, 02, 032: Μαριὰμ
Throughout the Gospel, John seems to switch bewilderingly between the Greek and Semitic forms of this character’s name. Förster (2014) has analysed the fifteen instances of the name in John. Of the fourteen in the nominative or accusative, each one has manuscripts with each form of the name and in thirteen each form is shown by a manuscript from the fifth century or earlier. No manuscript from before the fifth century
gives one form consistently; rather each manuscript has both forms in differing combinations. Of the Gospels, only John has this absence of pattern. There is also very little correlation between the forms of the name and which Mary is being discussed, except that 01 always uses the Greek for Mary of Bethany and the Semitic for the other women called Mary. It seems likely therefore that, as with the perfect and aorist verbs in chapter 17, John had a particular reason for choosing each form at the place where he did, but this was not obvious to later scribes and so there were many TEs and harmonisations, such that we are unlikely ever now to be able to reconstruct the initial text or see John’s rationale in his choice.

Lagrange (1936, 511) suggests that in Jesus’ direct address to Mary, he uses the Semitic form, but John uses the Greek form for third person narrative. The Semitic form is more intimate and personal (especially for one native Aramaic speaker addressing another), but the Greek form is more suitable for the narrator of a Greek text, written presumably to people whose Greek was better than their Aramaic (otherwise John would have written in Aramaic). Förster suggests that the variation may relate to confusion between the accusative ending, -ν, and the ending of the Semitic form, -μ.

It is possible to test these theories. Förster has tabulated the readings of all the major early manuscripts for each instance of the name: 01, 02, 03, 04, 05 and all papyri (for this kind of precise linguistic variant, versional data is of no value and citational very little). In order to establish John’s pattern, I start with pure external evidence: what do the majority of these early witnesses show? The answer to this, in each passage is shown in the table below, together with other relevant details.

---

8 For the table of data, see Förster 2014, 4. The fifteen passages are 11:1, 2, 19, 20, 28, 31, 32, 45; 12:3; 19:25 (bis); 20:1, 11, 16 and 18. All are nominative or accusative apart from 11:1 (which is genitive). Förster gives the reading of a range of important manuscripts for each of these passages. The only passage where both forms are not attested from the fifth century or earlier is 11:20.
These results permit only negative conclusions. There is no correlation of name-form with woman named: four out of the nine references to Mary of Bethany and three out of the five references to Mary Magdalene have the Semitic form, i.e. roughly the same proportion for each woman. These results also disprove Lagrange’s theory of direct address. Although the one instance of direct speech does have the Semitic form, that form also occurs frequently outside direct speech (seven out of the fourteen non-direct-speech occurrences). Four out of the five accusative occurrences have the Semitic form, but only four out of nine nominatives have the Semitic. This means the Semitic does correlate somewhat to the accusative. This hardly proves Förster’s theory, but it does demonstrate that it is plausible. Since no better explanation is apparent, I will assume that Förster is right and that the Greek form is generally initial and the Semitic arose through confusion in the accusative case due to the similar sound of mu and nu, which

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Majority of Major Early Manuscripts (Greek or Semitic)</th>
<th>Direct Address? (Y/N)</th>
<th>Case (Nominative or Accusative)</th>
<th>Which Mary (Bethany, Clopas or Magdalene)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:1</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:19</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:28</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Possibly implied</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:31</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:32</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:3</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:25a</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:25b</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:11</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:16</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:18</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
confusion then spread to the nominative case. This is also confirmed by the fact that there is no Semitic influence in the genitive reading at 11:1. I therefore take all Semitic forms as TEs. I rate them as C, however, because of the agnosticism which must surround the whole matter.

01, 02: TE.

C

ἐκ

01, 032: ἀπὸ τῆς θύρας ἐκ

Harmonisation to Mark 1:3 (Brown), though the wording is not exactly the same.

A

2:

Σίμωνα

01: τὸν Σίμωνα

Linguistic improvement.

A

3:

ἤρχοντο...ἐτρέχουν δὲ

01 only: ἐτρέχον

Haenchen suggests that the omission is harmonising with Luke 24:24, by avoiding giving the impression that Peter and the Beloved Disciple actually went into the tomb.\(^9\) However, 01 will recount the Beloved Disciple’s entry to the tomb in v.8. Moreover, Luke 24:24 hardly requires that no one enters the tomb. It is more likely harmonisation to the immediate context: 01 does not want create confusion by appearing to portray the two disciples going into the tomb, the standard meaning of ἐς τὸ μνημεῖον, before John explicitly narrates them going into the tomb a few verses later.

01: harmonisation.

A

---

\(^9\) He makes this point with reference to complete omissions in the verse.
καὶ...μαθητῆς
01 only: omitted
02 only: ὁ δὲ ἄλλος μαθητῆς
τάχιον
01 only: δὲ τάχιον

These two variation units are best taken together. Presumably, 02 thought δὲ a better connector than καὶ for some linguistic reason. 01’s reading is harder to explain. It is unlikely to be a TE, because 01 compensates for the loss of a connector in καὶ...μαθητῆς by adding the δὲ later. Presumably 01 thought that the additional mention of ὁ ἄλλος μαθητῆς, written in full, so soon after v.3, was pleonastic.
01, 02: linguistic improvement.

A

πρῶτος εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον
01 only: εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον πρῶτος

The best explanation seems to be delay for rhetorical emphasis. Since the meaning is not changed, we cannot call this a content change, so I class it as a linguistic improvement.

A

5:

κείμενα τὰ ὀθόνια
01, 02: τὰ ὀθόνια κείμενα
044 only: τὰ ὀθόνια κείμενα μόνα
01, 02: harmonisation (to v.6).

Although v.6 is missing in 01, the scribe is still likely to have been familiar with it.

A
6:

οὗ μέντοι…κείμενα (v.6)
All of this is missing in 01. This is clearly a TE (admittedly a large one) by homoeoteleuton. 01 makes a number of omissions and TEs in this chapter, so possibly this is “scribal fatigue” as scribes approach the end of the book.
A
καὶ (1)
01: in the longer omission
02, 󰇀: omitted
󰇀, 03, 032: text
The external evidence probably favours inclusion. It is easy to see how καὶ might have been viewed as superfluous.
02: linguistic improvement.
A

9:

ἡδείσων
01 only: ἡδεῖ
Harmonisation to v.8 (Bultmann, Lindars).
A

10:

αὐτοῦς
02, 032, 󰇀: ἐαυτοῦς
01, 03: text
Both variants presumably mean something like “to their own homes”, for which this sort of language is a widely attested idiom (e.g. Josephus, Ant. 8.124 (Bernard); OG Num 24:25 (Barrett)). Barrett suggests this is unlikely, because John would have used
εἰς τὰ ἰδία, as at 1:11; 16:32 and 19:27. However, there is not much else the word could mean and there is no reason John should not have used two idioms for the same concept. The sense is clearly reflexive, but the form without epsilon can have a reflexive sense (Smyth 1956, 305). The difference between the two forms is on the merely orthographic and it is very difficult to say what the initial text said. Given that the longer form is more usual for the reflexive, it probably represents a linguistic improvement.

02: linguistic improvement.

B

11:

Μαρία

𝔓66, 01: Μαριὰμ

01: TE.

C

πρὸς

01 only: ἐν

ἐξω κλαίουσα

01, 02: κλαίουσα

20: κλαίουσα ἔξω

03, 032: text

ἔξω could easily have been omitted by TE. This is almost certainly the explanation in 02. It is probably also the case in 01, though here there is another possibility: πρὸς was changed to ἐν as a linguistic improvement, because πρὸς with the dative is not a normal word for “in” or “at” (though it does occur in John 1:1) and then ἔξω was omitted to harmonised with ἐν. However, it is more likely that 01 omitted ἔξω for transcriptional reasons and changed πρὸς to ἐν independently, as a linguistic improvement.

01: linguistic improvement

01, 02: TE.

A

---

10 First two references Barrett, the last mine.

11 See Bernard for the arguable lack of harmony between ἔξω and ἐν.
12:

δύο
01: omitted
Brown suggests possible harmonisation to the synoptics here, since Matthew and Mark mention only one angel. However, Luke mentions two (24:4) with no variation in 01. If harmonisation were the issue, one would also expect the plural ending to be changed, not to mention ἐνα πρὸς τῇ κεφαλῇ καὶ ἐνα πρὸς τοῖς ποσίν. I therefore follow Lindars in assuming TE.

B

ἐν λευκοῖς καθεζομένους
01: καθεζομένους ἐν λευκοῖς
TE.
A

13:

καὶ (1)
01: omitted
Possibly this is a TE, but more probably the lack of a conjunction makes the narrative more vivid and stresses the surprise and excitement of an angel speaking.

01: content change.
B

λέγει
01: text
03: καὶ λέγει
02: text. The first hand wrote τίνα ζήτεις, but this was overwritten and the hand of the over-writer seems so similar to the rest of the MS, that it was probably in scriptorium.
05: τίνα ζήτεις;

Given that the 02 correction was probably in scriptorium, the external evidence for the 03 and 05 readings is weak. The 03 reading is probably a linguistic improvement, because the phrase was thought to need a connector.

A

15:

Ἅρσοῦς

02, 05, 20: ὁ Ἅρσοῦς

𝔓66, 01, 03, 032: text

Articles with names, particularly Jesus, are complex and unpredictable in John. Of 244 instances of the name, 123 have article-variations. This is approximately 54%, compared with 16% in Matt, 13% in Mark and 35% in Luke (Nevius 1965, 82-8312). Such high variation makes general rules difficult to establish, though both Fee (1970-71) and Nevius (1965) attempt to do so. As with names of Mary, one is left to follow the majority of the early evidence and posit TE for the rest.

02: TE.

C

dοκοῦσα

01 only: δὲ δοκοῦσα

Linguistic improvement.

A

ἐβάστασας

01 only: ἐ ὁ βαστάσας

This change could be an attempt to add to the intensity of Mary’s plea – “if you are the man who moved him” sounds more plaintive than “if you moved him.” This is more likely here than a TE, because it completely restructures the sentence.

01: content change.

B

12 It is not clear why Nevius’ percentage for John does not quite tally with the absolute number.


16:

Ἰησοῦς
01, 02, 032, 20: ὁ Ἰησοῦς
03, 05: text
See comments on 20:15.
03: TE.
A

Μαριάμ
02, 05, 20: Μαρία
01, 03, 032: text
01, 03: TE.
C

ἐκείνη
01, 05: δὲ ἐκείνη
01: linguistic improvement.
A

Ἐβραϊστὶ
02 only: omitted
There seems no particular obvious explanation for 02. It is a long and complex word to slip out through TE. Perhaps the best explanation for such an error is that the Greek-speaking scribe had to make such an effort to remember the following Semitic word, ραββουνι that she forgot Ἐβραϊστὶ.
02: TE.
B

17:

Ἰησοῦς
01, 02, 032, 20: ὁ Ἰησοῦς
See comments on 20:15.

03: TE.

μὴ μου ἅπτου

Bernard influentially proposed the conjecture μὴ πτόου ("do not fear", passive imperative of πτοέω, I terrify). He argued that this could easily become corrupted to μὴ ἅπτοι and then the μου added in a variety of different places. The reason for the conjecture is that it is not easy to see the logic of Jesus’ words: why should his imminent ascension be a reason for no touching, especially since he later invites Thomas to touch him? However, given the wealth of NT evidence available, conjecture is surely only justified when all attempts to explain the text as we have it have failed (Barrett, Beasley-Murray). The conjecture creates its own problems, since one must explain why Jesus should tell Mary not to be afraid, when there is no particular evidence she was afraid (Lindars).

I therefore take the text in almost all our witnesses as initial. It seems reasonable to explain 03’s reading as TE.

A

πατέρα

𝔓66, 02, 03: πατέρα μου

The μου is likely harmonisation to v.17b (Beasley-Murray, Brown, Lincoln).

02: harmonisation.

A

δὲ

Late corrector of 01, 05: οὖν

02: omitted
02 is normally more liberal with connectors than the other manuscripts. This suggests that there may be a reason for the omission. Connectors like this are less common with imperatives and it is plausible that 02 omits to give greater vividness to the command. 02: linguistic improvement.

B

μου (2)
01, 05, 032: omitted
A similar pattern of witnesses omit the μου here as did so earlier in the verse and Schnackenburg suggests that there is a connection, but they are in quite different contexts so this is unlikely. The external evidence arguably supports the μου, but it is also likely to be an improvement since the sentence is arguably awkward without it: for the sentence to be clear we need to know what brothers are intended. Dodd (1963, 324) suggests that the brothers in question are the sons of Mary. Acts 1:14 suggests that Jesus appeared to them. Brown argues that John’s most likely meaning is the disciples, Jesus’ spiritual brothers, because Mary announces the news to them in v.18, and in v.17b Jesus stresses that he is ascending “to my Father and your Father”, implying that the disciples now have the same spiritual Father as him. John writes with little awareness of Mary’s other children: it seems unlikely that Jesus would entrust his mother to the Beloved Disciple, if she had other living children. Even if John did not intend to refer to Mary’s children, it is still possible that later scribes understood the brothers that way and removed the μου in order to change the meaning. Texts like the Proto-Evangelium of James show that the perpetual virginity of Mary was a popular doctrine in the early centuries (see Zervos 2019 for an argument that the Proto-Evangelium had extremely early sources). However, since the external evidence for the omission is entirely respectable and the sentence is improved by the μου, it was probably added as a linguistic improvement.
02, 03, 04: linguistic improvement.

B

ἀναβαίνω
01 only: οἶδοι ἀναβαίνω
The word certainly adds energy and excitement to the story and can only have been added for that reason.
01: content change.
A

18:

Μαριὰμ
02, 05, 032, 20: Μαρία
𝔓66, 01, 03: text
01, 03: TE.
C

ἐώρακα
02, 05, 078, 20: ἐώρακεν
33: ἐώρακαμεν
𝔓66, 01, 03, 032: text
Barrett argues convincingly that the readings of 02 is an attempt to clarify the ὅτι followed by first person direct speech. lectio difficilior would therefore counsel avoiding them, especially given that the first person ἐώρακα has a powerful vividness (Barrett, Schnackenburg). It also has strong external evidence.
02: linguistic improvement.
A

19:

τῇ μιᾶ
01: μιᾶ
05, 20: τῇ μιᾶ τῶν
032: μιᾶς
02, 03, 078: text
01: TE.
A
The external evidence is with the shorter reading, which is more explicit. 01 may be alluding to Matt 18:20 (Bernard). Whether or not this is the case, it is certainly a content change.

A

λέγει αὐτοῖς

01 only: λέγει

01 is clearly not initial, because of the weak external evidence, but its motives are not clear. There is no reason, in language, style or content, to remove the word. I therefore tentatively posit a TE.

B

20:

τὰς χεῖρας

02, 03: καὶ τὰς χεῖρας

20: αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας

01, 05, 032, 078: text

The reading of 02 and 03 is both less well attested and facilior. It seems to be an attempt to stress the magnitude of what Jesus is doing: in English we might say “he showed both his hands and his side”. This expresses something not in the alternative reading, so I classify it as a content change.

02, 03: content change.

A

21:

ὁ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν

01, 05, 032: πάλιν
Although the external evidence is balanced, ὁ Ἰησοῦς, written as a nomen sacrum, could easily disappear by haplography after αὐτοῖς (Metzger). Dittography would be less likely, because individual parts of a word are less likely to have been written twice.

01: TE.

A

πέμπω

01: πέμψω

05: ἀποστέλλω

02, 03, early post-scriptorium corrector of 05, 032, 20: text

01 has the external evidence against it, especially when we note that 05, although a different verb, supports the present tense. 01 situates the sending into the future. This is possibly harmonisation to Luke-Acts, where the “sending” of the Church at Pentecost comes after the Ascension. However, there is no real disharmony: Pentecost in Acts 2 is mainly about the sending of the Spirit and only indirectly the sending of the Church. The simplest explanation is surely that this is a content change, moving the sending into the future, to reflect the fact that the mission of the church to all nations is still future at this point.

01: content change.

A

23:

ἂν (1)

02 only: ἐὰν

This could be read as a content change, in that it introduces a conditional element into the sentence, rather than an indefinite one (no longer “whosoever sins”, but “if…the sins of anyone”). However this perhaps reads into the Greek differences that a native speaker would barely notice, but which are exaggerated when the two phrases are translated into English. It is therefore better to classify this as a linguistic improvement.
Moule (1959, 152) notes that ἄν is used where we might expect ἐάν six times in John, so such a linguistic improvement is unsurprising.¹³

A

τινον (both occurrences)

03 and Latin and Syriac evidence: τινος

The strong external attestation of the plural suggests that it is initial. What then has motivated 03’s change? Zahn notes that the singular could be harmonisation to liturgical use in confession and baptism, but the plural may be harmonisation to the verbs (it is not entirely clear if the sins or the people are intended as the subjects). Whether or not there is liturgical harmonisation (which is surely rather speculative without evidence of such liturgies), the singular may reflect the idea that sins belong primarily to individuals, not communities. This is reinforced by the fact that 03 retains αὐτοῖς as plural: the sins that are retained belong to multiple individuals.

03: content change (counted twice, because of the two occurrences).

A

ἀφέωνται (3p, perf, indic, passive – Barrett suggests “a Doric-Ionic-Arcadian” perfect passive, which is a standard form in the NT (Blass, Debrunner and Funk 1961, 49))

01: ἀφεθήσεται (3s, fut, indic, passive)

032, 078, 20: ἀφίενται (3p, pres, indic, passive)

02, 03, 05: text

03: ἀφείονται.

03 is probably a variant spelling of one of the other readings, but it is not clear which. Barrett, Metzger and Schnackenburg suggest it is a variant on the text reading, but this requires taking η as a variant spelling for ε. This is unlikely, because it is hard to imagine epsilon ever being pronounced long. A long e-vowel in Greek would be expressed by eta, but not epsilon (Gignac (1975) nowhere notes that they were commonly interchanged). Presumably this is why Moulton and Howard (Moulton, Howard and Turner 1908-76, 2:206) suggest that 03 is a variant spelling of 032. However, they do not explain how the omicron and epsilon in the penultimate syllable can be regarded as equivalent. Even taking into account the variety of Greek spellings

¹³ Moule does not list the six references.
in this period, this form cannot be convincingly traced to any recognisable part of ἀφίημι, so I classify it as a linguistic non-improvement.

On the one hand, the external evidence favours the text reading (though not by an enormous margin), but on the other, the perfect may be harmonisation to κεκράτηνται (Lincoln). The harmonisation argument is weaker here than at other variation units however. It is reasonable that scribes would want the two verbs to be in different tenses, since forgiving and retaining sins are not symmetrical actions: forgiving effects a change in the future, but retaining is more the absence of action, in the present (Zahn). This shows that, even though the perfect might appear harmonised, it is also difficilior (Metzger). Forgiveness or retention of sins is naturally a present or future action: one cannot undo or change past events, one can merely cause them not to have present or future consequences. Does this mean the perfect is so much difficilior as to be impossible? In fact there are a number of possible explanations: Turner (1965, 80-82) suggests a translation like “whosesoever sins you forgive, they have been forgiven”, i.e. those forgiving sin or pronouncing forgiveness only recognise something which God has already done. Elsewhere, Turner (Moulton, Howard and Turner 1908-76, 3.83) elaborates that this is a resultative perfect and notes that this idiom is particularly common in John, because of “[John’s] love of emphasis and solemnity, its stress on the abiding significance of everything”. The case for a perfect in the initial text, therefore, is strong. 01’s change to the future can thus be understood as a content change: it is surely more than a linguistic improvement, given the important nuances of each tense. It is not clear why 01 changes to the singular. Brown argues that it relates to whether people or sins are forgiven. However, surely it is reasonable that in either case, the verb should be plural. Therefore it is best to clarify the change of number as a linguistic non-improvement.

01: content change, linguistic non-improvement.
A
03: linguistic non-improvement.
B

ēv (2)
01 only: ēv δὲ
02 only: ēv
See comments on a similar variation-unit, pp.161-62. 01 adds the addition of a connecting word, another linguistic improvement.

01: two linguistic improvements.
02: linguistic improvement.

κρατήτε
01 only: κρατηνται
TE.
A

24:

ἠλθεν
01 only: οὖν ἠλθεν
01 has moved the οὖν forward from v.25. It does not “work” here syntactically, because it is in the subordinate clause introduced by ὅτε. It is probably a TE.
A

Ἱησοῦς
02, 032, 078, 20: ὁ Ἱησοῦς
𝔓5, 01, 03, 05: text
See on 20:15.
02: TE.
C

25:

ἄλλοι
01 only: omitted
TE (homoeoteleuton).
A
αὐτοῦ τὸν τύπον
01: αὐτὸν τύπον
𝔓66(vid): αὐτοῦ τοὺς τύπους
022: αὐτοῦ τὸν τόπον

The external evidence is very much with the text reading. 01 was mostly likely a TE for it: the scribe initially wrote simply τὸν τόπον and an in scriptorium corrector added the AY on the front of the TON as a partial correction. This is almost certainly an incomplete correction, since αὐτὸν τόπον makes little or no sense (literally the phrase would read “unless I see in the hands it the mark of the nails”). The in-scriptorium correction was later further corrected to αὐτὸν τὸν τύπον. It seems therefore that 01’s exemplar had the text reading.

01: TE.

Above is the passage in 01. τύπον is on the next line.

τὸν τύπον τὸν ἥλων (2)
01 only: τὴν χεῖραν αὐτοῦ
02, 078, Latin and Syriac evidence: τὸν τόπον τὸν ἥλων
03, 05, 032, 20, Coptic evidence: text

The external evidence is evenly balanced. Lindars and Schnackenburg argue for τύπον in the first instance and τόπον in the second, because it is likely that the initial text had

14 I follow CSP in assigning the correctors.
a different reading at each place and was changed to harmonise. Schnackenburg points out that τόπον is more likely in the first place and τόπον in the second, because it is more logical to see a mark and place a finger on a place than vice versa. I tentatively conclude for τόπον here, because scribes are much more likely to harmonise than to create diversity. 01 seems to be a TE under the influence of the context.

01: TE.
03: harmonisation.

B

τὸν δάκτυλόν μου
01, 05, 032: μου τὸν δάκτυλον
μου τὴν χειρὰ
02, 078, Μ: τὴν χείραν μου
05: μου τὰς χειράς
f¹: τὴν χεῖρα
03 alone: μου τὴν χείραν (there is a nu bar, which was not re-inked)

01, 032: text

I take these two variation units together. In both cases, there is reasonably strong external evidence for placing the μου earlier and it is certainly less usual Greek order, making it the more difficult reading. However, it is unlikely that word order was the same in both instances and therefore I tentatively conclude that the μου was first in the initial text only at second variation unit, since the external evidence is better there. The spelling of χειραν in 03, at the second variation unit, was a common, though not grammatically standard, alternative third declension accusative ending in the Christian era (Blass, Debrunner and Funk 1961, 26).

First Variation Unit:
02, 03: linguistic improvement.

Second Variation Unit:
02: linguistic improvement.
03: linguistic non-improvement.

B

26:

04 becomes extant again with the beginning of this verse.

αὐτοῦ
01 only: omitted
TE (omission of small words).

A

27:

There is some fairly significant rewriting in 02, but the hand and ink are so similar that it was likely in scriptorium, possibly correcting a dittography.

28:

ἀπεκρίθη
02, 20: κοι ἀπεκρίθη
01, 03, 04, 05, 032: text
External evidence is against the added καὶ. It is a clear linguistic improvement and fits with 02’s already noted tendency to add conjunctions.

A

Θωμᾶς

01: ὁ Θωμᾶς

The external evidence is against the inclusion of the article. 01 presumably included it for linguistic reasons, since Thomas has already been referred to.

A

29:

λέγει

01, 032: εἶπεν

The external evidence is with the present tense, which is also difficilior.

01: linguistic improvement.

A

αὐτῷ

01, 032: δὲ αὐτῷ

This and the previous variation unit have an almost identical pattern of attestation (i.e. everything that has the aorist also has the δὲ), so NA²⁸ treats them as one. However, they are not related in sense. Moreover, the post-scriptorium corrector of 01 has corrected εἶπεν back to λέγει, but left δὲ, so in a sense, 01² is an example of this combination. The external evidence is against the δὲ and it is clearly difficilior.

01: linguistic improvement.

A

ὁ Ἰησοῦς

𝔓66, 03: article omitted

See comments on the article with Jesus at 20:15.

03: TE.

C
πεπίστευκας
01 only: καὶ πεπίστευκας
01 has the external evidence against it and is the more expansionary and therefore *facilior*. This is a clear attempt to bring out the contrast between bare faith and faith accompanied by sight.
01: content change.
A

ιδόντες
01 only: ιδόντες με
με is an expansionary addition, emphasising in whom people must believe.
01: content change.
A

καὶ πιστεῦσαντες
02 only: πεπιστευσαντες
TE.
A

30:

αὐτοῦ
02, 03: omitted
𝔓66, 01, 04, 05, 032, 20: text
The majority of the early evidence is with the longer reading. The omission is probably due to TE. However, John frequently uses μαθηταί without αὐτοῦ (e.g. 4:31, 33; 11:7, 8, 54; 13:5, 22; 20:18, 19, 20 (some of which have textual variants) (Schnackenburg)) and there is early evidence for the omission, so I grade this variation unit modestly.
02, 03: TE.
B
The external evidence is very evenly balanced at this verse. This is especially true when we lay aside reverence for 01 and 03 and consider Fee’s (2001) work on \(\Psi^{66}\). \(\Psi^{66}\) is listed by NA\(^{28}\) as *vid*, but it is clear that it could never have read the aorist. One can clearly see the tau and the eta and the lacuna in the middle has space for only two letters (image NTVMR, n.d.). One can see traces of an epsilon and an upsilon. Although they seem to be slightly out of horizontal alignment with the other letters, examining the rest of the page will show that this is normal practice for \(\Psi^{66}\) (Fee 2001, 31).

As discussed at 17:21, according to Fee’s (2001) research, of six verbs in ἵνα-clauses in John with textual variation over the tense, where there is no complete change of stem involved, five of them involve πιστεύω (6:29; 13:19; 17:21; 19:35; 20:31). This suggests that scribes thought carefully about the appropriate tense for πιστεύω after ἵνα, because they were more willing to change it. Unfortunately for modern textual critics, this also means that scribal changes are likely to have been frequent and strong evidence for the initial text is elusive.

This verse is often cited in debates about the purpose of John’s Gospel – is it evangelistic or pastoral, written so that non-Christians will become Christians or so that Christians will stay Christians? Most scholars admit that tense cannot alone decide this (Barrett, Lincoln, Lindars, Michaels, Morris, Schnackenburg). The present could express “begin believing and carry on for a life-time” (Carson 2005, 713). Riesenfeld (1965, 220), who makes a detailed survey of ἵνα-clauses in the Johannine corpus, argues
that, although they normally express “die christliche Lehre oder das christliche Leben”, which we presumably believe or enjoy in an on-going state, nevertheless they can be in the aorist as well as the present. Equally, the aorist does not necessarily express a punctiliar action in these contexts, as is clear from counter-examples such as 1 John 5:13 (Lindars). It is therefore invalid to argue directly from tense to purpose and therefore, relevantly for this project, it is equally invalid to argue directly from evidence of purpose to tense.

Other internal arguments include the fact that, as I argued at 17:21, the aorist is the default tense and we should therefore expect a present to be changed to an aorist more often than vice versa. On the other hand, here ἔχητε is present subjunctive, so the present would be a natural harmonisation (Brown). The participle later in the verse, πιστεύοντες, is present, suggesting on-going action and for this to be coherent, the verb in the ἵνα-clause should express some continuous sense as well. This can, as noted above, be expressed by the aorist, but, given that the participle is present, it would be logical that the finite verb be present as well. It is very plausible that a present was changed to an aorist, as default tense, by a scribe who did not notice the participle. I count this as a TE, rather than a linguistic improvement, because it is more the result of failure to read the sentence carefully than attempts to improve the language.

02, 04: TE.

C

καὶ

01 only: omitted

TE.

01, 05: ζωὴν αἰώνιον

04: ζωὴν αἰώνιον αἰώνιον

Once 04 is included with 01 and 05 as evidence for the longer reading, the external evidence for the longer reading is reasonable, but it is also clearly more expansionary and so less likely. In 04, the word was clearly originally written twice, the second time deleted, with supra-linear dots. As often with deletions, it is unclear whether it was
done in scriptorium or later. It seems best to mark this as both a grade A harmonisation for 01 and 04, since both add αἰώνιον, reflecting common Johannine language, but a grade C TE for 04, because we are not sure whether or not the dittography was corrected in scriptorium.

I have thus analysed all relevant variation in John. The trend observed in Romans, that 02 often changes connectors, in particular introducing δέ, is only very loosely confirmed. It adds the word in 1:40, but removes it in 20:17. A new trend observed in John is that 01 twice in chapter 1 omits verbs of speaking which are not required for the text to make sense (vv.20, 32). We can also notice in 01 an increasing frequency of changes of all kinds, including TEs, in chapter 20. It seems that somewhere in 01’s ancestry, or perhaps to a small degree at several different stages in that ancestry, scribes were getting tired as they approached the end of the book (though speculation on the mind of scribes is obviously impossible to substantiate). Once again, I will tabulate the data and analyse it in significantly more detail at the end of the thesis.
5: Analysis of Variants in Revelation

In this chapter, I analyse the textual characteristics of the pandects in Revelation, as I have done in John and Romans. Revelation has a textual tradition rather different to the other books of the NT, including in ways that are relevant to the project. It has often been noted that the relative value of manuscripts appears to change, 02 and 04 taking the place of 01 and 03 (see p.17 for references). As has been noted before, it is part of the aim of this project to test such assumptions.

The relations between manuscripts of Revelation have been the subject of a number of studies, which I only have space to discuss in broad outline. In the nineteenth century, Bousset (1894, 1906) and Weiss (1892) used an approach similar to Hort’s: they grouped manuscripts and determined the characteristics and relationships of those groups. Weiss’ work is also methodologically similar to mine, in that he investigates the textual characteristics of individual manuscripts (but it is not a focussed study of the pandects).

Hoskier (1929) collated many manuscripts of Revelation and compiled a detailed apparatus. Although his dismissal of the text of Andreas’ commentary and the high value he gave to minuscules is considered eccentric today, his thoroughly gathered data remains valuable (Parker 2008, 230-31). Schmid’s (2018) seminal study is influenced by Hort’s method. Both scholars were faced with an enormous body of data and only a Lachmannian stemmatic method of analysing it, so they were forced to synthesise their many witnesses into groups.1 Schmid argues for two early groups, one chiefly represented by 02 and 04 and the other by 𝔊17 and 01. Lembke (2016) reports how the CBGM has been used to test this division and that the data only partially supports it. Although 02 and 04 agree at 75% of Teststellen, suggesting a strong relationship, 01

1 For an argument for the connection between a wealth of manuscripts and the development of groups or text-types, see Gurry 2016. For an example of Schmid reasoning in this way, see the following: “In this collection of the Apocalypse’s Greek manuscripts, the entire base of witnesses, compromising over two hundred manuscripts leads back to a relatively small number of groups...that can be summarised again in four chief branches. In this way, the entire manuscript tradition can be used for the Urtext’s reconstruction and what is useless can be eliminated.” (Schmid 2018, 31, emphasis translators’).
agrees with \( \Psi^{47} \) at only 63% of Teststellen, only slightly higher than its agreement with 02 (50%) and 04 (56%) and only slightly higher than \( \Psi^{47} \)'s agreement with 02 (53%) and 04 (52%). As Lembke argues, with every NT book, we have a random selection of surviving manuscripts. Therefore, if you take any three, such as 01, 02 and 04, two will be closer to each other than either is to the third. If you then add a fourth, such as \( \Psi^{47} \), it will either be closer to the isolated third or to the pair. If it is closer to the isolated third, it is tempting to build a theory of text-types on these facts, but they do necessarily warrant it (Lembke 2016, 204).

As discussed in chapter 1, there have also been a number of recent, Royse-influenced, singular-readings-focused studies of particular manuscripts of Revelation, notably Hernández’s (2006) work on the pandects and Malik’s (2017) on \( \Psi^{47} \). Revelation has thus been thoroughly studied both with a Hortian method and with a Roysian one, focused on singulars. The time is arguably right for an approach such as mine, which avoid the pitfalls of other methods, by focusing on textual characteristics.

The Majority Text of Revelation is more complex than in the rest of the NT. Since Revelation was not read in the lectionary of the Eastern Church, the Byzantine-era manuscripts are more diverse than in other parts of the NT, so there is no single “Byzantine text” (Parker 2008, 233). The majority of Byzantine-era manuscripts have a certain homogeneity, but can also be divided into sub-families. NA\(^{28}\) divide them into two groups, Andreas and Koine, but this is too simplistic for present purposes. I therefore refer to the apparatus of Hodges and Farstad (1985) and cite the Majority Text according to their categories (although I, of course, reject their view that, outside of Revelation, the earliest form of the text is always found in the majority of manuscripts). Although there have been many attempts to classify and group the different manuscripts of Revelation (e.g. Weiss 1892; Bousset 1894, 1906; Hoskier 1929), Hodges and Farstad’s apparatus is easy to use and prepared with the benefit of recent research. They identify five sub-families, with the following sigla:

- \( \text{M}^a \): The largest group, broadly representing what NA\(^{28}\) calls the Koine text
- \( \text{M}^b \): A small group of manuscripts with a text form associated with the commentary of Andreas of Caesarea
The so-called “Complutensian” group, containing a mixture of Andreas and Koine readings. Hodges and Farstad argue that it is the Koine influence that is earlier and more fundamental.

M^d and M^e: both versions of the Andreas text.

(For more detail, see Hodges and Farstad 1985, xxxii-xliiv).

These sigla have very different meanings to the similar sigla in NA²⁸. When I cite “Majority”, I mean at least four of these groups.

How independent are these five sub-groups? The question is important because, when judging variants, five independent witnesses have much more persuasive weight than five sub-types, descended from a common ancestor some remove from the initial text. Hodges and Farstad (1985, xxxvi) themselves argue that “there is no substantial reason to believe that Andreas and [Koine] have any stemmatic relationship to each other except in the original itself”. Schmid (2018, 136) had argued that fourth-century correctors of 01 were using a text-type similar to that associated with the Andreas manuscripts and that therefore this text must be early, considerably earlier than Andreas’ actual commentary. This would mean it is more likely to be independent of the Koine form. Recently however, Hernández (2014) has found that Schmid seems to have misinterpreted the scholarship on the 01 correctors and in fact the first post-scriptorium corrector was as late as the seventh century. Malik (2015) argues that the sixth century is a more realistic date. This means that the 01 corrector’s familiarity with the Andreas text cannot prove a fourth century date for that text.

However, the age of the Andreas text-form ultimately cannot prove or disprove the independence of Hodges and Farstad’s five groups. Schmid (2018, 87-88) finds seventy-two passages where the Andreas and Koine texts agree, at twenty-nine of which he argues the agreement is co-incidental or agreement on the initial text. The remaining forty-three indicate that they probably have common ancestors later than the autograph, but, on the other hand, they agree sufficiently rarely to suggest that they are not especially closely related and therefore their combined testimony is relatively weighty.
Another issue which differentiates the text of Revelation from the rest of the NT is that the Greek is arguably more Semitised. There is debate about to what extent the unusual grammar and syntax of Revelation are due to Semitic influences. Charles (1920) and Thompson (1985) have strongly argued for the presence of Semitisms, but Moț (2015) argues against them, suggesting that all the book’s linguistic peculiarities can be explained within a Greek linguistic context. Part of the problem is the definition of “Semitism”. Often in scholarship, the term is used with a strong sense to mean words or structures in a non-Semitic language (normally Greek) that are so obviously influenced by a Semitic language that they are strong evidence that the relevant text was translated from a Semitic Vorlage, even if there is no independent evidence of this Vorlage. In this strong sense, genuine Semitisms are hard to find, because it is often possible to account for what seems Semitic by explanations other than translation from a Semitic Vorlage, such as the influence of LXX or of the Egyptian form of Hellenistic Greek. For these reasons, Gathercole (2012) and Davila (2005) argue against any strong-sense Semitisms in (respectively) the Gospel of Thomas and the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha and Wilcox (1984) argues for only a few in the NT. However, there is also a weaker sense in which Greek prose can be “Semitised”: it can be written de novo in Greek, but influenced in idioms by Semitic languages, perhaps via LXX (sometimes called “Septuagintalisms”) or because the writer was a native Semitic-speaker. Sceptics of strong-sense Semitisms grant that there are many Semitisms in this weak sense in Jewish Greek literature (though they often only use the term “Semitism” to refer to Semitisms in the strong sense). Schmidt (1991) argues for many weak-sense Semitisms in Revelation. I use the term “Semitism” to refer to Greek that is Semitic in the weak sense, implying no claim about whether or not any part of Revelation was translated from a Semitic Vorlage.

Revelation has been the subject of complex redactional hypotheses. Aune (1997, cxix-cxx) isolates a number of pericopes in Revelation which, he argues, were written earlier and only incorporated into the main text after it was completed. Massyngberde-Ford (1975) argues the earliest parts of the text were written by a Jewish, non-Christian disciple of John the Baptist. As in John, while these redactional matters are not entirely irrelevant to my project, it is generally agreed that the work had reached its final form prior to our earliest manuscripts. Therefore the initial text, which is the “yardstick” against which we measure the textual characteristics of the pandects, is the final
redaction, not a collection of separated sources. As in the previous chapter, for convenience sake, I refer to the author or final redactor of this final form as John, without wishing to imply support for any particular theory of authorship.

As before, I discuss every variation unit where there is any disagreement between the pandects, where they all disagree with the text of NA²⁸, or where there is significant doubt regarding the initial text, excluding orthographic variants. I categorise as in previous chapters. I present the textual data as in previous chapters. I list the readings of the three manuscripts under investigation, the various branches of the Majority text and any other ancient authorities that may be relevant. When any pandect or branch of the Majority text is not listed, it can be assumed that it supports the text reading.

A number of times, 01 omits the article when it would normally be appropriate and I note these here, rather than each time they occur. In deciding when the article is appropriate, I follow the approach of Levinsohn (2000, 148-63) that when a noun has already been “activated”, i.e. brought to the reader or listener’s attention, then the only reason for it to be anarthrous is if it is particularly emphasized. The passages are: 1:5; 12:14; 13:2, 16; 22:1, 2, 3, 17 (twice – see ad loc for detailed discussion, including an image, of the article with πνεῦμα)

All are classified as A grade linguistic non-improvements.

Verse-by-Verse Analysis

Revelation 1

1:

Verse Missing in 04.

δούλοις

01 alone: ἁγίοις

The external evidence suggests that 01’s reading is not initial. However the explanation for the change is not obvious. ἁγίος expresses specialness and sanctity. Such a thought
would appeal to Christians facing hostility from their surrounding communities.\(^2\) Karrer (2009, 382) argues that 01’s use of the ἀγ- root here and at 3:14 and 22:21 shows the manuscript’s dualistic, particularist leanings. Hernández (2006, 84 n. 236) dismisses this explanation as unlikely, since if there was a scribal interest in this idea, we would see it more often throughout Revelation. It is most likely therefore that 01’s insertion is harmonising with the salutations of the Pauline documents, where the ἀγ-root is common.\(^3\)

01: harmonisation.

A

tὸ δούλῳ

02 only: τοῦ δούλου

TE

A

3:

τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας

01: τὸν λόγον τῆς προφητείας

04 only: τοὺς λόγους τούτους τῆς προφητείας

02, Majority: text

There are two issues to consider here: the number of λόγος and the pronouns. Regarding the number, the external evidence for the plural is strong, both here and at the other passages where similar language is used (22:7, 10, 18) (Aune). The singular also makes the sentence read less naturally, given that the book contains not only many words, but many ideas and stories. Regarding the pronouns, the external evidence points to excluding them. 04’s introduction of the pronoun is presumably an attempt to improve the language, a view bolstered by the fact that the scribes of the late Greek manuscripts also thought such improvement was needed.

01: linguistic non-improvement.

04: linguistic improvement.

\(^2\) This is not to make any claim about state persecution, it is rather to make the mild claim that at no time before the conversion of Constantine were Christians the dominant culture.

\(^3\) Rom 1:7; 1 Cor 1:2; Eph 1:1; Phil 1:1; Col 1:2.
The external evidence is strongly in favour of the accusative. John’s regular style with ποιέω seems to be a second accusative object to express the thing into which the first
object is made (e.g. 3:12, 5:10 and 12:15, all with no significant variants). Since there is no obvious cause of TE, the motive is presumably linguistic.

02, 04: linguistic improvement.

A

eἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων ἀμήν.
01: εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τῶν αἰώνων
02, 𝔓\textsuperscript{18}: εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ἀμήν

04, Majority: text

01 has slender external evidence, so it is probably TE. However, the choice between the shorter and longer forms is more complex. The shorter form is attested by two significant early manuscripts. Smalley also argues that it is simpler and less expansionary and therefore likely to be initial. Here, however, the canon of less expansionary reading is arguably outweighed by other canons. The longer form occurs eleven times in Revelation and is thus characteristically Johannine (Metzger). Muraoka (2015, 412-13) also argues it is influenced by LXX in a typically Johannine way (it occurs at 4 Macc 18:24; Ps 83:5; Dan 3:90; 7:18 (both texts)). On the other hand, as Beale argues, its very frequency makes it unlikely to be the initial reading, since it makes harmonisation probable. When, as here, the least intrinsically plausible reading is attested by two early manuscripts, but not by many late manuscripts, it is difficult to judge if this was a TE in the early manuscripts, which has been rightly corrected, or authorial variation, which the later manuscripts have harmonised. In the end, I submit that the ease of TE by 02 and 𝔓\textsuperscript{18} must nudge us to conclude that their reading is not initial (Osborne, Thomas).

01, 02: TE.

C

7:

μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν
04: ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν

The external evidence is clearly with μετὰ. The change is likely due to harmonisation with Dan 7:13 (where there is significant textual variation, for details see Ziegler,
Munnich and Fraenkel 1999 *ad loc* and Matt 24:30 (without significant variation) (Weiss 1892, 159). Mark 13:26 and Luke 21:27 both have ἐν, without significant variants (Thomas). Hernández (2012, 94-95) suggests that harmonisation to the Gospels is “a well-attested scribal habit” and that therefore harmonisation to Matthew is more likely than to Daniel, but, on the other hand, Revelation contains many OT allusions, so the OT context would presumably have been important to the scribes of Revelation as well. Moreover, Hernández does not explain why 04 harmonises to Matthew, not to Mark and Luke. The fact that there is such variety in how the NT writers take the preposition arguably suggests that they were not especially concerned to quote Daniel exactly, which arguably makes it unlikely that scribes of Revelation would harmonise to Daniel. ἐπὶ is an understandable content change, since it expresses position upon and we can readily picture a figure seated upon clouds. I therefore suggest that this is a content change, but rate as C.

δῆσεται
01: δῆσονται
Harmonisation to κόψονται, later in the verse (Schmid 2018, 129).
A

πᾶς
01 only: παρ
TE.
A

οἵτινες αὐτῶν
01 only: pronoun omitted
TE.
A

ἐπὶ αὐτῶν
01: preposition omitted
TE.
A
8:

καὶ τὸ ὦ
01: καὶ ἐγὼ καὶ τὸ ὦ
Linguistic improvement
A

 öde
01, M\textsuperscript{abc}: adds ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος
M\textsuperscript{d}: adds ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος
02, 04, M\textsuperscript{ac}: text
01: harmonisation with 21:6 (Metzger, Smiley) and 22:13.
A

9:

ἐν Ἰησοῦ
01: ἐν Ἰησοῦ (though CSP express a degree of uncertainty about correcting hands here)
02: ἐν Χριστῷ
M\textsuperscript{abc}: ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ
M\textsuperscript{de}: Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
04: text
It is much more plausible that a scribe add one of the names of Jesus than remove it. Schmid (2018, 238-39) has found that John’s regular term, when not using the double name, is Ἰησοῦς and it is highly plausible that the scribe of 02 or an ancestor, would change that to Χρίστος, by harmonisation with Paul or because it implied a higher Christology.
02: content change.
B

νῆσῳ
04: σω
TE.
A όπίσω μου φωνήν μεγάλην
02 (alone): φωνήν μεγάλην ὅπισθέν μου
Μa b(pt) c: φωνήν ὁπίσω μου μεγάλην
01, 04, Mde: text

The external evidence is against 02 here, but it is hard to see what the explanation is. It is hardly an improvement, since it reads more clearly if φωνήν μεγάλην is nearer ὡς σάλπιγγος than if μου is in that position, since it is the voice, not the author, that is like

B 

ἐγενόμην
02 only: ἐγώ ἐγενόμην

Linguistic improvement (presumably done for clarity).

A

διὰ τὸν λόγον
04: καὶ τὸν λόγον

Transcriptional error.

A

tὴν μαρτυρίαν
01 and Majority: διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν

The balance of external evidence favours the preposition. Schmid (1955, 2.217) also argues that it is John’s style to repeat prepositions when there are two nouns. As always when any regular practice is identified, the point “cuts both ways”, since scribes are likely to harmonise to that regular practice. Here, however, the authorial proclivity to repeat prepositions would arguably not prompt scribal harmonisation: the authorial proclivity is a general principle, rather than a specific series of words, which would create a mental echo for the scribe, prompting her to harmonise. Presumably the scribes omitted in the interest of concision, such that this counts as a linguistic improvement.

02, 04: linguistic improvement.
a trumpet. Regarding the change of ὀπίσω to ὤπισθεν, Labahn (2012, 108-09) notes that Ezek 3:12, to which John here alludes, has κατόπισθεν, which may be influencing 02, but this is uncertain.

02: linguistic non-improvement (A), harmonisation (C).

11:

ὁ βλέπεις
04: ὁ βλέψεις
01: omitted
02 and all Majority groups: text

Both the overwhelming weight of external evidence and the sense of the passage tell against 01’s reading. 01’s omission must be TE resulting from homoeoteleuton with the sigmas of βλέπεις and λεγούσης. The strong weight of external evidence also rules out the future tense of 04. The most likely cause is harmonisation due to the many instances of psi in the context.

A

Tischendorf cites 04 as βλέπεις. Lyon (1959, 413) includes it in his list of Tischendorf’s errors. Lyon is clearly right.

εἰς βιβλίον
01 alone: εἰς τὸ βιβλίον

Linguistic non-improvement.

A

καὶ πέμψον
01 only: καὶ omitted.
This is more than an orthographic distinction, but relates to the form of the noun. 02 and 04 take it as feminine singular, the rest of the evidence as neuter plural. Schmid (2018, 200) points out that it is neuter in all inscriptions and literary references (at least at the time Schmid wrote – it is not clear if the 2018 translators have verified this) and therefore the feminine reading is almost certainly the result of the influence of the other endings in nu. 2:18 forms the name in neuter plural without significant variation, which is further evidence for this being the standard form.

02, 04: linguistic non-improvement.

Variations in the order of the list:

01 only puts Smyrna after Thyatira and omits Sardis.

TE (twice).

The issue is one of tenses. Me⁷ has aorist, 02 present and the others imperfect. Imperfect is arguably the most appropriate tense to use and enjoys strong support.
02’s present tense is most likely due to the epsilon being “swallowed” in TE with the preceding sigma.

13:

ἐν μέσῳ
01 only: μέσον
Linguistic non-improvement.

τῶν λυχνιῶν
01 and Majority: τῶν ἑπτὰ λυχνιῶν
02 and 04: text

The external evidence is balanced. Schmid (2018, 138) notes that the arrangement of witnesses is similar with a similar doubtful ἑπτά at 5:6. Schmid argues that the inclusion is initial in both cases, but this does not follow simply from the patterns of attestation being the same. In the present verse, the number may have been added due to harmonisation with ἑπτὰ λυχνίας in the previous verse. There is thus a more plausible explanation for the insertion of the number than its omission.

01: harmonisation.

B

ὁμοίων
02 alone: ὁμοίωμα

Karrer suggests that this is harmonisation to Ezek 1:26. The immediate context of the word is different in both verses, but on the other hand, Ezek 1 is in general a passage with strong links to Rev 1.

02: harmonisation.

B

ὑίὸν ἀνθρώπου
02, 04 and Ma(p) cdc: υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου
01 and Ma(p) b: text
The external evidence moderately favours the dative. Schmid (2018, 261) notes that the dative reflects standard grammar and therefore the accusative is *difficilior*. 02’s dative is doubtless the result of its variant, ὁμοίωμα, in the previous variation unit, which regularly takes the dative.\(^4\)

04: linguistic improvement.

02: not counted, because the text is clearly the result of the previous variation unit.

\(B\)

ποδήρη

02: ποδήρην

TE from other final nus.

\(A\)

14:

ὁς ἔριον

04, M\(^{de}\): ὡσεί ἔριον

The external evidence is fairly even. Aune points out that ὡσεί is found for ὡς at 1:17 and 16:3 in 01 and at 16:13 in 01 and \(𝔓\)\(^{47}\). This suggests that it was a common change made by early scribes. Even Labahn (2012, 105-07, 116, 124), who discusses the possibility of solving this variation unit with reference to Dan 7:9 (both texts), which has ὡσεί, suggests that this variation is so common in Revelation that TE is more likely.

04: TE.

\(A\)

15:

οὶ πόδες...πεπυρωμένης

01: οἱ πόδες...πεπυρωμένοι

Majority: οἱ πόδες...πεπυρωμένοι

02 and 04: text

\(^4\) For the case of ὁμοίωμα, see Karrer.
The reading of 02 and 04 is grammatically difficult, since the adjective agrees with nothing obvious. Weiss suggests it is a genitive absolute with an implied χαλκολιβάνης as subject, implied from recent context. Weiss claims this feminine form of the word for bronze is standard Greek. He offers 17:8 as another example of a genitive absolute without a stated subject. Hort and Thomas agree. Karrer suggests μορφῆς as the implied noun. The dative reading makes the word agree with χαλκολιβάνῳ and the nominative plural with πόδες and are obvious linguistic improvements (Mounce). The fact that there are two different improvements on the difficult reading further suggests that it is the initial text (Thomas).

01: linguistic improvement.

B

16:

καὶ ἔχων
01: καὶ ἔχειν
02: καὶ

04 and all forms of majority: text

The external evidence is clearly against the complete omission of the verb, as in 02. This is best explained as a linguistic improvement, since the scribe evidently thought the text read better without the verb. Something similar can be said of the reading of 01: the external evidence is clearly against it and it is easy to see how the indicative might have seemed clearer to the scribe than the participle, since there is nothing obvious for the participle to agree with. As Charles notes, “hanging” participles with present continuous sense are a Semitic idiom, which a Greek scribe might easily correct to an indicative. Thompson (1985, 109) argues that έχων is a standard, though non-literal, way of rendering the Hebrew 荅. Either way, this seems to be a weak-sense Semitism.

01 and 02: linguistic improvement.

A

ἀστέρας

02, Ψ98: ἀστέρες
02: TE.
A

ὡς ὁ ἥλιος φαίνει
01 and Boharic: φαίνει ὡς ὁ ἥλιος
01: linguistic improvement.⁵
A

17:

πρὸς τοὺς πόδας
01: εἰς τοὺς πόδας
The slim attestation of 01’s reading suggests it is unlikely to be initial, but there is little to account for the change. There can hardly be said to be a difference in content, so presumably, the scribe of the variant preferred εἰς for some subtle linguistic reason.
01: linguistic improvement.
B

ὡς νεκρός
01: ὡςεὶ νεκρός
By the same reasoning, as at 1:14…
TE.
A

ἔθηκεν
01: ἐπέθηκεν
Presumably linguistic improvement.
A

μὴ φοβοῦ
01: omitted

---

⁵ Charles argues that this is a corrected Semitism.
There is no more plausible explanation for this change than content. The scribe could plausibly have so strongly thought that fear was an inappropriate reaction to encountering God, that she removed even a negative reference to fear. Whilst this may seem unlikely, no better explanation presents itself.

C

ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ πρῶτος
02 only: ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ πρωτότοκος
02’s uniqueness suggests that it is almost certainly not initial. As Hernández (2006, 127-28) argues, it is likely that the change is content-driven, because πρωτότοκος is a heavily loaded theological concept, applied significantly to Christ in Col 1:15, 18. This is especially likely because 02 makes the same change in 2:8.

02: content change.

A

18:

καὶ ὁ ζῶν
01 only: καὶ omitted
A linguistic improvement to avoid “piling up” of the word καὶ.

A

19:

ἄ μέλλει
04: ἂ δεῖ μέλλει
01: ἂ δεῖ μέλλειν
02, Majority: text
To add δεῖ is unnecessary and, as Schmid (2018, 104) points out, doubtless due to harmonisation to 1:1, 4:1 and 22:6. Von Ameln, Kabiersch and Berdozzo (2012, 407 n. 30) argue that the reading of 04 could either be a TE whereby the final nu of μέλλειν has dropped out or it may be a botched attempt to combine the other two readings. It is unlikely that attempts to tidy and smooth out would fail to such an extent, so a TE is more likely.
01: harmonisation.

04: TE.

A

\(\gamma e\nu\ne\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\)

\(M^{\text{ab}(p)}: \gamma i\nu\e\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\)

02: \(\gamma e\nu\ne\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\) (more likely an orthographic equivalent for \(\gamma i\nu\)- than for \(\gamma e\nu\)-, because epsilon-iota with iota is more readily interchangeable with plain iota than plain epsilon)

The difference is the tenses. The external evidence favours the aorist. Aune, following Schmid, notes that, although in general in the NT, \(\mu\ell\ell\epsilon\iota\) takes a present infinitive, in Revelation, it takes a present nine times and an aorist three times (excluding this verse). One of the present infinitives has textual variants to an aorist and all the aorists have textual variants to a present (Schmid 2018, 219). This all suggests that scribes expected presents and were much more likely to change aorists to presents than \textit{vice versa}. The aorist is therefore likely initial.

02: linguistic improvement.

A

20:

\(\epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\ieta\ \delta\epsilon\xi\iota\upsilon\iota\)

02: \(\epsilon\nu\ \tau\ieta\ \delta\epsilon\xi\iota\upsilon\iota\)

Given the external evidence, 02 is almost certain to be not initial, but it is linguistically arguably better: the risen Christ presumably holds the starts in his hand, rather than letting them rest upon his hand. Aune suggests harmonisation to 2:1 as another possible explanation. It is hard to adjudicate between the two, but the low external evidence for \(\epsilon\nu\) makes a harmonisation more likely: if the \(\epsilon\pi\iota\) was sufficiently poor language for a scribe to reject it, we would expect many other scribes to make the same judgment, but it is plausible for a harmonisation not to be so widespread.

02: harmonisation.

B

\(\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\sigma\iota\omega\nu\ \epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\nu\)

01: verb omitted
This is most plausibly a linguistic improvement to avoid repeating the verb, which is at the end of the verse.

A

ἀι λυχνίαι αἱ ἐπτά
01: ἐπτὰ λυχνίαι
Mb: αἱ ἐπτὰ λυχνίαι αἱ
M<sup>cde(pt)</sup>: αἱ ἐπτὰ λυχνίαι ἂς εἴδες
M<sup>e(pt)</sup>: ἐπτὰ λυχνίαι ἂς εἴδες
02, 04, M<sup>a</sup>: text

The external evidence seems to favour the reading of 02, but certainty is difficult, not least because the Majority Tradition is so fragmented. It is at least as plausible as anything else that 01’s reading arose by TE due to repeated –αι endings.

01: TE.

B

(Lyon transcribes 04 without the final iota on λυχνίαι, but Tischendorf includes it. Lyon (1959, 413) does not list this in his list of errata in Tischendorf; so there seems to be an error on Lyon’s part here: either he did not notice the iota in Tischendorf, or omitted to print it himself or omitted it from the list of errata. Unfortunately the word is underneath a particularly obscure part of the over-writing and it is impossible to be sure, even using the multi-spectral images. Because Lyon does not list this as an error in Tischendorf, it seems most likely that this is his own “typo” in writing his transcription.)
The nu-eta is lacunose, but there can be no doubt this is what it is. It is fairly clear that 02’s reading is not initial. Aune dismisses it as a “careless TE”. However, Hernández (2006, 130 n. 143) notes that, by the time of the NT, περιβλέπω is sometimes deponent, so the phrase makes sense as a way to express “looking at the sun”. He goes on to note that Oecumenius connects the sun to Jesus, in such a way that “looking at” becomes at least as plausible a translation as “clothed with”. The cause of the variation could thus either be transcriptional or content-related. The most likely explanation is a combination: TEs are much more likely when they lead to a reading that makes good sense, but in that case the fundamental nature of the change will be transcriptional.

B

ὴ σελήνη

01 only: τὴν σελήνην

Hernández (2006, 80 n. 205) suggests that the case change is due to attraction to the accusative, τὸν ἥλιον. Since the result is nonsense, rather than a text that is like another passage in a meaningful way, I categorise it as a TE, not a harmonisation.
2:

καὶ κράζει
04: καὶ ἐκραζὲν
Μ\(\text{abc}\): ἐκραζὲν
Μ\(\text{def(pt)}\): κράζει
02: κράζει καὶ
01, \(\Psi\)^47: text

There are two different points of variation here, the verb and the καὶ. Regarding the καὶ, it is arguably bad Greek to include it, since it appears to co-ordinate a participle and a main verb (Bousset). However, this makes the καὶ difficilior and therefore likely to be initial. Moreover, it has the backing of all the early evidence and Swete and Thomas argue that it is perfectly admissible Greek. Schmid (2018, 255) offers a number of other examples where καὶ is used to co-ordinate a main verb and a participle, such as at 1:5-6. 02’s movement of the καὶ appears to be a linguistic improvement, so that it co-ordinates two participles, not a participle and a main verb. Regarding the tense, the present has the weight of the external evidence and the historic present would be an idiom scribes could plausibly correct to the literally correct tense (Smalley, Aune).

02, 04: linguistic improvement.

A

3:

μέγας πυρρὸς
04: πυρὸς μέγας
\(\Psi\)^47, 01: πυρρὸς μέγας
02: text

It is possible that the reading of 04 is not an alternative spelling of πυρρός, the colour word, but the genitive of πῦρ, fire (Massyngberde-Ford). However, the colour makes much better sense and there is no reason to posit an unlikely variant when an orthographic explanation will suffice.\(^6\) Regarding the position, the balance of external

\(^6\) Aune, Bousset, Farrer, Smalley and Weiss all assume it is the colour.
evidence slightly favours the colour word coming first. Weiss suggests that, since it is more important for sense, placing it second is a linguistic improvement. However, arguing this persuasively would require proving that generally in Greek, size adjectives come before colour. It is a possible explanation, but in the light of the lack of evidence, I rate it as C.

02: linguistic improvement.

C

τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτοῦ

02: τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν

𝔓47: τὰς κεφαλὰς

The external evidence is against 02, which appears to be influenced by the plurals in context. I classify it as a TE, rather than a harmonisation, because it is not harmonised to another passage or to an idea in this passage; rather it is a nonsense reading produced by the influence of the plurals. There is clearly only one dragon, so “their heads” makes little sense.

02: TE.

A

4:

τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

01 only: τὸ τρίτον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

The extra words are deleted by supralinear dots, but CSP is confident they are postscriptorium. As Hernández (2006, 66) says, the repetition of τρίτον is “thoughtless”.

01: TE.

A

ἔστηκεν

04 only: ἔστήκει

The parsing and meaning of the text reading depends on the breathing: it could either be ἔστηκεν, the perfect of ἱστήμι, which would have a present sense or ἔστηκεν, the imperfect of στήκο (Thomas). The reading of 04 is more difficult to account for. ε > ει is not a common orthographic variant (it is not mentioned in Gignac 1975). It could
possibly be a perfect subjunctive of ἵστημι, but this would be a rare form and there is no reason to have a subjunctive here. I therefore class it as a TE.

A

5:

υἱὸν ἀρσεν

𝔓47, 01, many late manuscripts, Majority: υἱὸν ἀρσενα (with orthographic variants)

02, 04: text

The basic problem here is between the masculine and neuter forms of the accusative of ἀρσήν. Both forms are attested: the masculine is used at 12:13 and the neuter at Exod 2:2; Isa 66:7; Jer 20:15; 37:6 (Aune). Fekkes (1994, 184) and Beale point out that the use of the masculine at 12:13 shows that John clearly knew it, but on the other hand, that could be an argument for harmonisation (Smalley). The neuter is clearly difficilior, since word agrees with a masculine noun, υἱός. One possible reconciliation is that ἀρσεν is not an adjective describing υἱὸν, but a noun in apposition (Thomas; Schmid 2018, 94). John may also have chosen the neuter as a conscious allusion to Isa 66:7, which has a similar context of blessing after the suffering of God’s people (Loisy, Beale, Osborne; Fekkes 1994, 184). It is thus entirely plausible that the neuter is the initial reading and the masculine a linguistic improvement. Weiss and Tasker (1949, 65) both suggest that the alpha may have dropped out due to TE, but one of Weiss’ major arguments for this is the geographical spread of the masculine reading and textual critics today are generally sceptical of geographical arguments.7 I thus suggest that the masculine is a linguistic improvement.

01: linguistic improvement.

B

ἐν ῥάβδῳ

04, various minuscules: preposition omitted

Everything else: text

---

7 P.Oxy. 3.405 is often cited in this connection. It is a manuscript of Irenaeus from the early third century at the latest. The text of Irenaeus’ work had spread within decades from Lyon to Egypt. See Blummel and Wayment 2015, 287-88.
Bousset (1894, 27) notes that this is a reasonably common linguistic improvement, replacing the ἐν, which seems to show influence of the Hebrew instrumental ב, with a more “properly” Greek instrumental dative.

04: linguistic improvement.
A

ἡρπάσθη
01 only: ἡρπάγη
Aune argues that text form is “certainly original”. It is the original Attic form, whereas the other is more Hellenised.

01: linguistic non-improvement.
A

6:

ἐχει ἐκεῖ τόπον
04, some later witnesses: omit ἐκεῖ
The longer reading, with ἐκεῖ, is very likely to be initial, because the word would easily be omitted, next to the similar-sounding ἐχει (Aune) and because the sentence reads better without it. ἐκεῖ here is a resumptive adverb, which arguably reflects a Semitic idiom: in Hebrew, מ...ר is a natural construction (e.g. Gen 13:4; 2 Sam 15:21 (Aune)). δοπο with a resumptive adverb is used relatively commonly in Greek which has been under Semitic influence of one kind or other (e.g. Rev 17:9; B-text Judg 18:10; Ruth 3:4; Eccl 9:10 (Aune)). It is thus entirely plausible that John wrote the ἐκεῖ and it was removed either by TE or Atticisation (Aune; Thompson 1985, 111-12). A scribe would be much more likely to make TEs in accord with what she thought a text “should” say, on grounds of language or content, so both probably played a role.

04: TE; linguistic improvement.
A

τρέφωσιν
Μąc, 046: ἐκτρέφωσιν
01, 04: τρέφωσιν
Although surprising, the plural is readily explained as an impersonal plural or plural of divine action (Beale, Weiss; Thompson 1985, 22). The indicative is at first sight harder to explain. Despite its many grammatical eccentricities, Revelation never otherwise follows ἵνα with an indicative (Schmid 2018, 233). Weiss and Bousset argue that 01 and 04 have made a TE, with Weiss noting that both also change ω to οῦ in the participle, νικῶντι in 2:17. However, this is interchange between οῦ and ω is relatively common in the papyri, including when it creates ambiguities between indicative and subjunctive (Gignac 1975, 1.210), so this is probably best read as orthographic variation.

αὐτῆν
01 (only): αὐτῶν
TE (Hernández 2006, 85).
A

7:

ὁ Μιχαὴλ.
02 only: ὅτε Μιχαὴλ.
02 is highly unlikely to preserve the initial text here. The added τε could either be copulative, linking with the following καὶ to co-ordinate Michael and his angels, or it could be ὅτε, creating a temporal clause. In either case, it is a clear linguistic improvement (Hernández 2006, 121).
A

tοῦ πολέμησαι
𝔓 47, 01, Majority: article omitted
The infinitive is difficult syntactically and made even more difficult by the genitive article. Moule (1959, 129) writes “it is doubtful whether any less barbarous Greek than that of Revelation would have tolerated [such language]”. Beale suggests supplying a verb such as ἔλθον, so that Michael and the angels become the subject. Mounce reasonably suggests ἐγένετο in the previous clause could play that role. However, this does not explain the τοῦ or the fact that the infinitive has a nominative subject. Beale suggests the phrase may express purpose (so that it means “and there was war in heaven.
in order that Michael and his angels should fight with the dragon…”). This is made more plausible by the fact that often in LXX, nominative + τοῦ + infinitive translates the Hebrew construction noun-subject + lamedh + infinitive. However, it is hard to understand why the verb, πολεμέω, would in this way be dependent on the phrase ἐγένετο πόλεμος. This seems tautological: it would mean “there was war in order that there be war”. Lancellotti (1964, 112) suggests that we take the infinitive as a historic or verbal infinitive, which explains why it has a nominative subject. He explains the τοῦ by dittography with the preceding αὐτοῦ. He argues that such a dittography could very easily happen and that articular infinitives are rare in Revelation. This is in fact the only one, but there are twenty-seven in Matthew, sixteen in Mark, seventy-two in Luke, four in John, fifty-two in Acts and 111 in the undisputed Pauline letters (Aune). Thus dittography, creating an articular infinitive, is much more plausible than an articular infinitive in the initial text, especially given the strong external evidence. Although the shorter reading is obviously facilior and although in general I argue for the helpfulness of lectio difficilior as a criterion, we would be foolish to be slaves to any single criterion.

02, 04: TE.

8:

ἵσχυσαν

𝔓47, 04, Mṭ: ἱσχύσαν

01 only: ἱσχύσαν πρὸς αὐτὸν

02, 04: πόλεμος αὐτοῦ

02, Mṭbc : text

The singular verb is clearly difficilior, because the preceding subject in the previous verse, ὁ δράκων…καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ is plural. Even allowing for the tendency of Greek to use singular verbs with multiple singular subjects, a plural verb would still be appropriate, because ἄγγελοι is plural (Thomas, Smalley, Weiss; Schmid 2018, 110). Massyngberde-Ford suggests that the singular may allude to Theodotion-Daniel 7:21. This relatively obscure allusion might easily be missed by a scribe, who would then

8 E.g. Ps 24:14; 1 Chr 9:25; Eccl 3:15 (Beale).

9 Aune refers to the “genuine” Pauline letters, without specifying which he thinks those are.

10 Weiss also thinks the τοῦ is due to dittography.
correct to plural. The addition by 01 is fairly clearly a clarifying addition (Hernández 2006, 69), which, since it adds in a meaningful way to the content, I classify as a content change.

04: harmonisation (to surrounding plurals).

01: harmonisation and content change.

A

tόπος

01 only: τότε

A clear nonsense TE (Hernández 2006, 64-64).

A

eὑρέθη αὐτῶν

01: eὑρέθη

Μabc: eὑρέθη αὐτῷ

Μd, Ψ47: αὐτῶν eὑρέθη

02, 04, Mє: text

The text reading has fairly strong external attestation and is difficilior, because it separates the dependent genitive from its noun (Aune, Smalley). The dative reading is plausibly harmonisation to 20:11 and Theodotion-Daniel 2:35 (Aune), but both these passages have a plural dative, so the case for harmonisation is relatively weak. It is most likely that in all their different ways, the various readings attempt to resolve the separation between the genitive and its partner-noun. The very fact that many resolutions have been attempted strengthens the probability that this is the initial text.11

01: linguistic improvement.

A

9:

ό μέγας, ο ὄφις

01: ο μέγας ὄφις

Ψ47, 115 (vid), Bohairic: ο ὄφις, ο μέγας,

---

11 Aune and Smalley make this point about the αὐτῶν eὑρέθη reading.
Everything else: text

The external evidence does not incline in any particular direction, since the text reading has 02 and 04 and the reading of \( \text{𝔓}^{47} \) has two papyri and an early version (in a context where the version is valuable, because the difference in meaning between “snake” and “great” is easily detectable across languages). TEs are obviously common with long strings of nouns and adjectives with similar endings. The text reading has a neat pattern of noun, adjective, noun, adjective, but as always, this is also a good reason why a scribe would correct to the text reading. Since a decision must be made, the sense that the reading of the papyri is \textit{difficilior} leads me to submit that it is initial. 02 and 04 are thus a linguistic improvement and 01 a non-improvement (because \( \text{o \, μέγας}, \, \text{o \, ὄφις} \) builds up substantives in a dramatic manner).

C

καί \( \text{o \, Σατανάς} \)

\( \text{𝔓}^{47}, \, \text{M}^{abcde}, \, καί \, Σατανάς \)

01: \( \text{o \, Σατανάς} \)

Everything else (incl \( \text{M}^e \)): text

Schmid’s data suggests that it is hard to find a convincing general pattern for the \textit{Sprachgebrauch} of Revelation with regard to the article, but its omission here by some manuscripts is arguably caused by its omission also with \( \text{Διάβολος} \) (Smalley; Schmid 2018, 210). This is plausible given the strong external evidence for its inclusion. 01’s omission of the καί may be a TE or a linguistic improvement, because \( \text{ὁ \, Σατανάς} \) is in apposition to \( \text{Διάβολος} \), rather than being co-ordinate to it. The fact that relatively few other witnesses or groups have followed 01 arguably suggests that a TE is more likely.

B

10:

\( \text{ἡ\, ἐξουσία} \)

02, 628: article omitted

\( \text{𝔓}^{47}: \text{ἡ\, σωτηρία} \)

In 02, the article has been added by a corrector. The ink colour seems so similar to the rest of the codex that it was probably in scriptorium. The fact that 02 is rarely corrected
suggests that the corrections were made using the same exemplar as the first writing and therefore were probably done in scriptorium. Therefore, there is very little evidence for any variant and the pandects do not vary.

τοῦ Χριστοῦ
04 only: τοῦ κυρίου
This is almost certainly a TE, because TEs between KY and XY were easy and common (Hernández 2006, 153 n. 125).

κατήγωρ
All evidence apart from 02: κατήγορος
Given the extremely strong external evidence against 02, it is striking that not only has NA28 adopted it, but many scholars defend it, because it is a hapaxlegomenon in the NT, LXX and Apostolic Fathers (Jörns 1971, 113) and as such difficilior (Metzger, Osborne, Smalley; Hernández 2006, 124 n. 128). In some cases, this reflects a view that κατήγωρ reflects an underlying Aramaic רגלט (Bousset, Charles, Swete, Weiss). However, this seems to place too much weight on the difficilior criterion. Tasker, following Palmer, argues that that the third declension forms of agent nouns were becoming more common in fourth and fifth centuries (under influence of the Latin -tor suffix) (Tasker 1949, 65). Palmer (1945, 1.118) himself notes that “the archaic and majestic saviour of this suffix rendered it suitable for the language of religion,” offering παντοκράτωρ as an example. It is hard to know quite how seriously to take Palmer’s claims about the “archaic and majestic savour”, but at the very least 02’s form was known and acceptable language in the period when 02 was copied. Moreover, PGM X. 25 contains a reference to κατηγόρας, accusers. This is evidently a masculine, accusative, plural of the form used by 02. The papyrus is dated fourth-fifth century by
the *editio princeps* (Preisindanz 1973-74, II.52). There is thus plentiful evidence that the form would have been known to the scribe of 02 and that she would have had good reason to use it, so the external evidence should carry the day. The “mystical savour” is as plausible an explanation as any.

02: linguistic improvement.

A

κατηγορῶν αὐτοῦς

01, 04, Mabc: κατηγορῶν αὐτόν

𝔓47, 02, Mde(pt): text

The external evidence is even, but the accusative is *difficilior*, because verbs of accusing normally take a genitive (Smalley; Blass, Debrunner and Funk 1961, 96).

01, 04: linguistic improvement.

A

11:

αὐτοὶ ἐνίκησαν

01 only: οὗτοι ἐνίκησαν

This is most likely a linguistic improvement, since, in “good” Attic Greek, αὐτοί is not used as a nominative pronoun, meaning “they”.

A

τὸν λόγον τῆς μαρτυρίας

04 only: τὴν μαρτυρίαν

TE (Hernández 2006, 153 n. 129).

A

12:

οἱ οὐρανοὶ

01, 04, Mab: article omitted

---

12 Jörns 1971 for the reference.
Although the external evidence is even, most scholars favour the articular version as initial, because John frequently uses the articular nominative as a vocative (Aune, Bousset, Smalley; Schmid 2018, 110-11, 216). Later scribes not familiar with this idiom might plausibly “correct” it by removing the article.

01, 04: linguistic improvement.

A

ἐν αὐτοῖς σκηνοῦντες

04: ἐν αὐτοῖς κατασκηνοῦντες

01, many versional and citational witnesses: κατοικοῦντες ἐν αὐτοῖς

Many scholars make the point that κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν refers elsewhere in the book to non-Christians and that the point of κατοικοῦντες is to imply that the devil will only cause trouble for unbelievers (Beale, Mounce, Swete). Thus it has relatively little external support and there is a plausible reason for it being introduced. Hernández (2006, 152 n. 123) suggests reasonably that 04’s reading may be an attempted conflation.

01, 04: content change.

A

Οὐαὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν

01: οὐαὶ εἰς τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν

02: οὐαὶ τὴν ἀγάπην καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν

M^{ep}: οὐαὶ τοῖς κατοικοῦσι τὴν γῆν...

M^{abc}: οὐαὶ τῇ γῇ καὶ τῇ θαλάσσῃ

04, M^{de(p)}: text

02’s reading is obviously a major TE (Hernández 2006, 106). The other readings disagree about the appropriate construction with οὐαί. It is perhaps unhelpful to think of a “regular construction” with an emotional expletive, but Bousset, Smalley and Aune note that οὐαί with a bare accusative is the rarest form, occurring only here and at 8:13 (where the dative is also a variant reading). Aune notes that it occurs with the nominative at 18:10, 16 and 19. He also makes a detailed study of its use in LXX and finds twelve uses with the dative, nine with the nominative and only three with the accusative. Thus, the bare accusative is clearly difficilior but enjoys relatively strong external attestation (especially given that 02’s reading is clearly a TE from the bare
accusative). 01’s construction is unusual, according to Aune’s data, but is a plausible attempt to improve something comparably unusual.

02: TE.
01: linguistic improvement.

A

ἔχων θυμόν μέγαν
01 only: ἔχων θυμόν
This is presumably a TE naturally occasioned by the prevalence of final nus.

A

13:

ἔδιωξεν
01: ἔδωκεν
𝔓47: ἀπῆλθεν ἐκδιώξαι
The text reading is likely initial on external grounds and the reading of 01 is a careless TE (Hernández 2006, 64).

A

14:

αἱ δύο πτέρυγες
𝔓47, 01, Mabc: article omitted
τοῦ ἄετοῦ
01 only: article omitted

Taking ἄετοῦ first, the external evidence strongly suggests including the article. It could be generic (like in the English sentence, “Traditional Asian medicine uses the horn of the rhino”) (Mounce, Thomas). Alternatively, many scholars connect it to particular important eagles in the OT or Second Temple Jewish lore, such as the eagle of Exod 19:4 and Deut 32:10-12 (Beale, Smalley, Osborne (who cites 1 Enoch 96.2; Testament of Moses 10.8)). Massyngberde-Ford suggests that the article is used to distance the eagle here from that of 8:13. Any of these explanations could easily have been misunderstood by a scribe of 01 or its ancestor, who either might not “get” the
reference or not understand the idiom of the generic article. This is thus a plausible content change, with the scribe of the variant removing the element of definiteness. As has been discussed on p.177, 01 frequently removes the article in Revelation.

Regarding the article with δύο πτέρυγες, the external evidence is relatively even, but the evidential value of 01 is reduced, since, as Weiss argues that 01 regularly omits the article when a dependent genitive gives a sense of definiteness. Regarding internal evidence, if the word for “eagle” has the article, so naturally would the word for “wings”, because if the eagle is definite, then the wings will be also. This makes the article facilior. I therefore tentatively submit that it is not initial and is added by 02 and 04 as a linguistic improvement.

01: content change.
A
02, 04: linguistic improvement.
C

καιρόν
01: omitted
TE due to homoeoarcton.
A

καιροῦς
01, 04: κερος
It is tempting to dismiss this as an orthographic variant, but 01 and 04 spell the word και- elsewhere in the verse. Presumably, a scribe would not consciously and deliberately spell the same word in two different ways next to each other and since there is no word κερος that could reasonably make sense here, this must be a TE.
A

και ἡμίσυ καιροῦ
04 only: omitted
TE.
A
15:

ἔβαλεν

Tischendorf, Sigismund (2010, 334) and von Ameln, Kabiersch and Berodozzo (2012, 439 n. 140) all suggest that 02 originally read ἔλαβεν and that this was changed by a late corrector. While there seems to have been some disturbance to the word, I am far from persuaded that we can be certain of this and rate this as a C grade TE.

ίνα...ποιήσῃ

04 only: ἰνα ποιήσῃ αὐτήν ποταμοφόρητον

04’s reading is almost certainly not initial. Hernández (2006, 149) suggests that the change in word order is “for the sake of emphasis”. It is not quite clear what significant item is emphasised more on the new reading, so presumably what Hernández means is that the whole sentence reads more clearly. I suggest this is best considered a linguistic improvement.

A

16:

τὸν ποταμὸν ὅν

02 only: τὸ ὕδωρ ὅ

It is unlikely that 02 has the initial text. Presumably the motive behind the change is that “drink the water” is more natural than “drink the river”. The words obviously have different meanings, so this could be considered a content change, but the idea that is expressed does not change, so I consider it a linguistic improvement.

A
ἐπὶ τῇ γυναικὶ

𝔓47, 04: ἐπὶ omitted

Aune and Smalley suggest that the use of ἐπὶ with ὀργίζομαι is relatively unusual and as such difficilior. Swete has a thorough discussion of the construction taken by ὀργίζομαι in LXX and the NT. It is used:

+ ἐπὶ + Dat – Gen 40:2; Num 31:14
+ ἐπὶ + Acc – 2 Kgs 19:28; Ps 73:1; 105:40
+ εἰς – Deut 7:4
+ ἐν – Judg 2:20; 3:8 (both A and B texts); 10:7 (B text only)
+ bare Dat – Num 25:3; Matt 5:22

This suggests that there is no one typical construction with ὀργίζομαι. Therefore, there is no real warrant to call 04’s reading a linguistic improvement.

04: linguistic non-improvement.

A

ποιήσαι πόλεμον

Words transposed in 01 and 1854 only

There seems to be no obviously better way to explain this variant than TE.

A

τῶν λοιπῶν

01 only: τῶν ἐπιλοίπων

Hernández (2006, 86) suggests that the prefix is “without justification”. The meaning is entirely clear without it. We can only conclude that the scribe either believed the expression would be clearer or in some way more stylistically felicitous, but it is impossible to rule out an intended difference in meaning.

01: linguistic improvement.

B

Ἡσοῦ

01 only: τοῦ Θεοῦ
There is probably little significance to the added article, because, according to Schmid (2018, 203), Ἡ翻身 never has the article in Revelation. It is tempting to read profound theological significance into the change of noun, but it is surely more likely to be, as Hernández (79, n. 194) argues, harmonisation to Θεοῦ, earlier in the verse.

A

18:

ἐστάθη

025, 046, 051, M, versional evidence: ἐστάθην

The first person is commands little scholarly favour (but Beckwith supports it). It seems a strange detail to add that the dragon decides to stop by the sea, when he appears to be leaving the stage in v.17. John does not say why the dragon stands there. On the other hand, it is entirely natural that John transition to his next vision by inviting us to picture himself, standing on the shore of Patmos, contemplating the ocean (Beckwith, Loisy, Swete). At similar dramatic moments, 17:3 and 21:10, John changes his physical location (Beckwith). Swete further adds that an end-of-line nu-bar could very easily be missed by TE.

On the other hand, the weight of early evidence arguably favours the third person (Mounce, Satake). The first person could also plausibly be taken as harmonisation to εἶδον in 13:1 (Bousset, Metzger, Satake, Weiss; Schmid 2018, 79). John also never elsewhere changes location in Revelation without being told to (Satake, Thomas). The lack of reason for the dragon to stand by the sea and, indeed, the rather anticlimactic end to the dragon story also makes third person difficilior. It seems likely therefore that the pandects have the initial text.

Revelation 13

1:

ἀὑτοῦ (first)

01: ἀὑτῶν

Harmonisation (to the other plurals in the verse).
déka diáδήματα
01 only: diáδήματα déka
Harmonisation (to the order of the previous two number phrases in the verse).

όνόματα
𝔓47, 01, 04, M: ονομα

Mounce claims that the external evidence is even, though surely it in fact favours the singular, because there are three early manuscripts against one. The plural is likely to have arisen by harmonisation with 17:3, which has similar content (Koester), and with the context in this verse, where many of the other nouns in the clause are plural (Beale, Smalley, Thomas). The singular is also arguably *difficilior*, because it is hard to imagine how a single name could be written over several heads (Osborne). Tasker (1949, 65) suggests that the plural was John’s standard practice, since it is found at 17:3 with minimal variation. However, we cannot infer that John used the plural here simply because he used it at 17:3, especially since the contexts are different. I therefore suggest that the singular is initial and that 02 is harmonised to the plurals in the immediate context.

λέοντος
01: λεόντων

While there is very little other evidence in support of 01’s reading, it is hard to see what motivates it. There is no particular linguistic or content reason to justify the plural and no plurals in context. There seem few better options than considering it a TE.

μεγάλην
02 only: μεγάλην ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ
Sigismund (2010, 336) judges that this correction is by an in scriptorium corrector, which makes it relevant to my project. Sigismund suggests that 02 is here harmonising to Dan 7:6, which, in a very similar context, ends with the same phrase. There is textual variation in the Daniel passage, some witnesses reading αὐτῇ, but 02 has αὐτῷ, just as in Revelation.

02: harmonisation.

A

3:

ἐθαυμάσθη

01, Mabc: ἐθαύμασεν
04 only: ἐθαυμαστόθη

𝔓47, 02, Mde: text

The external evidence is roughly even. Thompson (1985, 12-13) suggests that the passive is a (weak-sense) Semitism, because in OG Lev 26:32, θαυμάζομαι, passive, translates the Hebrew שׁוּשׁ, Qal, sometimes meaning “to be appalled”. Whether or not the passive is some sort of Semitism, the standard form of the word in Attic is active (LSJ). Thus, using a quasi-deponent form of the word is difficilior and so probably initial, whereas the active is probably a linguistic improvement.

01: linguistic improvement.
04: linguistic non-improvement (an otherwise unknown form).

A

4:

προσεκύνησαν τῷ θηρίῳ

02, Md: προσεκύνησαν τῷ θηρίον
M[et]: phrase omitted

𝔓47, 01, 04, Mabc: text

Except, of course when the sense is passive, e.g. Isocrates, Archid. 105, τῶν προγεγενημένων μᾶλλον θαυμασθομέθα, we will be marvelled at more than our ancestors (reference LSJ).
Kilpatrick (1990, 55) quotes Pseudo-Herodian’s Atticising grammar, *Philetairus*, as saying that the accusative is correct. Therefore he concludes “the dative was held to be incorrect and we should expect it to be changed to the accusative and not the other way about”. Fee (1993b, 131-36) however, argues against the principle that we should always express scribes to Atticise. He suggests that it is at least as likely that a scribe would harmonise to the idiom of LXX, since the Attic forms would have seemed archaic and LXX forms would have been liturgically familiar to scribes. Further, there are a number of instances of the verb taking a dative object, in Revelation, with apparently minimal evidence of scribal change to the accusative (notably 4:10; 7:11; 11:16; 19:4; 10; 22:9 (Fee 1993b, 131-36).

The accusative is, however, common in Revelation with neuter nouns (Aune 1997, 2.717). Weiss (1891, 194) argues that with a dative object, the verb means “to worship, adore” (*anbeten*), but with an accusative, it means “to pay/render homage to” (*huldigen* (the German word can have other meanings such as “to pay addresses to (a lady), to embrace (a belief or custom)”, but here the sense is clearly homage)) (Breitsprecher et al. 1983). Schmid (1955, 2.200-03) similarly suggests that the verb followed by the dative means “to worship” (*anbeten*) but followed by the accusative it means “to prostrate oneself before” (*sich verneigen*). The former has implications of articulate prayer (*bieten*) and therefore, it is used of God or intelligent beings who may hear prayer and the latter is used of inanimate objects and animals. Schmid admits that this is a debatable rule, especially if 02 is initial here. Even in Schmid’s list of examples, there are exceptions and he somewhat arbitrarily considers the dragon, but not demons or the beast, to be capable of hearing prayer. Smalley notes that the dative here may result from harmonisation to the context. Judging which is initial is therefore complex, but the constellation of early evidence leads me to posit the dative. The accusative reading could reflect a tendency either to Atticise or to conform with the pattern of usage in Revelation discerned by Schmid. Neither is a perfect explanation, but in both cases, this is a linguistic improvement.

02: linguistic improvement.
5:

βλασφημίας
M
ac
te(pt) and other evidence: βλασφημίαν
02, M
bd: βλάσφημα
01, 04, P
47, M
sp(pt): text
02 is most likely harmonising to μεγάλα, by replacing the noun βλασφημία with the adjective βλάσφημος, to avoid the uncoordinated combination of an adjective and a noun as objects (Schmid 2018, 111).

A

ἐξουσία
01: omitted
The stylistic felicity of ἐξουσία ποιῆσαι balancing στόμα λαλοῦν makes 01’s reading a linguistic non-improvement. There is no particular reason this should have happened due to TE, but I rate it as B to reflect the fact that this is possible.

B

ποιῆσαι μήνας
01: ποιῆσαι ὁ θέλει μήνας
M
abc: πόλεμον ποιῆσαι
All other major evidence: text
01’s reading adds clarity and as such is a linguistic improvement.¹⁴

A

I do not discuss the καὶ in the number, because I consider the various different ways of writing numbers to be orthographic variants.

6:

eἰς βλασφημίας
025, 046, 051, M
ac
de, Latin evidence: εἰς βλασφημίαν

¹⁴ So Mounce, who says that 01 “properly interprets”.
𝔓47, Syriac, Coptic: βλασφημήσαι

All pandects, M⁴: text

The external evidence is fairly evenly balanced. I suggest that the infinitive is unlikely to be initial, since it has only one major Greek witness. The plural would refer to individual blasphemous utterances, of which the beast says many. The singular would mean “blasphemy” in a more general sense. The singular is attested in Eph 4:31 and Matt 12:31, but the plural in Ezek 35:12, so either has precedent in relevant Greek (LSJ). The matter is indeed finely balanced, but, the prevalence of sigmas in the context make the plural a plausible TE.

All pandects: TE.

C

tὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ
01 only: τὸ ὄνομα αὐτὸν
TE.

A

καὶ τὴν σκηνήν αὐτοῦ
04: omitted.
TE resulting from the scribe jumping from the second to the third αὐτοῦ (Beale).

A

tοὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ σκηνοῦντας
025, 046, 051, M⁴, Latin evidence: καὶ τοὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ σκηνοῦντας

𝔓⁴⁷ only: ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ
01 only: τοὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ σκηνοῦντες

The reading of 02 and 04 has the best of the external evidence. The addition of the καὶ co-ordinates God’s dwelling place and the people dwelling in heaven, but its omission means they are in apposition: God’s dwelling place is his people in heaven. Commentators explain this idea in a variety of ways. Caird writes: “The monster’s attack on the church is a blaspheming of that divine presence which is to be found wherever two or three are gathered together in the name of Christ”. Boxall underlines this (in the volume that replaces Caird’s in the Black’s series) by arguing that the ἐν
τῶν οὐρανῶν σκηνοῦντας are the present people of God, literally dwelling on this earth, because they are the opposite of οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, which in 13:8 refers not literally to all the current inhabitants of this earth, but to those who make their home in this world, i.e. the beast’s followers. God’s dwelling and his people are identified in 1 Cor 3:9 and 1QS8 (Massyngberde-Ford). Prigent offers a moving and subtle interpretation that Christians live now in the presence of God and that what the beast destroys is their daily sense and awareness of that.\(^{15}\) The complexity of these ideas led both to the addition of the καὶ and to \(\Psi^{47}\)’s attempt to resolve it.\(^{16}\) 01’s change of alpha to epsilon is a rather more mundane TE.

A

7:

καὶ ἐδόθη... αὐτοὺς

\(\Psi^{47}, 02, 04, M^{c}:\) omitted.

Many scholars, particularly Anglophone ones, take this as an omission by TE because the scribe skipped from the first καὶ ἐδόθη to the second (Aune, Beale, Beckwith, Metzger, Mounce, Osborne, Satake, Smalley, Thomas). However, two continental European colleagues defend the shorter text. Karrer (2012a, 70-71) suggests that the external evidence for the shorter reading is strong and that the fatalistic tone of the longer is well suited to the second or third century. Tóth (2012, 30-33) similarly argues that the external evidence for the shorter text is diverse and early. He also notes that the longer text breaks up the a-b-a-b pattern between βλασφημία and ἐξουσία in vv.5-7:

\[
egin{align*}
& ἐδόθη αὐτῷ στόμα... βλασφημίας... \\
& ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία... \\
& ἠνοιξεν τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ εἰς βλασφημίας... \\
& ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία
\end{align*}
\]

The longer text is also more difficult to understand: the war comes out of nowhere and is not further resolved or developed. There are many allusions to Daniel 7 throughout this chapter and the longer text may have been influenced by Dan 7:21 (Theodotion)

\(^{15}\) Satake and Smalley follow this general approach.

\(^{16}\) For the latter, Osborne.
and 7:8 (OG). These arguments make the matter disputable. However, a TE is surely more likely to be widespread than a deliberate, contentful addition, because it is less likely that different scribes would agree on the latter coincidentally. Moreover, Tóth’s various arguments for how the passage works better without the plus are also reasons for a scribe to omit it. Thus, I submit that the longer reading is initial.

02, 04: TE.

B

ἐξουσία

01: ἐξουσίαν

04: ἐξουσα

In 04, the iota of ἐξουσία appears to be missing. The word is written over a line break and Lyon and Tischendorf both print the iota at the end of the line, before the break. However, every surrounding letter is clear and I do not see it. I rate it as a low-grade TE.
01: linguistic non-improvement.

A

04: TE.

C

καὶ λαὸν

04: καὶ λαοῦς

Mce(pt), Ψ47: omitted

MHT: move phrase to after ἐθνος

01, 02, Mabd: text

The external evidence clearly favours the inclusion of the phrase somewhere. Although normally, as Bousset (1894, 34) argues, the Majority Text manuscripts add more than they reduce, Bousset himself admits that this is an exception.\textsuperscript{17} The external evidence also favours the singular. Although the plural claims the support of some versional evidence, the idiomatic use of singular and plural for concepts, such as “people” where there can be a conceptual case made for either, varies so significantly between

\textsuperscript{17} Tasker (1949, 65) also agrees external evidence favours the inclusion, though normally he supports the reading of Ψ\textsuperscript{47}.\textsuperscript{17}
languages that the versions are weak evidence for their Greek exemplars. However the
singular could much more plausibly have resulted from harmonisation to the string of
singulars in context and it is hard to see why the plural would have been inserted, if
not initial. I therefore tentatively suggest that the plural is initial; the many singulars in
the immediate context mean the singular is more likely to be a harmonisation than a
TE.
01, 02: harmonisation.
B

8:

προσκυνήσουσιν αὐτόν
01, Mεο: ...αὐτῶν

Lyon has αὐτοῦ but this goes against Tischendorf and it is so clearly αὐτόν that I
suspect this is Lyon’s “typo”.

It is not clear how Weiss and Schmid’s rule for the case governed by προσκυνέω would
apply here (see p.212): the object is the beast, whom Schmid classifies as inanimate,
suggesting an accusative. However, the manuscripts with the accusative use the
masculine, rather than the neuter, suggesting that they think of the beast as an animate,
personal figure. Prigent notes that throughout the paragraph, it is unclear whether the
beast is masculine or neuter and so the convenient gender ambiguity of the dative made
it attractive to scribes. This argument, added to the weight of external evidence,
suggests that the accusative is initial and the most likely explanation for 01’s dative is
a linguistic improvement.
B
The majority of scholars prefer the reading of 04, since it is the most plausible origin of the others (Aune, Beale, Metzger, Smalley). On this view, 02’s οὐαί is a TE and the readings of the others are attempts to harmonise with the plural, πάντες, by making the relative pronoun and/or the noun, ὄνομα, plural. The plurals are more natural, because John is referring to all the different people who refuse to worship the beast, who all have different names, and so the singular is *difficultier*. Michaels explains the singular relative pronoun by arguing that the referent is the beast (αὐτὸν from earlier in the verse). However, it is unusual for a relative to be so distant from its antecedent and, as Osborne notes, nowhere else in Revelation are non-human characters said to be in the book of life. Osborne and Prigent both suggest that John thinks of the gathered crowd of believers as one unit. However, against all this must be said that the external evidence for the plural is strong and, as Tasker (1949, 66) notes, the neighbouring οὐ makes TE plausible.

Any reading which is consistently singular or plural is probably a harmonisation. Charles notes the Hebrew idiom, where שֵׁם, name, is used in the singular to refer to the names of multiple individuals (Num 26:33; Deut 12:3; 1 Sam 14:49). Charles notes that John uses this idiom at 17:8, where those worshipping the beast appear to have one ὄνομα. The Majority reading, with singular ὄνομα but plural ὄν, could thus be initial and the other readings harmonisations for consistency of number.

What about the number of αὐτοῦ/-οῦ? The only reading with both ὄν and ὄνομα omits αὐτός entirely. This seems unlikely, given the strong early evidence for it. The plural αὐτῶν would most naturally arise from the influence of the ὄν. I therefore reconstruct

---

18 For the reading of the pronoun, Michaels 1992, 92-93. For the application to the textual problem, see Beale.
as initial ὅν οὐ γέγραπται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. This occurs in no manuscript. However, every one of its parts has attestation, so it is no more conjectural than any other eclectic edition of a part of the NT. It is also more difficult than the NA28 reading, because it contains a mixture of singulars and plurals.

Thus, I classify as follows:
01: two linguistic improvements (makes ὄνομα and αὐτοῦ plural), TE (the lost οὗ).
02: linguistic improvement (changes ὅν to οὗ) and TE (changes οὗ to οὐαι)
04: linguistic improvement (changes ὅν to οὗ)

B

τῷ βιβλίῳ

𝔓47, Μερο: τῇ βιβλίῳ

01: βιβλίῳ

04 alone: βιβλίῳ

02 and the Majority: text

There are two issues here: which noun is used and whether it has the article. Smalley notes that John uses the feminine and neuter forms interchangeably (for the feminine, 3:5; 20:15; for the neuter 17:8; 20:12; 21:27). There seems little to choose between the nouns and NA28 presumably adopted the neuter form because of external evidence. Regarding the article, it makes for better Greek syntax, since the book is concrete and known to the writer, but John often omits the article with nouns which govern a genitive, following Hebrew idiom (Schmid 2018, 203-04). It seems rather unlikely that a scribe would correct to a Hebrew idiom, so contra NA28, I suggest that the initial text was that of 04, anarthrous neuter.

02: linguistic improvement (article).

A

10:

εἰ τις εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν, εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν υπάγει

𝔓47, 01, 04, Majority: εἰ τις εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν υπάγει

02, Μb, some versional evidence and Irenaeus Latin: text
Beginning with the “big picture” of this variation unit, there are broadly three possible interpretations of the verse: persecutors should beware because what they do to Christians will be done to them (“lex talionis – beware”); Christians should be encouraged, because what persecutors do to Christians will eventually be done to the persecutors (“lex talionis – encouragement”); Christians should patiently endure, because whatever is going to happen is going to happen (“que sera sera”). NA\textsuperscript{28} has the \textit{que sera sera} reading in each clause. “Lex talionis – encouragement” makes this passage an allusion to Matt 26:52 (or to some pre-synoptic tradition material which became Matt 26:52). “Lex talionis – beware” has minimal scholarly support (only Farrer). It is the closest in meaning to Jer 15:2 and 43:11 (MT numbering) to which John arguably alludes. However, John (and the NT writers in general) frequently alter the meaning of their OT allusions. Verse 10c also implies that John is addressing Christians.

It is only really possible to make sense of the first clause (on either the long or the short reading) as \textit{que sera sera}. Either reading could express \textit{que sera sera}, but neither could really express either \textit{lex talionis} reading, because it is clearly the person being punished with captivity who is taken into captivity. Schüssler-Fiorenza (1986, 132-33) adds that in 14:4, an arguably similar context, the subject of \textit{ὑπάγω} is clearly the Lamb leading the saints, not the persecutors. So the meaning of the first clause is probably \textit{que sera sera}, but is the shorter or longer reading initial?

Many commentators prefer the longer (Aune, Beale, Charles, Metzger\textsuperscript{21}). It can be argued that the longer reading is inherently implausible, because it turns v.10a into a

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item 04\textsuperscript{19} is far from clear here, but this is Lyon’s reconstruction and it is certainly more likely to be this than any other known variant.
\item 20 For this set of variation units, I have simplified Hodges and Farstad’s apparatus.
\item 21 Delobel (1979, 165) terms the matter “discutable”.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
condition where the protasis has no verb, whereas the shorter makes v.10a simply the protasis of a longer conditional, where 10bi is the second part of the protasis and 10bii the apodosis. However, Weiss provides other examples of when John omits verbs in parallel clauses (specifically 8:13 with no significant variation). He also suggests that the omission of the verb strengthens the link between protasis and apodosis and so adds power to the clause.\textsuperscript{22} Koester notes that the longer reading, with the repeated αἰχμαλωσίαν, fits the “epigrammic style” of the verse. On the other hand, Osborne notes that the longer reading is arguably \textit{difficilior}. The external evidence is clearly with the shorter, so on balance I follow that.

What does that imply for the second clause? Of course, if the first is \textit{que sera sera}, the second could still be “\textit{lex talionis} – encouragement”. Indeed, Loisy suggests that they have different meanings and that 02 alters the second clause in order to harmonise them. However, the ὅδε clause makes the same application from both of them, meaning they probably make similar points. This suggests the second clause means \textit{que sera sera}. Moreover, Osborne notes that the emphasis in the preceding verses is on God sovereignly giving to the beast the power of persecution (ἐδόθη is many times repeated). This fits well with \textit{que sera sera}. Thomas argues that “\textit{lex talionis} – encouragement” is hard to understand, because there is no hint of God meeting out justice until the next chapter. Although there are obvious resonances between this chapter and the next (notably the ὅδε phrase being repeated, 14:12 (Satake)), the difference in context means that the idea of \textit{lex talionis} cannot necessarily be imported from that chapter to this (\textit{pace} Satake). Thomas adds that “\textit{lex talionis} – encouragement” leaves hanging the question of how or by whom the wicked will be taken into captivity or killed by the sword. God is never recorded as doing either of those things and there is little sense in the context of hostile powers doing so, which is the sense of the logion in Matthew. \textit{que sera sera} is also more consistent with the ὅδε clause. The indicative ἔστιν suggests that this is not moralising application but description: to have the attitude to suffering which the first part of the verb expresses is to display ὑπομονή and πίστις.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{22} Weiss disagrees with my interpretation. n of the meaning of the verse (favouring the \textit{lex talionis} approach, which I discuss in my notes on the second half of the verse). It gives more weight to our shared answer to the text-critical question that it “works” on both interpretations.

\textsuperscript{23} For more on the ὅδε sayings in Revelation, see Lambrecht 2009.
The obvious problem with *que sera sera* in the second clause is that it is attested only by 02 and as such has weak external evidence (especially when we remove particular reverence for particular manuscripts). Karrer (2009, 392-93; 2012a, 69-70) argues further that the fatalism implied in *que sera sera* is in general typical of 02. However, his main evidence for this is 02’s use of the present tenses for the reign and rule of the saints in 5:10 and 20:6 and this is surely equally problematic for any reading of 13:10 (because, of course, chapters 5 and 20 describe the triumph of the saints in and by Christ, whereas chapter 13 describes their suffering under the beast – both are parts of John’s story, but the story’s coherence lies in not confusing them). Vos (1965, 104-09) argues that because John frequently alludes to the OT and less frequently to the synoptic tradition, it is likely that an allusion to the synoptics would be changed to an OT allusion. However, this argument can run the other way. In the fourth and fifth centuries, let alone later, we know Matthew was much better known than LXX, because it was more copied and commented on. Thus, a scribe could very plausibly have changed an OT allusion, particular an unclear and difficult one, to a Matthean allusion. This is much more likely than a change in the other direction: it is highly unlikely that a scribe would take a clear allusion to Matthew and mangle it into an unclear allusion to Jeremiah. I thus suggest that 02 is initial in the second clause.

01, 04: harmonisation (the second clause).

02: TE (dittography in the first clause).

B

11:

ὀμοία

04 alone: ὄνομα

𝔓⁴⁷ only: ὁμοίω

04: TE.

A

ὡς δράκων

04 alone: ὡς δράκων

TE.
A

04 might say ΔΡΑΚΩΝ, but this does not matter. It is clear from this image is that there is no vowel between the rho and the kappa, so Tischendorf, who transcribes ΔΡΑΚΩΝ is wrong.

12:

τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ κατοικοῦντας
04: τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐν αὐτῇ
Apart from the lack of external evidence, the reading of 04 is likely, on philological grounds, to be a stylistic correction. Placing the prepositional phrase after the participle is closer to standard Koine Greek syntax (Blass, Debrunner and Funk 1961, 142-43), but Charles identifies a number of instances in Revelation where it is between the article and the participle (12:12, 14:13, 18:17). Significantly, 18:17 has textual variants, which show scribes altering the construction back to the more normal form, as found in the 04 variant.
04: linguistic improvement.

Α

ἵνα προσκυνήσουσιν
Majority: ἵνα προσκυνήσωσιν
01 alone: προσκυνεῖν
𝔓47, 02, 04: text

There is strong external evidence in favour of NA²⁸’s reading. Further, in Attic Greek, one would expect an aorist subjunctive after ἵνα in primary sequence. However, the future indicative is common in Revelation (Aune 1997, cxcvi-cxcvii), so this is almost
certainly the initial reading, which the Majority tradition has corrected. 01’s infinitive appears at least as natural as the ἵνα clause, so presumably represents an attempt to improve style. It has so little external evidence, it is highly unlikely to be initial.

01: linguistic improvement.

A

tοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ

Late, non-majority witnesses: τοῦ θανάτου

02 alone: αὐτοῦ

As Aune point out, the final pronoun here is a *pronom en abundans*, technically unnecessary given the relative pronoun at the start of the clause. It is a weak-sense Semitism, reflecting the fact that a Semitic language would have a personal, pronominal suffix here. The idiom occurs a number of times in Revelation (7:2; 12:6, 14; Aune; Thompson 1985, 112). Both the late witnesses and 02 are, in different ways, trying to correct this unstylistic redundancy.

02: linguistic improvement.

A

13:

ἵνα...καταβαίνειν

01, M\textsuperscript{(n)}: ἵνα καὶ πῦρ ποιή καταβαίνειν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

\Psi\textsuperscript{47}, M\textsuperscript{b}: ἵνα καὶ πῦρ ποιήσῃ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβῆναι

M\textsuperscript{ac}: καὶ πῦρ ἵνα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνῃ

02, 04: text

Internally and externally, the various options are finely balanced. The reading of M\textsuperscript{ac} is almost certainly later, since it is a Greek correction of a typical weak-sense Semitism, that is using ποιέω followed by an infinitive to express the Hebrew causative verb forms (Thompson 1985, 23). The slight majority of early evidence is with the NA\textsuperscript{28} reading, so I follow that (rated C, because this is hardly decisive). The change of word-order in 01 presumably has linguistic motives, but the text reading is hardly wrong, so 01 is hardly an improvement.

01: linguistic non-improvement.

C
14:

τῆς γῆς ποιῆσαι
01 only: τῆς γῆς καὶ ποιῆσαι
Linguistic non-improvement (pleonastic καὶ).

A

dε ἔχει
M\textsuperscript{ac}: δεῖχεν
M\textsuperscript{ep}: 01: δεῖχε
02, 04, M\textsuperscript{bd}c(pt): text
The reading of M\textsuperscript{ac} is a correction to a past tense, to harmonise with the aorist ἔζησεν.\textsuperscript{24}
02 and 04 are employing the constructio ad sensum, i.e. using masculine pronouns to refer to a neuter noun, because the real-world referent of the noun is male. Schmid (2018, 244-49) surveys the data on this construction and concludes that it is impossible to formulate general rules for when constructio ad sensum is used in Revelation. I therefore follow NA\textsuperscript{28} on the balance of the external evidence. 01’s change is therefore a linguistic improvement.\textsuperscript{25}

A

tὴν πληγήν
M\textsuperscript{a}: πληγήν
01: πληγής
All other major evidence: text
The omitted article is slightly more complex here, because 01 has the support of M\textsuperscript{a}. Muraoka (2015, 416) argues this is a Semitism: the article is omitted from the nomen regens. Thus, he argues, it is more likely to be initial. Whilst this is possible, the general propensity of 01 to omit articles surely makes it unlikely. Mounce adds that the omission of the article makes the πληγή less specific and thus the image has wider application than Nero’s suicide. 01 also makes a TE, changing -ην to -ης by influence of the following words.

\textsuperscript{24} Space forbids discussing the validity of viewing Greek tenses in temporal terms.
\textsuperscript{25} Mounce also connects the neuter relative to the neuter antecedent.
01: TE and linguistic non-improvement (omission of article, counted in the introductory list).

A

15:

αὔτῷ

02 and 04: αὕτη

It is difficult to make sense of the feminine. Westcott and Hort (1881, 138) suggest it may refer to γῆ in earlier verses and even conjecture that γῆ may have originally been next to the pronoun or even instead of it. This is speculative however and nowhere in Revelation is the earth personified in this way (though Westcott and Hort link the idea to pagan religions). Schmid (2018, 96) suggests the explanation may be the feminine μαχαίρη. While less speculative than the Cantabrigians, this too seems unlikely. Similarly implausible is Swete’s suggestion that there is influence from εἰκόνα in the preceding verse and τῇ εἰκόνι in the next. δοῦναι is omitted in 04 (see next variation unit) and if this omission was the initial reading, then Swete’s suggestion is more realistic: the pronoun refers to τῇ εἰκόνι and its redundancy makes it a Hebraic pronomem abundans, which a scribe would plausibly remove. However, the external evidence is so strong in favour of including δοῦναι that a theory built on its omission is highly unlikely. TE, influenced by the eta of ἔδοθη, is more plausible than any other explanation.

02, 04: TE.

A

δοῦναι

04 only: omitted.

TE.

A

ἴνα καὶ λαλήσῃ...θηρίου [final instance]

04: omitted

TE (resulting from a scribe’s eye jumping from the first to the final instance of τοῦ θηρίου).
A

ἵνα καὶ
02: omits καὶ.
The word is present in 02, but it appears as if it may possibly be a corrector’s addition after the production of the manuscript.
02: TE.
C

ἵνα (second)
01 and Majority: omitted
Metzger and Aune agree that the inclusion of the word is essential for the passage to make sense. Aune further claims that it is more likely to have been omitted than added, because it is more plausible that a number of scribes omit by TE than John write the verse without it and several different scribes think to invent it. Thomas and Smalley agree that a TE is likely.
01: TE.
A

ἐὰν
01, Mde: ἄν
The external evidence is finely balanced, but ἄν is strictly the better Attic form, whereas in Koine Greek, ἄν became increasingly dominant (Blass, Debrunner and Funk 1961, 57). It seems therefore that ἄν is most plausibly a linguistic improvement.
B

προκυνήσωσιν
01: προσκυνήσωσιν
All other major evidence: text
As noted at the similar variation unit in v.12, the subjunctive is better here by Attic standards, but the future indicative is a weak-sense Semitism common in Revelation (Aune 1997, l.cxcvi-cxcvii; Thompson 1985, 98-99). The balance of external evidence supports NA28’s subjunctive. It is likely that 01 is harmonising to other instances of the indicative in Revelation (this case is minimally weakened by 01’s use of an infinitive in v.12).

01: harmonisation.

A

tῇ εἰκόνι

02 and Μερ: τὴν εἰκόνα

All other major evidence: text
See comments on v.4, τῷ θηρίῳ.

02: harmonisation.26

B

16:

τοὺς πλουσίους καὶ τοὺς πτωχούς

01: inverts πλουσίους and πτωχούς

TE.

A

αὐτοῖς

01: αὐτῷ

The singular better expresses the idea that each individual will be sealed.

01: linguistic improvement.

A

τὸ μέτωπον

Μετ., Ψ47: τὸν μετόπον

04: τοῦ μετόπου

26 Thomas agrees that the dative is initial.
01, 02, $M^{\text{a(p)b}}$: text

The plural reading likely results from harmonisation with οὐτὸν. Even Tasker (1949, 66), who generally favours $Ψ^{47}$, accepts that it is unlikely to have the initial text here. The uncontested singular τῆς δεξιᾶς makes clear that John is satisfied with using a singular for body parts of crowds, in a context like this. 04 is presumably harmonising to the genitive in τῆς δεξιᾶς. Schmid (2018, 221-25) surveys the evidence for the case governed by ἐπί in various circumstances but there seems to be no obvious general rule, so there is probably no grammatical or stylistic factor at work.

04: harmonisation.

B

17:

καὶ (first)

01, 04: omitted

As the scholars agree, the issue here is whether the ἵνα clause is dependent on ποιεῖ and co-ordinate with δοσιν or dependent on δοσίν. If the former, καὶ is needed to make this clear, but if the latter, καὶ is confusing. The scholars unanimously suggest the former and this is certainly a more plausible reading of the text, but it fails to explain the reading of 01 and 04 (Aune, Metzger, Smalley, Thomas, Weiss; Schmid 1955, 2.104). It seems the only explanation is TE.

01, 04: TE.

B

εἰ μὴ ὁ ἔχων

04: εἰ μὴ τέχων

This is almost certainly a TE, but it may be more complex than it appears. Possibly the error is to omit a negating particle and we should understand μὴ τέχων as an orthographic variant on μετέχων, sharing. I rate as a B-class TE to reflect this uncertainty.

B

27 Mounce agrees on the analysis of the variation unit, but not which is initial.
τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θηρίου
04: τοῦ ὄνοματος τοῦ θηρίου
𝔓47: ἢ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θηρίου
01: τοῦ θηρίου ἢ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ
02 and the majority: text

NA28 takes the phrase in question in apposition to τὸ χάραγμα. The apposition by sheer juxtaposition is a little clumsy, hence the various attempts to smooth it over by genitive of apposition or conjunction. The fact that the various witnesses have solved this problem in different ways suggests that the problem is itself initial and the alternatives are stylistic improvements (Thomas).

01, 04: linguistic improvement.

A

18:

νοῦν
01: οὖς

Harmonisation to the common phrase in Revelation, ὁ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω.

A

ψηφισάτω
04: φισάτω

TE.

A

ἀριθμὸς γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν, καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτοῦ

Mab: ἀριθμὸς γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν, ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτοῦ [i.e. they omit καὶ]
04, Mab(np): add an additional ἐστίν at the end of the phrase

𝔓47, 01, Mas(p), various versions: ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν

02: text

01’s reading is clearly the result of TE by homoeoteleuton: the exemplar had the reading of 04 and the scribe jumped from -οῦ ἐστίν to another. Between 02 and 04, the ἐστίν added by 04 is not necessary but arguably smoother. John does not normally
seem liberal in his use of the copular verb, so it is more plausible that it was added for stylistic reasons than removed.

01: TE.

04: linguistic improvement.

A

\[\text{ἐξακόσιοι ἐξήκοντα ἔξ} \]

01 alone: \[\text{ἐξακόσιαι ἐξήκοντα ἔξ} \]

04, \[\text{𝔓}^{115}: \text{ἐξακόσιαι δέκα ἔξ} \]

02, Majority, \[\text{𝔓}^{47}: \text{txt} \]

I do not include numerals as variants as I consider variation between words and numerals to be a matter of orthography. In this sense, I disagree with Michael (2000), who argues that because 666 has attestation in numerals as well as words, it is better attested. The same variant does not have greater external evidence just because different orthographic conventions are sometimes used to express it. The same is true of the genders of the numbers.

Irenaeus is often included in the evidence here, but he records both major variants being known in his time\(^{28}\) and so supports both equally (his preference for 666 is irrelevant – his testimony is significant because it gives a window onto the manuscripts extant in his time, not because he is a good judge of which is initial).

The external evidence is insufficiently strong to be decisive. Although many scholars favour 666 on external grounds, Sanders (1918) suggests that 616 is earlier and points to its good attestation in the Latin tradition.

In assessing the internal arguments, we are forced into the interpretative quagmires surrounding the number. Many scholars favour an explanation based on gematria, the ancient practice of encoding words as numbers, by giving each letter a numerical value. Blummel and Wayment (2016) discuss the widespread use of this technique and its particular application to interpreting this passage. Smalley argues against gematria,

\(^{28}\) Cited and discussed Donaldson 2009, 2.545-46.
because ἀριθμὸς...ἀνθρώπου does not mean a number of a particular man (because there is no τινος) but of humanity in general. This is arguably the sense of the phrase in 21:17. Moreover, generally in Revelation, the numbers are symbols, rather than codes. However, Loisy and Koester maintain that it is a specific man, whose name we are intended to calculate, because that is the plain meaning of ψηφίζω. John clearly intends us to count or calculate something. Let us therefore consider gematric solutions.

The most popular among modern scholars is Nero. A particular form of his name transliterates into Hebrew consonants רסנ, which, converted into a number, is 666. Conveniently, when the final nun is omitted from the Hebrew name (i.e. when the Latin form is transliterated into Hebrew, not the Greek), the result is 616 (Beckwith, Berger, Boxall, Koester, Loisy, Metzger, Osborne, Schüssler-Fiorenza). The objections are that the spelling, רסנ, without a yodh as a mater lectionis, is unusual and that it is unlikely that John would make use of Hebrew when writing in Greek for a Greek audience (he explains Hebrew words at 9:11 and 16:16 (Koester)). However, there is contemporary evidence both for trans-linguistic gematria (Koester) and for the spelling רסנ (Hilliers (1963, 65) discusses an example in “an Aramaic document from Murabba‘át”).

There are also other gematric solutions. Giet (1957, 76-83) suggests that the initial letters of a succession of Roman emperors come to 666. He bases this suggestion on a passage on Sib. Or. 5.12-51, which has a similar gematria. The Sibylline Oracles are a collection of Jewish and Christian oracular texts, with various redactional layers from many different periods. The relevant part, book V, is likely to date to early second century CE (Collins 2008, 4), so it is unlikely to have actually inspired John, but may speak to what ideas and ways of doing gematria were around in his time. Baines (1975) argues for Vespasian, on the grounds that the Revelation may have been written by or for a Jewish Christian group that looked to Jesus as “a national saviour” and so the beast may be a persecutor of Jews more than Christians. On this view, the lesser beast is Vespasian’s son, Titus, and the 666 is achieved by converting titles of Vespasian found on coins into Hebrew letters and then into numbers. Schmidt (2002) argues for Claudius: if you start with CLAVDIVS, invert the A into a V and then turn the resulting double-V into an X (because an X looks like two Vs and 5+5=10), you get CLXDIVS,
which easily becomes DCLXVI, or 666. This may seem convoluted, but it avoids positing use of Hebrew, and uses only one name, which is arguably implied by v.17. Several gematric solutions resolve the puzzle by arguing that 616 is the initial reading. Birdsall (2002) suggests the solution is Caligula, or ΠΑΙΟΣ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ, which comes to 616. Hartingsveld (1978) suggests 616 referring to Domitian, because there is evidence in the ancient world that gematria sometimes worked by giving the first letter of the word the value of aleph/alpha and reconfiguring the alphabetical values accordingly. On this basis, סָנַיְמוֹד רַסיֵק comes to 616. Stauffer (1947) argues for Domitian, but totalling 666, because Domitian’s official name on inscriptions is ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΩΡ ΚΑΙΣΑΡ ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑΝΟΣ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ ΓΕΡΜΑΝΙΚΟΣ, abbreviated to Α ΚΑΙ ΔΟΜΕΤ ΣΕΒ ΓΕ, which comes to 666. Bruston (1904) suggests not a specific emperor, but a figure symbolic of them all, Nimrod ben Cush, the mythical founder of the Babylonian empire. First century Jews would have seen the Roman occupation as analogous to the Babylonian exile, even before 70 CE, let alone after it (Wright 1992).

All these theories require varying degrees of linguistic or mathematical gymnastics. It is therefore probable that whatever name John encoded, he worked the translation, transliteration and mathematics to give a result of 616 or 666 because that was what he wanted for some other reason, rather than because it was the natural result of the simplest way to do the calculation. Presumably, his aim was the more general, non-gematric symbolism of the number (Farrer, Peake; Bauckham 1993, 388-89). Bauckham (1993, 384-407) argues for the symbolic significance of 666 at length, because of its mathematical relations: it is the triangular number of 36, which means it is the triangle of a number which is both a triangle and a square. The next natural number like this is 750,925. He suggests 616 probably arose because of the alternative transliteration of Nero. Six is also, of course, one less than seven, the number of perfection and completion. 666 looks like it is two less than 888, which is the gematria of Ἰησοῦς, a calculation made in the Sibylline Oracles (Sib. Or. 1.324-31; Farrer; Bauckham 1993, 397). Philo associates the number six with “corruption” and “inequality”.29 Combined with gematria, many of these symbolic solutions have merit.

29 Philo, QG 2.45 (noted Berger). The work does not survive in Greek, so I quote the Loeb translation, which is based on the Armenian.
Some solutions avoid both symbolism and gematria. Leithart argues that 666 is an allusion to that number in 1 Kgs 10:14, where it is Solomon’s income in gold talents. One wonders if even the most Scripture-soaked reader of Revelation would pick this up. Van den Bergh (1912) argues for a Gnostic link. In Gnostic thought, the figure of σοφία is linked to the number eight, the double triangle of which is 666. This takes seriously the introduction to v.18, ὥσπερ ἡ σοφία ἐστίν, but Gnosticism does not seem to be a major target of polemic elsewhere in Revelation (certainly less than Roman emperors). Bruins (1969) suggests that χξς, 666, may be evocative of the column headings of a Greek abacus, which would resonate with the commercial context. Whilst presumably this is not the whole explanation, it may add nuance to one of the others.

Where does this mass of options leave us? Presumably the answer is that one of the various Roman emperors suggested is the solution to the gematria, since Rome is so heavily in the context and John so clearly wants us to calculate the gematria, but that some or all of the various symbolic meanings are also present and they account for why John did the gematria such that it would come to either 616 or 666. Does this help us determine which is initial? Perhaps it is better to approach that question by asking which might more likely be changed. A different attempt to encode the same emperor is an unlikely, because interest in Roman history as a way to read the NT fades early in the Patristic period. None of the solutions advanced by the fathers are names of specific emperors (Osborne). Birdsall (2002, 355) suggests that possibly ΧΞς, 666, led to ΧΕΙζ by visual error, which was corrected to ΧΙζ, 616, because ΧΕΙζ is not a meaningful numeral (though Birdsall ultimately prefers 616 as initial). Williams (2007) suggests that ΧΙζ may have been inserted because it is a plausible parody of the nomina sacra IC, IHC, XC or XPC. In his major study of numerals in Greek Biblical manuscripts, Cole (2017, 193-94) is broadly supportive of this approach. Fascinatingly, it is also supported by the sixth or seventh century collection of Patristic commentators on the mark of the beast, normally known as Monogramma (in the modern edition of Gryson 2003). This parody would have been especially clear in the early manuscripts, because both nomina sacra and numerals were spelled with supralinear bars.

Both Birdsall’s argument and Williams’ have a great virtue: they explain well how one of the two readings could be altered to the other in the early patristic period, when Roman emperors were little discussed, but TEs and nomina sacra were common. There
is little certainty about when *nomina sacra* became ubiquitous, but they are in almost all our surviving manuscripts, so it is likely to have been very early. In both cases, the altered reading is 666, so that is likely initial. Which of the gematria is the correct solution to 666 is thus irrelevant to our purposes. The question is whether 616 was introduced by TE (Birdsall) or for theological reasons, to parody the name of Jesus (Williams). Perhaps dividing the two is unhelpful: a scribe who altered to ΧΙς cannot but have had in mind the resemblance to the *nomina sacra*, even if it was not entirely conscious. I classify this as a content change, since it has theological weight and significance.

04: content change.

**B**

**Revelation 22**

*04 is lacunose for this whole chapter.*

**2:**

€ντεθευ...ζωης

01 (alone): €θευ και

01 may be a TE, but very similar language, €θευ και €θευ, is used in Ezek 47:12 and the contexts are so similar that harmonisation is likely (Smalley).

**A**

ποιον...αποδιδουν

01 and M\(\text{ab(p)cd(p)}\): ποιον...αποδιδους

02: πουυν...αποδιδουν

All other major evidence: text

Here 01 and 02 make apparently opposite errors. In neither do the two participles agree, but in 01, the first is neuter and the second masculine and in 02 *vice versa*. The neutral is grammatically correct. This is one of a number of instances which Schmid (1955, 2.244, 248-49) argues are simply grammatical errors (*Fehler*) not explicable as weak-sense Semitisms or the author’s regular style. NA\(^{28}\) has corrected this error, by making both participles neuter. However, the external evidence for this harmonised reading is
relatively slim. Aune argues convincingly in favour of the neuter form for the second participle: the standard neuter participle of ἀποδίδωμι is ἀποδιδόν, the form found in a number of cursives (Hoskier 1929, 2.617-18). ἀποδιδόν appears to be an attempt to form the neuter participle as if the verb were a contract verb in -οω, rather than a verb in -μι. This form also occurs in 3:9, where NA²⁸ prints διδῶ, attested only by 02 and 04, which appears to be a contracted form of διδῶ, rather than the regular first person singular, present indicative active, διδῶμι, which is the reading of the Majority manuscripts. John thus seems to use the -οω form sometimes. When it is found in the variants, it is probably the initial text as scribes would be more likely to “improve” John’s grammar than make it less regular.

If the neuter is accepted for the second participle for these reasons, the masculine form in the first becomes unlikely on internal grounds (lack of agreement between the two and with the relevant noun) and external (minimal attestation). Despite its apparent lack of external evidence, I therefore conclude with NA²⁸. 02’s ποιῶ might have come about by being harmonised to the regularised masculine form of the second participle and the second then corrected back to its original neuter, but it is much simpler to assume TE in 02. The same is true of 01.

01, 02: TE.

B

tὸν καρπὸν

01: τοὺς καρποὺς

The weight of external evidence is so strong that 01 is almost certain not to be initial. There are a number of possible explanations. There may have been a TE resulting from, or intentional harmonisation with, καρποὺς earlier in the verse. The fact that ξύλου, in the next verse, is also made plural by 01 suggests that it is deliberate harmonisation to the plural καρποὺς, rather than a TE, but on the other hand, the fact that ἀντὶ, the next word after this variation unit, is singular suggests that any deliberate harmonisation was not systematic – the text of 01 literally means “the fruits of it [sg] and the leaves of the trees [pl]”. Incoherent as this may be, it seems there was some deliberate, but unsuccessful, aim to pluralise consistently and therefore I conclude that 01 has harmonised.

B

---

237
τοῦ ξύλου
01: τῶν ξύλων
Harmonisation to plurals in context (see previous variation unit).
B

3:

κατάθεμα
01 only: κάταγμα
TE.
A

ἔτι
01: omitted
Μb(pt)cdε: ἐκεῖ
02, Mab(pt): text

The external evidence is evenly balanced, but 01’s reading makes least sense. Although it is readable (“nothing accursed will be”), some sort of predicate after the copular verb would make the sentence read more naturally. ἔτι and ἐκεῖ are equally plausible: the reference could be to time (literally “nothing accursed will be then”, i.e. nothing accursed will exist in the eschaton, the time of the heavenly city) or place (“nothing accursed will be there [in the heavenly city]”). Each possible reading could be a harmonisation (Zech 14:11 for ἔτι and Rev 21:25 for ἐκεῖ (Aune)). At 22:5 a similar phrase occurs again, with the evidence divided between the same two words. 02 also has ἔτι, so either passage may have been harmonized to the other. NA28 shows no evidence that Rev 22 has been harmonised to Zech 14 in any witness, which suggests that this passage was not in the scribe’s mind when copying these chapters. On the other hand, 21:25 was very likely in the scribe’s mind when copying 22:3 (and the Zechariah text was clearly in John’s mind when writing the verse), so it is more likely an initial ἔτι (alluding to Zechariah) was altered to ἐκεῖ (harmonising with Rev 21) than vice versa. 01’s complete omission is presumably TE.
B
Charles argues that the future tense is better because the other words in the verse are future. However, this point can be made to the opposite effect – a present would more likely be harmonised to a future than a future “diversified” to a present. Further, the fact that the present has come down to us in two forms (the reading of 01 with the verb in the middle of the phrase, and that of the Majority Text manuscripts, with it at the end), suggests that one of the present tense variants is the source for all the others: an original present is likely to give rise to a future and a present with alternative word order, but an original future is not likely to give rise to two present variants and no alternative future. 02 has therefore probably harmonised to context. There is not a great deal to choose between the Majority Text reading and 01’s, but I prefer 01’s as it is earlier.

Interestingly, Bousset (1894, 40) argues in the reverse direction. He argues that the shortest reading, οὐ χρεία is likely to be original (ursprünglich – Bousset writes before this became a debated concept), because there are so many variant forms of the verb in the other readings. He does not elaborate on this, but presumably his thought is that if there was a verb in the original text, the witnesses with the verb would agree more on its form. I argue however that at many variation units where there was undoubtedly some sort of verb in the initial text, there are several variants for its mood or tense. 02: harmonisation.
The early evidence agrees that the first instance of the φῶς is genitive. The second is more complex. Thomas argues that the external evidence and the fact that the genitive reads much better combine to favour the genitive at both places in this verse. However, as Charles notes, χρεία governs the accusative at 3:17 and the genitive at 21:23. A number of manuscripts also attest the genitive at 3:17 (interestingly, not 02). This all suggests that John uses both with χρεία, but scribes alter accusative to genitive much more often than vice versa. It therefore seems, contra NA28, that the accusative is initial here. This is even more likely given that the genitive may be the result of harmonisation to the genitives earlier in the verse and in 21:23. It is particularly noteworthy that 02 has the accusative here and genitive earlier in the verse, suggesting the scribe here avoided harmonisation in either direction. Although the external evidence for the genitive is strong, it is much more likely that the accusative be altered to the genitive than vice versa.

01: linguistic improvement.

B

φωτίσει

01, M\(a\(pt\)\)bce : φωτιέ

M\(b\(pt\)\)d : φωτίζει

φωτίσω and φωτιῶ are both possible forms of the future of φωτίζω. Boas et al (2019, 189) note that the earliest form of the future of -ιζω verbs was probably with sigma and this became the epsilon contract form, but that in later Greek some verbs have both (e.g. we see both ἔλπισω and ἔλπιδο). Boas et al suggest the sigma-form is the purer Attic one, so here it seems likely that the contracted form is initial.

02: linguistic improvement.
6:

ἀπέστειλεν

01, versional evidence: ἀπέστειλεν με


Von Ameln, Kabiersch and Berdozzo (2012, 471 n. 241) suggest the alpha in 02 is uncertain and was added later by a corrector. While there may be some disturbance, it is doubtful and may have been in scriptorium, since the alpha is very like all the others. To acknowledge the possibility, I note a C-grade TE.

8:

ὁ ἀκούων καὶ βλέπων ταῦτα

01, M[bp]de: ὁ βλέπων καὶ ἀκούων ταῦτα

02, M[bp]c: text

These two equivalent pairings are roughly equally balanced internally and externally. Loisy and Smalley note that, normally in Revelation, visions come before the angelic explanations and therefore 01 might have thought that seeing is logically first. However, in the next sentence we read ἠκούσα καὶ ἔβλεψα, with no variation and with
ἀκοῦω first.\textsuperscript{30} It would be an elegant scribal flourish to change the order to make it consistent and equally typical of John’s somewhat clumsy style to make it inconsistent. Such immediately local influences surely trump broader trends in John’s epistemology. I therefore argue that, contra NA\textsuperscript{28}, 02 has harmonised and 01 preserves the initial reading.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{B}
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{ἔβλεψα}
  \item 02: \textit{ἔβλεπον}
  \item 01 and M\textsuperscript{b(pt)cde}: text
\end{itemize}

The difference is between the imperfect tense found in 02 and the aorist of 01. \textit{εἶδον} is highly unlikely to be initial because, as I have argued before, when there are two similar variants (i.e. as here two tenses of the same verb) and a third (i.e. here a different verb with a similar meaning), the different one is highly unlikely to be the source of the other two, but one of those two could well be the source of the other and the different one. Between the two parts of \textit{βλέπω}, external evidence favours the aorist. It is difficult to say which is more intrinsically plausible, partly because the meaning of the various tenses and aspects in Classical and Koine Greek is a matter of current scholarly controversy and partly because, whatever the “correct” rules are, it is unlikely that John would keep them. Schmid (2018, 219) and Aune both make the point that the aorist of \textit{βλέπω} is rare in Revelation, but Thompson (1985, 2), following Bousset, says the same for the imperfect. Every other finite verb in the sentence is aorist, so harmonisation is plausible (Schmid 2018, 219). Further they are all aorists in -σα, meaning a TE resulting from the endings is likely. On balance therefore, I conclude that the imperfect is probably initial and was harmonised to the aorist (so also Weiss 1891, 113). It is difficult to say if this is a deliberate harmonisation or a TE. The ending on the variant form is -\textit{ψα} whereas the ending on the surrounding forms, to which it may have been harmonised is -σα. This suggests we are dealing with intentional harmonisation, not TE.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{B}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{30} Schmid 1955, 2.126, acknowledges this argument, but does not follow it.
The change of preposition is presumably intended as a linguistic improvement and the loss of the article a TE natural when the scribe was concentrating on the change she was making.

A

11:

καὶ ὁ ῥυπαρὸς ῥυπανθήτω ἐτι
02: omitted

Majority: form the verb ῥυπαρευθήτω
01: text

02’s omission is almost certainly not original, since the external evidence is against it and because homoeoteleuton is so likely in this verse, given the repeated imperatives followed by ἔτι (Beale). Aune points out that ῥυπαρεύω, the form used by the Majority, occurs nowhere else in Greek literature. In the TLG (n.d.), it occurs only in commentaries on this passage and the PHI (2017) database of inscriptions and papyri.info (n.d.) database of documentary papyri turned up no instances. John probably coined it, because, as a non-native Greek speaker, he was unfamiliar with the usual verb on the ῥυπα- stem, ῥυπαίνω, which is attested in a variety of classical sources. Koester argues similarly that ῥυπαρεύω allows him to pair every noun in the sentence with a cognate verb. Of course, this might attract a Byzantine scribe to the reading, but it is unlikely that a Byzantine scribe would commit a linguistic solecism merely for rhetorical effect.31 It is even more implausible that the scribes of the Majority manuscripts would all introduce the same solecism (Smalley).

01: linguistic correction.
02: TE.

A

31 Contra Koester, it is not quite correct that, with the majority reading, every noun in the verse has a cognate verb, because of ὁ δίκαιος δικαιοσύνην ποιησάτω, but Koester’s point is still valid applying to three verbs out of four.
12:

ἀποδοῦναι
01 alone: ἀποδοθῆναι
Linguistic non-improvement.
A

13:

ὁ πρῶτος...τέλος
M\textsuperscript{cole(p)}: ἀρχή καὶ τέλος, ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἐσχατος
02 only: πρῶτος καὶ ἐσχατος, ἡ ἀρχή καὶ τὸ τέλος
01, M\textsuperscript{ab}: text

There are two different points of variation to consider here: the order of the pairs and the articles. On the question of the order, the external evidence is relatively evenly balanced. Similar language occurs at 1:8 and 21:6. 21:6 has alpha/omega followed by ἀρχή/τέλος in all witnesses. 1:8 has alpha/omega and then 01 adds ἀρχή/τέλος. 21:6 is a much more likely to be the source of harmonisation, since it is much nearer and the relevant words are much more widely attested. This in turn suggests that the reading which puts ἀρχή/τέλος first is likely the result of harmonisation.

On articles, the external evidence is arguably with NA\textsuperscript{28}’s reading. It is unclear why 02 omits the articles on the first pair. It is unlikely to be TE, since they are omitted on both nouns. The most likely explanation is that the scribe or that of his exemplar wanted to change the substantives into adjectives. This was presumably considered a linguistic improvement.
B

14:

πλώοντες τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν
Majority, Syriac, Bohairic, some Latin evidence: ποιοῦντες τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτῶν
01, 02, some minuscules, Latin evidence, Sahidic: text
Goranson (1997) argues for ποιοῦντες being initial here, because it is attested early (Tertullian) and because later scribes might have wanted to remove a “salvation by works” implication from Revelation. This imports sixteenth-century concerns into the thought of Patristic scribes. Goranson also misunderstands the Tertullian evidence. The passage is *Pud.* 19.9: *Sic et rursus: beati qui ex praeceptis agunt, ut in lignum vitae habeant potestatem et in portas ad introeundum in sanctam civitatem. Canes venefici, fornicator, homicida foras, utique qui non ex praeceptis agant.* Tertullian is here discussing 21:7-8, so he is likely to be quoting chapter 22 from memory, rather than having a copy to hand, so a memory error is quite plausible.

αὐτῶν ἐπὶ
01 only: αὐτῶν ὡς δὲ ἡ ἐξουσία ἐπὶ
Denniston (1934, 162-89) offers no parallel to this form of construction, with δὲ in a subordinate clause.\(^3\) I therefore consider this a linguistic non-improvement.

\(^1\)5:

φιλῶν καὶ ποιῶν
01, some late evidence: ποιῶν καὶ φιλῶν (variants of this with articles: M\(^0\))
M\(^de\), some late evidence: ὁ φιλῶν καὶ ποιῶν
As with the variation unit in v.13, we are faced with two aspects: the order of the words and the article. Regarding the order, the external evidence is finely balanced. Whilst it is easy to see how TE could lead either to be changed to the other, it is hard to see which change is more probable. There are also no obvious sources of harmonisation. “Loving” is perhaps logically prior to “doing”, but it is hard to conclude definitively whether or not *lectio difficilior* should apply here and make us reconstruct ποιῶν first.

In the end, I follow the very slight majority of external evidence (two Byzantine groups and 02) and take φιλῶν first as initial. The change introduced by 01 in reversing the order can hardly be mandated on linguistic grounds, but could easily have occurred by TE, since the words sound so similar.

---

\(^3\) Denniston (1934, 7) only considers evidence prior to 320 BCE, but remains relevant as the most thorough survey of Greek particles.
Regarding the articles, Schmid (1955, 2.199) explains that in general Revelation follows the regular Greek rule that with a singular participle, meaning “each” (jeder), πᾶς takes an article. However he cites this verse as an exception, implying that the anarthrous form is initial. The evidence for the article is so late and John’s grammar so irregular that he is probably right.

01: TE.
C

16:

ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις
02: ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις
The external evidence clearly favours ἐπὶ, which is also difficilior (Loisy, Satake).

02: linguistic improvement.
A

ὁ λαμπρὸς ὁ πρωϊνός
02: ὁ λαμπρὸς καὶ ὁ πρωϊνός
Mἐ(ρ): ὁ λαμπρὸς ὁ πρωϊνός ὁ αὐτός
01, Mἀβ(π)ἐδ(π): text
The matter of significance is the inclusion of καὶ and αὐτός. The external evidence is strongly against either. Both can be read as clarifying John’s Greek: καὶ links the double adjectives nicely and αὐτός “ties off” the phrase.

02: linguistic improvement
A

17:

τὸ πνεῦμα
01: there is a lacuna exactly where the τὸ should be. NA²⁸ cites 01 as omitting it, presumably because they reason that the damage was caused to the parchment before the manuscript was copied, rather than the lacuna taking away the τὸ. This is likely because the words seem to be spaced neatly around the hole.
The pi before the lacuna has been deleted by the in scriptorium corrector (CSP). This strengthens the hypothesis that the hole predated the manuscript production. The scribe wanted to write τὸ πνεῦμα, but had to stop because of the hole. When she resumed, she started the word again and forgot to delete the initial pi, which was then deleted by the scriptorium corrector. Thus the reading of 01 is the noun without the article. I have included in the list of times 01 omits articles on p.177.

18:

μαρτυρῶ
01 only: η μαρτυρῶ
01 dittographically repeats the final nu of v.17 and then reads it as an eta.

TE.
A

ἐπιθῆ ἐπ᾽ αὐτά
M: ἐπιθηση ἐπ᾽ αυτά
01: omitted
M\text{abc}, 02: text
01’s reading clearly results from TE due to homoeoarcton from ἐπιθῇ and ἐπιθήσει.
A

ὁ θεὸς ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν
01, M\text{abc}ce: ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν ὁ θεὸς
02: ὁ θεὸς (a much later (von Ameln, Kabiersch and Berdozzo 2012, 473 n. 245) hand has added ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν)
M\text{def}(p)\text{(with slight variation)}: ὁ θεὸς ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν
M^{ab(p)}: text

It is unusual and noteworthy that the reading chosen by NA^{28} is evidenced by neither 01 nor 02. 02’s reading has little external evidence and is little better than nonsense. 01 is only slightly unusual word order and has plenteous external evidence, so I take it as initial, but it is not obvious what caused 02’s variant. Since no other cause is apparent, it is presumably TE, but no more detailed cause (e.g. haplography or homoeoteleuton) is obvious.

02: TE.
A

19:

ἐὰν
01 only: ἄν
TE.
A

ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων
01: ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων τούτων
The epideictic pronoun is clumsy given the definite article and the dependent genitive with an epideictic pronoun.
01: linguistic non-improvement.
A

ἐκ τῆς πόλεως
02: preposition omitted
Despite the weak external evidence, Weiss (1891, 73) suggests that the 02 reading is the initial variant. He argues that the preposition could easily have been added to make clear that πόλεως is not governed by ἀπὸ. However, this argument only has persuasive power when tied to an a priori reverence for 02 in Revelation, which I am methodologically committed to renouncing. It is unlikely that the scribe of 02 or its ancestor would introduce a new lack of clarity by removing the preposition, so I submit that the removal was a TE.
B
20:

ταῦτα
01: ταῦτα εἶναι
Linguistic improvement.
A

Ἄμήν
01: omitted Ἀμήν
Mabh(pt)cd: Ἀμήν, ναὶ
It is unlikely that there would be two “Amen”s so close to each other, here and as the last word of the book. Here is much the difficilior place for it to be, since liturgically, it “fits” at the end (Boxall). The external evidence is also weak for the final Amen (Mounce). I thus conclude it was originally here and moved for liturgical reasons, i.e. a content change. I reject the ναὶ because of its lack of early evidence.
A

21:

πάντων
01: τῶν ἁγίων
Majority: πάντων τῶν ἁγίων
Many other minor variations (Osborne).
02: text
This is another variation unit with two different variables: πάντων and ἁγίων. The external evidence is against each word taken independently, but we cannot on this basis conclude that neither was there, since there is no external evidence for neither. On the one hand, it is unlikely that both were in the initial text, because of the tendencies of scribes to conflate. On the other hand, the two words are similar that one could easily drop out by homoeoteleuton (Ross 1976, 341).\[33\]

\[33\] Ross credits the point about homoeoteleuton to Bousset’s 1896 commentary. However, in the 1906 edition of the commentary, to which I have access, Bousset takes the opposite view. Thomas also makes the point the conflation is unlikely.
There are a number of possible sources of harmonisation: six of the twenty-one NT letters contain a final greeting with πάντων or similar.34 However, what seems to be scribal harmonisation might turn out to be authorial (or redactional) harmonisation: a scribe might harmonise to what he had previously copied, but John might also imitate the epistolary format of the great letter writer, Paul.35 No NT letter contains a final greeting with the ἀγι- root but that root is used to describe the people of God a number of times in Revelation.36 01 adds ἁγίοις in 1:1, which may suggest that adding words of this root was a very specific “scribal habit” (see discussion ad loc). The harmonisation arguments therefore leave us in the same quandary as the external evidence: there is evidence that both could be the result of harmonisation, but there is no external evidence for neither.

The most likely explanation is that discussed in more detail at 1:1, that ἁγίος is a theological addition, to highlight the “specialness” of God’s people in hard times. Charles and Karrer (2009, 380) both argue that πάντων would imply a universalism that sits ill with John’s thought elsewhere in the book, where the wicked will face the second death and Babylon will be destroyed.37 However, this argument is not especially persuasive, since there are other occasions in which early Christian writers who at times express a strongly particularist soteriology also use πᾶς in connection with the people who will be saved (e.g. 1 John 2:2; 2 Cor 5:14-15).

The loss of πάντων is easy to explain as a TE, because, once ἁγίος had entered the tradition, the two words look similar in majuscules (ΑΓΙΩΝ and ΠΑΝΤΩΝ) making it easy to jump from one to the other.

I therefore follow NA28 regarding the initial text and reconstruct the variants as follows. 01: content change (addition of ἁγίοις) (B) and TE (loss of πάντων) (C).

ἀμήν added at the end of the book by 01 and M^{abc}.

---

34 1 Cor 16:24; 2 Cor 13:13; Eph 6:24; 2 Thess 3:18; Titus 3:15; Heb 13:25.
35 The dating, authorship and authorial context of Revelation are well beyond our present scope, but it is at least possible that the author or redactor knew at least some of the Pauline letters.
37 E.g. chapter 18 passim; 20:11-15.
See the ἀμήν discussed above, v.20.

As with each of these data chapters, a full analysis must await the conclusion. We can notice already that Revelation appears to have a text with significantly greater uncertainty than John or Romans, since, although we have surveyed a smaller number of verses, we have had significantly more variation units to analyse. There is noticeably more linguistic non-improvement in Revelation. This may perhaps be due to the weak-sense Semitisms in Revelation: scribes may have been seen unusual language in their exemplars and not corrected it, because they expected unusual language in Revelation. Therefore our surviving witnesses for Revelation contain a greater number of linguistic non-improvements. Let us now turn to LXX.
In this chapter, I apply the method I have so far used on NT books to the LXX book, Sirach or Ecclesiasticus. I begin with a brief critical introduction and discussion of how I adapt my method to Sirach.

The Prologue to Greek Sirach states that it is a translation of a Hebrew text composed by the translator’s grandfather, Ἰησοῦς. Later, at 50:27, we read about a paragon of wisdom, Ἰησοῦς υἱὸς Σιραχ᾽Ελεαζαρ. This is presumably the grandfather. The Hebrew witnesses vary the names slightly and the Syriac has no name at all (Skehan and DiLella 1987, 557), but, according to the Greek, the work was originally written in Hebrew by Joshua ben Sira and translated into Greek by his grandson. Most modern scholars generally date the Hebrew Ur-text to the first quarter of the second century BCE and the translation to c.117 BCE (Skehan and Di Lella 1987, 8-10; Wright, 2015, 412-13; Beentjes 2006, 4).

For many centuries, there were no Hebrew manuscripts of Sirach known to scholarship, but, since the nineteenth century, a number have been discovered. Wright (2015, 411) estimates that we now have Hebrew attestation for about two-thirds of the book as found in other languages.

Within the Greek tradition, scholars discern a shorter recension (GI) and a longer one (GII). Their exact relationship and origins are matters of debate. Most however accept that there is a broadly united text, GI, found in the four pandects and the cursives which follow them. There is no manuscript which presents a pure GII text, but many have additions of various kinds, which are characterised as GII (Wright 2015, 420). The majority of significant additions appear in the first half of the book (Gile 2011, 243). There is also a longer recension of the Hebrew text, known as HII. Many scholars view GII as essentially a translation of HII, without wanting to claim that every GII reading originated in Hebrew (Rüger 1970).

There are a number of other versions. The Vulgate translators did no work on Sirach, so Vulgate Sirach is OL Sirach (Coggins 1998, 37). There is also a Syriac version, which van Peursen argues was probably translated from a Hebrew text similar to HII (van Peursen 2007, 14-37). Nelson (1988, 131-32) argues that this was produced by Syriac speaking Jews, in the
third or fourth century CE and that before the mid-fifth century CE, there was a Christian revision. Other versions include the Coptic and Arabic (Ziegler 1965, 30-31; Frank 1974).

Scholars compare the longer and shorter recensions in different languages, in an attempt to recover the history of the text, in a similar way to how their NT counterparts compare individual manuscripts (for a particularly explicit example of this approach, see Reiterer 1980). A key aspect of the puzzle is how the various longer forms of the text relate to each other. The Latin and Syriac versions share some of the plusses of GII: of the one hundred and fifty additional stichoi in GII, thirty-two are also in the Syriac and thirty-three in the Latin (Kearns 2011, 49). Both those versions have a number of their own unique additions. Although the Latin has clear affinities with GII, it is likely to have also been influenced by the Hebrew, because it agrees with the Hebrew against the Greek and all other versions, in metathesising 30:25-33:13a and 33:13b-36:16 (Ziegler 1965, 27). The Coptic versions are close to GI (Ziegler 1965, 30-31). The Arabic version has elements of both GI and GII: it has lots of the short plusses, but fewer of the long ones (Frank 1974).

Hart (1909) and Kearns (2011) argued that agreement between the various longer forms of the text (i.e. HII, GII, the Latin and the Syriac) implies that they have a common ancestor, which was presumably in Hebrew and must have been close to HII. However, Gile (2011) has argued that many plusses in the versions did not originate in Hebrew: of c.150 lines of plusses in GII, only three passages, comprising ten cola together, have undeniable Hebrew counterparts. There are also seventy-five cola in the Latin which are not in any Greek manuscript. The Syriac also has a number of its own added cola. Thus it is probably unhelpful to think of a single, original HII underlying all the longer versions.

Aitken (2018) has argued that it is fundamentally problematic to think in terms of a single Hebrew Sirach Ur-Text at all. The variety of different text-forms across different manuscripts and different languages indicates broad textual diversity. Moreover, it is in the nature of aphoristic texts like Sirach to expand and change as new proverbs are added (or even removed). The fifty-one chapter form is too long and unwieldy to have been written de novo and likely involved the redaction of earlier sources. Much Jewish literature was transmitted orally in the Rabbinic period and this naturally leads to additions and omissions, especially in aphoristic texts. Aitken argues therefore that scholars have focussed too much on finding the Hebrew Ur-text and not enough on interpreting the various forms in various manuscripts, as works of
literature in their own right. Aitken can be seen as advocating a similar approach to Sirach as Parker 1997 does for the Gospels. Such an approach is much more suited to Sirach, because its aphoristic, non-narratival nature makes it much more the kind of work a scribe might feel free to change.

Even accepting Aitken’s arguments with regard to the Hebrew, it still seems likely that there was one original Greek version, translated from a Hebrew Vorlage, and that GII is an expansion of that first Greek version, rather than a fresh translation. This is because there is no evidence for any Greek version without the Prologue by the Grandson, so any subsequent translation must be a revision of that work. This argument does not require accepting the Prologue as face-value fact: even if it is a mere story, it is not a story that would have been made up coincidentally by two different people in the same words. However, Aitken’s arguments are also broadly consistent with the Prologue: the Grandson translated a Hebrew manuscript, by, or descended from a manuscript by, Ben Sira, but Ben Sira may have been more a redactor than the author of every word and his version was later altered significantly in the Hebrew tradition. One could object to this that the style of the prologue is markedly higher and more complex than the actual translation (suggesting that they have different authors). However, the translator admits in the prologue that his translation may lack rhetorical power, so we should expect the prologue to be more elaborately written than the translation, even if they had the same author. Dhont (2019, 402-03) adds that readers at the time might have expected a writer to use a very different style when writing a translation to when writing de novo. Moreover, Aitken (2011) argues that in fact the translation is written in a more impressive and literary style than many realise and therefore could be by the same author as the prologue. Therefore it is likely that all Greek manuscripts descend from one Ur-Übersetzung, which included the Prologue.

Moreover, all the Greek manuscripts agree against the Hebrew in metathesising 30:25-33:13a and 33:13b-36:16. Such agreement in error is unlikely to be coincidental (Wright 1989, 5). Thus it is almost certain that there was one original Ur-Übersetzung, from which all our Greek manuscripts descend. It does not matter for present purposes if the original translator really was the grandson of an author or major redactor of the Hebrew, but I shall refer to him or her henceforth as the Grandson. I assume that he was a largely competent Hebraist, since he did, after all, complete the translation! Therefore, ceteris paribus, I avoid explanations for text-critical problems which posit him making major Hebrew blunders.
Since there was probably one original translation, I am able to focus on the ways in which the pandects vary from the initial text of that translation, not the initial text of the Hebrew composition (which, as I discussed above, is a problematic concept anyway according to Aitken 2018). This project thus contributes to textual criticism of OG Sirach, rather than textual criticism of Hebrew Sirach using OG (for this distinction, see Lust 2002, 17). I am uninterested in variants that developed in Hebrew, between the earliest forms of the Hebrew text and the Grandson’s Hebrew Vorlage. This distances this chapter from most commentaries on Sirach, which are uninterested in variation within the Greek tradition, but only in using the critical reconstruction of the Grandson’s translation to reconstruct the Hebrew initial text (e.g. Schreiner 2002, Corley 2002, Zapff 2010). This focus on variation in the Greek tradition allows me to make meaningful comparison between the textual characteristics of the pandects in LXX and their characteristics in the NT, because the NT works have not gone through translation between their initial texts and the manuscripts I am investigating. The various Hebrew texts are still of interest to this project, because it is possible a pandect might have been corrected to be closer to them, either directly or via a Greek ancestor-manuscript with Hebrew influence. The daughter versions of the Greek (e.g. the OL) are also of interest, as they are in NT textual criticism, as potentially valuable witnesses to the initial Greek text. However, these daughter-versions are separated by several centuries from the Grandson’s translation, so are not as useful in reconstructing the initial text of the Grandson’s work as the OL, OS or Coptic are in reconstructing the NT. Because this project is focussed on textual variations in the Greek tradition, I do not discuss variation units where the Greek tradition and its daughter versions are united, even if the Hebrew or Syriac disagree.

As should hopefully be clear now, the focus of this project is not the particular habits of the individual scribes of the pandects, but the textual characteristics of the manuscripts, created aggregatesly by the scribes of all their ancestors. Any variation, introduced by any scribe between the initial text of the Grandson’s translation and the manuscript in question is therefore relevant.

I will consider every variation unit in Ziegler’s (1965) Göttingen edition, but will not write about the majority of them, since in the vast majority of cases, the pandects all agree and the external evidence is very clearly in favour of their reading. This is not to claim that whenever the pandects agree, that is always the initial text. However, in Greek Sirach this will very often be the case, because they are the oldest major witnesses by some margin. I will analyse chapters
13 and 47, because they are largely extant in all four manuscripts and come from very different parts of the book. Chapter 13 contains wisdom aphorisms typical of the book. Chapter 47 comes from the laus patrum, or tributes to Israel’s heroes. The base text I have used is the Rahlfs-Hanhart (2005) LXX. As throughout this dissertation, if a manuscript it is not cited at a particular variation unit, it has the text reading. For Sirach and Judges, I add a new category of variant: “conforming to the Hebrew”. As throughout the thesis, I only cite in the apparatus what is relevant to the discussion at hand.

Ziegler (1965, 53-56) makes a few comments on the textual characteristics of the pandects in Sirach: 03 has a number of singular readings; 01 contains several plusses, TEs and stylistic changes; 02 frequently changes particles, harmonises to nearby words and makes other linguistic changes. These are obviously exactly the kind of observations my thesis is aiming at, but my thesis will have the unique advantage of being able to compare these characteristics in different parts of the Christian canon.

In Sirach, 04 is more difficult to read than in the NT books I have examined. When 04 is uncertain for only a few characters, this is not noted and I assume these characters have the text reading, unless there is reason to assume the contrary. It is difficult to define exactly what proportion of the readings of 04 are in this category, since the category is not “black and white”. Tischendorf seems to have been able to see considerably more than is visible today. I assume therefore that the manuscript has deteriorated since the nineteenth century. On that basis, I assume that, if I cannot make out the reading but he gives the Rahlfs-Hanhart reading, that he has observed correctly. When I note a reading in 04 as illegible, I mean that it is illegible to both Tischendorf and me. Lyon’s work on 04 covered only the NT.

Verse-by-Verse Analysis

**Sirach 13**

1:

μολυνθήσεται
01 only: οὐ μολυνθήσεται
The Hebrew verb is קבד, meaning “stick”, such that the whole line means “whoever touches resin, it sticks on his hand”. The Syriac follows the Hebrew (Marböck). Box and Oesterley suggest that μολυνθήσεται is a mistranslation of the Hebrew. Smend suggests that the Greek originally read κολληθήσεται, which is used at 2:3 and 19:2 and is from the verb meaning “stick”. Peters suggests that μολυνθήσεται was the initial text and represents the Grandson’s attempt to clarify the meaning of the Hebrew. This seems the most likely explanation, since arguably the Greek is clearer. Contra Box and Oesterley, it seems unlikely that the Grandson would misconstrue the Hebrew out of sheer incompetence and, contra Smend, it is also unlikely that the initial reading of the Greek would be lost in all surviving Greek evidence. How then do we account for the added οὗ in 01? It may be οὗ, a relative pronoun, such that the phrase means “whoever touches pitch, by it he will be stained”. However, if such a clarification was needed, we would expect to see it more widely in the Greek tradition. It is therefore more likely to be οὗ. This might seem unlikely because the negated version of the line makes little sense and destroys the parallelism with the next line. However, it is quite plausible that an ancestor-manuscript of 01 was being read or corrected and the reader noticed that the Greek verb did not accord with the Hebrew. She noted this fact by writing οὗ above the verb, which then got incorporated into the main text. I record it as conforming to the Hebrew and a TE, because it involves both.

01: conforming to Hebrew, TE.

B

2:

μὴ (2)

01, 02, OL, Sahidic, Coptic, Aethiopic, many minuscules, Hebrew: σοῦ μη

The internal arguments are even: a scribe is equally likely to have added σοῦ for clarity as to have removed it by TE. However, the external evidence for the longer reading is strong. It is not clear why the shorter reading is favoured by the editors. One could argue that, in Sirach, longer readings are in general unlikely to be initial, because the witnesses associated with the GII recension contain many longer readings. However, it is an important part of my methodology to avoid such assumptions about the value of particular witnesses. I therefore submit that the longer reading is initial, based on the external evidence. The σοῦ could easily have been omitted by TE.

B
Neither LSJ nor the abbreviated TLG (n.d.) know of a form of the verb without the rho, so it is best classified as a TE.

A

3:

The text reading has the weight of the early external evidence behind it, so it is probably initial. Presumably, the change was made to make the phrase stronger and more emphatic (“will be threatened” rather than “will be in need”).

A

4:

In 04, there are two lines of gap between v.3 and v.6. There is clearly text there, but it is completely illegible, even to Tischendorf.

Above is an image of the width of the page. It should be clear that there is text all the way across. On close examination of every part of the line, it is impossible to make anything out of the traces and they are at least as inconsistent with the Rahlfs-Hanhart text as consistent. On the basis of other lines on the page, it is likely the right-hand ends of the lines are show through from the other side. However, if this the case, then there is no text on the far-right of the page and there is therefore likely to be a missing verse. The most we can say is that 04 seems to have made a major content change, but we do not know exactly what it is.
04: content change.
A

6:

ἐλπίδα
02: ἐλπίδαν
Although the distinction is somewhat artificial, 02’s reading is clearly an alternative morphology, rather than an orthographic variant, i.e. it represents a different way to form the word, rather than merely to spell it. Blass, Debrunner and Funk (1961, 26) note that it is a known alternative third declension accusative form (see p.166 of this dissertation). I classify it as a linguistic non-improvement.
A

σοι καλὰ (3)
01: καλὰ
TE, perhaps due to the -σει on the end of the previous word.
A

ἔρει
02 only: ἕρις
This clearly cannot be ἕρις, strife. It is much more likely either a nonsense TE or an orthographic variant on ἔρεις, second person, singular, future of λέγω. Given that there is no obvious reason for the TE, the latter is more likely. The sense is that the rich man will not merely flatter the poor, but will engage him in polite conversation, such that each asks after the need of the other. This is a content change.
A

7:

7a is virtually illegible in 04.

ἀποκεφώσῃ
01, 02, 04, V, various minuscules: ἀποκεφώσει
03: text

04 is not entirely clear and Tischendorf can read nothing after the omega, but one can make out ΑΠΟΚΕΝΩC and the merest traces of what appears to be a lunate letter after that.

This may be simply an orthographic variant but it may reflect a morphological difference. αἰσχυνει in the previous clause could be either present (αἰσχύνει) or future (αἰσχυνεῖ). Given the many futures in context, the future is more likely. The verb under consideration here could either be aorist subjunctive (ἀπόκενώσῃ in standard modern orthography, which is the reading of 03) or future indicative (ἀπόκενώσει in standard modern orthography, the reading of the other pandects and V). The aorist is surely more natural here, given that emptying is one action. It is unlikely that 01, 02, 04 and V should all agree on such a grammatical oddity as a future indicative here. In v.5, with the same verb, the sense is clearly future indicative, because the parallel verbs are future indicative and there is no variation. It is thus likely that the -ει reading is harmonisation to v.5. The close proximity of v.5 makes this likely.

01, 02, 04: harmonisation.

B

ἐσχάτων

01, 02, 03, 04, Syro-Hexapla, Latin evidence: ἐσχάτω

In 03, the bar that appears in roughly the right area is not a nu bar, but a mark over καταμωκήσεται pointing to a ninth-century marginal note (Versace 2018, 199 for the date).

The external evidence thus strongly supports the dative singular and none of the pandects have varied from it.

καταλείψει

01 only: καλύψει
The Syriac agrees with 01 (Box and Oesterley), but the Hebrew agrees with the other pandects (‘אבר; I follow Hart in translating “pass by”, as it means in Ps 103:16, rather than Box and Oesterley, who translate it as “be angry”).

The external evidence and the likelihood that the Grandson would correctly render the Hebrew tell against 01. It is presumably a TE caused by the similar sounds. The fact that it had spread to the Vorlage of the Syriac suggests that it was originally made by the scribe of a common ancestor manuscript.

A

8:

μὴ (2)
01, OL: omitted

The majority of the early evidence is against the omission. It is possible that μὴ dropped out through TE, but there is no obvious trigger (such as homoeoteleuton). The sentence makes sense without it, because the first μὴ can still be assumed to govern the second clause. However, it is much clearer with the second μὴ and therefore it seems likely that it was added for clarity. It is not a content change, because the meaning is the same either way.

02, 03, 04: linguistic improvement.

B

ἀφροσύνη
01, 02, 03, 04: εὐφροσύνη

253 (alone among Greek manuscripts), OL, Sahidic: text

There is very little Greek evidence for ἀφροσύνη. It makes better sense in context and is closer to the Hebrew (‘אבר “lack”). For these reasons, Box and Oesterley claim it is the original reading of the Greek. Peters similarly suggests that εὐφροσύνη is a Fehler. It is not clear if he means a copyist’s mistake (meaning that the Grandson wrote ἀφροσύνη, as Box and Oesterley think) or the Grandson’s mistake in translating. It is implausible that the Grandson make such a mistake, but equally implausible that a patently wrong reading be accepted universally in the Greek tradition. It is most likely that there was a TE very early on in the copying process after the Grandson. A careless copyist might easily do this through the sound of the words, but the Grandson would be unlikely to, since, in the process of translation, he would be engaging with the content.
All four pandects: TE.

A

9:

σε προσκαλέσεται
02: σε προσκαλέσηται
03, Sahidic, Syro-Hexapla, several minuscules: προσκαλέσεται σε
04: Tischendorf reads 04 as agreeing with 03. It certainly does not agree with 02 (there is no sign of an eta). I can see no trace of a σε after and there is arguably room to have it before.

This image shows the final omega of τόσο and the beginning of προσκαλέσεται.

The image shows προσκαλέσεται and the space after it. I can see nothing which might a be a σε.

There are two variation units here: the epsilon vs. eta in προσκαλέσεται (i.e. is it indicative or subjunctive?) and the position of σε.

Regarding the first, the external evidence favours the indicative. It is easy to see why a scribe thought a subjunctive would read better: it could be rendered “and he may encourage you”, with a gently implied sense of purpose. This is a subtle content change.

Regarding the position of the σε, the later position is difficilior and has strong external evidence. Whilst unusual, it is perfectly comprehensible Greek and is consistent with the Grandson’s style in v.7, where the second person pronouns consistently come after the verbs. Placing it in its more normal position is a linguistic improvement.

02: content change.
A
01, 02: linguistic improvement.
A

10:

μὴ ἀπωσθῆς
03: ἵνα μὴ ἀπωσθῆς
The external evidence is against 03, which is also markedly *facilior*. Without ἵνα the sentence reads like a double imperative and balances less with the next line.
03: linguistic improvement.
A

11:

ἐπέχε
01: ἐπέχε (i.e. an extra epsilon)
The extra epsilon is deleted, but it is very difficult to see who has done the deletion: there are no supralinear dots, it is just rubbed out. It is clearly a TE, but it is impossible to know if it was corrected in scriptorium, hence I rate it C.
01: TE.
C

ἰσηγορεῖσθαι
01, 02, 03: ἵσηγορεῖσθαι
04: ἵσηγορεῖσθαι
It is most likely that these are merely orthographic variants. However, LSJ lists εἰσηγορία, meaning “reproach”, from which one could presumably form εἰσηγορέομαι, I reproach. LSJ also includes ἱσηγορέομαι, I speak as an equal (citing this passage as one of the occurrences). Either would work here in context. However, it is most likely that, whichever the Grandson intended, the different readings are orthographic variations on that verb, rather than a scribe attempting to change that verb to the other.

This variation unit is also significant, because Tischendorf appears to have made a mistake in transcribing 04. He writes ἑσ-, but in the image, one can clearly see the final -χε of ἔπεχε and then ἵσ-.

14:

This verse is in none of the pandects and only a few of the minuscules. It is also absent in HI (Marböck). 03 has an obelus after v.13, but there is no marginalion to which the obelus can attach and the obelus is hard to date\(^1\). It seems a scribe knew of a possible addition here, but not what it said. Box and Oesterley, Sauer and Schreiner all agree the addition is a late gloss. Hart (1909, 363, 366) claims the addition is initial because a form of it is found in the anthology of Antonius Melissa, but this is tenth century (Jeffreys and Kazhdan 2005), so too late to be significant. The pandects thus all seem to preserve the initial text by omitting v.14.

17:

εὐσεβή
01, 03: εὐσεβήν
Syro-Hexapla and witnesses associated with it by Ziegler 1965: εὐσεβεῖ
01 and 03 have the much less regular and so difficilior form, so are likely to be initial.
02, 04: linguistic improvement.

\(^1\) Personal Communication, Dirk Jongkind, March 2019.
There seems to be very little to choose between the two words. 02 clearly has the external evidence against it. Presumably ταπείνωσις somehow appealed on stylistic or aesthetic grounds. 02: linguistic improvement.

The external evidence strongly favours ταπεινός. Although Ziegler cites an impressive list of versions for πτωχός, the two words seem so similar in meaning that a non-Greek word in another language could translate one as easily as the other. Middendorp (1973, 81) cites Prov 19:4, which express a vaguely similar idea and contrast πτωχός with πλούσιος. Whilst it is unlikely that the 01 variant is consciously alluding to these specific texts in Proverbs, they demonstrate that πτωχός is the more natural counterpart to πλούσιος. The 01 variant is thus probably a content change to improve the rhetorical power of the contrast.

02’s form is passive. According to LSJ, the passive of σφάλλω is a standard way to express “to fall”. LSJ has examples from Homer to Plutarch. Although, as Smend points out, the active is
used in Amos 5:2 with a sense of “to fall”, this does not outweigh the classical examples in LSJ. Although OG Amos is a Greek Jewish text like OG Sirach, there is no particular evidence they had a close relationship. We should not even assume necessarily that Amos had been translated by the time the Grandson translated Sirach. The Grandson’s preface does not specify which precise books he had access to, it merely speaks in general terms about types of book. Therefore the passive is grammatically “right” here and ἔσφαλεν has both the external evidence and the difficilior criterion in its favour. 02’s reading is a natural linguistic improvement.

A

23:

04: there are some letters in the middle of v.23b (i.e. the second line of the four), which are not enough to make into a word, but cannot easily be reconciled with a known variant. Tischendorf has no note of them.

Since they do not represent a known variant, I tentatively posit a content change.

B

προσανατρέψουσιν
02: προσανατρέψουσιν
V: προσαναστρέψουσιν
04: illegible

\[\text{Dines (2015, 440) suggests a date for Greek Amos sometime in the second century BCE. For the general danger of assumptions about the relative dating of Sirach and other LXX books, see Caird 1982.}\]
The weight of external evidence is with the text reading. 02 has changed the tense from future to present, presumably because the scribe behind the variant thought the present fitted better syntactically with the aorist subjunctive in the apodosis of the conditional.

02: linguistic improvement.

A

24:

ὁ πλοῦτος

02, some Latin evidence: ἐστίν ὁ πλοῦτος

04: illegible

The external evidence is clearly against 02. ἐστίν is likely added for clarity.

02: linguistic improvement.

A

στόματι

03, V, Arabic MS (for details see Frank 1974): στόμασι (i.e. make it plural)

The external evidence favours the singular. It is hard to see what motivated the plural, because the singular is syntactically neater, because ἀσεβοῦς is singular. It seems most likely a TE.

A

ἀσεβοῦς

03, 753, Malachias Monachus: εὐσεβοῦς

04: illegible (Box and Oesterley ascribe εὐσεβοῦς to 04, but, since they give no justification or reference, I see no reason to follow them; I assume it has the text reading, in accordance with the principle stated on p.256).

The external evidence favours ἀσεβοῦς. It is hard to make sense of εὐσεβοῦς. The text so far has taken a low view of wealth and a high view of poverty, so it would hardly now say “poverty is evil in the speech of the pious”. Therefore we must conclude that εὐσεβοῦς is a TE from their similar sounds, as in v.8.

A
κόπων
03, Syro-Hexapla, Hebrew: κόπου
V: κόσμου
04: illegible
The external evidence clearly supports the text reading. 03 is best understood as a linguistic improvement, presumably the idea was that labour, as an abstract concept, is singular.
A

Sirach 47

1:

μετὰ τοῦτον
04, 248, 358, OL: μετὰ τοῦτο
I could make out nothing in 04 here, but Tischendorf is confident. The reading is also cited by Smend and Box and Oesterley. The neuter is significantly facilior and is a fairly clear linguistic improvement. I rate as B because of the uncertainties about whether that is the reading of 04.
B

2:

τῶν υἱῶν
01, 02: υἱῶν
04: illegible. Tischendorf sees υἱῶν in the middle of the line, such that there would be no room for the article, but this is far from certain to me, as the image shows.
Arguably the anarthrous reading is slightly *difficilior*, because the article is common with *ὑίοι Ἰσραήλ*, since they are a defined group, almost a proper name. It also has the better external evidence. 03 is therefore likely a linguistic improvement.

3:

ἐπαιξέν

02: ἐπεξέν
V: ἐπεξέν
03: ἐπαιξέν

In 03, the zeta has been corrected to xi, but from the pen shade, it appears that this was done by the re-inker.

04: ἐπαισεν

Tischendorf reconstructs this with confidence. I am more hesitant.
The image shows the epsilon and pi on the far left (very faint). I can see nothing after that.

01 only (among the early evidence): text
The text reading is an aorist of παίζω, I play. 04’s reading is an alternative aorist of the same verb. LSJ attests both. It is also possible that 04 is the aorist of παίω, I strike or smite. Box and Oesterley render the Syriac as “he slew” and Smend suggests this may be related to 04’s text. Whether or not this is true, the scribe behind 04’s variant probably intended an aorist of παίζω since it is much easier in context. The reading of 03 is the imperfect of the παίζω, which makes equally good sense. It is unlikely to be an orthographic variant on the aorist. 02’s reading is more difficult to parse. Aorists are not usually formed with zeta, so it looks like an imperfect of πέζω. According to TLG (n.d.), this verb appears in Photius’ lexicon, with a meaning similar to παίζω, so it is perhaps best treated as an orthographic variant on παίζω (for the plausibility of this interchange see Gignac 1975, 192). It is difficult to come to firm conclusions about the initial text, given that the external evidence is so finely balanced. Perhaps the best we can say is that the imperfect is mildly facilior. No-one would surely change an imperfect to an aorist and therefore lose the sense of continuousness, but a change in the other direction might be possible.

02, 03: linguistic improvement.
B

4:

χεῖρα
02, V, some minuscules: χεῖρας

---

3 I have never come across such a variant in the pandects and Gignac (1975, 123) also has no examples of a sigma becoming a zeta before a short vowel.
The external evidence supports the singular. The motive for the change to plural is presumably that David has two hands. Since the meaning is clearly the same in both versions, this is more an attempt at linguistic improvement than a content change.

02: linguistic improvement.

καταβάλειν

01, 04, a number of minuscules, Hebrew: κατέβαλεν

The infinitive must either be historic or still governed by the article in the previous line. Either way, it is clumsy. Given the even external evidence, lectio difficilior clearly rules for the infinitive.

01, 04: linguistic improvement.

5:

γάρ

04: omitted (both words adjacent to where the γάρ should be are completely legible and there is no space)

It is hard to account for this other than as a TE.

Α

δωνατόν

This word was initially omitted in 03, but its insertion was in scriptorium (Versace 2018, 116), so this is irrelevant to us.

ἀνυψῶσαι

03: ἀνυψώσει

It is possible that 03’s reading is merely an orthographic variation on the text. However, Gignac (1975, 260) suggests that -αι to -ει is a rare change. Therefore 03’s variant is probably a future indicative form (as I have accented it). An aorist subjunctive (with -ει as an orthographic alternative to -η) is also possible. An indicative arguably makes the sentence read better, since it prevents a string of infinitives increasingly distant from the main verb which governs them.

03: linguistic improvement.
6:

ἐδόξασαν
01, 02, 03, 04, all other Greek evidence: ἐδόξασεν
Sahidic and Hebrew: text

ηνεσαν
02, 03, 04: ηνεσεν
01: ηρεσεν (it is corrected, but CSP again has the correction post-scriptorium)
A number of minuscules, Sahidic, Ethiopic, Hebrew: text

These two variation units belong together. If the verbs are singular, they describe David praising God (and ἐν μυρίασιν would mean “among thousands”). If they are plural, they describe the Israelites praising David. In the Hebrew, there is an explicit subject צו, daughters.

Presumably this is why Rahlfs-Hanhart and Ziegler have the plural: it is more likely that the plural was changed to singular by TE very early in the Greek tradition than that the Grandson mistranslate it. However, this does not explain why the daughters appear nowhere in the Greek tradition, since θυγάτηρες could not so easily drop out by TE. It seems likely therefore that the Grandson altered the line so that it was about David’s praise of God. Thus the singular is initial and all the pandects preserve it, except 01, which here gives a nonsense TE (hence I leave it unaccented).

01: TE.

A

εὐλογίαις
02: ύλογίαις

The epsilon is omitted and later added at an uncertain date, so I note a TE, but rate it C, because it may have been corrected in scriptorium.

C

7:

ἐχθροὺς κυκλόθεν
01: ἐχθροὺς σου κυκλόθεν
The σου does not have enough external support to be initial, but the motive is clear – to make clear that David does not merely defeat his personal enemies, but does God’s work defeating God’s enemies. 01 similarly adds σου in v.10.
01: content change.

αὐτῶν

04: αὐτῷ

One explanation for this is that the originator of this reading took Φυλιστιμ as singular, but this is unlikely, since ὑπεναντίους is plural. Therefore it is probably a TE.

8:

ὕπιστῳ

01: ὑπίστου

This is incorrectly transcribed on CSP. The below image shows the image with the -ου ending, but the transcription with -ω.4

The genitive just about makes sense (“he gave thanks to the holy one of the most high”), but the dative is clearer. The genitive is therefore best classified as a linguistic non-improvement.

B

---

4 Screenshot taken 22 Feb 2019.
The accusative can be taken in apposition to ἐξομολόγησιν, such that the words are what the thanks consist of. This is clearer than the text reading, which presumably should be understood as an instrumental dative, but looks at first sight as if it is in apposition to ἁγίῳ ὑψίστῳ. 04’s reading is thus a linguistic improvement.

A

Iota and epsilon is not an interchange Gignac (1975) records. It is also difficult, if not impossible, to make sense of the abstract noun, ὑμνησις, in this context, so it is probably a TE.

A

LSJ records both forms of the word. However, they are not strictly orthographic variants, since mu and tau are totally different sounds. They are rather similar sounding alternative words for the same concept. The originator of the 01 variant must have thought one was preferable for linguistic reasons.

01: linguistic improvement.

A

The anarthrous form has the benefit of the external evidence and is also surely difficilior. The article is added to stress the definite nature of the altar. It is not clear why Rahlfs includes it, but Ziegler omits.

03: linguistic improvement.

A
10:

ἐν ἑορταῖς
01: ἑορταῖς
03: ἐν ὑρταῖς

In 01, the ἐν is clearly omitted through haplography with the previous word. The epsilon was omitted and added later in 03, but it is unclear whether this was in scriptorium or later. I therefore note it as grade C.

01: TE.
A
03: TE.
C

τὸ ἅγιον ὄνομα
04, various minuscules: τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἅγιον

The external evidence is against 04. There is little to choose between the two readings; presumably the scribe behind 04’s thought it was in some sense better written.

04: linguistic improvement.
B

αὐτοῦ
01: σου

The 01 text makes the hymn addressed to God, rather than merely about him. 01’s text made a similar change in v.7.

01: content change.
A
πρωίας
03: πρωϊ
03 gives the adverbial form. The genitive of the noun reads more clearly, so the adverb is *difficilior*, but has little external evidence. We can do little more than classify 03’s reading as a linguistic non-improvement.

A

11:

κύριος
03 seems to have changed the first letter of the *nomen sacrum* to chi, such that it stands for Χριστός. The date of this correction is unclear, but Ziegler cites it as late. Various Latin witnesses support it. It is obviously a Christian content change, not the Grandson’s reading. It is difficult to say however if the change was made to 03 in scriptorium. To reflect this doubt, I classify it as follows:
03: content change.

C

12:

[beginning of the verse]
04: adds καὶ
The καὶ is unlikely to be initial. It seems likely that the relevant scribe thought the sentence would read better with a connector. There may also be a certain poetic power from a long sequence of lines beginning with καὶ.
04: linguistic improvement.

A
v.12b

04: omits entirely
01: changes κατέλυεν to κατέπαυσεν

The verse as written, with κατέλυεν, he destroyed, makes little sense, since it is not clear who the son destroys. 01 and 04 represent different attempts to solve the problem, either by complete omission or changing the verb to one which has the more neutral meaning of “cause to stop, made to rest”. 01’s solution is also perhaps influenced by κατέπαυσεν in v.13.

01, 04: content change.

A

13:

I consider the various spellings of the name of Solomon to be orthographic variants, since it is clear what is intended and varying transliterations of foreign-language names naturally arise in a culture without standard spelling rules.

ὡ ὁ
01 only: ὡς

Various minuscules: ὡς ὁ

Although 01’s reading makes sense, it is no particular improvement on the verse as it stands and it is an easy TE, since in majuscules, sigma and omicron look similar.

A

14:

ἐνεπλήσθης
04: ἐσόφισθη, corrected to ἐσόφισθης

The correction is difficult to see, but Tischendorf is confident that it is there. Tischendorf gives no opinion on its date. The loss or gain of the sigma is presumably just TE. The change of verb could either be to make the metaphor clearer (so that it means something like “you were wise as a river of understanding”). However, in fact surely the metaphor is clearer in the text reading (“you were filled with understanding as a river”). The close presence of ἐσόφισθης in the previous line would easily lead to a TE.
A (even though the date of the correction is doubtful, there is no doubt about the change of ἐνεπλήσθης to ἐσοφίσθη).

15:

ἐνέπλησας
04: ἐνέπλησαν
These are aorists of ἐμπίπλημι, I fill. It is hard to see how the reading of 04, the third person plural, could make sense: it must be a TE.
A

17:

ἐν φδαίς
02, 04: καὶ ἐν φδαίς
The addition is a clear linguistic improvement, since it means that each dative substantive in the verse has a καὶ, which stresses further the extent and range of the ways in which Solomon amazed the nations.
A

ἐρμηνείαις
03: ἐρμηνεία
02: ἐρημιαῖς
03’s reading is best construed as the same as the text, but singular, referring to Solomon’s general practise of interpretation, rather than many specific interpretations. Presumably this was intended as a linguistic improvement. 02’s reading makes very little sense if taken as the dative plural of ἐρημία, desert, so it is more likely to be a nonsense TE for the text reading (and so I leave it without breathings or accents).
03: linguistic improvement.
02: TE.
A

ἀπεθαύμασαν
02: ἐπεθαύμασαν
02’s reading is a plausible linguistic improvement, since ἐπι- is more plausible than ἀπο- as a prefix expressing pure emphasis.

A

18:

In Ziegler’s apparatus, he notes that 04 omits the second θεοῦ. However the end of the line is illegible to me and Tischendorf. Possibly Ziegler is reasoning from the amount of space left, that there would be no room for the word, but it would take up little space (since it would obviously be written as a nomen sacrum). I therefore see no reason to think that it was not originally there.

19:

παρανέκλινας
01 and various minuscules: παρέκλινας
Many minuscules: παρενέκλινας
The issue is which prepositional prefix, παρα- or both παρα- and ἀνα-, should compound the verb κλίνω, I make to lie. (παρενέκλινας is presumably the result of confusion about where to place the augment). It is hard to see what difference in meaning there could be. The longer form has the best of the external evidence. The shorter form was presumably an attempt to simplify a long and complex word.
01: linguistic improvement.
A

20:

ἐν τῇ δόξῃ
01: τῇ δόξῃ
This is a plausible TE, possibly due to homoeoteleuton with μῶμον.
A
κατανυγήναι
01, 02, 03, 04: κατενύγην
Latin, some Greek evidence: text
The verb is κατανύσσω, meaning “stab, cut”, with the aorist passive κατενύγην. It is thus a choice between either aorist, passive, infinitive or aorist, passive, first person, singular, indicative. The verb is used in the NT and OG metaphorically, e.g. Gen 34:7; Acts 2:37. Ziegler and Rahlfs-Hanhart both opt for the infinitive, which fits much better in context, since it is not clear who the “I” would be in the indicative reading. However, the external evidence is very slender. Presumably they reason that it is more likely that an error be extremely widespread in the manuscripts than that the Grandson write something that makes such little sense. This is especially plausible given how easily it would be to make this change by TE, since the -αι of κατανυγήναι would very easily elide into the epsilon of ἐπι. This easy possibility of TE, combined with the improbability that the Grandson would write nonsense, arguably justifies overruling both the weight of external evidence and the hallowed principle of lectio difficilior. However, the issue remains doubtful and marginal.
All pandects: TE.
C

21:

ἀρξατ
01, V: ἀρξας
04: illegible
Some Latin evidence, Hebrew: omitted
01’s reading is presumably a participle. It is tempting to read it as a second person, singular, indicative, but it would be very unusual for the augment simply to disappear. Presumably the motive behind the change is to make the second half of the verse chronologically prior to the first: Solomon aggrieves Rehoboam into rebelling (v.21b), before the kingdom officially divides (v.21a). This expresses the meaning more clearly, so it is a linguistic improvement.
A

---

5 I follow Tischendorf, who is able to reconstruct KATE.
καταλίπῃ
02, many minuscules: ἐγκαταλίπῃ
04: illegible
01, 03, V, Syro-Hexapla, other minuscules: text
Rahlfs-Hanhart and Ziegler disagree: the latter prints 02’s reading. It is hard to choose between them. The external evidence is relatively even, but marginally favours the text reading. Their meanings are also similar. Arguably the additional preposition makes the word more elaborate and should therefore be rejected as a more expansionary way to make the same point.
02: linguistic improvement.
B

dιαφθείρῃ
01, 03, some minuscules: διαφόρη
d4: illegible
The choice is between an active and passive form. The active would mean something like “The Lord (implied from the previous colon) will not destroy [anything] from his works/words”. The passive could mean “[Nothing] will be destroyed from his works/words”, an impersonal negative passive. However, this is not particularly natural Greek and the Lord is the clearly implied subject in the next line. On the other hand, one could render the phrase “the Lord will not be destroyed from…” in the sense that he will not be turned back from anything he has planned, but this would be an unusual meaning for διαφθείρω. The parallelism with the surrounding verses clearly suggests the active form. Arguably a TE causing vowel change is more likely than the Grandson writing Greek with very bad sense.
01, 03: TE.
C

λόγων
All Greek and Greek-derived evidence: ἐργῶν
Hebrew: וַיְרַבְדוּ
Ziegler, Rahlfs-Hanhart and Smend all reconstruct λόγων, on the basis of the Hebrew, but it is unclear why that could not be rendered ἐργῶν, given that רבד can mean “thing” as well as
“word”. I submit that the Grandson could entirely reasonably have translated the Hebrew as ἔργων, which makes much better sense in context.

ἐκλεκτοῦ

04 only: ἐκλεκτόν

Tischendorf does not see it, but it is relatively clear. The image includes the AY- of the beginning of the next verse.

The plural seems to reflect the plurality of the nation of Israel and arguably emphasises the size and scope of God’s people.

04: content change.

A

σπέρμα

02: τὸ σπέρμα

The reading of 02 expresses the intended meaning more clearly by providing the definiteness that is implied, but not stated, by τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος αὐτῶν. This phrase presumably refers to Abraham, or possibly the patriarchs. 02’s reading clarifies that this figure has one defined seed, the continuing nation of Israel. It is possible that this is a Christian change to highlight Christ as the seed of Abraham. However, if this were the case, the change would probably be more widespread. It is more likely just a linguistic improvement, to make clear that the referent is the one nation of Israel, descended from Abraham.

02: linguistic improvement.

A

ĕδώκεν

01 only: δὲ ἔδωκεν
The relative pronoun makes the sentence more difficult to understand. Its origins are not easy to explain. It is hard to see how it could have arisen as a TE and adds little or nothing to the content or language of the verse. I can only classify it as a linguistic non-improvement.

23:

αὐτοῦ (1)
03: omitted
04: Tischendorf can read nothing, but there is an upsilon in the right place to be the first upsilon.

It makes little difference to the sentences whether or not we read αὐτοῦ, but it arguably adds clarity, so to omit it is a linguistic non-improvement.

ὁς
01, Hebrew: omitted
04: illegible

The external evidence supports the relative pronoun and it is difficilior. With it included, Ροβοαμ is the object of κατέλιπεν, a couple of lines earlier. Without it, Ροβοαμ is the subject of a new sentence. Since Ροβοαμ is anarthrous and indeclinable, it is impossible to tell which is right. However, the line is easier to read without it.

01: linguistic improvement.
λαὸν
02: τὸν λαὸν
04: illegible
As in v.22, 02 adds an article to make the definiteness more clear. Although it is obvious that the people of Israel are meant, the definite article removes any possibility of ambiguity.
02: linguistic improvement.


υἱὸς
02, 03, OL: υἱὸν
01, 04: text
Tischendorf does not see it, but there is a feint but definite omicron sigma in roughly the right place. The omicron sigma is on the left, with the vaguest traces of Ναβατ afterwards.

This makes the external evidence evenly balanced. The accusative is technically grammatically possible, since Ἰεροβοαμ can be taken as an object of κατέλιπεν earlier. This turns the sentence into a longer, more elaborate period. Either the nominative was changed to create a more complex, rhetorically impressive sentence or the accusative was changed to make a clearer one. Either way could be considered a linguistic improvement and it is difficult to tell which is right. Arguably the OL slightly tips the balance of external evidence in favour of the accusative, but the grading is low.
01, 04: linguistic improvement.
C

Either v.24a (καὶ Ἰεροβοαμ…) or v.24b (καὶ ἔδωκεν…) is completely omitted in 04 and this is unnoticed by Tischendorf. This is made clear by this series of images.

Figure 1 shows the left-hand-end of several lines. One can see the λαοῦ of the start of v. 23c and the Ροβ- of the start of v.23d. One can then see what could be either the καὶ Ἰε- of v.24a or the καὶ ἔ- of v.24b. In the line after that, one can just make out a καὶ.

This fourth line is clearly v.24c (καὶ ἐπληθύνθωσαν), as is proven by the fact that ἀντῶν σφόδρα can be clearly observed later in the line (figure 2).
Figure 3 shows that the line with αὐτῶν σφόδρα, captured in figure 2, is the fourth line of figure 1. It is clear in figure 1 that this fourth line runs in the interlinear space between the minuscule line with αὐτοῖς and the minuscule line with -ἀν. In figure 3, the scale is such that the reader can see both the αὐτῶν σφόδρα and the minuscule letters and so be clear that figure 2 is part of the fourth line of figure 1, thus proving that the scribe of the codex missed a line.

It is very likely that a line was dropped due to homoeoteleuton with καὶ.

04: TE.

A

τῆς γῆς
01 only: article omitted
This may be an attempt to save space on the line, which is somewhat crowded.

However there seems no reason why not to start the next line. It is more likely to be TE due to homoeoteleuton.

A

25:

ἔως
02 only: ὡς
Even allowing for the relatively small amount of text analysed, it is striking that there are relatively few variants in the pandects in Sirach and those that there are seem relatively easy to resolve. This might seem surprising, because Sirach has a reputation as a text-critically complex book. However, the complexity does not affect the pandects, because they are early witnesses to the form of the Greek text which predates the GII revision. How this earliest form of the Greek relates to the other forms of the text in other languages, and ultimately to the Hebrew, is a question for a different thesis. Let us now leave the calm of the wisdom literature for the chaos of Judges.
7: Analysis of Variants in Judges

In this chapter, I analyse variants in Judges. I will begin by discussing aspects of the textual history of Judges. As part of this, I will present arguments for the modern scholarly consensus that the so-called “proto-Lucianic” manuscripts, also called the AII-group, most often represent the initial text of the Greek translation. I will then discuss how this all affects my investigation and present my analysis as in previous chapters.

The Hebrew Text

Most scholars (e.g. Butler 2009, xli; Marcos 2011; Sasson 2014, 6-7) agree that the MT of Judges, as we have it in the Medieval codices, represents well the Hebrew consonantal text of the first century BCE. Therefore the Vorlage to the various forms of LXX Judges was a consonantal text similar to the MT. This is probable, not least because three of the four Judges fragments from the Judaean Desert, 1QJudg, 4QJudg\(^b\) and XJudg, agree closely with the MT (Marcos 2011, 6-7). The fourth fragment, 4QJudg\(^a\), has been thought to evidence an alternative Hebrew text-form, because it omits 6:7-10 (Barrera 1990; 2005; Rezetko 2013; Ulrich 2015, 67-70). However, there are alternative explanations for this omission. The omitted passage is between two petucha marks in the MT, suggesting that it may have been moved deliberately by the scribe of 4QJudg\(^a\) or even omitted accidentally by parablepsis (Hess 1997; Marcos 2003, 7; 2006, 39-40; Rofé 2011). It is beyond the scope of this chapter to argue this issue in detail, but it seems reasonable to assume that the Vorlage of the various forms of Greek Judges was a Hebrew consonantal text similar to the MT as we find it in the Medieval codices.

The Greek Text

The Greek text of Judges is more diverse than many other LXX books and the witnesses can readily be placed in different groups. This naturally gives rise to the suggestion that there may have been two or more independent early Greek translations of Judges (and so Rahlfs-Hanhart 2005 prints two texts of Greek Judges). However, Pretzl (1926) and Soisalon-Soininen (1951) have influentially argued that there are so many examples where most of the Greek tradition agrees against the MT, that they cannot be accounted for merely by manuscripts of one translation contaminating manuscripts of another. Instead, there must have been one original
translation, which is the ancestor of all our Greek manuscripts, but which was revised and corrected numerous times, including with reference to the Hebrew text. Pretzl (1926, 362-69) assembles a list of passages where there is widespread agreement within the Greek against the Hebrew. To take one simple example, 1:27 contains a list of cities not subdued by Manasseh. All our Greek manuscripts, apart from one minuscule, x, add an explanatory gloss to the first city, ἥ ἐστιν Σκοθῶν πόλις (with minor variations). It is much more likely that the translator added the gloss and the scribe of x omitted it than two or more different translators added it independently. Soisalon-Soininen (1951) goes further and compares the translation technique of the various Greek text-forms and concludes they are the same. For example, all tend to insert and omit words from the Hebrew in a similar pattern. For example, at 21:21, the Hebrew refers to the ἀλβίςΠιν. The Greek renders this οἱ θυγατέρες τῶν οἰκούντων Σηλῶν, with minor variations. In other words, the whole tradition agrees in inserting a verb of inhabiting, to clarify the Hebrew idiom (Soisalon-Soininen 1951, 31-33 for this example). The differences between the Greek text-forms should not be exaggerated. Even LaMontagne (2016, 51), who argues there were several independent Greek translations of Judges, calculates that in 75% of the text there is complete verbal agreement, which is surely highly unlikely to be coincidental. Soisalon-Soininen (1951, 59-60) notes that in view of the extremely large extent of agreement, the occasional disagreement can be easily explained as different editors emending the same text. As Cañas-Reillo (2018, 231) notes, scholars have focussed on the differences between various forms of Greek Judges, when in fact the commonalities both make up most of the work and are more important. Occasional disagreements pose no problem for those who posit one original translation, but the large scale agreement is difficult to explain on a model that assumes multiple independent translations. The vast majority of modern scholars have taken this approach (e.g., besides those already cited, Jellicoe 1968, 280-82; Lindars 1971, 1; Satterthwaite 2015, 103). Indeed, Cañas-Reillo (2018, 231, 243), the editor of the forthcoming Göttingen edition of Judges, has argued it is entirely reasonable for critical editions of Greek Judges to print only a single text of the book. This single Ur-Übersetzung is generally dated to the second century BCE (Satterthwaite 2015, 105-07). This is a relatively short time before our Judean Desert evidence for Hebrew Judges, which, as I have said, largely confirms the MT. Therefore it is likely that this Ur-Übersetzung had a Vorlage similar to the MT.
Implications for This Thesis

I therefore assume that there was one initial *Ur-Übersetzung*, OG, which was the ancestor of all our Greek witnesses and which translated a text similar to the MT. As with Sirach, I am investigating the pandects as tradents of OG, not as tradents of the Hebrew text via OG, because it is important that I compare all my sample passages in the same way, as tradents of a Greek source. Once again, as with Sirach, this emphatically does not mean that the Hebrew is irrelevant, because a major cause of variation within the Greek Judges tradition is some witnesses being corrected in line with the Hebrew.

This means that I do not need to concern myself with source-critical questions. Many Hebrew Bible scholars argue that Judges, as we have it today in the MT, is the result of a complex process of redaction from other documents. Whilst this may be true, the redaction process finished long-before OG was written and is therefore irrelevant to this project. For the reasons give above, I have assumed that the the *Vorlage* of OG was a text similar to the MT.

Part of the reason Judges is a suitable book for my purposes is that it is relatively stable in Hebrew but in Greek has a comparably complex textual tradition to the NT books (LaMontagne (2016, 52) and Webb (2012, 69) draw this parallel). An obvious difference is that the gap of time between the original composition of OG and our earliest witnesses is much larger than that between the composition of the NT books and our earliest manuscripts. This means that, even more than in NT textual criticism, raw numbers are more likely to mislead us: a reading supported by many manuscripts or old manuscripts is not necessarily the OG reading. Another difference between textual criticism of Greek Judges and textual criticism of the NT is that grouping witnesses into text-types and relating those types in a stemma is a more convincing method with Greek Judges, because the witnesses cluster into groups more clearly and definably and there is clear evidence for how those groups relate. Therefore, unlike in previous chapters of this thesis, I will analyse each variation unit with some prior assumptions about which witnesses are more likely to preserve OG, on the basis of the generally accepted

---

1 For a summary of the many approaches, see Rezetko 2013, 5-7.
2 For the point about numbers of manuscripts, see Barthélemy et al. 1976, ix-x.
3 Westcott and Hort (1882) influentially used this method with the NT, but it is generally acknowledged now that the method has its limitations when applied to the NT, because the NT witnesses do not group sufficiently clearly and consistently into text-types (see Epp 2014 for discussion of this question).
scholarly consensus about manuscript groups and their relations. I will now summarise this consensus and the arguments for it.

The witnesses are traditionally grouped into the following categories:

AI: principle witnesses 02, abckx
AII\(^5\): principle witnesses KZglnw
AIII: principle witnesses MNhy
B: principle witnesses 01, 03, ejfmqsz\(^6\)

From now on, I will use these sigla to refer to these groups of witnesses and the siglum, A, to refer to AI, AII and AIII together. Many scholars also use the letters, A and B, to refer to Codex Alexandrinus and Codex Vaticanus. To avoid confusion, I will, as throughout this dissertation, always refer to these manuscripts using the Gregory-Aland sigla, 02 and 03, even though these are rarely used by LXX scholars.

Once these groups are identified, we must now ask, which group is the oldest, or nearest to OG?

Cooper (1948) performed a lexical study to determine which groups typically used the older vocabulary. He concluded that the groups were all equidistant from OG (Cooper 1948, 65). However, more recent research along this line, notably Lee (1983) and Ross (2018, 205-06) argues that B is the most recent. Lee (1983, 131-48) demonstrates that, for example, ὀράω is rarely used in the present in Koine Greek; βλέπω is used instead. B consistently uses βλέπω.

Lee’s and Ross’s work are both much more likely to be accurate than Cooper’s, because they use much more extensive data for the history of Greek, including from documentary papyri.

Thus, on lexical grounds, B seems younger than A. I will now make the case that AII is the oldest of the A-groups. The key evidence is found in the Hexaplaric signs. I follow Gentry’s (2016) arguments that these signs did originate with Origen. Codex G retains a number of

---

\(^4\) I use the sigla from the Cambridge LXX (Brooke and McLean 1917) apart from when referring to manuscripts other than the pandects.

\(^5\) This group is sometimes called the “Lucianic” or “proto-Lucianic”. This term is misleading, since, while Lucian may have used and passed on this text, I will argue its origins were much earlier, since it was known to Origen.

\(^6\) These groupings are accepted by all scholars, including Cañas-Reillo, the leading contemporary specialist on Greek Judges, (2018, 231-32).
Hexaplaric signs, as of course does the Syro-Hexapla (henceforth Syr-Hex) (Billen 1942). A number of passages, not in the MT, have Hexaplaric rejection marks, but are found in AII witnesses. Almost certainly, this is because they were in the earliest of Origen’s Greek manuscripts, but rejected by him because they were not in his Hebrew manuscript(s).

For example, 19:23:

MT: נו וּעֵרָתּ־לַא
AI: μὴ πονηρεύσησθε δὴ
AII: μὴ πονηρεύσησθε δὴ καὶ μὴ ποιεῖτε τὴν ἀδικίαν ταύτην
OL: ne feceritis malitiam istam
B: μὴ κακοποιήσητε δὴ⁷

Syr-Hex: same reading as AII, butobelises καὶ μὴ ποιεῖτε τὴν ἀδικίαν ταύτην

Billen (1942) argues that Origen probably used a variety of manuscripts, which included one or more with μὴ πονηρεύσησθε δὴ and one or more with μὴ ποιεῖτε τὴν ἀδικίαν ταύτην. He preferred the former because it was closer to the Hebrew. Although he recorded both in the Hexapla, he marked the less Hebraic one as suspect, with an obelus. The conflate reading results from the fact that both were recorded in the Hexapla. The reading of AI is widespread because it is the one Origen eventually preferred, which would have been in the fifth column. B’s reading is a later improvement on AI. The earliest reading is likely μὴ ποιεῖτε τὴν ἀδικίαν ταύτην alone, which was obelised by Origen. It is found in the OL and is accessible in Greek only through AII, which combines it with the AI reading. Billen (1942) argues for this reason that in general the readings most likely to reflect OG are those obelised and those with the support of AII and the OL. This combination of evidence allows us to peer over Origen’s shoulder and see what readings he rejected. Aitken (2015a, 6) argues this is a key aspect of LXX textual criticism in general: Origen’s colossal labours to produce what he thought was a good text and remove other readings make him the father, perhaps the origin, of LXX textual criticism, but also one of its greatest obstacles!

Many modern scholars uphold reasoning similar to this, concluding that the initial text is often to be found in AII, especially when it agrees with the OL (Pretzl 1926, 239-44; Lindars 1987, 172-73; O’Connell 1996, 172-73; Marcos 2011, 8; Barrera 2014; Sattherthwaite 2015, 104; Cañas-Reillo 2018). Pretzl (1926, 363-63) helpfully also uses the same argument to negate the

---

⁷ This list is based on Bodine 1980, 3-4.
alternative: the B-text leaves no trace in Origen’s work, so it was likely produced after him and therefore is remote from OG. Moreover, AII is generally the preferred Greek text of Josephus (Harlé 1995) and Philo (Satterthaite 2015, 115). This all points to the seniority of AII compared to other text forms. Bodine (1980, 134) has made an influential study of the influence of kaige approaches to translation in Judges. He argues that AII shows least evidence of kaige influence and is therefore likely to be one of the earlier forms of the text. The only slightly dissenting voice is Soisal-Soininen (1951, 86, 90-94, 68-69), who accepts the reasoning that AII contains an old, pre-Origenic text, but argues that AIII is older and closest to the initial text, because its translation technique is so typical of Greek Judges. However, this argument makes assumptions about which kinds of translation technique are typical of the oldest form of Greek Judges. While Soisal-Soininen doubtless has many good arguments for these assumptions, it is surely an argument against them that the Hexaplaric signs highlight AII, not AIII, as the text known to, but rejected by, Origen.

Therefore, I shall proceed on the assumption that ceteris paribus AII is our most reliable guide to the initial text of OG. As noted above, this availability of prior evidence about the proximity of AII to the initial text is an important methodological difference compared with previous chapters. Fundamentally, however, I still investigate the textual characteristics of the pandects in relation to the initial text, which will often, though not always, be the AII text.

Prior Studies on Judges in the Pandects

As explained above, the majority of scholars suggest that 02 carries a text older than 03. Moore (1895, xlvi) notes that in Judges, 03 has affinities both to Cyril of Alexandria’s citations and to the Sahidic version, suggesting that it may be linked to fourth-century Egypt. Bodine’s (1980) thorough investigation of B shows that it has many of the characteristic features of the kaige recension. As well as bolstering the argument above, that B should be dated later than A, Bodine’s work is relevant to my project in other ways because he sheds light on the textual characteristics of B and therefore of 03. He has established that a chief textual characteristic is closeness to the Hebrew. Ross (2018, 205-07) argues similarly to Bodine, that the B-text is later than any of the others, but uses lexical evidence, rather than translation technique. This provides helpful detail on the history and characteristics of the text in 03, which my findings can complement and “fill out”.
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The newly found leaves of Judges in 01 await a thorough and systematic study and this is a major reason for including a chapter on Judges in this dissertation. There is only one article, Karrer 2012b, dedicated to them. Karrer demonstrates that the scriptorium text is clearly B but the first post-scriptorium corrector corrects back towards A. Marcos (2011, 7) briefly notes that 01 is a “faithful member” of the B-group. If B does date as late as the fourth century, there can be little time-interval between the production of the text and the production of 01 and 03. This arguably increases the likelihood that 01 and 03 were produced in the same locale, possibly even the same scriptorium.

There is thus room for this project in Judges, as in the other books.

The Details of My Method Applied to Judges

One of the ultimate aims of this project is comparison of textual characteristics across the canon. To facilitate comparison, I have varied the method as little as possible from that used in investigating other books. My rejection of the singular-readings method is particularly helpful in Judges, because many variants in the pandects are shared with their larger families. There is no Göttingen edition yet produced for Judges and the Rahlfs-Hanhart edition does not have a sufficiently detailed apparatus, so I use the apparatus in the Cambridge LXX (Brooke and McLean 1917). I consider every variation unit in the Cambridge LXX and every time one of the pandects varies from another or from the Cambridge LXX, excluding orthographic variants. I do not discuss the many variation units in the Cambridge LXX where only one or two late minuscules or versions vary from the initial text in a way that clearly has no relevance for the pandects. I use the B-text in Rahlfs-Hanhart as the text for my lemmata, much as I have used NA²⁸ in the NT chapters. This is a near-diplomatic of 03, so I of course do not assume it is the initial text, but, as in the NT chapters, it is presentationally helpful to have a base text from which to cite lemmata. I do not reproduce the apparatus of the Cambridge LXX in full, but cite everything relevant for each variation unit. I consistently cite the major groups, AI, AII, AIII and B when they agree as a group. When one of the A-groups is not cited, it is because its members are not tightly clustered enough to be of significant evidential value. When, and only when, a witness has no other Greek continuous manuscript support listed in the Cambridge LXX, I cite that reading including the word “only”. When relevant, I cite the versions. Where the Cambridge LXX cites the Latin of the OL, I give the Latin; otherwise, I assume that it has correctly assigned versitional evidence to a Greek reading. Because I am using a text very close
to 03, as my base text for lemmata, the apparatus is negative: if no note is given for 01, 03 or the B-group, the reader can assume that the witnesses not listed support the text. 04 is not extant in Judges. When relevant, I cite the MT according to BHS. I do not cite the Hebrew at every variation unit, because sometimes a variation unit has arisen entirely due to changes introduced within the Greek tradition and its descendants so the Hebrew is not relevant.

I have chosen to analyse 6:1-32. This choice was dictated largely by what is preserved in 01 and also by a desire to avoid the song of Deborah in chapter 5, which is extremely textually complex, partly because it is poetry and partly because it was used as a liturgical canticle (Cañas-Reillo 2018, 232). I only offer comments on the more complex variation units.

I include three additional categories to those used for the NT books. The first is self-explanatory: correction to the Hebrew. The second is “doubling”. I use it in situation like in the example above, from 19:23, when a witness includes two variants, presumably to prevent either being lost. The third is called “lexical variation”. This refers to the situation, frequent in Judges, when A and B translate the same Hebrew word with different Greek words, which appear to be synonyms or near synonyms. Generally, it is clear that B is later, but it is often difficult to tell what motivated B. The problem is that LXX lexicography is a field where we are only beginning to realise how little we know. Scholars debate whether the meaning of LXX vocabulary should be determined by the source language (broadly the approach of Lust, Eynikel and Hauspie’s lexicon (LEH)) or the target language (broadly the approach of Muraokoa in GELS). Ross (2018) takes three of these pairings of Greens words or roots and investigates their use in Koine Greek, including documentary papyri and inscriptions and so sheds light on why B introduced changes. However, to investigate three such pairs was Ross’ entire doctoral thesis. When faced with variants like this, therefore, I am frequently forced to classify them as “lexical variation”. By this I mean that one group of witnesses has replaced the OG lexeme with another, for reasons which are unclear without substantial further investigation of the use of each lexeme in Koine Greek. The reader can assume that I have looked up both lexemes in LEH and GELS and found nothing relevant to distinguish them. It will become clear to the reader that advances in LXX lexicography are a major need for the textual criticism of Greek Judges.

---

8 See Ross 2018 for details of the debate and Ross’ own method and results.
Verse-by-Verse Analysis of 6:1-32

1:

ἐνώπιον
02, some later AI and AIII MSS: ἐναντίον
Some AII minuscules: ἐναντίον
MT: ךניר
The external evidence is balanced and the versions are of little help, because the differences in meaning are so subtle. Lee (2018, 42-44, 174-75) argues that in the Pentateuch (and there seems no reason in this case why Judges should be different) translators decide which of these words to use based largely on personal taste. As discussed above, AII can generally be said to preserve an earlier text form. Moreover, Lee (2018, 43-44) argues that some Pentateuch translators sometimes preferred ἐναντίον to ἐναντίον prior to κυρίου, for the sake of euphony, so AII’s reading is difficilior. It seems likely therefore that 02’s reading is a linguistic improvement and B’s a lexical variation.

B

ἔδωκεν
02, AI, AII, OL, Syr-Hex: παρέδωκεν
MT: פַּרְדָּוָכֵן
παρέδωκεν clearly has the majority of the early, important evidence with it. It also fits the context better since the thought is very much “handing over”, rather than mere “giving” (see GELS for this distinction in meaning). Presumably the motivation behind B is to move closer to the Hebrew, which means simply “give”.

01, 03: conforming to Hebrew.

A

ἔπτα ἔτη
02, AII, OL: ἔτη ἔπτα
MT: בַּעֲשָׁנִים
The weight of the early, external evidence is with ἔτη first. Similar variation occurs at Gal 1:18, but the pattern of witnesses is different and the histories of the two textual traditions are very
different, so there is unlikely to be a connection. It is more probable that B is conforming to the Hebrew.

01, 03: conforming to Hebrew.

A

2:

ίσχυεν

02, minuscules from across the A-groups: κατίσχυεν

OL: praevaluit

MT: וַיַּשְׁחִית

The balance of the external evidence is with the longer version. As often, B conforms to the Hebrew, which obviously does not have compound verbs.

01, 03: conforming to Hebrew.

A

Ἰσραήλ (1)

B minuscules: τὸν Ἰσραήλ

AII, Syr-Hex (obelised): Ἰσραήλ σφόδρα

MT: χρήσατος

The strong external attestation suggests that σφόδρα is the reading of OG rejected by Origen. Its omission can either be explained as a TE or as conformation to the Hebrew. The latter is perhaps more likely, as it is a large word to drop out by error. It is noteworthy that here 01 and 03 depart from the rest of B in omitting σφόδρα, but not adding the article. They are together a “middle-term” between the initial text and B.

All pandects: conforming to Hebrew.

B

tάς τρυμαλίας τάς

02: ανδράς

AII and some AIII MSS: μάνδρας

x, Syr-Hex: τάς μάνδρας τάς (second τάς asterised in Syr-Hex)

Minuscles from across the groups: τάς μάνδρας

B minuscules: τάς τρυμαλίας
There are two problems here: the noun and the articles. Regarding the noun, the Hebrew word is a hapaxlegomenon, which clearly challenged the Greek translators (Sasson). μάνδρα means “enclosed space, square” and τρυμαλίῳ means “hole” (LSJ). 02’s reading is clearly a TE for μάνδρας (hence I leave it unaccented) (Soisalon-Soininen 1951, 18-19). μάνδρας is clearly favoured by the external evidence. B was presumably attempting to improve the translation. Regarding the articles, the external evidence favours no articles. The first article added by 01 and 03 corresponds to a Hebrew article and the second one is a common way to render the Hebrew רוש .

02: TE.
01, 03: conforming to Hebrew (twice).

The external evidence favours the dative, which is more natural after τοῖς ὄρεσιν. The direct object marker would plausibly prompt B to change to the accusative. It is less clear whether or not the preposition is initial, but given that the general trend seems to be to move towards the Hebrew, this is likely. Therefore all the pandects are moving towards the Hebrew, albeit 01 and 03 more so.

For the dative and the article, see previous variation unit. For the word choice, the external evidence is with ὀχυρώμασιν. It is unclear why B made the change, since ὀχυρώμα, fortress, is a perfectly reasonable translation of the Hebrew. The normal meaning of κρεμαστός is “hung, suspended”, which is hard to understand here. GELS notes this as the only place where the word appears to mean something like “fortress”. There are no transcriptional or linguistic
explanations. I therefore tentatively posit a content change, in that, for some reason, the person who made the change must have wanted to express something different by writing κρεμαστά.

C

3:

ἐὰν
02, AII: ὅταν
AI, AIII: ὅτε
OL: quando
Hebrew: הָיָה

The external evidence is squarely with a word meaning “when” and, with the support of AII, ὅταν is most likely to be initial. ἐὰν seems an attempt to reproduce the Hebrew.
01, 03: conforming to Hebrew.

A

ἔσπειραν
01: ἔσπειρον

02, much evidence from A, Syr-Hex, various versional witnesses: ἔσπειρεν
OL: seminabat

Most of the variation here is accounted for by the next variation unit, where there is doubt over whether to read a singular or plural. However, we must also note that 01 and the Latin evidence make the verb imperfect. The most natural explanation for this is because the imperfect better expresses a habitual action. However, it is interesting that 01 here departs from the rest of B. This makes it more likely that it was a TE, since no-one else in the group seems to have followed it.
01: TE.

B

οἱ uioi Ἱσραήλ (1)

02, much evidence from A, Syr-Hex, various versional witnesses: ἄνηρ Ἱσραήλ (ἄνηρ obelised in Syr-Hex)
OL: Israel
MT: יִשְׂרָאֵל
The Greek translators evidently thought a noun was needed (Butler). The external evidence is largely with ἄνήρ. The change to οἱ οἱοί was probably a linguistic improvement: the Greek expression is easier to understand and more natural.

καὶ (2)

B minuscules: omitted

All the pandects agree here in preserving what is probably the initial text, but it is interesting that 03 and 01 depart from B.

ἄνέβαιναν

All important evidence apart from 01 and 03: ἄνέβαινεν

The external evidence is clearly with ἄνέβαινεν. ἄνέβαιναν is probably an alternative way to form the imperfect, third-person plural (Harlé). If this is true, 01 and 03 may have changed to the plural because there are two named subjects, but it is more likely to be a simple TE.

B

οἱ οἱοί (2)

01 only: οἱοί

This is probably a TE, but on the other hand 01 also omits the article with οἱοί in v.6. This however proves little more than the fact that 01 committed this sort of error habitually.

A

συνανέβαινον

AII, some AI and AIII witnesses, Syr-Hex: καὶ ἄνεβαινον

MT: לָﬠְו וּ The external evidence leans towards καὶ ἄνεβαινον. Unusually, B appears farther from the Hebrew. Harlé suggests συνανέβαινον makes οἱ οἱοί ἄνατολῶν refer to a third party in the coalition, whereas καὶ ἄνεβαινον makes οἱ οἱοί ἄνατολῶν refer in apposition to a two-party coalition of the Midianites and Amalekites. He adds that at 7:12 and 8:10 (A-text only), it refers to the Midianites and Amalekites, so it is arguably likely to have that meaning here. This makes it even harder to see why B made the change. Presumably, it wanted to emphasise the unity of the coalition.

01, 03: content change.
B

αὐτοῖς
02, minuscules from across the groups, OL, Syr-Hex: ἐπὶ αὐτὸν
Three minuscules from diverse groups: ἐπὶ αὐτὸν
MT: ἔπη
External evidence favours ἐπὶ αὐτὸν, which is also difficilior. It is unclear why B should omit
the preposition, since the Hebrew has an equivalent and the bare dative is an unusual way to
express hostile assembly. The best explanation is probably that the preposition was omitted by
TE and then the pronoun changed to dative, so that it would make sense without a preposition.
The difference in number probably reflects the earlier difference between νιός and ἄνηπ.
01, 03: TE, followed by linguistic improvement.
B

4:

παρενέβαλον
01, 02, minuscules from across the groups, Syr-Hex: παρενέβαλλον
OL: committebant
The external evidence favours the imperfect. The most probable explanation for 03’s aorist is
TE (which could and quite probably did affect witnesses randomly across the groups).
A

eἰς αὐτοῦς
02, minuscules from across the groups: ἐπὶ αὐτοῦς
OL: cum eis
The external evidence marginally favours ἐπί. It is hard to see a better explanation than a TE,
especially since EΠ and EIC look similar in majuscules.
A

κατέφθειραν
Some B minuscules: κατέφθειρον
02, Al: διέφθειραν
AII, AIII: διέφθειρον
There is a double problem: the prefix and the ending. The external evidence favours the δια-
prefix, but we can only account for κατα- by lexical variation. Regarding the ending, this
appears to be an imperfect third plural in -αν. The best external evidence, AII, has the easier
reading, making interpreting the external evidence difficult. The irregular, alpha-ending
imperfect is difficilior, so is arguably more likely. This would mean that the reading of AII and
AIII is a linguistic improvement.
01, 03: lexical variation.
B

τούς καρποὺς αὐτῶν
02, A, Syr-Hex: τὰ ἐκφόρια τῆς γῆς
MT: מַזָּרִי לָו
On γῆς, B is clearly not initial, although here it is unusually against the Hebrew. Since there is
clearly no attempt to express different content, I consider it a linguistic improvement. On the
word for fruit or produce, GELS notes that ἐκφόριον always refers more broadly to agricultural
produce, but καρπός can have the specific meaning of fruit. On the other hand, LEH notes that
καρπός frequently has a figurative sense (e.g. in Hos 10:12), so it is unlikely that B used καρπός
to focus the referent on fruit. We can only say it is lexical variation.
01, 03: linguistic improvement, lexical variation.
A

ἔλθεῖν
02, some members of most A-groups: τὸ ἔλθεῖν
The external evidence is even, but the reading without the added article is difficilior. The
addition is a linguistic improvement.
A

οὐ κατέλιπον
02, some members of most A-groups: οὐχ ὑπελείποντο
The change of voice is simply a result of the change of prefix, since ὑπελείπον is regularly
middle (LSJ). The salient issues are the tense and prefix. The external evidence is even and all
variants make sense. The aorist tense is difficilior here, so arguably it is more likely to be initial,
which makes the κατα- prefix more likely. 02’s imperfect tense is thus a linguistic improvement
and its prefix a lexical variation.
ἐν τῇ γῇ Ἰσραήλ.
02, some members of most groups, Syr-Hex: ἐν Ἰσραήλ.
MT: יִשְׂרָאֶל
The external evidence is evenly balanced. Contrary to its normal practice, B goes against the Hebrew. The longer reading is *facilior* and as such less likely to be initial, because it is “a literary expansion inserting a common phrase” (Butler), i.e. a linguistic improvement.

A

οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς ποιμνίοις ταῦρον
02, AI, AIII: καὶ ποίμνιον καὶ μόσχον
AII: οὔτε ποίμνιον καὶ μόσχον
OL: oveμ nec vitulum
MT: רֶשׁ בֵּי
The external evidence is clearly against B. Butler explains B’s addition of ἐν by positing a Hebrew *Vorlage* for B with πψ, rather than πψ. However, this is unnecessary. The use of ἐν balances rhetorically with the previous ἐν τῇ γῇ (Harlé). This is in effect a harmonisation to context. On the animal types, Marcos suggests that AII follows the Hebrew more closely than B. However, he does not explain this and it is hard to see why Hebrew רושׁ, bull, would be better translated by Greek μόσχος, calf, than ταῦρος, bull. It is likely that B is in fact conforming to the Hebrew.
01, 03: conforming to Hebrew, harmonisation.

A

δόνον
AII only: ύποξύγιον
This is a helpful example of how lexical research can clarify the variation units I classify as “lexical variation”. Lee (1983, 140-48) notes that of these two words for donkey, ύποξύγιον was the more popular only from the third century BCE to the first century CE. It is thus very likely that ύποξύγιον was the initial text and δόνον a linguistic improvement following language change.
All pandects: linguistic improvement.

A
καὶ

02 only: omitted

κτήσεις

02, some members of the A groups: τὰ κτήνη

κτήσεις refers to a possession or creation; κτήνος refers more specifically to an animal (GELS).

Thus κτήσεις is significantly difficilior. It also has substantial external evidence. κτήνη is probably conforming to the Hebrew, a change made easier because the words sound similar.

Once again, here B is not the Hebrew conforming group.

σκηναὶ

02, AI, ΑΙΙΙ: τὰς σκηνὰς αὐτῶν παρέφερον καὶ παρεγίνοντο

ΑΙΙ, Syr-Hex: τὰς σκηνὰς αὐτῶν παρέφερον καὶ τὰς καμήλους αὐτῶν ἠγον (παρέφερον...ἠγον obelised in Syr-Hex)

OL: ad tabernacula sua adferebant

There are at least two questions: what is the verb with the tents and is the passage about camels initial? The case of σκηναί is a secondary question, easily resolved once we have established the verb.

The Hebrew has only one verb with “tent” (although there is Qere/Ketib variation), so there was likely only one in OG. The Greek probably developed multiple verbs because of multiple attempts to translate the Hebrew, which became combined and doubled up. παρεγίνοντο reads the Hebrew as Qal, וְאָבוּ “and they came”, whereas παρέφερον reads it as Hiphil, וּאָבי, “they brought”. The difference in Hebrew is minimal (Butler, Harlé, Marcos; Groß 2009, 90 n. 3).

Given the general principles outlined above, where there is a doubling with one reading supported by the OL and the other by B, the OL is more likely to be initial. B presumably read the Hebrew as Qal and conformed to that. A is doubling.
Regarding the camels, Harlé argues that they appear in 4QJudg* and “sans doute [en] l’hébreu originel”. Marcos argues that their presence in 4QJudg* is open to debate. The fact that they are in AII certainly suggests they are early in the Greek tradition. The fact that they are obelised in Syr-Hex suggests that they were known to, and rejected by, Origen, presumably because they were not in his Hebrew text (which, as I have noted, was probably close to the MT). The question then becomes whether they were inserted by the OG translator or someone between her and Origen. The fact that they do not appear in the OL is slight evidence for their being added subsequently to OG being produced. However, because it is quite possible that they were in OG, I note the pandects as having omitted them in order to follow the Hebrew and rate it as C, to reflect the uncertainty.

01, 03: conforming to Hebrew.
02: doubling.
A
All pandects: conforming to Hebrew.
C

καθὼς
02, some members of A: ὡς
It is likely the A-groups carry the initial text, by the principles generally used in this chapter.
01, 03: TE.
A

tοῖς καμήλοις
02, minuscules from most groups: ταῖς καμήλοις
It is difficult to adjudicate. Both genders are attested in LSJ and the gender could also reasonably change depending on the natural gender of the camel in question. Once again, the external evidence is also unclear because the manuscripts do not conform to their groups and could easily make such a small change independently. One can do little else than follow the majority of the early evidence, in this case the pandects, which suggests that 02 has made the change, presumably as a linguistic improvement.
C

Ἦρχοντο εἰς τὴν γῆν
02, AI: παρεγίνοντο ἐν τῇ γῇ
AII: παρεγένοντο ἐν τῇ γῇ
AIII: split between the two readings supported by the other A-groups

The external evidence is against the B reading, which is also facilior. It expresses the idea more clearly, so can be counted as a linguistic improvement. The difference between the 02 and AIII readings is between the imperfect and the aorist. The aorist is surely difficilior and the imperfect a linguistic improvement to express the on-going action.

02: linguistic improvement.
01, 03: two linguistic improvements (change of tense and word).

A

eἰς τὴν γῆν Ἰσραὴλ

Some AII witnesses: eἰς τὴν γῆν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ

MT: יָרַךְ א

Although AII frequently preserves readings which were eliminated from other witnesses to conform to the Hebrew, the Hebrew has here no word for Israel at all, so that cannot have been the motive for eliminating τοῦ (since then they would cut Ἰσραὴλ as well). There is thus no particular reason to suggest that AII has the initial text here. Probably the pandects preserve the initial text.

καὶ διέφθειρον

02: τοῦ διαφθείρειν

AII: split between the two readings supported by the A manuscripts

The choice is between an articular infinitive and a main verb. Unusually, A is closer to the Hebrew, since that has the preposition ל attached to the verb. The A-reading is also surely stylistically better. The majority of groups with known-to-be-early text forms suggests that the infinitive is more likely to be initial. Presumably B made the change to emphasise the fact that the Midianites actually did destroy Israelite property (Butler).

On the tense of the infinitive, 02’s present has weak external attestation. It is most likely a linguistic improvement, because the destruction was on-going.

01, 03: content change.
02: linguistic improvement.
6-7:

ἐβόησαν
02, A: ἐκέκραξαν
οἱ νεῖσι (1)
01: νεῖσι
ἀπὸ προσώπου Μαδιάμ
Most of the A witnesses, with minor variations, OL: καὶ ἐγένετο ἐπεὶ ἐκέκραξαν οἱ νεῖσι Ἰσραὴλ
πρὸς κύριον διὰ Μαδιάμ
02: the A-reading, but περὶ for διὰ.
It is easiest to take all these variation units together. First we may simply note 01’s TE omitting
the article with νεῖσι (see v.3).

The differences on the first verb of shouting are echoed at 10:10, 12 (Harlé). The TLG (n.d.)
suggests that βοάω is more Classical than κράζω, so B may be Atticising (but establishing this
firmly would require fuller lexicographic research).

The biggest variant is the long omission by B. The most plausible explanation is TE by
homoeoteleuton, either in Hebrew (with יְהָוהֵלֶא, affecting the Vorlage of B) or Greek (with
πρὸς κύριον, early in the descent of B, so the whole group was affected) (Marcos).

Finally, there is the preposition with Μαδιάμ. In B, the preposition was probably altered to ἀπὸ
to make better sense in the light of the omission (possibly influenced by v.6 (Schreiner 1957,
47)). Thus it is a linguistic improvement. διὰ was probably the initial preposition, because it
has strong external evidence and presumably περὶ was thought to be in some way a more apt
way to express the sense. Since the change is hardly one of content, I classify it as linguistic.
01: TE.
A
01, 03: linguistic improvement.
C
01, 03: TE.
A
02: linguistic improvement.
B
8:

δς ἀνήγαγον
01, n: ὁ ἀναγαγὼν
OL: qui adduxi
02, A: ὁ ἀναβιβάσας
MT: ἧνεκαν

The A-groups all agree on the participle, so this is probably initial. Although OL has a relative clause, this is likely because Latin has no active past participle. B has a relative clause, probably because that was thought closer to the Hebrew, which has a main verb, rather than a participle, even though it does not have the relative pronoun. Interestingly 01 is closer to A than to B. Regarding the lexemes, both are used of the Exodus\(^9\) so there is little to choose between them: we have to classify as lexical variation.

01, 03: lexical variation.
03: conforming to Hebrew.

C

ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου
02, various AII and AIII witnesses: ἐξ Αἰγύπτου
MT: יתיelage

External evidence is evenly balanced and unusually, A seems closer to the Hebrew than B, because it does not have a word for “land”. Possibly B is harmonising to Exod 20:2 and Deut 5:6, which both include ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου and are the opening of the Decalogue, an important and probably influential passage.

01, 03: harmonisation.

B

καὶ ἐξήγαγον ὑμᾶς…Αἰγύπτου
01, 02: omitted

This is a large TE by homoeoteleuton with Αἰγύπτου (Harlé). It is interesting that both 01 and 02 do the same omission, crossing group boundaries. However, given both how rigidly the manuscripts follow their groups generally in Judges and the objective arguments for the

---

\(^9\) Gen 50:24 for ἀνάγω, Exod 3:17 for ἀναβιβάζω (GELS).
classifications given in the introduction, co-incidental common error is more likely. This is a helpful example of how scribal errors are not always singular.

01, 02: TE.

A

υμῶν

Most of A, except 02: omitted

Once again in this verse, the group boundaries are challenged and 02 is with B in adding the word. The addition is very much difficilior, because in many other LXX occurrences of the common phrase ἐξ οἴκου δουλείας, there is no υμῶν (e.g. Exod 20:2; Deut 5:6; 6:12; 7:8). Thus, I submit that the pandects preserve the initial text.

9:

ἔρρυσάμην

01, 02: in the long omission

AII: ἔξειλόμην

AIII: ἔξειλάμην

OL: abstuli

The early witnesses agree against B. There is little to choose between the two lexemes, so one must classify as lexical variation.

A

Αἰγύπτου

AII only: Αἰγυπτίων

MT: מִשְׂרָאֵל

The use of the plural of the inhabitants, rather than the country is more usual Greek idiom. We thus seem to have the standard pattern of AII preserving a Greek reading, before it was conformed to the Hebrew.

All pandects: conforming to Hebrew.

A
10:

ἐγὼ κύριος
Some witnesses from various A-groups, OL: ἐγὼ εἰμὶ κύριος
MT: יהוה ינא
In the kaige tradition, the addition of εἰμὶ can be a way to distinguish ינא from יכונא (Bodine 1980, 15-16). However there is no יכונא in the Hebrew. It is likely that OG included the verb, because natural Greek requires one and that the later editors removed it because there was no יכונא and therefore, by later translation conventions, it more accurately reflected the Hebrew to exclude it.
All pandects: conforming to Hebrew.
A

καθήσεσθε
Most of the A-witnesses: κατοικεῖτε
02, M, N, y: ἐνοικεῖτε
OL: inhabitatis
MT: ישבים
The external evidence is with a compound of οἰκέω in the present tense. B’s verb arguably better reflects the Hebrew שָׁבַי, which can, like the Greek verb, mean “sit” as well as “dwell”. Regarding the tense, Harlé suggests that the present of A reflects the Hebrew present participle and the future indicative of B reflects the imperfective of the previous Hebrew verb. Arguably the idea expressed by the future tense here is that God is reporting again to Israel words he originally spoke at the time of entry to the land, when dwelling in it was still future. B therefore expresses more clearly the fact that they do not live in the land at the time of the original words. Regarding the prefix, the many instances of ἐν in the context make κατὰ difficilior and attested across the various A-groups, so it is likely initial.
02: harmonisation.
01, 03: linguistic improvement and conforming to Hebrew.
A
11:

ὑπὸ
02: ἐπὶ
The external evidence is clearly against 02. The best explanation is that the relevant scribe thought the angel would appear more exalted sitting on the tree, rather than beneath it.
02: content change.
A

tερέμνηθον
02, most of the A-witnesses, OL, Syr-Hex: δρῦν
The external evidence is with δρῦν. We must assume lexical variation.
A

tὴν ἐν ᾠραθα
02, most of the A-witnesses, OL, Syr-Hex: τὴν οὐσιαν ἐν ᾠραθα
MT: הָרְפָﬠְבּ רֶשֲׁא
Neither version particularly follows the Hebrew, which is a relative clause. The earlier text-forms have the longer reading. The shorter is arguably most likely the result simply of a transcriptional omission which was never corrected, because it reads well in Greek and translates the Hebrew accurately.
B

tὴν Ἰωας
01: ἐν τῇ οιας
02, AI, AIII, OL, Syr-Hex, several B minuscules: τὴν τοῦ Ἰωας
AII: split between ἦ τὴν τοῦ Ἰωας and ἦ ἦν Ἰωας
03: ἐν τῇ Ἰωας
MT: שָׁאוֹיְל רֶשֲׁא (Rahlfs-Hanhart print τὴν Ἰωας as the B text, but note that it is not the reading of 03 itself. The only witness noted in the Cambridge LXX apparatus is 128 and that is cited only on the authority of Holmes and Parsons.)
This variation unit has a number of peculiarities. 01 and 03 agree here against all the rest of the tradition. Moreover, AII is the closest to the Hebrew.

The phrase is difficult to understand without some indication that Ιωας is genitive, so those readings without such an indication are difficilior. Even if a genitive article were added, the reading of 01 and 03 is bizarre without a dative noun, agreeing with τῇ. It would mean “in the [territory? land?] of Joash”. It is also unclear how that could be easily derived transcriptionally from any of the others. I therefore very tentatively posit it as the initial text. 01 is thus a TE (the missing iota) and 02 (and AII) a linguistic improvement.

C

πατρός τοῦ Εσδρεί
02, AII: πατρός Αβιεζρεί
MT: רָבִּי יִשֵׁר
02 and AII repeat the concept of “father”, by both translating and transliterating the Hebrew root זר. They may be influenced by 4QJudg, which has ἁβεζρε, i.e. it places the article before the word for “father” and so incorporates it into Ezra’s name. Both forms are found elsewhere in Judges: at 6:34 A and B agree on Αβιεζρ (with no Greek word for Father) and at 8:32, they agree on τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Αβιεζρ (Butler). Knowing that AII regularly preserves doublets and the one not found in B is generally initial, it seems likely that OG had Αβιεζρεί, without a Greek word for Father. B is then a linguistic improvement.

02: doubling.
01, 03: linguistic improvement.

A

υἱὸς αὐτοῦ
02, AI, AIII: υἱὸς αὐτοῦ
MT: יִשׁ
01, 03: conforming to Hebrew.

A

ῥαβδίζων σῖτον
02, AIII, some representatives of AI and AII, OL, Syr-Hex: ἐρράβδιζεν πυροῦς
MT: והרט המש
There are two different questions here: the mood of the verb and the choice of noun. Regarding the first, the A-reading is likely initial on external grounds and the B-reading conforming to the Hebrew, which has a participle. On the noun, πυρός has the best external evidence. The TLG (n.d.) attests that both are used in the Classical as well as the Koine period. πυρός refers specifically to wheat, but σίτος to grain more generally (GELS, LEH). πυρός refers specifically to wheat (HALOT), so conforming to the Hebrew is unlikely to be the explanation. We must classify it as lexical variation.

01, 03: conforming to Hebrew, lexical variation.
A

εἰς ἐκφυγεῖν

02, AI, AIII: τοῦ ἐκφυγεῖν

AII, Syr-Hex: καὶ ἐσπευδέν τοῦ φυγεῖν (καὶ ἐσπευδέν obelised in Syr-Hex)

MT: יָנַי

The longest reading is clearly difficilior and there is no reason why any other would give rise to it, so it is likely initial. 02 could plausibly cut it for clarity (why would Gideon hurry to hide the corn when an angel, not the hostile Midianites, have appeared?). B then probably had the reading of 02, AI and AIII in her Greek Vorlage and brought that reading closer to the Hebrew.

02: content change.

01, 03: conforming to Hebrew.
A

ἀπὸ

02, representatives of AI and AIII: ἐκ

ἐκ is difficilior because it is much the less common expression in these chapters.

01, 03: harmonisation.
A

τοῦ Μαδιαμ

02, representatives of AI and AIII: omit τοῦ

MT: יָנִי

The reading without the article is closer to the Hebrew, but is difficilior, because there is no case-indicator. This is the sort of small, minor variant, which scribes might introduce or correct.
independently and therefore where the testimony of groups is less relevant. It therefore seems reasonable to assume that OG had the article, but was altered towards the Hebrew. 02: conforming to Hebrew.

A

12:

ώφη αὐτῷ
02 only: εὗρεν αὐτὸν
The external evidence is clearly against 02. Schreiner (1957, 85) suggests 02 may be harmonising to v.13, which would create a neat symmetry between the angel finding Gideon and troubles finding Israel. 02: harmonisation.

A

ὁ ἄγγελος
01, 02, B minuscules: ἄγγις
MT: יְהוָה
The omission could either be transcriptional or conforming to the Hebrew. The inherent probability of accidental omission of small words make the former more likely. 01, 02: TE.

B

ἰσχυρός τῶν δυνάμεων
02, AII, AIII, OL, Syr-Hex: δυνατὸς τῇ ἰσχύι
MT: יְהוָה רְצָא
01, 03: conforming to Hebrew.

A

13:

κύριε μου
01 only: κύριε, κύριε μου
02 only: κύριος, κύριος
Small number of representatives from across the groups, OL: κύριε
MT: יִנֹדֲא

Regarding the doubling or not of κύριος, it is an easy mistake to make either by haplography or dittography. It is unlikely to be harmonisation to Exod 34:6, because in OT, God’s double naming is there rendered κύριος ὁ θεός, despite the MT having a double tetragrammaton. 01 and 02 are in the small minority, so have almost certainly made a TE. Regarding the case of κύριος, 02 is also clearly in the minority. With nomina sacra, KC and KЄ are easily confused by TE. It is possible that the added pronoun is B reproducing the Hebrew (Harlé), although the difference in Hebrew is one of vocalisation, so this makes a far from certain assumption that the translator read the text with Masoretic vocalisation. I therefore rate this change as C.

01, 02: TE.
A
02: TE.
A
01, 03: conforming to Hebrew.
C

eἰς τί εὕρεν

02, small number of minuscules from AII: ίνα τί εὕρεν
AIII, other minuscules: καὶ ίνα τί εὕρεν

Regarding εἰς and ίνα, we see the standard pattern of B moving closer to the Hebrew. Regarding the καὶ before the ίνα, its inclusion is difficilior, as it appears to parallel the καὶ earlier in Gideon’s speech, making the sentence more difficult to follow. Aejmelaeus (1982) argues that rendering the apoditic wv as καί has is a common feature of the Greek Pentateuch. It is therefore unsurprising that it is found only in the A-text, even though A is normally less “literal” than B. Its absence in 02 is probably TE.

02: TE.
B
01, 03: conforming to Hebrew.
A

tὰ κακᾶ

Almost all other evidence, including 01: πάντα τὰ κακᾶ
03 only: text
03: TE.
A

ā

02, some AII and AIII manuscripts: ὅσα
MT: ῥέα
Neither external, nor internal evidence is decisive. Either could fairly translate the Hebrew. Lee (1983) also records no trend in use of the different forms at different times. AII, an early text-form and 02, an early manuscript with a relatively early form, give ὅσα, which gives it a slight edge. The B-reading is therefore probably a widespread TE.
B

μὴ οὐχὶ
All major evidence except 01 and 03: omit μὴ
MT: σὺν
μὴ οὐχὶ is highly unusual in Koine (Moulton, Howard and Turner 1908-76, 3.281-83). This is therefore probably a linguistic improvement by all the other evidence.

ἀνήγαγεν
02, Ethiopic: ἐξήγαγεν
The external evidence is against 02, which is probably a TE.
A

ἐξέρριψεν
02, some representatives of AI and AII, AIII, Syr-Hex: ἀπώσατο
OL: sprevit
MT: ובשׁשׁ
The balance of the early text forms seems to support ἀπώσατο. The meanings are similar, such that either could reasonably reflect the Hebrew. The words are so different in sound and shape that lexical variation is more likely than TE.
A

316
ἐξέρριψεν ἡμᾶς
01, 02, Al, AII, OL, Syr-Hex: ἀπώσατο ἡμᾶς κύριος (κύριος obelised in OL)
MT: יַזָּמֵן
The verb was discussed above, I now consider κύριος. The early text forms clearly support the addition. It is interesting both that 01 is with them and that it is A here that here follows the Hebrew. Presumably B omitted to avoid ungainly repetition of κύριος.
03: linguistic improvement.
A

ἐδόκειν
02, A-groups and versions: παρέδωκεν
01, 03: lexical variation.
A

Μαδιαμί
03 has what may be an iota, partially deleted at the end of the word. It may be a TE or an unusual punctuation mark. My rating reflects the uncertainty.

03: TE.
C

14:

ἐπέστρεψεν
01: ἀπέστρεψεν
02, A: ἐπέβλεψεν
MT: יַצָּמֵן
The external evidence supports A. ἐπιβλέπω is the standard translation in Judges of the Hebrew קָנָם (Marcos). The B-reading is most likely a TE and 01’s reading an additional one.
01, 03: TE.
A

εἰπεν
02, A, Syr-Hex: εἰπεν αὐτῷ
MT: רֶמאֹיַּו
The external evidence supports A. It adds the pronoun for clarity’s sake (Butler), which B then removes to conform to the Hebrew.
01, 03: conforming to Hebrew.
A

ἰσχύι
01, 03: τῇ ἰσχύι
MT: ῳχοֹב
Interestingly, the B minuscules agree with A. This is evidence that 01 and 03 may be among the earliest manuscripts in B. The later minuscules felt the article was needed for better Greek and so added it. Why did 01 and 03 remove the article? The Hebrew has no article, so conforming is certainly a possible motive, but the possessive suffix gives the Hebrew a sense of definiteness. TE in a common ancestor is more likely, because the rest of B quickly replaced the article, which suggests that the scribes of the B minuscules did not regard its omission as a Hebraism they wanted to imitate.
01, 03: TE.
A

ταύτῃ
02, AII: omitted
MT: π
01, 03: conforming to Hebrew.
A

ιδοὺ
02, AII, Syr-Hex: καὶ ιδοὺ
AIII, B minuscules: οὐκ ιδοὺ
OL: nonne
Interestingly, the OL is the closest to the Hebrew. ἰδοὺ was presumably added by OG to emphasise the angel’s words. καὶ makes the Greek read better, by connecting the ἰδοὺ-clause to what ran before. It is thus plausible internally and externally that καὶ ἰδοὺ is the reading of OG. The B minuscules added a negating particle to reflect the Hebrew, but this does not explain why 01 and 03 drop καὶ, but keep ἰδοὺ. It was probably TE.

A

15:

κύριέ μου
A, OL: omit μου (also obelised in Syr-Hex)

The early text-forms all testify that μου is initial. The final vowel of the Hebrew is uncertain: BHS, following Codex Leningradensis, has qamets, but notes that “pc Mss” (presumably Medieval, Masoretic manuscripts) have chireq. A qamets would translate into Greek without μου, a chireq with μου. We cannot tell what vowels would have been understood at the time OG was produced, so we cannot posit conforming to the Hebrew. Burney argues that “my” implies that Gideon has recognised that the angel in some sense is Yahweh, but in fact, this recognition does not come until v.21-22. Presumably A reasoned similarly, whereas B wanted to stress the personal connection between God and Gideon.

01, 03: content change.

B

ἰδοὺ
AII only: omitted

It is unclear if this is a TE in AII or a correction to the Hebrew by all later evidence. The fact that AII has a doublet in the variation unit immediately after the text could either suggest that the editor was working extremely hard to include everything or that a small word could slip out amidst the complexity of constructing the doublet. TE is more likely, because OL has the word and AII and OL normally agree on significant changes.
ἡ χιλιάς μου ἠσθένησεν ἐν Μανασσή

02, representatives of most A-groups: ἡ χιλιάς μου ταπεινότερα ἐν Μανασσή

AII only: ἡ χιλιάς μου ταπεινότερα ἐν Μανασσή καὶ εἰ χιλιάδες ὄλοντο ἐν Μανασσή

OL: millia minorata sunt in Mannase

MT: מְפִלָא דּנְמִבּ לַשּׁהֶ קִי

In some ways, this variation unit shows typical patterns because there is a doublet in AII, one of which reflects the Hebrew more literally than the other, and OL has the one farther from the Hebrew (because it has a verb, not a superlative adjective). However, more unusually, the rest of A has the reading which reflects the Hebrew. The fact that the OL has the verb suggests that this was initial and that A corrected back to the Hebrew and both readings ended up in AII. Where then did the B-reading came from? Pretzl (1926, 253) suggests that it may reflect an alternative Hebrew text form, which had the verb, לרח, “to cease” instead of the adjective, מְפִלָא, “the smallest, weakest”. This is possible, but unnecessary. The B-reading may also be conforming to the Hebrew, by changing ὄλοντο, a verb signifying total destruction, to one signifying mere weakness. Alternatively, it may be conforming to the Hebrew by introducing a verb to the A-reading. Either way, it conforms to the Hebrew.

All pandects: conforming to Hebrew.

A

ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ μικρότερος

Some AII witnesses, OL: ἐγὼ ὁ μικρός

02, other A-witnesses: ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ μικρός

MT: מְפִלָא צְריִﬠָ

B adds the copular to represent יִכֹנָא. Since this is standard kaige convention, in order to distinguish the Hebrew words for “I” (Bodine 1980, 15-16), I classify it as conforming to the Hebrew. Likewise, B’s superlative is an attempt to express the Hebrew article plus adjective. 01, 03: (twice) conforming to Hebrew.

A

ἐν οἶκῳ

02 only: τῷ οἶκῳ

Minusculae from different groups: ἐν τῷ οἶκῳ

The external evidence is with ἐν οἶκῳ, the various additions are linguistic improvements and 02’s reading a TE.
πατρός μου
02, minuscules from different groups: τοῦ πατρὸς μου
02: linguistic improvement.
A

16:

ὁ ἅγγελος κύριου
Some Al and AIII manuscripts, OL, Syr-Hex: omitted
MT: הַגָּפָר
The Hebrew portrays Yahweh himself as speaking with Gideon. This was not suited to Hellenising sensibilities, which disapproved of anthropomorphism and therefore most of the Greek tradition has changed it to “the angel of the Lord”. The omission is difficilior and has reasonable external evidence.
All pandects: content change.
A

Κύριος ἔσται μετὰ σοῦ
AII: ὃ τι Κύριος ἔσται μετὰ σοῦ
MT: הַכּוֹנַח הַגָּפָר
The ὃ τι both reflects a Hebrew word (כון) and makes the Greek read well, so it can only have dropped out by transcriptional omission.
A

πατάξεις
Some AII evidence: ἀποκτενεῖς
MT: הַגָּפָר
πατάξεις renders the Hebrew more literally, so ἀποκτενεῖς may be initial. However, we would surely expect more external evidence if this were the case.
17:

εἰ δὲ
02, A, Syr-Hex: καὶ εἰ
MT: καὶ ἐπὶ
The external evidence favours A. καὶ is perhaps an unusual way to start direct speech, so it is likely a linguistic improvement by B.
A

ἔλεος
02, A, OL, Syr-Hex: χάριν
MT: χάρι
The external evidence favours χάριν. The TLG (n.d.) suggests that both words were used extensively throughout in all periods. B probably used ἔλεος to emphasise God’s compassion and mercy (see GELS for this nuance of meaning).
01, 03: content change.
A

σήμερον πᾶν
02, some AI manuscripts, Syr-Hex: πᾶν σημεῖον (σημεῖον obelised in Syr-Hex)
σήμερον and σημεῖον are easily confused. Harlé and Soison-Soininen (1951, 19) suggest σημεῖον is earlier, but without much argument. Pretzl (1926, 264) suggests that AII and B agree here coincidentally and independently. This is certainly possible. However it is surely simpler to posit that OG had σήμερον πᾶν, but that a TE entered part of A, turning σήμερον to σημεῖον and then leading to πᾶν changing position.
02: TE.
B

ἐλάλησας
02, some A manuscripts, OL: σὺ λαλέεις
MT: ῥᾶτῳ
The present tense is probably initial on external grounds and the change is probably due to TE. B likely removed the σὺ to conform to the Hebrew.
B
18:

χωρισθῆς
02, various A manuscripts: κινηθῆς
MT: שׁומ
The external evidence arguably gently favours κινηθῆς. χωρίζω better represents the Hebrew שָׁמַר, which means “withdraw, depart” (GELS, HALOT).
01, 03: conforming to Hebrew.
A

ἐξοίσω
02, AII, some other A witnesses: οἴσω
MT: רָאַשְׁנִי
The external evidence moderately favours οἴσω. The prefix reflects אֵי, which means “bring out”.
01, 03: conforming to Hebrew.
A

θυσίαν
01: θυσία
All other evidence: θυσίαν μου
01’s omission of the nu is a TE. The omission of the μου was probably also a TE in an early common ancestor.
A

καὶ ἔλπην
AII: καὶ ἔλπην αὐτῷ ἱδοὺ
MT: רָאַשׁי
As in similar cases with this pattern of witnesses, AII is OG and the later text-forms all conform to the Hebrew.
A

καθίσμαι
01 and several B minuscules: καθιόμαι
02, various A manuscripts: καθήσομαι
OL: sedeo
It is clear that OG had a future of “to sit”, but this was formed in various ways at the time Judges was translated (Thackeray 1909, 271). It is thus difficult to say definitively which is initial, but external evidence supports καθήσομαι. The variants are probably TE.
01, 03: TE.
A

19:

τὰ κρέα ἔθηκεν ἐν τῷ κοφίνῳ
Some AII witnesses: ἐπέθηκεν τὰ κρέα ἐπὶ τὸ κανοῦν
02, AI: τὰ κρέα ἐπέθηκεν ἐπὶ τὸ κανοῦν
AIII: τὰ κρέα ἔθηκεν ἐπὶ τὸ κανοῦν
OL: [τὰ κρέα] imposuit super canistrum
MT: בּ שׂ שָׂ רָשָׂבַּה סּ
The external evidence supports the prefix on the verb, (especially because posuit simplex would have been entirely possible in OL). B may be conforming to the Hebrew, which has a simplex verb (compound verbs are of course not possible in Hebrew, but the point stands). On word order, there is little external evidence for the verb going first, but that external evidence is AII and following the Hebrew could easily account for putting the verb second. Thus AII is probably initial and the others conform to the Hebrew.

On the preposition, the external evidence strongly favours ἐπὶ. B’s ἐν is probably an attempt to render ב literally. On the word for “basket”, the external evidence is against B, but the nature of the change is less clear. Harlé notes that κανοῦν is much the more standard LXX word, κόφινος occurring otherwise only at Ps 80:7. However, this does not explain why κόφινος was introduced here. We can say little more than lexical variation.
01, 03: conforming to Hebrew (prefix).
B
All panedicts: conforming to Hebrew (word order).
B
01, 03: conforming to Hebrew (preposition).
A
01, 03: lexical variation (word for “basket”).

A

ἔβαλεν ἐν τῇ χύτρᾳ
02, A: ἐνέχεεν εἰς χύτραν

MT: י santa

B is probably conforming by the Hebrew by omitting the prefix from the verb and reproducing the preposition ב very literally. On the choice of verb, βάλλω has a range of meanings including “throw, cast, place”, whereas χέω is more specifically “pour [liquid]”. A’s reading is therefore clearer. B is probably trying to translate the Hebrew literally, since י santa is not used only of liquids.

01, 03: conform to Hebrew (3 times).

A

ἐξήνεγκεν αὐτὰ
A: omit αὐτὰ

MT: ἄμεν

Unusually, B is against the Hebrew and A with it. The external evidence suggests that A has the initial text. The addition is presumably because the Greek reads better if the verb of carrying has an explicit object.

01, 03: linguistic improvement.

A

tερέμινθον
A: δρῦν
See v.11.

01, 03: lexical variation.

B

προσήγγισεν
02, AI, AIII, Syr-Hex: προσεκύνησεν
AI: προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ

Brooke and McLean do not print the OL, but say that it agrees with 03, but adds an ei.

MT: י santa
Regarding the verb, Boling suggests that each Greek variant translates a different vocalisation of the Hebrew. MT’s שַׁגַּיַּו is Hiphil, but the alternative וַיִּכְבָּ is Qal (Barthélemy 1982, 90). Butler therefore suggests that B translates the Qal, meaning “go near”, and A translates the Hiphil, meaning “bring near”, which is easily paraphrased “bring an offering near, worship”. However Barthélemy (1982, 91), Barthélemy et al and Marcos also argue that either of the Greek forms could reflect the pointing of the MT, because προσηγγίζω also has a transitive sense “bring near”. Thus, the Hebrew is unlikely to be a decisive factor in decisions on this verse. προσκυνέω has the clear balance of the external evidence. Driver (1962-63, 12) suggests that προσηγγίζω may fit better with v.20, since approaching someone is a more natural precursor to conversation than worship. Harlé argues similarly that προσηγγίζω is initial and that προσκυνέω is a deliberate change to make the encounter look more worshipful. However, given the balance of the external evidence, it is surely more likely προσεκύνησεν is initial and that B is altering the text to fit the context better. It is quite likely therefore that AII’s inclusion of a pronoun object is also initial, since it is much better Greek and is supported by OL, but the Hebrew has no object.

01, 03: content change (choice of word).

A

All pandects: conforming to Hebrew (loss of pronoun).

A

20:

ο ἄγγελος τοῦ θεοῦ

g, n (two AII manuscripts): ο ἄγγελος κύριου τοῦ θεοῦ

02, almost all other A-group evidence: ο ἄγγελος κύριου

MT: ἄγγελος κύριου

As often part of A has a doublet, one closer to the Hebrew than the other; the one closer to the Hebrew is followed by B and the other is initial.

01, 03: conforming to Hebrew.

A

τὰ ἄζυμα

02, AII, some AI witnesses, OL, Syr-Hex: τοὺς ἄρτους τοὺς ἄζυμους (τοὺς ἄρτους obelised in Syr-Hex)
AIII, some AI witnesses: τοὺς ἀζύμους

We have a variation on the standard pattern, where a doublet preserves two readings, one initial and one closer to the Hebrew (which refers specifically to flat bread, so the ἀζυμ- root is a better translation\(^\text{10}\)).

02: doubling
01, 03: conforming to Hebrew.

A

τὸν ζωμὸν ἐχόμενα ἐκχεε

Some AII witnesses: ἐκχεον τὸν ζωμὸν

02, Other A witnesses: τὸν ζωμὸν ἐκχεον

MT: וֹפְשׁ קַרָמַּה־תֶאְו

On word order, the verb comes later in Hebrew, so its position at the end is probably a change to reflect that. On the tense of the imperative, the external evidence supports the aorist. Hebrew does not have tensed imperatives and it is difficult to view the present tense as conforming to the Hebrew. Nor does it really suit the context, since it is not an on-going command. I classify it as a linguistic non-improvement. The ἐχόμενα has no obvious correspondence in the Hebrew and it is not clear what it modifies in Greek. It may be adverbial, such that the phrase could perhaps mean “pour out any broth that is there”. NETS translates “next to [the other parts of the sacrifice]”. It is sufficiently unclear that I classify it also as a linguistic non-improvement.

All pandects: conforming to Hebrew (word order).

B

01, 03: linguistic non-improvement (twice, tense change and added participle).

B

21:

χειρὶ

All evidence except 03 and two B minuscules: τῇ χειρὶ

The fact that 03 stands nearly alone strongly suggests that this is a TE.

\(^{10}\) It is obviously impossible to prove that it could never refer to leavened bread, but the evidence in HALOT is all for unleavened.
A

ἀνέβη
02, Some A manuscripts, Syr-Hex: ἀνήφθη
MT: ḫn
data appears that we have the standard pattern here, where the earlier text-forms render the Hebrew loosely and it is then made more literal by B. B is thus conforming to the Hebrew.
A

ἐπορεύθη
02, manuscripts from across the A-groups: ἀπῆλθεν
MT: ḫn
As often, the external evidence favours A and the B follows the Hebrew, which has simply the verb ḫn, to go, without sense of “away”, implied by ἀπ-.
A

ἀπὸ
02, manuscripts from AI and AII: ἔξ
The external evidence points to the B-reading. All we can say for an explanation is lexical variation.
A

22:

οὗτος
Some B minuscules: οὗτος
01, 03: text
All other evidence: omitted
MT: ἢν
The external evidence favours omitting the pronoun and it is clear B is aiming to reflect the Hebrew.
A
κύριε μου
A, OL, Syr-Hex: μου omitted
See v.15.
01, 03: content change.
B
κύριε (2)
AIII, OL: omitted
The external evidence arguably favours the double-reading and omission due to haplography is highly probable.

ἀγγέλον
02, AII: τὸν ἀγγέλον
The anarthrous text has the majority of A manuscripts, so I submit that it is marginally more probable. The addition of it is likely therefore to be a TE.

πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον
03: πρόσωπον πρόσωπον
TE due to haplography.
A
23:

οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνης
02, two AI minuscules: μὴ ἀποθάνης
The οὐ was probably lost through haplography with the preceding word, φοβοῦ.
02: TE.
A

24:

ἐπεκάλεσεν αὐτῷ
01, B-minuscules: ἐπεκάλεσεν αὐτό
02, various A manuscripts across the sub-groups: ἐκάλεσεν αὐτό
Various other A manuscripts across the sub-groups: ἐκάλεσεν αὐτῶ
MT: יִרְזֶﬠָה יִבֲא
The early text-forms unite in favouring the simplex verb. The compound does little to change the semantic range: both verbs include the meanings, “to give something a name, to refer to something by name, to call for something” The change is probably lexical variation.

The case of the pronoun is clearer. The accusative would suit the Greek better, but the dative represents the Hebrew.
01, 03: lexical variation.
A
01, 03: conforming to Hebrew.
A

πατρὸς τοῦ Ῥεδρεί
AII (with minor internal variations): ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶ τῆς Ῥεδρεί
MT: יָבָא יִרְזֶﬠָה
As often, AII provides an extended explanation of the Hebrew, which later versions have cut in conformity to it.
All pandects: conforming to Hebrew.
A
καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἐκείνῃ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ κύριος

Some AII manuscripts: καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ κύριος ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἐκείνῃ
AIII, some AII manuscripts: as text, but ἐγενήθη for ἐγένετο
02, AI: as text, but ἐγενήθη for ἐγένετο and ἐν omitted

As often, the AII groups preserve the form of the text that is farthest from the Hebrew, yet easiest to read in Greek, and this is gradually literalised in the other forms, with B reaching the most extreme point of literalness. The exception to this pattern is the omission of ἐν in 02 and AI: the Hebrew includes ב, but it is equally natural in Greek to express location in time with a dative case without a preposition. It seems therefore that the omission of the preposition is the initial text and the inclusion a Hebraism. It is likely therefore that OG has survived entirely in no witness, but ran καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ κύριος τῇ νυκτὶ ἐκείνῃ.

All pandects: conforming to Hebrew (twice – the construction and the preposition).

A

tὸν μόσχον τὸν ταῦταν
02, most A manuscripts, OL, Syr-Hex: τὸν μόσχον τὸν σιτευτὸν
MT: הַפְּרֵי-מְשִׁיר

ὁς ἔστιν τῷ πατρί σου
02, A, OL: τοῦ πατρός σου
Syr-Hex: τὸν τοῦ πατρός σου
MT: פַּרְשָׁי

καὶ μόσχον δεύτερον ἐπταετῇ
02, AI: μόσχον τὸν δεύτερον τὸν ἐπταετῇ
Syr-Hex: text, but obelises δεύτερον
AII, AIII, OL: μόσχον ἐπταετῇ
MT: פַּרְשָׁי וּפַרְשָׁי

The second variation-unit is a straightforward instance of B conforming to the Hebrew.

---

11 Brooke and McLean do not quote the OL, but note that it retains a word for “and”.
In the first variation-unit, the Hebrew is difficult. Block literally translates יָסֶרַתֶא שּׁ רַפּ as “bull of the bullock” and notes that it seems an unusual way to refer to a bull. Péter (1975, 490 n. 7) notes on the basis of Ugaritic evidence that שּׁ רַפּ may be an epithet of Baal, such that the verse is saying “take a bull of Baal...”. Whilst possible, it seems too speculative to adopt in favour of Block’s explanation. A is a typically creative translation and B renders the Hebrew literally.

The final variation unit is more complex. The Hebrew refers to a רַפּ שּׁ יִנֵ, a “second bull”, but only one bull figures in the rest of the narrative and that bull is called “second” in vv. 26, 28. The oldest Greek witnesses omit “second” in v.25. B has δεύτερον in vv. 26 and 28, but A omits δεύτερον in v.26 and has σιτευτός in v.28. Resolving the Greek text thus requires resolving the problem of the second bull. It is reasonable to take the waw in רַפּ שּׁ יִנֵ as epexegetical, such that the whole phrase means “take the bull of the bullock, which is your father’s, that is the second bull, seven years [old]” (e.g. Barthélemy et al, Groß, Harlé; Gesenius, Kautzsch and Cowley 1910, 484; Barthélemy 1982, 92; Rudman 2000, 101; Bluedorn 2001, 93-94;). Burney offers 1 Sam 17:40 and 28:3 as unambiguous examples of this construction. However, a new problem arises: in what sense is this bull the “second”?

It is therefore useful to briefly overview the various solutions scholars have proposed to the problem of the second bull. Groß provides a useful taxonomy. Firstly, it is possible that the consonants ינשה are the result of textual corruption in the Hebrew tradition, prior to the MT. Secondly, it is possible that the Masoretes vocalised the word incorrectly. Thirdly, it is possible that the Masoretic text and vocalisation, meaning “second”, accurately reflect the Hebrew text in the time of OG and can be made to make sense. The first option, textual corruption prior to the MT, is supported by Burney and Schmidt (1970, 6-7). Schmidt argues that the original Hebrew was שּׁ רַפּ, which was corrupted to רַפּ יִנֵ, which then got introduced to other verses. He argues that A translates the earliest Hebrew and B the later form. It is also possible the original Hebrew was ינשה, which A might reasonably translate as σιτευτός in v.28. However, Soggin helpfully notes that ינשה is never otherwise translated σιτευτός.

Numerous scholars have suggested alternative vocalisations for ינשה, which may be reflected by A’s σιτευτός, such that A may in fact reflect the meaning of the Hebrew better than B. Guillaume proposes ינשה, which he suggests would mean “full-grown, mature” on the basis of similar roots in Arabic. Bluedorn (2001, 94-95) suggests this is also more plausible, because it
expresses an important theological nuance: there are no other references in the Hebrew Bible to seven-year-old bulls, so the point of this detail in the story must be that the bull is the same age as the Midianite oppression – both are full-grown and ripe for slaughter. Emerton (1978) and Thomas (1934) propose on the basis of Arabic and Syriac that Hebrew had a חנש root, meaning “exalted, majestic”. This means the A-reading is a good paraphrase, because a majestic or mature bull is a well-fed one. In this case, both MT and B misconstrue the word as meaning “second”.

The final option is to make some sense of the word as meaning “second”. Frevel (1995, 130-31) suggests that the bull is second because the first was sacrificed at the beginning of the Midianite rule. Becker (1990, 155) suggests that the passage alludes to 1 Kgs 18, where Elijah’s is the second bull to be sacrificed, the first being to Baal. However, as Block argues, it is hard to see how this could be clear to the first readers. Barthélemy (1982, 92-94), followed by Harlé, argues, with Arabic evidence, that the bull is the second-born (because the first-born was offered in sacrifice at birth) and that therefore Gideon is for practical purposes offering the first-born bull. Rudman (2000) informs us that Levantine oxen typically pulled in teams of two, one of whom was senior and stronger, such that “second” here means the weaker member of the team. There are thus a number of ways “second” could make sense.

Any of these interpretations of “second” is surely more likely than Hebrew scribes systematically mangling either the pointing or the copying, such that an easily comprehensible word became a difficult שעון three times in five verses (for the text-critical point, see Bluedorn 2001, 90; Guillaume 1949, 52). Moreover, it is difficult to make sense of the alternative vocalisations, because, as Rudman (2000, 98) argues, it is unlikely that Gideon’s bull would be mature, majestic or fat: in v.4, the Israelites are poor and own few animals; in v.11 they need to store grain and so could not fatten cows; in v.15 Gideon’s family are particularly poor; moreover, fattening is generally done to a bull at eighteen months, not seven years.

Thus, the Hebrew text at the time of the initial translation was probably correctly preserved by MT (with “second” interpreted in one of what ways suggested above) and misunderstood by OG, here as ἐπταετή and in v.28 as στεινόν. A would then be the initial Greek reading and B would have conformed to the Hebrew by correctly translating it. We have thus removed Gideon’s bull from the scholarly china shop.

01, 03: conforms to Hebrew (3 times).
Twice B, once A

ὅ ἐστιν τῷ πατρί
A, OL, Syr-Hex: ὅ ἐστιν τοῦ πατρός
MT: יִבָאְל ú רֶשֲׁא

This could be taken as B conforming to the Hebrew, because the Hebrew has the preposition ל, which more often expresses “to” than “of” and so suits a Greek dative. However, it is more probably a TE, since all the text-forms in fact follow the Hebrew quite closely, in that they express possession with a relative clause, which A does not normally do. The genitive has the substantial majority of early external evidence, so it is probably B which has made the TE.

B
tὸ θυσιαστήριον τοῦ βααλ...καὶ τὸ ἄλσος τὸ ἐπ᾿ αὐτό
Two B minuscules: ...ἐπ᾿ αὐτοῦ
02 only: ...ἐπ᾿ αὐτῆς
03, b, i: text (b is Al and i is B)
01, all other evidence: ...ἐπ᾿ αὐτῶ

The variation is the case of the pronoun, but understanding ἄλσος is important. LSJ, LEH and GELS all suggest a translation such as “grove, sacred grove”. However, ἄλσος is the standard OG rendering of the Hebrew יאשא, (e.g. Deut 16:21; 2 Chr 33:3; Mic 5:13). This Hebrew word sometimes refers clearly to a physical object or structure used in worship (e.g. 2 Kgs 18:4), but other times the sense is more of a heavenly divinity represented by the physical object (e.g. 1 Kgs 18:19; 2 Kgs 21:7). Sometimes OG changes the sentence so that a sacred grove will make sense (e.g. 1 Kgs 15:13, where in MT Maacah makes a horrible thing for Asherah but in OG she forms a conspiracy in a grove) but at other times, ἄλσος appears to function more as a calque, simply replacing the Hebrew word, even when the idea of a grove makes little sense (e.g. 2 Kgs 23:6, where even in OG Josiah carries the ἄλσος out of the temple).12 This bears on the gender and case of αὐτός here. If the translator had in mind a grove of trees, the sense would be something like “around it”. If instead, she intended a statue or single tree, the sense would more likely be “upon it, beside it”. The latter two are both regular meanings of ἐπί, but the former would be unusual. In v.26, all Greek texts agree on the phrase ἐν τοῖς ξύλοις τοῦ ἄλσους.

12 For the reference list, I searched using the electronic adaptation of Strong’s concordance available at BibleHub (2004-20). The analysis is my own.
This probably means “with the pieces of wood from the idol”, rather than “in the trees of the grove”, since the ξύλα are being used to make a fire for a sacrifice and the ἄλσος has been completely destroyed. It would be implausible that the whole grove be destroyed and all the trees used for a fire. Presumably ἄλσος has the same meaning here as in v.26, i.e. idol or statue. This suggests that the ἐπὶ means “on, beside”. The standard case for this to govern is the dative and we would expect neuter singular, because the referent is θυσιαστήριον. This reading enjoys the support of the external evidence. The variants do not conform to groups and thus it is likely we are dealing with a TE.

02, 03: TE.

A

ὀλεθρεύσεις
02 only: ἐκκόψαται
Most A-group witnesses, Syr-Hex: ἐκκόψεις
OL: excidis
MT: תָּרַךְ
Interestingly, here B seems to be farther from the Hebrew. The Hebrew word is from תָּרַךְ, to cut, but B translates it with a more general word for “destroy”. The external evidence is with A. We can only categorise it as lexical variation. 02’s reading appears to be a nonsense TE.

01, 03: lexical variation.

02: TE.

A

26:

κυρίῳ
03: τῷ κυρίῳ
Everything else: text
03: TE.

A

τῷ θεῷ σου
AI, AII, OL, Syr-Hex: add τῷ ὀφθέντι σοι (addition obelised in Syr-Hex)
MT: יִצְעָק
Pretzl (1926, 247) suggests the lamedh of יֶה may have been mistaken for a resh. Harlé suggests that the longer version is initial not only for the Greek translation, but for the Hebrew as well and that the phrase was omitted in both the B-text and MT, because it undermined the transcendence of God. Schreiner (1957, 57) suggests the phrase was added by harmonisation to Gen 35:1, which has a similar context. Both Harlé’s and Schreiner’s explanations are plausible. Although, as I have argued, it is very likely that the Vorlage of OG Judges was very similar to MT Judges, this does not mean that it was identical and if there is good reason to posit a small change in the Hebrew tradition, we should not be a priori closed to the idea. On the other hand, a solution which avoids positing purely conjectural Hebrew text-forms is surely preferable, so I tentatively conclude with Schreiner, that the A-reading is the result of influence of Gen 35:1. The question then becomes, did this harmonisation take place in the original translation, such that the harmonised version is OG, and the B-text corrects back to the Hebrew, or did the harmonisation enter the tradition subsequently, such that the B-text is OG? The general propensity of B to conform to the Hebrew would certainly suggest the former, but we must not be slaves to these assumptions. It is much more plausible that a copyist add a remembered phrase from elsewhere in the Greek Scriptures than a translator, who would necessarily concentrate much harder than a copyist. I therefore submit that, contrary to general trends, B has the initial text here. 02 happens here to agree with them.

On the case of κορυφή, the external evidence is obviously for the genitive. Although the Hebrew word is anarthrous, this is because it is in the construct state and so its absolute noun has the article. It would be unwise to be dogmatic about which is linguistically “better”. It is likely 03’s reading is a TE.
On the presence or absence of ὄρους, it is universal in the A-groups. Bodine (1980, 142) notes its omission as a kaige alteration: in other words, it is B conforming to the Hebrew. It would be natural for OG to add it, to clarify what “Maoz” was.

All’s rendering of the name, τῷψ, as κατάδυσις is unusual. The only other occurrence of κατάδυσις noted in GELS or LEH is in 1 Kgs 15:13, where it does not translate τῷψ. It is unlikely that a competent Hebraist like the OG translator would render τῷψ as κατάδυσις, but much more likely that a later scribe would be confused by a transliteration and incorrectly render it by κατάδυσις. It is likely that one of the transliterations is initial and the differences between them are mere orthography. The variant in the case of παράταξις arose because the genitive clearly results from dependence on καταδύσει.

Finally, the presence or not of the pronoun: it seems most likely that it follows the common pattern, whereby the inclusion conforms to the Hebrew, which has πι.

03: TE (case of κορυφή).
A
01, 03: conforming to Hebrew (omitting ὄρους).
A
All pandects: conforming to the Hebrew (the pronoun).
A

tὸν μόσχον τὸν δεύτερον
02: τὸν μόσχον τὸν δεύτερον
Manuscripts from across the A-groups: τὸν μόσχον
See discussion above, v.25. It is likely that the shorter reading is initial and that τὸν δεύτερον was added later to conform to the Hebrew. It is noteworthy that 02 here leaves its group and conforms to the Hebrew with B. 02’s extra μ in μόσχον is a TE.

02: TE.
All pandects: conforming to the Hebrew.
A

οὐ ἐξολοθρεύσεις
A-groups: οὐ ἐκκόψεις
02: ὁ ἐκκόψεις
See similar variation-unit in v.25, with an added TE (upsilon omitted) in 02. 02 has a number of errors in quick succession here.

01, 03: content change.
02: TE.

A

27:

δέκα

02, Al, AII, Syr-Hex: τρισκαίδεκα (τρισκαί obelised in Syr-Hex)
k (AII manuscript): δέκα καὶ τρεῖς

MT: ἡρσά

It would be easy to assume that B is correcting to the Hebrew. However, if this the case, we must account for why the first translator changed the number, especially because there seems no reason for Gideon to take thirteen men, either from context or from the symbolic or cultural resonance of certain numbers. It is more likely that B has the initial text and the number changed within the Greek tradition. There are a number of ways in which this could have happened. Pretzl (1926, 253) suggests that the Hebrew number was originally transliterated into Greek as γασαρα and the gamma was read as a numeral. However, there seems no reason to think why the OG translators should transliterate the Hebrew number, or indeed why a subsequent copyist should take the first letter as a numeral and then ignore the rest. It is also far from standard to transliterate the Hebrew ayin as a gamma: for example, in v.24 יִרְזֶﬠ is transliterated Εσδρι or Εζρι. It is more plausible that the preceding name, Gideon, was abbreviated to gamma and this was taken for a numeral (Harlé; Schreiner 1957, 51). One could plausibly speculate that this confusion was made easier because the abbreviation of Gideon’s name was something like a primitive nomina sacra and had a supralinear line, like a numeral. However, this idea involves speculating far beyond the evidence about the early development of nomina sacra and is not required for the more basic theory that the extra τρεῖς is best accounted for by a gamma that stood for Gideon’s name. This is more plausible either than Pretzl’s theory or the idea that the A-group is OG and the B-group corrected back to the Hebrew. Although the latter proves a useful model at many variation units, we must not be slaves to it and, in this case, it does not explain why the OG translator added the τρεῖς. I therefore submit that the addition is a TE, based on an abbreviation of Gideon’s name. It is possible that this error contaminated the whole tradition until B was produced and then B
corrected it back to the Hebrew, but, because AIII supports the B, it is more likely that B preserves the initial text.

02: TE.
A

έαυτοῦ
All other evidence, including 01: αὐτοῦ
03: TE.
A

ὁν τρόπον
A-groups: καθὰ
MT: ἔστη
01, 03: conforming to Hebrew.
A

πρὸς αὐτὸν κύριος
All pandects, AI, some B minuscules with minor variation: text
All other evidence: omitted
MT: ἐξῆνεν
All pandects: conforming to Hebrew.
A

ἐγενήθη
02, some manuscripts from across the groups: ἐγένετο
The variation cuts across the normal group lines and does not appear to be particularly influenced by the Hebrew, so it is most likely to be a TE. The passive is more likely to be initial because it has the majority of the early evidence.
02: TE.
A

τὸν οἰκον τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας τῆς πόλεως
AII: add final αὐτοῦ
MT: ... ἐσθήσει
It is possible the pronoun was omitted to follow the Hebrew, but it should also be noted that it is unnecessary to make sense of the sentence, since it is clear which city is intended, because the article communicates definiteness. It is unclear why the OG translator felt the need to add the pronoun if it is initial, or why AII added it if it is later. Given the general reliability of AII, I take it as initial. All the pandects are thus conforming to the Hebrew.

B

τοῖς ποιήσαι
02, AI, AII: μὴ ποιήσαι
AIII: τοῖς μὴ ποιήσαι
MT: ἀφήσῃ

The Hebrew is an infinitive construct. The absence of a negative particle in the Hebrew is probably why it is omitted in B.

01, 03: conforming to Hebrew.

A

ἡμέρας
AII: ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ
MT: בָּשָׁם

It is possible to read the omission of the preposition as conforming to the Hebrew, which has no preposition, but it could equally be a linguistic improvement or Atticisation or even the initial text, especially since it is followed widely in A. The bare genitive is a standard way to express time “during which” in Attic Greek. Thus, AII could be understood as an attempted linguistic improvement. However, since the bare genitive is arguably better Attic style, AII’s reading is also difficilior, and, given the consistent character of AII to carry an early text, it is likely to be initial here. This suggests that the pandects are either Atticising or conforming to the Hebrew. The fact that ἐν + dative has been changed not to a bare dative, but a genitive, suggests Atticisation.

All pandects: linguistic improvement.

B
28:

οἱ ἄνδρες τῆς πόλεως
All: οἱ ἄνδρες τῆς πόλεως αὐτοῦ
MT: רֹצֵי צָע

See the similar variation unit in the previous verse.
All pandects: conforming to the Hebrew.

καθήρητο
02, A: κατεσκαμμένον
B: text
MT: רצ

03: originally καθείρητο, but corrected to text.

It is possible the correction was in scripotorium, but in scripotorium corrections are rare for orthographic matters. Thackeray (1909, 201-02) notes that εἰ- not ἵ- is becoming the standard way to express the perfect and pluperfect of αἰρέω in the Ptolemaic period. As such, this may be more than orthographic, since it may mean that the scribe of 03 may be intending us to parse the verb as pluperfect, not imperfect. Thackeray even cites this passage in 03 as an example of the pluperfect. Whilst this is possible, it is surely more likely that this is an orthographic variation on the standard reading of the B-text, since the pluperfect is very unusual in Greek of any period. A has a participle, rather than an indicative and a different verb. The Hebrew does not have a participle, so B may conforming, but this does not explain the change of lexeme. A’s verb, κατασκάπτω means specifically “to raze, destroy”, whereas B’s καθαίρεω, can mean simply “to move down”. A’s thus suits the context rather better. Given the weight of the external evidence and fact that the change to indicative clearly follows the Hebrew, it is likely that A’s lexeme is the initial text. Given that the B’s is clearly less apt, I classify it as a linguistic non-improvement.
01, 03: conforming to the Hebrew, linguistic non-improvement.
A

ωλέθρευτο

02, AI, AII: ἐκκεκομμένον
MT: הָכֶנ
The pattern is very similar to the previous variation unit. The Hebrew has an indicative, not a participle. Here, lexically, A is surely closer to the Hebrew, since it expresses more clearly than B the idea of “cutting”. Presumably B changed the lexeme to express more totality of destruction (though this is strange, since in the previous variation unit, it seems almost to move in the opposite direction).
01, 03: conforming to the Hebrew (mood), linguistic improvement (lexeme change).
A

καὶ εἶδαν τὸν μόσχον τὸν δεύτερον, ὅν ἀνήνεγκεν
A, OL, Syr-Hex: καὶ ὁ μόσχος ὁ στεντὸς ἀνηνεγμένος εἰς ὀλοκαύτωμα (last two words obelised in Syr-Hex and omitted AIII)
MT: הָלָﬠֹה יִנֵ
On εἶδαν, the external evidence is against B. There is no equivalent for the word in the Hebrew, so it is most probably added as a linguistic improvement, to make the meaning of the passage clear, by reminding the reader that this is a description of what the townspeople saw. The case of μόσχος and its attributives is the result of this. On the adjective modifying the oxen, see the discussion in v.25 (B is conforming to the Hebrew, which was misunderstood by A). On the form of the verb of bringing, as in the previous variation units, B conforms to the Hebrew indicative (πυλέω). The specification of the sacrifice as a whole offering was likely added because ἀναφέρω does not necessarily imply a whole sacrifice. It was likely removed by B to follow the Hebrew (Harlé, Butler).
01, 03: linguistic improvement, conforming to Hebrew (three times).
All A

29:

τὸ ῥῆμα (twice)
02, A, OL, Syr-Hex: τὸ πρᾶγμα
The Hebrew word can mean “thing” as well as “word” and it clearly does so here. It seems almost that B is making a point of being literal to the Hebrew by translating the Hebrew as far from comprehensible Greek as possible!

01, 03: conforming to Hebrew.

A

έπεζήτησαν καὶ ἠρεύνησαν καὶ ἐγνωσαν

01, one B minuscule: text, but ἠραύνησαν for ἠρεύνησαν

02, AI, AIII, OL, Syr-Hex: ἀνήταζον καὶ ἔξεζήτουν καὶ ἕπαν

AII: as other A-groups but ἐποιείν for ἐπαν

MT: יָדְרְשַׁנְו נָבָכְשׁשׁ יָנָאָאָו

The external evidence is strongly with A, which is likely to be initial here. The reading of 01 is not a different verb, but an orthographic variation. The three-verb structure is constant but the tense and choice of verb varies. The imperfect for the first two arguably suits the context better, since the investigation is surely gradual. B seems to have changed to aorist to conform to the Hebrew wayyiqtols. The first two verbs have little to choose between them; they are lexical variation. In the final verb, A arguably reproduces the Hebrew more accurately, since the Hebrew has a neutral verb of speaking, not specifically of informing. Unlike its normal practice, B seems to have moved away from the Hebrew to use a word that works better in context.

01, 03: conforming to the Hebrew, lexical variation, linguistic improvement.

A

ἐπαν/ἐγνωσαν ὅτι Γεδεων

02, AI, AIII, OL, Syr-Hex: εἶπαν/ἐγνωσαν Γεδεων

MT: ינָאָאָו שְׁלֵם

On external evidence, A is clearly initial. B adds a ὅτι, which makes the transition Greek clearer (but interestingly moves away from the Hebrew, in that that does not have רָאָשׁ).

01, 03: linguistic improvement.

A

υίος

02, other manuscripts from across the groups: ὁ υίος
The group boundaries are so widely crossed here that this is probably a TE. It is not easy to determine which is initial, since the external evidence is even. It reads mildly better with the article, so the shorter reading is *difficilior*, which means it is probably initial.

01, 03: TE.

C

30:

εἰπον

02, manuscripts from across the groups: εἰπον

The first aorist form is a Koine innovation and is therefore *difficilior*, the second aorist form is an Atticising linguistic improvement.

01, 03: linguistic improvement.

A

ἐξένεγκε

A: ἔξάγαγε

01, 03: lexical variation.

A

tὸν υἱὸν σου

01 only: τὸν υἱὸν

TE.

A

καθείλεν

A (with minor variation between sub-groups): κατέσκαψεν

01, 03: Lexical variation.

A

ἀλέθρευσεν

02, AI: ἐκοψεν

AII, AIII: ἔξεκοψεν

See v.28.
01, 03: linguistic improvement.

A

31:

εἶπεν Ἰωας
01 only: εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Γεδεὼν υἱὸς Ἰωας
03, one B-group minuscule: εἶπεν Γεδεὼν υἱὸς Ἰωας
All other evidence: text

The added pronoun is redundant and confusing, because the people addressed are named immediately afterwards. It seems too significant an insertion to be a TE, so I classify it as a linguistic non-improvement. The insertion of Gideon as the subject is clearly not initial on external grounds. As Niditch notes, it magnifies Gideon’s role as hero of the story.

01: linguistic non-improvement.
01, 03: content change.

A

tοῖς ἀνδράσιν πᾶσιν, οἱ ἐπανέστησαν αὐτῷ
A: πρὸς τοὺς ἀνδρας τοὺς ἐπανισταμένους ἐπ’ αὐτόν
02: as the A-groups but ἐσταμένους for the participle
MT: לזל צור ינוכר צער

The first variation unit is πρὸς + accusative vs. the bare dative. The latter is more natural Attic Greek, since πρὸς would normally imply motion of some kind (John 1:1 is a famous exception, but this is unusual). The πρὸς can therefore be viewed as difficilior and the dative as a linguistic improvement. The πᾶσιν and the relative clause in B appear to be conforming to the Hebrew. 02 has a slightly different verb to the rest of A, but this is most likely a TE, because it is so minor and does not follow group patterns. On the final variation unit, the construction with αὐτός following the verb, it is noteworthy that B seems to have departed from the Hebrew in not using a preposition. According to LSJ, the bare dative is the standard construction for this verb in Classical Greek. Therefore it seem that the B-reading is a linguistic improvement, against the difficilior and therefore probably initial A-reading.

01, 03: linguistic improvement (twice), conforming to Hebrew (twice).

02: TE.

A
ὑπὲρ τοῦ Βααλ
02, A: περὶ τοῦ Βααλ
01, 03: Lexical variation.
A

σώσετε
02, manuscripts from across the groups: σῴζετε
This is almost certainly a TE, if not an orthographic variant, because it occurs across all groups. As often in such cases, it is difficult to identify the initial text. The previous, parallel verb, δικάζεσθε, is present, therefore a future here would be difficilior and as such arguably more likely to be initial.
02: TE.
B

δς ἐὰν δικάσηται αὐτῷ
AII: ὁστὶς ἡδίκησεν αὐτῶν
02, most A-group manuscripts: δς ἀντεδίκησεν αὐτῶ (02 and some A-group manuscripts: αὐτῶν for αὐτῶ)
MT: יה ירא רשף
Regarding the relative pronoun, the 02 reading is most literal, but the other witnesses include a sense of indefiniteness, which is implicit in the Hebrew. It seems so unlikely anyone would correct ὁστὶς (or indeed δς ἐὰν) to δς, that in this case, I submit that AII is not initial, but rather 02 and the other A-group manuscripts are. The additions, which create an indefinite sense, are linguistic improvements. On the verbs of judging, Harlé helpfully suggests the following translations:

B: δς ἐὰν δικάσηται αὐτῷ: “Celui qui lui fera procès” (whoever will bring a case for him)

AII: ὁστὶς ἡδίκησεν αὐτῶν: “Celui qui aura commis une injustice contre lui”

(whoever will commit an injustice against him)

02: δς ἀντεδίκησεν αὐτῶ: “Celui qui se sera opposé à lui en procès”

(whoever will be opposed to him in a case)

The context is that Joash (or Gideon, depending on how one reads a previous variation unit) is challenging people not to defend or contend for Baal and saying that whoever does so will die
in the morning. Thus, the sense of the passage makes clear that what is needed here is a verb of legal defence, not attack. This makes the readings of A, especially AII, decidedly *dificilior*, which makes it much more likely that one of them is initial. The B-reading is then a content change to restore sense to the passage. Which of the A readings is initial? AII’s reading is arguably even more difficult (because it has minimal legal, forensic sense), which suggests it is even more likely to be initial. 02’s reading is presumably then an attempt to conform the Hebrew by adding a forensic element to the Greek verb. The case of the pronoun was then changed to match the change of verb.

01, 03: linguistic improvement (addition of ἐὰν)
01, 03: content change.
02: conforming to Hebrew.

A

θανατωθήτω
02, A: ἀποθανέται

The A-reading is a future indicative, but B’s is a third person imperative. Although they are cognate, the two verbs are different (ὑποθνήσκω and θανατάω). It is not meaningful to compare to the Hebrew, which does not have comparable structures here. The B-reading is more linguistically sophisticated and accurate to the context, since Joash/Gideon is stating what should happen, not what will. Quite possibly the reason for the change of verb stem as well as form is because the third person imperative passive is easier to form with θανατάω, since it does not have a theta at the end of the stem. This of course makes the A-reading more likely to be initial.

01, 03: linguistic improvement.

A

εἰ θεός ἐστιν
02, AII, OL: εἰ ἐστιν θεός αὐτὸς
AI, Syr-Hex: εἰ θεός αὐτὸς ἐστιν (Syr-Hex obelises ἐστιν)

MT: אֶמְצָרָן

The αὐτὸς, wherever it is placed, is not in the Hebrew, but adds force to the Greek. B has clearly omitted it with reference to the Hebrew. The word order is less certain, but the majority of external evidence seems to place ἐστιν at the end. The most plausible explanation for 02’s change of word-order is emphasis (“if he is God Himself”).

347
02: linguistic improvement.
01, 03: conforming to Hebrew.

A

δικαζέσθω αὐτῷ

02, A-groups: ἐκδικήσει αὐτὸν

Some manuscripts, across the groups, make the form of αὐτός into the corresponding form of ἑαυτὸν

MT: ἠ ὑγ

What is clearly needed in context is a verb of legal advocacy or pleading, which δικάζωμαι is (LSJ, LEH, GELS). ἐκδικέω is more a verb of punishment or vengeance, which is also suitable. Both seem sufficiently suitable and reflective of the Hebrew (because all three are forensic terms), that we have to categorise this as lexical variation.

02: lexical variation.

B

καθεῖλεν

A-groups: κατέσκαψεν

01, 03: lexical variation.

A

All adds at the end of the verse: καὶ ὑμεῖς τί ἐπισυνίστασθε αὐτῷ;

Harlé translates the phrase “et pourquoi faites-vous cause commune avec lui?”, “and why do you make common cause with him?”. The αὐτῷ is presumably Baal. By the general pattern, it seems all the other groups are conforming to the Hebrew by omitting it. The slight oddness of the phrase in context explains why it survived only in All, the group most likely to preserve divergencies from the Hebrew.

All pandects: conform to the Hebrew.

B

32:

Ἰαρβααλ λέγων Δικασάσθω ἐν αὐτῷ ὁ Βααλ

01, B minuscules: Αρβααλ λέγων Δικασάσθω ἕαυτῷ ὁ Βααλ.
02, AIII, other A manuscripts, OL: Δικαστήριον τοῦ Βααλ.

Some AI manuscripts, Syr-Hex: Ίαρβααλ λέγων Δικαστήριον τοῦ Βααλ. (Ἰαρβααλ λέγων obelised in Syr-Hex)

OL adds at end of verse: et vocavit illud in die illa Ieroboan dicens Iudicet sibi Bahal quoniam deposuerunt altarium eius

MT: יַעֲרוּל לאָלָר נָרַב מַף

The citation of 01 is according to CSP. The page, as it can be seen on the website, is too waterlogged to see anything.

This whole verse is made complex, because it begins in all Greek witnesses with καὶ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτό, “and he called it”. The Hebrew is יָרְבָּאָל. The Greek interprets this as referring to the naming of a thing (because αὐτό is unambiguously neuter). Linguistically, this is an entirely valid reading of the Hebrew, but it is surely more natural to read the Hebrew as referring to the naming of a person, Gideon. This is how all of the fifty-one English translations available at biblegateway.com (n.d.) interpret it. It is not entirely clear what object or thing is being named, on the Greek reading of the passage. Harlé suggests that the most natural antecedent of αὐτό is the altar, but one would hardly give something a new name if it has just been destroyed. Since the neuter is universal in the Greek tradition and in OL, it is probably a misunderstanding by the OG translator and as such it is the initial text.

The absence of Ίαρβααλ λέγων is likely to be initial on external evidence and lectio difficilior. B thus follows the Hebrew in adding it. The same can be said about whether the name is explained with a noun or a verb.

01, 03: conforming to Hebrew (twice).

A

καθημέρηθη

02, AIII, some other A manuscripts: κατέσκαψεν
Before concluding the entire dissertation, some specific comments on Judges are needed.

It is clear that significant lexicographical research is necessary for serious advances in the textual criticism of Greek Judges. Much insight would be gained if we could tell why B often substituted a word in A for an apparent synonym, e.g. the difficulty of deciding between καρπός and ἐκφόρτων in 6:4. Ross (2018) treats this issue at length, resolves three examples of lexical variation and provides a helpful methodology for resolving others, but, as the above analysis demonstrates, there are many more instances to which his method must be applied.

This analysis of chapter six also suggests that it is unhelpful to think of two texts of Judges, one a free original translation and the other a literal revision. Firstly, the characterisations, “free” and “literal”, are problematic. Many scholars argue that the language of the LXX is not a stilted and unnatural rendering of the Hebrew, but is in fact standard Greek of the period (Lee 1983 and 2018; Evans 2001 for verbal syntax; Aitken 2014 for LXX vocabulary in Greek inscriptions). Mulroney (2016) has made this point in more detail in relation to Habbakuk and Dhont (2018) in relation to Job, which includes both Hebrew interference and highly literary Greek. A particularly interesting example is the frequent use of καὶ γε in some books and some forms of LXX. This has become so well known as a literalistic rendering of זָמַל that it has given its name to a particular translation tradition associated with literalism. However, Aitken (2015b) has argued that it would have been regarded as well-written, elegant Greek. As Dhont (2019, 396) puts it: “there seems little point in trying to conceptualize the translation process in terms of a choice along a single axis, from ‘literal’ to ‘free’ or vice versa”. With regard to Judges specifically, this means that whatever category we want to use to describe how B differs from A, it should not be literalness. It is far from proven that the majority of B’s lexical changes were motivated by literalness and Ross argues in that in at least three cases they were not (Ross 2018, especially 205-07).

Secondly, however exactly the difference between the groups is characterised, their boundaries are more complex than a simple binary. 02 stands somewhere between 01 and 03 on the one hand and AII on the other. There are not even five texts (OL, AI, AII, AIII and B), increasing
in literalness. The manuscripts cross group-boundaries and the A manuscripts Hebraise against B far too often for us to be so simplistic. It is more helpful to say that there is a gradation, from OG, which is often, but not always preserved in the OL and/or AII manuscripts, through the moderately edited 02 to the more thoroughly amended B-text. Even within B, 01 and 03 often appear to be less heavily adapted than the B minuscules. This has interesting consequences: 01 and 03 are the oldest witnesses to B. It is possible that the B-archetype is only one or two stages of copying older. This means that, in Judges, 01 and 03 may be, if not sibling-manuscripts, at least close cousins. 01 and 03 agreed against all or almost all other witnesses six times in the portion surveyed (the number of ἀναβαίνω in v.3, the added μη in v.13, the article with ἱσχύι in v.14, the absence of μοι in v.18, the pronoun in v.22, the change of subject in v.31). That is six times in only thirty-two verses. This of course raises the probability they share an original provenance or at least have a closely related story, which increases the plausibility that they were both in Constantine’s fifty.

Let us now synthesise the results of the whole thesis and draw some conclusions.
8: Results and Conclusions

In this chapter, I tabulate the numbers of each different type of variant in each manuscript and book. I then summarise and discuss the results.

Results Tables

I now present tables of how many variants of each different type appear in each manuscript in each book. The first number in each box is the absolute number of variants in the portions of the manuscript examined and the second is the mean number of variants per ten verses. The absolute numbers for 04 are noticeably lower, because, of course, less of 04 survives, but the means take this into account, because the mean number of variants in 04 is calculated over the number of verses surviving in 04, rounding to whole verses (i.e. 71 in John, 101 in Romans, 55 in Revelation; none of 04 survives in Judges and the relevant chapters survive completely in Sirach). The means are all to two decimal places and the mean of the means in the right hand column is based on these approximated figures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Level</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>Mean per MS per 10 vv.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transcriptional Error/A</td>
<td>6  0.58</td>
<td>6  0.58</td>
<td>8  0.77</td>
<td>4  0.50</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcriptional Error/B</td>
<td>2  0.19</td>
<td>2  0.19</td>
<td>4  0.38</td>
<td>2  0.20</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcriptional Error/C</td>
<td>2  0.19</td>
<td>3  0.29</td>
<td>2  0.19</td>
<td>3  0.30</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Transcriptional Errors</td>
<td>10  0.96</td>
<td>11  1.06</td>
<td>14  1.35</td>
<td>9  0.89</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Improvement/A</td>
<td>5  0.48</td>
<td>7  0.67</td>
<td>7  0.67</td>
<td>4  0.40</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Improvement/B</td>
<td>3  0.29</td>
<td>2  0.19</td>
<td>6  0.58</td>
<td>4  0.40</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Improvement/C</td>
<td>2  0.19</td>
<td>3  0.29</td>
<td>1  0.10</td>
<td>1  0.10</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Linguistic Improvements</td>
<td>10  0.96</td>
<td>12  1.15</td>
<td>14  1.35</td>
<td>9  0.89</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Non-Improvement/A</td>
<td>1  0.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Non-Improvement/B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Non-Improvement/C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1  0.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Linguistic Non-Improvements</td>
<td>1  0.10</td>
<td>1  0.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonisation/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5  0.48</td>
<td>5  0.48</td>
<td>4  0.40</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonisation/B</td>
<td>4  0.38</td>
<td>4  0.38</td>
<td>5  0.48</td>
<td>3  0.30</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonisation/C</td>
<td>1  0.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1  0.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Harmonisations</td>
<td>5  0.48</td>
<td>9  0.87</td>
<td>11  1.06</td>
<td>7  0.69</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Change/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3  0.29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Change/B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2  0.19</td>
<td>1  0.10</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Change/C</td>
<td>1  0.10</td>
<td>1  0.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Content Changes</td>
<td>1  0.10</td>
<td>1  0.10</td>
<td>5  0.48</td>
<td>1  0.10</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Variations</td>
<td>27  2.60</td>
<td>34  3.27</td>
<td>44  4.23</td>
<td>26  2.57</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category/Level</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Mean per MS per 10 vv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcriptional Error/A</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>6 0.61 4 0.56 1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcriptional Error/B</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>5 0.51 3 0.42 0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcriptional Error/C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>5 0.51 2 0.28 0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Transcriptional Errors</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>16 1.62 9 1.27 2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Improvement/A</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>7 0.71 7 0.99 1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Improvement/B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>5 0.51 4 0.56 0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Improvement/C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 0.42 0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Linguistic Improvements</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>12 1.21 14 1.97 2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Non-Improvement/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10 0 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Non-Improvement/B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.20 0 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Non-Improvement/C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Linguistic Non-Improvements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonisation/A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0 0 4 0.56 0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonisation/B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>2 0.20 2 0.28 0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonisation/C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Harmonisations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2 0.20 6 0.85 0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Change/A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>2 0.20 1 0.14 0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Change/B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1 0.10 1 0.14 0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Change/C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Content Changes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>3 0.30 2 0.28 0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Variations</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>36 3.64 31 4.37 6.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revelation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Level</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>Mean per MS per 10 vv.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transcriptional Error/A</td>
<td>29 3.77</td>
<td>12 1.56</td>
<td>17 3.09</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcriptional Error/B</td>
<td>6 0.78</td>
<td>7 0.91</td>
<td>4 0.73</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcriptional Error/C</td>
<td>4 0.52</td>
<td>5 0.65</td>
<td>2 0.36</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Transcriptional Errors</td>
<td>39 5.06</td>
<td>24 3.12</td>
<td>23 4.18</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Improvement/A</td>
<td>19 2.47</td>
<td>14 1.82</td>
<td>10 1.82</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Improvement/B</td>
<td>9 1.17</td>
<td>6 0.78</td>
<td>4 0.73</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Improvement/C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 0.39</td>
<td>2 0.36</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Linguistic Improvements</td>
<td>28 3.64</td>
<td>23 2.99</td>
<td>16 2.91</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Non-Improvement/A</td>
<td>18 2.34</td>
<td>2 0.26</td>
<td>3 0.55</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Non-Improvement/B</td>
<td>2 0.26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Non-Improvement/C</td>
<td>2 0.26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Linguistic Non-Improvements</td>
<td>22 2.86</td>
<td>2 0.26</td>
<td>3 0.55</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonisation/A</td>
<td>12 1.56</td>
<td>2 0.26</td>
<td>2 0.36</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonisation/B</td>
<td>6 0.78</td>
<td>7 0.91</td>
<td>2 0.36</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonisation/C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Harmonisations</td>
<td>18 2.34</td>
<td>10 1.30</td>
<td>4 0.73</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Change/A</td>
<td>4 0.52</td>
<td>1 0.13</td>
<td>1 0.18</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Change/B</td>
<td>1 0.13</td>
<td>1 0.13</td>
<td>1 0.18</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Change/C</td>
<td>1 0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 0.18</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Content Changes</td>
<td>6 0.78</td>
<td>2 0.26</td>
<td>3 0.55</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Variations</td>
<td>113 14.68</td>
<td>61 7.92</td>
<td>49 8.91</td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sirach:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Level:</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>Mean per MS per 10 vv.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transcriptional Error/A</td>
<td>9 1.76</td>
<td>3 0.59</td>
<td>3 0.59</td>
<td>7 1.37</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcriptional Error/B</td>
<td>1 0.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 0.20</td>
<td>1 0.20</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcriptional Error/C</td>
<td>3 0.59</td>
<td>2 0.39</td>
<td>3 0.59</td>
<td>1 0.20</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Transcriptional Errors</strong></td>
<td>13 2.55</td>
<td>5 0.98</td>
<td>7 1.37</td>
<td>9 1.76</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Improvement/A</td>
<td>6 1.18</td>
<td>11 2.16</td>
<td>5 0.98</td>
<td>5 0.98</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Improvement/B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 0.59</td>
<td>3 0.59</td>
<td>3 0.59</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Improvement/C</td>
<td>1 0.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 0.20</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Linguistic Improvements</strong></td>
<td>7 1.37</td>
<td>14 2.75</td>
<td>8 1.57</td>
<td>9 1.76</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Non-Improvment/A</td>
<td>1 0.20</td>
<td>1 0.20</td>
<td>2 0.39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Non-Improvement/B</td>
<td>1 0.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Non-Improvement/C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Linguistic Non-Improvements</strong></td>
<td>2 0.39</td>
<td>1 0.20</td>
<td>2 0.39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conforming to Hebrew/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conforming to Hebrew/B</td>
<td>1 0.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conforming to Hebrew/C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Conforming to Hebrew</strong></td>
<td>1 0.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Change/A</td>
<td>5 0.98</td>
<td>2 0.39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 0.59</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Change/B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 0.20</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Change/C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 0.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Content Changes</strong></td>
<td>5 0.98</td>
<td>2 0.39</td>
<td>1 0.20</td>
<td>4 0.78</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Variations</strong></td>
<td>28 5.49</td>
<td>22 4.31</td>
<td>18 3.53</td>
<td>22 4.31</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category/Level:</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Mean per MS per 10 vv.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcriptional Error/A</td>
<td>15.469</td>
<td>17.531</td>
<td>17.531</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcriptional Error/B</td>
<td>8.250</td>
<td>4.125</td>
<td>6.188</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcriptional Error/C</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Transcriptional Errors</strong></td>
<td>24.750</td>
<td>22.688</td>
<td>24.750</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Improvement/A</td>
<td>20.625</td>
<td>6.188</td>
<td>21.656</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Improvement/B</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>3.094</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Improvement/C</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>3.094</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Linguistic Improvements</strong></td>
<td>23.719</td>
<td>12.375</td>
<td>24.750</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Non-Improvement/A</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Non-Improvement/B</td>
<td>3.094</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.094</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Non-Improvement/C</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Linguistic Non-Improvements</strong></td>
<td>5.156</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.125</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonisation/A</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonisation/B</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonisation/C</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Harmonisations</strong></td>
<td>3.094</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>3.094</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conforming to Hebrew/A</td>
<td>59.184</td>
<td>17.531</td>
<td>59.184</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conforming to Hebrew/B</td>
<td>9.281</td>
<td>5.156</td>
<td>9.281</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conforming to Hebrew/C</td>
<td>3.094</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>4.125</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Conforming to Hebrew</strong></td>
<td>71.221</td>
<td>24.750</td>
<td>70.225</td>
<td>17.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubling/A</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubling/B</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubling/C</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Doublings</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical Variation/A</td>
<td>14.438</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>15.469</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical Variation/B</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical Variation/C</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Lexical Variations</strong></td>
<td>17.531</td>
<td>3.094</td>
<td>18.563</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Change/A</td>
<td>6.188</td>
<td>3.094</td>
<td>6.188</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Change/B</td>
<td>3.094</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.094</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Change/C</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Content Changes</strong></td>
<td>11.344</td>
<td>3.094</td>
<td>11.344</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Variations</strong></td>
<td>154.4813</td>
<td>68.2031</td>
<td>154.4813</td>
<td>38.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observations

We can make a number of observations from this data.

Beginning with Romans, 01 and 04 appear to preserve the initial text most consistently, 02 less so and 03 less still. 03 departs from the initial text almost twice as often as 04. These comments apply to most of the types of variation as well as to variation in general (e.g. 01 and 04 have the fewest transcriptional errors and linguistic improvements as well as the fewest variants overall). The substantial majority of variation from the initial text is due to transcriptional error or linguistic improvement (though in 03 harmonisation is also a major factor). In general, all our manuscripts seem to preserve the initial text of Romans relatively well: there are only, on average, about three variants, of any type, in every ten verses.

In John, the relative “success” of the different manuscripts at preserving the initial text differs somewhat. Here, 03 and 04 preserve the initial text most often; 02 has about twice as many variants and 01 about three times as many. Once again, these comments apply not just to variation in general, but also to the major types of variation, except that 01 and 02 have approximately similar rates of linguistic improvement. As in Romans, transcriptional errors and linguistic improvements are the dominant forms of variation, but content changes play a more significant role than the they do in Romans. Apart from 03, our manuscripts contain more variants in John than in Romans and the mean rate of variation, across all four manuscripts, is more than twice as high. We can say that the pandects are, in general, less “reliable” tradents of John than of Romans.

In Revelation, 01 varies from the initial text significantly more than either 02 or 04. Although transcriptional errors and linguistic improvements account for most of the variants, in 01 there are a significant number of linguistic non-improvements. Across all the pandects, the rate of variation in Revelation is significantly higher than John, so it is significantly less well-preserved.

In Sirach, none of the pandects stands out as preserving the initial text significantly more consistently than any other. Transcriptional errors and linguistic improvements are still the most common forms of variation, but content changes are marginally more numerous than in other books (relatively to the low number of variations in Sirach in general). 01 has a large
number of transcriptional errors and 02 a large number of linguistic improvements. 04 may have an artificially low number of variants in Sirach, because there are many illegible readings in 04’s Sirach and I do not count illegible readings as variants. It is difficult to take this into account by reducing the number of verses over which I calculate the mean number of variants (as I do with lacunae), because legibility is less binary than lacunae: quite literally, lacunae are clear cut but illegibility is a grey area. Therefore it is difficult to calculate exactly how many verses are affected.

Judges differs significantly from the other books considered, not least because of the importance of the Hebrew. 02 has far fewer variations than 01 and 03. This is in no small part because it has far fewer corrections to the Hebrew, but this is not the only reason. Even without the “Hebrew factor”, 02 would have about half the number of variations found in either 01 or 03. Judges seems less affected by harmonisation than the other books: its scribes and editors seem to have given so much attention to the Hebrew that they gave little thought to context or to other literary works. Lexical variation is uniquely present in Judges, because, of all the books examined, only in Judges do the pandects preserve a text that is the result of significant revision.

Thus, every book has a different manuscript as its most accurate tradent. For Romans, it is 01 and 04, for John 03 and 04, for Revelation 02 and 04 and for Judges 02. In Sirach all four are close together, such that although 03 has fewest variants on average, there is not a marked difference. This is an important finding of this research: in the most basic textual characteristic of accurately representing the initial text, each pandect varies significantly between books. The arguable exception to this is 04, which has high rates of preserving the initial text in every book considered here where it is extant.

On the other hand, the relative frequencies of different types of variation differ little between manuscripts and books: for most books and most manuscripts, transcriptional errors and linguistic improvements predominate, whilst other types of variation are much rarer. The exceptions are Revelation in 01, which has a relatively high number of linguistic non-improvements. In Judges, all the manuscripts (but 01 and 03 more so than 02) have a high proportion of correction to the Hebrew. It is problematic to compare Judges to most of the other books studied here, because John, Romans and Revelation did not have a Hebrew Vorlage (even if, on some theories, some of their sources might have done). Thus, although rates of
variation overall vary significantly between manuscripts and between books, rates of particular types of variation are fairly consistent between manuscripts and books, relative to the overall amount of variation. Although the fundamental textual characteristic of reliability varies significantly between manuscripts and books, more specific characteristics, i.e. propensity to particular types of change, vary little.

For most manuscripts, most books and most types of variation, A grades are more numerous than B or C grades. This gives added confidence in our conclusions, since it suggests that they are built on mostly reliable data-points.

τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν πρὸς τῶτα; These findings have considerable implications for how we reconstruct both the text of the Greek Bible and its history.

The Pandects as Tradents of the Greek Bible

At the beginning of this dissertation, I quoted Kurt Aland gently mocking Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort for treating 01 and 03 like guiding stars (Aland 1979, 11; p.5 of this dissertation). Forty years after Aland’s joke, what have we learned in this thesis about the value of the pandects?

Based on my results, the value of the pandects for reconstructing the initial text varies significantly from book to book. For Romans, 01 and 04 may be guiding stars, but not 02 and 03. In John, 03 and 04 are the most reliable guides; in Revelation, it is 02 and 04; in Sirach they are roughly equal; in Judges 02 is the most important guide. Of course, Westcott and Hort (1882, 1.260) acknowledged this, noting that in Revelation “familiar documents assume a new position”. Across all the books studied, 04 varies least from the initial text and in that sense is the “most reliable”. It is therefore unfortunate that it has received the least scholarly attention.

Although the pandects depart from the initial text to varying degrees relative to each other, in absolute terms, they generally preserve it well. When we consider the figures for mean rate of change, of any type, per ten verses, the figure is comfortably under 10.0 for most of the pandects in most books. In other words, in many verses one or more pandects present the initial text. The exception to this is Judges, but this is because the text of all three surviving pandects is the result of extensive editorial work, of which we have evidence external to the pandects.
(see the introduction to the chapter on Judges). In Sirach and Romans, for all the pandects, this figure is under 5.0 (except Sirach in 01, where it is 5.49): this means that for the majority of verses, the pandects have the initial text. It is fair to say that, in general, the text of the pandects closely resembles the initial text.

This is consistent with the generally high value given to the pandects in the Text und Textwert (TuT) volumes. TuT calculates how often a whole variety of manuscripts agree with each other and with the most recent NA text at a variety of Teststellen, chosen for their significance in profiling manuscripts. It is not meaningful to compare my results with the percentage agreements in TuT, because I do not use their Teststellen. Instead, I use complete chapters. Although this means I cover only limited parts of the books I investigate, it does at least mean I avoid the assumptions which must be built in when selecting Teststellen (Lembke 2012). However my results are confirmed by the fact that TuT consistently ranks the pandects among the manuscripts closest to the NA text, which one presumes at least approximates the initial text (though of course this assumption is exactly what makes Min and Barbara Aland’s arguments circular, which is why I only use TuT as an extra added confirmation to my results).

In Revelation, the three extant pandects are the manuscripts which agree first, second and third most with the NA text (Lembke, Müller and Schmid 2017, 422). In Romans, they rank only behind three small papyri with one or two Teststellen each (Aland 1991, 1.172). In John, 03 is fourth position, 04 seventh, 01 twenty-third and 02 twenty-sixth (Aland, Aland and Wachtel 2005, 1.33-34). This confirms the high value my results encourage us to place on the pandects. The fact that our two differing methods come to similar conclusions vindicates both the conclusion and each method.

The general reliability of the pandects varies more between books than it does between manuscripts: in other words, although, in each book, the pandects have different characteristics to each other, nevertheless the more dramatic differences are between what they all do in some books and what they all do in others. The mean number of variant readings, per ten verses, of all types across all four pandects, varies dramatically between books: in Romans it is 3.17; in

---

1 Lembke (2012, 42) explains how he selected Teststellen for Revelation: “Charakteristische Stellen, an denen Textformen differieren, ermöglichen ergiebige Zuordnung”. In other words, he selects Stellen, which allow manuscripts to be profiled with greater precision into groups he has already identified. The Teststellen method is an enormously powerful tool, but it works most effectively when bringing precision to a textual tradition where the manuscript groups are already understood in broad brushstrokes. Throughout this thesis, I have stressed that I want to come to the pandects with minimal assumptions about where they fit in the tradition.
Sirach it is slightly higher, at 4.41; in John it is higher still, at 6.55; Revelation has yet greater variation, at 10.50; Judges has the most variation at 38.86. The difference in text quality between books is greater than the difference between pandects. This means that it is misleading to say that, for example, the text of 02 is better in Revelation than it is in the Gospels (as is suggested by, e.g., Koester 2014, 145-46; Karrer and Labahn 2012, 13; Karrer 2009, 374; Cavallo 1967, 80). In my results, 02 averaged 7.92 variants per ten verses in Revelation and 7.58 in John. In other words, its quality in the two works is virtually the same. Its quality relative to the other pandects is, as I have noted, much higher in Revelation, but this becomes inconsequential when considered in the light of the large differences in the average text-quality of each book. Similarly, Fee (1993a) argues that the first part of John is “Western”. He is working from a model of Hortian text-types, where the Western text preserves the initial less often than the Neutral or Byzantine, so, if Fee was right, we would expect John to carry the initial text less in 01 than in other books. In John, 01 varies from the initial text on average 10.61 times per ten verses. In Romans and Revelation, the equivalent figures are 2.60 and 14.68. In other words, although 01 does vary significantly more in John than in Romans, it varies less in John than in Revelation. Fee’s “Western element” in the early chapters of John in 01 may be less significant than the more widespread textual uncertainties surrounding Revelation. The different pandects have a similar text quality within a given book, but the different books vary significantly in text quality within each pandect.

This should not surprise us, since the pandects all come from approximately the same time and culture. As I have argued in chapter 2, pandect manufacture was rare and it would take the specific combination of considerable material wealth and interest in Christian literature to motivate someone to produce one, so all fourth-sixth-century pandect-makers are likely to have these characteristics in common. On the other hand, the books of the Greek Bible have very different histories. It is unsurprising that there is on average greater variation in the text of Revelation than Romans, because the status of Revelation in the canon was more debated over a longer period, so scribes may have copied it with less reverence. It is interesting that Judges has so much more variation than Sirach. Even though both are translations of a Hebrew text, Sirach appears to have been much less revised to the Hebrew parent than Judges (in the pandects at least). This is surprising, because one would expect that scribes would more willingly alter a collection of aphorisms, where individual sayings can be added, removed or changed with minimal effect on the overall work, than a narrative.
Some particular comments about Judges are in order. In general, Greek Judges has the most varied and uncertain text of any of the books surveyed. General rates of variation, of any type, are significantly higher than in any of the other books. However, although differences are numerous, they are also small scale: every verse in one witness is recognisable as the same verse in most others.

The higher rate of variation in Judges is more than can be accounted for by the fact that there was a discernible revision of Greek Judges, producing the text we call B. This accounts for the high rates of conformity to the Hebrew in 01 and 03, but not for all variations. Even variations in 02 are more frequent than in other books. Lexical variation is much higher than in other books and this kind of variation is difficult to understand adequately without significant advances in Koine lexicography (Ross 2018; p.350 of this dissertation). Importantly, in all manuscripts, transcriptional errors are more common than in other books. A revision should if anything reduce transcriptional errors. The high rate of transcriptional errors suggests that scribal changes, not made by editors deliberately revising, but by scribes copying and making small changes along the way, were higher in Judges than in other books. Of course, there is a much greater time gap for variation to enter the tradition between the original translation of OG Judges and the pandects than is the case for the pandects and the NT books, but this point does not explain why Judges has so much more variation than Sirach. For whatever reason, Judges has spawned a chaotic textual tradition, at micro- and macro-level. It is noteworthy also that there are relatively high numbers of variation-units rated B or C: perhaps ironically, Judges was the book in which it was often impossible to judge confidently.

These findings make for interesting comparisons with Wevers’ work on the textual characteristics of 02 and 03 in the Pentateuch. Wevers argues that both preserve the initial text well in Genesis (1974, 228). The same is true in Exodus, but it is harder to be sure, because no witnesses to Exodus are sufficiently old to allow comparison (Wevers 1992, 81). Also in Exodus, Wevers (1992, 86) notes that 03 has a number of lexical variants, as it does in Judges. In Leviticus, Wevers (1986, 62-73, 71) argues that both 02 and 03 are accurate guides to the initial text and probably closely related, but 02 has more divergences. In Numbers, the situation is an interesting reversal of Judges: 03 is the much more accurate tradent, because 02 is more heavily Hebraised (Wevers 1982, 70-85). In Deuteronomy, Wevers (1978, 48-51) only discusses 03 and concludes that it is a relatively unimportant witness to OG, because there are also earlier manuscripts. Importantly for present purposes, the textual characteristics of the
pandects differ across the different books of the Pentateuch and in none of those books do we find a situation particularly similar to Judges. Although, in all the books surveyed, the pandects are sufficiently reliable tradents to be important for anyone interested in the initial text, nevertheless their textual characteristics vary widely between books. Wevers’ work thus reinforces my own in that it highlights the pandects’ general reliability and textual heterogeneity.

Can we say anything more specific, about which particular ways the pandects might guide us to the initial text? In the introduction to this thesis, I noted Wasserman’s (2014, 580; pp.5-6 of this thesis) image of reasoned eclecticism as a spiral: as we look at the readings of particular manuscripts, at particular variation units, we can begin to profile the textual characteristics of those manuscripts. This then allows us to establish the initial text at more complex variation units, allowing us in turn to see how different manuscripts behave at these more complex variation units. This then deepens our knowledge of their textual characteristics. While this might appear to be circular, it is in fact a spiral, because with each turn round our knowledge advances. How then do these results help us advance along this spiral?

As noted above, the pattern of what type of change predominates is fairly constant between books and across the pandects, with a few exceptions. In general, transcriptional errors and linguistic improvements are the most widespread. Harmonisations, linguistic non-improvements and content changes are all much less common, with the precise relations varying slightly between books and manuscripts. In Judges, all the pandects that survive (i.e. 01, 02 and 03) show strong influence by the Hebrew. Although 02 is markedly less influenced by the Hebrew text than 01 and 03, it still has more corrections to the Hebrew, on average per ten verses, than any other pandect has for any other type of change. As noted above, this is probably because of significant revision, subsequent to the initial translation. Kreuzer (2015) argues that LXX in 03 is heavily Hebraised and influenced by kaige in many books and may not be as reliable a guide to OG as it has often been seen.

It might appear that my findings clash with those of Jongkind (2007), who worked on 01 and tested a wide sample of passages, across the canon and across the range of scribes who contributed to the codex. He noted: “Harmonisation to the immediate and intermediate context does occur frequently” (2007, 245). He finds that Scribe D harmonises on average 11.3 times per ten folios in the Psalms and 26.7 times in Luke, while Scribe A does so 28.6 times in the
Psalms, 10.4 times in Paul and 19.3 times in Luke. He also has figures for Scribe D in Chronicles, but this is complicated by the way Chronicles is corrected in 01 (2007, 243-44). These data are in fact less different to mine than might appear. Jongkind is averaging amount of variation over ten folios, not ten verses, which will lead to much higher figures. He also uses several different categories for several different types of (in my terms) transcriptional error (e.g. “Nonsense word forms”, “Nonsense meanings”). When these are taken together, they outnumber both harmonisations and content changes, so our results are in fact quite similar. This is interesting, given that Jongkind used the singular-readings method. The fact that we agree arguably vindicates both methods, since it is unlikely that two significantly flawed methods would yield similar, and false, conclusions from similar evidence. Moreover, Paulson (2018) examines Matthew in the pandects (and 05 and 032) using the singular method and came to similar conclusions as Jongkind: he notes considerable transcriptional error and harmonisation (Paulson 2018, 125-32).

There is a possible tension between my results and those of Hernández (2006), who investigated the pandects in Revelation using the singular method. Although he also found that transcriptional errors predominated, he found relatively few linguistic changes; Hernández (2006, 193) also notes that the pandects harmonised “quite a bit”. He found a pattern of theological changes in 01, which he argued were anti-Arian. The differences between us arguably reveal differences in method. A concentration on singular readings is highly unlikely to “notice” linguistic improvements, since several scribes would likely make such changes to the initial text independently and once made they are likely to be copied. This is an excellent example of the weakness in the singular method identified by Strutwolf (2005, 146-47): certain kinds of change are likely to be copied by many subsequent scribes, which makes them very important for the history of the tradition and undetectable by the singular method.

An important characteristic, shared by all the pandects, in all books, is that they contain few content changes. These are much less frequent than transcriptional errors or linguistic improvements and often less frequent than harmonisations as well. Interestingly, Royse comes to the same conclusion from his use of singular readings to assess scribal habits of papyri (2008, 738). The fact that he comes to the same conclusion, looking at different manuscripts and using a different method, may suggest that this is a general characteristic of early Christian manuscripts. This may at first sight appear to be counter-evidence to the models of early Christian copying proposed by Ehrman (influentially 1993), Haines-Eitzen (2000) and Parker
especially 1997), all of whom argue that scribes of Biblical texts frequently changed their texts in ways which affected its meaning. However, it is worth noting here that although these writers give the rhetorical impression that they regard content changes to be frequent, they refrain from making specific numerical claims about how frequent they are, relative to other types of change: Ehrman (1993, 276) freely admits they are among the rarer kind of change.

The frequency of content changes in the NT text is an issue loaded with ideological baggage and often clouded with rhetoric. It has theological, cultural, even political, implications for debates about the “authority” and “reliability” of the Christian Bible. Is the NT as we have it today knowably and reliably the same as that written in the first century, or is it in fact the product of many scribes over many centuries, with frequent and significant changes since the first century? Once the rhetoric is “turned down”, I suspect most scholars would agree with a middle-position, which my research supports: theological changes can certainly be observed, but they are relatively rare compared to other changes and we can normally easily recognise what the earliest reading was. In none of the pandects, nowhere in the canon, are theological changes even nearly as frequent as linguistic improvements or transcriptional errors: scribes were more concerned to tidy up the grammar of the NT than its theology and they made careless “typos” more often than they did either. Even though I presume in favour of transcriptional errors when in doubt, the disparity between very frequent transcriptional errors and rare content changes is too great to be explained by this alone. The vast majority of all the variation units I have analysed, including content changes, are rated A, suggesting there is little significant doubt about the initial text or the type of change. Ehrman agrees: although he discusses interesting theological changes at length, he concludes that they are rare (1993, 276). He writes assuming that the initial text can normally easily be recognised, since that is the only way we can know that it has been changed (he stresses his debt to traditional textual criticism in Ehrman 1993, in the non-paginated introduction). On the other hand, confessional scholars who are respectful of the evidence would agree that deliberate, content-related changes did occur, even though they are usually sufficiently rare and easy to recognise that they do not obscure the content of the initial text (e.g. Gurry and Hixson 2019 and Kruger 2012b).

We can also observe a number of minor, specific, textual proclivities, exhibited by particular pandects in particular books. I noted in Revelation that omission of articles is common in 01. In Romans, 02 frequently changes connecting words, especially introducing δέ. This is seen to some extent also in John: 02 adds δέ at 1:40 but also omits it in 20:17. 01 omits pleonastic
verbs of speaking twice in John 1 (vv.20, 32) and seems to make many more mistakes and changes in chapter 20 than earlier, perhaps a sign of scribal fatigue. These minor trends are fascinating, but they are frustratingly difficult to “pin down” consistently across the different books, which arguably underlines the impression that the scribes of each pandect, for all their diversity, were at least aiming to produce a uniform text.

This study has shown that the pandects are an important resource to anyone trying to reconstruct the earliest form of the text of the Greek Bible and that they give should give us relative confidence in our reconstructions of the initial text. There is a potential danger of circularity here, of course. It is a very similar circularity to that which I earlier noted in the approach of Min and Barbara Aland. Often, when attempting to decide the reading of the initial text, I have given some weight to the reading of the pandects, because they are early manuscripts and are therefore separated by a relatively small gap of time from the initial text. However, age of course in no way, by itself, guarantees that a manuscript will preserve the initial text (Lanier 2019). In his discussion of the age criterion, Lanier (2019) argues that the textual quality of a manuscript is more important than its age, as a criterion for judging readings. I wholeheartedly concur, but, in this thesis, I investigate textual quality and therefore cannot assume it. I must, however, make full use of the external criteria which are methodologically open to me. Age is surely one of those. Other things being equal, age of witnesses surely is an argument in favour of a reading, because changes will have had less time to enter the tradition. Often, of course, other things are not equal, however, and in those circumstances, I have not simply bowed to the pandects because they are old. I have rather tried to weigh a whole range of evidence, internal and external, at each variation unit, of which age has only been one. The only criteria I have ignored are those which would beg my question, that is, beliefs and assumptions about which manuscripts are “good” and which are not. If my method is valid (and I have argued that it is) and if I have applied it accurately, consistently and fairly at every variation unit (and I have argued at each variation unit that I have), then the conclusion follows that in general the pandects often carry the initial text. From now on, any textual critic attempting to reconstruct the initial text can reasonably give particular weight to the pandects. I have, in an important sense, provided evidence for what I refused to assume.
The Pandects as Artefacts of Christian History

The pandects are valuable evidence for “new philology”. They have much to tell us about scribal and copying practices in the fourth, fifth and (depending on how 04 is dated) sixth centuries. Much work has been done on scribes and copying prior to the fourth century. Haines-Eitzen (2000) has argued that significant changes were common and that scribes were editors as well as copyists. Mugridge (2016), on the other hand, has argued that most Christian texts were copied by professional copyists, quite probably not Christians, who were uninterested in the content and so probably changed little. Jongkind (2007, 246) argues that it is likely scribal practices differed little before and after the mid-fourth-century, because his finds in 01 are similar to those of Royse for the early papyri. My research provides evidence for the copying of a particular group of manuscripts from the fourth-sixth century. Specifically, the pandects are evidence of careful, organised and accurate scribal activity in the period. They were likely costly and time-consuming to produce and the fact that they carry the initial text with fairly consistent reliability suggests that the copying received similar care.

This all sits well with my argument in chapter two, tying 01 to Constantine and 03 to Constantine or Constans. For these newly Christian rulers, good government of the Empire meant good government of the Church, which appears to have included the provision of beautiful, well-made and accurately-copied Bibles. When the Church became established, the Emperors took texts with diverse characteristics and combined them into single, organised and presentationally uniform bibliographic units, containing the whole canon. This is consistent with the theory that the scribes of 03 were engaged in careful, philological work. This has been argued for in various ways. O’Neill (1989) attempts to identify the text-critical principles used by the editors. Payne (1995; 2017; Payne and Canart 2000) attempts to demonstrate that the marginalia in 03 have text-critical significance. Williams (2018) notes 03’s care over i-vowels. Jongkind (2019b) argues that 03 in Romans has shown care over variants in the order of Ἰησοῦς and Χριστός. O’Neill’s unsystematic approach and Payne’s rather far-fetched theories differentiating the marginalia in 03 means their work has not been influential. However, Williams’ and Jongkind’s arguments that 03 is the product of careful work are persuasive and add to the plausibility of imperial backing for 03. It is interesting that 05, which, particularly but not only in Acts, has a famously different text to what is probably initial, was probably

---

2 For a rebuttal of Payne, see Niccum 1997 and Miller 2003.
produced in Berytus, with no imperial connection (Parker 1992, 261-86). Thus, we have a plausible picture of Emperors, commissioning Bibles as beautifully and accurately produced as possible, to serve the Church, now publicly recognised and imperially patronised. There is of course no evidence that this is true of 02 and 04.

The pandects are also significant for the history of the Christian Bible because they bring the Testaments together for the first time. The pandects are a clear and visible attempt to combine into one bibliographic unit vastly different texts. It obviously does not take a detailed study of textual characteristics to see that the Christian Bible, whether in a modern printed copy or an ancient pandect, is a vast collection of corpora, diverse in theme, content and genre. However, my research reveals that, however much the scribes of the pandects laboured towards visual uniformity, the various books within them differ markedly in their textual characteristics. The diversity of content and genre in the Christian Bible is mirrored and paralleled by the diversity of textual characteristics in the pandects. This is important because it shows that the first pandects are an important stage in the story of how these diverse literary works, preserved in diverse texts, came to be regarded by Christians as the one, unified Christian Bible. To create a pandect is to act out in book production one of the most profound hermeneutical moves ever made. It is to claim that the Jewish Scriptures are also Christian and that the NT is the climax and answer to the Jewish Scriptures. The four early pandects we have studied show us the first stage of that process, because the diverse textual characteristics have not yet been “ironed out”; the scribes have achieved visual and bibliographic unity, but not textual homogeneity. Interestingly this is less so in 04, which has the most consistent textual characteristics throughout and is the chronologically latest pandect to be produced. It is quite possible that during the intervening century or so between the first pandects and 04, the different textual characteristics had been flattened out.

Of course, it is possible to exaggerate the importance of pandect production in this story. After all, Christians had regarded the works that would later become the NT as on the same level with the Jewish Scriptures since at least the time of 2 Peter, where the letters of Paul were called γραφαί (2 Pet 3:16), a word normally reserved in early Christian circles for spiritually authoritative books, although of course literally it means any writing. Similarly 1 Tim 5:18 arguably appears to quote both Testaments in parallel. However, it is one thing to believe in theory that different literary corpora belong together; it is quite another to bind them into the same book. Although it would be many centuries before the word “Bible” became commonly
used as a singular noun to refer to the whole collection (Williams 2012, 169-72), the production of single bibliographic units would surely underline the unity of the concept.

Fabry (2012) argues that the way the Testaments are connected within a pandect is enormously significant for the theology of the relationship between Judaism and Christianity, Israel and the Church. 01 appears to end with Job (though 01 is badly damaged in the OT) and Greek Job ends on a note of resurrection, an excellent lead-in to the NT. Likewise, 02’s OT ends with Sirach, which closes on a mention of καιρός, once again, an apt way to hint to readers that in the NT “the time has been fulfilled”. The MT order of the books of the Hebrew Bible is arguably a reaction by Rabbinic Judaism against Christian orderings: Ruth is moved out of the historical books to make the identity of Israel less tied to the Davidic king and MT ends with Chronicles, when the Jews return to the land to build the temple again, in other words to continue living as Jews without a new covenant or a Davidic Messiah (Fabry 2012). Fabry’s ideas are fascinating, but there is a prior point: that the two Testaments were combined is more significant than how they were combined. My research underlines this, because it shows that in their textual characteristics, the various books of the canon, in both Testaments, were still different. The pandects represent an attempt to create unity out of diversity.

This point is in no way undermined by the fact that 01 and 02 contain early Patristic material that are not today considered part of the NT by most Christian traditions (specifically the Epistles of Clement and Barnabas and the “Shepherd of Hermas”). When two or more different groups are combined, the combination is no less significant if the second group receives some additional members.

This point about the significance of the pandects for the combination of the Testaments remains valid, whatever view one takes on the relationship between canon and codex. Some scholars have argued that, for the early Christians, the codex form is broadly an indicator of canonical status (Hurtado 2006, chapter 2; Kruger 2012a, chapter 7), whereas Meade (2019) has argued that in fact there is little relationship. Either way, it remains a significant move to present both Testaments in the same format, as one bibliographic unit. By bringing together the varied parts of the Christian Bible, the pandects helped create “Biblical Theology”.

---

3 The Ethiopian Orthodox Church has a more flexible understanding of canonicity than other expressions of Christianity and sometimes appears to consider the Clementine Epistles and Hermas as canonical (Personal Communication, Ralph Lee, 30 December 19; Cowley 1974).
Methodological Reflections and Suggestions for Further Research

Inasmuch as it has yielded results which differ in interesting and intellectually productive ways from other scholars, my method can be said to have “worked”. Further studies, applying this method to other important manuscripts (most obviously the papyri) and other parts of the pandects therefore recommend themselves. Many recent studies have been done using the singular method (e.g. Head 1990; 2004; 2008; Hernández 2006; Jongkind 2007; Royse 2008; Malik 2017; Paulson 2018). Farnes (2019) and Hixson (2019) have both, as I discuss in chapter 1, provided evidence against the validity of the method. It is time for another method to be tried and I submit that mine is a good candidate.

There is also a need for more thorough individual studies of 04 and, to a lesser extent, 02 and 03. I have argued that 04 is of consistently significant value for the initial text, but it has been the subject of no major monograph since Tischendorf’s study nearly two-hundred years ago (I exclude Lyon’s dissertation, since it was never published in full, though it is freely available through the University of St Andrew’s). We eagerly await Grenz’s forthcoming Cambridge PhD thesis on 03. 02 is the subject of Smith’s 2014 study, but this focusses on scribal and codicological matters. This is not sufficient for such important manuscripts. Only 01 has received fairly thorough attention (Myshrall 2005; Jongkind 2007; Parker 2010b; McKendrick et al 2015).

NT textual criticism has been turned around in recent years by the rise of the CBGM. The CBGM is a method for developing stemmata and eventually editing a text, so this thesis does not employ it directly, but my method shares many of its principles. Kurt Aland’s gentle mocking of older scholars, which I have quoted more than once, comes in the context of an argument to reconstruct the earliest form of the text by constructing local substemmata for each variation unit, not to slavishly follow “good” manuscripts. On the basis of these local substemmata, the global stemma and the initial text can be reconstructed. This is similar to Wasserman’s spiral, referred to above, and it is also, of course, exactly how the CBGM works (see Mink 2011 for an explanation of the method). The CBGM, developed in Aland’s own institution, the University of Münster, is doing exactly what Aland called for. My research can help move us along the spiral and as such can be considered a partner-entreprise to the CBGM. I treat each variation unit individually and produce something like a local substemma (in that I decide which variant is the source variant and how the others were created) and then make a
general profile of the manuscript on the basis of those local substemmata. I discussed above how the CBGM can be used to refine the singular method (Strutwolf 2005, 147; Gurry 2017, 114, 119-20; pp.14-15 of this dissertation). Here I submit that my research will be relevant to users of the CBGM, because it will inform their decisions as to which is the source variant at each variation unit, by telling them how much value, and of what kind, to place on the pandects.

I have argued that the pandects are significant for old philology, because they guide us helpfully to the individual text, especially the under-valued 04. I have also argued they are important for new philology, because they show us the first attempts to unify the Christian Scriptures and two of them are arguably imperial commissions. It may be impractical to say *tolle, lege* regarding manuscripts which the general public are not allowed to touch, but I commend them to all students of the Christian Bible.
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