

כִּי-עֲמַךְ מִקּוֹר חַיִּים  
בְּאוֹרֶךְ נִרְאָה-אוֹר

"Toil at the sacred text;  
More fruitful grows the field;  
Each generation for the next  
Prepares a richer yield."

THE RELATION OF THE TEXT OF THE BEATTY GOSPELS  
TO THE CAESAREAN TEXT

A Dissertation  
Submitted to the Faculty  
of the  
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary  
Louisville, Kentucky

In  
Partial Fulfillment  
of the  
Requirements for the Degree  
of  
Doctor of Theology

by  
Roy Oliver Beaman  
May 1946

Dedicated to  
Mary and Mary Anne

---

401  
THESES  
Th.D.  
B37r  
ORIGINAL

## PREFACE

Since the Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, discovered in 1931, are generally rated as the most important discovery since that of the Codex Sinaiticus by Tischendorf, one of the most pressing desiderata for investigation in the field of New Testament Textual Criticism is the ascertaining of the bearing of this new evidence on the text of the New Testament. Moreover, since one of the liveliest issues in the same field today is the rating of the Caesarean Text of Streeter, this research has been devoted to the relation of these two in the Four Gospels. More precisely stated, therefore, the present attempt seeks to ascertain and demonstrate the bearing of the text of the Beatty Gospels on the newly discovered Caesarean Text.

In pursuing this research, the investigator has here essayed not to write a critique on the history of New Testament Textual Criticism, though that is needed, but has endeavored to delineate the development of the family idea as the surest means of attacking the problems of important readings of the New Testament. Insofar as the first part is a critique, however, he has largely depended on the work of a successor who saw a bit more clearly than his predecessor. Such a dissertation would not evince the scientific approach he has intended if it did not draw heavily on

previous workers. Consequently, although he has purposed to give due credit by frequent citations and much footnoting, yet the investigator has not disguised his own judgment, modestly given, on a problem which is still fresh and quite inchoative. He has tried to state the evidence dispassionately and to weigh this accumulation of facts in the light of the best principles yet formulated. This survey of the development of the Caesarean Text and the problems raised both by it and the Beatty Gospels does not intend nor hope to settle the current controversies, but the facts have been introduced in this thesis that the terms used may be clearly understood and that the evidence of the P<sup>45</sup> Gospels may be placed on the proper side in these issues.

The fact that neither topic, the Beatty Gospels nor the Caesarean Text, is a matter of as general knowledge in theological circles as could be fondly wished made it imperative that this discussion furnish a concise and yet quite full description of both. The development of the Caesarean Text from its very inception is traced because, if a correct appraisal of this contribution is to be had, the reader must see the problem in all its perspective. On the acceptance or rejection of the Caesarean Text hangs the course that a generation hence will pursue in its textual studies.

For the elucidation of the technicalities of the second and main part of this study the investigator has

added in its proper place there a simple statement of his method of procedure. The investigator had thought to treat the entirety of P<sup>45</sup>, but Dr. Davis had advised the wisdom of taking a segment. It may also be remembered that Streeter gave only short sections of a few chapters in his notable book. The investigations on Mark and Luke have been carried far into the work of the collation, and the writer hopes to present these in some manner later. All of Matthew is covered and one of the two chapters of John extant in the fragments.

In the concluding part of this dissertation are set down the broad deductions and resultant evaluations to which the guiding principles and investigated data seemed to lead. That some of these may be revised in the light of future efforts on the investigator's part or that of others belongs to the inherent nature of the problem herein weighed. In no other field is the adage more applicable than in Textual Criticism, that *βίος μικρός, τέχνη μακρά*.<sup>1</sup> It is still true that "men disparage not Antiquity, who prudently exalt new Enquiries" (Sir Thomas Browne). In this persuasion the investigator has found joy in what Harnack called "real scavenger's labour in which one is almost choked with dust"<sup>2</sup> and has disdained what the same writer termed breaking off

---

1 Brevis vita, ars longa; life is short, art is long.

2 Adolf Harnack, The Sayings of Jesus, p. xii

prematurely and resting satisfied with work only half done. Yet he has not, as could be wished, the linguistic equipment to employ Georgian and Armenian in his investigation. He must rest the results of his researches with fellow-craftsmen in this all-too-neglected science of Textual Criticism. If he has but pushed back the darkness a bit that the light may shine less dimly in the search for the original text of the New Testament, his reward is sure. After all, Aulus Gellius was right, "Veritas est filia temporis" (Truth is the daughter of time).

For the acknowledgement of his deep debt to printed helps the investigator must refer to the general bibliography and for specific instances to the pages where such assistance has been recorded. For his obligation to other types of encouragement and aid he must list the following:

Libraries--The Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.; The Library of Duke University, Durham, N. C; The Library of Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachusetts; The Library of the University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois; The Louisville Free Public Library, Louisville, Kentucky.

Individuals--He deeply appreciates two letters from Dr. F. G. Kenyon, London, in answer to questions about the papyrus discussed in this dissertation. Various members of the Graduate School put him under lasting debt in the details of writing in the Greek and other matters. He must record

the interest of W. E. Allen, Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the Rio Baptist Theological Seminary, Brazil, manifested in much conversation on problems common to both of us. Dr. Leo T. Crismon, Assistant Librarian of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary Library, has manifested a keen interest from the first and has given help in cases too numerous to mention.

Faculty--Drs. Henry Turlington and Edward A. McDowell, both connected with the New Testament Department, have given special encouragement and wise counsel. To his professors in his minor fields, Dr. J. McKee Adams (now in the service on high) and Dr. Sydnor L. Stealey, he owes much for guidance in study, particularly to the latter for personal friendship and encouragement in undertaking a very difficult task. Lastly, and here because the greatest, he rejoices to record his deep gratitude for keen interest and deep insight manifested by his major professor, Dr. W. Hersey Davis, head of the New Testament Department, ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἡμέρας αὐτῆς ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

A HISTORICAL SURVEY: THE FAMILY IDEA IN NEW TESTAMENT

TEXTUAL CRITICISM

<u>Chapter One -- THE FAMILY IDEA BEFORE HORT</u> . . . . .	1
I. From Bengel to Griesbach . . . . .	3
1. Bengel . . . . .	3
2. Wetstein . . . . .	8
3. Semler . . . . .	9
4. Griesbach . . . . .	11
II. Griesbach's Three Great Successors . . . . .	17
1. Carl Lachmann . . . . .	18
2. Tischendorf . . . . .	20
3. Tregelles . . . . .	22
 <u>Chapter Two -- THE TEXTS AND FAMILIES OF HORT</u> . . . . .	 27
I. The Aim of Westcott and Hort . . . . .	30
II. The Method and Principles of Hort . . . . .	31
1. The Genealogical Method of Hort . . . . .	31
2. Hort's Handling of Mixture . . . . .	33
(1) Conflate Readings . . . . .	34
(2) External Evidence . . . . .	35
(3) Internal Evidence of Groups . . . . .	36
III. The Families of Hort . . . . .	37
1. The Syrian . . . . .	37
(1) Conflate Readings . . . . .	38
(2) Patristic Quotations . . . . .	38
(3) Internal Evidence . . . . .	38
2. The Western . . . . .	39
3. The Alexandrian . . . . .	41
4. The Neutral . . . . .	43

<u>Chapter Three</u> -- <u>ANTECEDENTS TO STREETER: FERRAR TO LAKE.</u>	45
I. The Ferrar-Group . . . . .	45
1. As Studied Before Ferrar . . . . .	46
2. The Pioneer Work of Ferrar . . . . .	48
3. Martin's Localization of the Group . . . . .	52
4. J. Rendel Harris' Studies . . . . .	53
5. Von Soden on the Ferrar-Group . . . . .	59
6. Hutton on the Ferrar-Group . . . . .	62
7. Subsequent Additions to Ferrar Studies . . . . .	63
II. Codex 1 and Its Allies . . . . .	64
1. Their Study Before Lake . . . . .	65
2. Lake's Work on the Group . . . . .	67
3. Von Soden's Treatment of the Group . . . . .	71
4. Hutton's Analysis of the Group . . . . .	73
5. Lake's Later Study of the Group . . . . .	75
III. Codices 22, 28, 565 and 700 . . . . .	76
1. Codex 22 . . . . .	76
2. Codex 28 . . . . .	79
3. Codex 565 . . . . .	80
4. Codex 700 . . . . .	81
IV. The Koridethi Codex or <sup>(H)</sup> . . . . .	85
V. The Washington Codex or W . . . . .	90
VI. Oriental Versions and the Caesarean Text . . . . .	97
1. Syriac . . . . .	98
2. Armenian . . . . .	99
3. Old Latin . . . . .	100
4. Coptic . . . . .	101
5. Georgian . . . . .	101
<u>Chapter Four</u> -- <u>STREETER'S CAESAREAN TEXT</u> . . . . .	103
I. Trends Calling for a New Appraisal . . . . .	104
1. New Materials Since Hort . . . . .	104
2. Hints of Local Texts or Western Stratification . . . . .	104
3. Changes in Hort's Estimate of B . . . . .	110

II. Elements in Streeter's Contribution . . . . .	111
1. The Localization of the Group . . . . .	111
(1) The Period of Divergence . . . . .	112
(2) The Process of Standardization . . . . .	113
(3) The Use of Origen in Localizing to Caesarea . . . . .	115
2. The Enlargement of the Group . . . . .	118
(1) The Inclusion of All Four Gospels . . . . .	118
(2) The Inclusion of Other Witnesses . . . . .	118
(3) The Classification of Caesarean Witnesses. . . . .	119
3. The Evaluation of the Group . . . . .	122

## PART II

### THE CAESAREAN TEXT INVESTIGATED IN THE BEATTY GOSPELS

<u>Introduction</u> -- <u>THE CHESTER BEATTY BIBLICAL PAPYRI</u> . . . . .	125
I. The Story of Discovery . . . . .	125
II. Description of the Papyri . . . . .	128
1. The Date . . . . .	128
2. The Eleven Beatty Codices . . . . .	129
3. P <sup>45</sup> or the Beatty Gospels and Acts . . . . .	131
4. The Vienna Fragment (P <sup>45V</sup> ) . . . . .	132
III. The Method of This Study . . . . .	135
<u>Chapter One</u> -- <u>MATTHEW</u> . . . . .	139
I. The Condition of Matthew in P <sup>45</sup> . . . . .	139
II. Collation and Critical Apparatus . . . . .	139
III. Previous Study of the Caesarean Text in Matthew . . . . .	169
IV. Singular Readings of P <sup>45</sup> in Matthew . . . . .	172
<u>Chapter Two</u> -- <u>JOHN</u> . . . . .	175
I. The Condition of John in P <sup>45</sup> . . . . .	175

II. Collation and Critical Apparatus . . . . .	175
III. The Type of Text . . . . .	205

PART III

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE PRESENT STATUS OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM

I. Tendencies of Recent Textual Criticism . . . . .	208
1. A Tendency to Segmentation . . . . .	208
2. An Over-Emphasis on the Versions . . . . .	210
3. A Veering toward Conjectural Emendation . . . . .	212
II. The Testimony of P <sup>45</sup> . . . . .	213
1. The Accuracy of the Text . . . . .	213
2. The Spread of the Text . . . . .	213
3. Modifications and Confirmations of Hort . . . . .	214
4. The Rating of the Family . . . . .	214
III. Desiderata . . . . .	216
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	219

PART I

A HISTORICAL SURVEY: THE FAMILY IDEA IN NEW TESTAMENT  
TEXTUAL CRITICISM

Chapter One

THE FAMILY IDEA BEFORE HORT

Chapter Two

THE TEXTS AND FAMILIES OF HORT

Chapter Three

ANTECEDENTS TO STREETER: FERRAR TO LAKE

Chapter Four

STREETER'S CAESAREAN TEXT

## CHAPTER ONE

### THE FAMILY IDEA BEFORE HORT

The history of the text of the New Testament falls easily into two distinct periods, that of the written text and that of the printed text. Ximenes of Spain printed the first Greek New Testament in 1514, but its publication for use came eight years later. Erasmus of Rotterdam, the European scholar, both printed and published his Greek New Testament in 1516. As touching the development of New Testament Textual Criticism as a science, however, the pre-Erasman millennium and a half may be passed by save to note that the earlier period furnishes the materials with which the later period must deal and out of which it formulates its working principles.

Furthermore, the four centuries since Erasmus form two broad divisions of almost equal length. From the time of this great scholar until the researches of Bengel of Germany in 1734 the chief concern was the collection of evidence.<sup>1</sup> No definitive method of dealing with the mass of facts emerged.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. C. E. Hammond, Outlines of Textual Criticism, 3rd edition, p. 74

<sup>2</sup> Perusal of the two first volumes of Richard Simon (A Critical History of the Text of the New Testament, 1689, and A Critical History of the Versions of the New Testament, 1692) revealed not a hint of such a method.

It is not that post-Bengelian workers have not multiplied the store of available materials, but that their study has gathered along the lines of the substantial foundation of this critic and concerned itself largely with means and methods of attacking the ever-increasing volume of evidence.

As to the best mode of deciding between conflicting readings, a confusion of opinions prevailed. Bengel vividly portrayed the situation in these words,

One relies on the antiquity, another on the number of Manuscripts, nay, even to such an extent, as to exaggerate their number: one man adduces the Latin Vulgate, another the Oriental Versions; one quotes the Greek Scholiasts, another the more ancient Fathers: one so far relies upon the context (which is truly the securest evidence), that he adopts universally the easier and fuller reading: another expunges, if so inclined, whatever has been once omitted by a single Ethiopic--I will not say translator, but--copyist: one is always eager to condemn the more received reading, another equally determined to defend it in every instance.<sup>3</sup>

## I. FROM BENDEL TO GRIESBACH

1. Bengel. The idea first advanced by Bengel at Tubingen in 1734 is that of family relationship between manuscripts and between readings. Community of reading indicates community of origin. Workers previous to Bengel were

---

<sup>3</sup> J. A. Bengel, Gnomon of the New Testament, 4th ed., (Edinburgh, 1860, translated by A. R. Fausset), Vol. I, p.12

well aware of the techniques of copying<sup>4</sup> and seem to have had some idea of the affinity of readings. Embryonic of the genealogical method and somewhat incidentally, Thomas Marshall in 1665<sup>5</sup> had pointed out the agreement of the Anglo-Saxon and Gothic Versions with D,<sup>6</sup> Richard Simon in 1690 had seen in the Syriac a consonance with D "and consequently with the Italic" [Old Latin],<sup>7</sup> and John Mill in 1707 had observed the agreement of the Latin with Codex A.<sup>8</sup> In 1720 Richard Bentley seized this cue of the similarity of the ancient Greek and Latin evidence as the determinative in his proposed Greek New Testament.<sup>9</sup>

But the advance of Bengel, consisting in his demonstrating the fact that this kinship can be used in weighing the value of the several lines of testimony, was nothing

---

4 Cf. Jean-Baptiste Morel, "Elements de Critique," (Paris, 1766; reprinted in J. P. Migne's Première Encyclopédie Théologique), Vol. 47, Paris 1866, columns 969-1116

5 Article "Thomas Marshall," DNB

6 Observ. in Vers. Anglo-Saxon, I, 495, cited by Simon, Hist. Crit. des Vers. du N.T., 1690, pp. 23c, 164c

7 Simon, op. cit., p. 139c

8 John Mill, Novum Testamentum Graecum (Oxford, 1707), Tom. I, p. clxiii and cliv; cf. Tregelles, On the Printed Text of the Greek Testament (London, 1854), p. 44c; Warfield, Textual Criticism of the New Testament (New York, 1886), p. 156b

9 Reproduced in English in Novum Testamentum Graece, Tischendorf, Vol. III, Prolegomena, Gregory, 1894, p. 232



short of epoch-making. Previously manuscripts, versions and quotations had been counted; with Bengel these three sources of Textual Criticism began to be weighed. Thus he "pointed out the deceptiveness of numerical superiority detached from variety of origin."<sup>10</sup> "His acuteness perceived the advantages of a genealogical classification, and his diligence worked out the main outlines of the true distribution."<sup>11</sup> In his Novum Testamentum Graecum in 1734,<sup>12</sup> the Tubingen scholar, outlining and illustrating his critical principles,<sup>13</sup> "became the starting point for modern text-criticism of the New Testament"<sup>14</sup> and in some ways "the father of modern criticism."<sup>15</sup>

In the matter of families Bengel was truly a pathfinder, and in this distinction lies his chief claim for notice as a textual critic. Respecting this he wrote,

The origin of variant readings can be investigated and represented by single codices, by pairs of codices, by

---

<sup>10</sup> F. J. A. Hort, The New Testament in Greek, Vol. II (New York: 1882), p. 180c

<sup>11</sup> Warfield, op. cit., p. 219a

<sup>12</sup> Tubingae

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., pp. 371-449

<sup>14</sup> Hauck, "John Albrecht Bengel," Schaff-Herzog, New Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, II, p. 52f

<sup>15</sup> Kirsopp Lake, The Text of the New Testament, 6th edition (London, 1928), p. 64c

smaller and larger companies, by families, tribes, and nations of these.<sup>16</sup>

Always either the variety of reading is twofold or, where it is manifold, it is soon reduced to twofoldness.<sup>17</sup>

In his second edition he named the two families Asiatic and African--"The codices, versions, and fathers divide into two families, Asiatic and African."<sup>18</sup> "It was thus that a ground plan of a division into Alexandrian and Byzantine was laid down";<sup>19</sup> or, to use Hortian terms, Syrian and Pre-Syrian.

The following rule of Bengel shows his decided preference for the African evidence, "The reading of the African family is always old but not always genuine."<sup>20</sup> Somewhat indistinctly and yet adumbrating the clearer delineation of Griesbach, it should be added, this pioneer subdivided the African into two subordinate tribes, "represented typically

<sup>16</sup> Bengel, N.T. Graecum, Tubingae, 1734, p. 387, "Posset variarum lectionum ortus, per singulos codices, per paria codicum, per syzygias minores majoresque, per familias, tribus, nationesque illorum, investigari et repraesentari."

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., p. 429, "Semper aut duplex est varietas lectionis, aut, ubi multiplex, ad duplicitatem mox redigitur."

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 2nd ed., 1737, cited from the Gnomon, Vol. I, p. 25, "Codices, Versiones, et patres in duas discedunt familias, Asiaticam, et Africanam."

<sup>19</sup> Tregelles, op. cit., p. 71

<sup>20</sup> Bengel, Gnomon, I, p. 25, "Lectio familiae Africanæ semper antiqua est, sed tamen non semper genuina."

by A and by the Old Latin,"<sup>21</sup> Codex A being the only great uncial much known in his day.

Though the family ideas of Bengel seem somewhat indefinite today, one must judge his theories in the light of his day, and when this is done, the distinctiveness of his contribution appears.<sup>22</sup> No stronger proof of this is needed than the fact that the post-Bengelians story epitomized delineates the work of those who contested and confirmed, enlarged and modified his essential conclusions.<sup>23</sup>

A firm grasp of these fluctuations in the process of weighing manuscripts constitutes the necessary prolegomenon to all secure progress toward a scientific handling of the problems of New Testament Textual Criticism. It is this fact which justifies this historical survey before the

<sup>21</sup> Hort, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 180c; cf. Hammond, op. cit., 3rd ed., p. 75

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., p. 287b. F. Nolan (An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, London, 1815, p. 138c) described Bengel's work as the most "ingenious and important" of classifications of manuscripts "suggested by MM. Bengel and Semler, but reduced to practice by the learned and accurate M. Griesbach." Further (Ibid., p. 6c), "The comprehensive brevity of his plan, and the scrupulous accuracy of his execution, have long and must ever command our respect."

<sup>23</sup> "A similar arrangement of texts is now known to exist in the mss. of profane authors," (T. H. Horne, An Intro. to the Crit. Study and Knowl. of Holy Scriptures, 8th ed., 1852, Vol. I, p. 205, col. 1a). Similarly a family relationship has been observed between the Hebrew manuscripts of the Old Testament (B. B. Edwards, Encyl. of Rel. Knowl., 1858 edition, p. 231, col. 1a).

actual examination of the particular problem of this thesis.

2. Wetstein. So long as one considers the positive contributions of J. J. Wetstein of Basle (1693-1754), he may well agree with the estimate of J. D. Michaelis, "In short, he has performed more than all his predecessors."<sup>24</sup> He greatly increased the materials, did some creditable collating, enriched his pages with scintillating philological observations, introduced the system of manuscript notation still in vogue with modifications, and methodically described the materials of New Testament Textual Criticism.<sup>25</sup>

Little, however, can be said for the character of his textual theories. In his Prolegomena<sup>26</sup> in 1730 this scholar divided the manuscripts according to their antiquity, their country of origin, and their style of writing into four principal classes, the last of which he divided into three sub-classes.<sup>27</sup> However, by the time Bengel published his Greek Testament in 1734, this promising trend had reversed itself. Wetstein, both in 1735 and in his own valuable

---

24 Michaelis, Intro. to the N.T., 1793, II, p. 479

25 "Never before had there been so methodical an account presented to the biblical student, of the manuscripts, versions, and fathers," (Tregelles, op. cit., p. 77).

26 "Prolegomena ad N.T. Graeci editionem accuratissimam e vetustissimis codicibus mss. denuo procurandam," etc., from Marsh's Michaelis, Vol. II, p. 473

27 Ibid., pp. 473, 858

edition of the Greek New Testament in 1751-52, definitely disparaged the work of the famous Bengel on two particular points. He held that the greater number of manuscripts merited support.<sup>28</sup> Bengel had given great weight to Codex A in his system of families; Wetstein charged that "Codex Alexandrinus indeed has no weight separate from the Latin, to which it has been changed and interpolated."<sup>29</sup> The importance of delineating the reactionary trends of Wetstein is seen in the fact that the spell of his influence retarded progress in scientific criticism until Griesbach set it on a firm basis. In the words of Tregelles, the view of Wetstein left all manuscripts before those who followed him "as one labyrinth through which there was no definite guiding clue."<sup>30</sup>

3. Semler. From Wetstein to Griesbach little progress can be recorded in the principle of New Testament Textual Criticism. England busied herself "on the whole successfully"<sup>31</sup> with the criticism of the Hebrew Scriptures. The theories of Wetstein and the influence of J. D. Michaelis

---

<sup>28</sup> Wetstein, N.T. Graecum, Tom. I, p. 166; cf. Tom. II, p. 870

<sup>29</sup> "Codex vero Alex. nullum pondus habet seorsum a Latinis, ad quos mutatis & interpolatus est" (Ibid., I, p. 159).

<sup>30</sup> Tregelles, op. cit., p. 80

<sup>31</sup> Scrivener, A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, 3rd edition, p. 462

(1717-91) held the field. J. S. Semler (1725-91), in his annotations on Wetstein's Prolegomena published in 1764 at Halle, broke the spell somewhat by showing the fallacy<sup>32</sup> of the Latinizing theory of Wetstein. Semler's great pupil, Griesbach, "showed that the MSS. charged with Latinising were such as contained the readings cited by Origen."<sup>33</sup>

Continuing Bengel's idea of weighing codices and adapting his twofold classification, Semler<sup>34</sup> in 1764 (just thirty years after Bengel) called the families Oriental (Bengel's Asiatic) and Western (Bengel's African). Unfortunately, by assigning these families respectively to recensions by Lucian of Antioch and Origen of Alexandria, he planted the disturbing seed of the idea of various recensions or revisions of the New Testament text and first introduced the troublesome name "Western" to designate a textual family.

Expanding his view in 1767, Semler made three divisions or recensions: (1) Alexandrian, represented by the Egyptian writers, the pupils of Origen, and the Syriac,

---

<sup>32</sup> Tregelles, op. cit., p. 81c; cf. Gregory, Prolegomena, p. 187c, "Defendit acriter codices Graeco-Latinos aliosque ut ex Latinis non falsos."

<sup>33</sup> Tregelles, op. cit., p. 92a

<sup>34</sup> Gregory gives Semler's words (Proleg., p. 188, fn.2).

Memphitic [Bohairic], and Ethiopic Versions; (2) Oriental, used at Antioch and Constantinople; (3) Occidental or Western, embodied in the Latin Versions and fathers.<sup>35</sup> "The mass of the later MSS. he regarded as having mixed texts, and as possessing little importance,"<sup>36</sup> but his "theory derives special importance from its adoption and extension by his pupil J. J. Griesbach, whose name ranks with the highest in textual criticism."<sup>37</sup>

4. Griesbach. Of this Jena scholar (1745-1812)

J. L. Hug remarked,

In the practical exercise of criticism he excelled Bengel in this respect, that he had a finer perception of the manner of individual writers and their peculiarities of diction, and selected his readings accordingly.<sup>38</sup>

Though F. Nolan sought to overthrow Griesbach's conclusions, this English scholar said of the German,

The great merit of M. Griesbach's scheme consists in the singular skill with which he covered the feeble points which were left exposed by his predecessors.<sup>39</sup>

Tregelles estimated that with Griesbach, "in fact, texts

---

<sup>35</sup> Apparatus ad liberalem N.T. Interpretationem, p. 45f (cited by Gregory, Prolegomena, p. 188)

<sup>36</sup> Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible, p. 161a

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., Text. Crit. of the N.T., 2nd ed., p. 281

<sup>38</sup> Hug, Intro. to the N.T., p. 195f

<sup>39</sup> Nolan, op. cit., p. 188c

which may be called critical begin."<sup>40</sup> Hort venerated his name "above that of every other textual critic of the New Testament."<sup>41</sup> Warfield discerned that Griesbach's mature conviction was that on the study of 'recensions,' as on a hinge, all criticism of the text must turn.<sup>42</sup> His classification of families "held the field until the days of Westcott and Hort."<sup>43</sup> Despite Hort's veneration no one was more incisive than he in pointing out the limitations of the views of Griesbach.

"Unfortunately he followed Semler in designating the ancient texts by the term 'recension,'"<sup>44</sup> "failed to apprehend in its true magnitude the part played by mixture in the history of the text during the fourth and following centuries, or to appreciate the value of the observation of groupings as a critical instrument by which a composite text can be to a great extent analysed into its constituent elements," and "was driven to give a dangerously disproportionate weight to internal evidence, and especially to transcriptional probability."<sup>45</sup>

---

40 Tregelles, op. cit., p. 83c; so Schaff, Companion to the Greek Testament, 4th ed., p. 250

41 Hort, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 185b

42 Warfield, op. cit., p. 220c

43 Kenyon, Text of the Greek Bible, p. 161a

44 Cf. Griesbach, N.T. Graece, I, p. lxxiii; Laurence at Oxford in 1814 showed that no 'recensions' were really made (Horne, op. cit., p. 205, col. 2c).

45 Hort, op. cit., II, p. 181, 183, 184c



Had not Griesbach been fettered by his recension-theory, he would in all his editions have adhered far more closely that he did to ancient evidence.<sup>46</sup>

Similarly J. L. Hug (1765-1846), though he paid a deserving tribute to the impulse Bengel gave to the progress of criticism<sup>47</sup> and though he "brought out the important new fact of the early broad currency of the Western text,"<sup>48</sup> conjectured as a corrective to the family ideas of Bengel and Griesbach<sup>49</sup> three different recensions in the strict sense of the term--Hesychius for Alexandria, Origen for Palestine, and Lucian for Antioch.<sup>50</sup>

Notwithstanding the fact that Hug pressed his theories too far, his original treatment<sup>51</sup> of the state of the popular text adumbrated Streeter's theory of local texts.<sup>52</sup> To Hug's incipient observations Hort paid this tribute,

---

46 Tregelles, op. cit., p. 85b

47 Hug, op. cit., p. 193c; first Ger. ed. 1808

48 Warfield, op. cit., p. 220

49 Scrivener, Plain Intro., 3rd ed., p. 519a

50 Hug, op. cit., pp. 115-142. In his "Meletemata," (Commentarius Criticus, Jena, 1798-1811, particula II, p. xxxxi), referring to Hug, Griesbach remarked, "Ego vero magnopere gravius sum. . .habere me virum celeberrimum mihi conseutientem."

51 Hug, op. cit., pp. 85-115; cf. 303ff

52 Streeter, The Four Gospels, 1925, 5th ed. 1936

Hug started from what was in itself on the whole a true conception of the Western text and its manifold license. He called it the *κοινή ἔκδοσις*, or 'Vulgate Edition,' taking the name from the text of the LXX as it was in its confusion before the reform attempted by Origen in his Hexapla. But further he conjectured that the disorderly state of this popular text led to its being formally revised in three different lands, the product of each revision being a 'recension' in the strict sense of the word.<sup>53</sup>

Griesbach's first edition of the Greek New Testament (in parts, 1774-77) "contained the well-defined embryo of his future and more elaborate speculations."<sup>54</sup> These he continued in his critical dissertations in *Symbolae Criticae*<sup>55</sup> and matured in his second and principal edition.<sup>56</sup>

But the contribution of Griesbach that has influenced his successors most was his treatment of textual families. "At the onset of his labours, indeed, this acute and candid enquirer was disposed to divide all extant materials into five or six different families; he afterwards limited them to three,"<sup>57</sup> two ancient and one more recent. To these

---

53 Hort, *op. cit.*, II, sec. 248, p. 181

54 Scrivener, *Plain Intro.*, 3rd ed., p. 462c

55 Vol. I, 1785; Vol. II, 1793

56 *N.T. Graece* (Halle-London, Vol. I, 1796; Vol. II, 1806).. It made use of collations gathered since the first edition--by C. F. Matthaei of Moscow (1744-1811), F. K. Alter of Vienna (1749-1804), A. Birch of Copenhagen, and Moldenhawer of Denmark.

57 Scrivener, *op. cit. supra*, p. 470c

three classes he assigned the names Alexandrian, Occidental or Western, and Constantinopolitan,<sup>58</sup> and in the same order did he hold their text to be relatively pure.

These three classes would respectively correspond to the three sources from which Bentley speaks of MSS. having come to us--from Egypt, from the West, and from Asia.<sup>59</sup>

Perhaps the most important of the several suggestions of Griesbach in his Prolegomena<sup>60</sup> for the handling of the

58 Griesbach, N.T. Graece, 2nd ed., I, pp. lxxivf

59 Tregelles, op. cit., p. 84b. Kenyon (Text of Gk. Bible, p. 161b) listed these in some detail, "(1) Alexandrian, including the uncials C L K (it will be remembered that B was almost unknown and A undiscovered), the minuscules 1, 13, 33, 69 and a few others, the Bohairic, Harklean Syriac, Armenian, and Ethiopic versions, and the quotations in Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius and others; (2) Western, including D with some support from 1, 13, 69, the Latin versions (especially the OL.) and Fathers, and the Peshitta Syriac; (3) Constantinopolitan, including A (which he thought Bengel had rated too high) and the mass of later Greek MSS.; and this third class he regarded, like Bengel and Semler, as of altogether inferior value."

60 Griesbach, N.T. Graece, 2nd ed., Vol. I, pp. lxxvii-lxxxii.

Schaff summarized Griesbach's fixed rules (Griesbach, ibid., I, p. lxxf) "that a reading must be supported by ancient testimony; that the shorter reading is preferable to the longer, the more difficult to the easy, the unusual to the usual" (Schaff, op. cit., p. 250f). Nolan summarized the principles of Griesbach thus (op. cit., p. 315), "The principles of his criticism are reducible to two canons. . . 1. The internal marks of authenticity. 2. The consent of the oldest and best witnesses, consisting of manuscripts, versions, and fathers, especially if they are of different kinds of text, or follow different recensions" (Cf. Griesbach, Symb. Crit., II, p. 90, note, "In judicandis. . . sequantur"; cf. his Proleg., p. lxxix, sec. e).

He also recognized the problem of mixture though imperfectly (Symb. Crit., Tom. I, p. cxxviii; cf. Tregelles, op. cit., p. 88b; Schaff, op. cit., p. 251b).

relative value of these families and that most characteristic of his system was that the reading supported by two of the families is, ceteris paribus, to be preferred. He accepted the testimony of either the Alexandrian or Western in opposition to the Byzantine but held that the Alexandrian was less generally corrupted than the Western.<sup>61</sup> According to Hammond,<sup>62</sup> Griesbach himself allowed that the line of demarcation between his Alexandrian and Western was not rigid.

Despite much opposition to the views of Griesbach,<sup>63</sup> essentially as Hort, however, posterity will ever regard this next great pathfinder after Bengel.

What Bengel had sketched tentatively was verified and worked out with admirable patience, sagacity, and candour by Griesbach, who was equally great in independent investigation and in his power of estimating the results arrived at by others.<sup>64</sup>

---

61 Nolan, op. cit., p. 317

62 Hammond, op. cit., p. 75

63 Until Matthaei learned that Wetstein held to the superiority of the Constantinopolitan evidence (Tregelles, op. cit., p. 85f), he hurled epithets at both Wetstein and Griesbach. The Moscow scholar characterized the Jena scholar as 'vana' (Griesbach, Symbolae Criticae, tomus prior, in unnumbered 'praefatio' near the end), but Griesbach always remained devoid of a spirit of retaliation. In like manner both Birch and Scholz repudiated the doctrine of Griesbach and adhered to the Byzantine Text (Kenyon, Text of Gk. B., p. 161c). Nolan, an English scholar, sought to refute Griesbach and classified the authorities in 1815 into representatives of three ancient editions--Egyptian, Palestinian, and Byzantine--and favored the Byzantine (Op. cit.; cf. Kenyon, op. cit., p. 162, fn. 1). Scrivener (Plain Intro., 3rd ed., p. 361fn.) properly rated Nolan's book as "that curious medley of exact learning and bad reasoning."

64 Hort, op. cit., II, p. 181

## II. "GRIESBACH'S THREE GREAT SUCCESSORS"

When the quarter of a century of setback in the development of Textual Criticism interposed by the Napoleonic wars passed, "the stream burst out again"<sup>65</sup> in two German scholars, Scholz and Lachmann. "Scholz represents the end of the old period, Lachmann the beginning of the new."<sup>65</sup>

Scholz of Bonn classed the evidence into two families with decided preference for the Constantinopolitan over the Alexandrian.<sup>66</sup> As a forerunner to Burgon, he proposed that the Alexandrian group had survived only because, being erroneous, it had been less used.<sup>67</sup> According to Tregelles, Scholz considerably influenced English thought.<sup>68</sup> However, Schaff claimed that around 1845 the Bonn scholar (died 1852) "retracted his preference for the Byzantine text."<sup>69</sup>

Though Hort thought it not to his purpose to review the work of the "three great successors" of Griesbach--Lachmann of Berlin, Tregelles of England, and Tischendorf of Leipzig--some conception of their principles relative to

65 Kenyon, Textual Crit.<sup>2</sup>, p. 284

66 N. T. Graece, Leipzig, 1830-36, Vol. I, pp. xv, xix. Tregelles (op. cit., p. 92c) observed that Scholz formerly held to five families.

67 Kenyon, Text. Crit.<sup>2</sup>, p. 285c; cf. Nolan, passim

68 Tregelles, op. cit., p. 92c

69 Schaff, op. cit., p. 254a; cf. 13c

textual families must not be here passed over. Hort, however, did class their texts as substantially of ancient type, acknowledge more help from Tregelles than from the two others, and complain that they virtually abandoned "Griesbach's endeavour to obtain for the text of the New Testament a secure historical foundation in the genealogical relations of the whole extant documentary evidence."<sup>70</sup>

1. Carl Lachmann (1793-1851). Lachmann finally did what many had felt needed to be done, namely, reconstruct a Greek text from documentary evidence alone without the use of existing editions. He rejoiced to be carrying out the unfulfilled promises of Bentley. His small edition in 1831 marks the beginning of the modern period of Textual Criticism. This classical scholar boldly set aside the Byzantine evidence and sought to create a text from the two older types of text--Oriental and Occidental.<sup>71</sup> He intended only a provisional text,<sup>72</sup>

---

70 Hort, op. cit., II, p. 186, section 255

71 Schaff, op. cit., p. 255c

72 Tregelles became the first to grasp the significance of the work of Lachmann and has given a sympathetic statement of his principles (Op. cit., pp. 97-117), saying (Ibid., p. 116fn.), "Lachmann it was who first entered the domain of textual criticism, in the direction and through the channel of access, which Bentley pointed out a hundred and twenty years before." Unfortunately Lachmann's 1831 edition did not explain its intention. He did not plan it as a final text but as a working basis for approach to the primitive text. However, he made the matter clear in 1850 (Larger Ed., Berlin, 1850, Vol. II, p. v). Scrivener (Op. cit., p. 480a) observed that "an esoteric pupil" might have gathered this from the preface to the first volume of the Larger Edition (Pub. at Berlin, 1842, pp. v, xxxiii).

a text of the fourth century, and for this purpose dismissed in principle all later evidence.

He relied mainly on the uncials A, B, C, H<sub>3</sub>, P, Q, T, Z, and the quotations in Origen; but since of these B was only imperfectly known to him through the collations made for Bentley, C is imperfect, and the others only fragments, sufficient evidence sometimes failed him, and in such cases he had recourse to Western evidence, the bilinguals D D<sub>2</sub> E<sub>2</sub> G<sub>3</sub>, the Old Latin a b c g, <sup>A</sup> and F of the Vulgate, and the early Latin Fathers.<sup>73</sup>

Besides his failure to make clear his purpose and his idea of families, other weaknesses are obvious in the work of Lachmann. Hort pointed out three: too narrow a selection of documents, too artificially rigid an employment of them, and too little care in obtaining precise knowledge of some of their texts.<sup>74</sup> The first of these is basic and has been perceived by practically every subsequent textual critic.<sup>75</sup> Yet this "vir doctissimus et κριτικώτατος,"<sup>76</sup> as Reuss called him, broke new ground if a bit unskillfully at first and lighted a torch which, trimmed by Tregelles and Tischendorf, reached universal brilliance in the skilled hands of Westcott and Hort.

---

73 Kenyon, Text of the Greek Bible, p. 162f

74 Hort, op. cit., II, p. 13

75 Tregelles, op. cit., p. 100a; Schaff, op. cit., p. 256; Scrivener, Plain Intro., 3rd ed., p. 478c, 522a; Vincent, op. cit., p. 113b; Kenyon, Text. Criticism of the N.T., 2nd ed., p. 288c

76 "Most learned and most discerning man" (cited by Schaff, op. cit., p. 256fn.)

Interest in the subject was now aroused, and the middle of the nineteenth century saw an epochmaking advance, both in the collection of evidence and in the development of textual theory. The former is mainly connected with the names of Tischendorf and Tregelles, the latter with those of Westcott and Hort. From this point English scholarship comes back into the front line, but the first achievements to be recorded are those of a German.<sup>77</sup>

2. Tischendorf (1815-74). Though the first palm of recognition for Tischendorf goes to him for his prodigious and unprecedented labor in discovering and editing ancient texts, especially New Testament ones, his secondary role as textual critic is more pertinent here, nor is it relevant to appraise now his monumental and un superseded Critical Apparatus.<sup>78</sup>

Both excellencies and weaknesses characterized the critical principles of this indefatigable worker. He refused to be shackled by Lachmann's too narrow scope of evidence and gave the most inclusive array of materials. Choosing not to bind again the bands of the Textus Receptus clipped by Lachmann, he perceived that the ultimate evidence rests in the most ancient authorities.

The text is only to be sought from ancient evidence, and especially from Greek MSS., but without neglecting the testimonies of versions and fathers. Thus the whole

---

<sup>77</sup> Kenyon, The Text of the Gk. Bible, p. 163b

<sup>78</sup> Tischendorf, N.T. Graece, editio octava critica maior (Leipzig, 1869-72)



conformation of the text should proceed from the evidences themselves, and not from what is called the received edition.<sup>79</sup>

"While Lachmann aimed at attaining only the oldest text, Tischendorf sought for the best text."<sup>80</sup>

On the other hand, Tischendorf did not strictly adopt any classification of families. Cautiously he recognized a fourfold division of witnesses in two pairs: Alexandrian and Latin, Asiatic and Byzantine.

The Asiatic and Byzantine embraced the more recent documents; the Alexandrian and Latin the more ancient. The question of the origin of these classes is not settled by the difference of the several countries through which the text was propogated, since the codices of one country were sometimes conveyed to another.<sup>81</sup>

Unfortunately his critical judgment was not so sound or stable as could be wished; and he was liable to be over-influenced by the witnesses which he had last studied.<sup>82</sup>

Especially is this last true in his too slavish following of Aleph.<sup>83</sup> "Tischendorf's text fluctuated considerably in the various editions which he put forth, but it is unfair to judge his results now by any but his great and final eighth edition."<sup>84</sup>

---

79 Tischendorf, trans. by Tregelles, op. cit., p. 119

80 Vincent, op. cit., p. 123

81 Vincent, op. cit., p. 124; cf. Tregelles, op. cit., p. 127c

82 Kenyon, Textual Criticism<sup>2</sup>, p. 290b

83 Scrivener, Plain Intro<sup>3</sup>, pp. 528c, 529b; cf. Robertson, Intro. to Textual Crit. of the N.T., 1925, p. 34f

84 Warfield, op. cit., p. 224c

One thing is clear and certain--he had an open mind toward new evidence.

3. Tregelles (1813-75), the great contemporary of Tischendorf and likewise a collator of scrupulous accuracy, "carried the work of Lachmann a step further. . . . His aim was not to produce the text of the oldest Greek manuscripts, those of the fourth century as Lachmann did, but to reproduce the oldest text obtainable."<sup>85</sup> It is very significant that about 1838, reacting against Scholz's rejection of the earlier evidence in favor of the numerically preponderant later witnesses,<sup>86</sup> he planned an edition of the Greek New Testament de novo from ancient documentary evidence, without knowing that Lachmann had already anticipated such a venture.<sup>87</sup> To say the least of it, their independent arrival at essentially the same conclusion is unique.

Unlike Lachmann, however, Tregelles did not confine himself to such narrow lines of evidence.<sup>88</sup> He used the most ancient manuscripts, versions, and Fathers. He, moreover, called in the testimony of the Syriac, Latin, Coptic, Ethiopic,

---

85 Robertson, op. cit., p. 32

86 Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible, p. 164b

87 Ibid., Textual Crit. of N.T.<sup>2</sup>, p. 291c. Hence Scrivener is only partly right in marking Tregelles as Lachmann's disciple (Plain Intro., 3rd ed., p. 520a).

88 Hort, op. cit., p. 13c

and Armenian Versions. That is, he chose no version this side of the sixth century<sup>89</sup> and employed only three minuscules--1, 33, and 69.<sup>90</sup> From his examination of Matthew 19:17, he concluded that the mass of manuscripts, "in the proportion of about ninety to one," opposed the ancient and widespread reading of this passage and that "the mass of recent documents possess no determining voice, in a question as to what we should receive as genuine readings. We are able to take the few documents whose evidence is proved to be trustworthy, and safely discard from present consideration the eighty-nine ninetieths, or whatever else their numerical proportion may be."<sup>91</sup> Yet he significantly recognized that an old text may lie in a later manuscript.<sup>92</sup>

Speaking of the family classification of Griesbach and the undeserved discredit thrown on such by Nolan<sup>93</sup> and

---

89 Tregelles, op. cit., p. 171c

90 Kenyon, Text. Crit. of N.T.<sup>2</sup>, p. 292c

91 Tregelles, op. cit., p. 138b

92 Ibid., pp. 180c, 181fn

93 Nolan, op. cit. In his "Supplement" in 1830 he gloried that his opponents were about silenced. In T. H. Horne's Introduction (supra, fn. 23) the family ideas of Nolan and Scholz are treated at length with great deference to both but with a leaning to the latter. This Intro. had reached its 8th ed. from 1828 to 1854. On Scrivener's estimate of Nolan, see footnote 63, supra ult. Perusal of the many pages of Nolan convinced this investigator of the justness of this estimation.

Scholz,<sup>94</sup> Warfield declared that Tregelles "redemonstrated this distribution, and put it upon an invincible basis of observed fact."<sup>95</sup> This the English scholar did by his great contribution which he called Comparative Criticism. He happily applied, as Scrivener understood it,<sup>96</sup> this term to

that delicate and important process, whereby we seek to determine the comparative value, and trace the mutual relations, of authorities of every kind upon which the original text of the New Testament is based.

The development of this method turned the tendency since then more and more to ancient evidence.<sup>97</sup>

---

94 The preceding footnote indicates the influence of this theory in England. Moses Stuart in 1836 felt with Schott and De Wette that no terra firma had been yet won in the classification of manuscripts because of the state of their collation and the examination of patristic literature ("Notes to Hug's Introduction," op. cit., p. 686). He further felt that Laurence in 1814 and Nolan in the succeeding year had scored some success in their criticism of Griesbach. Yet he could not accept unmodified either these or Hug and Scholz (Loc. cit.). Even Hammond said as late as 1880 (Op. cit., 3rd ed., p. 75f; cf. 2nd ed.), "It really seems that to go beyond the general distinction recognised by all between the two chief groups is very precarious. The gap even between these, much more between any subdivisions, can be bridged over by a number of copies exhibiting texts with all intermediate degrees of resemblance." (Cf. Birks, Essay on the Right Estimation of Ms. Evidence in the Text, p. 7a). Such an attitude made ripe the need for Hort's handling of the problem of mixture.

95 Warfield, op. cit., p. 221a

96 Scrivener, Plain Intro<sup>3</sup>, p. 521a

97 Warfield, op. cit., p. 222b

Publishing an edition of the Apocalypse on these lines in 1844<sup>98</sup> Tregelles travelled over Europe collating all the manuscripts to which he could gain access, expounded his critical principles in 1854<sup>99</sup> and 1856,<sup>100</sup> and issued his work with excellent apparatus between 1857 and 1872.<sup>101</sup> It is worthy of remark that Tischendorf used these parts as they appeared and seems to have delayed his work until they were available.

Tregelles meant by the term Comparative Criticism

such an investigation as shows what the character of a document is,--not simply from its age, whether known or supposed,--but from its actual readings being shown to be in accordance or not with certain other documents. By an estimate of MSS. through the application of comparative criticism, is intended merely such an arrangement as may enable it to be said, that certain MSS. do, as a demonstrated fact, present features of classification as agreeing or not agreeing in text with ancient authorities with which they are compared.<sup>102</sup>

However, beyond this point of dividing the witnesses into early and late the excellent method of Tregelles could

98 The Book of Revelation Transcribed from the Ancient Greek Text, with appendix "A Prospectus of a Critical Edition of the Greek New Testament, now in Preparation"

99 An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek N.T.

100 "An Intro. to the Textual Crit. of the N.T.," Horne, op. cit., 10th ed. (cited from Vincent, op. cit., p. 131)

101 The Gk. Test. Edited from Ancient Authorities, with the Latin Version of Jerome from the Codex Amiatinus

102 Tregelles, Printed Text, p. 132. Warfield (op. cit., p. 112f) gave an excellent summary of this helpful principle.

not go, and its weaknesses may be pointed out. It determined the ancient text but did not demonstrate that this was a pure text and an approximation to the autographic text.<sup>103</sup> It left the situation "hopeless before all cases in which the oldest witnesses themselves differ."<sup>104</sup> It failed to solve the problem of mixture and leaned too heavily on the personal quality or "critical tact."<sup>105</sup> It was not clear-cut in its treatment of the textual families.

Speaking of the "twofold division stated by Bengel, the modifications of Semler, the ordered system of Griesbach," "the refined theory of Hug," and the fourfold classification of Tischendorf, Tregelles held that

the line of demarcation would often be extremely faint, if an attempt were made definitely to mark out what should belong to each of these supposed classes. For it may be questioned how far an actual classification of MSS. (to say nothing now of any other authorities) is practicable beyond the distinction of the ancient and the more recent; subdivisions no doubt exist.<sup>106</sup>

He then proceeded to point out some of these, but desisted from following them to a logical analysis of families beyond the ancient and the later. This task Tregelles left for his friend, Hort, but had made no little progress in paving the way for such a climactic advance.

---

103 Warfield, op. cit., p. 113c

104 Ibid., p. 114a

105 Ibid., p. 126

106 Tregelles, op. cit., p. 127f. Vincent's idea (op. cit., p. 132b) that Tregelles "denied" the possibility of more than two families is too strong for the author's own more cautious "it may be questioned."

## CHAPTER TWO

### THE TEXTS AND FAMILIES OF HORT

In Hort there was a second resurgence of the family principle of Bengel.<sup>1</sup> After both Bengel and Griesbach, a period of inaction or positive retrogression on the genealogical line followed. Aroused by the epoch-making collection of evidence by Tischendorf and Tregelles, especially the former's discovery of Codex Aleph and his edition of B, Westcott and Hort<sup>2</sup> labored for twenty-eight years on their edition of the Greek text, published in 1881,<sup>3</sup> the same year as the Revised Version, the English fruitage of this surge of textual studies.

It is generally held that Hort set forth the principles of Textual Criticism, more clearly than they have ever been explained and was the most commanding critic of the entire history of the art of New Testament Textual Criticism.

---

1 Their theory was in the "direct line of descent from Bengel and Griesbach" (Kenyon, Text of Gk. Bible, p. 165c; cf. ibid., Textual Crit., 2nd ed., p. 294c).

2 Though the Introduction embodies the joint conclusions of the two Cambridge scholars, yet since Hort wrote the prolegomena, reference is more often made to Hort in these pages. Their essential views were printed in 1870 but privately circulated (Birks, op. cit., p. 4, 8).

3 Westcott and Hort, The N.T. in the Original Greek, Vol. I, Text; Vol. II, Introduction

The estimation of A. T. Robertson follows,

The work of Hort is far and away the ablest discussion of the science of the textual criticism of the Greek New Testament in existence. . . . They have lifted the whole matter out of the realm of empiricism to the level of historical science.<sup>4</sup>

Souter pronounced their edition the greatest ever published and their Introduction

an achievement never surpassed in the scholarship of any country, . . . held in the highest esteem in all civilised countries, and on the foundation they have laid the future will do well to build.<sup>5</sup>

Their "work is the foundation of nearly all modern criticism"<sup>6</sup> and "forms the necessary point of departure"<sup>7</sup> for all later study. Kenyon appraised their efforts in part as follows,

The epoch-making character of their work lies not so much in any absolute novelty in their views as in the thoroughness with which they were elaborated, and the influence which they have exerted on all subsequent criticism of the New Testament.<sup>8</sup>

Though multiplied pages could be filled with praiseful estimates from scholars most competent to judge concerning the monumental contribution of Hort, it is fitting to close this appraisal with the tribute of the scholar who has been in the forefront of the discovery of the Caesarean Text that has

---

4 Robertson, op. cit., p. 36

5 Souter, Text and Canon of the N.T., 1912, p. 103

6 Lake, The Text of the N.T.<sup>2</sup>, 1902, p. 63c

7 Ibid., p. 68a

8 Kenyon, Textual Criticism<sup>2</sup>, p. 294b



modified somewhat the current views of Hort's Neutral Text. Streeter, stating that his view is in a sense a further development of and yet in another an attempt to supersede the theory put forward by Hort, added,

I wish, therefore, once and for all to affirm that this implies no undervaluing of the truly epoch-making character of the work of that great scholar. There is no greater name in the history of Textual Criticism. But for Hort, no such thing as what I am here attempting would be possible; and such modification of his views as seems to be necessary is mainly due to the discoveries made since the time he wrote.<sup>9</sup>

The true state of affairs prior to Hort, however, owed a monumental debt to the labors of three significant workers--Lachmann, Tregelles, and Tischendorf. The former chapter styled them 'Griesbach's Three Great Successors' but just as pertinently one may name them 'Hort's Three Great Forerunners.' Apart from this mighty threefold heritage the work of Hort, as he gratefully recognized,<sup>10</sup> could not have reached its high stage of scientific development. They mounted the stream of the science of New Testament Textual Criticism with a deep rudder and definitively directed the stream's course upward. Practically every handbook on the science since Hort has expounded his method, but that of Robertson is the best for simplicity and thoroughness.<sup>11</sup>

---

9 Streeter, The Four Gospels,<sup>5</sup> p. 34

10 Hort, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 186

11 Robertson, op. cit., 1925, pp. 37b, 148-220

The contribution of Hort can be epitomized in the twofold method used in attacking the twofold problem. The twofold problem was the mass of variants presented by the many witnesses and the problem of mixture in transmission. The genealogical approach provided the twofold method--to eliminate the late witnesses and to deal with the problem of mixture.

### I. THE AIM OF WESTCOTT AND HORT

The cry of Bentley and Lachmann was for the text of the oldest documents. Having placed his objective point back of Lachmann's, Tregelles sought not the oldest manuscripts but the oldest text. Then Westcott and Hort endeavored to determine the "actual excellence of the text."<sup>12</sup> Their aim was to "value all the mass of evidence,"<sup>13</sup> "all classes of phenomena,"<sup>14</sup> and thus restore the original text.<sup>15</sup> One of their excellencies

---

<sup>12</sup> Warfield, op. cit., p. 114b

<sup>13</sup> Souter, op. cit., p. 103b

<sup>14</sup> Hort, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 65a; cf. 285c

<sup>15</sup> Robertson, op. cit., p. 37a; Hort, op. cit., p. 1, sec. 1, "This edition is an attempt to present exactly the original words of the New Testament, so far as they can now be determined from surviving documents." Ibid., p. 288, sec. 375, "Our own aim, like that of Tischendorf and Tregelles, has been to obtain at once the closest possible approximation to the apostolic text itself." Ibid., p. 284b, sec. 371, "The text of this edition of course makes no pretension to be more than an approximation to the purest text that might be formed from existing materials."

over Bengel and Griesbach is that they dealt with a larger body of material. Though much of the data must on principle be refused a determining voice, all of it must be first heard, sifted, and weighed. Hort, in the final section to his Introduction,<sup>16</sup> anticipated any of his critics by declaring his edition not yet final and entered a caveat against a slavery to his text.<sup>17</sup>

## II. THE METHOD AND PRINCIPLES OF HORT

1. The Genealogical Method of Hort. The virtue of Hort's method does not lie in his masterful handling of internal evidence per se,<sup>18</sup> which leaves an "amount of latent uncertainty"<sup>19</sup> and "carries us but a little way towards the recovery of an ancient text,"<sup>20</sup> but in his family or genealogical approach. His investigations justified Griesbach's general conclusions and so added to and elucidated them as to

---

16 Hort, op. cit., p. 323, sec. 425

17 The fact that some feel that this servitude has seized some scholars and many of the generality of Greek students gives proof of the timeliness of Hort's warning. However, this chapter designs chiefly an exposition of Hort's method; the final part of this investigation will discuss the modifications of Hort in the light of the present research.

18 Hort, op. cit., pp. 19-30

19 Ibid., p. 286c

20 Ibid., p. 25a

"develop a usable system of textual criticism by the genealogical method."<sup>21</sup> "The most rudimentary form of criticism consists in dealing with each variation independently, and adopting at once in each case out of two or more variants that which looks most probable,"<sup>22</sup> but Hort's method is rather the most refined.

This technique is founded on the fact that manuscripts are copied one from another and are not independent. "By the nature of the case they are all fragments, usually casual and scattered fragments, of a genealogical tree of transmission, sometimes of vast extent and intricacy."<sup>23</sup> External facts may point to an affinity, as the repetition of physical defects such as the loss of one or more leaves, but for scientific proof it is necessary to investigate the character of each manuscript comparatively.<sup>24</sup> "Coincidence of reading infallibly implies identity of ancestry wherever accidental coincidence is out of the question."<sup>25</sup>

Affinity of reading thus reduces the problem of number to some simplicity.<sup>26</sup> Ten given manuscripts may have descended

---

21 Warfield, op. cit., p. 221b

22 Hort, op. cit., p. 19c

23 Ibid., p. 39b

24 Ibid., pp. 46, 53b

25 Ibid., p. 287b; cf. pp. 46, 231c

26 Ibid., pp. 41, 43

from one ancestor, or from two, and so on to ten. The fewer the ancestors, the simpler the problem of transmission.<sup>27</sup> Herein numerical preponderance yields to qualitative preponderance<sup>28</sup> as number is interpreted by descent.<sup>29</sup>

Yet this method has its limitation. If mixture were not a widespread and integral part of the intricate line of transmission, the family method would solve the difficulties almost perfectly. That is, when by the family method certain groups of witnesses have been discovered, some authorities join themselves now to one group and now to another because they possess mixed texts. The inconstancy of the groupings constitutes the most serious obstacle in analyzing the textual situation. Hort himself pointed out that "where the two ultimate witnesses differ, the genealogical method ceases to be applicable, and a comparison of the intrinsic general character of the two texts becomes the only resource."<sup>30</sup>

2. Hort's Handling of Mixture. The invasion of mixture into the stream of transmission introduces uncertainties

---

27 Ibid., p. 43

28 Ibid., p. 44a

29 Ibid., p. 44b. We may presume that the concurrence of the plurality is more probable than one single document since one scribe is more likely to err than several, but Hort correctly observed that this single exception does not touch the principle itself (Loc. cit.).

30 Ibid., p. 42a

into the process of internal evidence of documents,<sup>31</sup> weakens the homogeneousness of the witness<sup>32</sup> by making the community of origin partial,<sup>33</sup> and produces convergence in descent instead of divergence.<sup>34</sup> The New Testament, therefore, even more than classical literature,

needs peculiarly vigilant and patient handling on account of the intricacy of evidence due to the unexampled amount and antiquity of mixture of different texts, from which few even of the better documents are free."<sup>35</sup>

It is relevant here to recall that Griesbach recognized and sought ineffectively to deal with this difficulty of descent<sup>36</sup> and that Tregelles' Comparative Criticism failed before this phenomenon.<sup>37</sup> It is generally thought that Hort was a master on just this point. Now what expedients did he employ in attacking this knotty situation? With some clearness three lines of approach call for mention:

(1). Conflate Readings. In such a case, three principal forms of reading appear, two short and one longer.

---

31 Ibid., p. 35b

32 Ibid., p. 38a

33 Ibid., p. 46c; cf. Warfield, op. cit., pp. 151a, 154a, 156c

34 Ibid., p. 48c; cf. Warfield, ibid., p. 155a

35 Ibid., p. 73b; cf. Robertson, op. cit., pp. 192-94

36 Supra, pp. 12, 15 fn. 60

37 Ibid., p. 26

The theory of conflation is that the longer is a combination of the two shorter variants. The fact that in such instances the longer variants are not found in the earlier writers confirms that conjecture. This seems to show that the two shorter are not partial omissions of the longer or a 'double simplification.' Hort cited eight instances but thought there were others and classed this phenomenon as "the clearest evidence for tracing antecedent factors of mixture in texts."<sup>38</sup> This estimate is just because "conflate readings show mixture in its simplest form."<sup>39</sup>

From these eight instances Hort made these inferences--

If a reading is conflate, every document supporting it is thereby shown to have a more or less mixed text among its ancestry. . . . We learn to set an especial value on those documents which rarely or never support conflate readings . . . . It is incredible that mixed texts should be mixed only where there are conflate readings.<sup>40</sup>

(2). External Evidence. The process of disentangling admixture by conflation "is independent of any external evidence as to dates, being founded solely on the analysis and comparison of extant texts: but of course its value for purposes of criticism is much enhanced by any chronological evidence which may exist."<sup>41</sup> Chronological

---

38 Hort, op. cit., p. 49b

39 Robertson, op. cit., p. 192b

40 Hort, op. cit., p. 50f

41 Ibid., p. 52c, section 64

and geographical information may interpret obscure genealogical phenomena by "marking the relative date and relative independence of the several early documents or early lost ancestors of later documents or sets of documents."<sup>42</sup>

(3). Internal Evidence of Groups. When the extant documentary evidence antecedent to mixture yielded too small or uncertain materials for clearing the ambiguities of mixture, Hort fell back on the Internal Evidence of Groups, which can be applied to mixed and unmixed texts alike.<sup>43</sup> "The value of Internal Evidence of Groups in cases of mixture depends, it will be seen, on the fact that by its very nature it enables us to deal separately with the different elements of a document of mixed ancestry."<sup>44</sup> Referring to Westcott and Hort's showing how to apply internal evidence (transcriptional and intrinsic) to the external evidence of documents, Robertson pointed out that "by means of this powerful agent they have been able to attack the most difficult problems that had baffled Lachmann and Tregelles."<sup>45</sup>

---

42 Ibid., p. 58b

43 Ibid., p. 52c; cf. p. 57a

44 Ibid., p. 61b

45 Robertson, op. cit., p. 38b



### III. THE FAMILIES OF HORT

By the use of his method Hort outlined four distinct families--Syrian, Western, Alexandrian, and Neutral. The genius of Hort lies not only in isolating these families but in weighing their relative importance. The two processes are interdependent and yet for more objective study may be separated. The first is more factual, the second more theoretical, being based on one's interpretation of the first. It is possible to see a threefold process in the consideration of textual families--identification, attestation, and evaluation.

1. The Syrian. First of all Hort called attention to the fact that by a study of Chrysostom "all the important ramifications of transmission preceded the fifth century."<sup>46</sup> By an application of the three principles for attacking the ambiguities arising from the coalescence of lines of transmission Hort declared the Syrian Text late and eclectic, the result of a deliberate recension,<sup>47</sup> probably by Lucian of Antioch.

---

<sup>46</sup> Hort, op. cit., p. 93b; cf. Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible, p. 167b

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., pp. 133, 182c

(1). Conflate Readings. Hort did not originate the idea of blended readings;<sup>48</sup> his distinction lies in the use made of them to evince the lateness and eclectic nature of the Byzantine Text. The passages chosen are--Mark 6:33; 8:26; 9:38, 49; Luke 9:10, 54; 12:18; 24:53.<sup>49</sup>

(2). Patristic Quotations. Claiming that Chrysostom (who died in A. D. 407) first reveals use of this class of readings, Hort decided that there were no distinctively Syrian readings before the middle of the third century.<sup>50</sup>

(3). Internal Evidence. By this process Hort arrived at the conclusion that the Syrian Text was "not only partly but wholly derived from the other known ancient texts,"<sup>51</sup> not they from it, and is "only a modified eclectic combination of earlier texts independently attested,"<sup>52</sup> characterized by the traits of smoothness<sup>53</sup> and completeness.<sup>54</sup>

---

48 Simon, Griesbach, Marsh, Nolan, and Tischendorf hinted it.

49 Hort, op. cit., sections 134-146

50 Ibid., p. 114c

51 Ibid., p. 117c

52 Ibid., p. 118a; cf. p. 133

53 Ibid., p. 114c

54 Ibid., p. 134f

2. The Western. Judging that the Syrian witnesses may evidently in most cases be safely neglected<sup>55</sup> and confining himself accordingly to the earlier evidence, Hort outlined three Pre-Syrian texts. Questioning the fitness of the customary name for the Western Text since its witnesses come from the East as well as the West, this critic suspected that it "took its rise in North-western Syria or Asia Minor"<sup>56</sup> and then spread generally, being headed by D and other Greek-Latin manuscripts, the Old Latin, and the Latin Fathers. Hort thus summed up the patristic attestation,

Thus the text used by all those Ante-Nicene Greek writers, not being connected with Alexandria, who have left considerable remains is substantially Western. Even in Clement of Alexandria and in Origen, especially in some of his writings, Western quotations hold a prominent place.<sup>57</sup>

The two chief characteristics of this type of witnesses are wide divergence from other families<sup>58</sup> and "predominantly Latin attestation."<sup>59</sup> Other traits are "love of paraphrase,"<sup>60</sup> "a disposition to enrich the text at the cost of its purity by alterations or additions taken from traditional and perhaps

---

55 Ibid., p. 192a

56 Ibid., p. 108

57 Ibid., p. 113b

58 Ibid., p. 178a, "most licentious"

59 Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible, p. 167a

60 Hort, op. cit., p. 122c

from apocryphal or other non-biblical sources,"<sup>61</sup> and "fondness for assimilation."<sup>62</sup>

In the early and widespread variants of this text Hort saw the early process of deterioration in transmission at work. Though "the earliest readings which can be fixed chronologically belong to it"<sup>63</sup> and though it "was the most widely spread text of Ante-Nicene times,"<sup>64</sup> yet continuous study of its internal character evinces that it owes "its differences in a great measure to a perilous confusion between transcription and reproduction, and even between the preservation of a record and its supposed improvement."<sup>65</sup> Thus it is evident that it cannot be rejected on the lateness of its text as the Syrian but on grounds of intrinsic probability,<sup>66</sup> or evidence of groups.<sup>67</sup> Hort further concluded that the Western Text suddenly collapsed after Eusebius.<sup>68</sup>

---

61 Ibid., p. 123b

62 Ibid., p. 124c

63 Ibid., p. 120a

64 Ibid.; cf. Warfield, op. cit., p. 220b

65 Ibid., p. 121b

66 Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible, p. 168

67 Hort, op. cit., p. 194a

68 Ibid., p. 141a

3. The Alexandrian. Hort saw a stylistic revision which, because of the local relations of its habitual representatives,<sup>69</sup> he called Alexandrian. "The changes made have usually more to do with language than matter, and are marked by an effort after correctness of phrase,"<sup>70</sup> "being formed by skilful but most petty corrections,"<sup>71</sup> "and not seldom display a delicate philological tact."<sup>72</sup>

Our critic assigned it a character and weight "somewhat intermediate"<sup>73</sup> between the corrupt Western and the correct Neutral, being in fact "an offshoot from"<sup>74</sup> the Neutral Text. It is "a small group, not embodied wholly in any one MS. or group of MSS., but normally akin to the Neutral family but differing from the leading representatives of that family"<sup>75</sup> and to be "discerned when some members of that group, notably  $\chi$  CLX 33 and the Bohairic version, differ from the other members headed by B."<sup>76</sup> "Hort's 'Alexandrian' is a

---

69 Ibid., p. 109a; cf. p. 230a

70 Ibid., p. 131c

71 Ibid., p. 178a

72 Ibid., p. 131c

73 Warfield, op. cit., p. 160a

74 Hort, op. cit., p. 176c

75 Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible, p. 167a

76 Ibid., Intro. to Text. Crit.<sup>2</sup>, p. 298b

variation from his 'Neutral' with occasional Western mixture."<sup>77</sup>  
 The readings are "consequently of minor importance, and are not always distinctly recognisable."<sup>78</sup>

Admitting that the process is a delicate one, Hort proposed to detect Alexandrian readings by a "comparison of contrasted groupings in successive variations"<sup>79</sup> and rated CL and the Bohairic Version as the most constant witnesses.<sup>80</sup> On the grounds of Intrinsic and Transcriptional Probability Hort valued the Alexandrian readings "certainly as a rule derived from the other Non-Western Pre-Syrian readings, and not vice versa"<sup>81</sup> and rejected all distinctively Alexandrian readings when otherwise unattested.<sup>82</sup>

Thus Hort judged both Pre-Syrian Non-Neutral texts as wholes "aberrant,"<sup>83</sup> that in the case of exclusively Western or exclusively Alexandrian readings a strong presumption lies against them,<sup>84</sup> and that the number of readings to be accepted

---

77 Robertson, op. cit., 2nd ed., 1928, p. 244

78 Kenyon, Our Bible and the Anc. Mss.<sup>4</sup>, 1903, pp. 78,  
 111a

79 Hort, op. cit., p. 167a

80 Ibid., p. 166b

81 Ibid., p. 130c

82 Ibid., p. 177c

83 Ibid., p. 173a

84 Ibid., p. 173b

from these is exceedingly small.<sup>85</sup>

4. The Neutral. Hort thought this type of text was unedited or at least relatively pure from editorial revision<sup>86</sup> and therefore fitly termed Neutral. He listed B, the Egyptian Versions, and Origen as the chief witnesses,<sup>87</sup> followed B first of all, but expressed some diffidence on what he strangely termed 'Western non-interpolations.'<sup>88</sup> He owned that Alexandria was a leader in the perpetuation of this 'incorrupt text,' but emphasized that it was by "no means confined to Alexandria"<sup>89</sup> but rather that Non-Western Pre-Syrian texts persisted in varying degrees of purity in various regions throughout the Ante-Nicene period.<sup>90</sup> In testing the character of the Neutral Text Hort took binary and ternary variations and found these groups favoring the Neutral against the aberrant Western and Alexandrian texts.<sup>91</sup>

Thus this critic decided that the Syrian may in most cases be safely neglected, that the Western and Alexandrian

---

85 Ibid., p. 174a; cf. 208c

86 Ibid., p. 224c

87 For fuller statement of witnesses, see ibid., p. 192b, and compare Schaff, Companion to Greek Testament, 4th ed., p. 422c.

88 Hort, op. cit., pp. 175-77

89 Ibid., p. 128b

90 Ibid., p. 129b

91 Ibid., p. 170f; cf. p. 172c

are ancient but aberrant texts, and that the Neutral is the best family,  $\Lambda$ B the best group, and B the best single document. He did this by the use of the fathers "whose quotations enable us to locate these groups approximately both in time and in space."<sup>92</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> Kenyon, Intro. to Text. Crit.<sup>2</sup>, p. 298c



## CHAPTER THREE

### ANTECEDENTS TO STREETER: FERRAR TO LAKE

Hug had given incipient observations on local texts<sup>1</sup> and Tregelles<sup>2</sup> and Alford<sup>3</sup> had pointed out that later minuscules may contain texts far older than their age. Modern research may well bear in mind as almost prophetic that, with the exception of new discoveries of materials, basically most of the investigation that isolated the Caesarean Family is hinted in embryo in Hort's section 211.<sup>4</sup> That section includes reference to Families 1 and 13 and Codex 565 or 2<sup>pe</sup>. Hence this chapter will trace the study of local texts from Ferrar in 1868 to Lake in 1923, just one year before Streeter's great book. The mainspring of such investigations has been the family idea of manuscript study.

#### I. THE FERRAR-GROUP

The Ferrar-Group originally consisted of Codices 13 at Paris, 69 at Leicester, 124 at Vienna, and 346 at Milan, but now has several new members. Present research in New

---

1 Supra, p. 13f

2 Supra, p. 23c

3 Alford, cited at length by Birks, op. cit., p. 23

4 Hort, op. cit., II, p. 154

Testament Textual Criticism, especially that of Lake and Streeter, has brought into prominence this group of minuscules, and the design of this thesis makes a resume of such investigations very pertinent.

1. As Studied before Ferrar. Ludolph Kuster, a Westphalian who edited Mill's work at Rotterdam in 1710, stated that Codex 13 supplied him with more various readings than all the other Paris codices together.<sup>5</sup> Wetstein (who again collated it) and others observed close relations between it and Codex 69. Griesbach, having examined Codex 13 in detail and having noted six hundred extra readings, declared it full of good readings and from the same source as D, D having undergone greater changes. This critic further judged that "the omissions of other good codices receive a great accession of weight from its support, but of itself it is of little weight in such variations."<sup>6</sup>

---

5 Ferrar and Abbott, A Collation of Four Important Mss. of the Gospels, Dublin, 1877, p. iv; cf. Scrivener, Plain Intro., 3rd ed., p. 180c. The Abbe de Louvois collated for Kuster (Lake, Fam. 13, Philadelphia, 1941, p.10).

6 Ferrar and Abbott, op. cit., p. xli. Note that among Griesbach's witnesses to his Western Text--D, 1, 13, 69, 118, 124, 131, 157--are three members of both Fams. 1 and 13 (See Moses Stuart, "Notes to Hug's Intro.," Hug, op. cit., p. 685b). G. Begtrup, a Dane, made a collation of 13 around 1797; it was published by Birch and appears to have been used by Tischendorf. Ferrar and Abbott recorded the fact that scholars had long desired more accurate collation of this codex and of Codex 346 (Op. cit., p. iv).

Mill collated Codex 69, was the first to observe "its striking affinity with Codex Bezae,"<sup>7</sup> but did not particularly value it. Wetstein used a "much more accurate"<sup>8</sup> collation made by John Jackson and William Tiffin of Cambridge<sup>9</sup> and remarked on its affinity with Codex 13.<sup>10</sup> Tregelles, recollating it very accurately<sup>11</sup> in 1852, admitted it and two other minuscules in forming his text and remarked, "It is of far higher value, not only than the great mass of recent cursive copies, but also than the greater part of the later uncials."<sup>12</sup> Scrivener recollated it very minutely in 1855<sup>13</sup> and estimated that "no manuscript of its age has a text so remarkable as this, less however in the Acts than in the Gospels."<sup>14</sup>

Scrivener summed up the affinities of Codex 124 in 1861 in these words,<sup>15</sup> "It resembles the Philoxenian Syriac,

---

7 Scrivener, Codex Augiensis, p. xlv

8 Ibid., p. xli

9 For stories of these, Lake, Fam. 13, p. 15, fns.

10 Carte and Dobbin made collations of it, and Scrivener thought that Jackson made another (Cd. Augiensis, p. xlii).

11 Tregelles, op. cit., p. 166

12 Ferrar and Abbott, op. cit., p. iv

13 Scrivener, Codex Augiensis, p. xlii

14 Scrivener, Plain Intro., 3rd ed., p. 190c

15 Scrivener, Plain Intro., 1st ed., p. 158

the old Latin, Codd. DL. 1. 13, and especially 69 (Treschow, Alter, Birch)."<sup>16</sup>

Before Ferrar, Codex 346 at Milan had attracted little notice though Scholz had examined and partially collated it, and scholars desired a collation of it.<sup>17</sup> This early work may be marked as significant, however, since it attracted Ferrar's attention by showing affinity between Codices 346 and 13.<sup>18</sup> Hug<sup>19</sup> urged that Codices 13, 69, and 124 contained an ancient text, especially in their peculiar readings, that their resemblance to D may reveal a Latinizing tendency, that they evince an affinity with B, L, Origen, the Sahidic, and the Peshitta (124 showing more harmonization here than the others), that Codex 1 has some connection with these and especially with Origen, and that in line with his chief contention these all have connection with his *κοινὴ ἔκδοσις*.

2. The Pioneer Work of Ferrar. W. H. Ferrar, Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, discovered in 1868<sup>20</sup> by a

16 Codex 124, esteemed by Birch the best of the Vienna Codices, had been defectively collated by Treschow in 1773, Alter at Vienna in 1787, and by Birch in 1788 at Hauniae. Alter noted itacisms. Tischendorf followed Scholz who seems not to have consulted Alter.

17 Ferrar and Abbott, op. cit., p. iv

18 Lake, Fam. 13, p. 18b

19 Hug, op. cit., pp. 101-103, sec. 29; cf. p. 140a

20 Scrivener, Plain Introduction, 3rd ed., p. 181a

detailed comparison of the group that the four manuscripts (13, 69, 124, 346) were transcripts of one not very distant archetype. Ferrar more accurately collated Codex 13 and reproduced with minor corrections Scrivener's collation of 69. Where the collations of Alter and Birch had disagreed, Emanuel Hoffman of Vienna examined Codex 124 for Ferrar.<sup>21</sup> Ill health kept Ferrar from personally collating Codex 346, and Ceriani procured a collation for him and later checked it for Abbott.<sup>22</sup> Ferrar died in 1871, and his colleague at Trinity College, T. K. Abbott, continued the research. Scrivener remarked in 1875<sup>23</sup> that in Abbott's judgment the archetype "may have equalled Codex Bezae in age, while it exceeded it in purity of its text." In 1877 Abbott published these researches with an introduction and a short facsimile of each codex.<sup>24</sup>

By ascertaining the amount of coincidences<sup>25</sup> and the amount of differences<sup>26</sup> between these codices these scholars

---

21 Ferrar and Abbott, op. cit., p. xvi

22 Loc. cit.

23 Scrivener, Six Lectures, p. 82

24 Ferrar and Abbott, op. cit., pp. lviii and 389

25 Ibid., pp. xix-xxiv, especially p. xix

26 Ibid., p. xxiv

demonstrated their common origin<sup>27</sup> and their affinity with other manuscripts.<sup>28</sup> They felt certain that the agreement of three of the four gives the reading of their archetype<sup>29</sup> and claimed for this archetype an authority "second only to that of the three or four most ancient uncials."<sup>30</sup>

The Dublin duumvirate used Codex 13 to help to eliminate accidental omissions and frequent errors from oversight or carelessness in the others. They decided that Codex 124 had undergone more modification of text than the others and that Codex 346 "is still more closely related than 69 to 13."<sup>31</sup> Each manuscript has 125 to 200 lections not found outside of this group, the great majority being common to more than one of them.<sup>32</sup> In the last three Gospels (Matthew is deficient) these codices agree in over one hundred readings "for which no other manuscript authority is

---

27 Ibid., p. xxxiii

28 Ibid., p. xlvii

29 Ibid., p. v

30 Ibid., p. iv. Some details about the four minuscules may be mentioned. In Codex 13 they found 1523 itacisms (ibid., p. xii), in 124 (it being more carefully written than the others) they discovered 243 such variants, and in 346 they located 1320 itacisms (ibid., p. xvi). "Apart from additions and omissions, Codex 13 has hardly more than a dozen readings in which it is not supported by one or more of the others, and most even of these are mere trifles or obvious mistakes" (ibid., p. vf).

31 Ibid., p. v

32 Ibid., p. xxxiii

adduced."<sup>33</sup>

Codex 346 in the Ambrosian Library, Milan, Italy, was purchased in 1606 at Gallipoli in Calabria in the toe of Italy. Ceriani conjectured from some notes at the end of the volume that relate to Calabria and from an appendix in the same hand as the codex that it was written in that region.<sup>34</sup> Abbott thought that the general character of the writing and itacisms which obtained in other Calabrian manuscripts around the twelfth century confirmed this conclusion.<sup>35</sup>

This pioneer work of Ferrar was the Caesarean Family in embryo, and the group is still one of the primary members of that family;<sup>36</sup> yet no more conscious was its discoverer of its significance than was Mill in his hints that germinated the family idea in manuscript study.<sup>37</sup> Very significantly, however, did Ferrar and Abbott avow that Codices 28 and 565 show most resemblance to the group, that

---

33 Ibid., p. xix. Perhaps the most striking variant of this group is the placing of the pericope on adultery after Luke 21:38.

34 Ibid., p. xv

35 Loc. cit.

36 Streeter, op. cit., p. 50

37 "At first the significance of this group was far from clear. . . . Subsequent developments were to add to its importance" (Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible, p. 174b).

most frequent agreement with the Armenian and some of the Old Latin is evident, and that the hypothesis that the group lies very close to D is false.<sup>38</sup>

3. Martin's Localization of the Group. In 1886 J. P. Martin<sup>39</sup> localized all the group (except Codex 69) as written in Calabria (or Sicily). This research followed the suggestion of Ceriani and Abbott on Codex 346. His approach was paleographical and concerned hagiographical notices in the menology of feasts celebrated only in Calabria.<sup>40</sup>

A further value of Martin's work was the expansion of the group by adding fresh members, Codex 348 at Milan and Codex 543 in the British Museum. Harris called the former "a not very close ally of the group,"<sup>41</sup> and Lake denied its

---

38 Ferrar and Abbott, op. cit., pp. xxvii, 1. Hort said of their work, "Most cursives of the Gospels which contain many ancient readings owe more to Western than to Alexandrian sources. Among these may be named four, 13, 69, 124, and 346, which have recently been shown by Professors Ferrar and T. K. Abbott to be variously descended from a single not very remote original, probably uncial; its Non-Syrian readings belong to very ancient types, but their proportion to the fundamentally Syrian text as a whole is not great" (Op. cit., p. 154b).

39 Martin, Quatre Manuscrits Importants du N.T., 1886

40 Harris, The Leicester Codex, 1887, p. 3

41 Harris, Further Researches into the Hist. of the Ferrar-Group, 1900, p. 3a



being a Ferrar text.<sup>42</sup> Harris denominated the latter "a most important addition to the historical knowledge of the group."<sup>43</sup> Martin further speculated that Codex 211, a Greek-Arabic document at Venice, since it is connected by appended matter, was similar to Codices 69 and 346.<sup>44</sup> Lake owned it had some points of affinity but was not a primary member of the group.<sup>45</sup> Thus we see that Martin really added only one member to the group, Codex 543, on which Scrivener (his 556) had already remarked in 1883 that the position of the pericope on adultery is that of Ferrar's four "with which its text much agrees."<sup>46</sup>

4. J. Rendel Harris' Studies. In 1887 this scholar investigated Codex 69<sup>47</sup> and concluded that it might have come from South Italy, a view held by Lake in 1941 as tentative,<sup>48</sup> and suggested that Codex 561 (Gregory 713)<sup>49</sup>

---

42 Lake, The Text of the New Testament,<sup>2</sup> 1902, p. 20fn

43 Harris, op. cit., p. 3a

44 Cf. Gregory, Prolegomena, p. 511a

45 Lake, "Some New Members of the Ferrar Group," JTS, 1889, pp. 117-19; cf. The Text of N. T., 2nd ed., p. 20fn

46 Scrivener, Plain Intro.<sup>3</sup>, p. 237a; cf. infra, p. 54b

47 Harris, Origin of the Leicester Codex, 1887

48 Lake, Fam. 13, pp. 14, 27c

49 Ibid., p. 4a; cf. Metzger, "The Caesarean Text of the Gospels," JBL, December 1945, p. 459a and footnotes

belongs to the same group.

In 1890 C. R. Gregory<sup>50</sup> said that Codex 543 appears to belong to the Ferrar-Group, from the enumeration of the *ῥήματα* and *στίχοι*, the description of the titles of the Gospels, and the peculiar tract on the limits of the patriarchates. He further concluded that the eleventh century Codex 788 in the National Library at Athens is a Ferrar manuscript<sup>51</sup> and added that W. H. Simcox in April 1886 assisted him in collating Codex 826 and "disclosed its consanguinity with this family."<sup>52</sup>

In Adversaria Critica<sup>53</sup> in 1893 appeared posthumously Scrivener's detailed description of 543, his collation of it with the Ferrar-Group, and his definite alignment of it with the group.<sup>54</sup>

In his monograph in 1893 Harris advanced two theories.<sup>55</sup> He examined the curious twofold reckoning of *ῥήματα* and *στίχοι* in the separate Gospels.

50 Gregory, Prolegomena, Leipzig, 1890, p. 553c

51 Ibid., p. 581b

52 Ibid., p. 585b

53 Cambridge, 1893, pp. xvi-xxii, 1-59

54 Harris, Further Researches, p. 6; Lake, "Some New Members of the Ferrar Group," JTS, I, p. 117fn

55 Harris, On the Origin of the Ferrar-Group, mentioned in his Further Researches, p. 5f

He thought that the word *ῥῆμα* was a translation from Syriac, and that the number of *ῥήματα* represented a somewhat corrupt form of the stichometry found in Syriac mss. This theory was never warmly supported, but was perhaps not adequately discussed; certainly the difference between the various stichometric counts in the Gospels is still a mystery.<sup>56</sup>

Furthermore, Harris claimed a Syriac origin for the most characteristic Ferrar readings,<sup>57</sup> thinking they were influenced by Tatian's Diatessaron.<sup>58</sup> Lake rated this as "a theory which was part of the general effort, of which he [Harris] and the late Dr. Chase<sup>59</sup> were the chief protagonists, to find a Syriac element in the 'Western' text."<sup>60</sup>

In developing his hypothesis of a Hesychian-recension (roughly Hort's Neutral) Bousset of Gottingen in 1894 held that Family 13 shows relation to such a text.<sup>61</sup> In treating his group KΠ(M) he noted that minuscules 33, 157, Families 1 and 13 very often go with the Hesychian-recension

---

56 Lake, Fam. 13, p. 3b

57 Kenyon, Intro. to Textual Criticism,<sup>2</sup> p. 132a

58 Lake, "Some New Members of the Ferrar Group," p. 117

59 F. H. Chase, The Syriac Element in Cd. Bezae, 1893

60 K. Lake, etc., Fam. 13, p. 3b

61 W. Bousset, "Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament," Texte und Untersuchungen, Band 11, Heft 4, p. 83b

even without KΠ, though they have clear relationship with KΠ; therefore they show a mixed text.<sup>62</sup> The next year J. Armitage Robinson affirmed that the Ferrar-Group "again and again accompanies the Old Syriac and the Armenian in very remarkable readings."<sup>63</sup> Again,

I would only now hazard the opinion that the connecting link between the Armenian and the Ferrar group will be found in the Old Syriac base which I believe underlies the Armenian Version.<sup>64</sup>

It was in 1899 that Kirsopp Lake, a pupil of Rendel Harris, found that Codices 348 and 211 do not belong to the group, but his inspection of Codices 826 and 828 (more true to the Ferrar type than 826) in the monastery of Grotta Ferrata definitely put these manuscripts in the Ferrar-Group, both the appended materials and the text disclosing definitive Ferrarisms.<sup>65</sup> In a second visit the next year, Lake confirmed Gregory's identification of Codex 788 as a member of the group.<sup>66</sup> Out of this came a new book by Harris, with whom Lake had traveled, and a joint determina-

62 Ibid., p. 112a; cf. 118a, 127b

63 Robinson, "Euthaliana," Texts and Studies, Vol. 3, p. 77a

64 Ibid., p. 81b

65 Lake, "Some New Membs. of the Ferrar Group," p. 119f

66 Supra, p. 52a; cf. Fam. 13, p. 4b

tion to edit the Ferrar text, a project soon postponed indefinitely.<sup>67</sup>

This book appeared in 1900.<sup>68</sup> In it Harris observed that activity was then conspicuous in the study of the Western Text, summarized the story of Ferrar researches, and added,

After Codex Bezae, it may be doubted whether any Greek text is so important to the student as that lost archetype from which the members of the Ferrar-group depend, and which is capable of a restoration out of the evidence which is furnished by the individual members of the group.<sup>69</sup>

This monograph recognized eight manuscripts--13-69-124-346-543-788-826-828--as already within the Ferrar-Group and added Codex 230.<sup>70</sup>

Besides the above, this book did two things. It worked out the Calabrian origin of the group in detail,<sup>71</sup>

67 Lake, Fam. 13, p. 4f

68 Harris, Further Researches into the History of the FERRAR-GROUP, London, 1900

69 Ibid., p. 1

70 Ibid., p. 78a, "It will be admitted that this manuscript is a Ferrar manuscript. It may not have the textual displacements, but it clearly has the readings. It would be superfluous to enlarge on this." Scrivener (Plain Intro., 3rd ed., p. 208) has said, "An interesting copy, deemed by Moldenhawer worthy of close examination." The latter examined and partly collated it for Birch (Harris, Further Researches, p. 77a).

71 Cf. Kenyon, Text. Crit., p. 112; 2nd ed., p. 132

holding that the appended group of saints in the menology localizes the manuscript, especially so with the inclusion of small or local saints. Thus Harris' work was chiefly historical in localizing the group rather than textual in seeking the nature of the text. Secondly, the writer concluded that at least part of the group, having a tract on the Climates of Africa, is descended from a bilingual Graeco-Arabic archetype in Sicily in the twelfth century.<sup>72</sup> He further felt that because of much common matter Codices 69, 346, and 543 form a subordinate group.<sup>73</sup>

Certain sporadic notices of our group remain to be summarized. In 1899 Vincent<sup>74</sup> characterized the Ferrar text as a mixture of Western and Syrian readings. More accurately, Kenyon in 1901 held that it is clear that this text is "predominantly" Syrian with many Neutral or Western readings.<sup>75</sup> Speaking of Family 1 in 1902, Lake held it

probable, though not quite certain, that the same text is preserved with a different series of corruptions in the Ferrar Group, in 22 and 28, minuscules of the twelfth century at Paris, in 565.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> Harris, Further Researches, p. 35ff; cf. Metzger, op. cit., p. 459b

<sup>73</sup> Harris, ibid., p. 35a

<sup>74</sup> Vincent, op. cit., p. 167

<sup>75</sup> Kenyon, Textual Crit., p. 112; 2nd ed., p. 131f

<sup>76</sup> Lake, Text of the N. T., 2nd ed., p. 20f. In Cd. 1 and Its Allies, 1902, Lake suggested that the eight Ferrar

In 1904 M. R. James identified another manuscript as written by the same scribe as that of Codex 69<sup>77</sup> and added several more in 1910<sup>78</sup> and 1911.<sup>79</sup> The effect of these tends to locate Codex 69 eventually in South Italy.<sup>80</sup> In 1906 Delehayé corrected Martin and Harris in some details of Calabrian hagiography but left the general conclusion of Calabrian origin of Ferrar manuscripts intact.<sup>81</sup>

5. Von Soden on the Ferrar-Group. Von Soden accomplished two things, an enlargement of the Ferrar-Group to thirteen manuscripts and a new treatment or analysis of the archetypal text. He added Codices 174, 230, 837, 983, and 1689. Codex 174 is "most important, for it is one of the two dated and localised members of the family,"<sup>82</sup> written (according to its colophon) by Constantine the

---

mss. be called Fam. 13 (p. vi) and that so far as Mark is "concerned we have to recognize a close connection between fam<sup>1</sup> and fam<sup>13</sup> 22 28 565 700" (p. 1).

77 James, "The Scribe of the Leicester Codex," JTS, April 1904, V, p. 445ff

78 Ibid., "Two More Mss. Written by the Scribe of the Leicester Codex," Jan. 1910, p. 291ff

79 Ibid., "Another Book Written by the Scribe of the Leicester Codex," April 1911, p. 465f

80 Lake, Fam. 13, p. 5

81 Ibid., pp. 2c, 54

82 Ibid., p. 4c; cf. 56b, 57b, 61b

Protopapa in 1052 at Taberna in the heel of Italy.<sup>83</sup> It has a Ferrar text in each Gospel except Mark.<sup>84</sup> He added Codex 230 in the Escorial<sup>85</sup> and Codex 837 in Milan, but Lake has protested, "Neither of these Codices seem to be of first class importance, and only Mark 1.1-32 is extant in 837."<sup>86</sup> Von Soden regarded 230 as more closely related to 13 and 346 than to any other manuscript<sup>87</sup> and 983 and 1689 as very nearly twins.<sup>88</sup> Codex 1689 is the other dated and localized Ferrar member, being copied in 1200 (or 1282) in 'Megglaboton,'<sup>89</sup> most likely a town in South Italy.<sup>90</sup>

Von Soden recognized the Ferrar-Group (which he termed J or I') as one of the best witnesses to the earlier form of his I text (roughly Hort's Western),<sup>91</sup> being one of

---

83 For a collation, see ibid., p. 155ff.

84 Ibid., p. 57b

85 Already added by Harris in 1900, supra, fn. 70

86 Lake, Fam. 13, p. 5

87 Ibid., p. 62

88 Ibid., p. 5

89 Ibid., p. 4f

90 Cf. ibid., p. 56b, 61a

91 Ibid., p. 5f; Lake, Text of the N. T.<sup>5</sup>, p. 21b



the ten or more sub-groups of I.<sup>92</sup> His K text (roughly Hort's Syrian) fell into three main classes--K<sup>1</sup>, the earliest form, K<sup>r</sup>, the latest, and K<sup>x</sup>, the inclusive intermediate form. This earliest form, K<sup>1</sup>, had been influenced in its readings by J or the Ferrar-Group,<sup>93</sup> which influenced group he termed K<sup>i</sup>.<sup>94</sup> K<sup>i</sup>, consisting of the Uncials EFGH, was thought to be either K<sup>1</sup> influenced by J or more probably J corrected to a K<sup>1</sup> standard. Lake judged this as substantially accurate<sup>95</sup> and "extremely valuable,"<sup>96</sup> though he showed at the latter date that D fails to show strong affinity to the Ferrar-Group and its allies.<sup>97</sup>

Publishing his results in 1907,<sup>98</sup> H. Von Soden split the Ferrar-Group into three sub-groups, which Lake substantially confirmed in 1941.<sup>99</sup> First, the largest group,

---

92 Kenyon, Text of Greek Bible, p. 181f; Lake, RTP, Oct. 1908, "Von Soden's Treatment of the Text of the Gospels," p. 209b

93 Kenyon, Text of Greek Bible, p. 179

94 Lake, Text of the N. T.<sup>5</sup>, p. 101b; ibid.<sup>6</sup>, p. 79b

95 Lake, "Von Soden's Treatment of the Text of the Gospels," RTP (October 1908), IV, 4, p. 206c

96 Ibid., "The Text of the Gospels," HTR (July 1923), XVI, 3, p. 267c

97 Ibid., p. 275b

98 Von Soden, Die Schriften des N. T., Vol. ii

99 Lake, Fam. 13, p. 5c

seven in all--Codices 13, 230, 346, 543, 826, 828, 837. Second, Codices 69, 124, 174, 788--four in all. Third, Codices 983 and 1689.

6. Hutton on the Ferrar-Group. E. A. Hutton contributed to textual studies a very thought-provoking monograph in 1911 containing an "Excursus on the Ferrar Group"<sup>100</sup> that dealt with the mutual relationship of the members of this group. He had available for study collations of only five of the extended Ferrar-Group--13, 69, 124, 346, 543--and found 141 important readings common to the five. From an analysis of these he judged that the "grandparents" of the five were only two (69 and 124), that 13 and 543 are closely related as in every one of the 141 lections they are alike and are probably therefore copies of the same exemplar, and that all that is valuable in the five is contained in 69 and 124, the two best of the group. He thought that the Ferrar-Group represents "a purely local text" and that 69 and 124 were independent for at least three generations. Lake observed that "what he really did for the Ferrar group was to perceive, at least in outline,

---

<sup>100</sup> Hutton, An Atlas of Textual Criticism, 1911, pp. 48-58; cf. Metzger, op. cit., p. 460; Lake, Fam. 13, p. 6; Kenyon, Intro. to Textual Criticism of the N. T., 2nd ed., p. 131

the problem of<sup>101</sup> the second group in Von Soden's sub-groups.<sup>102</sup>

Hutton suggested further that "the Western family has several sub-groups."<sup>103</sup> He sent Burkitt certain Syrian readings supported by the Sinaitic Syriac. From these Burkitt proposed to recategorize in Mark Hort's families as follows,

(1) A<sup>B</sup> generally with C\*<sup>L</sup>Δ sah boh--an Alexandrian-Caesarean group; (2) D lat.af<sup>r</sup>-eur--a Western group; (3) a group 1 & c 13 & c 28 565 700--an Eastern group, so called because readings of this group often agree with syr.S and we know that cod. 565 had some connection with Pontus; (4) the Antiochian or Syrian.<sup>104</sup>

The noteworthy thing here is the cleavage between D and the forming Caesarean Family.

#### 7. Subsequent Additions to Ferrar Studies.

In his examination of Mark 5:3 to end Sanders concluded that "the often expressed opinion that sometimes MS 124 alone preserves the original readings may now be considered as established."<sup>105</sup> Frederic Macler in 1919 "found that the

101 Lake, Fam. 13, p. 6c

102 Supra, p. 61f

103 Hutton, op. cit., p. 38

104 Ibid., p. 65c

105 Sanders, "The N. T. Mss. in the Freer Collection," p. 74

Armenian was closely related to von Soden's I type."<sup>106</sup>

In 1923 Lake and Blake<sup>107</sup> confirmed Lake's view advanced in 1902 of affinity between Fam. 1, Fam. 13, 28, 565, and 700, added Theta, furnished a collation of these witnesses in Mark with NBDS, and demonstrated that D does not belong with this family. Thus revising Von Soden in this last respect, they showed that "the family is not more closely allied to D than it is to B."<sup>108</sup> The general position of these witnesses is that they, "though they may have been based on the Neutral and Western texts, represent types intermediate between them and the later texts."<sup>109</sup>

## II. CODEX 1 AND ITS ALLIES

Taking a cue from Ferrar's Group, Kirsopp Lake<sup>110</sup>

---

106 E. C. Colwell, Journal of Religion, XVII, 1, p. 58a

107 Lake and Blake, "The Text of the Gospels," HTR, (July 1923), XVI, 3, pp. 267-286

108 Ibid., p. 275b

109 Ibid., p. 267b. Here is the place only to mention in passing Streeter's perception of the now extended Ferrar-Group as a primary witness to his Caesarean Text, R. P. Blake's inclusion of the Georgian as a witness, Lake's studies on the Caesarean Text of Mark, Kenyon's analysis of P<sup>45</sup> as partly Caesarean, Colwell's emphasis on the Armenian as Caesarean, and Lake's monograph on Family 13 in 1941.

110 Lake, "Codex 1 and Its Allies," Texts and Studies (Cambridge University Press), VII, 3

published in 1902 a study of four long-known minuscules--1 at Basle, 118 at Oxford, 131 at Rome, and 209 at Venice-- and named them Fam. 13.

1. Their Study Before Lake. The Dominican library at Basle lent Codex 1 to Reuchlin for some thirty years for the use of Oecolampadius and Gerbelius, who were assisting in the correction of Erasmus' first edition,<sup>111</sup> but, sad to say, Erasmus "little used or valued it."<sup>112</sup> Amandus Polanus used it in his German translation of the New Testament at Basle in 1603.<sup>113</sup> Bengel gave a few extracts from it as Bas. γ, made for him by Iselin,<sup>114</sup> and Wetstein collated it, thinking its provenance was the monastery of *Ἀνάστασις* in Constantinople, which conclusion Lake regarded as false.<sup>115</sup>

Griesbach<sup>116</sup> significantly saw that Codex 1 often agrees with 118 and 131, more often with 209, and with

111 Gregory, Prolegomena, p. 457

112 Scrivener, Plain Intro.<sup>3</sup>, p. 179b. Hoskier (Cd. 604, app. F, p. 4a) said, "This is not correct," and referred to Wetstein N. T. Mat. Crit. and Scrivener's footnote, p. 431.

113 Gregory, Textkritik des N. T., p. 127

114 Loc. cit.

115 Lake, "Cd. 1 and Its Allies," p. xiii

116 Griesbach, Symbolae Criticae, I, p. ccii-ccxxiii, especially p. cciiif

Origen's text in his commentary on Matthew. C. L. Roth collated it for Tischendorf; Tregelles collated the Gospels and compared his results with Roth's.<sup>117</sup> Discussing the Non-Syrian element in the Ferrar-Group, Hort remarked,<sup>118</sup>

Nearly the same may be said of 1 and 209 of the Gospels, which contain a large common element of common origin, partly shared by 118, also by 131.

In 1883 Scrivener concluded as follows,<sup>119</sup>

In the Gospels the text is very remarkable, adhering frequently to the uncial Codd. BL and such cursives as 118, 131, and especially 209.

Following Griesbach, Gregory<sup>120</sup> characterized its text as remarkable, resembling Origen's commentary on Matthew and agreeing with the three other members of the group.

Griesbach diligently collated Codex 118,<sup>121</sup> and Birch collated Codex 131 in the Gospels.<sup>122</sup>

Bessarion had Codex 209 with him at the Council of

117 Gregory, Textkritik, p. 127

118 Hort, op. cit., II, p. 154, section 211

119 Scrivener, Plain Intro.<sup>3</sup> p. 179b. Hoskier added some details of description (Cd. 604, app. F, p. 3f).

120 Gregory, Prolegomena, p. 457; cf. pp. 493, 496, 510c

121 Griesbach, Symbolae Criticae, I, p. ccii-ccxxiii

122 Scrivener, Plain Intro.<sup>3</sup> p. 199b. Though Scrivener remarked on the similarity of Aldus Minutius' Gk. Testament in 1518 (loc. cit.) and though Gregory (Proleg., p. 496; Textkritik, p. 156c) accepted this, Lake (Cd. 1, p. xviii<sup>f</sup>), following a hint of Harris, seems to have overthrown this original suggestion of Birch.

Florence in 1439<sup>123</sup> and made some notes on it.<sup>124</sup> Birch did little toward its collation, Engelbreth gave him some readings, Fleck published part of a collation by Heimbach, Burgon did some work on it,<sup>125</sup> but Scrivener<sup>126</sup> voiced the need for a good collation of both 205 and 209. Scrivener<sup>127</sup> further remarked that its delicate style of writing greatly resembles Codex 1 and that its text shows affinity to B and 1. He also saw resemblance between 209 and 205 in the Apocalypse, but Gregory<sup>128</sup> concluded that perhaps 209 was the parent of 205. Lake accepted the view that 205 is a copy of 209 and therefore declined to treat it in "Codex 1 and Its Allies."<sup>129</sup>

2. Lake's Work on the Group. Lake's monograph, "Codex 1 and Its Allies" (the preface is dated Easter 1902), developed a paragraph in his Text of the New Testament,

---

123 Scrivener, ibid., p. 205c

124 Lake, "Codex 1 and Its Allies," p. xxic

125 Gregory, Prolegomena, p. 510c

126 Scrivener, Plain Intro.<sup>3</sup>, p. 205f

127 Loc. cit.

128 Gregory, Prolegomena, p. 510c, "Codicis 205 fortasse parens;" ibid., Textkritik, 1909, p. 167c, "Vielleicht verwandt mit Evv. 205." Does this indicate a change of view?

129 Lake, "Codex 1 and Its Allies," p. xxif

the second edition of which appeared earlier that year. This summary paragraph<sup>130</sup> affirmed a common archetype for the group, that the text represents an old local text though with assimilation to a later type of text, and that "it is probable, though not quite certain, that the same text is preserved with a different series of corruptions" in the Ferrar-Group, and Codices 22, 28, 565.

Lake collated the group, using Tregelles' collation of Codex 1,<sup>131</sup> and named them Family 1. In an effort to exhibit the common reading of their archetype, he printed Codex 1 as the oldest and best manuscript of the group, apart from obvious slips, and gave the readings of the others in an apparatus criticus.<sup>132</sup> Accepting Lake's observation mentioned above<sup>133</sup> that 205 is a copy of 209, we have therefore five manuscripts in this group. Burgon had conjectured that the ancestor of 209 was an uncial, but Lake leaned to the view that the ancestor of the group was a minuscule.<sup>134</sup>

---

130 Lake, Text of the N. T.<sup>2</sup>, 1902, p. 20c. It should be noted that Bousset did some work on these manuscripts (supra, p. 55f).

131 Lake, "Codex 1 and Its Allies," p. vib

132 Ibid., pp. vb and xli

133 Supra, p. 67b

134 Lake, "Codex 1 and Its Allies," p. xxxvi



Seeking to ascertain their relations, Lake studied the variations of the group (which they share in common)<sup>135</sup> from the standard text. Despite the presence of obscuring mixture, he reached the following conclusion,

Ultimately all four represent a common original. . . In the case of 131 it is only in St Luke and a few chapters of St Mark that the original archetype seems to have been followed, while in 118 we have a most interesting example of the way in which a scribe sometimes deserted the text of the manuscript which he was copying and sometimes doubted which of two readings he would adopt.<sup>136</sup>

It will be seen at once from these lists [which form an important part of Lake's monograph] that the text of fam<sup>1</sup> in St Mark differs from that in the other Gospels in two points. It has a more definite connection with the Old Syriac, and it has a greater number of readings which cannot be classified as belonging to any generally recognized family.<sup>137</sup>

It is far more difficult to say anything about the character of the text in the other Gospels, as the phenomena are by no means so clearly marked. The list of subsingular readings, which are found in none of the generally recognized types of text, is much reduced in size, and is not much longer than the list of readings supported by N<sup>1</sup>B, which, especially in St Matthew and St Luke, are more prominent than in St Mark.<sup>138</sup>

Though Lake saw more of these readings in John than in Matthew and Luke, he deduced no connection between either of

---

135 Ibid., p. xxiv

136 Ibid., p. xlvi

137 Ibid., p. 1

138 Ibid., p. lv

these Gospels and the then incipient Caesarean Family.<sup>139</sup> He felt that the narrower circulation of Mark and the less frequent use of it by commentators saved it from the leveling process which the other Gospels had to endure.<sup>140</sup> Thus its local flavor persisted longer.

Significantly did Lake draw attention to the affinities of his group to Family 13, Codices 22, 28, 565, and 700 so far as Mark is concerned.<sup>141</sup> He expressed its larger relations as follows,

It has many points in common with the text of A<sup>1</sup>B, some points in common with the Old Latin text, a considerable number of readings which cannot be classified, and only a few which are shared with the Old Syriac.

An element akin to A<sup>1</sup>B and a Western (geographically speaking) element are therefore the most noticeable features. The same description would be true of the text in use at Alexandria in the days of Clement. But there is no special closeness of connection between Clement's text and the text of fam<sup>1</sup>, and therefore we cannot say that the text of fam<sup>1</sup> seems to represent in these Gospels the pre-Origenic text of Alexandria. At the same time this is not an impossible suggestion. Our knowledge of the pre-Origenic text depends on Clement's quotations, which are often free and by no means cover the whole text.<sup>142</sup>

It is likewise significant, in the light of the present stage of textual studies, that Lake advanced the idea of local

139 Loc. cit.

140 Ibid., p. lvi

141 Ibid., p. 1

142 Ibid., p. lv-lvi

texts as partly explaining these phenomena. He thought that "the evidence as a whole does not point clearly to a single locality, though it does not exclude it; and further that it does definitely exclude localities widely separate,"<sup>143</sup> otherwise the similarity of text would be hard to explain. Since this text seems to have been current in a comparatively limited region in the East, Lake suggested that the "only definite localities which there is any reason to suggest are Jerusalem and Sinai, and even for these the evidence is insufficient to justify confident assertion."<sup>144</sup>

3. Von Soden's Treatment of the Group. In 1906 Von Soden<sup>145</sup> added certain weak representatives to Family 1--namely, 22, 205, 206, 209, 697, 872<sup>mk</sup>, 924, 1005, 1192, 1210, 1278, 1582, and 2193. The four subdivisions of these will be shown shortly. Though Von Soden recognized that 1542 shows affinity to Family 1, yet his grouping obscured this fact and scholars have been wary of the reliability of his collations.<sup>146</sup>

In his review of Von Soden's work, Lake<sup>147</sup> set down

---

143 Ibid., p. liii

144 Ibid., p. liv

145 Von Soden, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, I, ii (Leipzig, 1906), pp. 1042 ff

146 Metzger, op. cit., p. 461a and fn. 18; H. C. Hoskier, "Von Soden's Text of the N.T.," JTS, XV (April 1914), pp. 307-326

147 Lake, "Von Soden's Treatment of the Text of the

the fact in 1908 that Von Soden almost simultaneously with him collated Codices 1, 118, 131, 209, 205, 206 and compared their results and checked the manuscripts afresh where differences of collation appeared. Von Soden did not regard 205 and 206 as direct descendants of 209. Lake then continued,

this was also the opinion of Dean Burgon, but I still think it is very doubtful if it be correct. Their text agrees with cod. 209 with extraordinary closeness. Considering that cod. 205 was written by Ioh. Rhosenius for Cardinal Bessarion, and that Bessarion was the owner of cod. 209, there is good reason for thinking that 205 is a copy of 209. Otherwise his views seem to be the same as my own as to the relations between the MSS.<sup>148</sup>

Von Soden found four sub-groups supporting his H<sup>r</sup> group which is in turn, along with J (the Ferrar-Group), a witness to his I text (roughly Hort's Western).<sup>149</sup> (1). 872 is regarded as an independent witness in Mark. (2). These seven fall into two classes, the first manuscript being the best--three primary codices 22, 1192, 1210; four secondary codices 1278, 1005, 924, 697. (3). This includes Codices 1, 118, 131, 209, 205, 206. (4). Two new manuscripts, 1582 and 2193, preserve the H<sup>r</sup> text better than the manuscripts of subdivision three. Though these two manuscripts often agree with Family 1, they are nevertheless independent witnesses

---

Gospels," RTP, IV, 4 (October 1908), p. 210a

148 Loc. cit.

149 Ibid., pp. 209f

to H<sup>r</sup>. Lake concluded that the text of H<sup>r</sup> (Family 1 and its poor relations) "has suffered comparatively little from K-contamination."<sup>150</sup>

4. Hutton's Analysis of the Group. Having in mind Codices 22, 28, 157, 565, and 700 and Families 1 and 13, Hutton wrote as follows,

The comparatively small but important group of mixed MSS. of the Gospels has never yet been satisfactorily accounted for and it is to be feared that they are all summarily dismissed as of little value or interest. Thus they are left out of account or, as Dr Scrivener complained, and as was partially true in his days, they are quoted when they agree with A or B or D, etc., but ignored when they differ from these and support the later uncials. This is obviously unfair and infringes the first and greatest of all canons of criticism, which is that all evidence must be taken into account. We propose therefore to consider the two points of primary importance, namely the origin and the value of mixed texts.<sup>151</sup>

The members of Family 1 are "less closely related" than Family 13, and the interest in tracing out the former group is therefore the greater. Choosing Mark 1:1-5:26, Hutton found the following,

The non-Syrian peculiarities of 118 and 131 are few and unimportant. 209 has no peculiarities worth notice.

We analyse their common readings and find that 118, 131, and 209 are in agreement with the Syrian

---

150 Ibid., p. 211a

151 Hutton, Atlas of Text. Crit., 1911, p. 14

text six times only in 78 citations. This is a very small proportion indeed, being only one in 13. There was therefore but little Syrian corruption in their common ancestor who was probably removed from 1 by but a single generation, its total corruption being less than 8 per cent.<sup>152</sup>

This last statement is based on Hutton's conclusion that Codex 1 is the parent ultimately of the series, a general confirmation of Lake's conclusions.<sup>153</sup>

Speaking more generally, Hutton incisively said,

When the Syrian text began to be taken as authoritative other texts would be brought more or less into conformity with it--some less, like 33, 565 (St Mark), 700, 61 (Acts), and others more, like 13 and its fellows, or still more 28, 22, 157 and a few others, until finally we get MSS. like K $\bar{\Gamma}$  with but a small pre-Syrian element. The chief importance of all these is that they are proofs that many of the readings of N, B and D are not peculiarities of those MSS. but real readings which were once current just as in fact non-Vulgate readings in mixed Latin texts are of value as corroboration of the purer Western texts.

We can easily imagine that this is exactly what would happen as soon as an authorized text once gained respect. The old MSS. would be corrected by the necessary additions or omissions, but many things, such as differences of order, would be left unaltered as of little importance and thus a mixed text with a good basis would go forth to be again altered into greater conformity by subsequent generations until the trace of the original exemplar was all but lost. Besides these we should have of course perfect copies of the new authorized text and these would gradually overwhelm the others just as MSS. of the Vulgate slowly got the upper hand of the mixed texts. The processes were exactly the same and the result was

---

152 Ibid., p. 16.

153 Ibid., pp. 17-19

similar in both cases.

But this is not all. What critics hope to find in mixed MSS. is a clue or clues to much of the past history of the text, and this search is not so hopeless as it seems.<sup>154</sup>

5. Lake's Later Study of the Group. In July 1923 Lake, reaffirming his general conclusions reached in 1902 in "Codex 1 and Its Allies," significantly classed  $\Theta$ <sup>155</sup> with 28, 565, 700, and Families 1 and 13, refuted Soden's placing D in the group with 28, 565, 700, and  $\Theta$ , demonstrated that Von Soden erred in not grouping Families 1 and 13 in the same class with 28, 565, 700, and  $\Theta$ .<sup>156</sup> The outstanding conclusions of this article are<sup>157</sup>--1. This group shows mixture of the same 'family-text' with the Syrian or Antiochian Text. 2.  $\Theta$  and 565 show least admixture with Antiochian readings. 3. Ingredients in  $\Theta$  and 565 not of Antiochian origin belong to the 'family-text.'

---

154 Ibid., pp. 19-20

155 Lake, etc., "The Text of the Gospels," HTR, XVI, 3, p. 275b

156 Ibid., p. 269

157 Ibid., p. 285. At the same time Lake threw out hints on Codex 1071 which he later developed. In the same article (pp. 277-283) R. P. Blake thought he saw both Georgian and Coptic influence on  $\Theta$  and connected it with Sinai.

### III. CODICES 22, 28, 565, AND 700

Minuscules 22, 28, 565, and 700 do not form a related group as do Families 1 and 13 but stand rather as individual witnesses to the Caesarean Text. They are here grouped together for ease of treatment.

1. Codex 22. Wetstein cited Codex 22 in certain places in his margin from the first collation of the manuscript made by Simonius in the margin of Curcellaeus' Greek Testament, and Scholz very imperfectly collated it.<sup>158</sup> Scrivener<sup>159</sup> in 1861 rated this codex as "very imperfectly known, but contains remarkable readings;" in 1883 he added, "This copy calls aloud for a fresh collation."<sup>160</sup> Gregory simply marked its text as "bonae notae."<sup>161</sup> In 1902 Lake regarded it as of the same type text as his Family 1<sup>162</sup> and in 1908 he observed that it had "long been known as an important witness to a peculiar type of text."<sup>163</sup> Above<sup>164</sup> it was

---

158 Sanders, "A New Collation of MS 22," p. 91

159 Scrivener, Plain Intro., p. 144

160 Ibid., 3rd ed., p.182

161 Gregory, Prolegomena, p. 466

162 Lake, Text of the N. T., 2nd ed., p. 21a; "Codex 1 and Its Allies," p. 1, introduction

163 Lake, "Von Soden's Treatment," etc., p. 209c

164 Supra, p. 72c



pointed out that Von Soden made it a primary witness with others to the same type of text as the extended family I. Gregory in 1909 set down with disappointing succinctness that "der Text ist gut."<sup>165</sup>

In 1914 H. A. Sanders published "A New Collation of MS 22 of the Gospels."<sup>166</sup> In this he pointed out the unreliability of Von Soden's collation. At first Von Soden assigned 22 to his H<sup>r</sup> group but in publishing his text rearranged the members of the group so that H<sup>r</sup> became I<sup>n</sup> and Codex 22 is joined in a special sub-group with 118 and 209.

Not only does he thus break up Lake's family 1 into two groups but states that the collation was found so faulty that new ones had to be made.<sup>167</sup>

Sanders<sup>168</sup> concluded that there can be no question of the general relationship of 22 with Soden's group I<sup>n</sup>, which is an enlargement of Lake's Family 1, and that, however,

as a whole von Soden's assumption that MS 22 belongs in a sub-group with 118-209 seems utterly without foundation. In its fam. 1 readings it goes more closely with MS 1, and it draws near to 118-209 only in the corrections to Antioch type; thus it seems to draw nearer to 118 in Mt. 22 to 28 and to 209 in John 17 to 21.<sup>169</sup>

---

165 Gregory, Textkritik, p. 134

166 JBL, XXXIII, pt. ii, pp. 91-117

167 Sanders, ibid., p. 92

168 Ibid., p. 95c

169 Ibid., p. 97b

Anent the affinities of Codex 22 Sanders classed as most noticeable its frequent agreement with the versions, especially the Old Latin.

Hardly less striking are the special agreements with MSS 660, H, D, 1279, and 472. In the case of MS 660 there are enough special agreements in Mark, Luke, and John to make it fairly certain that their ancestors were of the same local type of text. Doubtless the parents of MS 660 have suffered correction also, but for MS 22 this is certain. In fact the discovery of this older set of readings makes it probable that this text tradition suffered two corrections, first to the fam. 1 type and then to the Antioch text.<sup>170</sup>

In 1916 Lake<sup>171</sup> still retained Codex 22 as showing affinity with Family 1, but in 1923 he footnoted the following,

I also included cod. 22, but its affinity is much less clear, at least in Mark 1, and I have therefore neglected it in this article. Von Soden reckons it among the I<sup>n</sup> MSS.; this may be right in Matthew, but the question requires further investigation.<sup>172</sup>

In 1928 Codex 22 is not classed with the Caesarean Family, but of it it is said,

Cod. 22 and some other MSS. are also classified by von Soden as a sub-division of this family. There is undoubtedly some connection, but von Soden's results were based on a singularly bad collation, and are therefore very doubtful.<sup>173</sup>

170 Ibid., p. 103c

171 Lake, Text of the N. T.<sup>5</sup>, p. 20f

172 Lake, "The Text of the Gospels," p. 269, fn.8

173 Lake, The Text of the N. T.<sup>6</sup>, p. 21a

Remarking on Soden's inclusion of 22 in the family of Codex 1 and Sander's general agreement therewith, Streeter added,

As nearly all the readings of 22 not found in 1-118-131-209 occur in other members of fam. Θ, it matters little whether it is classed with fam. 1 or as an independent member of the larger family.<sup>174</sup>

What does matter is to know whether the non-Byzantine element in a mixed MS. belongs mainly or entirely to the Θ family.<sup>175</sup>

However, in his study of Origen's "Commentary on Matthew," Streeter preferred to regard 22 as on a par with the other witnesses to the Caesarean Text.<sup>176</sup>

2. Codex 28. Scholz<sup>177</sup> collated all of Codex 28, and Scrivener said in 1861, "It often resembles Cod. D, but has many unique readings and interpolations."<sup>178</sup> In 1882 Hort estimated that it "has many relics of a very ancient text hereabouts."<sup>179</sup> Gregory thought that its text had much in common with D.<sup>180</sup> Lake found that it has the

---

174 Streeter, op. cit., p. 80, fn. 1

175 Ibid., p. 579b

176 Ibid., p. 585

177 Gregory, Prolegomena, p. 468a

178 Scrivener, Plain Intro., p. 145

179 Op. cit., p. 242b

180 Gregory, Prolegomena, p. 468

more ordinary text save in Mark<sup>181</sup> and regarded it as a witness to the larger family along with Families 1 and 13, Codices 22, 565, and 700.<sup>182</sup> In 1923 he merely reaffirmed this conclusion.<sup>183</sup>

3. Codex 565. Of Codex 565 Scrivener said in 1861, "A very important copy, especially in St Mark,"<sup>184</sup> and in 1883, "Of much critical importance, especially in St Mark."<sup>185</sup> Hort classed its text as marked by non-Syrian readings.<sup>186</sup> Muralt collated it in 1848 and Belsheim in 1885.<sup>187</sup> H. S. Cronin made some corrections to Belsheim

181 Lake, "Codex 1 and Its Allies," p. lvi

182 Ibid., p. 1

183 Lake, "The Text of the Gospels," p. 269

184 Scrivener, Plain Intro., p. 178a

185 Ibid., 3rd ed., p. 226c. The process of numbering 565 officially has indeed been slow and, as Lake pointed out (Text of N. T., 2nd ed., p. 21), a pain to the student. At St. Petersburg it was called VI, 470, by Muralt 53 in his catalog of St. Petersburg mss., but Tischendorf called it 2<sup>pe</sup> because it stood second in Muralt's list. In his first edition Scrivener followed Tischendorf, later called it 473, though Hort designated it 81. Gregory called it 565 though Von Soden numbered it ε93. One is reminded of Rendel Harris' saying, "A worse curse than that of Shakespeare's epitaph might be invoked upon the heads of those who alter, unnecessarily, the notation of New Testament MSS" (AJP, V (1884), p. 93). "Thy ignominy sleep with thee in thy grave, But not remember'd in thy epitaph" (I Hen. IV, v, 4, 101).

186 Hort, op. cit., II, p. 154

187 Gregory, Prolegomena, p. 556f

in 1899.<sup>188</sup>

On the value of its text Lake has said,

It will be noticed that the degree of mixture with  $\zeta$ , tested in this somewhat rough and ready method, differs considerably--565 seems to be the least, and 22 the most mixed, for fam<sup>1</sup> has 31 variants from  $\zeta$ , fam<sup>13</sup> 30 variants, 22 11 variants, 28 26 variants, 565 48 variants, 700 30 variants. It is also worth noticing that fam<sup>1</sup> has 4 variants unsupported by any other member of the group, fam<sup>13</sup> has 3, 22 has 1, 28 has 2, 565 has 4, 700 has 8. This, too, seems to suggest that 565 is the purest member of the group. As it is also the only codex which says anything about the origin of its archetype this fact is especially important.<sup>189</sup>

In 1923 Lake estimated,<sup>190</sup>

There is little doubt that  $\Theta$  and 565 have a higher percentage of non-antiochian readings than any other member of the group; in other words they are relatively freer from the influence of K.

#### 4. Codex 700. Scrivener called Codex 700

(which was acquired by the British Museum in 1882) Codex 604 and said it

is a very important manuscript, full of readings which recall Cod. B., and some almost unique, e.g. Luke xi. 2, for which Gregory of Nyssa is the only

---

<sup>188</sup> Texts and Studies, V, iv, pp. 106-108. This manuscript came from Houmisch Khan in Pontus, near the Black Sea (Gregory, Prolegomena, p. 556c). Its colophonic material asserts that it was written and compared with Jerusalem copies which are in the holy mountain. Lake took the holy mountain to mean Mount Sinai (JTS, I, p. 445).

<sup>189</sup> Lake, "Codex 1 and Its Allies," p. lxxiii

<sup>190</sup> Ibid., "The Text of the Gospels," p. 276a

other known authority. "It calls aloud for collation," to borrow Dean Burgon's language.<sup>191</sup>

Gregory characterized it as having readings of extraordinary note (eximiae notae).<sup>192</sup> Burgon predicted in the Guardian, July 20, 1882, "that this Codex would become, when its readings had been gathered and made known, one of the most famous codices in the world."<sup>193</sup> W. H. Simcox collated Luke and about half of Matthew during two years of residence near London. However, he gave only Luke in his article in 1884.<sup>194</sup> He concluded thus,

It will be seen that the noteworthy readings are far more numerous in the first half of the Gospel than in the second. In the first four chapters I have counted about 60 cases where 604 agrees, against the received text, with the approximate consensus of the group of authorities to which N<sup>o</sup>BL 33 belong: about 80 where it agrees with the T. R. against these, and some 30 odd where it differs from the T. R. and is supported by some ancient authority (usually "Western") other than that mentioned. In from 4 to 6 passages N<sup>o</sup> B, etc., 604, and the T. R. all differ from one another: in from 22 to 24, the reading of 604 is, so far as I am aware, almost or altogether unique. On the other hand, in the last four chapters (218 verses compared with 232) there are (besides mere clerical errors and varieties of spelling) only 35

---

<sup>191</sup> Scrivener, Plain Intro.<sup>3</sup>, p. 243a; cf. Streeter, op. cit., p. 277, on Luke 11:2

<sup>192</sup> Gregory, Prolegomena, p. 570b

<sup>193</sup> H. C. Hoskier, Collation of Cd. Evan 604, p. vi, preface; cf. p. xxxvi, introduction

<sup>194</sup> Simcox, "Collation of the British Museum Evan. 604," AJP, V, 4 (1884), pp. 454-465

deviations in all from the received text; and of these at least 7 are cases where the modern "Received Text" is a merely accidental one, not agreeing with the mass of even the later codices. Of the 28 real deviations from the so-called Syrian text, or received text of mediaeval Greece, the substitution of the simple for the reflexive pronoun in XXII 66 and (doubtfully) in XXIV 27 are almost the only ones where 604 agrees with Λ and B or L against the mass of MSS. In most of the other cases it has some respectable authority for its reading, but usually late, often only cursive: as in the very remarkable passage XXII 20.

This last reference reads ὀνόματι instead of αἵματι ; from this and a few other readings the collator suggested a slight Marcionite influence on the text.<sup>196</sup>

H. C. Hoskier very minutely collated Codex 700 in 1890 and pointed out various slips in Simcox's work.<sup>197</sup> Streeter gave the following summary of Hoskier's researches,

Hoskier in his edition of 700 sets out all the agreements of that MS. with the great uncials against the Byzantine text. From these it appears that 700 is supported by B against D 63 times, by one or more members of the group Λ L C Δ against B D combined 34 times, while it joins D against B 111 times.<sup>198</sup>

I found that, if the readings of Θ were added to those of the MSS. cited by Hoskier, every single one of these readings of 700 was supported by at least one other member of the family.<sup>199</sup>

---

196 Loc. cit.

197 Hoskier, A full account and collation of the Greek minuscule Codex Evangelium 604, London, 1890

198 Streeter, The Four Gospels,<sup>5</sup> p. 85c

199 Ibid., p. 574b

Lake saw affinity between it and Families 1 and 13, Codices 22, 28, 565.<sup>200</sup> Von Soden's apparatus gives its readings.<sup>201</sup>

Codices 28, 565, and 700 fall with some eleven other manuscripts into Von Soden's I<sup>a</sup> text-type, one of the some ten sub-groups of his I text (roughly Hort's Western). This I<sup>a</sup> group is the best representative of the I text. Two are quite newly-listed codices (1542 and 1654) and are closely connected textually with 28, though not direct descendants of it. There is a special relationship between 565, 28, 544, 1542, and 1654, and among these 565 and 28, which have a far better text in Mark than elsewhere, are closely connected with each other. Another group consists of D, Θ, 700, and their poor relation 372, and among these there is a special connection between 700 and Θ on the one hand, and D and 372 on the other. All these manuscripts have suffered by corruption with K<sup>1</sup>, but independently of each other; moreover, D, the oldest and most famous witness, besides having been contaminated with K<sup>1</sup>, has been influenced by parallelization, omission due to paleographical causes, and, above all, by the African Latin and Syriac versions; but when these influences have been noted D reveals itself as a witness for I<sup>a</sup>, of the same type as Θ and 700. Thus the text of I<sup>a</sup> can be recon-

---

200 Lake, "Codex 1 and Its Allies," p. 1

201 Streeter, op. cit., p. 576a



structed by choosing the readings found in both sub-groups, and by eliminating those due to parallelization and K influence.<sup>202</sup>

#### IV. THE KORIDETHI CODEX OR Θ

Though some notices of Θ had been made before, Oscar von Gebhardt gave Gregory some information about this manuscript from Georgia for his Textkritik des Neuen Testaments in 1900.<sup>203</sup> Gregory thought it a minuscule and numbered it 1360<sup>204</sup> but later, when its uncial character became known, designated it Θ.<sup>205</sup> Von Soden placed it in his I<sup>a</sup> type as 6050 in the group with D and 700<sup>206</sup> as a twin sister of 700 and declared that it completely solved the riddle of D.<sup>207</sup>

---

202 In this paragraph, by the use of Gregory (Textkritik, pp. 418-25) his numbering has been substituted for Soden's and the words of Lake adopted ("Von Soden's Treatment of the Text of the Gospels," p. 215f). Bousset in 1894 gave some notice of Hoskier in treating his very doubtful Hesychian revision.

203 The first part appeared in 1900. The ms. was discovered in a remote valley in the Caucasus around 1853, then some years later it disappeared for some thirty years.

204 Gregory, Textkritik des N. T., p. 257

205 Ibid., p. 1037c

206 Lake, "Von Soden's Treatment," etc., p. 215f

207 Lake, "The Text of the Gospels and the Koridethi Codex," p. 269a. Von Soden said (i, 2, pp. 1297-1302), "This

In 1913 Beermann and Gregory published a transcript of the text, a lengthy description, and several plates.<sup>208</sup> "The variants are merely recorded but not studied."<sup>209</sup> Zwaan thought that the possible Georgian and Armenian affinities of the text of  $\Theta$  should have been studied since "the question of an older Georgian text with perhaps more affinity to Armenian and Syriac tradition is looming in the background."<sup>210</sup> Zwaan then cited the works of Th. Kluge and Conybeare on the Georgian and continued,

It seems very probable that many early "Western" readings will find additional support there. The "Western" text or, as one might prefer to call it, the "version-tradition," will then perhaps appear more as an Eastern text outside the province of leading Greek scholarship, and the questions about its unity or manifoldness will come to the front. It seems not to be a safe procedure if any evidence should be ruled out of court before it has been collected and adequately tested.<sup>211</sup>

---

MS. forms a very valuable parallel to  $\delta$  5[D], with which it is bound up by a close original affinity. It is written in a better but more heavy hand, in Luke and John increasingly contaminated with K, yet next to  $\delta$  5 the best authority for I<sup>a</sup>." Zwaan added that "genealogical research on the lines of Professor Sanders' study of W is, however, still to be desired" ("The Editions of the Freer and Koridethi Gospels," RTP, IX, 9 (March 1914), p. 539.

208 Beermann and Gregory, Die Koridethi Evangelien.

209 Zwaan, op. cit. in fn. 207, p. 538a

210 Loc. cit.

211 Ibid., p. 538f. The Coptic affinities of  $\Theta$  have been variously discussed. Beermann, agreeing with Oskar von Lemm and Marr, thought that Psalm 40:8f written on the inner

Lake's fifth edition of his The Text of the New Testament in 1916 (quite likely merely a reprint of the fourth in 1908) reviewed the situation as Soden had left it;<sup>212</sup> that is, as a witness to the I or Western Text.

However, F. C. Burkitt in 1915 wrote that Θ and W have "remarkable affinities with each other and what used to be called 'Western' authorities, particularly in St. Mark's Gospel."<sup>213</sup> Both 565 and Θ came from the region round about Trebizond and, though in some respects there is differ-

---

side of the cover of the manuscript betrays touches of Georgian, Armenian, and possibly Coptic (Beermann--Gregory, op. cit., p. 583). Zwaan (op. cit., 540-542) contended that the use of the earlier khutsuri dialect of the Georgian instead of the literary or Kharthveli dialect explains the variances. However, R. P. Blake (HTR, XVI, 3 (July 1923), p. 277-283), using photostatic copies brought from Tiflis (where the ms. is) by his wife, urged in 1923 that the heaviness and coarseness of the script relates it to the Coptic and signifies that the scribe did not write but drew his letters (p. 278) and revived the Beermann hypothesis of Coptic influence on Psalm 40:8f on the cover. This last led him (and Lake) to hold that Θ may have come from Mt. Sinai (p. 282f). Zwaan answered this ('No Coptic in the Koridethi Codex,' HTR, Jan. 1925, pp. 112-114), referring to his previous article, and Blake replied ("Rejoinder," HTR, ibid., p. 114). Being without knowledge of Georgian and without photographs of the manuscript, I think it likely that Zwaan is right. However, the affinity of the text must, in the last analysis, be dependent on a comparison of distinctive readings.

212 Lake, Text of the N. T.<sup>5</sup>, p. 101c

213 Burkitt, "W and Θ : Studies in the Western Text of Mark," JTS, XVII (Oct. 1915), p. 1a

ence, they show "some noteworthy points of connection."<sup>214</sup>  
 The unique readings were ancient when W and Θ were written  
 and "the irregular distribution of these readings, unevenly  
 distributed even over the Gospel of Mark, is in itself a  
 proof that we are dealing with accidental survivals, rather  
 than with a living local recension."<sup>215</sup>

The three MSS. [Θ W 565] have further this in common,  
 that they come to us from the very frontiers of the  
 Byzantine Empire, if not from outside; nearer Con-  
 stantinople their eccentricities might have been  
 discovered and smoothed away.<sup>216</sup>

The variation from other lines of transmission is greater  
 in Old Latin manuscripts in Mark than in other Gospels. Be-  
 cause of less use of Mark "there was less tendency towards  
 uniformity of text and the restriction of alterations."<sup>217</sup>

In modification of his former view Lake in 1923 de-  
 clared that Θ is only a first cousin (hardly a twin sister,  
 as Soden) of 700 and that it helps to define, rather than  
 solve, the problem of D.<sup>218</sup> He corrected Soden's placing D  
 with Θ 700 28 565 and his not putting Families 1 and 13 in

---

214 Ibid., p. 2b

215 Ibid., p. 3a

216 Ibid., p. 3b

217 Ibid., p. 3c

218 Lake, "The Text of the Gospels and the Koridethi  
 Codex," p. 269

the  $\Theta$ -group. Lake further showed<sup>219</sup> that the family ( $\Theta$  fam<sup>1</sup> fam<sup>13</sup> 28 565 700) is not more closely allied to D than it is to B, that  $\Theta$  "contains a noticeably smaller admixture of K-readings than any of the other MSS," that 565 stands with  $\Theta$  in this higher percentage of non-antiochian readings,<sup>220</sup> and that "these manuscripts all represent copies of a common original which has been corrected in different ways in different places to accord with the later K text."<sup>221</sup> Lake concluded that, so far as Mark is concerned,

the 'family-text' is itself a combination of Western and Neutral readings. Most, though not all, of the great Western interpolations are absent, but there are about as many Western readings of the less striking type as there are Neutral readings.<sup>222</sup>

Ernest von Dobschutz in 1923 named the text of  $\Theta$  remarkable (Höchst merkwürdiger Text) and allied to the Old Latin and the Old Syriac.<sup>223</sup>

219 Ibid., p. 275b

220 Ibid., p. 276a. Kenyon (The Story of the Bible, 1937, p. 105a) agreed that Soden was "certainly wrong" in associating  $\Theta$  with D.

221 Ibid., p. 277b

222 Ibid., p. 285c

223 Dobschutz, Eberhard Nestle's Einführung in das Griechische Neue Testament, p. 93. Robertson (op. cit., p. 91) in 1925 still marked its text as Syrian; but see his account of Streeter's work (op. cit., 2nd ed., 1928, p. 243f, and his Studies in the Text of the N. T., 1926, ch. VI, pp. 76-79).

V. THE WASHINGTON CODEX OR W

This Gospel uncial, brought from Egypt near Cairo in 1906 by C. L. Freer of Detroit and now kept in our nation's capital, is generally dated in the fifth century. In addition to certain informational notices at various times, Henry A. Sanders first published his studies of it in 1912, the year of the photographic facsimile, but reprinted them with only minor changes in 1918.<sup>224</sup>

Concerning the text Sanders wrote,

The text of W . . . shows some affiliations with the Sahidic Version, but far more with the Old Latin and Syriac, while scribal errors point rather to Bohairic than to Sahidic influence.<sup>225</sup>

Peculiarities characteristic of the bilinguals headed by Codex D and by the Old Latin and Old Syriac MSS are now found in W, an old Greek MS of Egypt, and have long been known in Irenaeus and other church fathers of his time and earlier. The characteristic features of this type of text were well established and widespread before 150 A.D. . .<sup>226</sup>

Speaking of the close alliance of the early versions to the peculiarities of the Western Text, Sanders added,

---

<sup>224</sup> Sanders, "The N. T. Mss. in the Freer Collection," Univ. of Mich. Studies: Humanistic Series, Macmillan, N. Y., 1918, pp. 323.

<sup>225</sup> Ibid., p. 3b

<sup>226</sup> Ibid., p. 44a

My comparisons with the text of W, especially in Mark and the early part of John, establish this intimacy most clearly. Only rarely did I fail to find authority for W's "special" variants in some one of the versions, Syriac, Latin, Coptic, Gothic, Armenian, or Ethiopic. In the cases where I failed I generally attributed it to the inadequacy of the textual apparatus in the versions or to the insufficiency of my own acquaintance with all these languages.<sup>227</sup>

So decidedly does the text of W differ in the different Gospels that Sanders differentiated seven different parts<sup>228</sup> and found it wise to estimate these sections of text separately. In Matthew he found a uniform Syrian or K<sup>1</sup> text, Soden's earliest form of the Syrian, of which the best manuscripts previously known are Ω SV. After deducting transcriptional variants, Sanders found 1505 notable variants of which 1205 belong to the Syrian Text.<sup>229</sup> In the 300 non-antiochian readings the Neutral leaning is not very strong. Omitting the Neutral, the witnesses to which W in Matthew

shows the most similarity are the following: fam 1, D, fam 13, OL, Syr, Bo, Sah, 700, Eth, l. 184, Arm, 238, 22, 157, 4, 106, 299, 245, 435, 28.<sup>230</sup>

In Mark Sanders at first discovered no extensive Syrian

227 Ibid., p. 42a

228 Cf. Facsimile of the Washington Ms. of the Four Gospels in the Freer Collection, p. v

229 Sanders, "The N. T. Mss. in the Freer Col.," p. 48

230 Ibid., p. 53

or Neutral influences and a lack of homogeneousness in the sixteen chapters. The break appeared in the fifth chapter.<sup>231</sup> In 1:1-5:30 he found the most characteristic feature that of agreement with the Old Latin.<sup>232</sup> Thus in a study of 258 noteworthy readings he found the following agreements with W<sup>233</sup>--Old Latin, 202; D, 85; Sahidic, 40; Bohairic, 34; Sinaitic Syriac, 33; Codex 700, 24; Peshitta, 21; Ethiopic, 21; Codex 565, 18; Armenian, 17; Family 13 and Codex 28, 16 each; Family 1, 15.

In Mark 5:31 to end there is a decided relationship between W and the Old Latin, but not the special agreements as in the first part of Mark. Sanders took 490 subsingular readings and found the following results<sup>234</sup>--Old Latin, 186; Family 13, 170; Family 1, 122; Codex 565, 120; Codex 28, 119; D, 116; Sinaitic Syriac, 101; Sahidic, 101; Bohairic, 71; Codex 700, 70; Armenian, 58; Peshitta, 55; Codex 299, 38; Codex 472, 32; L, 30; N, 24; Ethiopic, 19; Lectionary 184, 18; C, 18; B and the Gothic, 16 each; Δ, 15--concluding that neither the Neutral nor the Syrian "had any influence on this

---

231 Ibid., p. 63c

232 Ibid., p. 64a

233 Ibid., p. 70f

234 Ibid., p. 73; cf. 73c and 74a



part of W."<sup>235</sup>

By a comparison of Luke with  $\mathcal{N}$  ABD Sanders discovered a "decided change in character between the earlier and later portions."<sup>236</sup> "It is plain that early in chapter eight W definitely parted company with the  $\mathcal{N}$ B text and went over to a text closely allied to A."<sup>237</sup> In 1:1-8:12, out of 678 important variants W agrees with the Neutral Text ( $\mathcal{N}$ BL 33) 488 times.<sup>238</sup> Out of 1399 readings in 8:13 to end 11:2 are Syrian of the  $K^1$  type (the earliest type of the Syrian).<sup>239</sup>

In John 5:12 to end, out of 1307 subsingular variants 840 are certainly and 147 possibly Neutral while but eight readings point to the Syrian Text.<sup>240</sup> Out of 225 important variants of W in John 1:1-5:11, ninety agree or partially agree with the Neutral,<sup>241</sup> but in some respects the text is like that of Mark 1:1-5:30, with less Latin and more Coptic influence.<sup>242</sup> Kenyon in 1937 dated this quire in the seventh

---

235 Ibid., p. 82b

236 Ibid., p. 87a

237 Ibid., p. 88b

238 Ibid., p. 88c

239 Ibid., p. 96

240 Ibid., p. 113b

241 Ibid., p. 128b

242 Ibid., p. 133c

century and marked its text as Syrian.<sup>243</sup>

J. de Zwaan of Leiden approved Sander's method and analysis of the text of W but wisely insisted that it is a thing of vital importance to textual scholarship that the genealogical side of research not be neglected in deference to the "version-tradition" of Von Soden-Hoskier-Sanders.<sup>244</sup> Commending Sanders' analysis of the text of W, Burkitt insisted in October 1915 that W and Θ have "remarkable affinities with each other" and with 'Western' authorities, especially in Mark.<sup>245</sup> Of Mark Burkitt wrote in part,

Mk. i-v 30 has a large 'Western' element, i.e. it has many agreements with the Old Latin and the Old Syriac and with Codex Bezae (D). The rest of Mk. has many K-readings, but a large peculiar element remains.

It is the text of Mark in W that challenges particular and detailed attention, because the problems raised are both interesting in themselves and also have not yet received satisfactory solution. . . . What needs investigation in W is the 'Western' element, i.e. that represented strongly in the Old Latin, the Old Syriac, and a group of Greek MSS, of which D is the oldest and the most famous.<sup>246</sup>

Burkitt held that, when one finds a manuscript as W in Mark 1:1-5:30 differing widely from the Syrian Text dominant from

---

243 Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible, p. 101

244 Zwaan, RTP, March 1914, p. 535a

245 Burkitt, "W and Θ : Studies in the Western Text of Mark," JTS, XVII (Oct. 1915), p. 1a

246 Ibid., p. 1f

about A. D. 400 onwards, while the later chapters mainly agree with this type, "though containing many noteworthy readings of the same character as those in the earlier chapters, it is reasonable to suppose that these later chapters have been corrected, though imperfectly corrected, to the dominant text."<sup>247</sup> Burkitt concluded in part as follows,

Cod. W proves in very numerous instances to give the Greek text of readings hitherto only known from Old-Latin MSS, readings which therefore were under the suspicion of being no readings at all, but only corruptions current in Latin or paraphrastic renderings of the 'ordinary' Greek text. Now we see that they must have been made in the actual text of the Greek MS from which the Old Latin was made.<sup>248</sup>

Goodspeed<sup>249</sup> recollated W with Westcott-Hort as the standard and said of its text,

In type of text W is curiously heterogeneous, showing three somewhat distinct strata, neutral [sic], Western, and Syrian. Matthew and Luke, chaps. 8-24, are decidedly Syrian in type. John and the early part of Luke (chaps. 1-7) which follows it are neutral, with some Western readings interspersed; e.g., the omission of the

---

247 Ibid., p. 4c

248 Ibid., p. 21b

249 Goodspeed, "The Freer Gospels," Hist. and Linguistic Studies, 1st series, I, 2, pp. 65 1 facsimile. Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, July 1914. While W was being studied by Sanders for publication, Goodspeed (AJT, XIII, 4, Oct. 1909, p. 602b) conjectured that its most characteristic affinities would be Western and might turn out to be, "as some things suggest," "a fresh uncial witness to set beside the much-discussed Bezan." Such a prediction, however, went quite wide of the mark.

Lucan genealogy. The primitive subscription *κατα Ιωαννης* is a further hint of the neutral ancestry of this part of the manuscript. Mark is decidedly Western throughout, and while its readings are often not those of D they are usually of the same general kind as they, and so illustrate Hort's feeling that the Western is as much a textual tendency as a definite textual type.<sup>250</sup>

The Freer Gospels, by reason of its age, importantly reinforces ancient testimony for the various types of text it reflects. In its Syrian parts it stands with Alexandrinus as a second and hardly inferior Greek witness. In its neutral parts, while less pure than B, it has sustained probably no more adulteration than A, with which it shows certain external affinities; and in antiquity it ranks next after these codices among uncial witnesses. In its Western portion it is certainly no less free than D, and with its greater probable age it promises to play an important part in further studies of the Western text.<sup>251</sup>

Robertson, commending the temper of Goodspeed, expressed the need for a full, fresh study of the manuscript by an adherent of Hort and regarded the codex as a splendid illustration of mixture as Hort expounded it. Studying certain readings, he found Hort's Alexandrian class also in the manuscript and concluded,

Early as it undoubtedly is, it does not rank with A or B. It is more like A in its mixed character. But it will repay careful study precisely because of the complex character of the text which it contains. We can no longer condemn a reading because it is Western. The Western class has various strata in it, and is anything but homogeneous. If the neutral class is a revision, the Western has a con-

---

250 "The Freer Gospels," p. 64a

251 Ibid., p. 65c

glomeration of readings in the various documents that preserve it.<sup>252</sup>

This confirmed his earlier conclusion, "It has a mixed text, Neutral, Western, Alexandrian, or even Syrian."<sup>253</sup>

According to Kenyon, hardly any manuscript has such complicated signs of parentage as W. Matthew is Syrian; Mark 1:1-5:30 is Western or akin to the Old Latin; the rest of Mark is Caesarean; Luke 1:1-8:12 is Neutral while the remainder is Syrian; John 1:1-5:11 (a quire added in about the seventh century) is Syrian; the rest of John is Neutral.<sup>254</sup>

## VI. ORIENTAL VERSIONS AND THE CAESAREAN TEXT

Since the period subsequent to Ferrar's germinal isolation of his group has witnessed a new treatment of the versions, it will be relevant here to summarize the contacts observed between these and the growing Caesarean Text. Only the pre-Streeter stage will now be mentioned and, so far as possible, in the order of the suggestion of their connection

---

<sup>252</sup> Robertson, Studies in the Text of the New Test., 1926, p. 101

<sup>253</sup> Robertson, Intro. to Text. Criticism, p. 88

<sup>254</sup> Kenyon, Text of the Greek Bible, 1937, p. 101; ibid., The Story of the Bible, 1937, p. 100f; cf. W. F. Howard, "The Greek Bible," 1940, "The text is of an unusually mixed character" (p. 73b).

with the formulation of the new text-type.

1. Syriac. From Ferrar to Streeter affinity of the ever-increasing Caesarean group with the Syriac tradition has been claimed. Treschow and others saw a resemblance between Family 13 and the Philoxenian Syriac.<sup>255</sup> More stichometrically than textually Harris perceived connection between the Ferrar-Group and the Syriac.<sup>256</sup> Robinson thought he saw Old Syriac relations in this group.<sup>257</sup> But Lake claimed definite connection of Family 1 with the Old Syriac, Family 13, 28, 565, and 700.<sup>258</sup> Dobschutz allied the text of  $\Theta$  with the Old Syriac,<sup>259</sup> and Sanders claimed affiliation of W with the same.<sup>260</sup> Burkitt proposed the same alliance of W in Mark 1:1-5:30.<sup>261</sup>

At the same spot where Tischendorf discovered  $\aleph$ , the monastery of Saint Catherine at Mount Sinai, the Cambridge twins (Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson) discovered in 1892 a

---

255 Supra, p. 48a

256 Supra, p. 54f

257 Supra, p. 56a

258 Supra, p. 58f

259 Supra, p. 89c

260 Supra, p. 90

261 Supra, p. 94

Syriac palimpsest of the Gospels, belonging to the fifth century or earlier. It proved to be older than the Peshitta and more perfect than the Curetonian, though representing with considerable variations the same ancient version in an earlier form.<sup>262</sup> The text reinforced the Neutral against the Syrian but differed from the Neutral "in very much the same way (though not in the same passages) as did the Latin group which Westcott and Hort called 'Western',"<sup>263</sup> and also had affinity with the Ferrar-Group.<sup>264</sup> Immediately those who favored the Western Text argued that, dating with others the Old Syriac Version in the latter part of the second century, this fifth century manuscript represented a Greek text of the second century and therefore much older than ,\B, the chief representatives of the Neutral.<sup>265</sup> This claim of the superiority of the Syriac text is one of the chief points of investigation in this thesis.

2. Armenian. Significantly Ferrar and Abbott perceived very frequent agreement between their group and

---

262 Kenyon, The Story of the Bible, p. 90f

263 Ibid., p. 92a

264 Ibid., p. 103

265 Ibid., p. 91c

the Armenian,<sup>266</sup> and Robinson conjectured a relation between the two.<sup>267</sup> In 1914 Zwaan proposed that the relation of  $\theta$  to the Armenian should be studied,<sup>268</sup> and in 1919 Macler found the Armenian closely related to Soden's I-type.<sup>269</sup>

3. Old Latin. Treschow and others<sup>270</sup> observed connection between Family 13, Codex 1, and the Old Latin. Ferrar and his helper avowed frequent agreement of their group with this version,<sup>271</sup> and Lake perceived the relation of the larger group to the same version.<sup>272</sup> Sanders especially classed the affinities of 22 and W with the Old Latin.<sup>273</sup> Burkitt remarked on the affinity of  $\theta$ W 565 in Mark to this version,<sup>274</sup> and Dobschutz emphasized the same for  $\theta$ .<sup>275</sup>

---

266 Supra, p. 52a

267 Supra, p. 56a

268 Supra, p. 86a

269 Supra, p. 63c

270 Supra, p. 48a

271 Supra, p. 52a

272 Supra, p. 70b

273 Supra, p. 90f

274 Supra, p. 94f

275 Supra, p. 89c



4. Coptic. Michaelis in 1787 regarded the Sahidic as in part Western,<sup>276</sup> and Harris himself in 1891 conjectured that this Western element "ultimately leans, in part, on a Latin base."<sup>277</sup> Beermann, Lemm, Marr, and Blake thought that  $\Theta$  might have paleographical relation to the Coptic but did not investigate the text.<sup>278</sup> Zwaan ably contested this view.<sup>279</sup> Sanders considered that the text of W is allied to the Sahidic, especially so in the first part of Mark.<sup>280</sup> However, it is now known that the Sahidic shows more relation to the Neutral than was formerly thought.<sup>281</sup>

5. Georgian. For long, with Scholz<sup>282</sup> and others, the Georgian was held to be Constantinopolitan. Hort did not even mention it in his treatment of versions.<sup>283</sup> Blake perceived its Caesarean character and passed along his

---

276 Harris, Codex Bezae, p. 43a

277 Ibid., p. 50f

278 Supra, p. 86f, fn. 211

279 Supra, p. 86f, fn. 211

280 Supra, pp. 90b, 92a

281 Kenyon, The Story of the Bible, p. 130b; Text of the Greek Bible, p. 204c

282 Tregelles, op. cit., p. 94a

283 Hort, op. cit., II, pp. 78-86, secs. 107-122

idea to Streeter in time for the latter to incorporate it in his first edition.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### STREETER'S CAESAREAN TEXT

The contribution of Streeter to textual studies has received warm praise. Kenyon estimated that "the results of a generation of criticism are magisterially summed up and carried forward to further conclusions in Canon Streeter's recent work."<sup>1</sup> Robertson, "grateful for the bold path outlined by Streeter, even though we retain Hort's classification," valued Streeter's Four Gospels as "the most important contribution to the study of Textual Criticism since the days of Hort."<sup>2</sup>

Streeter worked on the lines of Hort; his attempt was not a changing of routes but a further working of the same route.<sup>3</sup> Besides this evident relation to Hort, Streeter's additions became "the coping stone"<sup>4</sup> of the structure gradually erected since Ferrar laid the foundation stone so far back as 1868. The unique step of Streeter lies, not in the proposed changes in nomenclature for textual families,

---

1 Kenyon, "English Versions of the Bible," Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge, p. 646

2 Robertson, Intro. to Text. Crit. of N. T., 2nd ed., 1928, pp. 243-245

3 Streeter, op. cit., p. 34; cf. supra, p. 29

4 Kenyon, Text of Gk. Bible, p. 176b

but in his treatment of the section of witnesses formerly known as Western.

### I. TRENDS CALLING FOR A NEW APPRAISAL

Into the formulation of the Caesarean Text went three distinct yet interacting trends. These accentuate and ultimately clarify the problem.

1. New Materials since Hort. The most notable of the many new manuscripts from Hort to Streeter are four, in the order of their discovery for use in textual studies--700, Sinaitic Syriac, Θ and W.<sup>5</sup> These occasioned, objectified, and directed somewhat the course of study. It is but natural that the mastery of new materials should be paramount in the efforts of researchers, especially in a field with so few workers.

2. Hints of Local Texts or Western Stratification. Semler, Griesbach, Hort, and the English Revisers grouped under the term 'Western' what is in reality different types of text. Whether Streeter is final in his view of local texts or not, the fact is undeniable that no longer can the 'Western' be regarded as a unit. Hort did not so

---

5 Cf. Streeter, op. cit., p. 32a

regard it though writers have frequently stated that he did. Fresh investigation of already known materials, however, made more evident the stratification of the Western Text.

Not frequently does an idea burst full-grown in the research of an investigator. Notwithstanding the monumental nature of the contribution of Streeter on local texts, there have been determinative antecedents in the views of other workers. It is not claimed that these explain Streeter's view nor that his exposition is simply a recrudescence of former views without climactic modifications in the right direction, but it is claimed that the similarity is close enough to make this backward glance instructive, particularly so if such delineates clearly his superior work on this point.

Hug's original treatment of the local texts with their concomitant divergencies seems to have been the first to adumbrate Streeter.<sup>6</sup> Hort's perception of Hug's true conception at the first has already been mentioned.

In 1876 Hammond remarked,

---

6 Hug "intended to exhibit the mode in which he thought the grouping had arisen. He thought he could discern four groups; one containing examples of an unrevised text, the other three being derived from this by independent revisions" (Hammond, op. cit., 3rd ed., p. 75b). This unrevised or common edition corresponds in the main with the Old Latin, D, the Old Syriac or Peshitta, and the more ancient fathers (Moses Stuart, "Notes to Hug's Intro.," p. 683) and resulted from the divergencies that arose locally through early transmission.

The wide acceptance of these [Western] interpolations in the East and West has suggested the hypothesis that they had their origin in the traditional oral teaching, which was long the instrument alike of extending and edifying the Church.<sup>7</sup>

The remark of Hort on *χώραν Σαμφουρῆιν*, the reading of D, shows his idea of local texts, "Perhaps a local tradition, though the name has not been identified with any certainty. Sepphoris is apparently excluded by its geographical position."<sup>8</sup> The same is true in his seeing several texts in the Western and his approval of Hug's germinal concept.

Within narrow geographical areas it [mixture of previously independent texts] was doubtless at work from a very early time, and it would naturally extend itself with the increase of communication between distant churches.<sup>9</sup>

Hort also spoke of the local relations of the habitual representatives of the Alexandrian Family.<sup>10</sup>

Birks said in opposition to Hort's Western Text, It [the hypothesis of local texts] is evidently not a fact at all, but a pure conjectural inference and is wholly wanting in direct and positive evidence.<sup>11</sup>

---

7 Hammond, *op. cit.*, 2nd ed., p. 75b; 3rd ed., p. 76. Dr. John A. Broadus owned a copy of the second edition by 1877; after sidelining much of the paragraph and underlining the words "traditional oral," he put in the margin these words, "cf. old Bapt. preacher."

8 Hort, *op. cit.*, II, appendix, p. 89

9 *Ibid.*, p. 8, section 12

10 *Ibid.*, p. 109a

11 Birks, *op. cit.*, p. 13a

The Gospels and Epistles are the common inheritance of the whole church. But local texts could have no other possible basis than local faults of transcription alone.<sup>12</sup>

Birks argued that the prevalence of the Western showed it was not local, but he failed to note that Hort saw in this type of text several texts. What was more serious in his contention was his failure to perceive that a text must have been local before it became prevalent. Quite curiously enough he then argued on stratification in the Western, "There must thus have been many divergent varieties, differing at least as much from each other as from the truth."<sup>13</sup>

Describing the recensions of Hug, Scrivener in 1883 subscribed to the local text idea as a phase of the early history of texts made local by distribution. He said,

All that can be inferred from searching into the history of the sacred text amounts to no more than this: that extensive variations, arising no doubt from the wide circulation of the New Testament in different regions and among nations of diverse languages, subsisted from the earliest period to which our records extend.<sup>14</sup>

Harris held in 1891 that the peculiarities of D were traceable to local origins.<sup>15</sup>

---

12 Ibid., p. 15b

13 Ibid., p. 18c; cf. 19b

14 Scrivener, Plain Introduction,<sup>3</sup> p. 519b

15 Harris, Codex Bezae, p. 191

In 1895 Kenyon, though he denied the likelihood of a formal Syrian revision as Hort postulated, thought it possible that this type of text may have arisen by general consent at Antioch so as to combine divergent readings, smooth away differences and harshnesses, and to produce an even and harmonious text.

Such a principle might easily be adopted by the copyists of a single neighbourhood, and so lead in time to the creation of a local type of text, just as the Western text must be supposed to have been produced, not by a formal revision, but by a development of a certain way of dealing with the text in a certain region.<sup>16</sup>

Then followed, as Kenyon stated it, the influence of Constantine on the adoption of this type of text for then and ensuing centuries.

Salmon, claiming that Hort's Neutral was the text-type at Alexandria, thought of two main centers, Rome and Alexandria, from which radiated varying types of text. "If the Roman text were different from the Alexandrian, it might be only as the second edition of a book differs from the first."<sup>17</sup> He could not allow that the Western variations were licentious changes but were vitally bound up with these centers and the local circulation of the Gospel message.

---

<sup>16</sup> Kenyon, Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts, 1903 printing, p. 114

<sup>17</sup> Salmon, Some Criticism of the Text of the New Testament, p. 158; cf. Vincent, op. cit., p. 173c



In 1902 Kirsopp Lake said,

It is almost certain that no "Western" authority does more than represent a local text, unrevised, it is true, but almost always lost and interpolated.<sup>18</sup>

But in 1908 Lake pretty clearly set forth in embryo what Streeter later developed. Lake characterized this view as only hypothetical. Each Gospel circulated separately some forty years or more before the formation of the four-fold gospel, and certain differences arose from copying and tended to become a fixed local tradition. As a result of communication between the churches there followed a gradual assimilation of local texts and a tendency toward a standard text. The Latin versions would represent two local texts, the Old Syriac another, and so on. By study we can reconstruct some of the most important local texts of the second and early third centuries. Because of a tendency to assimilation such reconstruction would more likely underrate the amount of difference between the local texts.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Lake, "The Text of the Gospels in Alexandria," *AJT*, VI, 1 (January 1902), p. 88fn. In his Text of the N. T. (2nd ed., p. 20c) he classed the Ferrar-Group as an old local text.

<sup>19</sup> Lake, "Von Soden's Treatment of the Text of the Gospels," p. 293f; cf. "New Testament," J. F. Bethune-Baker, *JTS*, XI (1909-10) p. 121ff. Lake felt that the name 'Western' comprises remnants of local texts which have survived the period of recensions. Though he footnoted the observation that Hort saw that the Western was not geographically western, yet he then charged that Hort "was not able to see"

3. Changes in Hort's Estimate of B. Parallel with the investigation of local texts (and in some sense the fruit of it) there arose an insistent demand for a new evaluation of the Neutral Text of Hort, chiefly B. Three facts had been made more or less evident. Accumulative proof pointed to the localization of this type of text to Alexandria, the admittance of some (even if slight) revision in B, and yet the recognition by most that B is the best document and the Neutral the best type of text.<sup>20</sup>

---

that the Western was "not one but several local texts" (p. 294). This is a misconception of Hort, a thing too prevalent among modern modifiers of Hort. Hort did not claim unity in the Western Text.

Lake held that the theory that Soden's H<sup>r</sup> J I<sup>a</sup>  $\Phi$  and the other subdivisions of the I text are as equally well explained by the hypothesis of "comparatively late local texts" as by Soden's theory of an I recension (*ibid.*, p. 282b). He charged that Von Soden took the "aftermath," as it were, of really ancient local texts for a definite recension (*ibid.*, p. 284). He further found the agreement between the diatessaron and the Latin versions due to the common use of the same local text (*ibid.*, p. 289fn).

Hutton (*op. cit.*, p. 49c) saw in Family 13 a local text.

Robertson, whose work on textual criticism was concurrently in the press with Streeter's, independently of Streeter pointed to the stratification of the Western Text (*op. cit.*, *passim*).

The foregoing hints on local texts culminated in the work of Streeter.

20 Cf. Streeter, *op. cit.*, p. 32

## II. ELEMENTS IN STREETER'S CONTRIBUTION

There are three distinct elements in the contribution of Streeter--the localization, the enlargement, and the evaluation of the group known as Caesarean. What is attempted here is not so much an appraisal as an analysis, an attempt to break down Streeter's system into its leading parts and tendencies. The first element emphasizes the method while the others are in part consequent results of the application of such a method.

Streeter, seeking the subtler shades of textual meaning, found an early diversity among the witnesses which later dovetailed itself into a remarkable uniformity. In the elucidation of this problem, he studied three broad questions: First, How are we to account for the early diversity? Second, How are we to explain the later uniformity? Third, Which text-type, or combination of types of text, is the closer to the primitive text of the autographs? Therefore, he discussed first how the local texts arose, then how these underwent a levelling process.<sup>21</sup>

1. The Localization of the Group. Taking as a thesis that there was a period of divergence followed by standardization, he proceeded to seek proof.

---

21 Ibid., p. 30

(1). The Period of Divergence. The oldest Greek manuscripts, the oldest versions, and the quotations of the earliest fathers all attest diversity.<sup>22</sup> The explanation is to be found in the fact that each Gospel at first circulated separately and had its own peculiar local history in the section or church where it was written or first sent.<sup>23</sup> Too slight notice in textual studies has been paid to the intent and audience of each writer and his particular book.

Copying, the necessary handmaiden to circulation in those days, originated various readings or the development of local texts.<sup>24</sup> The very character and habits of the local scribes gave a local trend to the manuscripts.<sup>25</sup> Since the larger variants would be the first to be standardized as most noticeable, the local character is most clearly evinced by concurrence in special minor variants.<sup>26</sup> The churches were at first relatively isolated because of distance, the fewness of Christians, the slow means of travel, and the

---

22 Ibid., p. 38c

23 Ibid., p. 13c

24 Ibid., pp. 27c, 37c

25 Ibid., p. 36a

26 Ibid., pp. 36c, 27c

pressure of persecutions.<sup>27</sup> It is manifest that copies sent to different sections and from different sections would not be identical.<sup>28</sup>

(2). The Process of Standardization. Because of the local nature of the divergence and the local connections in the diffusion of copies, this phenomenon of diversity would be slowly observed, and consequently slow would be the trend toward uniformity. Coincidence might occur, but the custom of a particular scriptorium would be toward uniformity.<sup>29</sup> Streeter deemed this standardization so pervading that after A. D. 600 local texts were rarely copied except in out-of-the-way places<sup>30</sup> and that later than the eighth century local types were employed as exemplars in the remoter districts only.<sup>31</sup> Each local text is related to its next-door neighbor far more closely than to remoter members of the series.<sup>32</sup>

This process of diversification produced a variety of local texts, otherwise known as "Western."<sup>33</sup> Out of this has

---

27 Ibid., p. 36b

28 Ibid., p. 35c

29 Ibid., p. 35

30 Ibid., pp. 28c, 68b

31 Ibid., p. 42a

32 Ibid., p. 106b

33 Ibid., p. 32a

arisen the chief problems of New Testament Textual Criticism. But the approach of Streeter helps to make the problem more definite if not less complex. Such is true provided Streeter is right in thinking that the maximum local diversity was reached around 200.<sup>34</sup>

The clue to the situation lies in the careful use of the early manuscripts and critical editions of the fathers.<sup>35</sup> There one sees that the patristic manuscripts have often been conformed in text to the Byzantine type but not so in the accompanying comments.<sup>36</sup> To illustrate: The lemma of Origen in Matthew 26:3-5 has been conformed in the Benedictine edition to read "and the scribes", with the Syrian Text, but his comment makes it clear that these words were absent from the manuscript he employed.<sup>37</sup> It is thought that no optional solution inheres in this phenomenon. "It is only through a chapter of accidents, different in every case, that any MS. not representing the standard text has survived."<sup>38</sup>

---

34 Ibid., p. 39a

35 Ibid., p. 45f

36 Vaganay, Textual Criticism of the New Testament, p. 81

37 Streeter, op. cit., p. 46b

38 Ibid., p.

(3). The Use of Origen in Localizing to Caesarea. Streeter established the remarkable fact that Origen (died A. D. 253) had in his later works, after his removal from Egypt to Caesarea in Palestine in A. D. 231, used a text of the type of  $\Theta$  and its allies. He, therefore, concluded that Origen used the Neutral Text in Egypt but the Caesarean at Caesarea, a name given it by Streeter from the famous library and center of Caesarea.

Streeter himself regarded this as the most original and perhaps the most important of his suggestions. Retrospectively he saw the generation and more of labors on local texts crowned with this coping stone of the arch and prospectively he envisioned

a new conception of the history of the text during the first three centuries--differing as much from that held by Westcott and Hort as from the more recent view put forward by von Soden.<sup>39</sup>

It is interesting to note that Streeter had two fore-runners in this singular view, Griesbach and Lake. Streeter set down the relation of his own discovery to the view of Griesbach, in these words,

At this point there flashed across my mind the distinction between the two texts used by Origen which was worked out as long ago as 1811 by Griesbach in his Commentarius Criticus (Part II, pp. x-xxxvi)--a book to which my attention had been called by Prof. C. H. Turner some months before. Gries-

---

39 Ibid., p. xxviii; cf. 54a

bach's thesis was that Origen in his Commentary on John used an "Alexandrian" text of Mark for Mk. i.-xi., and a "mixed text" for the remainder of the Gospel, but that he used a "Western" text of Mark in his Commentary on Matthew and in his Exhortation to Martyrdom, both of which belong entirely to the period when he lived in Caesarea. It occurred to me to review the evidence submitted by Griesbach in the light of MSS. of the Gospels which have only been discovered or properly edited since his time. The results were astonishing.

Two points became clear. (a) The difference noticed by Griesbach between the use of an "Alexandrian" and of a "mixed" text of Mark corresponds to the change, not from the earlier to the later chapters of Mark, but from the earlier to the later books of the Commentary on John. (b) Both this "mixed" text of Mark and the so-called "Western" text used in the Commentary on Matthew and in the Exhortation to Martyrdom are practically identical with the text of fam. 6. At once we notice the salient fact that the change in the text used corresponds, roughly speaking, to a change of residence. Origen himself tells us that the first five books of the Commentary on John were written before he left Alexandria for Caesarea, in 231. The Exhortation to Martyrdom was written shortly after the outbreak of persecution of 235; the Commentary on Matthew (about 240) is probably one of the works taken down by shorthand from lectures delivered on week-days in the church at Caesarea.<sup>40</sup>

Speaking of Family 1, Family 13, 22, 28, 565, and such codices, Lake had thrown out the hint in 1900<sup>41</sup> that one ought to localize the text of some of the minuscules at Caesarea. By 1902<sup>42</sup> he had excised this conjecture. When Mrs. Silva New, the reviser of Lake's book, confronted him

---

40 Ibid., p. 92; cf. p. 77c

41 Lake, The Text of the N. T., first ed., p. 21

42 Ibid., second edition



with this fact, he doubted it until he saw the actual page. Consequently the hint, confirmed by Streeter, was restored to the sixth edition.<sup>43</sup> The Lakes summed up the matter thus in 1941, "This had been partly seen by Griesbach and partly by Lake, but B. H. Streeter first made the point clear."<sup>44</sup>

The distinctiveness of the clarity of Streeter lies in the fact that prior to him the prevailing view, now made obsolete, was the same as that of Moses Stuart expressed so far back as 1836,

Origen's numerous works clearly shew that his codices of the New Testament were of the Alexandrine hue.... Nor has Origen in any of his works, apparently quoted a different text from that which seems to have been predominant at Alexandria. If all this be allowed, as I think it must be by those who are conversant with this subject...<sup>45</sup>

Corroborating, confirming, and supplementing the analyses of Streeter in general, Lake, Blake, and New slightly modified Streeter's original theory by pointing out that Origen possibly used a Caesarean text before leaving Alexandria, that at Caesarea he at first used an Alexandrine text, but soon reverted permanently to a Caesarean type of text.<sup>46</sup> Streeter gave assent to this change and followed

43 Ibid., 1928, pp. 22, 84; cf. Lake, "The Caesarean Text of the Gospel of Mark," p. 208f

44 Kirsopp and Silva Lake, "Family 13," p. 6f

45 Stuart in Hug, op. cit., p. 684c

46 Lake, Blake, and New, "The Caesarean Text of the Gospel of Mark," pp. 258-285

Lake in the proposition that Eusebius used the same text. Using the faulty evidence of Von Soden, Streeter had originally reached the negative conclusion that Eusebius did not use this type of text.<sup>47</sup>

2. The Enlargement of the Group. In two definite ways Streeter enlarged the Caesarean Family, to include the other Gospels besides Mark and to include the addition of other witnesses.

(1). The Inclusion of All Four Gospels. The discussions of Lake and others had not extended this group beyond Mark; Streeter held that it extended to all four Gospels and gave short tables of evidence to that effect.<sup>48</sup> Extended collations must yet be made and studied to put the matter on a secure basis of observed fact, but it is generally conceded that this worker established his theory as a working basis for general conclusions.

(2). The Inclusion of Other Witnesses. The most notable of these are Family 1424, W<sup>mark</sup>, and the Old Georgian. Several other witnesses have been added, but these will be presented in connection with P<sup>45</sup> since subsequent

---

47 Streeter, op. cit., p. 91; cf. xiii. The change was first made in the fourth edition, in 1930.

48 Ibid., pp. 81, 83, 582-84

modifications of Streeter have since the Beatty discovery centered around that remarkable codex.

(3). The Classification of Caesarean Witnesses. Streeter broke these witnesses into five classes-- primary ( Θ 565<sup>mark</sup>), secondary (Family 1, Family 13, 28, 700, W<sup>mark</sup>, Old Georgian), tertiary (1424&c. 544 N-Σ -0-Φ 157), supplementary (U Λ 1071 1604 Old Armenian), and patristic (Origen A. D. 240 Eusebius 325).<sup>49</sup>

Streeter regarded 565 as the most important ally of Θ in Mark and slightly superior to it, but for the other Gospels the least important of the group because it suffered more than any of the others from Byzantine revision.<sup>50</sup> Θ stands next to 565 in importance and

has suffered considerably from Byzantine revision. Its importance lies in the fact that it supplies a missing link and enables us to see the real connection between certain cursives, the exceptional character of which has long been an enigma to the critic.<sup>51</sup>

The extended Family 1, a typical representative of the Caesarean Family,

does not by any means stand to the Old Syriac in the same relation as does D to the Old Latin.... Its affinities with the Armenian are almost as

---

49 Ibid., p. 108

50 Ibid., pp. 49a, 64a, 81a, 574c

51 Ibid., p. 79f; cf. p. 574c

numerous... as those with the Old Syriac<sup>52</sup>

[and] is only a very little nearer to B<sup>N</sup> than it is to the Old Lat. and D.<sup>53</sup>

Codex 1582 is the oldest manuscript of Family 1 and the only one comparable in importance to Codex 1.<sup>54</sup> Thinking that the text of South Italy was in all probability akin to D, Streeter conjectured that the ancestor of Family 13 came from the East.<sup>55</sup> He regarded 69, 124, and 983 as specially important as often preserving readings not found in the other members.<sup>56</sup> He found the Ferrar-Group "distinctly nearer to B<sup>N</sup> than to D."<sup>57</sup> Codex 28, written by an ill-educated scribe, has a large non-Byzantine element.<sup>58</sup> 700, an important member of the Caesarean Family, is, unlike Family 13, slightly nearer to D than to B<sup>N</sup> and compares with  $\Theta$  in proportion of Byzantine mixture.<sup>59</sup> Shortly after the appearance of Streeter's book on The Four Gospels in 1924, he subjected W

---

52 Ibid., p. 90b

53 Ibid., p. 86b

54 Ibid., p. 88b and 80a

55 Ibid., p. 81

56 Ibid., p. 80c

57 Ibid., p. 86a

58 Ibid., p. 42b

59 Ibid., 86b

in Mark 5:31-16:8 to close comparison with the six chief Caesarean witnesses already mentioned. He published these conclusions in the Harvard Theological Review in April 1926 and incorporated them in the second edition of his book that year. He concluded that

in this part of Mark W represents the Caesarean text in a very pure form, but has suffered, though to a comparatively small extent, from a Byzantine reviser.<sup>60</sup>

[and] is so ancient [being of the fifth century] that in conjunction with the quotations by Origen and Eusebius it makes the existence of such a text no longer an hypothesis but an ascertained fact.<sup>61</sup>

Just in time for inclusion in the first edition of The Four Gospels, Blake pointed out to Streeter connection between the Caesarean Family and the Old Georgian. Then Streeter said,

If, on further investigation, it should appear that this close relation between fam. Θ and the Georgian holds throughout all four Gospels, the Old Georgian version will become an authority of the first importance for the text of the Gospels; for it will enable us to check and supplement the evidence of Θ and its allies much as the Old Latin does for that of D.<sup>62</sup>

Streeter thought that Lake, Blake, and New confirmed this conjecture in 1928.<sup>63</sup>

---

60 Ibid., p. 168c

61 Ibid., p. 599c

62 Ibid., p. 91a

63 Ibid., p. xiii; cf. 85a. The tertiary and supplementary witnesses are of minor importance, and the patristic witnesses have already been discussed (supra, pp. 115-118).

3. The Evaluation of the Group. Until Streeter the newly-studied segment of witnesses, accumulating since Ferrar, was generally classed as Western and had no more recognition in circles of learning than an interesting group of manuscripts with ancient readings and some mixture to the later type. Streeter christened the group as a family of first-rate importance and equated it with Hort's Neutral, Syrian, and Western. He saw Hort's Neutral and Alexandrian as one and used the latter name.

The text of fam. Θ is almost equidistant from both the Alexandrian and the Western texts. The balance inclines slightly, but only slightly, to the Western side, while there are a very large proportion of readings found neither in D nor in typical Alexandrian MSS. We have therefore in fam. Θ a clearly defined and distinctive text which may properly be ranked side by side with the three great texts, Alexandrian, Western, and Byzantine hitherto recognized.<sup>64</sup>

Considered as a whole, the text of fam. Θ is not very much nearer to D than it is to B.<sup>65</sup>

Fam. Θ agrees with Syr. S. in certain conspicuous insertions, which are found also in D... It is clear that the Greek text from which the Old Syriac was translated is more closely related to that of fam. Θ than to any other extant Greek MSS.; but it would be a great mistake to suppose that it is in any sense the same text. Indeed a notable feature of the fam. Θ is the number of its agreements with B against the Syriac. It is also noteworthy that the fam. Θ is frequently supported by the Armenian against the Old Syriac.<sup>66</sup>

---

64 Ibid., p. 84c

65 Ibid., p. 86c

66 Ibid., p. 89f

This is still the battleground respecting the Caesar-  
ean Family. Does the group rate as a full-fledged family  
equal to the Neutral or is it just a minor yet important  
group? It is hoped that the investigations of this thesis  
may contribute somewhat to the solution of this burning  
question.

PART II

THE CAESAREAN TEXT INVESTIGATED IN THE BEATTY GOSPELS

Introduction

THE CHESTER BEATTY BIBLICAL PAPYRI

Chapter One

MATTHEW

Chapter Two

JOHN



## INTRODUCTION

### THE CHESTER BEATTY BIBLICAL PAPYRI

#### I. THE STORY OF DISCOVERY

In the London Times, November 19, 1931,<sup>1</sup> Sir Frederic Kenyon, late Director and Principal Librarian of the British Museum, London, and a noted expert in the study of Biblical manuscripts, announced the purchase in Egypt by Chester Beatty of eleven codices of papyrus. Mr. Beatty, an American resident in London and a noted collector of manuscripts, especially illuminated ones, had secured this valuable treasure in the winter of 1930-1931 and deposited it in the British Museum for Kenyon to study and edit. For some four years thereafter different portions of the discovery came to light, having been secured from dealers by Mr. Beatty, Professor Junkers, the University of Michigan agent, Mr. Scheide, Mr. Merton, and others, and it is still possible that other portions of it may yet appear since the finders mutilated the codices and distributed them to several buyers for financial reasons.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Clipping in files of Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

2 In a letter to the writer under date of March 12, 1946, Dr. F. G. Kenyon says in part, "I know of no fragments of P<sup>45</sup> other than those of Mr. Beatty and those published by Dr. Gerstinger."

From the very first eminent scholars have judged these papyri to be the oldest and most valuable of the major evidence yet to come from the sandy archives of the Land of the Nile. They contain considerable portions of the Greek Bible and date back to as early as the second century of the Christian era. It is no marvel, therefore, that this discovery is hailed as the most important since the discovery of the Codex Sinaiticus by Tischendorf a century ago.

Since papyrus discoveries and papyrus-hunting began in earnest in Egypt, the officials have tightened down on research there. On account of this situation no sure report of the locality of the Beatty Papyri has yet come to hand, nor have the Egyptian authorities found where the discovery was made. Yet certain gossip or rumors about the find have appeared. In 1933 Kenyon could do no more than localize them to the Fayum whose arid vaults of sand have yielded so much in recent decades. He said in part,

Their place of origin is unknown, since they reached him [Beatty] through the hands of natives and dealers, whose statements as to provenance are not always reliable. From their character, however, it is plain that they must have been discovered among the ruins of some early Christian church or monastery; and there is reason to believe that they come from the neighborhood of the Fayum.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, fasciculus I, p. 5

In 1938 Kenyon added that the find

is said to have come from the region of Aphroditopolis, on the right bank of the Nile, about thirty miles above Memphis, and presumably represents the library of some early Christian church.<sup>4</sup>

The originals may be seen in the British Museum, at the University of Michigan, in the Museum of Princeton University, in the National Library at Vienna, in Italy, and in private hands. Most of the papyri, however, can now be studied in photographic facsimiles as well as in the transcripts of the various editors of the precious remains.

It is estimated that a papyrus roll or codex would not last at the most for more than a century if used, and the decay of being deposited in a grave has made the papyri more brittle. When this group of papyri reached the British Museum, some appeared as no more than a mere lump of papyrus.<sup>5</sup> Before Sir Frederic could begin his studies in earnest, the materials had to be treated chemically (so that their tearing apart and flattening out would not destroy them) and placed between glass. That is the work of a skilled artist, and Dr. Ibscher of Berlin mounted the papyri

---

4 Ibid., Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts, 4th ed., 1938, p. 64. He had given similar conclusions in 1937, "Apparently in a cemetery or the ruins of a church in the neighborhood of Aphroditopolis" (The Text of the Greek Bible, p. 39). Again, "Fayum or (with somewhat more definiteness) as in the neighborhood of Aphroditopolis, on the opposite side of the Nile" (ibid., The Bible and Archaeology, p. 225). See also Sanders, A Third-Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul, p. 13f

5 Kenyon, C. Beatty Bibl. Papyri, fasc. I, p. 6

under glass with exceptional skill and returned them to Kenyon for editing. Early in 1932 Kenyon had finished the tedious task of transcribing the New Testament manuscripts, with collations and introductions, but the publication of them did not start until the next year and then followed successively for several years.

## II. DESCRIPTION OF THE POPYRI

1. The Date. Perhaps the early date of the Beatty Papyri is the most interesting feature of the entire discovery. It pushes the date for the documentary evidence for the Greek Bible back one to two centuries earlier than the Sinaiticus and the Vaticanus Manuscripts of the fourth century. Papyrus fragments of Biblical manuscripts older than the Beatty Papyri were already known, but in proportion to the Beatty leaves these are mere fragments. The oldest known Biblical papyrus is a portion of Deuteronomy in a fine book-hand of the second century B. C., discovered and edited by C. H. Roberts in 1936.<sup>6</sup> The oldest of the New Testament is a fragment of John's Gospel of the first half or early in the second century A. D. It too was discovered by Roberts

---

<sup>6</sup> C. H. Roberts, Two Biblical Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, 1936

in the same John Rylands Library, Manchester, and demonstrates the early date of this Gospel.<sup>7</sup>

The dating of manuscripts is a science within itself, and the dating of this group of papyri has been determined, not by the opinion of just one man, but by several scholars in this field. The leaves or folia are not dated, to be sure, but the science of paleography is so well developed that there can be no reason to doubt the substantial accuracy of the estimates of papyrologists. For the portion studied in this theses, the writer has accepted the dating of these specialists. Kenyon dated the several codices in the second, third, and fourth centuries, some details of which may be seen below, and several other scholars have confirmed his datings.

2. The Eleven Beatty Codices. The eleven codices or books of this discovery were thought at first to be twelve and fall into three main divisions--New Testament, Old Testament, and non-canonical writings.

Besides the codex with which this thesis is concerned (which will be described separately and more in detail), two are New Testament manuscripts; one preserves eighty-six out of one hundred and four leaves of a codex of Paul's Epistles

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, November 1935

while the other with only slight imperfection contains Revelation 9:10-17:2. Kenyon dated the first in the first half of the third century and the second in the same or probably in the second half of the century. The text of the first has a preponderance of agreement with B, with A and  $\Delta$  not far behind; the text of the second is closest to  $\Delta$  and C, with P next, and A rather further away.

Two codices preserve parts of Genesis, one of the fourth and the other of the third century. Papyrus VI of the collection, dating not later than the second century and likely not after the middle of that century, contains parts of Numbers and Deuteronomy. At the time Kenyon first edited this codex, it had the distinction of being the oldest of the Beatty Papyri, the oldest manuscript of any size of any part of the Bible, and the earliest example of the codex form of manuscript. It is a specimen of a high class of book production and shows affinity with the text of B, with an Origenian tinge. Papyrus VII, with a portion of Isaiah, is notable for containing several marginal glosses in an early form of Coptic, the earliest extant specimen of the Fayumic dialect. These Coptic additions also fix the papyrus in the Fayum and point to a third century date. Papyrus VIII is fragments of Jeremiah and to be dated in the late second or early third century. Portions of Ezekiel, Daniel, and Esther form one codex though they were at first study thought to belong to

two codices. Wilcken preferred the second century, and Kenyon remarked that there is at any rate no reason to put it after the first half of the third century.

Papyrus XI of the group represents two pages of Ecclesiasticus from the fourth century. The twelfth codex of the group consists of parts of Enoch and Melito of the fifth (Kenyon) or fourth (Sanders) century. Kenyon did not at first identify the work of Melito but indicated that it concerned the suffering of Jesus. Campbell Bonner of the University of Michigan later identified it as a homily of Melito, from whom only a few quotations are preserved in other writers, and edited it.

3. p<sup>45</sup> or the Beatty Gospels and Acts. Though this codex was merely a lump of papyrus when it reached London, its mounting showed that it was more valuable than was first thought. It has in the fifteen intervening years become the most famous codex of the group. It is particularly interesting in showing that so early as the third century the four Gospels and the Acts were grouped together into one codex.

The finders or dealers must have sensed its importance. They sold parts of it to at least three buyers, Mr. Beatty, the University of Michigan representative, and Professor Junkers for the Vienna Library. These have all been published,

the Michigan leaves having been generously transferred to Mr. Beatty. Kenyon published this codex before the others of the group because of the keen interest in the Gospels,<sup>8</sup> accompanied later by a photographic facsimile.<sup>9</sup>

"Only in two cases has the page numeration escaped destruction," but these are valuable since they show that the original contained approximately 220 leaves, approximately 218 being required for the five books. That means that there may have been a few blank pages at the back. The pagination and the identity of the scribal hand show that these five books--the Gospels and Acts--were a single unit. A second hand increased somewhat the occasional use of punctuation. Its abbreviations for the divine names are particularly interesting.

It is dated by Kenyon in the first half of the third century. Professor A. S. Hunt assigned it to the third century but preferred the later half of that century. However, Drs. H. I. Bell and W. Schubart independently formed the same opinion as did Kenyon. Its small and very clear hand shows that it is the work of a competent scribe.

4. The Vienna Fragment (P<sup>45V</sup>). In the spring of 1930 the National Library of Vienna, Austria, secured

---

8 Kenyon, C. Beatty Bibl. Pap., fasc. II, text

9 Ibid., plates



through Professor Hermann Junkers, then director of the German Archaeological Institute in Cairo, Egypt, three large and five small fragments of P<sup>45</sup>. Their official number there is Greek Papyrus Vienna 31974. The editor, Dr. Hans Gerstinger, and Sir Frederic Kenyon, the editor of the London fragments (P<sup>45L</sup> when the two are cited together), have by the inspection of photographs reached with certainty the conclusion that the fragments belong to the same codex as P<sup>45</sup>.

In fact, the salesman informed Professor Junkers that a large number of bound leaves ought to exist, but Junkers searched in vain for them until the same dealer told him that another European had acquired them and carried them to England. Soon the German read Kenyon's sensational announcement that the well-known collector, Chester Beatty, had committed the collection to the British Museum and to Kenyon for the delicate task of treating and editing the extremely precious discovery.

Gerstinger discovered in editing the fragments that some one had torn almost vertically through the full length of the codex-leaf which once contained the text of Matthew 25:41-26:39. The text begins on the recto (the side with the horizontal fibers) and runs immediately forward on the verso. The number of lines of the recto amounts to thirty-seven; the verso, which has somewhat larger writing and broader space between lines, has only thirty-five lines. There remain only

the line-ends, the beginning of the lines and in each instance fully a good third of each line. The size of the edge allows the number of letters of each line to count up to approximately 59.

The writing material is thin and very carefully prepared; it is fairly badly preserved, very broken and of a dark-brown color. The ink is a strong black, in places artfully made blacker or deeper. The writing is an extremely careful, elegant book-writing, the product of the trained secure hand of a professional book calligrapher. It is a typical representative according to the right sloping sort of the so-called strict-style, a style met frequently in the book-writing of that day, specially of the third century. Gerstinger paleographically compared the writing with that of several other papyri and decided that at the latest the Vienna Fragment is to be dated in the middle of the third century.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Hans Gerstinger, "A Fragment of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex in the Papyrus Collection of the National Library in Vienna," Aegyptus, Vol. 13, I (1933), Milan, pp. 67-69. Besides the description here translated from the German and summarized, Gerstinger gave a diplomatic transcript of the text of the Vienna fragments, collated them with the text of Von Soden, made some strictures on the type of text, and subjoined paleographical and critical remarks.

III. THE METHOD OF THIS STUDY

The critical apparatus of Kenyon as well as that of Gerstinger limited its scope of evidence. The big problem here, therefore, has been that of making up a critical apparatus from which to study the textual affinities of the Beatty Gospels. The guiding purpose in such a presentation has been to see the entire conformation of the textual situation. To such an extent the purpose has dictated the method. However no attempt has been made at this point to prejudge the evidence. The result of such an array of readings will be to set forth the various relations and the comparative value (superior or inferior is not at present indicated) of p<sup>45</sup> and the other witnesses.

The reader has here not only the variant readings of p<sup>45</sup> from the main body of witnesses, but a statement of all readily available evidence of the singular readings of others. Even if only one witness differs from the joint witness of p<sup>45</sup> and all other witnesses, that variance is indicated. In the cases of adscripts, movable  $\nu$ , and itacisms only such evidence as was available on the desk at the time has been given; no attempt has been made at exhaustiveness. Most collators disregard these minutiae. These details are included in such cases only as were known from writers that indicate them or from personal collations. The pages have

not been burdened with such customary statements as 'vid' in stating that the rest or all witness to a reading; all evidence in such cases is relative and depends on what is known. Any day a new manuscript or a new collation of already known manuscripts may alter somewhat the statement of evidence.

The citation of editors in the evidence is in no wise authoritative; only documentary evidence is that. However, the presentation of editorial opinion often helps one to grasp more readily the situation. If the text were presented here, this statement of editors might be obviated, but it is in no way intended to prejudice the judgment toward or against a truly critical solution of the problem. Lachmann (Ln), Tregelles (Tr), and Tischendorf (Ti) generally agree with Westcott and Hort (WH) unless it is otherwise indicated. The editors fall with P<sup>45</sup> unless they are differently cited. Almost invariably the reading of the codex being studied is stated first, yet this again is not to prejudge the case but to clarify the problem.

It is thought that the abbreviations are so common or so clearly stated that a complete resolution of them is unnecessary. One who has saturated himself with this study may, however, fail to explain something that needs explaining. A full presentation of them would be too lengthy.

add, like om, does not say as to whether the reading belongs to or is no part of the true text. It is merely a

relative way of stating the evidence. It is omitted or added by this or these witnesses, as the case may be, with respect to the other witnesses. A longer way of stating the evidence was tried but later abandoned for this one because of its general use and because of its brevity.

etc, as in number (1) in the critical apparatus on Matthew, means that all known evidence falls on this side. In number (25), however, the first "etc" means other uncials, the second other minuscules.

Jer is for Jerome; jer in Syr<sup>Jer</sup> is for the Jerusalem or Palestinian Syriac.

P<sup>45</sup> is the official numbering of the Chester Beatty Gospels and Acts, the chief subject of this thesis. P<sup>45</sup> means the London or Beatty Parts. P<sup>45V</sup> means the Vienna fragment. P<sup>45L&V</sup> means a combination of the London and Vienna fragments.

Pesh or pesh superscribed with Syr stands for the Peshitta of the Syriac.

= on the authority of; however, after names of editors or editions, it simply means 'has' or 'have.'

. . . is the indication that another side of the evidence is introduced. Note well: in the cases in which this series of dots occurs often, each new phase of evidence looks back to the first statement of the evidence. Number (223) on Matthew gives four different readings and is not clear unless

one returns to the first each time.

ς , the combination of the two Greek letters στ , the initial letters of Stephen, in Greek *στέφανος* , whose edition is normally regarded as the Textus Receptus. However, Scrivener's edition of the Textus Receptus has been used here throughout.

[ ] , square brackets indicate that parts of the text had to be supplied since the papyrus has a gap. In number (2) in the apparatus on Matthew [ων means that these two letters do not appear on the papyrus. In number (37) only two letters appear in the papyrus.

. under a Greek letter indicates doubt about the letter. In number (4) in Matthew the five closing letters of the Greek word are somewhat defaced but can be made out with comparative certainty.

- is used to avoid writing the entire Greek word again. In number (21) in Matthew -ησεν means that manuscript Θ reads *ηκολουθησεν* . - does not mean minus or omit.

( ) in the statement of the evidence indicates that the manuscript does this with some modification. Usually that modification is made clear in the full statement of the evidence.

+ means the same as add; reference must be made to the first statement of the evidence in the particular case.

## CHAPTER ONE

### MATTHEW

#### I. THE CONDITION OF MATTHEW IN P<sup>45</sup>

Both the London and Vienna fragments will be studied here. This fact offsets somewhat the statement of Kenyon, who dealt with the London fragments only. Kenyon said, "The remains in Matthew are so scanty that the figures do not signify much. They are, however, given for the sake of completeness."<sup>1</sup> The attitude assumed in this investigation is to be thankful for what we do have, however fragmentary it may be, and proceed to weigh its testimony. What we do have represents four of the twenty-eight chapters, namely 20, 21, 25, and 26.

#### II. COLLATION AND CRITICAL APPARATUS

- 20:24 (1)  $\delta\upsilon\omicron = P^{45}$  etc . . .  $\omicron\upsilon\omicron = \theta$   
(2)  $\delta\upsilon\omicron$   $\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi[\omega\nu$  with  $P^{45}$  etc  
. . .  $\Gamma = \text{I}\alpha\kappa\omega\beta\omicron\upsilon$  και  $\text{I}\omega\alpha\nu\nu\omicron\upsilon$  (con-  
formed to Mark 10:41)  
(3)  $\delta\upsilon\omicron$   $\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi[\omega\nu = P^{45}$  etc . . .  
Boh ( $\overline{\text{ΠΙCΩΝ B}}$ ) Sah ( $\text{ΠCΩΗ CΗΑΘ}$ ), the  
brothers two

- 20:25 (4) ἀρχόντες = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . 473 = δοκούντες  
ἀρχεῖν
- 20:26 (5) Σ WH = ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας = P<sup>45</sup> ,<sup>12</sup>CDΘ uncs<sup>12</sup>  
700 1278 most mins OL<sup>most</sup> Vg Syr<sup>cur</sup> pesh har  
Geo . . . WHmrg = μεγ. ἐν ὑμῖν = B 713 1093  
1396 1675 lect 185 Sah Boh
- (6) ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι = P<sup>45</sup> Θ etc  
. . . transpose after γεν. = C 1402 others ff<sup>1</sup>
- (7) ἐν ὑμῖν = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . ὑμῶν = LZ 892
- (8) μέγας = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . 71 om = μέγας
- (9) γενέσθαι = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . 28 = εἶναι
- (10) μέγας γενέσθαι = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . .  
γεν. μεγ. = 440 443 713 1574
- (11) μέγας = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . primus (first) = (1) 2  
(other OL = maior)
- 20:27 (12) Σ = ὑμῖν εἶναι = P<sup>45</sup> ,<sup>12</sup>CDZ 085 X (ὑμῶν  
εἶ. ) uncs<sup>12</sup> all mins OL Vg Syr<sup>cur</sup> pesh har  
. . . WHmrg = εἶναι ὑμῶν = B
- (13) εἶναι = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om = L
- (14) εἶναι πρῶτος = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . πρῶ. εἶν.  
= W 1241 1515 most OL Vg Arm
- (15) πρῶτος = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . M = maior (greater)
- (16) ἐν ὑμῖ]ν or ὑμῶ]ν P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om =  
Pesh<sup>1</sup> ms



- (17) WH = εστᾱ[ι = P<sup>45</sup> XCDKLMNOUWZ ΔΘΠ\* ΣΦ 085  
 fam 1 fam 13 22 33 157 543 565 569 677 700 892  
 1582 many others [Tisch about 70 others] most  
 vers (OL Vg Boh Sah Arm Syr<sup>pesh</sup> cur) Or<sup>trans</sup> Mt  
 Dam<sup>par</sup> cd . . . Σ = εστῶ = BEGHSVXY Γ Π<sup>2</sup>  
 28 most mins Geo<sup>1</sup> Or<sup>once</sup>

- 20:28 (18) Σ = ηλθε . . . WHSod = ηλθεν = P<sup>45</sup> θ  
 (19) αντι πολλων = P<sup>45</sup> θ most uncs all mins f 1  
 q Vg<sup>(most)</sup> Syr<sup>sin</sup> (from space) pesh har Sah Boh  
 Aeth Arm Geo . . . add with much variation

υμεις δε ζητειτε εκ μεικρου αυξησαι  
 και εκ μειζονος ελαττον ειναι.  
 εισερχομενοι δε και παρακληθεντες  
 δειπνησαι μη ανακλινεσθαι εις τους  
 εξεχοντας τοπους μηποτε ενδοξοτερος  
 σου επελθη και προσελθων ο  
 δειπνοκλητωρ ειπη σοι· ετι κατω χωρει  
 και καταισχυνθηση εαν δε αναπεσης  
 εις τον ηττονα τοπον και επελθη σου  
 ηττων ερει σοι ο δειπνοκλητωρ· συναγε  
 ετι ανω και εσται σοι τουτο χρησιμον =

D Φ a b c d e ff<sup>1.2</sup> g<sup>1.2</sup> h m n r<sup>1.2</sup> aur gig and  
 emm Syr<sup>cur</sup> har (cd mrg) Hil Leo Juven recognize  
 it.

- 20:29 (20) κ[αι = P<sup>45</sup> Θ others Sah (ΔΕ) R<sup>sax</sup> (vide post)  
 . . . ϕ Vg (Tisch 153\* W&W R\*)=om
- (21) ηκολ]ουθησαν = P<sup>45</sup> D Γ 047 659 1365 1402  
 2145 c d e ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>2</sup> q r<sup>2</sup> Vg (few) Syr<sup>har</sup> Sah Aeth  
 Arm . . . -ησεν = Θ most uncs fam 13 700 most  
 mins a b f ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l n vg<sup>(most)</sup> Syr<sup>cur</sup> pesh jer  
 Boh Geo
- (22) om αυτω or place in another position = P<sup>45</sup> . . .  
 λ<sup>\*</sup>=om . . . ς WH = αυτω = Θ fam 13 700  
 others
- (23) οχλοι πολλοι = P<sup>45</sup> D 047 659 1365 1402  
 2145 c d e ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>2</sup> q r<sup>2</sup> Vg (few) Syr<sup>har</sup> Sah Aeth  
 Arm Chrys Bas<sup>seleuc</sup> . . . WH = οχλος  
 πολυς = Θ most uncs most mins fam 13 700 a b  
 f ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l n am for san Syr<sup>cur</sup> pesh jer Boh  
 Geo Or<sup>bis</sup> Hil
- 20:30 (24) ακουσαντες = P<sup>45</sup> Θ others . . . και  
 ακου. = 700 Syr<sup>cur</sup> pesh jer Geo<sup>2</sup> Aeth
- (25) ακουσαντες = P<sup>45</sup> λ BΘ etc 700 etc f<sup>(ut</sup>  
 audierunt) vg<sup>1</sup> ms = audientes . . . ηκουσαν  
 with και before εκραξαν = D 1424 It<sup>(exc f)</sup>  
 vg<sup>(most)</sup> Sah Geo<sup>1</sup> Syr<sup>cur</sup> pesh jer . . . when they  
 heard = Aeth
- (26) κ̄ε = κυριε = P<sup>45</sup> etc (see below) . . . ιϋ  
 700 N<sup>scholz</sup> 69 mill & scr . . . κυριε Ιησου  
 L Z Σ 124

- (27)  $\overline{\kappa\epsilon}$  = P<sup>45</sup> B C E G H K L M N S U V W X Γ Δ Π  
 most mins f ff<sup>2</sup> q Vg Sah Boh<sup>our</sup> Lord Syr<sup>pesh</sup>  
 (my Lord) har Or Dam Op . . . om = Ἰ Δ Θ fam 13  
 (exc 124) 118 157 209 384 543 565 566 655 (700  
 above) 1689 a b c d e ff<sup>1.2</sup> h n r<sup>2</sup> Syr<sup>cur</sup> jer  
 Aeth Arm Geo
- (28)  $\zeta$  = κυριε after ελεησον ημας =  
 P<sup>45</sup> C N O W X Γ Δ Π Σ Φ Ψ 1 22 33 124 700  
 =  $\overline{\iota\upsilon}$  most others f q Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har (Geo) . . .  
 WH = κυ. ελεη. ημ. = B L Z 892 1354 g<sup>1</sup> 1 r<sup>1</sup>  
 Vg Sah
- (29)  $\upsilon\iota\epsilon$  = P<sup>45</sup> others . . . Ιησου υιε = Ἰ  
 L N Θ Σ 69 124 543 700 (Legg Hoskier only υιε)  
 892 893 1365 a c e h n Syr<sup>jer</sup> Boh Aeth Arm Geo
- (30) WHmrg = υιε = P<sup>45</sup> Ἰ C D E F Θ Π\* Σ Φ  
 1 2 4 6 33 (69) 80 91 (124) 238 240 243 440  
 483\* 484 489 565 569 Lects (Hosk)=6\* 44 47 150  
 195 196 222 234 257 b d f ff<sup>1.2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> 1 q r<sup>2</sup>  
 Syr<sup>cur</sup> pesh har Sah Or<sup>once</sup> Eus Chrys Dam . . .  
 $\zeta$  WH = υιος = B G H K M S U V W X Y Z Γ Δ Π<sup>2</sup>  
 1 118 209 700 and most mins Or<sup>bis</sup>
- (31) Δαυιδ = P<sup>45</sup> Boh (  $\overline{\eta\delta\alpha\sigma\iota\delta}$  ) Latt<sup>dauid</sup>  
 . . .  $\zeta$  = Δαβιδ . . . Ln Tr T1 WH = Δαυειδ =  
 B D W Θ Sah  $\overline{\eta\delta\alpha\sigma\epsilon\iota\delta}$
- 20:31 (32) Verse 31 = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . 157 om ver., by homoioteleuton

- (33)  $\zeta$  WH = ο δε οχλος = P<sup>45</sup> Θ most uncs 700  
 most mins Syr<sup>har</sup> Sah Boh<sup>few</sup> Geo OL<sup>most</sup> (turba  
 autem) Vg Arm . . . οι δε οχλοι = Ν Ο Σ  
 1223 ff<sup>1</sup> Vg<sup>1</sup> ms Syr<sup>pesh</sup> jer cur (those crowds)
- (34) ρ πολλ]ω = P<sup>45</sup> . . . πολλω μαλλον = λ'  
 :: Tisch thought conformed to Luke and Mark  
 . . .  $\zeta$  WH = μειζον = Β Δ C W U ( πλεον )  
 Θμητων fam 1 fam 13 700 1579 & 952 ( μεθονα )  
 1424 ( μειζονως )
- (35) presence of πολλω or some form = P<sup>45</sup> Sah  
 Boh etc . . . om = Syr<sup>cur</sup>
- (36) εκραυασαν = P<sup>45</sup> . . . εκραυαζον =  
 Θ Φ fam 13 543 . . .  $\zeta$  = εκραζον = C N O  
 W X Γ Δ Π<sup>1</sup> Σ ς most mins OL Vg Syr<sup>har</sup> jer  
 Boh (B D Δ E J M) Aeth Arm Geo<sup>2</sup> . . . WH = εκραζαν  
 = λ' B D L Z Π\* 3 9 33? 66 174 264 700 892  
 Syr<sup>cur</sup> pesh Sah Boh<sup>most</sup> Geo<sup>1</sup>
- 20:32 (37) εφω]νη[σεν = P<sup>45</sup> Θ etc . . . vocans=ff<sup>1</sup>
- 21:13 (38) κ[ληθησεται = P<sup>45</sup> Θ 700 etc . . .  
 γενησεται = 118 209 . . . εστιν =  
 1093 Justin
- 21:14 (39) και<sup>first</sup> = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om=Sah Boh<sup>B D Δ E F K</sup>  
 M S

- 21:15 (40)  $\text{ιε]ρωι} = P^{45} . . . \text{without adscript} = \Theta$
- (41)  $\text{τους κραζοντας εν τω ιε]ρωι} = P^{45} \text{ etc} . . . \text{εν τω ιερω τ. κρα.} = 1093$
- (42)  $\text{εν τω ιε]ρωι και λεγοντας} = P^{45}$   
 etc . . .  $\text{om} = M^{W\&W} . . . \text{Q}^{W\&W} = \text{om} = \text{et dicentes}$   
 (and saying)
- 21:16 (43)  $\text{ς} = \text{ειπον} = P^{45} \text{ C N W uncs}^{12} \text{ fam 1 fam 13}$   
 most mins . . . Ln Tr Ti =  $\text{ειπαν} = \text{,}' \text{ B D L}$   
 $\Theta$  (33 hiat) 700 (Sah Boh<sup>most</sup> = they said . . .  
 Sah<sup>1</sup> ms Boh<sup>3</sup> ms = saying . . . Vg 15 mss =  
 dicant (pres subjn) & 10 mss = dicunt Syr<sup>cur</sup> pesh;  
 Aeth Arm = they say)
- (44)  $\text{αυτωι} = P^{45} . . . \Theta = \text{αυτω}$
- (45)  $\text{ς WH} = \text{αυτωι} = P^{45} \text{ etc} . . . \text{om} = \text{Vg}^3 \text{ mss}$
- (46)  $\text{ς WH} = \text{α[κουεις} = P^{45} \Theta$  most uncs 700 most  
 mins OL Vg Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har Sah Boh<sup>(Γ)</sup> Geo<sup>1</sup> Or<sup>bis</sup>  
 Iren . . . prefix  $\text{ουκ} = \text{F H 4 28 108 157 230}$   
 $238 245 270 273 346 399 440 476 482 544 655 726$   
 $999 1200 1375 1396 1424 1588 1604 1675$  Syr<sup>cur</sup>  
 Boh<sup>exc</sup> Γ (Geo<sup>2</sup> = audisne, equivocal testimony  
 here)
- (47)  $\text{αυτοι]ς} = P^{45} \text{ others} . . . \text{αυτω} = D^*$
- (48)  $\text{ναι} = P^{45} \Theta$  700 etc . . .  $\text{om} = 1574 \text{ Geo}^1$
- (49)  $\text{ουδεποτε} = P^{45} \text{ all uncs most mins d g}^1 \text{ l q}$   
 aur Vg<sup>most</sup> Syr<sup>cur</sup> pesh jer Sah Boh<sup>most</sup> Iren Clem  
 . . .  $\text{ουκ} = 28 \text{ b c f ff}^{1.2} \text{ h r}^2 \text{ Vg}^3 \text{ mss Boh}^{\text{JK}} \text{ Arm}$

- 21:17 (50) πολεως = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om=ι\* (suppl ι<sup>c</sup>) 28
- (51) Σ WH = βηθανιαν = Θ others Cop = ΕΒΗΘΑΝΙΑ  
Latt<sup>Bethaniam</sup>. . . βαιθανιαν = P<sup>45</sup> (26:  
6 = βη[θανια )
- 21:19 (52) Σ WH = ηλθεν = P<sup>45</sup> Θ Cop others . . . και  
ηλθεν = 697 e g<sup>2</sup> Vg<sup>2</sup> mss Syr<sup>cur</sup> pesh jer Geo
- (53) Σ WH = μονον = P<sup>45</sup> others . . . μονα = 59  
61 157 692 1278 1365 700 (Hoskier remarked, "The  
scribe himself has changed his original *ΜΟΝΟΝ*  
to *ΜΟΝΑ* --this unique reading" (Codex 604,  
Intro., p. XXIV)
- (54) Σ WH = και third = P<sup>45</sup> ι' B Θ 700 etc Boh<sup>exc</sup> K  
. . . om = Sah Boh<sup>K</sup> Syr<sup>pesh</sup> ms 21
- (55) Σ WH = λεγει = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . he said = Syr<sup>all</sup>  
Cop Geo
- 25:41 (56) Σ WH = ερει] και = P<sup>45</sup> Θ others . . .  
και ερει=most OL most Vg Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har jer
- (57) και = P<sup>45</sup> others . . . om=a b r<sup>2</sup> Vg<sup>4</sup> mss  
Pesh<sup>1</sup> ms Cop Aeth
- (58) και τοις = P<sup>45</sup>Vienna etc . . . Boh = ἡηιζωοσ  
(to the wicked)
- (59) Σ WH = αι]ωνιον = P<sup>45</sup>Vienna etc . . .  
αιω. εξωτερον = 40\*

- (60)  $\zeta_{WH} = \text{το ητοιμασμη[ενον]} = P^{45} \lambda' A B \Theta$  etc  
 (-μενω, FK) 700 f  $g^2$  l m q most Vg Cop Syr<sup>all</sup>  
 Aeth Arm Geo Or<sup>some</sup> Aug Hil<sup>once</sup> Eus Const Did  
 Cyr Bas Tert . . . WHapp = ο ητοιμασεν ο πατηρ  
 μου = D fam l (exc 118) 22 1582 a b c d ff<sup>1.2</sup>  
 $g^1$  h r<sup>1.2</sup> aur Vg<sup>R(W&W)</sup>; (with some variance  
 these fathers--Iren Or<sup>some</sup> Ruf Just Clem<sup>Hom</sup>  
 Hipp Hil<sup>twice</sup> Cyp
- 25:42 (61)  $\gamma\alpha\rho = P^{45V}$  etc . . . om = Boh<sup>2</sup> mss  
 (62) first  $\kappa\alpha\iota = P^{45V}$  etc . . . om = Sah  
 (63) first  $\omicron\upsilon\kappa = P^{45V}$  and  $\lambda'^*$  om by error, then supply  
 above line
- 25:43 (64)  $\mu\epsilon \xi\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma = P^{45V}$  etc . . . Pesh =  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  before  $\xi\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$   
 (65)  $\xi\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma \eta\mu\eta\nu \kappa\alpha\iota = P^{45}$  etc . . . om = Syr<sup>sin</sup>  
 (66)  $\kappa\alpha\iota \gamma\upsilon\mu\nu\omicron\varsigma \eta\mu\eta\nu = P^{45}$  Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh . . .  $\kappa\alpha\iota$   
 $\gamma\upsilon\mu\nu\omicron\varsigma = \Theta$  . . .  $\gamma\upsilon\mu\nu\omicron\varsigma \eta\mu\eta\nu = a h r^2 m Vg^3$  mss  
 Geo Aug Tat<sup>diat</sup> Pesh<sup>1</sup> ms Sah Boh . . .  $\zeta_{WH} =$   
 $\gamma\upsilon\mu\nu\omicron\varsigma = B$  etc 700 etc . . . om =  $\lambda'^*$  21 124  
 127\* 1194 1424 1604
- (67)  $\zeta_{WH} = \text{πικριβαλετε με} = P^{45V} \Theta$  etc 700 etc . . .  
 om =  $\lambda'^*$  21 124 127\* 1194 1424 1604 . . . om  
 $\mu\epsilon = \text{lect 47}$
- (68)  $\zeta_{WH} = \text{ασθενης} = P^{45} \lambda' A B$  etc 700 etc . . . was  
 sick = Sah $\eta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega\eta\epsilon$  Boh $\eta\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega\eta\iota$  Aeth . . . and I  
 was sick = Pesh<sup>most</sup>

(69)  $\zeta$  WH = επεσκεψασθε = P<sup>45</sup> Ἄ A B Θ etc  
 a b c d f g<sup>1</sup> h l m r<sup>1</sup> aur Syr<sup>all</sup> Cop Arm . . .  
 ηλθατε προς = 1424 ff<sup>1.2</sup> corr m q r<sup>2</sup> Geo  
 (om=to me = Geo<sup>1</sup>) . . . for ΟΥΚ ΕΠΕΣΚ. ΜΕ  
 P<sup>45</sup> seems etc ff<sup>2\*</sup> has venimus ad te (we came  
 to you)

25:44

(70) P<sup>45V</sup> reads αποκριθωσονται for -θησονται  
 in Dr. Gerstinger's edition (see comment below)

(71)  $\zeta$  WH = αποκρι. = P<sup>45</sup> Ἄ B D I L 0136 Θ uncs<sup>11</sup>  
 fam 13 28 33 71 157 543 565 700 892 1278 most  
 mins (Tisch about 150) a b c d ff<sup>1.2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l aur  
 Vg<sup>most</sup> Sah Boh<sup>most</sup> Syr<sup>sin</sup> har jer Aeth Arm Goth  
 Const Cyp others . . . αποκρι. αυτω = Ἄ\* seems  
 hardly many mins f h m r<sup>2</sup> Vg(ed & gat mm emm ing)  
 . . . + = Sah<sup>ms</sup> 114 ΝΒΙΝΚΟΟΘΕ (the others)  
 . . . + those on the left hand = Aeth

(72)  $\zeta$  WH = καῖ = P<sup>45V</sup> etc . . . om = Ἄ\* 21 1515 Boh  
 (F<sub>1</sub> G M) Pesh (similarly for και αυτοι r<sup>2</sup>  
 reads injusti = the unrighteous)

(73)  $\bar{\kappa}\epsilon$  = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . Our Lord = Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh . . .  
 om = Vg<sup>1</sup> ms

(74) ποτε = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . ποτε δε = G 259 566

(75) ειδομεν = P<sup>45</sup> Θ etc . . . ιδ- = A K L  
 0136 many mins . . . ιδαμεν = Σ

(76) η before διψωντα = P<sup>45V</sup> etc . . . και = Aeth



- (77) η διψω. = P<sup>45V</sup> etc . . . om=Geo<sup>A</sup>
- (78) η before ζεν[ον = P<sup>45V</sup> etc . . . και =  
Aeth . . . om=Pesh<sup>ms</sup> 13
- (79) α]σθηνη και εν φυ[λακη = P<sup>45</sup> (etc)  
. . . ασθ. before η ζεν. = 157 . . . ασθ.  
after εν φυ. = b c
- (80) α]σθηνη και = P<sup>45</sup> Aeth . . . ζ WH =  
ασθ. η = θ etc 700 etc
- (81) ζ WH = διηκονησαμεν = P<sup>45V</sup> θ etc 700 etc  
. . . δια- = A\* seems . . . διε- = B\*Δ . . .  
ηδιη- = ι'
- 25:45 (82) ζ WH = αποκριθη]σεται = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . .  
+ ἡ βασιλευσεν (the king) = Boh<sup>ms</sup> M . . .  
+ και = U θ 124 Vg<sup>1</sup> ms Syr<sup>jer</sup> . . . answered  
= Boh<sup>(mss D4 F1)</sup>
- (83) ζ WH = αυτοις = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om=Aeth . . .  
transpose after saying = Boh<sup>ms</sup> M Syr<sup>pesh</sup> sin
- (84) ζ WH = λεγ[ων = P<sup>45</sup> seems etc . . . om  
λεγ. = ff<sup>1</sup> . . . and says = Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh jer
- (85) ζ WH = λεγω υμιν = P<sup>45V</sup> etc . . . om = 229  
440 1689 Vg<sup>1</sup> ms
- (86) ζ WH = τουτων = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om = lect 184
- (87) ζ WH = τουτων των = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . +  
αδελφων μου των = Γ 124 157 238 248 251  
291 348 954\* 1010 1293 1515 E\* (wrote αδελφ

but stopped writing) Pesh<sup>1</sup> ms Boh<sup>2</sup> mss Chrys<sup>bis</sup>

- (88)  $\zeta$  WH = ελαχιστων = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . μικρων  
= 700 Sah ( ἤνεϊκοσι or ἤνηι = these  
little ones)

- 25:46 (89) ΟΥΤΟΙ = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . ΟΙΤΟΙ = θ . . . om  
= 71\* . . . injusti (unrighteous) = r<sup>2</sup>

- (90) ΜΕΝ (indeed) after ΟΥΤΟΙ = Sah

- (91)  $\zeta$  WH = κολασιν αιωνιον = P<sup>45</sup>L&V etc d  
f g<sup>1</sup> l m aur Vg Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh har Cop Aeth Arm  
Geo . . . poenas aeternas (punishments eternal)  
= q . . . ignem aeternum ( -nam = r<sup>1</sup>; fire  
eternal) = a b c ff<sup>1.2</sup> h r<sup>1.2</sup> Aug Cf Aph

- (92)  $\zeta$  WH = και απελευσονται ουτοι κ.τ.λ. =  
P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . Aph Epiph<sup>once</sup> and Aug transpose  
order of clauses.

- 26:1 (93)  $\zeta$  WH = και = P<sup>45</sup> all uncs all mins Syr<sup>pesh</sup> sin  
Arm Aeth Vg<sup>(exc 2 mss)</sup> Boh ( οσοι, and) . . .  
after ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ = Sah<sup>δε</sup> Vg<sup>2</sup> mss autem = but  
. . . om=Sah<sup>ms</sup> lll

- (94) ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om = 1010 1293

- (95) ὁ ἰῆ after τουτους = P<sup>45</sup>V . . .  $\zeta$  WH =  
ο Ιη. after ετελεσεν = θ etc 700 etc  
. . . Lord Jesus = Syr<sup>jer</sup> Aeth . . . om = Syr<sup>sin</sup>

- (96) παντας τους λογους τουτους =  
 p<sup>45V</sup> (seems) etc d h r<sup>1.2</sup> Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har Cop Arm  
 Or . . . παν. after τουτους = a b c f  
 ff<sup>1.2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l q aur Vg Aug<sup>har</sup> Iren? Jer . . . om =  
 E Γ 4 7 66 124\* 157 201 237 241 243 246 273 474  
 479 480 483\* 495 544 565 566 983 1355 1375 1515  
 1689 lect 49 Syr<sup>sin</sup>
- (97) τους λογ. τουτ. = p<sup>45V</sup> etc . . . this  
 all word = Aeth
- (98) τουτους = p<sup>45V</sup> etc . . . τους = W . . .  
 om = Vg<sup>1</sup> ms=J
- (99) τῶν μαθητῶν = p<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om =  
 238 Vg<sup>ms</sup> R\* . . . τοις εαυτου μαθητας  
 = Y . . . Sah = ΝΕΥΜΑΘΗΤΗΣ (his disciples)  
 ms 114 has ΘΥ for ΘΗ ; ms 111=om ΤΗC
- 26:2 (100) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = μετα δυο ημερας = p<sup>45</sup> etc . . .  
 W = μεθ ημερας δυο
- (101) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = παραδιδοται = p<sup>45V</sup> etc b ff<sup>1</sup> Syr  
 . . . παραδοθησεται = Θ 483 700 1207  
 1223 OL<sup>rest</sup> Vg Sah Boh . . . has delivered =  
 Geo . . . + to the chief priests (principibus  
 sacerdotum) = r<sup>2</sup>
- (102) εις το στρναλι (σταυρωθηναι) =  
 p<sup>45V</sup> etc . . . that he might be crucified (ut

crucifigatur; ut crucifigetur = r<sup>2</sup>) = most OL  
Vg Aug . . . that they might hang Him = Aeth

- 26:3 (103)  $\zeta_{WH} = \text{πρῆσβυτεροι}$  without add = p<sup>45V</sup>  
etc . . . + και οι γραμματεις = 1010  
1293 Pesh<sup>ms</sup> 18:: cf Mr & Lu
- (104)  $\zeta_{WH} = \text{του λαου}$  = p<sup>45</sup> Sah etc . . . om = B\*
- (105)  $\zeta_{WH} = \text{του λεγομενου καια]φα}$  =  
p<sup>45L&V</sup> etc . . . om = Syr<sup>sin</sup> Geo<sup>2</sup>
- 26:4 (106)  $\zeta_{WH} = \text{και}$  = p<sup>45</sup> .l' A B Θ etc Boh etc . . .  
om = Sah
- (107)  $\zeta_{WH} = \text{συνεβουλευσα[ντο}$  = p<sup>45</sup> .l' A B Θ  
etc 700 etc OL<sup>(exc d)</sup> Vg Sah etc Chrys<sup>cd</sup> gue  
. . . -λευοντο = D d Pesh Chrys<sup>7</sup> cdds
- (108)  $\zeta_{WH} = \text{απο]κτεινωσι[ν}$  = p<sup>45</sup> etc . . .  
αποκτινωσῑ = Θ
- (109)  $\zeta_{WH} = \text{αποκ.}$  = p<sup>45</sup> Θ etc . . . απολεσωσιν =  
59 259 470 999 (Tisch = about 10) . . . om = B\* 36 40  
61 174 258 r<sup>2</sup> Vg<sup>ms</sup> L (W&W) . . . Vg<sup>ms</sup> C = hocciderent
- 26:5 (110) ελεγον δε = p<sup>45V</sup> etc . . . enim (for) =  
Vg<sup>ms</sup> R\* . . . Pesh Aeth = and said
- (111)  $\zeta_{WH} = \text{θορυβος γενητα]ι}$  = p<sup>45V</sup> most  
uncs mins OL Vg Syr<sup>har</sup> . . . γεν. θορ. = Θ  
Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh jer Cop

(112) γενητα]ι εν τωι λαωι = P<sup>45V</sup> etc . . .

ε. τ. λ. γεν. = h r<sup>1</sup> vg<sup>1</sup> ms

(113) τωι λαωι = P<sup>45V</sup> . . . without adscript = Θ

(114) ζ<sup>WH</sup> = εν τωι λαωι = P<sup>45V</sup> Θ etc 700 etc  
 . . . του λαου = 1200

26:6

(115) τωι = P<sup>45V</sup> probably homoioteleuton (so Gerstinger) . . . ζ<sup>WH</sup> = του δε γενομενου = uncs 700 etc (vers. generally by a clause)

(116) ζ<sup>WH</sup> = δε = P<sup>45V</sup> etc . . . om = Arm

(117) ζ<sup>WH</sup> = Σιμωνος without add = Θ etc 700  
 etc . . . + του λεγομενου = P<sup>45V</sup>

26:7

(118) αλαβασ]τρον εχουσα μυρου = P<sup>45V</sup>

157 . . . ζ = αλα. μυ. εχ. = A W Γ Δ Π

Σ Φ Ξ etc most mins Bas Chrys<sup>edds</sup> & mos cdds

. . . WH = εχ. αλα. μυ. = Λ' B D L Θ 089

fam 13 33 102<sup>Wet</sup> 543 700 892 1295 lect 48 OL

Vg Cop Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har Arm Aeth Chr<sup>ms</sup> gue Or<sup>trans</sup>

(119) ζ = κεφα]λην = P<sup>45V</sup> A L W Γ Δ Π Σ Φ Ξ

(exc M) 22 33 124 157 565 892 most mins Bas

. . . WH = κεφαλης = Λ' B D M Θ 089 fam 1

fam 13 (exc 124) 106 301 443 476 543 700 999

1170 1219 1355 1402 2145 many mins Lects (Hosk)

= 2 18 20 28 47 49 50 234bis 257 259 Chrys<sup>edds</sup> & ms gue

(120) ζ<sup>WH</sup> = αυτου = P<sup>45V</sup> etc Sah etc . . . before

της κεφαλῆς = 1355 . . . Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh Aeth

26:8 (121) ἰδοντες δε = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . και before  
 ηγανακτησαν = Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh . . . h r<sup>2</sup> =  
 quod cum vidissent (because when they saw)

(122) ζ<sup>WH</sup> = ηγανακτησαν = P<sup>45V</sup> θ etc 700  
 etc . . . om=Syr<sup>sin</sup>

26:9 (123) ΤιWH = εδυνατο = P<sup>45</sup> λ' B\* K L W Δ Θ Π  
 089 4 7 22 71 265 273 291 482 489 517 565 655  
 892 1010 1219 1241 1293 1346 1396 1675 Chrys<sup>ms</sup>  
 gue Bas<sup>eth</sup> Bas<sup>seleucia</sup> . . . ζ = ἡδυνατο =  
 A B<sup>2</sup> D Γ Σ Φ Ψ fam 1 fam 13 700 most mins  
 Amphil

(124) ζ<sup>WH</sup> = πολλου = P<sup>45V</sup> θ = π<sup>δ</sup>λου etc 700  
 etc g<sup>1</sup> 1 Vg<sup>most</sup>; ms 0 = multum Syr Cop Geo<sup>1</sup> & B  
 (praetio magno, for a great price = 3 Vg mss;  
 praetia magna = r<sup>2</sup>; praetio multo = ff<sup>1</sup>g<sup>1</sup> aur  
 Vg<sup>2</sup> mss; multo praetio = f Vg<sup>4</sup> mss Geo<sup>A</sup>; praetio,  
 a b c h q r<sup>1</sup>; caro, d) . . . om = 047 ff<sup>2</sup>

26:10 (125) γινους = P<sup>45</sup> uncs mins d ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> 1 Aur Vg  
 . . . when moreover he knew = Syr<sup>har</sup> Geo<sup>1</sup>;  
 because as he knew = a b c h ff<sup>2</sup> r<sup>1.2</sup>; quod  
 cognito = f; however he recognized and = Syr<sup>sin</sup>  
 pesh jer (om=however)

(126)  $\zeta_{WH} = \epsilon\iota\varsigma \epsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\epsilon = P^{45V} \Theta$  etc Cop . . .  
 $\epsilon\nu \epsilon\mu\omicron\iota = M$  (cf in me, OL Vg Syr<sup>har</sup>)

- 26:11 (127)  $\zeta_{WH} = \pi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon \gamma\alpha\rho \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \pi\tau\tau\omega\chi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma =$   
 $P^{45V} \lambda A B D G K L S U V W Y \Delta(\Theta) \Pi \Sigma \Phi$   
 092 fam 1 (exc 118) 4 fam 13 (exc 69) 21 22 33  
 71 (209) 273 476 565 566 892 1012 1355 2145  
 most mins OL<sup>most</sup> Vg<sup>most</sup> Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har Sah (Arm)  
 Chrys<sup>ms</sup> gue Or? . . .  $\tau$ .  $\pi\tau\omega$ .  $\gamma\alpha\rho \pi\alpha\nu$ . =  
 E F H M  $\Gamma$  3 6 12 22 25 28 59 61 69 73 75 80 84  
 90 118 119 131 157 209 218 235 237 238 240 242  
 243 244 245 247 248 251 252 267 274 300 301 330  
 435 440 471 472 474 475 477 483\* 484 485 517  
 569 692 700 Lects (Hosk) = 6 24 44 46 47 48bis  
 49bis 50 53 67 150 195 222bis 234bis 257 259  
 ff<sup>2</sup> Syr<sup>sin</sup> Boh Aeth Geo Chrys Amphil Chr<sup>ed</sup> & mos 6
- (128)  $\zeta_{WH} = \gamma\alpha\rho = P^{45V}$  etc etc . . . but = r<sup>1</sup>  
 (autem) Aeth Geo . . . om =  $\Theta$  209 Vg<sup>1</sup> ms Arm
- (129)  $\zeta_{WH} =$  second  $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\tau\epsilon = P^{45V}$  all uncs and mins  
 d ff<sup>1.2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l r<sup>1</sup> Vg<sup>some</sup> habebitis (will have)  
 = a b c f g<sup>2</sup> q r<sup>2</sup> aur Vg<sup>many</sup>
- (130)  $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$  without add = P<sup>45V</sup> all Gk . . . +  
 with you = ff<sup>2</sup> h Syr<sup>sin</sup> jer Cop
- 26:12 (131)  $\zeta_{WH} = \beta\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha = P^{45V} \lambda A B \Theta$  etc . . .  
 $\beta\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha = \Sigma$

- (132)  $\Sigma_{WH} = \gamma\rho = p^{45V}$  etc . . . Arm om . . .  
but or and =  $Vg^1$  ms Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh
- (133)  $\Sigma_{WH} = \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$  after  $\gamma\rho = p^{45V}$  etc . . . om =  
tol . . . before  $\gamma\rho = h r^1 Vg^1$  ms Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh  
Aeth H11
- (134) ecce enim mittens =  $r^2$  . . .  $p^{45V}$  etc have no  
word for 'ecce' (behold).
- (135)  $\Sigma_{WH} = \epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu = p^{45V} \theta$  etc . . .  
 $\pi\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu = 517 954 1675$  lect 184
- 26:13 (136)  $\Sigma_{WH} = \tau\omicron \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\omicron\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$  =  $p^{45V} =$   
this position if  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$  is present, others  
. . .  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$  before  $\tau\omicron \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\omicron\nu =$   
 $OL^{most} Vg$  Syr<sup>jer</sup> Cop Aeth Geo
- (137)  $\Sigma_{WH} = \lambda\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\eta\iota = p^{45V}$  etc . . .  
om = 69
- (138)  $\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu = p^{45V}$  others . . .  $\pi\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu =$   
lect 184
- (139)  $\Sigma_{WH} = \epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu [\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta = p^{45V}$  other Gk  
d h q  $r^2 Vg^2$  mss Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh har Aeth Geo  
. . . transpose order = a b c f ff<sup>1.2</sup>  $g^1$  l  
aur Cop.
- (140)  $\Sigma_{WH} = \kappa\alpha\iota \omicron \epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu [\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta = p^{45}$   
etc . . . om =  $\theta$
- 26:14 (141)  $\tau\omega\nu \delta\omega\delta\epsilon[\kappa\alpha = p^{45V}$  others . . . W  
=  $\tau\omega\nu \delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha \delta\omicron\upsilon$  . . . de discipulis eius



(some of His disciples) = r<sup>2</sup>

26:15 (142) WH = ΕΙΠΕΝ = P<sup>45V</sup> Θ . . . Σ = ΕΙΠΕ

(143) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = ΕΙΠΕΝ = P<sup>45V</sup> others Boh Syr<sup>har</sup> Sah<sup>1</sup> ms  
Geo<sup>1</sup> . . . saying = most Sah . . . ΚΑΙ ΕΙΠΕΝ =  
D Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh jer Aeth Arm Geo<sup>2</sup> Eus<sup>dem</sup> Or<sup>trans</sup>  
OL Vg

(144) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = παραδωσω αυτο̅ν̅ = P<sup>45V</sup> most uncs  
most mins d . . . transpose = 157 a b c f ff<sup>1.2</sup>  
h l r<sup>2</sup> aur Vg<sup>most</sup>

(145) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = οι δε = P<sup>45V</sup> Θ etc Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har jer  
(once) Sah Boh<sup>some</sup> . . . and these = OL & Vg<sup>at</sup>  
or ad illi Syr<sup>sin</sup> Boh<sup>1</sup> ms Aeth Arm

27:17 (146) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = προση̅λ̅θ̅ον̅ = P<sup>45V</sup> Θ etc . . .  
+ αυτω = Mmrg 28 243 1515 gig

26:18 (147) Stephen (1550) Bezae (now and again) Elzevir  
(1624) WH = ΕΣΤΙΝ = P<sup>45V</sup> Θ . . . Σ = ΕΣΤΙ

(148) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = ποιω = P<sup>45V</sup> λ' A B Θ etc all mins  
OL<sup>most</sup> Vg Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh har Arm . . . ποιησω =  
D d q Sah Geo Or<sup>trans</sup>

(149) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = το πασχα = P<sup>45V</sup> λ' A B etc etc  
. . . W = τα πασχα

26:19 (150) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = οι μαθηται = P<sup>45V</sup> uncs mins etc  
. . . + his = Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh Aeth

- (151)  $\zeta$  WH =  $\omega\varsigma$  = P<sup>45V</sup> etc . . . καθως = 1295
- (152)  $\zeta$  WH = συνεταξ[εν] = P<sup>45V</sup> etc c d ff<sup>1.2</sup> g<sup>1</sup>  
q l aur Vg<sup>most</sup> . . . προσεταξεν = M\*U 259  
348 660 697 983 1010 1279 1293 1579 1689 a b f  
h r<sup>1</sup> Vg<sup>2</sup> mss Syr Sah . . . said = Boh
- (153)  $\zeta$  WH = second και = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om = r<sup>1</sup> Sah
- (154)  $\zeta$  WH = και ητο[ιμασαν] το πασχα =  
P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om = G
- 26:20 (155) ανεκειτο = P<sup>45V</sup> all Gk; was reclining = d f  
ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l Vg<sup>most</sup> Syr Cop Aug . . . reclined  
(discubuit) = a b c ff<sup>2</sup> h q r<sup>1</sup> aur gig Vg<sup>2</sup> mss  
Aeth Or<sup>trans</sup>
- (156) ανεκειτο without add = P<sup>45V</sup> all Greek etc  
. . . +In=ff<sup>2</sup> tol cor Pesh<sup>1</sup> ms
- (157)  $\zeta$  WH = δω]δεκα = P<sup>45</sup> ,λ' &D(ιβ) etc etc  
. . . om = l Pesh Or<sup>trans</sup>
- (158)  $\zeta$  = δω]δεκα without add = P<sup>45</sup> (from space;  
so Kenyon and Gerstinger) p<sup>37</sup> seems B D E F G  
H K S U V Y<sup>text</sup> Γ Ω most mins fam l fam l3 22  
543 565 700 1582 Chrys<sup>once</sup> Eus . . . + μαθητων  
= ,λ' A L M W Ymrg Δ Θ Π Σ ϕ 074 4 33 71  
157 174 238 253 265 273 280 472 489 517 892  
954 1219 1241 1295 1346 1354 1424 1515 1675  
2145 f ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> q r<sup>1</sup> Vg<sup>some</sup> Syr<sup>har</sup> jer Cop Arm

Geo Chrys<sup>once</sup> Aug . . . + αΥΤΟΥ = 106 a b  
 c ff<sup>2</sup> h aur Vg<sup>(exc am)</sup> Aeth Or<sup>trans</sup> Pesh (has  
 'his' but not 'twelve')

- 26:21 (159) λ]εγω υμιν = P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>37</sup> etc etc . . . om = 692
- (160) υμιν without ΟΤΙ = P<sup>45V</sup> P<sup>37</sup> 241 245 566  
 1402 1555 . . . ∫<sup>WH</sup> = +ΟΤΙ = all uncs Θ  
 700 most mins Geo<sup>1</sup>
- (161) παρα]δωσει = P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>37</sup> . . . -σι = Θ
- 26:22 (162) ηρξ]αντο = P<sup>45V</sup> P<sup>37</sup> . . . ηρξατο = 476 482
- (163) λεγειν after ηρξαντο = P<sup>45</sup> Θ etc . . .  
 om = Boh<sup>some</sup> . . . saying = r<sup>1</sup> Syr<sup>jer</sup> . . . after  
 εκαστος = 346
- (164) λεγειν without add = P<sup>45V</sup> P<sup>37</sup> from space<sup>Θ</sup><sub>Λ</sub>fam 13  
 102 543 517 700 954 1424 1604 1675 lect 49 OL  
 Vg Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh (1 ms) Boh Aeth Geo Eus<sup>dem</sup> Or  
 . . . ∫<sup>WH</sup> = +αΥτω = most uncs most mins  
 Syr<sup>pesh</sup> (most) har jer Arm Sah
- (165) εις = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . + καθεις = 1689
- (166) WH = εις εκ[αστος = P<sup>45V</sup> P<sup>37</sup> (hiatus)  
 .<sup>1</sup> B C L Z 33 102 892 Sah Aeth . . . ∫ = om  
 εις = A W Γ Δ Π Σ Φ Ψ 074 fam 1 22 28  
 565 700 1241 many others Syr<sup>har</sup> (text) Arm Eus
- (167) ∫ = αΥ]ων after εκαστος = P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>37</sup> A D  
 M W Γ Δ Θ Π Σ Φ Ψ 074 fam 1 fam 13 22 28  
 157 473 517 543 565 700 1241 1295 1574 1582 1675

- 1689 many others d Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh har (mrg&txt)  
 Boh Arm Eus . . . WH = om αΥΤΩΝ = .λ' B C L Z  
 33 102 892 Sah Aeth OL Vg Or<sup>trans</sup> Chrys<sup>eds&cdds</sup>
- (168) ΕΚΑΣΤΟΣ ΑΥΤΩΝ = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om = Or<sup>once</sup>  
 . . . ΕΙΣ ΑΥΤΩΝ = 1200 1424
- (169) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = ΕΙΜ[ ] = P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>37</sup> etc . . . om = 954
- 26:23 (170) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = ΑΠΟΚΡΙΘ]ΕΙΣ = P<sup>45V</sup> P<sup>37</sup> etc . . .  
 om = Syr<sup>sin</sup>
- (171) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = ΕΙΠΕΝ = P<sup>45V</sup> etc . . . said = a d h r<sup>1</sup>  
 Syr<sup>all</sup> Boh Geo<sup>1</sup> . . . says = b e f ff<sup>1.2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l q  
 aur Vg Aeth . . . saying = Boh..† one = Syr<sup>sin</sup>  
 Geo<sup>2</sup>
- (172) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = ΕΜΒΑΨΑΣ = P<sup>45V</sup> P<sup>37</sup> etc Or<sup>twice</sup> . . .  
 ΕΝΒΑΠΤΟΜΕΝΟΣ = D (conformed to Mark,  
 Tisch)
- (173) ΤΗΝ] ΧΕΙΡΑ ΜΕΤ ΕΜΟΥ ΕΝ Τ[ΩΙ ΤΡΥΒΛΙΩΙ =  
 P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>37</sup> (D) Θ 700 d Syr<sup>all</sup> Cop Geo<sup>1</sup> Or<sup>once</sup>  
 . . . Σ = ΜΕΤ ΕΜ. ΕΝ ΤΩ ΤΡΥ. Τ. Χ. =  
 C W Γ Δ Π Σ Φ Ψ many mins; cf Clem . . .  
 WH = Μ. ΕΜ. Τ. Χ. ΕΝ ΤΩ ΤΡ. = .λ' A B L Z O74  
 33 157 245 517 892 954 1295 1424 1515 1675 lect  
 47 a b c f ff<sup>1.2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l q aur Vg (Aeth) (Arm)  
 Geo<sup>2</sup> cf Or
- (174) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = ΕΝ = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . D Or<sup>once</sup> = ΕΙΣ

- 26:24 (175)  $\zeta_{WH} = \omicron \mu[\epsilon\nu] = P^{45} P^{37}$  , $\nu$  A B C L uncs<sup>12</sup>  
 most mins a b d f ff<sup>1.2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h l q aur Vg<sup>most</sup>  
 Sah Geo Or<sup>trans</sup> . . . και ο μεν = 118 209  
 251 280 697 982 1170 1295 . . . et quidem (and  
 indeed) = c Vg<sup>3</sup> mss . . . and = Syr Cop<sup>some</sup> Aeth  
 . . . om = Arm
- (176)  $\zeta_{WH} = \upsilon\pi\alpha\gamma\epsilon\iota$  (compound) = P<sup>45</sup> all Gk . . .  
 goes (simplex) = ff<sup>2</sup> r<sup>1</sup> Cop
- (177)  $\zeta_{WH} = \pi\epsilon\rho\iota \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$  = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . .  
 περι εαυτου=A
- (178)  $\zeta_{WH} = \delta\epsilon$  = P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>37</sup> etc . . . om = 348 Epiph<sup>once</sup>  
 Adam
- (179) ανθρωπωι εκεινω = P<sup>45</sup> . . .  $\overline{\alpha\nu}$   
 $\overline{\omega}$  εκεινω =  $\Theta$ , P<sup>37</sup> likewise without adscript
- (180) second ανθρωπου = P<sup>45V</sup> (  $\hat{\omicron}\delta$  = not enough  
 to fill space, as some read) P<sup>37</sup>  $\Theta$  etc . . .  
 om = 28
- (181)  $\zeta_{WH} = \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\iota\delta\omicron\tau\alpha\iota$  = P<sup>45V</sup>  $\Theta$  all Gk a b d  
 f g<sup>1</sup> aur Vg<sup>some</sup> Syr Geo . . . fut tense = c ff<sup>1.2</sup>  
 h l q r<sup>1</sup>  $\delta$  Cop Iren<sup>trans</sup>
- (182)  $\zeta_{WH} = \kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\nu$  = P<sup>45V</sup> etc . . . δια τουτο  
 καλον = D a d
- (183) αυτωι = P<sup>45</sup> . . . αυτω =  $\Theta$  P<sup>37</sup>
- (184)  $\zeta_{WH} = \epsilon\iota$  = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . η = A Δ . . .  
 εη = Σ
- (185)  $\zeta_{WH} = \omicron \alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$  = P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>37</sup>  
 etc Boh Arm Aeth . . . om = Syr<sup>sin</sup> Sah? cf Epiph

- 26:25 (186)  $\zeta$  WH = ο παραδιδ[ους] = P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>37</sup> Θ . . .  
 παραδους = lect 47 . . . προδιδους = 074
- (187)  $\zeta$  WH = ο παραδιδους = P<sup>45</sup> all Greek c ff<sup>1</sup>  
 g<sup>1</sup> l Vg<sup>most</sup> Geo<sup>2</sup> . . . imperf or pluperf = Syr  
 har jer a b f ff<sup>2</sup> q r<sup>1</sup> aur gig Vg<sup>2</sup> mss Cop Geo<sup>1</sup>  
 . . . the betrayer = Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh
- (188) αυ]ιωι = P<sup>45</sup> . . . αυτω = Θ
- (189) ο ιη after αυ]ιωι = P<sup>45</sup> X fam 13 124 440  
 1675<sup>2</sup> a b c f ff<sup>2</sup> h q r<sup>1</sup> Vg<sup>6</sup> mss Pesh Geo<sup>2</sup>  
 Or<sup>trans</sup> . . .  $\zeta$  WH = αυτω alone = B most  
 uncs 700 most mins d ff<sup>1</sup> l g<sup>1</sup> aur Vg<sup>most</sup> Syr<sup>sin</sup>  
 har jer Cop Aeth Arm Geo<sup>1</sup>
- 26:26 (190)  $\zeta$  WH = εσθιοντων δε αυτων = P<sup>45V</sup>  
 P<sup>37</sup> most uncs 700 most mins f ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l aur  
 Vg<sup>most</sup> Or<sup>trans</sup>; similarly και εσθ. αυτων =  
 243 Syr<sup>sin</sup> Arm Aeth Geo Tat<sup>diat</sup> . . . αυτων  
 δε εσθ. = D Θ fam 13 (exc 124) 543 few mins  
 a b c d ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>2</sup> h q r<sup>1</sup> Vg<sup>1</sup> ms Pesh
- (191)  $\zeta$  WH = ο ιη = P<sup>45</sup> etc Pesh . . . Syr<sup>jer</sup> = Lord  
 Jesus . . . om = Δ 1375 . . . om = ὀ = M
- (192) ο ιη λαβων = P<sup>45V</sup> D d . . .  $\zeta$  WH = λαβ.  
 ο ιη. = P<sup>37</sup> most uncs 700 most mins . . .  
 ο ιη. after αρτον = 157 1170
- (193) WH = α[ρτον = P<sup>45V</sup> (P<sup>37</sup> hiatus) X B C D G  
 L Z Θ 074 fam 1 17 24 33 89 90 102<sup>Wet</sup> 157 201\*

234 240 244 259 473 483\* 484 700 892 1582 many  
others Lects (Hoskier) = 49 259 Chrys<sup>twice</sup>

. . . ΤΟΝ ΑΡΤΟΝ = Α W Γ Δ Π Σ Φ Ξ most  
mins Bas<sup>eth</sup>

- (194) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = εὐλογη[σα]ς = P<sup>45</sup> .Α Β C D G L Z  
Θ Φ Ω 074 0160 33 157 700 892 many more OL  
Vg Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh har (mrg) Cop Aeth Arm Geo<sup>1</sup>  
Tat<sup>dial</sup> aph . . . ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΣΑΣ Α Ε F H K  
M S U V W Y Γ Δ Π Σ fam 1 fam 13 22 28 543  
565 1582 many mins (Tisch = 130) Syr<sup>har</sup> txt  
Geo<sup>2</sup> Ar Bas Or<sup>trans</sup> Chrys . . . + it = Sah (he  
broke it) Syr<sup>sin</sup> (over it)

- (195) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = μαθηταις = P<sup>45V</sup> P<sup>37</sup> .Α Β C D E F G  
H K L M S V W Y Z Ω Θ 0160 fam 1 13 33 69 543  
700 892 1582 many mins Boh<sup>some</sup> . . . + ΑΥΤΟΥ =  
U 238 473 1278 etc OL Vg<sup>most</sup> Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh  
Sah Boh<sup>some</sup> Aeth Geo Or<sup>trans</sup>

- (196) Σ = καί before ειπεν = Α C Γ Π uncs<sup>9</sup>  
most mins f ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l q aur etc Vg<sup>most</sup> Or<sup>trans</sup>  
Bas<sup>eth</sup> . . . WH = om καί = P<sup>45V</sup> P<sup>37</sup> .Α\* Β D  
L Z 1 13 33 69 (102<sup>wet</sup>) 118 209

- (197) Σ = ειπε . . . WH = ειπεν = P<sup>45V</sup>

- (198) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = ειπεν = P<sup>45V</sup> P<sup>37</sup> .Α Β D L Θ etc 1 13  
33 69 118 209 700 etc . . . λεγων = 697 1278  
c f ff<sup>2</sup> h r<sup>1</sup> Vg<sup>3</sup> mss Sah





- (207) ΕΚΧΥΝΝΟΜΕΝΟΝ with WH or -ΥΝΟΜΕΝΟΝ  
with  $\zeta$  = P<sup>45V</sup> . . . Clem = ΕΚΧΕΟΜΕΝΟΝ
- 26:29 (208)  $\zeta$ <sup>WH</sup> = λεγω δε = P<sup>45V</sup> etc . . . om δε =  
229 . . . γαρ for δε = 238 243 1170 Vg<sup>1</sup> ms  
Syr<sup>sin pesh</sup> (1 ms) . . . και before λεγω =  
Aeth . . . αμην for δε before λεγω =  
Or<sup>trans</sup> (cf Or<sup>once</sup> = και αμην before λεγω )
- (209) WH = υμιν without add = P<sup>45V</sup> Α Β Δ Ζ Θ Σ  
fam 1 13 33 69 543 892 1582 etc a b c d ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup>  
1 q aur Vg<sup>most</sup> Geo<sup>l&B</sup> Iren<sup>trans</sup> Epiph<sup>once</sup> Or  
Cyr Cyp . . .  $\zeta$  = + οτι = A C E F G H K L M  
S U V W Y Φ Ω 074 22 28 124 346 565 700 1241  
most mins f ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>2</sup> r<sup>1</sup> Vg<sup>some</sup> Syr<sup>all</sup> Cop Aeth  
Arm Geo<sup>A</sup> Epiph<sup>once</sup> Or<sup>trans</sup>
- (210)  $\zeta$ <sup>WH</sup> = απ [αρτι after ου μη πιω = P<sup>45V</sup>  
etc . . . before ου μη = 476 Iren<sup>trans</sup> Or<sup>trans</sup>  
. . . om = a Vg<sup>1</sup> ms Clem Epiph
- (211)  $\zeta$ <sup>WH</sup> = εως της ημερας εκεινης οταν =  
P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . Clem = μεχρις αν . . .  
Epiph<sup>Eus</sup> = εως αν . . . Or<sup>once</sup> = εως for  
ΟΤΑΝ . . . Or<sup>once</sup> = εως only (Or<sup>trans</sup> = nisi  
cum)
- (212) μεθ υμων = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om = c Boh<sup>1</sup> ms  
Arm<sup>cdd</sup>

- (213)  $\Sigma$  WH =  $\overline{\text{του πατρὸς}}$  (πατρός) μου = P<sup>45V</sup>  
 etc Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh Arm Clem Iren<sup>trans</sup> Or<sup>trans</sup> once  
 . . . των ουρανων = lect 184 Epiph Or<sup>once</sup>  
 . . . του θεου = Pesh<sup>1</sup> ms Tat<sup>diat</sup> Or<sup>once</sup>
- (214)  $\Sigma$  WH = και = P<sup>45</sup> etc Boh = οσοι (and), not  
 δε (but) . . . Sah = δε (but), not αγω (and)
- (215)  $\Sigma$  WH = εξηλθον = P<sup>45</sup> etc Boh Pesh . . .  
 sing (he went out) = Pesh<sup>1</sup> ms Boh<sup>1</sup> ms
- 26:31 (216)  $\Sigma$  WH = τότε = P<sup>45V</sup> etc Cop τότε . . . om =  
 Boh<sup>msH</sup>
- (217)  $\Sigma$  WH = λεγει = P<sup>45V</sup> etc . . . said = 1 Vg<sup>1</sup> ms  
 Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh jer Geo<sup>2</sup> Cop . . . Geo<sup>1</sup> = answered  
 and said
- (218) αυτοις = P<sup>45V</sup> etc . . . om = b . . . His  
 disciples = Vg<sup>2</sup> mss Syr<sup>jer</sup>
- (219)  $\Sigma$  WH = ο [Ιησους] = P<sup>45V</sup> etc . . . om =  
 517 1675 r<sup>1</sup>
- (220) εν εμοι εν τη νυκτι = P<sup>45V</sup> etc  
 . . . εν εμοι after νυκτι = Epiph
- (221) ταυτητι = P<sup>45</sup> . . . without ads = P<sup>37</sup> Θ
- (222) εν τη νυκτι ταυτη = so P<sup>45V</sup>  
 seems from space, etc . . . P<sup>37</sup> = εν ταυτη  
 τ[η νυκτι] ταυτη
- (223)  $\Sigma$  = διασκορπισθησεται = P<sup>45V</sup> P<sup>37</sup>  
 D E F H<sup>2</sup> K S U V W Y Γ Δ Θ Π Φ Ω fam 1

(exc 118) 22 28 565 most mins Or<sup>once</sup> Eus Chrys  
 . . . WH = - ΣΟΝΤΑΙ = p<sup>mich</sup> 6652 Α Α Β Γ Δ  
 Η\* Ι Λ Μ Σ 047 067 074 fam 13 33 47 51 52 54  
 58? 74 90 118 150 157 174 225 230 234 243 248  
 251 252\*\* 262 291 443 473 477 483 484 485 508  
 543 544 566 659 700 713 788 826 828 892 983  
 1010 1187 1438 1555 1579 2145 Lects 3 21 24  
 36 44 49 150\* 184 all versions Or<sup>once</sup> . . .  
 Διασκορπισω = 4 273 . . . after ποιμνης =  
 074 157

26:32 (224) γαλ[ιλαιαν. αποκριθεις] δε ο π[ετρος] =  
 p<sup>45L&V</sup> seems from space Θ etc . . . after  
 γαλ. = κακει με οψεσθε = 565 a Vg<sup>2</sup> ms

26:33 (225) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = σκανδαλι]σθησομαι = p<sup>45V</sup> etc  
 . . . + εν σοι = F 1689 Syr<sup>sin pesh</sup> Geo

26:34 (226) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = αυ[τω] = p<sup>45V</sup> etc . . . om = 700 Chrys  
 . . . petro (Peter) = a

(227) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = πριν αλεκτορα φωνη[σαι] = p<sup>45V</sup>  
 etc . . . πριν (L = +η ; Or = προ for πριν )  
 αλεκτοροφωνιας=(L) 1 209 1582 a (Or)

26:35 (228) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = καν = p<sup>45V</sup> etc . . . εαν = 074 543  
 Syr<sup>sin pesh</sup>

(229) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = συν = all . . . τον = p<sup>45V</sup>

- (230)  $\zeta_{WH} = \text{συν σοφι αποθανειν} = P^{45V}$  seems etc . . .  
 $\text{συναποθανειν σε} = 1200$
- (231)  $\zeta_{WH} = \text{οι μαθηται} = P^{45V}$  etc . . . om = 1597
- 26:36 (232)  $\text{γεσσαμ[ανει]} = P^{45V}$  . . .  $\text{γεθσεμανει} = \Sigma$  . . .  
 $\text{γεθσαμανει} = D$  . . .  $\text{γηθσημανη} = M^2$  . . .  
 $\text{γηθσημανι} = \theta$  . . .  $\text{γηθσσημανει} = K$  . . .  
 $\text{γεσσημανει} = EV$  1295 . . .  $\text{γεσσημανη} = G^* H$   
. . .  $\text{γεσσημανι} = \Omega$  124 . . .  $\text{γεδσημανι} = W$   
. . .  $\text{γετσημανει} = 1473$  (so 262 399\* 565 661  
1187 have  $\text{γετση}$  for the first part) . . .  
 $\text{γεθσιμανη} = 61$  75 127 511 (Scr) 700 1278 lect  
222 . . .  $\zeta = \text{γεθσημανη} = M^* \Phi$  . . . Ln  
 $\text{TrTiWH} = \text{γεθσημανει} = A B C F S$  067<sup>seems</sup> 074  
 $P^{37}$  most mins . . .  $\text{γεθσημανι} = \lambda' L U \Pi \Gamma$
- (233)  $\zeta_{WH} = \text{απελθων}$  (complex)  $= P^{45}$  etc . . . going or having  
gone (simplex) = most versions
- (234)  $WH = \text{εκλει προσευξωμαι} = P^{45V} P^{37}$   $\lambda' B D L \Theta$   
074 fam 13(exc 124) 33 102 157 543 700 892  
1295 etc a b c f ff<sup>2</sup> h q Or<sup>trans</sup> (cf. ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1.2</sup>  
Vg) . . .  $\zeta = \text{transpose} = A C E F G H K M S U$   
V W Y  $\Gamma \Delta \Pi \Phi \Omega$  fam 1 22 124 1241 1582 most  
mins most OL Cop Aeth Or H11
- (235)  $\zeta_{WH} = \text{εκλει} = P^{45V}$  etc . . . om = 4 544  
 $\text{Syr}^{\text{sin pesh}}$  Arm Geo

- 26:38 (236)  $\zeta_{WH} = \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma = P^{45V} P^{37} pmich 6652 \lambda^A B C^* D$   
 L W  $\Theta \Sigma \Phi$  067 fam l 21 28 33 69 124 270 291  
 443 659 700 726 892 999 1200 1375 1574 1582  
 2145 most others OL<sup>most</sup> Vg Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh jer  
 Cop Aeth Arm Geo<sup>1</sup> . . . + o  $\text{Ἰησοῦς} = C^3 E F G H$   
 K M S U V Y  $\Gamma \Delta \Pi \Omega$  074 22 71 131 157 238 262  
 346 543 565 692 697 1241 1278 many others  
 . . . + behold = Syr<sup>sin</sup>
- (237)  $\zeta_{WH} = \gamma\rho\eta\gamma\omicron\lambda\rho\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon = P^{45V}$  etc . . .  $P^{37} = \epsilon\gamma\rho\eta\gamma\omicron\lambda\rho\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$   
 (so  $P^{37}$  prefixes  $\epsilon$  in verses 40 and 41)

### III. PREVIOUS STUDY OF THE CAESAREAN TEXT IN MATTHEW

Though all admit that what has been done in the study of the Caesarean Text in Matthew is not very satisfactory, a review of the efforts is in point before further advance is attempted. What has been accomplished may furnish the clue or clues to guide the researcher in an almost virgin field.

Belsheim thought it good to cite only the more weighty variants of 565 (from the Textus Receptus) in Matthew, Luke, and John.<sup>2</sup> The work of Ferrar and Hoskier is collation and can hardly be said to indicate textual affinities, though indeed they furnish materials from which one may reach such

---

<sup>2</sup> Metzger, op. cit., p. 484a

conclusions. Streeter thought that the Caesarean Text extended to all four Gospels. This he did, however, more by analogy with the other Gospels, especially Mark, than by actual investigation.

Stanislas Lyonnet in 1934 maintained that the Armenian text of Matthew agrees little if any with D but does show decided affinity with  $\Theta$  and its family<sup>3</sup> and that he had sufficient evidence to prove that not only in Matthew and Mark but also in Luke and John the Armenian Version is definitely Caesarean in character "maintaining a happy equilibrium between the Western and Neutral texts."<sup>4</sup> Blake edited in 1933 the Georgian Version of Matthew as well as Mark and deemed that he found the text to be definitely of the Caesarean pattern.<sup>5</sup>

In 1933 Kenyon gave the following figures on P<sup>45</sup> in Matthew.<sup>6</sup> The first figure gives the number of agreements with the papyrus; the second the readings against the papyrus:  $\aleph$ --4, 6; A--1, 7; B--2, 9; C--4, 6; D--7, 6; L--1, 9; W--5, 6;  $\Theta$ --5, 9; fam 1--5, 6; fam 13--8, 5;  $\zeta$ --3, 7. Then he presented

---

3 Ibid., p. 466c

4 Lyonnet in Lagrange (Critique Textuelle, II, p. 363), cited by Metzger, op. cit., p. 467a

5 Metzger, op. cit., p. 468

6 Kenyon, C. Beatty Bibl. Papyri, fasc. II, text, p. xii

the singular readings or agreements in small groups. P<sup>45</sup> has three singular readings, 2 singular with Δ', none with A and B, 2 with D, and none with W and fam 1. It should be remembered that he did not discuss the Vienna fragment of this papyrus. He remarked,

The remains of Matthew are too slight to enable the character of the text to be determined. So far as the evidence goes it appears to show a slight preponderance of the Caesarean group over the others, with Δ' and D next in preference.<sup>6</sup>

In 1935 Tasker concluded from a short survey that no Caesarean text emerges in Matthew and Luke, that the Θ family shows more assimilation to Ϝ in Matthew than in Mark, and that Origen in his Exhortation to Martyrdom used a text for Matthew equivalent to Δ' B.<sup>7</sup> Streeter's<sup>8</sup> rejoinder pointed out that Tasker erred in using readings of family Θ that support Ϝ and that Tasker's evidence properly interpreted shows that "Origen in Matthew and Luke, as well as in Mark, used the Caesarean text."<sup>9</sup>

Metzger called attention last year to what he considered "a most significant analysis of the complexion of the

6 Kenyon, C. Beatty Bibl. Papyri, fasc. II, text, p. xii

7 R. V. G. Tasker, "The Quotations from the Synoptic Gospels in Origen's Exhortation to Martyrdom," JTS, xxxvi, 1 (Jan. 1935), pp. 60-65

8 B. H. Streeter, ibid., pp. 178-180

9 Ibid., p. 180

Caesarean text."<sup>10</sup> He said this in praise of a thesis, entitled "The Caesarean Text Inter Pares," written by E. McA. Baikie at Cambridge University in 1936. The writer sought to determine whether or not the Caesarean text is a unity, and studied Matthew 3, Mark 12, and Luke 12. He thought from this survey that the Caesarean witnesses were in greater absolute agreement with outsiders than with the majority of their fellows, that Eusebius and Origen in this respect are typical Caesareans, and that

a final suggestion is made that the Caesarean unity is one of influences rather than origin, and that the Caesarean text, in a measure at least, is really a Textual Process.<sup>11</sup>

#### IV. SINGULAR READINGS OF P<sup>45</sup> IN MATTHEW

Various readings fall into two main classes, singular ones that have no other support and subsingular ones which find some corroborating testimony, from that of one to the majority. The latter class tends to show family affinity. What at first may appear as singular readings in P<sup>45</sup> will on inspection be found in other manuscripts. In arriving at the unique readings of P<sup>45</sup> the practice in this investigation has

---

10 Metzger, op. cit., p. 475f

11 Ibid., p. 476



been to set aside at first those readings which in the initial stage of the research appeared to be merely scribal errors. Gradually these lists were by comparison with various witnesses narrowed down until they reached the irreducible minimum.

There are some ten singular readings in P<sup>45L&V</sup>. Kenyon rightly marked no. 34 as conjectural, and Gerstinger spoke of no. 115 as homoioteleuton. Numbers 36, 51, and 232 are cases of spelling or itacism. Number 117 is an interesting addition. The writer first regarded nos. 70 and 229 as itacisms; then he wrote Dr. Gerstinger at Vienna, sending the letter by air mail through Dr. Kenyon in London, with the request that the Vienna editor check the papyrus. Dr. Kenyon, under letter dated February 4, 1946, suggests that he thinks it safe to assume that they are 'simple printer's errors.' No example of such itacism has yet been located by the writer.<sup>12</sup> Number 22 is doubtful, and 95 is a matter of order.

Alongside this may be set the singular readings collected from other witnesses. These must be judged in the

---

<sup>12</sup> Moulton (A Gram. of N. T. Gk., Vol. I, 2nd ed., p. 41) has interestingly suggested that orthographical peculiarities of the New Testament uncials, in comparison with the papyri and inscriptions, will help to fix the provenance of mss. and thus supply criteria for that localizing of textual types which is an indispensable step towards the ultimate goal of criticism.

light of the fact that many of the details are omitted by the authorities used. The number would be larger if they were subjected to the intense scrutiny given P<sup>45</sup>. The writer noted several singular readings of  $\Theta$ . Movable  $\nu$  and adscripts are counted accurately only for P<sup>45</sup>. In the cases presented here P<sup>45</sup> has the following of all the other witnesses in binary readings and one or more confirming witnesses in ternary or more involved readings.

Numbers in parentheses refer to the apparatus above. OL<sup>ms</sup> have 11 (226, 37 84 202 218 91 101 89 72 134 141);  $\Theta$  (34 66 89 108 140 161 232), Aeth (71 76 78 83 97 102 208), Vg<sup>ms</sup> (42bis 110 109 73 98 133), Syr<sup>sin</sup> (65 95 122 170 191 206 236), Sah (62 106 90 214 143 93 99) have 7 each; Or (168 208bis 211bis 227), Boh (58 152 171 71 82 216) have 6 each; W (98 100 141 149 232), r<sup>2</sup> (above, 5 last OL) have 5 each;  $\Sigma$  (75 131 184 232), Arm (132 116 175 202), Pesh (16 64 68 78) have 4 each; D (47 172 232), M (15 191 232), Geo (77 101 217) have 3 each; A (81 177), B (12 104), P<sup>37</sup> (222 237), 28 (9 180), 71 (8 89), 157 (32 79), 1200 (114 230), lect 47 (67 186), lect 184 (86 138), L (13 227), b (see above, 218 202), ff<sup>1</sup> (37 84, see above), and Clem (207 211) have two each; 24 have 1 each--  $\lambda$  (81), E (87), G (154), K (232), U (34), Y (99), 074 (186),  $\Gamma$  (2), 40 (59), 69 (137), 229 (208), 346 (163), 473 (4), 692 (159), 954 (169), 1093 (41), 1295 (151), 1355 (120), 1424 (34), 1597 (231), 1689 (165), Syr<sup>cur</sup> (35), Syr<sup>jer</sup> (191), Epiph (220).

CHAPTER TWO

JOHN

I. THE CONDITION OF JOHN IN P<sup>45</sup>

The relatively small portion represents two chapters out of twenty-one--chapters 10 and 11. The lines are fairly complete so that most of the words of the sixty-five verses can be made out. Only chapter 10 is studied here. The Sub-Achmimic manuscript discovered by Petrie and edited by Thompson has been used here as 'Pet'. When 'Cop' is used, it stands with 'Sah' and 'Boh'.

II. COLLATION AND CRITICAL APPARATUS

- 10:7 (1) ζ<sup>WH</sup> = ε[ιπ]ε[ν] = P<sup>45</sup> Greek most vers . . . says  
= Pesh
- (2) ζ<sup>WH</sup> = ουν = P<sup>45</sup> from space, λ' \* & ca A B D E F G L M  
S U W Γ Δ Θ all mins fam 1 13 28 69 124 700 Pet  
. . . om = e Lucif Boh Arm
- (3) ζ<sup>WH</sup> = παλιν = P<sup>6</sup> A B D E F G L M S U W Γ Δ Θ Π 28  
118 157 700 1278 most mins OL Vg Syr<sup>Jer</sup> har Pet  
. . . om = p<sup>45</sup> from space, λ' \* & ca 1 63 69 124 253  
565 e ff<sup>2</sup> r aur\* Cyr Lucif
- (4) ζ = αυτοις = P<sup>45</sup> λ' a & cb A D E F G K L M S U W  
Γ Δ Λ Π Θ fam 1 13 28 69 124 157 700 1278 OL

Vg<sup>most</sup> Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har jer Arm Aeth Goth Cop . . .

TiWH = om = λ\* B Vg<sup>1</sup> ms

(5) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = ο ἠ̄ = P<sup>45</sup> P<sup>6</sup> λ' a&ca A B D E F G L M S U W  
X Γ Δ Θ fam 1 13 28 33 69 106 124 700 Cop Pesh  
. . . om = b l

(6) Σ [WH] = ό = P<sup>45</sup> Θ etc 28 700 1278 etc . . .  
om = B 118

(7) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = λεγ]ω υμιν = P<sup>45</sup> A W Θ etc fam 13 28 700  
etc . . . υμ. λε. = B

10:8 (8) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = παντες = P<sup>45</sup> λ' A B Θ etc fam 13 fam 1 28  
700 etc Cop Syr etc Or Lucif Valent Clem . . .  
om = D b d fos Did Quaest

(9) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = παντες without add = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . + δε  
= Γ Boh<sup>1</sup> ms . . . και before = Boh<sup>1</sup> ms Syr<sup>pesh</sup> sin

(10) Σ = προ εμου ηλθον = Θ fam 1 (exc 131) fos Pesh<sup>1</sup> ms  
Arm Chrys<sup>cat</sup> Valent Or<sup>once</sup> Nonn Cyr Quaest; or  
ηλθ. π. εμ. = λ' c A B D K L W X Δ Π 3 Fam 13  
(exc 124) 18 33 56 58 61 71 73 76 83 86 122\*\*  
123 125\*\* 127 145 157 170 201 218 239 241 246  
247 248 249 251 252 253 254 259 262 299 440 470  
471 472 473 477 479 480 482\*\* 486 489 700 1278  
Lects 54 55 gat Syr<sup>cod&har</sup> Boh Aeth Arr Geo Slav  
Or Did Isid etc . . . Ti = om προ εμ. = P<sup>45</sup> seems  
λ\* E F G M S U Γ Δ 28 106 131 237 435 about 100  
mins a b c e f ff<sup>2</sup> g l q am fu for etc Goth Sah

Pet Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har (text) Jer Pers Bas Chrys Cyr  
Thdor<sup>heracl</sup> etc.

- (11)  $\zeta_{WH} = \kappa\lambda\epsilon\pi\tau\alpha]i = P^{45} A$  etc . . .  $\kappa\lambda\epsilon\pi\tau\epsilon = \Theta$   
 (12)  $WH = \epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\nu = P^{45} A \Theta$  . . .  $\zeta = \epsilon\iota\sigma\iota = \text{fam 1}$   
 (13)  $\zeta_{WH} = \epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\nu = P^{45} \lambda A B$  etc 28 etc . . .  $\eta\sigma\alpha\nu =$   
 6 63 71 116 248 253 254 259 Arm Did Jer  
 (14)  $\zeta_{WH} = \lambda\eta\sigma\tau\alpha\iota = P^{45} A$  . . .  $\lambda\eta\sigma\tau\eta = \Theta$   
 (15)  $\eta\eta\kappa\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\nu = P^{45} L$  Or Did . . .  $\zeta_{WH} = \eta\kappa\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu =$   
 $\lambda A B \Theta$  etc fam 1 fam 13 28 700 1278 etc Or  
 (16)  $\zeta_{WH} = \pi\rho\omicron\beta\alpha\tau\alpha$  without add =  $P^{45} A$  etc . . .  
 $+ \underline{\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\nu\omicron\kappa\sigma}$  (sic) =  $\Theta$

10:9

- (17)  $\zeta_{WH} = \eta\theta\upsilon\beta] \alpha = P^{45} A \Theta$  etc fam 1 etc . . .  
 $\theta\upsilon\beta\alpha\iota = 700$  improper ads . . .  $\eta \pi\upsilon\lambda\eta \eta \alpha\lambda\eta\theta\iota\nu\eta$   
 = Naass  
 (18)  $\theta\upsilon[\rho] \alpha = P^{45}$  etc . . . +  $\tau\omega\nu \pi\rho\omicron\beta\alpha\tau\omega\nu = 118 209$   
 (19)  $\zeta_{WH} = \epsilon\alpha\nu = P^{45}$  etc . . .  $\alpha\nu = W$   
 (20)  $\zeta_{WH} = \tau\iota\varsigma = P^{45} A$  etc . . .  $\Theta = \tau\eta\varsigma$   
 (21)  $\zeta_{WH} = \kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota = P^{45} A \Theta$  etc . . .  
 om =  $W \Delta a e \delta$  Lucif  
 (22)  $\zeta_{WH} = \kappa\alpha\iota$  3 times in verse =  $P^{45}$  etc Sah Pet  
 Boh<sup>most</sup> . . . omit all 3 = Boh<sup>some mss</sup> (not al-  
 ways the same)

10:10

- (23)  $\zeta_{WH} = \kappa\alpha\iota \theta\upsilon\sigma\eta = P^{45}$  etc . . . om = a e . . .  
 28 =  $\theta\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota$ , also  $\alpha\pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota$

- (24)  $\epsilon\iota = P^{45} \theta$  . . . A =  $\epsilon$  by corrector
- (25)  $\zeta_{WH} = \epsilon\gamma\omega$  without add =  $P^{45} A \theta$  etc . . .  
 $+ \delta\epsilon = D a d Boh^{some} Aeth Goth Syr^{sin}$
- (26)  $\zeta_{WH} = \epsilon\gamma\omega$  thru  $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu \epsilon\chi\omega\sigma\iota\nu = P^{45}$  etc . . .  
 $om = Sah^1 ms$  . . .  $om \kappa\alpha\iota \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\sigma. \epsilon\chi = D d$   
 $ff^{2*}$
- (27)  $\zeta_{WH} = \zeta\omega\eta\nu = P^{45}$  etc . . .  $+ \alpha\iota\omega\nu\iota\omicron\nu = \iota$   
 $Pesh^1 ms Aeth$
- (28)  $\zeta = \epsilon\chi\omega\sigma\iota$  and  $\epsilon\chi\omega\sigma\iota\nu = P^{45}$  fam 1 . . .  $Tiwh$   
 $= -\sigma\iota\nu$  and  $-\sigma\iota\nu = A$  etc . . .  $-\sigma\iota$  and  $-\sigma\iota = \theta$
- (29)  $\zeta_{WH} = \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu = P^{45}$  ,  $\iota' A B \theta$  etc 28 700 1278  
 etc . . .  $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\omicron\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu = X \Gamma$  69 157 lect 20  
 $Ath$  . . .  $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu = W$
- 10:11 (30)  $\zeta_{WH} = \epsilon\iota\mu\iota = P^{45}$  etc . . .  $\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\iota = W$
- (31)  $\omicron \kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma \pi\omicron\iota\mu\eta\nu$  twice =  $P^{45}$  . . .  $\zeta_{WH} = \omicron \pi\omicron\iota.$   
 $\omicron \kappa\alpha\lambda.$  twice = A  $\theta$  etc fam 1 fam 13 28 700  
 1278 etc (Vg = Pastor bonus, with  $\zeta_{WH}$  for  
 first; for second, Vg has bonus pastor with  $P^{45}$   
 but a b c d e f ff<sup>2</sup> l r  $\delta$  Aug = Pastor bonus)
- (32) Second  $\omicron \kappa\alpha\lambda. \pi\omicron\iota.$  =  $P^{45}$  etc . . .  $om = Boh^1 ms$   
 . . . prefix  $\kappa\alpha\iota = Boh^3 mss.$  . . .  $+ \delta\epsilon$  (but) =  
 $Aeth Syr^{sin} pesh$  (1 ms) . . . between  $\kappa\alpha\lambda.$  and  
 $\pi\omicron\iota.$  = autem = a l; enim = b Vg<sup>1 ms</sup>
- (33)  $\delta\iota\delta\omega\sigma\iota\nu = P^{45}$  ,  $\iota' *$  D b c Vg<sup>most</sup> Boh Syr<sup>sin</sup> jer  
 (Aeth) Aug . . .  $\zeta_{WH} = \tau\iota\theta\eta\sigma\iota\nu = \iota'^\circ A B \theta$  etc

fam 1 fam 13 28 700 1278 etc Sah Pet a e f l  
aur Vg<sup>5</sup> mss Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har Arm Clem Or Eus Const  
Bas Chrys Cyr Thdrt Tert Lucif Hil

(34) ΣWH = ὑπερ = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om = Boh<sup>1</sup> ms

(35) των = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . τον = Θ, itacism

(36) ΣWH = των προβατων = P<sup>45</sup> λ' A B (Θ) etc fam 1  
fam 13 28 700 1278 etc Vg<sup>most</sup> a c d f l s . . .  
sheep = Arm . . . His sheep = b e ff<sup>2</sup> r aur cor  
vat Vg<sup>several</sup> Sah Pet . . . His flock = Syr<sup>sin</sup>  
pesh

10:12 (37) WH = ο μισθωτος = P<sup>45</sup> B G L W fam 1 (exc 118 209)  
a am fu for ing mt Boh<sup>1</sup> ms Lucif . . . Σ = + δε =  
Α Γ Δ Π uncs<sup>6</sup> 28 118 209 700 1278 most mins  
Eus Chrys; Tr mrg = ο δε μισ. = λ' D X Δ Θ  
fam 13 33 157 lect 253 Const Cyr Eus Chrys; also  
for presence of δε = OL<sup>most</sup> Vg<sup>most</sup> Cop Syr<sup>pesh</sup>  
sin har Arm Aeth

(38) μισθωτος = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . + the false = Syr<sup>sin</sup>

(39) μισθωτος και = P<sup>45</sup> λ' A B etc . . . om = Cop  
Pesh

(40) και ουκ ων ποιμην = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om = e Syr<sup>sin</sup>  
pesh (some)

(41) WH = εστιν = P<sup>45</sup> A Θ . . . εστι = fam 13

(42) WH = εστιν = P<sup>45</sup> λ' A B L X W\* Θ fam 1 (exc 118  
209) 33 42 565 Const Eus Chrys<sup>4</sup> mos mss Cyr . . .

- $\zeta = \epsilon\iota\sigma\iota = D \Gamma \Delta \Lambda$  uncs 7 28 118 209 700  
 1278 most mins Chrys<sup>montf</sup>
- (43)  $\iota\delta\iota\alpha \tau\alpha \pi\rho\omicron\beta\alpha\tau\alpha = P^{45} \theta . . . \zeta^{WH} = \tau\alpha \pi\rho. \iota\delta.$   
 $= \iota$  A B etc fam 1 fam 13 28 700 1278 etc
- (44)  $\epsilon\rho\chi\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu = P^{45} \theta$  etc . . . om = A\*
- (45)  $\zeta^{WH} = \epsilon\rho\chi. \kappa\alpha\iota = P^{45}$  etc . . . om = Sah<sup>1</sup> ms  
 Syr<sup>pesh</sup> sin Arm Aeth
- (46)  $\tau\alpha \pi\rho\omicron\beta\alpha\tau\alpha = P^{45}$  etc . . . his flock = Syr<sup>sin</sup>
- (47)  $\alpha\phi\epsilon\iota\eta\sigma\iota\nu = P^{45} . . . \alpha\phi\eta\eta\sigma\iota\nu = \iota$  A B etc fam 1  
 fam 13 28 700 1278 etc
- (48) WH =  $-\sigma\iota\nu = P^{45}$  A  $\theta . . . \zeta = -\sigma\iota =$  fam 1 fam  
 13 700 1278
- (49)  $\zeta^{WH} = \kappa\alpha\iota \phi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota = P^{45}$  etc . . . om  $\kappa\alpha\iota = Boh^2$  ms
- (50)  $\phi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota = P^{45}$  etc . . . + quia mercennarius est  
 (because he is a hireling) = b
- (51)  $\alpha[\rho\pi]\alpha\zeta\epsilon\iota = P^{45}$  etc . . . prefix 'comes' = Pesh
- (52)  $\zeta^{WH} = \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha = P^{45}$   $\iota$  A B  $\theta$  etc a c e f r  $\delta$  Goth  
 Boh Pet Syr<sup>jer</sup> . . . om = D b g ff<sup>2</sup> l Vg<sup>most</sup>  
 Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh har Sah<sup>some</sup> Aug
- (53)  $\zeta^{WH} = \kappa\alpha\iota \sigma\kappa\omicron\rho\pi\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota = P^{45}$  etc . . . Const adds  
 nothing after  $\kappa\alpha\iota \alpha\rho\pi\alpha\zeta\epsilon\iota . . . Chrys$  lacks  
 $\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\rho\chi.$  to  $\alpha\rho\pi. \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$
- (54) TITrWH =  $\sigma\kappa\omicron\rho\pi\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota = P^{45}$   $\iota$  B D L W  $\theta \Pi$  fam 1  
 (exc 118 209) 22\* 25 33 37 42 482 489 565 d  
 Syr<sup>sin</sup> jer Arm Lucif . . .  $\zeta$  [LnTrmrg] = +  $\tau\alpha$



προβατα = A X Γ Δ Λ uncs<sup>7</sup> fam 13 (118 209)  
 28 700 most mins OL Vg Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har Sah<sup>some</sup> Goth  
 Aeth Cyr . . . + the flock = Syr<sup>sin</sup> . . . +  
 αυτα = (Sah) Pet Boh Const

- 10:13 (55) ζ [LnTrmrg] = ο δε μισθωτος φευγει at beginning  
 = A<sup>2</sup> X Γ Δ Λ Π uncs<sup>7</sup> (118 209) fam 13 28  
 700 1278 most mins a b c f ff<sup>2</sup> g l Vg Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har  
 Aeth Goth Cyr . . . TiTrWH = without the addi-  
 tion = P<sup>45</sup> ,ι' A\* B D L W Θ fam 1 (exc 118 209)  
 22\* 33 d e Syr<sup>jer</sup> Cop Arm Aeth Lucif
- (56) ζ<sup>WH</sup> = οτι μισθωτος εστιν = P<sup>45</sup> ,ι' A B etc fam 1  
 fam 13 28 700 1278 etc . . . om = W (also lacks  
 ο δε to φευγ.)
- (57) μισθωτος = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . + in it = Syr<sup>sin</sup>
- (58) WH = εστιν = P<sup>45</sup> ,ι' A (lacking in W) Θ . . .  
 ζ = εστι = fam 1 fam 13
- (59) ζ<sup>WH</sup> = των = P<sup>45</sup> A etc . . . τ̄ο = Θ
- (60) ζ<sup>WH</sup> = των προβατων = P<sup>45</sup> etc Sah Pet Arm Aeth  
 etc . . . the flock = Pesh . . . 'it' = Syr<sup>sin</sup>
- 10:14 (61) ζ<sup>WH</sup> = ειμι = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . ειμει = W
- (62) ζ<sup>WH</sup> = ο ποιμην ο καλος = P<sup>45</sup> ,ι' A B Θ etc Or  
 Eus<sup>Psa&Isa</sup> Vg . . . ο καλος π. = D Eus<sup>Psa</sup>  
 . . . 'the shepherd who is good' = Sah

- (64) first τα εμα = P<sup>45</sup> etc Vg etc . . . 'My sheep'  
= OL<sup>7</sup> mss
- (65) WH=γινωσκουσι μετα εμα = P<sup>45\*</sup> ,λ' B (D)  
= γινωσιν L W-σιν OL Vg<sup>most</sup> Cop Syr<sup>sin</sup> jer  
Aeth Arr Goth Pers<sup>some</sup> Eus<sup>psa</sup> Cyr Nonn . . .  
γινωσκει κ. τ. λ. = p<sup>45</sup> corrector Epiph . . .  
Σ = γινωσκομαι υπο των εμων = A X Γ Δ Θ γινωσκ-  
Λ Π uncs<sup>7</sup> Vg<sup>some</sup> all mins Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har Arm  
Pers<sup>some</sup> Chrys Cyr Thdrt
- (66) ΣWH = first και = P<sup>45</sup> all Greek Sah Pet Boh<sup>9</sup> mss  
. . . om = Boh<sup>most</sup>
- (67) WH = με = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . εμε = D
- (68) + at end of verse = 'and known am I by my own'  
= Syr<sup>sin</sup> . . . om = P<sup>45</sup> etc
- 10:15 (69) και καθως = P<sup>45</sup> . . . ΣWH = om και = ,λ' etc  
fam 13 fam 1 28 700 1278 etc
- (70) γεινωσκει = P<sup>45</sup> etc Sah Pet . . . 'knew' = Boh
- (71) γεινωσκει = P<sup>45</sup> A W Θ . . . ΣWH = γινωσκει =  
fam 13 etc | γεινωσκω = P<sup>45</sup> . . . γεινοσκω = Θ  
. . . ΣWH = γινωσκω = fam 1 etc
- (72) ΣWH = μου = P<sup>45</sup> etc Eus<sup>psa isa</sup> Cop OL<sup>most</sup> Vg  
etc . . . om = D 58 71 d
- (73) διδωμι = P<sup>45</sup> ,λ' \* D W d Pers Arab Aeth (cf. verse  
11) . . . ΣWH = τιθημι = ,λ' ° A B Θ<sup>τειθ-</sup> etc

fam 1 fam 13 28 700 1278 etc OL<sup>most</sup> Vg (e & Cop  
= future tense) Boh<sup>2</sup> mss Pesh Eus<sup>psa isa</sup> Ath  
etc

- (74) των = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . τον = Θ (five itacisms in  
one verse)
- (75) ΣWH = προβατων = P<sup>45</sup> , A B Θ W etc fam 1 fam  
13 28 700 1278 etc a d δ am fu for others<sup>9</sup> Arm  
. . . + μου = b c e f ff<sup>2</sup> g l Vg<sup>most</sup> Cop Syr<sup>jer</sup>  
Aeth . . . + των εμων = Ath . . . 'the flock' =  
Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh . . . 'My flock' = Pesh<sup>1</sup> ms
- 10:16 (76) ΣWH = και αλλα = P<sup>45</sup> , A B etc Sah Boh Syr<sup>sin</sup>  
Arm . . . + δε = D 346 d<sup>(autem)</sup> r<sup>(sed)</sup> Pet = Δ Ε  
Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har (Aeth) Eus Thdrt<sup>twice</sup> . . . +  
quidem (indeed) = a
- (77) απερ = P<sup>45</sup> . . . α = , A B Θ etc fam 1 fam 13  
28 700 1278 etc etc
- (78) ΣWH = και in κακεινα = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om =  
Pesh<sup>1</sup> ms . . . 'because' = Pesh<sup>1</sup> ms
- (79) ουκ = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om = Vg<sup>1</sup> ms
- (80) WH = δει με = P<sup>45</sup> , B D L W Δ Θ Π 1 fam 13  
33 OL Vg Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har jer Or Eus Bas Chrys Cyr  
Thdrt . . . Σ = με δει = A X Γ Λ 28 118 209  
700 1278 most mins
- (81) ΣWH = με = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om = Vg<sup>1</sup> ms

- (82)  $\zeta_{WH} = \kappa\alpha\iota$  before  $\tau\eta\varsigma \varphi\omega\nu\eta\varsigma = P^{45}$  etc . . . +  
 'also' = Syr<sup>sin</sup> Aeth Pet . . . + 'all' = Syr<sup>pesh</sup>  
 sin . . . + ad (to, toward) = Vg<sup>1</sup> ms . . . ut (so  
 that) = a l
- (83)  $\zeta_{WH} = \kappa.\tau. \varphi\omega\nu. \alpha[\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omicron\upsilon]\sigma\iota\nu = P^{45}$  etc . . .  
 om = Vg<sup>1</sup> ms (but added in mrg)
- (84) WH =  $\alpha[\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omicron\upsilon]\sigma\iota\nu = P^{45}$  A W  $\theta$  . . .  $\zeta = -\sigma\iota =$   
 fam l fam l3
- (85) TrWH =  $\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota = P^{45}$   $\lambda' \circ$  B D L W X  $\theta$  fam l  
 (exc 118 209) 33 565 f for Cop Syr<sup>har</sup> (mrg) jer  
 Arm Goth Clem (Chrys) . . .  $\zeta = \gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota = \lambda' *$   
 A  $\Gamma \Delta \Lambda \Pi$  uncs<sup>7</sup> fam l3 118 209 700 1278 most  
 mins OL<sup>most</sup> Vg<sup>am</sup> fu etc Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har (text) Eus  
 Bas Cyr Thdrt
- (86)  $\zeta_{WH} = \epsilon\iota\varsigma \pi\omicron\iota\mu\eta\nu = P^{45}$  all Greek etc . . . om =  
 Boh<sup>1</sup> ms . . . place 'with' before = Boh<sup>1</sup> ms . . .  
 prefix  $\kappa\alpha\iota =$  Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh har Arm . . . 'of one  
 shepherd' = Aeth
- 10:17 (87)  $\zeta_{WH} = \mu\epsilon \circ \overline{\pi\rho}$  or  $\circ \pi. \mu.$  before  $\alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\alpha = P^{45}$   
 (lacuna is indecisive on  $\overline{\pi\rho}$ ) all Greek etc . . .  
 'loves me My Father' = Boh Arm . . . 'and My  
 Father because of this loves Me' = Syr<sup>sin</sup>
- (88)  $\zeta_{WH} = \epsilon\gamma\omega$  after  $\omicron\tau\iota = P^{45}$   $\lambda' A B$  etc all mins  
 Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har Arm Aeth . . .  $\epsilon\gamma\omega$  before  $\omicron\tau\iota =$   
 Sah<sup>2</sup> mss . . . om = Sah<sup>3</sup> mss Syr<sup>sin</sup>

- (89)  $\zeta_{WH} = \tau\theta\eta\mu\iota = P^{45}$  A  $\theta$  . . .  $\tau\theta\eta\mu\epsilon\iota = W$
- (90)  $\zeta_{WH} = \tau\theta. \tau\eta[\nu] \psi\upsilon\chi\eta\nu \mu\omicron\upsilon = P^{45}$  all Gk etc . . .  
 $\mu\omicron\upsilon_{om} = e$  Vg<sup>2</sup> ms add it above line . . . trans-  
 pose  $\tau\theta. = c$  ff<sup>2</sup> . . . + 'for the sheep' = a c  
 . . . after  $\tau\theta.$  'for My sheep' = e
- (91)  $\zeta_{WH} = \tau\theta\eta\mu\iota = ,\lambda'$  P<sup>45</sup> A B all Gk Boh<sup>most</sup> . . .  
 fut tense = Sah Pet Boh<sup>2</sup> mss
- (92)  $\zeta_{WH} = \pi\alpha\lambda\iota[\nu] = P^{45}$  all Greek etc . . . om =  
 Boh<sup>2</sup> mss
- (93)  $\zeta_{WH} = \iota\nu\alpha$  to  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\eta = P^{45}$  etc . . . om = Vg ms f
- 10:18 (94) WH =  $\eta\rho\epsilon\nu = P^{45}$  , $\lambda'$ \* B . . .  $\zeta_{[WHmrg]} = \alpha\iota\rho\epsilon\iota =$   
 $\lambda' c$  A (  $\theta$  & W =  $\epsilon\rho\epsilon\iota$  ) etc fam 1 fam 13 28 700 1278  
 etc a b c e f ff<sup>2</sup> g e Vg (some Latt = future  
 tense) Cop Pesh etc Or Eus Did Cyp Hil
- (95)  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha = P^{45}$  E Or . . .  $\zeta_{WH} = \alpha\lambda\lambda = A \theta$  etc fam  
 1 fam 13 etc . . . om = Pesh<sup>1</sup> ms Aeth
- (96)  $\epsilon\gamma\omega = P^{45}$  etc . . . om = Boh<sup>1</sup> ms
- (97)  $\zeta_{WH} = \alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha \epsilon\gamma\omega \tau\theta\eta\mu\iota \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\nu \alpha\pi \epsilon\mu\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon = P^{45}$  from  
 space , $\lambda'$  A B  $\theta$  etc fam 1 13 28 700 1278 etc  
 Vg<sup>but</sup> 1 ms omits  $\alpha\pi \epsilon\mu.$  Or<sup>often</sup> Eus<sup>twice</sup> but  
 both om  $\alpha\pi \epsilon\mu.$  . . . om = D 64 251 d 1\* Eus<sup>thrice</sup>
- (98) first  $\epsilon\zeta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\nu = P^{45}$  etc . . . + autem (but, more-  
 over) = a
- (99)  $\zeta_{WH} = \text{first} \epsilon\chi\omega$  without add = P<sup>45</sup> A etc 28 etc  
 . . . +  $\gamma\alpha\rho = \text{Syr}^{\text{sin}}$  pesh Aeth

- (100)  $\zeta_{WH} = \tau\iota\theta\eta\mu\iota = P^{45}$  .l' A B  $\theta$  etc . . . - $\mu\epsilon\iota = W$   
 . . . fut tense = e Vg<sup>2</sup> mss
- (101)  $\zeta_{WH} = \theta\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\iota = P^{45}$  A most uncs and mins . . .  
 $\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota = E X \Gamma \Lambda$  28 many mins . . .  $\theta\iota\nu\alpha\iota = \theta$
- (102)  $\zeta_{WH} = \theta\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\iota \alpha\upsilon[\tau\eta]\nu = P^{45}$  A etc 28 etc . . .  
 $\theta = \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\nu \theta\iota\nu\alpha\iota$  . . . for  $\alpha\upsilon[\tau\eta]\nu$  28 aur Vg<sup>2</sup> mss  
 substitute  $\tau\eta\nu \psi\upsilon\chi\eta\nu \mu\omicron\upsilon$
- (103)  $\pi\alpha\lambda\iota\nu \epsilon\zeta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\nu \epsilon\chi\omega = P^{45}$  Syr<sup>sin</sup> Or<sup>twice</sup> Eus<sup>once</sup>  
 . . .  $\zeta_{WH} = \epsilon\zeta. \epsilon\chi. \pi\alpha\lambda\iota\nu = .l' A B \theta$  etc  
 fam 1 fam 13 28 700 1278 etc Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har Arm  
 Aeth Or<sup>thrice</sup> Eus<sup>twice</sup>
- (104)  $\zeta_{WH} = \pi\alpha\lambda\iota\nu = P^{45}$  etc . . . om = E 64 80 110  
 225 e ff<sup>2</sup> Boh<sup>4</sup> mss Eus<sup>once</sup> Chrys Hil<sup>once</sup>, but  
 also has it once . . . after  $\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\iota\nu \alpha\upsilon[\tau\eta]\nu =$   
 Boh<sup>2</sup> mss
- (105) second  $\epsilon\zeta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\nu \epsilon\chi\omega = P^{45}$  etc . . . om = Syr<sup>sin</sup>
- (106)  $[\epsilon]\nu\tau\omicron\lambda\eta\nu = P^{45}$  B  $\theta$  . . .  $\tau\eta\nu \epsilon\nu\tau\omicron\lambda\eta\nu = .l' B$   
 etc fam 1 fam 13 28 700 etc
- (107)  $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\nu \epsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\omicron\nu \epsilon\nu\tau\omicron\lambda\eta\nu = P^{45}$  . . .  $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau. \epsilon\nu\tau.$   
 $\epsilon\lambda. = B \theta$  . . .  $\zeta_{WH} = \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau. \tau\eta\nu \epsilon\nu\tau. \epsilon\lambda.$   
 $= .l' A$  etc fam 1 fam 13 28 700 1278 etc . . .  
 'this is the com. which' = Boh . . . place  $\kappa\alpha\iota$   
 before = Boh<sup>2</sup> mss . . . place  $\omicron\tau\iota$  or  $\gamma\alpha\rho$  (be-  
 cause) before = Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh; so 'enim' ( $\gamma\alpha\rho$ )  
 after  $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\nu = a$

- (108) ε]ντολην = P<sup>45</sup> A . . . -λιν = Θ
- (109) π]αρα = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . W wrote παρ, erased, then wrote παρα; corrector put απο
- 10:19 (110) εγενετο παλιν = 1 346 565 569 . . . P<sup>45</sup> = either ουν or παλιν before εγ. = most; hardly space in lacuna of P<sup>45</sup> for both
- (111) ΣWH = εν τοις ιουδαιοις = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . εν τω οχλω = X . . . before εγενετο = 33 . . . ιουδεοι σ = Θ (sic)
- (112) Verse = 'and when these he was speaking there was a division' = Syr<sup>sin</sup> . . . P<sup>45</sup> = as Greek
- (113) ΣWH = του[τους] = P<sup>45</sup> Greek most vers Boh<sup>most</sup> Sah Pet . . . 'this' = Boh<sup>11</sup> mss Aeth
- (114) ΣWH = αυτων = P<sup>45</sup> A etc . . . αυτον = Θ , itacism
- (115) αυτων οτι = P<sup>45</sup> D Chrys . . . ΣWH = om οτι = ,λ' A B Θ etc fam 1 fam 13 28 700 1278 etc
- (116) ΣWH = δαιμον[ο]ν = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . δαιμων νιον (sic) = Θ
- (117) ΣWH = και = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om = e Vg<sup>1</sup> ms
- (118) ΣWH = μαινε[ται] = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . μενεται = A Θ fam 13 . . . 'wholly insane' = Pesh
- 10:21 (119) ΣWH = αλλ]οι = P<sup>45</sup> D etc most mins Sah<sup>most</sup> Pet OL<sup>most</sup> Vg<sup>most</sup> . . . +δε = W fam 13 d Vg<sup>1</sup> ms

- Boh Sah<sup>1</sup> ms Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh (the order varies)
- (120)  $\zeta_{WH} = \alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota \epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu = P^{45}$  etc . . .  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu \delta\epsilon$   
 $\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota = W$
- (121)  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu = P^{45}$  all Gk Sah Boh . . . 'say' = Pet  
 Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh (some) (Aeth = 'and there are who  
 say')
- (122)  $\zeta_{WH} = \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \tau\alpha \rho\eta[\mu\alpha]\tau\alpha = P^{45}$  ,l' A B  $\Theta$  etc  
 mins (exc 440) Chrys (see below) . . .  $\tau. \rho\eta\mu.$   
 $\tau\alpha\upsilon.$  = D 440 Chrys Vg<sup>1</sup> ms
- (123)  $\zeta_{WH} = \rho\eta\mu\alpha\tau\alpha = P^{45}$  etc . . .  $\epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha = \text{Syr}^{\text{har}}$  mrg
- (124)  $\zeta_{WH} = \tau\alpha\upsilon. \tau\alpha \rho\eta\mu. \omicron\upsilon\kappa \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu = P^{45}$  etc Cop Arm  
 Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh har . . .  $\omicron\upsilon\kappa \epsilon\sigma. \tau\alpha \rho\eta\mu. \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha =$   
 D d
- (125)  $WH = \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu = P^{45}$  A  $\Theta$  Chrys . . .  $\zeta = \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota =$   
 fam 1 fam 13
- (126)  $\zeta_{WH} = \delta\alpha\iota\mu\omicron\nu\iota\omicron\nu \delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\alpha\iota = P^{45}$  all Gk OL<sup>most</sup>  
 Vg . . . transpose = ff<sup>2</sup>
- (127)  $\zeta_{WH} = \delta\alpha\iota\mu\omicron\nu\iota\omicron\nu = P^{45}$  A  $\Theta$  etc . . .  $-\nu\iota\omega\nu =$   
 71 248 253 . . .  $^+ \epsilon\chi\omega\nu = 38$
- (128)  $\zeta_{WH} = \tau\upsilon\phi\lambda\omega\nu \omicron\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma = P^{45}$  ,l' A B ( $\Theta$ ) etc  
 most mins OL<sup>most</sup> Vg<sup>most</sup> Or . . . transpose = D  
 245 d e f Vg<sup>1</sup> ms Chrys<sup>twice</sup>
- (129)  $\tau\upsilon[\phi\lambda]\omega\nu = P^{45}$  A etc . . .  $-\omicron\nu = \Theta$  , itacism
- (130)  $\tau\upsilon\phi\lambda\omega\nu = P^{45}$  all Greek . . . 'of one blind' or  
 'a blind man' = Pesh Sah<sup>1</sup> ms Pet



- 10:22 (131) T<sup>i</sup>W<sup>H</sup> = ΕΥΚΑΙΝΙΑ = P<sup>45</sup> ,λ' B\* D L W ΕΥΚΕΙΝΙΑ Θ  
 some mins . . . ΣLn = ΕΥΚΑΙΝΙΑ = A B<sup>3</sup> X  
 uncs<sup>rest</sup> fam 1 fam 13 28 700 1278 most mins  
 . . . 'the restoration' = Aeth . . . 'feast of  
 dedication' = Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har . . . 'the feast  
 which is called the honor of the holy house' =  
 Syr<sup>sin</sup>
- (132) ΧΕΙΜΩΝ ΔΕ [ην = P<sup>45</sup> . . . ΣLn = και χ. ην =  
 A E F K M S U Γ Δ Λ Π<sup>2</sup> seems, then deleted  
 και fam 13 28 118 209 700 1278 most mins a c e  
 f g l Vg Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har jer Boh<sup>2</sup> mss Arm Aeth  
 Chrys Goth . . . T<sup>i</sup>TrW<sup>H</sup> = χ. ην = ,λ' B D G L X  
 W Θ = χ'μ- Π 1 33 42 d ff<sup>2\*</sup> r Sah Pet Boh<sup>most</sup>  
 Aeth Chrys 1 mos ms Aug . . . om = b
- 10:23 (133) Εἰν τῶι ἱερῶι ἐν τῆι = P<sup>45</sup> . . . om adscripts  
 = A Θ
- (134) ΣW<sup>H</sup> = τῆι = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om = Δ
- (135) ΣW<sup>H</sup> = second εἰν = P<sup>45</sup> ,λ' A B etc Boh<sup>1</sup> ms  
 Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har . . . 'under' = Sah Boh<sup>most</sup> Pet  
 . . . 'in the stoa of Solomon which is in the  
 temple' = Syr<sup>sin</sup>
- (136) ΣTrW<sup>H</sup> = του = P<sup>45</sup> seems from space B L X Θ 118  
 209 many mins . . . om = ,λ' A D W Γ Δ Λ Π  
 uncs<sup>7</sup> fam 1 (exc 118 209) fam 13 28 700 1278  
 many mins Chrys

- (137) WH = σ]ολομωνος = P<sup>45</sup> ,λ\* B D E F G Δ Λ Θ  
 1 fam 13 28 mins<sup>50</sup> (Tisch) Chrys<sup>3</sup> mos mss  
 . . . -ωντος = ,λ<sup>c</sup> A K L M S U W X Γ Π 118  
 209 very many mins Chrys . . . σαλομωντος = W
- (138) σ]ολομωνος = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . + 'in the temple' =  
 c ff<sup>2</sup> Syr<sup>sin</sup> (see supra, No. 135)
- (139) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = τη[ν ψυχην = P<sup>45</sup> etc Boh<sup>most</sup> . . . plural  
 = Boh<sup>7</sup> mss
- 10:24 (140) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = και = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om = Boh<sup>5</sup> mss
- (141) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = [ελε]γο[ν] = P<sup>45</sup> A Θ etc . . . ελεγαν = D
- 10:25 (142) απεκριθη = P<sup>45</sup> Θ all Greek . . . present tense  
 = Syr<sup>sin</sup> . . . om = fu
- 10:31 (143) εβαστασαν = P<sup>45</sup> Θ Vg<sup>most</sup> = W&W . . . WH =  
 + παλιν without ουν = ,λ B L W 33 157 (after  
 λιθους) ff<sup>2</sup> g am fu for em iac ing mt taur  
 Sah<sup>most</sup> Pet (Arm) Goth Ath Aug . . . Σ = ουν  
 παλιν = A X etc fam 1 700 1278 most mins OL<sup>most</sup>  
 Vg<sup>some</sup> Sah<sup>some</sup> Boh Syr<sup>har</sup> . . . † ουν without  
 παλιν = D fam 13 28 330 mins<sup>5</sup> OL<sup>many</sup> Boh Arm  
 . . . prefix και = Syr<sup>pesh</sup> jer Aeth . . . pre-  
 fix = 'when he said these' = Syr<sup>sin</sup>
- (144) Σ<sup>WH</sup> = λιθ[ους οι ιουδ]αιοι = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . .  
 transpose = 69 254 few other mins lect 48 e f  
 Syr<sup>pesh</sup> jer . . . om οι ιουδ. = W Sah<sup>1</sup> ms Syr<sup>sin</sup>  
 Athan

- (145)  $\zeta_{WH} = [\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu]$  = P<sup>45</sup> from space etc . . . +  
'the Jews' = Boh<sup>1</sup> ms
- 10:32 (146)  $\zeta_{WH} = \alpha]πεκριθη αυτοις [ο ιη = P^{45} ,\lambda' A B W \Theta$   
mins<sup>most</sup> Sah Arm Syr<sup>har</sup> . . . απ.  $\bar{\iota}\zeta$  και ειπεν  
 $\alpha\upsilon\tau.$  = 33 Aeth . . . 'answering however Jesus  
said to them' = fos . . . 'answered them Jesus  
saying' = c e l? Boh Arm<sup>cdd</sup> . . . 'he answered  
and said' = Boh<sup>2</sup> mss . . . 'says to them Jesus'  
= Syr<sup>pesh</sup> sin . . . + 'saying' = Vg<sup>1</sup> ms
- (147)  $\zeta_{WH} = \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$  = P<sup>45</sup> Boh<sup>2</sup> mss = om . . . c = ei  
(him) . . . + παλιν = Pesh<sup>1</sup> ms
- (148) LnTiWHmrg = εργα κ]αλα = P<sup>45</sup> ,\lambda' A K Θ Δ Π  
fam 1 33 106 157 254 565 1278 Scr<sup>e</sup> others a c  
e f l am fu for fos ing Sah Boh Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har jer  
Arm Aeth Ath Quaest (Aug) . . .  $\zeta = \kappa\alpha\lambda\alpha \epsilon\rho.$  =  
D L X Γ Δ uncs<sup>7</sup> fam 13 28 700 most mins d  
ff<sup>2</sup> seems g<sup>seems</sup>  $\delta$  Vg<sup>1</sup> ms Goth Hil Aug . . .  
WH = καλα after υμιν = B
- (149)  $\zeta_{WH} = \kappa]αλα$  = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om = W 127\* 220  
245 lect 54 b Syr<sup>sin</sup> Thdrt
- (150)  $\zeta_{WH} = [\epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha]$  = P<sup>45</sup> seems from space etc . . .  
om = 127\* 245 Epiph
- (151)  $\zeta_{WH} = \epsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\chi\alpha$  = P<sup>45</sup> A etc . . . εδιδασα = Θ
- (152)  $\zeta_{WH} = \pi\omicron\iota\omicron\nu$  = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . + ουν = W Boh

- (153)  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$  = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om = W  $\Delta$  <sup>2</sup> 69 157 435  
lect 44 tol (Boh) Ath<sup>eds</sup> . . . om =  $\alpha\upsilon$ .  $\epsilon\rho\gamma\omicron\nu$  =  
e . . .  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$  = A
- (154)  $\epsilon\rho\gamma\omicron\nu$  = P<sup>45</sup> etc a b c f ff<sup>2</sup> g l Vg Sah Syr<sup>pesh</sup>  
har etc . . . - $\omega\nu$  = K 28 many mins Pet Goth  
Syr<sup>sin</sup> Epiph . . . 69 =  $\pi\omicron\iota\omega\nu$   $\epsilon\rho\gamma\omicron\nu$  . . . om =  
a? e Vg<sup>1</sup> ms
- (155)  $\zeta\omega\eta$  =  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$   $\epsilon\rho\gamma\omicron\nu$  = P<sup>45</sup> etc  $\epsilon\rho$ .  $\alpha\upsilon\tau$ . = X 71  
124 Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har Vg<sup>1</sup> ms Arm Aeth
- (156) WH =  $\epsilon\mu\epsilon$  = P<sup>45</sup> , $\lambda$ ' B L  $\Theta$  33 . . .  $\zeta$  Lnmg =  
 $\mu\epsilon$  = A D X W fam l 13 700 1278 most mins
- (157) TlTrWH =  $\epsilon\mu\epsilon$  [ $\lambda\iota\theta\alpha$ ] $\zeta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$  = P<sup>45</sup> , $\lambda$ ' B L  $\Theta$  33 a b  
e OL<sup>exc</sup> 6 Vg Ath . . .  $\zeta$  Ln =  $\lambda\iota\theta$ .  $\mu\epsilon$  = A D X  
W fam l fam 13 28 700 1278 c d f l  $\delta$  aur\* Goth  
Boh Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har jer Epiph Thdrt Hil
- (158) WH =  $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\varsigma$  = P<sup>45</sup> seems from space , $\lambda$ '\* B D  $\Theta$   
c d e Syr<sup>sin</sup> jer Ath Hil . . .  $\zeta$  = + $\mu\omicron\upsilon$  = , $\lambda$ '<sup>c</sup>  
A L W X etc fam l fam 13 700 1278 all mins  
OL<sup>most</sup> Vg Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har Arm Aeth etc Thdrt Quaest
- (159)  $\zeta\omega\eta$  =  $\lambda\iota\theta\alpha$ ] $\zeta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$  = P<sup>45</sup>  $\Theta$  most perhaps . . . =  
- $\tau\alpha\iota$  = A W 28
- 10:33 (160)  $\alpha\pi\epsilon\kappa\rho\iota\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$  = P<sup>45</sup> , $\lambda$ ' A B etc . . . present  
tense = Syr<sup>pesh</sup> sin . . . +  $\gamma\alpha\rho$  (enim) = e  
Vg<sup>2</sup> mss

- (161) WH = οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι without add = P<sup>45</sup> , A B K  
 L M\* W X π Θ fam 1 28 mins<sup>20</sup> OL<sup>most</sup> Vg  
 Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har Sah Pet Boh<sup>most</sup> Goth Arm Ath Hil  
 ...Ϛ = + λεγοντες = D E G H M<sup>2</sup> S U Γ Δ Λ fam  
 13 700 1278 most mins d s Syr<sup>jer</sup> Boh<sup>1</sup> ms  
 Aeth<sup>most</sup> . . . + 'and said' = e Vg<sup>1</sup> ms Boh<sup>6</sup> mss  
 Aeth<sup>some</sup>
- (162) ϚWH = αὐτῶι οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι = P<sup>45</sup> Δ<sup>2</sup> etc . . .  
 transpose = Δ \*
- (163) καλοῦ ἐργου = P<sup>45</sup> all Greek OL<sup>most</sup> Vg . . .  
 transpose = d
- (164) ϚWH = σε after λιθαζῶμεν = P<sup>45</sup> . . . trans-  
 pose = a c f ff<sup>2</sup> l aur . . . before ου = e r
- (165) ϚWH = βλασφημίας = P<sup>45</sup> Θ . . . -μείας = A
- (166) ϚWH = περὶ βλας. = P<sup>45</sup> Greek<sup>all</sup> Sah<sup>most</sup> . . .  
 'you blaspheme' = Sah<sup>3</sup> mss Pesh Aeth . . .  
 transpose after ἀνθρώπος = Syr<sup>sin</sup>
- (167) ϚWH = καὶ = P<sup>45</sup> A B Θ etc fam 1 fam 13 28 700  
 1278 Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh jer Arm . . . om = , ὕ c Cop  
 Cyr Thdrt
- (168) ϚWH = οτι = P<sup>45</sup> all Greek etc . . . om = Syr<sup>sin</sup>  
 pesh . . . πως = Meth
- (169) ϚWH = συ = P<sup>45</sup> most Greek Or Eus Ath etc Novat  
 Meth . . . om = D K π 131 mins<sup>10</sup> d e Vg<sup>1</sup> ms  
 Syr<sup>pesh</sup> jer Chrys Quaest (Aug . . . καὶ οτι συ =  
 erased = Vg<sup>1</sup> ms

- (170)  $\zeta_{WH} = \alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma \omega\nu = P^{45}$  etc . . . transpose =  
e f l r aur Vg<sup>1</sup> ms
- (171)  $\zeta_{WH} = \sigma\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu = P^{45}$  , $\lambda$  A B  $\Theta$  W etc fam 1 (exc  
118) 700 1278 etc . . .  $\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu = G U \Lambda$  fam 13  
28 118 566? many mins Or Meth . . . om = b d e  
r
- 10:34 (172)  $\zeta_{WH} = \alpha\pi\epsilon\kappa\rho\iota\theta\eta = P^{45}$  all Gk Pet etc . . . 'says'  
= Syr<sup>pesh</sup> sin . . .  $\dagger$   $\pi\alpha\lambda\iota\nu = Sah^1$  ms
- (173)  $\zeta_{WH} = \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma = P^{45}$  etc . . . om = e r Boh<sup>2</sup> ms
- (174)  $\bar{\iota}\eta = P^{45}$  B W Eus Ath . . .  $\zeta_{TiWH} =$  prefix  
o =  $\lambda$   $\Theta$  etc fam 1 fam 13 28 700 1278 etc Eus  
Ath . . .  $\dagger$   $\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\nu = D Boh^{most}$  d (Aeth)
- (175)  $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu = P^{45}$  etc . . . Pesh = 'thus  
written in'; Syr<sup>sin</sup> = 'thus in written'
- (176)  $TiWH = \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu = P^{45}$  A  $\Theta$  . . .  $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota =$  fam 1 fam  
13
- (177)  $\epsilon\nu\tau\eta\eta\iota \gamma\rho\alpha\phi\eta\iota$  before  $\epsilon\nu \tau\omega\iota \nu\omicron\mu\omega\iota = P^{45}$  . . .  
om =  $\lambda$  A B  $\Theta$  etc fam 1 13 28 700 1278 etc
- (178)  $\tau\omega\iota \nu\omicron\mu\omega\iota = P^{45}$  . . . no ads = A  $\Theta$
- (179)  $\nu\omicron\mu\omega\iota = P^{45}$  , $\lambda$ \* D  $\Theta$  lect 19 a b c e ff<sup>2</sup> l r  
aur Eus Tert Cyp Hil . . .  $\zeta_{WH} = + \upsilon\mu\omega\nu =$   
 $\lambda^a$  A B L W X  $\Theta$  uncs<sup>rest</sup> fam 1 fam 13 28 700  
1278 most mins f g Vg Sah Boh Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har jer  
Arm Aeth Eus Ath Thdrt . . .  $\dagger$   $\eta\mu\omega\nu =$  few mins  
. . .  $\mu\omega\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma = 245$

- (180) WH =  $\sigma\tau\iota$  before  $\epsilon\gamma\omega$  = P<sup>45</sup> , $\lambda'$  B D L W X  $\Theta$  12 33  
38 57 a b c e ff<sup>2</sup> g l Vg Syr Eus Ath Cyp Hil  
. . .  $\zeta$  = om = A  $\Gamma \Delta \Lambda \Pi$  uncs<sup>7</sup> most mins  
f  $\delta$  Goth Arm Aeth Ath Thdrt Tert
- (181)  $\zeta$ WH =  $\epsilon\gamma\omega$  = P<sup>45</sup> , $\lambda'$  c A B  $\Theta$  W fam l fam 13 28  
700 1278 etc . . . , $\lambda'$ \* OL1\* = om
- (182)  $\zeta$ WH =  $\epsilon\iota\pi\alpha$  = P<sup>45</sup> , $\lambda'$  B E G H K L W X  $\Gamma \Delta \Lambda$   
fam l 28 700 1278 many mins Eus Ath (Naass)  
. . . Ln =  $\epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\nu$  = A D M S U  $\Delta \Theta$  fam 13 forty  
mins Thdrt
- (183)  $\zeta$ WH =  $\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon$  = P<sup>45</sup> A fam l . . .  $\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$  = W,  
itacism
- 10:35 (184)  $\zeta$ WH =  $\epsilon\iota$  = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . et = Vg<sup>lm\*</sup>
- (185)  $\zeta$ WH =  $\epsilon\iota$  = P<sup>45</sup> , $\lambda'$  A B  $\Theta$  etc fam l fam 13 28  
700 1278 etc . . . + $\omicron\upsilon\nu$  = 235 249 mins<sup>3</sup> c f l  
r fos Arm Hil . . . + $\delta\epsilon$  = Boh<sup>1</sup> ms . . . prefix  
 $\kappa\alpha\iota$  = Pesh<sup>1</sup> ms Aeth
- (186)  $\zeta$ WH =  $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\nu$  = P<sup>45</sup> seems , $\lambda'$  A B etc Boh Pesh  
Arm Sah<sup>most</sup> . . . 'they called' = Sah<sup>1</sup> ms . . .  
'he named' = Arm<sup>cdd</sup> . . . 'they said' = Pesh<sup>1</sup> ms\*
- (187)  $\Theta$ εους without add = P<sup>45</sup> Cyp . . .  $\zeta$ WH = +  
προς ους ο λογος του θεου εγενετο or εγεν. του  
θε. = most others . . . om  $\epsilon\iota$  to θεου = Syr<sup>sin</sup>
- (188)  $\zeta$ WH =  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om = Boh<sup>1</sup> ms Vg<sup>1</sup> ms  
. . . neither = Pesh

- (189)  $\zeta_{WH} = \sigma\upsilon = P^{45}$  etc . . . om = Vg<sup>1</sup> ms\*
- (190)  $\zeta_{WH} = \lambda\upsilon\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota = P^{45}$  etc . . . erased = Vg<sup>1</sup> ms  
. . . Vg<sup>1</sup> ms\*
- (191)  $\lambda\upsilon\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota = P^{45}$  e Cyp . . . +η γραφη = all  
others (Syr<sup>sin</sup> = substitute 'the word of God')
- 10:36 (192)  $\zeta_{WH} = \sigma\nu = P^{45}$  λ' A B etc . . . prefix 'then'  
= Sah Pet . . . prefix 'but' = Arm Aeth . . .  
+ ergo (ουν) = Vg<sup>2</sup> mss
- (193) ο  $\overline{\pi\rho}$  = P<sup>45</sup> all Gk Sah Pet etc . . . Boh<sup>1</sup> ms =  
my Father . . . God = Vg<sup>1</sup> ms Boh<sup>1</sup> ms
- (194) WH = ηγιασεν = P<sup>45</sup> A Θ . . . ζ = om ν = fam  
1 13
- (195)  $\zeta_{WH} = \eta\gamma\iota\alpha\sigma\epsilon\nu = P^{45}$  λ' A B Θ etc fam 1 fam 13  
28 700 1278 etc Sah Pet Boh<sup>most</sup> Or Eus Ath Did  
Cyr etc Tert Cyp etc . . . αγαπησεν = U 47
- (196)  $\zeta_{WH} = \kappa\alpha\iota = P^{45}$  Greek etc . . . om = Boh
- (197)  $\zeta_{WH} = \alpha\pi\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\nu = P^{45}$  A . . . -τιλ- = W Θ
- (198)  $\zeta_{WH} = \upsilon\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma = P^{45}$  etc Sah etc . . . om = Syr<sup>sin</sup>
- (199)  $\zeta_{WH} = \lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon = P^{45}$  Θ . . . λεγεται = W 28
- (200)  $\zeta_{WH} = \beta\lambda\alpha\sigma\phi\eta\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma = P^{45}$  Greek d f g aur ∫ Vg<sup>many</sup>  
Pesh Cop Or Eus Ath Did Cyp Novat . . . 3rd  
person sing = a b e ff<sup>2</sup> l r mm Eus Cyp . . .  
1st per sing = c Goth . . . I have blasphemed  
= Hil



- (201)  $\zeta_{WH} = \epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\nu = P^{45}$  etc . . .  $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\nu = 472$  Syr<sup>sin</sup>  
 . . . 'you said' = Sah<sup>1</sup> ms . . . om = G . . .  
 + to you = Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh Aeth Boh<sup>1</sup> ms
- (202)  $\omicron \upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma = P^{45}$  . . .  $\zeta_{WH} = \upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma =$  all Greek  
 (  $\theta$  fam 1 fam 13 28 700 1278 )
- (203)  $\overline{\theta\upsilon} = \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon = P^{45}$  seems from space  $\lambda'$  D E G W 28  
 69 124 218 258 330 472 (mins<sup>10</sup>) Eus Did Chrys  
 Cyr Ps-Ath Dam . . .  $\zeta_{WH} = \tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon =$  A B L  
 X  $\theta$  etc fam 1 fam 13 (exc 69 124) 28 700 1278  
 most mins Or Eus Ath Thdrt
- (204)  $\omicron \upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma \overline{\theta\upsilon} = P^{45}$  etc . . . transpose = Arm<sup>cdd</sup>  
 . . . that the Son of God = Syr<sup>sin</sup> (sic)
- (205)  $\zeta_{WH} = \epsilon\iota\mu\iota = P^{45}$  A  $\theta$  . . .  $\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\iota = W$  . . . a  
 blank page follows in Vg ms G, then what fol-  
 lows is by another hand
- 10:37 (206)  $\zeta_{WH} = \epsilon\iota = P^{45}$  Gk Latt Sah Pesh etc . . . +  $\delta =$   
 Boh<sup>7</sup> mss . . . prefix  $\kappa\alpha\iota =$  Pesh<sup>mss</sup> 12 37 & most  
 eds Aeth . . . om  $\epsilon\iota \omicron\upsilon =$  Pesh<sup>ms</sup> 7
- (207)  $\zeta_{WH} = \omicron\upsilon = P^{45}$  etc . . .  $\mu\eta =$  fam 13 Chrys . . .  
 for  $\epsilon\iota \omicron\upsilon = \epsilon\iota\mu\omicron\upsilon\eta = \theta$  (sic)
- (208)  $\zeta_{WH} = \tau\omicron\upsilon \overline{\pi\rho\varsigma} \mu\omicron\upsilon = P^{45}$  Gk etc . . . om = Sah<sup>1</sup> ms  
 . . . om  $\mu\omicron\upsilon =$  a b e ff<sup>2</sup> Sah<sup>1</sup> ms Cyp
- (209)  $\zeta_{WH} = \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\tau\epsilon \mu\omicron\iota = P^{45}$   $\theta$  cod 1 most Gk etc  
 . . . -  $\eta\tau\epsilon =$  118 209 . . . -  $\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota =$  A W . . .  
 transpose = a c d e ff<sup>2</sup> r aur Cyp Aug . . .

om  $\mu\omicron\iota$  = Boh<sup>1</sup> ms

- 10:38 (210)  $\delta\epsilon$  = P<sup>45</sup> etc Sah Pet Boh<sup>most</sup> . . . X = above line . . . Boh<sup>1</sup> ms = om . . . om  $\epsilon\iota$  to  $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\eta\tau\epsilon$  = e . . . quod si ( $\epsilon\iota$  γαρ) = b ff<sup>2</sup> l aur (also has  $\delta\epsilon$ )
- (211)  $\zeta\omega\eta$  =  $\pi\omicron\iota\omega$ ] = P<sup>45</sup> seems from space Greek etc . . . + 'them' = Cop
- (212)  $\zeta\omega\eta$  =  $\kappa\alpha\nu$  for  $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\alpha\nu$  P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . only  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  (et) a b c f ff<sup>2</sup> l gat Vg<sup>3</sup> mss Cyp (the translator misread  $\iota$  for  $\nu$ ; the man who copied this from the longhand was confused though he chose  $\nu$ )
- (213)  $\zeta\omega\eta$  =  $\epsilon\mu\omicron\iota$  = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om = Boh<sup>1</sup> ms
- (214)  $\zeta\omega\eta$  =  $\mu\eta$  = P<sup>45</sup> ,l' A B W  $\Theta$  etc most mins . . .  $\omicron\upsilon$  = fam 13 Chrys . . . om =  $\Lambda^*$  1\* 229\* Dam
- (215)  $\zeta\omega\eta$  =  $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\eta\tau\epsilon$  = P<sup>45</sup> B L M =  $^{-\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon}$   $\Gamma$   $\Pi$  118 209 700 1278 many mins Ath Chrys Dam . . .  $\tau\iota\omega\eta$  =  $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\tau\epsilon$  = l' A E G H S U W =  $^{-\tau\alpha\iota}$  X  $\Delta$   $\Lambda$   $\Theta$  1\* 22\* 28 33 69 124 131 very many mins Bas Amb Vig . . .  $\theta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\tau\epsilon$   $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$  = D Ps-Ath (also  $-\eta\tau\epsilon$  at times for  $-\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ ) OL (order fluctuates) Vg Tert Cyp etc
- (216)  $\zeta\omega\eta$  =  $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$   $\epsilon\rho\gamma\omicron\iota\varsigma$  = P<sup>45</sup> ,l' A B W  $\Theta$  etc fam 1 28 700 1278 etc Sah<sup>most</sup> etc Hil<sup>some</sup> . . . +  $\mu\omicron\upsilon$  = H M

fam 13 157 many mins Sah<sup>1</sup> ms Pet Chrys Hil<sup>once</sup>

. . . 'the works believe and you will know

that' = Syr<sup>sin</sup> . . . 'themselves works' = Pesh

. . . prefix vel = η = b c f

(217) Σ = ΠΙΣΤΕΥΣΑΤΕ = P<sup>45</sup> A E G H M S X Γ Δ = -σεται

Λ fam 13 28 118 209 700 1278 most mins

Ath<sup>once</sup> Bas Chrys . . . WH = ΠΙΣΤΕΥΕΤΕ = ΛB

D K L U W = -εται Θ Π 1 33 482 489 Ath<sup>some</sup>

Ps-Ath Dam

(218) ΣWH = ΙΝΑ ΓΝΩΤΕ = P<sup>45</sup> uncs most all mins d r

Vg . . . αναγνωστε = W . . . om = Ath<sup>once</sup> . . .

'and know' = (with variations) a b c e ff<sup>2</sup> Cyp

Tert . . . ΙΝΑ ΕΙΔΗΤΕ = Ps-Ath

(219) γ]εινωσκητε = P<sup>45</sup> . . . WH = γιν- = A W Θ etc

(220) WH = γινωσκητε = P<sup>45</sup> B L X = -ετα W = -εται Θ

fam 1 32? 33 565 cop Syr<sup>Jer</sup> Arm Aeth (Ath)

Ps-Ath Hil . . . Σ = ΠΙΣΤΕΥΣΗΤΕ = (Λ') A (E)

Γ Δ Λ Π uncs<sup>6</sup> fam 13 28 700 1278 most mins

f g Vg Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har Goth Bas . . . om = D a b c

e ff<sup>2\*</sup> 1 Tert Cyp . . . Dam = ΙΝΑ ΓΝΩΤΕ ΚΑΙ

ΠΙΣΤΕΥΗΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΕΠΙΓΙΝΩΣΚΗΤΕ

(221) ΣWH = no verb after ΕΝ ΕΜΟΙ = P<sup>45</sup> all Gk d r δ

Vg<sup>1</sup> ms . . . add est (is) = Latt<sup>most</sup>

(222) Transpose to read ΟΤΙ ΕΓΩ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΠΑΤΡΙ ΚΑΙ Ο ΠΑΤΗΡ

ΕΝ ΕΜΟΙ = Syr<sup>sin</sup> Aeth Boh Ps-Ath Chrys Thdrt

Tert

- (223)  $\zeta$ WH = ο  $\overline{\pi\rho}$  = P<sup>45</sup> ,ι' A B Θ W etc all mins Sah  
 . . . om = Sah<sup>1</sup> ms . . . + μου = Pesh Sah<sup>1</sup> ms  
 Pet
- (224) αυτωι = P<sup>45</sup> no adscripts = A Θ
- (225)  $\zeta$ [Ln] = αυτωι = P<sup>45</sup> Α Γ Δ Λ Π Θ uncs<sup>7</sup> most  
 mins fam 1 fam 13 28 700 1278 b f ff<sup>2</sup> l r (δ)  
 Sah<sup>2</sup> mss Pet Syr<sup>har</sup> text Ath<sup>once</sup> Bas (Cyp)  
 Hil<sup>some</sup> . . . WH = τω πατρι = ,ι' B D L X W 33  
 157 a c e f Vg Sah<sup>most</sup> Boh Syr<sup>pesh</sup> har (mrg) jer  
 Arm Aeth Or Eus Ath<sup>once</sup> Hil<sup>several</sup> Dam (+μου =  
 Sah<sup>2</sup> mss Boh Pesh)
- 10:39 (226)  $\zeta$ WH εζητουν = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . Syr<sup>sin</sup> (again after  
 (these) were wishing the Jews') Chrys = ηθελησαν
- (227) εζ. δε = P<sup>45</sup> f Sah<sup>2</sup> mss . . . και εζ. = D d  
 Syr<sup>pesh</sup> jer Aeth . . .  $\zeta$ [TrWH] = εζ. ουν =  
 ,ι' A K L W X Δ Π fam 1 fam 13 1278 many mins  
 OL (exc f) Vg Sah<sup>most</sup> Syr<sup>har</sup> . . . εζ = B Θ 28
- (228) Ti = αυτον without παλιν = P<sup>45</sup> ,ι'\* D 64 69 440  
 mins<sup>8</sup> a b c e ff g l Vg Syr<sup>pesh</sup> (1 ms) jer Chrys  
 . . . παλιν before εξ Boh Arm . . . παλιν be-  
 fore πιασαι αυτον = U Sah Aeth Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh (most)  
 . . .  $\zeta$  = παλιν αυτον = B E G H M S Γ Δ Θ  
 fam 13 28 700 1278 many mins Syr<sup>pesh</sup> (some) har  
 jer . . . αυτον παλιν = ,ι'<sup>c</sup> A K L W X Δ Π fam  
 l 33 mins<sup>5</sup> f Goth

- (229)  $\zeta_{WH} = \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$  without add = P<sup>45</sup> seems from space  
etc . . . +  $\omicron\iota\ \iota\omicron\upsilon\delta\alpha\iota\omicron\iota$  = 69 Syr<sup>sin</sup>
- (230)  $\zeta_{WH} = \tau\eta\varsigma\ \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\varsigma$  = P<sup>45</sup> , $\lambda'$  A B D W  $\Theta$  etc fam  
13 28 700  $\delta$  . . .  $\tau\omega\nu\ \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\omega\nu$  = fam 1 22 247  
565 OL (exc  $\delta$ ) Vg Boh Sah Syr<sup>all</sup> Arm Goth
- 10:40 (231) WH =  $\alpha\pi\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$  = P<sup>45</sup> A  $\Theta$  . . .  $\zeta$  = no  $\nu$  = fam 1
- (232)  $\zeta_{WH} = \kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\pi\eta\lambda.$  = P<sup>45</sup> , $\lambda'$  B W  $\Theta$  etc fam 1 fam  
13 28 700 1278 etc OL Vg Syr Arm Aeth . . .  
 $\alpha\pi\eta\lambda.\ \omicron\upsilon\nu$  = A . . . om  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  = Sah Pet
- (233)  $\zeta_{WH} = \pi\alpha\lambda\iota\nu$  = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om = e Syr<sup>sin</sup> pesh
- (234)  $\zeta_{WH} = \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\pi\omicron\nu$  = P<sup>45</sup> , $\lambda'$  c etc 28 etc Sah  
Boh<sup>7</sup> mss . . . om = , $\lambda'$ \* 225 245 Chrys . . . om  
 $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  = Sah<sup>2</sup> mss Boh<sup>most</sup>
- (235)  $\zeta_{WH} = \eta\nu$  = P<sup>45</sup> Gk . . . Vg<sup>1</sup> ms = orabat (speak-  
ing, preaching)
- (236)  $\zeta = \text{I}\omega\alpha\nu\nu\eta\varsigma$  = P<sup>45</sup> A , $\lambda'$   $\Theta$  fam 1 . . . Tr WH  
=  $\text{I}\omega\alpha\nu\eta\varsigma$  = B D
- (237)  $\zeta_{WH} = \tau\omicron\ \pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\nu$  = A W etc fam 1 28 700 1278 etc  
(cf a e f ff<sup>2</sup>  $\delta$ ) . . .  $\tau\omicron\ \pi\rho\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$  = P<sup>45</sup> , $\lambda'$   $\Delta$   $\Theta$   
fam 13 218 Chrys . . . om = 33 mins<sup>few</sup>
- (238)  $\tau\omicron\ \pi\rho.\ \beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\zeta\omega\nu$  = P<sup>45</sup> all Greek a e f ff<sup>2</sup>  $\delta$   
. . . transpose = Vg . . .  $\tau\omicron\ \pi\rho\omega.$  before  
 $\text{I}\omega\alpha\nu\nu\eta\varsigma$  = aur
- (239) second  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  = P<sup>45</sup> , $\lambda'$  A B D  $\Theta$  W etc Sah<sup>some</sup> f g  
Vg Syr<sup>har</sup> Aeth etc . . . om = Sah<sup>most</sup>

- (240)  $\zeta$ WHmrg =  $\epsilon\mu\epsilon\iota\nu\epsilon\nu$  = P<sup>45</sup> ,L' A D L W  $\epsilon\mu\epsilon\iota\nu$  X Γ  
 $\Delta\Lambda\Pi$  uncs<sup>7</sup> fam 1 fam 13 28 700 1278 all mins  
 f g Vg Pet etc . . . LnTr mrg WH =  $\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\epsilon\nu$  B a  
 b c e ff<sup>2</sup> l . . .  $\epsilon\mu\iota\nu\epsilon\nu$  = A Θ . . . 'he was'  
 = Pesh Arm . . . om = Syr<sup>sin</sup>
- (241)  $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota$  = P<sup>45</sup> all Greek Sah<sup>most</sup> Vg etc . . . 'at  
 that place' = Sah<sup>1</sup> ms . . . om = Syr<sup>sin</sup>
- 10:41 (242)  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  = P<sup>45</sup> all Greek Sah<sup>2</sup> mss . . . om = Sah<sup>most</sup>  
 Pet .
- (243)  $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota$  = P<sup>45</sup> all Greek . . . 'a multitude' =  
 Sah Pet . . . multitudes = Boh . . . great  
 multitudes = Boh<sup>1</sup> ms
- (244)  $\zeta$ WH =  $\overset{\kappa\alpha\iota}{\wedge}$   $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota$   $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$  = P<sup>45</sup> ,L' A B etc fam 1  
 fam 13 28 700 1278 etc . . .  $\eta\lambda\theta.$   $\delta\epsilon$   $\pi\omicron\lambda.$  = Θ
- (245)  $\zeta$ WH = second  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  = P<sup>45</sup> etc Sah Pet . . . om =  
 Boh<sup>2</sup> mss
- (246)  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu$  = P<sup>45</sup> from space etc . . . + 'to him' =  
 Pesh<sup>1</sup> ms
- (247)  $\zeta$ WH =  $\omicron\tau\iota$  = P<sup>45</sup> seems from space A B L X W Θ  
 uncs<sup>rest</sup> mins<sup>all</sup> OL<sup>most</sup> Vg<sup>etc</sup> . . . om = ,L'  
 D c e
- (248)  $\zeta$  =  $\text{I}\omega\alpha\nu\nu\eta\varsigma$  = P<sup>45</sup> A Θ fam 1 . . . TrWH =  
 $\text{I}\omega\alpha\nu\nu\eta\varsigma$
- (249)  $\zeta$ WH =  $\mu\epsilon\nu$  = P<sup>45</sup> A Θ all uncs fam 1 fam 13 (exc  
 69 124) 28 700 1278 most mins Sah . . . om = 69

- 124 tisch\* mins<sup>few</sup> Arm Chrys Sah<sup>1</sup> ms Boh<sup>1</sup> ms
- (250) ΣWH = σημειον = P<sup>45</sup> fam 1 etc . . . ΕΛ =  
added in mrg . . . σιμιον = Θ . . . W = σημιον
- (251) ΣWH = εποιησεν = P<sup>45</sup> Α Θ . . . no ν = fam 1
- (252) ΣWH = σημειον εποιησεν = P<sup>45</sup> ,ι' Α Β Δ Γ (Δ)  
(Λ) Θ uncs<sup>5</sup> 28 700 1278 mins<sup>most</sup> OL<sup>most</sup> Vg  
. . . επ. σημ. = K L M W X Π fam 1 fam 13 157  
565 mins<sup>5</sup> Or Chrys
- (253) ουδε εν = P<sup>45</sup> W Θ fam 1 fam 13 22 60 1278 Or  
Syr<sup>pesh</sup> jer har Goth . . . ΣWH = ουδεν = most  
uncs 700 most mins . . . before σημειον = a c  
fos
- (254) ΣWH = δε = P<sup>45</sup> etc Sah<sup>most</sup> δε . . . om = Sah<sup>1</sup> ms  
Boh<sup>6</sup> mss
- (255) ΣWH = παντα οσα = P<sup>45</sup> all Greek Pesh . . . 'all  
words (ψαρε) which' = Sah Pet . . . Ϸ ω β  
(thing) = Boh
- (256) Ιωαννης ειπεν = P<sup>45</sup> D b f l . . . ΣWH = trans-  
pose = ,ι' Α Β Θ etc fam 1 fam 13 28 700 1278  
etc . . . om Ιωα. = W 248 Syr<sup>sin</sup> Boh Arab<sup>walt</sup>
- (257) ΣWH = περι = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . περη = Θ
- (258) ΣWH = τουτου = P<sup>45</sup> uncs<sup>most</sup> all mins ϸ hoc (this)  
. . . Α = αυτου
- (259) ΣWH = ην = P<sup>45</sup> etc . . . om = Θ

- 10:42 (260) WH = ΠΟΛΛΟΙ ΕΠΙΣΤΕΥΣΑΝ = P<sup>45</sup> λ' B D L M (W)  
 fam 1 33 565 mins<sup>few</sup> OL Vg Sah Boh Syr<sup>pesh</sup> jer  
 Arm Aeth Chrys (ΤΟΙΝΥΝ after ΠΟΛΛΟΙ) . . . ζ =  
 transpose = Α Γ Δ Λ Π uncs<sup>6</sup> (Tisch cites X  
 on both sides) fam 13 28 700 1278 mins<sup>most</sup>  
 Syr<sup>har</sup> Goth
- (261) ζW = ΚΑΙ = P<sup>45</sup> λ' A B D L Θ etc fam 1 fam 13  
 28 700 1278 etc . . . ΟΥΝ after ΠΟΛΛΟΙ W
- (262) ΠΟΛΛΑ ΕΠΙΣΤΕΥΣΑΝ ΕΙΣ ΑΥΤΟΝ without ΕΚΕΙ =  
 P<sup>45</sup> seems from space 16 Latt Pesh Chrys . . .  
 ζ = ΠΟΛ. ΕΠΙΣ. ΕΚ. ΕΙΣ ΑΥ. = E G H S Γ Δ Λ  
 28 700 1278 many mins . . . WH = ΠΟΛ. ΕΠΙΣ.  
 ΕΙΣ ΑΥ. ΕΚ. = λ' A B D K L M U W X Π Θ fam 1 fam  
 13 mins<sup>10</sup> Sah Boh Syr<sup>har</sup> jer Arm Aeth Goth  
 . . . , ΕΠΙΣ. ΕΚ. ΠΟΛ. ΕΙΣ ΑΥΤΟΝ = mins<sup>3</sup>

### III. THE TYPE OF TEXT IN JOHN

Kenyon found that P<sup>45</sup> stands between the Neutral and the Western Families, but slightly nearer to the Western.<sup>1</sup>  
 "An almost equal adherence to λ' B, D, and Θ, but with a noticeable leaning to D and Θ in particular readings."<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Kenyon, C. Beatty Bibl. Pap., Fasc. II, text, p. xiv

2 Ibid., p. xvi



Tasker saw more accommodation to the Byzantine Text in family  $\Theta$  in John than in Mark and concluded that it is therefore difficult if not impossible to say what family  $\Theta$  is in John. He further concluded that P<sup>45</sup> in text-type cannot be identified with the Caesarean Text.<sup>3</sup> Lyonnet thought he saw a definitely Caesarean strain in John.<sup>4</sup> Tasker also pointed out that P<sup>45</sup> in John shows a mixture similar to the mixed character of the Caesarean Text.<sup>5</sup>

This investigation shows that out of 33 readings selected, 10 stand with and 23 against  $\zeta$  and that the figures are reversed relative to Westcott and Hort. That shows a definite Neutral leaning. Also, there are 27 readings of P<sup>45</sup> that oppose both types of text; some 163, singular and all, stand with both.

Taking 49 readings in which P<sup>45</sup>,  $\lambda'$ , B, D, and  $\Theta$  testify, we found the following:

	<u>with</u> P <sup>45</sup>	<u>against</u> P <sup>45</sup>
$\lambda'$ -----	36 -----	13 -----
B -----	33 -----	16 -----
D -----	16 -----	33 -----
$\Theta$ -----	31 -----	18 -----

Thus the leanings are in order, 36 for  $\lambda'$ , 33 for B, 31 for  $\Theta$ , and 16 for D. Since  $\Theta$  seems to be Neutral in John, there is thus a strong Neutral leaning in John.

---

3 Tasker, "The Ch. Beatty Papyrus and the Caesarean Text of John," HTR, XXX, 3 (July 1937), p. 157c

4 Ibid., p. 164

5 Metzger, op. cit., p. 467a

6 Tasker, op. cit., supra, p. 162

PART III

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE PRESENT STATUS OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM

## CONCLUSIONS FROM THE PRESENT STATUS OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM

Already tentative conclusions have been drawn. More important, however, are the general conclusions that remain to be set forth from the study of the Beatty Gospels together in their relation to the whole conformation of the text but especially relative to the Caesarean Text.

### I. TENDENCIES OF RECENT TEXTUAL CRITICISM

Certain great underlying trends are observable in New Testament textual studies in the past half century. Those who have been most in the front in these matters may have been least conscious of which way their own studies pointed. Not one of these trends is a separate unit within itself, and there is danger in singling them out that they will be emphasized out of proportion to their true force in the movement. For clarity of presentation, however, they must be mentioned one by one.

1. A Tendency to Segmentation. The period of the study of local texts has been intensified effort in a particular field. This is true from the very nature of the case, and unless such research narrows one's horizon, it is the proper method. One must, in addition, go on and relate

the segment considered to the whole body of evidence.

The panacea for such segmentary investigation is to have within one's purview the entirety of textual data. There needs to be a harking back to the intent of Tregelles and particularly to the scope of evidence encompassed in Tischendorf. Others have complained that Legg<sup>1</sup> is too limited in its presentation. He does not mention the Vienna fragment of P<sup>45</sup> and is silent often on what one desires to find in such a work. It is this principle, whether it is justified or not, of asking for the full evidence before decision on P<sup>45</sup> and related issues is stated. Consequently the writer has sought to give a rather full critical apparatus in his work. The Coptic and Syriac, beyond the Greek and Latin, have been used, but other citations of evidence have in the main been secondary.

The conviction has grown on this investigator that not yet has the field of evidence been sufficiently worked to expect the final answer as to the rating of the Caesarean Text of Streeter, and in the meanwhile the need for caution against segmentation of outlook and against over-emphasis on one's particular field of endeavor is evident.

---

1 Legg, Novum Testamentum Graece, vols. on Mark and Matthew

2. An Over-Emphasis on the Versions. Much valuable work has been done on the Latin, Coptic, Syriac, Armenian, and Georgian since Hort formed his text and wrote his introduction. Versions related to Streeter's group have been worked with some success since his first statement of his theory, but much yet remains to be done.

The issue in the Council of Trent, the Reformation, and later discussions concerned the relative authority of the Latin and the Greek. Erasmus and others were justly opposed to the vagaries of those who, like Morinus,<sup>2</sup> held the Latin as superior to the Greek. The answer of the Complutensian scholars that the Latin between the Greek and Hebrew on the same page was analagous to the crucifixion of Christ Jesus between robbers shows the unjust temper of the times. It is possible that there followed, like the swing of a pendulum, a movement that went too far away from the versions, but how much better is the modern view of some that the consonance of the Old Latin k and the Sinaitic Syriac, for instance, should outweigh the entire Greek tradition? Von Soden, followed by Moffatt, was enamored with this disregarding of the Greek line of transmission.

The nature of the versions is well illustrated in each section of critical material presented above. The in-

---

2 Harris, Codex Bezae, p. 42c

stances are numerous to show that the virtue of these versions was that they were renderings into the vernacular of the people and were never meant to be critical replicas of the Greek line of evidence. Some details have been presented that may border on the tedious to one not schooled in these minutiae, but it is out of such peccadilloes of the versions that we must come to an appraisal of them. A return to the relative values of the Greek-line and the version-line of transmission is a crying need of today. Scrivener<sup>3</sup> and others have protested against a too ready reliance on the testimony of the versions against the Greek tradition.

Among the weaknesses of this over-emphasis may be mentioned the following. The modern trend strikes at the very structure of a sound system of textual criticism. One must practice textual criticism in its various processes on the Latin or Syriac line, for instance, and show an unbroken line of transmission. P<sup>45</sup>, among other witnesses, provides us with documentary evidence older than the oldest manuscripts of even the oldest versions. One has no difficulty in accepting the early date of the Latin, Syriac, and Coptic versions, nor is their great worth to be neglected; but the insistence asserted here seeks to distinguish the date when the version was made and the date of the earliest point to which we can

---

3 Scrivener, Plain Intro<sup>3</sup>, p. 524c

at present trace this handing down of the version-line. What occurred between the making of the version and the earliest manuscripts available? These must not be allowed to turn us from the superior Greek line of transmission.

To revert to the tendency first observed above, it is natural but none the less unsafe for critics to allow this period of segmentary research on local texts to overthrow the main stream of Greek tradition. It is comparable to paddling in the backwaters or tributary streams and claim that one is in the very middle of the stream. A deep knowledge of Latin and other languages is valuable for the textual critic, but above all his getting the feel of the Greek, his insight into the nuances of the speech itself, and his approach to all the other languages requisite for the textual critic from the watchtower of the Koine are on the priority list for him.

### 3. A Veering toward Conjectural Emendation.

The strange thing about this anomaly is that conjectural emendation and its consequent turning from documentary evidence has come just when the objective data for a sound science of Textual Criticism has reached a peak and breadth never known before. Tregelles warned against it, and it was to be hoped that Hort had forever established the science on documentary evidence. The early date and the freedom of P<sup>45</sup>

call aloud for a return from any leaning toward a pure subjectivism. That is exactly what conjectural emendation is. One may as justly push his conjecture as another, and if this continues, confusion alone can be the result.

## II. THE TESTIMONY OF P<sup>45</sup>

Certain phases of the testimony of P<sup>45</sup> may be focused around the following points:

1. The Accuracy of the Text. It is known that the text of the Beatty Collection confirms the integrity of both the Greek Old Testament and the Greek New Testament. It also pushes back the documentation of the Bible books a century beyond the great uncials. Since a document hardly ever represents an archetype contemporary with itself, it may be safe to conclude that the ancestor of P<sup>45</sup> must be fifty or more years older than the papyrus. We can be assured that the readings of our papyrus are old, the oldest we have of any considerable extent.

2. The Spread of the Text. P<sup>45</sup> gives enough unquestioning testimony to the Caesarean type of text to show that it had spread, even if it originated at Caesarea, to Egypt. The conviction is growing on scholars that the text may not have originated at Caesarea but have had only an



important center there. However, this point is vitally involved in one's view of the exact nature of both the text of P<sup>45</sup> and of the Caesarean group.

### 3. Modifications and Confirmations of Hort.

This papyrus with its mates gives evidence against the Burgon contention and for the critical text of Hort. But to say that it has seriously upset, far from overthrown, the general position of Hort is to beg the question. The whole state of discussion and investigation is still too unsettled for such a conclusion.

### 4. The Rating of the Family. This is the most knotty and yet the most entrancing of the problems today. Streeter most likely was a bit premature in rating his group as a full-fledged family alongside the other great families. That there is stratification in the 'Western' is now more fully known, but to know just what to do about it is still the matter fondly desired by textual critics.

One may argue that this group deserves as much as Hort's Alexandrian ever did to be called a family. That may be granted, but was the Alexandrian ever a family? Was it not rather a textual process or tendency modifying others, especially the Neutral? Yet this modification does not rule out the Neutral from still rating as the best family.

This point seems to be pretty well made out that the

Caesarean witnesses may be a part of a way of dealing with the text, a process towards the roots of which investigators must still dig before they can announce that they have brought forth the taproot of the matter.

The only other conclusion the writer wishes to record now is that Lake and others may be right in thinking that P<sup>45</sup> stratifies the Caesarean Family and gives us truly a Pre-Caesarean type. One may venture to think that this is the true route in the investigations of the future. It is sure that P<sup>45</sup> brings us nearer to our goal. If it can be shown that it is truly Pre-Western, Pre-Neutral, and Pre-Caesarean, as the writer quite diffidently surmises, then its importance can but increase.

It will clear the matter somewhat to say that a change in the names of Hort's families does not change the genius of his theory. Streeter saw that more clearly than some of his fellow-craftsmen. The situation at present does not weaken the Hortian view but rather widens the testimony and gives us a surer basis for reconstructing the New Testament Text. Light is what we all seek. Subjectivism must be out. The evidence must speak, and it is not weak nor indecisive on the great issues. Perhaps if the study needed were completed, one might say the same on finer points.

The route of the investigation of local texts is the route by which to get behind them to the true text. The

thing about Streeter's view that commends itself to the present writer is that it seeks to stay on the historical level instead of dealing with hypothetical matters beyond the knowledge of textual critics. The modern method of postulating conjectures as if they were facts will never bring us to the desired solution of the problems, so intricate and multiform, of New Testament Textual Criticism.

The writer had hoped that this study might bring assurance as to some concrete solutions of textual problems. He has some ideas, but they must be left for further development. Beside Hort's quandary about 'Neutral non-interpolations' and a few other readings, the facts now point to leaving the critical text as it stands until further research can be made or new materials come to hand.

### III. DESIDERATA

Not all the desiderata of New Testament Textual Criticism are pertinent here but only such as the present study points out, clarifies, and accentuates. That means that one must pass by suggesting the desire for more critical editions of the Ante-nicene fathers and their use, the study of P<sup>46</sup> and P<sup>47</sup> relative to their respective portions of the New Testament text, and the crying need for a new Tischendorf better than Legg, unlike Von Soden, and on the lines

Tischendorf so well followed (but in English or some modern European language).

Something of insecurity inheres in the study of the Caesarean Text so long as the prevailing custom continues of taking a mere segment for study. Research into the various witnesses or near-witnesses to such a text-type must proceed until the four Gospels are covered throughout in each case. Fuller studies of the use of this text by Origen and Eusebius call aloud for some interested researcher. Scholars with knowledge of Coptic, Syriac, Georgian, Armenian, and Persian are needed to press further the investigations of the relations of these to this matter of local texts. The door to such efforts is open through acquaintance with the Koine Greek, a fair knowledge of Latin, and such other linguistic equipment (the more the better) as his particular task demands. One worker or even a few workers cannot complete the onerous but rewarding undertaking.

More concretely one may suggest that the student may take P<sup>45</sup> through the whole of Luke, or through the whole of Mark, or through the eleventh chapter of John, or study the papyri portions that are parallel with this discovery. Or, the investigator may take the newly discovered Coptic (Subachmimic) manuscript of John and study its relations to the Caesarean and other types of text. A good praxis in this field is the study of any manuscript available to the

interested student in its relation to the Streeter-type of text. Why does not, finally and most concretely, some one or ones get interested in studying the affinities of Codex Robertsonianus? Much interesting and fruitful thesis material lies near the surface for the earnest digger.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beermann, Gustav, and Caspar R. Gregory, Koridethi Evangelien. Leipzig: Hinrich, 1913.
- Bengel, John A., Gnomon of the New Testament. 5 vols.; Fourth edition; Translated by A. R. Fausset; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1860.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Novum Testamentum Graecum. Tubingen: George Cotta, 1734.
- Bousset, W., "Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament," Text und Untersuchungen, 10:83, 1893.
- Birks, Thomas Rawson, The Right Estimation of Manuscript Evidence in the Text of the New Testament. London: Macmillan and Company, 1878.
- Blake, R. P., "Rejoinder," Harvard Theological Review, 18:114, January, 1925.
- Bowman, John W., The Robertson Codex. Allahabad: 1928.
- Burton, John W., Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels. Edited by Edward Miller. London: George Bell and Sons, 1896.
- Burkitt, F. C., "W and  $\Theta$  : Studies in the Western Text of Mark," The Journal of Theological Studies, 17:1ff; October, 1915.
- Chase, Frederic H., The Old Syriac Element in the Text of Codex Bezae. London: Macmillan and Company, 1893.
- Colwell, E. C., "Slandered or Ignored?" The Journal of Religion, 17:48-61, January, 1937.
- Crum, W. E., A Coptic Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939.
- Davis, William H., Greek Papyri of the First Century. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1933.
- Dobschutz, Ernst von, Eberhard Nestle's Einfuhrung in das Griechische Neue Testament. Fourth Edition; Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1923.

Ferrar, W. H. and Abbott, A Collation of Four Important Manuscripts of the Gospels. Dublin: 1877.

Gertsinger, Hans, "A Fragment of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex in the Papyrus Collection of the National Library in Vienna," Aegyptus, 13:67-69, 1933.

Goodspeed, Edgar J., "The Freer Gospels," History and Linguistic Studies, First Series. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1914.

Gregory, Caspar R., Novum Testamentum Graece: Prolegomena. Volume three; Leipzig: Hinrich, 1894.

\_\_\_\_\_, Textkritik des Neuen Testaments. Leipzig: Hinrich, 1909.

Griesbach, J. J., Novum Testamentum Graece. Second edition; 2 vols.; London and Halle: Payne and McKinley, 1806.

\_\_\_\_\_, Symbolae Criticae. 2 vols.; Halle: Impensis Io. Jac. Curtii ovidae, 1785.

Hammond, C. E., Outlines of Textual Criticism. Second edition; London: Macmillan and Company, 1876.

\_\_\_\_\_, Outlines of Textual Criticism. Third edition; London: Macmillan and Company, 1880.

Harris, J. Rendel, "Codex Bezae," Texts and Studies. J. Armitage Robinson, editor; Cambridge: University Press, 1891.

\_\_\_\_\_, Further Researches into the History of the Ferrar-Group. London: C. J. Clay and Sons, 1900.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Origin of the Leicester Codex of the New Testament. London: C. J. Clay and Sons, 1887.

Hatch, William H. P., The Principal Uncial Manuscripts of the New Testament. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.

Hauck, A., "Johann Albrecht Bengel" The New Schaff Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Vol. II, 52 f.

Horne, T. H., An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of Holy Scriptures. Eighth edition; 2 vols.; New York: R. Carter and Brothers, 1850.



Horner, G., The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect. 4 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898-1905.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect. 7 vols.; Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1911-1924.

Hoskier, H. C., A Full Treatment and Collation of the Greek Minuscule Codex Evangelium 604. London: 1890.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Von Soden's Text of the New Testament," The Journal of Theological Studies, 15:307-326, April, 1914.

Howard, W. F., "The Greek Bible," The Bible in Its Ancient and English Version. Edited by H. Wheeler Robinson; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.

Hug, John L., Introduction to the New Testament. Translated by David Fosdick. Andover: Gould and Newman, 1836.

Hutton, E. A., An Atlas of Textual Criticism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911.

James, M. R., "Another Book Written by the Scribe of the Leicester Codex" The Journal of Theological Studies, 12: 465f., April, 1911.

\_\_\_\_\_, "The Scribe of the Leicester Codex," The Journal of Theological Studies, 5:445ff, April, 1904.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Two More Manuscripts Written by the Scribe of the Leicester Codex," The Journal of Theological Studies, 11: 291f., January, 1910.

Kenyon, Frederic G., "English Versions of the Bible," The History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge: New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1929.

\_\_\_\_\_, Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. Second edition; London: Macmillan and Company, 1912.

\_\_\_\_\_, Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts. Fourth edition; New York: Harper and Brothers, 1940.

\_\_\_\_\_, Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible. Fasc. VII; London: Emory Walker Limited, 1933.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Codex Alexandrinus. London: Longmans and Company, 1909.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Story of the Bible. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1937.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Text of the Greek Bible. London: Duckworth, 1937.

Lake, Kirsopp, "Codex 1 of the Gospels and its Allies," Text and Studies 7:1-201, 1902.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Some New Members of the Ferrar Group," The Journal of Theological Studies, 1:117-119, 1899.

\_\_\_\_\_, "The Text of the Gospels in Alexandria," American Journal of Theology, 6:88ff., January, 1902.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Text of the New Testament. Second edition; London: Rivingtons, 1902.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Text of New Testament. Fifth edition revised; New York; Edwin S. Gorham, 1916.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Von Soden's Treatment of the Text of the Gospels," Review of Theology and Philosophy, 4:201-295, October-November, 1908.

Lake, Kirsopp and Silva, "Family Thirteen," Studies and Documents, 13:1-161, 1941.

\_\_\_\_\_, Studies and Documents, 13 vols.; London; Christophers, 1941.

Lake, Kirsopp and Silva New, The Text of the New Testament. Sixth edition revised; London: Rivingtons, 1928.

Lake, Kirsopp, Robert P. Blake and Silva New, "The Caesarean Text of the Gospel of Mark," The Harvard Theological Review, 21:208-404, October, 1928.

Lake, Kirsopp and R. P. Blake, "The Text of the Gospels," Harvard Theological Review, 16:267-286, July 1923.

- Lee, Sidney, Dictionary of National Biography. Second edition; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1906.
- Legg, S. C. E., Novum Testamentum Graece: Evangelium Secundum Marcum. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Novum Testamentum Graece: Evangelium Secundum Matthaeum. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.
- Lewis, Agnes S., Light on the Four Gospels from the Sinai Palimpsest. London: Williams and Norgate, 1913.
- Martin, J. P., Quatre Manuscrits Importants du N. T. 1886.
- Metzger, Bruce M., "The Caesarean Text of the Gospels," Journal of Biblical Literature, 64:457-489, December, 1945.
- Michaelis, John D., Introduction to the New Testament. Translated from the fourth German edition by Herbert Marsh; 2 vols; Cambridge: Archdeacon, 1793.
- Mill, John, Novum Testamentum Graecum. Oxford: E Theatro Sheldoniano, 1707.
- Milligan, George, The New Testament Documents. London: Macmillan and Company Limited, 1913.
- Morel, Jean-Baptiste, "Elements de Critique," Première Encyclopédie Théologique, XLVII, 969-1116.
- Murdock, James, The New Testament: A Literal Translation from the Syriac Peshita Version. New York: Stanford and Swords, 1852.
- Nolan, F., An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate. London: 1815.
- Pusey, Philippus E., Tetraeuangelium Sanctum. Edited by Georgius Gwilliam; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901.
- Roberts, Colin H., An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1935.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Two Biblical Papyri in the John Rylands Library. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1936.
- Robertson, A. T., An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. First edition: Nashville. Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, 1925.

- \_\_\_\_\_, An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. Second edition; New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company, 1928.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Studies in the Text of the New Testament. Nashville: Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, 1926.
- Robinson, J. Armitage, "Euthaliana," Text and Studies, 3:77f, 1895.
- Salmon, George, Some Criticism of the Text of the New Testament. London: John Murray, 1897.
- Samson, G. W., English Revisers' Greek Text. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Moses King, 1882.
- Sanders, H. A., "A New Collation of Manuscript 22," Journal of Biblical Literature, 33:91-117, 1914.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "A Third Century Papyrus of Matthew and Acts," Quantulacumque. London: Christophers, 1937.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Facsimile of the Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels in the Freer Collection. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1912.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection," University of Michigan Studies: Humanistic Series. New York: Macmillan, 1918.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1918.
- Schaff, Philip, A Companion to the Greek Testament and the English Version. Fourth edition revised; New York: Harper and Brothers, 1903.
- Schofield, Ellwood M., "The Papyrus Fragments of the Greek New Testament." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, 1936.
- Scholz, John M., Novum Testamentum Graece. 2 vols.; Leipzig: Fr. Fleisher, 1830-36.
- Scrivener, Frederick H., Codex Augiensis. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Company, 1859.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Novum Testamentum. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1901.

- ✓  
 \_\_\_\_\_, A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament. First edition; Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Company, 1863.
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament. Third edition; Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Company, 1883.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Six Lectures on the Text of the New Testament. Cambridge, Deighton, Bell and Company, 1875.
- Simcox, W. H., "Collation of the British Museum Evan. 604," American Journal of Philology, 5:454-465, 1884.
- Simon, Richard, A Critical History of the Text of the New Testament: London: 1689.
- \_\_\_\_\_, A Critical History of the Versions of the New Testament. London: 1692.
- Soden, Hermann F. von, Griechisches Neues Testament. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1913.
- Souter, Alexander, The Text and Canon of the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920.
- Streeter, B. H., "Origen, A and the Caesarean Text," The Journal of Theological Studies, 36:178-180, 1935.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Caesarean Text of Matthew and Luke," The Harvard Theological Review, 28:231-235, July, 1935.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Four Gospels. Fifth edition; London: Macmillan and Company, Limited, 1936.
- Tasker, R. V. G., "The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Caesarean Text of Luke," The Harvard Theological Review, 29:345-352, October, 1936.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Quotations from the Synoptic Gospels in Origen's Exhortation to Martyrdom," The Journal of Theological Studies, 36:60-65, 1935.
- Thompson, Herbert, The Gospel of St. John. London: University College, 1924.
- Tischendorf, Constantinus, Novum Testamentum Graece. Eighth edition; 2 vols.; Leipzig: Hinrich, 1872.

- Tregelles, Samuel P., An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1854.
- Trench, Richard C., Synonyms of the New Testament. Fourth edition revised; Cambridge: Macmillan and Company, 1858.
- Vaganay, Leo, An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, translated by B. V. Miller; London: Sands and Company, 1937.
- Vincent, M. R., A History of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1899.
- Warfield, Benjamin B., Textual Criticism of the New Testament. Fifth edition; New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1898.
- Westcott, Brooke F., and F. J. A. Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek. 2 vols.; New York: Harper and Brothers, 1882.
- Wetstein, Johann J., Novum Testamentum Graecum. Amsterdam: Dommeriana, 1751-2.
- Wordsworth, John, Nouum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine. 3 vols.; Second edition; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889-98.
- Zwaan, J. de, "No Coptic in the Koridethi Codex," Harvard Theological Review, 18:112-114, January, 1925.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Editions of the Freer and Koridethi Gospels," Review of Theology and Philosophy, 9:539, March, 1914.