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Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus has been the neglected member of the family of great uncials. Photographic facsimiles have been produced of B, A, B, D, and the others, but only a sample page or two of the valuable palimpsest is available in textbooks. All the other important codices have been studied more than once. But as regards Codex C only Tischendorf has labored seriously over it. In textbooks on textual criticism, Codex C has been given - almost without exception - less than half the space of any of the other main uncials. To be sure, it is a difficult manuscript to read, and many lacunae exist. Yet because of its age and the quality of its text, every possible piece of information should be accurately extracted from this once beautiful codex. Due to the unwarranted neglect of Codex C, this study was undertaken. The suggestion for a re-examination of the manuscript originated with Professor D. Kurt Aland of Halle in conjunction with the international committee sponsored by the American Bible Society, The National Bible Society of Scotland and the Württemberg Bible Society in Germany.

During the study of the manuscript the work by R. B. Haselden was consulted in the hope that some scientific means might be used to recover more of the lost text of C. Several publications by the Palimpsest-Forschung Institut of the Beuron Monastery were also consulted. Little benefit was realized from these references. Some of the possible scientific aids were not available at the Bibliotheque Nationale in Paris. Others which were used proved to be of negligible value. Light filters and ultraviolet photographs revealed nothing that could not be seen by the unaided eye. Infra-red photographs were able to pierce the "globeri" tinture, but they did not recover what has been lost to time and the eraser. This was rather disconcerting, because at several points the codex could give valuable assistance on troublesome readings. On the other hand 99% of the writing on the extant folios has been transcribed; we shall be satisfied that more has not been taken from us.

This edition varies in several ways from that of Tischendorf. The scriptio continua text with uncial letters (used by Tischendorf to imitate the codex, not to provide a facsimile) has been abandoned in favor of the more readable form used in modern editions of manuscripts. Word divisions, when more than one possibility exists, are purely arbitrary and not the witness of the codex. I have not written the text of the correctors in the body of the text as Tischendorf did, but rather have relegated them entirely in the Appendices. Furthermore, Tischendorf's edition contained only one Appendix with all necessary notes. I have seen fit to separate the work of the different scribes who have worked on the codex. As a result separate Appendices are found containing notes on the text of the original scribe, the two correctors, and finally an Appendix with notes on the edition of Tischendorf to point out where I have corrected his text. In this way the work of each man has been separated and can be referred to more easily. Wherever necessary, cross references are noted. Appropriate remarks are always found when and why I have disagreed with Tischendorf.
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Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus (Gregory: Oh; von Soden: 53) has been in its present home in Paris since 1602 when it was brought from Italy by Catherine de' Medici. The manuscript belonged to the de' Medici family less than one hundred years. It was in the east, perhaps at Constantinople, until the beginning of the sixteenth century, at which time Andrew raster appears to have given it to his patron, Lorenzo de' Medici. In Paris the Codex originally was given the number 1905, but now is listed as Grec 9 in the manuscript department of the Bibliothèque Nationale. 1

Scrivener denied that this manuscript was among those bought by Marshall Strossi.

Until Wetstein studied the manuscript it had been assumed that the librarian Boivin first detected the partly erased text of the Old and New Testaments. Wetstein, however, credited this discovery to the French protestant Peter Allix, and his contention was verified by Tischendorf. To this writer it seems difficult to believe that the earlier writing had remained unnoticed or even that no one knew a biblical text once existed under the thirty-eight sermons of Ephraem of Syria. On many pages from one to six lines stand out clearly at either the top or bottom of the page where the twelfth century text was not written. It is more likely that, because of the condition of the codex, very little significance was attached in pre-text-critical days to the partially hidden text when other more legible texts were available. It remains true, nevertheless, that Peter Allix was the first to make known the earlier contents of the manuscript and thereby establish its value.

Allix made no use of his discovery. The first to cite any readings

---


2. J.J. Wetstein, Novum Testamentum Graecum, Tomus I (Amstelaedami, 1751), p. 27. In his Prolegomena twenty-one years earlier Wetstein assumed, as did everyone else at that time, that Boivin was the discoverer of the lower text.
from Codex C was Kuster, who in 1710 and again in 1723 published Mill’s Greek New Testament and included such readings as were forwarded to him by Boeijn. These citations of Codex C (listed in Kuster’s edition as Paris 9) were very sporadic and in no way a complete or systematic presentation of the text of the manuscript. Further interest in the codex was aroused by the brief description given by Montfaucon and more especially by his facsimile specimen of the script. The first serious attempt to study Codex C and its text was made in 1716 by J.J. Wetstein, then in his early twenties. He first made ample extracts of its text and showed these to Richard Bentley, the Cambridge philologist, who encouraged him to complete his collation. This he did while on leave from his chaplaincy duties. For his work Bentley paid him fifty pounds sterling. Although it was deposited with Bentley in Cambridge, this collation, of course, was never incorporated into Bentley’s projected edition of the Greek New Testament. The first publication of the exact contents of the codex was made in Wetstein’s Prologomena, issued anonymously from Amsterdam in 1730. This was followed in 1751 and 1752 by his Greek New Testament, throughout which the readings of the codex are first cited by its present symbol. Wetstein’s collation was made against the 165th Amsterdam edition of the Textus Receptus. His citations of Codex C represented a highly significant contribution to textual studies although it was not completely satisfactory when judged by later critical standards. Less significant variations, such as addition or omission of the article and differences in word order, were not noted. Wetstein made no indication of places where he was unable to read the text. Furthermore, his attempts to distinguish between the original scribe and the two correctors were quite unsatisfactory. Finally, a

1. Ludolph Kuster, Novum Testamentum Graecum, etc. 2nd ed. (Lipsiae: Filii J. Friderici Geditschii, 1723). This second edition was merely the unaltered stocks of the first edition with a new title page. On page 1b of his Praefatio Kuster described briefly the manuscript and states that the citations in the apparatus were received from Boeijn. In all likelihood Kuster had not even see the codex.


not insignificant number of errors had been found in his collation.

After Wetstein numerous scholars examined the codex and testified
to the competency of his work. More than one, however, voiced the
sentiment that more could yet be garnered by another careful study of
the text. Griesbach desired that as much as was still legible be
printed letter for letter. This concern on the part of Griesbach was
probably heightened by what he thought was a marked deterioration in
the condition of the manuscript. He was unable to detect many places
which Wetstein had read. Although he studied the manuscript to some
extent, he added only two readings (Mark 6:2, 4) to those cited by
Wetstein. A generation later Lachmann indicated the same that was
waiting for the scholar who would undertake to publish a complete edi-
tion of the Codex. He was the first, it appears, to suggest the ap-
plication of a chemical re-agent to bring out the latent text.

The next significant move was made by F.F. Fleck of Leipzig who
studied the manuscript in 1834-35. At his instance the "globerti"
tincture was applied by the library authorities to the vast majority of
folios. This application undoubtedly facilitated the deciphering
of the codex, and has restored previously illegible sections of the
text. In numerous places, however, the workers have betrayed their
lack of experience in this type of manuscript work by leaving large
black spots where the tincture was almost splashed on the folios. His
study indicated certain facts relative to the history of the codex and
will be discussed later. He added nothing to the list of variant read-
ings. He left that task to another greater than himself who was to
come after him.

1. cf. John David Michaelis, Introduction to the New Testament,
trans, from the 4th edition by Herbert Marsh, Vol. II, Part I (Cambridge:

2. J.J. Griesbach, Symbolae Criticae, Tausus Prior (Halse, 1785),
p. vii.

3. Carl Lachmann, "Rechenschaft über seine Ausgabe des neuen Testa-
ments," Theologische Studien und Kritiken, XII (1830), p. 831f.

4. F.F. Fleck, "Über die Handschrift des neuen Testamentes gewöhnlich
Codex Ephraemi Syri Recenscriptus genannt in der Königlichen Bibliothek zu
In 1840 C. Tischendorf at the age of 25 and fresh from his appointment to the faculty at Leipzig came to Paris to produce the first complete text of the codex with a thorough Introduction and copious notes in an Appendix. Almost without exception the scholarly world accorded its unreserved praise and many assumed that the codex need not be further examined. Yet others did look at the manuscript, if for no reason other than to gain an adequate appreciation of Tischendorf's accomplishment. Tragellis looked at the codex several times to satisfy his own mind as regards the variant reading in 1 Timothy 3:16, but he made no serious attempt to test the accuracy of Tischendorf. The learned Italian, A. Ceriani, however, did question the accuracy of Tischendorf's work, but his call for a new examination of the codex fell on deaf ears. It is probable that no one felt the limited improvement on the text of Tischendorf would be worth the immense amount of painstaking labour involved in reading so difficult a manuscript. Hermann von Soden shows his acquiescence to Tischendorf's edition and makes no mention that either he or his assistants looked at the codex. On the other hand he lists as Schreibfehler readings in Tischendorf's text which are clearly wrong and which could have been easily corrected had he felt the need to verify those readings.

More than one hundred years have passed since Tischendorf published his edition of Codex C. This writer has not been able to note a single instance of a critic finding any errors in this standard edition. With

1. Constantinus Tischendorf, Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus sive Fragmenta veteris Testamenti e Codice Graeco Parisiensi Celeberrimo Quodt di Vindobonae Christiani Seculi (Lipsiae: Berth. Tauchnitz, 1855). The New Testament was printed and published separately in 1843. In the 1845 edition various printer's errors found in the former edition have been corrected. Throughout this edition the 1845 edition of Tischendorf is used.


the availability of new photographic techniques and the possibility that another century might have favorably affected the New Testament text, the time seemed right for a new and thorough examination of this very valuable and significant witness to the ancient text of the New Testament.

II Description of the Codex

A. Condition and Appearance.

The present condition of our codex is far from its original glory. "It is," as Gregory has said, "like a man who has been raised in the war. Its beauty and fulness are departed." Yet vestiges of its former glory are seen clearly in its square, smooth script as the lines of its solid single column stretch across the page. Its early color was light tan vellum with a dark brown ink. On a very few pages unaffected by the tincture, these colors are seen to be only slightly modified by time. The first three lines of each book of the New Testament were written in a very non-durable vermillion ink, of which no traces can be seen. Most of the pages, however, are a greenish blue with every shade from light green to dark blue. The original letters are now dark blue or blue green and, at times, almost black. The upper twelfth century script is black and often gives a blotted appearance due to the tincture. At several points where the tincture appears to have been spilled, black or blue-black smudges have obscured the text.

By those who have been able to make the comparison, the vellum is not considered to have as high a quality as the other primary New Testament uncials, especially Codex A. The present condition of the individual folios varies considerably. Many are quite firm and do not show any appreciable amount of wear and tear. These leaves have no holes and their margins are still close to their original size. Others have not fared as well. Holes have been caused either by the erasures of the early correctors or by the person who first dismantled the codex to write the sermons of Ephraem. In many places these erasures have made the folios

transparently thin. A very limited number are quite vitiated throughout with holes and creases or folds, and are held intact by tape. The twelfth century scribe who wrote the upper text was not unduly concerned to erase the early text, but rather he depended on his heavier pen and darker ink to obscure the biblical text. For this we can be thankful. Most of the text can be copied with absolute certainty. On the other hand numerous significant readings are quite indistinct or even permanently lost.

At the present time the codex is made up of two hundred-eight leaves, of which one hundred-forty-five are of the New Testament. When Tischendorf studied the manuscript there was one more folio, but for some unexplained reason folio 133 of the present binding — the one used for a facsimile by Tischendorf — has disappeared. The present binding is according to the upper text; the lower text has been thoroughly mixed. More than a few folios were reversed when the later text was written so that the top of a page of the sermons is the bottom of the page of the biblical text. The folios are preceded by four modern leaves. The first, dated 23 November 1883, contains the following note: Volume de 209 feuillets de fol. 138 manque/ C. Tischendorf a donne dans son Codex Sphraemi Syri rescriptus (Lipsiae, 1845,) un fac-simile d'une page de ce feuillet, qui contenait un fragment de l'Ecclesiaste, 5, 5 - 6, 10.

Two others are indices for locating the biblical text. One has the folios numbered consecutively and notes the portion of the biblical text contained on each folio. The other is a reverse index which lists the chapters of the New Testament and then gives the folio or folios which contain the separate chapters. The fourth leaf contains notes on the text and specimens of the script.

B. The Format.

It has already been mentioned that Codex 8 has only one column per page. The full lines contain approximately 40 letters, although on some

1. That this page is missing was, apparently, first noted in 1883 at which time a note to this effect was placed in the beginning of the codex. As far as I know no one has, directly or indirectly, laid the blame for its absence to Tischendorf.
pages the number of letters per line is only 35 or 36. There are generally 41 lines per page; but on three pages 42 lines have been written, while the two extant folios of 1 Peter have 46 lines on all four pages. On six occasions the scribe added two to five letters below the last letters of the last line. The lines are evenly spaced, having been marked out by a sharp stylus whose imprint can usually be seen quite clearly. The scribe has freely used the paragraph system. From four to twelve lines per page have not been filled. This characteristic is seen much less in Revelation and somewhat less in some of the Pauline epistles than elsewhere. Large marginal letters have been used regularly, but apparently not according to any pattern. They are used at the beginnings of paragraphs and Ammonian sections, but they have also been used in the middle of words. They probably provided a limited artistic touch in an otherwise straightforward format.

Two punctuation marks are seen throughout the manuscript. The high period is placed approximately at the top of the letters and usually occupies a little less space than one letter. The other sign is a small cross. From these punctuation marks two questions arise: (1) Does the period represent one mark throughout the codex, or more than one depending on its height above the line? The latter proposition was defended by Hug who stated that a stop was placed at the foot of a letter for a comma; for a colon the stop was placed in the middle of the letter. This contention was accepted by others, but was rightly rejected by Tischendorf as an invention of the critics. No such technical system was used by the original scribe. (2) The second question is whether the original scribe ever used the small cross, especially at the end of a paragraph, or whether in every instance this cross is to be credited to a corrector.

1. None of the pages of the manuscript has only 40 lines, despite what Tischendorf has said to the contrary. On the page he mentions as having only 40 lines he has skipped one line completely. The page containing Philippians, however, does have 40 lines, but this is because the text of that letter ends on line 40. Tischendorf also notes that the first page of 1 Corinthians has 42 lines. But on this see Appendix A.

This problem cannot be settled so peremptorily. In most places the cross is easily assigned to the corrector because it is squeezed between letters or added above the line. Only at the end of a major passage is there any question: Hug claimed the original scribe did use the cross in these instances. Tischendorf was not prepared to be so dogmatic as in the previous question regarding the high period; yet he did not hesitate to differ again with Hug. Very often this cross is quite indistinct, but when it is seen clearly, it does not have the same solid stroke characteristic of the first scribe. Even more damaging to Hug's position is the fact that at the end of a paragraph both the high period and the cross are often seen. It is highly unlikely that one scribe would have placed two different punctuation marks together. In the light of these observations we can definitely reject the statements of Hug and accept the conclusions of Tischendorf that the first scribe used only one punctuation mark, namely, the high period.

The uncial writing is continuous except for the limited use of the high period. No accents or breathing marks were included by the original scribe, but were added by a later hand. For the diaeresis over the \( \textcircled{u} \) and \( \textcircled{u} \) at the beginning of a syllable a straight line is used rather than one or two dots. In the margin the Ammonian sections are found in all four gospels, but at present the Hesbalian canons are not seen. It is quite likely, as others have mentioned, that these were written with the same vermilion ink that was used at the beginning of each book and have likewise disappeared. There are no \textit{κεφαλαία} on the pages of the text, but lists of \textit{Τίτλοι} preceded the four gospels. Of these \textit{Τίτλοι}, however, only those for Luke and John are now extant. The titles at the beginning of each book and subscriptions at the end are extremely simple with no added artistic touch such as is found, for example, in the Sinaitic codex. The titles to the gospels are simply \textit{Εὐαγγέλιον κατά Ματθαίον, Εὐαγγελίων κατὰ Λούκαν, Εὐαγγελίων κατὰ Ἰωάννην}

1. Loc. cit., on neither of these questions of punctuation did Hug alter his position in the fourth German edition of his Einleitung published in 1847 after the appearance of Tischendorf's Prolegomena.

2. E.g., Scrivener, op. cit., p. 123.
The first page of Mark is missing and are written with the more permanent brown ink in letters slightly larger than those of the text. The subscriptions at the end of the gospels are identical to the titles. No trace is left of the title of Acts. For the Pauline epistles the subscriptions are simply προς Ῥωμαίους, and so forth. Those for the catholic epistles are Ιακώβου ἐπιστολή, and so forth.

The nomina sacra written by the scribe are those generally used at that time in New Testament manuscripts:

\( \zeta, \iota, \eta \)
\( \theta, \theta, \theta, \theta \)
\( \chi, \chi, \chi, \chi \)
\( \pi, \pi, \pi, \pi \)
\( \nu, \nu, \nu, \nu \)
\( \alpha, \alpha, \alpha, \alpha \)
\( \kappa, \kappa, \kappa, \kappa \)
\( \pi, \pi, \pi, \pi \)
\( \mu, \mu, \mu, \mu \)
\( \delta, \delta, \delta, \delta \)
\( \epsilon \)

βαβεβα is used once, in Matthew 2,16. The word ουμανος is shortened very infrequently. ιοπαλλα is always shortened, usually to ιολα, but once in Luke to ιελα, and in Acts everytime but once to ιελα. The και compendium is never used and the same may be said for all other ligatures. Once (in Romans 16,21) at the end of the line the original scribe wrote μοι in the following fashion: The horizontal line at the end of a line for μ is used regularly, but not always. No other abbreviations or variations are made from the straight lettered text.

C. The Contents.

All twenty-seven canonical books were contained in Codex C. There is no evidence that any extra-canonical books were included. The following are the exact contents of the codex in its present form:
Matthew
1. 2 - καὶ τοὺς αδελφοὺς 5.15 - καὶ οὐσίαν λυ
2 leaves missing
7.5 - δοξον, καὶ τοτε 17.26 - αὐτῶ ο Ἰς ἀρα
1 leaf missing
19.13 - μοι εἰ τι οφείλεις 22.20 - καὶ η ἑπιγραφή
1 leaf missing
23.17 - ἡ ο ναος αγιαξων 24.10 - πολλοι καὶ ἀλλήλους
1 leaf missing
24.45 - εαυτου του δουναί 25.30 - δούλον ἐκβαλεται
1 leaf missing
26.22 - εἰς εκαστος μητι 27.11 - των ουδαίων
1 leaf missing
27.47 - τινες δε των 28.14 - ποιησομεν
1 leaf missing
Mark
1.17 - υμας γενεσθαι 6.31 - φαγειν ημκαιρουν
2 leaves missing
8.5 - πον επτα, και παρ 12.29 - ημων ζε ει εστιν
1 leaf missing
13.19 - ται γαρ αι τιμαι to the end. (16.20)
Luke
1. 2 - και υπηρεται 2.5 - εμνηστευμενη αυτω
1 leaf missing
2.42 - λυμα κατα το εθος 3.21 - απαντα τον λαου
1 leaf missing
4.25 - επι ετη τρια 6.4 - εφαγεν και ἐδωκε
1 leaf missing
6.37 - και μη κρινετε 7.16 - τον λαον αυτου
2 leaves missing
8.28 - νη μεγαλη ειπεν 12.3 - επι των δωματων
9 leaves missing
19.42 - σου οτι ηγουσιν 20.27 - επηρωτηραιν αυτο
1. Because of the amount of space available it is not possible for the missing leaves to have contained the synopsis de adulteria.
1 leaf missing
24.15 - πιθανον εχων προς
26.19 - διειθησε τη
1 leaf missing
27.16 - φης την αράντες
28.4 - ζην ουκ ειασεν
1 leaf missing

James
1.2 - περιπεσητε ποιχι
4.2 - και πολεμείτε
1 leaf missing

1 Peter
1.2 - πνοεις εις υπακοην
4.5 - ζωντας και νεκρους
1 leaf missing

2 Peter
1.2 - χαρις υμιν to the end.

1 John
1.2 - καμεν και μαρτ.
4.2 - εληλυθοτα εκ του θυ
2 leaves missing

3 John
3 - εχαρην γαρ to the end.

Jude
3 - αγαπητοι πασαν to the end.

Romans
1.3 - του γενομενου
2.4 - μετανοιαν δε αγει και
1 leaf missing
3.21 - και των προφητων
9.5 - εις την αιωνας αμην
1 leaf missing
10.15 - μη αποσταλασιν
11.31 - και ουτοι νυν ημει
1 leaf missing
13.10 - ουν νομου η αγαπη to the end.

1 Corinthians
1.3 - χαρις υμιν
7.18 - μη επισπασθω
1 leaf missing
9.7 - γαξεσθαι τις στρατ.
13.8 - ειτε γλωσσαι
2 leaves missing
15.40 - μεν η των επ. to the end.
2 Corinthians
1.2 - καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ δῶ 10.8 - καθαρευών υμῶν
3 leaves missing

Galatians
1.21 - εὐεξία ἡλέον to the end.

Ephesians
2.18 - οἱ αμφοτεροὶ
4.16 - εαυτοῦ εν αγαπῇ
2 leaves missing

Philippians
1.22 - ρησομένων γεωργίῳ
3.5 - ἡ φυλής βενια
1 leaf missing

Colossians
1.2 - χάρις υμῖν to the end.

1 Thessalonians
1.2 - εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ δῶ
2.8 - ὑμῖν εὐεξηθεὶς
2 leaves missing

Hebrews
2.4 - μερισμοίς κατὰ τὴν
7.16 οοιος ακακος
1 leaf missing

9.15 - εστὶν ὁποῖος θεον.
10.24 - εἰς παροξυσμὸν ἀγά
3 leaves missing

12.16 - μὴ τίς πορνὸς to the end.

1. Eberhard Nestle, in his Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament (London: Williams and Norgate, 1901), p. 63, erroneously stated that the whole of 1 Thessalonians had been lost.

2. In his Prolegomena (p.15) Tischendorf explains sufficiently the reasons for stating that Hebrews originally followed 2 Thessalonians.

3. It is possible that Wetstein saw the folio that contained Hebrews 11.15 - 12.16? In his Prolegomena Wetstein stated that Codex C was desunt from 10.24-11.15 instead of from 10.24-12.16 - that is, only one folio was lost instead of two. His statement could be dismissed lightly as an inaccuracy except for the fact that 11.15 is precisely where the second of the two missing pages would have begun. He must have had a reason for picking out verse 11.15. Against the possibility that he saw this folio is the fact that in his New Testament he stops citing codex C at 10.24 and doesn't resumes again until 12.16. This does not prove, however, that he never saw this folio.
1 Timothy
3.9 - ριον της πιστεως
5.19 - η τριων μαρτυρων
1 leaf missing

2 Timothy
1.5 - χαριν εχω τω δω to the end.

Titus
1.2 - προ χρονων to the end.

Philemon
3 - χαρις υμιν to the end

Revelation
1.2 - ος εμαρτυρησεν
3.19 - ζηλευε ουν και μετα
1 leaf missing
5.14 - κυνηγαν και ειδον
7.14 - μοι ουτοι εισιν
1 leaf missing
9.17 - και ουτως ειδον
16.13 - πνευματα τρια ακαθαρ
1 leaf missing
16.2 - παντος ορνεου
19.5 - αυτον οι μιχροι
3 leaves missing

From these contents we may present the following table:

Number of leaves preserved: 145

Number of leaves missing:

- Matthew: 7½
- Mark: 3½
- Luke: 18
- John: 14
- Acts: 12
- Catholic Epistles: 4
- Pauline Epistles: 22
- Revelation: 6

Total: 145

Total Folios originally in New Testament: 232

1. Because of a fortuitous textual transposition on the leaf containing Rev. 10.9 - 11.12, the contents of that page should be given in
It is easily seen that all the New Testament books are represented except 2 Thessalonians and 2 John. Several of the smaller epistles are extant in their entirety except for the first three colored lines. On the other hand Luke and, more especially, John are somewhat fragmentary. Luke 12.14-19.42 is the largest lost section.

D. The Script.

The letters in this codex are larger than those of the other "big three" New Testament uncials. In execution the letters are more like the Alexandrian Codex in the British Museum than either the Vatican or Sinaitic manuscripts. The letters most similar to Codex A are α, γ, (although a little more erect in Codex C), Π (the horizontal stroke is high), Θ, Κ, Λ, Μ, Ν (at times the body is almost diamond-shaped: Θ), and Ω. The books on the ends of ε, ζ, and η are quite pronounced.

Gamma is only two-thirds as wide as other square letters. The base of delta extends beyond its two legs and sometimes to the next letter. This base has a smaller hook than, for example, the τ. The diagonal stroke of μ joins the vertical strokes just short of the ends of these strokes.

The tail of the rho curls at the end; ρ. The two arms of upsilon

An adequate explanation for this phenomenon is given by Harold Oliver, "A Textual Transposition in Codex C," JBL LIXVI (1957), pp. 231-236. A further note might well be added on the text of Revelation. H. R. Charles in his commentary on the Apocalypse has stated that the text of C is "most carefully written." (The Revelation of St. John, IGC Series, Vol. I (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1920), p. 150.) This statement must be qualified. One item will show why: in chapters 10-16 a significant number of omissions — often by homoteleuton — is noted. Because they may have a relationship to the conclusions reached by Oliver, these omissions are listed here: (a) 10.2 — ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ; (b) 10.8 — ΣΥΜ ΤΩ ΘΕΟΥ; (c) 12.11 — ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ; (d) 13.16 — ΧΙΛΊΑΝ ΧΙΛΙΕΣ; (e) 13.15 — ΙΩΑΝΝΗΣ; (f) 13.15 — ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ; (g) 16.13 — ΑΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ; (h) 15.3 — ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ; (i) 16.13 — ΆΛΦΑΒΗΤΟΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ; (j) 17.11 — ΣΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ. By insisting on qualifying Charles' statement, we do not in any way degrade the basic quality of the text of C in the Apocalypse. But the scribe's peculiarities are still frequent and apparent.

2. If, as was undoubtedly so, the Titeloi for Matthew and Mark were included in the codex the number of missing folios is 59 and the total number originally in the codex was 234.

3. In his Handbook to the Textual Criticisms of the New Testament p. 73 F.G. Kenyon stated, "Then complete, the New Testament would have occupied 238 leaves." Did he include pages for Titeloi of Acts, the catholic epistles, the Pauline epistles and Revelation? No evidence exists for such an assumption.
meet at or very near the base line. One of the strokes of χι is curled slightly: X. The vertical stroke of ρσι is not so long as in Codex A.

The impression of this script is one of majesty and indicates that the manuscript was almost certainly produced in a scriptorium or, at least, by a professional scribe.

It is scarcely worthwhile to note the comment made by Wetstein as regards the date of Codex C. He drew attention to a note added to the text of Hebrews and concluded the manuscript was written before A.D. 542. Aside from the validity of the argument, the conclusion is insignificant since no one is inclined to date the manuscript so late. The question of the date of Codex C is usually decided largely on paleographic grounds. Our codex is later than both Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiacus, but not later than Codex Alexandrinus. In addition to the writing Hinckendorf cited the limited punctuation, the very simple subscriptions, and its textual affinities as evidence of the manuscript's antiquity. The fact that its single column represents, to a certain extent, a development from the three and four columns of B and B must also be considered. The absence of any Lachian apparatus in the Pauline epistles indicates a limit on how late the codex may be placed. When all items are considered, we see no reason to reject the general conclusion that Codex C belongs to the first half of the first century.

Hinckendorf correctly noted that different scribes wrote the Old and New Testament sections of Codex C. Much less certainty remains as to whether more than one scribe had a hand in copying the New Testament. No hint of different scribes is found in variations of the script, but we cannot on this basis alone preclude the possibility of more than one scribe. Scholars faced the same problem in Codex B, yet they have successfully located the different writers. Several notes on the orthography of the manuscript should be instructive. The tltiism in Codex B is seen throughout the manuscript. The verbal suffixes, θαλ, θα, and ταλ, τε are interchanged regularly with one exception: they are not confused in the fourth gospel. This indication of a change in John can be followed up

by other observations. Aside from one instance in Luke, the codex always has the spelling \textit{ תָּלָקַט}. But in John \textit{דָּלָקַט} is found every time. A peculiarity found only, but regularly, in John is \textit{מָטָאָנִּים}. In none of the other gospels is the pre-modern omitted so frequently as in John. Furthermore, John alone of the gospels frequently has \textit{אַתְּרָוָה} 1 rather than \textit{אַתָּרָה}. Finally we notice that once the scribe wrote \textit{כֹּל} for \textit{כּל}. The combined weight of these differences in John, if they cannot be explained by a difference in the history of its text, suggest that another hand might have written the fourth gospel. 2

It has been suggested by others that a different scribe wrote the book of Acts. The use of \textit{אָחָא} instead of \textit{אָחָה} for \textit{אָחָה} is taken as a clear indication of a different scribe. Taken by itself this is probably not sufficient to substantiate the theory of another hand. But the more than usual carelessness of the scribe is also impressive. One gets the idea that the writer of Acts was not thoroughly at home with the Greek language — or at least with Lukan syntax and vocabulary. This fact of the carelessness of the scribe, however, can be stressed too much. Any number of factors — such as health, emotional problems, lighting — could explain a temporary lapses from the scribe’s customary accuracy. 3

Only one other possibility is worth mentioning as regards the different scribes. In the text of Revelation the scribe has written \textit{אָרְעָא} for \textit{אָרְעָא} several times. This orthographic error is not found elsewhere in the manuscript. As in Acts the scribe has been more careless than usual, but this

1. A number of times the name is not found because the pages are lost, but in each gospel the name is found more than once.

2. This omission of the pre-modern is found even more often in the Pauline epistles, but this part of the codex shows none of the other characteristics of the fourth gospel so as to suggest that the scribe of John was also the scribe of the Pauline corpus.

3. Of even greater significance is the slight difference in the subscription at the end of John. Here the subscription is written on two lines: \textit{אֶלֶּהַנַּהַנַּהַנַּהַנַּה לְאֶלֶּהַנַּהַנַּהַנַּה קָטָאָנִּים}. In Mark and Luke (the end of Matthew is missing) the subscription is written on one line: \textit{אֶלֶּהַנַּהַנַּהַנַּה קָטָאָנַּהַנַּהַנַּה קָטָאָנַּהַנַּה קָטָאָנַּהַנַּה}. 4


5. On this basis we could allude that for Tischendorf’s edition of Codex C different persons copied the text of Matthew (where I have found 1.3 errors per folio) and the catholic epistles (where I have found 3.4 errors per folio).
is of doubtful value in assessing the possibilities of different scribes. The general problem of the text in Revelation is so complex in itself.

No other variations have been found to suggest different scribes. The horizontal line for \( \chi \) at the end of a line is used with equal frequency and is marked identically throughout the codex. The crowded letters at the ends of the lines show no variation. Punctuation does not vary except in the fourth gospel where the author's style probably explains the increased use of the high period. We conclude by emphasizing that cases for different scribes are best supported in John and Acts, especially the former, and that slight evidence is also found in Revelation for another writer.

III Provenance of the Manuscript.

Our discussion of the provenance of the Codex C might most profitably begin with a summary of Tischendorf's comments. Tischendorf traces the travels of the codex backwards, noting first that it was probably brought to Italy either from the area of Constantinople or Constantinople itself. Of this we may be fairly certain. To go beyond this Tischendorf relied more on conjecture and a personal interpretation of the very limited evidence in the manuscript itself. He assumed that the difference between the first and third hands could not be explained entirely by the lapse of time. A difference in location was also necessary. He turned, therefore, to Alexandria. This was probably inevitable since more is known of the text and manuscripts of this area than any other corner of the ancient world.

His bases for claiming Egypt or Alexandria as the homeland of Codex C are its similarity to Codex Alexandrinus and, to a letter extent, other codices generally assumed to have come from Egypt. He then notes various spellings and errors in the text which suggest an Egyptian origin. He failed to note, however, one fairly solid piece of evidence mentioned by Milne and Skeat in support of an Egyptian origin. These scholars noted that Codex C has

\[ \text{\textit{\textepsilon\textit{\textepsilon\textit{\textepsilon\textit{\textepsilon\textit{\textepsilon}}}}} \text{six times out of seven instead of \textit{\textepsilon\textit{\textepsilon\textit{\textepsilon\textit{\textepsilon\textit{\textepsilon}}}}}}. \]

But this type

1. cf. his Introduction, p. 15ff.

of evidence must be used cautiously. Attention should be drawn to words of Tragelles written more than a century ago: "... the occurrence of Alexandrian forms in a MS of the New Testament does not prove that Egypt was the country of such a MS as to its origin." Still unsolved is the problem of how widely diffused Alexandrian Greek was in New Testament times and during the early history of the transmission of the text. Until we know this we cannot assign a manuscript to Egypt simply because it contains some Egyptian forms. If Alexandrian critics set the pace as regards the New Testament text, as Zuntz asserts, then the stream of influence worked out from Alexandria and our limited evidence remains ambiguous. Milne and Skeat should again be quoted. "Unfortunately we have no evidence to show how uniform the scribal tradition of the Graeco-Roman world was at this period, and until that is decided no amount of similarity can be used to decide origin." There are no fortuitous spellings or confusion of proper names as have been found in Codex Sinaiticus to suggest a possible origin. Critics have generally voiced their hesitancy to locate Codex C. Our examination adds nothing to a possible solution. We must be content to pose the problem and give a likely solution.

IV The Correctors

We have already noted that two different correctors have altered or added to the text of Codex C. Before their work is discussed a few comments will be made concerning corrections made to his own text by the original scribe.


A. Corrections by the Original Scribe.

The first scribe has rarely corrected his own text. These instances are all noted in the appendices and need not be enumerated here. What is somewhat surprising in a deluxe manuscript such as Codex C is for the scribe to show so little concern with his corrections. These corrections may be divided into two classes according to the way they have been made. (1) Most of the time the scribe has erased some letters and written over the erasures. This erasing has not been done so thoroughly as the erasing done by the first corrector. The original letters can usually be seen fairly easily under the present text. The erasures are not very extensive. He never erased a full line to add letters. The most he has erased is about twelve letters; usually the erasure is limited to three or four letters. (2) A limited number of corrections have been made, not by erasing, but by adding a single smaller letter either between letters or above a letter. In Revelation 13.15, for example, the scribe wrote εθεος and then added θ above the theta: εθεος. Very seldom are any of the corrections by the original scribe significant for textual criticism. Usually they correct obvious scribal blunders.

B. The First Corrector.

Because of the style of his script the first corrector is usually dated a century after the first scribe, or about the middle of the sixth century. This need not be questioned, but it might be safer to be more general and date him anytime in the sixth century. The stroke of his pen is not so heavy as that of the original scribe; neither is his script too elegant, though it is far from the slovenliness of the second corrector. The letters are slightly smaller and normally lean slightly to the right. Even if he has ample space, his letters are still smaller.

This corrector has made an attempt to preserve the good appearance of the manuscript. He never crosses out words or letters to write between the lines. Erasing was his common (though not sole) method of correcting the text. These erasures vary in thoroughness; in some places the original letters are clearly seen; in others even infra-red photographs have not brought out the erased text. The erasures also vary from a single
letter to four or five complete lines. In this way the corrector has tried to avoid writing in the margins, although from time to time he does violate the right margin. Many times the corrector erased letters or words without adding anything to the text. In these instances of omissions he has left the place blank and has not attempted to space the remaining letters evenly. It may well be asked how we know that such omissions were made by the first corrector since there is no script by which to identify him. To this we can only say that such erasures are not known to have been made by the second corrector who either crossed out or encircled with dots what he wished to omit from the text. These erasures are not by the second corrector. They are, therefore, either by the first corrector or by another corrector who erased the text before the codex came into the hands of the second corrector. Some indeed have questioned if there might not be more than two correctors. But if some of the omissions are to be assigned to a third hypothetical corrector, then this corrector's work was strictly limited to erasing. Only two hands other than the original scribe are seen to have worked on the manuscript. We cannot believe a corrector did nothing but erase. We endorse without reservation, therefore, the two correctors as described by Tischendorf. The practice of erasing by the first scribe has been discussed at length. At times, however, he has extended the text by adding small letters above the line much the same way as the original scribe. These small letters are sufficiently different from those of the first scribe so that they are not confused.

The first corrector has worked throughout the manuscript, but not always with the same frequency. He has made almost twice as many changes in each of Mark, Luke, and John as in Matthew. Acts and the Pauline epistles are between these extremes. He has scarcely bothered to alter the text of Revelation. The per-folio corrections of the different books or groups of books is as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Folios</th>
<th>Corrections</th>
<th>Average per folio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>15½</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cath. epistles</td>
<td>9 ½</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul. epistles</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the following page is given a more complete and detailed breakdown of the distribution of expansions made by both correctors. No tendency is seen for the correctors to make fewer changes as they get farther into the manuscript. Although more scribal blunders are found in Acts than elsewhere, the corrector has not been more active here. He has made no effort to correct all such errors.

For critical purposes Hort considered the text of the first corrector as almost equally valuable with the original text. This must have been because a few of the corrections agreed with Codex B. But many more of the expansions agree with Codex A or other Byzantine uncials in the gospels. Its most frequent ally is probably Codex II, especially in Mark where the corrector agrees with Codex II on thirty-seven readings in which the testimony is divided. When one considers the number of obvious errors which have been corrected and the number of singular or sub-singular readings of Codex C which have been made to agree with the mass of witnesses, this total represents a high degree of similarity. It is doubtful if the readings of this corrector can be considered as significant for an early text, although its textual affinities are worth noting for the history of the text and the study of relationships between various witnesses.

Where was the home of the first corrector? Tischendorf conjectured that it was probably somewhere in Palestine, Syria or Asia Minor, because

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Leaves</th>
<th>First totals</th>
<th>Corrector per page</th>
<th>Second totals</th>
<th>Corrector per page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 1.1 - 9.11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.11 - 13.21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.21 - 17.26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.28 - 24.10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.10 - 28.14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17 - 6.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 - 10.49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.50 - 16.20</td>
<td>6+</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 - 6.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.37 - 10.37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.38 - 24.53</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.8 - 21.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 - 7.11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.12 - 13.32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.32 - 21.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Peter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Peter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 3 John, Jude</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom. 1.1 - 9.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.15 - 16.27</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor. 1.1 - 10.16</td>
<td>4+</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.16 - 16.23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph, Phil, Col, I Th.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim, Tit, Phil.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
he seemed to be between the first scribe in Egypt and the second corrector in Constantinople. But this is without foundation. The fact that both the script and the text are between the first and third hands does not mean the scribe must have been geographically between the other two. We must remember, furthermore, that we do not necessarily know the origin of the codex itself.

C. The Second Corrector.

This corrector has done much to mar the beauty of Codex C. He made no attempt to preserve untouched the margins, but instead has placed innumerable notes in both margins as well as the tops and bottoms of the pages. His writing is far from elegant and can be dated in the dying days of uncial writing: Tischendorf's ninth century date is good enough. In addition to the textual emendations the corrector has added spirants and accents as well as the punctuation marks. The largest part of the second corrector's work consists of the regular liturgical notations placed in the margin to assist the reader in using the New Testament in church worship. A complete list of these lexical notes has been given in Tischendorf's Prolegomena. We have not considered it necessary or desirable to reproduce all these notations, but have been content to list corrections and additions which should be made to his list. Since these corrigenda et addenda will be used only in conjunction with the complete list, the page numbers given here refer to the pages of Tischendorf's edition. These changes are as follows:

Page 30 - add after Tischendorf's entry: $\epsilon \nu \chi \rho \sigma \varepsilon \iota \nu \iota \omega$.

" 33 - $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta$, $\Pi \tau \omega \chi \rho \sigma \varepsilon \iota \nu \iota \omega$. Tischendorf has erroneously placed this entry on page 32 which has no marginal note.

" 66 - $\chi \rho \sigma \varepsilon \iota \nu \iota \omega$ is written under $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta$. $\pi \tau \omega \nu \gamma \theta \iota \omicron \nu$.

" 83 - Tischendorf omits the following note half-way down in the right-hand margin: $\zeta \tau \iota \chi \alpha \tau \mu \alpha \chi \rho \tau \iota \beta \alpha \rho$.

" 110 - Tischendorf has omitted the following note which is found about ten lines down in the left-hand margin: $\chi \rho \Pi \tau \omega \chi \rho \sigma \varepsilon \iota \nu \iota \omega$.

1. see pages 25 - 28.
Page 172 — Instead of what Tischendorf has, read the following: σαββάς.

173 — A little over halfway down the page in the right-hand margin, add the following: ΧΝ. Ἠ. ἘΤΕΚ ΤΩΡ ΕΥΚΕΤΩΝ, etc.

226 — σαββάς Ἡ. αἰείως τ. παρακαλοῦσας. This is placed by Tischendorf on both pages 225 and 226. Page 225 has nothing.

The second corrector has also made emendations in all parts of the text except Revelation; he has made no changes there. His corrections tend to be more sporadic than those of the first corrector. In the catholic epistles his emendations are limited to 1.7 per folio, while in the fourth gospel there are 33.3 corrections per folio — much higher than any average by the first corrector. We note the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Leaves</th>
<th>Corrections</th>
<th>Per Folio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cath. epistles</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul. epistles</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A further breakdown in the distribution of corrections may be seen in the table on page 23.

The text of the corrector is pure Byzantine, or Nestorian and Nestor’s Syrian, and is seldom of more significance than the average cursive text of the ninth or tenth century. His work is more likely to be studied for its contribution to liturgical history and the study of lectionaries. The orthography is more Byzantine. The following spellings are found frequently: ΝΟ. for ΕΙΣ. ΔΙΟ. for ΔΙΟ. ΧΝ. for ΧΑΙ. Ο. for Ο. The ΧΝ. compendium is also used as well as other figures.

Tischendorf believed the home of the second corrector was Constantinople. But again the evidence is less than conclusive. We are fairly certain the manuscript was in the Constantinople area at the beginning
of the sixteenth century, but this is a long time after the ninth century. Certain notes and names may suggest Constantinople, but they are sufficiently ambiguous as to be open to more than one interpretation. We should be safe to point toward Constantinople and vicinity without closing the door to other possibilities.

V Results of the Present Study

We must immediately mention that the work of Tischendorf, by and large, has been verified by the present study. This is not to say that errors have not been found. Even the most careful collator will make errors. The errors we have found are listed in Appendix A. Many are insignificant; but a significant number are important for the textual criticism of the New Testament. For example, arrangements will be made to correct more than seventy citations of Codex C in Nestle's edition of the Greek text.

This edition differs in a number of ways from that of Tischendorf. He reproduced the large marginal letters as they are found in the Codex. His text was printed in *scriptio continua* with the uncial letters. We have been content to reproduce the text without any effort toward imitation. When the text had been erased and re-written by the first corrector, he printed the corrector's text in slightly smaller letters even though he was able to decipher some or all of the original letters. When the vellum was torn or when nothing could be seen, he left his text blank and indicated by commas the number of letters probably lost. This edition adopts the more modern method of using brackets to print what cannot be seen. We have made one modification: to differentiate between the two reasons for not being able to recover the original text we have used different signs. The square brackets [ ] indicate the folio is torn so that there is no vellum to hold the letters. Parentheses ( ) are used when the vellum is intact, but the text is lost for any of a number of reasons. This distinction, it is hoped, will avoid unnecessary work for anyone who may want to consult the codex for a specific reading. If he notes that our text has the reading in square brackets, he will know that nothing will be gained from again consulting the codex itself. All notes on the two
correctors will be found in Appendices B and C, and reference is always made when, and why, we have disagreed with Tischendorf.

Only with great hesitation is one encouraged to disagree with Tischendorf in obscure matters. He was a great paleographer. Anyone who is acquainted with the story of how he disagreed with all others in declaring that the last verse of John's gospel in Codex Sinaiticus was added later and how his contention was verified by an infra-red photograph will know the hesitancy we felt whenever we had to depart from his conclusions. Yet Tischendorf was young when he tackled Codex C. It represents his first work on an important manuscript. Even when possible deterioration in the manuscript is considered, the impression is gained that on a few occasions Tischendorf wrote more than he saw. One significant incident is the text in I Peter 2:13. Tischendorf wrote: \textit{protatynpe kai\text{\textsuperscript{a}}} kai\text{\textsuperscript{a}} ay\text{\textsuperscript{a}}\text{\textsuperscript{a}}, but I have written \textit{UK. kai\text{\textsuperscript{a}}} kai\text{\textsuperscript{a}} ay\text{\textsuperscript{a}}. As far as we have been able to find, kai\text{\textsuperscript{a}} represents a singular reading of Codex C, so that Tischendorf could not have expected it. We did not expect it either. But we studied the reading in the manuscript itself, in a natural photograph, and in an infra-red photograph. They all tended to confirm our first impression. The lower half of both phi and upsilon are seen. Why he wrote kai\text{\textsuperscript{a}} if he did not see it is difficult to say. One word in his defense, however, ought to be said. In a manuscript of this type when so many words and letters are indistinct, and when the reader knows what he expects to see, it is often difficult to draw the line between when he thinks he sees and when he actually sees. The best illustration of this dilemma is when one is driving into Paris in the early morning fog. He looks for the Eiffel Tower and knows what he expects to see. He may be deceived by vague traces in the fog and probably is not able to say exactly when he definitely saw the tower. This will be the experience of anyone who reads Codex C. For this reason we have tried to stay on the safe side and write only what we definitely saw, including in parentheses what could not be seen or what we were not sure we saw. This one criticism of Tischendorf must not detract from his work. His edition of Codex C was a magnificent achievement.
Throughout the text and notes of this edition we have tried to keep in mind the needs and problems of the editor of a Greek text and the citations in his critical apparatus. He faces difficult problems in citing a manuscript which has so many lacunae as does Codex C. Is it satisfactory, for example, to include our manuscript among others under a common sign? In Nestle's apparatus the Hexychian symbol includes Codex C unless stated otherwise. In reality, however, who knows all the places where Codex C is missing? The Hexychian symbol is still used. It is true that Nestle's text only attempts to indicate generally the witnesses for and against different readings. Yet it cannot afford to be ambiguous.

A more serious and difficult problem arises when the text has been changed by the first corrector. The original text is often lost permanently. At other times because of the nature of the reading and the amount of space available we can be quite certain what the corrector added, but we cannot know if he re-wrote the original text after adding something to the text. At various places the corrector has erased beyond recovery several lines of the text to add a word or phrase. It cannot be assumed that the corrector re-wrote the original text. To illustrate the problem we cite the text of Romans 7.2ff. All of the text in Romans 7.21-8.2 is re-written. Nothing in the re-written text can be said to represent the text of the original scribe. In his eighth edition Tischendorf has made this mistake. Another example where Tischendorf cites Codex C for what was written by C2 is Romans 14.5. Two full lines have been erased and re-written by the corrector. Tischendorf cites Codex C as a witness for OC ὑπὲρ ὑπὸ rather than OC ὑπὲρ. But this is the corrected text. We do not know what the first scribe wrote.

Another problem related to this is when to cite C2 for a variant reading. When several words have been erased to add some letters, should all the words then re-written — even though they represent the text of the original scribe — be cited as the text of the corrector? In Mark 15.15, for example, the corrector erased χαίρε, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν οὐρανῶν and wrote καὶ λέγειν χαίρε, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν οὐρανῶν.
We clearly credit καὶ λέγειν to the corrector. But does ὁ βασιλεὺς (instead of βασιλεύ) which the original scribe also wrote, represent a critical judgment on the part of the corrector? Or after adding καὶ λέγειν did he simply reproduce the first text?

We are content to stress these problems in citing Codex C. In the notes in the appendices we have tried to indicate clearly the condition of the text and conclusions we have reached so as to guide the critics and editors who alone must make the decisions for their own works.
APPENDIX A

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE ORIGINAL Scribe

Matthew

9,26 - After ἔγραψεν the original scribe wrote autóc, but corrected this mistake himself to read autóc.

26.39 - The original scribe has added in the margin the text of Luke 22.43 and indicated that it is to be read after ἀλλά ὥσπερ ὅπως.

Mark

1.45 - The original scribe wrote τοῦ ἁρματόν at the end of the line, but failed to write τοῦ on the next line. Neither of the correctors has supplied the needed letters.

2.16 - The original scribe did not write τί ὅτι after ἀρχηγὸς τοῦ as Tischendorf has stated. A long hole in the vellum covers the beginning of this line where ταῦτα τοῦ was written. Tischendorf's edition is as follows . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . τί ὅτι (each letter is represented by one dot). I do not know how he saw the τί unless he assumed some mark below the line to be vestiges of it. Neither do I see an ἢ before ὅτι. (It is, of course, possible that this hole has been enlarged during the last century.) Yet it still remains impossible for τί to have been written because the space simply is not sufficient. In line 18 ταῦτα τοῦ occupies the maximum amount of space that is available before ὅτι. It is quite possible that the first corrector erased ταῦτα τοῦ (hence the holes) to add τί. This would explain Tischendorf's ἢ before ὅτι.

3.5 - I cannot tell whether the original scribe wrote ἀποκάτωσιν (with Wetstein) or ἀνεξ. (with Tischendorf). A small hole has removed part of the latter, and a heavy black mark covers the rest.

3.31 - The ω of χχχχ cannot be seen entirely. But space is quite limited and not sufficient - as Tischendorf has assumed - for ω. He thought he saw ω after χχχχ, but this is the first part of ω. There can be no doubt that he is wrong.
9.2 - The original scribe has apparently written ἀδ (or ἀλ) after ημερας. What this could mean, or how it was confused with εγ, I cannot say. Except for the bottom of the second letter, this is very clear.

9.18 - Tischendorf said the original scribe wrote καὶ τοιχεὶ του του ὄσοντας after ἀποίκει. This is impossible. In the previous line nine letters use the same amount of space taken by Tischendorf's twenty-one letters! It is not likely that A wrote ἀδ καὶ τοιχεὶ - omitting του του ὄσοντας - because the second corrector has added αὐτοῦ at the end of the line. A correction by the first corrector is precluded, since even his more crowded writing would not fit in the limited space without extending into the margin. Codex C, therefore, contained ἀποίκει του του ὄσοντας (with Codex X).

John

21.13 - The original scribe wrote ἐξεταί ὁ ἢς. Tischendorf rejected this reading, largely on the basis of space, and suggested either ἐξεταὶ ὁ ἢς or ἐξεταὶ ἢς. I have been able to detect the article and apparently the ἢς. Furthermore, in line 5 the ταις of μαθητᾶς easily fits into the space available for ται ὁ. Our text need not be doubted. Nestle's apparatus does not cite Codex C for either reading.
APPENDIX B
ALTERATIONS MADE BY THE FIRST CORRECTOR

Matthew
1.5 - ὁμηρό (twice) for Ἰωβηρό (?)
1.8 - Ἰοκάματ (twice) for Ἰοκάμα.
1.13 - ἰβίου (second) for - ? The original "inepte" spelling is unknown.
1.18 - add γαρ after ἀνεπεθυμητικά.
3.6 - add παντες after ἐβαπτίζοντο.
4.1 - τοτε ο ἢ Ἰκ αὐνχέν for αὐνχέν δε ο ἢ.
4.10 - add οἰκοω υου after υπαγε. The vellum is wrinkled at this place and none of the original letters can be seen. But the text of this edition fits the space well.
4.12 - add ο ἢ after αὐνουας δε. None of the original letters can be seen. Our text is based only on the space available.
4.19 - add ο ἢ after αὐτοις.
4.21 - add και before δαίμονικομενος.
7.9 - ἀειγει for ἀεις (?).
7.12 - πολιουγιν for ποιωσιν. Tischendorf said A wrote ου and B changed it to ο. There can be no question that he is wrong. The letters ου are obviously crowded.
7.16 - σταμαλην for -λινας. A conflated his two choices.
7.19 - add ουν after παν.
7.21 - add αὐτος εἰσελευσται εἰκ την βασιλειαν των οὐνων after οὐνοις.
7.24 - εκβοδουντεν for οικ.
7.26 - εκβοδουντεν for οικ.
7.29 - add αὐτων after γραμματεις.
8.3 - add ο ἢ after αὐτου. The surface of the vellum after αὐτου is permanently rubbed out. The text of A is dictated by the space available.
8.1 - ἤμωντος for ἄμωντος.

8.7 - B has written εἰσὶ δὲ ἔθεεν before a hole in the vellum. It is impossible to know the text of A. The space fits the generally accepted text very well. Certainly there is not room for the text (ἀκολούθει μόνον εἰσὶ ...) of Δ.

8.13 - γεννητὸν for γεννιτὸν. Tischendorf erred in crediting γεννητὸν to the original scribe.

8.17 - τοιοῦ for τοιαίου. Tischendorf thought a duplicated ν had been erased. But all of our letters can be seen.

8.25 - προσελθοντες οἱ ἁγιαὶ for, perhaps, προσελθοντες αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί. Approximately 1½ lines have been erased and in this space the corrector has written: κυριακῶν αὐτοῖς ἐκθέσασεν καὶ προσελθοντες οἱ μαθηταί. It is certain that the original scribe wrote more than this. Tischendorf's suggestion that the corrector removed αὐτῷ after προσελθοντες and αὐτῷ after μαθηταί has a very sound foundation and fits the space fairly well. I have two modifications to make, however, to his conjecture.

1. Line 33 probably ended with οἱ ἁγιαὶ and line 34 began with θηταί αὐτῶν. From an infra-red photograph it is fairly clear that (of α(helper) was the last letter on the line. Line 34 then began μαθηταί αὐτῶν for which there is sufficient room.

2. Line 33 then has several letters less than the other lines in this area. Perhaps something was duplicated; this could give the corrector sufficient cause for re-arranging the entire line instead of merely erasing αὐτῷ and αὐτῶν.

8.31 - δείλως for, perhaps, δείλως. I do not think Tischendorf was correct in saying an original δ was changed to read α.

Neither the δ nor the η has been disturbed and δ does not fill the space well. This spelling has probably been changed more than once.

9.9 - add μαθηταίον λέγοντες after καθελοῦν. Enough letters are seen to make this certain. Tischendorf did not attempt to
say what change had been made. It is clear, however, that A wrote less than B since the end of line 37 has not been erased. This reading of Codex 63 is a singular reading and has no other witnesses. I cannot say whether A wrote προλόγει (c, N, D) or προλόγει(ειν (c, Bod, B).

9.27 - add καὶ λεγοντες after κρακοντες.

10.3 - καὶ λέββαλος ο ἐκκλησίας θαῦδαιος for, probably, καὶ λέββαλος ο καὶ θαῦδαιος. At the end of the line δαιος is seen as well as αι (of καὶ?) in a position which suggests our text. This reading represents one of the possibilities put forth by Tischendorf.

10.13 - μεν η η δικχα for μεν νυ η δικχα (?).
10.19 - ὑνα for υπερα.
11.23 - ὀτι ει for ὀτι. I cannot doubt that A omitted ει rather than ὀτι. This is based largely on the fact that a larger area has been erased than that which ει would occupy. The letters ει would not even reach the margin, whereas A apparently extended his first letter into the margin.

12.6 - μεικων for μεικων (?).
12.8 - add καὶ εἰτιν after κή.
12.11 - add ἐσται after τίς.
12.13 - εἰσετεν καὶ ἀπεκατεσθη δι' ὅν της αλήθη for - ?

Nothing can be seen of traces of the original text. Holes prevent us from telling whether the original scribe wrote more or less than the corrector.

12.17 - ὧν μονήν του προφτου λεγόντες ἵσοστιν ο παῖς ὑμοῦ on προτίθον ο γνώμονος μοῦ εἰς on for - ? It is probable that from 6 to 10 letters have been added, but over a space this large one cannot be certain. Tischendorf suggested, among other things that B wrote ὧν for an original δι' and he thought he saved ο under εἰς on. To me, the latter suggestion is questionable. A curved mark (for ω?) is seen under on, but it
leaves some space between ο and ΠΡΟΟΥΜΕΝ. I am fairly certain, however, that I have detected the γ of ΜΥΟΥ on an infra-red photograph at a point that makes it impossible for Codex C to have written other than ΜΥΟΥ ΟΥ ΠΡΟΟΥΜΕΝ.

12.22 - add ΤΩΛΟΣ καὶ before ΧΩΝΟΣ.
12.29 - διατελοι for απαγαλ.
12.44 - omit καὶ before ΑΕΩΡΙΛΟΥΜΕΝ. (?)
12.48 - add ΜΟΥ after ΥΠΟ. Tischendorf assumed B re-wrote the text of A. But A definitely wrote less than B. This place is quite difficult, but the Μ is the most certain letter.
13.57 - add ΕΙ after ατινος. Tischendorf thought this was by the original scribe.
14.19 - ΧΟΡΤΟΥ for ΧΟΡΤΟΥ. The corrector has not completed his change of the text, for ΤΟΥ has not been made to read ΤΟΥ.
14.19 - omit καὶ before ΛΑΒΟΥ.
14.25 - ΠΛΕΒΙ for ΑΠΛΕΒΙ. (?)
14.29 - ΕΛΕΒΙ for, probably, καὶ ΠΛΕΒΙ.
14.33 - ΟΙ δὲ ΕΥ ΤΟ ΠΛΟΙΟ for, perhaps, ΟΙ δὲ ΕΥ ΠΛΟΙΟ. Nothing can be seen, even with the infra-red photograph, of the original letters. Two letters undoubtedly have been added, but this is the most we can say with any certainty.

15.4 - add ΣΟΥ after ΤΟΥ ΠΑΡ.
15.17 - ΕΙΣ ΑΦΕΔΟΝΩ for - ? The original scribe omitted perhaps one or two letters. Certainly ΤΟΥ was not included.
15.32 - ΣΠΛΑΥΧΝΙΖΟΜΕΝ for, possibly, ΣΠΛΑΥΧ. One of the first six letters was omitted by A.
15.36 - ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΣΑΙ ΕΧΛΑΣΕΝ for, probably, ΕΧΛΑΣΕΝ. Tischendorf assumed that A wrote ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΣΕΝ καὶ and omitted ΕΧΛΑΣΕΝ. This is impossible because of the available space. The letters ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΣΕΝ καὶ Ε will not fit after ΙΧΘΥΩ. A must have written καὶ ΛΑΒΟΥ... ΕΧΛΑΣΕΝ καὶ ΕΩΧΚΕΥ.
16.3 - add καὶ before ΤΟ ΜΕΝ.
Matthew

16.11 - add ἀποστειλέων before ἀποστείλετε.

16.13 - omit ὡς before ὅς.

16.19 - omit καὶ before ἄδου.

16.22 - ἐκθέματω for ἐκθέματο (?). Tischendorf did not note that the _ had been erased and credited A with having ἐκθέματο.

17.8 - add ὧδε ἐκεῖνος after ἡμοῦ.

18.29 - add εἷς τοῦς τοὺς αὐτούς before ἀποκαλεῖ.

18.29 - add γάντα before σοι. Tischendorf erred in thinking that the corrector reversed the order of the original text when he added γάντα. The letters can be seen as indicated in the text.

18.35 - οὐκανίζω for ἐκουσ. (?)

19.19 - add σου after ἵνα.

20.3 - omit duplicated τοῖς (?).

20.6 - omit ἀπουσίας after ἀποτικάς.

20.10 - πλεῖονα for πλεῖον.

20.12 - omit οτι before οτοι (?).

20.19 - αὐτοριζωται for αὐτοριζωται.

21.1 - add καὶ ἀποκαλεῖν after ἰδοὺν. This, I think, can be assumed because of the space available. A wrote less than B. Other than this, it is impossible to know if A wrote εἷς or ἀποκαλεῖν before τοῖς as Τ6 rightly says. Nestle is questionable in quoting our MS with Codex B as having εἷς.

21.28 - εἰκεῖν for εἰκεῖν. Tischendorf failed to note this, but it is quite obvious. The present χ is not by A.

21.28 - πρωτό for προί.

21.28 - add μου after ἀνελευνί.

21.30 - δεύτερον for ἐπτεῦ.

22.15 - add καὶ αὐτοῦ after ἐλπίζω.

23.26 - μαρισιάζω for μαρισιάζω. We have here another instance in which the scribe combined suffixes. Cf. Mt. 7:16 and possibly Acts h.2.

23.35 - add αὐτῷ after ἀνελευνή.
Matthew

24.5 - omit ὅτι before εὐω εἰς (=?).
24.6 - μοῦ for μοῦ after ἔλεου.
25.20 - add ταλίνα before εκεῖνος.
25.31 - ὑπερὶ for ὑπερεί.
25.50 - ἐσπάδει for ἐσπάδει (?).
25.51 - τῶν for τῶν before μετά.
25.53 - δοκεῖ for δοκεῖ δοι.*
25.59 - ἀσιστοδοςίαν for -οις. I do not know why Tischendorf hesitated to credit οις to the corrector. By every criterion they are not the letters of the original scribe.

26.60 - add καὶ before πολλῶν.
26.60 - add ὡς εὐσφον after ὑσβησάωντων.

26.61 - add, perhaps, νιόν, before τοῦτον. This is based only on considerations of space. Due to homoiotelemata the scribe confused οὖ of τοῦ for οὖ of νιόν. The only other possibility might be νιόν ἀδι, omitting τοῦ. No other combination of letters fits the space.

26.65 - omit, perhaps, τι after λέγων. Tischendorf said the corrector erased ὅτι, but without doubt the space is not sufficient for these letters.

26.69 - omit οὖν before ἀντὶ.

27.3 - ἦτε ἰῶν οὐδας for - ? The space available makes it impossible for more than one or two letters to have been omitted.

27.9 - ἦσομεν for ἦν.

27.63 - ὅτι... πλανὸν εἰς ἐκεῖνος (εἰκεν) for - ? Nothing can be seen of the original letters except η under the first η of ηντοτην. After ηντοτην the vellum is so thin the writing on the other side can be easily seen. Tischendorf said he detected ὅτι εἰκεν at the end of the line. I am certain he could not have seen anything here. I think he saw the writing on the other side of the leaf. Part of line 39 is hopelessly wrinkled and the rest has a hole so thin very little can be seen. From the space
Matthew
available, however, we know that A wrote much more than our
common text. Something was undoubtedly duplicated.
28.10 - Because the vellum is torn we cannot know whether A wrote καὶ
ἐκεῖ or κακεῖ. On the basis of space the former is more
preferable. But there is no indication - other than the hole
itself - that a corrector changed the text to read κακεῖ.

Mark
1.19 - add ἀυτῶν after δικτού.
1.20 - ἔβαλλον for ἐβαλλόν. Tischendorf did not note that the
text had been corrected and credited -βαλόν to the original
scribe.
1.44 - a for κάθως before προσεταύειν.
1.45 - redundant v between εὕ and ε新浪微博.
2.7 - οὕτω for οὕτω.
2.18 - omit μάθηται before τῶν υἱῶν.
2.22 - add o νέος after ἐνεξαίτο. o οἶνος.
3.15 - omit οὗς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὁμολογεῖ.
3.16 - ἐρμακεν πάντως νοοῦν καὶ ἐκβαλ. τα βαλλ - for ἐπεκβαλ.
τα βαλλ. καὶ ἐκτίθη τους δίδωσαν.
3.26 - αὐτῷ ἐν ἑαυτῷ for ἐν εὐτων αὐτῷ.
3.26 - καὶ ἁμαρτίαιν ὑπὲρ for ἁμαρτίαιν ἔχειν καὶ ou.
3.27 - καὶ, probably, for ἀλλά.
3.29 - κωδικοῦ for κωδικοῖ. This is based entirely on the amount of
space available which precludes the possibility of an original
κωδικοῖς.
3.31 - σινετάκτη (ἑκτ.?) for -κωντές.
4.8 - εὐ (3 times) for εἰς (3 times). The second εἰς can be seen.
The other two are assumed because no other explanation will explain
the erasures that have been made.
4.9 - o εὐνοῦ for οε εὔνει.
4.11 - add, probably, ὑπὲρ after σεβοται. All we can
know for certain is that A wrote less than B.
h.18 - ουτοι for αλλοι.
h.18 - omit ειςων before οι τον λογον.
h.20 - add ευ, probably, before εστροντα. Something was omitted by A.
h.26 - omit οτι after ελεγεν.
h.26 - τον for το before γιδον.
h.27 - νυκτα for νυκτος.
h.27 - βλασταν for βλαστα.

h.28 - πληνω, for, perhaps, πληνες. Tischendorf suggests, and I think it is quite likely, that A wrote δες for δεις. This helps explain why B erased more than the δ, but doesn't explain why the ρ was also erased. No attempt is made to fill the space evenly.

h.30 - βασιλειαν του for - ? It is not likely that A omitted του, for it would have merely been added by the corrector to the end of the line. Two or three letters of βασιλειαν probably were omitted; perhaps the scribe mistook οι for ει.

h.30 - τοι ημερολογιον παραβιλεγεν αυτων for, probably, τινι αυτων παραβιλον θωμεν. This line is hopelessly marred and partially torn. Our text is the most likely conjecture.

h.31 - οκ for ωκ before οταν.

h.33 - πολλαις ελαει for - ? Tischendorf in his appendix wrote "et quidem justi fere spatium", but in Tz he said Codex G agrees with Codex L in omitting πολλαις. This undoubtedly is wrong. The space requires that πολλαις (or something its "size") be included. It is possible that A reversed the common order and wrote ελαει πολλαις, but this is improbable.

h.35 - add το before ηλεια.

h.36 - add δε after αλλα.

h.38 - διευκολουων for, probably, ευειδον. The original scribe did not omit και since the κ can be seen.

5.3 - αποδειχων οδης θων, for αλεξει ουξετι ου. ευν.
5.5 - κορονον εαυτων for - ? A has corrected his own text. Tischendorf said the present αυ εαυτων is by B, but I disagree. Only
Mark

ἀὐτοῖς are by B; but they are not crowded in such a way as to suggest that A wrote ἄυτον instead of ἄυτον.

5.13 - add ὅπως ἐν before ὡς διαχειλεῖν.

5.20 - omit ὥς before τὴ δεκαπολεῖ. (?)

5.21 - omit ὧν before ὁχλο. (?)

5.27 - omit τὰ before περί. (?)

5.31 - add ὑπερεῖ after ἀυτῇ. I cannot tell whether A wrote τῷ or τῷ in δυνάτον.

5.31 - καὶ ἐγὼ for - ? Tischendorf said that the original scribe probably omitted καὶ, but there is no foundation for this assumption. καὶ ἐγὼ easily fits in the available space. I do not know how B changed the text, but I would suggest that the corrector, in erasing line 16 to add χαράδει, unintentionally affected the writing of line 17. To support this conjecture it should be noted that the crowding of B's letters in line 17 appears to be caused only by the hole in the vellum and not by lack of space.

6.2 - πάντα for ἀπαντά.

6.2 - omit ἵνα before καὶ δυναμεῖ. (?)

6.4 - omit ἄυτον after δυναμεῖν.

6.11 - ὠρισκεῖν ὑπὲρ ὅραται for ὠρισκεῖν ὑπὲρ ὅραται.

6.15 - add ἐκίνητο after ἀρρώστοι.

6.23 - The corrector possibly added καὶ ὕπονεγον ὑπὲρ ὅτι. Nothing can be seen of the original text, but this fits the space admirably. We cannot be certain whether καὶ and ὕπονεγον were added or omitted. On line 18 under ὅτι of the corrected text two letters appear to be ὅτι. If this is part of ὅτι εἰπών, then the original text was nonsense. ὅτι would not fill the space and καὶ ὑπὲρ ὅτι is too much to fit.

6.26 - ὧπερ ὑπερεῖνειμένων for - ? Even with the infra-red photograph nothing can be seen.

6.31 - add ὧν before ἀμάντος. Enough of the original text can be seen to make this certain.
Mark

8.24 - ΑΥΘΩΝΟΔΟΥΣ ΜΕ ΟΔΙΚΑ ΚΕΠΙ for ΑΥΟΥΣ, ΟΤΙ ΜΕ ΟΥΝ

8.25 - ΚΩΣΤΙΝΕΥ for ΚΕ.

8.25 - ΕΒΕΒΕΛΕΥ for ΕΙΣΙΣΑ.

8.25 - ΠΑΡΑΝΤΙ for ΠΑ.

8.26 - ΟΙ ΜΕΛ for ΛΕΥΟΤΕΙΣ ΟΤΙ. Tischendorf erred in saying A wrote ΟΙ ΜΕΛ; to me there is no doubt that he wrote ΟΤΙ after ΛΕΥΟΤΕΙΣ. The space available rules out ΟΙ ΜΕΛ. Furthermore, the corrector most likely would not have erased ΛΕΥ: ΟΙ ΜΕΛ and then re-written ΟΙ ΜΕΛ. He has made no attempt to fill the space evenly. I cannot doubt that A wrote ΛΕΥΟΤΕΙΣ ΟΤΙ.

8.34 - ΟΙ ΤΙΣ for ΟΙ ΤΙΣ before ΘΕΛΕΙ.

8.34 - ΕΛΕΙΨΙ for ΕΧΟΛΟΥΕΙ.

8.35 -  add ΟΥΤΟΣ, probably, before ΕΛΕΙΠ. At this place the vellum has several holes. It is certain, however, that A wrote less than B.

8.36 - ΑΥΟΣ for ΑΥΟΥ. Tischendorf said the second corrector wrote Ο for ΑΥΟΥ because it is obvious that he wrote Ο for ΑΥΟΥ. I would, however, reconstruct the history of this variant in this way: (1) A wrote ΤΟΥ ΑΥΟΥ; (2) B changed ΑΥΟΥ to ΑΥΟΣ, but overlooked the preceding article. (3) C omitted the article.

Numbers (1) and (3) are certain. Number (2) may be questioned. I take this position because I doubt if C ever erased as thoroughly as the last letter of ΑΥΟΥ has been erased. C rejected ΤΟΥ by circling it with periods - as was his custom. B thoroughly erased the final Τ and wrote ζ - as was his custom. The first corrector, then, as well as the second should be considered a witness for ΑΥΟΣ.

9.9 - ΕΚ ΒΕΚΡΟΥ for ΕΚ ΒΕΚΡΟΥ.

9.13 - ΠΣΑΛΙΝΟΥ for, probably, ΠΣΑΛΙΟΥ.

9.20 - I disagree with Tischendorf who said B wrote 1500V for 1500V.

The word 1500V has not been touched. The text is not very clear, but no attempt has been made to erase the Ω, which is the clearest of all the letters. I cannot surmise what Tischendorf saw to
suggest his change.

9.23 - add το before ΠΙΣΤΕΥΟΝΤΩΝ. Tischendorf wrote ΠΟΥΤΑ at the end of line 19 and ΔΟΥΝΑΤΑ το on line 20. But this represents the corrected text of B. It is very clear that A wrote ΠΟΥΤΑ at the end of line 19. The horizontal line is quite clear. The letters ΠΟΥΤΑ at the end of line 19 are obviously by B. At the beginning of line 20 το (by A) can be seen before a hole in the vellum. There is not sufficient room on line 20 for το ΔΟΥΝΑΤΑ το. What A wrote has to be conjectured; either ΔΟΥΝΑ το (or a similar error) or ΔΟΥΝΑΤΑ. I prefer the latter because the το after the hole appears to be by A and το would be very crowded after it.

9.24 - add κε before ΒΟΤθΕΙ.

9.42 - add εις εμε after ΠΙΣΤΕΥΟΝΤΩΝ. Tischendorf was not certain what A wrote, but preferred ΠΙΣΤΙΝ ΕΧΟΝΤΩΝ to ΠΙΣΤΕΥΟΝΤΩΝ because he could see no indication of the Π under the line. The letters ΕΧΟΝΤΩΝ are clearly apparent at the end of the erased area. At the beginning of the line ΕΧΩ τοι can be seen as well as the top of τοι. Between this τοι and ΕΧΟΝΤΩΝ A could not have written ΕΧΩ τοι. On the other hand ΕΧΩ fits well. Codex C, therefore, agrees with Codex Δ*.

10.1 - omit και before ΠΕΡΑΝ.

10.12 - αλλο for αλλον before ΜΟΙΧΕΑ.

10.27 - add δε after ΕΜΦΕΛΙΣ.

10.32 - και οι for οι δε before ΑΧΟΛΟΥΘΟΥΝΤΕΣ.

10.33 - ΙΕΡΟΣΟΛΥΜΑ και for -? Tischendorf suggested that B wrote ΛΑΟΥΝ for -ΛΑΟΥΝ. While I have no better conjecture, I doubt if B would have erased ΙΕΡΟΣΟΛΥΜΑ to change ΙΗ to ΙΗ. Certainly A did not omit και. ΙΕΡΟΣΟΛΥΜΑ was probably misspelled.

10.40 - ΟΙΕ for οι before ΠΟΙΜΗΝΩΤΑ.

10.42 - ΜΕΝΙΛΟΙ for ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΟΣ.
10.46 - add ἄρτο before ἱεδεῖκιν.
10.46 - add ἀποκατέ do after ὑπὸ τὴν οὖν.
11.3 - TOUTO for TOUTOUTO. (?) A wrote TOUTOUTO, not TOUTO,
as both Tischendorf and Wetstein conjectured. The to
before έκατε are quite clear now and evidence of the η can
be seen. The first corrector, therefore, erased a redundant
υτο rather than και.
11.3 - omit καλίν after τοῦτο.
11.11 - add ὁ κ. after ἐκ τοῦ οὐκολοῦν. Tischendorf has entirely
overlooked this correction.
11.13 - ἔφον οὐ χαὶ τὴν οὐκολοκ for οὐ χαὶ τὸν οὐκολοκ οὐκ νῦ.
11.25 - ἄγιστε for ἄγιστε.
11.31 - add ὀνυ before οὐκ ἐκιστείνοι.
12.1 - add ὄντω before ὑπὸνοιν.
12.6 - εἰσεβ for ἔχον.
12.9 - add ΤΟΣΟΤΟΣ after ἔκοινοις.
12.14 - εἰς οὐν for εἰς. Tischendorf said A wrote καὶ οὐνοῦν and
that B simply changed εἰσον to εἰς. There can be no doubt
that A omitted οὐν. Concerning εἰς, the second ε is not
like the usual ε of A, but it is strikingly similar to the ε
at the end of line 17 (in τεκνία). I am quite sure that A
wrote εἰς.
12.14 - omit ε}'. before εφεστίν.
12.20 - add οὐν after εκτα.
12.20 - add καὶ κατορκο before εἰσβεν. Tischendorf noted that a correction
had been made, but did not mention any variant either in his
appendix or in ΤΒ. In the 16th edition he does mention, however,
that something was added by the corrector. Although very little
can be seen, the detection of γ as placed in our text makes our
text beyond doubt. The word εἰσβεν fits precisely between καὶ
ο and γ. Codex G does not agree with Codex A, which has εἰς.
12.23 - add οὐν before αὐτίκεισι.
12.29 - εἰς for έι at ετε after ο θεος μνήμα μεν εἰς.
13.19 - ης for τιν before εχισεν.
13.31 - τιμήθησαί for -οῦνται. Tischendorf erred in crediting -οῦνται to the original scribe. The η is not like the script of Α. Furthermore, the area has been erased and the horizontal stroke for the η can be seen.
13.38 - add καὶ before εκπιστό.
14.2 - αί for τίνι.
14.4 - add καὶ λέγετες after εαυτος.
14.6 - έσταιμόντω for -ουστο.
14.8 - αυτόν for, probably αυτή. Tischendorf said Α wrote αυτή, but I am quite certain it was αυτή. The α and η are clear. Remains of the η appear to survive. The letters ητ between α and η would be crowded.
14.10 - o μάρτυρες for μάρτυρ εί.
14.13 - μάρτυρες for μάρτυρι. The letters are barely visible and Tischendorf assumed they were by Α. But the present μάρτυρ is obviously quite crowded. The available space allows only μάρτυρι — or some absurd spelling.
14.20 - omit εν before τουβλιον.
14.27 - add ευ μι isbn εν τον μυκτι. Ταυτ after εκεδαιοθεμενεσ.
14.30 - add οις after ωνήσαι.
14.35 - add χαίρε before οιβέσαι.
14.51 - καθηγαντες αυτον οι μενισκοι for καθηγουσιν αντον.
14.72 - καὶ εκ στεφεου for καὶ ευθεως (or ευδος). Tischendorf noted that καὶ was at the end of line 37 and εκ στεφεου at the beginning of line 38. In the margin a modern hand (perhaps Wetstein) has verified this by writing "καὶ εκ στεφεου."
There can be no doubt, however, that this represents a correction by the first corrector. The vertical stroke of a large original κ (presumably) is seen at the beginning of the line. Otherwise none of the original writing can be seen; but the following items
conclusively verify our text: (1) καὶ at the end of line 37 is by B rather than A; (2) at the beginning of line 38 ex is clearly far out in the margin; (3) the ε′ s and μ′s of δευτερον indicate that it also is by B. The text of A, therefore, must have fitted in the place occupied by δευτερον (without the marginal ex). Hence, καὶ εὐθέως (or εὐθὺς). Codex C, then, unites with Codd. δ, L in writing καὶ εὐθέως (or εὐθὺς) ἄληθεν.
14.72 - add, probably, δικ after σοφίζει. This is the solution proposed by Tischendorf. Something has been added to the text. I consider it less likely that σοφίζει was changed to ἀληθεύονται.
14.7 - ἐπιστρίγισαν for ἐπιστροφίσαν (sic!).
14.18 - add καὶ λέγειν after αὐτοῦ.
14.19 - ἐπιστρίγισαν for, probably, ἐπιστρεφάται.
14.22 - add τοῦ before γόλγοθα.
14.23 - add πιέν after αὐτῷ.
14.10 - omit καὶ before καρδίᾳ η λαγ.
14.16 - εὐθέως for κατευθύνει.
14.16 - προσευχόσαν for -σα.
14.1 - omit τοῦ before σαββάτου. (?)
14.7 - omit, probably, καὶ before εἰς.
14.9 - add ὦ after αὐγαστάς. Tischendorf erred in noting that B changed καὶ αὐγαστάς to αὐγαστάς ὦ. The words καὶ αὐγαστάς would be crowded. Even αὐγαστάς ὦ is crowded. Our text cannot be doubted. It is based on one clear fact: the area that has been erased can be seen and it does not include where B wrote the initial 3 of αὐγαστάς. Originally nothing was written here. Line 32 appears now as follows: οὐντο γαρ. αὐγαστάς ὦ Κωνι.
The words αὐγαστάς ὦ are by B. But only the part occupied by αὐγαστάς ὦ has been erased. The original scribe wrote εμοὶ οὔντο γαρ and then left a short space before writing the long ending of Mark. The note of many writers to the effect that Codex C with many other manuscripts gives no indication that the long ending might be spurious must, therefore, be corrected.
Mark
16.10 - omit ἢ after ἐξείνη. (?)
16.17 - ἀλφαλογονεῖτε for ἀκολ.
16.18 - ἀλλαδίας after ἀλποροσίαν.
16.20 - ἀνταχον for - ? The surface has been permanently rubbed away. Probably A omitted one letter.
16.20 - omit ἅλην after ὅτελεων.

Luke
1.13 - διοτί for ὅτι.
1.18 - τὸν ἀγγελοῦν for, perhaps, ἀγγελοῦν. This is a conjecture based largely on the space available. Tischendorf said A wrote πος αὐτοῦ. I do not think this will fill all the space, while πος ἀγγελοῦν fits admirably. One cannot, however, be dogmatic.
1.34 - μαρίαν for μαρία.
1.36 - μαρίαν for μαρία.
1.39 - omit duplicated ἄλω after μαρία.
1.41 - τὸν ἅλην τὸν ἅλην τὴν ἅλην, τὴν ἅλην, τὴν ἅλην τὴν ἅλην.
1.43 - ἐν ἔλεον ἡ ἑν ὁ τοῦ χυρίου (not κύριοι as Tischendorf said) ὅπως for - ? Tischendorf said something was previously omitted. I am certain this is not so. Tischendorf failed to note that χυρίου is spelled out by B. Both lines 9 and 11 over the same area have an equal number of letters. If A wrote κύριοι instead of χυρίου (as he has done in every other instance), then B wrote less, not more, than A.
1.45 - add καὶ after μοῦ.
1.46 - μαρίαν for μαρία.
1.50 - ἀγγελός ἀγγελός for ἀγγελός καὶ ἀγγελός.
1.61 - ἐν ἐν ἁμαρτεία for ἐν ἐν ἁμαρτεία.
1.63 - ἐν ἁμαρτεία for ἐν ἁμαρτεία.
1.65 - ἐν ἁμαρτεία for - ? The text is permanently lost. A probably erroneously omitted two or three letters.
1.66 - omit γάρ before χείρ.
1.80 -  

This correction (an inserted  above the line) may be by either B or C. There is no way to judge paleographically who added it.

2.5 -  

Tischendorf said A wrote  and B corrected the text by adding  . I confess that I can see nothing except that the second letter is  . The codex is tightly bound and I cannot see the margin.

2.66 -  

Tischendorf fails to comment on this variant in his appendix, but notes that εν at the end of line 5 is not by A. But he notes that A wrote  on line 5 (A 650 650). At the end of line 4, however, the is all by B; A wrote  without  on line 5. In support of this the vestiges of the  seem to appear below the line.

2.67 -  

Tischendorf did not note that  was a correction.

2.68 -  

With Tischendorf I wrote the given text because I know of no other possibility which will fill the line. At the beginning of line 650  is certain. Our text still leaves the line about  letters shorter than any other full line on the page.

2.69 -  

Tischendorf was wrong to assume that A wrote  . This is 60% more letters than the space can take. The omission of  is, therefore, the most likely conjecture unless the text of A was absurd.

2.54 -  

Tischendorf was undoubtedly wrong to have read  by A. He did not even note that the text had been corrected.
Luke 13:14 - ΝΑΣΑΝΘΕΙΓΕΩ for - ? The first corrector has re-written the four letters ΠΑΝΙ. Tischendorf said A wrote ΠΑΝΙ, and B changed it to ΠΑΝΙ. But to me the letters of B are slightly crowded - only enough to suggest that Π was omitted by A. This is, of course, only a conjecture, but Tischendorf's reading must also be so recognized. His text is less likely.

Luke 13:15 - omit πανι after τολομον. (?)

Luke 13:16 - add κατα after τολομον. (?)


Luke 13:18 - ΠΟΣΟΝ for ΠΟΣΟΝ. (?)

Luke 13:19 - ΠΟΣΟΝ, ΠΟΣΟΝ for ΠΟΣΟΝ. (?)

Luke 13:20 - add κατα after τολομον. Tischendorf erred in saying the present ΠΟΣΟΝ of ΠΟΣΟΝ is by A. Parts of all the letters can be seen.


Luke 13:24 - εκείον for εκείον. (?)


Luke 13:30 - add κατα after τολομον. Tischendorf did not note the original error or that it had been corrected.


Luke

8.41 - omit οὐ before οίκοθεν.

8.42 - omit αὐτῷ after ἀπεκρίθησα. Nothing can be recovered of the text of A. αὐτῷ has also been re-introduced into the text by C. This solution as proposed by Tischendorf is most likely. The first corrector began line 15 with αὐτῷ.

8.54 - εὐλογεῖ for εὐλογοῦσαι. Tischendorf did not credit B with adding the οὐ.

9.5 - δεχισθέων for δεχθῶν. To me the only letters visible are εὐω and ζητέω: these are by B. The corrector probably erased the last part of the line to insert εὐω.

9.12 - Tischendorf said A apparently omitted χαταλαγίαν. It is impossible to know what A wrote, but I think there is too much space for simply τούς αὐτούς εὐκαλώτατα εἰςίτισιν. The text of A was more likely ἀπείπτε.

9.31 - omit ὃς after ἑλέγουν. (?) - Office of Table of Contents

9.41 - add ἀποκριθέων ὅς after ἀποκριθέων.

9.49 - add ὃ before ἱλασίας. B has written ὃ δὲ ἱλασίας. It is more likely that A omitted ὃ rather than δὲ because of the space. To omit δὲ would leave too much room.

9.49 - εἰςιτα for δίδασκαλε. The letters at the beginning of line 2 are λε while the last letter in line 1 was ὂ. The remaining letters cannot be seen.

9.58 - ἀλοιποῦ for, probably, ἀλοιποῦ:

10.22 - add, perhaps, αὐτοῦ after ἀδικεῖται.

10.30 - add δὲ, probably, after ἑυλογεῖσαν. The limitations of space suggest our text.

10.35 - omit καὶ after ἑξάλογων.

10.38 - add αὐτῆς after ἀντὶκεισται. Tischendorf erred in stating that A wrote τοῦ αὐτοῦ. The original αὐτῷ can clearly be seen, and the remaining space is perfect for φόνο. Furthermore, the corrector would
be very unlikely to erase τὸν Κύριο simple to change ξ to Ἰ.

10.42 - be for τε after ἐξίσουν.

10.42 - ὁ λόγον ἐκ τοῦ ἐκτισμοῦ τοῦ νῦν ἐκτιστεῖν τοῦ νῦν ἐκτιστεῖν.

11.7 - add οὕτως after παραίσια.

11.23 - add με after οὐχοδικέον. Tischendorf failed to note this addition.

11.24 - πεπολυμένα for, probably, ἔνα. Tischendorf said only that the text of A was inspcta. The letter ξ of έκελέω is discernable at a point which suggests the reading that is included in parentheses in this edition. The corrector objected to the nomina sacra for unclean spirits.

11.26 - ἔξεστιν καὶ ἀναλήματα τὸ for ὅτι? The original scribe probably wrote six to eight more letters than the corrector, but it is impossible to know what he wrote.

11.44 - The redundant οὐ before οὐκ is erased. (?)

11.52 - add καὶ after εἰσηγητή.

19.13 - περιηγαγεῖν for προκαταθέσαι.

19.16 - χαλκόθεται for στοιχ.

19.16 - υφικε for probably has been re-written by B. He may have thought he would need room when he wrote χαλκόθεται for στοιχ at the end of the preceding line; but having put all of χαλκόθεται on that line he merely re-wrote the text of A. Certainly this fits well if - as is quite likely - the ο of υφικε was a large letter in the margin.

20.5 - omit τῷ after ἱερῷ. (?)

20.6 - omit ὅτι before οὐκ ἠγομένως.

20.11 - ἐκεῖνον δεύοντον ὀν for ὅτι? The text of A cannot be recovered.

Our text, which is Tischendorf's conjecture, is most probable. It is certain that A wrote more than B.

20.16 - οἱ κακοῖς has perhaps been erased, although it appears to me that A may have written ὃν Κύριον, and a corrector
removed the redundant του as well as οικ. Though it may be objected that the nomina sacra for οἰκία is not used except when referring to Jesus, I need only refer to line 2 where οικ. is so used.

20.23 - ὁ ἀναφόρασθαι for ἀναφόρασθαι.
20.25 - omit το before καταγείρει. (?)
21.34 - ἐρείπως for, probably ἐρείπως. The letters vioi are slightly crowded, and if any letter other than i were omitted, there would be too much space.
21.38 - λέγω for ὁτι.
22.13 - ἄπληστος for -ἀπλᾶτος.
22.16 - οτι ὅνιμην ὑπ' ητής εὐτ. εὐτ. ἄνωτερον for ὑπ' ητής εὐτ. ἄνωτερον. Tischendorf said nothing in his appendix about οτι, but in T5 remarks that the original scribe apparently omitted it. It is now certain that A omitted οτι.
22.18 - add η before ἄπληστος. I am reasonably certain of this.
Tischendorf noted that A omitted ου rather than η. But ου at the beginning of the line is by A. All the letters except η in ἄπληστος can be seen. Unfortunately small holes prevent the original letters from being seen. Between ου and οἰκία, however, three letters (viz., ου η η) fit much better than two (i.e., η η). Read, therefore, οὐ κ. ὁ οἰκίαι instead of οὐ η ἄπληστος.

23.28 - ἐπάνω ὑπ' for ἐπάνω μν.
23.29 - ἐρείπως for ἐρείπως.
23.30 - ἀποκρέασθαι for ἀποκρέασθαι.
23.40 - καταπληκτικὴν auto λέγων for καταπληκτικὴν auto λέγων.
23.41 - η for σχημ. after κατάλαθι.
23.41 - add κατ' before κατά.
23.42 - οὐ του μν. οὐ κε for οὐ του μν. οὐ κε.
23.45 - add οὖν to πάλιν ἐρείπως. The second corrector then adds: κατ' εὐπροσδοκίαν το τοῖς κατ'. This is the solution proposed.
by Tischendorf, and there seems little reason to doubt that it is correct.

23.48 - add εαυτων after τους τους.
23.51 - τοιαυτας γας for ταυτας γας.
23.55 - αυτον ex των γαλ. for ex των γαλ. αυτων. Tischendorf erred in saying the original scribe omitted αυτον. The letter ν can be seen shortly before εθεον. Furthermore, all the letters easily fit in the space which would not be filled by ex των γαλ. γαλατων. The writing of B is not cramped.

23.56 - add και before υποτη.
24.2 - ανο for εκ.
24.7 - οτι δει των των ανων for των των ανων ανω των δει.
This is the best conjecture since nothing can be seen of the text of A. The space is sufficient.

24.46 - add, probably, και ουτως εορια after κυριακαι. The entire line has been erased and only the initial και and the final α are certain. Under εορια vertical strokes are apparent, but whether they are πτ - as Tischendorf said - I do not know. I see no reason to doubt this text since it adequately fills the line.

24.48 - add δε after υπερ.
24.49 - add ιιμη after πολη.
24.49 - δυναιν εν υπνο σ for εν υπνο σ.
24.53 - add ανουντες και. With Tischendorf I do not believe that B added μην. There is not room at the end of the line and I see no traces of its having been erased elsewhere.

John

1.20 - omit και after παντις (7)
1.26 - ιερος δε for ιερος.
1.28 - ηθαινα for ηθαινα.
1.38 - omit αυτον after ακολουθουντες. (7)
3.34 - add τος after οιδων.
4.5 - ακοπεων for ου εκεν.
John

h.16  -  add ο  Ἰ Ὁ after ἀξειλ ὑπνι.

h.25  -  πάντα for παντι.

h.35  -  τετραπύνωκ εὐαίτια. ξαμ for  ὁ. Nothing can be seen of the
original text. With Tischendorf I believe two or three letters
may have been omitted.

h.47  -  καθεύδη χαί λαχ for  ὁ. The original text is permanently
lost. Our text is the conjecture of both Tischendorf and Wetstein,
but not necessarily the only one. It is certain that A wrote
less than B.

h.54  -  omit ὑε before παλιν. (?)

5.7  -  ὑε ἀπον ὑε ὑαν ἐκε ὑλει for ἀπον ὑαν ἐκε ὑλει.?

5.7  -  ὑαν for ὑαν. (?)

5.9  -  ὑαν for ὑαν.

6.10  -  after ἐκε τη ὅ either η or η has been erased, probably by B.
It appears to me to have been η.

√ 6.17  -  add εἰκ ἐκε after κατεθνοῦ ὑε. Tischendorf erred in saying A
wrote εἰκ ἐκε. The page is torn at this point, but the let-
ters, ηηη, that Tischendorf noted at the end of the line are
definitely by the first corrector and extend into the margin.
The original text, which has been erased, contained less than
εἰκ ἐκε. ἐκε ἐκαγνη. I cannot doubt that A omitted εἰκ ἐκε
and that B erased ἐκε ἐκαγνη to insert εἰκ ἐκε.

6.57  -  add undoubtedly ὅι ἐκε after ὑαναι. Tischendorf thought A
wrote ὅι for ὑαναι. He erred in saying that the letters
κακη were by B. The letters κακη are by A; B added κακη and
then began line 5 with ναγ. But since A wrote κακη at the end
of line 4, line 5 must have begun in one of 4 ways: (1) ἐκε
κακη ὅι ἐκε, (2) ἐκε ἐκε κακη ὅι ἐκε, (3) ἐκε κακη ὅι ἐκε, (4) ἐκε κακη ὅι. The first two are rejected because of space
limitations. The fourth does not fill the space. Lines 4 and
5 over the same space have 9 and 10 letters respectively. I
have adopted the third possibility as the most likely text of
A. In adopting this text I assume — and this is not always safe to do — the text of A did not mistakenly omit the verb altogether and write διέβασκα τι διέδραμε.

6.72 - add ὧν after εἰς.

7.1 - omit καὶ before ὑπάρχω. (?)

7.1 - περιπατεῖπεν for -? A must have omitted 2 or 3 letters.

8.45 - omit ὑπάρχω after ἔγειρον. (?)

8.52 - δοκάζω for δοκάζω.

9.7 - add αὐτοῦ after ἐπεξεργασάμενος. In his appendix Tischendorf says nothing about ἐπεξεργασάμενος but in 76 says A apparently wrote ἐπεξεργασάμενος. I am far from certain.

9.9 - add δὲ after εἰρηνικός.

11.12 - αὐτὸ for αὐτῷ after ἀληθινῷ.

11.17 - add εἰς ἑαυτῶν after ὁ Ἰς. The corrector has written ἑαυτῶν οὐν ὁ Ἰς at the end of the previous line. Tischendorf guessed badly on this variant. He thought the first writer wrote ὅπερ οὐν καὶ ἐμπέθεν but does not explain what was placed in the space occupied by these words when the corrector changed the text. Only traces of the original text can be seen, but the surest evidence for our text is the horizontal line for the nomina sacra before εὐδοκεῖ.

11.18 - δεικνύετε for δεικνύετε.

11.21 - add perhaps τοῦ after τοῦς. This is based entirely on the space available.

11.28 - κίνουσα for, probably, εἰκόνα. Tischendorf wrote in his appendix "Inepte erasse videtur," but in 76 cites Codex G with Codex B as having originally contained εἰκόνα. The original scribe definitely wrote one letter less than the corrector.

11.29 - omit δὲ after ἐξεινισ.

11.31 - ἔγειροντες for δοκάζωντες.

11.32 - τὴν Ἰς for Ἰς τη.

11.39 - τετελευτηκότες for τετελευτηκότες.
11.41 - omit αὐτόν after ἀπετέ. 

11.65 - add ἀπελείον o IC before εἰσιον τοῦ. Tischendorf stated that B also omitted εἰς αὐτόν and that it was later added by C. But this εἰς αὐτόν is by B. The second corrector has not worked over the text at this point.

13.12 - omit καὶ before ἐιλαθεν. (?) 

13.13 - o xς καὶ o δίος. for o δίος καὶ o xς. 

13.23 - add θεό, probably, after μν. 

13.24 - add oυυ, perhaps, after νευει. It is more likely that A omitted oυυ than τοῦτο. Nothing, however, is certain. 

13.31 - ὑπ. for ὑπ. 

13.32 - add eι o δικ δοσιασθην εν αὐτω after καὶ o δικ δοσιασθην αὐτον εν αὐτω. The original x at the beginning of the erased area is apparent. Though nothing else can be seen, every consideration supports our text. The text of A ended at about the middle of line 13. Whether A wrote αὐτω or αὐτῳ before καὶ εὐθύς is not known. It cannot be assumed that B, after expanding the text, re-wrote the original text. 

14.2 - omit οτι after μν. (?) 

14.5 - καὶ πως διώκει τὴν οἶδαν ἐδέειν for πον ὦ δεικν 

16.25 - ἀναγγελῶ for ἀναγγέλω. 

16.28 - παρὰ for εκ. 

17.1 - add καὶ after λυ.
17.3 - γίνομαι for -αι.
17.12 - omit καὶ before ἐμπληκα.
17.23 - The redundant εἰς is erased after τετελείωσον.
18.10 - ὄμοιον for ὀμοίον. (?) Tischendorf said this correction is
by C. I don't know his reason for so stating. The letters αο
are simply erased as was the habit of B and as Tischendorf has
also assumed throughout his edition.
18.14 - ἀπολέγαται for ἀποθανεῖν.
18.15 - τῷ ἰ ἃ for αὐτοῖς.
18.16 - οὐ ἐν γνωτός τῷ διδαξεῖ for οὐ γνωτός τὸν διδασκεῖ.
The letters ἐν are clear; the rest is assumed from this and
the available space.
18.25 - ἀρ. εἰ τὸν οὐν ἐκδιδόνυ for ἀρ. εἰ ἐκδιδόνυ.
18.27 - ο ΠΕΤΡΟΣ for ΠΕΤΡΟΣ.
18.28 - ἀλλ ιν for ἀλλ.
18.32 - οἶκεν for οἴκειν. The _ appears to have been partially erased.
Tischendorf did not note the presence of the _ and wrote οἶκεν
as the original text.
18.33 - omit παῦν after οὐν.
18.34 - αὐτοῖς for ἀνο σεματο.
20.31 - The original scribe wrote a redundant αἰώνιον. After this,
because the vellum is torn, it is impossible to know what was
written, but presumably what is included in brackets. B erased
the duplicated αἰώνιον and wrote ἐκτετείπα before the ruined
part of the vellum. C omitted αἰώνιον altogether.
21.3 - ὀδύνευ for ὀδύνε τι.
21.15 - ιονω for ἵονων.
21.15 - γονία for γραμματα.
21.16 - ιονω for ἵονων.
21.17 - ιονω for ἵονων.
21.18 - ἀλλ οὐ διώκεται ἰδιώτατα ἀλος ἐκτετείπα for ἀλος ἐκτετείπα
ἀλλ οὐ διώκεται.
21.22 - ἀκολουθεῖ μοι for μοι ἀκολ.
Errors in Tischendorf's Edition of the Original Text of Codex C

Matthew

2.23 - δια, not υπο.

7.12 - κοινωνιν, not κοινωνιν. See Appendix B.

8.6 - δινως, not δεινως.

8.13 - γεννητω, not γεννητω.

8.17 - ποιαιαυ, not ποιαιαυ.

8.31 - not δεινως, but, probably, δεινως.

8.34 - επηλθην, not επηλθην.

9.12 - κρινων, not κρινων.

10.33 - δ αν αρνητηται, not δ αλαρνητηται.

12.45 - πονηροτερα, not πονηροτερα.

12.46 - μηρ, not μηρ μου. See Appendix B.

13.33 - εις, not ευ, before αλευρου.

13.49 - αγγελοι του θυ, not αγγελοι (without του θυ).

13.57 - ατιμως, not ατιμως ει.

15.36 - not ευχαριστητεν, but εκλασεν.

16.22 - επιτιμην, not επιτιμην.

18.29 - γοι αποβως, not αποβως γοι. See Appendix B.

19.16 - σχω, not εχω.

19.28 - καισεθε, not καισεθε.

20.32 - θελες, not θελες.

21.10 - εγισθη, not εσισθη.

21.21 - ορει, not ορει.

21.23 - ελαθοντος, not ελαθοντος.

21.28 - ειπεν, not ειχεν.

21.28 - πρω, not πρωτω.

24.8 - ωδε ινων, not ωδων.

26.65 - not οτι εβλασω, but, perhaps, τι εβλασω.

27.5 - ανεκωνησεν, not ανεχ.

27.58 - εκενευσεν, not εκελευσεν. This is quite clear. What the scribe thought he was writing is certainly not clear.
Matthew
28,5 - οφειλείς, not -θε.
28,10 - οφείλεις, not -θε.

Mark
1,20 - Χεβεδαίον, not Χεβεδαίον See Appendix B.
2,16 - οτι, not τι οτι after μαθητικς αυτων See Appendix A.
3,18 - Tischendorf omitted a full line: ιακωβον του του αλφανου και Θαδδαίου και.
3,20 - apparently Συναθαι, not Συναθαι.
4,31 - κοκκω, not κοκκων. See Appendix A.
4,33 - not ελαλει, but πολλακις ελαλει or ελι, πολ. See Appendix B.
5,34 - και ισθι, not ισθι. See Appendix B.
6,1 - τοις, not της, before συγγενεσιν.
6,13 - πλιθον, not ελιφον.
8,6 - αναπεσιν, not αναπεσειν.
8,26 - του, not τους, before ανους.
8,28 - οτι, not οι μεν, after λεγοντες See Appendix B.
9,2 - not εκ after ημερας, but οδ (or ολ). See Appendix A.
9,18 - τους οδοντας, not και τρι ει τους οδοντας. See Appendix B.
9,18 - ειπα, not ειπον.
9,23 - πιστευοντι, not το πιστευοντι. See Appendix B.
9,42 - πιστευοντων, not πιστιν εχουντων. See Appendix B.
10,12 - αυτης before γαμηση, not αυτου.
10,39 - βαπτισθησονται, not -θε.
11,3 - τουτοντο, not τουτο και. See Appendix B.
11,28 - της σοι, not τι σοι.
12,14 - ειπε, not ειπον ουν.
13,31 - παρελευσονται, not -σεται.
14,8 - not αιτη, but αυτ
14,13 - υπαγε, not υπαγετε. See Appendix B.
14,64 - παινεται, not παινετε.
14,72 - και ευθεω, not και εκ δευτερου See Appendix B.
Mark
15.10 - παραδεχόμενον, not -χείραν.
15.21 - κυριακή, not κυριακή.
16.7 - προσεγγίστηκαν, after ορίζω, not θανάτω.
16.9 - ανήσυχος, not κατ' ανήσυχος. See Appendix B.
Luke
1.18 - not αυτού, but perhaps αγγελού.
2.11 - not μερικός οδωρ, but μερικον.
2.16 - αυτον, not αυτού, after εκεινοντα.
2.51 - not κατεβή, met αυτων, but κατεβή,
3.13 - πλεον, not πλειον.
3.14 - επηρεαστήκας δε, not επηρεαστήκαν.
3.16 - μου, not εμου, after αποχωρέσοντος. See Appendix B.
4.29 - not κατακρινομεναι, but, perhaps, κατακριμωμαι. See Appendix B.
5.30 - του, not τους, before μαθητας.
5.30 - not λεγοντες, but [αυτου] λεγοντες. See Appendix B.
7.4 - του ιν, not αυτον, after προς.
7.9 - ευραν, not ευρον.
8.31 - ιμα, not ινα.
8.32 - αργελιη, not -βλον.
8.33 - αν μισον, not υπο μισον.
9.5 - δεχωται, not δεχωτα.
9.10 - ιδια, not ιδιαν.
9.22 - του, not τους, before ιν.
9.33 - ιοουσι, not ιοουσει.
9.92 - προσευχομενον, not προσερχ.
10.39 - αυτου, not του ιν, after κοσμ.
See Appendix B.
11.12 - αλλα, not αλλ, before ουα.
11.16 - ενι, not ενι, before δαχτυλον.
11.18 - απεκτινων, not απεκτεινων.
11.53 - ενεχειν, not επεχειν.
20.19 - τοις χειρας, not χειρας.
Luke

20.20 - αὐτοῦ, not ἀυτοῦ before λόγου.
22.8 - φωγμεν, not φαγμεν.
22.18 - εἰς οὐ, not εἰς ἦ, before βασιλεία. See Appendix B.
23.30 - πεσατα! not πεσατα!
23.43 - παραδίσω, not παραδείσω.
23.52 - πειλατώ, not πιλατώ.
23.55 - γαλιλαίας αὐτῶ, not γαλ. See Appendix B.

John

1.25 - ο προφητης, not προφητης.
1.40 - των ακουσαντων, not ακουσ.
4.39 - ἰδια, not δια, before τον λόγου.
4.45 - εν τη εορτη, not εις την εορτην after πλοην.
6.17 - πιστευν, not πιστ. εις εμε. See Appendix B.
6.53 - αμη αμη, not αμη.
6.56 - τα, not το before αιμα
6.57 - not κη δι εμε, but κησει. See Appendix B.
8.38 - ηκουσατε, not -ται.
11.44 - ις αυτοις, not αυτοις ο ις.
13.26 - ψωμιον, not ψωμ. This, apparently, is corrected in Τ8.
17.7 - εγνωσαν, not εγνωκαν.
17.13 - not καρδιας εαυτων, but, perhaps, καρδιας σεαυτων.
18.14 - συμφερει, not συμφερει.
18.32 - ειπειν, not ειπεν. See Appendix B.
21.13 - ερχεται ο ις, not ερχεται ις.
21.24 - ο και μαρτυρων, not ο μαρτυρων.