

A RE-EXAMINATION
OF
CODEX EPHRAEMI RESCRIPTUS

being a Thesis presented by
Robert W. Lyon, B.S., B.D., Th.M.
to
The University of St. Andrews
in application for
the degree of Ph.D.

PREFACE

Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus has been the neglected member of the family of great uncials. Photographic facsimiles have been produced of S, 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.

1

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 Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. Others which were used proved to be of negligible value. Light filters and ultra-violet photographs revealed nothing that could not be seen by the unaided eye. Infra-red photographs were able to pierce the "gioberti" tincture, 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.

1. R. B. Haselden, Scientific Aids for the Study of Manuscripts, Transactions of the Bibliographical Society, Supplement No. 10 (Oxford: The University Press, 1935), 108 pp.

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.

I have now the pleasure of expressing my gratitude to those who have helped me in the process of editing this manuscript: to Principal Matthew Black of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews University, for guidance and helpful advice throughout the course of this study. His enthusiasm for pure research is contagious. To Professor Bruce M. Metzger of Princeton, New Jersey for his general interest in the project and for several suggestions in the line of bibliography. To Dr. R. McL. Wilson of St. Mary's College for reading the introductory chapter and making valuable criticisms and to Robert Way, student of United College, for proof-reading part of the text of the codex. A special word of appreciation is extended to Professor Merrill M. Parvis of Emory University, Emory Georgia, for the use of the micro-film of Codex C, and to the American Bible Society for underwriting the cost of photographs and for providing me with a Greek typewriter. A word of appreciation is also due to the staff of the Manuscript Department of the Bibliothèque Nationale for their cooperation in more ways than one can mention. I must also mention the

quiet assistance and encouragement given by my wife; to her also I am grateful for her part in typing the thesis. Finally, I must acknowledge the Grace of the Sovereign God Who intervened when eye disease threatened to halt this project. Through His goodness and mercy alone is this thesis presented as a finished work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	11
Introduction.	1
A. History of Previous Studies of Codex C	1
B. Description of the Codex	5
1. Condition and appearance	5
2. The format	6
3. The contents	9
4. The script	15
C. The Provenance of the Manuscript	18
D. The Correctors	19
1. Corrections by the original scribe	20
2. The first corrector.	20
3. The second corrector	24
E. The Results of the Present Study	26
THE TEXT.	30
Appendices: Explanations and <u>Sigla</u>	320
A. Notes on the Text of the Original Scribe	322
B. Alterations Made by the First Corrector.	328
C. Alterations Made by the Second Corrector	380
D. Corrections to the Edition of Tischendorf.	404
Bibliography.	414

INTRODUCTION

Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus (Gregory: 04; 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 Lascar 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 Bibliotheque Nationale.

¹
Scrivener denied that this manuscript was among those bought by Marshall Strozzi.

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. ²Wetstein, 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

1. F.H.A. Scrivener, A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, 4th ed. edited by Edward Miller, vol. I (London: George Bell and Sons, 1894), p. 121.

2. J.J. Wetstein, Novum Testamentum Graecum, Tomus I (Amstelredami, 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,¹ who in 1710 and again in 1723 published Mill's Greek New Testament and included such readings as were forwarded to him by Beivin. 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 Montfaucon² 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 sample 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 Prolegomena, issued anonymously from Amsterdam in 1730.³ 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 1654 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 Gleditschii, 1723). This second edition was merely the unsold stocks of the first edition with a new title page. On page 4b of his Praefatio Kuster described briefly the manuscript and states that the citations in the apparatus were received from Beivin. In all likelihood Kuster had not even seen the codex.

2. Bernardi de Montfaucon, Palaeographia Graeca sive de Ortu et Progressu Literarum Graecarum, (Paris, 1708), p. 218f.

3. J.J. Wetstein, Prolegomena ad Novi Testamenti Graecum,^{editio} (Amstelae-
dami: R. & J. Wetstenios and G. Smith, 1730), p. 12.

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.¹ 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.² A generation later Lachmann indicated the fame that was waiting for the scholar who would undertake to publish a complete edition of the Codex.³ He was the first, it appears, to suggest the application 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 1834-35.⁴ At his instance the "gioberti" 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 readings. 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: J. Archdeacon, 1793), p. 260.

2. J.J. Griesbach, Symbolae Criticae, Tomus Prior (Halsae, 1785), p. vi.

3. Carl Lachmann, "Rechenschaft über seine Ausgabe des neuen Testaments," Theologische Studien und Kritiken, III (1830), p. 831f.

4. F.F. Fleck, "Über die Handschrift des neuen Testaments gewöhnlich Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus genannt in der königlichen Bibliothek zu Paris," Theologische Studien und Kritiken, XIV (1841), pp. 126ff.

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.¹ 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. Tragelles looked at the codex several times to satisfy his own mind as regards the variant reading in I Timothy 3.16,² but he made no serious attempt to test the accuracy of Tischendorf. The learned Italian, A. Ceriani,³ 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 acquiescence⁴ 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 Quinti ut Videtur post Christum Seculi, (Lipsiae: Bernh. Tauchnitz, 1845). 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.

2. Samuel P. Tragelles, An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament, (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1854), p. 228. Tragelles refers to his "repeated inspection of this passage."

3. A. Ceriani, "Lecture della Classe di lettere e Scienze Storiche e Morali, Critica Biblica," Reale Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere Rendiconti, Series II, Vol. XXI (1888), p. 547.

4. Hermann von Soden, Die Schriften des neuen Testaments, I. Teil (Berlin: Verlag von Arthur Glaue, 1902-1910), p. 935f.

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 maimed in the war. Its beauty and fulness are departed."¹ 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 vermilion 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 so 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

15. C.R. Gregory, Canon and Text of the New Testament (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1907), p. 308.

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 138 of the present binding — the one used for a facsimile by Tischendorf — has disappeared.¹ 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 le fol. 138 manque/ G. Tischendorf a donne dans son Codex Ephraemi Syri rescriptus (Lipsiae, 1845, h.) un fac-simile d'une page de ce feuillet, qui contenait un fragment de l'Ecclesiaste, V, 5 - VI, 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 C 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 on 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,¹ while the two extant folios of I 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.² 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 Philemon, 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 I Corinthians has 42 lines. But on this see Appendix A.

2. J.L. Hug, *An Introduction to the Writings of the New Testament*, trans. by Daniel C. Wait, vol. I (London: C. & J. Rivington, 1827), p. 272.

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.¹ 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 i and 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 Eusebian canons are not seen. It is quite likely,² as others have mentioned, that these were written with the same vermillion ink that was used at the beginning of each book and have likewise disappeared. There are no κεφαλαια on the pages of the text, but lists of τιτλοι preceded the four gospels. Of these τιτλοι, 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 ευαγγελιον κατα ματθαιον, ευαγγελιον κατα λουκαν, ευαγγελιον κατα ιωαννην

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 ρωμαιους, and so forth. Those for the catholic epistles are ιακωβου επιστολη, and so forth.

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

ις, ιυ, ιν

θς, θυ, θω, θν

χς, χυ, χω, χν

πνα, πνς, πνι, πνατα

πνικος, πνικης, πνικον; πνικα, πνικων

υς, υυ, υν, υε

ανος, ανου, ανω, ανον, ανε, ανοι, ανων, ανοις, ανους

κς, κυ, κω, κν, κε

πηρ, πρς, πρα, περ, πρες, πρων, πρασιν, πρας

μηρ, μρς, μρι, μρα

σηρ, σρς, σρι

δαδ

ιλημ

ουνος

βλεεμ for βηθλεεμ is used once, in Matthew 2.16. The word ουρανος is shortened very infrequently. ισραηλ is always shortened, usually to ιηλ, but once in Luke to ιελ, and in Acts everytime but once to ισλ.

The χαι 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 μου in the following fashion: μου. The horizontal line at the end of a line for υ 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:

Beginning with:Ending with:Matthew

- 1.2 - και τους αδελφους 5.15 - καιουσιν αυ
2 leaves missing
- 7.5 - δοκον. και τοτε 17.26 - αυτω ο ις ara
1 leaf missing
- 18.13 - μοι ει τι οφειλεις 22.20 - και η επιγραφη
1 leaf missing
- 23.17 - η ο ναος αγιαζων 24.10 - πολλοι και αλληλους
1 leaf missing
- 24.45 - εαυτου του δουναι 25.30 - δουλον εκβαλεται
1 leaf missing
- 26.22 - εις εκαστος μητι 27.11 - των ιουδαιων
1 leaf missing
- 27.47 - τινες δε των 28.14 - ποιησομεν
1 leaf missing

Mark

- 1.17 - υμας γενεσθαι 6.31 - φαγειν ηκαιρουν
2 leaves missing
- 8.5 - πον επτα. και παρ 12.29 - ημων χς ει εστιν
1 leaf missing
- 13.19 - ται γαρ αι ημεραι 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 λαον
1 leaf missing
- 4.25 - επι ετη τρια 6.4 - εφαγεν και εδωκε
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 δοματων
9 leaves missing
- 19.42 - σου οτι ηξουσιν 20.27 - επηρωτησαν αυτο

1 leaf missing

21.21 - τότε οι εν τη 22.19 - ποιείτε εις την

2 leaves missing

23.25 - εις την φυλακην 24.7 - τον υν του ανου οτι δει

1 leaf missing

24.46 - και ειπεν αυτοις to the end.

John - περιεποιετο τους...

1.3 - δε εν ο γεγονεν 1.40 - παρα ιωαννου

2 leaves missing

3.33 - την μαρτυριαν 5.16 - εκποιει εν σαββατω

2 leaves missing

6.38 - ω το θελημα το εμον 7.3 - ιουδαιαν ινα και

1

2 leaves missing ✓

8.34 - πας ο ποιων 9.11 - οφθαλμους και ειπε

2 leaves missing

11.8 - γουσιν αυτω οι μ. 11.46 - ο εκποιησεν ις

2 leaves missing

13.8 - λεγει αυτω πετρος 14.7 - αυτον και εωρακατε

2 leaves missing

16.21 - οτι εγεννηθη ανος 18.36 - εκ του κοσμου του

2 leaves missing

20.26 - και μεθ ημερας to the end.

Acts 21 leaf missing

1.2 - πανς αγιου ους εξελ. 4.3 - εθεντο αυτους εις τη

2 leaves missing

5.35 - ειπεν δε προς 10.42 - ζωντων και νεκρων

2 leaves missing

13.1 - ος μαναην τε 16.36 - πορευεσθε εν ειρηνη

4 leaves missing ✓

20.10 - λων αυτου ειπεν μη 21.30 - εκλεισθησαν αι θυραι

1 leaf missing

22.21 - και ειπεν προς 23.18 - προς τον χιλιαρ

1. Because of the amount of space available it is not possible for the missing leaves to have contained the pericope de adultera.

1 leaf missing

24.15 - πίδα. εχων προς

26.19 - απειθης τη

1 leaf missing

27.16 - φης την αραντες

28.4 - ζην ουκ ειασεν

1 leaf missing

James

1.2 - περιπεσητε ποικ.

4.2 - και πολεμειτε

1 leaf missing

I Peter

1.2 - πνς εις υπακοην

4.5 - ζωντας και νεκρους

1 leaf missing

2 Peter

1.2 - χαρις υμιν to the end.

1 John

1.2 - χαμεν 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. κα

1 leaf missing

3.21 - και των προφητων

9.5 - εις την αιωνα αμην

1 leaf missing

10.15 - μη αποσταλωσιν

11.31 - και ουτοι νυν ηπει

1 leaf missing

13.10 - ουκ νομου η αγαπη to the end.

I Corinthians

1.3 - χαρις υμιν

7.18 - μη επισπασθω

1 leaf missing

9.7 - γαζεσθαι τις στρατ.

13.8 - ειτε γλωσσαι

2 leaves missing

15.40 - μεν η των επ. to the end.

2 Corinthians

- 1.2 - και ειρηνη απο $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$ 10.8 - καθαιρεσιν υμων
3 leaves missing

Galatians

- 1.21 - επειτα ηλθον to the end.

Ephesians

1 leaf missing

- 2.18 - οι αμφοτεροι 4.16 - εαυτου εν αγαπη
2 leaves missing

Philippians

- 1.22 - ρησομε ου γνωριζω 3.5 - $\overline{\iota\eta\lambda}$ φυλης βενια
1 leaf missing

Colossians

- 1.2 - χαρις υμιν to the end.

I Thessalonians

- 1.2 - ευχαριστουμεν τω $\overline{\theta\omega}$ 2.8 - ημιν εγεννηθητε
2
4 leaves missing

Hebrews

- 2.4 - μερισμοις. κατα την 7.16 οσοις ακακος
1 leaf missing
9.15 - εστιν οπως θαν. 10.24 - εις παροξυσμον αγα
3
2 leaves missing
12.16 - μη τις πορνος to the end.

1. Eberhard Nestle, in his Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament (London: Williams and Morgate, 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 resume again until 12.16. This does not prove, however, that he never saw this folio.

1 Timothy

1 leaf missing

3.9 - ριον της πιστεως

5.19 - η τριων μαρτυρων

1 leaf missing

2 Timothy1.3 - χαριν εχω τω $\Theta\omega$ 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 - κυνησαν και ειδον

7.14 - μοι ουτοι εισιν

1 leaf missing

9.17 - και ουτως ιδον

16.13 - πνευματα τρια ακαθαρ¹

1 leaf missing

18.2 - παντος ορνεου

19.5 - αυτον οι μικροι

3 leaves missing

From these contents we may present the following table:

Number of leaves preserved:

145

Number of leaves missing:

Matthew	7 $\frac{1}{2}$
Mark	3 $\frac{1}{2}$
Luke	18
John	14
Acts	12
Catholic Epistles	4
Pauline Epistles	22
Revelation	<u>6</u>

Total

87
3

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 12.4 - 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, ζ (although a little more erect in Codex C), η (the horizontal stroke is high), θ, κ, λ, μ, ρ, (at times the body is almost diamond-shaped: ◇), and ω. The hooks on the ends of ε, σ, and τ 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 tau. The diagonal stroke of mu joins the vertical strokes just short of the ends of those strokes: N. The tail of the rho curls at the end: ρ. The two arms of upsilon

detail: beginning with 10.9, και απηθα, to 10.10, και οτε ε[φαρον]; then 7.17, δακρυον to 8.4, του θυ; then 11.3, χιλις to 11.12 λεγουσης. An adequate explanation for this phenomenon is given by Harold Oliver, "A Textual Transposition in Codex C," JBL LXXVI (1957), pp. 233-236. A further note might well be added on the text of Revelation. R. H. Charles in his commentary on the Apocalypse has stated that the text of C is "most carefully written." ((The Revelation of St. John, ICC Series, Vol. I (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1920), p. cxcvii)) This statement must be qualified. One item will show why: In chapters 10-16 a significant number of omissions — often by homoioteleuton — is noted. Because they may have a relationship to the conclusions reached by Oliver, these omissions are listed here: (a) 10.2 - των δεξιων; (b) 10.8 - εν τη χειρι; (c) 12.11 και ηιου καιρου; (d) 13.6 - και την ακνην αυτου; (e) 13.15 - ινα και λαληση . . . τη εικονι του θηριου; (f) των προεδρευων και; (g) 14.4 - απο των ανθρωπων; (h) 15.3 - και αδουσι . . . του θεου; (j) 16.13 - δρακοντες και εκ του στοματος του. 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 τιτλοι for Matthew and Mark were included in the codex the number of missing folios is 69 and the total number originally in the codex was 234.

3. In his Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament p. 71 F. C. Kenyon stated, "When complete, the New Testament would have occupied 238 leaves." Did he include pages for τιτλοι 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 chi curls slightly: \times . The vertical stroke of psi 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 Sinaiticus, but not later than Codex Alexandrinus. In addition to the writing Tischendorf 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 S must also be considered. The absence of any Euthalian 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 *fifth* century.

Tischendorf 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 problems in Codex S, yet they have successfully¹ "located" the different writers. Several notes on the orthography of the manuscript should be instructive. The itacism i for ei is seen throughout the manuscript. The verbal suffixes, Θαι, Θε and ται, 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

1. H.J.W. Milne and T.C. Skeat, Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus (London: The British Museum, 1930), pp. 11-30.

by other observations. Aside from one instance in Luke, the codex always has the spelling κίλατος. But in John κείλατος is found every time.¹ A peculiarity found only, but regularly, in John is παρειστάσι. In none of the other gospels is the nu-moveable omitted so frequently as in John.² Furthermore, John alone of the gospels frequently has ληψομαι rather than ληψομαι. Finally we notice that once the scribe wrote κε for κα. 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.³

It has been suggested by others⁴ that a different scribe wrote the book of Acts. The use of ισλ instead of ιηλ for ισραηλ 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 lapse from the scribe's customary accuracy.⁵

Only one other possibility is worth mentioning as regards the different scribes. In the text of Revelation the scribe has written η for ει 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 nu-moveable 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: ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ and ΚΑΤΑΙΩΑΝΝΗΝ. In Mark and Luke (the end of Matthew is missing) the subscription is written on one line: ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝΚΑΤΑΜΑΡΚΟΝ and ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝΚΑΤΑΛΟΥΚΑΝ.

4. Ludwig Traube, Notitia Sacra, Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters, Zweiter Band (München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1907), p. 70f.

5. On this basis we could allege 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 v 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.¹ 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 lesser 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 ² τετοααοxnc six times out of seven instead of τετεααοxnc. But this type

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

2. Milne and Skeat, op. cit., p. 67.

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 (*italics his*) Egypt to be the country of such a MS as to its origin." ¹ 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, ² 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." ³ 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 ⁴ 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.

1. Tragelles, op. cit., p. 125.

2. Gunther Zuntz, The Text of the Epistles, A Disquisition Upon The Corpus Paulinum, The Schweich Lectures of 1946 (London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1953) p. 263ff.

3. Milne and Skeat, op. cit., p. 66.

4. F.J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, Beginnings of Christianity, Part I The Acts of the Apostles, Vol. III the Text of Acts, by James Hopes (London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1926) p. iv. "There seems to be no sufficient reason for any confident assertion that it is of Egyptian origin."

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 εδoθ and then added η above the theta: εδoθ^η. 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 erasing 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 emendations 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:

<u>Book</u>	<u>Folios</u>	<u>Corrections</u>	<u>Average per folio</u>
Matthew	24	91	3.75
Mark	16	121	7.5
Luke	15 ⁴	100	6.7
John	10	70	7.0
Acts	20	96	4.8
Cath. epistles	9 ¹	66	7.0
Paul. epistles	39	177	4.5
Revelation	8	10	1.25

On the following page is given a more complete and detailed breakdown of the distribution of emendations 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 corrector¹ or 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 emendations 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

1. Cf., Scrivener, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

DISTRIBUTION TABLE FOR THE CORRECTORS

<u>Text</u>	<u>Leaves</u>	<u>First totals</u>	<u>Corrector per page</u>	<u>Second totals</u>	<u>Corrector per page</u>
Matthew 1.1 - 9.11	5	26	5.2	23	4.6
9.11 - 13.21	5	15	3.0	14	2.8
13.21 - 17.26	5	16	3.2	14	2.8
19.28 - 24.10	5	17	3.4	21	4.2
24.15 - 28.14	4	17	4.25	22	5.5
Mark 1.17 - 6.1	5	40	8.0	12	2.4
6.2 - 10.49	5	34	6.8	38	7.6
10.50 - 16.20	64	47	7.8	13	2.2
Luke 1.1 - 6.4	5	34	6.8	34	6.8
6.37 - 10.37	5	23	4.6	42	8.4
10.38 - 24.53	54	43	8.6	29	5.8
John 1.1 - 9.11	5	24	4.8	52	10.4
11.8 - 21.25	5	46	9.1	81	16.2
Acts 1.1 - 7.44	5	25	5.0	32	6.4
7.44 - 13.32	5	27	5.4	4	0.8
13.32 - 21.3	5	21	4.2	223	4.6
21.3 - 28.4	5	23	4.6	5	1.0
James	2	21	10.5	33	1.5
I Peter	2	17	8.5	1	0.5
2 Peter	2	14	7.0	29	4.5
1, 3 John, Jude	34	14	4.0	3	1.0
Rom. 1.1 - 9.5	5	16	3.2	6	1.2
10.15 - 16.27	34	19	5.4	35	1.4
1 Cor. 1.1 - 10.16	44	15	3.3	19	4.2
10.16 - 16.23	3	10	3.3	10	3.3
2 Corinthians	5	25	5.0	8	1.6
Galatians	3	12	4.0	7	2.3
Eph, Phil, Col, I Th.	5	34	6.8	11	2.2
Hebrews	5	25	5.0	23	4.6
Tim, Tit, Phile.	5	21	4.2	1	0.2
Revelation	8	10	1.25	0	0.0

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 ~~corrections~~ ^{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.¹ 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: εν κρω εκινω.

" 33 - σαββ. ΙΑ' τω κρω εκινω. Tischendorf has erroneously placed this entry on page 34 which has no marginal note.

" 66 - κρω εκινω is written under σαββ. Ε του νησθιου. 11 27

" 83 - Tischendorf omits the following note half-way down in the right-hand margin: ΖΤΙ' τω ζτ κατ μα κω ΤΑΒ.

" 110 - Tischendorf has omitted the following note which is found about ten lines down in the left-hand margin: κω Η' τω κρω εκινω.

1. see pages 25 - 28.

Page 172 - Instead of what Tischendorf has, read the following: σαββ 2.

ΕΝ ΤΕΣ ΠΑ ΠΑΥΛΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΒΑΡΝΙΒΑΣ ΔΕΡΝΘΟΝ ΕΝ ΑΝΤΙΩΧ.

" 173 - A little over halfway down the page in the right-hand margin, add the following: ΚΥ 2. ΕΝ ΤΕΣ ΠΑΕΡ ΕΥΕΝΕΤΩ, etc.

" 226 - σαββ Ι. αδελφοι. παρακαλο υμας. 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 13.3 corrections per folio — much higher than any average by the first corrector. We note the following results:

<u>Book</u>	<u>Leaves</u>	<u>Corrections</u>	<u>Per Folio</u>
Matthew	24	94	4.0
Mark	16	63	4.0
Luke	15 $\frac{1}{2}$	105	7.0
John	10	133	13.3
Acts	20	64	3.2
Cath. epistles	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	16	1.7
Paul. epistles	39	90	2.35
Revelation	8	0	0.0

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 Westcott and Hort'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: ης for εις, τις for της, κε for και, ο for ω. The χα compendium is also used as well as other ligatures.

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: ὑποταγντε καὸν κτισει ἀνθρ, but I have written ὑκ. καὸν φουσει ἀνθρ. As far as we have been able to find, φουσει 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 κτισει 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 see 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 lacunas as does Codex C. Is it satisfactory, for example, to include our manuscript among others under a common sign? In Nestle's apparatus the Hesychian symbol includes Codex C unless stated otherwise. In reality, however, who knows all the places where Codex C is missing? The Hesychian 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 7.24ff. All of the text in Romans 7.24-8.2 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 ος μεν γαρ rather than ος μεν. 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 15.18, for example, the corrector erased χαίρε ο βασιλευς των ιουδαιων and wrote και λεγειν χαίρε ο βασιλευς των ιουδαιων.

We clearly credit καὶ λεγεῖν to the corrector. But does ο βασιλευς (instead of βασιλεϋ) which the original scribe also wrote, represent a critical judgment on the part of the corrector? Or after adding καὶ λεγεῖν 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 οτι the original scribe wrote αυτο, but corrected this mistake himself to read αυτη.
- 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 αλλ ω ο.

Mark

- 1.45 - The original scribe wrote το ν λ ο at the end of the line, but failed to write ο ν on the next line. Neither of the correctors has supplied the needed letters.
- 2.16 - The original scribe did not write τι ο τι after μαθηταις αυτου as Tischendorf has stated. A long hole in the vellum covers the beginning of this line where ταις αυτου was written. Tischendorf's edition is as follows υ . ι ο τι (each letter is represented by one dot). I do not know how he saw the υ unless he assumed some mark below the line to be vestiges of it. Neither do I see an ι before ο τι. (It is, of course, possible that this hole has been enlarged during the last century.) Yet it still remains impossible for τι to have been written because the space simply is not sufficient. In line 18 ταις αυτου occupies the maximum amount of space that is available before ο τι. It is quite possible that the first corrector erased ταις αυτου (hence the holes) to add τι. This would explain Tischendorf's ι before ο τι.
- 3.5 - I cannot tell whether the original scribe wrote αποκατεστη (with Wetstein) or απεκ. (with Tischendorf). A small hole has removed part of the letter, and a heavy black mark covers the rest.
- 4.31 - The ω of κοκκω cannot be seen entirely. But space is quite limited and not sufficient - as Tischendorf has assumed - for ο ν. He thought he saw ο after κοκκω, but this is the first part of ω. There can be no doubt that he is wrong.

Mark

- 9.2 - The original scribe has apparently written αδ (or αλ) after ημερας. What this could mean, or how it was confused with εε, I cannot say. Except for the bottom of the second letter, this is very clear.
- 9.18 - Tischendorf said the original scribe wrote και τοιζει τους οδοντας after αποριζει. 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 αφ. και τοιζει - omitting τους οδοντας - because the second corrector has added αυτου 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 αποριζει τους οδοντας (with Codex X).

John

- 21.13 - The original scribe wrote ερχεται ο ις. Tischendorf rejected this reading, largely on the basis of space, and suggested either ερχετε ο ις or ερχεται ις. I have been able to detect the article and apparently the ς. Furthermore, in line 5 the τα ις of μαθηταις easily fits into the space available for ται ο. 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 - ωβηδ (twice) for ιωβηδ (?)
- 1.8 - ιωσαφατ (twice) for ιωσαφα. 7.2
- 1.13 - αβιουδ (second) for - ? The original "inepte" spelling is unknown.
- 1.15 - add γαρ after μνηστευθισης. very close, without 1/2
gap neg, will
have been 1/2
transcribing
pg. 2-36
- 3.6 - add παντες after εβαπτιζοντο.
- 4.1 - τοτε ο ις ανηχθη for ανηχθη δε ο ις.
- 4.10 - add οπισω μου 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 ις after ακουσας δε. None of the original letters can be seen. Our text is based only on the space available.
- 4.19 - add ο ις after αυτοις.
- 4.24 - add και before δαιμονιζομενους.
- 7.9 - αιτησει for -σεις (?).
- 7.12 - ποιουσιν for ποιωσιν. Tischendorf said A wrote ου and B changed it to ω. There can be no question that he is wrong. The letters ου are obviously crowded.
- 7.16 - σταφυλην for -ληνας. A conflated his two choices. cf. Mt. 23.26.
- 7.19 - add ουν after πιν.
- 7.21 - add ουτος εισελευσεται εις την βασιλειαν των ουνων after ουνους.
- 7.24 - ωκοδομησεν for οικ.
- 7.26 - ωκοδομησεν for οικ.
- 7.29 - add αυτων after γραμματεις.
- 8.3 - add ο ις after αυτου. The surface of the vellum after αυτου is permanently rubbed out. The text of A is dictated by the space available.

Matthew

8.4 - μουσης for μωσης.

8.7 - B has written εγω ελθων θερει 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 (ακολουθει μοι εγω . . .) of A.

8.13 - γεννηστω for γεννητω. Tischendorf erred in crediting γεννηστω to the original scribe. *von Tischendorf von **

8.17 - ηραιου for ηραιουου. Tischendorf thought a duplicated υ had been erased. But all of our letters can be seen.

8.25 - προσελθοντες οι μαθηται for, perhaps, προσελ. αυτω οι μαθ. αυτου. Approximately 1½ lines have been erased and in this space the corrector has written: κυριων αυτος δε εξαθειθεν και προσελθοντες οι μαθηται. It is certain that the original scribe wrote more than this. Tischendorf's suggestion that the corrector removed αυτω after προσελθοντες and αυτου after μαθηται has a very sound foundation and fits the space fairly well. I have two modifications to make, however, to his conjecture.

(1) He said line 33 probably ended with οι μα and line 34 began with θηται αυτου. From an infra-red photograph it is fairly

clear that ι (of οι) was the last letter on the line. Line 34

then began μαθηται αυτου 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 αυτω and αυτου.

8.31 - δαιμονες for, perhaps, δειμονες. I do not think Tischendorf was correct in saying an original ε was changed to read αι.

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

9.9 - add ματθαιου λεγομενον after καθημενον. Enough letters are seen to make this certain. Tischendorf did not attempt to

Matthew

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 C* is a singular reading and has no other witnesses. I cannot say whether A wrote ηκολουθει (C, N, D) or ηκολουθησεν (C, Bod. B).

9.14 - μαθηται for μαται.

9.27 - add και λεγοντες after κραζοντες.

10.3 - και λεββαιοσ ο επικληθεις θαδδαιοσ for, probably, και λερβαιοσ ο και θαδδαιοσ. At the end of the line δαιοσ is seen as well as αι (of και?) in a position which suggests our text. This reading represents one of the possibilities put forth by Tischendorf.

10.13 - μεν η η οικια for μεν ην η οικια (?).

10.19 - ωρα for ημερα.

11.23 - οτι ει for οτι. I cannot doubt that A omitted ει rather than οτι. 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 - μειζων for μειζων (?).

12.8 - add γιν εστιν after κς.

12.11 - add εσταται after τις.

12.13 - εξετεινεν και απεκατεσταθη υγιης ως η αλλη 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.

12.17f - υκο ησαιου του προφητου λεγοντος ιδου ο παις μου ον

ηρετισα ο αγαπητος μου εις ον 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 υκο for an original διδ and he thought he saw εν ω under εις ον. To me, the latter suggestion is questionable. A curved mark (for ω?) is seen under ον, but it

Matthew

leaves some space between ω and ηυδοκησεν. I am fairly certain, however, that I have detected the υ of μου on an infra-red photograph at a point that makes it impossible for Codex C to have written other than μου ον ηυδοκησεν.

12.22 - add τυφλος και before κωφος.

12.29 - διαρρησαι for αρρησαι.

12.44 - omit και before σεσαρωμενον. (?)

12.48 - add μου after μηρ. Tischendorf assumed B re-wrote the text of A. But A definitely wrote less than B. This place is quite difficult, but the ρ is the most certain letter.

13.57 - add ει after ατιμος. Tischendorf thought this was by the original scribe.

14.19 - χορτους for χορτου. The corrector has not completed his change of the text, for του has not been made to read τους.

14.19 - omit και before λαβων.

14.25 - ηλθεν for απηλθεν. (?)

14.29 - ελθειν for, probably, και ηλθεν.

14.33 - οι δε εν τω πλοιω for, perhaps, οι δε εν πλοιω. 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 τον πα.

15.17 - εις αφεδρωνα for - ? The original scribe omitted perhaps one or two letters. Certainly τον was not included.

15.32 - σπλαγχνιζομε for, possibly, σπλαγχν. One of the first six letters was omitted by A.

15.36 - ευχαριστησας εκλασεν for, probably, εκλασεν. Tischendorf assumed that A wrote ευχαριστησεν και and omitted εκλασεν. This is impossible because of the available space. The letters ευχαριστησεν και ε will not fit after ιχθους. A must have written και λαβων . . . εκλασεν και εδωκεν.

16.3 - add και before το μεν.

Matthew

- 16.11 - add προσεχειν before προσεχετε.
- 16.13 - omit δε before ο ις.
- 16.19 - omit και before δωσω.
- 16.22 - επιτιμω for επιτιμιω (?). Tischendorf did not note that the ι had been erased and credited A with having επιτιμω.
- 17.8 - add μεθ εαυτων after μονον.
- 18.29 - add εις τους ποδας αυτου before κατεκαλει.
- 18.29 - add παντα before σοι. Tischendorf erred in thinking that the corrector reversed the order of the original text when he added παντα. The letters can be seen as indicated in the text.
- 18.35 - ουρανιος for επουρ. (?)
- 19.19 - add σου after κρα.
- 20.3 - omit duplicated τοι (?).
- 20.6 - omit αργους after εστωτας.
- 20.10 - πλειονα for πλειον.
- 20.12 - omit οτι before ουτοι (?).
- 20.19 - αναστησεται for εγερθησεται.
- 21.1 - add και βηθανιαν after βηθανι. 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 εις or προς before το ορος as T₆ rightly says. Nestle is questionable in quoting our MS with Codex B as having εις.
- 21.28 - ειχεν for ειπεν. Tischendorf failed to note this, but it is quite obvious. The present χ is not by A.
- 21.28 - πρωτω for κρω.
- 21.28 - add μου after αμπελωνι.
- 21.30 - δευτερω for ετερω.
- 22.15 - add κατ αυτου after ελαβον.
- 23.26 - παρισαιε for παρισαιοιε. We have here another instance in which the scribe combined suffixes. Cf. Mt. 7.16 and possibly Acts 4.2.
- 23.35 - add αν after οπως.

Matthew

- 24.5 - omit ΟΤΙ before ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ (?).
- 25.8 - ΗΜΩΝ for ΥΜΩΝ after ΕΛΕΟΥ.
- 25.20 - add ΤΑΛΑΝΤΑ before ΕΚΕΡΩΝΗΘΑ.
- 26.31 - ΝΥΚΤΙ for ΝΥΚΤΕΙ.
- 26.50 - ΕΤΑΙΡΕ for ΕΣΤΑΙΡΕ (?).
- 26.51 - ΤΩΝ for ΤΩ before ΜΕΤΑ.
- 26.53 - ΘΟΧΕΙΣ for ΘΟΧΕΙ ΣΟΙ.
- 26.59 - ΘΑΝΑΤΩΣΟΥΣΙΝ for -ΣΩΣΙΝ. I do not know why Tischendorf hesitated to credit σου to the corrector. By every criterion they are not the letters of the original scribe.
- 26.60 - add και before ΠΟΛΛΩΝ.
- 26.60 - add ΟΥΧ ΕΥΡΟΝ after ΠΡΟΣΕΛΘΟΝΤΩΝ.
- 26.61 - add, perhaps, ΝΙΟΝ, before ΤΟΥΤΟΥ. This is based only on considerations of space. Due to homoioteleuton the scribe confused ΟΝ of ΤΟΥ for ΟΝ of ΝΙΟΝ. The only other possibility might be ΝΙΟΝ ΘΥ, omitting ΤΟΥ. No other combination of letters fits the space.
- 26.65 - omit, perhaps, ΤΙ after ΛΕΓΩΝ. Tischendorf said the corrector erased ΟΤΙ, but without doubt the space is not sufficient for these letters.
- 26.69 - omit ΑΥΤΩΝ before ΠΑΝΤΩΝ.
- 27.3 - ΤΟΤΕ ΙΔΩΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΣ for - ? The space available makes it impossible for more than one or two letters to have been omitted.
- 27.9 - ΙΕΡΕΜΙΟΥ for ΙΗΡ.
- 27.63 - ΟΤΙ Ο ΠΛΑΝΟΣ ΕΚΕΙΝΟΣ (ΕΙΠΕΝ) for - ? Nothing can be seen of the original letters except π under the first μ of ΑΝΤΙΘΗΜΕΝ. After ΑΝΤΙΘΗΜΕΝ the vellum is so thin the writing on the other side can be easily seen. Tischendorf said he detected ΟΤΙ ΕΙΠΕΝ 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.

- 26.10 - Because the vellum is torn we cannot know whether A wrote και εκει or και εκκει. 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 και εκκει.

Mark

- 1.19 - add αυτων after δixτου.
- 1.20 - ζεβεδαιο for ζεβεδαιου. Tischendorf did not note that the text had been corrected and credited -δαιου to the original scribe.
- 1.44 - α for καθως before προσεταιξεν.
- 1.45 - redundant v between εν and επιθωικ.
- 2.7 - ουτως for ουτω.
- 2.18 - omit μαθηται before των παρισαιων.
- 2.22 - add ο νεος after ρησει ο οινος.
- 3.14 - omit ους και αποστολους ωνομασεν.
- 3.16 - θεραπευειν τας νοσους και εκβαλ τα δαιμ for εκβαλλ τα δαιμ και εκοιτηεν τους δωδεκα.
- 3.26 - ανεστη εφ αυτον for εφ αυτον ανεστη.
- 3.26 - και μεμερισται ου for μεμερισθη και ου.
- 3.27 - και, probably, for αλλα.
- 3.29 - χοισεως for εμπτιας. This is based entirely on the amount of space available which precludes the possibility of an original εμπτιατος.
- 3.31 - στιμωτες (=εστ.?) for -κωτες.
- 4.8 - εν (3 times) for εις (3 times). The second εις can be seen. The other two are assumed because no other explanation will explain the erasures that have been made.
- 4.9 - ο εγω for ος εχει.
- 4.11 - add, probably, γνωσι after δεδοται. All we can know for certain is that A wrote less than B.

Mark

- h.18 - οὗτοι for ἄλλοι.
- h.18 - omit εἰσιν before οἱ τον λογον.
- h.20 - add εν, probably, before ἐξηκοντα. Something was omitted by A.
- h.26 - omit οτι after ελεγεν.
- h.26 - τον for το before σκορον.
- h.27 - νυκτα for νυκτος.
- h.27 - βλαστειν for βλαστα.
- h.28 - πληρη for, perhaps, κληρες. Tischendorf suggests, and I think it is quite likely, that A wrote ρες for ρης. This helps explain why B erased more than the ς, 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 merely have been added by the corrector to the end of the line. Two or three letters of βασιλειαν probably were omitted; perhaps the scribe mistook σι for ει.
- h.30 - ποια παραβολη παραβαλωμεν αυτην for, probably, τινι αυτην παραβολην θωμεν. This line is hopelessly marred and partially torn. Our text is the most likely conjecture.
- h.31 - ος for ως before οταν.
- h.33 - πολλαις ελαλει for - ? Tischendorf in his appendix wrote "et quidem justo fere spatio", but in TB he said Codex C 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 ελαλει πολλαις, but this is improbable.
- h.35 - add το before κεραν.
- h.36 - add δε after αλλα.
- h.38 - διεγειροουσιν for, probably, εγειρ. The original scribe did not omit και since the κ can be seen.
- 5.3 - αλυσεσιν ουδεις ηουν. for αλυσει ουκετι ουδ. εδυν.
- 5.5 - κοιτων εαυτον for - ? A has corrected his own text. Tischendorf said the present ων εαυτον is by B, but I disagree. Only

Mark

- 6.8 - ων ε are by B; but they are not crowded in such a way as to suggest that A wrote αυτον instead of εαυτον.
- 5.13 - add ησαν δε before ως δισχιλιτοι.
- 5.20 - omit ολη before τη δεκαπολει. (?)
- 5.21 - omit ο before οχλος. (?)
- 5.27 - omit τα before περι. (?)
- 5.34 - add θαρσει after αυτη. I cannot tell whether A wrote τηρ or τερ in θυγατερ.
- 5.34 - και ιοθι for - ? Tischendorf said that the original scribe probably omitted και, but there is no foundation for this assumption. και ιοθι 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 θαρσει, 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 - κιντα for απαντα.
- 6.2 - omit ινα before και δυναμεις. (?)
- 6.4 - omit αυτου after συγγενεσιν.
- 6.11 - οσοι εαν μη δεξωνται for οσαν μη δεξηται.
- 6.15 - add εστιν after προφητης.
- 6.23 - The corrector possibly added και ωλοθεν αυτη οτι. Nothing can be seen of the original text, but this fits the space admirably. We cannot be certain whether δ and με were added or omitted. On line 18 under με of the corrected text two letters appear to be οε. If this is part of ο εαν, then the original text was nonsense. με would not fill the space and αιτησης is too much to fit.
- 6.26 - συναναιρεμενους for - ? Even with the infra-red photograph nothing can be seen.
- 6.31 - add οι before επαγοντες. Enough of the original text can be seen to make this certain.

Mark

- 8.24 - ΕΥΘΕΩΡΟΥΣ ΩΣ ΔΕΥΘΕΡΑ ΠΕΡΙ for ΕΥΘΕΩΣ ΟΤΙ ΩΣ ΔΕΥ
ΘΕΩΣ ΠΕΡΙ.
- 8.25 - ΕΚΕΘΙΜΕΝ for -ΚΕ.
- 8.25 - ΕΥΕΒΛΕΨΕΝ for ΔΙΕΒΛ.
- 8.25 - ΙΠΠΑΥΤΕΣ for -ΤΑ.
- 8.28 - ΟΙ ΜΕΝ for ΛΕΓΟΝΤΕΣ ΟΤΙ. Tischendorf erred in saying A wrote ΟΙ ΜΕΝ; to me there is no doubt that he wrote ΟΤΙ after ΛΕΓΟΝΤΕΣ. The space available rules out ΟΙ ΜΕΝ. Furthermore the corrector most likely would not have erased ΛΕΥ. ΟΙ ΜΕΝ and then re-written ΟΙ ΜΕΝ. He has made no attempt to fill the space evenly. I cannot doubt that A wrote ΛΕΓΟΝΤΕΣ ΟΤΙ.
- 8.34 - ΟΣ ΤΙΣ for ΕΙ ΤΙΣ before ΘΕΛΕΙ.
- 8.34 - ΕΛΘΕΙΝ for ΑΚΟΛΟΥΘΕΙΝ.
- 8.35 - add ΟΥΤΟΣ, probably, before ΩΩΣΕΙ. At this place the vellum has several holes. It is certain, however, that A wrote less than B. *To have remained in both without written anything is a mistake (ου σιγῆσαι αὐτὸν) it amounts to ου αὐτὸς σιωπῶν.*
- 8.36 - ΑΥΟC for ΑΥΟV. Tischendorf said the second corrector wrote ο ΑΥΟC for ΤΟV ΑΥΟV because it is obvious that he wrote ο for ΤΟV. I would, however, reconstruct the history of this variant in this way: (1) A wrote ΤΟV ΑΥΟV; (2) B changed ΑΥΟV to ΑΥΟC, 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 ΑΥΟV has been erased. C rejected ΤΟV by circling it with periods - as was his custom. B thoroughly erased the final υ and wrote ς - as was his custom. The first corrector, then, as well as the second should be considered a witness for ΑΥΟC.
- 9.9 - ΕΚ ΥΕΧΡΩΝ for Ε ΥΕΧΡΩΝ.
- 9.13 - ΠΘΕΛΗΤΩV for, probably, ΠΘΕΛΩV.
- 9.20 - I disagree with Tischendorf who said B wrote ΙΩΩV for ΙΩV. The word ΙΩΩV 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

Mark

suggest his change.

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

9.24 - add κε before βοηθει.

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 υ under the line. The letters οντων are clearly apparent at the end of the erased area. At the beginning of the line των πι can be seen as well as the top of τ. Between this τ and οντων A could not have written ιν εχ. On the other hand ευ fits well. Codex C, therefore, agrees with Codex Δ.

10.1 - omit και before περι.

10.12 - αλλω for αλλον before μοιχετα.

10.27 - add δε after εμβλεψας.

10.27 - add τουτο before αδυνατον. In T6 this change is credited to C.

10.32 - και οι for οι δε before ακολουθουντες.

10.33 - ιεροσολυμα και for - ? Tischendorf suggested that B wrote -λυμα for -λημ. While I have no better conjecture, I doubt if B would have erased σολημ to change ημ to υμα. Certainly A did not omit και. ιεροσολυμα was probably misspelled.

10.40 - οις for οι before ητοιμασται.

10.42 - μεγαλοι for βασιλεις.

Mark

- 10.46 - add απο before τερειχω.
- 10.46 - add προοιτων after κατα την οδον.
- 11.3 - τουτο for τουτουτο. (7) A wrote τουτουτο, not τουτο και as both Tischendorf and Wetstein conjectured. The το before εικατε are quite clear now and evidence of the υ can be seen. The first corrector, therefore, erased a redundant υτο rather than και.
- 11.3 - omit καλιν after αυτον.
- 11.11 - add ο ις after εις ιεροσολυμα. Tischendorf has entirely overlooked this correction.
- 11.13 - μονον ου γαρ ην καιρος for ο γαρ καιρος ουκ ην.
- 11.25 - ποιετε for αποτε.
- 11.31 - add ουν before ουκ επιστευσα.
- 12.1 - add υτω before ουαγιμον.
- 12.6 - ειχεν for εχων.
- 12.9 - add τουτους after γεωργους.
- 12.14 - ειπε ουν for ειπε. Tischendorf said A wrote ειπονουν and that B simply changed ειπον to ειπε. There can be no doubt that A omitted ουν. Concerning ειπε, 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 τεχνι). I am quite sure that A wrote ειπε.
- 12.14 - omit ει before εξεστιν.
- 12.20 - add ουν after επι.
- 12.20 - add πρωτος before ελαβεν. Tischendorf noted that a correction had been made, but did not mention any variant either in his appendix or in T8. In the 1845 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 ελαβεν fits precisely between και ο and γ. Codex C does not agree with Codex A¹ which has εις.
- 12.23 - add ουν before ανισταει.

Mark

- 12.29 - εις for ει after ο θς ημων κς.
- 13.19 - ης for ην before εκτιθεν.
- 13.31 - καρτευσεται for -ουται. Tischendorf erred in crediting -ουται to the original scribe. The ε is not like the script of A. Furthermore, the area has been erased and the horizontal stroke for the nu can be seen.
- 13.34 - add και before εκιστω.
- 14.2 - δε for γιο.
- 14.4 - add και λεγοντες after εαυτους.
- 14.6 - εβεβαιωντο for -μουντο.
- 14.8 - αυτη for, probably αυη. Tischendorf said A wrote αυτη, but I am quite certain it was αυη. The α and η are clear. Remains of the υ appear to survive. The letters ιτ between α and η would be crowded.
- 14.10 - ο ισκαριωτης for ισκαριωθ ο.
- 14.13 - υκαιετε for υκαιε. The letters are barely visible and Tischendorf assumed they were by A. But the present ετε is obviously quite crowded. The available space allows only υκαιε -- or some absurd spelling.
- 14.20 - omit εν before τροβαλον.
- 14.27 - add εν εμοι εν τη νυκτι ταυτη after ακανθαρισμεθα.
- 14.30 - add δς after φωνησαι.
- 14.45 - add χαιρε before οιββει.
- 14.51 - κατησαντες αυτον οι νεανισκοι for κδιτουσιν αυτον.
- 14.72 - και εκ δευτερου for και ευθεως (or ευθως). Tischendorf noted that και was at the end of line 37 and εκ δευτερου at the beginning of line 38. In the margin a modern hand (perhaps Wetstein) has verified this by writing "και εκ δευτερου." 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

Mark conclusively verify our text: (1) και at the end of line 37 is by B rather than A; (2) at the beginning of line 38 εκ is clearly far out in the margin; (3) the ε's and υ's of δευτερου indicate that it also is by B. The text of A, therefore, must have fitted in the place occupied by δευτερου (without the marginal εκ). Hence, και ευθεως (or ευθως). Codex C, then, unites with Codd. Ν, L in writing και ευθεως (or ευθως) αλεκτωρ.
 14.72 - add, probably, δεις after φωνισαι. This is the solution proposed by Tischendorf. Something has been added to the text. I consider it less likely that αργνην was changed to ακαρνην.

15.7 - εποιηκισαν for κεκεποιηκισαν (sic!).

15.18 - add και λεγειν after αυτον.

15.19 - ενεκτυον for, probably, ενεκτυσαν.

15.22 - add τον before λογουθα.

15.23 - add πισειν after αυτω.

15.40 - omit και before μαριαν η μαγ.

15.46 - εθηκεν for κατεθηκεν.

15.46 - προσεκυλισεν for -σε.

16.1 - omit του before σαββατου. (?)

16.7 - omit, probably, και before εικα.

16.9 - add δε after αναστας. Tischendorf erred in noting that B changed και αναστας to αναστας δε. The words και αναστας would be crowded. Even αναστας δε 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 α of αναστας. Originally nothing was written here. Line 32 appears now as follows: βουνο γαρ αναστας δε πρωι The words ανιστας δε are by B. But only the part occupied by νιστας δε has been erased. The original scribe wrote ενοβουνο 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 δε after εκεινη. (?)
- 16.17 - παρ ακολουθησει for ακολ.
- 16.17 - add κεναις after λαληρουσιν.
- 16.20 - πανταχου for - ? The surface has been permanently rubbed away.
Probably A omitted one letter.
- 16.20 - omit αμην after σημειων.

Luke

- 1.13 - διotti for οτι.
- 1.18 - τον αγγελον for, perhaps, αγγελον. This is a conjecture based largely on the space available. Tischendorf said A wrote προς αυτον. I do not think this will fill all the space, while προς αγγελον fits admirably. One cannot, however, be dogmatic.
- 1.34 - μαριαμ for μαρια.
- 1.38 - μαριαμ for μαρια.
- 1.39 - omit duplicated αμ after μαριαμ.
- 1.41 - η ελισ. τον ασπ. της μαρ. for τον ασπ. της μαρ. η ελισ.
- 1.43 - ινα ελθη η ημερ του κυριου (not κυ as Tischendorf said) μου for - ? Tischendorf said something was previously omitted. I am certain this is not so. Tischendorf failed to note that κυριου is spelled out by B. Both lines 9 and 11 over the same area have an equal number of letters. If A wrote κυ instead of κυριου (as he has done in every other instance), then B wrote less, not more, than A.
- 1.45 - add και after μου.
- 1.46 - μαριαμ for μαρια.
- 1.50 - γενεας γενεων for γενεας και γενεας.
- 1.61 - εν τη συγγενια for εκ της συγγενιας.
- 1.63 - ειναιχιδιον for ειναιχιδα.
- 1.65 - περιτοιχουντας for - ? The text is permanently lost. A probably erroneously omitted two or three letters.
- 1.66 - omit υπο before χειρ.

LANGE

- 1.80 - αυθελ/εωκ for αυθελ/εωκ. This correction (an inserted ι above the line) may be by either B or C. There is no way to judge paleographically who added it.
- 2.5 - ελυτοτ. for ελυτοτ.
- 2.5 - Tischendorf said A wrote αυτω and B corrected the text by adding υουακι. I confess that I can see nothing except that the second letter is υ. The codex is tightly bound and I cannot see the margin.
- 2.44 - ημερικ οδου for, undoubtedly, ημερικ. Tischendorf fails to comment on this variant in his appendix, but notes that ηε at the end of line 4 is not by A. But he notes that A wrote ρικ οδου on line 5 (A=ηρικ οδου). At the end of line 4, however, ηε is all by B; A wrote ημερικ without οδου on line 5. In support of this the vestiges of the ρ seem to appear below the line.
- 2.46 - αυτουκ for αυτου. Tischendorf did not note that αυτουκ was a correction.
- 2.48 - With Tischendorf I wrote the given text because I know of not other possibility which will fill the line. At the beginning of line 16 οου κλυω is certain. Our text still leaves the line about 4 letters shorter than any other full line on the page.
- 2.48 - κλυω for και ελω.
- 2.51 - add ηετ αυτου, probably, after κατεβη. Tischendorf was wrong to assume that A wrote αυτουκ και κατεβη ηετ αυτου. This is 60% more letters than the space can take. The omission of ηετ αυτου is, therefore, the most likely conjecture unless the text of A was absurd.
- 2.51 - add και ηαθεν after υιζαυθ (-ετ, -εθ).
- 3.11 - λεγει for λαγει.
- 3.14 - εμπωρησεν for εμπωτω δε. This is very obscure, but Tischendorf was undoubtedly wrong to have read εμπωρησεν by A. He did not even note that the text had been corrected.

Luk

- 4.29 - κατανοησιν for - ? The first corrector has re-written the four letters τινι. Tischendorf said A wrote τινι, and B changed it to τινι. But to me the letters of B are slightly crowded - only enough to suggest that ι 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.
- 4.30 - αυτων for αυτο
- 5.12 - omit και after πολεων. (?)
- 5.15 - add υπ αυτου after θεραπευεσθαι.
- 5.28 - παντα for παντας. (?)
- 5.30 - αυτου λεγοντες for - ? Tischendorf said A omitted αυτου; but λεγοντες does not fill the space. The text of A undoubtedly was faulty, but there is no way of knowing what he wrote. Perhaps, due to haplography the scribe skipped from the first υ to the second υ in αυτου. Our text represents an attempt to fill the space with the number of letters it originally contained. In any event Codex C is not a witness to the omission of αυτου.
- 5.30 - add και αποστολων after τελωνων. Tischendorf erred in saying the present ιστε of εσθιστε is by A. Parts of all the letters can be seen.
- 5.39 - add ευθεως before θελει.
- 6.1 - διαπορευεσθαι for πορ.
- 7.1 - εκειδε for εκειδη.
- 7.4 - omit αυτω after λεγοντες. (?)
- 8.29 - εφελθειν for επηλθεν
- 8.31 - ινα for ινα Tischendorf did not note the original error or that it had been corrected.
- 8.35 - add τι εστιν after ιδειν.
- 8.37 - γεννασηνων for γενας.
- 8.38 - εδειτο for εδετο.
- 8.40 - add ο before οχλος.
- 8.41 - εισελθειν for ινα εισελθη.

Luke

- 8.44 - omit δε before ορισθεν.
- 8.47 - omit αυτω after απηγγειλεν. Nothing can be recovered of the text of A. αυτω 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 απηγ.
- 8.54 - εξειδε for εξειδεδε.
- 9.5 - δεχωνται for δεχωνται. Tischendorf did not credit B with adding the ν.
- 9.9 - add, probably, εγω before ικουω. To me the only letters visible are εγω and ζητει: these are by B. The corrector probably erased the last part of the line to insert εγω.
- 9.12 - Tischendorf said A apparently omitted καταλυσασιν και. It is impossible to know what A wrote, but I think there is too much space for simply τους αγρους ευρωσιν επισιτισμων. The text of A was more likely inepte.
- 9.31 - omit δε after ελεγον. (?)
- 9.41 - add αποκριθεις δε after ηουνηθησαν.
- 9.49 - add ο before ιωαννης. B has written ο δε ιωαννης. It is more likely that A omitted ο rather than δε because of the space. To omit δε would leave too much room.
- 9.49 - επιστατα for διδασκαλε. The letters at the beginning of line 2 are λε while the last letter in line 1 was α. The remaining letters cannot be seen.
- 9.58 - αλωπεκες for, probably, αλωπηκες.
- 10.22 - add, perhaps, αυτου after μαθητας.
- 10.30 - add δε, probably, after υπολαβων. The limitations of space suggest our text.
- 10.35 - omit και after εξελεθων.
- 10.38 - add αυτης after οικισαν.
- 10.39 - του ιν for αυτου. Tischendorf erred in stating that A wrote του κυ. The original αυτ can clearly be seen, and the remaining space is perfect for ου. Furthermore, the corrector would

Luke

be very unlikely to erase του κυ simple to change χ to ι.

10.40 - δε for τε after ἐκιστοσσο.

10.42 - ολιγον δε εστιν χοεια η ενος for ενος δε εστιν χοεια.

11.7 - add μου after παιδια.

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

11.24 - κνευμα for, probably, πνι. Tischendorf said only that the text of A was inspte. The letter ε of εεελθη 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 - εκει και γινεται τε for - ? 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 ου before ουκ is erased. (?)

11.52 - add και after εισηλατε.

19.43 - περιβαλ. for προσβαλ.

19.46 - χληθησεται for εστιν

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

20.5 - omit την after εοει. (?)

20.6 - omit οτι before εε ανων.

20.11 - ετερον δουλον οι for - ? 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 - ο κυριος has perhaps been erased, although it appears to me that A may have written ο κς του του ισκ. and a corrector

Intro

removed the redundant του as well as ο κς. Though it may be objected that the nomina sacra for κς ος is not used except when referring to Jesus, I need only refer to line 2 where κς is so used.

20.23 - η παυουριαν for αυτουριαν.

20.25 - omit τω before κς ος. (?)

21.34 - εφιδιος for, probably εφιδος. The letters ιδι are slightly crowded, and if any letter other than ι were omitted, there would be too much space.

21.38 - εω for οει.

22.13 - αυλαουτες for -ουτες.

22.16 - οτι ουκει ου ην φ. ε αυτου for ου ην φ. αυτο. Tischendorf said nothing in his appendix about οτι, but in T8 remarks that the original scribe apparently omitted it. It is now certain that A omitted οτι.

22.18 - add η before βασιλει. I am reasonably certain of this. Tischendorf noted that A omitted ου rather than η. But ως at the beginning of the line is by A. All the letters except β in βασιλει can be seen. Unfortunately small holes prevent the original letters from being seen. Between ως and αυλει, however, three letters (viz., ου β) fit much better than two (i.e., η β). Read, therefore, ως ου βασιλει instead of ως η βασιλει.

23.28 - ιαν ην for ιαν ην.

23.29 - εφεθρεψαν for εθρεψαν.

23.30 - ηεσται for κεσται.

23.40 - επιτιμω αυτω λεγων for επιτιμω αυτω εφ.

23.40 - ε for εφ after κς ος.

23.41 - add κς before ηεις.

23.42 - τω ις ου κς for ις ου κς.

23.45 - add του ηλίου εκλειποντες. The second corrector then added κς ος ο ηλίου κς. This is the solution proposed

Luke

by Tischendorf, and there seems little reason to doubt that it is correct.

23.48 - add εαυτων after τηντοις.

23.54 - ~~εραδωκεν~~ αβ. for ~~εραδωκεν~~ και αβ.

23.55 - αυτω εκ της γαλ. for εκ της γαλ. αυτω. Tischendorf erred in saying the original scribe omitted αυτω. The letter υ can be seen shortly before εθεωσ. Furthermore, all the letters easily fit in the space which would not be filled by εκ της γαλιλαιας. The writing of B is not cramped.

23.56 - add και before υποστο.

24.2 - απο for εκ.

24.7 - οτι δει τον υν του ανου for τον υν του ανου οτι 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 εδει after γεγοικται. The entire line has been erased and only the initial κ and the final α are certain. Under εδει vertical strokes are apparent, but whether they are κτ - 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 υμεις.

24.49 - add ιλημ after πολει.

24.49 - δυναμιν εξ υψους for εξ υψ δυν.

24.53 - add αινουντες και. With Tischendorf I do not believe that A added αμην. 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 πρωτοστο. (?)

1.26 - μεσος δε for μεσος.

1.28 - βηθαβαρα for βηθανια.

1.38 - omit αυτω after ακολουθουντας. (?)

3.34 - add ο θς after διδωσιν.

4.5 - ο εδωκεν for ου εδωκεν.

John

- h.16 - add ο ις after λεγει αυτη.
- h.25 - παντα for απαντα.
- h.35 - τετραμηνος εστιν και for - ? Nothing can be seen of the original text. With Tischendorf I believe two or three letters may have been omitted.
- h.47 - καταβη και ιαση for - ? 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 δε before καλιν. (?)
- 5.7 - ναι κε ανον δε ουκ εχω ινα for κε ανον ουκ εχω ινα:
- 5.7 - βαλη for εμβαλη. (?)
- 5.9 - αυτου for εαυτου.
- ✓ 6.40 - after εγω τη either η or υ has been erased, probably by B. It appears to me to have been η.
- ✓ 6.47 - add εic εμε after κιστευω. Tischendorf erred in saying A wrote εic εμε. The page is torn at this point, but the letters, ζωη, 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 εic εμε εχει ζωην. I cannot doubt that A omitted εic εμε and that B erased εχει ζωην to insert εic εμε.
- 6.54
6.57 - add undoubtedly δι εμε after ζησει. Tischendorf thought A wrote ζη for ζησει. He erred in saying that the letters κακει were by B. The letters κα are by A; B added κει and then began line 5 with υος. But since A wrote κα at the end of line 4, line 5 must have begun in one of 4 ways: (1) κειυος ζη δι εμε; (2) κειυος ζησει δι εμε; (3) κειυος ζησει; (4) κειυος ζη. The first two are rejected because of space limitations. The fourth does not fill the space. Lines 4 and 6 over the same space have 9 and 10 letters respectively. I have adopted the third possibility as the most likely text of

John

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 ΚΕΙΝΟΣ ΔΙ ΕΜΕ.

6.71 - add ΩΝ after ΕΙΣ.

7.1 - omit ΚΑΙ before ΜΕΤΑ. (?)

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

8.45 - omit ΟΜΙΝ after ΛΕΓΩ. (?)

8.54 - ΔΟΞΑΖΩ for ΔΟΞΑΣΩ.

9.7 - add ΑΥΤΟΥ after ΕΠΕΧΡΙΣΕΝ. In his appendix Tischendorf says nothing about ΕΠΕΧΡΙΣΕΝ but in T⁶ says A apparently wrote ΕΠΕΘΗΚΕΝ. I am far from certain.

9.9 - add ΔΕ after ΕΚΕΙΝΟΣ.

11.12 - ΑΥΤΟΥ for ΑΥΤΩ after ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ.

11.17 - add ΕΙΣ ΒΗΘΑΝΙΑΝ after Ο ΙΣ. The corrector has written ΕΛΘΩΝ ΟΥΝ Ο ΙΣ at the end of the previous line. Tischendorf guessed badly on this variant. He thought the first writer wrote ΗΛΘΕΝ ΟΥΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΥΡΕΝ 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 ΕΥΡΕΝ.

11.18 - ΔΕΚΑΠΕΝΤΕ for ΔΕΚΑΕΝΤΕ.

11.21 - add perhaps ΤΟΥ after ΠΡΟΣ. This is based entirely on the space available.

11.26 - ΕΙΚΟΥΣΑ for, probably, ΕΙΚΑΔΑ. Tischendorf wrote in his appendix "Inapte erasse videtur A," but in T⁶ cites Codex C with Codex B as having originally contained ΕΙΚΑΔΑ. The original scribe definitely wrote one letter less than the corrector.

11.29 - omit ΔΕ after ΕΚΕΙΝΗ.

11.31 - ΛΕΓΟΝΤΕΣ for ΔΟΞΑΝΤΕΣ.

11.32 - ΗΝ ΙΣ for ΙΣ ΗΝ.

11.39 - ΤΕΘΥΜΚΟΤΕΣ for ΤΕΤΕΛΕΥΤΗΜΚΟΤΕΣ.

John

- 11.44 - αὐτοῖς ο ἱς, probably, for ἱς αὐτοῖς. I am quite certain of this although I have not seen any letters well enough to place them without brackets. To include the article would crowd the text. Also, a ς, smaller than the rest of the text, indicates the text has been corrected, although Tischendorf notes nothing of the corrector's hand. Furthermore the horizontal line for the nomina sacra is seen at both the beginning and end of the space. The former is almost certainly by the original scribe.
- 11.44 - omit αὐτοῦ after ἀφ' ἑστέ.
- 11.45 - add σημείον ο ἱς before ἐπιστεύσαν. Tischendorf stated that B also omitted εἰς αὐτοῦ and that it was later added by C. But this εἰς αὐτοῦ is by B. The second corrector has not worked over the text at this point.
- 13.12 - omit καί before ἐλάβεν. (?)
- 13.13 - ο κς καί ο διδ. for ο διδ. καί ο κς.
- 13.23 - add δε, probably, after ἡν.
- 13.24 - add οὖν, perhaps, after νευεῖ. It is more likely that A omitted οὖν than τοῦτω. Nothing, however, is certain.
- 13.31 - υὺν for υὺ.
- 13.32 - add εἰ ο θς ἐδοξασθη ἐν αὐτῳ after καί ο θς δοξασει αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῳ. The original κ 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 αὐτῳ or ἐαὐτῳ before καί εὐθὺς is not known. It cannot be assumed that B, after expanding the text, re-wrote the original text.
- 14.2 - omit οτι after υμῖν. (?)
- 14.5 - καί πως δυναμεθα την οδον εἶδεναι for πως οἰδμεν την οδον.
- 16.25 - ἀναγγελω for ἀπαγγελω.
- 16.28 - καθα for ἐκ.
- 17.1 - add καί after ἰνα.

John

- 17.3 - ΥΙΝΩΟΧΩΟΙΥ for -οι.
- 17.12 - omit και before εφωλαξα.
- 17.23 - The redundant εις is erased after τετελεσμενοι. (?)
- 18.10 - ωτιον for ωταριον. (?) Tischendorf said this correction is by C. I don't know his reason for so stating. The letters ω are simply erased as was the habit of B and as Tischendorf has also assumed throughout his edition.
- 18.14 - απολεσθαι for αποθαινειν.
- 18.15 - τω ιυ for αυτοις.
- 18.16 - ος ην γνωστος τω αρχιερει for ο γνωστος του αρχιερεως.
The letters ρεως are clear; the rest is assumed from this and the available space.
- 18.25 - μαθ. ει του ανου εκεινου for μαθ. ει εκεινου.
- 18.27 - ο πετρος for πετρος.
- 18.28 - αλλ ινι for αλλ.
- 18.32 - ειπεν for ειπειν. The ει appears to have been partially erased. Tischendorf did not note the presence of the ει and wrote ειπεν as the original text.
- 18.33 - omit καλιν after ουν.
- 18.34 - αφ εαυτου for απο σεαυτου.
- 20.31 - The original scribe wrote a redundant αιωνιον. 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 αιωνιον and wrote εχρητε before the ruined part of the vellum. C omitted αιωνιον altogether.
- 21.3 - ουθεν for ουδε εν.
- 21.15 - ιωνι for ιωαννου.
- 21.15 - αρνια for προβατα.
- 21.16 - ιωνα for ιωαννου.
- 21.17 - ιωνα for ιωαννου.
- 21.18 - αλλ οι ζωωντιν δε και οισοντιν for αλλος ζυγει σε και οισει.
- 21.22 - ακολουθει μοι for μοι ακολου.

ERRORS IN TISCHENDORF'S EDITION OF THE
ORIGINAL TEXT OF CODEX C

Matthew

- 2.23 - δια, not υπο.
- 7.12 - κοιωσιν, not κοιουσιν. See Appendix B. *from Remington*
- 8.6 - δινως, not δεινως. *See Appendix B*
- 8.13 - γενητω, not γενηθητω. *mention, allow full form, v. 11*
- 8.17 - ησαιοιου, not ησαιου. *Isaiah, v. 11*
- 8.31 - not δεμονες, but, probably, δειμονες. *1/a ?*
- 8.34 - εξηλθον, not εξηλθεν. *See Appendix B*
- 9.12 - χριαν, not χρειαν. *See Appendix B*
- 10.33 - δ αν αντησται, not δ απαντησται.
- 12.45 - πονηροτερα, not πονεροτερα.
- 12.48 - μηρ, not μηρ μου. See Appendix B.
- 13.33 - εις, not εν, before αλευρου. *Will have εν*
- 13.49 - αγγελοι του θυ, not αγγελοι (without του θυ).
- 13.57 - ατιμος, not ατιμος ει. *See Appendix B*
- 15.36 - not ευχαριστησεν, but εκλασεν. *Like B*
- 16.22 - επιτιμιαν, not επιτιμην. *See Appendix B*
- 18.29 - σοι αποδωσω, not αποδωσω σοι. See Appendix B.
- 19.16 - σχω, not εχω. *See Appendix B*
- 19.28 - καθησεςθε, not καθισεςθε. *See Appendix B*
- 20.32 - θελεις, not θελετε. *See Appendix B*
- 21.10 - εσισθη, not εσεισθη. *See Appendix B*
- 21.21 - ορει, not ωρει. *See Appendix B*
- 21.23 - ελθοντος, not ελθοντες
- 21.28 - ειπεν, not ειχεν.
- 21.28 - πω, not πρωτω. *See Appendix B*
- 24.8 - ωδεινων, not ωδινων.
- 26.65 - not οτιεβλασφ, but, perhaps, τι εβλασφ.
- 27.5 - ανεχωρησεν, not απεχ.
- 27.58 - εκενλευσεν, not εκελευσεν. This is quite clear. What the scribe thought he was writing is certainly not clear.

Matthew

28.5 - ποβεισθαι, not -θε.

28.10 - ποβεισθαι, not -θε.

Mark

1.20 - ζεβεδαιου, not ζεβεδαιον See Appendix B.

2.16 - οτι, not τι οτι after μαθηταις αυτου See Appendix A.

3.18 - Tischendorf omitted a full line: ιακωβον τον του αλφαιου
και θαδδαιον και.

3.20 - apparently δυνασθαι, not δυνασθαι.

4.31 - κοκκω, not κοκκον. See Appendix A.

4.33 - not ελαλει, but πολλαις ελαλει or ελ. πολ. See Appendix B.

5.34 - και ισθι, not ισθι. See Appendix B.

6.4 - τοις, not της, before συγγενεσιν.

6.13 - ηλιφον, not ελιφον.

✓ 8.6 - αναπεσιν, not αναπεσειν.

8.24 - του, not τους, before ανους. *Το οτι p. 314: here anglican!*

✓ 8.28 - οτι, not οι μεν, after λεγοντες See Appendix B.

9.2 - not εξ 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 τω πιστευοντι. See Appendix B.

9.42 - πιστευοντων, not πιστιν εχοντων. See Appendix B.

10.12 - αυτης before γαμηση, not αυτου.

10.39 - βαπτισθησεσθαι, not -θε.

11.3 - τουτουτο, not τουτο και. See Appendix B.

11.28 - τις σοι, not τι σοι.

12.14 - ειπε not ειπον ουν.

13.31 - παραλευσονται not -σεται.

14.8 - not αιτη, but αυη.

14.13 - υπαγε, not υπαιγετε See Appendix B.

14.64 - φαινετα, not φαινετε.

14.72 - και ευθεως, not και εκ δευτερου See Appendix B.

Mark

- 15.10 - παράδοξωσαν, not -κείσαν.
 15.21 - κυρηναι, not κυρενε.
 16.7 - προαγει after οτι, not υπαγει.
 16.9 - ανιστας, not και ανιστας. See Appendix B.

Luke

- 1.18 - not αυτον, but perhaps αγγελον.
 2.44 - not παιδας οδον, but παιδας.
 2.46 - αυτον, not αυτους, after επερωτωντα.
 2.51 - not κατεβη μετ αυτων, but κατεβη.
 3.13 - πλεον, not πλειον.
 3.14 - επηρωτων δε, not επηρωτησαν.
 3.16 - μου, not εμου, after ισχυροτερος.
 4.29 - not κατακριμνησαι, but, perhaps, κατακτημνησαι. See Appendix B.
 5.30 - του, not τους, before μαθητας.
 5.30 - not λεγοντες, but [αυτου] λεγοντες. See Appendix B.
 7.4 - τον ιν, not αυτον after προς.
 7.9 - ευραν, not ευρον.
 8.31 - ιμα, not ινα.
 8.42 - συνεθλιβον, not -βλον.
 8.43 - υπ ουδενος, not υπο ουδενος.
 9.5 - δεχεται, not δεχονται.
 9.10 - idia, not idiau.
 9.22 - του, not τον, before ιν.
 9.33 - μωυσι, not μωυσει.
 9.42 - προσευχομενου, not προσερχ.
 10.39 - αυτου, not του κυ, after ποδας. See Appendix B.
 11.42 - αλλα, not αλλ, before ουαι.
 11.46 - ενι, not επι, before δακτυλων.
 11.48 - απεκτιναιν, not απεκτειναιν.
 11.53 - ενεχειν, not επεχειν.
 20.19 - τας χειρας not χειρας.

Luke

- 20.20 - αυτου, not αυτον before λογον.
 22.8 - φωγωμεν, not παγωμεν.
 22.18 - εως ου, not εως η, before βασιλεια. See Appendix B.
 23.30 - πεσαιται, not πεσεται.
 23.43 - παραδισω, not παραβεισω.
 23.52 - πειλατω, not πιλατω.
 23.55 - γαλιλαιας αυτω, not γαλ. See Appendix B.

John

- 1.25 - ο προφητης, not προφητης.
 1.40 - των ακουσαντων, not ακουσ.
 4.39 - ιδια, not δια, before τον λογον.
 4.45 - εν τη εορτη, not εις την εορτην after ηλθον.
 ✓ 6.47 - πιστευων, not πιστ. εις εμε. See Appendix B.
 ✓ 6.53 - αμην αμην, not αμην.
 ✓ 6.56 - τα, not το before αιμα.
 6.57 - not ζη δι εμε, but ζησει. See Appendix B.
 8.38 - ηκουσατε, not -ται.
 11.44 - ις αυτοις, not αυτοις ο ις.
 13.26 - ψωμιον, not ψωμω. This, apparently, is corrected in T8.
 17.7 - εγνωσαν, not εγνωκαν.
 17.13 - not καρδιαις εαυτων, but, perhaps, καρδιαις σεαυτων.
 18.14 - συμφερι, 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.