

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

4-15-1943

Critical Studies in the Text of Romans Based on P46

Elmer Moeller

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_moellere@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Moeller, Elmer, "Critical Studies in the Text of Romans Based on P46" (1943). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 76.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/76>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

CRITICAL STUDIES IN THE TEXT OF ROMANS BASED ON P46

A dissertation
submitted to the Seminary Faculty
in candidacy for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity

Department of New Testament Exegesis

by

Elmer J. F. Moeller

Saint Louis, Missouri

April, 1943

*W. Arndt.
P. Lehmann*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction.....	1
I. Papyrus 46 and Textual Criticism.....	5
II. The Romans Text of Papyrus 46.....	20
III. Papyrus 46 as Sole Authority.....	28
IV. The Constantinople Tradition.....	34
V. The Alexandrian Tradition.....	71
VI. The Western Tradition.....	101
VII. Is there a Gallic-Smyrnaean Text?.....	144
Conclusion.....	165
Appendix I.....	169
Appendix II.....	172
Bibliography.....	187

CRITICAL STUDIES IN THE TEXT OF ROMANS BASED ON P46

Introduction

The Protestant world in 1633 received from the presses of Isaac, Bonaventura, and Abraham Elzevier, that great family of Dutch printers, the second edition of their New Testament text, based on the Erasmus-Stephanus-Beza editions and prefaced by the remark: "textum ergo habes nunc ab omnibus receptum, in quo nihil immutatum aut corruptum damus."¹ The equanimity with which theologians accepted this Textus Receptus as the exact reproduction of the autographs of the inspired writers themselves is castigated by the eminent English critic Samuel P. Tregelles, who writes:

...many Protestants ceased from all inquiry into the authorities on which the text of the Greek Testament in their hands was based; they received with a kind of traditional submission what the publishers presented to them; although they might have well known that the same care and attention are demanded as to the text of God's Holy Word, as are bestowed upon ancient works of a value infinitely less. But so it was; and those who justly condemned the proceedings of the Roman Catholic Council of Trent, in 1545, in declaring the Latin Vulgate version authentic, and who showed the ignorance and weakness of

1. von Dobschuetz, Eberhard Nestle's Einführung in das Griechische Neue Testament, p. 65.

the Papal decrees by which in 1590 and 1592 diverse editions of the Vulgate were declared to be exclusively genuine, - were, in fact, following a Greek text which they had tacitly adopted as authentic; and they did this with as little intelligence as did the Romanists in their use of the Clementine Vulgate....We need not wonder that Bentley should have spoken of "the Protestant Pope Stephens."¹

Times have changed. Before the writer are fourteen volumes, ranging from 163 to 1486 pages in thickness, presenting in more or less critical fashion the problems of the New Testament text. And these are but a few of the many libraries of works which scholars during the past three centuries have produced, probing the difficulties which surround the ascertaining of the exact words of the New Testament canon.

Mere scholarship or critical curiosity, however, are not the stimuli which direct this bit of research. There is something deeper, more impelling. Dr. W. Arndt has well analysed that "something" when speaking on the proper motivation for New Testament textual criticism. We, he said, who pride ourselves as staunch defenders of the doctrine of the verbal inspiration of Holy Writ, can well afford to devote much time to ascertaining as nearly as is humanly possible what the exact words of Holy Writ are.

The purpose of this thesis has a background. Two years ago Doctor Arndt interested several of his students, among them the writer, in the problem of isolating in the Pauline epistles

1. An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament, pp. 35-36.

a Caesarean text such as that which the critics Lake, Streeter, and others find chiefly in Codex Theta for the Gospels.¹ The resulting studies in the critical editions of Tischendorf and von Soden and in the text of Papyrus 46 (P46) served as a fine introduction to further work.² Because of the interest which these studies aroused, as master's thesis in the graduate school of Washington University, Saint Louis, the writer made a critical apparatus for the extant Romans text of P46 as edited by Professor Sanders,³ which collated all the variants among the majuscule mss. as they are recorded by Tischendorf, von Soden, and Merk.⁴ From those variants in the Romans text of P46 have been selected the ones used in this thesis, and to the collated majuscule evidence has been added the vershinal and patristic evidence of Tischendorf.⁵

In the textual studies purged by the writer since the initial work under Doctor Arndt and prior to work on the present thesis, no evidence of a Caesarean text in the Pauline epistles was discovered. On the contrary, a more closely woven textual tradition in the Pauline epistles than in the Gospels was indicated. Of particular interest was the apparent close relationship between the ninth century

1. D. E. Nestle, Novum Testamentum Graece, introduction, p.48.

2. Constantinus Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Graece; H. F. von Soden, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments; H. A. Sanders, A Third-Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul.

3. Op. cit.

4. Tischendorf, op. cit., von Soden, op. cit., Augustinus Merk, Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine.

5. Op. cit.

Graeco-Latin codices, F and G, and third century P46. The investigation of that relationship and, necessarily, of the relationship among the principle sources of textual evidence constitute the basis of this thesis. The results of the investigation, in the author's judgment, are amazing. It is his purpose, therefore, to set forth the relationship between P46 and the majuscles, the principle versions, and the most important patristic evidence.

In doing so, the writer finds it necessary to give a background of the various textual problems involved. This requires a presentation of the findings and opinions of some of the major textual critics of recent years. Since, however, the writer does not intend to write a new handbook of textual criticism, he without hesitation quotes profusely from critical authorities whenever necessary, the quotations being for the purpose of giving the opinions and conclusions of eminent authorities in the field of criticism under consideration. The interpretation of the tabulated results of the writer's own research well enough, he trusts, will fulfil the purpose of this thesis.

I. Papyrus 46 and Textual Criticism

In 1930, A. Chester Beatty, an American collector of mss. who lives in London, acquired a number of papyrus leaves from a dealer in Egypt, which on examination were discovered to be "portions of codices of various books of the Greek Bible." The source of the mss., as closely as can be ascertained, is "the region of Aphroditopolis, on the right bank of the Nile, about thirty miles above Memphis," where presumably there was some early Christian church, a part of whose library the mss. represent.¹

The mss. have been numbered by Prof. E. von Dobschuetz and Prof. A. Rahlfs, whose registers of the New Testament and of the Old Testament mss., respectively, are generally accepted, as follows: P45, the Gospels and Acts; P46, the Pauline epistles; P47, Revelation; 961, Genesis; 962, Genesis; 963, Numbers and Deuteronomy; 965, Isaiah; 966, Jeremiah, 967, Ezekiel and Esther; 968, Daniel; and 964, Ecclesiasticus.² Included in the mss. was also the book of Enoch and a homily of unidentified authorship "on the passion of Melito, Bishop of Sardis in the third quarter

1. Sir Frederic Kenyon, Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts, p. 126.

2. Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible, Fasciculus I, pp. 6-9.

of the second century."¹

As originally acquired, P46 consisted of ten leaves.

Soon after these had been published,

it was announced that the University of Michigan^A had acquired thirty more leaves of the same codex, in excellent condition.... Scarcely had these been published by Professor H. A. Sanders, of Michigan, together with the ten Beatty leaves, when they were capped by the acquisition of Mr. Beatty of forty-six leaves more. The entire manuscript therefore consists, in its present state, of eighty-six nearly perfect leaves out of a total of 104, of which the last five were probably blank.²

The age of P46 has been estimated variously. Despite Professor Sanders' statement that although he agrees with Kenyon as to the third century dating, he hesitates to emphasize the first half of the century,³ Kenyon holds firm, "and further consideration," he remarks, "does not make me think this too early. On the contrary, Prof. Ulrich Wilken, who is universally recognised as the first living papyrologist, considers that it may even belong to the second century, and that at any rate 'about A. D. 200' would be a safe dating."⁴

"If we are startled by this early attribution," writes H. C. Hoskier, "we have only to examine the text, in order

1. Kenyon, Our Bible and the Ancient Mss., p. 126.

2. Ibid., p. 125.

3. Op. cit., p. 13.

4. Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Fasc. III Supplement, p. xiv. Heinrich Seesemann, in "Der Chester-Beatty Papyrus 46 und der Paulustext des Clemens Alexandrinus," Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der aelteren Kirche, 36 (Berlin, 1937), p. 90, likewise refers to Wilken's statement from Archiv fuer Papyrusforschung, xi. 113.

to rest assured that we are in the presence of something which is contemporaneous with, or which may have preceded the compilation of the Sahidic version; thus, the circumstantial evidence is definite, for this is generally attributed to a period circa A. D. 190."¹

Since its discovery several men have made extensive studies in P46. Their names and works have already been mentioned: Kenyon, Sanders, Hoskier, and Seesemann. How many other scholars have worked with the text the writer has no way of ascertaining. The two most recent editions of the New Testament, Nestle's sixteenth edition and Merk's third edition, both of which collate the testimony of P46 in their critical apparatus, have been already alluded to. While their editions are valuable when one treats the principal New Testament variants, for an intensive study of P46 they are inadequate, since they do not collate the more minute variants which most frequently characterize a manuscript.

Before presenting the opinions and conclusions of critics as to the place of P46 in New Testament textual criticism, it will be well to review as briefly as possible the theories and contentions which one must consider in evaluating the evidence of P46.

Possibly the most generally held opinion as to the

1. "A Study of the Chester-Beatty Codex of the Pauline Epistles," Journal of Theological Studies, xxxviii (Oxford, 1937), p. 149.

development of the New Testament text is that which assumes that in the third and fourth centuries there were made definite and clearly defined recensions or revisions in the centers of ecclesiastical culture of that period, Alexandria, Caesarea in Palestine, and Antioch. Von Dobschuetz summarizes the matter well:

Hieronymus schreibt im Vorwort zur Uebersetzung der Chronikbuecher: 'Alexandria et Aegyptus in Septuaginta suis Hesychium laudat auctorem, Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani martyris exemplaria probat, mediae inter has provincias Palaestinae (-nos v.l.) codices legunt quos ab Origene elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt; totusque orbis hac inter se trifaria varietate compugnat.' Dasz diese zunaechst auf das griechische AT bezuegliche Angabe auch fuer das NT Geltung hat, bezeugt derselbe Hieronymus, wenn er in seiner Widmung der Evangelienuebersetzung an Damasus (382) schreibt: 'praemitto eos codices quos a Luciano et Hesycio nuncupatos paucorum hominum adserit perversa contentio, quibus utique nec in veteri instrumento post septuaginta interpretes emendare quid licuit nec in novo profuit emendasse; cum multarum gentium linguis scriptura ante translata doceat falsa esse quae addita sunt.' Sicheres ueber den Text dieser 3 Rezensionen koennen wir nicht sagen, aber es besteht groeszte Wahrscheinlichkeit, dasz sie, wie fuer das AT, so auch fuer das NT Bez. dessen Einzelteile in bestimmten Handschriftengruppen wiederzuerkennen sind.¹

* This theory of the three-recensional development of the text was first voiced by John L. Hug (1765-1846²), the refutation of which, by Westcott and Hort, the writer quotes verbatim because of the importance of the question: were there recensions, and if so, when and where?

1. Op. cit., p. 26. The same opinion is voiced by Fritz Barth, Einleitung in das Neue Testament, pp. 453-454.
2. Von Dobschuetz, op. cit., p. 20.

Hug started from what was in itself on the whole a true conception of the Western text and its manifold license. He called it the... 'Vulgate Edition', taking the name from the text of the LXX as it was in its confusion before the reform attempted by Origen in his Hexapla. But further he conjectured that the disorderly state of this popular text led to its being formally revised in three different lands, the product of each being a 'recension' in the strict sense of the word. The alleged evidence consists in two well known passages of Jerome. In the first he speaks of the diversity of copies of the LXX in different regions; Alexandria and Egypt appeal, he says, to the authority of Hesychius; Constantinople and Antioch approve of the copies of Lucian the Martyr; the intermediate provinces read the Palestinian volumes, wrought out by Origen and published by Eusebius and Pamphilus; and the whole world is set at discord by this threefold difference. In the second passage,...he is stating vaguely to what Greek sources he proposes to have recourse in correcting the Latin Gospels. "I pass by", he says, "those volumes which bear the names of Lucianus and Hesychius, and are upheld by the perverse contentiousness of a few men": he adds in obscure language that 'they had neither been allowed to make corrections (emendare) after the Seventy in the Old Testament, nor profited by making corrections in the New Testament!'. The latter quotation, enigmatic as it is, distinctly implies the existence of copies of the New Testament or the Gospels bearing in some way the names of Lucianus and Hesychius, and supposed to have in some way undergone correction; and likewise associates the same names with some analogous treatment of the LXX. As they appear in company with Origen's name in a similar connexion in the first quotation, Hug supposed that Hesychius had made a recension of both Testaments for Alexandria, Lucianus for Antioch, and Origen for Palestine. He had next to discover descendants of the supposed recensions in existing groups of documents, and had no difficulty in assigning the Constantinopolitan text to Lucianus: but since Hesychius plausibly claimed the 'Alexandrian' text, he could find no better representative of Origen's supposed work than an ill defined and for the most part obscure assemblage headed by AKM.

Origen's quotations prove conclusively that no such text as these documents present can ever have proceeded from him: and it is hardly less certain, as Griesbach shewed by the implicit testimony of various passages, that he never made anything like a recension of the New Testament. It does not follow that the same can be said of Lucianus and Hesychius....the Syrian text must have

been due to a revision which was in fact a recension, and which may with fair probability be assigned to the time when Lucianus taught at Antioch. Of the Alexandrian corrections more than one stage can certainly be traced: whether the primary corrections were due to a distinct revision cannot, we think, be determined, and it would be little gain to know. That Hesychius had no hand in any revision which can have produced them is proved by the occurrence of many of them in Origen's writings, at a much earlier date. But it is quite conceivable that Hesychius made or adopted some eclectic text too shortlived to have left recognisable traces of itself in extant evidence, though it may be a hidden factor in the process of mixture to which some of our texts are partly due.¹

The reader will do well to keep in mind this rejection of the "Caesarean" text, since other evidence and opinions will be brought forth in the development of this thesis to support Westcott and Hort's opinion.

In opposition to Hug's conjecture and as a development of "all that was most valuable in the work of their predecessors,"² Westcott and Hort developed their method of textual criticism, which has dominated the New Testament field since that time.

Space will not permit a complete presentation of the Westcott-Hort approach, and for the purposes of this thesis it will suffice to give the various types of text which these two men predicated. The writer follows Souter's summarization.³

1. B. Westcott and F. Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek, Introduction and Appendix, pp. 181-183.

2. Alexander Souter, The Text and Canon of the New Testament, p. 118.

3. Ibid., pp. 118-126.

The latest type of text is the Syrian (substantially the Textus Receptus and our King James' Version), which is preserved almost pure in the majority of the minuscules, as well as in the later majuscules. It is present especially in the Peshitta and Harclean Syriac versions,¹ although "all the versions from the fourth century onwards are more or less Syrian in text, among which Latin Mss. like f and g and the Gothic version are prominent."²

The Syrian text is of least importance, since apparently "the authors...had before them the documents representing at least three earlier forms of text; Western, Alexandrian, a third."³ The reason for the mixture of documents, it is assumed, results from the destruction of mss. under Diocletian's persecution (284-305) in which whole regions were undoubtedly devastated of texts, necessitating the procurement of copies from elsewhere.⁴

Of the Alexandrian text "hardly a pure witness remains,

1. The Syriac Peshitta represents a probable Syriac revision, indicated by the existence of the older Curetonian Syriac Gospel, and the almost total extinction of other Old Syriac Mss, contrasted to the great number of extant Vulgate (Peshitta) Syriac Mss, and by the narrow range of variation found in the Vulgate Syriac Mss. The revision was probably done at Edessa or Nisibis, centers of Syrian ecclesiastical life. The Antiochian text, found in the Antiochian fathers, represents a revision at Antioch, which was taken as a standard for a similar authoritative revision of the Syriac text, which later was subjected to a second revision, which the Vulgate Syriac did not undergo, but which is found in the Harclean Syriac. Lucianus of Antioch is probably the moving spirit of the revisions. (Westcott and Hort, op. cit., pp. 136-138.)

2. Souter, op. cit., p.126.

3. Westcott and Hort, op. cit., p. 116.

4. Ibid., p. 139.

but many traces are found in a number of Mss. of the better class," (in the Pauline epistles ξ^1 ACP); "also in the Sahidic and Bohairic versions, especially the latter; further, in the Armenian, the Latin Vulgate (or another revised Latin text), the Alexandrian Fathers."²

The Western text, of which Westcott and Hort remark that it was the most widely spread text of Ante-Nicene times; and sooner or later every version directly or indirectly felt its influence,"³ is found pure, for the Pauline epistles, in δ DGF, "with the chief Old-Latin Mss. and Fathers,...and the Greek (non-Alexandrian) Ante-Nicene Fathers." Many Western readings are found however in ξ B, "Latin Vulgate, Syriac versions, Sahidic, Armenian, Gothic (especially), Ethiopic."⁴

The third type of text represented in the Syriac text is what Westcott and Hort called the Neutral text, made up of Pre-Syriac non-Western readings, and found chiefly in B and ξ , although B in Paul "has here and there Western readings," and ξ likewise. Also H and M have preserved much Neutral text in the Pauline epistles.⁵

1. For the sake of convenience, the letter ξ is used in this thesis for the Pauline text of Codex Sinaiticus, generally designated by the Hebrew letter "Aleph." Seesemann, op. cit., uses "S", and Merk's critical edition, op. cit., does likewise.

2. Souter, op. cit., pp. 125-126.

3. Op. cit., p. 120.

4. Souter, op. cit., p. 125.

5. Ibid., pp. 122, 125.

The most important recent comment which the writer finds on these types of text is made by Caspar Rene Gregory, who accepts the Neutral text, which he calls the "original" text,¹ and the Western text, which he re-names the "re-wrought text,"² but concerning the Alexandrian or "polished" text he makes the following remarks:

Seeing that this correction of the text either did not extend to the whole New Testament or has at least not reached our hands in its entirety, we perhaps should speak only of "readings," and not of a "text." Yet we give it for the present the benefit of a doubt and call it a text. If complete manuscripts be one day found, they can at one pass into their place. This text I name the Polished Text.... Westcott, and Hort called it, and that with geographical propriety, the Alexandrian Text.... Since this text is, as has been seen, of a fragmentary character or of an ethereal existence, it is less easy to determine definitely at what time it probably arose. It seems most likely to have been the work of the early third century or of the late second century, and it will be the most prudent thing for us for the present to date it simply with the year 200.³

We shall do well to recall Gregory's opinion when later on we find little or no evidence of an "Alexandrian" text, in the sense of Westcott and Hort.

A reclassification of evidence was attempted by the German scholar, von Soden, whose work,⁴ however, has found little acceptance. His system of numbering mss. is ponderous, and his mss. divisions are not essentially new. His K (Koine) division "is practically the Syrian text of

-
1. Canon and Text of the New Testament, pp. 483-485.
 2. Ibid., pp. 486-491.
 3. Ibid., pp. 493-494.
 4. Op. cit.

Westcott and Hort," his H (Hesychius) text "is Westcott and Hort's Neutral and Alexandrian texts," and his I (Jerusalem) text "roughly answers to Westcott and Hort's Western text. Here again his apparent simplicity defeats itself, for he finds eleven subdivisions of I....His actual Greek text does not differ greatly from that of Westcott and Hort though he reaches his conclusions in his own independent and tortuous way."¹

Hoskier makes the interesting observation:

I have tried to tackle von Soden, but in his forest of figures my eyes fail me. On his card he indicates that most of his MSS of 'Paul' were only roughly examined, and the notes seem to bear this out. Also, he hardly does justice to Matthaei's collations. He may have been in a hurry to reach the end of his work, for the indications are, as shewn in the list below, that his agents did examine, cursorily or otherwise, codices as far afield as Moscow and Sinai and Athos.²

The writer, having worked through the apparatus of von Soden in those parts of Romans in which the text of P46 is extant, V 17 to VI 14, VIII 15 to 36, IX 22 to XIV 9, XV 11 to XVI 27, finds that it does not compare favorably with the apparatus of Tischendorf, both as to format and as to evidence. His system of noting variants and evidence is very complicated; he is not so accurate as is Tischendorf, nor so thorough, not collating as much testimony of the fathers

1. A.T. Robertson, An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, pp. 242-243.

2. "The Shorter Text" of the Pauline Epistles as gathered from the Papyrus 46," Appendix to an article on the Chester-Beatty Papyrus of the Pauline Epistles known as P46 in The Journal of Theological Studies, p. 18, note.

or of the versions. The chief value of his work, in the writer's opinion, lies in the minuscule evidence which he records.

Merk uses the same large groups as von Soden's, but presents his evidence much more clearly. He uses the generally accepted mss. symbols instead of those of von Soden.

Having now as briefly as possible glanced over the important points in New Testament textual criticism which affect the material of this thesis, we are ready to present the opinions which other critics have voiced concerning P46.

Kenyon, drawing from the historical development of textual criticism, gives the following judgment on the Chester Beatty Papyri in general and Papyrus 46 in particular:

The first and most important conclusion derived from the examination of them (the papyri) is the satisfactory one that they confirm the essential soundness of the existing texts. No striking or fundamental variation is shown either in the Old or the New Testament. There are no important omissions or additions of passages, and no variations which affect vital facts or doctrines. The variations of text affect minor matters, such as the order of words or the precise words used. On these matters, which are of high interest rather than of fundamental importance, they offer evidence of great value to Biblical critics. But their essential importance is their confirmation, by evidence of an earlier date than hitherto available, of the integrity of our existing texts....

Half a century ago, at the time of the production of the Revised Version of the English Bible, the main controversy lay between the supporters of the traditional 'Received Text', embodied in the vast majority of extant manuscripts and reproduced in our Authorized Version, and those who followed Hort and other scholars in preferring the evidence of the older authorities, notably the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS. and the early versions, which had become known in the course of the nineteenth century. When, however, the Received Text was decisively shown to be of relatively late origin, and the superiority

of the earlier authorities was accepted by practically all scholars, a difference developed itself between the champions of Hort's 'Neutral Text', resting almost wholly on the Codex Vaticanus and its close allies, and those who saw in the so-called 'Western Text' evidence of a yet earlier type, of which the most notable features were marked variants in the text, especially of Luke and Acts. It is for its bearing on this controversy that the new MS. will be most eagerly examined. It would be presumptuous for the first editor to dogmatize as to the verdict given by it. This much, however, can be said without hesitation. On the one hand, it is not an out-and-out supporter of the 'Neutral' or Vatican type of text; but neither is it, on the other hand, and out-and-out supprotter of the 'Western' type. It has stronger affinities with other MSS. than the Vaticanus; but it confirms none of the more noticeable readings of the Western text, such as are found in the Codex Bezae and the Old Latin and Old Syriac versions. Its closest affinities are with the group of authorities which have only of recent years been recognized as such, and which have received the title of 'Caesarean' from the proved use of authorities of this type of Origen in his later years at Caesarea, and which consequently may be presumed to have been found in the library formed at that place by Pamphilus and Eusebius.

The fuller discussion of this conclusion must be reserved for more competent scholars after more detailed examination of the evidence which will be set out in the edition of this papyrus. For the moment it must suffice to point out that the occurrence of this type of text in a manuscript from Egypt contemporaneous with, or at latest not much later than, Origen seems to show that the type did not take its rise at Caesarea, but existed already in Egypt. It points, perhaps, decisively, to the conclusion that the Vatican MS. does not represent a text of original purity dominant in Egypt throughout the second and third centuries; that other texts, with many minor variations, existed during that period in Egypt as well as elsewhere; and that the Vatican text represents the result, not of continuous unaltered tradition, but of skilled scholarship working on the best available authorities. It may still be, in result, the best single representative of the original text; that the problem remains open as before: but the claim made for it of almost exclusive predominance and primitive purity is shaken.

On the other hand, the new evidence would seem to go far towards completing the disintegration of the so-called 'Western' text considered as a single family. Criticism had already shown that the term 'Western' was a misnomer, if it was intended to cover all texts,

earlier than the Byzantine or 'Received' text, which differed from the 'Neutral' type, since such texts were found in the Old Syriac and other eastern authorities. It had further shown differences between the eastern and western representatives of these non-Neutral early texts; and that the more marked variations found in some of them were not to be regarded as characteristic of the whole group. It is this last conclusion which is more definitely confirmed by the Chester Beatty Papyrus. It has many readings in common with Codex Bezae and other 'Western' authorities; but it has none of their more striking variations. It seems to confirm the view that the notion of a single 'Western' type of text must be given up, and that we must recognize that throughout the second and third centuries there was in existence a considerable variety of readings which had not yet crystallized into families. Some of these may well be superior to some which eventually found a place in the Vatican recension; but the recognition of this does not carry with it the acceptance of those other and more marked divergences which are found in some early authorities, both western and eastern. The most that can be said is that all readings which can be shown to be of early date must be considered on their merits, without being absolutely overborne by the weight of the Vatican MS.¹

Seesemann has likewise remarked on the early existence of 'Western' readings which P46 indicates:

Aus diesen Beispielen geht eindeutig hervor, dass es vor der Rezension des IV. Jh.s in Aegypten zahlreiche "westliche" Lesarten gegeben hat; und nicht nur die Tatsache des "dass" wird uns hier plastisch vor Augen gefuehrt; die ist ja zur Genuege bekannt; sondern noch mehr: es ergibt sich aus dem Angefuehrten, wie zahlreich die "westlichen" Lesarten hier waren. Und je mehr alte Textzeugen ans Tageslicht kommen, um so mehr alte "westliche" Lesarten werden uns bekannt.... "Westliche" Lesarten gab es in Aegypten um 200 in ganz groszer Zahl. Ueber ihre Urspruenglichkeit ist damit noch nichts gesagt; gerade der Vergleich von Cl. und P beweist, dass sie um 200 zum groszen Teil nicht unbestritten waren sondern dass sich neben ihnen auch die spaeter bei H erhaltenen Lesarten fanden.²

1. Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Fasc. I, pp.15-17. The writer would call the reader's attention particularly to Kenyon's remarks on the "Caesarean" text and its early origin.

2. Op. cit., p. 95. P₁₅ P₄₆

The relationship of P46 with the Alexandrian group of mss. (ⲚABC) is closer than with the Western mss. (DFG), according to the evidence of Kenyon, who in a chosen group of variants notes agreement between P46 and the Alexandrian group 501 times, the Western group 140 times. He writes:

The papyrus ranges itself quite definitely with the Alexandrian rather than with the Western group, though the preponderance is much less strongly marked in Romans than in the other Epistles. There remains, however, a respectable minority of agreements with the Western group, and it is to be remembered that there are not a few other cases where one of the Alexandrian witnesses is found supporting a Western reading, so that we have, for example, BDFG against ⲚAC, or CDFG against ⲚAB. The result is to confirm the belief, to which other evidence seems to point, that while the Alexandrian group is on the whole the most trustworthy authority for the text of the New Testament, readings supported by the Western group are at times to be preferred, and should receive consideration on their merits.¹

Harking back to the remarks that the claim for the Vatican text "of almost exclusive predominance and primitive purity is shaken"² Kenyon alludes to the critical edition of Westcott and Hort, who describe their edition as "an attempt to present exactly the original words of the New Testament, so far as they can be determined from surviving documents,"³ basing it principally on the texts of

1. Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Fasc. III Supplement, p. xvii. The Aleph in the text was changed to Ⲛ by the writer.

2. Cf. supra p. 16.

3. Op. cit., p. 3.

Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. Kenyon writes:

With regard to the best known of the modern critical texts, that of Westcott and Hort, on a comparison of all the variants in Romans noted in the critical apparatus of this edition (ignoring the singular readings of the papyrus, which naturally do not appear in WH), the papyrus concurs with WH in 171 readings, and differs in 101. In Ephesians the figures are 162 with WH and 28 against; in Galatians 105 and 48; in Philippians 70 and 31.

These general conclusions which have been drawn from studies in P46 have been well summarized by Hoskier: "A careful review of pap 46 will reveal a situation of much interest, for it exhibits, me judice, a closer textual relationship, even if rougher, between Rome, Sardinia, Carthage, Alexandria, Ephesus, Corinth, and Byzance, than obtained one hundred to two hundred years later."²

1. Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Fasc. III Supplement, p. xxii.

2. Appendix, op. cit., p. 3.

II. The Romans Text of Papyrus 46

As the reader has noticed in the title of this thesis, only the Romans text of P46 is to be studied. The question may be raised: Can adequate results be obtained from only such a small part of the codex, which itself is but a part of the entire New Testament? Why not study the entire codex?

In answer the writer might facetiously remark that he hasn't had the time. But, speaking in all seriousness, he believes that by studying only the text of Romans in P46, or that of any other of the Pauline epistles therein contained, much valuable information can be gained. Conclusions gained from the analysis of the ms. text of merely one book of the New Testament are worthy of consideration.

But why? If the reader were to turn to p. 103 of von Dobschuetz' Einleitung, he would find there a table which gives the number of extant mss. appearing in each century, beginning at the fourth, arranged according to their content. From the fourth century we have one codex of the complete New Testament, one codex containing the Gospels, the Acts and catholic epistles, and Paul's letters, seven codices containing only the Gospels, three containing only the Acts and catholic epistles, and five containing only the Pauline epistles. From the period covering some thirteen centuries,

beginning with the fourth, we have received 150 mss. containing only the Pauline epistles. P46, containing only the Pauline epistles, is therefore not an alien among New Testament mss.

Of these 150 mss., as von Dobschuetz shows on p. 97 of the same book, 21 are majuscles. These are not the sole majuscule evidence for Paul's writings, however. There are listed one majuscule containing only Romans, seven containing only I and II Corinthians, three, Galatians, two, Ephesians, one, I and II Thessalonians, two, I and II Timothy. From this it is evident that Paul's letters were preserved also individually.

Reason for this is found in the method of preserving literary works.

Before the advent of the leaved codex, which in the case of parchment occurred apparently in the third and fourth centuries, in the case of papyrus earlier, as is proved by the papyrus codices of the Chester Beatty collection, rolls were the means of preserving writing.¹

Souter remarks that "the main part of the theological library which he (Pamphilus) founded at Caesarea consisted of the voluminous works of Origen on rolls."²

Consequently, in a collection of rolls which made up the canon of the New Testament as it was known in any one

1. Cf. Gregory, op. cit., pp. 299-328, chapters on "Papyrus" and "Parchment," and von Dobschuetz, op. cit. pp. 32-33.

2. Op. cit., p. 84.

section of the Mediterranean world, there might have been, were, indeed, from the evidence we have, rolls from various other sections, with texts of varying antiquity and varying degrees of accuracy. Indeed, one author, as in the case of Clement of Alexandria, might use different rolls of the same book when writing different works.¹ When therefore the contents of a collection of rolls would be copied into one codex, the texts of the individual books would probably differ as to trustworthiness. A good example of this is Codex Delta of the Gospels, a ninth or tenth century ms. from Switzerland, of which the text of Mark is much older than that of the other Gospels.²

Additional indication of the fact that the New Testament books were handed down singly before the time of the codex, is the different orders in which the books are found. Kenyon comments interestingly on the peculiar order of the epistles in P46:

The position given to Hebrews immediately after Romans is almost unique, the only other example recorded by Gregory (Prolegomena, 1894, p. 140) being the eleventh- or twelfth-century MS. formerly known as Paul 100 and now as minuscule 1919. In the earliest vellum codices, ζ ABC, and the Bohairic version it follows Thessalonians and precedes the Pastorals, while in D and the Latin authorities generally it follows the Pastorals. The chapter numeration, in B, however, places it after Galatians, and the Sahidic version after ~~after~~ 2 Corinthians and before Galatians. Its present position is a proof of the high importance assigned to it, and of the unquestioning acceptance of its Pauline authorship. The order of the other Epistles also (1

1. Gregory, op. cit., p. 494.

2. Ibid., p. 359.

and 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians) appears to be unprecedented.

We seem to have here some light on the formation of the Pauline canon. An early (not necessarily the earliest) stage, represented by the papyrus, shows it as including all the general epistles, but not the personal (Pastoral); Hebrews is accepted as Pauline without question, and given the second place as ranking only after Romans in importance; the shorter epistles have not yet settled down to their final order, but perhaps the priority given to Ephesians is a recognition of the special attractiveness, and consequent popularity, of that Epistle. The acceptance, and even the pre-eminence, of Hebrews is entirely in accordance with what we know of opinion in Egypt about the beginning of the third century; for it will be remembered that Clement of Alexandria, who was approximately contemporary with this MS., repeatedly quotes it as Pauline, and this indeed was the universal opinion in the East, though Origen, struck by the marked difference in style, suggests that while the substance is Pauline the actual wording may be that of a disciple. Next, there is a stage, represented by the earlier uncials, in which doubts as to the Pauline authorship of Hebrews have caused it to be relegated to the last place among the general epistles. The Pastorals have been added to the canon, but are placed after Hebrews, possibly because they also were accepted with some doubt, but perhaps more probably because of their personal character. Finally, there is the stage when the Pastorals have been fully accepted while Hebrews has been relegated to the borderland between the epistles of Paul and those of James, Peter, John, and Jude. This appears to be a predominantly Western arrangement, both in the position assigned to the Hebrews (which was definitely not regarded as Pauline in the West before the time of Jerome, who was influenced by his knowledge of Eastern MSS.) and in placing the Catholic Epistles after the Paulines, instead of appending them to Acts as in Greek MSS. generally. This stage is not necessarily later in date than the second; the difference may be of place rather than of time. In both stages the order of the shorter epistles has been modified, it being the general rule, though to some exceptions, to place Galatians first, probably from a feeling that its argumentative character links it with Romans and Corinthians, while Ephesians, with its tone of warm and eloquent emotion, is placed more appropriately with Philippians and Colossians.¹

1. Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Fasc. II Supplement, pp. xi-xii.

In view of the foregoing, the writer feels that a study such as this thesis undertakes of only the Romans text can offer valuable information to the textual critic. One will of course not judge the character of entire P46 on the basis of deductions drawn from a study of only the Romans text. But these deductions can serve as hypotheses, to be tested by further studies in P46.

The writer would take this opportunity to describe the method which he has employed in his study of the papyrus. In his apparatus to the Romans text of P46¹ he numbered each variant consecutively for purposes of ready reference.² There were some 553 variants, which included every reading recorded by Tischendorf and von Soden in their apparatus, excluding a few variants in spelling. For the work undertaken in the present thesis, the writer selected 333 as the most important of these readings. Having transferred the major testimony of his apparatus to 3" by 5" filing cards, he added from Tischendorf's apparatus the supporting and opposing testimony of the fathers and of the versions. These cards were then sorted and analytically arranged, and their testimony tabulated in the manner which the reader will note in the footnotes of the following chapters.

The reader will find in Appendix I a catalogue of the

1. Cf. *supra*, p. 3.

2. In this thesis, where a variant is referred to and a number in parenthesis accompanies the reference, the number is the catalogue number of the variant. It can be checked in Appendix II.

majuscules collated, with pertinent information to identify them. Likewise will be found there an explanation of Tischendorf's sigla. Appendix II contains the variants used in this thesis, with the majuscule testimony and whatever other evidence from Tischendorf's apparatus has been used.

A word is in place concerning the adequacy of the evidence presented. Tischendorf is very thorough in collating the majuscules. The evidence of the versions and fathers likewise seems to be quite completely recorded. Hoskier, however, finds numerous readings in P46, the fathers, and versions, which are not listed in Tischendorf or von Soden. Eg., in Rom. X 6, P46 syr d e Pelag and half the Vulgate mss. have OYK for OYKETE . Or, again, in Rom. XIV 4, P46 syr Ambrst have $\eta\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\epsilon\iota\ \eta\ \pi\iota\pi\tau\epsilon\iota$, while other witnesses omit the first η . None of the critical editions to which the writer has access have this last variant.¹

While one can be quite sure, therefore, that the Greek ms.² evidence is complete, one cannot be certain that all pertinent testimony of the versions and the fathers is available in the sources used in this thesis. In fact, one can be sure that the opposite is the case. When there-

1. Hoskier, "A Study of the Chester Beatty Codex," *op. cit.*, p. 155.

2. Throughout this thesis, the terms ms. and mss. refer only to the majuscule witnesses. The writer has not analysed any of the minuscule evidence, feeling both that the minuscule field would add too much to the scope of this thesis, and that the evidence obtained from a study of only the majuscules would be worthwhile.

fore no definite conclusion can be drawn concerning the relationship of a particular father to P46, or again, when a definite conclusion seems to be tenable, one must bear in mind that only with more complete evidence, not available to the writer, can the conclusion be made definite. This fact, however, should not discourage the reader. One does the best one can with the available materials.

While speaking of practical matters, the writer would explain the terminology used by him in designating the text families. The word "Constantinople" refers to the type of text as found most frequently in $\text{KL}\text{P}\alpha^7$,¹ and generally in H-0142.² "Alexandrian" refers, not to Westcott and Hort's "Alexandrian," but to the testimony of the mss. ZABC . Similarly, by "Western" the writer does not mean the "Western" text of Westcott and Hort, but the testimony of DEFG .

One last item. Since Ms. C has lacunae from Romans IX to X 15 and from XI 31 to XIII 10; and Ms. P from VIII 33 to IX 11 and from XI 22 to XII 1, an omission of their sigla will often occur when their group is listed.³

1. von Soden's α^7 . Whenever this ms. is cited, the writer substitutes a Latin "a" for the small Greek alpha.

2. A group of mss. collated by Merk, consisting of H, I, 048, and 0142, which in all but a few instances agree among themselves, and are therefore cited as a unit. Their testimony is not available for all the variants, since Merk has treated only a select number of readings. Where they disagree among themselves, they are cited individually.

3. Not until a final check in Gregory, Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes, p.102, while writing this thesis, did the author discover that K has a lacuna from Rom. X 18 till I Cor. VI 13. The testimony of K is therefore to be ignored from variant (123) on. The author corrects wherever possible in the tables.

The omission will therefore not necessarily mean that either is opposing the testimony of its group. Only where they are ^ementioned should these two codices be considered; no deduction can be made from apparent failure to cite their evidence. In the case of codex E, Tischendorf, whether from oversight or because of lacunae, sometimes fails to record its testimony. No deduction can therefore be made from its absence. Likewise with the versions. The support of syr^{sch} (Peshitta) does not necessarily mean that syr^P (Harclean) is on the opposite side; nor does mention of DEFG assume the support of d e f g, the Latin texts of these bi-lingual codices. Only when the witnesses are specifically mentioned can their testimony be adduced as for or against a certain reading.

III. Papyrus 46 as Sole Authority

In checking the 333 variants included in this study, the writer noted 15 in which P46 has no majuscule evidence to support it.¹ Whether or not the fathers and versions offer evidence the writer could not ascertain.

Most of these variants can be traced to scribal error. A few, however, are worthy of note.

In VIII 23 (40), P46 omits *καὶ αὐτοὶ* after *ἀλλὰ*, losing emphasis by doing so, but not changing the sense. For with or without *καὶ αὐτοὶ*, the subject of *σπειροῦμεν ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ* determines the meaning of the verse.

In X 19 (132), P46 omits *ὑμᾶς* as object of *παράβηλυσω*. A second *ὑμᾶς* occurs, however, as object of *παραφύσσω*. The Textus Receptus therefore has correlative clauses with identical objects, P46 correlative verbs with one object.

The reader will note that these two variants are concerned with omissions in P46. H.C. Hoskier, in his article in the Journal of Theological Studies, and in the appendix to the article,² presents the hypothesis of "the Shorter Text" of the Pauline epistles, basing it upon many such omissions in the papyrus text.

1. Nos. 29, 40, 132, 229, 258, 355, 384, 386, 453, 460, 473, 491, 492, 513, 517.

2. Op. cit.

In developing the hypothesis, Hoskier speaks first of the difficult constructions in P46.

Critics too often look askance at so-called 'barbarisms' and at the personal preferences or failings of writers - (how all of us, invariably, have certain frailties in the matter of composition) - as if the primitive texts were so perfect and completely 'polished'; and they are apt to forget so frequently that all the attempted polishing, and the harmonizing for consistency's sake, took place later; so that, when we recover roughness of diction, doubtful grammar, or unacceptable constructions, - judgment being passed in accordance with certain strict modern standards - we are, perhaps more nearly approximating the primitive of the original text, than be setting down these things, forthwith, as pure errors of the pen or of the head of scribes and copyists. This must undeniably be the case, the farther back we go in our researches.¹

When, therefore, omissions occur in P46, it cannot be assumed a priori, Hoskier believes, that its text is poor, and that later, more "polished" texts present a more accurate tradition. Why not assume that the original text was "shorter" and less polished? "It seems certain," Hoskier writes, "that much editing took place. Some Pauline prose rises to such poetic heights that 'improvements' were not attempted at these places. Other passages formed the subject of most unwelcome meddling. All this has been hidden so far. The papyrus now points an important finger in many helpful directions."²

Evidence for this "shorter" text Hoskier finds throughout the papyrus. Most of it is furnished by the Ethiopic text, which very frequently is the sole support of P46

1. "A Study of the Chester-Beatty Codex," op. cit., p. 151.
2. Ibid., p. 152.

(Tischendorf does not record these readings). This strange but undeniable affinity Hoskier finds in the following instances pertaining to Romans: IX 2, omit $\mu\alpha\iota$; XII 4, omit $\gamma\alpha\rho$; XIII 12, add $\sigma\upsilon\nu$; XV 5, $\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$ for $\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu$; 19, add $\tau\epsilon$; 28, omit $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota$; 29, $\tau\epsilon$ for $\delta\epsilon$; 30, omit $\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\iota$; XVI 7, $\text{I}\sigma\upsilon\lambda\iota\alpha\nu$. In XV 5, "P46 and aeth alone make St. Paul say: 'Now the God of patience and consolation grant us to be like minded toward one another.'"¹ Further research will throw more light on this interesting hypothesis.

In the text of P46 we have not only one witness, but two. For P46 was corrected by a second hand, which is accepted as being of the same age as the original hand. Evidence of these two witnesses is found in the three variants in the P46 text of Romans where correction occurs other than in the case of mere scribal error. In (311), P46* ("*" after a majuscule signifies the first, "C" the correcting hand) is supported by the Syriac, P46^C by β^*P , while the remaining witnesses support two other readings. In (321), P46* stands with AC. (429) finds P46* with DEFG.

It is important to note that in these three variants, P46^C agrees each time with β^* , and that P agrees with β^* , a fact unimportant in itself, were in not for the combination of P46^C β^*P with no other support in (311). The affinity of P, Constantinopolitan though it be, with the Alexandrian codices, will be brought out more clearly in

1. Appendix, op. cit., p.5.

our consideration of the Constantinople text.

Variant (311) bears closer investigation than we have given it. The following diagram will show why.

Ⲫ ^C Ⲙ ^C ⲉ ^D Ⲛ ^G Ⲕ ^K Ⲛ ^L ⲛⲁ ⁷	vg	arm	aeth	Chr	Cyr	Thdrt	Cyp	Ambrst
P46* syr ^{utr}	καὶ	εὐδυσωμεθα					
P46 ^C Ⲫ*P		εὐδυσωμεθα	οὐν				
		εὐδυσωμεθα					

Conflation is a characteristic of the Constantinople text. Yet, instead of $\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\upsilon\delta\upsilon\varsigma\text{-}\omicron\upsilon\nu$, which would be a true conflate reading, the Constantinople text conservatively adopts $\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\upsilon\delta\upsilon\varsigma$. On the other hand, P46^CⲪ*, early third and fourth century mss. representing at least second and third century texts, respectively, eliminate the basis of a later conflation, go literally to the heart of the matter, and pick only $\epsilon\upsilon\delta\upsilon\varsigma\omega\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$. And P, a ninth century ms., ordinarily a supporter of the Constantinople text, agrees. Truly a remarkable comment on the critical judgment exercised by the scribes of P46* and P46^C.

On this very matter Hoskier comments: "When the scribe, therefore shews us that he weighed and discarded" one reading for another, "we must give him credit for as faithful a performance of his task as his materials allowed....we...must give pap 46 credit for steering a rather careful course in such matters" of critical processes.¹

A less favorable comment on the scribe of P46 or one of his literary forebears is variant (543). In diagram it

1. P46, Addenda et Corrigenda, p. 1.

appears thus:

D*EFG defg aeth	καὶ θελω
ⲀABCD ^c KLPⲱa7	θελω δε
P46	καὶ θελω δε

Here we have a remarkable instance of conflation already in the second century text of P46, a strong proof of the simultaneous existence of a Western and an Alexandrian (Westcott and Hort's "Neutral"?) reading, both of which P46 adopted. On the other hand, one can explain the reading in P46 as the correct one, of which the other two readings are attempted improvements.

The most interesting and undoubtedly the most important reading in which P46 stands alone is the position of the doxology which in the Textus Receptus occurs at the end of XVI in vv. 25-27, variant (460) in this thesis. The Textus Receptus is supported by ⲀABCD*EP def vg cop aeth Or Ambrst. A(sic)LP(sic)ⲱa7 Oec syr^P Or(sic) Chr Cyr Thdrt Dam Theophyl place the doxology after XIV 23. D^cFGH*0142 g Marcion omit it entirely. P46, alone of all witnesses, places the doxology after ch. XV 33.

The discussion of this reading by Kenyon deals well with the interesting critical questions involved:

Erasmus in this instance followed the Vulgate instead of the standard Byzantine text, so that the Textus Receptus and the Authorized Version here agree with the older uncials....Marcion rejected both the last two chapters, and they have been questioned by modern scholars. Ch. XVI has especially been the subject of attack, on the ground that St. Paul was not likely to have so many personal messages to give to members of

a Church which he had never visited, and it has been argued that this chapter is in fact a separate letter, intended to introduce 'our sister Phoebe' to the Church at Ephesus, which had accidentally become attached to the letter to the Romans. Gregory, for example, would have liked to detach XVI from Romans, and to place the doxology at the end of XV; but in the absence of any support from manuscripts or versions he did not venture to do so.

It is therefore interesting to find that this is precisely the position given to it in the papyrus. The doxology follows immediately after XV. 33, ending with the word $\alpha\mu\eta\psi$ and a colon, the text of XVI following on in the same line. Prof. Sanders is inclined to take this as a decisive confirmation of Gregory's conjecture; but in the absence of any support it is difficult to accept his view. The difficulty still remains of how a letter of introduction for Phoebe should have been extant without preface or conclusion, and would have been attached to the great Epistle to the Romans. It is also hard to understand how, if this were its true place, it came to be moved to the end of ch. XIV. Ch. XV. follows on XIV naturally enough, dealing with the same subject, and probably no one would have questioned its authenticity but for the presence of the doxology at the end of XIV. An explanation is required which will account for the floating position of these verses; and the simplest appears to be that given by Sanday and Headlam in their edition of the Epistle, to the effect that the long list of salutations in XVI was not considered suitable for reading in Church, and that the doxology, which was too fine to miss, was moved elsewhere - to the end of XIV in the recension adopted in the Byzantine Church, or to the end of XV, as we now find it in the Beatty-Michigan Papyrus.¹

1. Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Fasc. III Supplement, p. xviii.

IV. The Constantinople Tradition

The Constantinople text, or, as Westcott and Hort call it, the Syrian text, was, in the opinion of these two critics, compiled from "documents representing at least three earlier forms of text: Western, Alexandrian, and a third."¹ This contention is well substantiated by an analysis of the variants considered in this thesis, although whether there were three or two is a debatable question.

The first table of variants,² 95 in all, out of a

1. Op. cit., p. 116.

2.

P46 ^c & S ABC	& KLP ^a 7:	429
P46 & "	& "	: 4, 55, 103, 104, 136, 168, 356, 360, 365, 388, 395, 405, 428, 445, 463, 464, 484, 487, 493, 520, 523, 527, 536, 540, 547
" & " & D ^c	& "	: 14, 238, 358, 458, 538, 552.
" & " & D ^c E	& "	: 6, 61, 177, 221, 255, 257, 306, 377, 399, 411, 469.
" & " & D E	& "	: 9, 11, 12, 27, 32, 39, 88, 101, 112, 117, 124, 126, 140, 147, 155, 184, 233, 236, 244, 245, 266, 268, 277, 283, 289, 293, 304, 330, 382, 390, 402, 419, 424, 427, 435, 437, 439, 446, 452, 494, 535, 538
" & " & D ^c F G	& "	: 526
" & " & F G	& "	: 23, 139, 141
" & " & D ^c EF G	& "	: 185, 271, 305
" & " & D*	& "	: 410
" & " & D*E	& "	: 274
" & " & D EF ^c G	& "	: 242
" & " & D D G*	& "	: 226

Note: In each table presented in this thesis, the number after the colon is that of a variant, catalogued in Appendix II.

total of 333 considered, shows agreement between P46, the Alexandrian mss. ($\mathcal{A}BC$), and the Constantinople group (KLP $\mathcal{D}\alpha 7$, P and K's support being absent in the lacunae mentioned previously). As we shall note, 25 of these show no Western support at all. In 70 variants, some Western support is shown. The group in which DE agrees is significantly large, 42 in all. The conclusion to be drawn from the table is that the Constantinople text relied a great deal on the Alexandrian text. Furthermore, there are definitely two large ms. groups, the Alexandrian and the Constantinopolitan. Finally, the text of P46 is fundamentally that which was generally accepted in the early days of Christianity.

In the next table of variants, 27 in all, the entire Western text ($DEFG$), which represents a third ms. group, agrees with the Constantinople text and with P46, the Alexandrian support being more or less complete.¹ This table, compared with the previous one, would indicate less dependence of the Constantinople text on the complete Western than on the

1.

P46	&	$\mathcal{A}B$	&	$DEFG$	&	Const	:	148
"	&	$\mathcal{A}C$	&	"	&	"	:	1, 105, 106, 315, 403.
"	&	$\mathcal{B}C$	&	"	&	"	:	54, 165, 273, 309, 312, 545, 546
"	&	\mathcal{C}	&	"	&	"	:	368
"	&	ABC	&	"	&	"	:	350
"	&	\mathcal{A}	&	"	&	"	:	160
"	&	$\mathcal{B}^c\mathcal{A}B$	&	"	&	"	:	291
"	&	$\mathcal{B}^*\mathcal{A}B$	&	"	&	"	:	251, 134
"	&	$\mathcal{B}^*\mathcal{A}C$	&	"	&	"	:	387
"	&	$\mathcal{B}^c\mathcal{B}$	&	"	&	"	:	66, 67, 299
"	&	$\mathcal{B}^c\mathcal{B}C$	&	"	&	"	:	46
"	&	\mathcal{B}^c	&	"	&	"	:	102, 370
"	&	$\mathcal{B}^c\mathcal{B}C^*$	&	"	&	"	:	172

complete Alexandrian tradition.

In the next 17 variants the eclectic character of the Constantinople text is shown. Part of the Western, part of the Alexandrian mss. throw their support to the eastern text.¹

There are but three variants in which the Constantinople text has support from only one of the other two ms. groups, or from P46 alone.²

The text of P46 agrees therefore with the total Constantinople mss. in almost two-fifths of the variants considered, 142 out of 333. Or, expressed otherwise, almost two-fifths of the generally accepted text in eastern Christianity, when variants are considered, can be traced directly back to about the year 200 A.D.

	1.					
P46	& β ^c AB	& DE	& Const	:	89	
"	& β AB	& "	& "	:	171	
"	& β AB ^c C	& "	& "	:	504	
"	& β AB C ^c	& "	& "	:	518	
"	& β A C	& "	& "	:	354	
"	& β B C	& "	& "	:	164, 510	
"	& β A C	& D ^c EFG	& "	:	138	
"	& β A	& "	& "	:	223	
"	& β A C	& D ^c E	& "	:	186, 448, 451	
"	& β ABC	& "	& "	:	34	
"	& β B	& D*E	& "	:	270	
"	& β A	& FG	& "	:	145	
"	& β ^c B	& FG	& "	:	100	
"	& β ^c A C	& D ^c	& "	:	456	
	2.					
P46	& β		& Const:		394	
"		& DEFG	& "	:	65	
"			& "	:	111	

In 92 variants the total Constantinople text disagrees
with P46.¹

1.			
A ABC		& Const	: 40, 44, 252, 287, 288, 310, 363
"	& D ^c	& "	: 361, 392, 543
"	& D ^c E	& "	: 19, 181, 182, 224, 278, 279, 320, 323, 401
"	& D E	& "	: 12, 26, 72, 77, 142, 322, 440
"	& D E G	& "	: 423
A		& "	: 240, 300, 460
A		& "	: 384, 473
BC	&	& "	: 430
C		& "	: 492
C ^c	&	& "	: 341
A C		& "	: 406, 421
B C		& "	: 16
B C ^a		& "	: 45
B C ^b		& "	: 93
B C ^a ABC		& "	: 425, 491
B C ^b	& D ^c	& "	: 217
B A	& "	& "	: 258
B A ^c B	& "	& "	: 267
A C	& "	& "	: 56
B C ^b	& D ^c E	& "	: 232
A	& "	& "	: 90
A	& "	& "	: 259
ABC ^c	& "	& "	: 33
B A C ^c	& "	& "	: 137
B A	& D E	& "	: 78, 301
B <u>BP46</u> C ^c	& "	& "	: 321
B B C ^c	& "	& "	: 459, 517
B ^c C ^c	& "	& "	: 495
A C	& D E G	& "	: 374
B A	& "	& "	: 497
B C ^b	& D ^c EFG	& "	: 290
B B	& "	& "	: 143
B B ^c C ^c	& "	& "	: 506
B C ^c	& D* FG	& "	: 316
B A C ^c	& D E	& #	: 28, 190, 355, 372, 443, 490, 551
B A B ^c C ^c	& D EFG	& "	: 203
B *AB	& "	& "	: 132
B *A C ^c	& "	& "	: 471
B C	& "	& "	: 50
B BC	& "	& "	: 420
B	& "	& "	: 107
A C	& "	& "	: 548, 426
C	& "	& "	: 187
B C ^b	& "	& "	: 82, 83, 120, 192.
	D ^c	& "	: 483
	D ^c E	& "	: 207, 245, 282
	B ^c FG	& "	: 193, 194
	DEFG	& "	: 453, 553
		& "	: 292

But in these disagreements, it will be well to note, the eclectic text of the East chooses only 26 which the entire Alexandrian tradition supports, and only 13 which the entire Western group supports. Which would indicate that regarding the worth of the old readings which P46 has and the Constantinople mss. do not have there was much varied opinion in the third and fourth centuries. For there are 53 variants in which only part of the Alexandrian and only part of the Western tradition support the Constantinople text.

In general, the Constantinople text was quite a finished product. In 234 out of 333 variants there is agreement among the principle majuscles. Yet the fact that in the remaining 90 plus, there is division in the Eastern house indicates that at the time of these majuscles there was no absolute edition or recension which was widely accepted, although, it is true, a certain type of text was generally followed.

Majuscles K and L break least frequently from the family group.¹ Of interest is the support of L in (234): syr^D arm aeth Thphyl Aug; and in (537): syr^{sch} cop arm aeth Chr Dam. The variant was evidently not unknown.

1.	K	&	B ^C		:28
	K				: 75
P46	&	L	&	B C	: 468
"	&	L	&	AB*	: 228
	I		&	DEFG	: 389
	L				: 48, 234, 417, 537

Most frequent of the Constantinople texts to break from the group is codex P; 14 times with P46, of which 11 variants are supported by Alexandrian mss., indicating a strong Alexandrian influence; and 26 times opposed to P46, again supported by Alexandrian testimony in 18 instances.¹

The eight variants in which P stands alone cannot be considered evidence either for or against P, since Tischendorf may not have adduced all the witnesses available. The Alexandrian influence on P varies, A standing a sole supporting representative twice, B once, C twice, and then

1.			
P46	& P		: 343, 346
"	& P	& β ABC	: 163, 337
"	& P	& β *ABC*	: 488
"	& P	& β *ABC & D*	: 327
"	& P	& β ABC & D E	: 431
"	& P	& " & D*EFG	: 130
"	& P	& β *ABC & D EFG	: 418, 441, 447
"	& P	& β *A & D EFG	: 154
"	& P	& " & D ^c	: 336
"	& P*	& C* & FG	: 173
	P		: 75, 91, 308, 398, 467, 479, 482, 553
	P	& P46 ^c / β *	: 311
	P	& A	: 109
	P	& β A	: 229
	P	& β B	: 386
	P	& C	: 347
	P	& BC	: 414
	P	& ABC	: 486
	P	& β *A C	: 339
	P	& β ABC	: 189
	P	& " & FG	: 378
	P	& A & "	: 470
	P	& β A & "	: 508
	P	& B & D* FG	: 397
	P	& AB & D E	: 95
	P	& β C & D*	
	P	& β ABC & D EFG	: 386
	P	& " & D* FG	: 513
	P	& β *ABC & D*EFG	: 122

various combinations with varied frequency. The one instance in which P* is recorded, (173), in which P46C*FG support P*, indicate that there was perhaps second century influence in the ms. from which P was copied. The influence of β can be readily seen, a fact which Gregory mentions.¹

Codex Ψ shows both Alexandrian and Western influence in the readings in which it separates from the Constantinople group. Worthy of note is the fact that in (273) (455)(500) the Armenian version supports Ψ , indicating, perhaps influence of the parent text of Ψ of the Armenian translation.²

Little is indicated by the separate ⁵testimony of a7, P Ψ , Ψ a7, and other combinations, other than that the types of reading were quite mixed when these mss. were written. In (297), the Armenian supports P Ψ , but in

1. Textkritik, p. 102.

2.

P46 & Ψ	:	156
" & " & FG	:	201
" & " & β B & D E	:	113
" & " & β ABC & "	:	349
" & " & β AB & D EFG	:	91, 92
"	:	62, 41, 2.
" & β B	:	98
" & β^c CAB	:	115
" & β^c A C &	:	455
" & β^c BC	:	534
" & β^c A & D*	:	97
" & β B & D*	:	195
" & β^c & D ^c E	:	542
" & C & D EFG	:	500
" & FG	:	170
" & D ^c	:	273

(230)(230) opposes $\Psi a7$, modifying our judgment of the preceding paragraph, and indicating a mixed relation between Ψ and the Armenian, if any at all.¹

There are but few readings, eight in all, in which the Constantinople mss. stand alone.² Three of them, (17)(41) (336), are conflate readings and will be considered later. Since Tischendorf offers no evidence on the others, one can judge concerning them. They are, in any event, but mech-

1. P46 & a7			:209
" & "	& A C &		:41
" & "	& S *BC & D*		:127
" & "	& S AB & D E		:302
"	& S ABC*		:17
"	& S *BC		:15
"			:524
" & P Ψ	& S AB & D E		:348
" & "	& S ABC & DEFG		:367
" & "	& S *AB & DEFG		:438
" & "	& S ABC & D*FG		:549
"	P Ψ & S		:297
" & $\Psi a7$	& S AB* & DEFG		:24
" & "	& S ABC & DE		:133
" & "	&	FG	:167
"	& S B*C & DEFG		:29
"	& AB ^C & FG		:230
"	& S AB ^C & D*FG		:231
" & LP	& A & FG	:86	
"	LP		:457
"	LP & B ^C & D ^C		:281
"	LP	& DE	:364
" & KLa7	& S B & FG	:96	
"	KLa7		:91
" & L Ψ	& B & DEFG	:544	
"	& A & DE	:131	
"	$\Psi^c a7$ & S * & D ^C E	:286	
" & L $\Psi a7$	& C & EFG	:10	
P46* & "	& S AB & DE	:75	
2. KL a7			:92
KLP			:41
KLP Ψ			:15, 17
L $\Psi a7$:163, 286, 336
L a7			:367

anical variants.

This completes the analysis of the five Constantinople mss. in relation to P46. Little of importance can be deduced from the evidence, other than that the Constantinople is a mixed text, quite definitely formed, yet not fully at harmony within its own ranks. Codex P is the one ms. which shows quite definite leanings to the Alexandrian group. The reader will note from Appendix I that Merk and von Soden place P in the HI groupings, while the analysis of the writer would indicate a K label as more appropriate. In general it can be said that the Constantinople text draws more heavily on the Alexandrian than on the Western tradition.

The writer has also undertaken an analysis of the H-0142 group, which Merk and von Soden place in the H family of mss., which, however, according to the writer's analysis, in the Romans text at least belong in the Constantinople group.

The three variants out of a total of 209 recorded by Merk in which the group divides its testimony¹ indicate nothing more than that the mss. have texts of mixed sources, something to be expected in the Constantinople family. The one variant, (117), in which H-0142 is recorded as sole witness, finds

1. HI 0142	& β^* A C	& P	: 339
048	& P46 & β^c B & DEFG	& KL η a7	:
HI 0142	& C ^c	& KL η a7	: 341
048	& P46 & β ABC* & DEFG		:
HI	& P46 & β ABC	& P	: 337
048 0142	& DEFG & L η a7		:

the subjunctive mood replacing the indicative without any affect on the meaning of the verse.

These four manuscripts support the total Alexandrian group without unanimous support from the Western and Constantinople groups, 12 times, in nine of which P46 supports H-0142.¹

In 16 variants there is agreement with the Western as a total group, 13 of the variants being supported by P46.² The reader will note, if he checks with Appendix II, that in variants (109)(366)(347)(414)(486)(189) codex P is the only one of the Constantinople group with which H-0142 disagrees, an indication of P's lukewarm adherence to the

1. H-0142	& P46	& Alex	&				:83,120
"	&	"	&	"	& D* FG		:207,282
"	&	"	&	"	& D*EFG		:483
"	&	"	&	"	& D* FG	& P Ψ	:549
"	&	"	&	"	& D E	& a7	:302
"	&	"	&	"	& "	& Ψ	:349
"	&	"	&	"	& "	& LP a7	:170
"		&	"	&	FG & P		:378
"		&	"	&	D E & KLP		:167
"		&	"		& L Ψ a7		:479
2. H-0142	& P46	& β^* AB	& DEFG				:93
"	&	"	& β^* ABC	& "	& β	& KL Ψ a7	:418,441,447
"	&	"	& β B	& "	& "	& L Ψ a7:	366
"	&	"	& A C	& "	& "		:347
"	&	"	& β AB	& "	& "		:414
"	&	"	& β A	& "	& "		:486
"	&	"	& β	& "	& "		:189
"	&	"	& β^c B	& "	& LPa7		:455
"	&	"	& β^c A	& "	& "		:534
"	&	"	& AB	& "	& L a7		:297
"		&	β^c EC	& "	& Ψ a7		:29
"		&	β^c B	& "	& L Ψ a7		:229
"			&	&			:547

Constantinople text.

The Constantinople group and H-0142, with only partial or no support from the other two groups, in 51 instances, only 13 of which show the agreement of P46 with the Constantinople text.¹

1. H-0142	&	P46	&	Const	:111
"	&	"	&	"	:394
"	&	"	&	"	:171
"	&	"	&	"	:504
"	&	"	&	"	:354
"	&	"	&	"	:510
"	&	"	&	"	:186,448,451
"	&	"	&	"	:34
"	&	"	&	"	:100
"	&	"	&	"	:323
"	&	"	&	"	:138
"	&	"	&	"	:384
"	&	"	&	"	:406,421
"	&	"	&	"	:16
"	&	"	&	"	:492
"	&	"	&	"	:425,491
"	&	"	&	"	:45
"	&	"	&	"	:258
"	&	"	&	"	:267
"	&	"	&	"	:232
"	&	"	&	"	:90
"	&	"	&	"	:259
"	&	"	&	"	:33
"	&	"	&	"	:137
"	&	"	&	"	:301,78
"	&	"	&	"	:321
"	&	"	&	"	:459,517
"	&	"	&	"	:495
"	&	"	&	"	:374
"	&	"	&	"	:290
"	&	"	&	"	:143
"	&	"	&	"	:355
"	&	"	&	"	:245
"	&	"	&	"	:194,193

In 74 readings H-0142 agrees with the entire Constantinople and Alexandrian groups, in 52 of them being supported by P46.¹ One may note that when the Western support is added to H-0142 in this group of variants, DE in 18 and D^CE in 17 readings are the most frequent representatives of the Western group.

There are but 7 readings in which the total Alexandrian and total Western groups throw their support to H-0142, in five of which instances P46 lends its support.²

H-0142 agrees with the total Western and total Constantinople group 33 times, supported by P46 in 20 instances.³

1. H-0842 & P46 & Alex	& Const	:55,103,104,136, 356,388,395,405, 484,493,520,527
" & " & " & " & D ^C	& "	:14,238,458,539
" & " & " & " & D ^C E	& "	:6,221,255,257, 306,377,399,411, 469
" & " & " & " & D E	& "	:9,11,32,39,112, 126,140,184,236, 254,266,283,419
" & " & " & " & D ^C FG	& "	:305,526
" & " & " & " & DEF ^{CG}	& "	:242
" & " & " & " & DE G*	& "	:226
" & " & " & " & "	& "	:40,44,287,288, 310,363
" & " & " & " & D ^C	& "	:361,392,543
" & " & " & " & D ^C E	& "	:19,181,182,224, 278,279,320,323
" & " & " & " & D E	& "	:12,26,72,142,440
2. H-0142 & P46 & Alex	& DEFG	& P ⁷ :367
" & " & " & " & "	& LP ⁷	:524
" & " & " & " & "	& "	:92
" & " & " & " & "	& P ⁷ a ⁷	:234
" & " & " & " & "	& "	:537
" & " & " & " & "	& L ⁷ a ⁷	:343,346
3. H-0142 & P46 & β	C & DEFG	& Const :368

In 26 variants H-0142 is supported by split testimony from the various text groups, in the case of 13 of the variants there being support from all the groups.¹ P46 supports

H-0142	& P46	& β AB	& DEFG	& Const	:148
"	& "	& β^*AB	& "	& "	:251
"	& "	& β^cAB	& "	& "	:291
"	& "	& β A C	& "	& "	:1,315,403
"	& "	& $\beta^*A C$	& "	& "	:387
"	& "	& β A	& "	& "	:105,106
"	& "	& β BC	& "	& "	:165,545
"	& "	& β B	& "	& "	:237
"	& "	& β^cB	& "	& "	:6667,299
"	& "	& β^cBC	& "	& "	:46
"	& "	& A	& "	& "	:166
"	& "	& β^cA	& "	& "	:102,370.
"	& "	& β A C	& "	& "	:436,443,490
"	& "	& β^*AB	& "	& "	:132
"	& "	& β^*AC^c	& "	& "	:471
"	& "	& β C	& "	& "	:50
"	& "	& β B	& "	& "	:107
"	& "	& β BC	& "	& "	:420
"	& "	& A C	& "	& "	:426,548
"	& "	& C	& "	& "	:187
"	& "	& β^c	& "	& "	:82,192
1. H-0142	& P46	& β^*ABC	& D*EFG		:217
"	& "	& ABC*	& D*E		:311
"	& P46	& β B*		& LP	:230
"	& "	& β AB		& LPa7	:500
"	& "	& β^*ABC^*		& P	:488
"	& "	& β^c		& a7:	:457
"	& "	& β ABC*		& "	:17
"	& "	& A		& KL a7	:113
"	& "	& β^cB		& LPa7	:154
"	& "		& D ^c FG	& "	:460
"	& "		& D ^c E	& LPa7	:513
"	& P46	& β^* BC	& D*	& a7	:127
"	& "	& B*	& D ^c E	& L	:231
"	& "	& A C	& D ^c EFG	& L a7	:195
"	& "	& β^*	& D ^c	& KL β a7	:122
"	& "	& β	& FG	& "	:95
"	& "	& β BC	& DE	& LPa7	:470
"	& "	& B ^c	& D ^c E	& L a7	:77
"	& "	& β BC	& D	& K P	:10
"	& "	& β ABC ^c	& D E	& LP β a7	:173
"	& "	& C	& D E	& La7	:201
"	& "	& β^*A	& D*	& β	:97
"	& "	& β^cA	& D ^c E	& LPa7	:176
"	& "	& β A C	& D ^c E	& LPa7	:397

H-0142 in 10 of these readings.

In summary of the foregoing evidence, which in tabulated form might well have been omitted except for the sake of documentation, the following can be stated: H-0142 is supported by the total Western group in 56 out of 209 instances, by the total Alexandrian, 93, by the total Constantinople, 157. The individual mss. rank as follows:

P46	121	D*	103		
Σ*	156	E	134	L	190
A*	151	F	73		
B*	140	G	75		

Taking L as a representative ms. of the Constantinople text, and noting the support of the total Constantinople group, we hold that H-0142 is definitely Constantinople in character, being influenced, however, by the Alexandrian text more than are the other individual Constantinople mss., and showing, furthermore, more influence by the Alexandrian than by the Western mss., of which E in particular, with D, is much closer to H-0142 than are FG. P46, holding the intermediate position that it does between the Alexandrian and Western type of text, indicates as much by its testimony.

In considering the Constantinople text, one ^{must} take cognizance of the Syriac versions. While it is true that the "Western" text of Westcott and Hort finds substantiation in the older Syriac versions, an observation which the reader will recall from ch. I, the fact, however, that the late Syriac text is quite Constantinopolitan in character, and that the "Syrian" text of Westcott and Hort is apparently based on Syriac and Greek, warrants our testing the entire

Syriac tradition in this chapter.¹

In the Gospels there is found an "Old-Syrian text... as it was in existence in the year 150," whose witnesses are the Curetonian and Sinaitic mss.² There is no specific witness for why a text in the Pauline epistles. Following Westcott and Hort, however, who reason that the discovery of the Curetonian Syriac "renders the comparatively late and 'revised' character of the Syriac Vulgate (Peshitto) a matter of certainty," we can safely assume that the Peshitta text of the Pauline epistles represents the revision of an earlier text. If it be thought that this assumption is too great, and the contention is made that an "Old-Syrian text" for the Pauline epistles did not exist, we shall willingly accede. The value of the Peshitta testimony rises; it becomes the earliest Syriac version of the Pauline letters.

The Peshitta is not, however, the sole Syriac witness.

In the year 506 Xenaia (Philoxenus), Bishop of Maburg (Hierapolis), superintended a more exactly literal translation of the New Testament made by his choor-episkopos, Polycarp. Of this translation in its original form only the books lacking in the Peshitta Canon, namely, Second and Third John, Second Peter, Jude, and the Apocalypse, survive. The Greek manuscripts from which the translation was made were of considerable textual purity... though this Philoxenian version has for the most part perished, it exists almost complete in a revision made by Thomas of Harkel on the basis of two or three accurate Greek manuscripts, in the year 616-17, at Alexandria. The purpose of this revision was to make the accurate Philoxenian version more literal still.³

1. Gregory, Canon and Text, pp. 496-500.

2. Ibid., p. 400.

3. Souter, op. cit., pp. 61-62.

The value of the Harclean Syriac is enhanced by the fact that "the margin contains readings taken from Greek MSS, which must either have been ancient or have had ancient texts."¹

That summary will suffice as introduction to our analysis of the Syriac texts. The sigla which Tischendorf uses are the following: "syr^{sch}," the Peshitta; "syr^D," the Harclean Syriac; "syr^{utr}" or "syr," both versions ("d e f g" are the Latin texts of the Græco-Latin codices DEFG).

Of the 110 readings of the Syriac which Tischendorf cites in the section of Romans under observation, 32 record the agreement between P46 and both Syriac versions.² This

1. Westcott and Hort, op. cit., p. 85.

syr ^{utr} & P46*						vs vg	vsAmbst:311
"	& P46	& β *ABC*	& D	& P	vs de g	vs vg	vsAmbst:311
"	& "	& β B		& LP	& defg	& "	:230
"	& "	& β AB		& LPa7	vs defg	& $\frac{1}{2}$ vg vs	:500
"	& "	& "		& KL β a7	vs defg	vs vg vs	:103
"	& "	& β ABC		& LP β a7	& fg	& "	:395
"	& "	& "		& "	vs defg	& "	:136
"	& "	& "		& "	& f	vs " vs "	:487
"	& "	& β ^c AB		& LP*	vs defg	& "	:286
"	& "	& "	& DEFG	& LPa7	& "		:189
"	& "	& β ^c B	& D ^c EFG	& KL a7	& defg	vs " vs "	:97
"	& "	& β AB	& D EFG	& β	& defg	& "	:92
"	& "	& β ABC	& "	& LP β	& "	& "	:524
"	& "	& β BC*	& "	& LP β a7	vs defg	vs " vs "	:172
"	& "	& β ^c	& "	& "	& "	& "	:370
"	& "	& "	& "	& KL β a7	& d fg	vs " & "	:102
"	& "	& β A	& "	& "	& defg	& "	:106
"	& "	& β ^c BC	& "	& KL β a7	& d fg	& "	:46
"	& "	& β ^c B	& "	& LP a7	& defg	& "	:455
"	& "	& "	& "	& KL β a7	& "	& "	:66
"	& "	& "	& "	& L β a7	vs defg	vs " vs "	:339
"	& "	& A	& D ^c EFG	& "	& "	& "	:223
"	& "	& β AB	& D E	& LP β a7	& de	vs " vs "	:266
"	& "	& β BC	& "	& L β a7	& efg	& "	:470
"	& "	& β ABC	& D ^c E	& LP β a7	& e	& "	:469

brings at least one-third of the Syriac tradition into the second century. The Alexandrian and Constantinople support the Syriac consistently, although the corrected mss., such as β^c , cannot be counted such strong support. In 24 of the readings there is definite Western support, although the testimony of D^cE cannot be relied on too heavily, as we shall see when examining the Western text in ch. VI. In no reading does the Syriac agree only with the Constantinople text, an indication of the dependence of the latter on the former.

The relationship of the Itala (defg) and the Syriac is important, since both versions can be assumed to have arisen very early. In the 27 readings in which Tischendorf adduces Itala evidence, defg agree eight times with syr, and oppose seven times. Partial Itala support is noted 12 times.

This would indicate, on the one hand, that both versions had a common base. 17 out of 27 readings are found in both. That p46 also has them carries the floruit of the readings back into the second century. On the other hand, that they disagree would show that there were opposing readings contributed by their common source and by possible influence

syr ^{utr}	& P46	& β AB	& D ^c E	& LP ψ a7	& def	& vg	& Ambst:255
"	& "	& "	& "	& "	& "	& vg vs	" :257
"	& "	& β A C	& "	& "	& fg	& " vs	" :448
"	& "	& B*	& "	& L	& defg	& " &	" :231
"	& "	& β^c A C	& D ^c	& KLP ψ a7	vs defg	& " vs	" :456
"	& "	& β B	& FG	& KL ψ a7		vs " &	" :100
"	& "	& β	& "	& "	& d fg vs	" vs	" :95

in their later developments.

That there is disagreement within the Itala in 12 variants indicates that the Itala tradition is mixed, and that the fountain which provided the entire Itala with the seven readings which oppose the Syriac likewise may have supplied a part of the Itala with mixed readings within its own confines.

The Vulgate shows a closer relation to the Syriac than does the Itala, agreeing in 21 readings. This would indicate that Jerome compared the Itala with the Syriac or a similar tradition, and in some cases rejected the Itala in favor of the latter.

In only four instances does Ambrosiaster, a faithful follower of the Vulgate (or vice-versa), favor the Syriac. In three of those, (257)(448)(456), he supports part of the Itala; while in the fourth, (100), Tischendorf offers no Itala reading.

There are 20 readings (in (378) the testimony of syr^{sch} is assumed) in which the Peshitta alone is recorded as supporting P46. In 15 of these Tischendorf cites syr^P as opposed to P46.¹ That syr^{sch} agrees with Alexandrian and

		1. (# shows syr ^P as opposed to P46 with remaining witnesses)									
#	syr ^{sch}	& P46	& §			& LP/a7	vs defg	vs vg	vs ambst	394	
#	"	& "	& § ABC			& P	vs "	vs "	vs Ambst	:337	
#	"	& "	& §*AB				vs "	vs "	vs "	:83	
#	"	& "	& A	&D EFG			& "	vs "	vs "	:15	
#	"	& "	& § AB	& #			& "	& "		:292	
"	& "	& "	& B	& FG			& d g	& "		:78	
"	& "	& "		& FG			& d g	& "		:77	
"	& "	& "		& FG			vs defg			:12	

Constantinople readings, although it may be with but one witness from each group, is not strange. For the Peshitta assumedly drew on the Alexandrian, and both were drawn on by the Constantinople. But the three variants in which only Western majuscles agree, and the three in which the Alexandrian join the Western mss., are significant. Here we have readings of undeniable antiquity, found in P46 and in the Alexandrian and Western mss., and in the Syriac Peshitta. The Peshitta must find its roots back in the second century.

Significantly, no where does syr^{sch} display a pure Constantinople reading, another indication of the priority of the Syriac version.

The Harclean Syriac, breaking from P46 and the Peshitta, in two instances supports only the total Western group, a symptom of relationship which cannot be ignored. In four, however, it is supported only by Constantinople majuscles, which would indicate either that it is the source of certain Constantinople readings, or, more probably, that the Constan-

	syr ^{sch}	& P46		& FG		& d g		& Ambst :77
#	"	& "		& D*EFG		& d fg vs vg	& Ambst :361	
"	"	& "		& D E	& L ũa7vs	defg vs "	vs "	:378
"	"	& "	& S ABC	& D E	& P	de & "	& "	:431
#	"	& "	& S AB	& D ^C E	& LPũa7&	d fg & "	& "	:221
#	"	& "	& B	& D* FG	& P	de & "	& "	:397
#	"	& "	& B	& D E FG	& L ũ	defg & vg&	"	:544
#	"	& "	& AB	& DEFG	& L a7	defg vs vg	& "	:297
#	"	& "	& S *AB	& #	& H-etc&	defg vs "	vs "	:93
#	"	& "	& S *ABC	& "	& P	defg & "	& "	:447
#	"	& "	& "	& "	& P	" & "	& "	:418
#	"	& "	& S AB	& "	& Pũa7	" & "	"	:234
#	(syr ^D)	& "	& S ABC	& FG	& P	" & "	& "	:378

tinople readings, or, more probably, that Constantinople readings were selected from the mss. used by its editor. The net result of analysing syr^P on the basis of these variants is the conclusion that it is not so pure not so old a text as that of the Peshitta, although in some instances it draws from a common source with the Western groups.

In nine readings the Peshitta agrees with the complete Itala, DEFG likewise agreeing. Where it disagrees with part of the Itala, it is in readings where the Western majuscles are of divided testimony. The fact, however, that, in cases of split testimony, the Itala testimony does not harmonize with the Greek counterpart in the bi-lingual codices prevents one from explaining the disagreements between Itala and the Peshitta and between Western codices and the Peshitta as being of the same type. When the Peshitta disagrees with part of the Western and part of the Itala text, it is disagreeing apparently with two traditions, not one. In converse, when syr^P agrees with part of the Itala and part of the Western texts, it agrees, not with one, but with two traditions. In such cases, one may ask, which Syriac strain is to be preferred? The writer will not now venture a definite conclusion, but would point out that the reading which agrees with P46 is stamped as second century.

The Peshitta agrees with the Vulgate eight times, disagrees with it eight times. The Harclean Syriac agrees with the Vulgate eight times, disagrees six times. This would indicate that when the Syriac tradition split, or its

Greek parents separated, Jerome chose from both sides. Ambrosiaster differs with the Vulgate but twice, both times favoring an Itala reading. There need therefore no connection be made between him and the Syriac versions, except through the Vulgate.

In 24 variants the Peshitta is opposed to P46, the latter four readings being assumed from the opposing testimony of syr^P. The latter supports P46 in 15 variants, according to Tischendorf's citations.¹

In this group of variants one notes the same characteristic as in the previous group: the Peshitta does not have unsupported Constantinople readings. (The one exception, (537), has syr^{sch}_L inserting "Jesus" before "Christ" in the phrase

1. (# shows syr^P supporting P46)

#	syr ^{sch}	& z *A C		vs	vg	vs	Ambst:67
#	"	& A			&	"	:237
#	"	& A					:546
#	"	& z ^c B		& defg	&	" &	:387
"	"		& FG	&	"	&	:112
"	"		& FG				:101
"	"		& FG ^c		vs	vg	:226
"	"		& DE FG				:4
#	"		& D FG	&	f		:41
#	"		& D* FG	&	d fg	vs "	:177
#	"		& D*EFG	&	defg	& " vs	:14
#	"	& z C	& KLP z a7	&	" &	"	:16
"	"		& D EFG	&	defg		:365
#	"		&	&	"	vs "	:360
"	"	& z ABC*	& a7	vsd fg	&	"	:17
"	"		& D ^c E	& KL a7	vsdefg	vs vg vs	" :549
#	"	& z ^c	& D ^c E	& z	& defg	& " &	" :542
#	"	& A	&	LP z a7	vs "	vs " vs	" :259
"	"	& z A	& D E	& P z a7	& defg	& vg &	" :468
#	"		& L	vs efg	vs vg		:537
#	{ syr ^P &P46		& D EFG	& KL z a7	& defg	& vg &	" :65
#	{ " & " & z ABC		&	& LP z a7	&	& "	:388
#	{ " & " & z AB		& D ^c E	& LP z a7	& f	&	:306
#	{ " & " & z ABC						:536

"the Lord-our-Christ." Codex L probably drew the reading from the Peshitta or a related text.) Contrariwise, it agrees five times with only Alexandrian readings, and nine times with only Western readings. The absence of Constantinople support would indicate that in these instances the Peshitta recorded one of the two types of ancient readings from which the Constantinople text could pick.

Of significance is the fact that the Harclean agrees with P46 in opposition to the Peshitta only twice, (17)(65), when supported only by Western readings, but 13 times when supported by Alexandrian. Although the relationship, therefore, between the Harclean Syriac and the Western text can be demonstrated, the connection with the Alexandrian is much stronger. And in 13 out of 15 instances the Harclean requires at least two other Alexandrian mss. before it will adopt the reading of P46. Which would indicate that syr^D, as a later text than syr^{sch}, needed greater proof of the authority of the type of reading in P46 than does syr^{sch} (cf. previous table), which in four instances, (12)(77)(361)(378), agrees with P46 when only Western majuscles agree, and in two additional instances when only a single Alexandrian ms. adds its testimony, (15)(78).

Syr^{sch} agrees with the Itala seven times, and disagrees four times. Syr^D agrees three times, disagrees four times. The incomplete nature of the Itala testimony in relation to the Syriac precludes dogmatizing. But this split testimony

with the Itala and likewise with P46 indicates that at the time when the text of P46 was formulated, the late second century, two types of variants, two strata of readings, were in existence. Those which P46 favored were sometimes adopted by the Itala, sometimes rejected. The Peshitta did the same. The Harclean Syriac, however, required more evidence than the Peshitta before it would adopt a reading like that of P46. As indicated previously, however, it sometimes agrees with the Western group on readings which are apparently from a common early source.

Hoskier supports the hypothesis of related sources for the Syriac and Itala when he states concerning P46: "We are in the presence of a Greek document, circa 200, which is already a compound or composite vehicle of the Latin version, and, possible, of a Syriac version, both of which may have run concurrently with the Greek for some time."¹

The Vulgate supports the Peshitta seven times, opposes it four times. In only one instance, however, does Jerome break with the Itala and the Western codices, (36). In all the other readings, when a change is made from a part of the Itala tradition, it is either supported by one Itala ms. or by the Western Greek codices. Which would indicate that Jerome was chary of adopting a reading contrary to the entire Western tradition, Greek and Latin. In (360), where he

1. "A Study of the Chester-Beatty Codex," op. cit. , p.149

we have noted before; some Western readings; some Western-Constantinople readings; some Alexandrian-Constantinople readings. The exceptional Peshitta-Constantinople readings are of relatively little importance, which the reader will see if he checks with Appendix II, and are probably Syriac readings adopted by the Constantinople text.

In checking back on previous tables, the writer finds that there is agreement only between a Syriac reading and an Alexandrian reading without Constantinople support in the instances when the Peshitta disagrees with P46, (67) (237)(387)(546). The Harclean Syriac never, so far as the author can tell, supports an Alexandrian reading unless Western or Constantinople evidence unites with it. This seems to be in keeping with the early character of the Peshitta. It would more likely perpetuate an Alexandrian reading or a Western reading, with little to support either, other than scribal preference, than would the Harclean, which had several centuries of text tradition behind it, and which would choose a reading only if attested by a large number of authorities, among which one would count the church fathers of the Antiochian school.

The relation between the Syriac and Itala, eight agreements, 10 \bar{d} agreements, bears out our previous opinion, that both can trace their lineage to a time when it was possible to choose between two variants of apparently equal value. In only one instance does Jerome forsake utterly Latin support,

(229). And there it is a matter of word order. Ambrosiaster adheres strictly to his Latin tradition, either Itala or Vulgate, or both.

In two variants the Syriac versions disagree and at the same time oppose P46.¹ In (440) the Peshitta supports a purely Western reading. In (336), syr^P is followed by the Constantinople text, having adopted a reading found in defg vg, but which possibly is a part of the Alexandrian tradition, as shown by the support of H*0142, which sometimes are distinctly Alexandrian. This is more likely the case, than the syr^P should show Latin influence, although such is not impossible, since Hoskier predicates a bi-lingual parent of P46, a point which will be discussed in ch. VII.

The Armenian version, closely related to the Constantinople mss., has an interesting beginning.

The Armenians used at first the Syrian Bible. Mesrob and the Armenian patriarch Isaac began in the fifth century to prepare an Armenian Bible from the Syriac. In the year 431, however, two of Mesrob's pupils named John "Ekelensis" and Joseph "Palnensis" were at the Council of Ephesus and brought Greek manuscripts home with them. Mesrob and Isaak recognized at once the greater value of the Greek text, and threw aside the translations that they had already made from the Syriac. John and Joseph were sent to Alexandria to learn Greek thoroughly, and then they translated the whole New Testament from the Greek. Nothing was more natural than that their long use of the Syrian

syr^{sch}¹ & FG & defg & Ambst: 440
 syr^P & ABC & DE & LP/a7 & vg :

syr^{sch} & ABC & D*EFG : 336
 syr^P & LP/a7 & defg & vg & Ambst:

New Testament should have so strongly impressed its forms upon their minds as to cause them here and there to use Syrian readings.¹

In checking through the 86 citations of the Armenian by Tischendorf (one citation in which editions of the Armenian text disagreed (266) is not included), we find that in 42 instances the text which P46 represents was followed.² In only two of these, (536) and (323), does the

1. Gregory, Canon and Text, p. 406.

2.

arm	&	P46	&	/	AB*	&	LP	&	defg	&	vg	&	Ambst	&	syrr	:	230		
"	&	"	&	/	ABC											:	536		
"	&	"	&	/	*ABC*		&	P					&	"		:	488		
"	&	"	&	/	ABC		&	LPVa7					&	"		:	487		
"	&	"	&	/	^c AB		&	L V*					&	"		:	286		
"	&	"	&	/	ABC		&	P					&	syrrsch		:	337		
"	&	"	&		"	&	D*E									:	193		
"	&	"	&		"	&	"				&	"				:	194		
"	&	"	&	/	B	&	D* FG		&	defg	&	"	&	Ambst	&	syrr ^p	:	259	
"	&	"	&	/	AB	&	D EFG		&	defg	&	"			&	syrrsch	:	292	
"	&	"	&			&	D* FG		&	efg	&	"	&	"		:	323		
"	&	"	&			&	"								&	syrr ^p	:	542	
"	&	"	&			&	D E	&	L Va7							:	378		
"	&	"	&			&	D EFG	&	L Va7			&	"	&	"	&	syrr	:	189
"	&	"	&	/	*BC	&	D ^c	&	KL Va7							:	122		
"	&	"	&	/	BC	&	D*	&	a7	&	de	&	"	&	"	:	127		
"	&	"	&	/	ABC	&	DE	&	P	&	de	&	"	&	"	&	syrrsch	:	431
"	&	"	&	/	AB	&	"	&	PV	&	de	&	"	&	"	&	syrr ^p	:	348
"	&	"	&	/	^c A C	&	D ^c	&	LPVa7							:	456		
"	&	"	&	/	ABC	&	"	&	KL P Va7							:	14		
"	&	"	&		B*	&	D ^c E	&	L	&	defg	&	"	&	"	&	syrr	:	231
"	&	"	&	/	AB	&	"	&	LPVa7	&	ef	&	"			:	255		
"	&	"	&		"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	"			:	257		
"	&	"	&	/	A C	&	D ^c E	&	L	&	fg	&	"			:	448		
"	&	"	&	/	^c B	&	FG	&	KL Va7							:	100		
"	&	"	&	/	ABC	&	D* FG	&	HV	&	defg	&	"	&	"	&	"	:	549
"	&	"	&		"	&	D*EFG	&	P	&	defg	&	"	&	"		:	130	
"	&	"	&		A	&	D ^c EFG	&	L Va7	&	defg	&	"	&	"	&	"	:	223
"	&	"	&		B	&	D EFG	&	L V	&	"	&	"	&	"		:	544	
"	&	"	&	/	*AB	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	"			:	93		
"	&	"	&	/	*ABC	&	"	&	P	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	syrrsch	:	418
"	&	"	&		"	&	"	&	P	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	"	:	447
"	&	"	&	/	^c A	&	"	&	LPVa7	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	syrr	:	370
"	&	"	&	/	A	&	"	&	KL Va7	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	"	:	106

Armenian follow a single family, the Alexandrian and Western, respectively. In (542), where it agrees with D*FG, also syr^P agrees. There are but four variants in which the Constantinople is abandoned for the combined Western-Alexandrian tradition, (193)(194)(259)(292), the latter two, however, being supported by the Syriac. In general, therefore, one can say that the Armenian records the old readings of P46 only when they are accepted by some Constantinople authority.

There is not enough evidence to warrant conclusions concerning the relationship of any single ms. and the Armenian version. The hypothesis concerning ¶ which the writer tentatively advanced finds no further substantiation.

In no instance when the Armenian holds the old reading of P46 does syr oppose. Syr^{sch} supports five times, syr^P four times, which indicates merely the fact that in some readings in which Constantinople authority was followed, the two Syriac texts varied. It is interesting, however, to note that in four of the five instances in which arm syr^{sch} agree with P46, codex P is the only one of the Eastern mss. which offers support. Which would indicate both the possible

arm	&	P46	&	g ^c B	&	D EFG	&	L ¶a7			&	syr	:339
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	KL ¶a7	&	vg	&	"	:66
"	&	"	&	g ^c BC	&	"	&	KLP ¶a7	&	d fg	&	" & Ambst	:46
"	&	"	&	g ^c BC*	&	"	&	LP ¶a7			&	"	:172
"	&	"	&	g ^c AB	&	"	&	¶	&	defg	&	" & "	:92
"	&	"	&	g ^c ABC	&	"	&	LP ¶	&	" & "	&	"	:524

relation of P and syr^{sch} and the relative antiquity of some of the readings in P.

There are 46 readings in which the Armenian disagrees with the second century text of P46.¹ In no reading where the

1.

arm	&	C							& syr	:148
"	&	β ^c B							& defg & vg & Ambst & syr ^{sch}	:387
"	&	β*AB							& e & vg	:102
"	&	βA BC								:65
"	&	β*A C								:67
"	&	β ^c		& L	ψa7				& syr	:441
"	&	β C		& KLP	ψa7		& " & "	& syr ^{sch}	:16	
"	&	ABC		& P						486
"	&	β AB		& LP	ψa7		& " & "	& syr	:288	
"	&	β ABC*		& a7			& " & "	& syr ^{sch}	:17	
"	&	β		& Hψ			& " & "	& syr ^p	:297	
"	&	A C	& DEFG			& defg	& " & "	& " & "	:394	
"	&	β A		& LP	ψa7					:384
"			& DE			& def	& " & "	& " & "	& syr	:463
"			& "			& de	& " & "	& " & "		:103
"			& FG			& defg	& " & "	& " & "	& syr ^{sch}	:112
"			& "			& " & "			& syr	:419
"			& D FG			& f			& syr ^{sch}	:41
"			& D*FG			& d fg				:469
"			& DEFG			& d fg				:163
"			& "			& defg	& " & "			:104
"			& "			& "				:356
"			& "	& LP	ψa7	& " & "		& " & "	& syr ^p	:453
"			& D ^c E	& L	ψa7		& " & "	& " & "	& " & "	:513
"			& "	& "			& " & "	& " & "	& syr	:282
"			& "	& "		& " & "	& " & "	& " & "		:207
"			& D ^c	& ψ						:273
"			& "	& L					& syr ^p	:234
"	&	AB	& D E	& P		& e	& " & "	& " & "		:195
"	&	β ^c	& D ^c E	& LP	ψa7	& defg	& vg & "	& " & "	& syr	:232
"	&	β ^c	& "	& KLP	ψa7		& " & "	& " & "	& " & "	:90
"	&	β ^c A	& "	& LP	ψa7		& " & "	& " & "	& " & "	:178
"	&	β AB	& "	& LP	ψa7		& " & "	& " & "	& " & "	:279
"	&	β ABC	& "	& L	ψa7				& " & "	:224
"	&	β ^c	& D ^c	& "		& e	& " & "	& " & "	& " & "	:217
"	&	β ^c A ^c B ^c	& "	& LP	ψa7	& f		& " & "	& " & "	:267
"	&	β ^c C ^c	& D ^c /FG	& L	ψa7		& " & "	& " & "		:311
"	&	β ^c B ^c C ^c	& D E	& LP	ψa7				& " & "	:495
"	&	β ^c	& D ^c EFG	& "		& defg	& " & "	& " & "	& " & "	:290
"	&	β ^c B	& D ^c EFG	& "		& fg	& " & "	& " & "	& " & "	:143
"	&	β ^c	& DEFG	& KLP	ψa7	& defg	& " & "	& " & "	& " & "	:120
"	&	"	& "	& "		& " & "	& " & "	& " & "	& syr ^p	:83

Syriac is cited do we note disagreement with syr. Either one or both Syriac texts are followed quite consistently by the Armenian. Syr^{sch} supports the Armenian five times by itself, syr^p six times by itself.

There are three variants, (102)(67)(65), in which only Alexandrian support is found for the Armenian reading. Whether this influence came direct or through intermediary channels we cannot ascertain. Tischendorf may or may not have complete evidence. We are inclined to think not.

Of the nine purely Western readings found in the Armeniana, five have no Syriac support. The writer is inclined to believe that there is some intermediate channel which would bring the Western to the Armenian, or that there is a common source, from which by chance also the Armenian derived a few readings. Direct contact, however, is not out of the question. But more complete evidence must be found before a conclusion can be drawn.

The rest of the readings indicate merely the Constantinople character of the Armenian. The one reading, (234), in which only L of the majuscles supports the Armenian, is attested by syr^p. The Syriac influence is by natural.

The presentation of the evidence of the following fathers is for the sake of completeness. Of the group, Chrysostom

arm	& S ^c	C	&	DEFG	&	KLP	va7		&	vg		&	syr	:50		
"	& S ^c	B	&	"	&	L	va7	&	defg			&	"	:229		
"	&	A C	&	"	&	LP	va7			&	"	&	Ambst	&	"	:548
"	&	C	&	"	&	Y		&	"						"	:500

is really the only one whose evidence is of importance. Ignored is the testimony of Theodoret, "ein Syrer, geboren gegen Ende des vierten Jahrhunderts, Moench, vielleicht im Jahre 420 zum Bischof von Cyrus in Syrien ernannt; als Freund des Nestorius und Gegner Cyrills wurde er im Jahre 449 vertrieben, aber 450 wieder eingesetzt; er starb etwa im Jahre 457."¹ Westcott and Hort state that his notes are "chiefly founded on the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Chrysostom."² Having analysed Chrysostom's testimony, the writer felt that Theodoret's testimony would add little to the value of this thesis.

The evidence offered by Athanasius is small.³ "Geboren in Alexandria etwa, Bischof von Alex. im Jahre 328 (Andere 326), vier Mal im Exil, starb 373,"⁴ he despite his Alexandrian residence uses a Constantinople text. It would be better to say, rather, that the Alexandrian text which he uses was adopted by the Constantinople. P46 agrees with him three out four times. Variant (111) is interesting, in that it shows a reading of P46 not held by the rest of the Alexandrian mss., used nevertheless by Athanasius and the Constantinople mss.,

1. Gregory, Textkritik, p. 819.

2. Op. cit., p. 88.

3.

Ath	& P46	& AB	& D ^C E	& LP ⁷ a7	& af	& vg	& syr	:252
"	& "	& *A C	& D EFG	& LP ⁷ a7			& syr ^P	:387
"	& "			& KL ⁷ a7				:111
"				& L a7				:115

4. Gregory, Textkritik, p. 777.

used nevertheless by Athanasius and the Constantinople mss., an indication of the mixture of readings in his day.

Eusebius, "Bischof von Caesarea, vielleicht etwa 270 geboren, gestorben etwa 340,"¹ gives testimony which is typically Constantinopolitan.² Both when supporting and opposing P46, he agrees with Constantinople mss. The two exceptions, (193) and (54), in which he chooses an Alexandrian-Western and an Alexandrian reading for no apparent reason, may be explained by the fact that he agrees with Origen in these two readings, and may be following his authority.

Of Constantinople character are what few readings³ we have of Methodius, "Bischof von Tyrus (Oder, wie Andere meinen, von Olympia in Lycien), blühte um 290, er war ein Gegner der Lehre des Origenes; er starb als Märtyrer 311 in Chalchis in Griechenland (in Coele-Syrien?)."⁴

1. Ibid., p. 792.

2.										
Eus	&	P46	&	∫	ABC	&	Or	&	D*E	:193
"	&	"	&	"				&	LP∫a7 & vg	& syr ^{sch} :398
"	&	"	&	"				&	D ^c & KLP∫a7	& syr ^p :14
"	&	"	&	∫	AB			&	D E & LP∫a7	:244
"			&	A			&	Or		:54
"			&	∫ ^c ABC			&	D*EFG	& P	:122
"			&	∫* B			&	D ^c EFG	& LP∫a7 & vg & fg & syr	:143
"			&	∫ ^c			&	D EFG	& KLP∫a7 & vg & defg & syr ^p	:83
"			&	"			&	"	& LP∫a7 & # & d fg	:192
"			&	∫ ^c B			&	"	& L ∫a7 & defg & syr	:229
"			&	∫ C			&	"	& KLP∫a7 & " & "	:50

3.

Meth	&	P46	&	ABC	&	D ^c E	&	KLP∫a7	:34
"			&	B				& vg	:41
"			&	∫ ABC*			&	a7	:17
"			&	∫ ABC			&	KLP∫a7	:40

4. Gregory, Textkritik, p. 806.

The evidence of Cyril of Jerusalem,¹ "Bischof...vom Jahre 350 bis zum Jahre 386, obschon drei Mal vertrieben,"² is fragmentary. The combinations of testimony are not particularly notable, except in perhaps (109). There the Alexandrian A with the more Constantinopolitan P, plus Cyril of Jerusalem, would indicate a possible relationship that is not extraordinary. Lack of further evidence prevents, however, any speculation.

Basilius Magnus, "Bischof von Caesarea in Kappadozien, geboren 329, gestorben 379,"³ likewise offers little evidence of singular quality.⁴ The combination of Alexandrian and Western, and the dependence of the Constantinople on either or both of the other two families is to be expected. Basilius' dependence on the Syriac is quite in accordance with the location of his bishopric.

1.
Cyr^{hr} & P46 & DEFG & KL Va7 & defg & vg & syr^D :65
" & " & β^c B & " & " & " & " :67
" & " & A & " & P & " & " :109
" & β^c C & " & KLPVa7 & " & syr :50
2. Gregory, Textkritik, p. 787.
3. Ibid., p. 781.
4.

Bas	& P46	& AB	& D EFG					& syr ^D	:16
"	& "	& β ABC	& D ^c	& KLPVa7				& "	:14
"	& "	& β AB	& D ^c E	& LPVa7	& ef	& vg	& syr		:255
"	& "	& β A	& D EFG	& KL Va7	& defg	& vg	& "		:106
"	& "	& β* A C	& "	& LPVa7			& syr ^D		:397
"		& A		& "					:240
"		& C ^c		& "			& syr		:341
"		& β* A C		& P	& defg	& vg			:339
"		& AC	& "		& "	& "	& syr ^D		:394
"		& "	& "	& L Va7	& "	& "	& "		:337
"		& A B	& DE	& P	& "	& "			:95
"		& A	& D ^c E	& LPVa7			& syr ^{sch}		:259
"		& A	& D ^c E	& "		& "	& syr		:279
"	& P46 ^c	& β B	& D E	& "					:321

We come now to the testimony of Chrysostom, "geboren in Antiochien etwa 347, im Jahre 381 Diakonus in Antiochien, im Jahre 386 Presbyter in Antiochien, Bischof von Konstantinopel vom Jahre 398 bis zum Jahre 404, im Exil gestorben im Jahre 407.¹ As taken from the citations of Tischendorf, the testimony of Chrysostom is divided quite evenly for and against P46, 58 to 55. In the readings in which P46 concurs,² one is immediately impressed with the unanimity

1. Gregory, Textkritik, p. 784.

Chr	&	P46	&	B				vs	syr	:	443
"	&	"	&	B ^c				vs	syr ^{sch}	:	426
"	&	"	&	BC	&	L		vs	"	:	468
"	&	"	&	B*	&	LP		&	syr	:	230
"	&	"	&	AB	&	KL	∇a7	&	"	:	103
"	&	"	&	"	&	"			"	:	104
"	&	"	&	ABC	&	LP	∇a7	&	"	:	395
"	&	"	&	AB	&	LP	a7	&	"	:	500
"	&	"	&	ABC	&		∇a7		"	:	417
"	&	"	&	A ^c	&	D*		vs	"	:	143
"	&	"	&	AB	&	DEFG		&	defg & vg &	vs	syr ^{sch} 292
"	&	"	&		&	D* FG	&		"	:	401
"	&	"	&		&	D EFG		&	defg	:	363
"	&	"	&		&	D ^c	&	P	vs	syr ^D	336
"	&	"	&		&	D E	&	L	∇a7	vs	" 378
"	&	"	&		&	FG	&	L	∇a7 & fg	:	308
"	&	"	&		&	D EFG	&	"	& vg &	syr	189
"	&	"	&		&	"	&	KL	∇a7 & defg & vg &	syr ^D	165
"	&	"	&		&	"	&	"		:	111
"	&	"	&	A ^c C	&	D ^c	&	LP	∇a7 & vg &	syr	456
"	&	"	&	ABC	&	"	&	KLP	∇a7 &	syr ^D	14
"	&	"	&	B*	&	D ^c E	&	L	& defg & vg &	syr	231
"	&	"	&	A C	&	"	&	LP	∇a7	:	186
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	"	& fg & vg &	"	448
"	&	"	&	ABC	&	"	&	KLP	∇a7	:	34
"	&	"	&	ABC	&	"	&	LP	∇a7 & e &	" & syr	469
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	"	& d fg	:	184
"	&	"	&	AB	&	"	&	"	& ef &	" & " &	255, 257
"	&	"	&	AB	&	"	&	"	& f &	" & syr ^D	306
"	&	"	&	"	&	D E	&	"	& de &	" & "	348
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	LP	∇a7 & de	& syr	266
"	&	"	&	ABC	&	"	&	"	vs	"	194

exhibited between Chrysostom and the Constantinople mss. There are two pure Alexandrian readings and two pure Western readings, and two in which both traditions unite, without the Constantinople support. In all the other readings, however, there is agreement between Constantinople mss. and Chrysostom.

Of the 40 readings where Syriac testimony is cited, only five show total Syriac opposition. In two readings the Peshitta opposes Chrysostom, in three the Harclean Syriac. Where syr denies support, there are but two of the five readings in which Constantinople mss. do not warrant Chrysostom's choice. In (443), Chrysostom sides with P46 and B, in (143) with P46 β^c AD*. In these instances he apparently chose what he believed

Chr	& P46	& β A C	& D E	& LPVa7					:354
"	& "	& β	& FG	& KL Va7	& d fg		& syr		:95
"	& "	& β^c B	& "	& "			& "		:100
"	& "	& A C	& D ^c EFG	& L a7					:195
"	& "	& A	& "	& L Va7	& defg & vg	& "			:223
"	& "	& β^c B	& "	& KL a7	& "		& "		:97
"	& "	& β A C	& "	& LPVa7	& fg	& "			:138
"	& "	& β ABC	& D*EFG	& P	& defg	& "	& "		:130
"	& "	& B	& D EFG	& L V	& "	& "	& vs syr ^p		:544
"	& "	& β	& "	& L Va7					:486
"	& "	& β^c	& "	& KL Va7			& syr		:102
"	& "	& β^c B	& "	& LP a7	& "	& "	& "		:455
"	& "	& "	& "	& KL Va7			& syr ^p		:67
"	& "	& "	& "	& L Va7			& syr		:339
"	& "	& A	& "	& KL a7					:198
"	& "	& β A	& "	& KL Va7					:105
"	& "	& "	& "	& "	& defg & vg	& syr			:106
"	& "	& β^c BC	& "	& KL P Va7	& d fg	& "	& "		:146
"	& "	& β C	& "	& LP Va7					:368
"	& "	& β^c A C	& "	& "			& syr ^p		:387
"	& "	& β BC	& "	& "					:545
"	& "	& β BC*	& "	& "			& syr		:172
"	& "	& β ABC	& "	& LP V			& "		:524
"	& "	& β^c ABC	& "	& P	& defg		& vs "		:441
"	& "	& β AB	& "	& V	& "	& "	& "		:92

to be the better reading.

Since the contrary Vulgate and Itala readings are not tabulated in this table, no conclusion can be drawn, other than that both the Latin versions show ample support for Chrysostom's readings.

The readings in which Chrysostom opposes P46 admit much the same conclusions as the previous group.¹ The over-

1.										
Chr	&	B			vs	sy ^r	:1			
"	&	⊗*A C			vs	sy ^r	:66			
"	&	⊗*ABC			vs	"	:370			
"			&	P			:398			
"			&	KL a7			:191			
"			&	L a7		&	:367			
"			&	⊕	&	vg &	:2			
"			&	KLP	&	sy ^r D	:41			
"	&	A	&	LP⊕a7			:240			
"	&	⊗ ^c A	&	"			:473			
"	&	⊗ ^c B	&	"	&	sy ^r	:154			
"	&	⊗ ^c A C	&	"			:406, 421			
"	&	⊗ ^c C	&	KLP⊕a7	&	vg &	sy ^r ^{sch} :16			
"	&	⊗ ^c ABC	&	LP⊕a7			:425			
"	&	⊗ ^c ABC	&	KLP⊕a7			:40			
"	&	⊗ ^c C ^c	&	L⊕a7	vs	sy ^r	:488			
"	&	⊗ ^c	&	"	&	sy ^r D	:447			
"	&	A	&	KL a7			:113			
"	&	A	&	LP⊕a7	&	sy ^r D	:460			
"	&	A ^c	&	L⊕a7	&	sy ^r	:341			
"	&	⊗ ^c A	&	KLP⊕a7			:45			
"	&		&	D*EFG	&	g	:358			
"	&		&	D ^c	&	sy ^r	:483			
"	&		&	D ^c E	&	vg &	sy ^r D	:513		
"	&		&	D ^c E	&	defg &	vg &	sy ^r	:207	
"	&		&	FG	&	LP		:133		
"	&		&	D ^c FG	&	L⊕a7	&	sy ^r	:194	
"	&		&	"	&	d fg &	"	:193		
"	&		&	D EFG	&	LP⊕a7 &	defg &	"	:453	
"	&		&	"	&	L⊕a7 &	"	"	:337	
"	&		&	"	&	" &	"	vs	sy ^r	:553
"	&	⊗ ^c	&	D ^c	&	e &	"	&	"	:217
"	&	"	&	"	&	KLE⊕a7	&	"	"	:90
"	&	⊗ ^c A ^c B	&	"	&	f	&	"	"	:267
"	&	& AB	&	D	&	K P	&	defg &	"	:10

whelming agreement with Constantinople mss. cannot but be noticed. The one purely Western reading (358) and the three purely Alexandrian, (1)(66)(370), give evidence of some choice on the part of Chrysostom. Two of these latter readings are among the five in which Chrysostom breaks with syr, as opposed to agreement in 23 instances with syr, in two with syr^{sch}, and in eight with syr^P.

This evidence on Chrysostom substantiates the statement of Westcott and Hort: the "overwhelming proportion of the variants common to the great mass of cursive and late uncial Greek Mss. are identical with the readings followed by Chrysostom in the composition of his 'Homilies.'"¹

The matter of conflations in the Constantinople text will close our consideration of this group of mss. There are four

Chr	& β A	& D E	& LP ψ a7						:301
"	& β BP46 ^c	& "	& "						:321
"	& β C	& "	& L a7						:201
"	& A C	& D E G	& LP ψ a7						:374
"	& β *	& D ^c E	& ψ ^c a7			vs syr			:286
"	& β	& D ^c E	& LP ψ a7	& defg	& vg	& syr			:252
"	& A	& "	& "			& syr ^{sch}			:259
"	& β ^{CA}	& "	& LP a7		& vg	& syr			:178
"	& β ^{CA}	& "	& KLP ψ			& syr			:127
"	& β ABC	& D ^c E	& L ψ a7			& "			:224
"	& β A C	& "	& "			& syr ^P			:397
"	& β "	& "	& LP ψ a7	& de	& vg				:137
"	& β ^c C ^c	& D ^c FG	& L ψ a7						:311
"	& β C	& D EFG	& LP ψ a7						:187
"	& β ^c	& "	& KLP ψ a7	& defg	& vg	& syr			:120
"	& "	& "	& "	& "	& "	& syr ^P			:83
"	& "	& "	& L ψ a7	& d fg	& "				:192
"	& β ^c B	& "	& "	& defg		& syr			:229
"	& β C	& "	& KLP ψ a7		& vg	& "			:50
"	& A C	& "	& LP ψ a7		& "	& "			:548

1. Op. cit., p. 91.

quite clear cases of conflate readings:

(45) P46B* τις
 B^cDEG dfg vg ChrOrCypAmbrst τις τι
 Z* τις καλ
 Z^cAKLPψa7H-0142 τις τι καλ

(41) DFG omit
 B vg MethCraug καλ
 ψ ημεις
 KLPH-0142syr^pChrThdrtThphylOec καλ ημεις
 P46ZACa7 ημεις καλ

A closer examination of (41) by a grammarian will perhaps explain why the Alexandrian mss. favor the reading they do.

(17) P46DEFG dfg IrOrTertVict αυτη
 ZABC*a7H-0c42 vg sah cop syr^{sch}
 arm aeth OrMethAntiochDamAug ταις επιθυμιας αυτου
 C^cKLPH αυτη εν ταις επιθυμιας αυτου

(336) D^cP BasChr δυνατος γαρ
 ZABCD*EFG syr^{sch} δυνατεσ γαρ
 KLψa7H-0142 defg vg go syr^p CypAmbrst
 ThdrtDam δυνατος γαρ εστιν

In one variant the Constantinople text form a sort of compromise reading between singular dative and plural genitive by taking plural dative.

(282) P46ZABD*FGH-0142 defg guelph cop go ClemDamIrTert
 τω αγαθω εγω αλλα τω κακω
 vg OrAmbrst τοις αγαθοις εγω αλλα τοις κακοις
 D^cEKLψa7 syr arm Chr ThdrtAmbrst
 τω αγαθω εγω αλλα τω κακω

V. The Alexandrian Tradition

The Alexandrian mss., δ A B and C (the latter being a palimpsest and having many lacunae, so that its testimony is more or less fragmentary), are closely related. Out of 333 variants, there are 169 in which the four agree (C is assumed not to be in opposition when its testimony is lacking). In 126 of the 169, P46 is supported by the entire group. We shall investigate these variants first of all.

There are 43 variants in which the entire Alexandrian group, the entire Constantinople, and DE of the Western group agree.¹ In five more variants DE remains constant, but the Constantinople family divides.² These 48 variants, therefore, in which P46, the Alexandrian mss., and DE agree, demonstrate a large group of readings common to both the Alexandrian and part of the Western group, and a common origin is a logical explanation thereof. One may observe, too, that

1. 9, 11, 13, 27, 32, 39, 88, 101, 112, 117, 124, 126, 140, 147, 155, 184, 233, 236, 244, 254, 266, 277, 268, 283, 289, 293, 304, 330, 364, 382, 390, 402, 419, 424, 427, 435, 437, 439, 446, 452, 494, 535, 538.

2. P46 & Alex & DE & P :431
 " & " & " & ψ :349
 " & " & " & a7:302
 " & " & " & ψ a7:133
 " & " & " & LP a7:170

DE is evidently a definite division of the Western group. The Constantinople mss. are also very favorable to the P46-Alexandrian-DE alignment.

The next group of readings is those in which the P46-Alexandrian combination is supported by various parts of the Western text.¹ Besides the continued unanimity of the Alexandrian group, several other conclusions can be drawn from this evidence. These are 36 variants showing disagreement within the Western group, indicating an unsettled text. The affability which the Constantinople mss. show to Alexandrian-Western readings is continued in 31 of the 36 variants.

Two of the variants offer interesting comment on the Western group. In (242), F* stands alone among the mss., but is supported by syrOrAug, an indication of early influence on the first hand of the ninth century F. In (226) FG^c are supported by no mss., but by syr^{sch}OrCyrHil. These

1.				
P46	& Alex	& D*	& LPVa7	:410
"	& "	& D ^c	& KLPVa7	:14,238,358,458,539,552.
"	& "	& D ^c E	& KLPVa7	:19,61,177,221,255,257,306, 377,399,411,469.
"	& "	& D* E		:193,194
"	& "	& "	& LPVa7	:274
"	& "	& FG	& KLPVa7	:23,139
"	& "	& D* FG		:207,245,282
"	& "	& D* FG	& P	:549
"	& "	& D ^c FG	& KLPVa7	:141,526
"	& "	& D*EFG		:483
"	& "	& "	& P	:130
"	& "	& "	& LP a7	:273
"	& "	& D ^c EFG	& LPVa7	:185,271,305
"	& "	& DEF ^c G	& "	:242
"	& "	& DE G*	& "	:226

two variants indicate an early origin for two peculiarly Western readings.

In the next group of variants¹ the important thing to note is the 26 readings in which P46, the Alexandrian, and all the Constantinople majuscles unite, without any Western support, an indication of the rejection of a large number of strictly Western readings in favor of the Alexandrian. The two readings in which P46* and P46^c disagree would seem to show that in one instance the original reading was deemed the better by the formulators of the Constantinople tradition, in another instance the corrected reading. That 32 readings occur in which the entire Alexandrian group agree with P46, contrary to all the Western texts, would seem to imply that when the Western majuscles agree among themselves and oppose the P46-Alexandrian reading, the reading in question is peculiarly Western, and of less value than the Alexandrian unless some ancient source such as the Itala of Africa or some similarly old witness can be adduced to support it. Since it is true, however, that the Western readings are demonstrably

1. P46 & Alex	:553
" & " & P	:163,337
" & " & P ^a 7	:417
" & " & P ^a 7	:389
P46 ^c & " & LP ^a 7	:429
P46* & " & L ^a 7	:75
P46 & " & Const	:4,55,103,104,136,168,356,360, 365,388,395,405,428,445,463, 464,479,484,487,493,520,523, 527,536,540,547

in most cases as old as Alexandrian readings, the pure Western may contain the original reading despite Alexandrian opposition.

Comparing this table with the preceding one, the writer notes that the majority of Constantinople mss. generally choose the reading in which P46-Alexandrian testimony is supported by some Western evidence, and that, when total Western support is lacking, it is a rare reading indeed which is not adopted by the eastern majuscles.

The logical deduction would be that, were the P46-Alexandrian evidence to be supported by all the Western majuscles, the Constantinople would whole-heartedly accept. And yet, in the nine variants¹ which show such unanimity, the mss. of the Constantinople tradition are by no means agreed. Ergo, exit logic, and the Constantinople group maintains its character as an eclectic text.

This concludes the variants in which P46 and all the Alexandrian mss. agree. Of these 126 agreements, the total Constantinople tradition adopts 93 as a part of its text. 72 of the 93 have Western testimony. The Constantinople text, however, is not consistent in the application of what seems

1. P46 & Alex & DEFG	:292
" & " & " & " & K P ⁴⁶ a7	:48
" & " & " & " & P ⁴⁶ a7	:234
" & " & " & " & KLP a7	:62
" & " & " & " & KL $\bar{\nu}$:91
" & " & " & " & LP $\bar{\nu}$:524
" & " & " & " & P $\bar{\nu}$:367
" & " & " & " & P ⁴⁶ a7	:537
" & " & " & " & $\bar{\nu}$:92

to be the principle, and sometimes refuses to adopt a reading which receives unanimous P46-Alexandrian-Western support.

In the next larger group of variants, 82 in all, are included the readings in which P46 is supported by one or more of the Alexandrian mss., readings in which an Alexandrian mss. has been corrected being excluded.¹ Before

1.					
P46	& β			:47	
"	& β		& LP ψ a7	:394	
"	& β	& D EFG	& LP ψ a7	:486	
"	& β	& FG	& KL ψ a7	:95	
"	& β A	& D EFG	& LP ψ a7	:414	BC with P
"	& β A C		& a7	:41	
"	& "	& "	& Const	:1,105,106,315,403	
"	& "	& D ^c EFG	& "	:138	B with D* de Ambrst Or
"	& "	& D ^c E	& "	:186,448,451	B with B*FG
"	& "	& D E	& "	:354,467	B with FG
"	& β AB			:187	
"	& "	& D E	& P ψ	:348	C with FGLa7
"	& "		& LP a7	:500	C with DEFG ψ
"	& "	& D E	& Const	:171	C with FG
"	& "	& D EFG	& "	:148	C with syrcoparm
"	& "	& "	& L ψ a7	:347	C with F
"	& β B			:548	vs AC
"	& "	& F		:374	"
"	& β B	& D*EFG		:56	"
"	& "	& D EFG		:240,300	vs A
"	& "	& D ^c E	& ψ	:113	"
"	& "	& D*E	& Const	:270	"
"	& "	& D* FG		:259	"
"	& "	& D ^c EFG	& KL ψ a7	:109	vs AP
"	& "	& "	& Const	:237	
"	& β BC	& D EFG	& Const	:54,164,165,309,545,546	
"	& "	& D E	& "	:510	vs AFG
"	& "	& "	& KL ψ a7	:47	vs AFGP
"	& β B	& FG	& K a7	:96	vs ADEL ψ
"	& β BC	& FG	& P a7	:131	vs ADEL ψ
"	& "	& FG	& Const	:312	vs ADE
"	& β C	& D EFG	& "	:368	
"	& A			:107,420	
"	& A	& FG		:459	
"	& A	& FG	& LP	:86	

considering these variants, however, a brief comment on the individual Alexandrian mss. is in place, since all are not, in a geographical sense, Alexandrian.

Codices ξ and B are of uncertain geographical origin. Westcott and Hort venture this opinion: "We are inclined to surmise that B and ξ were both written in the West, probably at Rome; that the ancestors of B were wholly Western (in the geographical, not the textual sense) up to a very early time indeed; and that the ancestors of ξ were in a great part Alexandrian, again in the geographical, not the textual sense."¹ Gregory inclines to the view that both manuscripts

P46	&	A	&	FG	&	Const	:145	
"	&	A	&	D EFG			:15	
"	&	A	&	"	&	KL	a7:98	
"	&	A	&	"	&	Const	:160	
"	&	A	&	D ^c EFG	&	L	ψa7:223	
"	&	AB					:50	
"	&	AB	&	D ^c E			:316	
"	&	AB	&	D* FG			:232	
"	&	AB	&	D EFG			:16	
"	&	"	&	D ^c EFG	&	KL	:37	
"	&	"	&	D EFG	&	L	a7:297	
"	&	A C	&	"	&	L	ψa7:366	(vs ξ BP)
"	&	"	&	D ^c EFG	&	L	a7:195	
P46*	&	"					:321	
P46&		ABC	&	D EFG	&	Const	:350	
"	&	"	&	D ^c E	&	"	:34	vs ξ D*FG
"	&	BC			&	L	:468	
"	&	C	&	EFG	&	L	ψa7:10	
"	&	B					:45,190,373,421,436,443,457,490,551.	
"	&	B	&	F			:497	
"	&	B	&	FG			:78,301	
"	&	B	&	D* FG			:137	
"	&	B	&	"	&	P	:397	
"	&	B	&	D EFG			:406	
"	&	B	&	"	&	L	ψ	:544

1. Op. cit., p.267.

are of the fifty which in 331 A.D. the Emperor Constantine ordered from Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea,¹ whose testimony we have examined. Support for this view lies in Tischendorf's opinion that one of the four scribes of ζ wrote all of the New Testament which is extant in B.² Of the text of B, Westcott and Hort opine: "We have not been able to recognize as Alexandrian any readings of B in any book of the New Testament which it contains;" of ζ they state: "the text is all but entirely Pre-Syrian, in the Pauline epistles showing the least mixture of Western and Alexandrian strains."³

Evidence points to the fact that A was written in Egypt, "probably in the last half of the fifth century."⁴ Codex C is likewise ascribed to Egypt, and was written "probably... before the middle of the fifth century."⁵

The marked agreement in text among these four mss., two of which are admittedly Egyptian, added to which is the testimony of the Egyptian ms. P46, warrants, without successful adverse contention, the designation "Alexandrian," as applied to ζ ABC in a geographical sense.

An overall look at the variants under consideration leads to but one conclusion: there were, generally speaking, two readings which existed at the time of P46, both of which

-
1. Canon and Text, pp. 326-327, 336-337, 339.
 2. Ibid., p. 336.
 3. Op. cit., pp. 150-151.
 4. Gregory, Canon and Text, p. 341.
 5. Ibid., p. 348.

were in apparently good standing, from the majuscule viewpoint, and from which the Alexandrian mss., including P46, promiscuously chose. Furthermore, the Western majuscules likewise perpetuate many of these readings, either themselves choosing, or being descendants of mss. which exercised such free choice. The fundamentally close relationship of the Western and Alexandrian texts cannot, therefore, be denied.

It will furthermore be noted that the Constantinople mss. had difficulty in exercising preference, apparently choosing quite evenly between the textual groups.

There is no favoritism among the mss. in choosing the readings which P46 chose. In this group of variants, β agrees 45 times, A 39, B 41, C (despite its lacunae) 30 times with P46.

Of the mss., B is apparently closer to P46 than are β and A. A alone agrees with P46 nine times, combined with either β or B, seven times, a total of 16. β alone agrees four times with P46, combined with either A or B, 11 times, a total of 15. B, however, stands as sole Alexandrian supporter of P46 16 times, combined with A or β 16 times, a total of 32 times. (C is not analysed individually because of its lacunae.)

B seems to hold peculiar readings with P46 more readily than A or β . β stands as sole majuscule supporter of P46 but once, A but twice, while B has nine readings in common with only P46. Which would indicate that P46 and B are more independent of the Alexandrian tradition, and that they more

frequently chose independent readings than did the other Alexandrian Mss.

We have been speaking, however, as though these mss. were all of the same age. Putting our conclusions on a chronological basis, we have something like this. In the latter half of the second century, there were, generally speaking, two types of readings of equal merit in Egypt. P46 and the ancestor of B, whose peculiarities B perpetuates, more frequently chose readings that later were rejected than did A and ξ .

Ancestors of the Western Greek majuscles likewise drank deeply of the Egyptian spring. They are, however, not much at harmony in their choices. In 19 out of 82 instances they all adopt the reading which P46 rejects. In something like 25 instances they all support the type of reading which P46 chose. In the 35, more or less, remaining readings, part of the Western tradition agrees with P46 in its choice, part of the time it disagrees.

B seems to have a closer alliance with the Western forefathers than its fellows ξ and A. Note readings (186) (448)(451)(354) and (467), where B agrees only with Western majuscles. Kenyon comments on this relationship of B, the Western text, and P46: "It is noteworthy, and of some significance, that several readings in which B joins the Western group of MSS. DFG, and which are rejected by WH, are supported by the papyrus. Also there are several places where B stood alone against the other principal MSS., and

now has the support of the papyrus.¹

All of which evidence seems to indicate that, in the Pauline epistles at least, Romans specifically, there are no "Neutral" readings which are closer to the original than are other readings, a conclusion to which Kenyon in his discussion which is quoted in ch. II likewise comes, and that there are no special "Alexandrian" readings as opposed to "Neutral," but that "all readings which can be shown to be of early date must be considered on their merits, without being absolutely overborne by the weight of the Vatican Ms."²

In the group of variants in which readings of P46 that are not supported by both the original scribe and the corrector are listed, little can be learned about the correctors.³ The writer did not distinguish in his collation

1. Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Fasc. III Supplement, p. xxii.

2. Ibid., Fasc. I, p. 17.

3. P46 & β^* & D^c & KL Ψ a7:122
 " & β^c & D EFG & Const :102,370
 " & β^{cA} & D* :143
 " & β^*AB & D EFG & P Ψ :438
 " & " & " & Const :134
 " & " :83,120
 " & β^*ABC :192
 " & β^*AB & D* FG :90
 " & " & D EFG :93
 " & β^*ABC & D*EFG :217
 " & β^*AB & D EFG & Const :251
 " & β^*AB & D* :290
 " & β^*ABC & D* & P :327
 " & β^*ABC & D EFG & " :418,441,447
 " & β^*AB & D E & Const :89
 " & " & KL Ψ :286
 " & " & D EFG & Const :291
 " & S*A & D EFG & P :154

of the majuscles between the five correctors who worked extensively on β , between the two correctors of B, and between the two correctors of C.¹ The conclusions, however, which were drawn from a study of the previous group of variants are substantiated by the testimony of the first hands of the codices. β supports P46 25 times, A 29 times, B 42 times, the correcting hands not being considered. The general, though

P46	& β^*A	C	& DEFG	& Const	:387
"	& β^cA	C	& D ^c	& "	:456
"	& β^c	B	& D EFG	& "	:299
"	& "	"	& D ^c EFG	& KL	a7:97
"	& "	"	& FG	& KL	Ja7:100
"	& "	"	& D EFG	& L	Ja7:339
"	& "	"	& "	& LP	a7:455
"	& "	"	& "	& KL	Ja7:66
"	& "	"	& "	& "	:67
"	& β^*BC		& D*	& a7:	127
"	& β^cBC		& D EFG	& "	:46
"	& β^cBC^*				:471
"	& A*		& D*EFG		:267
"	& B*				:203
"	& B*		& D ^c E	& L	:231
"	& B ^c				:426
"	& β	B*	& D* FG		:33
"	& β	B*		& LP	:230
"	& AB*		& D*		:506
"	& AB*		& D*	& L	:228
"	& β	AB*	& D EFG	& Ja7:	24
"	& "	"	& D EFG	& LP	Ja7:28
"	& "	"	& D* FG	& Ja7:	281
"	& "	"	& FG		:495
"	& β	AB ^c C	& D E	& Const	:504
"	& C*		& FG	& P	:173
"	& β	ABC*	& D EFG		:341
"	& β^*ABC^*			& P	:488
"	& β	BC*	& D EFG	& Const	:172
"	& β^cBC^*				:471
"	& BC ^c		& D E	& L	Ja7:508
"	& β	ABC ^c	& D E	& Const	:518

1. Gregory, Textkritik, pp. 20-21, 35, 41.

inconsistent support of P46 by the Western testimony, sometimes entire, sometimes divided, is again noticed. The likewise inconsistent choice of the Constantinople mss. is to be noted. Of interest is the divided testimony of Origen to (291), in which variant he supports both β^* and β^c , and indication of the worth of apparently both readings.

The next group of readings records the opposition to P46 by all the Alexandrian mss. in 43 out of the 333 variants considered.¹ One notes immediately that the Western majuscules are again not regular in their testimony. They choose, apparently indiscriminately, between readings opposed and those supported by P46. Of all the readings, those in which DE and D^cE support the Alexandrian group are most often adopted by Constantinople mss., an observation which was made when

1. Alex		:65,453
"	& D EFG	:111
"	& D*EFG	:336
"	& D E	:308
"	& D* FG & P	:513
"	& D EFG & P	:386
"	& D*E & P	:460
"	& FG & P	:378
"	& D ^c & LP ψ a7:	361,392,543
"	& D E & LP	:167
"	& " & K LP ψ a7:	12,26,72,77,142,322,440
"	& D ^c E & "	:19,181,182,224,278,279,320, 323,401
"	& D E G & "	:423
"	& D EFG & L ψ a7:	343,346
"	& D ^c EFG & "	:482
"	& D EFG & L ψ	:209
"	& D EFG & LP a7:	156
"	& KLP ψ a7:	40,44,252,287,288,310,363
"	& P	:189

were considered the variants supported by P46-Alexandrian-DE testimony. Apparently the DE testimony is the most influential of the Western group.

Comparing this group with the next group of readings,¹ we note that while P46 stands unsupported by Alexandrian

1. § AB	&	LP a7	492
C	&	LP a7	
§ A	&	Const	430
BC	&	Const	
§ A	&	Const	384,473
BC & DEFG			
§ A & D ^c	&	Const	258
§ BC & D E	&	Const	517
A & FG			
§ A C & DE	&	Const	355
§ C & DE	&	L a7	201
A			52,326
B			318
§ ABC*	&	a7	17
C ^c	&	KLP	
§ B*C & DEFG	&	a7	29
B ^c	&	KLP	
§ ^c & DEFG	&	Const	82
§ ^c A & "	&	LP a7	534
§ ^c A & D ^c E	&	LP a7	178
§* BC			
§ ^c & D ^c E			
§*ABC	&	LP a7	542
§ ^c B & DEFG	&	L a7	229
§*A	&	P	
§ ^c C			
§ AB & DEFG	&	LP a7	132
§ ^c C ^c & D ^c FG	&	L a7	
ABC* & D*E			311
§ ^c	&	P	
§ ^c AB	&		115
§ ^c ABC	&	LP a7	425,491

witnesses in 43 instances, A is thus only twice, ξ , B, and C each once. P46 is therefore a representative of a period in textual history when there was much greater variation among mss. and less unity in the Alexandrian tradition than when the great majuscles of the third and fourth centuries were written. One harks back to Hoskier's "shorter text" hypothesis, and wonders whether the attempts at textual revision which must have preceded the unity of the ξ ABC group in actuality added to the inspired Word, or at least changed it.

In inconsistent agreement of the Western and Constantinople majuscles is the only important testimony of this last group of variants.

The apparatus of Tischendorf records too infrequently the testimony of the Egyptian and related version to allow any adequate comparison to be made. We may present Hoskier's conclusions here for the sake of completeness; namely, that "the underlying sympathy" of P46 "ranges rather more with the base of the Bohairic than with that of the Sahidic.... Beyond this, the largest sympathy is with the base of the Aethiopic version. I have counted over fifty cases of unique agreement of aeth with the papyrus."¹ Westcott and Hort, having studied the two Coptic versions, held that the Memphitic (Bohairic) "no less than the Thebaic" (Sahidic) "had Western readings, but they are with comparatively few exceptions,

1. "A Study of the Chester-Beatty Codex," op. cit. pp. 149-150.

readings much current in the fourth century, and possibly owe their place to comparatively late mixture. The Thebaic on the other hand has a large proportion of distinctively Western readings of an older type."¹

The first of the Alexandrian fathers whose testimony we shall consider is Clement of Alexandria, "geboren in Athen, erst heidnischer Philosoph, dann Christ, reiste er viel; er wurde Presbyter in Alexandrien und Schueler des Pantaenus, schliesslich flogte er Pantaenus etwa im Jahre 189 als Vorsteher der catechetischen Schule in Alexandrien; vor Verfolgung fliehend besuchte er im Jahre 202 Jerusalem, Antiochien und Kappadocien, kehrte dann nach Alexandrien zurueck, wo er zwischen 212 und 220 starb."²

According to critics who have examined the testimony of Clement, the mixed character of the texts used in Egypt at his time is amply demonstrated. Westcott and Hort remark: "Even in Clement of Alexandria Western quotations hold a prominent place. On the other hand, the many Non-Western readings supplied by Clement of Alexandria prove that great divergencies were in existence at latest by the end of the second century."³ Gregory observes: "...we can apparently in some places see that Clement of Alexandria used different rolls of scripture when writing different works."⁴

The conclusion of Seesemann is the following: "Ein Vergleich des Paulustextes des Cl. mit dem Text von P erweist erneut die grosse Mannigfaltigkeit der Textueber-

1. Op. cit., p.157 ~~1881~~. p. 155.

lieferung in der Zeit vor den vereinheitlichenden Rezensionen des IV. Jh.s....Der Paulustext von Cl. und von P unterscheidet sich in sehr vielen Einzelheiten, obgleich sie beide einen Text bieten, der im Grundcharakter der späteren ägyptischen Rezension entspricht."¹

While the writer finds no strong relationship between Clement and P46 as does Seesemann, which is due undoubtedly to the incomplete citations of Tischendorf, he does find evidence² of the "divergencies" of text, predicated also by

2. Gregory, Textkritik, p.785.

3. Op. cit., p. 113.

4. Canon and Text, p.494.

1. Op. cit., p.97. P is P46.

Clem	&	P46	&	AB	&	D*	FG			:232
"	&	"	&	ABC	&			LP	va7	:463
"	&	"	&	B*	&			LP	& defg & vg & syr	:230
"	&	"	&	ABC	&				va7	:364
"	&	"	&	B*AB	&					:120
"	&	"	&		&	FG	&	L	va7 & fg	:308
"	&	"	&	B*	&	D ^c	&	KL	va7	:122
"	&	"	&	B*	&	D ^c E	&	L	& defg & vg & syr	:231
"	&	"	&	ABC	&	"	&	LP	va7 & af & vg & syr	:255
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	"	& " & " & "	:257
"	&	"	&	ABC	&	DE	&		va7	:137
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	KLP	va7	:9
"	&	"	&	BC	&	FG	&	LP	va7	:312
"	&	"	&	ABC	&	DEG	&	"		:22
"	&	"	&	AB	&	D*FG	&		& defg	:282
"	&	"	&	AC	&	D ^c EFG	&	L	a7	:195
"	&	"	&	AC	&	D ^c EFG	&	LP	va7 & fg & vg	:138
"	&	"	&	BC	&	DEFG	&	KLP	va7 & d fg & vg & syr	:46
W	&	"	&	B*ABC	&	DEFG	&	P	& defg	:441
"	&	"	&	BC	&	DEFG	&	KLP	va7	:54
"	&	"	&	B ^c	&	DEFG	&	LP	va7	:299
"	&	"	&		&		&	KL	va7	:111
"	&	"	&		&		&	P		:346
"	&	"	&	B	&		&			:315, 318, 106, 105

Westcott and Hort, which indeed the studies of the majuscule evidence just completed amply demonstrate.

In the first place, the testimony of Clement to the readings of P46 is quite divided. In 23 variants he supports P46, in 23 he opposes. And in one variant, (366), he gives both negative and positive testimony, something to which Gregory undoubtedly referred when speaking of the "different rolls" used by Clement. Examining the evidence for the readings, one finds that, while in those in which Clement supports P46 there seems to be more unified and stronger testimony among the Alexandrian mss., allowing us to conclude perhaps that when Clement and P46 agree, we have a superior Alexandrian reading, nevertheless, the readings in which Clement opposes P46 still find Alexandrian support.

The Western acceptance of the Clement-Alexandrian readings is not whole-hearted, to be sure, 16 with P46-Clement,

Clem &	A	& P	:109
"	& D E		:139
"	& A	& KL a7	:113
"	& A	& LPVa7 & def	:300
"	& § ABC	& "	:310
"	& D ^c FG	& L Va7 & syr	:194
"	& "	& " & d fg & vg	:193
"	& FG	& LPV	:302
"	& AB	& D E & P & e & vg	:95
"	& § A	& D ^c & LPVa7 & vg	:258
"	& § ^c A	& D ^c E & KLPV & syr	:127
"	& § ABC	& D ^c E & LPVa7	:320
"	& "	& " & d	:323
"	& § ^c C ^c	& D ^c FG & L Va7 & vg	:311
"	& § A	& D E & LPVa7	:301
"	& P46 ^c § B	& "	:321
"	& § ^c	& D EFG & L Va7 & d fg & vg	:192
"	& § C	& " & KLPVa7 & vg & syr	:50
"	& § A C	& " & L Va7	:190

14 opposed (D^c is not considered Western testimony); it is quite in keeping, however, with the general character of the Western mss.; namely, a large number of ancient, well-attested readings, mixed with a smaller number of what we call Western readings.

The Constantinople mss. are inclined to agree with Clement in those readings where several Alexandrian or Western mss., preferably both, support him. In several instances, however, Clement is not supported when but few mss. concur; eg. (105) (106)(315)(318), in which B is sole support for Clement; (109), in which AP lend support; and (139), where DE agrees. On the other hand, the Constantinople mss. do follow Clem A in (113) and (300), and P46 Clem in (111). As the writer remarked above, however, the Constantinople mss. follow no logic in adopting readings.

Of interest is the testimony of the Itala. In (230) and (111) defg favor P46 Clem without any Greek Western support; in (300) def agrees with only Clem A of the early witnesses; fg in (231) agree with P46 B* Clem vs D*FG; f in (255)(257) with P46~~A~~B Clem vs FG. All of which to the writer indicates that the Itala found certain, if not the majority, of its ingredients in the Alexandrian mixing bowl, independent of the Greek Western tradition, with which it becomes united in the Graeco-Latin codices DEFG.

The agreement of the Syriac in general can be explained as a supporting of a wide-spread Alexandrian reading. That the Syriac and the Western text (not the Westcott-Hort "Western") have cognate sources and do not depend on each other, a supposition which the writer is inclined to accept, is supported by (194), where syr follows D^cFG and the Constantinople mss., but no Alexandrian mss., yet is supported by Clement. The writer would surmise that the syr and D^cFG both got their reading down in Egypt, or from a common second century text.

The next Alexandrian witness is Origen, "geboren in Alexandrien im Jahre 186, Vorsteher der katechetischen Schule in Alexandrien schon im Jahre 203, besuchte Rom, Arabien, Palaestina, im Jahre 231 vertrieben, gründete er eine Schule in Caesarea; er litt viel als Gefangener fuer seinen Glauben, starb 254 in Tyrus."¹

Dogmatic conclusions on the basis of Origen's testimony are precluded by a statement of Westcott and Hort:

Several important works of Origen are..., wholly or in part, extant only in Latin, and need ... allowance for two alternatives in the employment of their evidence as to biblical texts. Caution is especially needed where Rufinus is the translator, as in the early treatise De Principiis, the commentaries on Canticles and Romans, ...for his well known licence in manipulating Origen's own language indoubtedly extended to the quotations; and at least in the commentaries the deprecation of text has apparently been increased by the condensation of the voluminous original.²

1. Gregory, Textkritik, p. 808.

2. Op. cit., p. 160.

They themselves, however, express the opinion:

Many of the verses which he quotes in different places shew discrepancies of text that cannot be accounted for either by looseness of citation or by corruption of the MSS of his writings; and in most instances the discrepant readings are those of the primary extant groups.... It is even possible, as Griesbach shewed long ago, to trace to a certain extent his use of different MSS when writing different treatises; and moreover he now and then refers in express words to variations between MSS.¹

It was because of such evidence offered by Origen that Westcott and Hort rejected Hug's "Caesarean" text which was supposedly based on Origen's writings. The comment of Kenyon which we quoted in ch. I bears repetition, since it shows how preliminary studies in P46 support this rejection: "It must suffice to point out that the occurrence of this type of text [Caesarean] in a manuscript from Egypt contemporaneous with, or at latest not much later than, Origen seems to show that the type did not take its use at Caesarea, but existed already in Egypt."²

With these preliminary observations, we are ready to analyze Origen's testimony in the light of P46 and other witnesses.³

1. Ibid., pp. 113-114.

2. Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Fasc. I, p. 16.

3.

Or & P46 & AB	:50
" & " & AB *ABC	:192
" & " & D EFG & defg & vg	:425,310
" & " & FG & " & " & Δa7	:167
" & " & AB * & " & " & "	:495
" & " & B & D* FG & " & " & syr ^D	:259
" & " & " & D EFG & g	:300
" & " & " & " & defg & "	:240

There is, first of all, a group of 17 variants, not included in the table, (17)(95)(104)(193)(229)(232)(255)(257)

Or	&	P46	&	β	AB	&	D	EFG	&	defg	&	vg		&	syr ^{sch}	:292		
"	&	"	&	β	ABC	&	D*	EFG	&	"	&	"		&	"	:483		
"	&	"	&	β ^c	AB					"	&	"	&	L	β*	&	syr	:286
"	&	"	&	β	B					"	&	"	&	LP		&	"	:230
"	&	"	&	β	ABC								&	P	βa7		"	:364
"	&	"	&	β	AB								&	LP	a7	&	"	:500
"	&	"	&	β	ABC				&	de	&	"	&	LP	βa7		"	:540
"	&	"	&	"							&	"	&	LP	βa7	&	"	:395
"	&	"	&	"					&	defg	&	"	&	"		&	syr ^D	:388
"	&	"	&	"					&	f	&	"	&	"		&	"	:428
"	&	"	&	"							&	"	&	"		&	"	:360
"	&	"	&	"							&	"	&	"		&	"	:547
"	&	"	&	"							&	"	&	KLP	βa7		"	:55
"	&	"	&	β ^c	A C	&	D ^c				&	2	&	"		&	syr	:1456
"	&	"	&	β	ABC	&	"						&	"		&	syr ^D	:14
"	&	"	&	β*	BC	&	D*		&	de	&	vg	&	"	a7		"	:127
"	&	"	&	β	B*	&	D ^c E		&	defg	&	"	&	L		&	syr	:231
"	&	"	&	β	AB	&	D ^c E		&	f	&	"	&	LP	βa7	&	syr ^D	:306
"	&	"	&	β	AB	&	D ^c E		&	d fg	&	"	&	"			"	:221
"	&	"	&	β	AB	&	D ^c E		&	ef	&	"	&	"		&	syr	:252
"	&	"	&	β	AB	&	"		&	e	&	"	&	"		&	"	:469
"	&	"	&	"		&	"		&	fg	&	"	&	"		&	"	:448
"	&	"	&	"	ABC	&	"						&	KLP	βa7		"	:34
"	&	"	&	β	BC	&	D E		&	efg	&	"	&	L	βa7	&	"	:470
"	&	"	&	β	ABC	&	"		&	de	&	"	&	P		&	syr ^{sch}	:431
"	&	"	&	β	AB	&	"						&	"	a7		"	:302
"	&	"	&	"		&	"		&	defg	&	"	&	KL	βa7		"	:117
"	&	"	&	"		&	"		&	"	&	"	&	LP	βa7		"	:283
"	&	"	&	"		&	"						&	"			"	:236
"	&	"	&	"		&	"		&	de			&	"		&	syr	:266
"	&	"	&	"		&	"						&	"			"	:244
"	&	"	&	β	BC	&	FG						&	"			"	:312
"	&	"	&	β	ABC	&	D E G						&	"			"	:22
"	&	"	&	"		&	D* FG		&	defg	&	vg	&	P		&	syr ^D	:549
"	&	"	&	A		&	D ^c EFG		&	"	&	"	&	KL	βa7	&	syr	:223
"	&	"	&	β	ABC	&	D*EFG		&	"	&	"	&	P		&	"	:130
"	&	"	&	β*	ABC	&	"		&	d fg			&	"			"	:217
"	&	"	&	β	B	&	D EFG		&	defg	&	"	&	L	β		"	:544
"	&	"	&	β ^c	B	&	"						&	L	βa7		"	:339
"	&	"	&	β ^c	BC	&	"		&	d fg	&	"	&	KLP	βa7	&	syr	:46
"	&	"	&	β	A	&	"		&	defg	&	"	&	KL	βa7	&	"	:106
"	&	"	&	"		&	"						&	"			"	:105
"	&	"	&	β*	A	&	"		&	"	&	"	&	P			"	:154
"	&	"	&	β	AB	&	"		&	"	&	"	&	β		&	"	:92
"	&	"	&	β	AEC*	&	"		&	"	&	"	&	"			"	:341
"	&	"	&	β*	ABC	&	"		&	"	&	"	&	P		&	syr ^{sch}	:418,447

(291)(299)(301)(323)(337)(397)(460)(463) (545), in which
 Origen favors in one or more places the reading of P46, in

Or	& P46	& §*ABC	& D EFG	& defg	& vg	& P			:441
"	& "	& § ABC	& "	& "	& "	& LPV	& syr		:524
"	& "	& § "	& "	& defg	& "	& Pva7	& syrP		:537
"	& "	& § BC	& "	& "	& "	& LPva7			:165
"		& A							:54,52,362
"		& A					& syr ^{sch}		:237
"		& B			& "				:41
"		& B					& syr ^{sch}		:1,467
"		& § ^c B		& defg	& "				:387
"		& §*A C							:67
"		& §*ABC							:370
"						& L a7	& syr		:367
"			& D E	& de	& "				:103
"			& F*	& f			& "		:242
"			& FG ^c				& "		:226
"			& FG						:258
"			& FG	& d fg					:184,128
"			& FG		& "				:164
"			& "	& defg	& "		& "		:9,155,419
"			& "	& "			& syr ^{sch}		:440
"			& D* FG	& d fg					:177
"			& D EFG	& defg	& vg		& syr		:40
"		& B	& D*	& de					:138
"		& §*A	& D E		& vg				:100
"		& BC	& D FG	& d fg	& "				:45
"		& § ^c			& "	& KLPV	& syr ^P		:15
"		& § ABC	& D*EFG						:336
"		& "	& D ^c E	& defg	& "	& L va7	& syr		:207
"			& D ^c FG		& "	& "	& "		:194
"			& D EFG	& defg	& "	& LPva7	& syr ^P		:453
"						& KLPva7	& "		:93
"		& § ^c				& "			:32
"		& §*A C				& LPva7			:473
"		& § A				& PV	& syr ^P		:297
"		& § ABC				& P			:189
"		& § C				& KLPva7	& syr ^{sch}		:16
"		& § AB				& LPva7	& syr		:44,288
"		& § ABC	& D ^c			& "	& syr ^P		:361
"		& § A	& D*			& "			:97
"		& § AB	& D	& defg	& "	& K P			:10
"		& § A	& D E	& "	& "	& Pva7	& syr ^{sch}		:468
"		& § P46 ^c	& "			& LPva7			:321
"		& § ABC	& "	& f		& KLPva7			:26
"		& § ABC*	& D*E						:311
"		& § ^c A	& D ^c E			& KLP a7	& syr		:178
"		& § AB	& D ^c E			& LPva7	& "		:279

one or more places opposes it. This in itself would be a strong indication of a mixed tradition to which Origen had access, and both streams of which seemed equally good.

Then, of the 120 variants in which Origen's undivided testimony is recorded, 60 favor P46, and 60 oppose it. Of the 60 readings in which P46 offers no support for Origen's text, there are but 18 readings which have no recorded Alexandrian witness, seven of the 18 offering only Western majuscule, Itala, and Vulgate support, seven offering in addition Syriac Peshitta support (five of these also have syr^P), three more adding the Constantinople mss. (one of these three has only syr^P), with only one reading having merely syr and Constantinople mss. as agreeing witnesses.

If one accepts the proposition which the writer set forth in ch. IV, that "the Peshitta must find its roots back in the second century," a conclusion in which Hoskier himself concurs,¹ and assumes, furthermore, that the Syriac

Or	& §	ABC	&	D ^C E		&	KLP	∇	a7		:320	
"	&	"	&	"		&	"				:224	
"	&	"	&	D* FG		&	P				:513	
"	&	"	&	FG	& defg & vg	&	P	&	syr ^P		:378	
"	&	§*	B	&	D ^C EFG	&	fg & vg	&	LP	∇	a7 & syr	:143
"	&	§ ^C	ABC	&	D*EFG		P				:122	
"	&	"	C	&	D EFG		LP	∇	a7		:187	
"	&	"	A C	&	"		& vg	&	"		:548	
"	&	§*	AC ^C	&	"	&	defg & "	&	LP	∇	a7	:471
"	&	§	A C	&	D EFG		L	∇	a7		:190	
"	&	§	A C	&	"	&	" & "	&	LP	∇	a7 & syr	:443

1. "We are in the presence of a Greek document, circa 200, which is already a compound or composite vehicle of the Latin version and, possibly, of a Syriac version, both of which may have run concurrently with the Greek for some time." ("A Study of the Chester-Beatty Codex," *op. cit.*, p. 149.)

translated from Greek mss. those readings in which it agrees with Western majuscles, he can accept the hypothesis that there were found in Egypt or the eastern Mediterranean world readings in the Greek tradition which Origen accepted, which some or all of the forefathers of the Western majuscles adopted, which the early Syriac translators chose, and which would be substantiated were another ms. like P46 to be discovered, a ms. which goes back to the time before the editing and recensions choked off colorful individuality in the textual tradition and perhaps even eliminated, albeit unintentionally, inspired words themselves.

This hypothesis explains the derivation of all but six of the variants. What of them?

Were the writer to stop here, and all six variants to stand unchallenged as accidents or exceptions to the hypothesis just set forth, he would still, in his judgment, have demonstrated on the basis of previous evidence that, in the text of Romans at least, there is no "Caesarean" text, as distinguished from the Alexandrian and Constantinopolitan and Western, that is based on and is to be found in Origen's writings. But even these six need not stand as "thorns in the flesh."

Variant (103) lists DE de Or as the only early supporters of a reading which is identical except for word order with that supported by FG fg cop aeth. The early origin of the Coptic version¹ and the connection with the Ethiopic version

1. Gregory presupposes "before the close of the second century," Canon and Text, p. 404.

has with the late second or early third century P46 would, would, by not illogical reasoning, indicate a second century Greek reading similar to that in DE and Origen. Furthermore, the independence of the Itala over against the companion Greek text, an independence which has been partially, and will be quite conclusively, demonstrated, would allow for the Latin translation in the second century of a Greek variant which Origen adopted.

Variant (258) can be explained as homoeoteleuton, which error occurred both in the ms. Origen used and in that which the copyist of G used, followed by F; or which both Origen and the copyist of G committed.

Variants (184) and (128), in which FG dfg support Origen, might have an early Egyptian reading from which both the Itala and Origen's reading were derived, as indicated by the disagreement of d with its Greek mate.

Variant (164) shows agreement of FG Or in transposition of the words "I am," in Greek not a serious blunder.

Variant (177) shows a difference in word order, in which D*FG dfg Or are supported again by cop aeth. Cf. the explanation of (103).

A much more simple explanation of the purely Western readings in Origen, unsupported by Alexandrian testimony, is indicated by the advice of caution which Westcott and Hort give, which is quoted above. Rufinus Terantius, a Italian, a presbyter of Aquileia, later a monk, who lived for more

than twenty years in the East and died about 410, "uebersetzte viele Werke der griechischen Schriftsteller ins Lateinisch, zum Beispiel das Buch des Origenes $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\ \lambda\eta\gamma\omega\upsilon$ und viele der Kommentare des Origenes..."¹ In the process of his translating, it is but natural that he should sometimes use a reading of the West with which he was familiar, rather than the unfamiliar Greek reading which Origen used. In the judgment of the writer, this possibility of emendation by Rufinus, a possibility which Westcott and Hort uphold, is a very trustworthy explanation of the matter at hand, superior to the previous one which the writer makes, since in the first series of explanations conjecture admittedly plays a large part, logical in the writer's estimation though it be.

It may seem to the reader, perhaps, that the writer is a priori prejudices against the "Caesarean" text. Perhaps so. For it does offer a very easy way for textual critics to divide automatically, in 1-2-3 order, the testimony of the manuscripts. Either they are Western, or Caesarean, or Alexandrian, or Constantinopolitan, or Carthaginian, or what have you. The evidence is too overwhelmingly against such simplicity. Out of 137 readings witnessed by Origen, recorded by Tischendorf, Origen agrees with some Alexandrian authority 119 times. That certainly leaves no room for a "Caesarean" text. And of the 18 readings without Alexandrian support, the assumption being that they are Origen's testimony, there

1. Gregory, Textkritik, p. 815.

are but two, (258)(164), which do not allow for a logical explanation of an early, second-century, common origin for Western, versional, and Origenic readings. And these two exceptions are clearly scribal errors, which, it is true, might have been copied from Origen by a later scribe, but which also might have occurred independently. The assumption that that the Western readings owe their existence in Origen's writings, not to Origen himself, but to Rufinus, of course puts the matter out of the sphere of doubt. Under either assumption, however, Origen's Western readings represent no Caesarean text.¹

There are several other conclusions which can be drawn from Origen's testimony. It is striking that when Origen adopts the readings which we find in P46 he only three times veers away entirely from the other Alexandrian mss. for a purely Western reading, and in all but two of the others he agrees with at least two Alexandrian majuscles. Contrariwise, when he rejects the readings of P46, he 17 times

1. Too late to make a collation of the readings contained in it, the writer's attention was directed by Souter to "a MS. at the Laura monastery on Mount Athos" which contains Origen's text "of the Epistle to the Romans complete, which some biblical scholar in the tenth century had carefully copied out of a manuscript of Origen's commentary on that epistle in the original Greek, now lost. ...on the whole it is the Neutral text to which he witnesses in this Epistle." (Op. cit., pp. 83-84.) Gregory describes the ms., minuscule 1739, in his Textkritik, p. 1176. Von Soden considers the ms., which he numbers a78, to be a witness of the H recension (von Dobschuetz, op. cit., pp. 52, 102). Its testimony would seem to indicate Origen's dependence on the Alexandrian tradition.

entirely abandons extant Alexandrian ms. evidence, and in 12 variants agrees with only one of the group.

Assuming that we have Origen's own text, we may adopt one of three explanations. Either Origen often thought that the less favored readings were the better; or those which we think to be the less favored were in reality not considered so to be in Origen's time, but are merely readings of which the extant supporting witnesses are few; or Origen often followed his own mss. regardless of the fact that other more numerous mss. favored another reading. The writer favors the second of the three.

If we assume, however, that the Western readings are textual emendations by Rufinus, the necessity of conjecture is immediately reduced considerably, and one need suppose little more evidence than we now have in order to explain Origen's apparent exercising of critical judgment in choosing what seems to us to be an inferior reading, but which seemed to him to be right. (The classic example of Origen's textual criticism is found in John I 28, where he changed Bethany to read Bethabara.)

Checking through the variants, one finds 19 readings in which one or more of the Itala mss. break from their Greek codices, very frequently from their Itala fellows, to support an Alexandrian reading. In three instances there is rank desertion by Itala mss., in which contrary to other Itala and the entire Western majuscule evidence an

Alexandrian reading is supported. There can be only one explanation. The Itala is a separate version from the Western Greek mss., though it may be influenced by and have influenced them, which finds its source in readings accepted in Egypt back in the second century.

The Vulgate in nine readings breaks from its Western moorings to follow an Alexandrian-Origen reading, and indication of Jerome's exercise of critical judgment.

Checking on the Syriac, we find that in a number of instances it concurs with only Origen and P46, or Origen and an Alexandrian ms., an indication of the eclectic character as well as the early basis of the Syriac version.

The evidence of Cyril, "Bischof von Alexandria vom Jahre 412 bis zum Jahre 444,"¹ exhibits the same divergencies of text which have been demonstrated thus far.² In

1. Gregory, Textkritik, p. 787.

2. (# marks divided testimony)

	Cyr	& P46*&	ABC							:321
	"	& P46	& A		& LP	Ja7		& syr ^P		:460
	"	& "	& § B*		& LP		& defg & vg	& syr		:230
	"	& "	& § ABC		& LP	Ja7	& " & "	& syr ^P		:388
	"	& "	& "		& "					:463
	"	& "	& § AB		& L	Ja7				:104
#	"	& "	& "	& D E			& de	& vg		}103
#	"	& "	& § AB		& KL	Ja7		& syr		
	"	& "	& A C	& D ^c EFG	& L	a7				:195
	"	& "	& § AB	& D EFG	& "	↓				:91
	"	& "	& §*AB	& "			& defg		& syr ^{sch}	:93
	"	& "	& § ^c B	& "	& KL	Ja7		& vg & syr		:66
	"	& "	& § A	& "	& "		& defg & vg	& syr		:106
	"	& "	& "	& "	& "					:105
	"	& "	& § C	& "	& KL	LPJa7				:368
	"	& "	& § BC	& "	& "					:545
	"	& "	& "	& "	& "			& vg		:165
	"	& "	& §*A C	& "	& "			& syr ^P		:387
	"	& "	& AB	& "	& L	a7	& defg		& syr ^{sch}	:297
	"	& "	& § AB	& "	& "	↓	& defg & vg	& syr		:92
	"	& "	& § ABC	& "	& LP	↓		& vg & syr		:524

19 instances he uses the same reading which P46 adopts, in 18 instances he rejects. In two variants he has both types of reading. All of the readings in which he agrees with P46 have the supporting witness of other Alexandrian mss., in all but one instance at least two of the mss. agreeing. When, however, Cyril disagrees with P46, he in five instances follows the reading of only one Alexandrian ms., in four instances the reading of Western mss. without Alexandrian support. The Itala in eight readings again displays evidence of its early Alexandrian readings. The Syriac displays no particular vagaries. Only once does the Vulgate step aside to support Cyril's Alexandrian testimony.

This concludes our survey of the Alexandrian readings. A conclusion comprising one sentence is the following: With

Cyr	& β^* ABC									:370
"		& FG		& VG						:164
"	& β ABC	& "	& P	& VG	& defg	& syr ^D				:378
"	& β A		& LP ψ a7							:384
"	& A C	& D EFG		& VG	& defg	& "				:394
"	& A		& "		& def					:300
"	& β^c		& KLP ψ	& VG		& "				:15
"	& A		& P							:109
"		& D* FG								:6
"		& D ^c FG	& L ψ a7			& syr				:194
"		& "	& "	& VG	& d fg					:193
"		& FG	& LP ψ							:302
# "	& P46 β	& FG	& KL ψ a7		& d fg	& syr				:95
# "	& AB	& DE	& P	& VG	& •					:95
"	& β	& D ^c E	& LP ψ a7	& VG	& defg	& syr				:232
"	& β A	& D/E	& "							:301
"	& A C	& D E G	& "							:374
"	& β^c C ^c	& D ^c FG	& L ψ a7	& VG						:311
"	& β^c	& D EFG	& L ψ a7	& VG	& d fg					:192
"	& β^c C	& D EFG	& KLP ψ a7	& VG		& syr				:150

the exception of eccentric Western readings and a few Constantinople readings, all variant readings can be traced back to second century Egypt.

VI. The Western Tradition

The type of text called "Western" by Westcott and Hort had as chief characteristics its antiquity, being older than and a basis for the Syrian text, and its divergence from the "Neutral" text which was represented chiefly in \mathcal{B} . The study which we have made, however, of the Alexandrian text demonstrates that many of the readings, heretofore generally accepted as "Western", are in reality identical with those of Alexandrian mss., and are as old as and, among ancient authorities and versions, of equal value with, the so-called "Neutral" readings. Kenyon, as we noted in ch. I, in his preliminary studies of P46 had come to the same conclusion.

In dealing, therefore, with the manuscripts which have their home in the western Mediterranean world, we shall analyse them as we have the Alexandrian and Constantinople documents, to see whence they arise and what influence they display.

Anyone but faintly familiar with P46 is aware of what Hoskier calls "the intimate relation of the papyrus' foundation text with the group of graeco-latins DFG."¹ Hoskier even goes so far as to predicate, on basis of the agreement

1. P46, Addenda et Corrigenda, p. 1.

of P46 and FG against B or β , a "drastic revision" of the text which came between P46 and FG.¹

Be that as it may, an analysis of the relationship of P46 and the Western majuscles cannot but prove interesting.

Codex D, Claromontanus, is a sixth century ms. of the Pauline epistles, which de Beze obtained at a monastery in Clermont in France sometime before 1581.² Codex E is a ninth century copy of codex D, after the latter had been corrected by many hands.³ Codex F and codex G are two ninth century codices which come from Switzerland, either being brothers, i.e. copied from the same parent ms., or F being dependent on G.⁴

The largest group of readings, one which demonstrates the basic relationship of the Western majuscles with the second century textual tradition, consists of those in which P46 is followed by one or more Western mss., 224 out of 333, which does not include 18 variants in which D^cE and nine in which D^c only of the Western group agree, these latter two witnesses being in general Constantinople witnesses.

Of this group there are 73 in which DEFG are

-
1. "A Study of the Chester-Beatty Codex," p. 158.
 2. Gregory, Canon and Text, pp. 350-351.
 3. Ibid., p. 365.
 4. Ibid., pp. 366-367.

unanimous in their agreement.¹ Looking over these variants, we note that there are by seven in which there is no Alexandrian support for DEFG other than P46. In 26 variants there is added one or two Alexandrian mss., and in the remaining 40, full Alexandrian approval is given. The Constantinople mss. see fit to adopt 46 of these well attested readings.

D^cEF^cG agrees with P46 in eight readings, (37)(97)(138)

1. P46 & DEFG	:17,44,288,310,363,425,429
" " & " & β^* AB	:93,418,438,441,447
" " & " & β AB	:92,292,341.
" " & " & β ABC*	:341
" " & " & β^* ABC	:418,441,447
" " & " & A	:15
" " & " & B	:406,421
" " & " & AB	:16
" " & " & AB*	:24
" " & " & β B	:240,300
" " & " & β^* A & P	:154
" " & " & KL ψ a7	:65,102,189
" " & " & KLP ψ a7	:82
" " & " & KL a7	:98
" " & " & β & L ψ a7	:486
" " & " & β^* & K P	:115
" " & " & A & KL a7	:98
" " & " & A & LP ψ a7	:160
" " & " & β^c & LP ψ a7	:370
" " & " & B & L ψ	:544
" " & " & β A & KL ψ a7	:105,106,414
" " & " & β^c B & "	:66,67,339
" " & " & β B & "	:109
" " & " & A C & L ψ a7	:366
" " & " & β^* A C & "	:387
" " & " & β B & LP ψ a7	:237
" " & " & β^c A & LP a7	:534
" " & " & β^c B & LP ψ a7	:299,455
" " & " & β C & "	:368
" " & " & AB & "	:297
" " & " & β ABC & KLP ψ a7	:1,28,46,48,54,62,91,
" " & " & " & LP ψ a7	:134,148,165,172,234,251,
	273,291,309,315,347,350,
	367,403,508,524,537,545,
	546

(185)(195)(223)(271)(305), three of which, (97)(138)(223), show split Alexandrian support. Which indicates that of the readings in Egypt in the second century some were chosen by a portion of the parent mss. of the Western text, opposite readings by the other mss.

D*EFG likewise agrees in eight readings with P46, (56)(103)(217)(267)(361)(392)(483)(543). In all of these D^c supports Constantinople mss. Since, however, Tischendorf distinguishes 10 correctors,¹ the writer will not attempt to classify as to textual quality the corrections made on D.

P46 and D*FG agree in 22 instances.² In all of these except one, (542), D^cE follows Constantinople mss., an indication of the character of the reading in which only D^cE of the Western witnesses add support.

P46 and D^cFG agree in two readings, (141) and (526). The opposition of D*E to P46 indicates again the choice between two types of variants which was made by the precursors of the Western mss. A lack of unity is shown in the Itala in these two variants, d^he supporting P46 in (141), defg opposing in (526). This matter will be dealt with fully in considering the Itala version.

These variants which we have now been considering show

1. Gregory, Canon and Text, p. 365.

2. 19, 33, 90, 137, 178, 181, 182, 207, 224, 232, 245, 259, 278, 279, 281, 282, 320, 323, 397, 401, 542, 549.

that in 113 instances approximately one-third of all the variants considered, most of the Western witnesses agree with the Alexandrian testimony of P46.

The next group of readings are the 64 in which P46 and only DE agree. Of these, there are 51¹ in which P46DE are supported by the total Alexandrian and Constantinopolitan testimony. This indicates first of all the worth of DE testimony, and secondly the independent character of FG.

Turning to Tischendorf, we find that 26 of these variants have no recorded support of any kind for FG. Even if one assumes that fg sometime^m agree, as may be the case in Tischendorf's method of tabulating witnesses, one still has a very large group of eccentric readings. This may be the "drastic revision" of which Hoskier speaks. The writer, however, offers this explanation; that the ancestry of FG is made up of similar bi-lingual codices, many of whose copyists either knew no Greek, and who therefore made many scribal errors and errors of uninformed judgment in copying the text, or, if they knew Greek, were fully convinced of the authority of one of the two texts and altered the other accordingly. This would account for the development of a stratum of peculiar readings. The probability of the explanation will be demonstrated in the discussion of the next chapter.

1. 9, 11, 13, 27, 32, 39, 88, 89, 101, 112, 113, 117, 124, 126, 128, 140, 147, 155, 164, 184, 233, 236, 244, 254, 266, 268, 277, 283, 289, 293, 304, 330, 364, 382, 390, 402, 419, 424, 427, 435, 438, 439, 440, 446, 452, 467, 494, 520, 535, 536, 538.

The 23 remaining variants allow for influence on FG from the Itala, from the Syriac, and from the fathers.¹ But even their testimony does nothing more than attribute greater antiquity to the readings, without demonstrating that there was in the ancient Greek texts such a reading extant. From what we know, however, of the Syriac and Itala, one may conjecture that possible off-color readings of mss. no longer extant were incorporated into the translations, readings which found their way into none other of the majuscles than FG, and which FG received from the versions or some other channel.

There are yet thirteen readings in which FG opposed P46DE, but no without majuscule support.² The adoption of the Constantinople readings which go back undoubtedly to the fourth and fifth centuries can be easily understood in a ninth century codex. But whence the third century, even

1. FG & defg & vg & Ambrst:	9,11,39,112,155,364,520
" & " & "	:419,437
" & "	:440
" & "	:283
" & h fg	:184,427,446
" & fg	& Fulg :382
" & " & "	& Hil :140
" & " & "	& Ambrst & Cyr :164
" & " & "	& syr ^{sch} :112,440
" & " & "	& syr :9,15,419

2. FG & A ABC:	378	FG & C KL a7:	348
" & A	:510	" & h	:170
" & A P:	470	" & KLP	:133
" & B*:	504	" & KLP h	:302
" & B	:354	" & KLP a7:	349
" & C*:	518	" & KL h a7:	431
" & C	:117		

second century, influence of Alexandrian readings? In two instances, (378)(504), the supporting Itala and Syriac indicate a possible line of communication. But what of the other readings? First of all, they exist, both in FG and in Alexandrian mss. That cannot be denied. How they found their way into FG is another matter. The writer, pointing to the agreement between P46 and FG, which we shall soon consider, might hazard this conjecture. There lies perhaps in the sands of Egypt another papyrus ms., which would show other readings than those of P46, readings which are found only in FG, in the Itala and Syriac, and in a few of the fathers. Most authorities rejected these readings. But by some freak of chance, the ancient forefather of FG adopted them, and by means of the vagaries of transmission of testimony bequeathed them to its lineal descendants, F and G. - The writer admits the fantasy of the conjecture. Yet it is not too improbable. The discovery of P46 and the influence of its evidence on textual criticism bears that out. The only other explanation is no explanation; namely, peculiar Western readings.

Variant (321) is interesting, in that it shows P46* agreeing with AC, but P46^c adopting a reading which DE follows.

The next group of variants demonstrates once more the divergency of readings both in the Alexandrian group and, consequently, in the predecessors of the extant Western

majuscules.¹ P46 and D*, frequently agreeing, here part company, the latter to join FG and part of the Alexandrian testimony, while D^cE remain with P46 and the remainder of the Alexandrian group. The eclectic character of the Constantinople group is evident, although its liking for the D^cE combination can be readily seen from its support in 15 out of 18 instances.

D*E reunites with P46 in four instances, (193)(194) (270)274).

We come now to the 25 variants in which P46 is supported by FG and opposed by DE, usually the more faithful witnesses.² Of first importance are the readings

1.	P46 & D ^c E & Alex & Const	:6,61,177,221,255,257,306,377,399,411,469
	" & " & B* & L	:231
	" & " & SA C & LP	7:186,448,451
	" & " & AB	:316
	" & " & S* & D ^c a	7:236
	" & " & ABC & KLP	7:34
2.	P46 & FG	:12,26,72,75,77,142,322,430
	" & " & D	:201
	" & " & D	7:167
	" & " & B	:78,301
	" & " & A	:459
	" & " & A & LP	:86
	" & " & S AB*	:495
	" & " & C* & P*	:173
	" & " & S B & K	a7:96
	" & " & S BC & P	a7:131
	" & " & S & L	7:308
	" & " & S & KL	7:95
	" & " & S A & LP	7:145
	" & " & S ^c B & KL	7:100
	" & " & S BC & LP	7:312
	" & " & S ABC & KLP	7:23,139

which only P46 and FG have in common. There are eight of them. Before P46 was discovered, those eight were "Western peculiarities." Now they are second century readings, found only in P46 and F and G of all the majuscles. It is this to which the writer referred when above, in speaking of the solitary witness-bearing of FG, he made the conjecture that many of the readings which FG alone among the majuscles now support may be indeed second century Egyptian readings, perpetuated by some stroke of chance in one of the parent manuscripts of F and G. If one were to remove the testimony of P46 from this group of variants, it would differ in no respect from the group in which FG at the present time are sole Western witnesses. The eclecticism of the Constantinople text and the varied character of the Alexandrian text is evident. All that is needed is another second century witness to vindicate the Western idiosyncrasies of FG

The remaining variants demonstrate the lack of harmony among the Western majuscles.¹ The variants (374) and (497) offer an opportunity for interesting comment on the testimony

-
1. P46 & EFG:10
 " & D EF^CG:242
 " & F :374,423,429
 " & G:87
 " & D EG*:226
 " & D EG :22
 " & D* :127,143,228,290,327,410,482,506
 " & D^C :14,122,238,336,358,456,458,539,552

of F and G. In the former, P46^B are followed by F in opposition to G, to which as we have seen it is related; in the latter, P46B are followed by F, again contrary to the testimony of G. It is evident therefore that there were two types of readings from which the ninth century scribes could choose, both of which types go back into the second century.

Variant (226) brings us again to the problem of "Western readings." FB^c, opposed to P46DEG*, is supported solely by syr^{sch}OrCypHil. While Origen's testimony may be an emendation by Rufinus, the testimony of syr^{sch} and Cyp cannot be gainsaid. Whence the reading?

The following chart summarizes the relationship of P46 to the Western mss. It gives the number of agreements, based on a consideration of 333 variants.

D 138	E 177	DE 138	F 142	G 142
D*180		D*E 150		
D ^c 175		D ^c E 164		
(D*and D ^c include D)				

Recalling that there is a group of 64 variants in which only DE agree with P46, and noting that the difference between D* and FG is not so great as that, we are forced to an important conclusion. Despite the underlying unity of the Western text, expressed in DEFG testimony, a unity which carries the Western tradition back to the second century, there is great divergency of testimony. The only way to account for it is to assume that there are several, if not many, lines of descent which go back to the second century tradition. One of these lines culminates in D*(DE), another

in D^cE, a third in FG, still another in D*FG, with possibly still others, each of which, although having many readings in common with the others, possesses its own peculiar second century readings, as they have been identified by P46. The total number of Western readings, as noted above, which have been given a second century stamp by P46, is 224 out of 333.

What of the other readings?

There are 10 readings in which P46, with a peculiar reading, opposes DEFG. Four of these give no majuscule support to the Western text, (40)(287)(491)(492). All of them, however, with possibly (492) excepted, show supporting Itala testimony, which would permit one to consider the readings to have had at least a second century existence. (40) offers, in addition, syr cop arm OrAug, a strong indication of the antiquity of that reading.

The other readings of the group¹ are given the stamp of antiquity by the Alexandrian support. Even the approval of only Constantinople mss. in (453) is reassuring.

A group of 24 readings is now brought to our attention in which DEFG again stands alone, with P46 in the opposing

1.	P46	vs	DEFG	vs	BC		:384,473
	"	vs	"	vs	g ABC	vs P	:286
	"	vs	"	vs	g B*C	vs Pa7:29	
	"	vs	"			vsLP	Pa7:453
	"	vs	"	vs	g ^c B	vs L	Pa7:229
	"	vs	"	vs	g*AB	vsLP	Pa7:132

camp, joined by the total Alexandrian and Constantinople tradition.¹ Checking the group, we find that in all but three instances, Itala support is given, and even in those three, two could be assumed from Tischendorf's apparatus. It is therefore a safe conjecture that these DEFG-Itala readings are of great antiquity, DEFG uniting, as we have seen, several streams of influence from, and the Itala independently reaching back into, the second century.

The antiquity of the remaining DEFG readings which oppose P46 is indicated by the majuscule support which they receive.² The three readings in which only Constantinople

1.	DEFG	sch	cop	aeth	defg	vg	Or Cyr:103
	"	syr sch	"				:4
	"				"	" arm	:104
	"				"		:136
	"				"	"	:163
	"				"	" "	:168
	"	"			"	"	:356
	"	"			"		:360
	"	"			"		:365
	"						:388
	"				de		:395
	"						:405
	"				d fg		:428
	"		"	"	defg	"	:445
	"				" (?) "	" (?)	:457
	"				"		:479
	"				"	" "	:484
	"				de g	" "	:487
	"				d fg		:493
	"				defg		:523, 527
	"						:536
	"				fg		:540
	"				defg		:547
2.	DEFG		&	L			:389
	"		&				:417
	DE G	&	B ^c				:45
	DEFG	&	C	&	ψ		:500
	"	&	A C				:394

support is given may be traced to cognate errors or to influence of one group on the other.

The final group of readings, whose fundamentum divi-
dendi is their lack of the same,¹ demonstrates both the mixed character of the Western family and the ancient character of many of the readings. The reader will note how frequently syr cop aeth Or, not to speak of the Itala, take the Western readings back into the second and third centuries.

A bit of summarization is not out of place. In the analysis which we have made, evidence points to the fact that, whether witnessed by Alexandrian mss. or not, readings supported by DEFG can safely be assumed to be of equal age with those of P46. Further, many of the peculiar readings of the Western divergencies, D(DE), D^CE, FG, D*FG, even when

1. D E	&	& def	vg	syr	Or cop aeth:	463
"		& de				:464
"	& SA	& P	7	& defg	vg syr ^{sch}	Or cop aeth:468
D FG		& f		"		:41.
"						:252
D EFG		& de	g	vg		:488
DE	& SA C	& LP	7			}355
FG						
DE	& BC	&				}517
FG				& defg	vg	Or
D* FG	& ABC	& P		&		cop aeth:513
D ^C E		& L	7		vg syr ^P	
D*E						
D ^C	& SA	& LP	7		vg	}258
FG						
D*E	& ABC	& P		& def	vg syr ^{sch}	Or cop aeth:460
D ^C FG				g		

unsupported by majuscule evidence, can be traced back to a very early period by virtue of the evidence of the versions and fathers. The writer would therefore conclude that the value of the Western majuscules lies not in their indicating, which they do not, a recension-like unity similar to that of the Alexandrian group, but rather in their demonstration of the ancient character and the geographical dispersion of readings which are demonstrably of ancient standing.

We shall proceed next to the Latin versions, the Itala and the Vulgate. But first a brief resume of their history is in place.

The Old Latin translation arose probably in North Africa, Rome and Southern Italy in Christian circles were too thoroughly Greek at first to need a Latin text. It appears to have been made at or soon after the middle of the second century, and to have been used, for example, by the translator of Irenaeus.... I think that we may count upon the existence of this translation as early as the year 170 at the least.¹

Another Latin text developed later, apparently in Northern Italy.

These two Latin texts have very much in common, both in the underlying Greek text and in language, and many of the differences are fully compatible with the supposition that the African was the parent of the European text, having undergone revision when it travelled northwards, and been in some measure adapted to the needs of a more highly cultivated population. On the other hand, other differences, not so easily accounted for by this process, afford some justification for the alternative view that Italy had an indigenous version of her own, not less original than the African.²

1. Gregory, Canon and Text, p. 156.

2. Westcott and Hort, op. cit., pp. 78-79.

Later there is supposed to have been "another change in the Itala, based on the Greek MSSS Augustine probably used such a text."¹

In response to Pope Damasus' request, Jerome of Stridon undertook a revision of the Latin text, completing the Gospels in 384, the rest of the N.T. in probably the following two years.² "Internal evidence shows that the Latin MSS which he took as a basis for his corrections contained an already revised text, chiefly if not wholly 'Italian' in character." When the revision of the Gospels found so much opposition, "in the other books of the New Testament...his changes were evidently much scantier and more perfunctory. ...We learn from his own account nothing about his Greek MSS except that they were old."³ One of the Greek mss. used largely by Jerome "must have had to a great extent a common original with A."⁴

It was centuries before the revision of Jerome was accepted by the Church. When Gregory the Great sat in the chair at Rome both the old and the new translation were there in use. Sometimes the ninth century has been named as the time at which Jerome's work came into general use. Yet the Anglo-Saxons, who copied many manuscripts, kept to the old text. And the manuscript of the Old-Latin text marked c, the Codex Colbertinus, was written in the eleventh century, and that Gigas, the gigantic manuscript at Stockholm with the Acts and Revelation in Old-Latin, was written in the thirteenth century.⁵

1. Ibid., p. 79.

2. Gregory, Textkritik, p. 614.

3. Westcott and Hort, op. cit., p. 80.

4. Ibid., p. 152.

5. Gregory, Canon and Text, pp. 411-412.

The Clementine Vulgate of 1592 is the official and final revision of the Latin text by the Catholic Church.¹

In this thesis is analysed the evidence of the Itala text of the bi-lingual codices, DEFG, only where the Latin disagrees with the Greek. Of d Souter writes: "The Latin is not an exact translation of its accompanying Greek, but, except where it has been harmonised with the Vulgate in the longest epistles, represents exactly the text used by Lucifer of Cagliari (in Sardinia) (d 371)." And of g he remarks: "It has many alternative interlinear readings, one of the two being Vulgate. The Old-Latin readings probably represent a fourth-century text, as they not infrequently agree with the text of the Pauline Epistles contained in the commentary by the 'Ambrosiaster,' who flourished in Rome about 375."²

There are 86 instances in which one or more of defg break from their Greek mates. This would, to the writer, indicate definitely the independent origins of the Itala versions in general, and the partial independence, in particular, of defg from their accompanying Greek texts.

The readings involved³ divide themselves into two groups.

1. Ibid., p. 413.

2. Op. cit., p. 45

3. d & P46 & FG :77,430
 d & " & ξ & FG & KLP ψ 7:95
 d & " & ξ^c B & D^c EFG & KL a3:97
 d & " & A & " & L ψ a7:223
 d & " & B & FG :78

40 in support of P46 and opposed to one or more of the

e	&	P46	&	Σ^* ABC				:192
e	&	"	&	Σ^* BC	&	D*	&	a7:127
e	&	"	&	AB	&	D* FG		:232
e	&	"	&	Σ^* AB	&	D* FG		:90
e	&	"	&	Σ B	&	D* FG		:255
e	&	"			&	D* FG		:323
e	&	"			&	D* FG		:224
e	&	"	&	Σ ABC			&	LPJa7:493
e	&	"	&	Σ AB	&	D* FG		:282
e	&	"	&	Σ ABC	&	"	&	PJ :549
e	&	"	&	B	&	"	&	P :397
de	&	"	&	Σ A C	&	D*		:143
"	&	"	&	Σ AB*	&	FG		:495
"	&	"	&	B	&	"		:301
"	&	"			&	"		:12
"	&	"			&	"	&	Ja7:167
"	&	"	&	Σ ABC			&	LPJa7:540
"	&	"	&	Σ ABC	&	D ^c FG	&	LPJa7:141
"	&	"	&	"	&	FG	&	" :139
"	&	"	&	"	&	FG	&	KLPJa7:23
f	&	"	&	"			&	LPJa7:428
f	&	"	&	Σ AB	&	D ^c E	&	LPJa7 :257
ef	&	"	&	"	&	D ^c E	&	" :255
g	&	"	&	"	&	D E	&	" :283
g	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	L Ja7:470
g	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	KL Ja7:117
fg	&	"	&	Σ A C	&	D ^c E	&	LPJa7:448
"	&	"	&	Σ AB	&	D E	&	LJa7 :75
d fg	&	"	&	B*	&	D ^c E	&	L :231
"	&	"	&	Σ AB	&	D ^c E	&	LPJa7:221
"	&	"	&	Σ ABC	&	D ^c E	&	LPJa7:377
defg	&	"	&	Σ B				:548
"	&	"	&	Σ B*			&	LP :230
"	&	"	&	Σ ABC			&	LPJa7:388
d					&	FG		:184,427,446
d			&	Σ ABC			&	LJa7:195
d			&	Σ A C	&	D ^c E	&	KLPJa7:137
d			&	Σ^c	&	D ^c EFG	&	LPJa7:290
d					&	D ^c FG	&	L Ja7:193
e			&	B	&	D*		:138
e			&	B	&	D* FG		:448
e			&	Σ^* A				:46
e			&	Σ^* AB				:102
e			&	Σ^c	&	D ^c	&	L Ja7:217
e			&	Σ ABC	&	D* FG	&	P :513
e			&	"	&	D ^c	&	LPJa7:392
e					&	D ^c FG	&	L Ja7:194
e					&	D* FG		:306

Western mss., 44 opposed to P46, which in such a reading would be supported by the Greek ms. whose Itala mate diverges.

Most important, of course, are the readings in which the entire Itala group breaks from DEFG. We note that there are six of these, in five of which the Itala goes directly back to Alexandrian readings, an indication of the early origin of the Itala. That in two of these, instances, however, DEFG likewise go back to Alexandrian, though opposing, readings, intimates in no uncertain terms that early Alexandrian readings were perpetuated both through the Itala and through the Western Greek majuscles.

The three instances in which dfg break from their majuscles indicate the same conclusion.

de	&	FG	:155,321,364,419
			9,11,39,112,437,440
"	& B*	& FG	:504
"	& β ABC	& "	& P :378
f	& β AB*	& D*	& KLP ψ :77
f	& β ABC	& D ^e E	& KLP ψ a7 :26
f	& β A ^c B	& D ^c	& KLP ψ a7 :267
f	& β A	& D E	& " :78
f	& β ABC	& D*E	& P :460
fg	& β^c	& D ^c E	& ψ :542
"	& β A	& D E	& P ψ a7 :468
"		& D*E	:526
"	& A		:545
def	& A	& LP ψ a7	:300
def	& β^*A		:299
efg	& β AB	& D*	& K P :10
"			& KL :53
defg	& β^c B		:387
"		& L ψ a7	:336
"	& β^*A C	& P	:339

The readings in which f and g, singly or together, break from their majuscles but at the same time support DEde, prove nothing except the independence of fg from their majuscle reading. The antiquity need not extend back beyond de.

There are two readings of interest however in this class. In (545) fg breaks with DEFGde to support A. And in (428), breaking away again, it supports P46~~ABCLP~~7. The alliance with the entire Alexandrian group makes this significant, although one can explain f's testimony by influence from the Constantinople group. The witness of P46, however, in the writer's opinion, makes the latter unlikely.

The readings in which de break from DE to support only FGfg are notable. Five of the group are possibly errors peculiar to the Itala and followed in FG. Although it is not impossible that they have an early origin as the writer conjectured above. The other five give every evidence of an Egyptian origin, through the early Itala translations. For, apparently stemming from the same original source, is the supporting testimony of syr^{sch} Or in (440), syr cop aeth Or in (419), syr Or in (155), syr^{sch} Or in (112) and (9).

It will be recalled that in discussing Alexandrian testimony, the writer used the argument that the original Greek could be the one source for Origen's testimony,

syr testimony, and Itala testimony which all three followed. The writer does not now intend to use Origen and syr as a proof for the early origin of the Itala and its transmission of Egyptian readings into fourth, seventh, and ninth century Western documents. The concurrence, however, of defgFG syr Or with cop aeth in (419) demonstrates beyond a reasonable doubt that the Latin Itala, specifically de, does transmit Egyptian readings independently. When, therefore, Or syr Itala concur without support of the Egyptian versions, it seems more logical to assume that again there is a common second century source, rather than to try to find a "peculiar Western reading" in Or syr Itala which might have arisen from the "Caesarean" text.

That this hypothesis is sound is demonstrated by the nine variants in which de P46 FGfg agree, supported in the majority of instances by the complete Alexandrian tradition; and by the two variants in which only de FGfg agree, supported however by B* (504) and ~~ABC~~. (378).

Itala e breaks most frequently with its majuscule of the individual mss., 20 times in all. If one assumes that it parted from d because of the Greek mss. (it supports D*FG frequently), he has a difficult time explaining why in three instances it follows D^c vs D*E, in 13 instances D* vs D^cE, and why in four instances it follows neither. Rather than assume that e selected critically from the readings of D* and D^c, even rejecting some, the writer would assume

Itala testimony in e which goes back to early Greek sources. For even if one does predicate a critical e scribe, it remains to be explained upon what basis that scribe, in three instances, ignored completely the testimony of the Western majuscles, of d and of Constantinople mss., and went back to the reading of P46~~8~~*ABC (192), ~~8~~*A (46), and ~~8~~*AB (102).

The text of d has already been identified as ^{to} fourth century Sardinian.¹ It is impossible that it should have been influenced by its younger brethren, E(D^cE?)FGefg. It also extremely unlikely, though not impossible, that it should have felt Constantinople influence. Be that as it may, d deserts DEe in (430) and (77) to support readings of P46 and FG, readings, by the way, which before the discovery of P46 were "Western" idiosyncrasies; and in (78) it joins P46BFG against the protest of its own family group.

One explanation for these phenomena is to assume direct contact in these instances between d and second-century Egyptian readings by means of the Itala translation. A second possibility exists, however; namely, that d might have been influenced by a Gallic or Italian Greek ms. other than D, containing readings which could be traced back to second century Egypt, and which therefore make of d's peculiar testimony, not an indication of Itala translation of an early reading, but a modification in the Itala because of the influence of third or fourth century Greek mss.

1. Souter, op. cit., p. 45.

Admitting for the moment the plausibility of this argument, the writer would point to the three variants in which d, four or five centuries before F and G were written, broke from D to adopt a reading which later appears in FGfg. Easy enough, one says. FGfg follow d. But d supposedly broke from D to follow a Greek ms. That would make the testimony of FGfg of mor^e importance, in these instances, than perhaps that of D. And there would be no longer any room for "Western" idiosyncrasies.

Either of these two explanations, therefore, carries the independent testimony of FGdfg back to second century Egypt, either through the Itala or through Greek mss.

By strange chance, these two explanations of the three variants which are supported solely by FGdfg, bring us into contact with the "Caesarean" theory. Variants (446) and (184) find Origen's testimony in accordance with that of FG. The reader will recall that these apparent "Western" readings in Origen were explained either as textual emendations in the translation of Rufinus, or identical readings derived from the same source, in the case of FGdfg, possibly through the Itala, possible through Greek mss. These latter two possibilities once again present themselves. If we assume that Origen's testimony was really that which Rufinus asserts, then either of these two possibilities, or even both, find ready acceptance. There is room then, however, for but few Western peculiarities.

If, on the other hand, we assume an emendation by

Rufinus, then the possibility of an eccentric reading must be granted. The writer freely admits that possibility. He would point out, however, that the compass of what are called Western peculiarities has become extremely limited, and that the second century testimony which the Itala has been demonstrated to contain, supplemented by the direct influence of second century readings through the Greek on so far removed witnesses as F and G, have deposited the Western text and "Western" readings not only on the doorstep but before the fireplace of second century New Testament textual tradition.

The next group of readings to be considered are those of the Vulgate. Since the Vulgate is a revision of the Itala, it is chiefly from this viewpoint that we wish to analyse its testimony.¹

1.							
vg	& d		& P46	& β ABC	& D*E		:194
"	& e	& syr	& "	& β^c AB		& Lj*	:286
"	& "	& "	& "	& β ABC	& D ^c E	& LPJa7:	469
"	& e	& syr ^p	& "	& "	& D EFG	& PJa7:	537
"	& de		& "	& "		& LPJa7:	540
"	& de		& "	& β^* BC	& D*	& a7:	127
"	& de	& syr ^{sch}	& "	& β ABC	& D E	& P	:431
"	& de	& syr ^p	& "	& β AB	& "	& Pj	:348
"	& f	& "	& "	& β AB	& D ^c E	& LPJa7:	306
"	& fg		& "		& FG	& j	:201
"	& fg	& syr	& "	& β ABC		& LPJa7:	395
"	& fg	& "	& "	& β A C	& D ^c E	& LPJa7:	448
"	& fg		& "	& β A C	& D ^c EFG	& "	:138
"	& ef	& "	& "	& β AB	& D ^c E	& "	:255
"	& ef	& "	& "	& "	& "	& "	:257
"	& de g		& "	& "	& D EG*	& L Ja7:	226
"	& "		& "	& "	& D EF ^c G	& LPJa7:	242
"	& efg		& "		& D* FG		:323
"	& e fg		& "		& "		:278
"	& "		& "	& β AB	& D ^c E	& LPJa7:	221

Out of a total of 142 readings in which the testimony

vg	& d fg	& syr	& P46	& ξ^c BC	& DEFG	& KLP	Va7:46
"	& defg	& "	& "	& ξ B*		& LP	:230
"	& "	& "	& "	& ξ ABC		& LP	Va7:388
"	& "	& syr ^D	& "		& D EFG	& KL	Va7:65
"	& "	& "	& "		& FG	&	Va7:167
"	& "	& "	& "		& D EFG		:425
"	& "	& "	& "		& "		:310
"	& "	& "	& "		& D* FG		:224
"	& "	& "	& "			& KL	Va7:111
"	& "	& "	& "	& B	& FG		:301
"	& "	& "	& "	& ξ AB*	& FG		:495
"	& "	& syr ^D	& "	& ξ B	& D* FG		:259
"	& "	& "	& "	& "	& D EFG		:240
"	& "	& syr ^{sch}	& "	& ξ AB	& D EFG		:292
"	& "	& "	& "	& ξ ABC	& D*EFG		:483
"	& "	& syr ^D	& "	& "	& D* FG	& ψ	:549
"	& "	& "	& "	& "	& D*EFG	& P	:130
"	& "	& syr ^{sch}	& "	& ξ^* ABC	& D EFG	& P	:418,447
"	& "	& "	& "	& ξ ABC*&	& "	&	:341
"	& "	& syr	& "	& ξ AB	& "	& ψ	:92
"	& "	& "	& "	& ξ^* A	& "	& P	:154
"	& "	& "	& "	& B	& "	& L ψ	:544
"	& "	& "	& "	& ξ^c B	& "	& LP	a7:455
"	& "	& "	& "	& A	& D ^c EFG	& L	Va7:223
"	& "	& "	& "	& ξ^c	& D EFG	& LP	Va7:370
"	& "	& "	& "	& ξ A	& "	& KL	Va7:106
"	& "	& "	& "	& B*	& D ^c E	& L	:231
"	& "	& "	& "	& ξ AB	& D E	& LP	a7:283
"	& "	& "	& "	& ξ AB	& "	& KL	Va7:117
"	& "	& "	& "	& ξ ABC	& FG	& LP	Va7:139
(Itala is not recorded in the following 5 variants)							
"	& "	& "	& "		& D EFG	& L	Va7:189
"	& "	& "	& "	& ξ^c B	& "	& "	:166
"	& "	& "	& "	& ξ ABC	& "	& LP	:524
"	& "	& "	& "	& ξ BC	& "	& LP	Va7:165
"	& "	& syr ^D	& "	& ξ^c B	& "	& KL	Va7:167
(Itala is opposed to vg in the following 8 variants)							
"	& syr	& "	& "	& ξ^c A C	& D ^c	& LP	Va7:456
"	& "	& "	& "	& ξ ABC	& D ^c	& "	:539
"	& syr ^D	& "	& "	& "	& D ^c E	& LP	Va7:177
"	& syr	& "	& "	& ξ AB		& L	Va7:500
"	& "	& "	& "	& ξ ABC		& LP	Va7:136
"	& "	& "	& "	& "		& KLP	Va7:55
"	& "	& "	& "	& "		& LP	Va7:547
"	& syr ^D	& "	& "	& "		& LP	Va7:360

in which the Vulgate abandons the Itala entirely, eight times in support of P46, 14 times in opposition to P46, an indication perhaps of the closer relationship of P46 to the Itala than to the Vulgate. In 13 of the 22 instances, the Vulgate abandons likewise the Western majuscles (although it is a moot question whether D^c and D^cE when supporting Constantinople mss. are Western witnesses). In all 13 readings but two, the vg follows at least one Alexandrian ms. (β^c with Constantinople mss. is not considered an Alexandrian witness), in eight instances two or more Alexandrian majuscles agreeing. This would indicate that Jerome was careful in changing a reading of the Itala, doing so only when he had what he considered strong proof. In but one instance did he change upon what appears to be little support, variant (41).

(No Itala is recorded for the following variants)

vg		& FG	:164
"	& β* A	& D E	:100
"	& β ABC	& KLP	Ja7:44
" & syr ^p	& β ABC	& D ^c & LP	Ja7:361
"	& β C	& D EFG & KLP	Ja7:50
"	& β ^c C ^c	& D ^c FG & L	Ja7:311
" & syr		& J	:2
	(vg vs Itala)		
"	& B		:41
" & syr ^p	& β	& BV	:297
"	& β A	& P	:229
" & "	& β ^c	& KLP	:15
" & "	& β ^c	& KLP	Ja7:93
" & syr ^{sch}	& β C	& "	:16
" & syr	& β A B	& "	:288
" & syr ^{sch}	& β ABC*	& a	a7:17
" & syr ^p		& D ^c E & L	Ja7:513
" & syr	& β ^c	& " & LP	Ja7:90
"	& A	& D ^c & LP	Ja7:258
"	& β* A	& D*	J :97
" & syr ^p	& β ABC	& D E & LP	Ja7:440
" & syr	& A C	& D EFG & "	:548

in which only B of the majuscules supports him. Both Origen and Methodius, however, support him in his choice.

There are but two of what to the writer seem late Syriac readings, (15) and (93), in which vg syrP ζ^c and the Constantinople mss. agree.

The variants for which Tischendorf includes no specific Itala readings support the same conclusion as above given, that Jerome, if he changed from the Itala at all, or the accepted Western reading, did so only for good reasons.

In examining the variants in which Jerome apparently selects one of two Itala readings, we note that he usually picks the reading supported by strong Western majuscule or strong Alexandrian testimony, or both.

In (201) we note that he picks a reading held by P46 FGfgh. In (111) he follows defg against ζ ARDEFG, his reading being justified by P46KL ψ AVH*0142 Clem Ath Chr Or Ambrst. Contrary, however, to overwhelming opposing evidence he keeps defg in (11)(39)(364) with FG Ambrst, a sign of his reluctance to abandon the text with which the Latin world was familiar.¹

Of the Latin patristic testimony we shall take up first that which is most complete; namely the testimony of Ambrosiaster, whose writings, with those of Tertullian,

1. Augustin wrote to Jerome of a congregation which threatened to abandon their bishop unless he restored the old Latin reading of Jonah IV 6, which he had replaced with Jerome's reading, based on the Hebrew. (Gregory, Canon and Text, p. 411.)

Hoskier found alone of the Latin fathers to "reveal vestiges of the pre-third century text of the Pauline epistles."¹

"Ambrosiaster oder Pseudo-Ambrosius, vielleicht Faustinus, ein roemischer Presbyter, der nach der Mitte des vierten Jahrhunderts bluehte und folgendes Buch schrieb oder zusammenraeffte: "Commentaria in tredecim epistulas beati Pauli", das den Werken des Ambrosius beige stellt wird."² Faustinus, who may have been Ambrosiaster, was "ein roemischer Presbyter zur Zeit des Ludiferianischen Schismas um das Jah 383."³ Souter, however, writes that "Ambrosiaster...is generally agreed now to have been Isaac, a converted Jew, the enemy of Pope Damasis." The text, he observes, "is like that used by Ambrose, and may have been the very text which Jerome took as the basis of the Vulgate."⁴ Thinking ahead to the testimony of Ambrosiaster, the writer would ask the question: did Jerome use Ambrosiaster, or did Ambrosiaster use Jerome?

In the testimony of Ambrosiaster⁵ we find first of

1. "A Study of the Chester-Beatty Papyrus," p. 152.

2. Gregory, Textkritik, p. 773.

3. Ibid., p. 794.

4. Op. cit., p. 88.

5.

Ambst	&	P46	&	defg	&	vg	&	D	EFG			:310,425			
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	∅	B	:240			
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	D*EFG	&	∅	ABC	:483			
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	P	:130		
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	D	EFG	&	∅	AB	&	∅	:92
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	∅	ABC	&	LPV		:524
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	∅	ABC*				:341
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	∅	BC*&	KLPV			:172
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	∅*ABC	&	P			:418,447

all, and most important, a remarkable agreement with the

Ambst	&	P46	&	defg	&	D EFG	&	§*ABC	&	P	:441
"	&	"	&	"	&	vg	&	§ BC	&	LP	7:165
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	§ A	&	KL	7:105
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	"	:106
"	&	"	&	"	&	vg	&	§ ^c B	&	"	:67
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	§ ^c	&	LP	7:370
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	B	&	L	7:544
"	&	"	&	"	&	vs	&	AB	&	KL	7:297
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	§*A	&	P	:154
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	KL	7:65
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	L	7:189
"	&	"	&	"	&	D* FG	&	§ B	&		:259
"	&	"	&	"	&	vs	&	§*AB	&		:90
"	&	"	&	"	&	FG	&	§ AB*	&		:488
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	B	&		:301
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	7:167	
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	§ B*	&	LP	:230
"	&	"	&	"	&	D ^c E	&	B*	&	L	:231
"	&	"	&	"	&	D ^c EFG	&	A	&	L	7:223
"	&	"	&	"	&	D* FG	&	§ ABC	&	P	:549
"	&	"	&	"	&	FG	&	§ ABC	&	LP	7:139
"	&	"	&	"	&	D E	&	§ AB	&	KL	7:117
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	KL	7:111
"	&	"	&	e	&	D ^c E	&	§ ABC	&	LP	7:469
"	&	"	&	de	&	D*	&	§ ^c A	&		:143
"	&	"	&	"	&	D*	&	§ BC	&	7:127	
"	&	"	&	"	&	D E	&	§ ABC	&	P	:431
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	§ AB	&	P	:348
"	&	"	&	"	&	D* FG	&	B	&	P	:397
"	&	"	&	fg	&	FG	&		&		:142
"	&	"	&	fg	&	"	&	§ ABC	&	LP	7:395
"	&	"	&	"	&	FG	&	§ ABC	&	LP	7:312
"	&	"	&	"	&	D* FG	&	B	&		:137
"	&	"	&	d g	&	FG	&		&		:77
"	&	"	&	"	&	FG	&	B	&		:78
"	&	"	&	ef	&	D ^c E	&	§ AB	&	LP	7:285
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	§ ABC	&	LP	7:428
"	&	"	&	d fg	&	"	&		&		:44
"	&	"	&	"	&	D* FG	&		&		:181,278
"	&	"	&	"	&	vs	&	"	&		:279
"	&	"	&	"	&	D*EFG	&		&		:361
"	&	"	&	"	&	D EFG	&	§ ^c	&	KL	7:102
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	§ ^c BC	&	KL	7:46
"	&	"	&	"	&	2	&	§ AB	&	LP	7:221
"	&	"	&	efg	&	D E	&	§ BC	&	L	7:470
"	&	"	&	"	&	D* FG	&		&		:323
"	&	"	&	"	&	vg	&	§ AB	&	LP	7:500
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	§ ABC	&	LP	7:55,547
"	&	"	&	"	&	D ^c	&	"	&	KL	7:14

Vulgate text. Of the 102 variants in which Tischendorf

Ambst	& defg	& vg	& FG					
"	&	"	& harl&	FG				:9,11,39,112,155,364
"	&	"	& vg &	D EFG				:440
"	&	"	& "		& $\beta^*A C$	& P		:104
"	&	"	& "			& LP	Va7:336	:1339
"	&	"	& "	& "	& A C			:394
"	&	"	& "	& "		& L	Va7:337	:394
"	&	"	& "	& D ^c E		& L	Va7:207	
"	&	"	& "	& D ^c EFG	& β^c	& LP	Va7:290	
"	&	"	& "	& D EFG	& β^c	& KL	Va7:83	
"	&	"	& "	& "	& A C	& LP	Va7:426	
"	&	"	& "	& "	& $\beta^c A C$	& "		:443
"	&	"	& "	& D E	& $\beta^c A$	& P	Va7:468	
"	&	"	& "	& D ^c E	& β^c	& LP	Va7:232	
"	&	"	& "	& "	& β^c	& U		:542
"	&	"	& "	& D	& $\beta^c AB$	& K P		:10
"	&	"	& "	FG	& $\beta^c ABC$	& P		:378
"	&	e	& "	& D E	& A	& P		:95
"	&	e	& "	& D ^c	& β^c	& L	Va7:217	
"	&	f	& "	& D ^c	& $\beta^c A^c B$	& LP	Va7:267	
"	&	de	& "	& D E				:103
"	&	"	vs "	& D*	& B			:138
"	&	"	vs "	& D* FG	& B			:448
"	&	"	& "	& D E	& $\beta^c ABC$:308
"	&	fg	& "	FG				:164,266
"	&	fg vs	"	& D EFG	&			:540
"	&	fg & vg	&	& D ^c FG	& $\beta^c C^c$	& L	Va7:311	
"	&	de g	&	& D EFG				:487,488
"	&	d g vs	"	& D* FG				:257
"	&	def	&	& D E				:463
"	&	"	&	& D*E		& P		:460
"	&	d fg	&	& D EFG				:493
"	&	"	vs "	& D* FG				:177
"	&	"	&	& D FG	& B ^c			:45
"	&	"	&	& D ^c FG		& L	Va7:193	
"	&	"	&	& D/EFG	& β^c	& L	Va7:192	
"	&	efg vs	"	& D ^c FG		& L	Va7:194	
(no Itala recorded in the following variants)								
"	&	"	&			& U		:2
"	&	vs "		& β^*				:456
"	(& sprachgr)			& A				:237
"	&	vg & D ^c E		& β^c		& L	Va7:513	
"	&	"		& β^c		& LP	Va7:93	
"	&	"		& β^c		& KL	Va7:15	
"	&	"		& β^*A		& P		:229
"	&	"		& β^c	C	& KL	Va7:16	
"	&	"		& $\beta^c A$		& LP	Va7:473	
"	&	"		& $\beta^c AB$		& LP	Va7:288	
"	&	"	& D*	& β^*A		& U		:97

quotes both Ambrst and vg, only 15 show disagreement; not quite the harmony which Souter predicates, but noteworthy nonetheless.

In the variants in which Ambrosiaster differs with the Vulgate, he always is supported by some Itala testimony. In one case he is supported by defg, in six instances by a combination of three of the four Itala witnesses, and in six instances by at least two. The writer notices, in looking at the table, that Ambrosiaster differs with the Vulgate and e six times, an indication of possible connection between e and the Vulgate. Checking back on the vg tables, he finds that while Jerome supports d and g each but once against the other Itala mss., he supports e eight times, a possible relationship which can be investigated on the basis of more extensive material than Tischendorf presents.

In variant (283) Ambst supports both a reading peculiar to FG and a reading found in DEdefg and the other witnesses, an indication either ^{of} different sources in the two instances or of the exercise of critical judgment.

In variant (553), which relates to the position of Romans XVI 24, Ambst with P arm syr^{sch} aeth places v. 24 after v. 27.

The author's study of the testimony of Augustin, "Bischof von Hippo, geboren 354, gestorben 430,"¹ concludes as doesthe analysis of Westcott and Hort, who predicate

1. Gregory, Textkritik, p. 779.

another change in the Itala, beyond the African and Northern Italian, based on Greek mss., a type of text which Augustin probably used.¹ For among the variants² to which Augustin bears witness, we find four in which he supports each of two different readings. In (11) he supports both FGdefg vg and the opposing witnesses. In (93) he now supports vg, now defg. In (95) he uses the reading of dfg one time, that of e vg at another time. In (337) he now supports, now opposes defg vg.

1. Op. cit., p. 79.

2.

Aug	&	P46	&	Σ*AB	&	D*		vs	defg	vs	vg	vs	syr	:290	
"	&	"	&	Σ B	&	D* FG		&	"	&	"	&	syr ^D	:259	
"	&	"	&	Σ B	&	D EFG				vs	"	&	"	:16	
"	&	"			&	D		&	efg	&	"		"	:323	
"	&	"			&	FG	&	↓	&	fg	&	"	"	:201	
"	&	"	&	Σ AB	&		&	KLPJa7	&	vs	"	&	"	:103	
"	&	"	&	Σ ABC			&	LPJa7	&	f	&	"	"	:428	
"	&	"	&	Σ* BC	&	D*	&	a7	&	de	&	"	"	:127	
"	&	"	&	Σ ABC	&	D ^c	&	KLPJa7	vs	defg	vs	"	&	syr ^D	:14
"	&	"	&	Σ AB	&	D ^c E	&	LPJa7	&	f	&	"	&	"	:306
"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	"	&	ef	&	"	&	syr	:257
"	&	"	&	Σ ABC	&	D E	&	KLPJa7	vs	defg	vs	"	vs	"	:9
"	&	"	&	Σ ^c B	&	D EFG	&	L Ja7	vs	"	vs	"	&	syr	:339
"	&	"	&	Σ B	&	"	&	LPJa7				&	syr ^D	:237	
"	&	"	&	Σ AB	&	"	&	L a7	&	"	vs	"	&	syr ^{sch}	:297
"	&	"	&	Σ BC*	&	"	&	LPJa7	vs	"	vs	"	&	syr	:172
"	&	"	&	Σ AB	&	"	&	↓	&	"	&	"	&	syr	:92
"	&	"	&	Σ ABC	&	"	&	PJa7	&	e	&	"	&	syr ^D	:537
"	&	"	&	Σ ABC*	&	D EFG			&	defg	&	"		:341	
"	&	"	&	Σ*ABC	&	D*EFG			&	d fg	vs	"		:217	
"			&	B										:1	
"			&	B						vs	defg	&	"	:41	
"							&	L						:234	
"			&	B	&	D* FG								:6	
"			&	A C	&	D EFG			&	defg	&	"	&	syr ^D	:394
"			&	Σ*A			&	P			&	"		:229	
"			&	Σ ABC			&	P			vs	"	vs	"	:189
"			&	Σ A C			&	Pa7	vs	defg	vs	"	&	syr ^D	:544
"			&	Σ AB			&	LPJa7	vs	"	&	"	&	syr	:288
"			&	Σ ABC			&	KLPJa7	vs	d fg	&	"	&	"	:44
"					&	D ^c FG	&	L Ja7	vs	d	vs	vg	&	syr	:194

In the other variants, those included in the table, in which he adheres to but one reading, he now abandons both defg and vg, now either of the two, now only part of the Itala. In but one reading, however, (544), does he abandon both Itala and vg without having supporting testimony for his reading in one or more of the Western majuscles. In that instance, he supports ξ ACPa7, evidently an Alexandrian reading, to which type he is apparently partial, using only five readings out of 36 which no Alexandrian mss. witness (ξ^c is not considered Alexandrian). The variant (234) in which he agrees only with L of the majuscles can be explained, perhaps, by the agreement of aeth, which may indicate an obscure Egyptian reading which Augustin adopted. Its appearance in L can be explained by syr^Darm, which may have obtained it from the same source as did aeth Aug. It is easy enough, however, to remove the whole difficulty by calling it a scribal emendation (cf. Appendix II).

Another North African witness we have in Cyprian, "zum Bischof von Carthago etwa 280 eingesetzt; starb 258."¹ Souter writes concerning him:

The existence of a (relatively) complete New Testament in Africa first comes into clear view in the writings of Cyprian..., who quotes a Latin Bible abundantly and accurately. The fact that on close study the translation used by him shows secondary characteristics confirms the conclusion that in Tertullian's time a Latin New Testament already existed in Africa, and suggests that it is the result of a long period of translation commenced not later than 150.²

Aug	& ξ^c	& D ^c E	& KLP ^a 7	vs defg	& vg	& syr	:90
"	& ξ	& "	& "	& "	& "	& "	:232
"	& ξ AB	& "	& "	vs d fg	& "	& "	:279
"	& ξ ABC	& "	& "	vs defg	vs "	& "	:224
"	& "	& FG	& P	& "	& "	& syr ^D	:378

The evidence of Cyprian,¹ though meager, indicates general agreement with the Itala vg tradition. His testimony, however, is not unanimous, for in (290) he disregards defg vg for P46~~g~~*ABD*. Whether it was the Western or Alexandrian mss. which influenced him one cannot tell. The fact that in variant (315) Cyprian follows a reading found only in B Clem Amb sah would lead one to assume the Alexandrian. Variant (337), in which there is no Alexandrian, but Western and Const. support, would indicate the Western influence. Evidence, therefore, does not permit a decision either way.

Variant (226) brings us to the perennial "Caesarean" question. FG^c syr^{sch} OrCypHil agree. Everything points to a Latin emendation by Rufinus, the peculiar reading having arisen perhaps in Carthage, where Cyprian used it, except for syr^{sch}. How did the early Syriac translation,

1. Gregory, Textkritik, p. 786.

2. Op. cit., p. 36.

1.							
Cyp	&	P46	&	D EFG	&	defg & vg	:310
"	&	"	&g	AB &	"	& " & " & syr ^{sch}	:292
"	&	"	&	" &	L Va7	& " & syr	:189
"	&	"	&	g *AB &	D*	vs " & " vs "	:290
"	&	"	&	B* &	D ^c E &	KL & " & " & "	:231
"	&	"	&	g BC &	FG &	LPVa7 & fg	:312
"	&	"	&	g ^c BC &	D EFG &	KLPVa7 & d fg & " & "	:46
"			&	g ^c B &	" &	L Va7	:229
"			&	g ^c C ^c &	D ^c FG &	L Va7 & vg	:311
"			&	" &	D EFG &	L Va7 & defg & " & syr ^D	:337
"				" &	L Va7	& " & "	:336
"			&	B ^c &	D FG	& d fg & "	:45
"				" &	FG ^c	& de g vs " & syr ^{sch}	:226
"			&	B(&	Clem Amb sah)		:315

which presumably the Peshitta either incorporates or in the Pauline epistles actually is, get the reading? The writer would answer: from a common source, presumably second-century Egypt.

The quotations of Cyprian "which are fortunately copious and carefully made, and thus afford trustworthy standards of African Old Latin in a very early though not the earliest stage," differ from Tertullian's quotations, about which Westcott and Hort also remark: "The rich evidence supplied by Tertullian's works is indeed difficult to disentangle, because he was fond of using his knowledge of Greek by quoting Scripture in immediate and original renderings, the proportion of which to his quotations from the existing version is indeterminate but certainly large."¹

Tertullian was born "in Carthago etwa im Jahre 150 oder 145, zum Presbyter ernannt etwa 192, vielleicht im Jahre 199 Montanist geworden, starb ungefaehr im Jahre 240."²

"The statements of Tertullian leave no doubt that when he wrote, near the beginning of the third century, a Latin translation of the New Testament was already current in North Africa."³ "...in addition to his actual mention of existing Latin translations, it is clear that he sometimes

1. Op. cit., p. 78.

2. Gregory, Textkritik, p. 818.

3. Westcott and Hort, op. cit., p. 78

used them himself. A study of his quotations by Monceaux has shown that he must have possessed translations of Luke, John, Galatians, First Corinthians, Romans, and Ephesians."¹ (N.B.:the reader will do well to recall this paragraph when the relationship of P46 to the Itala is treated in ch. VII.)

That "there is a wider difference between the earlier and later stages of the 'Old Latin'...than between the later stages and the Vulgate"² is a detail which the meager testimony of Tertullian included in this thesis does not bring out.

The few variants in which Tertullian testifies³ show that he had a mixed type of text. It was a text which followed Alexandrian readings, to be found in all or part of the Western majuscles, but not always found in the Itala mss. which we include in our study. Nothing more definite can be said. One may bear in mind, however, that in Tertullian we find the same close relation of Alexandrian and Western readings which we find in P46. Furthermore, Tertullian, living at the time when P46 was presumably written, forms an excellent channel for the entrance of old, second century Greek readings

1. Souter, op. cit., p. 35.

2. Westcott and Hort, op. cit., p. 78.

3.

Tert	& P46	& A	& DEFG	& defg	vs	vg	& syr ^{sch}	:15
"	& "	& AB	& "		vs	"	& syr ^P	:16
"	& "	& § ABC	& DE & KL P ⁷	vs	"	vs	"	vs syr :9
"	& "	& "	& "	vs	"	vs	"	:11
"	& "	& "	& D ^c	vs	"	vs	"	& syr ^P :14
"	& "	& §	& FG & KL P ⁷	& d fg	vs	"	& syr	:95
"		& § AB	& D & K P	& defg	&	"		:10
"		& A	& D ^c E & LP ⁷	vs	"	vs	"	& syr ^{sch} :259
"		& § ^c	& DEFG & KL P ⁷	&	"	&	"	& syr :120

into the Latin tradition, to crop out perhaps in the Itala in variants such as (95), where d breaks from DE to join FGfgP46 β against the vg (the Constantinople agreement in this variant being accounted for by syr^{utr}). One may assume in such cases, the writer believes, that dfg represents one channel, FG β 46 β another (the writer will demonstrate in ch. VII the "channel" between FG and P46), through which the same reading traveled, in translation and in the Greek, from its second century source, to be reunited in codices FGfg.

We come next to the testimony of Hilary of Poitiers, "etwa im Jahre 310 (Andere 320) geboren, vom Heidentum zum Christentum bekehrt, im Jahre 354 zum Bischof von Poitiers ernannt; im Jahre 356 wegen seiner Angriffe auf die Arianer in Phrygien vertrieben, wurde er im Jahre 360 wieder eingesetzt; er starb 368."¹

The general agreement of his testimony² with the Itala

1. Gregory, Textkritik, p. 800.

2.

Hil	& P46	&	AB	& D EFG		vs vg & syr ^P	:16
"	&	"		& FG &	U	& fg & "	:201
"	&	"		& D EFG &	KL Ua7	& defg & " & "	:65
"	&	"	& β ABC	& FG &	LP Ua7	& " & "	:139
"	&	"	& "	& D*EFG &	P	& " & "	:130
"	&	"	& β^c B	& D EFG &	KL Ua7	& " & "	:67
"	&	"	& β A	& " &	"		:105
"	&	"	& β A C	& D ^c EFG &	LP Ua7	& fg & "	:138
"				& D E		& def & " & syr	:463
"				& D E		& de & "	:103
"				& FG ^c		vsdeg vs " & syr ^{sch}	:226
"				& FG		& fg	:140
"			& β^c	& KLP U		& " & syr ^P	:15
"				& D EFG		& defg & "	:104
"				& D ^c FG &	L Ua7	& d fg & "	:193

and vg is immediately evident. Obviously, he used a text very similar to the basic text of the Vulgate.

A few of his readings are quite interesting.

In (15) there seems no reason for his breaking with the Itala and Western mss. to support the Constantinople text. The writer finds no indication in the evidence which Tischendorf offers that Hilary derives the reading from an ancient source. Apparently, therefore, the leaven of the Eastern text had, prior to the Vulgate, been working in Italy and Gaul, leavening a part of the lump of Ambrosiaster and Hilary, with whose reading Jerome agrees in his revision of the Latin text.

One wonders whether the solitary testimony of FGfghil in (40) will ever be vindicated by another P46, or whether we have here a "Western" reading.

Along the same line is the problem of (194): does FG go back through a Greek channel direct to an ancient reading which Clement knew, which was translated into aeth syr, and into the Itala, to be perpetuated in efg by such links as Aug Hil Ambrst, at the same time that L⁹va7H-0142 in the East followed that identical reading, which they found in syr Eus Chr Cyr Or and Clement; or are efg FG Hil Aug merely disciples of the Constantinople tradition?

Hil	& D ^c FG & L ⁹ va7	vs d	vs vg & syr:194
"	& S A C & D ^c E	& LP ⁹ va7	& de & " :137
"	& S A	& D E	& P ⁹ va7 & defg & " & syrsch:468
"	& S ^c	& D EFG	& KLP ⁹ va7 & defg & " & syr :120
"	& S ^c	& D EFG	& L ⁹ va7 & d fg & " :192

Checking over the table which lists these variants, one notices some remarkable things.

There are six readings in which Irenaeus agrees with Western majuscles which have only P46 as majuscule witness.

In (77), without the witness of P46, one had merely a "Western" reading, found peculiarly both in Western majuscles and the Syriac Peshitta. P46 comes along, establishes a common source for both FGdg and syr^{sch}, with Irenaeus, perhaps, as a link between P46 and FG.

B and FGdg stood alone formerly in (78). P46 assists now, and Irenaeus stands as connecting link.

A good question, in connection with these two variants, is: why does d break from D, and why f from F? Look at variants (17) and (279). DEFG and D*FG, respectively, supported by dfg, by Tertullian, by Irenaeus, and by P46. Would not a good answer be that in the text of P46 we have the common second century source, in Irenaeus the Greek link to the Western Greek texts, in Tertullian and the Itala the Latin link to dfg, because of which direct influence of second century readings through the Latin tradition, d can break from D in variants (77) and (78), to join gFG in supporting the common reading from which both Greek and Latin witnesses trace a separate descent?

The remaining readings uphold this hypothesis. Even variant (286), in which P46 Iren agree with only e vg of the Western witnesses, strengthens the case. Why does e

break from DEFGdfg? A possible explanation lies in the alternative of either the Latin translation which only e perpetuates, or the influence which the reading which Irenaeus upheld exerted on the Latin texts, but which was counteracted in the Greek mss. DEFG by some stronger influence.

The following tentative conclusions may be drawn from these variants: 1) Irenaeus had a ms., the text of which was very similar to that of P46, possibly a brother or cousin, which ms. he used in the West, readings of it being preserved in DEFG, in D*FG, in DE, in D^CE, and in EG, the various members of the Western family which we observed earlier in this chapter; 2) the Latin tradition is based on readings taken in many instances from mss. with a text similar to that of P46, which Latin tradition carries the readings through the centuries and places them, independently of the Greek text, into the great bi-lingual codices.

What of the disagreements between Irenaeus and P46?

In variant (1) Irenaeus supports B with OrChrAug. When we recall that P46 and B oftentimes support each other against the other Alexandrian majuscules, it is not difficult to understand that Irenaeus should include some readings of B which P46 does not support. The same holds for the solitary agreement of P46A in (172).

In variant (287), DEFGdefg Ir omit $\kappa\lambda$, which P46 has,

while all other witnesses replace it with $\lambda\nu\lambda\gamma\eta\eta$. Apparently P46 is closer to the Western reading than are the other mss.

The testimony of Irenaeus in variant (120) is doubtful. δ° DEFG Const.defg vg syr arm go insert $\tau\omega\nu\ \epsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\zeta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omega\nu$ $\epsilon\iota\phi\eta\rho\eta\nu$ after $\pi\omicron\delta\epsilon\varsigma$ in the clause $\omega\varsigma\ \omega\rho\alpha\iota\omicron\iota\ \omicron\iota\ \pi\omicron\delta\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\omega\nu\ \epsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\zeta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omega\nu\ \tau\omicron\ \gamma\epsilon\theta\alpha$. P46~~8~~*BAH-0142 sah cop aeth omit it. Irenaeus has et Paulus artem dicens: *Quam speciosi pedes evang. bona, evang. pacem.* Tischendorf¹ regards the phrase as an emendation. The fact that Irenaeus places the words at the end rather than within the clause would indicate either that he himself added them to make Paul's statement a complete quotation of Is. LII 7, or that he had a ms. which represented an intermediate step between the Alexandrian tradition and the Western-Constantinople text. He might have added the Western interpolation to his own briefer Alex. ms., placing it at the end instead of within the clause; or his ms. might have been an already emended Alexandrian ms., the emendation being in later copies of this verse placed within the clause.

In an additional variant, (6), Irenaeus' testimony is not applicable to the readings in question, but is presented here for the sake of completeness. P46~~8~~ABCD⁶E KLP~~7~~a7H-0142 have $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \upsilon\pi\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\eta\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\eta\theta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omicron\tau\epsilon\iota\ \omicron\iota\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota$. D*FG Cyr Aug add $\lambda\nu\theta\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon$ after $\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$. FGdfg have $\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \lambda\nu\theta\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon\ \upsilon\pi\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\eta\varsigma$.

1. In the apparatus to Romans X 15.

Irenaeus writes: ¹ννρ δε ωσπερ δεκ της υπακοης του ενος ανθρ. του πρωτου εκηης - ουτως εδει και δε υπακοης ενος ανθρωπ.

του πρωτου εκ παθρον γεγεννημενον δεκλιωθηνα πολλους. The fact that Irenaeus is quoting freely and using the words in a sense different from that of the original verse would prevent a definite conclusion as to which variant he supports.

The relationship between P46 and Irenaeus is noted also by Hoskier. In addition to variant (287), he lists 11 more readings² from seven of the Pauline epistles, in eight of which readings Irenaeus definitely agrees with P46, in another of which his testimony is doubtful.

The conclusions to which the testimony of Irenaeus can bring us are extremely significant. So much so that the writer will devote an additional chapter to the matter, approaching it with the question, Is there a Gallic-Smyrnaean text?

1. Quoted by Tischendorf in the apparatus to Romans V 19.
 2. (— means omit)
- "Rom VI 12 — ταις επιθυμιας Cum DEFG d*efg m Iren^{int} Or^{int}
 Tertbisvict tumpel
- IX 26 — υμεις post μου = syr aeth Iren Ambrst Pel^B
- XI 17 — της βιβλης και Cum DFG Iren boh^L
- 1 Cor VIII 6 — αλλ Cum B Tert Iren Eus et sah basm
- XV 54 — το δευτερον τουτο ενδουηται αποθρονη και
 Cum ~~BC~~* IM vg boh aeth Ath Hil Ambrst Iren^{int}
 Fulg Oros Bed
- Eph IV 9 — μερη Cum D*EFG deg goth syr aeth Tert Iren
 Lucif Theodrt Victorin Arit Vien Hil Hier Ambrst
- 16 και ερεγγελος (pro κατενεργειαν) Solus (Iren omits)
- 25 — διο Tert Iren(?) et Lucif
- Gal III 19 — κειν Cum FG g vg Iren^{int} Ambr
- Col I 18 — εν αντε των νεκρων Cum ~~B~~* Eus Iren^{int}
- III 5 — κακην post επιθυμιαν Cum FgG (Contra Iren Tert
 Cyp^E)

From the "Appendix," op. cit., pp. 7. ff. The two citations of Pelagius (Pel) have been added to the above by the writer from Hoskier's P46 Addenda et Corrigenda, p. 2. The conventional sign for Codex Alpha which Hoskier uses the writer has changed to β .

VII. Is there a Gallic- Smyrnaean Text?

We shall best approach the problem of our chapter by getting better acquainted with Irenaeus.

Irenaeus is another of the living bonds between the East and the West, between Smyrna, we may say in general Asia Minor, and Lyons or Gaul. It is to be agreed that we do not know positively that he was born and grew up in Asia Minor....I think, however, that his reverence to Smyrna and to Polycarp and to Florinus, a friend or at least an acquaintance of his boyhood, all point to a stay of some years in Smyrna; and nothing seems to speak against his having been born there, save the tradition, almost isolated tradition, that he was by birth a Syrian....In one special way there would be no obstacle to Syrian birth, if namely, like Tatian, he should have been brought up in Syria as a Greek. However, I regard it as most likely that he was born and lived through his boyhood at least in Asia Minor, and probably in or near Smyrna. Thus far we can only guess at the date of his birth. He was probably born between the years 135 and 142.

As a boy he saw Polycarp at Smyrna, and he appears to have been younger than Florinus whom he also saw, also during his own boyhood, at Smyrna and in the presence of Polycarp....Florinus, who was a presbyter in the Church at Rome, became a heretic, took up the Valentinian Gnosticism while Victor was bishop, and therefore after 189 or 190. And Irenaeus, who has been finding that Florinus' heretical books are spreading that heresy in Gaul, not only writes to Victor and begs him to suppress Florinus and his writings, but also writes to Florinus himself, and begins by recalling his having in boyhood seen Florinus playing a distinguished part in the imperial chambers and before Polycarp....

Irenaeus was then no stranger to the Church at Rome, for he had about ten years before as a presbyter of the Church at Lyons carried the letter of that Church and of the Church at Vienne about the persecutions to the Church at Rome, and his Church gave him a high and warm recommendation to the Church in the imperial city.¹

1. Gregory, Canon and Text, p. 146.

Of his great treatise against heresies, which is extant in Latin translation, no Greek MS is known to exist. Epiphanius, however, writing about 375, has transcribed into his own principal work the greater part of the first of the five books. Other Greek writers and compilers, from Eusebius onwards, have preserved many short fragments, a few being likewise extant in a Syriac or Armenian dress. Secure knowledge of the character of the text of the New Testament used by Irenaeus himself can of course be obtained only from the Greek extracts and from such readings extant only in Latin as are distinctly fixed by the context; and it is solely from these materials that we have described his text as definitely Western. In the use of the Greek extracts the age and other circumstances of the several sources from which they are derived have to be considered. The Greek transmission is independent of the Latin transmission, but not always purer. Greek corruptions absent from the Latin version, due either to the use of degenerate MSS of Irenaeus by late writers or to degenerate transmission of the works of these writers themselves, can often be detected in the language of Irenaeus himself, and might therefore be anticipated in his quotations. But these individual ambiguities do not disturb the general results. The passages subject to no reasonable doubt render it certain that the translator largely modified biblical quotations in conformity with an Old Latin text familiar to him, but perhaps unconsciously, certainly irregularly and very imperfectly....Occasionally, with the help afforded by the other Old Latin evidence, we can arrive at moral certainty that the translator has faithfully reproduced his author's reading; but more commonly the two alternatives have to be regarded as equally possible. Both texts are Western; and the evidence is valuable, whether it be that of Irenaeus or virtually of a fresh Old Latin MS, though in the former case it is much more valuable.¹

It is safe to assume, the writer believes, that the Greek text which Irenaeus used and which the 21 variants cited in ch. VI evidence, came from Smyrna. For there is, without P46, no good explanation for so many Western Greek readings, eg. those in FG and D*FG, beyond the adjective

1. Westcott and Hort, op. cit., pp. 159-160.

"Western," a term which covers both Greek and Latin peculiar readings. Irenaeus' support of such readings could formerly be attributed to the "Western" Old Latin influence. P46 however labels these peculiar readings in which it agrees as Alexandrian. Irenaeus' testimony becomes, not the text emended by an Old Latin translator, as Westcott and Hort believe at least one-half of it to be, but the link between the second century Greek tradition of the eastern Mediterranean world and the peculiar readings of the Western Greek tradition in western Europe.

The Smyrnaean origin of Irenaeus' text is upheld by Gregory, who facetiously remarks: "It does not seem to me that the raising of Greek texts is to be supposed to have been the specialty of the Christian husbandmen in the cities of Gaul."¹

Assuming therefore that Irenaeus' testimony can in many instances be designated as Greek, assuming, furthermore, that Irenaeus brought his Greek text from Smyrna in particular or Asia Minor in general, one is confronted with two possibilities. Either one assumes that the Pauline text of Smyrna, in the Letter to the Romans, at least, is a lineal descendant, brother or cousin, of the text which P46 follows, and that therefore Egypt was the fount of the New Testament tradition, whence most of the mss. were obtained, a conclusion

1. Canon and Text, p. 426.

not at all unlikely, or one faces a situation in which one finds, ca. 150 A.D., a remarkably unified basic textual tradition throughout the eastern Mediterranean world, so that in Smyrna, in Alexandria, and presumably then in other ecclesiastical centers, ancient texts similar to that of P46 existed. This latter view seems quite logical.

That but little evidence of the peculiar readings which existed so early is now extant in ms. form can be explained by recensions. In the writer's opinion, evidence points to important concerted editorial effort at an early period, after the floruit of P46; only in Alexandria, however. This may have been the results of the work of Hesychius whom Jerome mentions.¹ What seems to be an Antiochian recension, the Constantinople text, would, in the writer's opinion, be best explained as a general acceptance of the Alexandrian text, with modification to some extent by local mss. and versions, in which Western readings of ancient character were found. Whether an actual Lucian recension² existed is difficult to state.

That the Constantinople tradition depends largely on the Alexandrian rather than on the type of reading found in DEFG, can be explained, the writer believes, on the basis of history. A mixed text, of what we call Alexandrian and Western readings, a natural outgrowth of multiplication of texts in the early Christian era, was to be found throughout the East.

1. Von Dobschuetz, op. cit., p. 26.

2. Ibid.

In Alexandria editorial efforts had developed from the mixed a sort of standardized text. The Diocletian persecution destroyed, however, most of the mss. of Asia Minor and Syria. When religious tolerance was once more effected, it was from the southern Mediterranean lands, Egypt and Palestine, that mss. were brought. Constantine himself ordered fifty from Eusebius of Caesarea.¹ This movement of mss. brought the Alexandrian type text into prominence in Asia Minor. Combined with the local textual tradition, although there is little if any evidence for the development of a unity like that of Alexandria, it became the Constantinople or "Syrian" text. That there had arisen a particular Syrian text during the time that the Alexandrian text had developed is entirely possible. Its identity has been lost however in the assumed adoption of the textual tradition of Alexandria.

In the Alexandrian text had been included many readings which the early mss. taken to Gaul and Rome and the West also contained. This would account for the basic unity of the Western majuscles and the Alexandrian and Constantinople mss. The peculiar readings, however, which these predecessors of extant Western majuscles perpetuated and which they had obtained perhaps in Smyrna and other ecclesiastical centers, especially also in Alexandria, were in many cases eliminated from the Alexandrian text. Perhaps such readings

1. Gregory, Canon and Text, p. 263.

were still favored farther north in Asia Minor, a supposition which will account for peculiar "Western" readings in the Syriac versions. When, however, the destruction of mss. occurred under the persecutions of the emperors, all, or at least most, witnesses to the existence of peculiar "Western" readings in Asia Minor and southward were destroyed, and the only place where one could find them was in the Western majuscles and in the versions which had received them from pre-recension mss. Such was the state of affairs before P46 arrived. Now we have a ms. which carries us from the Western testimony through the devastation of the persecutions back to a time before the editorial eliminated from popular mss. what in modern times have been called "Western" readings.¹

Hoskair seems to incline to somewhat this same view, and would, the writer believes, concur in the statement that much ms. evidence for "Western" readings was lost in the persecutions. For he writes:

The fact that omission in pap46 finds support only in FG is not in itself significant of a weak link in the chain. What it shews is, that between the ninth-century

1. Westcott and Hort, some fifty years ago, without the evidence of P46 to connect the "Western" unity which they found in the Itala, the Western majuscles, frequently in the Syriac, even in some Alexandrian mss., with pre-recension Egyptian evidence, wrote: "...On the whole we are disposed to suspect that the 'Western' text took its rise in North-western Syria or Asia Minor, and that it was soon carried to Rome, and thence spread in different directions to North Africa and most of the countries of Europe. From North-western Syria it would easily pass through Palestine and Egypt, to Ethiopia. But this is at present hardly more than a speculation." (Op. cit., p. 108.) What conclusions would they have reached with the testimony of P46?

codices FG and this papyrus of the early-third century there intervened the recensions of B, of ξ , of A, of C, of E, of H, of Coptic, of Gothic, which added the word....

...Greek B comes out of the ordeal in the Pauline epistles rather well, although the pap46-B combination is quite eclectic, and, as FG are frequently found with pap46 against B, it is evident that there were drastic revisions subsequent to the date of the papyrus text...

...With these stepping-stones (1) and von Soden a78.. — grown into a bridge, by a legitimate inductive process — we can see, and beyond any peradventure, that the agreements between pap46 and the group FG plus the Itala and others, are by no means fortuitous, and that the elder group of Greek uncials on parchment — hitherto our mainstay, — represents only two-thirds of the ancient text.¹

The relationship of P46 and what can be identified as Irenaeus' Greek testimony, the writer believes, has been herewith thoroughly demonstrated. What of Irenaeus' Latin quotations?

When Irenaeus' Latin testimony agrees with the same witnesses as does P46, one could safely assume that the Latin is a rendering of the Greek original. Or when his testimony agrees with a Western reading attested by an Alexandrian ms., eg. B or A (cf. variants (1) and (172)), the same conclusion can be drawn. Likewise, when his testimony agrees with the Itala and with perhaps either syr^{sch} or sah or cop, it is safe to conclude that the Greek reading he used was identical with the Latin, and that both are derived through different channels from an ancient common source.

No one will deny that Irenaeus perhaps influenced the Itala. Westcott and Hort speak of a separate origin for each of the African and North Italian versions.² What is

1. "A Study of the Chester-Beatty Codex," op. cit., pp. 157.159.

2. Op. cit., p. 79.

more natural than that Greek mss. brought into the West from the East and that those which were already in use in Rome, for St. Paul wrote to the Romans in Greek, should influence the Itala of Italy and Gaul?

Thus far we have traced the Greek tradition from the East into the West. What of the Latin evidence? Is it to be traced solely to the influence of texts like that of Irenaeus? Or may one predicate an independent Latin version, based directly on early second-century Greek mss.?

In our discussion of Tertullian, the reader will recall, evidence pointed strongly to the existence of a Latin New Testament. Souter states that "the fact that on close study the translation used by him shows secondary characteristics confirms the conclusion that in Tertullian's time a Latin New Testament already existed in Africa, and suggests that it is a result of a long period of translation commenced not later than 150."¹ Gregory, more conservatively, sets the date at 170.²

It matters not whence the African translators obtained their mss., whether direct from Rome or from Alexandria, or elsewhere. The assumption of a mixed state of the text in the second century all over the Mediterranean world would allow for the existence in the Greek text which furnished the basis for the North African text of purely Alexandrian

1. Op. cit., p. 36.

2. Canon and Text, p. 156.

readings, Alexandrian-Western readings, and purely Western readings. As the African Itala amalgamated with the Northern Itala, undoubtedly more purely Western readings were added, so that in the Itala which accompanies the Greek bi-linguals one has second century readings which not only were taken into the African Itala in the second century but were added to the Northern Itala in the third century. The support of the African fathers would help identify the former, their opposition the latter.

The reader will bear in mind that the testimony of the Western Greek mss. and that of the Latin must be considered separately. While one may oftentimes assume mutual influence in the texts of the bi-lingual codices, as will be illustrated shortly, isolated testimony in either text does not predicate a "Western" peculiarity. It may well point to an early reading which was perpetuated in the particular ms. from which the text in question descended.

Light is thrown on this matter of the independent character of the Latin version by Hoskner, who makes the following statements:

If the reader will examine a Graeco-Latin bi-columnar, such as F, of which Scrivener's edition is before me, as I write, he will notice how difficult it was to see that the articulated word in the Greek column did not make the line too long for the corresponding Latin line - even in the long lines of F - especially where two or more articles occurred in the same Greek line. This brings us squarely up against the question as to whether the original of P46 (one or more generations back) did not have its stem in a Graeco-Latin - the length of whose lines, of course, would be mere guess-work. Otherwise, it is extremely

difficult to account for the omission - we may almost say the suppression - of some Greek articles, and their introduction, thereagainst, by P46 in other places, of which there are numerous examples, not dealt with in this examination.

In this connexion read what Scrivener has to say in his introduction to the Codex Augiensis (F), p. xxvi, where, although Codex Augiensis and Codex Boernerianus (G) are very much alike, he counts ~~thirty~~ ^{thirty-two} differences relating to the omission or insertion of the Greek article.¹

Souter explains certain phenomena in Codex D in the same way.

The actual character of Codex Bezae is best explained in the words of Professor Burkitt, whom I am following in this section...: 'This, of course, might take place in many ways. The most obvious is that the immediate ancestor of Codex Bezae was a Greek MS., of which a Latin translation was made by some one who was familiar with one of the current Latin versions; on this hypothesis some readings of this Latin translation were the result of literal translation from the opposite side, others will differ from the Greek side and agree with the current ecclesiastical Latin. Under these circumstances the Greek side might be corrected here and there to agree verbally with the Latin on the opposite page. Our Codex Bezae (on this hypothesis) is a transcript of this bilingual so corrected.'²

If one adopts the view of Hoskier, that an ancestor of P46 was a bi-lingual codex, he has ironclad proof for the development of a Latin version independent of the influence of many types of readings which later texts adopt. He has furthermore remarkable evidence of the early testimony which it has been assumed the Itala contains. Too, the peculiar relationship of P46 and F and G can be traced not only through the Latin but through Greek channels, Latin influence having

1. Appendix, p. 18.

2. Op. cit., p. 27.

been exerted on the Greek text in the second as well as in the eighth and ninth centuries. And, finally, the essentially trustworthy character of G and F as containing fewer "Western" peculiarities than was formerly supposed becomes more evident.

Thus far we have reviewed the pertinent evidence connected with the development of the New Testament text of Western Europe from the second century mixed text through the media of the Itala and of Greek mss. such as Irenaeus presumably brought to Gaul, to which we naturally add the influence of the mixed text in mss. which were to be found in Rome. The reader will have observed frequently in the past discussion of evidence the peculiar relationship between P46 and FG. It is now the purpose of the writer to demonstrate the connection between the second-century readings found in both the Itala and in Irenaeus' Greek text and the readings of DEFG, specifically FG, which breaks much more frequently from the basic DEFG text which P46 and the Alexandrian mss. support than does DE.

A brief orientation in the development of ecclesiastical culture in Gaul and Western Europe will help our discussion.¹

The monasticism which "made its appearance in the third century in Egypt, and became general in the east in the

1. The writer gratefully acknowledges the advice and assistance of Milton Ernstmeyer, who from his thesis work on Beginnings of Irish Monasticism furnished the writer with bibliography and much helpful information for this historical section of the latter's thesis.

fourth century"¹ soon found its way into the West, into Italy and into Gaul.

...it is with the name of St. Martin of Tours that the beginnings of Gallic monachism are rightly associated. A Pannonian by race, born early in the fourth century, he had practised the monastic life for some years before becoming bishop of Tours in 372. Nearly ten years earlier he had established a monastery near Poitiers, and on becoming bishop of Tours he formed one just outside of his episcopal city, at the place afterwards called Marmoutier. Here he gathered together eighty monks, and lived with them a life of great solitude and austerity. ...it was indeed a reproduction of the life of the Egyptian monks.

...by the end of the fourth century monasteries and monks and nuns were already numerous not only in the province of Tours, but in Rouen and the territory that afterwards became Normandy and Picardy.

The beginning of the fifth century witnessed the inauguration of monachism in Provence, at Marseilles under the influence of John Cassian, and in the island of Lerins under that of Honoratus. From Lerins went forth a number of monk-bishops, who throughout the fifth and sixth centuries, by the monasteries they set up in their episcopal cities, and by the monastic rules they composed for their government, spread far and wide through south-eastern Gaul the influence and ideas of Lerins. In other parts of Gaul, too, monasteries arose in the fifth century, the most famous being Condat in the Jura mountains.²

The introduction of Christianity from Gaul into Ireland on a significant scale was begun by "a young Briton named Succat," better known as St. Patrick, escaping to Gaul from his Irish captivity, was educated in a monastery of southern Gaul, "perhaps at Lerins, and who then returned to Ireland."³

When Attila the Hun sacked northern Gaul in 451,⁴ mona-

1. J.W. Thompson and E.N. Johnson, An Introduction to Medieval Europe, p. 54.

2. Dom. E.C. Butler, "Monasticism," Cambridge Medieval History, I, p. 534.

3. Thompson and Johnson, op. cit., p. 210.

4. Ibid., p. 99.

stic learning fled to Christian Ireland for refuge.¹ The consequent "fusion of old Irish culture with Christianity in its eastern monastic form and with the late Roman literary tradition introduced from the monasteries of southern Gaul, where both Latin and Greek literature were cultivated, brought quick scholarly, artistic, and literary results in Ireland."²

The Irish monastic schools, following the Gallic tradition, fostered both classical and Biblical knowledge, in both Latin and Greek.³ We can understand, therefore,

...how Pelagius could so learn his Greek in Ireland in the year 415 that he could carry on in Jerusalem a debate with Orosius the Spaniard in a tongue for which the latter required the services of an interpreter. Ovid and Vergil were read in Ireland well before the fifth century; and it is no longer remarkable that in the year 595 the Irish saint Columban commanded Greek, an idiom which Gregory the Great could not master, although he had twice been papal nuncio in Constantinople.⁴

Irish monasticism was hardly a century old before it began to expand. P.S. Dinneen describes what this expansion meant to the student of the monastic school.

...He receives ordination and...sails for Britain, or passes into Gaul, or reaches the slopes of the Apennines, or the outskirts of the Black Forest. The rest of his life is devoted to the foundation of monasteries to which schools are attached, to the building of churches and to the diffusion around him of every known branch of knowledge. He may have taken books from Ireland

1. P.S. Allen, The Romanesque Lyric, p. 156.

2. Thompson and Johnson, op. cit., pp. 211-212.

3. P.W. Joyce, A Social History of Ancient Ireland, p. 425.

4. Allen, op. cit., p. 155.

over seas, and, of these, relics are now to be found among the treasures of the ancient libraries of Europe.¹

Two such students were St. Columban (born in 534²), mentioned above, and St. Gall, who after years of missionary work in Gaul, came to Switzerland, where St. Columban left his friend and went on to Italy. On the site of the oratory which they had used "was subsequently built the great monastery of St. Gall."

Irish influence on the continent did not confine itself to the activities of these two men. "St. Columban was the first of a long line of Irish monks and scholars who for centuries penetrated the continent." His type of monastery, however, did not long remain independent. Benedictine rivalry developed, and "by 700 the latter had crowded out its Irish rival....Nevertheless, even after accepting the Benedictine rule, the Irish houses never forgot their Celtic origin, and continued to be known as Schottenkloester (Irish monasteries). Irish scribes in continental houses, too, can always be recognized by the personal notes they added to their manuscripts."³

Using this foregoing as a framework, we shall attach the items of evidence concerning the Western text to their proper place.

-
1. "Irish Love of Learning," The Glories of Ireland, p. 39.
 2. Allen, op. cit., p. 162.
 3. Thompson and Johnson, op. cit., pp. 214-216.

Codex G, which is in the Royal Library at Dresden,¹ "was apparently written late in Cent. IX, probably at St. Gallen by an Irish scribe (though it may possibly have been brought to St. Gallen from Ireland);² It is, in the opinion of Gregory, one of a group of three manuscripts, "probably written by the same monk at the same time," the other two, which Gregory saw in the library at St. Gallen, being a psalter and Codex Delta of the Gospels. The latter is a Graeco-Latin mss, and in it "there are Greek notes here and there, which mention Godeschalk, who died in 866, and a later hand names Aganon, who died in 941....One interesting thing about this manuscript is that it seems to have been written by an Irish monk, and perhaps at St. Gallen itself, in the ninth or tenth century."³ Having examined G, Gregory tells us that "Aganon...and Goddeskalkon, which is Gottschalk, are mentioned in the margin, and at one point there are some Irish verses."⁴

Codex F, as already pointed out in a previous chapter, is related to G, and of the six gaps in codex G, contains four.⁵

Going back about four hundred years, we come to Pelagius, described above as being a fluent Greek scholar, trained in Ireland. He was, according to Gregory, a Briton, who "besuchte

1. Gregory, Canon and Text, p. 366.

2. Westcott and Hort, op. cit., p. 149.

3. Canon and Text, pp. 352-358.

4. Ibid., p. 367.

5. Ibid.

an Rom Anfang des fuenften Jahrhunderts; im Jahre 405 fing er an eine neue Haeresie zu verbreiten; im Jahre 408 war er in Sicilien, 411 in Hippo, nachher in Aegypten und in Palaestina; man weiss nicht, wo und wann er starb."¹

"It is possible," writes J.B. Bury, that, as some claim, Pelagius was born in Ireland, but the evidence rather points to the conclusion that he belonged to an Irish family settled in Western Britain....While Patrick was serving in Ireland, Pelagius was in Rome..."²

Regardless of where he was born, Pelagius shows a peculiar agreement with P46, a fact to which Hoskier call attention. There are eight variants in the book of Romans³ in which Pelagius supports P46, three times against combined Western Greek and Itala testimony, twice with partial support from them. The agreement with P46, one of which readings Irenaeus supports, might indicate the usage by Pelagius of a Greek

1. Textkritik, p. 810.

2. Life of St. Patrick, p. 43.

3. (— means omit)

"Rom VI 11	— εγρα	Cum ADEFG Tert Chr syr arm aeth Pel ^A
VI 12	— τας επι θυμας	Cum DEFG d*efg Iren Orig Tert Pel
VIII 23	— υποθεσαν	Cum DFG dfg Ambrst Pel [†]
IX 26	— υμες post μου	= syr aeth Iren Amvrat Pel
XII 17	ερωτιον των υβριων	(— παρων etc.) Cum de Pel
XV 15	— υμας	Cum Chr [†] Pel ^{ERG}
XV 27	— ηυδοκησαν και	Pel ^B Ambrst

- from P46 Addenda et Corrigenda, p.2.

In XII 17 the writer would add the supporting testimony of A^CD^oEF^G from Tischendorf; in XV 27, according to the writer's investigations, P46 does not omit the two words with Pel^B Ambrst. An additional variant is that of XV 30, where P46DEFG Itala vg cop aeth Pel add υμων after ηυδοκησαν.

ms., with which language he was familiar, which traced its ancestry through Irenaeus to the second century text found in P46.

St. Patrick, as can be expected, forms a definite link between Ireland and Gaul. N.F.D. White, who translated St. Patrick's Latin writings, tells us that the text of the Latin Bible used by Patrick is, in the Old Testament, that current before St. Jerome published his retranslation from the Hebrew (A.D. 391-404); while the quotations from the New Testament seem to follow partly St. Jerome's revision (A.D. 383) and partly earlier versions. Patrick's New Testament was of the type current in South Gaul, where he was educated.¹

Souter connects Gaul and Ireland by showing that Hilary "used in the Gospels a text having points of contact with r (the Irish-Latin Codex Usserianus of the sixth century)." "No doubt," he continues, "Great Britain and Ireland first got the Gospel from Gaul."²

The significance of this transmission of the Latin text is indicated by Gregory's statement, in his discussion of the different Latin strata, the first of which developed in Northern Africa: "From one translation, then, or if anyone insist upon it, from two or three independent Latin translations, the manuscripts passed through the provinces to Gaul, to Great Britain, to Ireland."³

-
1. A Translation of the Latin Writings of St. Patrick, p.4.
 2. Op. cit., p. 87.
 3. Canon and Text, p. 409.

We are now back in fifth century Gaul, not too long before the writing of Codex D of the Gospels and Codex D of the Pauline epistles,¹ and little more than two centuries after Irenaeus' death. Both Codex Bezae (D Gospels) and Codex Claramontanus (D epistles) formerly belonged to Theodore de Beze,

the celebrated Frenchman who passed over to Switzerland and became the successor of Calvin as leader of the Genevan Church. He said, when he in the year 1581 gave the former manuscript to the University of Cambridge, that it had long lain in the dust in the monastery of St. Irenaeus at Lyons, and that it had been found there during the civil war in 1562. In the last edition of his notes on the New Testament in the year 1598, however, he called this manuscript "The Codex Claramontanus." And on the back of the title of the manuscript now at Paris, (D ep), Beze wrote that it was found in the monastery in Clermont-en-Beauvoisis....It does not make much difference whether he got one from Lyons and the other from Clermont, a hundred and thirty or forty kilometres distant, or both from Clermont. The manuscripts doubtless belonged together originally.²

Souter tells us that "in the ninth century, the martyrologist Ado, who probably wrote at Lyons, makes use of a text of Acts, which is the same as that in Codex Bezae, but otherwise unknown."³ "We shall not err greatly," he also remarks, "in concluding that Irenaeus's copy of the Gospel was practically equivalent to an early ancestor of the Greek side of Codex Bezae, excelling the latter by greater freedom from corruption."⁴

-
1. Gregory, Canon and Text, p. 351.
 2. Ibid., pp. 350-351.
 3. Op. cit., p. 26.
 4. Ibid., p. 79.

The writer herewith closes the case for the Gallic-Smyrnaean text. We have seen that there is evidence of a widely spread second century text containing what we call Alexandrian and Western readings, according to the general geographical location of their seeming predominance. The Alexandrian revision or editing of the text eliminated many of the Western readings. Some few, however, were perpetuated in the East in the Syriac and other versions, particularly the aethiopic, according to Hoskier's investigations. Of the Syriac Western readings, some found their way into the Constantinople mss., which was based chiefly on the Alexandrian tradition.

Before, however, the editors' pencils had spelled the doom of many peculiar, less popular, perhaps readings, Greek manuscripts were taken to the West,¹ to Rome and to Gaul, where the second century readings were perpetuated by monastic scribes. In this same period there arose in North Africa a Latin translation, based on the same pre-recension text as found in manuscripts, brought perhaps from Egypt (cf. Hoskier's hypothetical bi-lingual ancestor of P46), perhaps from Rome, perpetuating the same type of reading. These two streams of text united in the sixth century bi-lingual codices, the Greek having been perhaps changed by contact with the Latin, the Latin by contact with Greek mss. Gaul, with its monastic

1. It is true that some books were originally sent from Rome to the rest of the Christian world, eg. Romans and Mark. Since, however, the chief ecclesiastical cultural centers were in the East, it is more than likely that the chief source of N.T. mss. was the East, and not the West, even in the case of books like Romans and Mark.

Græco-Roman culture, fostered this variegated, and yet definitely characterized, text, not editing it as did the Alexandrians, but passing it on to Irish culture, whence it was brought again to continental Europe, culminating, in the Pauline epistles, in the Swiss-Irish Græco-Latin codices F and G. A Gallic-Smyr^anean text? A better name would be, perhaps, the "Gallic second century text."

Conclusion

The writer can best conclude this thesis by setting down what to him seems to be the significance and value of the prominent Pauline, specifically Roman, witnesses.

1. The Constantinople mss., standing alone, are of little importance. When they join with the Alexandrian mss., they demonstrate that the East adopted the Alexandrian tradition.

2. The united Syriac (syr) is a witness for the pre-recension second century text. The Syriac Peshitta is generally a second century witness when it differs from the Harclean Syriac. Either, however, may apparently reverse its position, the Harclean being an earlier witness than the Peshitta.

3. The Armenian version is a follower of the Syriac and Constantinople texts.

4. The Alexandrian majuscles, including P46, united, represent a very important ancient text. Divided, they represent two types of texts called Western and Alexandrian, the relative value of which must be decided on the weight of their respective support.

5. The Bohairic and Sahidic are good century witnesses.

DE DEF~~G~~ represent a very good second century text, a reading of which is probably of the same antiquity as that of an opposing P46~~A~~BC reading. Divided, they represent different

texts, each of which probably goes back to the second century, each of which must be judged on the basis of supporting evidence.

7. The Itala represents a second century text. Where the Itala testimony is divided, supporting evidence must decide which reading is to be preferred.

8. The Vulgate, in agreement with the Itala, supports the same original text as does the Itala. When opposed, its value must be determined by the witnesses of the reading which it supports.

9. The fathers, in general, represent the text of their locality and age. The Constantinople fathers reproduce generally the Constantinople and Syriac texts. Origen and Clement represent pre-recension texts. Irenaeus represents a second century text, both in the Greek and in the Latin, the latter being possibly the early Itala text, possibly an accurate translation of his original Greek text. Tertullian represents both second century original Greek and the earliest Itala texts. Cyprian represents the Itala. Ambrosiaster and Hilary represent the mixed Latin tradition which preceded the Vulgate.

10. A demonstrably second century reading is better than a later reading. When two readings are demonstrably second century, the number of supporting witnesses, eg. Itala, syr^{sch}, sah, DEFG are each a witness, must determine the better reading. When two readings seem to have equal

testimonial merit, an analysis of their essential worth on the basis of hermeneutical principles must be made.

To illustrate these principles, the writer applies them to two variant readings, the one from Hebrews IX 11 (Nestle, Novum Testamentum Graece), the other from Romans VI 12 (17).

In Hebrews IX 11 we read *γενομένων* with P46BDitsy, *μελλοντων* with ξA Const. vgsy^{hmg}. P46B represents one-half the Alexandrian second century text, ξA the other half. The Constantinople text follows ξA , and therefore represents the same text. One may assume, however, that it represents added testimony, since it chose between Alexandrian readings. It is balanced by sy(Syriac), which represents a second century reading. The vg, following the Const.-Alexandrian reading, represents the same evidence. The Greek marginal reading of the Harclean Syriac (sy^{hmg}), breaking from sy, undoubtedly goes back to the same witnesses as the Constantinople reading. D represents a second century reading. Itala likewise. In favor of *μελλοντων* one has one good second century witness and another that is doubtful, the latter being corroborated by two late witnesses. *γενομένων* is supported by four second century witnesses of undenied authority. The latter reading is obviously the correct one.

In Romans VI 12 (17) we read *αυτη* with P46DEFGdfg Ir Or Tert. $\xi ABC^*a7H-0142$ vg sah cop *αυτ^{sch}* arm aeth Or (five times) Meth Aug Dam have *ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ* . C⁶

KLPQ have $\alpha\upsilon\delta\eta$ $\epsilon\upsilon$ $\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\pi\iota$ $\theta\upsilon\mu\lambda\alpha\iota\varsigma$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\upsilon\upsilon$.

The testimony of the Constantinople group is definitely to be discounted, for it represents a perfect example of a conflate reading. P46 represents part of the second century tradition, δ ABC another part. It is therefore evident that both readings existed side by side. DEFG represents a witness for $\alpha\upsilon\delta\eta$, the combined group of Western majuscles. It also indicates several streams of Greek testimony, converging into one unit. In the author's opinion, P46DEFG balance δ ABC*. Irenaeus is a part of the P46DEFG tradition, and adds nothing. defg, supplemented by Tertullian, furnishes another witness for $\alpha\upsilon\delta\eta$ as a second century reading. That e, however, disagrees, as does also Aug, weakens the Ital evidence somewhat. Origen's testimony is split, with his heavier approval on the longer reading. The Peshitta is a strong witness. The selection of e's testimony by the vg is presaged in Aug. That a7H-0142 abandon their Constantinople fellows is not so strong a testimony, but it adds weight to the witness of the Alexandrian group.

The witnesses therefore seem to balance thus:

P46DEFG Ir vs δ ABC*a7H-0142 Meth Dam
 dfg Tert vs sah cop
 Or vs Cr

The remaining witnesses, syr^{sch} arm, vg Aug, aeth, throw the balance definitely in favor of the longer reading.

Appendix I

A. The following table gives the majuscules according to their designation in this work, with other pertinent information, based on Merk's introduction to his third edition, Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine, pp. 22-33, and on Nestle's introduction to his sixteenth edition, Novum Testamentum Graece, p. 15. The sigla of Nestle are followed where possible. For the Greek alpha is substituted a Latin a, for the Hebrew aleph, א. The four mss. which Merk collates in addition to the others are placed at the bottom of the list. d stands for Greek delta.

Column 1 shows the sigla of the majuscules; column 2 shows von Soden's sigla; 3, the century in which the ms. originated; 4, the name; 5, the place where the ms. is kept; 6, the contents (a-Gospels, a-Acts and the catholic epistles, p-Paul's letters, r-Apocalypse, — -total New testament); 7, Merk's designation as to families, following von Soden.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Σ	d2	IV.V	Sinaiticus	London	—	H
A	d4	V	Alexandrinus	London	—	I ^x H
B	d1	IV	Vaticanus, gr. 1209	Vatican	cap	H
C	d3	VI	Ephraemi rescriptus	Paris	—	H
D	a1026	VI	Claremontanus	Paris	p	I ²
E	a1027	IX	Sangermanensis	Petersburg	p	I ²
F	a1029	IX	Augiensis	Cambridge	p	I ²
G	a1028	IX	Boernerianus	Dresden	p	I ²
K	A ^{pp} , I ¹	IX		Moscow	ap	K
L	a5	IX	Angelicus	Rome	ap	K
P	a3	IX	Porfirianus	Petersburg	apr	IH
Ψ	d6	VIII.IX		Athos	Mark to Hebrews	H
a7	(cf. note 1)	X		Sinai	ap	I ²
H	a1022	VI	Coislinianus	Athos, Petersburg	p	H
I		V		Washington	p	H
048	a1	V		Vatican	ap	H
0142	06	X		Munich	ap	H

1. Merk, op. cit., p. 31, lists a7 as a minuscule; von Soden, op. cit., Teil I, 1, p. 216, lists it as a IX century uncial.

B. The following are the symbols for the versions and the fathers used by the writer, following the critical apparatus of Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Graece, with the meaning as given in the introduction to Novum Test. Graece or in Prolegomena by R.N. Gregory.

Versions:

- aeth - the Ethiopic version (intro., Novum Test. Graece).
- arm - the Armenian version (ibid.).
- cop - the Memphitic version (ibid.), identical with Nestle's Bohairic in his critical edition, op. cit., intro., p.51.
- d e f g - the Latin texts in the Greek majuscles DEFG, respectively (Prolegomena, pp. 968-969).
- harl - a ninth century Latin ms. (ibid., p. 992).
- sah - the Sahidic version (intro., Novum Test. Graece).
- syr^{sch} - the Syriac Peshitta, Schaaf's edition (Prolegomena, p. 820 ff.).
- syr^P - the Syriac version of Polycarp, revised by Thomas of Harclea (ibid., p. 823 ff.).
- syr^{pmg} - an indication in the margin of syr^P of a different reading in some Greek ms.
- syr, syr^{utr} - both the Peshitta and Harclean Syriac.
- vg, vg^{cle} - the Clementine Vulgate of 1582 (Prolegomena, p. 978). (The writer uses vg to indicate any number of the vg mss. when cited separately by Tischendorf.)

Fathers¹ (taken from Prolegomena, pp. 1154-1230):

- Afric - Julius Africanus.
- Amb - Ambrosius.
- Ambst² - Ambrosiaster or Pseudo-Ambrosius.
- Ath - Athanasius.
- Aug - Augustin.
- Bas - Basil the Great.
- Chr, Chrys - Chrysostom.
- Clem - Clement of Alexandria.
- Cyp - Cyprian.
- Cyr - Cyril of Alexandria.
- Cyr^{hr}, Cyr^{hier} - Cyril of Jerusalem.
- Dam - John of Damascus.
- Eus - Eusebius of Caesarea.
- Euth - Euthalius of Egypt.
- Hil - Hilary.
- Ir, Iren - Irenaeus.
- Marc, Mcion_x - Marcion.
- Meth, Method - Methodius.

1. Patristic abbreviations that appear in this thesis other than those here given are of such little importance as to warrant no inclusion.

2. For convenience' sake the author generally uses Ambst.

Cec - Oecumenius.
Or - Origen.
Pel - Pelagius.
Tert - Tertullian.
Thdrt - Theodoret of Syria.

Appendix II

The following variant readings are those used in the thesis proper. Of them nos. 2, 22, 47, 52, 128, 318, 326, and 398 are not found in the footnote-tables, but have been added to the thesis wherever their testimony is pertinent. According to Gregory, Textkritik, p. 102, majuscule K offers no testimony from ch. X 18 on. Its witness has therefore been dropped from variant 128 on.

In listing the variant, the author places first the variant number in parenthesis, a number which was attached when the readings were collated by the author, followed by the chapter and verse, after which appears the Greek reading of P46 with supporting witnesses. The alternate reading or readings are separated from the first reading and its witnesses by three periods.

- (1) V 17 *δωρεάς* P46⁸ACDEFGKLP⁷α7H-0142...omit B Ir Or Chr Aug
- (2) V 17 *δωρεάς* P46...*δωρεάς και* Ψ vg syr Chr Thdrt
Isid Ambrst
- (4) V 18 *δικαιωματος* P46⁸ABCKLP⁷α7...*το δικαιωμα* DEG...
και δικαιωμα F syr^{sch} cop
- (6) V 19 *υπακοης του ενος* P46⁸ABCD⁶EKLP⁷α7H-0142...
του ενος ανθρωπου υπακοης FGd*fg...*υπακοης*
του ενος ανθρωπου D*FG Cyr Aug Am Ir: *νυν δε*
ωσπερ δια της υπακοης του ενος ανθ. του πρωτως εκη Ψ 715-
ουτως εδει και δε υπακοης ενος ανθ. του πρωτως εκη
παθονου γεγεννημενου δικαιωθηναι πολλους.
- (9) VI 2 *οιτινες* P46⁸ABCDEKLP⁷α7H-0142 Clem Tert Aug...
ατινες μ FG defg vg syr Or Ambrst
- (10) VI 2 *ζησομεν* P46⁸CEFG¹L⁷α7 Chr Dioc...*ζηρομεν* β AB
DKPH-0142 Clem Chr Thdrt Dam defg vg Tert Or
Ambrst
- (11) VI 5 *αλλα* P46⁸ABCDEKLP⁷α7H-0142 Tert Aug... *και* FG
defg vg Ambrst Aug
- (12) VI 8 *γα* P46FG (libere syr^{sch} "igitur")... *δε*
 β ABCDEKLP⁷α7H-0142 defg
- (13) VI 13 *ουζησομεν* P46⁸ABCDEKLP⁷α7...*ουνηρομεθα* FG
- (14) VI 14 *ωτω* P46⁸ABCD⁶EKLP⁷α7H-0142 cop syr^p arm aeth
Eus Bas Chr Thdrt Dam Tert Or Ambrst Aug Pel
...*τω* π ^w D*EFG defg vg syr^{sch}
- (15) VI 11 *νεκρους μεν* P46ADEFG d*efg syr^{sch} aeth Tert...
ειναι νεκρους μεν β *BCa7H-0142Dam...*νεκρους*
μεν ειναι β ^cEKLP⁷ vg syr^p Or Did Bas Chr Euth
Thdrt Hil Ambrst Cyr

- (16) VI 11 $\overline{\iota\eta\upsilon}$ P46ABDEFG... $\overline{\iota\eta\upsilon}$ τω κ̄ω ημων β GKLP ψ a7
H-0142 vg cop arm syr^{sch} Or Did Chr Euth
Dam Thphyl Occ Ambrst (with P46 also syr^P
aeth Bas Cyr Thdrt Thphyl Occ Tert Hil Aug Pel
- (17) VI 12 αυτη P46DEFG d*fg Ir Or Tert... αυτη εν ταις
επιθυμiais αυτου C^oKLP ψ ... ταις επιθυμiais αυτου
 β ABC*a7H-0142 vg sah cop syr^{sch} arm aeth Or
Meth Dam Aug
- (19) VI 13 ζωρτες P46D*FG... ζωρτας β ABCD^oEKLP ψ a7h-0142
- (22) VIII 15 κρησόμεν P46 β ABCDEGKLP ψ a7 Ir Clem Or Did...
κρησόμεν F
- (23) VIII 16 ο πατηρ P46 β ABC^oFGKLP ψ a7 de... ο πατηρ ωστε DE
- (24) VIII 16 συμμετρει P46 β AB*DEFG ψ a7... συμμετρει B^oC
KLP
- (26) VIII 17 κληρονομοι P46FG... κληρονομοι μεν β ABCDEKLP
 ψ a7 f Or
- (27) VIII 17 ου P46 β ABCDEKLP ψ a7 f ...omit FG
- (28) VIII 17 συν κληρονομοι P46 β AB*DEFGLP ψ a7... συ κληρονομοι
B^oCK
- (29) VIII 17 πασχομεν P46... συμπασχομεν B^oKLP... συμπασχομεν
 β B*CDEFG ψ a7H-0142... τρωμεν AP
- (32) VIII 20 ουχ εκουσα P46 β ABCDEKLP ψ a7H-0142... ου θελουσα
FG... non volens defg vg Ir Or Hil... non
voluntaria Ambrst... non sponte Hil Amb
- (33) VIII 20 εφ P46 β B*D*FG... επ AB^oCD^oEKLP ψ a7H-0142
- (34) VIII 21 οτι P46ABCD^oEKLP ψ a7H-0143 Thdot Or Meth Chr
Thdrt Dam... διοτι β D*FG
- (37) VIII 21 δουλαiα P46ABD^oEFGKL... δουλαiα β CD*P
- (39) VIII 22 συνωδινει P46... οδινει FG defg vg Ambrst...
συνωδινει β ABCDEKLP ψ a7H-0142 Amb Sedul Or
- (40) VIII 23 αλλα P46... αλλα και αυτοι β ABCKLP ψ a7H-0142 Meth Chr
Dam Thphyl Occ... αλλα και ημεις αυτοι DEFG defg vg
syr cop arm Thdrt AOr Aug
- (41) VIII 23 ημεις και P46 β ACa7 Dam... και ημεις KLPH-0142
syr^P Chr Thdrt Thphyl Occ... και B vg Meth Or
Aug... ημεις ψ ...omit DFG f syr^{sch}arm ("habentes
nos ipsi" d* β g Ambrst)
- (44) VIII 23 απεκδεχομενοι P46DEFGdfg Ambrst... απεκδεχομενοι
νοθεσιαν β ABCKLP ψ a7H-0142 vg syr Meth Or Aug
- (45) VIII 24 τiς B*P46... τiς τι και β AKLP ψ a7H-0142... τiς τι B^o
DFG dfg vg Chr Or ^{hp} Ambrst... τiς και β *
- (46) VIII 24 ελπιζει P46 β BCDEFGKLP ψ a7H-0142 dfg vg syr
cop arm aeth Clem Chr Thdrt Dam Or Cyp Ambrst
... υπομενει β *A
- (47) VIII 27 ερουνων P46 β ... ερευρων ABCDEFGKLP ψ a7
- (48) VIII 27 εντυχανει P46 β ABCDEFGKLP ψ a7... υπερτυχανει I
- (50) VIII 28 οδi P46AB Or...omit β CDEFGKLP ψ a7H-0142 vg
syr cop arm Clem Or Eus Chr^{hr} Chr Cyr Thdrt
Dam Lcif Aug
- (52) VIII 30 προωρισεν P46 β BCDEFGKLP ψ a7... προεγνω A Or
- (54) VIII 30 ους δε P46 β BCDEFGKLP ψ a7 Clem... και ους A Or Eus

- (55) VIII 32 γε του ιδιου υιου ουκ P46^sABCKLP^a7H-0142, vg Or
Ambrst... ουδε του ιδιου υιου D... ουδε υιου ιδιου
FG
- (56) VIII 32 αλλ P46^sBD*EFG... αλλ ACD^cKLP^a7
- (61) VIII 32 τα P46^sABCD^cDKLP^a7 Or...omit D*FG
- (62) VIII 32 χρισος εστι P46^sABCDEFGLPa7...^hχρισος εστι
- (65) VIII 34 κικ P46^sDEFGLPa7 it vg syr^p Cyr^{hr} Chr Thdrt Ambrst
Hil Ir...omit ^sABC cop arm aeth Or Did Dam
- (66) VIII 34 ερεθεις P46^s^sBDEFGLPa7H-0142 vg syr arm Ir
Cyr Or... ερεθεις εκ νεκρων ^s*AC cop aeth Did
Chr Dam
- (87) VIII 34 κικ P46^s^cBDEFGLPa7H-0142 vg syr^p Cyr^{hr} Chr
Thdrt Ambrst Hil Ir...omit ^s*AC cop arm aeth
Or Did Dam
- (72) IX 23 το πλουτος P46FG... τον πλουτον ^sABDEKLP^a7
H-0142
- (75) IX 25 ωση P46^cFG... ωσε P... οση K (osee fg)... ωση
P46^s^sABDEL^a7
- (77) IX 26 εαν κληθουσι P46... αν κληθουσι FG
(d*g Ambrst omit αν; syr^{sch} vocabantur; Ir
vo cabatur)... ερηθη B^cD^cELa7... ερεθη ^sAB*
D*KP^hH-0142 f
- (78) IX 26 κληθουσι P46BFG d*g Ambrst shr^{sch}Ir...
κληθουσι αυτοις ^sADEKLP^a7H-0142
- (82) IX 27 καταλιμμα P46... καταλιμμα ^s^cDEFGLPa7H-0142
...υπολειμμα ^s*AB
- (83) IX 28 ποιησει P46^s^s*ABH-0142 syr^{sch} cop aeth Eus Dam
Aug... ερδουκισουνη οτι λογον συντετημενον ποιησει
^s^cDEFGLPa7 defg vg syr^p go Eus Chr Euthal
Thphyl Oec Ambrst
- (86) IX 29 ομοιωθημεν P46AFGLP Euthal... ωμοιωθημεν ^sBD
EK^a7
- (88) IX 30 τη P46^sABDEKLP^a7... της FG
- (89) IX 32 εκοφαν ^s*ABDEKLP^a7... -εκοφεν ^s*...
-εκοφαν FG
- (90) IX 32 εκοφαν P46^s^s*ABD*FG... -εκοφαν γαρ ^s^c
DEKLP^a7H-0142 vg syr arm Chr Thdor Thdrt Hier
Hier Aug Sedul (with P46 are defg cop Or Ambrst
Dam)
- (91) X 1 δεησις P46^sABDEFG^h Cyr... δεησις μου P...
δεησις η KLa7 Chr Euthal Thdrt Dam
- (92) X 1 λυτων P46^sABDEFG^hH-0142 defg vg go syr cop
arm Or Chr Cyr Dam Ambrst Aug... του Ισραηλ KLa7
Thdrt Thphyl Oec
- (93) X 1 λυτων P46^s^s*ABDEFGH-0142 d*efg go syr^{sch} arm
aeth Cyr Dam Aug... λυτωρεστιν ^s^cKLP^a7 syr^p vg
Chr Thdrt Euthal Thphyl Oec Or Aug Ambrst
- (95) X 3 δεκκισουνην P46^sFGKLP^a7H-0142 dfg go syr aeth
Ir Tert Or Chr Cyr Thdrt Aug Amb...omit AB
DEF e vg cop arm Clem Or Bas Chr Cyr Procop
Dam Aug Ambrst

- (96) X 5 Μωυσης P46^gBFGKa7... Μωυσης ADELPH
- (97) X 5 τῆρ δεικαιοσυνη τῆρ εν του νομου οτι P46^gB
D^cEFGKLa7 defg syr go Chr Thdrt... οτι before
τηρ δεικ- ~~g~~*A^dH-0142 vg Or Dam Ambrst Cass
- (98) X 5 του P46ADEFGLKa7 arm Chr Thdrt Dam...omit
~~g~~B^g
- (100) X^d 5 αυτα P46^gBFGKLJa7H-0142 syr arm Chr Thdrt
Ambrst...omit ~~g~~*ADE vg Or Dam
- (101) X 5 ανθρωπος P46^gABDEKLJa7...omit FG fg syr^{sch}Chr
- (102) X 5 αυτου P46^gDEFGKLJa7H-0142 syr Chr Thdrt Ambrst
... αυτη ~~g~~*AB e vg go cop arm Or Dam
- (103) X 8 λεγει P46^gABKLJa7H-0142 go syr Chr Cyr Dam Aug...
η γραφη λεγει FG fg cop aeth...
DE de vg Or Thdrt Cyr Hil Ambrst λεγει η γραφη
- (104) X 8 το ρημα εστιν P46^gABKLJa7H-0142.Or Chr Thdrt
Cyr Dam... εστιν το ρημα DEFG defg vg go arm
Or Hil Ambrst
- (105) X 9 εν P46^gADEFGLJa7H-0142 Ir Or Chr Thdrt Cyr
Dam Hil Ambrst... το ρημα εν B Clem
- (106^g) X 9 ην ην P46^gADEFGLJa7H-0142 defg vg syr arm
go Ir Or Bas Chr Cyr Thdrt Dam Ambrst... οτι
ηs is B cop Clem
- (107) X 9 χρ P46A...omit ~~g~~BDEFGLJa7H-0142
- (109) X 9 αυτων ηρειρεν P46^gBDEFGLJa7H-0142... ηρειρεν αυτων
AP Clem Cyr^{hr}Cyr
- (111) X 14 επικαλεσονται P46KLJa7H-0142 Clem Ath Chr Thdor
Euthal Thdrt Dam defg vg Or Ambrst... επικαλε-
σονται ~~g~~ABDEFG
- (112) X 14 πως P46^gABCDEKLJa7H-0142... η πως FG defg vg Or
syr^{sch} arm Or Ambrst
- (113) X 14 πιστευσωσιν P46^gBDEJ Chr... πιστευσωσιν AKLa7
H-0142 Clem Ps-Ath Chr Euthal Thdrt Dam...
επιστευσωσιν FG
- (115) X 14 ακουσωσιν P46... ακουσωσιν La7H-0142.Clem
Ath Chr Thdrt... ακουσωσιν ~~g~~*ABJ... ακουσωσιν
~~g~~*DEFGKP Dam
- (117) X 15 κηρυξωσι P46 ~~g~~ABDEKLJa7... κηρυξωσιν H-0142
(both supported by defg vg Or Ambrst)...
εκηρυσσωσιν FG
- (120) X 15 ποδες P46^g*ABH-0142 sah cop aeth Clem Or
Thdrt Euthal Dam... ποδες των ευαγγελιζομενων
ειρηνην ~~g~~*DEFGKLJa7 defg by syr arm go Chr
Thdrt Euthal Thphyl Oec Hil Amb Text (Ir: et
Paulus atuem dicens: Quam speciosi pedes
evang bona, evang. pacem)
- (122) X 15 τα P46^g*D^cKLJa7H-0142 arm Chem Chr Euthal Thdrt
...omit ~~g~~*ABCD*EFGP Or Eus Dam
- (124) X 16 του ευαγγελιου P46^gABCDEKLJa7... του ευαγγελιου FG
- (126) X 17 η P46^gABCDEKLJa7H-0142... ουνη FG sah

- (127) X 17 $\chi\epsilon\upsilon$ P46 β *BCD*a7H-0142 de vg go sah cop arm
aeth Or Ambrst Aug Pelag... β° AD \circ EKLP β syr
aeth Clem Ps-Ath Thdor Chr Thdrt Dam Sedul
...omit FG fg Hil
- (128) X 18 $\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu\upsilon\gamma\epsilon$ P46 β ABCDEKLP β a7...omit FG Or β fg
- (130) X 19 $\iota\omicron\rho\alpha\eta\lambda\ \omicron\nu\kappa\ \epsilon\rho\nu\omega$ P46 β ABCD*EFG β defg vg sah cop
go arm aeth Or Chr Dam Hil Ambrst... $\omicron\nu\kappa\ \epsilon\rho\nu\omega$
 $\iota\omicron\rho\alpha\eta\lambda$ D \circ L β at syr Thdrt Taphyl
- (131) X 19 $\mu\omega\upsilon\sigma\eta\varsigma$ P46 β BCFG β a7... $\mu\omega\sigma\eta\varsigma$ ADEL β
- (132) X 19 $\pi\eta\lambda\ \beta\eta\lambda\omega\sigma\omega$ P46... $\pi\eta\lambda$ - $\lambda\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ β° C... $\pi\eta\lambda$ -
 $\upsilon\mu\alpha\varsigma$ β° ABDEFG β LP β a7H-0142
- (133) X 19 $\epsilon\pi\iota$ P46 β ABCDE β a7 Clem... $\epsilon\pi\iota$ FG β LP Chr Thdrt Dam
- (134) X 19 $\upsilon\mu\alpha\varsigma$ P46 β *ABDEFGLP β a7... $\lambda\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ β° C aeth
- (136) X 20 $\lambda\pi\upsilon\tau\omicron\lambda\mu\alpha$ κας P46 β ABCLP β a7H-0142 vg syr Or...
omit DEFGdefg.
- (137) X 20 $\epsilon\nu$ P46BD*FG fg Ambrst...omit β ACD \circ ELP β a7H-0142
de vg Clem Chr Euthal Thdrt Dam Hil
- (138) X 20 $\epsilon\rho\epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\eta\nu$ P46 β ACD \circ EFGLP β a7H-0142 fg vg Clem
Chr Euthal Thdrt Dam Hil... $\epsilon\rho\epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\eta\nu$ $\epsilon\nu$ BD*
de Ambrst Or
- (139) X 21 $\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma$ P46 β ABCFLP β a7 Or defg vg Hil Ambrst...
 $\epsilon\pi\iota$ DE Clem
- (140) X 21 $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\alpha\rho\tau\iota$ $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$ P46 β ABCDELP β a7H-0142...omit
FG fg Hil
- (141) X 21 $\alpha\rho\tau\iota$ $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$ P46 β ABCD \circ FGLP β a7 de... $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$
D*E
- (142) XI 1 $\tau\eta\nu$ $\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\nu$ P46FG Amb Ambrst... $\tau\omicron\nu\ \lambda\lambda\omicron\nu$
 β ABDEL β a7H-0142
- (143) XI 1 $\omicron\nu$ $\pi\rho\epsilon\rho\nu\omega$ P46 β° AD* Chr Thph Aug Ambrst...omit
 β *BD \circ EFGLP β a7H-0142 fg vg syr sah cop arm aeth
go Or Eus Euthal Thdrt Dam Aug Amb
- (145) XI 4 $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\nu$ P46AFGLP β a7... $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\iota\pi\omicron\nu$ β BDE
- (147) XI 4 $\tau\eta$ P46 β ABDEL β a7... $\tau\omega$ G... $\tau\omicron$ F
- (148) XI 5 $\omicron\nu\nu$ P46 β ABDEFGLP β a7H-0142...omit C syr cop arm
- (154) XI 6 $\chi\eta\varsigma$ P46 β *ADEFG β defg vg sah cop arm Or Dam
Ambrst... $\chi\eta\varsigma$ $\epsilon\iota\delta\epsilon$ $\epsilon\beta$ $\epsilon\rho\theta\omega\nu$ $\omicron\nu\kappa\epsilon\tau\iota$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ (B
omit $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$) $\chi\eta\varsigma$ $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota$ $\tau\omicron$ $\epsilon\rho\theta\omega\nu$ $\omicron\nu\kappa\epsilon\tau\iota$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$
 $\epsilon\rho\theta\omega\nu$ ($\chi\eta\varsigma$ B) β° EL β a7H-0142 syr Chr Thdrt
Taphy Oec
- (155) XI 7 $\epsilon\pi\epsilon$ $\beta\eta\tau\epsilon\iota$ P46 β ABDEL β a7... $\epsilon\pi\epsilon$ $\beta\eta\tau\epsilon\iota$ FG defg
vg syr Or Ambrst
- (156) XI 7 \omicron P46 β ...omit β ABDEFGLPa7
- (160) XI 8 $\kappa\iota\theta\omega\varsigma$ P46ADEFGLP β a7H-0142 Chr... $\kappa\iota\theta\omega\varsigma$ β B
- (163) XI 13 $\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu\upsilon$ P46 β ABCP... $\mu\epsilon\nu$ L β a7H-0142...omit DEFG
dfg go arm
- (164) XI 13 $\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon$ $\epsilon\rho\omega$ P46 β BCDEL β a7... $\epsilon\rho\omega$ $\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon$ FG vg go
Cyr Or Ambrst...omit A
- (166) XI 13 $\epsilon\rho\omega$ P46 β BCDEFGLP β a7H-0142 vg go Cyr Or Ambrst
...omit A arm Thdrt
- (167) XI 13 $\delta\omicron\beta$ $\alpha\sigma\omega$ P46FG β a7 defg vg Ghd τ Or Amb τ Amb...
 $\delta\omicron\beta$ $\alpha\beta\omega$ β ABCDELP Aug H-0142

- (168) XI 14 μου την σαρκη P46^sABCLP^ua7... την σαρκη μου
DEFG it vg Or
- (170) XI 15 κοσμου P46^sABCDELPa7H-0142... κοσμου FG^u
- (171) XI 15 προλημψις P46^sABDELPA7H-0142... προλημψις
CFG
- (172) XI 16 δε P46^sBC*DEFGLP^ua7 syr cop arm Chr Thdrt
Dam Aug (quodsi) defg vg Or Ambrst)... γαρ A
Ir (et si)...omit C^e
- (173) XI 16 η P46C*FGP* Chr... ει η ^cABC^cDELP^cu7H-0142
- (177) XI 17 της πιοσητος της ελεας εγενου P46^sABCD^cELP^ua7
vg.go syr^p Ir... εγενου της πιο- της ελεας D*FG
dfg cop aeth Or
- (178) XI 17 της P46D*FGdfg Ir... της ριξης της ^sBC^u cop
Dam... της ριξης της και ^dAELPa7H-0142 vg go
syr arm aeth Or Chr Thdrt Antioch
- (181) XI 18 ου P46D*FG dfg Ambrst...omit ^sABCD^cELP^ua7
H-0142
- (182) XI 18 κευχασαι P46D*FG... κευχασαι ^sABCD^cELP
u7H-0142
- (184) XI 19 εβεκλαρθησαν P46^sABCDELP^ua7H-0142 Chr Thdrt
Antioch Dam... ει κλαρθησαν FG dfg Or
- (185) XI 19 κλαδου P46^sABCD^cEFGLP^ua7 Chr Antioch Dam... ου
κλαδου D* Thdrt Antioch Thphyl
- (186) XI 20 εβεκλαρθησαν P46^sACD^cELP^ua7H-0142 Chr Thdrt
Antioch Dam... εκλαρθησαν BD*FG
- (187) XI 20 υψηλη φρονει P46^sAB... υψηλοφρονει CDEFGLP^ua7
H-0142 Or Chr Thdrt Antioch Dam
- (189) XI 21 μπως P46DEFGL^ua7H-0142 vg syr arm go Chr
Thdrt Antio Thphyl Oec Ir Cyp Ambrst
- (190) XI 22 του P46B...omit ^sACDEFGL^ua7 Clem Or
- (192) XI 22 αποτομια P46^s*ABC Or Dam... αποτομιαν ^sDEFG
L^ua7H-0142 dfg vg Or Hil Ambrst Clem Eus Chr
Thdrt Cyr Phot
- (193) XI 22 χρησοτης P46^sABCD*E arm Or Eus Dam... χρησοτητα
D^cFGL^ua7H-0142 dfg vg Or Hil Ambrst Clem Chr
Cyr Thdrt Phot
- (194) XI 22 ου P46^sABCD*E d vg cop arm Dam Pelag...omit
D^cFGL^ua7H-0142 go syr aeth Clem Or Eus Chr
Thdrt Cyr Hil Aug Ambrst
- (195) XI 22 επιμενης P46ACD^cEFGLa7H-0142 Clem Chr Thdrt
Cyr Dam... επιμενης ^sBD*^u
- (201) XI 25 ητε P46FG^u fg vg Hil Aug... ητε εν AB Dam...
παρ ^sCDEKLa7H-0142 Chr Thdor Thdrt
- (203) XI 25 αρι P46B*... αρις ^sAB^cDEFGKL^ua7
- (207) XI 26 προμενος P46^sABCD*FGH-0142 Euthal... προμενος
καλ D^cEKL^ua7 syr cop arm Or Chr Thdrt defg vg
Or Hil Ambrst
- (209) XI 26 λοβεβεις P46a7... λοβεβεις ^sABCDEFGKL^u
- (217) XI 30 γαρ P46^s*ABCD*EFGH-0142 dfg cop aeth go Or
Chr Dam Thphyl Aug... γαρ καλ ^sD^cKL^ua7 e vg
syr amr Chr Thdrt Oec Ambrst

- (221) XI 31 οντολ P46^sABD^cELP^a7H-0142 dfg vg Or Ambst...
 οντολ D*FG syr^{pmg}
- (223) XI 31 οντολ P46AD^cEFGL^a7H-0142 defg vg syr arm aeth
 go Or Chr Thdrt Ambrst... οντολ νυν ^sB^d* Dam
- (224) XI 32 τη παρθ D*FGP46 defg vg Ir (omits with FG)
 Amb... τας παρθας ^sABCD^cEL^a7H-0142 syr cop
 arm go Or Chr Thdrt Dam Aug
- (226) XI 36 αιωρας P46^sABDEG*LP^a7H-0142 deg vg... αιωρας
 των αιωρων FG^c syr^{sch} Or Cyp Hil
- (228) XII 1 οικτιριμων P46AB*D*L... οικτιριμων ^sB^d*D^cEFGL^a7
 (229) XII 1 εναρστον ου P46... τω εναρ- ου ^sB*AP vg Or
 Amb Ambrst Aug Dam... εναρ- τω ου ^sB^dCEFG
 LP^a7H-0142 defg arm syr cop Or Eus Chr Thdrt
 Tert Cyp
- (230) XII 2 οντολ χηματιζεοδε P46^sB*LP^aH-0142 defg vg go cop
 syr arm aeth Clem Chr Cyr Thdrt Dam Phot Oec
 Or Cyp Ambrst... οχηματιζεοδε AB^cDFGL^a7
 Thphyl
- (231) XII 2 μεταμορφουοδε B*D^cELH-0142 defg vg go cop
 syr arm aeth Clem Chr Thdrt Dam Phot Oec Or
 Cyp Ambrst... μορφουοδε ^sAB^d*D*FG^a7 Thphyl
- (232) XII 2 νουο P46ABD*FG cop Clem Or Cyp... νουο των
^sD^cELP^a7H-0142 defg vg syr arm go aeth Or Chr
 Cyr Thdrt Dam Aug Ambrst
- (233) XII 2 του P46^sABDEL^a7...omit FG
 (234) XII 3 της P46^sABDEFGP^a7H-0142... του ου της L go syr^p
 arm aeth Thphyl Aug
- (236) XII 3 ηη οδελ φροειν P46^sABDEL^a7H-0142...omit
 FG fg
- (237) XII 3 ο ου εμεριον P46^sBDEFGLP^a7H-0142 syr^p Hier
 Aug... εμεριον ο ου A syr^{sch} Or Ambrst
- (238) XII 4 κλαπη P46^sABD^cLP^a7H-0142... ωσπερ D-EFG
 (240) XII 4 πολλα μελη P46^sBDEFG defg vg Or Thdrt Thphyl
 Ambrst Aug... μελη πολλα ALP^a7 Bas Chr Antioch
 Dam Oec
- (242) XII 4 ηη λζειν εχει P46^sABDEF^cGLP^a7H-0142 deg vg Ambrst
 ... εχει ηη λζειν F* f syr Or Aug
- (244) XII 5 εομεν P46^sABDEL^a7 Or Eus...omit FG
 (245) XII 5 το P46^sABD*FG Antioch Dam... ο D^cEL^a7H-0142
 Eus Chr Thdrt
- (251) XII 7 δεκοντων P46^s*ABDEFGLP^a7H-0142... ο δεκοντων
^sB^d Bas Thdrt
- (252) XII 7 η τοι P46... ετε ^sABL^a7...omit DFG
 (254) XII 9 αποστουροντες P46^sABDEL^a7H-0142... μισουροντες FG
 (255) XII 11 κω P46^sABD^cELP^a7H-0142 Hier Ambrst Or ef vg
 syr cop arm go aeth Clem Or Ath Bas Chr Thdrt
 Antioch Dam Thphyl Oec... κλιω D*FG d*g Hier
 Or Ambrst(?)
- (257) XII 13 χρεαις P46^sABD^cELP^a7H-0142 ef vg syr cop arm
 aeth go Clem Or Chr Thdor Thdrt Dam Thphyl Oec
 Aug... μρεαις D*FG Thdor d Or Hil Ambrst Aug

- (258) XII 14 ευλογεστε τους δωκοντας και μη κατασθε P46...
 ευλογ- τους δωκ- υμας ευλογ- και μη καταρ- β^A
 $D^c L P \psi a 7 H - 0142$ Clem vg... ευλογ- τους δωκ- ευλογ-
 και μη καταρ- B... ευλογ- και μη καταρ-
 ευλογ- τους δωκ- υμας $D^* E d e$... ευλογεστε και μη
 κατασθε FG fg Or
- (259) XII 15 χειρινοντων P46 $\beta^B D^* F G$ Ambrst Aug defg vg go syr^{sch}
 arm Or... χειρινοντων και $A D^c E L P \psi a 7 H - 0142$ syr^{sch}
 cop aeth Bas Chr Thdrt Dam Tert Amb
- (266) XII 17 και P46 $\beta^A B D E L P \psi a 7 H - 0142$ de syr cop arm Or Chr
 Thdrt Dam... και ουμονον ερωπιον τουθου αλλα και
 FG fg vg go arm Leif Ambrst
- (267) XII 17 των P46 $A^* D^* E F G$ deg ... παντων $\beta^A^c B D^c L P$
 $\psi a 7 H - 0142$ f syr cop arm go Or Chr Bas Thdrt
 Dam Ambrst
- (268) XII 19 ανταποδω P46 $\beta^A B D E L P \psi a 7$... ανταποδω FG
- (270) XII 20 ψωμιζε P46 $\beta^B D^* E L P \psi a 7$... ψωμιζει $D^c F G$... ψωμιζε A
- (271) XII 20 εν P46 $\beta^A B D^c E F G L P \psi a 7$... και εν D^*
- (273) XII 20 εν P46 $\beta^A B D^* E F G L P a 7$... εν δε ψD^c arm go
- (274) XII 20 ποτιζε P46 $\beta^A B D^* E L P \psi a 7$... ποτιζει $D^c F G$
- (277) XII 21 υπο P46 $\beta^A B D E L P \psi a 7$... απο FG
- (278) XIII 1 πασαι P46 $D^* F G d f g$ Ir Ambrst... ισα ψυχη $\beta^A B D^c$
 $E L P \psi a 7 H - 0142$
- (279) XIII 1. υπωτασθε P46 $D^* F G$ dfg Ir Ambrst Tert... -εσθε
 $\beta^A B D^c E L P \psi a 7 H - 0142$ vg syr cop arm aeth Or Did
 Bas Chr Thdrt Dam Aug
- (281) XIII 2 ληψοντε P46 $\beta^A B^* D^* F G \psi a 7$... ληψοντε $B^c D^c E L P$
- (282) XIII 3 των αγαθων ερων αλλα των κακων P46 $\beta^A B D^* F G H - 0142$ defg
 cop go Clem Dam Ir Tert (in plural in vg Or
 Ambrst)... των αγαθων ερων αλλα των κακων $D^c E$
 $L \psi a 7$ syr arm Chr Thdrt Ambrst
- (283) XIII 4 σοι P46 $\beta^A B D E L P \psi a 7 H - 0142$ defg vg Iren Or Tert
 Ambrst... omit FG Ambrst
- (286) XIII 4 εχδικος εις οργην P46 $\beta^c A B L \psi^* H - 0142$ arm aeth
 go Ir Or vg syr cop... εις οργην εχδικος $\beta^* D^c E$
 $\psi^c a 7$ Chr Thdrt... εχδικος $D^* F G$ dfg
- (287) XIII 5 και P46... ανακη $\beta^A B L P \psi a 7 H - 0142$... DEFG defg go
 Ir omit.
- (288) XIII 5 υποτασθε P46... υποτασσεσθε P46 $^c D E F G$ defg
 go Ir... υποτασσεσθε $\beta^A B L P \psi a 7 H - 0142$ Or syr cop
 arm aeth vg Ambrst Aug
- (289) XIII 5 και P46 $\beta^A B D E L P \psi a 7$... omit FG
- (290) XIII 7 ποδοτε P46 $\beta^* A B D^*$ cop Or Dam Cyp Aug... ποδοτε
 ουν $\beta^c D^c E F G L P \psi a 7 H - 0142$ defg vg syr arm go Chr
 Thphyl Oec Ambrst
- (291) XIII 8 σφειλετε P46 $\beta^c A B D E F G L P \psi a 7 H - 0142$ Or... σφειλοντες
 $\beta^* Or$
- (292) XIII 8 αληλους αγαπαν P46 $\beta^A B D E F G$ defg vg syr^{sch} arm
 go Or Chr Thdrt Dam Cyp... αγαπαρ αληλους $L \psi a 7$
 sah cop syr^p aeth Thphyl Oec
- (293) XIII 9 το P46 $\beta^A B D E L P \psi a 7$... γεγραπτη FG fg Amb

- (297) XIII 9 κλεψεις P46ABDEFGLa7H-0142 defg syr^{sch} sah
go Clem Or Dial Cyr Thdrt Dam Aug Amb Ambrst
... ου ψενδομορτυρησεις $\beta\psi\upsilon$ vg syr^P arm
aeth Or Chr
- (299) XIII 9 εντολη P46^gCBDEFGLP^ua7H-0142 Clem Or...
εστιν εντολη β^*A D m def vg Or
- (300) XIII 9 τω λογω τουτω P46^gBD^gEF^g & Or... τουτω τω λογω
ALP^ua7 def Clem Chr Cyr Thdrt Dam
- (301) XIII 9 δρασησεις P46 BFG defg vg Or Ambrst... εν τω δρασησεις
 β ADEL^uP^ua7H-0142 Clem Or Dial Chr Cyr Thdrt
Dam
- (302) XIII 9 σειυ τον P46^gABDEa7H-0142 Clem Or Dial Thdrt Dam
... εαυτον FGLP^u Clem Chr Cyr Thphyl Oec
- (304) XIII 10 πλησιον P46^gABDEL^uP^ua7... πλησιω FG
- (305) XIII 10 ουκ εφραβεται P46^gABD^gEFGL^uP^ua7H-0142... ου
κατεφραβεται D*
- (306) XIII 10 ου P46^gABD^gELP^ua7H-0142 f vg sah cop syr^P
go Clem Or G r Thdrt Dam Aug... δε D*FG deg
aeth...omit P
- (308) XIII 11 ωρη ημας ηδη P46FGL^ua7 fg go Clem Chr Thdrt
Thphyl Oec... ηδη ωρη ημας P... ωρη ηδη ημας
 β ABCDE de vg Dam Ambrst Hier
- (309) XIII 12 ηρρικεν P46^gBCDEFGLP^ua7 Clem Or ... ηρρισειν A
- (310) XIII 12 αποβλημεθα DEF^gGP46 defg vg Or Cyp Ambrst...
αποθωμεθα β ABCL^uP^ua7H-0142 Clem
- (311) XIII 12 ενδυσωμεθα ου P46*syr... και ενδυσωμεθα $\beta^*C^*D^*FG$
L^ua7 vg arm aeth Chr Cyr Thdrt Cyp Ambrst...
ενδυσωμεθα δε ABC*D*EH*0142 cop Clem Or Dam...
ενδυσωμεθα P46^g β^*P
- (312) XIII 12 απλα β BCFGLP^ua7H-0142 Clem Or Cyp Ambrst P46 ...
εφρα ADE de
- (315) XIII 13 ερεδι και ζηλω P46^gACDEF^gTL^uP^ua7H-0142 Ir Or...
εν ερεδι και ζηλω B sah Clem Amb Cyp
- (316) XIII 14 αλλα P46ABD^gE... αλλα β CD*FGLP^ua7
- (318) XIII 14 τον κν ιν χν P46^gACDEFGLP^ua7... χν ιν τον B Clem
- (320) XIII 14 της P46D*FG dfg... και της β ABCD^gELP^ua7 Clem Or Bas
- (321) XIII 14 εις επιθυμιαν P46*AC Ath Cyr Thdrt Dam... εις
επιθυμιαν P46^g β DEL^uP^ua7H-0142 Ign Clem Or Bas
Chr Thdrt Thphyl Oec... FG defg
vg Ambrst
- (322) XIV 2 ος P46FG... ο β ABCDEL^uP^ua7 Clem Or
- (323) XIV 2 εθθειετω P46... εθθειετω β ABCD^gELP^ua7H-0142 d Clem
Or Tert Hier... εθθειετω D*FG efg vg arm Or Ambrst
Aug
- (326) XIV 3 κρενετω P46^gBCDEFGLP^ua7... κρενετω A Or
- (327) XIV 3 ο δε P46 β^*ABCD^*P ... και ο $\beta^*D^*EL^*a7$...
FG
- (330) XIV 3 μη P46^gABCDEL^uP^ua7...omit FG fg
- (336) XIV 4 δυνατος γαρ P46D P^uBas Chr... δυνατος γαρ εστιν
L^ua7H-0142 syr^p Thdrt Dam defg vg go Cyp Ambrst
... δυναται γαρ β ABCD*EFG

- (337) XIV 4 $\bar{\kappa}\bar{\varsigma}$ P46^sABCPhi sah 6op arm go aeth Bas Aug syr^{sch}
... $\bar{\theta}\bar{\varsigma}$ DEFGL Ψ a7 048 0142 defg vg syr^p Or Bas Chr
Thdrt Dam Cyp Aug Ambrst
- (339) XIV 5 $\mu\bar{\epsilon}\nu$ P46^s^cBDEFGL Ψ a7 048 syr cop arm aeth Or
Chr Thdrt Aug... $\mu\bar{\epsilon}\nu\gamma\eta$ $\bar{\zeta}$ *ACPhi 0142 defgvg
go Bas Dam Ambrst
- (341) XIV 6 $\phi\rho\upsilon\epsilon\lambda$ P46^sABC*DEFG 048 defg vg cop aeth Or
Ambrst Aug... $\phi\rho\upsilon\epsilon\lambda$ και ομη φρονων τηρ ημεραν
κυριω ου φρονει C^cL Ψ a7HI 0142 syr arm Bas Chr
Thdrt Dam Phot
- (343) XIV 6 και ευχαριστει P46P... ευχαριστει γαρ $\bar{\zeta}$ ABCDEFGF
L Ψ a7H-0142
- (346) XIV 6 και ευχαριστει P46P arm Clem Isid Dam...
ευχαριστει γαρ $\bar{\zeta}$ ABCDEFGFL Ψ a7H-0142
- (347) XIV 8 απο θυγατρων P46^sABDEFGL Ψ a7H-0142 Dam... απο θυγατρων
CP
- (348) XV 11 παντα εθνη τον $\bar{\kappa}\bar{\nu}$ P46^sABDEP Ψ de vg syr^p go arm
cop Chr Thdrt Dam Ambrst... τον $\bar{\kappa}\bar{\nu}$ παντα εθνη
CFGLa7
- (349) XV 11 επαινεσασθε P46^sABCDEFH-0142 Chr Dam...
επαινεσασθε FGLPa7 Chr Thdrt Thphyl Oec
- (350) XV 12 ησους λεγει P46^sABCDEFGL Ψ a7... λεγει ησους $\bar{\zeta}$
(354) XV 13 πληρωσαι P46^sACDELP Ψ a7H-0142 Chr Thdrt Dam...
πληρωσασθε EFG
- (355) XV 13 προσθη χαρις και ειρηνης P46... προσθη χαρις και
ειρηνης $\bar{\zeta}$ ACDELP Ψ a7H-0142... προσθη χαριτος και
ειρηνης $\bar{\Psi}$... προσθη χαρι και ειρηνη FG
... ει προσθη χαρι και ειρηνη B
- (356) XV 13 εν τω πιστευνειν P46^sABCLP Ψ H-0142a7... omit DEFG
defg arm
- (358) XV 13 εν P46^sABCD^cLP Ψ a7... omit DEFG g Chr
(360) XV 14 αδελφοι και αυτος εγω περι υμων $\bar{\zeta}$ ABCLP Ψ a7
... και αυτος εγω περι υμων αδελφοι DEFG
defg syr^{sch} Thdrt
- (361) XV 14 αδελφοι P46D*EFG dfg Thdrt Ambrst... αδελφοι μου
 $\bar{\zeta}$ ABCD^cLP Ψ a7H-0142 d vg cop syr^p Or
- (363) XV 14 μεστοι P46DEFG defg Chr... και αυτοι μεστοι
 $\bar{\zeta}$ ABCLP Ψ a7H-0142
- (364) XV 14 αγαθουνης P46^sABC Ψ a7 Clem Or ... αγαθουνης
DELP... αγαπης FG defg vg Ambrst
- (365) XV 14 πεπληρωμενοι προσης γρωσεως δυναμενοι και αλληλους
P46^sABCLP Ψ a7... και πεπληρωμενοι προσης γρωσεως
αλληλους δυναμενοι DEFG defg syr^{sch}
- (366) XV 14 προσης P46^sACDEFGL Ψ a7H-0142 Clem Thdrt... προσης
της $\bar{\zeta}$ BP Clem Dam
- (367) XV 14 αλληλους P46^sABCDEFGL Ψ H-0142... αλλους La7 syr
Or Chr Thdrt Thphyl Oec
- (368) XV 15 τολμη ετερον P46^sCDFGLP Ψ a7H-0142 Chr Thdor Cyr
Thdrt Dam... τολμη ετερος AB
- (370) XV 15 αδελφοι P46^s^cDEFGLP Ψ a7H-0142 defg vg syr arm
Thdrt Dam Ambrst... $\bar{\zeta}$ *ABC cop aeth Or Chr Cyr Aug

- (372) XV 15 ἀναμνησκῶν P46B... ἐπαναμνησκῶν β AC
DEFGLP ψ a7
- (374) XV 15 ἀπο P46 β BF Dam... ὑπο ACDEGLP ψ a7H-0142 Chr
Thdrt Cyr
- (377) XV 16 εἰς τι P46 β ABCD^cELP ψ a7H-0142 defg... γερουθλι
D*FG
- (378) XV 16 ἰη̅υ̅ χ̅ρ̅υ̅ P46DEL ψ a7 cop arm aeth Chr Cyr Thdrt...
χ̅ρ̅υ̅ ἰη̅υ̅ β ABCFGPH-0142 defg vg syr^pOr Chr Dam
Aug Ambrst
- (382) XV 16 εὐπρόθετος P46 β ABCDELP ψ a7... omit FG fg Fulg
- (384) XV 17 ἐχω P46... ἐχω οὖν β ALP ψ a7H-0142 arm Chr Cyr
Thdrt Dam... ἐχω οὖν τὴν BCDEFG
- (386) XV 18 τι τολμησῶ λαλεῖν P46... τολμησῶ τι λαλεῖν β ABC
DEFGP... τολμησῶ λαλεῖν τι L ψ a7
- (387) XV 18 τολμησῶ P46 β *ACDEFGLP ψ a7H-0142 cop syr^p Ath
Bas Chr Cyr Dam... τολμῶ β ^cB Did Cyr Thdrt defg
vg syr^{sch} arm Or Archel Ambrst
- (388) XV 18 λαλεῖν P46 β ABCLP ψ a7H-0142 syr^p arm Ath Did Bas
Cyr Dam Oec defg vg Or Archel Ambrst(dicere)...
εἰπεῖν DEFG Bas Dial
- (389) XV 18 κατεῖργασατο P46 β ABCP ψ a7... κατηργασατο DEFGL
- (390) XV 18 χ ^s P46 β ABCDELP ψ a7... ο χ ^s FG
- (392) XV 19 αὐτου P46D*EFG dfg... omit β ABCD^cLP ψ a7
- (394) XV 19 οὐ P46 β LP ψ a7H-0142... α̅ριου ACDEFG defg vg cop
arm syr^p Ath Bas Did Cyr Thdrt Aug Ambrst...
omit B
- (395) XV 19 ὡστε με ἀπο ἱερουσαλημ καὶ κυκλῶ μεχρι του
ιλλυρικου πεπληρωκεναι P46 β ABCLP ψ a7H-0142 vg
cop syr^{schp} aeth Or Chr Thdrt Dam Ambrst Aug
Ign Or Eus... ὡστε πεπληρωσθαι ἀπο ἱερουσαλημ
μεχρι του ιλλυρικου πεπληρωκεναι καὶ κυκλῶ
DEFG de
- (397) XV 20 φιλοτειμουμαι P46... φιλοτιμουμενον β AD^cEL ψ a7C
H-0142 syr^p Or Chr Euthal Thdrt Dam... φιλοτι-
μουμαι BD*FGP de vg Or Ambrst
- (398) XV 20 ευ̅γγελι̅ζε̅σθαι β ABCDEFGL ψ a7... ευ̅γγελι̅σε̅σθαι
P Chr
- (399) XV 20 ου̅χ̅ ο̅που P46 β ABCD^cELP ψ a7H-0142... ο̅που ου̅κ
D*FG fg Chr
- (401) XV 20 ο P46D*FG Chr... omit β ABCD^cELP ψ a7
- (402) XV 20 αλλοτριον θεμελιον P46 β ABCDELP ψ a7... αλλοτριω
θεμελιω FG
- (403) XV 21 ο̅ς ου̅κ ἀνηγγελη̅ περι̅αυ̅του ο̅φον̅ται P46 β AC
DEFGLP ψ a7H-0142... ο̅φον̅ται ο̅ς ου̅κ ἀνηγγελη̅
περι̅αυ̅του B
- (405) XV 22 ενεκοπησθη P46 β ABCLP ψ a7H-0142... ενεκοπην DEFG
- (406) XV 22 πολλακις P46BDEFG... τι πολλα β ACL ψ a7H-0142
Chr Thdrt Dam
- (410) XV 23 κλεμασε P46 β ABCD*LP ψ a7... κλιμασεν D^cEFG
- (411) XV 23 ἐχω̅ν P46 β ABCD^cELP ψ a7H-0142... ἐχω̅ D*FG dfg

- (414) XV 23 πολλων P46~~z~~ADEFGL~~z~~7H-0142 Chr Thdrt... (Κορων
BCP Dam
- (417) XV 24 πορευομεν P46~~z~~ABC~~z~~7 Chr Dam... πορευομεν DEFGP
Euthal... πορευομεν L
- (418) XV 24 σπριαν P45~~z~~*ABCDEF~~z~~GPH-0142 defg vg syr^{sch} cop
arm aeth Or Dam Ambrst Pel... σπριαν ελευσομεν
προς υμης ~~z~~^cL~~z~~7a7 syr^p Euthal Thdrt Tphyl Oeg
- (419) XV 24 γη P46~~z~~ABCDEL~~z~~P7a7H-0142...omit GF defg vg syr
cop arm aeth Or
- (420) XV 24 πορευομενος A... δεπορευομενος ~~z~~BCDEFGL~~z~~P7a7H-0142
Dam
- (421) XV 24 απο P46B... αφ DEFG... υφ ~~z~~ACLP~~z~~7a7H-0142 Chr Thdrt
Dam
- (423) XV 24 επιλησθω P46F... επιλησθω ~~z~~ABCDEGL~~z~~7
(424) XV 25 γυνε P46~~z~~ABCDEL~~z~~P7a7...γυν FG
(425) XV 25 δεκονησεν P46DEFG defg vg Or Ambrst... δεκονων
~~z~~^cABC~~z~~LP7a7H-0142 Chr Thdrt Dam... δεκονησων ~~z~~^{*}
- (426) XV 26 ευδοκησεν P46^c Chr Thdrt... ηυδοκησεν ~~z~~^{*}...
ευδοκησεν ACDEFGL~~z~~P7a7H-0142 defg Ambrst
- (427) XV 26 μακεδονα P46~~z~~ABCDEL~~z~~P7a7...μακεδονες FG d
(428) XV 26 αριων των εν ερουσλημ P46~~z~~ABC~~z~~LP7a7f vg Or
Aug Ambrst... εν ερουσλημ αριων DEFG d g
- (429) XV 26 των P46^c~~z~~ABC~~z~~LP7a7...omit P46*DEFG
(430) XV 27 οφειλεται γη P46FG dfg... ευδοκησεν γη και
οφειλεται BCL~~z~~P7a7... ηυδοκησεν γη και οφειλεται
~~z~~A... οφειλεται DE e
- (431) XV 27 εις αυτων P46~~z~~ABCDEP de vg syr^{sch} cop arm Or
Dam Ambrst... αυτων εις FGL~~z~~7a7
- (435) XV 28 ον P46~~z~~ABCDEL~~z~~P7a7... ον οφκ FG
(436) XV 28 τον P46B... ευτοις τον ~~z~~ACDEFGL~~z~~P7a7H-0142
(437) XV 28 υμων P46~~z~~ABCDEL~~z~~P7a7... υμης FG defg vg
(438) XV 28 σπριαν P46~~z~~*ABDEF~~z~~GPH Chr Dam... την σπριαν
~~z~~^cCLa7 Thdrt
- (439) XV 28 οιδα P46~~z~~ABCDEL~~z~~P7a7... γεινωσκω FG
(440) XV 29 τε P46... δε ~~z~~ABCDEL~~z~~P7a7H-0142 vg cop syr^p...
γη FG defg syr^{sch} Or Ambrst
- (441) XV 29 ευλογις P46~~z~~*ABCDEF~~z~~GPH-0142 defg cop arm aeth
Clem Or Ambrst... ευλογις του αγρεκου του
~~z~~^cL~~z~~7a7 syr arm Chr Thdrt
- (443) XV 30 υμης P46B Chr... υμης αδελφοι ~~z~~ACDEFGL~~z~~P7a7
H-0142 defg vg syr cop aeth Or Thdrt Dam Ambrst
- (445) XV 30 προσευχαις P46~~z~~ABC~~z~~LP7a7 Or... προσευχαις υμων
DEFG defg vg cop aeth Pel
- (446) XV 30 υπερ μου P46~~z~~ABCDEL~~z~~P7a7...omit FG dfg Or
(447) XV 31 και P46~~z~~*ABCDEF~~z~~GPH-0142 defg vg syr^{sch} cop
arm Or Dam Ambrst... και εν ~~z~~^cL~~z~~7a7 syr^p Chr
Thdrt Tphyl Oeg
- (448) XV 31 δεκονικ P46~~z~~ACD~~z~~ELP7a7H-0142 fg vg syr cop arm
aeth Or Chr Thdrt Dam... δωροφορι BD*FG de Ambrst
- (451) XV 31 εις P46~~z~~ACD^cELP7a7H-0142 Chr Thdrt Dam Chr Thdrt
... εν BD*FG Chr

- (452) XV 31 εὐπρόσδεκτος P46^s ABCDELP^a7... πρόσδεκτος FG
 (453) XV 31 δεα των αρχων γενηται P46... γενηται τοις αρχοις
 DEFGLP^a7 defg vg syr^p cop arm Or Chr Thdrt...
 τοις αρχοις γενηται ABC Dam
 (455) XV 32 ελθω P45^s BDEFGLP^a7H-0142 defg vg syr aeth
 Chr Thdrt... ελθων ^s*ACV cop arm Or
 (456) XV 32 Ω ^s*ACD^cLP^a7 vg syr cop arm Or Chr Thdrt Dam P46
 ... ου χυ ^s* Ambrst... ου ου B... ου ου D*EFG defg
 (457) XV 32 ο P46B... συναναπαυσωμαι υμιν ^s*ACV Chr Or Euthal
 Thdrt Dam... και συναναπαυσωμαι υμιν ο ^s*a7H-
 0142... συναναπαυσωμαι υμιν ο LP... αναψυξω μεθ υμων ο
 DE... αναψυξω μεθ υμων ο FG (tendency to this reading
 in defg vg Ambrst)
 (458) XV 33 μετ P46^s ABCD^cLP^a7H-0142... ητω μετ D*EFG
 (459) XV 33 υμων P46AFG fg... υμων αμην ABCDELP^a7H-0142
 (460) XV 33 vv.25-27 of Textus Receptus, ch.XVI, P46... after
 XIV 23, AKLP^a7 Oec syr^p Or Chr Cyr Thdrt Dam
 Theophyl... after XVI 23, ^sABCD*EF Or def vg
 syr^{sch} cop aeth Ambrst... omit D^cFGH-0142 g Marc
 (463) XVII 26 τε P46^s ABCLP^a7 Clem Or Cyr... omit DE def vg Or
 Hil Ambrst syr cop arm aeth
 (464) XVI 27 σοφω Ω P46^s ABCLP^a7... Ω σοφω DE de
 (467) XVI 27 ω P46^s ACDEL^a7... ουτω P... omit B Cr
 (468) XVI 27 αιωρας P46BCL Chr Cyr Thdrt... αιωρας των αιωρων
^sADEP^a7 defg vg syr^{sch} cop arm aeth Or Dam Hil
 Ambrst
 (469) XVI 1 δε P46^s ABCD^cELP^a7H-0142... omit D*FG dfg arm aeth
 (with P46 e vg syr cop Or Chr Thdrt Dam Ambrst)
 (470) XVI 1 ημων P46^s BCDEL^a7H-0142 dfg vg syr cop Or Thdrt
 Dam Ambrst... υμων AFGP
 (471) XVI 1 και P46^s BC*... omit ^s*AC^cDEFGLP^a7H-0142 defg
 vg Or
 (473) XVI 2 προσδεξθητε P46... προσ- ουτην BCDEFG defg... ουτην
 προσ ^sALP^a7 Or Chr Euthal Thdrt Dam Ambrst
 (479) XVI 5 και ην και οικον ουτων εκκλησιαν P46^s ABCLP^a7
 H-0142... omit P... after v.3, DEFG defg
 (482) XVI 5 απηχθη P46D*... απηχη ^sABCD^cEFGL^a7... omit P
 (483) XVI 5 τοις P46^s ABCD*EFG defg vg cop arm aeth Or Dam
 Ambrst... ηαυτοις B^cLP^a7ay syr Chr Thdrt Thpyhl Oec
 (484) XVI 5 εις χρ P46^s ABCLP^a7H-0142... εν χ^w DEFG defg
 vg Or
 (486) XVI 6 μπεριμ P46^s DEFGL^a7H-0142 Chr Thdrt Dam...
 μπεριμ ABCP cop arm
 (487) XVI 6 εις υμεις P46^s ABCLP^a7 syr cop arm aeth...
 εν υμιν DEFG deg vg Or Ambrst
 (488) XVI 6 υμεις P46^s *ABC*PH-0142 syr cop arm aeth...
 υμεις ^s*C^cL^a7 Thdrt Dam Chr Thdrt Dam... εν υμιν
 DEFG deg vg Ambrst
 (490) XVI 7 ους P46B... omit ^sACDEFGLP^a7H-0142
 (491) XVI 7 ος και P46... ος ^sABC LP^a7H-0142... ους DEFG
 defg vg... omit ^s*

- (492) XVI 7 γεγονεν P46... γεγοναν ~~AB~~... γεγονασιν CLP^a7
H-0142...omit DEFG
- (493) XVI 7 $\chi\rho\omega$ P46~~AB~~CLP^a7H-0142 Or... $\chi\rho\omega$ $\tau\upsilon$ DEFG dfg
Ambrst
- (494) XVI 8 $\alpha\sigma\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\epsilon$ P46~~AB~~CDEL^a7... $\alpha\sigma\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ F...
 $\alpha\sigma\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ G
- (495) XVI 8 $\alpha\mu\pi\lambda\alpha\tau\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ P46~~AB~~*FG defg vg cop aeth Or Ambrst
... $\alpha\mu\pi\lambda\alpha\tau\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ CB^cDEL^a7H-0142 syr. arm Chr Thdrt
Chron Dam
- (497) XVI 8 $\epsilon\upsilon$ P46BF... $\mu\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon$ ~~AC~~DEGLP^a7
- (500) XVI 9 $\chi\rho\omega$ P46~~AB~~LP^a7H-0142 syr cop aeth Or Chr Thdrt
Dam Ambrst... $\eta\omega$ CDEFG^y dfg arm Chr
- (504) XVI 10 $\mu\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\upsilon$ P46~~AB~~CDEL^a7H-0142... $\mu\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\upsilon$
B*FG defg vg
- (506) XVI 11 $\sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\eta$ P46AB*D*... $\sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\eta$ ~~AB~~^cCD^cEFGLP^a7
- (508) XVI 12 $\tau\upsilon\phi\alpha\iota\kappa\tau\epsilon\upsilon$ P46BC^cDEL^a7... $\tau\upsilon\phi\alpha\iota\kappa\tau\epsilon\upsilon$ C*... $\tau\upsilon\phi\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\upsilon$
~~AB~~FGP
- (510) XVI 12 $\alpha\sigma\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\epsilon$ $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\delta\alpha$ $\tau\eta\upsilon$ $\alpha\gamma\lambda\eta\tau\eta\upsilon$ η $\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\mu\omicron\lambda\lambda\alpha$ $\epsilon\kappa\omicron\pi\iota\tau\epsilon\upsilon$
 $\epsilon\upsilon$ $\eta\omega$ P46~~BC~~DEL^a7H-0142...omit AFG
- (513) XVI 14 $\epsilon\mu\eta\upsilon$ $\epsilon\mu\alpha\upsilon$ $\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\upsilon\beta\alpha\upsilon$ P46... $\epsilon\mu\eta\upsilon$ $\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\upsilon\beta\alpha\upsilon$ $\epsilon\mu\alpha\upsilon$
~~AB~~CD*FGP defg cop aeth Or... $\epsilon\mu\alpha\upsilon$ $\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\upsilon\beta\alpha\upsilon$ $\epsilon\mu\eta\upsilon$
D^cEL^a7H-0142 vg syr^p arm Chr Thdrt Chron Dam
Ambrst
- (517) XVI 15 $\beta\eta\tau\epsilon\alpha$ P46... $\nu\eta\tau\epsilon\alpha$ ~~BC~~DEL^a7H-0142... $\nu\eta\tau\epsilon\alpha\upsilon$
AFG degf vg Or Ambrst (nereum)
- (518) XVI 15 $\lambda\omicron\upsilon\lambda\iota\alpha\upsilon$ P46... $\iota\omicron\upsilon\lambda\iota\alpha\upsilon$ ~~AB~~C^cDEL^a7H-0142...
 $\iota\omicron\upsilon\lambda\iota\alpha\upsilon$ C*FG
- (520) XVI 15 $\omicron\lambda\upsilon\mu\pi\alpha\upsilon$ P46~~AB~~CLP^a7H-0142... $\omicron\lambda\upsilon\mu\pi\iota\alpha\upsilon$ DE...
 $\omicron\lambda\upsilon\mu\pi\epsilon\iota\delta\alpha$ FG... $\omicron\lambda\upsilon\mu\pi\alpha\delta\epsilon\mu$ defg vg Or Ambrst
- (523) XVI 16 $\alpha\sigma\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\epsilon$ $\nu\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ $\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\tau\epsilon\upsilon$ $\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\upsilon$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\chi\rho\omega$
P46~~AB~~CLP^a7H-0142...omit DEFG defg
- (524) XVI 16 $\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\upsilon$ P46~~AB~~CDEFGLP^a7H-0142 vg syr cop arm aeth
Or Cyr Thdrt Ambrst...omit a7 Chr Dam Thphyl Oec
- (526) XVI 17 $\mu\eta\lambda\kappa\lambda\omega$ P46~~AB~~CD^cFGLP^a7H-0142... $\epsilon\phi\omega\tau\omega$ D*E defg vg
- (527) XVI 17 $\sigma\kappa\omicron\pi\epsilon\iota\upsilon$ P46~~AB~~CLP^a7H-0142 vg Or ... $\alpha\sigma\phi\alpha\lambda\omega\varsigma$
 $\sigma\kappa\omicron\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon$ DEFG defg
- (534) XVI 17 $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\tau\epsilon$ P46... $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\iota\alpha\tau\epsilon$ ~~AC~~DEFGLP^a7H-0142 Chr
... $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\iota\alpha\tau\epsilon$ ~~ABC~~^y Thdrt Dam
- (535) XVI 18 $\tau\omega$ P46~~AB~~CDEL^a7...omit FG
- (536) XVI 18 $\eta\mu\omega\upsilon$ $\chi\rho\omega$ P46~~AB~~CP syr^p arm aeth Thdrt... $\chi\rho\omega$
 $\eta\mu\omega\upsilon$ DEFG
- (537) XVI 18 $\eta\mu\omega\upsilon$ P46~~AB~~CDEFGP^a7H-0142 syr^p arm aeth Thdrt
e/vg Or Aug fg... $\eta\mu\omega\upsilon$ $\tau\upsilon$ L syr^{sch} cop arm aeth
Chr Dam
- (538) XVI 18 $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\upsilon$ P46~~AB~~CDEL^a7... $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\upsilon$ FG
- (539) XVI 18 $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\alpha\varsigma$ P46~~AB~~CD^cLP^a7H-0142 vg Or...omit
D*EFG defg Chr
- (540) XVI 19 $\nu\mu\omega\upsilon$ $\nu\pi\alpha\kappa\omicron\eta$ P46~~AB~~CLP^a7 de vg Or... $\nu\pi\alpha\kappa\omicron\eta$ $\nu\mu\omega\upsilon$
DEFG fg Ambrst
- (542) XVI 18 $\chi\alpha\iota\omega$ $\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$ $\epsilon\phi\omega\mu\epsilon\upsilon$ P46D*FG d arm syr^p... $\epsilon\phi\omega\mu\epsilon\upsilon$
 $\chi\alpha\iota\omega$ $\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$ ~~AB~~CLP^a7... $\chi\alpha\iota\omega$ $\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$ $\tau\omicron$ $\epsilon\phi\omega\mu\epsilon\upsilon$
~~BC~~^cD^cE^y Chr Thdrt defg Ambrst vg syr^{sch}

- (543) XVI 19 και θελω δε P46... και θελω D*EFG defg aeth...
θελω δε ~~Σ~~ABCD^cLPψa7
- (544) XVI 19 σοφους P46BDEFGLΨ defg vg cop arm aeth Clem Or
Chr Thdrt Ambrst... σοφους μεν ~~Σ~~ACPa7 syr^p Chr
Dam Thphyl Oec Aug
- (545) XVI 20 συντριψει P46~~Σ~~BDEFGLPψa7H-0142 Or Chr Cyr Dam
Thphyl Oec Or Victor Ambrst... συντριψαλ A Or
Gall Thdrt
- (546) XVI 20 υπο τους ποδας υμων εν ταχει P46~~Σ~~BDEFGLPψ
a7H-0142... εν ταχει υπο τους ποδας υμων
A syr^{sch}
- (547) XVI 20 η χρις του κυ ημων ιηου μεθ υμων P46~~Σ~~ABCLPψa7
vg Or Ambrst... omit DEFGH-0142 defg
- (548) XVI 20 ιη P46~~Σ~~B... ιη χυ ACDEFGLPψa7H-0142 vg syr
cop arm aeth Or Chr Thdrt Dam Ambrst
- (549) XVI 2B λσπαζεται P46~~Σ~~ABCD*FGPψH-0142 defg vg cop syr^p
arm Or Chr Thphyl... λσπαζονται D^cELa7 syr^{sch}
Thdrt Dam Oec
- (551) XVI 21 λουκιος P46B... λουκιος και ~~Σ~~ACDEFGLPψa7
- (552) XVI 21 μου P46~~Σ~~ABCD^cLPψa7... μου και δι εκκλησιασιν πασαι
των χυ D*EFG defg
- (553) XVI 23 v.24, omit P46~~Σ~~ABC... η χρις του κυ ημων (υμων L)
τω χυ (FG omits τω χυ) μετα παντων υμων αμην
DEFGLPψa7... ~~Σ~~ABCD*E add vv. 25-27 (cf. 460)...
P add vv. 25-27,24 (sic), omitting ημων in v.24

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, Philip S., The Romanesque Lyric, Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press, 1928.
- Burgon, J. W., and Miller, Edward, The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels, London, George Bell and Sons, 1896.
- Bury, J. B., The Life of St. Patrick, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1905.
- Butler, Dom. E. C., "Monasticism," The Cambridge Medieval History, I, planned by J. B. Bury, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1924.
- Dinneen, P. S., "Irish Love of Learning," The Glories of Ireland, edited by Joseph Dunn and P. J. Lennox, Washington, D. C., Phoenix, Limited, 1914.
- Dobschuetz, E. von, Nestle's Einfuehrung in das Griechische Neue Testament, Vierte Auflage, Goettingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1923.
- Gregory, Caspar R., Canon and Text of the New Testament, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924.
- _____, _____, Prolegomena, Novum Testamentum Graece, Lipsiae, J. C. Hinrichs, 1884.
- _____, _____, Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes, Leipzig, J.C. Hinrichs, 1909.
- Hoskier, H. C., "A Study of the Chester-Beatty Codex of the Pauline Epistles," Journal of Theological Studies, XXXVIII (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1937), pp. 148-163.
- _____, _____, P46, Addenda et Corrigenda, Oxford, University Press, 1937.
- _____, _____, "'The Shorter Text' of the Pauline Epistles as gathered from the Papyrus 46," Appendix to an article on the Chester-Beatty Papyrus of the Pauline Epistles known as P46, The Journal of Theological Studies, No. 150, Oxford, University Press, April, 1937.

- Joyce, P. W., An Illustrated History of Ireland, New York, Longmans, Green and Col., 1920.
- Kenyon, Sir Frederic, Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1940.
- _____, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible, Fasciculi I-VIII, London, Emery Walker Limited, 1933-1941.
- Merk, Augustinus, S. I., Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine, Editio Tertia, Romae, Sumptibus Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1938.
- Nestle, D. Erwin, Novum Testamentum Graece, Edition Sexta Decima, Privilegierte Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1936.
- Robertson, A. T., An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, New York, George H. Doran Company, 1925.
- Salmon, George, Some Thoughts on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, London, John Murray, 1897.
- Sanders, Henry A., A Third-Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of Paul, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1935.
- Seeseman, Heinrich, "Der Chester-Beatty Papyrus 46 und der Paulustext des Clemens Alexandrinus," Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der aelteren Kirche, 36 (Berlin, 1937), pp. 90-97.
- Soden, Henry F. von, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, Teil I, zweite Ausgabe (1911), Teil II, Sonderausgabe (1913), Goettingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Souter, Alexander, The Text and Canon of the New Testament, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924.
- Thompson, James W., and Johnson, Edgar N., An Introduction to Medieval Europe, New York, W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1937.
- Tischendorf, Constantinus, Novum Testamentum Graece, Editio Octava Critica Maior, I und II, Lipsiae, Giesecke & Devrient, 1869-1872.

Westcott, Brooke F., A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament, fifth edition, Cambridge and London, Macmillan and Co., 1881.

Westcott, B. F., and Hort, F. J. A., The New Testament in the Original Greek, Introduction and Appendix, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1882.

White, Newport J. D., A Translation of the Latin Writings of St. Patrick, London, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1918.