



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

- This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.
- A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.
- This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.
- The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.
- When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

SCRIBAL HABITS IN CODEX SINAITICUS, VATICANUS, EPHRAEMI,
BEZAE, AND WASHINGTONIANUS IN THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

GREGORY SCOTT PAULSON

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH, NEW COLLEGE
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

EDINBURGH, UK

2013

The thesis has been composed by the candidate and is the candidate's own work.

Gregory Scott Paulson, Ph.D. candidate

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page.....	i
Declaration.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	xi
Abbreviations, Critical Signs, and Collation Key.....	xii
Abstract.....	xx
Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
1.1. Why the Gospel of Matthew?.....	3
1.2. The Selection of Manuscripts.....	4
1.3. Studies of Scribal Habits and a Lacuna in Research.....	6
1.3.1. E.C. Colwell.....	7
1.3.2. James R. Royse.....	7
1.3.3. Juan Hernández Jr.....	8
1.3.4. A Lacuna in Research.....	9
1.4. Definition of Singular Reading and Methodology.....	12
1.4.1. Critique of the Singular Reading Methodology.....	14
1.4.1.1. Preliminary Remarks.....	14
1.4.1.2. True Singularity of a Variant.....	15
1.4.1.3. Limitations of Printed Editions.....	18
1.4.2. Precautions.....	19
1.4.3. Uncorrected Readings.....	21
1.5. Layout of the Dissertation.....	24
Chapter Two: Codex Sinaiticus.....	26
2.1. Introduction.....	26
2.1.1. The Scribes.....	27
2.1.2. Dictation Theory.....	27
2.2. <i>Nomina Sacra</i>	28
2.2.1. Overview of <i>Nomina Sacra</i>	28
2.2.2. Scribe A.....	29
2.2.2.1. Primary <i>Nomina Sacra</i>	29
2.2.2.2. Secondary <i>Nomina Sacra</i>	29
2.2.2.3. Tertiary <i>Nomina Sacra</i>	30
2.2.3. Scribe D.....	31
2.3. The Singular Readings of Scribe A in Sinaiticus in Matthew.....	32
2.3.1. Orthography.....	32
2.3.1.1. Overview of Orthography.....	32
2.3.1.2. Itacisms.....	34
2.3.1.3. Other Vocalic Changes.....	34
2.3.1.4. Consonantal Changes.....	34

2.3.1.5. Omissions and Additions of Letters.....	35
2.3.1.6. Other Spellings.....	35
2.3.2. Inexplicable Spellings.....	35
2.3.3. Nonsense in Context.....	36
2.3.4. Parablepsis.....	36
2.3.4.1. Overview of Parablepsis.....	36
2.3.4.2. Haplography.....	37
2.3.4.3. Dittography.....	39
2.3.5. Transpositions.....	39
2.3.5.1. Overview of Transpositions.....	39
2.3.5.2. Corrected Leaps.....	41
2.3.5.3. Transpositions.....	42
2.3.6. Influence from Context.....	42
2.3.7. Gospel Harmonizations.....	45
2.3.7.1. Harmonization Overview.....	45
2.3.7.2. Gospel Parallels.....	46
2.3.8. The Use of Conjunctions.....	47
2.3.9. Definite Articles.....	47
2.3.10. Other Substitutions.....	48
2.3.11. Other Omissions.....	50
2.3.12. Inexplicable Changes.....	51
2.3.13. Koine Grammar.....	52
2.3.14. Other Construed Singular Readings.....	52
2.3.15. Theological Readings and Interpretation of the Text.....	53
2.4. The Singular Readings of Scribe D in Matthew.....	54
2.5. Conclusion.....	56
Chapter Three: Codex Vaticanus.....	59
3.1. Introduction.....	59
3.2. <i>Nomina Sacra</i>	59
3.2.1. Primary <i>Nomina Sacra</i>	59
3.2.2. Secondary and Tertiary <i>Nomina Sacra</i>	60
3.3. The Singular Readings in Vaticanus in Matthew.....	60
3.3.1. Orthography.....	61
3.3.1.1. Itacisms.....	61
3.3.1.2. Other Vocalic Changes.....	61
3.3.1.3. Consonantal Orthography.....	61
3.3.2. Misconstrued Spellings.....	62
3.3.3. Not Construed in Context.....	62
3.3.4. Parablepsis.....	63
3.3.4.1. Haplography.....	63
3.3.4.2. Dittography.....	64
3.3.5. Influence from Context.....	64
3.3.6. Inexplicable Readings.....	65
3.3.7. Attic and Koine Greek.....	65
3.3.8. Aorist Constructions.....	66
3.3.9. Transpositions.....	67
3.3.10. Substitutions for Synonyms.....	68

3.4. Conclusion.....	68
Chapter Four: Codex Ephraemi.....	70
4.1. Introduction.....	70
4.1.1. Scribe and Correctors.....	71
4.1.2. Date and Provenance.....	71
4.2. <i>Nomina Sacra</i>	71
4.3. The Singular Readings in Ephraemi in Matthew.....	72
4.3.1. Orthography and Spelling.....	72
4.3.1.1. Itacisms.....	73
4.3.1.2. Vocalic Orthography.....	73
4.3.1.3. Consonantal Orthography.....	73
4.3.1.4. Letter Omissions.....	73
4.3.1.5. Letter Additions.....	74
4.3.1.6. Other Spellings.....	74
4.3.2. Omission and Addition of Syllables.....	75
4.3.3. Parablepsis.....	75
4.3.3.1. Within Words.....	75
4.3.3.2. Whole Words.....	76
4.3.4. Nonsense Readings In Context.....	77
4.3.5. Textual Improvement.....	77
4.3.6. Influence of Context.....	77
4.3.7. Inexplicable Readings.....	78
4.3.8. Harmonization to Mark.....	79
4.4. Conclusion.....	80
Chapter Five: Codex Bezae.....	82
5.1. Introduction.....	82
5.1.1. The Scribe, Correctors, and Bezae's Provenance.....	83
5.2. <i>Nomina Sacra</i>	84
5.3. The Singular Readings in Codex D in Matthew.....	84
5.3.1. Orthography.....	86
5.3.1.1. Itacisms.....	86
5.3.1.2. Vocalic Changes.....	86
5.3.1.3. Consonantal Orthography and Other Spellings.....	87
5.3.1.4. Consonant Exchanges.....	87
5.3.1.5. Letter Addition.....	88
5.3.1.6. Letter Omission.....	88
5.3.1.7. Syllable Omissions.....	88
5.3.2. Not Construed in Context.....	88
5.3.3. Inexplicable Readings.....	89
5.3.4. Parablepsis.....	89
5.3.4.1. Haplography.....	90
5.3.4.2. Dittography.....	91
5.3.5. Transpositions.....	91
5.3.6. Synonym Substitutions.....	92
5.3.7. Definite Articles.....	93
5.3.7.1. Proper Names.....	93

5.3.7.2. Common Nouns.....	94
5.3.7.3. Verbs.....	94
5.3.7.4. Genitive Absolute Construction.....	95
5.3.8. Attic, Koine, Hebraic, and Latin Constructions.....	95
5.3.9. Influence from Context.....	96
5.3.10. Agreement in Bezae Between the Greek and Latin Columns.....	100
5.3.11. Noun and Adjective Changes.....	101
5.3.12. Use of Pronouns.....	101
5.3.13. Textual Improvement.....	102
5.3.14. Use of Verbs.....	104
5.3.15. Other Omissions.....	106
5.4. Conclusion.....	107
Chapter Six: Codex Washingtonianus.....	109
6.1. Introduction.....	109
6.1.1. Provenance and Date.....	109
6.1.2. The Scribe and Correctors.....	110
6.2. <i>Nomina Sacra</i>	110
6.3. The Singular Readings in W in Matthew.....	111
6.3.1. Orthography.....	111
6.3.1.1. Itacisms.....	111
6.3.1.2. Other Vocalic Changes.....	112
6.3.1.3. Consonant Orthography.....	112
6.3.1.4. Other Spellings.....	113
6.3.2. Not Construed in Context.....	113
6.3.3. Parablepsis.....	114
6.3.3.1. Haplography.....	114
6.3.4. Transpositions.....	115
6.3.5. Influence from Context.....	116
6.3.6. Synonym Substitutions.....	117
6.3.7. Attic and Hebraic Influence.....	118
6.3.8. Aorist Constructions.....	119
6.3.9. Stylistic or Inexplicable Changes.....	120
6.3.10. Textual Emphasis.....	121
6.3.11. Concerning Pharisees.....	121
6.3.12. Conflations.....	122
6.4. Conclusion.....	122
Chapter Seven: Conclusions.....	125
7.1. General Conclusions.....	125
7.1.1. <i>Nomina Sacra</i>	125
7.1.2. Orthography.....	126
7.1.3. Attic vs. Koine Grammar.....	127
7.1.4. Harmonizations.....	127
7.1.5. Conflations.....	127
7.1.6. Theological Readings.....	128
7.1.7. The Shorter Reading.....	128
7.2. Conclusion.....	131

Appendix One: Select Details of II-V/VI Century Greek Manuscripts that Contain the Gospel of Matthew.....	132
Appendix Two: Singular Readings in Sinaiticus in Matthew.....	134
1. Scribe A.....	134
2. Scribe D.....	144
Appendix Three: Singular Readings in Vaticanus in Matthew.....	146
Appendix Four: Singular Readings in Ephraemi in Matthew.....	152
Appendix Five: Singular Readings in Codex D in Matthew.....	157
Appendix Six: Singular Readings in Washingtonianus in Matthew.....	173
Appendix Seven: Non-Singular Readings in Sinaiticus in Matthew.....	180
Appendix Eight: Non-Singular Readings in Vaticanus in Matthew.....	189
Appendix Nine: Non-Singular Readings in Ephraemi in Matthew.....	195
Appendix Ten: Non-Singular Readings in Codex D in Matthew.....	198
Appendix Eleven: Non-Singular Readings in Washingtonianus in Matthew.....	225
Appendix Twelve: <i>Nomina Sacra</i> in Sinaiticus in Matthew.....	231
1.	231
Ihsouj.....	231
2.	232
Xristoj.....	232
3.	233
kurioj.....	234
4.	235
Qeoj.....	236
5.	237
pneuma.....	237
6. anqrwpoj.....	238
7. pathr.....	238
8.	238
uioj.....	238
9.	239
mhthr.....	239
10.	239
ouranoj.....	240
11.	240
Israhl.....	241

12.	241
Daueid.....	242
13.	242
Ierousalhm.....	243
	243
Appendix Thirteen: <i>Nomina Sacra</i> in Vaticanus in Matthew.....	243
1.	243
Ihsouj.....	244
2.	
Xristoj.....	245
3.	245
kurioj.....	245
4.	245
Qeoj.....	246
5.	246
pneuma.....	247
6. angrwpoj.....	247
7. pathr.....	248
8.	248
uioj.....	249
9.	249
mhthr.....	249
10.	249
ouranoj.....	249
11.	
Israhl.....	250
12.	250
Daueid.....	250
13.	251
Ierousalhm.....	251
	251
Appendix Fourteen: <i>Nomina Sacra</i> in Ephraemi in Matthew.....	252
1.	252
Ihsouj.....	253
2.	253
Xristoj.....	254
3.	254
kurioj.....	254
4.	254
Qeoj.....	
5.	255
pneuma.....	255
6. angrwpoj.....	255
7. pathr.....	256
8.	256
uioj.....	257
9.	258
mhthr.....	259

10.	260
ouranoj.....	260
11.	261
Israhl.....	261
12.	261
Daueid.....	261
13.	
Ierousalhm.....	262
	262
Appendix Fifteen: <i>Nomina Sacra</i> in Codex D in Matthew.....	268
1.	269
Ihsouj.....	277
2.	278
Xristoj.....	
3.	280
kurioj.....	280
4.	281
Qeoj.....	
5.	283
pneuma.....	283
6. anqrwpoj.....	283
7. pathr.....	283
8.	283
uioj.....	284
9.	
mhthr.....	285
10.	285
ouranoj.....	285
11.	286
Israhl.....	287
12.	294
Daueid.....	
13.	295
Ierousalhm.....	295
	295
Appendix Sixteen: <i>Nomina Sacra</i> in Washingtonianus in Matthew.....	297
1.	298
Ihsouj.....	299
2.	299
Xristoj.....	
3.	
kurioj.....	
4.	301
Qeoj.....	301
5.	301
pneuma.....	301
6. anqrwpoj.....	302
7. pathr.....	302

8.	uioj.....	303
9.	mhthr.....	
10.	ouranoj.....	
11.	Israhl.....	
12.	Daueid.....	
13.	Ierousalhm.....	
Appendix Seventeen: Itacisms in Sinaiticus in Matthew.....		
1.	ai >	
	e.....	
2.	e >	
	ai.....	
3.	ei >	
	i.....	
4.	i >	
	ei.....	
5.	Singular Readings with Non-Singular Orthographic Changes.....	
Appendix Eighteen: Itacisms in Vaticanus in Matthew.....		
1.	i >	
	ei.....	
2.	Singular Readings with Non-Singular Orthographic Exchanges.....	
Appendix Nineteen: Itacisms in Ephraemi in Matthew.....		
1.	ai >	
	e.....	
2.	e >	
	ai.....	
3.	ei >	
	i.....	
4.	i >	
	ei.....	
5.	Singular Readings with Non-Singular Orthographic Changes.....	
Appendix Twenty: Itacisms in Codex D in Matthew.....		
1.	ai >	
	e.....	
2.	e >	
	ai.....	
3.	ei >	
	i.....	
4.	i >	

ei.....

5. Singular Readings with Non-Singular Orthographic Exchanges.....

Appendix Twenty-One: Itacisms in Washingtonianus in Matthew.....

1. ai >
e.....

2. e >
ai.....

3. ei >
i.....

4. i
>ei.....

5. oi >
u.....

6. Singular Readings with Non-singular Orthographic Exchanges.....

Appendix Twenty-Two: Singular Omissions (-) and Additions (+) of
Words.....

Table A22.1 Codex Sinaiticus.....

Table A22.2 Codex Vaticanus.....

Table A22.3 Codex Ephraemi.....

Table A22.4 Codex Bezae.....

Table A22.5 Codex Washingtonianus.....

Bibliography.....

Acknowledgements

I am indebted to several scholars who helped whet my appetite for textual criticism. While in seminary, I took Greek Readings with then adjunct professor Juan Hernández Jr. I had a number of opportunities outside of class to chat with Dr. Hernández about his Ph.D. dissertation and became fascinated with the world of biblical manuscripts and scribal habits. When I began applying for doctorate programs I communicated with Dr. Hernández about dissertation topics and his response toward a proposal of singular readings in Matthew was very encouraging. Throughout the dissertation process, Dr. Hernández has been an indispensable conversation partner on all matters of textual criticism and selflessly looked over several drafts of my dissertation, as well as portions of papers presented at conferences. For this, I owe him a lifetime supply of Penguin Classics. I have also received encouraging support toward my research from my supervisors Dr. Paul Foster and Prof. Larry Hurtado at the University of Edinburgh. Thanks to these scholars' encouragement and enthusiasm, I have had an opportunity to research a very rewarding subject within New Testament textual criticism.

Numerous colleagues and staff at New College and the wider University of Edinburgh provided stimulating conversations and enriching friendships that I will cherish for a lifetime. I express the deepest gratitude and debt to all the scholars whose work has forged the way ahead of me. Their indefatigable efforts to wrestle with the complexities of this topic provided a firm foundation upon which to stand.

My parents, Dr. Steven and Sally Paulson, have supported me in my intellectual and spiritual journey every step of the way. Their example has taught me far more than is possible to state here. Their tireless patience, authenticity, strong work ethic, and love of learning have all deeply shaped the way I conduct my life.

My wife, Katie, has been very supportive, patient, and helpful, and has provided many encouraging and challenging conversations. Her feedback and ideas have not only helped shape this study for the better, but have given me a new lens to look through at life.

ABBREVIATIONS, CRITICAL SIGNS, AND COLLATION KEY

All biblical citations are from the Gospel of Matthew unless otherwise noted.

ENGLISH ABBREVIATIONS

GNT	Greek New Testament
MS(S)	Manuscript(s)
NT	New Testament
OT	Old Testament
1s, 1p, 2s, etc.	First person singular, first person plural, second person singular, etc.

EDITIONS

BHS	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> , ed. K. Elliger and W. Rudolph. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.
ECM	<i>Novum Testamentum Graecum Editio Critica Maior</i>
IGNTP	International Greek New Testament Project
LXX	Unless otherwise noted, <i>Septuaginta</i> , ed. Alfred Rahlfs. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.
NA ²⁷	The Nestle-Aland <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> , 27 th ed, ed. Barbara and Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2001. When the NA ²⁷ is enclosed within brackets [NA ²⁷], that means the text found in the NA ²⁷ is enclosed within brackets, indicating that the editors are not certain of the best reading.
NA ²⁸	The Nestle-Aland <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> , 28 th ed, ed. Barbara and Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.

REFERENCE WORKS

BDAG	Danker, Frederick William, ed. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature</i> , 3d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
------	--

- BDF Blass, F. and A. Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. and rev. Robert W. Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- INTF Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung. Their New Testament Transcripts Prototype can be found here: <http://nttranscripts.uni-muenster.de/>
- Liddell-Scott Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. New ed. Henry Stuart Jones and Roderick McKenzie. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.
- Moulton and Milligan Moulton, James Hope and George Milligan. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament: Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1930.
- TDNT *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel, vols. 1-10. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: Grand Rapids, 2006.

ABBREVIATIONS OF COMMONLY CITED MANUSCRIPTS

For complete list of manuscript abbreviations, see *Index Subsidiorum Criticorum* in Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 7th ed. (1859), 1:cxxx-ccxxxii (*Catalogus Codicum Graecorum*), ccxxvii-cclv (*Versiones Antiquae*), and cclv-cclxix (*Scriptores Ecclesiastici*). The most common abbreviations found in the study are as follows:

-) Codex Sinaiticus. Gregory-Aland 01. Folio numbers are from the British Library digital manuscript. The siglum for the scribes and correctors have been adopted from the British Library (see “Production of the Manuscript” and “Revisions”, http://www.codexsinaiticus.org/en/project/transcription_detailed.aspx). On-line at <http://www.codexsinaiticus.org/en/manuscript.aspx>
- B Codex Vaticanus. Gregory-Aland 03. The siglum for scribes and correctors have been adopted from the INTF New Testament Transcripts Prototype.
- C Codex Ephraemi. Gregory-Aland 04. Lyon’s corrections of Tischendorf’s transcription have been included. Folio numbers reflect the Bibliothèque nationale de France digitization of the MS. On-line here: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8470433r>
- D The Greek text of Codex Bezae. Gregory-Aland 05. Folio numbers are from the University of Cambridge Digital Library edition of Codex Bezae. On-line here: <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-NN-00002-00041/1>

W	Codex Washingtonianus. Gregory-Aland 032. Folio numbers are from Sanders, Henry A., <i>Facsimile of the Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels in the Freer Collection</i> (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1912).
<i>f</i> ¹	Family One. MSS 1 118 131 209 1582 <i>et al.</i> are included in the symbol. ¹
<i>f</i> ¹³	Family Thirteen. MSS 13 69 124 174 230 346 543 788 826 828 983 1346 1689 1709 <i>et al.</i> are included in the symbol. ²
M	The Majority Text. MSS E F G H S Y W 2 3 8 9 <i>et permulti alii</i> are included in the symbol. ³
<i>d</i>	The Latin text of Codex Bezae. Folio numbers are from the University of Cambridge Digital Library edition of Codex Bezae.
<i>it</i>	Itala. Represents all or the majority of Old Latin witnesses as a group. Individual witnesses are represented by an italic letter, e.g. <i>a</i> , <i>b</i> , <i>ff</i> ² , etc.
vg	Vulgata. Represents agreement of the most important editions of the Vulgate in support of the same Greek reading.
Latt	Represents the entire Latin tradition in support of the same Greek reading.
lat	Represents the support of the Vulgate and a part of the Old Latin tradition for a reading.
sy	All the Syriac versions extant for the passage give witness to the Greek reading indicated.
cop	All the Coptic versions extant for the passage give witness to a particular Greek reading.
bo	Bohairic Coptic
sa	Sahidic Coptic
mae	Middle Egyptian (Mesokemic) Coptic
mae ²	Middle Egyptian Coptic Codex Schøyen
arm	Armenian

¹ See NA²⁷, 713.

² See Swanson, *Matthew*, ix, and NA²⁷, 713.

³ See Swanson, *Matthew*, ix, and NA²⁷, 714.

geo	Georgian
aeth	Ethiopic

LATIN ABBREVIATIONS

<i>et al.</i> (<i>et alii</i>)	And some (MSS)
<i>pc</i> (<i>pauci</i>)	A few (MSS)
<i>pler</i> (<i>plerique</i>)	Many (MSS)
<i>plu</i> (<i>plures</i>)	Most (MSS)
<i>rell</i> (<i>reliqui</i>)	All remaining (MSS). The NA ²⁷ is retained in <i>rell</i> unless otherwise noted.

CRITICAL SIGNS

Most of the critical signs used in the study here are described in the NA²⁷ and have been reproduced here for convenience (some have been elaborated or have been altered due to font limitations, notably the ^s sign).⁴

- The word following in the text is omitted by the witnesses cited.
- | . . The words, clauses, or sentences following | in the text are omitted by the witnesses cited. The sign \ marks the end of the omitted text.
- # The word following in the text is replaced with one or more words by the witnesses cited. When there is more than one word replaced in the text, then #¹ marks the first word, #² marks the second word, etc. The sign #om. notes that the following witnesses cited omit the word.
- § The sign marks the location where one or more words, sometimes a whole verse, is inserted. When there is more than one instance of a textual insertion, then §¹ marks the first insertion, §² marks the second insertion, etc.
- s . . . s* The words following in the text are replaced with other words by the witnesses cited. The second sign ^s marks the end of the replaced text.
- | A solid vertical line separates the various alternative readings from each other within a single instance of variation.
- 2314* Variants of word order are represented by italic numerals which correspond to the order of the words in the text (*I* = the first word in the text, etc.).⁵

⁴ The signs are found on pp. 6*-14* and 20*-33* (also pp. 809-812) in the NA²⁷. For Latin abbreviations, see also Parker, *Codex Bezae*, xxii.

() Witnesses which show only minor differences are noted in parentheses () along with the witnesses for the main variant. MSS in parentheses contain a very similar reading to the one they are cited for and usually differ only by an itacism or transposition (unless the point of citing the variant is to show an itacism or transposition, then the MSS in parentheses differ in another insignificant, minor way). The witnesses in parentheses differ in a way that does not affect the discussion of the variant for the MS under analysis. For example, when discussing D in Mt 10:18c, most MSS read *axqhsesqe*, and D 111 *et al.* read *staqhsesqai*. The reading of) P W D Q 2* 33 157 is *axqhsesqai*, which is an orthographic spelling of what most MSS read. The orthographic change *e > ai* does not affect an analysis of D when commenting on the variant in D 111 *et al.*⁶

a? Letters with a dot below them are difficult to see in the MS.

[. . .] An ellipsis within brackets signifies non-extant text. Letters within brackets are reconstructed, non-extant text.

om. The variant is omitted in the witnesses cited.

– Minus sign. When a MS is cited with a minus sign, that MS’s reading has been deemed either not significant to cite, the MS is lacunose, or the MS omits the text. For example, in Mt 13:33, the text of D omits *allhn parabolhn elalhsen*.⁷

* Identifies the original reading when a correction has been made.

^c Identifies a correction made by a later hand, but sometimes also by the first hand.

A, B A correction made by an identified hand known as scribe A, or scribe B, etc.

Corr.C When an identified hand is referred to as “scribe C”, it is cited with as “corrector C” or ^{Corr.C} so not to be confused with an unidentified correction marked as ^c.

^{mg} (*in margine*) Indicates a reading in the margin of a manuscript without being identified as either a correction or an alternative reading.

^{vid} (*ut videtur*) Indicates that the reading attested by a witness cannot be determined with absolute certainty.

⁵ For example, the reading of W in Mt 6:23 is *estin skotoj: Mt 6:23 skotoj estin rell |21 W.*

⁶ 10:18c *#axqhsesqe rell () P W D Q 2* 33 157) |#staqhsesqai D 111 it^{pler} (0171 sy^s) Cyp Hil Or^{int3,532.534}.*

⁷ 13:33 *allhn parabolhn #elalhsen rell -D |#pareqhken C 243 1241 pc sa^{mss}.*

- > The sign represents a change from one variant to another.⁸ For example, when a verb in the present tense is substituted for a verb in the aorist tense, it can be displayed as “present > aorist”. The sign can also show the order of words that have been transposed.⁹ The symbol is not used in the critical apparatus but in prose when describing variants.

EXPLANATION OF TEXTUAL COLLATIONS

The text supplied for a variant does not always comprise a complete sentence, clause, or even phrase. The words surrounding a variant are included as merely a reference point should the reader be consulting a reference text such as the NA²⁸ or Swanson. The MSS supplied for each variant are typically cited in the Gregory-Aland order (papyri, majuscules, minuscules, versions, and Patristic quotes). In most cases the first reading is the text of the NA²⁸ in order that it gives the reader bearing for locating the text within its fuller context in an edition of a GNT. Also, if the text of a MS contains an abbreviation (e.g. numeric or *nomen sacrum*) the word is usually written in full (usually accompanied by an explanation, noting if there is an abbreviation) so that the text is easily found in a GNT where there are normally no abbreviations. The text of the early versions is expressed in Greek or Latin for ease of reading, rather than Syriac, Coptic, Old Church Slavonic, etc. The following are further explanations of the collation of variants:

When the critical signs are not able to be used effectively, or their use would be confusing or cumbersome (e.g. for a reading that has multiple variants), the variant reading is cited in its entirety. Such a complex variant is the following, Mt 15:22,

15:22 #ekrazen \$¹ legousa \$²)^c B Q f¹ 700 (pc) NA²⁷ |#ekracen) * Z 0281 f¹³ 579 1241 pc |#ekraugasen C K L W G D 0106 (f¹)1424 c ff² g¹ vg^{ed} |#ekraugazen M l 844 l 2211 pc |\$¹opisw autou D d |\$¹autw K L W G D 0106 (f¹)|\$²opisw autou c ff² g¹ vg^{ed}

A less dense way to express 15:22 is,

15:22	ekrazen legousa) ^c B Q f ¹ 700 (pc) NA ²⁷
	ekracen legousa) * Z 0281 f ¹³ 579 1241
pc	ekraugasen autw legousa	D d
	ekraugasen autw legousa	K L W G D 0106 (f ¹) 565 M
(lat) sy ^h	ekraugazen legousa	M l 844 l 2211 pc
	ekraugasen legousa opisw autou	c ff ² g ¹ vg ^{ed}

⁸ The sign is employed in similar textual critical studies to represent a change from one to another, cf. Roysse, *Scribal Habits*, and Urbán, “Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis (D): Intercambios Vocálicos en el Texto Griego de Marcos,” *Collectanea Christiana Orientalia* 4 (2007): 245-268.

⁹ The word order in B in 18:31 is transposed genitive pronoun > article > subject in 18:31: oi sundouloi oautou rell |312 B |o482 l184.

An exception to the Gregory-Aland order of MSS is the placement of the (possible) cause of haplography on the initial line of the variant citation rather than the placement of the NA²⁷ text as the initial text. The underlined text identifies parablepsis:

6:28 aucanousin ou #kopiuousin oude nhqousin B 33 *f*¹
 |#kopiwsin)^c
 ou cainousin oude nhqousin oude kopiwsin) *vid
 NA²⁷ aucanousin ou nhqousin oude kopiwsin Q sy^c
 aucanei ou kopia oude nhqei M K L M N P *f*
 13 700 788

When there is more than one variant in a given verse, sometimes the first variant may be designated “a”, the second “b”, etc. For example, the text of W in 17:8 contains two variants:

17:8a oautwn *rell* |oW
 17:8b eidon ei mh auton Ihsoun mononB* Q 700 NA²⁷ | 12435)
 eidon ei mh ton Ihsoun monon B^c C^c (D) L M *f*^{1 13} 33 (579
 1346) *pler*
 eidon ei mh Ihsoun monon W

Subsumed in *rell* is the correction or original text; in the example below, *rell* includes D^c.

6:5 #autwn *rell* |#auton D*

When a specific corrector has been identified, it is cited along side of *rell* (as in 10:28 below) with a capital superscript; otherwise, an unidentified corrector is notated by ^c (as in 4:16 below).

10:28 #apokteintai *rell* D^D |#sfacai D*
 4:16 o laoj foj eiden mega) B C W *pc* NA²⁷
 o laoj eidon foj #mega D^c |#megan D*

In the orthographic appendices (seventeen through twenty-one), usually there are no additional words supplied along with the variant. In the case of a word that is found in two or more instances in the same verse, the first occurrence of the word is cited with the superscript numeral one and the second occurrence is cited with the superscript two, etc. For example,

12:31¹ #afeqhsetai *rell* |#afeqhsete) L

12:31² #afeqhsetai *rell* |#afeqhsete)

Some orthographic spellings in a MS reoccur throughout Matthew. In these instances, they are recorded as,

1:24; 18:25*; 19:3, 9*; 22:24, 25* #gunaika *rell* |#guneka)

This indicates that the spelling of *gunaika* in) is *guneka* in 1:24; 19:3; and 22:24, as well as 18:25; 19:9; 22:25 in)*. There are also instances where citing “*rell*” is inaccurate, and therefore other spellings are placed in parentheses. For example,

6:11, 12; 13:36 (hmhn L); 15:33; 20:12; 21:25; 22:25 (emin Q); 24:2, 3; 25:8 (umin 157), 11 (umin 1346); 26:63, 68 #hmin *rell* |#hmein D

In all instances above, D reads *hmein*, but in 13:36 L reads *hmhn*, in 22:25 Q reads *emin*, in 25:8 157 reads *umin*, and in 25:11 1346 reads *umin*.

ABSTRACT

This study examines singular readings in the Gospel of Matthew across five of the earliest extant Greek copies of Matthew: Codex Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, Ephraemi, Bezae, and Washingtonianus. In each of the selected MSS, it is determined where a spelling, word, clause, phrase, sentence, or group of sentences is different from other MSS. These “singular readings” are collected in order to shine light on what such idiosyncrasies can tell us about the MS or tendencies of the scribe who copied the MS. One of the more interesting finds is that some of our MSS add text more than they omit it, which is contrary to other studies.

Apart from itacistic changes, alternate spellings are not always the most frequent type of singular reading in our MSS. The MSS have similar types of singular readings, but they often go about creating them in different ways. Conclusions are that our MSS either prefer Attic Greek to Koine (Washingtonianus) or *vice versa* (Sinaiticus), but two MSS (Vaticanus and Bezae) fluctuate between both grammatical standards. Our MSS typically have a high percentage of error due to parablepsis, but one MS seems to skip letters *within* words more often than *entire* words (Ephraemi). Ephraemi does not transpose words, but when the other MSS create transpositions, they all record instances where the genitive pronoun is placed prior to the word it modifies and verbs are moved forward in sentences. In addition, transpositions in Sinaiticus could have resulted from corrected leaps. Context often plays a part in the creation of singular readings, but context affects each MS differently. Nearby text seems to prompt changes in all of our MSS, but remote text such as a gospel parallel, does not often influence our scribes: Ephraemi contains the only harmonization seems to be intentional. In Sinaiticus and Washingtonianus, several readings exhibit possible interpretations of the text (but typically these do not appear to be theological changes) and they both contain readings that conflate textual variants.

All of the singular readings record either a textual addition, omission, or substitution, but the MSS do not end up with the same amount of text: both Codex Vaticanus and Ephraemi add more words than they omit, whereas Codex Sinaiticus, Bezae, and Washingtonianus end up with more omissions. This final element adds a counterweight to other studies that contend MSS omit text more than they add.

The examination yields few singular readings of dramatic theological import. Rather, the singular readings expose grammatical currents of the 4th-5/6th centuries, currents that are more prevalent than scribal attempts to re-present the text of Matthew.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Knowledge of biblical MSS was once an esoteric privilege, reserved only for the elite scholar. Even access to secondary sources such as photographic or typeset facsimiles could be a rare commodity in libraries. Today, however, the digitization of manuscripts has created enormous opportunity for the exploration of these formerly clandestine artifacts. More possibilities and opportunities exist for in depth studies of these MSS than was once only possible through the restriction of printed sources. For some MSS, it is now unnecessary to rely on facsimiles or transcriptions and their idiosyncrasies for a look at the ancient document—anyone can view these MSS online and discover firsthand the unique qualities they each possess. Though it is possible to view and read certain MSS online or by facsimile, what is *not* available is an option to compare these documents and see *how* they are unique. Besides the physical shape or size of these MSS, how do the *texts* of these MSS compare? For example, do some MSS contain verses that others do not? Do others omit details in the text that we are all familiar with? Are there other ways that the texts of biblical MSS differ from each other? Scribes who copied the NT have no doubt altered the

texts they copied,¹ but the exact degree and causes of corruption are not always clear *prima facie*.²

This study proposes to study the Gospel of Matthew across five different MSS: Codex Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, Ephraemi, Bezae, and Washingtonianus. In each of the selected MSS, it is determined where a spelling, word, clause, phrase, sentence, or group of sentences is different from other MSS. These “singular readings” are collected in order to shed light on what such idiosyncrasies can tell us about the MS or scribe who copied the MS.

¹ This study is informed by the notion that there are certain psychological processes that a scribe or any reader, whether modern or ancient, undergoes when reading a text. While the conditions and context of a scribe can never be recreated or fully uncovered today, i.e. habits of a 2000-year-old scribe can never be replicated in a laboratory, psychological studies have assisted in understanding *why* textual alterations exist and that *indeed* the human process of reading and memory is fallible. It has been determined in recent psychological studies that readers actually “fixate only 50 percent to 75 percent of the words in a text [and] intuitively it still makes sense that whatever words we do look at, we look at in order. After all, we *understand* them in order, so it stands to reason that we look at them in order as well” (E. Paulson and Freeman, *Insight from the Eyes*, 33). No matter the skill level, “readers will skip over words visually while reading” (E. Paulson, “Miscues and Eye Movements: Functions of Comprehension,” 247). Therefore, it is reasonable to attribute certain scribal alterations to unintentional psychological phenomena, which, in some cases, could result in word transpositions, omissions, or other alterations. E. Paulson states that *oral* reading miscues can be applied to *silent* reading miscues (E. Paulson, “Adult Readers’ Eye Movements During the Production of Oral Miscues,” 62ff). In the psychological studies performed with adults reading English texts, “most of the omitted words were function words or short verbs, like *do, to, the, a, and, that,* and *of*; few would suggest that these adults, none of whom omitted lower frequency and ‘harder’ words like *tuberculosis* and *untenable*, were able to read the word *the*” (E. Paulson, “Are Oral Reading Word Omissions and Substitutions Cause by Careless Eye Movements?” 47, 59).

Jongkind also contributes to our understanding about the realm of the psychology of the scribe, noting several studies confirming that human memory is not always accurate. See Jongkind, “Singular Readings in Sinaiticus,” 49-52.

² A now famous example of a work that argues for theological changes in MSS is Bart D. Ehrman’s *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, though this work has caused great consternation in some circles of scholarship and is repeatedly scrutinized. Commenting on the mark these scribes left on their texts Ehrman states, “In all of these textual modifications, great or small, we can detect the anonymous workings of proto-orthodox scribes, unnamed Christians who were very much involved in the conflict and struggles of their day.” Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, 242. He identifies four types of christological alterations that orthodox scribes are responsible for. Anti-adoptionist corruptions of scripture emphasize Jesus’ divinity, in particular concerning his virgin birth, baptism, and his humanity. Anti-separatist alterations stress that the human Jesus and the divine Christ are not separate entities, but are a unity: Christ was born with the spirit in him and it did not leave when he died. Insertion of the phrase, “our Lord Jesus Christ” in MSS was particularly useful for the orthodox corruption of potentially separatist readings. Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, 165. Anti-docetic corruptions portray Jesus as suffering in the flesh and experiencing pain. In addition, embracing a physical resurrection was essential for the orthodox. Anti-Patrippassianist theology seeks to counter the lack of discrimination between God and Jesus: there is one God, and he came down, suffered, and died. Thus, orthodox readings would not contain a definite article for “God” or would have “Lord” substituted for “God” because “Lord” can comprise both “God” and “Christ”. He states, “Scribes altered their sacred texts to make them ‘say’ what they were already known to ‘mean’.” Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, 276. All of Ehrman’s categories have to do with the divinity and humanity of Jesus or God.

Apart from itacistic changes, alternate spellings are not always the most frequent type of singular reading in our MSS.³ The MSS have similar types of singular readings, but they go about creating them in different ways. Based on the singular readings, major conclusions are that our MSS either prefer Attic Greek to Koine or *vice versa*, but one MS (Vaticanus) fluctuates between both grammatical standards. Our MSS typically have a high percentage of error due to parablepsis, but one MSS seems to skip letters *within* words more often than *entire* words (Ephraemi). Context often plays a part in the creation of singular readings, but context affects each MS differently. All of the singular readings either record a textual addition, omission, or substitution, but the MSS do not return to zero point (that is, they do not end up with the same amount of omitted and added text): both Codex Vaticanus and Ephraemi add more words than they omit, whereas Codex Sinaiticus, Bezae, and Washingtonianus end up with more omissions. These peculiar tendencies and more will be explored in each of the main chapters.

1.1. WHY THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW?

By focusing the study on the same text for each MS, the study will provide a baseline for analysis. Although every book of the NT deserves attention, the Gospel of Matthew has been selected as the backdrop for this study simply because it (1) is of considerable length and (2) is included in the canon of the NT. The Gospel of Matthew contains approximately 1,067-1,071 verses, depending on the MS,⁴ which provides enough text to gather many singular readings.

The canonical gospels hold a primary position in the NT. Of the gospels, Matthew is placed first in order in most MSS. According to E.C. Colwell, and

³ Daniel B. Wallace states, “Of the hundreds of thousands of textual variants in NT MSS, the great majority are spelling differences that have no bearing on the meaning of the text.” Wallace, “Lost in Transmission,” 40. By including only singular readings, the study will bypass many of these spelling differences.

⁴ There are five verses where some of our MSS do not agree on their inclusion: 16:3; 17:21; 18:11; 21:44; 23:14. The verses 17:21; 18:11; 23:14, are omitted in the standard text of the NA²⁷, as well as)^(*) B, but are included in C^(lac) W. Codex Bezae includes 17:21 and 18:11, but not 23:14. Mt 16:3 is not in) B, but is in our other MSS and 21:44 is not in D, but is in our other MSS. Therefore, the total number of possible verses transcribed in C W are 1,071, in D are 1,069, and in) B are 1,067. (The verses 18:11 and 23:14 occur in lacunae in C, but the MS would presumably follow most other MSS here, as it often does, in including them. The verse 17:21 is added in Sinaiticus by)^{cb2}, and is not included in the total of verses of the *prima manu*.)

subsequently Peter M. Head, the number of patristic citations recorded can measure the popularity of the gospels in early Christianity.⁵ Thus, the order of popularity from greatest to least, as it is reflected in the patristic citations, is identical to the Western order of the gospels: Matthew, John, Luke, and then Mark. B.H. Streeter attests to the early popularity of Matthew, saying Matthew gained “universal acceptance so soon,”⁶ and A. Souter claims that Matthew was the most popular gospel in early Christianity.⁷ In addition, Luz states that “because Matthew is the chief Gospel of the church, the history of influence of the Synoptic material is predominantly that of the Gospel of Matthew.”⁸ There is no debate about the positive reception of Matthew within the NT canon.⁹ The point of Matthew’s popularity only indicates that Matthew was well used in early Christianity, and it so happens that it was the most used of the gospels.

1.2. THE SELECTION OF MANUSCRIPTS

The 5,700+ extant MSS of the GNT range from 2nd to 18th century.¹⁰ The selection of MSS in the study is based on their age and completeness. The papyri were an obvious option to include in the study because they are highly venerated;¹¹ but

⁵ See Head, “Observations,” 240-241, 240 n.7, for his reference to *Biblia Patristica: Index des Citations et Allusions Bibliques dans la Littérature Patristique* (5 vols), to check the list of patristic citations that weigh favorably for Matthew’s popularity.

⁶ Burnett Hillman Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscripts Tradition, Sources, Authorship, & Dates*, rev. ed. (London: MacMillan and Co., Limited, 1953), 486.

⁷ Alexander Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (London: Duckworth, 1913), 161.

⁸ Luz, *Matthew*, 1:95.

⁹ In a discussion of the early (1st-3rd centuries) reception of the Gospel of Matthew, Stanton draws several conclusions: due to the amount of Oxyrhynchus papyri that contain Matthew (P^{145 53 4+64+67 77 103 104}), it must have been popular in the town of Oxyrhynchus, though the papyri discovered there could have been imported from another city. He also states that at an early date (by the late 1st century or 2nd century), the Gospels must have been circulated in notebook form (rather than scroll or codex). Stanton, “The Early Reception of Matthew’s Gospel,” 48-50, 53, 56, 60.

¹⁰ The *codices Graeci* cited in the NA²⁷ range in date from 2nd cent. (such as P⁹⁰) to 18th cent. (such as 2318). NA²⁷, 684-712.

¹¹ Kraus notes the “nearly sensationalist perception and sometimes even magical fascination” associated with the texts written on papyrus. Thomas J. Kraus, *Ad Fontes: Original Manuscripts and Their Significance for Studying Early Christianity—Selected Essays*, Texts and Editions for New Testament Study 3, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Wendy J. Porter (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 15. The preference to venerate the papyri is damaging since it overlooks early MSS written on parchment. There has been much attention given to MSS written on papyrus, or at least catalogued as *P. Oxy*. Some vellum MSS are catalogued as *P. Oxy*, such as *P. Oxy* 1077, containing a small portion of

unfortunately, they are generally quite fragmented: no early papyri that are dated before the fifth/sixth century¹² contain more than 6% of Matthean text and most even contain less than 1% of text.¹³

Moving away from the earliest extant MSS to a later date, the earliest vellum codices become available. The earliest non-fragmented (or *nearly* non-fragmented) codices date to the fourth and fifth centuries, and with a cut-off date of the fifth/sixth century, six codices become available. Of these, only three, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and Washingtonianus, are not fragmented and contain 100% of the text of Matthew, and two are close to whole, Ephraemi (75.2%) and Bezae (D) (93.1%).¹⁴ One codex contains less than a quarter of the Matthean text, Alexandrinus, and is not included in the study due to its lacuna.¹⁵ Therefore, the study includes the codices Sinaiticus (both, scribe A and D),¹⁶ Vaticanus, Ephraemi, Bezae (the Greek text, D), and Washingtonianus because they are the earliest MSS that contain *most* or *all* of Matthew.¹⁷

Matthew. Kraus believes it is not warranted to change the cataloguing system since it is currently universal in all things papyrological. Kraus, *Ad Fontes*, 18. Pickering also notes that vellum catalogued as *P. Oxy* is a shortcoming of the cataloguing system. S.R Pickering, “The Significance of Non-Continuous New Testament Textual Material in Papyri,” in *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts: The Papers of the First Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, ed. D.G.K. Taylor. Texts and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature, ed. D.C. Parker and D.G.K. Taylor, 3d series, vol. 1 (Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 1999), 122.

¹² The date does not include MSS dated to the 6th century, but includes MSS straddling the 5th/6th century.

¹³ See appendix one. The quantitative description of each MS (i.e. percentage of extant Matthean text) has been generous to designate a single letter of a verse as an extant verse, which is also the method of the NA²⁷. Therefore, the quantity of verses has been maximally estimated, not to provide greater authority to the MSS, but in order to clarify what portions, if any, a particular MS contains. The NA²⁷ states, “It should be noted that for purposes of description here a verse is counted present if a single letter of it is preserved.” NA²⁷, p. 80*.

¹⁴ See appendix one.

¹⁵ Codex Alexandrinus contains 18.7% of Matthew. See appendix one.

¹⁶ Scribe A of Sinaiticus is responsible for 88.51% of the transcription of Matthew, and riding A’s coattails into the study is scribe D who is responsible for 11.49% of the transcription of Matthew.

¹⁷ In his introduction to New Testament textual criticism, Greenlee states that) A B C D W are “some of the more important uncial mss.” He then introduces *only* those in his discussion of uncial MSS. *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*, 37, 37-42.

1.3. STUDIES OF SCRIBAL HABITS AND A LACUNA IN RESEARCH

The foundation of a “scribal tendency” or “scribal habit” methodology that analyzes singular readings has essentially been established in the works of E.C. Colwell¹⁸ and James R. Royse.¹⁹ They (and others) have recognized that singular readings are a valuable resource in determining scribal tendencies. Prior to Colwell, singular readings were an element that was typically discarded (with some exceptions) when determining the “original text”.²⁰

Recently, the shift of the conversation from “original text” to “initial text” has given studies of scribal habits a more prominent place. The initial text “seeks to determine the textual form(s) (archetypes) from which the extant evidence derives, and also theoretically open-ended, in that it both seeks to move beyond the archetype(s) to the initial text, and leaves open the question of the relationship between the initial text and any earlier form(s) of text.”²¹ The initial text then

serve[s] the interests and purposes of a variety of perspectives and approaches, including those who may wish to recover no more than the earliest surviving text(s), those who wish to focus on the history of the transmission and reception of these text(s), and those who may wish to investigate the relationship between the initial text and the origin(s) of the textual tradition of which it is a part.²²

The concept of the initial text is open to a variety of studies of the text of the NT, not limiting investigations solely to determine what the original author wrote. This study is essentially modeled after the studies performed by E.C. Colwell, James Royse, as well as Juan Hernández, Jr, all of whom use a singular reading methodology.

¹⁸ Ernest C. Colwell, “Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A Study of P⁴⁵, P⁶⁶, P⁷⁵,” in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, New Testament Tools and Studies, ed. Bruce M. Metzger, vol. IX (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1969), 106-124.

¹⁹ James R. Royse, “Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri,” Th.D. diss. (Graduate Theological Union, 1981), now published as James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*. New Testament Tools, Studies, and Documents, vol. 36, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Eldon J. Epp. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2008.

²⁰ “Original text” is placed within quotations because there can be no absolute assurance about what *exactly* the original text was. Eldon Jay Epp, “The Multivalence of the Term ‘Original Text,’” *Harvard Theological Review* 92 (1999): 245-281.

²¹ Holmes, “From ‘Original Text’ to ‘Initial Text,’” 680-681.

²² Holmes, “From ‘Original Text’ to ‘Initial Text,’” 681.

1.3.1. E.C. COLWELL

Working under the assumption that scribal tendencies can be useful in an analysis of MSS, Colwell, in his 1965 essay, opened a new door for textual criticism.²³ Instead of considering every textual variant in a MS, Colwell hones in specifically on the singular readings. Working under the assumption that singulars are scribe-created, Colwell maintains that they could reveal a scribe's unique tendency. In "Method of Evaluating Scribal Habits," Colwell's concern is not with determining the "original text", but with ascertaining what types of textual alterations are characteristic of a particular MS. Colwell analyzes three early MSS and discovers distinct patterns of scribal habits in each MS. He observes certain key characteristics of the MSS, such as infrequent remote parallel harmonizations and harmonizations to the immediate context (which occurred quite frequently). In particular, Colwell determines that the scribe of P⁴⁵ edits his text for concise expression; the scribe of P⁶⁶ is quite sloppy in his copying; and the scribe of P⁷⁵ intends to reproduce an accurate copy (yet improved the style of the text). Now, with a better understanding of those particular MSS, they can be assessed more accurately in the present and future.

1.3.2. JAMES R. ROYSE

After Colwell's essay, the potential of singulars remained largely untapped by textual critics. Royse, however, devoted his work to the study of singular readings. He paid particular attention to Colwell's work and applied his basic method to six papyri, three of which were a reassessment of Colwell's papyri. Royse determined that the scribe of P⁴⁵ purposefully omitted portions of text for conciseness, which agreed with Colwell's analysis. The scribe of P⁴⁶ misspelled frequently and created nonsense readings resulting from carelessness and a misunderstanding of the text. The scribe of P⁴⁷ created a large number of singulars, given the "limited" amount of text available, consisting of orthographic variations, omissions, harmonizations, and stylistic improvements.²⁴ A unique feature found in P⁶⁶ is the mass of corrections—some of them to a different exemplar. The scribe of P⁷² was "extremely careless,"

²³ Dirk Jongkind states the difference between Westcott-Hort and Colwell is that "individualisms are to be ignored" in the Westcott and Hort approach. Dirk Jongkind, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*, Text and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature 3d series, ed. D.C. Parker and D.G.K. Taylor, vol. 5 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2007), 134.

²⁴ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 397.

evident by the multitude of orthographic variations and nonsense singulars, yet a theological tendency is noticeable that resembles a high Christology.²⁵ The scribe of P⁷⁵ generally seemed to copy carefully, though not as meticulously as Colwell's initial analysis describes. Perhaps one of the most novel discoveries by Royse was that the scribes of his MSS generally tended to omit more than they added. The result of the study challenged a major tenant of textual criticism—that of *lectio brevior potior*.²⁶ His discovery has been assessed in other MSS and the same has been found to be true. Singular readings have indeed become important evidence for scribal behavior at this point.

1.3.3. JUAN HERNÁNDEZ JR.

Hernández's published dissertation also focuses on singular readings. He essentially uses the methodology of Colwell with the expansion provided by Royse,²⁷ but instead of focusing on the entire text of MSS, he focuses on one book of the NT, Revelation, across three MSS: Codex Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi. Thus, his interest lay particularly with scribes' interpretation of Revelation. He states that the scribes of his three MSS "were most certainly involved in addressing contemporary interpretive concern through textual changes, though these changes occur neither *where* nor *how* nor *to the degree* that we might expect."²⁸ Concerning Sinaiticus, he argues that some readings appear to refute Arianism, even though the proponents of Arianism did not seem to use the Apocalypse to defend their position.²⁹ The singular readings in Sinaiticus witness assimilation to the grammatical context as well as other grammatical changes, but these are not generally significant.³⁰ In Alexandrinus, the singular readings reveal many grammatical and stylistic changes as well as theological changes. Christ's title is

²⁵ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 488. Wassermann confirms the theological tendency in, *The Epistle of Jude*, 47-49.

²⁶ A scholar of classical texts, A.C. Clark noticed the same phenomenon as Royse would discover decades later. A.C. Clark, *The Descent of Manuscripts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1918), vi.

²⁷ Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 41.

²⁸ Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 192.

²⁹ If Sinaiticus originated from Egypt, perhaps the MS was altered because of a strong anti-Arian orthodoxy found in the local church of Alexandria. The provenance of Sinaiticus could have possibly resulted in anti-Arian scribal alterations. See Kannengiesser, "Athanasius of Alexandria vs. Arius: *The Alexandrian Crisis*," 207.

³⁰ Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 88.

changed from *prwtoj* to *prwtotokoj* (Rev 1:17) in Codex A and another theological reading (Rev 20:4) “could betray some sensitivity to the idea of Christians being beheaded” with the change of “those who were decapitated” to “those upon whom war was made.”³¹ Ephraemi, on the other hand, does not seem to possess many singulars that change the grammar of the Apocalypse *nor* any that deal with theology. About this, Hernández states that “Possibly, the theological issues reflected in our fourth century MS (Sinaiticus) were no longer pressing in the fifth.”³²

Hernández also notices that the scribes of his MSS tend to omit more than add, which agrees with Roysse’s finding concerning *lectio brevior potior*. He urges an examination of these MSS elsewhere in the NT to see if the same phenomenon is present.³³

1.3.4. A LACUNA IN RESEARCH

Although some of our MSS have undergone text-critical analyses, there has never been systematic study of the singular readings in the Gospel of Matthew. In general, the study of singular readings is not often pursued, but the study of MSS and scribal habits is, of course, nothing new. For example, G. Zuntz studied P⁴⁶,³⁴ Carlo M. Martini studied P⁷⁵ and Codex Vaticanus,³⁵ and Gordon D. Fee studied P⁶⁶,³⁶ but

³¹ Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 130-131.

³² Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 155.

³³ Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 195.

³⁴ Zuntz compared MSS to see which ones agree with the early, valuable text of P⁴⁶, and compared readings characteristic of text-types to the MS as well (Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles*, 58-67; 68-159). His study elucidated certain characteristics of the scribe of P⁴⁶, such as a tendency to make blunders (Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles*, 18-20).

³⁵ Martini pays particular attention to the relationship between P⁷⁵ and Codex B by using elements from Colwell’s critique of the genealogical method (Colwell, “Genealogical Method: Its Achievements and its Limitations,” in *Studies*, 63-83. Though Martini used the original article of Colwell’s under the same name in *JBL* 66 (1947): 109-133), as well as methods of Westcott and Hort, Zuntz, and E.A. Hutton (in E.A. Hutton, *An Atlas of Textual Criticism*). See Martini, *Il Problema del Codice B*, 66-85. Luke 12:1-54 (containing 190 variants) is used as a base text to compare P⁴⁵, P⁷⁵, A, B, D, W, Q, W, and the *Textus Receptus* to each other (Martini, *Il Problema del Codice B*, 84). Martini’s statistical analysis shows that P⁷⁵ and B are the closest related MSS out of the selected group: 171 out of 190 variants agree (Martini, *Il Problema del Codice B*, 84-85). The data shows that the two are even more similar than) compared to B, where only 139 variants agree (Martini, *Il Problema del Codice B*, 84-85).

³⁶ Gordon Fee in his study of P⁶⁶ focused a portion of his work on scribal tendencies. He determined that the scribe of P⁶⁶ had a habit of making corrections, which included additions, deletions, changing word order, and rewriting. The evidence led Fee to believe the scribe of P⁶⁶ was “a careless and ineffective workman.” Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 57. Though it is a valid conclusion,

none of these focus on singular readings. Some studies concern our MSS, such as Codex Bezae (e.g. researches conducted by Eldon J. Epp,³⁷ George E. Rice,³⁸ Michael W. Holmes,³⁹ and D.C. Parker),⁴⁰ but, again, they do not focus solely on

Fee's evidence did not include singular readings. There is only one singular reading cited by Fee: in 13:24 P⁶⁶ corrects the text to εἰπεν, which is a Western reading. Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 67. The evidence is based on corrections made by the scribe. The scribe of P⁶⁶ made corrections as he went along, and, by noting the difference between mistakes and corrections, Fee determined just how "careless and ineffective" the scribe was (Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 57).

³⁷ Eldon Jay Epp in his study of codex Bezae focused on the theological readings in Acts. He compared the text of D against B (the dilemma of a base text is so noted by Epp, *Theological Tendency*, 35-36), and from the differences, he was able to determine that in Bezae the Jews had a greater role in the death of Jesus and had a more negative attitude towards the apostles, but the anti-Judaic tendencies displayed in Bezae do not stop there. It was also found that Jesus as Messiah is placed above and beyond Judaism. Epp's study further defined the "Western" text since Bezae is the primary member of the text type. His study was the first of its kind (post-Westcott and Hort) to be entirely devoted to the study of a theological tendency in a MS in a single book, Acts. Epp's groundbreaking monograph concerns the portrayal of the Jews in D and the Western text in Acts. (There is an example where D deviates from the Western text in Act 2:33 with the singular omission of ὑμεῖς οἱ. Epp, *The Theological Tendency*, 68-69.) He notices three (not always distinct) categories of theological alterations. First, there is a lack of ignorance motif for the Jews to use as a scapegoat, which emphasizes their guilt. They also give a more pointed condemnation of Jesus in D (Epp, *The Theological Tendency*, 41-64). Second, universalism is prominent in the Western text, not in order to show the equality of the Gentiles and Jews, but in order to portray the mission to the Gentiles prominently above the importance of Judaism (Epp, *The Theological Tendency*, 64-119). Third, the Jews have more hostility toward the Apostles in the Western text. In addition, Paul, Peter, and the other apostles are held in higher esteem than what is found in the B text (Epp, *The Theological Tendency*, 120-164).

³⁸ In the Gospel of Luke, Rice found similar anti-Judaic biases as Epp did in the Western text. Beyond the types of theological variants Epp notices, Rice observes that the Jews' rejection of John the Baptist is a rejection of God's offer of salvation in D. Therefore, singular readings pertaining to Jewish hostility (including rejection of Jesus, John the Baptist, and the apostles), the elevation of Christianity above Judaism, and the heightening of the apostles' deeds are indicators of the theological motivations. Rice, "The Anti-Judaic Bias of the Western Text in the Gospel of Luke," 54-55.

³⁹ Michael W. Holmes in his Ph.D. dissertation, "Early Editorial Activity and the Text of Codex Bezae in Matthew," systematically explains the cause of many variants found in Bezae. Because the process of adding variants from a wide range of sources was not a common practice, as is found in D, Holmes determined that there was *one* scribe of D who inserted the variants (Holmes, "Early Editorial Activity," 249). Holmes states that the work of the scribe was "a deliberate, editorial gathering-together of material standing on the fringes (or even outside) of the usual lines of textual transmission" (Holmes, "Early Editorial Activity," 248). Holmes does not limit his investigation to singular readings, but includes well-attested Western readings; and therefore, his conclusion may indicate characteristics of the Western tradition in combination with the habits of the scribe of Bezae.

⁴⁰ David Parker performed a paleographical analysis of Codex Bezae. He revises conclusions from previous Bezan studies, such as Scrivener's (Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 107) and Cavallo's (Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 30). Parker conducts his paleographical study by analyzing such physical features as the bilingual layout of the text, the missing leaves and their probable contents, the page numbering, punctuation, the hands of the scribe and correctors (which can provide information for dating), sense units, and *nomina sacra*. Several features of the codex have convinced Parker that its scribe is Latin because the Latin paleographic features of the codex outnumber Greek features, such as the format of the colophons and superscriptions, some OT quotations are indented, and the square shape of Bezae is typically Latin, yet one of the few non-Latin characteristics of the MS are the dimensions of the text, which are less square, and therefore, less Latin-esque (Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 10).

singular readings. When Matthew has been the focus of a study, then the MSS under consideration were not our codices (e.g. Kyoung Shik Min⁴¹ and Tommy Wasserman⁴² both analyze the Matthean papyri and 0171 [Holmes, noted previously, who studies Codex D but does not rely solely on singulars]). When a study has focused on singular readings in one of our MSS, then the NT book used as the survey text was not Matthew (e.g. Codex W in Mark,⁴³ Codex) in Mark,⁴⁴ and) in Luke and Pauline Epistles).⁴⁵ Therefore, the study of singular readings in our MSS in Matthew will provide a new foray into these MSS and Matthew.

⁴¹ The purpose of Min's study is to determine statistical relationships of MSS and to determine scribal habits in the vein of Colwell/Royse. He limited his study to the 13 papyri dated to the 3rd/4th century that contain a portion of Matthew (P^{1 35 37 45 53 64/67 70 77 101 102 103 104 110}) as well as the parchment MS 0171. Min observes three instances where the "original text" should reflect his findings: (1) Mt 20:30 should read *kurie elehson hmaj* (though this seems to reflect a familiar phrase) as B *et al.* read, not *elehson hmaj kurie* as P⁴⁵ *et al.* read; (2) Mt 25:22 should not contain *de* as P³⁵ does not read it; and (3) Mt 21:44 should be omitted as it is in P¹⁰⁴ (Min, *Die Früheste Überlieferung des Matthäusevangeliums*, 289ff). Another finding of his study was that his MSS do not produce theological variants (Min, *Die Früheste Überlieferung des Matthäusevangeliums*, 305). Such a finding is not based solely on singular readings, but all readings that diverge from the text of the NA²⁷. (According to Schmid, Min's study fails to consider the Old Latin with the Western text which affects his analysis [§5.5] and is inconsistent in his treatment of the Church Fathers [§5.6ff]. Schmid, review of *Die Früheste Überlieferung des Matthäusevangeliums (bis zum 3./4. Jh.)*, by Kyoung Shik Min, *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 15 (2010) [journal on-line]; available <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/v15/index.html>; Internet; accessed 5 February 2013.

⁴² Wasserman reassess the MSS that Min analyzed, using the same methodology. He nuances a few of Min's claims, such as the carelessness of P³⁷ and the seeming error omission of *o i 9* in Mt 25:41 in P⁴⁵, but he also agrees on many points, such as the textual quality of P⁷⁰ and 1071. Wasserman, "The Early Text of Matthew," 91, 93, 97, 103.

⁴³ A revision of Larry W. Hurtado's 1973 dissertation was published in which was a chapter devoted to the discussion of singulars in Codex W in Mark. Using Colwell's basic methodology, but focusing only on intentional singulars, Hurtado noticed certain editorial work of the scribe of W. For instance, the scribe tended to harmonize Mark to gospel parallels, he improved the style and grammar of the text, omitted words for concise expression, added words for clarification, changed words which affected the text's content (not just stylistic improvements), and transposed words. The conclusion found by Hurtado was that the scribe altered his text in order to "produce a copy of Mark in a style of Greek familiar to the reader of that day" (Hurtado, *Text-Critical Methodology*, 81).

⁴⁴ Peter M. Head reports on the presentation of Mark in Codex Sinaiticus. He provides lengthy discussions of the quire construction (§6-12), paragraphing (§13-23), abbreviations (§24-38), *nomina sacra* (§39-58), and Eusebian Sections (§59-62). Concerning the singular readings (§63-65), he found that many consist of the itacistic change *e i > i*, but he also records several transpositions, substitutions, alterations of verbal prefixes, and six harmonizations to Matthew. Head, "The Gospel of Mark in Codex Sinaiticus: Textual and Reception-Historical Considerations," *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 13 (2008) [journal on-line]; available <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/v13/index.html>; Internet; accessed 5 February 2013.

⁴⁵ Dirk Jongkind devotes a chapter of his published dissertation to its singular readings in 1 Chronicles, Psalms, the Pauline epistles, and Luke. Sinaiticus has several scribes at work, and Jongkind compared the habits of the scribes in different books. In Psalms he notes there are two different scribes at work with different habits: scribe D makes fewer errors, additions/omissions, and harmonizations than scribe A, and corrects the text by erasure more often than scribe A, however, each scribe tends to make leaps in the text just as often as the other does (Jongkind, *Scribal Habits*, 200-

1.4. DEFINITION OF SINGULAR READING AND METHODOLOGY

This study explores what types of scribal habits emerge when singular readings are analyzed. Theoretically, a singular reading is a textual variant that occurs in only one MS, and therefore is not original to the autograph; rather, a copyist could have created it. Epp defines “singular reading” and notes the usefulness for a study of scribal habits:

A “singular reading” is a “reading” found in one NT MS but with the support of no other; it is a unique reading as far as our knowledge of NT MSS extends . . . Hence, they are to be utilized in the study of individual MSS and scribal habits, but should be excluded from those procedures in textual criticism that attempt to determine manuscripts kinship or to establish the text of the NT.⁴⁶

Though the singular reading data that is gathered in this study could be used as a tool for other work concerning the initial text (e.g. it could be dismissed completely with hope to determine the earliest possible reading), it is applied to scribal habits. There is generally little use for analysis of singular readings in textual criticism apart from studying scribal habits.⁴⁷ Colwell and Tune also state that singular readings can be applied to a study of scribal habits:

Yet the Singular Readings have a value in the initial appraisal of the work of the scribe in a particular manuscript. If his pages are crowded with them, he is a careless or rash workman. Moreover a study of his singular readings will reveal habits and inclinations that will aid in the appraisal of his readings which are not singulars.⁴⁸

201). In Luke, scribe A, again, seems to pay less attention to the text than scribe D. In the Pauline material that Jongkind chose to analyze (Rom, Col, 1 and 2 Thess, and Heb), scribe D is responsible for only 1.92 folios of writing and scribe A is responsible for 14.49 folios (Jongkind, *Scribal Habits*, 202). The amount of evidence is disproportionate between scribes, and Jongkind, unsurprisingly notes that scribe A creates many more singular readings in the material than scribe D (Jongkind, *Scribal Habits*, 218).

⁴⁶ Epp, “Toward the Clarification of the Term ‘Textual Variation’,” 59.

⁴⁷ Kenyon includes some singular readings in his apparatus, such as P⁴⁵, as Royse notes in “Scribal Habits,” 89. The critical apparatus of the NA²⁷ also supplies singular readings at points, but is by no means a regular occurrence.

⁴⁸ Colwell and Tune, “Method in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings,” 104.

Instead of comparing one MS to another to reveal differences,⁴⁹ the study will compare variant reading against all cited MSS in certain Greek New Testaments. Therefore, a singular reading in the study here is defined as an uncorrected Greek variant with no support in Tischendorf's 8th edition,⁵⁰ Legg,⁵¹ Nestle-Aland 27th edition (NA²⁷),⁵² *NTG/ECM Parallel Pericopes*,⁵³ and Swanson.⁵⁴ (In some instances, Sanders has found agreement between W and a Church Father that is not indicated in these critical editions of the GNT and here Sanders is followed.)⁵⁵ After an initial collation of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus using the INTF New Testament Transcripts Prototype, and a collation of Ephraemi, Bezae, and Washingtonianus using Swanson, the readings have been checked against facsimiles, digital images, and/or other transcriptions of the MSS to confirm the readings. The critical editions are used to check agreement of MSS to determine if the readings are indeed singular readings.⁵⁶ These editions (Tischendorf, Legg, etc.) are either the same sources that similar studies have employed or are the latest editions available.⁵⁷ This method of identifying scribe-created singular readings is, however, not without its problems.

⁴⁹ Modern works that compare two MSS to each other include Epp's monograph, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*, and Zuntz' work, *The Text of the Epistles*; but this practice goes further back to critical editions of the Greek New Testament, including Erasmus' Greek New Testament of 1516 and the Complutensian Polyglot of 1522. See Epp, "Traditional 'Canons' of New Testament Textual Criticism," 79.

⁵⁰ Constantinus Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, vol. 1, 8th ed. (Lipsiae: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869).

⁵¹ S.C.E. Legg, *Nouum Testamentum Graece: Secundum Textum Westcotto-Hortianum, Euangelium Secundum Matthaeum* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1940).

⁵² *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2001.

⁵³ *Novum Testamentum Graecum/Editio Critica Maior: Parallel Pericopes*, ed. Holger Strutwolf and Klaus Wachtel. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011.

⁵⁴ Reuben J. Swanson, ed. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus*, vol. 1, Matthew (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

⁵⁵ For example, Sanders found agreement between W, Origen, and Chrysostom for the transposition in Mt 19:24. Therefore, Mt 19:24 (and other variants that Sanders has cited) are not included as singular readings in W. *The New Testament Manuscripts*, 140. In addition, the word order in 25:32 in W is similar to the Ethiopic. Sanders, *The Text of the New Testament*, 63.

⁵⁶ When singular readings are found to have support of other sources, they are placed in appendices seven through eleven so that they are documented as being non-singular.

⁵⁷ To determine singular readings, Colwell used only Tischendorf ("Scribal Habits," 108); Royse used Tischendorf, von Soden, NA, UBS, and Hoskier for Revelation in his unpublished Th.D. diss. ("Scribal Habits," 4), and used those editions plus Clark, Aland's *Synopsis*, Legg, the IGNTP, *Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus*, and Swanson in his 2008 publication "following an initial collation using Tischendorf" (*Scribal Habits*, 65); Hurtado used Tischendorf and Legg (*Text-Critical Methodology*, 68); Head used NA²⁷, Tischendorf, von Soden, and Swanson, ("John", 400); Hernández used Tischendorf, von Soden, Hoskier, Andrew of Caesarea, and NA²⁷ (*Scribal Habits*, 47); Jongkind in Paul used NA²⁷, von Soden, Tischendorf (*Scribal Habits*, 202), and IGNTP in Luke (*Scribal Habits*, 221).

1.4.1. CRITIQUE OF THE SINGULAR READING METHODOLOGY

One difficulty of using a singular reading methodology for determining scribal habits is the true singularity of a variant (i.e. did the scribe actually create the reading or did he copy it?). Another obstacle are the limitations of using a printed, critical edition to compare readings.

1.4.1.1. Preliminary Remarks

Tischendorf proposes that scribe B of Vaticanus and scribe D of Sinaiticus are one in the same, but Milne and Skeat theorize that scribe A of Vaticanus and D of Sinaiticus have more in common.⁵⁸ They do not posit that the same scribe was involved in both MSS, only that a certain scriptorium must have had repeated similar practices, such as colophon design.⁵⁹ One way to compare these hands, B^A, B^B, and)^D, is to look at the same portions of text copied by each scribe to see if the same variants occur in the same location in the different MSS, but using a methodology of singular readings creates an *impossibility* here. By sheer definition of “singular reading” there will be no identical data between two MSS in the same textual location. Hypothetically, if scribe A of one MS changed mou to emou in Mt 18:35 and scribe B of another MS changed mou to emou in Mt 18:35 as well, a comparison of such changes would not be possible because they would not be singular readings. A strict study of singular readings does not permit commentary on the production of identical variants by different scribes (such readings, however, may be considered sub-singular readings). In addition, if one scribe transcribed more than one MS, then using the singular reading methodology would be a weak tool, assuming the scribe has *some* consistencies in his work (e.g. changing mou to emou in the same place in two different MSS).

⁵⁸ Milne and Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors*, 89-90.

⁵⁹ Skeat, “The Codex Sinaiticus, the Codex Vaticanus, and Constantine,” 603. In addition, there are uncanny textual similarities between the two MSS as well, such as influence from parallel texts in Mt 4:16; 8:9; Mk 15:46; and they agree in error in Mk 4:8 and Lk 13:15. Pisano, “The Text of the New Testament,” 33. See also Elliott, “T.C. Skeat on the Dating and Origin of Codex Vaticanus,” 70-71.

The singular reading methodology proposed in this study limits a full analysis of a scribe's habits.⁶⁰ The study of scribal habits then must not only include sub-singular readings (as defined by Westcott and Hort),⁶¹ but if it is possible that two scribes made the same change in the same location without any connection to one another, then the study of scribal habits must include readings attested by any number of MSS. Perhaps greater weight can be given to a singular reading being a scribe-created phenomenon than a scribe-replicated phenomenon, but a scribe's habits should also be able to be found in any of his transcription. The problem is, as it always was, what did the scribe *copy* and what did the scribe *create*. That is why a singular reading methodology is appealing—there is generally more confidence about what reading a scribe created if that reading occurs nowhere else in an extant MS.

1.4.1.2. True Singularity of a Variant

Concerning the availability of MSS to check a reading's singularity, Colwell optimistically states, "The restriction of this study to singular readings can be made with confidence in view of the wealth of manuscript attestation."⁶² He maintains that the great volume of Greek NT MSS, which today there are over 5,700 extant,⁶³ bolsters confidence in attributing a singular reading as a scribal creation. The premise is that the scribe of the MS at hand created the singular reading because the reading is not found in another extant MS. The promise of MS discoveries in the future, however, may prove today's singular reading to be attested by more than one

⁶⁰ In addition, the singular readings do not portray any direct evidence about the date or provenance of the MSS. It is not possible to tell with any greater certainty if Codex Bezae was produced in Beirut or Egypt, or if Washingtonianus was created in the 5th century or 8th century.

⁶¹ Westcott and Hort define as sub-singular readings: readings "which have only secondary support, namely, that of inferior Greek MSS, of Versions, or of Fathers, or of combinations of documentary authorities of these kinds" (Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, 230).

⁶² Colwell, "Scribal Habits," 108.

⁶³ Bruce M. Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 4th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 50. See also John F. Oates, Roger S. Bagnall, Sarah J. Clackson, Alexandra A. O'Brien, Joshua D. Sosin, Terry G. Wilfong, and Klaas A. Worp, *Checklist of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*, <http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/clist.html>, March, 2008. See also Kurt Aland, ed., *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1994).

MS tomorrow.⁶⁴ Along the same vein, Royse is still somewhat confident, stating, “given the mass of data already available, carefully conducted studies of individual manuscripts are not likely to be made completely worthless by future finds.”⁶⁵

An unknown number of MSS have, however, been destroyed or lost through time.⁶⁶ Non-extant MSS may contain identical readings that are ostensibly singular readings in extant MSS. In her discussion of the Chester Beatty papyri, Barbara Aland criticizes the singular reading methodology stating, “The method is still useful, although it should be underscored that there are no singular readings in the strictest sense. There is no way of knowing that what we regard as singular readings were not also to be found in the great mass manuscripts that have been lost.”⁶⁷ Although the criticism is certainly reasonable, she nevertheless agrees with its results of singular reading analysis in general. Regarding Colwell and Royse’s analysis of P⁴⁵, she positively states, “A first impression of the quality of a manuscript can be gained from its singular readings, as Colwell and after him Royse and others have shown.”⁶⁸ Furthermore, she affirms that when determining the “nature of the copyist’s work it is especially helpful to consider his singular readings, thus demonstrating as clearly as possible the particular nature of our copyist’s scribal habits.”⁶⁹ Therefore, even though Aland pinpoints a fundamental flaw of the singular reading methodology, she nonetheless finds the method beneficial.

⁶⁴ For example, one MS that has proven otherwise *singular* readings to be *non-singular* is P¹²⁷, a fifth-century papyrus of Acts. In the *editio princeps*, Parker and Pickering reveal that P¹²⁷ “offers a new free version [of Acts]. Although it differs greatly from Codex Vaticanus, it also presents a strikingly different version from that found in Codex Bezae” (Parker and Pickering, ed., 4968, 6). The new discovery has supplied scholars with new variants for the NT, but it also supports several readings that “were previously singulars in Codex Bezae” (Parker and Pickering, ed., 4968, 13).

⁶⁵ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 54.

⁶⁶ Thomas Scott Caulley writes, “Perhaps the biggest challenge to textual criticism today is the paucity of MSS dating earlier than the fourth century. The traditional explanation is that prior to Constantine’s protection of the church, many manuscripts were destroyed as Christians were persecuted. In addition, presumably countless MSS perished from exposure to the elements, reminders that the finds we do have are largely attributable to coincidence.” Caulley, “The ‘New’ Textual Criticism: Challenges and Promise,” 227-228.

⁶⁷ B. Aland, “The Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri,” in *The Earliest Gospels*, 110 n.12. In another essay, she states, “The mass of extant witnesses to the New Testament text is larger than that of any other ancient Greek text,” but does continue on to admit “much has been lost, especially in the earliest time.” Barbara Aland, “New Testament Textual Research, Its Methods and Its Goals,” in *Translating the New Testament: Text, Translation, Theology*, ed. Porter and Boda, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans (2009): 18.

⁶⁸ B. Aland, “The Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri,” in *The Earliest Gospels*, 110.

⁶⁹ B. Aland, “The Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri,” in *The Earliest Gospels*, 111.

Maurice Robinson picks up the notion of lost readings, and agrees with Aland's "imperfectly stated" hypothesis.⁷⁰ Because Robinson contends that the Byzantine text contains the most original readings but is a late text, he must therefore assume that the readings unique to the Byzantine text have been lost early on in transmission. Robinson is convinced that "the majority or even a large minority of what are today known as singular readings have not in fact been singular since the time they appeared in the manuscript that presently contains them."⁷¹

J.K. Elliott acknowledges such a potential deficiency in the singular reading methodology, but he prefaces his own analysis of P⁴⁵ under the auspices of the same methodology stating,

So, it may be argued, today's singular reading could tomorrow turn into a reading shared by other recently read manuscripts. That may indeed be a working possibility, but for the most practicable purposes we may accept that, as the singular readings of an early manuscript like our P⁴⁵ are not shared with other early manuscripts (and most of the manuscripts written up to the ninth century have been read in detail by modern scholars), they are for the most part unique to that manuscript . . . All we may do is to say that of the manuscripts that happen to be extant today we have at this or that verse a text otherwise unattested elsewhere.⁷²

Elliott's position is somewhat a middle ground between Robinson and Colwell/Royse. He acknowledges it is impossible to know if a scribe in fact added or omitted, rather than copied a shorter or longer text; therefore he avoids commentary on *scribal activity* and instead analyzes the *text* of P⁴⁵, carefully choosing not to say that *the scribe* did this or that, but that *the text* reads this or that. He avoids using the words "adds" or "omits" when describing scribal activity. Elliott concedes to the possibility that a scribe may have copied the variant rather than changed or altered it; thus his explanations of variants informs us only that a MS contains a longer or shorter reading than another MS. In his attempt to

⁷⁰ Robinson, "Rule 9," in *Translating the New Testament*, 55.

⁷¹ Robinson, "Rule 9," in *Translating the New Testament*, 55 n.95.

⁷² J. Keith Elliott, "Singular Readings in the Gospel Text of P⁴⁵," in *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels – The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex P⁴⁵*, ed. Charles Horton (London: T & T Clark International, 2004), 123.

circumvent such assuming words, Elliott substitutes “adds” with “has”, and “omits” with “lacks”, etc.,⁷³ but this is still non-neutral.

1.4.1.3. *Limitations of Printed Editions*

The availability of MSS is not the only challenge when comparing handwritten MSS against printed editions. Orthography and spelling standards are established in printed editions, but in handwritten MSS there may be no such consistency, or perhaps a feature such as punctuation was added by a later scribe. There are also word divisions in printed editions, which are not a regular feature in our MSS; and, in fact, all of our MSS employ different paragraphing and enumerating. Deciding where words are divided (e.g. is it *eiselqwn* or *eij elqwn*?) is already making an assumption about the text.

Even if printed editions were able to display this information, there is still the dilemma that they are not exhaustive in their account of textual variants. In an attempt to satisfy such data that most critical editions omit, Swanson includes subsections in his work that display several items, where he notes lacunae in MSS, variant spellings, *nomina sacra*, and MS headings and titles, but he cites a mere sixty-eight MSS in his work,⁷⁴ which is a long way from 5,700.⁷⁵

There are further complications with using the editions. Swanson’s work is infamous for errors, especially in scribal corrections.⁷⁶ Several scholars have criticized Legg and others for their inaccuracy.⁷⁷ Even Tischendorf and the Nestle-Aland editions disagree various MS readings, and then one must look to the MS itself to find the answer—not an easy task considering that not every NT MS has a facsimile available or is available online.⁷⁸

⁷³ Elliott, “Singular Readings in the Gospel Text of P⁴⁵,” in *The Earliest Gospels*, 125.

⁷⁴ Swanson, *Matthew*, vi-viii. His list should also include P⁴⁵.

⁷⁵ See Swanson, *Matthew*, x-xi, xv.

⁷⁶ There is a webpage devoted to documenting errors in Swanson’s work. “Rueben Swanson Errata List,” available <http://www-user.uni-bremen.de/~wie/texte/Swanson-errata.html>; Internet; accessed 5 February 2013.

⁷⁷ For example see Wikgren, “The Citation of Versional Evidence in an Apparatus Criticus,” 95-115, especially 96-97 for criticism of Legg and von Soden. See also Elliott, “The International Greek New Testament Project,” 576-578.

⁷⁸ Elliott, however, provides a helpful bibliography for many MSS: J.K. Elliott, *A Bibliography of Greek New Testament Manuscripts*, 2nd ed. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 109 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

1.4.2. PRECAUTIONS

In the singular readings gathered in this study, there are some instances where word division can make a difference in the meaning of the text or in determining scribal habits. These are dealt with on a case-by-case basis. Orthography and spelling are some of the least attested variants in critical editions. Swanson is particularly helpful here as he provides a subsection in his work with orthographic data; and in some instances, Legg notes variants with “*sic*” indicating a spelling difference.

If a scribe’s idiosyncrasies crept into the MS he was copying, could they be noticeable in his singular readings? If it is *not* possible to extract information about a scribe’s habits from his singular readings, can we assume that every time the scribe erred or changed the text in some way, that there was at least one other scribe who has made the same change? Perhaps it is equally unreasonable to assume that *every* singular reading is scribe-created just as it is unreasonable to assume that a scribe created *no* singularities in his text.

Of course, future discoveries will be able to nuance previous studies with their data, but even so, it is not likely that every singular reading documented in the study here will be found to have support in another MS. At least *some* of the singular readings in each MS must be true singular readings.⁷⁹ That is why the study attempts to record *every* singular reading in our MSS with strict criteria.

This study has, however, found some patterns in our scribes’ work that are so rare among MSS (i.e. not attested in another MS), that there is a good possibility that the scribe created them. In order to minimize problems and pitfalls associated with a singular reading methodology, several precautions have been taken. Sub-singular readings are not used as data to support a scribal habit,⁸⁰ and readings that agree with

⁷⁹ Hurtado noted in his study of the singulars in Codex W that this method of determining scribal tendencies was not “infallible”, but his conclusions did not, however, “depend upon a few examples” of singular readings. Hurtado, *Text-Critical Methodology*, 68-69.

⁸⁰ Royse states, “It is necessary to be aware of the possibility that witnesses other than continuous-text Greek manuscripts may occasionally be of importance for the study of the habits of the scribes of such manuscripts” (Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 72). In Royse’s study, quite a few of the singular readings have versional and Patristic support, but he states, “Often the alleged support is doubtful, and even if genuine may be coincidental” (Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 68 n. 11. Accordingly, he marks readings as singular when there is agreement with the versions and Fathers: “but the readings that have only such support [i.e. versions and Fathers] are still considered singular.” Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 73). In the study here, however, singular readings are not included if they have versional and Patristic support to give the strictest attention to singular readings.

the early versions⁸¹ or patristic citations are likewise excluded from the study.⁸²

Strict allowance of singular readings should not be surprising, but mainly where this study parts from the methodology of Royse and Hernández, and follows Colwell, is in the collation of uncorrected readings, rather than corrected readings.

⁸¹ In this study, particular attention is given to variants where they disagree with all other Greek MSS. There can be a direct correlation, grammatically and syntactically, between Greek MSS, but that is not so easily the case when comparing Greek MSS to the early versions: nuances in other languages cannot be directly correlated to Greek in every instance, and the study here relies on second-hand sources, i.e. critical editions, to make judgment calls in instances. Here, the essays in Metzger's *The Early Versions of the New Testament* are especially helpful. For most of the early versions Metzger presents in his volume, a specialist of that language surmises limitations in its correlation with Greek. For example, Brock states that word order in Syriac is not as free as seen in Greek, and the Syriac article "does not correspond at all to that of the Greek article" (Metzger, *The Early Versions*, 83). These aspects and other correlational limitations outlined in *The Early Versions* have been considered in the study. (For Syriac see pp.83-98; Coptic pp. 141-152; Armenian pp. 171-181; Georgian pp. 199-214; Ethiopic pp. 240-256; Arabic p. 268; Latin pp. 362-374; Gothic pp. 388-393; and Old Church Slavonic pp. 431-442 in Metzger, *The Early Versions*.) That said, however, the study is intentionally strict not allowing agreement between a Greek MS and an early version. (Because most versions do not employ definite articles similarly as the Greek, the absence of an article in Greek still counts as a singular reading; otherwise, there would be no singular readings concerning the omission of an article. For example, Latin does not have an equivalent word used as a definite article, but rather a relative clause could create definiteness.) Hernández uses versional readings only to support his claim that scribes omitted more than they added (Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 153-154; 154 n. 130).

⁸² One of the greatest potentials of Patristic quotations is that a Father can be "pinpointed with relative precision in both time and space," thus giving an insight to what the text looked like at a particular period and geographical location (Ehrman, "The Use of the Church Fathers in New Testament Textual Criticism," 156). Patristic quotes are important witnesses to textual variants and can offer the earliest glimpse of a gospel, however, Fee notes four main dilemmas: (1) did the Father quote from a text or from memory, (2) was the Father normally precise or loose in his biblical quotes, (3) was the Father's work intended as a commentary or controversial treatise where accuracy could be expected, or in a sermon where a quote may not be as precisely recorded, and (4) did the Father quote from different Bibles in his works? Fee, "The Use of Greek Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism," 344-345. Petersen remarks similarly about Patristic quotes, stating that it can be uncertain if a citation is a "quotation, a paraphrase, or an allusion; one cannot know whether the author is citing from memory or from a written source; etc." Petersen, "The Genesis of the Gospels," 35-36. There are on occasion quotes introduced by a Father with the words, "For it is written." Glover, "Patristic Quotes and Gospel Sources," 248. Ehrman states that "none of the so-called apostolic fathers presents us with clear and certain citations of the New Testament documents to any extent (if they cite these documents *at all*)." Ehrman, "The Text of the Gospels at the End of the Second Century," 99. Wheeler adds that "quite often the father quoted the same passage in different forms," he continues, "Origen is especially noted for this." Wheeler, "Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem," 317. Royse refers to Fee and others when he notes, "The pitfalls in the assessment of Patristic evidence have been frequently stated." Though he generally does not include the Patristic quotes in his study, Royse states, "Naturally, such a procedure is not intended to minimize the importance of other evidence for other tasks in New Testament textual criticism, or indeed even for a richer understanding of some of the readings considered here [i.e. in his *Scribal Habits*]." Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 71.

1.4.3. UNCORRECTED READINGS

Though Scrivener works towards the goal of determining the “original text” of the NT, the final product of a MS, including corrections by contemporary scribes of the initial scribe, is important for him. He states,

Corrections by the original scribe, or by a contemporary reviser, where they can be satisfactorily distinguished, must be regarded as a portion of the testimony of a manuscript itself, inasmuch as every carefully prepared copy was revised and compared (αὐτὴν ἐβλήθη/ῆ), if not by the writer himself, by a skilful person appointed for the task (οἱ διορθωτὴν, οἱ διορθωτῆς/ῆ), whose duty it was to amend manifest errors.⁸³

Hernández finds corrected readings to be a similar asset. Concerning Sinaiticus, he states that confusion between corrections by scribe A and scribe D “is of no consequence for our study [of scribal habits]. Readings corrected by the *primâ manu* are considered only in their final form. The resulting correction is regarded as the reading that comes from the scriptorium.”⁸⁴ He also states, however, that “we are less certain about *when* A or D were responsible for the *primâ manu* corrections.”⁸⁵ Though the corrections of Codex Sinaiticus may “provide valuable information concerning the history of the New Testament,”⁸⁶ corrections are not included in the study here because the concern is for what can be considered the first stage of scribal transcription.

Hurtado emphasizes the importance of recognizing corrections made by different scribes in a single MS.⁸⁷ He states, “Corrections in the hand of the original scribe, however, tell us more about the attitude of the scribe toward the task of copying, and how concerned the scribe was to produce a satisfactory copy.”⁸⁸ He emphasizes the value of corrections: “These corrections in most cases reflect the scribe going back over the copied text, comparing it with the exemplar, and catching

⁸³ Scrivener, *Introduction*, 53. Also Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 57-58 n. 39.

⁸⁴ Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 57.

⁸⁵ Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 57.

⁸⁶ Brogan, “Another Look at Codex Sinaiticus,” 19.

⁸⁷ Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 186.

⁸⁸ Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 186.

mistakes (e.g., accidental omissions or repetitions, misspellings, or other confusions).”⁸⁹

Milne and Skeat speak of the daunting task of studying corrections in Sinaiticus: “The study and identification of the various correctors constitutes the most difficult task in the investigation of the manuscript.”⁹⁰ Furthermore, Milne and Skeat document that the scribes of Sinaiticus corrected the MS using different hands.⁹¹ The inclusion of corrected readings can be a perilous task if it is difficult to determine with accuracy what scribe is responsible for what correction. Along these lines, Royse states,

In some places, of course, it may not be possible to discriminate with confidence between corrections by the scribe and corrections by a later hand. (This is especially true of deletions by dots or crossing out.) Fortunately, there are only comparatively few corrections in our six papyri that are clearly by later hands, while many are clearly by the scribe.⁹²

Corrections deserve more attention than is possible here in the study of singular readings, as scribes may correct a reading to a well-attested variant. All corrections, including corrections *in scribendo*,⁹³ will not constitute data for the analysis here. Scribal corrections could benefit from special attention in the hopes of determining the process and technique of correction and how that method differs from the initial copying. A comparison of the corrected and uncorrected readings would cast more light on scribal behavior and perhaps illuminate what kind of readings the scribe altered and perhaps why he corrected them. This study restricts itself to the parameters of uncorrected work, conceding that the fullest study of scribal habits is not to be confined only to the uncorrected *or* to the corrected readings, but an analysis and synthesis of the two. This study is, in that sense, the first step of discerning scribal habits in our MSS.

Royse believes that the practice of excluding corrections in a study of scribal habits is “unjustified, and may give a very misleading impression of a scribe’s

⁸⁹ Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 186.

⁹⁰ Milne and Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors*, 40.

⁹¹ Milne and Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors*, 46-50.

⁹² Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 77 n. 40.

⁹³ As Royse defines it, *in scribendo* corrections are corrections made “in the course of copying.” Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 78-79.

activity.”⁹⁴ In two different studies of P⁴⁵, one study which does not include corrected readings (so Colwell) and one that does include corrections (so Royse), the latter “essentially” confirms the former’s judgments.⁹⁵ The results are, however, primarily due to the paucity of corrections in the MS. A study of a MS such as P⁶⁶, which contains many corrections, would most likely produce disparate results when comparing corrections to original text because there are in fact many corrections in the MS. The purpose of the study here is to uncover scribal habits based on the initial transcription by the *prima manu*, not corrections. Therefore, corrected text will not be included in the study.

While the study of corrections is an interesting matter especially for elucidating a historical context,⁹⁶ this study posits that an investigation of uncorrected readings will contribute foundational dimension of scribal behavior, which can then be analyzed against corrections of the readings. The desideratum of this research is to analyze the *prima manu* hand of each MS, outwith corrections by the *prima manu*, conceding that a full and complete study of scribal habits would include corrections, as well as a comprehensive analysis of the scribe’s work in an entire MS, and a full analysis of a MS would include data from all corrections, and depending on the type of study, even a paleographical analysis. There are unknown factors that lead a scribe back to his text to make corrections: for example, did the scribe notice his own mistake, did the scribe later change his mind about a reading, did his supervisor recommend that he amend the text? Certain idiosyncrasies are more transparent in uncorrected error than a patina of corrections, and *vice versa*. To analyze various kinds of corrections properly, there must be a base of knowledge of the uncorrected readings, which comprise the primal layer of scribal habits, thus the present work.

⁹⁴ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 74.

⁹⁵ Hurtado, “P⁴⁵ and the Textual History of the Gospel of Mark,” 146.

⁹⁶ Hurtado states, “In the corrections made by the original scribe and those made by a contemporary, we have historically important evidence suggesting a concern for a satisfactory, ‘accurate’ copy of a text, this concern datable to the time of the manuscript.” Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 186.

1.5. LAYOUT OF THE DISSERTATION

With the premise of the study stated and the methodology explored, the study can now commence. Each of the main chapters focuses on one MSS and its singular readings in the Gospel of Matthew.

Chapter two focuses on Codex Sinaiticus and the two scribes at work in Matthew. Scribe A, who copies most of Matthew, creates 163 singular readings. There are many instances of haplography, dittography, and changes influenced by grammatical context. These changes outnumber any singular orthographic changes. Some readings may intend to improve the text, as potential inconsistencies are amended or a confessional statement is reworked, but these are the exceptions to patterns of readings that otherwise do not significantly change the meaning of the text. Scribe D creates 16 singular readings where the only phenomenon that occurs more than once is the change of pronouns to reflexive.

Chapter three is on Codex Vaticanus, which produces one of the lowest counts of singular readings in the study, tallying 97. There are high numbers of transpositions, influence from context, and several changes from Koine to Attic and *vice versa*, yet the readings rarely, if ever, change the meaning of the text.

Chapter four focuses on Codex Ephraemi, which produces the fewest number of singular readings in the study, 75. Itacistic and orthographic changes each occur less often than the most frequent type of alteration, haplography. There is one harmonization to Mark, which is uncharacteristic compared to the other types of readings.

Chapter five is on Codex Bezae. The greatest number of singular readings is gained from the study here, 259. There is a high number of orthographic changes, which could be from the scribe using Greek as his second language. As in the other MSS, many changes are grammatical, and there are several change from Koine to Attic and *vice versa*, but there are more instances where Latin has influenced a change. Overall, it seems the Western element that the MS is known for is absent from the singular readings.

Chapter six focuses on Codex Washingtonianus, which produces 112 singular readings. Many of these readings are influenced from the context and some are

synonymic substitutions. This is the only one of our MSS that shows a clear preference for Attic grammar and consistent sensical readings.

The final chapter, seven, compares different types of changes of the MSS, such as *nomina sacra*, orthography, Attic and Koine grammar, harmonizations, conflations, and theological readings. In addition, the criterion of *lectio brevior potior* is discussed with the empirical evidence gained from the study of singulars.

CHAPTER TWO: CODEX SINAITICUS

2.1. INTRODUCTION

J.K. Elliott writes, “If there is one biblical manuscript and one only that the man in the street has heard of, it is likely to be the Codex Sinaiticus.”¹ And that statement is even truer today with the worldwide stir that the digitization project made under the auspices of the British Library, which went online in 2009.² The codex’s “primacy of position in the list of New Testament manuscripts”³ is evident in its consistent citation in critical apparatuses of the Greek NT and is often mentioned with Vaticanus as *the* prominent biblical MSS.⁴

The geographic origin of our five MSS is uncertain as each of their recorded histories begins at least a millennium after production.⁵ Hernández states that the question of provenance “is of doubtful value for elucidating our study of scribal habits.”⁶ Nevertheless, it is generally accepted that Codex Sinaiticus was most likely produced in Egypt⁷ or Caesarea⁸ in the 4th century.⁹ Today, portions of the codex are housed at Mt. Sinai, St. Petersburg, Leipzig, and London.¹⁰

¹ Elliott, *Codex Sinaiticus and the Simonides Affair*, 5.

² British Library, Leipzig University Library, St Catherine's Monastery at Sinai, and the National Library of Russia. *Electronic Version of Codex Sinaiticus*. <http://www.codexsinaiticus.org/en/manuscript.aspx>.

³ Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 62.

⁴ For example, Greenlee states) is “one of the two most famous uncial mss,” and B “is the other of the two most famous uncial mss.” *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*, 37, 39. Sinaiticus is discussed with codices A and B in the aptly named essay by Pattie, “The Creation of the Great Codices,” in *The Bible as Book*. K. Aland and B. Aland state, “The uncials have played a dominant role well into the twentieth century, with three manuscripts in particular enjoying the limelight,” which are) B D. *The Text of the New Testament*, 103. Westcott and Hort discuss) with A B C. *Introduction*, 74-75, §98.

⁵ “It is unknown where any of the three great codices were written,” remarks Pattie about) A B. Pattie, “The Creation of the Great Codices,” 65.

⁶ Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 136.

⁷ Elliott, “T.C. Skeat on the Dating and Origin of Codex Vaticanus,” 75-76.

⁸ Elliott, “T.C. Skeat on the Dating and Origin of Codex Vaticanus,” 74.

⁹ Parker, *Codex Sinaiticus*, 7, 54.

¹⁰ See Jongkind for a description of the known contents of codex) and their housing locations. Jongkind, *Scribal Habits*, 8-9.

2.1.1. THE SCRIBES

There are three scribes at work in the original transcription of the codex, scribes A, B, and D, and they belong to “a well-trained professional class.”¹¹ Scribe A transcribed most of the NT, but some portions of Matthew (and other books) are copied by scribe D, including Mt 16:9 (starting with *th petra*) through 18:12 (ending with *anqrwpw*) and 24:36 (beginning with *peri*) through 26:6 (ending with *leprou*).¹²

2.1.2. DICTATION THEORY

The dictation theory proposed by Milne and Skeat is tenable in the OT, particularly because the wealth of comparative spelling differences of the scribes is hard to justify otherwise.¹³ In a MS that was “undoubtedly” written by dictation, errors that go beyond spelling, such as omissions or repetitions, are explained by blaming the reader of such mistakes.¹⁴ Tindall suggests that the NT in Sinaiticus was, however, copied from a written exemplar as opposed to dictation.¹⁵ If the scribes copied an exemplar that itself was dictated, then that could account for the rigid disparity in spelling of the scribes’ work. After having “studied the manuscript in great detail,” Jongkind disfavors the dictation theory and accounts for the orthographic differences between scribes by attributing them to the third of what he considers the four stages of the copying process (developed by Alphonse Dain):¹⁶ (1) reading the text, (2) retention of the text, (3) internal dictation, and (4) actual movement of the hand.¹⁷

¹¹ Silva, “The Text of Galatians,” in *Scribes and Scripture*, 19.

¹² Scribe D in the NT is also responsible for Mk 14:54 (beginning with the *qh*sen of *hkolouqh*sen) though the end; Lk 1:1 though 1:56 (ending with *ton*); 1 Thes 2:14 (beginning with *sumfuletwn*) through the end; Heb 4:16 (beginning with *proserxwmeqa*) through 8:1 (ending with *tau*); and Rev 1:1 through 1:5 (up to and including *nekrwn*). See Milne and Skeat for a comprehensive list of the scribal work of A, B, and D in the LXX and the NT. *Scribes and Correctors*, 29. Jongkind notes that scribe D in Matthew transcribed 24:36-25:21; but a check with Milne and Skeat and the MS does not support this. Rather, the scribe is responsible for transcribing 24:36-26:6, which is a full folio more than what Jongkind notes.

¹³ Royse notes that the example of dictation theory that Milne and Skeat provide is from the OT. Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 89 n. 75.

¹⁴ Milne and Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors*, 59.

¹⁵ Tindall, *Contributions to the Statistical Study of the Codex Sinaiticus*, 17.

¹⁶ See Jongkind, *Scribal Habits*, 23.

¹⁷ Jongkind, *Scribal Habits*, 250, 250-252.

2.2. NOMINA SACRA

2.2.1. OVERVIEW OF *NOMINA SACRA*

The *nomina sacra*, or sacred names, are a group of words (Jesus, God, Lord, etc.) that are contracted in writing with a horizontal stroke written above the contraction, e.g. ϩ8j8 for ϩεοj. Referring to the ways the scribes of Sinaiticus employed *nomina sacra*, Jongkind states, “Within all this variety, individual scribal preferences can be detected. This means that to a certain extent the scribe imposed their own preferences upon the presentation of the text.”¹⁸ With this in mind, an analysis of the *nomina sacra* in each MS has been included in the study of our MSS to help identify MS characteristics and elucidate any potential scribal tendencies.¹⁹ The *nomina sacra* readings are not included in the tally of singular readings, unless they are actually singular (e.g. 24:15 in Sinaiticus).

In the article, “The Origin of the *Nomina Sacra*” by Hurtado, it is noted that the words Ihsouj, Xristoj, Kuriouj, and Qeoj are among the earliest words to become abbreviated in MSS (the primary *nomina sacra*).²⁰ Later, the words pneuma, anqrwpoj, and stauroj are found in abbreviated forms (the secondary *nomina sacra*), and finally the words pathr, uioj, swthr,²¹ mhthr, ouranoj, Israhel, Daueid, and Ierousalhm are the last to be abbreviated (the tertiary *nomina sacra*).²² Hurtado encourages scholars to become acquainted with “historical *realia* such as NT manuscripts and not to confine their studies to printed editions (where one is unlikely to find any hint of such things as *nomina sacra*).”²³ Indeed, Prior takes the study a necessary step further with Codex W and

¹⁸ Jongkind, *Scribal Habits*, 83.

¹⁹ Luijendijk notes that the *nomina sacra* may reflect Christian education on the part of the scribe: “The earliest Christian exercises show that *nomina sacra* were taught at a basic educational level.” Luijendijk, *Greetings in the Lord*, 68, 57-78.

²⁰ Hurtado, “The Origin of the *Nomina Sacra*: A Proposal,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 117 no. 4 (1998): 655-673. The article is expanded in Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts* (2006): 95-134.

²¹ The word swthr and any of its forms do not occur in Matthew.

²² There are rare occurrences of other names in biblical MSS that are not contracted but have a bar written over them: in P.Bod. VII and VIII is found M8i8x8a8h8l8, N8w8e8, S8a8r8r8a8, A8b8r8a8a8m8, A8d8a8m8; in P.Bod XIII is found A8d8a8m8, and the contractions d8n8i8n8 (for dunamin) and A8b8r8m8 (for Abraam). In P.Egerton II is found m8w8 (for Mwushj) and h8[s8a8j8 (for Hsaiaj). Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 98 n. 12; Luijendijk, *Greetings in the Lord*, 66 n. 28.

²³ Hurtado, “The Origin of the *Nomina Sacra*,” 672.

distinguishes between which occurrences of *nomina sacra* are sacral and which are nonsacral in Matthew, as well as where the *nomina sacra* are contracted and where they are not.²⁴ Where a *nomen sacrum* is not contracted, it is referred to as “full word” or *plene*, e.g. ϩεοϩ instead of ϩ8ϩ8 or ϩ888. The organization of Prior’s data into sacral and nonsacral instances of *nomina sacra* may potentially shed light on a scribe’s attitude toward his text. The study here follows suit in the identification of sacral and nonsacral instances of the *nomina sacra*. (See appendices twelve through sixteen for each MSS’ *nomina sacra* in Matthew.)

2.2.2. SCRIBE A

2.2.2.1. Primary Nomina Sacra

With a few exceptions, the *nomina sacra* lexemes of Ihsouj (i888, i8u8, i8n8), Xristoj (x888, x8u8, x8n8, x8e8), Kurioj (k888, k8u8, k8w8, k8n8, k8e8), and Qeoj (q888, q8u8, q8w8, q8n8, q8e8), are always contracted in the work of the scribe A in Sinaiticus in Matthew.²⁵ The *plene* Ihsoun in 1:21 is difficult to see in the MS—it seems to have been erased and replaced with autou i8n8. One instance of the nonsacral plural kurioij is written in *plene* (6:24). One instance of the sacral ϩεου is not abbreviated (27:43) which is spoken by the chief priests, scribes, and elders as they mock Jesus on the cross. The ϩεου that they speak is a quote from Jesus: “for he [i.e. Jesus] said, ‘I am God’s Son’.”

2.2.2.2. Secondary Nomina Sacra

The *nomen sacrum* lexemes of pneuma are always contracted in the work of scribe A in Matthew (p8n8a8, p8n8s8, p8n8i8, p8n8a8twn, p8n8a8ta).

²⁴ Prior, “The Use and Nonuse of *Nomina Sacra* in the Freer Gospel of Matthew.” Some reviewers have noticed errors in Prior’s essay but have not provided a systematic correction of these errors. See Wasserman who states “Prior’s results are based on a sufficient range of data, which will be useful in future study of this interesting phenomenon. The accentuation and spelling of the Greek should have been checked more carefully, since there are several errors and inconsistencies.” Wasserman, review of *The Freer Biblical Manuscripts: Fresh Studies of an American Treasure Trove*, ed. Larry W. Hurtado, *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 13 (2008) §16 [journal online]; available <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/v13/index.html>; Internet; accessed 3 March 2013. See chapter six on Codex W, section 6.2, for a reassessment and correction of some of Prior’s data.

²⁵ The *nomen sacrum* i888 is written by)^{ca} in 26:63. It is not included in appendix twelve.

There are a few instances where nonsacral lexemes of $\alpha\eta\rho\omega\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon$ are written in *plene* (5:13, 19; 6:5; 7:9; 13:25; 15:11¹; 21:25), which are all spoken by Jesus. As a *plene* sacral word, it is found in *Son of Man* sayings said by Jesus (8:20; 20:18, 28). It is otherwise always contracted ($\alpha\eta\eta\omicron\omicron\sigma\sigma$, $\alpha\eta\eta\omicron\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$, $\alpha\eta\eta\omega\omega$, $\alpha\eta\eta\omicron\omicron\eta\eta$, $\alpha\eta\eta\omicron\omicron\iota\iota$, $\alpha\eta\eta\omega\omega\eta\eta$, $\alpha\eta\eta\omicron\omicron\iota\iota\sigma\sigma$).²⁶ There are two instances where the plural genitive abbreviation is written with a moveable nu at the end of a line as $\alpha\eta\eta\omega\omega$ (15:9; 23:13), and the final nu is added later (by)^{ca}). In 23:4, $\alpha\eta\eta\omega\omega$ is written by)*, but the over bar is added later (by)^{ca}).

2.2.2.3. Tertiary Nomina Sacra

Lexemes of $\rho\alpha\theta\eta\rho$ are usually contracted ($\rho\theta\theta\rho$, $\rho\theta\theta\sigma\sigma$, $\rho\theta\theta\iota\iota$, $\rho\theta\theta\alpha\alpha$, $\rho\theta\theta\omega\omega\eta\eta$) in sacral as well as nonsacral instances. Its lexemes are found in *plene* only for nonsacral instances (4:22; 10:35; 23:32).

Lexemes of $\upsilon\omicron\omicron\upsilon$ are always contracted to two letters ($\upsilon\sigma\sigma$, $\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon$, $\upsilon\eta\eta$), except for one instance where three letters form the only dative *nomen sacrum* of $\upsilon\omicron\omicron\upsilon$ ($\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\omega$).²⁷ Nonsacral *plene* lexemes of $\upsilon\omicron\omicron\upsilon$ are found when spoken by an angel (1:20), Jesus (5:9, 45; 8:12; 9:15; 10:37; 13:38¹, 38²; 17:26; 21:5; 22:2; 23:31), Pharisees (12:27), and in narration in a quote of Jeremiah referring to Judas (27:9). In addition, when lexemes of $\upsilon\omicron\omicron\upsilon$ are associated with Zebedee, they are written in *plene*: spoken by the mother of the sons of Zebedee (20:21), in narration in reference to the mother of the sons of Zebedee (20:20¹, 20²; 27:56) or just the sons of Zebedee (26:37). Sacral *plene* lexemes of $\upsilon\omicron\omicron\upsilon$ are found in the first two instances of the word in the title verse of Matthew (1:1¹, 1²), in narration (1:25), in *Son of Man* sayings by Jesus (8:20; 12:32), in a trinitarian formula spoken by Jesus (28:19), and when spoken by certain individuals: the tempter ($\omicron\ \rho\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha\zeta\omega\eta$) (4:3, 6), passersby who deride Jesus on the cross (27:40), children crying out in the temple “Son of David” (21:15), demoniacs (8:29), two blind men (9:27; 20:30), and a Canaanite woman (15:22).

The lexemes of $\mu\eta\theta\eta\rho$ are usually contracted ($\mu\theta\theta\rho$, $\mu\theta\theta\sigma\sigma$, $\mu\theta\theta\iota\iota$, $\mu\theta\theta\alpha\alpha$). Non-sacrally, it is written in *plene* when referring to the mother of the

²⁶ The word $\alpha\eta\eta\omicron\omicron\iota\iota\sigma\sigma$ is written by)^{S1} in 19:26 and is not included in this list.

²⁷ The sacral $\upsilon\eta\eta$ at 1:21 is written by)*, and is written in full, $\upsilon\omicron\iota\omicron\eta$, by)^{S1}. The sacral $\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon$, written by)* in 20:31 is changed to $\upsilon\theta\theta$ by)^{ca}.

sons of Zebedee (20:20) and in a quote of Micah 7:6 spoken by Jesus (10:35). Sacral *plene* lexemes are found in several instances (1:18; 2:11, 13, 14; 12:46). The word $\mu\eta\theta\rho\varsigma$ is omitted by)^* in 12:47, but is written by)^A in the lower margin. The variant in 27:56 in)^* does not read a lexeme of $\mu\eta\theta\rho\varsigma$, but)^{ca} reads $\mu\eta\theta\rho\varsigma$ in 27:56¹ and $\mu\eta\theta\rho\varsigma$ in 27:56².

Lexemes of $\omicron\rho\rho\rho\rho$ ($\omicron\rho\rho\rho\rho$, $\omicron\rho\rho\rho\rho$, $\omicron\rho\rho\rho\rho$, $\omicron\rho\rho\rho\rho$, $\omicron\rho\rho\rho\rho$) are found contracted about as often *plene*. In 5:3; 19:23, there is a moveable nu at the end of the plural genitive sacral $\omicron\rho\rho\rho\rho$. In 24:35, $\omicron\rho\rho\rho\rho$ is omitted in)^* , but is written $\omicron\rho\rho\rho\rho$ by)^{ca} .

The *nomina sacra* $\text{I}\rho\rho\lambda$ ($\text{I}\rho\rho\lambda$, $\text{I}\rho\rho\lambda$) and $\text{D}\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\text{id}$ are contracted in every instance ($\text{d}\rho\alpha\text{d}\rho$) except $\text{D}\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\text{id}$ in 1:6² in the genealogy of Jesus. The name $\text{I}\epsilon\rho\upsilon\sigma\alpha\lambda\eta\mu$ is only contracted twice ($\text{I}\rho\lambda\eta\mu$ in 23:37¹, 37²), which is found in Jesus' lament of Jerusalem, just after his seven woes to the scribes and Pharisees.

2.2.3. SCRIBE D

The primary *nomina sacra*, $\text{I}\eta\varsigma\upsilon\text{j}$ ($\text{I}\rho\varsigma\varsigma$, $\text{I}\rho\upsilon\varsigma$, $\text{I}\rho\eta\varsigma$), $\text{X}\rho\text{I}\sigma\text{t}\circ\text{j}$ ($\text{x}\rho\varsigma\varsigma$), $\text{k}\upsilon\rho\text{I}\circ\text{j}$ ($\text{k}\rho\varsigma\varsigma$, $\text{k}\rho\epsilon\varsigma$), $\text{Q}\epsilon\circ\text{j}$ ($\text{q}\rho\upsilon\varsigma$), are always contracted in the work of scribe D in Sinaiticus in Matthew, except for some nonsacral lexemes of $\text{k}\upsilon\rho\text{I}\circ\text{j}$ in the parable of the talents. The words $\rho\nu\epsilon\mu\alpha$, $\mu\eta\theta\rho\varsigma$, $\text{I}\rho\rho\lambda$, $\text{D}\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\text{id}$, and $\text{I}\epsilon\rho\upsilon\sigma\alpha\lambda\eta\mu$ are not found in the transcription of scribe D in Matthew.

Lexemes of $\alpha\eta\eta\rho\omega\text{j}$ ($\alpha\eta\eta\circ\rho\upsilon\varsigma$, $\alpha\eta\eta\rho\omega\varsigma$, $\alpha\eta\eta\circ\rho\text{I}\rho$) are found contracted and *plene* in both sacral and nonsacral instances. It is found in *plene* in some *Son of Man* sayings (17:12; 24:37, 39, 44; 25:31). The *plene* genitive form is found with a moveable nu in 24:37, ending one line of text with $\alpha\eta\varsigma$, then continuing on the following line with $\eta\rho\omega\upsilon$.

Lexemes of $\rho\alpha\theta\rho$ ($\rho\eta\theta\rho\varsigma$, $\rho\eta\rho\varsigma\varsigma$) are found in only five instances in the work of scribe D. In two instances that are clearly sacral, it is written in *plene* (18:10; 24:36).

The lexeme $\upsilon\text{I}\circ\text{j}$ ($\upsilon\rho\varsigma\varsigma$) is only found once contracted (16:16), which is a sacral context.

The word $\omicron\rho\rho\rho\rho$ is never contracted in the work of scribe D in Matthew.

2.3. THE SINGULAR READINGS OF SCRIBE A IN SINAITICUS IN MATTHEW²⁸

Codex Sinaiticus has no lacunae in the Gospel of Matthew and contains 1,067 verses. Scribe A copied the majority of the gospel, 942 verses, and scribe D copied 125 verses. Scribe A creates 163 singular readings (that is one singular for every 5.77 verses). The most frequent types of singular readings are due to parablepsis, resulting in the omission and addition of text, and influence from context. Some readings may intend to improve the text, as potential inconsistencies are amended or a confessional statement is reworked, but these are the exceptions to patterns of readings that otherwise do not significantly change the meaning of the text.

2.3.1. ORTHOGRAPHY

2.3.1.1. *Overview of Orthography*

The term “itacism” notes an established pattern of vocalic interchange, namely sounds represented by *i*, *ei*, *h*, *hi*, *oi*, *u*, and *ui*²⁹ (and are *not* included in the tally of singular readings),³⁰ whereas “orthography” notes recognized and acceptable vocalic and consonantal spelling differences (and *are* included in the tally of singular readings).³¹ Consonantal orthographic spellings include, but are not limited to, palatal, labial, dental, lingual, and nasal consonant interchanges, as well as addition and omission of letters.³²

²⁸ See appendix two.

²⁹ Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:235.

³⁰ Itacistic spellings do not count toward Hernández’s calculation of singular readings. Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 54 n. 20.

³¹ Caragounis identifies vowels and diphthongs that are interchangeable: *ei* > *i*, *ei* > *h*, *u* > *i*, *ui* > *i*, *oi* > *i*, *h* > *i*, *hi* > *i*, *o* > *oi* > *w*, *oi* > *wi*, *ai* > *e*, and *au* > *eu* > *hu*. He also identifies similarly spelled but identically pronounced interchanges: *h* > *u*, *h* > *i*, *i* > *ei* > *h*, *u* > *i* > *h*, *i* > *oi*, and *o* > *w*. Caragounis, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament*, 365-377; 518-546.

³² The labial consonants are *p*, *b*, *f*, and *m*. The palatals are *k*, *g*, and *x*. The linguals are *t*, *d*, *q*, *s*, *l*, *n*, and *r*. The smooth mutes are *p*, *k*, and *t*. The middle mutes are *b*, *g*, and *d*. The rough mutes are *f*, *x*, and *q*. The labial mutes are *p*, *b*, and *f*. The palatal mutes are *k*, *g*, and *x*. The lingual mutes are *t*, *d*, and *q*. The liquids are *l*, *m*, *n*, and *r*. The nasals are *m*, *n*, and nasal *g*. Goodwin, *Grammar*, 9-10, §16-22.

According to Royse, itacistic variations “rarely have any possible effect on the sense of a passage,”³³ but are included in the study to note any potential scribal characteristics. The importance of studying spelling differences, according to Sanders, is that such “peculiarities indicate . . . the date and nationality of the scribe, or even the character of Hellenistic Greek, but not the direct MS affiliation.”³⁴ The spelling used by the scribe may be able to help place him in time and perhaps a geographical context,³⁵ but may not be useful for determining pronunciation.³⁶ The exchange of letters in our MSS may only confirm their dating within a very broad period but may evince some leanings toward Attic or Koine Greek standards.

In Gignac’s *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, 32,284 Greek documents dated 30 B.C.E. to 735 C.E. are surveyed and their differences in spelling are recorded.³⁷ His analysis of the Roman and Byzantine era texts, which span the chronology of) , B, C, D, and W, proves most useful for comparison of orthography.³⁸

Because the study is of singular readings, there will ultimately be many spellings not attested in any MS. On the frequency of spelling patterns, Gignac states,

³³ Hernández does not include the “ubiquitous ‘itacistic’ confusions between ei and i, ai and e, oi and u” in his study. Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 54 n. 20. See Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 79-80.

³⁴ Sanders, *The New Testament Manuscripts*, 48, cf. 25-26.

³⁵ Although Swanson states, “The reporting of all variants, even itacisms, is indispensable for telling us something of the provenance of the manuscripts, and also as an indicator of the quality of the scribal work,” which may be overstated, the itacistic data do *at least* produce patterns of spelling in each of our MSS. Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Matthew*, x.

³⁶ Gignac states, “In phonology, the Greek of the early Roman period stands closer to Modern Greek than to classical Attic.” He continues, “The evidence of the papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods for the pronunciation of the various sounds is so discrepant that examples can be found to support almost any theory about the pronunciation of Greek at this time. This situation could lead to skepticism about the value of orthographic variations for determining the pronunciation of a dead language unless the conflicting evidence can be reconciled by distinguishing various causes simultaneously at work.” Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:43, 45.

³⁷ Gignac leads his study with caution, noting five caveats: (1) sounds of a dead language cannot be precisely nailed down, (2) spelling may not accurately represent shifts in pronunciation, (3) orthographic spelling is not as frequent in writings of native speakers as those of foreigner speakers, (4) it may not be possible to date shifts in phonology, and (5) what may seem to be an orthographic variation could simply be a mistake, such as anticipation and repetition (includes haplography and dittography of letters and syllables), inversion, mechanical reproduction, analogical information, and etymological analysis. Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:58-59.

³⁸ Gignac states that these documents, most of which are papyri, “constitute our richest source of knowledge of Koine Greek.” Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:1.

If certain letters or groups of letters interchange only rarely and infrequently, there might be another explanation. But when they are confused frequently, so that a certain letter or group of letters stands for another and vice versa in document after document, this in itself establishes a strong presumption that such a departure from a traditional norm of orthography had a meaning, and that it expresses some reality in the speech of the writers concerned.³⁹

Not every interchange of letters is frequent enough to establish a pattern, and in fact “the practice of a particular scribe may show no consistency.”⁴⁰ Nevertheless, Gignac notes all instances of letter interchanges in his papyri and when examples are found even in a single instance, it is labeled as a “sporadic” interchange.⁴¹ The purpose of including a scribe’s spelling, whether an interchange occurs in one instance or multiple instances, is to better understand spelling conventions. The result of this information can then be applied to other variants to see if the scribe has substituted one word for another or in fact merely created an orthographic spelling. It would be possible then, to argue as Hernández does for the variant $\chi\iota\lambda\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\eta$ in place of $\tau\epsilon\iota\chi\omicron\upsilon\eta$ in Sinaiticus in Rev 21:17 as an itacistic spelling for $\chi\epsilon\iota\lambda\omicron\upsilon\eta$, which may “[shed] light on the Apocalypse’s early readership and scribal activity” if it is an early harmonization to Ezekiel.⁴²

2.3.1.2. *Itacisms*

In Sinaiticus in Matthew, some itacistic changes occur often in the transcription by scribe A, $e\iota > i$ (337)⁴³ and $a\iota > e$ (192), and their reverse are considerably less frequent $i > e\iota$ (7) and $e > a\iota$ (3).⁴⁴

2.3.1.3. *Other Vocalic Changes*

Apart from itacistic changes, other vocalic changes include $a > e$ (5:41; 9:4), $o > a$ (9:20), $ou > w$ (26:15b), and $w > ou$ (27:64).

³⁹ Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:57.

⁴⁰ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 80.

⁴¹ Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:50.

⁴² Hernández, “A Scribal Solution to a Problematic Measurement in the Apocalypse,” 278. The only occurrence of $\chi\epsilon\iota\lambda\omicron\upsilon\eta$ in Matthew is in 15:8, where in fact the itacism $e\iota > i$ is found ($\chi\iota\lambda\epsilon\sigma\iota\eta$), but is read by) N Q, and therefore not included in the study of singular readings here.

⁴³ In the text of Revelation in Sinaiticus, there are over one hundred non-singular readings that witness the change $e\iota > i$. Hernández, “A Scribal Solution,” 275.

⁴⁴ See appendix seventeen.

2.3.1.4. *Consonantal Changes*

Besides vocalic changes, there are palatal mute exchanges $k > x$ (1:14¹, 14²; 20:13), lingual mute exchanges $d > t$ (1:13, 14a, 15), a labial change $p > f$ (5:33), and another consonant change g or $d > z$ (8:28).⁴⁵

2.3.1.5. *Omissions and Additions of Letters*

Rather than an exchange, there is a vowel *addition* between a consonant and a vowel (26:65).⁴⁶ There are final vowel omissions (18:18; 22:16). There are consonant omissions (12:33; 27:23). Omission of final nu in verbs is not relegated to occur only before vowels or consonants, and is omitted before either (21:25; 22:21; 22:30; 28:7).⁴⁷

2.3.1.6. *Other Spellings*

There is a syllable omission (4:18) and a non-contracted preposition (14:7)⁴⁸ in the singular readings.

2.3.2. INEXPLICABLE SPELLINGS

“Nonsense readings” are not grammatically construed and do not make sense in context, but are still referred to as significant readings. Colwell and Tune define “nonsense reading”:

This is the extreme case of the unintended error. It is the one clear, objectively demonstrable error. It is by definition, that variant reading which does not make sense, and/or cannot be found in the lexicon, and/or is not Greek grammar.⁴⁹

These are typically “egregious blunders,” Royse writes about nonsense readings, and states that they “will frequently involve confusion of similar words or forms.”⁵⁰

⁴⁵ Some of these occur in proper names, i.e. Sadwk, Abiout, Eliout, and Gazarhnwn.

⁴⁶ Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:310.

⁴⁷ Only 28:7 ends a line of text. See Robertson, *Grammar*, 220.

⁴⁸ Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:315.

⁴⁹ Colwell and Tune, “Method in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings,” 101.

⁵⁰ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 91.

Some singular readings in Sinaiticus in Matthew are nonsense because they are not real words (12:49;⁵¹ 13:25; 26:15a).

2.3.3. NONSENSE IN CONTEXT

“Nonsense” comes in two forms: “strictly nonsense” and “nonsense in context.”⁵²

The following singular readings in Sinaiticus do not make grammatical or logical sense in context, but are real words. A verb is changed to a noun, which is the addition of one letter (6:6).⁵³ Concerning pronouns, one case change creates nonsense (20:14b),⁵⁴ as well as one number change (20:34).⁵⁵ There is a nonsensical substitution of *Daniel* for (a contracted form of) *Israel* (24:15).⁵⁶

2.3.4. PARABLEPSIS

2.3.4.1. Overview of Parablepsis

Colwell and Tune describe “dislocated readings” as resulting from the scribe taking his eye off the exemplar. “When he looks at it again,” they say, “his eye falls upon a word identical with (or similar to) the last word he copied, but—alas!—located some distance before or after the last word he copied.”⁵⁷ Parablepsis consists of one or a group of identical or similar letters that occur in two locations. Parablepsis can cause

⁵¹ Perhaps the nu ending of the preceding *thn* influenced an addition of nu to *xira* (an orthographic spelling of *xeira*), although, in that case, *xirhn* might be expected. The reading in) * is not a real word.

⁵² Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 91. Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 62, 63.

⁵³ The text of) * reads a genitive instead of a dative as *rell*.

⁵⁴ There are no vocalic changes *oi* > *u* in the singular readings of scribe A in Matthew, and thus the change from dative to nominative here creates a reading that is nonsense in context.

⁵⁵ The text of) * reads a singular pronoun, but should be plural to match the subject, *duo tufloi* from 20:30.

⁵⁶ The text of) * reads the *nomen sacrum* for Israel, which is not construed in context because no prophet called Israel, or Jacob who is called Israel (Gen 35:10), spoke such words of desecration as Matthew declares. The three letters of the abbreviation, *ihl*, are the same as the final three letters of the word it replaces, *Danihl*. Perhaps there was confusion with the preceding *dia* with *dan* and thus the scribe skipped the *dan* of *danihl*, leaving *diaihl*. When the scribe encountered the word *ihl*, perhaps there was a natural inclination to place a bar over it since it resembles the *nomen sacrum* for Israel. This would assume the scribe was paying enough attention to the word he was copying to think it read *Israel*, but not enough attention, or knowledge, to realize that a prophet called Israel never said these things. Perhaps there is mention of Israel in the targumim or pseudepigrapha where he is associated with this, but if this reading is intentionally created by the scribe and means this, then the scribe would have some familiarity of Jewish extra-canonical sources.

⁵⁷ Colwell and Tune, “Method in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings,” 102.

haplography (the omission of text)⁵⁸ and dittography (the repetition of text).⁵⁹

Haplography may include homoeoteleuton, omission due to parablepsis occurring on the endings of words or ending of lines, and homoeoarchton, omission due to parablepsis occurring on the beginnings of words or beginning of lines.

2.3.4.2. Haplography

There are many possible instances of haplography (25). These account for 15.33% of the singular readings in Sinaiticus (scribe A) in Matthew. Omission of three words or more are almost always due to haplography in the singular readings in Sinaiticus (in 14 instances of three or more words being omitted, 10 are due to haplography). Some are omissions of an entire clause (7:27b;⁶⁰ 13:39)⁶¹ or two clauses (9:15),⁶² or are omissions of phrases (28:2-3).⁶³

Sometimes the omission may also be due to beginning a new line of text, involving entire phrases (10:9)⁶⁴ or one clause (5:45;⁶⁵ 10:39),⁶⁶ two clauses (19:18),⁶⁷ one word (21:19;⁶⁸ 27:53a),⁶⁹ or adjuncts (8:3;⁷⁰ 12:44).⁷¹

⁵⁸ Epp defines haplography as the “unintentional deletion of a passage. . . because of similar or identical words in a narrow context.” Epp, “Toward the Clarification of the Term ‘Textual Variant’,” 51.

⁵⁹ Epp defines dittography as the “unintentional repetition of a passage. . . because of similar or identical words in a narrow context.” Epp, “Toward the Clarification of the Term ‘Textual Variant’,” 51.

⁶⁰ In 7:27b, the text of) * lacks a clause (probably due to the parablepsis of –moi kai).

⁶¹ In 13:39, an entire clause is lacking, probably due to the parablepsis of ο(i) de geris—.

⁶² Two full clauses are lacking here in) *, probably by haplography (due to parablepsis of –n ο numfioj).

⁶³ In 28:3, the words hn de h eidea autou are lacking in) *. It is likely due to the parablepsis of autou.

⁶⁴ In 10:9, the parablepsis of –on mhde could have caused an omission of the phrase (which is part of the complement), mhde arguron, by the scribe. The mh of the first mhde ends the final line of a column and the scribe could have lost his place as he began a new column.

⁶⁵ In 5:45, the text of) * lacks an entire clause. The final word αγαουj, is split between columns, ending with aga on one column and beginning with ουj on a new column (folio 202, line 1, column 4). Scribe A could have skipped text due to the –ουj endings of the following words (dikaiouj and adikouj), which would be an instance of homoeoteleuton. Apparently, the scribe noticed the mistake later and finished line 1 of column 4 with kai brexei epi, and added dikaiouj kai adikouj himself in the margin (the color of the ink used in the emendation here by) ^A is lighter than usual).

⁶⁶ In 10:39, the scribe leaps from one substantival participle to another substantival participle, perhaps due to the small parablepsis of the article, ο, or because of the grammatical parablepsis of substantival participles. An entire clause is omitted in) *.

⁶⁷ The text of) * is lacking ou moixeuseij ou kleyeij, which is probably a leap due to the parablepsis –eij ou. In the Markan parallel, 10:19, the text of) * (and *f*¹) reads an omission of mh moixeushj, which could also have been due to a leap (from –eushj mh to –eushj mh).

There are omissions of adjuncts with parablepsis of one letter (13:44;⁷² 14:23),⁷³ and omissions of adjuncts with parablepsis of three letters (19:26).⁷⁴

Some are omissions of a single letter, occurring when the same letters are found back-to-back (6:14)⁷⁵ or a similar phenomenon (18:20;⁷⁶ 20:14a).⁷⁷

There is one omission of the preposition *en* (22:1),⁷⁸ omissions of conjunctions (19:10;⁷⁹ 20:19),⁸⁰ and two omissions of a verb/participle (22:15;⁸¹ 27:33).⁸²

Of these leaps, two involve parablepsis of *en* (21:19; 22:1) and two involve the parablepsis of *on* (22:15; 27:33).

Two pronoun omissions have one letter of parablepsis as well as preceding text that may have somehow aided in their omission (9:30;⁸³ 20:7).⁸⁴

⁶⁸ The predicator *euren* is omitted, probably by homoeoteleuton due to the parablepsis of *-en* in three consecutive words (*ouden euren en*).

⁶⁹ The text of Sinaiticus is lacking *eishlqon*. The omission could result from a leap from *eis* to *eij* (or *eis* to *eis* as it would look in majuscule script), and would be an instance of homoeoarchton. The preposition *eij* begins a new line of text.

⁷⁰ In 8:3, homoeoarchton may be found (due to parablepsis of initial epsilons), which omits the adjunct *euqewj*. After the initial epsilon of *ekaqarisqh*, the word continues onto the next line.

⁷¹ The combination *kai elqon* “can be, in Semitic idiom, the protasis of a conditional sentence: ‘and if he come and find it, etc.,’ the apodosis being introduced by *to/te* (v. 45).” McNeile, *Matthew*, 183. In)*, the verb *elqon* is omitted, perhaps by homoeoarchton in)*, and creates a difficult reading.

⁷² In 13:44, the adjunct *en tw agrw* is omitted in)*, perhaps by parablepsis of a single letter, omega, prompting homoeoteleuton.

⁷³ In 14:23, the adjunct *apolusaj touj oxlouj* is lacking, which may be because of the parablepsis of a single letter, alpha in *apolusaj* and *anebh*, prompting homoeoarchton.

⁷⁴ In 19:26, the text of)* is lacking the adjunct, *para anqrwpoij*. Perhaps the parablepsis of *-oij* (also found in *autoij*) caused homoeoteleuton. The adjunct is added in the margin with the noun written as a *nomen sacrum*, *a8n8o8i8s8*. Parablepsis is found either with the abbreviation or written in full as *anqrwpois*.

⁷⁵ The previous word, *paraptwmata*, ends with an alpha, which may account for the omission of the alpha in *autwn*.

⁷⁶ The conjunction is omitted before the numeric abbreviation for three, *g8*. Perhaps the proximity of the similarly formed letters *hg8*, as would be written in the codex, caused a sort of parablepsis; thus the single word, *h*, could have been leaped over due to oversight.

⁷⁷ The text of)* reads a dative relative pronoun (*w*) instead of a dative article (*tw*). Merely omitting the tau, leaving the omega, creates the relative pronoun—perhaps it was an oversight as *toutw* contains parablepsis with the article *tw*.

⁷⁸ The text of)* does not read the preposition *en*, perhaps due to parablepsis of the previous word, *eipen*.

⁷⁹ The scribe of)* could have leaped from iota to iota, thus omitting *ei*.

⁸⁰ The omission of *kai* may be due to homoeoteleuton (parablepsis with the preceding *-ai*). It is the seventh and final occurrence *kai* in the sentence (20:18-19).

⁸¹ The omission of *elabon*, perhaps by homoeoteleuton, is part of a phrase meaning *take counsel* (cf. 28:12 below). The omission of the verb creates nonsense in context.

⁸² In 27:33, the attributive participle, *legomenon*, may have been omitted due to the parablepsis of the *-on* endings with *topon* preceding it. The reading of)* is still grammatically construed, but it is a difficult reading.

2.3.4.3. Dittography

There are several instances of dittography (9), which comprise 5.52% of the singular readings. In one instance (7:26),⁸⁵ the scribe repeats at least one word if not two. In another instance, the scribe repeats two words (19:1).⁸⁶ There are instances where one letter in one word is repeated where the word is split between lines (1:18;⁸⁷ 8:26),⁸⁸ and where two letters are repeated when the word is split between lines (13:28).⁸⁹ There are instances where the final word of one line is repeated as the first word of the following line (11:19;⁹⁰ 21:43).⁹¹ There is one instance where a letter below where the scribe was copying was reproduced above it (24:24).⁹² One dittograph is a word substitution for a previous word (24:22b).⁹³

2.3.5. TRANSPOSITIONS

⁸³ The omission of the pronoun in) * could be an oversight, due to the parablepsis of nu endings with the previous word (anewxqhsan). A similar phrase, ofqalmwn autwn, occurs prior in 9:29, and could have aided in the omission of the pronoun in v.30, if autwn was fresh in the scribe's mind.

⁸⁴ The pronoun hma \bar{j} is omitted, perhaps by homoeoteleuton (final sigmas of oudeij and hma \bar{j}). The verb, emisqwsato, now does not have a direct object, unlike prior in 20:1: misqwsasqai ergataj.

⁸⁵ The text of) * repeats either kai paj or just paj. Where a second kai would be located, the text of) * is unreadable. This is probably an instance of dittography.

⁸⁶ The scribe produces an obvious dittograph of kai hlqen.

⁸⁷ The word mnhssteuqishj in) * ends one line with mnhs and begins the next line with steuqishj.

⁸⁸ The word here begins qal on one line and continues lassh on the following line. This is probably not an intentional spelling with a double lambda, but dittography caused by the separation of the word onto two lines.

⁸⁹ The scribe repeats the final syllable of auta, writing the additional ta on a new line.

⁹⁰ Scribe A transcribed two consecutive kais, the first ends a line and the second begins a line.

⁹¹ In) *, the letters kar occur at the bottom of a column, and karpouj begins the following column. The scribe began the new column by copying the word afresh.

⁹² The text of) * reads an iota before yeudoxristoi. Almost directly below in the MS, the iota of kai is found, which is followed by yeudoprofhtai. The aberrant iota before yeudoxristoi may be accounted for considering (1) the parablepsis of yeudoxristoi and yeudoprofhtai, and that (2) the location of the words are almost directly on top of each other in the MS:

garyeudoxristoi
kaiyeudoprofhtai

Perhaps the words were arranged similarly in the exemplar so that the scribe created a dittograph of a letter below where he was copying.

⁹³ Instead of kolobwqhsontai, the text of) * reads ekolobwqhsan. The substitution could be influenced from the same word earlier in the verse, which are both followed by ai hmerai ekeinai. In addition, ekolobwqhsan and the word it replaces are similar in spelling, which could have aided in the change kolobwqhsontai > ekolobwqhsan. The substitution is, however, nonsense in context.

2.3.5.1. Overview of Transpositions

Colwell states that “another clue to the nature of a scribe’s work can be obtained from a study of his transpositions. Since word order in Greek is very free, it may be assumed that most changes in word order are due to scribe error.”⁹⁴ On the contrary, Read-Heimerdinger states that the rearrangement of word order, or transposition, by a scribe is “likely to be more conscious and deliberate.”⁹⁵ She states, “Some languages have a word order which is said to be ‘fixed’, in other words which is determined by grammatical or syntactical rules which are very rarely altered (e.g. English).”⁹⁶ The study here attempts to find patterns of a scribe’s transpositions in the singular readings in order to help understand his work.⁹⁷ In B. Aland’s analysis of singular readings in P⁴⁵, she states, “In order to recognize the nature of the copyist’s work it is especially helpful to consider his frequent transpositions and omissions. I take my examples from the singular readings, thus demonstrating as clearly as possible the particular nature of our copyist’s scribal habits.”⁹⁸

Caragounis states that non-Greek grammarians are usually “influenced by the spirit of their own language” when trying to “fix the word-order of the Greek sentence”⁹⁹ (although Silva charges Caragounis for the same).¹⁰⁰ In order to satisfy a less subjective approach, lest English grammar guide the study of word order here, clauses have been broken down into grammatical units. Throughout the study, four terms are normally employed to discuss the various syntactical units that comprise a clause: subject (“a word group or the word groups of which something is predicated”), predicator (“all verbal forms”), complement (“a word group or the

⁹⁴ Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 116. Porter states that word order in Greek is generally free but not to be overestimated. He states that if the Greek article is used, it “must precede its substantive, regardless of how many intervening elements may occur, much as the same as in English.” Porter, “Word Order and Clause Structure in New Testament Greek,” 177. Read-Heimerdinger notes other such examples of “aspects determined by grammatical or syntactical considerations,” which are “the position of *de* or the relative pronoun.” Heimerdinger, “Word Order in Koine Greek”, 140.

⁹⁵ Heimerdinger, “Word Order in Koine Greek,” 144.

⁹⁶ Heimerdinger, “Word Order in Koine Greek”, 139-140.

⁹⁷ Of the two approaches to word order studies, this project will proceed with a grammatical and syntactical approach, as opposed to a functional and pragmatic approach. See Kwong, *The Word Order of the Gospel of Luke*, 2.

⁹⁸ Aland, “The Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri,” 111.

⁹⁹ Caragounis, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament*, 405. He then lists several authors differing opinions on the word order of Greek: Kühner, Keickers, Howard, Blaß-Debrunner-Rehkopf, Turner, Robertson, and Dionysios.

¹⁰⁰ Moisés Silva, “Biblical Greek and Modern Greek: A Review Article,” *WTJ* 67 no. 2 (Fall 2005): 391-404.

word groups that ‘complete’ its predicator. Common complements are direct and indirect objects’), and adjunct (“a word group or the word groups that modify the predicator, providing an indication of the circumstances associated with the process. Common adjuncts are prepositional and adverbial phrases”).¹⁰¹ At OpenText.org, each verse of Matthew has been diagrammed and each grammatical unit is marked as subject, predicator, complement, or adjunct.¹⁰²

Some word transpositions occur because of parablepsis. These are instances where the scribe leaped from the same letters to the same letters, but having noticed the mistake, returned to copy the skipped words out of place. A “corrected leap”, as it is called, would have been an omission due to parablepsis if the scribe did not catch his mistake and correct it before erasure or other means of correction were necessary to fit in the missing words. Though transpositions may be considered primarily a result of error (so Colwell), they may only *seem* errorless, however, if word order in Greek is considered so unfettered that virtually any transposition may be (coincidentally) grammatically construed.

2.3.5.2. Corrected Leaps

There are instances where it seems that the scribe leaped over text due to parablepsis, then returned to the omitted text and copied it, thus not *omitting* text, but copying it *out of order*. Several transpositions could have stemmed from correcting a leap (4:24b;¹⁰³ 14:17;¹⁰⁴ 18:19;¹⁰⁵ 21:34-35;¹⁰⁶ 27:56a and 56b).¹⁰⁷

¹⁰¹ <http://opentext.org/model/introduction.html>

¹⁰² The primary partners of OpenText.org are Matthew Brook O'Donnell, Stanley E. Porter, and Jeffery T. Reed. <http://opentext.org/>

¹⁰³ The reading is difficult to see in Sinaiticus here, but if it is as the British Library posits, *de?moniazomenouj (demoniacs) > s?el?h?niazomenouj (lunatics)*, then the scribe probably leaped from *sunexomenouj kai* to *demoniazomenouj kai* (thus omitting *demoniazomenouj kai*) and copied the following *kai selhniazomenouj*. The singular reading occurs in a location where several words have similar endings and/or beginnings that provide several occurrences of parablepsis; and thus several MSS contain omissions here (as easily seen in Swanson, e.g. M D 1346 1424. Swanson, *Matthew*, 31).

¹⁰⁴ There is a transposition in 14:17 between two clauses: *ouk exomen wde* and *ei mh pente artouj kai duo ixquaj*. In the second clause, one word (*artouj*) from the complement (*pente artouj kai duo ixquaj*) has been placed in the first clause. The *wde* ends a line of text and *artouj* begins the next line.

¹⁰⁵ The complement (*genhsetai*) has been placed prior to the predicator (*aihthswntai*). It is possible that the parablepsis (*tai* endings) could have initiated the transposition.

¹⁰⁶ Due to erasure, the writing of the *prima manu* is difficult to read in). Tischendorf, Legg, and the NA²⁷ cite no variants for) here. Swanson, *Matthew*, 21:34, reads *ina labon*. The

2.3.5.3. Transpositions

Other transpositions have no evidence of parablepsis. With one possible exception of an improvement (28:13),¹⁰⁸ these readings could be considered difficult or nonsense readings (4:12;¹⁰⁹ 7:28;¹¹⁰ 14:1;¹¹¹ 23:34;¹¹² 26:44).¹¹³

2.3.6. INFLUENCE FROM CONTEXT

Many singular readings have similar or verbatim text nearby that could have influenced a change, producing assimilation. These readings (25) account for 15.33% of the singular readings. Most of these readings seem to be influenced from the preceding text (4:23b;¹¹⁴ 5:39;¹¹⁵ 6:16b;¹¹⁶ 9:12;¹¹⁷ 10:21;¹¹⁸ 11:23;¹¹⁹ 12:22;¹²⁰

codexsinaiticus.org reads k?a?i? labo?n?. The ina cited by Swanson would indicate a purpose clause in 21:34 here. The online digital images and transcription (codexsinaiticus.org) suggest kai as opposed to ina, which would be more grammatically congruent with the indicative labon rather than the infinitive labein in *rell*. If the text of) * did in fact read as the British Library tentatively states, then the alteration from kai labon to labein may result from a leap to kai labontej in v. 35, which was then corrected before the scribe completed labontej. In addition, there are several instances of parablepsis, ou, could have provided more opportunities to leap from the same to the same.

¹⁰⁷ To create the singular reading in) * in 27:56ab, the scribe could have leaped from the first Maria to the second Maria (v.56a), and supplied Maria out of place twice (v.56b). Legg states the omission in) * is “*per homoeotel[euton]*.” Legg, *Matthaeum*, 27:56. The verse in full for) * is, en aij hn Maria h tou Iakwbou kai h Maria h Iwshf kai h Maria h tw n uiwn Zebedeou. The verse in full in most MSS is, en aij hn Maria h Magdalahnh kai Maria h tou Iakwbou kai (h)^{ca} Iwshf mhthr kai h mhthr tw n uiwn Zebadaiou. In comparison to *rell*, then, the reading of) * (1) has not specified that the first Maria was *Mary Magdalene*, (2) contains another possible Mary, who is *the mother of Joseph* and may not be the same Mary, *mother of James*, since the name is mentioned twice, and (3) has specifically stated that the mother of Zebedee’s sons is named Mary (which is contrary to Mark’s third woman, Salome, in Mk 15:40).

¹⁰⁸ The reading of Sinaiticus here contains an occurrence of two consecutive verbs of speech. (In the NT, two consecutive forms of legw are found in Mt 22:4; 24:3; 28:13; Lk 7:9; 13:27; 19:40; 20:2; 22:34; Jn 21:19.) The scribe transposed oti to what is a more common location in such a grammatical construction.

¹⁰⁹ The singular transposition in) * creates a difficult reading because oti follows Iwannhj. As a result of the word placement, there could be potential confusion of the verbal (akousaj) subject as *John* rather than the intended *Jesus*.

¹¹⁰ The subject has been moved away from the verb in) *.

¹¹¹ The result of the transposition in 14:1 separates Herod’s title, o tetraarxhj, from his name.

¹¹² With the kai transposed in) *, the reading is nonsense.

¹¹³ The transposition in) * here places the adjunct (ek tritou) in the complement (ton auton logon).

¹¹⁴ The addition of autouj in) * is found in the context of Jesus teaching in Galilee, and produces the translation, *teaching them*. Luz states that the following phrase in 4:23, *in their synagogues* (en taij sunagwgaij autwn), “makes clear that the evangelist and his community have their own place outside these synagogues.”¹¹⁴ If the use of the pronoun after *synagogues* “reflects a feeling against the Jews as a hostile body” (Cf. 7:29; 9:35; 10:17; 11:1; 13:54;

12:34;¹²¹ 19:21;¹²² 20:18b;¹²³ 21:7b;¹²⁴ 24:10).¹²⁵ Some readings are influenced from proceeding text (7:22;¹²⁶ 7:25;¹²⁷ 8:7;¹²⁸ 15:11a;¹²⁹ 21:39;¹³⁰ 23:4a;¹³¹ 23:37;¹³²

McNeile, *Mathew*, 99), then the additional pronoun after *teaching* in) * could reiterate such division. If, as Foster states, that “the references [in Matthew] either to ‘their’ of ‘your synagogues’ (Matt 4:23; 9:35; 10:17; 12:9; 13:54; 23:34) should not be underestimated as showing the boundary division between one community as opposed to the more dominant emergent Judaism” (Foster, *Community, Law and Mission in Matthew’s Gospel*, 5), then the additional pronoun in) * in 4:23b could stress the point more than without it.

The singular reading, however, is not necessarily Anti-Judaic because “preaching” and “teaching” are not entirely different (Luz, *Matthew*, 1:205; Nolland, *Matthew*, 182); therefore, the addition in) * could be purely for grammatical repetition. The singular reading could have been unintentionally influenced by the previous pronouns in vv. 21 (autou, autwn, autouj) and 22 (autwn, autw); thus autouj in v. 23 was a natural grammatical fit because the participle didaskwn can take a direct object.

¹¹⁵ The verb in) here is aorist passive infinitive (as opposed to active in *rell*). In this context in the gospel, Matthew sets up the thesis-antithesis structure with anti in v. 38 and antisthnai in v. 39. Luz, *Matthew*, 1:324. (Also in the context, Matthew may be quoting from LXX Isa 50:8 [Gundry, *Matthew*, 94. France states that similar language is found in Lev 19:18; Deut 32:35; Prov 20:22; 24:29; 25:21-22; Sir 28:1-7. France, *Matthew*, 219], however, the infinitive verb in) and *rell* do not exactly mirror the aorist active imperative verb [antisthtw] in Isa.) Because of the connection between the two verses, the scribe could have recalled the passive of erregh (v. 38) and changed anqisthmi in the following verse to passive. Nevertheless, the passive in v. 39 fits well in context.

¹¹⁶ Connected with amhn, the addition of gar in) * fits well in context (cf. BDF §452.3.). The conjunction gar is used earlier in the same verse, which may have influenced a repetition later in the verse.

¹¹⁷ The plural word in) here, rather than singular in *rell*, matches the number of oi isxuontej immediately before.

¹¹⁸ The scribe may have been influenced by the preceding nominative, thus changing adelfon to nominative, but it should be accusative to be grammatically construed.

¹¹⁹ The text of) * reads a plural pronoun instead of a singular. The pronoun does not match su, used earlier, but could perhaps refer to the inhabitants of Capernaum. There are several plural words preceding (ai dunameij ai ghenomenai), which could have influenced the scribe to write a plural pronoun.

¹²⁰ The scribe may have interpreted the preceding daimonizomenoj tufloj kai kwfoj as more than one person rather than two characteristics of the same person, hence the change from a singular to plural pronoun.

¹²¹ The phrase gennhmata exidnwn appears in three instances in Matthew (3:7; 12:34; 23:33), none of which are changed from plural to singular except here in) *. The preceding words, which are singular, tou karpou to dendron ginwsketai (v. 33), could have influenced the scribe to continue with the singular.

¹²² The scribe of) * transcribes a 2p verb rather than 2s as in *rell*. The 2p is incongruent in context. The previous noun is plural (ptwxoij), which could have influenced a change in the verb.

¹²³ Instead of the instrumental dative in *rell*, qanatw, the classical use of the accusative is found in) 700, qanaton. BDF §195.2. The singular reading in Sinaiticus here is the addition of the preposition eij. The prepositional phrase earlier in the sentence, eij Ierosoluma, may have influenced the addition of eij before qanaton later in the sentence in). The result is a doublet: it highlights the connection between Jerusalem and death, which emphasizes Jesus’ prediction of his death in Jerusalem and puts the spotlight on him even more (as opposed to Jesus *and the disciples*, cf. Mk 10:32-34. Luz, *Matthew*, 2:539).

¹²⁴ The scribe adds the preposition epi, which may have been influenced by the epi after epeqhkan earlier in the verse, or perhaps influenced from the previous word, epanw, which is a synonym. (After epeqhkan in v.7, ep is read by) B D L Z Q F 69 174 788 892* 983 1295 1606 1689 NA²⁷; epeqhkan epanw is read by *rell*.) Reading epi after epanw is not construed in context because of its redundancy following the synonymic preposition. Never in the NT does a

24:17;¹³³ 26:21).¹³⁴ Some readings could be influenced from surrounding text, i.e. both preceding and proceeding text (2:9;¹³⁵ 4:24a;¹³⁶ 6:28;¹³⁷ 27:16).¹³⁸ Some of these readings produce nonsense in context (7:25; 10:21; 12:22; 19:21; 21:7b).

preposition occur with epanw (Mt 2:9; 5:14; 21:7; 23:18, 20, 22; 27:37; 28:2; Mk 14:5; Lk 4:39; 10:19; 11:44; 19:17, 19; Jn 3:31; 1 Cor 15:6; Rev 6:8; 20:3).

¹²⁵ The substitution in) here was probably influenced by (or perhaps was a leap back to) paradwsousin umaj eij qliy in v. 9 (so Nolland, *Matthew*, 964; Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:693 n. b). Gundry states that, “as a whole, v. 10 says that persecution will influence many church members to betray one another. Mutual hatred will result.” Gundry, *Matthew*, 479. The reading of v.10 emphasizes the *persecution* element with the addition of eij qliy in, but the omission of kai mishsousin allhlouj overlooks the result of the very persecution that is emphasized, and thus the doublet of vv. 10-11, where each verse contains a cause and a result, is deemphasized.

¹²⁶ Most MSS read onomati daimonia ecebalomen kai tw sw onomati dunameij pollaj in 7:22. The text of) * includes polla following daimonia and includes pollaj following dunameij: no other MS reads polla(j) twice here as Sinaiticus does. The addition could be due to a similar, but not exact, parablepsis of daimonia and dunameij. Though the repetition is also not exact (polla and pollaj), the scribe could have nevertheless been influenced from the proceeding text of dunameij pollaj.

¹²⁷ The verb must be plural to be construed with the subject, oi anemoi, not singular as it is in) *. In context, there are singular nouns following the verb (th oikia ekein), which may have contributed a to a nonsensical verbal number change.

¹²⁸ The addition of akolouqi moi in) * anticipates toij akolouqousin in 8:10. Nolland states that the addition of akolouqi moi in) * “forces the following clause [egw elqwn qerapeusw auton] to be construed as an indication of Jesus’ intention.” *Matthew*, 352 n. d.

¹²⁹ The phrase tou stomatoj touto (15:11b) occurs later in the verse; therefore the addition of touto after to stoma in 15:11a could be the result of assimilation. The addition could modify stoma (*this* mouth) or it could act as touto does in 15:11b (*this* defiles man). The result of the addition in v.11a is a doublet with v.11b.

¹³⁰ The verb change from compound to simple avoids repetition of the following ecw.

¹³¹ The singular reading in) in 23:4a, adding megala between fortia and barea, “enhance[s] the solemnity of Jesus’ words” (Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 49) by exaggerating the opponents’ burden, which is in contrast to Jesus’ light burden (to fortion mou elafiron estin, Mt 11:30). The complement in 23:4b, *and hard to carry* (kai dusbastakta), is omitted in in) Lf¹ et al. According to the UBS committee, kai dusbastakta in v.4b was omitted “due to stylistic refinement or accidental oversight [i.e. parablepsis]” (Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 49). The addition of megala in v.4a, then, compensates for the absence of part of the complement in v.4b (though the complement may not have been known by the scribe, i.e. was not in his exemplar). On the other hand, the scribe could have anticipated the adjective barea, and simply added a synonymic adjective, megala. In addition, the word megalunousi, following in v.5 (10 lines later in)), could have somehow caught the attention of the scribe, influencing him to write megala in the previous verse (4a).

¹³² The *prima manu* of Sinaiticus could have committed haplography in the middle of a word: instead of agag, the scribe wrote ag. There are, however, no other instances where the scribe truncates a word due to parablepsis (except the misspelling in 6:14, but the parablepsis is composed in two words, not within one word). Perhaps, then, the subsequent present tense episunagei influenced a preemptive change in the aorist episunagagein to the present tense episunagein here in) *.

¹³³ In the *Sitz im Buch*, vv.17-18, there are two “images of desperate urgency.” Nolland, *Matthew*, 972-973. The first image is the man on the roof: “to leave as quickly as possible would involve leaving everything in the house behind.” Ibid. The second image is a man working in the field, who has no time to retrieve his garment. The latter of the two images is grammatically singular, arai to imation autou, and may have caused a preemptive alteration in) * in v. 17, from a plural article, ta, to a singular article, to.

2.3.7. GOSPEL HARMONIZATIONS

2.3.7.1. Harmonization Overview

A harmonization occurs when “discordant parallels” are brought into verbal agreement.¹³⁹ Elliott states that in general, “Much deliberate alteration took place [on the part of scribes] in effect to assimilate parallel texts, the commonly recognized harmonizing of Gospel parallels especially to conform Mark and Luke to the wording of Matthew being the most frequent.”¹⁴⁰ Included here are variants that have a parallel in the synoptics that may have influenced harmonizations.

¹³⁴ The scribe could have been influenced by the following legw to substitute eipen with legi. Hernández notes that in Revelation, scribe A replaces one verb for another in one instance, but the verb which influenced the change is located several sentences earlier: the replacement of eidon with edoqh in Rev 16:31a, and the earlier occurrence of edoqh is in 16:8. Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 79; 79 n. 200; 206.

¹³⁵ The following word autouj and/or the previous 3p verbs may have caused the scribe change the verb in 2:9 prohen > prohgon. An orthographic exchange from e > o is not typically found in Sinaiticus in Matthew; therefore, the verb takes touj magouj (v.7) as its subject, as opposed to o asthr in *rell*, which creates a difficult reading.

¹³⁶ Instead of the dative form of basanoj (so *rell*), the text of) * reads the accusative form. The change to accusative could have been influenced from the following accusatives, sunexomenouj, daimonizomenouj, selhniazomenouj, paralutikouj. The words basanoij and sunexomenouj stand almost directly on top of each other in the codex, especially the endings.

¹³⁷ The translation of) * for the latter part of Mt 6:28 is, *Consider the lilies of the field, how they do not comb, nor spin, nor labor*. The singular portion of the reading in) * is a verb substitution (aucanousin > zainousin) and the addition of a negative particle ou. There are now three negatives in Sinaiticus: “...neither this, nor this, nor this...” The change in) * from aucanousin (*they grow*) to ou cainousin (*they do not comb*) fits well in context, which is about clothing (eudumatoj) and lilies (krina). The verb in) *, zainw, means to comb or clean (of wool), which corresponds well with nhqw in the same verse. There are several factors that could have prompted the change in) * here: (1) the spelling of aucanousin is similar to a word that fits well in context, though not a synonym, cainousin; (2) the addition of ou before cainousin is similar in spelling to the first two letters of aucanousin and (3) ou could have been an assimilation of the following ou . . . oude construction.

¹³⁸ The text of) * reads an accusative article (ton) and conjunction (te) before desmion (in place of tote). The alteration in) * is simply the addition of a nu in the middle of tote (ton te). The reading is grammatically construed, but in context is a difficult reading because the de combined with te produces the translation, *in addition*, or *also*, to which there is no addition. If this were an unintentional alteration, perhaps the accusative case of desmion prompted an unintentional (and preemptive) inclusion of an accusative definite article, ton, and/or maybe the ending of eixon influenced a nu to follow the omicron in tote—thus the result was ton te.

¹³⁹ Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 263.

¹⁴⁰ Elliott, “Singular Readings in the Gospel Text of P⁴⁵,” 123. Wright states, “The principle of conformity and agreement, so far as scribes, editors, and revisers were concerned, was of the essence of dogma in the matter of scriptural relationships.” Wright, *Alterations of the Words of Jesus*, 24.

Harmonizations may have been from “memory and the concomitant process of association of ideas” if not from another physical text.¹⁴¹ Harmonization implies that the scribe was familiar, or at least knew of, parallel texts. If a scribe alters the text to another gospel, that means the scribe either had a copy of that gospel out and was referring to it, or, the scribe had that portion memorized and could recite it and fit it appropriately into the text before him. Frequent harmonizations could possibly indicate that the scribe had copied the text enough that it became well known through repetition, or that he was concerned with incongruent parallels.

Holmes suggests three criteria that can potentially help identify a harmonization as intentional or unintentional: (1) harmonization of a long text shows more intentionality than a short text; (2) texts that are similar to begin with are easier to unintentionally harmonize than those texts which are more disparate; and (3) texts that have only a few commonalities are less likely to be intentionally harmonized.¹⁴² These criteria shall be useful to follow in order to, as Holmes sates, “contribute at least a degree of objectivity to an inevitably subjective investigation.”¹⁴³

2.3.7.2. *Gospel Parallels*

Few readings resemble synoptic parallels verbatim, none of which seem to be intentional harmonizations (20:31a;¹⁴⁴ 27:15).¹⁴⁵

¹⁴¹ Wright, *Alterations of the Words of Jesus*, 25.

¹⁴² Holmes, “Early Editorial Activity,” 138.

¹⁴³ Holmes, “Early Editorial Activity,” 138-139.

¹⁴⁴ According to Nolland, Matthew’s *meizon* is a simplification of Mark’s *pollw mallon*. Nolland, *Matthew*, 828. In Mt 20:31a, scribe A replaces *meizon* with the “fairly rare” *pollw mallon* (Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 166), which aligns it with the Markan and Lukan parallels (Mk 10:48; Lk 18:39). The scribe does not alter the word *meizon* in similar occurrences in Matthew: 12:6; 18:4; 23:11, 17 (23:19 is omitted in). Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:108. When applying Holmes’ harmonization criteria (Holmes, “Early Editorial Activity,” 138), it seems that the variant in Sinaiticus may not be an *intentional* harmonization because the parallel texts are already very similar and the portion of text that is harmonized in Sinaiticus in Matthew is very small and does not elicit much difference in meaning. Though the dative substantive + comparative adjective/adverb construction is rare, the scribe of Sinaiticus here provides a grammatically construed, alteration.

¹⁴⁵ The word recorded by the *prima manu* of) in Matthew here, *parhtounto*, is the same in the Markan parallel (15:6) in) * A B* D (also NA²⁷) (most other MSS in Mark read *htounto*). In) * in Matthew, then, the crowd *asked* for Barabbas to be released rather than *wished* him to be released; but in v.17 and v.21 (as well as the gospel parallels: Mt 27:17 || Mk 15:9; Jn 18:39 [Mt 27:21 has no direct gospel parallel]), Sinaiticus reads *wish* as do most other MSS, and not *ask* as in Mt 27:15. The notions of *asking* or *wishing* could be synonyms in context. Both verbs can emphasize “the coming free choice of Barabbas” (Gundry, *Matthew*, 560), but perhaps *ask* involves more initiation—to *ask* for Barabbas means speaking up—rather than merely *wishing* for him. The variant in) * here resembles the Markan parallel, but if Holmes’ criteria are applied, it may not necessarily be an intentional harmonization because the text that is harmonized is small, just one word, and the texts

2.3.8. THE USE OF CONJUNCTIONS

Twice, a repetitious *kai* is omitted (8:15b;¹⁴⁶ 9:35a),¹⁴⁷ and sometimes it is omitted even when it is not repetitious (9:9;¹⁴⁸ 12:11c;¹⁴⁹ 26:33;¹⁵⁰ 27:53b).¹⁵¹ Synonymic conjunctions are exchanged (10:40;¹⁵² 18:30a;¹⁵³ 18:31).¹⁵⁴ There is an instance where the addition of a conjunction eliminates asyndeton between sentences (27:24)¹⁵⁵ or eliminates conjunctive participle asyndeton (27:3).¹⁵⁶ A conjunction is added in another instance, perhaps unintentionally (6:16a).¹⁵⁷

2.3.9. DEFINITE ARTICLES

Read-Heimerdinger states that in general in NT Greek, “The use of the article in Greek is not a straightforward matter as can be seen from the discussions on the

are already similar to begin with. Harmonizations seem to be rare or even nonexistent in the singulars in Sinaiticus, but synonymic substitutions are more common which may be the case here (cf. 9:6, 27; 21:7a; 22:9; 24:28; 28:5b, 12).

¹⁴⁶ The omitted *kai* in) * is the second of two occurrences in the short sentence (it is the last of four occurrences of *kai* in the whole of v. 15). The sentence is still grammatically construed with its omission, but the progression of narrative is hindered because the *kai* began a new clause.

¹⁴⁷ The scribe eliminates the third occurrence of *kai* in a sentence where *kai* is otherwise read in five instances.

¹⁴⁸ The second of three occurrences of *kai* in the sentence is omitted in) *, but the narrative still progresses smoothly.

¹⁴⁹ The singular portion of the variant in) here is the omission of *kai*, which still produced a grammatical construed sentence. (The transposition in), similar in *c ff*^{1.2} *h vg*^{pler} *sy*^{c.s.p} *sah bo*, may emphasize [illegal] action [*egerei*] on the Sabbath.)

¹⁵⁰ The conjunction *ei* introduces a real condition here in 26:33. Zerwick, *Grammatical Analysis*, 87; Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, § 306. The omission of *ei* in) * creates an unnecessarily difficult reading.

¹⁵¹ The sentence is wanting in narrative progression without the conjunction in 27:53b. The omission unnecessarily complicates sentence structure.

¹⁵² The use of *de* here results in “additive relation” between the two clauses (BDAG s.v. *de*), which are translated, *The one who receives you receives me and (de) the one who receives me receives the one who sent me*.

¹⁵³ The *alla* refers to the *de* at the beginning of the verse, see BDF § 447(1), but the substitution with *kai* in) * is also grammatically construed.

¹⁵⁴ The text of Sinaiticus reads *de* instead of *kai* here and adds an article for *elqontej*. The use of the nominative article with *de* could mark “the continuation of a narrative,” and is “common in all the historical books.” BDF §251.

¹⁵⁵ BDF § 462(1).

¹⁵⁶ Scribe A wrote an indicative verb with a conjunction, *metamelhgh kai*, in place of *metamelhqeij*. The singular reading of) * may have been intended to eliminate the repetitive, and perhaps awkward, asyndetic participles in the context. BDF §421 (the participles in Mt 27:3 have an unequal value: *idwn, o paradouj, metamelhqeij*).

¹⁵⁷ The addition of *kai* in) * is grammatically unnecessary because of the *de* that follows. Perhaps the addition of *kai* fit naturally in its place if the scribe did not anticipate *de*.

subject in the New Testament Greek grammar books.”¹⁵⁸ In Sinaiticus, definite articles are omitted, some substantival (6:9;¹⁵⁹ 27:11)¹⁶⁰ or in front of names (9:28a;¹⁶¹ 22:32b;¹⁶² 22:32c;¹⁶³ 22:42).¹⁶⁴ One article is added, creating an articular proper name (10:4).¹⁶⁵ Another is added, perhaps, due to influence of the context (23:16).¹⁶⁶

2.3.10. OTHER SUBSTITUTIONS

Some word substitutions work well in context (9:6;¹⁶⁷ 22:9;¹⁶⁸ 28:5b;¹⁶⁹ 28:12).¹⁷⁰

Some are similarly spelled to the words they replace (9:27;¹⁷¹ 21:7a;¹⁷² 24:28).¹⁷³

¹⁵⁸ Read-Heimerdinger, *The Bezan Text of Acts*, 116.

¹⁵⁹ The substantival article is omitted from a prepositional phrase in) *.

¹⁶⁰ The article is omitted by the *prima manu* from a substantival participle.

¹⁶¹ The article has been omitted in) * here before the name *Jesus* (i8s8, as it is written in the text of Sinaiticus). Perhaps repetition of the final two letters (iota and sigma) of previous word with the contraction i8s8 created confusion: autoi8s8oi8s8.

¹⁶² In 22:32b, the article is omitted before the second occurrence of qeoj in the sentence. See the following note for 22:32c.

¹⁶³ The article is omitted before the third occurrence of qeoj in the sentence (22:32), which is a quote of Ex 3:6. This, along with v.32b and the non-singular reading in v.32d (oo qeoj *rell* |o) D W 28), contain no definite article for qeoj. As it stands, the reading for 22:32 in Sinaiticus only contains the article for the initial qeoj (v.32a). Likewise, only the article for the initial qeoj is found in LXX Ex 3:6, which may be an attempt at continuity in Sinaiticus in Matthew. Unfortunately, the book of Exodus is not extant in Sinaiticus, otherwise, the verse in Matthew could be compared to it to attest its textual harmony (as the scribe may attest in 21:42 with the quote of LXX Ps 117:22).

¹⁶⁴ The scribe creates an anarthrous name, *Dauid*, which resembles the gospel parallels (Mk 12:35; Lk 20:41). This is very unlikely an intentional harmonization, however, due to the insignificance of change—such an alteration probably did not intend to elicit the parallel contexts, which are already very similar.

¹⁶⁵ The additions of articles in) *, o Ioudaj o Iskariwthj, create an articular proper name (only the article before Ioudaj is a singular reading).

¹⁶⁶ The addition of oi before tufloi could be influenced from context as it precedes oi legontej. In addition, the ending of the previous word, odhgoi, could have also influenced an article with the same letters: oi.

¹⁶⁷ The text of) * here reads poreuou instead of upage in *rell*, which are essentially translated the same in context. The imperative verb poreuou is used 16 times in the NT (most often in Luke-Acts) and serves a special purpose in every instance: it is used after Jesus heals someone, forgives sins, or when he gives a parabolic example to follow (Lk 5:24; 7:50; 8:48; 10:37; 17:19; Jn 4:50; [8:11]); it is spoken by God, the resurrected Jesus, the Spirit, and angels (Mt 2:20; Jn 20:17; Act 8:26; 9:15; 10:20; 22:10; 22:21); and is used in pivotal contexts (it is used by Pharisees warning Jesus about Herod’s murderous intentions [Lk 13:31] and is uttered by Felix to send Paul away, from which he never returns [Act 24:25]). Based on these uses, the text of Sinaiticus astutely employs a verb that fits well in the context of performing a miracle (i.e. healing the paralytic, Mt 9:2-8).

¹⁶⁸ The reading in) * is difficult to see, but the British Library suggests udatwn for odwn. In Jesus’ parable about the wedding banquet, in) * the king’s messengers sought people along *the waters*, rather than *the main roads*. The term udwr is generic enough to mean all types of water—in Homer it is rarely used to refer to seawater. Liddell-Scott, s.v. u3dwr.

¹⁶⁹ The verb in) * here is aorist passive as opposed to present middle in other MSS. Concerning the verbal mood, if the ending of fobhghtai is itacistic, e > ai, then the verb is imperative (which would align the mood with *rell*). Such itacistic spellings are, however, rare in the

The substitution of *Antipatris* for *hometown* (13:54) is difficult to explain, which may be a singular reading that is construed in context (so Ropes) or perhaps not (but could reveal provenancial information of the codex, so Harris, Milne, and Skeat).¹⁷⁴

work of scribe A in Matthew: two instances of ending changes, e > ai, are found in the work of scribe A in Matthew (see appendix seventeen). If the ending is not itacistic, which is probably the case here, then the verb is subjunctive.

The particle *mh* with present imperatives forbids the continuation of an act, whereas *mh* with aorist subjunctives forbids a future act “with an absolute prohibition, as distinct from the prohibition ‘in principle’ conveyed by the present.” Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, §246. The verbal emphasis with the *mh* + subjunctive in) * here has compensated for Matthew’s choice of a “weaker *fobeisqe* . . . to Mark’s stronger *ekqambeisqe*.” Nolland, *Matthew*, 1249. Surely, the scribe did not intend to compensate for the evangelist Matthew’s use of Mark—but the alteration does, however, result in a stronger grammatical negation than the present imperative found in *rell* in Matthew.

¹⁷⁰ The singular portion of the reading in) * is the substitution of *labontej* with *epoihsan*. The use of *sumboulion* with *labanein* or *poiein* is a translation of the Latin phrase, *consilium capere*. BDF, §5.3; BDAG, s.v. *sumboulion*. It is used “in the sense ‘counsel’ (rather than ‘council’).” Cranfield, *Mark*, 122. In every instance in the NT where *sumboulion* is used with *labanein* or *poiein* (or *didwmi*), there are variant readings in MSS witnessing one or the other verbs (In Mt 12:14 *epoihsan* replaces *elabon* in L 1184; in Mt 22:15 *epoihsan* replaces *elabon* in 1527; in Mt 27:1 *epoihsan* replaces *elabon* in D Latt Cop; in Mk 3:6 a form of *poiein* replaces *edidoun* in) A C D W M f¹ et al.; and in Mk 15:1 *labontej* replaces *poihsantej* in 113. The only other instance of *sumboulion* in the NT is in Act 25:12 and is not used with one of the aforementioned verbs). The verbs *labanein* and *poiein* (and *didwmi*) seem to be somewhat interchangeable when used in conjunction with *sumboulion*; and therefore, the substitution in 28:12 in) * does not affect the meaning of the text, but is a construed substitution.

¹⁷¹ The text of) reads a form of *kraugazw* instead of *krazw* as *rell*.

¹⁷² The singular reading in) * here is not significantly different than the other variants. It is comprised of a simple verb (also in D K N W Y Q P 700 1241) and is in the 3rd person plural (as in)^{ca} L 4 16 245 291 579 892). The same verb and form (*ekaqisan*) is read in) * in the Markan parallel (Mk 11:7).

¹⁷³ The text of) * reads *opou* > *pou*. The reading can be construed in context because *pou* does not need to be “strictly local”. Liddell-Scott, s.v. *pou=*, A.2; BDF § 103. If the change was unintentional in) *, perhaps the previous genitive words, *tou u8u8 tou a8n8o8u8* (v.27), somehow affected the transcription of *opou* (v.28).

¹⁷⁴ The text of) * reads *antipatrida* instead of *patrida*. The singular reading here has been pivotal for some scholars (e.g. Harris) in identifying a Caesarean provenance for Codex), noting that “as [the scribe] sat writing in the neighboring city of Caesarea,” he unintentionally substituted a generic word (*patrida*) with the familiar proper noun (*antipatrida*). Harris, *Stichometry*, 75. (The Judean city Antipatris was “founded by Herod the Great and named after his father. . . on the road Lydda to Caesarea.” BDAG, s.v. *Antipatrij*.) Milne and Skeat agree, stating that Harris’ argument “appears almost incontrovertible” and that “scribes as careless and ignorant as those of the Sinaiticus might easily have perverted *patrida* into a meaningless jumble, or substituted another word of approximately the same sound, but no one unconnected with Palestine would be likely to have produced *Antipatrida*.” *Scribes and Correctors*, 67-68. It may not be entirely reasonable, however, to base the scribe’s and/or the MS’s provenance solely on the singular variant in 13:54. If there were more evidence of a Caesarean provenance, perhaps this variant would act as supplemental proof, but provenancial evidence may not so confidently and exclusively rest on a solitary variant. Not convinced of the explanation of *Antipatrida*, Ropes conjectures that the scribe “coined a word (or else a very rare one) to mean ‘foster-native-place’.” *The Text of Acts*, xlvii n. 1. Though Ropes intends to make sense of the reading, it could be simply that the reading is itself nonsense in context.

2.3.11. OTHER OMISSIONS

Some omissions may be mere oversights, but are still rendered sensible in context (18:12;¹⁷⁵ 23:11),¹⁷⁶ one of which is probably due, somehow, to the two scribes (A and D) ending and beginning their transcription (24:35).¹⁷⁷

In two instances, the object of an object-complement construction is omitted ([1:21];¹⁷⁸ 1:23).¹⁷⁹ Both of these involve naming Mary's child as Jesus/Emmanuel and witness the omission of the genitive pronoun, but both of these readings are difficult to see in the MS (especially 1:21).

Some omissions are seemingly inexplicable, but the word/phrase that is omitted can be understood or implied in context. Perhaps there is a desire for concise expression or elimination of redundancy in these singular readings (4:23a;¹⁸⁰ 9:35b;¹⁸¹ 12:37;¹⁸² 21:30;¹⁸³ 27:48;¹⁸⁴ 28:10).¹⁸⁵

¹⁷⁵ Five lines after scribe A's transcription resumes following the transcription by scribe D (folio 210), an adjunct is omitted in 18:12 ([probata] *epi ta orh* [kai]). One way to account for the omission in)^* here is by homoeoarchton, which is possible only if the exemplar of Sinaiticus read *probata . . . poreugeij*, as do B Q *et al.* (the letters pi, rho, and omicron could possibly furnish a leap even though they are transposed: *por/pro*, and therefore could be metathesis). Sinaiticus is corrected with the addition *epi ta orh* by)^{S1} , but *porbata* and the following *kai* are not included. Due to the correction not including *probata*, it may be more likely, then, that the exemplar of)^* did not contain *porbata*, and thus the omission of *epi ta orh* is not due to parablepsis, but rather is a scribal oversight.

¹⁷⁶ The pronoun *umwn* is not read in Sinaiticus here. In the longer form of the saying found earlier in Matthew, 20:26, the pronoun is read in Sinaiticus, *este umwn diakonoj*; also, the genitive is found in Sinaiticus in the "similar saying" in Mk 9:35, *kai pantwn diakonoj* (McNeile, *Matthew*, 332). The omission in 23:11 does not seem to have significant theological implications, but renders the translation, *The greatest among you will be a servant*, rather than *will be your servant*.

¹⁷⁷ The omission in)^* "is presumably a scribal oversight" (Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:368 n. 281). Usually, large omissions in the singular readings of Sinaiticus have evidence of parablepsis, but that is not evident here. The omission occurs at the end of the last column of a page of codex)^* (folio 213b). The omission is probably due to the changing of scribes in the MS because the work of scribe A ends here (and begins again with Mt 26:7) and scribe D picks up with v. 36.

¹⁷⁸ The original hand is difficult to see here. The *prima manu* may have written *Ihsoun* in full and omitted the pronoun *autou*.

¹⁷⁹ As in 1:21, the scribe in 1:23 omits the genitive pronoun after *to onoma*. If)^* reads as the British Library tentatively suggests (with the omission of *autou* in 1:21, 23), then the combination of *kalew + onoma + genitive pronoun + proper noun* may have posed a problem for the scribe in these two instances. The genitive pronoun in the proximate *ekalesen to onoma autou Ihsoun* in 1:25, however, remains there. Perhaps the "known quantity" of *onoma*, i.e. that a person has a name (Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 43 n. 21), renders the possessive pronoun obsolete for the scribe. One difference between the two alterations (vv. 21, 23) and the phrase in v. 25 is that the future form of *kalew* is found in vv. 21, 23 and the aorist is found in v. 25.

¹⁸⁰ The singular reading in)^* here is the omission of *olh* (in the Markan parallel, Mk 1:39, the reading in)^* contains *olhn*). Specifically concerning the word *olh* (*all*), Davies and Allison ask, "Is the universalism of the gospel (26:13; 28:19) foreshadowed in Jesus' preaching in 'all' of Galilee,

2.3.12. INEXPLICABLE CHANGES

One addition, though it seems grammatically unnecessary, fits well in context (9:28b).¹⁸⁶ Another reading involves verb a change from indicative to participle (8:15a).¹⁸⁷ One noun is inexplicably changed from singular to plural (7:21).¹⁸⁸ Metaplasm is found in one instance (2:2).¹⁸⁹

the land of the Gentiles (4:15)?” *Matthew*, 1:413. Schnackenburg states that “Galilee becomes the very region in which God’s mercy is unveiled in Jesus’ salvific activity.” *Matthew*, 39. If this detail is important, that *all* of Galilee is traversed by Jesus, then the scribe of) * has done Jesus’ ministry a disservice by stating he has not traversed the whole region; but nevertheless, the sense of the whole region, or *all*, can be implied in context even with the omission of ολη.

¹⁸¹ The singular portion of the reading in) * is the omission of πολλοι that is found in L F f^{13(exc.124)} 7 *et al.* The reading of) * then does not suggest how many people followed Jesus, as other MSS read “many”, but the adjective “many” could easily be implied in) *.

¹⁸² There are several verbal person changes in the context of 12:37, which leads Nolland to believe that “the change from the second person plural of the opening of v. 36 and the third person plural of its body to the second person singular here suggests use of traditional material.” Nolland, *Matthew*, 507-508. (Davies and Allison state the same notion; see *Matthew*, 2:351. McNeile states that the material is “drawn from another context. . . possibly a current proverb.” McNeile, *Matthew*, 181.) The pronoun σου in 12:37 in *Matthew* (which is omitted in *Sinaiticus*) could either aid in keeping track of the changes, from 2p to 3s to 2s, or it could perhaps be seen as confusing. Nevertheless, the pronoun is understood in the verb καταδικασθησθαι, so its omission in *Sinaiticus* does not affect the grammar or meaning of the text in any great way.

¹⁸³ The phrase, ο δε αποκριθεισ ειπεν, is omitted in) *. The same phrase occurs in the previous verse, and the parallelism between vv. 28, 29, and 30 is “nearly perfect” in *rell.* Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:168. Plausibly, the omission in) * may be for concise expression because wsautwj is not omitted, thereby noting the similarity between the verses.

¹⁸⁴ The partitive genitive (involving εκ + αυτων) is not omitted elsewhere in *Matthew* in) (Mt 10:29; 18:12; 22:35; 25:2). The omission of part of the subject may be a scribal slip.

¹⁸⁵ The text of) * does not read the genitive pronoun for τοις αδελφοις. (The previous occurrence when Jesus speaks of *my* brothers, 25:40, the pronoun is read in *Sinaiticus*.) It is still possible to infer μου from context, though the text flows better with its inclusion; and therefore, it is still possible to claim from the context that “the risen Lord continues to refer to his disciples as his brothers (and sisters) now even after they abandoned him.” Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:874.

¹⁸⁶ The text of) * reads a pronoun that refers to Jesus’ actions being done *to you*, i.e. the blind men. If “the primary emphasis rests on Jesus’ ability rather than on the blind men’s faith” in the narrative (Gundry, *Matthew*, 178), then the pronoun addition rivals such an interpretation because including an indirect object turns attention *to* the blind men.

¹⁸⁷ The verb in) * here is a participle, εgerqij (with an itacism ει > i), rather than indicative as in *rell.* hgerqh. There was probably no influence from the surrounding verbs, as they are all indicative.

¹⁸⁸ The scribe changes the singular qelhma to plural. In the other instances of qelhma + tou patroj in *Matthew* (12:50; 18:14; 21:31), the singular readings do not witness alterations to qelhma. The text of) * then states here that the person who does the *desires* of the Father will enter into heaven, rather than the one who does the *desire* of the Father.

¹⁸⁹ The masculine ending of astera is changed to feminine in both 2:2 and 2:10 (the latter occurrence is read by) * C), which may be a kind of metaplasm (fluctuation of declension). BDF § 49. In the singular readings, other occurrences of asthr are not likewise altered in *Matthew*. Another occurrence of the declined τον astera in Rev. 2:28 is not altered in), but asteraj is found instead of astera in Rev. 9:1 in) *.

2.3.13. KOINE GRAMMAR

Some singular readings, grammatical in nature, situate the scribe in a Koine context, particularly using –w verb endings in place of –mi verb endings (4:8;¹⁹⁰ 18:30b;¹⁹¹ 26:46),¹⁹² and using 1st aorist verb endings in place of 2nd aorist endings (7:27a;¹⁹³ 15:12).¹⁹⁴

2.3.14. OTHER CONSTRUED SINGULAR READINGS

Some case changes produce a good grammatical structure (3:15;¹⁹⁵ 19:15;¹⁹⁶ 20:31b).¹⁹⁷

¹⁹⁰ The 3s primary verb ending for –w verbs is used here in Sinaiticus in place of the 3s ending for –mi verbs. If verbs ending in –(nu)mi in Koine were “give[n] place to synonyms or new formations in –w” (Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, §493. The new –w formation of deiknumi is found in Mt 16:21; Jn 2:18; [Rev 22:8] in the majority of MSS), then perhaps the singular reading in Sinaiticus (diknuei) was one of the new formations, or at least an acceptable formation. (The “decline” of mi verbs is “strongly felt in Koine as compared with classical Greek.” BDF §92. The BDAG states that deiknuw goes back at least to Herodotus, 5th cent. B.C.E. S.v. deiknumi. See also Goodwin, *Greek Grammar*, §787.1, .2, where he states verbs in hmi and wmi are inflected in ew and ow in Homer and Herodotus.) The other occurrence of deiknusin in the NT, Jn 5:20, reads diknusin in) (but deiknuei in codex D).

¹⁹¹ The aorist subjunctive 3s –mi verb is transcribed with an –w verb ending.

¹⁹² The verb paradidwmi is transcribed with an –w verb ending (paradidw) in) *, as opposed to a –mi verb ending.

¹⁹³ In Koine, the 1st aorist form is often substituted for an Attic 2nd aorist (BDF §75), which may explain the 1st aorist active ending on hlqan in) instead of the expected 2nd aorist ending. The word occurs at the end of a column line in the codex, so there is a bar over the alpha indicating moveable nu.

¹⁹⁴ The verb eipon is transcribed with a 1st aorist active ending (eipan), rather than the 2nd aorist (eipon).

¹⁹⁵ The context of the variant is Jesus’ response to John about how it is fitting for Jesus and John, i.e. for us (hmin/hmaj), to baptize Jesus to fulfill all righteousness (plhrwsai pasan dikaiosunhn). Instead of the dative hmin,) * reads the accusative hmaj as the subject of the infinitive plhrwsai, which is construed because the subject (us) is different than the person to whom Jesus is speaking (John). BDF §409(3).

¹⁹⁶ The context of Mt 19:15 and the parallel Mk 10:16 is *the laying on of hands*, which is “a mark of blessing [that] appears in a variety of biblical contexts.” France, *Matthew*, 727. In the gospels and Acts, the blessing occasionally has the preposition epi with it (Mt 9:18; Mk 8:25; Act 8:17; 9:17; 19:6. Cf. France, *Matthew*, 727-728), but it is most common not to have a preposition (Mt 8:3, 15; 9:29; 17:7; Mk 6:5; 7:32; 8:23; Lk 4:40; 13:13; Act 6:6; 9:12; 13:3; 8:18, 19; 19:6; 28:8. Cf. France, *Matthew*, 727-728). Davies and Allison state that Matthew’s change to autoij in 19:15 from Mark’s ep auta (Mk 10:16) “enhance[s] the parallelism with 19:13.” *Matthew*, 3:34. Of all of the occurrences of the blessing throughout the NT, only in Mt 19:15 does the text of Sinaiticus include a preposition in the blessing (the MSS 483 484 also have the preposition in Mt 19:15). The inclusion of the preposition is probably more of an *aberration* here in Sinaiticus than it is a *harmonization* to the Markan parallel (Mk 10:16). The singular portion of the reading in Sinaiticus is the case change to accusative, which is construed as the object of the verb epiqeiij.

¹⁹⁷ The text of) * here reads a genitive uiou before Daid, rather than the nominative or vocative as in other MSS. (In the Lukan parallel, Lk 18:39,) * also reads a genitive uiou, but in the Markan parallel, Mk 10:48, the vocative is found.) In Matthew, the relationship between the words son and David produce a genitive of relationship structure.

2.3.15. THEOLOGICAL READINGS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE TEXT

Several readings could be the result of forethought on the part of the scribe. Some omissions may intend to “fix” the text in some way, by clearing up an inconsistency (12:46;¹⁹⁸ 28:5a).¹⁹⁹ Sometimes the text is expanded upon, either by conflation of variants (14:29),²⁰⁰ or other additions (15:5).²⁰¹ There is an instance where a question is turned into a statement (5:46).²⁰²

One reading, though grammatically construed, may not produce a good interpretation of the text (21:42).²⁰³ Another reading, perhaps one of the most

¹⁹⁸ Matthew places Jesus’ mother and brothers at the scene while Jesus is speaking to the crowds, but it does not state in) * that his mother and brothers were *seeking to speak to him* (zhtountej autw lalhsai). Several MSS (including) *) omit the entirety of the following verse (v.47), which is easy to account for due to parablepsis of zhtountej and lalhsai in v.46 and v.47 (Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 26; but McNeile states, v. 47 “is absent from the true text, Mt. having already summarized Mk.’s equivalent. It was added probably to supply an antecedent to tw|~ le/gonti au0tw|~ [of v.48].” *Matthew*, 184-185). The omission in) * in v. 46, then, “is hard to account for” because the text of) * lacks the parablepsis (zhtountej and lalhsai) of vv.46 and 47 that could have produced haplography of the adjunct in v.46, zhtountej autw lalhsai. Nolland, *Matthew*, 516 n. b-b. The portion of text that is omitted in) * is not necessary for context to make sense, especially because Jesus’ mother and brothers never speak to him, they are only referenced by him.

¹⁹⁹ Concerning the *Sitz im Buch* at Mt 28:5a, the women’s fear has not been stated yet (but is stated in v.8), only the guards’ fear has been stated (found in the previous verse, v.4). The omission of the adjunct, *the women*, in) * resolves such perceived inconsistency: because they are not yet afraid, they cannot be told to be unafraid. Following, the emphatic umeij (umij) no longer contrasts the two groups in) *, the women and soldiers, by speaking only to the women (Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:667), but combines them and now the angel speaks to both groups, not solely to the women.

²⁰⁰ The reading of) * in 14:29 is a conflation of two variants (so Nolland, *Matthew*, 595 n. i-i.). It is comprised of the elqein from *rell* and the hlqen from B C* *et al.* The kai from the reading in B C* *et al.* is substituted with an inferential oun in) * and aids in separation of the two conflated phrases (BDAG s.v. oun). The reading in) * may be an “exegetical expansion introduced by the scribe” as Metzger posits (*A Textual Commentary*, 30).

²⁰¹ The text of) * reads ouden estin after wfelhqhj in 15:5. The addition in) * refers to the preceding dwron as the subject. Nolland states that the scribe of) * does not understand the custom (15:3, 6 paradosin) of giving to the temple in lieu of supporting elderly parents; thus the meaning of) * gives the sense, “The gift you would have gained from me is nothing.” Nolland, *Matthew*, 606 n. d. If the addition is read as a *commentary* on the custom, rather than the addition being a *misunderstanding* of the custom (so Nolland), then it resembles similar usage found in Mt 23:16 (ouden estin), meaning that the law is not binding and in this case that children should honor their parents (see BDAG, s.v. oudeij 2.b.b). The addition in) *, then, emphasizes the hypocrisy of the tradition along with the “very definite negation,” ou mh immediately following in v. 6. Luz, *Matthew*, 2:325 n. 1. This addition in 15:5 is perhaps an explanation of the text by the scribe.

²⁰² The use of ouxi indicates “an affirmative answer is expected.” BDF §427.2. The omission of the negative conjunction in) * still produces a sensical reading, but it is in the form of a statement rather than question.

²⁰³ The singular reading in) *, genitive > dative, is a portion of the LXX Ps 117:22 quote (which was also copied by scribe A in the OT portion of the codex, but contains the genitive *Lord*). The preposition para with the genitive of person denotes source (*this was the Lord’s doing*) as opposed to a rendering with upo that would denote direct cause (*done by the Lord*). Zerwick,

interesting singulars in Matthew in Sinaiticus, concerns the confessional statement by the centurion (27:54a, 54b).²⁰⁴ These singular readings (21:42; 27:54ab), however, use minutiae that could produce either (1) drastic theological changes, which is unlikely intentional because such minutiae in the singulars is not used elsewhere to rework Matthew (cf. 6:6; 20:14b, 34 for nonsense in context; cf. 7:21; 8:15a for inexplicable changes), or (2) they may be a re-working of phrases that could have been perceived to be *grammatically* awkward rather than *theologically* awkward, or (3) are errors that happen to make sense in context.

2.4. THE SINGULAR READINGS OF SCRIBE D IN MATTHEW²⁰⁵

Scribe D creates 16 singular readings (that is one singular for every 7.81 verses), but the data is very limited. There are a few types of changes that are represented more than once, which are transpositions, pronoun changes to reflexive, haplography, and consonant changes, but none occur more than twice.

There is one itacistic change in the transcription of scribe D, $ai > e$. In the transcription of Matthew by scribe D, the particle $alla$ is not contracted to all in one instance when it precedes a word beginning with a vowel (16:17).²⁰⁶ There are two consonant omissions (18:3; 25:16) and one initial vowel omission (17:10).

Grammatical Analysis, 70. The scribe may have interpreted the variant in the very manner Zerwick cautions against by mistakenly supplying the dative of cause. Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, §58.

²⁰⁴ There are two singular features in) * in 27:54. The transposition (27:54a) within the complement ($\tau\omicron\upsilon \rho\epsilon\omicron\upsilon \upsilon\iota\omicron\jmath$), places the predicator ($h\eta$) between the genitive and nominative nouns. The inclusion of a definite article (27:54b), also a singular reading in) *; thus, the predicate is placed before the verb followed by an articular $\rho\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ resulting in emphasis of *the Son* of God. The grammatical construction in) * resembles 27:40, $e\iota \upsilon\iota\omicron\jmath e\iota\lbracket \tau\omicron\upsilon \rho\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ (but not 27:43, $\omicron\tau\iota \rho\epsilon\omicron\upsilon e\iota\mu\iota \upsilon\iota\omicron\jmath$; nor 14:33, $\rho\epsilon\omicron\upsilon \upsilon\iota\omicron\jmath e\iota\lbracket$), “to which the present confession is the positive counterpart.” Nolland, *Matthew*, 1221. In context, the centurion has “limited knowledge” of *the Son of God*, but he “recognises the presence of deity and has enough evidence to be profoundly convinced that Jesus is bona fide.” Nolland, *Matthew*, 1220. The change in) * may intend to eliminate the possibility that the centurion meant *a son of God*, which would be allowed by the anarthrous $\upsilon\iota\omicron\jmath$ in its position in *rell* (so Gundry, *Matthew*, 578; France, *Matthew*, 1084 n. 50; Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:852). “In any case,” states Zerwick, “the Christian reader is meant to recognize a confession of the whole truth” (*Grammatical Analysis*, 96), which is the result of the reading in) *: *Jesus is the Son of God*. If this is *over translated*, however, there could be an emphasis on *the God* and not *the son*; but this may not be possible because $\upsilon\iota\omicron\jmath$ is transposed forward in the sentence.

²⁰⁵ See appendix two.

²⁰⁶ Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:316.

There are few instances where scribe D omitted text where there is evidence of parablepsis (18:8;²⁰⁷ 24:37).²⁰⁸ There are only two transpositions in the text transcribed by scribe D (16:13;²⁰⁹ 17:8),²¹⁰ none of which have evidence of parablepsis. Scribe D adds only one article (24:39),²¹¹ which may be a careless addition—perhaps caused by preceding text. There are instances where pronouns are substituted for reflexive (24:49;²¹² 25:36),²¹³ or are substituted for articles (25:44a).²¹⁴ One noun has an inexplicable case change (16:19¹).²¹⁵ In one instance, an unnecessary second augment is found on an aorist verb (25:44b).²¹⁶ In one instance, the name *Jesus* is omitted, but is understood in context (17:17),²¹⁷ and in another instance the nonsacral name *lord* is omitted but is understood in context (25:22).²¹⁸

²⁰⁷ The scribe commits haplography due to parablepsis of *sou skandalizei se ... kalon soi estin* in vv. 8 and 9.

²⁰⁸ There is an omission of part of the subject, perhaps by haplography, leaping from *tou* to *tou*.

²⁰⁹ The verb *legousin* here is part of an interrogative predicate in the accusative case (Zerwick, *Grammatical Analysis*, 52). Scribe D places the verb closer to the following accusative predicate, *ton uion tou anqrwpou*.

²¹⁰ The Aramaic proleptic pronoun construction is altered here (Zerwick, *Grammatical Analysis*, 55. The Aramaic proleptic pronoun construction is also found in Mt 3:4; Mk 2:21; 6:17, (18), 22; (12:36, 37); Jn 9:13. Turner, *Syntax*, 41.). The pronoun is no longer rendered proleptic (as in B* Q 700) but as an antecedent pronoun, which is a common grammatical construction in the NT. Zerwick states, “The proleptic use of pronouns, i.e. their use to ‘introduce’ a noun which follows . . . is a pure Aramaism, and has been almost entirely eliminated from the usual text.” Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, §204, cf. §205. McNeile, *Matthew*, 251.

²¹¹ The addition of an article in) * before *ewj* may be a scribal slip. The second word after *ewj* is the same article, *o*, which could have caused a preemptive addition before *ewj*.

²¹² When the word *sundoulouj* occurs in Matthew (the word does not occur in the other gospels: Mt 18:28, 29, 31, 33), a non-reflexive personal pronoun is used in all instances in Sinaiticus except here in 24:49, which is the only occurrence for which scribe D is responsible. (Not concerning *sundoulouj*, the previous occurrence of *autou*, 24:48, is changed to reflexive in) 892.)

²¹³ The change here, *me* > *eme*, occurs at the end of six instances of *me* in vv. 35-36 and is the final word of a sentence. The location in the codex is the first and only word on the top line of a column (folio 214b). The alteration, similar to occurrences of *autou* > *eautou*, may be intended for emphasis.

²¹⁴ The singular element of the variant in) * is the substitution of *autoi* for *oi*, which renders a similar translation with either variant, *autoi* or *oi*.

²¹⁵ The accusative is used here in) * rather than the genitive in *rell*. In context, the difference between accusative and genitive when modified by *epi* is not significant.

²¹⁶ The text of Sinaiticus here contains a second augment to the aorist *diakonew*. A non-Attic spelling is found in *rell*, but an Attic rendering would be *ediakonhsamen*. BDF §69.4.

²¹⁷ The text of) * does not read *Ihsouj* and places the article, *o*, forward in the sentence. Although the Markan parallel is similar (Mk 9:19, omission of *Jesus*), it is not a harmonization because the name *Jesus* is still understood in context.

²¹⁸ The text of) omits the nonsacral *kurie* in 25:22. Its omission does not affect the meaning of the text because it is understood in context.

2.5. CONCLUSION

In his concluding remarks on the underwhelming results of a study of singular readings in Sinaiticus in Mark, Head states, “there is simply not a great deal of evidence for peculiar Sinaitican interpretive moves in the re-presentation of Mark.”²¹⁹ In Sinaiticus in Matthew, however, there are a few noticeable habits and items worth mentioning, but the gospel is not re-presented in a drastic way.

The textual context seems to be the greatest influence on scribe A to make changes in the text of Matthew. The scribe will skip or repeat text due to parablepsis; and if parablepsis is not involved, preceding and/or proceeding text still influences changes. Although the text seems to influence the scribe, the rare instances when singular readings resemble a gospel parallel are probably a coincidence. Therefore, the scribe seems to be influenced most from the nearby context rather than remote parallels.

A preference for Koine grammar is also noticeable in some instances in the singular readings of scribe A. These Koine-isms seem to be the scribe’s own creation since they are not simply repeated from the grammatical context of Matthew as many other changes seem to be.

Hernández counts 158 significant singular readings of scribe A in the Apocalypse,²²⁰ but only a few more are found in Matthew (163), which is a longer book. He states that in Revelation, 25.32% singulars are additions, mostly of one word,²²¹ and 31.01% are omissions.²²² In Matthew in the work of scribe A, 31.28% of the singulars are omissions, which is closely aligned with Revelation, and 15.33% are additions, which is less than in Revelation. Not only are the rates of *omissions* nearly identical between Matthew and Revelation, but there are also *more* omissions than additions in both books.

Hernández documents several non-itacistic vocalic changes in the work of scribe A in Revelation: a > ei (1), ai > a (1), e > a (2), e > h (1), h > ei (1), o > a (1), and o > ou (1).²²³ His count of singulars tallied 9.45% to be orthographic,

²¹⁹ Head, “The Gospel of Mark in Codex Sinaiticus,” §66.

²²⁰ Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 60.

²²¹ Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 65.

²²² Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 70.

²²³ Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 61.

which includes “confusion of nasal sounds (1), confusion of consonants (2), replacement of vowels (8), dropping of consonants (5), adding of consonants (1), and occurrence of un-contracted forms (2).”²²⁴ Apart from itacisms, scribe A in Matthew creates more than three times as many orthographic spellings as is found in his work in Revelation.

Milne and Skeat contend that “mannerisms of spelling can provide considerable assistance” in differentiating between the work of scribes A and D,²²⁵ and Jongkind determined that the amount of itacistic spellings in the work of scribe D in the synoptics was significantly fewer per folio than scribe A.²²⁶ When itacisms (not including other vocalic or consonantal changes) are taken into account, there is an *astonishing* contrast in the singular readings in Sinaiticus in Matthew. In the transcription by scribe A, there are 539 singular itacistic changes, which amounts to one change for every 1.74 verses. In the transcription by scribe D, there is only one singular itacistic spelling, which, therefore, amounts to one change for every 125 verses. Compared to Jongkind’s itacistic findings for Sinaiticus, the singular readings in Matthew display an exaggeration of the scribes’ work. On the other hand, the *non-itacistic* spellings amount to 2.54% of the text transcribed by scribe A, which is a relatively similar percentage to the orthographic changes in the transcription of scribe D, which amount to 3.2% of the text. Therefore, the itacistic spellings display a great contrast between the two scribes, but other vocalic and consonantal orthography is not helpful for differentiating the work of the two scribes.

In general, the textual data for scribe D in Matthew is scarce. There are only a few types of singular readings that occur more than once, such as haplography, transpositions, and pronoun changes to reflexive. Itacistic and orthographic variation by scribe D are almost nonexistent, which is a great contrast to the amount by scribe A. The disparity of orthographic spellings between scribe A and scribe D then is difficult to account for if both scribes copied the same exemplar by eye. Nevertheless, it is noticeable that such orthographic disparity is tolerated in a single

²²⁴ Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 60.

²²⁵ Milne and Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors*, 51. Milne and Skeat state three causes for scribe A’s orthography: colloquialisms, phonetic errors, and indefensible blunders (i.e. carelessness). Milne and Skeat, *Scribe and Correctors*, 52. They conclude that D is “the most correct” of the scribes, “who alone reaches the standard of good literary papyri.” Milne and Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors*, 53.

²²⁶ Jongkind, *Scribal Habits*, 91.

MS even when the scribes are working together. The contemporaneous differences in orthography of scribe A and D may witness to the lack of standardization of the time.

CHAPTER THREE: CODEX VATICANUS

3.1. INTRODUCTION

The panegyric consensus that “Codex Vaticanus B is certainly foremost among the important witnesses to one of the least contaminated forms of the [Greek New Testament] text” is rarely contested.¹ The MS is usually attributed to the fourth century² and is considered one of “the most valuable of all the manuscripts of the Greek Bible.”³ Perhaps it is not surprising, then, that in Matthew the NA²⁸ uses two singular readings of Vaticanus (9:3; 26:53b) for its standard text (*txt*). The Gospel of Matthew in B contains no lacunae. One scribe (scribe B) transcribed the entirety of the NT in Codex Vaticanus and is responsible for portions of the OT as well.⁴

3.2. *NOMINA SACRA*

3.2.1. PRIMARY *NOMINA SACRA*

The *nomina sacra* for Ihsouj (i8s8, i8u8, i8n8), Xristoj (x8s8, x8u8, x8n8, x8e8), Kurioj (k8s8, k8u8, k8w8, k8n8, k8e8), and Qeoj (q8s8, q8u8, q8w8, q8n8) are “regularly used” in B in the NT,⁵ but there are a few instances of these (except Xristoj) written in *plene* in Matthew. Lexemes of Ihsouj are contracted in every instance except in 1:21—coincidentally in the same place where Codex Sinaiticus reads the only *plene* Ihsoun, when the angel tells Joseph what to name his child. Lexemes of Kurioj are regularly contracted in sacral and nonsacral instances. Lexemes of Kurioj are found in *plene* in some

¹ Pisano, “The Text of the New Testament,” 41. Hoskier, on the other hand, would rather “sing the Death-song of B as a neutral text.” Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:iii.

² Pisano states, “The close affinity which exists between the text of B and the third-century Bodmer Papyri XIV-XV (P⁷⁵) implies that B’s text was written before the more recent recensions and text types, especially the Byzantine type, were developed.” He continues, “The characteristics of the text of B, along with its affinity with P⁷⁵ and its proximity to Sinaiticus, suggest a date of approximately the middle of the fourth century AD for the copying of B.” Pisano, “The Text of the New Testament,” 34.

³ Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 67.

⁴ Scribe B copied 1 King 19:11-2 Edr and Hos-Dan. Scribe A copied Gen 46:28-1 King 19:11; Ps-Tob. Milne and Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors*, 87, 88.

⁵ Pisano, “The Text of the New Testament,” 28. Pisano does not note the vocative *nomen sacrum* for Xristoj, x8e8.

nonsacral instances (6:24; 10:25; 18:27, 31, 32, 34; 25:23) and sacral instances (12:8; 20:8). Lexemes of $\text{Q}\epsilon\omicron\text{j}$ are always contracted, except the vocative $\text{q}\epsilon\epsilon$ in 27:46¹, 46².

3.2.2. SECONDARY AND TERTIARY *NOMINA SACRA*

Lexemes of pneuma in B in Matthew are written in *plene* more often than contracted ($\text{p}\eta\text{n}\eta\text{a}\eta$, $\text{p}\eta\text{n}\eta\text{s}\eta$, $\text{p}\eta\text{n}\eta\text{i}\eta$).⁶ Pisano notes that pneuma is used “somewhat sporadically” in B in the NT,⁷ but it is interesting to see that in Matthew, although the *plene* forms are used in both sacral and nonsacral instances, the contracted forms are used *only* in sacral instances: the contractions of pneuma are only found in the baptism of Jesus (3:11, 16), when Jesus “gave up his spirit” on the cross (27:50), when it is combined with *holy* (1:18, 20), when Jesus is led by the spirit into the wilderness (4:1), and when David speaks by/in the spirit (22:43).

The remaining words, $\text{anq}\rho\omega\text{p}\omicron\text{j}$,⁸ $\text{p}\alpha\text{t}\eta\rho$, $\text{u}\iota\omicron\text{j}$,⁹ $\text{m}\eta\text{t}\eta\rho$, $\text{o}\upsilon\rho\alpha\text{n}\omicron\text{j}$,¹⁰ $\text{I}\sigma\rho\alpha\eta\lambda$, $\text{D}\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\text{i}\delta$, and their lexemes are only found in *plene*, except for the genitive of $\text{p}\alpha\text{t}\eta\rho$ ($\text{p}\eta\text{r}\eta\text{s}\eta$) in 10:32 in context of confession.

3.3. THE SINGULAR READINGS IN VATICANUS IN MATTHEW¹¹

There are no lacunae in B in Matthew and contains 1,067 verses. There are 97 singular readings in B in Matthew, which is among the lowest counts in our MSS, and amounts to one singular reading for every eleven verses. There are high numbers of transpositions, influence from context, and several changes from Koine to Attic and *vice versa*, yet the readings rarely, if ever, change the meaning of the text.

⁶ In 10:1, pneumatwn has a moveable nu as it occurs at the end of a line.

⁷ Pisano, “The Text of the New Testament,” 28. Pisano does not note the contracted forms $\text{p}\eta\text{n}\eta\text{s}\eta$ and $\text{p}\eta\text{n}\eta\text{i}\eta$ for pneuma .

⁸ In 12:35¹, $\text{anq}\rho\omega\text{p}\omicron\text{j}$ is written an on one line and $\text{q}\eta\text{r}\omega\text{p}\omicron\text{s}$ on the following. In 24:39, 44, $\text{anq}\rho\omega\text{p}\omicron\upsilon$ is written a η , then continues to the next line, $\text{q}\rho\omega\text{p}\omicron\upsilon$. Likewise in 6:1, $\text{anq}\rho\omega\text{p}\omega\text{n}$ is written a η , then continues to the following line, $\text{q}\rho\omega\text{p}\omega\text{n}$. In 15:20², $\text{anq}\rho\omega\text{p}\omicron\eta$ is written $\text{anq}\rho\omega\text{p}\omicron}$ η as it occurs at the end of a line.

⁹ In 16:13, $\text{u}\iota\omicron\eta$ is written $\text{u}\iota\omicron\eta$, as it occurs at the end of a line.

¹⁰ The sacral full word $\text{o}\upsilon\rho\alpha\text{n}\omega\text{n}$ contains a moveable nu when it occurs at the end of a line (3:2; 5:20; 7:21; 8:11; 10:7; 19:12, 14; 25:1).

¹¹ See appendix three.

3.3.1. ORTHOGRAPHY

3.3.1.1. Itacisms

In B in Matthew, there are “consistent”¹² itacistic changes $i > ei$ (73).¹³ There are no other itacistic changes in the singular readings of B in Matthew.¹⁴

3.3.1.2. Other Vocalic Changes

Vocalic changes are some of the most frequent types of changes in the singular readings in B in Matthew (13.4% of the singular readings). There are eight varieties of vocalic (non-itacistic) changes: $a > o$ (19:12; 26:53a), $ai > a$ (13:48), $e > a$ (13:14), $e > h$ (25:10), $e > i$ (26:53b), $ea > e$ (28:2-3), and $ei > e$ (10:22). In addition, several changes involve an iota omission in kai (6:19), oi (12:1b), and $eautoij$ (21:38a). Iota is omitted before a back vowel (26:59),¹⁵ and it is added in another instance which creates a hiatus (26:14).¹⁶

3.3.1.3. Consonantal Orthography

There are no orthographic consonantal *additions* in B in Matthew, but there are nine types of omissions and one exchange: these are the most persistent type of singular reading in B in Matthew, found in 26.8% of the singular readings. There is the simplification of double nu in forms of $Iwannhj$ (3:4; 4:21; 11:2, 4, 7, 11, 12, 13, 18; 14:3, 4, 8, 10; 21:26, 32),¹⁷ and the simplification of a double mu (23:25).¹⁸ There is omission of medial nu following mu (10:19),¹⁹ omission of final nu (7:16; 21:17; 21:41), omission of a medial nasal before a dental stop (26:63),²⁰ omission of

¹² Pisano, “The Text of the New Testament,” 34.

¹³ In Mark in B, Voelz counts the change $i > ei$ in B “chief among its features.” Voelz, “The Greek of Codex Vaticanus,” 211.

¹⁴ See appendix eighteen.

¹⁵ A similar omission of iota is found in LXX Susanna 1:60, $yeudomarturaj$. Gignac states that “an accented i is very frequently omitted before a back vowel,” which may be the case in B* in 26:59. Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:302.

¹⁶ Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:109, 319.

¹⁷ The instances of $nn > n$ in $Iwannhj$ are simplification, though it is only found once in Gignac’s study and not in a proper name. Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:158.

¹⁸ Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:157.

¹⁹ The text of B* reads $merimhshte > merimhshte$. Gignac notes a similar occurrence in $upomnhma > upomhma$ in *PMich.* 123. Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:117.

²⁰ Such omissions are frequent in the Byzantine papyri. Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:116-117.

sibilant before a dental stop (3:12),²¹ omission of initial sigma (12:33), omission of final sigma before a word beginning with a vowel (13:15),²² and omission of final sigma before a word beginning with a consonant (15:32).²³ There is one singular dental exchange *kat > kaq* (20:17).²⁴

3.3.2. MISCONSTRUED SPELLINGS

Some unusual spellings are found in B in Matthew (21:46;²⁵ 28:11).²⁶ There are some instances where a syllable has been omitted (17:23;²⁷ 18:9)²⁸ or is simply misspelled (27:1).²⁹

3.3.3. NOT CONSTRUED IN CONTEXT

In some instances, the text of B contains a singular reading that is construed neither grammatically nor logically (13:30^{2,30} 21:33).³¹ One omission of ten letters does not have evidence of parablepsis (10:14).³²

²¹ Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:130.

²² Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:125.

²³ Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:124-125.

²⁴ The dental exchange in 20:17, *kat > kaq*, is also found in non-singular instances in B in Matthew, e.g. 17:1, 19; 24:3.

²⁵ The reading of B* is difficult to see here. If it is *ekrathsa* (so INTF, similar to *ekrathsa* in Swanson), then the scribe has added an augment to the verb in the infinitive mood.

²⁶ The spelling *skoustwdiaj* in B* instead of *koustwdiaj* is flummoxing; it is not found in Gignac, Moulton and Milligan, Liddell-Scott, or BDAG. The initial sigma could be a dittograph of the preceding *thj*, but the same addition of sigma is found on *koustwdian* in B* K in 27:65 (though not in 27:66).

²⁷ The *th* of *trith* is omitted in B*.

²⁸ The final syllable *-zei* is missing from *skandalizei* in B.

²⁹ The word *genomenhj* is recorded as *gomenhj* in B*.

³⁰ The text of B* reads a feminine pronoun where *rell* reads a neuter. The pronoun refers to the articular infinitive *to katakausai*, and is therefore not grammatically construed.

³¹ The verb is 2p in B*, but 3s would be the sensical reading because of the 3s subject in 21:40, *o kurioj tou ampelwnoj*. The reading in B* could have been influenced by the 2p verb that begins 21:33, *akousate*, but the verbs surrounding *ecedete* are all 3s (*efuteusen*, *perieqhken*, *wrucen*, *wkodomhsen*, and *apedhmhsen*). The word *ecedete* occurs in the middle of a line of text in B, so it is not the case of a moveable *nu* at the end of a line which would match the other *-en* verbal endings.

³² The omission of *mh(n) dechtai u* renders the reading of B* nonsensical. A verb (i.e. *dechtai*) should be present here for grammatical construal, but the greatest indicator of a scribal blunder within the variation unit is the omission of the *upsilon* of *umaj*. The entire omission consists of ten letters if the exemplar of B* read as *rell* (if the exemplar read as B^{c1}, the omission is still of ten letters, consisting of the *nu* of *mhn* and the contraction of *ai* to a single letter in *dechtai*). This haplography does not consist of parablepsis, but it does align with other omissions of 10 letters.

3.3.4. PARABLEPSIS

3.3.4.1. Haplography

There are instances of omissions when there is evidence of one letter of parablepsis that could have resulted in homoeoteleuton (5:16;³³ 13:17).³⁴ There is an instance of homoeoarchton, consisting of two letters of parablepsis (19:17).³⁵ There is an instance where a word is truncated, possibly due to parablepsis within the word itself (21:38b),³⁶ and a three-letter word reduced to one letter, perhaps due to parablepsis with the following word (27:45),³⁷ as well as a similar phenomenon (14:13).³⁸

³³ The text of B does not read *erga* following *kala*. The word *kalon* “describes a work as it is seen by others,” writes McNeile (*Matthew*, 57). He references two other instances in the gospels where *kalon* + *ergon* is used in a similar context, Mt 26:10 and Jn 10:32. In neither instance is *ergon* omitted or altered in B; nor in the instances of rabbinic expression involving *kala* and *erga* that Gundry lists (Mt 3:10; 7:17, 18, 19; 12:33) does the text of B have readings that suggest something else besides *good works* (Gundry, *Matthew*, 78), which is “an established expression” (Luz, *Matthew*, 1:252). The omission here may be a result of a scribal leap from alpha to alpha, or because it is understood in *ta kala* it is omitted. The meaning of the pericope is not changed with the omission (so Nolland, *Matthew*, 211 n. e).

³⁴ Concerning a similar wording in 10:41, Gundry connects *dikaioi*, a Matthean term, with *dikaion*, stating that Matthew pairs prophets with righteous men (Gundry, *Matthew*, 258), but the text of B reads *dikaioi* in 10:41, unlike 13:17. The scribe may have omitted *kai dikaioi* in 13:17, which is a portion of the subject, by homoeoteleuton, leaping ten letters from iota to iota. If it is an intentional alteration, perhaps the scribe is commenting on the nature of prophecy.

³⁵ The text of B* lacks the number *εij* here. Perhaps the parablepsis of epsilon (and sigma) incited a leap from *εij* to *εstin*.

³⁶ The omission of *om* in *klhronomoj* may be a leap from omicron to omicron.

³⁷ The text in B* records only the epsilon of *ewj*, perhaps because of a jump from omega to omega: *ewj wraj*.

³⁸ The reading in B* here is difficult to see. The INTF tentatively notes that the scribe of B* omitted *en* (marked as *ut videtur*), but Swanson indicates an adverb change *ekeiqen* > *ekei* here (Swanson does not distinguish *ut videtur* readings in his work). If the reading is as the INTF cites, there is a chance of homoeoteleuton, a leap from *en* to *en*. If the reading of B* is as Swanson cites, then such an alteration may be the result of proleptic attraction, *ekei* for *ekeiqen*. Turner, *Syntax*, 226, §2. Wallace states that distinction of far/near demonstratives is not always made in the NT (Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 318, 328), however, similar instances of *ekeiqen* + *anexwrhsen* in 12:15 and 15:21 (Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:486) are not altered in B. In addition, Nolland notes that “the use of ‘from there’ with ‘withdrew’ links a pattern in Matthew in which a verb for moving on is used to point to the itinerant nature of Jesus’ ministry.” Nolland, *Matthew*, 588. Of the eight other instances of a similar pattern identified by Nolland in Matthew, never does the scribe of B change the adverb *ekeiqen* (cf. 4:21; 9:9, 27; 11:1; 12:9, 15; 13:53; 15:21, 29; 19:15 where *probaj*, *paragwn*, *paragonti*, *metebh*, *metabaj*, *anexwrhsen*, *methren*, *ecelqwn*, or *eporeuqh* are found), but there are, however, other possible instances of the scribe creating haplography with small amounts of parablepsis; therefore, if the reading of B* here is as INTF cites, which is probably the case, it would be in alignment with other instances of haplography.

3.3.4.2. Dittography

There is one instance of a dittograph (21:4)³⁹ and a sort of modified dittograph (26:57).⁴⁰

3.3.5. INFLUENCE FROM CONTEXT

In some instances, the textual context seems to have some bearing on a singular reading—it seems possible the preceding or proceeding text has influenced a change for 6.18% of the singular readings in B in Matthew. Sometimes text is repeated from preceding text (2:13;⁴¹ 17:15).⁴² Influence from the preceding text could have created a theological reading in one instance (12:32a).⁴³ There is a substitution of a proper name with a pronoun, which may have been influenced by preceding text (26:51).⁴⁴ Sometimes proceeding text influences changes as well (15:11;⁴⁵ 25:32).⁴⁶

³⁹ The scribe of B* leaps 20 letters, perhaps caused by pi in *plhrwqh* and *profhtou*, and repeats text.

⁴⁰ The text of B* reads *oi de krathsantej ton Ihsoun efugon* at the beginning of v.57, which is similar to the addition in G^c, *oi de stratiwtai krathsantej ton Ihsoun* (which is mostly a dittograph, save *stratiwtai*). The addition here in B* creates a modified dittograph, in that the beginning of v.57 is repeated, then the final word of v.56, *efugon*, is repeated. If *Ihsoun* in v. 57 is spelled in full in the exemplar of B, then the addition is of 30 letters, but if *Ihsoun* is abbreviated as *i8n8* as it is in B in v. 57, then the addition involves 26 letters.

⁴¹ The prepositional phrase of v.12, *eij thn xwran autwn*, is repeated in v.13 in B. It could have been prompted by the similar *anexwrhsan* (v.12) and *anaxwrhsantwn* (v.13). The repetition occurs 36 letters (or 35 letters if not counting the nu omission at the end of a line) after its principle occurrence.

⁴² The preceding *mou* is repeated after *uion*.

⁴³ The addition of the negative *ouk* in B* in v. 32a changes the meaning of the verse to read that it will *not* be forgiven if someone speaks against the son of man. Nolland states that the addition of *ouk* in B* destroys the structure of the sentence, and results in the protection of the significance of the son of man. Nolland, *Matthew*, 503 n. d. (The addition is not found in the parallel in B in Lk 12:20.) The addition in v.32a could have been influenced from the context, as the “synonymous parallelism” (Nolland, *Matthew*, 505) with the previous verse reads, *blasfhmia ouk afeqhsetai*; and therefore, the subsequent use of *afeqhsetai* retained the negative.

⁴⁴ The previous reference to Jesus was by a pronoun (26:50 *autou*), which might have influenced the substitution of *Ihsou* for *autou* in v. 51. (Hoskier notes that B* is *ut videtur* and agrees with “Hil” here, but no reference is given for a treatise of Hilarius’s and after consultation of the facsimile, it seems the distinction of *ut videtur* is not warranted. Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:16.)

⁴⁵ The verb in B here is simple, whereas other MSS contain a compound. The word *eij* that follows the verb could have influenced the change to eliminate redundancy. Or, perhaps, the scribe leaped from epsilon to epsilon in the verb, thus omitting its prefix, *eis*.

⁴⁶ Several scholars note that the difference between *probata* and *erifwn* is not entirely clear, and why a shepherd must separate (*aforiei/aforisei*) them is even more puzzling (cf. France, *Matthew*, 961-962; Nolland, *Matthew*, 1025-1026; Luz, *Matthew*, 3:276-277). The text of B singularly reads *erifwn* as a diminutive in 25:32. The word in diminutive form is also found in the following verse, 25:33 *erifia*, in all MSS (also, an interchange is found in Tob 2:12, 13, *erifion* and *erifoj*. BDAG, s.v. *erifion*). The scribe could have noticed a way to distinguish *probata*

3.3.6. INEXPLICABLE READINGS

One omission in B in Matthew eliminates part of the subject of the sentence (26:3).⁴⁷ There is only one instance where the text of B is singular in its omission of an article (20:32).⁴⁸ Sometimes small words (two or three letters) are omitted, perhaps due to carelessness (1:25;⁴⁹ 12:48;⁵⁰ 16:17).⁵¹ In another instance, an adjective is changed to an adverb and the word that the adjective modified is omitted (22:39).⁵²

3.3.7. ATTIC AND KOINE GREEK

Some of the singular readings in B in Matthew seem to be Atticisms, or at least more closely aligned with classical usage than Koine (5:10, 11,⁵³ 12:32b),⁵⁴ but a few

from *erifia* in v. 33, thus gaining clarity in v. 32 by employing a diminutive. (Interestingly, the scribe of B, along with P⁷⁵, write *erifion* for *erifon* in Lk 15:29.)

⁴⁷ The combination *presbuteroi + tou laou* occurs in four instances in the synoptics, all in Matthew: 21:23; 26:3; 26:47; 27:1. Only in 26:3 does the text of B not read part of the subject, *tou laou*.

⁴⁸ The text of B does not read the article for *Ihsouj* here, which is found in indirect speech.

⁴⁹ The context of Mt 1:25 is concerns the virginity of Mary, specifically that Joseph had no relations with her *until* (*ewj [ou]*) she had born a son. The combination *ewj + ou* is often used with aorist indicative in the NT (BDAG, s.v. *ewj*, 1.b.), which is the case here with *eteken*. The text is grammatically construed with or without *ou* (McNeile, *Matthew*, 10). (The text of B does not contain variant readings in similar occurrences of *ewj* in 5:25, 26 or 16:28, but the contexts are different from 1:25. For a list of uses of *ewj* in the NT see Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:221-225.) No matter if the reading is *ewj ou* or simply *ewj*, because when *ewj ou*, *ewj*, or *ewj otou* follows a negative in the NT, the implication is “that the negatived action did, or will, take place after the particle . . . [and] the words [in 1:25] are concerned only with the fact of virginity at the time.” McNeile, *Matthew*, 10. Hoskier states, “In a great variety of ways *ewj* is used in the N.T., and this may have led to carelessness.” Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:221. It seems, then, that the omission of *ou* in B* here does not alter the passage grammatically or theologically, and perhaps Hoskier’s sentiment about carelessness is accurate here.

⁵⁰ The text of B* does not read *mou* in Mt 12:48 (nor in the parallel with codex D, Mk 3:33). The omission does not resemble typical classical or Koine usage (cf. BDF §284.1) and is probably an accidental omission.

⁵¹ Contrary to Swanson, 1424 does in fact read *oti* here, which makes the omission a singular reading in B* (see MS 1424 folio 031b line 16 on the website for Center for the Study of New Testament Manuscripts: http://images.csntm.org/Manuscripts/GA_1424/GA_1424_0031b.jpg. Accessed 05 January 2013). The omission of the causal *oti* in B* here creates a difficult reading, but it is still grammatically construed (on causal adverbial *oti* see Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 460).

⁵² In a comparison of Mt 22:39 to the Markan parallel (12:31), Luz states that *omoi a* in Matthew, which is absent in Mark, means, “The second commandment is of equal importance with the first.” Luz, *Matthew*, 3:83. In the variation unit in Mt 22:39, the text of B reads an adverb, *omoiwj*, in place of an adjective, *omoi a*, and omits the dative pronoun (the use of dative with the adjective *omoi o j* is, however, “frequent” in the NT. Turner, *Syntax*, 220). Perhaps the change to adverb rendered the pronoun unnecessary if it is understood in context.

⁵³ The form *eneken*, as opposed to *eneka*, is generally found from the 3rd cent. C.E. onward. BDF §35.3; Moulton-Milligan, 213, s.v. *e3neka*, *e3neken*, *ei3neken*; BDAG s.v. *e3neka*. (In the NT, *eneka* is found in Mt 19:5 in a few MSS including B; Mt 19:29 in few MSS; Mk 13:9 only in B; Lk 6:22 in most MSS; Lk 21:12 in codex D; Act 19:32 in some MSS including B;

more singular readings exemplify Koine grammar rather than Attic (10:16;⁵⁵ 10:25a, 25b;⁵⁶ 25:6).⁵⁷ There is a fluctuation of declension with the dative plural of *sabbaton*, which does not resemble the typical Attic form (12:1a).⁵⁸

3.3.8. AORIST CONSTRUCTIONS

An alternate, but construed, spelling is found for an aorist form of *dunamai* (17:16).⁵⁹ In a few consecutive instances, there is a move away from the aorist tense to present in *gennaw* in Jesus' genealogy (1:12a, 12b, 13).⁶⁰

There are instances where 2nd aorist active endings are found on 1st aorist verbs (7:25; 8:32; 9:3, 28), and the reverse (23:23). It is interesting to note that in a MS where there are changes Koine > Attic and *vice versa*, that there are also changes

Act 26:21 in most MSS; Rom 8:36 in many MSS.) The word *eneka* is found in B as a singular reading in Mt 5:10, 11, when Jesus is addressing the crowds during the Sermon on the Mount (the Beatitudes). The usage here could be an attempt to add an Attic element to Jesus' speech.

⁵⁴ The construction *ou mh* + aorist subjunctive or future indicative is found in classical usage, but is considered more emphatic in the NT and is usually restricted to LXX quotes and the words of Jesus, as it is here in) * B. BDF §365. The text of B is singular, reading an aorist subjunctive rather than the future indicative as in *rell*, but the reverse is typical of the progression of classical to Koine where the subjunctive is replaced by the future. BDF §363.

⁵⁵ The reading in B here is accusative, *eij meson*, rather than dative *en mesw*. The preposition *eij* was used with verbs of rest in classical, whereas *en* was used with verbs of motion (Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, §99). In Hellenistic Greek, "the distinction between rest and motion begins to be neglected" (*ibid.*) which could account for the alteration in B here because *eij meson* modifies a verb of motion, *apostellw* (Zerwick, *Grammatical Analysis*, 30). Therefore, the construction in B here seems to be Koine.

⁵⁶ The text of B* reads the dative instead of the accusative in two "awkward" instances in 10:25a, 25b. McNeile, *Matthew*, 144. The accusative in Koine Greek was being phased out (Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 138), but the change in B* here may result from contemporary usage because the dative takes the place of the classical accusative (Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, §51) (which was the default case of the oblique cases in classical. Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 177).

⁵⁷ The text of B reads an aorist middle *ginomai* in place of a perfect active in 25:6. In some instances in the NT, the perfect replaces the aorist in narrative, which is a late classical and phenomenon. BDF §343. The narrative in Mt 25:6 is one of the places where the perfect is used where an aorist is expected in Koine, but B reads an aorist.

⁵⁸ Concerning the word *Sabbath(s)*, the readings in *rell* and B are both neuter plural dative, but *rell* is a 3rd decl. and codex B is a 2nd decl, which is a fluctuation in declension (BDF §52). The 2nd decl. form, *sabbatoij*, in the LXX is typically preceded by *en toij* (cf. Lev 26:35; Num 28:10; 1 Chr 23:31; 2 Chr 8:13; Zech 8:13; Ezek 45:17; 46:3), unlike here in B where the preposition is not found. Also, in 12:12, B 1555 read the 2nd decl.

⁵⁹ Instead of *hdunhqhsan*, the text in B reads *hdunasqhsan*, a change *h > as*. Both are 3p aorist indicative. The form in B appears to be an acceptable spelling in the LXX: Josh 15:63; 17:12; Judg 1:19; 2:14; 14:14; 2 Chron 30:3; Ezra 2:59; Neh 7:61; and Obad 7. The form *hdunhqhsan* is also found in LXX and NT: Exod 12:39; Judg 2:14; 2 Kings 3:26; Job 32:3; Ps 129:2; Isa 7:1; Dan 5:15; Matt 17:16; Luke 9:40; and Heb 3:19.

⁶⁰ Of the 38 occurrences of the aorist *gennaw* in the genealogy of Jesus in Matthew (1:1-16), the text of B reads a present tense in three instances, 1:12a, 12b, 13. The alterations all occur consecutively at the start of the third list of generations (1:12-16), but the regular employment of *egennhsen* resumes after the three occurrences of *genna*.

of 1st aorist > 2nd aorist and *vice versa*. In the singular readings, the Attic aorist constructions outweigh Koine aorist constructions (four to one), but Koine grammatical constructions are found more often than Attic (five to three in favor of Koine). Nevertheless, the bottom line is that *both* Koine and Attic usage is found.

3.3.9. TRANSPOSITIONS

Words in B in Matthew are transposed more frequently than most other types of singular readings, comprising 8.24% of the singular readings. In some instances in B in Matthew, verbs are placed forward in sentences (13:39;⁶¹ 20:27)⁶² or moved back (15:15).⁶³ Sometimes the genitive pronoun is placed before the word it modifies (18:31;⁶⁴ 20:13;⁶⁵ 20:34).⁶⁶ One transposition may be stylistic (22:43),⁶⁷ and one corrected leap may produce a theological reading (6:33).⁶⁸

In the aforementioned transpositions, good grammar is reflected in readings that involve placing a genitive pronoun (or dative) forward in sentences (15:15; 18:31; 20:13, 34) or placing it after the verb (20:27).⁶⁹

⁶¹ The verb *estin* is placed closer to the beginning of the sentence, which is good biblical Greek placement (with Hebraic influence). Turner, *Syntax*, 347-348.

⁶² The text of B X 085 in Mt 20:27 resembles Mk 10:44 (especially D W f¹ 565 2542, which read *umwn einai prwtōj*). The singular feature of the text of B in Matthew, however, is the transposition to *predicator > adjunct > complement*.

⁶³ The word order in B here is transposed to *subject > complement > predicator*.

⁶⁴ The word order is transposed *genitive pronoun > subject*.

⁶⁵ The singular portion of the variant in B here is the transposition within the partitive *genitive complement (eni autwn)*.

⁶⁶ In B, the transposition occurs with the complement here. The genitive pronoun has been placed prior article and noun.

⁶⁷ The text of B* Q contain an additional *autōn* than *rell*, but the word order between B* and Q differs slightly.

⁶⁸ In B here, the words *basileian* and *dikaiosunhn* are transposed. According to Metzger, the result of the reading in B “suggest[s] that righteousness is prerequisite to participation in the kingdom.” *A Textual Commentary*, 16. Such an interpretation is accurate if in Mt 5:10, 20, *dikaiosunh* “represents the distinctive lifestyle of the disciples” (France, *Matthew*, 271).

The intention of the reading in 6:33 is difficult to determine because there is evidence of *parablepsis: thn*. The two instances of *thn* stand directly on top of each other in B, both occurring as the final word on a line. Thus, it is possible to see that after the principle *thn* was copied, the scribe skipped to the following *thn* and copied *dikaiosunhn* out of order, then noticed his mistake and copied *basileian* so as to not leave it out altogether. Even if the reading is a corrected leap, Metzger’s interpretation is reasonable, but it means that the reading is accidental, not intentional.

⁶⁹ Concerning pronoun placement, “Unemphatic (enclitic) pronouns and the like are placed as near the beginning of the sentence as possible;” and “Unemphatic pronouns tend to follow immediately the verb.” BDF, 249, §473.1; 248, §472.1.d.

3.3.10. SUBSTITUTIONS FOR SYNONYMS

Some words are substituted with synonyms (6:32;⁷⁰ 16:4;⁷¹ 27:13).⁷² Pronouns are changed to reflexive in two instances, which may be stylistic (5:28;⁷³ 13:24).⁷⁴

These substitutions account for 5.15% of the singular readings in B in Matthew. (Reflexive pronouns in B in Mark are also found, but Voelz is vague here, noting that they occur in 5-10 instances.)⁷⁵

3.4. CONCLUSION

Pisano notes that “harmonizations and conflate readings, which are found frequently in later manuscripts, are generally absent from B.”⁷⁶ Indeed, no singular readings in B in Matthew seem to consist of harmonizations or conflate readings. In a comparison of B to P⁷⁵, Porter states that “a large number of textually insignificant variations (spelling, itacism, confusion of vowels and consonants with like sounds, nu-movable, confusion of the endings of the first and second aorist forms)” exist.⁷⁷ These same types of variations in B when compared to P⁷⁵ are also found in the singular readings of B in Matthew.

In several instances in B in Matthew, groups of ten letters either produce or result in singular readings: could this indicate that the exemplar had ca. ten letters per

⁷⁰ The text of B* contains a verb substitution, from *xrhzw* (*have need of*) to *xraomai* (*make use of*), which the latter is “a common multivalent term” (BDAG, s.v. *xraomai*). The reading of B* is a mere difference of the omission of -ze- in the verb *xrhzete*. The connection to 6:8, *xreian, need* (Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:659; France, *Matthew*, 270), is now disconnected with the verb change in B* in v. 32.

⁷¹ The verb read in B* here, *aitei*, is a contextual synonym for *epizhtein*.

⁷² The interrogative pronouns *posa* (*so rell*) or *osa* (*so B*) in 27:13 are used as an exclamation, and are both characteristic of NT Greek as opposed to classical (BDF §304; Turner, *Syntax*, 50). The forms *posoj* and *osoj* both seem to be used in classical and Koine, but no MSS read these here (BDAG s.v. *o3soj*, s.v. *po/soj*; Moulton-Milligan s.v. *o3soj*, s.v. *po/soj*).

⁷³ The text reads a reflexive pronoun here in place of *autou*. In v.28 in B, the epsilon of *en* occurs almost directly above the epsilon of *eautou*, which could have influenced the epsilon addition of *autou* if it was unintentional.

⁷⁴ The text of B reads a reflexive in place of *autou* (but in a close parallel, 13:31, *en tw agrw autou*, the scribe does not change the pronoun to reflexive).

⁷⁵ Voelz, “The Greek of Codex Vaticanus,” 213.

⁷⁶ Pisano, “The Text of the New Testament,” 34.

⁷⁷ Porter does not, however, state *how many* insignificant differences there are between in his comparison. Porter, “Papyrus Bodmer XV (P75) and the Text of Codex Vaticanus” *JBL* 81 no. 4 (Dec. 1962): 367-368.

line?⁷⁸ There are about 16-18 letters per line in B the NT,⁷⁹ which means if the exemplar had ten letters per line, then the scribe of B would have not been copying his exemplar exactly line for line. Not much more can be made of this since there are so few examples, but perhaps variants elsewhere in B in the NT also arise from the same phenomenon.

There are two instances where singular readings result in theological changes (6:33; 12:32a), but these have evidence that could indicate error.

Voelz argues that the text of B in Mark has an Attic tendency.⁸⁰ Such a one-sided preference is not found in the singular readings in B in Matthew since there are instances of *both* Koine and Attic grammar and aorist forms.

Overall, the singular readings in B in Matthew do not indicate a concern for improving the text, rather, there seems to be a concern for creating as few aberrations as possible—perhaps this could indicate a concern for preservation of the text. There are a few examples of transpositions and grammar changes, but these are rare (especially rare are orthographic changes) and it would seem that the scribe fared well in accurate exemplar reproduction, if that can be inferred from producing the fewest singular readings per verse of our MSS.

⁷⁸ There are two omissions consisting of ten letters (10:4 and 13:17). One addition is of a multiple of ten letters (21:4) and another readings is an addition of a word that occurs ten letters previous (17:15).

⁷⁹ Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible*, 74.

⁸⁰ Voelz, "The Greek of Codex Vaticanus," 228, 229.

CHAPTER FOUR: CODEX EPHRAEMI

4.1. INTRODUCTION

Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus has been likened to “a man who has been maimed in the wars. Its beauty and its fulness are departed,” writes Gregory.¹ During the twelfth century, the codex was “dismembered” and the parchment was reused for another text.² The original biblical text was erased, and then written “in large cursive letters scrawling over the shadows of the former text”³ were thirty-eight treatises of St. Ephraem, the fourth-century Syrian Church father (hence the name *Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus*).⁴ Tischendorf attempted to “decipher the almost totally obliterated underwriting of the palimpsest” by applying chemical reagents—the results were published in 1843.⁵ After the invention of the ultra-violet lamp, Lyon gained a better view of the underwritten biblical text for his 1958 dissertation.⁶ Today, the biblical text is difficult to determine in many places and the indication of *ut videtur* for some readings is especially appropriate with this MS. Thus, Ephraemi presents a unique problem compared to other MSS in the study: the entire biblical text was actually erased. Although modern techniques aid in reading most of it, many readings are still difficult to see which has led to differences in transcriptions. A few potential singular readings, 12:13a, 13b; 14:33, are too obfuscated to be certain of the true

¹ Gregory, *Canon and Text*, 348.

² Parker, *New Testament Manuscripts*, 73. MSS written on parchment (and occasionally on papyrus) were sometimes “rubbed clean of their writing in order to be written on a second, or even a third time. It was quite a common practice between the sixth and ninth centuries when papyrus and parchment were in short supply.” Such re-used MSS are known as palimpsests. Vaganay, *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*, 9. There are at least 57 majuscule Greek NT MSS that are palimpsests and 51 (or 52) majuscule lectionary palimpsests. Parker, “The Majuscule Manuscripts of the New Testament,” 23.

³ Dunn, “An Examination,” 9

⁴ Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 69.

⁵ Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 69.

⁶ Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible*, 18 n. 34. Several corrections of Tischendorf’s transcription by Lyon (“A Re-examination of Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus,” Ph.D. diss., 404-407) have exposed hitherto unknown singular readings in Matthew (8:13, 17, 31; 12:48; 13:57; 15:36; 16:22; 20:32; 21:23, 28a, 28b; 26:65; 27:58) and have aligned some ostensible singular readings with other MSS (13:33; 21:10, 21: 27:5).

reading and therefore these are not counted as *singular* in the study (and are relegated to appendix nine).⁷

Some portions of Matthew are not extant in Codex C. There is a lacunae in 1:1-2, as well as eight missing leaves containing 5:15-7:5; 17:26-18:28; 22:21-23:17; 24:10-45; 25:30-26:22; 27:11-46; 28:15-end.⁸

4.1.1. SCRIBE AND CORRECTORS

One scribe is responsible for the initial transcription (scribe A) and there are two correctors (scribes B and C).⁹

4.1.2. DATE AND PROVENANCE

A date of 400-450 is a reasonable estimate for the MS,¹⁰ and was produced, perhaps in Egypt.¹¹

4.2. *NOMINA SACRA*

Several *nomina sacra* are always contracted. Every lexeme of Ihsouj (i8s8, i8u8, i8n8), Xristoj (x8s8, x8u8, x8e8), Qeoj (q8s8, q8u8, q8w8, q8n8), pathr (p8h8r8, p8r8s8, p8r8a8, p8e8r8, p8r8w8n8), mhthr (m8h8r8, m8r8s8, m8r8i8, m8r8a8), Israhl (i8h8l8) and Daueid (d8a8d8) in C in Matthew are contracted as *nomina sacra*. There is one instance of

⁷ In 12:13a Tischendorf records an elision, but Swanson reads a dittograph of kai. Lyon states that for the reading of 12:13a and 12:13b, “Nothing can be seen of traces of the original text. Holes prevent us from telling whether the original scribe wrote more or less than the corrector.” Lyon, “A Re-examination,” Ph.D. diss., 330.

In 14:33, Lyon states that, “Nothing can be seen, even with the infra-red photograph, of the original letters. Two letters undoubtedly have been added, but this is the most we can say with any certainty.” Lyon, “A Re-examination,” Ph.D. diss., 331. According to a very tentative judgment, perhaps the *prima manu* only omitted the article for ploiw in 14:33 (so Lyon).

⁸ Lyon, “A Re-Examination,” Ph.D. diss., 10. See also C 04 in *Codices Graeci et Latini*, in the NA²⁸, 799.

⁹ Lyon, “A Re-Examination,” Ph.D. diss., 19-26.

¹⁰ Lyon, “A Re-Examination,” Ph.D. diss., 15-16.

¹¹ Lyon believes there is “one fairly solid piece of evidence” for an Egyptian provenance, which is the use of the Egyptian form tetraarxhj instead of tetarxhj. Lyon, “A Re-Examination,” Ph.D. diss., 18. The word tetraarxhj is used 6 of 7 times in C. Milne and Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors*, 67 n. 1. On the other hand, Lyon contends that pinpointing the provenance to Egypt may not so easily accomplished, depending on how widespread Alexandrian Greek was at the time. Gregory conjectures that it was written in Egypt before the middle of the fifth century. Gregory, *Canon and Text*, 348.

a lexeme of $\alpha\eta\rho\omega\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\iota$ written in *plene*, found in 10:23 as a part of the *Son of Man* phrase—otherwise, it is always abbreviated ($\alpha\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$, $\alpha\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$, $\alpha\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$, $\alpha\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$, $\alpha\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$, $\alpha\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$, $\alpha\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$, $\alpha\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$, $\alpha\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$, $\alpha\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$).

With $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon\iota$ ($\kappa\eta\eta\eta$, $\kappa\eta\upsilon\eta$, $\kappa\eta\eta\eta$, $\kappa\eta\eta\eta$), $\rho\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ ($\rho\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$, $\rho\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$, $\rho\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$), and $\upsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon\iota$ ($\upsilon\eta\eta\eta$, $\upsilon\eta\upsilon\eta$, $\upsilon\eta\eta\eta$, $\upsilon\eta\eta\eta$, $\upsilon\eta\eta\eta$), there is a clear distinction between sacral instances, which are always abbreviated, and nonsacral instances, which are always *plene*.

The contracted *nomen sacrum* lexemes of $\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$ ($\omicron\eta\upsilon\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$, $\omicron\eta\upsilon\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$) are employed the least of any *nomina sacra* in C in Matthew, occurring only twice (7:21; 16:19). Otherwise, it is always written in *plene*. The *nomen sacrum* form of Ierousalhm ($\iota\eta\lambda\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$) is found in three instances (2:1; 23:37¹, 37²), otherwise it is always written in *plene*.

4.3. THE SINGULAR READINGS IN EPHRAEMI IN MATTHEW¹²

Ephraemi contains 75.25% of Matthew, or 806 of 1,071 verses. The extant material in Matthew produces 75 singular readings, which amounts to one singular reading per 10.74 verses. This is the fewest amount of singular readings of our MSS in Matthew, but singulars occur only *slightly* more frequently than in Vaticanus in Matthew (where there is one singular for every eleven verses).¹³ Itacistic and orthographic changes each occur less often than the most frequent type of alteration, haplography. There is one harmonization to Mark, which is uncharacteristic compared to the other types of readings.

4.3.1. ORTHOGRAPHY AND SPELLING

Hernández found that 15.58% of the singulars in the text of Revelation in Ephraemi are orthographic variations that are comprised of “consonantal confusion (1); vowel

¹² See appendix four.

¹³ Hernández states that his conclusions of scribal habits in C in Revelation “cannot be considered incontrovertible proof of a particular scribal tendency” due to the six absent leaves, yet he could still deduce some scribal habits. Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 135. Ephraemi has 62.22% of the text of Revelation extant, or 252 verses. There is more than three times the amount of verses extant in C in Matthew than Revelation.

replacement (8); and consonantal duplication (3).”¹⁴ Apart from itacistic spellings, he discovers seven different exchanges: a > e (1), e > a (1), ei > h (1), iei > i (1), o > a (1), ou > w (1), and w > ou (2).¹⁵

The orthography in C reflects some of the same changes recorded by Hernández in Revelation and Gignac in the Roman and Byzantine papyri, but there are *more* and *different* spelling variations in C in Matthew than are noted by Hernández and Gignac. This may not only suggest a lack of standardization of the time, but a lack of standardization within Ephraemi (at least between the books of Matthew and Revelation).

4.3.1.1. *Itacisms*

There are not many itacistic spellings in C in Matthew, the greatest being i > ei (11), followed by the reverse, ei > i (3), then e > ai (2) and its reverse, ai > e (1).¹⁶

4.3.1.2. *Vocalic Orthography*

Changes involving vocalic orthography are one of the most common types of singular reading in C in Matthew (12% of the singular readings). Outwith itacisms, other vocalic changes include ai > a (9:15), ai > ei (8:31), eh > h (17:15), ei > e (14:4), h > e (3:10), h > i (24:4), o > a (15:11), o > e (8:32), and either o > ow or w > ow (12:6).¹⁷

4.3.1.3. *Consonantal Orthography*

Few changes in C in Matthew involve consonantal orthography. There is one lingual change (4:21a) and one labial change (16:12).

4.3.1.4. *Letter Omissions*

¹⁴ Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 138.

¹⁵ Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 139-140.

¹⁶ See appendix nineteen.

¹⁷ Lyon suggests that the reading is meizown, but is unsure. Lyon, “Re-examination,” Ph.D. diss., 330. Tischendorf notes that there is something, perhaps an omicron, before the omega in meizwn. Tischendorf, *Codex Ephraemi*, 312.

Omissions of single letters are frequent among the singular readings in C in Matthew (10.66% of the singular readings). When there is no evidence of parablepsis and the reading is unlikely to be an orthographic spelling, there are instances where words are shortened by one letter (8:5;¹⁸ 11:21; 20:19; 27:64).¹⁹ There are two aberrant spellings that occur more than once, Iwsafat > Iwsafa (1:8¹, 8²) and twn > tw (13:44; 26:51).²⁰

4.3.1.5. Letter Additions

There are instances where words are lengthened by one letter (16:22;²¹ 22:10a,²² 26:50; 27:58),²³ and sometimes the addition is a final sigma (4:2, 21b; 7:9).

4.3.1.6. Other Spellings

There are several misconstrued spellings in Ephraemi. There are word-ending confluations (7:16;²⁴ 23:26)²⁵ and inexplicable spellings (2:16;²⁶ 8:21;²⁷ 16:3).²⁸ In

¹⁸ The change from masculine to neuter is nonsense in context. It is not an instance of a moveable nu because it does not occur at the end of a line in C.

¹⁹ The variant in 27:64 is an aphaeresis of epsilon. Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:319.

²⁰ The variant in 13:44 (but not 26:51) is an omission of final nu before a word beginning with a rough breathing on the vowel. Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:112.

²¹ The change from verb, *epitiman*, to noun, *epitimian*, is the difference of a single letter, iota, and could be accidental repetition influenced from the repetitious iotas in the verb.

²² The “curious usage” of *agamoj* in C here could be translated as *unmarried [person]* (BDAG, s.v. *a!gamoj*). Such a translation, however, produces nonsense: *the unmarried person was filled with guests*. If *agamoj* means *single estate*, then the reading in C is grammatically construed, but still nonsense in context (Liddell-Scott, s.v. *a)ga/metoj*). Perhaps the alpha of *agamoj* was accidentally influenced by the preceding *aga* of *agaqouj*. Tischendorf states that the reading of C is *vitiose*, or faulty (Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 1:141).

²³ Lyon writes for this particular variant in 27:58, “What the scribe [of C] thought he was writing is certainly not clear.” Lyon, “A Re-examination,” Ph.D. diss. 404.

²⁴ The reading of C appears to be a nonsense conflation of plural and singular accusative noun endings. Lyon states that scribe A “conflated his two choices.” Lyon, “Re-examination,” Ph.D. diss. 328. Tischendorf writes that the ending is “yolked together” (*coniunxit*). Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum*, 1:32.

²⁵ Lyon states that the scribe “combined suffixes.” Lyon, “Re-examination,” Ph.D. diss., 332.

²⁶ Lyon records *b818e8e8m8* as a *nomen sacrum* for *Bhqleem* (Lyon, “A Re-examination,” Ph.D. diss., 9). This is the only instance of such a spelling in Ephraemi in all of the other occurrences of *Bhqleem* in the MS. In Tischendorf’s transcription (Tischendorf, *Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus*, 5, ln. 23), there is no bar over *bleem* as other *nomina sacra* have in Ephraemi and Lyon makes no note of an error in Tischendorf here. The word *bleem* in Mt 2:16 is unique in that omissions of more than one letter in C in Matthew usually comprise a complete syllable, but not here, which is the omission of *hq*. It is difficult to decide if it is a *nomen sacrum* that occurs nowhere else or a misspelling that occurs nowhere else.

²⁷ The spelling may be influenced by the similar letters of *maqhtwn*, which precedes three words earlier in C.

²⁸ The change *xeimwn* > *xeixwn* may be due to the similar look of the majuscule mu and xi (though that may be a little far fetched).

9:30, the verb $\alpha\nu\omicron\iota\gamma\omega$ has been triple augmented in some MSS ($\eta\nu\epsilon\omega\chi\eta\sigma\alpha\eta$),²⁹ but the text of C* retains the $\omicron\iota$ of the present stem (instead of $\epsilon\omega$). In one instance, there may be a confusion of similar looking letters (24:3b).³⁰

4.3.2. OMISSION AND ADDITION OF SYLLABLES

There are instances where words that are shortened by one or two syllables (4:14; 12:4, 7; 15:2; 20:10b)³¹ and one instance where a word is lengthened by a syllable (26:67).

4.3.3. PARABLEPSIS

4.3.3.1. *Within Words*

In some instances, there is evidence of parablepsis where words are shortened by two letters (8:13;³² 19:1;³³ 21:28b;³⁴ 26:57).³⁵ In other instances, words are lengthened by one letter (10:20)³⁶ or two letters back-to-back (8:17;³⁷ 27:49),³⁸ possibly resulting from letter repetition in the same word, which led to confusion. Most of these singular readings (8:13, 17; 21:28b; 26:57; 27:49) result in either the addition or omission of a syllable.

²⁹ Zerwick, *Grammatical Analysis*, 27-28.

³⁰ The text of C reads $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ instead of the interrogative $\rho\omicron\tau\epsilon$. The change could have been accidental due the similar look of pi and tau. The interrogative is needed with $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ for grammatical construal. Tischendorf calls the change *vitiose*, or faulty. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 1:157.

³¹ There is an omission of $\mu\epsilon$ in 22:10b, which is similar to Rev 6:2 in C. Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 216.

³² The change in $\gamma\epsilon\eta\eta\gamma\eta\tau\omega$ from passive to middle, $\gamma\epsilon\eta\eta\tau\omega$, in C could result from a leap from eta to eta. The passive verb form of $\gamma\iota\eta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ + dative used in similar contexts, Mt 9:29 and 15:28 (Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:32), is not altered in C, but there are other instances where words are truncated where there is evidence of parablepsis.

³³ The omission of the syllable in C, resulting in $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\eta\eta$, may be due to parablepsis. The letter epsilon is found in eight instances in three consecutive words ($\epsilon\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\eta\eta$ being the final of the three words), which may have contributed to oversight due to repetition.

³⁴ The scribe of C may have leaped from omega to omega, transcribing $\rho\tau\omega$ instead of $\rho\tau\omega\tau\omega$. Four of the preceding nine letters are omega ($\rho\sigma\epsilon\lambda\gamma\omega\eta\tau\omega\rho\tau\omega$), which may have created confusion for the scribe.

³⁵ The singular reading in C here omits a syllable in $\alpha\phi\gamma\alpha\gamma\omicron\eta$, creating $\alpha\phi\gamma\omicron\eta$.

³⁶ The additional lambda of $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$ is nonsense.

³⁷ In C here, there is the repetition of $\alpha\iota$. The preceding $\iota\alpha$ of $\delta\iota\alpha$ may have contributed to carelessness while transcribing $\text{H}\sigma\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon$.

³⁸ The scribe repeats $\sigma\omega$ in the word $\sigma\omega\sigma\omega\eta$.

4.3.3.2. Whole Words

Parablepsis is also found when entire words are omitted (13:3-4;³⁹ 13:15;⁴⁰ 15:30;⁴¹ 15:36)⁴² and added (12:47;⁴³ 20:11;⁴⁴ 26:39;⁴⁵ 26:65;⁴⁶ 27:56).⁴⁷ When complete words or letters are added, sometimes the repetition begins a new line of text (2:20;⁴⁸ 7:22;⁴⁹ 17:4).⁵⁰

³⁹ The scribe of C could have jumped from *speirein* in v. 3 to *speirein* in v. 4, which would account for the omission. Regarding the omission in C, Tischendorf states, “*a speir. ad speir. transiliens.*” Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 1:68. The word *speirein* in C begins a new line of text.

⁴⁰ The predicator, *akouswsin*, is omitted due to parablepsis. In the verse, the repetition of *kardia*, *wsin*, and *ofqalmouj* create parablepsis, but this possible instance of haplography would be caused by *wsin*. The omega of *wsin* ends line 25 and *-sin* begins line 26 (folio 22).

⁴¹ The *prima manu* of C could have jumped from *touj* to *touj*, thus omitting *para touj* by haplography. The omission is found at the end of a verse that contains many words ending in *-ouj*.

⁴² If Lyon’s correction of Tischendorf is accurate here, the text of C* does not read *euxaristhsaj*. Lyon, “A Re-examination,” Ph.D. diss., 331, 404. According to the text of C*, then there is no mention of Jesus giving thanks (*euxaristhsaj*) before he distributed the bread and fish to the crowd. Perhaps the parablepsis of *aj* in *ixquaj* and *euxaristhsaj* prompted the scribe to omit by homoeoteleuton.

⁴³ The text of C reads *autw* twice.

⁴⁴ The *kata tou* is repeated.

⁴⁵ The text reads *epesen* twice back to back. Perhaps the parablepsis of *ep* in *epi* and *epesen* caused the scribe to commit dittography.

⁴⁶ The reading is difficult to see in C, but Lyon deciphers the writing after *legwn* in 26:65 as *ti*, not *oti* as posited by Tischendorf (Lyon, “A Re-Examination,” Ph.D. diss., 333). There is a *ti* following *eblasfhmhsen*, which could have been duplicated after *legwn* if the scribe jumped from the *nu* endings of the words.

⁴⁷ The singular portion of the reading in C here is the addition of *kai*, which occurs as the first word of a line of text, preceding the first instance of *Mariam*. It is possible that the parablepsis of *Mariam* (or even *hn/nh Mariam*) caused the repetition of *kai*. Including 26:65, these are the only singular instances in C* in Matthew where the reading precedes the cause of the error in the text; though this is rare, it seems to be caused by parablepsis.

⁴⁸ The first *thn* is written *th 8* at the end of a line in C, then the second *thn* begins the next line.

⁴⁹ The text of *rell* contains a question beginning with *ou*, but the text of C contains a statement that begins with *outwj*. The sentence has the same essential meaning, regardless of whether it is a statement or a question. The singular reading in C, *outwj*, is the final word of a page (folio 9) and then the following *sw* begins a new page (folio 10). The alteration may be a dittograph of the letter sigma, similar to 2:20 where dittography is produced at the end of a line of text. There are instances, however, where a *final sigma* is added without evidence of parablepsis onto a number (4:2 *tesserakontaj*), a name (4:21 *Zebenaïouj*), and a verb (7:9 *aithseij*), all of which result in nonsense. Regarding 7:22, it is not certain what can be gained in context by changing the question into a statement. Hernández notes one occurrence of letter repetition in C in Revelation, the repetition of epsilon in 3:7 *oudeij > oude eij*, which is nonsense in context and occurs in the middle of a line of text (folio 294), not different lines as it is in Mt 7:22. Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 142, 216.

⁵⁰ The line of text ends with *skh*, and the following line begins afresh with *skhnaaj*.

With exception of orthography and letter omissions, the addition of words due to parablepsis is the most common type of singular reading in C in Matthew: dittography accounts for 10.66% of the singular readings.

4.3.4. NONSENSE READINGS IN CONTEXT

Some singular readings in C in Matthew create nonsense in context (5.33% of the singular readings). The readings here are modifications of existing words, rather than complete word additions or omissions, and involve verbal endings (20:32;⁵¹ 21:17a;⁵² 21:23;⁵³ 23:24).⁵⁴ In all of these instances, the word created is an actual word, but in context, it does not make sense.

4.3.5. TEXTUAL IMPROVEMENT

Two singular readings may improve the text (9:2;⁵⁵ 21:1).⁵⁶

4.3.6. INFLUENCE OF CONTEXT

Some of the singular reading could be influenced from the grammatical context (6.66% of the singular readings). A few readings may have been influenced by the

⁵¹ A change from 2p to 2s creates nonsense in C.

⁵² In 21:17a, C* reads the aorist passive 3p form of *aulizomai* instead of the 3s form as in *rell*. The change in verbal number from singular to plural makes the reading inconsistent with the 3s context: *Jesus* left them (*katalipwn autouj*) and *he* went forth (*echlqen*) to Bethany and *he* lodged there (*hulisqh*)—not *they* lodged (*hulisqhsan*). Furthermore, the next verse begins with the singular (*epanagwn* and *epeinasen*); thus the reading in C* here is grammatically inconsistent within the context.

⁵³ The reading of C here, a plural nominative participle, is not a grammatically construed genitive absolute as is the reading in) B D *et al.*, but it could refer to the subject, *oi arxiereij kai oi presbuteroi tou laou*. Following *elqontej*, C still reads the genitive pronoun, *autou*, of the genitive absolute; thus the reading of C does not seem to be grammatically construed.

⁵⁴ With the change from active participle to indicative in C*, the article, *oi*, functions as a personal pronoun, *they*, and *oi de* would be needed for grammatical construal. The mood change eliminates consistency with the other participle in context (*katapinontej*).

⁵⁵ Matthew has eliminated the historic present here (Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:87). The Markan parallel, 2:3 (as well as Lk 5:18), reads the present participle *ferontej*. The conative imperfect (*prosferon*, read in all MSS for Mt 9:2), which is present in function, is actually changed to present in form in C (*prosferousin*). Zerwick, *Grammatical Analysis*, 25.

⁵⁶ The nonsingular addition of *kai Bhqanian* (so C F *f*¹³ 33 *et al.*) is harmonized from Mk 11:1 and Lk 19:29; but the additional *kai* that follows the harmonization in C is a singular reading (and is the only singular addition of a conjunction in Matthew in C). The inclusion of *kai Bhqanian* is somewhat jarring, but the additional *kai* improves the flow of the narrative, which was interrupted by the harmonization, and therefore the additional *kai* in C may have been intentional because it improves the flow of the text (cf. 19:9).

immediate grammatical context (5:10;⁵⁷ 15:32;⁵⁸ 21:28a).⁵⁹ Other readings may have been influenced by a *distant* context rather than the immediate context (22:20;⁶⁰ 25:6).⁶¹ Hernández found that four out of five times the textual context had influenced the scribe to create singular readings in Revelation, but that is much more often than here in Matthew.⁶²

4.3.7. INEXPLICABLE READINGS

There is one omission of a pronoun in the singular readings of C in Matthew (12:48).⁶³ There are a few readings that could be mere oversights (13:57;⁶⁴ 21:17b,⁶⁵

⁵⁷ Here is the only singular reading in Matthew in C when an article is added where there is no evidence of parablepsis. The addition is perhaps influenced from 5:6, *thn dikaiosunhn*, where *righteousness* “is a future object for which men hunger,” whereas in v. 10, *righteousness* is “a quality for which they are persecuted” (McNeile, *Matthew*, 53). In this portion of text in C, each of the nine Beatitudes (5:3-12) begins a new line of text, each line starting with *makarioi*.

⁵⁸ The reading of C in Matthew here contains the same verb in the Markan parallel (Mk 8:1, *legei*). The word *legei* occurs frequently, which perhaps aided in its substitution in place of *eipen*, and is probably not an attempt to harmonize the texts because the substitution makes little of meaning in the text. (Codex C is lacunose in the Markan parallel.)

⁵⁹ The text of C reads *eipen* in place of *eixen* (folio 38). The result is nonsense, mainly because the following complement (*tekna duo*) could be expected to be in the dative case if the man (*anqrwpoj*) were speaking to the two children. There are also occurrences of *eipan* and *eipen* nearby (vv. 27 and 28 respectively) that might have influenced an unintentional alteration.

⁶⁰ The text of C contains a conjunction substitution and adds a relative pronoun. This particular introduction of discourse, *o de legei*, is not common in the gospels (there are four occurrences of *o de legei* in the Gospels: Mt 17:20; Mk 6:38; 16:6; Jn 6:20), but a similar *o de eipen* or especially *eipen de* is found more often throughout the gospels. A few words earlier, in v. 19, is *oi de*, which may have influenced the alteration in v. 20 in C.

⁶¹ Throughout the LXX and NT, the grammatical construction *eij + apanthsin/ upanthsin/ sunanthsin* is used interchangeably with a noun/pronoun in an oblique case. In Mt 25:6, the text of C contains the grammatical construction *eij + sunanthsin* with a dative pronoun. A few verses earlier, in 25:1, the text of C reads *eij + upanthsin* with a dative noun (the phrase in 25:1 contains a dative in C 157, *upanthsin tw numfiw*, as opposed to the genitive in *rell, tou numfiou*). Though there may be a preference for the dative case in 25:1 (with 157) and 25:6 (with 113 163), the singular portion of the reading, *apanthsin > sunanthsin*, produces a grammatically construed reading since it is a familiar Koine Greek construction.

⁶² Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 144 n. 70.

⁶³ Here is the only instance where the original text of C singularly omits a personal pronoun in Matthew, if the reading is certain (Lyon, “A Re-examination,” Ph.D. diss., 331). The omission creates inconsistency with the parallelism involving *mou* that follows (*oi adelfoi mou*) in v. 48, as well in v. 47 where the pronoun *sou* is used with *h mhthr*. The omission, however, creates consistency with the absent pronoun of *h mhthr* preceding in v. 46, but is still, perhaps, an arbitrary omission.

⁶⁴ The omission of *ei* eliminates the idiom, *ei mh*, and results in a difficult reading but is grammatically construed.

⁶⁵ In 21:17b, the omission of *ekei*, a Mattheanisms (Gundry, *Mathew*, 415), in C* may be a simple oversight. Its inclusion is implied in context.

24:45)⁶⁶ one of which is the omission of one adjective where other MSS read two adjectives (12:22a).⁶⁷

4.3.8. HARMONIZATION TO MARK

Perhaps the most interesting singular reading in Ephraemi in Matthew is the harmonization in 24:3a to Mk 13:3. This is certainly a harmonization, but it may not be an *intentional* one.⁶⁸ The addition in C provides details of the whereabouts of the Mount of Olives—it is *opposite the temple*. All other MSS leave out this detail in Matthew. The text of Mk 13:3 reads the same, $\text{oroj tw n elaiwn katenanti tou ierou}$, in C and most MSS. Commenting on Mark, Cranfield states that the location of the Mount of Olives “commanded a view of the Temple across the Kedron valley,” because “it was from the Mount of Olives that the full grandeur of

⁶⁶ The word eautou in 24:45 in C occurs as the first word on the first line of text on a page (folio 43), following a missing folio. The context in Matthew lends itself naturally to the use of a reflexive pronoun, as found in C. Hernández found two instances of changes to reflexive pronouns in C in Revelation, but noted both were “switched arbitrarily,” which may be the case here as well. The change $\text{autwn} > \text{eautwn}$ occurs in Rev 3:4; 18:19a. Weiss notes that the scribe of C has an “unjustified preference” for the reflexive. Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 152, 152 n. 120, 216, 218. The only singular occurrence of a change to reflexive in Matthew in C is here in 24:45.

⁶⁷ The reading in C* in Mt 12:22a bears close resemblance to the parallels (Mt 9:32; Lk 11:14), which make no mention of tuflon . If Holmes’ harmonization criteria were applied to the reading here, this would probably not be considered an intentional harmonization. The material that is harmonized is small, which is only the omission of tuflon kai in C* in Matthew. The parallels, including Mark, are similar and have many commonalities, such as casting out a demon (Mt 9:33; 12:22; Lk 11:14) by the name of demons/Beelzebul (Mt 9:34; 12:24; Mk 3:22; Lk 11:15), the people were amazed (Mt 9:33; 12:23; Lk 11:14); and the statements about a kingdom divided against itself and Satan against himself (Mt 12:25-26; Mk 3:25-26; Lk 11:17-18), which make it easier to include an unintentional harmonization.

The omission of tuflon creates an inconsistency later in v. 22b when Jesus heals the one who is both tuflon and kwn , not just kwn as in v. 22a in C. On the other hand, the presence of parablepsis (the kappas and the $-\text{oj}$ endings), could have caused homoeoteleuton, but that would require two leaps, from $-\text{oj}$ of daimonizomenoj to $-\text{oj}$ of tuflon , then $k-$ of kai to $k-$ of kwn .

⁶⁸ Applying Holmes’ harmonization criteria, it may be intentional, on the one hand, because it is a lengthy addition: it is not the mere omission of a word that brings harmony to Matthew and Mark here, but three words—a complete phrase—that is included *verbatim* from Mark. On the other hand, it could be *unintentional* because the parallels contain the same story (Jesus telling his disciples about End Times signs) and many textual details are similar, such as the prediction about all of the Temple stones being thrown down (Mt 24:2; Mk 13:2); the prediction about many coming in his/Christ’s name (Mt 24:5; Mk 13:6); the prediction about hearing of wars and rumors of wars (Mt 24:), etc. Because of the vast similarities of the parallels, it is possible to consider that, as the scribe was transcribing such similar material, a detail was recalled and placed in an appropriate location. If the scribe was familiar with Mark, that makes it even more plausible that such a detail was recalled from memory. It is not possible to determine, however, if the addition was intentional or not, but it is a harmonization of Matthew to Mark nonetheless.

the Temple could be best seen.”⁶⁹ This is the longest addition in Ephraemi in Matthew and in fact, besides the instances of dittography, this is the only singular reading where more than one word is added to the text of Ephraemi. This may be the only singular reading in all five of our MSS that is obviously a gospel harmonization.

4.4. CONCLUSION

With a few possible exceptions, Hernández notices that C in Revelation “exhibits almost no editorializing and certainly no *clear* theological changes among its singular readings.”⁷⁰ This conclusion also holds in Matthew.

The orthography in C in Matthew agrees with contextual standards in that it hardly deviates from typical Koine usage except in errors. The scribe makes no attempt at Atticizing, thereby, revealing himself to be a product of his colloquial environment.

The scribe does not typically create great errors, that is, usually only one word is modified at a time, but the number of variants that result in haplography and dittography are great. There are many instances where words are shortened or lengthened by one (or two) *syllable(s)* (11),⁷¹ as well as instances where words are shortened (8)⁷² or lengthened by *one letter* (7).⁷³

Generally, most singular readings consist of only minor changes, which is then surprising to find a glaring harmonization in 24:3a to Mark. This instance seems to go against all other proposed habits in C in Matthew. Could this be an instance where there is MS agreement with a non-extant MS? Perhaps, and considering as well the few small differences that could be attempts to improve the text, it would be very difficult to characterize the scribe (by these singular readings) as one who made deliberate attempts to alter the text of Matthew; rather, the scribe typically makes very small changes, ones that do not drastically change the text.

⁶⁹ Cranfield, *Mark*, 393.

⁷⁰ Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 154.

⁷¹ 4:14; 8:13, 17; 12:4, 7; 15:2; 20:10b; 21:28b; 26:57, 67; 27:49

⁷² 1:8¹, 8²; 8:5; 11:21; 13:44; 20:19; 26:51; 27:64.

⁷³ 4:2, 21b; 7:9; 16:22; 22:10a; 26:50; 27:58.

There is an interesting phenomenon in C that most MSS do not seem to feature in their singular readings: the tendency to add more than omit. The scribe creates fewer (percentage-wise) singular readings in Matthew than Revelation, but creates more additions. In Revelation, 11.63% of the singulars are additions,⁷⁴ which is somewhat less than the 13.33% in Matthew. A greater disparity, however, are the percentages of omissions: in Revelation, Hernández records omissions for 48.84% of the singulars,⁷⁵ which is quite outstanding, but a relatively mere 10.66% of the singulars are omissions in Matthew. In Matthew, the calculation reveals that there are more instances of additions than omissions, which is opposite of what is found in Revelation. On the other hand, the amount of text overall that is omitted is greater than what is added: fourteen words are omitted, but thirteen words are added.

The singular readings record several (proposed) mechanical errors, that, if not included in the tally of singular readings, then leaves a one to one ratio of instances of additions to omissions—yet there is still more text added (six words) than omitted (five words).

In the text of Revelation, there are no singular readings in Ephraemi documented as dittography, apart from orthographic duplication of nu.⁷⁶ This is interesting. Usually a scribe commits greater errors toward the end of a MS. Did he get a break before getting to the end? Was he already fatigued when he started Matthew? Can inexperience be a factor in Matthew, gone by Revelation? Ephraemi is a good example of a MS with an array of textual agreement resulting in a codex that is not homogenous from book to book.⁷⁷ It would be interesting to see, then, if the singular readings in Ephraemi are as disparate as its type of text. So far, it seems that from book to book the singular readings and scribal habits are not entirely

⁷⁴ Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 143.

⁷⁵ Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 145.

⁷⁶ Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, see p. 140 for mention of orthographic duplication of nu; and see p. 143-145 for textual addition that are not a result of dittography. There are instances of haplography, both homoeoteleuton and homoeoarchton, in the text of Revelation in Ephraemi. Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 146-147.

⁷⁷ Dunn demonstrates in Matthew that Codex C is closer to Byzantine than another type of text (based on 940 units of variation in Matthew), where as in Mark, C contains “a certain level of independence” from all text types (p. 180), but is most affiliated with Alexandrian and contains minor Byzantine agreements (based on 803 units of variation in Mark), Luke contains good agreement with Alexandrian, Byzantine, and Caesarean texts (based on 814 units of variation), and in John C “presents a strong and uncompromised witness to the Alexandrian text” (p. 248) (based on 551 units of variation). Dunn, “An Examination,” 43, 112; 116, 172; 245-247; 248, 304.

similar, especially the amount of dittography produced. Perhaps a study of the books in-between Matthew and Revelation could help with answers.

CHAPTER FIVE: CODEX BEZAE

5.1. INTRODUCTION

Codex Bezae's textual differences from the majority of MSS cannot help but draw attention. Metzger and Ehrman state, "No known manuscript has so many and such remarkable variations from what is usually taken to be the normal New Testament text."¹ Bezae's "free addition (and occasional omission) of words, sentences, and even incidents" is without a doubt intriguing, but these features do not seem to be found in the singular readings in D.²

Codex Bezae is the only Graeco-Latin bilingual MS of the gospels.³ This chapter will focus on the Greek text of Bezae because, as Epp states, "the Greek of D remains by far the more significant side of this bilingual codex."⁴

The text in both columns is written in sense-lines, or cola, a "regular feature of Graeco-Latin bilingual manuscripts."⁵ There are other biblical Graeco-Latin bilingual MSS, such as Codex Claromontanus (D^P) (a Greek-Latin bilingual MS with a Western text written in sense lines, containing only the Pauline Epistles).⁶ Codex Bezae contains the gospels in the Western order, along with P⁴⁵, Washingtonianus, and Monacensis (X),⁷ as well as Old Latin (*a b e f f f² q*) and Gothic MSS,⁸ and is representative of the Western text type. About the Western text, Metzger writes,

The chief characteristic of Western readings is fondness for paraphrase. Words, clauses, and even whole sentences are freely changed, omitted, or inserted. Sometimes the motive appears to have been harmonization, while at other times it was the enrichment of the narrative by the inclusion of traditional or apocryphal material.⁹

¹ Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 71.

² Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 71.

³ Jordaan, "Variation in Word Order between the Greek and Latin Texts in Codex Bezae", *South African Perspective on the New Testament*, 99. For a list and discussion of Greek-Latin biblical and non-biblical MSS see Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 50-69.

⁴ Epp, *Theological Tendency*, 10. Heimerdinger states, "The use of the Latin side [of Bezae] as a model for the Greek is, however, a matter which is open to a great deal of question." Heimerdinger, "Word Order in Koine Greek," 143.

⁵ Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 73.

⁶ Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 73.

⁷ Hurtado, "Introduction" in *The Freer Biblical Manuscripts*, 1, 5 n. 10.

⁸ Sanders, *The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection*, 27.

⁹ Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 6*.

MSS that share affinities with the so-called Western text in the gospels include P⁶⁹, Sinaiticus (in Jn 1:1-8:38), Washingtonianus (in Mk 1:1-5:30), 0171, the Old Latin, sy^{s.c} (in part), and the early Latin Fathers.¹⁰ In the study here, however, it is apparent that the characteristics of the Western text do not align with the singular readings in D in Matthew.

5.1.1. THE SCRIBE, CORRECTORS, AND BEZAE'S PROVENANCE

One scribe is responsible for the initial text of Codex Bezae. Eighteen other scribes are involved in corrections and/or lectionary notes, ranging in date from the fifth to seventh centuries (and the supplemental material in the ninth century).¹¹ The initial scribe of Bezae is typically considered to have spoken Latin as his primary language and to possess a “working” knowledge of Greek.¹²

The Alands give a brief account of Codex Bezae's origin, stating it “was written in either Egypt or North Africa, probably by a scribe whose mother tongue was Latin,”¹³ but many provenances have been argued.¹⁴ Besides lack of direct evidence of provenance, which is the case of many MSS, the *sui generis* nature of the Graeco-Latin gospel codex makes its provenance especially difficult to discern. The date, as well, is arguable, but 400-450 C.E. is a common assertion.¹⁵

¹⁰ Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 15*. In Acts, the Western witnesses include P^{29 38 48} D E 383 614 1739 sy^{hmg.palms} cop^{G67}, early Latin Fathers, and Ephraem. In the Epistles the Western witnesses include D F G, Greek Fathers to the end of the third century, Old Latin MSS, and early Latin Fathers.

¹¹ Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 48-49.

¹² Billings, *Do This in Remembrance of Me*, 15.

¹³ Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 109.

¹⁴ Parker systematically (yet briefly) eliminates many argued provenances for Bezae, which include Southern Gaul (J.M.A. Scholz), North Africa (E.A. Lowe), Sicily (Ropes), Sardinia (Souter), South Italy (Lake and Brightman), Dacia (Lowe, though he also argued for Sicilian provenance), Antioch (F.H. Chase), Jerusalem (Stone), and even Britain (though Britain was argued posthumously by J.A. Bengel). Parker then contends that Berytus (modern day Beirut) was the birthplace of the MS because of the prominence of Latin there. Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 261, 266-278.

¹⁵ Cavallo's date of 450 C.E. is based on the Greek text, but Parker dates the MS 50 years earlier based on the Latin text. Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 30.

5.2. *Nomina Sacra*

Parker states that in D, the *nomina sacra* denote an imitation of “practices totally archaic for the year 400” because contemporary contractions are not used.¹⁶ The contractions for *Ihsouj* (i8h8s8, i8h8u8, i8h8n8) and *Xristoj* (x8r8s8, x8r8u8, x8r8n8, x8r8e8) consist of three letters rather than two letters as in our other MSS. These two words as well as *Qeoj* (q8s8, q8u8, q8w8, q8n8, q8e8) are always found contracted, never *plene* in D in Matthew.¹⁷ There is one instance where a lexeme of *kuriōj* is written in *plene* (13:27, which is nonsacral), otherwise it is always contracted (k8s8, k8u8, k8w8, k8n8, k8e8).

The only plural instances of *pneuma* are written in *plene* (10:1; 12:45, which are nonsacral), otherwise *pneuma* and its lexemes are always contracted (p8n8a8, p8n8s8, p8n8i8). Normally, *phthyr* is written in *plene*, but the singular genitive (p8r8s8) is found in several sacral instances (11:27; 13:43; 18:10; 26:29). Some occurrences of p8r8s8 are found when Jesus refers to his father (in heaven), e.g. 11:27; 18:10; 26:29, but it is also written in *plene*, *patroj*, when Jesus refers to his father (in heaven), e.g. 10:32, 33.

Lexemes of *anqrwpōj*,¹⁸ *uioj*,¹⁹ *mhthyr*, *ouranoj*,²⁰ *Israh1*,²¹ *Daueid*, and *Ierousalhm* are always written in *plene* in D in Matthew.

5.3. THE SINGULAR READINGS IN CODEX D IN MATTHEW²²

¹⁶ Parker argues that the abbreviations used in *d* vary greatly, which “presents the present situation [of development].” Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 104. That is, there was not yet a set of standard abbreviations for the Latin *nomina sacra*, so the scribe of Bezae abbreviated through a process of trial and error, (as opposed to following an older way as found in the Greek). Parker notes that *deus* is abbreviated in a contemporary way, *d8s8*.

¹⁷ In 4:6¹, the *nomen sacrum* for *qeoj* has no bar over the top: *qs*. Immediately following, the *nomen sacrum* does have a bar: *q8s8*.

¹⁸ The nonsacral *anqrwpwn* in 10:33 occurs at the end of a line and has a moveable nu.

¹⁹ There are no instances of the form *uioj* used in nonsacral instances because of lacunae in the MS (e.g. 1:20; 7:9). In 13:38¹, *uioi* is missing the final iota: *uio*.

²⁰ There are instances where *ouranwn* (always sacral full-word) occurs at the end of a line and has a moveable nu (13:11; 16:19; 19:14)—the same for *ouranon* in its only occurrence at the end of a line (14:19). In 5:48, D* reads *ouranoi j*, but is corrected to *ouranio j* by D^B.

²¹ In 10:6; 15:24, Israel is spelled *Eisrah1* (also noted in appendix twenty).

²² See appendix five.

The majority of Bezae is intact, but there are several lacunae in Matthew: 1:1-20; 3:7-16 (of which there is a supplementary folio but its readings are not included for this study); 6:20-9:2; and 27:2-12. These lacunae calculate to eleven missing folios of the original codex, which contain 121 verses. Of the 948 extant verses of Matthew in D, there are 259 singular readings. One singular reading occurs for every 3.66 verses, which is the greatest ratio of singular readings per verse and the greatest number of singular readings in Matthew of our MSS. Some readings in Bezae are difficult to see because, in some cases, chemicals have been applied to the MS. Even where no chemicals have obfuscated the text, some words are still difficult to see (e.g. 2:21,²³ 23:38).²⁴

There is a high number of orthographic changes, which could be from the scribe using Greek as his second language. As in the other MSS, many changes are grammatical, and there are several change from Koine to Attic and *vice versa*, but there are more instances where Latin has influenced a change. Overall, it seems the Western element that the MS is known for is absent from the singular readings.

²³ The reading of D is difficult to determine in 2:21 as τὴν Ἰσραὴλ or γὴν Ἰσραὴλ because the top bar of the initial letter, tau of gamma, is difficult to see. Both Swanson and Scrivener posit that the reading of D* here is τὴν, and was changed to γὴν by a corrector (Swanson, *Matthew*, 20; Scrivener, *Bezae Codex*, 5, 428). (The *d* text is lacunose here.) In contention of Swanson and Scrivener, it appears that the reading is τὴν, but this is not conclusive as I have not consulted the MS in person. In Bezae, the majuscule gamma, γ, has a slight serif on the top left side and the top right bar appears to have a *very slight* curve upwards, a unique shape since the top of the top bar is level, but the underside of the top bar appears curved. The majuscule taus and pis in the MS sometimes have very faint top bars. In the situation of 2:21, the initial letter of γὴν/γὴν does not have the under-curve of the top bar (as other gammas do), but rather a straight and level line that resembles other taus and pis on the folio which themselves have faint top bars as possible here. Therefore, through consultation of the digital images on the Cambridge website, 2:21 is not recorded as a singular reading in D, but as τὴν Ἰσραὴλ and in agreement with the majority of MSS.

²⁴ An erasure mark is present for the first letter of the pronoun in D*. If the text of D* read a 1p pronoun instead of a 2p (as in *rell*), the reading would be nonsense in context. About the difficulty in D here, Scrivener writes, “*forsan hmwn p.m., sed h periit omnino: u erasum, cujus vestigia jam leguntur, vix primae manus est*” (“Perhaps hmwn first hand, but h has vanished entirely: u has been scraped off, whose traces are presently seen, the first hand is difficult [to see].”) Scrivener, *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis*, 431, n.80b.ln.3). A change in the pronoun from 2p to 1p could result from the similar pronunciation of upsilon and eta (Robertson states that “the N.T. MSS. get mixed over h9mei=j and u9mei=j” since eta and upsilon “came to be pronounced alike as in modern Greek.” Robertson, *Grammar*, 195), although there are no other singular readings involving umwn > hmwn, or *vice versa*, in D. In P⁴⁶, Royse noticed a specific tendency to change forms of umeij to forms of hmeij, and not *vice versa*: 2 Cor 7:11a, 15a; 9:14a, 14b; Eph 6:22; Heb 10:35 (Rom 15:5; Eph 3:13). Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 321.

5.3.1. ORTHOGRAPHY

5.3.1.1. Itacisms

The change $i > ei$ (264) is the most common itacistic spelling in D in Matthew, greatly outnumbering the other itacistic spellings: $e > ai$ (23), $ei > i$ (12), and $ai > e$ (9).²⁵

In a study of D by Urbán, its orthography in Mark is compared to the NA²⁷. It is documented that $i > ei$ occurred most frequently (233 instances), followed by $e > ai$ (76), $ei > i$ (51), and $ai > e$ (34).²⁶ The same itacism exchanges are also found in the same order, from greatest to least, in the singular readings in D in Matthew.

5.3.1.2. Vocalic Changes

Besides itacisms, the vocalic changes are a common occurrence among the singular readings in D in Matthew (accounting for 8.88% of the singulars). The singular readings in D in Matthew witness thirteen types of vocalic changes: $a > e$ (2:6, 8d; 11:25; 18:15b; 25:22), $a > o$ (17:8), $e > a$ (10:8; 11:8; 17:18), $e > ei$ (24:49), $e > h$ (19:12), $e > i$ (12:20b), $h > e$ (2:8a, 16a; 6:12), $ei > e$ (12:41a), $o > a$ (16:4), $o > w$ (21:31), $w > a$ (2:16b), $w > o$ (26:13), and $w > oi$ (4:13). Twice the change $e > h$ occurs with the verb $erxomai$ (12:43; 13:1b).

There is some disparity of non-itacistic vocalic changes in D in Matthew compared to D in Mark (against the NA²⁷). Urbán documented ten similar types of changes,²⁷ eighteen other types of changes were not in the singular readings in D in Matthew,²⁸ but there are three types of changes are not found in Urbán's study that are found in Matthew.²⁹

²⁵ See appendix twenty.

²⁶ Urbán, "Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis (D): Intercambios Vocálicos en el Texto Griego de Marcos," 245-268.

²⁷ Urbán documented $a > e$ (5), $a > o$ (2), $e > a$ (6), $e > ei$ (2), $e > h$ (7), $e > i$ (2), $h(h) > e$ (5), $o > a$ (8), $o > w$ (5), and $w > o$ (4). Ibid.

²⁸ Urbán found $a > ai$, $aa > a$, $a > h$, $ai > e$, $e > o$, $h > a$, $h > ei$, $h(h) > i$, $i > a$, $i > e$, $i > h$, $i > oi$, $o > e$, $oi > u$, $ou > o$, $u > i$, $u > ou$, and $w > ou$, which are not in the singular readings in D in Matthew. Ibid.

²⁹ The changes $ei > e$, $w > a$, and $w > oi$ are not documented in Urbán's study. Ibid.

5.3.1.3. Consonantal Orthography and Other Spellings

The following changes are found in single instances, some of which are identifiably colloquial: interchange of final nu and sigma (13:1a),³⁰ the Attic form $\rho\rho$ instead of $\rho\sigma$ (14:27),³¹ a reduplicated rho (9:36),³² medial sigma omitted before a stop (15:1),³³ omission of gamma before a front vowel (12:41b),³⁴ omission of final nu before a word beginning with a vowel (21:28),³⁵ the addition of a vowel between two consonants, i.e. anaptyxis (26:23b), which is more frequent in “the colloquial nature of the language of the papyri in comparison with the formal nature of inscriptional and other literary or monumental evidence,”³⁶ and a full spelling of $\alpha\rho\omicron$ (25:32a).³⁷ There is a non-itacistic spelling of $\rho\epsilon\iota\eta$ (27:34¹, 34²).³⁸ There is one instance of metathesis (23:33).³⁹ There is a general misspelling of $\upsilon\gamma\iota\eta\eta$ that involves both $\upsilon > \eta$ and $\iota > \upsilon$ (12:13).

5.3.1.4. Consonant Exchanges

As were *vocalic* changes, *consonant* exchanges are among the most frequent type of change found in the singular readings in D in Matthew (accounting for 13.89% of all singulars). The nasal exchanges of $m > n$ occurs often in words beginning with *emp* (11:26; 15:14b; 17:2; 18:14; 23:13; 25:32b; 26:70; 27:29, 30, 41)⁴⁰ and *sum* (18:6, 19a; 19:10). There are two other instances of $m > n$ (4:15; 15:16). The change $\gamma > n$ occurs when gamma precedes a palatal mute or xi (15:32a; 18:15a; 18:27), especially when the palatal mute is another gamma: $\gamma\gamma > n\gamma$ (3:2; 4:17; 11:10;

³⁰ 13:1a $\epsilon\eta$ for $\epsilon\eta$. Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:131-132.

³¹ 14:27 $\rho\rho\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$. Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:142.

³² 9:36 $\rho\rho\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\mu\epsilon\eta\omicron\iota$. The rho has been reduplicated in an Ionic or Hellenistic fashion. BDF, 38, §68.

³³ 15:1 $\rho\rho\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\mu\epsilon\eta\omicron\iota$. Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:130.

³⁴ 12:41b $\eta\epsilon\alpha\eta$ for $\gamma\eta\epsilon\alpha\eta$. Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:72.

³⁵ 21:28 $\tau\omicron$ for $\tau\omicron\eta$ before $\alpha\mu\pi\epsilon\lambda\omega\eta\alpha$ (which is $\tau\omega\alpha\mu\pi\epsilon\lambda\omega\eta\iota$ in NA²⁷). Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:112.

³⁶ 26:23b $\tau\rho\upsilon\beta\alpha\lambda\iota\omicron\eta$. Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:311.

³⁷ 25:32a. Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:315.

³⁸ The MSS) * D contain the same reading, except that) * is an itacism of what D reads. The “vulgar” form $\rho\epsilon\iota\eta$ is “overwhelmingly attested in papyri of the Roman age.” Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary*, sv. $\rho/\iota\eta$.

³⁹ The word $\epsilon\chi\iota\delta\eta$ is found in five instances in the NT (Mt 3:7; 12:34; 23:33; Lk 3:7; Act 28:3). One of which, 23:33, D reads $\epsilon\chi\iota\delta\eta$, perhaps resulting from metathesis.

⁴⁰ The IV/V cent. P¹⁹ reads $\epsilon\mu\pi\rho\sigma\gamma\eta$ along with D in 10:32¹, 32², 33¹, and 33². Unfortunately P¹⁹ is lacunose for other occurrences of $\epsilon\mu\pi\rho\sigma\gamma\eta$. See appendix ten.

13:49b; 15:35; 24:33; 26:18; 27:48). Other changes involve linguals (10:10; 13:41,⁴¹ 52), palatal mutes (10:36; 17:24¹; 22:44), labials (15:37), smooth mutes (27:13), and letters that produce similar sounds, *s* > *z* (12:20c) and *sk* > *c* (5:2).

5.3.1.5. Letter Addition

In one instance, *nu* is added after *eta* (13:34). There are other letter additions, *iota* (12:40) and *sigma* (12:4; 26:45).

5.3.1.6. Letter Omission

There are a few instances of *sigma* being dropped before an *ei* ending (5:41; 9:2; 12:19).⁴² There are also omissions of *alpha* (19:29), *iota* (9:20; 13:38¹), and *nu* (15:22a).

5.3.1.7. Syllable Omissions

There are few omissions of syllables (2:22; 27:54).

5.3.2. NOT CONSTRUED IN CONTEXT

Some gender changes of adjectives do not match the head noun (4:16c).⁴³ Some case changes do not create grammatically construed sentences (4:18,⁴⁴ 6:18c,⁴⁵ 17:20).⁴⁶

⁴¹ In 13:41, D reads *sunlecousin* for *sullecousin*. The lambda that is replaced with the nu (*sull* > *sunl*) reflects an augmented spelling, but without the augment (imperfect: *sunelaloun*). In the previous verse, there is the same *l* > *n* interchange in D (*sunlegontai*) which resembles the Latt and matches the plural noun *ta zizania*.

⁴² 5:41 *aggareuei*; 9:2 *qarei*; 12:19 *akouei* (which is a possible scribal error. So Holmes, "Editorial Activity," 218). Similar omissions are found in Codex W in Matthew: 21:41a; 23:14.

⁴³ In 4:16c, the text of D* reads a masculine adjective in place of a neuter that modifies the neuter *fwj*.

⁴⁴ The noun here is the direct object and should be accusative for grammatical construal. Perhaps the final sigma on previous word, *ballontej*, influenced a change in D*.

⁴⁵ The transcription of *krufia* in 6:18c is difficult to see due to chemical agents on the page (folio 16v). The text of D* probably read *krufia*, which was corrected to *krufaiw* by D^A. The plural accusative form of *krufioj* would be nonsense in context, and should be singular dative to be grammatically construed as it is found in other MSS.

⁴⁶ The reading in D*, *kokkoj*, a nominative instead of an accusative, is nonsensical in context.

5.3.3. INEXPLICABLE READINGS

Some singular readings seem to be inexplicable, such as the spelling $\alpha\pi\omicron\kappa\rho\epsilon\iota\eta\iota$ for $\alpha\pi\omicron\kappa\rho\iota\eta\epsilon\iota\eta\iota$, which occurs in two instances (21:21; 26:23a). Sometimes conjunctions are omitted (4:16e;⁴⁷ 5:25a;⁴⁸ 13:25)⁴⁹ or added (13:1c),⁵⁰ perhaps inexplicably. Some names are declined that are not normally declinable (24:15).⁵¹

5.3.4. PARABLEPSIS

There is no reason to believe that the codex was written by dictation rather than by eye, because, as Parker states, “The evidence for this lay in the high number of readings where the copyist’s eye had been distracted by groups of letters near to those he was attempting to copy.”⁵² Indeed, both letters and words are repeated in the singular readings in D in Matthew that would support Parker’s claim. There are both omissions (12) and additions (12) in D in Matthew that could have resulted from parablepsis. These account for 9.26% of the singular readings in D in Matthew.

⁴⁷ The text in Matthew here is an OT quote. In the source of the quote, LXX Isa 9:1, the $\kappa\alpha\iota$ is omitted in Tischendorf’s *Vetus Testamentum Graece* and the BHS, but not in Rahlfs’ *Septuaginta*. The conjunction is omitted in D* *d* in Matthew.

⁴⁸ In the four other occurrences of $\epsilon\omega\eta\iota + \omicron\tau\omicron\upsilon$ in the NT (Mt 5:25a; Lk 12:50; 13:8; 22:16; Jn 9:18), only in Jn 9:18 does the text of D offer a variant: $\epsilon\omega\eta\iota \omicron\upsilon$ (also P^{66*} 1071). The omission of $\epsilon\omega\eta\iota$ in Mt 5:25a is perhaps an oversight by the scribe of D*.

⁴⁹ The $\kappa\alpha\iota$ in *rell* aids in separation of clauses, but its omission in D* creates a difficult reading.

⁵⁰ The context in Matthew never states that Jesus is *in* a house, but states only that he went *out* of a house (although the word $\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\omega$ may imply a house in 12:46. McNeile, *Matthew*, 187). The omission in D *a b d e f f f*^{1,2} *g*¹ *k* *Sy*^s eliminates such an inconsistency, but the text of D *d* adds a conjunction, which may smooth the text.

⁵¹ The text of D* seems to read a declined form of $\text{D}\alpha\text{n}\iota\eta\lambda$, which is not normally declinable. This may be harmonized with the genitive that follows, $\tau\omicron\upsilon \rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\omicron\upsilon$, but the form $\text{D}\alpha\text{n}\iota\eta\lambda\omicron\eta\iota$ is actually attested elsewhere, in the Epistle of Aristeeus 49, and $\text{D}\alpha\text{n}\iota\eta\lambda\omicron\upsilon$ is witnessed in Josephus (*Ant.* 10, 193). BDAG s.v. $\text{D}\alpha\text{n}\iota\eta/\lambda$.

⁵² Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 30.

5.3.4.1. Haplography

Some word omissions have evidence of one letter of parablepsis (2:9;⁵³ 12:1a).⁵⁴

Some omissions are of one letter when the same letter occurs back-to-back (12:1c;⁵⁵ 15:29).⁵⁶ Some omissions occur within a word itself that has two letters of parablepsis found back-to-back (10:34²),⁵⁷ or between two words (26:16).⁵⁸ Several leaps of two letters within one word are found when there is a single letter of parablepsis (12:41c;⁵⁹ 13:30;⁶⁰ 18:25;⁶¹ 21:46).⁶² One leap is of a two-letter word that has evidence of parablepsis (21:22).⁶³ Another leap leaves partial words remaining, but are still real words (26:1).⁶⁴

⁵³ The ending of akousantej is not transcribed in D* here. It is possible that the scribe leaped from the tau of akousantej to the tau of tou. The word akousan as it stands in D* is a neuter singular participle, which is nonsense in context.

⁵⁴ The text of D does not contain the neuter plural dative article for sabbasin here. Perhaps the scribe leaped from the final sigma of Ihsouj to the sigma of toij or the initial sigma of sabbasin, thus passing over toij.

⁵⁵ In D, there is an addition of a nonsensical genitive article for the accusative staxuj, but perhaps if the exemplar of D read as U W *et al.* rather than *rell*, then the scribe could have leaped from the sigma of touj to the initial sigma of staxuj.

⁵⁶ The scribe writes only one of the consecutive omicrons of to oroj.

⁵⁷ The misspelling in D*, eirhn, could result from a leap from hn to hn within eirhhn.

⁵⁸ The nonsense word in D, apote (or the preposition and conjunction, apo te), could result from a leap from ot to ot in apo tote.

⁵⁹ A leap from alpha to alpha (katakrinousin) would account for the omission of letters within the word in D*.

⁶⁰ It could be possible that the scribe leaped from eta to eta (apoqhkhn), thus creating a nonsense reading.

⁶¹ The omission of do in D* in apodoqhna*i* could have resulted from a leap from omicron to omicron within the word.

⁶² The scribe of D could have leaped from eta to eta (profhthn), which would explain the misspelling.

⁶³ In 21:22, the inclusion of an renders the statement indefinite (Zerwick, *Grammatical Analysis*, 68), but the omission of an in D only slightly minimizes emphasis on the indefiniteness. The omission of such minutiae may be explained as haplography, as it falls between parablepsis: osa an aithshte.

⁶⁴ Zerwick notes that “all five Great Discourses in Mt conclude w[ith] this same formula: kai\ e0ge/neto o3/te e0te/lesen. . . ([7:28;] 11:1; 13:53; 19:1; 26:1).” *Grammatical Analysis*, 21. The text of D is lacunose in 7:28, but agrees with the concluding formula in 11:1 and 13:53. In 19:1, however, the D text and some Latin witnesses read elalhsen in place of eteleesen, and here in 26:1, the D* text reads o telesen in place of ote eteleesen. Grammatically, the reading in D* is either a nominative articular future infinitive without a governing preposition, or an aorist active indicative with a personal pronoun, but neither option is grammatically construed in context: the former option would place a future tense verb in a past tense context, and the latter option has an article functioning as a pronoun, which is not grammatically construed because it is not used in a de or men construction (see Wallace on the article used as a personal pronoun. *Greek Grammar*, 211-212). The reading of D* could have resulted from a leap from ote to etelesen.

5.3.4.2. Dittography

Sometimes words are repeated back-to-back (4:6a;⁶⁵ 13:38a;⁶⁶ 23:3;⁶⁷ 23:6)⁶⁸ and in one instance they are repeated out of order (21:3).⁶⁹ Sometimes letters are repeated back-to-back (10:15;⁷⁰ 11:24a;⁷¹ 13:22;⁷² 21:29).⁷³ Sometimes letters are repeated within a word (6:20;⁷⁴ 26:12;⁷⁵ 27:60).⁷⁶

5.3.5. TRANSPOSITIONS

Most transpositions seem to be merely grammatical in nature rather than for word emphasis. Sometimes the genitive pronoun is placed before the word(s) it modifies (4:24),⁷⁷ or after (5:29).⁷⁸ Sometimes words are transposed to verb > subject (5:18),⁷⁹ or similar (12:4b);⁸⁰ or the reverse: subject > verb (26:26;⁸¹ [or similar

⁶⁵ The text of D* reads a dittograph of $\tau\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ in place of the article $\tau\omicron\upsilon$. Only the latter $\tau\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ in D* here has a bar over the top ($\tau\epsilon\bar{\omicron}\upsilon$) indicating *nomina sacra*. The former $\tau\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ is contracted without the bar ($\tau\epsilon\upsilon$).

⁶⁶ This is a peculiar reading in D*. The scribe repeated lettering, $\tau\eta\jmath$ *bas*, which was later erased (the top bar of the tau was erased, only leaving a vertical line, which then acts as the missing iota in $\upsilon\iota\omicron$, see 13:38¹). An explanation can become convoluted, involving the scribe mistaking the vertical line of the missing final iota of $\upsilon\iota\omicron\iota$ as the vertical line for the tau of $\tau\eta\jmath$, then continuing on to copy $\tau\eta\jmath$ *bas*, then becoming confused and recopied $\tau\eta\jmath$ *basileiaj*.

⁶⁷ The D* text reads a dittograph of two words. The addition of *panta* $\omicron\upsilon\omicron$ is not grammatically construed.

⁶⁸ The text of D* repeats the article, $\tau\eta\eta$, for *prwtokleisian*.

⁶⁹ The scribe may have leaped (from $\nu\upsilon$ to $\nu\upsilon$ of $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\eta\eta$ *xreia* $\eta\eta$) and copied *exei* out of place, then copied the missing *xreia* $\eta\eta$ and continued onto copy *exei* again.

⁷⁰ The *prima manu* of D may have copied the eta of *hmera* twice.

⁷¹ The dative of $\gamma\eta$ is needed here, rather than $\gamma\eta\jmath$ as in D. Perhaps the scribe merely copied the sigma of *Sodown* twice.

⁷² The text of D* here reads a plural accusative $\rho\lambda\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\jmath$ rather than the singular genitive $\rho\lambda\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ in *rell*. The reading of D* does not fit the context or the definite article $\tau\omicron\upsilon$. Perhaps the initial sigma of *sunpneigei* was copied twice, and therefore, the mistake is the result of dittography.

⁷³ The *prima manu* of D repeats the prepositional prefix of *metamelhqeij*, possible by leaping back from the second instance of *me* in the prefix.

⁷⁴ The letters $\omicron\upsilon\jmath$ are repeated in $\eta\eta\sigma\alpha\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\jmath$ in D*.

⁷⁵ In D* here, *matoj* is repeated in the word *swmatoj*. This could result from a leap back from the μ of *mou* to the μ of *swmatoj*.

⁷⁶ The text of D* reads a dittograph of $\eta\eta\lambda\iota\sigma\alpha\jmath$ within *proskulisaj* (the text of *d* reads a participle rather than an indicative as in *Latt*).

⁷⁷ The word order in D here within the subject is transposed to genitive pronoun > noun.

⁷⁸ In the transposition in D, the $\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ does not interrupt the attributive position of \omicron $\omicron\eta\eta\lambda\mu\omicron\jmath$ and \omicron $\delta\epsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon\jmath$ as in *rell*. The transposition of words occurs within the subject and results in the word order of noun > adjective > genitive pronoun.

⁷⁹ The word order in D *d* here is predicator > subject.

⁸⁰ The order of the two predicators is rearranged in D so that the complementary participle, *econ*, follows the verb, *hn*.

(12:1b)].⁸² Sometimes the word order of noun > adjective creates a singular reading (18:28).⁸³ One transposition may be for word emphasis, rather than purely grammatical reasons (16:22b).⁸⁴

5.3.6. SYNONYM SUBSTITUTIONS

Some words are substituted with words that are better suited for the context (10:28;⁸⁵ 15:27a;⁸⁶ 16:3).⁸⁷ Twice, words are replaced with more common words (2:8c;⁸⁸ 6:18a).⁸⁹ One pronoun is replaced with the noun it represents (15:14a).⁹⁰ One

⁸¹ Following the genitive absolute in 26:26, in D the word order reads subject (o Ihsouj) > verb (labwn), rather than verb > subject as in other MSS.

⁸² The transposition in D of tillein and staxuj is complement > predicator.

⁸³ The text in D *d* is transposed within the complement to noun > adjective. (The number ekaton (100) is abbreviated as r8 in D here. There is no abbreviation here in *d*.)

⁸⁴ The context of the pericope is a “remarkable act” by Peter to “reprove” Jesus. Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:480. The touto refers to the suffering Jesus must undergo, made explicit in 16:21. The words touto and soi are transposed in D (D also reads an orthographic spelling of estai). The emphasis seems to fall on the final element, soi. Thus in Bezae the sentiment is not that *this* (touto) suffering could not happen, but it could not happen *to this person* (soi), i.e. Jesus.

⁸⁵ The verb sfazw is used to describe brutal homicide as well as murder in sacrificial contexts, but the context of 10:28 is within admonishments about persecution. In particular in the NT, the verb sfazw is used with lamb (arnion) in Rev 5:6, 12; 13:8. BDAG, s.v. sfazw. In LXX Zech 11:4, 7, the noun sfagh is used with probata: ta probata thj sfaghj. BDAG, s.v. sfagh. The use of sfazw with yuxh is only found in Rev 6:9, which refers to martyrs, taj yuxaj twn esfagmenwn dia ton logon tou qeou. If sfazw + yuxh alludes to martyrdom, then the scribe of D* in Mt 10:28 has chosen specific wording to emphasize the surrounding context of persecution in Matthew because the D text reads the combination of sfazw + yuxh.

⁸⁶ The reading of D here is yeixwn, rather than the diminutive y(e)ixiwn in *rell*. Holmes notices that in all three occurrences of the diminutive yixion in the NT (Mt 15:27a; Mk 7:28; [Lk 16:21 yixiwn is omitted in P⁷⁵] * B L it sy^{s.c} sa^{mss} bo^{pt} CI NA²⁷), the D text always reads the non-diminutive yic (“Editorial Activity,” 183). Outside of the NT, the diminutive form is found in Archig^{ap.Orib.8.23.5} (2nd cent. C.E.) referring to “stomach residue after emesis.” (Liddell-Scott, s.v. yixi/on) The non-diminutive form is found in several authors (Plu^{2.77f} [1st-2nd cent. C.E.]; Aret^{CD2.12.CA2.11} [2nd cent. C.E.]; Alex.Aphr^{Pr.1.40} [3rd cent. C.E.]; Hsch [5th? cent. C.E.]) referring to breadcrumbs (Liddell-Scott, s.v. yi/c), which is the context in Mt 15:27a. Therefore, the text of D reads a form that is more associated with breadcrumbs than the diminutive, which regards gastronomy.

⁸⁷ In 16:1-4, the word ouranoj is found in four instances. In the third instance (16:3), the text of D reads ahr instead of ouranoj (*d* and the Latin witnesses read *caelum*, which can be translated as *sky* or *heaven*). Because the context of vv. 2-3 concerns notions of sky and the weather, this could have prompted the scribe of D to substitute o ouranoj with the more precise o ahr, signifying *atmosphere* or *sky*. As it stands in *rell*, there is “a deliberate play on the word ‘heaven/sky’ as it occurs in the request, v.1” (Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:455), but the D text exposes the *double entendre* with the reading of o ahr.

⁸⁸ The word epan is a *hapax legomenon* in Matthew (Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:245) and occurs in only two other instances in the NT (Lk 11:22, 34). In one of those instances (Lk 11:34), the text of D reads epan with the majority of MSS, whereas in the other instance (Lk 11:22), the text of D reads ean in place of epan. The result of the singular reading in 2:8c (and Lk 11:22) is that an uncommon word is replaced with a word that occurs more frequently in the NT.

⁸⁹ The text of D reads a word that is used more commonly in conjunction with a subjunctive (fanhj). Although opwj is also common, Wallace states, “The single most common category of the

adjective is replaced with a similarly spelled adjective (20:10),⁹¹ and another one is substituted with a dissimilarly spelled word (10:16).⁹² Other substitutions are found with a proper noun (23:39)⁹³ and an adverb (25:17).⁹⁴

5.3.7. DEFINITE ARTICLES

Turner states, “Codex Bezae will often omit the art[icle] in an arbitrary way, perhaps through Latin influence.”⁹⁵ Concerning singular readings in D in Matthew, the article is omitted in a few instances in front of the names *Jesus* and *Magdalene*.

Alterations involving definite articles account for 11.19% of the singular readings in D in Matthew.

5.3.7.1. Proper Names

In some instances, articles are omitted with proper names or titles (9:33;⁹⁶ 16:13b).⁹⁷

In three instances each, the nominative articles for Jesus (14:31; 27:46; 28:16) and

subjunctive in the NT is after *ina*, comprising about *one third* of all subjunctive instances.” *Greek Grammar*, 471.

⁹⁰ The reading of *rell* has *autouj* referring to either *pasa futeia* in 15:13 or the Pharisees in v. 12 (Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:436). The reading in D *d*, however, records *touj tuflouj* instead of an ambiguous pronoun; thus, this reading refers to “the blind leaders of the blind” subsequent in 15:14a. The alteration may result from parablepsis of the forms of *tufloj* in proximity (although *d* contains the same variant without parablepsis), or this might be an attempt at clarifying the text. Even though the Pharisees are being referred to as *blind* in v. 14, it is not until after *autouj* that Jesus makes the comparison (*tufloi eisin*); therefore, this would be a preemptive clarification.

⁹¹ In 20:10, the comparative adjective is *pleion* in some MSS, but is replaced in D with *pleiw*, an indeclinable form (Moulton-Milligan, *s.v. plei/wn*). The form *pleiw* is also found in Mt 26:53 in) * B D.

⁹² Instead of *akeraiouj* (*harmless*), the text of D links *aplothj* (*guileless*), with doves, which Davies and Allison commend as a “good interpretation.” Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:181. Commenting on the text represented in *rell*, Luz states, “The dove’s purity fits well with the sheep’s nonviolence.” Luz, *Matthew*, 2:88. The connotation of doves with purity/guileless works well in context.

⁹³ This is the only singular reading in Bezae in Matthew where another noun is substituted for *qeouj* or *kurioj* (the text reads a *nomina sacra*, so it is a difference of one letter in Greek, *k8u8 > q8u8*, or two letters in Latin, *d8m8o8 > d8e8i8*). This portion of 23:39 is from Ps 118:26, *blessed is the one coming in the name of the Lord*. In other occurrences of Ps 118:26 in the NT, e.g. Mt 21:9; Lk 13:35; 19:38; Jn 12:13, Bezae reads *Lord*. The words *qeouj* and *kurioj* can be used interchangeably here without altering the meaning of the text, so perhaps the substitution was merely used to be specific, as opposed to a theological heightening.

⁹⁴ The adverb that modifies *o autoj* in *rell*, *wsautwj*, is replaced with a synonymic adverb in D, *omoiwj*.

⁹⁵ Turner, *Syntax*, 173.

⁹⁶ The scribe omits the masculine singular dative article for *Israhel*.

⁹⁷ Nolland comments on the reading in D here (omission of article for *uion*), stating that the article is omitted because the scribe “is concerned to avoid any impression that John the Baptist or the other figures are being identified as ‘the Son of Man’.” *Matthew*, 655 n. b-b. On the other hand, if the

Magdalene (27:56;⁹⁸ 27:61a;⁹⁹ 28:1) are omitted. Only in two instances are articles added with proper names, both of which are genitive (12:42;¹⁰⁰ 15:39b).¹⁰¹

5.3.7.2. Common Nouns

There are many instances where articles for common nouns are omitted (5:3;¹⁰² 5:48;¹⁰³ 6:18b;¹⁰⁴ 6:18d;¹⁰⁵ 10:13²;¹⁰⁶ 10:35;¹⁰⁷ 13:16b;¹⁰⁸ 19:28²;¹⁰⁹ 21:13;¹¹⁰ 24:21),¹¹¹ likewise, it is added in several instances (11:11a;¹¹² 11:11b;¹¹³ 11:16;¹¹⁴ 12:12;¹¹⁵ 18:19b;¹¹⁶ 27:15).¹¹⁷

5.3.7.3. Verbs

In one instance, the article is supplied with an equative verb (27:16).¹¹⁸ In another instance, the article is omitted when it belongs to a substantival participle (23:16).¹¹⁹

scribe is free with use and nonuse of the article, which is likely the case, then not much weight may be given to such a minor omission.

⁹⁸ The text of D* does not read the article for Magdalhnh.

⁹⁹ The text of D* does not read an article for Magdalhnh, which is also the reading in the Markan parallel in D (Mk 15:47).

¹⁰⁰ The genitive article is supplied in D* with the first occurrence of *Solomon* in 12:42.

¹⁰¹ The text of D reads the feminine singular genitive article with *Magadan*.

¹⁰² The neuter singular dative article is omitted in D* for *pneumatī*.

¹⁰³ The text of D* does not read the plural dative article for *ouranoi*.

¹⁰⁴ The reading of D* does not include the article for *krufia* (changed to *krufaiw* by D^A). The article is added by D^{CorrC}.

¹⁰⁵ As in 6:18b, *tw* is omitted in D for *krufaiw* in 6:18d.

¹⁰⁶ The D* text does not read the feminine singular nominative article for *eirhnh*.

¹⁰⁷ The masculine singular genitive article is omitted before *patroj*, but is retained before *mhtroj* in the same verse.

¹⁰⁸ The text of D does not read the neuter plural nominative article for *wta*.

¹⁰⁹ The reading in D* here omits the feminine plural accusative article for *dwdeka*.

¹¹⁰ The D* text does not include the nominative article for *oikoj* here.

¹¹¹ The neuter singular genitive article is not witnessed in D (in *rell* it is used as a substantive with the adverb, rendering the translation of *ewj tou nun* as *until the present*. Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 231-232). The preceding phrase, *ap arxhj*, does not have an article in all MSS, which is a common omission in prepositional phrases—even more, it is especially common for prepositional phrases not to have an article when the genitive follows, as it does here. Zerwick, *Grammatical Analysis*, 79. Perhaps the omission of the *tou* in D following *ap arxhj* is somehow influenced from preceding construction of prepositional phrase + genitive.

¹¹² The text of D* reads a masculine plural dative article for *gennhtoi* here.

¹¹³ The text of D* reads an article for *gunaikwn* here.

¹¹⁴ Of the MSS that read the feminine singular accusative *agora* (as opposed to the plural dative *agoraij*), D is the only one that includes an article.

¹¹⁵ The D* text reads a neuter singular genitive article for *probatou* here.

¹¹⁶ The neuter singular genitive article is read with *pragmatoj* in D*.

¹¹⁷ The article for *eorthn* is read in D here.

¹¹⁸ The text of D reads the article with the equative verb (see Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 436, for uses of equative verbs).

¹¹⁹ The text of D* does not read the article for substantival participle *legontej*.

5.3.7.4. Genitive Absolute Construction

In one instance of a genitive absolute, the text of D reads an articular genitive absolute (13:6a).¹²⁰

5.3.8. ATTIC, KOINE, HEBRAIC, AND LATIN CONSTRUCTIONS

Read-Heimerdinger notices that there are “conflicting conclusions” as to whether the language in D is more colloquial (so Parker) or classical (so Delebecque).¹²¹ As far as singular readings are concerned, there are instances of both, Koine (5) and classical (4), features in D in Matthew, but there are more instances where Latin seems to have influenced a change (9).

Sometimes there is a de-Atticization of the Greek in the singular readings (27:1;¹²² 28:2),¹²³ but some grammatical constructions are more classical than Koine (13:46a;¹²⁴ 14:25;¹²⁵ 19:28¹;¹²⁶ 24:19).¹²⁷ There are instances where aorist

¹²⁰ The grammatical construction in D here is an articular genitive absolute. The text of D reads the masculine singular genitive article with the noun *sun* (hliou).

¹²¹ Read-Heimerdinger, *The Bezan Text*, 175, 175 n. 4.

¹²² The word *wste* in 27:1 is “normally consec[utive, but] here final.” Zerwick, *Grammatical Analysis*, 91. The conjunction *wste*, a “favorite” of Matthew’s (Gundry, *Matthew*, 552), is replaced with *ina* in D and the verb is future indicative (also 69^{ms}) rather than aorist infinitive. The use of *wste* + infinitive is found in classical Greek and in 27:1 would mean to suggest an intended result. BDF §391.1-3. In the NT, however, “a *ina*-clause so often serves as periphrasis for the infinitive,” and the future indicative has been “introduced to a very limited degree in the very places where it would *not* have been permissible in classical, i.e. after *ina* and final *mh*.” BDF §369.1-2. Thus, here the text of D manifests Koine grammar (*ina* + future indicative) rather than Classical (*wste* + infinitive).

¹²³ The D text reads *apo* instead of *ek* in *rell*. The meaning is essentially the same in D (*descended from heaven*) and *rell* (*descended out of heaven*). The change from *ek* to *apo* is a de-Atticization of the Greek (Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:44).

¹²⁴ The reading in D is a different verb and tense than in *rell*. The perfect tense verb in *rell*, *pipraskw*, “has no active aorist” (Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, §289), but in context, the aorist is found “wanting” in the verb (Zerwick, *Grammatical Analysis*, 44). The scribe of D has changed to a different verb, *pwlew*, and altered the tense to aorist. The change from a perfect form of *pipraskw* to an aorist form of *pwlew* in D reflects an older grammatical familiarity “because the perfect in later Greek use lost its specific sense and became a simple narrative tense like the aorist.” Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, §289. In addition, the BDF states, “There are scattered traces of the late use of the perfect in narrative.” BDF §343.

¹²⁵ The change from dative to genitive agrees with *thj nuktoj* that follows. Now the whole phrase is in the genitive of time. BDF §186.

¹²⁶ The word *dekaduo* is found in Ptolemaic papyri in place of *dwdeka* (Moulton-Milligan, s.v. *dekadu/o*; BDF §63.2). Though it is written in full here in D, the second occurrence of *dwdeka* in D (and) in 19:28 is abbreviated, *i8b8*.

¹²⁷ The present active participle of *rell* is in the middle voice in D, which forms a *hapax legomenon* in the LXX and NT (except D [and 28] in the gospel parallels Mk 13:17; Lk 21:23; read *qhlazomenaij*). The verb is used transitively in Matthew, which is similar to the use found in P.Lond 951^{verso2ff} (late 3rd cent. C.E.), *qhlazein*, but there it is active in voice. Moulton-Milligan,

subjunctives are replaced with future indicatives, which is a Koine feature¹²⁸ (5:25b;¹²⁹ 5:25c;¹³⁰ 27:64),¹³¹ two of which are modified by *mhpote* (5:25b and 27:64). One singular reading creates a Hebraicism (5:40a).¹³²

While some singular readings seem grammatically Attic, Koine, or Hebraic, Latin seems to influence spelling rather than grammar. In two instances, proper names in the genitive case are spelled with *-ouj* endings when the Latin forms end with an *s* (2:1;¹³³ 11:12).¹³⁴ Several other singular readings resemble Latin spellings (2:11; 3:4; 13:44a; 21:9¹, 9², 15; 26:6).¹³⁵

5.3.9. INFLUENCE FROM CONTEXT

The influence from context seems to be the most common cause of alteration in the singular readings in D in Matthew (accounting for 12.35% of the singular readings). In many instances, singular readings seem to be influenced from preceding text (5:10;¹³⁶ 5:12b;¹³⁷ 5:24;¹³⁸ 5:36;¹³⁹ 11:3;¹⁴⁰ 12:26;¹⁴¹ 12:28;¹⁴² 12:34;¹⁴³ 13:48a;¹⁴⁴

s.v. *qhla/zw*. The verb is, however, found in the middle voice in Arist.^{GA773a13} (4th cent. B.C.E.), *ou sullambanousi qhlazomenai*. Liddell-Scott, s.v. *qhla/zw*. The use of the middle voice in D in 24:19 seems to be classical.

¹²⁸ BDF §363.

¹²⁹ Instead of an aorist subjunctive form of *paradidwmi*, the text of D reads a future indicative. The conjunction *mhpote* usually modifies a subjunctive (as seen in the parallel, Lk 12:58 [katakrein*h* in D]), but in Mt 5:25b (and Heb 3:12) it modifies a future indicative (cf. *mhpw*j** which modifies a perfect indicative in Gal 4:11). BDF §370.

¹³⁰ Davies and Allison state that one of several ways Matthew alters Q differently than Luke (in Lk 12:58) in Mt 5:25 is that Matthew constructed the sentence so that the verb in 5:25b, *paradw*, is implicitly read into v. 25c after *o krith*j** instead of being explicitly stated. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:519-520. Codex D reads the future indicative form of *paradidwmi* in both v. 25b and 25c rather than the aorist subjunctive. (The Latin *d* is aligned with the majority of Latin MSS, reading the subjunctive *tradat* in both v. 25b and 25c, as opposed to reading a future with D.)

¹³¹ The aorist subjunctive *eipwsin* in 27:64 is a future indicative in D. The conjunction *mhpote* modifies *kleywsin* and *eipwsin* in v.64, but only *eipwsin* is changed to a future indicative.

¹³² In 5:40a, the nominative participle in D (*o qelwn*) followed by *autw* is “in the Hebraic manner,” McNeile states, “which is possibly the true reading.” McNeile, *Matthew*, 69-70. In addition, “anacoluthon (without a relative clause) following an introductory participle [e.g. 5:40a] is Semitic,” and “a comparable usage is found in classical.” Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:454; BDF §466.4.

¹³³ The spelling of *Hrwdou* in D as *Hrwdouj* could have been influenced from the nominative form, *Hrwdhj*, or perhaps the Latin *Herodes*.

¹³⁴ The reading in D*, *Iwannouj*, should be genitive to be grammatically construed.

¹³⁵ In 26:6, the spelling is probably influenced from the Latin, *leprosi* (so BDAG, s.v. *lepro/j*). The spelling in D* is a *hapax legomenon* in the NT and LXX. The word is also used adjectivally in the parallel, Mk 14:3, but D reads *leprou*.

¹³⁶ The verb in D here, *este* in place of *estin*, is probably an orthographic spelling of the 3s future indicative *estai* rather than a 2p present indicative form of *eimi* (i.e. *este*). The orthographic change *ai* > *e* is found in *estai* in other instances in D as well as other verbs (cf. 1:23; 9:2; 16:19², 22; 19:27; 21:37; 22:28 in appendix twenty). In addition, the verb in *d* here is 3s future

13:49a;¹⁴⁵ 18:22;¹⁴⁶ 19:6;¹⁴⁷ 21:5;¹⁴⁸ 21:39;¹⁴⁹ 24:30b;¹⁵⁰ 27:59;¹⁵¹ 27:61b).¹⁵² There are few instances where the inclusion of articles is probably influenced from the

indicative, *erit*). The change from present, *estin*, to future, *estai*, in D fits well in context of the Beatitudes, and would imply a future reward of heaven: “Blessed are the persecuted for sake of righteousness, because theirs *will be* the kingdom of heaven” (emphasis added). All but one of the preceding Beatitudes (5:3) imply future rewards (5:4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9), and therefore, the text of Bezae here could have been influenced by the previous futuristic context.

¹³⁷ The change from accusative *uparxontaj* to genitive *uparxontwn* could be due to influence from the ending of the preceding word, *umwv*.

¹³⁸ The imperative verbs in *rell* and D here are synonyms, translated *be reconciled*. The short parables in 5:23-24 and 5:25-26 pertain to reconciliation and so the verb in D fits well in context. France, *Matthew*, 202. The preposition *kata* is found in the previous verse, which could have influenced a change of the verbal prefix, *dia-* to *kata-*, in D.

¹³⁹ The word transposition in D is also found in *dk Cyp*¹⁷⁸ Aug^{semel}. The singular element of the D* text here is the present infinitive verb, *poiein*, in place of an aorist infinitive, *poisai*, that is found in most MSS. A present tense indicative verb (*dunasai*) precedes the singular reading and could have influenced the *prima manu* of D to continue with the present tense in his transcription of the following verb.

¹⁴⁰ The noun *erga* from the previous verse could have influenced an unintentional change in D* in 11:3, *erxomenoj* > *ergazomenoj*.

¹⁴¹ The “synonymous expressions” in 12:25, *erhmoutai* and *ou staghsetai*, are not as synonymous in D* as they are in most MSS because in D* they are not all in the same verbal voice (in 12:25, *sthsetai* is read in D* *f*¹³ 174 230 788 826 828 983). Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:342. The reading in the following verse in D, 12:26, is a singular reading, *sthsetai*, a change from passive to middle, which could have been influenced from the same verb *sthsetai* in v. 25 in D* *f*¹³ *et al.*

¹⁴² The verbal number in D* does not fit the grammatical context. There are no other verbal ending changes such as this in D* that are singular readings. Therefore, in D* here, this may be a scribal slip from 3s to 3p, influenced from the previous plural noun, *ta daimonia*.

¹⁴³ The addition of *agaqa* clarifies the text since both *agaqa* and *ponhroi* are mentioned previously in the verse (cf. *ff*² where the opposite of *agaqa* is used, i.e. *mala*).

¹⁴⁴ The reading in D here is an aorist indicative, as opposed to an aorist participle in *rell*. The reading in *d* is also indicative, but future tense, as opposed to the present participles (*educentes*, *ducentes*) or perfect indicatives (*eduxerunt*, *duxerunt*, *posuerunt*, *imposuerunt*) in the Latin variants. The verb *anabibzein* (used only here in the NT) is mainly classical (McNeile, *Matthew*, 204). The reading in could have been influenced from the preceding word, an aorist indicative (*ephrwqh*).

¹⁴⁵ The phrase uttered at the end of 13:40, in which *sunteleia (tou) aiwnoj* is repeated from v. 39 (Nolland, *Matthew*, 560), is identical to the phrase in *rell* that begins 13:49: *outwj estai en th sunteleia tou aiwnoj* (Gundry, *Matthew*, 280; Nolland, *Matthew*, 569). In D in 13:49 however, the “common eschatological term” *aiwn* is substituted with *kosmou* (Gundry, *Matthew*, 272), which the latter “is a broad term for both the created universe . . . and for human society in general” (France, *Matthew*, 535). The nearest use of *kosmoj* before v.49 in D is within the same eschatological context in v.38 (though in different parables). The *kosmoj* in v.38 may refer to “the widespread extension of the kingdom through evangelism” (Gundry, *Matthew*, 272), which “points to a time when missionary activities had spread much further” than Palestine (McNeile, *Matthew*, 200). The text of D contains a variant due perhaps to the physical, earthly, terms of the preceding verses (vv. 47-48), terms that have more consonance with *kosmoj* than *aiwnoj*, e.g. *a net cast into the sea* (*saghnh blhqeish eij thn qalassan*), *bringing onto the shore* (*anabibasantej epi ton aigialon*), *put the good into the vessels* (*sunelecan ta kala eij aggh*), and therefore the scribe could have been influenced by the preceding context.

¹⁴⁶ The D text reads an adverb, *eptakij*, instead of the adjective *epta*, which may have been influenced by other words ending in *-takij* in vv.21-22, such as *potakij*, *eptakij* (twice), and *ebomhkontakij*.

¹⁴⁷ The preceding verb in context, *sunezeucen*, is compounded. The verb change *xwrizetw* > *apoxwrizetw* in 19:6 in D parallels the previous compound verb naturally because they are antonyms. The text of D may have been influenced from the grammatical context with the

previous words (13:48b;¹⁵³ 24:30a).¹⁵⁴ One addition could be a harmonization with the preceding context (15:22b).¹⁵⁵

Only two, however, seem to be influenced from preceding text (12:18a;¹⁵⁶ 26:53).¹⁵⁷

change to compound here in 19:6. The simple verb in 19:6 in *rell*, *xwrizetw* (*separate*), is, however, more commonly used in the context of divorce than the compound. BDAG, s.v. *xwrizw* and s.v. *apoxowizw*.

¹⁴⁸ The word *upozugion* in D* is part of a quote from Zech 9:9. Looking at the entirety of 21:5 in the NA²⁷, the first four words agree with LXX Isa 62:11 (*eipate th qugatri Siwn*); the next ten words agree with LXX Zech 9:9 (*idou o basileuj sou epxetai soi prauj kai epibebhkwj epi*); and the final six words agree with MT Zech 9:9 (*onon kai epi plwn uion upozugion*). Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:118-119. The final word, *upozugion*, in the NA²⁷ is *genitive* and parallels the MT, but the D* text reads an *accusative* instead and parallels the LXX. (Though the D* text agrees here with the LXX, earlier, the D* text omits *kai*, along with *61 a b e ff^{1 2} h v g^{ed} fu san gat fr aeth Cyp*, which deviates from the LXX.) The final six words in D* do not conform to LXX Zech except for *upozugion*. Instead of being a harmonization to LXX Zech, it is possible that the alteration to accusative was merely influenced from the previous word, *uion*.

¹⁴⁹ The verb ending *-an* in *ecebalan* in D is a 1st aorist ending; but a 2nd aorist ending, *-on*, would be expected on the 2nd aorist stem *ecebal-*. Perhaps the ending of the previous aorist verb, *apekteinan*, influenced a change in the following verb, *ecebalon*, in D. (The word order in D, as well as *Q a b c d e ff² h r^{1 2} geo Iren^{int} Lucif Iuvenc*, is transposed so that *apekteinan* is placed before *ecebalon/ecebalan*.)

¹⁵⁰ The text of D reads dative plural (*ouranoi j*) instead of singular (*so rell*), but *d* remains dative singular (Parker states that the Latin in 24:30, *caelo*, may attest to a harmonization. *Codex Bezae*, 203). Of the four occurrences of *ouranoj/caelum* in vv.29-30, *d* always reads a singular (either *caelo* or *caeli*), where D reads two singulars (*ouranoi j*, *ouranou*) and two plurals (*ouranwn*, *ouranoi j*). Only in one instance do D and *d* agree here (*tou ouranou* and *caeli* in v.30). The previous occurrence of *ouranoj* in v. 29 is plural, which could have influenced a change following in v.30 to plural. Parker states that D was influenced by the context (*Codex Bezae*, 202), which is presumably the former *twn ouranwn*.

¹⁵¹ The text of D reads a compound verb as opposed to the simple verb in *rell*. (The text of *d* reads a cognate of the Latt reading.) The preceding Greek verb, *apodoqhna i* two words earlier (in 27:58), is compound, which could have influenced the scribe of D to substitute *labwn* with the compound *paralabwn*, thus creating a connection between the two words.

¹⁵² Gundry states that there is an intended parallel in the Matthean text between *katenanti* (in B D) in 27:24a and *apenanti* (in *rell*) in 27:61b. *Matthew*, 582. The text of D creates a stronger link between the two passages than the wording in *rell* because the word *katenanti* is supplied in both instances, 27:24a and 27:61b.

¹⁵³ The text of D reads a neuter plural accusative article with *aggia* (*aggh* in NA²⁷) where no other MSS contain an article. The prior noun (*kala* in *rell*; *kallista* in D 700 *et al.*) has a neuter plural article with it, which could have possibly influenced an addition for the following noun (i.e. *ta aggia*).

¹⁵⁴ The *tou* in D before *en* is probably unintentional, due to unconscious repetition or dittography of the definite articles in *tou uiou tou anqrwpou*, which immediately precede it (so Holmes, "Editorial Activity," 227).

¹⁵⁵ The additional preposition and pronoun (*opisw autou*) in D *d* are not foreign to the context since the similar *krazei opisqen hmwn* is found in the following verse. The addition in *Bezae* could be a pre-harmonization.

¹⁵⁶ The non-singular variant in D in 12:18b (*en w* in place of *eij on*) is caused by "assimilation" of Mt 3:17 and 17:5 (Holmes, "Editorial Activity," 168). The text of D in 12:18 contains a parallel between 12:18a and v.18b with the combination of a preposition with a relative pronoun: *eij* is supplied with *on* in v.18a, just as is *en* with *w* in v.18b.

Some substitutions are influenced from the word it replaces (11:22;¹⁵⁸ 11:24b;¹⁵⁹ 14:24b;¹⁶⁰ 15:27b;¹⁶¹ 20:15;¹⁶² 26:15),¹⁶³ three of which are hn > h (11:22, 24b; 14:24b); most, however, do not seem to be construed in context. In one instance, a substitution with a definite article, t h j, resembles the word it replaces, h j (24:38).¹⁶⁴ Some verbs are replaced with synonyms that are spelled very similarly (9:10;¹⁶⁵ 26:55b;¹⁶⁶ 27:53).¹⁶⁷

¹⁵⁷ The plural accusative form of the noun legiwn, is a singular genitive in D*. The noun then agrees with the following genitive, aggelwn, but it should be plural to be grammatically construed with the preceding dwdeka.

¹⁵⁸ The text of D reads the relative pronoun hn in place of the comparative particle h. The reading of D* here is not construed with the comparative anektoteron (*more tolerable*).

¹⁵⁹ As in 11:22, the text of D* reads a relative pronoun in 11:24b where all other MSS read a comparative particle. The pronoun um(e)in, read by D M^{mg} 124 659 1424 it vg^{mss} sa^{ms} bo^{pt} arm^(cdd) Ir^{int278} is retained from the plural subject from earlier in the sentence.

¹⁶⁰ The reading in D* of either a conjunction or article, rather than a verb, is not grammatically construed.

¹⁶¹ The reading of D here is a diminutive form of *dogs* (which occurs earlier in the verse), rather than the word for *masters* as in *rell*. The reading in D is perhaps influenced from the similar spelling of kuriwn and the na of the kunaria that occurs earlier in 15:26 and 27. The non-diminutive form of *dogs*, kuwn, has a figurative use, which can imply “those who were unbaptized and therefore impure.” BDAG s.v. ku/wn. The change *masters* > *little dogs* could make sense in context if there is an implication that masters are unbaptized/impure, but the figurative implication is more closely associated with kuwn rather than kunarion. In addition, there seems to be other instances where a singular reading in D closely resembles the word it replaces—these instances typically do not make sense in context.

¹⁶² The singular reading in D* is a substitution of ecestin, *it is lawful*, for estin, *it is*, which does not make sense in context.

¹⁶³ The plural article in *rell*, which functions as a nominative pronoun, is a plural dative relative pronoun in D. The reading in D is nonsensical because a nominative is needed to modify the verb esthsan.

¹⁶⁴ In D*, the addition of the feminine singular genitive article could be a careless error due to the similarly spelled pronoun h j, or influenced from the preceding en taij hmeraij.

¹⁶⁵ The verb in D* is from sugkeimai, which is a synonym for what it replaces, sunanakeimai (so BDAG s.v. su/gkaimai).

¹⁶⁶ The text of D reads the verb kaqhmai, rather than the synonym kagezomai as in *rell* (or *sum* in *r*^{1.2}). The verb employed in D is often, but not exclusively, used with *throne* (qronoj) in the NT in contexts of the Divine sitting on a throne and judging, protecting, or being worshiped (cf. Mt 19:28; 23:22; Lk 22:30; Rev 4:2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 5:1, 7, 13; 6:16; 7:10, 15; 19:4; 20:11; 21:5). Jesus is the subject of the verb in Mt 26:55b but instead of sitting on a *throne*, he is sitting *in the temple* (en tw ierw), so perhaps the substitution in D is meant to conjure divine/kingly imagery.

¹⁶⁷ Gundry comments that the word enefanisqhsan here in Matthew “connotes juridical appearance for the purpose of testimony” (*Matthew*, 577), which fits well in the *Sitz im Buch*. (The context in Matthew here is when Jesus dies on the cross and the earth shook. Tombs opened, the bodies of saints were raised, and after Jesus’ resurrection, they appeared [enefanisqhsan] to many people in the holy city. There are no direct parallels of the Matthean text [cf. Mk 16:9, 12. The text of *d* is lacunose in Mark here].) The text of D* in Mt 27:53 reads a simple verb, fainw, which is a cognate of emfanizw in *rell*. In *d*, the text reads *paruerunt*, rather than the compound *apparuerunt* in Latt (both are inflected forms of the verbal root *pareo*). Though the verbal substitution in D* *d* occurs in a theologically difficult context, i.e. the resurrection of the dead occurring before Jesus’ own resurrection (France, *Mathew*, 1082), the difference in meaning between D* *d* and *rell* does not solve any theological problems.

5.3.10. AGREEMENT IN BEZAE BETWEEN THE GREEK AND LATIN COLUMNS

Clark states that most likely, an old-Latin MS was utilized to produce text where *d* and D disagree, thus “The consequence was that readings of this MS. were mixed up with [the scribe’s] own literal translation from the Greek.”¹⁶⁸ There are, actually, a couple of singular readings that could suggest *d* was translated from D (15:32b;¹⁶⁹ 22:24).¹⁷⁰ In another instance, however, the text of D and *d* do not agree on details in the story (14:6).¹⁷¹

5.3.11. NOUN AND ADJECTIVE CHANGES

¹⁶⁸ Clark, *Acts*, xliv.

¹⁶⁹ The omission in D* *d** is of a phrase that is “unique to this pericope” (cf. Mk 8:1-3). Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:450. The sentence is still construed without the final clause of the verse and could, perhaps, be a paraphrastic omission. The omission was added by the *prima manu* in small text between two lines.

It is interesting to discover that the Latin text also omits the phrase. The omission in D* in could be explained by parablepsis, a leap from *qelw* to *odw* or (*qelw* to *odw*) (so Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:447 n. c), but there is no evidence of parablepsis in *d**. If it was established that some portions of the Latin text were transcribed as a translation of the Greek column, than the reading here in both D* and *d** would support such a claim: first, the Greek was transcribed with an instance of haplography, then the Latin was translated from the Greek side. The reading alone, however, does not prove that *d* was translated from D, but could support such a claim.

¹⁷⁰ The reading in Bezae in Mt 22:24 lacks the phrase *his wife* (though it is found in the parallels Mk 12:19; Lk 20:28 in D), and therefore it is not explicitly stated that Moses said (Deut 25:5) that a brother *must marry his brother’s widow* to raise up children for his deceased brother, only that *he must marry* and raise up children. The parablepsis of *autou* could have resulted in haplography of the complement phrase (*his wife*, *thn gunaika autou*) by the *prima manu* of D (Holmes attributes the omission to homoeoteleuton. “Editorial Activity,” 129-130 n.30). Upon further investigation, there are some interesting features in Bezae here that *cannot* be explained by haplography: (1) where normally the sense lines of D and *d* are parallel with each other, on two lines of folios 75b and 76a the text is not parallel—this occurs where the omission of *his wife* would be in both columns (on folio 76r, the words *fratri suo* end ln.2, but on folio 75v, *o adelphoj autou* begins ln.3.); (2) the word *semen* is left unfinished by the *prima manu* of *d**, written as *sem*; and (3) up until *ut ducate/nubat*, the *d* text is in agreement with Latin MSS (Latt reads: *ut ducate frater eius uxorem illius et suscitset semen patri suo*; and *d** reads: *ut nubat patri suo et excitet sem patri suo*), but the D text agrees with the majority of Greek MSS for the *entire* verse, except for the omission of *thn gunaika autou*, which *d* is also lacking (admittedly, this third feature of Bezae in 22:24 may have nothing to do with the scribe but perhaps merely how the exemplar read). Although haplography is a possibility for the omission in D, it does not explain the omission in *d*, unless *d* was translated from D; but that still does not explain the unaligned sense lines in the columns (cf. 75b ln.3 and 76r ln.2). Nevertheless, the reading in Bezae, both in D* and *d**, is construed in context.

¹⁷¹ There is confusion in MSS in the Markan parallel (Mk 6:22) whether the dancing girl is Herodias’ daughter, *authj thj Hrwdiadoj* (so A C W M *f*¹ *plu*), or Herod’s daughter Herodias, *autou Hrwdiadoj* (so) B D *pc* NA²⁷) (for a concise explanation see Cranfield, *Mark*, 211-212). Instead of the genitive *Hrwdiadoj*, D reads the nominative *Hrwdiaj* and states that the girl dancing is Herod’s daughter Herodias. The text of *d*, however, states the other variant, that the girl dancing is Herodias’ daughter (*filia Herodiadis*).

There are three types of changes here, one reading creates a construed gender change (19:4),¹⁷² the preposition and nominal case of a prepositional phrase is changed (14:14),¹⁷³ and the case, number, and gender of a comparative adjective is changed (23:17).¹⁷⁴

5.3.12. USE OF PRONOUNS

Some pronouns are replaced with another pronoun (12:39;¹⁷⁵ 22:12;¹⁷⁶ 23:38),¹⁷⁷ one of which may have been influenced from preceding text (27:44).¹⁷⁸ There is an instance where prolepsis is created (12:45).¹⁷⁹ One pronoun is omitted, perhaps due

¹⁷² The word in this portion of 19:4 is within a quote from LXX Gen 1:27 where the adjective *qhluj* is neuter (*qhlu*), but the text of D reads a masculine, *qhlun* (*d* and Latt read a feminine noun, *feminam*).

¹⁷³ The prepositional phrase in D is plural genitive rather than plural dative in *rell*. The meaning of the dative *epi* is similar to the meaning of the genitive *peri* in context here. None of the Latin variants resemble D here, which are plural accusative (*super eos*), plural dative (*de eis, illis*), or singular genitive (*eius*).

¹⁷⁴ The comparative adjective in D is neuter plural accusative, rather than masculine singular nominative as in *rell* (cf. 20:10).

¹⁷⁵ Instead of *auth*, the text of D* reads *soi*. Holmes states that *the scribes and Pharisees* (12:38) are identified as the evil and adulterous generation in D* because *soi* refers to them (Holmes, “Editorial Activity,” 219). Grammatically, however, *scribes and Pharisees* are plural and *soi* is singular, so *soi* in D*, just as *auth* in *rell*, still refers to *genea pohnra kai moixalij* (evil and adulterous generation). In addition, the plural *autoij*, which *explicitly* refers to *the scribes and Pharisees* is used in 12:39 in D and *rell*, so the referent *soi* is not construed even in the same sentence—it merely refers to *genea* as did *auth*.

¹⁷⁶ The nominative article in 22:12 refers to *etaire*, which occurs in the previous sentence (but the same verse). Turner states, “In class[ical] Attic *οἱ* *de*/ rarely refers to the subject of the preceding sentence,” but is frequently employed in the NT to reference the previous subject (Turner, *Syntax*, 37, §1b). The text of D reads the relative pronoun, *οἱ*, in place of the nominative article here, and is a grammatically construed alternative to the reading of *rell* (cf. *οἱ* *de* > *ο* *de* in Mk 15:23. BDF §251).

¹⁷⁷ The reading in D* here is difficult to see.

¹⁷⁸ The *autoi* in D* matches the gender, number, and case of the following *οἱ λησται* (*the robbers*). Thus the pronoun no longer functions as an identical adjective in D* (as in *rell*) and is translated, “But this, they, even the robbers...”

¹⁷⁹ The reading in D* *d* here is an instance of a proleptic pronoun being followed by a resumptive noun. Turner states that “the proleptic pronoun followed by resumptive noun is an Aramaic peculiarity,” and that “it appears particularly in codex Bezae” (Turner, *Syntax*, 41), but this is the only instance in Matthew in D that is a singular reading.

to oversight (19:20).¹⁸⁰ In one instance, the article is omitted when it functions as a pronoun (16:23).¹⁸¹

5.3.13. TEXTUAL IMPROVEMENT

Some singular readings improve the text by aiding in narration (12:23;¹⁸² 21:36;¹⁸³ 26:61),¹⁸⁴ and eliminating asyndeton (25:38).¹⁸⁵ In one instance, a mathematical calculation is not performed (25:28),¹⁸⁶ so that could be considered a concession for a reader who cannot perform mathematical addition, but no other such non-calculations are performed in the singular readings in D in Matthew.

Few singular readings go deeper than grammatical changes. Two singular readings involve a Christological statement (16:16)¹⁸⁷ and another theological

¹⁸⁰ The addition of *from my youth* (ek neothtoj mou) in 19:20 in some MSS is harmonized from the synoptic parallels, Mk 10:20; Lk 18:21 (Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 40). In Matthew, the singular portion of the reading of D is the omission of mou (and is omitted Lk 18:21 in D as well, but not Mk 10:20). The omission of the pronoun may be a simple oversight in Bezae or thought unnecessary.

¹⁸¹ The reading of D omits the neuter plural accusative article τα, which functions as a pronoun in context (the Latin MSS read the pronoun *ea*, except for *d*). This is the second occurrence of the article τα (functioning as a pronoun) in the verse.

¹⁸² The addition in D* introduces indirect speech and is grammatically construed.

¹⁸³ The text of D reads ουν following παλιν, which, in context, aids in the continuation of the narrative (Liddell and Scott, *s.v.* ουν, II.). None of the gospel parallels (Mt 22:4; Mk 12:4; Lk 20:11) read the same ουν as in D in 21:36.

¹⁸⁴ The text of D reads a kai before ειπον, which may intend to help the flow of the narrative.

¹⁸⁵ Davies and Allison notice parallelism between 25:35-36 and 25:37-39, stating, “Each question consists of pote + se + eidomen + condition of sufferer (+ kai + verb ending in –men) + h + condition of sufferer + kai + verb ending in –men.” *Matthew*, 3:428. The text of D reads kai in place of the Matthean conjunction h in 25:38 (Gundry, *Matthew*, 514). The D text now reads kai three consecutive times in v.38, producing “the impression of extensiveness and abundance.” BDF, 240, §460.3. The kai is used in the same manner just prior, in 25:35-36, which grosses six instances, and could have influenced the substitution in the subsequent parallel in v.38 (though not in *d*).

¹⁸⁶ The variant in Bezae refers to the same person as in *rell*, but is “representing the original amount [of talents] given” in the parable, as Nolland states about D. Nolland, *Matthew*, 1011-1012 n. m. In the text, there are five (25:16) and five (25:20) talents, which are added together in *rell* in v.28, equaling ten (deka) talents, but the text of D does not add the talents together.

¹⁸⁷ The text of D* reads το σωζοντοj in 16:16, which calls Christ Son of the *Saving* God, rather than του ζωντοj, Christ Son of the *Living* God. The singular reading in D* contains an article that is not grammatically construed (it should be masculine to agree with γεοj, not neuter το). The variant in D* might preserve an Aramaic saying: yyx *to live*, or yyx *who liveth*, but was misread as yxmd *who saveth* (so Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 245; Holmes, “Editorial Activity,” 83. See also Holmes, “Editorial Activity,” 223, 231 where the reading is listed under “Christological Variants”). The similarity in spelling between yyx and yxmd is not necessarily more confusing than the spelling difference between ζωντοj and σωζοντοj. (The Latin *d** reads *saluatoris* and was corrected to *viventis*, which are not similarly spelled, and therefore confusion does not seem to stem from the Latin text.) It is not easy to determine exactly what the cause of the reading is, but nonetheless, the text of D* and *d** still state that Christ is the Son of the *Saving* God.

statement (19:26).¹⁸⁸ Both of these, however, could be unintentional alterations. One reading hints at the disciples' ignorance of Jesus (26:1-2),¹⁸⁹ and another singular reading enhances the literary style of the text (18:29).¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁸ The reading in D* of *dunaton . . . dunata*, destroys all "(antithetical) parallelism" and sense of the verse. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:53. The text in D* states that all things are possible for men *and* God, rather than other MSS that state it is *impossible* for men and *possible* for God. The reading may be theological as it could place God and man on the same omnipotent plane, or at least may speak of cooperation between the two. The cause of the reading could have been from the latter occurrence of *dunata* in the verse.

¹⁸⁹ In 26:1-2, both D and *d* do not read *autou oidate/suis scitis*. The majority of Latin MSS read, *discipulis suis scitis quia*, and the omitted text in *d, suis scitis*, may be due to the parablepsis of *-is*, but Parker does not identify any instances of haplography in one column (e.g. *d*) of Bezae that has influenced an omission in the other column (e.g. D); therefore the omission in *d* (even though there is parablepsis) probably did not spawn the omission in D (see his discussion on omissions, Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 89ff).

The singular portion of the variant in Bezae is the omission of the verb *oidate/scitis*. The Greek verb is either an indicative (*you know*) or imperative (*know you that*), and the Latin verb is either indicative or a participle. (Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:437; Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:754. Luz states that *oidate* is indicative because the disciples are already aware of what *oidate* refers to. Luz, *Mathew*, 3:330. Gundry states that Matthew employs *oidate*, which "is a favorite of his," to portray "the disciples as those who understand." Gundry, *Matthew*, 517. The gospel parallels, Mk 4:1 and Lk 22:1, do not contain *oidate*, which McNeile comments, "Mt. alone relates that the Lord reminded the disciples of the date, introducing a reference to His death, already thrice predicted." McNeile, *Matthew*, 372.) If *oidate* was interpreted as either an indicative or imperative, it could have been omitted in Bezae because it seemed redundant because the disciples "would hardly need to be informed about the calendar, and Jesus has already repeatedly told them about his approaching death." France, *Matthew*, 969 n. 2. Along these lines, the word *oidate* is substituted in Act 3:17 in Bezae in a variant that Epp identifies as an eradication of the ignorance motif of the Jews. Epp, *Theological Tendency*, 42ff. Though the "ignorance motif" in Luke-Acts pertains to the Jews, in Mark the "ignorance motif" is connected to the disciples. Nolland states that in *Matthew*, "the Markan ignorance motif, especially when it shows the disciples stuck in their ignorance ('they were afraid to ask him'), does not suit Matthew." Nolland, *Matthew*, 720. Indeed, instances of the disciples' ignorance are not as common in Matthew as in Mark, so it is interesting that the variant in Bezae could possibly change the narrative to highlight such ignorance. This single instance does not, however, create a *motif* of ignorance, but perhaps the prevalence of ignorance motifs in some biblical books, i.e. Luke-Acts and Mark, influenced a change in another book, i.e. Matthew. In other words, perhaps an extra-matthean motif spilled over into Matthew.

¹⁹⁰ Concerning the pericope here, Hagner states, "The plea of the fellow servant for mercy is deliberately patterned after the plea of the first servant [in v.26]." *Matthew*, 2:539. The substitution of *kagw* in place of *kai* in D here emphasizes the 1s context and perhaps evokes the reverse (and almost verbatim) situation in v.26.

5.3.14. USE OF VERBS

The tense, voice, or prefix of some verbs has been changed, though the difference is only one letter (4:6b;¹⁹¹ 5:22;¹⁹² 6:7;¹⁹³ 12:18c;¹⁹⁴ 17:5)¹⁹⁵ or two letters (4:7;¹⁹⁶ 12:36;¹⁹⁷ 20:3;¹⁹⁸ 24:12).¹⁹⁹ One verb is changed from 3s > 2s (12:20b).²⁰⁰ Some

¹⁹¹ The context in Matthew here is a quote from LXX Ps 90:12. The verb *airw* is formed with an iota only in the present tense (Mounce, *Morphology*, §31.5d), such as found in D here: *airousin*. The verb in *rell* is in the future tense, *arousin*, as well as the previous verb in the quote, *enteleitai*, but *airw* in D does not agree in verbal tense within the context (there are no singular a > ai orthographic changes in D to suggest that this is an orthographic variant). This may, however, be merely an instance of incorrect word formation where the iota is mistakenly retained from the present tense stem, and not a deliberate attempt to alter the verbal tense.

¹⁹² In 5:22, the text of D* reads an antonym for what *rell* reads. The change from *orgizw* (*make angry, provoke to anger, irritate* [Liddell-Scott, s.v. *o0rgi/zw*]) to *orgazw* (*soften, knead, temper* [Liddell-Scott, s.v. *o0rga/zw*]) is nonsensical and is the difference of a change from iota to alpha, which could result from a scribal slip. There does not seem to be any metaphorical or idiomatic use of *orgazw* that might fit the context of anger.

¹⁹³ The word *battalogew* is an onomatopoeic word meaning to *stammer* or *stutter*, and is identical in meaning to the more common *battarizw* (Liddell-Scott, s.v. *battologew*; s.v. *battarizw*. BDAG, s.v. *battalogew*). In 6:7, E G 700 *etl al.* read the omicron stem, *bat(t)ō—*, where as) B W and other MSS read the alpha stem, *batta—*. Little is certain about the origins of the word, and the TDNT capitulates that “such words sometimes defy exact linguistic analysis” (TDNT, s.v. *battalogew*). The word in D* contains a stem with lambda, *bla—*, which is a hapax legomenon in the NT. The D text resembles the Latin *blatero* in regards to the lambda, but no Latin MSS read *blatero* in 6:7 (the Latin MSS instead read the synonym *loquor*). If Latinization occurred here, “it must lie somewhere in the complex history of the Bezan text itself.” Moulton-Milligan, s.v. *battologew*.

¹⁹⁴ The context of 12:18c is a quote from Isa 42:1-4 (which is probably Matthew’s “independent translation of the Hebrew” and has some “influence from the LXX and targum.” Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:323). The singular reading in D is in the present tense rather than the future tense as in *rell*. It is, however, merely the difference of an additional lambda in D, which could have been duplicated if the double gammas (preceding) somehow influenced a letter repetition, but there are, however, no other singular readings that witness a double letter formation similar to this. The reading in D is grammatically difficult because it is a present tense verb surrounded by future tense verbs (*qhsu* and *erisei*).

¹⁹⁵ The imperfect tense in D* here fits the context appropriately. The reading in *d*, however, is future tense (as opposed to perfect in Latt) and is not grammatically construed in context.

¹⁹⁶ The variant here is part of an OT quote (LXX Deut 6:16 or Is 7:12) that is spoken by Jesus to the devil. The *ek* prefix adds a perfective nuance that is lost in the simple verb in D. Zerwick, *Grammatical Analysis*, 8. Instead of, *you will not put the Lord your God through a test*, D is translated as, *you will not test the Lord your God*. The “key word (*ek*)*peirazw* (v. 7) appears again in 16:1,” which is simple in both D and *rell*. Luz, *Matthew*, 1:188.

¹⁹⁷ The reading in D *d* is in present tense, unlike) B C *et al.* which read the future tense, or aorist subjunctive in *rell*, or perfect participle in it^(pler) *vg*. Holmes acknowledges the possibility that the variant in D (and *d*) could refer to the “‘careless words’ which were being spoken at that [present] time by Jesus’ opponents, the Pharisees . . .”¹⁹⁷ rather than their *future* words having to be accounted for in the day of judgment (*en hmera krisewj*). The following verb, *apodwsousin*, is still in the future tense, so the change in D *d* to present does not eliminate *all* futuristic thought.

verbal tense changes seem unnecessary because they do not match the tense of the surrounding verbs (10:25;²⁰¹ 15:39a).²⁰² The pluperfect tense in D seems to be employed well in two close instances (11:20, 21d).²⁰³ In another instance, the individual is emphasized with a change from passive to the middle voice (25:29).²⁰⁴ One verbal change lessens the connection between words (or phrases) (15:3).²⁰⁵ There is one instance of *constructio ad sensum* where a verb is changed to singular to agree with the singular collective noun (27:27).²⁰⁶

¹⁹⁸ The verb in *rell* is an “echoing” of *echlqen* in 20:1 and reappears in vv. 5 and 6. Gundry, *Matthew*, 396. The verb in D, however, loses some of the connection with its other forms in the pericope because it is now a (double) compound verb.

¹⁹⁹ The text of D reads an aorist active infinitive (and *d* reads a perfect passive participle), as opposed to the aorist passive infinitive in *rell*, the perfect active indicative in Latt, or the present active indicative in *a*. The following accusative, *thn anomian*, is still the subject of the infinitive *plhqunai* in D.

²⁰⁰ In 12:20b, the verb *katagnumi* in D* *d** here is 2s, but is 3s in *rell* and D^F *d*^G. The verse is a portion of the Is 42:1-4 quote.

²⁰¹ The change from aorist to present in D *d* and is construed in context even though the previous verb is aorist (*genhtai*).

²⁰² The change to the present tense in D creates inconsistency with the tenses of the surrounding aorist verbs, *apolusaj* and *hlqen*.

²⁰³ The “catch word” in 11:20, *egeneto* (aorist), is changed to *gegoneisan* (pluperfect), in D, which is similar to the change in 11:21d (*egenonto* > *gegoneisan* in D). Luz, *Matthew*, 2:151. Luz interprets the pericope (Mt 11:20-24) stating, “The issue here is not that these cities [Chorazin and Bethsaida] are self-righteous or have a false awareness of their own election. It is simply that they did not recognize the ‘mighty deeds’ [*dunameij*] that Jesus performed as a call to repentance.” Luz, *Matthew*, 2:153. The alteration to a pluperfect tense in D in 11:20 and 11:21d could intend to emphasize how the *dunameij* that were performed in the past have an enduring effect on the cities of Xorazain and Beqsaeida (cf. BDF §347.2, 3).

²⁰⁴ In the context of 25:29, Hagner states, “The future passive verbs [*perisseuqhsetai* and *arqhsetai*] imply God as the acting subject.” Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:736. In D, the former verb is changed to middle voice and the latter verb remains passive. (In the Latin, the former verb is active and the latter is passive.) The Greek and Latin variants are all in the future tense, and are still aligned with Hagner’s interpretation, but the text of D perhaps nuances the text by emphasizing the individual with the middle voice employed in *perisseusetai*: *he will have abundance [for himself]* (cf. Lk 15:17 *perisseuontai*).

²⁰⁵ The verb in this portion of 15:3 in D is infinitive (*parabainai*), rather than indicative in *rell* (*parabainete*). Though the verb occurs elsewhere in the LXX and NT, as an infinitive it is a *hapax legomenon*. McNeile notices a connection between *kai umeij parabainete* in v.3 and the indicative *parabainousin* in v.2, which replaces Mark’s *kalwj aqeteite* (Mk 7:9). McNeile, *Matthew*, 222. The connection is not as perceptible in Matthew in D because of the different verbal moods in *parabainai* and *parabainousin*, but such a connection is still noticeable in D.

²⁰⁶ The change from 3p to 3s in D may derive from the subject, *olhn thn speiran*, comprised of singular nouns that are collective in meaning. BDF §134.

5.3.15. OTHER OMISSIONS

In one instance, the omitted text can still be implied in context (2:3).²⁰⁷ There is one instance where a detail of John the Baptist's death is omitted (14:8).²⁰⁸ In another instance, a direct object is omitted (12:20a).²⁰⁹ In one instance, one of two subjects is omitted (13:44b).²¹⁰

The reading in 15:37-38 is interesting because it does not mention the number of people Jesus fed (which was four thousand), and it states that everyone was filled *apart from women and children*. The *prima manu* must have caught the omission and corrected it himself.²¹¹

²⁰⁷ In all of Matthew, *Jerusalem* is neuter plural (except maybe 3:5), but here in 2:3 *pasa Ierosoloma* is feminine. Davies and Allison state that the omission of *pasa* in D (and the omission of *omnis* in *d*) “restores consistency” with the neuter gender (*Matthew*, 1:237 n. 36). (France notices a connection of 2:3 to 21:10 where *all the city* will be *stirred up* by Jesus; and therefore it is appropriate that *all Jerusalem* “is already perturbed at the prospect of a dynastic revolution.” France, *Matthew*, 70. On the other hand, Luz remarks that because “Herod was so unpopular with the Jerusalem inhabitants . . . that news of the birth of a royal child or especially a messianic child would have caused great joy.” Luz, *Matthew*, 1:135.) The inclusion of *all Jerusalem* can still be implied even though the text of Bezae lacks *pasa*.

²⁰⁸ The request by Herodias' daughter to have John's head presented on a platter, and Herod's subsequent acquiescence to her wish, “underlines the degradation of the royal court.” Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:413. The detail of how the head will be presented, *on a platter* (*epi pinaki*), is omitted in Bezae. Holmes states that the omission in D in 14:8 is simply “an insignificant late scribal slip” (“Editorial Activity”, 191), but there may be more to it than that. Interestingly, the mention of people who have been beheaded (*peplekismenwn*) is omitted in Codex Alexandrinus in Rev 20:4 and replaced with those who have been in war (*pepolemhenwn*). About the substitution in Codex A, Hernández states, “the exchange [*peplekismenwn* > *pepolemhenwn*] offers a more euphemistic term to replace the graphic depiction of beheaded Christians standing before God's throne!” (*Scribal Habits*, 118 n.104). The phrase *epi pinaki* is graphic (i.e. a “hideous touch” [Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:473]), and perhaps if it were considered *too* graphic it was omitted. The same notion, however, is not subsequently omitted in v.11 in Bezae.

²⁰⁹ In 12:20a, the direct object, *bruised reed* (*kalamon suntetrimmenon*), of the verb *katagnumi* is omitted in D* *d**, and the following *smoldering wick* (*linon tufomenon*), takes its place as the direct object. The Latin portion of Bezae contains the same omission of the direct object, *harundinem quassatam* (with no evidence of parablepsis). The verses are a portion of the Is 42:1-4 quote.

²¹⁰ The reading in Bezae does not contain the noun *anqrwpoj*, but does read *tij* (along with MS 892) that can stand in place of the omission as the subject. The omission in D no longer echoes the previous uses of *anqrwpoj* in v.25 or v.31 (Gundry, *Matthew*, 276, 277).

²¹¹ In one of the few explanations of variant readings made by Swanson in his work, he states that a line of text in D was erased and the text from *kai to* in v.37 through *andrej* in v.38 was converted into two lines (which probably comprised three lines of the exemplar. Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 90). Swanson, *Matthew*, 152. Indeed, it appears that line 4 (folio 52v) was made into lines 4 and 5, completed in smaller than normal lettering. The scribe must have skipped the text from *kai to* through *andrej* and probably continued with *xwrij k.t.l.* before noticing.

5.4. Conclusion

Codex Bezae is often characterized as abounding with harmonizations, due to the nature of the Western text type to which it belongs.²¹² Vogels argues that D was influenced by Tatian's Diatessaron.²¹³ He lists 220 points of variation that are harmonizations in Matthew,²¹⁴ but Vogels' criteria for what qualifies as a harmonization embraces a multitude of readings which are by no means singular and are often no more significant than an omission of the most common conjunctions, e.g. *oti* in 27:47, or a substitution of a *kai* for a *de* in 12:26 and 27.²¹⁵ Many singular readings in D in Matthew are not remarkable and it seems that the singular readings are in fact distinctly *non-Western*. Some changes are minute, the difference of one or two letters, and others are influenced from previous text, but are not exactly harmonizations. The characteristics of the Western text seem to be nearly absent from the singular readings in D. The sheer dearth of singular harmonizations in D in Matthew, however, could suggest that the scribe himself was not involved in creating the notorious Western harmonizations in his copy; rather, he copied them.

Concerning deliberate editing of his text, Holmes states that the scribe of D intended to smooth his text:

A number of Bezan variants entail changes, usually in the word order or syntactical structure, the effect of which is to produce a text that reads more smoothly than it previously did. That is, the original contains some feature or aspect felt to be awkward which has been altered in the Bezan text.²¹⁶

²¹² Not limiting the study to singular readings, Parker notes that the D text is harmonized with the context and parallel passages in all the gospels (Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 248, 256.), but states that there are more harmonizations in the Latin column than the Greek (Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 203.).

²¹³ Vogels states, "Der Evangelientext des Codex Cantabrigiensis ist durch eine Evangelienharmonie—ein Diatessaron—stark beeinflusst: das ist die These dieser Arbeit." Vogels, *Die Harmonistik*, 2. He uses the 1906 edition of Nestle's *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine* because it is based on the editions of Tischendorf and Westcott-Hort, and where they differ he uses the edition of B. Weiß. Vogels, *Die Harmonistik*, 1, 7.

²¹⁴ Vogels has determined that D contains 1,278 harmonizations in all four gospels, but that number includes non-singular variants as well. Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 189.

²¹⁵ Vogels, *Die Harmonistik*, 63-71.

²¹⁶ Holmes, "Editorial Activity," 189.

When considering *only* the singular reading in D in Matthew, however, it seems that any “editing” of the text resulted in minute changes. Most of the changes cannot suggest a clear desire of the scribe to adjust for awkwardness, as Holmes found. Rather, many changes occur because of contextual influence (with and without parablepsis) as well as a different spelling standard (in fact, none of our other MSS witness so many consonant exchanges). The singular readings that seem to have improved the text are few and could possibly be unintentional, but on the other hand, the majority of singulars do not consist of nonsensical readings. Considering that D accumulates the most singular readings of our MSS, it is counterintuitive to find that these variants do not seem to produce a drastic re-presentation of Matthew.

CHAPTER SIX: CODEX WASHINGTONIANUS

6.1. INTRODUCTION

“To this manuscript one can merely call attention, as at the moment of writing very little is known about it,” wrote Souter about Codex Washingtonianus in the 1935 edition of *Text and Canon of the New Testament*.¹ It was only twenty-nine years earlier that Charles L. Freer purchased it from an antiquities dealer in Giza, Egypt.² The MS is now placed in the ranks of important majuscule New Testament MSS and its description is often included in introductory textual critical manuals. A unique feature of the MS that often draws attention is the Freer Logion, a lengthy insertion of text after Mk 16:14.³

6.1.1. PROVENANCE AND DATE

The study here will go with the date stated in the NA²⁸, which is 4th/5th century,⁴ but there is a varying range of dates proposed for the codex, from fourth century to eighth century.⁵ There is some indirect evidence of Giza, Egypt, as its provenance.⁶

¹ Souter, *Text and Canon*, 31.

² The four MSS purchased on Wednesday, December 19, 1906 were a codex of the four Gospels (i.e. Codex W), a fifth-century codex containing Deuteronomy and Joshua, a fifth-century codex of Psalms, and a fragmented, sixth-century codex of Paul’s Epistles. Freer subsequently purchased a fifth-century Coptic codex of Psalms in 1908 and a fragmented third-century papyrus codex of the Minor Prophets in 1916-1920. Hurtado, “Introduction,” 1. Clarke, “Paleography and Philanthropy,” 25.

³ For an overview of the Freer Logion, see Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 80-81; and especially Jörg Frey, “Zu Text und Sinn des Freer-Logion,” *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XCIII (2002); 13-34.

⁴ NA²⁸, 802.

⁵ Sanders dates it to fourth maybe fifth century; Cavallo and Maehler give a date of late fifth century; and Fonkič and Poljakov note that it resembles a “Palestinian” hand of the eighth century. Schmid, “Reassessing,” 246-248. In a thorough investigation of the script of the main hand of W, Schmid debunks the aforementioned dates and notes that it resembles *P.Oxy* 1817, which would place it late sixth century. In the end, however, Schmid is not steadfast in his judgment and declares that a new and detailed paleographical study over the variations of sloping pointed majuscule scripts, as well as carbon dating of the MS itself, is demanded in order to ascertain a more precise date. Schmid, “Reassessing,” 246, 249.

⁶ A prayer subscription (i.e. a colophon at the bottom of a page that is a prayer) in the Gospel of Mark, addressed to an unknown Timothy, leads Sanders to believe that the MS is from the Church of Timothy in the Monastery of the Vinedresser located near the third pyramid in Giza, Egypt. Sanders states that the prayer is the “only hint” of provenance. Sanders, *The New Testament Manuscripts*, 1. Finegan notes that the “somewhat sloping uncials” are similar to a fifth of sixth century fragment of Enoch found at Akhmim in 1886, which is south of Giza along the Nile. Finegan, *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts*, 145.

6.1.2. THE SCRIBE AND CORRECTORS

There are at least eight hands discernible in the MS.⁷ The *prima manu* is responsible for transcribing the entirety of the gospels in W except for one quire,⁸ which comprise the first sixteen pages of John.⁹

6.2. NOMINA SACRA¹⁰

The lexemes of Ihsouj (i8s8, i8u8, i8n8) and Xristoj (x8s8, x8u8, x8n8, x8e8) are always contracted in W in Matthew. Lexemes of kurioj (k8s8, k8u8, k8w8, k8n8, k8e8) are found contracted in sacral and nonsacral instances, but written in *plene* only in nonsacral instances (6:24; 10:25; 18:32). Lexemes of qeoj (q8s8, q8u8, q8w8, q8n8) are always contracted except the vocative occurrences in 27:46¹, 46², written as qe^e and qee, respectively,¹¹ but “a cogent explanation for why q8e8 was so rarely employed in biblical manuscripts” is still wanting.¹² Lexemes of pneuma (p8n8a8, p8n8s8, p8n8i8, p8n8t8a8) are always contracted in sacral and nonsacral instances except for the plural in 10:1, but is contracted as a plural in 8:16; 12:45.

⁷ Sanders, *The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection*, 38.

⁸ Haugh, “Was Codex Washingtonianus a Copy or a New Text?” in *The Freer Biblical Manuscripts*, 167. The first quire of John contains 1:1 up to krabatton sou kai peripatei in 5:12. Schmid, “Reassessing,” 231.

⁹ The quire of John was produced, probably in the eighth century, independently of the rest of the MS. The three hands found here are not found elsewhere in the codex. Royse, “The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex,” 186. Sanders, *The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection*, 38. The condition of the MS “is so perfect that there is rarely a letter missing or indistinct,” save three missing leaves. Two of the missing leaves contain Jn 14:25 from o de paraklhtoj to 16:7 including eleusetai proj umaj. One missing leaf contains Mk 15:13 from oi de palin to 15:38 including esxisqh eij duo. Sanders, *The New Testament Manuscripts*, 27. Sanders, *Facsimile of the Washington Manuscript*, vii.

¹⁰ I would like to express my appreciation to J. Bruce Prior who generously corresponded with me at length (13-26 July 2010) concerning his essay, “The Use and Nonuse of Nomina Sacra in the Freer Gospel of Matthew.” In his essay, the data for nonsacral abbreviations of kurioj lexemes are not included, neither is documentation of some full word occurrences (they are split between lines in the MS: 19:29 patera; 10:23 uiobj; 7:11 ouranoi; 16:13 anqrwpoi), nor is there mention of the form p8r8o8s8 for p8r8s8 in 10:29, 32, and other errors (3:9 patera; 24:30 uiou; 14:19 ouranon; 2:1 ierosolum for ierousalhm; a second occurrence of a8n8o8u8 in 24:37; 3:3 k8u8). This may be confirmed through consultation of images of the codex. The placement of *nomina sacra* and full words into sacral and nonsacral categories remains nearly identical to Prior’s arrangement.

¹¹ Royse states that the omission of epsilon in the first occurrence, qe, is due to haplography of epsilon: qee > qe. Royse, “The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex,” 196.

¹² Prior, “The Use and Nonuse of *Nomina Sacra*,” 165.

Some words are found contracted and *plene* in both sacral and nonsacral instances, such as $\alpha\eta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon$ ($\alpha\eta\eta\omicron\sigma\sigma$, $\alpha\eta\eta\omicron\sigma\upsilon$, $\alpha\eta\eta\omega$, $\alpha\eta\eta\omicron\eta\eta$, $\alpha\eta\eta\omicron\eta\iota$, $\alpha\eta\eta\omega\eta\eta$, $\alpha\eta\eta\omicron\eta\iota\sigma\sigma$, $\alpha\eta\eta\omicron\sigma\upsilon\sigma\sigma$)¹³ and $\mu\eta\theta\eta\rho$ ($\mu\eta\eta\eta\rho$, $\mu\eta\eta\omicron\sigma\sigma/\mu\eta\eta\sigma\sigma$, $\mu\eta\eta\eta\iota$, $\mu\eta\eta\eta\alpha$). Lexemes of $\pi\alpha\theta\eta\rho$ ($\pi\eta\eta\eta\rho$, $\pi\eta\eta\omicron\sigma\sigma/\pi\eta\eta\sigma\sigma$, $\pi\eta\eta\eta\iota$, $\pi\eta\eta\eta\alpha$) are also found contracted and *plene* in both sacral and nonsacral instances—the only sacral *plene* lexeme is vocative (6:9; 11:25; 26:39, 42). There are two forms of the genitive *nomen sacrum* $\pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho\upsilon$, $\pi\eta\eta\sigma\sigma$ and $\pi\eta\eta\omicron\sigma\sigma$, the latter only occurs twice, 10:29, 32. Lexemes of $\epsilon\iota\sigma$ are found contracted and *plene* in both sacral and nonsacral instances.

There are two words that appear as contractions only once. The word $\text{I}\sigma\eta\rho\alpha\eta\lambda$ is normally found in *plene*, but occurs as $\iota\sigma\sigma\eta\rho\eta\lambda$ in 27:42, which is the last occurrence of the word in Matthew.¹⁴ The word $\text{D}\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\iota\delta$ is normally *plene*, but contracted ($\delta\alpha\alpha\delta$) in 12:33.

The remaining *nomina sacra*, $\upsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon$, $\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\eta\omicron\upsilon$,¹⁵ and $\text{I}\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\lambda\eta\mu$, are found only in *plene*.

6.3. THE SINGULAR READINGS IN WASHINGTONIANUS IN MATTHEW¹⁶

There are no lacunae in W in Matthew and contains 1,071 verses. There are 112 singular readings, which amounts to one singular for every 9.56 verses. Many of these readings are influenced from the context and some are synonymic substitutions. This is the only one of our MSS that shows a clear preference for Attic grammar and consistent sensical readings.

6.3.1. ORTHOGRAPHY

6.3.1.1. Itacisms

The most common itacistic changes are $i > ei$ (43) and $e > ai$ (26), then their reverse $ei > i$ (19)¹⁷ and $ai > e$ (17). There is one change $oi > u$.¹⁸

¹³ In 6:1, $\alpha\eta\eta\omega\pi\omega\eta$, occurring at the end of a line, is written with a moveable nu. Also a moveable nu in 16:13, $\alpha\eta\eta\omega\pi\omega\iota$ occurs as the end of a line, ending the line with $\alpha\eta$, and beginning the next line with $\eta\omega\pi\omega\iota$.

¹⁴ In 19:28, it is written $\text{I}\sigma\eta\rho\alpha\eta\lambda$, rather than $\text{I}\sigma\eta\rho\alpha\eta\lambda$.

¹⁵ In 10:7; 13:33, $\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\eta\omega\eta$ ends a line and contains a moveable nu.

¹⁶ See appendix six.

6.3.1.2. Other Vocalic Changes

Vowel changes, other than itacisms, are among the most common type of change found in the singular readings in W in Matthew, accounting for 11.6% of the singular readings. There are nine types of (non-itacistic) vocalic exchanges, most only occur once. There is a > h (25:34),¹⁹ a > i (26:67), ai > a (3:5²; 12:50; 24:18),²⁰ ei > h (16:27), o > a (3:6;²¹ 27:44), o > e (8:16); o > w (20:29), ou > h (27:55),²² and ou > w (21:41b; 24:9).

6.3.1.3. Consonant Orthography

The exchange of consonants are the most frequent type of change found in the singular readings in W in Matthew, found in 16.07% of the singular readings. Several changes in W resemble spellings in Roman and Byzantine papyri, such as an exchange with liquids l > r (26:41),²³ omission of nu or nasal (5:22²; 12:12;²⁵ 27:41;²⁶ 27:58), and various omissions of sigma (3:12;²⁷ 5:44;²⁸ 21:41a; 23:14;

¹⁷ In 12:40, the word *treij* occurs four times and Codex W is the only MS that consistently contains the change *ei* > *i*. The change is found in) only in the first three occurrences (the fourth occurrence is written as a numerical sign: Ϡ8) and is found in N only in the first occurrence. Therefore, only 12:40⁴ is counted as a singular reading for W.

¹⁸ See appendix twenty-one.

¹⁹ The change, seemingly imperative to subjunctive, is a change a > h perhaps caused by the adjacent *etas* (so Royse). Royse, "The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex," 195-196.

²⁰ The only singular instances of *ai* > *a* exchanges are with the conjunction *kai*, which may result from faulty diphthong pronunciation (Sanders, *The New Testament Manuscripts*, 25. Sanders also refers to the same change in Mt 12:50, but perhaps that should be labeled as *videtur*), although in two instances, the letter following the alpha begins with a vertical stroke, thus the vertical stroke of the iota could have been unintentionally subsumed in the letter (for example, *kaipasa* becomes *kapasa* in 3:5²).

²¹ In 3:6, o > a, "looks like a cursive gloss." Sanders, *The New Testament Manuscripts*, 46.

²² The exchange *ou* > *h* in *diakonousai* may be a "syntactical confusion of the correct form of *diakonew*" (so Royse); although Gignac notes such an exchange in one instance that is not related to syntactical form. Royse, "The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex," 204. Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:217.

²³ The change could have been influenced by *erxetai* in v. 40 (so Royse); but Gignac found similar liquid interchanges in the MSS in his study. Royse, "The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex," 189. Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:102ff.

²⁴ Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:112

²⁵ Omission of nu before a stop. Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:111-112.

²⁶ Sanders believes that if *farisaiw* was the last word of the line in the exemplar of W, then there was a bar over it indicating a contraction of nu; if there was something written above the bar, then the bar became "obscured" and therefore the scribe of W would have been unaware of the nu, hence its omission. Sanders, *The New Testament Manuscripts*, 47. The word in W is not the final word of a line.

²⁷ Omission of sigma before a labial. Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:130

25:46).²⁹ Perhaps the omitted sigma in 21:41a and 23:14 is also a reoccurring phenomenon of the period because it is also found in the orthography in Codex D in Matthew (cf. 5:41; 9:2; 12:19 in D). There is one singular instance of letter doubling to *σσ* (9:20),³⁰ and one instance of simplification *ρρ* > *ρ* (26:65). There are two instances of epsilon omission (27:4a;³¹ 27:47).³²

In addition, there is a lingual change (18:27), labial change (18:34), nasal change (14:32), and an omission of a delta (14:3).

6.3.1.4. Other Spellings

The form of *ανοιγω* in 20:33 in W is not found elsewhere in the NT.³³ There is one instance of metathesis (2:16).³⁴ There are some nonsense spellings (26:72), two of which add an iota before an omicron (13:46; 20:1). There is an instance of an omission of a fricative intervocalic gamma (1:9).³⁵

6.3.2. NOT CONSTRUED IN CONTEXT

Some changes from singular to plural (26:18)³⁶ and *vice versa* (21:32b)³⁷ are a difference of one letter and are not construed in context. Other verbal changes are not entirely construed (17:24;³⁸ 21:30).³⁹

²⁸ The sibilant omission occurs before a word beginning with a vowel. Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:125

²⁹ The omission of the final sigma is before a word beginning with a consonant. Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:124

³⁰ Gignac states that in the Roman and Byzantine papyri he analyzes, “Nouns tend to be spelled with *-σσ-* unless specifically Attic or late.” Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:148.

³¹ The false elision may be a slip due to the adjacent epsilons. Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:318

³² This may be an instance of aphaeresis of the epsilon. Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:319

³³ The text of W reads *ανευξωσιν* in 20:33. The augmentation of *ανοιγω* “has become very involved.” See *αν-οι/γειν* in BDF §101.

³⁴ The nonsensical substitution of *wise men* for *wedding* may result from confusion in letters: *mag* > *gam*.

³⁵ Of the many instances of the verb *εγεννησεν* in the genealogy of Matthew, this is the only instance in W where it is missing the gamma. Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:68ff. Royse, “The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex,” 202.

³⁶ Though the article for *pasxa* is neuter plural here in W, it is not found elsewhere in Matthew with a plural article (e.g. 26:2, 17, 19). The word *pasxa* is never plural in *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (TLG). Sanders notes that the number change in v.18 is a mistake. Sanders, *The New Testament Manuscripts*, 24.

³⁷ Perhaps the singular subject of the previous clause (*Ιωαννης*) influenced the change from 2p to 3s. The result is nonsense in context.

³⁸ The phrase in 17:24 needs the verb *τελει* for grammatical construal, but it is omitted in W. Perhaps the reading in W is an incomplete spelling of the verb *τελει* (instead *τε*) or a substitution of negation words, *ου* for *ουτε* with an omission of the verb.

6.3.3. PARABLEPSIS

6.3.3.1. Haplography

Some omissions have evidence of parablepsis that could have facilitated a leap.

These account for 7.14% of the singular readings. In some instance, parablepsis consists of two letters (2:17;⁴⁰ 7:17;⁴¹ 27:46)⁴² three letters (8:28;⁴³ 18:4;⁴⁴ 19:1,⁴⁵ 26:1),⁴⁶ or eleven letters (16:2-3).⁴⁷

³⁹ The text of W* reads an indicative verb instead of a participle. The ο δε + indicative is construed, but would need *kai epien* following. Royse states that the scribe caught part of the mistake and changed the eta of *apekriqh* to *ei* in *scribendo*, but did not correct the augment. Royse, “The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex,” 189.

⁴⁰ The omission of *του profhtou* is a leap from *ou* to *ou* (so Royse, “The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex,” 202).

⁴¹ The scribe leaps from *on* to *on*, thus omitting *agaqon* (so Royse, “The corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex,” 202). The adjective should be included for the doublet to match noun and adjective: *dendron agaqon . . . sapron dendron*.

⁴² In place of *lima* (*lema* in NA²⁷), the text of W reads *ma*. The words before *ma* in W are *hli hli*, which create parablepsis. Thus, *hli hli lima sabaxqanei* becomes *hli hlima sabaxqanei* in W.

⁴³ A portion of the adjunct has been omitted in W (a leap from *peran* to *xwran*), perhaps by homoeoteleuton. In Matthew, the region in which the story takes place is somewhat disputed in MSS, evident by the number of textual variants for *Gadarhnwn* (there are similar variants in the parallels, Mk 5:1 and Lk 8:26). See Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 18-19. The omission in W of *ei j thn xwran*, does not, however, resolve any matter concerning the location of the story (and is not omitted in the parallels in W).

⁴⁴ Sanders posits that the scribe of W has written *του oura* (the beginnings of *του ouranou*) instead of *en th basileia*, but Royse argues for *toutou* here because the scribe “leapt back from *meizwn* to *paidion*, which would likely have stood (as in W) more or less directly above in the exemplar.” Sanders, *The New Testament Manuscripts*, 156; Royse, “The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex,” 188-189. Though Royse’s argument for what W* reads is convincing, his explanation for the *cause* of the leap is not accurate if the exemplar resembles W because in W the final *nu* of *meizwn* is below the initial *pi* of *paidion*. For his explanation to be convincing, the final *nu* of *meizwn* should stand below the final *nu* of *paidion*, not six letters prior as it is. Sanders’ theory that the exemplar of W contained ca. twenty letters per line is perhaps more accurate than a six-letter discrepancy here since the leap from *meizwn* to *paidion* is twenty-two letters.

⁴⁵ Royse states that the leap from *thj* to *thj* “probably stood more or less directly above in the exemplar (as in W).” Royse, “The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex,” 189. If the exemplar is ca. twenty letters per line, Royse’s explanation is somewhat off because the leap is of twenty-nine letters. It is possible, however, the leap is *still* a result of parablepsis because the words *thj* and *thj* do stand almost directly on top of each other, and therefore the error in copying *Galilaiaj* a second time could be due to parablepsis in W itself (rather than in the exemplar).

⁴⁶ The surrounding occurrences of *-ouj* perhaps influenced the scribe to write *touj* in place of *toutouj*.

⁴⁷ Both Sanders and Legg state that the omission in W in 16:3 is due to homoeoteleuton (a leap from *purrazei gar* to the same). Sanders, *The New Testament Manuscripts*, 26; Legg, *Matthaeum*, 16:2.

Sanders proposes that the exemplar of Washingtonianus had either about twenty or forty letters per line.⁴⁸ Two instances of leaps that may support his claim: the leap of twenty letters (18:4) and the leap that consists of thirty-nine letters (16:2-3). Apart from these instances, however, there does not seem to be further evidence among the singular readings that could indicate an exemplar of ca. twenty or forty letters per line.

6.3.4. TRANSPOSITIONS

Transpositions account for 4.46% of the singular readings in Matthew in W. There is one instance where a verb is moved forward in the sentence (19:8),⁴⁹ and other instances that resemble such (9:6;⁵⁰ 23:8).⁵¹ In one transposition, the subject is placed further back in the sentence and the complement is moved forward (12:27).⁵²

Hurtado noted that the scribe of W in Mark preferred to transpose possessive pronouns *before* nouns rather than *after* nouns.⁵³ In the few instances of transpositions involving a genitive pronoun (12:27; 19:8; 23:8), only once (27:39)⁵⁴ does a singular reading in W in Matthew align with what Hurtado established in W in

⁴⁸ Sanders, *The New Testament Manuscripts*, 27. Sanders, *Facsimile of the Washington Manuscript*, vi. Finegan, *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts*, 145.

⁴⁹ The text of W is transposed here to subject > predicator > adjunct (and, though not a singular reading, does not read the complement *umin*). Royse notes that the transposition in W* may be stylistic, moving the verb forward in the sentence (Royse states that the omission of *umin* [also omitted in 892 Chr] may intend to “generalize the applicability of the law.” Royse, “The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex,” 203. (The transposition and omission of *umin* agree with the parallel Mk 10:4-5, but the transposition may be coincidental to Mark since the change does not seem to be significant.)

⁵⁰ In W here, the predicator (*afienai*) is prior to the adjunct (*epi thj ghj*), which occurs within the larger complement (*ecousian exei o uioj tou anqrwpou epi thj ghj afienai amartiaj*). Thus, the order in W is subject (*o uioj tou anqrwpou*) > predicator > adjunct > complement (*amartiaj*). Sanders notes that the transposition in 9:6 is harmonized with *rell* in the Markan parallel (*The New Testament Manuscripts*, 61). Indeed W in Mt 9:6 resembles the reading of many MSS in Mk 2:10 (though not the transposition in) C D L M 700 *plu* [*epi thj ghj afienai amartiaj*], or B Q 157 [*afienai amartiaj epi thj ghj*], or in W itself which omits *epi thj ghj* and is a singular reading). There are other singular readings in W where the verb is placed forward in the sentence, so perhaps, rather than being a harmonization to a word order that may be insignificant, the transposition may be coincidental because of a desire to move *afienai* forward in the sentence. There is, however, no guarantee that a harmonization to a parallel can be excluded because here W does not follow the normal text—in Mark W is singular.

⁵¹ The transposition within the complement (*umwn o kaqhghthj*) results in the nominative being placed next to the verb it modifies (*estin*).

⁵² In W here, there is a transposition of word order to adjunct > complement > predicator > subject > complement.

⁵³ Hurtado, *Text-Critical Methodology*, 80.

⁵⁴ The word order in W has been modified within the complement.

Mark. There are more singular readings in W in Matthew than Mark that place the genitive pronoun *after* the noun rather than *before*.⁵⁵

6.3.5. INFLUENCE FROM CONTEXT

Readings that seem to be influenced by context are found in 13.39% of the singular readings in W in Matthew, which is the most frequent type of reading apart from orthographic changes. Some additions could be influenced from preceding text (7:8;⁵⁶ 10:5;⁵⁷ 18:15;⁵⁸ 19:9a;⁵⁹ 20:12;⁶⁰ 20:15;⁶¹ 21:23;⁶² 24:11),⁶³ or be the result of a desire for a doublet (21:26;⁶⁴ 22:7)⁶⁵ or triplet (27:51).⁶⁶ Some changes may be

⁵⁵ The non-singular reading in 24:20 in W in Matthew, however, agrees with Hurtado's findings. See 24:20 in appendix eleven.

⁵⁶ The scribe could have been influenced by the preceding \omicron α τ ω ν λ α β α ν ϵ ι to change ζ η τ ω ν to α τ ω ν . The verbs in context, α τ ϵ ω , ζ η τ ϵ ω , and κ ρ ω ω , "have a religious dimension in Jewish-Christian usage: one asks or seeks God, one knocks on the 'gate of mercy'." Luz, *Matthew*, 1:421. The substitution in W* weakens the effectiveness of the verbal triumvirate, unless for some reason *asking* should be emphasized over *seeking*.

⁵⁷ The text in W reads a compound verb here. Perhaps the $-\epsilon$ κ α ending of the previous word, δ ω δ ϵ κ α , influenced an addition of a similar sound, ϵ κ —, or ϵ ζ —, to α ρ ϵ σ τ ι λ ϵ ν .

⁵⁸ The text of W reads a 2nd aorist imperative ending here rather than the 1st aorist imperative ending seen in *rell*. Perhaps the scribe was influenced by the preceding 2nd aorist imperative ending of υ ρ α γ ϵ .

⁵⁹ The change to plural agrees with the number of the preceding subject μ ι ν , rather than the 3s generic subject introduced with \omicron γ α ν . Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 478.

⁶⁰ The change to singular is nonsense, possibly influenced by the ν of the preceding word, which is η μ ι ν in W (so Royse, "The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex," 195).

⁶¹ The relative pronoun is changed to a comparative particle in W, perhaps influenced by the ω γ in the preceding verse: ω γ κ α ι σ ι . (In BDAG *s.v.* ω γ , there is an example for the comparative use of ω γ , similar to ω γ in W here: "γενησθητω σοι ω γηλειω *let it be done (=it will be done) for you as you wish.*")

⁶² The verb in W here is 3s, as opposed to 3p in *rell*. The verb is surrounded by 3s phrases, which could have, perhaps, influenced the 3s change in ρ ρ σ η λ γ \omicron ν . Prior to ρ ρ σ η λ γ \omicron ν in W is a 3s dative construction (which is a genitive absolute in some MSS), ϵ λ γ \omicron ν τ ι α υ τ ω , and following ρ ρ σ η λ γ \omicron ν in W is another 3s dative construction, α υ τ ω δ ι δ α σ κ \omicron ν τ ι . The verb in W, ρ ρ σ η λ γ \omicron ν , creates nonsense in context.

⁶³ The text of W reads υ μ α γ instead of ρ \omicron λ λ \omicron υ γ . In the pericopes surrounding the variant here, The False Christs (24:3-5), Wars, Rumors of War, Famine, and Earthquake (24:6-8), and Tribulation, Hate, Death, and Betrayal (24:9-13), ρ \omicron λ υ γ is used in six instances as a pronoun and υ μ ϵ ι γ is used in three instances. A form of the verb ρ λ α ν ω is used in three instances, twice with ρ \omicron λ υ γ and once with υ μ ϵ ι γ (in the majority of MSS, Mt 24:4 contains υ μ α γ ρ λ α ν η σ η ; 24:5 contains ρ \omicron λ λ \omicron υ γ ρ λ α ν η σ η ν ι ν ; 24:9 contains υ μ α γ and υ μ α γ ; 24:10 contains ρ \omicron λ λ \omicron υ γ ; 24:11 contains ρ \omicron λ λ \omicron υ γ and ρ λ α ν η σ η ν ι ν ρ α λ λ \omicron υ γ ; and 24:12 contains ρ \omicron λ λ \omicron υ γ). The scribe may have recalled υ μ α γ ρ λ α ν η σ η of v.4, and due to the mixture and interchangeability of ρ \omicron λ υ γ and υ μ ϵ ι γ throughout the surrounding pericopes, the scribe committed the unintentional alteration of ρ λ α ν η σ η ν ι ν ρ α λ λ \omicron υ γ > ρ λ α ν η σ η ν ι ν υ μ α γ in v.11.

⁶⁴ The verse in Matthew here is part of a deliberation between the chief priests and elders. They are considering how to respond to Jesus' question of John's baptism: did it come from *heaven* (\omicron υ ρ α ν \omicron) or from *man* (α ν κ ρ ω ρ ω ν)? The text of W contains a singular reading here, recording α ν κ ρ ω ρ \omicron instead of α ν κ ρ ω ρ ω ν . The grammatical change from plural to singular is insignificant in context as the meaning in context stays the same. The change could have been influenced by the preceding singular \omicron υ ρ α ν \omicron .

due to an influence from preceding text (13:2;⁶⁷ 24:49).⁶⁸ Concern for temporality [cf. 24:32b; 25:19] or repetition of previous word (13:20).⁶⁹ There may be one gospel harmonization (6:30).⁷⁰

Hurtado identifies fourteen variants where the scribe of W in Mark harmonizes to other gospels.⁷¹ Although the harmonizations have support with other MSS, Hurtado maintains they can in fact be attributed to the scribe of W because “these kinds of harmonizations mean little for textual relationships without overall agreement in a majority of all readings.”⁷² The relatively “small variants,” states Hurtado, were harmonized to “the more popular Gospels” in order to “improve or clarify the Markan text.”⁷³ There is a great discrepancy in the singular readings of W in Matthew compared to Hurtado’s findings in Mark since there seem to be few (6:30 [9:6; 19:8]) possible gospel harmonizations in Matthew in W. Perhaps great care was taken in Matthew not to bring disconcertant gospel parallels into harmony.

⁶⁵ The text of W (though it is difficult read here) repeats the verb *ubrizw* from the preceding verse, which results in a doublet.

⁶⁶ Instead of the earth being *shaken* (*eseisqh*), the text of W reads that the earth was *split* (*esxisqh*). Now in W in 27:51, the verb *sxizw* is read in three instances (as opposed to two instances in most MSS): the shrine was split, the earth was split, and the rocks were split. The verb in W here, *esxisqh*, is repeated from earlier in the verse.

⁶⁷ The text of W reads singular, *a large crowd*, in place of a plural, *many crowds*. This is a possible pre-harmonization to the singular *o oxloj* in the final clause of the verse.

⁶⁸ The verb in W here is in the future tense rather than present. The text of W is still grammatically construed, retaining a substantival participle, but the verbal change creates a difficult reading with the future tense. There is a future indicative verb immediately following (v. 51, *hcei*), which, perhaps, influenced a preemptive unintentional change in *twm mequontwm* to the same tense.

⁶⁹ The addition of *kai* in W in 13:20 may be an unintentional repetition of the previous *kai*, as it is in the textual vicinity. If 24:32b and 25:19 are an indication of the scribe’s concern about temporality, and if the *kai* is an intentional addition, then the reading here may also show such a concern. The addition in W, then, could emphasize that it is *both* immediately *and* with joy that one should receive the word of the kingdom (Mt 13:19, *ton logon thj basileiaj*).

⁷⁰ In W in 6:30, the noun *o agrouj* is read twice. It is found in all MSS before *shmeron* and it is found again after *shmeron* only in W. The first occurrence of the word in the verse (*tou agrou*) could have simply influenced the scribe to repeat it in another instance (*en agrw*). On the other hand, Sanders notes that the singular addition in W here is harmonistic (he suggests with Lk 12:18, but Lk 12:28 seems to be a closer parallel. *The New Testament Manuscripts*, 61). It is aligned verbatim in the Lk 12:28 parallel: *ei de ton xorton en shmeron en agrw onta in M U W Y f¹³ 33 1071*; as opposed to *ei de en agrw ton xorton onta shmeron in (P⁷⁵) B L NA²⁷*. The result of the addition in W is a doublet: *en agrw* doubles *eij klibanon*, which is then, “The grass of the field being *in the field* today and tomorrow being thrown *into an oven*” (emphasis added).

⁷¹ Hurtado, *Text-Critical Methodology*, 69-71.

⁷² Hurtado, *Text-Critical Methodology*, 71.

⁷³ Hurtado, *Text-Critical Methodology*, 71.

6.3.6. SYNONYM SUBSTITUTIONS

The substitution of words with synonyms occurs somewhat frequently in the singular reading in W in Matthew, accounting for 8.03% of the singular readings. There is an instance where a word is substituted with a synonym that is spelled very similarly (14:36).⁷⁴ There are some other conjunction/particle substitutions (16:9).⁷⁵ There is one preposition substitution, *apenant i* > *epi* (27:61).⁷⁶ Some substitutions are with synonyms and may be stylistic in nature (9:15;⁷⁷ 21:18),⁷⁸ two of which (24:32b;⁷⁹ 25:19)⁸⁰ concern temporality. The inferential conjunction *oun* is used as a replacement (14:25;⁸¹ 26:19).⁸²

6.3.7. ATTIC AND HEBRAIC INFLUENCE

There are several instances where singular readings may produce Attic grammar (9.82%). One omission in W is probably either due to Attic influence or desire of elimination of redundancy (6:7b).⁸³ Some singular readings create classicisms

⁷⁴ In 14:36, the change *s* > *l* in *dieswqhsan* > *dielwqhsan* may result from a stem change to *dialwfaw*, a synonym, rather than an orthographic lingual change.

⁷⁵ The reading in W, *oute*, is similar to *rell*, *oude*, possibly resulting from oral confusion.

⁷⁶ The alteration to *epi* (*near*) in W may place Mary Magdalene and the other Mary closer to the tomb than the reading of *rell*, *apenant i* (*opposite of the tomb*). Perhaps a close physical proximity to the tomb intends to give their witness even more authority.

⁷⁷ The itacistic reading in W (*afaireqh* > *afereqh*) is from the “very common” verb *afairew* (Moulton-Milligan, *s.v.* *aofaire/w*), which is a contextual synonym of the verb in *rell*, *apairw*.

⁷⁸ The text of W reads a form of *upagw* instead of *epanagw* or *paragw*, which are synonyms in context.

⁷⁹ Both *egguj* (*rell*) and *euquj* (W) can be used to indicate temporal proximity (BDAG *s.v.* *e0gguj* 2.a; *s.v.* *eu0qu/j* 1). The word *egguj* is not uncommonly used in an eschatological sense, cf. Phil 4:5; Rev 1:3; 22:10 (Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:366), so it may not be for theological reasons that the text of W reads *euquj* instead since both seem to be able to be used interchangeably in an eschatological context.

⁸⁰ In the pericope here, Matthew is referring to the *parousia* (so Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, 2:748; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:407; Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:735). France suggests that the “‘imminent’ *parousia* will not be *immediate*.” France, *Matthew*, 954. Perhaps concerned with the temporality of the passage, the text of W then connotes an indefinite amount of time, *tina* (BDAG *s.v.* *ti\j* 1.b.g), instead of a long time, *polun* (BDAG *s.v.* *polu/j* 2.a.a.).

⁸¹ In W here, *oun* is found in place of *de* (cf. Jn 6:19). If the replacement of *de* with *oun* is intentional, perhaps it is a stylistic alteration.

⁸² The word order in W is modified to accommodate the replacement of *kai* with an inferential *oun*. BDAG *s.v.* *oun*.

⁸³ The *oti* is used in Koine with verbs of believing (e.g. *dokew*). BDF §397(2). The *gar* is a causal connector (BDF §452), and therefore the following *oti* may have felt unnecessary or redundant to copy. Roysse notes that the scribe of W took “*oti* as inferential and redundant after *gar*.” Roysse, “The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex,” 202, 202 n. 49.

(12:20;⁸⁴ 13:38;⁸⁵ 26:14),⁸⁶ and if not a classicism, a good grammatical construction is created (12:4).⁸⁷ There is a verbal change, future indicative > aorist subjunctive (26:15),⁸⁸ which resembles classical usage. The spelling of ginwskw with an additional gamma, gignwskw (11:27¹, 27²; 16:3a; 24:15; 24:32a) is influenced from the Attic,⁸⁹ but it is a spelling that resurges during the Byzantine period.⁹⁰

There is an instance of an elimination of a grammatical Hebraicism in W (2:6).⁹¹

6.3.8. AORIST CONSTRUCTIONS

Verbal endings are conflated in one instance (23:37).⁹² The instances of $\text{a} > \text{o}$ (10:40, 11:17a; 14:35; 28:11) are a change from 1st aorist forms to 2nd aorist forms.⁹³

⁸⁴ Zerwick states that the ou mh construction “is never used by the Evangelists (or by Luke in Acts) in their own narrative but only in quoting the spoken word” (*Biblical Greek* §444). The addition of mh following ou in W in 12:20 not only occurs in a LXX quote (Is 42:1-4) but also with a future indicative (kateacei) which creates a classicism (BDF §365).

⁸⁵ The text of W has a singular verb, as opposed to a plural, with a neuter plural subject (Royse, “The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex,” 194), which is an Attic feature. BDF §133.

⁸⁶ Hagner points out that “Matthew will not have the reader miss the irony that it was eij twn dwdeka , ‘one of the twelve,’ which the evangelist moves to the beginning of his sentence, who actually betrayed Jesus.” Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:761. In general, the form dekadu (W) is found instead of dwdeka in Ptolemaic papyri (Moulton-Milligan, s.v. dekadu/o ; BDF §63.2. Cf. 19:28¹ in Codex D), and may be more of a classical spelling than Koine. The words, *one of the twelve*, here refer to Judas Iscariot, who is “new actor on stage.” Luz, *Matthew*, 3:345. Interestingly, Head notices in a different MS, Sinaiticus, that in Mark the number twelve is written in plene as opposed to the typical abbreviation when it is associated with Judas, but does not make much of it, saying, “I could be more persuaded that there was something in this view if there were more consistency in other regards” (Head, “The Gospel of Mark in Codex Sinaiticus,” 14, §27). There are, however, no other singular readings in W in Matthew that could suggest a stigma with Judas.

⁸⁷ In Matthew here, the pwj , which is found in all MSS except W, is indirect and (a weakened) interrogative (Zerwick, *Grammatical Analysis*, 35). When the conjunction wj (found in W in place of pwj) is used temporally, it “is most frequently followed by the aorist indicative,” which is the construction found in W in Mt 12:4 (and the Lukan parallel, Lk 6:4): $\text{wj} + \text{eishlqen}$. Funk, *Beginning-Intermediate Grammar* §866.1. (In W in the Markan parallel, Mk 2:26, pwj is employed and a participle, eiselqwn , follows instead of an indicative.) The text of W in Mt 12:4 then reads a common temporal construction instead of an uncommon one (cf. BDF §396).

⁸⁸ The text of W here reads an aorist subjunctive (paradw) and *rell* reads a future indicative (paradwsw). The text of W also reads an aorist subjunctive in the gospel parallels (Mk 14:10 [paradoi is a variant spelling of a second aorist subjunctive. Zerwick, *Grammatical Analysis*, 154] and Lk 22:4). (Sanders states that the W and *d* read the same here in Matthew [*The New Testament Manuscripts*, 60], but *trado* in *d* is present indicative.) The change may be a classicism. BDF §363.

⁸⁹ Sanders, *The New Testament Manuscripts*, 23.

⁹⁰ Gignac states, “the older orthography gign- becomes more common in the Byzantine period.” Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:176.

⁹¹ The use of gh with Iouda is a Hebraicism (so *rell*), which would otherwise be a definite article. BDF §261.4. The text of W reads a locative dative article in place of gh .

⁹² In 23:37, the scribe may have attempted to write an aorist, influenced from 21:35 eliquobolhsan (so Royse, “The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex,” 195), but there is no augment in W in 23:37 and the previous use in 21:35 is quite removed from 23:37, both textually and

If preference for the 2nd aorist is an Attic feature, and if the *possible* Atticisms (above) are in fact Attic, then it is possible that Atticization may be one of the most frequent types of alteration found in the singular readings in W in Matthew, almost eclipsing consonant orthography singulars, accounting for 14.28% of the singulars.

6.3.9. STYLISTIC OR INEXPLICABLE CHANGES

One addition fits naturally in place, but is not necessary (17:25).⁹⁴ There is an instance where omitted text is understood in context (21:8).⁹⁵ One omission may be a mere oversight (17:8b).⁹⁶ One pronoun is changed from reflexive to personal (16:24).⁹⁷ Some verbal changes may be stylistic in nature (11:17b;⁹⁸ 12:33^{1,99}

contextually. The word in W here conflates endings, combining –hsan with –ousa, creating liqobolhsousa.

⁹³ Sanders, *New Testament Manuscripts*, 23.

⁹⁴ Inclusion of ο Ihsouj at the beginning of 17:25 is a singular reading in W, which is written as a *nomen sacrum*, ο i8s8. Royse suggests that the addition may have been either a misreading of a duplicated eis for ois, or just a natural addition due to the frequency of the “presence of ‘Jesus’ as subject” (Royse, “The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex,” 195). Royse’s latter option is more viable than the former as long as the exemplar contained a similar letter formation to W: the epsilons in W are more angled than curved (*E* rather than *e*), and the omicrons are typically smaller in size than other letters, which may suggest that the letters epsilon and omicron are not easily confused for each other than if they were both circular and the same size. The name *Jesus* occurs later in the same sentence as the subject, so the singular addition in W earlier in the sentence is not necessary.

⁹⁵ The term kladouj (*branches*) may connote “something fitting a religious procession” (Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:123. Cf. Mk 11:8; Lk 19:36; Jn 12:13). If kladouj “is a more natural word than Mark’s hapax legomenon,” i.e., stibadaaj, *straw, grass, or reeds* (Gundry, *Matthew*, 410), then perhaps the text of W omits the adjunct phrase (apo tw n dendrwn) because it is a detail that is understood in context.

⁹⁶ All Greek MSS for Mt 17:8b contain either the article ton or the intensive pronoun auton (or both in C* 33), but the reading of W is singular, reading neither variant: Ihsoun monon (cf. Lk 9:36). If auton was in the exemplar, perhaps some emphasis is lost in W; and if ton was in the exemplar, it could have been omitted due to oversight. Hurtado finds only one pronoun in Mark (Mk 6:10) to be omitted because it is unnecessary, otherwise there are no pronoun omissions. Hurtado, *Text-Critical Methodology*, 75.

⁹⁷ The text of W reads auton in place of eauton. Though confusion of autoj and eautoj is a common scribal phenomenon (Royse, “The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex,” 194), the verb aparneisqai + a reflexive pronoun “is a new linguistic creation” in the Markan parallel 8:34 (so Luz, *Matthew*, 2:383). Perhaps the grammatical construction, if unfamiliar, prompted the mistake.

⁹⁸ The text of W reads an infinitive form of klaiw as opposed to a 2p indicative koptw in *rell*, an infinitive koptw in Q 1071, or a 2p indicative klaiw in 1424^c. The form eklausasqai read in W is not found in the NT or LXX. The doublet in 11:17, hulhsamen umin kai ouk wrxhsasqe with eqrhhsamen (umin) kai ouk ekoyasqe, is not as strongly tied together in W because the second 2p indicative verb (ekoyasqe) is replaced with an infinitive from a different root verb (eklausasqai).

⁹⁹ Concerning the composition of vv. 33-35 by Matthew, Montefiore states that they “are not here in their original connection” (Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, 2:196). He continues, noting that the 2p aorist active imperative poihsate is “rather obscure” and the original would have been indicative (Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, 2:196). The text of W may read a 3s aorist middle

16:3b;¹⁰⁰ 21:32c).¹⁰¹ There are omissions of conjunctions (19:9b;¹⁰² 21:32a),¹⁰³ but one singular reading eliminates asyndeton (13:41),¹⁰⁴ which may be similar to what Hurtado noted in Mk 1:9 for a concern to avoid asyndeton.¹⁰⁵

6.3.10. TEXTUAL EMPHASIS

Some singular readings emphasize the illustrative quality of the text (14:30;¹⁰⁶ 24:39).¹⁰⁷

6.3.11. CONCERNING PHARISEES

subjunctive in its place, or an Ionic (α > η [Goodwin §147]) and itacistic (ε > αι) spelling of the same imperative in *rell*, but it is not entirely clear what the scribe of W is up to here.

¹⁰⁰ The text of W reads an aorist infinitive of δοκίμαζω instead of present infinitive (as in G M N *et al.*) or present indicative (as in L), or an aorist infinitive of γίγνωσκω (as in al^{mu} it^{pl} vg). Perhaps the change in W is stylistic here, preferring a punctiliar tense instead of durative (BDF §338, §335).

¹⁰¹ The text of W here reads the article τω instead of τού with the infinitive, both neuter in gender (there is no governing preposition in W). If the τού + infinitive construction was wanting in some aspect (conceivably because a high-Koine construction was not desirable), perhaps the change, τω + infinitive, produced a low-level construction (the τω + infinitive construction is, however, very rare, occurring only in 2 Cor 2:13). Turner states the τού + infinitive construction “belongs to a higher level of the Koine.” *Syntax*, 141 (cf. BDF §400). Another possibility is that the scribe wanted to produce a causal construction (τω + infinitive) instead of a consecutive infinitive construction (Zerwick, *Grammatical Analysis*, 68; Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, §351. Turner, *Syntax*, 142). Still, another possible reason for a change is that the verb takes the dative here, which prompted the scribe to create a dative construction. Overall, however, there is little difference in meaning with the change and could be a simple oversight on the part of the scribe.

¹⁰² The text of W here does not read the connective και between two clauses.

¹⁰³ The omission of the particle οὐκ here is by oversight (so Royse, “The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex,” 203).

¹⁰⁴ The addition of και before ἀποστείλει in W here smoothes over asyndeton.

¹⁰⁵ Hurtado, *Text-Critical Methodology*, 73.

¹⁰⁶ The context of 14:30 is the dramatic story of Peter walking on water, which encourages both sympathy and empathy on the part of the reader. Sympathy occurs when Jesus calms their fears, invites Peter to walk on the water, and when he reaches out his hand when Peter cries for help. Empathy is evoked by several factors: Peter dares to get out of the boat, there is a natural fear of wind, the description of what Peter saw and felt, Peter cried, “Lord save me”, and the episode ends with the disciples worshiping Jesus as the Son of God (Wiarda, *Peter in the Gospels*, 93-94). The text of) B* *et al.* states that Peter saw *the wind* (ἀνεμὸν) and *was afraid* (ἐφόβηθη). The text of *rell* states that Peter saw *the strong wind* (ἀνεμὸν ἰσχυρὸν) and *was afraid* (ἐφόβηθη), which contains an additional word that “heighten[s] the dramatic effect” (Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 30). The text of W states that Peter saw *the strong wind* (ἀνεμὸν ἰσχυρὸν) and *was exceedingly afraid* (σφόδρα ἐφόβηθη) *to continue on* (ἐλθεῖν), which contains two more words than *rell*.

¹⁰⁷ The addition of ἀν is probably compounded with the verb ἠλθεν rather than used as a separate particle following ἐwj. The combination ἐwj (conjunction) + ἀν (particle) never occurs in the NT with an indicative (normally with a subjunctive). Turner, *Syntax*, 110, 111. When attached to the verb ἠλθεν, creating ἀνηλθεν in W, the verb is better suited to modify ο κατακλυσμοῦ. Instead of “until the flood came,” as *rell* is translated, W is translated as “until the flood rose.” Though McNeile states that “flood” is commonly found in apocalyptic literature to signify the final destruction of the world (*Matthew*, 357), the change in W does not seem to have a theological motive but rather nuances the imagery of water rising.

One singular reading in W portrays the Pharisees, along with the chief priests and elders, as ones who conspired to arrested Jesus (26:3), which aligns with Hurtado's findings in W in Mark.¹⁰⁸

6.3.12. CONFLATIONS

Some singular readings are confections of textual variants (23:25),¹⁰⁹ two of which manifest actions of Jesus (8:29;¹¹⁰ 12:15-16).¹¹¹

6.4. CONCLUSION

¹⁰⁸ In 26:3, most MSS read two subjects, *the chief priests and elders*, who conspired to arrest Jesus. Other MSS read a third subject, either, *the scribes* (S D W 1223), or *the Pharisees* (W). The Markan parallel (Mk 14:1) reveals an interesting reading in W, where *Pharisees* is read in place of *scribes* (in the other gospel parallels, Lk 22:2 and Jn 11:47, W reads the same subjects as most MSS). On the variant in Mark, Hurtado posits that the *prima manu* of W holds the "opinion" that the *Pharisees* were "the real culprits and not the scribes." Hurtado, *Text-Critical Methodology*, 80. Hurtado mentions that throughout Mark (barring the passion narrative), the Pharisees are a main opposition of Jesus and the singular reading in Mk 14:1 is therefore aligned with the rest of the gospel. Perhaps this belief takes wider hold than only in Mark, but here in Matthew in W as well. When Jesus is actually arrested, however (Mt 26:47), *the Pharisees* are not found—only *the chief priests and elders* in W.

¹⁰⁹ At the end of 23:25, the word *akrasiaj* is "replaced" by "various scribes." Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 50. All MSS read one noun following the *kai* except for W (*wrong doing, injustice*), *aeth* (*inequality, greed*), and *sy^{hl}* (*excess and inequality*), which read two nouns. The reading in W contains both of the well-attested variants, *akrasiaj* and *adikeiaj*, but they are not connected with a conjunction (as is found in *sy^{hl}*). Sanders states that "the scribe [of W] copied his original so accurately that he did not add the connective necessary to make a conflate reading." Sanders, *The New Testament Manuscripts*, 47. In other instances of conflate readings in W (8:29; 12:15-16) the text contains a connective so that the text reads smoothly.

¹¹⁰ In 8:29 in text of) * 713* *vg^{mss} bo^{pt}*, demoniacs ask Jesus if he will *destroy* them (cf. Lk 4:34), and in the text of *rell*, the demoniacs ask Jesus if he will *torture* them. The text of W combines the two variants with a conjunction (*destroy and torture them*), perhaps by copying a correction in his exemplar (so Sanders, *The New Testament Manuscripts*, 46). The conflation in W results in two signs of Jesus' power: he has the ability to *destroy and torture* the demoniacs, rather than merely one or the other of these abilities. But is the reading in W intended to magnify Jesus' power, or does the scribe merely want to preserve the readings in his exemplar? What do the other confections do—preserve readings or magnify Jesus' powers?

¹¹¹ The reading of *rell* states that Jesus *healed all of the crowd* (*equerapeusen autoij pantaj*) and *warned them* (*epetimhsen autoij*) not to make him known. The reading of D *et al.* states that Jesus *healed them* (*equerapeusen autoij*), *and all whom he healed* (*pantaj de ouj equerapeusen*), *he rebuked them* (*epeplhcen autoij*) not to make him known. The text of W contains a conflation of two variants, incorporating the reading of *rell* and D *et al.*, which reads, Jesus *healed them* (*equerapeusen autoij*), *and all whom he healed* (*pantaj de ouj equerapeusen*), *he rebuked them* (*epeplhcen autoij*) and *warned them* (*epetimhsen autoij*) not to make him known. The result of the conflation in W is two negative actions of Jesus rather than only one: he warns the crowd *and* rebukes them. Sanders believes that the scribe of W incorrectly copied a correction in his exemplar, resulting in a conflation (Sanders, *The New Testament Manuscripts*, 46).

Among other scribal characteristics of W, Sanders notes a “decided tendency toward Attic or other old forms.”¹¹² Conversely, Hurtado contends, “Nearly all the scribal changes in Codex W seem prompted by a similar kind of concern to produce a copy of Mark in a style of Greek familiar to the reader of that day.”¹¹³ To satisfy both of these scholars’ remarks, these Attic features would have to be “familiar” in the scribe’s context. This is a possibility, since some of the singular orthography in W are older forms that have resurged at a later date. Perhaps other Attic features in the singular readings were also in vogue in the scribe’s context. Though there are several instances where an Attic construction is created, no singular readings seem to make the text more Koine than it already is. This is not true for the orthography, where readings are aligned with *both* Koine and Attic standards. This interesting mixture of grammatical standards could benefit from further probing in W in the NT.

In his study of intentional singular readings in W in John, Haugh devotes much attention to verbal changes (11), specifically changes from aorist to perfect (5).¹¹⁴ In general with the Gospel of John, the perfect tense occurs more frequently than Matthew.¹¹⁵ Haugh notes that the alterations from aorist to perfect in John in W were not altered by the scribe of W but were probably transcribed from the exemplar of W.¹¹⁶ Although Haugh begins by categorizing such alterations as intentional on the part of the scribe, he concludes by stating that the alterations do not express the same motives of the scribe that Hurtado noted in his study of W in Mark. Therefore, Haugh believes such changes are not attributable to the scribe.¹¹⁷ The singular readings in W in Matthew do not display changes from aorist to perfect, which could support Haugh’s analysis.

There are enough singular reading that make sense in context, involving (a)syndeton, confections, emphasis of text, stylistic alterations, and creation of doublets/triplets, that could suggest that the scribe continually found places to improve the text. That is, the scribe repeatedly changed the text of Matthew, not so that it is dramatically re-presented, but so that it comes across a little more polished

¹¹² Sanders, *The New Testament Manuscripts*, 26.

¹¹³ Hurtado, *Text-Critical Methodology*, 81.

¹¹⁴ Haugh, “Codex Washingtonianus,” 172-178.

¹¹⁵ John contains 1/8th of all perfects in the NT. Enslin “The Perfect Tense in the Fourth Gospel,” 121. Haugh, “Codex Washingtonianus,” 174.

¹¹⁶ Haugh, “Codex Washingtonianus,” 178.

¹¹⁷ Haugh, “Codex Washingtonianus,” 175.

than, perhaps, what is found in other MSS. These changes are not a systematic overhaul, but are small changes that occur frequently enough throughout Matthew that when considering all of the sensical changes, Matthew seems to be a tighter text, especially considering the assimilations to the nearby context. There does not seem to be many nonsense readings, which could help to suggest that when the scribe *did* create singular readings, that they were more often than not intentional. But irrespective of the scribe's intentionality, the result is the same: the singular readings in W in Matthew often make sense in context and, on the whole, make the text and flow of Matthew a little more resilient than, perhaps, the exemplar was.

CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSIONS

An examination of singular readings illumines a number of identifiable patterns in each of our MSS. General patterns that span all five MSS in Matthew include orthographic exchanges, haplography, transpositions, and changes resulting from contextual influence. While these patterns are ubiquitous throughout, they are not always carried out in precisely the same manner from MS to MS. Concerning orthography, there are many nasal exchanges in Bezae, but nasals are not exchanged in Washingtonianus and are instead dropped out; instances of haplography in Sinaiticus sometimes begin a new line of text, but in Vaticanus text lines do not seem to factor into haplography; several transpositions in Sinaiticus could have resulted from correcting leaps; Sinaiticus has several possible instances where proceeding text has influenced a change, but Ephraemi seems not at all affected by proceeding text. Utilization of singular reading methodology seems to have been effective in elucidating unique characteristics of our MSS that might otherwise not be visible.

7.1. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

7.1.1. *NOMINA SACRA*

None of the MSS contain divided *nomina sacra*, that is, when *nomina sacra* are contracted, they are all found on one line and do not start on one line and continue to the next. On the other hand, *plene nomina sacra* in both sacral and nonsacral instances can be found divided between lines of text. There are, however, moveable nus, as in) 5:3; 19:23 where the plural genitive ο8u8n8w8 ends a line. Also, the adjective ouranioj is used primarily in Matthew and it is never found contracted in our MSS.¹

There are only a few instances where overbars are not provided by the *prima manu*. In 23:4, ανwn is written by)*, but the over bar is added later (by)^{ca}). In Codex D in 4:6¹, the *nomen sacrum* for qeoj has no bar over the top: qς. Immediately following in D, the *nomen sacrum* does have a bar: q8ς8. In D* in

¹ The word ouranioj and its forms are found in Mt 5:48; 6:14, 26, 32; 15:13; 18:35; 23:9; Lk 2:13; Act 26:19.

4:6a, there is a dittograph of $\tau\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ in place of the article $\tau\omicron\upsilon$. Only the latter $\tau\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ in D* here has a bar over the top ($\tau\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\upsilon}$) indicating *nomina sacra*. The former $\tau\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ is contracted without the bar ($\tau\epsilon\upsilon$).

Lexemes of $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ are always abbreviated in our MSS, which is one of the few traits regarding *nomina sacra* that span all of our MSS. Lexemes of $\iota\eta\varsigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ are also always contracted in our MSS, except in 1:21 in both Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, where $\iota\eta\varsigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ is written in *plene*. There are a few other notable patterns, particularly in Sinaiticus and Ephraemi: in Sinaiticus, it seems particular attention is given to Zebedee, ensuring that forms of $\upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ and $\mu\eta\tau\eta\rho$ are written in *plene* when associated with him. When a *nomen sacrum* can function sacrally as well nonsacrally (which are all of the *nomina sacra* apart from the proper names and $\tau\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$), Codex Ephraemi is the only one of our MSS that provides a clear distinction: lexemes of $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$, $\rho\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$, and $\upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$ are always contracted when they are sacral and are always *plene* when nonsacral.

7.1.2. ORTHOGRAPHY

Itacistic spellings that result in singular readings are the most common type of change in all of our MSS. In Sinaiticus and Bezae, the itacisms outnumber the singular readings (τ): 539 to 163 and D: 394 to 259), but in Vaticanus and Ephraemi, the singular readings outnumber the itacisms (B: 97 to 73 and C: 75 to 17). In Washingtonianus, the ratio of itacistic changes to singular readings is nearly identical (106 to 112). Besides many one-off changes, one hitherto undocumented (in sources that I have checked) orthographic pattern is found in two MSS, D and W, which is the omission of sigma before $\epsilon\iota$.² Perhaps the pattern is due to a type of Greek preference; but while W favors classicisms, D contains singulars that witness both Koine and classical constructions. Perhaps this pattern could be due to geographic locale of the scribes, but because the provenance of these two MSS is so debatable this makes such a point of agreement puzzling, considering the paleographic features of the MSS are so different as well.

² In D, 5:41; 9:2; 12:19; and in W, 21:41a; 23:14.

7.1.3. ATTIC VS. KOINE GRAMMAR

With the exception of Ephraemi, our MSS display changes Koine > Attic and/or *vice versa*. Also, there seems to be some flux in aorist forms in some MSS, changing 1st aorist endings to 2nd aorist and *vice versa*. There seems to be a connection between these two phenomena in our MSS. Sinaiticus, which features a preference for Koine grammar in its singular readings, also prefers 1st aorist verbal endings.

Washingtonianus, which prominently features Atticisms, prefers 2nd aorist verbal endings. But, the MSS that feature both Attic and Koine grammar in their singular readings either display both changes, from 1st aorist to 2nd aorist and the reverse (though in Vaticanus there is more of a preference for 2nd aorist verbal endings) or no distinction at all in aorist forms (so D).

7.1.4. HARMONIZATIONS

There is little preference for gospel harmonizations in the singular readings of our MSS in Matthew. Many of the singular readings seem to have been influenced by the preceding text, rather than remote gospel harmonization, the exception being Ephraemi, where one harmonization (24:3a) seems to be the exception in all of the singular readings gathered in the study.

7.1.5. CONFLATIONS

In) 14:29; W 8:29; W 12:15-16; and W 23:25, the texts contain conflated readings. In all instances except W 23:25, the scribes have combined two variants *with their own addition* to smooth the fusion. In most instances, the conflation concerns Jesus, either his teaching or a narrative where he is featured as one of the main characters. In these instances, instead of choosing, for example, variant A or variant B, it appears the scribes chose to combine them. Codex Sinaiticus contains a conflation in 14:29, which Van Aarde identifies as a key soteriological passage.³ In a critical passage such as this, perhaps it was preferable for the scribe to combine variants than to risk inclusion of the wrong variant. Both scribe A of) and the scribe of W

³ Van Aarde notes that there are several key passages in Matthew concerning soteriology: 6:14-5 and 18:21-35; 1:2c; 8:25; 10:22; 14:28-33; 16:25; 19:25; 24:13 and 27:39-40, 41-43, 49. Van Aarde, "IHSOUS, the Davidic Messiah, as Political Saviour in Matthew's History," 15-26.

smooth their conflation with helping words (except W 23:35), thus not merely copying two variants, but forging a grammatical nexus between them.

7.1.6. THEOLOGICAL READINGS

A few of the singular readings are theological in nature, but these are typically the exceptions, rather than the norm. There is not enough evidence to ascertain with certainty whether these readings are intentional since they are rare and defy other types of patterns, and they could otherwise be explained as error. Irrespective of the scribes' intentionality or comprehension, however, these readings do have nuanced theological implications but these do not drastically, and certainly not consistently, re-present Matthew.

7.1.7. THE SHORTER READING

Royse argues that the principle of the preference for the shorter reading (*lectio brevior potior*) is not a reliable principle for characterizing scribal behavior in the papyri he analyzes.⁴ Regarding this tenet, his study distinguishes between two types of scholars: those who agree *in theory* that the shorter reading is to be preferred (or is to be preferred except for mechanical errors), i.e. Griesbach, Hort, Metzger, the Alands, Boismard, and Lamouille, and those scholars who do not agree that the shorter reading is to be preferred, i.e. Scrivener, Kilpatrick, A.C. Clark, and Elliott. Colwell's empirical analysis of scribal habits records more omissions than additions. Royse, Head, Min, and Hernández springboard from Colwell's study to demonstrate that "scribes from the first several centuries tended to omit rather than to add."⁵

Three of our MSS produce the same result as Royse's study.⁶ The singular readings of scribe A of Sinaiticus in Matthew confirm fifty omissions (for a total loss of 115 words) and twenty-five additions (for a gain of 31 words). The data for scribe D is extremely limited. Scribe D omits in two instances (for a loss of 3 words) and adds in one instance (for a gain of 1 word). The singulars of Bezae (D) display thirty-four omissions (for a loss of 58 words) and twenty-seven additions (for a gain

⁴ Royse's entire tenth chapter is devoted to a discussion of the shorter reading. *Scribal Habits*, 705-736.

⁵ "The first several centuries" includes up to the 5th century, since Codex Ephraemi in Hernández's study omits more than it adds. Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 732.

⁶ See appendix twenty-two.

of 30 words). The singulars of Washingtonianus record twelve omissions (for a loss of 25 words) and ten additions (gaining 18 words). These seem to be aligned with Royse's findings.

Two of our MSS do not fit into this schema, one concerning *quantity* of added words (Vaticanus) and one concerning *frequency* of additions (Ephraemi). One of our texts, Vaticanus, gains more words in its singular readings in Matthew than it loses, but there are more instances of omissions than additions. The scribe of Vaticanus omits in eleven instances (a loss of 14 words) and adds in six instances (a gain of 18 words). This ratio of word gain to word loss (favoring word gain) is not aligned with Royse's study.

In another text, Ephraemi, the singular readings in Matthew record more instances of additions than omission, but the overall word omissions are greater than additions. The scribe of Ephraemi omits in eight instances (for a loss of 14 words) and adds in ten instances (for a gain of 13 words). This is also not aligned with Royse's study since there are more instances of additions than omissions. Though these two MSS, Vaticanus and Ephraemi, add more than they omit, the difference between them is an issue of frequency versus quantity. What is interesting, however, is that none of our MSS contain more word additions than omissions *as well as* a greater tendency to add than omit.

Why does a dissimilar phenomenon occur in Ephraemi and Vaticanus compared to other MSS? Ephraemi and Vaticanus both record the fewest number of singular readings of our MSS, as well as the lowest loss/gain of text (though Washingtonianus is close behind).⁷ In Ephraemi in Revelation, no instances of dittography are found as singular readings.⁸ Hernández states that the scribe of Ephraemi in Revelation "exercised extreme caution *not* to add to his codex."⁹ Perhaps this is an indication that the scribe's skill improved throughout the copying process, from Matthew to Revelation, but still Hernández notes that the scribe was a careless copyist, due to the large amount of insignificant singulars.¹⁰ Even if obvious

⁷ Interestingly, P⁴, which preserves Luke, contains more additions (5) than omissions (4), but the data pool is, of course, extremely limited. Hernández, "The Early Text of Luke," 125.

⁸ See Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 132-155.

⁹ Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 144.

¹⁰ Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 144.

errors (i.e. haplography and dittography) are excluded from the tally of additions and omissions, Vaticanus and Ephraemi still end up with a longer text.

Royse puts forth three exceptions where the longer reading is not to be preferred as the “original text”: (1) if the longer reading is late (externally), (2) if the longer reading is a harmonization, or (3) if the longer reading is an attempt at grammatical improvement.¹¹ Points 1 and 3 account for the instances of confluents in Sinaiticus (14:29) and Washingtonianus (8:29; 12:15-16; [W 23:25]), where the scribes conflated readings and then added one or two words (except W 23:25) to smooth the alteration.

Though Royse does not mention scribal error in these three exceptions,¹² the longer reading could also not be preferred if there is evidence of dittography (that is, by parablepsis). General copying habits of our scribes reflect a tendency to omit more than add (save Ephraemi and Vaticanus) except when encountering variants, where neither one was discarded but rather combined to create a new, longer, reading.

While, in general, the preference for the shorter reading is still a reasonable assumption when judging scribal habits, Royse correctly notes that “no simple rule will suffice for all or even most [textual] variations.”¹³ Here, the scribal preference for the shorter reading is not axiomatic, because two out of our five MSS of Matthew add more than they omit, resulting in a longer text. Epp believes that “at this juncture the discipline is not fully prepared either to drop the shorter reading criterion in favor of a longer reading canon, nor is there sufficient confidence to maintain the shorter reading option without clear accompanying recognition of the longer reading criterion. It is not an either/or situation but one requiring adjudication case by case.”¹⁴ This adjudication is a fair rule for the singular readings of our MSS in Matthew.

¹¹ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 735.

¹² Jongkind faults Royse and others for misunderstanding the principle of *lectio brevior potior*: “Apparently Griesbach was only concerned with the few substantial rewritings and not with the vast majority of inconsequential readings. On the other hand, the reception of this canon in later scholarship shows that it is very easy to misunderstand Griesbach on this particular point.” Jongkind, *Scribal Habits*, 139.

¹³ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 736.

¹⁴ Epp, “Traditional ‘Canons’,” 115.

7.2. CONCLUSION

Singular readings are manifested in our MSS in a variety of ways. There are similar types or categories of changes, but each MS has a distinctive way of generating these changes. Most changes involve haplography/dittography and grammatical nuances, while few record subtle theological changes. The scribes were not limited to one spelling standard, adjustment of grammar seems to be acceptable to a (varying) degree, and the scribes omitted more than they added except for the scribes of Ephraemi and Vaticanus and in some instances, when scribes came across variants or corrected readings in their exemplar they would conflate them.

While an examination of our five MSS of Matthew has yielded few singular readings of dramatic theological import, the singular readings do expose grammatical currents of the 4th-5/6th centuries, currents that are more prevalent than scribal attempts to re-present the text of Matthew. There is potential for these results to be utilized in future studies to ascertain to what extent scribal behavior is homogenous from book to book.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aland, Barbara. "The Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri." In *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels—The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex P⁴⁵*, ed. Charles Horton, 108-121. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series no. 258, ed. Mark Goodacre. London: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- Aland, Barbara. "New Testament Textual Research: Its Methods and its Goals." In *Translating the New Testament: Text, Translation, and Theology*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Mark J. Boda, 13-26. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2009.
- Aland, Kurt. *Kurzgefasste Liste der Griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, 2nd expanded ed. Arbeiten zur Neutestamentlichen Textforschung, vol. 1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994.
- Aland, Kurt and Barbara Aland. *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*, 2d ed. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989.
- Allen, Willoughby C. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.
- Altaner, Berthold. *Patrology*, trans. Hilda C. Graef. New York: Herder and Herder, 1961.
- Bartsch, Hans-Werner. *Codex Bezae Versus Codex Sinaiticus im Lukasevangelium*. Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms Verlag, 1984.
- Bauer, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, ed. Robert Kraft and Gerhard Krodel. Translated by a team from the Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- Blass, F. and A. Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. and rev. Robert W. Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Biblica Patristica: Index des Citations et Allusions Bibliques dans la Littérature Patristique*. Centre d'Analyse et de Documentation Patristiques, Equipe de Recherche Associée au Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, ed. J. Allenbach, A. Benoît, D.A. Bertrand, A. Hanriot-Coustet, E. Junod (vol. 3), P. Maraval, A. Pautler, P. Prigent, M. Scopello (vol. 5), F. Vinel (vol. 6), and Th. Ziegler (vol. 6), vols. 1-6. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1975, 1977, 1980, 1987, 1991, 1995.

- Billings, S. Bradly. *Do This in Remembrance of Me: The Disputed Words in the Lukan Institution Narrative (Luke 22.19b-20): An Historico-Exegetical, Theological and Sociological Analysis*. Library of New Testament Studies 314, ed. Mark Goodacre. London: T&T Clark International, 2006.
- Birdsall, J. Neville. "After Three Centuries of the Study of Codex Bezae: the *Status Quaestionis*." In *Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunel Colloquium, June 1994*, ed. D.C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux, xiv-xxx. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996.
- Birdsall, J. Neville. "The Codex Vaticanus: Its History and Significance." In *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text*, ed. Scot McKendrick and Orlaith O'Sullivan, 33-41. London: The British Library, 2003.
- Black, Matthew. *An Aramaic approach to the Gospels and Acts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.
- Blass, F. and A. Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. and rev. Robert W. Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- British Library, Leipzig University Library, St Catherine's Monastery at Sinai, and the National Library of Russia. *Electronic Version of Codex Sinaiticus*. <http://www.codexsinaiticus.org/en/manuscript.aspx>. Accessed February 19, 2011.
- Brogan, John J. "Another Look at Codex Sinaiticus." In *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text*, ed. Scot McKendrick and Orlaith O'Sullivan, 17-32. London: The British Library, 2003.
- Bultmann, Rudolph. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1963.
- Burk, Denny. *Articular Infinitives in the Greek of the New Testament: On the Exegetical Benefit of Grammatical Precision*. New Testament Monographs, 14, ed. Stanley E. Porter. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006.
- Canart, Paul. "Le Vaticanus graecus 1209: notice paléographique et codicologique." In *Le manuscrit B de la Bible (Vaticanus graecus 1209)*, ed. Patrick Andrist, 19-45. *Histoire du text biblique 7*, ed. Christian-Bernard Amphoux and Bernard Outtier. Lausanne, Switzerland: Éditions du Zèbre, 2009.
- Caragounis, Chrys C. *The Development of Greek and the New Testament*. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 167*, ed. Jörg Frey. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Casson, Lionel. *Libraries in the Ancient World*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.

- Caulley, Thomas Scott. "The 'New' Textual Criticism: Challenges and Promise." *Stone-Campbell Journal* 13 no. 2 (Fall 2010): 225-241.
- Clark, Albert C. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Critical Edition with Introduction and Notes on Selected Passages*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.
- Clark, A.C. *The Descent of Manuscripts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1918.
- Clarke, Kent D. "Paleography and Philanthropy: Charles Lang Freer and His Acquisition of the 'Freer Biblical Manuscripts'." In *The Freer Biblical Manuscripts: Fresh Studies of an American Treasure Trove*, ed. Larry W. Hurtado, 17-74. Society of Biblical Literature Text-Critical Studies, no. 6, ed. Sidnie White Crawford. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Clark, Kenneth W. "Textual Criticism and Doctrine." In *Studia Paulina: In Honorem Johannis De Zwaan, Septuagenarii*, ed. J.N. Sevenster and W.C. van Unnik, 52-65. Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn N.V., 1953.
- Colwell, Ernest C. "Method in Grouping New Testament Manuscripts." In *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, 1-25. New Testament Tools and Studies, ed. Bruce M. Metzger, vol IX. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1969.
- Colwell, Ernest C. "Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A Study of P⁴⁵, P⁶⁶, P⁷⁵." In *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, 106-124. New Testament Tools and Studies, ed. Bruce M. Metzger, vol IX. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1969.
- Colwell, Ernest C. and Ernest W. Tune. "Method in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings." In *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, 96-105. New Testament Tools and Studies, ed. Bruce M. Metzger, vol IX. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1969.
- Comfort, Philip W. and David P. Barrett, ed. *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts*. A Corrected, Enlarged Edition of *The Complete Text of the Earliest New Testament Manuscripts*. Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, 2001.
- Cranfield, C.E.B. *The Gospel According to Mark*. The Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary, ed. C.F.D. Moule. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Crossan, Dominic M. "Anti-Semitism and the Gospel." *Theological Studies* 26 (1965): 189-214.

- Danker, Frederick William, ed. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*, 3d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Davies, W.D. and Dale C. Allison. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. 3 vols. International Critical Commentary, ed. J.A. Emerton and C.E.B. Cranfield. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988-1997.
- Dunn, James D.G. "The Messianic Secret in Mark." *Tyndale Bulletin* 21 (1970): 92-117.
- Dunn, Mark. "An Examination of the Textual Character of Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus (C, 04) in the Four Gospels." Ph.D. diss. Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1990.
- Ehrman, Bart D. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Ehrman, Bart D. "The Text as Window: New Testament Manuscripts and the Social History of Early Christianity." In *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, eds. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 361-379. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2001.
- Elliott, J. Keith. *Codex Sinaiticus and the Simonides Affair: An Examination of the Nineteenth Century Claim that Codex Sinaiticus was not an Ancient Manuscript*. *Analekta Vlatadon* 33, ed. Panayotis C. Christou. Thessalonica: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1982.
- Elliott, J. Keith. "The International Greek New Testament Project's Volumes on the Gospel of Luke." In *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles: Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation*, 575-594. *Supplements to Novum Testamentum* 137, ed. M.M. Mitchell and D.P. Moessner. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Elliott, J. Keith. "Mathetes with a Possessive in the New Testament." *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 35 (1979): 300-304.
- Elliott, J. Keith. "Singular Readings in the Gospel Text of P⁴⁵." In *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels – The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex P⁴⁵*, ed. Charles Horton, 122-131. London: T & T Clark International, 2004.

- Elliott, J. Keith. "T.C. Skeat on the Dating and Origin of Codex Vaticanus." In *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles: Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation*, 65-78. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 137, ed. M.M. Mitchell and D.P. Moessner. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Elliott, J. Keith. "Theodore Skeat et l'origine du *Codex Vaticanus*." In *Le manuscrit B de la Bible (Vaticanus graecus 1209)*, ed. Patrick Andrist, 119-133. Histoire du text biblique 7, ed. Christian-Bernard Amphoux and Bernard Outtier. Lausanne, Switzerland: Éditions du Zèbre, 2009.
- Elliott, J. Keith. "Thoroughgoing Eclecticism in New Testament Textual Criticism." In *Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis* in honor of Bruce M. Metzger, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 321-335. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2001.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. "Multivalence of the Term 'Original Text.'" *Harvard Theological Review* 92 no. 3 (July 1999): 245-281.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. "The Significance of the Papyri for Determining the Nature of the New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission." In *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*, ed. William L. Petersen, 71-103. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity, vol. 3, ed. Charles Kannengiesser. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, ed. Matthew Black, vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. "Toward the Clarification of the Term 'Textual Variant'." In *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*, ed. Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee, 47-61. Studies and Documents, ed. Irving Alan Sparks, vol. 45. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. "Traditional 'Canons' of New Testament Textual Criticism: Their Value, Validity, and Viability—or Lack Thereof." In *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views in Contemporary Research*, ed. Klaus Wachtel and Michael W. Holmes, 79-127. Text-Critical Studies, ed. Sidnie White Crawford, no. 8. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- Fee, Gordon D. *Papyrus Bodmer II (P66): Its Textual Relationships and Scribal Characteristics*. Studies and Documents XXXIV, ed. Jacob Geerlings. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968.

- Fee, Gordon D. "Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism—Which?" In *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*, ed. Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee, 124-140. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1993.
- Fee, Gordon D. Review of *A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul*, by John J. Clabeaux, *CBQ* 53 (1991): 320-321.
- Finegan, Jack. *Encountering New Testament Manuscripts: A Working Introduction to Textual Criticism*. London: S.P.C.K., 1975.
- France, R.T. *The Gospel of Matthew*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament, ed. Ned B. Stonehouse, Frederick Fyvie Bruce, and Gordon D. Fee. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2007.
- Foster, Paul. *Community, Law and Mission in Matthew's Gospel*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2, reihe 177, ed. Jörg Frey. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Foster, Paul. A Review of *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*, by James Royse. *ExTim* 121 no. 7 (2010): 346-347.
- Frey, Jörg. "Zu Text und Sinn des Freer-Logion." *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XCIII (2002); 13-34.
- Funk, Robert W. *A Beginning-Intermediate Grammar of Hellenistic Greek*. 3 vols. Sources for Biblical Study 2, Wayne A. Meeks, ed. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1973.
- Gamble, Harry Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Gaston, Lloyd. "The Messiah of Israel as Teacher of the Gentiles: The Setting of Matthew's Christology." *Interpretation* 29 no. 1 (Ja 1975): 24-40.
- Gignac, Francis Thomas. *Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, vol. 1 Phonology. Testi e Documenti per lo Studio Dell'antichità. 55. Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino-La Goliardica, 1976.
- Globe, Alexander. "Some Doctrinal Variants in Matthew 1 and Luke 2, and the Authority of the Neutral Text." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 42 no. 1 (Ja 1980): 52-72.
- Glover, Richard. "Patristic Quotations and Gospel Sources." *New Testament Studies* 31 no. 2 (April 1985): 234-251.
- Goodwin, William W. *A Greek Grammar*. Surrey, UK: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1992.

- Greenlee, J. Harold. *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964.
- Greeven, Heinrich. "The Gospel Synopsis from 1776 to the Present Day," trans. Robert Altham. In *J.J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-critical Studies 1776-1976*, ed. Bernard Orchard and Thomas R.W. Longstaff, 22-49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Gregory, Caspar Rene. *Canon and Text of the New Testament*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1907.
- Grenfell, Bernard P. and Arthur S. Hunt, ed. 1227. St. Matthew's Gospel xii. In *Oxyrhynchus Papyri X*, 12-14. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1914.
- Griesbach, J.J., ed. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 2 vols. 9th ed. London: J. Mackinlay, 1809.
- Gundry, Robert H. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1982.
- Haines-Eitzen, Kim. *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Hagner, Donald A. *Matthew 1-13*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 33a, ed. David A. Hubbard, Glenn W. Barker, and Ralph P. Martin. Dallas: Word Books, Publisher, 1995.
- Hagner, Donald A. *Matthew 14-28*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 33b, ed. David A. Hubbard, Glenn W. Barker, and Ralph P. Martin. Dallas: Word Books, Publisher, 1995.
- Hall, Christopher A. *Learning Theology with the Church Fathers*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2002.
- Haugh, Dennis. "Was Codex Washingtonianus a Copy or a New Text?" In *The Freer Biblical Manuscripts: Fresh Studies of an American Treasure Trove*, ed. Larry Hurtado, 167-184. Society of Biblical Literature Text-Critical Studies, no. 6, ed. Sidnie White Crawford. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Harris, J. Rendel. *Stichometry*. London: Clay, 1893.
- Harris, Murray J. "Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament." In *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, vol. 3, ed. Colin Brown, 1171-1215. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981.

- Head, Peter M. "Christology and Textual Transmission: Reverential Alteration in the Synoptic Gospels." *Novum Testamentum* 35 no. 2 (1993): 105-129.
- Head, Peter M. "The Gospel of Mark in Codex Sinaiticus: Textual and Reception-Historical Considerations." *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 13 (2008) [journal on-line]; available <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/v13/index.html>; Internet; accessed 3 February 2013.
- Head, Peter. "The Habits of New Testament Copyists: Singular Readings in the Early Fragmentary Papyri of John." *Biblica* 85 (no.3 2004): 399-408.
- Head, Peter. "Observations on Early Papyri of the Synoptic Gospels, especially on the 'Scribal Habits.'" *Biblica* 71 (no.2 1990): 240-247.
- Heimerdinger, Jenny. "Word Order in Koine Greek: Using a Text-Critical Approach to Study Word Order Pattern in the Greek Text of Acts." *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 9 no. 18 N (1996): 139-180.
- Hernández, Juan, Jr. "The Early Text of Luke." In *The Early Text of the New Testament*, ed. Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger, 121-139. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Hernández, Juan, Jr. *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse: The Singular readings of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2, reihe 218, ed. Jörg Frey. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Hernández, Juan, Jr. "A Scribal Solution to a Problematic Measurement in the Apocalypse." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 56 no. 2 (Ap 2010): 273-278.
- Holmes, Michael W. "Early Editorial Activity and the Text of Codex Bezae in Matthew." Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1984.
- Holmes, Michael W. "From 'Original Text' to 'Initial Text'." In *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, 2nd ed., ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 637-688. New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Eldon J. Epp. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Hoskier, H.C. *Codex B and its Allies: Part I, A Study and an Indictment*. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1914.

- Hoskier, H.C. *Codex B and its Allies: Part II, Chiefly Concerning Δ, but Covering Three Thousand Differences Between Δ and B in the Four Gospels, with the Evidence Supporting Each Side, including the New Manuscripts Evidence by Von Soden, and the Collateral Readings of Other Important Authorities.* London: Bernard Quaritch, 1914.
- Hurtado, Larry W. "Developments and Directions in N.T. Textual Criticism." In *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts: The Papers of the First Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, ed. D.G.K. Taylor, 26-48. Texts and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature, ed. D.C. Parker and D.G.K. Taylor, 3d series, vol. 1. Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 1999.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins.* Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2006.
- Hurtado, Larry W. "Introduction." In *The Freer Biblical Manuscripts: Fresh Studies of an American Treasure Trove*, ed. Larry W. Hurtado, 1-15. Society of Biblical Studies, Text-Critical Studies no. 6, Sidnie White Crawford, ed. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Hurtado, Larry W. "The Origin of the *Nomina Sacra*: A Proposal." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 117 no. 4 (1998): 655-673.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *Text-Critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text: Codex W in the Gospel of Mark.* Studies and Documents 43, ed. Irving Alan Sparks. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1981.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *The Parables of Jesus*, 2d rev. ed. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Jongkind, Dirk. *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus.* Texts and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature 3d series, ed. D.C. Parker and D.G.K. Taylor, vol. 5. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2007.
- Jongkind, Dirk. "Singular Readings in Sinaiticus: The Possible, the Impossible, and the Nature of Copying." In *Textual Variation: Theological and Social Tendencies? Papers from the Fifth Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, ed. H.A.G. Houghton and D.C. Parker. Texts and Studies: Third Series, ed. David Parker and David Taylor, vol. 5. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008.
- Jordaan, G.J.C. "The Word-Order Differences between the Greek and the Latin Text in Codex Bezae." In *A South African Perspective on the New Testament: Essays by South African New Testament Scholars presented to Bruce Manning Metzger during his Visit to South Africa in 1985*, ed. J.H. Petzer and P.J. Hartin, 99-111. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986.

- Kannaday, Wayne C. *Apologetic Discourse and the Scribal Tradition: Evidence of the Influence of Apologetic Interests on the Text of the Canonical Gospels*. Society of Biblical Literature, Text-Critical Studies 5, ed. James R. Adair, Jr. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.
- Kannengiesser, Charles. "Athanasius of Alexandria vs. Arius: *The Alexandrian Crisis*." In *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, ed. Birger A Pearson and James E. Goehring, 204-215. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- Kenyon, Frederic G. *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. London: Macmillan, 1901.
- Kenyon, F.G. *The Text of the Greek Bible*, 3d ed. London: Gerald Duckworth & Company Limited, 1975.
- Klijn, A.F.J. *A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts*. Utrecht: Drukkerij v.h. Kemink en Zoon N.V., 1949.
- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. *Matthew as Story*, 2d rev. enlg. ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- Koester, Helmut. "The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century." In *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*, ed. William L. Petersen, 19-37. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity, vol. 3, ed. Charles Kannengiesser. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- Kotsifou, Chrysi. "Books and Book Production in the Monastic Communities of Byzantine Egypt." In *The Early Christian Book*, ed. William E. Klingshirn and Linda Safran, 48-66. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2007.
- Kraus, Thomas J. *Ad Fontes: Original Manuscripts and Their Significance for Studying Early Christianity—Selected Essays*. Texts and Editions for New Testament Study, vol. 3, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Wendy J. Porter. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Kraus, Thomas J. and Tobias Nicklas. "The World of New Testament Manuscripts: 'Every Manuscripts Tells a Story.'" In *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their World*, ed. Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas, 1-12. Texts and Editions for New Testament Study, ed. Stanley Porter and Wendy J. Porter, vol. 2. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

- Kwong, Ivan Shing Chung. *The Word Order of the Gospel of Luke: Its Foregrounded Messages*. Library of New Testament Studies 298, ed. Mark Goodacre. Studies in New Testament Greek 12. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Lake, Helen and Kirsopp Lake. *Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus: The New Testament, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Shepherd of Hermas Preserved in the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.
- Legg, S.C.E. *Nouum Testamentum Graece: Secundum Textum Westcotto-Hortianum, Euangelium Secundum Matthaeum*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1940.
- Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. New ed. Henry Stuart Jones and Roderick McKenzie. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.
- Luijendijk, AnneMarie. *Greetings in the Lord: Early Christians and the Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Harvard Theological Studies 60, eds François Bovon, Francis Schüssler Fiorenza, and Peter B. Machinist. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 1-7*, trans. Wilhelm C. Linss. A Continental Commentary. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 8-20*, trans. James E. Crouch, ed. Helmut Koester. Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 21--28*, trans. James E. Crouch, ed. Helmut Koester. Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- Luz, Ulrich. *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew*, New Testament Theology, James D.G. Dunn, ed., trans. J. Bradford Robinson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Lyon, R.W. "A Re-examination of Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus." Ph.D. diss., The University of St. Andrews, 1958.
- Lyon, R.W. "A Re-examination of Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus." *New Testament Studies* 5 no. 4 (July 1959): 260-272.
- Maius, Angelus, ed. *Codex Vaticanus, H Kainh Diaqhkh, Nouum Testamentum Graece: Ex Antiquissimo Codice Vaticano*. London: William & Norgate and D. Nutt, 1859.
- Martini, Carlo M. *Il Problema della Recensionalità del Codice B alla Luce del Papiro Bodmer XIV*. Analecta Biblica: Investigationes Scientifcae in res Biblicas 26. Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1966.

- McKim, Donald K. *Theological Turning Points: Major Issues in Christian Thought*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1988.
- McNeile, Alan Hugh. *The Gospel According to St. Matthew: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2d ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2002.
- Metzger, Bruce M. and Bart D. Ehrman. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 4th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Milne, H.J.M. and T.C. Skeat. *The Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Alexandrinus*, 2d ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955.
- Milne, J.M. and T.C. Skeat. *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1938.
- Min, Kyoung Shik. *Die Früheste Überlieferung des Matthäusevangeliums (bis zum 3./4. Jh.)*. Arbeiten zur Neutestamentlichen Textforschung. Institute für Neutestamentliche Textforschung der Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität Münster/Westfalen, band 34. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.
- Montefiore, C.G. *The Synoptic Gospels, edited with an Introduction and a Commentary*. 2 vol. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1909.
- Moulton, James Hope. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol. III Syntax, Turner, Eric G. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1963.
- Moulton, James Hope and George Milligan. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament: Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1930.
- Mounce, William D. *Basics of Biblical Greek*, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003.
- Mounce, William D. *The Morphology of Biblical Greek*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.
- Nolland, John. *The Gospel of Matthew*. The New International Greek Testament Commentary, ed. I. Howard Marshall and Donald A. Hagner. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005.

- Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27th ed, ed. Barbara and Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2001.
- Novum Testamentum Graece*, 28th ed, ed. Barbara and Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.
- Novum Testamentum Graecum/Editio Critica Maior: Parallel Pericopes*, ed. Holger Strutwolf and Klaus Wachtel. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011.
- Oates, John F., Roger S. Bagnall, Sarah J. Clackson, Alexandra A. O'Brien, Joshua D. Sosin, Terry G. Wilfong, and Klaas A. Worp. *Checklist of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*. <http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/clist.html>, March, 2008.
- Parker, David C. *Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and its Text*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Parker, David C. *Codex Sinaiticus: The Story of the World's Oldest Bible*. London: The British Library, 2010.
- Parker, David C. "Is 'Living Text' Compatible with 'Initial Text'? Editing the Gospel of John." In *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views in Contemporary Research*, eds. Klaus Wachtel and Michael W. Holmes, 13-21. Text-Critical Studies, ed. Sidnie White Crawford, no. 8. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- Parker, David C. *An Introduction to New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Parker, David C. "The Majuscule Manuscripts of the New Testament." *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, eds. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 22-42. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2001.
- Parker, David C. and S.R. Pickering, ed. 4968. Acta Apostolorum 10-12, 15-17. In *Oxyrhynchus Papyri LXXIV*, 1-45. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2009.
- Parsons, Peter. *City of the Sharp-Nosed Fish: Greek Lives in Roman Egypt*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 2007.
- Pattie, Thomas S. "The Creation of the Great Codices." In *The Bible as Book: The Manuscripts Tradition*, ed. John L. Sharpe III and Kimberly Van Kempen, 61-72. London: The British Library, 1998.

- Paulson, Eric J. "Are Oral Reading Word Omissions and Substitutions Caused by Careless Eye Movements?" *Reading Psychology* 23 (2002): 45-66.
- Paulson, Eric J. "Adult Readers' Eye Movements During the Production of Oral Miscues." Ph.D. diss., University of Arizona, 2000.
- Paulson, Eric J. "Miscues and Eye Movements: Functions of Comprehension." In *Scientific Realism in Studies of Reading*, ed. Alan D. Flurkey, Eric J. Paulson, and Kenneth S. Goodman, 247-264. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2008.
- Paulson, Eric J. and Anne E. Freeman. *Insight from the Eyes: The Science of Effective Reading Instruction*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2003.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine, I The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1971.
- Petersen, William L. "The Genesis of the Gospels." In *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel*, ed. A. Denaux, 33-66. Leuven: University Press, 2002.
- Pickering, S.R. "The Significance of Non-Continuous New Testament Textual Material in Papyri." In *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts: The Papers of the First Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, ed. D.G.K. Taylor, 121-141. Texts and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature, ed. D.C. Parker and D.G.K. Taylor, 3d series, vol. 1. Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 1999.
- Pisano, Stephen. "The Text of the New Testament." In *Prolegomena: Exemplum Quam Simillime Phototypice Expressum Codicis Vaticanani B (Vat. Gr. 1209) Praestantis Humanitatis Operis Rei Publicae Italicae Officina Typographica et Argentaria Sumptibus Suis Comparavit*, 27-41. Vatican City: La Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana e L'Instituto Poligrafico e Zecca Dello Stato, 1999.
- Plummer, Alfred. *An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953.
- Porter, Calvin L. "Papyrus Bodmer XV (P75) and the Text of Codex Vaticanus." *JBL* 81 no. 4 (Dec. 1962): 363-376.
- Porter, Stanley E. "Word Order and Clause Structure in New Testament Greek: An Unexplored Area of Greek Linguistics Using Philippians as a Test Case." *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 6 no. 12 N (1993): 177-205.

- Prior, J. Bruce. "The Use and Nonuse of *Nomina Sacra* in the Freer Gospel of Matthew." In *The Freer Biblical Manuscripts: Fresh Studies of an American Treasure Trove*, ed. Larry Hurtado, 147-167. Society of Biblical Literature Text-Critical Studies, no. 6, ed. Sidnie White Crawford. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Read-Heimerdinger, Jenny. *The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 236, ed. Stanley E. Porter. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Renehan, Robert. *Greek Textual Criticism: A Reader*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969.
- Rice, George E. "The Anti-Judaic Bias of the Western Text in the Gospel of Luke." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 18 no. 1 (Spring 1980): 51-57.
- Roberts, Colin H. and T.C. Skeat. *The Birth of the Codex*. London: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Robertson, A.T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934.
- Robinson, Maurice. "Rule 9, Isolated Variants, and the 'Test-Tube' Nature of the NA²⁷/UBS⁴ Text: A Byzantine-Priority Perspective." In *Translating the New Testament: Text, Translation, and Theology*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Mark J. Boda, 27-61. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2009.
- Robinson, Thomas A. *The Bauer Thesis Examined: The Geography of Heresy in the Early Christian Church*. Lewiston, New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1988.
- Ropes, J.H. *The Text of Acts*, vol. 3 of *The Beginning of Christianity*, ed. F.J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, part 1. London: Macmillan, 1926.
- Royse, James R. "The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex." In *The Freer Biblical Manuscripts: Fresh Studies of an American Treasure Trove*, ed. Larry Hurtado, 185-226. Society of Biblical Literature Text-Critical Studies, no. 6, ed. Sidnie White Crawford. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Royse, James R. "Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri." Th.D. diss., Graduate Theological Union, 1981.
- Royse, James R. *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*. New Testament Tools, Studies, and Documents, vol. 36, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Eldon J. Epp. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2008.

- Royse, James R. "Scribal Tendencies in the Transmission of the Text of the New Testament." In *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, 2nd ed., ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 461-478. New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Eldon J. Epp. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Sanders, Henry A. *Facsimile of the Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels in the Freer Collection*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1912.
- Sanders, Henry A. *The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection, Part I: The Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels*. University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series 9/1. New York: Macmillan, 1912.
- Schaff, Philip. *The Creeds of Christendom with a History and Critical Notes*, 6th ed. Vol. II The Greek and Latin Creeds. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2007.
- Schmid, Ulrich. "Reassessing the Palaeography and Codicology of the Freer Gospel Manuscript." In *The Freer Biblical Manuscripts: Fresh Studies of an American Treasure Trove*, ed. Larry Hurtado, 227-251. Society of Biblical Literature Text-Critical Studies, no. 6, ed. Sidnie White Crawford. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Schmid, Ulrich. Review of *Die Früheste Überlieferung des Matthäusevangeliums (bis zum 3./4. Jh.)*, by Kyoung Shik Min. *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 15 (2010) [journal on-line]; available <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/v15/index.html>; Internet; accessed 3 February 2013.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolph. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Translated by Robert R. Barr. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2002.
- Silva, Moisés. "Biblical Greek and Modern Greek: A Review Article." *WTJ* 67 no. 2 (Fall 2005): 391-404.
- Silva, Moisés. "The Text of Galatians: Evidence from the Earliest Greek Manuscripts." In *Scribes and Scripture: New Testament Essays in Honor of J. Harold Greenlee*, 17-25. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- Skeat, T.C. "The Codex Sinaiticus, the Codex Vaticanus, and Constantine," *JTS* 50 no. 2 (Oct 1999): 583-625.
- Skeat, T.C. "The Codex Vaticanus in the Fifteenth Century." *JTS* 35 no. 2 (Oct 1984): 454-456.
- Souter, Alexander. *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*. London: Duckworth, 1913.

- Stanton, Graham N. "The Early Reception of Matthew's Gospel: New Evidence from Papyri?" In *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study*, ed. David E. Aune, 42-61. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001.
- Stanton, Graham N. "Matthew's Christology and the Parting of Ways." In *Jews and Christians: The Parting of Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. James D.G. Dunn, 99-116. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1999.
- Streeter, Burnett Hillman. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscripts Tradition, Sources, Authorship, & Dates*, rev. ed. London: MacMillan and Co., Limited, 1953.
- Theissen, Gerd. *A Theory of Primitive Christian Religion*. Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 1999.
- Thrall, Margaret E. *Greek Particles in the New Testament*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1962.
- Tindall, Christian. *Contributions to the Statistical Study of the Codex Sinaiticus*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1961.
- Tischendorf, Constantinus. *Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus sive Fragmenta Novi Testamenti e Codice Graeco Parisiensi Celeberrimo Quinti ut Videtur Post Christum Seculi*. Leipzig: Bernh. Tauchnitz, 1843.
- Tischendorf, Constantinus. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 2 vols. 8th ed. Lipsiae: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869.
- Tischendorf, Constantinus. *Vetus Testamentum Graece*. 2 vols. Lipsiae: F.A. Brockhaus, 1869.
- Turner, Eric G. *The Typology of the Early Codex*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977.
- Urbán, Ángel. "Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis (D): Intercambios Vocálicos en el Texto Griego de Marcos." *Collectanea Christiana Orientalia* 4 (2007): 245-268.
- Vaganay, Léon and Christian-Bernard Amphoux. *An Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*, trans. Jenny Heimerdinger. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Van Aarde, Andries G. "IHSOUS, the Davidic Messiah, as Political Saviour in Matthew's History." In *Salvation in the New Testament: Perspectives on Soteriology*, ed. Jan G. van der Watt, 7-31. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, ed. M.M. Mitchell and D.P. Moessner, vol. 121. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

- Van Haelst, Joseph. *Catalogue des Papyrus Littéraires Juifs et Chrétiens*. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1976.
- Voelz, James W. “The Greek of Codex Vaticanus in the Second Gospel and Marcan Greek.” *Novum Testamentum* XLVII no. 3 (2005): 209-249.
- Vogels, Heinrich Joseph. “Die Harmonistik im Evangelientext des Codex Cantabrigiensis: Ein Beitrag zur Neutestamentlichen Textkritik.” In *Text und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur*, vol. 6 no. 3, ed. Adolf Harnack and Carl Schmidt, 1-118. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1913.
- Wagner, Walter H. *After the Apostles: Christianity in the Second Century*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Wallace, Daniel B. “Lost in Transmission: How Badly Did the Scribes Corrupt the New Testament Text?” In *Revisiting the Corruption of the New Testament: Manuscript, Patristic, and Apocryphal Evidence*, ed. Daniel B. Wallace, 19-55. Text and Canon of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic and Professional, 2011.
- Wasserman, Tommy. “The Early Text of Matthew.” In *The Early Text of the New Testament*, ed. Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger, 83-107. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Wasserman, Tommy. *The Epistle of Jude: Its Text and Transmission*. Coniectanea Biblica, New Testament Series, ed. Bengt Holmberg and Kari Syreeni, vol. 43. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2006.
- Wasserman, Tommy. Review of *The Freer Biblical Manuscripts: Fresh Studies of an American Treasure Trove*, ed. Larry W. Hurtado. *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 13 (2008) [journal on-line]; available <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/v13/index.html>; Internet; accessed 3 March 2013.
- Wasserman, Tommy. “Theological Creativity and Scribal Solutions in Jude.” In *Textual Variation: Theological and Social Tendencies? Papers from the Fifth Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, ed. D.C. Parker and H.A.G. Houghton, 75-83. Texts and Studies: Third Series, ed. David Parker and David Taylor, vol. 5. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss and Fenton John Anthony Hort. *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, introduction and appendix. Cambridge: MacMillan and Co., 1882.

- Wheeler, Frank. "Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem: A Textual Commentary on the Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark." Ph.D. diss., Baylor University, 1985.
- Wiarda, Timothy. *Peter in the Gospels: Pattern, Personality and Relationship*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2 Reihe, ed. Martin Hengel and Otfried Hofius, 127. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Wikgren, Allen P. "The Citation of Versional Evidence in an Apparatus Criticus." In *New Testament Manuscripts Studies: The Materials and the Making of a Critical Apparatus*, ed. Merrill M. Parvis and Allen P. Wikgren, 95-115. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950.
- Willard, Louis Charles. *A Critical Study of the Euthalian Apparatus*. Arbeiten zur Neutestamentlichen Textforschung. Herausgegeben im Auftrag des Instituts für Neutestamentliche Textforschung der Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität Münster/Westfalen, von David C. Parker and Holger Strutwolf, band 41. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.
- Wright, Leon E. *Alterations of the Words of Jesus as Quoted in the Literature of the Second Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1952.
- Zerwick, Maximilian. *Biblical Greek: Illustrated Examples*, English edition adapted from the fourth Latin edition by Joseph Smith, 2d reprint. Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici 114. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1985.
- Zerwick, Max. *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*, 5th rev. ed. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1996.
- Zuntz, G. *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum*. The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1946. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.

APPENDIX ONE: SELECT DETAILS OF II-V/VI CENTURY GREEK MANUSCRIPTS THAT CONTAIN THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

G-A	Publication Number and/or Artifact Number	NA ²⁷ Date	Provenance/ Current Location	Matthean Contents	Percent of Extant Matthean Text
p ¹	<i>P. Oxy</i> 2/ E 2746	III	Oxyrhynchus/ University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia	1:1-9, 12, 14-20	1.5
p ¹⁹	<i>P. Oxy</i> 1170	IV/V	Oxyrhynchus/ Bodleian Library, Oxford University	10:32-11:5	1.4
p ²¹	<i>P. Oxy</i> 1227/ Theo. Pap. 3	IV/V	Oxyrhynchus/ Muhlenberg College, Allentown	12:24-26, 32-33	0.4
p ²⁵	Inv. 16388	IV	?/ Staatliche Museen, Berlin	18:32-34; 19:1-3, 5-7, 9-10	1.0
p ³⁵	Firenze. PSI 1	IV(?)	Oxyrhynchus/ Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana	25:12-15, 20-23	0.7
p ³⁷	Inv. 1570/ <i>P. Mich.</i> 3.137	III/IV	Fayum/ Special Collections Library, University of Michigan	26:19-52	3.1
p ⁴⁵	<i>P. Chester Beatty</i> I; <i>P. Vindob.</i> G. 31974	III	?/ Chester Beatty Library, Dublin; Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna	20:24-32; 21:13-19; 25:41-26:39	5.6
p ⁵³	<i>P. Mich.</i> inv. 6652	III	Fayum/ University of Michigan Library, Ann Arbor	26:29-40	1.1
p ⁶²	<i>P. Osloensis</i> 1661	IV	?/ Universitetsbiblioteket, Iniversitetet i Oslo.	11:25-30	0.5
p ⁶⁴	Gr. 17	c.a. 200	Coptos (?)/ Magdalen College, Oxford.	3:9, 15; 5:20-22, 25-28; 26:7-8, 10, 14-15, 22-23, 31-33	1.7
p ⁶⁷	<i>P. Barc.</i> inv. 1		Coptos (?)/ Fundació Sant Lluç Evangelista, Barcelona.		
p ⁷⁰	<i>P. Oxy</i> 2384/ PSI inv. CNR 419, 420	III	Oxyrhynchus/ Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford/ Ist. Pap., Firenze.	2:13-16; 2:22-3:1; 11:26-27; 12:4-5; 24:3-6, 12-15	1.7
p ⁷¹	<i>P. Oxy</i> 2385	IV	Oxyrhynchus/ Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford.	19:10-11, 17-18	0.3
p ⁷⁷	<i>P. Oxy</i> 2683	II/III	Oxyrhynchus/ Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford.	23:30-39	0.9
p ⁸⁶	Inv. Nr. 5516	IV	?/ Institut für Altertumskunde, Köln Universität.	5:13-16, 22-25	0.7
p ¹⁰¹	<i>P. Oxy</i> 4401	III	Oxyrhynchus/ Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford.	3:10-12; 3:16-4:3	0.7
p ¹⁰²	<i>P. Oxy</i> 4402	III/IV	Oxyrhynchus/ Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford.	4:11-12; 4:22-23	0.3

P ¹⁰³	<i>P. Oxy</i> 4403	II/III	Oxyrhynchus/ Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford.	13:55-56; 14:3-5	0.4
P ¹⁰⁴	<i>P. Oxy</i> 4404	II	Oxyrhynchus/ Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford.	21:34-37; 21:43-45	0.6
P ¹⁰⁵	<i>P. Oxy</i> 4406	V/VI	Oxyrhynchus/ Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford.	27:62-64; 28:2-5	0.6
P ¹¹⁰	<i>P. Oxy</i> 4494	IV	Oxyrhynchus/ Ashmolean Museum, University of Oxford.	10:13-15; 10:25-27	0.5
) 01	Add. 43725	IV	?/ British Library, London.	Complete	100
A 02	Royal 1 D. VIII	V	?/ British Library, London.	25:7-end	18.7
B 03	Vat. gr. 1209	IV	?/ Biblioteca Vaticana, Vatican City.	Complete	100
C 04	Paris. Gr. 9	V	?/ Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.	1:3-5:14; 7:6-17:25; 18:29-22:20; 23:18-24:9; 24:46-25:29; 26:23-27:10; 27:47-28:14	75.2
D 05	Nn. 2. 41	V	?/ University Library, University of Cambridge.	1:20-6:20; 9:2-27:2; 27:12-end	93.1
W 032	06.274/ <i>Washington MS III</i>	IV-V (VII-VIII)	?/ Smithsonian Institute, Washington D.C.	Complete	100
058	Pap. G. 39782	IV (V)	Fayum/ Nationalbibliothek, Wien.	18:18-19, 22-23, 25-26, 28-29	0.7
071	<i>P. Oxy</i> 401/ Mus. Inv. 3735	V/VI	Oxyrhynchus/ Semitic Museum, Harvard University, Cambridge.	1:21-24; 1:25-2:2	0.6
0160	P. 9961	IV/V	?/ Staatliche Museen, Berlin.	26:25-26, 34-36	0.4
0170	<i>P. Oxy</i> 1169/ Pap. 11	V/VI	Oxyrhynchus/ Speer Library, Princeton Theological Seminary.	6:5-6, 8-9, 13-15, 17	0.7
0171	<i>P. Berlin</i> inv. 11863; Staatliche Museen, Berlin. <i>PSI</i> 1.2 + <i>PSI</i> 2.124	c.a. 300	Hermopolis Magna/ Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Firenze.	10:17-23, 25-32; Lk 22:44-56, 61-64	1.4
0231	P. Ant. 11	IV	Antinoopolis/ Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.	26:75-27:1, 3-4	0.3
0242	71942	IV	Assouan/ Egyptian Museum, Cairo.	8:25-9:2; 13:32-38, 40-46	2.4

APPENDIX TWO: SINGULAR READINGS IN SINAITICUS IN MATTHEW

1. Scribe A

- 1:13 #Abioud *rell*)^{S1}|#Abiout)*
- 1:14¹ #Sadwk *rell*)^{S1}|#Sadwx)*
- 1:14² #Sadwk *rell*)^{S1}|#Sadwx)*
- 1:14a #Elioud *rell*)^{S1}|#Eliout)*
- 1:15 #Elioud *rell*)^{S1}|#Eliout)*
- 1:18 #mnhsteuqeishj *rell*|#mnhsteuqishj)*|#mnhsteuqishj)^{S1} C P|#mnhsteuqhsij L*|#mnhsteuqhsij L^c|#mnhsteuqhsij Q 2 565|#mnhsteuqhseij 579
- 1:21 #kaleseij to onoma autou Ihsoun *rell*)^{S1}|#kalesei L* (g¹ Arm)|#kalesousi 1241
kaleseij to onoma I?h?s?o?u?n?)*
- 1:23 #kalesousin to onoma oautou Emmanouhl *rell*|#kaleseij D 2* 1391 1184 d** bo^{MSS} Epiph Or Eus |o) **unreadable*
- 2:2 ton astera en *rell*)^{S1}
ton asteran)*
- 2:9 #prohgen *rell* (proh~gen)^{S1})|#prohgon)*
- 3:15 #hmin *rell*)^{S1})^{ca}|#hmaj)*
- 4:8 #deiknusin *rell*|#diknuei)|#diknusein C|#edeicen D 372|#diknusin P W D Q
- 4:12 oti Iwannhj (*rell*)^{S1})^{ca} NA²⁷ |21)*
- 4:18 ton #legomenon *rell*
ton #kaloumenon)^{S1} 21 27 28 348 476 726 1071 1573 1579 1604 *al.*
Eus|#loumenon)*|#epikaloumenon E 892
- 4:23a en oolh th Galilaia (B) C k sy^{c.s.p.h} sa bo mae NA²⁷ |o) *
olhn thn Galilaian *rell*)^{S1}
- 4:23b didaskwn\$ *rell*)^{S1}|\$autouj)*
- 4:24a kai #¹basanoi j #²sunexomenouj *rell*)^{S1}|#¹basanouj)*|#¹om.
E* 2|#²sunexomenoi j U D 28
kai basanizomenouj 1424

4:24b kai #daimonizomenouj |kai selhniazomenouj\ *rell*
(da?i?moniazomenouj)^{ca})|#s?el?h?niazomenouj) *
|#de?moniazomenouj)^{S1}|#demonizwmenouj 1071|#om. M D 280 566 1588
1604 sy^s || 253 475 1346 1424 | I (om. 234) 71 692

5:33 #epiorkhseij *rell*|#efiorkhseij)|#epeiorchsiij D
|#epoirkiseij 118|#epiorkishj 1346

5:39 #antisthnai *rell*|#antistaqhnai)

5:41 #aggareusei *rell*|#engareush)|#aggareuei D|#aggareush
E G K V Q S 13 543 33 157 243 471* 149|#angareush W 124 788
|#aggereush D 1071 1424|#agkareusei 59 66 483 484

5:45 agaouj \$ |kai #brexei epi dikaiouj kai adikouj\ *rell*
|\$kai brexei epi ponhrouj kai agaouj E*||)*|#brexi)^A Q
|#brexh L

5:46 ouxi kai oi telwnai *rell*)^{S1} |o)*

6:6 su de otan #proseuxh *rell*)^{corr}|#proseuxhj)*

6:9 pater hmwn oo en toij ouranoij *rell*)^{S1} |o)*

6:14 #autwn *rell*)^{S1}|#utwn)*

6:16a \$otan de *rell*)^{S1}|\$kai)*

6:16b amhn\$ *rell*)^{ca}|\$gar)*

6:28 aucanousin ou #kopiuousin oude nhqousin B 33 *f*¹
|#kopiwsin)^{S1}

ou cainousin oude nhqousin oude kopiwsin)*

aucanousin ou nhqousin oude kopiwsin Q sy^c

NA²⁷

aucanei ou kopia oude nhgei M K L M N P *f*
13 700 788

7:21 to qelhma tou patroj*rell*)^{S1}
ta qelhmata tou patroj)*

7:22 daimonia \$ *rell*)^{S1}|\$polla)*

7:25 #prosepesan)^{S1} B C E X Z *f*^{1 13} 700 788 1071 1346 syr^{p mg gr} Cyr^{es77}
Chr Dam NA²⁷|#prosepesen)*|#prosepeson K L M S U V P W 157 565
|#prosekrousan W|#proserrhcan Q S 579 *pc* Eus|#prosekoyon 33
1424 *pc* (Eus^{ps367})

7:26 kai paj \$ o akounw *rell*)^{S1} |\$[kai?] paj)*

7:27a #hlqon *rell* |#hlqan)

7:27b oi potamoi kai |epneusan oi anemoi okai\)^{ca} ||)* |o)^{S1}

7:28 \$oi oxloi epi th didaxh autou *rell*)^{S1})^{ca} |\$pantaj D Q f¹
1582 22 697 1278 sh^h | 345612)*

8:3 kai oeugewj ekaqarisqh *rell* (B* E L N X P 2) |o) * |21 566

8:7 legei autw\$)^{ca} B 892 k sy^s cop bo NA²⁷ |\$akolouqi moi)* |\$o
Ihsouj *rell* |\$apokriqej o Ihsouj 1093*^{vid}

8:15a #hgerqh *rell*)^{S1} |#egerqij)*

8:15b o puretoj kai . . . okai *rell*)^{S1} |o) *

8:26 qalassh *rell* |#qalassh)

8:28 tw n #Gadarhnwn B C* M D Q 4 21 (59) 174 251 273 399 pc sy^{s.p.h.txt}
geo¹ Epiph Or NA²⁷ | #Gazarhnwn) * | #Gergeshnwn *rell*)^{ca}
|#Gergeshnwn C^c L W f¹³ 565 579 788 | #Gadarinwn 59 l47

9:4 #kardiaj *rell*)^{ca} |#kardiej)*

9:6 #upage *rell*)^{ca} |#poreuou) * |#peripatei 1071

9:9 okai legei *rell*)^{S1} |o) *

9:12 #iatrou *rell* |#iattrwn) *)^{ca}

9:15 estin o numfioj |eleusontai de hmerai otan aparqh ap
autwn o numfioj\ (*rell*)^A ||)*

9:20 #aimorroousa *rell* |#aimaroousa) * |#aimoroousa)^{ca} W W
|#aimorroousa K |#aimorouosa L

9:27 #krazontej *rell* |#kraugazontej)

9:28a autoij o |o Ihsouj\ *rell*)^{ca} |o) * || 18 35 66 150 201 222 246 251
252* 253 479 484 740 1328 1329 1330 1334 1339 2726 sy^s

9:28b dunamai \$ touto poihsai *rell*)^{S1})^{ca} | 213 B N 892 q vg^{ed} | 132 C*
geo¹ |\$umin)*

9:30 #autwn ooi ofqalmoi *rell*)^{ca} |#om.) * |#autw E* |o700 |231 D it
vg

9:35a autwn okai khru^{ss}wn *rell*)^{S1}|o)*

9:35b malakian \$ *rell*)^{S1}|\$en tw law^{C3} EFGKMUXYGQ P118²
579 700 *pm c* vg^{mss} (gat *al*³) sy^h aeth arm geo |\$kai polloi hkolouqhsan
autw *a b h*
malakian en tw law kai \$ hkolouqhsan autw)*\$|\$polloi
L F *f*^{13(exc.124)} 7 262 273 348 517 543 566 713 1010 1187 1293 1346 1424 1574 *g*¹
Tat

10:4 \$¹Ioudaj \$² *rell*)^{S1}|\$¹o)*\$|\$²o)* B D K M S D P *f*¹ 33 *pc* Chr
NA²⁷

10:9 xruson | #¹mhde arguron\ #²mhde *rell*)^{S1}||)*|#^{1&2}mhde D L F
*f*¹³ 543 7 157 273 892 |#¹mhde Q 4 28 1424|#²mhde 565 700|#²h 2145

10:21 adelfoj #adelfon *rell*)^{ca}|#adelfoj)*

10:39 |o eurwn thn yuxhn autou apolesei authn okai\ o
apolesaj *rell*)^{ca}(D)|o)^D||)*

10:40 kai o *rell*)^{ca}(om. 579 haplography)
o de)*

11:19 esqiwn \$ kai *rell*)^{S1}(B)|\$kai)*

11:23 #soi *rell*)^{S1}|#umin)*

12:11c #¹auto kai #²egerei *rell*|#¹autw K L Q 2* 59 700 1071 1424
1184|#¹om. U|#¹auton *f*¹³ 13 471* 475*|#²egeirei C D G *f*¹³ 124 174 230
826 828 788 983 1093 1424 1515 1689|#²egeiri L|#²eceregi 247
\$ egerei auto)|\$kai *c ff*^{1.2} *h* vg^{pler} sy^{c.s.p} sah bo

12:22 #auton *rell*)^{ca}|#autouj)*

12:33 autou #kalon *rell*)^D|#alon)*|#agaqon)^A

12:34 #gennhmata exidnwn *rell*)^{S1}|#gennhma)*|#genhmata D

12:37 osou katadikasqhsh (*rell*)NA²⁷|o)

12:44 echlqon kai #elqon euriskei *pler*)^DNA²⁷|#om.)*
|#ecelqon U|#hlqon D

12:46 ecw |zhtountej #autw lalhsai\ (*rell*)^A[NA²⁷]||)*|1243 D Q
F *f*¹³ 7 33 174 230 349 517 659 788 826 828 983 1346 1424 1689 *d fl* aur vg^(pler) sy^h
bo aeth arm Or^{Matt.XI.4}|#auton 28|#soi 487

12:49 #xeira oautou *rell*|#xeiraj 28|#xira)^{S1}|oD 124 *a b ff*¹ *g*¹ *k q*
vg Or^{3,480} Aug

xiran?)*

13:25 #epespeiren)^{S1})^{ca} B N Q 0281^{vid} f¹ 33 1241 pc Antitact it^{pler} vg Aug
NA²⁷ | #epseiren C D^{gr} E F L W pc f¹³ M e k q sy^{c.s.p.hl.} sah bo aeth arm geo Ir^{gr}
Chr | #epesparken)*

13:28 auta \$ rell)^{S1} | \$ta)*

13:39 diabolos | o de qerismos sunteleia \$ aiwnos estin\ oi
de qeristai rell)^{S1} ||) * | \$tou)^{ca} C L W 0106 0233 0250 f¹ M

13:44 kekrummenw | en otw agrw\ #on eurwn rell)^{S1} ||) * | o D N 700
1071 1424 | #o Q

13:54 #patrida rell)^{S1} | #antipatrida)*

14:1 en ekeinw \$¹ tw kairw hkousen \$² Hrw dhj rell)^{S1})^{ca} | 561234
) * | \$¹ de D 122 157 300 d sy^{s.c.p.} bo | \$² o X

14:7 #meq orkou rell | #met X Q S 124 | #meta)

14:17 #wde ei mh pente artous rell (79^{vid}))^{ca} | 15234) * | #de 2766*

14:23 kai | apolusaj tous oxlouj\ anebh rell)^D ||) *

14:29 ta udata kai #hlqen proj ton Ihsoun B C* 21 399 700
1010 1293 1355 1555 1604 sy^{c.s} (sa) arm geo NA²⁷ | #hlqe 700^c
ta udata #elqein proj ton Ihsoun rell
| #elqhn Q
ta udata elqin | hlqen oun\ proj ton Ihsoun) * ||)^{ca}

15:5 wfelhqhjs rell)^{S1} | \$ouden estin)*

15:11a to stoma\$ rell)^{ca} | \$touto)*

15:12 #legousin B D Q f¹³ 33 579 700 pc (ff¹) | #eipon C M L W 0106 lat
sy^h | #eipan)

18:12 ennea \$ epi ta orh okai #poreuqej L 15 579
NA²⁷ | \$pro E*(?) | orell (G L S U)^{S1} | #poreumenos D
ennea | probata epi ta orh kai\ poreuqej B Q f¹³
(exe 124) 543 517 788 954 1346 1424* 1675 sa mae arm ||) *

18:18 legw oumin #osa rell)^{S1} | o 700* | #wj 579 | #oj)*

18:19 #¹aihthswntai #²genhsetai autoij B D | #¹aithsontai rell
1346 | #²doqhsetai 33 | #²genhsontai 346 1346 | 132)

18:20 oh treij rell)^{S1} | o)*

18:30a #alla *rell*)^{ca}|#kai)*|#all F Y D *f*¹ 16 71 477 485 983 1223 1279
1473 1579 1588

18:30b #apodw *rell*)^{ca}|#apodh)*

18:31 #¹kai #²elqontej *rell*|#¹oi de)|#²apelqontej Q *f*¹³ 33 565
788 1346

19:1 \$ kai hlqen *rell*)^{S1})^{ca}|\$kai hlqen)*

19:10 oi maqhtai \$ oei outwj P⁷¹)^{S1})^{ca} B Q *eff*¹ g¹ sa^{ms} mae [NA²⁷]
|\$autou *rell* [NA²⁷] |o)*

19:15 #autoij *rell*|#ep autouj)|#autou 118|#ep auta 483 484

19:18 ou foneuseij \$ ou o¹moixeuseij ou o²kleyeij ou *rell*)^{S1}
|1452367 1446 |1236547 2786 |\$to 184 348 829 2726 |o¹61 555 740 979 |o²579
1336

ou foneuseij ou)*

19:21 #ecej *rell*)^{S1}|#ecete)*|#echj E G

19:26 oautoij |para anqrwpoij*rell*)^{S1} |oQ 1183 sah ||)*

20:7 oti oudeij ohmaj emisqwsato *rell*)^{S1} |o)*

20:13 #ouk *rell*|#oux)

20:14a toutw #tw esxatw *rell*)^{S1} |#w)* |231 D 1071

20:14b wj kai #soi *rell* |#su)

20:18b auton oqanatw *rell* |oB aeth
auton eij qanaton)
autou qanaton 700

20:19 staurwsai okai th trith *rell*)^{S1})^{ca} |o)*

20:31a #meizon *rell*|#pollw mallon)|#pleon U|#meizona 184 348
555 829 952 1421 1579 2726|#perisswj 1071|#meizwn *f*¹³ 124 157 788
|#meizonwj 851 1273 1424 1506

20:31b uiobj Daid*rell* (om. 124)

uiou Daid)*

uie Daid P^{45vid})^{ca} C D L N O S F 085 0281 4 16 33 61 130 174^c 176
184 222 233 348* 372 489 517 555 579 659 713 740 807 829 863 892 954 990 1219
1230 1241 1293 1295 1329 1421 1424 1528 1555 1579 1606 1675 1692 2680 2726
it vg Or

20:34 #autwn *rell*)^{S1} |#autou) * |#om. Q 2546

21:7a #epekaqisen B C F M S U V X Z^{vid} G D f¹³ *pler* it^{pler} sy^{utr.cu} sa pc Or pc
NA²⁷ |#ekaqisan) * |#epekaqisan)^{ca} 4 16 245 291 892 |#ekaqhto D 700
|#epekaqhsen H 118 1071 |#ekaqhsen K Q |#epekaqhsan L 579
|#ekaqisen N Y P S 1241 |#ekaqaisen W |#epekaqise 69

21:7b epanw #autwn *rell* NA²⁷ |#auton)^{ca} L 892 |#autou D Q l27 it^{pler} sy^h
|#authj 2^c
epanw ep autwn) *

21:19 ouden oeuren |en auth\ *rell*)^{S1} (692)|o) * || 945 990 1424 ff¹ geo¹

21:25 poqen #hn *rell*)^{ca} (om. 999 1012) |#estin 28 d e |#h) *

21:30 #¹wsautwj |o de #²apokriqeiij eipen\ *rell* |#¹wj auto D
|) * |#²apokriqij)^{ca} |#²apokreiqeiij D |#²apekriqh W *
|#²apekriqeiij W^c |#²apokriqhj 579 |#²aphlqe Y 118 157

21:34-35 gewrgouj \$ #labein tou karpouj autou^{21:35} kai
labontej *rell*)^{S1} (D) |\$tou 157| \$ekeinouj 1424 |#k?a?i? labo?n?
) *

21:39 #ecebalon ecw *rell* |#ebalon) |#ecebalan D |#eceballon Z
|#om. 69

21:42 para #kuriou *rell*)^{ca} |#kuriw) *

21:43 #karpouj *rell*)^{ca} |#karkarpouj) *

22:1 o¹eipen o²en *rell*)^{S1})^{ca} |o¹E sy^p |o²) *

22:9 twn #odwn *rell*)^A)^D |#u?d?a?twn) *^{vid}

22:15 #¹sumboulion #²elabon *rell*)^{ca} |#¹sunboulion D K Q |#²om.) *
|#²epoihsan 1574

22:16 #ei *rell*)^{ca} |#e) * |#h 28

22:21 #legousin *rell* |#legousi) |#oi de eipon 1604

22:30 #gamousin *rell* |#gamousi) |#gamountai f¹³ 579

22:32b o qeoj Isaak *rell*
qeoj #Isak) * |#Isak)^{ca}

22:32c kai oo qeoj Iakwb *rell* (om. 69) |o)

22:42 otou Daudid *rell* |o)*

23:4a fortia\$ *rell* |\$megala)

23:11 #¹umwn #²estai oumwn diakonoj *rell* |#¹en umin Q 477 1279
1473 1579 a c h r^{1.2} sy^{c.s.p.h} sa bo |#¹om. vg^{2mss} |#²estw G 241 246 252 253 258 495
566 6923 983 1093 1355 1391 1573 1574 1604 2145 r¹ geo |o) |1243 a ff¹ g¹ l m q
vg^(pler) sy^h

23:16 #¹odhgoi \$ #²tufloi ooi legontej *rell*)^{corr} D^{CorC} |\$oi) *
|#¹odigo i D* 2 565 1346 |#²tuf lwn Q |oD*

23:34 #staurwsete okai ec autwn*rell*)^{ca} (om. D a d Lucif)
|#staurwshte S |oq
staurwsete ec autwn kai) *

23:37 #episunagagein *rell*)^{ca} |#e?peisuna?[c]a?i? P⁷⁷
|#episunagein) *

24:10 |kai allhlouj #¹paradwsousin\ \$kai #²mishsousin
allhlouj *rell* ||aeth|#¹paradwswsin S F |\$eij qanaton F 124 495*
1093 |#²miswsin F
kai allhlouj paradwsousin eij qliyin
)

24:15 dia #Danihl *rell*)^{S1} |#i8h8l8) * |#Danihlou D*

24:17 |arai #¹ta\ #²ek *rell*)^{ca} (om. 2 *homoeoteleuton*) || 1010 1293 |#¹to
) * |#¹ti D Q f¹ 28 33 565 700 1424 1582 l2211 arm aeth latt sy^{p.h} arm geo Epiph
Hipp^{anit} Cyp Caes^{dial bis} Isid^{1,210} Ir^{lat} Oi^{int2,224} |#¹om. sy^s |#²epi 047

24:22b #kolobwqhsontai oai hmerai ekeinai *rell*)^{ca}
|#ekolobwqhsan) * |oE

24:24 gar #yeudoxristoi *rell*)^{S1} (l184 c) |#iyudoxristoi) *
|#yeudoxreistoi B D |#yeudoxrhstoi 69 157 |#om. D 565 ff² h d geo¹

24:28 #opou *rell* |#pou) * |#opoi D

24:35 |o ouranoj kai h gh paraleusetai oi de logoi mou ou
mh parelqwsin\ (*rell*))^{ca} NA²⁷ ||) *

26:15a eipen #ti *rell*)^{S1} |#i) *

26:15b #dounai *rell* |#dwne)

26:21 #eipen \$¹amhn \$² |legw umin\ *rell* |#legi) |\$¹eis sy^{s.h} bo geo¹
|\$¹iesus vg (mm) geo² |\$²amhn l48 Eus^{dem} |\$²de V || 692

26:33 \$¹oei \$²pantej *rell* |\$¹kai 1424 *c fff¹ g^{1.2} h l* aur vg sy^{p.h} aeth arm
Aug^{cons} |o)* |\$²kai)^{ca} F K W Y P 71 482 517 579 697 700 1241 sat mu^{vid} it⁵ vg
syr^{ut} arm aeth Or^{4,412 et437} Bas^{2,159} Epiph Hil

26:44 |oek tritou\ ton auton logon)^{ca} B M L 4 262 273 566 1170
1187 1555 1573 NA²⁷ ||P³⁷ A D K P F *f¹ (exe 118)* 71 157 265 472 489 565 1219
1295 1346 1424 1515 1574 1582 y^{scr} *a b dff² r^{1vid}* |oE* |34125)*

26:46 #paradidouj *rell*)^{ca} |#paradidwn)*

26:65 #marturwn *rell* |#marturiwn)

27:3 #metamelhgeij *rell* |#metamelhgh kai)* |#metamelhqij)^{ca}

27:11 oo hgemwn *rell*)^{S1})^{ca} (om. W Q sy^s geo¹) |o)*

27:15 on #hqelon *rell*)^{ca} |#parhtounto)*

27:16 eixon de #tote desmion *rell*)^{S1} |#ton te)* |#om. *bff² h r¹*
vg^(3MSS) sy^{s.p.hl.}

27:23 #perisswj *rell*)^{ca} |#perissw)* |#perissoteron S *f¹* 118 1582

27:24 umeij \$ oyesqe *rell*)^{ca} |\$de)*

27:33 topon olegomenon *rell*)^{ca} |o)*

27:48 eij |ec autwn\ *rell* ||)

27:53a #eishlqon eij thn agian *rell* |#om.) |#hlqon D it vg sy^{s.h} sah
bo

27:53b polin okai *rell* |o)

27:54a qeou uioj #hn *rell*)^{ca} |213 B D^{gr} 69 102 *b h l r²* aur vg^{ed} sy^{hl.h} sah bo
(aeth) geo Or^{int} et^{4,298} |23tou l)* |#estin C *f g¹* go Aug^{ioh} Vig

27:54b \$qeou *rell*)^{ca} |#tou)*

27:56a hn |#Maria oh Magdalhnh kai\ Maria *rell*)^{ca} (S 28 124 346
348 474 543 565 566 579 788 1279 l184) ||)* |#Mariam L *f¹* |oD*
hn \$ Mariam h Magdalhnh kai Mariam C^{Corr.C} D Q 713 sy^{omn}
arm geo |\$kai C*

27:56b |h tou\ Iakwbou \$¹ kai \$² Iwshf \$³ #mhthr kai h mhthr
rell ||E 71 348 692 1424 1515 1573 1574 1604 l184 |\$¹tou mikrou l183 |\$²h)^{ca}
|\$³h 90 157 |#Iwshtoj D^c |#Iwsh 28 892 |#om. it
h tou Iakwbou kai h Maria h Iwshf kai h Maria h)*

27:64 #kleywsin *rell* | #kleyousin)

28:2-3 autou ^{28:3} |hn o¹de o²h #eidea autou\ *rell*)^{S1} B^{c2} ||) * |o¹geo
|o²66 l47 |#eide B* |#idea F G K L S U V W G D Q P S F f^{1.13} 33 69 157
565 788 1071 1241 1346 l844 |#ide L 579

28:5a eipen |taij #gunaicin\ *rell* ()^{S1 unreadable})^{cb2} ||) * |#gunaici S
Y U w f¹ 69 28 118 157 700

28:5b mh #fobeisqe *rell* | #fobhqhtai) * |#fobisqai)^{ca} Q
|#fobeisqai C D L W 579

28:7 idou #eipon *rell*)^{ca} |#eipa) * |#eipan B*

28:10 toij #adelfoij omou *rell*)^{ca} |#maqhtaij 157 1555 |o) *

28:12 #suboulion te lambontej arguria *rell* | #suboulion W
suboulion te #epoihsan \$ arguria) * |\$kai labontej
)^{S1})^{cb2} |#labontej)^{ca}
suboulion lambontej argurion D

28:13 legontej eipate ooti *rell* | l32) |o33

2. Scribe D

16:13 legousin oi anqrwpoi einai NA²⁷ *pler* | l423 f¹ ff¹ 1 1582 vg^(1MS)
oi anqrwpoi legousin einai)^{ca} D 579 700 a b e g² q r^{1.2} sah geo²
Ir^{int210} | l243) *

16:17 #all *rell* | #alla)

16:19¹ epi thj ghj *rell*)^{ca}
epi thn ghn) *

17:8 auton Ihsoun monon B* Q 700 NA²⁷ | l213) *)^{ca}
oton Ihsoun monon *rell* B^{c2} | l312 D it^{pler} vg arm |oW

17:10 #ephrwthsan *rell*)^{S1} | #phrwthsan) * | #eperwthsan C 2^c
|#ephrwtisan E | #epirwthsan L 2 * | #hrwthsan 1689

17:17 apokriqeiij ode o Ihsouj eipen *rell* |oW 1071 b g l l r²
vg^(pler) geo

o de apokriqeiij eipen autoij) *
tote apokriqeiij o Ihsouj eipen autoij)^{ca} Z 579 892
l184 aur vg^(1MS) y^{scr semel} for aeth bo

18:3 #eiselqhte *rell*)^{S1} | #eiselqhe) * | #eiselqhtai M W Q 2 * 579

18:8 #ekkoyon *rell*)^{ca}|#ecele)*

24:37 |tou uiou\tou anqrwpou *rell*)^{ca}||)*

24:39 \$¹ewj\$² #hlqen o kataklusmoj *rell*)^{S1})^{corr}|\$¹o)*|\$²an W
|\$²ewj Y*|\$²ou G D 6 33 157 Chr|\$²otou 346|#eishlqen 16 544 692
1093 1293

24:49 sundoulouj \$ K M U V W G D P S M 2 28 346 565 579 1071 geo²
sl^{cdd} Thph Or^{int} Hil Iren^{int} Bas^{eth cdd}|\$autou *rell*|\$eautou)

25:16 #talanta *rell*)^{S1}|#alanta)*|#ta K

25:22 okurie *rell*|o)

25:36 proj #me *rell*|#eme)

25:44a apokriqhsontai\$¹ okai autoi \$² legontej *rell*)^{ca}
|o)^{S1} 21 1515 cop^{dz}|\$¹autw *ff*² h m r² vg^(pc) gat mm emm ing|\$²autw f¹ 1 22
1582* 118

apokriqhsontai autw oi legontej)*

25:44b ou #dihkonhsamen *rell*|#diakonhsamen A|#diekonhsamen
B* D|#dihkonisamen 565
ouk hdihkonhsamen)

APPENDIX THREE: SINGULAR READINGS IN VATICANUS IN MATTHEW

- 1:12a Iexoniaj #egennhsen *rell* (K) |#genna B
- 1:12b #egennhsen ton Zorobabel *rell* (D 157 1071) |#genna B
- 1:13 #egennhsen ton Abioud *rell*)^{S1} (Abiout)*) |#genna B
- 1:25 ewj oou eteken *rell* B^{c2} |oB*
- 2:13 \$ oidou aggeloj *rell* |\$eij thn xwran autwn B |\$ton magon
C³ D³ (2^c) 248 349 506 517 892 |osy^{c.s.p}
- 3:4 #Iwannhj *rell* |#Iwanhj B
- 3:12 #asbestw *rell* B^{c2} (om. P¹⁰¹) |#asbetw B* |#abestw W
- 4:21 #Iwannhn *rell* |#Iwanhn B
- 5:10 #eneken *rell* |#eneka B
- 5:11 #eneken *rell* |#eneka B
- 5:16 idwsin umwn ta kala oerga *rell* B^{c1} |oB* |1345 346 |13425 28 246
482 483 1093 1355
- 5:28 #autou *rell* |#eautou B
- 6:19 #kai brwsij *rell* |#ka B
- 6:32 #xrhzete *rell* B^{c1} |#xrhte B* |#xrhzetai W 13 2* 33 579
|#xrhzhte D |#xrizetai 1071 |#xreizete 1424
- 6:33 thn basileian\$ |tou qeou\ kai thn dikaiosunhn autou
rell [NA²⁷] | |) g^{1.2} k l m^{semel} am vg^{3mss} cop Eus^{pr12,16} Ps-Ath^{2,378} Tert [NA²⁷]
|\$twn ouranwn 301 Clem^{579.lib242} Chr^{txt.com} Iust |\$autou 236 440 cop aeth
v^{cantscr} Aph¹⁰⁵
thn dikaiosunhn kai thn basileian autou B
- 7:16 #sullegousin *rell* B^c |#sullegousi B*
- 7:25 #hlqon *rell* |#hlqen 1071 |#hlqan B
- 8:32 ecelqontej #aphlqon *rell* |#aphlqan B
- 9:3 #eipan B NA²⁷ |#eipon *rell* |#eipen 346
- 9:28 #proshlqon *rell* |#proshlqan B

10:14 #¹oj #²an #³mh #⁴dehtai umaj *rell* |#¹osoi L |#²ean C M M
D Q *f*¹pc |#³mhn B^{c1} |#⁴decontai L
oj an maj B*

10:16 en mesw *rell*
eij meson B
emmesw C L F W

10:19 #merimhshte *rell* B^{c2} |#merimhsete G Q 253 154
|#merimhseite 579 |#merimhshte B*

10:22 #upomeinaj *rell* B^{c2} |#upomenaj B*

10:25a ton #oikodespothn *rell* B^{c2} |#despothn 470
tw oikodespoth B*

10:25b touj #oikiakouj *rell* B^{c2} |#oikeiakouj C D Y M U W *f*¹ 22 157
1582 *al.*
toij oikakouj B*

11:2 #Iwannhj *rell* |#Iwanhj B

11:4 #Iwannh *rell* |#Iwannei D W D |#Iwannhn E |#Iwanh B^c
|#Iwanei B*

11:7 #Iwannou *rell* |#Iwanou B

11:11 #Iwannou *rell* |#Iwanou B |#Iannou Y*

11:12 #Iwannou *rell* |#Iwanou B |#Iwannouj D* |#Iannou E 565

11:13 #Iwannou *rell* |#Iwanou B |#Iannou C 124

11:18 #Iwannhj *rell* |#Iwanhj B

12:1a o Ihsouj \$otoij #sabbasin *rell* |\$en W 238 |oD*
|#sabbatoij B |#sabasi K |#sabbasi M U *f*¹ 124^c 28 157 700 |#sabasin
565

12:1b #oi de maqhtai *rell* B^{c1} |#o B*

12:32a anqrwpou \$afeqhsetai *rell* B^{c1} () K L Q*) |\$ouk B*

12:32b ouk afeqhsetai autw oute *rell*
#ouk afeqhsete aute oute)^{S1})^{ca} L |#ou mh)*
ou mh afeqh autw oute B

12:33 #sapron *rell* B^{c1} |#apron B*

12:48 adelfoi omou *rell* B^{c1} |oB*

13:14 #akousete) B^{c2} C L D P *f*¹ pc NA²⁷ |#akousate B* |#akousetai D 579

13:15 #toiij wsin *rell* B^{c1} |#toi B*

13:17 polloi profhtai |kai dikaioi\ *rell* B^{c1} ||B*

13:24 en tw agrw #autou *rell* |#eautou B
en tw idiw agrw D Eus^{es.bis}
eij ton agron autou 1424

13:30² #auta *rell* B^{c1} |#autaj B* |#om. D it^(exfk) vg

13:39 exqroj o #speiraj auta estin *rell* |15234 B |#speirwn L 2
1346

13:48 #aigialon *rell* B^{c1} |#agialon B* |#egialon W

14:3 #Iwannhn *rell* |#Iwanhn B

14:4 #Iwannhj *rell* |#Iwanhj B

14:8 #Iwannou *rell* |#Iwanou B

14:10 #Iwannhn *rell* |#Iwanhn B

14:13 anexwrhsen #ekeigen oen *rell* B^{c1} |#ekigen) |#ekei 1279
|oB*^{vid}

15:11 to #eiserxomenon *rell* |#eisporeuomenon 157 238
|#erxomenon B

15:15 o Petroj eipen #autw *rell* |1243 B |4123 Q 124 788 1349 |3412 124
|#autoij 579 |#om. 659 954 1424 ff¹ sah

15:32 #touj maghtaj *rell* B^{c1} |#tou B*

16:4 #epizhtei *rell* (-700) B^{c1} |#zhtei D* Q b c e |#aitei B*

16:17 ooti *rell* B^{c1} |oB*

17:15 elehson mou ton uion \$ *rell* B^{c2} |\$mou B*

17:16 #hdunhqhsan (*rell*) NA²⁷ |#hdunasqhsan B |#hdunanto Z
|#hdunhqhsan 2* |#edunhqhsan K P 265 489 892 1219 1346 1184

17:23 #trith hmera *rell* B^{c2} |#tri B* |#trij 1346^c
treij hmeraj D (*d sy^s cop^{bo}*)

18:9 #skandalizei *rell* |#skandalei B |#skandalizh F L D
|#skandalhzh 2 |#skandalhsei 579

18:31 oi sundouloi oautou *rell* |312 B |o482 1184

19:12 #dunamenoj *rell* B^{c2a} |#dunomenoj B* B^{c2b}

19:17 o¹eij estin o²o agaqoj) B^{c1} L Q 892* 1582* 1424^{mg} *a d lat*
sy^{s.c.hmg} mae bo Or NA²⁷ |o¹B* |o²D 1 22 700 791 2372 Iren Iust Valent Marcos
Naass
oudeij agaqoj *rell* (892^c)

20:13 apokriqejij eni autwn oeipen) D Q 085 124 700
1573 it^{pler} vg arm geo Or^{3,705} Chr NA²⁷ |1324 B |o1346 |1423 *rell*
apokriqejij oeipen monadi eni autwn D

20:17 #kat idian *rell* B^{c2} |#kaq B*

20:27 |en umin\ oeinai prwtoj *rell* | |sy^{pesh(1MS)} |oL
einai umwn prwtoj B |213 X 085
en umin prwtoj #einai W 1241 1515 it^{pler} vg arm |#genesqe
28

20:32 oo Ihsouj *rell* |oB
om. 1574 1594 *r*²

20:34 tw n #¹ommatwn #²autwn D L *f*¹³ 124 788 NA²⁷ |#²autou) * |312 B
|#¹ofqalmwn *rell* |#²om. Q

21:4 gegonen ina plhrwqh to rhqen #dia tou \$¹ profhtou \$²
legontej *rell* B^{c1} |#upo L Z G Q *f*¹³ 69 482 543 544 700 788 892 *pc*
|\$¹plhrwqh to rhqen dia tou B* |\$²zaxariou M^{mg} 42 *a c h bo*^{1MS} Chr
Hil^{psal.cxlv.1} |\$²hsaiou *r*² vg^{3MSS} bo^{1MS} aeth

21:17 #Bhqanian *rell* B^{c2} |#Bhqania B* |#Biqanian W 1071
|#Bhqaneian D

21:26 #Iwannhn *rell* |#Iwanhn B

21:32 #Iwannhj *rell* |#Iwanhj B

21:33 #ecedeto) * C* L NA²⁷ |#ecedete B* |#ecedoto *rell* B^{c2}

21:38a #eautoij *rell* B^{c2} |#autoij L| #eautoj B*

21:38b #klhronomoj *rell* B^{c2} |#klhronoj B*

21:41 #apodwsousin *rell* B^c |#apodwsousi B* |#apodwswsin W
|#apodosousin Q

21:46 #krathsai *rell* B^{c2} |#ekrathsai B*^{vid} |#kpateisai E*
|#poihsai f¹³ 1346

22:39 omoia #¹auth #²agaphseij *rell* |#¹authj D 0102 0138 176 238
807 1295 |#¹tauth D* Z^{vid} 692 it vg sy^{omn} bo aeth arm geo |#²agaphsij) W
|#²agaphshj E
omoijw agaphsij B

22:43 kalei auton kurion legwn B^{c2} D 0107^{vid} 0281 33 1093 latt
sy^{(c).p.(hier)} (sa bo) arm geo² NA²⁷ |321 *rell* |132) L Z 892 |312 69 sy^{hl} |31 1424 |231
954 |om. aeth
kalei auton auton kurion legwn B* |12435 Q

23:23 #afhkate *rell* B^{c2} |#afhkete B*

23:25 #grammateij *rell* |#grammatij) W |#gramateij B

25:6 kraugh #gegonen *rell* |#egeneto B

25:10 kai #ekleisqh *rell* B^c |#hkleisqh B*

25:32 ta probata apo twn #erifwn *rell* |#erifiwn B
ta probata ap aghlwn 700*

26:3 oi presbuteroi |tou laou\ *rell* B^{c1} (1071) || B*

26:14 #arxiereij *rell* B^{c2} |#arxi+erij) |#arxii+ereij B*

26:51 eij otwn meta \$ Ihsou *rell* |oP³⁷ |\$tou L 4 273 472 544 1010
1354 1396 l53 l184 |\$discipulorum sy^s
eij twn met autou B (Hil?)

26:53a #dunamai *rell* B^{c2} |#dunomai B*

26:53b #legiwnaj B* NA²⁷ |#legiwnwn) *) S¹ L |#legaiwnwn)^{ca}
|#legeonwn A D 788 |#legewnaj *rell* B^{c2} |#legewwnwn C K Q P f¹³ 33 565
700 1071 |#legeiwnhj D* |#legeionaj D^D |#legeonaj E^c |#om. ff²

26:57 oi de krathsantej ton Ihsoun aphgagon *rell* B^{c1}
oi de krathsantej ton Ihsoun efugon oi de
krathsantej ton Ihsoun aphgagon B*

oi de stratiwtai krathsantej ton Ihsoun oi de
krathsantej ton Ihsoun aphgagon G^c

26:59 ezhtoun #yeudomarturian *rell* B^{c2} |#yeudomarturan B*
|#yeudomartureian D

26:63 tou #zwntoj *rell* B^{c2} |#zwtoj B*

27:1 #genomenhj *rell* B^{c2} |#gomenhj B*

27:13 ouk akouej #posa *rell* B^{c1} |#osa B* |#tosa D* |#pwsa M

27:45 #ewj wraj *rell* (D) |#e B*

28:2-3 autou ^{28:3} |hn o¹de o²h #eidea autou\ *rell*)^{S1} B^{c2} | |) * |o¹geo
|o²66 l47 |#eide B* |#idea FGK S U V W G D Q P S Ff^{1.13} 33 69 157 565
788 1071 1241 1346 l844 |#ide L 579

28:11 tinej thj #koustwdiaj *rell* |#koustwdeiaj A |#skoustwdiaj
B* |#koustodiaj 69 157 |#kwstoudiaj 2

APPENDIX FOUR: SINGULAR READINGS IN EPHRAEMI IN MATTHEW

- 1:8¹ #Iwsafat *rell* |#Iwsafa C*
- 1:8² #Iwsafat *rell* |#Iwsafa C*
- 2:16 en #bhqleem *rell* |#bleem C |#beqleaim D* |#bhqleem D^B
|#biqleem L W 349 1071
- 2:20 thn \$ yuxhn *rell* |\$thn C
- 3:10 #hdh *rell* |#hde C
- 4:2 hmeraj #tesseractakonta) B* L P D 33 NA²⁷ |#tesseractakonta
rell |#serakonta 579 |#tesseractakontaj C |#m8 D
- 4:14 #profhtou *rell* |#fhtou C
- 4:21a tou #Zebedaiou *rell* (om. M W 33 *haplography*) |#Zebenaioj C
|#Zebedeou L
- 4:21b tou #Zebedaiou *rell* (om. M W 33 *haplography*) |#Zebenaioj C
|#Zebedeou L
- 5:10 \$ #dikaiosunhj *rell* |\$thj C |#dikaiosunhn 13
- 7:9 #aithsei o uioj) B L D Q 2 28 157 1424 |#aithsh *rell*
|#aithseij C
- 7:16 apo akanqwn #stafulaj *rell* C^A |#stafulhn E G K L M S U V X
D P arm aeth Lcif Aug^{semel} |#stafulhnaj C*
- 7:22 ou tw sw onomati *rell*
outwj sw onomati C
- 8:5 parakalwn #auton *rell* C^c |#auto C*
- 8:13 episteusaj #genhqhtw *rell* |#gennhqhtw G P* 1424 |#genhtw
C
- 8:17 #Hsaiou *rell* |#Isaiou L Q 2 |#Hsaiaiou C
- 8:21 #autw *rell* |#matwn C |om. 399 1579
- 8:31 oi de #daimonej *rell* |#deimonej C |#demonej L
- 8:32 kai #apeqanon en toij udasin *rell* |#apeqanan)^c
|#apeqanen C

9:2 kai idou #prosferon *rell*|#prosferousin C

9:15 #dunantai *rell*|#dunanta C|#dunate N|#dunatai D
|#dunante 579

9:30 kai #hnewxqhsan B D N S 33 NA²⁷|#anewxqhsan *rell*
|#hnoixqhsan C*|#aneoxqhsan C^{Corr.C}L

10:20 #alla *rell*|#allla C

11:21 #oti *rell*|#ot C

12:4 #proqesewj *rell*|#prosewj C|#prosqesewj D

12:6 #meizon *rell*|#mizon) N? W Q|#meizown C*|#meizwn C^AL N?
D F *f*¹³ 2 13 22 118 124 157 209 346 440 543 565 788 1010 1071 1200 1346 1424

12:7 #katedikasate *rell*|#katesate C|#kataidikasatai L
|#katadikasate D|#tedikasate 33*|#katekrinete 1574 2145

12:22a odaimonizomenoj |tufloj kai\ kwfoj *rell* C^B|o1071||C*
daimonizomenon tuflon kai kwfon\$ B 0281^{vid} 1424 1675
sy^(s.c.p) cop aeth geo |\$et surdus b (vg^{2MSS})|\$et surdus et mutus (*ff*¹) h

12:47 eipen de tij #autw \$ *rell* [NA²⁷] |om. verse) * B L G 126 225 238
400* 443 1355 1093 *ff*¹ k sy^{c.s} sa [NA²⁷]|#twn maqhtwn autou)^A|#twn
maqhtwn autou proj auton 892 bo|\$autw C

12:48 mhthr omou *rell* C^B|oC*^{vid}

13:3-4 speirwn otou #speirein ^{13:4} |kai en tw speirein\ auton
rell |oD|#spire)|#speirai D L M W Q *f*^{1 13} 33 *pc*|#speirai ton
sporon autou 28 579 ||C

13:15 kai toij wsin \$ oakouswsin *rell*|\$autwn)^b 157 |oC

13:44 #twn *rell*|#tw C

13:57 oei mh *rell* C^B|oC*

14:4 #exein *rell* C^c|#exin)|#exen C*

15:2 #maqhtai *rell*|#maqhte) Q|#matai C

15:11 eij to #stoma *rell*|#stama C

15:30 autouj |para touj\ podaj *rell* C^B||C*
autouj #upo touj podaj D b|#makroqen
emprosqen autou proj 1424

15:32 #eipen *rell*|#legei C

15:36 ixquaj |okai euxaristhsaj\ eklasen kai *rell* C^B |oM K L*
M N W G D 157 1241 l2211 *ff*¹ sy^h || C*^{vid}

16:3 #xeimwn *rell*|#xeixwn C|#ximwn N Q

16:12 #farisaiwn *rell*|#fareisaiwn) B|#parisaiwn C|#farisew
Q*

16:22 #epitiman *rell* C^B|#epiteimwn B (D)|#epitima 579
|#epitimian C*

17:4 #skhnaj *rell*|#skhskhnaj C

17:15 #elehson *rell*|#elhson C|#elehswN Q

19:1 #etelesen *rell*|#etelen C|#elalhSen D a b c e f f^{1.2} g¹ r¹ bo^{2MSS}
Hil

20:11 kata tou \$ oikodespotou *rell*|\$kata tou C

20:19 #staurwsai *rell*|#staurwse)|#staurwai C|#om. X

20:32 ti #qelete *rell*|#qele 1071|#qeleij C

21:1 eij #Bhqfagh \$ (*rell*) NA²⁷|\$kai Bhqanian kai C|\$kai
Bhqanian F *f*¹³ 33 543 1346 sy^h

21:17a kai #hulisqh *rell* C^{Corr.C}|#ulisen U
kai hulisqhsan C*

21:17b oekei *rell* C^{Corr.C} |oC*

21:23 #elqontoj) B D L Q F *f*^{1.13} 33 372 543 700 788 892 1346 Or NA²⁷
|#elqontej C|#eiselqonti K P 1424 l48|#elqonti *rell*|#proselqonti
1241

21:28a #eixen tekna duo *rell* C^B (B 142 299 1424 lat vg Hil)|#eipen C*

21:28b tw #prwtw *rell*|#prw C

22:10a agaqouj kai eplhsqh o #gamoj *rell* (K)|#numfwn) B* L 0120
892 sy^{hmg} pc|#gamoj umwn D Q *f*¹³ 124 700 788 1346|#agamoj C

22:10b #anakeimenwn *rell*|#anakimenwn)|#anakeinwn C
|#anakeimenou K|#anakhmenwn 2*

22:20 #kai legei autoij *rell* |#o de C |#om. D 69 it *b e ff*^{1 2} *g*² *h sah sy*^{s c}
mae

23:24 ooi #diulizontej ton kwnwpa *rell* C^c |o)^c B D* L sa^{mss}
|#diulizontai C*
oude ulizontej ton kwnwpa⁵⁷⁹

23:26 #Farisaie tufle *rell* C¹ |#Fareisaie B |#Farisaioie C*

24:3a orouj #tw n elaiwn *rell* |#tw K
#orouj tw n elewn) D L 2 |#orou Q
orouj tw n elewn katenanti tou ierou C

24:3b #pote tauta *rell* |#tote C

24:4 #planhsh *rell* |#planhsi C |#planhswei U |#planhsei Q 2* 28
579 |#planhsousi 118

24:45 #¹autou otou #²dounai) B I L U D *al*³⁰ fere Bas^{eth} Chr NA²⁷ |
#¹eautou C |oD *al pc* Chr Ephr |#²didonai E F G H K M S V W G P *al pl*
Ephr

25:6 eij #¹apanthsin #²autou *rell* [NA²⁷] |#¹upanthsin Z Q S 157
Cry |#²om.) B 700 [NA²⁷] |#²autw l13 l63
eij sunanthsin autw C

26:39 epesen \$ epi proswpon *rell* C^B |\$epesen C*

26:50 #etaire *rell* |#eqtaire C* |#eterai D 579 |#etere E* W Q

26:51 #tw n *rell* |#om. P³⁷ |#tw C*

26:57 Ihsoun #aphgagon proj *rell* (157) |#hgagon 579 |#aphgon C

26:65 legwn \$ eblasfhmhsen ti eti xreian)^c B C^B D L Z Q 090
0281 33 700 892 latt NA²⁷ |\$oti *rell* |\$ti C*^{vid}
kai #legei oide eblasfhmhsen ti eti xreian)* |osy^{sch}
|#legwn sy^p pers^p aeth

26:67 #ekolafisan *rell* |#ekolafilasan C |#ekolafhsan E F K Q W
2 13 124 579 788 1424

27:49 #swsw n *rell* |#swsai)* Q 69 1010 1071 1241 1293 l184 |#swswsw n
C |#swsei D 1 209 1582* |#swson F Y K 2* 28 157 700* |#swzwn W

27:56 hn |#Maria oh Magdalhnh kai \ Maria *rell*)^{ca} (S 28 124 346
348 474 543 565 566 579 788 1279 l184) | |)* |#Mariam L f¹ |oD*
hn \$ Mariam h Magdalhnh kai Mariam C^{Corr.C} D Q 713 sy^{omn}
arm geo |\$kai C*

27:58 #ekeleusen *rell* |#ekenleusen C

27:64 #esxath *rell* |#aisxath D |#sxath C |#esxati 2*

APPENDIX FIVE: SINGULAR READINGS IN CODEX D IN MATTHEW

- 2:1 Hrwdou *rell* (*Herodis* Latt)
Hrwdouj D (*Herodes d*)
- 2:3 kai #pasa \$ Ierosoluma met autou *rell* |#om. D d |#passa L
|\$h N Z S 248 280 692 Eus^{dem}
- 2:6 #poimanei *rell* |#poimani) |#poimenei D
- 2:8a #Bhqleem *rell* |#Beqleem D |#Biqleem L W 349 148
- 2:8c #epan *rell* |#otan D |#ean Prot^{cdd6}
- 2:8d #apaggeilate *rell* |#anaggeilate 124 |#epaggeilatai D*
|#apaggeilatai D^B
- 2:9 #akousantej \$ tou basilewj *rell* D^{CorrC} |#akousan D* |\$para
1071
- 2:11 #qhsaurouj *rell* |#qhnsaurouj D |#thensauros a b d f ff¹ k q
- 2:16a en #bhqleem *rell* |#bleem C |#beqleaim D* |#bhqleem D^B
|#biqleem L W 349 1071
- 2:16b #hkreibwsen *rell* |#hkreibasen D |#hkribwse 1424
- 2:22 #efobhgh *rell* D^{Corr.C} |#efhgh D*
- 3:2 #hggiken *rell* |#hngiken D |#hggeiken W D |#hggike f¹ 118
157 788 1346
- 3:4 #kamhlou *rell* (*d lacunae*) |#kamhllou D |#kamilou 28 565
|#camelli k sy^{hl.hier} geo |#cameli q |#camellorum it^{pler} vg sy^{c.s.pesh} cop aeth arm Eus
Aug
- 4:6a #tou qeou *rell* D^A |#qeou D*
- 4:6b #arousin *rell* |#airousin D
- 4:7 ouk ekpeiraseij *rell*
ou peiraseij D
non #tentabis Latt |#temptauis d* |#temptabis d^G
- 4:13 #katwkhzen *rell* |#katoikhzen D |#katokhsen E* |om. sy^s
- 4:15 #Nefqalim S L W W 2 28 565 579 NA²⁷ |#Nefqaleim *rell*
|#Nefqalein D

4:16c #mega *rell* D^c |#megan D* |#*magnam* Latt (*magnum d*)

4:16e kai #skia *rell* D^B |#skha L
skeia D* *d*

4:17 #hggiken *rell* |#hngiken D |#hgghken L |#eggeiken W 1071
|#hggike 13 118 157 788

4:18 #amfiblhstron *rell* D^B (*rete* Latt) |#amfiblhstroj D* |#*retiam d*

4:24 h akoh oautou *rell* |oD |312 D

5:2 #edidasken *rell* |#edidacen D

5:3 otw pneumatī *rell* D^{CorrC} |oD*

5:10 #estin *rell* |#este D (*erit d*)

5:12b umwn *rell* |om. sy^s
umwn uparxontwn D*
umwn uparxontaj D^c *d* (Latt^{al}) sy^c bo?
umwn oi paterej #umwn U |#autwn *b c k* syr^{cu}

5:18 panta genhtai *rell* |21 D *d*

5:22 #orgizomenoj *rell* D^D |#orgazomenoj D*

5:24 #diallaghqi *rell* |#kataallaghqi D

5:25a oewj #otou *rell* D^A |oD* |#ou 13 28 124 543 788 1241 1184

5:25b mhpote se #paradw *rell* D^c |#paradwsei D* |132 Cl

5:25c o krithj \$) B^{f.1.13} 16 59 265 372 892 1473 1579 1588 *k* sy^{hier}
aeth arm geo^B Aug^{serm.387} Clem Alex^{strom.IV.14.95} Hil |\$se paradwsei D |\$se
paradw L W G D Q P S M 346 33 157 565 *al. pler* it vg sy^{c.pesh.hl} cop geo^{1 et}
A |om. 1346
o kritij paradw700

5:29 oo ofqalmoj sou o decioj *rell* (1071) |oS 157 |12453 D

5:36 ou dunasai mian trixa leukhn poisai h melainan
) ^{S1} B 33 892 1844 pc lat NA²⁷ |12634578 f¹ 209 sy^{hier} cop |12346578 0250
124 543 700 788 1071 h |12348756 238 |12634875 sy^{c.s.pesh} Aph⁵⁰⁰ Tat^{diat} |1264578
Clem²⁶²
ou dunasai mian trixan leukhn poisai h #melainan) *
|#melanan W |12345786 E 157 1346
ou dunasai #poiein trixa mian leukhn h melainan
D*|#poih sai D^{B.D} dk Cyp¹⁷⁸ Aug^{semel}
ou dunasai mian trixa leukhn h #melainan poisai M
K M U D P^c S 2 22 28^c 118 157 346 565 1424 sy^h|#melenan 28*|#melaina
579|#melanan P*
ou dunasai mian trixan leukhn poisai melenan L
ou dunasai mian trixan leukhn poish h melenan Q
|12346578 f¹³

5:40a tw qelonti soi *rell*
o qelwn soi D
ton qelonta soiD 485

5:41 #aggareusei *rell*|#engareush)|#aggareuei D|#aggareush
E G K V Q S 13 543 33 157 243 471* 149|#angareush W 124 788
|#aggereush D 1071 1424|#agkareusei 59 66 483 484

5:48 o ouranioj teleioj estin *rell* D^B
o o¹en o²toij ouranoij teleioj o³estin E² K M S D Q P
22 565 579 700 al pl b c d g¹ h k sy^{cu.sch.pesh.hier} Aug^{aliq} Clem^{792allud} Lcif Tert |o¹geo²
|o²D* |o³d k geo¹⁽²⁾

6:7 #battaloghshte) B f¹³ NA²⁷|#battologhshte *rell*
|#blattologhshtai D*|#blattaloghshtai D^D|#batologhshte E G
1241 1183 sy^{p(mg gr)}|#battalogeitai W 59 471 1604|#batgologhshte
517 892|#battologeite 700|#batologhshte 1424

6:12 #ofeilhmata *rell*|#ofilemata D|#ofelhmata K L

6:18a #opwj mh fanhj *rell*|#ina D

6:18c #krufaiw kai) B D^A f¹ 22 660 NA²⁷|#krufia D*^{vid}|#kruptw *rell*

6:20 #qhsaurouj *rell* D^c|#qhsaurousouj D*

6:18b tw patri sou tw en otw *rell* D^{CorC} |oD*

6:18d o \$blepwn en otw #krufaiw) B f¹ 22 600 NA²⁷ |oD |\$se 273
|#kruptw *rell*

9:2 #qarsei *rell* D^{p.m.}|#qarei D*|#qarse L|#qarsi Q 579

9:10 #sunanekeinto *rell* D^{Cor.C}|#sunekeinto D*

9:20 #imatiou *rell*|#matiou D|#hmatiou 2

9:33 otw Israhel *rell* D^{CorC}|oD*

9:36 #errimmenoi *rell*|#erimmenoi) B C D^c S S 22 21 280 349 990 1574
1606 1184|#rerimmenoi D*|#erhmenoi L|#errhgmenoi M
|#errhmenoi X W 471|#errimenoi G D 209|#perierimmenoi 1093 |om.
Bas

10:8 |nekrouj #egeirete\) B C* N 1 1582* f¹³ 33 157 565 700^c 1346
NA²⁷|#egeirate D||C³ L X Y G Q P m 118 209 124 59 245 251 482 485 517
700 1278 al. plur. f sy^{pesh.hier} sa aeth^(2cdd.) arm geo^{1etB} Eus

10:10 xitwnaj *rell*|#xeiqwnaj D*|#xeitwnaj D^H|#xeitonaj L
|#xitonaj Q

10:13² oh eirhnh *rell* D^B|oD*

10:15 en \$ hmera *rell*|\$h D*|\$th hmera D^H

10:16 #akeraioi *rell*|#aploustatoi D

10:25 #epekalesan *rell*)^{ca} (vocaverunt Latt)|#epekalesanto) * L N 4 59
pc|#ekalesan Q 0171 f¹ 124 2 700 1424 Epiph|#kalousin D (uocant d)
|#apekalesan Y U 157*

10:28 to swma thn de yuxhn mh dunamenwn #apokteinai (*rell*)
|#apoktinai) D^D N W Q|#sfacai D*|#apokteinanta 579

10:34² #eirhnhn *rell* D^D|#irhnhn)|#eirhn D*|#hrhnhn Q

10:35 otou patroj *rell*|oD

10:36 #exqroi *rell*|#ekqroi D

11:3 #erxomenoj *rell* D^B|#ergazomenoj D*

11:8 #hmfiesmenon *rell*|#hmfiasmenon D|#peribebhlhmenon 472

11:10 #aggelon *rell*|#angelon D

11:11a gennhthtoij *rell* D^c|\$thtoij D*

11:11b gunaikwn *rell* D^c|\$thwn D*

11:12 #Iwannou *rell* D^A (*Ioannis* Latt; *Iohannis d*)|#Iwanou B|#Iwannouj D*|#Iannou E 565

11:16 |en otaij agoraij\ () B Z 1 33 892 1424 1582* l184 NA²⁷ |*orell* ||118 1071 1582^c
en \$agora 047 28 59 251 349 399 470 485 544 1293 1574 al.
|\$th D

11:20 #egenonto *rell*|#gegoneisan D|#egeneto P*|#eginonto 692 1071
#¹*factae* #²*sunt* Latt|#¹*facti d*|#² *fuerant k*

11:21d #egenonto *rell*|#egegoneisan D|#egenhqhsan 33 157 517 892 1391 1424 1675 l7 l49

11:22 h #umin *rell*|#soi M*|om. 1346
#hn umein D*|#h D^c

11:24a #gh Sodomwn *rell* (L)|#ghj D|#om. 1604 ff¹ k Iren^{int}

11:24b h \$ #soi *rell*|\$en 21 1279|#umin M^{mg} 124 659 1424 it vg^{mss} sa^{ms}
bo^{pt} arm^(cdd) Ir^{int278}|#su 157 471*
#hn umein D*|#h D^c

11:25 #apekaluyaj *rell*|#apekaluyej D

11:26 #emprosqen *rell*|#enprosqen D

12:1a o Ihsouj \$ otaij #sabbasin *rell* D^{CorrC}|\$en W 238 |oD*
|#sabbatoij B|#sabasi K|#sabbasi M U f¹ 124^c 28 157 700|#sabasin 565

12:1b tillein \$staxuj *rell*|\$touj U W 118 28 700 sa bo
tou staxuj tillein D

12:1c otouj staxuj U W 118 28 700 sa bo |*orell*
tou staxuj D

12:4a #proqesewj *rell*|#prosewj C|#prosquesewj D

12:4b ouk econ hn *rell* |132 D
ouk #econ Chr^{com}et^{mo6}|#echn Or|#ecestin C 16 33 118 726 1010 1375 1579 1675|#ecesti 28

12:12 \$probatou *rell* D^c|\$tou D*

12:13 #ugihj *rell* |#hguhj D* |#ugeihj D^{p.m.} |#ugih E* |#ugieij L Q
|#om. l184* a b c ff¹ h vg^{IMS} sy^{c.s.pesh} aeth arm Hil

12:18a idou oo paij mou \$on hretisa *rell* |oD |\$eij D

12:18c #apaggelei *rell* |#apaggellei D |#apaitelai L |#anaggelei
348 700 788 1187 |#epaggelei 248 485

12:19 #akousei *rell* |#akouei D |#akoush 28 476 l184

12:20a |kalamon suntetrimmenon\ *rell* (B) D^F ||D* d*
#arundinem quassatam Latt |#harundinem d^G

12:20b #kateacei *rell* |#katiaceij D* d* (*confringes*) |#kateacen D^F d^G

12:20c ou \$ sbesei *rell* () D 1071) |\$mh 713
ou omh zbesei D* |D^c

12:23 #mhti \$ *rell* D^c |#mh 258 945 990 |\$oti D*

12:26 #staqhsetai *rell* |#sthsetai D

12:28 #efqasen *rell* |#efqasan D*

12:34 lalei \$ *rell* D^D |\$agaqa D* d |\$mala ff²

12:36 #lalhsousin) B C Q 4 21 33 273 713 945 1093 1223 1354 1391 1555
NA²⁷ |# lalousin D (*locuntur d*) |#lalhswsin *rell* |#locuti it^(pler) vg

12:39 #auth *rell* D^D |#soi D* |#autoij Iust

12:40 wsper gar hn Iwnaj *rell* |1243 047 252 892
wsperi gar Iwnaj D*
wsper ogar Iwnaj D^c c^{scr} |o472
wsper gar egeneto Iwnaj Q 7 517 954 1391 1424 1675 l49 l184
hn Iwnaj 565

12:41a #Nineuitai B C L W X D Q S 213 443 1574 2145 al. NA²⁷
|#Nineueite) |#Neineuetai D* |#Neineueitai D^D |#Nhneuitai G
|#Nineuitai *rell*

12:41b #geneaj *rell* D^B |#neaj D* |#genaiaj E

12:41c #katakrinousin *rell* D^D |#kakrinousin D*

12:42 \$Solomwnoj kai idou (*rell*) D^c NA²⁷ |\$tou D*

12:43 #ecelqh *rell* |#echlqh D

12:45 ta esxata \$ tou #anqrwpou oekeinou *rell()* |\$xeirona tw
E |#ouranou Q |34512 1689 |o348 sy^c

ta aisexata \$ tou anqrwpou ekeinou WD^c |\$autou D* d

13:1a #en *rell* D^c |#ej D*

13:1b #ecelqwn *rell* |#echlqen D

13:1c o Ihsouj \$thj oikiajB Q 1 124 788 1424 1582* Or^{3,3} NA²⁷ | \$ek
) Z 33c *f h q* vg Or^{int3,2} Chr(et^{mo7}) |\$apo *rell*

o Ihsouj \$ *a b e f f f*^{1,2} g¹ k Sy^s |\$kai D d

13:6a hliou ode #anateilantoj *rell* |o4 61 h geo
|#anatilantoj) N W |#anathlantoj Q |#anatellontoj 1253 2542
tou de hliou anateilantoj D
kai hliou anateilantoj 735

13:16b ota wta *rell* |oD

13:22 tou #¹ploutou #²sumpnigei *rell* |#¹kosmou 157 |#²sunpneigei
B* D^c |#sumpneigei B^c |#sunpnigei) C L N W D Q f¹³ 788 565
|#sunpnhgh 2* |#sumpnhgh 2^c |#sumphngei 28
tou ploutouj sunpneigei D*

13:25 tou sitou okai *rell* |oD*

13:30 #apoqhkh n *rell* D^B |#apoqhn D* |#apoqhkin W

13:34 tauta panta #elalh sen *rell* D^c |#elali)^c W |#elalhnsen D*

13:38¹ oi #uioi *rell* D^c |#uio D*

13:38a \$thj basileiaj *rell* D^c |\$thj bas D*

13:41 #sullecousin *rell* |#sunlecousin D |#sulecousin L
|#sullecwin F

13:44a #qhsaurw *rell* D^c |#qhnsaurw D* |#thensauro d

13:44b anqrwpoj *rell*
tij oanqrwpoj 892 |oD d

13:46a #pepraken *rell* |#epwlhsen D |#pepraxen E

13:48a #anabibasantej *rell* |#anebibasan D |#anabhbasantej F L Q
13 2 579 1346 1424 |#anabasantej 118 |#educentes c ff¹ l vg |#educentes d

|#ducentes r² vg^{2MSS} /#eduxerunt a b fff² h q sy^{omn} sa bo aeth |#duxerunt g¹
|#posuerunt e |#imposuerunt k

13:48b eij #aggh) B C N M* Q 1 1582 124 399 700 892 Or NA²⁷ |#aggeia
rell |#agia L |#aggia P X |om. sy^{c.s}
eij ta aggia D

13:49a tou #aiwnoj rell |#kosmou D

13:49b #aggeloi rell |#angeloi D

13:52 #maqhteugeij rell |#maqhteugij) |#maqhteugeij D
|#maqhteugh L

14:6 othj Hrwdiadoj rell |oW (Q) f¹ 124 788
autou Hrwdiaj D

14:8 \$ owde epi #pinaki thn kefalhn rell |\$ecauthj 1424 |oit^(pler)
vg^(5MSS) bo |#pinakoj 473
wde \$ kefalhn D* d |\$thn D^B

14:14 #¹ep #²autoij rell |#¹en L 485 |#²auton I 067 1253 Or^{3,509}
|#²autouj F 13 33 868 979 983 1331 1335 1424 1574 1689
peri autwnD
super eos k sy^{c.pesh.hl} sa bo
ode eis d |off¹ vg^(mu.)
#illis a b c g¹ h l |#eius aur vg^(pleret WW)

14:24b #hn gar enantioj rell D^K |#h D*

14:25 tetarth #de fulakh rell |#oun W
tetarthj de fulakhj D

14:27 #qarseite rell |#qarsite) |#qarreite D |#qarseitai W Q
2* |#om. 517 954 983 1424 1675 1689

14:31 oo Ihsouj rell |oD |om. E* vg^(1MS)
dominus noster sy^{pesh}

15:1 tote proserxontai rell D^{Cor.C} Or^{txt}
tote #proerxontai D* |#aperxontai Or^{com}

15:3 dia ti okai #¹umeij #²parabainete rell |o) * 579 1012 1187
1365 Iren |#¹hmeij f¹³ |#²parabainai D
dia ti umeij paralambainete 1071

15:14a #autouj *rell*|#tougj tuflouj D d

15:14b #pesountai *rell*)^{S1}|#pesounte)*|#empesountai F O W S F 4
262 273 517 565 659 700 1010 1012 1293 1295 1412 1424 1675 *al. Epiph*
|#enpesountai D

15:16 #akmhn *rell*|#aknhn D

15:22a #ekeinwn *rell* D^{p.m.}|#ekinwn)|#ekeiwn D*|#ekeinon L
|#authj 349 517 659 954 1424 1675

15:22b §¹legousa §²*rell* |§¹autw M K L M U V W X G D P F 0106 0119
565 *ff*¹ k vg^(3MSS) sy^{hl.p} Bas |§¹opisw autou D d |§²autw *ff*² g¹ vg^{pler} Aug

15:27a #yixiwn *rell*|#yeixiwn B|#yuxiwn 565 1071|#yeixwn D

15:27b #kuriwn *rell* D^c|#kunariwn D*

15:29 to #oroj *rell*|#roj D

15:32a #splugxnizomai *rell*|#splugxnizome) C W|#splanxnizomai
D|#splaxnhzomai K|#splugxnizwme L|#splaxnizomai D W

15:32b ou gelw |#mh pote eklugwsin en th odw\ *rell* D^{p.m.} D^D d^{p.m.}
|#mh) 1 22 1582* 700 892 2372* a b c g¹ l q aur vg sy^{omn} || D* d*

15:35 #paraggeilaj B f^{1 13} 33 579 788 1346 NA²⁷|#paraggilaj) Q
|#ekeleusen *rell*|#parangeilaj D|#ekeuse Y*|#ekeleuse Y^c M U
118 157 700 1071|#keleusaj 291

15:37-38 ^{15:37} |kai to perisseuon tw n klasmatwn hran epta
#¹spuridaj plhrej^{15:38} oi de esqiontej hsan
#²tetrakisxilioi andrej\ (*rell*) NA²⁷ || D*|#¹sfuridaj D^{p.m.}
|#²tetrakisxeilioi B D^{p.m.} W Q|#tetrakisxiliaj 157

15:37 #spuridaj *rell*|#sfuridaj D

15:39a #enebh) B N S F W 1 18 33 35 124 184^{vid} 735 892 1009 1328 1334
1335 1338 1339 1342 1348 1582 1604 1661 2193^c 2372^c 2766 NA²⁷|#anebh *rell*
|#enbainei D

15:39b §Magadan (*rell*) NA²⁷ |§thj D

16:3 o ouranoj oupokritairell (om. verse) B Y f¹³ 2* 157) |o C W D 33
NA²⁷
o ahr D

16:4 #shmeion ou doqhsetai *rell*|#shmion) D^c W|#shmian D*
|#shmiwn Q

16:13b otou uion tou anqrwpou *rell* |oD

16:16 tou zwntoj *rell* D^H
#to swzontoj D* (*saluatoris d**) |#tou D^A
#uiui Latt |#uiuentis d^G |#om. l sy^{pesh(1MS*)} Hil^{semel.Trin.VI.36}

16:22b #¹estai osoi #²touto *rell* |#¹estwf 13 788 1071 |oa b e ff² sy^c Hil
al |#²toutwL
este touto soi D d

16:23 ta tw n anqrwpwn*rell* |om. e
\$ tou anqrwpou D d |\$ta ff¹ q sy^{c.(p.hl.)} sah aeth

17:2 #emprosqen *rell* |#enprosqen D

17:5 #epeskiasen *rell* D^D (*obumbravit* Latt) |#obumbrabat d
epeskiazend^{*}

17:8 #eparentej *rell* |#eperontej D* |#eparantej D^{p.m.+D}

17:18 #eqerapeuqh *rell* |#eqarapeuqh D

17:20 kokkon *rell* D^B |#kokkoj D* |#kokon FD |#koko L |#kokkw 2
|#kokko 1424*

17:24¹ ta #didraxma (*rell*) |#didragmata D

18:6 #sumferei *rell* |#sunferei D |#sumferi Q

18:14 #emprosqen *rell* |#enprosqen D |#emprosqe 1346

18:15a #elegcon *rell* |#elencon D |#elegce W |#ellegcon W 579

18:15b #ekerdhsaj *rell* |#ekerdhsej D |#ekerdhsaj EL

18:19a #sumfwnhswsin *rell* |#sumfwnhsousin) ENLD Q f¹³ 700 788
1071 1346 1424 |#sunfwnhsousin D

18:19b pantoj\$ pragmatoj *rell* D^c |\$tou D*

18:22 ewj eptakij #¹alla oewj ebdomhkontakij #²epta B D^c
058^{vid} 174 2145 NA²⁷ |#¹all *rell* |od e ff¹ h |#²eptakij D* |#septies Latt
|#septies et septies b r² vg^{2MSS} |#septem septem sy^{c.s.pesh}

18:25 #apodoqhnai *rell* D^A |#apodoqhne) |#apoqhnai D*
|#apodwqhnai 579 1071 |#apodounai 1604

18:27 #splugxnisqejj *rell* |#splugxnisqij) |#splanxnisqejj D
|#splugxnhsqejj E2^c |#splaxnisqejj K |#splugxnhsqhj 2*
|#splugxnisqhj 579

18:28 ekaton dhnaria *rell* |21 D d

18:29 #kai *rell* |#kagw D d

19:4 #qhlu *rell* D^c |#qhlun D* |#qulh 1346

19:6 #xwrizetw *rell* |#apoxwrizetw D |#separet Latt |#separari a

19:10 #sumferei *rell* |#sumferi) Q |#sunferei D |#sumferh 2*

19:12 #eunouxisqhsan *rell* |#hunouxisqhsan D |#eunouxiqhsan G
|#eunouxhsqhsan 28

19:20 efulaca \$) * B L Q $f^1 579 700 ff^1 g^{1.2} l m$ aur
vg^(pler) Iren Cyp Ath^{cod} NA²⁷ |\$ek neothtoj mou *rell*)^{cb2} |\$ek neothtoj D
d
efulacamhn ek neothtoj mou C W G D S F M Minusc. pler
Or

19:26 adunaton . . . dunata *rell* D^A
dunaton . . . dunata D*

19:28¹ #dwdeka *rell* |# i8b8) |#dekaduo D

19:28² otaj dwdeka *rell* D^B |oD*

19:29 #ekatontaplasiona *rell* D^B |#pollaplasiona B L 579
|#ekatontaplasion D* |#poflaplasiona L* |#pollaplasiwna 579
|#ekatontaplasiwna 2* 1071

20:3 #ecelqwn *rell* |#diecelqwn D

20:10 #pleion B C* L N Z 085 $f^{1.13} 124 579 788 1346 /844 NA^{27}$ |#pliona
) |#pleiona *rell* |#pleiw D |#plion W Q |#pleiwna 1071 |#plewn
Or^{semel Matt.XV.30}

20:15 #ecestin omoi *rell* D^K |#estin D* |oF
econ moi estin 157

21:3 oautwn xreian exei *rell* D^B |or²
atuou xreian exei) Q 544 579 1194 1241 1515
autwn exei xreian exei D*

21:5 #¹uion #²upozugiou *rell* D^K |#¹om.)^c L Z f¹ d g¹ |#¹uon F |#¹uiwn
579 |#²pwlon neon f¹ |#²upozugion D* |#²subiugalis l

21:9¹ #wsanna *rell* |#ossana D* (*ossana d*) |#wssana D^H |#wssanna F
|#wsana L 2

21:9² #wsanna *rell* |#ossana D* (*ossana d*) |#wssana D^H |#wanna E*
|#wsana L Q 2

21:13 oo oikoj *rell* D^H | oD*

21:15 #wsanna *rell* |#ossana D* (*ossana d*) |#wssana D^H |#wsana L Q* 2

21:21 #apokriqeij *rell* |#apokreij D |#apokrhqeij Q
|#apwkriqeij 28 |#apokriqhj 579

21:22 osa #¹an #²aithshte *rell* |#¹ean C E F G K M O S V W Y
D P S Minusc. *pler.* |#²aithseite Q |#²aithsete 28 |#²aiteisqai 1071
osa aithshte D
osa ean #aithshsqe L 4 273 482 544 945 1355 Clem
|#aithshtai M W 69 |#aithseitai 579

21:28 en tw ampelwni \$ *rell* |\$mou B C^B E F G H S U V W X
Z P^c F W 0102 0281 579 1241 1424 *pc fl r*² vg^(pler) sy^{omn} sa bo^{pt} mae Or^{3,770} Eus^{luc}
Cyr^{glaph} Op
eij to ampelwna D*
eij ton ampelwna \$ D^B a b d e ff^{1,2} h q Chr Dam^{2,809} |\$mou
1424 *c f g*¹ aur vg Ps-Ath^{dispu}

21:29 #metamelhqeij *rell* D^c (v.30 B f¹³ 4 174 230 238 262 273 346 543 566
700 788 826 828 983 1187 1346 1555 1573 *r*² vg^(2MSS) sy^{hier} sa^(pler) bo aeth^(2cdd) arm
geo) |#metamelhqij) |#metametamelhqeij D* |#metameliqhj 579
1071 |#(v.30)metamellhqeij Q

21:31 #duo *rell* D^c |#duw D*

21:36 \$¹palin\$² *rell*)^{ca} |\$¹kai) * m vg^(1MS) syr^{pesh(pler).sch} |\$²oun D |\$²de
487 579 (*iterum vero d*) vg^(1MS)
rursus iterum ff¹
rursus etiam cop

21:39 #ecebalon *rell* |#ebalon) |#ecebalan D |#eceballon Z

21:46 #profhthn *rell* |#profhn D

22:12 #o de *rell* |#oj D
at ille it^(pler) vg
ille autem sy^{s.pesh.hl} sa bo geo |#qui d

22:24 autou |thn gunaika oautou\ *rell* || D d |ovg^(1MS)

22:44 #exqrouj *rell* |#ekqrouj D

23:3 panta ooun\$ *rell* D^K |o118 579 vg^(2MSS) sy^c bo aeth arm geo |\$panta
oun D*

23:6 thn #prwtoklisian *rell* |#prwtoklhsian F G G D 2*
28 69 565 579 1071 |#protoklisian Q
taj #prwtoklisiaj)^{ca} 157 713 892 a c f f f¹ g¹ h l m r^{1.2} aur
vg sy^{c.s.pesh(pler).hl.hier} sa bo aeth Hil |#prwtoklhsiaj L f¹ 33
othn thn prwtokleisian D* |oD^K

23:13 #emprosqen *rell* |#enprosqen D

23:16 ooi legontej *rell* D^{CorC} |oD*

23:17 #meizwn *rell* |#meizw D |#meizon F

23:33 #exidnwn *rell* |#exnidwn D

23:39 #kuriou *rell* |#qeou D d

24:9 #apoktenousin *rell* |#apokteinousin D

24:12 #plhqunqhna*i* *rell*)^{ca} |#plhqunqhne)* |#plhqunai D
|#abundavit Latt |#abundat a |#repleta d

24:15 #Danihl *rell*)^{S1} D^A |#ihl)* |#Danihlou D* |#Daniele Latt
|#Danielum d

24:19 #qhlazousaij *rell* |#qhlazomenaij D |#enqhlazousaij L
|#nutrientibus Latt |#lactantibus d

24:21 ap arxhj \$ kosmou #ewj otou nun *rell* |\$tou 579 |#mexri 1223
|oD |om. 660 1293 1424 Hip

24:30a \$oen *rell* |\$tou D |o544 1515
ek tw n 713 sah

24:30b #ouranw *rell* |#ouranoi*j* D |#ouranwn 713 sah |o544 1515

24:33 #egguj *rell* |#enguj D

24:38 #axri |hj hmeraj\
axrei thj hmeraj\$ *rell* || sy^{s.pesh.(2MSS)} aeth |#axi Q*
arxij hmeraj D* |\$hj D^D
f¹³ 69 124 543 788 1346

25:17 #wsautwj *rell*|#omoiwj D

25:22 #paradwkaj *rell*|#paradwkej D|#edwkaj 579

25:28 #deka *rell*|#pente D d

25:29 #perisseuqhsetai *rell*|#perisseusetai D|#periseuqhsetai
X W G|#prosteuqhsetai Or^{Iohan^{32.7et9}}|#*abundabit* Latt

25:32a #ap allhlwn *rell*|#apo D

25:32b #emprosqen *rell*|#enprosqen D

25:38 kai sunhgagomen #¹h gunnon okai #²periebalomen \$ *rell*
|#¹kai D|#²perieballomen D 1424 I53|#²periebalwmen 579 1346 |osa
|\$se157 b c ff^{1.2} g¹ r² aur vg^(pler) sy^{s.pesh.hier} sa bo aeth arm geo

26:1 #¹ote #²etelesen *rell* D^K|#¹wj U|#²etelen K
|#²sunetelesen M 248 566 954|#²elegen 59|#²etelesen 579
o telesen D*

26:1-2 ^{26:1}toij maqhtaij |oautou, ^{26:2}oidate\ oti *rell* |ol47|| D d
^{26:1} |toij eautou maqhtaij\ ^{26:2}oidate oti Y||238
vg^(IMS*)

26:6 tou #leprou *rell* D^c|#leprwsou D*

26:12 tou #swmatoj mou *rell* D^c|#swmatosmatoj D*

26:13 #olw *rell*|#olo D

26:15 #oi de esthsan *rell* D^c|#oij D*

26:16 apo tote *rell*
apote D

26:18 #egguj *rell*|#enguj D

26:23a #apokriqeij *rell* D^K|#apokriqij)|#apokreij D*
|#apokriqhj 579|#om. sy^s

26:23b tw trubliwplu NA²⁷
to #trublion sah cop|#trubalion D (*d parapside*)

26:26 labwn |o Ihsouj\ \$ arton P³⁷) B C G L Q 1 4 33 79 118 205
209 517 579 700 735 792 892 954 968 1012 1230 1331 1333 1343 1424 1446 1451
1574 1582 1692 1780 2680 2766 NA²⁷ ||1375 |\$ton *rell* |1423 157 851 1170

o Ihsouj labwn arton D d
labwn o Ihsouj touj artouj 2542
labwn o|Ihsouj ton\ artonM|oD 1675 ||1348

26:45 #tou *rell* D^{Corr.C} |#toug D*

26:53 #legiwnaj B* NA²⁷ |#legiwnwn) *)^{S1} L |#legaiwnwn)^{ca}
|#legeonwn A D 788 |#legewnaj *rell* B^{c2} |#legewwn C K Q P f¹³ 33 565
700 1071 |#legeiwnhj D* |#legeionaj D^D |#legeonaj E^c |#om. ff²

26:55b #ekagezomhn *rell* |#ekaqhmhn D |#eram r^{1.2}

26:61 #eipan) Q 124 NA²⁷ |#eipon *rell* |#kai eipon D

26:70 #emprosqen *rell* |#enprosqen D

27:1 #¹wste \$ #²qanatwsai *rell* |#¹opwj S |\$auton 69
|#²qanatwsousin 69^{mg}
ina qanatwsousin D (*d lacunose*)

27:13 ouk akoueij #posa *rell* D^F |#osa B* |#tosa D* |#pwsa M

27:15 \$eorthn *rell* |\$thn D

27:16 \$legomenon *rell* (om. 1090 Got.) |\$ton D

27:27 #sunhgagon *rell* |#sunhgagen D |o1344

27:29 #emprosqen *rell* |#enprosqen D |#emprosqeen Q

27:30 #emptusantej *rell* |#enptusantej D

27:34¹ #piein *rell* |#pin) * |#pein D |#om. L

27:34² #piein *rell* |#pin) * |#pein D

27:41 #empaizontej *rell* |#empezontej) W Q W 69 788
|#enpaizontej D |#empaizontaij E* |#om. 348

27:44 to d #autorell |#autw W
to de autoi D*
to #de auto D^c F |321 517 |#om. g¹ sy^p arm
de sy^s sah

27:46 oo Ihsouj *rell* |oD |om. 2 21 349 892

27:48 #spoggon *rell* |#spongon D

27:53 #enefanisqhsan polloi*j* *rell* |#efanhsan D* *d*
|#enefaneisan D^{Cor.C}

27:54 #legontej *rell* D^B |#gontej D*

27:56 oh #Magdalhnh *rell* D^B |oD* |#Magdalin*h* S 124 346 543 28 348 474
565 579 788 1279 1184 *al.*

27:59 #labwn *rell* |#paralabwn D |#*accepto* Latt |#*suscipiens* *d*

27:60 #proskulisaj *rell* D^c *d* |#proskulisaslisaj D*
|#proskulhsaj EF2 |#prosekulisaj U |#proskilusaj 69 |#*advolvit*
Latt

27:61a oh Magdalhnh *rell* D^B |oD*

27:61b #apenanti *rell* |#epi W |#katenanti D

27:64 #eipwsin *rell* |#eipwsi B M S U Y 69 118 157 700 788 1071 1346
|#erousin D

28:1 oh Magdalhnh *rell* D^B |oD*

28:2 #ec *rell* |#ap D |#*de* Latt

28:16 oo Ihsouj *rell* |oD

APPENDIX SIX: SINGULAR READINGS IN WASHINGTONIANUS IN MATTHEW

- 1:9 #egennhsen ton Iwaqam *rell* |#eennhsen W*
- 2:6 #gh Iouda *rell* |#th W
thj Ioudaiaj D 61 a c d f g¹ q
- 2:16 #magwn *rell* |#gamwn W
- 2:17 #Ieremiou tou profhtou *rell* W^{c2.mg} |#Ihremiou D^c P^c
|#Hremiou D*
Ihremiou W*
- 3:5² #kai *rell* |#ka W
- 3:6 #potamw up autou ecomologoumenoi *rell* |#patamw W |#om.
C^{c3} D L G P M (exc. M) 13 124 pc
- 3:12 #asbestw *rell* |#asbetw B* |#abestw W*
- 5:22² #an *rell* |#a W
- 5:44 #touj exqrouj *rell* |#tou W
- 6:7b dokousin gar ooti *rell* |oW*
- 6:30 ei de ton xorton tou agrou shmeron \$ onta *rell* |\$en agrw
W
- 7:8 kai o #¹zhtwn #²euriskei *rell* W^{c2} (om. 273 1579) |#¹aitwn W*
|#²eurhsei 99 732 1093 1780 2546*^{vid} l^{vid} Aug
- 7:17 dendron oagaqon karpouj #kalouj poiei *rell* W^{c2} |12354 B
|12453 D |#agaqouj 700 |oW*
- 8:16 #genomenhj *rell* |#gonomenhj W
- 8:28 #peran |eij thn xwran\ *rell* |#pera D || W
- 8:29 pro kairou basanisai hmaj *rell*
hmaj apolesai pro kairou) * 713* vg^{mss}
bo^{pt}
apolesai hmaj kai pro kairou basanisai W
- 9:6 epi othj ghj afienai amartiaj *rell* |41235 W |o487
- 9:15 #aparqh *rell* |#arqh D f¹ 71 237 g^{scr} al |#afereqh W |#parelqh
472

9:20 #kraspedou *rell* |#krasspedou W |#kraspaidou 2 |#om.1689 *a b*
c g¹ k vg^{IMS}

10:5 #apesteilen *rell* |#apestilen) N Q |#aposteilaj F
|#eapesteilen W

10:40 #aposteilanta *rell* |#apostilanta) Q |#apostilonta W
|#aposthlanta 2*

11:17a #Hulhsamen *rell* |#Hulisamen L Y 13 2 788 1346 1424
|#Hulhsomen W

11:17b #ekoyasqe *rell* |#eklausasqai W |#koyasqai Q 1071
|#eklausate 1424^c |#*planxistis* Latt |#*lamentastis d k sy^{cu.s}* sa bo

11:27¹ #epiginwskei *rell* |#epiginwski) |#ginwskei C 71 692 *g^{scr}*
Clem¹ Iust^{tr100} Eus^{marc88cdd} Did^{tri26.72} |#epigeinwskei D |#epigignwskei W

11:27² #epiginwskei *rell* |#epiginwski) |#epigeinwskei B D
|#epigignwskei W |#ginwskei 71 692

12:4 #pwj eishlqen *rell* |#wj W

12:12 #oun *rell* |#ou W

12:15-16 autouj pantaj ^{12:16}kai #¹epetimhsen #²autoij *rell* (B)
|#¹epetima Q |#²autouj 2 700
autouj ^{12:16}pantaj de ouj egerapeusen #epeplhcen
autoij \$ D 1 *a b c ff¹ (h) k it* |#epeplhssen *f¹ |\$kai* epetimhsen
autoij W

12:20 ou \$kateacei *rell* (D) |\$mh W

12:27 touto autoi kritai esontai umwn) B D 1424 NA²⁷ |12534 L
16 1579

touto autoi umwn esontai kritai C 0233 *f¹³ M pler* |12354 Q *f*
¹*pc c vg^{cl}*
touto kritai esontai autoi umwn W |15423 348 477 1279 1473

12:33¹ #poihsate *rell* |#poihshtai W |#poihsan sy^s

12:50 #kai *rell* |#ka W

13:2 oxloi polloi *rell*
oxlon pollon W

13:20 kai #euquj \$meta xaraj *rell* |#euqewj E U S 659 892 1279
1355 1424 1675 Or |#om. e sy^s |\$kai W

13:38 ta de #¹zizania #²eisin *rell* (D) |#¹zeizania B |#¹zhzania Q
2* 28 1346 |#²estin W* |#²om. M

13:41 \$ #apostelei *rell* (X) |\$kai W |#aposteli) |#apostellei G
157

13:46 polutimon *rell* |#poluteimon B D |#poloutimion W
|#polutimwn Q

14:3 #Hrwdiada *rell* |#Hrwiada W |#Hrwdiaida 700*

14:25 #de *rell* |#oun W

14:30 anemon efobhqh) B* 073 33 vg^{1ms} sa bo
[NA²⁷]
anemon isxuron efobhqh *rell* [NA²⁷]
anemon isxuron sfodra efobhqh elqein W

14:32 #anabantwn) B D Q f1 33 700 788 1346 1424 NA²⁷ |#embantwn
rell |#enbantwn W

14:35 #apesteilan *rell* |#apestilan) N Q |#apestilon W

14:36 #dieswqhsan *rell* |#eswqhsan) al 579 |#dielwqhsan W

16:2-3 om. vv. 2-3) B V X Y G W* f¹³ 2* 13 124* 157 230 267 472 478 543*
788 826 828 1473 1573 sy^{s.c} sa mae bo^{pt} arm Or Hier^{mss} [NA²⁷]
purrazei ogar |o ouranoj \$¹ 16:3 kai \$² prwi Shmeron
xeimwn purrazei gar \ (*rell*) [NA²⁷] |oM 471 1293 e || W |\$¹ kai ginetai
outoj K |\$² palin K

16:3a #ginwskete *rell* (D) [NA²⁷] (om. v.3) B Y f¹³ 2* 579 788 [NA²⁷] |
#geinwsketai D (1346) |#gignwsketai W

16:3b ou #dunasqe\$ *rell* [NA²⁷] |om.) B L Y f¹³ 2* 579
788 [NA²⁷] |#dokimazete L |#suniete S 700 al⁵⁰ |\$gnwnai al^{mu} it^{pl} vg
ou dunasqe dokimazein G M N O U S 33 al^{mu} syr^{sch}
ou dunasqai odokimasai W |oD

16:9 #oude *rell* (om.) X) |#oute W

16:24 aparnhssqw #eauton *rell* |#auton W*

16:27 #apodwsei *rell* |#apodwsh W

17:8b auton Ihsoun monon B* Q 700 NA²⁷ |213) *)^{ca}

oton Ihsoun monon *rell* B^{c2} |312 D it^{pler} vg arm |oW

17:24 umwn ou telei *rell*
umwn oute W

17:25 #elqonta eij thn oikian)^c B f¹ NA²⁷ |#eiselqonta) * 579
|#ote hlqon C 27^{ev} |#eiselqonti D |#ote eishlqon U syr^{cu} |#ote
eishlqen o Ihsouj W* |#eiselqontwn Q f¹³ 788 1346 |#elqontwn
autwn 33 |#ote eishlqen *rell*

18:4 to paidion #touto outoj estin |o meizwn\ en th
basileia twn ouranwn *rell* (D) |#touton f¹³ || 579
to paidion touto outoj estin o meizwn toutou twn
ouranwn W*

18:15 #elegcon *rell* |#elencon D |#elegce W |#ellegcon w 579
|#elegcai 247

18:27 to #daneion *rell* |#danion) D E L D Q 2* 124 788
to nanion W
thn ofeilhn 1 1582 1424

18:34 #basanistaij *rell* |#basanhstaij E |#masanistaij W

19:1 apo thj Galilaiaj kai hlqen \$ eij ta oria thj
#Ioudaiaj (*rell*) NA²⁷ |\$kai hlqen) * |#Galilaiaj W*

19:8 Mwushj \$ proj thn sklhrokardian #¹umwn #²epetreyen
#³umin (*rell*) |\$men U |#¹hmwn 579 |#²egrayen 1424 Eus |#³om. 892 Chr |
2345671 D a b c d e f g¹ h r¹ vg^{1ms} | 1672345 W^c | 162345 W*

19:9a #autou *rell* |#umwn W*

19:9b kai #¹gamhsh allhn #²moixatai *rell* C^c |#¹gamhsei H S
|#²poiei authn moixeughnai C* |#²mhxate Q*
poiei authn moixeughnai (P²⁵) B N 1 4 f¹ m¹⁸⁹ cop syr^{hr vid}
bo Or^{3,647sq} Aug
\$gamhsh allhn moixate W |\$kai D Q^c 579 1424

20:1 #omoia *rell* |#omuoqei C^c |#omoiua M* |#oimia W

20:12 #autouj *rell* |#auton W*

20:15 #o qelw *rell* |#w 579 |#wj W

20:29 #hkolouqhsen *rell* |#hkolouqhsan D G 1424 |#hkwlouqhsen W

20:33 ina #anoigwsin B L Z Q 13 33 69* 124 157^c 233 346 543 713 788 826
828 892 983 990 1223 1230 1253 1293 1692 2680 Or^{bis} pc NA²⁷ |#anoixqwsin
rell|#anewxqwsin W|#anuxqwsin W|#anableyomen 851

21:8 ekopton kladouj |apo tw n dendrwn\ rell(N)||W

21:18 #epanagwn rell)^{ca} B^{c1} |#epanagagwn) * B* L |#paragwn D it
syr^{c.hier} Hil |#upagwn W |#reuertens f g¹ l q aur vg sy^{pesh.hl} sa (bo) |#ascendens aeth
geo¹

21:23 #proshlqon rell |#proshlqen W |#proshlqan 33 |#proshlqwn Q
2*

21:26 #anqrwpwn rell|#anqrwpou W

21:30 #¹wsautwj |o de #²apokriqei j eipen\ rell|#¹wj auto D
|)|*|#²apokriqij)^c |#²apokreiqei j D |#²apekriq h W*
|#²apekriqei j W^c |#²apokfiq h j 579 |#²aphlq e Y 118 157

21:32a ouk rell |oW*

21:32b #episteusate rell |#episteusatai D |#aipisteusatai L
|#episteusato W* |#episteusan 1424

21:32c o¹usteron #tou pisteusai \$ o²autw rell (28 r² aur) |o¹047 |#tw
W |#om. Q 124 1010 |\$en Q 33 713 892 sy^{s.pesh} Or |o²c ff^{1.2} g¹

21:41a #apolesei rell |#apolesi) |#analwsei L |#apolei W
|#apolesh 28

21:41b #apodwsousin rell |#apodwsousi B* |#apodwswsin W
|#apodosousin Q

22:7 #wrgisqh rell |#wrghsqh L |#u?b?r?i?s?qh W* |#orgisqh
1071 1424 l183 l184

23:8 estin oumwn o didaskaloj)^c B 33 NA²⁷ |o1093 l184 q
estin umwn o kaqhghthj rell | 2134 659 692 700 1194 1200 1424
1604 l183 |l342 W

23:14 om. verse) B D L Q pler NA²⁷ |#profasei rell |#profaei W

23:25 arpaghj kai #akrasiaj rell |#adikiaj C E F G H K S U V G W
28 157 579 700 pm sy^{p.et} Bas^{eth 236 cod} Chr^{mo 5} Op pc |#akraseiaj D
|#pleoneciaj M 1093 Chr^{montf} Dam^{par517} |#akaqarsiaj O S 66 71 1295 1515
l844* Cl |#akrasiaj adikeiaj W |#ponhria j 999 |#intemperantia lat
|#intemperantiae d |#iniquitate r² sy^{pesh} |#incontinentia e r¹ |#iniustitia f

|#immunditia ff¹ g^{1.2} l m aur vg sah sy^s sa bo geo |#iniquitate auaritia aeth
|#intemperantia et iniquitate sy^{hl}

23:37 #liqobolousa *rell* |#liqobolhsousa W* |#liqobolhsasa W^c

24:9 #paradwsousin *rell* |#paradosousin E* Y 1424 |#paradwswsin W

24:11 #pollouj *rell* |#umaj W |#allhlouj 1241

24:15 #anaginwskwn *rell* |#anageinwskwn D |#anagignwskwn W
|#anaginoskwn Q |#anaginwskon 118 565

24:18 #kai *rell* |#ka W

24:32a #ginwskete *rell* |#ginwsketai L Q 2* 579 |#gignwsketai W
|#geinwsketai B² D G 348 1187 *al.* |#geinwskete B*

24:32b #egguj *rell* |#enguj estin D (33) 482 *pc* it vg sy^{s,h.} Or^{int} |#euquj W

24:39 \$¹ewj\$² #hlqen o kataklusmoj *rell*) S¹)^{corr} |\$¹o) * |\$²an W
|\$²ewj Y* |\$²ou G D 6 33 157 Chr |\$²otou 346 |#eishlqen 16 544 692
1093 1293

24:49 meta twn #mequontwn *rell* |#mequwntwn E* |#mequstwn W

25:19 polun xronon) B C D G L Q 074 f^{1 13} 33 245 517 543 700 788
892 954 1346 1424 1582 1675 it vg^(1ms*) arm cop geo sy^{hier} Or^{3,631} NA²⁷ | 21 *rell*
xronon tina W

25:34 #klhronomhsate *rell* |#klhronomhshte W*

25:46 \$ #eij zwhn *rell* |\$ei 124 |#ei W

26:1 touj logouj #toutouj *rell* |#touj W

26:3 oi #arxiereij \$ kai oi presbuteroi *rell* |#arxeiereij D
|\$kai oi grammateij M K M U G P S Q 22 346 28 157 565 579 892 1006
1342 1346 1506 *al pler c fff² g² h q r⁽¹⁾ sy^{(s.)pesh.hl}* Arm gat Chr Or^{int3,891} in^{txt}
(*transposition* 1010 1071 1293 sy^{pesh(1ms)}) |\$kai grammateij S D W 1223
|\$kai oi farisaioi W

26:14 #dwdeka *rell* |#dekaduo W

26:15 #paradwsw *rell* |#paradw W

26:18 #to pasxa *rell* |#ta W

26:19 kai epoihsan *rell*
epoihsan oun W

26:41 #eiselqhte *rell* | #elqhte P³⁷ b ff² sa bo | #eiselqhtai) DL
| #eiserqhte W*

26:65 #dierrhcen *rell* | #dierhcen W

26:67 #erapisan) A B C pc NA²⁷ | #errapisan auton G f¹ 579 700
| #errapisan M f¹³ plu | #eripisan W | #erapizon 157

26:72 #¹meta #²orkou) A B C K L W D Q P* S F 33 71 565 892 1346
1402 2145 NA²⁷ | om. l184 | #¹meq *rell* | #²rorkou W

27:4a oi #¹de #²eipan L f¹³ 33 788 1346 NA²⁷ | #¹d W* | #²eipon *rell*

27:39 taj kefalaj oautwn *rell* | 312 W | o251 544
thn kefalhn autwn D d bo aeth geo¹

27:41 #farisaiwn D M K M U D P S F 2 4 22 71 157 273 346 348 349 517
565 579 1071 1279 1424 1579 plu l47 | #om. *rell* | #farisaiw W

27:44 #wneidizon *rell* | #oneidizon H L 69 118 1424 | #wneidizon D
| #wnidizon Q 1346 | #wneidizwn 2* | #onidizon 579 | #wnidizan W

27:46 #lema) B L 4 33 273 700 a g¹ l vg^(aliq.) am emm for ing harl (sa) bo aeth^{pc}
arm^{pc} aug Eus^{dem486.excd2(item490bis)etps389} NA²⁷ | #lima A K U G D Q^f P S F 090
346 471 472 475 481 483 565 692 892 l183 al. f q go sy^{p.hl} Eus^{es544} Chr^{gue} Bas^{eth cod}
| #leima E F G H M S V al Bas^{eth cdd} | #lama D Q f¹ 22 565 al. pler a b d ff¹ h gat
mm aur vg^(aliq.) aeth^{pc} arm^{aliq.} geo Eus^{dem496ed(item490bis)} Bas^{eth cod} Or^{int3,924} | #ma W
| #laba vg^(1MS) | #lamma c g² vg^{ed} Bas^{eth235ed} | #labath r² | #lamath vg^(1MS)

27:47 ekei #esthkotwn) B C 33 700 pc NA²⁷ | #estwtwn A D M K M f¹
¹³ pler | #sthkotwn W

27:51 kai h gh #eseisqh *rell* | #esisqh) *)^{ca} K* L Q | #eshsqh E*
| #esxisqh W | #esxisqei 2*

27:55 #diakonousai *rell* | #diakonhsai W*

27:58 #proselqwn *rell* | #proshlqen D | #proselqw W

27:61 #apenanti *rell* | #katenanti D | #epi W

28:11 #aphggeilan *rell* | #anhggeilan) D Q 565 | #aphggeilon W

APPENDIX SEVEN: NON-SINGULAR READINGS IN SINAITICUS IN MATTHEW

- 1:2 #Issak *rell* | #Isak) (*a b d e f f² h k r¹*) *vg*
- 1:6 #Solomwna *rell* | #Solomwnta W D S 472 1071 1093 *al pler*
 | #Salomwn) * 1 209 | #Solwmwna) ^{c?} | #Salwmwna) ^{b?} | #Salomwna 33 692
 | #Solomwn 399 700 983 1689 | #Solomonem *g¹ k q* *vg*
- 1:7 Abia, Abia *pler* NA²⁷
 Abioud Abioud *f¹³ pc it sy^{hmg}*
 #Abeia, Abeia 1183 | #Ab[ei]a P¹
 #Abia Abiaj) * 131 | #Abiaj sah
- 1:13 #Abioud *rell* | #Abiout) * *c* *vg*
- 1:14 #Sadwk Sadwk *rell* | #Zadwd Q
 Sadwx Sadwx) * *g¹*
 Saddwk Saddwk W
- 1:14-15 Elioud #Elioud *rell* | #Eleioud E*
 Eleioud Eleioud E^c
 Eliout Eliout) * *vg*
- 1:23 #Emmanouhl *rell* | #Emanouhl) * 472
- 2:6 ogar *rell* | o) * 2
- 3:6 opotamw | up autou \ *rell* | o D C* E K 700 788 *pc* | |) * sy^{p(1MS)} Hil
- 3:11a men\$ *rell* | \$oun 13 118 124 543 788 999 1093 1588 | \$gar) 892
- 3:11b umaj baptizw en udati) * B W *f¹* 33 124 700 788 1010 *c f f¹ l m*
vg^{pler.etWW} NA²⁷ | 1342) S¹ Or^{4,131.132} | 2134 rell
- 4:19 #alieij *rell* | #aleeij) * B* C | #alheij L
- 4:22 to ploion \$ *rell* | \$autwn) * aeth | om. verse M W 33
 ta diktua \$ 126 *c f f¹ g² h l* aur *vg^{pler}* | \$autwn *b g l vg^{pc} sy^c sa* | om.
sy^s
- 5:30 | kai mh olon ton swma sou \ *rell*) ^{S¹} | | 579 | om. verse D *pc*
vg^{ms} sy^s bo^{ms}
 h olon ton swma sou) * Lucif
- 5:40 #autw *rell* | #tautw) * 892 | #om. Or
- 5:42 #se *rell* | #soi) * *y^{scr}*
- 6:15 o pathr #umwn *rell* | #hmwn 245 579 | #om. *f sy^c* | #umin) 301

6:16a ooi upokritai *rell* |o) * 1279

6:16b ta proswpa *rell*
to proswpon) * *k* syr^{sch} Aug

6:22 ean ooun *rell* |o) *pc* lat sy^c mae bo^{ms}

6:25 tw swmati oumwn ti *rell* |o) * *b*

6:32 oiden #garšo pathr *rell* |#de)^c |šo qeoj) * mae

7:4 tw adelfw sou \$ *rell* |\$adelfe) *g*² vg^{pc} sa^{1ms} Gild

7:13a polloi |h pulh\ *rell* ||) * 1646 *a b c h k m* Clem^{bis} Or^{1,228} et^{2,800} et^{3,270}
Eus^{ps286} Or^{int2,387} Cyp Lcif al

7:13b oeisin *rell* |o) * sah (Cl)

7:18a ponhrouj poiein)^{S1} C L W Z Q 0250 0281 *f*^{1 13} 33 M latt sy Or^{pt}
ponhrouj enegkein () *^{unreadable} B Or^{4,221} Ad Dial⁴⁰ (Dial⁴¹
prosenegh)

7:18b kalouj poiein)^{S1})^{ca} B C L W Z Q 0250 *f*^{1 13} 33 M lat sy Or^{pt}
kalouj enegkein) * Dial⁴⁰ (Dial⁴¹ prosenegkai) Or^{3,267}

7:22 #ecebalomen *rell* |#eceballomen) * geo Dam^{1,605} |#eceballwmen
L |#ecebalwmen 565 697 |#epoihsamen 1424

7:28 #ecephssonto *rell* |#ecephlhttonto) * Eus

8:4 #legei *rell* |#epen) * *k* Cl

8:6 okurie *rell* |o) * *k* sy^{sc} Hil

8:11 #Issak *rell* |#Isak) (*a b d e ff*² *h k r*¹) vg

8:12 #ekblhqhsontai *rell* |#eceleusontai) * it^{pler} syr^{cu} et^{sch} Heracl ap
Or^{4,276} Ir^{int} Cyp^{semel} Aug^{saepc} |#emblhqhsontai 118

8:28 elqontoj autou)^c B C Q *f*^{1 13} 788 (1346) NA²⁷
elqonti autw *rell* (D)
elqontwn autwn) * (vg^{mss} arm)

8:29 pro kairou basanisai hmaj *rell*)^{S1}
hmaj apolesai pro kairou) * *pc* vg^{mss} bo^{pt}
apolesai hmaj kai pro kairou basanisai W

9:5 okai *rell* |o) * sah

9:10a egeneto autou anakeimenou *rell* |132) ° C 99 544 1093 1170 1396
Eus
anakeimenwn) * 892 syr^{sch.pesh} Aeth

9:10b oelqontej *rell*)^{S1} |o) * 243 150 a sa bo^(IMS) sy^{hl}

9:16 plhrwma oautou apo *rell* (D) |o) * a h sy^s

9:17 alla ballousin oinon neon eij askouj kainouj *rell* (L 2*
157) -D D 1071
alla oinon neon eij askouj ballousin kainouj C 21 399
517 (892) 1010 1293 1424 149 1844(*) l 2211 it^{pler} vg Aug
all oinon neon eij askouj kainouj blhteon) 1604

9:21 ean omonon *rell* |o) * a g² h

9:22 o de oIhsouj *rell* |o) * D a b c k q sy^s

9:24 kategelwn #autou\$ (*rell*)|#auton D* |\$eidotej oti
apeqanen) * 61 sah^(2MSS)

9:31 oolh *rell* |o) * (sy^s)

10:3 Alfaiou okai *rell* (M N) |o) * 122

10:5 odon oeqnwn *rell* |o) * 1424

10:11 tij en auth *rell* / 231) K p^{scr}

10:16 ooi ofeij *rell* |oL
ooi ofij B* K Q f¹³ 33 157^c 579 |o157* 700 1346
o ofij) * Epiph Or^{3,2}

10:34 hlqon balein eirhnhn (*rell*) |132) g¹ ff¹ q Tert Hil

11:8 idein anqrwpon *rell*)^{S1})^{ca} (L) |21) * 1355

11:27 patroj omou *rell* |o) * sa^{mss} bo Iust^{tr100} Marcos ap Ir^{int93} Hil

11:29 ap emou *rell*)^A)^D |om.) * 245 1010

12:11a oean #empesh *rell* |oD 33 124 157 234 346 700 788 1424 b sy^{s.c} sa bo
|#enpesh)^{S1} D L N W Q 28|#empesei 1071 1346|#pesh) * G

12:11b #krathsei *rell* |#krathsaj) ff¹ h|#kratei D|#kratisei L 2*

12:13 #¹ugihj wj \$ #²h allh *rell*|#¹ugeihj D^c|#¹hguhj D*
|#¹ugih E*|#¹ugieij Q|#¹om. l184* a b c ff¹ h vg^{1MS} sy^{c.s.pesh} aeth arm Hil |\$et
a fff^{1.2} h vg^{pc}|#²ei 2
ugihj) 892*
ugihj . . . llh C^{vid}
#¹ugihj wsei #²allh 28 118|#¹ugieij L|#²alh 1424

12:31¹ #afeqhsetai *rell*|#afeqhsete) L

12:47 |eipen de tij autw idou h mhthr sou kai oi adelfoi
sou ecw esthkasin zhtountej soi lalhsai*(rell)* [NA²⁷||)* B (L)
G 126 225 238 400* 443 1355 1093 ff¹ k sy^{s.c} (sah) [NA²⁷]
eipen de tij twn maqhtwn autou idou h mhthr sou kai
oi adelfoi sou ecw zhtousin se)^A (892)

13:10 parabolaij laleij oautoij *rell*)^{S1} |I32)* 954 Eus^{dem} |ovg am
Tert

13:17 ogar *rell*|o) X F 983 1170 1241 1689 a b c e fff^{1.2} g¹ h l aur vg^{4mss} cop
aeth arm geo Hil

13:36 #hlqen eij *rell*|#eishlqen) Or^{3,3bis} (a b h q abiiit)

13:57 oIhsouj *rell*|o) 21

14:19 #keleusaj *rell*|#keleusate B*|#ekeleusen) Z e ff¹ Or^{3,479 b}
|#keleuei Or^{3,509} et⁵⁰⁹

14:26 oi de maqhtai idontej auton)^{S1} B D f¹³ 788 1346 mae NA²⁷
kai idontej auton oi maqhtai C M L W D 0106 33 sy^h (bo^{pt})
idontej de auton) * Q 700 pc it sa Eus^{pt}

14:28 kurie ei su ei *rell* |2341) 892

15:17 \$afedrwna *rell* |\$ton) G Chr

15:18-19 |kakeina koinoi ton anqrwpon ^{15:19}ek gar thj
kardiaj*(rell)* NA²⁷ ||) W 33^{vid} bo^{ms}

16:6 oautoij *rell*|o) 892 l184 bo^(1MS)

16:9 oupw noeite |#oude mnhmoneuete*rell*||)* X|#oute W

17:11 eipen\$ B D W 33 700 pc |\$autoij C M L (f¹) f¹³ 579 1424 pler
|\$autoij oti) 713

17:15 oKurie *rell*|o) Z

17:18 |o paj\ *rell* | |) 1515*
 o paj autou 1071
 o anqrwpoj 349 517 954 1424 1675

17:24² ta #didraxma *rell*)^{ca} |#didragma ML 118f13 28 157
 565 700 1071 |#didraxmata 579 |#didraxmon 1093 |#tributum a d e f f¹ n
 vg^(pler) aeth |#didgrama uel censum b |#didgramam g¹
 #deidragma D |#didraxa) * mae bo
 to #didragma W |#didraxmon Cyr^{4,791}

17:25-26 apo tw n allotriwn ^{17:26} \$ *rell* | \$ o de efh apo tw n
 allotriwn) bo^{pt}

18:5 oen paidion toiouto B Q f¹ 700 NA²⁷ | 213) G syr^p arm |o S X D 2
 579 al plus¹⁵ e sah cop syr^{sch} al

18:18 #dedemena *rell* |#dedemenon) * 251

18:21 eipen oautw (*rell*) |o) * Dam^{par828} sy^s

18:24 #muriwn *rell* |#pollwn) * sah cop Or^{3,621} et^{627sq}

18:25 #tekna *rell* |#pedia) Chr (et^{mo6})

19:8 legei autoij \$ *rell* | \$ o 118 | \$ o Ihsouj) M F a b c mae

19:12 ogar *rell* |o) * vg^(2MSS) Epiph

19:21 #einai *rell* |#genesqe) * Clem

19:24 dia #truphmatoj)^{ca} D E F G H L S V (W) X Y Z G D f^{1 13} 33 579
 892 1241 1424 pm NA²⁷ |#trhmatoj) * B Or |#trumaliaj C K M U Q 0281
 124 157 565 700 l2211 pm

19:25 ode *rell* |o) * geo

20:24 oi deka \$ *rell* | \$ hrcanto aganaktein) 253 473 1207 d^{scr}

20:29 oautw *rell*)^{S1} |o P⁴⁵) *

20:30 #oti \$ o Ihsouj *rell*)^{S1})^{ca} |#o) * | \$ o 544 1012 |o 565

20:33 #hmwn *rell* |#umwn) * D (Y 118 28 579)

21:14 #proshlqon *rell* |#proselqontej) * (bo)

21:27 kai autoj *rell*
 o Ihsouj) (0293) pc (a) c e f f^{1 2} h sy^{c.p} et^{sch}

21:31 umin ooti oi telwnai *rell* |o)* 1279 1473 l184

21:33 wrucen oen *rell* (1071) |o)* 69

21:36 *palinrell*
kai *palin*) * *syr*^{sch}
palinoun D*
palin de 579 (iterum vero d)
*rursus iterum ff*¹
rursus etiam cop

21:43 #authj *rell* |#autou) * 238 Or^{3,705} |#om. *ff*¹ *syr*^{cu} *et*^{sch}

22:11 oekei *rell* |o)* Chr

22:15 |oen logw\ *rell* ||) * bo^(1MS) |o517 579 1424

22:23a \$en *rell* |\$kai) * *sy*^{s.h} *aeth*

22:23b oautw *rell* |o)* *vg*^(2MSS) *sy*^s

23:26 kai oto #ektoj *rell* |oD |#entoj) * l183 l184 |#ecwqen D Clem

22:29 apokriqej de *rell*
kai apokriqej) *aeth*

22:32 #Issak *rell* |#Isak) (*abdeff*² *hkr*¹) *vg*

23:3 poihsate |kai threite\ kata)^c B L Z Q 124 sah cop *syr*^{hr}
arm *aeth* Eus^{ps} Hil^{sem} NA²⁷ ||) * *pc sy*^s *mae*²
poieite kai theite kata D *f*¹ 1 118 209
threin threite kai poiete kata M (F) K M U Y W D P 0102
0107 *f*¹³ 2 33 28 157 565 579 788 1071 1346 1424 M *q sy*^{p.h} (Ir^{lat})
poiein poieite kata G
poiein poieite kai threite kata 700
akouete kai poieite kata *sy*^c

23:4b |kai #dusbastakta\ okai epitiqeasin epi touj wmouj
rell (dusbastakta *pro* barea 544 700 1010 1293) ||) L *f*¹ 892 1582 *abeff*²
h sy^{c.s.pesh} bo Iren^{int} |#adusbastakta D* 700 |#dusbakta 0138 |o1295

23:7-8 rabbi \$^{23:8} |umeij de mh klhqhte rabbi\ eij gar)^c B L *f*¹
¹³ D 565 (Q) NA²⁷ ||) * (124) sah |\$rabbi (*rell*)

23:35 Zaxariou |uiou Baraxiou\ *rell* (D) ||) * 6^{ev} 13^{ev}

23:37 oh #apokteinousa touj profhtajB pler NA²⁷ |o659
|#apoktenousa)^c D f¹³ 33 69 579 pc Caes^{dial} Cyr^{es9} et⁴⁰
touj profhtaj apoktenousa)* Or^{3,167}

24:2 opanta *rell*)^{s1} |o) * 1093

24:3 #kat idian *rell* |#kaq) B*

24:7 esontai limoi \$ |kai seismoι\ (B D) E* NA²⁷ |1432) bo
|\$kai loimoi (*rell*) || 565 1573

24:9 upo o¹pantwn o²twn o³eqnwn *rell*)^{ca} -579 |o¹) * r² |o²D* C W f¹ 1
131 1424 ti* Chr Ps-Ath^{dispu} | o³C f¹ 1424 l 2211 pc 1 131 ti*(sy^s) bo^{ms} Chr Ps-
Ath^{dispu}

24:14 en olh th oikoumenh *rell*
eij olhn thn oikoumenhn (P⁷⁰)) e h r¹

24:24 shmeia omegala *rell* |o) W* pc ff¹ r¹ bo^{ms}

24:26 ean ooun *rell* |o) * 248 geo

24:28 ptwma *rell*
swma) * (corpus it vg Hil)

24:32 ota fulla *rell* |o) * 300

24:34 ewj #an *rell* |#om.) 1604 |#ou 157 209

24:48 #autou *rell* |#eautou) 892

25:20 pente otalanta labwn *rell* |o) 506

25:24 #sklhroj ei anqrwpoj*rell* |#austhroj 1 22 |132 G 124 157 579
anqrwpoj austhroj ei) a b c f (ff²) g¹ h l q r^{1,2} aur vg

25:33 oautou ta de erifia ec euwnumwn *rell* |oA al³ fu(^{vid}) aeth Cyr^{mal}
Bas^{se} Or^{int4,622} Cyp^{sem} Avit |234561) (cop syr^{utr})

25:43 sunhgagete me \$¹ |gumnoj \$² kai ou periebalete ome\
rell |\$¹kai p⁴⁵ Q sy^{s,p} |\$²hmhn P⁴⁵ h vg^{mss} sy^{s,p} ||) * 124 21 127* 1194 1424
1604 |o)^c 147

26:50 oIhsouj *rell* (exc. P³⁷) |o) Z^{scr} 1185

26:62-63 autw |ouden apokrinh ti outoi sou
katamarturousin o de Ihsouj esiwpa kai o arxiereuj eipen
autw\ (*rell*) ||) * 243 983 1689 1183

26:65 legwn \$ eblasfhmhsen ti eti xreian)^{ca} B C^c D L Z Q 090 33
700 892 NA²⁷ |\$oti *rell* |\$ti C^{*vid}
kai #legei oide eblasfhmhsen ti eti xreian) * |osy^{sch}
|#legwn sy^p pers^p aeth

26:72 orkou #oti *rell* |#legwn D b c ff² mae |#om.) 36 40

27:5 kai riyaj ta \$ arguria *rell* |\$triakonta) 122 Chr^{gue}

27:9 #tote *rell* |#kai) * vg (*et tunc* am)

27:41 grammatewn kai presbuterwn *rell* |321) 238
Eus^{dem498}
grammatewn kai presbuterwn kai farisaiwn M f sy^{p,h} bo^{pt} arr
pers^p sl Or^{int3,921} Thphyl
grammatewn kai farisaiwn D W 1424 p c a b c ff² h
q gat Cassiod sy^s

27:45 |epi pasan thn ghn\ ewj *rell* (B*) | |) * 248 l Lactant^{4,18}
ef olhn thn ghn ewj)^c 1424

27:48 #epotizen *rell*)^{ca} |#epotizo?n) * F

27:51-52 esxisqhsan |kai ta mnhmeia anewxqhsan\)^c B D M 700
788 pler NA²⁷ | |) * 2*

27:55 #ekei\$ *rell* |#kakei) sy^{p(pler)} |#kai D al¹⁰ Chr^{gue} |#om. 579| \$kai F
K L P 33 1071

28:10a #apelqwsin *rell*)^{ca} |#elqwsin) * Latt |#apelqwn 579

28:15 #diefhmisqh *rell* |#efhmisqh) D 33 60 Or^{1,249} et^{4,455}

28:18 oautoij *rell* |o) * 1375*

APPENDIX EIGHT: NON-SINGULAR READINGS IN VATICANUS IN MATTHEW

- 1:3 #Zara *rell* | #Zare P¹ B
- 1:12 Salaqihl Salaqihl *rell*
Selaqihl Selaqihl B (g¹ k *Selathiel*)
- 1:18 o¹Ihsou o²Xristou *rell* Or^{int3,965} | o¹ 71 it vg sax fr syr^{cu} pers^w Ir^{int bis} Ps-
Ath⁶³³ Thph^{cod} Aug | o² W 74 pers^p et^{cod} Max^{dial} | 21 B Or^{int3,965}
- 2:13 #fainetai *rell* | #efanh B it vg Ir^{int} pp^{lat} sa mae
- 4:19 #alieij *rell* | #aleeij) * B* C | #alheij L
- 5:1 o¹autw o²oi maqhtai *rell* | o¹B pc Or^{3,496} | o²579
- 5:18 ewj oan panta *rell* (D) | oB* l2211 pc
- 5:32 kai ooj #ean apolelumenhn gamhsh *rell* (om. D pc a b k
Or^{mss}) | o348 1279 1473 | #an) * K* W? S 118 f¹³ (124) 237 349 473* 543 565 597
700 1071
kai #o apolelumenhn gamhsaj B 80 sa? Or | #oj 372
|#oj an 245
kai #¹oj #²an apolelumenhn gamhsei Q | #¹wj L | #²ean 2 579
- 5:37 #perisson *rell* | #perison B* D
- 6:16 #autwn *rell* | #eautwn B W 485 1093 l47 l50
- 6:18 fanhj toij anqrwpoij nhsteuwn *rell* | l423 B k
- 6:21 estai okai h kardia sou *rell* | oB bo^{mss}
- 6:22 o ofqalmoj \$ *rell* | \$sou B it^{pler} vg^{ed} aeth Or^{int2, 109} Hil al
- 6:25 th yuxh #umwn *rell* | #hmwn B 2
- 6:34 #eauthj oarketon *rell* B^{c2} | #authj B* L D co? | oG* 506 692
- 7:8 #anoighsetai *rell* | #anoigetai B sy^{c.p.hl} bo | #anoixqhsete Q*
- 7:14 \$ stenh *rell* | \$de B 1582*^{vid} sa^(al)
- 7:17 karpouj kalouj poiei *rell* B^{c1} -W* 700 | 231 D | l32 B* B^{c2} vg^{mss}

7:18a ponhrouj poiein)^{S1} C K L W Z D Q 0250 0281 f^{1 13} 33 565 579 700
892 1241 1424 /844 M latt sy Or^{pt}
ponhrouj enegkein () *unreadable) B Or^{4,221} Ad Dial⁴⁰ (Dial⁴¹
prosenegh)

7:18b kalouj poiein)^{S1})^{ca} B C K L W Z D Q 0250 f^{1 13} 33 565 579 700
892 1424 /844 M lat sy Or^{pt}
kalouj enegkein) * Dial⁴⁰ (Dial⁴¹ prosenegkai) Or^{3,267}

7:24 touj logouj otoutouj rell |oB* 1424 a g¹ k m go syr^{hr} mae bo^{mss}
Cyp

9:28 dunamai \$ touto poihsai rell |213 B N q vg^{ed} |132 C* |\$umin) *
(lat)

10:7 ooti rell |oB sy^s

10:37 acioj |kai o filwn uion h qugatera uper eme ouk
estij mou acioj\ rell | | B* D 17 243 syr^p cod

12:10 #kathgorhswsin rell |#kathgorhsousin D W 1346
|#kathgorhswsi B* L

12:11 toij #sabbasin rell |#sabbasi B* L |#sabbasin N

12:12 #sabbasin rell |#sabbatoij B 1555

12:22 #proshnexqh rell |#proshnegkan B 0281^{vid} 1424 1675 sy^(s.c.p) et^{utr} sa
bo aeth geo

12:38 tw n |grammatewn kai\ Farisaiwn olegontej rell (M Q) |
14325 K 238 251 252 482 544 1355 1675 2145 | | 579 |osy^c
tw n grammatewn legontej B 59

13:5a #ecaneteilen rell |#ecaneteilan B it vg sy^h (exorta/nata sunt)

13:5b baqoj \$ ghj rell |\$thj B 372 2737

13:6 #ekaumatisqh rell B* |#ekaumatwqh B^{c2} |#ekaumatisqhsan D it
vg sy^h cop^{sa.bo} |#ekaumastisqh D^c |#ekaumastisen D* |#ekaumathsqh
Q 2*

13:16 wta oumwn oti rell |oB 1424 a b c ff² g¹ q Chr^{mol} Hil

13:44 kai pwlei opanta osa exei) D f¹ 1 61 108 118 127 it^{pler} vg syr^{cu}
et^{sch} cop mae NA²⁷ |13452 rell (28) |oB 28 61 435 arm^{cdd} bo Or^{3,446}

14:2 kai |dia touto\ rell | | B* a

14:5 #oti *rell*|#epiedh N S|#epi P|#epei B* 700

14:19 #keleusaj *rell* B^{c1}|#ekeleusen) Z 243 1012 1295 *l184 e ff*¹
sy^{c.s.pesh.} sa bo geo Or^{3,479b}|#keleusate B* 1093|#keleuei Or^{3,509} et⁵¹⁰

14:36 parekaloun oauton *rell* |oB* 892 *q* Or^{3,487} Chr

15:27 ogar *rell* |oB *e* sy^{s.pesh.hier} sa bo^{1ms}

15:30 xwlouj tuflouj kullouj kwfouj) 157 *a b ff*² sy^s NA²⁷ | 1243 M
E G P U *pc f*^{1 13} 118 2 700 788 1071 1346 cop syr^{cu} et^{sch} arm | 1423 C K 565 *pm* | 4123
L W D *l q* vg^{st.ww} sy^h | 4213 33 892 1421 *l* 844 *l* 2211 *pc* aur (*ff*¹) vg^{cl} | 1324 B 0281
pc sa^{mss} mae

15:31 #¹qauasai #²blepontaj *rell* | 21 B 892 | #¹qaumazein E*
|#²blepontej D Q | #²bleponta 33 237 713 892

15:32 oti ohdh hmera (*rell*) |oB 106 301 1

16:12 didaxhj twn Farisaiwn kai Saddoukaiwn *rell* () W) -*f*¹³
| 12543 (B) 0281^{vid}

16:14 #alloi de *rell*|#allh 1346|#oi B Eus^{steph223} Chr^(mo5)

16:17 o pathr mou o |en otoij\#ouranoij *rell* ||*f*¹³ 565 579 788
1346 |oB *l184* |#ouranioj 0281 *f*¹³ 565 579 788 1346

16:17 ooti *rell* |oB* 1424*

16:21 #deiknuein *rell*|#deiknunai B Or^{3,537}

16:21 #deiknuein *rell*|#deiknunai B 892

16:22 hrcato epitiman autw\$ legwn) (C) M K L M U W D
P 2 118 579 1071 NA²⁷ |\$kai F | 1324 *f*^{1 13} 124 157 700 788 1346 1424
hrcato autw epeiteiman kai legein D (it)
hrcato auton peitiman legwn Q
hrcato autw epitiman autw legwn 565
legei autw epiteimwn B 346

16:24 oo Ihsouj *rell* B^{c2} |oB* 713* 2372
om. 118 157 205 209 348 349 487 565 1446 *l184* sa^{ms}

17:1 #kat idian*rell* B^{c2}|#kaq B* P⁴⁴
leian D *d* Eus^{dem208}

17:4 treij skhnaj *rell* | 21 B 0281^{vid} *e*

17:19 #kat idian *rell*|#kaq B* D

18:16 meta sou oeti ena h duo *rell* |o579 |345612 P^{44vid} B 0281
meta seautou eti ena h duo) K L M Q P f^{1 13} 33
788 pc

18:28 o douloj oekeinoj *rell* |oB 245 arm^{zoh}

19:22a ton logon \$ *rell* |\$touton B 51^{ev} a b c ff¹ syr^{cu} et^{sch} sah

19:22b #kthmata *rell* |#xrhmata B Chr

19:24 dia #truphmatoj)^{ca} D E F G H L S V (W) X Y Z G D f^{1 13} 33 579
892 1241 1424 pm NA²⁷ |#trhmatoj) * B Or |#trumaliaj C K M U Q 0281
124 157 565 700 l2211 pm

20:9 kai #elqontej *rell* |#elqwntej 2*
elqontej #de B sy^c sa^{mss} bo^{mss} (arm) |#oun D Q f¹ 33 788 1346

20:14 qelw #de \$ *rell* |#egw B bo^(1MS) aeth |\$kai E 118 209 1424 a b c ff¹
^{1.2} g¹ h n r¹ aur vg |\$egw sah

20:17¹ #kai *rell* |#mellw de B f¹ Or

20:17a anabainw *rell* |#anabenwn) Q |#anabainein B f¹ Or |#anabainon
2*

20:17b oo Ihsouj *rell* |oB f¹³

20:18 oqanaton) 700 |oB aeth
qanatw *rell*

20:26 qelh en umin megaj genesqai *rell* |14523 C (579) 1424 pc ff¹
|14235 B sah cop
qelh umwn megaj genesqai L Z 892

21:28 tekna duo *rell* |21 B 142 299 1424 lat (vg Hil)

21:29 #upagw okurie kai ouk aphlqen f¹³ 700 788 1346 |#egw B 346
4 238 262 r² vg^{1MS} bo aeth | oQ

21:30 usteron ode metamelhqeij aphlqen Q f¹³ 69 543 700 788 1346
geo2 |oB r² vg^{2MSS} (sy^h sah^{pler} bo aeth arm geo)

21:31 #prwtoj *rell* |#esxatoj (D) Q f¹³ 69 238 262 543 700 788 1346
|#usteroj B 2^{pe} sah |#deuteroj 4 273

23:32 #plhrwsate |#ephrwsate D 118|#plhrwsete B* 60 e ar^e ar^p
perss

23:37 ta nossia #authj) * B^{mg} D M W D 0102 33 892 1424 Clem¹⁴³
Or^{3,293} Eus^{dem} et^{ecl} Cyr^{es9} et⁴⁰ Thdrt^{1,698cod} NA²⁷
ta nossia eauthj *rell*
ta nossia B* 700 Clem^{pt} Or^{3,167} et²⁰⁶ Eus^{ps 138} et^{ter} Cyp

24:3 #kat idian *rell* |#kaq) B*

24:23 #pisteushte *rell* |#pisteuhte B^c |#pisteuete B* 262 Or^{cdd}

24:38 gamountej kai #gamizontej) 33 1346 NA²⁷ |#gamiskontej B
1424? 1675 |#ekgamizontej *rell* |#gameizontej D |#ekgamiskontej
W 517 1424? |#ekgameizontej D |#ekgamhzontej Q |#eggamizontej
S 047 13 *pc*

25:23 hj pistoj *rell* |21 B 102 h r¹ Ir^{lat}

25:37 pote se #eidomen *rell* |#eidamen B* 067

25:40 eni toutwn\$ |twn #adelfwn mou\ twn elaxistwn *rell* |\$twn
mikrwn I || B* 0128* 1424 ff^{1 2} Cl^{pt} et⁴⁶⁷ Eus GrNy |#elaxistwn 118*
eni toutwn adelfwn mou twn elaxistwn 579

25:42 kai oouk edwkate *rell* P^{45c} B^{c2} |oP^{45*} B*

26:4 ton Ihsoun dolw #¹krathswsin |kai #²apokteinwsin\ *rell*
(M S W Y Q f¹ *pc*) |#¹krathsousi 28 || B* 36 40 61 174 258 r² vg^{1MS} |#²
apoleswsin 579

26:42 proshucato #legwn *rell* |#o Ihsouj legwn L Q f¹ 69 124 788
1424 |#om. B 102 g¹

27:6 eij ton #korbanan *rell* B^{c2} |#korban B* f g¹ q aeth |#korbanan
E K M 22 f¹³ 4 229 248 273 472 517 543 544 788 1010 1071 1241 1555 *pc* vg^(2mss)
gat Chr^{ed} Or^{int3,914} Aug^{cons3,28} |#korbana X 157 act^{pil ven} (sy^{sch.hr}) |#korbona 33
sy^{s.pesh.hl} |#Golgoqan 69 |#korbwnan 118 Cyr^{hr198} |#corbonam ff¹ mm |#corbam
a (b c) d h r¹ (ff²)

27:29 ec akanqwn #epeqhkan epi *rell* (33) |#eqhkan K N Y W D Q P
1 69 124 al¹² |#perieqhkan B 131 *pc* Chr^{mo1}

27:35 auton #diemerisanto ta imatia *rell* |#diemerisato B^c
|#diemerisan B* Q *al.*

27:40 ei uioj ei tou qeou \$ katabhqirell [NA²⁷] |\$kai) * A D
[NA²⁷]

ei uioj qeou ei katabhqi B a b c f f f^{1.2} g¹ h l r^{1.2} aur vg
aeth Or^{int} Aug

27:43 epi ton qeon *rell*
epi tw qewB Eus^{ps82} (it^{pl} vg *in deo or domino*)

27:46 sabaxqani *rell* |#sabaxqanei) A W 69 700 |#sabaktanei B 22
|#zafqanei D* (*zaphthani d f f² h*) |#safqanei D^c |#sabbathani r¹ |#sabactani
f f¹ |#sibactani q |#zabachthani vg^{1MS} |#zabethani g¹ |#zaptani b vg^{3MSS} |#zabthani
vg^{tot} |#zabtani vg^{1MS} |#zahthani a

27:65 #koustwdian *rell* B^{c2} |#fulakaj D*^{vid} arm^{usc} |#koustoudian D^c
|#skoustwdian B* K |#koustodian 67 |#custodiam f f¹ l vg^(pler) (sy^{s.hl} sah bo
arm geo¹ Aug) |#custodes a b c d f f² g¹ q aur vg^(1ms) sy^{pesh.hier} (geo²) |#milites h r¹
vg^(4mss)

APPENDIX NINE: NON-SINGULAR READINGS IN EPHRAEMI IN MATTHEW

- 2:10 #astera *rell* | #asteran) * C
- 3:16 erxomenon #ep auton *rell* D^B (*d super*) | #proj C* E* 71 247 258
148 | #eij D* 21 299 Eus^{ps}
- 4:19 #alieij *rell* | #aleeij) * B* C | #alheij L
- 4:23 kai perihgen en olh th Galilaia (B) NA²⁷
kai perihgen o Ihsouj en th Galilaia) *
kai perihgen o Ihsouj olhn thn Galilaian)^c Df¹ 157 33
kai perihgen olhn thn Galilaian o Ihsouj *rell*
kai perihgen o Ihsouj en olhn th Galilaia C*sy^{s.p.h}
bo|12567834 C^c
- 7:20 #apo tw n karpwn *rell* | #ek C (*ex it*^{pler} vg Leif Aug)
- 8:27 oti o¹kai o²oi anemoi kai h qalassa *rell* | o¹C a b c ff¹ g¹ h q
vg sah cop syr^{sch} aeth Hil Op | o² 124
- 8:32a kai eipen autoij \$ upagete *rell* | \$o Ihsouj C b c g¹ h sy^{p.sch}
- 8:32b pasa h agelh *rell* | 231 C* 21 399 892 1010
- 9:9 anqrwpon kaqhmenon epi to #telwnion *rell* | 13452 C 21 399
1010 | #telwneion 124 346 33
- 9:10 polloi telwnai kai amartwloi elqontej *rell* | 14325 C cop
aeth Cyr^{es 105} | 21345 W | 43215 157 | 12534 565
- 9:27 elheson hmaj \$ *rell* | \$kurie Nf¹³ 13 788 pc 147 pc g² geo^B | \$o D 700
|\$Ihsou C* S 21 399 1293
- 9:28 dunamai \$ touto poihsai *rell* | 213 B N 892 q vg^{ed} | 132 C* geo¹
|\$umin) *
- 10:13 men #h *rell* | #hn C* 157
- 10:17 paradwsousin gar oumaj *rell* | oC* 99
- 10:19 th #wra *rell* | #hmera C* 1424 cop syr^{hr}
- 10:23 legw umin \$ ou mh *rell* | \$oti C* 245
- 11:13 #Iwannou *rell* | #Iwanou B | #Iannou C 124

11:27 kai oudeij #epiginwskei *rell*|#epigeinwskei D
|#epigignwskei W|#ginwskei C 71 692 g^{scr} Clem¹ Iust^{tr100} Eus^{marc88cdd}
Did^{tri26.72}

12:10 #ephrwthsan *rell*|#eperwthsan C X 485|#ephrwtisan E
|#epirwthsan L

12:13a kai eceteinen kai *rell* C^B
kai eceteinen ...kai (C*^{vid?})

12:13b #¹ugihj wj \$ #²h allh *rell*|#¹ugeihj D^c|#¹hguhj D*
|#¹ugih E*|#¹ugieij Q|#¹om. l184* a b c ff¹ h vg^{1MS} sy^{c.s.pesh} aeth arm Hil |\$et
a fff^{1.2} h vg^{pc}|#²ei 2
ugihj) C^B 892*
ugihj . . . llh (C*^{vid?})
#¹ugihj wsei #²allh 28 118|#¹ugieij L|#²alh 1424

13:10a kai #proselqontej \$ *rell*|#proselqontoj U|\$autw C cop

13:10b oi maghtai \$ *rell*|\$autou C X it^{pl} et^{sch} vg^{mss} syr^{cu.p} sa bo et^{sch} cop
aeth Eus^{dem} Chr^{mo4}

13:33 allhn parabolhn #elalhsen *rell* -D|#pareqhken C 243 1241
pc sa^{mss}

14:33 oi de en otw ploiw *rell* C^{Bvid} |o(C*^{vid?})

15:20 ou #koinoi ton anqrwpon *rell* (-1071 1424 *haplography*)
|#koinwnei D|#koinei C l184

15:33 en #erhmia *rell*|#erhmw topw C cop Or^{3,510}

17:8 touj ofqalmouj oautwn \$ oudena *rell* |oW|\$ouketi C* O S

17:20 legw umin \$ ean *rell* |\$oti C l27 sah cop Or^{3,202}

17:25 #elqonta eij thn oikian)^c B f¹ NA²⁷|#eiselqonta)* 579
|#ote hlqon C l27|#eiselqonti D|#ote eishlqon U syr^{cu}|#ote
eishlqen o Ihsouj W|#eiselqontwn Q f¹³ 788 1346|#elqontwn
autwn 33|#ote eishlqen *rell*

17:26 eipontej de \$apo twn allotriwn) B Q 0281 f¹ 700 892* pc
vg^{mss} sa bo^{pt}; Chr NA²⁷ |\$tou Petrou 892^{mg}
legei autw apo twn allotriwn D sy^s
legei autw o Petroj apo twn allotriwn |eipontoj de
oautou apo twn allotriwn\C Cyr |oL | *rell* (D)

19:9 okai #¹gamhsh allhn #²moixatai *rell* C³ |oW
 |#¹gamhsei H S Y G 0211 3 28 579 713 732 752 791 827 954 968 983 1009 1093
 1253 1273 1296 1326 1333 1334^c 1340 1342 1346 1446 1555 1574 1593 1692 1823
 |#¹gamhsaj 740 |#²moixate W D Q^c 579 1424 |#²mhxate Q* |1324 79
 poiei authn #moixeughnai (P²⁵) B N 0233 1
 4 273 f¹ 2680 2766 m¹⁸⁹ cop syr^{hr vid} bo Or^{3,647sq} Aug |#moixasqai 1502
 kai #gamhsh allhn poiei authn moixeughnai C* 61*
 555 829 1279 |#gamhsei 16 1528 1579 2726

19:13 oi de maqhtai #epetimhsan) L M W M f^{1 13} 33 pc NA²⁷
 |#epeteimhsan B |#epetimwn C 66 it vg

20:12 outoi ooi esxatoi *rell* |oC* H*

20:21 kaqiswsin o¹outoi oi o²duo \$ uioi mou *rell* |o¹C 56 58 a e n
 sah cop Bas^{se181 133bis} Isid^{1,187} |o²H |\$oi 579

21:23 kai tij soi edwken *rell*
 h tij soi edwken C ff¹ g²

21:41 #ekdwsetai *rell* |#ekdosetai 118 f¹³ 2 157 565 788 1346 1424
 |#ekdwsei C pc Cyr^{es}

24:5 legontej \$ egw *rell* |\$oti C* F 245 713 1047 1200 1579 1604 2145
 149 1184 f syr^{utr} bo geo² arm Or^{int 3, 851}

24:8 #wdinwn *rell* |#wdeinwn B C D 565 1424 |#odunwn D* 1293 |#odinwn
 13 579 |#dolorum it vg

26:49 eipen \$ xaire *rell* |\$autw P³⁷ C (sy^s) sa^{ms} mae bo Eus^{dem}

26:69 hsqa meta Ihsou tou #Galilaiou *rell* |#Galeilaiou B D
 |#Galileou) |#Nazwraiou C 047 238 252* syr^{sch} pers^p

26:73 kai gar \$ h lalia sou *rell* -L |\$Galilaiouj ei kai C* S
 sy^{h**}

27:54 qeou uioj hn *rell* |213)^c B D^{gr} 69 102 b h l vg^{ed} Or^{int} et^{4,298}
 qeou uioj estin C f g¹ go Aug^{ioh} Vig
 uioj hn tou qeou)*

APPENDIX TEN: NON-SINGULAR READINGS IN CODEX D IN MATTHEW

- 1:23 kalesousinrell
 kaleseij D 2* d** y^{scr} bo^{mss} Eus^{dem320} Epiph^{2,1,5lib} Vig
- 1:25 egeinwsken authn ewjB
 eginwsken authn ewj *rell*
 egnw authn ewj D syr^{sch} it Hil
- 2:6a #gh Iouda *rell* |#th W
 thj Ioudaiaj D 61 a c d f g¹ q
- 2:6b oudamwj *rell*
 mh D (ff¹ tol *numquid*, it^{pl} Tert Hil al *non*)
- 2:9 ou hn to paidion *rell*
 tou paidiou D b c d g¹ k q
- 2:11 to paidion*rell*
 ton paida D (565 it vg aur Aug^{cons})
- 2:13a to #paidion *rell* |#paidiwn 2*
 ton paida D (565 it vg aur Aug^{cons})
- 2:13b eipw soi *rell* |21 D al
- 2:13c to paidion*rell* |#paidiwn 2*
 ton paida D (565 it vg aur Aug^{cons})
- 2:13d apolesai #auto *rell* |#autw KL* 28 1071 |#auton D a d f ff¹ k
 aur vg^(pler) Aug^{cons} |#om. b c g¹ vg^(1 MS)
- 2:14 to #paidion *rell* |#pediwn)
 ton paida D (565 it vg aur Aug^{cons})
- 2:16 apo #dietouj *rell* D^B |dieteiaj D* (it vg a *bimatu*)
- 2:17 rhqen *rell*
 rhqen upo kuriou D aur
- 2:20 to paidion*rell*
 ton paida D (565 it vg aur Aug^{cons})
- 2:21a egerqeij *rell* (it^{pler} vg *surgens* vel *consurgens*)
 diegerqeijD (*k exsurrexit*)
- 2:21b to paidion*rell*

ton paida D (565 it vg aur Aug^{cons})

3:16a o¹to pneuma o¹to qeou o²katabainon *rell* [NA²⁷]|o¹) B
[NA²⁷]|o²Ir^{int}

[.....]katabainonta ek tou ouranou D (Latt)
to pneuma tou qeou #katabainon ek tou ouranou
372|#katabainonta *a b c d g¹ h l* vg^(3mss) sy^h gat mm Hil

3:16b #wsei *rell* Eus^{dem}|#wj D Eus^{ps409}

3:16c erxomenon #ep auton *rell* D^B (*d super*)|#proj C* E* 71 247 258
148|#eij D* 21 299 Eus^{ps}

3:17a legousa *rell*
legousa proj auton D *a b g¹ h* sy^{c.s.}

3:17b outoj estin *rell*
su ei D *a sy^{c.s.} Ir Aug^{ioh1}*

4:3 proselqwn o peirazwn eipen autw *rell* |15234 C M L 1424
pler
proshlqen autw o peirazwn okai eipen autw D it^{cdd}
|ocop

4:4a o de apokriqei eipen *plu* NA²⁷
apokriqei de o Ihsouj eipen D (it^{mu} syr^{cu} sax)

4:4b |ekporeuomenw dia stomatoj\ qeow *plu* NA²⁷ | |D *a b d g¹ k*
Sy^{hier}

4:8 #deiknusin *rell* (C P W D Q)|#diknuei)|#diknusein C
|#edeicen D 372|#diknusin P W D Q

4:14 \$legontoj *rell* |\$tou D U

4:16b foj eiden) B C W *pc* NA²⁷ | 21 E K L M P S U V G D *al pler k* vg
Hipp^{fragm} Or^{bis}
eidon foj D it^{pm} Eus^{dem}

4:16d toij kaqemenoi *rell* NA²⁷
oi kaqhmenoi D it^{pm}

4:17a tote \$ *rell* |\$gar D *d k*

4:17b oo Ihsouj *rell* |oD 16

4:18 peripatwn *rell*
paragwn D it^{pler} sy^s Eus

- 4:24 egerapeusen autouj *rell*
pantaj egerapeusen *D a b c d g¹ h Sy^{pesh.hl}*
- 5:11a oneidiswsin umaj kai diwcwsin *rell*
diwcousin umaj kai onidisousinD (33) *h k (sy^c) mae bo cop aeth*
- 5:11b eipwsin pan ponhron kaq umwn) *B NA²⁷*
eipwsin pan ponhron rhma kaq umwn *C W plu*
eipwsin kaq umwn pan ponhron *D h k m flor syr^{cu} et^{utr}*
Const^{2,8,1} Tert Lcif
- 5:11c ponhron \$kaq umwn yeudomenoi) *B [NA²⁷] | \$rhma rell*
ponhron \$kaq umwn *[NA²⁷]*
kaq umwn pan ponhron *D (b c d h k syr^s geo Tertullian*
al)
- 5:11d #¹eneken #²emou *rell* | #¹eneka *B* | #²dikaiosunhj *D 47 a b c g¹ k*
- 5:12a toij ouranoij *rell*
tw ouranw *D 258 it^{mu} Hil^{ter} al mu*
- 5:15 #all epi *rell* | #alla *D S*
- 5:19 #ean *rell* | #an *D^{CorC} 33* | #om. *D* (it^{pl} vg pp^{lat mu} non exprim)*
- 5:19-20 ¹⁹ouranwn. ²⁰ | oj d an poihsh kai didach outoj
megaj klhqhsetai en th basileia twn ouranwn. legw gar
umin oti ean mh perisseush umwn h dikaiosunh pleion twn
grammatewn kai Farisaiwn ou mh eiselqhte eij thn
basileian twn ouranwn\ (*rell*) (M*) | | *D d vg^(1MS)*
- 5:24 profere *rell*
profereij *D* a b f* pc*
- 5:29 blhqh *plu NA²⁷*
apelqh *D 700^{mg} it sy^{sc} (mae) bo cop*
- 5:29-30 ²⁹geennan. ³⁰ | kai ei h decia sou xeri
skandalizei se ekkoyon authn kai bale apo sou sumferei
gar soi ina apolhtai en twn melwn sou kai mh olon to swma
sou ^sblhqh eij geennan^s\. (*rell*) | ^seij geennan apelqh) *B f¹ 33*
157 NA²⁷ | | D pc vg^{ms} sy^s bo^{ms}
- 5:32 moixeughnai | kai oj ean apolelumenhn gamhsh
moixatai\ *plu NA²⁷ | | D (0250) 64 579 a b k cdd ap sy^{s.c} sa^{ms} bo Aug*
- 5:39 thn odecian *rell* | oD *k ar^p cdd^{lat} ap Aug^{adimant19} Dial Amb*

- 5:40b #¹afej #²autw *rell*|#¹doj 471 1093|#²touto) * 892|#²om. Or
afhseij autw D d l m vg^{1MS} Bas^{bapt637}
- 5:41 autou \$ duo *rell*|\$eti alla D a b c (ff¹) g¹ (h) k (vg^{cl} am for syr^{cu})
Chrom Ir^{int} Aug
- 5:42 qelonta apo sou*rell*
qelonti apo sou^{565 700}
qelonti D k m Clem Cyp
- 6:4 h sou h elehmosunh *plu* NA²⁷ |3241) * 33 |124 D |324 1071 | 3421 D it
vg
- 6:5a filousin \$ *rell*|\$sthnai D a b c h k q
- 6:5b proseuxesqai *rell*
\$proseuxomenoi 13|\$kai D h k
- 6:5c #autwn *rell*|#auton D* Latt
- 6:8 #aithsai auton *rell*|#aiteisqai 157
anoice to stomaD h
- 6:10 owj en ouranw *rell* D^A |oD* a b c k bo^{mss} Tert Cyp Aug^{semel}
- 6:14 afhsei kai umin*plu* NA²⁷
afhsei umin kaiD b c f g¹ h k q
- 6:17 aleiyai *rell*
aliyon D a l³
- 6:19 shj kai brwsij afanizei *rell*
shj kai brwsij afanizousin D* Or^{3,239}
- 9:6 #egerqeij *rell*|#egeire B 0281 pc lat
egeire kaiD a g^{1 2} h k aeth Hil
- 9:11a okai idontej *rell* |oarm
eidontej de D d sah
- 9:11b ti meta tw n telwnwn kai amartwlwn esqiei o
didaskaloj umwn*pler* NA²⁷
ti o didaskaloj umwn meta tw n amartwlwn kai telwntwn
esqiei D b c g¹ h q
- 9:15a #mh *rell*|#mhti D (it vg *numquid*)

9:15b \$hmerai *rell()* |\$ai D* 59 61 1279

9:15c nhsteusousin *pler* NA²⁷
 nhsteusousin en ekeinaij taij hmeraij *D a b c g¹ h q f f f¹ k*
 vg syr^{p mg} Bas^{2,247} Or^{int2,239}

9:17a rhgnuntai oi askoi *rell*
 rhssei o oinoj o neoj touj askouj *D g¹ k m Sy^{hr s}*

9:17b #ekxeitai *rell* |#om. D k Arn |#ekxutai 579

9:17c apolluntai) B *pc* NA²⁷ |#apolountai L W *pc* |#apollutai D k
 Arn

9:17d alla ballousin *rell()* C 21 399 517 892 1010 1293 1424 1604 I49
 I844^(*) I 2211 it^{pler} vg Aug)
 ballousin de *D (a) k*

9:17e #sunthrontai *rell* D^{Cor.C} (*f f f¹* aur vg sy^{s.p.hl}, Aug: *conseruantur*)
 |#throntai D* (*a d h k q seruantur*) |#om. S

9:21 ean monon aywmai *rell*
 ean aywmai monon *D b c f f f¹ g¹ k vg*

9:22 oIhsouj #strafeij *rell* |o) * *pc* it sy^s |#epistrafelij CL W Q
 f¹ M
 esth strafeij *D a l²*

9:24 #autou *rell* D^D |#auton D* Latt

9:25 thj #xeiroj *rell* |#xiroj)
 thn xeira D Latt

9:28a elqonti de)^c B C L W *pler* NA²⁷
 elqontoj de autou 700 *pc f*
 eiselqonti de autw) * N (1424 *al*)
 kai erxetai *D a b c g¹ h k*

9:28b proshlan B
 \$proshlqon*rell* |\$kai *D a b c d g¹ k*

9:30 #autwn ooi ofqalmoi *rell*)^{ca} |#om.) * |#autw E* |o700 |231 D it
 vg

9:34 |oi de Farisaioi elegon en tw arxonti twn damoniwn
 ekballei ta daimonia\ (*rell*) | |*D a d k Sy^s*

9:38 tou kuriourell D^D
ton kurionD* Latt

10:4a \$ Simwn *rell* |\$o C* |\$kai D h q syr^{sch}

10:4b Kananaioj (*rell*)
Xananaioj D a c f f¹ vg Or^{int}

10:5a olegwn *rell* |o) * 1424
kai legwn D it^{pler} vg^{mss}

10:5b Samareitwn B pc
Samaritwn) L W pc NA²⁷
Samaritanwn D (it vg)

10:6 #poreuesqe ode *rell* |#poreuesqai B* E W D 2* 1071 |oCyr^{glaph380}
upagete D d k

10:8a #qerapeuete *rell* |#qerapeusate D Latt

10:8b #egeirete *rell* |#egeirate D Latt

10:8c #kaqarizete \$ *rell* |#kaqareisate kai D (Latt om. kai) |#om.
28 1428* |\$kai 348 k sy^{s.pesh}

10:8d #ekballete *rell* |#ekbalete D F Q 2 4 99 273 349 485 1108 1424

10:10 gar \$¹o ergathj thj trofhj autou \$²) B C L pler NA²⁷
|\$¹estin D 21 399 517 544 713 945 1010 1293 1391 1396 l49 l184 vg |\$²estin
rell

10:11 eij hn d an polin h kw mhn eiselqhtepler NA²⁷ | 123458 700 f
¹ 1 118 209 a b f f¹ h k Hil al sy^s |12345867 L 0281 f¹³ 124 pc sah co
h polij eij hn an eiselqhte eij authn D 28

10:13a okai ean *rell* |oD sy^p arm

10:13b ean de mh h acia plu NA²⁷
om. 579
ei de mh ge D d sy^s

10:13c #elqatw) C N W f¹³ pc NA²⁷ |#99 b^{scr*} |#elqetw B M f¹ pc |#este
D d sy^{s.p(1 MS)}

10:14 |thj okiaj h\ thj polewj oekeinhj *rell* || D arm^{zoh} |oD al⁶ it^{pler}
vg

- 10:15 Gomorrwn *pler* NA²⁷
 Gomorraĵ C M P 1 22 *al plus*³⁰ *ff*¹ *h k Chr*^{montf} *et*^{mo6}
 Gomoraj D L*
- 10:17 en taij sunagwaij *rell*
 eij taj sunagwaij D 0171
- 10:18a #hgemonaj *rell* | #hgemonwn D 111 Or^{1,158}
- 10:18b de kai basileij *rell* | om. D 111
- 10:18c axqhsesqe *rell* () P W D Q 2* 33 157)
 staqhsesqai D 111 *it*^{pler} (0171 *sy*^s) Cyp Hil Or^{int3,532.534}
- 10:20 patroj #umwn *rell* | #om. D (*non d*) Epiph Or | #hmwn 479** 482 1184
- 10:28 en geennh *rell*
 eij geennan D (*it*^{pler} vg Ir^{int} Tert)
- 10:29a ŝassariou *rell* (L) | ŝtou D* Or^{2,722}
- 10:29b pwleitai *rell*
 pwlountai D it vg Hil Cyp
- 10:30 umwn de kai ai trixej *rell*
 alla kai ai trixej D *it*^{pler} Clem²⁶³ Hil Ir^{lat vid}
- 10:32 en autw *rell*
 auton D L
- 10:35 anqrwpou kata tou patroj *rell*
 uion kata patroj D 42 114* *it*^{pler} *sy*^{s.c}
- 10:37 acoij | kai o filwn uion h qugatera uper eme ouk
 estij mou acioj\ *rell* || B* D 17 243 *syr*^p cod
- 10:39 kai o apolesaj *rell*
 o de apolesaj D Tert
- 10:41 lhmyetai | kai o dexomenoj dikaion eij onoma dikaiou
 misqon dikaiou lhmyetai\ (*rell*) NA²⁷ || D d 482 1093 153
- 10:42a #mikron (*rell*) NA²⁷ | #elaxistwn D (1424 *it* vg go al *minimis*)
- 10:42b #yuxrou (*rell*) NA²⁷ | #udatoj D it lat *Sy*^{s.c} co; Or Cyp
- 10:42c apolesh ton mison *rell*

apolhtai o misqoj *D a b c g¹ h k q* cop aeth sy^{s^c} bo Cyp

11:4 kai apokriqei*j rell*
apokriqei*j de* *D a b c ff¹ g¹ h*

11:5 anablepousin |kai xwloi peripatusin\ *(rell) || D d*
1187 1346 1355 1675 2145 [C1?]

11:8 anqrwpon oen *rell D^B |oD** it vg

11:12a ode *rell |oD* a sy^s bo^{aliqu}*

11:12b \$biastai *rell |\$oi D Clem⁹⁴⁷*

11:20a #egenonto *plu NA²⁷ |#gegoneisan D (d k)*

11:20b dunameij oautou *rell |oD g¹ sy^{cu}*

11:21a #Xorazin N U f¹ 579 700 NA²⁷ |#Xorazein) B W pc |#Xwrazei
28 |#Xorazain D (*a q corazain, b ff2 g1 vg corozain*)

11:21b ouai #soi *plu NA²⁷ |#sou S W*
kai D it^{pler} Hil

11:21c Bhqsaida C N f¹ 33 pc NA²⁷
Bhqsaidan B W pc
Bhdsaidan) K P 565
Beqsaeida D (*a c g¹ h q vg bethsaida*)
betsaida b d f ff¹ l

11:28 pefortismenoi \$ *rell |\$estai D (it vg estis)*

12:6 legw #de *rell (700) |#om. 565 |#gar D k syr^{cu}*

12:11a #ecei *rell |#exei D pc c^{scr} it vg^{mss}*

12:11b otouto *rell |oD it^{pl} syr^{cu} et^{sch}*

12:11b #krathsei *plu NA²⁷ |#kratei D k*

12:18b #on) * B |#eij on)^c C^c W pler NA²⁷ |#en w C* D 1424 f¹ 33

12:20 ou sbesei *rell*
ou mh zbesei D* 713

12:21 #elpiousin *rell D^c |#elpizousin D sah |#credent k aeth*

12:25a pasa basileia merisqeisa kaq eauthj*rell*

pasa basileia merisqeisa #kaq eauthn L 118 33 28 1424
|#ef D Chr^{com.gue}

12:25b #staqhsetai *rell* D^{Cor.C} |#sthsetai D* f¹³ 174 230 788 826 828 983
|#sustaqhsetai 482

12:26 kai ei *rell*
ei de kai D (*d si autem; b ff² g¹ q si enim; c ff¹ h si ergo; a si*)

12:35 oo agaqoj *rell* D^D |oD* Or^{semel (3,665libere)}

12:37 #kai ek tw n logwn *rell* |#h D^{gr} a c g¹ Hil Paulin

12:44 #euriskei *rell* |#eurhsei 124 |#eureiskei ton oikon D
(sy^{hmg})

12:45² eautou *rell*
autou D E* *al pc*

12:45 #xeirona *rell* |#xirona) |#xeiron D* l184 |#xeirwna L 59 124
245

12:47a |ecw esthkas in zhtountej \ C M W *pler* [NA²⁷] | |) B L G [NA²⁷]
esthkeisan ecw zhtountej D b c f g¹ ff² h q syr^{utr} | 21354 33

12:47b |zhtountej soi lalhsai \ C M W *pler* [NA²⁷] | |) B L G [NA²⁷]
zhtountej lalhsai soi D b c f g¹ ff² h q syr^{utr} | 21354 33

12:50 #an poihs h) B W *plu* NA²⁷ | #ean f¹³ 1346 | #om. *al pc*
#an poihs ei L *pc* | #ean 124 788
poiei D d sy^{c.s.p.} sah

13:1 ecelqwn *rell*
echlqen D it^{pl} syr^{cu} et^{sch} Or^{int3,835} Hil

13:2 #eisthkei B^c D^{c?e?} K M S U Y G P W f¹ 28 118 124 157 565 579 700
788 1071 1346 1424 etc. NA²⁷ | #isthki) | #isthkh E* | #istikei 2*
|#isthkei B* C W E^c F G L W X Z D Q 2 33 etc. | #esthkei D^{*?c?e?} (*d*
stabat) 234 (*a b c ff² h vg stabant*)

13:3 otou speirein B *pc* |o1424
otou speirai L W *pc* |oD

13:6b #ekaumatisqh *plu* NA²⁷ | #ekaumatwqh B² | #apechranqh E*
|#ekaumatisqhsan D sy^h

13:6c #echranqh *rell* | #apechranqh E* | #echranqhsan D sy^h

13:8 #edidou *rell*|#edidoun D it vg

13:13 autoij lalw *rell* |21 N O Q S f^{13} 7 33 174 230 517 543
565 788 826 954 1424 1555 1675 *pc* it^(pler) (*loquar c*) vg sy^{c.s.pesh} sa bo arm geo
#lalei oautoij D*|#elalei D^B |oL c Cyp

13:14a #anaplhroutai\$ *rell*|#anaplhroute W*
|#anaplhrountai Q 579|#plhrountai 1 485 1582* |\$ep M W^c
tote plhrwqhsetai oep D |o7 517 954 1424 1675

13:14b \$Hsaiou *rell* (L) |\$tou D l185 |om. 126 *at^A b Chr^{mo2}*

13:14b oh legousa *pler* NA²⁷ |oS f^{13} *pc*
legousa poreughti kai eipe tw law toutwD it mae
Eusebius

13:16a ooi ofqalmoi *rell* |oD M*

13:17 ouk #eidan) B N 33 NA²⁷|#eidon *rell*
oux #idon Q f^1 788 1346|#hdunhqhsan eidein D *d geo¹*

13:19 autou *rell*
autwn D *q*

13:22 #spareij *rell* (*b f ff¹ g² h q* vg *est seminatus*)|#speiroumenoj D (*a c*
d g¹ ff² k seminatur)

13:23a o ton logon akouwn *plu* NA²⁷
o akouwn ton logon D it vg syr^{cu} et^{sch}

13:23b oj dh *plu* NA²⁷
tote D *a b c h q (k* et tunc)*

13:24 tw agrw autou *plu* NA²⁷
tw idiw agrw D Eus^{es.bis}

13:28 oi de douloi legousin autw) NA²⁷
oi de douloi autw legousin C
oi de douloi eipon autw L W *pc*
legousin autw oi douloi D *a b c e ff² g¹ k syr^{sch}*

13:29 o de #fhsin) B C D 21 399 892 1010 1295 1396 1555
NA²⁷|#efh *rell*|#efh autoij N O Q S 33 1071 *a* vg^(3MSS) (sa bo^{pc} geo)
|o de\ legei autoij 33 659 1424 1675 *b f q ff^{1.2} g^{1.2} l* aur vg aeth
arm || D *d k (h r) sy^{c.s}*

13:29 ama \$autoij ton #stion *plu NA²⁷ |\$it^{pl} cop syr^p*
 |#seiton Q
 ama kai ton seiton sun autoij D (k syr^{cu} arm) | 156234 (G) ff¹
 g² vg syr^{sch}

13:30a sunaucanesqai amfotera *plu NA²⁷*
 amfotera sunaucanesqai D it vg

13:30b |auta oeij\) B *pler NA²⁷ | oL X D 1 a l⁵ a b c g^{1.2} ff² q* am for em gat
 san mm syr^{cu} et^{sch} arm^{zoh} Chr(et^{mo6}) || D e f h k Or^{3,135} Ir^{latvid} Epiph

13:30c #sunagagete *rell* | #sunagete B Y* G 1 348 440 1689
 | #sunlegetai D k | #sunagagetai W 2* 28 579 | #sunatagete D*
 | #eisagagete 1194 | #agagete 1293

13:32 pantwn otwn spermatwn *rell* | oD* 124 346 543 828

13:33 #elalhsten autoij\$ B M f¹ 33 *pler NA²⁷ | #pareqhken C*
 | \$legwn) L M f¹³ 788 *pler* | om. D 76 k syr^{s.c}

13:46b opanta osarell | o 1071 a c h Cop^{bo(pler)}
 a D (a c) d (h) ff²

13:40 #sullegetai *rell* / #sunlegontai D it vg

13:54 toutw \$ *rell* | \$touta kai tij W | \$pasa D 892 pc sys mae aeth
 Eus^{steph223} et^{ps398}

13:58 thn apistian *rell*
 taj apisteiaj D 892 k

14:2a \$outoj *rell* | \$mhti D pc b f h vg^{mss} gat mm

14:2b Iwanhj o baptishj \$ *rell* | \$on egw apekefalisa D a d ff¹ h vg^{mss}

14:3a kai en fulakh apeqeto) * B* pc NA²⁷ | 142 th 3 f¹ 700 pc | 2
 th 314)² Z^{vid}
 kai eqeto en fulakh C L W 0106^(c) M it^{pl} vg syr^{omn} cop arm
 | en th\ fulakh D a^{vid} e k aeth Or^{3,469} || 61

14:3b oFilippou *rell* | oD a c d (e) ff¹ g¹ k l vg^(pler) aug^{cons.2.92}

14:8 \$doj moi fhsin *rell* | \$eipen W
 epien qelw ina moi doj ec authj 1424
 eipen doj moi D 0106^c 1424 it vg^{mss} syr^{cu} et^{sch}
 aeth

14:9 kai touj sunanakeimenouj *rell*

kai dia touj sunanakeimenouj D it^{pler} syr^{cu} aeth

14:14 touj #arrwstouj *rell* (1230) (*languidos* Latt) | #arrwstountaj D
233 372 2737 | #arrwstaj 3 | #*infirmos d* | #*animas geo*¹
taj nosouj 863

14:16 dote autoij umeij fagein *rell*
dote umeij fagein autoij D 1354 *d*

14:19a touj oxlouj *rell*
ton oxlon D^{gr} 892 it^{pler} vg mae bo^{mss} arm^{zoh}

14:19b tou xortou) B C* W Q *f*¹ 33 157 565 579 NA²⁷
#touj xortouj C^c K M P U D P 2 28 118^c 788 *f*¹³ 1071 1346 | #tou
L
ton xorton D 16 61 892 (it vg syr^{cu} et^{sch} syr^{p mg} cop arm aeth *super*
faenum)

14:19c #labwn *rell* (*acceptis* Latt) | #elaben D (*accepit d*) (e) sy^{s c .pesh.} cop^{sa} aeth
geo | #labwn D

14:22 auton *rell*
om. D it

14:24a ohdh stadiouj pollouj | apo thj ghj\ apeixen B *f*¹³ 174
230 543 788 826 828 1346 sy^{hier} NA²⁷ | osy^{pesh} sa (bo) | | 238 983 1689
ohdh meson thj qalasshj hn) C F L P W X
G D P S F 073 084 0106 *f*¹ 33 M (lat) sy^h mae? | o28 *a b d f f f*¹ l geo | 21345 1555
hn \$ meson thj qalasshj 517 954 1424
1675 | \$eij D *d* it vg sy^{hl}
hdh stadiouj thj ghj apeixen ikanouj 700
ohdh apeixen apo thj ghj stadiouj ikanouj Q | osy^c

14:28 oo Petroj *rell* | oD 482* 544

14:33 qeou uioj ei *rell*
uioj qeou ei osu D *d* aeth | oit vg sy^s sah bo arm geo

15:1 tw Ihsou *rell*
autw *f*¹ 1424
proj auton D it^{pler} vg aeth Hil Aug^{cons2,102}

15:3 eipen oautoij *rell* | oD *e* cop

15:11a ou \$ *rell* | \$pan D *d* pers^p

15:11b stoma \$ koinoi *rell* (C) | \$touto) *
stoma koinwni D (*d communicat*)

- 15:11c touto koinoi *rell* |om.f¹ 124 1071
ekeino koinwneiD (*d Tert Aug Hier communicat*)
- 15:18 koinoi ton anqrwpon *rell* D^D
koinwnei ton anqrwpon D* (*d communicant*) Aug^{semel}
- 15:20a tauta #estin *rell* |#eisin D* e ff¹ k Aug^{semel}
- 15:20b koinounta *rell* D^D
koinwnounta D* (*d e ff¹ k Aug^{semel} communicant*)
- 15:20c fagein ou #koinoi *rell* |#koinei C |#koinwnei D* (*d k Aug^{semel} communicat*)
- 15:24 ta probata\$ *rell* | \$tauta D sy^{s.c.h}
- 15:26 estin kalon *rell*
ecestin D it sy^{s.c} Origen
- 15:27 #esqiei *rell* (B) |#esquosin D y^{scr semel}
- 15:28a apokriqiej o Ihsouj eipen auth *rell*
apokriqiej eipen auth D G al² fu syr^{cu}
- 15:28b ow gunai *rell* |oD 259
- 15:30a okwfouj *rell* |oD 1207 (472) pc d g² l
- 15:30b autouj |para touj\ podaj *rell* C^B || C*
autouj #upo touj podaj D b |#makroqen
emprosqen autou proj 1424
- 15:30c eqerapeusen autouj *rell*
eqerapeusen autouj pantajD 954 b c ff² g¹ it sa^{mss} bo^{mss}
- 15:31 \$tuflouj *rell* | \$touj D 1012
- 15:32a oxlon\$ *rell* | \$touton D E^c c f g² cop Hil Chr^{mo4}
- 15:32b treij \$ *rell* | \$eisin kai D (it)
- 15:34 eipan) pc NA²⁷
eipon\$ B C L W pc | \$autw D^{gr} pc syr^{omn}
- 16:1 peirazontej ephrwthsan auton B plu NA²⁷ | 132 D 1396
peirazontej ephrwtwn auton) * pc

16:2 oautoij *rell* | oD $y^{\text{scr}} \text{it}^{\text{mu}}$

16:4a genea ponhra kai moixalij(*rell*) NA²⁷
genea ponhra D 4 a e ff¹² Prosp

16:4b shmeion #epizhtei *rell* -700 | #shmion) W | #simeion 2
|#shmeiwn 1346
shmeion aitei B*
#shmion zhtei D^H d | #shmion Q
zhtei shmion D* b c e quaerit signum

16:7 oi de dielogizonto *rell*
tote dielogizonto D 4 a b c e ff² sy^s Lcif

16:9a \$touj pente *rell* | \$ote D D

16:9b tw n #pentakisxiliwn *rell* | #pentasxiliwn 124
toij pentakisxileioij D d (c ff² g² in milia quinque) geo¹

16:10 tw n tetrakisxiliwn *rell*
touj tetrakisxiliouj 157
toij tetrakeisxeileioij D (a b c f g¹² ff¹² q vg Lcif in quattuor
milia)

16:11 #artwn eipon umin *plu* NA²⁷ | #artou E F G H U V X G D it^{pl}
vg Or^{3,518} Amb
artou eipon \$ D a b ff² Lcif | \$umin W pc

16:13a oautou *rell* | oD d arm

16:17 eipen oautw *rell* | oD am fu

16:18a tauth th petra *rell* | 231 E*
tauthn thn petran D (D) Eus^{dem121} it vg

16:18b mou thn ekklhsian *rell*
thn ekklhsian mou D it vg Tert Cyp

16:21 th trith hmera egerqhna i *rell*
meta treij hmeraj anasthna i D cop bo

16:22a hrcato epitiman autw \$ legwn) (C) M K L M U W D
P 2 118 579 1071 NA²⁷ | \$kai F | 1324 f¹³ 124 157 700 788 1346 1424
hrcato autw epeiteiman kai legein D 283 (it)
hrcato auton peitiman legwn Q
hrcato autw epitiman autw legwn 565
legei autw epiteimwn B 346

16:26 #kerdhsh *rell* D|#kerdhsei HL 2* 28 579|#kaierdhsh Q
|#kerdisei 1071|#kerdh Latt|#kerdanh Or^{3,545}

16:27 tw n aggelwn autou *rell*
tw n aggelwn tw n agiwn C 1071 1365 *b* Avit
tw n agiwn aggelwn autou D *d* 047 Chr
angelis suis sanctis *b* sy^{pes}

17:1a \$Iwannhn (*rell*) NA²⁷ |\$ton D* 253 Cyr^{es}

17:1b #kat idian*rell*|#kaq B*
leian D *d* Eus^{dem208}

17:2a metemorfwqh emprosqn *rell*
metemorfwqej o Ihsouj emprosqn D *e* (sy^p)

17:2b okai elamyen *rell* |oD *d e*

17:6 kai akousantej *rell*
akousantej de D sah

17:7 #egerqhte *rell* (W)|#egeiresqai D l33

17:8 auton Ihsoun monon B* Q 700 NA²⁷
Ihsoun auton monon)
ton Ihsoun monon meq eautwn C^c 33
oton Ihsoun monon B² C* L^f 1 13 M |oW
monon ton Ihsoun D it vg

17:9 #katabainontwn *rell*|#katabainontej D *d* sy^{c-p}
|#katabenontwn W|#katabantwn 655

17:11 okai apokatasthsei *rell* |oD *a b c e* g¹ ff² sy^(p) et^{cu} et^{sch} sah

17:12b outwj kai o uioj tou anqropou mellei pasxein up
autwn (*rell*)
tote aunhkan oi maqhtai oti peri Iwannou tou
baptistou eipen autoij D it

17:13 tote sunhkan oi maqhtai oti peri Iwannou tou
baptistou eipen autoij (*rell*)
outwj kai o uioj tou anqropou mellei pasxein up
autwn D it

17:14a #elqontwn *rell*|#eiselqontwn 1424|#elqwn D it vg cop^{dz} arr
(sy^{s.c}) bo^{pt} Hil Aug

17:14b #auton plu NA²⁷ | #enprosgen autou D it^{mu} e fff¹ l Hil place^{om} sur^{cu}
et^{sch} arm vg syr^p

17:16 #¹hdunhqhsan #²auton qerapeusai (rell) NA²⁷
|#¹hdunasqhsan B|#¹hdunanto Z|#¹hdunhqeisan 2*|#²edunhqhsan
K P 265 489 892 1219 1346 l184
|#²autw 2
hdunhqhsan qerapeusai auton D it vg

17:19 #kat idian rell|#kaq B* D

17:24¹ ta #didraxa rell G|#didragmata D al. pc|#didragma ML 1
118 f¹³ 2 28 157 565 700 1071 1346 b ff² am fu for gat al.|#didragmas q|#tributum
a c d e fff¹ n vg^(pler) aeth|#dragma g²
to #didragma W|#didraxmon Cyr^{4,791}

17:22 sustrefomenwn de autwn) B f¹ (f g^{1.2} q vg) NA²⁷
anastrefomenwn de autwn rell
upostregontwn de autwn 579
autwn de anastrefomenwn D (a b c ff² n Hil)

17:23 th trith hmera egerqhna rell
th trith hmera anasthna (B) 047 118 f¹³ (1346^c) plu
meta treij hmeraj egerqhna D d (sy^s) cop^{bo}

17:24a elqontwn de rell
kai elqontwn D it vg syr^{cu} et^{sch}

17:24b tw Petrw kai #eipon rell|#eipan)^c B
kai eipan tw Petrw D 27^{ev} syr^{hr}

17:24² ta #didraxma rell)^{ca}|#didragma ML 118 f 13 28 157
565 700 1071|#didraxmata 579|#didraxmon 1093|#tributum a d e fff¹ n
vg^(pler) aeth|#didgrama uel censum b|#didgramam g¹
#deidragma D|#didraxa) * mae bo
to #didragma W|#didraxmon Cyr^{4,791}

17:27 \$stathra rell|\$ekei D it sy^{s,c}

17:26 eipontej de \$apo twn allotriwn) B Q 0281 f¹ 700 892* pc
vg^{mss} sa bo^{pt}; Chr NA²⁷ | \$tou Petrou 892^{mg}
legei autw apo twn allotriwn D sy^s
legei autw o Petroj apo twn allotriwn |eipontoj de
oautou apo twn allotriwn\C Cyr|oL| |rell (D) -33

18:2 \$esthsen rell|\$en D e sy^{s,c}

18:7 oplhn \$ ouai tw anqrwpw) FL^{f1} 22 579 892 d g¹ aur
vg^{st.ww} sy^{omn} sa^{mss} mae bo Did |osy^s |\$de D* sy^{s.pesh} |\$dico uobis r²
plhn ouai tw anqrwpw ekeinw rell | 15234 W e ff¹ | lde5234
geo

18:8 |h duo xeiraj\ h duo podaj exonta rell f q vg || G
h duo xeriaj exonta h duo podaj 1071
h duo podaj h duo xeiraj exonta D it^{pler} Chr^{cdd4}

18:9a kai ei rell
to auto ei kai D d sy^{c.s.pesh}

18:9b geennan otou puroj rell | o D
geennan \$ D d | \$to skotoj to ecwteron 1675

18:10 twn mikrwn toutwn (rell) NA²⁷ | 312 L
toutwn twn meikrwn twn pisteuontwn eij eme D b c ff^{1.2}
g^{1.2} syr^{cu} sah sax Hil

18:12a ti\$ umin rell | \$de D q^{scr} a cop syr^{cu}

18:12b #poreugeij rell | #poreumenoj D (pergens d, vadens q sy^{omn}) | #vadit
Latt | #vadet e h r² vg^(aliq.) | #ibit m geo

18:14 tou patroj mou B N G Q 078 0281 f¹³ 33 579 700 892 1241 1424 pc
sy^{s.h} co Or
tou patroj umwn) D^B K L W D f¹ 565 pc it vg sy^{c.p.hmg} NA²⁷
tou patroj hmwn D* al pc harl*

18:16 omarturwn rell | o D 435 (Aug^{semel})

18:17 kai\$ rell | \$wj D 301 ff¹ syr^{cu} et^p

18:18 dhshte epi thj ghj | estai dedemena en #ouranw kai
osa ean lushte epi thj ghj\ estai B NA²⁷ | | D* dn | #toij
ouranoij D^c L

18:20 ou gar eisin rell D^D
opou gar eisin) * N pc
ouk eisin gar D* (g¹) sy^s

18:26 peswn #oun rell | #de D y^{scr} it vg sah syr^p arm Lcif

18:34 apodw opan rell | o D y^{scr} al pc Chr (ita^{mo5})

19:1 #etelesen *rell*|#etelen C|#elalhsen *D a b c e f f*^{1.2} *g*¹ *r*¹ *bo*^{2MSS}
Hil

19:3 #legontej) B C L *pc* NA²⁷|#legontej autw D^{Cor.C} W *pc*
|#legousin autw D* *d e*

19:6 sunezeucen \$ anqrwpoj *rell*|\$eij en D *a e** f*^{1.2} *h* Aug Chrom

19:8a legei *rell*
kai legei D* *aeth*

19:8b Mwushj \$ proj thn sklhrokardian #¹umwn #²epetreyen
umin *rell* (C M L D *f*¹ 2 1071) | 2345671 D *a b c d e f g*¹ *h r*¹ *vg* | \$men U
|#¹hmwn 579 | #¹om. 892 | #²egrayen 1424 Eus | 1672345 W^c | 162345 W*

19:10 tou anqrwpou *rell*
anqrwpoj *p*²⁵
tou androj D *a b c f f*² *g*¹ *h m q* Amb *al*

19:13 taj xeiraj epiqh autoij) B C L W *plu* NA²⁷ | 1243 U *it* *vg*
| 3412 1424 | 3124 D *sah* cop Or^{3,658}

19:16 autw eipen) B Q *pc f*¹³ 13 157 346 700 892 *pc a b c e f f*^{1.2} *g*¹ *h q* sa
pc Chr Op NA²⁷
eipen autw C L M W *pc f*¹ 33 M sy^{omn} Or^{3,664} Bas^{eth242} et²⁷⁹
legei autw D (*vg ait*)

19:22 de o neaniskoj *rell* (33 1424)
o neaniskoj D* *fh*
ou neaniskoj D^A

19:25 eceplhssonto \$ *rell*|\$kai efobhqhsan D *a b c e f f*² *g*² *syr*^{cu}

19:27 #hkolouqhsamen *rell* D^B | #hkolouqhkamen D* Latt

19:28 #autoij *rell* | #autw D *al pc* | #autouj 1346

20:3 trithn wran eiden *rell*
wran trithn eiden D
trithn wran euren 1424
wran trithn euren D (*it*) *vg*

20:5 ekthn kai enathn wran) B C L W *pler* NA²⁷
wran ekthn kai ennathn D *f* Op Arn

20:6 #ecelqwn *rell* | #echlqen) * | #echlqen kai D *it* *vg*

20:10 okai elabon *rell* | *of*¹³ 1346

elabon de D it vg

20:11 egogguzon *rell*
egongusan D it^{pler} syr^{cu} et^{sch}

20:22a dunasqe pein to pothrion *rell* (W f¹³)
dunasqe to pothrion pein D G aeth

20:22b legousin autw *rell*
legousin D am sry^{cu} aeth

20:25 eipen *rell*
eipen autoij D W 238 e syr^{cu} et^{sch} sah cop aeth

20:28 #lutron anti pollwn *rell* | #lutrwn 579
lutron anti pollwn umeij de zeteite ek meikrou
auxhsai kai ek meizonoj #¹elatton einai eiserxomenoi de
kai paraklhqentej deipnhsai mh anakleinesqai eij touj
ecexontaj topouj \$ mhpote #²endocoteroj sou epelqh okai
proselqwn o deipnoklhtwr eiph soi eti katw xwrei kai
kataisunghsh ean de anapeshj eij ton httona topon kai
epelqh sou httwn erei soi o deipnoklhtwr #³sunage eti anw
kai estai soi touto #⁴xrhsimon D (it) vg^(pler) sy^c | #¹elattwn F
|\$anaklinesqe F | #²endocwteroj F | oF | | #³age F | #⁴xrhsimwteron
F

21:5 prauj okai *rell* | oD 61 a b e ff¹² h vg^{ed} fu san gat fr aeth Cyp

21:6 kai poihsantej *rell*
epoihsan D it vg

21:7a \$¹hgagon\$² *rell* | \$¹kai D it vg | \$²de 157

21:7b ep autwn) B L 69 NA²⁷
epanw autwn C M W pler
autw f¹³ 124 1346
ep auton D (F l 2211 a b e f ff¹² g² q Or^{4,181cod})

21:7c #epekaqisen B C f¹³ pler NA²⁷ | #ekaqisen N P | #ekaqhto D 700
| #epekaqisan)^c | #epekaqhsan L | #ekaqisan)*

21:11 oo apo *rell* | oD D

21:18 #epanagwn)^c B^c C pler NA²⁷ | #epanagagwn)* B* L | #upagwn W
| #paragwn D it syr^c Hil

21:21 toutw \$ *rell* | \$ean D S

21:24 erwthsw *rell*
eperwthsw D 482 483 484

21:24 logon ena on ean *rell*
ena logon #on ean C D^D F L 118 157 28 579 1424 |#o N|#om.
D* *d c e ff¹ h*

21:29 aphlqen\$ *rell* |\$eij ton ampelwna D it^{pler} syr^{cu}

21:32 #oude B *pc* NA²⁷ |#ou) C L W *pc* |#om. D (c) *e ff¹* sy^s*

21:37 proj autouj *rell* |om. 28 *e ff¹ m* Or^{3,782} (Cyr^{es660})
autoij D *a b c ff² h* Ir^{int277} Lcif

22:5a oj men B L W *pc* NA²⁷
o men) C *pc*
oi men D *b c ff² h* Ir^{int279} Lcif

22:5b oj de) B C* L W *pc* NA²⁷
o de C^c M *pc*
oi de D *b c ff² h* Ir^{int279} Lcif

22:7 o de basileuj wrgisqh) B L *f¹ 700*
NA²⁷

kai akousaj o basileuj ekeinoj wrgisqh C W X D
P 0102 (33^{vid}) M *f q sy^h* Dam^{par382}

o de basileuj akousaj wrgisqh Q *f¹³ 788 1346*
lat sy^p mae bo^{pt} Ir^{lat}

ekeinoj o basileuj akousaj wrgisqh D *a b c e ff²* Lcif

22:10 #ekeinoi *rell* |#autou D 49 it vg Ir^{int279}

22:11 #ouk *rell* |#mh C^c D *al pc* (Or^{4,379lib})

22:12 pwj #eishlqej *rell* |#hlqej D *b c e ff^{1.2} g¹* syr^{cu} Ir^{int} Aug Lcf

22:13 #ekbalete *rell* |#baletai D it (sy^{s.c}) It^{lat} Lcf

22:16a autw *rell*
proj auton D *a c f*

22:16b en alhqeia *rell*
thn alhqeian Ath^{ps841}
ep #alhqeia D* |#alhqeiaj D^c Eus^{ps141} Cyr^{glaph134}

22:17 |eipe oun hmin ti soi dokei\ *rell* (*f^{1 13}*) | |1424
ti soi dokei D *pc* it sy^s bo^{ms}

- 22:20 #kai legei autoij *rell* |#o de C |#om. D 69 it *b e f f*^{1.2} *g*² *h* sah sy^{s.c}
mae
- 22:24 \$epigambreusei *rell* |\$ina D Z^{vid} |\$kai 13 69 788 (*f*¹³ 1346)
- 22:28 tw n epta estai gunh *rell*
este tw n epta gunh D (*c d f f*^{1.2} *g*¹ *h l q r*^{1.2} aur vg)
- 22:34 epi to auto *rell*
epi to autw S 579
epi auton D it sy^{s.c} aeth mae? Hil
- 22:36 entolh #megalh en tw nomw*rell* |#mizwn Q
entolh en tw nomw megalh D 122
- 22:37 o de efh autw) B L 33 sah cop Ot^{int3,830} NA²⁷
o de Ihsouj eipen autw W Q *f*¹³ 2 700 788 1346
o de Ihsouj efh autw 0102 0161 *f*¹ M q sy^{p.h} mae
efh autw Ihsouj D lat bo^{ms}
- 22:38 h megalh kai prwth *rell*
h megalh kai h prwth L |45312 W cop
\$prwth kai megalh (D *transposition*) E F G H K M S U Y
G P W 2 28 157 579 1071 1424 *d f q* syr^{phl} arm pers^p Op |\$h O D Q^b S F 1070
174 237 563 565 Bas^{eth}
- 22:39 omoia #¹auth #²agaphseij *rell* |#¹authj D 0102 0138 238 1295
|#¹tauth D* Z^{vid} 692 it vg sy^{omm} bo aeth arm geo|#²agaphsij) W
|#²agaphshj E
omoiwj agaphsij B
- 23:3 eipwsin oumin *rell* |oD 4 273 280
- 23:11 ode *rell* |oD it^{pler} vg
- 23:15 chran poihsai *rell*
chran tou poihsai D Q *f*¹³ 788
chran ina poihsantai D mae? (it^{pler} vg *ut faciatis*)
- 23:25b #ecwqen *rell* |#ektoj 28 |#ecw D 238 Clem²⁸² Chr^{mol} (X^{comm})
- 23:26 kai oto #ektoj *rell* |oD |#entoj) * l183 l184 |#ecwqen D Clem
- 23:27a ecwqen omen fainontai wraioi *rell* | 2341 *f*¹³ 788
1346 | 2314 157 |oD
ecwqen men fanontai toij anqrwpoj wraioi F
ecwqen men fainesqe toij anqrwpoj dikaioi 33 (mae)

ecwgen o tafoj fainetai wraioj
Cyr^{iulian335} Ir^{int250}

D Clem²⁸²

23:27b #gemousin *rell*|#gemei D Clem²⁸² Cyr^{iulian335} Ir^{int250}

23:34a |proj umaj\ *rell*||D y^{scr}

23:34b |kai ec autwn mastigwsete\ en taij sunagwgaij umwn
kai *rell*||E
kai

D a d Lcif

23:37 #authn *rell*|#se D y^{scr} (it vg Ir^{int} Or^{int} te)

24:2 \$ou mh afeqh *rell*|\$oti D syr^p

24:3 thj shj parousiaj *rell*
thj parousiaj sou D (it vg *adventus tui*)

24:8 #wdinwn *rell* D^B|#wdeinwn B C D 565 1424|#odunwn D* (it vg
dolorum)

24:11 egerqhsontai *rell* (ff¹ vg *surgent*)
ecegerqhsontai D (*a d e q* Cyp Lcif *al exsurgent*)

24:17 oautou *rell* |oD a b ff² q Iri^{nt} Cyp Hil

24:23 wde. . . wde *rell*
wde. . . ekei D 16^{ev} Thdrt^{2,1287} ed Ps-Ath^{dispu}

24:30 dunamewj kai dochj pollhj*rell*
dunamewj pollhj kai dochjD 115 it^{pler} vg Cyp Amb *al*

24:31a salpiggoj \$megalhj)^c L W *pc* NA²⁷ |\$fwnhj B M *pler* |\$kai
fwnhj D 1241 it^{pler} vg Dam^{par346} Hil

24:31b #ap akrwn *rell*|#apo D X

24:38 |ekeinaij otaij pro\ B 472 1295 1515 aur sy^{hl.hier.} arm NA²⁷
|oD 44^{7petr} 697 1573 it vg geo ||L 892 115 a e ff¹ Or
\$taij por) M |\$tou nwe 461 1424

24:45a tij #ara estin *rell*|#gar D y^{scr} (*q* Or^{int3,878} Op *quis enim*; it^{pler} *quis*
nam; Hil *quis namque*)

24:45b #¹autou otou #²dounai) B I L U D *al*³⁰ fere Bas^{eth} Chr NA²⁷
|#¹eautou C|#²didonai E F G H K M S V W G P *al pl* Ephr |oD *al pc* Chr
Ephr

- 24:51 autou meta tw̄n upokritw̄n qhsei *rell*
autou qhsei meta tw̄n upokritw̄n D it (exc q) vg Hil
- 25:3 #gar) B C L 33 NA²⁷ | #om. *rell* | #de Z Q $f^1 157 b c f f^1 g^{12} h l q$ vg
aeth Aug al | #oun D $f f^2$
- 25:3-4 elaion\$ ^{25:4}ai de fonimoi elabon elaion en toij
aggeioij *rell* | \$en toij aggeioij autwn D 1424^{vid} ($f f^1$) Arn
- 25:7 paraqenoi oekeinai *rell* | oD 22^{ev} arm
- 25:10 aperxomenwn de oautwn *rell* | oQ^{h*}
ewj upagousin D ($b c f f^2 g^2 h$)
- 25:17 o ta duo ekerdhsen\$ *rell* | \$kai autouj A C³ K M U W D Q P
M $f^{1.13} 2 28 p c h s y^h$
o ta duo otalanta labwn \$ekerdhsen c fr aeth^{ro} Op | o253 it vg
cop Or^{int3,883} | \$kai autoj D 1515 d
- 25:18 labwn oapelqwn *rell* | oD $a l^3$ it^{pler}
- 25:22 #ide *rell* | #idou D 2145 it^{pler} vg^{pler} VSS *rell* | #eide W
- 25:24a de kai o to en *rell*
de o to #ena D* $1 a b c g^2$ | #en D^c
- 25:24b #oqen *rell* | #opou D W 56 (1) lat vg sa
- 25:25a apelqwn *rell*
aphlqon kai D 252*^{vid} it vg aeth geo Or^{int}
- 25:25b #ide *rell* | #eidou D VSS^{pler} | #eide W | #o de 1515
- 25:33 omen *rell* | oD it^{pl} syr^{sch} et^{pcod} arm aeth
- 25:38 de se eidomen (*rell*) NA²⁷
de eidomen se D Clem
- 25:39 pote ode *rell* | oP* 565
h pote D it (exc $f f^1$) vg cop Clem⁹⁵² (Or^{3,890lib})
- 26:4 sunbouleusantorell
sunbouleuonto D Chr (*d consiliabantur*)
- 26:7 autou anakeimenou\$ *rell* | \$autou D^{gr} $a b c f f^2 h q$ mm Amb
Or^{int3,892}

- 26:14 Iskariwthj *rell* vg^{ed} sah cop syr^p Or *al*
Skariwthj D Q^c vid (lat) *f*
- 26:15 ŝeipen *rell* |ŝkai D latt (sa^{ms}) bo
- 26:18 poiw *rell*
poihsu D (d q Or^{int3,896} *faciam*)
- 26:23 o embayaj *rell*
o enbaptomenoj D 579
- 26:24a ŝ¹o men ŝ²uioj *rell* |ŝ¹kai 118 |ŝ²oun D Z Chr^{edd5}
- 26:24b ŝkalon hn *rell* |ŝdia touto D *a d*
- 26:25 ŝIoudaj *rell* |ŝo D *al pc*
- 26:27 |piete ec autou opantej\ *rell* || *a c* |oD *b*
- 26:28 #peri pollwn *rell* |#uper D Or^{3,194} Cyr^{4,360} Chr
- 26:34 oen *rell* |oP³⁷ D *a b c ff² h q* fu Chr
- 26:40 maqhtaj kai euriskei autouj *rell* (L)
maqhtaj #autouj kai euriskei autouj D* Chr |#autou D^{corr*}
al it vg cop sry^{sch} aeth Or^{int3,903} Hil
- 26:47 okai eti *rell* |o28 1293 it^{pler} vg (exc for) sy^s sah^(2 MSS) bo^(1 MS) Lcif |21 D
d vg (1 MS) sah^(pler)
- 26:50a |o de oIhsouj eipen\ o¹autw (*rell*) NA²⁷ || P³⁷ |o) |o¹700
eipen de autw o Ihsouj D it (exc q) vg aeth Lcif
- 26:50b etaire ef o parei (*rell*) NA²⁷ || P³⁷ |o) |o¹700
ef o parei eterai D *a c f* syr^{sch} Lcif
- 26:51a patacaj *rell*
epatacen D it^{pler} syr^{utr} Lcif
- 26:51b arxierewjŝ *rell* |ŝkai D U* it^{pler} syr^{utr} Lcif
- 26:54 plhrwqwsin *rell*
plhrwqhsontai D it vg (Oros)
- 26:55a eipen o Ihsouj *rell*
o Ihsouj eipen D *a*
- 26:55b echlqate (*rell*) NA²⁷

- hlqate $D(a b c f f^2 g^2 h q \text{ gat})$
- 26:60a oux euron $A C^c M W p c | \text{om.}) B C^* L p c N A^{27}$
 kai ouk euron to echj $D d f f^2 h$
- 26:60b \$pollwn proselqontwn yeudomarturwn $) B C^* L N^* 1$
 51 102 118 124 209 23^{ev*} $b f f 1 g 1.2 l n$ vg sah cop arm pers^w Or^{1,315} et^{4,386} Cyr^{4,855}
 NA²⁷ | \$kai $A C^c M W p l e r$
 to echj kai polloi proshlqon yeudomarturej $D d f f^2 h$
- 26:60c #proselqontej *rell* |# hlqon $D i t$ vg sy^{s.p}
- 26:61 outoj efh *rell*
 touton hkousamen #legonta $D^* b c f f^2 h$ |#legontoj D^c
- 26:64 umin\$ *rell* |\$oti $D p c$ syr^{sch}
- 26:66 apokriqentej *rell*
 apokriqhsan pantej kai $D a b c h$ gat sy^s
- 26:67 #oi *rell* |#alloi D (sah go)
- 26:71 allh\$ *rell* |\$paidiskh $D a b c f f^2 h n q$ vg arm Or^{int}
- 26:72 orkou #oti *rell* |#legwn $D b c f f^2$ mae |#om.) 36 40
- 26:73 kai gar h lalia sou dhlon se poiei *rell*
 kai gar Galilaioj ei kai h lalia sou dhlon se poiei
 C*
 kai gar h lalia sou omoiazeti $D (a b c f f^2 h q$
 gue^{lect})
- 26:75 eirhkotoj | autw oti \ *rell* | | $D 61 47^{ev}$ it vg aeth
 eirhkotoj oti $) B L 0281^{vid} 33 892 p c$ lat sa^{mss} NA²⁷
- 27:1 #elabon *rell* |#epoihsan $D a c f r^2$ vg^{5MSS} sa^{1MS} bo^{1MS}
- 27:13 sou #katamarturousin *rell* D^F | 21 D^* geo |#kathgorturousin 1
 209
- 27:14 |proj #oude \ *rell* |#ouden $L Q f^{13}$ | | $D d$ sy^{p.hl.hier} aeth arm
- 27:22 poihsw *rell*
 poihswnen $D p c a b c f f^2 h q$ Or^{int3,919}
- 27:24a #apenanti *rell* |#katenanti $B D$ |#emprosqen 544
- 27:24b aqwoj eimi\$ *rell* |\$egw $D d$ it vg arm geo sah bo Aug^{cons}

27:28 auton \$ *rell* |\$ta imatia autou 33 *pc sy*^{hmg} *sa*^{ms} *mae bo*^{ms}
|\$eimation porfuroun kai *D d 157 a b c d f f f² h (q)* gat mm (*Or*^{int} *sy*^s)

27:31 okai aphgagon *rell D^B |oD** *d sah*

27:39 taj kefalaj *rell*
thn kefalhn *D d bo aeth geo¹*

27:41 #elegon *rell |#legwn 579 |#legontej D 7pe g^{1,2}*

27:45 ewj wraj enathj *rell |132 D 892 d*

27:46 sabaxqani *rell |#sabaxqanei) A W 69 700 |#sabaktanei B 22*
|#zafqanei *D** (*zaphthani d f f² h*) |#safqanei *D^c |#sabbathani r¹ |#sabactani*
ff¹ |#sibactani q |#zabachthani vg^{1MS} |#zabethani g¹ |#zaptani b vg^{3MSS} |#zabthani
vg^{tot} |#zabtani vg^{1MS} |#zahthani a

27:53 #eishlqon *rell |#om.) |#hlqon D it vg sy^s sa bo*

27:55 #ekei\$ *rell |#kakei) |#kai D al¹⁰ Chr^{gue} |#om. 579| \$kai F K L P*
33 1071

27:57 otounoma *rell |ogeo²*
#to onoma *D 482 |#w 155*

27:58 Pilatw *rell |#Peilatw A B*(D) Q |#Peilatw kai D it vg sy^{s.p.hi.}*
aeth geo Or^{int}

27:59 to swma oo Iwshf *rell |oL 229 472 1515 1184*
Iwshf to swma *D a d f f² h* r¹ sy^{s.pesh.hier}*

27:61 kai oh allh *rell |oA D d h*

27:64a ewj othj *rell |oD L F 251 253 700 945 1071 1223 1391 1402 1574 1579*
Chr^{mo2}

27:64b trithj hmeraj *rell |21 D it vg sy^{hl} Or^{int3,931}*

27:65 #koustwdian *rell B^{c2} |#fulakaj D*^{vid} arm^{usc} |#koustoudian D^c*
|#skoustwdian *B* K |#koustodian 67 |#custodiam ff¹ l vg^(pler) (sy^{s.hl} sah bo*
arm geo¹ Aug) |#custodes a b c d f f f² g¹ q aur vg^(1ms) sy^{pesh.hier} (geo²) |#milites h r¹
vg^(4mss)

27:66a hsfalisanto ton tafon *rell D^{Cor.C}*
hsfalisan ton tafon *D* 174 1574*

- 27:66b thj koustwdiaj *rell* |#kwstoudiaj A |#koustoudiaj D^c
|#koutwdiaj L |#koustodiaj 69 157
tw n fulakwn D* arm
#*custodibus* it vg (go hiat) |#om. *h* vg^(2mss)
- 28:7 oidou *rell* |oD p^{scr} *a b c ff² h* Or^{int2,155}
- 28:9 autou touj podaj *rell* |231 touj podaj autou D it vg Chr^{gue}
- 28:10 #oyontai *rell* |#oyesqai D 10^{pe} *e h*
- 28:12a ote *rell* |oD al² (*a e ff² h*)
- 28:12b arguria ikana *rell*
argurion ikanonD it^{pler} vg syr^{sch} arm
- 28:15 Ioudaioij #mexri *rell* |#ewj) * 1424 Or^{4,455} Chr(et^{mo})
toij Ioudaioij ewj D 59 270
- 28:18 en #ouranw *rell* |#ouranoij D Bas^{euno289}
- 28:19a #poreugentej *rell* |#poreuesqai D sy^{p.hl.} sah bo arm geo Or^{4,262} Cyp
- 28:19b #oun B W D Q P *f*¹³ 118 33 *pc* NA²⁷ |#om. *rell* |#nun D *a b h n*
Victorian Hil^{ter}
- 28:19c otou uiou *rell* |oD 1295 Epiph

APPENDIX ELEVEN: NON-SINGULAR READINGS IN WASHINGTONIANUS IN
MATTHEW

- 1:3 Esrwm Esrwm *rell*
Ezrwm Ezrwm *Wf*
- 1:14 #Sadwk Sadwk *rell* | #Sadwd Q
Sadwx Sadwx) *g*¹
Saddwk Saddwk *W D ff*¹ *q* aur vg
- 1:18 o¹Ihsou o²Xristou *rell* Or^{int3,965} | o¹ 71 it vg sax fr syr^{cu} pers^w Ir^{int bis} Ps-
Ath⁶³³ Thph^{cod} Aug | o² W 74 pers^p et^{cod} Max^{dial} | 21 B Or^{int3,965}
- 2:13 fainetai kat onar tw Iwshf *pler* NA²⁷ | 23145 B C K P 33 700
892 *pc* Thph | 14523 W 1184 *f g*¹ sy^{c.s.hl}
- 3:17 twn ouranwn *rell*
tou ouranou *W 1184 h* vg sy^{c.s.p.h} Iren
thj nefelhj 118
- 5:36 #melainan *rell* | #melenan L Q 28* *f*¹³ | #melanan *W P**
- 5:21 #foneuseij *rell* | #fwneuseij L | #foneushj *W 1184 Clem*
| #fwneushj 579
- 5:43 #mishseij *rell* | #meishseij B D | #mishshj *W S* | #mhshhseij
M Q 2* 13 565 | #mhshseij 1424
- 6:7 #battaloghshte) B *f*¹³ NA²⁷ | #battaloghshte *rell*
| #blattaloghshtai D* | #blattaloghshtai D^D | #batologhshte E G
1241 1183 sy^{p (mg gr)} | #battalogeitai *W 59 471 1604* | #batgologhshte
517 892 | #battologeite 700 | #batologhshte 1424
- 6:18 #¹krufaiw #²apodwsei osoi *B D^A f*¹ 22 660 NA²⁷
| #¹krufia D* | #²apodwsi) Q
krup^tw autoj apodwsi soi *W sy^{pesh} geo*¹
krup^tw apodwsei osoi *rell* | o346 1346
krup^tw apodwsoi sei 579
- 6:20 diorussousi #oude kleptousin *B* 1 1582* 118* | #kai) 1
1582* 118
diourussousin #oude kleptousin *rell* | #oute 700* 1071
diorussousin *W k*
- 6:23 skotoj estin *rell* | 21 *W k*

7:25 #prosepesan)^c B C E X Z D f^{1.13} 237 238 242 245 543 700 788 892
 1071 1346 l47 syr^{p mg gr} Cyr^{es77} Chr Dam NA²⁷ |#prosepesan) *
 |#prosepeson K L M S U V P F W 22 157 565 al. pler. |#prosekrousan
 W 54 234 Philo^{enarr in cant} |#proserhcan Q S 579 pc Eus |#prosekoyon 33
 252 259 1424 pc (Eus^{ps367}) |#inruerunt ff l g² l aur vg^(pler) (sy^{c.pesh.hl} cop)
 |#impegerunt c f k m q vg^(1ms) Aug^{epist} Cyp |#offenerunt a b g¹ h |#inciderunt m
 |#uenerunt vg^(1ms) |#percusserunt geo¹ |#corripuerunt geo²

8:27 estin outoj \$ rell (L) |\$o anqrwpoj W 1354 1506 Hil |\$kai 788

8:29 #ekracan rell |#ekrazon W 489 Epiph

8:30 #boskomenh rell |#boskomenon 579 |# boskomenwn W X al²
 it d cop

9:9 #legomenon rell |#onomati S vg arm |#kaloumenon W 1396

9:10 opolloi #telwnai rell (C 21 399 892 1010 1396) |2l W 157 sy^s aeth
 Cyr^{es.105} |o1675 arm |#telwne) *

9:27 ekeiqen tw Ihsou rell (1071) |23l W 713 945 954 d vg

10:14 touj logoj umwnrell
 twn logwn umwn W* 1194

10:17 oautwn rell |oW g² aur*

10:21 #teknon kai epanasthsetai tekna rell |#tekna W 49 64 Or

10:22 teloj #outoj rell |#om. W sy^s Diatess |#outwj M 13 472

10:33 ostij de rell
 kai ostij W sy^{c.s} arm geo²

12:1 \$toij sabbasin rell (B D* K pc) |\$en W 238

12:48a |tw #legonti oautw\) B D Z P*^{vid} 33 49^{ev} 892 1424 NA²⁷ || W Z
 |#eiponti rell |ok
 autw X

12:48b oeisin oi adelfoi rell |oW pc

13:20 ton logon \$ akouwn rell |\$mou W X D 245 2145 f* q syr^{p.hl}

13:22 ton logon \$ akouwn rell |\$mou W q

13:23 ton logon \$ akouwn rell (D W f¹³) |\$mou W 245 1012 q sy^p

13:30 #ewj tou qerismou B D 517 659 pc NA²⁷ |#axri) * L |#mexri
)° C f^{1 13} 565 plu |#mexrij W F

13:54 poqen toutw \$ rell |21 Q |\$pasa D |\$tauta kai tij W 242

14:2 #estin rell |#esti K W

14:8 \$doj moi fhsin rell |\$eipen W l vg^(3 MSS)
epien qelw ina moi doj ec authj 1424
eipen doj moi D 0106^c 1424 it vg^{mss} syr^{cu} et^{sch}
aeth

14:21 andrej #wsei rell -700 |#wj D D Q f¹ 33 1071 |#om. W 0161 pc lat
sy^{s.c.p} bo

15:18-19 |kakeina koinoi ton anqrwpon ^{15:19} ek gar thj
kardiaj \ (rell) NA²⁷ ||) W 33^{vid} bo^{ms}

15:23 #opisqen rell |#emposqen W 245

15:32 #fagwsin rell |#fagein W k Diatess (a b c Ambr)

17:4 mian kai Mwusei mian kai Hlia mian () C 700 f¹ pc NA²⁷ |
1234576 B^c M (pc)
mian kai Hlia mian kai Mwusi mian W l184

17:8a oautwn rell |oW 235 l44 e dimma

17:9 anqrwpou ek nekrwn egerqh B D 1604 NA²⁷
anqrwpou ek nekrwn anasthrell |1423 W sy^c cop Diatess

17:15 pur kai #pollakij rell (D) |#eniote D Q f¹ 22 Or^{3,574item578} mae
|#om. W 238 Hil |#crebo l aug vg |#aliquotiens ff² q |#saepius d |#aliquando a b c e
ff¹ g¹ n r¹ aeth arm

17:24¹ #ta rell |#to W Cyr^{4,791}

17:24² #ta rell |#to W Cyr^{4,791}

18:4 #oun rell |#om. G |#gar W g¹ sy^{c.s} Aprh |#kai 13 r² aeth

18:7 oplhn \$ ouai tw anqrwpw) F L f¹ 22 579 892 d g¹ aur
vg^{st.w} sy^{omn} sa^{mss} mae bo Did |osy^s |\$de D* sy^{s.pesh} |\$dico uobis r²
plhn ouai tw anqrwpw ekeinw rell |15234 W e ff¹ |Ide5234
geo

18:8 #eiselqein rell |#om. N W 1093 |#eielqein F* |#eiselqhn 2
|elqein 71* 482 544 1354 1355

18:17 oo eqnikoj *rell* |oW 33

18:19a legw #umin *rell* |#umein D |2I P^{44vid} W 174

18:19b #ou *rell* |#o W* X²

19:5 patera \$¹ kai thn mhtera \$² *rell* |\$¹ autou C Y D *f*^{1 13} 1424 *pc*
|\$² autou W M G 69 544 566 1187 1241 2145 sy^{omn} sah bo aeth geo² Or^{semel}

19:16 poihsu ina sxw zwhn aiwnion B C* D Q 700* Or NA²⁷
#poihsaj zwhn oaiwnion klhronomhsu) L 28 33 77 157 238
372 697 892 945 990 1010 1207 1223 1293 1515 1365 l2211 *pc* (sy^{c.s.hmg}) (sa^{ms} bo)
aeth arm |#poihsu 579 |obo^{2mss}
poihsu ina exw zwhn aiwnion *rell* |12435 W J^{vg}

19:24 dia #truphmatoj rafidoj eiselgein E F H L Z D *f*^{1 13} *pc*
NA²⁷ |#trumaliaj C K M U 0281 157 l2211 |4123 W Or Chr

dia #trhmatoj rafidoj eiselgein) *
|#truphmatoj)^c

dia #trhmatoj rafidoj dielgein B |#trumaliaj Q
124 565 700 |#truphmatoj D G S V X Y G

19:28 #Israhel *rell* |#Istrahl W (*a b ff² h n Istrahel*)

19:30 esxatoi \$ prwtoi *rell* |21) L 21 157 579 892 vg^{lms} aeth sy^{pesh}
|\$esontai W sy^{cu.s} Pist-Soph

20:27 einai umwn prwtoj estw B | 2134 X 085
en umin oeinai prwtoj #estai C M P 565 *f*^{1 13} *plu* NA²⁷ |oL
|#estw M *pc* |#este) D | 12435 W 1241 1515 it^(pler) vg arm

21:5 #o basileuj *rell* (1071) |#a W Q

22:38 oh megalh kai prwth *rell* |oD
h megalh kai h prwth L |45312 W cop
\$prwth kai megalh E F G H K M S U Y G P W 2 28 157
579 1071 1424 *dfq* syr^{p.hl} arm pers^p Op |\$h O D Q^b S F 1070 174 237 563 565
Bas^{eth}

23:17 #tij *rell* |#ti W Z

23:25 arpaghj kai #akrasiaj *rell* |#adikiaj C M K 579 700 *f* sy^p et^{p cod}
Bas^{eth 236 cod} Chr^{mo 5} Op *pc* |#akaqarsiaj S 844* item lat 66 71 *ff*¹ *g*^{1.2} *l* vg sah
sy^s co; Cl |#pleoneciaj M Chr^{montf} Dam^{par517} |#akrasiaj adikeiaj W
(sy^h)

24:11 #egerqhsontai *rell* | #ecegerqhsontai D | #anasthsontai W
4 262

24:13 teloj ooutoj *rell* | oW sy^s Diatess

24:14 opasin toij eqnesin *rell* | oW G bo (J¹) Or^{Cels.II.13} Chr

24:20 h fugh #umwn *rell* | #hmwn 579 | 312 W cop Or Eus

24:24 shmeia omegala *rell* | o) W* *pc ff*¹ r¹ bo^{ms}

24:38 gamountej kai #gamizontej) 33 1346 1355 1396 NA²⁷
| #gamiskontej B 1675 | #ekgamizontej *rell* | #gameizontej D
| #ekgamiskontej W 517 1424 | #ekgameizontej D | #ekgamhzontej Q
| #eggamizontej S 047 13 124 543 174 230 348 788 826 828 892 983 1093
1241 1346 1473 1515 1689

24:45 dounai autoij *rell*
didonai oautoij M K M P 565 579 *pc* | oW q (e)

25:24 #ogen ou dieskorpisaj *rell* | #opou D 56 *pc* sa
opou ouk eskorpisaj W latt

25:26 oti \$ qerizw *rell* | \$egw anqrwpoj austhroj eimei W sy^p (1 MS)
sah^(1 MS)

25:32 emprosqen autou panta ta eqnh *rell* (D) | 34512 W aeth

25:41 toij ec #euwnumwn *rell* | #euwnumoj W Latt

26:2 meta duo hmeraj *rell*
meq hmeraj duo W cop

26:12 #balousa *rell* | #ballousa W S

26:23 #outoj *rell* | #autoj 76 157 1071 1424 *pc* | #ekeinoj W Or

26:49 proselqwn tw Ihsou eipen *rell*
proshlqen tw Ihsou kai eipen W a r² sy^{omn} bo aeth geo

26:52 #autw *rell* | #autoij W W 788 | #autwj 124

27:6 ouk #ecestin *rell* | #estin W Eus

27:43 oti \$ qeou *rell* | \$tou W l47

27:49 #swswn *rell* | #swsai) * Q 69 1010 1071 1241 1293 l184 | #swswswn
C | #swsei D 1 209 1582* | #swson F Y K 2* 28 157 700* | #swzwn W *ff*¹ g¹

aur vg^(pler) Aug |#kaqelwn 544 |#liberare g² vg^(3mss) sy^{p.hl} cop aeth arm geo
|#saluaren f |#liberauit a b (c) ff² q r² |#liberat d vg^(1ms) sy^s |#liberet l Or^{int}
|#liberaret vg^(1ms) |#saluabit h r¹ |#liberet sy^{hier}

27:50 opalin kracaj *rell* | oFL | 21 W 945 1396 2145 sy^h

27:60 § th qura *rell* |§epi A 242 243 (1515 it vg geo Or^{int} Aug) |§en W 659
2145 sy^h

28:2 #katabaj *rell* |#katebh W (427 482) latt Sy^r (cop) aeth

APPENDIX TWELVE: *NOMINA SACRA* IN SINAITICUS IN MATTHEW¹

1. Ihsouj

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	i8s8		1:16; 3:13, 15, 16; 4:1, 7, 10, 17, 23; 7:28; 8:4, 10, 13, 14, 18, 20; 9:2, 4, 9, 15, 19, 23, 28, 30, 35; 10:5; 11:1, 4, 7, 25; 12:1, 15; 13:1, 34, 53; 14:13, 31; 15:21, 28, 29, 32, 34; 16:6, 8, 13, 17, 21, 24; 17:1, 7, 9, 18, 22, 25, 26 ; 18:22; 19:1, 8, 14, 18, 21, 23, 26, 28; 20:17, 22, 25, 30, 32, 34; 21:1, 6, 11, 12, 16, 21, 24, 27, 31, 42; 22:1, 18, 29, 41; 23:1; 24:1, 4; 26:1 , 10, 19, 25, 26, 31, 34, 36, 52, 55, 64; 27:11 ¹ , 11 ² , 37, 46, 50; 28:9, 10, 16, 18
s. gen	i8u8		1:1, 18; 2:1; 8:34; 9:10, 27; 14:1, 12; 15:1; 17:4, 19; 18:1; 21:27; 26:6 , 17, 49, 51, 59, 69, 71, 75; 27:1, 55, 57, 58
s. acu	i8n8		1:25; 14:29; 17:8; 26:4 , 50, 57; 27:17, 20, 22, 26, 27, 54; 28:5
s. acu		I?h?s?o?u?n?	1:21

2. Xristoj

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Matthew Citation
s. nom	x8s8	1:16; 2:4; 16:16, 20, 21 ; 23:10, 24:5, 23; 26:63
s. gen	x8u8	1:1, 17, 18; 11:2; 22:42
s. acu	x8n8	27:17; 22
s. voc	x8e8	26:68

3. kurioj

¹ The citations in bold signify *nomina sacra* in the work of scribe D of Sinaiticus, otherwise, all citations reference *nomina sacra* in the work of scribe A of Sinaiticus.

Num. & Case	Sacral nomen sacrum	Nonsacral Full Word	Nonsacral nomen sacrum	Matthew Citation
s. nom	k8s8			12:8; 20:8; 21:3; 22:44; 24:42 ; 27:10
s. gen	k8u8			1:20, 22, 24; 2:13, 15, 19; 3:3; 9:38; 21:9; 23:39; 28:2
s. dat	k8w8			5:33; 21:42; 22:44
s. acu	k8n8			4:7, 10; 22:37, 43, 45
s. voc	k8e8			7:21 ¹ , 21 ² , 22 ¹ , 22 ² ; 8:2, 8, 21, 25; 9:28; 11:25; 14:28, 30; 15:22, 25, 27; 16:22; 17:4 ; 18:21; 20:31, 33; 25:11¹, 11², 24, 37, 44 ; 26:22
s. nom		kurioj		25:19, 21, 23, 26
s. gen		kuriou		25:18, 21, 23
s. voc		kurie		25:20
pl. dat		kurioij		6:24
s. nom			k8s8	10:25; 18:25, 27, 32, 34, 21:40, 24:45, 46, 48, 50
s. dat			k8w8	18:31
s. acu			k8n8	10:24
s. voc			k8e8	13:27; 18:26; 21:30; 27:63

4. Qeoj

Num. & Case	Sacral nomen sacrum	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	q8s8		1:23; 3:9; 6:30, 32; 15:4; 19:6; 22:32 ¹ , 32 ² , 32 ³ , 32 ⁴
s. gen	q8u8		3:16; 4:3, 4, 6; 5:9, 34; 8:29; 12:4, 28 ¹ , 28 ² ; 14:33; 15:3, 6; 16:16, 23 ; 19:24; 21:31, 43; 22:16, 22:21, 29, 30, 31; 23:22; 26:61, 63 ¹ , 63 ² ; 27:40, 54
s. dat	q8w8		6:24; 19:26; 22:21
s. acu	q8n8		4:7, 10; 5:8; 9:8; 15:31; 22:37; 27:43
s. voc	q8e8		27:46 ¹ , 46 ²
s. gen		qeou	27:43

5. pneuma

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Nonsacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Matthew Citation
s. nom/acu	p8n8a8		3:16; 10:20; 12:18; 26:41; 27:50
s. gen	p8n8s8		1:18, 20; 4:1; 12:31, 32; 28:19
s. dat	p8n8i8		3:11; 5:3; 12:28; 22:43
s. nom		p8n8a8	12:43
pl. gen		p8n8a8twn	10:1
pl. acu		p8n8a8ta	8:16; 12:45

6. anqrwpoj

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Nonsacral Full Word	Nonsacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. gen	a8n8o 8u8				9:6; 10:23; 11:19; 12:8, 32, 40; 13:37, 41; 16:13, 27, 28; 17:9, 22; 19:28; 24:27, 30 ¹ , 30 ² ; 26:2, 24 ¹ , 24 ² , 45, 64
s. acu	a8n8o 8n8				26:72, 74
s. nom		anqrwpoj			7:9; 16:26¹; 17:14; 25:14, 24
s. acu		anqrwpon			15:11 ¹
pl. gen		anqrwpwn			5:13; 16:23; 17:22; 21:25
pl. dat		anqrwpoi j			6:5
pl. acu		anqrwpou j			5:19; 13:25
s. nom			a8n8o8s8		4:4; 8:9; 11:19; 12:10, 11, 12, 35 ¹ , 35 ² ; 13:28, 31, 44; 16:26²; 19:5, 6; 21:28, 33; 26:24; 27:57
s. gen			a8n8o8u8		10:36; 12:43, 45; 19:10
s. dat			a8n8w8		12:13; 13:24, 52; 18:7, 12, 23; 20:1; 22:2; 26:24
s. acu			a8n8o8n8		9:9, 10:35; 11:8; 15:11 ² , 20 ¹ , 20 ² ; 22:11; 26:72; 27:32
pl. nom			a8n8o8i8		7:12; 8:27; 12:36; 16:13
pl. gen			a8n8w8n8		4:19; 5:16; 6:1, 2; 10:17, 32, 33; 15:9; 19:12; 21:26; 22:16; 23:4, 7, 13
pl. dat			a8n8o8i8 s8		6:14, 15, 16, 18; 9:8; 12:31 ¹ ; 23:5, 28
s. gen				anqrwpo u	8:20; 17:12; 20:18, 28; 24:37, 39, 44; 25:31

7. pathr

Num. & Case	Sacral nomen sacrum	Nonsacral Full Word	Nonsacral nomen sacrum	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	p8h8r8				5:48; 6:4, 6, 8, 14, 15, 18, 26, 32; 7:11; 11:26, 27; 15:13; 16:17 ; 18:35; 23:9
s. gen	p8r8s8				5:45; 7:21; 10:20, 29, 32, 33; 11:27; 12:50; 13:43; 16:27 ; 18:14, 19; 20:23; 25:34 ; 26:29; 28:19
s. dat	p8r8i8				6:1, 6, 18
s. acu	p8r8a8				5:16; 11:27; 26:53
s. voc	p8e8r8				6:9; 11:25; 26:39, 42
s. gen		patroj			10:35
s. acu		patera			4:22
pl. gen		paterwn			23:32
s. nom			p8h8r8		10:21
s. gen			p8r8s8		2:22; 4:21; 21:31
s. dat			p8r8i8		15:5
s. acu			p8r8a8		3:9; 8:21; 10:37; 15:4 ¹ , 4 ² , 6; 19:5, 19, 29; 23:9
pl. gen			p8r8w8n8		23:30
s. nom				pathr	24:36
s. gen				patroj	18:10

8. uioj

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomina sacra</i>	Nonsacral Full Word	Nonsacral <i>nomina sacra</i>	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	u8s8				3:17; 9:6; 10:23; 11:19, 27 ¹ , 27 ² ; 12:8, 23, 40; 13:37, 41, 55; 14:33; 16:16 ; 19:28; 20:18, 28; 22:42, 45; 26:24 ¹ , 24 ² , 45, 63; 27:43, 54
s. gen	u8u8				20:31; 24:27, 30
s. dat	u8u8w				21:9
s. acu	u8n8				1:21, 23; 2:15; 11:27; 24:30; 26:64
s. nom		uioj			1:20
s. dat		uiw			22:2
s. acu		uion			10:37; 17:15 ; 21:5
pl. nom		uioi			5:9, 45; 8:12; 9:15; 12:27; 13:38 ¹ , 38 ² ; 17:26; 20:21; 23:31
pl. gen		uiwn			17:25 , 20:20 ¹ , 20 ² ; 27:9, 56
pl. acu		uiouj			26:37
s. nom			u8s8		7:9
s. acu			u8n8		21:37 ¹ , 37 ² , 38; 23:15
s. nom				uioj	4:3, 6; 8:20; 16:27 ; 17:5 , 9 , 12 , 22 ; 24:36 , 44 ; 25:31 ; 26:2 ; 27:40
s. gen				uiou	1:1 ¹ , 1 ² ; 12:32; 24:39 ; 28:19
s. dat				uiw	21:15
s. acu				uion	1:25; 16:13 , 28
s. voc				uie	8:29; 9:27; 15:22; 20:30

9. mhthr

Num. & Case	Sacral nomen sacrum	Nonsacral Full Word	Nonsacral nomen sacrum	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	m8h8r8				12:48, 49, 50; 13:55
s. acu	m8r8a8				2:20, 21
s. nom		mhthr			20:20
s. gen		mhtroj			10:35
s. gen			m8r8s8		14:8; 19:12
s. dat			m8r8i8		14:11; 15:5
s. acu			m8r8a8		10:37; 15:4 ¹ , 4 ² ; 19:5, 19, 29
s. nom				mhthr	12:46
s. gen				mhtroj	1:18; 2:11
s. acu				mhtera	2:13, 14

10. ouranoj

Num. & Case	Sacral Nomen Sacrum	Nonsacral Nomen Sacrum	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. gen	o8u8n8o8u8			11:23; 16:1; 24:30; 26:64; 28:2
s. dat	o8u8n8w8			5:34; 6:20; 19:21; 22:30; 23:22
s. acu	o8u8n8o8n8			14:19
pl. gen	o8u8n8w8n8			3:2, 17; 5:3, 19; 10:7; 11:11; 13:33, 44; 18:23; 19:12, 14, 23; 24:29
pl. dat	o8u8n8o8i8s8			5:12, 16; 6:1, 9; 7:11, 21; 12:50; 18:19
s. gen		o8u8n8o8u8		6:26; 8:20; 13:32; 24:29
s. nom			ouranoj	5:18
s. nom			ouranioj	5:48; 6:14, 26; 15:13; 18:35; 23:9
s. gen			ouranou	11:25; 21:25 ¹ , 25 ²
s. dat			ouranw	6:10; 18:18; 24:30; 28:18
pl. gen			ouranwn	4:17, 5:10, 20; 7:21; 8:11; 11:12; 13:11, 24, 31, 45, 47, 52; 16:19, 18:1, 3, 4 ; 20:1; 22:2; 23:13; 24:31, 36; 25:1
pl. dat			ouranoij	5:45; 10:32, 33; 16:17, 19¹, 19²; 18:10¹, 10² ; 14, 18

11. Israh1

Num. & Case	Sacral Nomen Sacrum	Matthew Citation
Indeclinable	i8h818	2:6, 20, 21; 8:10, 9:33, 10:6, 23; 15:24; 19:28, 24:15; 27:9, 42
Indeclinable	i8s818	15:31

12. Daueid

Num. & Case	Sacral nomen sacrum	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
Indeclinable	d8a8d8		1:1, 6 ¹ , 17 ¹ , 17 ² , 20; 9:27; 12:3, 23; 15:22; 20:30, 31; 21:9, 15; 22:42, 43, 45
Indeclinable		daueid	1:6 ²

13. Ierousalhm

Num. & Case	Sacral Nomen Sacrum	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. voc	i8l8h8m8		23:37 ¹ , 37 ²
s. nom		ierosoluma	2:1, 3; 3:5; 5:35; 16:21; 20:17, 18; 21:1, 10
pl. gen		ierosolumwn	4:25; 15:1

APPENDIX THIRTEEN: *NOMINA SACRA* IN VATICANUS IN MATTHEW

1. Ihsouj

Num. & Case	Sacral nomen sacrum	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	i8s8		1:16; 3:13, 15, 16; 4:1, 7, 10, 17; 7:28; 8:4, 10, 13, 14, 18, 20, 22; 9:2, 4, 9, 15, 19, 22, 23, 28, 30, 35; 10:5; 11:1, 4, 7, 25; 12:1, 15; 13:1, 34, 53, 57; 14:13, 16, 27, 31; 15:21, 28, 29, 32, 34; 16:6, 8, 13, 17, 21, 24; 17:1, 7, 9, 17, 18, 22, 25, 26; 18:22; 19:1, 14, 18, 21, 23, 26, 28; 20:17, 22, 25, 30, 32, 34; 21:1, 6, 11, 12, 16, 21, 24, 31, 42; 22:1, 18, 29, 41; 23:1; 24:1, 4; 26:1, 10, 19, 26, 31, 34, 36, 50, 52, 55, 63, 64; 27:11 ¹ , 11 ² , 37, 46, 50; 28:9, 10, 16, 18
s. gen	i8u8		1:1, 18; 2:1; 8:34; 9:10, 27; 14:1, 12; 15:1; 17:4, 19; 18:1; 21:27; 26:6, 17, 49, 59, 69, 71, 75; 27:1, 55, 57, 58
s. acu	i8n8		1:25; 14:29; 17:8; 26:4, 50, 56, 57; 27:17, 20, 22, 26, 27, 54; 28:5
s. acu		Ihsoun	1:21

2. Xristoj

Num. & Case	Sacral nomen sacrum	Matthew Citation
s. nom	x8s8	1:16; 2:4; 16:16, 20, 21; 23:10, 24:5, 23; 26:63
s. gen	x8u8	1:1, 17, 18; 11:2; 22:42
s. acu	x8n8	27:17; 22
s. voc	x8e8	26:68

3. Kurioj

Num. & Case	Sacral nomen sacrum	Nonsacral Full Word	Nonsacral nomen sacrum	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	k8s8				21:3; 22:44; 24:42; 27:10
s. gen	k8u8				1:20, 22, 24; 2:13, 15, 19; 3:3; 9:38; 21:9, 42; 23:39; 28:2
s. dat	k8w8				5:33; 22:44
s. acu	k8n8				4:7, 10; 22:37, 43, 45
s. voc	k8e8				7:21 ¹ , 21 ² , 22 ¹ , 22 ² ; 8:2, 6, 8, 21, 25; 9:28; 11:25; 14:28, 30; 15:22, 25, 27; 16:22; 17:4, 15; 18:21; 20:30, 31, 33; 25:11 ¹ , 11 ² , 24, 37, 44; 26:22
s. nom		kurioj			10:25; 18:27, 32, 34
s. gen		kuriou			25:23
s. dat		kuriw			18:31
pl. dat		kurioij			6:24
s. nom			k8s8		18:25; 21:40; 24:45, 46, 48, 50; 25:19, 21, 23, 26
s. gen			k8u8		25:18, 21
s. acu			k8n8		10:24
s. voc			k8e8		13:27; 21:29; 25:20, 22; 27:63
s. nom				kurioj	12:8; 20:8

4. Qeoj

Num. & Case	Sacral nomen sacrum	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	q8s8		1:23; 3:9; 6:8, 30; 15:4; 19:6; 22:32 ¹ , 32 ² , 32 ³ , 32 ⁴
s. gen	q8u8		3:16; 4:3, 4, 6; 5:9, 34; 8:29; 12:4, 28 ¹ , 28 ² ; 14:33; 15:3, 6; 16:16, 23; 19:24; 21:31, 43; 22:16, 22:21, 29, 31; 23:22; 26:61, 63 ¹ , 63 ² ; 27:40, 43, 54
s. dat	q8w8		6:24; 19:26; 22:21; 27:43
s. acu	q8n8		4:7, 10; 5:8; 9:8; 15:31; 22:37
s. voc		qee	27:46 ¹ , 46 ²

5. pneuma

Num. & Case	Sacral nomen sacrum	Nonsacral Full Word	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom/acu	p8n8a8			3:16; 27:50
s. gen	p8n8s8			1:18, 20; 4:1
s. dat	p8n8i8			3:11; 22:43
s. nom		pneuma		12:43
pl. acu		pneumata		8:16; 12:45
pl. gen		pneumatwn		10:1
s. nom/acu			pneuma	10:20; 12:18; 26:41
s. gen			pneumatoj	12:31, 32; 28:19
s. dat			pneumati	5:3; 12:28

6. anqrwpoj

Num. & Case	Nonsacral Full Word	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	anqrwpoj		4:4; 7:9; 8:9; 11:19; 12:10, 11, 12, 35 ¹ , 35 ² ; 13:28, 31, 44; 16:26 ¹ , 26 ² ; 17:14; 19:5, 6; 21:28, 33; 25:14, 24; 26:24; 27:57
s. gen	anqrwpou		10:36; 12:43, 45; 19:10
s. dat	anqrwpw		12:13; 13:24, 52; 18:7, 12, 23; 20:1; 22:2; 26:24
s. acu	anqrwpon		9:9; 10:35; 11:8; 15:11 ¹ , 11 ² , 18, 20 ¹ , 20 ² ; 22:11; 27:32
pl. nom	anqrwpoi		7:12; 8:27; 12:36; 16:13
pl. gen	anqrwpwn		4:19; 5:13, 16; 6:1, 2; 10:17, 32, 33; 15:9; 16:23; 17:22; 19:12; 21:25, 26; 22:16; 23:4, 7, 13
pl. dat	anqrwpoi j		6:5, 14, 15, 16, 18; 12:31; 19:26; 23:5, 28
pl. acu	anqrwpou j		5:19; 13:25
s. gen		anqrwpo u	8:20; 9:6; 10:23; 11:19; 12:8, 32, 40; 13:37, 41; 16:13, 27, 28; 17:9, 12, 22; 19:28; 20:18, 28; 24:27, 30 ¹ , 30 ² , 37, 39, 44; 25:31; 26:2, 24 ¹ , 24 ² , 45, 64
s. acu		anqrwpo n	26:72, 74

7. pathr

Num. & Case	Sacral Nomina Sacra	Nonsacral Full Word	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. gen	p8r8s8			10:32
s. nom		pathr		10:21
s. gen		patroj		2:22; 4:21; 10:35; 21:31
s. dat		patri		15:5
s. acu		patera		3:9; 4:22; 8:21; 10:37; 15:4 ¹ , 4 ² , 6; 19:5, 19, 29; 23:9
pl. gen		paterwn		23:30, 32
s. nom			pathr	5:48; 6:4, 6, 8, 14, 15, 18, 26, 32; 7:11; 11:26, 27; 15:13; 16:17; 18:35; 23:9; 24:36
s. gen			patroj	5:45; 7:21; 10:20, 29, 33; 11:27; 12:50; 13:43; 16:27; 18:10, 14, 19; 20:23; 25:34; 26:29; 28:19
s. dat			patri	6:1, 6, 18
s. acu			patera	5:16; 11:27; 26:53
s. voc			pater	6:9; 11:25; 26:39, 42

8. uioj

Num. & Case	Nonsacral Full Word	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	uioj		1:20; 7:9
g. gen	uiou		23:35
s. dat	uiw		22:2
s. acu	uion		17:15; 21:5, 37 ¹ , 37 ² , 38; 23:15
pl. nom	uioi		5:9, 45; 8:12; 9:15; 12:27; 13:38 ¹ , 38 ² ; 17:26; 20:21; 23:31
pl. gen	uiwn		17:25, 20:20 ¹ , 20 ² ; 27:9, 56
pl. acu	uiouj		26:37
s. nom		uioj	3:17; 4:3, 6; 8:20; 9:6, 27; 10:23; 11:19, 27 ¹ , 27 ² ; 12:8, 23, 40; 13:37, 41, 55; 14:33; 15:22; 16:16, 27; 17:5, 9, 12, 22; 19:28; 20:18, 28, 30, 31; 22:42, 45; 24:36, 44; 25:31; 26:2, 24 ¹ , 24 ² , 45, 63; 27:40, 43, 54
s. gen		uiou	1:1 ¹ , 1 ² ; 12:32; 24:27, 30, 37, 39; 28:19
s. dat		uiw	21:9, 15
s. acu		uion	1:21, 23, 25; 2:15; 11:27; 16:13, 28; 24:30; 26:64
s. voc		uie	8:29

9. mhthr

Num. & Case	Nonsacral Full Word	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	mhthr		20:20; 27:56 ¹ , 56 ²
s. gen	mhtroj		10:35; 14:8; 19:12
s. dat	mhtri		14:11; 15:5
s. acu	mhtera		10:37; 15:4 ¹ , 4 ² , 19:5, 19, 29
s. nom		mhthr	12:46, 48, 49, 50; 13:55
s. gen		mhtroj	1:18; 2:11
s. acu		mhtera	2:13, 14, 20, 21

10. ouranoj

Num. & Case	Nonsacral Full Word	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. gen	ouranou		6:26; 8:20; 13:32; 24:29
s. nom		ouranoj	5:18; 24:35
s. nom		ouranioj	5:48; 6:14, 26, 32; 15:13; 18:35; 23:9
s. gen		ouranou	11:23, 25; 16:1, 3; 21:25 ¹ , 25 ² ; 24:30; 26:64; 28:2
s. dat		ouranw	5:34; 6:10, 20; 18:10, 18 ¹ , 18 ² ; 22:30; 23:22; 24:30; 28:18
s. acu		ouranon	14:19
pl. gen		ouranwn	3:2, 17; 4:17; 5:3, 10, 19 ¹ , 19 ² , 20; 7:21; 8:11; 10:7; 11:11, 12; 13:11, 24, 31, 33, 44, 45, 47, 52; 16:19, 18:1, 3, 4, 23; 19:12, 14; 23; 20:1; 22:2; 23:13; 24:29, 31, 36; 25:1
pl. dat		ouranoij	5:12, 16, 45; 6:1, 9; 7:11, 21; 10:32, 33; 12:50; 16:17, 19 ¹ , 19 ² ; 18:10, 14, 19; 19:21

11. Israhl

Num. & Case	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
Indeclinable	israhl	2:6, 20, 21, 8:10, 9:33, 10:6, 23; 15:24, 31; 19:28, 27:9, 42

12. Daueid

Num. & Case	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
Indeclinable	daueid	1:1, 6 ¹ , 6 ² , 17 ¹ , 17 ² , 20; 9:27; 12:3, 23; 15:22; 20:30, 31; 21:9, 15; 22:42, 43, 45

13. Ierousalhm

Num. & Case	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	ierosoluma	2:1, 3; 3:5; 5:35; 16:21; 20:17, 18; 21:1, 10
s. voc	ierousalhm	23:37 ¹ , 37 ²
pl. gen	ierosolumwn	4:25; 15:1

APPENDIX FOURTEEN: *NOMINA SACRA* IN EPHRAEMI IN MATTHEW

1. Ihsouj

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Matthew Citation
s. nom	i8s8	1:16; 3:13, 15, 16; 4:1, 7, 10, 17, 23; 7:28; 8:4, 7, 10, 13, 14, 18, 20, 22, 32; 9:1, 2, 4, 9, 12, 15, 19, 22, 23, 28, 30, 35, 36; 10:5; 11:1, 4, 7, 20, 25; 12:1, 9, 15, 25; 13:1, 34, 36, 51, 52, 53, 57; 14:13, 14, 16, 27, 31; 15:16, 21, 28, 29, 32, 34; 16:6, 8, 13, 15, 17, 20, 21, 24; 17:1, 7, 9, 11, 17, 18, 20, 22, 25, 26; 19:1, 14, 18, 21, 23, 26, 28; 20:17, 22, 25, 30, 32, 34; 21:1, 6, 11, 12, 16, 21, 24, 31, 42; 22:1, 18; 24:1, 2, 4; 26:26, 31, 34, 36, 50, 52, 55, 63, 64; 27:50; 28:9, 10
s. gen	i8u8	1:18; 2:1; 8:34; 9:10, 27; 14:1, 12; 15:1, 30; 17:4, 19; 21:27; 26:49, 51, 59, 69, 71, 75; 27:1, 55, 57, 58
s. acu	i8n8	1:21, 25; 14:29; 17:8; 26:50, 57; 27:54; 28:5

2. Xristoj

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Matthew Citation
s. nom	x8s8	1:16; 2:4; 16:16, 20; 24:5; 26:63
s. gen	x8u8	1:17, 18; 11:2
s. voc	x8e8	26:68

3. Kurioj

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Nonsacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	k8s8		12:8; 20:8; 21:3; 27:10; 28:6
s. gen	k8u8		1:20, 22, 24; 2:13, 15, 19; 3:3; 9:38; 21:9, 42; 23:39; 28:2
s. acu	k8n8		4:7, 10
s. voc	k8e8		7:21 ¹ , 21 ² , 7:22 ¹ , 22 ² ; 8:2, 6, 8, 21, 25; 9:28; 11:25; 13:51; 14:28, 30; 15:22, 25, 27; 16:22; 17:4, 15; 20:30, 31, 33; 25:11 ¹ , 11 ² , 24; 26:22
s. nom		kurioj	10:25; 18:32, 34, 21:40, 24:46, 48, 50; 25:19, 21, 23, 26
s. gen		kuriou	25:18, 21, 23
s. dat		kuriw	18:31
s. acu		kurion	10:24
s. voc		kurie	13:27; 21:30; 25:20, 22; 27:63

4. Qeoj

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Matthew Citation
s. nom	q8s8	1:23; 3:9; 15:4; 19:6, 17
s. gen	q8u8	3:16; 4:3, 4, 6; 5:9; 8:29; 12:4, 28 ¹ , 28 ² ; 13:49; 14:33; 15:3, 6; 16:16, 23; 19:24; 21:12, 31, 43; 22:16; 23:22; 26:63 ¹ , 63 ² ; 27:54
s. dat	q8w8	19:26
s. acu	q8n8	4:7, 10; 5:8; 9:8; 15:31

5. pneuma

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Nonsacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom/acu	p8n8a8		3:16; 10:20; 12:18; 26:41; 27:50
s. gen	p8n8s8		1:18, 20; 4:1; 12:31, 32
s. dat	p8n8i8		3:11; 5:3; 12:28
s. nom		pneuma	12:43
pl. gen		pneumatwn	10:1
pl. acu		pneumata	8:16; 12:45

6. anqrwpoj

Num. & Case	Sacral nomen sacrum	Nonsacral nomen sacrum	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. gen	a8n8o8u8			8:20; 9:6; 11:19; 12:8, 32, 40; 13:37, 41; 16:13, 27, 28; 17:9, 12, 22; 19:28; 20:18, 28; 26:24 ¹ , 24 ² , 45, 64
s. acu	a8n8o8n8			26:72, 74
s. nom		a8n8o8s8		4:4; 7:9; 8:9; 11:19; 12:10, 11, 12, 35 ¹ , 35 ² ; 13:28, 31, 44; 16:26 ¹ , 26 ² ; 17:14; 19:5, 6; 21:28, 33; 25:14, 24; 26:24; 27:57
s. gen		a8n8o8u8		12:43, 45; 19:10
s. dat		a8n8w8		12:13; 13:24, 45, 52; 19:3; 20:1; 26:24
s. acu		a8n8o8n8		9:9, 32; 10:35; 11:8; 15:11 ¹ , 11 ² , 18, 20 ¹ , 20 ² ; 22:11
pl. nom		a8n8o8i8		7:12; 8:27; 10:36; 12:36; 16:13
pl. gen		a8n8w8n8		4:19; 5:13; 10:17, 32, 33; 15:9; 16:23; 17:22; 19:12; 21:25, 26; 22:16
pl. dat		a8n8o8i8s8		9:8; 12:31 ¹ , 31 ² ; 19:26; 23:28
pl. acu		a8n8o8u8s8		13:25
s. gen			anqrwpou	10:23

7. pathr

Num. & Case	Sacral nomen sacrum	Nonsacral nomen sacrum	Matthew Citation
s. nom	p8h8r8		7:11; 11:26, 27 ¹ ; 15:13; 16:17; 18:35
s. gen	p8r8s8		7:21; 10:20, 29, 32, 33; 11:27; 12:50; 13:43; 16:27; 20:23; 26:29
s. acu	p8r8a8		11:27; 26:53
s. voc	p8e8r8		11:25; 26:39, 42
s. nom		p8h8r8	10:21
s. gen		p8r8s8	2:22; 4:21; 10:35; 21:31
s. dat		p8r8i8	15:5
s. acu		p8r8a8	3:9; 4:22; 8:21; 10:37; 15:4 ¹ , 4 ² , 6; 19:5, 19, 29
pl. gen		p8r8w8n8	23:30, 32

8. uioj

Num. & Case	Sacral nomen sacrum	Nonsacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	u8s8		3:17; 4:3, 6; 8:20; 9:6; 10:23; 11:19, 27 ¹ , 27 ² ; 12:8, 23, 40; 13:37, 41, 55; 14:33; 16:16, 27; 17:5, 9, 12, 22; 19:28; 20:18, 28; 26:24 ¹ , 24 ² , 45, 63; 27:54
s. gen	u8u8		12:32
s. dat	u8w8		21:9, 15
s. acu	u8n8		1:21, 23, 25; 2:15; 11:27; 16:13, 28; 26:64
s. voc	u8e8		8:29; 9:27; 15:22; 20:30, 31
s. nom		uioj	1:20; 7:9
s. gen		uiou	23:35
s. acu		uion	10:37; 17:15; 21:5, 37 ¹ , 37 ² , 38
pl. nom		uioi	5:9; 8:12; 9:15; 12:27; 13:38 ¹ , 38 ² ; 20:21; 23:31
pl. gen		uiwn	17:25, 20:20 ¹ , 20 ² ; 27:9, 56
pl. acu		uiouj	26:37

9. mhthr

Num. & Case	Sacral nomen sacrum	Nonsacral nomen sacrum	Matthew Citation
s. nom	m8h8r8		12:46, 47, 48, 49, 50; 13:55
s. gen	m8r8s8		1:18; 2:11
s. acu	m8r8a8		2:13, 14, 20, 21
s. nom		m8h8r8	20:20; 27:56 ¹ , 56 ²
s. gen		m8r8s8	10:35; 14:8; 19:12
s. dat		m8r8i8	14:11; 15:5
s. acu		m8r8a8	10:37; 15:4 ¹ , 6; 19:5, 19, 29

10. ouranoj

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Nonsacral Full Word	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
pl. gen	o8u8n8w8n8			16:19
pl. dat	o8u8n8o8i8s8			7:21
s. acu		ouranon		14:19
s. gen		ouranou		8:20; 13:32
s. gen			ouranou	11:23, 25; 16:1, 3; 21:25 ¹ , 25 ² ; 26:64; 28:2
s. dat			ouranw	23:22
pl. gen			ouranwn	3:2, 17; 4:17; 5:3, 10; 7:21 ¹ ; 8:11; 10:7; 11:11, 12; 13:11, 24, 31, 33, 44, 45, 47, 52; 19:12, 14; 23; 20:1; 25:1
pl. dat			ouranoi j	5:12; 7:11; 10:32, 33; 12:50; 16:17, 19 ¹ , 19 ² ; 19:21

11. Israh1

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Matthew Citation
Indeclinable	i8h8l8	2:6, 20, 21; 8:10, 9:33, 10:6, 23; 15:24, 31; 19:28; 27:9

12. Daueid

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Matthew Citation
Indeclinable	d8a8d8	1:6 ¹ , 6 ² , 17 ¹ , 17 ² , 20; 9:27; 12:3, 23; 15:22; 20:30, 31; 21:9, 15

13. Ierousalhm

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. voc/ pl. acu	i8l8h8m8		2:1; 23:37 ¹ , 37 ²
s. nom		ierosoluma	2:3; 3:5; 16:21; 20:17, 18; 21:1, 10
pl. gen		ierosolumwn	4:25; 15:1

APPENDIX FIFTEEN: *NOMINA SACRA* IN CODEX D IN MATTHEW

1. Ihsouj

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Matthew Citation
s. nom	i8h8s8	4:1, 4, 7, 10, 17, 23; 9:2, 4, 9, 15, 19, 23, 28, 30, 35; 10:5; 11:1, 4, 7, 25; 12:1, 15; 13:1, 34, 53, 57; 14:13, 31; 15:21, 29, 32, 34; 16:6, 8, 13, 17, 20, 21, 24; 17:1, 2, 7, 9, 17, 18, 22, 25, 26; 18:2, 22; 19:1, 14, 18, 21, 23, 26, 28; 20:17, 22, 23, 25, 30, 32, 34; 21:1, 6, 11, 12, 16, 21, 24, 31, 42; 22:1, 18, 20, 29, 37, 41; 23:1; 24:1, 4; 26:1, 10, 19, 26, 31, 34, 36, 50, 52, 55, 63, 64; 27:37, 46, 50; 28:9, 10, 16, 18
s. gen	i8h8u8	2:1; 9:10, 27; 11:2; 14:1, 12; 17:4, 19; 18:1; 21:27; 26:6, 17, 49, 51, 59, 69, 71, 75; 27:1, 55, 57, 58
s. acu	i8h8n8	1:21, 25; 14:29; 17:8; 26:4, 50, 57; 27:17, 20, 22, 26, 27, 54; 28:5

2. Xristoj

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Matthew Citation
s. nom	x8r8s8	2:4; 16:16, 20; 23:10, 24:5, 23; 26:63
s. gen	x8r8u8	22:42
s. acu	x8r8n8	27:17; 22
s. voc	x8r8e8	26:68

3. kurioj

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Nonsacral Full Word	Nonsacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Matthew Citation
s. nom	k8s8			12:8; 20:8; 21:3; 22:44; 24:42; 28:6
s. gen	k8u8			1:22, 24; 2:13, 15, 17, 19; 3:3; 21:9, 42; 28:2
s. dat	k8w8			5:33; 22:44
s. acu	k8n8			4:7, 10; 9:38; 22:37, 43, 45
s. voc	k8e8			9:28; 11:25; 14:28, 30; 15:22, 25, 27; 16:22; 17:4, 15; 18:21; 20:31, 33; 25:11 ¹ , 11 ² , 24, 37, 44; 26:22
s. nom		kurie		13:27
s. nom			k8s8	10:25; 18:25, 27, 32, 34, 21:40, 24:45, 46, 48, 50; 25:19, 21, 23, 26
s. gen			k8u8	25:18, 21, 23
s. dat			k8w8	18:31
s. acu			k8n8	10:24
s. voc			k8e8	21:30; 25:20, 22; 27:63

4. qeoj

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Matthew Citation
s. nom	q8s8	1:23; 15:4; 19:6; 22:32 ¹ , 32 ² , 32 ³ , 32 ⁴
s. gen	q8u8	4:3, 4, 6 ¹ , 6 ² ; 5:9, 34; 12:4, 28 ¹ , 28 ² ; 14:33; 15:3, 6; 16:16, 23; 19:24; 21:12, 31, 43; 22:16, 22:21, 29, 31; 23:22, 39; 26:61, 63 ¹ , 63 ² ; 27:40, 43, 54
s. dat	q8w8	19:26; 22:21
s. acu	q8n8	4:7, 10; 5:8; 9:8; 15:31; 22:37; 27:43
s. voc	q8e8	27:46 ¹ , 46 ²

5. pneuma

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Nonsacral Full Word	Nonsacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Matthew Citation
s. nom/acu	p8n8a8			10:20; 12:18; 26:41; 27:50
s. gen	p8n8s8			1:20; 4:1; 12:31, 32; 28:19
s. dat	p8n8i8			5:3; 12:28; 22:43, 45
pl. gen		pneumatwn		10:1
pl. acu		pneumata		12:45
s. nom			p8n8a8	12:43

6. anqrwpoj

Num. & Case	Nonsacral Full Word	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	anqrwpoj		4:4; 11:19; 12:10, 11, 12, 35 ¹ , 35 ² ; 13:28, 31; 16:26 ¹ , 26 ² ; 17:14; 19:5, 6; 21:28, 33; 25:14, 24; 26:24; 27:57
s. gen	anqrwpou		10:36; 12:43, 45
s. dat	anqrwpw		12:13; 13:24, 45, 52; 18:7, 12, 23; 19:3; 20:1; 22:2; 26:24
s. acu	anqrwpon		9:9, 32; 11:8; 15:11 ¹ , 11 ² , 18, 20 ¹ , 20 ² ; 22:11; 27:32
pl. nom	anqrwpoi		12:36; 16:13
pl. gen	anqrwpwn		4:19; 5:13, 16; 6:1, 2; 10:17, 32, 33; 15:9; 16:23; 17:22; 19:12; 21:25, 26; 22:16; 23:4, 7, 13
pl. dat	anqrwpoij		6:5, 14, 15, 16, 18; 9:8; 12:31 ¹ , 31 ² ; 19:26; 23:5, 28
pl. acu	anqrwpouj		5:19; 13:25
s. gen		anqrwpo u	9:6; 10:23; 11:19; 12:8, 32, 40; 13:37, 41; 16:13, 27, 28; 17:9, 13, 22; 18:11; 19:28; 20:18, 28; 24:27, 30 ¹ , 30 ² , 37, 39, 44; 25:31; 26:2, 24 ¹ , 24 ² , 45, 64
s. acu		anqrwpo n	26:72, 74

7. pathr

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Nonsacral Full Word	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. gen	p8r8s8			11:27; 13:43; 18:10; 26:29
s. nom		pathr		10:21
s. gen		patroj		2:22; 4:21; 10:35; 21:31
s. dat		patri		15:5
s. acu		patera		4:22; 10:37; 15:4 ¹ , 4 ² , 6; 19:5, 19; 23:9
pl. gen		paterwn		23:30, 32
s. nom			pathr	5:48; 6:4, 6, 8, 14, 15, 18; 11:26, 27; 15:13; 16:17; 18:35; 23:9; 24:36; 25:41
s. gen			patroj	5:45; 10:20, 29, 32, 33; 12:50; 16:27; 18:14, 19; 20:23; 25:34; 28:19
s. dat			patri	6:1, 6, 18
s. acu			patera	5:16; 11:27; 26:53
s. voc			pater	6:9; 11:25; 26:39, 42

8. uioj

Num. & Case	Nonsacral Full Word	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. gen	uiou		23:35
s. dat	uiw		22:2
s. acu	uion		10:35; 17:15; 21:5, 37 ¹ , 37 ² , 38; 23:15
pl. nom	uioi		5:9, 45; 9:15; 12:27; 13:38 ¹ , 38 ² ; 17:26; 20:21; 23:31
pl. gen	uiwn		17:25, 20:20 ¹ , 20 ² ; 27:56
pl. acu	uiouj		26:37
s. nom		uioj	3:17; 4:3, 6; 9:6; 10:23; 11:19, 27 ¹ , 27 ² ; 12:8, 23, 40; 13:37, 41, 55; 14:33; 15:22; 16:16, 27; 17:5, 9, 13, 22; 18:11; 19:28; 20:18, 28; 22:42, 45; 24:36, 44; 25:31; 26:2, 24 ¹ , 24 ² , 45, 63; 27:40, 43, 54
s. gen		uiou	12:32; 24:27, 30, 37, 39; 28:19
s. dat		uiw	21:9, 15
s. acu		uion	1:21, 23, 25; 2:15; 11:27; 16:13, 28; 24:30; 26:64
s. voc		uie	9:27; 20:30, 31

9. mhthr

Num. & Case	Nonsacral Full Word	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	mhthr		20:20; 27:56 ¹ , 56 ²
s. gen	mhtroj		10:35; 14:8; 19:12
s. dat	mhtri		14:11; 15:5
s. acu	mhtera		10:37; 15:4 ¹ , 4 ² ; 19:5, 19, 29
s. nom		mhthr	12:46, 47, 48, 49, 50; 13:55
s. gen		mhtroj	2:11
s. acu		mhtera	2:13, 14, 20, 21

10. ouranoj

Num. & Case	Nonsacral Full Word	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	ouranoj		16:2
s. gen	ouranou		13:32; 24:29
s. nom		ouranoj	5:18; 24:35
s. nom		ouranioj	6:14; 15:13; 18:35
s. gen		ouranou	3:16; 11:23, 25; 16:1, 3; 21:25 ¹ , 25 ² ; 24:30; 26:64; 28:2
s. dat		ouranw	5:12, 34; 6:10, 20; 22:30; 23:22
s. acu		ouranon	14:19
pl. gen		ouranwn	3:2, 17; 4:17; 5:3, 10, 19; 10:7; 11:11, 12; 13:11, 24, 31, 33, 44, 45, 47, 52; 16:19, 18:1, 3, 4, 23; 19:12, 14; 23; 20:1; 22:2; 23:13; 24:29, 31, 36; 25:1
pl. dat		ouranoi	5:16, 45, 48; 6:1, 9; 10:32, 33; 12:50; 16:17, 19 ¹ , 19 ² ; 18:10 ¹ , 10 ² ; 14, 18, 19; 19:21; 23:9; 24:30; 28:18

11. Israh1

Num. & Case	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
Indeclinable	israh1	2:6, 20, 21; 9:33, 10:6, 23, 15:24, 31; 19:28, 27:42

12. Daueid

Num. & Case	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
Indeclinable	daueid	9:27; 12:3, 23; 15:22; 20:30, 31; 21:9, 15; 22:42, 43, 45

13. Ierousalhm

Num. & Case	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	ierosoluma	2:1, 3; 3:5; 5:35; 16:21; 20:17, 18; 21:1, 10
s. voc	ierousalhm	23:37 ¹ , 37 ²
pl. gen	ierosolumwn	4:25; 15:1

APPENDIX SIXTEEN: *NOMINA SACRA* IN WASHINGTONIANUS IN MATTHEW

1. Ihsouj

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Matthew Citation
s. nom	i8s8	1:16; 3:13, 15, 16; 4:1, 7, 10, 12, 17, 23; 7:28; 8:3, 4, 7, 10, 13, 14, 18, 20, 22; 9:2, 4, 9, 12, 15, 19, 22, 23, 28, 30, 35; 10:5; 11:1, 4, 7, 20, 25; 12:1, 15, 25; 13:1, 34, 36, 51, 53, 57; 14:13, 14, 16, 27, 31; 15:16, 21, 28, 29, 32, 34; 16:6, 8, 13, 17, 20, 21, 24; 17:1, 7, 9, 17, 18, 20, 22, 25 ¹ , 25 ² , 26; 18:2, 22; 19:1, 14, 18, 21, 23, 26, 28; 20:17, 22, 25, 30, 32, 34; 21:1, 6, 11, 12, 16, 21, 24, 31, 42; 22:1, 18, 29, 37, 41; 23:1; 24:1, 2, 4; 26:1, 10, 19, 26, 31, 34, 36, 50, 52, 55, 63, 64; 27:11 ¹ , 11 ² , 37, 46, 50; 28:9, 10, 16, 18
s. gen	i8u8	1:1, 18; 2:1; 8:29, 34; 9:10, 27; 14:1, 12; 15:1, 30; 17:4, 19; 18:1; 21:27; 26:6, 17, 49, 51, 59, 69, 71, 75; 27:1, 55, 57, 58
s. acu	i8n8	1:21, 25; 14:29; 17:8; 26:4, 50, 57; 27:17, 20, 22, 26, 27, 54; 28:5

2. Xristoj

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Matthew Citation
s. nom	x8s8	1:16; 2:4; 16:16, 20; 23:10, 24:5, 23; 26:63
s. gen	x8u8	1:1, 17; 11:2; 22:42
s. acu	x8n8	27:17; 22
s. voc	x8e8	26:68

3. kurioj

Num. &	Sacral	Nonsacral	Nonsacral	Matthew Citation

Case	<i>nomen sacrum</i>	Full Word	<i>nomen sacrum</i>	
s. nom	k8s8			12:8; 20:8; 21:3; 22:44; 24:42; 27:10; 28:6
s. gen	k8u8			1:20, 22, 24; 2:13, 15, 19; 3:3; 9:38; 21:9, 42; 23:39; 28:2
s. dat	k8w8			5:33; 22:44
s. acu	k8n8			4:7, 10; 22:37, 43, 45
s. voc	k8e8			7:21 ¹ , 21 ² , 7:22 ¹ , 22 ² ; 8:2, 6, 8, 21, 25; 9:28; 11:25; 13:51; 14:28, 30; 15:22, 25, 27; 16:22; 17:4, 15; 18:21; 20:30, 31, 33; 25:11 ¹ , 11 ² , 24, 37, 44; 26:22
s. nom		kurioj		10:25; 18:32
pl. dat		kurioij		6:24
s. nom			k8s8	18:25, 27, 34, 21:40, 24:45, 46, 48, 50; 25:19, 21, 23, 26
s. gen			k8u8	25:18, 21, 23
s. dat			k8w8	18:31
s. acu			k8n8	10:24
s. voc			k8e8	13:27; 18:26; 21:30; 25:20, 22; 27:63

4. Qeoj

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	q8s8		1:23; 3:9; 6:30; 15:4; 19:6, 17; 22:32 ¹ , 32 ² , 32 ³ , 32 ⁴
s. gen	q8u8		3:16; 4:3, 4, 6; 5:9, 34; 6:33; 8:29; 12:4, 28 ¹ , 28 ² ; 14:33; 15:3, 6; 16:16, 23; 19:24; 21:12, 31, 43; 22:16, 22:21, 29, 30, 31; 23:22; 26:61, 63 ¹ , 63 ² ; 27:40, 43, 54
s. dat	q8w8		6:24; 19:26; 22:21
s. acu	q8n8		4:7, 10; 5:8; 9:8; 15:31; 22:37; 27:43
s. voc		qe ^e	27:46 ¹
s. voc		qee	27:46 ²

5. pneuma

Num. &	Sacral	Nonsacral	Nonsacral	Matthew Citation
--------	--------	-----------	-----------	------------------

Case	<i>nomen sacrum</i>	Full Word	<i>nomen sacrum</i>	
s. nom/acu	p8n8a8			3:16; 10:20; 12:18; 26:41; 27:50
s. gen	p8n8s8			1:18, 20; 4:1; 12:31, 32; 28:19
s. dat	p8n8i8			3:11; 5:3; 12:28; 22:43
pl. gen		pneumatwn		10:1
s. nom			p8n8a8	12:43
pl. acu			p8n8t8a8	8:16; 12:45

6. anqrwpoj

Num. & Case	Sacral nomen sacrum	Nonsacral Full Word	Nonsacral nomen sacrum	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	a8n8o 8s8				8:27
s. gen	a8n8o 8u8				9:6; 10:23; 11:19; 12:8, 32; 16:13, 27, 28; 17:9, 12, 22; 19:28; 20:18; 24:30 ¹ , 30 ² , 37, 44; 26:2, 24 ¹ , 24 ² , 45, 64
s. acu	a8n8o 8n8				26:74
s. nom		anqrwpoj			4:4; 12:11; 13:31, 44; 16:26; 25:14, 24; 26:24
s. gen		anqrwpou			12:43; 21:26
s. dat		anqrwpw			13:24, 52; 18:23
s. acu		anqrwpon			10:35; 15:20
pl. nom		anqrwpoi			8:27; 12:36; 16:13
pl. gen		anqrwpwn			4:19; 6:1, 2; 15:9; 16:23; 22:16; 23:7
pl. dat		anqrwpoi j			6:5, 14, 15, 16, 18; 12:31; 23:5, 28
pl. acu		anqrwpou j			5:19
s. nom			a8n8o 8s8		7:9; 8:9; 11:19; 12:10, 12, 35 ¹ , 35 ² ; 13:28; 16:26; 17:14; 19:5, 6; 21:28, 33; 25:26; 27:57
s. gen			a8n8o 8u8		10:36; 12:45; 19:10
s. dat			a8n8w 8		12:13; 13:45; 18:7, 12; 19:3; 20:1; 22:2; 26:24
s. acu			a8n8o 8n8		9:9, 32; 11:8; 15:11 ¹ , 11 ² , 20; 22:11; 27:32
pl. nom			a8n8o 8i8		7:12
pl. gen			a8n8w 8n8		5:13, 16; 10:17, 32, 33; 17:22; 19:12; 21:25; 23:4, 13
pl. dat			a8n8o 8i8s8		9:8; 12:31; 19:26
pl. acu			a8n8o 8u8s8		13:25
s. gen				anqrwpo u	8:20; 12:40; 13:37, 41; 18:11; 20:28; 24:27, 39; 25:31
s. acu				anqrwpo n	26:72

7. pathr

Num. & Case	Sacral nomen sacrum	Nonsacral Full Word	Nonsacral nomen sacrum	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	p8h8r8				5:48; 6:4, 6, 8, 14, 15, 18, 26, 32; 7:11; 11:26, 27; 15:13; 16:17; 18:35; 23:9; 24:36
s. gen	p8r8o8s8				10:29, 32
s. gen	p8r8s8				5:45; 7:21; 10:20, 33; 11:27; 12:50; 13:43; 16:27; 18:10, 14, 19; 20:23; 25:34; 26:29; 28:19
s. dat	p8r8i8				6:1, 6, 18
s. acu	p8r8a8				5:16; 11:27; 26:53
s. gen		patroj			2:22
s. acu		patera			3:9; 19:29
pl. gen		paterwn			23:30, 32
s. nom			p8h8r8		10:21
s. gen			p8r8s8		10:35; 21:31
s. dat			p8r8i8		15:5
s. acu			p8r8a8		8:21; 10:37; 15:4 ¹ , 4 ² , 6; 19:5, 19; 23:9
s. voc				pater	6:9; 11:25; 26:39, 42

8. uioj

Num. & Case	Sacral Full Word	Nonsacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	uioj		3:17; 4:3, 6; 8:20; 9:6, 27; 10:23; 11:19, 27 ¹ , 27 ² ; 12:8, 23, 40; 13:37, 41, 55; 14:33; 15:22; 16:16, 27; 17:5, 9, 12, 22; 18:11; 19:28; 20:18, 28, 30, 31; 22:42, 45; 24:44; 25:31; 26:2, 24 ¹ , 24 ² , 45, 63; 27:40, 43, 54
s. gen	uiou		1:1 ¹ , 1 ² ; 12:32; 24:27, 30, 37, 39; 28:19
s. dat	uiw		21:9, 15
s. acu	uion		1:21, 23, 25; 2:15; 11:27; 16:13, 28; 24:30; 26:64
s. voc	uie		8:29
s. nom		uioj	1:20; 7:9
s. gen		uiou	23:35
s. dat		uiw	22:2
s. acu		uion	10:37; 17:15; 21:5, 37 ¹ , 37 ² , 38; 23:15
pl. nom		uioi	5:9, 45; 8:12; 9:15; 12:27; 13:38 ¹ , 38 ² ; 17:26; 20:21; 23:31
pl. gen		uiwn	17:25, 20:20 ¹ , 20 ² ; 27:9, 56
pl. acu		uiouj	26:37

9. mhthr

Num. & Case	Sacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Nonsacral Full Word	Nonsacral <i>nomen sacrum</i>	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	m8h8r8				12:46, 47, 48, 49, 50; 13:55
s. gen		mhtroj			10:35; 14:8; 19:12
s. dat		mhtri			14:11; 15:5
s. acu		mhtera			10:37; 15:4, 6
s. nom			m8h8r8		20:20; 27:56 ¹ , 56 ²
s. acu			m8r8a8		15:4; 19:5, 19, 29
s. gen				mhtroj	1:18; 2:11
s. acu				mhtera	2:13, 14, 20, 21

10. ouranoj

Num. & Case	Sacral Full Word	Nonsacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	ouranoj		5:18; 16:3; 24:35
s. nom	ouranioj		6:14, 26, 32; 15:13
s. nom	epouranioj		18:35
s. gen	ouranou		3:17; 11:23, 25; 16:1, 3; 21:25 ¹ , 25 ² ; 24:30; 26:64; 28:2
s. dat	ouranw		5:34; 6:10, 20; 18:18 ¹ , 18 ² ; 19:21; 22:30; 23:22; 24:30; 28:18
s. acu	ouranon		14:19
pl. gen	ouranwn		3:2, 4:17, 5:3, 10, 19, 20; 7:21 ¹ , 21 ² ; 8:11; 10:7; 11:11, 12; 13:11, 24, 31, 33, 44, 45, 47, 52; 16:19, 18:1, 3, 4, 23; 19:12, 14; 23; 20:1; 22:2; 23:13; 24:29, 31, 36; 25:1
pl. dat	ouranoij		5:12, 16, 45; 6:1, 9; 7:11, 21; 10:32, 33; 12:50; 16:17, 19 ¹ , 19 ² ; 18:10 ¹ , 10 ² ; 18:14, 19; 23:9
pl. dat	ouranioij		5:48
s. gen		ouranou	6:26; 8:20; 13:32; 24:29

11. Israh1

Num. & Case	Sacral nomen sacrum	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
Indeclinable	i8s8r8l8		27:42
Indeclinable		israh1	2:6, 2:20, 2:21, 8:10, 9:33, 10:6, 10:23, 15:24, 15:31, 19:28, 27:9

12. Daueid

Num. & Case	Sacral nomen sacrum	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
Indeclinable	d8a8d8		12:23
Indeclinable		daueid	1:1, 6 ¹ , 6 ² , 17 ¹ , 17 ² , 20; 9:27; 12:3; 15:22; 20:30, 31; 21:9, 15; 22:42, 43, 45

13. Ierosalhm

Num. & Case	Sacral Full Word	Matthew Citation
s. nom	ierosoluma	2:3; 3:5; 5:35; 16:21; 20:17, 18; 21:1, 10

s. voc	ierousalhm	2:1; 23:37 ¹ , 37 ²
pl. gen	ierosolumwn	4:25; 15:1

APPENDIX SEVENTEEN: ITACISMS IN SINAITICUS IN MATTHEW

1. ai > e

- 1:24; 18:25*; 19:3, 9*; 22:24, 25* #gunaika *rell* | #guneka)
- 2:8 #paidiou *rell* | #pediou)
- 2:13a #paidion kai thn mhtera *rell* | #pedion) | #paida D 565
- 2:13b #apolesai *rell* | #apolese)
- 2:14 #paidion *rell* | #pedion) | #paida D it vg
- 2:20 #paidou *rell* | #pediou)
- 3:1; 23:30; 24:19 #hmeraij *rell* | #hmerej)
- 3:1 #Ioudaiaj *rell* | #Ioudeaj)*
- 3:5 #Ioudaia *rell* | #Idaia L | #Ioudea)*
- 4:6 #enteleitai *rell* | #entelite)
- 5:15 #kaiousin *rell* | #keousin) | #kaiousi C K W f¹ pler
- 5:28 #epiqumhsai *rell* | #epiqumhse) | #epequmhsai L
| #epiqumisai 1071
- 6:1; 23:5 #qeaqhnaï *rell* | #qeaqhne)
- 6:18² #krufaiw)^c B D f¹ NA²⁷ | #krufew)* | #kruptw *rell* | #kriptw D
- 6:22 (estin 157); 11:24; 13:50; 24:3, 21, 27 #estai *rell* | #este)
- 8:22 #qayai *rell* | #qaye)
- 8:23; 12:1; 13:36; 14:15; 19:13; 21:20; 24:1 #maqhtai *rell* | #maqhte)
- 9:10; 21:31, 32 #telwnai *rell* | #telwne)*
- 9:10, 37; 23:1; 26:26* #maqhtaij *rell* | #maqhtej)
- 9:34; 12:28 (demwnia Q) #daimonia *rell* | #demonia)
- 10:3 #Maqqaioj B* D NA²⁷ | #Matqaioj *rell* | #Maqqeoj) | #Matqeoï
L

10:26a #apokalufqhsetai *rell* |#apokalufqhsete)
|#apokaluyqhsetai D

10:26b #gnwsqhsetai *rell* |#gnwsqhsete) |#apokalufqhsetai E
|#om. 1071

10:30 #hriqmhmenei *rell* |#hriqmhmene) |#hrhqmhmenei L
|#hriqmhntai 28 1424 |#aphriqmenei 482 |#hriqmimenei 579

10:41² #dikaiou *rell* |#dikeou)

10:41² (lhyetai M K M U P f^{13} 2 33 28 157 565 579 700 788 1071 1346 1424
|liyitai 28); 19:29 (leyetai M K M S U D W f^{13} 2 69 118 157 565 700
788 1071 1346 1424) |#lhmyetai *rell* |#lhmyete)

11:16 #taij B Z 1 33 892 1424 1582* l184 NA²⁷ |#tej)* |#th D |om. *rell*

11:16 (agora D 047 28 *pc* |om. 118 1071 1582^c); 23:7 #agoraij *rell*
|#agorej)*

11:18 #daimonion *rell* |#demonion)* |#daimoniwn Q |om. *parablepsis*
579

11:19 #edikaiwqh *rell* |#edikewqh) |#edikaiogh L

11:27 #apokaluyai *rell* |#spokaluye)

11:27 #yuxaij *rell* |#yuxej)

12:19 (om. 700 954); 22:40 (om. M); 23:6, 7, 30 #taij *rell* |#tej)*

12:31² #afeqhsetai *rell* |#afeqhsete)

12:37 #dikaiwqhsh *rell* |#dikewqhsh) |#dikaioghsei L
|#dikaiwqhsei 2* 13 28 579 1071 l187

12:41a #Nineuitai B C L W X D Q S 213 443 1574 2145 al. NA²⁷
|#Nineueite) |#Neineuetai D* |#Neineueitai D^D |#Nhneuitai G
|#Nineuitai *rell*

12:41b #anasthsontai *rell* |#anasthsonte) |#anastisontai K
|#anasthsontai 579

12:42; 20:19 (anasthsetai B C^c D M W Q *pler*); 24:7 (egerqhsontai L
|egerqhssetai Q) #egerqhsetai *rell* |#egerqhsete)

12:42 #akousai *rell* |#akouse) |#ina akousei 28 |#ina eidh 1071

12:43 #dierxetai *rell* |#dierxete) |#dianoidrwn 579

13:2 #kaqhsai *rell* |#kaqhsqe) |#kaqhsai S Y* 1071 |#kaqeisqai
2 579 |#kaqisai 1424

13:3 otou #speirein *rell* |oD |#spire) |#speirai D L M S W X Q
S W f^{1 13} 1582 7 28 33 71 659 700 892 1241 1266 1293 1391 Or^{semel}

13:11 #gnwnai *rell* |#gnwne)

13:12 #perisseuqhsetai *rell* |#perisseuqhsete)
|#periseuqhsetai N 1424

13:13,35 #parabolaij *rell* |#parabolej)*

13:17,43;23:28 #dikaioi *rell* |#dikeoi)

13:30a #qeristaij *rell* |#qeristej) |#qerhstaij 1071

13:30b #katakausai *rell* |#katakause)

13:49 #eceleusontai *rell* |#eceleusonte) |#eceleuswntai 579
|#eleusontai 346 1346

14:22 #embnai *rell* |#embhne) |#enbhnai D 28

15:13 #ekrizwqhsetai *rell* |#ekrizwqhsete)

15:14 #pesountai *rell*)^{S1} |#pesounte)* |#empesountai F O W S F 4
262 273 517 565 659 700 1010 1012 1293 1295 1412 1424 1675 *al.* Epiph
|#enpesountai D

15:31 #qaumasai *rell* |#qaumase)

15:32 #apolusai *rell* |#apoluse)

15:33 #xortasai *rell* |#xortase) |#xortasqhnai 1424

15:38 #gunaikwn *rell* |#gunekwn)

18:25 #apodounai *rell* |#apodoune) |#apodouna Y*

18:25 #praghnai *rell* |#praghne)*

18:25 #apodoqhnai *rell* |#apodoqhne) |#apoqhnai D*
|#apodwqhnai 579 1071 |#apodounai 1604

19:3; 22:15; 23:2, 25, 27, 29* #farisaioi *rell* | #fariseoi)
 | #fareisaioi B

19:5 #kollhqhsetai B D E F G H S U V W Q W 078 f^{13} (exc. 124) 2 7 22
 28 157 174 230 565 788 1346 *pler* NA²⁷ | #proskollhqhsete)
 | #proskollhqhsetai *rell* | #kolhqhsetai F

19:5 (gunaikei D W Q | guaiki L | gunaikh 2*); 26:10 (gunaikei D W)
 #gunaiki *rell* | #guneki)

19:5; 20:16; 24:7 (esonta D) #esontai *rell* | #esonte)

19:7; 20:23 #dounai *rell* | #doune)

19:7 #apolusai *rell* | #apoluse)

19:10 #gunaikoj *rell* | #gunekoj)

19:13 #paidia *rell* | #pedia)

19:25 #dunatai *rell* | #dunate)

19:25 #swqhnai *rell* | #swqhne) | #swqenai Q

19:30¹ #esontai *rell* | #esonte)

20:1 #misqwsasqai *rell* | #misqwsasqe) | #meisqwsasqai D
 | #mhsqwsasqai 2*

20:4; 23:35 #dikaion *rell* | #dikeon)*

20:15; 23:15, 23 #poihsai *rell* | #poihsse)

20:18 #paradoqhsetai *rell* | #paradoqhsete) | #paradoqhsaitai M
 | #paradwqhsetai 579 1071

20:19 #empaicai *rell* | #empece) | #empecai C D 2* 28 33 565 1071
 | #enpaicai D E | #enpecai W

20:19 #staurwsai *rell* | #staurwse) | #staurwai C | #om. X

20:27 #einai *rell* | #eine) | #om. L W 28

20:28 #dikonhsai *rell* | #diakonhse)

20:28 #dounai *rell* | #doune)

21:5; 26:45 #erxetai *rell* | #erxete)

21:11 #Galilaj *rell* | #Galileaj) | #Galeilaj B
 21:13 #klhqhsetai *rell* | #klhqhsete) | #genhsetai 118 209
 21:16 #ainon *rell* | #enon) | #ainwn L^f
 21:21 #genhsetai *rell* | #genhsete)
 21:32 #dikaiosunhj *rell* | #dikeosunhj) * | #dikaiwsunhj Q
 21:42 #grafaij *rell* | #grafej) *
 21:43 #arqhsetai *rell* | #arqhsete)
 21:44 #sunqlasqhsetai *rell* | #sunqlasqhsete)
 22:21a #Kaisaroj *rell* | #Kesaroj)
 22:34 #saddoukaiouj *rell* | #saddoukeouj) | #saddoukaouj D
 22:40 #tautaij *rell* | #tautej) *
 22:40 #profhtai *rell* | #profhte) *
 22:41 #farisaiwn *rell* | #farisewn) | #fareisaiwn B
 22:46 #apokriqnai *rell* | #apokriqhne) * | #apokreiqhnai D
 23:4 #kinhsai *rell* | #kinhse) | #keinhsei B D D | #khnhsai 2 *
 23:6, 34 #sunagwaij *rell* | #sunagwej) *
 23:12 #tapeinwqhsetai *rell* | #tapinwqhsete) | #tapinwqhsetai W
 Q
 23:13, 23, 25a, 27, 29 (oipokritai 579) #upokritai *rell* | #upokrite)
 23:23 mh #afeinai B L | #afine) | #afienai *rell*
 23:25², 25³, 26², 27, 28^{1*}, 28² #kai *rell* | #ke)
 23:27 #fainontai *rell* | #fenonte) | #fainete D
 23:29 #dikaiwn *rell* | #dikewn) * | om. H
 24:5 #eleusontai *rell* | #eleusonte)
 24:12a #plhqunqnai *rell* | #plhqunqhne) * | #plhqunai D

24:12b #yughsetai *rell* |#yughsete) |#yuxhsetai K

24:13 #swqhsetai *rell* |#swqhsete)

24:14 #khruxqhsetai *rell* |#khruxqhsete)

24:18 #arai *rell* |#are)*

24:19a #qhlazousaij *rell* |#qhlazousej)* |#qhlazomenaij D
|#enqhlazousaij L

24:19b #ekeinaij *rell* |#ekinej)* |#ekinaij)^c |#ekeinej L
|#ekhnaij 2

24:24 #yeudoprofhtai *rell* |#yeudoprofhte)

24:28 #sunaxqhsontai *rell* |#sunaxqhsonte) |#sunaxqhtai M

24:30 #fanhsetai *rell* |#fanhsete) |#fanhshtai 118

24:30 #koyontai *rell* |#koyonte)

24:30 #pasai *rell* |#pase)*

24:30 #ai *rell* |#e)*

24:30 #oyontai *rell* |#oyonte)

24:32 #genhtai *rell* |#genhte)

24:40 #paralambanetai *rell* |#paralambanete) |#paralambanetai
D*

26:13 #lalhqhsetai *rell* |#lalhqhsete)

26:15 #dounai *rell* |#dwne)

26:29 #kainon *rell* |#kenon)

26:31 #diaskorpiqhsontai *rell* |#diaskorpiqhsonte)*
|#diaskorpiqhsontai U 2

26:32 #egerqhnaï *rell* |#egerqhne)

26:36 #proseucwmai *rell* |#proseuceme) |#proseucomai D F S Q W
2 28 788 1424 |#eucomai 700

26:40 #grhgorhsai *rell*|#egrhgorhsai P³⁷|#grhgorhse)
|#grigorhsai Q|#grhgorisai 2 33|#grhgoreisai 1071

26:53 #apolountai *rell*|#apolounte)*|#apoqanountai M K M W 2
69 565 579 788 1071|#apouqanaountai D*|#apoqanaountai D^c

26:54, 56 #grafai *rell*|#grafe)*

26:54 #genesqai *rell*|#genesqe)

26:69 #Galilaiou *rell*|#Galileou)|#Galeilaiou B D|#Nazwraiou
C 047 238 252* syr^{sch} pers^p

27:37 #Ioudaiwn *rell*|#Ioudewn)

27:39 #lhstai *rell*|#lhste)*|#listai K

27:58 #apodoqhnai *rell*|#apodoqhne)*|#apodwqhnai 1071

27:61 #kaqhmenai *rell*|#kaqhmene)*

2. e > ai

6:3 #elehmosunhn *rell*|#elaihmousunhn)

7:11 #oidate *rell*|#oidatai)

10:11 #ecetasate *rell*|#ecetasatai)

3. ei > i

1:21 #swsei *rell*|#swsi)

1:23 (ech L 1424); 12:11 (ech Q) #ecei *rell*|#eci)

2:6 #poimanei *rell*|#poimani)|#poimenei D

2:8 #apaggeilate *rell*|#apaggilate)|#apaggeilatai D* W
|#epaggeilatai D^c|#apagghlate 2|#anaggeilate 124

2:13 #zhtein *rell*|#zhtin)

2:15; 6:21; 12:45; 13:42, 58; 19:2; 22:13; 24:28 #ekei *rell*|#eki)

2:21 (diegerqejij D 33); 8:25a (hgerqh *rell*), 26 #egerqejij *rell* |#egerqij)

3:3 #rhqejij *rell* |#riqejij 579 |#rhqij)

3:3 #euqejiaj *rell* |#euqiaj) |#euqhaj L

3:9a; 4:17; 11:7; 26:22 #legein *rell* |#legin)

3:9b #egeirai *rell* |#egirai)

3:11 #baptisei *rell* |#baptisi) |#bapthsei L |#baptisai 579

4:6 #enteleitai *rell* |#entelite)

4:8; 13:11, 19, 38, 41; 24:14 #basileiaj *rell* |#basiliaj)

4:10; 8:7, 22, 26; 9:9, 37; 12:13, 44 (leg^h Q); 15:33; 18:32 (eipen 579); 19:8, 20; 20:8, 21, 23; 21:13, 16, 31; 22:8, 12, 20, 21, 43; 26:31, 35, 36, 40, 45; 27:13, 22 #legei *rell* |#legi)

4:17; 5:3, 19¹ (baseileia Q); 10:7; 11:11, 12; 12:25, 26 (basilei E), 28; 13:24 (bassileia L), 31, 44, 45, 52; 18:23; 19:14; 20:1; 21:43; 24:7 #basileia *rell* |#basilia)*

5:9 #eirhnopoi^{oi} *rell* |#irhnopoi^{oi}) |#eirhnopoi^{ei} 13 |#eirhnopoi^{oi} 124 |#oirhnopoi^{oi} 1346

5:13, 48; 6:12 (Q eimeij); 10:31; 13:18; 15:16 (umh^j 579); 19:27, 28; 20:4 (eimeij K), 7; 21:13, 32; 23:8, 28, 32; 24:33; 26:31; 28:5 #umeij *rell* |#umij)

5:20; 7:21; 19:23, 24; 21:31; 23:13; 24:7 #basileian *rell* |#basilian)

5:26; 12:9, 15; 14:13; 15:21, 29 #ekiqein *rell* |#ekiqen)

5:27 #moixeuseij *rell* |#moixeusij) |#muxeuseij L |#mhxeuseij Q* |#moixeushj 579 1071

5:29 (skandalizh L 243 244 346 1582* 1071 1346 1184 |skandalhzh 2* |skandalizh 2^c), 30 (skandalizh L G D 471* 1071 |skandalhzei 2*) #skandalizei *rell* |#skandalizi)

5:29 #sumferei *rell* |#sumferi) |#sumferh Q

5:33 #apodwseij *rell* |#apodwsij) |#apodwshj W 1071 |#apodoseij 565

5:40; 15:26 #labein *rell* | #labin)

5:44 #anatellei *rell* | #anatelli) | #anatele L 1424 | #anatallei D

6:6 #apodwsei *rell* | #apodwsi)

6:14, 15 #afhsei *rell* | #afhsi) | #afhsh G Q 1424

6:24 #mishsei *rell* | #mishsi) | #meishei B W | #mhshsei L 565 1346 | #misisei 33 | #mhsisei 1071

6:24 #agaphsei *rell* | #agaphsi) * | #agapisei D * | #ahgaphsh 1424

6:27 #trefei *rell* | #trefi) | #trefh K L 2

6:34 #merimnhsei *rell* | #merimnhsi) | #merhmnhsei L | #merimnhsh N 579 1424

7:4* (erij)^c | legeij Q 700); 27:11 #ereij *rell* | #legij)

7:10 #aithsei B C K L N W D S f^{13} 28 33 124 157* 892 1071 1241 1424 ff^1
 vg sy^{c.pesh.hl} bo Clem^{hom} NA²⁷ | #aithsi) | #aithsh *rell*

7:25, 27; 10:19; 13:1; 22:23 #ekeinh *rell* | #ekinh)

8:15; 9:25 (xeira D) #xeiroj *rell* | #xiroj)

8:20a #kataskhnwseij *rell* | #kataskhnwsij) | #kataskinwseij Q | #kataskhnwshj 2

8:20b (exh L 579); 9:6 (exh G); 13:12¹ (aixei L), 12², 12³, 21 (aixei L), 27 (exh E), 44 #exei *rell* | #exi)

8:22 #akolougei *rell* | #akolouqi) | #akolouqh L Q W 2 13 1071

8:28; 9:22; 10:14; 15:28; 22:46 (eknhhj 2*); 26:29 #ekeinhj *rell* | #ekinhj)

8:31 #ekballeij *rell* | #ekballij) | #ekbaleij E K* 33 1071 | #ekbalhj L 2 1424

9:22 #qrasei *rell* | #qrasi)

9:24 #anaxwreite *rell* | #anaxwrite) | #anaxwreitai W 579 | #anaxwrhtai Q

10:13¹, 13² #eirhnh *rell* | #irhnh)

10:18 #basileij *rell*|#basilij)

10:21 #goneij *rell*|#gonij)|#gwneij L

10:28¹ #fobeisqe *rell*|#fobisqe)|#fobhqhte B D Y N S W 1 28 33
118 1424 1582|#fobeisqai C 13 1346|#fobhsqe F K 349 1071
|#fobhqhtai W Q|#fwbeisqe 2|#fobhsqe 579

10:28² #fobeisqe B NA²⁷|#fobisqe)|#fobhqhte *rell*|#fobeisqai C
W|#fobiqhte L

10:29 #peseitai *rell*|#pesitai)|#peseite D

10:31 #fobeisqe B f¹ 157 NA²⁷|#fobisqe)|#fobhqhte *rell*
|#fobeisqai D L W|#fobhqhtai 2 579

10:32 #omologhsw *rell*|#omologhsi)|#omologhsh E U W 28 1582*

10:34¹, 34² (eirhn D*; hrhnhn Q) #eirhnhn *rell*|#irhnhn)

10:39 #eurhsei *rell*|#eurhsi)|#swsei 118|#euresei 1071

11:1 #didaskein *rell*|#didaskin)

11:4, 25 (apokreiqeij D|apokriqhj 579), 39 (apokriqhj 579); 14:28
(apokreiqeij D|apokriqei Q |om. Sy^c); 15:13 (apokreiqeij D
|apokrhqhj Q), 24 (apokriqhj 579); 20:22 (apokriqhj 579); 22:29
(apokreiqeij D); 26:23 (apokreij D*|apokriqhj 579), 25
(apokriqhj 1346); 27:25 #apokreiqeij *rell*|#apokriqij)

11:9 (eidein D M 124); 12:38 (eidein Q) #idein *rell*|#idin)

11:10 #kataskeuasei *rell*|#kataskeuasi)|#kataskeuasoi 1346

11:20 (dunamhj Q), 23; 13:54 (dunamhj Q), 58 (dunamhj 2*); 14:2; 24:29
#dunameij *rell*|#dunamij)

11:25 (ekein Y*); 12:1; 14:1; 27:19 #ekeinw '*rell*|#ekinw)

11:27; 20:7 #oudeij *rell*|#oudij)

11:27¹ (ginwskei C 71 692 g^{scr} Clem¹ Iust^{tr100} Eus^{marc88cdd} Did^{tri26.72}
|epigeinwskei D), 27² (epigeinwskei B D|ginwskei 71 692)
#epiginwskei *rell*|#epiginwski)|#epigignwskei W

12:4; 14:16; 15:20 (faghn E*); 26:17 #fagein *rell*|#fagin)

12:5 #iereij *rell*|#ierij)|#eiereij D|#ereij Q*

12:9 (xeiran L W f^{13} 118 157 788 1346); 26:23, 51 #xeira *rell*|#xira)

12:12 #diaferei *rell*|#diaferi)

12:20 #sbesei *rell*|#sbesi)|#zbesei D*|#sbessi D|#s...seij 1071

12:25¹ #merisqeisa *rell*|#merisqisa)|#merisqhsa K L Q 2* 565 579

12:26 #ekballei *rell*|#ekballi)|#ekbalei L 349 472|#ekballh 348|#ekbalh 1424

12:29 (om. D|eiselqwn 478); 19:17 (eisqein E*), 24 #eiselqein *rell*|#eiselqin)

12:30 #skorpizei *rell*|#skorpizi)|#skorphzei 579

12:39 #epizhtei *rell*|#epizhti)|#zhtei L|#epizeite 579|#epeizhtei 1071

12:41 #krisei *rell*|#krisi)|#kreisei Q

12:45a #katoikei *rell*|#katoiki)|#kateikei 1346

12:45b #ekeinou *rell*|#ekinou)

12:45c #xeirona *rell*|#xirona)|#xeiron D* 1184|#xeirwna L 59 124 245

12:46 #eisthkeisan *rell*|#isthkisan)|#isthkeisan B C F G W D Q 33|#isthkasi L|#istikeisan D|#eisthkhsan 2*|#esthkasin 700

12:49 #xeira oautou *rell*|#xeiraj 28|#xira)^{S1}|oD 124 $a b f f^1 g^1 k q$ vg Or^{3,480} Aug xiran?)*

13:2 #eisthkei B^c D^E K M S U Y G P W f^1 28 118 124 157 565 579 700 788 1071 1346 1424 etc. NA²⁷|#isthki)|#isthkh E*|#istikei 2*|#isthkei B* C W E^c F G L W X Z D Q 2 33 etc.|#esthkei D* (*d stabat*) 234 (*a b c f f^2 h vg stabant*)

13:3 #speirwn *rell*|#spirwn)|#speiron K L|#sphrwn Q 2*

13:11; 21:40 #ekeinoij *rell*|#ekinoij)

13:17 #idein *rell*|#idin) |#eidein D W|#ideinn Q

13:19 #arpazei *rell*|#arpazi) |#airei 7 517 954 1424 1675

13:22 #ginetai *rell*|#ginete) |#geinetai B C D W|#ghnetai Q

13:36 (afhj Q); 18:12 (afhsei B L Q f^1 788 1346 NA²⁷ |afihsi D |afhj 2*); 26:44 #afeij *rell*|#afij)

13:41 #apostelei *rell*|#aposteli) |#aposte/lei X|#apostellei G 157

13:44a #pwlei *rell*|#pwli) |#pwlh Q |#polei D W 1 28 579 1071

13:44b #ekeinon *rell*|#ekinon) |#ekeinwn 579

13:52 #maqhteugeij *rell*|#maqhteujij) |#maqhqeuqeij D |#maqhteugh L

14:4 #exein *rell*|#exin) |#exen C

14:9 #sunanakeimenouj *rell*|#sunanakimenouj) |#sunakeimenouj G K|#sunanakhmenouj M Q 1346 |#sunanakeimenouj D

14:16 #apelqein *rell*|#apelqin) |#apelqhn Q

14:21; 15:38 #wsei *rell*|#wsi)*

14:27 #qarseite *rell*|#qarsite) |#qarreite D|#qarseitai W Q 2* |#om. 517 954 983 1424 1675 1689

14:28 (apelqein 346 1346), 29 (elqhn Q |hlqe 700^c); 19:14 (elqhn 2*); 22:3 #elqein *rell*|#elqin)

14:35; 18:32 (ekeinh D) #ekeinhn *rell*|#ekinhn)

15:2 (xersin 1346); 19:13, 15 (x D?); 22:13; 26:45, 50; 27:24 #xeiraj *rell* |#xiraj)*

15:17 #noeite *rell*|#noite) |#noeitai W 579

15:17 #xwrei *rell*|#xwri)

15:22 (ekeiwn D* |ekeinon L |authj 349 517 659 954 1424 1675); 24:29 (ekeinon 579) #ekeinwn *rell*|#ekinwn)

15:28 (qelhj M 2 565 1346 1424); 19:17 (qelhj F 28 579), 21 (qelhj F);
20:21 (qelhj 1071 1346) #qeiej *rell* | #qelij)

16:1 #peirazontej *rell* | #pirazontej) | #phrazontej 579

18:21 #amarthsei *rell* | #amarthsi) | #amarthsh E H W D f^{13} 1346
1424

18:23; 22:2 #basilei *rell* | #basili)

18:27 #splugxnisqej *rell* | #splugxnisqij) | #splanxnisqej D
| #splugxnhsqej E 2^c | #splaxnisqej K | #splugxnhsqhj 2*
| #splugxnishj 579

18:27 doulou #ekeinou *rell* | #ekinou) | #om. B Q 1 124 1582*

18:28 (om. B); 26:24; 27:8, 63 #ekeinoj *rell* | #ekinoj)

18:35 #poihsei *rell* | #poihsi)

19:3 #peirazontej *rell* | #pirazontej) | #peirazwntej Q

19:5 #katalieyi *rell* | #kataliyi) | #kataliyiei C W Q
| #kataluyei 13 | #katalhyei 579 1424

19:13 #xwreitw *rell* | #xwritw)

19:15 #epiqej *rell* | #epiqij) | #epiqhj Q | #epeiqej 124

19:29 #klhronomhsei *rell* | #klhronomhsi) | #klhronomhsh M 1184
| #klhronomhsai Q | #klhronomisei 700 | #klhronomhsh 1424

20:17, 18a; 21:10; 26:67 #eij *rell* | #ij)*

20:22 #pinein *rell* | #pinin) | #piein B G 085 245 477 482 485 579 1365
1689 2145 | #peinein D | #pinei 13 | #pinhn 2* | #pinw 118 1424

21:15, 45; 26:59; 27:1, 20, 41 #arxiereij *rell* | #arxierij)

21:15 (gramateij Q* | grammatoij 13 | grammaiteij 1071); 23:15, 34;
26:57 (gramateij Q) #grammateij *rell* | #grammatij)

21:29 #metamelhqeij *rell* D^c (v.30 B f^{13} 4 174 230 238 262 273 346 543 566
700 788 826 828 983 1187 1346 1555 1573 r^2 vg^(2MSS) sy^{hier} sa^(pler) bo aeth^(2cdd) arm
geo) | #metamelhqij) | #metametamelhqeij D* | #metamelihj 579
1071 | # (v.30)metamellhqeij Q

21:41 #apolesei *rell*|#apolesi)|#analwsei L|#apolei W
|#apolesh 28

22:7 #ekeinouj *rell*|#ekinouj)

22:10 #ekeinoi *rell*|#ekinoui)

22:10 #anakeimenwn *rell*|#anakimenwn)|#anakeinwn C
|#anakeimenou K|#anakhmenwn 2*

22:11 #anakeimenouj *rell*|#anakimenouj)

22:16 #alhqeia *rell*|#alhqia)|#alhqeiaj D^c|#alhqha Q

22:16 #blepeij *rell*|#blepij)

22:17 #dokei *rell*|#doki)|#dwkei 579

22:24 #anasthsei *rell*|#anasthsi)|#ecanasthsei F H M Q 440
1012 1093 1194 1279 1295 1424 1515 1574|#ecanastash S|#anastash
1582*

22:37 #agaphseij *rell*|#agaphsij)|#agaphshj 157 579 Cl^{pt}

22:43,45 #kalei *rell*|#kali)

23:13 #eiserxesqe *rell*|#iserxesqe)*|#eiserxesqai D L W Q 2 28
1071|#eiserxesqai D|#hserxesqai 579

23:18 #ofeilei *rell*|#ofili)|#ofilei C L W Q|#ofeilein D
|#ofeilh 13|#wfeilei 579 1424

23:22 #omnuei *rell*|#omnui)|#omnoiei L

23:29 #kosmeite *rell*|#kosmite)|#kosmeitai C L W D 13 69 579
|#kosmhte Q

23:36 (ecei F); 24:14 #hcei *rell*|#hci)

23:37 #episunagei *rell*|#episunagi)|#episunagagei K

24:19b #ekeinaij *rell*|#ekinej)*|#ekinaij)^c|#ekeinej L
|#ekhnaij 2

24:22¹, 22², #ekeinai *rell*|#ekinai)

24:29 #dwsei *rell*|#dwsii)|#dosei E*|#dwsh U 2*

24:31a #apostelei *rell* |#aposteli) |#apostellei H 2 1071
|#apostellh Q

24:31b episunacousin *rell* |#episunacei 1375 1604 sy^s bo^{3mss} Hil
|#episunaci)* |#episunacousin Y M S U W f¹ 13 69 28 157 700

26:7 #anakeimenou *rell* |#anakimenou)

26:14a #poreugeij *rell* |#poreuqij)

26:14b #arxiereij *rell* B^{c2} |#arxi+erij) |#arxii+ereij B*

26:20 #anekeito *rell* |#anekito) |#anekeitw 579

26:21 #eipen *rell* |#legi)

26:24 #upagei *rell* |#upagi)

26:35 #apoqanein *rell* |#apoqanin) |#apoqanhn Q 2* 69

26:37 #lupeisqai *rell* |#lupisque) |#lupeisque A 28 |#lupisqai W
Q |#luphsqai 579

26:42 #parelqein *rell* |#parelqin) |#parelqhn Q

26:54 #dei *rell* |#di)* |#edei C 047 f¹ 28 1396 Or^{Cels.II.10}

26:58 #hkolougei *rell* |#hkolouqi) |#hkolough E S Q W 2 13 28 124
579 |#hkoloughsan 33

27:14 #qaumazein *rell* |#qaumazin)

27:24 #wfelei *rell* |#wfeli) |#ofelei L 69

27:34¹ (om. L), 34² #piein *rell* |#pin)* |#pein D

27:43 #qelei *rell* |#qeli) |#qelh F

27:63 #egeiromai *rell* |#egiromai) |#egeirwmai E 579

27:8 #apaggeilai *rell* |#apaggilai) |#apagghlai Q

28:20 #threin *rell* |#thrin)

4. i > ei

7:12 #umin *rell* |#umein)

8:34 #idontej *rell* |#eidontej)

9:2 #idwn *rell* |#eidwn) |#idon E* 1346

16:12 apo |thj zumhj\ tw n artwn B)^{ca} L 157 713
892 954 1241 1295 *l48 e gl l* aur vg sa bo geo^{1etB} Or ||*f*¹ 1 517 1424 1582 1675 Or
apo thj zumhj |tou artou\
346 174 565 566 788 *a b d ff² sy^s arm* *rell* || D Q 124
apo thj zumhj tw n #fareisaiwn |kai saddoukaiwn\
|#farisaiwn 579 || 33)*

21:2 #katenanti B C D L Q *f*¹³ 28 33 157 700 788 1346 NA²⁷
|#katenantei) |#apenanti *rell* |#katenanth L |#apenti D

26:34 #nukti *rell* |#nuktei D

28:6 #idete *rell* |#eidete) |#eidetai D W |#om. 124* |#idetai 579
1071

5. SINGULAR READINGS WITH NON-SINGULAR ORTHOGRAPHIC CHANGES

5:13 #katapateisqai *rell* |#katapatisqe) |#katapatisqai W Q
1071 |#katapateisqe 579

10:16 #akeraioi *rell* |#akaireoi) |#akereoi L Q 124 579
|#akairaioi 33 1071

11:11 #eghgertai *rell* |#eghgerte) |#egeigertai M 2 33 124 1071
1424 |#aigeigerte L

12:24 #ekballei *rell* |#ekballi) |#eballei D |#ekbali Q
|#ekbalei 1424

12:39 #doqhsetai *rell* |#doqhsete) |#dwqhsete L Q* |#dwqhsetai
Q^c 579 1071

12:42 #katakrinei *rell* |#katakryni) |#katakryni D
|#katakrynh L |#katakrynosin U 346 1346

13:4 #speirein *rell* (om. C) |#spirin) |#speirin DE |#spirein W
Q

13:18 #speirantoi B 13 33 1071 1346 NA²⁷ |#spirantoi)*
|#speirantoi *rell* |#spirantoi N |#sphyrontoi Q

14:27 #fobeisqe *rell* |#fobisqe) |#fobeisqai C D P 2 28 157 579
|#fobhsqe E* 565 1071 |#fobisqai W |#fwbeisqe Q

16:1 (ephdeicai K|deicai 2);24:1 #epideicai *rell*|#epidice)
|#epideice L|#epidicai Q

18:34 #orgisqei *rell*|#orgisqij)|#orgisqhj E*|#orghsqei G 2
|#orgeisqei W|#orghsqhj Q*|#orghsqij Q^c|#orgisqhj 579

20:10 #pleion B C* L N Z *f*¹¹³ 124 579 788 1346 NA²⁷ |#pliona)
|#pleiona *rell*|#pleiw D|#plion W Q |#pleiwna 1071|#plewn
Or^{semel Matt.XV.30}

21:3 #apostelei B D M 69 157 700 1582* NA²⁷ |#aposteli)
|#apostellei *rell* |#apostelli Q |#apesteile 349 1293 (1424) 1675

21:41 #ekdwsetai *rell* |#ekdwsete) |#ekdwsei C |#ekdosetai *f*13
2 118 157 565 788 1346 1424 |#ekdosete 1346

22:18 #peirazete *rell* |#pirazete) |#peirazetai D L W D 13 33
579 1071 |#pirazetai Q |#phrazetai 2*

23:13 #kleiete *rell* |#kliete) |#kleietai D L 2 13 |#klietai W
|#kliestai Q

26:38 #grhgoreite *rell* |#grhgorite) |#grhgoreitai D 700
|#grigorite Q |#grhgrohte 2

27:12 #kathgoreisqai *rell* |#kathgorisqe) |#kathgorisqai W
|#kathgoreisqe Q |#kathgoreisqe 1346

APPENDIX EIGHTEEN: ITACISMS IN VATICANUS IN MATTHEW

1. i > ei

- 1:6 tou #Ouriou *rell* |#Oureiou P¹ B |#riou L |#Oriou 124
- 1:25 #eginwsken *rell* |#egnw D |#egeinwsken B
- 2:22; 3:13; 4:18; 15:29; 21:11 (Galilea*j*); 27:55 (Agileilaia*j* A Y W D P |Galhlaia*j* K L) #Galilaia*j* *rell* |#Galeilaia*j* B
- 3:7; 5:20 (Farissewn Q |Farhsaiwn 2*); 16:6; 22:41 (Farisewn))
#Farisaiwn *rell* |#Fareisaiwn B
- 3:10 #acinh *rell* |#aceinh B |#achnh 28
- 3:12 #siton *rell* |#seiton B |#suton 788^c
- 4:12 #Galilaian *rell* |#Galeilaian B
- 4:15 #Galilaia *rell* |#Galeilaia B |#Galilaia*j* D* L |#Galilaian *f*¹³
- 4:23 #Galilaia) * C NA²⁷ |#Galeilaia B |#Galilaian *rell*
- 7:2 #krinete *rell* |#kreinete B
- 8:15 #dihkonei *rell* |#diekonei B*
- 8:26 #epetimhsen *rell* |#epeteimhsen B |#epetimhse K U 13 118 157 700^c 788 |#epethmhsen L |#epethmhse 1071
- 8:28 #lian *rell* |#leian B
- 9:11, 14; 12:2, 24; 15:1, 2; 16:1; 19:3 (Fariseoi); 21:45; 22:15 (Fariseoi), 41; 23:2 (Fariseoi), 13, 15, 23, 25 (Fariseoi), 27 (Fariseoi), 29 (Fariseoi)*); 27:62 #Farisaioi *rell* |#Fareisaioi B
- 9:30 #enebpimhsato *rell* |#enebrimhqh) *f*¹ NA²⁷ |#enebreimhqh B*
- 10:28 #apoktennontwn) C D W Q 33 700* NA²⁷ |#apoktenontwn *rell* |#apokteinontwn B
- 10:42 #mikrwn *rell* |#elaxistwn D |#meikrwn B
- 11:4 #Iwannh *rell* |#Iwanei B* |#Iwanh B^{c2} |#Iwannei D W D |#Iwannhn E

11:19 #esqiwn *rell* |#esqeawn B

12:20a #suntetrimmenon *rell* D^{mg} |#suntetreimmenon B |#om. D*

12:20b #nikoj *rell* |#neikoj B

13:21 #qliyewj *rell* |#qleiyewj B |#qleiyaiwj D

13:25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 36, 38, 40 #zizania *rell* |#zeizania B

15:27a #esqiei *rell* |#esqiuousin D |#esqeiei B

15:27b #yixiwn *rell* |#yeixiwn B |#yuxiwn 565 1071 |#yeixwn D

17:15 #piptei *rell* |#peiptei B

19:13 oi de maqhtai #epetimhsan) L M W M f^{1 13} 33 pc NA²⁷
|#epeteimhsan B |#epetimwn C 66 it vg

23:26 #Farisaie *rell* |#Fareisaioie C* |#Fareisaie B

23:34 #mastigwsete *rell* |#masteigwsete B

24:29 thn #qliyin *rell* |#qleiyein D |#qleiyin B

25:44 #dihkonhsamen soi *rell* |#dhakonhsamen ordiakon. A*^{vid}
|#hdihkonhsamen) |#diekonhsamen B* (D?) |#dihkonisamen 565

26:7 #barutimou *rell* |#polutimou) A L M Q P 33 157 565 1424 pc
|#baruteimou B |#poluteimou D |#barutumou K

26:62 ouden #apokrinh *rell* (-) * 243 983 1689 l183) |#apokreinh B
|#apokrinei H 28 517

27:9a tou #tetimhmenou *rell* |#temeimenou D |#teteimhmenou B

27:9b on #etimhsanto *rell* |#eteimhsanto B

27:46¹, 46² #hli *rell* (157) |#elwi) 33 |#elwei B |#hlei D E D Q S F
090 1 1582 1604 |#heloι vg^{mu} cop aeth |#heli it vg^{pler} arm geo Clem Cyp Aug |om.
sy^{s.pesh.hier}

28:7, 10; 28:16 thn #Galilaian *rell* |#Galeilaian B

2. SINGULAR READINGS WITH NON-SINGULAR ORTHOGRAPHIC EXCHANGES

24:32 #ginwskete *rell*|#geinwskete B*|#ginwsketai L Q 2* 579
|#gignwsketai W|#geinwsketai B²D G 348 1187 *al.*

24:44 #ginesqe *rell*|#geinesqe B|#geinesqai D|#ginesqai W Q
2* 28 579

APPENDIX NINETEEN: ITACISMS IN EPHRAEMI IN MATTHEW

1. ai > e

10:16 #peristerai *rell*|#peristaire C

2. e > ai

7:7 #aiteite *rell*|#aiteitai C|#aitite NW Q 579

10:16 #peristerai *rell*|#peristaire C

3. ei > i

4:9 #proskunhshj *rell*|#proskunhsij C|#proskunhseij E L D S
2 253 346 692 788* 1241 1346 1424 *l47 l183* al. mu.

4:10 #proskunhseij *rell*|#proskunhshj) L P 28|#proskunhsij C

17:20 #ereite *rell*|#erite C|#ereitai W 2*

4. i > ei

3:11 #eimi *rell*|#eimei C|#eimh L 1346

4:8 #deiknusin *rell*|#diknuei)|#diknusein C|#edeicen D 372
|#diknusin P W D Q

13:15 kai th kardia #sunwsin *rell*|#suniwsin 2 33 1071
|#suneiwsin C

13:23 #sunieij) B D Q NA²⁷|#suneiwn C|#suniwn *rell*

14:8 #probibasqeisa *rell*|#probibasqisa) 788
|#probeibasqeisa C|#probibasqhsa E* Q 13 2^c 579|#probhbasqisa
K|#probhbasqhsa L 2* 1346

15:10 #siniete *rell*|#suneiete C|#sunietai W 2* 579|#sunete
1424

22:19 #epideicate *rell*|#epidicate) W Q|#epeideicate C
|#upodeicate S 28 71 349 399* 700 1187

23:26 #Farisaie *rell*|#Fareisaioie C*|#Fareisaie B

24:9 eij #qliyin kai *rell*|#gleiyin B D|#qliyij 157|#qliyeij
L 047 *f*¹ 1071 1582 *plu sy*^{p.h.mg} Or^{int}|#qliyein C

26:31 #nukti *rell*|#nuktei C|#noikti 2|#nukth 1424

26:75 #prin *rell*|#prein C

5. SINGULAR READINGS WITH NON-SINGULAR ORTHOGRAPHIC CHANGES

23:31 #martureite *rell*|#marturite) Q|#martureitai C
|#marturitai W|#marturhte 579

24:9 #qliyin *rell*|#qleiyin B|#qliyein C|#qleiyein D
|#qliyeij L 047 f^1 4 273 *pler*|#qlhyin 2|#qliyij 157

APPENDIX TWENTY: ITACISMS IN CODEX D IN MATTHEW

1. ai > e

- 1:23 #tecetai *rell* |#tecete D
- 2:23 #Nazwraioj *rell* |#Nazwreoj D W
- 5:10 (estin *rell* |*erit d*) 16:19², 22; 19:27 (estin 251); 22:28 #estai *rell* |#este D
- 9:2 #afientai) B NA²⁷ |#afewntai *rell* |#afionte D
- 21:37 #entrapsontai *rell* |#entrapsonte D |#entrapsontai 2* |#entrapswntai 579

2. e > ai

- 2:8b #ecetasate *rell* |#ecetasatai D
- 2:8d #apaggeilate *rell* |#anaggeilate 124 |#epaggeilatai D* |#apaggeilatai D^B
- 2:16a en #bhqleem *rell* |#bleem C |#beqleaim D* |#bhqleem D^B |#biqleem L W 349 1071
- 6:19 #qhsaurizete *rell* |#qhsaurisetai D
- 12:1 #esqiein *rell* |#aisqiein D |#esqeiein 1071
- 13:21 #qliyewj *rell* |#qleiyewj B |#qleiyaiwj D
- 14:21 #esqiontej *rell* |#aisqiwntej D* |#aisqiontej D^c |#esqiwntej 579
- 15:38 #esqiontej *rell* |#aisqiontej D
- 16:21 #arxierewn *rell* |#arxeieraiwn D
- 21:2 #agagete *rell* |#agete B 56 58 |#agetai D |#agagetai W
- 21:31 #prwtoj *rell* |#usteroj B |#aisxatoj D |#esxatoj Q f¹³ 700 788 *pc*
- 21:32 #episteusate *rell* |#episteusatai D |#aipisteusatai L |#episteisan 1424
- 24:42 #oidate *rell* |#oidetai D

25:28 #arate *rell*|#aratai D
 25:35 #epotisate *rell*|#epoteisatai D|#epothsate L U D Q 2 33
 579 1346 1424
 25:40¹,40² #epoihsate *rell*|#epoihsatai D
 26:49;27:29 #xaire *rell*|#xairai D
 26:50 #etaire *rell*|#eterai D
 27:64 #keleuson *rell*|#kaileuson D
 27:64 #esxath *rell*|#aisxath D|#sxath C|#esxati 2*
 28:9 #xairete *rell*|#xairaitai D|#xairetai W Q 2*

3. ei > i

5:33 #epiorkhseij *rell*|#efiorkhseij)|#epeiorkhsij D
 |#epoirkiseij 118|#epiorkishj 1346
 6:12 #ofeilhmata *rell*|#ofilemata D|#ofelhmata KL
 9:3 #blasfhmei *rell*|#blasfhmi D|#blasfhmh L
 9:19 #hkolouqhsen *rell*|#hkolouqei) C 21 33 399 1396 1604
 |#hkolouqi D|#hkolouqhsan E M 4 273 471 713 149 1184
 14:29 #pereipathsen *rell*|#peripathsen D D *d e* vg
 16:21 #arxierewn *rell*|#arxeieraiwn D
 17:12/13 #pasxein *rell*|#pasxin D
 18:33 #edei *rell*|#edi D
 21:34 #labein *rell*|#labon)|#labin D
 23:27 #gemousin *rell*|#gemi D (Clem²⁸² Cyr^{iulian335} Ir^{int250})
 24:48 #xronizei *rell*|#xronizi D|#xronhzei 2*
 25:41 #erei *rell*|#eri D

4. i > ei

2:13 (om. sy^{c.s.pesh}); 11:8; 12:42 #idou *rell* | #eidou D

3:3 #tribouj *rell* | #treibouj D

3:4 #dermatinhn *rell* | #dermateinhn D

4:6; 5:23; 13:5; 26:39 #epi *rell* | #epei D

4:16a \$skotia)^c B | \$th W
 #skotei *rell* | #skoti) * C D 2* 565 | #skoth Q
 th skoteiaD

4:16f #skia qanatou *rell* D^B | #skeia D* | #skha L

4:19 #opisw *rell* | #opeisw D

5:16 #idwsin *rell* | #eidwsin D | #idosin 1071 | #idwsi 1346

5:17 #nomishte *rell* | #nomeishte D | #nomhshte L Q 124 2 28 788 1346
 | #nomishtai W D 157 | #nomhsetai 118* | #nomhshtai 118^c
 | #nomizhte 346

5:18, 22, 28, 32, 34, 39, 44; 6:1, 5, 14, 16, 19, 20; 9:29; 10:15, 20, 23 (umhn 1071),
 27, 42; 11:9, 11, 17, 21, 22¹, 22² (soi M | om. 1346), 24; 12:6, 31, 36; 13:11, 17;
 15:15; 16:28 (umhn 579); 17:12, 20¹, 20²; 18:3, 10, 12, 13, 18, 19, 35; 19:8, 9, 23,
 24, 28; 20:4, 26¹, 26², 27, 32; 21:21, 24, 27, 31, 43; 22:31, 42; 23:9, 13, 15, 16, 23,
 25a, 27, 29, 36, 39; 24:23, 25, 26, 34, 47; 25:12, 34, 40, 45; 26:13, 15, 21, 29, 64, 66;
 27:17, 21 (umhn E*); 28:7 (om. P*), 20 (hmin 579) #umin *rell* | #umein
 D

5:25 #isqi *rell* | #isqei D | #isqh Q

5:25 #antidikoj *rell* | #antideikoj D | #anthdikoj L

5:36; 17:4¹, 4² (mia Q), 4³; 19:5; 21:19; 28:1 #mian *rell* | #meian D

5:40 #imation *rell* | #eimation D | #hmation Q 2

5:42 #aitounti *rell* | #aitountei D

5:44 eulogeite touj katarwmenoj #umaj L W D Q P S m f¹³ *pler*
 | om.) B f¹ *pler* NA²⁷ | #umein D* | #umin 118

5:44 #misousin M K L M U W *pler* (om.) B 1071 *pler* NA²⁷)
 | #meisousin D | #mhsousin L | #mhsountaj 2* | #misountaj 1582^c

5:46 #misqon *rell* | #meisqon D | #misqhn D

6:3;27:29 (dexian MKMUWG D P 064 plu) #decia *rell*
|#deceia D

6:11, 12; 13:36 (hmhn L); 15:33; 20:12; 21:25; 22:25 (emin Q); 24:2, 3; 25:8
(umin 157), 11 (umin 1346); 26:63, 68 #hmin *rell* |#hmein D

6:16 #upokritai *rell* |#upokreital D |#upokrite L

9:6 #amartiaj *rell* |#amarteiaj D

9:8, 11; 27:54 #idontej *rell* |#eidontej D

9:16a #imatiw *rell* |#eimatiw D |#hmatiw L 2

9:16b #imatiou *rell* |#eimateiou D |#hmatiou 2

9:16c #sxisma *rell* |#sxeisma D |#sxima K

9:22 (idon Q |om. sy^s); 21:19 #idwn *rell* |#eidwn D

9:35 #malakian *rell* |#malakeian D |#malakhan 2*

10:6; 15:24 #Israhl *rell* |#Eisrahl D

10:8 leprouj #kaqarizete *rell* () P W D Q 2* 579) –
1424*|#kaqareisate D

10:15 #mastigwsousin *rell* |#masteigwsousin D |#mishgwsousin
E L 2*

10:42 #potish *rell* |#poteish D |#pothsei L 1071 1424 |#pothsh D 13
124 |#potisei 2 33* 346 1346 l53 l184

11:22 #krisewj *rell* |#kreisewj D |#krhsewj 2*

11:25 (apokriqij) |apokriqhj 579); 13:37; 14:28 (apokriqij)
|apokriqei Q |om. Sy^c); 15:13 (apokriqij) |apokrhqhj Q); 21:24, 29,
30 (apokriqij)^c |apekriqh W* |apekriqei W^c |apokfiqhj 579
|aphlqe Y 118 157); 22:29 (apokriqij); 24:2 (om. C M W pler); 25:40
#apokriqej *rell* |#apokreiqej D

11:27 #epiginwskei *rell* |#epiginwski) |#ginwski C
|#epigeinwskei D |#epigignwskei W

12:5 #iereij *rell* |#ierij) |#eiereij D |#ereij Q*

12:41 #Nineuitai BCLWDQNA²⁷ |#Nineueite) |#Neineuetai
D* |#Neineueitai D^c |#Nhneuitai G |#Nineuitai *rell*

12:42 #katakrinei *rell* |#katakryni) |#katakryni D
|#katakrynh L |#katakrynosin U 346 1346

12:43 #euriskei *rell* |#eureiskei D |#euriskon 700

13:47 #palin *rell* |#palein D

13:54 #sofia *rell* |#sofeia D |#sofi F* |#swfia L

14:4 #genesioij) BLNA²⁷ |#genesiwn *rell* |#genesioij D
|#gesion 13 124 788 1346

14:13 #idian *rell* |#eidian D |#hdian L 579

14:15 #oyiaj *rell* |#oyeiaj D

15:5 #timhsei BCNWDQ P²S W 047 f¹³ 1 33 124 543 565 788 1071
1295 1346 1582* NA²⁷ |#timhsh *rell* |#teimhsei D |#thmhsh E* K
|#thmhsei E^c 2* |#timisei Q |#thmisei 579

15:8 #tima *rell* |#teima D |#thma L 2 |#om. W

15:17 #koilian *rell* |#koileian D

15:20 #aniptoj *rell* |#aneiptoj D

16:2 #oyiaj *rell* |#oyeiaj D

16:3 #prwi *rell* |#prwei D |#prwiaj EM^{mg} 33 71 213 235 473 477 485 655
1071 1207 1223 1365 1396 1574 |#proi Q* 1424

16:3 #diakrynein *rell* |#diakrynein D |#diakrynhn Q

16:22 #pitiman *pler* NA²⁷ |# epeiteiman D (it)

16:24 #tij *rell* |#teij D |#thj L |#ostij 1071

16:28 #idwsin *rell* |#eidwsin D |#idwsi YKLMSUW f¹ 28 118 157
700 1071

17:2a (hmatia 2*); 21:7 (imati K*), 8 (hmatia 2*) #imatia *rell*
|#eimateia D

17:2a (hmatia 2*); 21:7 (imati K*), 8 (hmatia 2*); 27:35 (eimatia A)
#imatia *rell* |#eimateia D

17:2b to foj *rell*
xiwn it vg Syr^{cu} aeth arm^{add} bo^{mss} Hil pc |#xeiwn D

17:24² ta #didraxma *rell*)^{ca} |#didragma ML (W) 118.f 13 28
157 565 700 1071 |#didraxmata 579 |#didraxmon 1093 |#tributum a d e fff¹
n vg^(pler) aeth |#didgrama uel censum b |#didgramam g¹
#deidragma D |#didraxa) * mae bo
to didraxmon Cyr^{4,791}

17:27 #skandaliswmen *rell* |#skandalizwmen) LZ
|#skandaleiswmen D |#skandalisomen 28 |#skandalhswmen 2 579
1424

18:6 #skandalish *rell* |#skandaleish D |#skandalhsh E 1346
|#skandalhsei L 579 |#skandalisei H Q 2* 1071

18:16; 26:61 #triwn *rell* |#treiwn D

18:17 #ekklhsia *rell* |#ekklhseia D |#ekklhsia HK

18:17 #ekklhsiaj *rell* |#ekklhseiaj D |#ekklhsia 472 478 565 1675
1184

19:6; 24:41¹, 41² #mia *rell* |#meia D

19:7 #apostasiou *rell* |#apostaseiou D

19:10 #aitia *rell* |#etioj P²⁵ |#aiteia D |#aitha L

19:19 #plhsion *rell* |#plhseion D |#plhsiwn 579

19:28 #paliggenesia *rell* |#palingenesia) B* C E M L W Z D Q f¹³
2 33 579 1071 |#palingeneseia D |#palhngenesia Q
|#palinengenesia S

20:1 #misqwsasqai *rell* |#misqwsasqe) |#meisqwsasqai D
|#mhsqwsasqai 2*

20:7 #emisqwsato *rell* |#emeisqwsato D* |#emisqwsatw Q

20:13 #apokriqij *rell* |#apokreiqij D

20:18 #katakrinousin *rell* |#katakreinousin D

20:19 #mastigwsai *rell* |#masteigwsai D |#masthgwsai M 2* 1071

20:22a #piein *rell* |#peiein D |#pin W |#poiein f¹³

20:22b #pinein *rell* |#pinin) |#piein B G 085 245 477 482 485 579 1365
1689 2145 |#peinein D |#pinei 13 |#pinhn 2* |#pinw 118 1424

20:31a #epetimhsen *rell* |#epeteimhsen D |#epethmhsen K Q 565 1071
|#epitimhsen M |#epetimhsan N

20:31b #siwphswsin *rell* |#seiwphswsin D |#siwphiswsin E K W
|#siwphsousin L N O D S 579 |#siwphswsi 1071

21:16 #nhpiwn *rell* |#nhpeiwn D |#nipiwn E K

21:23a #didaskonti *rell* |#didaskontei D |#didaskontej 118
|#didaskwnti 579

21:23b,27 #ecousia *rell* |#ecouseia D

21:23c #ecousian *rell* |#ecouseian D

21:27 #apokriqentej *rell* |#apokreiqentej D

21:35 #eliqobolhsan *rell* |#eleiqobolhsan D |#eliqobolisan 69
1071

21:42a #apedokimasan *rell* |#apedokeimasan D |#apedokhmasan 2 28
1424 |#apedwkimasan 579 1346 |#apedwkhmasan 1071

21:42b #gwniaj *rell* |#gwneiaj D |#goniaj E L U 2* 565 579 1424

22:5 #idion *rell* |#eidion D

22:6 #ubpisan *rell* |#ubreisan D |#ubrhsan 28

22:18 #upokritai *rell* |#upokreitai D |#upokrite 2*

22:30 #gamizontai) B D L 047 f^1 22 *pler* NA²⁷ |#ekgamizontai M G D
P S F 2 *pler* |#gameizontai D |#gamiskontai W 33 124 157 700 713
788 1295 |#gamhskontai Q |#ekgamhizontai 2* |#engamizontai 13
|#eggamiskontai 69 1346 Clem^{semel} *pc* |#eggamizontai 1093 1241 1515
Or^{semel} |#ekjamizousin 1194

22:37 #kardia *rell* |#kardeia D

22:46 #apokriqhna *rell* |#apokriqhne)* |#apokreiqhna D

23:6 #prwtoklisian *rell* |#prwtoklisiaj)^{ca} 157 713 892 *a c f f f^1 g^1 h l*
m r^{1.2} aur vg sy^{c.s.pesh(pler).hl.hier} sa bo aeth Hil |#prwtokleisian D

|#prwtoklhsian F G G D 2* 28 69 565 579 1071 |#prwtoklhsiaj L f¹ 33
|#protoklisian Q

23:13 (afietai W Q 579 |afhetai 2); 24:40 (afiete) 28), 41 (afiete
) 28) #afiete *rell* |#afeietai D

23:25c arpaghj kai #akrasiaj *rell* |#akraseiaj D |#adikiaj C E F G
H K S U V G W 28 157 579 700 *pm* sy^{pet} ^{p.cod} Bas^{eth 236 cod} Chr^{mo 5} Op *pc*
|#akaqarsiaj O S 66 71 1295 1515 1844* Cl |#pleoneciaj M 1093 Chr^{montf}
Dam^{par517} |#akrasiaj adikeiaj W |#ponhriaaj 999 |#intemperantia lat
|#intemperantiae d |#iniquitate r² sy^{pesh} |#incontinentia e r¹ |#iniustitia f
|#immunditia ff¹ g^{1.2} l m aur vg sah sy^s sa bo geo |#iniquitate auaritia aeth
|#intemperantia et iniquitate sy^{hl}

23:27 #akaqarsiaj *rell* |#akaqarseiaj D

23:28 #anomiaj *rell* |#anomeiaj D

23:37 #nossia *rell* |#nosseia D |#nosia E* H Q P 565* 579 1424

24:15 #idhte *rell* |#eidhte D |#idhtai W |#idite 579

24:15 #anaginwskwn *rell* |#anageinwskwn D |#anagignwskwn W
|#anaginoskwn Q |#anaginwskon 118 565

24:18 #imation *rell* |#eimateion D

24:27, 37, 39 #parousia *rell* |#parouseia D

24:29 thn #qliyin *rell* |#qleiyein D |#qleiyin B

24:38a #axri *rell* |#axrei D |#axrij f¹³ 69 124 543 788 1346 |#axi Q*

24:38b gamountej kai #gamizontej) 33 1346 1355 1396 NA²⁷
|#gamiskontej B 1675 |#ekgamizontej *rell* |#gameizontej D
|#ekgamiskontej W 517 1424 |#ekgameizontej D |#ekgamhzontej Q
|#eggamizontej S 047 13 124 543 174 230 348 788 826 828 892 983 1093
1241 1346 1473 1515 1689

24:42a #klinhj *rell* |#kleinhj D |#klhnhj 1346

24:42b #miaj *rell* |#meiaj D

24:43 #oikian *rell* |#oikeian D |#oikon L W

25:25 #ide *rell* |#eidou D

25:33 #erifia *rell*|#erifeia D

25:35 #epotisate *rell*|#epoteisatai D|#epothsate L U D Q 2 33
579 1346 1424

25:37 #diywnata *rell*|#deiywnata D

25:42 #epotisate *rell*|#epoteisate D|#epothsate E L Q 2* 33 579
1071 1424|#epotisatai W

25:44 #diywnata *rell*|#deiywnata D|#dhywnata 579|#diyonta E* K

26:3 #arxiereij *rell*|#arxeiereij D

26:7 #barutimou *rell*|#polutimou) A L M Q P 33 157 565 1424 *pc*
|#baruteimou B|#poluteimou D|#barutumou K

26:27 #piete *rell*|#peietai D|#pietai W 579

26:29a #arti *rell*|#artei D

26:29b #basileia *rell*|#baseileia D

26:40 #isxusate *rell*|#isxusaj A 1396|#eisxusatai D|#isxusatai
L

26:51 #wtion *rell*|#wteion D|#otion D

26:58 #idein *rell*|#eidein D

26:59 ezhtoun #yeudomarturian *rell*|#yeudomarturan B*
|#yeudomartureian D

26:65 #imatia *rell*|#eimatia D|#hmatia 2*

26:67 #erapisan *rell*|#eripisan W|#erapizon 157
|#errapisan M f^{13} 1582 22 543 33 565 700 892 al.
#erapisan auton G f^1 1 579 700 1071 1241 1295 1582 1604
2145 $f f^1 g^{1(2)} i q$ aur vg (*pler*)|#erappisan F|#erapeisan D

27:28 auton *rell*
auton ta imatia autou 33 *pc* sy^{hmg} sa^{ms} mae bo^{ms}
auton imation porfuroun\$ 157 |\$kai 157 *a b c d f f^2 h*
(*q*) gat mm (Or^{int} sy^s)
auton eimation porfuroun kai D

27:48 #epotisen *rell*|#epoteizen D|#epothzen W 579

27:49 Hliaj #swwn *pler* NA²⁷ |#kai swsei 11582*
Hleiaj kai swsei D

27:63 #trithj *rell* |#treithj D

5. SINGULAR READINGS WITH NON-SINGULAR ORTHOGRAPHIC EXCHANGES

16:22 #ilewj *rell* |#eilewj) B W Q |#eileoj D* |#ileoj FS 13 124
788

17:27 #agkistron *rell* |#ankistron D |#agkhstron L |#aggistron Q
S W 2* |#ankustrou 2²

18:28 #epnigen *rell* |#epneige B |#epneigen D |#epnige H Y U 13
118 157 700 788 1346 |#epnhgen K W 2* |#epnhge 28 1071

23:27 #fainontai *rell* |#fenonte) |#fainete D

23:28 #fainesqe *rell* |#fenesqe) 2* |#fainesqai C E W Q 13 33 579
|#fenesqai D

24:9 #qliyin *rell* |#qleiyin B |#qliyein C |#qleiyein D
|#qliyeij L 047 *f*¹ 4 273 *pler* |#qlhyin 2 |#qliyij 157

24:44 #ginesqe *rell* |#geinesqe B |#geinesqai D |#ginesqai W Q
2* 28 579

27:64 #xeirwn *rell* |#xeiron) S F 28 33 69 245 565 579 1424 |#xeirw
D |#xerw L |#meizwn 247

28:5 #zhteite *rell* |#zhteitai D |#zhtitai W Q |#zhtite 2
|#zhthte 565

APPENDIX TWENTY-ONE: ITACISMS IN WASHINGTONIANUS IN MATTHEW

1. ai > e

- 6:17 #niyai *rell* |#niye W
- 10:2; 26:37 #Zebedaious *rell* (|#Zebedeou D|#Zebedeou) L)
|#Zebaideou W
- 13:2 #aigialon *rell* |#egeialon W
- 13:14 #anaplhrou tai *rell* |#plhrwqhsetai D 7 517 954 1424 1675
|#anaplhrou te W* |#anaplhrou tai Q 579 |#plhrou tai 1 485 1582*
- 13:48 #aigialon *rell* |#agialon B* |#egialon W
- 16:1 #Saddoukaious *rell* |#Sadoukaious L Y* Q* |#Saddoukeous W
- 16:6 (-U 157 *haplography*), 11, 12 (-579 *f*¹) #Saddoukaiwn *rell*
|#Saddoukewn W
- 16:13 #Kaisareiaj B F G *plu* NA²⁷ |#Kaisariaj) C D L *plu*
|#Kesariaj W
- 17:9 #katabainontwn *rell* |#katabainontej D *d sy*^{c-p}
|#katabenontwn W |#katabantwn 655
- 25:10 #agorasai *rell* |#agorase W |#agwrasai 579
- 26:35 #aparnhsomai *rell* |#aparnhswmai A M K U P 1582 118 157 1071
|#arnhsomai H |#aparnhsome W
- 26:56 #maqhtai *rell* |#maqhte W
- 26:75 #fwnhsai *rell* exc. *f*¹ |#fwnhse W
- 27:20 #aithswntai *rell* |#aithsontai E H W 2 1071 1346 1424
|#ethswntai W |#aitisontai 13
- 27:42 #dunatai *rell* |#dunate W
- 27:42 #swsai *rell* |#swse W

2. e > ai

- 5:44 #poieite *rell* |#poieitai W |#poihte KL 2*

6:16 #nhsteuhte *rell*|#nhsteuhtai W|#nhsteuete S 348 l47
|#nhsteuiete 2*

6:15 #afhte *rell*|#afhtai W

6:33 #zhteite *rell*|#zhtite N|#zhteitai W|#zhthte Q

6:34 #merimnhshte *rell*|#merimnhseite EW 2|#merhmnsite L
|#merimnhshtai W|#merhmnhseite 1071

7:23 #apoxwreite *rell*|#apoxorhte L 2*|#apoxwritai W
|#apoxwrite D|#anaxwrite Q|#anaxwreite f^{13} 788

10:8 #dote *rell*|#dwte GL 2 l3 1346|#dotai W

10:11 #meinate *rell*|#minate) N|#meinatai W|#mhnate Q 118
|#menete 28

10:19 #merimnhshte *rell*|#merimhshte B*|#merimnhshtai W
|#merimnhsete G Q 253 l54|#merimnhseite|#merimnhsite 1424

14:27 #fobeisqe *rell*|#fobisqe)|#fobeisqai CDP 2 28 157 579
|#fobhsqe E* 565 1071|#fobisqai W|#fwbeisqe Q

17:7 #egerqhte *rell*|#egeiresqai D l33|#egerqhtai W

17:9 #eiphte *rell*|#eiphtai W|#eipeite 1071

18:10 #orate *rell*|#oratai W

18:35 #afhte *rell*|#afhtai W|#afeite 579

21:2 #poreuesqe) B L Q f 1 33 157 788 1346 1424 NA²⁷|#poreuqhte
rell|#poreuqhtai W|#poreuesqai 13

21:2 #agagete *rell*|#agete B 56 58|#agetai D|#agagetai W

21:21 #exhte *rell*|#exeite E 2 579 1071|#exhtai W

21:21 #eiphte *rell*|#eiphtai W

21:24 #eiphte *rell*|#eipite L|#eiphtai W|#eipeite 1071

21:25 #episteusate *rell*|#aipisteusate L|#episteusatai W

23:3 eipwsin umin #poieite *rell* (D)|#poihsate) B L Q 124 NA²⁷
|#poiete F K Y (G) 2|#poieitai W|#poiein (G) f^1 118 700|#poihte
565|#pointai 579

23:14 om. verse) B D L Q *pler* NA²⁷ |#katesqiete *rell* |#kataisqieietai
W |#katesqieietai 13 579

23:39 #eiphte *rell* |#eiphtai W |#ipeite 13

24:2 #blepete *rell* |#blepetai W

24:15 #idhte *rell* |#eidhte D |#idhtai W |#idite 579

25:42 #epotisate *rell* |#epoteisate D |#epothsate E L Q 2* 33 579
1071 1424 |#epotisatai W

3. ei > i

1:21 #kaleseij *rell* |#kalesei L* |#kalesij W

2:4 (grammathj S*); 15:1 (gramateij Q); 17:10; 23:2 #grammateij
rell |#grammatij W

5:43 #agaphseij *rell* |#agaphsij W |#agaphshj 2* 788

9:26 #ekeinhn *rell* |#ekinhn W

11:11¹ #meizwn *rell* |#mizwn) N Q |#mizon W |#meizon 565 892

11:22 #Seidwni *rell* |#Sosomni N |#Sidonei W

12:40⁴ #treij *rell* |#trij W

13:34 #elalei *rell* |#elalhshen)* D 1675 sah |#elalh E M G 2 565
579 |#elali W |#hlalh Q

16:23 #froneij *rell* |#fronij W |#efrwnesaj Q

17:4 #Mwusei *rell* |#Mwsh *uel* Mwsei C E F *pc* 700 2 33 M L M U Q P^c f¹³
157 1071 579 |#Mwush L Q P 2 F 892 |#Mwusi W

19:19 #agaphseij *rell* |#agaphsij W |#agaphsej Q* |#agaphshj 579

20:22 dunasqe #piein *rell* |#peiein D |#pin W |#poiein f¹³

25:26 #hdeij *rell* |#hdiij W |#idhj 69 |#hdhj 1424

25:27 #balein *rell* |#balin W |#katabalein 517 1424 |#labein 697

26:41 #grhgoreite *rell* |#egrhgoreite P³⁷ |#grhgoreitai D L 579
|#grhgorite W |#grhgorhte Q 69

27:4b eipan L f¹³ 33 788 1346 NA²⁷ |#eipon *rell* |#i(pon) W*

4. i >ei

- 1:5 #Iessai *plu* NA²⁷ | #Eiessai W
- 2:6 #elaxisth *rell* | #elaxeisth W
- 2:13 #isqi *rell* | #eisqei W | #isqei 2*
- 3:4 #meli *rell* | #melei W
- 5:1 #kaqisantoj *rell* | #kaqeisantoj W
- 5:15 #oikia *rell* | #okeia W
- 6:26 #oux *rell* | #ouxei W | #ouxi Q
ou pollw 28
- 6:27 #hlikian *rell* | #hlikeian W
- 6:34 #kakia *rell* | #kakeia W
- 7:14 #oligoi *rell* | #oleigoi W
- 7:25 #oikia *rell* | #oikeia W
- 8:9; 22:32; 24:5; 26:22, 25 (eimh 579); 27:24; 28:20 (hmi E* F 28 | om. 579)
#eimi *rell* | #eimei W
- 8:11 #anakliqhsontai *rell* | #anaklhqhsontai V 13 251 252 471 485
517 543 al. | #anakleiqhsontai W
- 8:16 #oyiaj *rell* | #oyeiaj W
- 9:37 #oligoi *rell* | #oleigoi W
- 10:34 #nomishte *rell* | #nomishtai) DD | #nomhseite L
| #nomeishtai W | #nomhshte Q 2 28 788 1346
- 11:22 #Seidwni *rell* | #Sosomni N | #Sidonei W
- 13:2 #aigialon *rell* | #egeialon W
- 13:48 #kaqisantej *rell* | #kaqhsantej L Q W 2* 28 1071 1346
| #kaqeisantej W
- 14:11 #pinaki *rell* | #pinakei W | #pinakh 2*

14:23 #idian *rell* |#eidian W |#hdian 2*

18:34 #orgisqeij *rell* |#orgisqij) |#orgisqhj E* |#orghsqeij G
2 |#orgeisqeij W |#orghsqhj Q* |#orghsqij Q^c |#orgisqhj 579

20:1 #prwi *rell* |#prwei W

21:7 #epekaqisen B C F M S U V X Z^{vid} G D *f*¹³ *pler* it^{pler} sy^{utr.cu} sa *pc* Or *pc*
NA²⁷ |#ekaqisan) * |#epekaqisan)^{ca} 4 16 245 291 892 |#ekaqhto D 700
|#epekaqhsen H 118 1071 |#ekaqhsen K Q |#epekaqhsan L 579
|#ekaqisen N Y P S 1241 |#ekaqeisen W |#epekaqise 69

21:34 #hggisen *rell* |#hggeisan W |#hgghsen Q

22:14 #oligoi *rell* |#oleigoi W

23:14 om. verse) B D L Q *pler* NA²⁷ |#katesqiete *rell* |#kataisqeietai
W |#katesqietai 13 579

23:15 #upokritai *rell* |#upokreital W |#oipokritai 579

24:33 #idhte *rell* |#eidhtai W |#idhtai Q |#hdhte 1424

25:22 (idou D 2145 it^{pler} vg^{pler} VSS *rell*), 25 (idou D VSS *pler* |o de 1515);
26:65 (idou Q 157) #ide *rell* |#eide W

25:23 #oliga *rell* |#olhga L |#oleiga W

25:26 oti \$ qerizw *rell* |\$egw anqrwpoj austhroj eimei W (sy^{p(1MS)}
sah^(1MS))

26:67 #erapisan\$ *rell* |#erapeisan auton D |#eripisan W
|#erappisan auton F |#errapisan M *f*^{1 13} 1582 22 543 33 565 700 892 al.
|#erapizon 157 |\$auton G *f*¹ 1 579 700 1071 1241 1295 1582 1604 2145 *ff*¹
*g*¹⁽²⁾ *i q* aur vg (*pler*)

27:1 #prwiaj *rell* |#prweiaj W |#proiaj 2

27:2 #hgemoni *rell* |#hgemonei W |#hgemwnh 124 788 |#hgemwni 1424

5. oi > u

7:7 #anoighsetai *rell* |#anughsetai W |#aagisetai 2

6. SINGULAR READINGS WITH NON-SINGULAR ORTHOGRAPHIC EXCHANGES

5:44 exqrouj umwn\$) B 1 1582* NA²⁷ |\$eulogeite (*rell*)|\$euloghte
L Q 2*|\$eulogeitai W|\$eulogite 2^c|#eulogitai 1071

6:31 #merimnhshte *rell*|#merimnhseite L^c|#merimnhshtai W
|#merhmnhshte D|#merimnishtai Q|#merimnhsete 118 209

7:6 #balhte *rell*|#baleite E|#ballete L|#balhtai W|#baletai
2*|#om.13|#ballhte 473|#balete 1424

9:4 #enqumeisqe *rell*|#enqumeisqai D 13 33 157 1071|#enqumisqe
N|#enqumisqai W

10:14 #ektinacate *rell*|#ekteinacate D G L D 13 28 33 565 788
|#ektinacatai W|#ektinaca Y*|#ekthnacate Q 2|#ekteinacate
124 1071 1346|#ekteinacatai 1424

10:19² #lalhshste *rell*|#lalhsete E S U P W 157^c 700 1071 1582^c
|#lalhsetai M 579|#lalhshstai W|#lalhsite D

10:27 #khrucate *rell*|#khrussetai D Q|#kairuchte E*
|#khrughsete L|#khrucatai W

18:3 #genhsqe *rell*|#genesqe L|#genesqai W|#ghnesqai 13 2*
|#genhsesqai 579

20:19 #empaicai *rell*|#empece)|#empecai C D 2* 28 33 565 1071
|#empaicai D E|#enpecai W

23:13 #kleiete *rell*|#kliete)|#kleietai D L 2 13|#klietai W
|#kliestai Q

23:31 #martureite *rell*|#marturite) Q|#martureitai C
|#marturitai W|#marturhte 579

23:39 #idhte *rell*|#eidhte C M D|#idete E 2^c|#idhtai W|#idetai
2*|#ideite 13

24:42 #grhgoreite *rell*|#grhgorhtai L*|#grhgoreitai L^c D 579
1071|#grhgoritai W|#grhgorite Q

26:36 #Geqshmani) L U P W 33 124 NA²⁷|#Gesshmanei P⁴⁵ M D
|#Geqshmanei A B C *pc*|#Geqsamanei D|#Gedshmani W
|#Geqsshmanei K|#Geqshmanh M* 1582^c 118 2 157 1071|#Ghqshmanh
M^{c2}|#Ghqshmani Q|#Geqsemani S|#Gesshmani E G* H V W 124 461
pc|#Gessimani 124|#Getshmanei 565|#Geudshmani 579
|#Geqsimanh 700 1424

27:12 #kathgoreisqai *rell*|#kathgorisqe)|#kathgorisqai W
|#kathgoreisqe Q|#kathgoreisqe 1346

APPENDIX TWENTY-TWO: SINGULAR OMISSIONS (-) AND ADDITIONS (+) OF WORDS

Table A22.1 Codex Sinaiticus¹

-13	-9	-8	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+4
24:35	9:15	10:39	5:45; 13:39	28:2-3	7:27b; 19:18; 21:30; 27:56a	12:46; 13:44; 14:23; 18:12	19:26; 24:37 ; 27:48; 28:5a;	1:21; 1:23; 2:2; 4:23a; 5:46; 6:9; 8:3; 8:15b; 9:9; 9:28a; 9:30; 9:35a; 10:9; 12:11c; 12:37; 12:44; 18:20; 19:10; 20:7; 20:19; 21:19; 22:1; 22:15; 22:32b; 22:32c; 22:42; 23:11; 24:10; 25:22 ; 26:33; 27:11; 27:33; 27:53a; 27:53b; 28:10;	4:23b; 6:16a; 6:16b; 6:28; 7:22; (7:26); 9:28b; 10:4; 11:19; 13:28; 15:11a; 18:31; 20:18b; 20:31a; 21:7b; 21:34-35; 23:4a; 23:16; 24:39 ; 27:16; 27:24; 27:54ab;	8:7; 15:5; 19:1	27:56b

Table A22.2 Codex Vaticanus

-2	-1	+1	+4	+5	+6
10:14; 13:17; 26:3	1:25; 5:16; 12:48; 14:13; 16:17; 19:17; 20:32; 22:39	12:32a; 12:32b; 17:15	2:13	21:4	26:57

Table A22.3 Codex Ephraemi

-4	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
13:3-4	12:22a; 15:30; 15:36	12:48; 13:15; 13:57; 21:7b	2:20; 5:10; 12:47; 21:1; 22:20; 26:39; (26:65); 27:56	20:11	24:3a

¹ In table A22.1, the citations in bold signify omissions/additions in the work of scribe D of Sinaiticus, otherwise, all citations reference omissions/additions in the work of scribe A of Sinaiticus.

Table A22.4 Codex Bezae

-15	-4	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2
15:37-38	15:32b	14:8; 22:24; 26:1-2	12:20a	4:16e; 5:3; 5:25a; 5:48; 6:18b; 6:18d; 9:33; 10:13 ² ; 10:35; 12:1a; 13:16b; 13:25; 13:44b; 14:31; 16:13b; 16:23; 19:28 ² ; 21:13; 21:22; 23:16; 24:21; 26:1; 26:16; 27:46; 27:56; 27:61a; 28:1; 28:16	10:15; 11:11a; 11:11b; 12:1b; 12:12; 12:18a; 12:20c; 12:23; 12:34; 12:42; 12:45; 13:1c; 13:6a; 13:48b; 15:14a; 15:39b; 18:19b; 21:3; 21:36; 23:6; 24:30a; 26:61; 27:15; 27:16;	13:38a; 15:22b; 23:3

Table A22.5 Codex Washingtonianus

-8	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
16:2-3	8:28; 21:8	2:17; 18:4	6:7b; 7:17; 17:8b; 17:24; 19:8; 19:9b; 21:32a	12:20; 13:20; 13:41; 23:25	6:30; 8:29; 14:30; 17:25	12:15-16; 26:3