

Copyright © 2013 Elijah Michael Hixson

All rights reserved. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has permission to reproduce and disseminate this document in any form by any means for purposes chosen by the Seminary, including, without limitation, preservation or instruction.

SCRIBAL TENDENCIES IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL  
IN CODEX ALEXANDRINUS

---

A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Faculty of  
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

---

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

---

by  
Elijah Michael Hixson

May 2013

**APPROVAL SHEET**

SCRIBAL TENDENCIES IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL  
IN CODEX ALEXANDRINUS

Elijah Michael Hixson

Read and Approved by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Brian J. Vickers (Chair)

\_\_\_\_\_  
John B. Polhill

Date \_\_\_\_\_

To my parents, Mike Hixson and Rachel Hayes

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE .....	xi
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF SCRIBAL TENDENCIES IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL IN CODEX ALEXANDRINUS .....	1
A Description of Codex Alexandrinus .....	1
Content and significance. ....	1
Name and history .....	4
The scribes of Alexandrinus. ....	6
Kenyon’s five scribes. ....	7
Milne and Skeat’s two or three scribes .....	7
Written by the hand of Thecla the Martyr? .....	8
Scribal Habits through Singular Readings: A Short Summary. ....	9
2. MANUSCRIPT AND METHODOLOGY .....	13
The Manuscript. ....	13
Method for Selecting Singular Readings .....	14
Editions used. ....	14
<i>Nomina sacra</i> and orthography. ....	16
“Sub-singulars” .....	18
Corrections .....	18
Classification of Singular Readings .....	20
Hernández’s study .....	20
Insignificant singulars. ....	21

Chapter	Page
Significant singulars . . . . .	21
Inherited singulars. . . . .	22
Summary of classification. . . . .	23
Explanation of the Tables Used . . . . .	26
3. SINGULAR READINGS IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL IN CODEX ALEXANDRINUS. . . . .	29
Insignificant Singulars. . . . .	29
Orthographic singulars . . . . .	29
Vowel replacement. . . . .	30
Consonantal changes . . . . .	32
Nonsense readings . . . . .	32
Strictly nonsense. . . . .	33
Nonsense in context . . . . .	35
Significant Singulars. . . . .	40
Additions. . . . .	40
One-word additions . . . . .	41
Additions of two or more words. . . . .	41
Factors in additions. . . . .	46
Omissions . . . . .	46
One-word omissions. . . . .	47
Omissions of two or more words . . . . .	55
Factors in omissions. . . . .	59
Transpositions not due to harmonization . . . . .	60
Harmonizations. . . . .	64
Harmonizations to context . . . . .	64
Harmonizations to usage . . . . .	68

Chapter	Page
Substitutions . . . . .	69
Verbs. . . . .	69
Two-word phrases . . . . .	74
Adjectives/adverbs. . . . .	77
Nouns . . . . .	79
An Inherited Singular . . . . .	81
4. DATA ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	83
Singular Readings: Raw Data. . . . .	83
Codicological Observations . . . . .	85
Corrections . . . . .	85
Summary of singulars and corrections . . . . .	87
Punctuation markers . . . . .	88
Line breaks . . . . .	90
Summary of punctuation markers and line breaks. . . . .	91
Phrases. . . . .	92
Comparison with Hernández’s Study on the Apocalypse in Alexandrinus. . . . .	92
Summary of Scribal Tendencies in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus. . . . .	94
Conclusions. . . . .	96
 Appendix	
1. SUMMARY OF SCRIBAL TENDENCIES IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL IN ALEXANDRINUS . . . . .	99
2. LOCATIONS OF VARIANTS . . . . .	100
3. SUMMARY OF REASONS WHY JOHN 3:16 IN ALEXANDRINUS CONTAINS AN INHERITED SINGULAR . . . . .	103
 BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	 105

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CBNT	Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series
IGNTP 1	W. J. Elliott and D. C. Parker, eds., <i>The New Testament in Greek IV: The Gospel According to St. John</i> , vol. 1, <i>The Papyri</i>
IGNTP 2	U. B. Schmid, W. J. Elliott, and D. C. Parker, eds., <i>The New Testament in Greek IV: The Gospel According to St. John</i> , vol. 2, <i>The Majuscules</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
JSNTSupp	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
NA <sup>26</sup>	Nestle-Aland 26 <sup>th</sup> ed.
NA <sup>27</sup>	Nestle-Aland 27 <sup>th</sup> ed.
NA <sup>28</sup>	Nestle-Aland 28 <sup>th</sup> ed.
NTGF	The New Testament in the Greek Fathers
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
NTTSD	New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents
SD	Studies and Documents
<i>SQE</i>	Kurt Aland, ed., <i>Synopsis quattuor Evangeliorum. Locis parallelis evangeliorum apocryphorum et Patrum adhibitis</i> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> ed.
Swanson	Reuben Swanson, ed., <i>New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus</i> (Respective volumes referred to in context)
<i>TC</i>	<i>TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism</i>
TCS	Text-Critical Studies



TDSA	Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità
Tischendorf	Constantine von Tischendorf, ed., <i>Novum Testamentum Graece, Editio Octava Critica Maior</i> , vol. 1
Tregelles	Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, ed., <i>The Greek New Testament: Edited from Ancient Authorities, with Their Various Readings in Full, and the Latin Version of Jerome</i> , pt. 2, <i>Gospels of St. Luke and St. John</i>
TS	Texts and Studies, 3 <sup>rd</sup> ser.
TU	Texte Und Untersuchungen: Zur Geschichte Der Altchristlichen Literatur
UBS <sup>3</sup>	United Bible Societies' <i>Greek New Testament</i> , 3 <sup>rd</sup> ed.
UBS <sup>4</sup>	United Bible Societies' <i>Greek New Testament</i> , 4 <sup>th</sup> ed.
von Soden	Hermann Freiherr von Soden, ed., <i>Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer Ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt, hergestellt auf grund ihrer Textgeschichte</i>
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1. Vowel replacement. . . . .	30
2. Consonantal changes. . . . .	32
3. Strictly nonsense. . . . .	33
4. Nonsense in context . . . . .	35
5. One-word additions . . . . .	41
6. Additions of two or more words. . . . .	42
7. One-word omissions. . . . .	47
8. Omissions of two or more words . . . . .	55
9. Transpositions. . . . .	61
10. Harmonizations to context: Substitutions. . . . .	65
11. Harmonizations to context: Omissions. . . . .	66
12. Harmonizations to context: Grammatical attraction. . . . .	67
13. Harmonizations to usage. . . . .	68
14. Substitutions: Verbs . . . . .	70
15. Substitutions: Two-word phrases. . . . .	73
16. Substitutions: Adjectives/adverbs. . . . .	78
17. Substitutions: Nouns. . . . .	79
18. An inherited singular . . . . .	82
19. Singulars: Raw data . . . . .	83
20. Singulars: Adjusted data. . . . .	84
21. Corrections. . . . .	86
22. Adjusted corrections. . . . .	87

23. Adjusted summary . . . . .	88
24. Singulars near punctuation . . . . .	90
25. Singulars near line breaks. . . . .	91

## PREFACE

This work would not be possible without the help of too many to list here. Apart from Dr. Brian Vickers' generosity and kindness, this thesis would not have happened. Not only did Dr. Vickers agree to take me as a student, but also his patience and encouragement along the way has seemed to be limitless. Dr. John Polhill has been a constant source of guidance and encouragement, lending his expertise in matters of textual criticism to me, even in his retirement. My interest in New Testament textual criticism is due largely to Dr. Polhill. He has been a source of help and wisdom to me, not only with respect to this thesis, but also in many other matters. My gratitude for Drs. Vickers and Polhill is more than could be expressed with words, and it has been a deep honor to study under two such gentlemen-scholars.

Special thanks must go to my family. My father, Mike Hixson, and my mother, Rachel Hayes, have always and in every way supported my efforts in seminary. I owe more to Katie, my wife, than to anyone else. She is a shining example of what it looks like to be like Jesus. She is always what I need, whether encouragement when I need encouragement, or rebuke when I need rebuke. I could not have done any of this without her.

Elijah Hixson

Louisville, Kentucky

May 2013

CHAPTER 1  
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF SCRIBAL  
TENDENCIES IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL  
IN CODEX ALEXANDRINUS

The dead hand of Fenton John Anthony Hort *still* lies heavy upon us, but the methodology developed by Ernest Cadman Colwell guides us to a better knowledge of NT MSS. The purpose of this study is to extend the research foreseen by Hort and inaugurated by Colwell in his watershed study, “Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits,”<sup>1</sup> to the Fourth Gospel in Codex Alexandrinus.<sup>2</sup> By isolating and categorizing the singular readings of a MS—those readings not found in any other known Greek MS, one may arrive at an approximation of the tendencies of the scribe who copied that MS.

**A Description of Codex Alexandrinus**

*Content and Significance*

Alexandrinus<sup>3</sup> is a fifth-century<sup>4</sup> codex that originally contained the Old and

---

<sup>1</sup>Ernest Cadman Colwell, “Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits,” in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, ed. Bruce M. Metzger, NTTS 9 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), 106–24; originally published as “Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text,” in *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, ed. J. Philip Hyatt (presented at the 100th Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1964), 370–89.

<sup>2</sup>London, British Library, Royal MS 1 D. VIII. Hereafter referred to simply as Alexandrinus.

<sup>3</sup>The majority of this section—specifically items not cited, is summarized from Frederic G. Kenyon, ed., *The Codex Alexandrinus (Royal MS. 1 D V-Viii) in Reduced Photographic Facsimile*, vol. 1 (London: British Museum, 1909), 1–11. Milne and Skeat also wrote a brief introduction to Alexandrinus, (Herbert John Mansfield Milne and T. C. Skeat, *The Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Alexandrinus* [London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1955], 30–40), but much of it is the same as Kenyon’s earlier introduction, save their proposal for the number and identification of the scribes.

<sup>4</sup>See the entry for Alexandrinus (02) in Kurt Aland et al., *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung 1 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994).

New Testaments, the Apocrypha, the apocryphal Psalms of Solomon and the Clementine Epistles, though with a few lacunae. Along with Codices Sinaiticus, Vaticanus and Ephraemi Rescriptus, Hort included Alexandrinus as one of the “four great Bibles.”<sup>5</sup> Alexandrinus is commonly abbreviated “A,” and it bears the Gregory-Aland number 02. Alexandrinus has lost approximately forty-seven leaves, of which there were originally 820.<sup>6</sup> The majority of the lost text (twenty-five leaves) came from Matthew’s Gospel, as the NT in Alexandrinus begins in the middle of the verse at Matthew 25:6. The other gaps in the NT are two leaves from the Fourth Gospel and three from 2 Corinthians. The Fourth Gospel is lacunose from 6:50-8:52, but the missing pages are not sufficient to accommodate the inclusion of the *pericope adulterae*.<sup>7</sup> The pages were apparently lost between the fourteenth century and 1627, based on Arabic numeration in the MS dated to the fourteenth century that reveals the presence of those pages at the time of its origin.

The textual quality of Alexandrinus differs from book to book. It is “block-mixed,” meaning that the quality and type of text in certain sections of the manuscript differs greatly from that in other sections. In the four Gospels, Alexandrinus has an early form of the Byzantine text-type, whereas elsewhere in the NT, it exhibits a very early, relatively pure form of the text. Aland and Aland place Alexandrinus in Category III in the Gospels, but elsewhere, Category I.<sup>8</sup> It is impossible to say whether this “block-

---

<sup>5</sup>B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1882; repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2003), 74–75.

<sup>6</sup>Kenyon, *Codex Alexandrinus*, 1:8.

<sup>7</sup>Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Biblegesellschaft, 1994), 187.

<sup>8</sup>Kurt Aland 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*, trans. Erroll F. Rhodes, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 109.

mixing” is the result of Alexandrinus itself having been copied from multiple exemplars<sup>9</sup> or if a single copy from multiple exemplars was made previously in its line of transmission.

Alexandrinus bears special significance for the study of the transmission of the text of the NT in two ways. Due both to the relative paucity of Greek attestation<sup>10</sup> and to the purity of its text, Alexandrinus is often considered the single most important MS of the Apocalypse. Hort noted that, “especially in the Apocalypse, [Alexandrinus has] many Pre-Syrian readings not belonging to either of the aberrant types.”<sup>11</sup> Later, he added that “A[lexandrinus] stands quite alone, or unsustained by any other Greek MS, in some manifestly right readings.”<sup>12</sup> More recently, Tobias Nicklas has referred to Alexandrinus as “perhaps the most important witness of a full text of Revelation.”<sup>13</sup> However, Maurice Robinson does not share the view that Alexandrinus is possibly the best witness to the text of the Apocalypse, remarking, “Obviously, the scribe of MS A was either quite careless or quite an editor, or a mixture of both.”<sup>14</sup>

The second way in which Alexandrinus bears special significance to text critics is that it was the first NT manuscript to be preserved by photographic reproduction. In

---

<sup>9</sup>Bruce M. Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption and Restoration*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 67; Aland and Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 109.

<sup>10</sup>As of 1997, according to J. K. Elliott, there were 303 extant MSS of the Apocalypse, in “The Distinctiveness of the Greek Manuscripts of the Book of Revelation,” *JTS* 48 (1997): 116.

<sup>11</sup>Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, 152.

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*, 261.

<sup>13</sup>Tobias Nicklas, “The Early Text of Revelation,” in *The Early Text of the New Testament*, ed. Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 226.

<sup>14</sup>Maurice Arthur Robinson, “Scribal Habits Among Manuscripts of the Apocalypse” (Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1982), 104.

order to do the work of textual criticism, scholars need access to the MSS themselves.<sup>15</sup>

For primarily this reason, the Center for the Study of New Testament Manuscripts (CSNTM) exists. Wallace, the founder and executive director of CSNTM states, “Our first task is to photograph digitally all surviving Greek NT MSS.”<sup>16</sup> However, Alexandrinus became the first NT MS to be made available through photographic reproduction in 1879, with the publication of Thompson’s facsimile edition of the NT portion of Alexandrinus.<sup>17</sup> Concerning the photographic reproduction, Kenyon wrote,

The Codex Alexandrinus was thus the first MS. (with the exception of the Utrecht Psalter) to be placed beyond the reach of destruction, so far as this can be assured by photography, and this publication remains as the best (and for most purposes the completely adequate) substitute for the original, which is thereby saved from much of the wear and tear of handling.<sup>18</sup>

It is ironic that these words appeared in Kenyon’s introduction for his own photographic facsimile of Alexandrinus, though Kenyon added, “The present issue of a facsimile on a reduced scale [i.e., Kenyon’s facsimile] is intended to serve the same purpose at a much lower cost.”<sup>19</sup>

### *Name and History*

Alexandrinus was first given its present name in 1657, by Brian Walton.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup>Daniel B. Wallace, “Challenges in New Testament Textual Criticism for the Twenty-First Century,” *JETS* 52 (2009): 96–97.

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.*, 96.

<sup>17</sup>E. Maunde Thompson, ed., *Facsimile of the Codex Alexandrinus: New Testament and Clementine Epistles* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1879). Three additional volumes containing the OT in Alexandrinus appeared subsequently.

<sup>18</sup>Kenyon, *Codex Alexandrinus*, 1:7.

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>20</sup>Scot McKendrick, “The Codex Alexandrinus, or The Dangers of Being a Named Manuscript,” in *The Bible As Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text*, ed. Scot McKendrick and Orlaith A. O’Sullivan (New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll, 2003), 2. McKendrick’s article is a fascinating look at the history and origin of Alexandrinus.



Originally, “Alexandrinus” only referred to “its recent ownership, not its medieval ownership, and certainly not its origin.”<sup>21</sup> An Arabic inscription on the first page of Genesis offers some information on the history of Alexandrinus before it came to England in 1627, stating that it was “Bound to the Patriarchall [sic] Cell in the Fortress of Alexandria. Whoever removes it thence shall be excommunicated and cut off. Written by Athanasius the humble.”<sup>22</sup> This “Athanasius the humble,” was likely Athanasius II, Patriarch of Alexandria from around 1275 until around 1315.<sup>23</sup> Although he was Patriarch of Alexandria, Athanasius II lived in Constantinople until around 1305, and it appears that he acquired Alexandrinus during that time, bringing it to Alexandria around 1308.<sup>24</sup> The MS remained in Alexandria until 1620, when Cyril Lucar, Patriarch of Alexandria became Patriarch of Constantinople; it is assumed that Cyril took Alexandrinus with him when he moved to Constantinople.<sup>25</sup>

The history of Alexandrinus becomes clearer in 1625. That year, Cyril offered the MS as a gift to James I of England. James’ death prevented him from ever receiving Alexandrinus, but Cyril renewed the offer to James’ successor, Charles I. Charles received the MS in 1627 through Sir Thomas Roe, the British Ambassador to Constantinople.<sup>26</sup> Alexandrinus has since remained in British custody.

While it seems clear that Cyril acquired Alexandrinus in Alexandria where it had been moved by Athanasius II the Patriarch of Alexandria who lived in

---

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., 3.

<sup>22</sup>The translation is given in Thomas S. Pattie, “The Creation of the Great Codices,” in *The Bible As Book: The Manuscript Tradition* (New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll, 1998), 69–70.

<sup>23</sup>McKendrick, “The Codex Alexandrinus, or The Dangers of Being a Named Manuscript,” 6.

<sup>24</sup>Pattie, “The Creation of the Great Codices,” 70; McKendrick, “The Codex Alexandrinus, or The Dangers of Being a Named Manuscript,” 6–7.

<sup>25</sup>McKendrick, “The Codex Alexandrinus, or The Dangers of Being a Named Manuscript,” 2.

<sup>26</sup>Kenyon, *Codex Alexandrinus*, 1:5.

Constantinople, one thing makes it unlikely that Athanasius acquired Alexandrinus in Constantinople: The Fourth Crusade. In the destruction of Constantinople in 1204, churches were robbed and anything seen to be of value was either stolen or destroyed.<sup>27</sup> Admitting the virtual impossibility of Alexandrinus surviving such destruction, McKendrick suggests an Ephesian provenance of Alexandrinus.<sup>28</sup> Alexandrinus was not the only MS Cyril sent to England through Sir Thomas Roe. Additionally, Roe brought back a Greek MS of Chrysostom's and Hesychius' commentaries on the Psalms (Roe MS 13), written near Ephesus in 1284-1285, and containing an Arabic inscription indicating that it was acquired and given to "the See of St. Mark [i.e., Alexandria], and whoever removes it will be excommunicated. Written by Athanasius the humble."<sup>29</sup> If, McKendrick argues, there was a manuscript of Ephesian origin that was moved to Alexandria by "Athanasius the humble" and then given by Cyril, Patriarch of Constantinople, but formerly of Alexandria to Sir Thomas Roe, "why not two?"<sup>30</sup>

Thus, it appears that the name "Alexandrinus" refers only to the period of about 300 years in which the MS resided in Alexandria. It seems to have stayed at Ephesus from its writing to its removal to Alexandria around 1308. In 1620, 312 years later, Cyril removed it from Alexandria to Constantinople, but gave it to Charles 1 only seven years later.

### *The Scribes of Alexandrinus*

In modern times, the number of scribes involved in the production of

---

<sup>27</sup>John Godfrey, *1204, the Unholy Crusade* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), 127–29.

<sup>28</sup>McKendrick, "The Codex Alexandrinus, or The Dangers of Being a Named Manuscript," 9–11.

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>30</sup>*Ibid.*, 9.

Alexandrinus has been debated. Kenyon first posited five scribes,<sup>31</sup> but Milne and Skeat argued for two, possibly three.<sup>32</sup> Additionally, some, including Cyril himself, have passed down the tradition that Alexandrinus was written by “Thecla the Martyr.”

### **Kenyon’s Five Scribes**

In 1909, Kenyon suggested that five scribes were involved in the production of Alexandrinus. Based on an analysis of the handwriting, Kenyon put forth the following explanation of the five scribes:

- I. Octateuch, Prophets, Maccabees, Job-Eccclus.
- II. Kings, Chronicles, Esther-Esdras, Psalms, Clementine Epistles.
- III. Matthew, Mark (with a table of κεφάλαια to Luke), 1 Cor. x. 8-Philemon (Hebrews precedes Pastoral Epistles).
- IV. Luke-1 Cor. x. 8 (including Catholic Epistles, which follow Acts).
- V. Apocalypse.<sup>33</sup>

This study retains Kenyon’s assessment of five scribes.<sup>34</sup>

### **Milne and Skeat’s Two or Three Scribes**

Although they drew heavily from Kenyon’s previous work, Milne and Skeat challenged his assessment that five scribes were involved with the production of Alexandrinus. Milne and Skeat affirmed Kenyon’s division of two scribes for the OT and Clementine Epistles, but they argued that Kenyon’s “Scribe I” was also his “Scribe III,” “Scribe IV” and “Scribe V.”<sup>35</sup> Kenyon’s “Scribe” IV may have some validity, however, since Luke-1 Corinthians 10:8 are written in “a smoother lighter hand and a reddish

---

<sup>31</sup>Kenyon, *Codex Alexandrinus*, 1:9–11.

<sup>32</sup>Milne and Skeat, *The Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Alexandrinus*, 38–39.

<sup>33</sup>Kenyon, *Codex Alexandrinus*, 1:9–11.

<sup>34</sup>Thanks are due to Andrew Smith, who first suggested to me that I should consider Kenyon’s five scribes over Milne and Skeat’s two or three.

<sup>35</sup>Milne and Skeat, *The Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Alexandrinus*, 38.

brown ink,<sup>36</sup> so they allow for a possibility of a third scribe (Kenyon's Scribe IV). Milne and Skeat's argument was based more on the appearances of colophons and the method of cross-referencing passages in the Gospels than on an analysis of the handwriting of the text. While colophons and referencing systems are certainly to be considered, they are not enough to dismiss Kenyon's assessment, since they, too, could have simply been copied as-is from a history of transmission that contained multiple exemplars.

### **Written by the Hand of Thecla the Martyr?**

Apart from Kenyon's assessment of five scribes and Milne and Skeat's assessment of two or three, Alexandrinus has long been associated with Thecla the Martyr.<sup>37</sup> Before it came to be known as Codex Alexandrinus, the MS was called both "Codex Regius"<sup>38</sup> and "Thecla's Bible."<sup>39</sup> An Arabic inscription at the beginning of the MS mentions this origin. The Arabic was translated into Latin by Richard Bentley, the Royal Librarian from 1693 to 1724.<sup>40</sup> Bentley's Latin translation, written underneath the Arabic, says. "They remember this book to be written by the hand of Thecla the Martyr."<sup>41</sup> Furthermore, Cyril himself wrote a note in the beginning of the MS before giving it to Charles I to the effect that the MS was written by Thecla, an Egyptian woman, just after the Council of Nicea, and that the colophon bearing her name had since

---

<sup>36</sup>Ibid.

<sup>37</sup>For treatment of the tradition that Alexandrinus was written by Thecla, see Kim Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 50–52, and McKendrick, "The Codex Alexandrinus, or The Dangers of Being a Named Manuscript," 5–6.

<sup>38</sup>Not to be confused with Codex Regius (L/019; Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département des manuscrits, Grec 62), an eighth-century Greek uncial MS of the Gospels.

<sup>39</sup>McKendrick, "The Codex Alexandrinus, or The Dangers of Being a Named Manuscript," 2.

<sup>40</sup>Kenyon, *Codex Alexandrinus*, 1:7.

<sup>41</sup>"Memorant hunc librum scriptu fuisse manu Thecla Martyris," my translation.

been torn from the end of the MS.<sup>42</sup> Unfortunately, both the Arabic inscription and Cyril's note likely originated around the same time in the early seventeenth century,<sup>43</sup> and the Arabic note "is not to be believed for a minute."<sup>44</sup>

Because there is no reliable concrete evidence to support the tradition, it is easily dismissed.<sup>45</sup> However, tradition of the origin of Alexandrinus by the hand of Thecla the Martyr does reveal one significant piece of information about Christian scribes and the transmission of the Bible. Haines-Eitzen notes, "What strikes me as most significant in the Thecla-Alexandrinus tradition is that nowhere is the plausibility of a female scribe questioned."<sup>46</sup> The tradition of Thecla the Martyr as the single scribe of Alexandrinus is certainly interesting, but has no bearing on this study. For simplicity purposes, masculine pronouns are used to refer to the scribe, but with the acknowledgment that it is entirely possible that the scribe of the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus could very well have been female.

### **Scribal Habits Through Singular Readings: A Short Summary**

Colwell was the first to propose that a methodical study of the singular readings in a given MS may reveal the habits of its scribes,<sup>47</sup> but he was not the first to discuss singular readings. More than half a century earlier, Hort discussed the "peculiarities" of Codex Vaticanus by analyzing its singular readings.<sup>48</sup> Colwell made a

---

<sup>42</sup>For a transcription of the Latin and an English translation, see Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters*, 50.

<sup>43</sup>McKendrick, "The Codex Alexandrinus, or The Dangers of Being a Named Manuscript," 5.

<sup>44</sup>Pattie, "The Creation of the Great Codices," 69.

<sup>45</sup>Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters*, 51.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid.

<sup>47</sup>Colwell, "Scribal Habits."

<sup>48</sup>Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, 230–46.

significant improvement on Hort’s work by studying P66, P45 and P75, including actual numbers and percentages of error, and thereby enabling a more scientific approach to the study of scribal habits.<sup>49</sup>

After Colwell, James R. Royse made an intense study of the singular readings in several early Greek papyri of the NT the subject of his 1981 dissertation.<sup>50</sup> This dissertation was heavily revised and updated, and twenty-five years later, published.<sup>51</sup> In his monograph, Royse gives painstakingly detailed analyses of P45,<sup>52</sup> P46,<sup>53</sup> P47,<sup>54</sup> P66,<sup>55</sup> P72<sup>56</sup> and P75.<sup>57</sup> Significantly, Royse argues that the canon that “the shorter reading should be preferred” should be abandoned, at least when evaluating early manuscripts, since the early scribes are more likely to omit than to add to a text.<sup>58</sup>

Peter M. Head confirmed Royse’s conclusions that scribes were more likely to omit than to add. Head undertook two studies of the early fragmentary papyri—one of the papyri of the Synoptic Gospels<sup>59</sup> and one of the papyri of the Fourth Gospel.<sup>60</sup> Each study

---

<sup>49</sup>Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 1969.

<sup>50</sup>James R. Royse, “Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri” (Th.D. diss., Graduate Theological Union, 1981).

<sup>51</sup>James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*, NTTSD 36 (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

<sup>52</sup>*Ibid.*, 103–97.

<sup>53</sup>*Ibid.*, 199–358.

<sup>54</sup>*Ibid.*, 359–98.

<sup>55</sup>*Ibid.*, 399–544.

<sup>56</sup>*Ibid.*, 545–614.

<sup>57</sup>*Ibid.*, 615–704.

<sup>58</sup>*Ibid.*, 705–36.

<sup>59</sup>Peter M. Head, “Observations On Early Papyri of the Synoptic Gospels, Especially on the ‘Scribal Habits’,” *Biblica* 71 (1990): 240–47.

<sup>60</sup>Peter M. Head, “The Habits of New Testament Copyists: Singular Readings in the Early Fragmentary Papyri of John,” *Biblica* 85 (2004): 399–408.

confirmed Royse’s findings that early scribes tended to omit rather than to add. Head also undertook his own study of the singular readings in P66,<sup>61</sup> though with the intention of evaluating Bart Ehrman’s charges of theological bias among the early scribes.<sup>62</sup> Head concluded, “What emerges from a study of the singular readings is a noticeable lack of any clear theological tendency in the scribal behaviour exhibited.”<sup>63</sup>

Another significant monograph in the study of scribal habits through singular readings is Dirk Jongkind’s *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*,<sup>64</sup> a published version of his Cambridge doctoral thesis, written under Head’s supervision. Jongkind considered other codicological factors in the scribal habits of Sinaiticus such as *nomina sacra*, orthography, textual divisions and numbering systems. Across the work of multiple scribes, Jongkind’s study extended the conclusions of Royse and Head about the scribes of early papyri to the fourth century: scribes are still more likely to omit.<sup>65</sup>

Finally, Juan Hernández Jr. analyzed the singular readings in the text of the Apocalypse in the three “great bibles” that contain it in his monograph, *Scribal Habits and Theological Tendencies in the Apocalypse*.<sup>66</sup> Hernández’ work is most relevant to this study, since it provides a way to evaluate Milne and Skeat’s assertion that both the

---

<sup>61</sup>Peter M. Head, “Scribal Behaviour and Theological Tendencies in Singular Readings in P. Bodmer II (P66),” 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, TS 6 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008), 55–74.

<sup>62</sup>Bart D Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

<sup>63</sup>Head, “Scribal Behaviour and Theological Tendencies in Singular Readings in P. Bodmer II (P66),” 74.

<sup>64</sup>Dirk Jongkind, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*, TS 5 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2007).

<sup>65</sup>*Ibid.*, 246.

<sup>66</sup>Juan Hernández, Jr., *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse: The Singular Readings of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi*, WUNT 2. Reihe 218 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 2006).

Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus were written by the same scribe. Like Jongkind and Head, Hernández confirms Royse's assertion that scribes were more likely to omit than to add, extending this tendency now into the fifth century.<sup>67</sup>

Since the publication of Royse's monograph, the study of singular readings has become more popular among scholars. Others have undertaken similar studies not mentioned here. Since an analysis of singular readings provides a way to evaluate each manuscript in a more scientific manner, it is a valuable tool for the text critic. This study seeks to extend the knowledge of ancient documents in a small way—to evaluate the tendencies of the scribe of the Fourth Gospel in Codex Alexandrinus.

---

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., 193.



## CHAPTER 2 MANUSCRIPT AND METHODOLOGY

### **The Manuscript**

Because access to the manuscript itself was not possible, this study was undertaken using images of Codex Alexandrinus. At the start of the study, only facsimile editions of Alexandrinus were available. The primary edition used was the facsimile edition published by the Trustees of the British Museum and edited by E. M. Thompson. The New Testament volume appeared in 1879.<sup>1</sup> This study utilized the digital images of this facsimile edition posted online by the Center for the Study of New Testament Manuscripts,<sup>2</sup> but the later facsimile edition edited by Kenyon<sup>3</sup> was also consulted. In addition to the facsimile editions of Codex Alexandrinus, it was occasionally necessary to consult Cowper's 1860 introduction to and transcription of the manuscript.<sup>4</sup>

After the initial collation was complete and a list of singular readings in the Fourth Gospel was compiled, the British Library made high-resolution color photographs of Alexandrinus available.<sup>5</sup> With these images, one is now able to enlarge the image

---

<sup>1</sup>E. Maunde Thompson, ed., *Facsimile of the Codex Alexandrinus: New Testament and Clementine Epistles* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1879).

<sup>2</sup>Available online via CSNTM at [http://www.csntm.org/Manuscript/View/GA\\_02](http://www.csntm.org/Manuscript/View/GA_02) (Accessed June 6, 2012).

<sup>3</sup>Frederic G. Kenyon, ed., *The Codex Alexandrinus (Royal MS. 1 D V-Viii) in Reduced Photographic Facsimile*, vol. 1 (London: British Museum, 1909).

<sup>4</sup>B. Harris Cowper, ed., *Codex Alexandrinus. H Καινη Διαθηκη. Novum Testamentum Graece Ex Antiquissimo Codice Alexandrino* (New York: B. Westermann & Soc., 1860).

<sup>5</sup>Available at [http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Royal\\_MS\\_1\\_d\\_viii](http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Royal_MS_1_d_viii) (Accessed March 4, 2013).

without sacrificing the clarity of the image, as well as discern subtle differences in the color of the ink. Additionally, the higher resolution and added color made it possible to analyze corrections more accurately by giving the ability to discern whether the manuscript contained smudged letters of a correction, traces of residual ink from the original reading, or merely bleed-through from the other side of the page. In many cases, punctuation markers were even discovered that were not visible in the facsimile editions. Consequently, every singular reading used in this study was re-analyzed, using the high-resolution images from the British Library.

### **Method for Selecting Singular Readings**

#### *Editions Used*

Initially, the text of the Fourth Gospel in Codex Alexandrinus was collated against the NA<sup>27</sup>.<sup>6</sup> The resulting collation notes were checked against the apparatus of Tischendorf.<sup>7</sup> Readings shared by other manuscripts were removed from consideration. This process of checking and removing duplicate readings was repeated with the following editions and their respective apparati: IGNTP 1,<sup>8</sup> IGNTP 2,<sup>9</sup> Swanson,<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>Barbara Aland et al., eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 9<sup>th</sup> printing of the 27<sup>th</sup> ed. (Nordlingen, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).

<sup>7</sup>Constantine von Tischendorf, ed., *Novum Testamentum Graece, Editio Octava Critica Maior*, vol. 1 (Lipsiae: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869; repr., Graz: Akademischen Druck – u. Verlagsanstalt, 1965).

<sup>8</sup>D. C. Parker and W. J. Elliott, eds., *The New Testament in Greek IV: The Gospel According to St. John*, vol. 1, *The Papyri*, NTTS 20 (Leiden: Brill, 1995).

<sup>9</sup>Ulrich Schmid, W. J. Elliott, and D. C. Parker, eds., *The New Testament in Greek IV: The Gospel According to St. John*, vol. 2, *The Majuscules*, NTTSD 37 (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

<sup>10</sup>Reuben Swanson, ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus. John* (Pasadena, CA: William Carey International University Press, 1995).

UBS<sup>3, 11</sup> UBS<sup>4, 12</sup> NA<sup>26, 13</sup> NA<sup>27, 14</sup> Tregelles,<sup>15</sup> Hort and Streane's *Addenda and Corrigenda* to Tregelles,<sup>16</sup> *SQE*<sup>17</sup> and Kearfott.<sup>18</sup> Unfortunately, most of the research was carried out before the NA<sup>28</sup> became available.<sup>19</sup>

Unlike previous studies in scribal habits,<sup>20</sup> this study does not use von Soden's *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*<sup>21</sup> to narrow the list of singulars. The accuracy of von Soden's apparatus has been attacked repeatedly. Aland and Aland remark that "The information in von Soden's apparatus is so unreliable that the reader soon comes to regard this remarkably full apparatus as little more than a collection of variant readings

---

<sup>11</sup>Kurt Aland et al., eds., *The Greek New Testament*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (New York: United Bible Societies, 1975).

<sup>12</sup>Barbara Aland et al., eds., *The Greek New Testament*, 4<sup>th</sup> rev. ed. (Nordlingen, Germany: United Bible Societies, 2005).

<sup>13</sup>Kurt Aland et al., eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 11<sup>th</sup> printing of the 26<sup>th</sup> ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1990).

<sup>14</sup>Barbara Aland et al., *NA*<sup>27</sup>.

<sup>15</sup>Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, ed., *The Greek New Testament: Edited from Ancient Authorities, with Their Various Readings in Full, and the Latin Version of Jerome*, pt. 2, *Gospels of St. Luke and St. John* (London: S. Bagster & Sons, 1861).

<sup>16</sup>F. J. A. Hort and A. W. Streane, eds., *The Greek New Testament: Edited from Ancient Authorities, with Their Various Readings in Full, and the Latin Version of Jerome*, pt. 7, *Prolegomena, and Addenda, and Corrigenda* (London: S. Bagster & Sons, 1879).

<sup>17</sup>Kurt Aland, ed., *Synopsis quattuor Evangeliorum. Locis parallelis evangeliorum apocryphorum et Patrum adhibitibus*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964).

<sup>18</sup>Steven Joseph Kearfott, "Codex Washingtonianus as an Illustration of the Need for the Discipline of Apparatus Criticism" (Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2005).

<sup>19</sup>*Novum Testamentum Graece* (Nestle-Aland), edited by the Institute for New Testament Textual Research Münster/Westphalia under the direction of Holger Strutwolf, 28<sup>th</sup> ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012).

<sup>20</sup>James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*, NTTSD 36 (Leiden: Brill, 2008); Dirk Jongkind, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*, TS 5 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2007).

<sup>21</sup>Hermann von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer Ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt, hergestellt auf grund ihrer Textgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck Und Ruprecht, 1911).

whose attestation needs verification elsewhere.”<sup>22</sup> Ehrman describes von Soden’s work as “woefully inaccurate.”<sup>23</sup> Wisse, after performing an extensive check of von Soden’s accuracy based on Luke 1, says, “Once the extent of error is seen, the word ‘inaccuracy’ becomes a euphemism . . . The comparison showed up mistakes at every stage.”<sup>24</sup> Hoskier, also giving an extensive review of von Soden’s work, calls it “a step backward”<sup>25</sup> in the discipline of New Testament textual criticism. Since even the slightest degree of inaccuracy could alter the statistical results of this study, and since von Soden’s work is widely regarded as inaccurate, this study makes use of Tregelles’ *Greek New Testament*.

### **Nomina Sacra and Orthography**

*Nomina sacra* and orthography present a set of challenges to the study of scribal habits through the analysis of singular readings in Greek New Testament manuscripts. Often, editions are content to neglect such subtleties in their apparatus. For example, the introduction to the NA<sup>27</sup> clearly states that it is not the intention of the editors to provide the complete history of transmission in “exhaustive detail.”<sup>26</sup> Thus, the use of *nomina sacra* and variant orthographical forms are commonly ignored in the apparatus of the NA<sup>27</sup>. While the orthography of a particular word may appear to be an orthographical singular, it may, in reality, be shared with several manuscripts but not

---

<sup>22</sup>Kurt Aland 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*, trans. Erroll F. Rhodes, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 23.

<sup>23</sup>Bart D. Ehrman, “The Use of Group Profiles for the Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence,” *JBL* 106 (1987): 468.

<sup>24</sup>Frederik Wisse, *The Profile Method for the Classification and Evaluation of Manuscript Evidence, as Applied to the Continuous Greek Text of the Gospel of Luke*, SD 44 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 16–17. Wisse’s explanation of these mistakes is given on p. 17.

<sup>25</sup>H. C. Hoskier, “Von Soden’s Text of the New Testament,” *JTS* 15 (1914): 307.

<sup>26</sup>Barbara Aland et al., *NA<sup>27</sup>*, 45\*.

listed in any of the consulted apparati. Although *nomina sacra* were noted in the original collation notes, the fact that the readings were recorded as *nomina sacra* was not used to select singular readings. However, some *nomina sacra*, rather, words abbreviated to *nomina sacra*, are singular to Codex Alexandrinus. These are recorded, presented as they were written by the scribe<sup>27</sup> and analyzed.

The orthography of Codex Alexandrinus presents additional challenges to a study of the scribal habits involved in its creation. Although Fee asserts that orthographical variation often “reflects scribal idiosyncrasies,”<sup>28</sup> it is difficult to assess whether an orthographical variation reflects a significant change or merely the spelling preferences of the scribe. Regarding the “peculiar orthography of the Codex,”<sup>29</sup> Cowper writes: “we can lay down no invariable rule regarding [its orthographical irregularities.]”<sup>30</sup> Cowper gives a list of common orthographical substitutions,<sup>31</sup> but prefaces the list with the warning that some of the variations “are to be met with only seldom, or even but once.”<sup>32</sup> The only so-called spelling variations deemed singular are those that occur very rarely in the Fourth Gospel text of Codex Alexandrinus, though they may be common in other manuscripts.

---

<sup>27</sup>One exception to this statement is the reading in John 5:18, which concerns a correction. In this instance, the exact form of the text cannot be accurately represented due to the limitations of the font. Instead, it must be described.

<sup>28</sup>Gordon D. Fee, “On the Types, Classification, and Presentation of Textual Variation,” in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*, ed. Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee, SD 45 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 66.

<sup>29</sup>Cowper, *Codex Alexandrinus*, ix.

<sup>30</sup>*Ibid.*, ix.

<sup>31</sup>*Ibid.*, x-xi.

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid.*, ix.

### **“Sub-Singulars”**

Gordon Fee defines a “sub-singular reading” as “a non-genetic, accidental agreement in variation between two MSS which are not otherwise closely related.”<sup>33</sup> To work with sub-singular readings is to seek to increase the accuracy of the results of a study in scribal habits. Unfortunately, there is no foolproof way to designate whether a sub-singular reading is indeed an accidental agreement or a product of faithful copying. The two (or more) manuscripts in question need not be genetically related; one or both scribes could have faithfully copied from a now-lost exemplar that originally agreed (accidentally) with the other manuscript. Royse designates readings singular in Tischendorf that find evidence in other apparati as sub-singular, marking them with asterisks,<sup>34</sup> but admits his inclusion in the class of sub-singulars “a few asterisked readings where one may reasonably suspect some genetic relationship.”<sup>35</sup> Hernández does not include sub-singulars in his monograph, *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse*.<sup>36</sup> In an attempt to stay as close to Hernández’s work as possible, this study does not include sub-singular readings.<sup>37</sup>

### **Corrections**

It is often difficult to identify the correcting hand in Alexandrinus. Many corrections are only comprised of a few letters, and the physical changes to the erased parchment further complicate the identification process. When identification of the

---

<sup>33</sup>Fee, “On the Types,” 67.

<sup>34</sup>Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 94.

<sup>35</sup>*Ibid.*, 67.

<sup>36</sup>Juan Hernández, Jr., *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse: The Singular Readings of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi*, WUNT 2, Reihe 218 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 2006), 96–131.

<sup>37</sup>There is one exception: the variant at John 9:19 is also found in MS 28, but there is sufficient evidence in Alexandrinus to suggest strongly that the variant is a scribal creation. For an explanation, see the discussion on John 9:19 below.

corrector is possible, it is given, especially if Scribe IV made the correction *in scribendo*. Kenyon's remarks on the corrections in Alexandrinus may shed some light on the difficulties involved with identifying the corrector:

With a very few exceptions, all the corrections are of early date, and it is often very hard to discriminate between the hands; especially as allowance has to be made for the fact that an erasure alters the surface of the vellum, and that consequently the ink of a rewritten passage necessarily has a difference appearance, even when the scribe is the same. . . . There are, however, a considerable number of passages where the corrector has been obliged to continue his writing in the margins, where the surface of the vellum has not suffered, and where consequently he can write his natural hand; and with the help of these it is possible to arrive at some conclusions with regard to the various correctors.<sup>38</sup>

Although it is possible that “corrections” in MSS are really not corrections at all, but “reader’s notes,”<sup>39</sup> such does not seem to be the case with corrections in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus. Schmid offers two criteria for identifying “reader’s notes:” the text of the “note” should be outside of the main formatting of the text of the manuscript (i. e. in the margin or between the lines), and it should be written in an identifiably different and more informal hand.<sup>40</sup> Corrections in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus fail to meet both these categories.

Because the purpose of this study is to assess the tendencies of the scribe who copied Alexandrinus, it is important to establish the original, uncorrected text. This is done whenever possible, and it is noted when reconstructions of the original text are uncertain. Corrections are always noted, and the correcting hand is identified when possible. Consequently, the singular readings discussed are those of the original,

---

<sup>38</sup>Kenyon, *Codex Alexandrinus*, 1:10.

<sup>39</sup>For a discussion of “reader’s notes,” see Ulrich Schmid, “Conceptualizing ‘Scribal’ Performances: Reader’s Notes,” in *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views in Contemporary Research*, ed. Klaus Wachtel and Michael W. Holmes, TCS 8 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 49–64.

<sup>40</sup>*Ibid.*, 55.

uncorrected text. Only once does a correction result in a singular reading,<sup>41</sup> but it is not included in the statistical calculations.

## **Classification of Singular Readings**

### ***Hernández's Study***

Because Hernández includes the singular readings in the text of the Apocalypse in Codex Alexandrinus in his study,<sup>42</sup> this study seeks to classify singulars according to his classification system. The reason for this is the goal of comparing the scribal habits documented by Hernández in the Alexandrian text of the Apocalypse to the scribal habits documented in this study in the early Byzantine text of the Fourth Gospel. Colwell describes two sources of error in the study of singular readings. In his own study, which uses only Tischendorf's apparatus to narrow the list of singulars, Colwell remarks, "It is true that some witnesses unknown to Tischendorf may support some of these readings, but it is also highly probable that many readings with minor support in Tischendorf are scribal creations."<sup>43</sup> By comparing the singular readings of Codex Alexandrinus in the Fourth Gospel to the singular readings in the Apocalypse as recorded by Hernández, this study seeks to shed light on the possibility of recognizing non-created singulars which would have originated earlier in the history of transmission.

Hernández lists eighty-four singular readings in the text of the Apocalypse in Codex Alexandrinus<sup>44</sup> and classifies them into three broad categories: insignificant

---

<sup>41</sup>This instance is at John 10:13; see discussion below.

<sup>42</sup>Hernández, *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences*.

<sup>43</sup>Ernest Cadman Colwell, "Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits," in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, ed. Bruce M. Metzger, NTTS 9 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), 108–9.

<sup>44</sup>Hernández, *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences*, 103.



singulars,<sup>45</sup> significant singulars<sup>46</sup> and non-created singulars—that is, singulars which were faithfully copied from the exemplar, or in Hernández’s case, singulars that represent the original text of the Apocalypse.<sup>47</sup>

### ***Insignificant Singulars***

Of the insignificant singulars,<sup>48</sup> Hernández gives two sub-groups: orthographical variations and nonsense readings. There are two types of orthographical variations: vowel replacement and consonantal changes. Since Hernández only generates the percent occurrence of significant singulars, and since information regarding vowel replacement is often omitted from apparati, this study has limited its consideration of vowel replacement, as described above. Additionally, there are two types of nonsense readings. Hernández describes strictly nonsense as “not words at all or orthographic variants of words,”<sup>49</sup> citing Royse’s yet to be revised and published dissertation.<sup>50</sup> Additionally, Hernández describes readings that are nonsense in context.<sup>51</sup>

### ***Significant Singulars***

Hernández offers six sub-groups in the larger category of significant singulars. They are additions,<sup>52</sup> omissions,<sup>53</sup> transpositions,<sup>54</sup> harmonizations,<sup>55</sup> grammatical

---

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., 103–6.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., 106–24.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., 124–25.

<sup>48</sup>For this section, see *ibid.*, 103–5.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., 104.

<sup>50</sup>James R. Royse, “Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri” (Th.D. diss., Graduate Theological Union, 1981).

<sup>51</sup>Hernández, *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences*, 105–6.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., 107–10.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., 110–14.

changes<sup>56</sup> and miscellaneous singulars.<sup>57</sup> Hernández subdivides additions into one-word additions and those involving two or more words.<sup>58</sup> He classifies omissions in the same way, but includes a discussion on factors in omissions.<sup>59</sup> These include omissions due to homoeoteleuton, homoeoarchton, inexplicable omissions and those due to harmonization. The broader category of harmonization does not include omission due to harmonization, but does include harmonization to parallels, to context<sup>60</sup> and to contemporary usage. Finally, Hernández offers five sub-divisions under grammatical changes, those involving the following: verbs, conjunctions, pronouns, adjectives and prefixes.<sup>61</sup>

### *Inherited Singulars*

There is always a possibility in the study of scribal habits of a manuscript of which the exemplar is unknown that some singular readings are not the creation of the scribe, but have been copied from a now-lost exemplar. There is one such reading in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus, at John 3:16. The reasons for taking John 3:16 as an inherited singular are given in Appendix 3.<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., 114–15.

<sup>55</sup>Ibid., 115–20.

<sup>56</sup>Ibid., 120–23.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., 123–24.

<sup>58</sup>Ibid., 107.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., 110–13.

<sup>60</sup>These are classified as additions, substitutions, transpositions, omissions and grammatical attraction.

<sup>61</sup>Hernández, *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences*, 120–22.

<sup>62</sup>See also my paper, “A Singular Reading from a Lost Exemplar: John 3:15-16 in Codex Alexandrinus.” (paper presented at the 2013 Eastern Regional Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Lynchburg, VA, March 2013).

### *Summary of Classification*

This study seeks to modify Hernández's classification system. Since both Hernández's study and this study are concerned with Alexandrinus, it is helpful to retain Hernández's system as closely as possible so that results can be compared. A summary of Hernández's classification system, including sub-divisions, is given in outline form below:

- I. Insignificant singulars
  - A. Orthographical variations
    - 1. Vowel replacement
    - 2. Consonantal changes
  - B. Nonsense readings
    - 1. Strictly nonsense
    - 2. Nonsense in context
- II. Significant singulars
  - A. Additions
    - 1. One-word additions
    - 2. Two or more words
  - B. Omissions
    - 1. One-word omissions
    - 2. Two or more words
    - 3. Factors in omissions
      - a. Due to homoeoteleuton
      - b. Due to homeoarchton
      - c. Inexplicable/arbitrary
      - d. Due to harmonization
  - C. Transpositions
  - D. Harmonizations
    - 1. Harmonizations to parallels
    - 2. Harmonization to context
      - a. Additions
      - b. Substitutions
      - c. Transpositions
      - d. Omissions
      - e. Grammatical attraction
    - 3. Harmonizations to usage
  - E. Grammatical changes
    - 1. Verbs
    - 2. Conjunctions
    - 3. Pronouns
    - 4. Adjectives
    - 5. Prefixes
  - F. Miscellaneous
- III. Non-created singulars

As can be seen more clearly above, there is some complexity with the classification of singular readings in Codex Alexandrinus. This study originally sought to

match Hernández's classification system exactly, in order to reflect most accurately the differences between scribal tendencies in the Fourth Gospel and those in the Apocalypse. This approach was partially abandoned for several reasons.

First, Hernández makes multiple classifications. His approach takes all the singular readings and identifies each of them. For example, consider the addition of *καί* in Alexandrinus at Rev 5:6. Hernández lists this reading in three places: as a one-word addition,<sup>63</sup> as a harmonization to context<sup>64</sup> and as a grammatical change involving a conjunction.<sup>65</sup> In each discussion, he mentions that the reading falls in each category. For the purposes of simplicity, this study seeks to identify a primary classification for each singular and to mention any other possibilities in its discussion.

Second, Hernández has the advantage of Hoskier's work on the text of the Apocalypse.<sup>66</sup> In 1929, Herman Hoskier published a collation of 220 manuscripts of the Apocalypse. Due to the paucity of extant manuscripts of the Apocalypse<sup>67</sup> in comparison with other books in the canon,<sup>68</sup> Hoskier's work was monumental. Only in recent years has a similar work of its magnitude been produced: Tommy Wasserman's *The Epistle of Jude: Its Text and Transmission*.<sup>69</sup> For this reason, singular readings in the Apocalypse

---

<sup>63</sup>Hernández, *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences*, 107.

<sup>64</sup>*Ibid.*, 116.

<sup>65</sup>*Ibid.*, 121.

<sup>66</sup>H. C. Hoskier, *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse: Collations of All Existing Available Greek Documents with the Standard Text of Stephen's Third Edition, Together with the Testimony of Versions, Commentaries and Fathers; a Complete Conspectus of All Authorities*, 2 vols. (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1929).

<sup>67</sup>As of 1997, there were only 303, according to Elliott, "The Distinctiveness of the Greek Manuscripts of the Book of Revelation," *JTS* 48 (1997): 116.

<sup>68</sup>As of 2005, there were 1,987 known continuous text manuscripts of the Fourth Gospel in addition to lectionaries, listed in Klaus Witte et al., *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments V: Das Johannesevangelium*, vol. 1, *Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung* 35 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005), 3–23.

can be more easily and accurately identified than those in the Fourth Gospel.

Third, Hernández's work lacks a category for substitutions, with the exception of substitutions that are also harmonizations to context. Rather than include categories for grammatical and miscellaneous changes, this study uses the larger designation "substitutions" to include singular readings not covered by any of the other categories, because they all happen to be substitutions. There are ten such readings in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus, so a separate category for substitutions is needed.

Last, each textual critic has his or her own way of doing things. A comparison of discussions of the same singular reading in multiple works reveals subtle differences among scholars. Consider Mark's Gospel in Codex Sinaiticus. Both Peter Head and Wayne Cornett have discussed scribal habits in Mark's Gospel in Sinaiticus,<sup>70</sup> but there are differences between them regarding several singular readings. Regarding the omission in Mark 1:32-34, Head regards it as a singular omission of sixteen words, because of an omission in Codex Washingtonianus.<sup>71</sup> On the other hand, Cornett considers it an omission of eighteen words.<sup>72</sup> Regarding Mark 15:46, Head considers the singular to be a harmonization to Matthew 27:60,<sup>73</sup> while Cornett sees it as a harmonization to Matthew 27:33.<sup>74</sup> Additionally, the overlap of Cornett and Jongkind reveals some differences. Jongkind sees the reading of Sinaiticus at Luke 12:29 as a

---

<sup>69</sup>Tommy Wasserman, *The Epistle of Jude: Its Text and Transmission*, CBNT 43 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2006).

<sup>70</sup>Peter M. Head, "The Gospel of Mark in Codex Sinaiticus: Textual and Reception-Critical Considerations," *TC* 13 (2008): 1-38; Wayne E Cornett, "Singular Readings of the Firsthand Scribe of Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospels" (Ph.D. diss., Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary, 2009).

<sup>71</sup>Head, "The Gospel of Mark in Codex Sinaiticus," 25.

<sup>72</sup>Cornett, "Singular Readings," 63.

<sup>73</sup>Head, "The Gospel of Mark in Codex Sinaiticus," 23.

<sup>74</sup>Cornett, "Singular Readings," 77.

harmonization both to context and to Matthew 6:31,<sup>75</sup> but Cornett understands it as a harmonization both to context and to Matthew 6:25.<sup>76</sup> Jongkind sees the singular in Sinaiticus at Luke 2:2 as an editorial reading,<sup>77</sup> but Cornett sees it as a word order variation with the addition of a moveable-v.<sup>78</sup> Although it is still possible to see general trends in scribal habits across multiple studies, works that are undertaken by different scholars betray the subjective judgments of their authors and cannot be compared as if they are empirically equal.

As a result of these differences, but out of a desire to remain similar to Hernández's work, this study classifies each singular reading only once, under its primary classification. The classifications stay as close as possible to those used by Hernández. Any contributing factors are noted in the discussions, and the results are presented in the conclusion both as simple calculations from the primary classifications, and as adjusted calculations, considering other contributing causes.<sup>79</sup>

### **Explanation of the Tables Used**

For each category of singular readings, a table is included, following Jongkind's example.<sup>80</sup> This is done in order to provide a quick reference for all the singular readings of that kind in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus. They are listed in canonical order from the first appearance to the final appearance. The reading is given, and a reconstruction of the exemplar is given as well.

---

<sup>75</sup>Jongkind, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*, 230.

<sup>76</sup>Cornett, "Singular Readings," 96.

<sup>77</sup>Jongkind, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*, 232.

<sup>78</sup>Cornett, "Singular Readings," 83.

<sup>79</sup>For example, some transpositions are likely due to accidental omissions corrected *in scribendo*. Results are given that count such instances among transpositions, and adjusted calculations are given that count such instances among omissions.

<sup>80</sup>Jongkind, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*.

Discussions of the scribe's exemplar of the Fourth Gospel are admittedly speculative and hypothetical. While no reconstruction of the exemplar can be proven, I have labored to provide, when possible, the text of the Fourth Gospel as it was most likely found in the exemplar from which Alexandrinus<sup>81</sup> was copied. In most cases, the text of the reconstruction of the exemplar is taken to be whatever reading best explains the text of Alexandrinus.<sup>82</sup>

The readings of Alexandrinus are given as they appear in the manuscript. Consequently, spaces are only used in the tables when spaces are found in Alexandrinus. However, spaces are used in the tables when referring to the likely reading in the exemplar and in the discussions (even when not found in Alexandrinus) in order to clarify the text. The font used is *AlexandrinusLSU*.<sup>83</sup> In the occasional case of a reading originally written on more than one line of text, the symbol “/” is used to denote the line break. *Nomina sacra*, intermarginal corrections, smaller letters at line endings and other textual features are reproduced as accurately as possible. While neither these textual features nor the writing style of the exemplar can be known, it is occasionally appropriate to offer a conjecture with respect to the text as it most likely appeared in the exemplar. For the sake of simplicity, *AlexandrinusLSU* is used for the text of Alexandrinus, its hypothetically reconstructed exemplar and any discussions of how the variant could have arisen due to the shape of the uncial script. *SBL Greek* is used in all other instances, such

---

<sup>81</sup>Or, what can be said at the very least, I have labored to provide, when possible, the exemplar from which the text of the *Fourth Gospel* in Alexandrinus was copied. Due to the mixed nature of the text of the codex as a whole, it is entirely possible that the four Gospels were copied from a different exemplar than that or those exemplars from which the rest of the codex was copied.

<sup>82</sup>Although Hernández does not attempt reconstructions of the exemplar in his monograph, Jongkind does, explaining his method as “choosing that manuscript reading that diverged the least from the reading in *Sinaiticus*,” in *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*, 147.

<sup>83</sup>The *AlexandrinusLSU* font used to print this work is available from Linguist's Software, Inc., PO Box 580, Edmonds, WA 98020-0580 USA tel (425) 775-1130 [www.linguistsoftware.com/ntmssu.htm](http://www.linguistsoftware.com/ntmssu.htm).

as in discussions of Greek grammar or usage in any editions or apparati of the Fourth Gospel—even when those apparati explicitly refer to the reading in Alexandrinus.



CHAPTER 3  
SINGULAR READINGS IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL  
IN CODEX ALEXANDRINUS

There are sixty-two singular readings in the Fourth Gospel in Codex Alexandrinus. Forty-six of these are significant singulars, in that they change the meaning of the text and are not nonsensical, with the exception of changes due to leaps. The remaining sixteen are insignificant—matters of orthography or nonsense readings. The distinction is largely that of Hernández. While Hernández uses only the significant singulars to construct a pattern of scribal habits, this study uses both categories. All scribal-created singular readings are considered in the calculations of how likely the scribe was to make an error in close proximity to a punctuation marker or a line break.

**Insignificant Singulars**

Of the sixty-two singular readings in the Fourth Gospel in Codex Alexandrinus, sixteen are insignificant. Insignificant singulars, for the purposes of this study, are defined as singular readings that make no meaningful change to the text of the exemplar, such as orthographic variations or nonsense readings.<sup>1</sup>

***Orthographic Singulars***

There are four orthographic singulars in the Fourth Gospel in Codex Alexandrinus (3:23, 18:21, 19:12 and 19:15). Three of these singulars are classified as vowel replacement (18:21, 19:12 and 19:15). The remaining singular is a consonantal

---

<sup>1</sup>See Juan Hernández, Jr., *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse: The Singular Readings of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi*, WUNT 2, Reihe 218 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 2006), 47.

change (3:23). The three vowel replacements occur within one word of a line break, and the consonantal change occurs immediately before a punctuation marker.

### Vowel Replacement

Table 1. Vowel replacement

Text	A	Exemplar
John 18:21	ΔΚΗΚΟΔΤΑϸ	ΔΚΗΚΟΟΤΑϸ
John 19:12	ΕΚΡΥΓΑΖΟΝ	ΕΚΡΑΥΓΑΖΟΝ
John 19:15	ΟΙΔΕ / ΕΚΡΑΥΓΑϸΟΝ	ΟΙ ΔΕ ΕΚΡΑΥΓΑϸΑΝ

The scribe replaced the second **Ο** in ΔΚΗΚΟΟΤΑϸ with Δ in John 18:21. Gignac comments that “nowhere outside of Egypt is there a frequent interchange of α and ο,”<sup>2</sup> though he mentions that ο is sometimes replaced by α “as a Rhod[ian] peculiarity,” citing examples from the second century B.C.E. to the third century C.E.<sup>3</sup> While an orthographical analysis might shed some light on the still-debated provenance of Alexandrinus,<sup>4</sup> a single instance of a vowel replacement proves nothing. It is the last word before a line break.

In John 19:12, the scribe omitted the first Δ in ΕΚΡΑΥΓΑΖΟΝ. On the one hand, this spelling would seem to be nonsensical, as Gignac writes that the αυ

---

<sup>2</sup>Francis T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, vol. 1, 2 vols. TDSA 55 (Milan: Istituto editoriale cisalpino-La goliardica, 1976-81), 288.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., n. 2.

<sup>4</sup>See the aforementioned argument for an Ephesian provenance of Alexandrinus, in Scot McKendrick, “The Codex Alexandrinus, or The Dangers of Being a Named Manuscript,” in *The Bible As Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text*, ed. Scot McKendrick and Orlaith A. O’Sullivan (New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll, 2003), 1-16.

diphthong always keeps the  $\alpha$  when it changed.<sup>5</sup> However, Cowper reports that in the “peculiar orthography” of Alexandrinus,  $\Upsilon$  is often substituted for  $\Delta\Upsilon$ , even citing  $\text{EKPYΓAZON}$  as an example.<sup>6</sup> The word immediately following  $\text{EKPYΓAZON}$ ,  $\text{\AA EΓONTEC}$ , is written across a line break and ends with a raised dot marking punctuation.

The singular reading in John 19:15 is the replacement of the third  $\Delta$  in  $\text{EKPAΥΓACAN}$  with  $\text{O}$ . In New Testament and early Christian usage,  $\kappa\rho\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  does not have second aorist forms,<sup>7</sup> making this reading nonsensical. However, Gignac does allow for the replacement of  $\text{O}$  with  $\Delta$ ; he states that the “interchange occurs almost exclusively in unaccented syllables, mainly in final syllables before  $-\varsigma$ ,” citing examples from the first to fifth centuries C.E.<sup>8</sup> Since “the accent in finite verbal forms is recessive,”<sup>9</sup> the accent should not fall on the ultima. Thus, this variant falls under Gignac’s category of vowel replacement. Cowper confirms that this is simply an orthographical variation, including the substitution of  $\text{O}$  for  $\Delta$  as a common orthographical peculiarity of Alexandrinus.<sup>10</sup> Also,  $\text{EKPAΥΓACON}$  is the first word on a new line. It is interesting to note that the scribe created two singulars in the space of three verses, both of which are orthographical variants on the same word, but he did not endeavor to harmonize them.

---

<sup>5</sup>Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:188.

<sup>6</sup>B. Harris Cowper, ed., *Codex Alexandrinus. H Kainē Diathēkē. Novum Testamentum Graece Ex Antiquissimo Codice Alexandrino* (New York: B. Westermann & Soc., 1860), x.

<sup>7</sup>Walter Bauer et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 565.

<sup>8</sup>Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:286–87.

<sup>9</sup>D. A. Carson, *A Student’s Manual of New Testament Greek Accents* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985), 22; see also William D. Mounce, *The Morphology of Biblical Greek* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 55.

<sup>10</sup>Cowper, *Codex Alexandrinus*, x.

## Consonantal Changes

Table 2. Consonantal changes

Text	A	Exemplar
John 3:23	ϞΑΛΛΕΙΜ·	ϞΑΛΕΙΜ

The only consonantal change in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus is the dittography of a single letter, Ϟ, in John 3:23. There is a small raised dot for punctuation immediately after the word.

### *Nonsense Readings*

There are twelve nonsense readings in the Fourth Gospel in Codex Alexandrinus. Two of these singulars are strictly nonsense—that is, they are neither words found in a lexicon<sup>11</sup> nor orthographical variants of words.<sup>12</sup> The other ten are nonsense in context. These ten are actual Greek words or orthographical variations of words, but they do not fit contextually in the passage, whether the disjunction pertains to grammar or content.<sup>13</sup> Royse mentions Colwell, agreeing that the prevalence of nonsense readings speaks to the relative care with which the scribe copied his exemplar, but makes a helpful distinction between the two types of nonsense readings, stating that the strictly nonsensical readings are “the more egregious blunders.”<sup>14</sup> It is noteworthy that although

---

<sup>11</sup>Ernest Cadman Colwell and Ernest W. Tune, “Method in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings,” in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, NTTS 9 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), 101.

<sup>12</sup>Hernández, *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences*, 62; James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*, NTTSD 36 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 91.

<sup>13</sup>Colwell and Tune, “Evaluating Variant Readings,” 101.

<sup>14</sup>Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 91.

both the strictly nonsense readings have been corrected (14:15 and 19:24), only two of the ten readings designated nonsense in context have been corrected (11:27 and 13:5). Jongkind notices the same high percentage of correction with respect to nonsense words in his study of 1 Chronicles in Codex Sinaiticus.<sup>15</sup>

### Strictly Nonsense

There are two strictly nonsense readings in the Fourth Gospel of Alexandrinus (14:15 and 19:24). Interestingly, both readings have been corrected. It is possible that Scribe IV made both corrections *in scribendo*, but only one (19:24) is long enough to make an informed judgment.

Table 3. Strictly nonsense

Text	A	Exemplar
John 14:15	ΓΑΤΤΑΤΕ (A*)	ΑΓΑΤΤΑΤΕ
John 19:24	ΠΡΟΣΜΕΝΠΕΡΙΑΥΤΟΥ (A*)	ΠΡΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ? ΠΡΟΣ ΑΛΛΗΛΟΥΣ?

In John 14:15, the scribe accidentally omitted the  $\alpha$  from the beginning of  $\alpha\Gamma\alpha\tau\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon$ . A scribe (possibly the original) corrected the reading by adding a small  $\alpha$  above the space between letters, so that the text resembles  $\epsilon\alpha\overset{\alpha}{\nu}\Gamma\alpha\tau\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon$ . This is the second word after a raised dot and a space in the middle of a line, denoting a division in the text.

<sup>15</sup>Dirk Jongkind, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*, TS 5 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2007), 159–60.

The reading in John 19:24 presents several problems. It is clear that the original reading of Alexandrinus after **ΟΥΝ ΠΡΟΣ**, or possibly **ΟΥΝ ΠΡΟΣ Α** has been erased, and in place of the original, Alexandrinus reads (starting from the uncorrected **ΠΡΟΣ**) **ΠΡΟΣ ΑΛΛΗΛΟΥΣ ΜΗ ΕΧΙΩ**. The ink of the correction is slightly lighter in shade than the ink of the surrounding text, and the shape of the letters betrays a later hand for the correction. It is likely that Scribe IV, who copied the Fourth Gospel, made this correction *in scribendo*, due to the fact that the next line appears to be uncorrected. Some of the letters, such as **Μ** and **Υ**, closely resemble the handwriting of Scribe II, but this resemblance is due to the altered texture of the parchment due to the correction. There is a small dot visible above the initial **Α** in the correction, perhaps marking the correction.

The original reading of Alexandrinus is also problematic. Most editions do not mention a correction here.<sup>16</sup> The best option is that the scribe leaped from **ΠΡΟΣ** to the second following **ΜΕΝ**,<sup>17</sup> likely skipping one or two lines in the exemplar. The residual ink under the correction corresponds with all the letters in this reconstruction, and, although this reconstruction places the final **Υ** slightly in the margin, it explains why the ink in **ΙΩ** (the part of the correction in the margin) is also imperfect. Swanson, on the other hand, suggests that the original reading there was **ΠΡΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ**, the same as the reading here in **Σ\***.<sup>18</sup> This fits with the correction having been made with a later hand and the initial darker and therefore possibly uncorrected **Α** after **ΠΡΟΣ**, but it too fails to account for the remnants of the stroke extending below just after the **Μ**.

---

<sup>16</sup>Of the editions consulted, only Swanson offers a reconstruction.

<sup>17</sup>This is the **ΜΕΝ** in **ΑΔΧΩΜΕΝ**.

<sup>18</sup>Swanson, *John*, 263.

## Nonsense in Context

There are ten singular readings in the Fourth Gospel of Alexandrinus classified as nonsense in context (10:32, 11:7, 11:27, 12:35, 13:5, 13:37, 14:22, 15:16, 18:9 and 18:33). Two of these have been corrected (11:27 and 13:5), but the later scribe who re-inked Alexandrinus corrected one (11:27) by selective re-inking. Hernández classifies omissions that result in nonsensical readings, such as the omission of a whole line, as nonsense in context.<sup>19</sup> In spite of the fact that such variants indeed result in nonsense readings of their respective passages, they are obviously omissions, so this study classifies them as such. Eight of the ten singulars that are nonsense in context begin as the first or second word before or after a line break (10:32, 11:7, 11:27, 12:35, 13:5, 13:37, 15:16 and 18:9). Five of them begin within two words of a punctuation marker (11:7, 13:5, 14:22, 15:16 and 18:9).

Table 4. Nonsense in context

Text	A	Exemplar
John 10:32	ΑΥΤΩ	ΑΥΤΩΝ ΑΥΤΩ <sup>−</sup> (possibly?)
John 11:7	ΠΟΛΙΝ	ΠΑΛΙΝ
John 11:27	ΛΕΓΕΙ ΑΥΤΩ / ΟΙC̄ (A*)	ΛΕΓΕΙ ΑΥΤΩ ΝΑΙ ΚΕ
John 12:35	ΚΑΤΑΒΗ	ΚΑΤΑΛΑΒΗ
John 13:5	ΗΡΞΑΝΤΟ (A*)	ΗΡΞΑΤΟ
John 13:37	ΔΥΝΑCΑΙΜΟΙ	ΔΥΝΑΜΑΙ CΟΙ
John 14:22	ΕΜΦΑΝΙΖΕΙC	ΕΜΦΑΝΙΖΕΙΝ
John 15:16	ΚΑΙ ΠΟΛΥΚΑΡΤΤΟΝ	ΚΑΙ ΠΟΛΥΝ ΚΑΡΤΤΟΝ

<sup>19</sup>Hernández, *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences*, 62–63.

John 18:9	ΕΣΑΥΤΟΥ	ΕΣ ΑΥΤΩΝ
John 18:33	ΑΥΤΟΙΣ	ΑΥΤΩ

In John 10:32, the scribe substituted the genitive plural, ΑΥΤΩΝ with the dative singular ΑΥΤΩ.<sup>20</sup> This could have occurred if the ΑΥΤΩΝ was at the end of the line in his exemplar, written as ΑΥΤΩ<sup>̄</sup>, or the scribe could have simply omitted a letter. Despite the reason for its origin, the dative singular is nonsensical in the passage, as Jesus asks διὰ ποῖον αὐτῶν ἔργον ἐμὲ λιθάζετε. It is possible that this is simply an orthographical peculiarity, as Gignac records instances of a final -ν being dropped before words beginning with a vowel, ranging from 35/36 C.E. to 572 C.E.<sup>21</sup> Alexandrinus fits in this range. Also of note is the fact that one word after ΑΥΤΩ is ΕΡΓΟ<sup>̄</sup>, the final word in the line. In either case, the reading in John 10:32 is an insignificant singular, possibly due to distraction from the upcoming line break.

Although it could be argued that the substitution of Α with Ο in the exemplar's ΠΑΛΙΝ in John 11:7 is merely a vowel substitution,<sup>22</sup> it is in this case that the substitution resulted in a different word, ΠΟΛΙΝ, but a real word nonetheless. The resulting accusative of πόλις would have Jesus saying to his disciples “Let us go to the city, Judaea,” rather than “Let us go to Judaea again.”<sup>23</sup> This singular is the first word of a new line, and it is immediately followed by a slightly larger space filled with a raised dot indicating punctuation.

<sup>20</sup>Cowper writes, “There is no trace of the iota subscript or adscript. Thus αυτω is always written αυτω,” in *Codex Alexandrinus*, viii.

<sup>21</sup>Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:112.

<sup>22</sup>See the discussions of John 18:21 and 19:15 above.

<sup>23</sup>Ἀγωμεν εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν πάλιν.



In the account of the raising of Lazarus, there is a singular reading at John 11:27 that is nonsense in context. The addition of the *nomen sacrum* Ο ΙC̄ is peculiar in translation as, rather than have Martha respond to Jesus' question, Alexandrinus reads "Jesus said to him, 'I have believed that you are the Christ, the Son of God come into the world.'"<sup>24</sup> This was most likely a harmonization of some kind, due to the familiar formula λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, found seventeen times in the Gospels, ten of which are in the Fourth Gospel. The re-inking scribe did not re-ink Ο ΙC̄ here, but did re-ink the Ε immediately after Ο ΙC̄. The variant comprises the first three letters of a new line.

In John 12:35, the scribe most likely skipped from the first Α to the second in ΚΑΤΑΛΑΒΗ, thereby omitting either ΑΑ or ΑΑ, though it makes no difference which was the technical omission. The resulting word is the aorist active subjunctive of καταβαίνω, rather than the same grammatical form of καταλαμβάνω. The resulting phrase leaves a very difficult accusative, ὑμᾶς, and, if taken as an accusative of respect, the phrase would be "in order that darkness might not descend with respect to you,"<sup>25</sup> rather than "in order that darkness might not overtake you."<sup>26</sup> The singular reading is the final word on its line in the text.

The scribe, in John 13:5, added a Ν into the aorist middle indicative, third person singular of ΗΡΞΑΤΟ, rendering it plural. Since Jesus is the only possible subject of the verb the plural form does not fit grammatically. There is a smudge in Alexandrinus where the Ν once was, because the Ν was subsequently erased, leaving traces of residual ink. The previous line extends slightly into the margin and is followed by a raised dot indicating punctuation, and the singular in 13:5 is the second word after

---

<sup>24</sup> ΛΕΓΕΙ ΑΥΤΩ / Ο ΙC̄ ΕΓΩ ΠΕΠΙΣΤΕΥΚΑ ΟΤΙ ΣΥ ΕΙ / Ο ΧC̄ Ο ΥΙΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΘῩ Ο ΕΙΣ ΤΟΝ / ΚΟΣΜΟΝ ΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΟΣ.

<sup>25</sup> Ἴνα μὴ σκοτία ὑμᾶς καταλάβῃ.

<sup>26</sup> Ἴνα μὴ σκοτία ὑμᾶς καταβῆ.

both a punctuation marker and a line break, following **ΚΑΙ**.

In John 13:37, the scribe transposed two syllables, writing **ΔΥΝΑCΑΙ ΜΟΙ** instead of **ΔΥΝΑΜΑΙ CΟΙ**. The transposition resulted in a change of person in both the verb and the pronoun. However, instead of Peter saying to Jesus “For what reason am I not able to follow you now,” Peter says “For what reason are you not able to follow me now?” Clearly, he would not have responded with such a statement after Jesus told Peter that he couldn’t follow where he was going (v. 36). These two words are the first two words of a new line.

The scribe wrote the present active indicative second person singular form of **ἐμφανίζω** rather than the present active infinitive in John 14:22 by substituting the final **Ν** of the infinitive with a **C**. This reading is nonsense in context, since the infinitive in 14:22 is a complementary infinitive modifying **μέλλω**, which is also in the indicative.<sup>27</sup> The next word after **ΕΜΦΑΝΙΖΕΙC** is **CΕΑΥΤΟΝ**, which is followed by a space and a raised dot marking punctuation. The best explanation is that the upcoming division in the text distracted the scribe, who looked ahead. He accidentally omitted the final **Ν** and wrote the initial **C** of **CΕΑΥΤΟΝ** twice.

The scribe omitted yet another **Ν** in John 15:16. Although it is a relatively rare variant, it is likely that the exemplar read **ΚΑΙ ΠΟΛΥΝ ΚΑΡΤΟΝ** instead of **ΚΑΙ ΚΑΡΤΟΝ**. Swanson lists *f*<sup>13</sup> and MS 1346 as having the former reading.<sup>28</sup> It could be that the scribe of Alexandrinus consciously altered the text of 15:16 (from an exemplar lacking **ΠΟΛΥΝ**) to fit with 15:8 (**ΚΑΡΤΟΝ ΠΟΛΥΝ**), but this is unlikely. If such a change occurred, one would expect to see the word order of 15:8 retained. The

---

<sup>27</sup>For a discussion of the complementary infinitive, see Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament with Scripture, Subject, and Greek Word Indexes* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 598–99.

<sup>28</sup>Swanson, *John*, 212.

scribe would also be far less likely to make the simple blunder of omitting a Ν while consciously changing his text—especially since his omission affects the only word he changed. However, in this instance the grammar of the passage is changed with the omission of Ν. In Alexandrinus, the scribe has created a situation in which a neuter adjective (ΠΟΛΥ) is modifying a masculine noun (ΚΑΡΤΟΝ). Whether this reading is grammatically nonsensical or orthographic in nature, it is still an insignificant singular. Although Gignac comments: “final nasals were dropped in the speech of many individual writers, regardless of the following sound,”<sup>29</sup> the physical aspects of the manuscript suggest that this variant was accidental. The preceding line ends with a raised dot indicating punctuation, and only the word ΚΑΙ precedes this variant in the new line.

In John 18:9, the scribe substituted ΑΥΤΟΥ for ΑΥΤΩΝ. This change affects the number of the pronoun. In context, the αὐτῶν refers back to the relative pronoun οὗς. The change in number yields a resulting pronoun that does not agree grammatically with its antecedent. Additionally, the word immediately following ΑΥΤΟΥ is ΟΥΔΕΝΑ, which ends the line prematurely, leaving space for four or five more letters, and the first letter of the next word is enlarged and written in the margin, likely denoting a paragraph division. There is the smallest of marks after ΟΥΔΕΝΑ. Although it is faded, it resembles the raised dot marking punctuation.

Finally, in John 18:33, the scribe makes another change in number which results in a pronoun disagreeing with its antecedent. Here, ΑΥΤΩ, referring to Jesus, has become ΑΥΤΟΙC. Since this blunder comes just after a singular reading in v. 32,<sup>30</sup> it is possible that external factors were at play here. Perhaps the scribe copied this passage at the end of the day and he was sleepy, or perhaps Brother Theophilus who

---

<sup>29</sup>Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:111.

<sup>30</sup>See the discussion below.

loves Jesus but, bless his heart, makes that annoying clicking sound whenever he sweeps, had just entered with a broom.<sup>31</sup> The singular reading, **ΑΥΤΟΙC**, is the third word after the *nomen sacrum* **ΙΝ**, which is immediately followed by a slight space and the raised dot denoting punctuation. This suggests that the scribe had in mind the common Gospels formula **ΚΑΙ ΕΙΤΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΙC**<sup>32</sup> and mistakenly wrote that phrase instead of **ΚΑΙ ΕΙΤΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ**.

### **Significant Singulars**

There are forty-six singular readings in Alexandrinus that can be used to construct a picture of the scribe's copying habits, apart from considering orthographical and nonsense singulars in close proximity to punctuation and line breaks. These are divided into five categories: additions, omissions, transpositions, harmonizations and substitutions. There are six additions, eighteen omissions, five transpositions, five harmonizations and twelve substitutions.

### ***Additions***

In six instances, the scribe added to Alexandrinus (5:6b, 6:22, 6:45, 18:37 and twice in 20:27). Two instances involve the addition of a single word (18:37 and 20:27). Four instances involve the addition of two or more words (5:6b, 6:22, 6:45 and 20:27).

---

<sup>31</sup>For examples of other thoughts that could have distracted the scribe, causing a copying error, see Dirk Jongkind, "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, TS 6 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008), 48.

<sup>32</sup>This phrase appears 4 other times in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus (2:19, 6:29, 6:43 and 9:30), and 8 times in Luke's Gospel, which was also copied by Scribe II (2:10, 9:48, 13:32, 16:15, 22:35, 22:46, 24:19 and 24:46). It is likely that the phrase originally occurred 2 additional times in the Fourth Gospel (7:21 and 8:14), and possibly a third (8:7), but since Alexandrinus is lacunose from John 6:50-8:52, it is impossible to be certain.

### One-word Additions

There are two single-word additions in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus (18:37 and 20:27). One is unexplained (18:37), but the other is a dittography after a line break, before a punctuation marker and has been corrected (20:27). Both occur within two words of a line break.

Table 5. One-word additions

Text	A	Exemplar
John 18:37	ΕΙΣ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΚΑΙ ΓΕΓΕΝΝΗΜΑΙ / ΚΑΙ ΕΙΣ ΤΟΥΤΟ	ΕΙΣ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΓΕΓΕΝΝΗΜΑΙ ΚΑΙ ΕΙΣ ΤΟΥΤΟ
John 20:27a	ΤΗΝ ΧΕΙΡΑ ΣΟΥ / ΣΟΥ· (A*)	ΤΗΝ ΧΕΙΡΑ ΣΟΥ

One of the two single-word additions in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus is the duplication of the conjunction **ΚΑΙ** in 18:37. It is noteworthy that the second **ΚΑΙ** begins a new line. The physical process of stopping to move to a new line is the cause of several singular readings in Alexandrinus, but it is curious that the first **ΚΑΙ** is the singular addition, not the second **ΚΑΙ**.

The other single-word addition in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus is a dittography of **ΣΟΥ** within a larger dittography. For discussion of this addition, see the discussion on the larger dittography in John 20:27b below.

### Additions of Two or More Words

Four times in the Fourth Gospel, the scribe of Alexandrinus adds two or more words (5:6b, 6:22, 6:45 and 20:27). While it is true that some of these additions due to

dittography might be better classified as nonsense in context, they are, nonetheless, additions. For the purposes of statistical analysis, they are included here. It is noteworthy that in the Apocalypse, Codex Alexandrinus does not have a single addition due to dittography.<sup>33</sup> Three of the four additions occur just after a line break (5:6b, 6:45 and 20:27) and the other occurs soon after a page turn (6:22). One addition seems to have come after a punctuation marker (5:6b).

Table 6. Additions of two or more words

Text	A	Exemplar
John 5:6b	dittography (A*)	ΛΕΓΕΙ ΑΥΤΩ ΘΕΛΕΙΣ ὙΓΙΗΣ ΓΕΝΕΣΘΑΙ
John 6:22	ΣΥΝΕΙΧΛΘΕΝΟΙΣ̄ ΤΟΙΣ ΜΑΘΗ / [page turn] / ΤΑΙΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΟΙΣ̄ (A*)	ΣΥΝΕΙΧΛΘΕΝ ΤΟΙΣ ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΟΙΣ̄ (?)
John 6:45	ΜΑ / ΘΩΝ ΤΗΝ ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑΝ	ΜΑΘΩΝ
John 20:27b	dittography (A*)	ΦΕΡΕ ΤΗΝ ΧΕΙΡΑ ΣΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΒΑΛΕ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΠΛΕΥΡΑΝ ΜΟΥ

The scribe of Alexandrinus committed a careless dittography in John 5:6b, having copied ΛΕΓΕΙ ΑΥΤΩ ΘΕΛΕΙΣ ὙΓΙΗΣ ΓΕΝΕΣΘΑΙ twice. A

<sup>33</sup>Hernández, *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences*, 110 n. 63.

different scribe corrected the error. This dittography was due to homoeoarcton, aided by a line break and punctuation. The scribe copied ΓΕΝΕCΘΑΙ, which was at the end of a line. The next word was ΛΕΓΕΙ, but instead of copying the ΛΕΓΕΙ that followed ΓΕΝΕCΘΑΙ, the scribe copied the previous ΛΕΓΕΙ in his exemplar. In Alexandrinus, there is a small space before the first ΛΕΓΕΙ. Since the correction begins the second ΛΕΓΕΙ with a large letter extending into the margin, it is likely that there was some kind of punctuation marker before it as well in the exemplar.<sup>34</sup>

The nearly vertical under-stroke of the λs in the correction does not match the λ typical of Scribe IV. It is most like the λ of Scribe I. The prominent “hook” on the Γ is observed only in the writing of Scribe I and Scribe V. Scribe I was the likely corrector here. Below is an attempt to reflect accurately what can be clearly seen in the manuscript. The first reproduction is a representation of the original reading. The letters in grey have been erased, but most of the letters can clearly be seen in the traces of residual ink left on the parchment. The second reproduction is the final form of this passage.

Original reading of John 5:6b:

ΑΥΤΩΘΕΛΕΙCΥ̅ΓΙHCΓΕΝΕCΘΑΙ  
 ΛΕΓΕΙΑΥΤΩΘΕΛΕΙCΥ̅ΓΙHC  
 ΓΕΝΕCΘΑΙΑΠΟΚΡΙΘΗΑΥΤΩ

Corrected Reading of John 5:6b:

ΑΥΤΩΘΕΛΕΙCΥ̅ΓΙHC  
 ΓΕΝΕCΘΑΙ  
 ΛΕΓΕΙΑΥΤΩ

The scribe added Ο ΙC̅ to the text in John 6:22, leaving Jesus’ name in the verse twice. Since both occurrences are in the nominative case and are *nomina sacra*, one

---

<sup>34</sup> X and W have punctuation markers in both places, and D begins a new line at each place.

could argue that this is singular reading should be classified as nonsense in context. The first occurrence of  $\text{O } \overline{\text{IC}}$  is the singular as the second occurrence is almost universally attested.

There are several interesting features at the manuscript at this passage. First, the gradual fading of the ink and a sudden darkening show that a scribe stopped to re-ink at the article  $\text{T O I C}$ , just *after* the singular addition. The uneven nature of this darker ink suggests that it was the work of the later scribe(s) who re-inked the manuscript. He did not re-ink the first occurrence of  $\text{O } \overline{\text{IC}}$ . Second, this singular occurs across a page turn. Third, the second occurrence of  $\text{O } \overline{\text{IC}}$ —the universally attested occurrence—has been stricken out with deletion points over the letters, resulting in the corrected text:  $\text{O } \overline{\text{IC}}$ . These points are the same shade of ink as the original text in this line. However, a later scribe has gone back and touched-up six or seven letters in the first line of folio 46v, beginning with the second occurrence of  $\overline{\text{IC}}$ . The article does not appear to be as dark, but the ink is uneven, suggesting that it too was re-inked.<sup>35</sup> The re-inking scribe did not re-ink the deletion points.

Based on the first three aforementioned features, the most likely explanation is that the scribe added the first occurrence of  $\text{O } \overline{\text{IC}}$  by accident. Then, he copied the second  $\text{O } \overline{\text{IC}}$  from the exemplar. Either he or another scribe corrected this mistake by adding deletion points over the second occurrence. Later, the re-inking scribe re-inked the passage according to the well-attested reading. The touch-up could confirm that the second reading was the “preferred reading,” though the later scribe may not have wished to erase the first occurrence of Jesus’ name out of reverence.<sup>36</sup>

However, the addition could be due to the visual similarity of  $\text{O } \overline{\text{IC}}$  and

---

<sup>35</sup>Perhaps the re-inking scribe re-inked his pen at  $\overline{\text{IC}}$ .

<sup>36</sup>This is, of course, only speculation.



ΤΟΙΣ, or it could be merely stylistic. The best explanation is that the scribe, reading ahead, mistakenly copied the subject of the clause, Ο ΙC, closer to the verb. When he came to Ο ΙC as it was in his exemplar, he copied it again. Realizing that he had copied Ο ΙC twice, he marked the second occurrence for deletion. His choice of the second occurrence rather than the first could have been for stylistic reasons, since the newly created reading is a departure from the known manuscript tradition. On the other hand, if Scribe IV marked the second occurrence of Ο ΙC for deletion *in scribendo*, he may have done so for practical reasons. The second Ο ΙC is on a different page than the first Ο ΙC, and so to delete the first Ο ΙC, the scribe would have had to turn the page back. If the ink was still wet, he risked smudging the ink or transferring it over to the following page by turning back to delete the first occurrence.

At John 6:45, the scribe supplied the object ΤΗΝ ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑΝ to the participle ΜΑΘΩΝ. In this passage, Jesus quotes Isaiah 54:13, but the addition occurs after the quote is finished. As no parallel can be found to explain this addition it is possibly just a matter of clarification on the part of the scribe. The line breaks in the middle of ΜΑΘΩΝ, but it is unlikely that this singular was due to a distraction.

The scribe commits another addition via dittography of the phrase ΚΑΙ ΦΕΡΕ ΤΗΝ ΧΕΙΡΑ ΣΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΒΑΛΕ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΠΛΕΥΡΑΝ ΜΟΥ in 20:27. The scribe committed a dittography of ΣΟΥ the first time he wrote the phrase, but when he copied the whole phrase a second time, he only wrote ΣΟΥ once. The dittography of ΣΟΥ occurs immediately after a line break and immediately before a raised dot denoting punctuation.<sup>37</sup> The beginning of the larger dittography also occurs immediately after a line break.

The usual sharp point on the under-stroke of Α, the prominent hook on the Γ,

---

<sup>37</sup>This mark is erased from the manuscript, but the larger space between the original Υ and κ and the presence of the dot in the correction strongly suggest that it was there originally.

the straight Υ and the Ε that almost connects like a Θ all suggest that this correction was made by Scribe V. The original and corrected texts are reproduced below.

Original reading of John 20:27:

ΛΟΝΣΟΥΩΔΕΚΑΙΪΔΕΤΑΣΧΕΙΡΑΣ  
ΜΟΥ·ΚΑΙΦΕΡΕΤΗΝΧΕΙΡΑΣΟΥ  
ΣΟΥ·ΚΑΙΒΑΛΕΕΙΣΤΗΝΠΛΕΥΡΑΝΜΟΥ  
ΚΑΙΦΕΡΕΤΗΝΧΕΙΡΑΣΟΥ·ΚΑΙΒΑΛ  
ΕΕΙΣΤΗΝΠΛΕΥΡΑΝΜΟΥΚΑΙΜΗ  
ΓΙΝΟΥΑΠΙΣΤΟΣΑΛΛΑΠΙΣΤΟΣ

Corrected Reading of John 20:27:

ΛΟΝΣΟΥΩΔΕΚΑΙΪΔΕΤΑΣΧΕΙ  
ΡΑΣΜΟΥ ΚΑΙΦΕΡΕ  
ΤΗΝΧΕΙΡΑΣΟΥ·ΚΑΙΒΑΛΕ  
ΕΙΣΤΗΝΠΛΕΥΡΑΝΜΟΥ  
ΚΑΙΜΗΓΙΝΟΥΑΠΙΣΤΟΣ  
ΑΛΛΑΠΙΣΤΟΣ

### **Factors in Additions**

The factors involved in the six additions to the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus suggest that line breaks and punctuation markers often distracted the scribe. Five of the six additions occur within two words of a line break (5:6b, 6:45, 18:37 and twice in 20:27) and the sixth occurs just after a page turn (6:22). Three of the six also seem to have begun adjacent to a punctuation marker (5:6b and both dittographic errors in 20:27). Three of the six were dittographic errors (5:6b and twice in 20:27) and one was likely due to visual similarity (6:22).

### ***Omissions***

The largest category of singular readings in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus

is that of omissions. Scribe IV created eighteen total omissions, but only four of them comprise more than a single word. Eight of the omissions have been corrected (3:13, 5:18, 9:7, 10:10, 10:12, 10:13, 13:12 and 17:11), whether *in scribendo* by Scribe IV or subsequently by another scribe. The close proximity of the omissions at 10:10, 10:12 and 10:13, coupled with the fact that all three have been corrected is admittedly curious.

### One-word Omissions

The biggest category of scribal change in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus is that of one-word omissions. There are fourteen such singular readings in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus (3:13, 4:26, 5:18, 6:28, 9:7, 10:12, 11:23, 12:15, 16:6, 16:19, 17:11, 17:25, 20:17 and 21:17). Five of these have been corrected (3:13, 5:18, 9:7, 10:12 and 17:11). Seven of the omissions occur within two words of a punctuation marker (9:7, 11:23, 16:6, 16:19, 17:25, 20:17 and 21:17), and ten omissions occur within two words of a new line (5:18, 6:28, 9:7, 10:12, 11:23, 16:6, 16:19, 17:11, 17:25 and 20:17). Six of the omissions are in close proximity to both a line break and a punctuation marker (9:7, 11:23, 16:6, 16:19, 17:25 and 20:17).

Table 7. One-word omissions

Text	A	Exemplar
John 3:13	ΟΕΝΤΩΟΥΝΩ̅ (A*)	Ο ΩΝ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΟΥΝΩ̅
John 4:26	Ι̅Ϟ	ΟΙ̅Ϟ
John 5:18	omit (A*)	Θ̅Ν
John 6:28	omit	ΟΥΝ
John 9:7	omit (A*)	ΝΙΨΑΙ
John 10:12	omit (A*)	ΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΟΝ

John 11:23	ἰϸ	οἰϸ
John 12:15	omit	ϸΟΥ
John 16:6	omit	ἀλλ'
John 16:19	omit	αὐτοῖς
John 17:11	ἐτι (A*)	οὐκέτι
John 17:25	Δεεγνωων	Δε σε εγνωων
John 20:17	omit	Δε
John 21:17	με λεγει	με και λεγει

The scribe omitted the nominative masculine singular participle **ων** in John 3:13, but this omission was corrected by another scribe. The parchment is clearly smudged, the ink is slightly atypical of Alexandrinus<sup>38</sup> and the letters **νω** of **ουνω** are written clearly, on clean parchment in the margin. Based on the handwriting, the correction was most likely made by Scribe II. A textual division comes just after the phrase, as the first letter of the following line is enlarged and written in the margin. The original omission was probably due to the visual similarity of **ων** and **εν**, which followed it in the exemplar.<sup>39</sup>

In John 4:26, the scribe omits the definite article from Jesus' name. This is an inexplicable omission of a single letter. In the manuscript, there is a raised dot marking punctuation followed by the phrase **λεγει αυτη ἰϸ**. It is possible that the pause caused the scribe to lapse into an imprecise memory of the phrase as he copied, since the

<sup>38</sup>But regarding the change in ink written over an erasure in a parchment manuscript, see Frederic G. Kenyon, ed., *The Codex Alexandrinus (Royal MS. 1 D V-Viii) in Reduced Photographic Facsimile*, vol. 1 (London: British Museum, 1909), 1:10.

<sup>39</sup>Since **ων** is semantically similar to **εν**, and Gignac reports that the definite article frequently replaces the relative pronoun, it is possible that the scribe omitted **ων** as a harmonization to contemporary usage. For an explanation and examples of this phenomenon, see Gignac, *Grammar*, 2:179.

anarthrous formula occurs earlier at John 4:16 in Alexandrinus. The same reading twice within ten verses would fall under Jongkind’s category of “harmonizations to intermediate context,”<sup>40</sup> but since the same omission of the article before  $\bar{\iota}\bar{\epsilon}$  is also found at 11:23, this is classified as a simple one-word omission.

The scribe of Alexandrinus accidentally omitted  $\Theta\bar{\Nu}$  in John 5:18, but quickly realized his mistake and corrected it after making the first stroke.<sup>41</sup> The  $\Theta$  is very clearly an  $\bar{\iota}$  that has been adjusted to become a very narrow  $\Theta$ . There is no trace of a diaeresis over the  $\Theta/\bar{\iota}$ , but there is above the following  $\bar{\iota}$ . Based on the manuscript at John 10:10,<sup>42</sup> it appears that for  $\bar{\iota}$  and  $\bar{\Upsilon}$ , the scribe wrote the letter, the diaeresis and the following letter, in that order. Swanson gives the original reading of Alexandrinus to be  $\bar{\iota}\bar{\epsilon}$ .<sup>43</sup> The following two letters are  $\bar{\iota}\bar{\epsilon}$ , but this reading would be nonsensical, because it would have the accusative article modifying a nominative *nomen sacrum*. Swanson’s conjecture is also unlikely because there is no trace of residual ink resembling a  $\bar{\epsilon}$  beneath the  $\bar{\Nu}$ . Since  $\Theta\bar{\Nu}$  occurs at the end of a line, it would be more likely that a later corrector would have erased the  $\bar{\iota}$  and rewritten it as  $\Theta$  than for him simply to alter it to be a misshapen  $\Theta$ . Therefore, this variant is a simple accidental omission of  $\Theta\bar{\Nu}$ .

The scribe omitted  $\Theta\Upsilon\bar{\Nu}$  in John 6:28. Although this is a singular omission among the Greek witnesses, Tregelles mentions that it is reflected in the Syriac<sup>44</sup> and

---

<sup>40</sup>Jongkind, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*, 143.

<sup>41</sup>One might contest the use of this example as a variant, especially since I argue that it was corrected immediately. However, since the purpose of this study is to examine the habits of the scribe, it is appropriate to include a discussion of John 5:18 in Alexandrinus here.

<sup>42</sup>See discussion below.

<sup>43</sup>Swanson, *John*, 58.

<sup>44</sup>Specifically, the Curetonian Syriac, the Peshitta, and the Jerusalem Syriac Lectionary.

Armenian versions.<sup>45</sup> The absence of οὖν in the Armenian may be a witness to John 6:28 in the Syriac, for although the Armenian version underwent a major revision modeled after the Greek text very early in the history of its transmission, it likely originated, at least in part, as a translation from the Syriac.<sup>46</sup> The omission of ΟΥΝ could simply be stylistic on the part of the translators.<sup>47</sup> ΟΥΝ would have been the second word in a new paragraph, for the preceding word ΕΙΤΟΝ begins the line with an enlarged Ε written in the margin.

There is a curious omission and correction in John 9:7. The scribe omitted ΝΙΨΑΙ and a later scribe corrected it. There is a punctuation marker at the end of a line, and the first word of the new line is ΨΠΑΓΕ, the word immediately before the place one would expect to find the word ΝΙΨΑΙ. However, the corrector wrote ΚΑΙ ΝΙΨΑΙ after ΟΙΛΩΑΜ, a reading shared only with 1424. This is a strange place to add the missing text, because as such, it has Jesus saying, “Go to the pool of Siloam and wash (which is translated “sent”).”<sup>48</sup> Additionally, there is an asterisk in the margin. This asterisk is the only marginal asterisk in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus, but its black ink and thin strokes<sup>49</sup> betray a much later hand—most likely that of Patrick Young, the

---

<sup>45</sup>Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, ed., *The Greek New Testament: Edited from Ancient Authorities, with Their Various Readings in Full, and the Latin Version of Jerome*, pt. 2, *Gospels of St. Luke and St. John* (London: S. Bagster & Sons, 1861), 404.

<sup>46</sup>S. Peter Cowe, “The Armenian Version of the New Testament,” in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., NTTSD 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 268.

<sup>47</sup>This is especially the case with the Armenian Version, in light of Erroll F. Rhodes’ remark that in the Armenian, “[c]onjunctions, prepositions, and other relational particles are particularly elusive for the textual critic,” in “Limitations of Armenian in Representing Greek,” in *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations*, ed. Bruce M. Metzger (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 177–78.

<sup>48</sup>ΨΠΑΓΕ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΚΟΛΥΜΒΗΘΡΑ ΤΟΥ ΟΙΛΩΑΜ ΚΑΙ ΝΙΨΑΙ Ο ΕΡΜΗΝΕΥΕΤ ΑΠΕΣΤΑΛΜΕΝΟΣ

<sup>49</sup>This instance proves the necessity of high quality images of manuscripts. The asterisk looks as if it could be ancient in both Kenyon’s and Thompson’s facsimile editions, but examination of the high

librarian of Charles I who added the pagination, modern chapter divisions and marginalia.<sup>50</sup> The original omission is singular among the Greek witnesses, but Tregelles cites the Old Latin MSS Vercellensis (a, IV/V cent.) and Veronensis (b, V cent.) as sharing the omission.<sup>51</sup> Jülicher confirms the lack of the phrase in the two MSS, but notes that he was unable to verify the text of Vercellensis at 9:7 and had to rely on the reports of previous editors.<sup>52</sup> Below is a reconstruction of the correction as seen in Alexandrinus.

Original reading in John 9:7:

ΤΟΥ ΛΙΩ ΔΑ ΜΟ ΕΡΜΗΝΕΥΕΤΑΙ

Corrected reading in John 9:7:

ΤΟΥ ΛΙΩ ΔΑ ΜΚΑΙΝΙ ΦΑΙΟ ΕΡΜΗΝΕΥΕΤ

The handwriting of the correction most closely resembles that of Scribe V. The abbreviation for ΔΙ used here is only used in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus in marginal corrections when space was needed.

John 10:12 in Alexandrinus contains another corrected omission of a single word. The scribe omitted the participle ΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΟΝ, but this omission was later corrected. The omission is not a nonsense reading. Without ΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΟΝ, A\* would be translated “The hired servant . . . sees the wolf and flees.”<sup>53</sup> A later hand, most likely Scribe II, corrected this reading. There are no visible traces of residual ink under the correction, save possibly the down-stroke of the Φ in ΑΦΙΗCΙΝ. The ink is

---

resolution images of the passage posted online by the British Library, the asterisk is clearly written with a black ink, not at all like that of the text.

<sup>50</sup>Kenyon, *Codex Alexandrinus*, 1:5.

<sup>51</sup>Tregelles, *Greek New Testament*, 425.

<sup>52</sup>Adolf Jülicher, *Itala: Das Neue Testament in Altlateinischer Überlieferung: IV: Johannes-Evangelium* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1963), 101.

<sup>53</sup>Alexandrinus is extant in this verse, but for the sake of brevity, I omitted part of the verse that is grammatically irrelevant.

slightly different for **ΕΡΧΟΜΕ-** but returns to normal for the remainder of the correction, written in the margin. The *καί*-compendium<sup>54</sup> is used, which is only used in marginal corrections in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus. The most likely cause of the omission was parablepsis due to the homoeoteleuton of **ΛΥΚΟΝ** and **ΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΟΝ**. The omitted **ΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΟΝ** should have been the last word on the line.

John 11:23 contains the very same type of singular omission as John 4:26. In each place, the scribe omitted the definite article **Ο** from the *nomen sacrum* **ΙC**. As is the case at 4:26, there is a raised dot marking punctuation followed by the phrase **ΛΕΓΕΙ ΑΥΤΗ ΙC**. In 11:23, **ΙC** is the last word in the line of text and it is followed by a very faint mark that appears to be the raised dot of punctuation.

In John 12:15, the scribe omitted **COY** from **Ο ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥC COY**. This reading is singular among the Greek witnesses, but Tregelles references some Sahidic support.<sup>55</sup> This passage is a quotation of Zech. 9:9. There is one ninth-tenth century minuscule, 86, in the Lucianic tradition of the LXX that omits **σoũ** in its uncorrected text at Zech. 9:9, but since A is both Alexandrian in Zech. and does not lack **σoũ** in Zech. 9:9, these similar omissions are coincidental.<sup>56</sup> The omission is inexplicable, but it is clear that Scribe IV was not harmonizing to Scribe I's Greek Zechariah.

The scribe of Alexandrinus omitted the conjunction **ΑΛΛ'** from John 16:6. The line breaks in the middle of the word **ΥΠΑΓΕΙC**, and there is a small space between **ΥΠΑΓΕΙC** and the following word **ΟΤΙ**. This space is filled with a raised

---

<sup>54</sup>κ̅

<sup>55</sup>Tregelles, *Greek New Testament*, 442.

<sup>56</sup>For information on Alexandrinus and MS 86 in the LXX of Zech, see Joseph Ziegler, *Duodecim prophetae*, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamuntum Graecum Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Göttingensis editum 13 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943).



dot marking punctuation, just before the scribe should have written  $\alpha\alpha\alpha'$ . The omission of  $\alpha\alpha\alpha'$  here was most likely accidental, due to the distractions brought on by the line break and the text division.

In John 16:19, the scribe omitted  $\alpha\Upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ . To make sense of the passage,  $\alpha\Upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$  is unnecessary. It is clear that Jesus is speaking to his disciples here. There are some physical matters in the manuscript that could have contributed to the omission. The line begins with  $\alpha\Upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\rho\omega\tau\alpha\nu$ , followed by a small space containing a raised punctuation dot. This should have been followed by the phrase  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\Upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ . However, it simply reads  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\nu$ , followed by another raised punctuation dot. Finally, the line ends with  $\pi\tau\epsilon\rho\iota$ . The pause to add the first punctuation marker could have distracted the scribe, as well as his reading ahead to the next punctuation marker, or even his upcoming line break. Whatever the specific cause, this omission appears to be accidental.

The singular variant in John 17:11 in Alexandrinus is difficult to classify, though it is clearly an omission. The difficulty in classification is due to the nature of the omission and how one would assign word spacing to the text. If one considers  $\omicron\Upsilon\kappa\epsilon\tau\iota$  to be a single adverb, the original omission of  $\omicron\Upsilon\kappa$  could be classified as a substitution of one word ( $\omicron\Upsilon\kappa\epsilon\tau\iota$ ) for another ( $\epsilon\tau\iota$ ). However, if one considers  $\omicron\Upsilon\kappa\epsilon\tau\iota$  to be a compound adverb made of two individual words,  $\omicron\Upsilon\kappa$  and  $\epsilon\tau\iota$ , this is an omission of a single word. Royse considers  $\omicron\Upsilon\kappa\epsilon\tau\iota$  to be two separable words, as he classifies the change of the first occurrence of  $\omicron\Upsilon\kappa\epsilon\tau\iota$  to  $\omicron\Upsilon\kappa$  in §46 at Romans 11:6 as an omission of an adverb ( $\epsilon\tau\iota$ ).<sup>57</sup> Following Royse, the reading of Alexandrinus at John 17:11 is classified as an omission of a single word.

The omitted word  $\omicron\Upsilon\kappa$  should have been the second word in a new line, but

---

<sup>57</sup>Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 277.

the omission was corrected. The word **καὶ** has been scraped away from its initial place at the beginning of the line and written in with small cramped letters at the end of the preceding line. Traces of residual ink remain where the letters of **καὶ** once were. **οὐκ** was written in over **καὶ**, and there is a small dot above the letters between the corrected **οὐκ** and the **ἐτι**. Though the correcting scribe only wrote six letters, they are sufficient to suggest that Scribe II made the correction.

The second occurrence of **κε** was omitted in John 17:25. Though this may have been a stylistic omission since it is the second occurrence of **κε** in the same verse, several factors in the manuscript suggest that it could have been accidental. First, v. 25 begins at the top of a new page. Second, the word following where **κε** should have been, **ἐφνω** ends the line in the middle, leaving enough empty space at the end of the line in which the scribe could have written approximately seven letters. The scribe may have anticipated a division in the text. Third, the phrase **ἐγω δε ἐφνω** is set off as a sense unit in and of itself, by a small raised dot placed in the slightly wider space just before the initial **ε** in **ἐγω**, and a small raised dot after the final **ν** in **ἐφνω**. These three divisions so close together in the text could have been a source of distraction for the scribe, especially since he had already written **κε** once in the verse. It is possible that the second **κε** was omitted accidentally because the scribe leaped from the **ε** in **δε** to the **ε** in **κε**, and the textual divisions in the physical text could have contributed to the scribe's lapse in attention.

The scribe omitted the conjunction **δε** after **πορευου** in John 20:17. This omission was most likely accidental, as **πορευου** occurs just after a small dot and is written cramped, into the margin, followed by a line break. The omitted **δε** should have been the first word of a new line. This reading is singular among Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, but some manuscripts of Origen also omit **δε** here. Ehrman, Fee and Holmes do not think **δε** was omitted in Origen's text, but admit that

the variant is difficult.<sup>58</sup>

The scribe of Alexandrinus omitted the conjunction **καί** immediately after a punctuation marker dividing the text in John 21:17. Although this omission is singular among Greek witnesses, Tregelles notes that some Old Latin manuscripts share it.<sup>59</sup> Jülicher reports specifically that *et* is absent here in Codices Vercellensis (a, IV/V cent.), Veronensis (b, V cent.) and Usserianus (r<sup>1</sup>, VI/VII cent.).<sup>60</sup>

### Omissions of Two or More Words

Of the eighteen omissions in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus, only four comprise two or more words (10:10, 10:13, 13:12 and 14:11). The first word of three of the omissions would have been the first or second word of a new line (10:10, 10:13, 13:12), and all three of these omissions have been corrected. One omission occurs just after both a line break and a punctuation marker (13:12). Additionally, one omission appears to be a leap from a punctuation marker to a second punctuation marker (14:11), and it is the only omission that was not corrected.

Table 8. Omissions of two or more words

Text	A	Exemplar
John 10:10	omit (A*)	<b>ΕΙ ΜΗ</b>
John 10:13	<b>Ο ΔΕ ΜΙΣΘ / ΩΤΟΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΜΙΣΘΩΤΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΟΥΜΕ / ΛΕΙ (A*)</b>	<b>Ο ΔΕ ΜΙΣΘΩΤΟΣ ΦΕΥΓΕΙ ΟΤΙ ΜΙΣΘΩΤΟΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ</b>

<sup>58</sup>Bart D. Ehrman, Gordon D. Fee, and Michael W. Holmes, *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen*, vol. 1, NTGF 3 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 334–35.

<sup>59</sup>Tregelles, *Greek New Testament*, 483.

<sup>60</sup>Jülicher, *Johannes-Evangelium*, 227.

		ΚΑΙ ΟΥ ΜΕΛΕΙ
John 13:12	omit (A*)	ΚΑΙ ΑΝΑΠΤΕΩΝ ΠΑΛΙΝ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΙΣ
John 14:11	omit	ΚΑΙ Ο ΠΑΤΗΡ ΕΝ ΕΜΟΙ

On the surface, the singular reading in John 10:10 appears to be orthographical; the scribe seems to have substituted **Ι** for **ΕΙ**. This particular replacement is very common, and almost no instances of the **Ι/ΕΙ** interchange were included in this study. Gignac reports, “There is a very frequent interchange of **ει** and **ι** (whether long or short etymologically) in all phonetic environments throughout the Romans and Byzantine periods.”<sup>61</sup> Gignac lists several instances in which **ι** is substituted for the word **ει**, dating from the first to the fourth centuries C.E.<sup>62</sup> Nevertheless, the variant in John 10:10 is not an example of this interchange.

A new line begins with **ΕΡΧΕΤΑΙ**, the word immediately before the singular reading in John 10:10. The word immediately after the phrase **ΕΙ ΜΗ** is **ἵνα**, and diaereses are used in Alexandrinus over both **Υ** and **Ι** when they begin a new word. Often, one of the dots in the diaeresis is very thin—a small dash—while the other has a rounder shape. Over the singular **ι**, the scribe wrote a diaeresis. The second, rounder dot is still above the space between **Ι** and **Μ**, but the first dot was written as a very short, thin line. The corrector simply wrote a crescent shape around the first line-dot, making it into a small **Ε** above the **ι**. Since no text is missing after this instance, one may reasonably

<sup>61</sup>Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:189.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid.

assume that this singular was the result of an accidental omission of **ΕΙ ΜΗ**, but was caught immediately by the scribe himself, who corrected his error *in scribendo* after writing the diaeresis, but before writing another letter. The shape of the following **Μ** also supports this hypothesis. The scribe responsible for the Fourth Gospel always connects the diagonal stroke of **Ν** to the very top of the initial down-stroke, but he connects the first diagonal stroke of **Μ** closer to the middle of the initial down-stroke. The **Μ** immediately after the singular is perfectly regular, showing no signs of abnormality. If the scribe had begun to write a **Ν** but corrected it to a **Μ**, the **Μ** here would show signs of abnormality. This correction demonstrates that the scribe stopped to add the diaereses before continuing on to write the rest of the word.

The original text at John 10:13 is very difficult. It appears that the scribe accidentally omitted **ΦΕΥΓΕΙ ΟΤΙ**, but wrote **ΜΙΘΩΤΟΣ** twice. What appears to be residual ink is actually bleed-through from the verso side of the parchment, making a reconstruction based on traces of ink impossible. However, some scholars offer a reconstruction of the text. Cowper proposes that the scribe leaped from the first **ΜΙΘΩΤΟΣ** to the second, accidentally omitting **ΦΕΥΓΕΙ ΟΤΙ ΜΙΘΩΤΟΣ**.<sup>63</sup> Based on the spacing, this reading is unlikely. The whole line has been erased and rewritten, but the following line picks up in the middle of **ΜΕΛΕΙ**. This physical structure of the passage indicates that whatever the original reading was in John 10:13, it occupied the entire line. While it is possible that the original reading here ended with the letters **ΜΕ** in **ΜΕΛΕΙ** based on the unaltered appearance of **ΛΕΙ** in **ΜΕΛΕΙ** on the next line, this type of reconstruction is not absolutely necessary if the correction was made *in scribendo*. Cowper's reconstruction leaves several letters of empty space at the end of the line, making his conjecture highly unlikely. Swanson,

---

<sup>63</sup>Cowper, *Codex Alexandrinus*, 203.

admitting that it is a conjecture, gives the original of Alexandrinus as ὁ δὲ μισθωτὸς ἐστὶν μισθωτὸς καὶ οὐ μέλει.<sup>64</sup> Swanson’s reconstruction gives a difficult reading of the passage, but it makes the best use of the spacing of the line. The altered texture of the parchment makes it difficult to identify the corrector here, but the letters are reasonably consistent with Scribe IV. Thus it appears that this correction was made *in scribendo*, though not perfectly; in the correction, the scribe substituted ΜΙΘΘΟC in place of the second ΜΙΘΩΤΟC, which is singular. Additionally, the omission began soon after a line break.

The scribe omitted the phrase ΚΑΙ ΑΝΑΠΤΕCΩΝ ΠΑΛΙΝ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΙC at John 13:12. While the omission is not entirely nonsensical, it does yield an awkwardly abrupt conversation. Without this phrase, John 13:12 reads: “Therefore, when he washed their feet, he took his garments; ‘Do you know what I have done for you?’”<sup>65</sup> It appears that the scribe omitted the phrase because of a homoeoteleutonic leap from ΑΥΤΟΥ to ΑΥΤΟΙC.

The omission occurred at a line break, and a later scribe corrected this omission in John 13:12 by writing the entire phrase in the margin. Additionally, a faint mark appears at the initial letter of the correction, the κ. This faint mark appears to be the remnant of a punctuation marker. The correction was written after the Eusebian apparatus was added, as the C of ΑΝΑΠΤΕCΩ<sup>—</sup> was written over the red down-stroke of the Eusebian apparatus. It does not use the καί-compendium, in spite of its length and need to preserve marginal space.

The scribe committed a curious error in John 14:11, omitting the phrase ΚΑΙ Ο ΠΑΤΗΡ ΕΝ ΕΜΟΙ. There is a raised dot in the text at the spot where the omitted

---

<sup>64</sup>Swanson, *John*, 141.

<sup>65</sup>ΟΤΕ ΟΥΝ ΕΝΙΨΕΝ ΤΟΥC ΠΟΔΑC ΑΥΤΩΝ ΕΛΑΒΕΝ ΤΑ ΙΜΑΤΙΑ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΓΙΝΩCΚΕΤΕ ΤΙ ΠΟΙΗΚΑ ΎΜΙ<sup>—</sup>.

phrase should be. The logical sense of the passage would have a punctuation marker just after the omitted phrase but not before; this is how the passage is printed in the NA<sup>28</sup>. However, divisions of the text both before and after this phrase would not be unknown among early manuscripts extant in John 14:11. Codex Washingtonianus, the punctuation of which “is regularly shown by slight spacings,”<sup>66</sup> begins the phrase on a new line, but the empty space at the end of the previous line is sufficient for the scribe to have written *καί* there. A short space also follows the phrase. Interestingly, in Codex Sinaiticus, the omitted phrase is an entire line by itself, extending slightly into the margin, followed by a raised dot. It is possible that the scribe’s exemplar also divided the text both before and after this phrase in John 14:11. If this was the case, the scribe leaped from a punctuation marker after  $\overline{\text{ΤΤΠΙ}}$  to the punctuation marker after  $\overline{\text{ΕΜΟΙ}}$ .<sup>67</sup> This explanation seems slightly more likely than a leap from  $\overline{\text{Ι}}$  to  $\overline{\text{Ι}}$ . Nonetheless, it is certain that the scribe omitted a whole phrase.

### Factors in Omissions

Like the factors involved in the six additions, the physical aspects of the manuscript surrounding the omissions to the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus suggest that line breaks and punctuation markers often distracted the scribe. Nine of the nineteen omissions occur in close proximity to a punctuation marker (9:7, 11:23, 13:12, 14:11, 16:6, 16:19, 17:25, 20:17 and 21:17), and fourteen of the nineteen omissions occur in close proximity to a line break (3:15-16, 5:18, 6:28, 9:7, 10:10, 10:12, 10:13, 11:23, 13:12, 16:6, 16:19, 17:11, 17:25 and 20:17). Seven omissions occur in the combined close proximity to both a line break and a punctuation marker (9:7, 11:23, 13:12, 16:6,

---

<sup>66</sup>Henry A. Sanders, ed., *Facsimile of the Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels in the Freer Collection* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1912), vi.

<sup>67</sup>Perhaps this type of leap could be described as due to an instance of *homoeopuncton*.

16:19, 17:25 and 20:17). six of the omissions involved a leap from the same to the same (3:13, 3:15-16, 10:12, 10:13, 13:12 and 14:11), though in one of these leaps, the scribe appears to have leapt from a punctuation marker to a punctuation marker (14:11). Four of the five longer omissions are due to leaps (3:15-16, 10:13, 13:12 and 14:11), but only two of the fourteen one-word omissions (3:13 and 10:12) can be identified as being due to leaps.

### ***Transpositions Not Due to Harmonization***

There are five transpositions in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus (2:13, 6:10, 9:15, 11:21 and 11:52), though all five of them could be accidental. One transposition begins with the first word of a new line (6:10). One begins immediately after a punctuation marker and division in the text (11:21). One occurs at a line break (11:52), and one begins at the second word after a punctuation marker and is divided by a line break (9:15). It is likely that four of these transpositions are accidental omissions followed by a correction *in scribendo* (2:13, 9:15, 11:21 and 11:52), though it is possible that all five of the transpositions are simply omissions corrected *in scribendo*.<sup>68</sup> Such an explanation of certain transpositions is not unprecedented. Colwell notes omissions that present as transpositions in  $\mathfrak{P}45$ ,  $\mathfrak{P}66$  and  $\mathfrak{P}75$ , explaining that these transpositions originated because “a scribe jumps over a word, copies the following word, looks back at his exemplar, catches his error, and writes in the omitted word out of order.”<sup>69</sup> Hernández quotes Colwell, arguing that eight out of the twelve instances of singular transposition in

---

<sup>68</sup>Hernández states that of the three transpositions found in the Apocalypse in Alexandrinus copied by Scribe V, only one is a corrected omission, in *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences*, 114–15. It is interesting that Scribe V created only one transposition out of three total by means of omitting something and adding it in shortly thereafter, while Scribe IV likely created three out of four transpositions in the Apocalypse this way.

<sup>69</sup>Ernest Cadman Colwell, “Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits,” in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, ed. Bruce M. Metzger, NTTS 9 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), 116.



the Apocalypse in Sinaiticus can be explained as omissions that were corrected *in scribendo*, “underscoring once again our scribe’s propensity for omissions.”<sup>70</sup>

Table 9. Transpositions

Text	A	Exemplar
John 2:13	ΕΙΣΙΕ / ΡΟСОΛΥΜΑΙϚ (A*)	Ο ΙϚ ΕΙΣ ΙΕΡΟСОΛΥΜΑ
John 6:10	ΠΟΛΥΣΧΟΡΤΟС	ΧΟΡΤΟС ΠΟΛΥС
John 9:15	ΠΗΛΟΝ ΜΟΥ ΕΠΕΘΗ / ΚΕΝ	ΠΗΛΟΝ ΕΠΕΘΗΚΕΝ ΜΟΥ
John 11:21	ΟΥΚ ΑΝ Ο ΑΔΕΛΦΟС / ΜΟΥ ΕΤΕΘΗΚΕΙ	Ο ΑΔΕΛΦΟС ΜΟΥ ΟΥΚ ΑΝ ΕΤΕΘΗΚΕΙ
John 11:52	ΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΘϚΤΕ / ΚΝΑ	ΤΑ ΤΕΚΝΑ ΤΟΥ ΘϚ

In John 2:13, the scribe wrote the nominative *nomen sacrum* ΙϚ twice. A judgment call is needed here, for if the scribe added the first occurrence and its definite article, this is an addition of two words. However, if the scribe added the second occurrence, which is anarthrous, this is an addition of a single word. There is manuscript attestation for the appearance of Jesus’ name in each place, but not in both places. The singular reading is the single, anarthrous occurrence of ΙϚ in the original, uncorrected text of John 2:13. Since this reading was most likely caused by an accidental omission

<sup>70</sup>Hernández, *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences*, 75.

that was immediately corrected, it is classified as a transposition.

The most likely explanation of this passage is that the scribe's exemplar read **Ο ΙΒ̄ ΕΙC ΙΕΡΟCΟΛΥΜΑ**. The scribe omitted **Ο ΙΒ̄** because of its visual similarity to **ΕΙC**. Noticing his mistake, he added **ΙΒ̄** to the end of the phrase but neglected the definite article. Later, but most likely at the time of the production of *Alexandrinus*, another scribe erased **ΕΙC ΙΕ** from the end of the line and rewrote the text as **Ο ΙΒ̄ ΕΙC**, but did not alter the second occurrence of **ΙΒ̄**, either by erasure or deletion points above the letters. None of the added letters are distinctive enough to aid in the identification of the correcting scribe, but the **Ο** seems that Scribe IV did not make the correction. Typically, Scribe IV wrote **Ο** by starting at the top and circling clockwise. This is evident by the frequent gap at the top and ink blotches in the upper right quadrant or the right side of the **Ο**. However, the **Ο** in the correction has a very noticeable gap at the bottom and is irregularly shaped in the lower left quadrant, although the uneven texture of scraped parchment could explain some irregularity.<sup>71</sup>

In John 6:10, the scribe reversed the word order of **ΧΟΡΤΟC ΠΟΛΥC**. Although this word order is singular among the Greek witnesses, Jülicher and Tregelles cite b as giving Old Latin support to the variant.<sup>72</sup> Additionally, **ΠΟΛΥC** is the first word of a new line. Thus, it is likely that the scribe simply lost concentration at the line break and accidentally reversed the word order.

The scribe also reversed the order of two words, **ΕΠΤΕΘΗΚΕΝ ΜΟΥ**, in John 9:15. Tregelles cites the Harclean Syriac version as having this word order,<sup>73</sup> but the variant is singular among Greek witnesses. Williams advises against using Syriac

---

<sup>71</sup>Kenyon, *Codex Alexandrinus*, 1:10.

<sup>72</sup>Jülicher, *Johannes-Evangelium*, 55; Tregelles, *Greek New Testament*, 402.

<sup>73</sup>Tregelles, *Greek New Testament*, 426.

witnesses for support of a word order variation with regard to the order of two words in a pair,<sup>74</sup> but **ΕΠΤΕΘΗΚΕΝ** and **ΜΟΥ** are not paired here. Although this transposition does not come immediately after the raised dot marking punctuation, it begins at the second word after the dot. The line breaks in the middle of **ΕΠΤΕΘΗΚΕΝ**. The likely explanation here is that the scribe was distracted by a punctuation marker in his exemplar, and accidentally omitted **ΕΠΤΕΘΗΚΕΝ**. He immediately realized his mistake and wrote **ΕΠΤΕΘΗΚΕΝ** after **ΜΟΥ** in the text. The explanation of the variant word order as an accidental omission is more likely than a simple reversal of word order, because the transposition makes the grammar in John 9:15 very awkward. The transposition has **ΜΟΥ** immediately following **ΠΗΛΟΝ**, which it does not modify, and places a verb, a preposition and an article<sup>75</sup> between it and the noun it modifies, **ΟΦΘΑΛΜΟΥΣ**. Additionally, the phrase **ΠΗΛΟΝ ΜΟΥ ΕΠΤΕΘΗΚΕΝ** is nonsensical in isolation, since **ΜΟΥ** modifies **ΟΦΘΑΛΜΟΥΣ**. Jongkind cites Junack<sup>76</sup> as having argued compellingly that a scribe would not copy a text devoid of meaning, but would rather copy sense units, making occasional mistakes as the mind moves faster than the hand.<sup>77</sup>

The largest text transposed by the scribe in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus occurs at John 11:21. The most likely cause of this transposition is accidental omission of the phrase **Ο ΑΔΕΛΦΟΣ ΜΟΥ**, which was then corrected. One feature in the

---

<sup>74</sup>Peter J. Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique and the Textual Criticism of the Greek Gospels*, TS 2 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2004), 204–35.

<sup>75</sup>**ΕΠΤΕΘΗΚΕΝ ΕΠΙ ΤΟΥΣ**

<sup>76</sup>Klaus Junack, “Abschreibpraktiken Und Schreibergewohnheiten in Ihrer Auswirkung Auf Die Textueberlieferung,” in *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis. Essays in Honor of Bruce M. Metzger*, ed. Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 277–95.

<sup>77</sup>Jongkind, “Singular Readings in Sinaiticus,” 48–49.

manuscript that supports this theory is that there is an abnormally wide space between the first transposed word, ΟΥΚ, and the text that precedes it. A faded raised dot is barely visible in this space, marking a break in the text. This pause to add punctuation to the text would have provided the opportunity for the scribe to become distracted.

In John 11:52, the scribe moved the modifying phrase ΤΟΥ ΘΥ̅ to a position between the noun it modifies and its article, from its original position after the noun. The text makes grammatical sense in either case. The likely reason for this transposition is that the scribe accidentally omitted ΤΕΚΝΑ and corrected his error by adding it back in after ΤΟΥ ΘΥ̅. Another possible explanation is that this was an intentional change to strengthen the relationship between ΤΑ ΤΕΚΝΑ and ΤΟΥ ΘΥ̅. The line breaks in the word ΤΕΚΝΑ.

### *Harmonizations*

The scribe who copied the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus occasionally harmonized his text (only five times), but his harmonized singulars are only due to two kinds of harmonization: those to context (6:44, 10:40, 15:10 and 16:15) and those to contemporary usage (16:18). All five of the harmonizations occur at the first or second word of a new line. Four of the harmonizations occur at the first word of a new line (6:44, 10:40, 16:15 and 16:18), and only one occurs at the second word (15:10). Only one of the five instances of harmonization is near a punctuation marker.

#### **Harmonizations to Context**

Two harmonizations to context are substitutions (10:40 and 15:10), one is an omission (6:44) and one is a harmonization to the grammar in the preceding verse (16:15).

#### *Substitutions Due to Harmonization to Context*

There are two substitutions that are classified as harmonizations to context in

the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus (10:40 and 15:10). Both substitutions occur just after the beginning of a new line.

Table 10. Harmonizations to context: Substitutions

Text	A	Exemplar
John 10:40	ΑΠΗΛΘΕΝΟΥΝ	ΚΑΙ ΑΠΗΛΘΕΝ
John 15:10	ΤΑΣ / ΕΝΤΟΛΑΣ ΤΑΣ ΕΜΑΣ	ΤΑΣ ΕΝΤΟΛΑΣ ΜΟΥ

In John 10:40, the scribe altered the syntax to harmonize with that of the preceding verse, changing ΚΑΙ ΑΠΗΛΘΕΝ to ΑΠΗΛΘΕΝ ΟΥΝ. In v. 39, Alexandrinus has the well-attested reading ΕΖΗΤΟΥΝ ΟΥΝ. In v. 40, the scribe wrote ΑΠΗΛΘΕΝ ΟΥΝ at the beginning of a new line.

The scribe substituted ΤΑΣ ΕΜΑΣ for ΜΟΥ in John 15:10. The antecedent ΕΝΤΟΛΑΣ begins a new line in the manuscript. However, in this case, there seems to be more evidence that the substitution was the result of a conscious effort to conform to the preceding style of the text. In the nine preceding verses, ΜΟΥ is used only three times, two of which are the formula Ο ΠΑΤΗΡ ΜΟΥ.<sup>78</sup> However, forms of the reflexive ΕΜΟΣ are used nine times in the nine preceding verses, and the instance nearest to v. 15:10 is articular.<sup>79</sup> Additionally, the phrase ΤΑΣ ΕΜΑΣ is in the middle of the line and forms the fourth and fifth words after the nearest preceding punctuation marker. It is unlikely that this change was accidental. Thus, the scribe most likely

<sup>78</sup>These two instances are John 15:1 and 15:8, while ΤΑ ΡΗΜΑΤΑ ΜΟΥ is used in 15:7.

<sup>79</sup>They are ΕΜΟΙ in 15:2, ΕΜΟΙ (twice) in 15:4, ΕΜΟΙ and ΕΜΟΥ in 15:5, ΕΜΟΙ in 15:6, ΕΜΟΙ in 15:7, ΕΜΟΙ in 15:8 and ΤΗ ΕΜΗ in 15:9.

substituted **ΤΑC ΕΜΑC** for **ΜΟΥ** in 15:10 in an effort to harmonize the wording to the preceding verses.

***Omissions Due to Harmonization to Context***

There is only a single instance in the Fourth Gospel of Alexandrinus where the scribe omitted a word or phrase on the basis of harmonization to context (6:44). The physical aspects of the manuscript suggest that the omission could have been partly accidental.

Table 11. Harmonizations to context: Omissions

Text	A	Exemplar
John 6:44	omit	<b>Ο ΠΤΗΡ</b>

In John 6:44, the scribe omitted the *nomen sacrum* **ΠΤΗΡ** and its article. It is possible since the scribe jumped from the article modifying **ΠΤΗΡ** to **ΠΕΜΨΟC**. In this case, this variant would actually be the omission of **ΠΤΗΡ Ο**. The surrounding text contains both punctuation and a line break, so that Alexandrinus reads **·ΕΑΝ ΜΗ** [new line] **Ο ΠΕΜΨΑC ΜΕ**. It is possible that the omission was at least partly accidental, due both to the fact that the omission begins six letters after a punctuation marker and that the omitted words would have started a new line. However, another cause of the omission of **Ο ΠΤΗΡ** could be harmonization to the passage. The phrase **ΤΟΥ ΠΕΜΨΑΝΤΟC ΜΕ** occurs three times shortly before this, once each in vv. 38, 39 and 40, and each of these three occurrences lacks the additional word **ΠΤΗΡ**.<sup>80</sup> The best

---

<sup>80</sup>This is true of Alexandrinus. In NA<sup>28</sup>, v. 40 designated the Father, not the Sender, and v. 29 adds the Father in the Majority Text. Alexandrinus, on the other hand reads only **ΤΟΥ ΠΕΜΨΑΝΤΟC ΜΕ** at all three places.

explanation is that the punctuation and line break provided enough distraction for the scribe accidentally to harmonize v. 44 to the phrasing of vv. 38-40 by omitting  $\text{Ο ΠΤΗΡ}$ .

### ***Grammatical Attraction***

Hernández defines the category of grammatical attraction as pertaining to a type of substitution in which the scribe does not change the actual word but substitutes a different grammatical form of the same word based on attraction to nearby forms.<sup>81</sup> There is only one harmonization in the Fourth Gospel of Alexandrinus that can be attributed to grammatical attraction (16:15), and it occurs in close proximity to both a punctuation marker and a new line.

Table 12. Harmonizations to context: Grammatical attraction

Text	A	Exemplar
John 16:15	$\lambda\eta\mu\psi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$	$\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\iota$

The reading in John 16:15 is difficult to explain. Both Tischendorf and Swanson cite a corrector of Codex Sinaiticus as agreeing with Alexandrinus in 16:15, but examination of Sinaiticus reveals that this is not the case. Sinaiticus does have the reading  $\lambda\eta\mu\psi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  in verse 14, but it skips verse 15 and begins verse 16 immediately after verse 14. A corrector has added verse 15 into the margin, but the text is clearly  $\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\iota$ . However,  $\lambda\eta\mu\psi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  in Alexandrinus is an alternate form of the attested reading,  $\lambda\eta\psi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ . Grammatically, the  $\mu$  in the present stem of the verb  $\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\alpha\upsilon\omega$  is sometimes

---

<sup>81</sup>Hernández, *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences*, 119.

inserted into other forms.<sup>82</sup> While the inserted  $\mu$  of  $\lambda\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$  is common in MSS copied within a few centuries of the autographs, it is lost in later MSS.<sup>83</sup> This raises a very difficult question: did the scribe of Alexandrinus harmonize  $\lambda\lambda\mu\beta\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota$  in verse 15 of his exemplar to  $\lambda\eta\mu\psi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  in verse 14, or did he simply copy  $\lambda\eta\mu\psi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  from his exemplar, and other MSS that transmitted the reading simply removed the inserted  $\mu$ ? It is unlikely that the scribe added the  $\mu$  while copying an exemplar that already contained the “updated” orthography.

In addition to the otherwise identical phrasing in v. 14,<sup>84</sup> the entire phrase begins with a punctuation marker,  $\lambda\eta\mu\psi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  begins a new line, and a punctuation marker immediately follows it. For these reasons, it is more likely that the scribe harmonized to v. 14 than copied  $\lambda\eta\mu\psi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  from his exemplar. Like John 6:44, this is likely a harmonization partly due to distraction by the physical aspects of the surrounding text.

### Harmonizations to Usage

There is only one singular reading in the Fourth Gospel of Alexandrinus that can be attributed to a harmonization to contemporary usage (16:18). The change is the first word of a new line.

Table 13. Harmonizations to usage

Text	A	Exemplar
John 16:18	$\tau\omicron\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota$	$\omicron\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota$

<sup>82</sup>Friedrich Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. Robert W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 53; Gignac, *Grammar*, 2:269.

<sup>83</sup>Blass and Debrunner, *Grammar*, 53.

<sup>84</sup> $\omicron\tau\iota\ \epsilon\kappa\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\mu\omicron\upsilon\ \lambda\eta\mu\psi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \cdot\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\lambda\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\ \psi\acute{\iota}\mu\iota\omicron\upsilon\ \cdot$



In John 16:18, the scribe changed the neuter relative pronoun to the neuter definite article. Since this is a minor variation within a larger variant,<sup>85</sup> Alexandrinus is misrepresented in many critical apparati that do not note the subtle difference here.<sup>86</sup> Gignac reports that the relative pronoun “is frequently replaced . . . by the definite article, especially from the late third century A. D. on.”<sup>87</sup> It is also the case that the harmonized definite article **ΤΟ** is the first word of a new line. Perhaps the scribe, being slightly distracted by the action of stopping to begin a new line, simply copied the phrase as he would have said it in his day, rather than as it was written in his exemplar.

### *Substitutions*

Twelve singular readings in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus are substitutions. Five of the substitutions are single-word substitutions involving verbs (3:7, 3:15b, 5:6a, 9:19 and 9:20), two involve two-word phrases (13:20 and 19:16), two involve adjectives (1:39 and 18:32), and three involve nouns (3:15a, 16:2 and 19:40). Six of the twelve substitutions occur in close proximity to a punctuation marker (1:39, 3:7, 5:6a, 16:2, 19:16 and 19:40, but 3:15b is a possible seventh). Seven of the twelve substitutions occur in close proximity to a line break (1:39, 3:7, 3:15a, 3:15b, 9:19, 9:20 and 19:16).

### **Verbs**

There are five verbal substitutions that are not due to harmonization in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus (3:7, 3:15b, 5:6a, 9:19 and 9:20). Of the five, only 3:15b does not involve a single letter. Three of the remaining four verbal substitutions are due

---

<sup>85</sup>The larger variant is the inclusion or omission of the phrase *ὁ λέγει*.

<sup>86</sup>See, for example, this passage in UBS<sup>4</sup>, NA<sup>26</sup>, NA<sup>27</sup>, NA<sup>28</sup> or *SQE*.

<sup>87</sup>Gignac, *Grammar*, 2:179.

to the omission of a **Ν** (3:7, 9:19 and 9:20) and the fourth involves the substitution of a **Ν** with a **ϸ** (5:6a). Hernández Reports only a single verbal change due to the omission of a letter by Scribe V in Revelation (Rev 1:12), but there it results in a tense change. The three such changes in the Fourth Gospel all result in a change from a form of *γεννάω* to a form of *γίνομαι*. It is also noteworthy that all three omissions have been corrected by a scribe who added the omitted **Ν** to the interlinear space above the location at which it should have been written originally.

All five verbal changes occur near either a punctuation marker or line break, or both. Two occur near a punctuation marker (3:7 and 5:6a), though it is possible that there was a punctuation marker after the uncorrected text at 3:15b. Four occur near a line break (3:7, 3:15b, 9:19 and 9:20). One occurs at both a line break and a punctuation marker (3:7, though possibly also 3:15b).

Table 14. Substitutions: Verbs

Text	A	Exemplar
John 3:7	ΓΕΝΗΘΗΝΔΙ (A*)	ΓΕΝΝΗΘΗΝΔΙ
John 3:15b	ΑΠΟΛΛΥΗΤΔΙ (A*)	ΑΠΟΛΗΤΕ (?) ΑΠΟΛΗΤΔΙ (?)
John 5:6a	ἴΔΩϸ	ἴΔΩΝ
John 9:19	ΕΓΕΝΗΘΗ (A*)	ΕΓΕΝΝΗΘΗ
John 9:20	ΕΓΕΝΗΘΗ (A*)	ΕΓΕΝΝΗΘΗ

In John 3:7, the scribe of Alexandrinus omitted a **Ν** from the **ΝΝ** in **ΓΕΝΝΗΘΗΝΔΙ**. This variant alters the sense of the verse on a technical level, since it substitutes the aorist passive infinitive of *γεννάω* for that of *γίνομαι*. The difference is

subtle. With the change, Jesus says “Do not marvel because I said to you, ‘It is necessary for you to be from above,’” though taken in the context of Jesus’ discussion with Nicodemus about being born again/from above, the sense of the passage is retained even with the change in the verb. The single **Ν** is frequently used in forms of *γεννάω/γίνομαι* in the surrounding passage, though Alexandrinus is singular only at 3:7. The **Ν** is also found twice in 3:4,<sup>88</sup> once in 3:5 and at least once in 3:6.<sup>89</sup> In contrast, the **ΝΝ** form is used only once in 3:3, and possibly once in 3:6. It is likely that this is a mere orthographical difference, but since it effects a change of verb, it is classified as a grammatical change. The singular reading is immediately before a division in the text; there is a punctuation marker and the line ends prematurely, leaving room for the scribe to have written five or six more letters.

In John 5:6a, the scribe substituted **ἴΔΩC** for the aorist active participle of *ὀράω*, **ἴΔΩΝ**, in his exemplar. The change results in an itacistic variation of the perfect active participle of *οἶδα*, **ΕΙΔΩC**. The variant is the second word after a punctuation marker, so it is possibly an accidental change. Taking the verb as **ΕΙΔΩC**, the passage would be translated “Jesus, having known this man [to be] lying, and knowing that he had been there much time already, said to him: “Do you wish to be well?””<sup>90</sup> This variant produces an awkward reading of the passage, but not a nonsensical one.

The singular reading in the uncorrected text at John 3:15b is **ΑΠΟΛΛΥΗΤΕ**. It is the result of a leap from v. 15-v. 16, and it has been corrected.

---

<sup>88</sup>It is found twice in the original, but a corrector added the second **Ν** in each instance in 3:4.

<sup>89</sup>Alexandrinus is lacunose just after the first **Ν** in the second occurrence of **ΕΓΕΝ[Ν]ΗΜΕΝΟΝ**.

<sup>90</sup>**ΤΟΥΤΟΝ ἴΔΩC Ο ἸC ΚΑΤΑΚΕΙΜΕΝΟΝ· ΚΑΙ ΓΝΟΥC ΟΤΙ ΠΟΛΥΝ ΗΔΗ ΧΡΟΝΟΝ ΕΧΕΙ ΛΕΓΕΙ ΔΥΤΩ ΘΕΛΕΙC ὕΓΙΗC.**

For further discussion of this passage, see the discussion of 3:15a below and Appendix 3.

The scribe committed the same error in both John 9:19 and 9:20, by writing **ΕΓΕΝΗΘΗ** instead of **ΕΓΕΝΝΗΘΗ**. Both vv. 19 and 20 are corrected to **ΕΓΕΝ<sup>Ν</sup>ΗΘΗ**. The correction is in the same place in each instance. Like John 3:7, the omission of a single **Ν** results in the text of Alexandrinus giving the aorist of *γίνομαι* instead of *γεννάω*. However, the man who was born blind was explicitly introduced as such in John 9:1, so that the technical difference in meaning<sup>91</sup> does not affect the sense of the passage.

MS 28 shares the reading of Alexandrinus in v. 19, but not in v. 20.<sup>92</sup> This shared reading contributes to a complex problem. On the one hand, some, such as Royse, might not include **ΕΓΕΝΗΘΗ** in v. 19 in an analysis of scribal habits because it is “sub-singular,” even though it is unlikely that the reading in MS 28 is a result of the reading in Alexandrinus.<sup>93</sup> On the other hand, **ΕΓΕΝΗΘΗ** is present in both verses, and in each instance, it is corrected in the exact same way. It could be suggested that both instances of **ΕΓΕΝΗΘΗ** in vv. 19 and 20 were faithfully copied from the scribe’s exemplar, especially in light of the presence of the form **ΕΓΕΝΝΗΘΗ** in John 9:20. The form **ΕΓΕΝΗΘΗ** also occurs in Matthew 26:24, Mark 14:21 and Acts 7:20. According to Swanson, the reading in Matthew 26:24 is shared by MSS  $\mathfrak{P}37^*$ ,  $\Theta$ , 28, 579 and 700\*,<sup>94</sup> the reading in Mark 14:21 is shared by MSS  $\Delta$ ,  $\Theta$ , 28, 69 and 579,<sup>95</sup> and the

---

<sup>91</sup>The difference would be translated “he was blind” rather than “he was born blind.”

<sup>92</sup>According to Swanson, *John*, 131.

<sup>93</sup>Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 94.

<sup>94</sup>Reuben Swanson, ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus. Matthew* (Pasadena, CA: William Carey International University Press, 1995), 260.

<sup>95</sup>Reuben Swanson, ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus. Mark* (Pasadena, CA: William Carey International University Press, 1995), 228.

reading in Acts 7:20 is shared by MSS  $\mathfrak{P}74^{\text{vid}}$ , 69, 547\*, 1175, 1739\* and 2492.<sup>96</sup> Thus, in spite of the reading occurring frequently elsewhere, it is only singular in John 9:20 and “sub-singular” in 9:19. Additionally, it is only corrected to  $\epsilon\Gamma\epsilon\text{N}^{\text{N}}\text{H}\Theta\text{H}$  in John 9:19-20. If the shorter form was faithfully copied from the exemplar, it would explain the lack of attestation of the shorter form in other manuscripts in John 9 and the fact that the reading was not corrected in Matthew 26:24, Mark 24:21 or Acts 7:20. Moreover, of the seven occurrences of  $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\theta\eta$  in the New Testament,<sup>97</sup> Alexandrinus is lacunose in one,<sup>98</sup> has  $\epsilon\Gamma\epsilon\text{N}\text{H}\Theta\text{H}$  in the five aforementioned, and has the longer form  $\epsilon\Gamma\epsilon\text{N}\text{N}\text{H}\Theta\text{H}$  only once, in John 16:21. Cumulatively, these matters might suggest that the exemplar from which Alexandrinus was copied in John 9:19-20 contained the shorter form,  $\epsilon\Gamma\epsilon\text{N}\text{H}\Theta\text{H}$ .

However, the physical aspects of the manuscript must also be considered here. The word  $\epsilon\Gamma\epsilon\text{N}\text{H}\Theta\text{H}$  in 9:19 is the first word on a new page.<sup>99</sup> The word was re-inked later, but the added  $\text{N}$  was not, based on the striking difference in the shade of the ink here. Some might suggest that the fact that the  $\text{N}$  was not corrected might be evidence of this reading in another manuscript—that the re-inking scribe consciously corrected the corrector by neglecting to re-ink his correction. It is doubtful that this is the case. The re-inking scribe did not have a steady hand, and often, his work is jagged and uneven.<sup>100</sup> The  $\text{N}$  is already smudged; it is more likely that the scribe knew he was unable to re-ink the correction without obscuring it beyond recognition. Additionally, the singular reading

---

<sup>96</sup>Reuben Swanson, ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus. Acts* (Pasadena, CA: William Carey International University Press, 1998), 107. Swanson gives the reading of  $\mathfrak{P}74$  as “ $\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\theta\eta$ ” here.

<sup>97</sup>According to the NA<sup>27</sup>.

<sup>98</sup>Matt 1:16.

<sup>99</sup>Folio 47, verso.

<sup>100</sup>For example, see  $\epsilon$ ,  $\Theta$  and  $\Omega$  in this very word at John 9:19.

in 9:20 occurs near the end of the line. Only one word (ΤΩC) follows ΕΓΕΝΗΘΗ before the line ends and a new line begins. These physical factors suggest that both John 9:19 and 9:20 were accidental misspellings of the scribe. Even though 9:19 is not a singular reading, it is only attested in a single manuscript (MS 28). Moreover, MS 28 was “most carelessly written by an ignorant scribe”<sup>101</sup> in the tenth or eleventh century.<sup>102</sup> Thus, the physical evidence suggests that the scribe created both readings accidentally.

### Two-word Phrases

There are two instances in which the scribe of the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus made a non-harmonizing substitution involving a two-word phrase (13:20 and 19:16). Although the singular reading at 19:16 could be a conflation, a one-word addition or a verbal substitution, the fact that the entire phrase is marked as a sense unit is the reason it is considered a substitution of a phrase.

Table 15. Substitutions: Two-word phrases

Text	A	Exemplar
John 13:20	ΑΤΙΝΑ	ΑΝΤΙΝΑ
John 19:16	ΚΑΙ ΑΠΗΓΑΓΟΝ	ΚΑΙ ΗΓΑΓΟΝ (?) ΑΠΗΓΑΓΟΝ (?)

At John 13:20, the scribe seems accidentally to have omitted a Ν, changing the

<sup>101</sup>Frederick Henry Scrivener, *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament for the Use of Biblical Students* (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1861), 145.

<sup>102</sup>Kirsopp Lake and Silva Lake, *Family 13 (The Ferrar Group): The Text According to Mark with a Collation of Codex 28 of the Gospels*, SD 11 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1941), 117.

phrase **ΑΝ ΤΙΝΑ** either to the neuter plural of **ΟΤΙΣ**, **ΑΤΙΝΑ**, or to the phrase **Α ΤΙΝΑ**. The latter option does not make sense in context, as it adds a neuter plural relative pronoun (**Α**) in with a competing masculine singular indefinite pronoun (**ΤΙΝΑ**). The former option is more coherent, but it introduces interpretive problems. With this reading, Jesus says, “The one who receives the things which I send receives me.”<sup>103</sup> To what “things” could Jesus refer here? This variant should be regarded as the accidental omission of a **Ν**. Regardless of the omission as the ultimate cause, this variant presents as a substitution.

At John 19:16, the scribe altered **ΚΑΙ ΗΓΑΓΟΝ** after **ΠΑΡΕΛΑΒΟΝ ΔΕ ΤΟΝ ΙΝ** to **ΚΑΙ ΑΤΗΓΑΓΟΝ**. This is curious because the form of the variant **ΚΑΙ ΑΤΗΓΑΓΟΝ** seems to be a singular reading among the Greek witnesses,<sup>104</sup> but it was the reading adopted for the *textus receptus*.<sup>105</sup>

There is very early attestation for the insertion of **ΑΤΗΓΑΓΟΝ**. Comfort and Barrett have reconstructed **ϩ66** as having **ΑΤΗΓΑΓΟΝ**, though it is fragmentary and lacunose at this point.<sup>106</sup> Additionally, **ϩ60** seems to read **ΑΤΗΓΑΓΟΝ** here, but

---

<sup>103</sup> **Ο ΛΑΜΒΑΝΩΝ ΑΤΙΝΑ ΠΕΜΨΩ ΕΜΕ ΛΑΜΒΑΝΕΙ.**

<sup>104</sup>The IGNTP majuscule volume also lists MS 0290 (ninth century) as likely agreeing with Alexandrinus in 19:16, but the transcription of 0290 is slightly uncertain here, reading **και α [πη]**, then a line break and the text continuing as **γαγον**, in Ulrich Schmid, W. J. Elliott, and D. C. Parker, eds., *The New Testament in Greek IV: The Gospel According to St. John*, vol. 2, *The Majuscules*, NTTSD 37 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 161. Without seeing an image, it is impossible to make a personal judgment on the reading of 0290; it is entirely possible that 0290 reads **και ηγαγον**. Since the only other attestation of **και ἀπήγαγον** comes from a ninth-century manuscript that is partially lacunose here, and since there are physical features that could have caused an error here, the reading at John 19:16 is deemed a scribal creation and discussed as a singular reading.

<sup>105</sup>This reading was adopted by the *textus receptus* as early as Erasmus' Third edition, Desiderius Erasmus, *Novvm testamentvm omne*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Basel: Johannes Frobenius, 1522), 237.

<sup>106</sup>Philip Comfort and David Barrett, *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts*, corrected, enl. ed. (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 2001), 461.

it also seems to lack **καὶ**, according to Casson and Hettick.<sup>107</sup>

Erasmus prepared his Greek NT on the basis of a few late manuscripts.<sup>108</sup> Codex 2 was used as the printer's copy of the Greek of the Gospels for the Greek New Testament, amended with Erasmus' notes, which are still visible in the manuscript to this day.<sup>109</sup> Curiously, Codex 2 reads *καὶ ἤγαγον*, but Codex 1, also used by Erasmus, reads *ἀπήγαγον*, without a *καί*.<sup>110</sup> Although the reading *καὶ ἀπήγαγον* is present in the *textus receptus*, there is reason to reject the idea that it was present in some unknown Greek manuscript consulted by Erasmus and somehow included in his edition of the Greek text without any subsequent record. On the Greek text of Erasmus' *Novum testamentum omne*, H. J. de Jonge observes, "At many places where the Greek manuscripts seemed to lack words or phrases which were found in the Latin Vulgate, Erasmus included retroversions from the Vulgate in his Greek edition; sometimes words, sometimes whole sentences,"<sup>111</sup> that "[s]everal words of these retranlations from the Vulgate (e. g. Rev 22:21 *ὁμῶν*) were never corrected or removed by Erasmus in accordance with authentic Greek textual witnesses, even after he had access to the Complutensian Polyglot in 1522"<sup>112</sup> and that Erasmus' "Greek text continually differs, for no reason, from the manuscript on which it is based, and thus contains readings without any basis in the

---

<sup>107</sup>Lionel Casson and Ernest L Hettich, eds., *Excavations at Nessana 2: Literary Papyri* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1950), 110.

<sup>108</sup>For a list, see Jan Krans, *Beyond What Is Written: Erasmus and Beza as Conjectural Critics of the New Testament*, NTTS 35 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 335–36.

<sup>109</sup>For discussion, see K. W. Clark, "Observations on the Erasmusian Notes in Codex 2," in *Studia Evangelica: Papers Presented to the International Congress on "The Four Gospels in 1957" Held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1957*, ed. Kurt Aland et al., TU 73 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959), 749–56.

<sup>110</sup>Images of each manuscript are available at <http://intf.uni-muenster.de/vmr/NTVMR/IndexNTVMR.php> (Accessed February 4, 2013).

<sup>111</sup>H. J. de Jonge, "Novum Testamentum a Nobis Versum: The Essence of Erasmus' Edition of the New Testament," *JTS* 35 (1984): 408.

<sup>112</sup>*Ibid.*, 409.



textual tradition.”<sup>113</sup>

The Old Latin is very diverse at this phrase, but it, like the Greek witnesses, seems to lack an exact attestation of the reading of Alexandrinus. The reading *et ducerunt*, which seems to be a translation of *καὶ ἤγαγον*, is found in Codex Brixianus (f, VI cent.),<sup>114</sup> and the reading *adduxerunt*, a translation of *ἀπήγαγον*, is found in Codex Monacensis (q, VI/VIII cent.), but none of the manuscripts analyzed by Jülicher attest to the Latin equivalent of the reading of Alexandrinus, *et adduxerunt*.<sup>115</sup>

The phrase **ΚΑΙ ΑΤΤΗΓΑΓΟΝ** occurs immediately after a raised dot marking punctuation, and the phrase stands alone as a sense unit. The line ends at **ΑΤΤΗΓΑΓΟΝ**, but there is sufficient space for the scribe to have written an additional 7-8 letters before beginning a new line. The new line begins with an enlarged **κ**, extending partially into the margin. This division denotes a new paragraph. Most likely, the scribe mistakenly altered **ΚΑΙ ΗΓΑΓΟΝ**, as it read in the majority of witnesses, to **ΚΑΙ ΑΤΤΗΓΑΓΟΝ** after the brief pause to add punctuation, but it is possible that the reading of Alexandrinus was the addition of **ΚΑΙ**. That the reading of Alexandrinus came about as a result of the Scribe conflating both attested readings *ἀπήγαγον* and *καὶ ἤγαγον* is unlikely in light of the absence of demonstrable conflation elsewhere in the Fourth Gospel.

### **Adjectives/Adverbs**

Twice in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus did the scribe make substitutions involving adjectives or adverbs that were not due to harmonization (1:39 and 18:32). One

---

<sup>113</sup>Ibid.

<sup>114</sup>According to Burton, Codex Brixianus is not Old Latin in the Fourth Gospel, but Vulgate with Old Latin readings. See Philip Burton, *The Old Latin Gospels: A Study of Their Texts and Language*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 62–74.

<sup>115</sup>Jülicher, *Johannes-Evangelium*, 203.

of these substitutions is inexplicable but occurs at the end of a textual division (1:39); it is the substitution of an adjective for a different adjective. The other seems purely accidental (18:32); it is the substitution of an adverb for an adjective.

Table 16. Substitutions: Adjectives/adverbs

Text	A	Exemplar
John 1:39	ΕΚΤΗ	ΔΕΚΑΤΗ
John 18:32	ΠΟΙ	ΠΟΙΩ

The scribe created a curious singular reading in John 1:39. This is a significant change, since it makes the time of Jesus' encounter with Andrew and the unnamed disciple the sixth hour, rather than the tenth. While ΔΕΚΑΤΗ and ΕΚΤΗ are visually similar, the substitution does not occur near the beginning of a line nor after a punctuation marker. However, ΕΚΤΗ ends its line prematurely, leaving sufficient space for the scribe to have written about seven letters. There is also a very faint mark after ΕΚΤΗ that appears as if it could be a punctuation marker. Since the other side of the page at the point is the blank section beneath the Johannine κεφάλαια, the mark cannot be bleed-through from the recto. It is possible that this error was accidental, rather than intentional.

Inexplicably, the scribe omitted the final Ω of ΠΟΙΩ at John 18:32. This omission changed the modifier of θανάτω from the interrogative adjective ποῖος to the interrogative adverb ποῖ. This is more likely an accidental omission of a letter than an intentional stylistic change of the grammar. Ultimately, the change does result in a grammatical change, though it does not result in the sense of the verse being altered.

## Nouns

Three times in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus did the scribe substitute nouns, not in an effort to harmonize (3:15a, 16:2 and 19:40). The similarity of two of these substitutions is remarkable. Both substitutions at 16:2 and 19:40 involve *nomina sacra* referring to Jesus, and both occur immediately before a punctuation marker. The other substitution—that of the accusative for the dative of *αὐτός* in 3:15a—is the second word of a new line, but it is less a substitution and more of a leap from 3:15 to 3:16. Nonetheless, the leap resulted in a substitution that was not corrected, so it is classified here.

Table 17. Substitutions: Nouns

Text	A	Exemplar
John 3:15a	ΕΠΔΥΤΟΝ	ΕΠ ΔΥΤΩ
John 16:2	κ̄ω	θ̄ω
John 19:40	θ̄Υ	ῑΥ

There appear to be three singular substitutions in John 3:15-16 in Alexandrinus, but the peculiarities of the text in this passage are the result of a single error of haplography due to homoeoarcton. The scribe’s exemplar read ΕΠ ΔΥΤΩ ΜΗ ΑΠΟΛΗΤΑΙ in v. 15.<sup>116</sup> In Alexandrinus, ΕΠ is the first word on a new line, which is a frequent location of accidental error. The scribe leaped from ΔΥΤΩ in v. 15 to ΔΥΤΟΝ in v. 16, and copied the remaining words of v. 16 faithfully, including the “singular” reading ΑΠΟΛΛΥΗΤΑΙ, though he copied it as

<sup>116</sup>The exemplar possibly read ΑΠΟΛΗΤΕ.

ΑΠΟΛΛΥΗΤΕ.<sup>117</sup> At the end of v. 16, the scribe added a punctuation marker and began a new line, but here, he realized his mistake and corrected ΑΠΟΛΛΥΗΤΕ to ΑΠΟΛΗΤΕ. The error began just after a line break and ended with a combination of a punctuation marker and a line break, at which the scribe had opportunity to pause and realize his mistake. For the purpose of consistency, this is classified here as a noun substitution, though it should be noted that the ultimate cause for this variant was a leap from ΑΥΤΩ in v. 15 to ΑΥΤΟΝ in v. 16. For a fuller discussion of this passage, see Appendix 3.

At John 16:2, the scribe substituted the *nomen sacrum* ΚΥ̅ for the *nomen sacrum* ΘΥ̅. This substitution makes sense in context. Here, Jesus speaks of the world’s hatred, that those who kill his disciples will think that they are offering service to God. The idea of offering service to “the Lord” also fits this context. It is possible but unlikely that the substitution of ΚΥ̅ for ΘΥ̅ is due to the LXX use of κύριος to translate the divine name יהוה, because the scribe does not exhibit any observable tendencies to harmonize to the LXX;<sup>118</sup> if there were such tendencies, there should be more proof than is found here.<sup>119</sup>

Due both to the weakness of this example and to the absence of additional supporting evidence, it is unlikely that this substitution of ΘΥ̅ to ΚΥ̅, familiar in the

---

<sup>117</sup>Gratitude goes to Peter Gentry here. I had suspected the leap and the form ΑΠΟΛΛΥΗΤΑΙ in the exemplar at 3:16 but had difficulty making sense of the residual ink of the ε of ΑΠΟΛΛΥΗΤΕ in 3:15\*. Dr. Gentry agreed with my theory of a singular reading from a lost exemplar and offered the suggestion that the residual ink was due to the form ΑΠΟΛΛΥΗΤΕ, not ΑΠΟΛΛΥΗΤΑΙ in 3:15\*.

<sup>118</sup>See, for example, the discussion of John 12:15 above.

<sup>119</sup>See Peter M Head’s assessment of the possible Christological implications of ̔66 at John 10:33—“If the scribe of ̔66 were particularly concerned to enhance the doctrine of the deity of Christ we might expect to see clearer evidence than this,” in “Scribal Behaviour and Theological Tendencies in Singular Readings in P. Bodmer II (P66),” 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, TS 6 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008), 67.

LXX as a sign for the *tetragrammaton*, was an intentional, anti-Semitic alteration, suggesting that the Jews would think that they are offering service to Yahweh in their persecution of Christians. Additionally, this change occurs immediately before the raised dot marking punctuation.

Finally, in John 19:40, the scribe substituted the *nomen sacrum*  $\Theta\bar{\Upsilon}$  for the *nomen sacrum* of Jesus' name,  $\Gamma\bar{\Upsilon}$ . Again, this does not change the meaning of the text, as Jesus is clearly divine in the Fourth Gospel. This variant, instead of reading that Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus “took the body of Jesus and bound it in linen cloths with spices,” reads “they took the body of God and bound it in linen cloths with spices.”<sup>120</sup> This reading certainly changes the way John 19:40 impacts the reader from a confessional point of view. As Elliott points out in the context of singular readings in P45, such readings offer a glimpse of what early Christians “were confronted with as they heard and studied their Gospels.”<sup>121</sup> While it could be argued that this impact was the desired effect of an intentional change, it is more likely the result of distraction, as the raised dot of punctuation occurs immediately after  $\Theta\bar{\Upsilon}$ .

### An Inherited Singular

In the context of the three instances in which it appears that Alexandrinus alone preserves the original text of the Apocalypse, Hernández writes, “[s]ingular readings that have a claim to originality are of *no significance* for our profile of scribal habits. Such readings are an example of *accurate copying* and are therefore ignored along with the rest of the accurately copied readings in a MS.”<sup>122</sup> Although it is not the sole

---

<sup>120</sup>  $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\alpha\beta\omicron\nu\ \omicron\upsilon\nu\ \tau\omicron\ \sigma\omega\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\iota}\bar{\upsilon}\cdot\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\delta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \epsilon\nu\ \theta\theta\omicron\nu\iota\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \tau\omega\nu\ \alpha\rho\omega\mu\alpha\tau\omega\nu\cdot$

<sup>121</sup> J. K. 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, JSNTSupp 258 (London: T & T Clark International, 2010), 130.

<sup>122</sup> Hernández, *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences*, 99, emphasis original.

witness to the original text of the Fourth Gospel, there is one singular reading in the Fourth Gospel of Alexandrinus that can be identified as a faithful copy of a singular reading in a lost exemplar. Because a reading copied from an exemplar does not reflect the habits of the scribe, but rather is a record of the history of transmission, this reading is not discussed in detail here, nor is it included in calculations used to determine scribal tendencies. However, as a true “singular reading,” the text of Alexandrinus at John 3:16 is given below.

Table 18. An inherited singular

Text	A	Exemplar
John 3:16	ΑΠΟΛΛΥΗΤΑΙ	ΑΠΟΛΛΥΗΤΑΙ

The singular reading is the present medio-passive subjunctive of ἀπόλλυμι instead of the aorist medio-passive form found in all other extant manuscripts. Based on physical features of the manuscript in John 3:15-16, it is clear that ΑΠΟΛΛΥΗΤΑΙ in John 3:16 was copied from the exemplar. For a summary of the reasons to consider this reading an inherited singular, see Appendix 3.<sup>123</sup>

---

<sup>123</sup>Additionally, I have outlined the reasons to consider this reading to be inherited in “A Singular Reading from a Lost Exemplar: John 3:15-16 in Codex Alexandrinus” (paper presented at the 2013 Eastern Regional Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Lynchburg, VA, March 2013).

CHAPTER 4  
DATA ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

There are sixty-two singular readings in the Fourth Gospel in Codex Alexandrinus. The raw numbers of singular readings and corrections are given below, but corrections should be made in order to get a more accurate picture of the scribe's tendencies. It appears that the manuscript was corrected with some degree of consistency, even if the corrector was not always the scribe responsible for the error. Additionally, punctuation markers and line breaks provided an opportunity for the scribe to err, and there is a small percentage of errors associated with phrases involving the verb λέγω following a punctuation marker.

**Singular Readings: Raw Data**

The raw data of the singular readings in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus are given below in Table 19. Some corrections and adjustments need to be made, however, before conclusions can be drawn accurately.

Table 19. Singulars: Raw data

Category	Number	% Total	% Significant
Orthographical	4	6.5%	N/A
Nonsense	12	19.4%	N/A
Additions	6	9.7%	13.0%
Omissions	18	29.0%	39.1%
Transpositions	5	8.1%	10.9%

Harmonizations	5	8.1%	10.9%
Substitutions	12	19.4%	26.1%

For a more accurate picture of how the scribe copied, the above percentages should be adjusted to reflect the ultimate cause of the variants. Four of the five transpositions are likely due to accidental omissions corrected *in scribendo* (2:13, 9:15, 11:21 and 11:52), two of the substitutions were due to a single omission (3:15) and another substitution was due to an omission of a single letter (13:20). Adjusting the calculations to make more accurate consideration of the scribe’s tendency to omit, the observations are as follows. Nonsense readings caused by omissions, substitutions, harmonizations or transpositions are not included in the adjustments, since a scribe would not have intentionally copied something nonsensical.<sup>1</sup>

Table 20. Singulars: Adjusted data

Category	Number	% Total	% Significant
Orthographical	4	6.6%	N/A
Nonsense	12	19.7%	N/A
Additions	6	9.8%	13.3%
Omissions	24	39.3%	53.3%
Transpositions	1	1.6%	2.2%
Harmonizations	5	8.2%	11.1%
Substitutions	9	14.8%	20.0%

---

<sup>1</sup>Klaus Junack, “Abschreibpraktiken Und Schreibergewohnheiten in Ihrer Auswirkung Auf Die Textueberlieferung,” in *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis. Essays in Honor of Bruce M. Metzger*, ed. Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 288–89.



## Codicological Observations

The rates of correction in Alexandrinus are very interesting. No orthographical or harmonizing singular was corrected, and in general, the singulars were all corrected with some consistency. On average, around three out of ten singulars were corrected, and they were corrected in largely the same ratio as they were created. Additionally, there is a high percentage of readings in close proximity to punctuation markers or line breaks. Head and Warren have demonstrated in a study of P13 that the action of stopping to re-ink the writing instrument was sufficiently distracting to the scribe to cause a higher rate of error at the point at which the scribe resumed copying.<sup>2</sup> Jongkind offers a fascinating analysis of the manuscript and psychological factors involved in the cause of error in biblical manuscripts, concluding that sometimes, external factors (among other things) can contribute to scribal error.<sup>3</sup>

## Corrections

Although they were not all made by the same hand, nearly one-third of the singular readings of the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus were corrected. There are a total of 21 corrections to the MS, as listed in Table 21 below.

---

<sup>2</sup>Peter M. Head and M. Warren, “Re-Inking the Pen: Evidence from P. Oxy 657 (P13) Concerning Unintentional Scribal Errors,” *NTS* 43 (1997): 466–73. They conclude on p. 473: “The specific examples of scribal re-inking of the reed-pen coincident with singular and non-original readings observed in P. Oxy 657, combine with the mechanics of the scribal setting and the comments of writers cited above to support the contention we began with, that *the constant necessity to re-ink one’s pen provided the opportunity for scribal distraction at the level of eye, memory, judgment and pen*” (emphasis original).

<sup>3</sup>Dirk Jongkind, “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, TS 6 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008), 35-54.

Table 21. Corrections

Category	Total Singulars	Corrections	% Corrected per category	% of Corrections
Orthographical	4	0	0.0%	0.0%
Nonsense	12	4	25.0%	19.0%
Additions	6	4	66.7%	19.0%
Omissions	18	8	44.4%	38.1%
Transpositions	5	1	20.0%	4.8%
Harmonizations	5	0	0.0%	0.0%
Substitutions	12	4	33.3%	19.0%
TOTAL	62	21	33.9%	100.0%

As with the general calculations on the types of singulars, the chart of corrections should be adjusted. Two of the additions were corrected in a single correction (20:27a, 20:27b), and two singulars were “corrected” by the re-inking scribe who did not re-ink the error. One of those two was a nonsense error in context (11:27) and the other was another addition of two or more words (6:22). The two instances in which the re-inking scribe selectively neglected to touch up the text of Alexandrinus at a singular reading would not have been a part of the manuscript as it was originally copied, but would have taken place much later.<sup>4</sup> Accounting for these corrections, the adjusted table is as follows.

---

<sup>4</sup>Kenyon wrote that the re-inking was carried out by “some relatively recent hand,” in *Codex Alexandrinus (Royal MS. 1 D V-Viii) in Reduced Photographic Facsimile*, vol. 1 (London: British Museum, 1909), 11.

Table 22. Adjusted corrections

Category	Total Singulars	Corrections	% Corrected per category	% of Corrections
Orthographical	4	0	0.0%	0.0%
Nonsense	12	3	25.0%	16.7%
Additions	6	2	33.3%	11.1%
Omissions	18	8	44.4%	44.4%
Transpositions	5	1	20.0%	5.6%
Harmonizations	5	0	0.0%	0.0%
Substitutions	12	4	33.3%	22.2%
TOTAL	62	18	29.0%	100.0%

Just less than a third of all singular readings were corrected, and this percentage of correction is loosely consistent throughout the different categories of singular readings. Significantly, not a single orthographical variation or harmonization was corrected, not even by the re-inking scribe. Twenty-five percent of nonsense errors were corrected, but it is misleading to imply simplistically that one in four nonsense readings were corrected. Within nonsense readings, there were two strictly nonsense readings and ten nonsense in context. Both of the strictly nonsense readings were corrected, but only one out of the ten nonsense in context readings was corrected. A later re-inking scribe brought that number up to two.

***Summary of Singulars and Corrections***

The combined summary of adjusted calculations on singular readings and adjusted data for corrections is given below in table 23.

Table 23. Adjusted summary

Category	Total Singulars	Corrections	% of Singulars	% of Corrections
Orthographical	4	0	6.6%	0.0%
Nonsense	12	3	19.7%	16.7%
Additions	6	2	9.8%	11.1%
Omissions	24	10	39.3%	55.6%
Transpositions	1	0	1.6%	0.0%
Harmonizations	5	0	8.2%	0.0%
Substitutions	9	3	14.8%	16.7%
TOTAL	61	18	100%	100.0%

The data shows that in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus, the pattern of correction roughly corresponds to the pattern of scribal error, even though the scribe who originally copied the text did not make all the corrections *in scribendo*. Just as there is a higher percentage of omissions than of other categories of error observed in Alexandrinus, there is also a higher percentage of corrections correcting omissions than those correcting singulars in other categories. It seems, however, that the correctors were not concerned with orthographical variation or harmonization.

### ***Punctuation Markers***

The Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus contains some textual divisions within its text. Paragraphs are marked by the ekthesis of an enlarged initial letter on a new line, though that letter may or may not be the first letter of the new paragraph. The scribe sometimes added spaces of varying lengths between words, phrases and paragraphs. Regarding similar spaces in §52, Larry Hurtado writes: “[T]he slightly wider spaces between words at certain points raise the intriguing possibility that they may be intended to mark off clauses and to signal the reader to make a slight pause, similar to the way a

comma functions in printed texts today.”<sup>5</sup> Additionally, the scribe often added a small dot in a space, at the end of a line or even in the normal gap between letters. These dots can be found at “high,” “intermediate” and “low” places within the normal area of writing.<sup>6</sup> Porter references I1043, a fifth century uncial lectionary manuscript of the Gospels similar to Codex Alexandrinus as using a similar small dot to divide text units within lections.<sup>7</sup>

The dots used to mark punctuation likely gave the scribe a cause for distraction in the process of copying, much like the act of re-inking did for the scribe of ϕ13.<sup>8</sup> Thirty-one out of sixty-two (50.0 percent) singular readings occur within close proximity<sup>9</sup> of a punctuating dot. In one case (19:16), only two words separate two punctuating dots and one of them is a singular reading. It is also possible that the uncorrected text of 3:15b (the singular reading ΑΠΟΛΛΥΗΤΕ) was originally followed by a punctuating dot, as the inherited singular in v. 16 is followed by punctuation. The parchment is too obscured from the correction to be sure if the dot was originally present, but if it was, it would bring the total to thirty-two out of sixty-two (51.6 percent) singular readings in close proximity to a punctuation marker. The thirty-one singulars in close proximity to punctuation markers are distributed as follows: six occur immediately after a dot, nine

---

<sup>5</sup>Larry W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 179.

<sup>6</sup>For discussion of these dots as they appear in the text of Isaiah 1-12 in Alexandrinus, see Willem Mijndert de Bruin, “Interpreting Delimiters: The Complexity of Text Delimitation in Four Major Septuagint Manuscripts,” in *Studies in Scriptural Unit Division*, ed. Marjo C. A. Korpel and Josef M. Oesch, *Pericope: Scripture as Written and Read in Antiquity* 3 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2002), 80–82.

<sup>7</sup>Stanley E. Porter, “The Influence of Unit Delimitation on Reading and Use of Greek Manuscripts,” in *Method in Unit Delimitation*, ed. Marjo C. A. Korpel, Josef M. Oesch, and Stanley E. Porter, *Pericope: Scripture as Written and Read in Antiquity* 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 44–60.

<sup>8</sup>Head and Warren, “Re-inking the Pen.”

<sup>9</sup>“Close Proximity” is defined here as within two words. In short, the punctuating dot must be one of the following: immediately before a singular reading, immediately before the word before a singular reading, immediately after a singular reading, or immediately after the word following a singular reading.

occur two words after a dot, four occur two words before a dot, eleven occur one word before a dot and one singular reading involves all the text between two dots (19:16).

Table 24. Singulars near punctuation

Place	Number of Singulars	% Near Punctuation	% Total Singulars
One word after	6	19.6%	9.7%
Two words after	9	29.0%	14.5%
Two words before	4	12.9%	6.5%
One word before	11	35.5%	17.7%
Between two	1	3.2%	1.6%
Total	31	100.0%	50.0%

### *Line Breaks*

In addition to punctuation markers, line breaks also provide the opportunity for a scribe to become distracted, though admittedly, any error in close proximity to a line ending may be coincidental. Since the average line in Alexandrinus is only twenty to twenty-five letters long, *any* reading can be within two words of a line ending if the words are long enough. However, Jongkind’s observations on Codex Sinaiticus offer some support for seeing line breaks as sources of distraction, since the average line of prose in Sinaiticus is about half the length of the average line in Alexandrinus. In spite of the shortness of lines in Sinaiticus, Jongkind still notes that line endings may be a source of distraction for the scribe.<sup>10</sup>

In the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus, thirty-one out of sixty-two singular

---

<sup>10</sup>Jongkind, “Singular Readings in Sinaiticus,” 48; Dirk Jongkind, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*, TS 5 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2007), 245.

readings (50.0 percent) occur within close proximity<sup>11</sup> to a line break.<sup>12</sup> Six of the thirty-one occur one word after a line break, six occur two words after a line break, ten occur two words before a line break and nine occur just before a line break. The higher percentage of singular readings just before a line break may be coincidental, due to the length of lines in Alexandrinus, but the presence of twelve singular readings on a new line in close proximity to its beginning suggests that line breaks did occasionally distract the scribe.

Table 25. Singulars near line breaks

Place	Number of Singulars	% Near Line Break	% Total Singulars
One word after	6	19.6%	9.7%
Two words after	6	19.6%	9.7%
Two words before	10	32.3%	16.1%
One word before	9	28.1%	14.1%
Total	31	100.0%	50.0%

***Summary of Punctuation Markers  
and Line Breaks***

Because many singular readings occurred near both punctuation markers and line breaks, there is some overlap. Only nine of the sixty-two total singular readings (14.5 percent) did not occur in close proximity to either a line break or a punctuation marker. Eight singulars (12.9 percent) occurred near punctuation markers but not near line breaks,

---

<sup>11</sup>Within two words, as defined above under “Punctuation Markers.”

<sup>12</sup>There is some overlap with punctuation markers; the thirty-one singulars near line breaks are not the thirty-one that are *not* near punctuation.

and twenty-two singulars (35.5 percent) occurred near line breaks but not near punctuation.

### *Phrases*

In addition to line breaks and punctuation markers, the formula “punctuation-phrase” may have had some contribution to scribal error. Five λέγω phrases that are not considered in close proximity to punctuation markers contain singular readings (8.1 percent). In three places (4:26, 11:23 and 11:27), the scribe wrote ·ΛΕΓΕΙ and an error shortly after. Twice (16:19 and 18:33), the scribe wrote ·ΚΑΙ ΕΙΤΕΝ and an error involving ΑΥΤΟΙΣ immediately after ΕΙΤΕΝ.

### **Comparison with Hernández’s Study on the Apocalypse in Alexandrinus**

Although a one-to-one comparison cannot be made with Hernández’s study on the Apocalypse in Alexandrinus,<sup>13</sup> there are some noteworthy observations. Importantly, the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse in Alexandrinus are each the work of a different scribe.<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, Hernández classifies singulars in multiple, simultaneous categories while this study seeks to find a single, ultimate classification for each singular reading. For this reason, numbers in Hernández’s study can seem slightly higher than those in this study.

Hernández also observes a tendency to omit in that 28.33 percent of significant singulars in the Apocalypse of Alexandrinus are omissions.<sup>15</sup> However, Hernández observed that additions to the Apocalypse comprised 20 percent of significant singulars

---

<sup>13</sup>Juan Hernández, Jr., *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse: The Singular Readings of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi*, WUNT 2, Reihe 218 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 2006), 96–131.

<sup>14</sup>Kenyon, *Codex Alexandrinus*, 1:10.

<sup>15</sup>Hernández, *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences*, 110.



in Alexandrinus.<sup>16</sup> The scribe who copied the Apocalypse was approximately 50 percent more likely to omit than to add. This stands in stark contrast to the scribe of the Fourth Gospel, who was nearly 400 percent more likely to omit than to add, as omissions are 39.3 percent of singulars, while additions constitute a mere 9.8 percent. Within the types of omissions, Hernández observes that eleven out of the twelve singular additions in the Apocalypse comprise only a single word,<sup>17</sup> although only two out of the six singular additions in the Fourth Gospel are of a single word. This is even more significant considering that the Fourth Gospel is considered to exhibit an early form of the Byzantine text-type in the Fourth Gospel, a textual cluster characterized by a stronger tendency to add than to omit.

Another difference between the scribe of the Apocalypse and the scribe of the Fourth Gospel concerns transpositions as corrections *in scribendo*. Hernández reports that only a single transposition out of a total of three in the Apocalypse can be attributed to omission, corrected *in scribendo*.<sup>18</sup> Similarly, the Fourth Gospel contains only five singular transpositions, a relatively low number of singular readings. However, four of the five singular transpositions in the Fourth Gospel seem to be omissions corrected *in scribendo*.

Harmonizations are another category in which the scribes of the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel seem to differ. Hernández reports, “[a] total of 21 (35 percent) instances of harmonizing occur among our significant singular readings.”<sup>19</sup> On the other hand, only five (11.1 percent of significant singulars, based on Hernández’s definition<sup>20</sup>)

---

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., 107.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., 114.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., 115.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., 106–7.

singular harmonizations occur in the Fourth Gospel. While over a third of singular readings in the Apocalypse are harmonizations, just over one-tenth of significant singulars in the Fourth Gospel are harmonizations.

In summary, the scribe of the Fourth Gospel was less likely to add than the scribe of the Apocalypse, and almost all of the additions in the Apocalypse comprise a single word, whereas only a third of additions in the Fourth Gospel comprise a single word. The scribe of the Fourth Gospel was much more likely to correct an omission *in scribendo* than the scribe of the Apocalypse, but the scribe of the Apocalypse was much more likely to harmonize than the scribe of the Fourth Gospel.

#### **Summary of Scribal Tendencies in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus**

In summary, just over half of the significant singular readings<sup>21</sup> in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus are omissions. There are more than twice as many singular omissions than there are singular readings of any other category among significant singulars. As Jongkind proved with Sinaiticus that the overall tendency of scribes to omit extended into the fourth century,<sup>22</sup> this study along with that of Hernández has observed that the tendency to omit, at least in the case of the scribes of the Fourth Gospel and of the Apocalypse in Alexandrinus, continues into the fifth century.

Although the scribe was likely to omit, he occasionally caught his omissions and corrected them *in scribendo*. These corrections presented as transpositions of the Greek text, but aside from this tendency to correct *in scribendo*, the scribe did not have a tendency to transpose.

After omissions, the scribe's next greatest tendency was to commit nonsense

---

<sup>21</sup>Significant singulars are all singular readings, excluding orthographic and nonsense readings.

<sup>22</sup>Jongkind, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*, 246.

errors. Most nonsense errors were nonsense in context. Very rarely did the scribe commit a strictly nonsense error, and strictly nonsense errors were always corrected. Nonsense errors in context were usually allowed to remain uncorrected.

The rate of substitutions observed in the Fourth Gospel is nearly equal to the rate of nonsense errors. Most commonly, the scribe confused forms of *γεννάω* with forms of *γίνομαι*, but these confusions were always corrected.

Although the scribe occasionally added words or phrases, in general, he did not have a habit of adding. There are only six singular additions to the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus, and two of them are errors of dittography.

The scribe was nearly as likely to harmonize as he was likely to add to the text, so in general, there was no clear tendency to harmonize his text with the surrounding context or contemporary use. Significantly, however, not a single singular harmonization in the Fourth Gospel was corrected. This suggests that in the fifth century, in the provenance of Alexandrinus, the deliberate editing of the NT text by a scribe in order to remove any possible inconsistencies was an accepted practice.

Only nine (14.5 percent) of all singular readings in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus did not occur near a punctuation marker or a line break. This suggests that punctuation and line breaks provided the opportunity for the scribe to become distracted and commit an error. It seems that line breaks were more likely to distract the scribe than punctuation markers, but that may be due to a higher ratio of line breaks to punctuation markers in the MS.

Finally, the scribe seemed to copy thoughts, rather than words or syllables. This conclusion is suggested by the presence of errors in *λέγω* phrases. Occasionally, the scribe would add a punctuation mark, followed by a short *λέγω* phrase that ended in a singular error. The idea that a scribe would copy thoughts, or sense-units, is consistent with Junack's argument that a scribe would not have copied in meaningless groups of

letters, but would have copied in sensical thought units.<sup>23</sup>

### Conclusions

It seems that the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus was copied by a relatively careful scribe who took care to copy his text without significantly altering it. The scribe retained the tendency to omit, rather than to add as is observed in studies of earlier manuscripts.<sup>24</sup> Although Alexandrinus displays an early form of the Byzantine text-type in the Fourth Gospel, it seems that the scribe took care not to add to the text of his exemplar. It is possible that multiple exemplars were used in the production of Alexandrinus, or at least the NT portion of Alexandrinus, but the possibility of a single exemplar—itsself produced from multiple exemplars—cannot be abandoned. At some point or during some time in the line of textual transmission from which Alexandrinus emerged, the text of the Gospels came to be more Byzantine, while the rest of the MS retained an early form of the text. The relative lack of additions, and especially the relative lack of harmonizations strongly suggests that the scribe responsible for copying the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus had very little to do with the early-Byzantine nature of its text. It is even possible that some of the singular additions or harmonizations are products of the textual history of Alexandrinus—relics of a series of lost exemplars, and were not created by the scribe of the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus. Unfortunately, there is not yet a clear way to isolate singular readings inherited from a lost history of transmission.

For future research, it would be helpful to see a comparative analysis of the

---

<sup>23</sup>Junack, “Abschreibpraktiken,” 288–89.

<sup>24</sup>James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*, NTTSD 36 (Leiden: Brill, 2008); Jongkind, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*; Peter M. Head, “Observations On Early Papyri of the Synoptic Gospels, Especially on the ‘Scribal Habits’,” *Biblica* 71 (1990): 240–47; Peter M. Head, “The Habits of New Testament Copyists: Singular Readings in the Early Fragmentary Papyri of John,” *Biblica* 85 (2004): 399–408.

singular readings of the Fourth Gospel, and perhaps of Luke's Gospel, with the singular readings in Acts or Romans of Alexandrinus. Kenyon argued that a single scribe was responsible for copying Alexandrinus from Luke to 1 Corinthians 10:8, which included the Catholic Epistles.<sup>25</sup> Although Milne and Skeat challenged Kenyon's conclusion, arguing for a single NT scribe (though two scribes are possible),<sup>26</sup> this study has observed marked differences between singular readings in the Fourth Gospel and those in the Apocalypse. At any rate, it seems to be agreed that the same scribe copied Luke through 1 Corinthians 10:8, regardless of whether or not he copied other portions of the NT. If any singular readings in the Fourth Gospel were inherited from a line of lost exemplars, and if these exemplars exhibited different patterns of scribal habits from those observed in Alexandrinus,<sup>27</sup> it may be possible to identify some discrepancies in patterns. For example, if, apart from dittography, the scribe *never* adds to the text of Acts, Romans or the Catholic Epistles, it may be reasonable to consider the possibility that some singular additions in the Fourth Gospel were inherited from previous transmission.<sup>28</sup>

Additionally, a study on the scribal tendencies in the Synoptic Gospels would

---

<sup>25</sup>Kenyon, *Codex Alexandrinus*, 1:10.

<sup>26</sup>Herbert John Mansfield Milne and T. C. Skeat, *The Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Alexandrinus* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1955), 38–9.

<sup>27</sup>D. C. Parker writes that “the method [of analyzing scribal habits by isolating singular readings] only works if we can be sure that the habits of the scribe are different from those of the exemplar, and of earlier copies,” in “Scribal Tendencies and the Mechanics of Book Production,” in *Textual Variation: Theological and Social Tendencies? Papers from the Fifth Birmingham Colloquium in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, ed. H. A. G. Houghton and D. C. Parker, TS 6 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008), 174. Because the text of the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus is an early form of the Byzantine text, and elsewhere Alexandrinus has a good, early form of the NT text, it can be reasonably assumed that *at some point* in the history of transmission, there was a striking difference in the scribal habits of an exemplar and those observed in Alexandrinus.

<sup>28</sup>I have offered some suggestions for the identification of inherited singulars in “A Singular Reading from a Lost Exemplar: John 3:15-16 in Codex Alexandrinus.” (paper presented at the 2013 Eastern Regional Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Lynchburg, VA, March 2013). For a summary of the reasons why  $\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\lambda\lambda\upsilon\eta\tau\alpha\iota$  in John 3:16 is identified as an inherited singular, see Appendix 3.

be greatly appreciated. Although there is not much of Matthew extant in Alexandrinus, Mark and Luke are both complete, and were copied by different scribes. Knowledge of the rate of harmonization to Gospel parallels would be helpful, especially if differences in the scribes' tendencies can be observed. Ideally, such a study would be the undertaking of a single person or group, in order to eliminate differences in how singular readings are classified. At any rate, Codex Alexandrinus still has much knowledge to yield, and it provides fertile ground for more research in the area of the textual history of the Christian Scriptures.

## APPENDIX 1

### SUMMARY OF SCRIBAL TENDENCIES IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL IN ALEXANDRINUS

1. The greatest tendency of error was that of omission.
2. The scribe very rarely transposed words. When he did, the transposition is almost always the result of an omission, corrected *in scribendo*.
3. The scribe rarely committed an error that was strictly nonsense. When he did, it was always corrected.
4. The scribe was nearly just as likely to commit a nonsense error as a substitution, but he was nearly twice as likely to omit, as he was likely either to substitute or to commit a nonsense error.
5. In general, there was not a distinct tendency to add to the text.
6. The scribe did not often harmonize the text, but when he did, it was never corrected.
7. Punctuation and line breaks provided an opportunity for the scribe to become distracted and make a mistake.

APPENDIX 2  
LOCATIONS OF VARIANTS

<u>Text</u>	<u>Folio</u>	<u>Location in Alexandrinus</u>	<u>Page in this work</u>
John 1:39	42v	Right column, 23 <sup>rd</sup> line from bottom	78
John 2:13	43r	Right column, 23 <sup>rd</sup> line from bottom	61
John 3:7	43v	Right column, 4 <sup>th</sup> line from top	70
John 3:13	43v	Right column, middle of page	48
John 3:15-16	43v	Right column, 21 <sup>st</sup> line from bottom	71, 79, 82, 103
John 3:23	44r	Left column, 13 <sup>th</sup> line from top	32
John 4:26	44v	Left column, 6 <sup>th</sup> line from bottom	48
John 5:6a	45r	Right column, 23 <sup>rd</sup> line from top	71
John 5:6b	45r	Right column, correction at center	42
John 5:18	45v	Left column, 16 <sup>th</sup> line from bottom	49
John 6:10	46r	Right column, second line from top	62
John 6:22	46r/46v	Final line of 46r, first line of 46v	43
John 6:28	46v	Left column, 26 <sup>th</sup> line from bottom	49
John 6:44	46v	Left column, 18 <sup>th</sup> line from bottom	66
John 6:45	46v	Right column, 12 <sup>th</sup> line from bottom	45
John 9:7	47r	Left column, bottom two lines	50
John 9:15	47r	Right column, 22 <sup>nd</sup> line from bottom	62
John 9:19	47v	Left column, first word	72
John 9:20	47v	Left column, 5 <sup>th</sup> line from top	72
John 10:10	48r	Left column, 10 <sup>th</sup> line from top	56



Text	Folio	Location in Alexandrinus	Page in this work
John 10:12	48r	Left column, 19 <sup>th</sup> line from top	51
John 10:13	48r	Left column, 22 <sup>nd</sup> line from top	57
John 10:32	48r	Right column, 18 <sup>th</sup> line from bottom	36
John 10:40	48v	Left column, 6 <sup>th</sup> line from top	65
John 11:7	48v	Left column, 15 <sup>th</sup> line from bottom	36
John 11:21	48v	Right column, 25 <sup>th</sup> line from bottom	63
John 11:23	48v	Right column, 22 <sup>nd</sup> line from bottom	52
John 11:27	48v	Right column, 11 <sup>th</sup> line from bottom	37
John 11:52	49r	Right column, 23 <sup>rd</sup> line from bottom	64
John 12:15	49v	Right column, 3 <sup>rd</sup> line from top	52
John 12:35	50r	Left column, 24 <sup>th</sup> line from bottom	37
John 13:5	50r	Right column, 2 <sup>nd</sup> line from bottom	37
John 13:12	50v	Left column, correction at center of page	58
John 13:20	50v	Left column, fourth line from bottom	74
John 13:37	51r	Left column, third line from top	38
John 14:11	51r	Left column, 8 <sup>th</sup> line from bottom	58
John 14:15	51r	Right column, 4 <sup>th</sup> line from top	33
John 14:22	51r	Right column, 22 <sup>nd</sup> line from bottom	38
John 15:10	51v	Left column, 9 <sup>th</sup> line from bottom	65
John 15:16	51v	Right column, 15 <sup>th</sup> line from top	38
John 16:2	52r	Left Column, 10 <sup>th</sup> line from top	80,
John 16:6	52r	Left column, 20 <sup>th</sup> line from top	52
John 16:15	52r	Left column, 3 <sup>rd</sup> line from bottom	67
John 16:18	52r	Right column, 8 <sup>th</sup> line from top	69
John 16:19	52r	Right column, 10 <sup>th</sup> line from top	53

<u>Text</u>	<u>Folio</u>	<u>Location in Alexandrinus</u>	<u>Page in this work</u>
John 17:11	52v	Left column, 4 <sup>th</sup> line from bottom	53
John 17:25	53r	Left column, 2 <sup>nd</sup> line from top	54
John 18:9	53r	Left column, 13 <sup>th</sup> line from bottom	39
John 18:21	53r	Right column, 15 <sup>th</sup> line from bottom	30
John 18:32	53v	Left column, center of page	78
John 18:33	53v	Left column, 21 <sup>st</sup> line from bottom	39
John 18:37	53v	Left column, 2 <sup>nd</sup> line from bottom	41
John 19:12	54r	Left column, 8 <sup>th</sup> line from top	30
John 19:15	54r	Left column, 20 <sup>th</sup> line from top	31
John 19:16	54r	Left column, middle of page	75
John 19:24	54r	Right column, 5 <sup>th</sup> line from top	34
John 19:40	54v	Left column, 14 <sup>th</sup> line from top	81
John 20:17	54v	Right column, 18 <sup>th</sup> line from bottom	54
John 20:27a	55r	Left column, correction in middle	41, 45
John 20:27b	55r	Left column, 4 <sup>th</sup> line of correction in middle	45
John 21:17	55v	11 <sup>th</sup> line from top	55

## APPENDIX 3

### SUMMARY OF REASONS WHY JOHN 3:16 IN ALEXANDRINUS CONTAINS AN INHERITED SINGULAR

Below is a summary of reasons why the reading **ΑΠΟΛΛΥΗΤΑΙ** in John 3:16 in Alexandrinus should be considered an inherited reading. This list is adapted from my paper “A Singular Reading from a Lost Exemplar: John 3:5-16 in Codex Alexandrinus.”<sup>1</sup> The best explanation is that the scribe leaped from **ΑΥΤΩ** in v. 15 in his exemplar to **ΑΥΤΟΝ** in v. 16. Instead of copying the words following from v. 15 of his exemplar, the scribe actually copied v. 16, realized his mistake, and corrected **ΑΠΟΛΛΥΗΤΕ** to **ΑΠΟΛΗΤΕ** in v. 15.

1. *The correction.* In the uncorrected text of John 3:15-16, the same substitution (**ΑΠΟΛΛΥΗΤΑΙ/Ε** for **ΑΠΟΛΗΤΑΙ/Ε**)<sup>2</sup> occurs twice; once in each verse, but only the first instance is corrected.

2. *The tendency to omit.* The scribe was far more likely to omit than to commit any other type of error, including substitution. Omissions amount to nearly a third of all singular readings in the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrinus, and that figure is not adjusted to include other omissions that present as transpositions or substitutions.

3. *The tendency of error near the beginning of a new line.* The scribe had

---

<sup>1</sup>“A Singular Reading from a Lost Exemplar: John 3:15-16 in Codex Alexandrinus.” (paper presented at the 2013 Eastern Regional Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Lynchburg, VA, March 2013).

<sup>2</sup>B. Harris Cowper, ed., *Codex Alexandrinus. H Kainē Diathēkē. Novum Testamentum Graece Ex Antiquissimo Codice Alexandrino* (New York: B. Westermann & Soc., 1860), ix-xi.

the opportunity to leap from v. 15 to v. 16 at the new line, following  $\Theta\tau\tau$ . Twenty-six out of sixty-two singular readings occur in close proximity to a new line (41.9 percent). A leap here is consistent with the scribe's demonstrated habits elsewhere.

4. *The absence of a tendency to change tense apart from harmonization.*

Only once in the Fourth Gospel did the scribe change tense, and that is in 16:15. There, the scribe changed a verb to a form previously used in the text. In 3:16, the scribe would have changed the tense of a verb to something other than what was used in the immediate context.

5. *An inherited singular is the best explanation for what is observed.*

If the scribe created the reading  $\alpha\tau\omicron\lambda\lambda\upsilon\eta\tau\alpha\iota$  in John 3:16, he would have gone against his tendency not to change the tense of the verb, he would have committed nearly a third of all the singular substitutions in the space of two verses, (two on the same line), and in a pair of identical substitutions,<sup>3</sup> one was corrected and the other was not. However, the explanation that the reading was inherited is consistent with the scribe's tendencies to omit and to commit error at the beginning of a new line, and it explains why the singular reading in v. 15 is corrected, but the same reading in v. 16 is not.

---

<sup>3</sup>With the exception of an irrelevant orthographical difference.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- 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*. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
- Aland, Kurt, Michael Welte, Beate Köster, and Klaus Junack. *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung 1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994.
- Bauer, Walter, Frederick W. Danker, W.F. Arndt, and F.W. Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Blass, Friedrich, and A. Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Burton, Philip. *The Old Latin Gospels: A Study of Their Texts and Language*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Carson, D. A. *A Student's Manual of New Testament Greek Accents*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985.
- Casson, Lionel, and Ernest L Hettich, eds. *Excavations at Nessana 2: Literary Papyri*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1950.
- Comfort, Philip, and David Barrett. *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts*. corrected, enlarged ed. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 2001.
- 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.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. *Novvm testamentvm omne*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Basel: Johannes Frobenius, 1522.
- Gignac, Francis T. *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*. 2 vols. Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'antichità 55. Milan: Istituto editoriale cisalpino-La goliardica, 1976-1981.
- Godfrey, John. *1204, the Unholy Crusade*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Haines-Eitzen, Kim. *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

- 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. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2006.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Jongkind, Dirk. *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*. Texts and Studies, 3<sup>rd</sup> ser., 5. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2007.
- Krans, Jan. *Beyond What Is Written: Erasmus and Beza as Conjectural Critics of the New Testament*. New Testament Tools and Studies 35. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Lake, Kirsopp, and Silva Lake. *Family 13 (The Ferrar Group): The Text According to Mark with a Collation of Codex 28 of the Gospels*. Studies and Documents 11. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1941.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Biblegesellschaft, 1994.
- Metzger, Bruce M., and Bart D. Ehrman. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption and Restoration*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Milne, Herbert John Mansfield, and T. C. Skeat. *The Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Alexandrinus*. London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1955.
- Mounce, William D. *The Morphology of Biblical Greek*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.
- Royse, James R. *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*. New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents 36. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Scrivener, Frederick Henry. *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament for the Use of Biblical Students*. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1861.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament with Scripture, Subject, and Greek Word Indexes*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Wasserman, Tommy. *The Epistle of Jude: Its Text and Transmission*. Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series 43. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2006.
- Westcott, B. F., and F. J. A. Hort. *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1882. Repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2003.
- Williams, Peter J. *Early Syriac Translation Technique and the Textual Criticism of the Greek Gospels*. Texts and Studies, 3<sup>rd</sup> ser., 2. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2004.
- Wisse, Frederik. *The Profile Method for the Classification and Evaluation of Manuscript*

*Evidence, as Applied to the Continuous Greek Text of the Gospel of Luke*. Studies and Documents 44. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.

### Articles

- Bruin, Willem Mijndert de. "Interpreting Delimiters: The Complexity of Text Delimitation in Four Major Septuagint Manuscripts." In *Studies in Scriptural Unit Division*, edited by Marjo C. A. Korpel and Josef M. Oesch, 66–89. Pericope: Scripture as Written and Read in Antiquity 3. Assen: Van Gorcum, 2002.
- Clark, K. W. "Observations on the Erasmus Notes in Codex 2." In *Studia Evangelica: Papers Presented to the International Congress on "The Four Gospels in 1957" Held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1957*, edited by Kurt Aland, F. L. Cross, Jean Danielou, Harald Riesenfeld, and W. C. van Unnik, 749–56. *Texte Und Untersuchungen: Zur Geschichte Der Altchristlichen Literatur* 73. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959.
- Colwell, Ernest Cadman. "Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits." In *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, edited by Bruce M. Metzger, 106–24. *New Testament Tools and Studies* 9. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969.
- . "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text." In *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, edited by J. Philip Hyatt, 370–89. Nashville; New York: Abingdon Press, 1964.
- Colwell, Ernest Cadman, 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* 9. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969.
- Cowe, S. Peter. "The Armenian Version of the New Testament." In *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 253–92. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. *New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents* 42. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Ehrman, Bart D. "The Use of Group Profiles for the Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987): 465–86.
- Elliott, J. K. "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*, edited by Charles Horton, 122–31. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 258. London: T & T Clark International, 2010.
- . "The Distinctiveness of the Greek Manuscripts of the Book of Revelation." *Journal of Theological Studies* 48 (1997): 116–24.
- Fee, Gordon D. "On the Types, Classification, and Presentation of Textual Variation." In *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*, edited by Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee, 62–79. *Studies and Documents* 45. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.

- Head, Peter M. "Observations On Early Papyri of the Synoptic Gospels, Especially on the 'Scribal Habits'." *Biblica* 71 (1990): 240–47.
- . "Scribal Behaviour and Theological Tendencies in Singular Readings in P. Bodmer II (P66)." In *Textual Variation: Theological and Social Tendencies? Papers from the Fifth Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, edited by H. A. G. Houghton and D. C. Parker, 55–74. Texts and Studies, 3<sup>rd</sup> ser., 6. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008.
- . "The Gospel of Mark in Codex Sinaiticus: Textual and Reception-Critical Considerations." *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 13 (2008): 1–38.
- . "The Habits of New Testament Copyists: Singular Readings in the Early Fragmentary Papyri of John." *Biblica* 85 (2004): 399–408.
- Head, Peter M., and M. Warren. "Re-Inking the Pen: Evidence from P. Oxy 657 (P13) Concerning Unintentional Scribal Errors." *New Testament Studies* 43 (1997): 466–73.
- Hoskier, H. C. "Von Soden's Text of the New Testament." *Journal of Theological Studies* 15 (1914): 307–26.
- Jonge, H. J. de. "Novum Testamentum a Nobis Versum: The Essence of Erasmus' Edition of the New Testament." *Journal of Theological Studies* 35 (1984): 394–413.
- 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*, edited by H. A. G. Houghton and D. C. Parker, 35–54. Texts and Studies, 3<sup>rd</sup> ser., 6. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008.
- Junack, Klaus. "Abschreibpraktiken Und Schreibergewohnheiten in Ihrer Auswirkung Auf Die Textueberlieferung." In *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis. Essays in Honor of Bruce M. Metzger*, edited by Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee, 277–95. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.
- McKendrick, Scot. "The Codex Alexandrinus, or The Dangers of Being a Named Manuscript." In *The Bible As Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text*, edited by Scot McKendrick and Orlaith A. O'Sullivan, 1–16. New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll, 2003.
- Nicklas, Tobias. "The Early Text of Revelation." In *The Early Text of the New Testament*, edited by Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger, 225–38. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Parker, D. C. "Scribal Tendencies and the Mechanics of Book Production." In *Textual Variation: Theological and Social Tendencies? Papers from the Fifth Birmingham Colloquium in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, edited by H. A. G. Houghton and D. C. Parker, 173–84. Texts and Studies, 3<sup>rd</sup> ser., 6. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008.
- Pattie, Thomas S. "The Creation of the Great Codices." In *The Bible As Book: The*



*Manuscript Tradition*, 61–72. New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll, 1998.

Porter, Stanley E. “The Influence of Unit Delimitation on Reading and Use of Greek Manuscripts.” In *Method in Unit Delimitation*, edited by Marjo C. A. Korpel, Josef M. Oesch, and Stanley E. Porter, 44–60. Pericope: Scripture as Written and Read in Antiquity 6. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Rhodes, Erroll F. “Limitations of Armenian in Representing Greek.” In *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations*, edited by Bruce M. Metzger, 171–81. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.

Schmid, Ulrich. “Conceptualizing ‘Scribal’ Performances: Reader’s Notes.” In *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views in Contemporary Research*, edited by Klaus Wachtel and Michael W. Holmes, 49–64. Text-Critical Studies 8. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.

Wallace, Daniel B. “Challenges in New Testament Textual Criticism for the Twenty-First Century.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 52 (2009): 79–100.

### Unpublished Works

Cornett, Wayne E. “Singular Readings of the Firsthand Scribe of Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospels.” Ph.D. diss., Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary, 2009.

Hixson, Elijah. “A Singular Reading from a Lost Exemplar: John 3:15-16 in Codex Alexandrinus.” Paper presented at the 2013 Eastern Regional Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Lynchburg, VA, March 2013.

Kearfott, Steven Joseph. “Codex Washingtonianus as an Illustration of the Need for the Discipline of Apparatus Criticism.” Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2005.

Robinson, Maurice Arthur. “Scribal Habits Among Manuscripts of the Apocalypse.” Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1982.

Royse, James R. “Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri.” Th.D. diss., Graduate Theological Union, 1981.

### Critical Editions and Manuscripts

Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 9<sup>th</sup> printing of the 27<sup>th</sup> ed. Nordlingen, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.

———. *The Greek New Testament*. 4<sup>th</sup> rev. ed. Nordlingen, Germany: United Bible Societies, 2005.

Aland, Kurt, ed. *Synopsis quattuor Evangeliorum. Locis parallelis evangeliorum apocryphorum et Patrum adhibitibus*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964.

- Aland, Kurt, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 11<sup>th</sup> printing of the 26<sup>th</sup> ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1990.
- . *The Greek New Testament*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1975.
- Cowper, B. Harris, ed. *Codex Alexandrinus. H Kainē Diathēkē. Novum Testamentum Graece Ex Antiquissimo Codice Alexandrino*. New York: B. Westermann & Soc., 1860.
- Ehrman, Bart D., Gordon D. Fee, and Michael W. Holmes. *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen*. Vol. 1. The New Testament in the Greek Fathers 3. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Hort, F. J. A., and A. W. Streane, eds. *The Greek New Testament: Edited from Ancient Authorities, with Their Various Readings in Full, and the Latin Version of Jerome, pt. 7, Prolegomena, and Addenda, and Corrigenda*. London: S. Bagster & Sons, 1879.
- Hoskier, H. C. *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse: Collations of All Existing Available Greek Documents with the Standard Text of Stephen's Third Edition, Together with the Testimony of Versions, Commentaries and Fathers; a Complete Conspectus of All Authorities*. 2 vols. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1929.
- Jülicher, Adolf. *Itala: Das Neue Testament in Altlateinischer Überlieferung: IV: Johannes-Evangelium*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1963.
- Kenyon, Frederic G., ed. *The Codex Alexandrinus (Royal MS. 1 D V-Viii) in Reduced Photographic Facsimile*. Vol. 1. 4 vols. London: British Museum, 1909.
- Novum Testamentum Graece* (Nestle-Aland). Edited by the Institute for New Testament Textual Research Münster/Westphalia under the direction of Holger Strutwolf. 28th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.
- Parker, D. C., and W. J. Elliott, eds. *The New Testament in Greek IV: The Gospel According to St. John, vol. 1, The Papyri*. New Testament Tools and Studies 20. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Sanders, Henry A., ed. *Facsimile of the Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels in the Freer Collection*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1912.
- Schmid, Ulrich, W. J. Elliott, and D. C. Parker, eds. *The New Testament in Greek IV: The Gospel According to St. John, vol. 2, The Majuscules*. New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents 37. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Soden, Hermann von. *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer Ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt, hergestellt auf grund ihrer Textgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck Und Ruprecht, 1911.
- Swanson, Reuben, ed. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus. Acts*. Pasadena, CA: William Carey International University Press, 1998.

- . *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus. John*. Pasadena, CA: William Carey International University Press, 1995.
- . *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus. Mark*. Pasadena, CA: William Carey International University Press, 1995.
- . *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus. Matthew*. Pasadena, CA: William Carey International University Press, 1995.
- Thompson, E. Maunde, ed. *Facsimile of the Codex Alexandrinus: New Testament and Clementine Epistles*. London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1879.
- Tischendorf, Constantine von, ed. *Novum Testamentum Graece, Editio Octava Critica Maior*. Vol. 1. Lipsiae: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869. Repr., Graz: Akademischen Druck – u. Verlagsanstalt, 1965.
- Tregelles, Samuel Prideaux, ed. *The Greek New Testament: Edited from Ancient Authorities, with Their Various Readings in Full, and the Latin Version of Jerome*, pt. 2, *Gospels of St. Luke and St. John*. London: S. Bagster & Sons, 1861.
- Witte, Klaus, Kurt Aland, Barbara Aland, and Klaus Wachtel. *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments V: Das Johannesevangelium*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung 35. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.
- Ziegler, Joseph. *Duodecim prophetae. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamuntum Graecum Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis editum* 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943.

## ABSTRACT

### SCRIBAL TENDENCIES IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL IN CODEX ALEXANDRINUS

Elijah Michael Hixson, Th.M.  
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2013  
Chair: Dr. Brian J. Vickers

This study seeks to gain an understanding about the scribal tendencies observed in the Fourth Gospel in Codex Alexandrinus using the method of isolating and classifying singular readings similar to what was first proposed by Colwell, and later modified by Royse and others. In addition to singular readings made before corrections, this study considers singular readings in relation to punctuation markers and line breaks. First, a brief introduction to Codex Alexandrinus is given. Second, the method used to undertake this study is set forth and explained. Third, each singular reading in the Fourth Gospel in Codex Alexandrinus is listed under each respective group in which it is classified, the text of the exemplar is reconstructed if possible and each singular reading is discussed. Finally, the resulting data are analyzed and conclusions are given regarding the tendencies of the scribe responsible for the Fourth Gospel in Codex Alexandrinus. In general, this thesis demonstrates that the strongest tendency of the scribe was that of omission; the scribe was reluctant to add or to harmonize. Harmonizations, when they do occur, are never corrected. Both punctuation and line breaks often afforded the opportunity for the scribe to become distracted and to commit error.

## VITA

Elijah Michael Hixson

### EDUCATION

B.S., Tennessee Technological University, 2007

M.Div., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2011

### ORGANIZATIONS

Society of Biblical Literature

The Evangelical Theological Society

### ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT

Laboratory and Teaching Assistant, Tennessee Technological University,  
Cookeville, Tennessee, 2004-2006

Academic Assistant, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville,  
Kentucky, 2011-2012