Appendix
Commentary on All Marginal Variants in GA 274

1. Notation

The collation data in this appendix follows the conventions of the Editio Critica Maior (ECM), using Gregory-Aland (GA) numbers for all manuscripts and the same shorthand for versional and patristic witnesses found in the Nestle-Aland (NA) and United Bible Societies (UBS) editions, along with the following sigla:

- \( ^* \) (e.g., 05\(^*\)): Indicates the reading of the first hand in a manuscript where there is a correction.
- A (e.g., 2A): Indicates an alternate reading to the main text in the given manuscript. In this study, we will understand this to include any marginal reading that is not obviously a correction. All of the marginal readings in GA 274 will be listed as having support from 274A in the textual apparatuses.
- C (e.g., 892C): Indicates the reading of a corrector in the given manuscript. When there is more than one corrector, the siglum may be further indexed (e.g., C1, C2a, C2b).
- f (e.g., 032f): When following a witness's siglum, indicates that that witness's reading is an error (Fehler) or, more specifically, a defective form of the reading under which the witness is listed. For convenience, the defective form is provided in parentheses after the cited witness.
- f (e.g., f\(^*\)): Represents the reconstructed archetype of a family of related witnesses. The superscripted number is derived from a representative extant manuscript in the family.
- K (e.g., 1424K): Represents the commentary in the given manuscript.
- L (e.g., L36): Represents a lectionary manuscript. If the lectionary has multiple lections with different readings for the given variation unit, then the lections will be indexed with distinct suffixes (e.g., L36/1 for the first lection and L36/2 for the second).
- P (e.g., P75): Represents a papyrus manuscript.
- pt (e.g., f\(^{3\text{pt}}\), sy\(^{3\text{pt}}\), Eus\(^{3\text{pt}}\)): When following a family, a version, or a patristic witness, this siglum indicates that only a portion of the manuscript tradition for that witness attests to the associated reading.
- S (e.g., 1200S): The associated witness is lacunose here, but another hand has supplemented the material.
- T (e.g., 2T): Indicates the text reading in manuscripts where there is an alternate or commentary reading.
- vid (e.g., P45\(^{\text{vid}}\)): Indicates that the given reading appears to have the support of the given witness, though parts of the reading may be uncertain or lacunose in the witness.

2. Collated Witnesses

For the purposes of determining the textual affinities of certain marginal readings in GA 274, I have gathered collation data for the variation units that contain these marginal readings. I selected 140 witnesses for the collation according to several guiding principles. First, due to their demonstrable antiquity, I included all papyri and majuscules with accessible images whose text
was legible and clearly identifiable.¹ For several palimpsests and discolored purple majuscules, I used published transcriptions as they were available.² For the textual families $f^1$, $f^3$, and $f^6$, I used existing critical texts, noting major inter-family divisions where they occurred.³ For the minuscules, I attempted to sample a roughly equal number of manuscripts (typically two to four) from each of the textual groups determined by the Claremont Profile Method to have a viable profile of readings in Luke.⁴ For the groups whose critical texts I used in the collation, I did not sample additional manuscripts. These were Wisse’s groups 1 ($f^1$), 13 ($f^3$), and Κ’ ($f^6$). The minuscules I sampled from the remaining groups were chosen on a balance of factors like strength of representation (measured by Wisse’s application of the Profile Method), age

---

¹ I accessed images primarily through the INTF’s Virtual Manuscript Room (http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de) and the Center for the Study of New Testament Manuscripts (http://csntm.org). Manuscripts deemed illegible were generally palimpsests without published transcriptions. Where these manuscripts had transcriptions available, I used them. Some manuscripts, like the commentary majuscule GA 055, have incomplete contents and are not indexed in the Virtual Manuscript Room, so I have opted not to use them.

² For convenience, I cite all of these sources below.


- For GA 024: Constantin von Tischendorf, Monumenta Sacra Inedita, vol. 6 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1869).


- For GA 042: Oscar von Gebhardt, Die Evangelien des Matthaeus und des Marcus aus dem Codex Purpureus Rossanensis (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1883).


³ For convenience, these are cited below.


⁴ These groups are described in 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, ed. Irving Alan Sparks, SD 44 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982), 91–116.
(with earlier manuscripts prioritized before later ones), and completeness (with fully extant manuscripts preferred to more lacunose ones). These witnesses, along with details of their age, current location, and Wisse groups, are outlined in table A.

Table A: Manuscript witnesses collated for this study. The ID column contains each witness’s Gregory-Aland number or family number. The Siglum column contains alphabetical sigla often used to identify certain majuscules. The Date column contains the century or centuries to which the witness is dated. The Location column contains the current location of the witness. The Group column contains the textual group to which Wisse assigns the witness in Luke based on the Claremont Profile Method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Siglum</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Six/Seventh</td>
<td>Austrian National Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P37</td>
<td>Third/Fourth</td>
<td>University of Michigan Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P45</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Chester Beatty Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P53</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>University of Michigan Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P59</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>Morgan Library and Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P66</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Bodmer Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P69</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Sackler Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P75</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P88</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P120</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Sackler Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>British Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>British Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>Π</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>Cambridge University Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>Basel University Library</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>University Library, Utrecht</td>
<td>Kmix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>Trinity College</td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>Ninth/Tenth</td>
<td>State and University Library, Hamburg</td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td>Π</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td></td>
<td>M27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>Russian National Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024</td>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>Herzog August Bibliothek</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>Herzog August Bibliothek</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027</td>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>British Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028</td>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana</td>
<td>Km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031</td>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>State Historical Museum, Moscow</td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Siglum</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Fourth/Fifth</td>
<td>Smithsonian Institution, Freer Gallery of Art</td>
<td>Mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek München</td>
<td>Mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>034</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Cambridge University Library</td>
<td>Π171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>Trinity College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>036</td>
<td>Γ</td>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>Bodleian Library</td>
<td>Kx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>037</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Stiftsbibliothek, St. Gallen</td>
<td>Kx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038</td>
<td>Θ</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>National Center of Manuscripts, Tbilisi</td>
<td>Mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>039</td>
<td>Λ</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Bodleian Library</td>
<td>Λ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040</td>
<td>Ξ</td>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>Cambridge University Library</td>
<td>Mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041</td>
<td>Π</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Russian National Library</td>
<td>Πa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>042</td>
<td>Σ</td>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>Museo Diocesano, Rossano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>043</td>
<td>Ψ</td>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>Albanian National Archives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>044</td>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>Ninth/Tenth</td>
<td>Lavra</td>
<td>Mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>045</td>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Dionysiou</td>
<td>Kx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>050</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>National Library of Greece</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Bavarian State Library</td>
<td>Kx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>054</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>063</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>070</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>083</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sixth/Seventh</td>
<td>Saint Catherine's Monastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>085</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>Russian National Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0102</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0105</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>Austrian National Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0115</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ninth/Tenth</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0141</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0162</td>
<td></td>
<td>Third/Fourth</td>
<td>Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0211</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>National Center of Manuscripts, Tbilisi</td>
<td>Mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0234</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0274</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>Coptic Museum, Cairo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0283</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Saint Catherine's Monastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0287</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Saint Catherine's Monastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0290</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Saint Catherine's Monastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0292</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>Saint Catherine's Monastery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0315</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fourth/Fifth</td>
<td>de Hamel Collection, Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1
13
Kx

2
Eleventh/Twelfth
Basel University Library
Kx

9
Twelfth
Bibliothèque nationale de France
Kx

16
Fourteenth
Bibliothèque nationale de France
16

22
Twelfth
Bibliothèque nationale de France
22b

27
Tenth
Bibliothèque nationale de France
M27
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Siglum</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>Lambeth Palace</td>
<td>M27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>Public and University Library, Geneva</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td>Π</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana</td>
<td>Λ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana</td>
<td>Λ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Thirteenth</td>
<td>Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana</td>
<td>Λ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td>Kx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Thirteenth</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td>291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana</td>
<td>291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>Sixteenth</td>
<td>Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>Bibliothèque du Grand Séminaire</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>Thirteenth</td>
<td>British Library</td>
<td>291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Russian National Library</td>
<td>Kx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>Eleventh/Twelfth</td>
<td>Christ Church</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>Thirteenth</td>
<td>University of Michigan Library</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
<td>University of Michigan Library</td>
<td>585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Russian National Library</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>Thirteenth</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>Biblioteca Estense</td>
<td>585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>British Library</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726</td>
<td>Thirteenth</td>
<td>Royal Library of Belgium</td>
<td>Πb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740</td>
<td>Fourteenth</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>Parliament Library, Athens</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>892</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>British Library</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>954</td>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
<td>Dionysiou</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005</td>
<td>Fourteenth</td>
<td>Iviron</td>
<td>22a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1071</td>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>Lavra</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1079</td>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>Lavra</td>
<td>Πa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1093</td>
<td>Fourteenth</td>
<td>Panteleimonos</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1167</td>
<td>Eleventh/Twelfth</td>
<td>Ioannou</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1192</td>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>Saint Catherine’s Monastery</td>
<td>22b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>Saint Catherine’s Monastery</td>
<td>Πb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1216</td>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>Saint Catherine’s Monastery</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1241</td>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>Saint Catherine’s Monastery</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1243</td>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>Saint Catherine’s Monastery</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1273</td>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>Auckland Public Library</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Siglum</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1319</td>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>Greek Orthodox Patriarchate, Jerusalem</td>
<td>Π</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1321</td>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>Greek Orthodox Patriarchate, Jerusalem</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325</td>
<td>Eighteenth</td>
<td>Greek Orthodox Patriarchate, Jerusalem</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1342</td>
<td>Thirteenth/Fourteenth</td>
<td>Greek Orthodox Patriarchate, Jerusalem</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1365</td>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>Greek Orthodox Patriarchate, Jerusalem</td>
<td>22a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1424</td>
<td>Ninth/Tenth</td>
<td>Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1519</td>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>Lavra</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>Fourteenth</td>
<td>Vatopedi</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1675</td>
<td>Fourteenth</td>
<td>Panteleimonos</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2597</td>
<td>Sixteenth</td>
<td>Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2786</td>
<td>Fourteenth</td>
<td>Unknown (formerly Thira, Prophetou Iliou)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L63</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Bibliothèque nationale de France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L387</td>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>National Library of Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L547</td>
<td>Thirteenth</td>
<td>Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L627</td>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>Dionysiou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L773</td>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>Ecumenical Patriarchate, Constantinople</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L844</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Saint Catherine's Monastery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L846</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Saint Catherine's Monastery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L848</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Saint Catherine's Monastery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L849</td>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Saint Catherine's Monastery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L950</td>
<td>Thirteenth</td>
<td>Uppsala University Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1126</td>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>Vatopediou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1602</td>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>Morgan Library and Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2211</td>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>Saint Catherine's Monastery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because many of these manuscripts are fragmentary, no textual apparatus in the following section contains all of them at once.

### 3. Commentary

For each marginal reading, I will list the folio number where it occurs, the name of the corresponding siglum (if one was used), and an indication of the script in which the marginal reading is written. For reasons of space, I do not attempt an exhaustive commentary on any reading; instead, I focus on internal considerations that indicate the nature of the marginal reading and external considerations of age, distribution, and support among manuscripts, versions, and patristic citations where relevant. For all class-A readings (as defined in the main article), I present a positive apparatus collating the textual witnesses listed in table A. For readings in other classes, I list witnesses (in the form of a positive or negative apparatus, depending on the need) wherever discussion of external evidence is warranted.

All images included in this commentary are derived from the Bibliothèque nationale de France's photographs of GA 274, except where otherwise noted.

---

5 See the main article for further discussion of the sigla used in GA 274.

6 Source: gallica.bnf.fr / Bibliothèque nationale de France. The photographs for GA 274 are accessible at https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b10005077n.
Appendix: Commentary on All Marginal Variants in GA 274

Matthew

Matt 1:11
Page: 6v
Siglum: lemniskos
Text: omit
Margin: ἐγέννησεν τὸν ιωάκημ ιωάκημ δὲ
Hand: 2a
Type: A
Collation:

 Comments:
While the omission of Jehoiakim in Matthew’s genealogy of Jesus could be explained as a scribal accident (homoioarcton or homoioteleuton occasioned by the repeated phrasing of the genealogy), the marginal reading is unlikely to be a simple correction for two reasons. First, the longer reading is not well-attested in the Byzantine text-type to which GA 274’s text is most closely aligned, so the manuscript is less likely to have inherited the reading from its main exemplar. Second, the marginal reading is written in a minuscule hand that is clearly distinct from the first hand and probably later. The simpler explanation is that the scribe or reader responsible for the marginal reading was aware of the longer reading, either from memory or from checking the manuscript against another copy.

The Text und Textwert volume for Matthew, which includes this variation unit as a Teststellen, lists 1246 manuscripts in support of the omission and 176 in support of the addition. Among the relatively few surviving manuscripts that preserve the longer reading, there is further variation in content. Some of this variation is significant in context. Manuscript GA 71, for instance, places Jehoiakim (spelled ιακειμ) between Amos and Josiah, where virtually all other witnesses to the longer reading place Jehoiakim after Josiah. For the most part, however, sub-variation in the longer reading concerns the spelling of Jehoiakim’s name. Notably, the spelling ωακημ found in the margin of GA 274 is an itacistic variant of the spelling ωακημ found in most of the manuscripts with the longer reading, which could indicate that the longer reading was recalled from memory rather than copied.

In terms of versional and patristic support, the longer reading can be found in some early witnesses. The apparatus of the UBS4 critical edition notes that it can be found as an alternate reading in the Harklean Syriac version (seventh century), the Palestinian Syriac version (c. sixth century), a Latin translation of Irenaeus (second century), and Epiphanius (fifth century).7 The support from Epiphanius is not explicit but can be inferred in the absence of any other known textual variants in the Matthean genealogy.8

Matt 1:11–12
Page: 6v
Siglum: (twice)
Text: (twice)
Margin: (twice)
Hand: 2a
Type: C
Comments:
The marginal note changes μετοικεσίας and μετοικεσίαν in these two verses to μετοικησίας and μετοικησίαν, respectively. The spellings with epsilon appear to have been standard from very early on and in many places, as they are found in earliest witnesses and in many of the later ones, but the spellings with eta also have reasonably widespread support among later manuscripts. The fact that all corrections among the manuscripts examined change eta to epsilon further supports the idea that at least some scribes of the time considered the epsilon spelling the correct one.

Still, while a change to non-standard spelling seems like a sign of something more than just a correction, it seems hard to believe that the reader or scribe responsible would find a matter of orthography like this worthy of noting as an alternate reading. While the RP 2018 Byzantine text reads μετοικεσίας … μετοικησίαν with most of the manuscripts collated for this study, this does not imply that the Byzantine text-type uniformly adopted this spelling convention; RP is not based on an exhaustive collation of Greek manuscripts, and as the preface states, the edition standardizes general orthographic matters (which, presumably, would include this issue) throughout the text. Between these factors and the reasonably widespread support for the less common spelling, the most plausible explanation of the marginal note is that it is correction of two related misspellings to the spellings found in the manuscript’s exemplar.

Matt 2:13
Page: 8r
Siglum: arrow
Text: ἀναχωρησάντων δὲ αὐτῶν
Margin: ἀναχωρησάντων τῶν μ(ά)γ(ων)
Hand: 1

9 The following sixty witnesses use the epsilon spelling for both words: GA 01, 03, 04, 021, 024, 032, 036, 037, 038, 0287th, f6, f6th, 2, 9, 27, 33, 71, 75, 119, 157, 164, 217, 274T, 372, 431, 461C, 517, 544, 545, 579, 585, 700, 740, 892, 954, 1005, 1071, 1093, 1167, 1192C, 1200, 1216, 1273, 1321, 1325, 1365, 1424, 1574, 2597, 2786, L63, L387, L547, L627, L773, L844, L849, L1126, L1602, and L2211. The following twenty-eight witnesses use the eta spelling for both words: GA 017, 019, 028, 030, 031, 041, 042, 045, 0211, f1, 16, 114, 161, 184, 269*, 274A, 291, 371, 449, 461*, 726, 804, 1079, 1192*, 1243, 1243, 1319, and L848. There are also some witnesses exhibiting inconsistent spellings: GA 07 spells the pair of words as μετοικισίας … μετοικησίαν, suggesting a reading with two eta spellings changed by itacism; GA 199, 565, and 1519C have μετοικισίας … μετοικησίαν; GA 269C has μετοικεσίας … μετοικησίαν; and GA 1519* has μετοικησίας only and omits the beginning of v. 12, probably due to a skip of the eye.

10 Of the manuscripts sampled for this study, four are corrected here: GA 269, 461, 1192, and 1519. Of these, GA 461 and 1192 correct both words to use the epsilon spelling. GA 269C corrects only the first eta spelling to an epsilon spelling. GA 1519C supplies the omitted second word with the epsilon spelling, but does not bother to make the spelling in v. 11 consistent with this correction.

Type: L
Comments:
While a minority of continuous-text manuscripts does attest to the longer reading here, the lectionaries that unanimously support it make its origin clear; the lection that begins at this verse demands that something clearer be substituted for αὐτῶν. The marginal note of GA 274 is either part of a lectionary incipit or the result of someone misreading a lectionary incipit for an alternate reading.

Matt 3:6a
Page: 9r
Siglum: distigme (text only)
Text: omit
Margin: πάντες
Hand: 1
Type: A
Collation:

| 01 | 03 | 04* | 05 | 07 | 017 | 019 | 021 | 028 | 030 | 031 | 032 | 036 | 041 | 042 | 045 | 0211 | f | f | f |
|----|----|-----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 75 | 114| 119| 157| 161| 164| 184| 199| 217| 269| 274T| 291| 371| 372| 431| 449| 461| 517| 544| 545| 565| 579| 585| 700| 726|
| 740| 804| 892| 954| 1005| 1071| 1079| 1093| 1167| 1192| 1216| 1241| 1243| 1273| 1319| 1321| 1325| 1365| 1424| 1519| 1574|
| 1675| 2786| L63| L547| L627| L773| L844| L848| L849| L1126| L2211| f | f | f |
| add | παντες | 04C2 | 33 | 274A |

Comments:
The addition of πάντες may have been a deliberate stylistic improvement, supplying the preceding verb phrase with a subject, or it may have been a harmonization to the wording of Mark 1:5. But the preceding context makes the addition of a noun here superfluous, and the other Synoptic Gospels were more often harmonized to Matthew than vice-versa; the rarity of this addition among other witnesses may serve as evidence for these points.

The scarcity of support for the addition in the manuscript tradition also means that the marginal reading was not likely to be a correction to the text of a Byzantine exemplar. Rather, it was more likely to have arisen from knowledge of a variant reading. It is unclear how far back the variant reading goes. GA 33 is dated to the ninth century, but it preserves many readings from the earlier Alexandrian witnesses. GA 04 is dated to the fifth century, and its second corrector is thought to be from the sixth century.

Matt 3:6b
Page: 9v
Siglum: distigme. The entirety of the marginal note, including the siglum, has been smudged out (see image below), but the distigme above the corresponding location in the text remains perfectly visible.

---

12 Specifically, GA 16, 119, 217, 517, 892, and 1675 have the longer reading as their main text; GA 2, 75, and 461 join 274 in placing it in the margin; and the second corrector of GA 05 adds (and subsequently crosses out) τον μαγον after the shorter reading.
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86

Text: *omit*
Margin: [{ποταμῷ}]
Hand: unclear
Type: A
Collation:

ʻομιτ 04C3 05 07 017 019 028 030 031 036 041 045 0211 fβ 2 9 27 114 119 161 217 274T 274C 291 371 372 461 517 544 545 565 585 700 804 892 954 1071 1079 1241 1243 1273 1325 1675 2786 L63 L387 L547 L627 L844 L848 L849 | *add* ποταμῳ 01 03 04* 021 032f (παταμῳ) 037 042 f 16 22 33 71 75 157 164 184 199 269 274A | 431 449 579 726 1005 1093 1167 1192 1216 1319 1321 1365 1424 1519 1574 L773 L1126 L2211

Comments:

Given the placement of the marginal note’s corresponding siglum after Ἰορδάνῃ in the text and the diverse support for the addition of ποταμῷ in the same place, it is highly likely that ποταμῷ (harmonizing again to Mark 1:5) is the now-erased marginal reading. If this note and the previous one were both made on the basis of a text harmonizing to Mark, then it is likely that both came from the same non-Byzantine manuscript and were added by the same hand writing in majuscule script. Curiously, while that note was left intact, this one was erased.

Matt 3:8
Page: 9v
Siglum: obelos (twice)
Text: ὸν … ον
Margin: οὐς … ους
Hand: 1
Type: A
Collation:

καρπον αξιον 01 03 04 05S 07 017 021 028 031 032 036 037 041 042 045 0211 fβ fβ 9 16 22 27 71 75 114 119 157 161 164 184 199 217 269 274T 291 371 372 431 461A 517 544 545 565 579 700 804 892* 954 1005 1071 1079 1093 1167 1192 1216 1241 1243 1321 1365 1424 1519 1574 2786 L547 L773 L844 L1126 L2211 | καρπους αξιους 019 030 2 33 274A 449 461T 585 726 740 892C 1273 1319 1325 1675 L63

Comments:

The marginal note lists the plural “fruits worthy [of repentance]” as an alternative to the singular “fruit worthy [of repentance].” In contrast to the last two marginal notes, which indicated harmonizations to the parallel in Mark, this one harmonizes to Luke 3:8. Such a harmonization is rare, as the collation attests. Because the Byzantine text preserves the singular here, the plural found in the margin is likely an alternative reading based on a non-Byzantine manuscript.

Though the manuscript evidence does not make this clear, this textual variant has early origins. It has fourth-century attestation by Basil of Caesarea.15 The fourth-century majuscule GA

---
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03 also features a distigue on the line containing this part of the verse, which could arguably serve as further evidence of this variant’s antiquity.

Matt 3:11
Page: 9v
Siglum: ancora (upward)? The entirety of the marginal note and the corresponding siglum after πνι ἁγίῳ are smudged out, as shown below.

Text: omit
Margin: [καὶ πυρί]
Hand: unclear
Type: A
Collation:

\[\text{omit} 07 028 031 045 f^1 2 27 75 164 199 269 274T 431 461 517 544 545 579 726 740 954 1167 1192 1243 1319 1321 1424 1574 1574 2786 L63 L773 ] \text{add} \text{καὶ πυρί} 01 03 04 05S 017 019 021 030 032 036 037 041 042 0211 \text{f} \text{f}^9 9 16 22 33 71C 114 119 157 161 184 217 274A\text{vid} 291 371 372 449 565 585 700 804 892 1005 1071 1079 1093 1200 1216 1241 1273 1325 1365 1675 L547 L844 L1126 L2211

Comments:
Again, the placement of the corresponding siglum in the text (after ἐν πνι ἁγίῳ) and the presence of a well-known variant in the same place serve as strong indications that καὶ πυρί was the original content of the marginal note. This continued harmonization to the parallel in Luke gives us reason to suspect that the same person responsible for the last note was responsible for this one and likely derived the reading from the same source. Despite the relative popularity of the longer reading here, the Byzantine text lacks it, which gives us another reason to conclude that the marginal reading was derived from a source other than its main exemplar.

The manuscript evidence already dates the longer reading to no later than the fourth century. Patristic citations from Basil of Caesarea and Cyril of Jerusalem add further support to this dating.\(^\text{16}\) Finally, GA 03 contains a distigue on the line containing the longer reading, which may indicate knowledge of this variant on the part of fourth-century scribes.

Matt 4:13
Page: 10v
Siglum: lemniskos
Text: omit
Margin: κ(αὶ) καταλιπὼν τὴ(ν) ναζαρὲθ
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:

No obvious mechanical cause lends itself to a simple explanation of this omission, but since no other manuscript collated for this study omits this phrase, we would be hard-pressed to see this marginal note as an indication of a reading found elsewhere. The best explanation seems

\(^{16}\) See Racine, Text of Matthew in the Writings of Basil of Caesarea, 46–47, and Mullen, New Testament Text of Cyril of Jerusalem, 73.
to be that the scribe of GA 274 was copying a long sequence of locations in the surrounding context (Galilee, Nazareth, Capernaum, the regions of Zebulun and Naphtali) from memory and forgot this part of the sequence. If this was the case, then the marginal note would be a correction to an erroneous omission.

**Matt 5:44**
Page: 14r
Siglum: lemniskos
Text: omit
Margin: καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ἡμᾶς
Hand: 2b
Type: C
Comments:
There is a well-known textual issue concerning the two-part admonition εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ἡμᾶς. A few important witnesses (GA 01, 03, f, 22, 1192, 2786*) omit both phrases, supported by an Old Latin manuscript from the fourth or fifth century, the Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriac versions of the fourth century, the Sahidic Coptic version of the fourth century, and the church fathers Theophilus of Antioch (second century), Irenaeus (second century), Origen (third century), Adamantius (fourth century), Cyprian (third century), and Faustus of Milevis (fourth century). The first phrase by itself is found in GA 274T, 1071, 1325*, 1675, L866, and L1016, as well as in patristic citations from Clement of Alexandria (third century), Eusebius (fourth century), Theodoret (fifth century), and Tertullian (third century). The Didache (1.3) also appears to support the inclusion of only the first phrase, and in his discussion of textual variation at this point, Peter of Laodicea appears to have no knowledge of the second phrase. Another reading that omits the first phrase and includes the second is also preserved, though primarily by versional and patristic evidence. This line in GA 03 is marked with an umlaut, so it is possible that one of the longer variants was known at this point, though it is not clear which one. The longest reading, which includes both phrases, is supported by the majority of manuscripts, including the Byzantine tradition.

Regardless of whether the omission in the text was due to contamination from an alternate exemplar or the accidental result of homoioteleuton from one ὑμᾶς to the next, the Byzantine support for the inclusion of the omitted phrase strongly suggests that the marginal reading was intended as a correction towards the common text. The character of the minuscule script in which the note was written and the itacistic substitution of ἡμᾶς for ὑμᾶς in the reading suggest that the second phrase was supplied from memory by a later hand.

**Matt 6:22**
Page: 15v
Siglum: arrow
Text: omit
Margin: ουν
Hand: 1
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Type: C
Comments:
While the omission in the text of GA 274 is also found in the fourth-century majuscule GA 01 and a few versions (the Old Latin, Curetonian Syriac, and Middle Egyptian), the agreement is more likely than not coincidental; given that the words surrounding οὖν in the manuscript are ἐάν and ὁ, homoioteleuton or homoioarcton could easily explain the omission, and since the rest of the manuscript tradition supports the word’s inclusion, the marginal note is surely a correction.

Matt 7:6
Page: 16v
Siglum: arrow. The marginal reading, the sigla in both the text and the margin, and parts of the text have been erased, as shown below.

Text: τ[ά] ἅγι[α] (corrected to τὸ ἅγιον)
Margin: [τὸ ἅγιον]
Hand: unclear
Type: C
Comments:
The choice of singular or plural for the phrase “what is holy” is the only well-known variant in the text found on the line where the marginal note is placed. A clearer indication that the author of the marginal note had this variant in mind can be found in the clear signs of editing in the text: a final stroke beginning at what is now the omicron in τὸ has been erased, and the last two letters of ἅγιον are thinner than they are elsewhere on the page and appear to have been written with a different pen than the one used everywhere else. The only other well-known reading at this location, τὰ ἅγια, would explain both of these observations: a corrector changed this reading to τὸ ἅγιον by removing the tail of the alpha in the article, erasing the final alpha in ἅγια, and fitting -ον into the resulting space at the end of the word. In this scenario, the marginal note, which originally provided the common reading without changing the reading copied in the text, was subsequently erased, as it was no longer needed.

The reading τὰ ἅγια originally copied in the text of GA 274 is attested in a minority of manuscripts, being found in some members of Family 1, as well as GA 157, 431, 461, 544, 740, 1093, 1200, 1342, and 2786. Even so, the minority reading has earlier roots than its extant witnesses might suggest. It finds fourth-century support in allusions made by Cyril of Jerusalem and in multiple citations by Didymus the Blind. See Mullen, *New Testament Text of Cyril of Jerusalem*, 78, and Bart D. Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels*, NTGF 1 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1986), 50. It is worth noting that Didymus the Blind alternates between citing τὰ ἅγια and τὸ ἅγιον in different writings.
The remainder of the manuscript tradition, including the Byzantine text-type, overwhelmingly favors the singular phrase τὸ ἅγιον, so it is highly likely that the primary Byzantine exemplar whose text is reproduced in most of GA 274 had this reading and not the reading found in the text of GA 274. The scribe likely added τὸ ἅγιον to the margin to make a correction to the text found in this exemplar or, if that exemplar was not available for some reason, to record a more familiar phrase from memory. If the Byzantine exemplar indeed was not available (e.g., because it was lacunose here), then the scribe may have copied τὰ ἅγια from a supplementary non-Byzantine manuscript. In that case, the marginal reading would not be a correction _per se_, but it would be a note of a Byzantine reading, and one that probably was originally present in GA 274's Byzantine exemplar. Accordingly, it best fits the criteria of class C.

**Matt 8:13**

Page: 19r  
Siglum: asteriskos  
Text: _omit_  
Margin: καὶ ὑποστρέψ(ας) ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ εἰς τῇ ὥρ(ᾳ) εὗρε τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ ὑγιαίνοντα  
Hand: 2b  
Type: A  
Collation: 

| 01C1 03 07A 011 017 019 028 031 032 036 037 041 045 f^{12} f^{61} f^{2} 227 71 75 114 157 164 199 269 274T |  
| 291 371 372 431 461 517 565 585 759 700 726 804 892 954 1071 1079 1167 1192 1200 1243 1319 1321 1325 |  
| 1342 1424T 1519 1675 2786 L547 L627 L773 L848 L950 L2211 | _add_ longer reading _01* 01C2 04 07T_  
| 021 022 030 033 038 042 043 0211 f f^{31} f^{16} 16 22 33 119 161 184 274A 449 544 545 1005 1093 1216 1241 |  
| 1365 1424A | _add_ καὶ παντες εθαυμαζον και εδοξαζον τον θν  
L844 |

Comments:

The classification of this marginal reading is difficult. The lack of mainstream Byzantine support for the longer reading makes it less likely that this was a correction to an omission of text from the manuscript’s main exemplar. The addition could be a harmonization to the parallel in Luke 7:10 or to a similar passage in John 4:52–53.\(^{22}\)

On the other hand, a number of explanations exist for the omission. One is that the longer reading was intentionally omitted for stylistic reasons, with some scribes considering it redundant after the previous verse. Another is that the omission was occasioned by homoiocarcton from the καὶ at the start of the longer reading to the καὶ at the start of v. 14. A third possibility is that the longer reading was omitted due to lectionary usage because it originally occurred between the end of the lection containing v. 13 and the beginning of the lection containing v. 14.\(^{23}\)

---

\(^{22}\) Philip Wesley Comfort, _A Commentary on the Manuscripts and Text of the New Testament_ (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Academic, 2015), 140. This may also explain why the asteriskos symbol (typically used to mark passages suspected to have been inserted from other locations or sources) is used as the siglum for this marginal reading.

\(^{23}\) All but one of the lectionaries selected for this study end the lection with the shorter reading, and the one remaining lectionary (L844) adds a common explicit. Of the manuscripts that contain the longer reading and include lectionary notation, the following locate the longer reading between the τελος abbreviation marking the end of the lection and the αρχη abbreviation marking the start of the next lection: GA 04, 07, 038, 0211, 1, 184, 348, 545, 895, 983, 1190, 1194, 1216, 1528, and 1689. Many other manuscripts with the longer reading place the τελος marker after it, and a more comprehensive study of the lectionary tradition may reveal that parts of the tradition include the longer reading in the lection. Additionally, it is possible that the longer reading is a later addition,
It is worth noting that GA 03 has a distigme on the line containing the shorter reading. If the siglum can be understood to indicate knowledge of textual variation, then it could be a fourth-century witness to this variant, although it could also refer to a variant concerning the presence or absence of ἀυτοῦ after ὁ παῖς, which occurs on the same line.

**Matt 12:42**

Page: 28v
Siglum: ι
Text: ο
Margin: ω
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:

A corresponding siglum does not appear in the text, but the marginal note surely refers to the spelling of Solomon’s name in the middle of this verse (Σολόμονος). Throughout Matthew, and even later in this very verse, GA 274 preserves the common spelling Σολομῶνος, and as we have observed in the main part of this study, erroneous ο-ω interchanges were common for the scribe of GA 274, so the marginal note is clearly intended as a correction here.

**Matt 13:32**

Page: 30v
Siglum: The alternate reading is not in the margin but is written above the text in a majuscule script, as pictured below.

Text: *omit*
Margin: πάντων
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:

The RP margin does not note the addition of πάντων as a divided Byzantine reading, but both the text reading and the marginal reading of GA 274 are attested by cross-sections of the Byzantine tradition. Moreover, the omission could be explained as the result of homoioteleuton following the word μεῖζον, and the placement of the addition directly in the text, rather than in the margin, would be unusual for a note about a known variant reading. The addition of πάντων is therefore most probably a correction to the text found in GA 274’s Byzantine exemplar.

24 The omission is supported by GA 01, 03, 04, 05, 07, 09, 011, 019, 021, 022, 023, 028, 030, 031, 032, 033, 036, 037, 038, 042, 043, 045, 0211, f, f, 2, 16, 22, 27, 33, 71, 119, 164, 184, 199, 274T, 461, 517, 579, 700, 740, 892, 954, 1093, 1192, 1216, 1241, 1273, 1325, 1342, 1675, 2786, and L773. The addition of πάντων is found in GA 017, 034, 041, p, 9, 75, 114, 157, 269, 274A, 291, 371, 431, 449, 544, 545, 565, 585, 726, 804, 1005, 1071, 1079, 1167, 1200, 1243, 1319, 1321, 1365, 1424, 1519, 1574, and L950. A rare third variant is the addition of αὐτῶν, found in GA 372.
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Matt 15:28
Page: 35v
Siglum: ancora (rightward)
Text: ης
Margin: εις
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:
The marginal reading changes the subjunctive θέλῃς to the indicative θέλεις. While the subjunctive is viable and has diverse attestation here,\textsuperscript{25} the majority of the manuscript evidence, including the Byzantine text-type, supports the indicative, and as was noted in the summary of the text of GA 274, itacism was a common error for its scribe. The marginal note is therefore best explained as a correction of a common error.

Matt 19:27
Page: 43r
Siglum: ancora (upward)
Text: omit
Margin: δε
Hand: 1
Type: L
Comments:
The corresponding siglum in the text is placed after τότε ἀποκριθεὶς; presumably, the intended substitution is ἀποκριθείς δὲ. The vast majority of manuscripts have the reading of GA 274T, and the outside support for the marginal reading consists solely of the lectionaries L387, L547, L627, L773, L848, and L950. Of the two other lectionaries selected for this study, one (L1126) preserves the common reading, and the other (L844) has ἀποκριθείς by itself (a reading otherwise only supported by GA 04). Moreover, the lection covering Matt 10:32–38 is patched together with Matt 19:27–30 in many lectionaries, so the substitution can be explained as a stylistic smoothing of the skip that takes place in the lection.

Matt 20:22
Page: 44r
Siglum: The alternate reading is not in the margin but is written above the text in a majuscule script, as pictured below.

Text: omit
Margin: ν
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:
Given the placement of the additional letter directly in the text rather than through a note in the margin, the transcriptional probability of an original πίνειν being assimilated to the

\textsuperscript{25} It is also found in GA 021, β1\textsuperscript{15}, 2*, 9, 184, 199, 371, 565, 579, 1005, 1216, 1243, 1325, 1342, 1424, 1519, and L63.
previous πιεῖν in this verse, and the overwhelming attestation for πινεῖν in the manuscript tradition (and especially among the Byzantine witnesses),26 this note is best understood to be a simple correction to a perceived error in spelling. In reality, given the relatively widespread external support for πιεῖν, this reading may not have been an error on the part of the scribe but a faithfully-copied reading from a non-Byzantine exemplar containing it.

Matt 20:23
Page: 44v
Siglum: om
Text: omit
Margin: τοῦτο
Hand: 1
Type: A
Collation:

Comments:

This variation unit is complicated not just by the number of distinct placements of τοῦτο found in the manuscript tradition, but also by the fact that the hand responsible for adding the marginal reading's siglum to the text first placed it at the beginning of the phrase (274A*), then crossed it out and placed it later in the phrase (274AC). Given that the majority of the tradition, including the Byzantine text-type, favors the shorter reading, it is unlikely that either form of the marginal reading was a correction to the primary exemplar of GA 274. Given the sparse support for the former placement of τοῦτο, we might suppose that the reader or scribe responsible for it first attempted to recall the reading by memory and ended up placing the additional word in the place where it seemed most natural to them. If this was indeed the case, then a check against a secondary exemplar containing the addition could have corrected the marginal reading to the more common reading οὐκ ἔστιν εἰμὶ τοῦτο δοῦναι. The early and diverse support for this reading gives at least some probability to such a scenario.

While the earliest manuscripts containing οὐκ ἔστιν εἰμὶ τοῦτο δοῦναι date to the fifth century, patristic evidence can trace it a bit farther back.27 Some citations by John Chrysostom (fourth century) support the placement of τοῦτο in this location, though other citations support the reading without τοῦτο. Even the reading of GA 274A* finds fourth-century support in an allusion by Macarius of Egypt.28 Finally, the absence of τοῦτο in the parallel text of


26 Outside of GA 274, μέλλω πίνειν is attested in 01f (… πίνειν), 04, 07, 017, 019, 021, 022, 023, 028, 030, 031, 032, 033, 034, 035, 036, 037, 038, 041, 042, 043f (… πινεῖν), 045, f, f1, f2, 2*f (… πίνην), 2C, 9, 16, 22, 27, 33, 71, 114, 157, 161, 184, 199f (… πίνειν), 371, 372, 449C, 461, 544, 565, 700, 804, 892, 1093, 1071, 1079, 119, 1200, 1216, 1241, 1243, 1273, 1319, 1325, 1342, 1574, 2786, L387, L773, L844, L950; μέλλω πιεῖν is attested in 03, 05, 011, 013, 085, 0211, 164, 291, 449*, 545, 579, 585, 740, 1005, 1365, 2597, and L63; and πίνω is found in 75, 119, 269, 431, 517, 954, 1167, 1321, 1424, 1519, and 1675.
27 Versional evidence would certainly offer other early witnesses for us to consider, but since transpositions of word order can easily be lost in translation, it seems safer to set aside versional evidence so as not to risk a misinterpretation of the evidence here.
Appendix: Commentary on All Marginal Variants in GA 274

Mark 10:40 has been taken as intrinsic evidence that one of the longer readings, and probably the one supported by GA 274AC, is earlier than the shortest reading found in most manuscripts.  

Matt 23:9
Page: 50r
Siglum: ancora (upward)
Text: *omit*
Margin: [υμείς δὲ πάντες αδελφοί εστε]
Hand: 1
Type: A
Collation:

add υμείς δὲ πάντες αδελφοί εστε after 23:8 01 03 05 07 09 011 017 019 021 028 032 034 036 037 038 041 042 045 0102 0211 2 9 16 22 27 33 71 114 119 157 161 164 184 199 269 274T 291 371 372 449 544 565 579 700 740 804 892 954 1005 1071 1079 1093 1192 1200 1216 1241 1273 1319 1321 1325 1365 1424 1519 1675C 2597 2786 L547 L773 L844 L848 L950 | add υμείς δὲ πάντες αδελφοί εστε after 23:9 030 75 274A 431 517 545 585 1167 1342 | omit in both locations 1675

Comments:
The marginal reading is probably best understood as marking a transposition rather than an addition, since the text of GA 274 already includes this phrase at the end of the previous verse, and no manuscript collated for this study includes the phrase in both places. Because of this, and because of the overwhelming external support for the placement of the phrase after v. 8, the marginal reading is better understood as an indication of a known variant reading than as a correction.

Less certain is how the transposition originated. Stylistic considerations offer one transcriptional explanation: an explanation about the brotherhood of the disciples seems more fitting after a statement about whom to call “Father” than after a statement about whom to call “Teacher,” so the transposition would have been natural to some scribes. There does not appear to be any early versional or patristic evidence supporting the placement of this phrase at the end of v. 9, so the transposition may well have a later origin.

Matt 23:12
Page: 50v
Siglum: The marginal reading has no siglum but is written after the end of the line of text and into the margin, as pictured below.

Text: *omit*
Margin: καὶ ὅστις ταπεινώσει ἑαυτὸν ὑψώσει
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:

The shorter reading is obviously the result of omission by homoioteleuton. Since the only other witness known to omit this phrase is GA 4, the error is common enough for two independent occurrences to be unsurprising, and the marginal reading of GA 274 is found in all other collated witnesses, there can be little doubt that the marginal reading is a correction.

**Matt 23:18**
Page: 50v
Siglum: asteriskos
Text: *omit*
Margin: καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ὀμόσῃ ἐν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ οὐδέν ἐστιν
Hand: 2c
Type: C
Comments:
Again, the simplest explanation for the omission is a haplography. A skip of the eye from ὃς ἐὰν ὀμόσῃ in this phrase to the similar phrase ὃς δ’ ἂν ὀμόσῃ later in the verse led the scribe to omit the first phrase. Supporting this conclusion is the observation that the scribe likely succumbed to homoioteleuton to the same extent earlier on the page (see the discussion of the previous marginal note). The marginal note is undoubtedly a correction.

Before we move on, it is worth observing that the scribe or reader responsible for this note curiously chose to mark it with an asteriskos. As we have seen earlier, this sign traditionally highlights text believed to be spurious or derived from another source or passage. It is hard to see how this usage would apply in this instance. It is possible that the exemplar of GA 274 was also missing this passage (presumably for the same transcriptional reasons argued above), and if the author of the note was aware of this, then he or she might have marked the addition in this way to point out that it was supplied from another copy. But even in this unusual scenario, the classification of the marginal reading as a correction would still be correct, since the omission in the text can still be explained as a clear error, regardless of which scribe was responsible for it, and since the supplied reading is otherwise ubiquitous in the manuscript tradition. It is also perfectly plausible that the author of the marginal note was simply not aware of the function of the asteriskos symbol.

**Matt 24:2**
Page: 52r
Siglum: The alternate reading is not in the margin but is written above the text in a majuscule script, as pictured below.

Text: *omit*
Margin: μη
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:
The μη written above the text is placed before the phrase οὐ καταλυθήσεται, but it was surely intended to be read after οὐ. As was noted in the “Scribal Habits” section of the article, omission of small words by oversight was a common error for the scribe of GA 274, so the
longer reading could plausibly be considered a correction on transcriptional grounds. Moreover, the placement of μη directly above the text, rather than in the margin with a siglum, also seems more in line with the process of correction than that of noting variant readings. On the other hand, if the exemplar of GA 274 had the shorter reading, then the scribe of GA 274 might easily have considered the more emphatic parallel in Mark 13:2 to be the original wording of Matthew and then corrected the shorter text of the exemplar after first copying it.

The likelihood of both scenarios outlined above may be why the external evidence is so divided. The earliest witnesses support the shorter reading, but the longer reading has support that is both widespread and as early as the sixth century. According to the RP edition, the Byzantine text predominantly has the shorter reading here, but manuscripts and manuscript families with strong Byzantine ties also support the longer reading.

Ultimately, whichever scenario we suppose gave rise to the addition of μη in GA 274, we can classify it, by virtue of the external evidence, as a correction towards a Byzantine reading. Furthermore, we would expect knowledge of a variant reading to be indicated in the margin proper rather than in the middle of the text. This note is best classified as type C.

Matt 25:19
Page: 55v
Siglum: s (margin only)
Text: ε
Margin: αι
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:
Here, a difference of a couple letters between the readings in the text and the margin effects a subtle difference in the meaning of a verb in the Parable of the Talents—whether the master “took up accounts” (συναίρει) with his slaves or “had a word” (συνερεῖ) with them. Both readings have early support, but συναίρει is more widely attested in the manuscript tradition. Since we already know that phonetic confusion between αι and ε was common to the scribe of GA 274, the text was most likely the product of a scribal error, which the marginal note subsequently corrected.

Matt 25:29
Page: 56r
Siglum: There is no siglum in the margin or the text, but the marginal reading begins at the end of the line of text and continues out into the margin, as pictured below.

---

30 The reading οὐ is found in GA 01, 03, 04, 05, 07, 019, 021, 028, 031, 032, 033, 036, 037, 038, 042, 045, 0102, 0211, f31 φ, f5, 2, 16, 22, 27, 71, 75, 119, 157, 161, 199, 269, 274T, 291, 371, 431, 461, 544, 579, 700, 740, 892, 1005, 1093, 1167, 1192, 1243, 1273, 1321, 1342, 1365, 1519, 2786. The reading οὐ μὴ is found in GA 017, 030, 034, 041, 043, f32, f31 φ, 9, 33, 114, 164, 184, 274A, 372, 449, 517, 545, 565, 585, 804, 954, 1071, 1079, 1200, 1216, 1241, 1319, 1325, 1424, 1574, 1675, L547, L848, and L950.

31 The support for συνερεῖ includes GA 05, 019, 032, 038f (συνεφεῖ), 043, 0211, 274T, 545, 579, 700, 1243, and L2211. The support for συναίρει includes GA 01, 02, 03, 04, 07, 017, 021, 028, 030, 031, 033, 034, 036, 037, 041, 042, 045, f33, f31 φ, 9, 16, 22, 27, 33, 71, 75, 114, 119, 157, 161, 164, 184, 199, 269, 274A, 291, 371, 372, 431, 449, 461, 517, 544, 565, 585, 726, 804, 892, 954, 1005, 1071, 1079, 1093, 1167, 1192, 1200, 1216, 1241, 1319, 1321, 1325, 1342, 1365, 1519, 1675, 2786, L63, L547, L773, L844, L849, L849, L950, and L1126. Further fourth-century support for this reading can be found in a citation by Basil of Caesarea (Racine, Text of Matthew in the Writings of Basil of Caesarea, 214). Finally, the first hand of GA 2 reads συνέρη, which a corrector has changed to συνήρει.
Text: *omit*

Margin: ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνει· ὁ ἔχων ὦτ(α) ἀκούειν, ἀκουέτω

Hand: 1  
Type: L  
Comments:

The longer reading is a common explicit used in several lections, and it is known to have been incorporated into the text in different forms and at different places in a number of manuscripts. Since no siglum is supplied in the margin of GA 274 here, it is likely that the note was understood to be for lectionary purposes only. Surprisingly, of the lectionaries collated for this study, most lack the explicit, and in some that use this passage for two lections, the explicit is found in one lection but not the other.

**Matt 26:28**

Page: 58v  
Siglum: arrow  
Text: ἐστι  
Margin: γάρ ἐστιν  
Hand: 1  
Type: C  
Comments:

While both readings have early support, the longer reading found in the margin is demonstrably more widespread, with support from Alexandrian witnesses, the Byzantine majority, and other textual families. Because the omission of small words has been shown to be a common mistake for the scribe of GA 274, it is highly likely that the shorter reading is the result of an accidental omission and the marginal note is a correction.

---

32 The full lectionary explicit is added after v. 29 in GA 0211, 2*, 75, 269, 371, 431, 954, 1243, and 1519. The shorter explicit ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω is added after v. 29 in GA 1167*. The full explicit is added after v. 30 in GA 034, 036, 045, 048, 804, and 1675.

33 Specifically, GA L63, L844, L848, L1126, and L2211 lack the explicit altogether, and each of GA L773 and L950 has one lection with the explicit and one without it.

34 The early manuscripts GA P45 (third century), P37 (third or fourth century), and 01 and 03 (fourth century) support the longer reading. Clement of Alexandria (second century) appears to support the shorter reading with a citation that begins with τοῦτο μοι ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμα (Carl P. Cosaert, *The Text of the Gospels in Clement of Alexandria*, NTGF 9 [Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008]). Of course, we must be careful in taking Clement’s words as evidence for two reasons: first, the citation may be indirect or imprecise, since it already transposes the phrase containing this variant to an order not found in any known manuscript, and it also shares elements with some forms of Mark 14:23; second, the context of the citation in Clement’s commentary may have led him to drop a γάρ originally present in his lemma.

35 Of the witnesses collated for this study, the only ones that support the shorter reading are Family 1 and GA 22, 75, 274T, 291, 449, 700, 1319, 1519, L63, L627, L773, L848, L950, and L1126.
As the early support for both readings has already made clear, this variant appears to have a very early origin. This line in the text has a distigme in GA 03, which may indicate knowledge of this textual issue in the fourth century.

**Matt 26:39**

*Page: 59r*

*Siglum: asteriskos (bottom margin)*

*Text: omit*

*Margin: καὶ ἀναστὰς ἀπὸ τῆς προσευχῆς*

*Hand: 1*

*Type: L*

*Comments:*

The lection that began in this passage would briefly skip to Luke 22:43–44 and back to Matthew. As expected, a lectionary note in the margin next to Matt 26:39 tells the reader to skip to the appropriate passage in Luke at this point. The marginal note under discussion is clearly intended to inform the reader to use the phrase from the beginning of Luke 22:45 when skipping back to Matt 26:40, with the asteriskos siglum correctly indicating that the text in question is from Luke, not Matthew.

**Mark**

**Mark 1:34**

*Page: 68v*

*Siglum: lemniskos*

*Text: omit*

*Margin: χν εἶναι*

*Hand: 1*

*Type: A*

*Collation:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>αὐτὸν</th>
<th>01*</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>05</th>
<th>07</th>
<th>09</th>
<th>017</th>
<th>028</th>
<th>030</th>
<th>034</th>
<th>036</th>
<th>037</th>
<th>041</th>
<th>043</th>
<th>045</th>
<th>0130</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>71</th>
<th>114</th>
<th>119</th>
<th>157</th>
<th>161</th>
<th>269</th>
<th>274T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>449*</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1319</td>
<td>1321</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐτὸν</td>
<td>χν εἶναι</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>019</td>
<td>032</td>
<td>038</td>
<td>042</td>
<td>0211</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>274A</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>1273</td>
<td>1342</td>
<td>1365</td>
<td>2542</td>
<td>L387</td>
<td>L773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐτὸν</td>
<td>τὸν χν εἶναι</td>
<td>01C2</td>
<td>011</td>
<td>021</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>449C</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>2786</td>
<td>L2211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τον χν αὐτὸν εἰναι</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>αὐτὸν τὸν χν εἴναι</td>
<td>544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comments:*

The support for the marginal reading is widespread enough to make the marginal note difficult to classify. Indeed, the reading is found in Family 35 (which von Soden designated K', a Byzantine subgroup), and it occurs in the margin of the RP edition, indicating that a substantial portion of the Byzantine text-type supports it, so it is certainly plausible that the exemplar of GA 274 attested to this reading and the marginal note merely indicates a correction back to that text. Thankfully, since this variation unit was included as a Teststellen in the Text und Textwert Mark volume, we have access to much more comprehensive data: specifically, 960 witnesses support the reading αὐτὸν, 477 support αὐτὸν χν εἶναι, 148 support αὐτὸν τὸν χν εἶναι, 49 support τὸν χν αὐτὸν εἶναι, and 20 support αὐτὸν εἰναι τὸν χν.

The strongest argument against the interpretation of the marginal note as a correction is transcriptional probability: there is no obvious mechanical explanation for the omission of the longer phrase. Lacking an explanation in terms of accidental omission, we would have to conclude that the first hand of GA 274 omitted χν εἶναι intentionally, but as Metzger argues, “there
is no reason why it should have been altered or eliminated entirely."36 The Text und Textwert data shows that about 58 percent of the surviving manuscript tradition supports the shorter reading, so it is perfectly likely that the exemplar of GA 274 had the shorter reading in the first place. The widespread support for the reading found in the margin makes it just as likely that the reader or scribe responsible for that reading knew of it from elsewhere or had access to a copy containing it.

Mark 2:16
Page: 70r
Siglum: arrow
Text: omit
Margin: ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτ(οῦ) Τί ὅτι μετὰ τῶ(ν) τελωνων κ(αὶ) ἁμαρτωλ(ων)
Hand: first hand
Type: C
Comments:
While the omission is found in a few scattered witnesses,37 its presence in these witnesses can be easily explained as independent occurrences of haplography from one τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν to the next. Since the passage is unintelligible without the omitted content, the omission is clearly an error, and the marginal note is clearly a correction.

Mark 2:25
Page: 71r
Siglum: ancora (upward)
Text: omit
Margin: κ(αὶ) ἐπείνασ(εν)
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:
Since the only other witnesses known to omit here are GA 544 and 1241, there is no reason to suspect that GA 274’s Byzantine exemplar would have omitted the phrase here. Moreover, since the omission is obviously explained by homoioteleuton following the phrase χρείαν ἐσχέν, there is no reason to doubt that the marginal reading was written to correct this error.

Mark 5:21
Page: 76r
Siglum: lemniskos
Text: omit
Margin: εἰς γενήσαρετ
Hand: 1
Type: A
Collation: omit P45 vid 01 02 03 04 05 07 09 011 017 019 021 022 028 030 032 034 037 038 041 042 045 0211
f f1 f1 2 9 16 22 27 33 71 75 114 119 157 161 164 184 199 217 269 274 T 291 371 372 431 449 461 517 544
545 565 579 585 700 726 740 804 892 954 1005 1071 1079 1093 1167 1192 1200 1216 1241 1273
1319 1321 1325 1365 1424 1519 1574 1675 2786 L2211 | add εἰς γενησαρετ 274Af (… γενησαρετ) 1342

36 Metzger, Textual Commentary, 64.
37 It does not occur in any of the other witnesses collated for this study, but it is attested in GA 732, 803, 2106*, and 2206*. 
Comments:

The marginal addition is certainly not a correction to the Byzantine text of GA 274's exemplar, as only one other witness is known to preserve the longer reading.\(^{38}\) We also observe that at least among the lectionaries collated for this study, the verse containing this variant is skipped, with one lection ending at 5:20 and another beginning at 5:22. Thus, pending any new discoveries in the lectionary tradition, neither the omission nor the addition could be occasioned by a difference in wording from a lectionary incipit or explicit. The fact that the variant occurs in a verse located between lections does not help explain it either; if any omission occurred due to the placement of lections, we would expect it to involve the whole phrase between the lections, as is the case in Matt 8:13. The marginal reading is therefore unlikely to be a correction or a lection-related note; it is either a clarifying note imagined entirely by the scribe, or it indicates knowledge of a variant reading.

How likely was the scribe of GA 274 to have added this phrase without knowledge of a variant reading? Transcriptionally, the addition may be an imperfect harmonization to Matt 14:34, which mentions Gennesaret after the verb διαπεράω; however, besides being imperfect, such an addition would be redundant, since the phrase εἰς τὸ πέραν occurs a few words later in the verse. With respect to narrative style, the addition creates more problems than it solves. It is unlikely that the scribe of GA 274 would have independently invented it to clarify anything.

A more parsimonious explanation, and one that coheres well with the other agreements between the GA 274 margin and GA 1342 throughout the Synoptic Gospels (see the “Textual Affinity of Alternate Readings” section in the main article for more details), is that the scribe responsible for the marginal addition was aware of it from a source related to GA 1342.

Mark 6:55
Page: 80r
Siglum: lemniskos
Text: omit
Margin: ov
Hand: 1
Type: C

Comments:

The text, which reads ηκου, is clearly defective. The margin simply corrects it back to ἠκουον, the reading found in virtually all other manuscripts. The omission is easily explained as homoioteleuton occasioned by the preceding ou in the word, since in the minuscule script of GA 274, the final form of nu looks like an upsilon with a tail at the end.

Mark 7:2
Page: 80r
Siglum: lemniskos
Text: omit
Margin: ὅτι
Hand: 1
Type: A

Collation:

\(^{38}\) While the Text und Textwert Mark volume covers this variation unit and correctly notes the support for the addition in GA 1342, it does not note its presence in the margin of GA 274.
Appendix: Commentary on All Marginal Variants in GA 274

The textual question is whether or not the phrase beginning with κοιναῖς χερσίν is introduced with the conjunction ὅτι. Most witnesses, including those of the Byzantine text-type, omit it here, so there is a good chance that the primary exemplar of GA 274 did not have the conjunction, either. For this reason, even though the omission could readily be explained as a common error (as we have seen, the omission of small words was a common error for the scribe of GA 274), it was more likely the result of faithful copying.

Considerations of context further challenge the idea that the marginal reading is a correction to a scribal mishap. The presence or absence of ὅτι is closely linked to another variant a few words later between the participle ἐσθιόντας and the indicative ἐσθίουσιν. The only grammatically feasible combinations of these readings are ὅτι followed by the indicative (“seeing some of his disciples, that they ate with unclean hands”) or the participle without ὅτι (“seeing some of his disciples eating with unclean hands”). As a result, the majority of witnesses that omit ὅτι above typically also have the participle, and the minority that add ὅτι typically also have the indicative, though a surprising number of exceptional manuscripts (GA 517, 740, 1071, 1241, 1424, and 1675) add ὅτι while retaining the participle. Significantly, the text of GA 274 has ἐσθιόντας without ὅτι in agreement with the Byzantine text, but the margin only adds ὅτι and does not comment on the other variant. If the marginal note were intended as a correction to an error, then the proposed correction would actually make the text less intelligible.

In light of these considerations, the most likely explanation for the marginal reading is that it was written to indicate knowledge of a variant at this location. The author of the marginal note may have copied the conjunction from a manuscript that erroneously combined ὅτι with the participle ἐσθιόντας (as the exceptional manuscripts listed in the previous paragraph do) or may have subsequently noted the first variant and overlooked the second one.

Mark 7:4
Page: 80r
Siglum: arrow (twice). The reading does not occur strictly in the margin, but it is written, after a noticeable space, at the end of the line. The sigla are drawn around the phrase, as pictured below.

Text: omit
Margin: τὴν κοιλίαν
Hand: first hand
Type: S
Comments:
The first hand adds τὴν κοιλίαν (“the belly”) between κρατεῖν and βαπτισμοὺς. This reading appears to occur in only one other witness collated for this study, the ninth-century Uspenski Gospels (GA 461), and there, its presence can only be deduced from the size and shape of its near-complete erasure (see the figure below).
Mark 7:4 on folio 242 of National Library of Russia Φ. No. 906 Gr. 219 (GA 461), the ninth-century Uspenski Gospels. The long space following κρατεῖν is actually an erasure that has left only a small trace of the original reading; its size and the discernable penstrokes of the underlying text would accommodate τὴν κοιλίαν well. This image was used with permission from the National Library of Russia (nlr.ru/eng).

In GA 461, the addition seems to have been part of the text originally, but in 274, it is unmistakably separated from the rest of the line by a long space. We can infer from this that the scribe of GA 274 had always intended to set the reading apart, even if the surrounding sigla were the work of a later hand.

How did this reading originate? The phrase τὴν κοιλίαν seems unlikely to have been intended as a heading for this passage for several reasons. First, its location at the end of a line in the text is not the expected place for a heading; the top and bottom margins of the page are usually used for this purpose. Moreover, if it were part of a heading, then we would expect it to be in the genitive, not the accusative, as kephalaia are virtually always presented in a περὶ + genitive construction. Besides, the common heading for this passage is περὶ τῆς παραβάσεως τῆς εντολῆς τοῦ θυ.

It is far more reasonable to suppose that τὴν κοιλίαν occurs in the same place in both manuscripts because it was intended to be read at precisely that location. Without the added phrase, the object of the infinitive κρατεῖν is understood to be the “many other things” that the Pharisees have received by tradition. If τὴν κοιλίαν is interpretively supplied as the object of κρατεῖν, then the phrase could have the sense “and many other things, which they have received by tradition [in order] to master the belly.” Another possibility would be to treat τὴν κοιλίαν as the subject of κρατεῖν in an accusative-and-infinitive construction. In the context of food, κρατέω can mean “to digest,” so in this construction, the larger phrase would have the sense, “and many other things, which they have received by tradition for the belly to digest.” Both options admittedly require a stretch of the imagination, but presently, we have no better explanation for the reading in its context.

In any case, one question remains: why did the scribe of GA 274 set the addition apart from the text? One possibility is that the exemplar of GA 274 had a text like that of 461* in this place, with the addition included as part of the text. The scribe considered this reading to be an error but was too conscientious to omit the text found in the exemplar altogether and therefore opted to include the reading where it occurred but with added space to indicate its doubtful-ness. Both GA 274 and 461 are considered Byzantine witnesses, so their shared support for the addition is not unthinkable. This hypothesis has in its favor the direct evidence of GA 461, and it would also explain the reading’s subsequent erasure in that manuscript. Nevertheless, it has two weaknesses. First, the usual text-critical siglum used in GA 274 to indicate spurious

39 LSJ, s.v. “κρατέω.”
40 Hermann Freiherr von Soden, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911), 1.2:718–21, 765, assigns it to his Κ1 group.
readings (the asteriskos) is not used here. Second, in almost every other place where a spurious addition occurs in this manuscript, the scribe or editor responsible for correcting it erases it without a qualm.

An alternative explanation, and one that better accounts for the factors just mentioned, is that the scribe of GA 274 understood the addition to be an interpretive gloss and deliberately distinguished it from the text to avoid confusion. This hypothesis finds support in the point that the one other reading marked this way, the addition of γενεαὶ ὁς in Luke 3:38, is more clearly seen to be a scholion rather a variant reading.

Mark 7:13
Page: 80v
Siglum: double lemniskos
Text: omit
Margin: του θυ
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:
The corresponding siglum in the text appears to have been placed one line too high by mistake; the phrase ἀκυροῦντες τὸν λόγον at the beginning of v. 13 is missing τοῦ θυ at the end, and since no other manuscript is known to lack the phrase there, we have reason to suspect that this was an accidental omission and that the marginal note was written to correct it. A short article followed by a two-letter nomen sacrum would have been easy enough for an absentminded scribe to omit, even without any additional mechanical cause, but in this case, the first letter of the next phrase, τῇ παραδόσει, provides an occasion for homoioarcton.

Mark 7:26
Page: 81v
Siglum: arrow
Text: σύρα φοινίκισσα
Margin: συροφοινίκισσα
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:
This spelling variation surely arose through the hands of multiple scribes independently; it fractures virtually every textual family, including the Byzantine. This is due, at least in part, to its high transcriptional probability: the two readings both look and sound extremely similar. While the widespread attestation of both readings would make knowledge of the other reading perfectly plausible, the likelihood of the marginal reading being in GA 274’s Byzantine exemplar makes it just as plausible that it is a correction. As this is the simplest explanation of the marginal note, it is preferable here.

41 Of the manuscripts collated for this study, GA 03, 07, 021, 022, 028T, 030, 032, 033, 034, 036, 042, 045, 0211, f3, f6, 2, 9, 16, 22, 27th, 71, 75, 119, 157, 184, 199, 217, 274T, 291, 431, 449, 461, 517, 544, 700, 740, 804, 1005, 1093, 1167, 1192, 1216, 1243, 1321, 1342, 1365, 1675, 2786, L773 support σύρα φοινίκισσα up to defective and orthographic variation; meanwhile, GA P45, 01, 02, 017, 019, 028A, 037, 038, 041, f1, 114, 164, 269, 274A, 371, 372, 545, 565, 579, 585, 726, 892, 954, 1071, 1079, 1200, 1241, 1273, 1319, 1325, 1424, 1519, 1574, L387, L950, and L2211 support συροφοινίκισσα up to defective and orthographic variation. Finally, GA 05* has the ambiguous reading φυνισσα, and the reading φοινισσα of its first corrector does nothing to clarify matters.
Appendix: Commentary on All Marginal Variants in GA 274

Mark 8:26
Page: 83v
Siglum: The alternate reading is not in the margin but is written above the text with a common abbreviation, as pictured below.

Text: *omit*
Margin: τὸν
Hand: Unclear; the only letter written is majuscule, but given the darker hue of the ink and the more informal appearance of the script, this was likely written by a different hand than the one responsible for other majuscule marginal notes.
Type: C
Comment:
While the shorter reading εἰς οἶκον αὐτοῦ has early and widespread support, the Byzantine text preserves the grammatically fuller reading εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.42 Between that, the presence of this reading in the text rather than in the margin, and the observed tendency of GA 274’s scribe to make short omissions, we have no reason to doubt that this note was intended to be a correction. The only other possibility is that the scribe originally copied the shorter reading from an alternate exemplar because its Byzantine exemplar was unavailable, but even in this case, the note would still be classified as a correction towards a Byzantine text.

Mark 9:11
Page: 85r
Siglum: lemniskos
Text: *omit*
Margin: κ(α)ὶ οἱ φαρισαίοι
Hand: 1
Type: A
Collation:

| λεγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς 02 03 04 07 09 011 017 021 022 028 030 032f (… γραμματις) 033 034 036 037 041 042 045 021f 021f 021f | 2 9 16 22 27 33 71 75 114 119 157 164 184 199 217 269 27f 291 371 372 431 449 461 574 579 585 700 726 740 804 892 954 1005 1071 1079 1167 1192 1200 1216 1241 1243 1273 1319 1321 1342 |
| λεγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς λεγουσιν 05 038f (… γραμματις …) | λεγουσιν οἱ φαρισαίοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς 01f (… γραμματις) 019 1093 1342 |

Comments:
Here, the margin preserves not only a rare longer reading but an evidently singular transposition of such a reading. Based on the external evidence, GA 274’s Byzantine exemplar almost

42 The collated witnesses that support εἰς οἶκον αὐτοῦ include GA 01* (as part of a larger transposition), 02, 03, 04, 05, 07, 017, 019, 022, 028, 031174, 034, 036, 041, 042, 9, 27, 33, 71, 114, 157, 164, 199, 269, 27f, 291, 461, 804, 1079, 1216, 1319, 1321, 1342, 1519, and 2786. Those that support εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ include 01C2, 021, 030, 032, 033, 037, 038, 043, 045, 0211f, 021f, 021f, 2, 16, 22, 75, 119, 184, 274A, 291, 371, 372, 431, 449, 517, 544, 545, 565, 579, 585, 700, 726, 892, 954, 1005, 1071, 1093, 1167, 1192, 1200, 1241, 1243, 1325, 1365, 1424, 1675, L387, L773, and L950.
surely did not contain this addition, so the marginal note is unlikely to represent a correction toward the text of this exemplar. Yet because we lack an extant witness to the word order of GA 274A, we can only consider some conjectures. The scribe or reader responsible for this marginal note may have written it down from memory and accidentally transposed the word order in the process. Alternatively, the scribe or reader responsible may have had access to a now-lost manuscript related to those bearing the addition in the more common order, but having the addition in the alternate word order now preserved in the GA 274 margin.

The common reading and the reading λεγοῦσιν οἱ φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς both have fourth-century support from Greek manuscripts. The latter reading, according to the NA apparatus, finds support from the Vulgate and part of the Old Latin tradition. On the grounds of homoioteleuton, a transcriptional argument could be made that it predates the common reading, but its scant external evidence makes this argument a difficult one to accept.

**Mark 9:42**

Page: 86v  
Siglum: lemniskos  
Text: omit  
Margin: τοῦτων  
Hand: 1  
Type: L  
Comments:

The question is whether the phrase is ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τῶν πιστεύοντων or ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τοῦτων τῶν πιστεύοντων. The shorter reading can be explained transcriptionally as the result of homoioteleuton or homoioteleuton, while the longer reading can be explained as a harmonization to Matt 18:6 or Luke 17:2. Both readings are widely attested, but the Byzantine witnesses (as represented in our collation and by the text of the RP edition) are gathered behind the shorter reading. For this reason, we can conclude that the text of GA 274 was probably copied faithfully from its exemplar and that the marginal reading was probably not intended as a correction.

Several of the manuscripts containing the longer reading agree with the GA 274 margin in numerous places elsewhere in Mark, so the marginal note here could well reflect knowledge of a variant reading from a non-Byzantine continuous-text manuscript. But since a lection begins at this verse and all of the collated lectionaries that contain this lection feature the longer reading, the explanation of lectionary influence seems just as plausible and even simpler here.

**Mark 9:44**

Page: 86v  
Siglum: asteriskos (bottom margin)  
Text: omit  
Margin: πᾶς γὰρ ἐν πυρὶ ἀλισθήσεται

---


Hand: 1
Type: L
Comments:

The typical location of this concluding phrase is in v. 49, and there, the majority of witnesses, including GA 274, have a longer form that adds καὶ πᾶσα θυσία ἁλι ἁλισθήσεται. No other Greek manuscript is known to contain the margin’s addition after v. 44, but one lectionary among those collated for this study, GA L387, skips from v. 44 to v. 49 in the lection containing this passage. Further study is needed to determine if this is a common occurrence in other parts of the lectionary tradition, but for now, the best (if not the only) available explanation is that the marginal reading reflects a transposition related to lectionary usage, with the asteriskos siglum clarifying that the addition is transposed from its usual position several verses later.

Mark 11:26
Page: 91v
Siglum: arrow
Text: omit
Margin: ἄλλου εὐαγγελ(ίου) αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ύμιν ζητεῖτε κ(αὶ) εὑρήσετε κρούεται καὶ ἀνοιγήσεται ύμ(ῖν) πάς γάρ ὁ αἰτώ(ν) λαμβάνει κ(αὶ) ὁ ζητ(ῶν) εὑρίσκει κ(αὶ) τῷ κρούοντι ἀνοιγήσεται
Hand: 1
Type: L
Comments:

A well-known textual variant in this location concerns the addition or omission of the entire verse. An early and diverse minority of the manuscripts collated for this study, consisting of GA 01, 03, 019, 028, 032, 037, 044, 2, 157, 184, 565, 700, 892, 1093, 1216, and 1325, omits the verse, while all other collated witnesses, including GA 274, include it. Based on its placement in the text, however, the marginal note refers to a different textual variant: an addition at the end of v. 26. The “other gospel” (ἄλλου εὐαγγελίου) mentioned in this note probably refers to Matt 7:7–8 and not another copy of Mark. The same addition to v. 26 is found in GA 021, 034A, 274A, 579, 804, 1200A, L63, L387, L773 (in the second of two lections containing v. 26), and L950. Its presence in lectionaries, manuscripts like GA 021 with detectable lectionary influence, and the margins of other manuscripts strongly suggests that its source is the lectionary tradition.

Mark 12:26
Page: 93v
Siglum: s
Text: τοῦ
Margin: τ(ῆς)
Hand: 1
Type: A

45 Johann Martin Augustin Scholz, Biblisch-kritische Reise in Frankreich, der Schweiz, Italien, Palästina und im Archipel, in den Jahren 1818, 1819, 1820, 1821, nebst einer Geschichte des Textes N. T. (Leipzig: Friedrich Fleischer, 1823), 35, notes that the heading ἄλλου εὐαγγελίου is written in red ink, and he describes the marginal reading as an addition from Matt 7:7–8, although he erroneously indexes this variant to Mark 6:26 rather than 11:26.

46 Further collation data is needed to determine how common the addition was in the lectionary tradition. Besides the lectionaries collated in this study, the following lectionaries also feature the addition: GA L46, L182, and L563.
Appendix: Commentary on All Marginal Variants in GA 274

Collation:

επι του βατου 01 02 03 04 07 09 011 013 017 019 028 030 031 033 034 036 037 041 043 044*vid 045 0211 2 9 22 27 71 75 114 119 161 164 199 217 269 274 T 291 371 431 449 461 544 545 579 585 740 804 892 1005 1071 1079 1167 1192 1200 1241 1273 1319 1321 1325 1365 1519 1574 L387 L773 L950 επι της βατου 05 021 032 038 042 044C 16 33 184 274A 372 517 565 700 726 954 1093 1216 1243 1342 1424 1675 2786 επι τω βατω 157

Comments:

A minority of witnesses treats the word βάτος (bush) as feminine, where the majority, including the Byzantine text-type and the lectionaries, treats it as masculine. Based on the external evidence, then, the marginal note is unlikely to represent lectionary influence or a correction towards the manuscript’s main exemplar; it either indicates knowledge of a variant reading from another manuscript or constitutes an independent proposed emendation on the part of the scribe or reader responsible.

In the Greek text of the passage referenced here (Exod 3:2–4), the word βάτος is masculine, but the author of the marginal note may have been aware that the feminine βάτος is attested in Luke’s usage, both in the parallel passage Luke 20:37 and in Acts 7:35, where the same episode from Exodus is referenced. The marginal reading in question could therefore be a harmonization to a more popular gospel. Nevertheless, this seems like too minor and obscure an issue for a scribe or reader to bother addressing with harmonizing, so the classification of this marginal reading as a text-critical note remains compelling.

Mark 13:2
Page: 95r
Siglum: looped lemniskos
Text: omit
Margin: ὧδε
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:

The textual question is whether ὧδε is added or omitted between οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ and λίθος. On the one hand, the word in question is short enough to make accidental omission plausible, and on the other hand, the addition could be a harmonization to the parallel in Matt 24:2. Both readings have widespread and early attestation,47 and according to the NA48 apparatus, the support of the Byzantine text-type is divided between the addition and the omission.48 Because both readings have Byzantine support and either could easily have been changed into the other inadvertently, the marginal note could be classified as a probable correction towards GA 274’s Byzantine exemplar in either case. At the same time, since many of the witnesses supporting the addition also support GA 274’s type-A marginal readings elsewhere in Mark, and since several type-A

---


48 Aland et al., Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece, 158. This variation unit is also covered as a Teststelle in the Text und Textwert volume for Mark, which cites 1294 witnesses in favor of the omission and 254 in favor of the addition (although it does not note the support for the addition in the margin of GA 274).
marginal readings appear throughout this section of Mark, including the only other marginal reading marked with the looped lemniskos siglum, we cannot rule out the possibility that this note was intended to convey knowledge of the variant from an outside source. For now, the most conservative judgment, classifying the marginal reading as a correction, seems the best option.

Mark 13:18
Page: 96r
Siglum: looped lemniskos
Text: omit
Margin: μηδὲ σαββάτου
Hand: 1
Type: A

Collation:

| omit | 01 02 03 05 07 09 011 013 017 021 028 030 032 033 034 036 037 038 041 043 044 045 083 0211 f f<sup>6</sup> f<sup>6</sup> 2 22 27 71 75<sup>a</sup> 114 157 161 164 199 269 274 f<sup>T</sup> 291 371 372 431<sup>a</sup> 449 461 545 565 579 585 700 740 804 1005 1079 1093 1167 1192 1241 1273 1321 1325 1519 1574 L387 L773 L950 | μηδὲ σαββάτου 042 9 75C |
| παντες υμεις | 01 02 03 04 07 09 011 013 017 019 021 022 028 030 032 033 034 036 037 038 041 042 043 044 045 0211 f f<sup>6</sup> f<sup>6</sup> 2 9 22 27 71 75<sup>a</sup> 114 119 157 161 164 199 269 274 f<sup>T</sup> 291 371 372 431 449 461 517 545 565 585 700 726 740 804 892 954 1005 1079 1093 1167 1192 1200 1241 1273 1319 1321 1325 1519 1675 2786 L387 L773 L950 | παντες υμεις 05 f<sup>6</sup> 16 184 217 274A 544 579 1216 1243 1342 1365 1374 |

Comments:

Various additions harmonize this passage by degrees to Matt 24:20. The best-attested of these, which happens to be the one found in the margin of GA 274, is an imperfect harmonization. Most manuscripts, including those of the Byzantine text-type and the lectionary tradition, agree on the disharmonizing omission, so this note is unlikely to represent a correction towards GA 274’s Byzantine exemplar or a variant found in the lection containing this passage. With these two possibilities excluded, the remaining options are that the margin preserves a known variant reading from a non-Byzantine source or that it contains a harmonizing remark independently innovated by the scribe or reader responsible for it. The latter choice seems unlikely for two reasons: first, as has already been noted, the harmonization is not precise; and second, the small handful of witnesses to the marginal reading includes some manuscripts (GA 1342 in particular) known to agree with GA 274’s marginal readings elsewhere in Mark.

Mark 14:27a
Page: 98v
Siglum: diple periestigmene
Text: omit
Margin: υμεις
Hand: 1
Type: A

Collation:

| παντες υμεις | 01 02 03 04 07 09 011 013 017 019 021 022 028 030 032 033 034 036 037 038 041 042 043 044 045 0211 f f<sup>6</sup> f<sup>6</sup> 2 9 22 27 71 75<sup>a</sup> 114 119 157 161 164 199 269 274 f<sup>T</sup> 291 371 372 431 449 461 517 545 565 585 700 726 740 804 892 954 1005 1079 1093 1167 1192 1200 1241 1273 1319 1321 1325 1519 1675 2786 L387 L773 L950 | παντες υμεις 05 f<sup>6</sup> 16 184 217 274A 544 579 1216 1243 1342 1365 1374 |

Comments:

On transcriptional grounds, the shorter reading could have resulted from the longer by homoioteleuton, but the addition could have arisen through a desire for clarity in the subject or through harmonization to Matt 26:31. The shorter reading is found in the majority of
manuscripts, including the Byzantine text-type and the lectionaries, so the marginal reading is probably not a correction towards the text of a Byzantine exemplar or an indication of a lection-related variant. The marginal reading therefore seems to be a variant reading known to the scribe or reader responsible for the note.

Mark 14:27b
Page: 98v
Siglum: lemniskos
Text: omit
Margin: τ(ῆς) ποίμν(ης)
Hand: 1
Type: A
Collation:

omit 01 02 03 04 05 011 013 019 022 028 030 032 033 036 037 042 043 044 045 f1 f3 16 22
27 71 75 119 157 161 164 184 199 217 269 274T 371 372 431 461 517 544 545 565 585 700 726 740 892
954 1005 1167 1192 1200 1216 1241 1243 1273 1319 1321 1335 1365 1424 1519 1675
Comments:
The omission of τῆς ποίμνης has no obvious mechanical cause, and while the addition has support from a small number of Byzantine witnesses, the Byzantine text-type at large attests to the shorter reading, so the marginal note is unlikely to be a correction. Both readings are found in the lectionaries, so we have no indication that lectionary influence was the source of the marginal reading. The addition could be explained as an independently-proposed harmonization to the parallel in Matt 26:31, but since other manuscripts (including some that demonstrate consistent agreement with the GA 274 margin) are known to support the addition here, it is simpler to assume that the scribe or reader responsible for the note was aware of the reading from one of these sources. Again, the evidence commends the classification of the marginal note as an alternative to the majority reading preserved in the text.

Mark 14:47
Page: 99v
Siglum: ancora (rightward)
Text: ε
Margin: αι
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:
The marginal note changes the text from ἔπεσε to ἔπαισε. As the early and widespread manuscript support for both readings suggests, either reading is viable; we could say the disciple “struck” (ἔπαισε) the high priest’s servant with the sword or “fell upon” (ἔπεσε) him, in the sense of attacking him. Of course, while the viability of both readings explains why

49 Of the manuscripts collated for this study, those supporting ἔπαισε(ν) include GA 01, 04, 05, 019, 032, 036, 037, 038, 0211, f1, 179, 217, 274T, 346, 349, 371, 382, 472, 543, 579, 700, 726, 788, 826, 828, 1071, 1241, 1253, 1319, 1321, 1342, 1365, 1424, 1519, 1546, 1675, 2766, L387, and L950. Meanwhile, support for ἔπεσε(ν) includes GA 02, 03, 07, 017, 021, 022, 028, 030, 033, 041, 042, 044, 045, f1, f3, 2, 9, 16, 22, 27, 71, 75, 114, 119, 157, 161, 164, 184, 199, 269, 274A, 291, 372, 431, 449, 461, 517, 544, 545, 565, 585, 804, 892, 954, 1005, 1079, 1093, 1167, 1192, 1200, 1216, 1243, 1325, 2786, L773.
they are both well-preserved, the explanation of how either arose is simple: aural confusion between αι and ε would have made both words sound identical. The susceptibility of the scribe of GA 274 to this type of error, combined with the apparent prevalence of ἐπαισε(ν) among Byzantine witnesses, suggests that the marginal note was most likely a correction towards the manuscript’s Byzantine exemplar.

It is worth noting that the same textual issue barely took root in the parallel text of John 18:10. Thanks to Morrill’s comprehensive collation work in John 18,\(^5\) we can see that the vast majority of manuscripts preserved the reading ἐπαισε(ν), but ἐπεσε(ν) seems to have arose once early on, being preserved by the papyrus GA P66 and a few times independently later on.

Mark 16:1
Page: 103v
Siglum: arrow
Text: αὐτόν
Margin: τὸν ἴν
Hand: 1
Type: L
Comments:
The manuscript tradition variously alters the wording here for the purposes of clarity and piety. The majority of the tradition, including the Byzantine text-type, supports the reading αὐτόν preserved in the text of GA 274. The next-best attested reading is τὸν ἴν, found in the margin of GA 274. Smaller minorities support τὸν κ[π]ν, τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἴν, and τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κ[π]ν. While the manuscript evidence clearly supports αὐτόν as the earliest and most widely attested reading, τὸν ἴν finds support from several distinct textual groups, including f\(^3\), f\(^5\), part of the tradition of the Vulgate, and, perhaps most importantly, from the lectionary tradition.\(^5\) It is also worth noting that this verse occurs at the start of a lection, where clarification of this sort would be most expected. Given these factors, the best explanation is that the note indicates a variant derived from lectionary usage.

Mark 16:8
Page: 104r
Siglum: asteriskos (bottom margin). The marginal note is bordered on the left by a column of asteriskoi, as pictured below.

---

\(^5\) The lectionaries that support this reading include GA L60, L142, L211, L387, L563, L680, L770, L773, L848, L950, L957, and L1126. Those that support the common reading include GA L12, L627, and L1692. Meanwhile, GA L547 is a rare witness to the reading τὸν κν. Further investigation into the distribution of these readings among the lectionaries may be necessary to confirm my judgment on this marginal reading.
Appendix: Commentary on All Marginal Variants in GA 274

Text: omit

Margin: πάντα δὲ τὰ παρηγγελμένα τοῖς πε(ρὶ) τὸν Πέτρον συντόμως ἐξήγειλαν· μετὰ δὲ ταύτα καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ ἵς ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ ἀχρὶ δύσεως, ἐξαπέστειλ(εν)· δι αὐτῶν τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἄφθαρτον κήρυγμα τῆς αἰωνίου σριας ἀμήν

Hand: 1
Type: A
Collation:

omit 01 02 03 04 05 07 011 017 021 028 030 032 033 036 038 041 042 0211 \( f^6 \) 2 9 16 22 27 33 71 75 114 119 157 164 199 217 269 274 \( T \) 291 371 372 431 446 461 517 544 545 554 585 700 726 740 804 892 954 1005 1079 1093 1192 1200 1216 1243 1273 1319 1325 1342 1365 1519 1574 1675 2786 L387 L627 L773 L844 L846 L848 L849 L1126 L2211 | add intermediate ending 019 044 083 099 274A 579 L1602

Comments:

Since the only portion of text marked with asteriskoi is the intermediate ending, and since every Greek manuscript containing the intermediate ending includes it in addition to the long ending, the above collation does not concern itself with the sparse but early manuscript support for the short ending (GA 01 and 03). As the introduction and main part of this study have reiterated, the primary reason GA 274 has received any scholarly attention at all is the presence of the intermediate ending of Mark in its margin at this location. The intermediate ending is well-known and has received ample treatment in the literature, so we will not detain ourselves with further discussion here. It will suffice to say that the rarity of the intermediate ending makes the classification of the marginal note virtually certain. The use of asteriskoi suggests that the author of this note considered the intermediate ending to be spurious, although worthy of mention in the margin.

Mark 16:9
Page: 104r
Siglum: arrow
Text: omit
Margin: ὁ ἵς
Hand: 1
Type: L
Comments:

The addition of ὁ ἵς after ἀναστὰς δὲ has the effect of clarifying the subject of the action described later in the verse. As Jesus is not introduced before this point, the transition from v. 8 to v. 9 is awkward without such an addition, even in continuous-text manuscripts. The same is doubly true of the lectionaries that contain a lection starting at this verse. While we could view this marginal note as a reference to a variant reading found in other continuous-text manuscripts, the greater need and the consequent ubiquity of the addition in the lectionaries makes a slightly stronger case that the margin is referring to a reading borrowed from the lectionary tradition.

52 See the sources cited in the introduction.
53 This is supported by the continuous-text manuscripts known to make the addition; these include GA 045C (which places ὁ ἵς before δὲ), 0211, \( f^{25} \), \( f^{56} \), 2C, 27C, 274A, 515, 545, 585, 740, 954, 1005, 1071, 1200C, 1216C, 1241, 1273, 1342, 1365, 1519C, 1574, and 1675.
54 Most, such as GA L63, L387, L547, L627, L773, L848, L849, and L1126, add ὁ ἵς; others, including GA L844, L846, and L2211, add ὁ ἵς ἡμῶν ἵς ὁ χή.
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Luke 2:21
Page: 113r
Siglum: ancora (upward)
Text: αὐτόν
Margin: τὸ παιδίον
Hand: first hand
Type: L
Comments:
The readings in GA 274’s text and margin are both early and widely attested. The earliest manuscript support for αὐτόν comes from the fourth-century majuscules GA 01 and 03, while τὸ παιδίον finds fifth-century support in GA 05. In terms of versional and patristic evidence, we can push these dates a bit farther: αὐτόν has early support from the Old Latin tradition, and τὸ παιδίον has third-century support from Origen, at least according to some Latin copies of his works. The majority of the manuscript evidence, including that of the Byzantine text-type, is divided between the two readings, so the main exemplar of GA 274 could plausibly have preserved either variant.

Turning to transcriptional probabilities, τὸ παιδίον could have been shortened to αὐτόν by a scribe copying the larger phrase absentmindedly from memory, or αὐτόν could have been expanded to τὸ παιδίον for the sake of narrative clarity. Since either reading could have been the text of GA 274’s Byzantine exemplar, it follows that the marginal reading could be a correction towards the text of this exemplar in either case.

Ultimately, however, the hypothesis that requires the fewest auxiliary assumptions and coheres best with external and transcriptional evidence is that the marginal reading indicates a lection-based variant. Although two of the lectionaries collated for this study, L627 and L1126, preserve the reading of the GA 274 text, the lectionary tradition at large reads τὸ παιδίον here. The transcriptional argument for expanding αὐτόν to τὸ παιδίον for the sake of narrative clarity is particularly relevant to the lectionary context, as the lection containing this passage begins one verse earlier, and that verse offers no clarification on the referent of αὐτόν in this verse.

Luke 2:51
Page: 114v
Siglum: arrow
Text: καὶ ἡ
Margin: ἡ δὲ
Hand: first hand

55 The reading αὐτόν is found in GA 01, 02, 03, 017, 019, 027, 028, 030, 031, 033, 034, 037, 038, 039, 040, 041, 044, f, f, 16, 22, 27, 114, 161, 274T, 291, 371, 449, 461, 465, 545, 579, 585, 700, 726, 804, 892, 954, 1005, 1071, 1079, 119, 1200, 1241, 1243f (αυτων), 1319, 1321, 1365, 1424, 1519, 1675, L627, and L1126, with the more grammatically correct reading αὐτο occurring later in GA 9, 184, 1216f (αυτω), and 1342. Meanwhile, τὸ παιδίον is attested in GA 05, 07, 011, 013, 021, 045, 053, f, 2, 33, 71, 75, 119, 157, 164, 199, 217, 269, 274A, 372, 431, 1093, 1167, 1325, 2786, L63, L387, L773, L848, L849. The apparent conflation αὐτὸ τὸ παιδίον appears to be a later development, appearing only in GA 036.

56 This can be deduced from The Gospel according to St. Luke: Part One, Chapters 1–12, ed. the American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984), 43, where the “LECT” siglum is not listed after any of the variants to τὸ παιδίον in the negative apparatus.
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Type: L
Comments:
The textual contest is between the phrase καὶ ἡ μηρ αὐτοῦ and ἡ δὲ μηρ αὐτοῦ. Transcrip-
tionally speaking, it would not be unreasonable for a scribe to have changed ἡ δὲ to καὶ ἡ subconscio-
nously following a sequence of several phrases beginning with καὶ, so if the Byzantine exemplar of GA 274 had read ἡ δὲ originally, then the marginal note could be explained as a correction back to this reading. The external evidence for the marginal reading, however, appears to be slim, although it is surprisingly well-supported by the lectionaries.57 It is unclear, even with additional collation data, how much of the Byzantine tradition supports the mar-
ginal reading. Of the sixteen ᴾ witnesses included in the IGNTP collation of the first half of Luke,58 three read ἡ δὲ, and the corrector of one changes καὶ ἡ to ἡ δὲ.59 This sample is too small to be conclusive, but thankfully, the IGNTP collation does confirm that the lectionary tradition as a whole supports ἡ δὲ. Since this body of witnesses is far more abundant than a set of three manuscripts and a correction, we can tentatively conclude that the marginal note in GA 274 was meant to record a variant either read or remembered from the lection containing this passage.

Luke 3:38
Page: 117r
Siglum: chi, asteriskos. The note is technically not in the margin, but it fills in the space left over at the end of the second column of the Lukan genealogy.

Text: omit
Margin: γενεαὶ οζ
Hand: first hand
Type: S
Comments:
Given its surrounding sigla, the note is surely intended to be a scholion on the genealogy. It offers a total count of seventy-seven generations, which can be reached by including Jesus as the first entry or including God as the last. (Based on the two-column layout of the gene-
alogy, the scribe of GA 274 followed the latter procedure.) Similar notes appear in two other manuscripts collated for this study: GA 9 (which adds a running count before each generation, placing οζ with τοῦ θυ) and 461 (which adds ομοι γενεαι οζ, "seventy-seven generations in all," in its margin).

58 Gospel according to St. Luke: Part One, ix–x, lists the following minuscules as having the ᴾ profile: GA 2, 60, 123, 158, 343, 475, 577, 669, 1195, 1203, 1247, 1338, 1351, 1352, 1452, and 1458.
59 The specific witnesses are GA 2, 475C, 1338, and 1452.
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Page: 118v
Siglum: ancora (upward)
Text: omit
Margin: ὅτι οὐδεὶς προφήτης· δεκτός ἐστιν. ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ· ἐπ᾽ ἀληθείας δὲ. λέγω ύμῖν
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:
The omission in the text is an obvious case of homoioarcton from one λέγω ύμῖν to the next.

Luke 5:19
Page: 121r
Siglum: No siglum appears next to the marginal note or the corresponding place in the text. The reading appears by itself in the margin, as pictured below.

Text: ποίας
Margin: πῶς
Hand: 1b
Type: A
Collation:

Comments:
The reading with the earliest attestation from Greek manuscripts is clearly ποίας. It is also the reading with the most Byzantine attestation, but the support in this case is far from unanimous. The reading πῶς, found in the margin of GA 274, is supported by a significant bloc of the majority text, including f₇₆, and it has fifth-century support from two Old Latin witnesses.

The marginal reading is unlikely to be a correction to the text for two reasons: first, the mainstream Byzantine text-type supports the reading of the text, so the main exemplar of GA 274 most likely preserved this reading; and second, while ποίας and πῶς are similar words in appearance and sound, no single mechanical error explains them both, so the odds of the scribe of GA 274 changing πῶς to ποίας by mistake are low. Likewise, lectionary influence is unlikely to be the culprit, because the lectionary tradition supports the reading ποίας. The most likely explanation, then, is that the marginal reading arose from a scribe or reader's knowledge of a well-attested variant reading.

Luke 5:39
Page: 122v
Siglum: lemniskos
Text: omit
Margin: ollov
Appendix: Commentary on All Marginal Variants in GA 274

Hand: 1
Type: A
Collation:

\textit{omit} P₄ P₇₅ 0₁ 0₂ 0₃ 0₄ 0₇ 0₉ 0₁₇ 0₁₉ 0₂₁ 0₂₇ 0₂₈ 0₃₀ 0₃₁ 0₃₂ 0₃₃ 0₃₄ 0₃₆ 0₃₇ 0₃₈ 0₃₉ 0₄₁ 0₄₄ 0₄₅ 0₂₁₁ f₃ f₆ f₈ ² ⁹ ₁₆ ₂₂ ₂₇ ₃₃ ₇₁ ₇₅ ₁₁₄ ₁₁₉ ₁₅₇ ₁₆₁ ₁₆₄ ₁₈₄ ₁₉₉ ₂₁₇ ₂₆₉ ₂₇₄ᵀ ₂₉₁ ₃₇₂ ₄₃₁ ₄₄₉ ₄₆₁ ₅₁₇ ₅₄₄ ₅₄₅ ₅₅₆ ₅₇₉ ₅₈₅ ₇₀₀ ₇₂₆ ₇₄₀ ₈₀₄ ₈₉₂ ₉₅₄ ₁₀₅₅ ₁₀₇₁ ₁₀₇₉ ₁₀₉₃ ₁₁₆₇ ₁₁₉²vid ₁₂₀₀ ₁₂₁₆ ₁₂₄₁ ₁₂₄₃ ₁₂₇₃ ₁₃₁₉ ₁₃₂₁ ₁₃₂₅ ₁₃₆₅ ₁₄₂₄ ₁₅₁₉ ₁₅₇₄ ₁₆₇₅ ₂₇₈₆ L₃₈₇ L₇₇₃ | \textit{add} οἰνον 2₇₄A 3₇₁ ₁₃₄₂ L₉₅₀

Comments:

The classification of this marginal reading leaves little room for doubt. The clarifying addition of οἶνον after παλαιὸν is remarkably rare, being preserved in only a few other Greek manuscripts. Yet in spite of its rarity, the marginal reading is also demonstrably ancient on the basis of versional evidence: the Syriac Peshitta (fifth century) and both the Arabic and Persian translations of the Diatessaron (which itself is dated to the second century) attest to it.

\textbf{Luke 6:2}

Page: 122v
Siglum: arrow
Text: \textit{omit}
Margin: ποιεῖν
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:

While the omission of ποιεῖν after ἔξεστιν has very early support,⁶⁰ the sparsity of its witnesses compared to the unanimous Byzantine support for the addition, the general textual dissimilarity of GA 2₇₄ to its witnesses, and the easy transcriptional explanation for the omission in terms of homoioteleuton from -ιν to -ιν all come together to support the classification of the marginal note as a correction to a common scribal error in the text.

\textbf{Luke 6:10}

Page: 123r
Siglum: γράφεται abbreviation
Text: ὁ δὲ ἐποίησεν
Margin: κ(αὶ) ἐξέτεινεν
Hand: 1
Type: A
Collation:

ο δὲ ἐποιησε(ν) 0₂ 0₃ 0₇ 0₁₉ 0₂₁ 0₂₈ 0₃₀ 0₃₁ 0₃₄ 0₃₆ 0₃₇ 0₃₈ 0₃₉ 0₄₄ 0₄₅ 2 2₂ ₂₇ ₃₃ ₇₁ ₁₁₉ ₁₆₁Ṭ ₁₆₄ ₁₉₉ ₂₁₇ ₂₆₉ ₂₇₄ᵀ ₂₉₁ ₃₇₂ ₄₄₉ ₄₆₁ ₅₁₇ ₅₈₅ ₇₀₀ ₈₉₂ ₉₅₄ ₁₀₅₅ ₁₀₇₁ ₁₀₇₉ ₁₁₆₇ ₁₁₉²vid ₁₂₀₀ ₁₂₁₆ ₁₂₄₁ ₁₂₄₃ ₁₂₇₃ ₁₃₁₉ ₁₃₂₁ ₁₃₂₅ ₁₃₆₅ ₁₄₂₄ ₁₅₁₉ ₁₅₇₄ ₁₆₇₅ ₂₇₈₆ L₃₈₇ L₇₇₃ | o δε εποιησε(ν) 0₂ 0₃ 0₇ 0₁₉ 0₂₁ 0₂₈ 0₃₀ 0₃₁ 0₃₄ 0₃₆ 0₃₇ 0₃₈ 0₃₉ 0₄₄ 0₄₅ 2 2₂ ₂₇ ₃₃ ₇₁ ₁₁₈ ₁₆₁ | 0 δε εποιησεν ουτως 0₁₇ 0₄₁ f₆ ⁹ ₁₆ ₇₅ ₁₁₄ ₁₄₈ 3₇₂ ₄₃₁ ₅₄₄ ₅₆₅ ₇₂₆ ₈₀₄ ₁₀₇₉ ₁₁₆₇ ₁₂₀₀ ₁₂₁₆ ₁₂₄₁ ₁₂₄₃ ₁₃₁₉ L₅₄₇ | ος ευθεως εποιησε(ν) 7₄₀ | και εξετεινε(ν) 0₉ 0₃₂ f(… εξετεινε) 2₇₄A ₅₁₇ ₁₄₂₄ ₁₆₇₅ L₉₅₀ | o δε εξετεινε(ν) 0₁ f(… εξετεινε) 0₃₃ 0₂₁₁ f₆ ₁₅₇ ₁₆₁Α ₁₀₇₁ ₂₅₄₂ | o δε ειπε(ν) ₅₇₉*vid

Comments:

The majority of manuscripts, including the Byzantine text-type, supports the reading found in the text of GA 2₇₄, with a small group smoothing the reading further with the addition of

---

⁶₀ It is found in GA P₄, P₇₅²vid, 0₃, 0₅, 0₁₉, 0₂₇, 2₇₄ᵀ, and 7₀₀, as well as several versions, including the Old Latin, Latin Vulgate, and Sahidic Coptic.
Meanwhile, two small groups of manuscripts, both with early manuscript support, harmonize the text to the parallels of Matt 12:13 and Mark 3:5 to varying degrees by changing the verb to ἔξετεινεν.

The support of the Byzantine text-type for ὁ δὲ ἐποίησε(ν) and the support of the lectionary tradition for ὁ δὲ ἐποίησεν οὕτως, combined with the relative rarity of the marginal reading, would already make a strong case that the marginal note is an indication of a textual variant. Moreover, since the siglum is a common one used to indicate an alternative reading, there is no room for uncertainty on the classification.

Luke 6:29
Page: 124v
Siglum: lemniskos
Text: ε
Margin: αι
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:

A few scattered manuscripts (GA 07, 032, 371, and L387) join GA 274 in reading ἔροντός where the vast majority of witnesses have αἴροντός. It seems unlikely that the scribe had anything other than the common reading in mind at this location; while ἐρωτῶντός would be viable in the context (changing the sense of the phrase from “the one taking your coat” to “the one asking for your coat”), the scribe would have had to make a compound error involving two types of aural confusion and haplography to end up with ἔροντός. A far simpler explanation is that the reading of the text was an error due to confusion between the sounds αι and ε (a mistake common to the scribe of GA 274), with the correction to the common reading being supplied in the margin.

Luke 8:15
Page: 130r
Siglum: ancora (upward)
Text: omit
Margin: ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνει· ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω
Hand: 1
Type: L
Comments:

While this addition at the end of the verse has reasonably diverse support, the omission has the earliest and most widespread attestation. The most notable support for the addition comes from the lectionary tradition, which employs it as a standard explicit to lections centered on Jesus’s parables. The reading found in the margin of GA 274, therefore, likely ended up there, as it did in many other continuous-text manuscripts, by way of lectionary influence.

61 Gospel according to St. Luke: Part One, 169 lists most of its collated manuscripts, as well as many correctors, adopting one of ten forms of this addition.
62 Alternatively, the addition could also be explained as an assimilation to the appearance of the same phrase in 8:8, but given its coincidence with the end of a lection and its presence throughout the lectionary tradition, the explanation of lectionary influence lends itself much more readily to the classification of this marginal note.
Luke 8:41
Page: 132r
Siglum: ancora (upward)
Text: omit
Margin: εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸ(ν) οἶκον αὐτ(οῦ)
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:
The omission is not known to occur in any other manuscript, and it can be plausibly explained as an instance of homoioteleuton from the preceding αὐτὸν to αὐτοῦ. The marginal note is surely intended as a correction to this common scribal error.

Luke 9:12
Page: 133v
Siglum: ancora (upward)
Text: omit
Margin: ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν
Hand: first hand or 1 (the note is written in bolder weight and in a much darker ink than the text and most of the paratextual elements are, but it shares many elements with the first hand and hand 1; curiously, the script shifts from the minuscule of the first hand to the majuscule of hand 1 and back over the course of three lines)
Type: C
Comments:
No other continuous-text manuscript collated for this study omits this phrase at the beginning of the verse. The immediate context does not provide an obvious mechanical explanation for the omission, but the lectionary tradition does: the incipit τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ takes the place of the phrase in question in most lectionaries. The most straightforward explanation for the omission is that the scribe of GA 274 was copying from or consulting a lectionary at the beginning of this verse and, in the process of copying the text after the incipit, left out the original beginning of the verse. The corrector (who was likely the same scribe working at a later stage of the manuscript’s production, given the similarity of the script and the change in pen and ink) then noticed the omission and added it back in the margin as a correction.

Luke 9:35
Page: 135r
Siglum: γράφεται abbreviation
Text: ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἐν ὧ εὐδόκησα
Margin: ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος
Hand: 1
Type: A
Collation:
ο αγαπητος 02 04* 07 011 013 017 022 024 027 028 030 031 032 033 034 036 037 039 041 045 0211f (… αγαπητος) fP 2 9 16 22A 33 114 119 157 161 184 199 217 269 291 371 431 449 461 545 565 585 700 726 740 804 954 1071 1079 1093 1167 1192 1200 1216 1243 1273 1319 1325 1424 1519 1675 2542 L63f (… αγαπητος) L844 | ο αγαπητος εν ω ευδοκησα / ευδοκισα 04C3f (… ευδοκισα) 05 021 044 27 71 75 164 274T 544 1574 L387 L627 L773 L848 L849 | ο εκλεκτος P45 P75 01 03 019 040 274A 579 (… εκλεκτος) 892 1241 1342 2786 L1126f (… εκλεκτος) | ο εκλεκτος 038 fP 22T 1005 1365 L547 (ουτος εστιν αληθως ο εκλεκτος μου υιος)
Appendix: Commentary on All Marginal Variants in GA 274

Comments:
The reading preserved in the margin of GA 274 is rare and demonstrably ancient, but even if this were not the case, the classification of the marginal note would be easy in this case; the siglum used proves that the note is meant to indicate knowledge of a variant reading.

Luke 9:39
Page: 135r
Siglum: arrow
Text: μόγις
Margin: μόλις
Hand: 1
Type: A
Collation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>μόγις</th>
<th>P75 01 02 04 05 07 011 013 017 019f</th>
<th>021 028 030 031 033 034 036 039 041 044 045 0115</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>μόλις</td>
<td>P01 02 03 04 05 07 09 011 013 017 021 028 030 031 032 033 034 036 037 038 039 045 0211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both readings are synonymous, sharing the meaning “with great difficulty”; μόγις dominates both the early and late branches of the manuscript tradition of Luke, while μόλις is known to occur more frequently in post-Homeric writings. The sparsity of manuscript support for μόλις makes a sufficiently strong case for the classification of the marginal note as indicating knowledge of a variant reading.

Luke 9:50
Page: 136r
Siglum: whisker (upward)
Text: omit
Margin: οὐ γὰρ ἐστιν καθ’ ὑμῶν
Hand: 1
Type: A
Collation:

| omit | P75 01 02 03 04 05 07 09 011 013 017 021 028 030 031 032 033 034 036 037 038 039 041 045 0211 |
|-------|--------------------------------------|----------------|

Besides having third-century support from GA P45 and P75 and fourth-century support from GA 01 and 03, it finds indirect support in the fifth century from Cyril of Alexandria, who offers the conflation ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος. Textual critics also consider it to be authorial on intrinsic and transcriptional grounds. Metzger asserts, “The original Lukan reading is undoubtedly ἐκλελεγμένος, which occurs in a quasi-technical sense only here in the New Testament” (Textual Commentary, 124). Comfort goes into greater detail, remarking on the connection of this reading to the context and Luke's broader narrative goals: “The reading of the [critical] texts, supported by the four earliest manuscripts … is without question the one Luke wrote. The wording in Luke reveals the twofold position of Jesus as both God's Son and the chosen One—that is, the Father chose his Son to be the Messiah. Luke's wording is reminiscent of Ps 2:7 and especially of Isa. 42:1 (LXX), which speaks of the messianic Servant…. This entirely suits the context which speaks of Jesus’s ‘exodus from Jerusalem’” (9:31) (Commentary, 219–20).

LSJ, s.vv. “μόγις,” “μόλις.”
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Here, the margin of GA 274 preserves a rare Alexandrian reading. As P45 indicates, variations in this saying have an early and widespread history: GA 7, 60, 267, 1630, 1654, and L211 and L1642 (both in their second lections containing this passage) feature the same addition, but with ἡμῶν in place of ὑμῶν; GA L184, in its first lection containing this passage, adds only οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν; GA L12, L80, and L1642 make no addition in their first lections containing this passage, but include the addition with either ὑμῶν or ἡμῶν in the second lection. Moreover, GA L1642 substitutes οὐ γάρ ἐστιν καθ’ ἡμῶν· ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐστιν for the next phrase in its first lection containing this passage. As these clarifications regarding the lectionary support make clear, even within the lectionary tradition, many witnesses with two lections containing this passage transmitted different readings in each lection.

The omission could easily be explained as an omission by homioiarcton; the added phrase starts with οὐ γάρ and the next phrase with the similar-looking δὲ γὰρ. The transcriptional probability of such an error supports the classification of the marginal note as a correction, but the external evidence does not. The Byzantine text is unanimous in omitting here, so the main exemplar of GA 274 almost surely did, too. That said, even if a scribe or reader did write the marginal note as a correction to an easily explained scribal error, the source of the correction was probably a manuscript distinct from GA 274’s primary Byzantine exemplar.

Luke 9:52
Page: 136r
Siglum: No siglum appears in the margin or text. The marginal reading is written at the end of the line of text, barely extending into the margin. The reading is pictured below.

Text: omit
Margin: τόπον
Hand: 1, although the ink appears identical to that of the first hand
Type: A
Collation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>omit</th>
<th>P45</th>
<th>P75</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
<th>07</th>
<th>09</th>
<th>011</th>
<th>013</th>
<th>017</th>
<th>019</th>
<th>021</th>
<th>028</th>
<th>030</th>
<th>031</th>
<th>032</th>
<th>033</th>
<th>034</th>
<th>036</th>
<th>037</th>
<th>038</th>
<th>039</th>
<th>040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>041</th>
<th>044</th>
<th>045</th>
<th>0211</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>71</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>114</th>
<th>119</th>
<th>157</th>
<th>161</th>
<th>164</th>
<th>184</th>
<th>199</th>
<th>217</th>
<th>269</th>
<th>274</th>
<th>291</th>
<th>371</th>
<th>372</th>
<th>449</th>
<th>461</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>1273</td>
<td>1319</td>
<td>1321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325</td>
<td>1365</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>2786</td>
<td>L387</td>
<td>L773</td>
<td>L950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| add | τόπον | 274A | after αυτω τοπον | 1342 | (before αυτω) |

Comments:
The addition is exceedingly rare, being found in only one other manuscript, and there one word earlier. Since no other Byzantine witnesses or lectionaries are known to preserve it, it is highly unlikely that the scribe of GA 274 was correcting the text to a longer reading found in
the Byzantine exemplar of GA 274 or in any lection containing this passage. This leaves two possibilities: the addition of τόπον was an innovation independently made by this scribe and the scribe of GA 1342 to fill in a phrase lacking an object, or this scribe supplied the addition from a non-Byzantine exemplar.

A few factors favor the proposal that the addition was made independently. First and most obviously, the addition is made in slightly different places in both GA 274A and 1342. Second, τόπον is a general term that lends itself well to the context, and after ἑτοιμάσαι, it could have come to mind readily for anyone familiar with John 14:2–3. Finally, the addition is not offered as a formal marginal note; no sigla are used, and the addition’s placement is more at the end of the line than in the margin.

On the other hand, the addition is written in a noticeably different script than the rest of the text when it could just as easily have been written in the usual minuscule hand. One might argue that if the scribe had made the addition hastily, then the majuscule script might have been the result of absentmindedness or a judgment that the word would be more quickly written in majuscule than in minuscule, but the same scenario would also explain why the scribe did not write τόπον distinctly in the margin and add sigla in the appropriate places. Meanwhile, the strongest argument against the hypothesis that GA 274 and 1342 made the addition independently is that when the GA 274 margin departs from the Byzantine text to agree with a minority of manuscripts in Luke, GA 1342 is typically found in that minority (see 5:39, 9:35, 9:50). Thus, while the independent emergence of this variant remains a possibility, a classification of this marginal reading as type A is preferable given our current knowledge.

**Luke 10:36**

Page: 139r

Siglum: *omega* (inverted, dot above)

Text: *omit*

Margin: τοῦτων

Hand: 1

Type: C

Comments:

There are several shorter readings in this unit: τίνα οὖν, found in GA 05; τίς οὖν τῶν τρίων, found in f 95s, 16, 164, 274T, and 804; τίς οὖν τούτων τρίων, found in GA 036; τίς τοῦτων τρίων, found in GA 01* and 372; and τίς τούτων τῶν τρίων, found in GA P45, P75, 01C1, 03, 019, 040, 044, 070, f 95s, 892, 1342, and L2211. In contrast to these shorter readings, the most common reading by far is the fuller reading τίς οὖν τοῦτων τῶν τρίων, preserved in the margin of GA 274 and in virtually all other witnesses. Furthermore, the word τοῦτων is in double jeopardy of omission by haplography, with the preceding οὖν furnishing an occasion for homoioteleuton and the following τῶν for homoioarcton. Based on these considerations, it is perfectly reasonable to conclude that the marginal note was a correction to a very probable scribal error.

---

65 GA 1342 is dated in the *Liste* to the thirteenth or fourteenth century, so it could not have been a secondary exemplar for GA 274. Possibly, the scribe of GA 274 had access to an exemplar of GA 1342. Such an exemplar could have added τόπον in either of the positions found in GA 274 and GA 1342.

66 According to Houghton et al., *Palimpsest Catena of Codex Zacynthius*, an unattributed scholion in the commentary catena (302-1) of GA 040 paraphrases the question without the οὖν. Meanwhile, a scholion attributed to Origen (302-2) directly quotes the text in the same form as that of the lemma.

67 The exceptions among the witnesses collated for this study include GA 017 and 038, with the defective form τίς οὖν τοῦτον τῶν τρίων; GA 1325, with the similar defective form τίς οὖν τούτων τοῦ τρίων; L950, with the slightly fuller τίς οὖν ἐκ τούτων τῶν τρίων; L773, with τίς οὗτων τῶν τρίων; and 700*, with εἷς οὖν τούτων τῶν τρίων.
Luke 11:29
Page: 141v
Siglum: omega (dots above and below)
Text: omit
Margin: γενεὰ
Hand: 1
Type: L
Comments:
The majority of the manuscript tradition, including the Byzantine text-type, omits here, but the addition has early and widespread support. While this makes a classification of the marginal note as a correction unlikely, it does make it more likely that a scribe or reader could have come across the addition in another source and noted it in the margin. In this case, however, a simpler explanation for the marginal note exists: a lection begins in this verse, and the lectionary tradition uniformly attests to the addition. It seems most likely that a scribe made a marginal note of this change in the lectionary text after accounting for the usual changes involving the incipit at the very beginning of the verse.

Luke 12:21
Page: 144r
Siglum: whisker (stroked)
Text: omit
Margin: ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνει· ὁ ἔχω(ν) ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω
Hand: 1
Type: L
Comments:
As the discussion of the same marginal note in Matt 25:29 and Luke 8:15 has already established, this was a common explicit for lections involving parables. This is the most probable explanation for the marginal note.

Luke 12:49
Page: 145v
Siglum: ancora (upward)
Text: εἰς
Margin: ἐπὶ
Hand: 1
Type: L
Comments:
The readings εἰς τὴν γῆν and ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν both have early and widespread support, and the Byzantine text-type is divided between them, so the marginal note could plausibly be a

---

68 It is found in GA P75, 01, 02, 03, 05, 019, 033, 038, 040, 044, 070, f₁, f₂, 22, 33, 157, 164, 274A, 700, 892, 1005, 1071, 1192, 1241, 1342, 1365, 2786, L387, and L773. Gospel according to St. Luke: Part One, 257 indicates that the lectionary tradition and various versions (both the Old Latin and the Vulgate, the margin of the Harklean Syriac, the Sahidic and Bohairic Coptic, the Armenian, the Georgian, and some manuscripts of the Ethiopic) also attest to the addition.

69 The support for εἰς τὴν γῆν includes GA P45, 05, 07, 027, 028, 031, 034, 036, 037, 045, f₁, 2, 9, 16, 22, 75, 119, 161, 164, 184, 199, 217, 274T, 291, 371, 372, 431, 449, 461, 545, 565, 585, 740, 954, 1005, 1093, 1167, 1192, 1216, 1243, 1325, 1342, 1365, 1574, and L387. The support for ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν includes GA P75, 01, 02, 03, 017, 019, 021, 022, 030, 032, 033, 038, 041, 044, 070, 0211, f₁, f₂, 27, 33, 71, 114, 157, 269,
correction or an indication of known textual variation. Two other factors, however, together make a stronger case for its classification as a lectionary-related note: first, a lection begins at this verse, so this variation unit would be especially vulnerable to lection-related rewording; and second, the lectionary tradition is united in reading ἐπὶ instead of εἰς. While this does not necessarily imply that the ἐπὶ reading originated in the lectionary tradition, it does offer a compelling case for how it ended up in the margin of GA 274, since, as we have already observed, the manuscript features many other marginal notes best explained as arising from lectionary influence.

Luke 14:24
Page: 149v
Siglum: whisker (downward)
Text: omit
Margin: πολλοί γάρ εἰσιν κλητοὶ ὀλίγοι δὲ, ἐκλεκτοὶ
Hand: 1
Type: L
Comments:
While the earliest manuscripts and a wide variety of later manuscripts support the omission,70 the Byzantine text-type is closely divided between both readings. It is also worth noting that GA 03 has a distigme on this line, which could potentially indicate that the variant was known to scribes around the time GA 03 was produced. Again, the evidence allows for the possibilities that the marginal note was a correction or that it was an indication of a known variant reading. But the placement of the addition right after the τέλος marker on this line in GA 274, coupled with the predominance of the addition in the lectionary tradition, makes a compelling case that, at least in GA 274, the addition was intended for lectionary usage.

Luke 17:35
Page: 155v
Siglum: asteriskos
Text: omit
Margin: ἔσονται β ἀλήθουσαι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτ(ό)· ἡ μία παραληφθήσεται, κ(αὶ) ἡ ἑτέρα ἀφεθήσετ(αι)
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:
The only other collated manuscripts that omit this verse are GA 01*, 032*,71 1216, and 2786. The IGNTP Luke collation adds only GA 123 and 1352 to the list. Versional evidence for the omission is equally sparse, consisting of one Old Latin manuscript, one Vulgate manuscript, one copy of the Arabic Diatessaron, and the Persian Diatessaron. Even more curiously, the addition of verse 36 (a parallel of Matt 24:40) by a minority of witnesses is a better-attested variant than the omission of verse 35, but GA 274 omits verse 36 without comment. All of this

70 These include GA P45, P75, 01, 02, 03, 05, 07T, 017, 019, 021*, 022, 024, 027, 028T, 031T, 030, 032, 037, 038, 041, 044T, f1, f6, 22*, 114, 119, 157, 217, 269, 274T, 291, 372, 545, 565, 585, 461T, 726, 892T, 1005, 1079T, 1093, 1192, 1200T, 1241, 1319, 1321T, 1325, 1342, 1365, 1424T, 1519T, 1675T, and 2786.
71 The first hand of GA 032 started to write v. 36 after v. 34 but then erased the beginning of v. 36, added v. 35 at the start of the next page, and added v. 36 afterwards.
indicates that the omission of verse 35 in the text was likely a scribal mishap caused by homoioiteleuton following verse 34 and that the note in the margin was written to correct it.

The only remaining uncertainty is why the scribe or reader responsible for the marginal reading marked it with asteriskoi. Did this person truly consider Luke 17:35 to be spurious? This seems unlikely, since by the tenth century the inclusion of the verse would have been so widespread as to be present in most, if not all, of the manuscripts available to the author of the marginal note. Alternatively, the explanation offered for the use of asteriskoi in our discussion of Matt 23:18 might apply here; if GA 274’s exemplar also lacked verse 35, then the asteriskoi might indicate that the reading was not originally present and had to be supplied from another copy.

Luke 18:1
Page: 155v
Siglum: arrow
Text: προσέχειν
Margin: προσεύχ(εσ)θαι
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:

The verb προσέχω (to be cautious), while viable in the context, is not known to occur in any other manuscript at this location and can be explained as arising from the common reading προσεύχεσθαι due to two factors: the similarity in both words’ beginnings and the frequency with which both Matthew and Luke employ the verb προσέχω. An absentminded scribe could easily make such a substitution. For this reason, the evidence seems to favor the classification of the marginal note as a correction to an error in the text.

Luke 20:19
Page: 161r
Siglum: ancora (downward)
Text: omit
Margin: τὸν λαόν
Hand: 1
Type: L
Comments:

The external evidence here is divided. The earliest manuscripts, part of the Byzantine text-type, and the lectionary tradition add τὸν λαόν after καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν. A much smaller group of manuscripts adds τὸν ὄχλον instead. The remainder of the manuscript tradition, including a substantial part of the Byzantine text-type, adds nothing.

Transcriptionally, the omission could have arisen from any of the three longer readings by homoioiteleuton following the previous phrase, and since the longer reading featuring τὸν
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λαόν is supported by part of the Byzantine tradition, it is certainly possible that the marginal reading is a correction based on a Byzantine exemplar. In this case, however, the lectionary tradition, which is united in its support for the marginal reading, offers an even more compelling explanation: since this verse is the start of a lection, the addition of τὸν λαόν would provide clarity and context following the verb. Thus, while there is reasonable internal and external evidence for the claim that the marginal reading is a correction, there is stronger evidence that the marginal note is a reference to a lection-related change.

**Luke 21:4**  
Page: 162v  
Siglum: ancora (upward)  
Text: *omit*  
Margin: ταῦτ(α) λέγ(ων) ἐφώνει· ὁ ἔχ(ων) ὄταλακαίν ἀκουέτ(ω)  
Hand: 1  
Type: L  
Comments:  
Again, the best explanation for the marginal note is lectionary usage, the marginal reading being a common explicit for lections involving parables.

**Luke 21:24**  
Page: 163v  
Siglum: lemniskos  
Text: ἐ  
Margin: αί  
Hand: 1  
Type: C  
Comments:  
The marginal note changes μαχέρας to μαχαίρας. Since the former is obviously a misspelling of the latter due to the aural similarity of αί and ε (a common mistake for the scribe of GA 274), and since no other manuscript collated for this study attests to this spelling, the marginal note undoubtedly indicates a correction.

**Luke 22:43–44**  
Page: 166v  
Siglum: asteriskos. Both verses are bordered by a column of asteriskoi in the margin, as pictured below.

![Image of asteriskoi in the margin](image_url)  
Text: vv. 43–44  
Margin: *omit*  
Hand: unclear (any hand could be responsible for the sigla)
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Type: L
Comments:
The textual question of the authenticity of these verses has been the subject of much study.75 The addition and omission both possess widespread and early support from manuscript, versional, and patristic evidence. Thankfully, for the purposes of this study, we need only focus on how the omission arose in the margin of GA 274 and not in the rest of the manuscript tradition, and we have multiple clues that point to the lectionary tradition as the culprit here. The first and most obvious is the presence of the lectionary markings and notes surrounding the marginal sigla: the αρξ. abbreviation indicating the start of a lection occurs on both sides of the first marked line, and underneath the last marked line, there is a lectionary note that reads ὑποστρέψον εἰς τ(ὸν) Ματθ(αίον) κε(φάλαιον) σϙϛ κ(αὶ) λέγει ἔρχεται πρὸς τοὺς μαθητ(ὰς). An earlier lectionary note in Matt 26:39 tells the reader to jump to this section of Luke; this note indicates that the reader, after having read Luke 22:43–44, should return back to the passage in Matthew and pick up at Matt 26:40. The second clue is that the lectionaries (and some non-lectionary manuscripts, presumably as a result of lectionary influence) actually transpose these Lukan verses between Matt 26:39 and 26:40, adding them there while excluding them from Luke 22. Third, asteriskoi are used elsewhere in GA 274 to note transpositions in connection with lectionary usage (see Matt 26:39 and Mark 9:44). For these reasons, the marginal sigla are more likely intended to highlight a text patched together with another text for a lection than to indicate a corrective omission or dubious textual status.

Luke 24:1
Page: 170v
Siglum: arrow
Text: omit
Margin: γυναῖκες
Hand: 1
Type: L
Comments:
The marginal reading has sparse support from continuous-text manuscripts,76 but it and similar additions (like άἱ τίμιαι γυναῖκες in GA L2211) abound in the lectionary tradition. This is likely because a lection begins at this verse, and without the context of Luke 23:55, a clarification of the sentence’s subject is necessary. For all of these reasons, the marginal reading is best classified as lectionary-based.


76 Of the manuscripts collated for this study, GA 011, 013, 038, 0211, 274A, 461A, 544, 892*, 1005, 1093, and 1365 add γυναῖκες, 04C3 adds γυνεκες, and GA 199 and 1241 add άἱ γυναῖκες. Notably, the addition γυναῖκες has fourth-century support from Eusebius and fifth-century support from Hesychius of Jerusalem, and άἱ γυναῖκες has fourth-century support from Cyril of Jerusalem.
**John**

**John 1:21**
Page: 174r
Siglum: ancora (upward)
Text: *omit*
Margin: καὶ λέγει· οὐκ εἰμί· ὁ προφήτης εἶ σὺ;
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:
Two points favor the classification of this marginal reading as a correction to the omission in the text: first, the only other witness known to make a similar omission is GA 565, a manuscript with no significant textual relationship to GA 274 observed thus far; and second, the omission is easily explained by homoiooteleuton following the previous exchange, which in GA 274 ends with εἶ σὺ.

**John 1:28**
Page: 174r
Siglum: whisker (downward)
Text: ἐν βηθανίᾳ
Margin: ἐν βηθαβαρᾷ
Hand: 1
Type: A
Collation:

Comments:
This variant has a rich history. The textual issue is mentioned in early patristic sources, and the variant readings divide the manuscript and versional evidence. While GA 03 reads ἐν Βηθανίᾳ without any correction, the line containing the reading features a distigme, which could very well indicate scribal knowledge of the alternate reading. Because both readings have substantial Byzantine support, we might plausibly argue that the marginal reading is a correction, but the biggest problem with this argument is that there is no obvious explanation for either reading in terms of scribal error. The change, in whichever direction it occurred, seems more deliberate than accidental. Besides this, we note that, at least among the manuscripts collated for this study, the marginal reading of GA 274 is more often found as a correct-

---

77 As Donaldson notes, Chrysostom considered “Bethabara” to be the reading found in the most accurate manuscripts but kept “Bethany” as the base text for his commentary; Epiphanius read “Bethabara” but noted in passing that some copies had “Bethany”; and Origen, while remarking that most copies known to him read “Bethany,” preferred “Bethabara” on intrinsic grounds. (“Explicit References to New Testament Variant Readings,” 426–28).
tion, alternate reading, or commentary reading than as a first-hand reading. In other words, many scribes, editors, and readers were aware of the textual variant here and took note of it accordingly, and the one responsible for the marginal reading of GA 274 was probably no different.

**John 2:12**

Page: 176r
Siglum: ancora (upward)
Text: *omit*
Margin: κ(αὶ) οἱ μαθ(η)ταὶ αὐτ(οῦ)
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments: The larger phrase found in the common text reads αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. Of the manuscripts collated for this study, only GA 01 and the text of GA 274 read αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, with versional support from the Armenian version and part of the Old Latin tradition and patristic support from Epiphanius and Jerome. Since the Byzantine exemplar of GA 274 most likely had the marginal reading as its text, and since the omission can be easily explained by the common scribal error of homoioiteleuton, the marginal reading is best classified as a correction to the text.

**John 3:2**

Page: 177r
Siglum: arrow
Text: αὐτὸν
Margin: τὸν ἵν
Hand: 1
Type: L
Comments: While the reading τὸν ἵν is somewhat widespread, finding support from $f^1$, $f^3$, and several other scattered witnesses, a large part of its support comes from the lectionaries, and it is not hard to see why. John 3:2 is the start of a lection, and without the preceding context, a clarification for the referent of αὐτὸν would be necessary in these witnesses. For this reason, the marginal reading is best explained as an adjustment to be made following the lectionary incipit.

**John 6:24**

Page: 185v
Siglum: lemniskos
Text: *omit*
Margin: εἰς (written twice with what appear two different shades of ink but the same hand)
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments: Of all the manuscripts collated for this study, GA 274 is alone in omitting εἰς before κατεργασοῦ. Since the text makes little sense without this preposition, and since omissions of short words were a common mistake for the scribe of GA 274, the omission is surely an error that the marginal reading is meant to correct.
John 7:19
Page: 188v
Siglum: ancora (downward)
Text: omit
Margin: κ(αὶ) οὐδὲὶς ἔξ ὑμῶν ποιεῖ τὸν νόμον
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:
While it would be tempting to view the omission as a theologically motivated excision intended to soften the force of Jesus's question, it is far more likely that the omission resulted from homoioteleuton following another phrase that ends in τὸν νόμον. The marginal note is clearly a correction.

John 10:12–13
Page: 196r
Siglum: ancora (upward)
Text: omit
Margin: καὶ ὁ λύκος ἁρπάζει αὐτὰ κ(αὶ) σκορπίζῃ τὰ πρόβατ(α) ὁ δὲ μισθ(ωτὸς) φεύγη
Hand: first hand
Type: C
Comments:
Since the marginal note seems to have been written by the same hand responsible for the main text, no other manuscript is known to omit this portion of vv. 12–13, and the omission is easily explained by haplography from one φεύγει to another,78 the marginal reading is best explained as a correction to an obvious error in the text.

John 11:13
Page: 198r
Siglum: s
Text: αὐτοὶ
Margin: ἐκεῖνοι
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:
Here, the first hand of GA 274 substitutes a more common pronoun for a less common one, changing the ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἔδοξαν found in all other collated manuscripts to αὐτοὶ δὲ ἔδοξαν. Based on the absence of any external support for the text reading, the simplest explanation is that the substitution was a subconscious alteration towards more common wording that the scribe made while copying a line from memory. Accordingly, the marginal reading is a correction towards the common text.

John 12:1
Page: 200r

78 One might object that the marginal reading has the subjunctives σκορπίζῃ and φεύγῃ in place of the indicatives σκορπίζει and φεύγει found in the common text, making haplography less likely. A reasonable explanation for this is that the exemplar of GA 274 originally had the indicatives, but the scribe or reader responsible for the marginal reading supplied it from memory or from a poorly copied exemplar, with itacism resulting in the changed spellings.
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Siglum: arrow
Text: omit
Margin: ὁ ις
Hand: 1
Type: L
Comments:
The lectionaries that contain the lection starting at this verse transpose the chapter’s introductory phrase, ὁ οὖν ις, πρὸ εξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα, ἦλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν, to πρὸ εξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα, ἦλθεν ὁ ις εἰς Βηθανίαν. The tradition appears to have influenced a handful of continuous-text manuscripts, including GA 013, 038C, 045C, 69*, 109, 333, 1009, 1093, 1241, 1561, and 1788. For this reason, the marginal note probably indicates a transposition, not an addition, and is based on the standard lectionary incipit for this verse.

John 13:9
Page: 203v
Siglum: obelos
Text: omit
Margin: μου
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:
The omission of μου between μὴ τοὺς πόδας and μόνον has early and diverse attestation in GA P66, 05, 07, 2, 9, 27, 71, 274T, 1005, 1365, L547, L848/1, and L1126, as well as in some Old Latin witnesses and in commentary by Gregory of Nazianzus, but the vast majority of witnesses includes μου. The tendency of the scribe of GA 274 to omit small words or the possibility of homoioarcton from μου to μον- would easily explain the omission by the first hand, and the mainstream Byzantine support for the addition makes it likely that the exemplar of GA 274 included it. The marginal reading is therefore likely to be a correction.

John 19:11–13
Page: 214r
Siglum: whisker (upward), once before διὰ τοῦτο in verse 11, once before a lectionary note on the same line indicating a skip to the next marked location, and once at the start of verse 13
Text: ὁ οὖν πιλᾶτος
Margin: τότε ὁ πιλᾶτος
Hand: 1
Type: L
Comments:
The placement of the multiple sigla already hint that the nature of the marginal reading is lection-related. In the lection containing this passage, the lectionary tradition omits part of John 19:11, starting with διὰ τοῦτο, and all of 19:12. The change in conjunction from οὖν to τότε is occasioned by the omission of verse 12; Pilate’s response logically follows from the crowd’s accusation in that verse, but not from Jesus’s words in the first half of verse 11, so τότε produces a smoother transition.

John 19:35
Page: 215v
Siglum: arrow
Text: αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία
Margin: ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία αὐτοῦ
Hand: 1
Type: C
Comments:

Nearly every placement of αὐτοῦ in this phrase has support in some part of the manuscript tradition, and three of the possible word orders of the phrase αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία have substantial support, dividing the Byzantine tradition. In addition, many of the lectionaries collated for this study that feature this verse in multiple lections have different word orders in different lections; some, like GA L773, feature all three of the best-attested variants. While this may point to lectionary influence as the cause of the marginal reading, such an explanation would fail to account for other important facts. First, the lectionary tradition is not the only part of the manuscript evidence divided by these readings; each major reading has diverse support from many continuous-text manuscripts. Second, we do not know of any reason why scribes involved in the transmission of the lectionary tradition would deliberately change the word order of this phrase for different lections. It seems more likely that the various word orders we observe were incorporated into the lectionary tradition from an already-fractured tradition of continuous-text manuscripts.

That leaves two remaining explanations for the marginal reading: correction and knowledge of a textual variant. The latter option is difficult to justify here, as all three of the major variants claim Byzantine support. GA 274’s Byzantine exemplar could have had any of these readings, and this, combined with the transcriptional probabilities for the error, makes a correction to a Byzantine text plausible in any case. Ultimately, we must be resigned to the fact that the evidence still leaves open the possibility that the scribe knew of a variant word order from a distinct source, but we can at least be assured that even if the marginal reading were intended to convey knowledge of a variant reading, it would offer little information concerning its source, due to the widespread manuscript support for the marginal reading.

John 19:38
Page: 216r
Siglum: ancora (upward)
Text: μετὰ ταῦτα
Margin: τῷ κ(αιρ)ῷ
Hand: 1
Type: L
Comments:

Since this verse begins a lection and the marginal note appears to be an abbreviation for the common lectionary incipit τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ, the note is surely related to lectionary usage.

79 The order αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία is supported by GA 01, 02, 03, 05S, 019, 021, 032, 033, 036, 038, 041, 044, 041, 0211, f, f119, 2, 9, 16, 33, 114, 157, 184, 274T, 449, 461, 565, 1071, 1079, 1200S, 1243, 1273, 1342, 2786, L63/3, L63/4, L63/C1, L627/1, L773/2, L844, and L1126/2. The order ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ ἡ μαρτυρία is supported by GA P66, 07, 011, 017, 022, 028, 030, 034, 039, 045, 0290, 22, 71, 75, 119, 164, 199, 269, 291, 371, 431, 700, 892S, 954, 1167*, 1192, 1216, 1675, L387f (… μαρτυρηα), L547, L773/1, L773/3, L848/2, and L1126/3. The order ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία αὐτοῦ is supported by 013, 054, f5, f6, 27S, 217, 274A, 544, 545, 579f (ἐστην ...), 585, 726, 740, 1005, 1093, 1167C, 1241, 1319, 1321, 1325, 1365, 1424, 1519, 1574, L63/2, L63/5, L627/2, L627/3, L773/4, L848/1, L848/3, L849/3, L950/3, and L1126/1. Finally, L63*/1 features the shorter reading ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία, probably due to an accidental omission.
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Comments:
The marginal note changes the defective spelling σημένων in the text to σημαίνων. While the defective spelling is found in a few other witnesses (GA 05, 022, 038, and the first lection of L63), the vast majority of the manuscript tradition, including the Byzantine text-type, has the common spelling. For this reason, and because we know that αι-ε interchanges were a common mistake for the scribe of GA 274, we can confidently conclude that the marginal note is a correction.