

Scribal Corrections in Early Greek New Testament Manuscripts: The Fragments

Zachary J. Cole, *Reformed Theological Seminary*; Eunike C. Bentson, *Tacoma, Washington*;
and Randall M. Shandroski, *Wycliffe College, University of Toronto*

Abstract: This study catalogs and categorizes the scribal corrections found in the earliest fragmentary Greek New Testament manuscripts (second–fourth/fifth centuries). Although corrections are normally identified and discussed by manuscript editors, this analysis gathers such evidence from a wide range of artifacts in order to observe relevant trends in scribal habits across the group as a whole. Corrections are identified in the earliest 114 fragmentary manuscripts of the New Testament, including papyri and parchment. These corrections are then categorized and discussed, with attention given to the copying process, text-critical evidence, and the identity of the correctors.

1. Introduction and Method

In recent years there have been numerous fruitful examinations of the scribal corrections found in New Testament manuscripts, especially in the six largest papyri (P45, P46, P47, P66, P72, and P75) and early majuscules.¹ Such studies have shed light on the following concerns: scribal attitudes toward the text, the copying context, the transmission of the text, and the life of a manuscript after it was completed.² The present study seeks to analyze and draw obser-

We would like to thank Peter Malik for his advice while we planned this project. We are grateful also for the constructive suggestions made by the anonymous reviewer.

¹ Notable is James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*, NTTSD 36 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), who built upon the pioneering work of E. C. Colwell. On the corrections in Codex Sinaiticus, see Dirk Jongkind, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*, TS 3.5 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2007), and more recently: Peter Malik, “The Earliest Corrections in Codex Sinaiticus: A Test Case from the Gospel of Mark,” *BASP* 50 (2013): 207–54; Peter Malik, “The Earliest Corrections in Codex Sinaiticus: Further Evidence from the Apocalypse,” *TC* 20 (2015): 1–12; and Peter Malik, “The Corrections of Codex Sinaiticus and the Textual Transmission of Revelation: Joseph Schmid Revisited,” *NTS* 61 (2015): 595–614. On Codex Bezae, see D. C. Parker, *Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and Its Text* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992). On Codex Washingtonianus, see James R. Royse, “The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex,” in *The Freer Biblical Manuscripts: Fresh Studies of an American Treasure Trove*, ed. Larry W. Hurtado, TCS 6 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 185–226. On Codex Vaticanus, see Jesse Grenz, “The Scribes and Correctors of Codex Vaticanus: A Study on the Codicology, Paleography, and Text of B(03)” (PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 2021).

² E.g., Larry W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 186; Andrew Wilson, “Scribal Habits in Greek New Testament Manuscripts,” *Filología neotestamentaria* 24 (2011): 95–126; Loretta H. Y. Man, “The Textual Significance of Corrected Readings in the Evaluation of the External Evidence: Romans 5,1 as a Test Case,” *ZNW* 107 (2016): 70–93; Katrin Maria Landefeld, “The Significance of Corrections for the Examination of the Emergence of Variants,” *NTS* 68 (2022): 418–30.

vations from the scribal corrections found in the abundance of smaller, fragmentary New Testament manuscripts.

It is, of course, true that manuscript editors usually (though not always) identify scribal corrections where they appear in a given artifact, providing valuable insight into the work of an individual scribe. As yet, though, there has been little by way of organized examination of corrections across a wide range of witnesses. Other manuscript features have indeed been subjected to broad-based studies, including features such as the *nomina sacra*, codex dimensions, text divisions, and harmonization, for example, and with great benefit.³ Such analyses have identified important trends and patterns across large bodies of material witnesses. By gathering the evidence of corrections from a wide range of early manuscripts, this study seeks to identify broader trends among early scribes, including questions about the overall frequency of corrections, the kinds of corrections that scribes tended to make (or not), and the general attitude that scribes had towards the text. The present study, therefore, will catalog and categorize the scribal corrections in all the early fragmentary manuscripts dated up through the fourth/fifth century CE (second–fourth/fifth centuries), as a representative sample of scribal behavior.⁴ Given the amount of data under consideration here, our focus must necessarily be restricted to a basic overview of the corrections from this period, with the hope that it will aid future studies and investigations.

The exact definition of what constitutes a correction is not straightforward.⁵ For the purpose of this study, we include anything that appears to be an amendment to the text after the original act of writing, whether in the process of copying (*in scribendo*) or later, and those by the original scribe or a later hand. Only corrections to the text are considered, not added punctuation or diacritical marks. Corrections have been identified by examination of published manuscript editions, including those in relevant *editiones princeps* and those available on the INTF website.⁶ Whenever possible, these were checked against manuscript images. Close examination of the manuscripts led to the identification of some previously unnoticed corrections.

³ On the *nomina sacra*, see Hurtado, *Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 95–134; on codex dimensions, see Eric G. Turner, *The Typology of the Early Codex* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977); on text divisions, see Charles E. Hill, *The First Chapters: Dividing the Text of Scripture in Codex Vaticanus and Its Predecessors* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022); on harmonization, see Cambry Pardee, *Scribal Harmonization in the Synoptic Gospels*, NTTSD 60 (Leiden: Brill, 2019).

⁴ By “fragmentary” we mean all papyri (from II–IV/V, acc. to the *Kurzgefasste Liste*) except P45, P46, P47, P66, P72, P75, and all majuscules from the same date range except 01, 03, and 032. For studies of the corrections in these manuscripts, see note 1 above. The date range seeks to include as many witnesses as possible while remaining manageable.

⁵ See the methodological discussion in Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 74–79, and the extensive bibliographic footnote in Peter Malik, *P.Beatty III (P47): The Codex, Its Scribe, and Its Text*, NTTSD 52 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 72 n. 5.

⁶ For bibliographic information regarding *editiones princeps*, see the *Liste* and J. K. Elliott, ed., *A Bibliography of Greek New Testament Manuscripts*, 3rd ed., NovTSup 160 (Leiden: Brill, 2015). Other transcriptions were consulted occasionally, such as Lincoln H. Blumell and Thomas A. Wayment, eds., *Christian Oxyrhynchus: Texts, Documents, and Sources* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2015), and Philip W. Comfort and David P. Barrett, eds., *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts*, 2nd. ed. (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 2001). Note, however, that the most recent third edition of Comfort and Barrett (Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2019) has removed the majority of notes related to scribal corrections included in the first two editions.

Of the 114 manuscripts under examination, 70 lack any extant corrections: P1, P7, P8, P9, P10, P12, P22, P24, P25, P28, P29, P30, P32, P35, P39, P49,⁷ P52, P57, P62, P64+67,⁸ P65, P71, P78, P80, P82, P85, P87, P89, P90, P91, P95, P98, P101, P102, P104, P107, P108, P109, P111, P113, P114, P119, P120, P121, P122, P123, P125, P126, P133, P134, P137, 058, 0160, 0162, 0181, 0185, 0188, 0189, 0206, 0207, 0214, 0219, 0221, 0228, 0230, 0231, 0258, 0308, 0312, and 0315.

Thirty-seven of the manuscripts have at least one clear instance of a correction: P4, P5, P6, P13, P15, P17, P18, P19, P20, P23, P27, P37, P40, P48, P50, P53, P70, P77,⁹ P81, P86, P88, P92, P100, P103, P106, P110, P115, P117, P118, P139, P141, 059+0215, 0169, 0171, 0220, 0242, and 0270.

The remaining seven have possible instances of corrections, but for reasons enumerated below there is some uncertainty about them: P16, P21, P38, P69, P132, P138, and 057.

In the following sections, these corrections are presented by category of error, adapting the categories used by James Royse and others: orthography, strictly nonsense, nonsense in context, omissions, additions, substitutions, transpositions, and those that cannot be categorized with certainty.¹⁰ By *strictly nonsense* we mean readings that are nonsensical words or fragments of words.¹¹ *Nonsense in context* denotes a proper Greek word or phrase that is incomprehensible in its context. Readings are classified under orthography if the correction applies to a vocalic or consonantal interchange known from the Koine period.¹²

Given the difficulties involved in identifying the hand responsible for a correction, it is assumed that corrections are by the original scribe unless editors have explicitly suggested otherwise (firsthand corrections indicated by ^c, secondhand by ^{2c}, third by ^{3c}). Attention is also given to the possibility that a correction was made *in scribendo*, that is, while in the process of copying.¹³ Where these can be identified with some confidence, they are highlighted. Relevant text-critical information is also provided for each variation unit, although for the purpose of this analysis such information has been kept to a minimum and restricted to Greek evidence only.¹⁴ When multiple corrections occur within a single verse, these are distinguished by an accompanying letter (a, b, c, etc.) according to their order of treatment (e.g., Matt 1:1a).

⁷ It is possible that P49 and P65 belong to the same original codex.

⁸ It is possible that P4 and P64+67 belong to the same original codex.

⁹ It is possible that P77 and P103 belong to the same original codex.

¹⁰ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 74–79.

¹¹ Following E. C. Colwell, “Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A Study of P45, P66, and P75,” in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, NTTS 9 (Leiden: Brill, 1969), 106–24 (111), “The Nonsense Readings include words unknown to grammar or lexicon, words that cannot be construed syntactically, or words that do not make sense in the context,” and also Royse, who further distinguishes between strictly nonsense and nonsense in context (Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 91).

¹² According to Francis T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, Testi e documenti per lo studio dell’antichità 55, 2 vols. (Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino-La Goliardica, 1976–1981). On linguistic interchanges in recent study, see Mark Depauw and Joanne Stolk, “Linguistic Variation in Greek Papyri: Towards a New Tool for Quantitative Study,” *GRBS* 55 (2015): 196–220.

¹³ On which, see Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 115 n. 65.

¹⁴ The following apparatuses were used to obtain text-critical evidence: NA28; UBS5; Kurt Aland’s *Synopsis*; Tischendorf’s *Editio Octava Critica Major*; Reuben Swanson’s volumes of *Matthew*, *Mark*, *Luke*, *John*, *Acts*, and *Romans*; the IGNTP volumes of the *Gospel according to Luke*; the ECM volumes of *Mark*, *Acts*, and the *Catholic Epistles*; and the critical edition of Hermann von Soden. Due to the degree of error observed in von Soden’s apparatus, as a rule we have not listed witnesses cited by him alone unless they could be confirmed by a photograph or transcription. For the book of Revelation, Herman Hoskier’s collations were also consulted. *Solus* indicates that, as far as can be established, the reading in question is found in no other Greek witnesses.

Two sections (§§10–11) at the end provide summaries of the corrections that are identified as *in scribendo* and those that are from a later hand, followed by a final section with summative and concluding observations (§12).

2. Orthography

Reference	Uncorrected Text	Corrected Text
Matt 5:24 ¹⁵	οφεϵ P86* <i>solus</i>	αφεϵ P86 ^c <i>rell</i>
Matt 10:25a ¹⁶	βεελϵεβουλ P110* <i>solus</i>	βεελζεβουλ P110 ^c <i>rell</i> (βεεζβουλ 349 βεεζεβουλ 01 03 βελζεβουλ 05 019 033 16 566* 1093*)
Matt 23:37a ¹⁷	[ηθ]ελειϵα P77* <i>solus</i>	[ηθ]εληϵα P77 ^c <i>solus</i> (ηθελϵα <i>rell</i> ηθελϵα 346 579 1346)
Matt 26:28 ¹⁸	[εϵ]ϵυνομενον P37* <i>rell</i>	[εϵ]ϵυνομενον P37 ^{2c} 01 02 03 04 05 019 035 037 038 041* 042 043 047 064 1 33 174* 489 1010 1219 1293 1295 1582*
Luke 3:29	ῑ P4* <i>solus?</i>	ιηϵου P4 ^c 01 03 019 038 0124 f ³ 33 69 346 543 788 826 983 1241 1604 (ιωϵη <i>rell</i> ιεη 1192 ιεϵη 22 1005 1210 1365 2372 ιηϵω 036 f ¹ 1582* 2193 ιοϵη 1685 ιωϵηϵ 033 213 892 1342 ιωϵτη 273 ιωϵϵη 1542 <i>om.</i> του ιηϵου 157 2757)
John 16:20 ¹⁹	λοιπηθ̄η [ϵεϵε] P5* <i>solus</i>	λυπηθ̄η [ϵεϵε] P5 ^c <i>rell</i> (λυπηθηϵεϵε 01 02 032 2* 33 579 1071 1235 λυπηϵεϵε 022* λυπιθηϵεϵε 047)
John 16:21	λοι [πην] P5* <i>solus</i>	λυ [πην] P5 ^c <i>rell</i>
Acts 8:32a ²⁰	ανεγινωϵ ϵεν P50* <i>solus</i>	ανεγινωϵ ϵεν P50 ^c <i>rell</i> (ανεγεινωϵεν 03 ανεγιγωϵεν 2243)

Rel indicates the remaining Greek manuscripts not explicitly cited, but some variants have been ignored when they are irrelevant to the issue at hand.

¹⁵ On the interchange of α and ο, see Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:286–88, and Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 895.

¹⁶ On the interchange of ζ and ϵ, see Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:120–24, and Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 888. It is worth mentioning that P110 uses an apostrophe in the word: βεελ'εβουλ. Note also that NA28 (misleadingly) lists 05 and 019 in support of βεελζεβουλ.

¹⁷ On the interchange of η and ει, see Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:239–42, and Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 893. The *ed. princ.* registers some doubt about the originally written text, but we are persuaded the INTF transcription is correct with ει. In addition, since the beginning of the word [ηθ]εληϵα must be reconstructed, it is possible that a different form of the verb was written here. However, since there are no other known variants in the verb form, we have followed the *ed. princ.* and INTF transcription.

¹⁸ On the interchange of ν and νν, see Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:158, and Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 890. The second hand is suggested by Henry Sanders in the *ed. princ.*, but see Tommy Wasserman, “The Early Text of Matthew,” in *The Early Text of the New Testament*, ed. Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 83–107 (91), who suggests first hand.

¹⁹ On the interchange of υ and οι, see Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:198–99, and Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 892.

²⁰ On the interchange of ε and α, see Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:283, and Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 894.

Reference	Uncorrected Text	Corrected Text
Rom 5:3 ²¹	[θ]λειψιc 0220 [*]	[θ]λιψιc 0220 ^c <i>rell</i> (θληψιc 2147 θληψιc 1243 θληψιc 33 618 1646 2464 θλιψιc 02 06 010 012)
Rom 6:15 ²²	[εcμ]ε P40 [*] <i>solus</i>	[εcμ]εν P40 ^c <i>rell</i>
Rom 16:12 ²³	[τ]ρυφαναν P118 [*]	[τ]ρυφαιναν P118 ^c <i>rell</i> (τρυφεναν 01 02 010 012 025 326 1243 1837 2464 τρυφηναν 1874 ^c τυφαιναν 04 [*])
1 Cor 7:23a	γινεcθε P15 [*] <i>rell</i>	γεινεcθε P15 ^c P46 01 03 [*] (γεινεcθαι 02 06 [*] γινεcθαι 06 ^c 010 012 69 [*] 88 131 218 440 460 1243 1646 1175 1735 1881 ^c 2125 2464 γενηcθε 330 2400)
Heb 3:6 ²⁴	χαυχη [μα] P13 [*] <i>solus</i>	καυχη [μα] P13 ^c <i>rell</i>
Heb 3:10 ²⁵	προcωκτειcα P13 [*] <i>solus</i>	προcωκθειcα P13 ^c <i>solus</i> (προcωχθιcα <i>rell</i> προcοχθηcα 131 1243 1735 1962 προcωχθειcα 02 προcωχθηcα 020 025 33 81 88 181 218 999 1245 1315 1424 1646 1751 1836 1874 1881 1891 1908 1912 προcωχθηcαν 1319 2464 προcωχθητι 1573)
Heb 10:11	λιτου[ργων] P13 [*] 01 06	λειτου[ργων] P13 ^c <i>rell</i> (<i>om.</i> 2464)
Heb 11:3 ²⁶	φeνoμeγων P13 [*] 1243 1735	φαινομεγων P13 ^c <i>rell</i> (φαινωμενων 1319 φαιν 01 [*] φeνωμενον 1751)
Heb 11:32 ²⁷	δauιδ P13 [*] 06 ^c 0319 945 <i>pm</i>	δauειδ P13 ^c P46 01 06 [*] (δ̄ᾱδ̄ 02 018 020 025 <i>pm</i> δαβιδ 1 <i>al</i>)
Heb 12:11a ²⁸	[ι]ρηνικον P13 [*] 01	ειρηνικον P13 ^c <i>rell</i> (ειρηνηκον 1 1243 ειρινικον 1751)

²¹ On the interchange of ει and ι, see Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:189–90, and Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 892; more recently, Joanne Vera Stolk, “Itacism from Zenon to Dioscorus: Scribal Corrections of <ι> and <ει> in Greek Documentary Papyri,” in *Proceedings of the 28th Congress of Papyrology, Barcelona 1–6 August 2016*, ed. Alberto Nodar and Sofia Torallas Tovar, *Scripta Orientalia* 3 (Barcelona: Publicacions de l’Abadia de Montserrat 2019), 690–97.

²² On the omission of final *nu*, see Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:111–12, and Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 887–88. The correction in P40 at Rom 6:15 is located in fragment f, according to identifications made by Philip W. Comfort, “New Reconstructions and Identifications of New Testament Papyri,” *NovT* 41 (1999): 214–30 (220–21). The correction itself is noted in Comfort and Barrett, *The Text of the Earliest* (2nd ed.), but the images on NTVMR are not clear at this point.

²³ On the interchange of αι and α, see Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:194, and Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 892.

²⁴ On the interchange of κ and χ in the initial position, see Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:91–92, and Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 887. Although the χ was overwritten with κ by the scribe of P13, the identification is very likely. Note that the INTF transcription does not record many of the corrections recorded in the *ed. princ.*

²⁵ On the interchange of θ and τ, see Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:92, and Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 887.

²⁶ On the interchange of αι and ε, see Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:192–93, and Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 892.

²⁷ BDAG (s.v. “Δαυίδ, δ̄”) lists δ̄αυειδ as an alternate spelling of δ̄αυιδ. On the *nomen sacrum* form δ̄ᾱδ̄ more generally, see Ludwig Traube, *Nomina Sacra: Versuch einer Geschichte der christlichen Kürzung* (Munich: Beck, 1907), 104–5.

²⁸ Although the initial *iota* in [ι]ρηνικον in P13^{*} (at Heb 12:11a) is no longer visible, there is no real doubt about what letter stands beneath the correction ει-.

Reference	Uncorrected Text	Corrected Text
James 1:10 ²⁹	ταπεινουσι P23* <i>solus</i>	ταπεινωσι P23 ^c 03 (ταπεινωσει <i>rell</i> ταπινωσει P74 01 πιτσιει 614)
James 1:11a ³⁰	καυϙονει P23* <i>solus</i>	καυωνει P23 ^c (καυωνι <i>rell</i>)
Rev 8:7 ³¹	[το] γ̄ P115* 1719	[το] τριτ̄ο[ν] ² P115 ^{2c} <i>pm</i> (το τριτω 2067 το τριτων 1617 τω τριτω 2051)

The orthographical corrections made in our manuscripts reflect interchanges that were common in extrabiblical papyri, as indicated by the references to Francis Gignac’s grammar and Royse’s study. Most of the errors involve phonetic confusion, and the majority of these involve vowels. Some of these slips could perhaps involve visual confusion as well: for example, $\nu\nu > \nu$ (Matt 26:28), $\kappa > \chi$ (Heb 3:6). There is one instance of an omitted final *nu* (Rom 6:15).

Two of the corrections relate to the use of abbreviations. At Luke 3:29, the scribe of P4 appears to have initially written the *nomen sacrum* $\bar{\omega}$ and then changed it to the *plene* form $\iota\eta\kappa\upsilon\upsilon$. Perhaps the full form was preferred because in this instance $\iota\eta\kappa\upsilon\upsilon$ refers to Joshua rather than Jesus.³² The spacing suggests that this correction was made *in scribendo*.

Similarly, the last correction listed in this section (Rev 8:7 in P115) was made by a later hand adjusting the form of a numeral. Whereas the original scribe used the shorthand $\bar{\gamma}$ in place of the ordinal number $\tau\rho\iota\tau\omicron\nu$, a later hand corrected it to the longhand form while preserving the same value. Presumably this correction was made because numerical shorthand is unusual for ordinal numbers in New Testament manuscripts and is potentially confusing to a reader, since it obscures the case ending.³³ There is another possible instance of this sort of correction in P115 (see below).

Two other corrections appear to have been made *in scribendo*. In both P15 (1 Cor 7:23a) and P50 (Acts 8:32a), the spacing of the letters suggests that the errors were caught and corrected before the scribes continued to the following word.

Three additional instances of orthographical corrections are possible but uncertain due to partial illegibility.

Reference	Uncorrected Text	Corrected Text
Acts 23:27a ³⁴	κυ[λ?]λημφθεντα P48* P74 01 02 03* 642 1175 2200 ^{vid}	κυλλημφθεντα P48 ^c 08 (κυλληφθεντα <i>rell</i> κυλληφθεντα 1884)
1 Cor 7:23b	$\bar{\alpha}\nu[\theta?]\bar{\omega}\nu$ P15*	$\bar{\alpha}\nu\bar{\omega}\nu$ P15 ^c
Rev 14:20	$\bar{\beta}\chi$ P115* <i>solus?</i> (cf. 1854)	${}^0\bar{\beta}\chi?$ P115 ^{2c} [= διςχιλιων εξακοσιων 1854] (“εν αλλ̄, β” 456 ^{ms} $\bar{\alpha}\chi$ <i>rell</i> [= χιλιων εξακοσιων] χιλιων $\bar{\chi}$ 1719 $\bar{\alpha}\chi$ 1876 2014 2034 2036 2042 2043 2047 2074 2082 [= χιλιων εξακοσιων εξ̄ 2037 2046] εξακοσιων 2065 ^{txt} χιλιων 04 ^c ^{vid} χιλιων διακοσιων 01* 203 506)

²⁹ On the interchange of ω and $\omicron\upsilon$, see Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:209–11, and Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 892.

³⁰ On the interchange of ω and \omicron , see Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:275–77, and Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 894.

³¹ Transcriptions of the text here vary in their details but agree in essence (cf. *ed. princ.*, INTF, ISBTF, Parker).

³² See Tommy Wasserman, “A Comparative Analysis of P4 and P64+67,” *TC* 15 (2010): 1–26 (7 n. 31).

³³ See Zachary J. Cole, *Numerals in Early New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Text-Critical, Scribal, and Theological Studies*, NTTSD 53 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 206–10.

³⁴ On the assimilation of ν and liquids, see Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:169–170.

In the case of Acts 23:27a in P48, it is possible that the first *nu* of *συνλημφθεντα* was written over an initial *lambda*, but this is now unclear. Similarly, at 1 Cor 7:23b in P15, the scribe appears to have begun writing *ανθρωπων* in full, as the now-effaced letter strongly resembles a *theta* (so *ed. princ.*), but caught it immediately and corrected the text to the *nomen sacrum* *ωνων*. If so, this correction would be another instance of one made *in scribendo*.

Similar to Rev 8:7 above, it appears that another numeral in P115 was altered, this time at Rev 14:20, where the scribe originally wrote βχ. This, too, is an ambiguously written numeral. When standing for two thousand (as it presumably is here), the letter *beta* normally has either a surmounting curl or a preceding diagonal stroke. Thus, the faint loop added to the top left of the *beta* might be an attempt to clarify the meaning of the numeral, but, because of the faded state of the ink, it is difficult to be certain.³⁵

3. Strictly Nonsense

Reference	Uncorrected Text	Corrected Text
Mark 2:19	νανται P88* <i>solus</i>	δυνανται ² P88 ^{3c} <i>pm</i> (δυναντε 579 1579 l2211 δυναται 728 1005*)
Mark 2:23	εποριων P88* <i>solus</i>	εποριμων P88 ^c <i>rell</i> (εσπαρμενων 032 σποριμων 037 σποριμον 117* σπορημων 740 752 983 1009 1029 ποριμων l2211)
Luke 22:45	κοιμενους 0171* <i>solus</i>	κοιμωμενους 0171 ^{2c} <i>rell</i> (κοιμουμενους 022*)
John 1:33	μι P106* <i>solus</i>	μοι P106 ^c <i>rell</i>
John 11:2	ται P6* <i>solus</i>	ταις P6 ^c <i>rell</i> (τες 038)
Acts 10:30a	τ P50* <i>solus</i>	νηστ[ε]ων P50 ^c 02 ^c 05 08 020 044 33 104 614 1175 1241 1505 1884 2147 2495 2818 <i>al</i>
Acts 10:31a	προσευε P50* <i>solus</i>	προσευχη P50 ^c <i>rell</i> (αι προσευχαι 1890 ευχη P45 δεησια 1829 δεησις 228 996 1243)
Acts 10:31b	ενωπιου P50* <i>solus</i>	ενωπιον P50 ^c <i>rell</i>
2 Cor 7:7	περ P117* <i>solus</i>	υπερ P117 ^c <i>rell</i> (om. υπερ μου 018)
Heb 4:11	πετη P13* <i>solus</i>	πεση P13 ^c <i>rell</i> (περιπεση 256 πεσει 025 131 1319 1735 2464 om. 1573)
James 3:5	μ[ε]γαλαυχει P20* <i>solus</i>	μεγαλαυχει P20 ^c <i>rell</i> (μεγαλα αυχει P74 02 03 04* 025 33 ^{vid} 43 81 330 400 1243 1270 1297 1390 1595 1598 1893 2344 l884)
James 3:14	ψεδευ [cθe] P100* <i>solus</i>	ψευευ [cθe] P100 ^c <i>solus</i> (ψευδεσθε <i>rell</i> ψευδεσθαι 01 33 1243 1751 1874 ^c καταψευδεσθε 1840 om. και ψευδεσθε l427)
Rev 11:18	[διαφθειρ]ονας P115* <i>solus</i>	[διαφθειρ]οντας P115 ^c <i>pm</i>

³⁵ Cf. David C. Parker, "A New Oxyrhynchus Papyrus of Revelation: P115 (P. Oxy. 4499)," *NTS* 46 (2000): 159–74 (164). It is unclear how the ISBTF transcription arrived at *αχ* for P115^c.

Scribes created nonsense readings through a variety of means. Out of these thirteen errors, five result from the omission of a single letter (Mark 2:23; John 1:33; 11:2; 2 Cor 7:7; Rev 11:18), and two result from the loss of two letters (Mark 2:19; Luke 22:45). Two errors involve the confusion of letters (Acts 10:31b; Heb 4:11).

The correction in P106 at John 1:33 is worth highlighting because it appears to have been made *in scribendo*. Note that, after writing the *mu* of $\mu\omicron\iota$, the scribe wrongly wrote *iota* but corrected it to *omicron* with plenty of space to write *iota* again before the following word ($\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\nu$).

We can suggest causes for a few of these errors. For instance, the loss of $\delta\nu$ - from $\delta\nu\nu\nu\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$ in Mark 2:19 (P88*) might have been prompted by parablepsis with the immediately preceding $\omicron\nu$. In addition, the confusion of letters at Heb 4:11 in P13 could have been a visual error: $\varsigma > \tau$, as could have been the error $\nu > \upsilon$ in P50 at Acts 10:31b.

The remaining four nonsense readings are more challenging to explain. The error at Acts 10:30a in P50 might represent an erroneous leap forward. The editor suggests that, after writing $\eta\mu\eta\nu$, the scribe began to write $\tau\eta\nu \epsilon\nu\nu\alpha\tau\eta\nu$ (which would have omitted $\nu\eta\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu\omega\nu \kappa\alpha\iota$ or transposed it) but immediately corrected himself.³⁶ Similarly, in writing $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\nu\epsilon$ for $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\nu\chi\eta$ (Acts 10:31a), the scribe might have leapt to $\sigma\upsilon \epsilon\mu\nu\eta\varsigma$ - in the following line and fixed it before continuing, but this is just one possibility.³⁷

The precise reading of P100 at Jas 3:14 is difficult to discern. In any case, it is clear that the scribe wrote a nonsense word and failed in the attempt to correct it clearly.³⁸ The same is true of P20 at Jas 3:5. Although the correction has partially effaced the initially written text, the scribe has apparently attempted to rectify a nonsense word.³⁹

In addition, three more nonsense corrections are possible but uncertain due to partial illegibility.

Reference	Uncorrected Text	Corrected Text
Matt 10:26	$\beta?$ P110* <i>solus</i>	<i>om.</i> P110 ^c <i>rell</i>
Luke 3:27	$\omicron\nu$ [$\upsilon?$] $\eta\varsigma\alpha\nu$ P4* <i>solus</i>	$\omicron\nu$ $\rho\eta\varsigma\alpha\nu$ P4 ^c <i>solus</i> ($\rho\eta\varsigma\alpha$ <i>rell</i> $\rho\alpha\varsigma\alpha$ f ³ $\rho\eta\varsigma\alpha\alpha$ 69 700 713 2542 $\rho\iota\varsigma\alpha$ 179 11056 $\varsigma\eta\alpha$ 1604)
Acts 18:27 ⁴⁰	τ [$\iota?$] ν P38* <i>solus</i>	$\tau\eta\nu$ P38 ^c <i>rell</i>

³⁶ Alternatively, the copyist might have leapt to the *tau* in $\nu\eta\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu\omega\nu$.

³⁷ The editor suggests the overwritten letter was *sigma* rather than *epsilon* (so INTF); either way, the reading is nonsense.

³⁸ Here we follow the INTF transcription; but cf. *ed. princ.*: “ $\psi\epsilon\upsilon\delta\epsilon\nu$: half-formed υ and δ apparently run together, with supralinear dot over δ . The scribe may have written $\psi\epsilon\delta\epsilon\nu$ by mistake, then attempted to insert υ after the first ϵ , signalling the error with a dot over the δ . In which case he failed to delete the superfluous υ .” Either way, the original reading classifies as a nonsense error.

³⁹ Here we depart from the transcription of the *ed. princ.* and INTF in favor of the reading offered by J. K. Elliott, “The Early Text of the Catholic Epistles,” in Hill and Kruger, *Early Text of the New Testament*, 204–24 (213 n. 29): “P20 reads $\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\nu\alpha\nu\chi\epsilon\iota$ in which λ replaced υ as a correction; this λ was then understood in the *ed. pr.* to be a ligature of $\lambda\alpha$.” See also Blumell and Wayment, *Christian Oxyrhynchus*, 87, who suggest that the scribe first wrote $\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha\nu$ and then corrected the reading to $\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha \alpha\nu\chi\epsilon\iota$, with the resulting restoration: $\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda[[\alpha]]\alpha\prime\upsilon\chi\epsilon\iota$. Both proposals would classify as strictly nonsense.

⁴⁰ Compare Sanders’s first transcription in the *ed. princ.*, where he reads $[\dots]\theta\epsilon\iota\upsilon$ and calls it “doubtful,” with his later judgment about the same reading (P.Mich. 3.138): “ $\tau\eta\nu$ was corrected from $\tau\iota\nu$ in slightly lighter ink or the cross line has faded more on this decayed margin.” We opt for his latter opinion here. Note that INTF has $\tau\eta$ at this point. Tischendorf also lists “12lect” in support

In P110 at Matt 10:26, the *ed. princ.* suggests that between *οὐν* and *φ[οβηθητε]* stands a canceled *beta*. Clearly there is a stroke of ink. However, since we are unable to identify the stroke as a *beta* or a part of one, we list it here as a possibility. The remaining two possible errors involve the substitution of erroneous letters (Luke 3:27; Acts 18:27), but they are no longer sufficiently legible.

4. Nonsense in Context

Reference	Uncorrected Text	Corrected Text
Matt 10:25b	[τοιc?] οικιοιc P110* <i>solus</i>	[τους] οικιους P110 ^c <i>solus</i> (τους οικιακους <i>rell</i> τοιc οικιακοιc ο3* τους οικειακους ο4 ο5 ο21 ο30 ο32 ο34 ^f 22 35 157 270 280 473 1005 1071 1582 2372 <i>al</i>)
Matt 26:26	εκαλεεcεn P37* <i>solus</i>	εκλαcεn P37 ^c <i>rell</i> (εκλαcε ο34 ^{f3} 35 69 118 157 700 788 1005 ^c 1346 2372)
Mark 2:10	ε[χ]ε P88*	ε[χ]ει P88 ^{2c} <i>rell</i> (εχη ο7 εχι ο1)
Luke 5:36	παλαι ου P4* 827 2643	κα ιν ου ¹ P4 ^c <i>rell</i> (κενου 69*)
Acts 8:32b	τον P50* <i>solus</i>	του P50 ^c <i>rell</i>
Acts 10:28a ⁴¹	ιουδαιου P50* <i>solus</i>	ιουδαιω P50 ^c <i>rell</i>
Acts 10:28b	χοινοι P50* <i>solus</i>	χοινον P50 ^c <i>rell</i> (κυνον 81)
Acts 10:30b	τη P50*	ταυτης P50 ^c <i>pm</i>
Heb 10:16	[α]υτων α P13* <i>solus</i>	[α]υτων ² P13 ^c <i>rell</i>
Heb 10:19	εχονταc P13* <i>solus</i>	εχοντεc P13 ^c <i>rell</i>
Heb 12:11b ⁴²	αυτοιc P13* ο6 1 1319c 1912 1962	αυτης P13 ^c <i>rell</i> (αυτου 1315)
1 Pet 3:10	τη P81* P72	την P81 ^c <i>rell</i>
Rev 3:12	[του ν]αου P115* <i>solus</i>	[τω ν]αω P115 ^c <i>rell</i> (το ναον 2087 τω οικω 1006 1841 τω ονοματι 911 920 1859 2027)

Several copyists wrote identifiable Greek words that happen to be nonsense in their particular contexts. Of these thirteen errors, three could simply be orthographical slips (Mark 2:10; Heb 10:19; 1 Pet 3:10), but they have in any case resulted in nonsense in their contexts. Additionally, three readings could be the result of visual confusion (all in P50): του > τον; ιουδαιω > ιουδαιου; and χοινον > χοινοι (Acts 8:32b; 10:28a, 28b). Regarding the latter correction in particular, spac-

of τη. However, if “12lect” is equivalent to 160 (cf. Caspar R. Gregory, *Textkritik des neuen Testaments*, 3 vols. [Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1900–1909], 1:393, 465), then this would seem to be an error.

⁴¹ The precise reading here is uncertain. The *ed. princ.* suggests that the scribe first (correctly) wrote ιουδαιω, then (wrongly) corrected it to ιουδαιου, and then (re)corrected to the original ιουδαιω. Above we list it as presented by the INTF transcription.

⁴² The *ed. princ.* notes that the underlying letter(s) here could be either ο or οι. We have followed the INTF transcription here in printing αυτοιc. Either way, the reading would be nonsense in its context.

ing suggests that $\chi\rho\iota\nu\omicron\iota$ was corrected to $\chi\rho\iota\nu\omicron\nu$ before the scribe copied the following words (η $\alpha\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho|\tau\omicron\nu$).

Three instances result from harmonization to the immediate context. The substitution of $\pi\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon$ for $\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\upsilon$ by the scribe of P4 (Luke 5:36) is probably due to the frequent use of the word in the context (5:36, 37, 39). At Heb 12:11b, the scribe of P13 originally wrote $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\delta\iota$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\upsilon\mu\nu\alpha\varsigma\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$ instead of $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\delta\iota$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\upsilon\mu\nu\alpha\varsigma\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$. The erroneous $[\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\nu]$ $\alpha\upsilon$ in P115 (Rev 3:12) might be a harmonization to the immediately following phrase: $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$. One error appears to be a nonsensical harmonization either to the wider context or more familiar wording: P37 at Matt 26:26 (cf. $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\varsigma\epsilon\nu$ in 25:14).

Regarding Matt 10:25b in P110, the editor suggests that, while it is possible that $\omicron\iota\kappa\iota\omicron\iota\varsigma$ has been corrected to $\omicron\iota\kappa\iota\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, it is more likely that the *upsilon* was simply reinked. We have decided to retain it here as a correction because the shape of the originally written letter more closely resembles *iota* rather than *upsilon*, suggesting that it is indeed a corrected error.⁴³

Although the superfluous *alpha* in P13 at Heb 10:16 could be considered strictly nonsense, it is listed here as nonsense in context because it could be understood as a word (e.g., relative pronoun). It was the result of a leap from $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ either to $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ (thereby omitting $\epsilon\pi\iota\gamma\rho\alpha\psi\omega$) or, more likely, to $\tau\omega\nu$ $\alpha\mu\alpha\rho\tau\iota\omega\nu$ or $\tau\omega\nu$ $\alpha\nu\omicron\mu\iota\omega\nu$ (10:17).⁴⁴ Either way, the scribe immediately caught the error and canceled it. Similarly, the erroneous $\tau\eta$ in P50 (Acts 10:30b) appears to be a leap over the $\tau\alpha\nu$ - in $\tau\alpha\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$ that the scribe caught immediately.

One more correction possibly fits in this category but cannot be confirmed due to partial illegibility.

Reference	Uncorrected Text	Corrected Text
Mark 2:25	$\omicron\upsilon\upsilon?$ P88* <i>solus</i>	$\omicron\iota$ P88 ^{3c} <i>rell</i>

According to the *ed. princ.* and INTF transcription, the scribe of P88 (at Mark 2:25) wrongly wrote $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\omicron\upsilon$, which was subsequently corrected to $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\omicron\iota$. The IGNTP transcription, however, notes that this is possible but uncertain due to the poor state of the papyrus.

5. Omissions

Reference	Uncorrected Text	Corrected Text
Matt 5:13	<i>om.</i> P86* $\omicron\iota$ $\omicron\varsigma$ $\omicron\alpha$ $\overset{f}{\iota}$ 33 205 892	$\kappa\alpha\iota$ P86 ^{2c} <i>rell</i>
Matt 13:35	<i>om.</i> 0242* <i>solus</i>	$[\epsilon\nu$ $\pi\alpha]$ $ \rho\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\alpha\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron$ $\varsigma\tau\omicron\mu\alpha$ $[\mu\omicron\upsilon$ $\epsilon\rho\epsilon\upsilon\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota]$ 0242 ^c <i>rell</i>
Matt 13:56	<i>om.</i> P103* <i>solus</i>	$[\epsilon\iota]$ $\varsigma\iota\nu$ P103 ^{2c} <i>rell</i> ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma\iota$ 021 028 030 034 036 $\overset{f}{\iota}$ 118 157 700 ^c 1071)
Matt 23:37b ⁴⁵	<i>om.</i> P77* <i>solus</i>	$\kappa\alpha\iota$ ² P77 ^{2c} <i>rell</i>

⁴³ Note, for example, how other *upsilons* in P110 have a leftward tail at the very bottom (e.g., \downarrow ll. 1, 2, 4, 5; \rightarrow ll. 3, 5, 6, 8) while the *iotas* lack it (\downarrow ll. 2, 5; \rightarrow l. 6), as here. (Line numbers here follow those of the INTF transcription rather than the *ed. princ.*) Note also that a similar correction was made in Codex Vaticanus at this very point: $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\omicron\iota\kappa\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\iota\varsigma$ ($\omicron\iota\kappa\iota^*$), $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\omicron\iota\kappa\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ ($\omicron\iota\kappa\iota^c$).

⁴⁴ *Ed. princ.*: “The scribe apparently began to write $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ before $\epsilon\pi\iota\gamma\rho\alpha\psi\omega$, but that the α was meant to be deleted is not certain and its partial effacement may be accidental.”

⁴⁵ The *ed. princ.* identifies this as a correction from a second hand, but see Wasserman, “The Early Text of Matthew,” 98, and Peter Head, “Some Recently Published NT Papyri from Oxyrhynchus: An Overview and Preliminary Assessment,” *TynBul* 51 (2000): 1–16 (7), both of whom identify it as firsthand.

Reference	Uncorrected Text	Corrected Text
Matt 24:14 ⁴⁶	[το ευαγ]γελιον P70* 036 043 047 22 245 251 280 1012 1194 1295 1402 1574	[το ευαγ]γελιον τουτο P70 ^{2c} 05 (579) 1223 (τουτο το ευαγγελιον <i>rell</i>)
Matt 26:29 ⁴⁷	<i>om.</i> P37* 01* 04 019	του P37 ^{2c} <i>rell</i> (<i>om.</i> τουτου 037 043 124 157 174 ^c 485 892 983 1010 1375 1424 1579 1689)
Matt 26:39a ⁴⁸	<i>om.</i> P53* 019 037 042 ^f 205 892 2542	μου P53 ^{2c} <i>rell</i>
Matt 26:49–50	<i>om.</i> P37* <i>solus</i>	δε ο ιϛ P37 ^c <i>solus</i> ⁴⁹ (χαιρει ραββι και κατεφιλησεν αυτον ο δε ιϛ ειπεν <i>pm</i>)
Mark 15:32	αυτω 059+0215* <i>rell</i>	συν αυτω 059+0215 ^c 01 03 019 038 083 0184 79 372 472 517 579 713 780 892 949 1675 2427 2737 (<i>om.</i> 05 706 792 803 827 1029* 1241 1326 1402 1424 1446 1593 2542 ^s 1241 μετ αυτου 044)
Luke 2:42	αυτω P141* <i>solus</i>	αυτω ετη P141 ^c 05 019 579 (ετων <i>rell</i> ετη 273)
John 1:38a	<i>om.</i> P5* <i>solus</i>	οι δε P5 ^c <i>rell</i> (ο δε 579)
John 16:19	<i>om.</i> P5* 03 019 032 1071	ο P5 ^c <i>rell</i>
John 16:23–24 ⁵⁰	[δωσει υμειν] <i>om.</i> P5* <i>solus</i>	[δωσει υμειν] εν τω ονοματι [μου εως αρ]τ[ι ουκ ητησατε ουδεν] P5 ^{2c2} 01 03 04* 019 033 037 054 1844 (εν τω ονοματι μου δωσει υμιν εως αρτι ουκ ητησατε ουδεν <i>rell</i> δωσει υμιν εως αρτι ουκ ητησατε ουδεν 118 205 209)
John 16:29 ⁵¹	<i>om.</i> P5* 01 03 04* 022 038 039 041 044 0211 0250 1 157 262 489* 565 1187 1219 1342 1582* 2145 2193	[αυ]τω P5 ^c <i>rell</i> (<i>om.</i> αυτω οί 1321*)

⁴⁶ The *ed. princ.* identifies this as a correction from the first hand, but Wasserman attributes it to a second hand: Wasserman, “Early Text of Matthew,” 97.

⁴⁷ The *ed. princ.* identifies this as a correction from a second hand, but Wasserman attributes it to the first hand: Wasserman, “Early Text of Matthew,” 91.

⁴⁸ *Ed. princ.*: “The added μου is by a different hand but probably contemporary.”

⁴⁹ Although we have followed INTF here in reading the interlinear correction as δε ο ιϛ, the reading is not certain. For more on this variation unit, see note below.

⁵⁰ There is some uncertainty here due to manuscript damage, but it is clear that the omission has been restored (at least partially) in the bottom margin. Given the line length, it is more likely that P5 followed 01 and 03 (etc.) in having δωσει υμιν (or υμειν) prior to εν τω ονοματι μου (16:23) rather than the majority of witnesses, which have it after. Also, there are few different ways to restore the text of the marginal correction; cf. *ed. princ.*, INTF, IGNTF, and Comfort and Barrett (INTF is followed above). For further discussion, see Peter M. Head, “The Habits of New Testament Copyists: Singular Readings in the Early Fragmentary Papyri of John,” *Bib* 85 (2004): 399–408 (404), and Lonnie D. Bell, *The Early Textual Transmission of John: Stability and Fluidity in Its Second and Third Century Greek Manuscripts*, NTTSD 54 (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 119.

⁵¹ The NA28 apparatus appears to be in error here regarding the wording of 01 (John 16:29).

Reference	Uncorrected Text	Corrected Text
John 20:19	om. P5* <i>solus</i>	και ³ P5 ^c <i>rell</i>
Acts 9:35	om. P53* 01*	τ[ον] ¹ P53 ^c <i>rell</i> (την καρωναν I188 om. και τον καρωναν 1642*)
1 Cor 15:10a	[η χ]αρις κυν εμοι 0270* <i>solus</i>	[η χ]αρις [του] θ̄υ κυν εμοι 0270 ^{2c} 01* 03 06* 010 012 0243 6 1738 1739 (η χαρις του θ̄υ η κυν εμοι <i>rell</i> η χαρις η κυν εμοι 1611 1505 2495 η χαρις του θ̄υ η εις εμε P46 η χαρις αυτου η κυν εμοι 2143)
1 Cor 15:10b	[η χ]αρις [του] θ̄υ κυν εμοι 0270 ^{2c} 01* 03 06* 010 012 0243 6 1738 1739	[η χ]αρις [του] θ̄υ η κυν εμοι 0270 ^{3c} <i>rell</i> (η χαρις η κυν εμοι 1611 1505 2495 η χαρις του θ̄υ η εις εμε P46 η χαρις αυτου η κυν εμοι 2143)
Eph 1:11 ⁵²	om. P92* 044 263 1319 1573 2127	και P92 ^c <i>rell</i>
James 1:11b	om. P23* 1890 2138	και ³ P23 ^c <i>rell</i>
Rev 3:20 ⁵³	om. 0169* 1704 1852 2196	κρ̄ου ε[α]ν τ[ις] ᾱκου[χη της φωνη]ς μ[ου και ανοιξη την θυραν και] ⁵⁴ 0169 ^c <i>rell</i>
Rev 3:21a	om. 0169* <i>solus</i>	[μ]ου 0169 ^{2c} <i>rell</i>
Rev 4:3	om. 0169* <i>rell</i>	επι τον θρ[ονον] 0169 ^{2c} <i>solus</i>
Rev 13:3	om. P115* <i>rell</i>	εχ P115 ^c 01 02 04 046 ^c 025
Rev 14:15	om. P115* <i>solus</i>	η P115 ^{2c} <i>rell</i>

As is evident, our copyists were especially prone to the omission of *verba minora*: conjunctions, pronouns, articles, particles, prepositions, and the like. Of the twenty-five corrected omissions, most affect just one word: five involve *και*, five involve an article (*η bis*, *ο*, *τον*, *του*), four involve a pronoun (*αυτω*, *μου bis*, *τουτο*), and two involve a preposition (*κυν*, *εχ*). Also corrected are the omission of the verb *εικιν* and the noun *ετη*.

The remaining seven omissions involve more than one word. Four of these appear to be erroneous leaps forward. At Matt 26:49–50, the scribe of P37 leapt from the *ειπεν* of 26:49 to the *ειπεν* of 26:50, thus omitting *χαιρε, ραββι, και κατεφιλησεν αυτον. ο δε ιϛ ειπεν*. The inter-linear correction *δε ο ιϛ* (assuming this is an accurate transcription), fails to make sense of the text, although it is possible that the rest of the omitted text was supplied in the now-lost margin.⁵⁵ At John 1:38a in P5, the scribe omitted *οι δε* by leaping forward: [*ζητει*]τε *οι δε*. The same scribe made another leap at John 16:23–24, from *εν τω ονοματι μου* in verse 23 to the same words in verse 24, thereby omitting *εν τω ονοματι μου εως αρτι ουκ ητησατε ουδεν*. The errone-

⁵² INTF expresses some caution about this reading, adding “vid,” but Royse cites it without hesitation: James R. Royse, “The Early Text of Paul (and Hebrews),” in Hill and Kruger, *Early Text of the New Testament*, 175–203 (197).

⁵³ The original scribe of 0169 marked the omission and correction with an *anchora* symbol (†).

⁵⁴ Reconstruction taken from Peter Malik, “P.Oxy. VIII 1080: A Fresh Edition and Textual Notes on a Miniature Codex of the Apocalypse,” *APF* 63 (2017): 310–20.

⁵⁵ NA28 lists the error in P37 at Matt 26:49–50 as two separate variation units (the lengthy omission and an addition of *αυτω*), but this is probably misleading. The explanation given above removes the need to posit the addition of *αυτω*. For discussion, see Kyoung Shik Min, *Die Früheste Überlieferung des Matthäusevangeliums (bis zum 3./4. Jh.): Edition und Untersuchung*, ANTF 34 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005), 89 n. 3.

ously omitted text was supplied in the lower margin, possibly by a second hand.⁵⁶ At Rev 3:20, the scribe of 0169 erroneously leapt over $\kappa\rho\upsilon\omega \epsilon[\alpha]\gamma \dots [\theta\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu \kappa\alpha\iota]$ due to homoioteleuton and supplied the text in the lower margin in the same hand.

The omission at Matt 13:35 in 0242 does not have any obvious explanation and appears to be a simple lapse. In the case of Rev 4:3 in 0169, the corrector has mistakenly added $\epsilon\pi\iota \tau\omicron\nu\theta\rho[\omicron\nu\omicron\nu]$ after $\omicron \kappa\alpha\theta\eta\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$, harmonizing to the immediate context and creating a singular reading in the process.

The final two corrected omissions occur in 0270 at the same point in 1 Cor 15:10. The scribe originally wrote $\eta \chi\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma \kappa\upsilon\nu \epsilon\mu\omicron\iota$, an otherwise unattested reading. A corrector later added $\tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\bar{\upsilon}$, making $\eta \chi\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\bar{\upsilon} \kappa\upsilon\nu \epsilon\mu\omicron\iota$, which is an attested but minority reading. A second corrector then added another article, resulting in $\eta \chi\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\bar{\upsilon} \eta \kappa\upsilon\nu \epsilon\mu\omicron\iota$, which is the majority reading. In making the addition of η , the latter scribe partially effaced $\tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\bar{\upsilon}$.⁵⁷

Two more examples are possible but uncertain.

Reference	Uncorrected Text	Corrected Text
Matt 10:33	om.? 0171 037* 157	[οστις δ αν] αρνησεται με ενπροσ θεν των [αν]ων αρνησομαι καγω αυτον ενπροσθεν το[υ πρς μου του εν ουνοις] 0171 ^{2c} <i>rell</i>
Rev 11:9a ⁵⁸	om. P115* <i>rell</i>	χα[ι]? P115 ^{2c} (<i>post εθνων</i>) <i>solus?</i>

In the upper margin of 0171, the text of Matt 10:33 is written in a smaller, second hand. Because the folio is lacunose where the text should have been written originally, it can only be presumed that the original scribe omitted that verse (due to homoioteleuton). The second possible correction, Rev 11:9 in P115, is uncertain due to partial illegibility.

6. Additions

Reference	Uncorrected Text	Corrected Text
Acts 10:29	ουν P50* <i>solus</i>	om. P50 ^c <i>rell</i> (τω 08 1884)
1 Pet 2:23	τον τ[οπον] P81* <i>solus</i>	τ[οπον] P81 ^c 1575 (om. <i>rell</i>)
Rev 2:27	αυτου[ς] P115* <i>solus</i>	om. P115 ^c <i>rell</i>
Rev 3:10	[τ]ους P115* <i>solus</i>	om. P115 ^c <i>rell</i>
Rev 13:18	η P115* <i>solus</i>	om. P115 ^c <i>rell</i>

⁵⁶ As suggested in the *ed. princ.*: “This mistake has been corrected at the foot of the page, where l. 35 has been rewritten in a smaller and probably different hand with the missing words incorporated.” Pace Blumell and Wayment, *Christian Oxyrhynchus*, 44, who attribute it to the first hand. The poor state of the manuscript makes identification of the hand difficult.

⁵⁷ Cf. the suggestion in the *ed. princ.*

⁵⁸ The manuscript is difficult to read at this point, but if the transcription of $\chi\alpha[\iota]$ is accurate, it is a correction that creates a nonsense reading. One possible explanation for it could be the close proximity of $\tau\alpha$ [πτωματα] (INTF) or $\tau\alpha$ [πτωμα] (ISBTF) in l. 22 and [τα πτωματα] in l. 23, the second of which is (correctly) preceded immediately by $\chi\alpha[\iota]$. The corrector might have confused the two and mistakenly added $\kappa\alpha\iota$ to the first.

There are five corrected additions in our manuscripts. Three of these are obvious cases of erroneous dittography: *ουν τινι ουν* (Acts 10:29), *τον τον* (1 Pet 2:23), and *[τ]ρους τ[ουc]* (Rev 3:10).

Particularly interesting is the insertion of *αυτου[c]* at the end of Rev 2:27. According to NA28, the wider context runs thus: *καὶ ποιμανεῖ αὐτοὺς ἐν ῥάβδῳ κιδηρᾶ ὡς τὰ κεύη τὰ κεραμικὰ συντρίβεται* (2:27), which is clearly a paraphrase of Ps 2:9 (LXX): *ποιμανεῖς αὐτοὺς ἐν ῥάβδῳ κιδηρᾶ, ὡς κευῶς κεραμέως συντρίψει αὐτούς*. Herman Hoskier's collations show that no witness to John's Apocalypse other than P115* has *αυτους* after *συντρίβεται*.⁵⁹ While it is possible that the copyist erroneously repeated *αυτους* from the first clause, it seems equally as likely that the addition reflects harmonization to Ps 2 (LXX).⁶⁰

At Rev 13:18 in P115, it is clear that an *eta* stands before the numeral $\overline{\chi\iota\varsigma}$, and it is further clear that a dot was written above it. However, it is not entirely certain that the dot is a cancellation dot (what precedes it is lacunose), and it is unclear what this letter could have meant in the first place.⁶¹ Still, the most plausible explanation seems to be that the *eta* is a canceled error (or the end of one). If so, this error was corrected prior to the writing of $\overline{\chi\iota\varsigma}$.

There is another possible instance of a corrected addition:

Reference	Uncorrected Text	Corrected Text
John 1:38b	<i>αυ [τω] P5* rel</i>	<i>om.? P5^c 178 251 1424</i>

The IGNTP transcription records deletion dots above the first two letters of *αυ|[τω]* in conjunction with the corrected omission *οι δε* in John 1:38a (see above). It is unclear why *αυ|[τω]* would be canceled, since this would put P5 out of step with the vast majority of manuscripts. The poor state of the papyrus makes it difficult to be certain about the reading here.

7. Substitutions

Reference	Uncorrected Text	Corrected Text
Matt 10:25c ⁶²	<i>[επεκα?] λεσεν P110* solus</i>	<i>[επεκα] λεσαν P110^c? 01^c 03 04 017 032 037 f³ 565 579 pm (εκαλεσαν 038 0171 fⁱ 700 1424 pm απεκαλεσαν 030 034 157* 267 270 291 473 713 998 1200 1170 εκαλεσαντω 019 επεκαλεσαντο 01* 022 042 043 4 16 59 273 1010 1293 1555 1604 καλουσιν 05)</i>
Matt 26:24 ⁶³	<i>εγεννηθη P37* 02 038 28 579 700*</i>	<i>εγεννηθη P37^c rel</i>
Mark 2:22 ⁶⁴	<i>[βα]λει P88* 0211 117* 273 713</i>	<i>[βα]λλει P88^c rel (βαλι 038 βαλλη 732* 829)</i>

⁵⁹ Herman C. Hoskier, *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*, 2 vols. (London: Quaritch, 1929), 2:88–89.

⁶⁰ Parker suggests that either the exemplar contained annotations on another text or that the scribe consulted another copy or copies (“New Oxyrhynchus Papyrus,” 163).

⁶¹ See Parker, “New Oxyrhynchus Papyrus,” 160 n. 7.

⁶² The *ed. princ.* notes that P110 could have read either *επεκαλεσαν* or *εκαλεσαν* here.

⁶³ The second hand is suggested by Sanders in the *ed. princ.*, but see Wasserman, “Early Text of Matthew,” 91, who suggests first hand.

⁶⁴ ECM has a question mark here for the reading of P88*.

Reference	Uncorrected Text	Corrected Text
Acts 8:32c	αυτου P50* <i>solus</i> ⁶⁵	αυτον P50 ^c <i>rell</i> (αυτο 321)
Rom 8:21	[ελευθερ?]ωθη [εκ?] P27* <i>solus</i>	[ελευθερο]υται απ[ο] P27 ^{2c} <i>solus</i> (ελευθερωθησεται απο <i>rell</i>)
1 Cor 15:14	ημων 0270* 03 06* 049 0243 33 81 1241 1739 1881 147 <i>al</i>	υμων 0270 ^c <i>rell</i>
Eph 1:19	πλουτο[ς] P92* <i>solus</i>	υπερβαλλ[ον] P92 ^c <i>rell</i> (υπερ 385 υπερβαλλων 1877 <i>om.</i> 010 012)
Phlm 19	αυτο[ν] P139* <i>solus</i>	εαυτο[ν] P139 ^c 0150 256 263 365 1241 1933 2110 ⁶⁶ (σεαυτον <i>rell</i>)
Heb 9:14 ⁶⁷	[π]ο[ς][ω] P17* <i>rell</i>	[π]ολλ[ω] P17 ^c 33 1751
Heb 11:4	αυτου P13* <i>rell</i>	αυτω P13 ^c <i>solus</i>
Rev 1:6	του θ̄υ P18* 2196	τω θ̄ω P18 ^c <i>rell</i>
Rev 3:19	ζηλευε 0169* <i>rell</i>	ζηλωσων 0169 ^{2c} 01 025 2053 III ^A (ζηλου 314 617 664 743 1094 2016 2075 2077 2078 2436 ζητησων 1957)
Rev 3:21b	γενεικη[α] 0169* <i>solus</i>	ενικη[α] 0169 ^{2c} <i>rell</i>
Rev 3:21c	χεκαθικα 0169* <i>solus</i>	εκαθικα 016 ^{2c} <i>rell</i> (εκαθεικα 02 εκαθηκα 046 69 181 922 935 1894 1918 2026 2033 2036 2043 2047 2050 2052 2065* 2082 2329 2351)
Rev 9:20 ⁶⁸	[προσκυνη]ζουσι[ν] P115* P47 01 02 04 104* 452 459 467* 922 1828 2019 2021 2082 2084	[προσκυνη]ζωσι[ν] P115 ^c <i>rell</i> (προσκυνισωσι 1864)

Several of these substitutions might simply be orthographical slips (Matt 10:25c; 26:24; Mark 2:22; 1 Cor 15:14; Rev 9:20) or visual confusions (Acts 8:32c), but they have in any case created alternative readings. One error was caused by a leap back: in P92* at Eph 1:19, after writing τι το, the scribe accidentally leapt backward to τις ο (in 1:18) and wrote πλουτος instead of

⁶⁵ Von Soden lists δ602 (= GA 522) in support of αὐτοῦ, apparently in error. Manuscript images show that, although the script sometimes makes it difficult to discern the difference between *nu* and *upsilon*, the word is accented as αὐτόν.

⁶⁶ Von Soden lists α174 (= GA 255) as support for εαυτον in Phlm 19, but we are unable to verify this reading.

⁶⁷ We follow the INTF transcription and the *ed. princ.*, although the editor notes some uncertainty: “But the decipherment is doubtful, the first supposed λ being of a curiously rounded shape.” Pace Klaus Wachtel and Klaus Witte, eds., *Die Paulinischen Briefe: Gal–Hebr.*, vol. 2.2 of *Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), xliii, who observe the interlinear text but express doubt that it was intended as a correction.

⁶⁸ The presence of the movable *nu* at the end of προσκυνησουσιν (Rev 9:20 in P115) is uncertain, so Hoskier’s textual evidence has been simplified to focus on the relevant variation between -ου- and -ω-.

υπερβαλλον but caught the error and corrected it.⁶⁹ And in one case the scribe appears to have attempted to improve the sense of the text (P13 at Heb 11:4).⁷⁰

Four substitutions involve the change of verb tense. According to the most recent analysis of P27, the original reading at Rom 8:21 was either ελευθερωθη εκ or ηλευθερωθη εκ, either of which would be a singular reading that substitutes an aorist passive in place of the majority reading of the future passive (ελευθερωθησεται).⁷¹ The correction, however, created another singular reading, a present middle/passive form, which certainly changes the sense of the text here. Somewhat similar is the correction at Rev 3:19 in 0169. The original scribe wrote ζηλευε (present imperative) in line with the majority reading, but a secondhand corrector altered it to the relatively rarer aorist imperative ζηλωσον. Twice the corrector rectified unique readings of the original scribe, who had wrongly substituted perfect indicatives for aorist indicatives (Rev 3:21b, c).

The remaining three corrected substitutions are difficult to explain. One of these might reflect harmonization. In P18 at Rev 1:6, the scribe initially wrote ιερεις του θ̄υ but quickly corrected it to ιερεις τω θ̄ω. The phrase ιερεις τῷ θεῷ with the dative occurs only here in all of the LXX and New Testament (and ιερεις τῷ θεῷ never), but the same construction with the genitive (ιερεις τοῦ θεοῦ or ιερεις τοῦ θεοῦ) appears occasionally.⁷² In any case, since the *omega* of θ̄ω stands immediately after the canceled *upsilon* and before the next word, it is clear the scribe made the correction *in scribendo*.

The substitution in P139 at Phlm 19 could simply be a scribal slip (the omission of *ce-*), but both the original reading and its correction are understandable alternatives. It is unclear what would have caused the error.

In P17 at Heb 9:14, the scribe originally wrote the majority reading ποσω μαλλον but appears to have corrected it to πολλω μαλλον. Given the scant support for this reading, it seems unlikely to have been influenced by another exemplar. In addition, since the latter reading is only slightly more common in the New Testament than the former, it was probably not caused by harmonization to familiar wording.⁷³

One more corrected substitution is possible but uncertain due to the poor state of the papyrus. Although not noted in the *ed. princ.*, the INTF transcription notes the following as a possible correction in P53:

Reference	Uncorrected Text	Corrected Text
Matt 26:39b	αυτου P53* <i>rell</i>	εαυτου? P53 ^c <i>solus</i>

⁶⁹ See Royse, “Early Text of Paul,” 197.

⁷⁰ See the discussion in Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London: United Bible Societies, 1971), 671–72 (first edition, not in the second edition), though he suggests it is a transcriptional error.

⁷¹ Samuli Siikavirta, “P27 (Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1355): A Fresh Analysis,” *TC* 18 (2013): 1–10 (7). See also Royse, “Early Text of Paul,” 191.

⁷² Heb 7:1; Rev 20:6; Gen 14:18; 1 Sam 14:3.

⁷³ E.g., πολλω μαλλον: Matt 6:30; Mark 10:48; Luke 18:39; Rom 5:10, 15, 17; 1 Cor 12:22; 2 Cor 3:9, 11; Phil 2:12. ποσω μαλλον: Matt 7:11; 10:25; Luke 11:13; 12:24, 28; Rom 11:12, 24.

8. Transposition

Reference	Uncorrected Text	Corrected Text
Acts 10:31c	του $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$ ενωπιον P50* <i>solus</i>	ενωπιον του $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$ P50 ^c <i>rell</i>
Acts 23:27b	υπο των ιουδαιων συνλημφθεντα P48* <i>solus</i>	συνλημφθεντα υπο των ιουδαιων P48 ^c 08 (συλληφθεντα υπο των ιουδαιων <i>pm</i>)

Two corrections involve erroneously transposed wording. One might be tempted to classify these errors as dittographies, since they result in the doubling of words. However, it is more likely in both cases that the scribes mistakenly transposed the wording of their exemplar. In the case of Acts 10:31c in P50, the scribe should have written *εμνησθησαν ενωπιον του $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$* , but the text appears as: *εμνησθησαν του $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$ ενωπιον | του $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$* . Strictly speaking, this could be classified as an addition of *του $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$* . However, the more likely cause of error was a leap over *ενωπιον*, which was immediately caught and fixed by deleting the preempted word and writing the text in the correct sequence. The same explanation makes the most sense of the error at Acts 23:27b in P48.⁷⁴ The scribe should have written *τον ανδρα τουτον συνλημφθεντα υπο των ιουδαιων*, but the text appears as: *τον ανδρα τουτον υπο των ιουδαιων συνλημφθεντα υπο των ιουδαιων*. The scribe most likely leapt over *συνλημφθεντα* but immediately caught the error, deleted the initial *υπο των ιουδαιων*, and wrote the text in the correct sequence. As such, both of these constitute corrections made *in scribendo*.

9. Uncertain

9.1. Uncertain Category

Reference	Uncorrected Text	Corrected Text
Matt 10:25d	[βεελζε?]βουλ 0171*	[βεελζε?]ββουλ 0171 ^c (βεελζεβουλ <i>rell</i> βεεζβουλ 349 βεεζεβουλ 01 03 βελζεβουλ 05 019 033 16 566* 1093*)
Matt 10:33 ⁷⁵	αρνης[ομε?] P19*	αρνης[ομ]αι P19 ^c <i>rell</i> (απαρνησομαι ^f αρνησομε 01 038 αρνησωμαι 045 1071 αρνησωμε 017 019 2* 28 ^c αρνισομαι 579)
Matt 26:46 ⁷⁶	αγ[?]μεν P37*	αγωμεν P37 ^c <i>rell</i> (αγομεν 045 2372*)
Mark 2:12	εξ? P88*	<i>om.</i> P88 ^c <i>rell</i> ($\overline{\alpha\omega\omega\upsilon\eta}$ 79)
Acts 10:31d ⁷⁷	ειχη[?]ουεθη P50*	ειχηκουεθη P50 ^c <i>rell</i> (εχηκουεθη 2344 εχηκουεθησαν 1890)

⁷⁴ Note, e.g., that Christopher Tuckett, “The Early Text of Acts,” in Hill and Kruger, *Early Text of the New Testament*, 157–74 (168), classifies the error in P48 as dittography.

⁷⁵ Printed here is the INTF transcription, *pace* the editor: “There is no room for *αρνησομαι* or *-με*, and the scribe evidently made some error; possibly he wrote *αρνησω*.”

⁷⁶ According to Min, *Die Früheste*, 89, “αγομεν P37*^{vid}.”

⁷⁷ *Ed. princ.*: “The *kappa* of *ειχηκούεθη* is superimposed upon an indistinguishable letter.”

Reference	Uncorrected Text	Corrected Text
Acts 10:31e ⁷⁸	[?] P50*	αι P50 ^c <i>rell</i> (<i>om.</i> 020 049 81 218 319* 326 636 1243 1751 1838 1852 2147 2344)
Acts 23:12	[?]εγοντες P48*	λεγοντες P48 ^c <i>pm</i> (<i>om.</i> <i>pm</i>)
Heb 10:12 ⁷⁹	προσε[?]εγκας P13*	προσενεγκας P13 ^c <i>rell</i>

In many cases, it is certain (or nearly so) that a scribal correction has been made, but for some reason the error cannot be categorized with confidence. For example, on several occasions scribes corrected themselves by overwriting an erroneous letter that is now illegible, as in P13 (Heb 10:12), P37 (Matt 26:46), P48 (Acts 23:12), and P50 (Acts 10:31d, 31e), which may reflect either orthography, nonsense (strict or contextual), or substitution, if the original reading could be discerned.

At Matt 10:33 in P19, half the word in question is lacunose due to manuscript damage, so the exact nature of the correction cannot be determined. The same is true of 0171 at Matt 10:25d. At Mark 2:12 in P88, the scribe wrote something prior to ωτε and then erased it, leaving a mostly blank space with just traces of εξ. Assuming this is the correct transcription, it would suggest that the scribe either leapt over ωτε and began writing the following word, εξιταθε, or leapt back to εξηληθεν. Either way, this correction would classify as *in scribendo*.

9.2. Stray Letters, Marks, and Traces of Ink

In many cases scholars note stray letters or traces of ink that very well could be corrections but lack sufficient context or clarity for certainty. There are too many of such instances to catalog here, so we offer the following simply by way of illustration:

Manuscript	Notes
P13	INTF notes a possible but now unreadable interlinear correction after εχει at Heb 3:3 (f.47v l. 15).
P16	According to the <i>ed. princ.</i> at Phil 4:3 (v l. 23): “There are some faint marks above the ζ which might be interpreted as an over-written ν (συζυγε), but they are not certainly ink.”
P21	According to the <i>ed. princ.</i> at Matt 12:32 (r l. 6): “Traces of ink above το[υτ]ω perhaps indicate a correction.”
P38	According to Comfort and Barrett at Acts 18:28 (r l. 2), the <i>omicron</i> of ευτωνωσ was written over “a letter that is unable to be deciphered.” ⁸⁰
P69	According to Thomas Wayment, there are traces of a correction at Luke 22:41 (→ l. 2). ⁸¹

⁷⁸ *Ed. princ.*: “αί may first have been ω.” INTF, however, suggests η.

⁷⁹ The *ed. princ.* transcribes this word as προσενεγκας and comments, “The second ν if it be ν, in προσενεγκας was converted from ι or υ. The previous ν also seems to have been altered.” In contrast to the first statement, here we follow the INTF in transcribing as -εγκας.

⁸⁰ Comfort and Barrett, *Complete Text* (1st ed.), 135.

⁸¹ Thomas A. Wayment, “A New Transcription of P. Oxy. 2383 (P69),” *NovT* 50 (2008): 351–57 (354).

<i>Manuscript</i>	<i>Notes</i>
P81	The editor notes the presence of an <i>anchora</i> symbol (†) in the margin (at 1 Pet 3:7), which often signals the presence of a correction (cf. the omission in 0169 at Rev 3:20 above). ⁸² However, manuscript damage prevents certainty about the function of the symbol here. ⁸³
P86	INTF notes the interlinear letter μ after $\kappa\rho\nu\beta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ at Matt 5:14 (r l. 5).
P115	The <i>ed. princ.</i> notes possible a correction above $\tau\omega$ at Rev 2:14 (pp. 3–4, l. 3) and a possible deletion after $\phi\omega\nu\eta\nu$ at 10:4 (pp. 13–14, l. 113–114). In addition to these, note what appears to be a supralinear <i>eta</i> in 2:15 (pp. 3–4, l. 6); a supralinear <i>pi</i> after $\eta\mu\iota\upsilon$ at 11:9b (pp. 17–18, l. 164); and what appears to be a deletion stroke at 11:15 (pp. 17–18, l. 175).
P132	According to the <i>ed. princ.</i> at Eph 3:21 a visible ink stroke above the <i>tau</i> might be a now-lost interlinear correction (↓ 4).
P133	According to the <i>ed. princ.</i> at 1 Tim 3:15 there are some ink strokes that might be traces of interlinear corrections (↓ 9).
P138	According to the <i>ed. princ.</i> at Luke 13:27 there is some superscripted ink that might be a correction (↓ 7).
P139	According to the <i>ed. princ.</i> at Phlm 20, there are possible deletion dots over ρ and χ (↓ ll. 8–9).
057	According to the <i>ed. princ.</i> at Acts 3:10, the scribe initially wrote and then partially erased an <i>iota</i> adscript in $\tau\omega$ (col. 2, l. 3). ⁸⁴
0169	According to the <i>ed. princ.</i> at Rev 4:1, portions of hair side ll. 18–19 have been corrected and/or reinked. ⁸⁵ Similarly, at 4:2 (l. 25) there are traces of a marginal correction that could be a $\kappa\alpha\iota$.
0220	Recent analysis of this fragment suggests that there is evidence of a scribal correction at Rom 5:3 (r. l. 12), but physical damage prevents certainty. ⁸⁶

10. Corrections Made *In Scribendo*

Above we noted certain corrections that could be classified with some confidence as *in scribendo*, or made by the original scribe while in the process of copying. Here we repeat them for ease of reference, recalling that in one case there is some uncertainty due to illegibility (indicated by an asterisk).

<i>Manuscript</i>	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Type of correction</i>
P4	Luke 3:29	orthography
P13	Heb 10:16	nonsense in context
P15	1 Cor 7:23a, 23b*	orthography
P18	Rev 1:6	substitution

⁸² E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, Bulletin Supplement 46 (London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1987), 15–16; Alan Muggidge, *Copying Early Christian Texts: A Study of Scribal Practice*, WUNT 2/362 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 102.

⁸³ ECM lists several possible textual variants in 1 Pet 3:7.

⁸⁴ More likely, the mark is a line filler (cf. col. 2 l. 7).

⁸⁵ But see the cautionary remarks in Malik, “P.Oxy. VIII 1080,” 317–18.

⁸⁶ Daniel Stevens, “The Wyman Fragment: A New Edition and Analysis with Radiocarbon Dating,” *NTS* 68 (2022), 431–44 (esp. 439).

<i>Manuscript</i>	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Type of correction</i>
P48	Acts 23:27b	transposition
P50	Acts 8:32a	orthography
	Acts 10:28b, 30b	nonsense in context
	Acts 10:30a, 31a	strictly nonsense
	Acts 10:31c	transposition
P88	Mark 2:12	uncertain category
P106	John 1:33	strictly nonsense
P115	Rev 13:18	addition

A significant observation to be made here is the variety of categories that were subject to *in scribendo* corrections by the first hand. Every category of error is represented here, with the exception of omission (unless the uncategorized correction in P88 at Mark 2:12 qualifies as such). Moreover, the relative proportion of categories of *in scribendo* corrections corresponds well to the overall tally of all corrections (see §12), with the exception of omission. As we have seen, the category of corrected omissions is prominent among corrections as a whole, constituting no less than 20 percent, but it is virtually unrepresented among those that can be identified as *in scribendo*. This fact is unexpected. It could suggest that scribes were less likely to catch omissions while in the process of copying compared to other categories of error. However, the perhaps more likely explanation is that *in scribendo* corrections of omissions are simply difficult for modern-day editors to identify. Because omissions are normally corrected by scribes via interlinear insertion of the omitted text (rather than in-line correction), it is generally more difficult to determine when these were made. Thus, many of the corrected omissions identified here may well have been made by the first hand while in the process of copying, but they cannot be identified with confidence due to their interlinear placement. In any case, it is significant that scribes could be attentive to virtually every category of error while in the process of copying.

11. Later Correctors

Determining the identity of correctors is challenging even in well-preserved and clearly photographed manuscripts. It is all the more difficult in fragmentary and poorly photographed ones. We have, therefore, simply noted the suggestions of manuscript editors who perceive evidence of a later hand and summarize these here, recalling that in certain cases there is some uncertainty due to illegibility (indicated by an asterisk):

<i>Manuscript</i>	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Type of correction</i>
P5	John 16:23–24	omission
P27	Rom 8:21	substitution
P37	Matt 26:24	substitution
	Matt 26:28	orthography
	Matt 26:29	omission
P53	Matt 26:39a	omission
P70	Matt 24:14	omission
P77	Matt 23:37b	omission
P86	Matt 5:13	omission

<i>Manuscript</i>	<i>Reference</i>	<i>Type of correction</i>
P88	Mark 2:10	nonsense in context
P103	Matt 13:56	omission
P115	Rev 8:7; 14:20*	orthography
	Rev 11:9a*	omission
o169	Rev 3:19, 21b, 21c	substitution
	Rev 3:21a; 4:3	omission
o171	Matt 10:33*	omission
	Luke 22:45	strictly nonsense
o220	Rom 5:3	orthography
o270	1 Cor 15:10a, 10b	omission

Particularly striking here is the high percentage of secondhand corrections in the category of omissions. While there are a total of twenty-five corrected omissions, no fewer than eleven (possibly thirteen) of these are corrections by a second hand. In contrast, the category of orthography has a comparable total of twenty-one corrections, but only three (possibly four) of these are by a later hand. This difference in frequency could have several explanations. It may be that we are seeing an indication of what was happening in the various stages of quality control and that secondhand correctors were especially attuned to the possibility of omissions. However, it is also possible (and probably more likely) that corrected omissions are simply easier for *modern* editors to identify as secondhand since the supplied text offers more handwriting for analysis and comparison. In comparison, for example, by their nature deletion dots or strokes over added text usually do not provide an adequate writing sample to compare with the first hand. Thus, the high percentage of secondhand corrections of omissions is probably skewed by the fact that they are more easily identified as such compared to other categories of correction.

In only a few cases did editors identify a thirdhand corrector. P88 shows evidence of two distinct correctors after the original scribe on at least one occasion (strictly nonsense in Mark 2:19) and possibly again (nonsense-in-context reading in 2:25). Likewise, o270 appears to have a two-step correction process after the original scribe at an omission in 1 Cor 15:10.

12. Summary and Conclusion

By way of summary and conclusion, some observations are in order. As noted in the beginning of the study, out of the 114 manuscripts included in this sample, seventy lack clear indication of a scribal correction, while thirty-seven contain at least one correction. Seven more manuscripts possibly qualify. This means that roughly one third of the manuscripts examined here have at least one visible correction. Of course, the fragmentary nature of the artifacts means the true number of manuscripts with scribal corrections is probably much higher. We are glimpsing only bits and pieces of the material evidence.

The majority of the corrections appear to have been made by the copyists themselves, and some (although few) of these can further be classified as *in scribendo*. The *in scribendo* corrections reflect all categories of errors with the exception of omissions, which is most likely attributable to the difficulty of discerning precisely when an interlinear correction was made. At least fourteen manuscripts seem to have had a secondhand corrector after the original scribe (possibly a *diorthōtēs*), and these frequently rectify erroneous omissions. The high percentage of corrected omissions attributable to a second hand probably reflects the fact that

supplied text lends itself to identification as secondhand more so than deleted text. Only two manuscripts show evidence of a thirdhand corrector.

We can also make summative observations about the categories of corrections made (excluding those listed as only possible), although, as we saw above, some corrections could be categorized in different ways:

<i>Type of Correction</i>	<i>Total number</i>
Orthography	21
Nonsense	26
(Strictly nonsense)	13)
(Nonsense in context)	13)
Omission	25
Addition	5
Substitution	15
Transposition	2
Uncertain	8
Total	102

Even if a handful of the corrections were to be categorized differently, we are nevertheless able to make some instructive observations of these results. It is not surprising that the two largest categories of corrected errors are nonsense readings and omissions, which together constitute half of all the corrections identified. The high frequency of these two categories of corrections accords well with the findings of other recent studies, although a full comparison with these is beyond our scope here.⁸⁷ It appears likely that the high frequency of corrections to nonsense in this and other studies stems from the fact that, given their nature, nonsense readings would be among the easiest errors for a scribe or corrector to identify.

With respect to omissions, it is surely significant that we find five times the number of corrected omissions than we do additions. The relatively high frequency of corrected omissions probably reflects the now widely recognized tendency among early scribes to omit rather than to add.⁸⁸ That is, the most likely reason why we find more corrected omissions than additions is because scribes were more frequently omitting text than adding text in the first place.

The high percentage of orthographical corrections is arguably the most surprising result of this study and merits further attention.⁸⁹ Unlike nonsense errors and omissions, we might pre-

⁸⁷ Cf. Royse, *Scribal Habits*, esp. 227–28, 436–42, 563–65, 634–37; Royse, “Corrections in the Freer,” 185–226; Jongkind, *Scribal Habits*, esp. 159; Malik, *P.Beatty III*, 97.

⁸⁸ E. C. Colwell, “Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text,” in *The Bible in Modern Scholarship: Papers Read at the 100th Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, December 28–30, 1964*, ed. J. Philip Hyatt (Nashville: Abingdon, 1965), 370–89; republished in E. C. Colwell, *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, NTTS 9 (Leiden: Brill, 1969), 106–24; Peter M. Head, “Observations on Early Papyri of the Synoptic Gospels, Especially on the ‘Scribal Habits,’” *Bib* 71 (1990): 240–47; Peter M. Head, “The Habits of New Testament Copyists: Singular Readings in the Early Fragmentary Papyri of John,” *Bib* 85 (2004): 399–408; Jongkind, *Scribal Habits*, 246; Juan Hernández Jr., *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse: The Singular Readings of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi*, WUNT 2/218 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 87–88; Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 705–36; Malik, “Earliest Corrections in Codex Sinaiticus: Further Evidence from the Apocalypse,” 8; Wilson, “Scribal Habits,” 97–105.

⁸⁹ In fact, as noted above, many corrections classified as nonsense in context (Mark 2:10; Heb 10:19; 1 Pet 3:10) and substitutions (Matt 10:25c; 26:24; Mark 2:22; Rev 9:20) might simply have been

sume that orthographical errors by nature would be less easily identified by the original scribe or a later corrector. Such would seem to be the case in some recent studies of scribal corrections, specifically of the firsthand corrections in Codex Sinaiticus, which report proportionally fewer orthographical corrections.⁹⁰ Likewise, we might further presume that orthography is relatively less important to early manuscript users compared to other errors, as long as the sense of the text is preserved. However, since the present study and several others indicate such a high proportion of orthographical corrections,⁹¹ we can see that, on the whole, many of the earliest scribes (and correctors) were indeed concerned about the details of correct orthography, regardless of how often this was achieved in practice. The high frequency of orthographical corrections is thus an indication of the level of accuracy at which many of our scribes aimed.

orthographical slips, which would render the total number of orthographical corrections even higher.

⁹⁰ Malik, “The Earliest Corrections in Codex Sinaiticus: A Test Case from the Gospel of Mark,” 249–50; and Malik, “The Earliest Corrections in Codex Sinaiticus: Further Evidence from the Apocalypse,” 8.

⁹¹ See note 87 above.