

# Ancient Texts, Papyri, and Manuscripts

*Studies in Honor of James R. Royse*

*Edited by*

Alan Taylor Farnes

Scott D. Mackie

David T. Runia



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

For use by the Author only | © 2022  
Alan Taylor Farnes, Scott D. Mackie & David T. Runia

# Contents

List of Tables ix  
Notes on Contributors x

Introduction 1

*Alan Taylor Farnes, Scott D. Mackie and David T. Runia*

James Royle: Scholar and Connoisseur of Manuscripts, Texts and  
Libraries 8

*David T. Runia*

The Publications of James R. Royle 1976–2020 19

## PART 1

### *New Testament Textual Criticism*

1 In Defense of the *Urtext* 25

*Amy S. Anderson*

2 The Synoptic Problem and *Lectio Brevior Potior*: Does Brevity Suggest an  
Earlier Reading? 47

*Alan Taylor Farnes*

3 Evidence, Evaluation, and Edition: The Evaluation and Presentation of  
the Secondary Traditions and Approaches to Critical Editing – The  
Example of Acts 1:2 77

*Georg Gäbel*

4 Codex Sinaiticus's Fourth-Century Corrections and the Andreas "Text  
Type" 107

*Juan Hernández Jr.*

5 Scribal Habits Applied: Six Examples from the *Tyndale House Greek New  
Testament* 124

*Elijah Hixson*

- 6 The Various Scribal Habits Behind Substitutions 141  
*Dirk Jongkind*
- 7 A New Light on Old Variants: Notes on the New Testament Text of  
Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus 160  
*Peter Malik*
- 8 The Verso of MS 0188 (Berlin P. 13416) and the Text of Mark 11:17–25 191  
*Cambry G. Pardee*
- 9 New Traces of an Old Text: The Corrections of Gregory-Aland 424 in the  
Book of Acts 198  
*Tommy Wasserman*

## PART 2

### *Studies in Philo of Alexandria*

- 10 The Scribes of Philo of Alexandria's Oxyrhynchus Codex 219  
*Sean A. Adams*
- 11 Of Dreams and Editions: Emendations, Conjectures, and Marginal  
Glosses in David Hoeschel's Copy of *De Somniis* 2 243  
*Michael B. Cover*
- 12 Enduring Divine Discipline in Philo, *De Congressu* 157–180 and the  
Epistle to the Hebrews 12:5–17 269  
*Scott D. Mackie*
- 13 The Late-Byzantine Philonic Treatise *De mundo*: Analysis of its Method  
and Contents 302  
*David T. Runia*
- 14 The Student Sharpens the Master's Face: The Text of *QE* 2.62  
Reconsidered 329  
*Frank Shaw*
- 15 Philon als Jurist 348  
*Folker Siegert*

- 16 In Fragments: The Authenticity of the *Hypothetica* 367  
*Gregory E. Sterling*
- 17 The Conflation of Israel's Past, Present, and Future in Philo 400  
*Abraham Terian*
- Index of Biblical and Parabiblical Passages 415  
Index of Philonic Passages 423  
Index of Other Ancient Writers and Texts 429  
Index of Papyri and Manuscripts 433  
Index of Modern Names 436

# Codex Sinaiticus’s Fourth-Century Corrections and the Andreas “Text Type”

*Juan Hernández Jr.*

## 1 Introduction

Little did I know—upon crafting the proposal for this paper—that I would end up with more questions than answers, that I would look back over hundreds of hours of toil only to realize that the sure reward of all my efforts appeared to be nothing more than additional questions. But if Oliver Wendell Holmes is to be believed, fulfillment may be found in asking a question one cannot answer or in attempting a task one cannot achieve.<sup>1</sup> The complexity surrounding the relationship between Codex Sinaiticus and the Andreas “Text Type” may not be as dire as all that. But it does appear that there are a number of pressing questions that require further investigation for a more comprehensive picture of their connection to emerge—enough questions to prompt an existential moment in *any* textual critic. I begin, however, with the proposal as I first imagined it. In my proposal for my SBL paper early in 2012, I had written:

The corrections of an ancient manuscript offer an unparalleled opportunity to evaluate the judgments of early scribes and the state of their exemplars. Moreover, one can also revisit the assessments of textual critics who conscript scribal corrections for the reconstruction of the NT’s transmission history. Codex Sinaiticus’s fourth-century corrections offer an opportunity to do both. Over a half-century ago, Josef Schmid claimed that the Apocalypse’s Andreas ‘text-type’ went back to the fourth-century on the basis of its relationship to Codex Sinaiticus’s fourth-century corrections. This judgment, however, gave Colwell pause, noting that Schmid was relying on an earlier study by Bousset that had not been assessed in light of recent developments regarding the history of “text types.”<sup>2</sup>

1 Cited in Roy A. Sorensen, *Pseudo-Problems: How Analytic Philosophy Gets Done* (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), 14.

2 See E.C. Colwell, “Method in Establishing the Nature of Text-Types in New Testament Manuscripts,” in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, NTS 9 (Leiden:

I continued:

While the “text type” nomenclature continues to be hotly debated today, a fresh assessment of Codex Sinaiticus’s corrections in the Apocalypse may help clarify the issue. This paper will examine both the fourth and seventh century corrections in Codex Sinaiticus’s text of the Apocalypse, with a view toward creating a typology of scribal corrections and assess their connections to the putative Andreas “text-type.”

That was the original plan.

## 2 The Problem

Not long after I crafted the proposal, however, I found that Colwell’s very wording gave me pause. What exactly did he mean by “fourth-century corrections” of the Apocalypse? Was he referring to the *prima manu* corrections, made before the manuscript left the scriptorium? Or was he referring to the multiple hands of subsequent correctors?

I was even more puzzled when I discovered that Colwell referred to these corrections with the siglum,  $\aleph^a$ . For those of us familiar with Tischendorf’s sigla (as laid out by Gregory in the third volume of Tischendorf’s 8th critical edition),  $\aleph^a$  indeed points to a series of corrections believed to be contemporaneous with the Codex. However,  $\aleph^a$  *never* surfaces in Tischendorf’s textual apparatus for the Apocalypse. What we encounter are  $\aleph^c$ ,  $\aleph^{cc}$ , and  $\aleph^{cc*}$ .<sup>3</sup> I was unsure as to why Colwell was using  $\aleph^a$ . Neither did I know what he meant by it.

Giving Colwell the benefit of the doubt, I decided to set those questions aside for the moment and set out to isolate all of my data. I began by identifying every correction of the Apocalypse found in Tischendorf’s transcription of the Codex.<sup>4</sup> I then isolated every correction in H.C. Hoskier’s collation of that

---

Brill, 1969), 45–55; cf. W. Bousset, “Zur Textkritik der Apokalypse,” in *Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament*, TU 2/4 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1894), 42–44; J. Schmid, *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes*, vol. 2: *Die Alten Stämme*, Münchener theologische Studien 1, Historische Abteilung Ergänzungsband 1 (Munich: K. Zink, 1956), 127–129.

3 Tischendorf’s correctors for Codex Sinaiticus are  $\aleph^a$  (contemporary or nearly contemporary with the fourth-century scribe);  $\aleph^b$  (probably fifth/sixth century);  $\aleph^{ca}$ ,  $\aleph^{cb}$ ,  $\aleph^{cc}$ , and  $\aleph^{cc*}$  (seventh century); and  $\aleph^{ce}$  (twelfth century). See A.F.C. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 3 vols., 8th ed. (Leipzig, 1869–1894), 3, 346.

4 A.F.C. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Sinaiticum cum Epistula Barnabae et Fragmentis Pastoris*, 2 vols. (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1863).

manuscript<sup>5</sup> and created charts to compare the data mined from the apparatuses of von Soden,<sup>6</sup> Schmid,<sup>7</sup> and Nestle-Aland<sup>27</sup> with those of Tischendorf and Hoskier.

### 3 The Corrections

What I found was a manuscript that was extensively corrected. There were thirty-four *prima manu* corrections, as well as another twenty that were unidentified but universally recognized as having been made before the Codex left the scriptorium.<sup>8</sup>

These fifty-four corrections, however, were dwarfed by those made by the correctors known as  $\aleph^c$  (who offered about 290) and  $\aleph^{cc}$  (who offered up another thirty-eight or so). If we follow Tischendorf's taxonomy, which situates the corrections of  $\aleph^c$  and  $\aleph^{cc}$  to circa seventh-century, then the manuscript appears to have received the lion's share of editorial attention *after* it left the scriptorium. In other words, the text of the Apocalypse in Codex Sinaiticus was only minimally corrected by the initial scribes, identified as A and D by Milne and Skeat.<sup>9</sup> Most of the corrections surfaced after it left their purview.

5 H.C. Hoskier, *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse: Collations of All Existing Available Greek Documents with the Standard Text of Stephen's Third Edition, together with the Testimony of the Versions, Commentaries and Fathers. A Complete Conspectus of All Authorities*, 2 vols. (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1929).

6 Hermann von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt*, 2 vols. (Berlin: Duncker, 1902–1913).

7 Josef Schmid, *Der Apokalypse-Kommentar des Andreas von Kaisareia*; Text. Vol. 1/1 of *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes*, Münchener theologische Studien 1 (Munich: Zink, 1955).

8 These are listed in the appendix here as they appeared in the 2012 SBL presentation paper. A fresh, careful study of earliest layer of corrections, arranged somewhat differently but with some overlap, appeared a few years after my 2012 SBL presentation and concluded that there was no discernable evidence that scribe D ever carried out the task of inspecting the manuscript after it was copied (as can be observed in other parts of the codex). Most of the identifiable earliest corrections appear to have been made by the original scribe, A, at the copying stage. See Peter Malik, "The Earliest Corrections in Codex Sinaiticus: Further Evidence from the Apocalypse," *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* (2015): 1–12. Malik's conclusion also answers the question I had raised in 2006, upon noting the blemished and uncorrected character of the book's transcription, as to whether it had even received a final review before being dispatched. The answer appears to be "apparently not." See Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 95.

9 H.J.M. Milne and T.C. Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus* (Oxford: Oxford Uni-

Before exploring this more fully, however, a few observations need to be made about the *prima manu* corrections, as well about those variants that were intriguingly left “uncorrected.”

First, the *prima manu* corrections.

### 3.1 *Prima Manu Corrections*

By all accounts, the *prima manu* corrections were not only small in number but also of minimal disruption to the text. These include spelling changes, additions, omissions, and substitutions. Virtually all of the spelling changes involve a single letter. The additions are also small and restricted to a handful of “function” words, such as an article here, a particle there, and a stray preposition. Words marked for deletion were similarly restricted to those consisting of three letters or less. And of the handful of substitutions to emerge, only three appear to alter the meaning of the text, and then, only slightly.

The same is also true of those unidentified corrections that are nonetheless assigned to the scriptorium. They are also few in number and of minimal disruption to the text. The only difference here is that there are about a half-dozen words or so that were initially marked for deletion but then had those very deletion marks erased, offering us a glimpse into the process of scribal deliberation.

The substitutions that surface are also largely unremarkable and make virtually no difference to the reading of the text with only a couple of exceptions.

### 3.2 *Uncorrected Readings*

Turning our attention to those readings that were left uncorrected, we encounter sixteen of these. Again, most of these appear to be minor. There is one spelling variation; four minor additions; and a dropped verse that was never reinstated. Most of the uncorrected variants, a total of ten, consist of substitutions of one sort or another. A case can probably be made that many of these are, in some sense, sensible readings. After all, they appear to have been sensible to the scribes who chose *not* to change them. Of course, this is not true without qualification. There is, however, one variant, that is quite intriguing and merits some discussion.

In Rev 3:3, Jesus tells the church of Sardis that he will come like a thief and they will not “know (γνῶς) at what hour” he will come. Codex Sinaiticus, however, appears to exchange the aorist subjunctive γνῶς for γνῶση, a future middle indicative form of the same verb. The change makes little difference to the con-

---

versity Press, 1938), 45–50. See also Malik, who, as noted above, suggests that scribe D may not have reviewed the manuscript as expected: “The Earliest Corrections in Codex Sinaiticus,” 12.

text and is not neglected in the major apparatuses.<sup>10</sup> What is missing from the apparatuses, however, is the word that follows in Sinaiticus. The word *ποίη*, generally translated “what,” and forming part of the phrase “what hour,” is transcribed as *οίαν* in Codex Sinaiticus. The initial *π* appears to have been dropped from the word, apparently leaving us with a nonsense reading. The fact that consonants are dropped elsewhere in the manuscript, coupled with the fact that none of the major apparatuses contain the variant, appears to confirm the suspicion that *οίαν* may be a nonsense reading.

The assumption, however, should be rethought. First, the scribes *never* corrected *οίαν*. Second, the reading does appear to be supported by a handful of other witnesses.<sup>11</sup> Third, of all the readings involving spelling errors or missing consonants in the text of the Apocalypse in Codex Sinaiticus, *nowhere else* is the initial *π* ever dropped. But perhaps the most compelling reason to give the variant another look is semantic. The word *οίαν* can be read as the accusative form of the relative pronoun *οἷος*, a word that also means “what” and is roughly synonymous with *ποίη*. That is to say, whether the text transmitted was *γνώψης ποίαν* or *γνώψης οἷαν*, both readings would most likely have been understood in the same manner by an ancient reader. It is further worth noting that the very same relative pronoun, *οἷος*, functions adjectivally elsewhere in the NT, as when the author of 2 Tim 3:11 informs his readership of “what persecutions” (*οἷους διωγμούς*) he has endured, much like we appear to find in Codex Sinaiticus’s text of Rev 3:3, “what hour” (*οἷαν ὥραν*).

The explanation for the variant, however, may be much simpler than a two-step process involving a grammatical change and a substituted pronoun. In fact, the presence of a variant here may be, in part, illusory. The variation appears to have resulted from the confusion of a single letter. If one were to write *γνώψης ποίαν* next to *γνώψης οἷαν* in an uninterrupted uncial script, such as *ΓΝΩΨΗΣ ΠΟΙΑΝ / ΓΝΩΨΗΣ ΟΙΑΝ*, one would find that, *but for a single letter*, they are nearly indistinguishable. The simplest explanation then is that the uncial Π has been confused with the uncial Η, resulting in the appearance of a grammatical change in one word and the substitution of another. That is to say, here is an instance where the confusion of a single letter serendipitously results in the creation of

10 Schmid believes that the future *γνώψης* is a correction (i.e., not the *Urtext*) influenced by the nearby *ἡξω*. He also notes that the subjunctive mood usually followed *οὐ μή* elsewhere in the Apocalypse; thus, *γνώψης* is the “original” in this verse. See Schmid, *Studies*, 138–139.

11 Interestingly, the variant *οίαν* is supported by—and restricted to—every member of the Andreas subgroup *h*, 2060-2286-2302. There thus appears to be a genealogical component to this variant’s attestation. See Hoskier, *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*, 2.94; cf. Schmid, *Studies*, 28.

two meaningful variants. The degree to which this textual variation is solely a byproduct of scribal activity, textual history or a combination of the two in the textual tradition merits further study. Irrespective, future apparatuses should include the combinations γνῶσις ποίαν / γνώση οἴαν alongside the well-attested γνώση ποίαν.

### 3.3 *Transition to Later Corrections*

The issues raised by the *prima manu* corrections, as well as by those variants that were never corrected, however, are minor compared to the complexity of the corrections of  $\aleph^c$  and  $\aleph^{cc}$ . Not only are there far more of these in the Codex, but these corrections appear to have produced significant textual differences to the wording of the Apocalypse. If one were to compare all of them to Stephanus's edition of the Greek New Testament, one would find that the overwhelming majority of these corrections tend toward the so-called "Majority Text."<sup>12</sup> In other words, the textual complexion of the fourth-century codex is altered with the arrival of these later correctors.

Perhaps one of the most important claims to have been made in the last century, most notably and definitively by Josef Schmid, was that a significant number of these corrections offered evidence of an Andreas "Text Type" that goes back to the fourth century. The Andreas "Text Type" refers to the kind of text that Andrew of Caesarea reproduces in his seventh-century commentary on the Apocalypse. The distinctive features of his text, so the argument goes, were already present in the fourth-century corrections of Sinaiticus. That is to say, the Andreas "Text Type" is not a *seventh-century* product but a *fourth-century* text, and Sinaiticus's corrections prove it.

This is where we return to Colwell.

## 4 E.C. Colwell

As mentioned at the outset, I was initially puzzled by Colwell's use of  $\aleph^a$  to speak of Codex Sinaiticus's fourth-century corrections. It turns out, however, that Colwell was simply repeating Schmid's prior identification. What Colwell actually wrote was that: "... before Schmid's argument for a fourth-century date

<sup>12</sup> "Majority Text" is used advisedly here and only as a broad category since the initial comparisons were made against Stephanus's edition. It is well known that the later streams of the Greek text of the Apocalypse split into the Andreas and Byzantine traditions. The point is simply that the  $\aleph^c$  and  $\aleph^{cc}$  corrections altered the text in the direction of a later textual tradition in a way in which the *prima manu* corrections clearly did not.

for Andreas is rejected, the evidence (which Schmid refers to) of the agreement of  $\aleph^a$  (the fourth century corrector of Sinaiticus) with Andreas must be explained.<sup>13</sup> Colwell continued: “Schmid’s argument here rests on his acceptance of the conclusions drawn by Bousset. Bousset’s work should be reviewed in the light of current understanding of the history of text-types.”<sup>14</sup>

It would thus appear that Colwell was actually poised to *reject* the claim of a fourth-century date for the Andreas “Text Type” on the basis of his understanding of the development of the textual tradition. His only caveat was that Bousset’s data needed to be double-checked, *something Colwell never got to do*.

The problem, however, would turn out to be even more fundamental than that. It would be *Schmid’s* data, rather than Bousset’s, that needed to be double-checked. And it would not be due to disputes over the nature of “text types,” but over questions surrounding the dating of the correctors of Codex Sinaiticus.

We begin with Bousset.

## 5 Wilhelm Bousset

Bousset’s study offers an analysis of the corrections of Codex Sinaiticus in  $\aleph^c$  and  $\aleph^{cc}$ . And he explicitly states that he is relying on Tischendorf’s taxonomy for these corrections. Under  $\aleph^c$ , Bousset isolates twenty-eight readings that are peculiar to *K*, which is Bousset’s siglum for the Andreas tradition. He then finds another eight  $\aleph^c$  readings that agree with *K* + *A*. And lastly, he isolates a third group of twenty-one  $\aleph^c$  readings that go with *K* and the rest of the manuscript tradition against the oldest majuscules. Bousset then concludes, on the basis of nearly sixty  $\aleph^c$  readings, that Codex Sinaiticus was corrected against a manuscript belonging to the “Andreas Text.” He then proceeds to make a similar claim for the corrections of  $\aleph^{cc}$ , identifying ten readings that agree with *K*. All told, Bousset argues that the corrections of both  $\aleph^c$  and  $\aleph^{cc}$  tend toward the “Andreas Text” in significant numbers.<sup>15</sup>

13 Colwell, “Method in Establishing the Nature of Text-Types,” 53 n. 1.

14 Colwell, “Method in Establishing the Nature of Text-Types,” 53 n. 1.

15 I would subsequently discover that Bousset’s was responsible for a number of groundbreaking observations, veritable “firsts” in the study of the Apocalypse’s textual history that had been all but forgotten in the 20th and early 21st centuries. For example, Bousset was the first to isolate and situate the Andreas archetype within the imagined scheme of the Apocalypse’s textual history; the first to make comprehensive use of minuscules in order to define the Apocalypse’s later textual traditions; the first to make a number of critical observations about the correlations between codex Sinaiticus and the Andreas text using the  $\aleph^c$  and  $\aleph^{cc}$  corrections; the first to argue that the text behind the Andreas tra-

Now, if we follow Tischendorf's system of correctors, as laid out in his 8th critical edition, the corrections of  $\aleph^c$  and  $\aleph^{cc}$  are dated circa the seventh century. And *nowhere* does Bousset claim a fourth-century date for these corrections. His only claim is that the corrections *appear* to have been made against a manuscript related to Andrew's text. That is to say, a fair and correct reading of Bousset would place the corrections to an "Andreas Text" in the *seventh* century, not the fourth, as Schmid appears to understand.

## 6 J. Schmid

With Schmid, however, the plot thickens. As Colwell noted, Schmid was relying on Bousset's study for his understanding of the link between Andrew's "Text-Type" and the corrections of Codex Sinaiticus. Schmid, however, makes an unprecedented move when he splits Bousset's data into *two* groups of correctors. One located in the fourth century. And the other in the seventh.

Schmid apparently gets this idea from his reading of Milne and Skeat, whose work he praises for its precision, noting how they had corrected the works of Tischendorf and Lake. Schmid appears to understand Milne and Skeat to have identified the corrections of the fourth-century scribes of the Apocalypse, A and D, with the  $\aleph^c$  corrections.<sup>16</sup> With that reading of their work, corrections that were previously assigned to the seventh-century are now moved back to the *fourth*.

The problem, of course, is that nowhere do Milne and Skeat identify the corrections of the A and D scribes with those of  $\aleph^c$ . The identification of A and D, as the fourth-century scribes of the Apocalypse, is consistent in works of both Tischendorf and Milne and Skeat. It is also true that A and D would have made corrections to the manuscript *before* it left the scriptorium, but nowhere do Milne and Skeat give any indication that those corrections are now to be equated with  $\aleph^c$ . That designation is restricted to the seventh century by Tis-

---

dition was none other than that of the fourth-century martyr Pamphilus, the renowned copyist of Origen's biblical manuscripts; and the first to argue Andreas of Caesarea had inherited his text rather than created it. And, as if that weren't enough, Bousset is responsible for identifying the two later traditions of the Apocalypse that would come to be designated as  $M^K$  and  $M^A$  in Nestle-Aland's Greek NT. All of this in the 19th century! For full detail see Juan Hernández Jr., "The Legacy of Wilhelm Bousset for the Apocalypse's Textual History: The Identification of the Andreas Text," in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse*, ed. Marcus Sigmund, Martin Karrer, Ulrich Schmid, ANTF 48 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015), 19–32; cf. Bousset, "Zur Textkritik der Apokalypse," 1–44.

<sup>16</sup> Schmid, *Studien*, 2.127.

chendorf, and Milne and Skeat do not dispute or revise that dating.<sup>17</sup> It appears then that Schmid has misunderstood Milne and Skeat and, on the basis of that misunderstanding, reinterprets Bousset’s data.<sup>18</sup>

The confusion is only compounded further when Schmid moves to re-label  $\aleph^c$ , which he calls  $S^c$ , to  $S^a$ . Schmid then re-labels  $\aleph^{cc}$  to  $S^c$ . By the time the dust settles, Schmid is working with *two* groups of correctors:  $S^a$  dated to the fourth century and  $S^c$  dated to the seventh. Both groups, he insists, make changes in the direction of Andrew’s text, leading to the conclusion that the Andreas “Text Type” *must* have already been present in the fourth century.

Of course, if Schmid’s argument is in fact predicated upon a misreading, then this is no small matter. The very cornerstone of a fourth-century date for the Andreas “Text type” is removed.

We might even be tempted to go so far as to give Schmid the benefit of the doubt and assume that he is simply using the  $S^a$  and  $S^c$  labels idiosyncratically, that he is referring to some *other* data not covered by Bousset, and that his claims could be redeemed once everything was clarified. Regrettably, we are only thrown into greater confusion when Schmid claims that *Bousset’s* study of  $S^a$  demonstrates that the majority of the fourth-century corrections were made against an Andreas text. Again, those supposed fourth-century  $S^a$  corrections, are actually the  $\aleph^c$  corrections dated to the *seventh* century.

And even if we decided to turn away from all of the earlier studies and set our sights on the most up-to-date data, we find that Schmid’s conclusions are only further contradicted by our modern critical editions. The corrections in question are today categorized as either  $\aleph^1$  or  $\aleph^2$  in  $NA^{27}$ , indicating that these corrections belong, respectively, to either the fourth through sixth centuries or the seventh.<sup>19</sup> That is to say, *none* of Schmid’s  $S^a$  corrections are dated with

---

17 Milne and Skeat were essentially noncommittal to a fixed date but they nonetheless considered the corrections in question the product of post-scriptorium activity: “The C correctors have been assigned by some to the fifth, by others to the seventh, and lack of comparative material enforces caution upon whosoever would decide between the two dates.” See Milne and Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors*, 65; cf. Schmid, *Studien*, 127 n. 2. Many years later T.C. Skeat would lean toward a sixth century date. See T.C. Skeat, “The Codex Sinaiticus, The Codex Vaticanus and Constantine,” *Collected Writings of T.C. Skeat*, ed. J.K. Elliott, *NovTSup* 113 (Leiden Brill, 2004), 200. Fresh paleographical investigations are clearly needed, although these may not be sufficient to settle the question once and for all. See Hernández, “Legacy of Wilhelm Bousset,” 30–31 nn. 50–51.

18 In the article that followed this original paper I traced the confusion to a possible mis-translation. See Hernández, “The Creation of a Fourth-Century Witness to the Andreas Text Type: A Misreading in the Apocalypse’s Textual History,” *NTS* 60.1 (2014): 111 n. 22.

19 With the exception of greater precision among the members of the two groups of correctors, the revisions to the apparatus of  $NA^{28}$  have not changed the clear distinction between

any certainty to a period contemporaneous with the manuscript. That was true with the studies of Bousset. That was true of Milne and Skeat. It continues to be true now.

## 7 Return to Colwell

We are now in a position to understand why Colwell unwittingly would speak of  $\aleph^a$  to refer to the fourth-century corrections of the Apocalypse. He was simply “parroting” Schmid. But Colwell was never in any actual danger of accepting Schmid’s claims about a fourth-century date for the Andreas “Text Type.” He was already doubtful of it on other grounds.

Ironically, with this disclosure, Schmid’s central claim fails yet another one of Colwell’s tests for a fourth-century text type: *the existence of a datable manuscript belonging to it*.<sup>20</sup> That manuscript, however, does not exist.

The damage, nonetheless, had already been done. Schmid’s claim of a fourth-century date for the Andreas “Text Type” has become established orthodoxy throughout the discipline since the publication of his *magnum opus*. His conclusions have been widely disseminated and even celebrated without question by text-critical luminaries of every stripe. G.D. Kilpatrick, for example, once wrote glowingly about how  $\aleph^a$  is the *only* independent, fourth-century witness to the Andreas “Text Type.”<sup>21</sup> It would appear now, however, that there is no such witness.<sup>22</sup>

---

scriptorium and post-scriptorium corrections as identified in this original paper. The chart in the appendix compares the groups of correctors in both  $\aleph^{A27}$  and  $\aleph^{A28}$ . For further discussion see, Juan Hernández Jr., “Nestle-Aland 28 and the Revision of the Apocalypse’s Textual History,” *Studies on the Text of the New Testament and Early Christianity: Essays in Honour of Michael W. Holmes*, ed. Daniel M. Gurtner, Juan Hernández Jr., and Paul Foster, NTTSD 50 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 71–81.

20 Colwell, “Method,” 52.

21 G.D. Kilpatrick, “Professor J. Schmid on the Greek Text of the Apocalypse,” *VC* 13 (1959): 1–3.

22 As noted throughout, the claims of this paper were developed further in three successive articles (Hernández, “The Creation of a Fourth-Century Witness;” “The Legacy of Wilhelm Bousset;” and “Nestle-Aland 28”). The findings proved foundational for further study and were carried in different directions by Malik, “The Earliest Corrections in Codex Sinaiticus;” and “The Corrections of Codex Sinaiticus and the Textual Transmission of Revelation: Josef Schmid Revisited,” *NTS* 61 (2015): 595–614.

8 Conclusion

None of this, of course, negates the enduring value of Schmid’s magisterial work on the textual history of the Apocalypse. Colwell, for one, was actually effusive about the work as a whole, believing that Schmid had indeed provided the necessary data for a stemma of text types to be made, *at least in large outlines*.<sup>23</sup>

It remains to be seen, however, what the future holds for the textual history of the Apocalypse. Today, the very language of text types is disputed, drawing fire from all sides. The skirmishes will no doubt continue—and perhaps even reach a fever pitch—as we begin to move across the Apocalypse’s difficult, textual terrain. The day for that battle, however, is not that far off.<sup>24</sup> In fact, the debunking of Schmid’s independent, fourth-century witness for the Andreas “Text Type” should be considered the opening salvo.

Appendix

*Corrections of the Apocalypse in Codex Sinaiticus*

- Prima Manu: 34.
- Unidentified: 20.
- ⲛ<sup>c</sup>: ca. 290.
- ⲛ<sup>cc</sup>: ca. 38.

*Prima Manu Corrections*

| Spelling |                      | Additions |               |
|----------|----------------------|-----------|---------------|
| 1:5a     | βασιλειων > βασιλεων | 3:13      | εχων > ο εχων |
| 2:8      | Σμυρνη > Σμυρνην     | 11:9a     | και           |
| 5:1d     | πτα > επτα           | 14:3a     | ην            |

23 Colwell, “Method,” 53. On the question of stemma(ta) for the Apocalypse’s textual tradition, see Schmid, *Studies*, xxviii–xxix, xxxiii–xxxvi, 156.

24 Indeed, the battle reached the Apocalypse’s shores in 2017, with the declaration that AC and P47-Sinaiticus could no longer be regarded as “text types” as Schmid had construed them. See Markus Lembke, Darius Müller, Ulrich B. Schmid with Martin Karrer, *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments VI: Die Apokalypse; Teststellen-kollation und Auswertungen*, ANTF 49 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017), 136\*–137\*. The claim, however, has to be taken with grain of salt. For an appreciative review of recent the *Text und Textwert* volume and a critique of the claim see Juan Hernández, Jr., “The Greek Text of Revelation” in *The Oxford Handbook on Revelation*, forthcoming.

|        |                       |       |    |
|--------|-----------------------|-------|----|
| 6:13   | μεμειγαλου > μεγαλου  | 16:21 | ως |
| 9:3    | κορπιοι > σκορπιοι    | 20:4  | ου |
| 11:11a | ημισου > ημισυ        |       |    |
| 14:2b  | κιθραις > κιθαραις    |       |    |
| 14:7   | πριησαντι > ποιησαντι |       |    |
| 16:13c | ειωσει > ωσει         |       |    |
| 17:4a  | χρουσουν > χρυσουν    |       |    |
| 19:2a  | πορνν > πορνην        |       |    |
| 19:9a  | λεγε > λεγει          |       |    |

**Omissions**

|        |               |
|--------|---------------|
| 7:16   | ετι           |
| 13:10  | υ             |
| 17:12c | βα            |
| 20:7   | σε            |
| 20:13  | τα            |
| 21:4b  | ετι οτι > οτι |
| 21:8   | ως            |
| 21:24  | δ             |
| 22:17  | π             |

**Substitutions**

|        |                      |
|--------|----------------------|
| 13:3   | θανατου > αυτου      |
| 14:1a  | του > αυτου          |
| 14:19  | σου > του            |
| 16:5   | των > του            |
| 16:15  | ερχεται > ερχομαι    |
| 17:15b | ειδε > ειδες         |
| 18:3   | μετα της > μετ αυτης |
| 22:7b  | προφητας > προφητιας |

**Unidentified Corrections****Spelling**

|       |                        |
|-------|------------------------|
| 2:7   | νεικωντι > νικωντι     |
| 3:2   | εγρηγορων > γρηγορων   |
| 3:7a  | εκκλησιαις > εκκλησιας |
| 9:17  | θυωδεις > θιωδεις      |
| 9:21a | φωνων                  |

**Omissions**

|       |         |
|-------|---------|
| 4:10b | ο       |
| 22:10 | τουτους |

**Aborted/reversed changes**

|        |                |
|--------|----------------|
| 3:7c   | και κλειων     |
| 4:3a   | ιερεις > ιρεις |
| 6:2    | ο ορ ε         |
| 6:6    | σιτου          |
| 13:13  | ποιη           |
| 19:12a | δε             |
| 19:15  | της οργης      |

**Substitutions**

|        |                      |
|--------|----------------------|
| 4:10a  | βαλλουσιν > βαλουσιν |
| 5:1a   | επι > ειπι           |
| 15:2   | αυτου: υ rubbed away |
| 18:18  | βλεπο- from λεγο-    |
| 19:14  | -μενοις > -μενοι     |
| 21:21c | διαυγης > διαυτης    |

Uncorrected Readings

**Spelling**

3:16a χλειρος  
18:11 γης σου

**Additions**

14:3b τω- and των  
22:18a η

**Omissions**

20:2 εδησ. αυτ. εις τ. αβυσσον

**Substitutions**

3:3b γνωσ ποιαν > γνωση οιαν  
4:4b τεσσαρες  
7:3 αδικησεται  
7:4 ηκουσαν  
9:10 ομοιοις  
9:16 μυριαδας  
13:6c σκηουντες  
13:14 πληγης  
16:13c εδοθη  
21:17 χιλος  
21:27c ουνου

**ⲛ<sup>c</sup> Readings and the Andreas Text:<sup>25</sup> Bousset, Tischendorf, Nestle-Aland 27–28**

TABLE 4.1

| Bousset | Tischendorf's Editio Princeps                | Editio Octava<br>Critica Maior | NA <sup>27</sup>  | NA <sup>28</sup>  |
|---------|--|--------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1:6     | ιερεις: Ca και ιερεις                        | ⲛ <sup>c</sup>                 |                   |                   |
| 1:20    | εκκλησιων και: Ca εκκλησιων εισιν και αι     | ⲛ <sup>c</sup>                 |                   | ⲛ <sup>2</sup>    |
| 2:13    | εν ταις: Ca εν αις                           | ⲛ <sup>c</sup>                 |                   |                   |
| 2:20    | Ιεζαβελ, η λεγουσα: Ca Ιεζαβελ, την λεγουσαν | ⲛ <sup>c</sup>                 | ⲛ <sup>1</sup>    | ⲛ <sup>2</sup>    |
| 3:5     | ουτως: Ca ουτος                              | ⲛ <sup>c</sup>                 | ⲛ <sup>1</sup>    | ⲛ <sup>2</sup>    |
| 4:1     | λεγων: Ca λεγουσα                            | ⲛ <sup>c</sup>                 | (ⲛ <sup>1</sup> ) | (ⲛ <sup>2</sup> ) |

25 According to Bousset, "Zur Textkritik der Apokalypse," 44. For a review of the data behind Bousset's claim that a *Vorlage* with the Andreas text stood behind the ⲛ<sup>c</sup> corrections see Malik, "The Corrections of Codex Sinaiticus," 595–614.

TABLE 4.1 (*cont.*)

| Bousset | Tischendorf's Editio Princeps   | Editio Octava<br>Critica Maior | NA <sup>27</sup> | NA <sup>28</sup>    |
|---------|---|--------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| 4:5     | θρονου Ca addidit α εισιν   | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 |                  |                     |
| 6:9     | σφραγιδαν την: Ca ε σφραγιδα  | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 |                  |                     |
| 6:15    | δουλος: Ca addidit και πας ελευθερος  | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 | Ⓝ <sup>1</sup>   | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>      |
| 7:9a    | περιβεβλημενους: Ca περιβεβλημενοι  | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 | Ⓝ <sup>1</sup>   | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>      |
| 7:9b    | φοινικας: Ca φοινικες   | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 |                  |                     |
| 7:10    | τω θρονω κ. τω αρνω: Ca του θρονου κ. του αρνιου  | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 |                  |                     |
| 8:11    | αψινθιον: Ca αψινθος  | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 | Ⓝ <sup>1</sup>   | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>      |
| 9:12    | ερχεται: Ca ερχονται  | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 | Ⓝ <sup>1</sup>   | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>      |
| 9:14    | λεγοντα: Ca λεγουσης  | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 | Ⓝ <sup>1</sup>   | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>      |
| 10:1    | η θριξ: Ca correxit ιρις  | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 | Ⓝ <sup>1</sup>   | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>      |
| 10:2    | βιβλαριδιον: super βλ Ca notavit λι   | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 | Ⓝ <sup>1</sup>   | (Ⓝ <sup>2,a</sup> ) |
| 11:8    | και: Ca improbavit  | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 | Ⓝ <sup>1</sup>   | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>      |
| 13:6    | τους: Ca και τους   | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>   | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>      |
| 16:17   | οτε: Ca ο ζ αγγελους  | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>   | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>      |
| 17:8    | και παλιν παρεστε: Ca και παρεστιν  | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>   | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>      |
| 18:7    | αυτην: Cc εαυτην  | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>   | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>      |
| 18:8    | ο θς ο κς ο κρινας: Ca κς ο θς ο κρινων   | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 |                  |                     |
| 20:9    | κατεβη: Ca supplevit πυρ απο του θυ εκ του ουνου κ.<br>κατεφαγεν αυτους και ο διαβολος ο πλανων αυτους εβληθη<br>εις την λιμνην | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>   | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>      |
| 21:9    | γεμοντων: Ca γεμουσων   | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 |                  |                     |
| 21:20   | αμεθυστινος: Ca αμεθυσος  | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>   | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>      |
| 21:23   | φαινωσιν: Ca addidit εν   | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>   | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>      |
| 22:2    | ενθεν: Ca addidit κ. ενθεν  | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 |                  |                     |
| 22:20   | ιηυ: Ca addidit χε  | Ⓝ <sup>c</sup>                 | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>   | Ⓝ <sup>2</sup>      |

### Acknowledgements

This paper was delivered at the Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting in Chicago, November, 19, 2012. I am grateful to the editors of this volume for accepting a revised version of the paper and affording me an opportunity to offer a retrospective of sorts on the original discovery of Josef Schmid's consequential (and universally overlooked) dating error, as well as the subsequent

scholarship it generated, scholarship that culminated with the publication of an English translation and critical edition of Schmid's German magnum opus: Josef Schmid, *Studies in the History of the Greek Text of the Apocalypse: The Ancient Stems* (trans. and ed. Juan Hernández Jr., Garrick V. Allen, and Darius Müller; Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2018). I am also grateful for the opportunity to honor James R. Royse, whose contributions to the field have launched the careers of many textual critics, including my own. The method developed in his own *magnum opus* would provide the road map for my own work on the Apocalypse. See James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (NTTSD 36; Brill, 2007); cf. 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). The reviews of his work also highlight its seminal impact on the scholarship of others, "Review of James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*" in *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 17 (2012). <http://jbt.org/v17/TC-2012-PR-Royse.pdf>.

I should add that not only did I adopt Royse's method for my own project, but I was also fortunate to have him weigh in on my work and participate in my dissertation defense at Emory. Over the years Jim and I have become good friends and colleagues, meeting annually at the Society of Biblical Literature meetings and sharing meals. The conversations have always been rich, illuminating, and aglow with the life of the mind. These have always yielded a trove of text-critical "war stories" about his experiences with historic figures, such as K.H. Regenstorff, G.D. Kilpatrick, E.C. Colwell, and Kurt Aland among others. And there were books. Many books. Books in multiple languages—and *never enough books*—to discuss. The annual dinners were (and remain) one of the highpoints of the professional meetings—a tradition we have continued for over fifteen years.

### Bibliography

- Bousset, W. *Zur Textkritik der Apokalypse. Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament.* TU 2/4. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1894.
- Colwell, E.C. "Method in Establishing the Nature of Text-Types in New Testament Manuscripts." Pages 45–55 in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament.* NTTS 9. Leiden: Brill, 1969.
- Hernández Jr., Juan, P.M. Head, Dirk Jongkind, and James R. Royse. "Review of James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*." *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 17 (2012): 1–22. <http://jbt.org/v17/TC-2012-PR-Royse.pdf>.

- Hernández Jr., Juan. *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse: The Singular Readings of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi*. WUNT 2/218. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Hernández Jr., Juan. "The Creation of a Fourth-Century Witness to the Andreas Text Type: A Misreading in the Apocalypse's Textual History." *NTS* 60.1 (2014): 106–120.
- Hernández Jr., Juan. "The Legacy of Wilhelm Bousset for the Apocalypse's Textual History: The Identification of the Andreas Text." Pages 19–32 in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse*. Edited by Marcus Sigismund, Martin Karrer, and Ulrich Schmid. ANTF 48. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015.
- Hernández Jr., Juan. "Nestle-Aland 28 and the Revision of the Apocalypse's Textual History." Pages 71–81 in *Studies on the Text of the New Testament and Early Christianity: Essays in Honour of Michael W. Holmes*. Edited by Daniel M. Gurtner, Juan Hernández Jr., and Paul Foster. NTTSD 50. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Hoskier, H.C. *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse: Collations of All Existing Available Greek Documents with the Standard Text of Stephen's Third Edition, together with the Testimony of the Versions, Commentaries and Fathers. A Complete Conspectus of All Authorities*, 2 vols. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1929.
- Kilpatrick, G.D. "Professor J. Schmid on the Greek Text of the Apocalypse." *VC* 13 (1959): 1–13.
- Lembke, M., D. Müller, Ulrich B. Schmid with Martin Karrer. *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments VI: Die Apokalypse; Teststellenkollation und Auswertungen*. ANTF 49. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017.
- Malik, Peter. "The Earliest Corrections in Codex Sinaiticus: Further Evidence from the Apocalypse." *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* (2015): 1–12.
- Malik, Peter. "The Corrections of Codex Sinaiticus and the Textual Transmission of Revelation: Josef Schmid Revisited." *NTS* 61 (2015): 595–614.
- Milne, H.J.M., and T.C. Skeat. *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1938.
- Royse, James R. *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*. NTTSD 36. Brill, 2007.
- Schmid, Josef. *Der Apokalypse-Kommentar des Andreas von Kaisareia*; Text. Vol. 1/1 of *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes*. Münchener theologische Studien 1. Munich: Zink, 1955.
- Schmid, Josef. *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes*, vol. 2: *Die Alten Stämme*. Münchener theologische Studien 1, Historische Abteilung Ergänzungsband 1. Munich: K. Zink, 1956.
- Schmid, Josef. *Studies in the History of the Greek Text of the Apocalypse: The Ancient Stems*. Translated and edited by Juan Hernández Jr., Garrick V. Allen, and Darius Müller. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2018.
- Skeat, T.C. "The Codex Sinaiticus, The Codex Vaticanus and Constantine." *Collected Writings of T.C. Skeat*. Edited by J.K. Elliott. NovTSup 113. Leiden Brill, 2004.

- von Soden, Hermann. *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt*. 2 vols. Berlin: Duncker, 1902–1913.
- Sorensen, Roy A. *Pseudo-Problems: How Analytic Philosophy Gets Done*. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.
- von Tischendorf, A.F.C. *Novum Testamentum Sinaiticum cum Epistula Barnabae et Fragmentis Pastoris*, 2 vols. Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1863.
- von Tischendorf, A.F.C. *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 3 vols. 8th ed. Leipzig, 1869–1894.