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## THE NEW BIBLICAL PAPYRUS.

On April 15 last the Times newspaper gave an account with two facsimiles of the discovery, and acquisition by the British Museum, of an important new biblical manuscript (MS Or. 7594) containing three books, viz. Deuteronomy, Jonah and the Acts of the Apostles, in the Sahidic or Southern Coptic version. On the same day was published a volume, issued by the British Museum, containing the text of the original MS edited by Dr. Wallis Budge with an elaborate introduction. ${ }^{1}$

The great importance of the new manuscript, which is a papyrus in Codex form, lies in the fact that there are means of dating it. The text of the three books, which is written in literary uncials, is followed by a short text, also in Coptic, in cursive writing. It is a familiar fact to scholars that the literary hands of the early centuries of the Christian era are peculiarly difficult to date on purely palaeographical grounds when there is no other evidence to determine their limits. If a general consensus as to the dates of the earliest Greek biblical uncial MSS has been reached, it is mainly from external considerations. Cursive writing however is not beset with the same difficulty. The large number of dated documents in cursive script which Egypt has yielded enables palaeographers to date such writing with very considerable accuracy, and hence this piece of cursive Coptic writing, as the Copts used Greek characters, has enabled Sir F. Kenyon to say that it is not later than AD 350, which throws back the biblical text to an earlier date by some 30 or 40 years at least in all probability.

I have had an opportunity, thanks to the kindness of the

[^0]authorities of the British Museum, of studying this extremely interesting papyrus; and though it is unfortunate that the earliest existing manuscript of any considerable portion of the bible should be in Coptic rather than in Greek, yet the nature of Coptic is such that it is nearly always possible to determine the Greek reading which lies behind it. It is not my intention however to enter here into the question of the relation of the new papyrus to the earliest Greek texts. I propose to confine myself to a much humbler task, that of adding a few remarks to the information given in the Introduction as to the material form of the Codex and the palaeography, and of helping to establish the correct text. This is necessary before the more important problems can be approached.

The handwriting. On p. xii of his Introduction Dr. Budge says "a careful examination of all the texts shows that they were written by one and the same hand." A comparison of the plates in the printed volume suggests a considerable difference in the hands of the three books at first sight, and there is some reason on closer acquaintance for maintaining the view that the writing is not all by the same hand. It is true that there is no manifest difference in the materials employed and the quality of the papyrus is fairly uniform throughout.

In Jonah certain letters are made quite differently from those in Acts, especially $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$. The former is of a rounded form as opposed to the square form employed in Deuteronomy and Acts; and the $\boldsymbol{r}$ is distinguished by resting on the line instead of being carried below it.

Further, as between Deuteronomy and Acts there are marked differences in several letters. The crucial ones are $\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{K}, \boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{\rho}, \underset{\mu}{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$, 2 and $\sigma$.

In Deuteronomy B is fairly large and always carried below the line ; in Acts it is small and stands on the line.

In the $\mathbf{k}$ of Deuteronomy the lower diagonal stroke comes away from the upper one at some distance from the vertical stroke; in Acts the two diagonal strokes meet on the vertical stroke.

In Deuteronomy the scribe writes $n$ with a straight diagonal ; in Acts the diagonal sags so much that part of it droops on to the line.

In Deuteronomy $\mathbf{p}$ is formed with a full rounded top loop which sometimes becomes a cap ; in Acts the loop is open at the top and does not reach as high as the top of the shaft.

In Deuteronomy $\omega($ also $\omega$ ) is made with the right half tending to be larger than the left half; in Acts the left half tends to be larger than the right half.

In Deuteronomy 2 is always made with a sharp break where the upper curve passes into the lower one, and the letter is apt to be carried a little below the line; in Acts there is no such break, but the letter tends to an extreme form in which the upper curve is carried down to the line almost vertically and the lower limb is a horizontal stroke carried along the line, almost like a $Z$ with a small head; and it is never carried below the line.

In Deuteronomy $\sigma$ has a sloping body and a straight tail which is carried above the other letters ; in Acts the body is round and the tail is curved over and does not rise above the other letters.

These distinctions are so well defined and so consistently maintained throughout the two books that it seems impossible that they can have been adopted deliberately. One can imagine a scribe being influenced by the script of the manuscript which he is copying so far as to write a square $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ in one book and a rounded $\boldsymbol{e}$ in another ; so also with the forms of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ or $\boldsymbol{\AA}$ or $\boldsymbol{B}$ or $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$; but the distinctions in $\boldsymbol{K}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sim}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ are much subtler and what may fairly be called unconscious. $\omega$ and $\underset{y}{ }$ are properly of equal size in their two halves, and no man deliberately adopts a preponderance on one side or the other ; he falls into it.

The literary hands of these scribes are artificial, and that is why a copyist may be influenced by his original to the extent above stated. Hence I do not regard the "rounded" $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and "short" $\boldsymbol{r}$ of the Jonah scribe as a decisive proof that he was distinct from the others; and when he is examined with regard to the crucial letters of Deuteronomy and Acts, he is found to side in respect of all of them with the Deuteronomy scribe. Now
this papyrus has this in common with $\mathrm{B}, \boldsymbol{\aleph}$ and A that the scribe often fits his words into the lines by writing the last letters of the line very small, frequently about half the size of the others (cf. Introduction p. xiii), and in so doing he is apt to use more cursive forms of the letters. The Deuteronomy scribe under these circumstances uses just the same forms of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ as the Jonah scribe; but the scribe of Acts never does so; when the latter writes $\boldsymbol{e}$ or $\boldsymbol{r}$ small at the line-ends they are still of the "square" and "long-tailed" form respectively. This is a further distinction between the scribes of Deuteronomy and Acts, and I am strongly of opinion that they are two and not one. As to Jonah and Deuteronomy I do not feel sure ; there is a marked resemblance between the hands, but there are differences. The chief one is that the Deuteronomy scribe in writing a $\boldsymbol{T}$ that is not "run on" (as often happens) to the next letter, frequently turns the right end of the horizontal bar upwards so as to make it look like an apostrophe ("comma," Introduction p. xiii) and as such it is often printed by Dr. Budge, though I think mistakenly, especially in the middle of a word. The scribes of Deuteronomy and Acts both used apostrophes at the end of words, the Jonah scribe very seldom, he has only about half a dozen in all ; but the Jonah scribe in making a non-ligatured $\tau$ ends the cross bar with a downward stroke at the right end ; and this seems to me one of those unconscious differences which betray a distinct hand. ${ }^{2}$ But I have an open mind as to the identity of the scribes of the first two books. A more prolonged study of the manuscript than I have been able to give it on this point might lead to more definite results.

In this connection it is worth remark that while each book has a separate pagination, neither Jonah nor Acts begins on a new quire. The page numbers are certainly contemporary, and I believe in each case written by the scribe himself. Those of Jonah look to me rather different in form from those of Deuteronomy, but this is perhaps rather a matter of feeling than

[^1]of demonstration. It is curious that of the three page-numbers which survive in Deuteronomy containing a $\mu(=40)$ two are round and one square. The only surviving one in Acts is square.

Structure of the Codex. Dr. Budge writes "The quires usually contained eight leaves, i.e. four sheets of papyrus measuring about $12 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{in}$. in height and 13 in . in width, folded in half, but some contained six leaves, and some only four. Whether the quires were signed by letters or numbers cannot be said, for no quire mark is preserved on any leaf" (Introd. p. xi):

It is not quite clear how he reaches these results; for my examination of the papyrus and tabulation of the leaves according to the arrangement of their fibres lead to the conclusion that the volume was composed of thirteen quires. ${ }^{3}$

Each quire consisted of five or six sheets which when folded gave ten or twelve leaves and therefore twice the number of pages. They were arranged as follows, the figures representing the number of leaves in each of the thirteen quires:-12(?), ${ }^{4}$ 12, 10, 12, 12, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10 . This is confirmed by the existence of several quire-marks which have been overlooked by the Editor. Each quire seems to have been numbered on the first and last page at the corner opposite to that bearing the page number. At the left hand corner of fol. $46 a$ is a $\overline{\mathbf{Z}}$, in the same ink as the pagination of the opposite corner $\overline{\mathbf{p} \boldsymbol{\lambda}[\overline{\mathbf{d}}],{ }^{5}}$

[^2]showing that it is the first page of the seventh quire, and on the verso of the last leaf of this quire fol. $55 b$ is a broken fragment of a number, probably another $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$ to mark the end of the quire. There is an $\overline{\boldsymbol{H}}$ on the left hand corner of fol. $56 a$, the first of the eighth quire, and a fragmentary but unmistakable $\boldsymbol{H}$ on the last page of the quire fol. $65 b$. On fol. $66 a$ again there is a fragment of a $\theta$ marking the commencement of the ninth quire, ${ }^{6}$ and on fol. $75^{b}$ is also a marking its end. Before the seventh and after the ninth quire all the corners of the pages where quiremarks ought to be found are broken away. In the last quire the order of the fibres shows that there must have been two more leaves (both VH ) at the end after the last leaf of the extant cursive writing.

A word may be added on the paragraph marks. In Deuteronomy they are of somewhat varied forms (see Introd. p. xii). Those on fol. 11 $b, 21 a, 28 a$ and $35 a$ and perhaps one also on fol. $24 b$ (mostly broken away) are inserted by the "later hand " in gray ink (see below). The rest are to all appearance in the same ink as the text, but they vary in shape and size and do not seem to be always by the same hand. ${ }^{7}$ They bear no relation to the various systems of paragraph division and numeration found in Codd. B and A, nor to the Coptic lectionary divisions given by Lagarde in his index to the Göttingen lectionaries (Orientalia p. 48).

In Acts on the other hand the paragraph marks are all of one form and are evidently inserted by the original scribe, ${ }^{8}$ with two exceptions, viz. that on fol. $65 b$ is inserted by the "later hand"

[^3](gray ink) and that on fol. $64 b$ is similar to the latter in shape, but is written in heavy brown ink and does not appear to be by the original scribe. Possibly also the small wedge-shaped sign on fol. $6 \mathrm{I} b$ is not due to him. This system of division again does not correspond to those found in Codd. B and $\mathbb{N}$ nor to the "Euthalian" system.

The "later hand." As Dr. Budge states (Introd. p. xxxi) with regard to the scribe of the Acts, and it is true of the whole MS, such corrections of the text as are found seem to have been made as he pursued his task by the original scribe or scribes. There is no evidence that he systematically corrected his own work, nor that any one else corrected it for him. Yet sporadically we come across signs of a later hand, which confines its work to touching up the text in parts where it was faded, and to adding occasional apostrophes ("commas") and also a few accents in the Song of Moses, and in one or two instances deleting a word by diagonal strokes. Its presence is easily distinguished by the ink. The original scribes used an excellent ink which is nearly black with the full pen and becomes a warm brown where it is thin. But the later hand uses an ink which, while occasionally black, is usually thinned to a gray, indeed mostly a palish gray. It is a different kind of ink too, and seems to have been more fluid, less viscous than the brown ink, so that even when used with a full pen it is distinguishable. The new hand first appears, so far as I have observed it, on fol. inb, it is busiest on fol. 24 to 30 ; on fol. $29 b$ is his only original contribution to the text; he inserts in Deut. xxii 9 after $\sigma$ po $\sigma$ a word which Dr. Budge has read didar (p. 63 note), but which I believe to be crad ("thou shalt not sow thy vineyard with two seeds"). I see no sign of his work in the text of Jonah, except that there are slight traces of what seems to be his ink in minute smudges in the margin ; and I have observed no sign of him in Acts except the addition of one paragraph mark at ch. v i2, but I have not examined the whole text with a view to his presence.

The end-script is also written in a black-gray ink, but though I have made a careful comparison of its ink with that of the
"later hand," I cannot come to any certain conclusion as to whether they are the same or not.

The end-script ("Colophon "). Whoever wrote the endscript, it was not the scribe of Deuteronomy at any rate. The latter has given us on fol $6 b$ a specimen of his cursive writing. At the beginning of Deut. vi 18 he wrote ekeespe $\overline{\mu l}$ on a bad place of the papyrus, and apparently not being satisfied with the result he wrote the same words in a cursive hand above it. His $\mathbf{k}$ and $\boldsymbol{p}$ are so distinct from those of the end-script that they cannot be attributed to the same hand.

The document has been partly translated by Dr. Budge on p. lv of his Introduction. As will be seen from the Collation appended to these notes, I read several words differently from him, and I give a translation of the whole, as far as I can, from beginning to end, quite literally :-
" The word of the Lord came to me, saying to me 'Say to this people ( $\lambda a o$ s) Why do you sin (perhaps have you sinned) ? You add $\sin$ to your sins, ${ }^{9}$ you make angry the Lord God who created you. Love not the world ( $\kappa o ́ \sigma \mu o s$ ) nor the things that are in the world ( $\kappa$.), ${ }^{10}$ for the glory of the world ( $\kappa$.) is the devil's ( $\delta \iota \alpha^{\prime} \beta$ ßoोos), and its dissolution. Remember that the Lord has pitied you, He who [created ?] everything, in order that he may deliver us from the bondage ( $\alpha i \chi \mu \alpha \lambda \omega \sigma i a$ ) of this world ( $\alpha i \omega \nu$ ), for often has the devil ( $\delta$.) desired ( $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \theta \nu \mu \epsilon i \nu$ ) to prevent the sun from rising over the earth, and the earth from [yielding her fruits ( $\kappa \alpha \rho \pi o ́ s) ~ ?]$ ], he wishing to devour men as the fire which runs in a stubble field, ${ }^{11}$ he wishing to swallow them up like water. And therefore God pitied us by sending his Son into the world (кó $\sigma \mu \boldsymbol{s}$ ) that he may save us from the bondage (aix.). He did not [send an ?] angel (ä $\gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda o s$ ) to come to us (?) nor archangel (?) ( $\dot{a} \rho \chi \dot{\gamma} \gamma \gamma \in \lambda o s$ ), ${ }^{12}$ but He was (reading arcy.) changed ..... (several lines lost) . . . . the earth on account of these deceivers ( $\pi \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \nu o s$ ) who will multiply

[^4]at the end of the seasons, for they will set up teachings which are nut from God, who will reject ( $\dot{\alpha} \theta \varepsilon \tau \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ ) the law ( $\nu o ́ \mu o s$ ) of God, they whose god is their belly, ${ }^{13}$ who say that there is no fast ( $\nu \eta \sigma \tau \epsilon i ́ a$ ), nor hath God appointed it, who make themselves strangers to the covenant ( $\delta \iota a \theta \eta^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ ) of God, ${ }^{14}$ who deprive themselves of the glorious promises, ${ }^{15}$ who are not established at any time in the strong faith ( $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s$ ). Do not let them deceive ( $\pi \lambda a \nu \hat{a} \nu$ ) you [in] these things. Remember that the Lord brought (?) fasting ( $\nu$. ) ever since he created the heavens...... men on account of the sufferings ( $\pi \dot{\alpha} \theta o s$ ) and the......on your account.

Other early Coptic MSS. Relying then on Sir F. Kenyon's date for the cursive script ("about the middle of the fourth century," Introd. p. lxiii), and bearing in mind the early date of the documents found in the binding ("early in the fourth or late in the third century" according to Mr. H. I. Bell, ibid. p. xvi), we must place the writing of the papyrus itself not later probably than AD 300-320. Had there been no indications such as the above, we should unquestionably, I think, have put a considerably later date on the papyrus (cf. Sir F. Kenyon, p. 1xiii). Dr. Budge says (p. xiii) "To assign anything like an exact date to the Codex is extremely difficult, because it is manifestly older than any other Coptic document available and because we have nothing else of the same period with which to compare it." With this verdict I cannot wholly agree. There are in existence a few Coptic MSS which have hitherto been tentatively dated later, but so closely resemble this one that I think they must now be brought much nearer to the early date of the new papyrus. At Berlin there is a papyrus (Or. 3065) containing the First Epistle of S. Clement in the Achmimic dialect, ${ }^{16}$ written with a single column to the page, which Dr. Carl Schmidt placed in the second half or end of the fourth century. The character of the writing is so close to that of the

[^5]British Museum papyrus that it must be brought into its immediate neighbourhood. Mr. Horner has claimed the fourth century for a fragment of S. John's gospel on papyrus in the Brit. Mus. ${ }^{17}$ Its heavy square uncials resemble those of the Golenischeff version of the Martyrium Petri, ${ }^{18}$ but I am not inclined to assign to either of them an earlier date than the fifth century. The papyrus no. 310 of the Rylands Library ${ }^{19}$ has a better claim to come into the latter half of the fourth century. Among vellums there are one or two which also are entitled to be associated with the earliest papyri. There is the Sahidic Psalter at Berlin (P. 3259) ${ }^{20}$ which is unfortunately so fragmentary that we cannot judge of the general aspect of the page, use of capitals etc., and we are confined to the forms of the letters, which are certainly early and very similar to those of the small Apocalypse in the Brit. Mus. ${ }^{21}$ These may perhaps come into the second half of the fourth century. And very little later, if at all, is the Codex containing the two Wisdoms at Turin, ${ }^{22}$ the fragment of the Middle Egyptian version of the Catholic Epistles ${ }^{23}$ and perhaps the first hand of the Pistis Sophica.

Evidence of Dialect. The documents found in the binding point to the papyrus having been bound at Hermopolis at a very early date (Introduction $p$. $x v-x v i i$ ). The dialect of Acts is practically pure Sahidic with very few aberrant forms. Deuteronomy on the other hand has a striking number of unusual forms and it is an interesting fact that they give evidence of a Hermopolitan dialect and so indicate that the book was also written there.

[^6]What we know of the dialect of Hermopolis (Eshmunên) is derived from a large number of documents, chiefly legal, which had their origin there and are now in the Rylands Library ${ }^{24}$ and in Vienna. ${ }^{25}$ One of its features is the substitution of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ for short e before $Z$ in such words as wrī, which becomes wraz. Thus we find wrą (ordz) ten times in Deuteronomy (never in Acts), ororą € \&oえ three times, corąc (i 41), Twßą (ix 25), coßдえ (xxiii 1), eropą $\overline{\mathbf{c}}$ (xxviii 68) and perhaps Kג̨K ( x i). We have $\overline{\operatorname{s}} \Sigma a p$ for $\operatorname{\Sigma dp}(\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ) in ii 5 , v if. 26 , xxxi 23 (cf. Rylands Cat. no. 292). w्yout is used for Sah. woustr all through Deuteronomy (the Sahidic form all through Acts), and w्रoret is the usual form at Hermopolis. Other peculiarities, which however I cannot trace to any special locality, are the plural form ker, only when used before rorte " other gods" (Deut. xiii ${ }_{1} 3$, xvii 3 , xxviii 14. 36.64, xxix 26 , $x x x$ 17), and the constant substitution of el for : (hardly ever in Acts) : but this, though it occurs in documents from Eshmunên, is not characteristic there.

The Acts also contain some peculiarities of word-form, but I cannot associate them as a group with any known dialect. It is noticeable that there is no trace of Achmimic in the MS. The most remarkable feature of the language of Acts is the frequent use of $\boldsymbol{\pi \Delta t ~ e t c . ~ f o r ~ \pi \in t ~ e t c . , ~ t h e ~ d e m o n s t r a t i v e ~ a d j e c t i v e . ~}$ At Hermopolis the usual form was $\pi \boldsymbol{r}$, and $\pi \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{s}$ is only known to us as a Bohairic form. It occurs in Acts v 5. 32, vi 14, vii 1 , ix I3. 14, x 44, xiii 42 ; never in Deuteronomy. In Acts we also find reddcye for eddaxe (vii 57 , normal in three other places), w्yourre for w्yoxre (xxvii 12, normal in five other places), and $\underset{y}{c} \pi$ for $x \boldsymbol{x}$ (xxiii 23, normal in x 9 ). This can hardly be accidental (cf. also w्ywre for $\sigma \omega \pi$, i 16), nor is Gwor eRon for kw eRon twice (xxvii 2I, xxviii 10), though $\sigma \omega$ for $x \omega$ (iv 14) and $x \omega$ for $\sigma \omega$ (xix 22) may be mistakes. Both Deuteronomy and Acts use rere and $\mu \bar{r}$ "and" indiscriminately, and both write $x \in$ for Sah. $x \bar{s}$ "or" (Deut.

[^7]viii 2, Acts viii 34). The only word connecting Acts with Hermopolis is ceraz twice for cerz (v 21, xxi 27).

The date of the papyrus carries us back probably beyond the period of the foundation of the monasteries of Egypt, but there are some traditions of Christianity as early in the neighbourhood of Hermopolis. Nearly opposite it on the east bank of the Nile was Antinoe, which sent a bishop to the Council of Nicaea (325) and had in its vicinity one of the oldest churches in Egypt, behind Der Abu Hennis, said to have been built by the Empress Helena (Butler, Coptic Churches, i 364 ; Clédat, Bull. Inst. fr. Arch. Or. ii 45). Hermopolis had a bishop of its own however already in the middle of the third century (Euseb. H. E. vi 46 ).

Collation of the printed text with the original papyrus. Unfortunately the printed text is disfigured by numerous misprints. I have supplemented Dr. Budge's list of errata by a collation, which however does not include accents, nor the breathing over $\boldsymbol{H}$ (represented usually in the printed edition by a circumflex accent). Nor has any notice been taken of the apostrophes ("commas," Introd. p. xiii), as they are partly really such and partly only details of the letters themselves, and not always easily distinguishable. They are of little importance except from the point of view of Coptic writing.
$\boldsymbol{r}$ at the end of a line is usually written in the original as a prolonged superlineation. The Editor has written them out, and they are not referred to in the collation; nor has any attention been paid to the word-division, which, as printed, occasionally destroys the sense of the Coptic, nor to the filling up of the lacunae, save when obviously wrong.

Note. The passage in Deut. xxii 9 referred to on p. 9 above does not exist in any other printed Coptic text ; but the same phrase occurs also in Levit. xix ig as nekredreス̃oõe nrrekxóq sropor crad (Miss. Arch. fr. vi p. 72).

The following abbreviations are used: $1 .=$ read, $\mathrm{v} .=$ verse, $\mathrm{om}=$ omit, orig $=$ original, prob $=$ probably, $\mathrm{pt}=$ point, sup $=$ superlineation.

## DEUTERONOMY．

I $39 \overline{\mathrm{~N}} \mathrm{RPpt}]$ sup over ist $\boldsymbol{p} \mid$ the mark over $\boldsymbol{H}$ by com－ parison with many later instances is not $q$ but a breathing｜［ET］ 1．$\in[J]$｜om pt after $\overline{\mu r e o q} 42 \overline{\operatorname{er}} \mathbf{T o}]$ om sup｜NEK］NETJ

 at end of $v .46$ om pt at end of $v$ ．

II 4 om pt after chesp｜［J］hortis 1 ．Th． 5 or［e］1．оrẹ｜ om pt at end of v．sidorose．．］sedoros［or］prob｜om pt at

 of $v$ ．Io om pt at end of $v$ ．II om pt at end of v ． 12 arw $1^{\circ}$ ］add $\left.\pi[\epsilon] \mid \pi \epsilon\right] \pi \epsilon \mid[K \lambda H]$ posoussa 1．［K入］нp．｜ om pt at end of v． 13 ग $[\omega]$ ors 1 ．Tors｜om pt at end of v ． 14 роилт］ $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ written above line 15 om pt after xwor｜ $17 \pi \times 0$ ］drxo｜om pt at end of v． 18 om pt at end of v ． 19 KスHporrore［Et］．．］Kスнporor！［ג］

## IV 48 дeprown］גeprews


 20］1． 2 ［［20 ג］｜［пто］or 1．n［Jo］or 5 dr［ok］1．dro［k］｜
 ［ $\overline{\boldsymbol{\ell}}] \pi \epsilon$ ］om［ $\overline{\boldsymbol{\ell}}]$｜om pt after птoor and after $X \in 7$ om pt at end of v． 8 KTderso］KTderse $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ Ton［TT$]$ 1． $\boldsymbol{\pi}$（prob） गолт фwß̣ little doubt as this scribe writes $\mathbb{B}$ half below the line｜


 om brackets 16 ETETV$\overline{\boldsymbol{N}}$ ］om sup｜ET］ETE｜EPE］ $\mathrm{PE} \mid 20$ UNTPE］$\mu \overline{N T J P E ~} 2$ I［qגi Maz］ $\bar{B}$ 1．q［גi］Mą $\bar{B} \quad 22$ margin
[ $\bar{\lambda}]$ om brackets $\mid$ om pt at end of $v .23$ om pt at end of $v$. 24 ETCARON] om E|pt after TCATE|E 2pגi] om E|om pt at end of v . 25 srorw己] om $\boldsymbol{N}$, prob the scribe intended to superlineate $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ at end of preceding line but he omitted to do so | om pt after srorte | eoror] sic 26 TEi] TE prob 27 NET 1. NET[व] 28 om pt after Naï| NET has been erased by the scribe $3^{1}$ Na[i] 1 . Nai 32 ETETN] ETETN
 om sup | om pt at end of v. 2 ETETME] om sup | om pt after noor | ETETNT] om sup 3 ETETN om sup | П[EK]NORTE 1. пrorte 4 пXOEIC] лxӧ̈ 5 गHpc] om sup 8 om pt at end

 CEI 12 om pt at end of $v$. I4 пKw Te] kw Te, $k$ is written over $\pi$ but only partly obliterates it 18 rarrorq] जुarora

 pt at end of $\mathrm{v} .24 \mathrm{TPE}^{\circ}$ ] TPE ${ }^{-}$om pt at end of v. 25 E


VII i et $\bar{N}]$ et $\bar{K} \quad$ om ebefore Na $4 \bar{n}[2 \bar{N}]: 1$. $\bar{n} Z \in \mathbb{N}$



 лт written below the line but all is now broken away except perhaps a part of $\boldsymbol{T} \quad 7 \mathrm{CE} \boldsymbol{J} \overline{\boldsymbol{\pi}}]$ om sup 8 XE$]$ om at end of line and insert before пxoesc il e'tetin] om sup 12 om pt at end of $\left.v .{ }_{13} \times \bar{q} i^{\circ}\right]$ qra | $\left.\omega \bar{p} \bar{k}\right]$ om sup 14 pt after



 $26 \lambda E] \sigma_{E}$

 $\overline{\mu r e[o] r ~} 3$ [dq]kג.1. ג[q]kג. | ekzo. 1. eḳ̨o[

IX margin [ $\overline{\boldsymbol{\mu E}}]$ om brackets 7 om pt at end of $\mathrm{v} .8 \overline{\mathrm{e}}$ ] om sup | om pt at end of v .9 om pt at end of v . io $\bar{\mu} \pi r$.] om sup |erchz] लerchz $122^{\bar{s}} 2^{\circ}$ ] $2 \bar{\Omega} \quad 15$ €ii] $\hat{\mathrm{I}}$ |om pt
 дगet̄̄r before $k \omega 17$ dit] dït | dirox.] dïrox. | Inte] $\bar{\mu} \pi \in T \bar{n} 18$ rл rorer] errsorere [roor] or above line | om pt at end of v. 20 גдpwr] omission here due to homoioteleuton $\mid$ om pt at end of v . 21 pok $2 \overline{\mathrm{q}}] \mathcal{2}$ above line $\mid \mathrm{pt}$ after
 sup | om pt at end of v. 23 om pt at end of v. 24 ताTETNO] NETETMO 25 om pt after zoor and at end of $\mathrm{v} .26 \cot [\boldsymbol{J} \overline{\mathrm{c}}]$ 1. $\cot \overline{\mathrm{C}}$ | ECXOOp] ETXOOP 27 ICAK] ÏCAK | ENTAV] ENTJ[K ?]


 of v. 6 recdine] rescdite | uredr $2^{\circ}$ ] ruedr | om pt at end of $v .7 \boldsymbol{\Delta r \omega}] \mathbf{\Delta r} 8$ the ends of all the lines of this $v$. may be taken out of the brackets, the fragment of papyrus on which they occur having been separated and mounted by mistake with fol. $45 \mid$ om pt at end of v. $9[E \operatorname{Bo\lambda }] \times \boldsymbol{x} 1$. $[\mathrm{ET}] \mathrm{BE} \mid$ om

 ${ }^{1} 3^{-1} 5$ remove all brackets from [лет] down to [лог], see above


 $\epsilon \hat{\mathbf{I}} \mid \boldsymbol{\mu}] \overline{\boldsymbol{u}} \mid \mathrm{pt}$ after $\psi \boldsymbol{\gamma} \times \mathbf{H} \mid \overline{\boldsymbol{N} \theta \epsilon}]$ add $\overline{\boldsymbol{N}}$

 on the pap. before $\boldsymbol{H}$; if anything was ever written there, it was not $\boldsymbol{H}$ and has been erased $\mid$ om pt at end of $\mathbf{v} .4$ om pt after
¿Jop and at end of v .7 KE$] \times \mathbb{}$ | om pt at end of v .
 [ $\boldsymbol{\pi}] \AA \boldsymbol{i} \mid$ om pt at end of v .9 ETETN] om sup | pt after गKגZ | om pt at end of $v$. IO om pt at end of $v$. II $\in T] \in T \bar{K} \quad 12 \mathrm{om}$
 [ $\bar{\mu}] 2^{\bar{s}}$ om pt at end of v. 14 pt after пекKдД | wор $\bar{\pi}$ ]

 16, 17, 18, 19, om pt at end of v. $20 \boldsymbol{N}] \overline{\boldsymbol{s}} \mid \mathrm{om}$ pt at end of v. 21 NCE] $\overline{\text { NCE }} \mid \omega \overline{\mathrm{K}}]$ om $\sup \mid \boldsymbol{N}$ TगE] $\sup$ over $\boldsymbol{N} 22$ лекrorte] menrorte 24 गeï epo] resepo 26, 27, 28, om
 गhrtin |e zenken.] Trearken. 30 2i] 2131 om pt at end of $v$.
 ertaruye. 3 ETETN $\left.1^{\circ} 2^{\circ} 3^{\circ} 4^{\circ}\right]$ om sup | $\overline{\mathrm{r}}$ rerpari] emerpars | erd] reed | $3,4,5,6 \mathrm{om} \mathrm{pt}$ at end of v. 5 нror] еreq. 6 e[r]rar 1. eredr | orwa्रere] orwus. | w्रpग] om sup 7 ETETNAZ1] om sup | NET[Nल्यH]PE 1 . $\boldsymbol{N E T N G}[\mathbf{H}] \mathrm{PE}$, if there was a superlineation it is broken away
 sup II ETETN] om sup |orcya] ercia 12 eTETJ] om sup | erasure] थлєеттоє Bõ slightly rubbed but every letter legible and I believe not intentionally erased $\left.142 \bar{\mu} \quad 2^{\circ}\right] \quad 2 \bar{\pi} \quad 14,15$ om pt at end of v. 16 orweeव] ororeव | ETETM] om sup
 om brackets $18 \overline{\mu \quad J o}$ ] ето | om pt after лоスлc and at end
 at end of $v .20$ pt after Jouy $\mid \bar{\rho} \bar{N}] \complement^{\bar{N}} 2 I$ ecoore $\left.\bar{N}\right]$ ecoor

 25 om pt after risrorq $2^{\circ}$ and at end of v. 26,27 om pt at end of v . 28 Eîpe $\mathrm{I}^{\circ} 2^{\circ}$ ] EIpe 29 nXOEIC] add $\lambda \in 30$


XIII om paragraph mark I init $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ not in margin $\mathrm{I}, 2$ om pt
 sup｜om pt at end of v． 5 ETETN］sic｜colon at end of v ． 6 Jexcy BHp］गekcy．｜ $\bar{\lambda} \bar{s}]$ om sup $\mid$ om pt at end of $v .7$ epor］epok｜pt after пKגZ 8 om pt after e poq and at end of $v$ ． 9 om pt after THp $\bar{q} \mid$ TOOT $\bar{q}]$ Jо́OT $\bar{q}$ Io scęr］sup over $N$｜ $\bar{N} T$ ］om sup｜om pt at end of v．II Eque［drrccu］l． Eqway［NCW］｜ $\operatorname{ar}[\omega \mathrm{NC}]$ 1． $\operatorname{arc}[\mathrm{Nc}] \mid$ colon at end of v ． 12，I3 om pt at end of v．I3 KE］ker i4 ered $\left.{ }_{15} 2 \omega T \bar{K}\right] 2 \omega T \overline{\mathbf{h}}$｜ETETN］om sup 16 EN］EKE｜POK $\bar{\varnothing}$ ］ pwk $\bar{Z} \mid \because(s i c)]$ om，the three dots are a broken but certain $\mathcal{Z}$ ， viz．the first letter of $2 \bar{\pi}$ ；there is nothing between лодля and $2^{\bar{N}} \mid$ om pt after गHpor and at end of v． 17 NNE］ $\left.\bar{N} N E \mid 2^{\bar{N}}\right]$ $2[\boldsymbol{N}]$

XIV 17 om pt at end of v．is ETETR］om sup｜om pt at
 of v． 2 I EKET］EKEt $22[\mathrm{XI}]$ ．［ $\sigma 1] \mid$ w्रp $\bar{\pi}]$ om $\sup \mid \bar{\rho}$ ZOTE］ om sup 24,25 om pt at end of v． 27 EKEîre］EKEEîse｜ гenhred］ гersorreed $/ \mathrm{om}$ pt at end of v ．

XV I N］$\overline{\mathrm{N}} 2 \mathrm{pt}$ after 2ıगorwk｜［weot］1．［weoficy］｜

 after reledk and at end of v．｜ex $\overline{\mu l}$ ex $\bar{\pi} \quad 7 \boldsymbol{\mu} \omega \pi \epsilon]$ add $\epsilon[q] \mid$
 1． $\bar{p} \sigma \bar{p}] \omega 殳 8 \bar{\mu}]$ add $\pi \in T \bar{q} \mid[\pi \in T \in q]$ om｜om pt after
 eRoえ dc and omit dc from bracket in next line io eket $\mathrm{I}^{\circ}$ ］ KE才｜$\overline{\mathrm{q}}[\boldsymbol{r}] \mathrm{d}$ l．$\overline{\mathrm{q}}$ only｜om pt at end of v．II ot $\left.\bar{K} \mathrm{I}^{\circ} 2^{\circ}\right]$ ［0］Jर्K 12 ekexoorq l．exexoor［q］i2， 13 om pt at end




 om sup $\mid$ om pt after $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ ese and at end of v．20，21，22， 23 ompt

over sf 21 [eqzoor etc.] prob only five letters in lacuna at beginning of line $\mid$ rer]cia 1. rercid | 22 orore] orwes

XVI i, 2 om pt at end of $v$. Ei$] \in \hat{\mathrm{i}} \quad 3$ [d] om $\mid \pi[\mu \mathrm{ed}$






 w्रдגXE] altered to cyad, not w्yגï, by a diagonal line drawn through $X \in$; a later hand, with gray ink, has put five dots over and four dots under the $x \in \mid \in B[0 \lambda 1$. $\in \operatorname{Bo}[\lambda \mid \Omega[H T \bar{q}] 1$.
 necessary to say that this is not a plural, but $\psi \gamma \mathcal{X H}$ followed

 II $\mu \bar{s}$ T]EKZ. 1 . $\mu \bar{s}]$ TEKZ. | ET 2] 1 . ET] $\bar{\mu} \bar{N} 12$ colon at
 [ERoz] | pt after лeksorte $2^{\circ}$ and after $\overline{s i s} \alpha \theta д B$ and after
 colon at end of v. 19 rucyaxe] sup over sr 20 pt after
 2̄ॅल्रHs but no practical doubt as to reading | TE日rc.] леөгс.

XVII 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 om pt at end of v. 2 ёTo] om sup $\left.4 \mathrm{E}^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}\right]$ add $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{e c}$ which has been added apparently by a later hand but in brown ink |



 guess. | тинт[є] 1. тинтє $\boldsymbol{r}$, the $\boldsymbol{r}$ is uncertain, but there are the vestiges of a letter consistent with or 9 го丁 $\bar{\top}$ ] om
 EKELAq｜ETOVrs． $2^{\circ}$ l．［e］TOrr．｜om pt at end of v． 12 eîpe］ etpe｜om pt after orннB，after ereedr and at end of $v$ ． 13 colon at end of $v .16$ om pt after ¿Twp and at end of v ． 1 pt after кнeee and after nazor． 17 om pt after sorB and at end of $v$ ．｜reqtacy．1．［r］reqtacy． 18 入ert．］orig written тert．，initial $\boldsymbol{T}$ altered to $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ by corrector in gray ink 18 ，19，
下ме्रнре

XVIII I om pt at end of v． $2 \underline{y}[\omega] \pi \in$ 1．w्ycurte｜גq 1．$\alpha[q]$ xooc 3 pt after rorннв｜w्yddt ev 1．w्रдdtor｜ crar ］ $\operatorname{erdp} \mid \theta \in] \Theta H$ ；om pt at end of v． 4 Narapxht］
 om pt after лісрднス 6 po［k］1．pok｜oracyo［r］1．oracuc


 om sup｜room for［Jow］in first lacuna｜$/ / / / / / 1$ 1．$x[\epsilon]$

 pt at end of v． 6 ENTJ［גq］1．ENTJdç｜uoorr］ $\bar{q}$ has been added by the corrector in gray ink，but I think over the same letter by the orig scribe $\mid X \in \boldsymbol{\lambda}]$ XEX̣ prob $\mid$ om pt at end of v ． 8 ete］तुTte 9 eîpe］eipe／trwir］etzwn｜n rekzoor］ sup over $\pi I^{\circ} \mid$ oroz］orę｜om pt at end of v．Io лeï］лגï

 line｜$\overline{\boldsymbol{\mu}}[\boldsymbol{\pi}]$ 1．$\overline{\boldsymbol{u} \pi \in \boldsymbol{T}}$｜next line prob 1．［ETXI EZ］
 paragraph mark is only a short straight line and is not by the
 om brackets 17 om pt after serephor 18 ［ $\bar{N} \sigma$ T］om brackets｜
 ［ceert］｜टнगor］after готє are remains of one letter only， prob $\bar{N}[\mathbf{C \in T} \overline{\boldsymbol{l}}] \mid \times 0]$ XE｜BaX in bracket］om $2 I$ pt after
orobze $I^{\circ} \mid$ after $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{I}_{\boldsymbol{X}} \mathrm{I}^{\circ}$ insert $\mathbf{E}$, and om in bracket at beginning of next line | пеед $\overline{\mathrm{N}}$ ] add or | [оге] рнте l. ернтє

XX i uscys] uscye | [Ore] 1. [er] as there is prob only room
 tip of the $x$ remains and shows that $\omega$ is impossible | [rxo] om
 pt at end of v. 3 pt after ллсрднд and $q \sigma \bar{B} B \in \mid$ боте] there is no trace of 20 left in the orig hand, the corrector in gray ink has written, by mistake, prob $\bar{\rho} 0$, carrying over $\bar{\rho}$ from the previous line, but the reading should be ¿OTE 4 NETNTROVTE]


 [ $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ oort E] room for five letters, perhaps [ $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ or $2^{\bar{N}}$ ] | after pwere 1. [XId]eIk 6 nрwre] om $\mu$ and insert in bracket in next line

XXII 3 [ $\mathbf{d}]$ cqcoup $\bar{\mu}$ om brackets $\mid$ om pt at end of $v .5$ [N]RE om brackets $\mid \bar{\mu}$ лг $\bar{B} c \omega$ 1. $\bar{\Omega} \bar{R} c \omega \quad 5,6$ om pt at end



 9 the addition after $X \in$ above the line in gray ink is crar not dids 12,13 om pt at end of v . 14 THG] TE $\sigma \mid \in \overline{\mathrm{p}}] \mathrm{c} \overline{\mathrm{p}} \mid$


 the final $\in$ is small and rather high, and it is clear cyrre was
 Teיs $\bar{T} p[\mathrm{o}]$. om pt after poorre $2^{\circ}$ and at end of v. | $\left.\sigma \lambda \bar{\pi}\right]$
 the orig scribe 19 [r w्रor] 1. [rweye]| Tddq] Tddr | pt



 of v .27 colon at end of v .29 om pt after sereedc and after

 letters in the lacuna, o $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ written small but certain $\mid$ om pt at end of v .
 colon at end of $v .2 \mathrm{om}$ pt at end of $\mathrm{v} .3 \overline{\mathrm{r}}] \mathrm{om}$, I can see
 was another letter $\mid$ om pt at end of v .5 Bddス̨del]
 are remains of $B$ and of a small letter, prob $\mathbf{o}$, after it $8 \mathrm{~B} \omega[\mathrm{~K}]$ om brackets 9 己dpe[¿] om brackets 9, IO, II om pt at end of v. Io xwp ] ercurn, the corrector has re-written the original word in gray ink, but it is possible to see that both original and

 12 [r] om 13 rewp] $\mu н p \mid \pi \bar{N} \Sigma$ ] $\pi N \bar{\Sigma} \mid$ om pt at end of v. 14 eqraceise] qraceire 15 TOOT $\bar{q}$ ] etoot $\bar{q}$ | Ed] om

 end of v. ig rex[cors]? 1. תekco 22 om pt at end of $v$.


 $\mu \in \boldsymbol{r}_{\bar{s}}$ (ic)] $\mu \bar{r}$ only 5 om pt at end of v. 8 ETETN] om sup io ercycre] ecycure | pt after epoq 12 rokz] sup over

 om pt at end of v. 20 EKNAKOT $\overline{\mathrm{c}}]$ EKNAKw $\overline{\mathrm{q}}$ | EKE $\overline{\mathrm{p}}$ ] om sup | пд1] пдї 21 есрдJ] есрдJ[ $\overline{\mathrm{q}}] \cdot$ no practical doubt, as the superlineation remains
 5 om pt at end of $v .6$ om pt after reor 7 EuyдN] Equ्रAN ।



 जoracy 17 the paragraph mark is added by the corrector in gray ink | om pt at end of $\mathbf{v .} 18$ om pt after éroce | pt after лє
 om pt at end of v. $3 \mathrm{\epsilon T}$ ] пет 6 өर्ekorl] dratekorr 7
 eqwore epwit Io ri] $\overline{\boldsymbol{r}}$




 artaro | $\overline{\boldsymbol{r} c \in \bar{p}}] \overline{\mathrm{r}}$ cep | om pt at end of v . 11 dq] aqt, either $t$ or $\boldsymbol{T}$, more probably the former $\mid \boldsymbol{\operatorname { r e x }}[\operatorname{OrIsa}]$.
 room for one letter in bracket, prob o from slight remains 16 лодлс] тлодлс 17 длоөнке] длоөнкн 18 мгепл.] sup

 the $p$ is uncertain, but it was a letter with a tail, not $\times$ |

 apparently remains of some letters | posores 1. poso[ers] $21,22,23 \mathrm{om}$ pt at end of v . 22 גpo[ $\omega]$ om brackets 23 e] $\overline{\mathrm{r}} 24 \mathrm{NTE}] \overline{\mathrm{r} T E} \mid \mathrm{pt}$ after EROX $2^{\circ} 25$ cגweq] cawcte|


 of all these letters $\mid \bar{\mu} \pi]$ add $R \bar{\lambda} \lambda_{E}$ at end of this line |
 mak and at end of v . | rekecore] mekecoore, there is a
small $o$ at the end of the line 33 om pt at the end of the v． $35 \overline{\mathrm{~m}}[\rho \boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{J}] \overline{\mathrm{K}} 1 . \overline{\mathrm{N}}[\mathrm{p} \overline{]}] \overline{\mathrm{K}} \quad 36$ the beginning of this v ． reads epe［rxo］eic xitū nee rekkedp［xwr．．．｜［ek］ 1. ［ $\mathrm{En} \overline{\mathrm{F}}$ ］｜om pt at end of v .37 om pt after w्रגXE 38 om pt at end of v .39 om pt after $2 \boldsymbol{H} \overline{\mathrm{~T}} \overline{\mathrm{q}}$｜qNT］sup over both $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ and $T$｜orwesor］oroser 42 colon at end of $v .44$
 pt after wлнре and at end of v． 48 esakZ］sup over 2
 v． $54,55 \mathrm{om}$ pt at end of v． $57 \mathrm{EI}(?)]$ ET｜ENT［dr］ $\mathrm{E} \hat{\mathrm{i}}$ ］
 of this line to beginning of next 59 ［ $\mathbf{\alpha \gamma \omega}] 1 . \boldsymbol{\alpha}[\boldsymbol{\gamma}] \omega$ 61 om pt at end of v． 62 kore］kores 63 ग［Hort］r］add Ta！｜ $\mathrm{B}[\mathrm{o} \mathrm{\lambda}]$ 1． $\mathrm{B}[\mathrm{o}] \lambda$ त 64 ［x］ $\mathrm{\omega q}$ 1．$x \omega \mathrm{q} \mid \mathrm{pt}$ after лкג己｜ $\boldsymbol{N} \bar{\Sigma}]$ EN $\overline{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \mid$ om pt at end of v .66 om pt at end of v .67 pt after
 ［p］ąc $\bar{c} \cdot a r[\omega t] \mid \bar{r} \partial \overline{\mu l}]$ om sup over $\boldsymbol{r} \mid$ colon at end of $v$ ．

XXIX i om pt after $\mu \omega \boldsymbol{\beta} B$ and at end of $v .2 \bar{\pi}$ кнथе $]$ om sup 3 om pt at end of v ． 5 pt after терненос 6 етет $\overline{\boldsymbol{N}}]$ om sup｜om pt at end of v． 7 or］add \＆ 8 racye］गлдcye｜

 erased 11 pt after проснスлтос II，I2 om pt at end of v．I3



 1．ग［K］d己 23 pt after pok $\overline{\mathcal{Z}} 24 \mathrm{E}$ өRe］ethe $25 \overline{\mathrm{~N}}$ пxoesc］

 $\epsilon$｜om pt at end of v ．

XXX I［גqroxk］1．Ṇ［oxk $\quad 2$ om pt at end of v． 3 quac．］om sup $\mid \bar{s} J d]$ om sup 4 om pt after $\overline{\mu r e d} 5$ om

[Kגc] 1. Xex[dc eke] there is room 7 Neil [caror] 1. setcc[ג]己己or 8 2poor] 1. 2poo]r | [илооr] 1. [uлоо] $\boldsymbol{r}$


 [me]k $\pi x$ 1. N[E]k

 Td[dq] om brackets 19 the paragraph mark is a simple line,

 certain, though only the lower tip remains, and there was no $\pi$ before it | ïcddk] 1. ̈̈cdd]k | om pt after İakwh
 grammar require it 2,3 om pt at end of $v$. 4 eipt $]$ elpe $\mid$ et $\overline{\Gamma T}]$ et ent 6 [ $\overline{\mu \pi}] \bar{p} 1$. [ $\overline{\mu \pi}] \rho \bar{\rho} \mid \boldsymbol{y} \lambda \Delta \Sigma]$ add $\boldsymbol{\alpha}[\gamma \omega] \mid$


 kdak read [as $\overline{\mathrm{m}}$ ]cwq. arw 7 [Boz $\bar{\mu}$ mic 1. [Boz]
 be transferred to the end of the preceding line $\mid$ in the lacuna
 of letter following $\boldsymbol{\pi e}$ suggest [пресßrtepoc] io [גq] [x] oor 1. [ $\bar{\mu} \pi \epsilon$ ] [¿]oor [ET]]erear | the first letter of the next line
 cR]o 1. n[cec]bô 13 w्रhpt] add sal |. .en coorrs 1.





 to be there, but is not $\mid$ ete[ $\operatorname{TNTanpo]~1.~eter~}[$ [tanpo $]$, the $\boldsymbol{r}$ certain from remains $\mid \boldsymbol{\omega}[\omega \pi \epsilon]$ there is room for mas in


EIO[TE] there is room for or in the bracket $\mid \in \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{E I} \omega]$ ]. $\in \operatorname{Ro}[\lambda \Omega t \in R \| \omega]$, the $o$ is certain and there is prob room for the rest | $\mathbf{c o}$ (?) . . l. cet[ $\epsilon$ ] | . . oro 1. [лє] ̧oro | Kтoor] add epator [N] | rorte l. [टen]rorte, space requires it |omit lacuna at end of line | [rce $]$ t orx $\overline{\mathrm{c}} 1$. [rar] $\overline{\text { reetror }} \overline{\mathrm{c}} \mid$




 it $\mid$ om pt at end of v. 27 [tc]oors l. [t]coors | $\boldsymbol{\mu}[\AA K]$ [ृ]

 1. $\underset{\text { [ }}{\text { [ }}$ [OCW] | Eïrataro] eïetaro | om pt at end of v. 29

 om pt at end of v .
 verses i, 2, 3, 4, 52 oreswie] oreiwite 4 om pt after $2 d \pi$
 $\bar{\pi}$. q 1 . $\bar{n}[$ ror $]$ q, there is room 6 om pt after $\pi \in$, insert one after $\left.\boldsymbol{\alpha} q \cot \overline{\boldsymbol{K}} \quad 7 \times \overline{\boldsymbol{s}} \quad \mathrm{I}^{\circ} 2^{\circ}\right]$ om sup |om pt at end of v . 8 om




 pt after aqceî and at end of v. i6 frox $\bar{q}]$ troroc |
 $\overline{\text { scwq] }} \overline{\text { rewk }} 19$ om pt at end of $v .20$ om pt after erroor, өגн, ecбórre and at end of v . | 20 Tdidréór ]
 and rensureed 24 om pt after epoor and insert one after cwsye 27 [МОргн . . NE] 1. [JОргн] N[NE] | om pt after oroescy and xwor | [N] re 1. [E]rroe 28 om pt at end of $v$. 30 om pt after Tddr and at end of v .34 om 'pt after ¿dTHEs|
cetcobe] cetoobe $36 \operatorname{erb}[w \lambda$ 1. erben [ $\lambda \quad 37 \mathrm{om}$ pt after norte and epoor $3^{8} \mathrm{om}$ pt after orcia and epwrsis

 after лecroq $2^{\circ} \mid \mathrm{pt}$ after pąтor 43 тaxp[0] [ureoq $\left.\bar{\pi}\right]$
 $\operatorname{ror}[\tau \epsilon] 44 \boldsymbol{\mu} \omega \boldsymbol{\gamma} \mathbf{c h c} \mathrm{I}^{\circ}$ and in v. 45 has no dots over $\boldsymbol{r}$,

 etratadq] e†ratadq | insert pt after rewar and om at end of $\mathbf{v}$. 50 om pt after epoc |cow] sic, the scribe has written both $\boldsymbol{n}$ and the long superlineation

 prob as Maspero | om pt at end of v .4 om pt after $\boldsymbol{\mu} \omega \dot{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ снс and at end of v . 5 om pt after $\lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{o c} 7 \mathrm{om} \mathrm{pt}$ after $\lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{o c}$,


 1. rębh[o]re |orw or] orŵon 12 map] om sup |om pt after thpor | neqtoreir] neqiorein (sic) 13 om pt after $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{x o \in i c} 14 \mathrm{om}$ pt at end of v .16 om pt after mßatoc and


 raq and $\in$ Bo 21 om pt after Tapxh (sic) and $\lambda$ dace 22 om pt after maq and Bacars 23 om pt after maq, w्युн and mxoeic | me eirme] mceirme, ceir is written over an erasure, the $\boldsymbol{n}$ over $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ prob; I think the first writing was $\begin{aligned} \text { fin (not ceen }\end{aligned}$ as Wessely) | Mápeqeî] Mapeqcê̂ 24 om pt after ráq 26 om pt after $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathrm{pit}$ and at end of v . 27 скнлн] скепн | om
 | лшр $\left.\overline{\omega_{]}}\right]$om sup 29 om pt after лісранス, $\overline{\mu r r o q}$ and epok | ленкад] sic

after randax 2 om pt at end of v. 3 pt after Ziepixue


 $\boldsymbol{r}]$ 1. $[\mu \overline{\mathrm{r}} \pi]$ | om pt at end of v . 12 om pt at end of v .

## JONAH.

I 1 om pt at end of v . 2 Twors [ r$] \overline{\mathrm{\Sigma}}$ 1. Jworer $\mid$ om pt









 1. $\sigma \omega \underline{y}$ ? 6 ewor] eroor | nrors l. nror [r] | single pt at


 end of $v$. Io om pt at end of v. II w्yorwor • cyorwor:


 [E] om brackets $\mid \overline{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{I}^{\circ}$ ] $\mathrm{dr} \mathrm{\omega} \overline{\mathrm{r}} \quad 7,8 \mathrm{om} \mathrm{pt}$ at end of v .8 dr
 coor, the superlineation not certain 10 margin [ $\overline{\boldsymbol{\imath}}$ ] om brackets

IV 2 pt after गKגZ | w्रop $\bar{\pi}]$ om sup | EKEîpe] EKEIPE 3, 4 om pt at end of v. 5 om pt after скнлн $62^{\bar{\mu}]} 2^{\bar{\sim}} 7$ גqоr]
aqpu 8 « $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \omega]$ add $\boldsymbol{N}$ ，room for $\mathrm{I}-3$ more letters $\mid$ om pt at end of $v .9 B \overline{N T}]$ om sup 11 om pt after $\underset{\mu}{ } \omega$ and at end

## ACTS OF THE APOSTLES．

I i dïJderoc］dîtaresoq $\mathrm{I}, 2 \mathrm{om}$ pt at end of v ． 3

 $9 \boldsymbol{\pi}] \overline{\boldsymbol{s}} \mid$ om pt after वrJ $\bar{q}$ and at end of v ．Io om pt after गתe and at end of v．II om pt after tre $1^{\circ} 2^{\circ}$ ，$\overline{\text { rereoc and at end of }}$ v． 12 om pt after xoest and at end of v ．$\overline{\mathrm{r}}$ or $\mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{HH}] \text { om sup }}$
 еллроскдрт．｜om pt at end of v．${ }^{1} 5$ єor（sic）］єor｜om pt after $\overline{s p a i r}$ and rexaq 16 xis $\bar{\pi}]$ om sup｜dqu्रwre］the $\omega \underline{y}$ is uncertain ；it looks as though the scribe had written $\underset{y}{\mu}$ first， then half erased it and written $\sigma$ over it ；in the next line u्ywre （clearly written）is intended for $\sigma \omega \pi \mid \boldsymbol{\mu s} \overline{\mathrm{c}}] \overline{\mathrm{N}} \overline{\mathrm{c}} \mid \mathrm{om} \mathrm{pt}$ at end
 $18 \overline{\mathrm{~s}}$ оrбои］om sup $\mid$ om pt after $\sigma \boldsymbol{\sim} \overline{\mathrm{c}}$, лесяго and at end of

 $23 \bar{\pi}$ Jart］NJar，there is no trace of $t 24 \bar{\mu}$ пгнт］om

 at end of v． 26 пелкスнрос］лекスнpoc｜ex $\overline{\boldsymbol{s}}]$ om sup｜


II I NeZoor］лezoor 2 margin［ $\bar{\lambda}$ ］om brackets $\mid \bar{N}$ or ллон］om sup｜om pt after $\bar{\pi} \sigma$ oric｜arcerorд］the $\gamma$ has been erased but incompletely $3,4,5,6$ om pt at end of v .4 om pt after ordaB $5 \bar{\pi} \sigma$ ］om sup $8 \bar{N} d c y]$ om sup $\mid$ om pt at end of v．9，IO，II om pt at end of v． $9 \overline{\text { surh }}$ ос $\overline{\text { re }}$ 人дurthc］ om sup on both words｜for $\lambda \lambda i]$ one dot over 1 io $\operatorname{\mu sisica}]$


end of v. i4 2pdi] zpas | rior
 17 ussical $\mu \overline{s i s c a} 17,18,19,20,21$ om pt at end of v.

 आuyoxire] пल्yoxve 24 to end of chapter om pt at end of every v. 24 sre] om sup $25 \overline{\mu r e o c}]$ om $\sup$ | qcyoon] sup



 $46 \overline{\mathrm{r}}$ огтрофн] om sup

III om every pt throughout this chapter except colon at end of v. i6 and pt after serterote in v. 22 II w्y $\bar{\rho} \boldsymbol{T} \bar{p}]$ $\omega_{j} \boldsymbol{\overline { p }} \boldsymbol{J} \omega \bar{\rho}$, a small $\omega$ inserted by original scribe between
 $14 \bar{\pi}$ or pwreE] om $\sup 15$ reroq] om sup $\mid$ sTd] ENTd 16 Taxpoq (?) reading certain | $\bar{\mu} \pi \in T \bar{\pi}]$ om sup over $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ | THp̄] Sic 19 ёTo] om sup 22 Natorrroc] Natornec 26 TOrroc] TOrNEC | NHTN] om sup | $\overline{\mathrm{N}}$ ] om sup

IV om every point throughout this chapter except the colon at end of $v .7$, a doubtful pt at end of $v$. 16 , the colon at end of v .26 , a pt after con $\overline{\mathbf{c}}$ in v .3 I and a colon (probably)



 om sup $20 \mu] \bar{\mu} 22$ entda] NTd 26 NEppwor] NEpwor, there is a fracture after $\in$ but such that the tail of the first $p$ would have been visible, had there been one 31 e $2 p \alpha i$ i]
 $37 \overline{\mathrm{r}}$ ле $\mathcal{X P}$.] $\overline{\boldsymbol{r} \pi \text { пе }}$ Х.

V om every point throughout this chapter except the colons and the pt at end of v. 28 i $\overline{\boldsymbol{T}} \overline{\mathrm{r}}$ ] om sup. $2 \overline{\mathrm{r}}$ oreefoc $]$ om
$\sup \mid \overline{\text { sidлост.] om }} \sup 7 \overline{\text { cocoorr }}]$ om sup 12 there is a paragraph mark by the "later" hand at the beginning of this v. 14 rrooro] sup over $\boldsymbol{N} \mid$ or [wz] l. orue |e po[o]r



 $\sup \mid \bar{\pi} \Delta \rho \mathcal{X}$.$] om \sup \mid \Delta \gamma \Delta \pi o p]$ dranopl 25 Ei$] \mathrm{El}$, the E is
 sar] aqxsroror [ereoc] om sup 28 еллst] om sup over $\boldsymbol{N} \mid$ EN] EXN, the $\boldsymbol{x}$ is fragmentary but certain $\mid \boldsymbol{\pi E i}] \boldsymbol{\pi E I} \mid \overline{\boldsymbol{l}}]$ $\bar{\sim} \mid \boldsymbol{N e} \boldsymbol{J} \bar{\pi} C B \omega]$ the first $\boldsymbol{\sim}$ has entirely disappeared under a fold of papyrus and, for all that is now visible, may be $\tau / \overline{\text { sjecsioc }}]$

 ork.] om $\sup \mid \boldsymbol{r T d \gamma}] \overline{\pi T} \boldsymbol{T} \boldsymbol{\gamma} 37 \bar{\pi}$ Tגлок.] om sup 39 margin $\overline{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{\theta} 1$. [ $\overline{\mathrm{s} \theta}]$

VI om every point throughout this chapter except a doubtful point at the end of $v .2$ and what appears to be one after
 roreesenis |enor] ener | eerehte] om sup $2 \overline{\text { sKd }}$ ] $\overline{\text { rKLw}}$



 om sup.

VII om every point in this chapter except after nrorte in v. 7, after кнее in v. 34, at the end of v. 42, after $\boldsymbol{e}$ одок and sar in v. 43, at the end of vv. 50 and 59 and after robe in v. 60 , and colons at the end of vv. 5, 42-44, 53, 602 N pwere] sup over of $3 \mathrm{JCABo}($ ?) q] reading certain $4 \boldsymbol{\pi \in i}]$ ï written





 17 [ $\boldsymbol{r}]$ om, it was never there nor at end of preceding line 20 $\bar{\pi}$ cyose.] om sup $21 \overline{\pi r o t}$ ] om sup 23 Nr seqcer.] sup over н $I^{\circ} 25 \overline{\operatorname{s}} \sigma$ 1. $\bar{n} \sigma[1]$ | [m]ororxaï 1. [n]ororxaï $26 \bar{\pi}$

 $\boldsymbol{\pi \epsilon}$..E] prob only one letter missing, perhaps [п] | גq $[\mathrm{P} p] \omega$ 1. $\mathbf{d q}[\mathrm{K}] \boldsymbol{\omega}$ prob $36 \mathbf{d r}[\boldsymbol{\omega}]$. $\mathbf{~ d r}$ sic 38 margin $[\overline{\mathrm{KE}}]$ there are remains of both letters $4^{1} 2^{\bar{N}} 2^{\circ}$ ] om sup 42 JdAq] Tגतo 44 пеелтगE] om sup, the $T$ stands in the margin $45 \times 1 \tau \overline{\mathrm{c}}]$

 ac 54 2poxp $\bar{x}]$ om $\sup 56 \overline{\operatorname{rcd}]}$ om sup 57 MddxE] uддcuesic 59 nira] $\overline{\pi r a}$

VIII om every point throughout this chapter except after pwq in v. 32 ; the colons are correct, but add one after фiスrлпос in v. 38 (sic)| I carioc] carcoc sic | $\overline{\text { ridroct.] om sup }}$
 $\overline{\mathrm{N}}$ [ $\overline{\mathrm{rre}} 12$ spwere] sup over ir 19 ereoc] om sup 23

 єел | orwr] a long sup over ir 39 qкот $\bar{q}]$ वॉкот $\bar{q}$
 om $\sup 6,7,8,9$, io om pt at end of $\mathrm{v} .7 \overline{\mathrm{r} p} \mathrm{p} \boldsymbol{\mathrm { p }} \mathrm{E}$ ] om sup $9 \mathrm{c} c \omega]$ व $\bar{c} c \omega$ II, 12, 13 om pt at end of v. 11 Nह $\left.\mathrm{I}^{\circ}\right] \overline{\mathrm{N}} \Sigma$
 $\bar{\pi}$ ororr] om sup $15-20$ om pt at end of v. 15 $\overline{\text { referroc] }}$ om sup 20 $\overline{r r e o q}]$ there are five dots over this word, evidently
 colon instead of pt 23 om pt at end of v .24 גrtarese (?)]
 ceding line 26 E ©fep.] om E(sic) 28 rerear] om sup | om
 $\operatorname{con} \overline{\mathrm{c}}]$ om sup 32 om pt at end of v. $33 \overline{\text { ®porre] }} 3$ om sup
 ereoor $39 \times \mathrm{Hpd}$ 1. $\mathcal{X H \rho}[\mathbf{d}] \mid \overline{\mathrm{r}} \sigma \mathbf{t}]$ om $\sup 39,40 \mathrm{om} \mathrm{pt}$
 between $\sigma$ and $\omega$ are remains of a letter, perhaps obliterated purposely

X 2 rarror [q], sup over se |suser] sure 3 om pt at end of $v .4$ om pt after лxoesc 5 om pt at end of $v .6$ गRдк] лвдкаyд sic apparently not erased 8 גq[xo]or [cor] 1. aqxoorc [E], vestiges at end of line seem to show that it was more prob $\mathbf{c}[\mathrm{E}]$ than $\mathbf{c}[\mathrm{or}] 8,9$, 10 om pt at end of v . erreoocye] erreocye, there is no trace of a second o| $\overline{\mathrm{N}}$ JEP] om sup II $\bar{r}$ orroof] om sup 12 T $\overline{\mathrm{B}}$ r.] om sup 13 Tworr] Jworsis I3, 14, 15 om pt at end of v. 15 ue xąuor] erc xazreor, I think the $c$ is certain, though there is a horizontal ridge in the middle of the letter which makes it look like $E$ at first sight $\left.{ }_{17} \bar{\pi} \boldsymbol{\chi}^{H} \boldsymbol{J} \overline{\mathrm{q}}\right]$ om sup over $\boldsymbol{r} \mid \mathrm{pt}$ after
 and $E \rho \bar{r}$ at beginning of next $\mid$ om pt at end of v. 19 нокщek] sup over first $\boldsymbol{\mu} \mid \pi \in$ İ 2] 1. nף] prob no room for more | [ $\pi N \bar{\Delta}]$ 1. $\pi[N \bar{\Delta}] \mid p \omega[\mu] E$ 1. pwee $19-23$ om pt at end of v. 20 Nakpire] $\lambda$ Iakpise 21 ripwere] om sup $\mid$
 om | NE] JE | pt at end of v. 25 TWeest] om sup over N $26 \mathrm{Eq} \times \mathrm{CW}]$ Eq may be correct but it is written small above the line and blotted, and it is really illegible | Jworr 1. Jwor $[\boldsymbol{N}] \mid$ om
 Niord]as |e.t l. et | [J]eqoros 1. [л]eqoroe[s|e er] om first e 30 mdi] there is a stroke through $\boldsymbol{i}$ to erase it $31,3^{2}$ om pt at end of v . also after odidacca in v. 3233 pt after cyapok 34 om pt at end of v. 36 下ॅu्यhpe] om sup | [orors
 and at end of v .38 om pt after $\lambda \mid \Sigma \beta o \lambda i o c$ and at end of v .


 KE] om sup 46 pt after nororte $47 \lambda] \bar{\lambda}$, as the note says,
it is for $\bar{r} \lambda \dot{d} d \gamma$ and it is an interesting form of assimilation found in other early MSS; there is no question of deletion | x/ Bגлт.] хллВдлт. $48 \overline{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{s} \mathbf{c}]$ om sup over $\pi$

XI i, 2 (prob), $3,4,5 \mathrm{om}$ pt at end of v. I ©iep. 1. [e] Iep. 5 еそ Jacic e eそctacic | ckeroc 1. cke[r] oc | pws] pọï 6
 7 Erc[थн l. erce[h|mexdïl. [лe]xaï 8 H is written over orte erased | лдк.] the $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ has been crossed out by a diagonal stroke by the orig scribe 8,9 , io om pt at end of v . Io suee]



 2w[ar l. $2 \omega\left[0 \gamma \mid \omega r Z^{\cdot}\right] \omega \times \bar{Z}$ : 19 drei] dres 22 om pt
 and at end of v. . 26 si Tep] $\overline{\mathrm{r}}$ Tep |orp $\overline{\mathrm{N}}$ ] om $\overline{\mathrm{N}} \mid$ [ $\boldsymbol{r}]$ ekk.] the letter in the bracket could be $T \mid \bar{N}]$ om sup $28 \bar{\pi} 2 \mathrm{HJ}]$ or
 गत्रd | om pt at end of $v$.

XII 4 плaçad sup over first $\pi$ prob 5 rerəapę] sup over $\boldsymbol{N} \mid \mathrm{pt}$ after ल్లJEKo |om pt at end of v. 61. лє Tpo[c] and $c r[d] \boldsymbol{r}$ | om pt after $\overline{\text { crite | Nerpacye }}$, the first $\in$ has nearly disappeared and it was probably \& rather than $\mathbf{E}$ or $\mathbf{o}$, cf. v. 197 om pt after oroess | Twors N $\bar{\Sigma}$ ] Tworn $\bar{\Sigma}$


 теcer | orwee] orwr | om pt at end of v. 15 NToc] sup over $\boldsymbol{n}$ | colon at end of v. 16 rdq$]$ l. $\lambda \mathrm{E}$ ] as Woide 17 ग[pe r]kג 1. Tperka | om pt after ko, raï and at end 18 लreator] om sup 19 om pt at end of v .23 om pt after xoesc and at end $\mid c \dagger] \bar{c} t \quad 25$ om pt at end of $v$.


 rap is written above the line，not $\pi \in$ ，which does not exist｜

 $\left.B \bar{\lambda} \lambda_{E}\right]$ there are remains of a letter between $B$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ，prob a $B, B B \bar{\lambda} \lambda E=\bar{r} B \bar{\lambda} \lambda E \mid$ oro［ro］sic（sic）•］1．oroercy only
 was never there｜ $\boldsymbol{r r r o o r}$ ］the scribe orig wrote $\overline{r r \mu o q}$ ，erased q but omitted to write $o$ over it and added $\gamma 14 \operatorname{Na\Sigma \omega }[\Sigma O c]$ ， om roc，it was never there $15 \overline{\operatorname{rap}} \mathcal{X}^{s c}$ ．1．rap $\mathcal{X}[\mathrm{s}] \mathrm{c}$ ．｜pt
 лル［ג $\overline{\text { roofra］}} \mathrm{E}$ 18，19，20， 21 om pt at end of $\mathrm{v} .19 \overline{\mathrm{~N}}$ Xdr．］om sup 20 sqJor］sup over $\mathrm{q} \mid$ om pt after pourte
 $\mu \bar{r} T P E]$ om $\left.\sup \mid \mathcal{Z}^{\bar{r}}\right] 2 \bar{\mu}: 23,24 \mathrm{om} \mathrm{pt}$ at end of v .25

 at end of v .27 N remp．］sup over first N 28 e $\boldsymbol{\mu} \mathrm{or}$ ］ $\sup$ over first $\mu 3^{1} 2^{\bar{N}}$ गรג入．］om sup $3^{2}$ pt after axron｜
 om sup $36,37,38$ om pt at end of v． $36 \overline{\mathbf{k}}$ кот $\overline{\mathbf{K}}$（sic）］$\overline{\boldsymbol{s} \text { ко } \boldsymbol{\tau} \overline{\mathbf{K}},}$ the $\bar{\pi}$ is partly broken，but I have no doubt of it 39 om pt


 50 om pt at end of v ．

XIV i， 2 om pt at end of v．i लिृєスス．］om sup 21. Nrorגdt 5 Treęr］om sup 8 om paragraph mark｜eq

 $\overline{\mu \pi B o \lambda} 15$＂еroor］om sup｜лגї л丁］sup over л $16 \overline{\mathrm{~s}}$ ］

 sup over first $\boldsymbol{\pi} \mid$ redrorq］add［ $\boldsymbol{r}] \boldsymbol{\alpha}[\boldsymbol{\gamma}] \quad 17,18$ om pt at end
 at end $21,22 \mathrm{om}$ pt at end of v .23 om pt after micinid
and at end 25 ettodataied (sic) 1. etranirled sic 26
 ñe日roc] om sup 28 om pt at end of $v$.

XV i NTE pt at end of v .2 om pt after reserdr | $\overline{\text { rasoct.] om }}$ sup |



 13 meeñca] reursca $14 \overline{\mathrm{~N}}$ ¿eerroc] om sup 16 trakote тrakw ] frakot [ $s$ ] Jakwt, the $r$ is certain as the superlineation remains | $\lambda \boldsymbol{d} \boldsymbol{r e} \boldsymbol{\mathrm { I }} \boldsymbol{\lambda}]$ om dots $\mid$ om pt at end of v. 17

 xis l. $[x]$ is ig $[t]$ om $\mid$ om pt at end of $v .20$ om pt after croc | pt after $\sigma \in 21$ om pt at end of v .22 om pt after
 all points $25-3 \mathrm{I}$ om pt at end of v. $25 \bar{\alpha} \bar{\pi} \lambda \in \sigma_{1}$ ] $\AA c \bar{\pi} \lambda 0 \sigma$ $26 \ldots[\psi \gamma] \mathcal{X}^{H}$ 1. [EX] $\gamma \boldsymbol{f}[\overline{N T E V} \psi \gamma] \mathcal{X} H$, there is room 27
 after Ndï 29 pt after NGE $\mid[\mathrm{p}]$ om $30 \bar{\pi}$ Joor has been erased by diagonal lines by the orig scribe $31 \mathrm{~N} ~ T E] \bar{\Gamma} T E 34$ गPE] TPE[q], the tip of q is left $34,35,36 \mathrm{om}$ pt a tend of v . 35 dertioxid] גNJoxid, $T$ is written larger than usual over an erasure and the $t$ has been omitted by the scribe ; it is nut $\dagger$
 req] 1. [c $\lambda \in] \pi[\in q] \mid \pi \omega p[x \in B o \lambda 1 . \pi \omega p x \in B[0 \lambda$ 3 8,39 om pt at end of v . 4 I ree] sere $/ \mathrm{pt}$ after oincoid $/ \mathrm{om} \mathrm{pt}$ at end of $v$.

XVI om the pt at the end of every v. exc. vv. $6,9,13,18$, 2I, 36 I insert pt after गєрßн | 1. गuноєос | $\overline{\boldsymbol{r}}$ orc̨.]


 ¿PAi] om all dots 10 ri TEp] sup over ir 12 TErepic]

Trepic | om pt after reдke入onid 13 om pt after टHग्व |

 om brackets 18 om pt after $2 H J^{\mathbf{c}} 20[\mathrm{P}]$ om 21 entecto]
 second $o$ has been deleted by a diagonal stroke thro' it by the


 these words are added in small writing and partly above the line, evidently an addition but prob by the orig scribe $31 \overline{\text { siJoor }}$ om sup $33 \overline{\mathrm{~s}}$ गercy $]$ om sup | om pt after chaye 34


 oret | 1. cencwror | 1. aret

XVII om pt at end of every $v$. in this chapter except 4, I4,
 $\rho[\boldsymbol{\mu}] \overline{\operatorname{moch}} \overline{\mathrm{B}}$, the eq is deleted by diagonal strokes and a fragment of a letter, prob $\overline{\boldsymbol{u}}$ but not $p$, remains before $\overline{\boldsymbol{N}} \mid \mathbf{E} \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{H}$ ] only a fragment remains of the letter before $\pi$, it looks more
 om sup i3 l. ares|ererнн] a third $\boldsymbol{H}$ has been written and crossed through $16[\overline{\mathrm{~N}}]$ om sup 18 pt after $\left.\overline{\mu \mu o c} \mathrm{I}^{\circ} 20 \overline{\mathrm{~m}}\right]$ om $\sup \mid \bar{\mu} B \bar{\rho} P \in] \overline{\boldsymbol{N}} B \bar{\rho} P \in$ sic, the whole word has been deleted



 pWue 26 om pt after лкдд 27 om pt after nord 28 понтос] понтос | пrorte] пror 29 1. [л]_rorte | 1 .



[^8]［кріслос］$\lambda \in \mid$ l．пдр end of v． 14 NE Erス．］TE Erス． 17 om pt after BHera and
 of v． 19 om pt after nHr $20[\boldsymbol{N}]$ om｜or［o］ency］om brackets， there is a small o above the line 21 om pt after reroc 22 ［J］kecapid］om［J］｜om pt at end of v． 24 om all points



XIX il．［e］pe｜l．dçer efe（sic）｜om pt at end of v． 2 om pt after eqoradR｜cwree］om sup 3 om pt after suse and at end 4 om pt after $\bar{r} c \omega q$ and at end $5-10$ om pt at end

 II $\boldsymbol{N}$ ］ $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ with room for $I$ or 2 more letters in a fracture｜$\overline{\text { slolx}}$ ］ om sup 12 om pt after coured 14 ers $\bar{T} \bar{q}]$ om sup over is 15 om pt after epog and at end 16 om pt after ломнpors

 por $\overline{2}$ or $]$ om $\sup \mid[t]$ om $19-22$ om pt at end of v ． 2 I ceTJ］om sup，there is no line but five dots over єगா implying

 $\operatorname{margin} \mid \boldsymbol{N} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{r}]$ om $\boldsymbol{N} \mid \mathrm{om}$ pt at end of v .27 om all points except the final one｜1．n［Jrof］ 28 om pt at end of $v .30-32$
 pt after c्रגXE $\mid$ om pt after Tw己 33 errex］arrex prob｜
 $34^{-41}$ om pt at end of v． 35 l．$\overline{\text { rTrọ }} 36$ ग $\left.\bar{r} \bar{\rho}\right]$ ग $\bar{\rho} \bar{\rho} 37$ $\overline{\boldsymbol{\mu} \pi}]$ еथл 38 1．टeraso［pd］！poc 40 лגI］леЇ prob，though it looks like лөї｜l．w［J］орт $\bar{\rho} \bar{\mu} \pi о o r ~ є е \bar{s} ~ e t c . ~ t h e ~ s e c o n d ~ o . ~$ of $\overline{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \pi \mathbf{r o o r}$ is very small and inserted as a correction between $o$ and $r$

XX $2 \overline{\operatorname{sc}} \boldsymbol{\alpha}]$ om $\sup \mid o m p t$ at end of v .3 2थe］2גट｜ $k \omega \boldsymbol{J} \bar{q}] \boldsymbol{\omega}$ altered to o ，prob in the same ink $\mid$ om pt at end of v ．

 pdcte and at end of v． $82 \bar{r}]$ om sup｜［ $\mu$ d］1．［ $\mu]$ d om pt after $ृ^{H} \overline{\mathrm{c}} 9$ om all points io om pt at end of v．II pt
 ［noroesm］as Woide，there seems to be vestige of final sf｜
 there is not room for all this，and there are remains of all the
 $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}[\boldsymbol{y} \omega]$ and at end of v ． $\boldsymbol{\pi \in} \in\left[\begin{array}{c}\boldsymbol{\omega} \omega \\ \omega\end{array}\right]$ after $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ is nothing except remains of a letter，nat $\mathbf{E}$ ，perhaps $\underset{\sim}{\boldsymbol{y}}$ and a fracture｜after eqrocucur the scribe wrote $\underset{y}{c}$ and deleted it with a diagonal stroke $171.2[\bar{\mu} \mu s] \mid 1 . \bar{N}[$ JEK $] \quad 17,18 \mathrm{om}$ pt at end of v ． 18 1．TeJ $[\bar{N}] \mid$ 1．nw्रo［ $\bar{\pi}] \mid$ 1．Ta［cta］19 1．nxoesc｜ $2^{\bar{N}}$ $\left.I^{\circ}\right]$ the 2 inserted later as a correction in margin $\left|1 . \in \pi[\ddagger] \mathrm{Br} \lambda_{\boldsymbol{H}}\right|$
 end｜лн ［nrorte］as Woide $2 \mathrm{I}-23$ om pt at end of v .22 l ． entc［oors｜1．eree［oï 24 1．$\lambda \rho[0] \mu o c \quad 25$ om pt after ror and at end of $v . \quad 26-30$ om pt at end of $v .28 \mathrm{om} \mathrm{pt}$
 out after it（cf．Deut．ii 5，v II，26，xxxi 23）｜$\overline{\operatorname{N} C d}]$ om sup｜orwry］om sup｜1．encetco $30 \bar{\pi}[\boldsymbol{N}]$ 1．N［Zen］｜ 1 ．
 1． $\bar{\mu}$［ord］ 321 ．［Jव $\overline{\boldsymbol{r}}$ пror］］Te s $\overline{\boldsymbol{r}} \mid$ in the middle of the next line is $\sigma_{0}$ ，fragmentary but certain｜ 1 ．［K2нporr］ousd｜om pt at end of v .34 om pt at end of v .35 om pt after sule
 cycurte，ic，xooc and at end of v．［ $\overline{\mathrm{s}}$ Joc ］om sup $36 \overline{\mathrm{~s}}$ Nai］$]$ r seds｜l．дqк $\lambda \bar{x}$｜om pt after тнpor and w्रतнス 371.



XXI om all points throughout the chapter except $v$ ．I after пдтגрД，v．II after orephte（insert）and jor $\boldsymbol{\text { jaï，v．}} 25$ after गлорsi\＆（insert），v． 27 after $\in$ Ro入 $1^{\circ}$（insert），v． 28 after eßoえ（insert），v． 30 after ZotReq，v． 32 after udtoï，v． 33

｜I［Kw］ 4 or 5 letters required in lacuna｜1． $\bar{\ell}[\pi]$ есррдстє｜l．


 orig wrote ернr，erased it and wrote hes over it，the super－
 1．Te－pear in l．［ $\sigma$ jx｜．．ddq］there is room for［Ncet］ddaq｜ Nreerroc］om sup is arwe］edrwet，prob nothing after
 not room for it $16 \bar{\pi} \sigma$ ］add $N$ prob，or $\mu$ possibly $18 \bar{N} \boldsymbol{N E}$

 line began with eTJ｜rerch］the $\gamma$ is broken，it was more prob q than $r 23$ l．गגÏ $\sigma E \in[J \bar{N}] 261 . \overline{\mathrm{r}}$ rpwere 27 ［л］еннсує］om brackets 28 ［Јоло］с 1．［лерл］е，remains of letter preceding $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ show it was $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ or $\boldsymbol{J}$ ，o impossible． 29 at end of line above marinoc are probable traces of R！！çer（ $\mu \boldsymbol{\mu}$
 rọeir｜1．пスдоc［cwo］r民•｜1，arcw［k］3i Xialapxoc］ xIスIAPXOC and similarly in every instance of this word in this chapter and in ch．xxii and xxiii 37 l．enekcó［orrr］ 391. aNรо［rp］ $\mid \boldsymbol{\lambda}[\mathrm{E} \boldsymbol{N} \boldsymbol{J} \epsilon]$ not room for four letters in lacuna， perhaps $\boldsymbol{\lambda}[\boldsymbol{E} \overline{\boldsymbol{N}}]$

XXII om all points in this chapter except in v． 3 after orcupx and гдreддлнд，in v． 5 after eseporcaднre and at end，in v． 8 after sazwpasoc and at end，in $v$ ．io after tradc，v．II at end，v． 15 at end，v． 20 after תekeeñtpe （insert）and $\boldsymbol{\pi E}$ and at end，v． $2 I$ at end（colon），v． 22 after



 repeated from those preceding without any sign of erasure or deletion io Jwors $N \bar{\Sigma}$ ］Jworsis II NG］the reading is certain，the $N$ has a faint line over its right half and above that a dot，the $\sigma$ has over it and rather to the right remains of a
superlineation or possibly of a $\tau$ above the line is l. w्रa
 22 є תexar] om e 22 [XE תגi] 1. prob [Xeqrers] ג[1] to fit
 $2415 \bar{\zeta}]$ om $\sup \mid[X \in K]$ Дגc 1. [X]eKddc |l. EqEE![UE XE 25
 been an erasure and the supposed $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is the remains of the erased letter $28 \overline{\mathrm{r}}$ orroof] om sup $301 . \overline{\operatorname{Noj}} \mid 1$. [ג] gorezcazNe [eTp]e
 pt at end of v. 3 om pt after лrosec 5 l. NEï $\mid$ om pt after गe

 orw apparently 9 l. $\boldsymbol{N [ E \Sigma ] p д \mu . ~ \overline { \mu } [ \pi c ] \AA [ \boldsymbol { N } ] \quad 9 - 1 2 \mathrm { om } \mathrm { pt }}$ at end of. v. Io om pt after лдrioc II om pt after exw $12 \bar{N} \overline{\text { Niora}}$.] $\bar{s}$ jor $\lambda$. only 14 Nerores] nerores 15 om pt after $\sigma E$ : $16-24$ om all points in these verses except in v. 18 after ¿ $\bar{p}$ curpe and in v. 21 at end i9 l. epoï 20 exe $[\boldsymbol{r}]$ om
 $27-35$ om all points except $v .31$ at end of $v .31$ l.

 $\overline{s i n}[\mathrm{E}]$ sic 35 l. NeKKdThpoc (sic)

XXIV om all points in this chapter except v. 2 at end and v. io after $\overline{r r r o c} 3$ l. oroesce 4 l. orugwcut 5 l. גrze





 brackets |l. c $\boldsymbol{c}[\mathrm{mal}] \lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda}[\mathrm{c}] \mathrm{sc}$

XXVI kdica $] \overline{\mathrm{c}} 1$. [ $\overline{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \boldsymbol{\pi} \overline{\mathrm{p}}] \mathrm{p}$, the o is not certain but the word is much more probable, since кai⿱aן is always repre-
sented by $\bar{p} p o$ in the Sahidic N.T. except in Luke iii 1 and John xix 15 where it is treated as a proper name $\mid$ om pt at end of $\mathbf{v}$.

XXVII om all points in this chapter except in v. i after
 v. 12 after Крнтн, v. 14 after 2pגs, v. 23 at end, v. 24 after mar $\lambda_{\mathrm{E}}, \mathrm{v} .25$ and 32 at end, v. 33 after $\in$ Bo $\lambda$ (insert), v. 34 at end, v. 38 after $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in$ (insert) and at end, v. 40 after $\in \operatorname{Ro\lambda }$ $I^{\circ} 2^{\circ}$ and rBoh (insert), v. 4 I after edidacca and at end and
 $\boldsymbol{Z}[$ [rk] oore 21 . [ג] Jprerstr, perhaps the line above $p$ is really a small \& written above the line |l. єqsed $\bar{\rho} \oslash \omega \boldsymbol{\sigma} \mid \overline{\mathrm{s}}$ ] om
 not room for puree, but not impossible | 2orrs] 2pas 4 2el]



 these verses can be improved by study as follows (the contents






 XE) גTKE[NH]-[CTIA OVE]!NE ? nar $\boldsymbol{r}]$ d ${ }^{1}$ etc. io l. ore[KдZ] | 1. reeos [o]s end of line II see]

 letter of ग़рп has nearly disappeared but the remains are more consistent with $T$ than $\mathcal{Z} \mid 1 . \boldsymbol{d N}[k \omega]$, there is a fracture after N and no trace of any further letter, the next line begins [ $\in \mathbb{B}]$ ] $0 \lambda$


[^9]of more letters, but there need not have been more and none are





 $\gamma$ seems certain $($ not $\sigma \lambda \lambda) \mid$ 1. pę Joor $\underset{\mu}{\omega}[\omega] 301 . \bar{n}[c \lambda]$ $32[\boldsymbol{N}]$ 1. $\overline{\boldsymbol{l}} / \mathrm{TpE}[\mathrm{c}]$ is possible, as a strip of repairing papyrus covers anything after e 36 ar l. saror 37 l. [oф] н revelp [e



XXVIII omit all points in this chapter except v. 2 after pwree, v. 3 at end, v. 6 after koor, v. io after $\in \operatorname{Bo\lambda }$ (insert) and at end, v. II after pגKote (insert), v. I3 after Zphrioc (insert), v. 15 after eporr, v. 16 after apXcurs (insert) and at end (colon), v. 20 after sеещeн $\bar{s}$ and at end, v. 23 after лrorte, s'c (insert) and ¿Joore, v. 24 end, v. 25 after serephr and retinerote (insert), v. 26 end, v. 27 after uddXE (insert), v. 31 after nrorte and end (colon) I l. $\bar{\sim}$ Tepen -orx[גii], there is prob nothing after $N$ in that line
 diagonal stroke through each letter |e Bor] om esic 4 wrī]
 1. $2 \overline{\text { ror }}-[\underline{\omega}] \overline{\mathrm{c}}$ [E $\boldsymbol{m}]$ quor 7 1. şu入e[ | beginning next line


 गronorc] the $\boldsymbol{r}$ has been deleted by a diagonal stroke 151 . $\pi[$ ro] $\boldsymbol{r t e} 16$ l. $\overline{\boldsymbol{r}}$ teper 17 l. eirehp | Of (?), the reading

 леиле-лрофнтнс (the reading is certain, there is no trace of
 26 there are quotation marks ( $>$ ) against the lines from фнтнс to revreddxe, but they are broken away against the lines
 גcwrel｜prob nothing after soï 27 1．$\lambda[d]$－oc 30．1．



Title．1．лостодос

Colophon．fol．io8b om all points｜line i l．［ג］rcyגxe， 21. xe etbe 4 TeTMp］Jet $\bar{n} t$ fol．roga om all points except



 $\bar{\mu} \overline{\mu \pi}] \bar{\mu} \pi \bar{q}[12$ गеス uncertain，it may be 1 and if there was an o it must have been

 is certain（cf．however the writing xi入iap $x$ oc for $x^{1 \lambda}$ ． throughout chapters xxii－xxiv of Acts）．I3 1．di入d
 neesnidaroc 2 गגH］ 0 dh，prob nothing lost before it 3 the line begins with cBoore and is complete，the last word is correct 4， 5 nothing lost at beginning 6 begins dor or $\lambda \in \quad 7,8,9$ nothing lost at beginning 9 l．$\overline{\text { rce }} \mid$ l．Tлscts［c et］iol．
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Coptic Biblical Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt, edited by E. A. Wallis Budge, M.A., Litt.D., 1912.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ In three instances (ETRHHT, ETOOT, NJOOT) the scribe has an apostrophe after the final $\boldsymbol{J}$ to mark it as the termination of the ist pers. singular.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Dr. Budge allows for six missing leaves between Deut. ii 19 and iv 49 ; but I am obliged to put eight leaves in this lacuna. The two leaves preceding it (Deut. i 39 to ii 19) and the two leaves following it (Deut. iv 49 to v 27) each correspond to exactly $5^{8}$ lines of Greek printed text in Swete's edition, or 29 lines Greek to each leaf of Coptic MS on an average. The lacuna equals 227 lines of Greek text; six leaves would be $6 \times 29=174$ lines of Greek text, whereas eight leaves would be $8 \times 29=232$ lines. I think it admits of no doubt. Similarly it appears to be necessary to assume that three leaves rather than two are lost between Deut. xxvi io and xxviii I .
    ${ }^{4}$ This allows for two blank leaves at the beginning of the book and three leaves for the commencement of Deuteronomy, which is lost (ch. i i-39). As the first extant leaf, fol. I in the printed edition, is HV ( $=$ horizontal-vertical fibres) while fol. 2 is VH (vertical-horizontal), this arrangement is almost compulsory.
    ${ }^{5}$ It is printed $[\overline{\mathrm{P} \boldsymbol{\lambda}]}$, but though it is put in brackets, remains of part of both

[^3]:    letters are distinctly visible. It should be $\overline{\mathrm{p} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda}}$-the third digit is broken away, but there is room for it-as by mistake two of the pages in the printed text are given the same number $\overline{\mathrm{PK}} \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$.
    ${ }^{6}$ Below this quire-mark is a $\boldsymbol{B}$, which it is difficult to explain, unless the scribe of Acts for some reason added a new series of marks for his own portion of the codex. There is a fragment of what may have been the tail of an $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ on the first page of Acts (visible on pl. V left hand corner, the $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ on the right hand is the page-number), but this is not really the beginning of a new quire.
    ${ }^{7}$ There is none on fol. $18 b$ as printed.
    ${ }^{8}$ There is none on fol. $84 a$ as printed.

[^4]:    ${ }^{9}$ Isai. xxx 1, Sirach iii 26, v 5. ${ }^{10}$ y John ii $15 . \quad{ }^{11}$ Wisd. iii 7.
    ${ }^{12}$ The reading is certainly $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{p} \boldsymbol{\operatorname { L }} \boldsymbol{\Delta} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}[$. This cannot be Coptic and can hardly be anything else than an error for $\mathbf{\alpha} \rho \mathcal{X}^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}[$ Cf. the similar remarkable
    

[^5]:    ${ }^{13}$ Phil. iii 19.
    ${ }^{14}$ Ephes. ii 12.
    ${ }^{15} 2$ Pet. i 4.
    ${ }^{16}$ Carl Schmidt 'Der erste Clemensbrief' etc. : Texte u. Untersuchungen xxxii (1908) with a facsimile.

[^6]:    ${ }^{17}$ The Coptic Version of the N.T. in the Southern Dialect, Oxford 1911 , vol. iii, a facsimile on pl. I.
    ${ }^{18}$ O. von Lemm, Koptische Apokryphe Apostelacten in Mél. Asiat. Bull. Ac. Imp. Sci. St-Pétersb. x fasc. 2 (1892) pl. I.
    ${ }^{19}$ Crum, Cat. of the Coptic MSS in the John Rylands Library, 1909, pl. I.
    ${ }^{20}$ Rahlfs, Die Berliner Handschrift d. sahid. Psalters, Berlin 1901 with 3 plates.
    ${ }^{21}$ Kenyon, Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the N.T. 1901, facsimile at p. 160. ${ }^{22}$ Rossi, Trascrizione di un Codice Copto etc. Turin 1883, pl. III.
    ${ }^{23}$ Crum, Coptic MSS from the Fayum, 1893, pl. I, no. II. He dated this as early as $300-350$ (p. 3).

[^7]:    ${ }^{24}$ Crum, Cat. MSS Rylands Library nos. $115-385$ with the exception of eight mentioned on p. viii, and cf. Crum, Cat. Coptic MSS Brit. Mus. p. 418 n.
    ${ }^{25}$ Krall, Rechtsurkunden 1895, over 100 documents, a list of which is given on p. 224.

[^8]:    XVIll $1 \quad 2 \bar{N}]$ om sup $2\left[\bar{\mu} 2^{\circ}\right] 2^{\bar{N}} \quad 2-6 \mathrm{om}$ pt at end of
    

[^9]:    ${ }^{1}$ For v. 9 cf. Crum, Coptic Ostraca No. 3.

