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ABSTRACT.

To my knowledge there has been no thoroughgoing eclectic study of the text of any New Testament book, although the principles of eclectic textual criticism have been applied to individual readings. This thesis attempts to provide a study of all the known variant readings in the Greek text of the Pastoral Epistles. To this end, a full critical apparatus has been compiled and a discussion on each variant reading is provided with the object of establishing the original text and of explaining how variants arose.

The theory, on which these discussions are based is found in an introductory chapter. This introduction begins by arguing that previous methods of textual criticism based largely on the "cult of the best manuscript" are untenable and unreliable nowadays- due partly to the growing realisation that no one manuscript or group of manuscripts contains the original text. Many scholars realise that the original reading may be found in any given manuscript. The implication of this is of course that the peculiar readings of every manuscript must (ultimately) be examined.

The principles for such an eclectic study then follow. These emphasise the need for an awareness of how scribes worked and how palaeography often caused variation in a text. It is also shownhow
Atticism was sometimes responsible for variant readings. This section of the Introduction also indicates how scribes often made deliberate alterations in a text they were copying in order to avoid a theological or grammatical expression they found offensive. It is also argued in this section how an awareness of the author's style can often enable the textual critic to reestablish the original text.

The Introduction closes with a discussion of the positive advantages of the eclectic method of textual criticism. Among these advantages are (1) that the original text is established independently of purely documentary evidence, (2) that a full commentary on the critical apparatus is written, and (3) that the behaviour and reliability of manuscripts can be seen.

There then follows a discussion on all the variant readings in "I Timothy", "II Timothy" and "Titus". The variants are arranged in verse order with the exception of the variants involving δε, αι, θε, and the Divine Names, which are discussed for convenience in Appendices. Each page of variants is headed by a critical apparatus showing Greek, Versional and Patristic evidence. Beneath each apparatus appears a discussion on the variant: this discussion is based on the principles outlined in the introductory chapter, and without regard to the "weight" of the manuscript support.

In Appendix I the author's use of the Divine Names ΙC ΧC, κC and ΘC is established and a discussion on the variants involving these titles follows. It is, for instance, argued that strict grammatical regulations governed the author in his use of arthrous or anarthrous κC and ΘC, and in the order of writing ΙC ΧC.
Appendix II contains the discussion of variants involving the addition and omission of \( \kappa\alpha\lambda\). It is argued that many instances of \( \kappa\alpha\lambda\) are original, but that scribes tended to reduce the frequent use of \( \kappa\alpha\lambda\), which characterises the style both of the author of the Pastorals and of Koine Greek. Appendix III deals with the variants omitting or adding \( \delta\zeta\). It is found that many instances of \( \delta\zeta\) are secondary, and have been added by scribes to avoid asyndeton.

Because the critical apparatus in this thesis contains a larger number of manuscripts than any previous critical apparatus of the Pastoral Epistles, many of the statements made in Wordsworth and White's apparatus to the N. T. in Latin are inaccurate. Appendix IV lists such inaccuracies and in particular shows how many variants known to Wordsworth and White in only Latin manuscripts, are now known to have Greek support.

Appendix V is concerned with the work of Westcott and Hort. These two scholars championed the merits of the readings of the manuscripts S and B for their New Testament text. This appendix begins with a list of readings followed by Westcott and Hort in the Pastorals. A commentary on the list shows that in the absence of B for the Pastorals, Westcott and Hort tended to follow the readings of S A C, but that the readings of other manuscripts were sometimes heeded. A statistical survey concludes this appendix and shows the extent to which Westcott and Hort used S, A or C.

The final two appendices are concerned with the results of the thesis. First, in Appendix VI, an attempt is made to show how the text of the Pastoral Epistles resulting from a purely eclectic treatment of the variants differs from existing printed editions of these epistles.
To this end, the readings I accept as original on the basis of the discussions in the main body of the thesis are collated against the readings of the Textus Receptus, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tegelis, Nestlé and Westcott and Hort. The readings, which have not appeared in any printed edition, are then listed together with their manuscript support. There are about 65 such readings, most of them supported by several manuscripts - only a few are supported by a few or late witnesses: only three readings are accepted without Greek support. Some of the readings concern word-order, others orthography, but in general most are of a grammatical or syntactical nature, and thus the resulting text differs but little from printed editions. Perhaps the most significant reading is the acceptance of $\nu \varrho \pi \tau \tau \iota \varsigma$ at 1 Tim. 1:15 and 3:1, and the acceptance of the longer reading at Titus 2:7. Very occasionally the discussion on variants does not yield a confident conclusion, and these readings are listed separately in Appendix VI.

The basic contention in the Introduction is that no confidence can be placed in the exclusive reliability of any one manuscript or manuscript grouping. This led to the discussion on variants based on principles, which were not purely documentary. Appendix VII shows the justification of that basic contention. The main uncial manuscripts and the bulk of the minuscules are examined in this appendix, and it is shown how often and where they preserve the correct reading, and how often they preserve the wrong reading.
Where they preserve the original text, the allegiences of the manuscript are noted. It is concluded that, in general, it is impossible to establish groupings of manuscripts. The final assessment is (1) that no one manuscript preserves the monopoly of truth, (2) that, because of their capriciousness, certain manuscripts (such as S A C) can not be relied on automatically, and (3) that any one manuscript (however untrustworthy basically) may preserve the original reading.
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PREFACE.

For many years textual critics have been dissatisfied with the theories about so-called neutral texts or "best" manuscripts but so far no thoroughgoing eclectic principles have been applied to any one New Testament book or books, even though eclecticism has been appealed to and exercised in the case of many individual readings throughout the Greek N.T. This study attempts to apply the theories of eclecticism to the letters to Timothy and Titus, and to discuss each variant reading with a view to establishing the original text. It also attempts to provide a full critical apparatus to the Pastoral Epistles.

Constant encouragement and supervision has been given throughout the preparation of this thesis by the Revd. G. D. Kilpatrick, Dean Ireland's Professor of the Exegesis of Holy Scripture in the University of Oxford. Sincere thanks go to him for his help and friendship. Thanks too are rendered to Dom B. Fischer at Beuron for allowing me to visit and make use of the files at the Vetus Latina Institut, and also to Professor K. Aland of the University of Münster in Westphalia for welcoming me to the Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung, where I was privileged to use its wealth of material.

I also wish to acknowledge Miss M. Davies' kindness in providing me with readings from 2344, which she was collating. Miss M. E. Thrall, lecturer in Hellenistic Greek at University College, Bangor, North Wales kindly advised me on variants concerning particles.
Finally I wish to thank the staff of the Bodleian library, Oxford, for its kindness and patience during the time this thesis was being written.
TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS.

(a) General Abbreviations.

The standard abbreviations used are generally those which appear in Appendix I (or on pages XIV - XVI) of the Concise Oxford Dictionary (4th edition by E. McIntosh). Those which differ or which are not included there are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ad. loc</td>
<td>ad locum. At the place under consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ ἑαν.</td>
<td>hapax legomenon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aor.</td>
<td>aorist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ap.</td>
<td>apud (= as quoted by).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byz.</td>
<td>Byzantine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod(d)</td>
<td>codex (codices).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm.</td>
<td>commentary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>def. art.</td>
<td>definite article.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dir.</td>
<td>direct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et al.</td>
<td>et alii (and others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f (f)</td>
<td>following (usually with reference to verses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gk.</td>
<td>Greek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inc.</td>
<td>including.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indic.</td>
<td>indicative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mg.</td>
<td>margin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid.</td>
<td>middle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mins.</td>
<td>minuscule (manuscripts).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ms.(s)</td>
<td>manuscript(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>neutar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom. sac.</td>
<td>nomina sacra (the divine names).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
om.  - omit.


pf.  - perfect.

pr.  - primus (first).

(b) Books, Editors, and Journals.

B. F. B. S. - The British and Foreign Bible Society.


Bl.-Deb. - Blass - Debrunner's Grammar. (See Bibliography).


I.C.C. - The International Critical Commentaries.


L. (+) S. - Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon (see Bibliography).

Migne P. G. - Patrologia Graeca (1857 - ).

N. E. B. - The New English Bible.


R. S. V. - The Revised Standard Version.

Tisch. - Tischendorf (usually with reference to his text of the N. T. See Bibliography).

T. R. - Textus Receptus.

W. (+) H. - Westcott and Hort (usually with reference to their text of the N. T. See Bibliography).

Z. N. T. W. - "Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft". Giessen and Berlin (1900 - ).

(c) The Books of the Bible.

These and all books from the apocryphal writings are usually abbreviated according to convention: e.g. Gen. = Genesis, Mk. = Mark, 1 Tim. = 1 Timothy.

(d) Greek Manuscripts.

S (Aleph) - Codex Sinaiticus.
A - Codex Alexandrinus.
C - Codex Ephraëmi Rescriptus.
D - Codex Claromontanus.
F - Codex Augiensis.
G - Codex Boernerianus.
H - Codex Euthalianus.
I - The Washington MS. (Freer Collection).
K - Codex Mosquensis.
L - Codex Angelicus.
P - Codex Porphyrianus.
Ψ - Codex Athous Laurae.
Manuscripts with numbers follow the conventional Gregory-Dobschütz - Aland symbol. Occasionally the von Soden grouping has been cited and indicated as such: this is because it is not always possible to ascertain how many mss. in that grouping are extant for the reading in question.

An asterisk denotes the original hand of a manuscript e.g. \( S^k \).

Superscript letters denote correctors e.g. \( D^b \).

P followed by a number refers to a Papyrus manuscript.

Lect. with a number following refers to a lectionary text.

Guelf. = Guelferbytarius.

(e) Greek Fathers.

Ath. - Athanasius.
Chrys. - Chrysostom.
Clem.-Alex. - Clement of Alexandria.
Cyr.-(Alex.) - Cyril of Alexandria.
Cyr.-Rome - Cyril of Rome.
Dam. - John of Damascus.
Didy.-(Alex.) - Didymus of Alexandria.
Epiph. - Epiphanius.
Bulog. - Eulogius.
Bis. - Eusebius.
Bis.-E. - Eusebius Ómesensus.
Buthal. - Buthalius.
Greg. - Myssa. - Gregory of Nyssa.
Hesych. - Hesychius.
Hipp. - Hippolytus.
Ign. - Ignatius.
Iren. - Irenaeus.
Oec. - Oecumenius.
Pamph. - Pamphilus.
Phot. - Photius.
Sev. - Sevarian of Gabala.
Theod. - Theodoret.
Theod-Mops. - Theodore of Mopsuestia.
Theophyl. - Theophylact.

All other Greek Fathers are not abbreviated.

(f) Latin Manuscripts.
L (vt) - Old Latin manuscripts.
d. - Claromontanus.
f. - Augiensis.
g. - Boerherianus.
m. - The Speculum.
dem. - Demidouianus.
diu. - Diuionensis.
mon. - Monza.
t. - Liber Commissus.
r. - Monacensis.
L (vg) - The Vulgate.

L (vg. clem.) - The Clementine Vulgate.

The Wordsworth and White symbols are adopted for Vulgate manuscripts.

(g) Latin Fathers.

Although my abbreviations of the names of the Latin Fathers closely follow the abbreviations used in the Vetus Latina Institut and in their "Verzeichnis der Sigel" (by B. Fischer. Freiburg 1949 and 1963) the majority are listed below:

Ald. - Aldhelm.
Amb. - Ambrose.
Ps.-Amb. - Pseudo Ambrose.
Ambst. - Ambrosiaster.
AN stat. - Anonymous Statutes.
AN te. - Anonymous Testimonies.
Anatol. - Anatolius.
Apon. - Aponius.
A. SS. - Acta vel Vitae Sæctorum
Ani. - Anianus.
Att. - Atticus.
Aug. - Augustine.
Ps.-Aug. - Pseudo Augustine.
Avit. - Avitus of Vienna.
Sen.-N. - Benedict of Nursia.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bon. IV</td>
<td>Pope Bonifatius IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cae.</td>
<td>Caesarius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caec.</td>
<td>Caecilianus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAN. nic.</td>
<td>Council of Nicaea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassian.</td>
<td>John Cassianus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car. or Cassiod</td>
<td>Cassiodorus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce-Ca.</td>
<td>Cerealis of Castellum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyp(r).</td>
<td>Cyprian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps-cyp.</td>
<td>Pseudo-Cyprian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Def.</td>
<td>Defensor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion.-E.</td>
<td>Dionysius Exiguus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buch.</td>
<td>Eucherius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bost.</td>
<td>Eustathasius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac.</td>
<td>Facundus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favst.</td>
<td>Faustus of Reji.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferriol.</td>
<td>Ferriolus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fir.</td>
<td>Firmicus Maternus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulg.</td>
<td>Fulgentius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.-Fu.</td>
<td>Pseudo Fulgentius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gau.</td>
<td>Gaudensius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gel.</td>
<td>Gelasius I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gi.</td>
<td>Gildas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr (eg)-M.(agnus)-</td>
<td>Pope Gregory the Great.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hes.</td>
<td>Hesychius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hil.</td>
<td>Hilary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.-Hyg.</td>
<td>Pseudo Hyginus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.-Ig. (lat.)</td>
<td>Pseudo Ignatius (in Latin).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is.</td>
<td>Isidore of Seville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer.</td>
<td>Jerome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.-Jer.</td>
<td>Pseudo Jerome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Luc.-Brug.</td>
<td>Lucas of Bruges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luc.</td>
<td>Lucifer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mart.</td>
<td>Martin of Braga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mart. I.</td>
<td>Pope Martin I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.-Milt.</td>
<td>Pseudo Miltiades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novat.</td>
<td>Novatian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacian.</td>
<td>Pacianus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pel.</td>
<td>Pelagius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pel. A: Pel. B</td>
<td>Pelagius Ms. A : Ms. B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos.</td>
<td>Possidius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praedest.</td>
<td>&quot;Praedestinatus&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prim.</td>
<td>Primasius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pris.</td>
<td>Priscillian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruf.</td>
<td>Rufinius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rus.</td>
<td>Rusticus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S - Mo.</td>
<td>Sacramentarium Mozarabicum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedul. - (Sc.)</td>
<td>Sedulius Scottus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tert.</td>
<td>Tertullian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theod-Mops. (lat.)</td>
<td>Theodore of Mopsuestia (in Latin).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps. - Vals.</td>
<td>Pseudo Valerius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vict. of Rome</td>
<td>Victorinus of Rome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vig.</td>
<td>Vigilius of Thapsus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.-Vig.</td>
<td>Pseudo Vigilius.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(h) Other versions: -

| Arm.              | Armenian.                           |
| Copt.             | Coptic.                             |
| (boh.)            | (boharic).                          |
| (sah.)            | (sahidic).                          |
| Eth.              | Ethiopian.                          |
| pp.               | (Pell Platt and Praetorius).        |
| ro.               | (Peshitta).                         |
| Goth.             | Gothic.                             |
| Syr.              | Syriac.                             |
| hl.               | (Harclean).                         |
| hl. mg.           | (Harclean margin).                 |
| pal.              | (Palestinian).                      |

(i) Classical and Other Authors.

<p>| Aesch             | Aeschylus.                          |
| Aq.               | Aquila.                             |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arist.</td>
<td>Aristotle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clem.</td>
<td>Letters of Clement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demos.</td>
<td>Demosthenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hdt.</td>
<td>Hérodotus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pind.</td>
<td>Pindar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plut.</td>
<td>Plutarch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soph.</td>
<td>Sophocles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm.</td>
<td>Symmachus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teb.</td>
<td>The Tebtunis Papyri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thuc.</td>
<td>Thucydides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xen.</td>
<td>Xenophon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTRODUCTION.

REACTION AGAINST WESTCOTT AND HORT'S METHOD.

1. The evidence of mss. other than SB.

"No one 'family' of mss .. has the monopoly of truth" (1).
"We can never speak of a 'bad text' or a 'good text' in
general, only a text with 'many good readings' or 'few
good readings' (2).

Such are the opinions expressed in two recent books against Westcott and Hort's method of textual criticism. There is now a growing distrust in the exclusive reliability of any one ms. or of any one text type. Modern textual critics usually allow witnesses from other text types to contribute readings. It is true that W. & H. allowed the Western text to influence their judgement as in the case of the so-called Western non-interpolations, but since the time of W & H., the Western text as a whole has been very much discussed, and nowhere more than in the book of Acts. For example, A. C. Clark in 'The Acts of the Apostles' (3) and J. H. Ropes in 'The Text of Acts' (4) discuss respectively the


(3) Published 1933.

relative merits of D and SB and although Clark favours D, and
Ropes, SB, both studies show that neither D on the one hand nor
SB on the other can be relied on exclusively throughout. The
confidence, which was put in Western readings, and which grew
after W. & H's. day, can also be seen in the work of F. C. Burkitt.
In an article entitled 'Texts and Versions' (5), he recognises
that D may have preserved some original readings. C. H. Turner (6)
shows that the Western Text is often superior in its readings.

The confidence in the superiority of the S.3. partnership has
been broken. It no longer reigns supreme. Other mss. may
equally have their share of original readings and, therefore, must
have their say. (7).

2. Text Types.

"... the guiding light of the Neutral text .. no longer
shines" (8).

The chief witnesses to W. & H's so-called Neutral text type have
lost their supreme authority, and their claim to contain the "best"

(5) In the 'Encyclopaedia Biblica' Vol. 4. Col. 4977 - 5031.

(6) J.T.S. XXIX p. 1. and in 'Markan Usage' J.T.S. XXVI p. 12,
p.145, p.225, p.337, XXVII p.58, XXVII1 p.9, p.349, XXIX p.276,
p.346.

(7) See G. D. Kilpatrick on Syrian readings in 'The Greek New
Testament Text of Today and the 'Textus Receptus' in the
MacGregor memorial volume. Especially p. 205.

(8) K. Aland 'The Significance of the Papyri for Progress in New
Testament Researches' p. 340 in 'The Bible and Modern
Scholarship' ed. J. P. Hyatt.
readings. The reason for this is, as seen above, a growing recognition of the merits of (particularly) D and its allies. But in addition to this, the realisation that no one text type is purer in its witness than another, weakens the power of the Neutral text type. Each text type as subject to corruption: no one text type escaped impurities of reading.

B. M. Metzger in a recent article (9) shows that Origen's variant readings can now be found in representatives of all text types. Origen was quite unconscious of impurity in any one line of textual tradition resulting from editorial activity.

K. W. Clark in 'The Gospel of John in Third-Century Egypt' (10) says that P 66 and P 75 vary considerably in their variants even though both are from the same district and are of similar age. Both represent 'mixed texts'. The development from them to fourth century texts like SBW shows no consistent indebtedness to either P 66 or P 75. Each of these three uncials agrees now with one papyrus, now with another, and sometimes shows no agreement at all with the papyri. (11).


(11) Besides, as G. D. Kilpatrick reminds us, early finds of papyri from Egypt which agree with SB in the main must not be claimed as near the original: finds are not made in Italy. If they were the same may be true of the Western text. In 'The Bodmer and Mississippi Collection of Biblical and Christian Texts' in 'Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies' Winter 1963, p. 33f.
A. F. J. Klijn (12) maintains that P 66 has a mixed text, but shows fewer Caesarean readings than P 45 and concludes that a variety of textual traditions were current in Egypt at the times these papyri were written.

G. Zuntz in 'The Text of the Epistles' (13) shows that P 46 has some Byzantine readings, but is linked by its errors to B. He speaks of a proto-Alexandrian bloc preserving readings not in later Alexandrian witnesses. Sometimes P 46 is with B, sometimes against, yet both mss. have a similar provenance. Readings thought of once as Byzantine, late, and therefore unworthy of consideration appear in an early papyrus. It is obvious that to speak of Byzantine readings in relation to P 46 or of Caesarean readings in relation to P 45 is to put the cart before the horse. It is useless under such conditions to try to maintain Streeter's nomenclature and method. The theory that we can detect local text types and say that some have been open to corruption more than others is really an extension of W & H's cult of the best ms. and is interable. The evidence of the papyri shows that we can now speak of 'text types' only in broad terms, and say that such and such a reading in P 46

(13) Schweich lectures 1946, Published 1953.
became more popular in a certain group of mss. (14).

Not only do the papyri support this view, but the lectionaries do too. Studies into papyrus and lectionary readings, undeveloped, at the time at Streeter's 'Four Gospels' (15) help to disprove the theory of rigid text types. A. Wikgren in 'Chicago Studies in the Greek Lectionary of the New Testament' (16) concludes that the basis of the lectionary texts cannot be identified with any text type, and that the lectionary text system developed from the third-fourth centuries and was founded on texts of a mixed character.

Another reason why mss. cannot be fitted into text types is given by E. C. Colwell and E. W. Tune in an article entitled 'The Quantitative Relationships between M S. Text-Types' (17). They show how the usual method of collation has often falsely evaluated the family relationship of that ms. (18). Using a

(14) Aland op-cit. p. 335 says that it is impossible to speak of mixed texts before rescensions were made. A rescension may have selected one text as represented in a papyrus and based the rescension on it.

(15) Fourth impression 1930.

(16) In the Casey memorial volume, op. cit.

(17) In the Casey memorial volume, op. cit.

(18) See also E.C. Colwell 'The Significance of Grouping New Testament Manuscripts N.T.S. Vol. 4, p. 73 f, where he says that limitation of attention to variants from the T.R. obscures the kinship of mss. See also E. C. Colwell and E. W. Tune 'Variant Readings: Classification and Use' JBL LXXXIII, p. 253 f.
statistical method of collation against a broad selection of mss., they claim to discover more accurately the agreements between types of text. For example, they show that \( \text{©} \) does not form a group with the T.R. and 565, as a single comparison with \( \text{©} \) as a base might suggest. They also show how Egyptian readings are of a mixed nature and are, therefore, as "corrupt" as any other given line of descent.

B. M. Metzger (19) shows how recent investigations into the Caesarean and Syrian text types and into the old Slavonic version are unable to maintain ms. groups in watertight compartments, and only serve to prove how much mixture exists in all branches of the N.T. ms. tradition.

3. The Genealogical Method.

As seen above, the evidence of certain early texts does not allow the critic to speak strictly about a pure line of textual transmission resulting in a given text type. The reason is the 'mixed' textual character of witnesses. Zuntz (20) remarks that 'faced with a tradition of this kind, the strictly genealogical method of textual criticism becomes inapplicable. It presupposes the existence of a definite archetype recoverable from extant copies through unambiguous lines of descent'. Milne and Skeat


(20) op. cit. p. 155.
say (21) 'In recent years it has been growing steadily clearer that the old idea of a variety of local texts each confined to a particular area is mistaken'.

But it is not only the disintegration of the theory of local text types, which has made W & H's (and Streeter's) genealogical method impractical. Mixture makes it impossible to confine a text to a certain geographical area or text grouping. Similarly, a full genealogical plan cannot be constructed to work back to an archetype. The genealogical method is possible in only a restricted way, such as in the building up of family 1, family 13, and family \( \pi \). F. H. Thonefeld (22) works back from D E F G to an archetype. But such a genealogical method is limited, and even in these family groups, variants, corruption and composite readings occur. They have to be explained, and as a result the term 'family' can be applied only in a loose way.

One example will suffice to demonstrate this. \( f \) and G, because of their peculiar readings are often independent of other mss. as at 1 Tim. 1:18 in reading \( \text{\varepsilon\iota\nu\mu\o\o\iota\pi\o\varepsilon\gamma\nu\gamma\varepsilon\lambda\chi\nu} \) but are with 33, 1739 and 2344 at 1 Tim. 1:9 in reading \( \text{\tau\varepsilon\upsilon} \), and with 436, 103 at al. in reading \( \text{\omicron\upsilon} \) at 1 Tim. 2:6. Throughout the

(21) op. cit. p. 20.

(22) 'Untersuchungen zur altlateinischen Überlieferung des 1. Timotheusbriefes' in Klassisch-Philologische Studien 26.
apparatus to the N.T. such mixture occurs showing mostly quite irregular points of contact between mss. It is obvious that under such conditions, it is impossible to draw up a genealogical tree or assess the pedigree and relationship of one ms. to another. Mixture, as E. C. Colwell (23) says, is both occasional and regular in nature. Intermarriage of mss. the correction of a late ms. against an earlier one, mss. copied from more than one exemplar, the fact that so many N.T. mss. have been lost, and the fact that many, which are available, present conflate readings, affect the whole ms. tradition and make it impossible to trace a genealogical pattern.


The increase of Biblical and textual studies since the time of W & H. has done much to dispel the 'cult of the best ms'. Some critics still try to clutch at the remnants of W & H's methods. But, with the distrust of the superiority of any given ms. or text type, with the disintegration of closely-knit family units, and with the recognition that the genealogical method is impractical, it is difficult to justify the use of these methods. A more rational system of textual criticism is obviously necessary to replace the old, and it is possible using new knowledge. For example, there is a much greater knowledge of Koine Greek due to papyrological studies, more grammars of N. T. Greek are available, the readings of fathers, versions and papyri are accessible. Past methods have been disproved, new knowledge is available: the way is clear for an eclectic study of the N.T. text.

THE CASE FOR ECLECTICISM.

1. The Use of Eclecticism by Textual Critics.

Vincent Taylor (24) realises that a critic cannot base his judgement of readings solely on the local-text theory or on the exclusive reliability of any one ms. or group of mss. In his 'Select Readings' he shows how other criteria must be used in assessing a reading especially when ms. evidence is balanced in division over a variant. He, therefore, considers the influence of doctrinal motives, orthography and style in creating a variation in a text.

B. Weiss in his edition of the N. T. (25) used an eclectic method of textual criticism. He worked through an apparatus criticus accepting readings on their intrinsic probability: he was conscious as he did so of the author's style and theology, and also of classes of error, as is seen in his 'Textkritik der Paulischen Briefe' (26) for example. As a result, he considered B the most reliable N. T. ms.

B. M. Metzger in the 'Text of the New Testament' (27), when assessing a reading, sometimes makes use of criteria other than

---

(25) Published 1894-1900.
(26) In 'Texte und Untersuchungen' XIV Heft. 3.
(27) Published 1964.
purely documentary but it would seem that he, like Taylor, resorts to these criteria to evaluate the worth of a reading, if the ms. evidence does not lead to a conclusive decision.

Westcott and Hort in the introduction to their Greek New Testament (28) show that knowledge of documents does not always help the critic to decide on the final judgement of readings, when both readings in a variant are attested by a division of the 'best' mss. In their 'Notes on Select Readings', they give examples of criteria other than purely documentary, which have made them decide on difficult readings. For instance, at Luke 22: 19b - 20, they consider the place of theology and of doctrinal motives in the creation of the longer text.

Metzger's article on Origen's variants (29) shows that Origen appears to have been an eclectic critic. In his discussion of Jn. 1:28, for example, he prefers 'Bethabara' on geographical and etymological grounds and ignores documentary evidence.

The new American Greek Testament (30) appears to have rejected exclusively documentary criteria. Consider for example Acts 16:12, where they print $\pi\rho\omicron\omicron\upsilon\nupsilon$ $\rho\omicron\omicron\nupsilon\omicron\omicron$ $\tau\varsigma$ following the old German, three Latin vulgate mss. and the Provençal version, against the rest of ms. tradition.

(28) Published 1882.

(29) op. cit.

2. The Case for a thorough-going Eclecticism.

"The true readings of the Greek N. T. cannot safely be derived from any one set of authorities, whether mss., versions or Fathers, but ought to be the result of patient comparison and careful estimate of the evidence given by them all" (31).

"The fluid state of textual criticism today makes the adoption of the eclectic method not only desirable, but all but inevitable" (32).

As seen in the last section, certain textual critics have made use of an eclectic method, but generally this method has been used only when documentary witness is such that these critics have been obliged to resort to other criteria.

In view of the present dilemma and discussion about the relative merits of individual mss., and of ms. tradition, it is reasonable to depart from a documentary study and to examine the N. T. text from a purely eclectic standpoint. Max Wilcox (33) in his study of the book of Acts makes a plea for an eclectic textual study of that N. T. book.

(31) An opinion expressed by F. H. A. Scrivener in the introduction to 'An Exact Transcript of the Codex Augiensis', p. XX.

(32) Expressed by R. V. & Tasker in the introduction to the 'Greek New Testament for the New English Bible', p. VII.

A. E. Housman in 'The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism' (34) advocates a thoroughgoing eclectic study for classical texts and tells the critic to weigh each reading on its merits, and not to hold preconceived ideas on mss. In the preface to his edition of Mamilius (35) he argues that the 'cult of the best ms. is a method of preventing an editor from thinking.' He also says that it is part of a textual critic's task to explain corrupt passages and not merely to correct them.

Even though, as seen above, critics like W & H and Taylor, do make use of criteria other than purely documentary in assessing certain readings, they are less confident in their trust of the other criteria. However, with the increased knowledge about N. T. Greek, authors' styles, causes of scribal error, and with the present day lack of confidence in individual mss' weight, it is possible to attempt a textual study of the N. T. using a consistent eclecticism. But to prevent such a study from being purely subjective, it can be based on certain principles.

(34) In 'Selected Prose' edited by J. Carter, p. 131.

(a) Horn. and line-omission.

It has long been recognised that homoioteleuton and, to a lesser extent, homoioarkton have been responsible for causing certain scribes to create shorter texts. However, it is not always legitimate to use these terms, because many omissions occurred in texts copied from, and written in, scriptio continua. It is, therefore, better to use the term coined by A. C. Clark (36) namely δψ. That is to say the same letter groups (or letter groups of similar appearance) recurring in a text can cause errors of omission. A scribe's eye passes from the first letter group to the second and omits the intervening text. Vogel's lists several examples of this cause of omission in his introduction (37). As this is an obvious cause of error, an eclectic study will presume that where Horn can be demonstrated, the longer text will be original, other things being equal. Such has been the method of argument at 1 Tim. 5:16 (q.v.) where the longer text ἀποτελεῖται is read with D et al. The shorter text can be explained by Horn because in reading ΠΙΚΤΟΣ ΠΙΚΤ the scribe's eye has passed from the first ΠΙΚΤ to the

(36) In the 'Descent of Manuscripts', p. 1.

(37) H. J. Vogels 'Handbuch der Textkritik des Neuen Testaments' 2nd ed.
See also W. Headlam 'On Editing Aeschylus', p. 92.
second, and he has omitted the intervening letters. Horn seems to have been a frequent cause of error in the Pastoral Epistles (for example the omission of 1 Tim. 3:7, the omission of καλής (1 Tim. 4:6), Κετοργον (2 Tim. 3:3) Αγαθον (Tit. 1:16)).

Another cause of omission is line-omission. Clark in his 'Acts of the Apostles' (38) shows how the shorter text of Acts was frequently the result of line omission. L. Havet (39) states the following rule: 'Quand un ms. omet de suite plusieurs mots sans qu'ils forment ensemble une unité de sens et sans qu'il y ait saut du même au même, il est a présumer que la suite de mots en question formait une ligne de modèle'. This cause of omission is less demonstrable in the Pastoral epistles, but it may be the reason for the shorter text at 1 Tim. 6:5 where ΐόκετερο'ς πετό των τοπικων is deficient in some mss.

In contrast to the old rule "brevior lectio potior", it would be truer to state that scribes tended to omit accidentally rather than add deliberately. When copying a ms., a scribe is for more susceptible to the former than the latter peculiarity. Additions to a text are the work of conscious editing; omissions from a text are the result of scribal error. Thus stands the

(38) Published 1933. Especially p. XXVII f.

(39) 'Manuel de Critique Verbale appliqué aux textes latins', p. 200.
basic rule. Obviously examples can be found where omission is due to editorial activity, or where the longer text has resulted from assimilation to parallel passages, or from scribal comment included into the text. But in general it is easier and more reasonable to explain the shorter text from the longer text, than vice versa, especially where Hom or line omission can be demonstrated.

(b) Author's Style and Usage.

"Wie bei jeden Autor ist bei der Apk. die genaue Prüfung des Sprachgebrauches für die Textkritik von größer Bedeutung" (40).

It is true to say that every author displays certain peculiarities in his use of language and idiom, which constitute his style. In order to determine the character of an author's style and usage, a comprehensive use of grammar, vocabulary, syntax, word order, and idioms has to be made, and rules about this usage can then be established. Variations from the rule should be particularly noticed to verify if a v.l. restores the author's usage to the norm. For instance, if there is no

(40) J. Schmid 'Studien zur Geschichte des Griechischen Apokalypseestextes' Vol. 2, p. 249 in Münchener Theologische Studien edited by F. X. Seppelt and others. Also see J. de Zwaan in the 'Beginnings of Christianity' Vol. 2, p. 30 f "The Greek of Acts" which stresses that each N. T. author was an individualist insofar as his style is concerned.
certain example of the perfect tense in a given work, an eclectic critic may justifiably be distrustful of a variant which reads the perfect. Also if it is discovered that a certain author is susceptible to Semitic idiom, the critic will be less distrustful of such an idiom in a variant reading.

Various scholars have worked on the style of individual N. T. writers (41) and each has discovered distinctive and peculiar features of N. T. Koine within these books. Presuming the Pastoral Epistles to have an independent author (42) the distinctive style and usage of that author can be appealed to, to decide on variant readings. (Even if one argues for Pauline authorship, the language and style are sufficiently different from Paul's undisputed writings as to enable us to study the Pastoral Epistles in isolation). Where it is impossible to establish Pastoral usage, perhaps through too meagre examples of a particular grammatical feature, N. T. usage as a whole is often a guide. However, where it is possible to establish author's usage, the result is likely to be more valuable.


(42) As Harrison and others believe.
Variants involving orthographical changes ought to be mentioned here. These variants can be evaluated in the same way, that is, using the style and usage of the author as a touchstone but added care is necessary. Spelling can vary considerably with the passage of time, and the quirks of individual scribes operate in this field very strongly, but a clue can often be found indicating the standard first century spelling. This can be seen in the case of 'ἐπιορκός' and 'ἐφιορκός' (1 Tim. 1:11): N. T. usage is not a guide as the word is found only here, but Phrynichus provides a clue to the correct reading when he indicates that 'ἐφιορκός' is the Hellenistic spelling (43).

The eclectic method of textual criticism cannot, by its very nature, create and abide by intransigent rules, but a basic rule of thumb may be stated: That a variant consistent with the author's style and usage elsewhere, is more likely to be original than a variant out of character with the general usage, other things being equal.

(c) Atticism.

"All our mss. have to a greater or less extent suffered from the same effacement of unclassical forms of words" (44).

(43) 'The New Phrynichus' by W. G. Rutherford CCLXX.

Another criterion, which can be appealed to, when assessing variant readings, is Atticism. Although not the only influence affecting stylistic improvement, Atticism may account for several changes in N. T. text. This movement was an attempt to improve Greek style and to rid the language of unGreek expressions. Lexicons and handbooks (45) of the second century A. D. enable us to appreciate Attic usage and the ideas and ideals of the Attic-stylists.

G. D. Kilpatrick in an article entitled 'Atticism and the Text of the Greek New Testament' (46) follows H. J. Vogels (47) in saying that most deliberate changes were introduced into the N. T. text by A. D. 200, and says that after Tatian, Christians were less free in altering the N. T. text as a reaction against the changes of text made for doctrinal reasons during the second century. (48).

(45) Such as Moeris' lexicon, the Philetairos attributed to Herodian, the Ecloga of Phrynichus, the ΑντιΑττικήτης and Demetrius on style.

(46) In 'Neutestamentliche Aufsätze': Festschrift for J. Schmid, p. 125 f.

(47) op. cit. p. 162.

Where the lexicographers and grammarians are unhelpful, the indexes to the Attic authors of the 5th - 6th centuries B. C. often enable the present day critic to recognise what was regarded as normal Attic usage.

It will frequently be observed that where a grammarian or lexicographer objects to a particular word, idiom or expression and marks it as Hellenistic by substituting the Attic equivalent, variation occurs also in the N. T. text where such an idiom or expression appears. That the neo Attic stylists were successful in influencing N. T. scribes may be seen from the apparatus to the N. T.: many unGreek or Hellenistic expressions occur here, while their Attic equivalents or counterparts appear in our printed editions. This should not be. An eclectic critic not reliant on ms. attestation will, other things being equal, accept the non-Attic reading to the Attic. Thus at 1 Tim. 1:4 the v.l. οἵκωλεψεν will be accepted as original because it was objected to by Atticists (49).

Metzger in 'The Text of the New Testament' (50) warns against such an assumption and states that influences other than Atticism may have affected scribes. But in answer to this objection, it may be stated that, when faced with a straight choice between an

(49) CCCXCLV of 'The New Phrynichus' op. cit.
(50) op. cit. p. 178.
Attic and a non-Attic expression, the latter is more likely to be what the original author wrote. A scribe is unlikely to substitute a perfectly normal Greek expression for a barbarism or unAttic expression which was current in the Hellenistic period. The stylistic consciousness of certain scribes may be compared with Matthew's use of Mark. Kine expressions or Semitic idiom would appear as barbaric or archaic Greek, and would be altered to Greek acceptable to the scribe and his contemporaries.

(d) Deliberate Alterations.

A consciousness and awareness of the field, in which deliberate alteration occurs, frequently helps the critic.

(i) Theological or liturgical alterations: These emendations attempt to clarify apparent difficulties in theology, or to avoid an expression offensive to the scribe. The omission of Luke 22:43-44, for example, is probably due to such a cause.

Where the critic is suspicious that additional detail has been added to amplify a theological point, or liturgical formula or where an apparently offensive detail has been omitted, an appeal to the author's stylistic usage, as well as to his theological standpoint will often provide additional support for either the longer or shorter text. As far as the Pastorals are concerned, this has been the criterion adopted with reference to the divine names in Appendix 1.
(ii) Grammatical and linguistic alterations: Just as Atticism accounts for many alterations in the N. T. text, so too do stylistic considerations within Hellenistic usage itself. Matthew improved Mark by altering less literary Koine into literary (51). N. T. scribes did the same with the texts they were copying. C. S. C. Williams lists such deliberate changes in his book 'Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts' (52). The direction of change was generally from less literary to literary Koine, and so the former will be accepted as original other things being equal.

(iii) Assimilation or harmonisation of parallel passages are frequent reasons for deliberate alterations of the text. This is especially noticeable in the case of O. T. quotations in the N. T. Scribes tended to bring these quotations into line with the familiar LXX form so that the version of a quotation least like an existing Greek translation of the O. T. will be the original, other things being equal. Assimilation also occurs frequently between the Synoptic Gospels. However, assimilation and harmonisation can operate elsewhere in the N. T. For instance, if a scribe alights on a group of words familiar to him, he may be reminded of a similar turn of phrase elsewhere in the N. T.,

(51) cf. W. C. Allen I. C. C. on Matthew.

(52) Especially chapter one.
and will accordingly assimilate the words in the ms. he is copying to the words he has been reminded of. Assimilation may occur within the same book between similar recurring ideas and phrases. The critic in such an instance must ask himself which is the likelier: that the author was consistent in his phraseology throughout his work, and that where a variant occurs changing a set phrase, the responsibility for such a variant rests with a scribe who occasionally altered a repetitive phrase on stylistic grounds, or that if a scribe encountered two different phrases expressing the same idea he would assimilate the one to the other. When this happens, the author's general style elsewhere must be appealed to. However, it may be remembered that assimilation is more likely to have occurred in the introductory and concluding formulae in the epistles: and this can be demonstrated in the case of the Pastorals.

(e) Accidental Errors.

Anyone copying a ms. is liable to error. A knowledge of palaeography helps the critic to explain why scribes made accidental errors. Sometimes words were misdivided, when being copied from scriptio continua; sometimes letters similar in shape were confused; at other times dictation caused aural errors. The misinterpretation of an abbreviation; the fact that a scribe may be copying from an exemplar without breathings or accents; the part played by itacism; and many other palaeographical and orthographical phenomena account for most of the accidental errors.
Introductions to textual criticism such as Vogels’ or Metzger’s list and illustrate some causes of palaeographical and accidental error, and many examples will be seen throughout the following discussion on the v.11 in the Pastoral epistles.
HOW FAR CAN AN ECLECTIC CRITIC GO?

By using criteria such as the above the critic may reach a conclusion in discussing textual variants and be able to say which variant is the original reading. However, it is legitimate to ask: can a reading be accepted as genuine if it is supported by only one ms.? There is no reason why an original reading should not have been preserved in only one ms. but obviously a reading can be accepted with greater confidence, when it has stronger support. When a weakly attested reading is accepted as the true reading, it must be shown why and how the variant came about and why it was so widely accepted.

Before accepting as original a reading found in only one ms., the critic must be aware of the characteristics of that ms. and its peculiarities (53). For example, in the Pastorals 1799 alone adds ΤΕΝΚΝΟΝ ΤΗΡΩΣΙ (ΤΙΤΕΣ) in several places: whereas under different conditions the critic might be tempted to look for possible reasons why the longer reading is correct, the fact that such an addition is a recurrent peculiarity of that ms. warns against such a decision. The additions in this example reveal the quirk of one scribe. For an assessment of scribal peculiarity see Appendix 6 and Appendix 7.

(53) Hort's dictum that knowledge of mss. must precede judgement of readings is therefore true to this extent.
The criteria under heading 3 above are not intransigent laws, merely pointers, rules of thumb and guides. The eclectic method of textual criticism by its very nature evaluates the merits of each individual variant. That is why it was impossible to pontificate when debating theoretically about harmonisation versus author's consistency (54). In practice, however, the critic will often be able to reach a conclusion based on such criteria as appear under heading 3. He will then examine the ms. evidence. If the reading he wishes to accept as original has weak support, then the reason why the support is weak must be sought and supplied.

Even Aland with his reservation about eclecticism says:
"Theoretically the original readings can be hidden in a single ms. thus standing alone against the rest of tradition" (55), and Tasker has a similar comment: "The possibility must be left open that in some cases the true reading may have been preserved in only a few witnesses or even in a single relatively late witness" (56).

(54) 3 (d) (iii) above.
(55) p. 340 in his article in the Hyatt volume op. cit.
(56) op. cit. p. Vlll.
POSITIVE ADVANTAGES OF THE ECLECTIC METHOD.

(1) An attempt is made to reach the true or original text. This is, of course, the ultimate aim of any textual critic, but the eclectic method, by using different criteria and by working from a different standpoint, tries to arrive at the true reading, untrammeled by discussion about the weight of ms. support.

(2) Klijn (57) writes "We shall have to hammer out the text of the original N. T., reading by reading, discussing every possibility", and this is what the eclectic method ensures. A full discussion of how v.11. came about is given: textual systems such as 'the cult of the best ms', tend to avoid such discussion. The full discussion reveals how scribes worked, what their knowledge of Greek and the N. T. was, and how errors appeared. It also demonstrates author's usage, and shows developments in the Greek language. The discussion may also improve knowledge about Koine Greek. Even if there remains doubt about the true reading in a given variant, a discussion about all the variants ensures that each has its say.

(3) Because an eclectic critic considers every relevant variant, a full apparatus must be available to him. This method ensures a discussion and consideration of each v.1., so that even false readings attested perhaps by only one ms. can be

(57) 'A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text in the Gospels and Acts', p. 171.
understood and the reason for their existence explained. Such a study provides a complete examination of any critic's apparatus of the work in question. A comprehensive apparatus ensures that no reading is unjustifiably labelled 'weak' or 'strong'. The only readings not discussed are those which are insignificant or obvious such as F and G's frequent and false word divisions, which in most instances do not form proper words. These v.l. are of value only to critics examining the text of these particular mss. (58).

(4) After reaching conclusions about the v.l., the behaviour of certain mss. can be traced, and from a standpoint independent of the documentary method. Often such a study serves as further ammunition against the documentary method, as the illogical fluctuations in mss. are visible. There is, for example, no consistency in the witnesses to erset as a variant to in the Pastorals; S, to cite one ms., sometimes reads erset sometimes erset. See Appendix 7 for a full assessment.

(5) The quirks and peculiarities of individual mss. are discovered, because, as seen under 'How far can an eclectic study go?', such features have to be taken into account before their evidence is relied on.

(58) Such as Tinnefeld on D E G. op. cit.
APPLICATION TO THE PASTORALS.

Having stated the theory in the above pages, it remains to explain how these theories have been applied to the following study. The Pastoral letters to Timothy and Titus have been selected because they form a unity within the N. T. The problem of Pauline authorship does not really arise, because where it is relevant to appeal to author's style, the 13 chapters of the Pastorals in many instances supply a sufficient body of evidence. If not, the N. T. as a whole has been appealed to. The Pastoral Epistles are also valuable for such a study, because in these letters, advocates of the so-called Neutral Text theory are at a disadvantage insofar as B is absent throughout. Appendix 4 on Westcott and Hort shows how these critics reacted to this situation.

Once the theory of a superior text or text group has been exploded, then the possibility exists that the original text has sometimes been preserved in a small group of mss. It follows, therefore, that a broad body of evidence must be collected and as many variants as possible listed. In this study, variants of grammar, syntax, vocabulary, omission and addition, and other textual alterations have been listed. Many variants of a purely orthographical nature have been included and discussed but they are not exhaustive. When a full collation of a ms. has been published, many of its v.11. reveal purely idiosyncratic
spellings (1), and can easily be recognised as such and rejected: only the more significant or interesting orthographical variants are discussed here.

The same is true of punctuation. The oldest mss. probably did not have a developed system of punctuation and discussion of these problems is so often purely exegetical in character. A few v.1l. of this nature are, however, included, but such discussion concerns the editor of a printed edition more than the textual critic trying to establish the original words of an author. The majority of the punctuation variants have been culled from Nestlé's 25th edition but the American Bible Society's N. T. lists variants of this sort in its footnotes (2).

The majority of the Greek variants have been gathered from the printed editions and collations listed in the relevant section of the Bibliography. The resources of the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung at Münster were made available and yielded valuable and hitherto unpublished textual evidence. But it must be realised that many of the Greek v.ll. discussed in this study are cited by only von Soden. The reliability of some of this scholar's readings and evidence has often been doubted, but, in the absence of a printed

(1) See for example the wild orthography in the papyri published by K. Treu in 'Archiv für Papyrforschung' Vol. 18, 1966.
(2) See also the introduction to this edition, p. XXIV following.
edition of the Pastorals with so full an apparatus as he provides, all his variants have been included here, even though later critical examination of von Soden's readings and/or attestation may prove them inaccurate from time to time.

Much of the versional evidence has come from the editions cited in the Bibliography, but the majority of the Latin Patristic variants have been taken from the files of the Vetus Latina Institut at Beuron. Until the Centre d'Analyse et de Documentation Patristique in the Protestant theology faculty at Strasbourg has been developed (1), the readings of the Greek Fathers have been taken from the printed editions of the N. T., but occasionally from editions of individual Fathers, as shown in the Bibliography. Where Fathers have been cited in support of a variant, it must be remembered of course that that Father does not necessarily use the same words every time he quotes the particular verse. The convention of fractions has not been adopted in my apparatus.

The apparatus to this study can of course be expanded as more and more mss. are collated and published, and many new v.l.l. will be discovered too. As far as the N. T. is concerned there are many more mss. extant today, than at the time of W. H. Aland's

Handlist (1) states that there are now 75 Papyri, over 200 uncials, nearly 3,000 cursives and about 2,000 lectionaries. The majority have not been collated or examined (2), and until an organisation such as that at Münster is able to make available more and more evidence, we must content ourselves with the readings now known. For this reason, readings which are said to be authentic in this study but which have meagre support must not be rejected as impossible readings on these grounds alone (See Appendix 6). As ever more readings are made known out of previously unread mss., attestation once meagre may become strong because of increased support.

Two papyri (1), about 24 uncials (2) and over 500 cursives read part or the whole of the Pastorals. The majority of the cursives have never been collated, and because of this only about 150 are cited in the following apparatus, and in some cases very infrequently. Uncials and papyri have been cited as fully as possible. P 32 is extant only at Tit. 1:11 - 15, 2:3 - 8 and P.61 is extant only at Tit. 3:1 - 5, 8 - 11, 14 - 15. Treu (3) knows papyri which include 1 Tim. 1:14 - 7, 15 - 16.


(1) P.32. P. 61.

(2) \text{SAC WD(e) FGH} 04,8, 075, 088, 041, 050, 0240, 0241 and 0151. 075. 0142 and 056 (commentaries). See Aland's 'Kurzgefasste Liste'.

(3) op. cit.
Uncials which are fragmentary in the Pastorals are as follows:

H (1 Tim. 1:7 - 2:13, 3:7 - 13, 6:9 - 13, 2 Tim. 2:1 - 9,
   Titus 1:1 - 3, 15 - 2:5, 3:13 - 15, and also (1)
   1 Tim. 1:14 - 7, 2:14 - 3:2, 2 Tim. 1:17 - 2:1).

I (Fragmented)

048 (1 Tim. 5:6 - 6:15, 2 Tim. 1:1 - 2:25, Tit. 3:13 - 15.)
088 (Tit. 1:1 - 13).
0205 (Tit. 2:15 - 3:7, 2:11 - 3:15 in Coptic).
0240 (Tit. 1:4 - 6, 7 - 9).
0241 (1 Tim. 3:16 - 4:3).

The majority of peculiar versional readings found only in
that version have generally been ignored, especially when the variant obviously does not reflect a Greek reading behind it.

Appendix 7 shows how various mss. deemed "important" or "neutral" or "significant" by textual critics have behaved. These mss. can be seen afresh having been subjected to an eclectic criticism, and a new evaluation of their distinctive readings can be made. Similarly, the results of an eclectic textual study of the variants in these three epistles have been added (Appendix 6), so that the new text derived from criteria other than those adopted by say W. & H. and von Soden can be studied.

(1) Additions in the contents of H known to Aland's list are from J. A. Robinson: "Puthaliana" in Texts and Studies (1895) Vol. 111 No. 3.
Because so many variants concern the divine names, and the omission or addition of \( \omega \alpha \) and \( \delta \), these problems have been grouped together and discussed in appendices. Where other variants are best discussed together, this has been done, and for this reason some variants are not in strict verse order. In each of these instances, a cross reference \textit{ad loc.} indicates where that reading and the discussion on it may be found. All variants are thus mentioned in their order of appearance in the Greek text.
DISCUSSION OF VARIANTS.

1. TIMOTHY.

1:1 τοῦ Χριστοῦ v.l. χριστοῦ του.

Discussed in Appendix One (i) b.

1:1 ἔπαγγελμα - ἔπαγγελμα S.

ἔπαγγελμα is found in the N.T. at 1 Cor. 7:6, 25, 2 Cor. 8:8, and in the Pastorals at Tit. 2:15. The phrase κατ᾽ ἔπαγγελμα as here, also occurs at Tit. 1:3 and in Rom. 16:26. The phrase is found in the LXX of Esther 1:18 in the sense of a 'royal command', and in the LXX of Daniel 3:16. It may have been objected to as a non-Attic word. The Attic equivalent is ἔπαγγελμα.

ἔπαγγελμα is frequent in the N.T. in the sense 'promise'. It is frequent in Classical authors (Plato, Demosthenes) and in the LXX (1 Es. 1:7, 4:7, Ps. 55(56):8. Amos 9:6, 1 Macc. 10:15, 4 Macc. 12:9). κατ᾽ ἔπαγγελμα occurs in the N.T. at Gal. 3:29, 2 Tim. 1:1.

Read ἔπαγγελμα. The reading of S occurred possibly through assimilation to 2 Tim. 1:1 or because the scribe preferred an Attic to a non-Attic word.
cf. v.1 omitting ΘΥ in a similar context at Titus 2:10.

ΘΥ is always qualified in the Pastorals (1 Tim. 2:3, Tit. 1:3 3:4 etc.) but not in the rest of the N.T., where it occurs only 9 times.

The opening sentences are balanced in the Pastorals. ΘΥ here is parallel to ΘΥ ΘΥ following. The omission is probably a sheer error. Anarthrous ΘΥ after anarthrous noun is typical of the author's usage (of 1 Tim. 3:5, 3:15, 4:4 etc.).
The balance of the opening sentences demands both the article and the order of the majority. cf. θυ του του θυτηρους τας οικονομες ημων following. This conforms with Pastoral usage at Tit. 1:4 3:6.
(cf order του θυ τηρων in Appendix I).

Bl-Deb. § 268 states that appositives with anarthrous θυ can dispense with the article in solemn contexts and cites this verse in support. Turner (p. 206) states that in formal wording as in the opening of an epistle, θυ and ΚΟ appear without the article followed by an anarthrous appositional phrase as at Phil 3:20 Rom. 1:7. The views of both of these scholars are disproved by Pastoral style and usage.

The order of 436, 256, etc. may have been motivated by an attempt to conform to the frequent occurrences in the Pastorals of appositional phrases before the noun as at 1 Tim. 2:3 2 Tim 1:10 Tit. 1:3, 2:10, 2:3, 3:4.
The variant πατρός could easily have been written for εὐαγγελίζω especially if the abbreviated forms were used GTC and τΓPC: and especially as πατρός occurs in the next verse. πατρός could also be the result of assimilation to 2 Tim. 1:2 and Tit. 1:4.

εὐαγγελίζω is used of God in this phrase at Tit. 1:3, 2:10, 3:6.

The opening sentences here are balanced and liturgical: here εὐαγγελίζω ἐγώ balances έλεημόν ἐγώ The addition of πατρός spoils this balance and looks like conflation, or the expansion of a liturgical formula.

Ignore variants.

1:1 καὶ πατρός καὶ as a v.l. is discussed in Appendix II.

1:1 ΚΧ ΚΣ v.l. ΚΧ ΚΣ ΚΧ is discussed in Appendix I(1)b.
1.2 Add \( \tau \eta \) before \( \varepsilon \upsilon \) - 489.

It is characteristic of the author to recapitulate by means of the definite article (cf 2 Tim 1:1 2:1 2:10 3:13) but here different criteria operate, especially as \( \tau \eta \) is senseless in the context. It can refer only to \( \tau \eta \varepsilon \lambda \tau \eta \delta \varepsilon \\) but to recapitulate after an interval is not the author's characteristic. Ignore the variant.

The following v.11 are to be considered in conjunction with the above.

1:14 Omit \( \tau \eta \varepsilon \upsilon \) - E. 5.

of 2 Tim 3:15 where a v.1 omits \( \tau \eta \varepsilon \upsilon \) but where the longer reading is presumed original on the basis of author's usage. The omission here would be untypical of Pastoral usage also.

1:11 Add \( \tau \eta \) before \( \kappa\alpha\tau \nu \lambda \varepsilon \) - L, H 263

(quae) L (vg)(vt d.f.g.) Arm.

Basil

Lucifer
If it is agreed that the recapitulation of the article as at 2 Tim 1:1 2:1 2:10 3:13 etc. is a characteristic of the author, especially before a preposition, it is reasonable to assume that τι here is original, and was omitted by scribes, who disliked this feature.

1:14 Omit της - 1908, 489.

The addition of της here conforms to the author's usage discussed above. The omission in this instance can be ascribed to the influence of "om.

2 TIMOTHY.

1:13 Omit τη - 2344.

The same rule of usage applies here as above. The omission was caused by "om.
1:2 ἀντρός - S A D FG
1739.33 and some other mins.
Origen.
Prim.

ἀντρός ἡμῶν - S DK L PH Ψ
T.R. 69 1908 etc. etc.
ণ. Eth. Copt (sah).
Ambst.
Chrys. Theod.

ἡμῶν is probably original. It balances ἀντρός ἡμῶν in v.1. ἀντρός and possessive occurs at Mt. 6:4 Lk 6:36 Rom. 1:7 etc. The possessive was omitted here on stylistic grounds: ἡμῶν occurs 4 times in verses 1 and 2.
1:2 \overline{\textit{KU}} - \\
\overline{\textit{KU}} - 1836

(for v.l. \overline{\textit{KU}} \overline{\textit{IU}} \overline{\textit{IU}} see Appendix I(iii)b).

This v.l. probably represents a second stage in the above reading. The exemplar to 1836 probably read \overline{\textit{KU}} \overline{\textit{IU}} \overline{\textit{IU}} \overline{\textit{IU}} and omitted \overline{\textit{IU}} accidentally through hom. \overline{\textit{KU}} \overline{\textit{IU}} is not a combination in the Pastorals.
The reading \( ησ\) εκπετούσ \( η\) πωπ \( \) is probably due to assimilation to v.l. In the opening sentences of the epistles, the author carefully balances his sentences, and it is uncharacteristic of Pastoral style to read a phrase such as \( ησ\) εκπετούσ \( η\) πωπ \( \) twice in an opening formula.

The usage of \( Κ\) here abides by Pastoral style. (cf 1 Tim, 1:2 6:3 6:14). See Appendix I on \( Κ\) in Apposition (iii)c.

The omission of the phrase is accidental and may have been caused through the omission of one line of the exemplar.
1:3 Omit κλόως - $ (vg).

Ephraim.

Probably this is a versional variant due to the recasting of the sentence for translation. If the v.l rests on a Greek ms., that ms. was influenced by Atticism, because Phrynichus CCCXCVII condemned κλόως.

This is the only occurrence of κλόως in the Pastorals. Ewald says that the anacolouthon in this sentence is possibly the result of rhetoric. Translators would find this awkward and therefore omit.

(i) P. Ewald: 'Probabilia betreffend den Text. des ersten Timotheusbriefes' in the Festschrift for Luitpold of Bavaria (1901).
occurs at Mt. 15:32 Mk. 8:2
Acts 11:23 (no v.l) and at Acts
13:43 18:18 (v.l. ἡμαρτ.

occurs elsewhere only at Acts 1:4 (no v.l).
Both words are synonymous in the context.

The v.l. by D² here probably represents the quirk of that scribe. The reading ΠΡΟΣΔΕΝΩ is to be preferred as it is a Pastoral word and is found at 1 Tim 5:5 (no v.l) ΠΕΡΙΜΕΝΩ is not found in the Pastorals.
The main vb. occurs after ζυγ, so it is to be presumed that the spelling of IP represents an alternative spelling of the subjunctive. In such v.11 it is difficult to determine the original spelling, but from collations known there is no v.1 for ζτιον λεγεισ at 1 Tim 5:1 and so the spelling of this subjunctive ending is to be followed here. The reading παραγγελλης is also an archographical error. After a main verb in the aorist, the aorist subj. gives the required futurist sense as at 1 Tim 1:16 1:18 1:20.

The following variants are to be considered here: -

2:2 Σιλαχμεν -
Σιλαχμεν - F* IP (F* reads -ομην)

It may be assumed that Σιλαχμεν does not represent an indicative ending but an alternative spelling of the subjunctive, although one which does not reflect the spelling of the subjunctive at 1 Tim 1:20, 6:9 (no v.11) (with omega).
As all the other verbs in this poem are indicative, it seems likely that the apparent subjunctive of FG is an example of carelessness by those scribes in omitting the augment.

6:1 θλασφημεται
θλασφημεναι - ΚΙ (G - ετος)
33. 1908. 102. 103. 1518.
2400. 206. 1799. 2412.

Howard (p. 71) shows that there is much variation in mss. between ζε and γ

In the Pastorals ζε (γη) is followed by the subjunctive mood. That the author spelt the subjunctive with γ may be seen at 1 Tim 5:1 5:2. Read θλασφημεται.
The verb is rare in the L + S examples.

The verb is frequent but occurs in the Pastorals only once (2 Tim. 1:17). The meaning of \( \gamma\eta \pi\eta\varepsilon\iota\varsigma \) is more suitable in the context, than \( \varepsilon\nu\lambda\gamma\eta\pi\varepsilon\iota\varsigma\) (research). \( \gamma\eta \pi\eta\varepsilon\iota\varsigma \) is part of the author's vocabulary, and bears the same meaning as at 1 Tim. 6:4.

On the other hand, it was a tendency for scribes to reduce compound words to simple, and there are many examples of this in the Pastorals. In this instance Dom could have assisted in the reduction:

\[ \lambda\varepsilon \tau\iota\nu \varepsilon\zeta \varepsilon \kappa \]
ταπείχεος εν μάλλον
μάλλον ταπείχεος ἑ 1908.
Arm.
Iren. Epiph.
Hil. Amb. Ang.

μάλλον ἡ stand together at 2 Tim. 3:4 and at
verbs appear are μάλλον and ἡ separated (cf
Acts 27:11, Jn. 3:19 where two contrasts are
juxtaposed). But see Acts 20:34 and variants which place
μάλλον and ἡ together.

Read ταπείχεος εν μάλλον.

οἰκοδομίαν - D

625 Iren.

οἰκοδομήν - D½

3 (vg. Hl (mg )). Goth. Iren-(lat.) Epiph.

L - 'aedificationem' supports οἰκοδομήν or οἰκοδομίαν

The commentaries of Bernard and Lock favour οἰκονομίαν. It is a word used at Col. 1:25. Eph 1:10, 3:2. 1 Cor. 9:17 (no v.11). Also at Eph. 3:9 (v.1 οἰκονομία) and 1 Pet. 4:10 (no v.1). The idea of God as the οἰκονομός occurs at Titus 1:7, and the church as his οἶκος occurs at 1 Tim. 3:15. It occurs in the LXX, and the word is also used by Attic authors since Xenophon. οἰκοδομία is rare in L & S. and does not occur in the N.T. It is found in Polyb. Jos and Plato.
οἰκοδομη occurs in the N.T. and LXX. It is equivalent to the Classical οἰκοδομης. Bauer says that the word was objected to by Atticists. Phrynichus CCCXCVI denounces it: οἰκοδομη ὑπ' ἑγεταί ἀντὶ λύτου δε οἰκοδομης.

Read οἰκοδομη which was objected to by Atticist scribes. It is a word found in some Attic authors (see Schmid: Atticismus III p. 248). οἰκοδομιας has little claim to originality. οἰκονομιας was probably added by scribes who objected to οἰκοδομη and substituted for it a Pastoral idea.

1:4 v.l. omitting ἤς ὢν is discussed at 1 Tim 1:2 (under the v.l. adding ἤ).
1:5 Add \( \eta \) before \( \alpha \gamma \delta \tau \tau \eta \) - 462

\( \alpha \gamma \delta \tau \tau \eta \) is anarthrous at Eph. 6:23. Jn. 13:35, Rom. 5:8. 1 Cor. 13:1 - 3 etc.

It is arthrous at Mt. 24:12. Lk. 11:42. Jn. 5:42. Rom. 5:5. 8:35. 12:8. etc. In such instances it is usually qualified. In the Pastorals \( \alpha \gamma \delta \tau \tau \eta \) is anarthrous at 1 Tim. 6:11.

It is possible that the article was added in an attempt to make the noun more definite, i.e. The love (of God).
Howard p. 72 shows that $c$ and $\eta$ are frequently interchanged. L & S. know only სუნდერის. The spelling of 1799 is the result of carelessness or is a scribal whim.
1:5 1739.  

The sentence matches 3 nouns and 3 adjectives. It is possible that the omission here was facilitated by Dom (Sigma at the end of $\varepsilon\upsilon\nu\varepsilon\iota\delta\eta\varsigma$ and the sigma at the end of $\gamma\alpha\delta\eta\varsigma$) or because scribes thought that the noun was qualified by $\varepsilon\upsilon\nu\varepsilon\iota\delta\eta\varsigma$. $\varepsilon\upsilon\nu\varepsilon\iota\delta\eta\varsigma$ is usually qualified in the N.T. (cf. Acts 23:1, 1 Cor. 8:12, 1 Pet. 3:16, 3:21) and in the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 3:9, 2 Tim. 1:3.
The sense requires these verbs to complete the construction. Accidental omission by one version.

Omit \( \mu \eta \tau \varepsilon \) (pr.) – Eth. 1845.

\( \mu \eta \tau \varepsilon \) construction occurs in the N.T. (cf. Mt. 5:34) but this long formula may have appeared as tautology to scribes, who would reduce it to \( \mu \eta \) – \( \mu \eta \tau \varepsilon \). The longer reading is more likely to be original.
1:7  \( \text{Ti\\nu\\nu} \) -  \\
\( \text{Ti\\nu\\o\\s} \) - P.  \\
\( \& (vg) \).

P and others write \( \zeta \) in v. 7a. The plural \( \text{Ti\\nu\\w} \) is probably correct here too.

The following v.l. is considered here.

2 TIMOTHY.

3:14  \( \text{Ti\\nu\\w} \) - SAC* F G P.  \\
33. 1739. 1022. 1912  \\
L(vt. d g) \( \& (pal) \).  \\
Pel. Hil. Ambst. Mart. I.  \\
\( \text{Ti\\nu\\o\\s} \) - C'D K L  \\
T.\&. and most minuscules.  \\
L (vg) \( \& (hl. vg) \) Arm. Goth. Eth.  \\
Chrys.  \\
Aug. Hil. Theod-Mops (lat.) etc.

Here different conditions exist but \( \text{Ti\\nu\\w} \) is probably original. The author is thinking of Timothy's Christian mentors since his childhood, and in particular Lois and Eunice. \( \text{Ti\\nu\\w} \) was altered to the singular because some scribes were under the impression that the reference was to the apostle (cf. 2 Tim. 3:10 - 11). Possibly the v.l. \( \text{Ti\\nu\\o\\s} \) represents
an exaltation of Paul and his teaching and may be compared to those v.11 where 'Jesus' replaces the Markan original 'Jesus and his disciples.' (This is pointed out by C. H. Turner on Markan Usage: JTS XXVI p. 225f. ).

The variant probably arose during a period, when it was essential to stress an undivided and direct line of teaching, an idea spoilt if the impression were promulgated that much early Christians as Timothy had more than one mentor. There is no reason to presume ΤΩΝΩΣ is an oblique reference to God.

Read ΤΩΝΩΣ.
Following λέγουσιν, διαβαλοῦνται is obviously correct. D corr. mistakenly strike out 'V'
1:8 1799 adds \( \text{TEKNOV ΠΡΟΔΕΞ} \) at 1 Tim. 1:8, 1:5, 3:3, 2:1 3:1, 4:4, 4:9, 5:1, 5:11, 5:22, 6:11, 6:17, 4:40 adds \( \text{TEKNOV ΠΡΟΔΕΞ} \) at the beginning of 1 Tim. 2:1, 3:1.


69 adds \( \text{TEKNOV ΠΡΟΔΕΞ} \) at 2 Tim. 3:10, 4:5, 4:40 adds \( \text{TEKNOV ΠΡΟΔΕΞ} \) at 2 Tim. 2:1, 3:1, 4:9, 1799 adds \( \text{TEKNOV ΤΙΤΞ} \) at Titus 1:5, 1:15, 2:11, 3:8.

 Whereas under different circumstances, one may be tempted to argue for the originality of the longer reading, and explain the shorter text as a reduction of personal detail and address at a time, when the epistles were read liturgically, these v.11 are obviously the quirks of three mss. 1799 has added the names arbitrarily throughout the epistles to stress the personal nature of the correspondence. This vocative is not characteristic of the author.

The addition by 69 at 2 Tim. 4:5 seems to be explanatory, in order to clarify \( ΣΥ \). Perhaps the same is true at 2 Tim. 3:10.

v.1. omitting \( \deltaΣ \) in this verse is discussed in Appendix III.
1:8 ἀντων -

κονον - P

1149

L (vg. BCH Θ KNO P T U Z) (vt. d.).

Aug. & Cypr.

Theod.

The following variant is also considered here:-

1 TIMOTHY.

5:23 δοντι δολιγω -

οινον δολιγον - P

1311

Xραομα\ + DAT. rei occurs in Acts 27:17 (v.l. + ACC).

1 Cor. 9:12, 9:15, (no v.11).

Xραομα\ + ACC. rei is not Attic according to L + S.

This occurs at 1 Cor. 7:31 (v.l. + DAT.). Read accusative
in both variants above. The datives are Atticists' corrections.

A v.l. by 1022 omitting δολιγω at 1 Tim. 5:23 is to be
ignored. Xραομα\ requires an object. Careless omission.
The I.C.C. on Matthew shows in the introduction how Mt. alters many Markan imperfects to aorists in the indicative mood. In the subjunctive and other moods, the tendency was to alter present tenses to aorists.

The present aktionsart implies a recurring hypothesis (cf. 1 Tim. 3:15) and this is appropriate here.

\[ \varepsilon \alpha \upsilon \] + pres. subj occurs at Rom. 14:8, Gal. 1:8, 1 Tim. 3:15, 2 Tim. 2:5, (no v.11) and at 1 Cor. 14:16 (v.1 aorist subj). \[ \varepsilon \alpha \upsilon \] + aor. subj. occurs at 1 Tim. 2:15 (see below), 2 Tim. 2:5, 2:21.

The following 2 variants are considered here:-

1 TIMOTHT.

1:18 \( \sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau \epsilon \upsilon \nu \) - S² A D² F G L K P.

T.R. and minuscules.

Chrys. Theod.

\( \sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau \epsilon \upsilon \nu \) - S² D² Ψ

Clem. - Alex.

W.H. print \( \sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau \epsilon \upsilon \nu \) in their margin.


\[\text{\varkappa} + \text{pres. subj. occurs in the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 2:2, 4:15, 5:7, 5:20, 6:1. \ } \text{\varkappa} + \text{aor. subj. occurs in the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 1:16, 1:20, 3:6, 3:7, 3:15, 5:16. The aorist subjunctive after \text{\varkappa} tends to bear a future meaning. The present, however, is probably original here after \text{\varkappa} and it was altered to the aorist to convey a future idea rather than a present possibility or desideratum.}

1 TIMOTHY.

2:15 \[\text{\varkappa} \text{\varkappa} \text{\varkappa} - \text{\varkappa} \text{\varkappa} \text{\varkappa} \text{\varkappa} \text{\varkappa} - \text{Theodoret.}

\text{(Not in D\textsuperscript{\textregistered} - error by Tregelles).}

Here, it must be borne in mind, that \text{\varkappa} could have caused the variant in either direction. Turner, p. 114 says that the aorist after \text{\varkappa} has the force "one event in the future anterior to the main verb" as at Mt. 4:9. This is the sense required here, because the verb \text{\varkappa} is not interpreted in an iterative sense. Read aorist subjunctive.
1:9 Omit \textit{τοῦτο} - 24.1.

\textit{οἶδα ὅτι} + \textit{δὲ ὁ} occurs at 1 Tim. 1:8,
2 Pet. 1:14 without \textit{τοῦτο}, but 2 Tim. 1:15, 2:23,
Tit. 3:11, Phil. 21, 1 Cor. 8:1, 8:4 etc. all have the
demonstrative.

Bl-Deb § 290:3 says that \textit{τοῦτο} prepares for a
subordinate clause dependent on \textit{δὲ ὁ}, \textit{ἐν τῷ ἑαυτῷ} etc.
This is characteristic of N.T. and Pastoral style. The
omission by 24.1 of \textit{τοῦτο} is probably accidental,
facilitated by hom.

\[\epsilonἰδω \text{ ἐν τῷ τοῦτο} \text{ ὑπό τι \textit{τοῦ}}\]
An example of dittography: 'v' from the next word \textit{vopos} has been repeated. Not all such \textit{v.\textonequarter l} are reported in the apparati of Greek editions, but full collations of mss. reveal many such errors. A few such variants occur in this study, but most are obvious and need no discussion.
1:9 Add ἀλλ' before ἄντικοις - FG

L (vt g).

An interpretative addition by FG g being an attempt to strengthen a weak adversative. It is uncharacteristic of the author to write 'ἀλλ' and ἐκ in the same clause.
solitarum is frequent in Acts but rare in the rest of the N.T. where it occurs at Mt. 28:12, Jn. 4:42, 6:18, Rom. 7:7, 1 Cor. 4:21, 2 Cor. 10:8, Eph. 3:19, Heb. 1:3, 6:5, 9:1, 12:2, Jude 6, Lk. 24:20, many with v.l. Many of the occurrences in Acts have v.l. Many of the occurrences in Acts have v.l. Many of the occurrences in Acts have v.l. 

is frequent in Attic Greek, and in the neo Attic stylists like Aelian and Philostratus II (see Schmid: Atticismus III page 343, and IV p. 559). There is no firm example of in the Pastorals. The firm examples in the N.T. are only found in the higher strata of Koine as in 'Hebrews' and 'Acts'.

here is an Attic correction. Read . Read also in the following v.l. and for the same reasons.

1 TIMOTHY.
2:12 -

1 TIMOTHY.
6:11 -

The v.l. adding before is discussed in Appendix II.
As often happens in a list, some mss. omit one or more elements accidentally (cf 1 Tim. 6:11) especially if, as here, καί was in the examples, and the scribes' eye went from one καί to the next omitting the intervening text. If the omission here was not accidental, it may have been because these fathers thought the list was complete and comprehensive.
As far as this study is concerned this is the most striking example of dittography listed.

The v.1 adding Ἄρα before ἄνοιγμα is discussed in Appendix II.
1:9 πατρό - μητρό - S A D F G L H.

33. 69. 263. etc.

Basil. Euthal.

πατρό - μητρό - P.

πατρό - μητρό - K.


216. 35* 2005. 1518. 255.

K* Group in von Soden.

λως - λως - S A D F G L P

33 and most minuscules.

Basil. Euthal.

λως - λως - Dc

69. 1908* 1739.

λως - λως - K (and H according to von Soden)

328. 1908. 436. 263. 226.

547. 255. 330. 242. 204. 2.

440. 216. 35* 2005. 1518.

K* Group in von Soden.

Epiph. Dam. Theod, Chrys.

The consciousness of the origin of the word has been weakened (i.e. πατρό + λως) and the analogy of other πατρό compounds has prevailed (such as πατροκτόνος, πατρονομός, πατροσβούλος etc.).

Cf. Mt. 6:7 θανατο - v.l θανατο - Here Radermacher in his Neutestamentliche Grammatik 2nd edition, p. 37, is correct, when he says 'Volksetymologische Anlehnung an
Radermacher also on p. 37 thinks that the ending - λος is the correct one.

Bauer lists examples of ῥατρολωσὶς spelling since Aesch. and brands it as Attic, and may make us hesitate in accepting Radermacher at this point.

The spelling -ωςίς should perhaps be accepted as original here. Blass-Deb § 26 doubts if ω would have had an iota subscript in the first century, but ω does occur for ο in Hellenistic literature.

The reading of K is the result of sheer carelessness. The reading of P is due to confusion with the omega following, or is a purely orthographical change of ο and ω.
This is an obvious instance of omission through homoeoteleuton:

1836 retains καί, and represents a second stage in the corruption, namely that καί was added to link τὸ πατρολογεῖν to ἰνδροφόνος once καί μητρολογεῖν had been omitted. This is also discussed in Appendix II.
Omission from a list is a frequent cause of variant readings (cf 1 Tim. 1:9, 6:11). The error here has been facilitated by ἡμ."
1:10 ἀνδραποδίστασις -

ἀνδραποδίτας - F G

Error by F.G. due to misreading ICT as IT.
1:10 Ἐπιρροκος

Ἐφιρροκος - D* P.

(Same v.l. at Mt. 5:33 in the verb).

Howard p. 314 says that Ἐπιρροκος in Koine appears as Ἐφιρροκος. Crönert in his "Memoria Graeca Herculanensis" p. 153 notes that most but not all his papyri favour Ἐπιρροκος in compounds such as Ἐφιρροκος.

The reading of D* P. should be accepted as original here on the evidence of Phrynichus, who condemns Ἐφιρροκος as un-Attic. Ἐφιρροκος: Ἐφιρροκος 

The reading of the majority of N.T. mss. here is due to Atticistic correction.
1:10 Variant omitting ᾧ is discussed in Appendix II.

1:10 Omit τι - 69.

τι is a word which could easily have been omitted by oversight (cf. v.l. at 1 Tim. 6:7) especially here when ἐκ οἴκῳ could have facilitated the omission: ἐκ τι.
1:10 Omit ἀντικείμενα - A.
       Pel.6

The verb is necessary to the sense. The omission may have
been facilitated by ὅμως especially if the iota of δικαιολογηθοῦν were written adscript in the exemplar of A. ἁπλὰ is a Pastoral word (cf. 1 Tim. 5:14).
1:11 Variant reading adding η before κατα is discussed at 1 Tim. 1:2 (v.1 add η).
1:11 Add Παύλος after ἐγώ - 33.

In the Pastorals, the alleged author's name appears only in the first verse of each letter. The ἐγώ Παύλος formula occurs at 2 Cor. 10:1, Gal. 5:2, Eph. 3:1, Phil. 19, Col. 1:23, 1 Th. 2:18., where there is a special reason for the emphatic statement.

The variant here is probably due to assimilation to the formula in the Pauline letters.
Both linear and punctiliar aspect are possible in the context. The author has had strength given to him, or he is in the continual process of being strengthened.

Scribes had the tendency to alter from the present to the aorist in moods outside the indicative. A second-hand and later report of the incident sees the reception of strength as punctiliar, whereas the author seem it as a linear process. The present is used at Phil 4:13 (no v.l.).

Read the present here too.
Cf. 1 Tim. 4:16 for frequency of S's omissions.

The phrase here echoes Phil. 4:13 .... τὸ ἐνδυνάμωσεν με (no v.l.), but it is unlikely that similarity results from assimilation. The verb ἐνδυνάμωσε needs an object (see above and 2 Tim. 4:17). The tendency of some scribes to reduce pronouns has resulted in this variant.
1:12 Add $\Theta\Omega$ before $\overline{\iota\upsilon\chi\nu}$ - 440. 491.

$\Theta\Omega$ does not occur in apposition to $\iota\upsilon\chi\nu$ although $\kappa\chi$ does. This is an example of a pious expansion of the divine name motivated in this instance either by trinitarian ideas, or at a time when the full divinity of Christ was first being discussed. Despite Tit. 2:13 which is ambiguous, the theology of the Pastorals is not so developed.

It is interesting to note that the addition of $\Theta\Omega$ in 440 caused the divine names to appear in the order $\overline{\iota\upsilon\chi\nu}$ (see Appendix I (i) b.).
1:12 Add ἐν before Χριστῷ — D

L (vg D, H ʕ C S V Z) (vt d dem g).

Arm. Eth.


Luc. Ambst.

Theod-Mops. Chrys.

The comment of Luc. Brug: 'non praeponas praepositionem
in' is not to be heeded.

If ἐν is added ἐνδοβηθείοντι refers to God (of 2 Tim. 2:1, 4:7
and see Eph 6:10) ἐν Χριστῷ ἐν is found at 1 Tim. 1:14, 3:13
2 Tim. 1:1, 1:9, 2:10, 3:12, etc. Without ἐν, Χριστῷ ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν
would be in apposition to ἐνδοβηθείοντι and would be an
uncharacteristically Pastoral use of the dative.

ἐν was omitted on stylistic grounds. Scribes tended to
reduce prepositions, especially ἐν which was overworked in
the N.T. The formula ἐνδοβηθείοντι ἐν may also have
offended stylists.

Variant omitting ἐν is discussed in Appendix I(i) a.
1:12 Add _female after Ṛ. - 255.

Cf. 1:13 where a v.1 adds Ṛ after Ṛ. Ṛ here has probably been introduced from the verse following.
Cf. το or ὁ πλούτος at 2 Cor. 8:2, Phil. 4:19, Col. 1:27, 2:2, where there is often correction from the Hellenistic το πλούτος to the Attic ὁ πλούτος. Possibly a similar correction exists here. The neutar το πρωτερον is Hellenistic and characteristic of N.T. usage, as may be seen in the following examples Jn. 6:62, 9:8, Gal. 4:13 (no. v.11).

v.1. τοτε may possibly be due to a misreading, or be an attempt to avoid το or το πρωτερον by substituting a more common word which conveys the same sense. τοτε is used in a similar context at Tit. 3:3.
1:13 Add τε after ὅντο - ἀψ

81. 442.

Ath.

Cf. v.l. at 1:12 adding ὅντο after τε

τε added here through confusion with the occurrences of τε in the previous verse.
1:13 'ΔΔΔ'
ΔΔΔ - S A D F G K L P.

33. 69. 1908. 223. 2423. 2587.
1902. 1799. 1022. 876. 2401. 2412.

The same variant also occurs at:

1 TIMOTHY.

2:12 'ΔΔΔ'
ΔΔΔ - A.

33.

3:3 'ΔΔΔ'
ΔΔΔ - S A P

2004. 256. 33.

5:23 'ΔΔΔ'
'ΔΔΔ' - Δe K L

T.R.

2 TIMOTHY.

2:9 ΔΔΔ -
ΔΔΔ - F G K L P

T.R. 1175. 1739. 104. 326, etc.

2:24 'ΔΔΔ'
ΔΔΔ - S A D F G

33. 81

'ΔΔΔ' occurs without any known variant at 1 Tim. 2:10
(before 's ') at 1 Tim. 6:17 (before 'π'), and before
vowels at 2 Tim. 1:2, 3:9.
Although problems about breathings did not usually affect scribes until after the 5th century (see Howard, p. 49), the direction of change in all these examples is from 'λλλλ' to 'λλλ'. Atticists would prefer to institute elision wherever possible and to avoid 'λλλλ' where it occurs before a vowel. Howard, p. 61 says that 'λλλλ' usually elides before articles, before prepositions with an initial vowel, and before pronouns.

All variants listed above occur before verbs, nouns or adjectives with the exception of 2 Tim. 2:9, where 'λλλλ' occurs before ς. Here 1 Tim. 2:10 may indicate author's regular usage, but if so it is difficult to decide how the variant 'λλλλ' arose. The variant at 2 Tim. 2:24 depends on the v.ll νπινον and ηππον (q.v. ad loc.).

Compare the variants υςςς and υςςς.

1:13 The variant adding άδά after 'λλλλ' is discussed in Appendix II.
Add συτοτο after ἀλλα - D2

Fel. Aug. (ideo).

συτοτο occurs frequently in the N.T. including 1 Tim. 1:16, 2 Tim. 2:10.

The variant is an attempt to give emphasis to a clause beginning with ἀλλα. τοτο must point forward to the διε clause, but the very presence of this διε clause throws doubt on the originality of συτοτο. At 1 Tim. 1:16, 2 Tim. 2:10, συτοτο anticipates a διε clause.

The addition may have been caused by assimilation to 1 Tim. 1:16, however, ἀλλα συτοτο ἔλεγθην.
The vb. ἵνα is found at Heb. 5:2, Acts, 13:27, 17:23, etc.

Many variants of this type occur in F and in G (cf 1 Tim. 2:6). Here one omits ἴν and the other ἵν. Both variants, which were possibly due to confusion with ἴνα, are to be ignored.
\[ \text{\`\varepsilon\nu} \]

\[ \text{\`\tau\eta} - \text{\D}\n\]

\[ \text{\`\tau\eta} \] represents a stylistic improvement by \text{\D}\n and is an attempt to reduce the incidence of \text{\`\varepsilon\nu}. \] The plain dative however was on its way out of fashion in the Hellenistic period. Blass-Deb. § 187 "The dative was exposed to a greater extent than either the accusative or the genitive to the encroachment of various prepositions especially \`\nu and \`\si on the function of the simple case". This explains the Hellenistic tendency, which our author followed: \text{\D}\n's reading is a later and probably Atticist "correction".
1:14 Variant adding καλ in after ἐστιν is discussed in Appendix II.

1:14 Omit μετὰ... ἐν and invert ἑκάτερον — 1518.

The omission may represent one or two lines of an exemplar. The scribe's eye passed from τάυ ἀκαίρειας to the divine names, which he inverts and alters to τάυ ἀκαίρειας to follow τάυ ἀκαίρειας.

1:14 The variant omitting τῆς is discussed at 1 Tim. 1:2 (v.1 adding τῆς).
1:15 ΠΗΓΑΣ -
καθρυππίνος (humanus) - L (vt r).

Codices known to Jer.
Aug. Fac. Ps-Pel. Ps-Vig.
Ps.-Hyg. Mar.-M.

The following variant is also considered here:

1 TIMOTHY.
3:1 ΠΗΓΑΣ -
καθρυππίνος - D
καθρυππίνος - L (vt d g m mon).

Codices in Jer. Ambst.

καθρυππίνος occurs in LXX. Herodotus, Philo, Josephus, and
in the N.T. at Acts 17:25, Rom. 6:19, 1 Cor. 2:13, 4:3, 10:13
Jas. 3:7, 1 Pet. 2:13 (without v.11).

ΠΗΓΑΣ is frequent in the N.T. with an arthrous noun
as a predicate, it occurs at 1 Cor. 1:9, 10:13, 2 Cor. 1:18,
1 Th. 5:2, 2 Th. 3:3 (no v.11).

Lock in his commentary (i) thinks that the correction from
ΠΗΓΑΣ in 135 is unlikely whereas the assimilation to
ΠΗΓΑΣ in 1 Tim. 4:9, 2 Tim. 2:11, Tit. 3:8 (no v.11)
is very probable. The phrase καθρυππίνος ὁ λόγος
is peculiar to the Pastorals in these variants, and Lock says

(i) In the I.C.C. series. ad loc.
that the meaning 'true to human needs' is probably right and akin to \( \eta \phi Ia\nu\delta p\omega\pi\nu\sigma\tau\alpha \) in Tit. 3:4.

Zahn (2) says that \( \alpha \nu\delta p\omega\pi\nu\sigma\sigma\ ) was the prevalent reading until Jerome but it was changed to \( \tau\iota\varepsilon\tau\iota\sigma\sigma\ ) in uniformity with the other examples of the phrase in the Pastorals.

Swete (3) suggests that the old Latin translators may have read \( \tau\iota\varepsilon\tau\iota\sigma\sigma\ ) as \( \tau\iota\iota\nu\iota\sigma\sigma\ ) i.e. the end of \( \alpha \nu\delta p\omega\pi\nu\sigma\sigma\ )

The phrase does not occur as such in the LXX or in the N.T. (but cf. Rev. 21:5, 22:6) although it is good Greek (\( \tau\iota\varepsilon\tau\iota\sigma\sigma\ ) occurs in Dionysius, Dio Chrysostom and Arrian). Swete also suggests that the translators may have been reminded of Rom. 6:19 'humanum dico'.

The notes on select readings in the New English Bible Greek Text say that at 3:1 \( \alpha \nu\delta p\omega\pi\nu\sigma\sigma\ ) was changed to \( \tau\iota\varepsilon\tau\iota\sigma\sigma\ ) in view of the frequent occurrence of the phrase. They also say that the change in the other direction is less likely.

The author is understood by translators to be quoting a proverbial saying. This suggestion should be accepted not


(3) H.B. Swete 'The faithful Sayings' in J T S XVIII, p. l.f.
only with reference to 1 Tim. 3:1 but also to 1:15 and for the same reasons as Lock and Zahn give. Swete's orthographical suggestion is unlikely.

Another motive for the change is that πιστος is an easier word, than ἀληθινος. It is difficult to see how ἀληθινος arose if πιστος was original. Jerome condemned ἀληθινος as an improbable reading; it is likely that scribes too found the word unacceptable.

Read ἀληθινος on both occasions.

1:15 XC IC v.l. IC XC is discussed in Appendix I (i)b.
1:15 ἐν τον κόσμῳ -
ἐν κόσμῳ - εἰς (vg C G T) (vt g).

Cassiod, Fulg. Aug.
Pel A Aug (omit hονc)

ἐν κόσμῳ - 1518.

Turner p. 175 says that κόσμος is frequently anarthrous especially after prepositions or in prepositional formulae. Blass-Deub. 253 lists such formulae, and includes ἐν κόσμῳ, ἀπό κόσμου. As with ἡ, the article could have the force "one world as opposed to another". Despite this, however, N.T. usage in general favours arthrous κόσμος after a preposition (see Jn. 1:9, 1:10, 3:17, 3:19, 6:14, 8:23, 8:26, 9:39, 11:27, 12:25, 2 Cor. 1:12, Eph. 2:12 etc), and so too does Pastoral usage (1 Tim. 6:7).

The usual phrase in the N.T. is ἐν τον κόσμῳ not ἐν κόσμῳ Jn. 1:9, 12:46, 16:28, Mk. 16:15, 1 Tim. 6:7). ἐν and ἐν are frequently interchanged (see I.C.C. on Matthew p. XXVII).

Follow Pastoral usage and read ἐν τον κόσμῳ.
The variant by F is purely orthographical. See examples elsewhere of the substitution of 'ο' for 'ὡ' in some mss.

Adv. - Adj. variants exist: elsewhere at Jn. 1:41, 8:7
1 Jn. 4:19 (πρωτός - πρωτος). Adverb 'at first' either of time or order appears frequently in the N.T. (e.g. Mt. 8:21, Rom. 3:2, 1 Cor. 11:1, Mk. 4:28 and 2 Tim. 1:5). The adjectival use occurs at Mt. 20:4, 20:8 Acts 27:43, Rom. 10:19). The context and the preceding statement (ἡ ν πρωτος ἀποκαλεῖ τοι) require πρωτος. This is the only example in the dative (in apposition to ἐν ἄρχω). The variant πρωτόν arose because some scribes were unfamiliar with the construction and thought that 'first' should be an adverb modifying ἐν δὲ μετά τοι. This confusion may have led some mss. to omit 'first'.

The omission of πας is a frequent variant and may be ignored. πας is only found in Luke-Acts with any degree of frequency. Outside this corpus, most examples have v.l πας. Even within Luke this v.l exists (cf. 4:140, 7:16, 9:15, 15:13, 17:29, 21:4). πας seems to be the normal form for the N.T. authors. The v.l απασαυε is stylistic and represents a correction from less literary koine to more literary. That the author of the Pastorals wrote πας after a consonant may be seen at 1 Tim. 2:1.

Read πασαυε.
Add \( \lambda \tau \omega \) before \( \rho \alpha \nu \rho \delta \upsilon \mu \) - 1908.

Turner p. 38 says that unemphatic enclitic pronouns were attached to nouns "with a liberality and casualness which offend classical taste". This was felt by scribes who removed \( \lambda \tau \omega \) here (or added it before the noun, as 1908 did).

\( \rho \alpha \nu \rho \delta \upsilon \mu \) occurs without a possessive at Gal. 5:22, 2 Cor. 6:6, Eph. 4:2, 2 Tim. 3:10, 4:2 (no v.11) but the sense here apparently requires \( \lambda \tau \omega \).

Although the Pastoral epistles are sparing in their use of possessives, scribes tended to reduce not add possessives. Apart from purely stylistic reasons, scribes may have removed \( \lambda \tau \omega \) on theological grounds, lest \( \rho \alpha \nu \rho \delta \upsilon \mu \) be thought to refer to Christ. With the exception of the developed theology in 2 Pet. 3:15, \( \rho \alpha \nu \rho \delta \upsilon \mu \) in the N.T. always refers to God's forbearance. (Rom. 2:4, 9:22, 1 Pet. 3:20).
Add \( \gamma \alpha \sigma \theta \varepsilon \omega \nu \) after \( \rho \varepsilon \chi \lambda \lambda \omicron \nu \tau \omega \nu \). Usually this ms. tends to omit. However \( \rho \varepsilon \chi \lambda \lambda \omicron \nu \tau \omega \nu \) here is linked to \( \omicron \tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \nu \varepsilon \omicron \nu \varepsilon \nu \pi \nu \alpha \omicron \tau \omicron \nu \), and \( \gamma \alpha \sigma \theta \varepsilon \omega \nu \) has been introduced from Heb. 9:11.
This variant represents a stylistic omission: διώτευσιν appears four times in vv 16 - 17. This title appears elsewhere in the N.T. in Rev. 15:3.

The variant is also an attempt to put the appositional phrases (ἐφάπαξ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ etc.), closer to βασιλέα ἡσυχίᾳ.
\(\gamma\delta\alpha\rho\tau\nu\gamma\ -\ \gamma\delta\alpha\nu\alpha\tau\nu\ -\ D^x\)

\(L\ (\text{vg})\ (vt\ r)\ \text{Goth. Eth. \& (hl.(mg.)).}\)


Add \(\gamma\delta\alpha\nu\alpha\tau\nu\\) after \(\lambda\rho\alpha\tau\nu\\) - F G

Add \(\gamma\delta\alpha\rho\tau\nu\\) after \(\lambda\rho\alpha\tau\nu\\) - L (vt r. mon).

Aug.

\(\gamma\delta\alpha\rho\tau\nu\) occurs in the LXX only at Wis. 12:1, 18:4. In the N.T. it refers to God at Rom. 1:23, and in the disputed ending of Mk. 16. It is a regular epithet of the deity in Philo (e.g. \(\nu\omega\delta\ \text{deus immut. 6}\)) and other writers. It is not a frequent word in \(L + S\)'s examples. It is found in Arist. Dion. Philo, and is used of the Christian community by Hippolytus. The Lexicon of Patristic Greek cites examples by Justin and Greg-Nyssa.

\(\gamma\delta\alpha\nu\alpha\tau\nu\) is very frequent in Patristic Greek. It is also found in the Sibylline oracles and Dion (used of God).

\(\gamma\delta\alpha\nu\alpha\nu\) occurs in I Tim. 6:16. The adjective occurs in Wisdom literature and in 4 Macc. but is not found without variant in the N.T. (see Jn. 1:18 apparatus criticus). It is frequent in \(L + S\)'s examples. The word presupposes a more developed theology.
is probably original here. It was felt to be an obvious quality of the deity, and scribes therefore thought it was unnecessary to mention it. It is a N.T. epithet of God whereas there is no firm example of \( \lambda \theta \alpha \nu \alpha \tau \alpha \varsigma \) Patristic evidence shows that \( \lambda \theta \alpha \nu \alpha \tau \alpha \varsigma \) gained popularity. It was then substituted for \( \lambda \theta \alpha \nu \alpha \tau \alpha \varsigma \). It is unlikely that F G and Ang are correct in having both adjectives. Doxologies in the rest of the Pastorals are fairly modest (cf. 1 Tim. 6:16, 2 Tim. 4:18). Scribes tended to add to these liturgical formulae. Four or five adjectives before \( \Theta \omega \) here would be very exceptional in Pastoral style. The additions are conflate readings. F G \( \gamma \eta \) Ang. knew mss. which read \( \lambda \delta \alpha \rho \alpha \tau \omega \) and other mss. which read \( \lambda \theta \alpha \nu \alpha \tau \alpha \varsigma \).
The longer reading could easily have been shortened through omission by Ῥωμ.

This formula exists with a similar variant at Jude 25, and at Ῥωμ. 16:27 (the disputed ending) it occurs again but without a variant omitting ΕΠΩ. It is significant that Latin witnesses omit this disputed ending, and also read the shorter text here. This may make us hesitate before accepting the longer reading: it could be an expanded liturgical formula, possibly due to assimilation to Ῥωμ. 16:27. Appendix 6 notes this variant as uncertain.

The variant omitting ΚΑ in this verse is discussed in Appendix II.
1:18 The discussion of ἡ ἡ ἐφανέρωσεν after ἡ ἐφανέρωσεν is found in Appendix III.

1:18 Παραγγέλλων — Παραγγέλλων - F G.

Παραγγέλλω in the N.T. occurs at Acts 5:28, 16:24, 1 Th. 4:2 and at 1 Tim. 1:5 (no v.11). Παραγγέλλω does not occur in the N.T. although the verb is frequent in the Gospels and Acts, often with v.1 ἀγγ.—

Παραγγέλλω (summons, order) is more appropriate in the context than Παραγγέλλω (used of a report, description, recital).

F G may have wished to avoid two consecutive words beginning with the same prefix, and altered Παραγγέλλω. Author’s usage suggests he compounded Παραγγέλλω with Παράφκαι. Read Παραγγέλλω.
Moulton in his Prolegomena, p. 158 reminds us that in general, Hellenistic Greek preserved the distinction between active and middle, but that some examples of the unclassical substitution of active for middle and vice versa are found.

The middle here means 'to commit' as at 2 Tim. 2:2. The active 'to set before' is used metaphorically of teaching at Mt. 13:24, 13:31 etc.

Here the middle is expected. The variant \( \text{παρατιθημένοι} \) is possibly orthographical error.
1:18 \(\text{ος} \) - 440.

and

1 TIMOTHY.

1:18 \(\text{ος} \) - 69.

The proximity of \(\text{ος} \) to \(\text{ος} \) and \(\text{ος} \) to \(\text{ος} \) has caused scribes of 440 and 69 respectively to confuse these pronouns. \(\text{πρατέως, ἔφη} \) is usually followed by the accusative \(\text{rei} \) and the dative of the person. The accusative is frequently used in the N.T. of blessings, etc. coming upon a person (cf. Mt. 10:13, 12:28, Acts 2:12 Jn. 18:4 etc.).

1:18 The variants \(\text{πρατέω} \) and \(\text{πρατέως} \), which occur between the above v.11 are discussed at 1 Tim. 1:8 (v.1. \(\text{χαρᾶ} \))
\text{\textit{\textbf{1:18 \textit{\textbf{πρ}}\textit{οδυώ + ε\textit{\textbf{τ}}\textit{ς}} occurs at Mt. 14:22, 21:31, 26:32, 28:7, Mk. 6:45, 14:28, 16:7, Acts 17:5 and 1 Tim. 5:24 (no v.l1.)}}} \\
\textit{\textbf{πρ}}\textit{οδυώ + ε\textit{\textbf{τ}}\textit{ς}} occurs at Acts 25:26 (bis) (no v.l1.)

\textit{\textbf{ε\textit{\textbf{τ}}\textit{ς}} appears with persons after π\textit{ρ}}\textit{οδυώ)} and \textit{\textbf{ε\textit{\textbf{τ}}\textit{ς}} occurs with places. However, the preposition ε\textit{\textbf{τ}}\textit{ς}} is used in the sense 'upon' with persons as at Rom. 5:12, 2 Cor. 10:14. The strict Classical meaning of ε\textit{\textbf{τ}}\textit{ς}} is "into". If ε\textit{\textbf{τ}}\textit{ς} is original here, scribes would have objected to it for this reason. The direction of change seems to have been from ε\textit{\textbf{τ}}\textit{ς} to \textit{\textbf{τ}}\textit{π}}\textit{ρ}, thus avoiding a non-classical use of ε\textit{\textbf{τ}}\textit{ς}} and also bringing the text into line with Koine of the higher literary stratum as in Acts 25:26.
1:18  \( \alpha \upsilon \tau \alpha \iota \varsigma - \)
\( \alpha \upsilon \tau \alpha \varsigma - 506. 1908. \)
\( \text{Omit 'Ev } \alpha \upsilon \tau \alpha \iota \varsigma / \alpha \upsilon \tau \alpha \iota \varsigma - 489. \)

The antecedent to \( \alpha \upsilon \tau \) can only be \( \pi \rho \delta \gamma \sigma \varsigma \alpha \varsigma \) which is feminine. Therefore read \( \alpha \upsilon \tau \alpha \iota \varsigma - 506. 1908 \) were possibly confused because the antecedent is far removed. The error could also have been motivated by orthographical and palaeographical considerations.

489 may have felt the phrase to be redundant. As seen from Mt's use of Mk., pronominal phrases tended to be reduced on stylistic grounds. The same motive may have lain behind 489's omission.
1:19 Add τῇ before ΠΣΣΠΣ· (πρ.) - P.

See references at Titus 1:13.

ΠΣΣΠΣ is anarthrous at 1 Tim. 1:19, 6:11, 2 Tim. 2:22, Tit. 2:10 (mostly prepositional phrases). It is arthrous at 1 Tim. 3:9, 4:1, 4:6, 4:12, etc.

χρῆσθαι συνεδρίαν following is anarthrous. Probably ΠΣΣΠΣ here is to be read without the article too. The addition of τῇ may have been an attempt to make the statement more definite, i.e. the Christian Faith. But in view of the author's usage and meaning elsewhere, it is not necessary to add the article for this purpose. The article could have been introduced from τῇ ΠΣΣΠΣ following.
1:19 ἐγὼ ἐπεστάλημαι -
οὕτως ἐπέστησα - 69.

The oblique cases of ἔτοιμος are found in the N.T., but here the sense is against it. ἐγὼ refers to ἐστιν. 
τίνες is the subject of the verbs following. The variant may possibly be a scribal attempt to avoid a subordinate clause. Read ἐγὼ τίνες.
1:19  ἐναύαγγελε—
       ἐναύαγγελε— A.

1912. 1311.

ἐναύαγγελε— 69. 1948.

ἐναβαγγελε— 1022. 

ναυαγγελε occurs here and 2 Cor. 11:25 (v.l. ἐναβ—).
It is not uncommon in Greek (Xen. Cyr. Hdt. Dem. Aesch.).

ναβαγγελε does not exist in L + S. It is probably a phonetic error, where 'ω' is pronounced as 'υ' or 'β'.

Gignac (i) shows that 'αυ' and 'αβ' were often interchanged due to the influence of the Latin "au". Howard p. 110 says that the spelling did not exist until the second century A.D. insofar as proper names like φλανιος, ει.λουνιος etc. were concerned.

All other words from the same stem (ναυς + θνημαρι) have ναυαγ—, νευ— forms are not found. That ε and α were often interchanged can be seen in Ziegler’s Introduction to Daniel p.68.

ἐναυαγγελε is an error, due possibly to a mistaken analogy to αγω in the 2nd aorist.

Read ἐναύαγγελε.

1:20  Ἐνεκές -  Ἐνεκές - A H D P
       326. 6. 1912.

and also

2 TIMOTHY.
2:13  Ἐνεκές -
       Ἐνεκές - A P D F G.
       326. 38. 256. 1319. 2298. 1912.
       L (vg).

N.B. other variations of spelling occur, but the above are the main examples.

Howard p. 69 points to frequent variation in mss. between α and Ε. Here the spelling Ἐνεκές should perhaps be adopted. Bauer says that this is the usual spelling in inscriptions (although he does not date these examples). The spelling Ἐνεκές is found, also in the Acta Pauli, and in Justin's Apol. I. 26:4.
This may be a sheer orthographical error but on the other hand may have a theological motive behind it. The scribe of 642 may have felt that it was God's task to send a person to Satan, and so altered the person of the verb. That the original author, as a Paulinist, wrote the 1st p.s. is not unlikely, as a similar idea occurs in 1 Cor. 5:3 and is expressed in the 1st p.s.
In the rest of the N.T., ἁμαρτέω is followed by a verb or object. Here ἰασάφημεν is necessary to the sense. The reading of ἕψ represents a careless omission facilitated by hom.

παρευμονάσθων μὴ βλασφημήσῃ.
2:1 ἐπαναλαμβάνω - Uncials except as below

Minuscles.

Arm. Copt (boh). Eth. L (vg)
Ambst. Aug. Luc. etc.
Origen.

παρακάλεστε - D* F G

Copt (sah) L (vt d) τ G
Hil. Ambst. Pel.

A similar use of the imperative occurs at 1 Tim. 5:1, 6:2, Titus 2:6. In the earlier part of the epistle, however, the author is giving his own witness. From 1 Tim. 4:6 to the end, he is commanding Timothy. There are no direct imperatives to Timothy before 4:6.

It is less usual for imperatives in the Pastorals to be placed at the beginning of a sentence or clause (cf. 1 Tim. 5:1, 6:2, 6:20 etc.).

Read ἐπαναλαμβάνω.
2:1 Omit παρασπών (pr.) - FG

240l.
Amb. Amb.
Origen.

παρασπών is frequently omitted. For further references see 1 Tim. 2:2, 4:9, 6:17.

It was possibly felt that παρασπών was unnecessary here after neutar adverb πρωτεύω (as at Mt. 8:21). The omission was possibly facilitated by Hom.

πρώτον παρασπώνTroineoude. 
This is another instance of nouns in a list being rearranged by scribes. In the absence of a precedent for these nouns together, follow the majority reading.
2:1 Omit ἔνευρος - I.

A further example of a word being omitted from a list.

Hom. may possibly have aided the omission here.

ضارός εἰς τῇ Ἐνευρὸς ἐς Χριστιάνος.
The other words in the list are plural. \( \varepsilon \chi\kappa\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma \) is used here in the primary sense of 'thanksgiving' as is usual in the N.T. This meaning is appropriate in the context. The scribe of 665 was probably more familiar with the technical sense 'Eucharist' and altered the noun to the singular under the mistaken idea that the author was demanding that a eucharist be celebrated for all men.
The word ἐπεροχή (connected with 'overproudness') does not occur in the N.T. Change of 'κ ο' and 'ο' is possibly orthographical: 'ν' may have been introduced accidentally, several words in the surrounding context end in this consonant.

ἐπεροχή with the meaning 'authority' fits the context better. The same phrase (ἐν ἐποχή) occurs at 2 Macc. 3:11, and the word itself occurs elsewhere in the LXX (Jer. 52:22, 2 Macc. 6:23, etc). ἐν was omitted on stylistic grounds. Moulton p. 103 says that ἐν was too overworked that "we cannot wonder at its ultimate disappearance as too indeterminate". Moulton p. 62 also mentions that the dative after a preposition was considerably more prominent in the N.T. than in the classical language or in post Classical writers. Attwists would, therefore, remove ἐν here.
2:2

ἵππαν —
ἵππαν — F G.

ἵππας occurs in late Greek according to L. + S.
In the LXX it occurs in Esther 3:13.

ἵππας does not occur in L. + S. and was probably written accidentally by F G because of the influence of ἔχων following.
This is a Pastoral word (1 Tim. 2:11, 2:12) and was probably omitted through hom.

Once the words had been omitted, they would not be readily noticed.
2:2 ἐγγυωμία ἐν τῷ ἐγγυωμία is discussed at 1 Tim. 1:3 (τὴν ἐγγυωμία λήσ.).

2:2 Omit ἄγα - ἀ

L (ντ ἰ)

Lucifer.

πᾶς + abstract noun occurs elsewhere at Mt. 3:15, 2 Cor. 1:4, 1 Tim. 3:4, 5:2, etc. Some scribes objected to πᾶς and therefore reduced its frequency in the N.T. mss.
"εὐσεβεία" is frequent in the Pastorals (11 times). It is used less frequently in the rest of the N.T. (2 Peter and Acts only). It is common in the LXX (but of 53 examples, 47 occur in 4 Macc). In the N.T. "εὐσεβεία" refers to God. By the time of Athanasius, "εὐσεβεία" meant 'orthodoxy' as in Arius and Didymus.

"εὐλαβεία" occurs at Heb. 5:7, 12:28, and means 'discretion' or 'caution'. The word is common in Greek literature, but in the sense of 'piety' it occurs only in Plutarch. "εὐλαβέσ" occurs 4 times in Acts, and 3 times in the LXX. "εὐλαβέσ" occurs once in the LXX (2 Macc.). The verb "εὐλαβείς" occurs at Heb. 11:7, and is probably original at Acts 23:10.

"εὐσεβεία" should be read here. It fits the context better than "εὐλαβεία" and is part of the author's vocabulary. The error is possibly due to misreading: there is only one letter difference in the two words.
Headlam on Aeschylus (op. cit), p. 121 says that \( \Upsilon \Delta \Pi \) is often inserted into texts. It is so here, and has been introduced to emphasise the connection of vv 2 - 3. The new sentence introduced by a demonstrative is not really asyndetic (cf. Bl. - Deb. § 459), \( \Upsilon \Delta \Pi \) is an interpretative addition by some mss. (cf. Gal. 1:10) and is unlikely to be original. Read \( \text{TOUTO} \) without \( \Upsilon \Delta \Pi \).
2:3 Omit \( \kappa\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu \) - 440. 823. 2.

The omission by 440 and 823 of \( \kappa\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu \) alone forms an unlikely reading. The reading of 2 is also likely to be a mere careless error. Assimilation to 1 Tim. 5:4 must also be taken into consideration.
2:3 ἐμω ἐπ
ἐν ἐμω - 440.

(cf. 1 Tim. 1:1 where σωτήρος in apposition to ἐν bears the possessive).

ἐμω here is likely to refer to σωτήρος. Hellenistic writers tended to prefer possessives post-positional. See A. Wifstrand 'A Problem Concerning the Word Order in the New Testament' (i) p. 172 following and especially p. 183. 440 attempts to apply the possessive to ἐπ

(i) In Studia Theologica Vol. 3.
2:4 ἀνδρωπῶν θέλει -
θέλει ἀνδρωπῶν - 1739.

θέλει here governs ἐωδῆναι and ἔλθεῖν so should precede both. θέλει precedes its infinitive at 1 Tim. 1:7, 2 Tim. 3:12 and this is by far the more usual position in the N.T. (Mt. 26:15 Jn. 5:40 Rom. 16:19, Gal. 1:7, etc.).

Ignore v.l. by 1739.`
Semitic idiom places *νά at the beginning of its clause. The direction of the change is likely to be from *νά *ς to *ς *ά. The changed order was intended to place emphasis on *ς. There is no firm example of *ά as the second word in its clause unless in such combinations as ἥλκα *ά, ἑσονΤας *ά, etc. As well as replacing the emphasis, the order of the majority of mss. recreates balance. At v.5 a *ς γνά occurs:

Variant omitting *ά is discussed in Appendix II.
2:5 ΙΟ ΧCi v.l. XI ΙΟ is discussed in Appendix I (i) b.

2:6 Omit ΙΠΞΡ - L.

A similar expression is found at Tit. 2:14 where ΙΠΞΡ is used without variant. This is in the same sense of 'on behalf of' after δύναμιν. The sense here requires 'ransom for all' not 'ransom of all'. L's reading is a careless omission.
The order for this sentence in Mk.10:45 is + reflexive + object.

In the Pastorals, reflexives appear early in the sentence. (1 Tim. 3:13, 6:10, 6:19). The reflexive here appears with \[ \text{Ignore v.l. by 24.1.} \]
Scribes objected to the two appositional phrases. The addition ς is to ease the construction. The v.l. adding ἓς occurs in some of the mss. adding ς, and attempts to complete the changed construction.

Corssen as quoted by Tinnefeld (op. cit. p. 22) says that this addition came to D F G from the Latin. But there is no reason why D F G did not originate the variant.

The reading of A is another attempt to ease the construction. It causes καρπος ἱδιος to follow περιτοικον and complete the sense of ς.

The reading of S is due to the addition of ς in this ms. See Appendix II. μαρτυρον is normally arthrous (cf. 1 Cor. 1:6, 2:1, 2 Cor. 1:12, 2 Th. 1:10, 2 Tim. 1:6). Ignore this reading. Read το μαρτυρον.
2:6  κατίναιος -  
κατίναιος - F.

(cf. v.11. by F at 1 Tim. 3:13, 5:16).

The variant here is a sheer error and should be compared to v.11. substituting "υ" for "λ" as in μοιονος  following is not affected by F's error here.
It is very likely that εἰς dropped out of A 81 through hom. ροεσολυσ
cf. Acts 26:20 for a similar variant θίεσολυσ

The scribe of A then altered the text to ἐπιστεύον ὰγν by assimilation to 1 Tim. 1:11 or Tit. 2:3. But ἐπιστεύον is more suitable in the context here.

καὶ ἀποστολὸς καὶ διδάσκαλος). The reading ἐν may reflect a later stage in the ms. tradition after εἰς had dropped out.

Blass-Deubler says that εἰς and ἐν were often confused in the N.T. This confusion lay behind the v.l. in FG L (vg). But at 1 Tim. 1:12 ὡς εἰς οὖσα +ἐν +ἐν occurs without v.l. with the same meaning as is required here. i.e. 'appointed for' ἐπιστεύον +ἐν occurs at 1 Cor. 12:28 but there the sense is 'in the church' and not 'for the church'.
2:7 Variant omitting και (pr.) is discussed in Appendix II.

2:7 Add γὰρ after ἀληθεία - 6:42.

(cf. 1 Tim. 2:3).

Here ἀληθεία-γεγονομένα are in parenthesis as at Rom. 9:1 (q.v.). Such a statement is already closely linked to its context by its very nature. Parenthesis is grammatically independent, i.e. asyndetic. 642 mistakenly adds γὰρ because the scribe misunderstood the flow of the sentence.
This is a favourite phrase in the Pauline epistles, and the v.l. here probably represents assimilation to Rom. 9:1, where the closest parallel exists.

These words should not be omitted. They are necessary to the sense, especially in view of the following οὐ βέβαιον. The error by 1984, 1985 is probably accidental.
Add ἐγὼ after ἐγὼ - 24:95.

Many 1 p.s. references in the Pastorals are without the pronoun. ἐγὼ is, however, used with 1 p.s. verbs at 1 Tim. 1:11, 2:7, 2 Tim. 1:11, 4:6, Tit. 1:3, 1:5, none of which are active verbs; and at 1 Tim. 1:15 with εἰρήνη for special emphasis.

It is unlikely that ἐγὼ is original here. It may have been introduced to the text by dittography.
Πνεῦμαντι - Α.

Τὸ μὴ εὐ - γνωσεῖ - Ε.


Τὸ μὴ εὐ occurs 33 times in the Pastorals with the meaning 'the Christian Faith'. Εν τῷ εὐ occurs at

1 Tim. 1:2, 1:4, 2:5, 3:13, 2 Tim. 1:13, Tit. 1:3, 3:15.

γνωσεῖ is frequent in the LXX and in the Fathers. Εν γνωσεῖ is found at 1 Cor. 8:11, 14:6, 2 Cor. 6:6, 8:7, 2 Pet. 3:18 (no. v.11). The reading of S 917, 2004 may have been caused by assimilation to Rom. 2:20 Εν γνωσεῖ καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν τῷ νόμῳ.

Εν πνευματι is frequent in the N.T. and occurs in the hymn at 1 Tim. 3:16. The reading of A may have been caused by assimilation to Ἰν. 4:23 Εν πνευματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ.

Both instances of assimilation are attempts to remove the Εν τῷ μὴ εὐ formula.
2:8 Βουλομαι -
Θολομαι - F G.

An impossible reading. F G's orthographical error does not form a known verb, although θολομαί or θελερι may have been in their minds, when they mistakenly copied Βουλομαι (which occurs elsewhere in the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 5:14, Tit. 3:8).
Pastoral order may be ascertained from 1 Tim. 2:1

περινάλα τῶν... vb. and object of περινάλα ποιεῖται.

The variants listed above exist to place the object of βουλομαι nearer that verb, and should be ignored.
The Hellenistic authors decline \(\delta\varepsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\varsigma\) as -\(\varsigma\) -\(\varsigma\) -\(\sigma\nu\) (Howard p. 157). Hence the accusative feminine pl. is -\(\sigma\varsigma\).

Attic Greek declined \(\delta\varepsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\varsigma\) as -\(\varsigma\) -\(\varsigma\) -\(\sigma\nu\).

This example is the only occurrence of the feminine of \(\delta\varepsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\varsigma\) in the N.T. The reading of H and the others is an Atticist correction.

The variant omitting \(\mu\alpha\lambdalpha\) in this verse is discussed in Appendix 2.
This word appears in the plural except at Lk. 9:46, 9:47, where the meaning is 'discussion'. In all the other occurrences (e.g. Mt.13:19, Lk.24:38, Rom. 1:21) the meaning implies 'evil intentions' or 'queries'. Either sense is appropriate here.

Possibly we should read the plural here. This was altered by some scribes to the singular in order to be consistent with the preceding ἄργυρος.
2:9 The variant adding η αι after ἔχοντως is discussed in Appendix II.

2:9 Add τας before γυναικες. D K L H Y

T.R. 69. 1908. etc.

Chrys. Theod. Euthal.

See v.l. at Tit. 2:6.

The words here parallel the phrase at verse 8 των θυρών so perhaps τας should be added here.

γυναῖκα, however, is anarthrous at 1 Tim. 3:11 γυναῖκας ἐκκλησίας and at Heb. 11:35, Mk. 15:40 (no v.l.) cf. also 1 Pet. 3:1 ἐφόροις αἱ γυναῖκες (v.l. omits αἱ).

At 1 Tim. 3:8 and 3:12 general nouns of this sort appear without the article.

Nevertheless, we should be inclined to add τας here, which parallels των θυρών. Some scribes omitted the article to conform to other and similar uses of the anarthrous generic noun.
Howard p. 157 states that κοσμίας has a dative feminine singular κοσμεω in the N.T. whereas the Attic form is κοσμημα. The reading κοσμημα is therefore an Atticistic alteration.

The adverb κοσμεω does not appear in the LXX and is a ἄγαν in the N.T. The classical meaning of καταστάλη is 'quietness' 'demeanour', whereas in the N.T. it is used in the sense of 'dress' 'attire'. Scribes familiar with the Classical meaning of καταστάλη may therefore, have altered κοσμικεω to κοσμεω believing that the meaning should be 'fittingly and with decorum' rather than 'in modest dress'. The context, however, speaks of clothing and appearance. Κοσμικεω is part of the author's vocabulary (1 Tim. 3:2).

The reading of K may be a pure error or an attempt to avoid the dative in —. The genitive plural is of no sense here.
and the following

1 TIMOTHY.

4:3 \(\mu\varepsilon\tau\alpha\lambda\) -
\(\mu\varepsilon\tau\) - 917. 1845. 330. 1149. 256. 226. 2400.

Clement. Origen.

1 TIMOTHY.

4:4 \(\mu\varepsilon\tau\alpha\lambda\) -
\(\mu\varepsilon\tau\) - FG


Clement. Origen.

\(\mu\varepsilon\tau\alpha\lambda\) precedes a vowel at 1 Tim. 6:6, and shows our author is insensitive to elision. Even though he does write \(\mu\varepsilon\tau\) as at 2 Tim. 4:11, \(\mu\varepsilon\tau\) is likely to be secondary in all the above examples, and represents a stylistic improvement.

See also 1 Tim. 4:14: also notice Scrivener's remark (i) that breathings and accents were not habitual until the 7th century.

(i) In the introduction to 'A Full Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus' p. XXIII.
A further instance of two nouns being inverted by copyists.

Follow the majority reading in the absence of precedent in the order of these words.
The reflexive pronoun is found in the N.T. and in the Pastorals (cf. 1 Tim. 6:19 and elsewhere).

There is no firm example of ἕυτας in the N.T. The error is possibly due to the careless omission of ἕυτας.
Scribes generally preferred the simple form of words to the compound, but as καταπληγαί is known neither to the N.T. nor to L.S., πληγαί is to be accepted as original here. Πληγαί appears in the LXX. The κατα— in A may have been introduced by error because of καταστολή earlier in the sentence.
Add ἐν before μαργαριταῖς. 2:9

Unlike 1 Tim. 5:23 (ἵλαρ) and 1 Tim. 3:7 (ἐγώ) where Semitic idiom is thought to have influenced the original author's language, here other criteria operate. It is possible, for example, that the preposition was added to create the balance ἐν...καὶ, ἐν....gamma. It is unlikely that this occurrence of ἐν is the sole survival of original ἐν before each noun. (cf. 1 Tim. 6:9).

The following variant ought to be considered here too.

1 TIMOTHY.

Add ἐν before Χρυσῶ — 1874

Although in general scribes tended to reduce the incidence of prepositions, here the longer reading is likely to be secondary. N.B. there is no préposition before ἐπὶ.
2:9 \( \kappa\lambda\upsilon \) (before \( \chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\chi\omega \)) -

\( \eta \) - \( \psi \) \( \Delta \) \( \Xi \) \( \Lambda \) \( \Theta \) \( \Upsilon \) 

T.R. 104. 6. 69. 1908. etc.

Gothic.

Clem-Alex. Origen. Euthal. Theod.

Basil. Chrys.


See Titus 3:10.

\( \eta \) is secondary. It was suggested to the above scribes by the following, and was added here for greater exactness. \( \kappa\lambda\upsilon \) is less precise, but the usage of \( \kappa\lambda\upsilon \) is the same at 1 Tim. 5:19.

Variant omitting \( \kappa\lambda\upsilon \) here is discussed in Appendix II.
2:9 Χρυςων - S D K L H Ψ
T.R. and most minuscules.

Χρυσων - A F G P.
326. 6. 1912. 33. 321. 1908. 1739.
223. 1022. et. al.

(Χρυσων appears in W. H's margin).

Χρυσων appears at Mt. 2:11, 10:9, 23:16, 23:17,
Jas. 5:3 (no. v.11.) and at Acts 17:29, (v.1. Χρυσων).
Not frequent in LXX.

Χρυσων appears at Acts 3:6, 20:33, etc. (no v.11.)
and at 1 Cor. 3:12 (v.1 Χρυσων) 1 Pet. 1:7 (v.1 Χρυσων)
Diminutive form is frequent in LXX, but less frequent in
L. + S. examples.

Diminutives were not popular with some scribes. c.f. variants
Μυρων and Μυρεων at Mk. 5:3, 5:5, 15:46, 16:2 etc.
and variants Παλιον and Παλινον as at Mt. 2:11, and variants
Κυριον and Κυριεον (48 times according to Arndt-Gingrich).
See particularly Mt. 13:48 Hermas 5:2, 5:5. The form Κυριεον
is frequent in Philo.
Phrynichus. (LX and CLXXI11) does not like -ιον -κριον
endings. Such a prejudice may have influenced scribes such as S D K L P H \( \Psi \) etc. above.

Read \( \chi \rho \upsilon \omicron \alpha \omicron \).
Add ἂργυρίῳ after Χρυσίῳ - 255, 223.
Add ἂργυρίῳ καὶ before Χρυσίῳ - group in von Soden.

The fact that both variants exist possibly indicates that ἂργυρίῳ or ἂργυρίῳ καὶ are additions attempting to expand the text. Hom could have been the cause of omission if either variant above had been original, but such a possibility here is less likely. Neither is original. The additions are due to the ease with which the combination 'silver and gold' comes to mind. See Acts 3:6, 20:33, 1 Pet. 1:18, 2 Tim. 2:20.
The variant \( \text{τὸς} \) may have been suggested by \( \text{καὶ ὁμοίως} \) at Eph. 5:3 (\( \text{καὶ ὁμοίως πρὸς τῆς ἰδιοτέρας} \)). \( \text{τὸς} \) introduces clauses at Acts 23:11.

See also Rom. 1:9, Mk. 7:6.

The direction of change seems to be from \( \text{δὲ} \) to \( \text{ἐν} \), as a comparison introduced by \( \text{ἐν} \) is expected in the context. The relative is more difficult to attach to an antecedent and really anticipates \( \text{δὲ ἐργανθὲν ἕησεν} \). It is unlikely that \( \text{ἐν} \) is part of the relative - Howard p. 179 knows of no such possible expansion.

The reading of 330 is probably the result of misreading \( \text{δὲ ἐν ἐπιτελεῖ} \).
At 1 Tim. 2:11 γυνὴ appears at the head of the sentence.

At 1 Tim. 5:1 the indirect object precedes the verb at the beginning of the sentence. It is not usual for an infinitive to stand first in a sentence in the Pastorals.

The variant ἥδε γυνὴ arose on stylistic grounds to prevent two consecutive sentences beginning with the same noun.
2:12 θεονομάτισμον is discussed at 1 Tim. 1:9 (δενονομάτισμον).

2:12 v. l. omitting δενονομάτισμον is discussed in Appendix III.

2:12 γυνὴ —

γυνὴ 255.

γυνὴ is singular at 1 Tim. 2:11, 2:14. The singular verb σωθήσεται appears at 1 Tim. 2:15. The author when speaking collectively uses the singular.

255 may have altered to the plural believing it to be more accurate.
Howard p. 278 says that εὐντευκτον was branded as vulgar by Atticists, but does not give any references for this statement.

εὐνπον is a κληρονομos in the Greek Bible. L.S. refer only to this passage with the meaning 'to have authority over'. The Classical meaning is 'to commit a murder' as in Aesch.

εὐντευκτον is frequent in the LXX, where it translates 17 different Hebrew words. It is also frequent in the N.T. and appears in the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 5:12. It is usually followed by the accusative. Therefore, it is nonsensical here, unless the variant ἀνασκοπήσα were found.

The error is likely to be an example of a scribe misreading a word, then writing down a shortened form of the original.
As with γυνὴ ἀνὴρ appears in the singular in the sense 'man collectively'.

F G may have altered to the plural believing it to be more correct, but the accusative is unlikely. The change, therefore, seems to be purely orthographical.

2:12 ἂλλα γ. v.l. ἄλλας is discussed at 1 Tim. 1:13 (ἅλλα).

Jerome.

The author's style demands Υπο in such contexts (cf. 1 Tim. 2:5, 4:8). Ignore v.l.

The following variants involving Υπο ought to be considered here.

1 TIMOTHY.

5:18 Omit Υπο - 226

Υπο fits the context, but it may have been added to remove the asyndeton. This variant is listed as doubtful in Appendix 6.

2 TIMOTHY.

2:7 Omit Υπο (enim) - L(vt. t).

Υπο here is emphatic. It was perhaps unsuitable in this lectionary.

2 TIMOTHY.

2:13 Omit Υπο - $ D F G K

1838. 1827. 1311. 263. etc.
L (vg.)(vt except f g) Arm.
Gothic. $ (hl.).
Tertullian.

Theodoret.

\[ \gamma\alpha\rho \] has been added to remove asyndeton. Therefore, accept the variant above. The rest of the poem is asyndetic between lines.

2 Timothy.

3:2 Omit \( \gamma\alpha\rho \) - 1836.

\[ L (v g \ C S T Z)(v t \ d m \ d e m) \]

Fir. Cypr. Lucifer.

The Latin mss which omit \( \gamma\alpha\rho \) read \( \kappa\alpha\lambda\) (et) at the beginning of the sentence. \( \kappa\alpha\lambda \) is weaker in the context and may well be original here. Once \( \kappa\alpha\lambda \) was removed, \( \gamma\alpha\rho \) was added to remove the asyndeton. See Appendix II.

2 Timothy.

3:6 Omit \( \gamma\alpha\rho \) - 1319

\[ L (v t \ m) \]


Retrospective \( \gamma\alpha\rho \) is in keeping with the author's style.

It may have been objected to as the third word in the sentence.
Again \( γπ \) is retrospective as at Tit. 1:7, 3:3, 3:9, 3:12). Particles are easily omitted by careless scribes but they are added by stylistically conscious scribes. Here the addition of \( γπ \) removes asyndeton.

This variant is listed as doubtful in Appendix 6.


̓πρωτος stands early in the sentence and before the verb at Acts 26:23, Rom. 10:19, 1 Jn. 4:19, Jn. 5:14, but this is by no means a general tendency in the N.T. Sometimes ̓πρωτος comes after the verb, sometimes before. Pastoral usage favours the position before the verb (1 Tim. 1:15, 1:16, 2:13, 5:12) and so ̓πρωτος ̓επὶ λαθωθή ought to be read here.
Both are synonymous in the context, although the compounded form may stress the entirety of the action.

appears at Eph. 5:6, Jas. 1:26 (no v.11).
Latin stylists objected to compound words. This can be seen in the following quotations.

'Richesses et Déficiences des Anciens Psautiers latins' (i) shows how Jerome avoids compounds in Latin for stylistic reasons.

Löfstedt (2) with reference to Latin says 'Eine der hervorstechendsten Eigentümlichkeiten der poetischen und gehobenen Sprache ist bekanntlich der Gebrauch der Verba simplicia statt der Komposita'.

Löfstedt (3) on 'Verba Simplicia pro Composita' also says 'Es werden nämlich nicht nur überhaupt die Verba simplicia in Spätlatein mit einer oft sehr überraschenden Freiheit statt der Komposita gebraucht'.

For these reasons read the compound form here:

(i) In 'Collectanea Biblica Latina' XIII p. 181.
   Also pp. 162 - 163.
(2) In 'Syntatica' Part 2 p. 278.
(3) In 'Vermischte Studien' p. 117.
 Particle omitted - 206. 270.

\( \gamma\alpha\rho \) is possible only if it refers back to verses 10 - 12 (cf. v.1. at 1 Tim. 5:14). Denniston on Particles (1) says that this usage is rare both in Attic and Koine Greek.

The sentence beginning with \( \sigma\omega\theta\gamma\varepsilon\tau\alpha\iota \) marks a progression in contrast to the preceding clause. An adversative conjunction is obviously required by the force of the author's arguments, and by the contrast between \( \sigma\omega\theta\gamma\varepsilon\tau\alpha\iota \) and \( \varepsilon\nu\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\beta\lambda\gamma\varepsilon\nu\gamma\varepsilon\omicron\nu\nu\varepsilon\nu \). The scribal alteration \( \gamma\alpha\rho \) was caused by a mistaken understanding in the flow of the argument.

\( \delta\varepsilon \) was overworked in the N.T., so that its removal or alteration may have been stylistic.

2:15 Add καὶ συνεσεῖς after σωφροσύνης.


$ (hl. mg.).

Added before σωφροσύνης 1245.

It is characteristic of the author to write long lists of human qualities (cf. 1 Tim. 3:8, 3:11, 2:8, etc.). The addition here is not inappropriate in the context, and συνεσις is a Pastoral word (at 2 Tim. 2:7).

Scribes, however, were also liable to add to existing lists like this, and the fact that the longer reading appears in two different positions makes us suspicious of its originality (cf. 2:9 adding ἔργανον).

This reading is listed as doubtful in Appendix 6.
2:15 - 3:1 πιστός ὁ λόγος belongs to 2:15 in Ἐ (-olds).

Theod-Mops. Chrys. etc.

Pel. Ambst.

πιστός ὁ λόγος begins a new sentence in

Ἀρμ.

Chrys.

At 1 Tim. 1:15 a short aphorism follows the words πιστός ὁ λόγος. There is no such aphorism at 1 Tim. 2:15, although there is at 1 Tim. 3:1. Swete (J T S Vol. 18, p. 1f) thinks that the words prevent an abrupt beginning to 3:1.

See 2 Tim. 2:11 and Tit. 3:8.
Add καὶ πίστις ἐποδοχῆς ἡγίας

after λόγος  - 33

L (vg D)

and the old Gallic lectionary 76 (if it is citing this verse and not 1 Tim. 1:15).

There are two firm examples of this phrase after ἡγίας

of λόγος (1 Tim. 1:15, 4:9).

Ignore the variant. Scribes assimilated this verse to the formula at 1 Tim. 1:15 (or 4:9).
3:1  
ε lạc -  
γυ  - 33.

ε lạc fits the context.  
ε lạc τ of is found without variant at 1 Tim. 5:16, 6:3.

The reading γυ has been caused by itacism, a frequent cause of scribal variation (see Bl - Deb. § 67).

The following variants ought to be considered here.

1 TIMOTHY.

3:15  
γυ τ of -  
ε lạc τ of (or ε lạc τ of) - C P.

ε lạc τ of in a causal sense occurs at 1 Tim. 1:4, 4:10, 6:9, 6:10, Tit. 1:11 (cf. Argyle in B. T. Vol. 6, p. 165 f).  
ε lạc τ of occurs in the Pastorals (see above), but obviously this sense is not required here.  
Itacism has again caused this variant.

1 TIMOTHY.

5:10  
γυ stands for second, third, fourth and fifth ε lạc - 1836. 623.  
γυ stands for second ε lạc 440.

Itacism has been responsible for this variant too, but a stylistic consideration may have been operative too, in an attempt to subjugate all the alternatives beneath the first occurrence of ε lạc.  
The repetitive ε lạc (for rhetorical purposes) is probably original.
TITUS.

1:9  

\[ \xi \] -  

\[ \varepsilon \] - 2401* 440.

n.b. 440 at 1 Tim. 5:10 (supra).

\[ \varepsilon \] obviously does not suit the context. \[ \xi \] is obviously correct. This variant shows that itacism operates in both directions (see variants above).
The office of an ἐπισκόπος occurs at Acts 1:20 (LXX). Elsewhere it is used of God's visitation.

ὁρεύω and Gen. rei is usually used in the sense of "desiring an office" rather than "desiring to be". This favours ἐπισκόπης.

The variant ἐπισκόπας occurred because of the proximity of this word (v. 2) and because of the commonness of this word in early Christendom.
At 1 Tim. 3:2, Luc. Brug comments 'Non commutes 'ergo' cum 'enim'.

\( \Delta \nu \) seems to be demanded at 1 Tim. 3:2. The inceptive \( \Delta \nu \) abides by the author's usage (1 Tim. 2:1). It is not the most normal (i.e. inferential) use of \( \Delta \nu \) which a scribe would be familiar with. \( \Delta \nu \) here in its inceptive sense 'well now ...' was misunderstood as 'therefore' by scribes and altered.
γαρ at 1 Tim. 3:2 is weak and may be an attempt to remove the hiatus caused by δει καθώς. The variant δε may have been suggested by δει δει at 1 Tim. 3:7. The omission at 1 Tim. 3:2 may represent an intermediate stage. After καθώς had been removed, this reading resulted, before the other variants came into existence to avoid asyndeton.

At 1 Tim. 5:14 καθώς is resumptive, returning to the main theme. The usage is similar to 1 Tim. 2:1, where the particle forms part of the natural Pastoral usage. βολαρα is followed by ὄνω at 1 Tim. 2:8 and again represents a constancy in usage. ὄνω is a way of emphasising the verb. In view of this strongly established Pastoral usage, it is difficult to account for the variants. δε is obviously weak in the context being a non-committal connective; γαρ could refer back to v.11 but is less likely to; Pastoral usage usually places γαρ closer to its context (see 1 Tim. 5:11). See Denniston (op. cit. p.63), who states that γαρ referring to a remoter context is not an Attic or N. T.habit. The variants may represent mere peculiarities of scribes. Headlam on Aeschylus (op. cit.) shows that γαρ and δε are frequently substituted in mss. (see especially p. 119).

Read ὄνω in both places.
The following variants are discussed here:

1 TIMOTHY.

3:16 \( \lambda \nu \epsilon \tau \iota \iota \iota \lambda \eta \phi \theta \eta \)  - SACD*FG.
\( \lambda \nu \epsilon \tau \iota \iota \iota \lambda \eta \phi \theta \eta \)  - D^cKLP

T. R. and the minuscules.

1 TIMOTHY.

4:3 \( \rho \epsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \iota \mu \psi \iota \nu \)  - SAD*FG.
\( \rho \epsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \iota \mu \psi \iota \nu \)  - CDKLP

Minuscula.

1 TIMOTHY.

5:7 \( \lambda \nu \epsilon \tau \iota \iota \iota \lambda \eta \iota \tau \tau \tau \)  - SACD*FG.
\( \lambda \nu \epsilon \tau \iota \iota \iota \lambda \eta \iota \tau \tau \tau \)  - D^cKLP

T. R. and the minuscules.

1 TIMOTHY.

6:14 \( \lambda \nu \epsilon \tau \iota \iota \iota \lambda \eta \iota \tau \tau \tau \)  - SDFG.
\( \lambda \nu \epsilon \tau \iota \iota \iota \lambda \eta \iota \tau \tau \tau \)  - D^cKLP

T. R. and the minuscules.

Mayser (op. cit) 1 part 1 p. 194 claims that the nasal is generally dropped, but that both forms (i.e. with and without \( \rho \)) are found in the papyri.
The spelling with μ is not in L. S.

The classical conjugation of λαπβαυω drops μ in certain tenses. The Hellenistic authors may have written μ to show the derivation of the word (this practice is not consistent).

Read all the above variants with μ
The following variants are discussed here:

1 TIMOTHY.

3:11 υἱὸς θαλάτου  - S A D H C


υἱὸς θαλάτου  - D K

T. R. 69. 1908.

υἱὸς θαλάτου  - F G L P

TITUS.

2:2 υἱὸς θαλάτου  - S A C H

Minuscules.

υἱὸς θαλάτου  - F.

υἱὸς θαλάτου  - G L P D

υἱὸς θαλάτου  - D K

Dam.
Moulton in his Prolegomena (op. cit.) reminds us (p. 34) that "the scribe made his choice of ζ, η, ζ etc. according to the grammar and the sense." L. S. favour νηφαλίος saying that νηφαλίος is branded as late. Howard p. 76 indicates the ease with which 'ζ' and 'ζ' were interchanged.

Radermacher in his Grammar (op. cit.) p. 43 says that "Ein Beleg für diese Schwächung (ζ → ζ) ist νηφαλίος. Häufig ist sie bei lateinischen Worten Λεγεων Legio".

The above comments suggest νηφαλίος to be original at 1 Tim. 3:2, and νηφαλίους at 1 Tim. 3:11 and Titus 2:2. The v.11. ζ, ζ and ζ are orthographical and possibly Atticistic alterations.

See v.11. ἡγείους, ἡγείους (Heb. 11:37) and μεγάλου and μεγάλα at Lk. 14:9.
πληκτην - S A D F G L P
(no add) 33. 1908.

Versions.

Origen (Lat.). Ambst.

πλεονεκτην - 1022. 1245
(no add) $ (v_e. MG.)

Add μη πλεονεκτην after α'εχροκερδη
- 1243. 1836. 440. 2400.

Add μη α'εχροκερδη after πληκτην - L
T.R. 31. 69. 104, etc.
$ Basil.

πληκτης occurs only here and at Tit. 1:7 (no. v.l.) in the N. T. Not in the LXX except Sm. of Ps. 34(35):15.
In L.S. only in Arist. Plut. Bistr. πλεονεκτης appears at 1 Cor. 5:10, 5:11, 6:10, 1 Th. 4:6 (no. v.l) in Sirach 14:9 and in the versions by Aq. and Sm. of Ps 9:24 (10:3). The word appears in Thuc. Hdt. Xen.
The contrast in the context favours πληκτην. The idea of μη πλεονεκτην is already present in 2 φελαργον following.
μη δεχομεθα has been added by assimilation to Tit. 1:7. It was easy for scribes to add to or to reduce lists of qualities. The reading of 1836. 2400. 1243. 440. is a conflate reading from mss. reading μη δεχομεθα after πληκτην, and from those mss. which read πλεονεκτην instead of πληκτην.
3:3 Variants ἅλλα' and ἅλλα are discussed at 1 Tim. 1:13 (agascar v.l. ἅλλα).

3:3 ἐπεικη -
ἐπεικη - F G.

(cf. similar variants by F G at 1 Tim. 1:13, 2:6, 5:16, 6:19, etc).

All the other adjectives in the list end in 'ν'. ἐπεικηš however is third declension. F G were confused by the other endings.
The forms ἐποίηθος and ἐποιηθής are both found in Classical authors, but ἐποιηθής is not found elsewhere in the N. T. ἐποιηθής is frequent in the Pastorals (1 Tim. 3:5, 3:12, 5:17, Tit. 3:8, 3:14) and in the rest of the N. T. at Rom. 12:8, 1 Th. 5:12 (no. v.11).

ἐποίηθος seems to be original here, on the basis of author's usage.

The reading of S is characteristic of this ms. See for example Rom. 12:8 ἐποιηθής (v.l. by S - ἐποιηθής) and at 1 Th. 5:12 ἐποιηθής (v.l. by S - ἐποιηθής). Bl-Deb. § 93 refers to this as "a transition to the -ω conj.ation".

S tries to give the "correct" form of -δαι -ς to verbs. The author of the Pastorals' usage is shown at 1 Tim. 3:12 ἐποιηθής (no. v.1).

Read ἐποιηθής.
At 1 Tim. 3:12 the author speaks of house (singular) and children (plural). The variant here is probably a sheer error.
Weiss puts a comma after ἔποταγή.

The children are to be ἐν ἔποταγή μετὰ πάσης σεμνοτῆτος. A similar usage occurs at 1 Tim. 2:15 and shows that such prepositional phrases added to datives are not uncharacteristic of the author's style. The comma is unnecessary.
3:5 Omit $\Theta U$ - 1311. 1874.

L (vt. t. mon.).

Amb. Aug.

Anarthrous $\Theta C$ dependent on an anarthrous noun is characteristic of the author. (cf. 1 Tim. 1:4, 4:4, 2 Tim. 1:1, Tit. 1:1, 1:7).

The same phrase occurs at 1 Tim. 3:13 (κυκλησθεν $\Theta U$), to which there is no obvious assimilation. The omission (if not accidental) may have occurred at a time when $\kappa y k l h s i a$ meant "the Church of God" and so $\Theta U$ would appear to be otiose.
As the future is obviously required by the sense, and as there is no reason to include a subjunctive at this point, the variant is orthographical, representing an alternative spelling of the future. This spelling is not characteristic of the author (e.g. at 1 Tim. 2:15 - no variant).

The following variant is considered here:

1 TIMOTHY.

5:11  καταστρηψιςως - S G D K L

Minuscules.

Chrys. Theod.

καταστρηψιςως - A F G P

104.

Again, the apparent subjunctive ending may represent an alternative spelling of the future, which does not represent the original author's spelling (see ἀρκεύω at 1 Tim. 6:8 and ἀποστησόντα at 1 Tim. 4:1) but it may also be assumed that the alteration was deliberate.

δέ ταύτα + Aor. Subj. implies a future action to be concluded before the action of the main verb (see Turner p. 112).

This would apply here and would represent Pastoral usage (Tit. 3:12) and N. T. usage (Mk. 2:20, 4:15, 4:16, 4:29 etc).
Ihd. does occur in the N. T. in the non-Classical sense of "when" as at Mk. 3:11, 11:25, Rev. 4:9, 8:1 (no. v.11.).
τοψωθεις -
τοψλωθεις - 1836. 256.

τοψω does not appear in the LXX, and the only occurrences in the N. T. are in the Pastorals (1 Tim. 6:4 and 2 Tim. 3:6 with variants q.v.). It is common in Greek literature; for example, in Aelian, Philo, Dem. Arist. etc.

τοψλω occurs in the LXX, and in Jn. 12:40, 2 Cor. 4:4, 1 Jn. 2:11 (no. v.11.). It is an Attic word. τοψλω is used in a metaphorical sense at Wis. 2:21, Is. 42:19 and in a literal sense at Tob. 7:7. In the N. T. the verb is used metaphorically.

τοψωθεις is probably original here as it forms part of the author's vocabulary. The reading τοψλωθεις probably occurred through misreading.
3:6 \( \varepsilon\nu\pi\varepsilon\varepsilon \) - \\
\( \varepsilon\nu\pi\varepsilon\varepsilon \) - D F G \\
\( \varepsilon\nu\pi\varepsilon\varepsilon \) - P

440.

and

1 TIMOTHY.

3:7 \( \varepsilon\nu\pi\varepsilon\varepsilon \) - \\
\( \varepsilon\nu\pi\varepsilon\varepsilon \) - D F G \\
\( \varepsilon\nu\pi\varepsilon\varepsilon \) - P.

\( \varepsilon\nu\pi\varepsilon\varepsilon \) does not occur in the N.T. \( \varepsilon\nu\pi\varepsilon\varepsilon \varepsilon \) occurs at 1 Tim. 6:9 (no. v.l.) and shows that the spelling of D F G does not reflect the author's usage but is a quirk of their own. \( \varepsilon\nu\pi\varepsilon\varepsilon \) occurs at Mt. 12:11 without a variant over P.

\( \varepsilon\nu\varepsilon \) is followed by the subjunctive in the Pastorals. The form of the verb in P is impossible. Howard p. 71 points to the frequent confusion of \( \varepsilon\nu \) and \( \varepsilon \). The spelling of P does not reflect the Pastoral spelling of subjunctive endings as far as we can ascertain from the undisputed readings at 1 Tim. 5:1, 5:21, etc.
As far as the Greek witnesses are concerned, they have assimilated the words of v. 6 to those of v. 7. The Fathers may have been citing 1 Tim. 3:7.
3:7 The verse is omitted by $G^\text{205}$

$L (\text{vt. } g)$. 

This variant is an obvious example of the operation of homoioteleuton. Both verse 6 and verse 7 end with $\tau\theta\omega$ $\delta\lambda\beta\sigma\omega\lambda\omicron\upsilon$. Verses 7 and 8 each begin with a delta.
3:7 The variant adding ΚΑΙ after δε is discussed in Appendix II.

3:7 δε δε - S A F G H

33.

δε δε λυτον - D K L P Ψ and F G according to von Soden.

69. 1912. 2344 etc. etc.

L (vt m)


Origen and other Fathers.

(cf. v.l. at 1 Tim. 3:15, adding δε).

The addition of the personal pronoun is essential to the sense. λυτον is the object of δε : μαρτυριαν καλη is not. It can, however, be argued that the following verb ἐμπέεση leaves no ambiguity as to the real subject of the verb, ἘΧΕΙΝ.

The explanatory λυτον could be scribal. If λυτον is original, its omission possibly represents an attempt by certain scribes to reduce pronouns on stylistic grounds. Thus scribal activity could have operated in both directions. This variant is listed as doubtful in Appendix 6.
Greek and Latin Fathers.

καλὰς ἐξευθύνω - S A H K L P

Most minuscules.

L (vg. W).

Except when it qualifies ἐργον, καλὸς appears in many positions in the Pastorals. Sometimes before its noun: as at 1 Tim. 1:18, 6:12 (bis) 6:13, 2 Tim. 1:14, 2:2, 3, 4:7.

Sometimes after its noun: as at 1 Tim. 6:19. Sometimes it is separated from its noun: as at 1 Tim. 3:13, 4:6.

The order ἐξευθύνω καλὰς would, therefore, not be impossible and it is in accordance with the author's style. Scribes would tend to invert the order to place the adjective nearer its noun.
3:7 ἐπίτευξεν v.l. ἐπίτευξα and v.l. ἐπίτευς are discussed at 1 Tim. 3:6 (ἐπίτευς).

3:7 Place τοῦ διάβολου before καὶ 1319.

The variant is possibly due to the influence of 1 Tim. 3:6, where τοῦ διάβολου follows ἐπίτευς.

τοῦ διάβολου should follow παγίδα, as this conforms to the idea at 2 Tim. 2:26 ...ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διάβολου παγίδος.
3:7 Add ֵטַּל before ֶחַדַּם - לַּיִל

L (vg H ̅ X K L)(vt. ̅א ̅ג ̅מ)

Pel. B  Jer.

The repetition of a preposition before a second noun is a characteristic of Semitic idiom, and is unlikely to have been added by scribes. On the contrary, they would remove such a repetition on stylistic grounds. Accept the addition as original.
Another omission by $S^k$

The instruction here parallels the instruction to wives in 
$^7$ll, where they are encouraged to be $\varepsilon\varepsilon\rho\nu\nu\varsigma$. As with 
the instructions to bishops too, the author gives deacons a 
positive command, before turning to prohibitions.

The error was either a careless omission, or was caused by 
hom $^-\quad \omega\varepsilon\alpha\upsilon\omega\ C ^{\varepsilon\varepsilon\rho\nu\nu\nu\ C}$. 

3:8 Omit $\varepsilon\varepsilon\rho\nu\nu\nu$ - $S^k$

1836. 181$^k$. 460. 122.
At 1 Tim. 3:8 

The variant represents a sheer error by 330.

At 1 Tim. 3:11 two adjectives follow in -ous. The ending may have confused the scribe. Howard p. 157 says that the reading of A is "a mere casual slip".

and

1 TIMOTHY.

3:11 εὐπρεπῶς - 
εὐπρεπῶς - A.
διαλογος – διαλογος - 623 * 69.

διαλογος - διαλογος, in the N. T. Polycarp § 5 uses the word. So too does Xen. but in the sense "given to repetition". In the LXX διγλώσσος is used in the sense "double-tongued" as at Prov. 11:13. Sir 5:9.

διαλογος does not appear elsewhere in the N. T., but the verb διαλογεμαλ appears in the Gospels, and διαλογεμαλ appears at 1 Tim. 2:8 in the sense of "quarreling".

Despite the uncommonness of διαλογος, this seems to be the word required in the context. A quality of character is necessary, and unless διαλογος can bear a meaning implying an "evil intention in quarreling", its place in the text here is doubtful.

Possibly δια- here occurred through assimilation with Tit. 2:3 where διαβολος precedes the words μηδε οίων πολλω. διαλογος may have been the result of misreading, or may have been a deliberate attempt to avoid an unusual word.
Ihe accusative is correct and agrees with διακόνοντις, σερνουσι, διογονος, ἔχονταις etc. Howard § 55 A:4, p. 130 says that the accusative plural m. and f. in -£ς was encouraged by the identity of nominative and accusative plurals of πολίς etc., and is common in papyri of early and late date.

The following variant is discussed here: -

1 TIMOTHY.
6:2 ἔχονταις - ἔχοντας - A F G D* I
326. 181. 623. 1838. 1908* 794.
69. 489.

The order of the sentence may have confused scribes. -δς may have been introduced from δειπνότας following or because scribes thought that ἔχονταις should agree with δειπνότας.

The nominative δι ἔχοντας should be read.

Possibly this variant was caused on orthographical grounds.

Howard pp. 68 - 69 states that three examples of the nominative in -δς are found in the LXX.
The genitive is either appositional or subjective.

Neither phrase (το Μυστηριον της πιετεψ : το Μυστηριον της ἀναστασεως) is found elsewhere in the N. T.

πιετεψ is used in an absolute sense (i.e. the Christian faith).

ἀναστασεως is never spoken of as a mystery in the N. T., but it is in the early church (e.g. Ath. ep. Drae 10.: Chrys 'in pasche' 7:5, Chrys:Paschale p. 228 - cited in Lampe's Lexicon of Patristic Greek). Christianity is spoken of as a mystery in the N.T.: for instance, at 1 Cor. 2:7, the wisdom of God is called a mystery. A reference to resurrection would be unusual in the context.

Read πιετεψ
3:1 πίστος v.l. αὐθεντικός is discussed at 1 Tim. 1:15 (πίστος v.l. αὐθεντικός).

3:1 Omit πίστος (αὐθεντικός) ὁ λόγος - 256.

The variant represents an accidental omission. The scribe may have considered the phrase redundant and unnecessary.
'en katharos syneidhse -
kai katharas syneidhsews - S

'en katharos syneidhse is found at 2 Tim. 1:3, but
Pastoral usage is ambiguous in its use of this phrase. See
1 Tim. 1:19 'exw pistei kai agadiv syneidhsein
and 1 Tim. 1:5 agape 'en katharas karbiasm kai
syneidhsews agadiv.

S is noted as unreliable at Titus 2:8, 2:14, 3:1, and its
reading ought perhaps be rejected here especially in view of
the frequent occurrences of phrases with 'en at the end of
sentences (1 Tim. 1:13, 2:9, 2:15 etc.).
On orthographical grounds, the error could have occurred in either direction. Atticism is more important than orthographical considerations here. This is shown by statements in Bl-Deb. § 277 and § 290 that οὗτος usually points backward, and that the Classical language used οὗτος for ἄντος. οὗτος is foreign to Attic usage. The subject of οὗτος is always obvious and is usually in the previous clause. This is so here. άντος however, provides a weak emphasis and scribes would have been tempted to alter an original άντος to ὅτος especially as καὶ οὗτος is a strong Semitism (see Acts 10:6, οὗτος v. 1, καὶ οὗτος and Lk. 8:41, καὶ άντος v.1. οὗτος).

Read άντος.
3:10 The variant omitting δε is discussed in Appendix III.

δειπναῷ ἐσχορέων
δοκιμαζόμεθα - 1311. 1319.

The passive ending and sense are required, but the active ending has been substituted by two mss. because of confusion with ἐκκονεῖτο ΤΩCAN following.

The following variant is discussed here: -

1 TIMOTHY.

5:16 ἡπαρκεῖσθω - S A F G.

33. 2344. 1175.

Pel B (subministraret).

ἱπαρκεῖτω - C D K L P.

T. R. 69. 1908, etc.

L (vg)(vt) - (subministret)

Euthal, Dam. Theod. Chrys.

Here the reverse has taken place.

The only occurrence of this verb in the N. T. is at 1 Tim. 5:10 where it is active. The examples in L.S. are all active. The middle ending may have arisen because of confusion with θυπέρ ἔλεγχος following (as von Soden (vol. 1 part 4, p. 1981) suggests).
There is no firm example of εὐτῶ in the N. T. and ὁ ἀρξάμενος is more common in the Ptolemaic papyri (see Howard, p. 112). ἔτοι is used by the author at 1 Tim. 2:13. Here ἔτοι gives the idea of progression necessary in the context. ὁ ἀρξάμενος is limiting. Perhaps because of its unpopularity (6 times in the Gospels in the sense "then" and 3 times in 1 Cor. with v. 11 ἐπικείμενον) ἔτοι was altered by scribes. Perhaps also, scribes were unaware that ἔκκαινον ὁ ἀρξάμενος is used in a technical sense in 1 Tim. (cf. 1 Tim. 3:13) and felt that the verb needed an object. ὁ ἀρξάμενος was therefore supplied to refer to God (or to the ἔπικαινον ὁ ἀρξάμενος). The variant ὁ ἀρξάμενος may also have occurred through confusion with ὁ ἀρξάμενος earlier in the sentence.
All Latin witnesses read "habentes" except Ambst and Pei who follow the majority of Greek mss. with "sine crimine (constitut;)".

occurs at Tit. 1:6, 1:7. It may have arisen from the occurrence of in v. 9 or v. 10. Hatch (1) argues that and were influenced to a certain extent by the Latin translation. If translates a Latin idiom the variant is explicable.

Read .

3:11 ἐρνεύς v.l. ἐρνεύς is discussed at 1 Tim. 3:8 (ἐρνούς).

3:11 νηρεύς v.l. νηρεύς and v.l. νηρεύς is discussed at 1 Tim. 3:2 (νηρεύς).

3:12 The variant adding δέ after σωκόνωι is discussed in Appendix III.

3:12 καλως -
καλων - ἐκ.

81.

The adverb is required by sense. καλως occurs before its verb in v. 13. καλως as an attributive adjective does not usually follow its noun in the Pastorals. (cf. 1 Tim. 1:18, 3:1, 4:6, 6:12). — ὁν occurred because of τακνων: the scribe thought he was writing an adjective to agree with this noun, but children are not called good in 1 Tim. 3:4.
If ὀκὼν is in fact ὀκώτος this is unlikely to be original as ὀκώτος as a diminutive of ὀκοῦς (see L.S.) does not occur in the N. T. The author, however, does use diminutives elsewhere (e.g. 1 Tim. 2:9 ἐκμετάλη) and diminutives were unpopular with scribes.

If ὀκὼν is ὀκώτος, it is from the noun ὀκός and there is frequent variation between ὀκός and ὀκότος in N. T. mss. See for example Lk. 12:39.

ὁκὼν is used by the author of the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 5:13, 2 Tim. 2:20, 3:6 (no. v.11.). ὀκός is used at 1 Tim. 3:4, 3:5, 3:13, 3:15.

Orthographical considerations oblige us to treat the reading of C as secondary. The ἴωΝ ending was probably suggested by ἴωΝ preceding.

Read ὀκὼν
is the main verb in the sentence, the subject of which is

The participial ending is a sheer error by 522 caused by the ending of.
3:13  ἐν πίστει τῇ  

ἐν πίστει ηὐ  - F G

Omit these words  - 181κ

L (vg Zκ)  

Pel  

If ηὐ is original, it refers to πολλὴν παρθένον but in the Pastorals, and in the rest of the N. T. (cf. Col. 1:4) "faith in Jesus Christ" is more usual than "boldness in Jesus Christ". Sheer error by F. G.

Col. 1:4 indicates that this phrase is found in the N. T. There is no obvious assimilation to this verse. The omission of ἐν πίστει τῇ would again cause the unparallelled reading "boldness in Jesus Christ". The omission was facilitated by hom.

παρθένον ἐν πίστει τῇ ἐν.
is incorrect in the context. A participle is required by sense. The -ω ending was possibly suggested by χρυφω preceding. Perhaps a recasting of the sentence as ταυτά καὶ χρυφω • ἐκ τοῦ λόγου • εἰς τὸ ἐπισκέπτεσθαι caused the error, but the placing of two 1 p.s. verbs together is untypical of the author (at 2 Tim. 1:12 the verbs are in two separate clauses).
The omission probably represents an attempt to reduce the incidence of pronominal phrases. Scribes objected to them, especially those involving 2 p.s. references.

\( \pi\rho\sigma\varsigma\ \varepsilon\varepsilon \) has no set place in the N. T. sentence. See the various positions at Heb. 13:13, 1 Th. 2:2, 2:18, 3:4, 3:6, Rev. 3:20 (after verb) 1 Th. 3:11, 2 Th. 3:10, Rev. 12:5 (at the end of the sentence) and 2 Th. 2:5 (before verb).

An infinitive dependent on a participle usually stand as closely together as possible (See references at Titus 2:8), but this is not always so. (cf. 2 Tim. 1:4 \( \tau\pi\tau\pi\cdot\omega\nu\ \varepsilon\varepsilon \) ).
It is difficult to decide which position represents the original, although ξλΩων προς εξ is likely in view of the position of pronominal phrases after this infinitive at Rom. 1:10, 1:13, 15:22, 15:23, 15:29, 1 Cor. 2:1, 16:11, 2 Cor. 1:16.
 occurs frequently in the N. T. without variant as at Lk. 18:8, Acts, 12:7, 22:18, 25:4, Rom. 16:20, Rev. 1:1, 22:6. It also occurs frequently in Pind, Aesch. Soph. Thuc. is not found in a comparative sense in the N. T. as Lock indicates in his commentary (1). The word is rare in the LXX although it occurs at 9is. 13:9. In the N. T. the word occurs at Jn. 13:27 (v.1. 2καρεξιον), Heb. 13:23 (no. v.l.), 13:19 (v.1. 2καρεξιον ), 2 Tim. 4:9 (v.1. iκαρεξιον: 2καρεξιον ). 2καρεξιον was objected to by scribes. Bauer says that the word was 'von den Attizisten verworfen'. The Philetaeros attributed to Herodian § 18 says φαττον ἐρείς, δοκεί 2καρεξιον. Phrynichus § 7viii says τακεξιον οἱ Ἑλληνες, οἱ λέγουσι θαττον δε. Moeris says τακεξιον οὐ λέγεται παρ' Ἀττικοῖς, ἀλλ' θαττον. τακεξιον was objected to because it had no elative force. The v.1. at Acts 17:15 τακεξιον for ὡς τακεξιον ought to be borne in mind here.

(1) Turner p. 30 points to τακεξιον as an example of the comparative for the positive at 1 Tim. 3:14 and 2 Tim. 4:9. Other examples could be elative (Jn. 13:27) or a true comparative (Heb. 13:19).

τακεξιον should be read here. It was altered by Atticistic scribes.
3:15 The variant omitting δὲ is discussed in Appendix III.

3:15 ἐπικυμνη -
ἐπικυμνη - 33.

The 1st p.s. is expected after γράφω. Sheer error by 33.
Add ζε after δελ. - D

L (vt d f)(vg) Arm.
Ambst. Hil. etc.
Origen, etc.

ζε is necessary to the sense. Possibly this was felt by the translators. Most of the evidence for ζε is versional. D was possibly influenced by L (vt d).

The person is indicated by εις δήσε and by τρος ες in the preceding verse. Where δελ + ινθ occurs with a personal pronoun, the person is not obvious from the context (Acts 9:6, 27:24 Rev. 10:11).

ζε is an explanatory addition by scribes and translators.

(cf. variant adding ἰδιων at 1 Tim. 3:7).
Either word agrees with author's usage of arthrous \( \sigma \kappa \rho \lambda \nu \) / \( \kappa \nu \) (See 1 Tim. 3:5, 4:4, 2 Tim. 1:1, 2:24).

\( \delta \kappa \kappa \lambda \) at 1 Tim. 3:5 refers to \( \sigma \kappa \rho \lambda \nu \). The close association of \( \delta \kappa \kappa \lambda \) and \( \sigma \kappa \rho \lambda \nu \) occurs also at Mt. 12:4, 21:13, Mk. 2:26, 11:17, Lk. 6:4, Heb. 10:21, Jn. 2:16, 2:17, etc. There is no firm example with \( \kappa \nu \).

\( \kappa \nu \) here is a stylistic alteration. \( \sigma \kappa \rho \lambda \nu \) occurs twice in this verse. This criterion accounts for the variation in mss. at 1 Tim. 5:4, 5:5, Tit. 2:10 (q.v.).

Read \( \sigma \kappa \rho \lambda \nu \)
3:15 ἡτίσ v.l. εἶτις is discussed at 1 Tim. 3:1
(εἶ v.l. ἦ).

3:15 ἀληθεια -
ἐκκλησία - 421, 1022, 1245, 2344.

ἀληθεια is used absolutely in the Pastorals. Here ἐτυλος...ἀληθεια is in apposition to ἐκκλησία ὅν Ἰωντοσ.

ἐτυλος in the N. T. usually refers to people in the N. T. (Gal. 2:9, Rev. 3:12) and in Eusebius H. E. 5:1 - 6. Lock thinks ἐτυλος ἀληθεια refers to Timothy, but Bernard in his commentary (p. 62 - 63) suggests that this is too strong of an individual. But ἐτυλος ἐκκλησίας would be even stronger. It is unlikely that ἐτυλος is loose and ungrammatical in apposition to ὅν as Holtzmann (cited in Lock's commentary) suggests, because this is an inadequate description of God. In view of this ἐτυλος ἀληθειας is to be taken with ἐκκλησία and so ἀληθειας is likely to be original. ἐκκλησία was obviously introduced from the previous occurrence of the word in the same sentence.
Add δ before φλ - 440.

If δ is original, it must refer to πρώτα, or to the whole of the phrase preceding it. However, it is unlikely to be original and is due to the scribe having misread the sentence as ..... 'the pillar and mainstay of the truth which is also unquestionably great'. This is wrong in view of the continuation of the sentence.
The adverb \( \text{oρολογούμενως} \) is rare. It is a \( \chi.\lambda. \) in the N. T. but appears in 4 Macc. 6:31, 7:16, 16:1. It also appears in the Ep. Arist. 24, in Thuc. Plat. Diod. Epict. Jos.

The reading \( \text{oρολογούμεν ὦς} \) came about when copying from scriptio continua. The scribe misdivided the word because of his unfamiliarity of this adverb. A. S. Lewis (1) says that the words in \( \& (\text{pal.}) \) which follow, probably formed part of a liturgy or creed recited by the congregation. But there is no example of \( ὦς \) introducing dependent indirect speech in the N. T.

Read, \( \text{oρολογούμενως} \).

(1) A. S. Lewis "1 Timothy 3:16" in J.T.S. XIX 1917, p. 80.
T. R. and most minuscules.
Lect. Byz.
Slavonic, Arabic Polyglott.
L (vg Lc).
Disciple of Appolinarius.

73. 181. 33. 442. 363. 2127.
Lect. 599.
Goth. (Copt. $\$ (?) Arm. Eth).
Epiph. Theod-Mops. Cyril-Alex
Orig. (Lat), Jer. Liberatus.
(Ephraim).

L (vt f g) (vg) - quod.
($\$ (?) Arm. Copt. Eth).
Vict. of Rome
(Ephraim).

This is probably the most discussed variant in the Pastoral epistles. Here are the views of some critics on the verse:

(1) Westcott and Hort on select readings p. 133. say that \( \Theta C \) is a late Antiochene reading. This change to \( \Theta C \) is one of the readings charged against Macedonius bishop of Constantinople at the time of his expulsion by Emperor Anastasius during the Monophysite influence of 510. The change was facilitated or caused by the removal of an apparent solecism and obtained concurrently with the acquisition of increased definiteness for a theological statement. The reverse can only be accounted for on palaeographical grounds. \( \Theta C \) is unlikely to stand at the head of 6 clauses though it might harmonise with the first. The antecedent of \( \xi \) is not found in the preceding verse, because this is an extract from a hymn and the preceding verse is not quoted.

(2) The view of Badcock (2) who translates the verse back into Aramaic from which language he presumes it comes, leaves no room for the divine name to appear.

Bernard in his commentary prefers ὦς because of the parallelism in the hymn and because ὦς is the relative to an unexpressed antecedent.

Field's notes approve of ὦς saying that ὦς is of no significance and that the first statement refers to God. He is concerned about the possible meaning of the relative and the fruitless attempts to link it to an antecedent.

Robertson (3) quotes Liberatus "Hunc enim immutasse ubi habet ὦς id est "qui" monosyllabum Graecum, lettera mutata ο in ο vertisse et fecisse ὦς id est "deus" ut esset: "Deus apparuit per carnem" ".

Tregelles, Tischendorf and others discuss this variant and much of the discussion hinges on whether certain mss. read ὦς or ὦς. Stylistic considerations and author's usage are usually ignored by textual critics but these criteria can help us to decide with certainty the original reading here.

If the reading $\varsigma$ is an example of the article used as a relative pronoun it is unlikely to be original. Turner, p. 37 points out that there are no certain examples of this usage in the N. T.

If $\varsigma$ is the neuter relative pronoun, it is, as Hammond points out, developed from $\delta$ because of the foregoing neuter $\mu\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\iota\rho\omicron\nu$. The idea of God or Christ as a mystery is however not alien to N. T. theology (cf. Col. 2:2 and possibly 1 Cor. 2:1) but it is difficult to see how the other variants arose if $\varsigma$ is original here.

$\epsilon\tau\omicron$ cannot be original. The section of $\epsilon\tau\omicron$ in the appendix on the divine names (Appendix 1) shows that anarthrous $\epsilon\tau\omicron$ in the nominative is untypical of Pastoral usage (e.g. at 1 Tim. 4:3, 2 Tim. 1:7, 2:25, Titus 1:2). Also $\epsilon\tau\omicron$ would be unsuitable in the context with $\delta\epsilon\nu\kappa\alpha\mu\omega\theta\eta$ following. The fact that this verse is a quotation from a hymn and that author's style and usage may be inoperative here, may be discounted in view of the following.

If $\delta$ is original, it explains how the other variants occurred.

(4) In his "Outlines of Textual Criticism applied to the New Testament" 6th edition, Appendix B.
As Hort says, δζ does not have an antecedent, as the verse is quoted out of its context. Scribes experienced the difficulty, which Field expressed and altered δζ to ῶε in order to provide a definite subject for the sentence. Such a change would be facilitated by orthographical considerations, and some scribes may have written ῶε accidentally. However, other scribes wrote δζ in an attempt to make the relative agree with the neuter antecedent μὲντηπίον. 69 and 88 conflated the two readings δζ and ῶε (69 is guilty of conflation at 1 Tim. 6:19 'οὐτὶ δζ μὲντηπίον) or else realised that ῶε in the exemplar should not appear without the article.

If δζ is original, it creates the parallelism in the verse noted by Norden in "Agnostos Theos" p. 254f.

The variant by 256 looks like a conflation of δζ and ῶε, or is an addition of ῶε to supply a nominative.

If δζ is original, it was altered to ῶε:

(a) because of a palaeographical and orthographical error.
(b) to supply a nominative and improve the construction.
(c) for dogmatic and theological motives.

δζ originally referred to Christ.
The antithesis in the hymn is between ἐν and ἀγγελος a revelation embracing two extremes. The revelation to angels is by a vision (ὡς θν) as at 1 Cor. 15:6 - 8.

Of also 1 Pet. 1:12, Eph. 3:10, and the Ascension of Isaiah 11.

The variant possibly occurred because 623 was reminded of 1 Cor. 4:9 ἀγγελος καὶ ἀνθρωπος.
3:16 Omit the third ἐν - 0241.

337. 323. 177.

L (vg except N).

L (vt except g).

Latin Fathers (except Aug.


The previous line in the poem appears without a preposition.

If the preposition were absent here too, the meaning would be

"preached by nations" rather than "preached among nations".

The use of ἐν in this sense of "among" is less frequently

found, and is a specialised use. There was a tendency for

scribes to reduce the incidence of prepositions. The omission

here may also have been made to improve the parallelism of the

couplet.

3:16 ἐπιστευθή v.l. πιστευθή is discussed at

1 Tim. 1:3 (παραγγειλας).

3:16 ἀνελημφθή v.l. ἀνεληφθή is discussed at

1 Tim. 3:2 (ἀνεπιλημφτον).
πνευμά is always neuter in the N. T. Sheer error by F. G.
The expression 'latter end of days', in the O. T. is always conveyed with ΞΕΧΑΤΟΣ as in ΓΕΝ. ΞΕΧΑΤΟΝ ΤΩΝ ΗΜΕΡΩΝ (Gen. 49:1) and ΓΕΝ. ΤΑΙΣ ΞΕΧΑΤΟΙΣ ΗΜΕΡΑΙΣ (Isa. 2:2). See also Num. 24:14. Deut. 4:30, 31:29, etc. ΨΕΓΕΡΟΝ appears at 3 Macc. 2:24 in the phrase ΓΕΝ ΚΡΟΝΩ. ΨΕΓΕΡΟΝ (See Hatch and Redpath's concordance).

Zerwick (1) says that ΨΕΓΕΡΟΣ strictly means 'latter' but that it is used here in the sense of 'last'. ΨΕΓΕΡΟΣ is usually used of times future to the speaker. This sense is required at 2 Tim. 3:1, 2 Pet. 3:3, Jude 18, but at all these places, the text reads ΞΕΧΑΤΟΣ (without variant). There is no firm example of the adjective ΨΕΓΕΡΟΣ in the N. T. At Mt. 21:31 the v.l. ΠΡΩΤΟΣ exists. It is rare in the LXX, where its sense is 'latter' 'next'. ΨΕΓΕΡΟΝ in the sense of ΨΕΓΕΡΟΣ is fairly frequent in the N. T.

(1) 'Biblical Greek' translated from the 4th ed. by J. Smith.
As ἕκτερος has not been used in its strict sense, ἕκτατος has been substituted to convey the true sense and to conform to the general term. The Latin translated as if the Greek read ἕκτατος. Blass-Debr 5.62 says that ἕκτατος in N. T. Greek appears in a comparative sense (as at Mt. 27:64) and ἕκτερος in a superlative sense, so that if the end needs to be emphasised ἕκτατος is used regardless of the number of units - duality is eliminated. If the relative is to be emphasised, the comparative is used without reference to the unity of comparison (i.e. ἕκτερος). At 1 Tim. 41 the times are future and so the superlative is needed.

The variant ἕκτερος may have arisen because of the different emphasis given to the sentence by scribes. An Atticist scribe may have objected to ἕκτατος because it strictly means the last of a series, just as πρῶτος means the first of a series. Turner p. 29–32 shows that there is much confusion in the N. T. over the comparison of adverbs and adjectives.
4:1 Add ἔπειτα before Τῆς πίετεως
- 206. 1149. 1799.
L (vg) adds "a".

cf. 1 Tim. 6:10 ἔπειτα πλανῶν ἔπειτα τῆς πίετεως
and variant discussed below.

Often Mt. improved Mk.'s style by omitting a preposition
when it follows a verb compounded with that same preposition,
or else altered the verb, e.g. Mk. 1:16 ορίζων ὄρος
= Mt. 4:18 ἔφερσαν ὄρος ; Mk. 1:21
ζητομένων εἰς = Mt. 4:17 ἐλθὼν εἰς .

In the sense 'to depart' ἀφείσθημι is followed by ἔπειτα
without v.11 at Lk. 4:13 Acts 5:38 Lk. 13:27 etc. In a
metaphorical sense 2 Tim. 2:19 has the verb and ἔπειτα
See also Heb. 3:12. Except for the absolute use at Lk. 8:13,
this is the only instance of the metaphorical use without the
preposition. Therefore accept the variant. Read ἔπειτα
Scribes omitted it on stylistic grounds.

The following variant is considered here:

1 TIMOTHY.

6:10 Omit ἔπειτα - 2.
This omission also represents a stylistic improvement: the
verb is compounded with the same preposition.
4:1 Add Ὄοθος before πίστεως - 255.

The variant probably represents an interpretative addition dating from a period of heretical faiths. Ὄοθος is used in the N. T. in Acts and Hebrews. πίστεως in the rest of the Pastorals obviously refers to a true faith in God or Christ.

Apologists were concerned with Ὅοθος λόγος e.g. Appendix 2:2, 7:7, 9:4, 55:4, Dial. 3:3, 8:2 etc. (1).

(1) See E. J. Goodspeed "Die Ältesten Apologeten".
4:1 The variant adding 

καὶ before προσέχωντες is discussed in Appendix II.

4:1 πλάνοις

- πλάνοι - 33.

- πλάνης - P. 0241.

440, 917, 462, and a few other minuscules.

L (vg). Arm.

Clem. Orig. Basil.


Bartlet (1) says that πνευμάτων πλάνης is a Hebraism and that πλάνοις is "suspiciously better Greek".

πλάνης, the Genitive of πλάνη (an error) is more common in the N. T. than the adjective πλάνοις, which is a 

Note that Σ.Σαβανάλιος following is qualified by the Genitive. πλάνης as a Semitism was avoided by certain scribes. It is likely to be original here.

πλάνοι by 33 is probably a sheer error of omission of sigma. Because of the case, it is unlikely to be a separate noun as at Mt. 27:3, 2 Cor. 6:8, 2 Jn. 7.

(1) In 'A New Fifth-Sixth Century Fragment of 1 Timothy' in J.T.S.X VII 1 (1917) p. 309.
4:1 The variant omitting καὶ before διακαλίζεστε is discussed at Appendix II.

4:1 διακαλίζεστε -
διακαλίζετε - $S^*$ $F^*$

69. 1799.

προσεχοντες is followed by the dative Πνευματιν; διακαλίζετε should also be in the dative case. The error by $S^*$ and others was caused by misreading, aided by the distance separating noun and verb.
4:1 Weiss puts a comma after δαμονύν. This punctuation is followed in most printed editions (B F B S diglott, Souter etc.).

Ἐν τούτῳ ἐπικρίνεις ψευδελογία is not to be taken with δαμονύν. The words refer to the whole sentiment expressed before. It is necessary therefore, to separate them off with a comma.
L + S. list the form with sigma as Vulgar for κατηκρινον.
In other words formed from this root, L + S. list both spellings.
In Howard p. 342 and p. 405 this word appears with the sigma bracketed.

Read with sigma. It may have been objected to by certain scribes as a Vulgar form.
In the Pastorals ἐγενέτους is used only as a reflexive as at 1 Tim. 6:10, 6:19 not as a possessive pronoun. This rules out the originality of ἐγενέτους here. There was much interchange between τοις and ἐγενέτους as seen in Mayser II 2 p. 73 § 66c. (1). τοις is likely to be original here. τοις was objected to. In the Classical

(1) See also S. B. Psaltes 'Grammatik der Byzantischen Chroniken' in 'Forschungen zur Griechischen und Lateinischen Grammatik' Vol. 2. p. 197.
language it meant "ones own personal." Turner p. 191 shows that in the N. T. Ἱκός appears as a mere possessive, although both meanings are apparent in Mt 22:5. Stylistic purists may have objected to this non-Classical use, and would omit it or change it. Both forms of variation are found in this reading. Particularly, has a marked dislike for Ἱκίος (see v.11 at Mt. 13:37, Mk. 15:20; Acts 1:19, 2:24).

The use of Ἱκός is similar at 1 Tim. 2:6, 3:4, 3:5, 3:12, 5:4, 6:15, 2 Tim. 4:3, Tit. 1:3, 2:5, 2:9.

The following variant is considered here:

1 TIMOTHY.

6:1 Ἱκίος -

ὁκίος - 440.

The arguments about Ἱκίος above apply here, and Ἱκίος ought to be read.
Marcion as quoted by Hippolytus.

Scribes sometimes followed the Classical rule whereby a relative pronoun is attracted to the case of its antecedent. See Turner p. 324, cf. Mk. 13:19 'ιν in A, w, C and also the v.11. below. Read ζ as original here: ου is an Atticistic alteration.

The following variants are discussed here: -

1 TIMOTHY.

4:6 ζ -
ζι - A.
436. 8 (Tischendorf).

Another example of attraction. ζ is likely to be original.

See Bl-Deb. 294,

and

TITUS.

3:5 ου -
ζι - C, S, P, D, F, G, A.
33, 424, 1739.


Clement. Theod.

Read ζ as original. ου is Atticistic.
4:3 θεός

In the context θεός is the eternal truth of the Christian gospel. This idea is weakened if it is qualified by αὐτοῦ. θεός is used absolutely of a body of doctrine (cf. Gal. 2:5 ἐν θεῷ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου and Rom. 1:25 ...πρὸς θεόν τοῦ θεοῦ where θεόν is objective genitive).

θεός is not qualified at 1 Tim. 2:3 and 6:5. The addition here represents an attempt by D to apply θεός directly to God.
4:4 Omit $\Theta \Upsilon - P.$

Anarthrous $\Theta \Upsilon$ dependent on an anarthrous noun is characteristic of the author. (1 Tim. 1:4, 3:15, 4:5, 2 Tim. 1:1, Tit. 1:1, 1:7).

$\pi \alpha \nu \kappa \tau \iota \sigma \rho \omicron \alpha$ occurs without $\Theta \Upsilon$ at Rev. 5:13, but there the context does not require $\Theta \Upsilon$. The omission here may be theological and based on the belief that all creation is God's, and that it is unnecessary to qualify $\kappa \tau \iota \sigma \rho \omicron \alpha$. The omission may possibly be stylistic: $\delta \Theta \Upsilon \epsilon \kappa \tau \iota \sigma \rho \omicron \alpha \nu \iota$ occurs in the previous verse.

4:4 $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha$ v.l. $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha$ is discussed at 1 Tim. 2:9 $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha$ v.l. $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha$. 
Both words are synonymous in the context. \( \lambda \alpha \rho \beta \alpha \nu \omega \) occurs in the Pastorals at 2 Tim. 1:5 (no. v.l.). \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \alpha \rho \beta \alpha \nu \omega \) occurs in the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 4:3, 2 Tim. 2:6 and at Acts 2:46, 27:33 and 27:34 (no. v.l.l.). At Acts 24:25 a variant reads simple verb.

Radermacher (1) says that the "Gebrauch des Verbums simplex an Stelle eines Kompositums (wie \( \kappa \varepsilon \varphi \omega \) für \( \kappa \alpha \tau \delta \varepsilon \kappa \varepsilon \upsilon \omega \)) ist bei ihm (Philo) wie anderswo ein Charakteristikum vulgärer Rede". However, Demetrius on Style § 191 says that simple verbs are the mark of better style. This fact has been borne out by other variants in this study. When a compound verb is followed by the same preposition in Mk., Mt. alters either the verb or the preposition (compare Mk. 1:16 and Mt. 4:18; Mk. 1:21 and Mt. 4:13; Mk. 5:13 and Mt. 8:32). \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \alpha \rho \beta \alpha \nu \omega \) is likely to be correct here.

4:5  ἐντευχοῦσας – ἐντευχοῦσιν – D

(cf. other variants by D at 1 Tim. 1:13, 3:13, 5:4).

ἀγαθῷ + δίδαξε + Genitive appears at Heb. 10:10, 13:12. The scribe misunderstood the sentence, and felt that ἐντευχοῦσιν should mean 'by petitions', but the dative plural should be ἐντευχοῦσιν.
No Classical examples of this verb are listed by L. + S. The verb does not appear in the LXX. N. T. examples make it unlikely that it bears the meaning 'to entreat' here. Elsewhere it is used of footgear ('to fasten on'). Lock ad loc. says that ουποτ.θημι is a gentle word suited to Timothy's youth. ουποδεορικα would not be gentle. ουποτ.θημι ('to set before') is more suitable in the context. N. T. knows the word only here and at Rom. 16:4.

ουποτ.θημι ('to put away') is found more frequently in the N. T. (Mt. 14:3, Acts 7:58, Eph. 4:22, 4:25, Col. 3:8, Heb. 12:1, Jas. 1:21, 1 Pet. 2:1) but is not suitable in the context. Sheer error.

Read ουποτ.θημι

The author sometimes separates noun and adjective, e.g. 1 Tim. 3:13 ἁγιόν.... καλόν. This separation may have caused 665 to err. See also v.l. omitting Ἰωής at 1 Tim. 4:8.

Horn. may have facilitated the omission.

ἀδελφοὶ ὦ Ἱκανοὶ καλοὶ ἔσω.
The reading of $D^{x}$ is obviously wrong and is an orthographical error. See 1 Tim. 1:10 where the $\phi$ in $\epsilon\nu\tau\rho\varepsilon\phi\rho\varepsilon\omicron\nu\varsigma$ is declared unAttic. See also Acts 13:18 $\epsilon\tau\rho\rho\phi\rho\phi\omicron\rho\eta\varsigma\epsilon\nu$ v.l. $\epsilon\tau\rho\rho\phi\rho\phi\omicron\rho\eta\varsigma\epsilon\nu$.

$\epsilon\nu\tau\rho\varepsilon\phi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\alpha$ 'to nourish' is found only here in the N. T. Schmid's "Atticismus" III p. 196 lists Aelian as having the word in his writings. $\epsilon\nu\tau\rho\varepsilon\phi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\alpha$ likewise is a $\zeta\lambda\nu$. In the Greek N. T. $\epsilon\nu\tau\rho\varepsilon\phi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron$ however appears at Eph. 5:29, 6:4 and frequently in the LXX (Gen. 45:7, 45:11 Isa. 23:4 etc.).

The choice is therefore between $\epsilon\nu\kappa$ and $\epsilon\nu\tau\rho\varepsilon\phi\rho\varepsilon\omicron\nu\varsigma$ This variant is listed as doubtful in Appendix 6. If a choice must be made $\epsilon\nu\tau\rho\varepsilon\phi\rho\varepsilon\omicron\nu\varsigma$ is preferable as forms of $\epsilon\nu\tau\rho\varepsilon\phi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron$ are found in the N. T.
The omission was motivated by stylistic considerations. 
καλός occurs earlier in the sentence. The omission was possibly facilitated by Hom.

- HC καλός HC
The two ideas the author is conveying are τοὺς λόγους τῆς πίστεως and τοὺς λόγους τῆς καλῆς διδακταλίας.

Scribes were possibly confused by the ἡ following and have made καλὴ διδακταλία dependent on ἐν τῇ πρεσβυτερίᾳ directly. The scribes may also have been reminded of 1 Tim. 5:17 ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδακταλίᾳ.
The sense obviously requires διδακτάλιας which is a frequent word in the Pastoral epistles (15 times compared to 5 times in the rest of the N. T.). 1831 adds διδакτονιας instead of διδακταλιας through confusion with the earlier occurrence of διδακτονιας in the sentence.
Burton (1) says that the N. T. authors knew the difference between the perfect tense and the aorist. The strict perfect is rare in the Pastorals. Perfect verbs in 1 Tim. without variant include 2:14 γέγονε : 3:5 ὁδεγέω : 1:8 ὅδεξαμεν : 5:6 θεοφείξε : 4:3 ἐπεγυγκοσία : 1:9 οἰκεῖα : 1:10 ἀνεκφείται. In view of the rarity of the strict perfect in the Pastorals, we should be inclined to read the aorist above. Scribes would alter aorists with a perfect meaning into perfects proper. The perfect of Παρακολουθέω occurs at Lk. 1:3 and 2 Tim. 3:10 (v.l.). Orthography would have eased the transition from aorist to perfect.

(1) E. D. Burton "New Testament Moods and Tenses", p. 44.
The following variants are also discussed here:

1 TIMOTHY.

4:10 \( \gamma \lambda \pi \iota \kappa \varphi \varepsilon \nu - \)
\( \gamma \lambda \pi \iota \varphi \varepsilon \nu - D^* \)

33.

The above arguments favour the aorist here. Orthography again would have eased such a change.

1 TIMOTHY.

5:5 \( \gamma \lambda \pi \iota \kappa \varepsilon \nu - \)
\( \gamma \lambda \pi \iota \varepsilon \nu - 88. \)

Orthography could have caused the variant in either direction, but the above arguments again apply, and the reading of 88 should be followed. That the perfect of this verb is suspect may be seen in the variant below.

1 TIMOTHY.

6:17 \( \gamma \lambda \pi \iota \kappa \varepsilon \upsilon \nu \lambda \varsigma - \)
\( \varepsilon \lambda \pi \iota \varepsilon \upsilon \nu - F \ G \)

John of Damascus.

Here orthography is unlikely to have caused the variant.
and \( \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\gamma\varepsilon\lambda\varsigma \) and \( \upsilon\pi\eta\lambda\alpha \) \( \phi\rho\omicron\omicron\nu\varepsilon\omicron \nu \) are present.

So \( \varepsilon\lambda\pi\tau\zeta\varepsilon\omicron\nu \) agrees naturally. The perfect has the idea of the durative effect of 'their having set their hopes on' - this is the idea, which scribes wished to convey in the sentence.

The perfect infinitive is rare. \( \tau\epsilon\omicron\omicron\nu\alpha\nu\alpha \) appears at Acts 14:19 \( \gamma\epsilon\omicron\omicron\nu\varepsilon\nu\alpha\nu \) at 2 Tim. 2:14 and \( \varepsilon\lambda\delta\epsilon\nu\alpha\nu \) at Tit. 1:16.

Read \( \varepsilon\lambda\pi\tau\zeta\varepsilon\omicron\nu \).
4:7 γραφής -
διγραφής - G.

An error not untypical of G. The αL in διγραφής is a dittography of those letters in the preceding καL.
4:7  ἡδοὺς -  θυρῶς - C.


ἡδοὺς  occurs in 1 Tim. 3:4, 2 Tim. 4:4, Tit. 1:14, 2 Pet.1:16. The sense and context require this word.

Transposition of letters has caused this variant.
4:7 ἵνα ἔσ -
γυμνό - 69.

γυμνό is an impossible form, and is a senseless error by 69.

4:7 The variant omitting the second ἔ is discussed in Appendix III.
The use of προς here is the same as at 2 Tim. 3:16.

L + S. cite examples of προς after ἀπελθον but no examples with εἰς. Turner p. 257 suggests that προς tends to appear with a personal object and εἰς with an impersonal; but this is unlikely to apply here. Bl.-Deb. § 207 says that εἰς is used for ἐπὶ and προς as at Jn. 4:5, Mt. 12:41, Lk. 3:7. Hence an interchange exists between these prepositions. προς is original here. It was altered on stylistic grounds: προς follows twice in the next verse.
This variant is interesting, because the scribe has begun to write γυναῖκα but has added to it the ending of σωματίκη (preceding).
4:8 omit προσ (pr.) - S

2400.

ωφελιμος + προσ + Acc. occurs at 2 Tim. 3:16.
Without the preposition ωφελιμος is followed by the
dative directly as at Tit. 3:8.

'ολιγον does occur without a preposition and is used
adverbially of time or of space as at MK. 1:19, 6:31, but
προσ 'ολιγον is found as at Jas. 4:14.

προσ here should be regarded as original. Its
omission was caused by stylistic considerations: προσ
occurs 3 times in verses 7 and 8.
4:8 Add \( \mu \varepsilon \nu \) after \( \lambda \gamma \alpha \gamma \nu \) - FG

\[ L (\nu \tau \varepsilon \eta \gamma) = \text{quidem} \]

and also

2 TIMOTHY.

2:21 Add \( \mu \varepsilon \nu \) after \( \varepsilon \delta \alpha \tau \theta \omicron \nu - 1827. \)

Turner p. 332 states the fact that there is much variation over the omission of \( \mu \varepsilon \nu \) in the N. T. mss., but he does not attempt to solve the problem of its originality.

\( \mu \varepsilon \nu \ldots \delta \varepsilon \) is used by our author at 2 Tim. 1:10, 2:20, 4:4.

There are about 20 examples of \( \mu \varepsilon \nu \ldots \delta \varepsilon \) in the LXX; and in the N. T. the construction occurs mainly in the N. T. books of higher style ('Acts' and 'Hebrews').

Blass-Deb. \( \S \) 447 shows that \( \mu \varepsilon \nu \) is classical, and so its introduction above by scribes is more probable than its omission by copyists. \( \mu \varepsilon \nu \) at 2 Tim. 2:21 may have been introduced from the preceding verse. \( \mu \varepsilon \nu \) solitarum is rare in the N. T. and never occurs in the Pastorals.

Ignore the addition of \( \mu \varepsilon \nu \) at both 1 Tim. 4:8 and 2 Tim. 2:21.
4:8 Omit \( \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \epsilon \) (sec.) - FG

L (vG L*)

Clement.

Read \( \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \epsilon \) before not after second \( \omega \phi \varepsilon \lambda \rho \sigma \) - 489.

1518. 483. 1022. 2400.

(cf. the omission of \( \varepsilon \nu \nu \alpha \nu \) at 2 Tim. 2:11, Tit. 3:8 and at 1 Tim. 2:5, 5:25). The v.l. omitting \( \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \epsilon \) probably represents a stylistic omission; \( \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \epsilon \) occurs earlier in the sentence. The omission could also have been motivated by Atticistic tendencies. Turner p. 294 points out that the ellipse of \( \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \epsilon \) is not so common in the N. T. as in Attic. See also Bl-Deb. \( \xi \) 127, and Doudna (op. cit) p. 4, where it is stated that the ellipse of \( \varepsilon \nu \nu \alpha \nu \) is often Classical.

The variant by 489 and others could represent assimilation to 4:8α. The endings of 3:6 and 3:7, however, suggest that the author is not always sensitive to repetitions. In this instance it seems more probable that scribes wrote the words in the same order in \( \gamma \) 8α and \( \gamma \) 8β for the sake of consistency.

Ignore this variant.
The context suggests that it is the \( \Sigma\nu\epsilon\beta\varepsilon\nu\alpha \) which has the promise in it. The plural of \( \Sigma\pi\alpha\gamma\varepsilon\lambda\nu\alpha \) is found less frequently than the singular in the N. T. (Rom. 9:4, Gal. 3:21, Heb. 8:6, 11:17).

Read the singular. It was altered to the plural, because it was felt that there were two promises: one for the present life, and one for the future.
The separation of \( \Delta \tau \alpha \gamma \nu \varepsilon \lambda \iota \alpha \nu \) from the dependent genitive may have caused the scribe to be careless. \( \Upsilon \mu \eta \varsigma \) is necessary to the sense.

"Promise of life" is a Pastoral idea paralleled at 2 Tim. 1:1.
4:9 Omit πανηγυρισμένος - σχέδιο.

 gev.

(cf. variants omitting πανηγυρισμένος elsewhere and see the list at 2 Tim. 4:8).

In other quotations of this phrase πανηγυρισμένος occurs (e.g. 1 Tim. 1:15). It is unlikely that the addition of πανηγυρισμένος is the result of assimilation in view of σχέδιο's tendency to omit.
The variant adding ἐκτὸς before κοπιῶμεν is discussed in Appendix II.

4:10 ἑγὼ νιώτερα - S* A C F G K.
1518. 88. 33. 1908. 104. 326.
1912. 1022.
Cyril.

4:10 ὀνειδιζομένα - S C D L P.
T. R. 1739. 69. etc.
Byz. Lect.
Versions.
Chrys. Origen. et al.
Theod-Mops (Lat.). Ambst et al.

W. H. place ὀνειδιζομένα in their margin. Latin translations read "maledicimur".

There are many examples of ἑγὼ νιώτερα in L. S. It is found in Macc. In the Pastorals the verb occurs at 1 Tim. 6:12, 2 Tim. 4:7, and in the rest of the N. T. at 1 Cor. 7:25 Col. 1:29 (no v.11.). The sense 'to fight' is suitable in the context and balances κοπιῶμεν (cf. γυμναζομαι).
The reading is protected by 2 Tim. 4:7.

ὁνειδιζομένα is also from an Attic verb. It occurs frequently in the LXX and the N. T. including 1 Pet. 4:14, Heb. 10:33, 13:13. Lock's commentary states that ὀνειδιζομένα
may be correct especially if 1 Tim. 4:10 is the faithful saying, but it is less suitable in the context. Persecution and reproach are not prominent in this epistle. It is not a Pastoral word. Possibly it was introduced into the text during a time of persecution.
4:10 ἔλπιδαρεν v.l. ἔλπησεν is discussed at 1 Tim. 4:6 (παρηκολούθητας v.l. παρηκολούθης).

4:10 ομιό -

οὖν τοι - δ'

L (vg) (vt. ñ f).

οὖν τοι - Φ.

'έπτι is usually followed by the dative in the N. T. (cf. 1 Tim. 6:17 'έπτι τω ομιο τω παρεχοντι) but at 1 Tim. 5:5 ελπισαι 'έπτι is followed by the accusative.

The original hand of D may have been influenced by the Latin side of the ms. The reading of Φ is a sheer orthographical error.
In view of the ambiguity of εὐθυρ, it was sometimes changed by scribes to πατὴρ. εὐθυρ is used of God at 1 Tim. 1:1, 2:3, Tit. 1:3, 2:10, 3:4. It was used of Christ at 2 Tim. 1:10, Tit. 1:4, 2:13, 3:6. πατὴρ as an attributive or title of God would be facilitated by trinitarian doctrines and by assimilation to those passages in the Pastorals, where God is so addressed (e.g. 1 Tim. 1:2, 2 Tim. 1:2, Tit. 1:4). In the rest of the N. T. πατὴρ is a common name for God.

πας ἀνθρωπος occurs at 1 Tim. 2:4 (no. v.l.) and elsewhere in the N. T. (Rom. 5:12, 5:18, 12:18, 1 Cor. 7:7, 1 Th. 2:15) (1) See also Tit. 2:11, 3:2, 1 Tim. 2:1.

ἀνθρωπων was possibly omitted through hom.—

παντών ἀνθρωπων

or because it was felt to be unnecessary as παντες often means 'all men' as at 1 Tim. 2:2.

4:10 The variant adding δε after μαθητα is discussed in Appendix III.

(1) Middleton on the Greek article discusses διας ἀνθρωπος on p. 103.
is necessary as an adversative. It is frequently found in the N. T. that balances a negative clause with a qualification. See for example 1 Tim. 2:9, 3:3, 5:1, 5:13, 6:2, 2 Tim. 1:8, 4:16, Tit. 1:7 - 8, 2:10, etc. 1739 possibly took as a separate sentence and thus omitted .
The meaning of the present and 2nd aorist imperative of ἔγγυς is virtually the same. The error is possibly orthographical - in either direction: see Howard (p. 76) who lists the changes of 'ς' and 'ς'.

ἔγγυς is probably correct here. It follows many present imperatives (παραγγέλε, διδάκε, καταφέρων), Scribes tended to alter present tenses to aorists in moods outside the indicative (see I.C.C. on Matthew).
The reading of 257 may represent a secondary stage in the transmission of the text. It may have attempted to replace ἐν πνεύματι once it had been accidentally omitted. On the other hand, it may simply represent the accidental rearrangement of elements in a list.
4:14 Omit ἐν - 1022.

A similar usage of ἐν occurs at 2 Tim. 1:5 ... τῆς ἐν ἐναντίον θεοῦ. The omission may have been caused by assimilation to ἐν later in the verse.
χαίρετος appears frequently in the N.T. epistles including 2 Tim. 1:6. Moulton and Geden's concordance indicates that the word was not used before the Christian era. In the LXX the words occur only in Sirach, with the v.l. χαίρετος at Sir. 38:30.

χαίρετος occurs in the N.T. at 1 Jn. 2:20, 2:27 (bis). It is frequent in Exodus (e.g. at 30:25). There is no indication elsewhere that Timothy was anointed, or that ordination by chrism was practiced in N.T. times. The reading could easily have occurred through the accidental dropping of 'α' (cf. 'αχριστός at 2 Tim. 3:2), or through assimilation to 1 Jn. 2:20, 2:27 where the anointing is God-given, "Gifts" are also said to be God-given in the N.T. (cf. 1 Cor. 7:7).

Read χαίρετος .
The context requires _EXTENDED_ . It is used in the sense 'medium through which' as at Mt. 1:22, Rom. 12:3. _META_ has been introduced through confusion due to the proximity of this preposition in this verse.

The following variant is also discussed at this point.

1 TIMOTHY.

4:14 _META_ -

F G

1149.

L (vg B L)(vt d) - per impositionem.


Theod.

The Latin may represent either another attempt to translate the phrase, or be the result of confusion with "per" earlier in the verse. The Greek _S_ probably arose through confusion with the earlier occurrence of _S_. But notice that 2 Tim. 1:6 writes _S_ θς Ε_πΙΩΝ_ and Acts 8:18 has _S_ θς Ε_πΙΩΝ_. If this preposition is accepted as normative in this phrase, then _META_ would be a stylistic improvement avoiding a repetition of the preposition (cf. variants at 1 Tim. 2:9, 4:3, 4:4).
The following consideration makes this unlikely.

Grundmann on ευν and μετά (l) says that here and at 1 Tim. 1:14 are two of the rare examples where μετά "hat die Bedeutung 'zusammen mit' 'in Verbindung'". (The other instances being Eph. 6:23 and Phil. 1:4). If this is so, there is reason for scribes to alter μετά to δ (l)

Both this avoidance of a rare usage and assimilation to 2 Tim. 1:6 have caused the variant.

The following variant is also discussed here:

1 TIMOTHY.

4:14 - των - δια - 241.

This is a further example of scribal confusion over the prepositions in this verse. των is obviously correct on grounds of sense and style (επι του δες εως + Gen. occurs at 2 Tim. 1:6). The variant may also be an attempt to avoid a double genitive.

(1) In Vol. 7 of Kittel's 'Theologisches Wörterbuch' p. 766 f. and especially in the footnote to p. 772.


.. 1739. 1319. 69.

$\$ (hl.) Goth. L (vg. L Z D S N)

Eth. (= episcoporum).

\textit{πρεσβυτερος} is rare and occurs in the N. T. only at
Lk. 22:66 and Acts 22:5 (no. v.11.) where it refers to the
Sanhedrin.

\textit{πρεσβυτερος} is frequent in the N. T. in this special
Christian meaning of "elder".

It is possible the reading \textit{πρεσβυτερος} resulted from
the accidental omission of 'L' or 'E'. But if the reading
\textit{πρεσβυτερος} was intentional, scribes may have written it to
avoid a possible misunderstanding with the word meaning
Sanhedrin. Scribes may also have been avoiding what they
thought was a diminutive. Koine showed a marked increase in
the use of diminutives (1). Howard p. 344 - 346 lists words,
which looked like diminutives. Scribes often objected to such

(1) "Besonderes charakteristisch für die Volkssprache sind
zwei Dinge: Rückgang im Partikelgebrauch und Häufigkeit
von Diminutivbildungen ... Diminutiva fehlen in hohen
Stil wie der attischen Tragödie gänzlich' in Radermacher's
N. T. Grammatik 2nd ed. p. 37."
endings. See Phryrichus LK and CXXVII.

Jeremias (2) suggests that ἀρχιερεῖον is a scribal error and that ἀρχιερεῖον bears the meaning 'college of elders'. It is as in Ignatius a collective noun (3). Katz (4) without ms. authority would like to read ἁρχιερεῖον as at Sus. 50. He says the reading ἀρχιερεῖον was the result of a mistaken resolution of a supposed contraction ἀρχιερεῖον. For this he draws attention to Gen. 43:33 where papyrus 962 alone reads ἀρχιερεῖον. But without ms. support at 1 Tim. 4:14 the suggestion by Katz must be discounted.

The spelling -εὐον is noted by L + S. It must be rejected here. The N. T. spelling is shown to be -ευν at Lk. 22:66, Acts 22:5 (no. v.11.).


Bernard, who, in his commentary, describes the insertion of εν as a mistaken explanatory gloss, is himself mistaken.

πας occurs with prepositions in the N. T. in such phrases as διά παντός, εν πάντι, πρό παντών. Εν πασελ occurs at 1 Pet. 4:11 and elsewhere in the N. T., including 2 Tim. 2:7, 4:5, Tit. 2:9 (no. v.11.).

The omission of εν is a stylistic improvement: εν is an overworked preposition in the N. T. The use of prepositions in Hellenistic Greek is characteristic especially where the older language would use a straight dative. This variant is therefore an Atticistic correction. The Pastorals do contain examples of straight datives e.g. Tit. 2:11 επί προσ πασελ. However, the direction of change in this variant is likely to be from εν πασελ to πασελ.
προεχεῖ - 6. 33. 88. 206. 424. 436. 1799.

Both are synonymous in the context. ςπρεχεῖ appears at Lk. 14:7, Acts 3:5, 19:22. Phil 2:16 (without v. 11). The verb is used by Philostratus II (see Schmid. 'Atticismus' IV p. 403).

προεχεῖ appears at 1 Tim. 1:4, 3:8, 4:1, 4:13, 6:3, Tit. 1:14 (no. v. 11.) and at Heb. 2:1, 2 Pet. 1:19, etc.

Following the usage of the author προεχεῖ will be preferred here. It was altered to ςπρεχεῖ possibly because this verb was gaining popularity in Atticist circles, as Philostratus' use of it may indicate.
The apparent change from present to aorist is probably no more than an orthographical variant. (cf. -κλειτός - λίπος - variants at 2 Tim. 4:20 and elsewhere). The present is more likely in the context following προσέξε. The iterative force is required.

'τ' and 'ε' were often interchanged in mss. (see Howard p. 76).
There is no reason for the augmented form in P, and its reading must therefore represent such an orthographical variant.
4:16 Add ἐν before ἄρτοις - D

910.

L (vt) (vg except M T).

ἐπιπεμένω is followed by ἐν only when a place is mentioned, as at 1 Cor. 16:18. In the metaphorical sense 'to continue in' a straight dative follows as at Rom. 11:22, 11:23, Col. 1:23 (no. v.11).

ἐν has been introduced from the previous verse. N. T. usage rules out the originality of ἐν in this variant.

The variant omitting the second καὶ in this verse is discussed in Appendix II.
Hellenistic Greek generally tended to use the 3rd p.s. reflexive instead of the 2nd p.s. (See Turner p. 42. Bl-Deb. § 64). The author of the Pastorals, however, does use the 2nd p.s. reflexive: ελευθερεύω occurs earlier in the sentence, without variant.

The variant by 81, therefore, probably represents no more than a careless omission of sigma.
S* frequently omits words (cf 1 Tim. 1:12, 3:8, 4:8, 4:9, 5:1, etc.).

Semitic idiom would encourage the addition of a pronominal suffix. In better Greek style, therefore, the omission of the suffix would be made. Another motivation for the omission here would have been the reduction of 2nd p.s. references - a tendency, which is noted elsewhere (1 Tim. 5:23, 6:21 etc.). This was an attempt to make the letters more general for later generations.
5:1 πρεσβυτέρων - 
πρεσβυτέρους - 1836.

and

πατέρα
πατέρας - 1836.

The accusative pl. has been substituted on the analogy with πρεσβυτέρας following and is an attempt to be consistent. However, ἕπτα πληθεία is followed by the dative, and παρακάλεω by the accusative (on which depend νεωτέρους, πρεσβυτέρας and νεωτέρας). πατέρα is in apposition to πρεσβυτέρων but is dependent on παρακάλεω.
5:1 Omit ὡς πάτερα - s*

Another omission by this ms. If the variant was intentional, the omission was due to the mistaken exegesis of the verse by the scribe, who thought that παρακαλέσι must precede νεωτέρους. ὡς πάτερα balances ὡς ἀδελφός and ὡς μητέρας balances ὡς ἀδελφός.
πρεσβυτερας - 1739.

πρεσβυτις which is the feminine of πρεσβυτης means 'an aged woman'. There is no firm example of this word in the N. T. although it appears as a variant at Tit. 2:3. Ἐπιφ. (Haer. Collyr. 79 uses the word of church widows not deaconesses).

πρεσβυτερας is probably original here. In Egypt πρεσβυτερος was used of official priests (1). ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΑΣ was altered because it might have appeared as if it meant a priestess, and priestesses were not required theologically. So 1739 altered the word to πρεσβυτις which can only mean 'an aged woman' in contrast to νεωτερας.

(1) See G. A. Deissmann 'Bible Studies' tr. by A. Griev. p. 233.
I Xyon\(\lambda\) -
X\(\gamma\)ylon\(\lambda\) - \(\chi\) \(\upsilon\)

794. 104. 1912. 88. 623. 920. 1836.

Omit \(\chi\) Xyon\(\lambda\) - 1874.

\(\chi\) Xyon\(\lambda\) was felt to be otiose, so 1874 omitted it.

Horn would have facilitated such an omission:

\[\text{\(\tau\varepsilon\kappa\) NA; \(\chi\) Xyon\(\lambda\) NA.}\]

In the following words, variants exist with 'K' for '\(\chi\)'.

Col. 2:11 \(\alpha\pi\varepsilon\gamma\delta\varepsilon\varepsilon\iota\) : Lk. 12:33 \(\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\gamma\lambda\iota\tau\tau\sigma\)

Heb. 12:5 \(\varepsilon\chi\lambda\mu\omega\) : Acts 9:39 \(\tau\varepsilon\pi\varepsilon\kappa\chi\nu\nu\rho\varepsilon\nu\alpha\lambda\) .

The N. T. generally softens '\(\nu\)', Howard p. 108 says that the papyri often show \(\chi\)- with '\(n\)' softened before a voiced sound.

L + S. state that \(\varepsilon\gamma\gamma\nu\omega\nu\) properly means "Grandson", whereas \(\zeta\chi\gamma\nu\omega\nu\) which is more common in mss. means "descendant". If two words are to be thought of in this context then \(\varepsilon\chi\gamma\nu\omega\nu\) is likely to be original, but it is difficult to say how far orthographical corruption is operative. Mayer I p. 228 says "Die auf attischen Inschriften bis etwa 300 v. Chr. nicht seltene Schreibung \(\varepsilon\gamma\gamma\nu\omega\nu\) für \(\zeta\chi\gamma\nu\omega\nu\) ist belegt". Rüsch (1) cites occurrences of both spellings, over centuries. Crönert

(op. cit. p.55) also lists both spellings in his papyri.

In view of the ambiguity over the spelling, accept \( \varepsilon ν \) as original in its sense 'grandsons'.
5:4 μανδανετωδαν - μανανατω - 3.323.1319.

L (vg. except A* D G L ⊂ N)

L (vt except g) = discat.

Ambst. Pel.

Ephraim.

μαδετωδαν - D*

The context requires μανδανετωδαν. It is the children who must learn. Scribes who altered to μανανατω did so believing it to refer to Χρα. They may, however, have altered the verb to the singular after a collective plural both elements of which are neutar.

The variant of D* is unlikely. The tendency to alter verbs to the aorist has been noted elsewhere. The present is required here after ξις and the iterative force is required by the context. μαδετωδαν may have occurred through misreading.
Omit πρωτον - 1908.

(cf. v.l. omitting πρωτω at 1 Tim. 1:16).

The omission is probably accidental. Once πρωτον was omitted, its absence would not be obvious.
The error might be an orthographical variant. If not, it is difficult to account for the genitive.
von Soden claims that some mss. add καὶ λόγον καὶ before ἕστυν, but his apparatus seems confused at this point.

The longer reading is probably due to assimilation to 1 Tim. 2:3 τούτῳ καὶ λόγον καὶ ἐποδέκτων.
\[5:14\]

\[\tau \upsilon \nu \theta \upsilon\]
\[\kappa \upsilon\]

- 1319.

Aug.

(cf. 2 Tim. 2:14).

\[\epsilon \nu \nu \pi \tau \xi \nu \nu \ (\tau \upsilon \nu \theta \upsilon)\]

is rare in the N. T. (Lk. 1:15, 1:76, 2 Cor. 8:21, Jas. 4:10) but is not found in the Pastorals.

\[\epsilon \nu \nu \pi \tau \xi \nu \nu \ (\tau \upsilon \nu \theta \upsilon)\]

is found at 1 Tim. 5:21, 6:13, 2 Tim. 4:1.

The reading \[\kappa \upsilon\]
is likely to be stylistic. \[\theta \xi\]
appears twice in verses 4 and 5.

Read \[\tau \upsilon \nu \theta \upsilon\].
5:5 ἡ ληπικευ v.l. ἡ ληπικευ is discussed at 1 Tim. 4:6
(v.l. παρηκολουθηκας).

5:5 ἐπὶ τοῦ θε - S A D K L
T.R. 69. 2344. 1908. etc.

ἐπὶ θε - C F G P
L (vt)(vg) support
Ambst. Amb.
Theod.

ἐπὶ κυ S K
ἐπὶ κυ D K

81
Car. . Salvian.

ἐλπις ω + ἐπὶ + θε occurs at 1 Tim. 4:10, 6:17.
θε appears twice in this sentence. On stylistic grounds,
some mss. altered the second occurrence, others the first.

Accept θε For a discussion on the article see
App. I (ii) b.
5:5 The variant omitting the third με is discussed in Appendix II.

5:5 Omit ταίσ (pr.) - 1836.

This variant is a sheer error by 1836 as the second occurrence of ταίσ is firm in the text.
Add ἡγουμένως before προσευχείς
- 1319.

ἡγουμένως occurs in the N. T. at 2 Cor. 6:5, 11:27,
but is not found with προσευχή. Lampe's
Patristic Greek Lexicon cites ἡγουμένως καὶ προσευχή from Bas. ep. 207:3 and others. Such an idea may have
influenced 1319.
5:7 The variant omitting ΚΑ\' is discussed in Appendix II.

5:7 ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμιτον v. l. ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμιτον is discussed at 1 Tim. 3:2 (v. l. ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμιτον)

5:8 Add ὀίκων after Ἰδιῶν - 462.

Τα Ἰδιῶ means here "one's own family" as at Ἰα. 5:43 and elsewhere. ὀίκων has been suggested by ἰκως ἐκω following, and may be a dittography. Otherwise, the longer reading may have been suggested by 1 Tim. 5:4 τοῦ Ἰδιῶν ὀίκων.
Add των before ὄντερων - C D K L P

T.R. 1739. 69, etc.

Chrys. Theod.

Omit των before ὄντερων - S D A F G.

442.

ὁικέωσ (household) occurs three times in the N. T., once here, once at Gal. 6:10 (arthrous: no. v.l.), and Eph. 2:19 (anarthrous no. v.l.).

των is arthrous earlier in the sentence, and it is therefore likely that ὄντερων is arthrous too. The article was omitted on stylistic grounds by scribes who felt that των (pr) governed ὄντερων also.
Blass-Deb. § 307 indicates that in New Testament Greek there was much fluctuation between active and deponent, but as far as this verb is concerned, L + S say that Atticists preferred the middle form προεκουμεν. In the N. T. the verb occurs at Rom. 12:17, 2 Cor. 8:21 (with v.11. deponent for active). Read προοεις here. This was altered by Atticist scribes.
5:8

$\varepsilon \varepsilon \tau i \nu$ - \\
$\varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \alpha \lambda$ - K.

The rest of this sentence speaks of present realities $\pi \rho \nu \o \varepsilon \zeta ( ) \eta \rho \varepsilon \tau \alpha \lambda$. Therefore, it would appear likely that the original author wrote $\varepsilon \varepsilon \tau i \nu$ here. K may read $\varepsilon \varepsilon \tau A \lambda$ because the scribe was confused by $\pi \rho \nu \o \varepsilon \zeta ( ) A \lambda$...

The following variant is considered here.

3:9

$\varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \alpha \lambda$ - \\
$\varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \iota$ - D F G

$\varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \alpha \lambda$ here occurs in a $\gamma \alpha \rho$ clause, which looks back to the future verb $\pi \rho \varepsilon \kappa \o \o \gamma \o \varepsilon \nu \nu$. The reading $\varepsilon \varepsilon \tau i \nu$ may have arisen through misreading, or from itacism.
5:9

\[ \chi\lambda\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\nu \]
\[ \chi\lambda\alpha\tau\tau\omega\nu \quad F\ G\]

103. 101. (MG)

Ω and 0 were often interchanged.

The adverbial use of the neutar of this word is its only occurrence in the N. T. This sense is required. The meaning is "less than 60 years "not" less 60 years."

The \( -\omicron\nu \) ending, if not an orthographical error, was caused by \( -\omicron\nu \) in \( \chi\tau\omega\nu \) following.
n.b. D. 436. 101 and others read γεγονων with the following clause. So too do the Latin versions. The readings of these mss. may have influenced P. The Latin reads "Uidia eligatur non minus sexoginta annorum, quae fuerit unius viri uxor".

The tense of γεγονων fits ζυοσ ... γυνη better than ζυοσ ουδεκοντα.

Perhaps the sense and punctuation of the Latin and others ought to be followed. The reading of P represents a more drastic attempt to remove the ambiguity. Ignore the reading of P.
Numerals in the N. T. usually precede their noun (cf. Mt. 25:15, 18:5, 18:10, 26:69, Rom. 5:12, 15:6, 5:17, 1 Cor. 10:8, 12:13, etc. etc.). Error by 223.
Strict lexicographers insist that ἱαῖός means 'good in a practical sense and καλὸς means 'good in a moral sense. But this is not always observed by N. T. authors. καλὸς occurs over 20 times in the Pastoral Epistles whereas ἱαῖός occurs only at 1 Tim. 1:5, 1:19, 2:10, 2 Tim. 2:21, 3:17, Tit. 1:16, 2:5, 2:10, 3:1 (often with ἐργον). The strict differences in meaning do not apply. The variant here can be decided by author's usage.

καλὸς + ἐργον occurs at 1 Tim. 3:1, Tit. 2:7, 2:14, 3:8, 3:14. καλὸς only occurs after ἐργον when a Semitic order prevails as at 1 Tim. 5:25. ἐργον + ἱαῖός occurs at 1 Tim. 5:10 (sec.), 2 Tim. 2:21, 3:17, Tit. 3:1, and πᾶσ precedes ἐργον.

καλὸς and ἱαῖός except with ἐργον do not have a fixed position in the rest of the Pastorals (see 1 Tim. 1:5, 1:19).

καλὸς is unlikely to be original here. There is no other example of this adjective following ἐργον in the Pastorals. On the other hand ἱαῖός only occurs with ἐργον when πᾶσ precedes. If καλὸς is original, it was altered to ἱαῖός through assimilation to the occurrence of this phrase later in the sentence. If ἱαῖός is original, it was altered on stylistic grounds, to provide variation in the words in the
sentence. This variant is listed as doubtful in Appendix 6.

The following variant is considered here:

1 TIMOTHY.

6:18 καλοις - 
        λυξθοις - I

1739.

The same arguments from author's style can be used here:

Nevertheless it may be considered that the author only wrote

λυξθοις with ἐργον where he also used ἔθες, and that as

ἔθες does not occur at either 5:10 or 6:18 καλοις should be

read at both places. Case does not affect usage in the

Pastorals. The Johannine usage of λυξθοις predicatively,

and καλος attributively is not applicable in the Pastorals.

If λυξθοις is original at 1 Tim. 6:18 it may have been

altered by scribes to create variety of expression: λυξθοεργεσιν

precedes. If καλοις was original, this too could have been

avoided because καλον follows later in the sentence.
ΤΕΚΝΟΤΡΟΦΗΣΕΩ is listed by Howard p. 392 as purely Hellenistic. It is not found in the LXX.

The adjective from ΤΕΚΝΟΦΟΡΗΣΕΩ is found in L + S, but there is no trace of the verbal form.

ΤΕΚΝΟΤΡΟΦΗΣΕΩ fits the context, and should be read here.

The variant by F G is due to misreading.
5:10 The variants reading \( \eta \) for the second, third, fourth and fifth occurrences of \( \epsilon \) are discussed at 1 Tim. 3:1, ες η \( \eta \).

5:10 ἐπηρχέσεν -
ἐπηρχέσεν - F
ἐπηρχέσεν - G

460. 101

N.T. authors usually write the augment in the aorist indic.
The variants are orthographical.
5:11 The variant omitting \( \delta \varepsilon \) is discussed in Appendix III.

5:11 Κατὰς τὴν περιπέτειαν ν.λ. Καταστρησθήσεσθαι is discussed at 1 Tim. 3:5 (Ρτπελεθεται ν.λ).  

5:12 τὴν πρωτὴν πιστίν-  
τὴν πιστίν τὴν πρωτὴν - 440.  

The reading of 440 probably represents the original order.  
Scribes were sensitive to such an unGreek order and idiom (cf. τὰ ἔργα τὰ καλά at 1 Tim. 5:25 and see also ν.λ. at Mt. 12:43 ἡ Χαρά ἡ προκήρυξις λατή ).
5:14 Δὲ v.l. δὲ and v.l. γαρ and the variant omitting the particle, are discussed at 1 Tim. 3:2 (οὖν v.l. γαρ).

5:14 Add τὰς before νεωτέρας - D

436. 442. 69.

(cf. 1 Tim. 2:9, Tit. 2:6 and variants).

At 1 Tim. 5:9 Χηρᾶ is anarthrous and at 1 Tim. 5:11 νεωτέρας... Χηρᾶ is anarthrous. Better style would be to add the article on the second mention of the noun, i.e. those definite younger widows just mentioned. Ignore v.l.

Note that most minuscules add Χηρᾶς. D does not.
5:14 Add χήρας after νεκτέρας - 81. 326. 1912.

181*. 223. 876. 1799. 209.

437. 424. 234. 1907 et al.

Chrys. Theod.-Hops.

Jer. Ruf.

Add χήρας after οὖν - 2401KK.

Although an original χήρας could have been omitted after νεκτέρας through hom., this is unlikely. The two positions for the longer reading make us hesitate. The word χήρας has been added on explanatory grounds. The word "widow" is some distance away (v. 11). The author, however, does not always repeat a noun especially if it is obvious from the context, for example νεκτέρας at 1 Tim. 5:2.
at 1 Cor. 7:38 ἤματιν means "to marry", i.e. "to practise marriage" rather than "to give in marriage" (1). But even though this verb may bear this meaning, the author of the Pastorals probably wrote ἤματιν in the sense "to marry" as at 1 Tim. 5:11, where he exhorts younger widows to marry.

1319 intended ἤματιν to bear the same meaning as at 1 Cor. 7:38. It is unlikely the scribe of this ms. intended ἤματιν to mean 'to give in marriage' as the rest of the sentence shows that the widows themselves are the subjects of the actions.

contains the idea of 'handing over' or 'transmitting', as at 1 Tim. 1:20 where this meaning is required. Here, however, the simple verb is needed. is frequent in the Pastorals including 1 Tim. 2:6 (bis), 4:14, etc. The variant is probably a quirk of one ms.
5:15 Verse omitted by 1736. 6.

The idea expressed in this sentence is paralleled in 1 Tim. 1:19. The sentence belongs to the context and to the author's theology. The language too is characteristic: the verb appears at 1 Tim. 1:6. The name 'Satan' appears at 1 Tim. 1:20.

These mss. omitted the verse because they objected to the theology in it, or else because they accidentally missed 2 or 3 lines from their exemplar. This cause of omission is emphasised by A. C. Clark in 'The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts', and in his rejoinder in J T S XVI, p. 225f.
δε is incorrect for several reasons. δε γνη is not found as a combination in the Pastorals: δε does not appear in the first word in a sentence; and γη fits the context. The error δε is due to the scribe's carelessness.
5:15 \( \varepsilon_{\text{\lowercase{t}}\text{\lowercase{r}}\text{\lowercase{i}}\text{\lowercase{a}}\text{\lowercase{p}}\text{\lowercase{t}}\text{\lowercase{a}}\text{\lowercase{p}}\text{\lowercase{z}}} \) Ti\( 3/5 \) - A F G

L (vt g)

\( \varepsilon_{\text{\lowercase{t}}\text{\lowercase{r}}\text{\lowercase{i}}\text{\lowercase{a}}\text{\lowercase{p}}\text{\lowercase{t}}\text{\lowercase{a}}\text{\lowercase{p}}\text{\lowercase{z}}} \) Ti\( 3/5 \) - S C D K L P

T.R. and minuscules

L (vg) (vt. à f).

\( \varepsilon_{\text{\lowercase{t}}\text{\lowercase{r}}\text{\lowercase{i}}\text{\lowercase{a}}\text{\lowercase{p}}\text{\lowercase{t}}\text{\lowercase{a}}\text{\lowercase{p}}\text{\lowercase{z}}} \) appears before its verb at 1 Tim. 3:1, 3:5, 6:3, and \( \varepsilon_{\text{\lowercase{t}}\text{\lowercase{r}}\text{\lowercase{i}}\text{\lowercase{a}}\text{\lowerline{p}}\text{\lowercase{t}}\text{\lowercase{a}}\text{\lowercase{p}}\text{\lowercase{z}}} \) appears at 1 Tim. 1:6. This order ought to be followed here. There are many instances of inverted order in mss. (see variants at 1 Tim. 5:2, 5:9). Scribes probably memorised phrases and occasionally copied the words down in the wrong order.
5:16 ἂν ὁμιλήσῃ ἡμῖν καὶ ἐν ζῇ ἡμῖν are discussed in Appendix III.

5:16 πιστὴ - S A C P. 048.

1881. 33. 263. 1908. 81. 1739.

L (vg) Coptic. (Arm.)

Ath. Euthal (MS.)


πιστὸς - L (vt g) Eth. (gm-


πιστὸς ἢ πιστῇ - D K L 4

T.R. 69, etc.

Lect. Byz.

L (vg codd.) $ (hl) (vg).

Chrys. Dam. et al.


This is an obvious place where hom can be demonstrated in favour of the originality of the longer text. Von Soden p. 1920 recognises the possibility that the scribes passed from ΠΙϹΤϹ to ΠΙϹΤϹ causing the omission of the intervening text. (He was influenced more by ms. attestation, of course, and rejected the longer reading as secondary).

ΠΙϹΤϹ alone is probably a versional peculiarity. These versions read ΠΙϹΤϹ but decided to translate as a masculine.
Tasker on the N.B.B. in Greek p. 441 discusses the shorter reading by saying that it is unlikely that the change in question was laid solely on women. Read πιστος γε πιστη.
5:16 ἐπαρκεῖτω v.l. ἐπαρκεῖσθω is discussed at 1 Tim. 3:10 (v.l. ὀφειλεῖσθωσ).  

5:16 ἐκκλησια -  ἐκκλησίας - F.

(cf. 1 Tim. 3:13; F is subject to such errors). Here the reading of F is a sheer error.
Both verbs are used figurately in the N. T. and both are synonymous in the context.

appears at Mt. 26:43, Lk. 9:32, 21:34, 2 Cor. 1:8, 5:4 without variant, and appears at 2 Cor. 2:5, 1 Th. 2:9, 2 Th. 3:8 without variant.

Scribes tended to prefer simple verbs to compound verbs. This has already been seen in other variants in the Pastorals. Here scribes would have been particularly sensitive about the style because appears twice as a prefix in this verse (appears).

Read .
5:16 Add ἀντων before ἐκκλησία - 1836.

The author is speaking generally, and of the church as a whole. ἀντων would be an unnecessarily precise addition, and is unlikely to be original.
This use of οὐκ ἔχει is paralleled at 1 Tim. 5:3 and 5:5. This use of οὐκ ἔχει in this position is common to the Pastorals (see also 1Tim. 6:19).

Accidental error by 69.
3:16

does not appear in the N. T. It means 'to be sufficient' and is less suitable in the context than ἐπαρκέω. ἐπαρκεῖ is part of the author's vocabulary and appears at 1 Tim. 5:10 and 5:16a. Compounds with ἐπαρκεῖ — are frequent in the Pastorals. If ἐπαρκεῖ is an intentional variant, it may have been introduced to avoid the repetition of the same verb in one sentence.

could easily be an unintentional contraction of ἐπαρκεῖ. The variant with ἐπαρκεῖ is probably orthographical. ἐπαρκεῖ is followed by the subjunctive in the Pastorals: and the subjunctive ending is spelt with ἐ (e.g. 1 Tim. 1:18).
The variant adding ס to after מ is discussed in Appendix III.

Omit סל - FG

Scribes tended to reduce the incidence of prepositions governing the dative case.

סלא is a frequent combination in the N. T. (e.g. Jn. 8:31, Acts 7:22, 7:29 etc.).

Read סל.
5:17 διδασκαλία -

διδασκαλίας - P (which omits αλλ also).

ἐλεφάντιον - I

διδάχη - 1739.

The omission of καὶ is discussed in Appendix II. For the variant by P, compare the v.l. at 1 Tim. 4:1. The dative is required after ἐν, but if the καὶ is omitted, the phrase 'word of teaching' results, and this idea is present at 1 Tim. 4:6. The direction of change seems to have been from οὐδὲ διδασκαλίας to the neater λόγῳ διδασκαλίας. Ignore the v.l. by P.

διδασκαλία occurs 15 times in the Pastorals and only 6 times in the rest of the N. T. The meaning here is 'active teaching' according to Lock p. 13. It is impossible to say that διδασκαλία in the Pastorals refers only to the substance of the teaching (although it can bear this meaning). Similarly it is impossible to say that διδάχη refers only to the activity of teaching (see Tit. 1:9 where it means 'the substance of the teaching'). So διδάχη and διδασκαλία are virtually synonymous here.

διδάχη here however is secondary and is due to assimilation to 2 Tim. 4:2.

ἀληθεία is probably an interpretative variant. It is used at 1 Tim. 2:4, 2:7, 3:15, 4:3, 6:5 and elsewhere in the Pastorals, often in an absolute sense.
5:18 The variant omitting γὰρ is discussed at 1 Tim. 2:13 (v.l. omitting γὰρ).

5:18 οὖν φιμωσεις θουν ἐλωντα - ACPI

33. 442 et al.

L (vg K L W)(vt f).

Pel.

βουν ἐλωντα οὗ φιμωσεις - SFGKL

Both. Arm. Θ (hl). L (vt d g r).


βουν ἐλωντα οὗ κηρωσεις - D

1739.

οὗ μὴ φιμωσεις βουν ἐλωντα - 69.

μὴ φιμωσεις βουν ἐλωντα - 440. 203. 506. 823.

Max Wilcox in 'The Semitisms of Acts' reminds us on page 53 that not all O. T. quotations in the N. T. are from the LXX as we know it: some in their divergence agree with the Massoretic Text, or the Targum, or the Samaritan Pentateuch. It may be assumed that scribes would tend to "correct" an O. T. quotation to the normal LXX reading. Therefore, it is generally true to say that the reading least like the LXX is likely to be original, other things being equal. The N. T. author may be quoting from memory, or from an edition of the O. T. which has not survived.
The quotation here appears in Deut. 25:4 without variants as οὐ φινωεῖς βουν ἁλωντα. This order is also found in the Hebrew and old Latin version.

At 1 Cor. 9:9 the quotation occurs in the order οὐ φινωεῖς βουν ἁλωντα. At 1 Tim. 5:18 we may assume βουν ἁλωντα to stand first. Scribes altered the order to make the quotation conform to the passage in Deuteronomy, or to assimilate it to the parallel passage in 1 Cor.

The variant χηρωεῖς also appears at 1 Cor. 9:9 in B* D* F G, and at Deut. 25:4 in Philo (see the apparatus to the Cambridge edition of the LXX).

φινω occurs at Mt. 22:36, Mk. 1:25, 4:35, and is an Attic word. χηρω is used in Xen. Jos. Chrys. and χηρωεῖς is likely to be original at 1 Tim. 5:18. It was altered because it did not conform to the familiar LXX wording, and also because it was not a strictly Attic word.

It is less easy to decide on the variants regarding the negative. οὐ μὴ is Classical when followed by the future tense, and the only certain example in the N. T. is at Mt. 16:22. The other instances usually have a variant reading the aorist as at Mt. 26:15. The I.C.C. on Matthew p. XXI shows that this Gospel
avoids double negatives in general, but takes no exception to 

Moulton's *Prolegomena* p. 190 shows that of the 93 occurrences of ὅν ἐτη in the N. T., 71 occurrences are with the aorist subjunctive, and 8 with the future (most of which are with variants). ὅν followed by the future indicative is a way of expressing an imperative as at Mt. 5:21, 6:5, 20:26 and in the Mosaic laws (e.g. LXX at Ex. 20). See Bl-Deb. § 365.

In view of the rarity of ὅν ἐτη read here.
5:18 Omit \( \zeta \) - 1319.

The citation in Lk. 10:7, Mt. 10:10 reads. \( \zeta \). Careless omission by 1319.
Add \( yap \) after \( \chi \rho \iota \sigma \sigma - F G \). 

\( yap \) has been added through assimilation to the quotation in the gospels, or because it often occurs with \( \chi \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \) in the N.T. (Mt. 10:10, Lk. 10:7, 23:41). It is incorrect here as \( yap \) joins two quotations: \( yap \) is unnecessary. The earlier occurrence of \( yap \) in the sentence may have caused F G to err.
5:18 τού μισθοῦ -
τῆς τρόφης - s

Clement.

Both nouns are frequent in the LXX. μισθός however occurs in association with ἐργατῆς at Jas. 5:4.

The maxim here is not in the O. T., but is cited by Lk. 10:7 (μισθοῦ), and by Mt. 10:10 τρόφης (v.l. μισθοῦ). Euripides and Phocylides use the maxim, with μισθός. μισθός therefore, seems to be the natural word used in this maxim. It was altered to τρόφης by scribes who assimilated the quotation to those mss. of Mt. reading τρόφης.

The I. C.C. to the Pastorals p. XXIV shows that the author of the Pastorals knew Luke's gospel better than Matthew's; so that if he found the quotation in a written source, he would have been more likely to follow Luke's wording.
5:19 ἀριστέρου — ἀριστεροῦς — L

(cf. 1 Tim. 5:1 where ἀριστεροῦς appears in the singular).

κατὰ in the sense 'hostility towards a person' is followed by the genitive as at Mt. 5:23, Lk. 23:14, Rom. 8:33. It is not usually followed by the accusative with this sense. Sheer error by L.
\[
5:19 \quad \text{παραδεχου} - \quad \text{ἐπιδεχου} - 1022, 1245.
\]

\[
\text{καταδεχου} - 2, 1311, 823, 635.
\]

καταδεχουμαι contains the idea of 'taking back or receiving' and is less appropriate here. It is not found in the N. T. It may have been introduced here by confusion with καταδ earlier in the sentence.

ἐπιδεχομαι is more suitable in the context. It is found in the N. T. at 3 Jn. 9, 10 only. It may have been written here because of the suggestion of ἐπι in later in the sentence.

παραδεχομαι means 'to receive from another' according to L. + S., and is more suitable in the context than the other variants. It is likely to be original. It is frequent in the N. T. (Mk. 4:20, Acts, 16:21, 22:18, Heb. 12:6 (no v.11.) and at Acts 15:4 with v.11 προσ- ἐπι- Ἰτ- ). There is confusion over this verb. Apost. Const. 75 on this verse uses προσδεχομαι.
This quotation appears at Deut. 19:15, ἐπὶ στόρατος δύο μαρτυρῶν καὶ ἐπὶ στόρατος τριῶν μαρτυρῶν στῆθεται (v.l. στῆθεται) τῶν ἐρήμων according to Swete, Ramsay and Tischendorf’s editions of the LXX with the variant δύο μαρτυρῶν τριῶν in Lucian. The Latin for this verse reads 'Sed in ore duorum aut (v.l. et) trium testium stabit omne verbum,' and the Hebrew of Kittel (and the B d’ B S) reads נָבָרְתַּנְיָה תְּנִין וְיָדִי נִכְרָה קָרְבֵּךְ קְרִיְתֵךְ. At Mt. 18:16 the quotation appears as ... ἐπὶ στόρατος δύο μαρτυρῶν τριῶν στῆθεται παντὸς ἡμᾶς. At 2 Cor. 13:1 the following is found: ἐπὶ στόρατος δύο μαρτυρῶν καὶ (v.l. ἡ) τριῶν στῆθεται παντὸς ἡμᾶς.
At Heb. 10:28 we read ... ἐπὶ δυσὶν ἡ πρὶςν παρτυρῶν.

The quotation here may also allude to Deut. 17:6 which reads in the LXX ... ἐπὶ δυσὶν παρτυσιν ἡ ἐπὶ τριῶν παρτυσιν

with variants omitting ἐπὶ and παρτυσιν (sec.).

By omitting ἐτομάτος the quotation at 1 Tim. 5:19 resembles Heb. 10:28 and Deut. 17:6. The v.l. by 255 is probably an assimilation to the dative plural of these verses, and is to be ignored.

Ἐπὶ is probably original; F G may have omitted it on stylistic grounds. ἐπὶ is necessary to the sense in this context (cf. use of ἐπὶ at 1 Tim. 6:13 and Acts 11:10).

καὶ is probably original. It was felt to be too loose in meaning. ἦ represents an attempt to translate ἦ more closely or is due to assimilation to Heb. 10:28 or Deut. 17:6. καὶ appears at Deut 19:15. The sense requires 'two or three'.

Read ἐπὶ δύο καὶ τριῶν παρτυρῶν.
The omission of the whole phrase from ἐκτὸς τοῦ πάρτωρυ may be due to the omission of two or three lines of the exemplar. If the omission was intentional, it may have been made because of theological or sociological objection to the sentiment: the clause may have been thought of as a limiting qualification and that one should not accuse an elder under any circumstances.
The variants adding βε after τούς and after τοὺς
 φαρσανοντας are discussed in Appendix III.

The variant omitting καὶ is discussed in Appendix II.

διαμαρτυρωμαι -
μαρτυρωμαι - 506. 206

The compound is more frequent in the Pastorals than the simple verb διαμαρτυρομαι occurs at 2 Tim. 2:14, 4:1 and in the rest of the N. T. at Lk. 16:28,
Gal. 5:3, Eph. 4:13, 1 Th. 2:12 (no v.11.).

The intensive form is characteristic of the author of the Pastorals and should be read here. As seen elsewhere scribes tended to prefer simple verbs to compound - hence the variant here.
5:21 \( \chi \nu \ \tau \iota \ \upsilon \ \chi \nu \) is discussed in Appendix I (i) b.

5:21 Add \( \delta \upsilon \tau \omicron \omega \) before \( \alpha \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \omicron \nu \) - 88. 436. 327.

Basil.

Ps-Jer. Jer. Dion-E.

Add \( \delta \upsilon \tau \omicron \omega \) after \( \alpha \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \omicron \nu \) - 33.

\( \beta \) (vg) Copt (boh).

Patricius. Pel.

(cf. II Tim. 4:1).

The author solemnly charges his hearers 1) before God, 2) before Christ and 3) before the angels. The variants above would make the change 1) before God and 2) before Jesus and his angels. If \( \delta \upsilon \tau \omicron \omega \) refers to Jesus, the idea is unusual. At Lk. 18:7 where the phrase \( \alpha \epsilon \lambda \kappa \tau \omicron \nu \ \delta \upsilon \tau \omicron \omega \) occurs, it refers to God. cf. also Lk. 1:11 (angel of the Lord) and Mt. 4:6 where Satan speaks of God's angels. Jesus is often listed with angels as at Mk. 13 (see especially \( \nu \ \gamma \nu \) 27) but they are not his. At Mk. 8:38, where the Parousia is described, and the Son of Man appears we read \( \rho \varepsilon \tau \alpha \ \tau \iota \nu \ \alpha \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \omicron \nu \ \tau \iota \nu \ \alpha \gamma \omicron \nu \) (but note the v.l. \( \kappa \alpha \) for \( \rho \varepsilon \tau \alpha \)).

If \( \delta \upsilon \tau \omicron \omega \) referred to God, it is ambiguous and may have been omitted on this account. If secondary it may also have been intended to refer to God. There is no firm instance in the
Lexicon of Patristic Greek to Christ's angels. The occurrence of the longer reading in two positions is significant and may warn us against its originality. This variant is listed as doubtful in App. 6.
The Pastorals tend to place οὗτος before its verb.

1 Tim. 6:11 ταύτα φευγε. 1 Tim. 4:16 τούτο γαρ ποιών 
1 Tim. 5:7 ταύτα παραγγέλλε.

Read ταύτα φυλάγγεσ here. Sheer error by 33.
κατὰ χαρίν is unsuitable in the context, and has been accidentally introduced to the text here by the scribe of 88. The words here should parallel χαρίσ προκριμάτως earlier, and for this reason κατὰ προεκλίσιν is likely to be original.

προεκλίσις is a ζ.λ. in the Greek Bible. It is not Attic.
προεκλήσις is also a ζ.λ. and L. + S. list is meaning 'judicial summons' (from προεκλίσιν).

The reading προεκλήσιν is probably an orthographical variant (see Howard p. 51 and Mayser I p. 82 f). The same variant occurs in Ep. Aristeas § 5.
Howard p. 96 f. states that in the second and third centuries B.C. λείη and ψήγη were equivalent, but an additional force was trying to differentiate the subjunctive and indicative. However, he gives no indication of the conditions prevailing in the first century A.D. Generally speaking most mss. of the Pastorals abide by the conventional spelling of the subjunctive endings.

There are many imperatives in the surrounding verses: κολαφέω, τηρεῖ, στροφίζει. There are very few aorist imperatives in 1 Tim., and the aorist imperative with its "once and for all" aspect is less suitable in the context (cf. aor. imper. at 1 Tim. 6:12, 6:20).

επιτιθεῖ probably represents the careless omission of θείον. There is no reason for the subjunctive here.
'αλλοτριος precedes its noun at Rom. 15:20, 2 Cor. 10:15, 10:16.

It follows its noun at Heb. 9:25 and at Acts 7:6 (where the sense is 'foreign').

The sense here, as at Rom. 15:20, 2 Cor. 10:15, 10:16 is 'not one's own' 'belonging to another', and is the opposite of 'διος. But no firm N. T. ruling can be established because Heb. 9:25 bears this meaning too, and there 'αλλοτριος follows the noun.
The words are necessary to the sense and ought not be omitted. The reading of \textsuperscript{2401} probably represents the accidental omission of two lines of the exemplar.
5:23 ὁ λογισμὸς ὀρθογνώμων v.l. ὀρθογνώμων is discussed at 1 Tim. 1:8 (v.l. Στομαχ).  

5:23 ἔλεος v.l. ἔλεος' is discussed at 1 Tim. 1:13 (v.l. ἔλεος).

5:23 ΤΟΥ -  
ΤΟ - Α.

στομαχος is a ζ.λ. in the N. T. In its sense 'stomach' it is masculine as in Plutarch. The scribe of A was confused by στομαχ which is neutar.
Parts of the body are often qualified by possessives in the N. T. (cf. Mt. 3:12, Lk. 6:6). The omission here represents another instance where 2nd p. singular references are removed. (cf. 1 Tim. 4:16 where a variant omits οὖ). 

Read οὖ.
Add δι στο σημείο της προκειμένης - F G

L (vt g) δ (vg).

δι στο σημείο της προκειμένης here is probably original and has been removed by scribes as a stylistic improvement.
5:25 omit  \( \lambda \nu \delta \rho \omega \tau \mu \nu \) - \( \psi \star \)  

(\( \text{cf. 1 Tim. 4:10 where a variant omits } \lambda \nu \delta \rho \omega \tau \mu \nu \))

\( \lambda \nu \delta \rho \omega \tau \mu \nu \) is probably original here. There are several reasons why it was omitted by scribes. They either felt that it was superfluous, or that it was undesirable on stylistic grounds. The omission of \( \lambda \nu \delta \rho \omega \tau \mu \nu \) would create a balance with \( \tau i \epsilon \omega \) following. Horn may also have operated:

\[ \tau i \nu \Omega \Lambda \nu \delta \rho \omega \tau \Omega \Lambda \nu \]  

\( \tau \nu \) + \( \lambda \nu \delta \rho \omega \tau \mu \nu \) is characteristic of the author of the Pastorals. (\( \text{cf. 1 Tim. 2:1, 2:4, Tit. 2:11, 3:2} \)).
5:24 Om. τα ἐν δήμῳ - 88. 326.

ἁμαρτία is usually arthrous in the N. T. when definite sins are in mind (cf. Lk. 5:23, Mk. 2:5, 2:7). Exceptions are caused by the presence of prepositions or by qualification of the noun.

Here definite sins are in mind. Read with the article. ἁμαρτία has been omitted through hom.: ἁμαρτία.
The context requires ἀμάρτημα. There is no logical reason why the scribes of 1022. 1245 wrote μάρτυς unless they misread the exemplar, seeing only the letters -ματ-
5:24 \( T\kappa\nu \) -
\( T\upsilon \nu \nu \) - 33.
L (vg 0)
Origen.

\( T\kappa\nu \) is likely to be original. It is the more difficult reading 'to others (their sins) follow'. This has been altered to \( T\upsilon \nu \nu \) on the analogy with v.24a to '(the sins) of others follow'.
1799 and 206 have been influenced by ἀναργυρόι, and attempted to balance the sentence by making ἡπακολούθουσιν into a participle. It is unlikely that the change was made in the opposite direction.
5:25 The variant adding \( \delta e \) after \( \varepsilon\varepsilon\omega\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma \) is discussed in Appendix III.

5:25 \( \tau\alpha\varsigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\alpha\nu\zeta\rho\gamma\alpha \) - K L

T.R. and most minuscules

Savarian. Oecum.

\( \tau\alpha\zeta\rho\gamma\alpha \tau\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\alpha\nu \) - S A D F G P

33. 69. 462.

L (vg) (vt. d.f.g.).

Amb.

Theophyl.

\( \tau\alpha\zeta\rho\gamma\alpha \tau\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\alpha\nu \) - 1912.

These words are omitted by 1739. 6.

(of. 1 Tim. 5:12 for the similar idiom \( \tau\upsilon\nu\pi\iota\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu \tau\nu\pi\rho\omicron\upsilon\tau\nu \).

\( \tau\alpha\zeta\rho\gamma\alpha \tau\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\alpha\nu \) is likely to be original here. The variants represent attempts to improve on the style and to avoid a Semitism.

The reading of 1739. 6. is to be ignored. Note that 1739 also omits \( \varepsilon\iota\omicron\varepsilon\iota\nu\tau\iota \). The words were probably accidentally omitted. \( \varepsilon\sigma\sigma\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma\kappa\alpha\iota\pi\rho\omicron\delta\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha \) makes no sense by itself. The presence of the words "good deeds" is assumed by \( \tau\alpha\zeta\rho\gamma\alpha \tau\alpha\kappa\alpha\lambda\alpha\nu \'\xi\omega\nu\tau\alpha \) following.
5:25 ΠΡΟΣΗΛΙΑ - S A
1739. 424

ΠΡΟΣΗΛΙΑ ἔσι - K L
T.R. 104. 69. 1908, etc.

ΠΡΟΣΗΛΙΑ ἔσι - D F G P
33. 424. 8. 88.
Origen.

L (vt)(vg.) adds sunt.

On the ellipse of ἔσι see references at 1 Tim. 4:8.

ἔσι follows ΠΡΟΣΗΛΙΑ in 24. Here the style would be improved if the verb to be were omitted. Note that 1739 also omits "good deeds" in this sentence.

ἔσι is likely to be original. It was altered to the singular following a neutar plural by Atticist scribes.
5:25  οὐ δυνατὰ - A D P

206. 1518. 2412. 33. 1908.
424. 1912. 234. 876. 1799.
1960. 2401.
Theod.

ζΔυνατὸν - 255.
οὐ δυνατὰ - S F G K L

T.R. 6. 1739, etc.

Chrys.

cf. Ἰ. 10:25, πάντα μαρτυρεῖ πέρι ἐμοῦ
where πάντα refers to the neutar plural τὰ ἐργὰ.
Hellenistic Greek however does not always abide by the
Classical usage of following a neutar plural with a singular
verb, hence scribes tended to correct to the Classical form.
The direction of change here therefore is from an original οὐ
ζΔυνατὸν. This rules out the possibility that ζΔυνατὸν
is correct: this reading was possibly due to misreading.
A verb is needed.

Read οὐ δυνατὰ.