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δουλοι -
δουλεαις - 1836. 2400. 442. 216^2. 489.
L (vg N) (vt r). Copt. (sah.).

δουλου - F G.

(cof. v.1. at 2 Tim. 1:7).

δουλοι is likely to be original. In apposition to δουλεια it was felt to be difficult, therefore two attempts were made by scribes to remove this difficulty by using genitives. If δουλειας were original, it is difficult to understand how the other variants arose.

δουλεια occurs in the N. T. at Rom. 8:15, 8:21, Gal. 4:24, 5:1, Heb. 2:15.

F G, as Timnefeld (op. cit.) shows and as is borne out by the investigation of these mss. in the Pastorals, have a tendency to mis-spell. 'Under the yoke of the slave' makes no sense, and one presumes that the original author generally wrote sense.

πρὸς γυναβ obviously means 'under the yoke (of slavery)' as 1836. 2400 and others attempt to make clear. Arndt and Gingrich understand the words in this way. The word is often used figurately in Hellenistic literature. See 1 Clem. 16:17 "under the yoke of grace" and see also Barnabas 2:6.
6:1 ἀγίος v.l. ἁγίος is discussed at 1 Tim. 4:2 (v.l. ἁγιον).


ἡγεσίως is frequent in the LXX and N.T. It occurs elsewhere in the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 1:12.

The curious variant by 1311 seems to have resulted from the careless contraction of the two words ἀγίος and ἡγεσίως.
The phrase τό δυνάμει του Θεού occurs at Rev. 3:12, but the phrase τό δυνάμει του Κυρίου is more frequent in the N. T. (Mt. 21:9, 23:12, Jas. 5:10, 5:14, Rom. 10:13, Acts 8:16 and see also 2 Tim. 2:19).

Arthrous Κυρίου after an arthrous noun agrees with Pastoral usage (cf. 1 Tim. 1:14, 2 Tim. 1:8). The same is true of Θεοῦ (cf. 1 Tim. 1:11, 2 Tim. 2:19 (pr.) Titus 2:5, 2:11, 2:13.)

Here N. T. usage suggests that the phrase should read τό δυνάμει του Κυρίου. This was altered because scribes found Κυρίου ambiguous.
6:1 διδασκαλία is singular at 1 Tim. 4:6 - 'Christianity'; and plural at 1 Tim. 4:1 - 'heresies'. διδασκάλος appears in the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 2:7, 2 Tim. 1:11, 4:3. In the context, the author is concerned more with teaching. Perhaps the variant arose to safeguard teachers of Christianity at a time of persecution. The Pastorals are not concerned with persecution as such.

1 TIMOTHY.

6:1 βλασφημείται v.l. βλασφημηταί is discussed at 1 Tim. 1:3 (v.l. παραγγελιάς).
6:2 ἐγόντες v.l. ἐχόντας is discussed at 1 Tim. 3:8
(v.l. προεχόντες).

6:2 καταφρονεῖτω ἔδω -
καταφρονητῶ ἔδω - I

440

John of Damascus.

Mayser 2:2, p. 211 shows that in the Ptolemaic papyri καταφρονεῖ does take γ in some parts.

Howard p. 71 shows that the letters Υ and γ are often interchanged. As with many of the orthographical variants, conventional spelling is generally to be followed. Unless it can be proved that the author of the Pastorals always wrote "γ" in such forms, the traditional "Υ" spelling must be read.
Perhaps the omission represents one line of the exemplars. Once omitted, the phrase would not be missed. The longer reading balances the sentence: another δέ clause follows.


Eu'ephyes " in the Classical language means 'piety' or 'reverence'. In the LXX and N. T. it usually means 'fear of God'. Of the 59 occurrences of the word in the LXX, 47 are in 4 Macc.

Eu'ephyes occurs in the N. T. only here and at Acts 4:9 (no v.l.). In the LXX, it occurs at Wis. 16:11, 16:24, 2 Macc. 6:13, 9:26, 4 Macc. 8:17, Ps. 77 (78) 77.

πιστος and ἀγίαττος are the predicates of the sentence, which determines that the subject ὁ τῆς Eu'ephyes (sic) ἀντιλαμβανομένου must be a description of the masters. Therefore the context refers to the benefit the masters receive from the obedience of their slaves. Eu'ephyes is not suitable in the context.

Eu'ephyes may have been introduced accidentally from υ. 3.
6:2 Omit ταύτα - 440.

cf. 1 Tim. 6:11 ταύτα φέυγε and 2 Tim. 3:1 τούτο δέ γεννήσας which show that author's usage favours the longer reading here. The omission probably resulted from carelessness, or from an attempt to heighten the instruction διδάσκει καὶ παραδάλει.
Add ὄνω after ἡμῶν - 1891.

ὅνω is comparatively rare in the Pastorals. The addition of it here is an attempt to remove asyndeton by means of a retrospective particle. (cf. the attempts made to remove asyndeton at Jn. 1:39). Here, however, the demonstrative in effect removes the need to avoid asyndeton. (cf. Bl-Deb§ 459. and see 1 Tim. 2:3, v.l. adding γαρ). The addition of particles is a characteristic scribal emendation in the Pastorals.
Turner p. 281 mentions the increase in the use of \( \nu \eta \) in the later language. On p. 283 he states that in the N. T. 
\( \varepsilon \lambda \) has \( \varphi \omega \) if the condition is real: \( \nu \eta \) is found in the Classical language. See 1 Tim. 3:5, 5:8 where \( \varphi \omega \) follows \( \varepsilon \lambda \). Bl-Deb. §428 instances this example of \( \nu \eta \) as a remnant of Classical usage and \( \varepsilon \lambda \ldots \varphi \omega \) at 1 Tim. 3:5, 5:8 as literary. See also Bl-Deb §42.

\( \varepsilon \lambda \ldots \nu \eta \) is found at Lk. 6:4, Barn. 6:19, Did. 12:4-5 (with v.11). \( \varepsilon \lambda \tau \gamma \ldots \varsigma \omega \nu \nu \) occurs at 1 Tim. 5:16 followed by an imperative.

Moulton p. 171 says that \( \varepsilon \lambda \varphi \omega \) is common but lists four examples of \( \nu \eta \) in the N. T. (1 Cor. 15:2, 2, Cor. 13:5, Gal. 1:7, 1 Tim. 6:3) of which he says only the last example is normal. Far from this being a stray claim for the originality of \( \nu \eta \), it confirms what Turner and Bl.-Deb. suspect (but do not state) namely that \( \nu \eta \) here is a Classical usage untypical of the N. T. \( \varphi \omega \) is original: it was altered by Atticist scribes.
is frequent in the Pastorals (1 Tim. 1:4, 3:8, 4:1, 4:13, Tit. 1:14 no v.11.) and in Heb. 2 Pet. Mt., Lk., Acts. Exegesis suggests that this verb should be read here. The author's concern as in other instances in 1 Tim. is that readers should not be perverted from the truth. The man in 4 is already supposed to teach falseness. There is no question of his "coming to γυλονωσι λογους ". For προσεκχωριν to have the meaning 'to consent to' is to give it a meaning not found elsewhere in the N. T. as Field (op. cit) points out in his Notes. Quoting Bentley he says that προσεκχω λογους is a phrase familiar to sacred and profane authors. Orthography could easily have accounted for both variants. προσεκχτικ is a sheer error through misreading. προσεκχτα is a mere spelling variant. There is no reason for the subjunctive (cf. ἐπὶ τοῖς διδασκαλεῖς.) Read προσεκχτα.
(cf. 1 Tim. 5:15 for comments on the inversion of words).

These examples encourage us to read ἀληθῆς λόγου here as the original order of the words. Sheer error by 2005.
6:3 ἐὰν χῦ v.l. χῦ ἀν is discussed at Appendix I (i) b.

6:3 τῇ ... διδασκαλίαν -

τὴς ... διδασκαλίας - 1912.

Many variants involve the word διδασκαλία (cf. 1 Tim. 6:1, 4:1, 4:6).

The genitive here would introduce the idea of 'words of teaching' as at 1 Tim. 4:6, but at 1 Tim. 5:17 'the word' and 'the teaching' are separated. The genitive is unlikely here as it is separated from its noun by too great a distance.
6:3 Add ὅπως after εὐθείᾳ ἔλαβεν - D

Latin mss.

The addition is uncharacteristic of the author. ὅπως, ὅπως, ὅπως are found at 1 Cor. 1:2, Acts 5:17, Lk. 8:43 Jn. 4:9. If original here there is no obvious reason why it was omitted. The reading in D however, is probably secondary and came to it through d and the Latin tradition.
ΤΕΠΤΥΨΩΤΑΙ - 
ΠΡΟΣΤΕΠΤΥΨΩΤΑΙ - 440.

ΤΥΦΩΝΩ usually appears in the perfect tense as at 1 Tim. 3:6 and 2 Tim. 3:4, and is therefore used by the author in the simple form. ΠΡΟΣΤΕΠΤΥΨΛΩ does not appear in L + S or in the N. T. Variant is a quirk of 440.

The following variant is also discussed here:

2 TIMOTHY.

3:4 ΤΕΠΤΥΨΨΕΝΟΙ - 
ΤΕΠΤΥΨΨΕΝΟΙ - 440.

ΤΥΨΛΩ is less appropriate in the context. It is not a Pastoral word, whereas ΤΥΨΛΩ is. The word, which is part of the author's vocabulary should be accepted as original here, as it fits the context too. The variant here again reveals the quirk of 440.
If the singular ὅνωσ is accepted as original, γενεται will be read here. The subject treated as a compound would have had a singular verb because the first element in the list is singular. To alter a singular verb to a plural after a compound subject is a favourite cause of textual corruption (cf. Acts 4:19, 5:17, 5:21, 5:29, 5:36, 7:11, 7:15, 8:21, 11:14, 13:11, 14:14, 16:15, 16:31, 26:30, Mk. 1:5, 1:36, 2:25, 3:31, 14:1, 14:43, 15:40 etc. etc.).

γενινται is either a variant spelling of the 2nd aor. subj. middle γενινται, or as the Latin understands it, from γενεω (which is used metaphorically at 2 Tim. 2:23). The plural form condemns the originality of the verb. It may have been written in an attempt to provide a stronger verb than γενεται.
6:4  φθoνος -

φθονος - Dκ

547. 330.

L (vg)(vt f g) Goth. Coptic.

Ambst. Lucifer.

φθονος - 823.

φθονος and ἐπέλεγον are associated at Rom. 1:29 (no v.l.)
and at Gal. 5:21 (v.l. φθονος). φθονος occurs only 4
times in the LXX (1 Macc. 8:16, 3 Macc. 6:7, Ἱερ. 2:24, 6:23),
but is fairly frequent in the N.T. φθονος is frequent in
the LXX, but is less in keeping with the list here. The
reading of 823 probably arose because of the careless omission
of the "ἐπέλεγον".

In the rest of the N.T. φθονος is singular at Rom. 1:29,
Mt. 27:13, Mk 15:11, Phil. 1:15 and at Tit. 3:3. It is
plural at Gal. 5:21, 1 Pet. 2:1. The direction of change
seems to have been from singular to plural in order to conform
to the plurals in the list, Βλασφημία(ς), ὑπονοεῖ, πένηρας
διαπαρατριβάλ (sic). See also v.l. ἐπέλεγον.

Read φθονος.
6:4 The variant adding \( \mathcal{W} \) before \( \varepsilon \pi \sigma \) is discussed in Appendix II.

6:4 \( \varepsilon \pi \sigma \) - S A K P

Minuscules.

\( \mathfrak{s} \) (vg). Coptic.

\( \varepsilon \pi \sigma \) - D F G L.

1175.

\( \mathfrak{s} \) (hl). Gothic. Latin (vg)(vt)(Fathers)

- contentiones.

The following variant is also discussed below

TITUS.

3:9 \( \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \) -

\( \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \) - S X \( \psi \) (D X F G - \( \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \))

999.

Eth.

Ambst. Jer.

\( \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \) - 241, 462.

At 1 Tim. 6:4 orthography could have accounted for the variant in either direction. Howard p. 131 says that "when \( \varepsilon \) and \( \mathcal{W} \) were identical in pronunciation, it is unlikely that such a new form \( \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \) would oust the regular \( \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \) (1 Cor. 1:11, no v.l.) and produce needless ambiguity". This says that \( \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \) is an alternative spelling for the singular \( \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \). There is no definite occurrence of \( \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \) in the N.T. The nominative
plural ἕπετος always appears with variant ἕποδας is the Hellenistic plural form. ἕπεσ is singular at Rom. 1:29, 15:13, 2 Cor. 12:20 (v.l. plural), Gal. 5:20 (v.l. plural) etc. The plural is found without variant at 1 Cor. 1:11. Read ἕπεις at 1 Tim. 6:4. If it was spelt ἕπες it would have appeared as a plural form to Atticist scribes, and may have accounted for its popularity: the plural in itself is not impossible - abstract expressions are often plural (see Mt. 15:19, Mk.7:21), but as seen above this spelling does not represent the normal Hellenistic plural.

ἔπεσ should be read at Titus 3:9. This conforms to the normal N. T. usage of this word in the singular, and accounts for the other variants. It was assimilated to the plurals around it by 241. 462. The second stage in the corruption came from Atticist scribes, who corrected this plural form to the form ἕπες.
6:4 Add ἰγλοσ after ἐπί σ - 181.

This word does not occur elsewhere in the Pastorals. The addition by 181 was probably motivated by assimilation to Gal. 5:20.
On this occasion we hesitate to state that the variant conforms to the tendency to make all the nouns in the list plural. (cf. v.l. φθεονοι, (ἐρευς)). The plural here is difficult to explain unless one follows Zerwick (1) and calls this a pluralis categoriae § 44.

βλασφημία is singular at Mt. 12:31, Mk. 7:22, Eph. 4:31. Col. 3:8, Rev. 2:9, and is plural at Mt 15:19, Mk. 3:28 (v.l. singular), Jude 9.

Here perhaps the plural is original. The final iota could easily have been omitted. Difficulty may have been felt about the plural form of this noun.

6:4 Omit ὑπονομεῖ τοναραί - 1518.

The variant here is another instance of accidental omission from a list. The reading may have been facilitated by Hom.

βλασφήμι Α1 ὑπονομεῖ τοναραί Α1.


Σιατριβαί (the only form known to the authors in Schmid's "Atticismus") occurs in the N. T. at Jn. 3:22, 11:54, Acts 12:19, 14:28, 15:35, 16:12, 20:6, 25:16, 25:14, but it is not found in the plural as a noun: and many of the above references are to the verb Σιατριβω. There are many words compounded with Σια in the Pastorals, e.g. 1 Tim. 1:7, 2:2, 3:6, 3:7, 3:11, 4:6, 5:21, 2 Tim. 2:26, 4:5, Tit. 3:8, etc.

Παρα + σια + root is not frequent in the N. T., and is not Classical. L + S. list Παρασιατριβη as "vulgar". Words with a double compound are rare among Classical writings. Scribes would object to this compound form. The original text here is either Σιαπαρατριβαι or Παρασιατριβαι.
is known only here according to L + S.

It is not a Classical compound. Because of its rarity it may be original, and was altered to the form  

because this compound was more familiar, or else reduced to a simple verb.
6:5  ἄπεστι ἐρρήνευν\-νει \\

ἄπεστραφεν\-νει ἀπὸ + ἐκ.

ἲστορεῖν (to rob) is suitable in the context.

It forms part of the author's vocabulary (Tit. 1:14).

It is usually followed by a direct accusative (cf. 1 Cor. 6:7).

ἄπεστραφεν\-νει comes from ἀποστραφεῖν (to repel, to turn back) and is not suitable in the context. ἀπὸ stands or falls with the verb.
ΤΟΥ ΒΟΥΒ is obviously wrong in the context after

διαστρεβω. It has been introduced from ΤΟΥ ΒΟΥΒ earlier in the sentence.
6:5 Γορισσον - 
Περασον - 1022. 1245.

Γορισσον is obviously correct in the context. The author continues his argument by discussing religion as a source of gain (v. 6).

Περασον is hardly appropriate in this discussion of religion. The reading probably arose through misreading.
The language of the longer reading could belong to our author. \textit{κριτηριόν} appears at 1 Tim. 4:1. \textit{To \upsilon \tau \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron} occurs at Tit. 3:11. A similar instruction is given at 1 Tim. 6:11 (\textit{ταύ τά \phi\epsilon\omicron\gamma\omicron\epsilon}) and there are many imperatives in this chapter.

If original, the omission could be accounted for, by the careless omission of 2 lines of the exemplar. If secondary, the longer reading would be a gloss introduced to the text.
In view of the above comments on the language, the former is more likely. Accept the longer reading.

The reading of 1912 is a sheer error.
6:6 Add ὅ before πορίσμος - 1022.

πορίσμον occurs in v. 5 without the article. Perhaps the scribe of 1022 considered that the second mention deserved the article. But the main emphasis in the sentence is on the repetition of ἐρείπεια. The article would give the wrong sense, i.e. "the reward is great: religion with contentment".
As Middleton on the Greek Article (op. cit. p. 390) points out, the addition of εὐθεία is unlikely after an arthrous noun. This would be untypical of our author. Εὐθεία does not occur qualified by Θ هذا in the Pastorals, or in the rest of the N. T. The longer reading is a pious addition.
alone is difficult. If it means 'because', it produces what A.J. (op. cit.) calls a preposterous statement.
If it does not mean 'because' it is elliptical. Scrivener (op. cit. Vol. 2 p. 395) says that the addition of \( \delta \gamma \lambda \omicron \nu \) or \( \alpha \lambda \eta \theta \varepsilon \varsigma \) smooths away any difficulties. W & H. on select readings ad loc. try to explain the difficult presence of \( \delta \tau \) on orthographical grounds, saying that it has developed from the ON of \( \kappa \sigma \rho \omicron \omicron \omicron \). There are other attempts to explain \( \delta \tau \). Some commentators like Bernard and Parry (1) point to Seneca (ep. 102) or Philo (de Sac. 6) to show other examples of what they call 'resumptive \( \delta \tau \)'.

Other examples for this phenomenon are Job. 1:21, Eccles. 5:15. Parry tries to read \( \alpha \delta \varsigma \) \( \delta \tau \) in this verse instead of \( \circ \tau \) and to translate as '... not to speak of being able to carry anything out'. Hillard cited by Lock says that \( \delta \tau \) comes from \( \delta \epsilon \tau \zeta \) and means 'wherefore' as in Eur. Hec. 13.

\( \delta \gamma \lambda \omicron \nu \delta \tau \) appears in the N. T. at 1 Cor. 15:27, Gal. 3:11. If original, its omission can be accounted for by hom: -

\[ \kappa \sigma \rho \omicron \omicron \omicron \delta \gamma \lambda \omicron \nu \]

This may be original here. \( \alpha \lambda \eta \theta \varepsilon \varsigma \) is unlikely to be.

\( \alpha \lambda \eta \theta \varepsilon \varsigma \delta \tau \) does not occur in the N. T. However if \( \delta \tau \)

(1) R. St. J. Parry 'The Pastoral Epistles'. &d 10c.
is original, this would explain how both ἀπλέεις ὡς and ἑγικῶν ὡς came into the text. Both represent attempts to improve the text, and to remove the difficulty of ὡς. If ὡς is original it is probably elliptical as at 1 Jn. 3:20 pace Bernard, who in his commentary attempts to explain this verse in another way.

Original ὡς would also account for the other variants. This variant is listed as doubtful in Appendix 6, but the choice lies only between ὡς and ὡς.
6:7 Omit τε - 061.

241. 2138.
L (vt. d m).
Pel

Reicke (1) on 061 says that the omission of τε in that ms. is merely "a fault of the text" and that τε is necessary in the context. This is true. τε is a word which is easily overlooked in copying (cf. 1 Tim. 1:10).

(1) B. Reicke "Les deux fragments grecs onciaux de 1 Tim. appelés 061 publiés" in Coniectanea Neotestamentica 41.
Add \( \text{υυυ} \) after \( \text{τττ 440} \).

At 1 Tim. 6:17 \( \text{υυυ} \) is used as a temporal.

Here \( \text{υυυ} \) is unlikely to be correct. To limit the statement to the present is to make the generalisation too precise. The variant possibly represents an interpretative addition designed to make the statement apply to a definite situation.
Reicke on 061 (op. cit.) says that διατροφή is original here, and that the plural is secondary having been caused by assimilation to εκπαρασάνατα.

In the N. T. προφή is always singular except at Jn. 4:8 προβάς (no v.l.). διατροφή occurs in the Greek Bible only at 1 Macc. 6:49 (no v.l.).

Follow Reicke's suggestion and read διατροφή.
Gignac (op. cit. p. 271) shows that the interchange of ' наличу' and ' наличу' occurs extremely frequently in all phonemic conditions at all places throughout the period of the post-Christian papyri, and is one of the most frequent interchanges. This is true also of the N. T. variants. See Howard p. 56.

There is no reason for the subjunctive here, and the reading by K and others is purely orthographical.

Read ἀρκεσθε, which is the normal indicative spelling in the Pastorals (e.g. 1 Tim. 4:10).
The changed word order in 181 is the result of the scribe's faulty memory. He probably committed the sentence to memory, but rewrote it in a changed order. ἔμπροσθεν is more frequent than ἔμπροσθεν ἔπαιχε in the N. T.

The following variants in this verse are also considered below.

Add τοῦ ἐκλεον τοῦ τῇ βασιλείᾳ after τῇ βασιλείᾳ. - D* F G

876. 431. 634. 2344. 1610.
L (vg clem.) (vt). Gothic.

chrys. Theod.
Aug.

The list ἐκείνη ἐπαρέσκεια τῷ Θεῷ is unqualified, and should remain so. The longer reading is secondary to the text, and is the result of assimilation to 1 Tim. 3:7.

Cyril-Alex.
Ephr.
This word is singular at 1 Tim. 3:7, 2 Th. 2:26, Rom. 11:9, Lk. 21:35. It may have been altered to the plural here to conform to the plurals following.
6:9 Add ἐν before ἐπὶ Θυμίας - 1149.

The reiteration of the preposition here, as at 1 Tim. 2:9 (v.l. adds ἐν) does not reflect Semitic idiom. The addition here is secondary and has been motivated by stylistic considerations. Περαπεραν and παγίδα earlier in the sentence are dependent on ἐν. These words are singular. It was felt by the scribe of 1149 that the cumbersome phrase ἐπὶ Θυμίας σολλας ἀνοητάς καὶ βλαβεράς should have its own preposition.
6:6 δυταρκείας
Εὐταρκείας - 69.
'Ακριβείας - 1908.

δυταρκεία (sufficiency) is a favourite Cynic and Stoic word, and occurs at 2 Cor. 9:8. It means 'contentment' here. The word does not occur in the LXX.

Εὐταρκεία has resulted from misreading. No such word is known by L + S. 69 may have been thinking of Εὐταρκεία (well-ordered).

'Ακριβεία occurs only at Acts 22:3 in the N. T. The meaning 'exactness' is not appropriate in the context here, even if it is read with Εὐκριβεία. This reading is the quirk of 1908.
6:9 άνομός - Most Greek mss.
L (vt r) - stulta.
Aug.

άνομος - 056. 014.2.

2.
L (vg) (vt d f g) - inutilia.
Cyril.
Ambst.

The word is omitted by L (vg Z).


Both words are Classical and both are suitable in the context:
άνομος means "unintelligent" and άνομος means
"unprofitable". Either could have been written for the other
by careless scribes.

άνομος occurs in our author's work at Tit. 3:3, and
occurs elsewhere in the N. T. άνομος does not occur in
the N. T. This indicates the probability that an original
άνομος was altered to άνομος.

The omission of the word could have occurred through Hom, but
may have been omitted because it was felt to be unnecessary in
the sentence. πελος in the Pastorals sometimes occurs
before or after the noun it is qualifying (cf. 1 Tim. 3:8, 3:13).
The fact that both ἀνεντόυς and ἑλάβερας following qualify ἡπτοθούριος πολλάς may also have influenced some stylists to omit one of the adjectives following ἡπτοθούριος.
6:9  βλαβερας
    βαρεας - 1836.

βλαβερας in the Greek Bible occurs only here and at
Prov. 10:26. It occurs elsewhere in Xen. and Plato.

βαρεας is due to misreading. It is an impossible
form.

The variants adding ἅλα before and/or after ἀνοητος
are discussed in Appendix II.
The omission was caused by Hom.

κακός is arthrous at Lk. 16:25, Rom. 16:19,
1 Cor. 13:5.
occurs only here and at Mk 13:22 (v.l. πλαναν —).

is frequent in the N. T. and is in the Pastorals at 2 Tim. 3:13, Tit. 3:3 without v.l.

Here — could have been omitted on stylistic grounds.

follows, and scribes often objected to this feature.

Scribes also tended to prefer the simple form of verbs.

Read .

Notice that to avoid some scribes omit . This variant is discussed at 1 Tim. 4:1 (v.l. omit ).
6:10 ἐαυτοῦς -
ἐαυτοῦς - 1311.
ἐαυτοὺς - 81.

(cf. 1 Tim. 6:19).

πέρ ( never occurs with the dative in the N. T. The verb περιπέτευμα (ὅλ. in the Greek Bible) is likely to be followed by the accusative. The reading of 1311 is possibly orthographical: ω and ύ are confused by scribes elsewhere.

ἀυτοῦ probably represents the careless omission of ἐ and the orthographical change of ω and ύ. It is unlikely to be ἀστειος. ἀστείος is not found without variant in the N. T. (cf. 1 Tim. 2:9).
πολλαίς —
πολλαίς — S H.

πολλάκις means 'variegated' and hence by extension 'various'. It appears at 2 Tim. 3:6 (see below) and Tit. 3:3 (no v.l.), and elsewhere in the N. T. It is less frequent in the Papyri, and where it is found as at Teb. III 703. 93 (111:91) it means 'many coloured'.

παλασ occurs in v. 9 and v. 12. Therefore, it was altered on stylistic grounds.

The following variant is also discussed here.

2 TIMOTHY.

3:6 πολλαίς —
πολλαίς — 177.

Here πολλαίς is probably original. πολλαίς is secondary and has possibly been introduced by assimilation to 1 Tim. 6:9 ἐπὶ θυμίασ πολλαίς.
6:11 Δε v.l. Τι is discussed at 1 Tim. 1:9 (v.l. Τι).

6:11 Omit ὑ - 1739. 1319.

L (vg F H ﬂ L M V') (vt. r m diu).

Maximus-Taurinensis. Ambst.


Missale Moz.

Theod. - Mops.

and

1. TIMOThY.

6:20 Omit Τι - P.

Turner p. 3 says that "Biblical and Hellenistic Greek share the non-Classical tendency to omit Τι in the vocative". On p. 33 he says that the Classical Τι is more frequently omitted in the N. T. than in the Classical language. Except in 'Acts' Τι is only used to express emotion in the N. T., and at 1 Tim. 6:20 possibly to express affection.

Bl.-Deb. § 146 agrees saying that "in conformity with Semitic and Koine usage before the vocative Τι is frequently omitted before the vocative in the N. T. while it was regularly used in Attic". The polite unemotional Τι is confined to 'Acts' and is classed as an Atticism.
The above statements make us suspect that the above variants represent the original text and that the addition of \( \omega \) is Atticistic. Josephus for example adds \( \omega \) before the vocatives in Aristeas (1). Gildersleeve on Classical Greek (op. cit. p. 7) says that the omission of \( \omega \) in prose is passionate or late; and that it was popular to write \( \omega \) before the vocative in Classical Greek.

However, \( \omega \) was an easy word for careless scribes to omit, and once it was omitted, its absence would not be felt readily.

At 1 Tim. 6:11 the vocative alone is really sufficient. Scribes may have thought this and omitted \( \omega \). \( \omega \) \( \chi n \theta _{p} \rho w \tau \eta \) is found at Rom. 2:1, 2:3, 9:20 without variant.

At 1 Tim. 6:20 \( \omega \) introduces a strict command. \( \omega + \) vocative is found in Acts 1:1, 18:14, 27:21 and is probably original here.

\( \omega \) is original in both variants. Its omission was due to carelessness.

(1) See Pelletier op. cit. p. 73.
6:11 The variant omitting τοῦ before ὤμοιος is discussed at Appendix i (ii) b.

6:11 The variant omitting the second ἔξερχομαι in this verse is discussed at Appendix III.
6:11  Omit ἔγερσε ἑλόν - S

1908.

Cop. (sah.) L (vg Ἡ). Aug.

Omission from a list is a fairly frequent cause of variation. (cf ἀγαπὴ following). See 1 Tim. 1:9, 1:10 and variants.

The omission here could also have been the result of assimilation to 2 Tim. 2:22.
6:11  Omit ἄγαμος - 1912.

Another instance of omission from a list.

ἄγαμος is a frequent Pastoral word and occurs at
1 Tim. 1:5, 1:14, 2:15, 4:12, 2 Tim. 1:7, 1:13, 2:22, 3:10,
Tit. 2:2, 2:10.
6:11 Add ἐφητεῖν after ἡγαπη - 1836. 181.

As with ἡγαπη (above) and ἐνεπεπελαγ (above) ἐφητεῖν could be original. The omission could be accounted for as another example of scribes carelessly omitting one or more elements from a list. Here hom could have facilitated such an omission:

ἢ ἡγαπὴ ἡ ἐφητεῖν ἡ Ἡ.

ἐφητεῖν occurs in the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 1:2, 2 Tim. 1:2, 2:22, Tit. 1:4 so may well be original here. If it is secondary, it may have come into the text here by assimilation with 2 Tim. 2:22.

This variant is listed as doubtful in Appendix 6.
6:11 \( \pi\rho\alpha\upsilon\pi\alpha\delta\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu \) - 263, 1912.

Petr-Alex.

Ephr.

\( \pi\rho\alpha\upsilon\pi\alpha\delta\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu \) - \( S^\# A F G P H^\# \psi \)

330, 326.

Copt (boh) supports the above readings.

\( \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omicron\tau\eta \) - K L

T.R. 33, 69, 1908, etc.

Chrys.

\( \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omicron\tau\eta \) - \( D^* S^c \)

104.

Copt (sah.) supports these two readings.

\( \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omicron\tau\eta \) occurs elsewhere in the Pastorals at 2 Tim. 2:25,

Tit. 3:2 with the variants below. \( \pi\rho\alpha\upsilon\pi\alpha\delta\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu \) is not a Classical word, nor does it appear in the LXX. It occurs in Philo (de. Abr. § 37) and is a ἰο in the N. T.

Either word is possible in the context. Offence may have been taken at \( \pi\rho\alpha\upsilon\pi\alpha\delta\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu \) because of its unfamiliarity. On analogy with 2 Tim. 2:4 \( \pi\rho\gamma\nu\nu\tau\lambda\iota\alpha\varsigma \) q.v. read \( \pi\rho\alpha\upsilon\pi\alpha\delta\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu \)(rather than \(-\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu \) here.

The following variants are also discussed here.
2 TIMOTHY.

2:25 πραύτητα - πραότητα - ψ. D ε

326. 1912. 330. 263. 88. 436. 69.
256. 1837.

Basil. Chrys.

and

TITUS.

3:2 πραύτητα - πραότητα - S ε ψ D F G

326. 88. 1908. 69. 256.

πραύτης is listed in L + S. as a late form of πραότης.
πραότης is Attic as shown by Blass-Debr. § 26. The spelling
with 'u' is more usual in the LXX. Bauer lists the 'u'
spelling and says it is found in Philo, Aesop and Josephus.
Crönet p. 290:2 says that πραότης is found in Isoc. Plat.,
and πραύτης in the N. T. and Philo.

There is much variation in the N. T. mss. e.g. see 1 Cor. 4:21,
2 Cor. 10:1, Gal. 5:23, 6:1, Eph. 4:2, Col. 3:12, Jas. 1:21, 3:13.

In view of the above evidence it is most likely that πραότης —
represents the original spelling in the above variants and that
πραύτης — is an Attic correction.
The variant adding και after ἕω is discussed in Appendix II.

The aor. passive of ἐλέω is ἐλήθην. The reading by F is a careless misreading of the vowel.
6:13 Omit ἐν τῷ εἰς τὸν Οὐράνον - s* F G.

33. 1739.

Ambr. Aug.


This variant is another example of how scribes tended to reduce 2nd p.s. references in an attempt to make the epistles more general. (cf. 1 Tim. 4:10, 5:23, 6:14).
The variant adding ἔως before ἔως is discussed in Appendix I (ii) b.

Omit (τέω) ἔως - 1836.

It is possible that the omission was facilitated by hom

ΤΟΥ ἔως ΤΟΥ ἔως -

and that as the sense was completed by ἔως - the omission would not be noticed readily. This presumes the exemplar of 1836 read τέως ἔως.
6:13  Omit τὸν (sec.) - 330<sup>+</sup>.

τὸν may have been omitted on stylistic grounds because of the frequency of the def. art. in this verse.

The use of the article here is characteristic of the author (cf. 1 Tim. 6:17 τὸν θεὸν τῷ πατρὶκοντο), and so the variant by 330<sup>+</sup> should be ignored.
In the LXX, both verbs are used to translate ζητέω.

ζώονεμι appears in the LXX and usually means 'to spare alive', but is never used of God except at 1 Sam. 2:6 (the Lord .... brings to life) and this meaning is unlikely here. It is found in the N. T. at Lk. 17:3, Acts 7:19 in the sense 'to preserve alive'. ζώονεμι is used of God in the LXX at 2 Kings 5:7, Neh. 9:6, Job. 36:6, Ps. 70:20 and is attributed to God in Rom. 4:17 in the sense 'to give life to' usually in the sense of creating animate objects (1).

Here ζωονουντος is original and is used in the sense of the Classical ζώονεμι i.e. 'to cause to live' rather than in the N. T. sense of ζώονεμι 'to preserve alive'. In Classical Greek both verbs are synonymous and Atticist scribes may have substituted ζωονουντος for ζωονουντος.

(1) See C. H. Turner on this verse in J T O ΛΛΠ, p. 270f.
6:13 ἐπί τον ναὸν is discussed at Appendix I (i) b.

6:15 ἀποκατακτοῦντος

The aorist is required by the context. The 'noun confession' is seen as a completed action before Pontius Pilate. The variant was caused by confusion with οὐσία in 1 Tim. 6:13a.
The Prolegomena to Tischendorf's New Testament p. 84 merely notes this variant without comment. Moulton's Prolegomena p. 35 says that it is impossible to decide on the autograph spelling; and on p. 47 says that it is "safer to spell according to tradition". This is probably true as far as this variant is concerned and as Martini (1) reminds us, mss. have their favourite form and maintain it throughout.

The variant could have occurred in either direction. Howard p. 76 says that 'ε' and 'θ' were equivalent in Papyri and inscriptions of the Hellenistic period.

This variant is listed as doubtful in Appendix 6.

6:14 Omit ἐξ - De

326.

Lect. 185.

Didymus.

(cf. v.l. omitting σο at 1 Tim 6:13).

This variant represents another attempt to make the epistles more general by reducing 2nd p.s. references.

Ignore the variant.

6:14 The variant adding καὶ before Ἦλπισίου is discussed in Appendix II.

6:14 Ἦλπισίου v.l. Ἦπισίου is discussed at 1 Tim. 3:2 (v.l. Ἦπισίου).
6:15 Omit καὶ ΠΟΒΟΣ - 81.

The omission here was caused either by hom

ρωκηριοσ καί ποβος

or on stylistic grounds as Ἐ ποβος follows.

The longer reading is consistent with N. T. phraseology
cf. Jn. 17:3. τοῦ ποβοῦ ἡγηθῶν Θεοῦ

Bernard ad loc. cites examples from Philo (de sac. Ab. e
Can. 30) where God is described as ... λιγηθων και ποβου παραπου

and from the Sibylline Oracles 3:718 where the words ΠΟΒΟΣ

ζητο ἐν Ἀνάλητος occur.

Ignore the variant.
6:15 Omit καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ὑπειρατῶν
- 122, 1908.

Hilary.

Origen.

The omission here was caused by hom

τῶν ὑπὲρ ὑπειρατῶν καὶ τῶν κυρίων τῶν ὑπειρατῶν.

The phrase is a frequent Biblical one, e.g. it occurs at Deut. 10:17, Ps. 136:3, Rev. 19:16, 17:14, etc. It is frequent in the Talmud and Midrash. (1).

Ignore the variant.

The variant adding \textit{Kal\ldots} before \textit{\(\phi\omega\sigma\varepsilon\)} is discussed in Appendix II.

\textbf{6:16 Omit \(\delta\varepsilon\ldots\tau\nu\eta\nu\eta^\tau\tau\alpha\nu\ldots\) 876.}

The omission probably represents three lines of the exemplar, and was accidentally omitted. If intentional, the reading of 876 may have been motivated by theological objection to the O. T. idea as found in Ex. 33. But the idea is also a N. T. one as at Jn. 1:18, so that the words omitted by 876 could easily have formed part of our author's theology.

Ignore the variant.
Gignac (op. cit.) p. 7 states that \( \varepsilon \) is identified with \( \iota \) in post-Christian papyri. Howard p. 76 states that the two vowel sounds were equivalent in Hellenistic literature and that it was a "matter of scribal fancy" which was written.

Pastoral spelling may be found at 1 Tim. 3:15, and the rest of the N. T. (1 Cor. 2:12, 13:2, 1 Jn. 2:29, Eph. 6:21) favours the \( \varepsilon \) spelling generally.

\( \varepsilon \varepsilon v \) should be read here. \( \delta v \) was the result of a changed orthography, suggested here by \( \varepsilon v \) following.

(cf. v.l. at 1 Pet. 1:8).
6:16 οὕτως ἀνδρῶν -

οὗτως οὕτως - F G

L (vt g) Gothic.
Nov. Amb. Maximus. -

Omit ἀνδρῶν - Æus.

οὗτως ...ἀνδρῶν occurs at Mk. 11:2.
οὗτως usually stands before its noun, as at
Lk. 4:24, 4:26, 16:13, Jn. 13:28, and represents normal
N. T. practice. Accept this order here.

The omission of ἀνδρῶν occurred because οὗτως
was felt to be sufficient by itself.

Read οὗτως ἀνδρῶν.
6:16 Add των before ἀνθρώπων - 181.

(cf. 2 Tim. 3:2).

At 1 Tim. 6:5 ἀνθρώπος is anarthrous.

N. T. usage is therefore divided over the addition or omission of the article after οὗτες. Pastoral usage, however, may help us to decide in favour of anarthrous ἄνθρωπων here. At 2 Tim. 2:4 οὗτες ἀπαρτευομένους occurs.

The scribe of 181 added the generic article (see Turner p. 180 f) - this is not likely to represent the original text.
cf. J. Schmid on the Apocalypse Vol. II p. 224 f. who states that οὔτε and οὔδε are frequent variants in mss. of the Apocalypse. As far as the rest of the N. T. is concerned οὔδε ... οὔτε is found at Jn 4:11, Gal. 1:12, 1 Th. 2:3, 3 Jn 10 but all occur with variant οὔδε ... οὔδε οὔδε is more common than οὔτε in the N. T. οὔδε is used by the author of the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 2:12, 6:7 (no v.11.) οὔτε is on the decline in the N. T. Like τε it was revived as an Atticism. οὔτε here is probably an Atticism. See S. Imer (1) who says that ".. οὔτε kommt klassisch bei den Epikern, Eligikern und Lyrikern vor.. Nachchristliche Papyri geben einige Belege so auch die Inschriften".

(1) In 'Syntaktische und Lexikalische Studien zur Historia Lausiaca des Palliados' in Uppsala Universitets Årskrift 1943 Vol. 2 p. 93.
6:16 The variant omitting the second καὶ in this verse is discussed in Appendix II.

6:16 Add τὸ before κράτος - S.

κράτος is anarthrous at Lk. 1:51, Jude 25 (in a doxology).
It is arthrous in doxologies at 1 Pet. 4:11, 5:11, Rev. 1:6, 5:13.

N. T. evidence is, therefore, ambiguous, but as τιμὴ is anarthrous, κράτος probably is too.

and

1 TIMOTHY.

6:21 αρη - Sc Db K L P

218 etc.

L (vg clem.).

ομη omitted by Sc A D F G.

33. 1739.

L (vg D S Grim) (vt).

2 TIMOTHY.

4:18 Omit αρη - 623.

L (vg F).

Pel.

2 TIMOTHY.

4:22 Add αρη after the last word of the epistle.

- Sc K L P γ D

T. R. 1702. 1704. 2404, etc.

Eth. Copt (boh m T) (vg).

L (vg) (vt d dem diu).


Theod-Mops (Lat.) Prim

John-Dam. Luthal.
TITUS.

3:15 Add θπην after the last word of the epistle.

S^c H P Ψ DË K L.

104, 326, 2587, 1702, 2404, etc.

Lect. 147 MG, 1153 MG, 1365.

On stylistic grounds scribes may have objected to a Semitic word, but at the end of epistles particularly, liturgical considerations would overrule this objection. Bauer ad loc. points out that θπην was added to epistles according to later custom and that it is not original. Von Soden p. 1982 says that scribes tended to add θπην. At the end of the other epistles there is usually variation, and in all instances θπην has been added.

At 2 Tim. 4:18 and 1 Tim. 6:16, however, θπην is likely to be original. θπην is found after doxologies at Rev. 22:21, 1 Tim. 1:17, Gal. 1:5, Eph. 3:21, 2 Pet. 3:18 and most of these examples are firm. The omission at 2 Tim. 4:18 may have been facilitated by hom.
For examples of the phrase with καίρους see 2 Cor. 8:13
ἐν τῷ (νῦν) καιρῷ.
Rom. 3:26, 11:5, ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ.
Rom. 8:18 τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ.

For the phrase with δινών see Mt. 12:32 ἐν τούτῳ τῷ δινών
οὔτε ἐν τῷ μελλόντι with v.l. ἐν τῷ νῦν δινών οὔτε ....
where the reference is to the world under aspects of time
(cf. 1 Tim. 1:17). Also see Mk. 10:30 ἐν τῷ δινών τῷ ἐρχόμενῳ
The author's usage may be seen at Tit. 2:12 ἐν τῷ νῦν δινών.
(no v.l.). Phrases with δινών in the N. T. usually appear
with a preposition as seen above, and at Rom. 16:27 and
Lk. 1:70. The reading of D is therefore uncharacteristic
and may have been influenced by the Latin huius saeculi.
Timefeld (op. cit.) indicates how d f g influenced D x G.
on occasion.

The author's usage suggests ἐν τῷ νῦν δινών to be
original. The variant καιρῷ possibly resulted from
assimilation to 2 Cor. 8:13 or Rom. 3:26 or Rom. 11:5.
Many imperatives appear from 1 Tim. 6:11 to the end of the epistle (φευγε, διώκε, τηρείεις, ἄγωνιηου). Here the author is ordering Timothy to give a command to the rich. This is a different situation from 1 Tim. 6:13 where the author is making a command directly to Timothy (παραγγέλλω). The 1st p.s. at 1 Tim. 6:13 may have been the cause of the variant above.

When the author makes a 1st p.s. command the verb is usually at the beginning of the sentence (cf. 1 Tim. 2:8, 5:14).

When the imperative mood occurs as here it comes after the object (cf. 1 Tim. 4:7, 4:11, 4:13, 6:11, 6:20 etc.).

For these reasons read παραγγέλλε here.
In the N. T. πλασθήκειν is usually applied to people and for this reason μηδενα is preferable to μηδεν at Titus 3:2. The variant by K represents the careless omission of 'α'. The contrast at Tit. 3:2 is with προς πάντας ἄνδρων τοὺς following and therefore μη is unsuitable, because it spoils the parallelism. The reading of F G was influenced possibly by 1 Tim. 1:20. μη πλασθήκειν

The error at 1 Tim. 6:17 was probably caused by μηδε following. In the Pastorals μη...μηδε occurs at 1 Tim. 1:4, 5:22. μηδεν...μηδε is not a New Testament combination. Generally in the N. T. ουδε and μηδε resume and emphasise a previous negation (see Turner p. 340 and see also 2 Cor. 13:7, 2 Th. 2:3, 1 Pet. 3:6 for examples of the μη...μηδεν construction).

6:17 ἐπιτελεύσειν v.l. ἔλπιζενα is discussed at 1 Tim. 4:6 (v.l. παρηκολούθησα).
6:17  ὅψηλα  φρονεῖν - S^k I

81.

Origen.

ὅψηλα φρονεῖν - A D F G L P H.

Most minuscules.


ὅψηλα appears at Mt. 4:8, 17:1, Mk. 9:2, Lk. 16:15

ὅψηλα appears before φρονεῖται at Rom. 12:16 (no v.1.).

ὅψηλα φρονεῖν appears with v.l. ὅψηλα φρονεῖ in S and P.46
at Rom. 11:20. This compound form is found in Pollux (1).

In view of the uncertain use of ὅψηλα φρονεῖ in the N. T.
and of the rarity of compounds with ὅψηλο— it is more likely
that ὅψηλα φρονεῖ is original here as at Rom. 12:16.
As seen above ὅψηλος is frequent in the N. T.; and
φρονεῖ is usually a simple verb in the N. T.

The variant probably arose through misreading. As far as
minuscules are concerned, when mss. were copied out of scriptio
continua into cursive script some scribes thought that the two

(1) See P. N. Harrison 'The Authorship of the Pastoral
Epistles' E. T. 1955, p. 77 f.
words ὐψηλὰ φρονεῖν should on the analogy of μεγαλοφρονεῖν appear as one word. As far as the uncial scribes thought along the same lines and altered A into 0.
πλοῦτος is dependent on ἀδηλος.

Misreading the exemplar may have caused the variant. Scribes thought that the dative should follow ἔτις and read ἀδηλοτης as an adjective agreeing with πλοῦτω (‘uncertain wealth’ instead of ‘uncertainty of wealth’). This may account for πλοῦτω, but is unlikely to be original as ἀδηλος -ον in the adjectival form from ἀδηλος.

Read πλοῦτος
The author's usage favours \( \text{ἐπὶ} \). 1 Tim. 4:10 reads \( \text{ἐπὶ} \)
\( \text{δόξα} \) \( \text{ἐπὶ} \) \( \text{δόξα} \) after \( \text{ἐλπίδω} \). See also
1 Tim. 5:5 and 6:17a. The only firm example of \( \text{ἐλπίδω} \) \( \text{ἐν} \)
is at 1 Cor. 15:19. \( \text{ἐπὶ} \) may have been altered on stylistic
grounds as \( \text{ἐπὶ} \) appears earlier in the verse, and \( \text{ἐν} \).
chosen by analogy with ἐν Χριστῷ. At 1 Tim. 4:10 θε is anarthrous and this verse again may indicate Pastoral usage, but here an adjective follows. See the full discussion in Appendix I (ii) b where it is argued that ἐν τῷ Θεῷ should be read here.

The longer reading echoes a phrase used of God at Mt. 16:16, Jn. 6:57, Rom. 9:26, 1 Th. 1:9, Heb. 3:12. See also Rev. 7:2 where a v.l. adds the article before Θε and Σωτος. If the longer reading is original we would expect the article to be included (as before παρεχοντί) (1). However, it is unlikely that it is original. (τῷ)Σωτος was probably added by assimilation to 1 Tim. 4:10. The author already has one phrase in apposition following (τῷ παρεχοντί) and is unlikely to have two such phrases following - it is not characteristic of his style.

(1) τῷ Σωτος is probably an early corruption of the text. The variant Σωτος is an Attic correction. See Turner p. 221-222: In the N. T. as opposed to Classical Greek a considerable number of instances of the omission of the second article appear to exist as here. (cf. v.11. at Eph. 6:5, Col. 3:22).
6:17 Omit μὴ - 33. 920.

Origen.

The variant probably represents an interpretative omission on theological grounds. Scribes believed that God's gifts were freely given: to say μὴ seems to limit this idea; hence they omitted the pronoun. There was a general tendency for scribes to dispense with pronouns.
6:17 παντα πλουσιωσ -
τα παντα πλουσιωσ - A I H.

33. 81. 1739.

Basil. Chrys.

τα πλουσιωσ παντα - T. R. 1836. etc.

Omit (τα) παντα - F G 81

The omission of παντα could have been caused by hom.
especially if the exemplars of F G 81 read τα παντα

TA παντα πλουσιωσ.

An object is required after παρεχοντα and παντα supplies it. The longer reading is in accord with N. T.
theology, cf. παρεχοντα (Eph. 4:6). Ignore variant omitting παντα

TA παντα should be read. At Col. 1:16 TA παντα refers to all the things God has created. 8 1125
occurs elsewhere at 1 Tim. 6:13 (in a similar context) and
at Heb. 2:8, 2:10, Acts, 17:25, 20:18, Mk. 4:11, 1 Cor. 15:28,
Rev. 4:11.

At Col. 3:16 πλουσιωσ follows the verb and a pronominal
phrase, but at 2 Pet. 1:11 it precedes the verb. N. T. usage
as a whole is therefore divided but Tit. 3:6 may decide Pastoral
usage. Here the order is as at Col. 3:16.
Both words are Attic and occur in the LXX and N. T. Usually in the N. T. ζωοϕ verbs require an object whereas the -ζωοϕ form of the verb is intransitive (cf. 1 Cor. 7:38), but there are exceptions such as ηαδίζω which is intransitive (Howard p. 409). In the rest of the N. T. πλουτιζω is followed by the accusative, or is passive.

Read πλουτευν here. The -ζωοϕ form may have been suggested by διαφελευριζω following.
The Pastoral epistles speak of καλος ἐργος and ἐργος ἄγιος but never of 'good words'. Possibly the variant represents a stylistic alteration, as πλουτείων ἐν ἐργος καλος may have appeared superfluous after ἄγιος ἐργεὶν.

1 Timothy.

6:18 καλος v.l. ἄγιος is discussed at 1 Tim. 5:10 (v.l. καλος).
Read the participle. The infinitive was introduced because of confusion with the infinitives in 6:18 ἀγαθοπληρεύειν. The participles in 6:19: εὐρεταδετοὺς κοινωνικοὺς ἀπο - are dependent on ζωῇ, and are actions simultaneous with the commands of the previous verses.

The reading of L may be a sheer error, but could represent an alternative spelling of the accusative. Moulton (Prolegomena p. 36) says that N. W. Greek had an accusative plural in -ς and this is found in the papyri and in N. T. mss. Gignac (op. cit.) p. 594) agrees with this saying that sometimes the accusative plural in post-Christian papyri varies between the of the Classical language and the of Modern Greek. Our author wrote the accusative plural in -ς as seen at 1 Tim. 6:9 for example.
6:19

ἐδύτοις -
ἐδύτοιος - P

440.

ἐδύτων - 1319.

(cf. 1 Tim. 6:10).

ἡπόκορος is followed by the dative of the person and the accusative of the thing as at Mt. 6:19, 6:20, Lk. 12:21, 2 Cor. 12:14.

The confusion in some mss. between 'u' and 'ι' which is noted elsewhere, accounts for the variant. ἐδύτοις. The force of ἡπόκορος may have caused 1319 to write the genitive.

Read ἐδύτοις.
6:19 Θερελλον καλον appears after μελλον in 330.

Prepositional phrases such as εἰς τὸ μελλον tend to come after the direct object in Pastoral usage (cf. 1 Tim. 4:7 πρὸς εὐσεβείαν : 1 Tim. 6:17 εἰς ἀπολαύσειν). The reading of 330 is a sheer error.
6:19 τὸ μέλλον -

ΤΟΝ ΜΕΛΛΟΝΤΑ - F G.

eis to melloν occurs at Lk. 13:9. The same idea is expressed in the genitive at Rom. 5:14 and in the dative at Eph. 1:21.

μελλοντα usually appears in the sense "things present" as at Rom. 8:38, 1 Cor. 3:22, Mk. 10:32 where it is plural. This remembrance may have caused F G to err.
If ἐνσώς is original, it agrees with Pastoral usage. At 1 Tim. 5:3, 5:5, 5:16 it appears as here between article and noun. Difficilior lectio potior may be an acceptable maxim on this occasion. Scribes found ἐνσώς difficult here, and consequently altered the text by identifying "the real life" with "the eternal life" as at 1 Tim. 6:12 ἐπιτάξαν τὴν ψυχὴν ἔχως. Note that the same verb occurs in each passage.

ἐνσώς occurs 43 times in the N. T. according to the I.C.C. on Galatians (op. cit. p. 432) and could easily have been in the scribe's mind. Read ἐνσώς here.
'οντὸς ἐννυχτίου is not found in the LXX or N.T. and is a conflate reading. The position of ἐντὸς does not agree with Pastoral usage. (N.B. 69 conflates ἐ + ἐκ at 1 Tim. 3:6).
6:20 The variant omitting ο is discussed at 1 Tim. 6:11 (omit ο).

6:20 παραδηγήν - S A D F G K L P H.

1799*, 1960, 2401*, 2412.

♀ (vg) Copt. (sah.).


παρακαταδηγήν - 326, 917, 489, etc.

Chrys. Hipp.

and

2 TIMOTHY.

1:12 παραδηγήν -

παρακαταδηγήν - 489, 2143, 547, 241, 1311, 38.

2, 323, 35, 1245, 1867, 1906.

234, 103, 223, 1022, etc.

Chrys. Theophylact.

and

2 TIMOTHY.

1:14 παραδηγήν -

παρακαταδηγήν - 876, 1799, 1960, 2401, 2412.

489, 2143, 547, 2, 323, 1319.

241, 103, 1908, etc.
Both forms are synonymous in the context $\pi\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\delta\eta\alpha -$

does not appear as an undisputed compound in the N. T.

although it is found frequently in Classical Greek.

παρακατάθνη is a frequent variant for παράδειγμα in the LXX.

In the Pastorals the author wrote παρά + τίθημι at 1 Tim. 1:18 (no v.l.) and παράδειγμα is original in the above variants.

παρακατάθηκα is an Attic correction. Demetrius CCLXXXVII: παράδειγμα ἓν πίνακας καὶ, ἵνα τινι συγγράφει τὰς εἰρήνεις ἥρεις δὲ τούτῳ παρακατάθηκα ἔρωμεν ὡς πλάτων καὶ Θουκυδίδης καὶ Σμοσδενές Moeris p. 207-10 lists παρακατάθηκα as Attic and παράδειγμα as Hellenistic.
6:20 ΚΕΝΟΦΩΝΙΑΣ  - S A D K L P

Most Minuscules.

ΚΕΝΟΦΩΝΙΑΣ  - F G H

103**: 442.

Arm. L (vg)(vt) - vocum novitatos.

Theod-Mops. Epiph.

Most Latin Fathers.

ΚΟΛΥΜΝΙΑΣ  - 917. 1874.

and

2 TIMOTHY.

2:16 ΚΕΝΟΦΩΝΙΑΣ  -

ΚΑΙΝΟΦΩΝΙΑΣ  - F G

Latin.


If one accepts Skeat's theory about dictation (1) these variants could have been aural. There is also much variation over ξ and α in mss. (see Vogels op. cit. p. 163 and Howard p. 69). On orthographical (or aural) grounds the error could have been in either direction.

(1) T. C. Skeat: 'The Use of Dictation in Ancient Book Production' in "Proceedings of the British Academy" X Ill p. 179 f.
The only reference to *κενοφωνία* in L + S. is to the above passages. The verb *κενολογεί* appears in the LXX of Isa. 8:19. The verb *καλοφωνεί* is known in Hestathius in the sense 'to use new words' but L + S list no noun from this verb. Bauer translates as 'moderne Redereien' but adds "wenn es sich nicht lediglich um eine phonetische Variante handelt". This is probably so, and we should accept as original *κενοφωνίας* which fits the context more naturally than *καλοφωνίας*. *καλοφωνίας* is not appropriate in the context and has been substituted for *καλοφωνίας* or *κενοφωνίας* because it is a more common word. The word, however, is not found in the plural in the N. T.
The reading with € is a sheer orthographical error. The spelling with € is normally reserved for the 1st Aor as at Jn. 5:15.

Mayser I:2 p. 166 shows that most papyri read double \ in participial forms. Bl.-Deb. § 11 says that the N. T. and papyri keep double consonants in obscure compounds but that elsewhere there is vacillation. The form with double \ should be read here. L + S. cite examples of this verb in the Passive with \\.

The reduction of the two \ may be due to scribal carelessness. This may be especially true if we accept the suggestion of Colwell in 'Some Unusual Abbreviations' in ms. 2427' (1) where he points out that one way of expressing a double consonant was to write an abbreviation-line over one consonant. This line could have been overlooked by some scribes.

(1) In 'Texte und Untersuchungen' 73 Studia Evangelica I (1959).
6:21 μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ - S A F G P H

33.

μετὰ εὗω - D K L

T.R. 1175. 69. 1908, etc.

L (vg)(vt) Ἁ. Arm. Lth.

Theod. John-Dam.

(cf. variants at 2 Tim. 4:22).

The author addresses Timothy directly at 1 Tim. 4:16, 5:23, 6:20 and in his introductory words. It is therefore consistent to use the 2nd p.s. in the closing formula. The address at the end of 1 Timothy is directed to Timothy as shown by 6:20. Compare 2 Jn. and 3 Jn., where the addressee is ostensibly the elect lady and the concluding greeting is in the 2nd p.s.

It is likely that μετὰ εὗω is original here. It was altered to the plural when the epistle became common and was read in the Church. The general epistles to churches conclude with the plural (see 1, 2 Cor. 1, 2 Thess., Heb. Gal. Phil).

The fact that μετὰ originally meant 'in the midst of' and that consequently could be considered incorrectly used when followed by the singular by strict Atticist stylists is less likely to be an important factor in the discussion of this variant, although it may have influenced some scribes to avoid the singular εὗω.

6:21 The variant adding ᾿ΑΠΩ is discussed at 1 Tim. 6:16.
2 TIMOTHY.

1:1 χυ το v.l. το χυ is discussed in Appendix I (i) b.

1:1 The variant omitting το (sec.) is discussed in Appendix I (i) a.

1:1 ἐπαγγελιάν -
ἐπαγγελίας - S.

κατά is followed by the accusative at 1 Tim. 1:1, 2 Tim. 1:9, 2:8, Tit. 1:1, 1:3, 1:4, 1:5, 1:9, 3:5, 3:7 etc. There is no example of κατά followed by the genitive in the Pastorals except at 1 Tim. 5:19 where κατά means 'against'.

There is no logical reason for the error. 440 omits ἓως and may have written ἐπαγγελίας to agree with the following τῆς. Sheer error by S.
Lil Omit ἔσχης - 440.

Ἰνίκεῖον ἔσχης is a Pastoral phrase. It appears at 1 Tim. 4:8 but there is no obvious assimilation to this verse.

ἕσχης is necessary here; it was omitted accidentally by 440.
1:1 Add κατά ομολόγησιν after ἐξομολογήσεις - 88.

The divine names occur in long liturgical formulae in the opening sentences of the epistles, and the author is careful to balance his ideas, perhaps following the tradition of Hebrew poetic parallelism. This variant is probably an addition to the original text. ἐξομολογήσεις is qualified by κατά ομολόγησιν at 2 Tim. 1:2 and balances κατά πατρὸς; but in 2 Tim. 1:1 ἐξομολογήσεις is not qualified. Similarly, therefore, it is unlikely that ἐξομολογήσεις is qualified.

The variant by 88 possibly represents assimilation to 1 Tim. 1:12.


The opening formulae of the Pastoral Epistles vary. Scribes, however, tended to harmonise the opening greetings and to assimilate one letter to another. θεος here is the result of harmonisation to 1 Tim. 1:2.

The following variant is considered here:

2 TIMOTHY.

1:2 Add ἐν πίστει after τεκνω - 33.

This variant represents another instance of assimilation between the opening verses of the epistles by 33. The addition here is due to assimilation to 1 Tim. 1:2.
This is discussed in Appendix II. See also the variants at Titus 1:14.

The words χάρις, ἐλεος, εἰρήνη occur at 1 Tim. 1:2, but assimilation to this verse is unlikely in this instance, because the longer reading does not represent a formula used by the author. The expanded liturgical formula by the Sahidic version is unlikely to reveal an underlying Greek text.
1:2 Add ἡμῶν after πατρὸς - 326. 2494. 57.

76. 330. 2400. 876.

8 (vg).

Pel.8

This variant represents another instance of assimilation in the opening verses of the epistles. Here ἡμῶν has been introduced from 1 Tim. 1:2.

The general tendency seems to have been to add possessive pronouns to divine titles as a result of liturgical influence. Elsewhere scribes tended to reduce postpositional possessive pronouns.

The following variants are also considered here:

TITUS.

1:4 Add ὑμῶν after Χαρίς - 33.
Add ὑμῶν after Κυ - 489.
Add ὑμῶν after πατρὸς - 33.

Eth.

Pel.8

The addition of ὑμῶν does not represent normal Pastoral usage (cf. 1 Tim. 1:2, 2 Tim. 1:2). If the pronoun appears μετὰ usually precedes it as at 1 Tim. 6:21, 2 Tim. 4:22, Tit. 3:15. ὑμῶν is either an explanatory addition or the
result of assimilation to Rom. 1:7.

The variant by 489 may be compared to the variant at 2 Tim. 4:1 
(τῶν καὶ ἑπτῶν). It is unlikely to be original: see 
Appendix I (iii) a. This variant also represents assimilation 
to Rom. 1:7. It is secondary and is an expansion of the 
liturgical formula.

πατὴρ appears with the possessive at 1 Tim. 1:2 (v.l. omit) 
but at Titus 1:4 the same balance does not exist. πατὴρ + 
possessive also occurs at Phil. 3. 1 Th. 1:3, 2 Th. 1:1, 1:2, 
Col. 1:2. The possessive here, as at II Tim. 1:2 has been 
introduced by assimilation to 1 Tim. 1:2.
The opening sentences are balanced and \( \Theta \nu \ \lambda \tau \iota \rho \omicron \sigma \) needs to be paralleled by \( \chi \nu \ \tau \iota \nu \ \kappa \omicron \upsilon \) \( \gamma \mu \nu \). Sheer error by \( P \).

\( \chi \nu \ \tau \iota \nu \ \chi \nu \) is discussed in Appendix I (i) b.
Both readings abide by the arthrous usage of these titles in the dative. See 2 Tim. 2:15 and Appendix I (ii) b.

In the N.T. it is more usual for thanks to be given to \(-\overline{\epsilon}t\) as at 1 Cor. 1:4, Rom. 1:8, 7:25, 1 Th. 1:2, Phil 4 etc.
There is no firm example where \(-\overline{\kappa}c\) appears in such a formula.

\(-\chi\alpha\pi\varsigma\) and \(-\overline{\epsilon}t\) are closely connected at 2 Tim. 1:2, Tit. 1:4, 2:11 and in the rest of the N.T. Read \(-\overline{\epsilon}\overline{\omega}\) here.
1:3 Add οὖν after Θυμ - D.

8. 33. 330.

L (vg D F H L M O W) (vt d dem.).

Goth. Copt. (sah.).

Origen.

Ambst. Pel S. Sedul.

Cassiod. Ps-Vig. Greg-M.

and

2 TIMOTHY.

1:12 Omit οὖν - D.

1799. 206. 102. 489.

2 TIMOTHY.

2:8 Omit οὖν - $ (pal.).

2 TIMOTHY.

2:10 Add οὖν after ἔκλειτος - $ (pal.).

2 TIMOTHY.

4:6 Omit οὖν - Tertullian.

2 TIMOTHY.

4:16 Omit οὖν - 2.
At 2 Tim. 4:16 stylistic considerations caused the variant because μοι and με follow closely.

At 2 Tim. 2:10 the variant appears characteristically in a Semitic version and is unlikely to represent a Greek original. ΕΚΛΕΚΤΟΣ used of a Christian is not qualified by a possessive pronoun in the N. T. (see Mt. 24:22, 24:24, Mk. 13:20, 13:22, 13:27, 1 Pet. 1:1).

ΠΟΥ may be original at 2 Tim. 1:3. The frequency of the oblique cases of the personal pronouns without emphasis is a feature of N. T. Greek. (Bl.-Deb. § 278). When scribes were not assimilating, they tended to omit possessive pronouns. The phrase ' I give thanks to my God' appears at Rom. 1:8, 1 Cor. 1:4, Phil. 1:3. The same is probably true at 2 Tim. 1:12 where ΠΟΥ is likely to be original.

The variant at 2 Tim. 2:8 is noteworthy because it is unusual to find ἔ (pal.) omitting a personal pronoun suffix. The reading is probably a sheer error. So too is the reading at 2 Tim. 4:6. The context in Tertullian's writing may have required the omission there.
A finite verb is needed in the context. The first hand of C was confused by προγονεύω or by the present participle following (ἐπιτομοῦ). Ignore the variant.
1:3 ἀδιάλειπτον -
ἀδιάλειπτος - 547.

ἀδιάλειπτος appears at Rom. 9:2 (no v.l.) ὅς
ἀδιάλειπτος appears at Rom. 1:9 ἀδιάλειπτος
occurs at 1 Th. 1:3, 2:13, 5:17.

(cf. v.11 οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ θεός and τὰ ἔργα τούτων - εὐς
at 2 Tim. 1:17, 2 Tim. 4:9 respectively).

The occurrence of ὅς may have caused the scribe to alter
the ending of ἀδιάλειπτον.

Read ἀδιάλειπτον.
If the variant was deliberate, it probably represents a stylistic alteration and is an attempt to prevent two consecutive participial clauses standing together. This is probably true of the versions concerned. F G may have overlooked a bar representing 'v' in their exemplar.

Read ἔπιπ.ποδωνυ.
δακρυνων occurs at Heb. 5:7, 12:17, Mk. 9:24 etc.

Error by F through misreading, or by connection to διακρυων "to knock" (see L + S).
\[\pi\lambda\rho\omicron\omega\]
\[\pi\lambda\sigma\omicron\omega\]

1799.
I \(\varepsilon!\) \(\cdot\) K\(\varepsilon\) (in Von Soden).

\(\pi\lambda\eta\sigma\omicron\omega\) (from \(\pi\nu\rho\nu\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\nu\)) fits the context and appears elsewhere at Mt 22:10, Lk. 5:7, Acts 19:29, etc.

\(\pi\lambda\rho\omicron\omega\) also fits the context. It occurs at Rom. 15:14 in the sense 'filled with knowledge' and at Acts 13:52 ('filled with joy') and suggests it is a N. T. phrase. There is no obvious assimilation to Acts 13:52. \(\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\omega\sigma\omega\) is probably original to the text here. The variant may have arisen through misreading.
1:4  Lock states that without a break after πληρωθῶ, ἓνα χαρις πληρωθῶ would be joined closely with the following words, i.e. 'filled with joy by the receipt of a reminder, which your coming would give'.

Otherwise δέομεν... would be loosely constructed with χαρις ἐχω 'I thank God on the recent receipt of a reminder of your faith'.
1:5 ὑπομένω -
ὑποκρίειν - (per incuriam) - ὑσθαλ (COD).

ὑπομένω is a N. T. word which fits the context here. ὑποκρίειν has been suggested by ἡ λατάτηριου later in the sentence.
At 2 Tim. 4:11 ἀναβάω occurs without variant and refers to only one act. Here, however, one act is not meant - a continuing feeling is what the author is emphasising. The tendency to alter present tenses to aorists outside the indicative has already been noted.
1:5 ἐνωθῆσεν
ἐνωθῆσεν - 255.
ἐνδοκησέν - 917.
ἐνοικησέν - D

ἐνδοκησεν is frequent in the N. T. but does not occur in the Pastorals. It is unsuitable in the context. The reading of 917 is a sheer error, due to misreading ἐνοικικός as ἐγκλοκός.
The reading of D 33 is also due to misreading.
ἐνοικεω occurs at 2 Tim. 1:14 and elsewhere in the N. T.
(e.g. 2 Cor. 6:16 Col. 3:16, Rom. 8:11, (no. v.1l.).
Rom. 7:17 (v.1. ὁκὲ). ὁκεω occurs at Rom. 7:18, 7:20, 8:9, 8:11, 1 Cor. 3:16, 7:12 etc. and in the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 6:16. Both simple and compound verbs are Attic. As ἔλευθεν follows, scribes took exception to the compound form here and reduced it to ὑπερῆσεν.
Read ἐνωθῆσεν.
1:5 Omit πρωτον - 1319.

This variant is less likely to represent a grammatical objection to πρωτον, than a mere careless omission facilitated by homoioteleuton.
As with many proper names in the N. T., there is much variation over the spelling. Bl-Deb. 3 says that 'the question as to the extent the mss. transmit the original orthography is still little clarified'.

The works of Fick and Bechtel (1) do not illuminate the problem here. They list Greek names in Λω and Λγ- but none which begin with Λαί -

Λω ις is a η λ in the N. T.

Accept the traditional spelling. Read Λω ις here.

1:5 Add ἐν before τὴν θητείαν - 2625. 489. 378. 483. 1022. 1845. 256. 2344.

Semitic idiom repeats the preposition before each noun it governs. This idiom in Greek was often objected to by scribes.

ἐν is probably original here. Scribes removed it because of the reason given above, and also because of the frequency of ἐν in the sentence, and in the N. T. as a whole. Bl-Deb. § 218 says that ἐν is used 2698 times in the N. T.
The spelling "Εὐνική" is preferred by Pick and Bechtel (op. cit.) and in Bechtel (op. cit.). Preisigke (1) knows this spelling from Pay. 130:18 III. Howard p 76 shows that 'ζ' and 'ει' were equivalent in papyri and inscriptions of the Hellenistic period.

Spelling often rested with a scribe's own preference. It is difficult to determine the original spelling. This variant is listed as doubtful in Appendix 6.

(1) F. Preisigke 'Namenbuch'.
Chantraine (1) says that the old perfect \( \pi\varepsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \) remains in the N. T. especially in Mt., Mk., Lk., and frequently in Paul. But the active makes no sense in the context.

The pf. pass. of \( \pi\varepsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \) appears at 2 Tim. 1:12 with variant and in the same sense as here. Read \( \pi\omicron\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \) here.

(1) P. Chantraine 'Histoire du Parfait Grec' p. 216 in "Collection Linguistique" XXI.
1:5  Omit 6ττ καὶ — 440.

πεισόραν ἔδωκε occur at 2 Tim. 1:12.

is awkward here, and it is difficult to account for its subsequent (scribal) addition if it is not original.

The reading of 440 is a careless omission.
εὐλογησικὸν - ἐπιμερνησικὸν - ὑδ

1022.

εὐλογησικὸν appears at Mk. 11:21, 14:72, 1 Cor. 4:17,
2 Cor. 7:15 Heb. 10:32 without variants. ἐπιμερνησικὸν
appears at Lk. 22:61, Jn. 14:26, 2 Pet. 1:12, 3 Jn. 10,
Jude 5 without variants and in the Pastorals at 2 Tim. 2:14,
Tit. 3:1 (no v.l re prefix).

Variation over the prefix in compounded words is a frequent
feature of scribal activity. It is not restricted to N. T.
mss. Pelletier (op. cit. p. 336) shows how Josephus'
corrections of Aristeas are often of this nature (cf.
παραλαμβάνω v.l. μεταλαμβάνω).

ἐπιμερνησικὸν is probably correct here. It is part of the
author's vocabulary. It was altered to εὐλογησικὸν
accidentally because of 'AN' at the end of the previous word,
or because of the ANA in εὐλογησικὸν - following.
As seen from Mt.'s use of Mk., there was a tendency to alter present tenses to aorists in moods outside the indicative. A secondary and later account often places events back one tense. Votaw (1) shows that this sort of variant occurs frequently in the LXX.

The present is more suitable in the context here and should be read.

χαρίσμα is frequent in the N. T. and appears in the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 4:14. θελήσα is also a frequent word in the N. T. and appears in the Pastorals at 2 Tim. 1:1, 2:26.

The context at 2 Tim. 1:6 is the same as that at 1 Tim. 4:14, but there is no obvious assimilation between the verses.

Read χαρίσμα

θελήσα may have been introduced from 2 Tim. 1:1.
It is argued in Appendix I (i) a, that except at 1 Tim. 5:11 where it occurs in the genitive, $\chi \gamma \varepsilon \rho \iota \mu \alpha$ does not occur without $\tau \iota \varepsilon$ in the Pastorals.

$\chi \rho \iota \varepsilon \mu \alpha \tau \iota \nu \sigma$ is a N. T. phrase and idea (cf. Rom. 6:23, 1 Cor. 7:7). Arthrous $\delta \tau$ dependent on arthrous noun agrees with Pastoral usage (2 Tim. 2:9, 2:19 (pr.) 3:17, Tit. 2:5, 2:11, 2:13).

The variant $\chi \nu$ probably occurred, when the full divinity of Christ was being realised. The scribe of A believed that $\delta \tau$ and $\chi \gamma \varepsilon \rho \iota \mu \alpha$ were interchangable (cf. 2 Tim. 2:15).
At 1 Tim. 4:14 \( \varepsilon \nu \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \omega \varsigma \) is anarthrous after \( \nu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \). It is anarthrous also at Heb. 6:2 but not at Acts 8:18.

Both at 1 Tim. 4:14 and here \( \varepsilon \nu \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \omega \varsigma \) is qualified by the genitive. Arguments in favour of the anarthrous form would be stronger were it not for \( \delta \) earlier in the verse. The scribe of 241 may have been influenced by this \( \delta \).

\( \delta \alpha \tau \eta \varsigma \varepsilon \nu \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \omega \varsigma \) does not conflict with N. T. usage (see Acts 8:18).
(cf. variants at 2 Tim. 1:8, Tit. 2:3, 2:10).

σύνδεσμο is infrequent in the Pastorals. Where it does occur, it occurs with another negative - usually οὐ - as at 1 Tim. 2:12, 2:7.

Read οὐ here.
1:7 Omit Στ αὐτο - 1319.

Arthrous Στ in the nominative is characteristic of the author (cf. 1 Tim. 4:3, 2 Tim. 2:25, Tit. 1:2).

Sheer error by 1319. The subject is obvious from the context and there is no reason why Στ should have been added by scribes.
1:7 δειλίας
δουλείας - 431. 1518.

Eth.

Clem. Didymus.

(cf. variant at 1 Tim. 6:1).

δειλία is a ἁ.λ. in the N. T., but the verb δειλίαω appears at Jn. 14:27.

"Cowardice" fits the context better, but δουλείας is not impossible.

At Rom. 8:15 where πνεῦμα δουλείας occurs, a contrast is made to πνεῦμα νεόθεσις that is a release from slavery into a new relationship. There is no such contrast at 2 Tim. 1:7 but scribes may have assimilated δειλίας here to δουλείας of Rom. 8:15.

Read δειλίας.
1:8

\( \tau \rho - \)
\( \tau \rho \tau \epsilon - 1022. 1611. 1108. 2138. 2005. 1852. 1245. 1518. \)

(cf. variants at Tit. 2:3 and 2:10).

\( \tau \rho \tau \epsilon \ldots \tau \rho \delta \epsilon \) is found in the Ptolemaic papyri according to Mayser II:3 p. 172. \( \tau \rho \tau \epsilon \) is used by the author at 1 Tim. 1:7 (v.l. omits \( \tau \rho \tau \epsilon \)), but there is no firm example in the Pastorals of \( \tau \rho \tau \epsilon \ldots \tau \rho \delta \epsilon \).

Read \( \tau \eta \).
The subjunctive is required for this prohibition (cf. εἰπήγερσις at Mt 6:2) and this imperatival force is required in the context.

The reading ἐπαίδεψείς is an orthographical variant. That the subjunctive ending is spelt with ἦ is shown at 1 Tim. 1:18, 3:15, 2 Tim. 2:4, 2:5, 4:17, etc., and this traditional spelling ought to be followed here.
1:8 Omit ὑμῶν - S*.

104. 1908.

Add τὸ after ἁμῶν - Gothic.

Add τὸ κῷ after ᾧ 104. 1908.

Add τὸ κῷ after ᾧ 1022, 234, 1245.

[Handwritten note: Ψ (n1.)]

Pel* . Pope Martin I.

The addition by 104. 1908 of τὸ κῷ may have caused them to omit ὑμῶν. The omissions of S do not usually represent the original text. τὸ κῷ ὑμῶν occurs at 1 Tim. 1:14, 2 Tim. 1:2 and should be read here.

As seen in Appendix I (i) a , the reading τὸ alone is unlikely to be original in the Pastoral Epistles, but the variant may indicate that the archetype to the Gothic read τὸ κῷ.

The order τὸ κῷ after κῷ is normal in the Pastorals (see Appendix I (iii) c), but the longer reading is unlikely to be original. Scribes tended to expand liturgical formulae here by assimilation to 1 Tim. 6:3, 6:14.
Add Ὄρνην ἐκατον after Βατάδ - 1319.

Ὁρνην does not occur in the N. T. The reading of 1319 represents an inappropriate and inexplicable addition.
Add τὴν before Ἀρθρωσ ᾧν - 462.

Arthrous ἐκ in the genitive is usually dependent on an arthrous noun in the Pastorals and it is significant that 462 adds the article before ὁ in this verse.

Though is anarthrous at Acts 10:38, but in the Pastorals Ἀρθρωσ ᾧ is usually arthrous when qualified. Here the preposition may have caused Ἀρθρωσ ᾧ to be anarthrous. This frequently happens (see 1 Tim. 2:15, 4:12).

Ἀρθρωσ ᾧ is arthrous in the N. T. when it refers to definite beings as at Mk. 13:35 or to a precise power as at Acts 8:10.

At 2 Tim. 1:8 the 'power' is precise and defined, but the preposition has caused the author to omit the article. The scribe of 462 tried to emphasise the phrase and has added the τὴν.

The variant adding τοῦ before ὁ is discussed in Appendix I (ii) b.
1:8  θεόν  -  
  αὐτοῦ - 2344.
and

2 TIMOTHY.

4:1  αὐτοῦ (after ἐπιφάνειαν) -  
  τοῦ θεον - 2344.

At 2 Tim. 1:8 θεόν is probably original. θεόν is a frequent N. T. idea (cf. Lk. 22:69, Acts 8:10, 1 Cor. 1:18, Rev. 19:1 etc). αὐτοῦ could refer grammatically to ἐπιφάνεια, but θεόν θεον is not a N. T. idea.

At 2 Tim. 4:1 τοῦ θεον is unlikely to be original, and seems to have been introduced as an explanatory gloss. τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ balances τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ. ἐπιφάνεια refers to Christ as at 1 Tim. 6:14, 2 Tim. 2:8, Tit. 2:13.

Ignore the variants.
Add ημας after καλεσάντως - 618. 177.

1908, 489, 1311, 1319.

Omit ημας after εσεάντως - 1908.

1908 made one occurrence of ημας after εσεάντως suffice for both εσεάντως and καλεσάντως. ημας is probably original after both καλεσάντως and εσεάντως. Scribes tended to remove suffixed pronouns in the Semitic position especially if they were repetitive.

κατά τον καλεσάντως ημας occurs at Gal. 1:6 and shows that the addition of the pronoun after this verb does not conflict with N. T. ideas.
1:9 Add ὅ before ἵναι - L.

The adjective ἵναι agrees with and qualifies ἄριστοι which is anarthrous. Sheer error by L.
1:9 κατὰ (sec.) -
κατ‘ - D K L.

T.R. 1175, 623, 1827, 436, 256, etc.

Theod. Dam. Euthal, Chrys.

καθ‘ - F G.

κατ‘ ἵσιν is a common N.T. phrase (cf. Mt. 14:13, 14:23, 20:17, Mk. 4:34, 7:33, Lk. 10:23 etc) but the variant καθ‘ occasionally exists. Scribes tended to elide words like κατα , μετα and ἔλλα to before vowels. If the original author wrote κατα here, the other variants are understandable. The author of the Pastorals did sometimes write κατ‘ before a vowel as at 1 Tim. 1:1, 1 Tim. 6:3, 2 Tim. 1:1, Tit. 1:3, but the direction of change is likely to be away from an original κατα . It is argued that θηγ should stand before ἵσιν , and if this argument is correct κατα is obviously the correct reading.

The following variants are considered here: -

TITUS.

1:1 κατ‘ -
κατα - F G.

Although it is argued above that scribes would tend to alter κατα to κατ‘ in order to elide words, we hesitate to accept κατα as original here. It has been shown above that
the author did occasionally write Κατ'. F G are not always reliable in this respect as can be seen in the variants here.

TITUS.

3:7  Κατ' -
     Κατ' - D
     Κατ' - F G.

As at 2 Tim. 1:9 Κατ' is likely to be the original reading.
1:9 Add την before ἔκλειψεν. 81. 330. 1837. 256.

Ath.

(cf. Titus 2:9).

Nouns following prepositions in the Pastorals are often anarthrous (cf. 1 Tim. 2:15, 4:12). ἑργα earlier in the sentence is arthrous because of ἡμῶν following. προδεικνύω is anarthrous after a preposition at Rom. 8:28, Eph. 1:11, προδεικνύω is arthrous in the N. T. at Mt. 12:4, Mk. 2:26, Lk 6:4, Heb. 9:2, Acts 11:23, 27:13, 9:11, Eph. 3:11 and at 2 Tim. 3:10.

When ἑντρόπος precedes its noun in the Pastorals the noun is usually arthrous as at 1 Tim. 3:4, 3:5, 3:12, 4:2, 5:4, 6:1, Tit. 2:5. This gives a firmer indication of the author's usage than the above, and suggests that την is original here. It was omitted by scribes because of the preposition.
The context requires the 1st p.p. as ἐγνώρισεν follows in the sentence.

The scribe of 1836 probably wrote μονε because of the frequency of 1st p.s. references in vv. 1 – 9.


1:6 δίνων -
δίνων - s c

πρὸ Χρονων δίνων occurs at Tit. 1:2 without variant. δίνων must agree with Χρονων here. Sheer error by this corrector of S.
1:9 Add ἐν ἐκκλησίαν τῷ after δίωμινων - P.

πρὸ ἧς ἐκκλησίας δίωμινων occurs at Tit. 1:2 without any addition.

(ἐν) ἐκκλησίαν τῷ occurs in the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 1:14, 3:13, 2 Tim. 2:1, 1:13, 3:15, usually at the end of a sentence. When other prepositional phrases are contained in the sentence, the evidence is as follows: 2 Tim. 2:10 ἐν ἐκκλησίαν τῷ precedes μετὰ δόσεως δίωμινων at 2 Tim. 1:1 κατ' ἐπιταγγελίαν Ἰωάνου is followed by ἐν ἐκκλησίαν τῷ. At 2 Tim. 1:1, however, the construction is different, so that the reference at 2 Tim. 2:10 provides the closest parallel and clue to the author's usage. This suggests that the variant reading here is uncharacteristic and should be rejected.
1:10 φανερωθελεαν
φανερωθαυτος - η.

φανερωθαυτος is an impossible form and has been introduced accidentally because of — αυτος following.

The accusative fem. sing. is required to agree with χριστως. Read φανερωθελεαν
The omission by 177 is a sheer error. $\text{ἐπιφάνεια}$ is a Pastoral word, and is found at 1 Tim. 6:14, 2 Tim. 4:1, 4:8, Tit. 2:13. This is the word generally used of the appearance of the deity. L + S. list $\text{ἐπιφάνεια}$ as the Epiphany as in Ath. 542E. This spelling here is an itacism, and as such probably represents no more than an orthographical variant.
1:10 **σωτήρος** -

- **Ρ**

218. 81. 1906.

**Ω** (hl.).

Origen.


Pel

(cf. v.l. at Tit. 3:6).

**σωτήρος** fits the context as saving acts are listed at the end of the verse. οὐ **σωτήρος** ἡμῶν in apposition to **ΧΥ** - **ΤΟ** is a Pastoral formula (cf. Tit. 1:14). **ΚΥ** was added through assimilation to 1 Tim. 6:14. ...τὸς ἐπὶ φανερὰς τοῦ **ΚΥ** ἡμῶν **ΤΟ** **ΧΥ**

1:10 The variants **ΤΟ** **ΧΥ** and **ΧΥ** **ΤΟ** are discussed in Appendix I (i) b.
At 2 Tim. 1:9, 1:14, 4:1 the article is repeated to resume the subject. If του is original, it was omitted on stylistic grounds. Such a usage is not always popular with scribes (see 1 Tim. 1:2).
1:10 Add \textit{vv} before \textit{\textdegree} - 440.

Ignore the variant. \textit{δε \textit{vv}} occurs earlier in the sentence. The scribe accidentally added \textit{vv} after the second. \textit{δε}.
1:10 Add τὴν before ἡμῖν - Δ.
Add τὴν before νῦν - 440.

ἀνθρώπων following is anarthrous and so ἡμῖν should be too. The article has been added by these scribes to suggest the Christian life or the present life (as 440's v.11 suggest) or to balance the article in τοῦ ὑπερτού preceding.
καὶ διδάκτης
καὶ διδάκτων * - 33.
καὶ διδάκτης Ἐθνῶν - SC D G et al.

* διδάκτων is added after ἀποστόλος in 623
διδάκτων replaces κηρυκτός in the Armenian. (N. B. 623 and 33 do not add Ἐθνῶν).

The addition of Ἐθνῶν is due to assimilation to 1 Tim. 2:7. If it had been original here there is no obvious reason for its omission by scribes.

διδάκτης is probably original. The author of the Pastorals calls himself a διδάκτης at 1 Tim. 2:7.

The addition of διδάκτων is probably due to assimilation to Col. 1:23, and it was felt this title was stronger than διδάκτης alone. Therefore 33 replaced διδάκτης by διδάκτων, 623 added it, and the Armenian substituted it for another word.
The two words do not occur together elsewhere in the Pastorals, so no precedent for the order can be established.

The variant is another example of readings created from a scribe's faulty memory. A scribe memorised the sentence but rewrote some words in a different order. Read ἀποστόλος καὶ διδάκτας. This order explains the variants already discussed.

The variant omitting καὶ is discussed in Appendix II.
Add ἐγενωθὲν after Ἀποκαλυφθήσεται - 38.

This verb does not appear in the aorist indicative elsewhere in the Pastorals. It is an unnecessary addition. ἐγενωθὲν governs all the verbs in the sentence. (cf. 1 Tim. 2:7).

The variant may have arisen through faulty misreading of ἐδόθη in the exemplar.
1:12 The variant omitting καί (pr.) is discussed in Appendix II.

1:12 πασχάω ἁλλ'.

πασχάω - 440. 823.

The sense of the sentence requires πασχάω ἁλλ'. It is unlikely that the author wrote 'suffering these things I am not ashamed'. The error by 440. 823 was due to misreading the argument of the sentence.
Chantraine (op. cit. p. 215) says that the pf. mid is frequent in the N. T. (39 times). The old type of pf. act tended to disappear in the N. T., with the development of the use of the pf. middle.

occurs at Gal. 2:7 with the meaning 'to have been entrusted' and is followed by a direct object. At 2 Tim. 1:12 an indirect obj. pron. follows.

The active is required by the context. The A I ending was probably introduced from following.
1:12 The variant omitting the second ἄλλων in this sentence is discussed in Appendix II.

1:12 The variant omitting μοῦ is discussed at 2 Tim. 1:3 (v.l. omit μοῦ).

1:12 διαφάνεια after ἃτι.
διαφάνεια after μοῦ 241. 876. 1518.

The variant represents an attempt to place διαφάνεια near φυλάξει. N. T. usage tends to separate διαφάνεια from its infinitive (cf. Rom. 11:23, 14:4).

1:12 παράδειγμα v.l. παράδειγμα is discussed at 1 Tim. 6:20 (v.l. παράδειγμα).
The dative is required after ἐν, which governs both πίστει and ἀγάπη as at 1 Tim. 2:15. The general context requires the meaning "faith and love". The genitive is unlikely to follow and depend on πίστει because of the intervening καὶ. Sheer error by D*.

The variant omitting ὑ γ is discussed in Appendix I (i) b.

The variant omitting τῇ is discussed at 1 Tim. 1:2 (v.1. add τῇ).
Except when it is qualifying ύπρος, καλός has no fixed place in the Pastoral epistles. It is attributive at 1 Tim. 1:8, 5:4; it occurs before an arthrous noun at 1 Tim. 1:18, 4:6, 6:12, 6:13, 2 Tim. 4:7; before an anarthrous noun at 1 Tim. 3:1, 2 Tim. 2:3; after an anarthrous noun at 1 Tim. 3:7, 6:19. The above references are not affected by case. Thus no firm precedent for usage can be found and so the reading παραδειγμάτι παράδειγμα παράδειγμα can be judged as the quirk of 1836.

1:14 παράδειγμα παράδειγμα παράδειγμα is discussed at 1 Tim. 6:20 (v.l. παράδειγμα).
1:14 ταύ -

ουτον - F G.

ουτον is an impossible form, and is the result of the dittography of Ἀγ. ουτον.
appears at 2 Tim. 1:5, and should be read here. 

is not a Pastoral word. The omission of the verb is due to carelessness. Rom. 8:11 contains the idea of the Spirit 'living in you'. may have been omitted through hom: -

arose through assimilation to Rom. 5:5.
The confusion of 'υ' and 'γ' is orthographical and is a common cause of variation in mss. See Howard p. 79.

At Tit. 2:8 υπών is original. It was altered possibly to meet the hortatory needs of the churches for which the mss. were being copied.

At 2 Tim. 1:14 ιπόν is likely to be original. ιπόν was written by some scribes because of assimilation to Rom. 8:11 or Col. 3:16. ο was written by other scribes because of the many 2nd p.s. references in this section.
Gignac (op. cit. p. 811) shows that Ὕδας was used regularly for ὑς ὅς in the post-Christian papyri. The variant here may be an attempt to avoid a non-Attic form. The 1st p.s. was chosen because at the time the letter was being copied, the information following would not be known. This variant represents another attempt to avoid the 2nd p.s.
Add ὑπ. after διὸς - 1836.

L (vg D R) (vt diu c)


The addition of ὑπ is secondary, and is an attempt to remove asyndeton. The advice of Luc. Brug. may be followed: "Scis hoc. Non interponas enim". The choice of ὑπ may have been determined by assimilation to 2 Tim. 1:12.
1:15 Omit Πνυτες - 206. 1799.

πνυτες was a word many scribes objected to (see 2 Tim. 4:21).
This was not surprising in view of its excessive use in the N. T. Bo Reicke reminds us (1) that after κεκ, πνυτες is the next most frequent word in the Greek Bible, and says it occurs over 1228 times in the N. T. Stylistic rather than exegetical or palaeographical reasons account for the variant above.

(1) B. Reicke on πνυτες and ξπνυτες in Kittel's Wörterbuch Vol. 5 p. 885 f. and especially p. 889.
1:15 φυγελος -
φυγελλος - A.

T.R. 1912. 920. 241. 1827. 1898 etc.
Copt. L (vg CLEM). (vt. òem.).
Epiph. Bas. Theod.

φυγελλος - 327. 442. 319.

This name does not occur elsewhere in the N. T. Howard says that the spelling φυγελος is better attested in inscriptions.

In N. T. mss. a double tendency occurs (a) to double consonants and (b) to reduce such doublets. At 2 Tim. 4:17, the variant ζυγεδην ζυγεδην exists, and ζυγεδην is accepted as original. The reading φυγελλος is read but without confidence here. The variants are orthographical.
The variant adding δ before Κ€ is discussed at Appendix I (ii) δ.

Parallels for this phrase are as follows: -

2 Tim. 2:25, δω + IND. OBJ. PRON. + SUBJ. + OBJ.
2 Tim. 2:7 δωη + IND. OBJ. PRON. + SUBJ. + OBJ.
2 Tim. 4:14 ἀπὸ δωη + IND. OBJ. PRON. + SUBJ.

This shows that the subject of the verb in these phrases is separated from the verb by an object. The order ἔλεος δ Κ€ should be read. The variant is an attempt to place the subject nearer the verb.

The subject is always expressed in this sort of phrase. The reading by 1319 is a sheer error due to hom.

The following variant is discussed here.
The reading of β (pal.) can be ignored. An object is required as at 2 Tim. 1:16. The variant is a sheer error of omission.

The variant by H 216 is an attempt to place the infinitive nearer the main verb. None of the other sentences listed above contains an infinitive. Difficulty felt over the presence of the infinitive caused the variant by P and Theod. εὐρέλυν ἐλεος together stands as the object. P. Theod by placing ἐλεος next to δ ἴπτει show an assimilation to 2 Tim. 1:16.
1:16 ἔπαιζε χυνθη -
οὗ καταις χυνθη - F G
ἔπης χυνθη - S K.

337. 256. 24.1. 24.2. 206. 1758 etc.

Origen. Basil, Chrys.

καταις χυνθη does not occur in the Pastorals. ἔπαιζε χυνθη occurs at 2 Tim. 1:8. F G misread ΟΥ ΚΕΠΑΙϹΧΥΝΘΗ as ΟΥ ΚΕΠΑΙϹ -
and hence wrote ΟΥ ΚΑΤΑΙϹ -

Howard p. 191 says that αι is usually augmented to ι but cites ἔπαιζε χυνθη as an exception (with reference to this verse). The change from αι to ι would be a natural grammatical one scribes tended to make to conform to N. T. practice: cf. Acts 1:9 ἔπηδη Lk. 16:8 ἔπηγες εν etc.

Read: ἔπαιζε χυνθη.
1:17 ἔλεως -
παραγενόμενος - 642.

παραγίνομαι is frequent in the N. T. and is in the Pastorals
at 2 Tim. 4:16 (v.l. ἑμπατ —). ἡνομαί is frequent
in the N. T. and occurs in the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 2:14, 4:12, 5:9, 6:4,
2 Tim. 2:18, 3:9, 3:11, Tit. 3:7. Both are Attic verbs.

παραγίνομαι is never followed by εὐ in the N. T. (at Acts 9:26
v.l. εἰς occurs). The compound form may have been added here on
exegetical grounds: the scribe understood the sentence to mean
"arrived at Rome", and felt παραγενόμενος would express this
better.
\[\text{ἐπούδαμον} - \text{SCD}^*\text{FGP.}\]


\[\text{ἐπούδαλιοτέρον} - \text{ψ DC K L}\]

T.R. 326. 1912. 69. etc.

L (vg)(vt).

Origen. Basil.

\[\text{ἐπούδαλιοτέρος} - \lambda.\]


(cf. \(\text{τάχεως}\) v.l. \(\text{τάχιον}\) at 2 Tim. 4:9).

\(\text{ἐπούδαμος}\) occurs at Lk. 7:4 (no. v.l.) and Tit. 3:13 (v.l. \(\text{τάχεως}\)). The comparative \(\text{ἐπούδαλιοτέρος}\) occurs at Phil. 2:2 (v.l. \(-\text{τερον}\)). The comparative of \(\text{ἐπούδαμος (ἐπούδαλιοτέρος)}\) occurs at 2 Cor. 8:22 (no v.l.) and at 2 Cor. 8:17 (v.l. \(-\text{τερος}\)).

Bl-Deb. § 102 says that adverbs of manner in \(-\text{ως}\) formed from adjectives have a comparative in \(-\text{τερος}\) in the N. T., whereas in Attic authors \(-\text{τερον}\) is normal. \(\text{ἐπούδαλιοτέρος}\) is probably original here. Some scribes altered it to the Attic form, others to the strict positive form of the adverb.
occurs at Lk. 2:44 (v.l. \(\varepsilon\gamma\tau\vp\varepsilon\nu\)) 2:45
(v.l. \(\tau\eta\)) Acts 11:25 (no. v.l.). The meaning of this
compound implies a "difficult search." \(\varepsilon\pi\varepsilon\gamma\tau\vp\varepsilon\nu\) occurs
at Mt. 6:32, 12:39, 16:4, Lk. 4:42, 12:30, etc. sometimes
with v.l. \(\gamma\tau\vp\varepsilon\nu\). It is not found in the Pastorals. Both
compounds are found in Attic Greek.

The simple verb is likely to be original in this instance.
Both compounds are attempts by scribes to improve on the force
of the verb: thus both \(\alpha\nu\varepsilon\gamma\tau\vp\varepsilon\nu\) and \(\varepsilon\pi\varepsilon\gamma\tau\vp\varepsilon\nu\) are
epexegetical in nature. \(\gamma\tau\vp\varepsilon\nu\) is of course a frequent verb in
the N. T.
1:17 ἐγέρθησαν(ν) με -
με ἐγέρθησεν - 2005. 996. 1661.

(cf. v.l. at 2 Tim. 2:12).

με precedes its verb at 2 Tim. 4:10, 4:16, 1:16, 3:11,
1 Tim. 1:13. It follows the verb at 1 Tim. 1:12,
2 Tim. 1:15, 4:17, 4:18.

Here ἐγέρθησεν με is original. The variant is
an attempt to make με apply more obviously to both ἐγέρθησεν
and εὑρέν (cf. Jn. 7:34, 7:36 for similar usage ἐγέρσετε
με καὶ οὐκ εὑρήσετε).
1:18 δ ΚC εὐφελ ἐλεος v.l. εὐφελ v. K C ελεος
v.l. δ K C ελεος εὐφελ v. K C are discussed
at 2 Tim. 1:16 (v.l. ελεος δ K C).

1:18 ἐλεος —
ἐλεον — ἐλεον

1891. 917. 919. 920. 623. 337. 460.
177. 794. 122.

and

TITUS.

3:5 το... ἐλεος —
τον... ἐλεον — ἐλεον K L

T.R. 326. 88. 623. 5. 256. etc.
Cyril–Alex.

Gignac (op. cit. p. 460) says that δ ἐλεος is rare in his
papyri. He says that το ἐλεος is Hellenistic and may
have arisen to distinguish ἐλεος and ἐλεον (which
were identical in pronunciation) in the oblique cases. In the
Herculanean papyri only the masculine is found (Grönert p. 176).
Moulton (Prolegomena p. 60) says that ἐλεος is neutar in
Hellenistic literature. 'The Psalms of Solomon' ed. by Ryle and
James shows that there is much variation between the neutar and
the masculine of ἐλεος (e.g. at 2:8, 5:14, 8:34, 9:16). See
also Howard, p. 126. There is no firm example of the masculine in
the N. T.

Read τό ζέλεσ and τό ζελεσ above. The variants are Atticisms.
1:18 ΠΥΡΩΝ ΚΥ
ΠΥΡΩΝ ΚΩ - ψ Ν

1908.
Theod. Chrys.

ΠΥΡΩΝ ΘΩ - Ν*

L (vt d) (vg D gig.).
Rus.

Omit - C.

241.
Tert.

ΠΥΡΩΝ omitted because it was thought to be otiose following ο ΚΩ.

Bl-Deb. §§ 237, 238 says that ΠΥΡΩΝ + DAT. is the least used case. ΠΥΡΩΝ + GEN is more usual with verbs of receiving, hearing, giving. The genitive after ΠΥΡΩΝ is found at Lk. 1:45 (ΠΥΡΩΝ ΚΥ). Read ΠΥΡΩΝ ΚΥ

ΘΩ may be a stylistic variant to avoid two occurrences of ΚΩ in the sentence.
The variant by 1845 is a careless omission of a prepositional phrase. The phrase is Pastoral and occurs at 2 Tim. 4:8.

*Ekevos* occurs before its noun at 2 Tim. 2:26, 2:13, Tit. 3:7. See also 2 Tim. 1:12, *eis Ekevena thn thmeran* and 2 Tim. 4:8 *en Ekevena th thmeran*.

Although διακονεῖν occurs in the N. T. followed by the dative pronoun as at Mt. 4:11, 8:15, 25:24, 27:55, Phil. 13 etc., the verb does not necessarily require μοι here. 

"Services" in general are in mind. μοι has been introduced by scribes to complete what they thought was the sense after εξῆς με καὶ εὔρεν.
γνωσκεῖν occurs in the Pastorals at 2 Tim. 2:19 (O. T.) 3:1 without variant.

ἐπηγινωσκεῖν is frequent in the N. T. and occurs in the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 4:3 (No v.l.). At 1 Tim. 4:3 the verb has a directive force as in Classical Greek. The form is less suitable here, and may be a quirk of 1022.
2:1 χωρος τυ v.l. τυ χωρος is discussed in Appendix I (i) b.

2:2 η ηγουεας —
ηγουεας - F G.

ηγουεας is an impossible form. Sheer error by F G caused by η preceding, which these mss. assumed was part of the verb ηγουω.
παρακλησις is frequent in the N. T. and occurs in the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 4:13. The variant may represent a deliberate alteration as Hippolytus may have felt ρατυρων was unsuitable to his purposes.
2:2 ἄνδρωνος - 
ἀγάς - 1836.
ἀνδρας - 2.

ὑιος occurs in the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 5:10, 2 Tim. 1:9, 1:14, Tit. 3:5. Each time it occurs, it is an adjective. ἴστος does not occur as an adjective with ἄνηρ or ἄνθρωπος in the Pastorals. ὑιος therefore, is unlikely to be original.

ἄνηρ occurs in the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 2:8, 2:12, 3:2, 3:12, 5:9, Tit. 1:6, 2:5. There is no real difference in meaning in the Pastorals between ἄνηρ and ἄνθρωπος although the former often refers to a married man. If ἄνθρωπος is original, it explains how ἀνδρας occurred. Colwell on the abbreviations of 2:27 (op. cit. p. 788) shows that ἄνθρωπος was sometimes abbreviated to ἄνος. 2 read this as an abbreviated form of ἄνηρ and wrote the dative plural of this noun in error. The abbreviation of ἄνθρωπος could also have caused the other variant here on palæographical grounds. ἀνοίκ was read by 1836 as ἀνοίκ.
2:2 ἡμῶν -
δύνατον - κ.

ἡμῶν suits the context. δύνατον may have been an interpretative addition prompted by ἐνδύματα in v. 1.
κακοπάθεω occurs at 2 Tim. 2:9, 5:4, Jas. 5:13 (no v.11.).

The only occurrence of κακοπάθεω known to L + S. is the reference at 2 Tim. 1:8. It is a Pastoral word, and should be read here. Scribes objected to compound verbs on occasion; so reduced then to simple verbs. Here, κακοπάθεω would also be objected to because of its rarity. The orthography is discussed below.

In reducing the verb to its simple form, some scribes thought the κακοπάθεω prefix ought to be κακό as at 2 Tim. 2:1. At 2 Tim. 2:1 κακό is used for special stress as ἐκνοῦμαι follows.

(1) Gwilliam in "The Palestinian Version of the Holy Scriptures" p. XXXVI says that three words in the Syriac attempt to render κακοπάθεω and show that the translator had this word before him.
In support of the originality of εὖ δὖν it can be argued, that

(a) scribes elsewhere tended to reduce 2nd p.s. references (e.g. at 2 Tim. 4:22).

(b) εὖ δὖν was omitted by some scribes on stylistic grounds, as it occurs in v. 1.

(c) if the exemplars read εὖν συγκαταθήσον as 451. 1735 etc. εὖ δὖν could have been omitted by hom. εὖ οὖν συγκαταθήσον on the other hand may represent a conflate reading. In which case, the real choice here is between εὖ δὖν κακοπάθησον and συγκαταθήσον.

The arguments advanced earlier favour the originality of συγκαταθήσον. This explains how the other variants arose.

If εὖ δὖν κακοπάθησον were original, it is difficult to explain how συγκαταθήσον occurred.

The Palestinian Syriac lectionary reading may represent a stress brought out by the translator. From an exemplar reading κακοπάθησον he added the pronoun.

The reading of 1175 is probably not so much an example of εὖ οὖν being omitted, as the reduction of a compound verb to a simple. The exemplar of 1175 probably read συγκαταθήσον.
As far as the orthography of the original reading is concerned, there is no hard and fast rule. Howard p. 104 suggests that ςυν before γχ assimilates and adds "assimilation takes place in composition according to the traditional spelling". Bl.-Deb. § 19 is non-committal saying ζυν and ςυν often assimilate but non assimilation is also frequent. As far as the Pastorals are concerned, see v.11 at 2 Tim. 2:12 συνβασιλευσον: 1 Tim. 3:6, ζρατεαγ Τιτ. 1:8 ζγκρατη. However at 2 Tim. 1:8 the reading συνκασωσον is found without variant, and should indicate Pastoral usage here.

Read συνκασωσον.
2:3 ἐπατίμητας - 
ἐσυνεπατίμητας - Ἰ.

D reads ἐσυνκακοπανδέσον earlier. The correctors of D remove the ὄν in that word and in the above variant.

ἐσυνεπατίμητας occurs at Phil. 2:25, Phm. 2 (no v.11.). ἐπατίμητας is frequent in the N. T. but does not occur elsewhere in the epistles.

ἐσύ was probably added before ἐπατίμητας by D because of confusion with ἐσυνκακο-, earlier.

Read ἐπατίμητας.

2 TIMOTHY.

2:3 χῦ ἦν v.1. ἦν χῦ is discussed in Appendix I (i) b.
2:4 Add τῇ Θῷ after ἑπτὰνονεύοντος - F G
L (vg) (vt f g t) Goth.
Cypr. Ambst. Orig (Lat.).
Theod-Mops (Lat.) etc.

ἔστρατευόμενον occurs at 1 Tim. 1:18 and is followed by the
dative and accusative.

The addition of τῇ Θῷ by scribes is more likely than the
omission. The longer reading represents an interpretative
addition by scribes concerned lest the sense be misconstrued.
βιος -
κόσμου - $ (pal. vg).

βιος is a frequent N. T. word and occurs in the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 2:2. The variant is probably just a translation necessity rendering βιος by נשמת and not by נשת.
Both spellings occur in the LXX. L + S however list ἡλετεία as Classical. The Papyri know this spelling (see Mayser II:2 p. 359 and II:1 p. 19 and I:3 p.8).

Howard p. 339 on -ειδα and -αι says that the shortened form -αι is due to the itacistic tendencies of scribes in the age of the uncials.

Perhaps in view of L + S, we should follow the spelling of the Uncials, and argue ἡλετεία as an Atticistic correction.
Origen.

The general tendency noted elsewhere has been to alter present subjunctives to aorists. ἔρευκα is a fairly popular verb in the N. T. and the present is the most common tense. Read ἔρευκα.
The variant omitting $\delta \varepsilon$ is discussed in Appendix III.

The variant omitting $\kappa \alpha \iota$ is discussed in Appendix II.

The variant adding $\zeta \eta$ after $\varepsilon \alpha \upsilon$ (sec.) is discussed in Appendix III.

U6Dwj - 33. 623. 917.

$\varepsilon \alpha \upsilon$ + subj. of the verb $\alpha \delta \lambda \varepsilon \omega$ is suitable in the context. The variant arose because of confusion with $\kappa \delta \lambda \eta \gamma \gamma$ following, or because $\kappa \delta \lambda \eta \tau \iota$ was misread as $\kappa \delta \lambda \eta \tau \iota \kappa \tau \iota$.
Zerwick § 151 says that the superlative τρῶτος supplanted the comparative in the N. T. See notes on ἀρχεῖος at 2 Tim. 4:9.

Turner p. 32 cites many examples where the N. T. and early Christian writings used πρῶτος in the sense of πρότερος (e.g. Acts 1:1 where πρῶτος is used of 2 volumes). In Classical Greek πρῶτος meant the first of a series. In the N. T. although this usage is found (as at Lk. 2:2), it often means the first of two. πρότερος according to Bl-Deb. § 62 has surrendered the strict Attic meaning to πρῶτος and now means only 'earlier'. At 1 Tim. 1:13 πρωτερον means 'formerly'. However, in this context πρῶτος is preferable to πρωτερον which is a sheer error by S. If the facsimile of S is examined it will be seen that the scribe began to write πρῶτον.
2:6 των καρπων
ἐκ του καρπου - 1311.
L (vg) "de fructibus"

τον καρπον - 489. 226. 255. 38. 69*. 462.
440. 1906. 319. 76. 425. 102.

πεταλαφθησεν followed by the acc. rei (usually with the force 'of the whole') occurs in the N. T. at Acts 24:25 (no v.l.).

The reading with ἐκ is obviously wrong, and seems to have been introduced through the Latin. The choice is between τον καρπον and των καρπων.

Bl.-Deb. § 169 states that the partitive genitive was replaced by other cases in the N. T. πεταλαφθησεν is cited as a verb followed by the genitive in the sense 'to receive a share of'. What appears as accusative above may be an orthographical variation for των καρπων.
2:7 \( \delta - S^A C F G P. \)

1739. 33.

L (vt g) Gothic. Eth. \( \delta \) (vg. pal).

Chrys.

\( \zeta - S^D H K L. \)

T.R. 104. 81. 326, etc.

\( \delta \) (hl.) L (vt d f t)(vg). Coptic. Arm.

Chrys. Theod-Mops.

Latin Fathers.

cf. 1 Tim. 1:7 ...... \( \zeta \) λεγομεν where \( \pi\epsilon\rho\iota \tau\iota\nu\nu \) follows.

\( \delta \), however, could refer to a definite statement which is to follow. \( \zeta \) would therefore be an interpretative correction. The forms of the relative are normal in the N. T.

\( \delta \) is tentatively offered as the original reading. \( \delta \) was more likely to be altered to \( \zeta \) than vice versa.
2:7 Add σοι after λέγω - $\$ \text{(pal.)}$. 

σοι has been introduced from later in the verse. $\$ \text{(pal.)}$ is not usually reliable for determining the underlying Greek text. Ignore the variant.

2 TIMOTHY.

2:7 σῶριν v.l. σωτερί is discussed at 2 Tim. 4:14 (v.l. ἁπλούσωτερί).
2:7 \( \gamma \alpha \rho \) occurs as the second word in its clause in the
Pastorals.

1 Tim. 2:5, 2:13, 3:13, 4:5, 4:8, 4:10 (\( \varepsilon \iota \sigma \tau \omega \tau \omicron \quad \gamma \alpha \rho \))
4:16, 5:11, 5:15, 5:18, 6:7, 6:10, 2 Tim. 1:7, 1:12, 2:16
(\( \epsilon \iota \tau \tau \omicron \pi \lambda \epsilon \iota \omicron \nu \quad \gamma \alpha \rho \)) 3:2, 3:6, 3:9, 4:3, 4:6, 4:10,
4:11, 4:15, Titus, 1:7, 1:10, 2:11, 3:3, 3:9, 3:12

Sheer error by D. (cf. v.l. by D\( ^{3} \) at 2 Tim. 4:10).

The variant omitting \( \gamma \alpha \rho \) is discussed at 1 Tim. 2:13 (v.l. omit \( \gamma \alpha \rho \)).
2:7 The variant adding ὀ before ἔκ is discussed in Appendix I (iii) d.

2:7 ἐυνεκίς
   ἐναρέω - 1836.

ἐναρέω occurs in the Pastorals at 2 Tim. 1:7, 1:8, 3:5.
ἐναρέω is not a Pastoral word although it occurs in the N. T.
at Lk. 2:47, 1 Cor. 1:19, Eph. 3:4, Col. 1:9, 2:2. Note that
ἐναρέω occurs as a variant for ἐνεκελεύσα at Mk. 12:33
and ἐνεὰτων for ἐνεὰτων at Mt. 12:25.

It is difficult to decide how this variant arose.
2:8 \[\mu\nu\eta\rho\rho\omicron\omicron\nu\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\ - \text{\textit{Dx}}.\]

1836. 1924.

In Appendix I (i) b under 'Accusative', it is argued that the
\[
\text{\textit{IN}}
\]
apparently belonging to \(\mu\nu\rho\rho\omicron\nu\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\) is in fact an
abbreviation for \(\nu\eta\sigma\omicron\omicron\nu\). Note that 1836 follows
\(\mu\nu\rho\rho\omicron\nu\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\varepsilon\nu\) with \(\text{\textit{IN}}\) alone. In the context the
imperative not infinitive is required.

2 Timothy.

2:8 \(\text{\textit{IN}} \text{\textit{AV}} \text{\textit{v.l. AV}} \text{\textit{IN}}\) is discussed in Appendix I (i) b.

The variant omitting \(\text{\textit{IN}}\) is discussed in Appendix I (i) a.
In all occurrences of the name in the N. T., the above variants exist (e.g. at Mt. 20:30, 20:31, Rom. 1:3, Rev. 5:5 etc). Both spellings exist in the LXX. W + H in their introduction p. 151 enunciate the principle that scribes tended to shorten long vowels. Howard p. 110 says that the spelling Δαβίδ came in with the cursives. The earlier spelling paralleled Roman names, e.g. Flavius Φλαντας. Silvanus appears as ΕΙΛΟΔΑΝΟΣ, but in papyri from the 3rd century A.D. as ΕΙΛΒΑΝΟΣ. In other names Β represents the Latin θ much earlier. These comments suggest that Δαβίδ is original. However, Colwell on the abbreviations of 2427 (op. cit. p. 791) points out that this name was often abbreviated to ΣΑΣ. Paap cited by Strycker (1) says that in the papyri from the first century A.D. onwards Δαβίδ is much more frequent than other spellings. There is no real clue as to the original N. T. spelling of the name. This variant is listed as doubtful in Appendix 6.

The variant omitting ΡΩ is discussed at 2 Tim. 1:3 (v.l. add ΡΩ).
The variant adding χριτί after ὑστερά is discussed in Appendix II.

The sense requires a negative. The omission could have been caused by hom.

The bar over the ΘΟΥ was not always clearly written: see the controversy at 1 Tim. 3:16.
This has the effect of creating a new sentence beginning with ἔλλαπος. Although this is not uncharacteristic of our author (cf. 1 Tim. 1:13, 1:16, 3:9) it is not likely here. ἔλλαπος refers back to the previous words and contrasts the chains of the prisoner with the chaining of the word of God. Αὐτῷ can stand at the beginning of a new sentence and refer back naturally. Ignore the punctuation of Ὁ + Ἡ.
2:10 Omit πάντα - 33. 206%. 

ὑποτεύω when it is transitive means 'to endure' and is followed by πάντα at 1 Cor. 13:7. When ὑποτεύω is intransitive the meaning is 'to stay behind' as at Lk. 21:43, Acts 17:14. The context requires the transitive meaning. The variant is a careless omission.

2:10 The variant adding μου after ἐκλέκτους is discussed at 2 Tim. 1:3 (v.l. add μου).
The Pastoral epistles always abide by the rule of concord.

F G are obviously wrong insofar as they break the concord.

As Turner points out on p. 232, τυγχανόω is followed by the genitive in the N. T. Sheer error by F G.
It is significant that this variant exists only in versions.

It is frequent in these epistles. cf. 1 Tim. 1:17

καὶ δοξά ἐς τοὺς διωνεῖς των διώνων

μετὰ δοξῆς διώνου is a frequent N. T. phrase and should be read here. It is difficult to explain the change away from διωνου

The following variant is also considered here.

2 TIMOTHY.

2:10 Omit μετὰ δοξῆς διωνου - L (vt t).

It is significant that this ms. is a liturgy. These words may not have been suitable to the needs of this version at this point, and were therefore omitted.
Add καὶ παρέχεις ἀπόδοξης ἢ ἡμός after λόγος - 74, 206, 429, 1311, 1799.

Add ἅ' ὅδ' καὶ Ἰωρέων after λόγος - 1838.

πράσινος ὁ λόγος occurs without any addition at Tit. 3:8.

See the variant at 1 Tim. 3:1. The longer reading has been introduced by assimilation to 1 Tim. 1:15, 4:9.

The reading by 1838 is a pious or liturgical addition.

K. W. Clark in 'The Theological Relevance of Textual Variation in Current Criticism of the Greek New Testament' in J B L Vol. LXXXV p.1 f and especially p. 15 acknowledges that many variants are theological in nature despite comments to the contrary by critics like Vaganay and Kenyon. This variant is one such theological alteration to the text. πράσινος ὁ λόγος elsewhere in the Pastorals leads directly into a quotation.
2:11 Souter's apparatus indicates the possibility that the punctuation is ἔνος, ε' and not ἔνος, Ε'.

Here ἔνος seems to point forward to the hymn. ἕν in the opening words of the hymn probably belongs to the quotation or else is an explanatory 'for, as you remember'. It is unlikely that ἕν introduces a reason for what has been said. Ε' therefore, introduces the hymn, and the standard punctuation should be followed, namely ἔνος, Ε'.
2:11 The variant adding καὶ after γὰρ is discussed in Appendix II.

2:11 Add ἀλλὰ before καὶ - 1836.

and

2:12 Add ἀλλὰ before καὶ - 1836.

A quirk by this ms. The addition of ἀλλὰ spoils the parallelism of the poem.
W. H. on orthography in their introduction p. 149 say that 'ό' is retained in 'συν' but not in 'ἐν' compounds. They say that assimilation is most frequent when the original force of the preposition is lost in the current sense of the compound.

Bl-Deb. § 34 says that the Hellenistic language tended to omit consonants. On the other hand Koine generally preferred to emphasise etymology. Crönert p. 60 lists examples of 'συν' and 'συν'. L + S. list Classical examples of this compound form, generally 'συν'. It is difficult to determine the original author's orthography but perhaps the etymological form 'συν' is the original.

All the other verbs in the poem end in 'ορεβ'. There is no need for the subjunctive ending here. Turner points out on p. 97 that mss. often vary between fut. ind. and aor. subj. The variant here is probably orthographical. Crönert p. 19 quotes Mayser: "- der quantative und qualitative Unterschied der beiden o - Laute wird seit dem Beginn des 2. Jahrh. v. Chr. verwischt."

Examples are given by Crönert. Read 'ορεβ' here.
2:12 ει v.l. Ἀλλα καὶ is discussed at 2 Tim. 2:11
(v.l. Ἀλλα καὶ).

2:12 Σύνβας-
Σύνβας - S F G A P.
Dam.

- βασιλευσεως -
- βασιλευσεως - C L A P.

1912. 1836. 623. 1311. 263. etc.

- βασιλευσεως - D*

Pel.

All the other finite verbs in the poem are indicative. There is
no reason for the subjunctive here. The reading ωρευν is
orthographical and represents the substitution of ο and ο. N. T.
mss. suggest generally that ωρευν be reserved as the subjunctive
spelling.

The second half of each line of the poem is future: Συνβαςεως
ζημηγεστας. The present is unlikely here both because of
the sequence of tenses and because it is less suitable in the
context. Sheer error by D*

Howard p. 104 is not helpful in deciding whether συν- or συν-
is the original reading. The reading which shows the etymology
better was the criterion adopted in the variant Συνβαςεως
συνδρομέν in this verse, and perhaps ought to be adopted here. (cf. 1 Cor. 4:8 συνδρομεν v.l. συνβ.)

Read συνδρομεν.
Turner p. 115 says that εἰ + fut. indic. is "almost causal" as at Mt. 26:33, Mk. 14:29, Lk. 11:8, 1 Pet. 2:20, 1 Cor. 9:11, but at 2 Tim. 2:12 the condition is only hypothetical. Bl.-Deb. § 372:2a says that without causal or restrictive implications εἰ + indicative of reality is limited almost only to (a) disjunctive deductions as at 2 Tim. 2:11, 12, Rom. 8:13, 1 Cor. 11:6, Rev. 13:10, Lk. 6:4 or (b) to other kinds of logical reasoning.

In the rest of the poem the εἰ clause contains a verb in the present tense. This conforms to Bl-Deb's (a) grouping.
Read ἐρωτομίζομαι.
2:12 ἐγκελνος -
 Ἑκελνος - 241.

and

2 TIMOTHY.

2:13 Ἑκελνος -
 Ἐκελνος - 223.

καὶ Ἑκελνος by crasis becomes Ἐκελνος and is frequent in the N. T. The parallelism in the poem suggests Ἐκελνος in one line balances Ἑκελνος in another. Scribes of 241 223 were confused: one wrote Ἑκελνος in both lines, the other wrote Ἐκελνος in both.
2:12 ἐρνησται ἡμᾶς — ἡμᾶς ἐρνησται — 255, 256.

(cf. v.l. at 2 Tim. 1:17).

ἐρνησται is followed by a pronoun at Mt. 10:33 (bis) Lk. 12:9, 22:57, Jn. 13:38, Acts 3:13. There is no instance in the N. T. of the pronoun preceding ἐρνησται. Read ἐρνησται ἡμᾶς on the basis of standard N. T. usage. The variant is another inexplicable instance of changed word-order.
2:12 ξρυγησεται
ξρνησηται - 33.

There is no reason for the subjunctive ending. The variant is orthographical. Read ξρυγησεται.
The omission of the particle is discussed at 1 Tim. 2:13 and it is decided on the basis of that discussion that the text without the particle is the original. The addition of $\Delta$ or $\gamma\alpha\rho$ is intended to remove the asyndeton especially if the phrase is part of the quotation, and not the author's comment.

Other variants concerning particles are discussed here:

2 TIMOTHY.

3:8 $\Delta$ -
$\gamma\alpha\rho$ - 81. 88.
Omit particle - 337. 2344.
Here because of its very weakness in the context is probably original. Some scribes substituted \( \gamma \lambda \rho \) because of the weakness of \( \delta \varepsilon \). The omission was probably accidental.

2 TIMOTHY.

4:6

\( \gamma \lambda \rho \) -

\( \delta \varepsilon \) - 999.

Origen.

Ruf.

\( \gamma \lambda \rho \) does not have the strict resumptive sense it has at 2 Tim. 1:7, 1:12, 3:9, 4:10. Some scribes therefore felt it was unsuitable and substituted \( \delta \varepsilon \). There is a precedent for this sort of correction. C. H. Bird (1) shows how Mt. and Lk. often eliminated Mark's \( \gamma \lambda \rho \) clauses because they are not used correctly. In Mk. as here and at 2 Tim. 2:13 supra, \( \gamma \lambda \rho \) seems to be used as if it were \( \delta \varepsilon \). Stylistically conscious scribes would take offence at this usage and substitute \( \delta \varepsilon \).

(1) In "Some \( \gamma \lambda \rho \) clauses in St. Mark's Gospel". J T S IV 1953 p. 171 f and especially p. 172-173.
2:13 ἐδυτόν -

and

2 TIMOTHY.

4:18 αὐτοῦ -

For the variant at 2 Tim. 2:13 see v.11 at 1 Tim. 2:9, 6:10.

There is no firm example of ἐδυτόν in the N. T. The reflexive sense is required. Bl-Deb.§ 283 points to the variation in mss. between ἑδ- and αὐ-. Here ἐδυτόν may represent the careless omission of ξ.

At 2 Tim. 4:18 the reflexive is of no sense and is a sheer error. ἀπεδοῦ dependent on βασιλεῖα is suitable in the context.
of. 2 Tim. 1:5 ὑπομνήσεως: Tit 3:1 ὑπομνήσεως.  
Therefore this verb forms part of the author's vocabulary.

The usage here is as at Tit. 3:1. διδάσκεις is the result of possible assimilation to 1 Tim. 6:2. Here, however, the charge is not to teach, but to remind them of the hymn and its meaning, or of the words to follow.

The variant ὑπομνήσεως is due to the accidental shortening of the original verb.

The aor. imper. mid. of this verb is not found elsewhere in the Pastorals. The present is required by sense. The reading by P may have been caused by the preceding ἦσσεν ἀρθήσαι.
Διαρρητοροπενος
Διαρρητορουρενος - C

255. 5. 623. 431. 1827.
Theod.

Διαρρητοροπενος appears after του in 1319.

The normal conjugation in Veitch (1) does not know of –σουρενος. Mayser I:2, p. 186 knows of no form with –ου – Reading by C and others may be a sheer error.

The author's usage at 1 Tim. 5:21, 2 Tim. 4:1 suggests that Διαρρητοροπα should precede Ζυνωτιον. The variation by 1319 is an attempt to place Διαρρητορονις near μη λογοδρακινυ but in so doing creates the reading ὑπορινηενε ζυνωτιον του του τον. This is not an idea found elsewhere in the Pastorals.

(1) W. Veitch "Greek Verbs" under Διαρρητορονις.
2:14 του ΚΡ

T.R. and most minuscules.

Lect. Byz.

L (vg)(vt d) § (hl. vg). Goth.

Copt. (boh. sah(mss.).

Chrys. Euthal. Theophyl


Theod-Mops (Lat.).

του ΘΥ

- S C F G.

31. 1175. 1912. 436. 69. etc.

Lect. 598.


Chrys.

Ephraim.

Omit του - D.

88. 1925. 2344.

γου - 206. 1799. 1758. 429.

Omit - 33.

γου is unlikely to be original. See Appendix I (i) a.

ἐνωτιον του ΘΥ is a characteristic Pastoral phrase. See 2 Tim. 4:1, and the arguments at 1 Tim. 5:4. There is no firm example in the Pastorals of ἐνωτιον (τοῦ) γου and although
such a phrase is found in the N. T. (e.g. at 2 Cor. 8:21 (v.l. סע ), it is rare. There is much variation between סע and ק in N. T. mss. If סע is original, so too is יא. See Appendix I (ii) b. The error by 33 is a senseless omission.
2:14 \[\text{\(\mu\eta\) - \(\mu\eta\delta\varepsilon\)} - 1518.\]

and

TITUS.

2:3 \[\text{\(\mu\eta\) - \(S^c P D F G H K L\).}\]

T.R. 33. 326. etc.

L (vg)(vt) non ... non. \$/ (hl. vg. pal.).

Clem. Bas. Chrys. Euthal, etc.

\[\text{\(\mu\eta\delta\varepsilon\) - \(S^* A C\).}\]

442. 1739.

and

TITUS.

2:10 \[\text{\(\mu\eta\) - \(\mu\eta\delta\varepsilon\) - \(C^c D F G\).}\]

33. 88. 5. 203. 506. 623.

\[\text{\(\mu\eta\delta\varepsilon\) occur in the Pastorals only with another negative,}\]

and never alone. cf. v.l. at 2 Tim. 1:7 and at 1 Tim. 2:12, 6:7.

1518 is unlikely, therefore, to preserve the correct and original reading at 2 Tim. 2:14.
The variants \(\rho \gamma\) and \(\rho \gamma \delta \epsilon\) often indicate variations of emphasis or a different handling of the conjunction. The v.l. at Tit. 2:3 may have been influenced by 1 Tim. 3:8 where \(\mu \gamma \delta \epsilon\) occurs as a second negative in the sentence. \(\rho \gamma\) is part of the author's usage. If \(\rho \gamma \delta \epsilon\) is original, \(\mu \gamma\) is the result of scribal assimilation to 1 Tim. 3:8. The variant at Tit. 2:10 is of the same type. \(\rho \gamma\) may be correct there, where \(\rho \gamma \delta \epsilon\) as at Tit. 2:3, 1 Tim. 3:8, 2 Tim. 1:8 negates adjectives or pronouns.
The object infinitive occurs after verbs of command at 1 Tim. 1:3, 4:3, 6:14, 6:17,18. El-Deb. § 389 says that the imperatival infinitive is not frequent in Attic Greek and occurs only twice in the N. T. without the subject. When the subject is to be expressed Paul uses ἐνα. The author of the Pastorals expresses the subject at 1 Tim. 1:3, 1:20. Here no ind. object follows ταύτα ἐπορισθέντες. Who are to be reminded? Obviously, a vague "them". Because of the rareness of this imperatival infinitive, and because of ἐπορισθέντες some scribes altered λογοράξειν to the imperative. (cf. Mk. 8:32 καὶ παρῆρε τοῦ λόγου ἐλάλησεν.). λογοράξειν is loosely dependent on διὰ μαρτυρίας.
2:14

επ’ - 
επ’ s - S ε ψ D K L.

1739. 104. 81. 6. 330. 69. etc.

and

οὐδενάν -
οὐδενάν - F G.

330. 2400.

L (vt g).

L + S. state that χρησμός can be followed by either επ’ or επ’. επ’, however, is likely to be original here as επ’ follows, so that some scribes may have altered the first occurrence on stylistic grounds.

Bauer states that χρησμός + Acc. is Classical and επ’ + Dat. is Hellenistic. If so, we may read οὐδενάν here. The variant οὐδενάν is therefore an Atticism.

Read επ’ οὐδενάν.
As shown at 1 Tim. 4:16 the author of the Pastorals did write the 2nd p. reflexive form despite the general Hellenistic tendency to use the 3rd p. form. The variant probably represents the careless omission of sigma.
2:15 \( \Theta \omega \) -

\( \chi \omega \) - A L.

Dam. Theod-Mops.

(cf. 2 Tim. 1:16).

It is argued in Appendix I (i) a that except at 1 Tim. 5:11 \( \chi \omega \) does not occur without \( \tau \) in the Pastorals. The variant here probably came about when the full divinity of Christ was being realised and that therefore \( \Theta \) and \( \chi \) were interchangable.

2 TIMOTHY.

2:15 The variant adding \( \kappa \alpha \) after \( \Theta \omega \) is discussed in Appendix II.
2:16 κενοφωνιάς v.l. κενοφωνιάς is discussed at 1 Tim. 6:20 (v.l. κενοφωνιάς).


περιετάχθη occurs at Jn. 11:42, Acts 25:7 (no v.l.) and Tit. 3:9 (v.l. παραλείπων). προετάχθη occurs at Rom. 12:8, 1 Th. 5:12 (no v.l.) and in the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 3:4 (v.l. προε — ) 3:5, 3:12, 5:17 (no v.l.) Tit. 3:8 (v.l. τεπε — ) Tit. 3:14 (no v.l.). Both are Attic verbs. The meaning here is as at Tit. 3:9. The mid. imper. occurs there and should be read here. περιετάχθη may have been objected to by scribes because of its rarity. προετάχθη

is less suitable in the context. The reading by F G is merely to avoid hiatus: variants of this sort are not usually included in this study.
and

2 Timothy.

πλέειν — πλέεις τον — 2:16.

πλέειτον — 2:12.

3:9 πλέειν — πλέεις τον — Κε group of von Soden. 51. 327, etc.

323. 876. 2:12.

Cyp.

Zerwick (op. cit. § 151) says that the comparative supplanted the superlative in the N. T. Bl-Deb. § 60 points to the decline in the strict use of the superlative in the N. T.: the superlative is used mostly with an elative force. Moulton's Prolegomena p. 78 f draws attention to πλέειτος in this respect saying that it is generally elative in the papyri. Turner p. 31 supports these views and says that the true superlative is virtually dead in the N. T. cf. Mt. 21:8 ἐπί πλέειτος ὥς χήμος and Mk. 4:1 ὥς χήμος πλέειτος (v.l. πλάλυς).

These views would support the originality of πλέειτον above, but there is no firm example in the N. T. of the Classical phrase ἐπί πλέειτον, ἐπί πλέειν.
however, occurs at Acts 4:17, 20:9, 24:4 (no v.11.). In this respect therefore πλετον is likely to be original, and πλετετον is an Atticistic variant.
2:16 Add ὅλων after προσκοποῦσιν - § (pal.).

and

2 TIMOTHY.

3:4 Add γὰρ after μᾶλλον - § (pal.).

These variants are unlikely to represent Greek readings. The particles appear in an unlikely position. The readings are versional peculiarities.
The reading of $D^c$ probably represents an attempt to add to $\alpha$ omitted by $D^k$. $\alpha$ is unlikely to represent a plural form, and is a mistaken spelling of the original.
The noun is usually singular and is so qualified in its context to refer to the Christian teaching. ἡγούμενος here refers to profane teaching. The variant may be an attempt to avoid confusion with the Christian teaching.
2:17 ὑαγγεῖα -

ὑαγγεῖα ἐν - F G

L (vt g) cancer ut.

ὑαγγεῖα is a λ. in the N. T. It is not Classical and does not occur in the LXX. F + G divided the word having noticed ἐν at the end of word and thought it was the conjunction ἐν. A ἐν clause is unwanted here. There is no word ὑαγγεῖα.

2 TIMOTHY.

2:17 (Ὑπενάγας v.l. Ὑπενάγος is discussed at 1 Tim. 1:20 (v.l. Ὑπενάγας)).
As Votaw (op. cit. p. 59) points out, and as the concordances show, the pf. inf. is very rare in the N. T. 1799 may have been confused by an unfamiliar form and abbreviated the verb accidentally by omitting ΥΩ.
Ctait ην before διαστασεως. SF G 48.

33.

Copt. (boh. COD.).

Cyril-Alex.

Look in the I.C.C. cites Polycarp § 7 and the Acts of Paul and Thecla § 14 for examples of διαστασεως without the article. This noun is anarthrous at Mk. 12:18, Lk. 20:27. The noun is arthrous at Acts 1:22, 2:31, Rom. 6:5. As shown in the N. T. and in Lampe's Lexicon of Patristic Greek, the presence of the article does not denote Christ's Resurrection.

Here the context speaks of a definite resurrection of believers. The article should be included in the original text.
2:18 τὴν πιστίν τὴν πιστίν - A C K L F.

Minusculae.


Most fathers.

τὴν πιστίν τὴν πιστίν - S D.

1175.

$ (vg) Gothic.

τὴν πιστίν πιστίν - S F G

33. L (v*g)

ομιτ - τὴν πιστίν - 263.

Place Διακριτοτήτων after τὴν πιστίν - D.

Goth. $ (vg).


The omission of τὴν πιστίν is unlikely to be original. It was facilitated by hom especially if the exemplar of 263 followed the reading of most cursives:

τὴν ΝΠΙΣΤΙΝ ΝΠΙΣΤΙΝ

This is not the only occurrence of τὶς in the genitive in the Pastorals (see 1 Tim. 1:7, 5:24 and v.l. at 2 Tim. 3:14). But it is not usual for the author of the Pastorals to place the genitive of possession between the article and the noun. Accept τὴν πιστίν τὴν πιστίν as original. Both variants τὴν πιστίν τὴν πιστίν and τὴν πιστίν πιστίν represent attempts to avoid the strict Semitic position of the
possessive. The same mss. which read ΤΗΝ ΠΙΕΤΙΝ ΤΗΝ ΤΙΝ ΒΛ read ἈΥΤΗΝ ΠΟΥ at the end to avoid the Semitic πλευρά + verb at the beginning of the clause. This change was facilitated by the fact that the verb in the previous clause (ἐσμέναι) comes at the end.
2:19  δ (pr.) -

δ - 69.

Sheer error by 69. This ms. also omits δ (sec.).
2:19

Arthrous θύ and arthrous Κύ dependent on an arthrous noun conforms to Pastoral usage. See Appendix I.

Κ€ was often avoided by scribes because of its ambiguity. In addition here, stylistic considerations could have motivated the removal of Κυ. Κ€ follows twice in the verse. θυ was an obvious choice for scribes: 1 Cor. 3:10 speaks of θ€ laying a foundation.

Read Κυ
2:19 ἐγνώ ἐκ τοὺς θυσίας δυτού —
Add παντώς before τοὺς — 5.

………….. λύτω 257. 24.12.
Add ὁ before ἐκ — 257.

The quotation appears at Num. 16:5 as μὴ ῥύσων Ἰωάνναν Ἰωάνναν (Kittel) and in the LXX as ἐγνώ ἐκ τοὺς θυσίας δυτού. The Apostolic Constitutions 2:54 reads ...ἐγνώ ἐκ τοὺς θυσίας δυτού (cited by Lock I.C.C. p. 101).

The addition of the definite article may be due to assimilation to the LXX of Num 16:5. Pastoral style normally reads anarthrous ἐκ only in the genitive case or after prepositions but as this v.l. occurs in an O. T. quotation the author's style may be inoperative as a criterion. See also Appendix I (iii) d.

The variant δύτω for δυτοῦ may be an Atticistic correction. Bl-Deb. § 189 says that Classical authors made the distinction between the genitive, which stressed the possessor, and the dative, which stressed the object possessed.

The adverb παντώς occurs in the N. T. at Lk. 4:23, Acts 21:22, 28:4, Rom. 3:9, 1 Cor. 5:10, 9:10, 16:12, but is not found in the Pastorals. The variant possibly represents a pious addition by a scribe, who wished to add emphasis to the statement.
2:19  Omit ο (sec.) - 69. 1799. 206. 429.

The definite article is not uncharacteristic of the author's style. cf. 2 Tim. 3:12 πάντες ἐν οἷς θελόντες and 2 Tim. 4:8. πρὸς τοὺς ἄγαπησε.

The omission was due possibly to haplography.
Tischendorf says Scrivener knew mss. which read \( \text{τοῦ } \kappa \upsilon \). The phrase in which this variant occurs is not an exact O. T. quotation, but is reminiscent of Isa. 26:13 (\( \text{τοῦ } \delta νομοῦ } \epsilon ον \delta νομίζων \) where \( \epsilon ον \) refers to \( \kappa ρις \).

Except in the phrase \( \epsilon ν \chi \omega , \chi \zeta \) in the Pastorals does not occur alone. It occurs with \( \chi \zeta \) everywhere except at 1 Tim. 5:11. \( \chi \zeta \) is unlikely to be original at 2 Tim. 2:19 as the variant is either orthographical (the change from \( \kappa \zeta \) to \( \chi \zeta \) being an easy one) or is deliberate (being a stylistic improvement, as \( \kappa \zeta \) occurs earlier in the verse). If the author's style is operative in this instance would normally prefer arthrous \( \kappa \zeta \). See Appendix I. Read (\( \text{τοῦ } \kappa \upsilon \) ).
The variant omitting $\delta\varepsilon$ (pr.) is discussed in Appendix III.

μονον -

μονακ - 69. 462. 436. 2344.

οὗ μονον ... $\alpha\lambda\nu\lambda\nu$ (καὶ) is a set phrase, and appears at Acts 19:26 1 Jn. 5:6 etc. μονακ is a sheer error.
Note that these mss. read μοναδ earlier.

This variant is another instance of changed order resulting from a scribal slip. A scribe memorised the sentence but rewrote it in a changed order. N. T. evidence is ambiguous for this phrase: Acts 17:29, Χρυσός ἢ ἀργυρός and Acts 20:33 ἀργυρίου ἢ Χρυσίου. The majority of mss. ought to be followed here in view of the unreliability of 69, 2344, 462 in these verses.
occurs at 1 Tim. 3:15, 2 Tim. 2:5. 2093 may have objected to the sound of and substituted the more common . Some Latin translators allowed themselves more freedom in rendering a part of speech such as a particle, and are therefore less valuable in helping us to determine the underlying Greek text.

Theod.

.Emit ἑαυτὸν - 1022. 1245.

(cf. 2 Tim. 4:3).

The reflexive follows the verb at 1 Tim. 2:6, 2:9, 2 Tim. 2:13, Tit. 2:14 and precedes at 1 Tim. 6:10. The position of the reflexive is not rigid in the rest of the N. T. either. The general tendency in the Pastorals, however, would cause us to prefer the majority reading.

The reading of 1022. 1245 represents a sheer error. The verb ἐκκαθαρίζω is transitive: the reflexive is needed.

The reading of 1611. 2005. represents an improbable form of καθαρίζω which is a frequent verb in the N. T. There is no example of ἐκκαθαρίζω in the N. T.

2 TIMOTHY.

2:21 The variant adding ὑπὲρ after ἑαυτὸν is discussed at 1 Tim. 4:8 (v. 1 add ὑπὲρ).
2:21  Omit ἐσταὶ ἐκεῖνος - S.

ἐἷς τινὲς is meaningless by itself. This clause (ἐσταὶ ἐκεῖνος ἐἷς τινὲς) forms the apodosis of the sentence. 5x may have connected ἐγίνακαν to ἐἷς τινὲς which resulted in the omission of ἐσταὶ ἐκεῖνος. The phrase is not uncharacteristic of a N. T. author, and the same idea is expressed at Rom. 9:21.
2:21  εἰς (pr.) -
     ἐπὶ ὑ — D F G.
     1175. 81. 1912. 547. 1611. 1704. 2005.

and

εἰς (sec.) -
     ἐπὶ ὑ — D F G
     1908.

εἰσπορεύομαι + εἰς occurs without variants at Rev. 9:7, 9:15.
εἰσπορεύομαι + ἔδαπ favors at Rev. 21:2 (no v.l.). The verb is
never followed by ἐπὶ ὑ in the N. T. ἐπὶ ὑ + however,
εἰς is followed by ἐπὶ ὑ at Tit. 3:1 and 1 Pet. 3:15. (no v.l.).

Turner p. 256 says εἰς here stands for ἐπὶ ὑ. The
Apostolic Fathers write εἰσπορεύομαι and ἐπὶ ὑ with
εἰς but Polybius only and frequently follows εἰσπορεύομαι
with ἐπὶ ὑ. N. T. usage prefers εἰς here.

εἰς τὴν occurs at 2 Tim. 2:20 (where the usage is the same as
here) and Rom. 9:21. εἰς may have been objected to on
stylistic grounds as it occurs three times in verses 20 and 21.

Read εἰς in both variants.
The variant omitting καί before εὐχρηστὸν is discussed in Appendix 2.

εὐχρηστὸν - εὐχρήστον - 2005.

εὐχρηστὸς occurs at 2 Tim. 4:11 and Phil. 11.
εὐχρήστον is possibly an orthographical variant of εὐχρηστὸν: εὐχρήστος occurs at Col. 3:15.

The context here requires εὐχρηστὸν and ἡγιάσμενον to stand together with τίς ἐκκαθαρὴ ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ τούτων,

Sheer error by 2005.
occurs at Tit. 2:9, 1 Tim. 6:1, 6:2 but is not used of God. As a title of God it is frequent in the LXX, but in the N. T. occurs only at Lk. 2:20, Acts 4:24, Jude 4, Rev. 6:10. 1311 may have wanted to insert the more popular title for 'master' or 'lord' namely Κύριος.

n.b. the Latin translates both nouns by 'dominus', so von Soden's apparatus which lists L (vg) support for Κύριος may be ignored.
\[2:21 \text{ omit } \text{ayxov} \text{ - 1319.}\]

\[\text{\'epyov is usually qualified in the Pastorals by the adjective 'good'. (cf. 2 Tim. 3:17, Tit. 3:1). The variant here as at Tit. 1:16 has been facilitated by hom:}\]

\[\text{\'epy on\'ayxov.}\]
The variant omitting \( \delta \varepsilon \) (pr.) is discussed in Appendix III.

The variant omitting \( \delta \varepsilon \) (sec.) is discussed in Appendix III.

\[ \pi \iota \eta \tau \iota \nu \, \alpha \gamma \alpha \tau \eta \nu \]
\[ \alpha \gamma \alpha \tau \eta \nu \, \pi \iota \eta \tau \iota \nu - F \, G \]
\[ L (vt. g). \]

cf. 1 Tim. 4:12 ...\( \varepsilon \nu \, \alpha \gamma \alpha \tau \eta \nu \), \( \varepsilon \nu \, \pi \iota \eta \tau \iota \nu \) ... ... 1 Tim. 6:11 ..... \( \pi \iota \eta \tau \iota \nu \) , \( \alpha \gamma \alpha \tau \eta \nu \) ..... (where the words occur in a list as here.) There is no reason to assume assimilation to this verse, which contains a larger list than at 2 Tim. 2:22. The following are also worthy of note: -

1 Th. 3:6 \( \pi \iota \eta \tau \iota \nu \) κα\( \alpha \) \( \alpha \gamma \alpha \tau \eta \nu \)

1 Tim. 1:14 με\( \tau \) \( \pi \iota \eta \tau \iota \nu \) κα\( \alpha \) \( \alpha \gamma \alpha \tau \eta \nu \)

1 Tim. 2:14 \( \varepsilon \nu \, \pi \iota \eta \tau \iota \nu \) κα\( \alpha \) \( \alpha \gamma \alpha \tau \eta \nu \)

Rev. 2:19 and Phil. 5 ...\( \alpha \gamma \alpha \tau \eta \nu \) κα\( \alpha \) \( \tau \nu \, \pi \iota \eta \tau \iota \nu \)

N.T. evidence is therefore ambiguous. The majority reading ought perhaps be followed here. It is not untypical of Pastoral usage. As elsewhere, such rearrangements of words are obviously accidental. Scribes did not always memorise the order of the sentence correctly before writing.
The following variants show the unreliability of the Palestinian Syriac version, when it stands alone.

2 TIMOTHY.

2:22 Add καὶ πίστευ after εἰρήνη - δ (pal.).

This variant is unlikely to represent the original text, as πίστευ occurs earlier in the list.

2 TIMOTHY.

2:26 Add διὸτι ἐστιν after παῦσας - δ (pal.).

διὸτι is not a Pastoral word. The variant is probably a translation necessity.

2 TIMOTHY.

3:14 Add κατηγορεῖ after προσκοπεῖ - δ (pal.).

The addition here is probably a pious insertion.
2:22 Add παντων before των - A C (F G) I. 048.

436. 330. 38. 1022. 33. 104. 81.

L (vt g) Eth. Coptic. $ (hl.).


(n.b. F G add παντων and omit των).

Bernard in his commentary says that παντων is secondary and comes from 1 Cor. 1:2. But there is no obvious assimilation to this verse. There is much variation over πας in the mss. of the Pastorals (see 2 Tim. 1:15, 4:8, 4:21 etc.). πας followed by article and noun (or participle) occurs at 1 Tim. 6:10, 2 Tim. 2:17 (v.1 omit article) 3:12, 4:8, 4:17. It is probably original here. Scribes tended to omit πας.

των probably fell out in F G through hom.
A similar phrase occurs at 1 Cor. 1:2, Acts 2:21, Rom. 10:13. The variant by A is unlikely to be correct. This ms. has been confused by earlier. In the above references the verb is in the middle, and means 'to invoke'. The reading of 2344 is a sheer error.

2 TIMOTHY.

2:22 The variant adding "lesu" after is discussed in Appendix I (i) a.
2:24 Ἰςλάνος v.l. Ἰςλάνος is discussed at 1 Tim. 1:13 (v.l. Ἰςλάνος).

2:24 Ἰτεινοῦ -

Ἀθ. Ἰτεινοῦ = Ἰκκ. Φ. Γ.

Φ. Γ. read Ἰςλάνος before, but in view of Pastoral usage, this does not necessarily mean that a consonant is to follow.

'Ἰτεινοῦ (pure) occurs elsewhere in the N. T. only at 1 Th. 2:7 (v.l. Ἰτεινοῦ). Metzger in his notes on select readings (1) decides that Ἰτεινοῦ is original at 1 Th. 2:7.

Ἀτεινοῦ (childish) occurs at Mt. 11:25, 21:16, Lk. 10:21, Rom. 2:20, 1 Cor. 3:1, 13:11, Gal. 4:1, 4:3 (no v.l.), and at Eph. 4:14, 1 Th. 2:7, Heb. 5:3 (v.l. Ἰτεινοῦ). It is not impossible for an author following in the Pauline tradition to refer to converts as "babes" as in 1 Cor. 3:1, but the direction of change is likely to have been from an original Ἰτεινοῦ to the more common word Ἰτεινοῦ.

(1) In the 'Text of the New Testament' p. 230 f.
2:25

ευν - F G

ευν - L (vg)(vt) - cum.


ευν is a rare preposition in the Pastorals. It appears only here and at 2 Tim. 4:11 in variants. There is no example of ευν πραοτητι in the N. T. ευ πραοτητι occurs at Jas. 1:21, 3:13 (no v.11.).

Read ευ here. F G appear to have been influenced by f g here.
The accusative is demanded here because the participle is in apposition to σει σουλον. As σουλον is somewhat removed, the error may have occurred because the scribes of 1311, 1319, mistook the flow of the sentence.
2:25 The reading of 489 may be rejected. KC is unparalleled in Pastoral usage.

KC may be due to assimilation to 2 Tim. 1:16, 1:18 where a similar sentence occurs. There is much interchange between KC and ΘC.
is frequent in the LXX in the sense 'to resist'
e.g. at Ex. 23:22, Is. 66:6. It occurs as a participial
substantive at 1 Tim. 5:14 ('the Devil'). The context and
the plural form here, however, show that the author is not
thinking specifically of the Devil as at 1 Tim. 5:14 but of
opposition generally.

is a word of higher Koine according to
Arndt and Gingrich, but is post-Classical. See also Nageli
"Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus" p. 30. The verb occurs in
Diod. Rust. Longinus (περ τυφός XVII:1) in the
sense 'to be adversely affected' (1). This verb is suitable
here in the sense "those who oppose". Read the present tense.
Scribes often wrote verbs in the aorist, even though the
original author wrote present verbs. This has been
demonstrated earlier.

Read .

(1) Cited by Field in his "Notes" ad loc.
2:25

\[ \text{petavous} \]

\[ \text{petavous} \] - 1908.

Omit \[ - S^x. \]

L (vt dem.).

\[ S^x \] is prone to omission (cf. 2 Tim. 4:8, 2:21, etc.). \[ \text{diwri} \] needs an object as at 2 Tim. 1:16, 1:18. \[ \text{petavous} \] is needed both grammatically and on grounds of sense. \[ \text{diwri} \] is sometimes followed by \[ \text{diwri} + \text{Acc.} \] (see L + S.), but it is less usual than \[ \text{diwri} + \text{obj.} \]. The accusative of \[ \text{petavous} \] is required in this construction. The phrase 'God of repentence' is unparallelled, whereas \[ \text{diwri petavous} \] occurs at Acts 5:31, 11:18.

Read \[ \text{petavous}. \]
Add ἐλθεῖν after ἐλθέως. - Ἰον.

An interpretative addition. The force of this verb is already apparent in ἐκ τοῦ γενομένου.
The variants have arisen because scribes misread their exemplar. \(\varepsilon \nu \nu \nu \nu \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \sigma \nu \) is inappropriate in the context. \(\varepsilon \nu \nu \nu \nu \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \sigma \nu \) is suitable. The subjunctive is required after \(\eta \tau \tau \tau \tau \tau \tau \). Read \(\varepsilon \nu \nu \nu \nu \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \sigma \nu \).
P shows the wrong form of the verb. The verbal stem is ἐγρήγορον (see L + S.).

2 TIMOTHY.

The variant adding διότι ἐστίν after ἡμᾶς is discussed at 2 Tim. 2:22 (v.l. add καὶ πιστίν).
The problem in this verse is whether \( \alpha \tau \omicron \tau \omicron \omicron \) and \( \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \lambda \nu \omicron \omicron \omicron \) refer to the same subject. Weiss by adding the comma thinks not.

The meaning of the verse is either:

a) 'Having been captured by the devil to do his will' or

b) 'After having been captured by the devil, they may then return to do God's will'.

J. P. Wilson (1) on the translation of this verse states that in Plato "Phaedo" 106 and "Protagoras" 310 \( \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \lambda \nu \omicron \omicron \) follows \( \alpha \tau \omicron \tau \omicron \omicron \) and both refer to the same person. Field (op. cit.) states that \( \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \lambda \nu \omicron \omicron \) is remoter and refers to God (v. 25), but also states that the devil is 'THAT person'.

\( \alpha \tau \omicron \tau \omicron \omicron \) uses two pronouns to refer to the same person. If this is so here, \( \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \lambda \nu \omicron \omicron \) has been substituted for \( \alpha \tau \omicron \tau \omicron \omicron \) by the author to suggest a contrast with God.

(1) 'The Translation of 2 Timothy 2:26' in E. T. XLIX (1937) p. 45.
whose will they ought to be doing, but this does not give the full force to \( \varepsilon \iota \mu \vartheta \gamma \iota \gamma \iota \rho \rho \varepsilon \nu \omega \) and is a harsh use of pronouns.

Lock, who discusses the possibilities at length in his commentary, concludes that the translation should be: "Having been saved alive, captured into life by the servant of the Lord, to do the Lord's will and not the devil's" (cf. Bengal, Wetstein and R V margin). This gives the full force to \( \varepsilon \iota \mu \vartheta \gamma \iota \gamma \iota \rho \rho \varepsilon \nu \omega \) (cf. 2 Cor. 10:5 for a similar metaphor). It also succeeds in making \( \varepsilon \iota \sigma \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \omega \ \vartheta \varepsilon \chi \iota \lambda \nu \mu \) parallel \( \varepsilon \iota \gamma \gamma \iota \varepsilon \omega \nu \) α\( \lambda \eta \delta \varepsilon \iota \varsigma \).

To place a comma after \( \alpha \upsilon \tau \upsilon \) does not really assist the exegesis.
\[ \varepsilon_S - \]
\[ \varepsilon_K - F G. \]

\[ \varepsilon_K \] is senseless in the context. The variant by

\[ F G \]

may be a sheer misreading of

\[ \varepsilon_1 C \quad \text{as} \quad \varepsilon_K. \]
Lock says in his commentary that γρωνετε is due to a feeling on the part of scribes that vv 1-9 are more general than 2 Tim. 2:22-25 or 3:10 f. This is probably so. It conforms to a tendency noted elsewhere that 2nd p.s. references are sometimes "corrected" to the plural. Weiss (op. cit. p. 37) writes that "γρωνετε ist eine ganz gedankenlose Einführung der umfassenderen Applikation nach Gal. 3:7". But there is no obvious assimilation to this verse, and it is more likely that the variant is an attempt to universalise the epistle.

Read γρωνετε

The spelling of F G is orthographical. Χ and ἃ were often interchanged (see Howard p. 69).
Add Ἰς before ἐκχαταῖς - P.

cf. Acts 2:17: ἐν ταῖς ἐκχαταῖς ἡμερῶν but in the Pastorals, the article is often dropped after ἐν, as can be seen at 1 Tim. 4:1, where the context is similar: ἐν οἱ ἑτεροίς καιροῖς. Ignore the variant.
3:2 The variant omitting γαρ is discussed at 1 Tim. 2:13 (v.l. omit γαρ).

3:2 The variant adding καί before τοῦ αὐτοῦ is discussed in Appendix II.

3:2 Omit δὲ — S

103. 234. et al. (according to Tischendorf).

cf. 1 Tim. 6:16).

Turner p. 180 f. says that the article is found before plurals like ἐνδοτομον in the N. T. This generic article was possibly objected to by certain scribes, perhaps because they considered the arthrous noun to be too definite here.


\[ \phi \lambda \gamma \nu \rho \omicron \] -
\[ \phi \lambda \alpha \nu \gamma \omicron \] - G.

\[ \phi \lambda \alpha \gamma \nu \rho \omicron \alpha \] occurs at 1 Tim. 6:10 and \[ \phi \lambda \alpha \gamma \nu \rho \omicron \] at Lk. 16:14. \[ \phi \lambda \alpha \nu \gamma \omicron \] is a word unknown to the N. T. or to L. + S. G. appears to have misread and shortened the original word.
3:2

\( \varepsilon \lambda \alpha \varepsilon \varepsilon \) - FG

\( \varepsilon \lambda \alpha \varepsilon \varepsilon \) - 103.

\( \varepsilon \lambda \alpha \varepsilon \varepsilon \) fits the context. It is a N. T. word and occurs at Rom. 1:30. 103 misread the exemplar, and thought the word was part of the verb \( \varepsilon \lambda \alpha \varepsilon \varepsilon \) (to weep). This is obviously unsuitable in the sentence.

G made a false analogy. Unlike \( \lambda \varepsilon \omega \nu \) - \( \lambda \varepsilon \omega \nu \), the genitive of \( \varepsilon \lambda \alpha \varepsilon \varepsilon \) is \( \varepsilon \lambda \alpha \varepsilon \varepsilon \), hence the nom. pl. is \( \varepsilon \lambda \alpha \varepsilon \varepsilon \). This should be read here.
3:2  ἡχρήστος -  
ἡχρίστος - ο*
ἡχρηστος - κ

69.

(οf. ἡχρήστος and v.l. at 2 Tim. 2:21).

ἡχρηστος occurs at Phil. 11 (no v.l.). ἡχρηστος occurs at Lk. 6:35 (no. v.l.). Both words are Classical.

ἡχρηστος however, is more suitable in the context, and is probably original here. The variants are orthographical.
As with other variants involving a changed order, the variant cannot always be accounted for on logical grounds. ζυράτης is a ζ-λ. in the N. T. No precedent for the order of these words can be established.
The omissions by Greek mss. can be accounted for by hom: -

This is a frequent cause of omission especially from a list.

The omissions by \$ (pal.) may be sheer carelessness. For other examples of omissions from a list see 2 Tim. 3:10.

The changed order of elements in a list is frequently found in mss. A scribe because of a fault in memory, sometimes rewrote a sentence in a different order. There is no reason why one order is right and the other wrong here.
The variant adding κατηγοροῦν after πρεσβυτάρι is discussed at 2 Tim. 2:22 (v.l. καὶ πρεσβυτάρι).

The variant adding ΤΣΟΨΩΡΕΝΣ v.l. ΤΣΟΨΩΡΕΝΣ is discussed at 1 Tim. 6:4 (v.l. ΤΣΟΨΩΡΕΝΣ).

The variant adding γλυττικά after μακάλαν is discussed at 2 Tim. 2:16 (v.l. add σοῦ).

The variant omitting ΔΞ is discussed in Appendix III.

The variants by $ (pal.) alone are not usually reliable witnesses to the underlying Greek text (see 2 Tim. 2:16, 3:4).

The reading here is probably due to a mis-translation of εὐθείαις.
The variant omitting χρίων is discussed at 1 Tim. 2:13 (v.l. omit χρίων).

Omit əC. 440. 823.

The article is needed to show the substantive nature of the participle. The omission of the article may have been motivated by οὕτως following.
This variant is listed as doubtful in Appendix 6.

'ἐνδυνάω' and 'ἐνίκω' are listed as alternative spellings in L. + S. Both spellings occur in LXX. In the rest of the N. T. the spelling 'ἐνδυνάω' is favoured. Bauer classes 'ἐνδυνάω' as poetic and ionic. cf. also Mayser I:2, p. 119 where 'δυνάω' is listed as poetic. This variant is listed as doubtful in Appendix 6.

'ἐνδυνάω' or 'ἐνίκω' is frequent in the N. T. (e.g. at Mt. 22:11, 27:31, 2 Cor. 5:3, Rom. 13:12, Col. 3:12). 'ἐνδυνάω' does not occur elsewhere in the N. T., and for this reason is unlikely to be original here. 'ἐνίκω' has been introduced from following.
In the N. T. generally -\( \omega \) verbs require an object. 
\( \alpha \iota \chi \rho \alpha \lambda \omega \tau \epsilon \nu \omega \omega \), however, occurs at Eph. 4:8 (no. v. l.) and is transitive. 
\( \alpha \iota \chi \rho \alpha \lambda \omega \tau \iota \omega \) occurs at Lk. 21:24, Rom. 7:23, 2 Cor. 10:5 followed by the direct object.

Psaltes (op. cit. p. 326) writes: "Die Verba auf -\( \omega \) haben wie schon von Mayser ... und von Blass für die Sprache des N. T. hervorgehoben wurde, in der späteren Zeit sehr weit um sich gegriffen und haben diese Tendenz auch noch bis heute behalten: denn auch jetzt ist im Ngr. das Suffix -\( \omega \) das am meisten wirkende paragogische Suffix". The -\( \omega \) form seems likely here. 
Bl.-Deb § 108 agrees with this view and says that \( \alpha \iota \chi \rho \alpha \lambda \omega \tau \iota \epsilon \nu \) is Hellenistic. The variant \( \alpha \iota \chi \rho \alpha \lambda \omega \tau \epsilon \nu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \nu \) has been coined on the analogy of \( \phi \alpha \upsilon \gamma \xi \sigma \omega \epsilon \nu \epsilon \nu \) but the -\( \epsilon \nu \epsilon \nu \) form strictly means 'to follow a profession'.

Read \( \alpha \iota \chi \rho \alpha \lambda \omega \tau \iota \epsilon \nu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \nu \).
3:6 Add Τλ before γυναῖκαρια - T. R. 440. 206, etc.

γυναῖκαρια is a ἀ. λ. in the N. T. Scribes sometimes objected to the generic article (see earlier in this verse, 1 Tim. 2:9 etc.). Τλ may be original.
3:6 Add \( \text{πολλαίς} \) after \( \text{καρπίαις} \) - 1022.

Ic' (von Soden).

\( \rho \) (hl.).

There is no parallel to \( \text{καρπίαις πολλαί} \) in the N. T. (1). However, \( \text{πολλαίς} \) here balances \( \text{πολυκλαίς} \) later in the sentence. If \( \text{πολλαίς} \) is original, it could have been omitted by hom.

This variant is listed as doubtful in Appendix 6.

(1) Lk. 7:47 does not offer a real parallel.
The three adjectives agree with \( \gamma υυκαριπ \) \( \varepsilon \varepsilon ουρευμενον \). 

440. 823 omit \( \omega \) in v. 6. They appear to have mistaken the flow of the argument in these verses. Ignore the variant.
3:6 Add καὶ ἐφοναγ after ἑπτάδυνας
-A.


Theod.

The longer reading is unlikely to be original. It is due to assimilation to Tit. 3:3.

3:6 πολλὰς v.l. πολλὰς is discussed at 1 Tim. 6:10 (v.l. πολλὰς).
The variant adding καὶ before παντοτές is discussed in Appendix II.

The continuous tense is required by the context especially after παντοτές. According to Greenlee (1) only the present tense can express this. The reading of 81 is due to misreading and shortening the original verb.

3:8 *v.l. γαρ v.l. omit particle, are discussed at 2 Tim. 2:13 (v.l. γαρ).

3:8 'λαύνης -
       'λαύνης - ὁθ
       nuthal. (COD.)

'λαύνης - L (vt m dem.) (vg)

Origen. (Lat.) Cyp. Ps-Jer. Lucifer, etc.
(n.b. most Latin witnesses read Μαρμβρης for 'λαυβρης).

H. Odeberg (1) says that 'λαύνης and 'λαυβρης are linked together but that in Hebrew texts, both names are 'stark verderben'. p may have been introduced from Μαρμβρης following.

Westcott and Hort on select readings say that 'λαύνης cannot be dismissed altogether. If 'λαύνης is original, the variant 'λαύνης would have arisen through assimilation to 'λαύνης καί 'λαυβρης. If 'λαύνης is original, 'λαύνης would be the quirk of scribes. This variant is to be considered in conjunction with 'λαυβρης v.l. Μαρμβρης. The variant is listed as doubtful in Appendix 6.

Odeberg (op. cit.) points out that the Gelasian decree of 494 condemned a book "Paenitentia Iamnae et Mambrae". This book is known to Origen (on Mt. §117). Μαυβρησ occurs in the Talmud and Gen. 13:18, 14:13, 14:24. Wilcox on the semitisms in Acts (op. cit. p. 114) says that the Latin reading is the correct one, and Sparks (1) thinks that F G have been influenced by their Latin side, and says that the variant by all Latin mss. except R is unlikely to be a mere slip. Μαυβρησ may be a correction from a possible Rabbinic source. Jewish authorities read נלך and פ"ר. The translator himself, says Sparks, could have been that Rabbinic source.

Strack-Billerbeck (op. cit. Vol. III p. 660 f) list the Rabbinic spellings cited above, and say the form with נ is the least correct, but original to the text here. Μαυβρησ is a Rabbinic correction. Read נאובררה.

(1) H. F. D. Sparks 'On the Form Μαυβρης in the Latin Versions of 2 Tim. 3:8' in J. T. S. XL 1939 p. 257 f.
Schmid (1) lists possible variations on the spelling of the name Moses found in Andreas' commentary: these include \( \text{Μωϋσέως} - \text{Μωσῆς} \) and \( \text{Μωυσ} - \text{Μωσ} \). The LXX varies between \( \text{Μωυσ} \) and \( \text{Μωσ} \); and in the rest of the N.T., similar variation exists, as at Mt. 1:44, Lk. 16:29, 16:31, Jn. 6:32, Acts 7:29, 7:31, Rev. 15:3. The usual Hebrew spelling is \( \text{נושי} \). Bl.-Deb. § 38 says that -\( \omega\) - is a diphthong attempting to reproduce the Egyptian pronunciation, and that \( \text{Μωυσ} \) is not an attempt to get back to Hebrew, but is the form of the name outside Egypt. This however is not constant as can be seen in Jeremias' list of spellings of this name in P. 45 and P. 46 (2). The spelling with -\( \gamma \) does not represent normal Pastoral orthography. Either \( \text{Μωϋσέως} \) or \( \text{Μωυσέως} \) is original here.


(2) \( \text{Μωυσ} \) by J. Jeremias in Kittel's "Wörterbuch" Vol. 4, p. 853.
3:8  ὅτι ὁ ὑπὸ ὅτι ὁ ὑπὸ 1739.

Howard p. 112 points out that in the N. T., the final s of ὅτι is practically fixed before a consonant. ὅτι also predominates in the Ptolemaic papyri.

The scribe of 1739 may have been confused because of the proximity of ὅτι and thought that ὅτι should be part of ὅτι.
3:8

σύνηστε - 
δυνατόν - F.

At 1 Tim. 3:10 the variant ἂν σύνηστε - ἂν δυνατόν exists, and it is argued that ἂν δυνατόν is original because it is a strong Semitism. ἂν δυνατόν occurs at 2 Tim. 2:10 (no. v.1.). αὐτός may be original here despite the general unreliability of F with respect to orthography. σύνηστε may have been introduced because of ὁ λόγος preceding.
φαντάζομαι - 

Τις θανάτου - 

Τις θανάτου - 547.

Τις θανάτου - 33. 917. 431.

Φαντάζομαι is not found in the N. T. It may represent an alternative spelling of Φαντάζομαι (which is found at Acts 13:8). The spelling with 'Τ' is the result of confusion with the aorist. Φαντάζομαι has been introduced from 2 Tim. 3:8a through misreading or assimilation.

The context presupposes a present reality (v. 6: ἔλεγεν, ἔθετες, ἠφέτης, ἠφέτης : v. 7: ἔλεγεν). To read the future here makes nonsense of the argument. Sheer error by 547.

Read Φαντάζομαι.
3:8 Add δῆταιν after νουν - S/ (pal. vg.).

This variant by a Semitic version can be dismissed as a translation peculiarity.

2 TIMOTHY.

3:8 The variant adding ἕλκε before ἡδονὴν is discussed in Appendix II.
Both are words found in the N. T., but neither word occurs elsewhere in the Pastorals. 'Folly' fits the context better. 

\( \delta \alpha \nu o \nu \) is therefore a sheer error.
3:9  'ἐᾶς τε ἐὰς τάξιν' is discussed at 1 Tim. 5:8 (v.l. ἐὰς τάξιν).

3:9  Omit  

This  refers to  ἡ δοξαλία. This rare use of the definite article as a pronoun possibly confused the scribe of who omitted it. This usage with the article is not uncharacteristic of the author as may be seen at 2 Tim. 2:20.
This variant also occurs at 1Tim. 4:6 q.v. for full discussion.

Turner p. 70 draws attention to the fact that this v.l. is fairly common in N. T. mss.

Moulton, in his Prolegomena p. 140 - 141 says that 'In Greek as in English, the line between aorist and perfect is not always easy to draw'. The variant here was facilitated by palaeography: the change from Κ to Κ or from Κ to Κ being an easy one. In view of the rarity of the perfect in the Pastorals, read παρηκμολογήται here.
See also 2 Tim. 4:6 and 4:17, where \( \varphi \circ \omega \) has been substituted for an original \( \varphi \circ \omega \). Orthographical considerations cannot help us to decide which is original here; they can only explain how the variant occurred. The context and grammar of the sentence proclaim \( \varphi \circ \omega \) to be original. \( \varphi \circ \omega \) qualifies the following nouns.
Omit \( \tau \eta \) (pr) - F G.

Omit \( \tau \eta \) (3rd) - 1799.

Omit \( \tau \eta \) (second and third) A.

1827. 103. 1926.

\( \tau \eta \) occurs seven times in this verse. The variants above represent attempts by various scribes to reduce this number.

The reduction would be a stylistic improvement. The original author wrote \( \tau \eta \) before all the nouns. \( \delta \delta \varepsilon \lambda \nu \lambda \varepsilon \) for example is frequent in the Pastorals and always appears with the article.

A. 103. 1926 also omit \( \tau \eta \ \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \pi \tau \eta \). This variant would be facilitated by hom. Omission from a list is a frequent cause of scribal error (see 1 Tim. 1:9).
'ἀγωγή is a λόγος in the Greek N.T., but it is found in L. + S. 'ἀγωγή occurs later in the sentence. The author is unlikely to have repeated himself in this way. The scribe of Dminster, however, was confused by this later occurrence and has repeated the noun.
3:10 The omission of \( \tau \eta \chi \nu \alpha \tau \eta \) is discussed two pages earlier.

3:11 \( \varepsilon \gamma \epsilon v \varepsilon \tau \theta \) —
\( \varepsilon \gamma \epsilon v o v \tau \theta \) - A.

460. 1245. 2401. 1022. 234. 1867.

(cf. v.l. at 2 Tim. 4:13).

Scribes tended to alter plural verbs following neutar plural subjects to singular verbs to conform to Classical practice. N. T. writers often followed neutar plurals with plural verbs. Read \( \varepsilon \gamma \epsilon v o v \tau \theta \) here.
3:11 Add ά Μίλ τήν δεκάλαν ἐπικαθῆνεν after Ἀντίοχεια. - 181.
Tischendorf says that Dam. (COMM) adds ά Μίλ δεκάλαν πεποποθε λέγει after Ἀντίοχεια.

These additions came from an Apocryphal source. The addition by 181 is characteristic of this ms. (cf. 2 Tim. 4:19).
This variant is a further example of how one element in a list was overlooked accidentally by a careless scribe.
3:11 Add δ' ψεὺν after πᾶντων - $ (pal. vg.).

(cf. v.l. by $ at 2 Tim. 3:8).

It is a characteristic of this version to add possessives. Here the intention was to improve the connection between πᾶντων and ὁ λογός τῆς ὑμνίους.
3:11 με ἐπεμενατο
ἐπεμενατο με 623.

Lect. Guelf.

L (vt dem.) (vg. DCT).


Omit ἐπ(ρ) ανατο Σ8.*.

cf. 2 Tim. 4:18 ρυμεται με δ Κ€

Note that it is mainly versional evidence which favours the changed order ἐπεμενατο με 623 may have been influenced by the order of 2 Tim. 4:18.

The omission by 88* is a senseless variant. The verb - a Pastoral one - is necessary to the sense.
3:11 δέπεσατο - δέπεσατο - ΑΔ.


(cf. 2 Cor. 1:10, Col. 1:13, 2 Pet. 2:7 and below at 2 Tim. 4:17 for other examples where this verb occurs with variants as above).

The examples of the augmented tenses of this verb in L. + S. show doubled 'p'. Mayser 2:3, p. 89 and p. 189 show that έπεσατω doubles 'p' in augmented tenses. Howard p. 101 points to the tendency in Hellenistic writing to double the consonant. In view of evidence from Koine, Classical and the papyri, δέπεσατο appears to be the original reading here, but it is difficult to explain how the variant with one 'p' came about.

The following variants involving this verb are discussed here:

2 TIMOTHY.

4:17 δέπνυσεν - δέπνυσεν - S A C

69.

Euthal.

The same arguments as above apply here. Read δέπνυσε
4:18 ξυσται -
ἐρπυστατο - FG

L (vt) (vg. CODD) - liberavit.


ξυσται should be read with ἀμείβω to balance ἐρπυστατο. The aorist here may have been written through confusion with ἐρπυστατο earlier.
In the Pastorals both \( \Theta C \) and \( \kappa C \) appear with the article in the nominative. \( \kappa C \) appears with \( \psi \nu \omega \mu \alpha \) at 2 Tim. 4:18. It is probably original here, but was altered to \( \Theta C \) because of its ambiguity.
3:12 The variant omitting ᾨε is discussed in Appendix III.

3:12 The variant omitting Ἡυ is discussed in Appendix I (i) a.

3:12 Ἡν ἐνήβης - SAP.

33. 69. 1912. 1739.

Eth. Copt. (sah.).

Aug.

ἐνήβης Ἡν - C D F G K L Ψ

T. R. 1838. 1175. 330 etc.

§ (hl.) Gothic. L (vg)(vt d f g).


Omit - 1022.

The omission is unlikely to be original. The words are indispensable in the sentence, and are Pastoral words (cf. Tit. 2:12).

The order at Tit. 2:12 is ἐνήβης Ἡν. Despite the fact that the verb at 2 Tim. 3:12 is infinitive, there is no reason to assume that the author deviated from his natural order of adverb + verb. The verb ἐνήβης is not qualified by the adverb.

Read ἐνήβης Ἡν.
3:13 The variant omitting δ ε is discussed in Appendix III.

3:13 γοητες - γοηται - D.

γοηταις - Dε F G

(cf. 2 Tim. 2:16 where Dε incorrectly alters the error by D).

Here the reading of Dε represents an attempt to add the sigma omitted by the first hand, without altering the incorrect δ ε.

Howard p. 127 cites the reading of D here but not as the authentic and original spelling.

The reading of F G is probably an orthographical variation.

The substitution of δ ε for ε is found elsewhere in these mss. (cf. 2 Tim. 3:1 γινωσκεταί).
At 2 Tim. 3:9 οὕτως πλεῖον means 'to progress further'. Here the progression is to a worse situation as described in the following πλανωμένης καὶ πλανώρεις. Εἰς τὸ χειρόν is a N. T. phrase and occurs at Mt. 5:26. It is suitable here. The variant was caused through assimilation to verse 9.
It is significant that only versional evidence supports this reading. The translators grasped the sense of both parts of \( \pi\lambda\nu\nu\acute{\alpha} \omega \) but wrote them in a different order.
3:14 The variant omitting Καί is discussed in Appendix II.


Ambst.

(n.b. 226ε also reads ἔπειτα ἔπειτα θῆς). The reading οἰς is unlikely. In the rest of the N. T. οἶς τετελεσμένος and οἶς τοῦ are followed by the accusative rei. οἰς has been introduced from οἰς ἔπειτα θῆς earlier in the verse.
π(ε τοῦ) is a ἕλεγχος in the N. T. The verb occurs in the LXX of Ps 77:8, 77:37 and elsewhere. 2 examples of the passive occur in 1 Clem. 15:4, 42:3 according to Bauer.

The passive of πεπείωκε occurs in the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 1:11, Tit. 1:3 (no v.l.), but there is no obvious assimilation to these verses. ξπεπείωκε is probably original. Scribes may have objected to the rarity of this verb, and so substituted the more common ξπεπείωκε. The change from εω to ο or ο to εω is not mentioned in Howard's notes on orthography. The change therefore seems to have been a deliberate one.

2 TIMOTHY.

3:14 ἵνα v.l. ἵνα is discussed at 1 Tim. 1:7 (v.l. ἵνα).
3:15 The variant omitting \( \text{Kal} \) is discussed in Appendix II.

3:15 \( \text{Acts} - \text{216} \)

\[ \text{Acts} - 216 \]

Bl.-Deb. § 209 states that in N. T. times \( \text{Acts} \) began to absorb \( \text{216} \). This seems to have happened here. Bauer lists \( \text{Acts} \) \( \text{Brephous} \) from Philo. This seems to be the normal preposition in the phrase in Hellenistic Greek. L. + S. know only \( \text{216} \) \( \text{Brephous} \) and cite \( \text{Acts} \) \( \text{Brephous} \) in this verse as an exception. \( \text{Acts} \) is original here. It was corrected by 216 to the more usual \( \text{216} \).
3:15 Omit ἐν (pr.) - S C b D² F G.

33. 1912. 1739.

Arm. Coptic.

ἐπιφ. Clem-Alex.

τὰ σεμαντάκτα referring to the O. T. is found in Philo Vit. Mos. iii 39 and Jos. Ant. 10:10 and 10:4, according to Bernard's commentary.

Weiss (op. cit. p. 76) argues that τὰ has been introduced from τὰ συμπεραών later. Von Soden p. 413 does not think τὰ is original. But in view of the parallels in Philo and Josephus, read τὰ as original.
The error by D is probably orthographical or was based on the mistaken assumption that ὄδας has the same 2nd p.s. ending as ἐραδές preceding.

The argument requires ὄδας. ἐραδές has been introduced from v. 14 where it occurs twice.
'Faith in Jesus Christ' is more usual in the Pastorals than 'salvation in Jesus Christ'. See 1 Tim. 3:13, 2 Tim. 1:14. 1319 accidentally omitted these words.
3:15 Add \( \eta \) before \( \pi\iota\varepsilon\tau\iota\varsigma \) - 33. 69.

For full details about arthrous and anarthrous \( \pi\iota\varepsilon\tau\iota\varsigma \) see Tit. 1:13. At Rom. 3:30 f. \( \pi\iota\varepsilon\tau\iota\varsigma \) in the genitive following \( \delta\iota\varsigma \) is arthrous twice, but there an earlier occurrence of \( \pi\iota\varepsilon\tau\iota\varsigma \) is found; here \( \pi\iota\varepsilon\tau\iota\varsigma \) is the first occurrence in the context.

At 2 Tim. 2:1 the idiom \( \varepsilon\nu \pi\iota\varepsilon \chi\alpha\rho\iota\tau\iota\varsigma \) occurs. This agrees with the longer reading here. However 2 Tim. 1:13 contains the reading \( \varepsilon\nu \pi\iota\varepsilon\tau\iota\varsigma \varepsilon\iota\varsigma \varepsilon\iota\varsigma \pi\iota\varsigma \varepsilon\iota\varsigma \varepsilon\iota\varsigma \varepsilon\iota\varsigma \varepsilon\iota\varsigma \varepsilon\iota\varsigma \varepsilon\iota\varsigma \). This provides a parallel for the shorter reading.

\( \pi\iota\varepsilon\tau\iota\varsigma \) may have been introduced because of \( \eta \) following.

\( \pi\iota\varepsilon\tau\iota\varsigma \) is arthrous after prepositions at 1 Tim. 1:2, 1:4, 1:5, 1:14, 2:7, 2:15, 3:13, 4:12, 2 Tim. 1:13, Tit. 1:1, 1:4, 3:15. Where \( \pi\iota\varepsilon\tau\iota\varsigma \) is arthrous after a preposition (1 Tim. 1:19, 6:1, 6:21, 2 Tim. 3:8) the context refers to a definite body of teaching known as THE Faith. This latter interpretation is possible here. This variant is listed as doubtful in Appendix 6, as no definite conclusion can be drawn.
3:15 Omit της εν - 1908. 2344.
Omit της - 442. 463.

It is characteristic of the author to recapitulate with the art. especially before εν ἡγεῖ τοῦ (cf. 2 Tim. 1:1, 2:1, 2:10, 3:13).
Scribes, however, seem to have objected to this feature, and many of the above examples appear with a variant reading omitting the article. The omission of της here is unlikely to be original. The omission of της εν is a senseless variant quite out of keeping with the author's style. The author of the Pastorals usually adds the preposition before the dative of the nomina sacra (e.g. 1 Tim. 1:14, 3:13) especially after θεος (see footnote of Turner, p. 263).

2 TIMOTHY.

3:15 ἡγεῖ τοῦ v.l. τοῦ ἡγεῖ is discussed at Appendix I (i) b. The variant omitting τοῦ is discussed at Appendix I (i, a.)
3:16 Add \( '\xi \tau \nu \) after \( \omega \phi \varepsilon \lambda \mu \sigma \) - 483.

Eth. L (vg. PZ tol. harl.).

L (vt dem. diu. t). \& (hl.).

Theod-Mops.

Fac. Ruf. Ps-Am and
most Latin Fathers.

cf. 1 Tim. 4:8 where \( '\xi \tau \nu \) occurs with \( \omega \phi \varepsilon \lambda \mu \sigma \) twice in one verse.

As Turner shows (p. 294), it was a N. T. habit and even more so an Attic habit to ellipse \( '\xi \tau \nu \) in certain sentences. The omission of \( '\xi \tau \nu \) here could be accounted for on stylistic grounds. The longer reading on the other hand, could be secondary, especially as far as the versional evidence is concerned, and be an attempt to avoid the ellipse. This variant is listed as doubtful in Appendix 6.
3:16 ἐλεγμον - ἐλεγχον -FGDP.

T.R. 326. 436. 1838. 1912, etc.

Clem.-Alex. Chrys.

The words are similarly confused in the Psalms of Solomon 10:1 (see Ryle and James' edition op. cit. p. 96). Both words come from the root ἐλεγχω and are both suitable in the context. ἐλεγχος occurs at Heb. 11:1 (no. v.l.) ἐλεγμος is a κα-λ in the N. T., but it occurs in the LXX at Num. 5:18, Sir. 21:6, 32:1 etc. Possibly the N. T. word ἐλεγχος is to be preferred here.
The reading of $D^*$ may be the result of assimilation to Jas. 3:2.
3:17 ἐγνηπενός - ἐγνηπενός - FG.


cf. 1 Tim. 5:14 ἀμνηπενόντω. I Tim. 6:18 ἐπανοτίσας ἐχεῖν
2 Tim. 3:6 ἀλαλεῖσσοντες and variants. See the citation from Psaltes at 2 Tim. 3:6.

-ιον verbs in the N. T. usually require an object. ἔγνηπται is not Classical, and may be original, despite the fact that it is not followed grammatically by a direct object. The verb occurs at Acts 21:5. ἔγνηπται occurs at Mk. 3:21: this is less suitable in the context.
4:1 Add οὖν ἦνω after διαρρήσατον
- D² κ. L.

T.R. and most minuscules.

§ (hl.).

Chrys. Luthal.

Theod-Mops (Lat.).

Add οὖν after διαρρήσατον - 1022. 88. 454.
2005. 2138. 1405. et al.

Theodoret.

οὖν if secondary, has been added to avoid asyndeton, but it
is not uncharacteristic of the author to use οὖν in this way
(cf. 1 Tim. 5:24 ὑπολογίζατο οὖν ἦνω). ἦνω is sometimes used by
the author for emphasis. (1 Tim. 1:11 έτετελείθηδεν καὶ ἦνω
and also see 1 Tim. 1:15, 2:7, 2 Tim. 1:11, 4:6, Tit. 1:3, 1:5).

This is a solemn proclamation and it is possible that ἦνω
(and οὖν) are original. On the other hand it must be
remembered that the mss. which read οὖν ἦνω also read τοῦ ἐκ
before τοῦ ἐκ, and the whole may represent a scribal
intensification of the seriousness. At 1 Tim. 5:21 διαρρήσατον
is followed by ἐνωστίον directly, and may indicate the author's
normal usage. This evidence is somewhat weightier and helps us
to reject the variants above.
Add τοῦ ρῦ before τοῦ χῦ - Ἐ Δ ᾠ. L.

Τ.Κ. 33, 1739, 104, etc.

ἡ. Gothic.

Sevanian. Ἰδη. Στυριλ.

Add κῦ before τοῦ χῦ - 1175 and others.

These variants, together with the variant adding ἥμων after τοῦ , and the variant χῦ ὧ χῦ are discussed in Appendix I (i) b. It is argued there that τοῦ before τοῦ χῦ is unlikely to be original. The formula τοῦ ρῦ (ἡμων) however, may be original, as at 1Tim. 6:3, 6:14. As a weighty pronouncement is being made, the addition of τοῦ ρῦ would be appropriate here. On the other hand it may be argued here, as for the variants ὧ χῦ , that the longer readings represent various attempts to amplify a liturgical formula.

Theological arguments about the apparent ambiguity of the phrase ἐρμὴν τοῦ δῦ καὶ χῦ τῦ are a two-edged sword. Some may say that scribes were responsible for the phrase, which assumes full divinity for Jesus, whereas others may claim that τοῦ ρῦ (ἡμων) are scribal additions to remove the apparent ambiguity. This latter argument is more likely here. 1 Tim. 5:21 provides the normal Pastoral usage, and agrees with the shorter reading.

Ignore the longer readings, which attempted to amplify the formula to avoid ambiguity.
Although cited by Tischendorf as an omission, this variant probably represents the substitution of ΚΩ for ΘΩ (cf. variants in this verse).

ὦραματορος occurs with ἐκκοίτον του ΘΩ at 1 Tim. 5:4, 5:21, 6:13 and 2 Tim. 2:14 (v.l. ΚΩ).
The tendency to alter present tenses to aorists in moods outside the indicative has already been noted. See also the I.C.C. on Matthew. This tendency has caused the variant here. \( \kappa \rho \iota \nu \varepsilon \varepsilon \lambda \nu \) is likely to be original.
If ψελλων is original, it could make ἰπτελελατολων and βασιλελατολων dependent on ροιελατον. This idea is difficult theologically. These two words may, however, be dependent directly on διαμπατοτομαλων, but this also is difficult in view of the fact that ενωσατον is before the divine names but not before 'appearing' and 'kingdom'. In view of these difficulties, it is understandable that scribes avoided κατα here. The original κατα was probably intended to depend on κριελατον and to bear the force 'through', showing how and through what agency the judgement was to be accomplished.

For a similar appeal to the thought of judgement see 1 Tim. 5:21, 6:13-16, Tit. 2:13. Κατα was supplied therefore to bear this meaning.
'through' more clearly. Διακρίτως was perhaps to have been expected as Κρίνω κατά bears the meaning 'to judge' according to at Jn. 18:31, Acts 23:3, Rev. 20:12-13. If, however, scribes intended κατά to follow διάκρισις this idiom would parallel the use of κατά + A C. after verbs of swearing (noted by Bl.-Deb. § 149). κατά could however mean 'at the 'time of'. Mayser II:2 p. 432 points out that κατά τὴν θλίψιν can mean 'zur Zeit, um'. This would imply that Christ would judge the living and the dead, at the time of his Parousia. At 2 Tim. Jesus' appearance is associated with judgement.

The reading with κατά provides less exegetical or grammatical difficulty but for this very reason may be secondary.
4:1 Omit \( \pi \nu \beta \alpha \kappa \iota \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu \alpha \tau \omicron \theta \omicron \omicron \) - 1908.

An obvious example where hom. has caused the omission of these words.

2 TIMOTHY.

4:1 \( \alpha \omicron \tau \omicron \omicron \upsilon \upsilon \upsilon \upsilon \theta \omicron \omicron \omicron \upsilon \) is discussed at 2 Tim. 1:8 (v.l. \( \alpha \upsilon \omicron \tau \omicron \omicron \omicron \) \( \upsilon \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \) \( \delta \omicron \omicron \)).
A similar variant occurs at 2 Tim. 3:13 πλανώντες καὶ πλανώμενοι.

The variant by C and others is an easy one for scribes to write. It is more logical for the original author to have written the positive before the negative, but no ruling can be established.

The omission occurred through hom, especially if the exemplars of 425 etc. followed the majority order:

εὐθύς καὶ ἀρμόδιον καὶ ἀρμόδιον.
The omission was caused by carelessness and represents another instance of omission from a list.
Add τιτευσ καὶ before διδακαλίας - 623.

(cf. variant at Tit. 2:1).

ζυγίνω occurs with διδακαλία at 1 Tim. 1:10 and Tit. 1:9. The reading above was probably caused by association with Tit. 1:13 where ζυγίνω and τίς τίς occur together.
\[ \alpha\nu\varepsilon\chi\omega \; \text{occurs in the N. T. at Mt. 17:17, Mk. 9:19, Lk. 9:41, Acts 18:14 etc. often with v.l. `\varepsilon\nu` - `\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\chi\omega` occurs at Mk. 6:19, Lk. 11:53, Gal. 5:1, 2 Th. 1:14 sometimes with v.l. `\alpha` \varepsilon\chi\omega (to endure) is more suitable in the context than `\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\chi\omega` (to entangle).} \]
4:3  κατὰ  -
πρὸς  - P D.

L (vg)(vt d f) - ad.


πρὸς  may be original. It is the more difficult reading, and scribes would tend to avoid it. κατὰ  may have been suggested because it precedes ἐπὶ θυμία at Jude, 16, 18, 2 Pet. 3:3.
The occurrence of the def. art. before ἡσσος after a preposition is not typical of Pastoral usage (see 2 Tim. 1:9 and the discussion at Tit. 2:9).

ἡσσος occurs before its noun at Jas. 1:14, 2 Pet. 3:3 and at 1 Tim. 3:4, 3:12, 4:2, 5:4, 6:1, 2 Tim. 1:9, Tit. 2:5, etc. However τας ἐπιθυμίας τας ἡσσος is the order stylists would object to and alter. This order appears at 2 Tim. 4:7 (τον δικαιον τον καλον). This order is likely to be original. The reading τας ἡσσος ἐπιθυμίας is secondary.
Other variants where Ὑ and Υ are interchanged include 1 Tim. 2:6 (καὶ ἀποῦσ) and 2 Tim. 4:17 (ὐδοῦ).

Here, the dative is required: ἔτη τοῦ εὐρεστοῦ ὑ is followed by the acc. δίδακα λοῦς, therefore the reflexive needs to be in the dative.
(cf. references at 2 Tim. 2:21, v.l. ἐν καθαρίᾳ ἑαυτοῦ) ἐπισκέπτεσθαι is a ἔλεγ. in the N. T., so no precedent for the order of reflexives with this verb can be established from N. T. usage. The reflexive in the dative precedes the verb at 1 Tim. 3:13 and follows at 1 Tim. 6:19, Tit. 2:14. Pastoral usage in this respect is ambiguous.
The future tense is required by the context. The variant may reflect a change of aspect: the future likelihood to the author may have become a present reality to the scribes of $\psi$ 81. 440.
This variant is an obvious example of where hom. has caused the omission. The scribe has jumped from the first occurrence of ἅγνα οὐράνιον to the second and omitted the intervening words.
is frequent in the N. T. but is not found in the Pastorals. \textit{ἀπόστρεψω} occurs in the N. T. and in the Pastorals at 2 Tim. 1:15, Tit. 1:14. The reading \textit{ἐπὶ στρεψω} is a stylistic change such as Mt. makes when Mk. has a verb compounded and followed by the same preposition. Here \textit{ἀπό} follows \textit{ἀπόστρεψω} grammatically, so some scribes altered the verb.

Read \textit{ἀπόστρεψω}.
κακοπτάδησον appears as a separate entity in the sentence, therefore once it was omitted, its absence would not be felt immediately. The verb occurs in the Pastorals at 2 Tim. 2:9.
Add ὡς καλὸς στρατιώτης Χυ Ἰω
after κακοπαθησον - A.

The longer reading has been introduced to the text here from 2 Tim. 2:3.

2 TIMOTHY.

4:6 γὰρ v.l. δὲ is discussed at 2 Tim. 2:13 (v.l. γὰρ).
The emphatic forms of the personal pronouns are not common in the N.T. (see Turner p. 42, p. 191, Mayser II:2, p. 67 - 68 and p. 71 f.). The emphatic form of the personal occurs at 2 Tim. 4:17, ἄναλυεως and 2 Tim. 1:8 ἐνς, but the possessive adjectives do not occur in the Pastorals. These possessives are, however, found in higher style Koine (1), and ἐνς here may have been introduced by scribes as a stylistic improvement. ἄναλυεως is a Semitic idiom and is original here.

The variant omitting μου is discussed at 2 Tim. 1:3 (v.l. add μου).

The following variant is discussed here: -

μου -

μου - 2005.

The genitive is required by the context. μου is an orthographical error. See 2 Tim. 4:3 έξω τοὺς

The position of \textit{ kalwv } in the Pastorals is not constant. For references see 2 Tim. 1:14 (v.l. \textit{ kalhν } ).

\textit{To ν αγωνα τον καλον } is Semitic in order. This feature of the author's style can be found in variants at 1 Tim. 5:25, 2 Tim. 4:3. Scribes objected to this idiom. \textit{To ν καλον αγωνα } is secondary, and is a stylistic improvement.
The scribe probably omitted the phrase accidentally. Once omitted, the words would not be readily missed. Both the verb and ἄρομα are N. T. words.
is frequent in the N. T. and occurs in the Pastoral at 1 Tim. 5:14, 2 Tim. 4:14. 
occurs in the N. T. at Lk. 14:14, Rom. 11:35, 12:19, 1 Th. 3:9, 2 Th. 1:6, Heb. 10:30 (no v. l.). For a discussion of double prefixed compounds see 2 Tim. 4:10 (v. l. καὶ τελείως). As at 2 Tim. 4:10 Pastoral usage decides the original reading.
Read ἀποδίδωμι. The variant may represent the quirk of one ms. or it may be exegetical: the scribe intended to convey the idea of a full and complete recompense.

The variant adding before is discussed in Appendix I (iii) d.
418 Omit ὧν καὶ ἔργας κρίτης before ὁ. — I.

These words are in apposition to ὧν κκ. They could have been omitted accidentally. Once omitted, their absence would not be noticed readily.
The variant omitting \( \pi\alpha\delta\varsigma \) is discussed in Appendix III.

Omit \( \pi\alpha\delta\varsigma - D^k \).

1739. 424\text{ex}. 1881.

L (vg) (vt except g) \( \not\varepsilon \) (vg).


(cf. v.11 at 2 Tim. 1:15, 2:10, 4:21 where \( \pi\alpha\varsigma \) is omitted).

\( \pi\alpha\delta\varsigma \) could have been omitted through hom:

\( \kappa\alpha\lambda\pi\alpha\delta\varsigma \Theta\alpha\varsigma \)

Some scribes may have felt \( \pi\alpha\delta\varsigma \) to be superfluous in the sentence and therefore omitted it.

\( \pi\alpha\varsigma \) + ARTICLE + Noun is Semitic in order and this order is found in the Pastorals at 1 Tim. 6:10, 2 Tim. 3:12, 4:17.

\( \pi\alpha\delta\varsigma \) here balances \( \omega \mu \rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon \delta\varepsilon \varepsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon \).
The words are necessary to sense. They may have been omitted through hom.:
Although the emphatic form 

is found at 2 Tim. 1:8,

is commoner in the Pastorals (see 2 Tim. 4:10). is probably original here.
\( \tau \alpha \chi \iota \omicron \omicron \) is not Classical. Bauer says that it was "... von der Attizisten verworfen". A statement in the Philetaeros 5 18 says \( \Theta \alpha \tau \tau \omicron \omicron \ \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon \iota \sigma \), \( \omicron \upsilon \chi \iota \omicron \omicron \). \( \tau \alpha \chi \iota \omicron \omicron \) is likely to be original here.

Bl.-Deb. § 102 says that \( \tau \alpha \chi \varepsilon \omicron \zeta \) is "literary". It occurs at 1 Tim. 5:22 (no v.l.) and elsewhere in the N. T. The variant is therefore a correction from less literary to more literary Koine. The variant \( ' \varepsilon \nu \ \tau \alpha \chi \varepsilon \omicron \omicron \) represents another attempt to avoid \( \tau \alpha \chi \iota \omicron \omicron \) and is an Atticistic variant.

The remarks at 1 Tim. 3:14 ( \( ' \varepsilon \nu \ \tau \alpha \chi \varepsilon \omicron \omicron \ v.l. \tau \alpha \chi \iota \omicron \omicron \) ) should be read in connection with this variant.
Here however the reading of 489 is unlikely to preserve the original order. It has already been decided that ταχέως is secondary to the text here.
For a similar variant by D⁺ see 2 Tim. 2:7. It is a sheer error by this ms.: ΥΑΡ should stand as the second word in the sentence.

It will have been noticed that where variants of changed order exists, other variants of omission occur. The reading by 1245 is incorrect. ΖΥΚΔΤΑΛΕΠΩ needs an object as at 2 Tim. 4:16.
4:10 ἔγκατελείπον -
 ἔγκατελείπον - S (D²) F G.
6. 81. 1912. 1898. 104.
326. 623. etc.

and the following variants are discussed together:

2 TIMOTHY.

4:13 ἀπελειπτόν -
 ἀπελειπτόν - A C F G L P.
1175. 104. 326. 1898. 88. 917.
1319. 256. 263. etc.

2 TIMOTHY.

4:16 ἔγκατελείπον -
 ἔγκατελείπον - C A F G D.
256. 1175. 1739. 104. 326. 920.
1022. 2004. 1845. 1319. 263.

2 TIMOTHY.

4:20 ἀπελειπτόν -
 ἀπελειπτόν - C L P Y
33. 104. 326. 1319. 256, etc.
In the above apparatus notice the inconstancy of mss. F G for example, sometimes writes aor. sometimes impf.

Howard p. 77 - 78 points out how ξ and ξ are often interchanged in mss. Blass-Deb. § 22 states that itacism makes certain vowels sound like ξ: mss. often wrote phonetically. On orthographical grounds the variant could have occurred in either direction. Headlam on Aeschylus (op. cit. p. 18) points to the ms. confusion of -λιτον- and -λειτον-

The I.C.C. on Mt. (p. XX f) shows that the imperfect tended to be altered by scribes to the aorist, but here other criteria operate. There is, for instance, no firm example of the imperf. in the Pastorals. Also it must be noted that the aorist is required by sense.
It is possible that certain scribes objected to the non-Attic aorist \( \lambda v \nu o \nu \), but it is surprising no variant \( \lambda v \psi \lambda \) occurs. The variant is probably orthographical. Read \( \lambda v \pi v \lambda \) throughout.

In addition to these variants of tense, other variants exist in the above words. These are dealt with below:

2 TIMOTHY.

4:10 ἀνατέλει

\( \kappa \alpha \tau \varepsilon \lambda \pi \varepsilon \) is frequent in the N. T. ἀνατάλει occurs at 2 Tim. 4:16 and elsewhere in the N. T. including Acts 2:31 where the variant ἀνατάλει \( \delta \gamma \) and \( \kappa \tau \varepsilon \lambda \pi \varepsilon \) occur. Usually scribes tended to eliminate the compound form of a verb in favour of the simple, but in the case of double-compounded verbs the rule may not operate, (cf. \( \pi \alpha \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \delta \kappa \nu \kappa \) v.l. \( \pi \alpha \kappa \alpha \delta \kappa \nu \kappa \) at 1 Tim. 6:20, 2 Tim. 1:12, 1:14 and \( \delta \iota \alpha \pi \alpha \tau \pi \iota \beta \gamma \) and \( \pi \alpha \kappa \alpha \delta \iota \alpha \tau \pi \iota \beta \gamma \) at 1 Tim. 6:5). Here, however, Pastoral usage is in favour of the originality of ἀνατάλει. \( \kappa \alpha \tau \lambda \lambda \pi \iota \pi \) is not part of the Pastoral's vocabulary.
2 TIMOTHY.

4:13 ἀπελεύθην (2) ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ κατέστησεν 255. 69.

κατέστησεν fits the context. ἀπελεύθην is secondary to the text and has been introduced from 2 Tim. 4:12.

TITUS.

1:5 ἀπελεύθη — S² A C D² F G 088. 0240.

33. 1906. 218. 442. 263 etc.

Origen. Basil.

κατελεύθη — S C D K L P.

T.R. and most minuscules.

Bas. Chrys. Theod. Dam. etc.

ἀπολέσατο occurs at 2 Tim. 4:13, 4:20, Heb. 4:6, 4:9, 16:26
Jude 6 (no. v.11.) κατελεύθη does not occur in the Pastorals but is frequent in the N. T. (e.g. at Mk 10:7, 12:19, 12:21, 1 Th. 3:1, Eph. 5:31, 2 Pet. 2:15). The context here is as at 2 Tim. 4:13, 4:20. Read ἀπελεύθη. The variant (which is synonymous in the context) may have been suggested by κατα — in κατετέθη following.
Variants ζυκ - and ζυκ - exist at 2 Tim. 4:10, 4:16, but they have not been listed above.

(a) because the existing apparatuses do not always provide full evidence about this sort of variant,

and

(b) previous discussions in this study on variants of this nature are often unrewarding and no clue to first century orthography is available although it is usually presumed that the form preserving the etymology is likely to be original. (cf. Tit. 1:8 ζυκρατη).
Most Latin mss. read Cresces or Crescens.

The name occurs at Acts 2:11 with v.l. Κρησκ- . The variant above may be due to the itacistic tendencies of certain scribes. Howard p. 72 shows how mss. alter γ to ζ . Preisigke's Namensbuch lists many names beginning with Κρη- (including Κρηςκιων ) but none with Κρη-. Perhaps, therefore, the most popular form of the name Κρησκ- ought to be read here.
Tasker's notes on the variants in the Greek Text of the N.T. say that \( \Gamma \alpha \lambda \alpha \tau \iota \alpha \nu \) is a corruption of \( \Gamma \alpha \lambda \alpha \tau \iota \alpha \nu \) by scribes, who understood it to mean Gaul, which was called \( \Gamma \alpha \lambda \alpha \tau \iota \alpha \nu \) by Greek-speaking people. Elsewhere in the N.T. however, \( \Gamma \alpha \lambda \alpha \tau \iota \alpha \nu \) is always Asiatic Galatia. Lightfoot's commentary on 'Galatians' (1) also states that \( \Gamma \alpha \lambda \alpha \tau \iota \alpha \nu \) could mean Gaul or Galatia in Paul's day, as is seen in Strabo, Josephus, Polybius etc. \( \Gamma \alpha \lambda \alpha \tau \iota \alpha \nu \) is original. It was altered to \( \Gamma \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \nu \) because some scribes thought that Gaul was meant. This is not likely to be so: \( \Gamma \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \nu \) refers to Galatia as at 1 Cor. 16:1. Weiss (op. cit. p. 9) indicates that the change could be orthographical. \( \Gamma A \Lambda \Lambda \Lambda \Lambda \Lambda \Lambda \Lambda \) was read as \( \Gamma A \Lambda \Lambda \Lambda \Lambda \Lambda \Lambda \Lambda \) by some scribes.

(1) In 'St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians' by J. B. Lightfoot. 10th edition p. 3 and p. 31.
Latin versions usually read Dalmatian.

\[ \Delta \lambda \rho \mu \alpha \tau \iota \alpha \nu \quad \Delta \varepsilon \rho \mu \alpha \tau \iota \alpha \nu \]

1845. 104. 440. 1149. 5. 623. 823.

1311.

There is much fluctuation over the spelling of the name \[ \Delta \lambda \rho \mu \alpha \tau \iota \alpha \varepsilon \] . Deissmann (Bible Studies p. 182) says that in the 2nd - 3rd centuries, some papyri read \[ \Delta \alpha \lambda \] — others \[ \Delta \varepsilon \lambda \] . Krahe (1) says that \[ \Delta \alpha \lambda \] — is the usual spelling, but \[ \Delta \varepsilon \lambda \] — is found in Dio and elsewhere. There is much variation. Psaltes (op. cit. p. 2) says that "\( \varepsilon \) erscheint für \( \alpha \) in Namen \( \Delta \varepsilon \lambda \rho \mu \alpha \tau \iota \alpha \varepsilon \)", and Radermacher (Grammar p. 43-44) assigns the reading \[ \Delta \varepsilon \lambda \rho \alpha \tau \iota \alpha \varepsilon \] to Latin influence.

The consensus of scholarly opinion favours \[ \Delta \lambda \rho \mu \alpha \tau \iota \alpha \nu \] here.

(1) H. Krahe: "Die Alten Balkanillyrischen Geographischen Namen" in 'Indogermanische Bibliothek' (7) p. 20.
The omission of \( \text{povos} \) by 1311 is unlikely to be original. \( \text{povos} \) conforms to N. T. usage as shown below. The omission can be ascribed to carelessness.

As far as the order is concerned, N. T. usage suggests that \( \text{povos} \) normally stays as close to its subject as possible (e.g. Mk. 6:47, Lk. 9:36, 24:18, Jn. 6:15, 16:32, Rom. 16:4). The context here demands that \( \text{povos} \) be understood with \( \text{epou} \), so that the order placing \( \text{povos} \) after \( \text{epou} \) is to be accepted as original. That D has little regard for order may be seen at 2 Tim. 2:7, 4:10, 4:20.

There is no firm example of \( \text{e} \) in the Pastoral epistles. Pastoral usage prefers \( \text{e} \) in such contexts, as can be seen in the closing greetings of the letters.
The versions and these two minuscules may have preferred two imperatives to stand together. Note that 1319 writes ἀγαγε.
The present imperative is more likely to be original. It was altered to the aorist in order to follow the aorist participle $\alpha \nu \alpha \lambda \mu \mu \nu$.

The reading $\alpha \gamma \alpha \gamma \varepsilon$ may also have resulted from dittography.
4:12 The variant omitting δε is discussed in Appendix III.

4:13 The variant adding δε after τοῦ is discussed in Appendix III.

4:13

φελονην -
φαλονην (and φαλωνην) L.

T.R. 1739. 326, etc.

φελωνην - K.

69. 1022. 2344. 2400. 356.

Howard p. 70 shows that most papyri of the first and second centuries favour φαλονης, but P. Fay, 347 parallels φελονης. L. + S. say that φελονης is the incorrect form of φαλωνης. But this variant does not exist. Howard p. 106 says that popular etymology may have suggested that the name came from φαλονης. However, the readings φαλωνης and φαλωνης are probably mere orthographical variants. It is impossible from the existing evidence to establish what the original author wrote.
The use of prepositions was widespread in Hellenistic literature. The numerous variants omitting prepositions show that scribes often objected to the frequency of prepositions. The reading by 1758 is one such variant.

\( \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \ K\alpha \rho \pi \omega \) was probably omitted because it was thought unnecessary.
4:13 The variant adding δέ after μᾶλλιστα is discussed in Appendix III.

4:13 μῆρβπάνας -
βερβπάνας - 69.

μῆρβπάνα is a Latin loan word and it occurs in P. Oxy, 2156:9 and Theodoret III 695 according to Bauer. The reading by 69 is an error of orthography.
Professions in apposition usually bear the def. art. in the N. T. (cf. Mt. 3:1 Ἰωάννης ὁ Βαπτιστής; Mk. 1:2 ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ τῶν προφητῶν).

The omission of ὁ here could have been facilitated by hom. Ἀλέξανδρος Ὁ Ὀ.
4:14  ἰποτ  κακῶ -
κακῶ ἰποτ  - P L.

218. 38. 69. 635. 2298.

L (vg)(vt f).

Ambst. Photius and most Latin fathers except Jer.

πολύς usually stands next to its noun in the Pastorals.

See 1 Tim. 3:8, 3:13, 6:9, 6:10, 6:12, 2 Tim. 2:2, Tit. 1:10, 2:3,
but here πολύτ ἰποτ  κακῶ is the more awkward style.

The variant represents an attempt to ease this difficulty by
placing πολύτ and κακῶ together.
The following variants exist in this quotation.

Omit ό - K.
489. 2400. 216. 876.
Eulog. ap. Phòtius.

Omit αὐτοῦ - S.*

Omit τὰ - 1908.

The quotation is a reminiscence of Ps. 62:12.

σὺ ( = Κ所提供) ἀποδεικνύεις ἐκαστῷ κατὰ τὰ ἐργάλα ἄρτου (with v.l. ἀποδεικνύεις).

and of Prov. 24:12.

....κατὰ τὰ ἐργάλα ἄρτου.

cf. also 2 Tim. 1:9 .......κατὰ τὰ ἐργάλα ἄρτου and 1 Pet. 1:17, 2 Cor. 11:15. See Rom. 2:6, Phot. 1:1 where a similar sentence reads ἀποδεικνύεις.
The above quotations suggest ἀυτοῦ to be original. It is in the semitic position. This idiom was often objected to by scribes. ❙ is prone to omission. The omission of ἀυτοῦ is stylistic, because ἀυτῷ occurs earlier in the sentence.

❙ is likely to be original. It is untypical of the author to write ἐκ in the nominative without the article. See App. I (iii) d and see 2 Tim. 1:18, 4:17.

The omission of ἃ is due to hom ὀλοκληρωμένος. ἐγείρεσθαι occurs with the article in the O. T. and N. T. occurrences of the quotation listed above.

Many difficulties have been experienced about the verb. Luc. Brug. comments: "Futurum indicativi 'reddet' non vertas in praesens imperativi 'reddat'." Aug. (serm in Monte 1:72) writes: "ἀπετέλεσεν ἀπόστολος non ait 'reddat' sed 'reddet' ... quod verbum praemuniantis est, non impregcantis". ἄρεσκε ἦταν objected to because it gives the impression that it is an imprecation. The future ἄρεσκε on the other hand gives no offence and is found in similar contexts at 2 Tim. 4:8, Prov. 24:12, Ps. 62:12, Rom. 2:6, ἄρεσκε.
was also questionable on grammatical grounds.  

could be read as an optative, and this mood is rare in the  

N. T. Atticist stylists like Phryneichus (1) did not  

approve of δον as an optative form: he preferred the  
Attic δον.  

These objections explain why δον was avoided by some scribes.  
The reading 'απε δονε' is secondary here, and δον is  
original, but not as an optative.  It is original as the  
subjunctive δον. δον occurs as a variant spelling for δο  
at Jn 15:16, Eph. 3:16 where the mood is subjunctive.  
The reading δο may represent a Hellenistic spelling for the 2nd  
aor. subj. active (2). That a firm example of the optative mood  
does occur in the Pastorals (at 2 Tim. 4:14  λογιστε ἑνε γεγο )  
does not really affect the issue here, for λογιστε ἑνε γεγο occurs  
after ἡ and this idiom is not unknown to Koine (cf. μι γνωτιτο).  
At 2 Tim. 4:14 the wish is not negative. If it was expected that an  
opative should appear here, it is surprising no scribes wrote the  
Attic optative δον.  The idiom at 2 Tim. 4:14 requires the  
subjunctive, as at 2 Tim. 2:7 (infra).  

(1) § COCGXIV.  

(2) Howard p. 210 cites δο as a subjunctive form.  Bl-Deb § 95:2  
agrees, saying that δο until 300 A.D. was seen as an uncommon  
opative: then altered to the normal subjunctive form.  He  
says of δο at Eph. 1:17 that "the alleged optative is  
subjunctive".  See also Turner p. 100.
In view of the above support for δοκεω as a subjunctive form, we may read ἑποδοκεω as the original form of the text. θεὸς εἶ resulted from assimilation to the LXX.

The following variants are also discussed here:

2 TIMOTHY.

2:7 δοκεω

δωεει - S A G D R G.

104. 1022. 1739. 326. 81. 6. 462.

1245.

L: (vgjvt) Copt. (boh.) Arm. Goth.

Hilary.

The context is similar to 2 Tim. 4:14. The grammatical problem is the same. δοκεω is original. It was altered to δωεει to avoid

(a) an unusual subjunctive form or

(b) because it was read as δοκεω and the optative gave the impression of an imprecation.

(c) because it was read as δοκεω and Atticist scribes objected to this form of the optative.
This variant particularly shows that δωθ represents a subjunctive spelling. Bl-Deb. § 370 states that μηποτε is followed by the subjunctive in the N.T. as at Lk. 3:15, 11:35, Gal. 2:2, Acts 5:39, 1 Th. 3:5. Moulton p. 193 comments that δωθ at 2 Tim. 2:25 is δωθ. He says that δωθ cannot be an optative here. The optative would clash with κανεσωμαι and could not be justified syntactically. For parallels to the form, Moulton points to γνωθι in Clem. Paed. 3:1 and elsewhere in early Christian literature. Some mss. read δωθ for δω at Plato. Gorg. 481A where an optative would be out of place. This is further evidence to the earlier discussion that δωθ is subjunctive, at 2 Tim. 2:7, 2:25, 4:16. It is relevant to inquire at this point what the mood of δωθ is at 2 Tim. 1:16, 1:18 (no v.11.). Should we print δωθ or δωθ. Harrison (3) assumes 2 Tim. 1:16, 1:18 (and 2:25) are optative. Turner p. 129 says that δωθ at 2 Tim. 1:16, 1:18 can be nothing else but optative. On p. 128, however, he says that Atticists often preferred the optative in such sentences. These

(3) P. N. Harrison 'Paulines and Pastorals' p. 15.
scribes, therefore, may have been contented to read δοκεῖ as ἐνδόκεῖ. We may, however, be justified in printing δοκεῖ at 2 Tim. 1:16, 1:18 as well as at Rom. 15:5, 2 Th. 3:16. These subjunctives would be rare examples of the jussive (see Turner p. 94). If this is so, there are no firm examples of ἐνδόκεῖ in the Pastoral epistles.
Sheer error by 1319. καὶ ἔδωκεν does not usually appear so late in a sentence in the Pastorals. (see 1 Tim. 1:9, 2:9 etc.).

The imperative comes late in the sentence at 1 Tim. 6:3, 6:11, 6:17 and is a frequent and effective device in the Pastorals.
The perfect tense is rare in the Pastorals and in the N. T. as a whole. It is unlikely to be original here. The perfect is due to an Atticist or stylistically conscious scribe.

(cf. 2 Tim. 3:8 'αντεστατι - 'αντεστησαν).

The following variant is also considered here: -

2 TIMOTHY.

4:17 παρεστη -
παρεστημεν 623.

As above, the perfect is unlikely to be original. Here the perfect would clash with πενεδουναρωςευ following (no. v.l.).

παρεστημεν occurs at 2 Tim. 2:15 (no. v.l.). συμπαρεστημεν does not occur in the N. T. and is unlikely to be original here.

Συμ - may have been introduced accidentally from συμπαρεγενετο in v. 16.
The variant omitting \( \rho\omicron\upsilon\omicron\) is discussed at 2 Tim. 1:3 (v.l. add \( \rho\omicron\upsilon\omicron\)).

4:16 \( \tau\alpha\rho\epsilon\gamma\nu\epsilon\zeta\tau\eta\) - \\
\( \sigma\omicron\tau\alpha\rho\epsilon\gamma\nu\epsilon\zeta\tau\eta\) - \( \Sigma\) D K L P. \\
876 and most minuscules. \\
Ith. \\
\( \tau\alpha\rho\epsilon\gamma\nu\epsilon\zeta\tau\eta\) occurs at Lk. 23:48 (v.l. \( \tau\tau\rho\) -) \\
\( \tau\alpha\rho\epsilon\gamma\nu\epsilon\zeta\tau\eta\) occurs frequently in the N. T. especially in Lk-Acts.

Compound verbs with double-prefixed prepositions are sometimes original, sometimes secondary (cf. 1 Tim. 6:5, 6:20, 2 Tim. 1:12, 1:14, 4:8, 4:10). Von Soden p. 1982 writes \( \tau\alpha\rho\epsilon\gamma\nu\epsilon\zeta\tau\eta\) kann durch \( \tau\alpha\rho\epsilon\gamma\nu\epsilon\zeta\tau\eta\) (17) veranlasst sein, wo Ić 5 259 \( \sigma\omicron\tau\alpha\rho\epsilon\gamma\nu\epsilon\zeta\tau\eta\) schreibt'. This may be so. Scribes tended to avoid or reduce compound verbs. See Pelletier (op. cit. p. 333) where Josephus rewrites Aristeas' \( \epsilon\iota\mu\sigma\omicron\nu\nu\alpha\omega\nu\omicron\) as \( \omega\omicron\upsilon\lambda\gamma\omega\). \\
Read \( \sigma\omicron\tau\alpha\rho\epsilon\gamma\nu\epsilon\zeta\tau\eta\).
4:16 Omit πε - 1739.

The omission here may have been motivated by stylistic considerations. πε may have been considered unnecessary as που precedes.

2 TIMOTHY.

4:16 ἐγκατελείπων is followed by πε at 2 Tim. 4:10. See also Mt 27:46 Acts 2:27, Heb. 13:5 for similar examples.
4:17 Add ἐζ after ἐπεστάλLES - 241.

зер has been introduced from v. 18, where it follows ἐννομοῦ. Ignore the variant.
The variant is an attempt to emphasise the contrast. ἐκκλήσει is a stronger adversative than ἐς (cf. 1 Tim. 1:9).
4:17 μοι παρεστή -  
παρεστή μοι - 1311. 241. 876.

Cassiod. Rufin.
Theod-Mops.

παρεστή - A.
L (vg $)(vt f)$.

(242 reads συμπαρεστη).

As seen at 2 Tim. 4:3, 4:6 and elsewhere, it is an easy orthographical error to write 'n' for 't' or 'c' for 'v'. In this context, however, μοι is required after παρεστή in the same way as ένεδυναρμέεν following needs an object. The omission of the pronoun is unlikely to be original. The verb παρεστήμη needs an indirect object, as at Rom. 16:2.

The order μοι παρεστή should be followed. This order was inverted in order to balance ένεδυναρμέεν με.

2 TIMOTHY.

4:17 παρεστή v.l. παρεστήμεν and v.l. συμπαρεστή are discussed at 2 Tim. 4:15 (v.l. αυτές η).
Note that 440 inverts 


4:17 δι' ἑροὺ το ἡρμηνεύω -

το ἡρμηνεύω δι' ἑροῦ - 440. 876.

The context demands emphasis on δι' ἑροῦ which is provided because it occurs early in the sentence. The reading of 440 876 is inexplicable.
4:17 πληροφορηθῇ -
πληρωθῇ - Π. Ο. 056.
442. 81. 88. 489. 256. 1891. 462.

πληροω occurs at 1 Tim. 1:4 and is frequent in the N. T.
πληροφορεω occurs at 2 Tim. 4:5 (no. v.l.) and at Lk. 1:1,
Rom. 4:21, 14:5, Col. 4:12.

The reading πληρωθῃ may represent an example of an
orthographical variant: the accidental shortening of a word.
Or it may be an Atticistic variant: to avoid the non Classical
verb πληροφορεω.
In Attic Greek a neuter plural is usually followed by a singular verb. Hellenistic Greek did not always abide by this usage. The plural here is original. The variant is an Attic reading.
There is no firm example of \( \pi \alpha \varsigma \) after its noun in the Pastorals. \( \pi \alpha \varsigma + \) Article + Noun is the Semitic order and it is found at 1 Tim. 6:10, 2 Tim. 2:22, 3:12, 4:8. The variant by 330 possibly represents an attempt to avoid a Semitism.

2 Timothy.

4:17 \( \epsilon \rho \upsilon \varsigma \delta \eta \nu \) v.l. \( \epsilon \rho \rho \upsilon \varsigma \delta \eta \nu \) is discussed at 2 Tim. 3:11 (v.l. \( \epsilon \rho \rho \upsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \alpha \tau \) ).

4:17 The variant adding \( \mu \varepsilon \) after \( \epsilon \rho \rho \upsilon \varsigma \delta \eta \nu \) is discussed at 2 Tim. 4:16 (v.l. omit \( \mu \varepsilon \) ).

4:18 The variant adding \( \nu \varepsilon \lambda \) before \( \rho \upsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \) is discussed in Appendix II.

4:18 \( \epsilon \rho \rho \upsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \alpha \tau \) v.l. \( \rho \upsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \) is discussed at 2 Tim. 3:11 (v.l. \( \epsilon \rho \rho \upsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \tau \alpha \tau \) ).

4:18 The variant adding \( \delta \) before \( \kappa \lambda \) is discussed in Appendix I (iii) d.

4:18 \( \alpha ^{\prime} \upsilon \tau \omicron \omicron \) v.l. \( \epsilon \alpha \upsilon \tau \upsilon \omicron \omicron \) is discussed at 2 Tim. 2:13 (v.l. \( \epsilon \alpha \upsilon \tau \upsilon \omicron \omicron \) ).
(cf. 1 Tim. 3:16 where $\delta\gamma$ means $\lambda\eta \tau \sigma \varsigma$).

$\lambda\eta \tau \nu$ here represents an exegetical variant. It is more explicit than $\varsigma$: 'to whom'. The variant may have been motivated by assimilation to 1 Pet. 5:11.
Our usual caution in accepting as original the peculiar readings of F G is heightened in this instance because F G are prone to this sort of variant (cf. 2 Tim. 2:18 (bis) 2:22, Tit. 3:4).

όδο ρα α in the nominative is usually arthrous in the N. T. (cf. 2 Tim. 2:10, 2 Pet. 2:10, Jude 25 (doxology) Rev. 4:9, 5:12, 11:13, 14:7, 16:9) but is anarthrous at Lk. 2:9, 2:14, 14:10, 19:38, Rom. 2:10, 1 Cor. 15:41, 2 Cor. 8:23, etc. F G may have been influenced here by 1 Tim. 6:16 where the nouns in the doxology are anarthrous. Ignore the variant.
4:18 Add καὶ τὸ κράτος after ἔπληξε - 81.

The addition is not original. It has been introduced from 1 Pet. 5:11 where τὸ κράτος precedes εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους τῶν ἁγίων.
4:18 Omit τῶν ἱλασμῶν - P.

The variant omitting ἀρνητικόν is discussed at 1 Tim. 6:16 (v.l. omit ἀρνητικόν).

2 TIMOTHY.

εἰς τοὺς ἱλασμοὺς τῶν ἱλασμῶν is a set phrase as at 1 Tim. 1:17, Rom 16:27, 1 Pet. 5:11. The omission by P 256 is accidental, and possibly motivated by hom. if ἀρνητικόν was absent in the exemplar.

ἀρνητικόν AC ἰλασμῶν AC παρεῖ
It was inevitable that when a letter originally written to an individual, became a sacred book read in public, some second person singular references would be altered. That scribes omitted or altered 2nd p.s. verbs and pronouns in the Pastorals has already been noted. Here is another example where the 2 p.s. (imperative) has been altered to the 2 p.p. The generalisation in this context is not really appropriate. The singular is original.
Other variants exist as with most proper names, but the above are the major variants.

\[\text{Other variants exist as with most proper names, but the above are the major variants.}\]

\[\text{$\Pi\rho\iota\epsilon\kappa\alpha\nu$ occurs at Acts 18:2, 18:18, 18:26 (no v.ll.) and at Rom. 16:3 and 1 Cor. 16:19 with v.ll. as above.} \]

\[\text{Freisigke's Namenbuch (op. cit.) does not list $\Pi\rho\iota\epsilon\kappa\alpha\nu$ but says the name $\Pi\rho\iota\epsilon\kappa\alpha\nu$ occurs in several papyri.} \]

\[\text{It is irrelevant to ask if the individual here is to be identified with Priscilla of Acts. If $\Pi\rho\iota\epsilon\kappa\alpha\nu$ is original here, it would be altered to agree with the name in Acts 18:2. This is probably what has happened, and $\Pi\rho\iota\epsilon\kappa\alpha\nu$ ought to be read here.} \]
Additions from an apocryphal source (probably the Acts of Paul and Thecla) are characteristic of these mss. See also 2 Tim. 3:11, Tit. 1:9, 1:11. Ignore the variant.
The variant adding Δξειν after Ἐραστός is discussed in Appendix III.

The variant omitting Δξειν after Τροφίμων is discussed in Appendix III.

\( \lambda \pi \epsilon \lambda \iota \pi o v \) v.l. ἀπελεύθησαν is discussed at 2 Tim. 4:10 v.l. (ἐγκατέλευθησαν).

ἐν Μ. λήτη ἦσθε οὐντα - ἦσθε οὐντα ἐν Μ. λήτη - D

\( \$ (vg)L (vg)(vt d) \).

Theod-Mops.

Ambst.

D is prone to inversion. See 2 Tim. 2:7, 4:10 etc. Versions are less valuable for determining original word order. These considerations may help us to ignore the variant.
The most popular reading Μ.λ.γ.τ.ω. is to be preferred. At Acts 20:15, 20:17 Μ.λ.γ.τ.ο. occurs without v.l. All the variants here can be accounted for on orthographical grounds.
4:21 ἀποστείλεν -
ὑετοῦ - Dε

181. 440. 460. 1311.

ἀποστείλεν occurs in the N. T. at 2 Cor. 7:11, 7:12, 8:7, Heb. 6:11, 2 Pet. 1:5, Jude 3 etc. ἀποστείλεν occurs at 2 Tim. 2:15, and occurs in connection with ἐλθεῖν at 2 Tim. 4:9, Tit. 3:12. This is normal Pastoral usage, and is to be preferred here. ὑετοῦ without for example με τα before it, is unlikely to be original.
A composite subject of which the first element is singular was sometimes followed by a singular verb in the N. T. cf. Mk. 1:36. Acts 5:36 (ἀνηπεδή and Σ.ελευθή). Scribes objected to this and replaced the singular verb with a plural verb. This seems to have happened here. Therefore read as original.
This is the only example of πᾶς after the noun in the Pastorals. It is, however, probably original to the text. Scribes tended to remove πᾶς. See 2 Tim. 1:15, 2:10, 4:8.
The names do not occur in the concluding verses of the other Pastoral epistles. At 1 Tim. 1:5, 1:16, 2:5 occurs but it is significant that the names are not in apposition to . Pastoral usage suggests that occur in apposition to only in the genitive and dative case. Similarly is not a title found in the Pastorals. The variants represent liturgical additions.
The omission of the words after πνευματός εἰσιν is explicable through hom. if the exemplars of 330, 8 read ἡ Χαρίς μετὰ εἰσιν with most minuscules. ἡ Χαρίς μετὰ εἰσιν is probably original. There are many 2nd p.s. references in the letter, including πνευματός εἰσιν earlier in the verse. The variant ὑπον is written in an attempt to make the letter more general. (See v.l. at the end of 1 Tim.). The reading ὑπον represents a second stage in the corruption of the text.

Howard p. 79 shows how easily scribes could write ὑπον for ὑπον.

The reading of D* d is unlikely to be original. The pf. imper. of ὑπον occurs only at Acts 15:29 (no. v.l.) and 23:30.
The omission of the words after πνευματος εου is explicable through hom. if the exemplars of 330, 8 read ἸΧΡΙΣ ΜΕΤΑ ΕΟΥ with most minuscules. ἸΧΡΙΣ ΜΕΤΑ ΕΟΥ is probably original. There are many 2nd p.s. references in the letter, including πνευματος εου earlier in the verse. The variant ίψων was written in an attempt to make the letter more general. (See v.l. at the end of 1 Tim.). The reading ἸΨΩΝ represents a second stage in the corruption of the text.

Howard p. 79 shows how easily scribes could write ίψων for ίψων.

The reading of Δκ d is unlikely to be original. The pf. imper. of ἨΩΝ occurs only at Acts 15:29 (no. v.l.) and 23:30
4:22 The addition of ἀργω at the end of the epistle is discussed at 1 Tim. 6:16 (v.l. omit ἀργω).