New Test. Stud. (2019), 65, pp. 103–121. © Cambridge University Press, 2018
doi:10.1017/S0028688518000243

A Re-Examination of New Testament Papyrus P99 (Vetus Latina AN glo Paul)*

ELEANOR DICKEY
Department of Classics, University of Reading, Whiteknights, Reading RG6 6AA, UK. Email: E.Dickey@reading.ac.uk

A bilingual Greek–Latin glossary in the papyrus Chester Beatty AC 1499 (= New Testament P99, Vetus Latina AN glo Paul) contains numerous short extracts from the letters of Paul. New photographs and re-examination of the original have allowed substantial corrections to previous editions of the text, causing some rare or unique variant readings to disappear and others to appear for the first time. The history of the glossary can now be better understood: it was probably created not directly from a text of Paul, but from an early Christian work, now lost, that quoted extensively from Paul.

Keywords: Paul, bilingual glossary, Chester Beatty 1499, papyrus P99, Vetus Latina

1. Introduction

In 1988 a substantial papyrus codex, containing among other material a bilingual glossary with numerous short extracts from the letters of Paul, was published as a monograph by Alfons Wouters.[1] This papyrus, known at that time as

* I am indebted to Philomen Probert and Daniela Colomo for helpful comments on a draft version of this article and for fruitful discussion; to Hugh Houghton for helpful comments, guidance on dealing with the biblical scholarship, and encouragement to submit the piece to this journal; to Maria Chiara Scappaticcio and the participants in the PLATINUM project for inviting me to re-edit this papyrus as part of that project and for discussion of readings; and to the Chester Beatty library for the photographs and for allowing me to spend two days inspecting the original.

1 A. Wouters, *The Chester Beatty Codex AC 1499: A Graeco-Latin Lexicon on the Pauline Epistles and a Greek Grammar* (Leuven: Peeters, 1988). This work largely supersedes earlier discussions of the codex, namely B. van Regemorter, 'Le Papetier-Libraire en Égypte', *Chronique d'Égypte* 35 (1960) 278–80; E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores: Supplement* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1971) no. 1683; A. Wouters, 'An Unedited Grammatical and Lexicographical Papyrus Codex in Dublin', *Ancient Society* 3 (1972) 259–62; *idem*, 'A Note on E. A. Lowe, C. L. A. Supplement No. 1683: A Greek Grammar and a Graeco-Latin Lexicon on St. Paul', *Scriptorium* 31 (1977) 240–2; *idem*, 'An Unedited Papyrus Codex in the Chester Beatty Library Dublin Containing a Greek Grammar and a Graeco-Latin Lexicon on

Chester Beatty AC 1499 and now as Chester Beatty BP XXI, has some significance for the Greek text of Paul: Wouters lists twenty-seven variant readings in its Greek text that do not appear in the apparatus of Tischendorf,[2] and the papyrus now figures in Nestle–Aland.[3] It is much more important for its Latin readings, which belong to the Vetus Latina tradition and include many interesting variants: Wouters lists sixty-seven variants in its Latin text not known from other sources,[4] and these readings have since been systematically entered into the Brepols Vetus Latina database.[5] The papyrus has been assigned by palaeographers to *ca.* AD 400[6] and is therefore among the earlier witnesses to Paul, particularly in Latin.

A few years after the original publication Wachtel and Witte published a re-edition of the papyrus' Pauline material.[7] They did not do a full re-examination of the original and improved only a few readings.

The present re-examination presents a significant number of new readings and identifications, some of which affect words that had been accepted as unique variants in the Vetus Latina tradition. It also offers a new interpretation of the glossary's history.

The glossary is a peculiar work combining 444 entries apparently taken from various letters of Paul (268 from Second Corinthians, 89 from Galatians, 66

Four Pauline Epistles', *Actes du XV^e Congrès International de Papyrologie*, vol. III (ed. J. Bingen and G. Nachtergael; Brussels: Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth 1979) 97–107; H. J. Frede, *Vetus Latina XXV: Ep. ad Thess., Tim., Tit., Philem., Hebr.* (Freiburg: Herder 1975) 26; R. Seider, *Paläographie der lateinischen Papyri*, vol. II.1 (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann 1978) 87–8 and Abb. 33 XVIII; *idem*, *Paläographie der lateinischen Papyri*, vol. II.2 (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann 1981) 121–2 and Abb. 46 XXII.

2 C. Tischendorf, ed., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, vol. II (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1872); see Wouters, *Codex*, 161–2.

3 E. Nestle, K. Aland *et al.*, eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012[28]). This papyrus is P99 there and in K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994[2]; also online at http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/liste).

4 See Wouters, *Codex*, 159–60.

5 In the database this papyrus is identified as 'AN glo W', but it is 'AN glo Paul' in R. Gryson, *Répertoire général des auteurs ecclésiastiques latins de l'antiquité et du haut Moyen âge*, vol. I (Freiburg: Herder, 2007) 138.

6 The dating is based on handwriting and cannot be regarded as precise. The date of *ca.* 400 is backed by Aland, *Liste*, 16; by K. Wachtel and K. Witte, *Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus*, vol. II*: Die Paulinischen Briefe. Teil 2: Gal, Eph, Phil, Kol, 1 u. 2 Thess, 1 u 2 Tim, Tit, Phlm, Hebr* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994) lxxii; and the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (which calls this papyrus 'Gloss. Paul.'). Wouters (*Codex*, 17) and Seider (*Paläographie* II.2, 122) prefer a fourth-century date, the *Leuven Database of Ancient Books* (www.trismegistos.org/ldab/, where this papyrus is number 3030) prefers a fifth-century date, and Lowe (*CLA Supplement*, no. 1683) a late fifth-century date.

7 Wachtel and Witte, *Die Paulinischen Briefe*, lxvii–xc.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688518000243 Published online by Cambridge University Press

from Ephesians and 1 from Romans) with 84 entries from other sources. Chunks taken from particular letters, within which the entries follow the order in which those phrases occur in Paul, are combined in a surprising order, with later chapters preceding earlier ones and chunks from one book alternating with chunks from another; the non-Pauline material occurs mainly in two substantial sections but can also be found scattered throughout the work.

The format of the glossary is unusual. Most ancient bilingual glossaries, indeed most ancient bilingual texts, are written in narrow columns (one lemma per line), with one language in one column and the other in the other.[8] This 'columnar' layout made it easy for readers to find a particular entry in either language by skimming down the relevant column, but it required a lot of space, as lemmata are inevitably unequal in length and the columns have to be as wide as the longest lemma plus an intercolumnium: the columnar layout can easily result in leaving blank half the writing space on a papyrus. Occasionally, therefore, one finds papyri in a 'post-columnar' layout: the columns are run together to save space, so that Latin and Greek words simply alternate within long lines, with some kind of punctuation, spacing and/or indentation system to help readers keep track of where the entries begin.[9] The Chester Beatty papyrus is one of these: it uses a pair of short diagonal lines (″) to indicate where one entry ends and the next begins, and a double point (:) to separate lemma and gloss within an entry. When a single lemma has multiple glosses, double points are also used to separate the different glosses, but word division within a lemma or gloss is not indicated. A typical passage therefore looks like this (lines 1271–4):

υπομονη:intolerantia:patientia″τωναυ
των:earundem″βεβαια:firma″καθυπερβο
λην:supramodum″υπερδυναμιν:suprabir
tutem″επεβαρηθημεν:oneratisumus″πρ

8 For a fuller explanation of this format and its history, including complete lists of bilingual papyri using this and other layouts, see E. Dickey, 'Columnar Translation: An Ancient Interpretive Tool That the Romans Gave the Greeks', *Classical Quarterly* 65 (2015) 807–21.

9 See P.Sorb. inv. 2069 verso (edited by E. Dickey and R. Ferri, 'A New Edition of the Latin–Greek Glossary on P.Sorb. inv. 2069 (verso)', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 175 (2010) 177–87 and explained in E. Dickey, 'The Creation of Latin Teaching Materials in Antiquity: A Re-Interpretation of P.Sorb. inv. 2069', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 175 (2010) 188–208) and P.Berol. inv. 10582 (edited by E. Dickey, 'How Coptic Speakers Learned Latin? A Reconsideration of P.Berol. inv. 10582', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 193 (2015) 65–77) as well as Dickey, 'Columnar Translation', 818. For medieval post-columnar arrangement, see E. Dickey, 'The Authorship of the Greek Version of Dositheus' Grammar and What It Tells Us about the Grammar's Original Use', *The Latin of the Grammarians: Reflections about Language in the Roman World* (ed. R. Ferri and A. Zago; Turnhout: Brepols, 2016) 205–35.

Expanded into the usual columnar format and with diacritics and word division, the same passage would look like this:

ὑπομονῇ	*in tolerantia, patientia*
τῶν αὐτῶν	*earundem*
βεβαία	*firma*
καθ' ὑπερβολήν	*supra modum*
ὑπὲρ δύναμιν	*supra birtutem* (i.e. *virtutem*)
ἐπεβαρήθημεν	*onerati sumus*

Another peculiarity of the glossary is that it is inconsistent about which language comes first. Most of the time the Greek is the lemma and the Latin the gloss, as in the example above, but sometimes we find the reverse order, with the Latin coming first and the Greek following as a gloss. Sometimes the order reverses for just one or two entries, sometimes for much longer. Moreover the writer's use of punctuation is not completely consistent: sometimes the double point is used at the end of an entry and/or the double diagonal line is used within an entry. Therefore it is not always clear how the entries should be divided up, a fact that is particularly problematic when the text is difficult to read.

The sheets containing the glossary were once part of a papyrus codex that also contained a Greek grammar, a Latin model alphabet and a large number of blank pages. In view of the blank pages it is believed that the codex was bound as a blank notebook and then (partially) written, rather than being first written and then bound. It was still intact when discovered but unfortunately was dismembered into separate sheets by the Chester Beatty library prior to scholarly documentation, necessitating a reconstruction of the original order of the sheets.[10]

2. The Creation and Transmission of the Glossary

Wouters envisaged the glossary as having no transmission history, with the scribe of this papyrus copying entries directly from a text of the letters of Paul.[11]

10 Wouters, who did that reconstruction, referred to each sheet by a folio number followed by an arrow to show the direction of the fibres, meaning that the sheets containing the glossary run as follows: 11 → (lines 1184–1211), 11 ↓ (1212–40), 12 ↓ (1241–70), 12 → (1271–99), 13 → (1300–29), 13 ↓ (1330–60), 14 ↓ (1361–90), 14 → (1391–1419), 15 → (1420–48), 15 ↓ (1449–54). Wachtel and Witte used 'recto' and 'verso' notations, which are potentially confusing since 'recto' can be used either of the side of a papyrus first written or of the side with horizontal fibres, leading to ambiguity when the side with vertical fibres was written first (as often in this codex). Wachtel and Witte's numeration follows the fibres rather than the writing order, so in their system the sheets containing the glossary run as follows: 11r, 11v, 12v, 12r, 13r, 13v, 14v, 14r, 15r, 15v.

11 See Wouters, *Codex*, 149.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688518000243 Published online by Cambridge University Press

But certain features of the glossary, to be discussed below, suggest that there were a number of intermediate steps between the ancient copy of Paul and this papyrus. One must therefore distinguish between what we can know about the scribe of the papyrus and what we can know about the original creator of the glossary.[12]

The only element of the papyrus that can be attributed with complete certainty to the scribe is the handwriting. This handwriting is reasonably fluent in both languages, but Lowe and Wouters both believed that the scribe was more at home writing Greek than Latin.[13] The selection of material in the codex is probably also attributable to the scribe; its unusual grouping (a Greek grammar, a Latin alphabet and a bilingual glossary) evidently has a linguistic purpose, and while the grammar suggests someone learning Greek, the alphabet suggests someone learning Latin. Wouters proposed that the writer was a Greek speaker trying simultaneously to improve his knowledge of his own language and to learn a new one, but Wachtel and Witte suggested that the writer was a Copt who had already learned to write in Coptic and was now learning both Greek and Latin.[14]

The Coptic hypothesis is persuasive on several grounds. It fits well with the scribe's greater facility with the Greek alphabet than with the Latin, since the Coptic alphabet is effectively Greek with a few extra letters. The use of a double point to divide a lemma from its gloss is a feature of Greek–Coptic as opposed to Greek–Greek or Greek–Latin glossaries,[15] and the closest known parallel to this glossary in terms of format is a trilingual language-learning text in Latin, Greek and Coptic.[16] That text has always been something of a puzzle, since it is not fully clear which language it was designed to teach. But perhaps the answer is that some Coptic speakers, like some English-speaking Classics students today, learned both Latin and Greek more or less simultaneously.

The original compilation of the glossary – probably not by this Coptic scribe – must have been a very different process from the one normally followed by ancient lexicographers. Most ancient glossaries have definitions that closely match their lemmata in both form and meaning, but this one uses much looser equivalents, often ones that do not really match when taken in isolation but are nevertheless equivalent in the context of the Greek text of Paul and a known Latin translation. For example, εὐφραίνων 'making happy' is paired with *laetificet* 'would make happy' in line 1237, and in lines 1248–9 ὑπερβαλλούσης 'surpassing' (genitive) is paired with *excellentem* 'surpassing' (accusative). The glossary must therefore have been compiled by taking two continuous texts, one in

12 Although it is tempting to use the glossary's numerous spelling mistakes to shed light on one person or the other, the errors cannot be attributed with certainty to either party and are therefore largely useless in this process (cf. Wouters, *Codex*, 166).

13 Wouters, *Codex*, 167; personally I cannot see the difference, but I am not an expert in this area.

14 See Wouters, *Codex*, 167 and Wachtel and Witte, *Die Paulinischen Briefe*, lxxiii.

15 See Dickey, 'Columnar Translation', 819.

16 P.Berol. inv. 10582, for which see Dickey, 'Coptic Speakers'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688518000243 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Latin and one in Greek, and trying to match them up.[17] Εὐφραίνων and *laetificet* are equivalent at 2 Corinthians 2.2, where the Greek reads εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ λυπῶ ὑμᾶς, καὶ τίς ὁ εὐφραίνων με εἰ μὴ ὁ λυπούμενος ἐξ ἐμοῦ; and the Vulgate *si enim ego contristo vos et quis est qui me laetificet nisi qui contristatur ex me?* (RSV: 'For if I cause you pain, who is there to make me glad but the one whom I have pained?') Likewise ὑπερβαλλούσης and *excellentem* are equivalent at 2 Corinthians 3.10, where the Greek is καὶ γὰρ οὐ δεδόξασται τὸ δεδοξασμένον ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει εἵνεκεν τῆς ὑπερβαλλούσης δόξης and the Vulgate *nam nec glorificatum est quod claruit in hac parte propter excellentem gloriam*. (RSV: 'Indeed, in this case, what once had splendour has come to have no splendour at all, because of the splendour that surpasses it'.) The entries that do not come from Paul seem to have been taken from another bilingual source (now lost) in the same way, as they display a similar loose equivalence: for example *certas* 'certain' (feminine plural) and ῥητούς 'definite' (masculine plural) in line 1298.

Why, then, do some entries contain more than two equivalents, such as the glossing of ὑπομονῇ with *in tolerantia, patientia* in line 1271? Wouters suggested that the Latin version of Paul used by the compiler contained multiple variant readings and the compiler simply copied them all into the glossary.[18] He points out that two ninth-century Latin manuscripts of Paul, the Codex Boernerianus and the Codex Augiensis, both contain multiple Latin variants, and he discusses three entries with variants, in each of which this explanation works well because both variants are Latin ones attested in the Vetus Latina tradition. These are line 1271 (quoted above, from 2 Corinthians 1.6); line 1260, where αἰώνιον is glossed with *inmensum* and *aeternum* (2 Corinthians 4.17); and line 1357, where ἀνεθέμην is glossed with *quievi* and *contuli* (Galatians 1.16). But the ninth-century manuscripts with multiple variants are significantly later than the date of this papyrus, and there is no evidence for the existence of such texts of Paul in antiquity. Moreover the three examples discussed by Wouters are atypical, for in others this explanation works less well. Sometimes the doublet is on the Greek rather than the Latin side, as in lines 1355–6, where the Greek is εὐδόκησεν, εὐαρέστησεν and the Latin *placuit* (Galatians 1.15). Sometimes the extract does not come from the Bible, as in lines 1292–3, where καθοσιώσει is glossed with *dicationi* and *devotioni*. Literary texts rarely accumulated sets of synonyms beside the various words, so even though we do not know exactly what the source of this entry was, it is unlikely to have contained variant readings in the Latin.[19] Ancient glossaries, on the other hand, often accumulated

17 Cf. Wouters, *Codex*, 105–6; Wachtel and Witte, *Paulinischen Briefe*, lxx.

18 Wouters, *Codex*, 153.

19 Further examples of multiple equivalents in non-Pauline entries are lines 1451, where the Greek is ἄγραν, θήραν, ζωγρείαν and the Latin *praedas*, and 1453–4, where the Greek is οὐκ ἀνῆκεν, οὐ πρέπει and the Latin *non decet*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688518000243 Published online by Cambridge University Press

additional equivalents, as collections of synonyms were more useful there than in a text. The easiest explanation for the multiple variants, therefore, is that the glossary had a transmission history as a glossary and that during that transmission additional variants were added to some entries.

The current layout of the text does not make additions feasible; there is absolutely no space to insert new material. But the situation would have been different if an earlier version of the glossary had a columnar layout with each entry beginning on a new line: such layout invites the addition of extra glosses because it has more blank space. And there is one passage in particular that can best be explained by the hypothesis that a variant was added while the glossary was in columnar format. This is lines 1306–7, containing entries from Galatians 3.11 and 5.1, in both cases with the Latin coming first. The papyrus reads *maṇifeṣte* : | [δ]ηλον ″ *planẹ* : *ꝯtinere* : ανεχεσθαι. In 3.11 the expected text is δῆλον and *manifestum* ('Now it is evident that no man is justified before God by the law …'), and in 5.1 it is ἐνέχεσθε and *contineri* ('… stand fast therefore, and do not submit again to a yoke of slavery.'). The papyrus' ανεχεσθαι is easy to explain as a misspelling of ἀνέχεσθε, a known variant in the Greek here, and *continere* is a plausible mistake for *contineri*, but what is one to make of *plane*?

Wouters, who did not see the double point between *plane* and *continere*, took *plane continere* together as the translation of ἀνέχεσθαι here, giving a unique Latin variant in 5.1. The punctuation, however, indicates that they should not be taken together. Moreover *plane continere* would be a very surprising variant here: there is nothing in the Greek that would encourage the addition of an extra word to the Latin, and Latin translations of the New Testament rarely introduce words that are completely unsupported by the Greek. It is more likely that *plane* was originally intended to be an additional gloss for δῆλον[20] – but in that case, why does the punctuation put it with *continere* rather than with δῆλον?

Perhaps the text originally looked like this:

confundor	ἀποροῦμαι
manifeste	δῆλον
continere	ἀνέχεσθαι

Then someone attempted to add *plane* as an additional gloss for δῆλον, squeezing it in to the space available, which was not ideal. That resulted in a text that looked like this:

confundor	ἀποροῦμαι
manifeste	δῆλον *plane*
continere	ἀνέχεσθαι

20 Cf. Wachtel and Witte, *Paulinischen Briefe*, lxxxv.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688518000243 Published online by Cambridge University Press

or perhaps like this:

confundor	ἀποροῦμαι
manifeste	δῆλον
plane	
continere	ἀνέχεσθαι

The next copyist, as he changed the layout, put *plane* with what followed it rather than what preceded, and therefore ended up with *manifeste* : δῆλον ″ *plane* : *continere* : ἀνέχεσθαι.

If this explanation is correct, it follows that the text from which the glossary was originally compiled did not contain all the material currently in the glossary. It may have had some variants, but it probably contained only one continuous text in each language. What else can we know about the source text?

As observed above, it must have been bilingual. But it was probably not in columnar layout, for the Greek and Latin of the glossary entries do not always match perfectly. Sometimes more of the passage has been excerpted in one language than in the other (e.g. σωφρονοῦμεν paired with *sobrii* rather than *sobrii sumus* in lines 1206–7),[21] or words in *scriptio continua* have been misdivided (e.g. ἐν τῇ παρησίᾳ paired with *in adventuti* by misdivision of *in adventu Titi* in lines 1221–2),[22] or the compiler simply matched up the wrong part of the verse (e.g. συνισταν⟨όν⟩των paired with *cumparantes* rather than *commendant* in line 1199).[23] Such mistakes would not have occurred if the format of the original had given the compiler a clear indication of how to match up the two languages.

The compiler's source, therefore, was one or more texts with a non-literal translation not in columnar format. For the Pauline material this is what we would expect in any case, since ancient bilingual copies of biblical texts rarely use the columnar format:[24] it is easy to see how the compiler of the glossary

21 2 Corinthians 5.13: εἴτε γὰρ ἐξέστημεν, θεῷ· εἴτε σωφρονοῦμεν, ὑμῖν and *sive enim mente excedimus, Deo; sive sobrii sumus, vobis.* (RSV: 'For if we are beside ourselves, it is for God; if we are in our right mind, it is for you.')

22 2 Corinthians 7.6: ἀλλ' ὁ παρακαλῶν τοὺς ταπεινοὺς παρεκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ Τίτου and *sed qui consolatur humiles consolatus est nos Deus in adventu Titi.* (RSV: 'But God, who comforts the downcast, comforted us by the coming of Titus'.)

23 2 Corinthians 10.12: Οὐ γὰρ τολμῶμεν ἐγκρῖναι ἢ συγκρῖναι ἑαυτούς τισιν τῶν ἑαυτοὺς συνιστανόντων· ἀλλὰ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἑαυτοὺς μετροῦντες καὶ συγκρίνοντες ἑαυτοὺς ἑαυτοῖς οὐ συνιᾶσιν and *non enim audemus inserere aut conparare nos quibusdam qui se ipsos commendant sed ipsi in nobis nosmet ipsos metientes et conparantes nosmet ipsos nobis.* (RSV: 'Not that we venture to class or compare ourselves with some of those who commend themselves. But when they measure themselves by one another, and compare themselves with one another, they are without understanding.')

24 I know of one early biblical text in the columnar layout, and that is not earlier than the sixth century: Codex Laudianus = Nestle–Aland E 08 = Vetus Latina 50 (R. Gryson, *Altlateinische*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688518000243 Published online by Cambridge University Press

could have worked from a facing-page translation of Paul, or even two separate copies, one in Greek and one in Latin. The difficulty comes with the non-Pauline material.

As Wouters observes,[25] most of this material must have been excerpted from continuous texts like the Pauline material, since it too has loose agreement between the two languages. Some of the non-Pauline entries are extensive enough, and distinctive enough, for one to be able to state with confidence that the text(s) from which they come are no longer extant: for example phrases such as *se detulisse* / ἑαυτοὺς παραγεγράφθαι (lines 1295–6) and *conpetentem* / προσελθόντων ἐντυχόντες (lines 1296–7). Some have a legal flavour, which led Wouters to suggest that their source was a juridical text:[26] *iuxta iuris ordinem* / κατὰ τὸν τοῦ δικαίου θεσμόν 'according to the order/precept of justice' (lines 1430–1), *persolvere* / τοῦ ταμίου λόγους εἰσφέρειν 'bring in the accounts of the treasurer' (1434–5), *testibus* / μαρτύρων 'witnesses' (1439), *pensitationibus* / τῶν εἰσφορῶν 'payments' (1440–1), *iudicis auctoritate* / τῆς δικαστικῆς προστάξεως 'judicial authority' (1441–2) and *procummulgatam* / πρυτανευθεῖσαν 'publicly proposed' (1444).

A freely translated juridical text from the fourth century would be unparalleled; at that period juridical texts were composed exclusively in Latin, and indeed one of the main reasons Greek speakers learned Latin was that they needed it to practise Roman law. We have just one translated juridical text from this period, a highly literal columnar translation made to help law students learn Latin.[27] Self-standing translations with different syntax in the two languages – the kind that must have been used to produce this glossary – do not emerge for legal texts until the sixth century. Moreover the words in the glossary are not technical

Handschriften (Freiburg: Herder, 1999) 77 = *CLA* II.251 = *LDAB* (www.trismegistos.org/ldab/) 2881. By contrast there are five early biblical texts with facing-page Latin translations, of which the earliest may come from the fourth century: Codex Bezae = Nestle–Aland D 05 = Vetus Latina 5 = *LDAB* 2929; Codex Claromontanus = Nestle–Aland D 06 = Vetus Latina 75 = *CLA* V.521 = *LDAB* 3003; *PSI* XIII.1306 = Nestle–Aland 0230 = Vetus Latina 85 = *LDAB* 3024; Verona Psalter = Vetus Latina 300 = *CLA* IV.472 = *LDAB* 3344; Coislinianus 186 = Vetus Latina 333 = *CLA* V.520 = *LDAB* 3403. Interlinear Latin translations do not appear until the ninth century (see H. A. G. Houghton, *The Latin New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016) 78). For more detail on the layouts of biblical and other early bilingual texts, see Houghton, *Latin New Testament*, 27–8, 52, 78–81 and Dickey, 'Columnar Translation'.

25 Wouters, *Codex*, 162–3.

26 Wouters, *Codex*, 163.

27 This is the treatise on manumission in the Leidensia version of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana (see E. Dickey, *The Colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*, vol. I (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012) 28–30); it has a number of different names, a fact that led Wouters (*Codex*, 163) to claim that there are two such bilingual juridical texts.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688518000243 Published online by Cambridge University Press

legal terms belonging primarily in a juridical text: they are non-technical terms used by laymen to discuss legal matters, and in fact some are commoner in Christian writings than in juridical ones. Christian writers use legal language for a variety of reasons: when discussing Jewish law, when using legal metaphors, and when describing the trials of martyrs, for example.

Therefore the non-Pauline material in this glossary could well come from a Christian text. If so, the compiler may have been using just one source, one that included portions of Paul as well as non-Pauline material. Use of such a source rather than a copy of the Bible might also explain the bizarre ordering of the Pauline material: the source text could have included substantial quotations from Paul, arranged in an order that fitted the writer's argument rather than in the order in which he found them in the Bible. The compiler of the glossary would then have taken phrases in the order in which they appeared in his source.

In sharp contrast to juridical texts, Christian texts from the time of this papyrus often have the characteristics identified in the source texts for this glossary: circulating in both languages, with one being a loose translation of the other rather than a literal version in columnar format. In addition to the Bible itself, notable examples of such texts are the extensive records of multiple church councils,[28] the Acts of the Christian Martyrs[29] and the *Shepherd of Hermas*, which was composed in Greek in the second century and translated into Latin *ca.* 200 and again in the fifth century.[30] Too little survives of the source text of this glossary to allow us to determine its genre with confidence, but the extensive use of passages concerning fund-raising from 2 Corinthians suggests that the source text might have been a fund-raising document, circulated bilingually to maximise its reach.

Wouters' explanation for the creation of the glossary, a single step from Pauline text to the preserved papyrus, requires a complicated, difficult and unlikely process: the compiler must have had access to multiple bilingual texts of the necessary type, both Pauline and juridical, and in creating the glossary must have moved back and forth between as well as within these texts. By contrast, the process suggested here is simpler and more plausible: the compiler worked from a single text (whether one bilingual edition or physically separate Greek and Latin versions), and probably went through it in order.

Unfortunately, if these arguments about the origin of the glossary are correct, its utility for reconstructing the text of Paul in either Latin or Greek is somewhat reduced. We have not a papyrus copied directly from a text of Paul, but instead a

28 See E. Schwartz and J. Straub, *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1925–) and note also G. F. Diercks, *Sententiae episcoporum numero LXXXVII de haereticis baptizandis* (*Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina* 3E; Turnhout: Brepols, 2004) xxxvii on a third-century council whose Latin records, part of the writings of St Cyprian, circulated in Greek as well.

29 See H. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972).

30 See C. Tornau and P. Cecconi, *The Shepherd of Hermas in Latin: Critical Edition of the Oldest Translation Vulgata* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014) 1–12.

papyrus copied from a columnar glossary made from a text containing extensive quotations from Paul. Under those circumstances most of the deviations from the usual Pauline text probably arose during or after the composition of the source text, rather than being found in the copy of the Pauline letters used by the composer of that text. But on the other hand, the longer creation process means that the Pauline extracts in this papyrus probably come from an earlier text of Paul than was previously thought.

3. New Readings and Identifications

When re-examination changes the readings in a papyrus it is customary to produce a re-edition.[31] This papyrus, however, is of interest primarily for the specific individual readings where it differs from the mainstream textual tradition of Paul, and those readings have already been extracted from Wouters' edition and absorbed by the scholarly literature on the New Testament and Vetus Latina. What scholars in these fields need, therefore, is not a re-edition of all 528 entries through which they can trawl to learn whether any of the important readings have changed, but rather a discussion of the particular passages in which the papyrus' important readings need to be updated. That discussion is therefore provided here.

The Center for the Study of New Testament Manuscripts has recently made available a new set of digital images of this papyrus that are significantly more legible than the ones published by Wouters. These images have been important in allowing me to improve on earlier readings of the papyrus, and because they are freely available they can be used to verify most of the new readings.[32] However, I have also spent two days examining the original in the Chester Beatty Library, and some of the new readings come from that process rather than from the images.

Because Wachtel and Witte's work is not well known, this list of new readings includes ones where Wachtel and Witte have successfully corrected Wouters' text. In other words, this section can function as an addendum to Wouters' work, providing all the significant updates to the text since 1988. Readings of particular interest are presented first, in the order of the Biblical passages, and a complete list of all the new readings follows.

2 Corinthians 7.4? = Line 1286

Papyrus reading: παρακλησει : *hortatione*
Usual text: παρακλήσει and *consolatione*

31 One will be published in *Latin Texts on Papyrus: A Corpus* (general editor M. C. Scappaticcio, forthcoming 2022).

32 The photographs are available online at www.csntm.org/manuscript/View/GA_P99.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688518000243 Published online by Cambridge University Press

RSV: 'I have great confidence in you; I have great pride in you; I am filled with comfort.'

Wouters identifies this entry as coming from 7.13,[33] at which point *hortatione* would be a unique variant in the Latin (indeed it is now identified as such in the Vetus Latina database). But the entry could just as easily come from 7.4, which has the same usual readings in both languages but at which point *hortatione* would be partially paralleled by *exhortatione* in several other Vetus Latina versions (including the Codex Claromontanus, to which this papyrus is known to have a special affinity[34]). Moreover, it is possible that this extract is not from Paul at all: the preceding entry in the glossary is from 2 Corinthians 1.17 and the following one not from the New Testament. Under those circumstances there is really not enough evidence to support the claim of a unique variant at 7.13.[35]

2 Corinthians 7.14? = Line 1229

New reading: η επ̣ι̣ [:] *qụaẹ* [*ad*]
Old reading: η̣ε̣ . . [.] . . . .[. . .]
Usual text: ἡ ἐπὶ Τίτου (see below) and *quae fuit ad Titum* (but *quae ad Titum fuit* is a known variant)
RSV: '... but just as everything we said to you was true, so our boasting before Titus has proved true.'

Wouters did not identify the verse to which this entry pertained,[36] presumably because he could not be certain of reading even ηε. Now those letters are clear enough to be certain, and therefore the entry must be from 7.14 if the entries are in sequence here: the preceding entry is from 7.11 and the following from 7.15, and in that section of text only one passage can begin ηε. The correct reading of Paul is actually disputed here, and not all sources include the ἡ; Tischendorf for example prints ἡ καύχησις ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Τίτου, and there is a common variant ἡ πρὸς Τίτον that would also fail to match the papyrus. But ἡ ἐπὶ Τίτου has good manuscript support and is printed in the 28th edition of Nestle–Aland. In Latin the *Codex Claromontanus*, to which this papyrus has an especially close relationship, has *quae ad Titum fuit*.[37]

2 Corinthians 9.2 = Lines 1184–5

New reading: [απο περυσι : *ab a*]*nno* | *priore*
Wachtel and Witte's reading: α̣[πο περυσι : *a*]*ṇno priore*

33 Wouters, *Codex*, 125, 127.
34 See Wouters, *Codex*, 158.
35 Cf. Wachtel and Witte, *Die Paulinischen Briefe*, lxxvi n. 4.
36 The same is true of Wachtel and Witte, *Die Paulinischen Briefe*, lxxix n. 16.
37 C. Tischendorf, ed., *Codex Claromontanus* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1852) 220.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688518000243 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Wouters' reading: [. . . απο περυσ?]ιν ″ | *priore*
Usual text: ἀπὸ πέρυσι and *ab anno praeterito* (but *ab anno priore* is a known variant)
RSV: '... I boast about you to the people of Macedonia, saying that Achaia has been ready since last year ...'

As Wachtel and Witte already realised, the letters read by Wouters as ιν″ are really *nno*. This means both that the usual reading of the Greek, ἀπὸ πέρυσι, fits the lacuna perfectly without the need to assume that something else stood before it, and that the Latin was a full match for the Greek, not a partial match; there is space in the lacuna both for Greek ἀπό and for Latin *ab*. Wachtel and Witte believed that they could see the bottom of the initial α at the start of the lacuna,[38] but the lines in question are more likely to be the ε of κενωθῇ in the next line, since in this papyrus α is normally small and rounded.

2 Corinthians 10.16 = Line 1203

New reading: [υ]p̣ερεκεινα : *ultra vos*
Old reading: [υ]p̣ερ εκεινα : *u̩ltra e̩os*
Usual text: ὑπερέκεινα ὑμῶν and *ultra vos*
RSV: '... so that we may preach the gospel in lands beyond you, without boasting of work already done in another's field.'

Wouters did not identify the source of this quotation; Wachtel and Witte noticed the similarity to 10.16 but did not recheck the papyrus and were therefore uncertain of the identification.[39] With the new reading the correspondence with 10.16 is clear, although the two languages are not completely parallel since the Latin includes one more word of the text than the Greek.

2 Corinthians 12.7 = Line 1398

New reading: s̩κολο̣ψ : *stimu̩lu̩s*
Old reading: s̩κολο̣ψ : *s̩timeg* . . .
Usual text: σκόλοψ and *stimulus*
RSV: 'And to keep me from being too elated by the abundance of revelations, a thorn was given me in the flesh ...'

Wouters believed that the usual Latin reading did not fit the traces on the papyrus,[40] but it does: the element that Wouters saw as the tail of *g* is actually

38 Wachtel and Witte, *Die Paulinischen Briefe*, lxxx n. 23.
39 Wachtel and Witte, *Die Paulinischen Briefe*, lxxxi n. 26.
40 Wouters, *Codex*, 142.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688518000243 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the top of the second *s* of *libentissime* in the line below. A unique Latin variant has therefore disappeared here.

2 Corinthians 12.10 = Line 1400

New reading: ευδοκῳ : *bene opinor*
Old reading: ευδοκῳ : *bene vịdẹor*
Usual text: εὐδοκῶ and *placeo mihi*
RSV: 'For the sake of Christ, then, I am content with weaknesses …'

Wouters was aware that his reading did not fit the traces well;[41] the new reading is clear on the original and on the new photographs. Both old and new Latin readings are unique variants.

2 Corinthians 12.13 = Lines 1400–1

New reading: κατạναρκησα : | *gravavo : egersio*
Wouters' reading: κατạναρκησα : | *gravaṿọ : egerfi*
Wachtel and Witte's reading: κạ̣τạ̣ṇạ̣ṛκṇṣῳ : | *gravaṿọ* (plus '*egersi* oder *egerfi*' in n. 37)
Usual text: κατανάρκησα and *gravavi* in 12.13; καταναρκήσω and *ero gravis* (with a known variant *gravabo*) in 12.14
RSV (12.13 and 12.14): 'For in what were you less favoured than the rest of the churches, except that I myself did not burden you? Forgive me this wrong! Here for the third time I am ready to come to you. And I will not be a burden …'

Wouters identified this entry as a quotation of 12.13 and saw *gravavo* as scribal error for *gravavi*. But Wachtel and Witte argued that *gravavo* must instead be *gravabo* and that the ending of the Greek looked more like ω than like α; they therefore identified this entry as coming from 12.14.[42] Their point about the Latin is not as strong as they claim it is, for although *b* is frequently written for *v* in this papyrus the reverse spelling is much rarer:[43] *gravavo* is unlikely to be an error for *gravabo*. Moreover the Latin in this glossary is not always a good match for the Greek, and therefore one should never force the Greek to fit the Latin. In this case it takes considerable forcing to make the Greek into a future, for the strokes that make up ω in Wachtel and Witte's reading are the ones that make up not α but σα in Wouters' reading: καταναρκήσω is impossible, and

41 Wouters, *Codex*, 142.

42 Wachtel and Witte, *Die Paulinischen Briefe*, lxxxiii n. 36.

43 There are at least twenty-eight examples of *b* for *v*, but *v* for *b* probably occurs only once (*provatione* for *probatione* in line 1230). This imbalance is normal in late Latin texts; see J. N. Adams, *The Vulgar Latin of the Letters of Claudius Terentianus* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1977) 31.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688518000243 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the choice is between κατανάρκησα and καταναρκήω. As the Greek in this papyrus is usually correct, the latter reading is extremely unlikely, and therefore the extract must come from 12.13. In those circumstances, the best explanation of *gravavo* is a suggestion made informally by Hugh Houghton, that *gravavo* arose from miscopying of *gravavi vos* (*vos* being the next word here in the usual text).

Egersio is probably a misspelling of *exerceo* 'drive on, keep at work', presumably functioning as an additional gloss on κατανάρκησα. Neither Wouters nor Wachtel and Witte proposed plausible explanations for their readings.[44]

2 Corinthians 12.20 = Line 1404

New reading: θ̣υμο̣ι : *inṛitat̤io̤nes*
Old reading: θ̣υμο̣ι̣ [± 10]*nes*
Usual text: θυμοί and *animositates*
RSV: 'For I fear ... that perhaps there may be quarrelling, jealousy, anger, selfishness, slander, gossip, conceit, and disorder.'

The Latin is a spelling variant of *irritationes* 'irritations'; it seems to be a unique variant here, but the Codex Claromontanus has *inritationes* as a supplement to *irae* at Galatians 5.20.

Galatians 3.5 = Lines 1372–3

New reading: επιχορηγων [:] | *tribuït*
Old reading: επιχορηγων [:] | *tribuet*
Usual text: ἐπιχορηγῶν and *tribuit*
RSV: 'Does he who supplies the Spirit to you and works miracles among you do so by works of the law, or by hearing with faith?'

The new reading matches the usual text exactly and eliminates what had been a unique variant in the Latin.

Galatians 5.4 and 5.12 = Lines 1307–8

New reading: *distrueṭis* : | κ̣ατηργηθη ″ *inquietant* : αναστατουντες
Wachtel and Witte's reading: *distrueṭis* : | [κ]ατηργηθησιν *quietant* : αναστ̣ατουντες
Wouters' reading: *distrueṭis* : | [κ]ατηργηθησιν *quietant* : αν̣αντατουντες
Usual text: κατηργήθητε and *evacuati estis* at 5.4, ἀναστατοῦντες and *conturbant* at 5.12
RSV: 'You are severed from Christ, you who would be justified by the law ...' (5.4) and 'I wish those who unsettle you would mutilate themselves!' (5.12)

44 See Wouters, *Codex*, 142; Wachtel and Witte, *Die Paulinischen Briefe*, lxxxiii n. 37.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688518000243 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The old reading *quietant* had the opposite meaning to the one required by both the context and the Greek; it arose from misreading the divider ″ as σ and consequently assigning *in* (letters that in this papyrus look exactly the same in both Latin and Greek script) to the wrong word.[45] In Latin the new reading is a unique and significant Vetus Latina variant. In Greek the new κατηργήθη, which if taken seriously would mean 'he was parted' (from καταργέω), is probably just missing the ending of the usual κατηργήθητε. Wouters' αṿαντατουντες, probably a typographical error, was corrected to αṿαṣταṭουντες already by Wachtel and Witte, but actually none of the letters are doubtful.

Ephesians 1.22? = Lines 1377–8

Wachtel and Witte's reading: *subiecit* : | υπεταξεν
Wouters' reading: *subiecit* : | υπεταξαν
Usual text: ὑπέταξεν and *subiecit*
RSV: '… and he has put all things under his feet and has made him the head over all things for the church …'

Wachtel and Witte are certainly right that the Greek is a singular rather than a plural.[46] It is less clear that they are right to reject Wouters' identification of the entry as coming from Ephesians 1.22, where it matches the usual text perfectly in both languages. Admittedly this entry is followed and perhaps preceded by entries from Galatians 3.19, so if coming from Ephesians it is oddly placed, but it is difficult to accept Wachtel and Witte's alternative explanation, that this entry is an amplification of the previous one (διατάσσει : *perordinat* 'ordains'). Such amplificatory entries do occur in this glossary,[47] but the connection with the previous entry is usually more obvious than it would be in this case.

Ephesians 3.8 = Line 1330

New reading: ανεξιχνιαστον : *iṇrepṛensibilae*
Wachtel and Witte's reading: ανεξιχνιαστον : *iṇrepṛ <re>ḥensibilae*
Wouters' reading: ανεξιχνιαστον : *.. re.* (?)*hensibilae*
Usual text: ἀνεξιχνίαστον and *(in)investigabiles*
RSV: 'To me, though I am the very least of all the saints, this grace was given, to preach to the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ …'

Wouters, while declining to supplement the Latin in his edition, suggested in his commentary that it might be a misspelling of *incomprehensibiles* (attractive owing

45 Cf. Wouters, *Codex*, 130.
46 Wachtel and Witte, *Die Paulinischen Briefe*, lxxxvi n. 54.
47 Cf. Wouters, *Codex*, 152.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688518000243 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to an attested variant *incompraehensibiles*) or its synonyms *indeprehensibiles* or *inapprehensibiles*.[48] But none of these readings can be reconciled with the traces, which point rather to a misspelling of *irreprehensibile* (cf. Wachtel and Witte's version, with a different misspelling of the same word). As this word means 'irreproachable' it is a poor match for the Greek (which means 'inscrutable'). The variant is unique in the Vetus Latina tradition.

Complete List of New Readings

The list below includes all places where Wouters' text of the papyrus should be updated, whether because of my own work or because of Wachtel and Witte's. Passages discussed above are also included here for ease of reference. However, changes that pertain only to the addition or removal of dots, or to the punctuation of the original without changing the meaning, are not included.

1184–5 [... απο περυσ?]ιν ″ | *priore* Wouters (2 Cor 9.2): new reading [απο περυσι : *ab a*]*nno* | *priore* (see above)

1185 κα̣[υχημα : *gloria*]*ṃur* Wouters (2 Cor 9.3): new reading κε[νωθη : *evacue*]*ṭur*. The new reading is a different lemma from the same verse; like the original reading, it matches the usual text in both Greek and Latin.

1187 [προκαταρ]τισωσιν Wouters (2 Cor 9.5): new reading κ̣[αταρ]τισωσιν (usual text προκαταρτίσωσιν). Wouters' supplement is far too long for the space available. Since καταρτίζω 'prepare' is considerably more common than προκαταρτίζω 'prepare beforehand', καταρτίσωσιν is a likely possibility, though I can find no actual parallels for that reading.

1203 [υ]π̣ερ εκεινα : *ụltra ẹos* Wouters (2 Cor 10.16): new reading [υ]π̣ερεκεινα : *ultra vos* (see above)

1224 ευ εξηρητον Wouters (not Pauline): new reading ευ εξηριτον (misspelling of εὖ ἐξαίρετον 'well chosen')

1229 η̣ε̣.. [.]....[...] Wouters (2 Cor 7.14): new reading η επ̣ι [:] *qụạẹ* [*ad*] (see above)

1240 [.........]...[.] *absorbeatur* Wouters (2 Cor 2.7): new reading [κα|τα]π̣ο̣θ̣η *absorbeatur* (matching the usual text)

1261 τα δ : *sed quae* Wouters (2 Cor 4.18): new reading τα δε : *sed que* (matching the usual text except for a misspelling in the Latin)

1262 [*in*]|*gemiscimus* Wouters (2 Cor 5.2): new reading *gemiscimus* (usual text *ingemescimus*; this variant appears to be unique)

1267 *suadamus* Wouters (2 Cor 5.11): new reading *suadamos* (misspelling of unique Latin variant)

48 Wouters, *Codex*, 134.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688518000243 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1268 *misericord̩*[*iarum*?] Wouters (2 Cor 1.3): new reading *misericord̩*[*ie*] (for *misericordiae*) (usual text *misericordiarum*, but *misericordiae* is a known variant)

1274–5 πρ̣[?]|ηχθην Wouters (not Pauline): new reading πρ̣[ο]|ηχθην (προήχθην, aorist passive of προάγω 'lead on, induce, persuade' (LSJ s.v. I.4), which can mean 'be ready to do' and would therefore be a good match for its Latin equivalent here, *prumptus* for *promptus* 'quick to respond' (*OLD* s.v. 4), if the source text had slightly different syntax in the two languages. The entry is unlikely to be from Paul because the ending -ήχθην, which is absolutely clear on the papyrus, occurs nowhere in the New Testament; nothing of which this word could be a corruption occurs near 2 Corinthians 1.8 or 1.9, the relevant section of text.)

1298–9 *pensitat̩i*[. . . .|. . .]. . φορο̣υ̣ α̣τελη Wouters (not Pauline): new reading *pensitati*[*onis im*|*une*]*m̩* : φορο̣υ̣ α̣τελη (φόρου ἀτελῆ 'not liable to tax': cf. *Codex Theodosianus* 13.5.32 = p. 755.1)

1303 *prius quam quod* ″ παρ ο̣ Wouters (not Pauline?): Wachtel and Witte rightly object to Wouters' identification of this entry as Galatians 1.9,[49] since παρ' ὅ : *id quod* in 1413 must reflect the same passage of Galatians 1.9, and it is unlikely that the process by which this glossary was created could have resulted in two quotations of the same Greek passage with different Latin equivalents. (Compare Galatians 2.11, which occurs twice in this papyrus, at 1304 and 1364, but which has not only the same Latin but also the same mistake in the Greek in both places.)

1305 καρηργησαι Wouters (Gal 3.17): new reading καταργησαι (matching the usual text)

1307 *planę c̣ọntinere* Wouters (Gal 5.1): new reading *planę* : *c̣ọntinere* (see above)

1308 [κ]ατηργηθησ̣ιν *quietant* : α̣ν̣αντατουντες Wouters (Gal 5.4, 5.12): new reading κ̣ατηργηθη ″ *inquietant* : αναστατουντες (see above)

1326 δογμα[σ]ιν Wouters (Eph 2.15): new reading δογμασ̣[ι]ν

1327 *reconcilians* Wouters (Eph 2.16): Wachtel and Witte's reading *reconsilians* is right (usual text *reconciliet*)

1330 . .*re* .(?)*hensibilae* Wouters (Eph 3.8): new reading *ịnrepṛensibilae* (see above)

1338–9 *ïn aṣṭ*[*u*]|*tia* Wouters (Eph 4.14): new reading *ïnaeq*[*ui*]|*tia* (misspelling of usual text *in nequitia*). The old reading assumed a misunderstanding of the text, whereby *astutia* 'craftiness', which occurs later in the same verse, was matched to the wrong Greek.[50]

49 Wachtel and Witte, *Die Paulinischen Briefe*, lxxxiv n. 40.

50 Cf. Wouters, *Codex*, 134.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688518000243 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1348–9 εὐτρα[± 2]|λολογεια Wouters (Eph 5.4): Wachtel and Witte suggest the supplement ευτρα[πε]λολογεια (usual text εὐτραπελία)[51]

1354 α[φθ]εαρσια Wouters (Eph 6.24): this reading is correct and should not be replaced by Wachtel and Witte's α[φ]θ̣αρσια

1355 υπαρχῳ̣ν των Wouters (Gal 1.14): new reading υπαρχοντων (ὑπαρχόντων, usual text ὑπάρχων τῶν; this variant is not in Tischendorf's apparatus)

1360 [. . .]*ḍuctọṣ* Wouters (Gal 2.4): new reading [*subin*]*ḍuctọṣ* (usual text *sub-introductos*, but *subinductos* is a known variant)

1365 aedebat Wouters (Gal 2.12): Wachtel and Witte's reading *aedabat* is correct (misspelling of usual *edebat*)

1367 ων : *cum sis* Wouters (correctly, but with no identification): this pair can be found in Philemon 9, but Wachtel and Witte suggest that the source is Galatians 2.14 ὑπάρχων and *cum … sis*, where ὤν is a known variant in the Greek.

1371 *inru*[[. .]] Wouters (Gal 3.17?): new reading *inruịt* (usual text *irritum facit*)

1373 *tribuet* Wouters (Gal 3.5): new reading *tribuït* (see above)

1378 υπεταξαν Wouters (Eph 1.22): Wachtel and Witte's ὑπέταξεν is right (see above)

1381–2 *a|gna* : *casta* Wouters (correctly, but with no identification): this may be from Philippians 4.8 ἅγνα, where the Vulgate has *sancta* but the Vetus Latina *casta*

1383 *obstruetur* Wouters (2 Cor 11.10): new reading *obstruïtur* (usual text *infringetur*)

1391 οδοιπορειας Wouters (2 Cor 11.26): new reading οδοιπορειαις (usual reading ὁδοιπορίαις)

1398 *ṣtimeg* . . Wouters (2 Cor 12.7): new reading *stimuḷuṣ* (see above)

1400 *bene ṿiḍeor* Wouters (2 Cor 12.10): new reading *bene opinor* (see above)

1401 *egerfi* Wouters (2 Cor 12.13): new reading *egersio* (see above)

1404 [± 10]*nes* Wouters (2 Cor 12.20): new reading *inṛiṭaṭiọnes* (see above)

1405 *diṣẹnsionẹṣ* Wouters (2 Cor 12.20): new reading *diṣṣẹnsionẹṣ* (matching the usual text)

1420 *lberevẹr*[Wouters (not Pauline): new reading *lbereveru*[

1421–2 [τα-?]|μιακας εισφορας επιπ. . . .σκοντες Wouters (not Pauline): new reading τ[α]|μιακας εισφορας επιτινεσκοντες ('increasing the taxes for the treasury': επιτινεσκοντες is for ἐπιτεινέσκοντες)

1423 αποπληροιντο Wouters (not Pauline): new reading αποπληροιντας (for ἀποπληροῦντας 'satisfying')

1436 *queremoniae* Wouters (not Pauline): new reading *queremonias*

51 Wachtel and Witte, *Die Paulinischen Briefe*, xc n. 79.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688518000243 Published online by Cambridge University Press