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

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

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

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

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

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

Further, as between Deuteronomy and Acts there are marked differences in several letters. The crucial ones are β, κ, π, χ, epsilon, and sigma.

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

In the κ of Deuteronomy the lower diagonal stroke comes away from the upper one at some distance from the vertical stroke; in Acts the two diagonal strokes meet on the vertical stroke.
In Deuteronomy the scribe writes r with a straight diagonal; in Acts the diagonal sags so much that part of it droops on to the line.

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

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

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

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

These distinctions are so well defined and so consistently maintained throughout the two books that it seems impossible that they can have been adopted deliberately. One can imagine a scribe being influenced by the script of the manuscript which he is copying so far as to write a square ι in one book and a rounded ι in another; so also with the forms of τ or θ or ρ or χ; but the distinctions in κ and ρ and ο are much subtler and what may fairly be called unconscious. ο and ω are properly of equal size in their two halves, and no man deliberately adopts a preponderance on one side or the other; he falls into it.

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

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

---

2 In three instances (**ἐῤῥήτ*, **ἐτουτ*, **ιτουτ*) the scribe has an apostrophe after the final τ to mark it as the termination of the 1st pers. singular.
of demonstration. It is curious that of the three page-numbers which survive in Deuteronomy containing a \( \Xi \) (= 40) two are round and one square. The only surviving one in Acts is square.

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

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

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

³ Dr. Budge allows for six missing leaves between Deut. ii 19 and iv 49; but I am obliged to put eight leaves in this lacuna. The two leaves preceding it (Deut. i 39 to ii 19) and the two leaves following it (Deut. iv 49 to v 27) each correspond to exactly 58 lines of Greek printed text in Swete's edition, or 29 lines Greek to each leaf of Coptic MS on an average. The lacuna equals 227 lines of Greek text; six leaves would be 6 \( \times \) 29 = 174 lines of Greek text, whereas eight leaves would be 8 \( \times \) 29 = 232 lines. I think it admits of no doubt. Similarly it appears to be necessary to assume that three leaves rather than two are lost between Deut. xxvi 10 and xxviii 1.

⁴ This allows for two blank leaves at the beginning of the book and three leaves for the commencement of Deuteronomy, which is lost (ch. i 1–39). As the first extant leaf, fol. 1 in the printed edition, is HV (= horizontal-vertical fibres) while fol. 2 is VH (vertical-horizontal), this arrangement is almost compulsory.

⁵ It is printed \( \Pi \Xi [\xi] \), but though it is put in brackets, remains of part of both
showing that it is the first page of the seventh quire, and on the verso of the last leaf of this quire fol. 55b is a broken fragment of a number, probably another z to mark the end of the quire. There is an h on the left hand corner of fol. 56a, the first of the eighth quire, and a fragmentary but unmistakable h on the last page of the quire fol. 65b. On fol. 66a again there is a fragment of a o marking the commencement of the ninth quire, and on fol. 75b is also a o marking its end. Before the seventh and after the ninth quire all the corners of the pages where quire-marks ought to be found are broken away. In the last quire the order of the fibres shows that there must have been two more leaves (both VH) at the end after the last leaf of the extant cursive writing.

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

In Acts on the other hand the paragraph marks are all of one form and are evidently inserted by the original scribe, with two exceptions, viz. that on fol. 65b is inserted by the "later hand"
The "later hand." As Dr. Budge states (Introd. p. xxxi) with regard to the scribe of the Acts, and it is true of the whole MS, such corrections of the text as are found seem to have been made as he pursued his task by the original scribe or scribes. There is no evidence that he systematically corrected his own work, nor that any one else corrected it for him. Yet sporadically we come across signs of a later hand, which confines its work to touching up the text in parts where it was faded, and to adding occasional apostrophes ("commas") and also a few accents in the Song of Moses, and in one or two instances deleting a word by diagonal strokes. Its presence is easily distinguished by the ink. The original scribes used an excellent ink which is nearly black with the full pen and becomes a warm brown where it is thin. But the later hand uses an ink which, while occasionally black, is usually thinned to a gray, indeed mostly a palish gray. It is a different kind of ink too, and seems to have been more fluid, less viscous than the brown ink, so that even when used with a full pen it is distinguishable. The new hand first appears, so far as I have observed it, on fol. 116, it is busiest on fol. 24 to 30; on fol. 296 is his only original contribution to the text; he inserts in Deut. xxii 9 after ἀπόστροφον a word which Dr. Budge has read ἀιαν (p. 63 note), but which I believe to be chay ("thou shalt not sow thy vineyard with two seeds"). I see no sign of his work in the text of Jonah, except that there are slight traces of what seems to be his ink in minute smudges in the margin; and I have observed no sign of him in Acts except the addition of one paragraph mark at ch. v 12, but I have not examined the whole text with a view to his presence.

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

The end-script (“Colophon”). Whoever wrote the end-script, it was not the scribe of Deuteronomy at any rate. The latter has given us on fol 66 a specimen of his cursive writing. At the beginning of Deut. vi 18 he wrote εκείπε η on a bad place of the papyrus, and apparently not being satisfied with the result he wrote the same words in a cursive hand above it. His κ and p are so distinct from those of the end-script that they cannot be attributed to the same hand.

The document has been partly translated by Dr. Budge on p. Iv of his Introduction. As will be seen from the Collation appended to these notes, I read several words differently from him, and I give a translation of the whole, as far as I can, from beginning to end, quite literally:—

“The word of the Lord came to me, saying to me ‘Say to this people (λαός) Why do you sin (perhaps have you sinned)? You add sin to your sins, you make angry the Lord God who created you. Love not the world (κόσμος) nor the things that are in the world (κ.),10 for the glory of the world (κ.) is the devil’s (διάβολος), and its dissolution. Remember that the Lord has pitied you, He who [created?] everything, in order that he may deliver us from the bondage (αιχμαλωσία) of this world (αἰών), for often has the devil (δ.) desired (ἐπιθυμεῖν) to prevent the sun from rising over the earth, and the earth from [yielding her fruits (καρπός) ?], he wishing to devour men as the fire which runs in a stubble field,11 he wishing to swallow them up like water. And therefore God pitied us by sending his Son into the world (κόσμος) that he may save us from the bondage (αιχ.). He did not [send an?] angel (ἀγγέλος) to come to us (?) nor archangel (?) (ἀρχάγγελος),12 but He was (reading ἀρχι) changed …… (several lines lost) …… the earth on account of these deceivers (πλάνος) who will multiply

---

9 Isai. xxx 1, Sirach iii 26, v. 5. 10 1 John ii 15. 11 Wisd. iii 7.
12 The reading is certainly ἀρχιαγγ. This cannot be Coptic and can hardly be anything else than an error for ἀρχιαγγ. Cf. the similar remarkable transcription χιλιάρχος for χιλιάρχος throughout Acts xxi–xxiii.
at the end of the seasons, for they will set up teachings which are not from God, who will reject (ἀθετεῖν) the law (νόμος) of God, they whose god is their belly,\(^{13}\) who say that there is no fast (νηστεία), nor hath God appointed it, who make themselves strangers to the covenant (διαθήκη) of God,\(^{14}\) who deprive themselves of the glorious promises,\(^{15}\) who are not established at any time in the strong faith (πίστις). Do not let them deceive (πλανάν) you [in] these things. Remember that the Lord brought (?) fasting (ν.) ever since he created the heavens...... men on account of the sufferings (πάθος) and the......on your account......”

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

---

13 Phil. iii 19. 14 Ephes. ii 12. 15 2 Pet. i 4. 16 Carl Schmidt ‘Der erste Clemensbrief’ etc.: *Texte u. Untersuchungen* xxxii (1908) with a facsimile.
British Museum papyrus that it must be brought into its immediate neighbourhood. Mr. Horner has claimed the fourth century for a fragment of S. John's gospel on papyrus in the Brit. Mus. Its heavy square uncial letters resemble those of the Golenischeff version of the Martyrium Petri, but I am not inclined to assign to either of them an earlier date than the fifth century. The papyrus no. 310 of the Rylands Library has a better claim to come into the latter half of the fourth century. Among vellums there are one or two which also are entitled to be associated with the earliest papyri. There is the Sahidic Psalter at Berlin (P. 3259) which is unfortunately so fragmentary that we cannot judge of the general aspect of the page, use of capitals etc., and we are confined to the forms of the letters, which are certainly early and very similar to those of the small Apocalypse in the Brit. Mus. These may perhaps come into the second half of the fourth century. And very little later, if at all, is the Codex containing the two Wisdoms at Turin, the fragment of the Middle Egyptian version of the Catholic Epistles and perhaps the first hand of the Pistis Sophia.

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

17 The Coptic Version of the N.T. in the Southern Dialect, Oxford 1911, vol. iii, a facsimile on pl. I.
19 Crum, Cat. of the Coptic MSS in the John Rylands Library, 1909, pl. I.
20 Rahlfs, Die Berliner Handschrift d. sahid. Psalters, Berlin 1901 with 3 plates.
21 Kenyon, Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the N.T. 1901, facsimile at p. 160. Rossi, Trascrizione di un Codice Copto etc. Turin 1883, pl. III.
22 Crum, Coptic MSS from the Fayum, 1893, pl. I, no. II. He dated this as early as 300–350 (p. 3).
What we know of the dialect of Hermopolis (Eshmunên) is derived from a large number of documents, chiefly legal, which had their origin there and are now in the Rylands Library and in Vienna. One of its features is the substitution of א for short  ח before  ג in such words as גא, which becomes והג. Thus we find והג (והג) ten times in Deuteronomy (never in Acts), והג אב three times, והג (י 41), והג (י 25), והג (ן 3 1), והג (ן 88) and perhaps והג (ך 1). We have והג for ח (חר) in ii 5, v 11, 26, xxxi 23 (cf. Rylands Cat. no. 292). והג is used for Sah. והג all through Deuteronomy (the Sahidic form all through Acts), and והג is the usual form at Hermopolis. Other peculiarities, which however I cannot trace to any special locality, are the plural form והג, only when used before והג “other gods” (Deut. iii 13, xvii 3, xxvii 14, 36, 64, xxix 26, xxx 17), and the constant substitution of והג for והג (חר) (hardly ever in Acts): but this, though it occurs in documents from Eshmunên, is not characteristic there.

The Acts also contain some peculiarities of word-form, but I cannot associate them as a group with any known dialect. It is noticeable that there is no trace of Achmimic in the MS. The most remarkable feature of the language of Acts is the frequent use of והג etc. for והג etc., the demonstrative adjective. At Hermopolis the usual form was והג, and והג is only known to us as a Bohairic form. It occurs in Acts v 5, 32, vi 14, vii 1, ix 13, 14, x 44, xiii 42; never in Deuteronomy. In Acts we also find והג for והג (vii 57, normal in three other places), והג for והג (xxvii 12, normal in five other places), and והג for והג (xxiii 23, normal in x 9). This can hardly be accidental (cf. also והג for והג, i 16), nor is והג אב for והג אב twice (xxvii 21, xxviii 10), though והג for והג (iv 14) and והג for והג (xix 22) may be mistakes. Both Deuteronomy and Acts use והג and והג “and” indiscriminately, and both write והג for Sah. והג “or” (Deut.


25 Krall, Rechtsurkunden 1895, over 100 documents, a list of which is given on p. 224.
viii 2, Acts viii 34). The only word connecting Acts with Hermopolis is $\text{Ceyre}$ twice for $\text{ceve}$ (v 21, xxi 27).

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

Collation of the printed text with the original papyrus. Unfortunately the printed text is disfigured by numerous misprints. I have supplemented Dr. Budge’s list of errata by a collation, which however does not include accents, nor the breathing over $\text{h}$ (represented usually in the printed edition by a circumflex accent). Nor has any notice been taken of the apostrophes (“commas,” Introd. p. xiii), as they are partly really such and partly only details of the letters themselves, and not always easily distinguishable. They are of little importance except from the point of view of Coptic writing.

$\text{n}$ at the end of a line is usually written in the original as a prolonged superlineation. The Editor has written them out, and they are not referred to in the collation; nor has any attention been paid to the word-division, which, as printed, occasionally destroys the sense of the Coptic, nor to the filling up of the lacunae, save when obviously wrong.

Note. The passage in Deut. xxii 9 referred to on p. 9 above does not exist in any other printed Coptic text; but the same phrase occurs also in Levit. xix 19 as $\text{nepmaneudoze niekxoq}$ $\text{pors}$ $\text{cma}$ $\text{y}$ (Miss. Arch. fr. vi p. 72).

The following abbreviations are used: l. = read, v. = verse, om = omit, orig = original, prob = probably, pt = point, sup = superlineation.
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IV 48 ΑΕΡΜΩΝ] ΑΕΡΜΩΝ

THE NEW BIBLICAL PAPYRUS.

VI 1 εἰπε] εἰπε | δι[ | inserted above line | τετηναβωκ | om sup | om pt at end of v. 2 τετης] τετης | om sup | om pt after πονυτε | ετητι | om sup | π[εκ]πονυτε l. πονυτε 4 πνοεικ | πνοεικ | τηρε | om sup 8 om pt at end of v. 9 πρωογ | πρωογ | 10 εκ | εκ | τρογ | τρογ | om pt at end of v. 11 pt after κλασογ | μιν | μιν | om sup over κ | ce] ce 12 om pt at end of v. 14 πνοτε] χωτε, κ is written over π but only partly obliterates it 18 πανουγ] πανουγ | κληρονομι κληρονο | insert μι before μ | ται | παι | om pt at end of v. 20 ζηνουκ | om sup | om pt at end of v. 21 om pt at end of v. 24 τρε 2°] τρε | om pt at end of v. 25 ε ων] ε[π]ων | pt at end of v.

VII 1 εΤ ] εΤ | 2 om ε before ΝΑ 4 Ν[Π]: l. Πεν 5 ετετι 2°] om sup | γρηγορογ | γρηγορογ | ετετι πονοδοπογ] ετετιενονοδοπογ | ει | εινογ | εινογ | κοορογ | κοορογ | om π before κληντο | ετετι πορκογ | ετετερ [οκρογ] | om pt at end of v. 6 πτκ πουλαιο | l. Πτκογ | λα] | πκ[νου]τε l. πκνου[τε] the τε was prob written below the line but all is now broken away except perhaps a part of τ 7 σετι] om sup 8 χε | om at end of line and insert before πνοεικ 11 ετετι | om sup 12 om pt at end of v. 13 με 1° | μαι | μαι | om sup 14 pt after θρογ 19 ται | τε] add τε 21 σωτη | om sup 22 pt after πτενουγ | αγαει l. [α]γαει | om pt at end of v. 23 [πεκ] l. [π]εκ | om pt at end of v. 24 πατογ | πατ | om pt at end of v. 25 ΝΟΒΕ] ΝΟΒΕ σιε | πνοεικ | π[π]οεικ 26 ΞΕ] σε
THE NEW BIBLICAL PAPYRUS.


XI 1 [ετοοτκ] 1. ετοοτκ] 2 ηυειμε] ηπειμε | μει] 2°] ηει | om pt at end of v. 3 ηματε] ηματε, there is a bad place on the pap. before Η; if anything was ever written there, it was not Η and has been erased | om pt at end of v. 4 om pt after
THE NEW BIBLICAL PAPYRUS.


XIII om paragraph mark 1 init e not in margin 1, 2 om pt
at end of v. 3 ΠCA] om sup | XIIT om sup | 4 ETETNI om sup | om pt at end of v. 5 ETETNI sic | colon at end of v. 6 ΠΕΚΥΒΗΡ] ΠΕΚΥΡ | ΔΠ] om sup | om pt at end of v. 7 ΕΡΟΥ] ΕΡΟΚ | pt after ΠΚΑΣ 8 om pt after ΕΡΟΠ and at end of v. 9 om pt after ΤΗΡΩ | ΤΟΟΤΩ | ΤΟΟΤΩ 10 ΝΣΕΠΙ] sup over Π | ΠΠ] om sup | om pt at end of v. 11 ΕΠΙΠΑΝΕΟ | ΑΥΠΙΩ ΝΠ] l. ΑΥΠΙΩ | ΝΠ | colon at end of v. 12, 13 om pt at end of v. 13 ΚΕΚΕΥ 14 ΕΜΑΤΕ] om sup 15 ΠΩΤΚ | ΠΩΤΚ | ΕΤΕΤΕΠ] om sup 16 ΕΠ] ΕΚΕ | ΠΟΚΩ | ΡΝΚΩ | ': (sic) om, the three dots are a broken but certain ρ, viz. the first letter of ΡΠ; there is nothing between ΠΝΛΙΚ and ΠΠ | om pt after ΤΗΡΟΥ and at end of v. 17 ΝΠΕ] ΝΠΕ | ΠΠ] ΠΠ


over \( \text{n} \) 21 [\( \text{eqgooy} \) etc.] prob only five letters in lacuna at
beginning of line | \( \text{n[\text{sic}]} \) \( \text{cia} \) l. \( \text{noycia} \) | 22 \( \text{oymo} \) \( \text{oymo} \)
THE NEW BIBLICAL PAPYRUS.


oyobge 1° after ôix 1° insert e, and om in bracket at beginning of next line | ΠΜΑ [n] | add oy | [oye]rhte 1. erhte

XX I m[ω]ui] μ[ω]ιε | [oye] 1. [ey] as there is prob only room for two letters; if three, 1. [eoy] | ε[ω]μ[ω]ευ 1. ôixωμ, the right tip of the x remains and shows that ω is impossible | [πxo] om brackets | om pt after nemak | tαχιτκ 1. [t]αχιτκ 2 om pt at end of v. 3 pt after πι[ρα]νλ and θφβε | θοτε] there is no trace of go left in the orig hand, the corrector in gray ink has written, by mistake, prob po, carrying over p from the previous line, but the reading should be θοτε 4 ηετθνουτε

neτθνουτε | colon after ηθνουτ and om pt at end of v. 5 [οc x]ε 1. [οc] Χε | [κωτ [n] 1. κωτ [n] | before δεικ (sic) there is room for [κινεψ] and in the next line for [πκκοτκ] | [μμουτ ι] room for five letters, perhaps [μου ζ]ν | after ρωμε 1. [κια]δεικ 6 πρωμε] om ι and insert in bracket in next line

over c | pt after ζητουῳωκ | οονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονονο

XXIII 1 η[ne ρω] 1. η[ne ρω] | ΤΕΚ[κ]ΗΚΙΑ Ι. ΤΕΚΗΚΙΑ | colon at end of v. 2 om pt at end of v. 3 η] om, I can see no trace of it 4 ΒΑΛΑΓΑΜ 1. ΒΑΛ[Α]ΓΑΜ, traces show there was another letter | om pt at end of v. 5 ΒΑΛΑΓΑΜ] ΒΑΛΑΓΑΜ 7 ΙΛΟΥΜΑΙΟΣ] ΙΛΟΥΜΑΙΟΣ | Κ[Β] 1. Κ[Β], there are remains of Β and of a small letter, prob 0, after it 8 ΒΩ[Κ] om brackets 9 ΔΑΠΕ[Σ] om brackets 9, 10, 11 om pt at end of v. 10 ΧΩΡ[Σ] ΕΥΣΥΗ, the corrector has re-written the original word in gray ink, but it is possible to see that both original and correction were ΕΥΣΥΗ | ΠΑ ΒΟΔ. ΠΠΠΟΔ | ΠΕ Ε ΣΟΥΗ] ΠΕΓΟΥΝ 11 ΕΠΗΓΩΤΠ ΕΠΗΓΩΤΠ | ΕΠΙ[Ε] om brackets 12 [η] om 13 ΧΩΡ ΜΗΡ | ΠΙΤΥ | ΠΙΤΥ | om pt at end of v. 14 ΕΠΗΓΩΤΙΝΕ] ΕΠΗΓΩΤΙΝΕ 15 ΤΟΟΤΣ] ΕΤΟΟΤΣ | ΕΑ | om accent over Α | ΕΛΑΝΩΝ] ΕΛΑΝΩΝ 16 om pt after ΝΑΡΑ- ΝΑΩ] 18 ΕΒΟΔ η] ΕΒΟΔΠ | ΠΙΑΑΑΥ] ΠΙΑΑΑΥ | om pt at end of v. 19 ΠΕΚ[ΟΝΤ] Ι. ΠΕΚΟΤ] 22 om pt at end of v. 24 ΔΙΩΣΚ Ι. ΔΙ[ΤΟΥ]ΩΚ
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XXXI 2 ΔΑΥ | ΔΑΥ | [ΔΑΥ ἔντ ΑΙ] l. [πτνα], space and grammar require it 2, 3 om pt at end of v. 4 εἰπέρ | εἰπέρ | θε [ΝΤ] θε ἐντ 6 [ΜΠ] Ρ l. [ΜΠ] Ρ | ώλας | ἔλεγχον | l. [ΝΠ] | ΠΕ ΝΤ | ΠΕΤ | [ΜΟΚ] | [ΝΠΕ Κ] | the space allows equally of [ΜΩ] [ΗΝ] Κ, the Κ is still there, l. θνατακουχ | ΘΒΟΛ [ΜΜΟΚΑ] -[ΔΑΥ] | ΦΟΥΝΑΚΑΑΚ | after ΚΑΛ read | ΑΝ Ν] | ΚΟΨ | ΔΑΥ 7 [ΒΟΛ Μ] | ΠΙΕ l. [ΒΟΛ] | ΜΠΙΣ[ΡΑ] | ΠΑΗΛ | l. [ΗΛ] | ΤΑΧΡΟ | l. ΤΑΧΡΟ | l. | should be transferred to the end of the preceding line | in the lacuna after ε l. [ΣΟΥ] | 8 ώλας | ώλας λ | [ΥΛΟΠΑ] | vestiges of letter following ΝΕ suggest [ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΣ] | 10 [ΑΚ] | [Χ] | ΟΥΛ l. [ΜΠΕ] | [Θ] | ΟΥΛ | [ΕΤ] | [ΜΑΥ] | the first letter of the next line is Χ 12 ΕΤ l. [ΕΤ] | [ΗΝ] | ΝΟΛΙΚ l. [ΗΝ] | [ΟΛΙΚ] | Ν (?). ΕΠΟ l. [Ν] | ΕΠΟ | ΕΠΟ | ΕΠΟ | ΦΕΛ | ΦΕΛ | | before ΑΛ read | ΕΤΟΥ | Ν | pt after ΠΚΑΣ | before ΤΗ read | . . | ΗΤΩ 14 [ΜΠΕ] . . . . . l. [ΗΤΕ] | [ΜΠΕ] | ΑΚ | [ΜΑΥ] | [ΗΚ] |Nu, there is room for ΝΤΙ in the bracket | ΕΙ Ε l. ΕΤΕΚ | ΡΑΤΟΥ | add | ΡΑΤΟΥ Ν | Ν | 16 om pt at end of v. 17 ΤΑΠΟΕΙ | ΤΑΠΟΕΙ 18 Ν ΠΕΝ | ΠΕΝ 19 [ΗΤΕ] | ΗΤΩ | ΗΤΕ | Ν only, the ΤΕ ought to be there, but is not | ΕΤΕ [ΗΤ] | ΤΑΠΟ | ΕΤΕ | [ΤΑΠΟ], the Τ certain from elsewhere | [ΓΡ] | [ΜΠΕ] | there is room for ΝΑΙ in the lacuna | ΕΠΕ | [Μ] | ΕΠΗ [Ε] | 20 [ΩΡ]Κ | l. [Ω]ΡΚ |
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XXXIII 1 ΑΥΨ ΝΑ] ΑΥΨ ΝΑΙ | om pt at end of v. 2 om
pt after ΜΕΙΩΜΑΣ] 3 Ε (?)] Ε is correct | Π[ΕΚΥΛΑ]ΧΕ 1. Π[ΕΚΥΛΑ]ΧΕ
prob as Maspero | om pt at end of v. 4 om pt after ΜΩΥΧΗΣΕ
and end of v. 5 om pt after ΛΑΟΣ] 7 om pt after ΛΑΟΣ,
ΒΟΗΝΟΣ and at end of v. and insert one after ΣΙΣ 9 Ε ΡΟΕΡ |
ΕΡΟΚ | om pt after ΥΑΧΕ 10 ΚΑΚ[ΩΒ] 1. ΚΑΚ[ΩΒ] |
ΟΥ ... Μ L. [Π]ΟΥ[ΕΙ]Υ Ν ΜΜ, there is room 11 ΝΕΡ[ΒΗΟΟ]ΥΕ
1. ΝΕΡΒΗ[Ο]ΥΕ | ΟΥ[Ω ΟΤ] ΟΥ[ΩΟΠ] 12 ΝΑΡ | om sup | om pt
after ΤΗΡΩΥ | ΤΕΙΩΤΟΥΕΙΗ | ΤΕΙΩΤΟΥΕΙΗ (sic) 13 om pt after
ΠΧΟΦΙΣ 14 om pt at end of v. 16 om pt after ΠΒΑΤΟΣ and
at end of v. | ΕΟΟΥΓ] om sup 17 Ο] om sup | ΥΡΜΠ] om sup | om
pt after ΜΟΝΟΚΕΡΩΣΤΟΣ] 18 om pt after ΕΒΟΛ and at end of v.
19 om pt after ΕΒΟΛ and ΜΜΑΥ and ΤΣΚΟΚ 20 om pt after
ΝΑΣ and ΕΒΟΛ 21 om pt after ΤΑΡΧΗ (sic) and ΛΑΟΣ 22
om pt after ΝΑΣ and ΒΑΣΑΝ 23 om pt after ΝΑΣ, ΥΜΝΠ and
ΠΧΟΦΙΣ | ΝΕ ΕΙΝΕ | ΝΣΕΙΝΕ, CEIN is written over an erasure,
the Ν over Ν prob; I think the first writing was ΤΙΝ (not CEIN
as Wessely) | ΜΑΡΕΧΕΙ] ΜΑΡΕΧΕΙ 24 om pt after ΝΑΣ 26
om pt after ΜΕΡΙΤ and at end of v. 27 ΚΚΗΠΗ] ΚΚΗΠΗ | om
pt after ΥΑΧΕ 28 om pt after ΚΑΚ[ΩΒ], ΚΑΟΟΣΕ and ΕΙΩΤΕ
| ΡΩΡΩΡ] om sup 29 om pt after ΠΙΡΑΝΗ, ΜΜΟΣ and
ΕΡΟΚ | ΠΕΥΚΑΣ] sic

XXXIV 1 om pt after ΑΒΑΥ | ΖΙΕΡΙΧΩ] ΖΙΕΡΙΧΩ 2 | pt
after ГАЛΛΑΛΛΑ 2 om pt at end of v. 3 pt after ΕΙΡΗΧΩ
and ΤΕΦΟΙΩΙΝΗ | ΤΠΟΛΕΙΟ | ΤΠΟΛΕΙΟ 4 ΚΑΣ] ΠΚΑΣ | ΜΜΟΣ
end of v. 6 ΛΑΛΛΑ] ΛΑΛΑΥ 8 ΜΠΟ] om sup 11 [ΑΥΛ ΜΠ
n] l. [ΜΠ n] om pt at end of v. 12 om pt at end of v.

JONAH.

I 1 om pt at end of v. 2 ΤΨΩΙΝ [n] f 1. ΤΨΩΙΝ | om pt
after ΠΟΛΕΙΟ | [ε] om 3 om pt after ΘΑΡΣΕΙΟ | ΤΕΤΡΗΜΕ
ΤΕΡΗΜΕ | ε[γ] τα 4 ει ε] ΕΕΤ | pt after ΘΑΛΑΣΑΙ |
[ΓΛΩΣΠΕ] ε 1. ΤΨΩΙΝ ε, prob not room for more 5 ΗΝ ΠΧΟΕΙ] 21
pt at end of v. 11 ΠΝΑΑΕΠ] ΠΝΑΑΕΠ | ΘΑΛΑΣ[ΚΕ] I.
ΘΑΛΑΣ 13 ΕΙΠΕ] ΕΙΠΕ 15 om pt at end of v. 16 ΠΡΩΜΕ]
ΠΡΩΜΕ | Π . ΠΕΡΗΤ Π[ΓΕ] ΠΕΡΗΤ

end of v. 7 Β[ΨΚ ε ΠΕΤΗΤ] I. Β[ΨΚ ΕΠΕ][ΕΠΗΤ] | om pt after
ΣΗΣΤ] and ΕΝΕΠ at end of v. | ΜΜΑ Ν] ΜΝΑ 8 ΨΨΩΕ (?)
end of v. 10 om pt at end of v. 11 ΩΟΨΩΟΥ | ΩΟΨΩΟΥ

III 1 om pt at end of v. 2 ΨΨΩΠ] om sup 3 ΠΟΛΕΙΟ ΝΕ]
ΠΟΛΕΙΟ ΤΕ | ΕΧΑΙΟΥΩΣΙ Ν] I. ΕΧΑΙΟΥΩΣΙ | ΜΜΟΣΟΥΕ] om sup
4 ΧΩΙΝΤΡ] ΧΩΙΝΤ ΠΩ] | Π (?) ΨΨΩΥ ΩΥΑ] ΝΑΟΥΡΡΟΥ 5 margin
[ε] om brackets | Π ιο] ΑΥΛ Π 7, 8 om pt at end of v. 8 ΑΥ
ΝΑΩΥ, the superlineation not certain 10 margin [κ] om brackets

IV 2 pt after ΠΚΑΣ | ΨΨΩΠ] om sup [ΕΚΕΙΠΕ] ΕΚΕΙΠΕ 3, 4
om pt at end of v. 5 om pt after ΚΗΝΗΝ 6 ΕΙ] ΕΙ 7 ΑΨΩΥ]
ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

1 I αἵταμιοὶ �足协αί 1, 2 om pt at end of v. 3
αἵταμιοὶ οἱ 7 om pt at end of v. 8 om pt after χωτὴ
and at end of v. | ΤΟΥΔΑΙΑ | ΤΟΥΔΑΙΑ | ΚΑΜΑΡΙΑ | ΚΑΜΑΡΙΑ
9 η om pt after η and at end of v. 10 om pt after ΤΝΕ
and at end of v. 11 om pt after ΤΝΕ 1° 2°, ἀμοὶ and at end of
v. 12 om pt after ΧΩΕΙΤ and at end of v. | η οὐθί
om sup 13 om pt after ΤΝΕ, θητὴ and at end of v. 14 οὐπροκτ.
ἐνπροκαρτ. | om pt at end of v. 15 έοῦ (sic) | έοῦ | om pt
after ἰπαν and ἰεθα 16 χιν η om sup | αἰγοψωπε| the
η is uncertain; it looks as though the scribe had written η first,
then half erased it and written η over it; in the next line θυμος
(clearly written) is intended for δοὺ | κις | κις | om pt at
end of v. 17 θητὴ | θητοῦ | om pt after θητὴ and at end of v.
18 η οὐδομ | om sup | om pt after δον, πεγγο and at end of
v. 19 margin [η] om brackets | ηπε ηπο | ηπεμτο | om pt
after ήεροπολημ | 2ο | om pt after θυμωπε and at end of v.
23 ηπαγ | ηπαγ, there is no trace of 24 | η ἀνθη | om sup
| έπολ | έπολ | ηπαγ | om sup | om pt at end of v.
25 ηπαγαπ | ηπαγαπ | om sup over Τ | ήούλας | ήούλας | om pt
at end of v. 26 πεθανος | πεθανος | εκι | om sup |
πεθανος | om sup | ηποκοτ | om sup | colon at end of v.

II 1 ηπογυ | ηπογυ 2 margin [τ] om brackets | η οὐ
πονο | om sup | om pt after ηπονε | αίμομογ | the η has
been erased but incompletely 3, 4, 5, 6 om pt at end of v. 4 om pt
after ουλαβ 5 ης | om sup | om pt at end of v. 9, 10, 11 om pt at end of v. 9 κινλος | κεκαλιθσον |
ομ sup on both words | ήούλας | one dot over 10 | κινλος | κινλος | om sup | η | ηκτη σο | ηκτη σο | 12 απορι | απορι | η | η | η 13, 14, 15 om pt at
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IV om every point throughout this chapter except the colon at end of v. 7, a doubtful pt at end of v. 16, the colon at end of v. 26, a pt after con in v. 31 and a colon (probably) at end of v. 32 2 ητι] ητι 6 ἰῳ 7 1. τετηρασσε] sic 9 ιτοκοιει] om sup 11 ηαι] ηαι | margin 18 1. 18 14 ταλογ] prob ταλογ, but o not quite certain 17 παραγειει] παραγειε 19 ιτο] om sup | θυτή] om sup 20 μ] μ 22 εντα] ητα 26 ηπρωγ] ηπρωγ, there is a fracture after e but such that the tail of the first p would have been visible, had there been one 31 1. σα] σα 1. 31 ην] 32 μηριογ] om sup 37 1. πεξρ] πεξρ.

V om every point throughout this chapter except the colons and the pt at end of v. 28 1 τ τ] om sup 2 ην ουμερη] om
sup | ναποστ.] om sup 7 ὑCipher | om sup 12 there is a paragraph mark by the “later” hand at the beginning of this v. 14 προορο] sup over ν | οφ[ως] l. οφος | e ῥο[ο]τ | 1 επον 15 αποκτάν l. τηνακτάν 16 σουντζ | om sup 19 εμ] μ | πρόπο | πρόπο 21 σουτμ] om sup | αυτο | αυτο | ομ | sup | συντον] om sup | αυτο | αυτο | σοντα | αυτο | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σοντα | σο...
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12 ΤΕΡΕ] sup over Ν | ΝΩΙ | om sup 13 ΟΥΝΩΡΩΣΙ] sup over Ν 15 ΝΤΩΤ] om sup 16 ΟΥΝΟΥΝ] om sup | ΝΩΤΗΝ Ν | ΝΩΤΗΝ 17 [Ν] om, it was never there nor at end of preceding line 20 Ν ꞌΩΜ] om sup 21 ΝΩΙ | om sup 23 Ν ΝΕΣΘΗΝ.] sup over Ν 1° 25 ΝΩΙ l. ΝΩΙ | ΝΩΙΟΥΝΧΑΙ l. [ΝΙΟΥΝΧΑΙ 26 Ν PΩΜΕ] om sup | Ν | Ν 27 ΝΕΥ] ΝΕΤ 30 Ν ΤΕΡΕ] sup over Ν | ΝΙΤΩΙΙ | om sup 32 ΚΤΟΛ] ΚΤΟΛ 34 ΩΤΩΜΙ] om sup 35 ΠΕ...Ε] prob only one letter missing, perhaps [Ν] | ΑΚ[ΠΠ]Ω l. ΑΚ[Κ]Ω prob 36 ΑΥ[Ω] l. ΑΥ sic 38 margin [ΚΕ] there are remains of both letters 41 ΝΩ 2°] om sup 42 ΤΑΑΩΠ] ΤΑΛΟ 44 ΠΝΙΤΡΕ] om sup, the Τ stands in the margin 45 ΧΙΤΤ] om sup | Ν | ΝΤΑ] ΝΤΑ 46 ΜΑ Ν] ΜΑ Ν 47 ΟΥΘ| ΟΥΘΕΙ 49 Π[Μ]Α l. ΠΑ sic (the word ΜΑ has been omitted) 50 ΑΚ 54 ΤΠΟΧΡΩ] om sup 56 ΠΧΑ] om sup 57 ΜΑΛΛΕΙ] ΜΑΛΛΕΙ sic 59 ΠΝΑ] ΠΝΑ


IX 2, 3, 4, 5 om pt at end of v. 5 ΠΕΤΤΙ] ΠΕΤΤΙΚ | ΠΤΩΚ] om sup 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 om pt at end of v. 7 ΠΡΩΜΕ] om sup 9 ΚΣΩ] ΚΣΩ 11, 12, 13 om pt at end of v. 11 ΝΤ 1° ΝΤ 13 | ΓΙΜ | om sup 14 ΜΝΑΕΙ] ΜΝΑΕΙ | ΑΡΧΙΖΟΕ] l. ΑΡΧΙΖΙΧ | Π ΟΥΩΝ] om sup 15-20 om pt at end of v. 15 ΠΕΣΘΝΟΣ] om sup 20 ΜΜΟΞ] there are five dots over this word, evidently to delete it | ΠΙΟΥΛΑΙ] om sup 21 ΠΑΡΧ] om sup 22 ΧΙΧ] colon instead of pt 23 om pt at end of v. 24 ΑΥΤΑΜΙΕ (?)] ΑΥΤΑΜΙΕ, certain | ΥΗ] sic, no trace of ΠΤΕΥ in this or preceding line 26 Ε ΘΙΕΡ.] om π] Ε (sic) 28 ΜΜΑΔΙ] om sup | om pt at end of v. 31 ΓΗ | Π] om Π | ΤΗΡΩ | ΠΙΝ] om both sup | ΚΟΝΣ] om sup 32 om pt at end of v. 33 ΠΡΩΜΕ] om sup
34 om pt after ταλακώ | colon after πεχθ 36 ἵμμου.] ἵμμου 39 χηρᾶ l. χηρ[α] | πστ] om sup 39, 40 om pt at end of v. 40 ἅ ὑπτ | pt after ἀγῳλά 43 ὅω] between σ and ω are remains of a letter, perhaps obliterated purposely

it is for πλαγγ and it is an interesting form of assimilation found in other early MSS; there is no question of deletion XI ἐπιτ. Xὶπιπτ. 48 π ἰγ] om sup over π


XIII 2 δε] δε is in margin | πτα] πται 2-7 om pt at end of v. 4 η τερ] sup over π 5 π καλ. ] γικαλ. | εγξουμε}

XIV 1, 2 om pt at end of v. 1 πξελ[α] l. sup 2 l. [ηπονατι 5 ηεει[ι] om sup 8 om paragraph mark | eeq [ηππι]μοι l. εεππιμοι sic 8–15 om pt at end of v. 9 ητοχ] ητοχ | ουνττι | ουνττι 10 μμος | μος sic | 13 μ πολα | μπολα 15 μμος] om sup | παι απ | sup over n 16 n | om sup | απ | ητ | τρε] τηυτθι | [πρόκλις] l. β[ωκ ζινεβ] | 17 δω πο] l. δω] πο | πρ μ] om μ | n μετ | sup over first n | πανομς] add [η]α [γ] 17, 18 om pt at end of v. 19 αν[τιος] | ταντιος. 20 om pt after πολις and at end 21, 22 om pt at end of v. 23 om pt after πιγια
and at end 25 εττατλεα (sic) 1. εττατλεα sic 26
πρεθνος] om sup 28 om pt at end of v.

XV 1 ΝΤΕΤΙΝΜΟ.] sup over first Ν | γυσομ] om sup | om pt at end of v. 2 om pt after ΝΜΑΤ | ΝΑΝΟΣΤ.] om sup |
ΤΗΝΑΚΩΤ [Ν]ΤΑΚΩΤ, the N is certain as the super-
lineation remains | ΔΑΥΕΙΑ] om dots | om pt at end of v. 17 |
[ω] is almost certain from remains | ΤΗΡ[ΟΥ] 1. ΤΗΡ[ΟΥ] | [ΝΑ] |
1. [Ν]Α | om pt after ΞΟΕΙΝ 18 Β[ΟΛ Ν ΝΑΙ] 1. Β[ΟΛ Ν ΝΑΙ] |
ΞΙΝ 1. [Χ]ΙΝ 19 [Τ] om | om pt at end of v. 20 om pt after |
ΣΝΟΩ | pt after 6Ε 21 om pt at end of v. 22 om pt after |
ΣΗΡΟΝ ηΝ 23 ΤΕΙ] om dots | ΠΣΥΡΙΑ] ΠΣΥΡΙΑ 24 om |
all points 25-31 om pt at end of v. 25 ACΠΔΕΣΙ] ACΠΔΟΣΙ |
26 . . [ΨΥ]ΧΗ 1. [ΕΑ]Τ[ΠΝΕΥΨΥ]ΧΗ, there is room 27 |
after ΝΑΙ 29 pt after ΝΩ | [Ρ] om 30 ΠΤΟΟΥ has |
been erased by diagonal lines by the orig scribe 31 Ν ΤΕ | ΝΤΕ 34 |
ΤΡΕ] ΤΡΕ[Κ], the tip of [Κ] is left 34, 35, 36 om pt a tend of v. |
35 ΑΝΠΟΧΙΑ] ΑΝΠΟΧΙΑ, Τ is written larger than usual over |
an erasure and the Τ has been omitted by the scribe; it is not |
36 ΜΑΡΠΙ] om sup | ΚΟΤΙΝ] om sup | ΚΝΥΡ 1. ΚΝΗ[%] 38 [C ΑΕ |
om pt at end of v. 41 ΜΗ] ΜΗ | pt after ΣΤΩΛΙΑ | om pt at |
end of v.

XVI om the pt at the end of every v. exc. vv. 6, 9, 13, 18, |
21, 36 1 insert pt after ΤΕΡΒΗ | 1. ΤΙΜΟΒΟΕΟΣ | Ν ΟΥΟΓ.] |
om sup 2 [Ρ ΜΠΕ] ΡΜΠΕ sic | 2ΤΙΝ] om sup | pt after |
ΑΥΣΤΡΟΣ 6 ΑΥΕΙ] om dots 7 ΝΟΙ 1. [Ν]ΟΤ 8 [ΤΕΡ ΟΥΟΑΤ] |
1. ΤΕΡ[ΟΥ]ΚΑΤ] there are remains of the last letters | ΑΥΕΙ η |
ΣΡΑΙ] om all dots 10 Ν ΤΕΡ] sup over Ν 12 ΤΕΜΕΡΙΚ]
THE NEW BIBLICAL TAPYRUS.

The second o has been deleted by a diagonal stroke thro' it by the orig scribe. XVII om pt at end of every v. in this chapter except 4, 14, 15, 17, 33 | 3 [\text{\underline{MM}\text{MOOY}]}] om sup 5 [\text{\underline{PEQ}}] 1. \text{\underline{P}[\text{\underline{M}}]\text{\underline{POCK}}}, the eq is deleted by diagonal strokes and a fragment of a letter, prob \text{\underline{M}} but not \text{\underline{P}}, remains before \text{\underline{N}} | \text{\underline{E} \text{\underline{NHI}}] only a fragment remains of the letter before \text{\underline{N}}, it looks more like \text{\underline{N}} than \text{\underline{E}}. XVIII 1 [\text{\underline{M}]}] om sup 2 [\text{\underline{MM}2}] 2-6 om pt at end of v. 5 [\text{\underline{EQ}]}] [\text{\underline{E}Q}P] | [\text{\underline{MM}OYDAI}] om sup 7 [\text{\underline{TY}N\text{\underline{AYW}}}] 8 l.
THE NEW BIBLICAL PAPYRUS.

XIX 1 l. [e]pe | 1. acēi eie (sic) | om pt at end of v. 2 om pt after epovaaβ | cωtμ | om sup 3 om pt after n̄m and at end 4 om pt after n̄cw and at end 5-10 om pt at end of v. 9 2ο[e]ine 1. 2οine | pt after τεριν | 1. γ̄ ω̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄̄
XXI om all points throughout the chapter except v. 1 after 

\text{XXI om all points throughout the chapter except v. 1 after} P\text{ATAPA, v. 11 after O\text{YERHTE (insert) and I\text{OYDAI, v. 25 after T}\text{PORPMIA (insert), v. 27 after EBO\text{A} 1° (insert), v. 28 after EBO\text{A (insert), v. 30 after GOTOQ, v. 32 after M\text{ATOI, v. 33 after PEPOYOAEI and C\text{ITE, v. 34 after W\text{AXE and GU}TOR\text{P}}}}
THE NEW BIBLICAL PAPYRUS.


XXII om all points in this chapter except in v. 3 after ουρωξ and ηαμαλιη, in v. 5 after θερουσαλιμ and at end, v. 8 after παζωραε and at end, in v. 10 after ημαλακ, v. 11 at end, v. 15 at end, v. 20 after πεκμπιτρε (insert) and πε at end, v. 21 at end (colon), v. 22 after πκαξ, v. 25, 27 at end, v. 28 after πολιτια and ζε (insert) | 3 αμ] om sup | ωρά] om sup 4 πρωμε] om sup 6 [ε] | 8 μω[ι] 8 l. μμ[ο] | [πεκ] πετ | 9 τε[κ] 9 τε[κ] twice] τε[κ] | the last three lines are repeated from those preceding without any sign of erasure or deletion 10 τουου αντ] τουουν 11 πσ] the reading is certain, the κ has a faint line over its right half and above that a dot, the σ has over it and rather to the right remains of a
superlineation or possibly of a T above the line 13 l. γαρ
po[ is followed by 1. [εβ]οχ 2° 16 ΜΤ[επικ.] om sup 19 [επικ.]
om sup 22 ε ΠΕΧΑΥ om ε 22 [xe paï] l. prob [xeqimpa][i] to fit
25 [pe]. om 27 e[p]e[y] there has been an erasure and the supposed Υ is the remains of the erased
letter 28 Η ΟΥΜΟΣ om sup 30 l. ΠΣΙ l. [a] oυμερακασι
[ετρ]e

XXIII 1 l. α[γ]ον επευπεξε | l. α[π]νολιτευε 2-8 om
pt at end of v. 3 om pt after πομομοσ 5 l. ΝΕΙ om pt after πε
6 om pt after πε | ΠΜ om sup | ΑΠ 2°] om sup 7 l. [γω]
πο[ neφαριος[αιος] με [ν] | om pt after καδανκαιος 8 [yw]
ουμω apparently 9 l. Μ[ηρ][παμε. μ[ν]μα [ν] 9-12 om pt
at end of v. 10 om pt after παυλοσ 11 om pt after ΕΚΩ
12 Η ΟΥΛΑ. only 14 [Ν]ΟΥΟΥΟΙ ΝΕΥΟΥΟΙ 15 om pt after δε
16-24 om all points in these verses except in v. 18
after [γω]περ and in v. 21 at end 19 l. εροι 20 ΕΚ[ν] om
[ν] 21 [yln]ας 7 l. [γα]ον 22 l. ΧΕ ΑΚΤΑΜΟΙ [Νμ]
27-35 om all points except v. 31 at end of v. 31 l.
[μματο][ν] 33 l. πτο[ου | 1. [ιιic]τα παυσ (sic) 33
παυλο[ν] επ[ε] 34 l. ΑΓΓΙ[ι][ε x]ε 1. ΕΙΝΑΙ
ΕΝ[ε] sic 35 l. ΠΕΚΚΑΤΗΡΟΣ (sic)

XXIV om all points in this chapter except v. 2 at end and
v. 10 after ΜΜΟΣ 3 l. ουκευ 1. ΟΥΩΜΩΤ 5 l. [ας]
π[ντηνυα] 11 l. Ευν[σωθομ] 12 l. ΕΠΝΕΥΜΟΝ. 13 [μ]
om sup | Ε ΜΕ | Μ Μ 1. ΟΥΚΑΘΡΗ (sic) l. ΠΗΝΤΟΥ 14
1. [α]μολοι[ (sic) | l. ΖΑΙΡΕΣ (sic) ΝΕΙΓΥ. | l. ΕΙΝΙΚΤ. prob |
brackets | 1. ΣΥΝΑΙ[δ]ΑΗ[ς]ic

XXVI ΚΑΙΙΑ[ν]π 1. [Μπρ]πο, the 0 is not certain but the
word is much more probable, since καίσαρ is always repre-
sent by ἰππο in the Sahidic N.T. except in Luke iii 1 and John xix 15 where it is treated as a proper name | om pt at end of v.


1 For v. 9 cf. Crum, Coptic Ostraca No. 3.

XXVIII omit all points in this chapter except v. 2 after ῥωμε, v. 3 at end, v. 6 after κοοντ, v. 10 after εβολ (insert) and at end, v. 11 after πακτε (insert), v. 13 after ἰρπυς (insert), v. 15 after ἐρον, v. 16 after ἰρκον (insert) and at end (colon), v. 20 after νπιε[τ]ιον and at end, v. 23 after νπούτε, ἰο (insert) and ἐποοντε, v. 24 end, v. 25 after νπερφυ and ἐπινησιοτε (insert), v. 26 end, v. 27 after μαάκε (insert), v. 31 after νπούτε and end (colon) 1 l. ντετεπ -οὐξα[αί], there is prob nothing after π in that line 2 π] | 3 | ἐμπος ώτ 2° this word has been deleted by a diagonal stroke through each letter | ἐβολ | om [sic] 4 ὧ[ν] | om sup 5 l. Τεπ 6 l. νποῦ - ωτ | 1. ομαι [σθα] | 1. ἐποον -[ο]ν[ε] [π]μον | 7 l. ἐμαλε | beginning next line 

Mayen | 1. νποβ | λιον πε | 9 l. ἦμον πεκ | but hardly room for σενε | 1. ἱνετ | πεν | πεγ prob 10 τεπ the super-lineation is long = τετεπ 13 l. ἀν ω μ[σ] -πα | 1. π[η] | τιολούς | the Υ has been deleted by a diagonal stroke 15 l. π[πο]υτε | 16 l. π τετεπ 17 l. εἰμηρ | θι (?) the reading is certain 18 l. ἐντ 19 l. ὧολαι | 20 l. αίτι | 1. αἰτεποθυτη | 1. ἐρο[τθ] | 23 l. ἦ[ε] | 1. πνομον[ε] | πνε - προφητης (the reading is certain, there is no trace of μοῦσκε etc) 25 l. ἀγ - ει | 1. ἄν τετ (sic) | 1. πισᾶ | 26 there are quotation marks (> against the lines from φητης to νευμαάκε, but they are broken away against the lines
Title. 1. ποστολος

Colophon. fol. 108b om all points | line 1 l. [ἀ]πωγασε, 2 l. ἔχε ἐτέθη 4 τετείπε] τετείπε φol. 109α om all points except perhaps that after πκαγ 2 l. [ἐ]τεί[πε] 4 [ὦ]ιαί (?) 1. [ὦ]α] 5 l. πκαγ ε[ηκαρ?] 6 l. ὁμίδ, the scribe first wrote ὡμι and then wrote a κ over the η | 1. [ὁ]ει [π] 7 l. πεκρωμ εἰπνητ 9 l. μπ[τρεπτι] 10 l. πκοσμος ἔχε[ε[πε[α]]φ] 11 μπ [μ]π[μπ] 12 τελος ἔδος | 1. εἰπνησ ὡρ[ο]ρ [ο]ρ, ρ uncertain, it may be ρ and if there was an o it must have been quite small | 1. ὡ[τ]ε ἀρχιαγ, in connection with [αγ]τελος just above, this strongly suggests ἀρχιαγ[τελος] but the π is certain (cf. however the writing χιλιαρχος for χιλιαρχος throughout chapters xxii–xxiv of Acts). 13 l. ἀλλα ἀ. σωβτην [ὁ] fol. 109b line 1 begins μ πκαγ ετέθη πεειπλανος 2 ταν]θαν, prob nothing lost before it 3 the line begins with σβοοε and is complete, the last word is correct 4, 5 nothing lost at beginning 6 begins ἀν ουκε 7, 8, 9 nothing lost at beginning 9 l. νεει [τ]τιε[τε] 10 l. [τ]τραμφυ 1. τρεππλανα δε μμωτην [γιτ]τι? 11 l. [τ]τραμφυ 1. τρεππλανα δε μμωτην [γιτ]τι? 12 begins [τού]την κτια (there is no ν) 14 l. ἔξ 15 l. ἰρος [χ] 16 l. πτερ 17 l. ὑμε