A STUDY OF VON SODEN'S H-TEXT IN THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES

J. TIM GALLAGHER

Berrien Springs, Michigan

A great deal of text critical work has been done in the Gospels and Acts. By contrast, the rest of the NT text has been given inadequate attention. An example of this is the paucity of work done in the text of the Catholic Epistles. This neglect is evident with respect to the task of classifying manuscripts as to text type. Heretofore it seems that scholars have depended largely on the work of Hermann von Soden for determining the textual pedigree of manuscripts of these epistles.

As recently as 1943, J. M. Bover [1] seems to have accepted without criticism von Soden's classification of manuscripts of the Catholic Epistles. On the other hand, A. Merk, [2] who generally stays very close to von Soden, recognizes that some manuscripts seem to have been wrongly classified. He therefore shifts 323 and 1739 from the I^{b2}-text into the H-text group but makes no mention of the doubtful classification of other manuscripts such as P, that von Soden had classified as witnesses to the H-text. Eberhard Nestle [3] seems to follow essentially the same practice as Merk by moving 1739 from the I^{b2}-text to the H-text group and leaving P unchanged.

Von Soden's classification has lately come up for more scrutiny. Two studies recently carried on deal extensively

---

[1] J. M. Bover, *Novi Testamenti Biblia Graeca et Latina* (3d ed.; Madrid, 1943), pp. lxxiv-v.

[2] Augustinus Merk, *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine* (8th ed.; Rome, 1957), pp. 39-40.

[3] Eberhard Nestle, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, edited by Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland (25th ed.; Stuttgart, 1963), p. 15.

with most of the Catholic Epistles. These studies by S. Kubo [4] and M. M. Carder [5] have demonstrated the untrustworthiness of von Soden's classifications of certain H witnesses. Kubo's work in 1 Pe, 2 Pe, and Jude has shown P to have been misplaced by von Soden in classifying it with the H-text. At the same time, he is in agreement with Carder and others in changing the classification of 1739 from I^{b2}, von Soden's classification, and including it among the H-text group.

These studies, however, have not included Jas. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to see whether P and 1739 are correctly classified by von Soden in Jas or whether these two manuscripts need to be reclassified.

The method used in this study is a modification of the "Multiple Reading Method" as proposed by E. C. Colwell.[6] Colwell's method of establishing textual affinities involves the examination of the relationship of individual manuscripts to each other in places in the text where there are three or more variants. He contends that by restricting such a study to what he calls "units of variation" [7] which exhibit at least three variant readings, the distinctive characteristics of text types are more readily apparent. However, this could not be done in Jas because there were normally only two variants

[4] Sakae Kubo, "A Comparative Study of P[72] and Codex Vaticanus" (Ph. D. dissertation, Dept. of New Testament and Early Christian Literature, University of Chicago, 1964), pp. 253-291. Kubo's dissertation has been published without the above cited section. Kubo, *P[72] and the Codex Vaticanus*, "Studies and Documents," Vol. XXVII, ed. Jacob Geerlings (Salt Lake City, 1965).

[5] According to an abstract of Muriel M. Carder's Ph. D. dissertation "An Enquiry Into the Textual Transmission of the Catholic Epistles" (Toronto, 1968), sent to Kubo by the author June 26, 1968.

[6] E. C. Colwell, "Method of Locating a Newly-Discovered Manuscript Within the Manuscript Tradition of the Greek New Testament," *Studia Evangelica: Papers Presented to the International Congress on "The Four Gospels in 1957" Held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1957*, ed. Kurt Aland, *et al.* (Berlin, 1959), pp. 757-777.

[7] A unit of variation is that place in the text where there is a difference among manuscripts.

in each unit. This seems to be true, with very few exceptions, also in the Catholic Epistles generally.

In order to select the units of variation which were to be studied, an examination was made of several editions of the Greek NT which contain extensive critical apparatus. The editions used were those of Tischendorf, [8] Tregelles, [9] von Soden,[10] Merk,[11] and Nestle.[12] The units of variation which were to be used were chosen on the basis of the number of supporting manuscripts. The manuscripts considered significant in the selection of these units were the ones to be used in this study (see below). If three or more of these manuscripts were in agreement with a reading and this reading opposed another reading supported by the rest of the manuscripts, the unit containing these two readings was selected for examination in this study.

Insignificant details such as movable nu's were not included in these apparatus. Itacisms, however, were included among the first list of units of variation,[13] but later they were dropped because some of the collations that were used did not make note of them.

The application of this method for gathering units of variation for examination yielded 172 such units. Among the 172 units of variation there were only 15 which included three or more variant readings. This circumstance would prohibit the use of Colwell's Multiple Reading Method in this study.

Manuscripts were chosen which represented von Soden's various text types. Virtually the same manuscripts were used in this work as in Kubo's study.

[8] Constantinus Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, II (Leipzig, 1872), 248-272.

[9] Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, *The Greek New Testament, Edited from Ancient Authorities, with Their Various Readings in Full, and the Latin Version of Jerome* (London, 1857-1897), pp. 617-627.

[10] Hermann von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, II(Goettingen, 1913), 614-623.

[11] Merk, *op. cit.*, pp. 740-751.

[12] Nestle, *op. cit.*, 573-582.

[13] Tischendorf made quite a point of including these in his apparatus.

These are the manuscripts and their classifications by von Soden:[14]

H------B, ℵ, C, A, P, Ψ, 33	I^c1---1611, 1518
I^a1-----1874, 917	I^c2---614
I^a2-----623, 5	J-----K
I^a3-----920, 69	K----S, L
I^b1-----260, 1758	K^c---223, 479
I^b2-----1739 323, 440	K^r---201

Of these Kubo had collated manuscripts B, ℵ, C, Ψ, 1874, 917, 623, 5, 920, 69, 260, 323, 440, 1611, 614, S, and 201. [15] Manuscript 223 was collated in Clark's *Eight American Praxapostoloi*.[16] Scrivener's *Codex Augiensis* [17] included a collation of 479. The work of Lake and New, *Six Collations of New Testament Manuscripts*,[18] contained 1739. A collation of A was done by the writer.[19] Manuscripts 1758 and 1518 were cited quite fully in von Soden's critical apparatus.[20] The same was true of manuscripts K, L, and P, in Tischendorf's critical apparatus.[21] Manuscript 33 was included in the apparatus of both Tischendorf and Tregelles.[22]

After this selection of manuscripts was made, a chart was set up (see Appendix) with the manuscripts listed horizon-

[14] Von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, Vol. I, Part 3 (Goettingen, 1911), p. 1705.

[15] The writer is deeply indebted to Kubo for the use of these collations. Had it not been for this generosity on his part this study could not have been undertaken.

[16] Kenneth W. Clark, *Eight American Praxapostoloi* (Chicago, 1941), pp. 97-103.

[17] F. H. Scrivener, *An Exact Transcript of the Codex Augiensis* (Cambridge, 1859), pp. 454-457.

[18] Kirsopp Lake and Silva New (eds.), *Six Collations of New Testament Manuscripts*, "Harvard Theological Studies," Vol. XVII (Cambridge, Mass., 1932).

[19] *The Codex Alexandrinus (Royal Ms. I D V-VIII): In Reduced Photographic Facsimile, New Testament and Clementine Epistles* (London, 1909).

[20] Von Soden, *op. cit.*, II, 614-623.

[21] Tischendorf, *loc.cit.*

[22] Tregelles, *loc. cit.*

tally across the page and the units of variation down the page so that the reading of each manuscript could be charted. For each unit the reading of the *Textus Receptus* [23] is cited first with the manuscripts that agree with it. Next, the variant, or variants, were cited with their support.

Each manuscript was checked against each of the original 172 units of variation. However, Codex C, the only incomplete manuscript, has a lacuna beginning with ch. 4:2 and running through the rest of the book.

After the attestation of all the manuscripts had been recorded in each unit of variation it became apparent that many of the units show no significant family grouping. Instead of a grouping, many of the units show scattered and random variation of scribal idiosyncrasies or very limited agreement of only three or four scattered witnesses. This came as no surprise since every unit of variation which met the support requirement of three or more manuscripts was included in the chart. A unit of variation was occasionally chosen with only one or two manuscripts supporting one of the variant readings if the manuscript, or manuscripts, were important. It seemed better to include more than necessary in order to avoid missing an important unit.

The next step was to eliminate the units of variation that were of no use to this study. Since it is the H-text with which the study is concerned, the unit had to contain a distinctive H-text reading. It did not, at this point, have to be a unique H-text reading but it did need to be distinct from at least the majority of either the I-text or the K-text.

With this in mind the readings had to be chosen that could be called H-text readings. These readings include:

1. any reading supported by all the H-text manuscripts,

2. any reading supported by both B and ℵ,

3. any reading supported by B and at least two other H-text manuscripts,[24]

[23] The writer used the 1873 Oxford edition of the *Textus Receptus*.
[24] Manuscript P could not be considered an H-text witness at this

4. any reading supported by all the H-text witnesses, other than B, when they are united in agreement against B.

There is one exception to this fourth rule, this being the last unit on the chart (see Appendix) found in ch. 5:20. This reading follows the fourth rule except for the deviation of Ψ. However, as can be seen, there is almost no support outside the H-text for the reading of the majority of the H-text witnesses, a circumstance which suggests that this reading should be regarded as peculiar to the H-text.

The delimitation according to the principles just set forth reduces the body of usable evidence to 57 units of variation. These units together with their manuscript support are all included on the charts shown below in the Apendix.

In order that the conclusions of this study might be complete, another step was taken. An attempt was made to isolate from the 57 units of variation those units that contain unique H-text readings.[25] A unique H-text reading, as understood there, is one that is distinct from both the I-text and the K-text, being supported by the H-text group and receiving the support of no more than two manuscripts outside the H-text group.[26] There are 18 units [27] out of the 57 units of variation that contained unique H-text readings.[28]

point, since its classification is partially the purpose of this paper, and without it three manuscripts were half of the H-text group. Half of the group is enough, if B is included, to make an H-text reading, providing, of course, that this reading is distinct from the majority reading of either the I-text or the K-text.

[25] Colwell, *op. cit.*, p. 762.

[26] As was the case with P (see *supra*, n. 24), 1739 was considered as neither an I^{b2} nor an H-manuscript since it is one of the manuscripts being tested.

[27] These unique readings are marked on the chart in the Appendix with an asterisk.

[28] Von Soden notes six readings in Jas that he considered unique H-text readings. Five of these have been included in this study. These are found in ch. 1:19; 2:10; 3:3, 5 and have been distinguished on the chart in the Appendix by the use of an S next to the asterisk. The sixth reading used by von Soden is found in ch. 5:4. Here the T. R. reads εισεληλυθασιν and has support of every manuscript used except B, C, and P. B and P support εισεληλυθαν which is the reading

The phenomena of attestation exhibited in the 57 units of variation selected for analyzing have been set forth in

TABLE 1

AGREEMENT WITH H-TEXT READINGS

(The total possible number of agreements is 57)

Manuscript	Number of Agreements	Percentage of Agreement
B	53	93
ℵ	51	89
C	27 of 36	75
A	38	67
1739	36	63
Ψ	33	58
P	33	58
33	27	47
614	26	46
1518	26	46
206	25	44
1758	25	44
1611	24	42
623	20	35
5	17	30
323	12	21
K	11	19
440	10	18
479	9	16
69	8	14
917	6	11
201	5	9
920	4	7
L	4	7
1874	3	5
223	3	5
S	1	2

von Soden cites as a unique H-text reading. C is the sole suppport for εισεληλυθεν. It seemed impossible to include this unit of variation in the 57 units used for this study. Since P is one of the manuscripts being considered, its support could not be counted. This left εισεληλυθαν supported only by B and just one manuscript. The support of a witness as important as B, with the sole corroboration of one other manuscript, seems hardly enough to justify the use of the reading in this study.

Table 1 and the corresponding data for the eighteen readings unique to the H-text are displayed in Table 2. In these tables are listed the number of times each manuscript agrees with the H-text reading in each unit of variation. The percentage of this agreement is then computed with the total number of agreements possible (*i.e.*, either 57 in Table 1 or 18 in Table 2).

Tables 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 are explained in their headings and discussed in the conclusion.

TABLE 2

AGREEMENT WITH UNIQUE H-TEXT READINGS

(The total possible number of agreements is 18)

Manuscript	Number of Agreements	Percentage of Agreement
B	17	95
ℵ	16	89
C	14 of 16	88
A	10	56
1739	10	56
Ψ	6	33
33	6	33
P	5	28
623	2	11
323	2	11
5	1	6
206	1	6
1758	1	6
1518	1	6
K	1	6
479	1	6

The conclusions to this study can be drawn from the data shown in the first two tables. This paper is, however, primarily concerned with the classification of P and 1739. It can easily be seen that manuscript 1739 should be included among the H-text group. In fact, its agreement with the H-text readings is considerably stronger than that of Ψ, P, or 33, two of which have not been in question. However, it

appears from Table 1 that the classification of 33 could undergo some further scrutiny, since its inclusion in the H-text group on the basis of Table 1 alone would also justify the inclusion of manuscripts 614, 206, 1518, and possibly even more. Yet, it can be said from this table that P looks very much like a witness of the H-text group.

The second table seems to give a clearer picture of the H-text. It would be expected that B, ℵ, and C would show stronger affinities to each other than to the other manuscripts of this group. Scholars today generally accept these three as being the best Alexandrian witnesses. Beyond these three, the H group appears to be somewhat amorphous. This is pointed up in the decision of Westcott and Hort to make a separate group, the "Neutral" text, which contains primarily the readings of ℵ and B. Westcott and Hort then constructed the "Alexandrian" text from "a group which is less distinct."[29] One of the most "Neutral" members of this group is C.[30]

Table 2 shows that this is also true in Jas. B, ℵ, and C demonstrate strong bonds with each other, forming the nucleus of the H-text. 1739 appears to be as strong a member of this group as A, with which it shares the same percentage of agreement. Ψ, 33, and P seem weaker but still with a right to be classified as H-text witnesses.

To check these conclusions, Tables 3-7 were formulated. A comparison of Table 3 with Table 1 shows that 1739 does not exhibit as much agreement with the I^{b2}-text as it does with the H-text group (see Table 4). When the percentage of agreement of P with the other manuscripts in the control group is studied (see Table 5), it becomes apparent that the text of this uncial is somewhat mixed, displaying affinities with witnesses of both the H-text and the I-text. This mixture of relationship is further studied in Table 6. Here it can be

[29] J. Harold Greenlee, *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1964), p. 79.

[30] Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament* (2d ed.; New York, 1968), p. 133.

seen that the non-H-text element of P is quite mixed. Finally, Table 7 indicates the relationship of P to von Soden's K-text. It is significant to note that both P and 1739 maintain their position among the other H-text witnesses in their relationship to the K-text. While P displays a higher degree of affinity with the K readings than does 1739, neither manuscript contains a significant K-text element.

TABLE 3

AGREEMENT WITH I^{b2} READINGS

(Units in which 323 and 440 agree are used for tabulation. The total possible number of agreements is 37)

Manuscript	Number of Agreements	Percentage of Agreement
1874	35	95
917	35	95
S	35	95
L	34	92
201	34	92
920	33	89
69	33	89
223	33	89
479	32	87
K	30	81
5	26	70
623	24	65
1611	24	65
206	22	59
1758	22	59
614	22	59
1518	20	54
Ψ	19	51
P	18	46
33	16	43
1739	16	43
A	14	38
C	9 of 26	35
ℵ	5	14
B	4	11

Therefore, the conclusion must be that von Soden was wrong to exclude 1739 from the H-text of Jas. At the same

time he seems to have been correct in including P in this group. While P offers weak attestation to the H-text, it is quite certainly part of the H-text group in distinction to the other non-H manuscripts used in this study. A further conclusion in regard to P can be drawn by comparing this study with that done by Kubo. If Kubo is correct in saying that P is not an H-text manuscript in 1 Pe, 2 Pe, and Jude, then P must be a mixed text in the Catholic Epistles.

TABLE 4

THE RELATIVE AGREEMENT OF ALL OTHER MANUSCRIPTS WITH 1739

(The total possible number of agreements is 57)

Manuscript	Number of Agreements	Percentage of Agreement
C	24 of 36	67
P	37	65
ℵ	36	63
A	36	63
33	34	60
B	32	56
Ψ	32	56
323	31	54
614	29	51
1758	28	49
1518	28	49
623	25	44
5	25	44
1611	24	42
206	21	37
479	21	37
917	20	35
440	20	35
69	19	33
920	18	32
1874	17	30
S	17	30
L	17	30
K	16	28
201	16	28
223	15	26

TABLE 5

THE RELATIVE AGREEMENT OF ALL OTHER MANUSCRIPTS WITH P

(The total possible number of agreements is 57)

Manuscript	Number of Agreements	Percentage of Agreement	von Soden's Classification
1758	41	72	I^{b1}
623	37	65	I^{a2}
1518	37	65	I^{c1}
A	36	63	H
1739	36	63	
614	35	61	I^{c2}
33	33	58	H
5	33	58	I^{a2}
1611	33	58	I^{c1}
Ψ	32	56	H
206	32	56	I^{b1}
C	20 of 36	55	H
440	31	54	I^{b2}
B	29	51	H
ℵ	29	51	H
201	28	49	K^{r}
920	27	47	I^{a3}
69	27	47	I^{a3}
323	27	47	I^{b2}
479	27	47	K^{c}
K	26	46	J
917	25	44	I^{a1}
L	25	44	K
1874	24	42	I^{a1}
S	24	42	K
223	22	39	K^{c}

TABLE 6

AGREEMENT OF OTHER MANUSCRIPTS WITH P WHEN P IS IN OPPOSITION TO THE H-TEXT READING

(The total possible number of agreements is 24)

Manuscript	Number of Agreements	Percentage of Agreement	von Soden's Classification
920	23	96	I^{a3}
S	23	96	K
1874	22	92	I^{a1}
440	22	92	I^{b2}
L	22	92	K
917	21	88	I^{a1}
69	21	88	I^{a3}
223	21	88	K^c
479	21	88	K^c
623	20	83	I^{a2}
201	20	83	K^r
5	19	79	I^{a2}
K	19	79	J
1758	18	75	I^{b1}
323	18	75	I^{b2}
1611	16	68	I^{c1}
1518	16	68	I^{c1}
614	15	63	I^{c2}
33	14	58	H
206	14	58	I^{b1}
Ψ	11	46	H
1739	11	46	
A	10	42	H
C	6 of 18	33	H
ℵ	1	4	H

TABLE 7
AGREEMENT WITH K-TEXT READINGS
(The total possible number of agreements is 56)

Manuscript	Number of Agreements	Percentage of Agreement
S	55	98
223	55	98
920	53	95
L	52	93
201	52	93
1874	51	91
917	50	89
440	48	86
K	48	86
479	48	86
69	46	82
323	40	71
5	36	64
1611	33	59
623	31	55
206	30	54
1518	29	52
614	29	52
1758	28	50
33	23	41
P	22	39
Ψ	22	39
A	18	32
C	10 of 35	29
1739	16	29
B	6	11
ℵ	6	11

APPENDIX

Units of Variations in James Used in This Study

Passage	Variation Units	H							Ia1		Ia2		Ia3		Ib1		Ib2			Ic1		Ic2	J	K		Kc		Kr
		B	א	C	A	P	Ψ	33	1874	917	623	5	920	69	206	1758	1739	323	440	1611	1518	614	K	S	L	223	479	201
1:5	μη	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X		X	
	ουκ												X	X									X	X		X		X
1:12	κυριος			X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Θεος																X	X										
*	omitted	X	X		X		X								X													
1:18	αυτου	X							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
*	εαυτου		X	X	X	X	X	X									X											
1:19	ωστε					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
*	ιστε	X	X	X	X												X											
1:19	εστω				X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
	και εστω						X																				X	
*S	εστω δε	X	X	X		X											X											
1:20	ου κατεργαζεται			X		X		X							X		X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X
	ουκ εργαζεται	X	X		X		X		X	X	X	X				X					X							

VON SODEN'S H-TEXT

III

Passage	Variation Units	H							Ia1		Ia2		Ia3		Ib1		Ib2			Ic1		Ic2	J	K		Kc		Kr
		B	ℵ	C	A	P	Ψ	33	1874	917	623	5	920	69	206	1758	1739	323	440	1611	1518	614	K	S	L	223	479	102
1:25 *	ουτος (1)					X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	omitted	X	X	X	X			X									X	X										
1:26	εν υμιν								X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	omitted	X	X	X	X	X	X	X								X	X	X		X	X							
1:27	τω	X	X	X	X	X	X	X							X		X	X		X	X	X						
	omitted								X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X
2:2 *	την		X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
	omitted	X		X			X														X							
2:3	και επιβλεψητε		X		X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X
	επιβλεψητε δε	X		X		X	X								X		X			X	X	X						
2:3	αυτω					X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X
	omitted	X	X	X	X		X	X							X					X	X	X						
2:4	και (1)					X			X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X		X			X	X	X	X	X	
	omitted	X	X	X	X		X	X							X				X		X	X						X
2:5 *	του κοσμου				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	τω κοσμω	X	X	X													X											

Passage	Variation Units	H							I^{a1}		I^{a2}		I^{a3}		I^{b1}		I^{b2}			I^{c1}		I^{c2}	J	K		K^c		K^r
		B	ℵ	C	A	P	Ψ	33	1874	917	623	5	920	69	206	1758	1739	323	440	1611	1518	614	K	S	L	223	479	201
2:10 *S	τηρησει				X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X
	τηρηση	X	X	X																								
	τελεσει						X										X											
	πληρωσει					X									X	X				X	X	X						
2:10 *	πταισει					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	πταιση	X	X	X	X																							
2:13	ανιλεως				X				X	X	X	X			X	X		X	X	X		X			X			X
	ανελεος	X	X	X	X	X							X	X	X		X				X		X		X		X	
	ανηλεος						X																			X		
2:13	ελεος (2)	X	X		X	X	X		X		X		X		X	X					X					X		
	ελεον			X				X		X		X		X			X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		X
2:15	δε	X		X	X	X	X						X		X		X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	omitted		X					X	X	X	X	X		X		X		X	X									
2:15 *	ωσι				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
	omitted	X	X	X																		X						
2:17	εργη εχη								X	X			X				X	X			X					X	X	X
	εχη εργη	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X		X	X	X			X	X		X	X	X				

Pas-sage	Variation Units	H							Ia1		Ia2		Ia3		Ib1		Ib2			Ic1		Ic2	J	K		Kc		Kr
		B	ℵ	C	A	P	Ψ	33	1874	917	623	5	920	69	206	1758	1739	323	440	1611	1518	614	K	S	L	223	479	201
2:18	εκ						X	X	X	X		X	X			X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
	omitted					X					X																	
	χωρις	X	X	X	X										X		X					X						
2:18	σου			X					X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X
	omitted	X	X		X	X	X	X			X						X				X	X						
2:18	δειξω σοι			X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
	σοι δειξω	X	X					X						X	X							X						
2:24	τοινυν								X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
	omitted	X	X	X	X	X	X	X								X	X				X	X						
2:26	των			X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X
	omitted	X	X				X								X						X	X						
3:3 *S	προς				X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	εις	X	X	X		X											X											
3:4	σκληρων ανεμων				X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X						X	X	X	X	
	ανεμων σκληρων	X	X	X		X									X	X			X	X	X	X	X					X

Passage	Variation Units	H							Ia1		Ia2		Ia3		Ib1		Ib2			Ic1		Ic2	J	K		Kc		K'
		B	ℵ	C	A	P	Ψ	33	1874	917	623	5	920	69	206	1758	1739	323	440	1611	1518	614	K	S	L	223	479	201
3:4 *	αν			X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	omitted	X	X																									
	εαν										X	X																
3:4	βουληται			X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X
	βουλεται	X	X																						X	X		
	βουληθη							X																					
	βουλοιτο														X	X													
3:5 *S	μεγαλαυχει		X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	μεγαλα																											
	αυχει	X		X	X	X																						
3:5 *S	ολιγον								X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	ηλικον	X	X	X	X	X							X															
3:6	ουτως					X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X			X	X	X
	omitted	X	X	X	X												X		X					X	X			
3:9 *	θεον								X	X	X		X	X	X					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	κυριον	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X				X	X	X										
3:12 *	ουτως ουδεμια πηγη αλυκον και					X			X	X		X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	ουτε αλυκον	X	X	X	X		X	X			X						X	X										

Pas-sage	Variation Units	H							I^{a1}		I^{a2}		I^{a3}		I^{b1}		I^{b2}			I^{c1}		I^{c2}	J	K		K^c		K^r
		B	א	C	A	P	Ψ	33	1874	917	623	5	920	69	206	1758	1739	323	440	1611	1518	614	K	S	L	223	479	201
3:17	και (2)			X	X				X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	omitted	X	X			X	X	X			X	X								X								
4:4	μοιχοι και					X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
*	omitted	X	X	†	X		X										X											
4:4	αν				X		X	X	X	X			X	X		X		X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X
	εαν	X	X		X						X	X			X		X			X	X	X						
4:10	του κυριου								X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X							X	X	X
	του omitted	X	X		X	X	X	X							X	X				X	X	X	X					
	θεου																X											
4:11	και κρινων	X							X	X		X	X	X				X					X	X	X	X	X	X
	η κρινων		X		X	X	X	X							X	X	X		X	X	X	X						
	κρινων										X																	
4:12	νομοθετης + και								X	X			X								X		X	X	X	X		
	κριτης	X	X		X	X	X	X			X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X		X					X	X
4:12	ος κρινεις								X	X			X		X			X		X			X	X	X	X		X
	ο κρινων	X	X		X	X	X	X			X	X		X		X	X		X	X	X	X						
	κρινης																										X	

Passage	Variation Units	H							Ia1		Ia2		Ia3		Ib1		Ib2			Ic1		Ic2	J	K		Kc		Kr
		B	ℵ	C	A	P	Ψ	33	1874	917	623	5	920	69	206	1758	1739	323	440	1611	1518	614	K	S	L	223	479	201
4:13	και (ι) αυριον				X	X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	η αυριον	X	X				X	X									X	X										
4:13	πορευσωμεθα				X		X	X	X			X	X	X	X				X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X
	πορευσομεθα	X	X			X					X					X	X	X			X						X	
4:13	εμπορευσωμεθα						X	X	X				X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	εμπορευσομεθα	X	X		X	X						X				X	X	X										
4:13	κερδησωμεν				X		X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	κερδησομεν	X	X			X						X						X	X									
4:14	επειτα δε							X						X	X						X							
	επειτα και	X	X		X						X	X											X					
	επειτα δε και								X	X			X				X	X	X					X	X	X	X	
	δε omitted															X				X		X						X
4:15	ποιησωμεν						X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	ποιησομεν	X	X		X	X						X		X					X		X							

Passage	Variation Units	H							Ia1		Ia2		Ia3		Ib1		Ib2			Ic1		Ic2	J	K		Kc		Kr
		B	א	C	A	P	Ψ	33	1874	917	623	5	920	69	206	1758	1739	323	440	1611	1518	614	K	S	L	223	479	201
5:7	αυτω	X	X		X	X	X	X			X	X		X	X	X	X			X		X						
	αυτον								X	X			X					X			X		X	X	X	X	X	X
5:9	κατ αλληλων																											
	αδελφοι		X						X	X					X	X		X					X	X	X	X	X	X
	αδελφοι κατ αλληλων	X			X	X	X	X			X	X								X	X	X						
5:11	ειδετε	X	X							X					X				X	X		X	X			X	X	X
	ιδετε				X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X			X			X	X			
5:11	ο κυριος		X		X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X					X	X	X	X						
	omitted	X							X	X					X	X	X						X	X	X	X	X	X
5:12 *	εις υποκρισιν				X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
	υπο κρισιν	X	X					X									X										X	
5:16	εξομολο- γεισθε		X				X		X	X			X	X				X	X					X	X	X		X
	+ουν	X			X	X		X			X	X			X	X				X	X	X	X				X	
5:16	τα παρα- πτωματα								X	X			X	X				X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X
	τας αμαρτιας	X	X		X	X	X	X			X	X			X	X	X			X	X	X						

Passage	Variation Units	H							Ia1		Ia2		Ia3		Ib1		Ib2			Ic1		Ic2	J	K		Kc		Kr
		B	ℵ	C	A	P	Ψ	33	1874	917	623	5	920	69	206	1758	1739	323	440	1611	1518	614	K	S	L	223	479	201
5:19	αδελφοι							X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X				X			X	X	X	X	X
	+ μου	X	X		X	X		X			X						X		X			X	X	X	X			
5:20	ψυχην	X					X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	+ αυτου		X	X	X			X			X	X					X											

* = Asterisks indicate unique H-readings
S = Capital S indicates von Soden's unique H-readings
(1) = Numbers in parenthesis indicate first or second occurrence of the word or phrase in the passage referred to
† = From this point on there is a lacuna to the end of Jas in Manuscript C