GREEK BIBLICAL PAPYRI IN THE BEINECKE LIBRARY

During the course of the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library’s recent project to conserve and catalog the Yale Papyrus Collection,1 I conserved all four of the Greek biblical papyri that have been identified in the collection thus far: fragments of Genesis (P. Yale I 1), the Psalms (unpublished), Acts (P. Yale I 3), and Ephesians (P. Yale I 2 + II 86). As a result partly of the repair work (especially in the case of Ephesians), partly of reexamination of the letter traces (especially in the case of Genesis), it is possible to make significant improvements over the published editions.2 The improvements to the Genesis and Ephesians papyri warrant full republication of these texts here, while just a few notes suffice for the Acts papyrus. The fragment from the Psalms was identified only recently by Robert G. Babcock, who is preparing an edition (P. CtYBR inv. 3082, bearing Psalms 148:6-9 and 149:1-4).3 My notes on doubtful readings in the transcriptions below for the most part concern only passages where a text critical variant might be entailed.

1. P. Yale I 1 (P. CtYBR inv. 419; Rahlfs 814): Genesis 14:5-8, 14:12-15

The text of the Yale fragment of Genesis 14 has been published only once. As a result of misreadings in the editio princeps, the Göttingen edition of the Septuagint inadvertently misrepresents papyrus 814 (P. Yale I 1) more often than it gives the readings accurately.4 Some of these errors were due to inadequate regard for orthographic variation, which is more frequent in this text than the first editor noted: ει for τι (r. 2, 6, 7, 8; v. 1, 5, 7, 8; cf. also r. 5); ε for αι (v. 12); ο for ου (v. 6); ηχ for ηχ (v. 7). These orthographic features are left unaltered in the transcription below, where I also represent only the punctuation of the manuscript (note especially the use of a raised point after proper names [r. 2, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13; v. 7, 8], and an apostrophe attached to the horizontal stroke of a word-final τ [v. 8, additionally followed by a raised point]). On both recto and verso, there is no doubt about where the left margin falls, but my transcription reflects an assessment of the line breaks at r. 9-10 and v. 3-5 that differs from the editio princeps.

With regard to the physical description that was given in P. Yale I, I want only to add the observation that a single remaining piece of what is either a patch along the spine, or else a vertical kollesis, occurs along the inner margin of the leaf (the remaining piece is about 6 mm wide, adhering to the verso).5 If this is a kollesis, then the left-hand edge of the right-hand kollema (as viewed on the recto) either is lost on the wanting conjugate leaf or else coincides exactly with the broken left-hand edge of the surviving leaf, and the kollesis steps up from left to right, with a reversal of fiber direction (such that the fiber pattern of the wanting conjugate leaf would be →/↓, the same as the extant leaf).

---


2 I assume that the first person singular in the introductions to P. Yale I 1-3 refers to C. Bradford Welles, as the author of these editions. Susan A. Stephens added a fragment to P. Yale I 2 (P. Yale II 86).

3 The Beinecke collection of ancient Greek biblical manuscripts also includes two parchment items: P. Dura 10 (the Diatessaron fragment) and, in the library’s general manuscript collection, MS 544 (1 Sam 24:11-25:20, 31:12-13, and 2 Sam 1:1-2:4; recently edited by Benjamin G. Wright, "A Greek Fragment of the Books of Samuel: Beinecke Library MS 544 (Ra 846)", Textus: Studies of the Hebrew University Bible Project 17 [1994] 79-100).

4 John William Wevers, Genesis, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum, vol. 1 (Göttingen 1974) 160-64. Wevers’s variation units that are most significantly effected by my reedition of 814 are: Gen 14:5 Όμημιστος, 14:7 ἡλιθσαν and ἐπι, 14:8 ειδομον, 14:13 τον ἰναικοβεθντν τις κα άνεβησθο 2°.

5 See the photographs published by Welles, "The Yale Genesis Fragment", Yale University Library Gazette 39 (1964) 1-8, with two plates before p. 1 (recto and verso, as also in P. Yale I, pl. 1), and by Bruce M. Metzger, Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography (New York and Oxford 1981) 62-63 (no. 5; verso only, with a slightly altered reprint of the corresponding transcription from P. Yale I).
Given Welles's controversial early dating of the Yale Genesis to "ca. A.D. 90", it is interesting to note that the earliest recorded opinion as to the date, a memorandum from 1932 by William H.P. Hatch headed "Papyrus #419" and now kept in the Beinecke Library's "Papyrology File", placed the manuscript in the middle of the third century C.E. But Welles was not alone in thinking that the manuscript was much older: correspondence in the same file shows that Colin H. Roberts, E.G. Turner, and T.C. Skeat all initially dated the manuscript to the late first or early second century. Later, however, all three British paleographers moved the Yale Genesis down at least to the mid-second century, possibly into the third, thus challenging one of the bases for Welles's claim that P. Yale I 11 was "the earliest Christian fragment identified thus far."

Recto, Gen 14:5-8

→ 1 οἱ μὲν αὐτῷ καὶ κατεκώπῃ· τοὺς εἰς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς ομμαίον καὶ τοὺς εἰς

4 ἐσαὴ τῇ πολεί 6 καὶ τοὺς χορραιοῦν· τοὺς εἰς

tὸν ὀρεσίν ἡμεῖς εἰς τῇ τερεμίνθῳ·

πῦρν ὑπὲ· εἰς τὴν ἐρήμων 7 καὶ τοὺς εἰς

8 τῆς κρίσεως αὐτῇ εἰσεῖν καθὼς καὶ κατεκώπῃν πάντας τοὺς ἀρχόντας καὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ομμαίον καὶ τοὺς κυρίοντας εἰς ἀκαννάθαν γοργὰ. 8 ἐκξήλ

12 θεν καὶ βασιλεὺς σῶματοι καὶ βασιλεὺς απὸ

Verso, Gen 14:12-15

↓ 1 εἰς σώματι 13 παραγεγενομένος δὲ τις τῶν ἀνακατάλτων αὐτῆς

4 τοιαὶ πρὸς τὴν δροῦ τῇ μαμίβη τοῦ αὐτοῦ

8 θῆ λατ· ο ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ ἱερικῆς
tῶν ἰδίων ἱκανονεὶς αὐτῷ τῇ

12 τῶν καὶ οἱ πεθεῖς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπεπέθανεν

r. 1: Very ambiguous traces of about three letters survive near the beginning of the preceding line.

6 There is also an undated exhibition label in Austin M. Harmon's hand, probably likewise from the early 1930s, dating the manuscript "2d cent."

7 Roberts to Welles 11 November 1963, 30 December 1963 (reporting Turner's opinion), and 6 March 1964 (reporting Skeat's opinion). See also Welles, BASP 1 (1963) 25-26.

r. 2 καὶ τοῦτο: there is probably not enough space for καὶ τοῦτο.
r. 2-3 εἰς ἑλθών: line length argues against restoring εἰς ἑλθῶν ὅτε λέγει.
r. 4 εὐγη: εὐγη is also possible.
r. 5: τὴς is almost certain.
r. 6: Space for 1-2 letters is left blank after ἐρμη. I take what appears to be a raised point after α at the end of the line to be a part of υ in r. 5.
r. 7 ηλθῶν ἐπε: v cannot be read; ε is very ambiguous, but π is certain (not γ); hence ηλθῶν ε(π)τ (Welles) is excluded.
r. 11 αὐτῶν: the two letters ας are smudged; possibly α[ας]των was intended. Space for 2-3 letters is left blank after θεμαρ (surface imperfection).
r. 12: Space for 2-3 letters is left blank after σωσίδωμαν (same surface imperfection as in r. 11).

v. 1: Very ambiguous traces of a few letters survive from near the end of the preceding line.
v. 1-2: The eight certain letters that can be read in line 1, combined with limited alternative interpretations for some of the other letter traces, secure the restoration of this line. The occurrence of τεκ (i.e. τις) at the end of the line leads to the expectation that line 2 reads τον οὐκοθέντων αὐτη, and at the beginning of line 2 τω is almost certain (for τ, only γ is an alternative). The eight undeciphered traces are very ambiguous, but the first is probably from ο, possibly from δ (hence Welles’s reading of certain δε, although what he read as ι is far from certain). The final ν of οὐκοθέντων is almost certain, and there is not enough space for του between οὐκοθέντων and ὁμηρ. Hence either there is a textual variant in line 2 that is not otherwise attested (something interposed between τον and οὐκοθέντων), or there is a copying error of some sort (possibly corrected: the letters between τον and οὐκοθέντων are so damaged that it is impossible either to read them or to be sure that they were not intentionally effaced by the copyist or a corrector).

v. 3 οὐκοτο: neither οὐκοτο nor οὐκοτον can be read.

v. 4-5 ο οἱ[ο]ρει: ο is very ambiguous, but ο is likely (only δ or ζ are alternatives); at the end of line 4 οὐκοθεί[ο] is possible, but not ογο and so on.

v. 5 του αὐτοφιος: I assume that it is the tail of ρ in ἔρηπι (v. 4) that gives a false impression of a raised point after φ. The deteriorated condition of the papyrus gives a false impression of a raised point occurs after ἐκγαλ. καὶ αὐτοφιος: the traces αὐτοφιο are very ambiguous except for τ (which could only also be θ); hence there is not enough space for του after κατ.

v. 6 ουνον: ευγην cannot be read.

v. 8 λαμ: the horizontal stroke of τ has an attached apostrophe at the right-hand end (additionally followed by a raised point). At the end of the line, the superlinear stroke for the letter ν is certain.

v. 9 ιδιος: possibly a diaeresis occurs over the initial i. At the end of the line, the superlinear stroke that marks the number is certain.

v. 10 δε[ν]: possibly δεν–, with the superlinear stroke restored.

v. 12: Possibly the line ends έπιστα, with no text lost after these letters.

2. P. Yale I 2 + II 86 (P. CTYBR inv. 415; P49): Ephesians 4:16-29, 4:31-5:13 (see pl. II and III)

Plates II and III show Yale’s leaf from a papyrus codex of the Pauline epistles after conservation work undertaken in 1993; compare the photographs published along with the editio princeps by Welles and Hatch.9

The surviving dimensions of P. Yale I 2 + II 86 (P. CTYBR inv. 415, formerly P. Yale inv. 415 + 531; also known as P49 by New Testament textual critics) are now 204 x 146 mm (the dimensions given in P. Yale I involve a misprint). Accepting that five lines are wanting from the verso before v. 1, the written area on the leaf can be reconstructed as approximately 204 x 125 mm (and the dimensions of the leaf as a whole may be estimated at approximately 268 x 180 mm). A vertical kollesis occurs near the outer margin, stepping down from left to right. The right-hand edge of the left-hand kollesma (as viewed on the recto) occurs 20-25 mm in from the right-hand edge of the leaf (a little to the right of the textblock), and the kollesis itself is ca. 25 mm wide.

An interesting codicological feature is the occurrence along the one extant left margin (on the verso) of a series of short oblique strokes (like acute accents). These marks occur approximately every other line (v. 2, 6, 8, [11?], 13, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24), always just left of the textblock, but not always in exactly

---

9 *Harvard Theological Review* 51 (1958) 33-37, with two plates before p. 33. All subliteral dots were omitted from this edition for typographical expediency.
the same position relative to a line.¹⁰ The spacing between the marks varies, the intervals being 24, 20, [19], [16], 17, 16, 16, 12, and 15 mm (measured from top to bottom). Probably these marks are a kind of bounding line that served successfully to help the copyist keep the left margin fairly straight and vertical (at worst, the line of the margin moves very slightly to the right as it moves down the page).¹¹

The following orthographic variation occurs: i for ei (r. 8); et for ε (r. 21; v. 8, 11, 13; possibly also r. 20); α for ε (r. 11, 17, 19 [bis]; v. 4, 18, 21, probably also 14); e for α (r. 11; v. 9, 15, probably also 23); o for α (v. 19); λλ for λ (v. 22, 24). Probably other examples are lost in some of the lacunas, but I have restored only two such possible occurrences (v. 14, 23), where the lengths of the lacunas favor it. Note also the omission of v from the end of κλαινοντευμα in v. 13.

The manuscript displays five kinds of punctuation mark: (1) colon, which sometimes, as in r. 6, is placed high above the line of writing (possibly a secondary addition) or frames a word-final horizontal stroke, as in v. 5 and 17 (r. 3–8, 14, 17, 19, 20, 22–24; v. 1, 5, 7, 9, 14, 16, 17 [possibly bis], 23 [bis], possibly also 10; I have restored several colons in lacunas that are long enough to warrant hypothesizing their occurrence, in r. 1 and v. 18, 22); — (2) raised point; in v. 8 it divides cola; in r. 24 it marks a break before exceeding letters written below the end of the line at the bottom of a page; in v. 24, above the right-hand end of γ, a point marks a syllable division between γ and χ; but in v. 3 and 17 its function is not obvious;— (3) apostrophe (r. 9); — (4) diaeresis (regularly over word-initial υ [nine times; restored also in r. 12 and i [r. 23], and over i in word-initial ι [v. 15]; an exception is the nomen sacrum in r. 11); (5) rough breathing (once, over η in v. 7, Turner’s form I+|GMW p. 14; GMW² p. 11).

As was noted in P. Yale I, the nomina sacra are usually followed by a space about the width of one letter, and the superlinear stroke continues over this space (as also in PS 10). According to the previous editors, P⁴⁹ contains five unique textual variants (P. Yale I, pp. 11 and 14). But two of these readings are to be eliminated, as follows:

(1) Because the previous editors read the line break at r. 11-12 as [άπο]ψ[ε] [θε] [θε] [θε] (Eph 4:22), there did not seem to be space enough in the lacuna at the beginning of r. 12 for the expected υμώκς, the omission of which is not attested. But since the correct reading of the end of r. 11 is οποθεκθεθε (i.e. άποθέκθεθε θεος: infinitive, as in r. 14 and 15), υμώκς may be safely restored at the beginning of the next line.

(2) The reading άκεπτ[π τε]κεγκα (for άκε τεκαγκα) in v. 17 (Eph 5:8) resulted from a misinterpretation of the letter traces and a misapprehension of the distances between them.

Thus three unique variants certainly remain in P⁴⁹:

(1) omission of κε[ι before ο θεος in v. 2 (Eph 4:32);
(2) ο[κτίσ[ε]c in v. 15 (Eph 5:6), the reading of which is now even more certain as a result of repair to the papyrus (proper positioning of loose surface fibers); and
(3) omission of γαρ before κρυφή in v. 22 (Eph 5:12).

Also in this regard it should be noted that Welles’s statement (P. Yale I, p. 14) that “in v 20, I would now read ΧΩ with the manuscripts rather than ΚΩ” seems to entail confusion between v. 13 and v. 20.¹² The reading of κοι in v. 20 was never in doubt, and the reading of ΧΩ in v. 13 has been made indubitable by repair to the papyrus (mend of a break, and proper positioning of loose surface fibers).

Recto, Eph 4:16-29

→ 1 [ αυ]του εν αγαπην; 17 το]ν σου ουν λε[γω] [και μαρτυρουμεν ειν κω μηκετι ι[μας π]ε[ρι]η[δα]την 19 [καθαε και] τ[α]λα ειθην περισσει εν [ματαιοτητι του 10 The same phenomenon seems to occur in the New Testament papyrus fragment P⁶⁵ (PSI XIV 1373, which is thought to be from the same codex as P⁴⁹), although here the marks are points rather than short strokes (v. 1, 3, 6, 8, 10 [2], 12, 15, 17—if I am not deceived by black and white photographs).

¹¹ To my knowledge, the occurrence of such marks in papyrus manuscripts has been noted elsewhere only in a small number of rolls: see E.G. Turner, Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World (Oxford 1971) 5; 2d ed. of the same by P.J. Parsons, BICS Supplement, vol. 46 (London 1987) 4 with n. 7 (with additional examples); William A. Johnson, “The Literary Papyrus Roll: Formats and Conventions: An Analysis of the Evidence from Oxyrhynchus” (Ph.D. diss., Yale University 1992) 224–30 (with further additional examples, and a different interpretation of the phenomenon’s significance).

¹² Cf. the comments on Eph 5:5 (= v. 13) by Hatch and Welles (above n. 9) 34 and 37.
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4 [νοος] αυτον 18 εκκοτωμενοι τη δι(α)νοια: οντες
[καπη]λοτριωμενοι της ζωης του θου: δια την αγιοι
[αν τη]ν αυκαν εν αυτοις: δια την [η]πωσιν τη
[καρδια]ς αυτων: 19 οιτινες απηλ: κατε ιαστους
8 [παρεδσκοκα της ασελγεια: εις εργα[ειαν] ακαθαρ
[εμεθετε τον σω: ει γε αυτοι η[πωσιν] του και εν αυτω
[δροσον του] γθεισμενον κατα τα[ε] επιθυμιας τη
απατης 23 αν]ανευσθαι δε εν τω πν [ι το]υ νοος υμων: 24
[και ενδυκ]εθαι τον καινον ανθ[ρωπου τον κατα
16 [θυ κτι σεθεται εν δικαιοσυνη [ ]της αλη
[εκκατο]ς μετα του πληρουν αυτου του ειμεν αλληλων
[μελη]: 26 το]ργιζεθαι και μη αμαρται[ν]τοι ο θλιος
20 [μη επικαθεται επι παρο[ρ]ημω υμων: 27 μηδε
[διοθε] τοπον το διαβολο 28 ο κλεπτων μηκετε
[κλεπτετο]ς: μαλλον δε [κ]οσματω εργαζομενος
[τις χερε]ιν το αγαθον: ινα εχε μεταθετοι
τος υμων

Verso, Eph 4:31-5:13

---

χνοι χαρι[α]ξεις μενου] εαντωι[ες] καθος ο θε εν [χω εγα]
ρικετο ημι[αν] 5:1 γινεσθε ουν μιμηται του θου ως τε[κνα]

4 σγαστα 2 κα[ι] πε[ρι]πατεται εν σγαση καθως κα[ι]
ο [χω] ηγασηκειν ημιας και παρεδουκεν εαυτου [Ηπερ]
ημιο προσφορα]υ και θυσια του θου εις οσμην [ευω
διας: 3 πορνειας] ται και ακαθαρσια πας η ιελ[αν]

8 εξεια: μηδε ονο]ιαξεθαι εν υμιν [κι]αθοις π[ιεπει]
ου ανήκειν αλλα μι]πλω [ευχαριστια 5 τουτο γαρ]

12 πλευς]κες ο [ε]ε[ι]ν ειδικολατρει αυ[κ ει]
κληρονομεια εν [τι] σιελια του χω θου 6 μηδεις
[ιμας απατητο] και γαες] λογοις: δια ταυτα γ[αρ ερχε]
τε η ορη] ου του θου [επι] τους υιους της απεικο[σ]

16 οιν γινεθεις δι[με]τρουχι αυτων: 8 πτε γαρ π[οτε]
[εκ]τος νηδι] δε Φως εν καπως τεκνα πιθος πε
ριπατεθ[ε]ι: 9 ο γαρ κ]αρπος του φωτος εν πε[ε η εγα]
θοκυν και δ]ειξιαιοπυν και αληθεια 10 δοκιμ[α]
20 ζοντες τι ετ[ε]ν ευαρες τοις τω κα 11 και μη [ευ]
κοινονεται τοις εργοις τ[θ]ις ακαρποι μι τε[κτους]
μαλλον δε κει[α] ελλεγχετ[ε] 12 το κριψη γινο[μενα]
υπ αυτων: [ε]χρον εετιν και ληγειν: 13 τα [δε παν]
24 τα ελλεγχομενα υπο του φωτος φανερο[υται]

r. 1: The bottom of a round letter (like o) survives from near the middle of the preceding line, above πη.

r. 2: The ends of r. 1-2 are wanting because the upper surface of the kollesis has stripped away.

r. 3: There is not enough space to restore το λοιπον εθη.

r. 5: What might appear to be a colon at the end of the line is not ink.

r. 9 πλεογεισια: a few very ambiguous traces before γεζια might survive.

r. 10: A few very ambiguous traces before ϛοτον might survive. ϛοτονε appears to be rewritten over the same letters written more faintly.

r. 11: The traces through εετιθι are very ambiguous, but they do not favor restoring εδιδαχθητε rather than εδιδαχθη-
tαι.

r. 14: ev is partly obscured by surface discoloration, not an attempt at erasure.

r. 16 | ητε: there is not enough space for και οοτι ητε as expected. Haplography?

r. 17: Both the length of the initial lacuna and the letter traces after it strongly favor the reading δηθο. The traces of τεη are very ambiguous, but they do not favor reading τε.

r. 19: Only the lower point of the colon survives.

r. 20 παροργειμ: παροργειμ is also possible.

r. 23: Only the left-hand point of the diacresis survives.

v. 1: Only the upper point of the colon survives.

v. 2: The superlinear strokes over θε and χω do not survive.

v. 5 πημας: thus restored because of 3 πημαν (also 6 πημαν); MSS. vary between πημας and υπιμας.

v. 6: The trace of υ is out of position due to damage to the papyrus.

v. 9: Line length argues in favor of restoring η at the beginning of the final lacuna rather than και.

v. 10: Possibly a colon occurs after ανηκεν. A few very ambiguous traces after μαξελλον might survive.

v. 12 ο [εετιθι: not enough space for οε εετιθι]

v. 13 ηληροιμεναι: sc. ηληροιμεναι.

v. 14 και γουσε: the regular spelling κερνος does not fill the lacuna, which requires three or four letters.

v. 15 ητε: the superlinear stroke is certain.

v. 17: Possibly a colon occurs after εκοτος (with only the lower point surviving).

v. 18 τεπι: probably not τεπ.

v. 22 ελλεγχετ[ε]: it is possible that a raised point was written above γ (as in v. 24); ελλεγχετ[αι] is also possible.

v. 23 [ε]χρον: ατεχρον is not impossible, but the length of the lacuna does not favor it.

v. 24 φανερο[υται]: or φανερο[υνται].

3. P. Yale I 3 (P.CtYBR inv. 1543; P50): Acts 8:26-32, 10:26-31

In the case of the Yale Acts papyrus, I want only to draw attention to two misprints in the edition in P. Yale I:13

col. II.13 ἐνεντίον: the MS reads ἐνοντίον

col. III.14: the MS has εφη after κορνηλιος

New Haven   Stephen Emmel

---

13 Both passages were given correctly in the editio princeps by Carl H. Kraeling in *Quantulumque: Studies Presented to Kirsopp Lake*, edited by Robert P. Casey et al. (London etc. 1937) 165-66, with photographs of recto and verso on a plate facing p. 164.
Ephesians 4:31–5:13; The Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University