

STEPHEN EMMEL

GREEK BIBLICAL PAPYRI IN THE BEINECKE LIBRARY

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 112 (1996) 289–294

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## 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,<sup>1</sup> 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biblical papyri that have been identified in the collection thus far: fragments of Genesis (*P. Yale I 1*), the Psalms (unpublished), Acts (*P. Yale I 3*), and Ephesians (*P. Yale I 2 + II 86*).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.<sup>2</sup> 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).<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> Some of these errors were due to inadequate regard for orthographic variation, which is more frequent in this text than the first editor noted: εἰ for ι (r. 2, 6, 7, 8; v. 1, 5, 7, 8; cf. also r. 5); ε for αἰ (v. 12); ω for ο (v. 6); ηκχ 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).<sup>5</sup> 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).

<sup>1</sup> See Stephen Emmel, "Antiquity in Fragments: A Hundred Years of Collecting Papyri at Yale", *Yale University Library Gazette* 64 (1989) 56-57; idem, "Coptic Biblical Texts in the Beinecke Library", *Journal of Coptic Studies* 1 (1990) 13 n. 1; Gisela Noack, "Conservation of Yale's Papyrus Collection", *Book and Paper Group Annual* 5 (1986) 61-73.

<sup>2</sup> 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*).

<sup>3</sup> 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).

<sup>4</sup> 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 Ὀμμαίους, 14:7 ἤλθοσαν and ἐπί, 14:8 κωδομων, 14:13 τῶν ἀνακωθέντων τις and ἀδελφοῦ 2°.

<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> Later, however, all three British paleographers moved the Yale Genesis down at least to the mid-second century, possibly into the third,<sup>8</sup> thus challenging one of the bases for Welles's claim that *P. Yale I 1* was "the earliest Christian fragment identified thus far."

### Recto, Gen 14:5-8

→	1	οι μετ αυτου και κατεκοψ[α]ν τ[ου]ς γι[γαντας] τους εν ακταρωθ· καρναιν και εθνη εις χυ ρα αμα αυτοις και τους ομμαιους και τους εν
	4	ζαυη τη πολει <sup>6</sup> και τους χορραιους· τους εν τοις ορεινις χειρ εως της τερεμινθου· της φαραν η εκτειν εν τη ερημω <sup>7</sup> κα[ι] α να[ς] τρεψαντες ηλθον επει την πηγην
	8	της κρισεως αυτη εκτειν καδδισ και κατεκοψαν παντας τους αρχοντας α μαληκ· και τους αμορραιους τους κα τοικουντας εν ααααν θεμαρ· <sup>8</sup> ε[ξ]ηλ[ι]
	12	θεν δε βασιλευς σοδοδομων κ[αι] βασιλευς γομορρα· και βασιλευς α[δα]

### Verso, Gen 14:12-15

↓	1	εν σοδομοις <sup>13</sup> παραγενομενος δε τεις των ..... ανασωθεντων απηγ γειλεν αβραμ τω περατη αυτος δε κ[α] τωκει προς τη δρυι τη μαμβρη ο αμ[ο]
	4	ρεις του αδελφου εκωλ και αδελφ[ου] αυναν οι ησαν συνωμοται του αβρα[μ] <sup>14</sup> ακουσας δε αβραμ· οτει ηκχμαλωτευ θη λωτ· ο αδελφος αυτου ηρειθμησε
	8	τους ιδιους οικογενεις αυτου τη κ[αι] κατεδιωξεν οπιω αυ[τ]ων εως δα[ν] <sup>15</sup> κ[αι] επεπεσεν επ αυτους την νυκτα αυ τ[ο]ς και οι πεδες αυτου και επατα[ξεν]
	12	

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

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

<sup>7</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> Turner, *The Typology of the Early Codex* (Philadelphia 1977) 19, 94-95, 164 (his codex OT7); Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (London 1979) 13; Roberts and Skeat, *The Birth of the Codex* (London 1983) 40.

- r. 2 καρναυ: there is probably not enough space for καρναυμ.  
 r. 2-3 ειχχυ[ρ]α: line length argues against restoring ειχχυ[ροτε]ρα.  
 r. 4 αση: εση is also possible.  
 r. 5: της is almost certain.  
 r. 6: Space for 1-2 letters is left blank after ερημω. 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 ηλθον επει: υ cannot be read ς; ε is very ambiguous, but π is certain (not ν); hence ηλθον ε(π)ι (Welles) is excluded.  
 r. 11 ααααν: the two letters αα are smudged; possibly αα[αα]αν 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 κοδοδομων (same surface imperfection as in r. 11).  
 r. 13 α[δα]: possibly α[δαα].
- 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 τεια (i.e. τικ) at the end of the line leads to the expectation that line 2 reads των ανακωθεντων απηγ, 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 α, possibly from δ (hence Welles's reading of certain δε, although what he read as ε is far from certain). The final ν of ανακωθεντων is almost certain, and there is not enough space for τικ between ανακωθεντων and απηγ. Hence either there is a textual variant in line 2 that is not otherwise attested (something interposed between των and ανακωθεντων), or there is a copying error of some sort (possibly corrected: the letters between των and ανακωθεντων 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 αυτος: neither αυτου nor αυτων can be read.  
 v. 4-5 ο αμ[ο]ρεια: ο is very ambiguous, but α is likely (only δ or λ are alternatives); at the end of line 4 ομ[ο] is possible, but not ομο and so on.  
 v. 5 του αδελφου: I assume that it is the tail of ρ in δρωι (v. 4) that gives a false impression of a raised point after φ. The deteriorated condition of the papyrus gives a false impression that a raised point occurs after εκωλ.  
 και αδελφ[ου]: the traces αδελφ are very ambiguous except for ε (which could only also be θ); hence there is not enough space for του after και.  
 v. 6 αυναν: ευναν cannot be read.  
 v. 8 λωτ: 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 ιδιουα: possibly a diaeresis occurs over the initial ι. At the end of the line, the superlinear stroke that marks the number is certain.  
 v. 10 δα[v]: possibly δα-, with the superlinear stroke restored.  
 v. 12: Possibly the line ends επαα, with no text lost after these letters.

## 2. *P. Yale I 2 + II 86 (P. CtYBR inv. 415; P<sup>49</sup>): 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.<sup>9</sup>

The surviving dimensions of *P. Yale I 2 + II 86* (P. CtYBR inv. 415, formerly P. Yale inv. 415 + 531; also known as P<sup>49</sup> 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 kollema (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

<sup>9</sup> *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.<sup>10</sup> 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).<sup>11</sup>

The following orthographic variation occurs: ι for ει (r. 8); ει for ι (r. 21; v. 8, 11, 13; possibly also r. 20); αι for ε (r. 11, 17, 19 [*bis*]; v. 4, 18, 21, probably also 14); ε for αι (r. 11; v. 9, 15, probably also 23); ο for ω (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 ν from the end of κληρονομεια 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 thus in r. 12] and ι [r. 23], and over ι in word-initial υι [v. 15]; an exception is the *nomen sacramenti* in r. 11); (5) *rough breathing* (once, over η̃ in v. 7, Turner's form 1 [+]*GMAW* p. 14; *GMAW*<sup>2</sup> 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 super-linear stroke continues over this space (as also in P<sup>65</sup> v. 10).

According to the previous editors, P<sup>49</sup> 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 [ἀπ]οθελ[ι]cθαι (Eph 4:22), there did not seem to be space enough in the lacuna at the beginning of r. 12 for the expected ὑμᾶς, the omission of which is not attested. But since the correct reading of the end of r. 11 is ἀποθεσθε (i.e. ἀποθέσ-θαι: infinitive, as in r. 14 and 15), ὑμᾶς may be safely restored at the beginning of the next line.

(2) The reading ὡςπε[ρ] τέκνα (for ὡς τέκνα) 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 P<sup>49</sup>:

- (1) omission of καὶ before ὁ θεὸς in v. 2 (Eph 4:32);
- (2) ἀπιτίας 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 γὰρ before κρυφῆ̃ 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 XΩ with the manuscripts rather than KΩ" seems to entail confusion between v. 13 and v. 20.<sup>12</sup> The reading of κω̄ in v. 20 was never in doubt, and the reading of χ̄ῡ 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 [ αὐ]τοῦ ἐν ἀγαπῆ[ι]:<sup>17</sup> το]υτο οὖν λ[εγω]  
[καὶ μαρτυρο]μᾱ ἐν κω̄ μηκετι ὑ[μᾶς] π[ε]ρ[ι] π[α]τ[ε]ρ[ι]ν  
[καθως καὶ τ]ᾱ ε̄θνη περιπατει: ἐν [ματ]ᾱιο̄τητι του

<sup>10</sup> The same phenomenon seems to occur in the New Testament papyrus fragment P<sup>65</sup> (*PSI* XIV 1373, which is thought to be from the same codex as P<sup>49</sup>), although here the marks are points rather than short strokes (v. 1, 3, 6, 8, 10 [?], 12, 15, 17—if I am not deceived by black and white photographs).

<sup>11</sup> 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).

<sup>12</sup> Cf. the comments on Eph 5:5 (= v. 13) by Hatch and Welles (above n. 9) 34 and 37.



μαλλον δε κ[α]ι ελληγγελ[ε:]<sup>12</sup> τα κρυφη γινο[μενα]  
 ὑπο αυτων: [ε]χρον εκτιν και λεγειν: <sup>13</sup> τα [δε παν]  
 24 τα ελληγγχομενα ὑπο 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. αυ]του: the traces of ]του are very ambiguous. See also note on r. 2.  
 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 τα λοιπ]α εθνη.  
 r. 5: What might appear to be a colon at the end of the line is not ink.  
 r. 7 απηλ [κοτεc]: both απηλη]κοτεc and απηληπ]κοτεc are possible.  
 r. 9 πλεο]νεξια: a few very ambiguous traces before νεξια might survive. ουχ': or ουκ'.  
 r. 10: A few very ambiguous traces before αυτον might survive. αυτονη appears to be rewritten over the same letters written more faintly.  
 r. 11: The traces through ε]c]τι are very ambiguous, but they do not favor restoring εδιδαχθητε rather than εδιδαχθη-ται.  
 r. 14: εν is partly obscured by surface discoloration, not an attempt at erasure.  
 r. 16 [ . . . ]ητι: there is not enough space for [και οκιοτ]ητι as expected. Haplography?  
 r. 17: Both the length of the initial lacuna and the letter traces after it strongly favor the reading δ]ιο. The traces of τα are very ambiguous, but they do not favor reading τε.  
 r. 19: Only the lower point of the colon survives.  
 r. 20 παρο]ργ]ιμω: παρο]ργ]ειμω is also possible.  
 r. 23: Only the left-hand point of the diaeresis survives.  
 v. 1: Only the upper point of the colon survives.  
 v. 2: The superlinear strokes over θc and χ[ω do not survive.  
 v. 5 η]μαc: thus restoredc because of 3 ημ]iv (also 6 ημωv); MSS. vary between ημαc and υμαc.  
 v. 6: The trace of φ 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 μα]λλο]v might survive.  
 v. 12 ο [εc]τιν: not enough space for ο]c εc]τιν.  
 v. 13 κληρονομεια: sc. κληρονομειαν.  
 v. 14 [κα]γοιc: the regular spelling κenoic does not fill the lacuna, which requires three or four letters.  
 v. 15 θ]υ: the superlinear stroke is certain. απιc]ια]c: not απειθειαc as in other MSS; c is almost certain (paleographically it could also be ο).  
 v. 17: Possibly a colon occurs after cκοτοc (with only the lower point surviving).  
 v. 18 τα]t: probably not τε].  
 v. 22 ελληγγελ[ε:] it is possible that a raised point was written above γ (as in v. 24); ελληγγελ[αι] is also possible.  
 v. 23 [ε]χρον: [αι]χρον is not impossible, but the length of the lacuna does not favor it.  
 v. 24 φανερο[υται]: or φανερο]υται].

### 3. P. Yale I 3 (P.CtYBR inv. 1543; P<sup>50</sup>): 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*:<sup>13</sup>

- col. II.13 ενεντιον: the MS reads εναντιον  
 col. III.14: the MS has εφη after κορηλιoc

New Haven

Stephen Emmel

<sup>13</sup> Both passages were given correctly in the editio princeps by Carl H. Kraeling in *Quantulacumque: 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.



