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PREFACE

In general, a doctoral thesis is tough reading and I am afraid this work is no exception. The reader will be confronted with long lists of readings and endless tables summarising extensive counts, all of which are presented in a prose that betrays the fact that the author is not a native English speaker. I do apologise for these flaws but gain some consolation from the notion that I never intended this work to fulfil any literary aspirations I might have. Rather, I have sought to make a contribution to the field of textual criticism of the Greek Bible, with a noticeable bias towards the New Testament side. I have aimed to present as much of the data as possible, which does not make for entertaining reading but does help the cause of verifiable scholarship. Despite checking, re-checking, and many rounds of corrections, it is almost inevitable that I will have made mistakes. I had to deal with a large amount of data and made many individual judgments on variants. Without doubt the reader will disagree with a number of my decisions. I do hope, though, that this will not affect the argument I try to make.

This study is a lightly revised version of the thesis I presented to the Faculty of Divinity in Cambridge in 2005. In the more than four years that it took to write the original thesis, many people have played a role in ensuring that it would be completed. Among them are, without doubt, my friends and fellow-labourers at Tyndale House. The warden, Dr. Bruce W. Winter, was instrumental in getting me to Cambridge in the first place, and throughout the years he has provided warm and welcome encouragement. Also the other members of staff at Tyndale House have been tremendous throughout my time with them and it is a privilege to have joined their ranks.

The Faculty of Divinity has been a most stimulating place to undertake the study of Codex Sinaiticus. It has a long-standing tradition of primary textual research which is still very much alive. Not only did the faculty take an active interest in my research by inviting me to read a paper to the Senior New Testament Seminar, but they also gave me plenty of opportunity to
connect with a number of leading experts in the field. I wish to thank Professor Graham Stanton for the role he has played in all this.

My supervisor, Dr. Peter Head, has been a tremendous inspiration through his advice, guidance, and knowledge of the field. I feel privileged to have worked under someone who took a sincere interest in the whole project from the beginning to the very end. My examiners, Professor David Parker and Professor J.K. Elliott, not only encouraged me to seek publication of my thesis, but also pointed out a fair number of possible improvements. I thank them for their support.

A special word of thanks is due to the Manuscript Department of the British Library. The Head of Medieval and Earlier Manuscripts, Dr. Scot McKendrick, ensured that during the writing of the thesis I gained access to the manuscript in order to verify information in Milne and Skeat’s *Scribes and Correctors* and to answer some of the questions raised in the course of my research. After the thesis was submitted for examination, but before it was accepted for publication, I had the privilege of being employed by the British Library as curator in the Codex Sinaiticus Digitisation Project. This longer exposure to the original manuscript lead me to change some of the details of the original doctoral thesis and also raised new questions which, I hope, will be answered during the course of the various studies undertaken in connection with the Digitisation Project. I am convinced that the present study will help others to see more in the manuscript, especially now that we can expect an exciting, new digital facsimile of *Sinaiticus*.

My church family at North Arbury Chapel, Cambridge, have surrounded me and my family with all their love, support, and prayers. They helped me balance the academic study of textual transmission and the practice of the Christian life. I thank them for giving me true Christian freedom.

I am blessed with a wonderful family. Without my children, Jonathan, Reuven, Hannah, Elisabeth, Joshua, and Sarah Grace, the writing of this work would have taken much longer. It is good to know that one’s harshest critics are those who love you most. My wife Marion has been a constant source of energy and I am grateful for having such a companion.

Tischendorf, whose name is intrinsically linked with *Codex Sinaiticus*, wrote the following words: “Providence has given to our age, in which attacks on Christianity are so common, the Sinaitic Bible, to be to us a full and clear light as to what is the real text of God’s Word written, and to assist us in defending the truth by establishing its authentic form.”

---

Tischendorf, I am not convinced that Codex Sinaiticus is a “full and clear light” in the textual criticism of the Greek Bible. Nevertheless, the manuscript does assist us in establishing the authentic form of Scripture. I am grateful to Him who is the God of Scripture for allowing me to play my own, minor, part in the study of that Book.

Dirk Jongkind

Autumn 2006
ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations have been avoided as much as possible, but when used they comply with The SBL Handbook of Style, edited by Patrick H. Alexander et al. (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999). Some frequently cited works are referenced by the following abbreviations:


INTRODUCTION

The following work contains a series of studies of the Codex Sinaiticus, further referred to as Sinaiticus. This name is used to describe all the parts of the Greek codex that are now preserved in four different places (London, Leipzig, St Petersburg, and St Catharine’s monastery on Mt Sinai), and of which the first published part was originally given the name Codex Friderico-Augustanus. Though I trust the results of this study will be sufficient justification for undertaking the project, some remarks on our aim may be in order. When, in the autumn of 2004, I told an eminent text critic that I was writing a thesis on Sinaiticus, her initial reaction was, “Is there anything left to study since Milne and Skeat’s work?” In the subsequent conversation I was able to explain what I was doing, but the response serves the point that a general feeling may exist that, since Milne and Skeat’s monograph of 1938, little remains to be done.

In this study we will focus on scribal behaviour. This broad term includes everything from the way the scribes prepared their writing material to the way in which they handled the text. Fortunately, Milne and Skeat have done much of the codicological and palaeographical work. In our study we will go one step further and use their results to form a better understanding of all the scribal activity present in Sinaiticus. Most of our studies limit themselves to the boundaries of the codex; we do not aim to undertake a large comparative study of the wider tradition or the contemporary manuscripts (one of the few exceptions is our study of the Eusebian apparatus in Chapter 3). No separate study was made of the bookhand that the scribes used, the biblical Majuscule; a thorough monograph has already been published on this subject by an expert palaeographer.1 Our stated aim also excludes the later history of the manuscript. What happened to the manuscript after the scribes finished working on it, such as the corrections made on the manuscript in later centuries and the controversy surrounding its so-called discovery by Constantin Tischendorf in the 19th century, lie beyond the boundary of our

---

1 G. Cavallo, Ricerche sulla Mainuscola Biblica (Firenze: Le Monnier, 1967).
study. For the sake of completeness, however, we have included discussions of the scribal hands of the so-called C correctors, who did their work only a few centuries after the manuscript was written. Their contributions must be subtracted from the current shape of the manuscript in order to arrive at the manuscript that left the hands of the scribes.

Most of the work for this study has made use of the facsimile editions of the Old and New Testament by Helen and Kirsopp Lake, supported by Tischendorf’s notes as published in his text editions of 1862 and 1863 and by the descriptions and lists contained in *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus*, by H.J.M. Milne and T.C. Skeat. Without the detailed description by Milne and Skeat this study would have been unthinkable; they are the giants on whose shoulders we stand.

To indicate a particular passage in the manuscript, a rather extensive means of referencing is used. A particular location is normally indicated as, e.g., Matt 22:29, folio 74.5 (NT 13), line 6.25. First the canonical reference is given, then the number of the quire (here quire 74) followed by the folio. Thus folio 74.5 means the fifth folio of quire 74. Between brackets the folio number of Lake’s facsimile is indicated, referring either to the Old Testament or New Testament volume. Thus, folio 13 of the New Testament is cited in the example above. Finally the column and line of the specific reference are given, where the column number is counted from the first column of the recto page. For text set in prose, this means that columns 1–4 are on the recto side, and 5–8 on the verso; in the books of the LXX that are set in the poetic layout, columns 1–2 are on the recto, 3–4 on the verso. In our example, line 6.25 indicates the 25th line of column 6, which is the second column on the verso side of the folio. Incidentally, when the reader comes across expressions such as 26.5 folios, they indicate the quantity of folios (here, 26 and a half) and not a combination of quires and folios.

In chapters 2–4, the reader will occasionally find text from *Sinaiticus* laid out according to the original line and paragraph division. However, one should realise that to a certain degree these texts have been edited: divisions between words have been added, some ligatures or contractions may have been resolved, and the crossbar “—”—indicating a final nu—may have been written out in full.

One final apology is necessary. In this study, reference is made to the scribes using the masculine pronoun: “he wrote”, “he made a mistake”, etc.

---

2 In accordance with Milne-Skeat, we use the quire numbering visible in the top right corner of the first page of each quire.
I am aware that this might give the impression that the author believes that the scribes were male. This is not the case; I simply do not know. There is literary evidence of female scribes in the earliest centuries. The masculine pronouns should be read in a generic rather than a gender-specific way.

---

3 Eusebius mentions young women in the ‘production team’ around Origen (*Hist. eccl.* 6.23.2).
1 HISTORY OF RESEARCH

PUBLICATION OF THE CODEX

Constantin von Tischendorf brought the first part of the codex to the West in January 1845 and published the 43 leaves the next year under the name of Codex Friderico-Augustanus.1 He remained vague about the origin of these leaves and did not mention that he had only been allowed to take part of what he had seen in St Catherine’s monastery at the foot of Mt Sinai. Apparently Tischendorf had only seen the prose sections of the OT, totalling 130 leaves, for he later tells us that he brought one third of the leaves to Leipzig.2 The Codex Friderico-Augustanus contains part of 1 Chronicles and the end of 2 Esdras, Esther and the beginning of Tobit, the last part of Jeremiah and the first part of Lamentations.3 During his first visit to Mt Sinai in 1844, Tischendorf also transcribed the folio containing the transition from Isaiah to Jeremiah, but he left this out of the 1846 publication. This transcription was only published after Tischendorf’s second visit of 1853,4 during which visit Tischendorf was not able to gain access to the manuscript and found only a fragment of a folio of Genesis.5 It is not impossible that Tischendorf was simply refused access to the manuscript as, between his first and second visit, the manuscript was in all

---

2 Tischendorf made first mention of this number in 1865 in a “Mémoire” read to the Royal Society of Literature. See I. Ševčenko, “New Documents on Tischendorf and the Codex Sinaiticus”, Scriptorium 18 (1964): 55 and n. 2.
3 Folio 35.1 (OT 4) – 37.3 (OT 22), and folio 47.1 (OT 96) – 49.8 (OT 119).
probability seen by the British Major MacDonald and certainly seen, and even studied, by the Russian archimandrite Porfiri Uspenski during his visits of 1845 and 1850. The latter discovered a loose fragment of a folio of Genesis and two fragments of a folio of Numbers, which were published by Tischendorf in 1865. Uspenski published part of the Genesis fragment and a part of the folio containing 1 Cor 13 in 1857. In this publication he revealed that the manuscript contained, besides the Greek Old and New Testament, also the letter of Barnabas in Greek. Apparently all the remains of the manuscript had been reunited between Tischendorf’s first visit and the visits of Uspenski. In 1859, during Tischendorf’s third visit to the Middle East, he obtained access to the manuscript and brought it to St Petersburg. A typeset semi-facsimile of the whole of the new discovery was published in 1862 in four parts; a less luxurious edition of the NT followed the next year.

The Russian scholar Beneshevich recovered a new fragment of the codex from the binding of a book at Mt Sinai and published it in his...

---


7 According to Beneshevich, Uspenski published the account of his journey of 1845 in 1856, which included a long description of Sinaiticus. The following year, the account of his journey of 1850 appeared (see below n. 10).


10 P. Porfiri, Vostok Khristianskii: Egipet i Sinai; bydy, ocherki, plany i nadpisi, 2 vols. (St Petersburg: 1857). The second volume contains the plates of which XV and XVI are a drawing of the passages of Sinaiticus. The 1 Corinthian 13 text covers 1 Cor 13:4–7, folio 82.4 (NT 73), line 3.18–32.

catalogue of manuscripts of St Catherine’s monastery. The fragment is a part of a folio of Judith, which was the only folio missing from an otherwise unbroken stretch of 116 completely preserved folios. A photographic facsimile of all the known text of *Sinaiticus* was published in 1911 and 1922 by Helen and Kirsopp Lake. In 1975, new parts of the codex were discovered in a previously blocked off room in the monastery. The 1999 catalogue of these finds contains photographs of two pages of Numbers. According to the description by Nikodopoulou, the new findings contain parts of Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Judges, and Hermas. Besides a brief description of the contents, these findings have not yet been published.

Tischendorf prefaced his 1862 edition with an introduction describing the physical and palaeographic attributes of the codex, which was taken over almost unchanged in the 1863 publication of the NT. In this introduction Tischendorf demonstrates the antiquity and importance of the codex but is especially interested in the text of the NT. Scrivener, in his “full collation” of *Codex Sinaiticus* of 1864, bases himself almost completely on Tischendorf and on the few pages published in facsimile. After Tischendorf, two other firsthand descriptions of the codex have been published: the introduction to the facsimile by Kirsopp Lake and, most important of all, the 1938 monograph by H.J.M. Milne and T.C. Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus*. In addition to the latter publication, the authors compiled a notebook in which all the corrections as listed in Tischendorf’s edition were checked and, if needed, corrected. This notebook, in Skeat’s handwriting, is signed off by both authors on

---

12 V.N. Beneshechiv, *Catalogus Codicum Manuscriptorum Graecorum qui in Monasterio Sanctae Catharinae in Monte Sina Asservantur* (St Petersburg: 1911 [reprint Hildesheim: Olms, 1965]). Beneshechiv went on three occasions to Mt Sinai (1907, 1908, 1911) but does not tell when or from which book he recovered the Judith fragment. Beneshechiv, *Manuscris Grecs*, 93–94.

13 From the section folio 34.8 (OT 3) – folio 49.8 (OT 119) only folio 38.8 (OT 35) was missing.


16 H.J.M. Milne and T.C. Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus* (London: British Museum, 1938). The study was made after the British Library acquired the manuscript in 1933.
December 14, 1939 and is kept in the British Library under Add. Ms. 78935 A.

The following table gives an overview of the modern locations of all the known parts of the codex:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Testament References</th>
<th>Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen 23:19–24:19; 24:25–24:46 (fragments)</td>
<td>St Petersburg, Russian National Library; Greek codex 2 and Greek codex 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev 20:27–22:30</td>
<td>Mt Sinai, St Catherine’s monastery; New collection, MG 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num 5:26–6:18; 6:22–7:20 (fragments)</td>
<td>St Petersburg, Russian National Library; Greek codex 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num 16:7–20:28; 23:22–26:2; Deut 3–4 (fragments); 28:68–30:16; Judg 4:7–11:2</td>
<td>Mt Sinai, St Catherine’s monastery; New collection, MG 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chr 9:27–11:22</td>
<td>London, British Library; Add. Ms. 43725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chr 11:22–19:17; 2 Esd 9:9–end; Esth; Tob 1:1–2:2</td>
<td>Leipzig, Universitäts-Bibliothek; Greek codex 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tob 2:2–end; Jdt 1:1–11:13</td>
<td>London, British Library; Add. Ms. 43725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Scribes and Correctors**

Tischendorf distinguishes four scribes working on the main text of *Sinaiticus*.¹⁷ Scribe A writes 1 Chronicles and 2 Esdras, 1 Maccabees and the last four folios of 4 Maccabees, the whole NT (except for six folios), and Barnabas. Scribe B writes the prophets and Hermas, scribe C the poetic books, and scribe D Tobit and Judith, the first half of 4 Maccabees, and in the NT, folios 74.2 (NT 10) and 74.7 (NT 15) in Matthew, 76.4 (NT 28) and 76.5 (NT 29) containing the ending of Mark and the opening of Luke, a folio in Thessalonians, 84.3 (NT 88), and in Hebrews, 84.6 (NT 91). Tischendorf does not know who writes most of the first column of Revelation but he notices a difference with the hand responsible for the rest of the book. A close similarity exists between scribes A and B, and between scribes C and D.

Scribe D must be the main corrector of the text who carries out the διορθωτις. Folio 82.4 (NT 73) provides evidence that some of the corrections were made before the addition of the titles: the title in the upper margin is moved to the left because of an already existing correction. On the pages by scribe D in the NT there is only one correction by corrector A, which must be the scribe himself. A corrector is able to use more than one

---

¹⁷ Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Sinaiticum*, xxi. Scrivener gives an English account of Tischendorf’s description which is followed from here on.
script, as is visible in the correction on folio 73.3 (NT 3), column 4. All the corrections are ascribed to one of the following correctors: A (contemporary, scribe D), B (described as a *vir doctus*), Ba (appearance somewhere in between A and B), and the series Ca, Ch, Cc, and Cc* (the last in Revelation only). Later and unimportant correction hands are D and E.

Scrivener contrasts Tischendorf’s view of four different scribes with Tregelles’s opinion that “he could not find such diversity in the writing as would necessarily lead one to refer the several portions to different scribes.” Scrivener adds that, on the basis of the published facsimile plates, he would not endorse the view that multiple scribes had worked on the manuscript. However, the peculiar omega with its raised central stroke, which does not occur in the facsimile pages of scribes C and D, occurs eight times in the two pages ascribed to B, and less often in scribe A’s section. Additionally, Scrivener notes that the leaves of the NT ascribed to D are much freer from itacisms than those on either side of them. Scrivener, tentatively, suggests that perhaps we have to reckon with only two scribes: A and B, and C and D combined. Ultimately, the whole question of the number of scribes does not make much difference to Scrivener; the whole work was clearly executed at the same time, and transcribed from the same older copy.

Scrivener accepts Tischendorf’s classification of the various corrector hands. In *Sinaiticus* the *prima manus* corrections are mostly recognizable by their in-line character (as opposed to later corrections, marked by erasure. The task of the διορθωτής was fulfilled by scribe D, designated corrector Aa by Tischendorf but sometimes simply called corrector A. Scrivener expresses some doubt regarding the consistency of Tischendorf’s classification of individual corrections when he remarks that the corrector who fixed an omission in 1 Cor 13 used four examples of the peculiar omega, which did not really look like scribe D. Scrivener, relying on Tischendorf, describes corrector A as a hand as elegant as that of the *prima manus*, mainly correcting omitted words throughout the NT, except in Revelation. Only 15 corrections exist by a corrector called A oblique, all in the Pauline corpus. This hand leans slightly to the right and is somewhat inferior to corrector A, both in elegance and date. Corrector B is a full age below corrector A (end of the sixth century) and this corrector is followed by Ba, who only worked on the early pages of Matthew. The various C

---

18 Scrivener, *Full Collation*, xvi.
19 *ibid.*, xviii.
20 *ibid.*, xix–xxv.
correctors (C, Cb, Cc, Cc*) are all placed around the seventh century and again Scrivener notes that Tischendorf may not have been entirely consistent in assigning corrections to individual hands of the C group: “In the Gospels and Apocalypse Tischendorf indicates C by Ca, by way of distinction, reserving C for a few cases, wherein, we presume, he is doubtful by which member of this class the change was made.”

In the introduction to the facsimile, Kirsopp Lake describes the various stages of work which occurred while the manuscript was still in the scriptorium:22 the writing of the text, the sub- and superscriptions, the tituli in Acts, the Eusebian canons, the stichoi numbering under the subscriptions to the letters of Paul, and the earliest corrections. Lake finds it difficult to distinguish between Tischendorf’s scribe A and B but accepts his judgement. The hand of scribe D is more characteristic. Lake sees the running titles in the NT as written by scribe D rather than scribe A, as Tischendorf thought, as they are also present on the folios by scribe D. Exceptions are the superscriptions in sections by scribe B, which are likely by the scribe himself. The actual form of scribe D’s superscriptions varies considerably. The subscriptions are written by the scribe of the main text, so that they are all by scribe A, except for Mark and 1 Thessalonians, which occur each on a folio written by scribe D. Also the subscription to John resembles A’s style much more than that of D, even though Tischendorf suspected that a different hand was at work in the last lines of the fourth Gospel. The hand which inserted the Eusebian apparatus is not assignable to any of the scriptorium hands and is therefore labelled by Lake as scribe E. The chapter divisions and tituli in Acts are all assigned to a corrector called A2. The stichoi in the Epistles are added in a small neat hand that is not identical with A2, but has more affinity with A4. Yet, Lake hesitates to equate these two as A4 looks “stiffer”; he therefore proposes a new scribe, “S”.23

Lake distinguishes more early correctors than Tischendorf. The A corrections are subdivided into the following types:24

A1 The uncial corrector A1 replaces the original writing with letters that are intended to resemble the erased ones as much as possible. As a

---

21 ibid., xxiii.
23 ibid., xxii.
24 Unfortunately, the only place where Lake discusses the issue of multiple early correctors is in the Introduction of the facsimile. There he gives one page with examples of each hand (plate III), but never goes so far as to give a systematic overview of all corrections.
rule, Tischendorf ascribes these to scribe D as sometimes the wedge sign is also added. But the inferiority of an erased surface makes it difficult to assign a hand with certainty.

A2 Corrections showing alternation of small and large letters were ascribed to scribe D by Tischendorf who argued this on the basis of the correction in Matt 5:45, in which both uncial and small letters are used. Though Lake is not totally convinced by this particular example, he sees elsewhere in the manuscript reason enough to ascribe the A2 corrections to scribe D.

A3 This corrector may or may not belong to the scriptorium. His corrections are marked by ligatures of $h$ and $n$ and an evenness in the size of the letters.

A4 The few corrections labelled A4 are characterised by an extreme neatness and regularity and may be slightly later than the scribes mentioned so far.

A5 This hand also made only a few corrections, which are marked by a very distinctive $\xi$.

Aherm This hand seems to have acted as the διορθωτής of Hermas only.

The corrections known as A oblique, B, and Ba, differ from the hands above in that they probably do not belong to the scriptorium but cannot be later than the fifth century, which is earlier than the date assigned by Scrivener.

A oblique An unimportant hand which made only a few casual alterations.

B He made frequent corrections on the first pages of Matthew and specifically on orthography and is therefore very interesting.

Ba The ink matches B, but the script A. It cannot be much later than the A group.

Regarding the identity of the various C correctors, Lake notes that the ink of the author of extensive notes appended to Esther and Ezra shows the same reddish ink as that of the NT Ca corrector, but he does not believe the hands to be identical.

Milne and Skeat looked afresh at the issue of the scribes and correctors of Sinaiticus and came up with a classification that partly supported Tischendorf but deviated considerably from the assessment by Lake.25 Their reinvestigation lead them to reduce Tischendorf’s four scribes to three, splitting up the poetic section originally attributed to scribe C.

---

among scribes D and A. The form of the ΚΑΙ-compendium (κ) and the occurrence of the filling mark, or diplē (δ) are the main distinguishing hallmarks, apart from the general appearance of the script. The three scribes (A, B, and D) have each their own peculiarities.

Scribe A starts to compress letters far back in the line, up to the sixth or seventh letter, and in poetic books even further back. Upright strokes in compressed letters are elongated, while rounded letters are very much diminished. He does not use the filling mark, and the oblique stroke of the ΚΑΙ-compendium makes an acute angle with the kappa.

Scribe B rarely compresses letters further than three letters from the line ending. He makes a moderate use of the filling sign (though twelve times on folio 46.8 [OT 95]) and the angle of the ΚΑΙ-compendium is slightly more blunted. His script is also characterised by the far-right position of the superlinear stroke, which denotes a nu at line endings. His spelling is very poor.

Scribe D uses compressed letters in much the same way as scribe A, but does not elongate the verticals. Also, he uses the filling mark more often than the other scribes and sometimes uses a double, or even triple version of it. The oblique stroke of the ΚΑΙ-compendium is rounded instead of acute. On the whole, his script is slightly smaller than that of the other two scribes and the size of the rounded letters as compared to the square letters is smaller. The first column of Revelation is assigned to this scribe.

Milne and Skeat corroborate their case for the identification of these three hands by pointing out that each of the scribes uses a specific coronis at the end of a book. Though the coronis of a scribe may vary from book to book, it will always display a similar basic pattern. “The coronis, in fact, amounts to his signature, so distinctive is the design (or designs) adopted by each and so restricted the range of individual variation.”26 In subsequent research the identification of the three hands by Milne and Skeat has been widely accepted.27

Milne and Skeat reassign also the various tituli, superscriptions and subscriptions among the three scribes. The result is summarised in the following table. The numbers in the column “Running Titles” refer to the pages in Lake’s facsimile.28 Roman type indicates those that were probably written at the same time as the text, italic type indicates those probably

---

26 Milne-Skeat, 27.
28 Taken from Milne-Skeat, 33–34.
added later, and the + symbol indicates those located in the centre of the upper margin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>book</th>
<th>scribe of text</th>
<th>superscription</th>
<th>running titles</th>
<th>subscription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen (fragment)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>B (?), A (4, 6), B (8, 10, 12, 14)</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num (fragment)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Esd (including the section of 1 Chr)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>A (8), B (24, 26)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esth</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tob</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B (24, 26), D (28)</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jdt</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Macc</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Macc</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>D (57 only)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lam</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel, Obad, Jonah, Nah, Hab, Zeph</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B (over Zechariah)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hag</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B (over Zechariah)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zech</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(cf. Haggai)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mal</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pss</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prov</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B (176, 182, 184, 186, 188), A (178, 180)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccl</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wis, Sir</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to be able to present the evidence of the numbered epistles, the last three columns are split in two as the numbering of the epistles preceded the addition of the words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>book</th>
<th>scribe</th>
<th>super-</th>
<th>running titles</th>
<th>subscription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of text</td>
<td>script</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D (69, 72, 73)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A (70, 71)</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal, Eph</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil, Col</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Thess</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Thess</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tim</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A (95), B (96)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tim</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus, Phlm</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pet</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Pet</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A (over 1 John)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 John</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(cf. 2 Peter)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 John, 3 John</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jude</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>book</th>
<th>scribe</th>
<th>super-</th>
<th>running titles</th>
<th>subscription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of text</td>
<td>script</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D (69, 72, 73)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A (70, 71)</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal, Eph</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil, Col</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Thess</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Thess</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tim</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A (95), B (96)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>..</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tim</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus, Phlm</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pet</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Pet</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A (over 1 John)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 John</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(cf. 2 Peter)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 John, 3 John</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jude</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to be able to present the evidence of the numbered epistles, the last three columns are split in two as the numbering of the epistles preceded the addition of the words.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>book</th>
<th>scribe</th>
<th>superscript</th>
<th>running titles</th>
<th>subscription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>No Wrd</td>
<td>Wrd No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnabas</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>... A</td>
<td>.. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermas</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>.. ..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Eusebian apparatus was not assigned to any of the scribes by Tischendorf or Lake, but Milne and Skeat distinguish the work of two scribes: scribe A writes the first 52 numbers in Matthew, scribe D all the remaining ones, retracing also the numbers initially written by scribe A. The writer of the *stichoi* in the subscriptions to the Pauline letters uses the same small script as in the headings of the epistles and is therefore likely to have been scribe A. On the folio containing the end of 1 Thessalonians (copied by scribe D), no *stichoi* number is found, which is concordant with the fact that they were added by scribe A and not by the scribe of the cancel-leaf (in this case, scribe D).

Besides the reassignment of the various scribal hands, Milne and Skeat also make a leap forward in the study of the various corrector hands. The A corrections are divided between corrections by scribes A and D, though Milne and Skeat are not always able to distinguish between the two. The larger corrections can be assigned on the basis of spelling, the shape of the arrow linking a correction in the upper or lower margin to the correct position in the text, the κοιτ-compendium, and the form of the letter ξ. All the A oblique corrections are assigned to scribe D, including those corrections where a mixture of an upright and oblique script is used. Hallmarks of scribe A are the arrow with the rounded head attached to the shaft, the κοιτ-compendium with the acute angle, and a fondness for ligatures. Scribe B only corrected his own work, which is not touched by any of the other scribes. The B and Ba corrections are also attributed to scribe A and D. The B corrections mainly occur on the first pages of Matthew and are to be seen as an abandoned project by scribe A to improve the quality of the codex. With the help of UV-light the problem of the last lines of the Gospel of John was solved. Initially the scribe finishes the gospel at the penultimate verse and places his *coronis* under the text. This *coronis* is afterwards erased, the final verse added and a new *coronis*.

---

30 Milne-Skeat, 40–44.
31 Milne-Skeat, 45.
32 Milne-Skeat, 12 and facing plate.
is inserted. All this is done by scribe A, who is also responsible for the remainder of the text. What Tischendorf thought was a different scribe turned out to be the same scribe writing over a large erasure, which does change the appearance of his script slightly.

Milne and Skeat believe that most corrections are simply made against the exemplar from which the text was copied, though a few indications exist that at least some corrections, present in the exemplar, have found their way into the text. In Isa 28:22, for example, the two variant readings οἱ ΔΕΣΜΟΙ οἱ ΩΦΕΛΑΜΟΙ are both in the text. Also Isa 24:7, where the scribe started Ο ΠΛΟΥΤΟΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΚ- (i.e. ΑΣΕΒΩΝ, reading of Q), but corrected the last word to ΑΠΑΝΤΩΝ, and Isa 29:11, where the text reads ΤΟΥΤΟΥΤΟ, corrected by Ca to ΤΑΥΤΑ, by Cb2 to ΤΟΥΤΟ.

The group of C correctors is increased by Milne and Skeat. The Ca corrector is identified along the same lines as Tischendorf had done, and C\textit{pamph} is also recognised in agreement with Lake. With regard to the Cb corrections, Milne and Skeat base their case primarily on the OT, as the Cb corrections in the NT are all by one hand. Milne and Skeat distinguish Cb1, Cb2, and Cb3, of which Cb2 is the one also active in the NT. Cb1 corrects 2 Esdras, Esther, Judith, 1 and 4 Maccabees, and a couple of places in the Prophets. Cb2 is found in the Gospels and in Genesis, Numbers, and the Prophets (except Jer and Lam). Cb3 is found in the Prophets only and seems to make no positive contribution to the text; he simply removes additions and substitutions by previous correctors and touches the spelling of the original text. Cc’s hand is rougher than the other C correctors and uses a blacker ink. He is responsible for the section numbering in Isaiah and makes a single correction, but mainly rewrites or retouches text by the original scribe or by Ca. In the NT he only works on the first two pages of Revelation and Barnabas. His supposed correction of John 13:26 rests on a misprint in Tischendorf. Cc* is only found in Revelation where he finishes the task of Cc.

In a review of *Scribes and Correctors*, Lake admits that he failed to note the change of hand between the first and second half of the Psalms but he has no doubt that Milne and Skeat are correct. However, he has still some doubts about whether the existence of a scribe C can be rejected. Concerning the identification of the scriptorium corrections with scribes A

---

33 Milne-Skeat, 46–50.
and D, Lake also has reservations. Not all corrections in the A group are in
the same script and though it is possible that scribes could use different
scripts, it is, to Lake, not the most likely option.35

DATE AND PROVENANCE

Tischendorf dates the manuscript firmly in the fourth century on the basis
of the titles of the Gospels (a simple kata ... instead of a more extended
title as euaggelion kata ...), the appearance of the script, and the contents of
the NT, which includes Barnabas and Hermas.36 He is followed in this
dating by the majority of subsequent scholars who give an opinion on this
matter.37 A point of discussion remains, however, as to whether Sinaiticus
could be part of Constantine’s order of 50 Bibles placed with Eusebius. If
so, this would lead to a date in the second quarter of the fourth century and
necessarily include Caesarea as the place of origin. The manuscript has also
been dated in the latter half of the century, and in that case, we would not
have a known context in which the manuscript was made.38

35 To a certain extent a similar disagreement is still reflected in NA27, p. 5,
where the \( \text{N}^1 \) corrections are dated ‘4. - 6. Jh.’ This group of corrections
presumably covers the A, B, and Ba corrections and is dated till up to two centuries
after completion of the manuscript, while Milne and Skeat assign all these
corrections to the original scribes.

36 Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Sinaiticum, xxix–xxxiii.

37 Dean Burgon sought to argue that Vaticanus was at least a full generation
earlier than Sinaiticus, but was succinctly refuted by Ezra Abbot, who showed that
most of the arguments used for an earlier dating of Vaticanus were false. J.W.
Burgon, The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to S. Mark Vindicated against
Recent Critical Objectors and Established (Oxford; London: James Parker and Co, 1871),
has a lengthy treatment on the date of Sinaiticus and prefers a date of 400 or
possibly a decade or so later. His only palaeographical argument is the resemblance
of the script with a dated inscription of AD 411. V.E. Gardthausen, Griechische
Palaeographie (Leipzig: Veit & Comp., 1911–13), II: 122–34. Thompson (An
Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912], 200)
dates Sinaiticus to the latter part of the fourth century, somewhat younger than
Vaticanus.

38 On Constantine’s order of 50 Bibles see Eusebius, de vita Constantini, IV, 36–
37. Athanasius tells in passing that he himself sent copies of the Holy Scriptures to
Constans (AD 341) but he does not inform us about the quantity of the order
(Athanasius, Apologia ad Constantium imperatorem, 4).