

The Letter To The Hebrews

In the manuscripts and versions of the New Testament the position of the Letter to the Hebrews varies widely.¹ It follows (a) immediately after Romans in \mathfrak{P}^{46} 103 455 1961 1964 1977 1994 2104 2576 2685; (b) after 2 Corinthians in 1930 1978 1992 2000 2248 cop^{sa}; (c) after Galatians in an ancestor of codex Vaticanus;² (d) after Ephesians in 606; (e) after 2 Thessalonians in \aleph A B C H I K P 0150 0151 more than eighty minuscules (including 33 81 88 181 436 1739 1877 1881 1962 2127) cop^{bo} arm geo^{mss} eth^{mss}; (f) after Titus in 1311 2183 (so too the *πίναξ* [list] in 1521, but not the text); (g) after Philemon in D L Ψ 048 056 075 0142 most minuscules (including 104 326 330 451 614 629 630 1984 1985 2492 2495) it^d vg syr^{p, h} cop^{bomss} eth^{pp}. There are also the following sequences: (h)...Colossians, Philemon, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Philippians, *Hebrews*, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus in 2690 2739, and (i)...1 and 2 Corinthians,

Galatians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon, *Hebrews*, James, Romans, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Jude, 1 and 2 Peter, 1 John in 1241 (the manuscript breaks off with 1 John).

Most printed editions of the Greek New Testament have followed the traditional sequence represented by (g), with Hebrews at the end of the Pauline canon. Other editions, however, following the witnesses mentioned under (e), place it after Paul's Letters to churches and before his Letters to individuals. These include Lachmann (1831), Tregelles (1857–72), Tischendorf (1869–72), Westcott and Hort (1881), B. Weiss (1894–1900), J. M. S. Baljon (1898), and H. von Soden (1913).

1.3 τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, καθαρισμόν {B}

Although the reading δι' αὐτοῦ καθαρισμόν (\mathfrak{P}^{46} D^{gr} 236 263 2005 2127) may appear to be rather strongly supported, the weight of D^{gr} is considerably weakened when one takes into account the presence of a conflation in that manuscript (τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, δι' αὐτοῦ καθαρισμόν...).³ On the whole the Committee thought it more likely that δι' αὐτοῦ or δι' ἑαυτοῦ (D^c K L M 614 1739 *Byz Lect al*) was added in order to enhance the force of the middle voice of ποιησάμενος, than that the phrase was present originally and then omitted in good representatives of the Alexandrian text (\aleph A B 33 81) as well as in Western witnesses (it⁸¹ vg).

1.8 σου (2) {B}

Although the reading αὐτοῦ, which has early and good support (\mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph B), may seem to be preferable because it differs from the reading of the Old Testament passage that is being quoted ([Ps 45.7](#) [= LXX 44:7] σου), to which, on this point of view, presumably the mass of New Testament witnesses have been assimilated, a majority

of the Committee was more impressed (a) by the weight and variety of the external evidence supporting σου, and (b) by the internal difficulty of construing αὐτοῦ. Thus, if one reads αὐτοῦ the

words ὁ θεός must be taken, not as a vocative⁴ (an interpretation that is preferred by most exegetes), but as the subject (or predicate nominative),⁵ an interpretation that is generally regarded as highly improbable. Even if one assumes that καί, which is absent from the Hebrew and the Septuagint of the Psalm, was inserted by the author with the set purpose of making two separate quotations, with ver. [8a](#) in the second person and [8b](#) in the third person,⁶ the strangeness of the shift in persons is only slightly reduced.

[1.12](#) ἐλίξεις {A}

Instead of ἐλίξεις, which is supported by the great preponderance of witnesses, two manuscripts (N* D*) read ἀλλάξεις, (the preponderant reading of [Ps 101.27](#) LXX), subsequently altered by correctors to εἰλίξεις.

[1.12](#) ὡς ἱμάτιον καί {B}

The words ὡς ἱμάτιον, strongly supported by ℣⁴⁶ N A B (D*) 1739 (it^d) arm eth, appear to be original with the author of the Letter, who inserted them in his quotation from [Ps 102.26](#) to show that the metaphor of the garment is continued. The absence of the words from most witnesses is the result of conformation to the text of the Septuagint.

[2.7](#) αὐτόν (2) {B}

While external evidence may seem to favor the inclusion of καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου (N A C D* P Ψ

33 (81) 1739 it vg syr^{p, h with *} cop^{sa, bo, fay} arm eth *al*), the Committee was impressed by the probability that the longer reading may be the result of scribal enlargement of the quotation ([Ps 8.7](#)), and therefore preferred the shorter reading, supported by ℣⁴⁶ B D^c K L *al*.

[2.8](#) [αὐτῶ] (1) {C}

Although the preponderant weight of external evidence might be thought to support αὐτῶ without question, the fact that the earliest Greek witnesses (℣⁴⁶ B), with support from several early versions, lack the word led the Committee to have some doubt as to whether αὐτῶ belongs in the text, and therefore it was decided to print the word enclosed within square brackets.

[2.9](#) χάριτι θεοῦ {A}

Instead of χάριτι θεοῦ, which is very strongly supported by good representatives of both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text ℣⁴⁶ N A B C D 33 81 330 614 it vg cop^{sa, bo, fay} *al*), a rather large number of Fathers, both Eastern and Western, as well as 0121b 424^c 1739* vg^{ms} syr^{pmss}, read χωρὶς θεοῦ. The latter reading appears to have arisen either through a scribal lapse, misreading χάριτι as χωρίς, or, more probably, as a marginal gloss (suggested by [1 Cor 15.27](#)) to explain that “everything” in ver. [8](#) does not include God; this gloss, being erroneously regarded by a later transcriber as a correction of χάριτι θεοῦ, was introduced into the text of ver. [9](#).

[3.2](#) [ὅλω] {C}

Both external evidence and transcriptional probabilities are singularly difficult to evaluate. On the one hand, ὅλω is read by a wide variety of text-types, but is suspect as having been conformed to the text of ver. 5 and/or of [Nu 12.17](#) LXX. On the other hand, several early and excellent witnesses (℣¹³ ℣^{46vid} B, joined by cop^{sa, bo, fay} a) lack ὅλω, but the omission may be a deliberate (Alexandrian?) emendation, introduced in order to render the Old Testament quotation more appropriate to the argument (in ver. 2 “whole” disturbs the parallelism between Moses and Jesus). In the face of such a balance

Page 595

of possibilities, a majority of the Committee thought it best to include ὅλω in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets in order to express doubt whether it belongs there.

[3.6](#) οὖ {A}

The reading ὅς, which appears to be predominantly Western in character (℣⁴⁶ D* 0121b 88 424^c 1739 it^{ar, b, d} vg Lucifer Ambrose), is probably a scribal modification of οὖ, introduced perhaps for the sake of logical exactitude (Christians are God’s house, not Christ’s house). The reading οὖ is more than sufficiently supported by early and diversified witnesses (℣^{13vid} ℣ A B C D^c I K P Ψ 33 81 it^v syr^{p, h, pal} cop^{sa, bo} arm).

[3.6](#) κατάσχωμεν {B}

After ἐλπίδος the Textus Receptus adds μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν, with ℣ A C D K P 33 81 629 1739 it vg a). It is probable, however, that the phrase is an interpolation from ver. 14, especially since not βεβαίαν but βέβαλιον is the gender that one would have expected the author to use, qualifying the nearer substantive τὸ καύχημα.

[4.2](#) συγκεκερασμένους {B}

Among the bewildering variety of readings preserved among the manuscripts (conveniently represented in the apparatus by the use of parentheses), the one that best explains the origin of the others is συγκεκερασμένους. Supported by early and diverse testimony representing both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text (℣^{13, 46} A B C D^{gr} Ψ (33) 81 1739 a), as the more difficult reading it would naturally have been altered to the easier nominative singular (℣ 57 (102) (it^d) syr^p cop^{sa} Ephraem Lucifer a).

[4.3](#) εἰσερχόμεθα γάρ {A}

Among the connectives γάρ is to be preferred both because of early and good external evidence (℣^{13, 46} B D K P Ψ 33 614 it vg syr^h cop^{sa} eth) and because it suits the context. The reading οὖν (℣ A C

Page 596

0121b 81 1739 cop^{bo}), which is considerably less vigorous, was suggested by οὖν in verses [1](#), [11](#), [14](#), and [16](#), which, however, are not parallel, for here οὖν seems to have a resumptive sense (“well then”). The colorless δέ (syr^p arm) probably represents a mere translational variant. The hortatory subjunctive, εἰσερχώμεθα, which is quite inappropriate with the following οἱ πιστεύσαντες, arose as a secondary development in connection with the misinterpretation that produced οὖν (A C *a*).

[4.3](#) [τήν] {C}

The balance between the weight of evidence for and against the presence of τήν led the Committee to decide to retain the word but to enclose it within square brackets.

[5.12](#) τινά {C}

The Textus Receptus reads the interrogative τίνα (hence AV renders, “ye have need that one teach you again which [τίνα] be the first principles of the oracles of God”), with B^c D^c K 88 614 *Byz Lect al*. Since the earliest manuscripts are without accent marks, editors must decide on the basis of context which is the more appropriate form; here the Committee felt that the indefinite pronoun (τινά) gives a sharper antithesis to εἶναι διδάσκαλοι in the preceding clause.

[6.2](#) διδαχῆς {A}

Although the reading διδαχήν, which is in apposition with θεμέλιον of ver. [1](#), is early (ℱ⁴⁶ B it^d), a majority of the Committee regarded it as a stylistic improvement introduced in order to avoid so many genitives. The reading διδαχῆς is strongly supported by good representatives of all the major types of text (ℵ A C D^{gr} I K P 33 81 614 1739 *Byz Lect al*).

[6.3](#) ποιήσομεν {A}

The future tense ποιήσομεν is to be preferred on the basis of (a) the weight of external evidence (ℱ⁴⁶ ℵ B I^{vid} 33 88 614 1739 it^{ar, b, d}

vg syr^{p, h} cop^{sa, bo, fay} *a*) as well as (b) its congruence with the following clause, “if God permits” (which is more appropriate with the future tense than with the exhortation “let us do this”). The reading ποιήσωμεν (A C D^{gr} P Ψ 81 *a*), if it is not merely the result of an orthographic confusion between ο and ω, probably arose from mechanical conformation with φερώμεθα in ver. [1](#).

[7.21](#) εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα {A}

On the one hand, the omission of the phrase κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισέδεκ could be explained if the eye of the scribe wandered from κατὰ to the κατὰ that follows Μελχισέδεκ. On the other hand, many scribes would have felt the temptation to add the phrase here (from ver. [17](#)). The Committee judged that the second possibility was much the stronger.⁷

[8.8](#) αὐτούς {B}

The variation between αὐτούς (ℵ* A D* I K P Ψ 33 81 it vg cop^{sa, bo, fay} *al*) and αὐτοῖς (℥⁴⁶ ℵ^c B D^c 614 1739 *Byz Lect al*) makes very little difference in sense, though the latter may be construed with either μεμφόμενος or λέγει. Observing the direction in which scribal corrections moved, a majority of the Committee preferred the reading αὐτούς.

[8.11](#) πολίτην {A}

Instead of πολίτην, which is strongly supported by ℥⁴⁶ ℵ A B D K L most minuscules it^d syr^{p, h} cop^{sa, bo, fay} *arm al*, the Textus Receptus substitutes the more commonplace πλησίον, with P several minuscules (including 81) it^{ar, b, comp} vg syr^{hmg} *eth al*.

[9.1](#) [καί] {C}

The evidence, evenly balanced for and against the presence of καί (it is read by ℵ A D *al*; it is lacking in ℥^{46vid} B 1739 *al*), is represented

Page 598

by the Committee in retaining the word but enclosing it within square brackets.

[9.2](#) ἄρτων

After ἄρτων several witnesses (B cop^{fay} eth^{ro}) add καὶ τὸ χρυσοῦν θυμιατήριον, and in ver. 4, instead of χρυσοῦν ἔχουσα θυμιατήριον καί, the same witnesses read only ἔχουσα. The transposition was obviously made in order to remove the difficulty concerning the author's statement regarding the location of the golden altar of incense in the tabernacle.

[9.10](#) βαπτισμοῖς, δικαιώματα {A}

The reading that best explains the origin of the other readings is βαπτισμοῖς, δικαιώματα, which is supported by early and good witnesses (including ℥⁴⁶ ℵ* A I P 33 81 1739 syr^p cop^{sa, bo, fay vid} Origen). It is more probable that, in view of the preceding datives, δικαιώματα was changed into δικαιώμασιν, and joined to them by means of καί, than that καὶ δικαιώμασιν, if it were original, was altered, on account of the concluding word ἐπικείμενα, into δικαιώματα. The singular number δικαίωμα (D* it^d) is a mere scribal oversight, and the reading βαπτισμοῖς καὶ δικαιώματα (ℵ^c B 451 2492), which has the appearance of being a conflation, provides no satisfactory sense.

[9.11](#) γενομένων {B}

Although both readings are well supported, on the whole γενομένων appears to have superior attestation on the score of age and diversity of text type ((℥⁴⁶) B D* 1739 it^d syr^{p, h, pal} Origen *al*). The presence of the expression τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν in [10.1](#), where the text is firm, seems to have influenced copyists here.

[9.14](#) αἰωνίου {A}

It was no doubt to be expected that, confronted with the rather unexpected phrase πνεύματος αἰωνίου, copyists would replace the

Page 599

adjective with ἁγίου, but there was no reason for their replacing ἁγίου with αἰωνίου.

9.14 ἡμῶν {C}

The external evidence for the two readings ἡμῶν (A D* K P 1739* *a*) and ὑμῶν (ℵ D^c 33 81 1739^c *a*) is rather evenly balanced. The former was preferred because the author uses the direct address only in the hortatory sections of his Epistle.

9.17 μήποτε {A}

Instead of μήποτε, three Greek manuscripts (ℵ* D* 075* ^{vid}) read μὴ τότε, which then requires the reader to understand the sentence as a question (“... since it is not in force as long as the one who made it is alive, is it?”). In all three manuscripts, a later hand has changed τότε to ποτε.

9.19 μόσχων [καὶ τῶν τράγων] {C}

Although the text without καὶ τῶν τράγων is supported by an impressive combination of witnesses (℥⁴⁶ ℵ^c K L Ψ 181 1241 1739 syr^{p, h, pal} Origen), a majority of the Committee thought it probable that the words had been omitted either accidentally (through homoeoteleuton) or deliberately (to conform the statement to [Ex 24.5](#)). Since, however, it is possible that the shorter reading may have been expanded by copyists in imitation of ver. 12 διὰ αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων (the sequence of which has influenced the reading of D 365 in the present passage), it was decided to enclose the words within square brackets in order to indicate a certain doubt that they belong there.

10.1 οὐκ αὐτήν {A}

The substitution of καί for οὐκ αὐτήν in the earliest known copy of the Epistle (℥⁴⁶) has produced an interesting reading, but one that certainly cannot be original, for the construction of the sentence

Page 600

implies a contrast between εἰκῶν and σκιά. The other readings, supported by individual minuscule manuscripts and the Armenian version, are scribal (or translational) idiosyncrasies.

10.1 δύνανται {B}

Although the reading δύνανται (ℵ A C D^b P 33 81 *a*) is strongly supported, it appears to have been introduced by copyists who were influenced by προσφέρουσιν. After some hesitation, partly because of the presence of other variant readings in the same verse, the Committee preferred δύνανται, which is supported by ℥⁴⁶ D*^c H K Ψ^{vid} 1739 *a*.

10.9 ποιῆσαι

After ποιῆσαι the Textus Receptus adds ὁ θεός, with **ℵ**^c L* 81 104 206 462 489 913 919 1739 2127 vg syr^{p, h with *} *al*. This addition, which is clearly a secondary assimilation to ver. [7](#) and/or to the Septuagint text of [Ps 39.9](#), is absent from **ⲓ**^{13, 46} **ℵ*** A C D K P 5 33 383 467 623 794 1319 2004 it^d syr^{htxt} cop^{sa, bo, fay} *eth*.

10.11 ἱερεύς {A}

The reading ἀρχιερεύς (A C P 88 614 syr^{p, h with *} cop^{sa, fay} *arm eth*) appears to be a correction introduced by copyists who recalled [5.1](#) or [8.3](#). In any case, the reading ἱερεύς is well supported by early and diverse witnesses (**ⲓ**^{13, 46} **ℵ** D K Ψ 33 81 1739 it vg syr^h cop^{bo} Ephraem Chrysostom *al*).

10.34 δεσμίοις {B}

The reading that best explains the origin of the others is δεσμίοις, which is supported by good representatives of both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text, as well as by several Eastern witnesses (A D^{gr}* 33 (81) 1739 it^{ar, b} vg syr^{p, h, pal} cop^{sa, bo} *arm Ephraem al*). Through transcriptional oversight the first iota was omitted, resulting in the reading δεσμοίς (**ⲓ**⁴⁶ Ψ 104 Origen). Then, in order to improve the sense, copyists added a personal pronoun, either αὐτῶν

Page 601

it^{d, (r), z}), referring to those mentioned in ver. [33b](#), or μου (**ℵ** D^c K P 88 614 *Byz Lect al*), in imitation of the statements in [Php 1.7](#), [13](#), [14](#), [17](#); [Col 4.18](#). The reading adopted for the text is confirmed by [13.3](#).

10.34 ἑαυτούς {A}

The reading ἑαυτούς, which is strongly attested by such Alexandrian and Western witnesses as **ⲓ**^{13, 46} **ℵ** A H Ψ 33 81 1739 it vg *al*, was first altered to the dative ἑαυτοῖς (D^{gr} K 614 *Byz Lect al*), and this in turn was strengthened by prefixing ἐν (1 467 489 1881 *al*). By a curious oversight the pronoun is omitted entirely in P and perhaps in the original of cop^{sa, bo}.

10.38 δίκαιός μου ἐκ πίστεως {B}

Influenced by the citation of the same Old Testament quotation in [Ro 1.17](#) and [Ga 3.11](#), where Paul omits the personal pronoun μου, **ⲓ**¹³ and the majority of later witnesses (D^c H^c K P Ψ 81 614 *Byz Lect*), followed by the Textus Receptus, omit the word here. But it undoubtedly belongs in the text, being strongly supported by early and reliable witnesses. The only question, however, is where it belongs, some (**ⲓ**⁴⁶ **ℵ** A H* 33^{vid} 257 383 1175 1739 1831 1875 it^{ar, comp, r} vg cop^{sa} *arm Clement al*) placing it after δίκαιος, and others (D* 1518 1611 it^d syr^{p, h} Eusebius) placing it after πίστεως. (The same kind of variation occurs in the manuscripts of the Septuagint of [Hab 2.4](#), where πίστεώς μου is read by **ℵ** B Q W* [W is the Freer papyrus dating from the third century; W^c deletes μου], whereas A and the minuscules of the Catena magna read δίκαιός μου.) In view of the strong external support, the Committee preferred the reading δίκαιός μου.

11.1 ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων {A}

The scribe of \mathfrak{P}^{13} , a third or fourth century papyrus copy, thoughtlessly wrote πραγμάτων ἀνάστασις.⁸

Page 602

11.11 πίστει καὶ αὐτὴ Σάρρα στέρρα δύναμιν {C}

The difficulties of this verse are well known (for example, in Greek the expression δύναμιν εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος ἔλαβεν is regularly used of the male in begetting, not the female in conceiving) and have led some scholars (including F. Field, Windisch, Zuntz) to suggest that καὶ αὐτὴ Σάρρα στέρρα is an early gloss that somehow got into the text. Appreciating the lexical difficulty, but unwilling to emend the text, a majority of the Committee understood the words καὶ αὐτὴ Σάρρα στέρρα to be a Hebraic circumstantial clause,⁹ thus allowing Ἀβραάμ (ver. 8) to serve as subject of ἔλαβεν (“by faith, even though Sarah was barren, he [Abraham] received power to beget ...”).

It is also possible to construe the words **ΛΥΤΗ ΣΑΡΡΑ ΣΤΕΙΡΑ** as a dative of accompaniment (in uncial script iotas subscript are ordinarily not indicated), so that the sentence runs, “By faith he [Abraham] also, together with barren Sarah, received power to beget ...”¹⁰

A second problem involves στέρρα, which is absent from several important witnesses ($\mathfrak{P}^{13\text{vid}}$ \aleph A D^c 33 614 a). Although admitting that the word might have been added as an interpretative gloss in an ancestor of \mathfrak{P}^{46} D* P Ψ 81 88 1739 it vg syr^{p, h} a), a majority of the Committee regarded it as more likely that the word dropped out through transcriptional oversight (**ΣΑΡΡΑΣΤΕΙΡΑ**). It was agreed that ἡ (D^{b vid} 81 88 1739 Euthalius a) and οὔσα (P 104 436 1984 2127 a) are obviously secondary.

11.17 προσειήνοχεν Ἀβραάμ τὸν Ἰσαὰκ πειραζόμενος

The evidence for the inclusion and for the position of the name Ἀβραάμ fluctuates curiously: (a) most witnesses read προσειήνοχεν

Page 603

Ἀβραάμ...; (b) a few Western witnesses (D it^d) read...πειραζόμενος Ἀβραάμ; (c) 1912 reads Ἀβραάμ προσειήνοχεν...; (d) 1245 1611 arm read...Ἀβραάμ πειραζόμενος; and (e) the name is omitted by \mathfrak{P}^{46} Ψ 330 2005 syr^h Chrysostom.

On the one hand, if the name were not original, the fact that verses 13-16 constitute a parenthesis may have led copyists to insert it in ver. 17, which resumes the narrative concerning Abraham; the variety of positions of the name suggests that it is secondary. On the other hand, if the omission of the name is not accidental, copyists may have felt that the subject of ver. 17 was so obvious that Ἀβραάμ was unnecessary. In any case, the Committee did not see its way clear to disregard the weight of the mass of evidence supporting the reading adopted as text.

11.23 βασιλέως. {A}

After ver. [23](#), certain witnesses (chiefly Western) add the equivalent of a whole verse recounting an additional feat of Moses: Πίστει μέγας γενόμενος Μωϋσῆς ἀνείλεν τὸν Αἰγύπτιον κατανοῶν τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ (“By faith Moses, when he was grown up, destroyed the Egyptian when he observed the humiliation of his brothers”). The interpolation, which is read by D* 1827 it^d vg^{mss}, was probably inspired by [Ac 7.24](#) and/or [Ex 2.11-12](#).

[11.37](#) ἐπρίσθησαν {C}

The presence in most manuscripts of the rather general statement ἐπειράσθησαν (“they were tempted”) amid the author’s enumeration of different kinds of violent death has long been regarded by commentators as strange and unexpected. Many have suggested that ἐπειράσθησαν is the corruption of some other word more suitable to the context, or that it entered the text as the result of inadvertent scribal dittography of ἐπρίσθησαν. Among the conjectural emendations of ἐπειράσθησαν the following have been proposed (the name of the scholar who, it appears, first proposed it is enclosed within parentheses): ἐπρήσθησαν (Gataker), ἀνεπρήσθησαν (Lücke), ἐπυρώθησαν (Bezae, edd. 3, 4, 5), ἐπυράσθησαν (Junius

Page 604

and Piscator), ἐπυρίσθησαν (Sykes), all of which mean “they were burned”; ἐπάρθησαν (Bezae, edd. 1, 2), “they were pierced” (cf. Luther’s “zerstochen”); ἐπηρώθησαν (Faber), “they were mutilated”; ἐπράσθησαν (le Moyne), “they were sold”; ἐσπειράσθησαν or ἐσπειράθησαν (Alberti), “they were strangled” or “they were broken on the wheel”; ἐπηρειάσθησαν (Reiske), “they were ill-treated”; ἐπέρθησαν (Kypke), “they were pierced through”; ἐπεράθησαν (Bryant), “they were stabbed”; ἐπειράθησαν (Wakefield), “they were impaled”; ἐσφαιρίσθησαν (reported by Griesbach), “they were broken on the wheel”; and even ἐταριχεύθησαν (Matthäi), “they were pickled”!

Several singular readings in individual manuscripts are due to carelessness and/or to itacistic confusion: thus D^{gr} reads ἐπιράσθησαν, ἐπιράσθησαν (sic), which stands for the aor. pass. ind. of πειράζω, and ms. 1923 reads ἐπρήσθησαν, ἐπειράσθησαν, of which ἐπρήσθησαν is an itacistic spelling of ἐπρίσθησαν (“they were burned”).

With some hesitation, but partly on the strength of the uncertain position of ἐπειράσθησαν in the witnesses (sometimes standing before ἐπρίσθησαν, sometimes after it),¹¹ the Committee decided to adopt the shorter reading preserved in ℣⁴⁶ 1241 1984 l^{44, 53} syr^p (cop^{sa}) eth^{ro, pp} Origen^{gr2/7, lat} Eusebius Acacius Ephraem Jerome Socrates Ps-Augustine Theophylact, and to print only ἐπρίσθησαν.

[12.1](#) εὐπερίστατον {A}

The reading εὐπερίστατον (“easily distracting”), which occurs in ℣⁴⁶ and 1739 (and perhaps lies behind it^{d, z}), is either a palaeographical error or a deliberate modification of εὐπερίστατον, which is supported by all the other known witnesses.

[12.3](#) εἰς ἑαυτόν {C}

Although external evidence strongly favors either εἰς ἑαυτούς (**N*** D^{gr} syr^p Ephraem) or εἰς αὐτούς (ℑ^{13, 46} **N**^b Ψ^c 048 33 1739*

Page 605

Origen *a*), the difficulty of making sense of the plural led a majority of the Committee to prefer the singular number, choosing εἰς ἑαυτόν as the least inadequately supported reading (A P 104 326 1241 John-Damascus). Several versions handle the passage freely, it^d reading *in vobis* and cop^{sa} arm omitting the phrase entirely.

[The plural is the qualitatively best supported and the more difficult (though meaningful) reading, and the one more likely to be altered. A.W.]

[12.18](#) ψηλαφωμένω {B}

External evidence strongly supports the reading ψηλαφωμένω without ὄρει (ℑ⁴⁶ **N** A C 048 33 (81) vg syr^p cop^{sa, bo} eth *a*). Moreover, the diversity of position of ὄρει in the witnesses that read the word (it stands before ψηλαφωμένω in 69 255 462 syr^h, and after it in D^{gr} K P Ψ 88 614 1739 *Byz Lect*) suggests that it is a scribal gloss derived from ver. [22](#).

[13.15](#) δι' αὐτοῦ [οὖν] {C}

Although most witnesses include οὖν (**N**^c A C D² K 056 0121b 0142 81 88 614 1739 most minuscules vg syr^h cop^{sa, bo} arm eth *a*), it is absent from several early and important witnesses (ℑ⁴⁶ **N*** D* P Ψ (it^d) syr^p). It is difficult to decide whether copyists added the word, which seems to be needed at this point, or whether it was accidentally omitted in transcription (αΥΤΟΥΟΥΑΝΑ--). In order to reflect the balance of probabilities a majority of the Committee decided to include the word in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets.

[13.21](#) παντὶ ἀγαθῶ {A}

After παντί the Textus Receptus, in company with C D^c K M P almost all minuscules and syr^p, h cop^{sa} eth *a*, adds ἔργω, an obvious homiletic gloss. If the word had been present originally, no good reason can account for its absence from ℑ⁴⁶ **N** D* Ψ it^{ar, b, d} vg cop^{bo} *a*. The singular reading παντὶ ἔργω καὶ λόγω ἀγαθῶ, in codex A, is from [2 Th 2.17](#).

Page 606

[13.21](#) ποιῶν

Although the reading αὐτῶ ποιῶν is strongly attested (**N*** A C 33* 81 1739^{mg} cop^{sa}), the Committee was disposed to regard the unintelligible pronoun as a dittograph of the preceding αὐτοῦ (as also αὐτό in ℑ⁴⁶).¹² The reading αὐτός ποιῶν (451 2492 it^{d, 65}) may be a homiletic expansion. The shorter reading ποιῶν, which was preferred by the Committee, is supported by **N**^c D^{gr} K P Ψ 88 614 1739* *Byz Lect* it⁶¹ vg syr^{p, h} cop^{sams, boms} arm *a*.

13.21 ἡμῖν {A}

In view of the preceding ὑμᾶς it is easy to understand why ἡμῖν, which is strongly supported by \mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph A D^{gr} K M 33 81 614 1739 syr^p cop^{sa, bo} arm *al*, was altered to ὑμῖν (C P Ψ 88 it^{d, 61, 65} vg syr^h eth *al*).

13.21 [τῶν αἰώνων] {C}

The phrase εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, which occurs only here in the Epistle to the Hebrews, is attested in all manuscripts in [1 Tm 1.17](#); [2 Tm 4.18](#), and in eleven of its twelve occurrences in Revelation. In the doxologies in [Ga 1.5](#); [Php 4.20](#); [1 Pe 4.11](#); [5.11](#); and [Re 1.6](#) the words τῶν αἰώνων are omitted by several (mostly later) manuscripts. In [He 5.6](#); [6.20](#); [7.17](#), and [21](#) (all quoting [Ps 110.4](#) [= LXX 109:4]) we find the short form εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, as also in [2 Cor 9.9](#) (where F G K 1739 *al* expand by adding τῶν αἰώνων) and [1 Pe 1.25](#). None of these instances of the short form occurs in a doxology. A quasi-doxology in [He 13.8](#) reads εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, with no variations (except the addition of ἀμήν in D* it^d).

In view of these data it is difficult to decide whether copyists, influenced by familiarity with the longer form in doxologies elsewhere in the New Testament as well as in current liturgical usage, added τῶν αἰώνων (\aleph A (C*) K P 33 81 614 1739 it^{ar, b, comp, z} vg syr^p cop^{samss, bo} eth *al*), or whether other copyists, either through carelessness

Page 607

or in imitation of εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας in [He 13.8](#), omitted τῶν αἰώνων (\mathfrak{P}^{46} C³ D^{gr} Ψ 1241 *Lect* syr^h cop^{samss} arm *al*). On the whole the Committee was disposed to prefer the shorter text as original, yet because of the weight of such witnesses as \aleph A (C*) 33 614 1739 *al*, it was decided to retain the words τῶν αἰώνων, but to enclose them within square brackets as an indication that they might well be a gloss.

13.25 πάντων ὑμῶν. {A}

The later liturgical use of the concluding words (“Grace be with all of you”) must have made it difficult for scribes not to add ἀμήν when copying the epistle. Several important witnesses, however, including \mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph^* I^{vid} 33 vg^{ms} cop^{sa} arm, have resisted the intrusion. Instead of ὑμῶν ms. 1241 reads ἡμῶν, and D^{gr*} reads τῶν ἀγίων.

13.25 Subscription

(a) The subscription in \aleph C 33 is πρὸς Ἑβραίους. Other subscriptions include the following: (b) πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ῥώμης A; (c) πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας P 1908; (d) πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐγράφη ἀπὸ (460 Euthalius^{ms} add τῆς) Ἰταλίας διὰ Τιμοθέου K 102 460 1923 Euthalius^{ms}, followed by the Textus Receptus; (e) ἢ πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολὴ ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας διὰ Τιμοθέου 425 464 *al*; (f) Παύλου ἀποστόλου ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας διὰ Τιμοθέου 404 *al*; (g) as (f) but instead of ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας it reads ἀπὸ Ἀθηνῶν· ἄλλοι δέ· ἀπ’ Ἰταλίας 1911; (h) ἢ πρὸς Ἑβραίους αὕτη ἐπιστολὴ ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας διὰ Τιμοθέου τοῦ ἀποστόλου τοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτοὺς πεμφθέντος διὰ τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου ἵν’ αὐτοὺς διορθώσῃται 431; (i) as (h) but after ἐγράφη add Ἑβραϊστί 104.

¹ The information given here has been derived chiefly from W. H. P. Hatch, "The Position of Hebrews in the Canon of the New Testament," *Harvard Theological Review*, xxix (1936), pp. 133–151, with many valuable additions supplied through the kindness of Kurt Aland from the files of the Institute for New Testament Text Research at Münster. For information concerning evidence from early canonical lists and patristic writers, see the article by Hatch.

² Although in codex Vaticanus Hebrews follows 2 Thessalonians, the chapter numbers in that manuscript disclose that in an ancestor it occupied a position after Galatians. The chapter numeration of the Pauline Letters begins with Romans and runs continuously through 2 Thessalonians. The Letter to the Galatians concludes with the 58th chapter, whereas the next Epistle, that to the Ephesians, begins with the 70th chapter, and then the numbers continue regularly through Philippians, Colossians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, ending with the 93rd chapter. Following 2 Thessalonians (as was mentioned above) stands Hebrews, which begins with the 59th chapter, and proceeds with the 60th, 61st, 62nd, 63rd, and 64th chapters, as far as [He 9.14](#), where the manuscript breaks off, the remaining part being lost. Doubtless there were originally eleven chapters in Hebrews (59 to 69). It is clear, therefore, from the sequence of chapter divisions that in an ancestor of codex Vaticanus Hebrews stood after Galatians and before Ephesians, and that the scribe of Vaticanus copied mechanically the chapter numbers even though they no longer were appropriate after Galatians.

³ The evidence can be set forth as follows: the phrase τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως is followed by (a) αὐτοῦ **ⲛ** A B 33 81 917 1175 1836 it vg arm *al*; (b) δι' ἑαυτοῦ (or αὐ-) **Ⲫ**⁴⁶ 0121 424^c 1739 cop^{sa} *al*; or (c) αὐτοῦ δι' ἑαυτοῦ (or αὐ-) D^{9r} K L most minuscules cop^{bo} *al*.

⁴ "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, and the scepter of righteousness is the scepter of thy kingdom."

⁵ "God is thy throne (or, Thy throne is God) for ever and ever, and the scepter of righteousness is the scepter of his [i.e. God's] kingdom."

⁶ "'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever,' and 'the scepter of righteousness is the scepter of his kingdom.'"

⁷ See also G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles*, 1953, p. 163.

⁸ According to H. D. F. Sparks, the papyrus reads ἀποστα[σις]; see Wordsworth and White, *Novum Testamentum*, Part 2, fasc. vii (Oxford, 1941), p. 743, where a variety of Latin evidence is also cited.

⁹ Cf. Matthew Black, "Critical and Exegetical Notes on Three New Testament Texts, Hebrews xi. 11, [Jude 5](#), James i:27, " in *Apophoreta; Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen* (Berlin, 1964), pp. 41 ff. The discussion of [He 11.11](#) is included also in Black's *Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 1967), pp. 83–89.

¹⁰ Commentators who prefer to take the words (with or without στεῖρα) as dative include E. Rignebach, *Der Brief an die Hebraer* (Leipzig, 1913), pp. 356 ff.; O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Hebraer* (Göttingen, 1949), p. 262; and F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids, 1964), p. 302.

¹¹ For a discussion of textual problems in the passage, see G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles*, 1953, pp. 47 f.

¹² For a discussion of the dittograph, see G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles*, 1953, p. 62.