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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Regional Distinctions in Greek

From its earliest literature Greek was not one unified language; rather it encompassed a number of dialects spoken by separate communities. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* contain elements indicative of distinct dialects. Then, in the Classical and Hellenistic periods, various Greek communities spoke their own dialects as literature and inscriptions testify. These dialects differed on the levels of morphology, inflection, and lexicon. Such distinctions define the Greek dialects for philologists.

Even with the wide-spread acceptance of Attic Koine as the *lingua franca* in the Mediterranean and parts of Asia under Alexander, local dialects continued to be spoken. A Northwest Greek Koine, showing a mixture of Attic and Northwest Greek elements, is in evidence as late as the second century BCE. Also, Doric Koine, being an Attic and Doric mixture, appears in inscriptions in the last three centuries BCE. This may mark the end of Doric on some level, but there is evidence that it persisted as a patois. For a collection of Spartan inscriptions to Artemis Orthia utilize one specific type of Doric, namely Laconian, in the second century CE. Buck considers these inscriptions an artificial revival reflecting the language still spoken by the Laconian peasants.

Lesbian, 1.

2. Ibid., 176.
3. Ibid., 272
4. Ibid., 272-273.
Laconian, and Elean inscriptions show this same dialect revival in the first and second centuries CE. Furthermore, the Modern Greek dialect of Tsakonian, sharing many features with Laconian, shows the survival of a dialect distinct from Attic in a mountainous area of the Peloponnese. As further evidence for the persistence of spoken Doric, Strabo, Suetonius, and Pausanias all testify to the existence of Doric in their times, that is in the first century BCE through the second century CE. Although Attic Koine became the dominant dialect in the eastern Mediterranean, evidence of communities speaking other Greek dialects occurs into the second century CE.

Yet the dialectal differences mentioned above do not distinguish the Greek of the New Testament from other types of contemporaneous Greek. Moulton considered the Greek Bible a "Durchschnittsprache which avoided local peculiarities." Speaking of these kinds of dialect distinctions, Meillet says, "les particularités locales ont été presque partout éliminées." Consequently, it is not fruitful to distinguish New Testament Greek from other types of Greek as defined by classical philology.

The manifestation of sound changes evidenced by Modern Demotic Greek does distinguish the various types of Greek in Roman times. One such change is the fricativization of the unaspirated voiced stop β from /b/ to /v/. Late Roman New
Testament manuscripts give evidence of this sound change, one instance being the variation δαβίδ ~ δανί (Lk 1:27). Furthermore, a number of Greek vowels merged to /i/, namely ει, ι, η, οι, υ, and ωι,11 at different times in different places from the second century BCE to the Byzantine era. This is iotacism. Another important sound change that took place in the late Roman era was the loss of vowel quantity distinction and the concomitant merger of o and ω. These changes did not occur uniformly among the Greek-speakers of Egypt, Palestine, Attica, and other regions. Admittedly, some of the changes happened in the same century in separate communities, such as the merger of ει and ι in Attica and Egypt.12 Yet for some other changes, several centuries elapse between the frequent demonstration of a change in one community and another. The merger of o and ω in Egypt and Attica13 as well as the merger of ι and η in Egypt and the Greek-speaking communities producing the New Testament are examples of this phenomenon. The timing of these developments differentiates the Greek-speaking communities of the Roman and even the Byzantine era.

Two sound changes will be investigated in this thesis to illuminate the phonology of the communities writing and copying the New Testament, namely the iotacism of certain vowels and the merger of o and ω. Firstly, onomastic variation in the Gospel of Luke demonstrated by Roman and Byzantine manuscripts as well as the Gothic and Vulgate versions will reveal the chronology of iotacism in these communities. Secondly, the

11. Ibid., 57.
13. Ibid.
unexpected rarity of the confusion of \( \circ \) and \( \lambda \) in certain late Roman manuscripts may reveal the timing of the merger of \( \circ \) and \( \lambda \) in these Christian communities. Through the chronology of iotaism and the merger of \( \circ \) and \( \lambda \) in this text one may better understand the relationship between the Greek of these Christian communities and the Greek witnessed in Egypt, Attica, and elsewhere.

One approach to understanding the variety in the Greek language during Roman times is bilingual interference. Both the Egyptian papyri and the New Testament Gospels were produced in an environment where Greek existed alongside an unrelated language spoken by a significant portion of the population. However, the effects of the other language on Egyptian Greek and New Testament Greek are quite distinct.

In Egypt the dialects of Coptic influenced the speech and writing of Greek. One influence on the language of the papyri was the lack of distinction in Coptic of certain Greek phonemes. For example, Coptic did not distinguish voiced and voiceless stops.\(^{14}\) As a result, Egyptian writers of Greek confused \( \gamma \) and \( \delta \) with \( \kappa \) and \( \tau \).\(^{15}\) In the papyri of the Fayum, one finds frequent variation of \( \rho \) and \( \lambda \).\(^{16}\) So one may conclude that the speakers of the Fayum had only one liquid phoneme. Also, Coptic \( \nu \) could stand for an allophone of \( /i/ \) and the phoneme \( /e/ \).\(^{17}\) This bivalence may explain the confusion of \( \eta \) and \( \iota \) in the Egyptian papyri. Another level of influence of Coptic on the language of the Greek papyri was syntax. For example, the Greek papyri show the Coptic phenomenon

\(^{15}\) Ibid., 76-77.
\(^{16}\) Ibid., 102.
\(^{17}\) Ibid., 242.
of "further specification of a relative by a resumptive personal pronoun."18 Also, the incorporation of Coptic loanwords likely affected the Greek papyri, although I located no studies elucidating any examples. Along with other factors, the wide-spread impact that the phonology of Coptic had on the Greek papyri makes them quite distinct from the Greek texts of Attica and Palestine.

Language interference in Palestine involved additional complications. For not only did Greek exist alongside Latin and the popularly-spoken Aramaic, but Hebrew also affected the linguistic and cultural milieu. The Aramaic evidence consists primarily of sepulchral inscriptions and literary fragments from Qumran.19 From the eighth century BCE Aramaic had been the lingua franca of the Near East20 and in the first century CE was still "the most commonly used language."21 Yet Aramaic did not totally supplant Hebrew in Palestine, for Qumran provides ample evidence of a community using Hebrew:22 Admittedly, there is hardly any clear inscriptive evidence of Hebrew in the first century CE (some sepulchral inscriptions could be Hebrew or Aramaic, especially given the borrowing of bar and ben into the respective languages).23 Many Latin inscriptions survived from this period, although the impact of Latin seems to be limited to

18. Ibid., 46.
22. Ibid., 159.
23. Ibid., 159-160.
Roman governance. These were the three languages other than Greek in first century Palestine, yet what influence they had on the Greek of the New Testament is greatly debated.

There is conflicting evidence as to what impact Aramaic and Hebrew had on Palestinian Greek texts. A statement by Josephus seems to indicate Aramaic had a profound impact on Greek on the level of parole. For he says,

\[
\text{ἐχω γὰρ ὀμολογούμενον παρὰ τῶν ὁμοθυμῶν πλείστον αὐτῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐπιχώριον καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν παιδείαν διαφέρειν καὶ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν δὲ γραμμάτων καὶ ποιητικῶν μαθημάτων πολλὰ ἔσπουδασα μετασχεῖν τὴν γραμματικὴν ἐμπειρίαν ἀναλαβὼν, τὴν δὲ περὶ τὴν προφορὰν ἀκρίβειαν πάτριος ἐκωλύσεν συνήθεια. παρ' ἡμῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἐκείνους ἀποδέχονται τοὺς πολλοὺς ἔθνων διάλεκτον ἐκμαθήνας καὶ γλαφυρότητι λέξεων τὸν λόγον ἐπικομψεύοντος.\]

Jos. Ant. 20.12.1

His πάτριος συνήθεια hindered τὴν περὶ τὴν προφορὰν ἀκρίβειαν which Feldman renders as "the habitual use of my native tongue has prevented my attaining precision in the pronunciation." Yet this difficulty did not manifest itself in Josephus' Greek writings. In the view of Thackeray, Josephus' oeuvre was "an excellent specimen of

24. Ibid., 129.
25. "For my compatriots admit that in our Jewish learning I far excel them. I have also laboured strenuously to partake of the realm of Greek prose and poetry, after having gained a knowledge of Greek grammar, although the habitual use of my native tongue has prevented my attaining precision in the pronunciation. For our people do not favour those persons who have mastered the speech of many nations, or who adorn their style with smoothness of diction." trans. L. H. Feldman, Josephus IX (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965), 527-529.
26. Ibid.
Atticistic Greek of the first century."\textsuperscript{27} Josephus offers some explanation for his fine Greek, \textit{χρησάμενος τισι πρὸς τὴν ἐλληνικὰ φωνῆν συνέργοις}.\textsuperscript{28} Even though Josephus claims to have learned Greek with great difficulty, the texts that he produced shows little interference from Aramaic.

Some Jewish communities seemed to favor Greek over Aramaic or Hebrew. A letter from a Jewish revolutionary, Bar Kokhba or one his associates, states a preference for writing in Greek,

\begin{verbatim}
εγραφῃ
δ[ε] εληνιστὶ διὰ
t[o or]αν μὴ ευρη-
θ[η]ναι εβραεστὶ
γ[ρα]ψασθαι\textsuperscript{29}
\end{verbatim}

This early second century papyrus indicates that there was probably a Jewish community in Palestine speaking primarily Greek. Additionally, Fitzmeyer considers the "\textsuperscript{29}Ελληνιστὰ from the dispute between the Ἐλληνισταὶ and the Ἑβραῖοι in Ac 6:1 to be "Christian Jews who habitually spoke Greek only."\textsuperscript{30} Not only were there communities in Palestine who spoke Greek as a second language, but there were also groups that spoke primarily Greek.

\textsuperscript{28} "using assistants for the sake of the Greek." Jos. \textit{Apion} 1.9.
\textsuperscript{29} "This letter was written in Greek because no reason was found to write in Hebrew." B. Lifshitz edited this papyrus in "Papyrus grecs du désert de Juda," \textit{Aegyptus} 42 (1962): 240-256.
\textsuperscript{30} Fitzmeyer (1991), 144.
Given the multi-lingual environment of Palestine in the first century CE, one would expect some influence from Aramaic, Hebrew, and Latin on the Greek of the New Testament. There is no evident bilingual interference on the level of phonology like there was in the Egyptian documentary papyri. One may explain this absence by pointing out the following distinctions: the literary nature of the New Testament as opposed to the documentary characteristics of the papyri, Egyptian autographs as opposed to New Testament manuscripts regularized through successive copies, and finally the difference between the phonemic systems of Coptic and Aramaic. The Greek of the New Testament does show the influence of Aramaic, Hebrew, and Latin through borrowed phrases and words. There is an abundance of Semitisms resulting from the use of the Old Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible and from a "spoken Jewish-Greek."  

For example, καὶ ἐγένετο (ἐγένετο δὲ) for Hebrew יַרְצָה/way והִי/ indicates the progress of the narrative, rendered in old translations 'it came to pass.' There are also a number of Latinisms like ἐξιος ἔστιν ὃ παρέξη τοῦτο from Lk 7:4 equivalent to dignus est cui hoc praestes. Such is the nature of the multilingual interference upon the Greek of the New Testament.

Both Egyptian Greek and New Testament Greek show the effects of other languages. Phonological confusion resulting from Greek phonemes undifferentiated in Coptic comprises a key feature of bilingual interference upon Egyptian Greek. In New Testament.

33. Ibid., 6.
Testament Greek, this feature is not significant, but the presence of Semitisms from the cultural milieu plays an important role. Consequently, these two contemporaneous corpora represent two separate types of Greek.

The study of these sound changes has adhered to the following methodological practices. Onomastic variants come from the apparatus of the International Greek New Testament Project's *The Gospel According to Luke, Part One: Chapters 1-12.* Even such a massive undertaking as this edition (a collaborative project involving 300 scholars over a 35-year period produced this edition) could not hope to produce a complete and totally accurate apparatus, yet it is sufficient to give a fairly accurate characterization of iotacism in the manuscripts of Luke in the first millennium CE. Manuscripts p66, p75, S, A, and D provided the variants pertaining to the merger of o and o. Further discussion will follow in the pertinent section. Only variants showing a minimal pair in another manuscript have been considered. Consequently, examples of metathesis have been disregarded. Also, we have generally not included morphological variants that were otherwise grammatically acceptable. As a shorthand for the compilation of manuscripts the terms *maxime* and *multi* have been employed, as defined in the List of Sigla. Additionally, the fourth edition of the United Bible Societies' *Greek New Testament* has

---

provided the *Ausgangstext* for comparison against the variants unless otherwise noted. These considerations have guided the investigation that follows.

**List of Sigla**


<> = the actual orthography of a particular language.

\(/\) = the proposed pronunciation of a grapheme or word.

*maxime* = a preponderance of manuscripts show a given reading with less than eight uncials and 15 minuscules at variance.

*multi* = at least five uncials contain a certain variant.

etc. = when a variant is classified as *multi*, the minuscules are omitted and thus indicated.

The manuscript classification system of Caspar René Gregory was followed: papyri are indicated by \(p_1^1, p_2^2, \ldots\); uncials are indicated by an initial 0, namely 046, 047... (uncials 02 through 045 follow Wettstein's use of Latin and Greek capital letters, namely A, B, C...Γ, Δ, Θ...).

S = \(\chi\). Following the practice of the International Greek New Testament Project, the Codex Sinaiticus (\(\chi\) according to Tischendorf) is assigned the symbol S and the Codex

Vaticanus 354 (S according to Wettstein) is reassigned as 028.

* = the text of the first hand or original scribe.

C = a correction in a manuscript either by the original scribe or a later hand.
CHAPTER 2
IOTACISM

The Variation $\varepsilon$ ~ $\iota$

The orthograph $\varepsilon$ merged with long $\iota$, /i:/, as the pronunciation of $\varepsilon$ changed from /e:/ to /i:/.

There is some evidence in the sixth century BCE for the neutralization of E/EI and I adjacent to resonants and under the influence of assimilation. Threatte considers some of these instances questionable based on the crudeness of these texts, mostly dipinti and graffiti. 37 Other examples he explains as "careless omissions or inaccurate renditions of diphthongs," unrelated to the sound change /e:/ > /i:/.

Teodorsson gives only insecure examples to substantiate his claim that this merger became general in certain phonetic positions in the fifth century BCE in Attic. 39 All the other examples are ambiguous or explainable by other factors. Threatte gives the first clear example of this variation indicating a pronunciation /i:/ for $\varepsilon$ in the fourth century BCE, and does not consider the phenomenon common until the end of the second century BCE. 40


38. Ποισερατος for Πεισερατος appears in sixth-century graffito, Hesperia Supplements, Vol. 8. (Athens: American School of Classical Studies, 1949), 405-408, plate 60. δοκις for δοκεις comes from a graffito on a black-figure cup in J. D. Beazley, Paralipomena to Attic Black-Figure and Red-Figure Vase Painters (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 72.


1.000. The variation of \( \digamma \sim \varepsilon \alpha \)

1.100. In initial position:

1. \( \varepsilon \rho \omicron \upsilon \omicron \sigma \alpha \lambda \lambda \mu \) \( \maxime \sim \varepsilon \rho \omicron \upsilon \sigma \alpha \lambda \mu \) 69; Go iairusalem; Lvg hierusalem Lk 2:25
2. \( \varepsilon \eta \rho \chi \omega \) \( \maxime \sim \varepsilon \eta \rho \chi \omega \) S; Go iaireikon; Lvg hiericho Lk 10:30
3. \( \iota \rho \ 60 \ 577 \ \iota \lambda 57 \sim \epsilon \omicron \rho \ \iota \omicron \ 954 \ \iota \omicron \ 1542 \ * \ \iota \omicron \ \iota \omicron \ 184 \ \iota \omicron \ 1642 \); Go heris; Lvg heris Lk 3:28

The first two examples show the typical variation of \( \digamma \sim \varepsilon \alpha \), indicating the sound /\i/. Gothic does not give the grapheme <ei>, which would indicate /iː/. Instead, Gothic represents this variation with <i>, indicating /i/.

Note that in medial and final positions, the Gothic Bible transcribes /i(ː)/ as <ei> far more frequently than <i>. Wulfila may simply consider these antevocalic instances of /i/ as short, thus writing the short <i>.

In Köbler’s *Gotisches Wörterbuch* only a few words appear that begin with ei-: the subordinating conjunction ei, its compounds, and *eisarn*. Also, there is the very common pronoun, eis ‘they.’ *eisarn* is the only non-compounded polysyllabic word in Gothic beginning with ei-. Pleiner considers this term to be a borrowing from Celtic. Suffice it to say, *eisarn* is an unusual word in the Gothic lexicon. In contrast to ei-, many Gothic words begin with i-. Based on the relative number of words in i-, it is not surprising that Wulfila represented these names with <i>.

Also note that Go <i> is always a vowel or part of a digraph, so Go <j> would

represent an initial non-syllabic yod.\(^ {44} \) And in Attic there is little evidence that initial unaccented \( \text{i} \) preceding a vowel became consonantal.\(^ {45} \) Hence this \(<i>\) is vocalic.

This vowel does not correspond to the common Biblical Hebrew forms \( \text{יְרַעְשָׁלֶים} \) and \( \text{יְרַעְשָׁלֶם} \). The rough breathing of the Vulgate form \( \text{hierusalem} \) reflects one of the Greek folk-etymologies of this word: \( \text{Ἱεροσαλήμ} \) – ‘temple security or temple shalom’ from Josephus: \( \tau \text{ό γὰρ ἱερὸν κατὰ τὴν Ἑβραίων γλῶτταν ὑπόμασε τὰ Σόλωμος ὅ ἐστιν ἀσφάλεια} \).\(^ {46} \) Smith\(^ {47} \) gives a number of examples with rough breathing: the Pilgrim of Bordeaux\(^ {48} \) and Eucherius\(^ {49} \) write \( \text{hierusalem} \); Eusebius \( \text{Ἱεροοσαλήμ} \); and Jerome \( \text{hierusolyma} \). The Vulgate form above agrees with the first of these variants. Smith also cites examples without rough breathing: Jerome, Willibard\(^ {50} \), Bernard\(^ {51} \), and Theodoric\(^ {52} \) all write \( \text{Ierusalem} \). The Gothic \(<i>\) and the Vulgate \(<i>\) both support /i/.

The variation \( \text{ιρ} \sim \text{εἰρ} \) does not indicate /i/ on the basis of the versional evidence. Instead, Go \(<e>\) and Lvg \(<e>\) indicate /e:/\( . \) Note that Go \(<e>\) always represents long /e:/\( . \) The textual evidence for the two variations consists of a few minuscules and lectionaries,

48. Non vidi 333 CE.
49. Non vidi ca. 427-440 CE.
50. Non vidi ca. 722 CE.
51. Non vidi 867 CE.
52. Non vidi ca. 1172 CE.
and the minuscules are all Byzantine, dating from the twelfth to the fifteenth century. The preponderance of manuscripts, including all the earliest ones, give the variant ηρ. Therefore, the name ειρ ~ ιρ ~ ηρ was read /ir/ infrequently, whereas the predominant reading was /er/.

1.200. In medial position
1.210. Where Gothic is <ei> and Vulgate is <i>

1. άµιναδαβ maxime ~ άµειναδαβ D Θ 1352*; Go ameinadabis; Lvg aminadab Lk 3:33
2. γαλλαιαν maxime ~ γαλειλαιαν B*; Go galeilaian; Lvg galilaeam Lk 2:39
3. γαλλαιας maxime ~ γαλειλαιας B* Θ; Go galeilaias; Lvg galilaeae Lk 4:31
4. γαλλαιας maxime ~ γαλειλαιας B* W; Go galeilaia; Lvg galilaeam Lk 8:26
5. δαυιδ maxime ~ δαυειδ B* D W Ξ; Go daweidis; Lvg david Lk 1:27, 2:4²
6. δαυιδ maxime ~ δαυειδ B* D W Ξ 0177; Go daweidis; Lvg david Lk 2:4¹
7. δαυιδ maxime ~ δαυειδ B D W Go daweidis; Lvg david Lk 6:3
8. ειαρος 0211 1342 ~ ειαρος R; Go iaeirus; Lvg iairus Lk 8:41
9. ελιακειμ maxime ~ ελειακειμ E 047 131 477; Go aileiakeimis; Lvg eliachim Lk 3:30
10. ελιακιμ N 33 892 1071 1542 1675 l12 l70 l150 l1127 ~ ελιακειμ maxime; Go aileiakeimis; Lvg eliachim Lk 3:30
11. ελισαβετ maxime ~ ελεισαβετ B*; Go aileisabaih; Lvg elisabeth Lk 1:5 cf. 1:7 1:13

1:24 1:36 1:40 1:41 1:57

12. ἐλεισάβεθ l253 ~ ἐλεισάβεθ D; Go aileisabaith; Lvg elisabeth Lk 1:5
13. ἐλεισάβεθ l253 ~ ἐλεισάβεθ Θ; Go aileisabaith; Lvg elisabeth Lk 1:13
14. ἐλεισαίου multi: C E F H K M X Γ Θ Λ Π Ω 028 047 etc. ~ ἐλεισαίου Β*; Go
    haileisaiu; Lvg heliseo Lk 4:27
15. εσλιμ L N Ψ 71 131 892 954 1203 1241 1242 1458 1675 /12 /150 /1127 ~ εσλιμ
    179 517 1194 1424 1425 2542 /299 /1056 /1642; Go aizleimis Lvg esli Lk 3:25
16. ηλιαν maxime ~ ηλιαν p75 B* D Θ; Go heleian; Lvg heliam Lk 9:19
17. ηλιαυ maxime ~ ηλιαυ A B*; Go heleins; Lvg heliae Lk 4:25
18. ησαιου maxime ~ ησαιου 179; Go eisaeiins (für esaeiins); Lvg esaiae Lk 4:17
19. ιαιρος Ε* 28c 33 179 472 1220 l253c l524 l1016 l1056 l1074 ~ ιαιρος maxime; Go
    iaeirus Lvg iairus Lk 8:41
20. ιεριχω maxime ~ ιεριχω multi: p75 B* L Ξ 0190 etc.; Go iaireikon; Lvg hiericho
    Lk 10:30
21. ιωρημ S N U V 33 123 472 478 1012 1192 1313 1338 1347 1351 1542 /1127 ~
    ιωρημ multi: p* A B D E G H K L M W X Y Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ Ω 028 047 0102 0124
    0211 etc.; Go ioreimis; Lvg iorim Lk 3:29
22. λευν multi: D E U V X Δ Λ Π Ω 028 etc. ~ λευν multi: S A B C L M N R W Γ Θ Ξ
    047 0211; Go laiwwi; Lvg levi Lk 5:27
23. λευν l1074 ~ λευν 1220; Go lawweis; Lvg levi 5:29
24. λευις multi: E K M N U V Γ Δ Λ Π Ψ Ω 028 047 etc. ~ λευις multi: S A B C L R W
    X Θ Ξ 0211; Go lawweis Lk 5:29
25. σαμαριτων multi: S A C L W X Y Γ Λ Ξ 0211 etc. ~ σαμαρειτων multi: p45 p75 B D
All of the above examples of the variation τ ~ ει point to Go <ei> and Vulgate <i>, corresponding to /i/. Even Go laiwwi (Lk 5:27) indicates correspondence to Go <ei> since nominative laiwwais (Lk 5:29) and accusative laiwwi show that Wulfila grouped this with the declension pattern of hairdeis/hairdi. Hence the <i> of laiwwi is morphological based on the <eis> of laiwwais. The only other instance that may not give this correspondence is ησαιου ~ ησαιου where the Vulgate reads esaiae. This could be read e-sai-ae, but as the Greek variation η-σα-ει-ον indicates as well as the Gothic, whose
only conceivable reading is *ei-sa-ei-ins*, the Vulgate must read *e-sa-i-ae*. Thus medial ṣ in these examples represents the sound /i:/.

1.220. Where Gothic is <i> and Vulgate is <i>

1. βηθσαιδα *multi*: C E G K L M R V X Y Δ Λ Ξ Π Ω 028 047 0115 0211 etc. ~

   βηθσαιδα N; Go baithsaidan; Lvg bethsaida Lk 10:13

2. ηλιας *maxime* ~ ηλιας p75 S B* D; Go helias; Lvg helias Lk 9:8

3. ηλιας *maxime* ~ ηλιας p45 p75 S B* D Θ 179; Go helias; Lvg helias Lk 9:30

4. ματθαιον *multi*: S A D E K L M N U V W Y Γ Δ Π Ψ Ω 028 047 0124 0211 ~

   ματθαιου 161 /1056; Go mattathiwis; Lvg matthathiae Lk 3:25

5. ματθαιον *maxime* ~ ματθαιου 161 /854; Go mattathias; Lvg matthathiae Lk 3:26

6. μαθαθιου /150 /1127 /1642 ~ μαθαθεου /1056; Go mattathias; Lvg matthathiae Lk 3:26

As shown for initial position, Go <i> may represent /i/ in the variation ṣ ~ ẹ, while the Vulgate has consistently shown <i>. Hence these instances indicate the short vowel /i/.
1.230. Where Gothic is <e> and Vulgate is <i>

1. ναμ 5 115 ~ ναεμ 047 1 205 209 1582* 1604; Go naem; Lvg naim Lk 7:11
2. ναεμ multi: Π S A B C D F H K L M R U V W X Δ Π Ψ Ω 028 etc. ~ ναεμ multi: Ε
   G Y Γ Θ Λ etc.; Go naem; Lvg naim Lk 7:11

Since this constitutes a hapax, it is insignificant for determining phonology, although there is a possible explanation. The sounds <ei> and <e> may have merged between the time of Wulfila and the earliest extant Gothic manuscripts since the error of <e> for <ei> occurs 28 times in the Gothic corpus. 54

1.240. Where Gothic is <e> and Vulgate is <e>

1. ηρωδίς 179 ~ ηρωδείς Θ; Go herodes; Lvg herodes Lvg 9:9
2. νηρεί 0211 ~ νεηρεί 983; Go nerins; Lvg neri 3:27

These examples evident in solitary manuscripts are best treated as iotacisms where the preferred reading is η. Also, these variants are extant in manuscripts no earlier than the ninth century when the confusion of η with ι and ει was common.

54. Marchand (1973), 51.
1.300. In final position.

1.310. Where Gothic is <ei> and Vulgate is <i>.

1. αδδιτ multi: D K N U V W Λ Π Ψ 0124 etc. ~ αδδειτ multi: p^4 S A B E G H M Y Γ Δ Θ Ω 028 047 0102 etc.; Go addeins; Lvg addi Lk 3:28

2. εσλι multi: D K U V W X Π 0102 0124 etc. ~ εσλει multi: S A B E G H M Y Γ Δ Θ Λ Ω 028 047 0211 etc.; Go aizleims; Lvg esli Lk 3:25

3. ηλι multi: p^4 D E K L N U V W X Π 0124 0211 etc. ~ ηλει multi: S A B G H M Y Γ Θ Λ Ψ Ω 028 047 0102; Go heleis; Lvg heli Lk 3:23

4. λευι multi: A D E H K L M N U V W Ξ Π 028 0124 etc. ~ λευει multi: S B G Υ Γ Γ Θ Λ Ψ Ω 047 0102 0211 etc.; Go laiweis; Lvg levi Lk 3:24

5. λευι multi: D E K M N U V W Ξ Π Ψ Ω 028 etc. ~ λευει multi: p^4 S A B G H L Y Γ Θ Λ 047 0102 0124 0211 etc.; Go laiweis; Lvg Levi Lk 3:29

6. λευι K Y Ψ 5 28 131 517 544 827 1009 1077 1295 1352 1604 2096 2766 l48 ~ λευει 1080 /292 /890; Go laiwwi; Lvg levi Lk 5:27

7. λευι Y ~ λευει D 1080; Go laiweis; Lvg levi Lk 5:29

8. μελχι multi: D E K N U V W Ξ Π Ψ 0124 etc. ~ μελχει multi: p^4 S A B E G H L M Y Γ Δ Θ Λ Ω 028 047 0102 etc.; Go mailkeis; Lvg melchi Lk 3:24

9. μελχι multi: D K N U V W Ξ Π 0102 0124 etc. ~ μελχει multi: p^4 S A B E G H L M Y Γ Δ Θ Λ Ω 028 047 0211 etc.; Go mailkeins; Lvg melchi Lk 3:28

10. σεμει multi: D K U V W Ξ Π 0211 etc. ~ σεμει multi: A E G H M N X Y Γ Λ Ψ Ω 028 047 0102 etc. ; Go saimaieinis; Lvg semei Lk 3:26
As in medial position, in final position there is a predominance of evidence for \( i \sim \varepsilon a \) representing /i(:)/. One distinction of the final position is the balance of evidence for both variants. In every occurrence above where a multitude of witnesses exist for \( i \) or \( \varepsilon a \), a multitude of witnesses likewise exhibit the other variant. So these two graphemes are interchangeable in final position. For \textit{laiwwi}, see discussion above.

1.320. Where versional evidence is inconclusive.

1. \textit{αρνη} L X 157 213 \sim \textit{αρνεῖ} S B Γ 1241 (v.l. \textit{αραμ}); Go aramis; Lvg aram Lk 3:33
2. \textit{ἰανναῖ} p\(^4\) vid S B L Δ Θ 13 33 69 543 788 826 828 1241 \sim ιανναῖ 1604; Go jannins;
   Lvg ianna\(\acute{\iota}\) Lk 3:24
3. \textit{ἰωαννι} 179 \sim \textit{ἰωαννεῖ} S A Θ 579; Go iohannen; Lvg iohanni Lk 7:18
4. \textit{ἰωαννι} 179 \sim \textit{ἰωαννεῖ} S A L; Go iohannen; Lvg iohanni Lk 7:22
5. \textit{νερη} 892\* \sim \textit{νερεῖ} 983; Go nerins; Lvg neri Lk 3:27
6. \textit{νηρη multi:} D K N U V W X Π Ψ 0124 etc. \sim \nu\rho\varepsilon\iota \textit{multi:} p\(^4\) S A B E G H L M Y Γ \Delta
   Θ Λ Ω 028 047 0102 0124 etc.; Go nerins; Lvg neri Lk 3:27
7. \textit{σιδωνι maxime} \sim \textit{σιδώνει} N; Go seidonai; Lvg sidone Lk 10:13
8. \textit{σιδωνι maxime} \sim \textit{σιδώνει} N; Go seidonai; Lvg sidoni Lk 10:14
9. \textit{χωραζιν} N 5 60 66 83 115 157 158 262\(^C\) 265\(^C\) 267\(^C\) 348 372 443 480 544 577 669\(^F\) 903
   954 1009 1216 1229 1247 1351 1355 1443 1579 1630 1685 2322 2399 2542 2757
   /12 /80 /1761 \sim \textit{χωραζιν multi:} E V Γ Π Ω 047 0211 etc.; Go kaurazein; Lvg

- 21 -
corazain Lk 10:13

10. χοράζειν R U Λ 1 6 7 16 22 118 124 161 174 205 209 229 230 262* 265* 267* 349 477 478 565 700 713 1005 1012 1187 1192 1194 1195 1203 1210 1215 1241 1313 1338 1342 1365 1582 1604 1654 1675 2372 2487 2613 l10 l32 l70 l76 l150 l211 l253 l299 l524 l547 l859 l890 l1016 l1074 l1231 l1579 l1599 l1627 l1634 l1642 l1663 – χοράζειν multi: p45 p75 S A B C G K L M X Y Δ Θ Ξ Ψ 028 0115 etc.; Go kaurazein; Lvg corazain Lk 10:13

In the example of ἀρνη ~ ἀρνεῖ, both the Gothic and Vulgate versions give readings based on the variant reading ἀρμη. νερη ~ νερεῖ and ιαννα ~ ιαννεῖ yield n-stems nerins and jannins, thus the Gothic morphology masks the Greek phonology. The Vulgate neri points to Greek /i/, but the Vulgate iannae points to another phenomenon. Here Jerome did not have or did not consider information beyond the form itself as he did with Lvg hierusalem. So he treated –αι as a diphthong without diaeresis, transliterating it –ae. Or alternately, he considered ιαννα to be the nominative, thus supplying a genitive in -ae.

The Gothic evidence corresponding to the τ ~ ετ variation indicates some persistence of the distinction between short and long vowels in the fourth century. Gothic differentiates short and long i-vowels by the graphemes <i> and <ei>, respectively, whereas Latin writes both short and long /i/ with <i>. Initially the error of ετ for τ only occurred when τ was long. The sound merger of ετ and τ spread to ι as the distinction of quantity and quality between ι and ι subsided. The loss of quantity distinction occurred

56. Ibid., 207.
in the late third century BCE for Ptolemaic Koine and in the second century CE for Attic. In the examples above, all the interchanges in final position correspond to Go <ei>, that is /i:/ . In medial position, nineteen different words correspond to Go <ei>. Whereas only three instances correspond to Go <i>, and only one of these names, ἡλειαζ ~ ἡλειαζ, exhibits the variation prior to the sixth century. That variation ει ~ ι did not occur until the sixth century CE or later in some of these names may indicate that the scribes considered ι to be a short vowel in these instances. This would correspond to Go <i> and indicate some persistence of quantity distinction. Thus, in only one example does Wulfila treat a medial or final ι having shown an early interchange of ι and ει as a short vowel. Although the three examples in initial position all correspond to Go <i>, the medial and final positions show that the long vowel Ι predominates in the ι ~ ει variation. Thus, vowel isochrony was not necessarily generalized in the early history of New Testament manuscripts.

The Variation ι ~ η

Some evidence indicates a pronunciation of η distinct from ι. The variation η ~ ι is “exceedingly rare” prior to 150 CE in inscriptions. Likewise, this variation was “rather infrequent” in the non-literary texts from Egypt between 325 BCE and 0 CE. In contrast to these statements, Caragounis makes the ludicrous postulation that "the popular

57. Teodorsson (1977), 238.
pronunciation of H was that of I" from the fifth century BCE until modern times. He explains his reasoning in the statement, "The important thing is not when this process ended, but when it started." Now, the earliest evidence of confusion shows change only on the level of some dialect or idiolect. It is only when most speakers of a language manifest the confusion that one may say that the language has undergone a sound change. Based on the frequency of this variation in Attica and Egypt, one may conclude that most speakers of Egyptian and Attic Greek distinguished η and ι at least until the first century BCE and second century CE respectively.

In later Egyptian papyri, η and ι demonstrate a general merger by the second century CE. Furthermore, Gignac says the variation occurs “very frequently in all phonetic conditions throughout the Roman and Byzantine periods.” Admittedly, he clarifies this statement, saying that this interchange increases in frequency later in the corpus. Gignac aims to vitiate the assertion that the variation of η and ε indicates that η was still an e-vowel. For he claims that η ~ ε occurs under the same phonetic conditions as ε ~ ι, thus showing that η is equivalent to /i/. So the frequent confusion of η and ι after the first century CE indicates the merger of these two sounds to /i/ among the Greek-speakers of Egypt.

Yet this evidence may not offer information concerning the phonology of the New Testament because of bilingual interference. The distribution of this variation in the

62. Ibid., 377.
63. Gignac (1975), 235.
64. Ibid.
65. Ibid., 242.
66. Ibid., 242, 242-246, 249-262.
Roman era supports such interference. For the interchange of η and τ occurs disproportionately in Ptolemaic papyri and in some other regional dialects of Koine affected by bilingualism.\textsuperscript{67} Such an argument is especially compelling considering the bivalence of Coptic η.\textsuperscript{68} In all dialects of Coptic, η could indicate /i/ as in Ιησος 'Isis'\textsuperscript{69} or /ε(:)/ as in φα-ηρ 'son of Ερ' and φα-μαλελελη 'son of Mahalaleel'.\textsuperscript{70} Consequently, Egyptians may have pronounced η as /i/, but other Roman-era Greek-speakers did not necessarily share this pronunciation.

2.000. The variation τ ~ η

2.100. Where the variations τ, ετ, and η are present, the η-variant is the following.

1. αμηναδοβ 16 213 346 517 1077 1338 1542 /80 /211 /854 /1056; Go ameinadabis; Lvg aminadab Lk 3:33

2. αρνη 131 (v.l. αραμ); Go aramis; Lvg aram Lk 3:33

3. γαληλαιαν 0211 543 /859; Go galeilaian; Lvg galilaem Lk 2:39

4. γαληλαιας 0211 2766; Go galeilai; Lvg galilaeam Lk 8:26

5. γαληλαιαις 0211; Go galeilaias; Lvg galilaeae Lk 4:31

6. ειανος /1663; Go iaeirus; Lvg iairus Lk 8:41

\textsuperscript{67} Ibid., 248.
\textsuperscript{68} Ibid., 249.
7. ἐλιακὴμ 2 472; Go aileiakeimis; Lvg eliachim Lk 3:30
8. ἐλησαβετ 0211 /859 /1074; Go aileisabaith; Lvg elisabeth Lk 1:5 cf. 1:7 1:13 1:24 1:36 1:40 1:41 1:57
9. ἐλησαβεθ Θ; Go aileisabaith; Lvg elisabeth Lk 1:5
10. ἐλησσαίου 0211 179 /859; Go haileisaiu; Lvg heliseo Lk 4:27
11. ἡπροονσαλημ 179; Go iairusalem; Lvg hierusalem Lk 2:25
12. ἡρα maxime; Go heris; Lvg heris Lk 3:28
13. ἡρωδίς maxime; Go herodes; Lvg herodes Lk 9:9, cf. ἡρωδίς 179 ~ ἡρωδεῖς Θ
14. ιαπρος 21 28* 69 477 /859; Go iaeirus; Lvg iairus Lk 8:41
15. ῥωσανῆ multi: D F G H K L M R U V W X Y Γ Δ Λ Ξ Π Ψ Ω 028 047 etc.; Go iohannen; Lvg iohanni Lk 7:18
16. ῥωσανῆ multi: F G H K M U V W X Y Γ Δ Θ Λ Ξ Π Ψ Ω 028 047 0211 etc.; Go iohannen; Lvg iohanni Lk 7:22
17. λευη 2 983 2542; Go laiwweis; Lvg levi Lk 3:24
18. λευη 2; Go laiwweis; Lvg Levi Lk 3:29
19. λευην 179; Go laiwi; Lvg levi Lk 5:27
20. λευης 983 /890; Go laiweis; Lvg levi Lk 5:29
21. μελχη 0211 179 983 2542; Go mailkeis; Lvg levi Lk 3:24
22. μελχη 179 213; Go mailkeins; Lvg melchi Lk 3:28
23. ναην 0211 28 1009 /1056 /1074; Go naem; Lvg naim Lk 7:11
24. νηρει multi: p S A B E G H L M Y Γ Δ Θ Λ Ω 028 047 0102 0124 etc.; Go nerins; Lvg neri 3:27
25. ἡρὴ 22 157 /10 /184 /1642; Go nerins; Lvg neri Lk 3:27, cf. νηρεί 0211 – νείρε 983
26. σεμεὶ 544 2542 /80 /1056; Go saimaieinis; Lvg semei Lk 3:26
27. σιδώνη 13 69 826 828 /1056; Go seidonai; Lvg sidone Lk 10:13
28. σιδώνη 13; Go seidonai; Lvg sidoni Lk 10:14
29. σηδώνι 179; Go seidonai; Lvg sidoni Lk 10:14
30. σηδώνος /1579*; Go seidone; Lvg sidonis Lk 6:17
31. χωράζην 69 /854; Go kaurazein; Lvg corazain Lk 10:13
32. φαρησαϊοι 472; Go fareisaielis; Lvg pharisaei; Lk 7:30
33. φαρησαϊων 472; Go fareisaic; Lvg pharisaeis Lk 7:36
34. φαρησαίοι 472; Go fareisaiast; Lvg pharisaii Lk 7:36
35. φαρησαίοι 472; Go fareisaius; Lvg pharisaii Lk 7:37

Only ὡςανη, ἡρωδῆς, ἦρ, and νηρεί manifest η in the Ausgangstext with all the other η-variants having an i-type vowel (ι or ει). For the first three of these names, the likely readings are Ἡωσάνη, Ἡρωδῆς, and Ἡρ. Also, the η of νηρεί shows itself in the Ausgangstext as νηρι. The phonology of ὡςανη based on Gothic and Latin forms is inconclusive since both are inflectional endings. But the versional witnesses of ἡρωδῆς, ἦρ, and νηρεί give evidence for /e/ from Go <e> and Lvg <e>. Apart from ἀρνῆ where the versional evidence is uninformative, the η in all the other instances points to /i/ corresponding to Go <ei>/<i> and Lvg <i>. The one exception is the ultima of νηρη for
which only the Vulgate gives clear evidence, indicating /i/. Consequently, most of these instances of η demonstrate the confusion of /ει/ with η to represent the underlying sound /i/.

2.200. The variation is only τ ~ η

This variation τ ~ η manifests itself distinctly from that of ε ~ ει ~ η in the Gothic witnesses. To be sure some examples of τ ~ η indicate /i/ in the versions, but the preponderance of evidence point to some /e/ sound. In contrast, only two names (‘Ηρωδης and ‘Ηρ) showing the variation τ ~ ει ~ η definitively indicate /e/ and one name does so ambiguously: ναίν ~ ναείν; Go naem; Lvg naim Lk 7:11.

1. Ἡαννα 13 ~ Ἡαννα 346; Go iohanna; Lvg iohanna Lk 8:3
2. ιουδαιας maxime ~ ιουδαιας 179; Go iudaias; Lvg iudaea Lk 6:17
3. ἵσκαριωτὴν maxime ~ ἵσκαριωτὴν 0211; Go iskarioten; Lvg scarioth cl. iscariotem Lk 6:16

In each of these instances, the η appears in only one manuscript. Also, each of these manuscripts, namely 179, 346, and 0211, date from the ninth century or later. Therefore, all the instances of τ ~ η in initial position are peripheral variants, exhibiting Byzantine-
era etacism, indicating /i/. Even though in these instances the variation ει failed to appear, the phenomenon in 2.210 mirrors that of 2.100 where η varied with υ/ει.


2.211. Where Gothic is <e> and Vulgate is <e>.

1. ασιρ 179 ~ ασιρ maxime; Go aseris; Lvg aser Lk 2:36
2. βθλεεμ 053 2 13 472 828 983 1009 1203 1241 1579 l48 l70 l1074 l1579 ~ βθλεεμ
   multi: S A B C D F G H K L M U V W Y Γ Δ Θ Λ Ξ Ψ Ω 028 047 0135 0177
   0211 etc.; Go bethla[i]haim; Lvg bethleem Lk 2:4
3. βθλεεμ Ω 047 179 346 472 1009 1192 1241 1579 l1074 ~ βθλεεμ maxime; Go
   bethlahaim; Lvg bethleem Lk 2:15
4. γαδαρίων E 0211 115 343 716 903 1009 1424 1630 l253 l524 ~ γαδαρίων multi: S
   A G H K M R U V W Y Γ Δ Θ Λ Ξ Ψ Ω 028 047 etc.; Go gaddarene; Lvg
   gerasenorum Lk 8:37
5. γαδαρίων Κ Λ 0211 69 179 343 472 565* 1009 1071 1216 1542 1630 l184 l211 l253
   l524 l1016 l1056 l1074 ~ γαδαρίων multi: A C E F G Η Μ Ρ Ρ Υ Υ Υ Γ Δ Π
   Ψ Ω 028 047 0135 0202 etc.; Go gaddarene; Lvg gerasenorum Lk 8:26
6. γερασίων 579 ~ γερασίων p75 B C* D; Go gaddarene; Lvg gerasenorum Lk 8:37
7. ερουσαλίμ 179 ~ ερουσαλίμ maxime; Go iairusalem; Lvg hierusalem Lk 10:30
8. ιωαννής 179 ~ ιωαννής maxime; Go iohannes; Lvg iohannes Lk 7:33
9. ιωαννής 179 ~ ιωαννής maxime; Go iohannes; Lvg iohannes Lk 9:54
10. ἔσιφ 0211 ~ ἔσηφ maxime; Go iosefis; Lvg ioseph Lk 3:24

11. μαγδαληνι 346 ~ μαγδαληνη multi: S A B D E G K L M P U V W Γ Δ Θ Ξ Π Ψ Ω 028 0211 etc.; Go magdalene; Lvg magdalene Lk 8:2

12. μαγδαληνι multi: F H X Y Λ Π* 047 etc. ~ μαγδαληνη multi: S A B D E G K L M P U V W Γ Δ Θ Ξ Π Ψ Ω 028 0211 etc.; Go magdalene; Lvg magdalene Lk 8:2

13. μοσις 179 ~ multi: μωσης ρ45 ρ82 Α Ε Ζ Η Μ Ρ Τ Υ Ψ Ω Λ 028 047 0211 etc.; Go moses; Lvg moses Lk 9:30

14. ρισα 179 /1056 ~ ρησα maxime; Go resins; Lvg resa; Lk 3:27

Of the fourteen instances showing variations of i ~ η in non-initial position corresponding to Go <e> and Lvg <e>, eight of these show the variation i in only one or two manuscripts. These manuscripts are 179 346 0211 /1056, all dating from the ninth century CE or later. At Lk 8:26 and 8:37 the i ~ η variation occurs in the distinct textual variants γαδαρηνων ~ γερασηνων. The Vulgate uniformly supports one variant, and the Gothic Bible the other. Both versions read <e> at the location of interest, giving partial support for two of the η-variants. In the two instances at 8:26 and 8:37, it seems clear that Wulfila and Jerome read η and transcribed Go <e> and Lvg <e> respectively, considering η to represent a front vowel more open than /i/. Although readings of η as /i/ may be in evidence, these two learned men of the fourth century CE did not hold to this pronunciation in this word.

Only one of the variants shows a multitude of witnesses for both variants, μαγδαληνη ~ μαγδαληνη. The majuscules S A B D E G K L M R U V W Γ Δ Θ Ψ Ω 028 etc. support
the latter reading while F H X Y Λ Π* 047 support the former reading. Should μαγδαληνη be the original reading, there is a possible explanation for the division of manuscripts. μαγδαληνη is based on the city name Νυμμυ /migdlα/ with the denominative place-name suffix -νός, -νη added. Copyists could have read μαγδαληνη as ending in the suffix -νη. This suffix is a patronymic in Hesiod, Όκεανός: Όκεανινη. It appears as other feminine types in Menander: Καρινη and in Aelius Herodianus: Ἡροινη. Then, in Koine -τοις remains a productive suffix for adjectives of material. So the correction from -ηνη to -νη may have occurred by morphological analogy. If this explanation is valid with μαγδαλη-νη coming from Νυμμυ /migdlα/, then this provides evidence that η was rather open, quite unlike close /i/. Additionally, the morphological analogy shown in μαγδαληνη ~ μαγδαλινη may apply to the variants γαδαρηνων ~ γαδαρινων and γερασηνων ~ γερασηνων. These particular examples are not necessarily instances of phonological confusion. But should these readings be considered phonological, they still would not place the confusion of τ and η prior to the eighth century CE based on the dating of the manuscripts containing the τ-variants.

71. Bauer (1979), 484.
76. Aelius Herodianus, Περὶ ὅρθογραφίας Vol. 3.2, 518.
2.212. Where Gothic is <ai> and Vulgate is <e>.

1. βιθσαιδα Ψ 047 472 1009 1071 /184 /1127 ~ βηθσαιδα multi: p45 S B C E F G M P R
   Ξ Π 0115 0135 0181 0202 0211 etc.; Go baidsaidan; Lvg bethsaida Lk 9:10
2. βιθσαιδαν L 115 477 ~ βηθσαιδαν multi: A H V W Y Γ ∆ Θ Λ Ω 028 etc.; Go
   baidsaidan; Lvg bethsaida Lk 9:10
3. βιθσαιδαν 69 115 1392 ~ βηθσαιδαν multi: p45 S U W Γ etc. ~ βαθσαιδαν 788; Go
   baithsaidan; Lvg bethsaida Lk 10:13
4. βιθσαιδα Ψ 472 565 1009 1071 ~ βηθσαιδα multi: C E G K L M R V X Y ∆ Λ Ξ Π Ω
   028 047 0115 0211 etc.; Go baithsaidan; Lvg bethsaida Lk 10:13

Only one word exhibits Go <ai> and Lvg <e>, making this a hapax. Nevertheless, Go
<ai> and Lvg <e> do indicate an e-type sound, accepting the view of Ebbinghaus and
Heidermanns that the proto-Germanic diphthong ai had become a monophthong.78

2.213. Where Gothic is <ei> and Vulgate is <i>.

1. σιμων maxime ~ σημων 179 /859; Go seimon; Lvg simon Lk 7:40
2. σιμωνος maxime ~ σημωνος 118; Go seimonis; Lvg simonis Lk 5:3
3. σιμωνα maxime ~ σημωνα 179; Go seimonau; Lvg simonem Lk 5:4
4. σιμωνα maxime ~ σημωνα 179*; Go seimon; Lvg simonem Lk 6:14
5. σιμωνα maxime ~ σημωνα 1187; Go seimon; Lvg simonem Lk 6:15

78. W. Braune, Gotische Grammatik: mit Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnis. rev. F.
6. ꞏORM S N U V 33 123 472 478 1012 1192 1313 1338 1347 1351 1355 1542 /1127 ~

This is another instance where η appears in only a few marginal instances. In each of
these examples, only one or two manuscripts give η. The Gothic and Vulgate versions
read τ as /i/ which represents almost all manuscripts, but a very small number of scribes
confused η and τ as /i/.

2.214. Where Gothic is <i> and Vulgate is <i>.
1. φιλιππον maxime ~ φιληππον L; Go fillipu; Lvg philippum Lk 6:14
2. σαλαθηλ maxime ~ σαλαθηλ 544 /854; Go salathielis; Lvg salathihel Lk 3:27

Based on the versions, the reading is the short vowel /i/, but the data here is too
insignificant for comment.

Certain manuscripts give more substantial testimony for τ ~ η variation. The
frequency of etacism in each manuscript has been determined based on the data from the
variations τ / ετ ~ η and τ ~ η. Thus onomastic variations from Luke 1-10:30 provide the
data for this analysis. Of the 8 papyri, 62 majuscules, 128 minuscules, and 41
lectionaries cited as witnesses in Luke, 79 10 majuscules, 56 minuscules, and 21

lectionaries give at least one clear instance of confusion between τ and η. Note the critical edition used here does not canvass all extant manuscripts. For the number of extant manuscripts containing a "continuous text of the Gospel of Luke, complete or fragmentary" surpasses 1787.80 About half of the minuscules and lectionaries and a smaller portion of the majuscules cited by the IGNTP Gospel of Luke contain an instance of this phonological merger. In addition, the following manuscripts contain three or more instances: 0211 2 69 179 346 472 477 983 1009 1071 1542 2542 1184 1859 11056 11074. These manuscripts give the clearest evidence for the phonological merger of τ and η.

Given the complex manuscript history of the New Testament, the dating of the merger of τ and η poses a difficult problem. But several approaches do present themselves. For example, one may attempt to connect these variations to a particular text-type. Also, one may consider which manuscripts exhibit the variation and which do not. These two approaches will be considered presently.

Firstly, the dating of manuscripts that contain or lack the variation in question will be considered. The earliest New Testament minuscules date to the ninth century CE, whereas the earliest papyri and majuscules date to the second and third century CE respectively.81 Because the earliest minuscules of any sort come from the ninth century, these manuscripts offer little data of interest for dating. But the papyri and majuscules are much more useful for dating the merger of the sounds τ and η.

Caragounis studied the orthographic variations of the Gospel of John in the Codex Sinaiticus,\(^{82}\) dating to the fourth century CE.\(^{83}\) He found 470 orthographical errors, but there were no instances of confusion between \(\imath\) and \(\eta\).\(^{84}\) As a comparison, consider the variation of \(\varepsilon\imath\) for \(\imath\) in the Roman-era Attic Inscriptions, "it is unusual to find a large text dated after the end of the first century B.C without some example of EI for \(\imath\)."\(^{85}\) In the Gospel of John from the Codex Sinaiticus, there were 32 instances of \(\varepsilon\imath\) for \(\imath\) and 418 instances of \(\imath\) for \(\varepsilon\imath\).\(^{86}\) Caragounis not only searches Codex Sinaiticus, but he also searches \(\text{p}^{66}\) for orthographic errors.\(^{87}\) \(\text{p}^{66}\) contains the Gospel of John in a fragmentary form from 1-21:17.\(^{88}\) In this papyrus, he finds 492 orthographic errors, but there is not one occasion of the variation \(\imath \sim \eta\). Caragounis naively projects modern views of spelling into the second and fourth century CE to denigrate the scribes producing these texts as \textit{anorthographoi}.\(^{89}\) Yet Comfort and Barrett give a different evaluation of the scribe producing \(\text{p}^{66}\), "the handwriting indicates that it was probably the work of a professional scribe...with a practiced calligraphic hand."\(^{90}\) Regardless of the soundness of Caragounis' methodology, the data speaks for itself. One may not conclude that the lack of this variation resulted from rigorous education in spelling, given the large number of errors.

---

82. Caragounis (2004), 497.
where phonological mergers have already occurred, i.e. $i \sim e$ and $e \sim ae$.\footnote{Ibid. 497, 514.} From Caragounis' studies one concludes that these particular second and fourth century scribes distinguished between the sounds $i$ and $\eta$.

It is also beneficial to consider which manuscripts exhibit the confusion between $i$ and $\eta$ by onomastic variation in Luke 1-10:30. One may exclude the minuscules since this manner of writing did not begin until the ninth century CE and hence is not particularly useful for dating this variation.\footnote{Metzger B. M. and B. D. Ehrman, \textit{The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 18.} In contrast, the dates of papyri and majuscules range from the second to the tenth/eleventh centuries CE.\footnote{Aland (1989), 81.} Consequently, the early papyri and majuscules are more useful for dating the merger of $i$ and $\eta$. None of the papyri exhibited any evidence of this merger. Admittedly, the texts of $p^3$, $p^7$, $p^{42}$, and $p^{82}$ are rather scant. However $p^4$, $p^{45}$, and $p^{75}$ taken together present a more substantial body of text. These three papyri from the third century CE\footnote{Aland (1994), 3, 8, 14.} contain no evidence of the variation between $i$ and $\eta$ in the names considered from Luke 1-10:30. Of the majuscules, the following contained at least one clear instance of this variation: $E$ (VIII century), $K$ (IX), $L$ (VIII), $\Theta$ (IX), $\Lambda$ (IX), $\Psi$ (IX/X), $\Omega$ (IX), 047 (VIII), 053 (IX), and 0211 (IX).\footnote{Ibid. 19-20, 23-24.} The majuscules that do show the variation come from eighth to ninth/tenth centuries. The 52 other majuscules did not yield any evidence of the variation in question. Some of the majuscules contain a continuous text, while others contain only small fragments. From
the fourth century CE, S and B contain continuous texts.\textsuperscript{96} A, C, D, and W, all substantial, date from the fifth century.\textsuperscript{97} Substantial but fragmentary texts from the sixth century for the passage in question are N,\textsuperscript{98} Ξ, and the manuscripts associated with 070.\textsuperscript{99} No ample texts are extant from the seventh century. And substantial texts from the eighth century include E, L, Ψ, and 047.\textsuperscript{100} So there is significant evidence for the absence of $\iota \sim \eta$ confusion through the sixth century CE. In the seventh century, the manuscripts are too fragmentary. Not until the eighth century does evidence for the orthographic variation of $\iota$ and $\eta$ arise. Based on these data, the phonological merger of $\iota$ and $\eta$ began in the seventh or eighth century.

Another way to approach this sound change is to determine its correlation with the Byzantine or majority text-type. Should the variation $\iota \sim \eta$ be a characteristic unique to the majority text, then one could reasonably expect a close connection between manuscripts that exhibit the variation more frequently and the majority text. Unfortunately, K. Aland's extensive project to classify New Testament manuscripts does not offer assistance in distinguishing manuscripts based on this particular variation. His Teststellen focus on variation on the level of inflection, whole words, and phrases. Yet, spelling variants seem to play no role in the passages selected. In fact, he has even regularized $\iota \sim \varepsilon\iota$ and $\alpha\iota \sim \varepsilon$ variants. For he groups $p^{75}$ with the manuscripts reading καὶ

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{96} Aland (1989), 107-109.
\item \textsuperscript{97} Ibid 108, 113.
\item \textsuperscript{98} Cronin, H. S., \textit{Codex Purpureus Petropolitanus} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1899), 45-53.
\item \textsuperscript{99} Aland (1989), 118-119.
\item \textsuperscript{100} Ibid., 110-118.
\end{itemize}
Also, Codex Alexandrinus at Lk 2:15 contains the reading οἱ ποιμανές, but Aland groups this manuscript with those containing οἱ ποιμένες.102 Whether Aland treats the variation ι ~ η like the two previous variations is unclear since out of thirteen New Testament passages known to contain this variation,103 none appeared as Teststellen in the volumes of Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des neuen Testaments.104 Consequently, the correlation between the variation ι ~ η and the Byzantine family of manuscripts is unknowable through this method.

In contrast, one may easily discern the connection between this variation and the Alexandrian text-type. p66, p75, Codex Vaticanus, and Codex Sinaiticus all preserve specimens of the Alexandrian text-type.105 As already shown, p66 and Codex Sinaiticus contain no instances of etacism in the Gospel of John. Also, p75, Codex Vaticanus, and Codex Sinaiticus do not exhibit the variant in the names from Lk 1-10:30. Hence this orthographic error did not occur in the Alexandrian tradition before the fourth century when the Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus were produced,106 and there is no correlation between this variant and the Alexandrian text-type.

102. Ibid., 3.
103. These passages came from Blass and Debrunner (1961), 14 and readings in A and D.
105. Metzger and Ehrman (2005), 278.
The Variation $\nu \sim \imath \sim \eta$

The rounded front vowel $\nu$ /y/ likewise became the unrounded front vowel /i/ in Modern Greek. The similarity between the pronunciation of $\nu$ and $\imath$ manifests itself early in the fifth century BCE on the crude texts of dipinti and ostraca.\textsuperscript{107} But after 480 BCE, Threatte gives no clear examples of this neutralization, and the inscriptions he surveys generally extend to the end of the third century CE. Likewise, Teodorsson finds an insignificant number of interchanges of $\nu$ and $\imath$ that are not due to causes like metathesis and assimilation.\textsuperscript{108} His findings demonstrate again that $\nu$ had not become /i(:)/ by 0 CE.

In the Roman and Byzantine periods more occurrences of this change appear from Egyptian papyri,\textsuperscript{109} but many of these instances are best explained by assimilation and other causes. In Egypt, Coptic bilingual interference likely caused some of these instances of variation, since Coptic had no rounded front vowel /y/.\textsuperscript{110} Regarding the confusion $\nu \sim \eta$, Hellenistic evidence for it comes mainly from one phonetic environment, namely before $\mu$.\textsuperscript{111} Then, it becomes more generalized in all environments in the Roman and Byzantine periods.\textsuperscript{112} So in the papyri, $\nu$ shows variation with $\eta$ in the Roman period, but does not show unrounding of $\nu$ to /i/ in all phonetic environments until the Byzantine period at the earliest.

\textsuperscript{107.} For example, a group of ostraca from 483/482 BCE contain nine reading Ἀριστονύμο and over a hundred reading Ἀριστονύμο. Threatte (1980), 261.
\textsuperscript{108.} Teodorsson (1977), 133-134, 225.
\textsuperscript{109.} Gignac (1975), 267, 273.
\textsuperscript{110.} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{111.} Teodorsson (1977), 226.
\textsuperscript{112.} Gignac (1975), 262.
3.000. The variation of υ ~ η

1. ασὶρ maxime ~ ασὶρ l547 l1016; Go aseris; Lvg aser Lk 2:36
2. νηνευη 1424 ~ ννευη l80; Go lacuna; Lvg ninevite Lk 11:32
3. τηρω 579* l1016 ~ τυρω maxime; Go twre; Lvg tyri Lk 6:17
4. τηρω 13 69 348 l1056 ~ τυρω maxime; Go twrai; Lvg tyro Lk 10:13
5. τηρω l1056 ~ τυρω maxime; Go twrai; Lvg tyro Lk 10:14

The minor variant in these cases is limited to a few minuscules and lectionaries, all dating to the ninth century and later. Also, these variations all occur adjacent to a resonant or nasal. Teodorsson observed that almost all of the few υ ~ η variations in the Hellenistic period occurred as the graphemic sequences <ἡμ> and <ὑμ>.113 There are only about ten names that contain υ as a simple vowel in the text under consideration. Three are in the list above. So a significant portion of that number shows the variation in a few manuscripts. Based on these data, no evidence exists to support the pronunciation of υ like that of η prior to the ninth century, a conclusion not in agreement with Gignac's evaluation based on Egyptian papyri. Furthermore, Wulfila transliterates υ with <w> and not with <ei>, <i>, or <e>. His transliterations are not purely orthographic since he transliterates the merged sounds ε and αι with <ai>. The fact that υ corresponded to the pronunciation /i/ by the ninth century will be shown by the variation ι ~ υ. In summary,

evidence from New Testament manuscripts of this interchange begins in the ninth century and only in a few phonetic environments.

3.010. Where the variations υ and η are present, οι occurs in the following instance.
1. τοιρω 179; Go twrai; Lvg tyro Lk 10:13

The digraph οι came to represent /i/ in Modern Greek. This instance may be a sign of the merger of οι with ι. It is found in the manuscript that shows the highest frequency of ι ~ η confusion, lending more credence to this variation as οι for /i/. Admittedly, it is only one example.

3.100. The variation ι ~ υ

1. ασιρ 179 ~ ασιρ /547 /1016; Go aseris; Lvg aser Lk 2:36
2. νυνευη multi: Ε* Η Β Υ Δ 028 etc. ~ νυνευη /80; Go lacuna; Lvg ninevitae Lk 11:32
3. τερικω multi: Α Β Μ Ν Ω Υ Ι Θ Λ Π Ψ Ω etc. ~ τερικω 2643 /1074; Go iaireikon; Lvg hiericho Lk 10:30
4. σμεων 5 ~ σμεων maxime; Go swmaion; Lvg symeon; Lk 2:25, 2:34
5. σμεων 71* ~ σμεων maxime; Go swmaions; Lvg symeon; Lk 3:30
Like \( \nu \sim \eta \), the minor variation \( \iota \sim \nu \) manifests itself in only a few manuscripts in each instance. Again, only minuscules and lectionaries present the minor variants, the earliest dating to 1160 CE.\(^{114}\) Like \( \nu \sim \eta \), these variants appear only adjacent to a nasal or a resonant. Teodorsson also observes this tendency in variants he collects from the Ptolemaic period.\(^{115}\) Two of the examples above, \( \alpha \sigma \eta \rho \) and \( \nu \nu \nu \nu \eta \), also show the \( \eta \)-variant. Since \( \iota \), \( \eta \), and \( \nu \) all became /\(i/ \) in Modern Greek, it is reasonable to consider the confusion of these graphemes as evidence for their pronunciation as /\(i/ \) by the Byzantine period.

3.110. In the following case an \( \omicron \)-variant appears in an item that elsewhere shows \( \iota \sim \nu \)

1. \( \epsilon \rho \rho \chi \omega \) 983 ~ \( \epsilon \rho \epsilon \chi \omega \) \( \rho \)\(^{75}\) B*L \( \Xi \) 0190 1241 1424 1770; Go lacuna; Lvg hiericho Lk 10:30

Since \( \epsilon \rho \rho \chi \omega \) is a later variant, \( \epsilon \rho \epsilon \chi \omega \) must represent an original pronunciation. There is no clear phonological basis for the \( \omicron \)-variant, this instance likely represents some other copying error.

Based on the evidence from the New Testament manuscripts, \( \nu \), \( \iota \), and \( \eta \) did not merge until the Byzantine period. \( \nu \) and \( \eta \) did not merge fully, but only in environments adjacent to a resonant or nasal. The merger could have been more general, but evidence is lacking for this supposition. This contrasts with the conclusions of Gignac, that this

---

merger occurred in all phonetic positions by the Roman period.\textsuperscript{116} According to the New Testament manuscripts, \(\upsilon\) did not become /i/ until the ninth century. Therefore, the sounds of \(\upsilon\), \(\iota\), and \(\eta\) were differentiated in the earlier manuscripts of the New Testament.

**Other \(\iota\) and \(\eta\) Variants**

4.000. The variation of \(\eta \sim \varepsilon\iota\)

1. \(\varepsilon\gamma\lambda\alpha\nu\nu\ 0211 \sim \eta\gamma\lambda\alpha\nu\nu\ maxime; \) Go heleian; Lvg heliam Lk 9:19
2. \(\iota\omega\alpha\nu\nu\eta\ S\ A\ L \sim \iota\omega\alpha\nu\nu\eta\ multi: \) F G H K M U V W X Y \(\Gamma\ \Delta\ \Theta\ \Lambda\ \Xi\ \Pi\ \Psi\ \Omega\ 028\ 047\ 0211\ etc; \) Go iohannen; Lvg iohannen Lk 7:22
3. \(\iota\omega\alpha\nu\nu\eta\ p^{75}\ B^{*} \sim \iota\omega\alpha\nu\nu\eta\ B^{C}\ D; \) Go iohannen; Lvg iohannen Lk 7:22

This variation is best treated as two separate phenomena. The first example exhibits one minor variant, notably present in one ninth century majuscule, 0211.\textsuperscript{117} This witness contains a high frequency of \(\iota \sim \eta\) variation. Hence this example is a case of \(\eta\) being treated as /i/ and written as \(\varepsilon\iota\). In the last two examples, the manuscripts containing the minor variant do not possess another single instance of \(\iota \sim \eta\) confusion from the names in Luke 1-10:30. Indeed, four of the five manuscripts date to the fifth century or earlier, the exception being the eighth century L.\textsuperscript{118} This is unlikely to be an instance of the confusion between \(\varepsilon\iota\) and \(\eta\iota\) in the dative singular because such a variation became rare

\textsuperscript{116} Gignac (1975), 262.
\textsuperscript{117} Aland (1994), 37.
\textsuperscript{118} Ibid. 20.
once ει and ι merged in most environments. A possible explanation for this example is that it instantiates the confusion of ει and η before a back vowel as seen from the context of this verse: απαγγελατε Ιωαννη α ειδε (Lk 7:22). Teodorsson considers this variation frequent in Ptolomaic Koine. In this phonetic environment ει did not merge phonologically with ι as early as it did in other environments. Instead, it maintained the sound /e:/.

Additionally, there is evidence that the spirant /h/ was lost by the period of Koine. So the word following Ιωαννη would be pronounced /a/, meaning that the final vowel of Ιωαννη would precede a back vowel. Consequently, both of the variants ει and η in this instance would be pronounced /e:/.

In this passage, 179 contains the ι-variant Ιωαννη. Yet this is a manuscript that contains a high degree of ι ~ η confusion and bears witness to a later time when ει before a vowel had become /i/. So this ει ~ η variation need not be evidence for the pronunciation of η as /i/; rather it may lend support to the pronunciation of η as /e:/ in the fifth century CE and earlier.

5.000. ε ~ η

1. βεθσαιδα Theodoretus Cyrrhensis ~ βηθσαιδα multi: C E G K L M R V X Y Δ Α Ξ Π
    Ω 028 047 0115 0211 etc.; Go bai家纺saidan; Lvg bethsaida Lk 10:13
2. ελησαβετ G 0211 179 /859 /1074 (june 24) ~ ηλησαβετ /1074 (september 23); Go
    aileisabaiṭh; Lvg elisabeth Lk 1:24

120. Ibid., 170.
121. 'Report to John what you saw.'
124. Sturtevant (1940), 72-73.
3. ελισσαυν multi: S A B C D G L U V Y Δ Ψ etc. – ηλισσαυν 0102; Go haileisaiu; Lvg heliseo Lk 4:27
4. νερει 983 – νηρει multi: p4 S A B E G H L M Y Γ Δ Θ Λ Ω 028 047 0102 0124 etc;
   Go nerins; Lvg neri Lk 3:27
5. σαλαθηλ 983 – σαλαθηλ maxime; Go salathiels; Lvg salithiel Lk 3:27

This variation was quite infrequent in the last two centuries BCE in Egypt. It declined from the higher frequency of the third century in Egyptian papyri. Occasional examples of this confusion occur in Attic inscriptions of early and later Roman times. Just as this variation was infrequent among first century BCE papyri, likewise it is among the manuscripts of the New Testament. Yet the variations from New Testament manuscripts all date to the seventh century CE or later. Only the citation from the fifth-century Church Father Theodoretus Cyrrhensis exhibits this variation at an earlier date. Admittedly, the International Greek New Testament Project citation does not clearly indicate from which work of Theodoretus the quotation comes. Consequently, it is difficult to determine the date of the manuscript providing this citation. Yet modern editions of Theodoretus' commentaries on Daniel and the Psalms make use of an eighteenth century edition to provide their text. Hence all the texts that manifest this

variant likely date to the seventh century or later. This means that η had likely merged with ι, both representing /i/. Yet Threatte considers such confusion in Roman-era Attic inscriptions evidence of the pronunciation of η as an e-vowel.128 This was likely the case in Attica during Roman times and in the third century BCE in Egypt when the variation ε ~ η occurred in these respective corpora. Yet a different explanation may be needed for these much later variants. Gignac proposes that the variations ε ~ η and ε ~ ι were both effectively ε ~ /i/ in Roman and Byzantine papyri because these two variations occurred in some of the same phonetic environments.129 The environments the two variations had in common were before a back vowel, adjacent to a nasal, before a liquid, in final position, and before the sibilant σ/ς.130 Four of the five instances in §5.000 occur in these environments, namely before σ/ς, before a liquid, and adjacent to a nasal. So these variants may reflect the confusion of the mid front vowel ε with the close front vowel η /i/.

6.000. ι ~ η ~ α

1. ιωρημ S N U V 33 123 472 478 1012 1192 1313 1338 1347 1351 1355 1542 /1127 ~ ιωρημ 6 27 477c 517 669* 700 827 903 954 1009 1071 1077 1223 1342 1452 1675 2757 /l2 l70 l299 l1056 ~ ιωρημ Γ 22 892 1203 1210 1604; Go ioreimis; Lvg iorim Lk 3:29

2. ρισα 179 l1056 ~ ρησα maxime ~ ρασα 13; Go resins; Lvg resa; Lvg 3:27

130. Ibid., 242-255.
3. σαλαθηλ maxime ~ σαλαθηλ 544 I854 ~ σαλαθηλ 472 I950; Go salathielas; Lvg salathihel Lk 3:27
4. βιθσαίαν 69 115 1392 ~ βηθσαίαν multi: p45 S U W Γ etc. ~ βαθσαίαν 788; Go baiithsaidan; Lvg bethsaida Lk 10:13

The last three of these four examples manifesting α may be explained by assimilation to an adjacent α. The first example could also be assimilation, given the many variants of this name, especially τουραμ. Additionally, α are ω may be confused orthographically, meaning that this could be an assimilation with an error of orthography. Otherwise, the variant τουραμ may indicate a knowledge of Hebrew on the part of the scribe. For this name in Hebrew is דַּרְדַּר/yəhôrâm/. But the most likely explanation of the variation τουραμ ~ τουραμ is harmonization with the genealogy in Matthew 1:8, where Tischendorf and Legg have τουραμ without any variants. In conclusion, none of these variants result from phonological confusion.

7.000. τ ~ ετ ~ ατ
1. εσλι multi: D K U V W X Π 0102 0124 etc. ~ εσλει multi: S A B E G H M Y Γ Δ Θ

The variants showing αι demonstrate an orthographic error, not phonological confusion. Schmidt infers orthographic confusion of α and ε in a cursive text from the third century CE. 134 It is this kind of error that appears to be in evidence here, notably between αι and ει.

134. Sanders and Schmidt (1927), 244.
Orthographic errors occur frequently in the manuscripts of the New Testament. Many of these result from the combination of the continuous development of the sounds of the Greek language and the conservatism of Greek orthography fixed some five hundred years earlier. The two most frequent sources of error are the confusions $\tilde{t} \sim e' \tilde{t}$ (both pronounced /i(:)/) and $\alpha\tilde{t} \sim e$ (both pronounced /ε/). Egyptian papyri and Attic inscriptions suggest that Greek lost its vowel quantity distinction in the third century BCE and the second century CE respectively.\textsuperscript{135} Now, should the date of the loss of vowel quantity in the Christian communities have occurred within these dates, then one might expect a frequent confusion of the o-vowels, o and $\omega$, at least among the copyists, if not also among the writers. Yet this is not the case. For both the second/third century papyrus p\textsuperscript{66} and the fourth century uncial Codex Sinaiticus (S) exhibit relatively few errors of this sort. In the Gospel of John from the Codex Sinaiticus, of the 470 vocalic errors there is only one instance of o instead of $\omega$ and none of $\omega$ instead of o.\textsuperscript{136} Likewise, in the extant passages of the Gospel of John in p\textsuperscript{66}, four instances of o instead of $\omega$ and one instance of $\omega$ instead of o occur out of the 492 vocalic errors.\textsuperscript{137} Compare this type

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{136} C. Caragounis, \textit{The Development of Greek and the New Testament} (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 497, n. 108.
\item \textsuperscript{137} Ibid., 514.
\end{enumerate}
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of confusion to the two aforementioned mergers. Codex Sinaiticus contains 350 errors of the type \( i \sim \varepsilon i \) and 110 of the type \( a i \sim \varepsilon \).\(^{138}\) Additionally, \( \text{p}^{66} \) demonstrates the variation \( i \sim \varepsilon i \) 294 times and the variation \( a i \sim \varepsilon \) 177 times. So how does one account for the discrepancy between the frequency of o-variation and the two front vowel variations, \( i \sim \varepsilon i \) and \( a i \sim \varepsilon \)?

One may consider whether the loss of vowel quantity is in evidence in the New Testament manuscripts. For this sound change would likely have occurred either before or during the time that these manuscripts were produced (the earliest manuscript considered here dates to around 200 CE). This deduction is conceivable since the change is demonstrable in the second century CE in the language communities of Egypt and Attica, as seen in the Egyptian documentary papyri and Attic inscriptions. Additionally, Modern Greek exhibits the change. Yet the low relative frequency of the o-type variations in the aforementioned second/third and fourth century CE manuscripts may indicate a preservation of vowel length, at least in certain communities even at such a late date. So it is appropriate to consider Greek vowel quantity both generally, and in New Testament manuscripts specifically.

Vowel quantity came to be regularly represented in writing during the archonship of Eukleides with the official acceptance of the Ionic alphabet.\(^{139}\) That is, the alphabet now distinguished mid-vowel length with the incorporation of \( \times \) and \( \Omega \). A need to disambiguate orthographically sounds that were distinct phonologically and phonemically motivated this change. In the Attic script E and O each represented two sounds, namely a

\(^{138}\) Ibid., 497, n. 108.
long and a short vowel. Yet it is not necessary that the long and short vowels in each instance be identical in quality. With regards to the o-sound, long ω represented an open-mid back vowel /ɔː/ with a sound quality between α and o, as in English saw.\textsuperscript{140} Sturtevant deduces this quality from the observation that the Ionic contraction of o + α and α + o both yield ω.\textsuperscript{141} In contrast, o was a mid back vowel. Allen sees no reason why o was ever otherwise, pronounced like German Gott.\textsuperscript{142} The e-type vowels also differed in quality. η represented an open-mid front vowel as seen in βή βή, the designation in Attic comedy of sheep bleating.\textsuperscript{143} Whereas ε was likely similar to the mid front vowel of Modern Greek.\textsuperscript{144} The vowel τ could be long or short with no orthographic distinction. And unlike the mid vowels, no clear distinction of quality between short and long is discernible.\textsuperscript{145} Likewise, α could be long or short with no difference in quality.\textsuperscript{146}

In summary, Attic Greek of the fourth century BCE contained long and short vowels where the mid vowels differed in both quality and quantity.

Vowel quantity ceased to be phonemic over time, as is evidenced by the situation in Modern Greek. For Modern Greek no longer distinguishes between short and long e-sounds and o-sounds. Rather, the language demonstrates a nonphonemic lengthening of stressed vowels. So there remains only the question of when the change occurred.

\textsuperscript{142.} Ibid., 63.
\textsuperscript{143.} ὅδι ἦλιθος ώσπερ πρόβατον βή βή λέγων βαδίζει (Kratinos, F45 \textit{Poetae Comici Graeci}).
\textsuperscript{144.} Allen, \textit{Vox Graec}\textit{a} (1987), 63.
\textsuperscript{145.} Ibid., 65.
\textsuperscript{146.} Ibid.
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A number of phenomena from Hellenistic, Roman, and Byzantine times may suggest a merger of short and long vowel quantity. Given the diversity of the Greek-speaking world in these time periods, it is not surprising that this merger would become prevalent at different times in these communities.

The confusion between short and long i as demonstrated by the variation of i ~ ì may indicate a loss of length distinction. Prior to 350 BCE, ì represented the diphthong /ei/ as well as the long e-vowel resulting from compensatory lengthening of a short e-vowel. These two sounds, represented by one grapheme, eventually merged to a long e-vowel, likely being a close mid vowel. The first evidence of this sound being confused with etymologically long i in Attica comes from ca. 350 BCE, but this confusion is not frequent in Attic inscriptions until the end of the second century BCE. The merger becomes so widespread that "it is unusual to find a large text dated after the end of the first century B.C. without some example of EI = ì." Now the instantiation of the ì for ì comes only later in Greek inscriptions, dating from the reign of Nero, and becoming more frequent after 150 CE. The later date for the inclusion of ì in the variation ì ~ i may indicate a loss of quantity distinction in the speech community of Attica, although the variation with ì remains "fairly rare," at least until 300 CE. In contrast, the Ptolemaic papyri show the variation ì ~ ì frequently even in some of the

---

147. Threette (1980), 299.
148. Ibid., 172.
150. Ibid., 195.
151. Ibid., 198.
152. Ibid., 200.
153. Ibid.
early documents, namely those from the first part of the third century BCE. And the variation of \( \epsilon t \) with short \( t \) becomes most frequent and general by the second century BCE. Hence these data indicate a loss of quantity distinction by the second century BCE in Egypt and in the second century CE among the inscriptions found in Attica.

Another possible indication of vowel isochrony is the predominance of a stress accent instead of a pitch accent. Since the pitch accent in Greek depends on the distinction of morae, Teodorsson suggests that the equalization of vowel quantity necessitated a change in accent. Threatte and Allen support the converse view: the advent of a stress accent would result in a change in vowel quantity.

Gignac suggests a stronger stress accent in Egyptian Greek based on "considerable interchange of vowels in unaccented syllables." Also, one finds the loss of vowels in unaccented syllables in Egyptian papyri, with these texts dating from the first century CE. This situation parallels the stress accent of Latin characterized by vowel weakening and vowel loss. Yet the phenomenon in Egyptian Greek is better explained as bilingual interference. For in Coptic, the strong stress accent causes vowel quantity to be indistinguishable in unaccented syllables.

158. Gignac (1975), 326.
159. Sturtevant (1940), 102.
160. Gignac (1975), 326.
which precedes Coptic shows the merger of unstressed vowels to schwa /ə/. 161

Subsequently, the Coptic of 400 CE develops two secondary unstressed vowels, 162 limited to certain environments. 163 So vowels often have little distinction in unstressed syllables in the native language of the Egyptian people. Additionally, the confusion and loss of unstressed vowels is much more common in Egyptian papyri than in the rest of Koine. 164 Therefore the evidence for a predominant stress accent in Egyptian papyri indicates not a shift from a tonal accent to a stress accent, but rather the influence of bilingual interference.

Likewise, one may derive evidence for the development of a stress accent from the rise of Byzantine verse alongside Hellenic verse. Hellenic verse depends on vowel quantity, light and heavy syllables, and has no fixed syllable count κατὰ στίχον, whereas Byzantine verse exhibits fixed accent within the line which resulted from paroxystic line end, 165 i.e. an accent fixed on the penultimate syllable of the line. From this starting point, the accents earlier in the line became fixed. Albrecht Dihle considers the first Byzantine verse in both Christian and pagan contexts to date from the fourth century CE. 166 Yet Maas places Byzantine poetry "in church hymns and folk poetry from about

162. Ibid., 452.
163. Ibid., 454.
164. Gignac (1975), 326
A.D. 500.” Consequently, the development of this new verse form supports the loss of the tone accent by the fourth or sixth century CE.

Additionally, the confusion of o and ω may provide evidence for the loss of quantity distinction. In Attic inscriptions, the variation of these vowels occurred in crude specimens before the second century CE. Only after 150 CE does this variation become more numerous. Even after this date, most of the errors are confined to a few lexical items. In contrast, the Greek-speaking populations of Egypt commonly confused these sounds from the third century BCE in a variety of environments, including inflectional endings. The variation o ~ ω offers evidence for loss of vowel quantity distinction by the third century BCE in Egypt and by the second century CE in Attica.

To gain a fuller understanding of the immediate effects of phonology on particular manuscripts, the manifestation of vocalic errata in portions of a number of early manuscripts will be considered. These include New Testament papyri and uncials from the second/third century CE to the fifth century CE.

Such an investigation raises a number of revealing questions concerning the low relative frequency of the o ~ ω alternation in the texts of Codex Sinaiticus and p 66. Is this phenomenon reflected in other manuscripts? Does ει exist as a variant of ι in these manuscripts, indicating a loss of vowel quantity? Are other less common variations comparable in relative frequency to the variation o ~ ω? These and other issues will be treated in what follows.

169. Ibid., 228-229.
Certain methodological considerations have guided the survey of these manuscripts. As in the treatment of orthographic variation of names, only minimal pairs were considered to be viable demonstrations of a particular variation. Also, variations discovered to be explainable as a similar spelling from another dialect were excluded from the data since they may have resulted from dialect influence and not phonological confusion. For example, the variation ειματοσμενον (A) ~ Ἰματοσμένον (Ausgangstext) may result from the dialectal variants Ἧμα ~ εἵμα.\textsuperscript{171} The "Register der Dialekte und anderer Sprachgruppen" from Fischer's edition of \textit{Die Ekloge des Phrynichos} gives an indication of the many dialects that make up Koine Greek and the possible variations.\textsuperscript{172} In the Ekloge, the grammarian Phrynichos laments the intrusion of many non-Attic (e.g. Aeolic, Doric, Ionian, Macedonian, and Syracousian) forms into late-Roman Koine.\textsuperscript{173} With regard to the editions of the manuscript, only facsimiles and respected transcriptions that aimed to set forth the original text were used out of a desire to exclude the correctors of the text from the tabulation of data. Such correctors might include the scribe himself, a διορθωτής, or some even later hand. Yet since such consideration is beyond the scope of this study, as far as it is possible, the data encompasses only the original writing of each manuscript. Consequently, one must discard transcriptions like Cronin's \textit{Codex purpureus petropolitanus} of Codex N which incorporates corrections into the

\textsuperscript{172} \textit{Die Ekloge des Phrynichos}, ed. E. Fischer (Berlin:Walter de Gruyter, 1974), 140-141.
\textsuperscript{173} Ibid.
transcription without comment. These guidelines serve to focus the information upon specific phonological issues at a particular point in time.

The manuscripts studied encompass papyri and uncialss dating from the second/third century CE to the fifth century CE. These include the extant passages of the Gospel of John in the second/third century papyrus p\textsuperscript{66}. One hundred fifty-six pages survive from this papyrus ranging from John 1:1-21:17 with nearly continuous text in the portions John 1:1-6:11 and 6:35-14:26. Also, the extant sections of Luke 3-12 in the second/third century papyrus p\textsuperscript{75} were examined. This papyrus, although rather fragmentary from Luke 3:18-7:45, being nearly intact in Lk 7:46-12:59, contains enough text to yield significant results. Additionally, the following majuscules came under the purview of this study: the entirety of John's Gospel in the fourth century Codex Sinaiticus (S),

Luke 1-8 in the fifth century Codex Bezae (D), and Luke 1-8 in the fifth century Codex Alexandrinus (A). These manuscripts provide ample evidence of vocalic variation.

---

175. One finds a list of all vocalic errors in p\textsuperscript{66} from the Gospel of John in Caragounis (2004), 502-514.
177. The transcription with accompanying facsimile was consulted from V. Martin and R. Kasser *Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV: Evangiles de Luc et Jean, Tome 1* (Köln:Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961).
178. There is a summary of the vocalic variations of Codex Sinaiticus in Caragounis (2004), 496, n. 108.
179. Scrivener produced a transcription of Codex Bezae in which "all that appears in our printed pages...proceeded from the original writer of the manuscript." A reprint of this edition provides the text for this study. F. H. Scrivener, *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis* (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, 1864; reprint, Pittsburgh, PA: The Pickwick Press, 1978).
The expected variations, in addition to other minor variants, manifested themselves in these manuscripts. In Table 1 below, one finds the frequency of all potentially significant phonological variants which occur more than once in any given manuscript. For example, the variation noted "ει for ι" indicates that the likely reading is ι (as in Ἡγεμόνιας Lk 4:25), but the manuscript shows ει (ηγεμόνιας D Lk 4:25).

Those frequencies with a question mark come from the orthographic data of Caragounis, namely the variations α ~ ε and o ~ α.181 One could infer from his book that these variations did not occur in the manuscripts he studied. However, it is also possible that he did not consider them as phonological variations. For Schmidt and Sanders conjectured that variations such as these found in the late third century Berlin Papyrus of Genesis resulted from orthographic confusion in a cursive ancestor.182 Yet these particular variations are quite distinct orthographically in the pertinent manuscripts except for o ~ α in p66, which could conceivably be confused. However, when properly written, even o and α are distinct in p66. Admittedly, the variation α ~ ε is unusual in Attic inscriptions,183 yet it occurs frequently in the Egyptian non-literary papyri, even in accented syllables where vowels are more regular.184 The variation o ~ α is frequent in Egypt, but is rare elsewhere.185 These variations may or may not be phonological, but they should not be disregarded from the start.

183. Threatte (1980), 120.
184. Gignac (1975), 278.
185. Ibid., 288.
First, let us consider a few initial observations about these variations. By far the most common variation is ει ~ ι. Notably, the high frequency of ει for ι in all these manuscripts shows that the merger of ει and ι has taken place in these communities at least by the time of these scribes. The mistake ει for ι is sure evidence of phonological
change, whereas $ for &$ may merely indicate orthographic deletion. The next most frequent variation was $\alpha i \sim \varepsilon$. Most commonly this variation occurs in verbal endings as when the third singular medio-passive $\pi\omega \iota \tau \alpha i$ is written instead of the plural imperative $\pi\omega \iota \tau \varepsilon$ from Luke 3:4 of the Codex Alexandrinus. The variation occurs as well in other environments, yet it is absent in the selection from p$^75$. The amount of text considered from p$^75$ admittedly was the smallest, so it is possible that the sample was insufficient to manifest this error. In the introduction to the Bodmer publication of this papyrus, Martin and Kasser state "La confusion de $\varepsilon$ et $\alpha i$ due à l'identité de prononciation est très rare," listing only a few examples. So this confusion does occur in p$^75$, although less frequently than in the other manuscripts.

Next comes the treatment of the variation $\omega \sim \omega$. The uncial S, A, and D each contain only one or two instances of this variation. This is striking in comparison with the high frequency of the two previous variations. Given that this variation shows such low relative frequency, it is not obvious to conclude that these variations are the result of the merger of $\omega$ and $\omega$.

The papyri demonstrate a higher number of $\omega \sim \omega$ variations. This situation may be analogous to the difference between the evidence of Egypt and Attica. That is, Attic inscriptions show this variation in limited environments, mostly in certain lexical items, whereas Egyptian papyri exhibit this variation frequently and in all

---

188. Threatte (1980), 224.
environments. After removing non-phonological variants, the data will show that there is no significant distinction between New Testament papyri and the parchment codices.

The variation $\varepsilon \tau \sim \eta$ provides a worthwhile comparison. Both the variations $\omicron \sim \omega$ and $\varepsilon \tau \sim \eta$ have a total of five instances in the three uncials S, A, and D combined. The latter variation occurs predominately before a vowel. It was most frequent in the second century BCE among the Egyptian papyri and in the period 50 BCE to 50 CE among Attic inscriptions. Subsequently, $\varepsilon \tau$ before a vowel shifted to $/i/$ in both dialects. So the variation $\varepsilon \tau \sim \eta$, limited to a specific environment and likely on the wane, was just as frequent as the variation $\omicron \sim \omega$ in the uncials.

Phonological merger is not the only possible cause for the variations in Table 1. Teodorsson lists a number of non-phonetic factors involved in variation. They include morphological causes. For instance, the writer may confuse two or more morphemes, such as $'\Omega\rhoου$ for $'\Omega\rhoωι$. Additionally, morphological developments and morphological interference may underlie some of these variations. For instance, imperfect and weak aorist forms intermingled as in the second person singulars $\varepsilon\gammaραψεζ$ for $\varepsilon\gammaραψαζ$ and $\varepsilon\gammaραφαζ$ for $\varepsilon\gammaραφεζ$, as well as the third plural imperfect $\varepsilon\gammaραφαν$ for $\varepsilon\gammaραφον$. Teodorsson also mentions "syntactic/contextual causes" such as the writer's

189. Teodorsson (1977), 151-159.
192. Ibid., and Gignac (1975), 189-190.
194. Ibid., 53.
misunderstanding of the syntax of a clause and "assimilation with graphic elements of an adjacent word." Also, assimilations to a neighboring vowel likely caused some of these variants. Finally, Threatte mentions "careless omissions" and "inaccurate renditions of diphthongs." For example, he posits this phenomenon to explain early instances of \( i \) for \( \varepsilon i \). All these causes may play a role in some of the variants listed above.

Variants more infrequent than those in Table 2 further illuminate the variation \( o \sim \omega \).

About half of these variants seem to result from an omission. These include \( \varepsilon \sim \varepsilon u, i \sim oi, \varepsilon \sim \varepsilon i, \alpha i \sim aia, i \sim ia, \) and \( \varepsilon \sim \varepsilon e \). The digraphs \( oi, \varepsilon i, \) and \( ai \) have ceased to be diphthongs. The dating of the phonetic change of \( \varepsilon u \) to /ev/ is uncertain. So \( \varepsilon u \) could have signified /eu/ or /ev/ in our manuscripts. Hence, only the variation \( \varepsilon \sim \varepsilon u \) may fall into the category "inaccurate renditions of diphthongs." Most, if not all, of these examples result from careless orthography.

The other minor variants consist of \( \varepsilon \sim i, o \sim i, \varepsilon \sim o, \alpha i \sim \varepsilon i, \alpha \sim \omega, \) and \( \varepsilon \sim \eta \). Surely the first four variations did not result from phonological confusion, because the two variant elements in each of these variations were quite distinct. For example, the variation \( o \sim i \) involves the mid back vowel \( o \) and the close front vowel \( i \).

The two vowels \( \varepsilon \) and \( \eta \) are much closer together in terms of point of articulation. In classical times \( \varepsilon \) was relatively more close than \( \eta \), which was more open. Yet \( \varepsilon \) became

196. Teodorsson (1977), 54.
198. Ibid.
199. Both Modern Greek and \( \lambda eβεις \) for \( \lambda eβεις \) (Lk 5:29) in the twelfth century CE lectionary /80 demonstrate the fricativization of \( v \) in \( \varepsilon u \). cf. Allen, *Vox Graeca* (1987), 94, n.8.
200. Ibid.
201. Ibid., 160.
more open, merging with monophthongized αι; and η, in the process of merging with close i, became more close. Consequently, the height of articulation of these two front vowels intersected at some time. Teodorsson places this intersection in the third century BCE in Egypt, based on the variation ε ~ η. However, in Attica this variation occurs both in early and late-Roman times. This seems to indicate that some community of Attic speakers had continued to pronounce η as /e(:)/ into the late-Roman period, while some may have begun to pronounce η as /i(:)/. Even though the phonological considerations for the confusion of ε and η seem favorable, at no time does this become a frequent variation. In fact, one may explain the known variants in these texts without recourse to phonology. Assimilation may explain the variants επηρεαζόντες for επηρεαζόντες (A Lk 6:28) and επηρεαζόντων for επηρεαζόντων (D Lk 6:28). The next form is less certain: δέχεται for δέχεται in ος εαν δέχεται (p Lk 9:48). One may posit confusion between subjunctive and indicative by the scribe resulting from the coincidence of forms like λύεις and λύης, λύει and λύη, λύομεν and λύωμεν in pronunciation. Yet there is little evidence for the pronunciation of η as /i/ = ei in the second/third century among the New Testament manuscripts. In an indefinite relative clause with ὅς ἔδωκα, one would expect a verb in the subjunctive. Yet perhaps the

203. Ibid.
205. Ibid.
confusion of ὃς and ὅςις evidenced in the Gospels\textsuperscript{209} led to a confusion of mood. Otherwise, δεχέται may have arisen from assimilation. None of these instances of ε ~ η are explainable only through phonological confusion, but may have arisen because of other factors.

The variation α ~ ω, also close in articulation, occurs in only a few instances in both Ptolemaic Koine\textsuperscript{210} and in Attic inscriptions.\textsuperscript{211} The one example from our corpus of selected manuscripts seems to have resulted from assimilation: χαρα for χώρα (D Lk 2:8). Consequently, the variation α ~ ω, like ε ~ η, likely did not result from phonological confusion.

All the variations less frequent than ο ~ ω are better explained by causes other than phonological confusion. Most of the infrequent variants result from assimilation and careless omissions. In each of the instances where a sound merger is possible, other potential causes present themselves, weakening the argument for a merger. Based on this evidence, the o ~ ω variation is either the most infrequent phonological confusion or not one at all.

To determine whether the leveling of vowel quantity manifests itself in these manuscripts, one may ask if the variation εί for ί occurs in each of the manuscripts. To observe this would be probable evidence for the sound change. Admittedly, Allen has made the argument that the variation εί for ί does not necessarily indicate a loss of vowel quantity distinction, it may merely indicate an equivalence of the graphemes εί and ί.

\textsuperscript{209} Ibid., 152-153.
\textsuperscript{210} Teodorsson (1977), 170.
\textsuperscript{211} Threatte (1980), 233-234.
originating from the equivalence of \( \varepsilon \alpha \) and \( \upipsilon \). Yet this seems a less likely explanation than the leveling of vowel quantity. So now the relative frequency of \( \varepsilon \alpha \) for \( \upipsilon \) and \( \varepsilon \alpha \) for \( \upipsilon \) will be considered.

The variation \( \varepsilon \alpha \) for \( \upieta \) gives the clearest indication of vowel length in our manuscripts. The length of \( \upieta \) in the likely reading of each word may be determined through etymology, discussions of grammarians, as well as usage in poetry. Only \( p^66 \), \( p^75 \), \( A \), and \( D \) are accessible to interpretation in this regard since Caragounis does not offer an elaboration of the data in \( S \), only the summary statistics. First, consider the fourth century uncial Codex Alexandrinus (\( A \)). It contains 40 instances of \( \varepsilon \alpha \) for \( \upieta \) in Luke 1-8. Nine of these certainly contain short \( \upieta \) and 3 forms are uncertain. The secure forms are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varia Lectio</th>
<th>Ausgangstext</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lk 3:1 ἡγεμονειας</td>
<td>ἡγεμονίας</td>
<td>abstract substantive in -( \iota )( \alpha )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LK 4:20 ἐκαθείσεν</td>
<td>ἐκάθθισεν</td>
<td>s-aorist from ( \nu)( \sigma)ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lk 5:3 καθεῖσας</td>
<td>καθίσας</td>
<td>s-aorist from ( \nu)( \sigma)ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lk 5:17 δυναμείς</td>
<td>δύναμις</td>
<td>i-stem noun, δυναμ-( \iota )-( \varsigma )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lk 5:24 κλινεῖδιω</td>
<td>κλινίδιω</td>
<td>diminutive -( \iota )-( \omicron )-( \omicron )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

216. Ibid., 304.
6. Lk 7:12 ἠγγείσεν  ἠγγείσεν  s-aorist to a verb in -ίζω
7. Lk 7:15 ἀνεκαθείσεν  ἀνεκαθείσεν  s-aorist from ἴσσεν
8. Lk 8:15 οἰτινες  οἰτινες  *-κώι- > -τί-
9. Lk 8:44 ρυσεῖς  ρύσις  i-stem noun, ρυσ-ί-ς

With this many of the 40 ει for ι variations coming from short ι, it seems likely that vowel quantity was not distinguished by the writers of this manuscript. Additionally, one of the uncertain forms in our selection from the Codex Alexandrinus is worthy of comment,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varia Lectio</th>
<th>Ausgangstext</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lk 8:38 ἔδειτο</td>
<td>ἔδειτο</td>
<td>ει treated as ε-ι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One may explain the reading ἔδειτο by resyllabifying ἔ-δε-ι-το as ἔ-δε-ε-ι-το. This unconventional syllabification could yield either a long or a short ι. Also note that ἔδειτο is the Attic form, but Koine possessed another form in parallel to this one. For Phrynichos warns against the use of the Ionic form ἔδεῖτο, thus indicating its use.219 Both of these forms are present in the manuscript tradition for this verse.220 Consequently, the Ionic form may have influenced the syllabification of the Attic form.

In Luke 1-8 of the Codex Bezae, ninety-nine instances of ει for ι manifest themselves. Thirty-three of these instances are υμειν / ημειν for ύμιν / ήμιν. Of the remaining sixty-six, seventeen represent words that contain short ι-vowels. Such evidence in the Codex Bezae demonstrates vowel isochrony in this manuscript as well. The evidence is the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varia Lectio</th>
<th>Ausgangstext</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lk 1:13 δεησεις</td>
<td>δεησις</td>
<td>i-stem noun, δεησ-ι-ς(^{221})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lk 1:15 κολειας</td>
<td>κολλίας</td>
<td>abstract substantive in -ια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lk 1:23 λειτουργειας</td>
<td>λειτουργίας</td>
<td>abstract substantive in -ια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lk 1:41 κολεια</td>
<td>κολλία</td>
<td>abstract substantive in -ια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lk 1:60 αποκρεθεισα</td>
<td>ἀποκριθεῖσα</td>
<td>aorist passive -κρι-(^{223})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lk 3:16 βαπτεσει</td>
<td>βαπτίσει</td>
<td>future to a verb in -τεω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lk 5:12 μεια</td>
<td>μιξ</td>
<td>*(s)m-iyå &gt; μια(^{224})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lk 5:29 οικεια</td>
<td>οἶκια</td>
<td>abstract substantive in -ια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lk 6:17 επει</td>
<td>ἐπὶ</td>
<td>locative ending(^{225})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lk 6:42 υποκρειτα</td>
<td>ὑποκριτά</td>
<td>cf. κρῖτος(^{226})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Lk 6:48 οικειαν</td>
<td>οἶκιαν</td>
<td>abstract substantive in -ια</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{221}\) Smyth (1956), 304.  
\(^{222}\) Ibid., 235.  
\(^{225}\) Sihler (1995), 368.  
\(^{226}\) Ibid., 517.
12. Lk 6:48 οἰκεία {oikéia} abstract substantive in -ια
13. Lk 6:49 οἰκέαν {oikéan} abstract substantive in -ια
14. Lk 6:49 οἰκείας {oikeías} abstract substantive in -ια
15. Lk 7:2 τιμέος  {v. l. timéoς} adjectival suffix -ο, -ια
16. Lk 7:6 οἰκείας {oikeías} abstract substantive in -ια
17. Lk 7:38 θρίζει  {v. l. thríζει} dative plural in -σί

In the extant portions of Luke 3-12 from p75, five of the thirty-six instances of ια for ι show an initial short ι. So it is likely that the copyists and potentially the writer of the Vorlage of this manuscript did not distinguish between ι and ι.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varia Lectio</th>
<th>Ausgangstext</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lk 6:38 πεπεσεμένον  {pepésemenón}</td>
<td>πεπεζομένον</td>
<td>πεζομένον 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lk 7:22 αποκριθείς  {apokrithēς}</td>
<td>αποκριθείς</td>
<td>aorist -κρι- 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lk 10:27 αποκριθείς  {apokrithēς}</td>
<td></td>
<td>aorist -κρι-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lk 12:3 σκοτεία  {skotíα}</td>
<td>σκοτεία</td>
<td>abstract substantive in -ια 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lk 12:42 σιτ[ο]μετρείον  {sitométrion}</td>
<td>σιτομέτριον</td>
<td>adjectival suffix in -ο, -ια to form a substantive 232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

228. Ibid., 58.
231. Ibid., 235.
In the extant passages of John’s Gospel in p66, there are one hundred thirty-nine instances of εἰ for Ἰ. Nearly half of these are of the type ημείν/ημείν for Ἰμείν/Πμείν. Additionally, twelve occurrences show εἰ for Ἰ. The frequency of this phenomenon offers strong evidence for vowel isochrony in this manuscript as well.

### Varia Lectio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varia Lectio</th>
<th>Ausgangtext</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Jn 1:33 εἰδῆς</td>
<td>ἵδης</td>
<td>zero-grade form of ἰϝειδ-, *(w)id-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Jn 4:36 μεισθον</td>
<td>μισθόν</td>
<td>*mizdho-, cf. Iranian mizda-, Old Indic mīḏhā-, Gothic mizdo234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jn 4:42 λαλειαν</td>
<td>λαλιάν</td>
<td>adjectival suffix in -ιο, -ια to form a substantive235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Jn 5:6 εἰδων</td>
<td>ἵδων</td>
<td>zero-grade form of ἰϝειδ-, *(w)id-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Jn 8:28 εδειδαξεν</td>
<td>ἐδιδαξεν</td>
<td>present reduplication with Τ236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Jn 8:44 επιθυμειας</td>
<td>ἐπιθυμίας</td>
<td>abstract substantive in -ια237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Jn 10:10 εινα</td>
<td>ἵνα</td>
<td>short everywhere in Greek238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Jn 10:33 βλασφημειας</td>
<td>βλασφημίας</td>
<td>abstract substantive in -ια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Jn 12:47 εινα</td>
<td>ἵνα</td>
<td>short everywhere in Greek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

235. Smyth (1956), 236.
237. Ibid., 235.
238. Frisk (1960), 726.
11. Jn 14:12 πιστεύων  
πιστεύων  
denominative verb of πίστος (zero-grade formation related to πεθομαι)

12. Jn 16:11 κεκριται  
κεκριται  
zero-grade form of perfect middle

With these facts in mind, it is fitting to consider in detail the manifestations of ο – ω in our manuscripts.  
p75 contains the following variations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varia Lectio</th>
<th>Ausgangstext</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lk 7:4</td>
<td>ο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 10:13</td>
<td>σιδονι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 12:58</td>
<td>παραδώσει</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Luke 7:4, the context of the variant in p75 is αξιος έστιν ο παρέξη η τούτο, whereas the United Bible Societies' fourth edition has 'Αξιος έστιν ω παρέξη τούτο. One interpretation may explain the syntax in p75. The sense of the verse could be the following, άξιος έστιν τούτον δο παρέξη, but the antecedent was incorporated into the relative clause and attracted to the relative. Lk 19:37 displays this construction, περὶ πασάν ων ειδον δυνάμεων. Yet this is an unusual construction and in this instance

240. K. Aland, B. Aland, et al., The Greek New Testament (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1998), 223. This phrase is a Latinism according to Blass and Debrunner (1961), 6 - dignus est cui hoc praestes - 'he is worthy that you should grant this to him.' cf. my introduction, 9.
241. 'He is worthy of this which you should grant.'
242. Blass and Debrunner (1961), 153-154 - 'on account of the miracles which they had seen.'
unsupported by any manuscripts prior to the eighth century CE.\textsuperscript{243} So this example seems to be a probable instance of the confusion of the sounds o and \(\omega\).

The next example involves the name of the town Sidon. \textsuperscript{p}\textsuperscript{75} has \(\sigma\iota\delta\omicron\omicron\nu\iota\) with only one other manuscript prior to the eighth century containing -\(o\)-, namely the fourth/fifth century majuscule \(W\). Additionally, the next verse in \textsuperscript{p}\textsuperscript{75} has \(\sigma\varepsilon\iota\delta\omicron\omicron\nu\iota\). Regardless of which form may be considered correct, the appearance of both -\(o\)- and -\(\omega\)- nearby in the same manuscript may indicate an uncertainty about this loan word. The Hebrew vowel \(\hbar\delta\ell\varepsilon\omicron\) in \(\gamma\tau\pi\nu\)\textsuperscript{244} (sometimes written \(\gamma\upsilon\tau\pi\nu\)\textsuperscript{245}) indicates a long vowel,\textsuperscript{246} although the words of Jerome give caution:

\begin{quote}
Nec refert, utrum Salem, an Salim nominetur, cum uocalibus in medio litteris perraro utantur Hebraei et pro uoluntate lectorum ac uarietate regionum eadem uerba diuersis sonis atque accentibus proferantur. \textit{Ep. 73.8}\textsuperscript{247}
\end{quote}

Otherwise, this could simply be a confusion of \(o\) and \(\omega\).

\begin{flushright}
\textit{244. Gn. 10:15; 10:19; 49:13}, etc.
\textit{245. Jos 11:8, 19:28}, etc.
\textit{247. It is of no consequence whether [the word Shalem] is pronounced Salem or Salim, because Hebrew very rarely uses vowel letters in the course of words, and according to the discretion of readers and the different regions the same word is pronounced with different sounds and accents.} trans. G. A. Rendsburg, "Ancient Hebrew Phonology," in \textit{Phonologies of Asia and Africa: Vol. 1}, ed. A. S. Kaye (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 76.
\end{flushright}
The last variant in p75 has the dative singular noun παραδοσει - 'handing down, surrender' instead of the likely reading παραδώσει, a future of the verb παραδώσωμι in Lk 12:58. The reading in p75 yields virtual nonsense, καὶ ο θερήσωσι, καὶ ο πράκτωρ καὶ ο πράκτωρ σε βαλει εἰς φυλακήν. With this reading, there is no explanation for σε and one loses the parallelism of these two clauses. Much preferred is the reading, ο κριτής σε παραδώσει τῷ πράκτορι καὶ ο πράκτωρ σε βαλεῖ εἰς φυλακήν. Phonological confusion is the most probable explanation since the aforementioned causes do not apply. Albeit p75 contains only three examples of ο ~ ω, still the most likely explanation for these variations is phonological confusion.

Next, the variation ο ~ ω will be considered in the papyrus p66 based on the study by Caragounis. He discovered five variations from this text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p66</th>
<th>Varia Lectio</th>
<th>Ausgangstext</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jn 7:3</td>
<td>θεορησωσι</td>
<td>θεορησουσι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 8:57</td>
<td>εορακας</td>
<td>εώρακας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 19:23</td>
<td>ανωθεν</td>
<td>ἀνωθεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 20:18</td>
<td>εορακα</td>
<td>εώρακα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 5:29</td>
<td>εκπορευσουνται</td>
<td>εκπορεύσουνται</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

249. Aland, Aland, et al. (1998), 260 - 'The judge will hand you over to the bailiff, and the bailiff will throw you into prison.'
Now, the two examples of εορακα(ς) for ἐὼρακα(ς) do not necessarily result from phonological confusion, for these two forms existed side by side.251 The original form was ἐὁρακα from *φεφο-, but was remade after the imperfect form ἐὼρον into ἐὼρακα in Hellenistic Greek.252 One may infer that the earlier form remained in use because the oldest LXX papyri have ἐὁρακα.253 Since both of these forms were in use, these variants likely arose from dialectal interference and not phonological confusion.

Although the likely reading of John 7:3 is the future form θεωρησοντι, the manuscript tradition does provide instances of the aorist subjunctive form θεωρησον (13 69 124 346). Hence θεωρησον likely arose from θεωρησοντι, showing variation in the stem θεωρε-. The only likely explanation for this instance is confusion of the sounds o and ω.

ἀν]οθεν from John 19:23 could have resulted from phonological confusion, albeit the form of the restoration is not entirely certain. A substantial fragment of text is missing at this location, as seen here with the UBS fourth edition reading in the lacunae: ο χιτ [ ὧν ἔραφος ἐκ τῶν ἄν ] οθεν γράφατ [ τῶς δὲ ὁλοκ ].254 Although Tischendorf,255 Merk,256 and Nestle-Aland257 give no variant to ἔνωθεν, the fact that the more-comprehensive critical edition of the Gospel of John by the International Greek New Testament Project has yet to be published prevents one from concluding that no such variant exists. And

252. Ibid.
254. Aland, Aland, et al. (1998), 397 - 'a seemless tunic woven entirely from the top.'
given the size of the first lacuna above, some other variation is quite possible. For -οθεν could be part of some other adverb of place, such as: ὀ̄κοθεν, ἀλλοθεν, αὑτόθεν, ὄμοθεν, etc. Admittedly, phonological confusion provides the most likely explanation for the reading in p.66.

The last example, ἐκπορευσώνται for ἐκπορεύσονται, is most likely a result of confusion between ο and ω. None of the causes for variation mentioned thus far apply to this instance. Moreover, the variant ἐκπορευσώνται presents an impossible form, a future subjunctive. Inflectional evidence is more indicative of change than lexical evidence because inflection tends to be more conservative in terms of orthography than word stems. Hence this is the strongest evidence yet for the merger of the two o-type sounds.

In the Codex Bezae, only two instances of the variation o ~ ω occur. They are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>Varia Lectio</th>
<th>Ausgangstext</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lk 2:15</td>
<td>γεγονώς</td>
<td>γεγονός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 4:26</td>
<td>σιδονίας</td>
<td>σιδωνίας</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variation of γεγονώς for γεγονός in Luke 2:15 results either from an adverbial use of the participle or phonological confusion. The UBS fourth edition gives the following context, ἴδωμεν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο τὸ γεγονός ὁ ὁ κύριος ἐγνώρισεν ἡμῖν. Codex

---

258. Smyth (1956), 99-100.
260. Aland, Aland, et al. (1998), 201 - 'Let us see this matter that happened which the Lord revealed to us.'
Bezae differs in this passage only at the place of the aforementioned variant. Other New Testament passages show a lack of agreement between a noun and its participle. For example, a masculine participle may refer to a neuter noun that is a personal being, agreeing ad sensum, as in Mk 9:20, Ἰδών αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα. Yet the passage in Luke is decidedly neuter in meaning. Another passage contains a masculine participle referring to the same neuter abstract ὁ Ἰουδαίας, ἀρχαίονος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας (Ac 10:37). A number of early witnesses contain ἀρχαίονος, including p74 S* A B C D; whereas p45 and a number of minuscules contain ἀρχαίονον. However, the more difficult reading in the passage from Luke does not have this kind of manuscript support. Only D and hscr* have the masculine participle γεγονός according to Tischendorf. So this reading likely arose from a Vorlage with γεγονός. Also, the participle in Lk 2:15 as an attributive adjective is much more closely tied to its noun than the participle in Ac 10:37, a predicative participle separated by a prepositional phrase. By this reasoning, the "quasi-adverbial sense" of the participle in Ac 11:37 poorly explains the variant in Lk 2:15. Thus, phonological confusion of the scribe is the mostly likely explanation.

With regard to σιδονιας in the Codex Bezae, since it is difficult or impossible to determine the original form of this word, this instance is uncertain as a variant. The difficulty lies in the nature of the witnesses supporting both variants, σιδονιας and

261. Blass and Debrunner (1961), 74 - 'the spirit seeing him'
262. Aland, Aland, et al. (1998), 447 - 'you know the thing happening throughout all Judaea began from Galilee.'
263. Tischendorf (1869), 429.
σιδώνιας. On the one hand, the majuscules D V^C (ninth century) Θ* (ninth century) along with Odysseus 4.84 and the Sibylline Oracles 3.451 support the reading σιδώνιας. On the other hand, the majuscules S A B^C C X Γ Θ^C Ψ with a fourth century BCE inscription,^265 LXX, and Josephus support the reading σιδώνιας.^266 Consequently, one cannot determine if σιδώνιας is the variant or the original form. Also, the variation may have resulted from dialectal usage of these two forms. It is uncertain whether the confusion of o and ω played any role in the manifestation of this variant.

The Codex Alexandrinus contains two potential instances of the variation o ~ ω. They are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Varia Lectio</th>
<th>Ausgangstext</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lk 3:14</td>
<td>ποιησομεν</td>
<td>ποιήσομεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 8:45</td>
<td>ρχλωι</td>
<td>ὠχλοι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variants ποιησομεν and ποιήσομεν may have resulted from phonological confusion or syntactic causes. The only uncials to show ποιησομεν are A C^C G U Ω; whereas all the others manifest ποιήσομεν. In Luke 3:14 soldiers question Jesus, the Codex Alexandrinus (A) having επηρωτων δε αυτον...και ημες τι ποιησομεν.^267 This is a clear instance of a deliberative question. In such a case "the NT nearly always has the

---

267. 'They were asking him...and we, what shall we do?'
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However, there may be instances of deliberative questions in the New Testament using the future indicative. The best example of a deliberative future occurs in Romans 4:1, τί ἔρωμεν εὐρηκέναι Ἀβραὰμ τὸν προπέταρα ἡμῶν κατὰ σάρκα. Less certain examples of deliberative questions with the future indicative are found in the New Testament at Ro 3:5, Lk 22:49, and Mk 6:37. Additionally, this kind of construction does occur in classical Greek, εἴπωμεν ἢ συγώμεν; ἢ τί δρασομεν; So it is unclear whether this variation occurred because of syntax or phonology.

The apparent confusion of οὔλοιτ for ὅλοιτ is an uncertain instance of the o ~ ω variation. For it is not necessarily a confusion of o and ω at all. ωι may have monophthongized in this community, as evidenced by the confusion of ωι and ν in the first century CE among Egyptian papyri and the complete unity of ωι and ν in the Greek inscriptions from the Jewish catacombs of the second and third centuries CE. But Attic inscriptions distinguish ωι and ν at least until the end of the second century CE. Additionally, our manuscripts show this variation only once in p. So our manuscripts appear to treat ωι as a diphthong. With regard to ωι, the dative singular was no longer written or pronounced as the diphthong, as can be ascertained from the statement of Strabo, πολλοὶ γὰρ χωρὶς τοῦ 1 γράφουσι τὰς δοτικὰς, καὶ ἐκβάλλουσι δὲ

269. 'What do we say that Abraham our ancestor found in the matter of flesh?'
270. Ibid.
271. Euripides, Ion 758 - 'Should we speak or be silent? Or do we do something?'
272. Gignac (1975), 201.
τὸ ἑθος φυσικὴν αἵτιαν οὐκ ἔχον. Since ωι had merged with ω, both could represent a long o-vowel. So the variants do not result from the variation of o and ω; rather, οὐχιοι for ὀχιοι represents a confusion of /oː/ and /oy/. More likely a scribal abnormality caused this variation. The fourth letter in οὐχιοι from the Codex Alexandrinus is half the width of other omegas in this manuscript. It is much more similar in shape to the omicron or sigma of this scribe. Perhaps a stray mark on an omicron resulted in a letter resembling an omega. Consequently, this variation is decidedly not phonological, arising rather from scribal negligence.

In summary, p°66, p°75, and Codex Bezae all contain instances of the variation o ~ ω likely resulting from phonological confusion, and Codex Alexandrinus contains a variant possibly owing to this same cause. For the purpose of the following summary, variants explainable only through phonological coincidence of o and ω were considered likely instances of phonological confusion, and those variants which may have arisen because of phonology or from some other cause are labeled possible instances of phonological confusion. p°66 contained two likely instances and one possible instance; p°75 exhibited three likely instances; A had one possible instance; and D manifested one likely instance of phonological confusion. One may not discern any clear separation between the two papyri from Egypt, p°66 and p°75, and the later parchment manuscripts, A and D, of unknown origin. For the number of o ~ ω variants in all these witnesses is quite low. One might have expected a higher frequency of o ~ ω variations in the papyri, since documentary papyri from the second century BCE onward show a high frequency of this

275. Strabo, Geographica 14.1.41 - 'For many write the datives without τ, and they reject the custom of writing τ, having no natural cause.'
variation in all environments\textsuperscript{276} in contrast to the limited nature of this variation in Attic inscriptions, even up to 300 CE.\textsuperscript{277} Yet the two papyri show comparably low instantiation of this variation as do the uncials.

The nature of the particular variants suggests that the merger of the sounds o and ω was rather pervasive. For these variants do not come mainly from certain proper names, as is the case with Attic inscriptions. Rather they occur in a diverse group of lexical and inflectional elements in common words as well as a proper name. The most striking indication of the pervasiveness of this merger is the form εκπορευονται from Jn 5:29 in p\textsuperscript{66}. This would be a future subjunctive, an impossible form only acceptable as ἔκπορευονται. Therefore, the merger of o and ω seems to be widespread by the second/third century CE, the time of the papyri p\textsuperscript{66} and p\textsuperscript{75}.

Yet, given the widespread nature of the merger, it has surprisingly little effect on the manuscripts. Scribes producing these manuscripts did not compose an original work, instead they copied these texts from a Vorlage, itself probably a copy. That means the manuscripts embed a chronology from first composition, through a number of copies, and finally to these late-Roman manuscripts surviving to this day. Just as the language of Homer reflects multiple dialects over a course of time, these manuscripts likewise reflect the language of multiple communities spanning one to four centuries. So it is possible that all the agents producing texts of the stemma codicum may not have reflected the sound merger, but perhaps a portion or only one of the agents did so.

Assuming this possibility, the merger would have occurred in the community of

\textsuperscript{276} Teodorsson (1977), 234.
\textsuperscript{277} Threatte (1980), 228.
scribe and not of the author, or vice versa. In the first case, certain variants may have appeared in the autograph. And afterward, a scribe not under the influence of the merger regularized some variants and perpetuated others. In the second case, the author may have consistently distinguished certain graphemes, either because the sound merger had not occurred in the author's speech community or through the author's conservative orthography. Then, the scribes copying this document, influenced by the sound merger in their speech communities, manifest the merger through variations between the Vorlage and its copies. These two scenarios may explain the lower than expected frequency of the $\omega \sim \omega$ variation.

A number of reasons make the second scenario, the one involving later manifestation of the variation, more probable. The phonology of Hebrew and Aramaic vowels in the first century CE is far from certain, yet they both seem to distinguish short and long $\omega$.278 Bilingual interference would thus not have hindered the distinction between $\omega$ and $\omega$. On the other hand, loanwords into Coptic manifest a confusion between Coptic $\omega$ and $\omega$.279 Also, the merger of $\omega$ and $\omega$ in Attica occurred in the second century CE,280 after the composition of the Gospels of Luke and John but before the production of the papyri $p^{66}$ and $p^{75}$ in the second/third century CE. This means that one community continued to distinguish $\omega$ and $\omega$ even after the composition of these two Gospels. The communities where the Gospels were written need not parallel the sound developments in Attica, but at

\[279. \ A. \ Böhlig, \textit{Die griechischen Lehnwörter im Sahidischen und Bohairischen Neuen Testament} (München: Lerche, 1954), 140. \]
\[280. \ Threatte (1980), 228. \]
the same time they need not parallel those in Egypt either, where the merger of o and ω was much earlier. Additionally, the two papyri in question were likely copied in Egypt. Therefore, the language of the scribes producing p⁶⁶ and p⁷⁵ reflected the language in the documentary papyri from Egypt. o and ω merged in Egyptian Greek by the second century BCE,⁸¹ resulting in very frequent confusion of these letters in all environments in the second and third centuries CE.⁸² Surely the scribes who copied p⁶⁶ and p⁷⁵ did not distinguish o and ω in their speech. With regard to the uncials S, A, and D, the merger would assuredly have taken place in these communities of the fourth and fifth century CE as well. These reasons make it conceivable that these two Gospels were composed in communities not manifesting the variation of o and ω, but copied by scribes not distinguishing o and ω.

---

²⁸¹. Teodorsson (1977), 234.
CHAPTER 4
THE PLACE OF NEW TESTAMENT MANUSCRIPTS IN THE PHONOLOGY OF THE GREEK SPEAKING WORLD

One may not assume the vernacular papyri of Egypt more closely reflect the phonology of the early Gospel manuscripts than the so-called conservative orthography of Attic inscriptions. Threatte showed that inscriptions in Attica do not merely reflect a conservative orthography unrepresentative of the speech of those producing the inscriptions. Rather, the variations in these inscriptions accurately demonstrate Attic phonology. The correspondence of variants between inscriptions and more vulgar texts, specifically *dipinti*, *ostraca*, *defixiones* or curse tablets, and *graffiti*, supports this claim. Furthermore, the speech of Attica undergoes certain sound changes as much as three to five centuries after that of Egypt as seen in papyri and inscriptions. Given these distinctions, the question arises, which speech community does the phonology of the Gospel manuscripts more closely resemble, admittedly, most of the sound changes at issue have taken place in Attica and Egypt prior to the copying of these early Gospel manuscripts; nevertheless, some of the changes postdate the writing of the autographs. Also, the frequency of these variants in the Gospels can be informative. Certain vocalic variations will concord more closely with Attic inscriptions than with Egyptian papyri.

The variation η ~ ι, indicating the change of η from a mid vowel to a close vowel, in the Gospel manuscripts more nearly reflects the developments in Attica than in Egypt. In Egypt, the first instances of this variation date to the third century BCE, being very frequent in the Roman and Byzantine periods. In contrast, the variation η ~ ι is extremely rare in Attica prior to 150 CE and even later there are signs that these two sound did not merge in all communities. The Gospel manuscripts, clear evidence of onomastic variants of this type begins in the eighth century CE. According to this evidence, the merger of η and ι occurred in the eighth century CE or possibly the seventh century, given the fragmentary nature of seventh century manuscripts. Additionally, in the portions of the five Gospel manuscripts studied (the equivalent of 71 chapters of text), there were only four instances of this variation (three from Codex Alexandrinus and one from Codex Bezae). The second through fourth century CE manuscripts showed no instances of this variation and the two fifth century manuscripts show a total of only four instances. This kind of testimony more closely resembles the later development of this variation in the inscriptions of Attica.

Regarding the variation o ~ ω, the Gospel manuscripts parallel the confusions in Attic inscriptions more than those from Egypt. In Attica after 150 CE, "examples become considerably more numerous." All the same, the orthography remains conservative in

most cases with a very small number of these instances involving inflection.288 Yet the Egyptian papyri show many instances of the interchange. Speaking of this variation in the papyri from the first century onward, Gignac says "This occurs very frequently in all phonetic conditions throughout the Roman and Byzantine periods."289 Furthermore, the confusion is frequent in the papyri from the third to first centuries BCE.290 In fact, it is one of the most common interchanges in the Ptolemaic period; only $\varepsilon$ $\sim$ $t$, $\eta$ $\sim$ $\eta$, and $\omega$ $\sim$ $\omega$ are more common.291 This means that the following interchanges were less common: $\alpha$ $\sim$ $\varepsilon$, $\omicron$ $\sim$ $\nu$, $\eta$ $\sim$ $\iota$, and $\eta$ $\sim$ $\epsilon$.292 In the Gospels, there are eight instances of the variation $o$ $\sim$ $\omega$ that most likely resulted from phonological confusion in the five manuscripts studied. One of these confusions results in a future subjunctive, an impossible form.293 Two other instances yield syntax that is virtually unintelligible.294 Based on these examples, the most likely explanation for these variants is phonological confusion of $o$ and $\omega$. Yet there are strikingly few instances of this variation. One scenario may explain these data: the writers of the autographs distinguished these two sounds but the scribes copying the texts exhibited the sound merger in their speech and writing, thus manifesting this variation. This situation would correspond much more closely to the development of these two back vowels in Attica. Not only do the Gospel manuscripts

288. These include εκείνον for ἐκείνων (ca. 175 CE), Ἐντυχο for Ἐντυχω (second century CE), and ηκο for ᾨκω (Roman). Threatte (1980), 231-232.
291. Teodorsson aims to provide an exhaustive list of variants for this time period, making such a comparison possible. Teodorsson (1977), 62-208.
292. Ibid.
293. εκπορευσόνται p66 In 5:29
294. καὶ ὁ κρίτης σε παραδοσει τω πρακτορι και ο πρακτωρ σε βαλει εις φυλακην p75 Lk 12:58 and το ρημα τουτο το γηγονος ο ο κυριος εγνωρισεν ημιν D Lk 2:15.
show a conservatism in this respect much like the Attic inscriptions, but also the proposed timing of the merger in the Gospel texts would correspond closely to the timing of the merger in the Attic texts. In contrast, the high frequency of this variation from the earliest Egyptian papyri is not useful for explaining this phenomenon in the Gospel manuscripts. Based on the merger of ο and ω in Attica, Egypt, and communities producing the Gospels, it is conceivable that the language demonstrated in the Gospels parallels the language of Attica more than that of Egypt.

The confusion of οι and υ in the Gospels likewise provides evidence similar to Attic phonology. The earliest evidence of this confusion in Attic inscriptions dates to the middle of the third century CE. But there is evidence of this interchange in Egypt from the third century BCE, being common in the second century BCE. Of the five Gospel manuscripts surveyed, only two show this variation, p75 and Codex Sinaiticus. p75 from ca. 200 CE contains one instance, σοι for συ in πορευων και σοι ποιει ομοιως Lk 10:37. This variant occurs before any of the Attic instances. It is probably best explained as Egyptian phonology manifesting itself in the transmission of this manuscript, a papyrus from the collection of Martin Bodmer. Codex Sinaiticus manifests four instances of υ for οι. Since Caragounis only cites the summary statistics for this manuscript, one may make no definite conclusions in this case. Nevertheless, it dates to the fourth century CE, near in time to the merger of οι and υ in Attica. Finally, p66, A, 

296. Teodorsson (1977), 140.
297. Threette (1982), 149.
298. 'Go and do likewise.'
and D exhibit no instances of this variation. These data suggest a phonology much more like that which one deduces from the Attic inscriptions where this variation is rare. The lack of variation in these three manuscripts is decidedly not suggestive of the Egyptian documentary papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods where the variation $\epsilon t \sim \nu$ is the third most frequent variant after only $\epsilon t \sim \iota$ and $\alpha t \sim \epsilon$.\textsuperscript{300}

The confusion of $\epsilon t$ for $\iota$ in the Gospel manuscripts may also exhibit greater similarity to the Attic inscriptions. This variation was frequent from the third century BCE in the papyri.\textsuperscript{301} Not only was this variation frequent, but it even became as numerous as the variation $\epsilon t$ for $\iota$. The latter confusion occurred 185, 128, and 92 times in the third through first centuries BCE respectively whereas the former confusion occurred 94, 167, and 55 times.\textsuperscript{302} This means that the confusion $\epsilon t$ for $\iota$ was slightly more numerous than $\epsilon t$ for $\iota$ in the second and first centuries BCE combined. In contrast, the Attic inscriptions manifest $\epsilon t$ for $\iota$ only after 100 CE and it remains rare even after 150 CE\textsuperscript{303} while the use of $\epsilon t$ for $\iota$ is widespread even in inflectional terminations.\textsuperscript{304} Now consider the relative frequency of $\epsilon t$ for $\iota$ and $\epsilon t$ for $\iota$ in the Gospel manuscripts. Only 5 of the 36 instances of $\epsilon t$ for $\iota$ in p\textsuperscript{75} involve short $\iota$. Likewise, 12 of 139, 9 of 40, and 17 of 99 instances of this variation involve short $\iota$ in our selections of p\textsuperscript{66}, A, and D respectively. At the very least, this relative frequency is significantly less than that of papyri in the last two centuries BCE. It may be more comparable to the Attic inscriptions, but a lack of precise

\begin{center}
300. Gignac (1975), 197.
301. Teodorsson (1977), 213.
302. Ibid., 82-98.
304. Ibid., 198.
\end{center}
information in this regard prohibits a more exact conclusion. Also, the variation et for ἦ in our manuscripts does not occur in inflectional endings except to confuse singular and plural i-stems, e.g. δυνατείς for δύναμις in A Lk 5:17. This parallels the tendency in Roman-era Attic inscriptions to avoid the confusion of et for ἦ in inflectional endings.\textsuperscript{305}

But in the papyri of the first century BCE, one finds forms such as πασεί, ἐμεί, and τεί.\textsuperscript{306} In summary, the nature of the variations et for ἦ and et for ἦ in early Gospel manuscripts more closely reflects the variants from Attic inscriptions.

The variation of υ and η also shows a closer similarity to Attic inscriptions than to Egyptian papyri. In the Ptolemaic papyri, this confusion is almost entirely limited to the lexemes ἴμεις and ὰμεῖς.\textsuperscript{307} Subsequently, the Roman and Byzantine papyri confuse υ and η "frequently in all phonetic conditions."\textsuperscript{308} However, this phenomenon seems to appear in Attic inscriptions only due to "graphic mistakes."\textsuperscript{309} Now, in the New Testament manuscripts, few instances of the variation occur. Names in Luke 1-12 exhibit this variation beginning in the eighth century CE\textsuperscript{310} and only adjacent to resonants. And in our five manuscripts, only p\textsuperscript{66} contains this interchange on two occasions. As such, these two variants could have resulted from Egyptian phonology and not be reflective of New Testament phonology more generally. Hence this is yet another interchange in which the Gospel manuscripts do not mirror Egyptian Greek but contemporaneous Attic inscriptions.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{305} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{306} Teodorsson (1977), 97-98.
\item \textsuperscript{307} Ibid., 135-136.
\item \textsuperscript{308} Gignac (1975), 262.
\item \textsuperscript{309} Threatte (1980), 267.
\item \textsuperscript{310} 13 69 348579* 1424 /80 /547 /1016 /1056 show this variation.
\end{itemize}
The phonology of the Gospel manuscripts more closely reflects Attic inscriptions because the Egyptian papyri manifest a level of bilingual interference unseen in the other two corpora. One may explain the confusions η ~ ῥ, οι ~ υ, and υ ~ η through Coptic influence. Yet the fact that the variations ο ~ ω and ει ~ ι occur frequently so much earlier in Egypt is not explicitly the result of bilingual interference. Rather, the loss of vowel quantity distinction in the second century BCE played a more explicit role. Yet, even with respect to vowel quantity distinction, bilingual interference may be the underlying cause. For the earliest Egyptian texts show vowel equalization in "some minor groups of literate speakers."311 From here vowel equalization spread to the rest of Egyptian Greek. These "minor groups" did not receive a Greek language exhibiting vowel isochrony since Egyptian Greek manifested this change earlier than other regions. Instead, their native language influenced their use of Greek. So all five of the aforementioned variations arose in Egypt at an earlier date due to bilingual interference. This means that the Gospel manuscripts more closely resemble Attic inscriptions than Egyptian papyri because the papyri are so distinct from the Greek of other regions.

311. Teodorsson (1977), 238.
REFERENCES


"Antiatticist." In *Anecdota Graeca, Vols. 1 and 3*, ed. I. Bekker, i. 75-116, iii. 1074-1077.


Beazley, J. D. *Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.


Horner, G. W. The Coptic version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect,


---- *The Phonology of Attic in the Hellenistic Period*. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis

- 94 -


---- "The Alleged Conservatism of Attic Epigraphical Documents: A Different View."


Wallace, D. B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New*