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The following plates are subjoined to Chapter VI:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>Plate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I a 1</td>
<td>nist</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I a 1-5</td>
<td>dot punctures, I d 1-5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I a 7</td>
<td>stauai:</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I b 12</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I b 15</td>
<td>seinaizos</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I b 19</td>
<td>garehsñäs:</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I c 2</td>
<td>ghatjandi</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I c 11</td>
<td>nei auk</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I c 13</td>
<td>gw (gaag / gwein)</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>LIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I d 4</td>
<td>iš:</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I d 25</td>
<td>gawandeins</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II a 5</td>
<td>leik is</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II b 11</td>
<td>ma nā</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II c 12</td>
<td>peihan habaida:</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II d 19</td>
<td>s (ga)rehnaiš</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>XLIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II d 25</td>
<td>gasalhano</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III a 20</td>
<td>andru (andru)</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>XXXVIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III b 11</td>
<td>sieteinom</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>XXXIX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III c 1</td>
<td>witoñ?</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>XL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III d 7</td>
<td>(mi)</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>XLI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV a 9</td>
<td>damš (sokjan)</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>XLII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV b 17</td>
<td>mikiłbuš jai fīn</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>XLIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV d 1</td>
<td>ana airbai</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>XLIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV d 5</td>
<td>air (air)</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>XLV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV d 18</td>
<td>jah gasakan</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>XLVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV d 25</td>
<td>ñ weika.</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>XLVII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V a 9</td>
<td>jōš: (frí</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>LIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V a 22</td>
<td>frū</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>LVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V b 16</td>
<td>gasok</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE SCRIBAL FORM OF THE TEXT AND ITS MODERN "IMPROVEMENTS"

1.1. Among works that have been metamorphosed by overzealous editing, few compare with the Gothic commentary on the gospel of John. The known leaves of this treatise comprise only 800 lines averaging about 13 letters each. Yet, if every word that scholars have added, deleted, replaced, transposed, or otherwise altered were to be counted separately, the total number of emendations would be approximately 1,500. Proportionally, there is at least one modification for every seven letters in the MS. The extent to which the commentary has been transformed by emendations, ranging from changes in individual forms to rephrasings of entire passages, can be appreciated only through examining the text of one edition after another, but even the gross statistical evidence is significant.

1.2. That editors have found it necessary to introduce at least some changes is understandable. The MS, a palimpsest that has been badly damaged in the course of fourteen centuries, is fragmentary, often complicated in phrasing, and in places almost indecipherable. Where readings of the codex have been doubtful or unintelligible, editors have necessarily relied upon their own judgment. In some instances their conjectures have been remarkably accurate, as shown by later examinations of the MS, though some scholars have been more disposed to revise the text than to explain it. Vollmer, for example, virtually composed a paraphrase, and Cromhout, though opposed to such liberal emendation, deleted approximately 940 words that he regarded as interpolated contaminations. Many editors, to be sure, have been more conservative, especially those of the present
century. Among the hundreds of alterations that have been suggested, comparatively few are to be found in the currently used editions, but the number is still high for so short a text.

1.3. All complete versions now in use (Dietrich, Streitberg, Wrede, Mayr, and Kock) are based on codex readings that were completed shortly before 1900. In the course of the half century that has passed since these readings were published, it has been repeatedly demonstrated that monochromatic radiation and high-contrast photography often make it possible to decipher badly faded and damaged MSS. Accordingly, the first objective of the present edition is to offer a new decipherment based on a study of the codex (1) under daylight, (2) under ultraviolet radiation, and (3) in photographs representing various combinations of filtered ultraviolet and conventional lighting with high-contrast enlargement, the method varying with the condition of the text. The photographic evidence makes it clear that the MS has been corrected with scrupulous care, in part by a second scribe. In instance after instance the scribal corrections in the codex make further emendation unnecessary.

1.4. Yet the language of the commentary raises some problems of form and meaning for which there are no paleographic solutions; some of the most troublesome passages in the MS are wholly illegible. Though it is still possible to alter the text wherever it offers difficulty, the unmistakable care with which the codex has been corrected argues strongly against further emendation. Where neither the first scribe nor the second has changed a supposedly incorrect phrasing or spelling, a modern editor may profitably hesitate before deciding to improve upon it. As observed above, there are already hundreds of intended improvements. Even when abbreviated in a critical apparatus, these are sometimes longer than the text itself. Accordingly, the second objective of the present edition is to re-examine those words and passages of the commentary that still appear to require explanation or emendation.

1.5. If the conclusions reached in the following chapters are justified, the phrasing of the MS needs no alteration. The corrections made by the first and second scribes have rectified every clear-cut mistake, even including some that have been overlooked by modern editors. Both scribes were presumably native speakers of Gothic who were familiar with the language of their own era, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that they had received at least some education. Of the two, the first was primarily a good craftsman who concentrated on neatness, occasionally at the expense of correctness. The second was no craftsman, but he was an acute, penetrating reader who understood the text thoroughly and corrected it with meticulous care. Among all the known editors of the commentary, he was not only the first but also incomparably the best. Thanks largely to his astuteness, the text to be considered here represents an exact transcription of the MS with no editorial alterations of any kind. There is of course no harm in substituting modern punctuation for that of early documents so long as there is no doubt regarding their meaning, but in this instance there is every reason to take advantage of the scribal marks in the codex, which provide an effective safeguard against many possible misinterpretations. Hence, despite the long-established practice of modernizing Gothic punctuation, the present edition retains that of the MS.

1.6. In a text that adheres strictly to the wording and punctuation of the codex, all emendations are of course rejected, but it does not follow that they should be ignored. Among the changes that have been proposed, some are clearly acceptable in substance, and a few anticipate the exact phrasing of the MS. Still others produce a kaleidoscopic effect on meaning, whether ingenious or outrageous, and the most extensive revisions (e.g., those of Vollmer and Cromhout) are at least interesting as modern compositions. But regardless of their individual merits, the emendations have a genuine cumulative value: if all the suggested interpretations of a given passage are taken into consideration, the chances of finding the correct interpretation are greater. It is for this reason that the scribal text, even when accepted at face value, can be analyzed more satisfactorily with
The Text and Its "Improvements"

the help of a full critical apparatus, including all readings of the codex and all emendations that have been used or proposed in complete editions, edited selections (though few contain unique features), reviews, articles, monographs, published dissertations, and glossaries.

1.7. The Biblical and theological parallels of the commentary have already been collated, especially by Dietrich; from his collation, which covers more than thirty pages. Streitberg has singled out the more literal correspondences. The dogmatic significance of the work and its authorship as well have been objects of study for more than a century. On these topics the present edition has nothing either new or original to offer, and there would be little to gain in reproducing the extensive material that is already available. For the present, in any event, the most indispensable requisite is a correct, unaltered, intelligible text.


II

THE MANUSCRIPT

LOCATION, CONDITION, FORMAT

2.1. The commentary is known through eight separate leaves of parchment, all of which belonged originally to the same MS. Five are now in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan, in Cod. E 147 parte superiore, 4° maj., pp. 77–80, 111–114, 309–310. The other three leaves are preserved in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, where they form pp. 57–62 of Cod. lat. 5750, 4° maj.

2.2. The rest of the Gothic document has been lost or destroyed, and even its surviving fragments bear the marks of extensive damage. All eight leaves have been cut or torn from their original binding, so that the remnants of their inner margins are extremely narrow. The Gothic text, which is written in a ferrous-base ink, has been partially erased on some pages, with the result that many letters are badly smeared and others completely smudged. Furthermore, all pages but one have been covered with Latin. In a nineteenth-century attempt at chemical decipherment (2.7) the leaves were stained with tincture of nut-gall; their present color ranges from a light yellowish tan to a deep brown, and the acid reaction has left visible evidence of corrosion. On the whole, however, the Gothic text has suffered more from bleaching than from any other single factor, especially in view of the fact that the leaves have been separated from their original binding for thirteen centuries (2.6).

2.3. Massmann, the first scholar to edit all eight leaves, determined their relative Gothic order by the sequence of their quotations from the gospel of John. In the table below are listed from left to right (1) the leaves in their reconstructed Gothic order, (2) their Latin order in the Ambrosian (A) and Vatican

1 Skeireins aliwageljons haurh iohannen (Munich, 1834), p. 56.
The Manuscript

(V) MSS. (3) the Arabic numbers now on the pages, and (4) the passages from John:

| I  | 4th | 113-114 | 1.29 |
| II | 1st | 77-78   | 3.3-5 |
| III V 2nd | 59-60 | 3.23-25, free version of 1.26-27 |
| IV V 3rd | 61-62 | 3.29-32, also 3.26 explaining 3.29 |
| V  A 2nd | 79-80 | 5.21-23, 17.23 |
| VI A 5th | 309-310 | 5.35-38, repetition of 3.30 |
| VII A 3rd | 111-112 | 6.9-13, partly in free rendering |
| VIII V 1st | 57-58 | 7.44-49, 50 (paraphrase), 51-52 |

2.4. The original length of the codex is a matter for conjecture. Massmann noticed an e occurring at the end of Leaf VIII and concluded that this letter must be a signature indicating the fifth quarto or fortieith page devoted to the first seven chapters of the gospel. Assuming a corresponding rate of progress in the explanation of the remaining chapters, he estimated that the length of the entire commentary would be about 12-14 quarto, or roughly 100 pages. The e in question, however, does not belong to the Gothic text (6.61) and so has no bearing on its length. According to a later estimate, the MS originally contained about 78 leaves up to the end of VIII, but this figure represents a partial miscalculation and should be 92. If the remainder of the

2 Ibid., p. 57.
3 Massmann (loc. cit.) believed also that he could distinguish a signature at the end of the first leaf—possibly f (500), k (20), or r (100)—and another at the end of the fifth—either o (800) or j (60)—but most of these numbers are incredible, and none of the supposed signatures is discernible in the MS.
4 See Ernst Dietrich, "Die Bruchstücke der Skireins, Texte und Untersuchungen zur altgermanischen Religionsgeschichte," ed. Fr. Kaufmann, II (Strassburg, 1903), xiii, n. 8. From the number of verses quoted on the extant leaves, Dietrich posited the following distribution of quotations for the preceding and intervening parts of the codex: 2 verses per leaf for Chap. 1; 3 verses per leaf for Chaps. 2-4; 5 verses per leaf for Chaps. 5-6; 7 verses per leaf for Chap. 7. If the foregoing assumptions are correct, there would occur

| before I  | about 14 leaves (28 verses) |
| between I and II | about 18 leaves (22+25+2 verses) |
| between II and III | about 6 leaves (17 verses) |
| between III and IV | about 1 leaf (3 verses) |
| between IV and V | about 23 leaves (4+54+20 verses) |
| between V and VI | about 2 leaves (11 verses) |
| between VI and VII | about 3 leaves (9+8 verses) |
| between VII and VIII | about 17 leaves (38+43 verses) |

The use of narrow double columns, averaging only about 13 letters per line, made justification difficult (4.4) and consumed space without improving the appearance of the pages. In con-

From these figures Dietrich concluded that the codex, with both the missing and the extant fragments, would comprise about 78 leaves up to the end of VIII, which breaks off in the midst of John 7.52. Within the frame of his assumption, his estimate of missing leaves is correct, but his total is not. The leaves supposed to be missing add up to 84, and when the 8 extant fragments are included, the total amounts to 92. Perhaps Dietrich unintentionally omitted the 14 leaves assumed to precede I.

The surviving fragments contain 32 verses from John, counting 7.50 (a paraphrase) but not repetitions or passages cited out of Biblical order, so that the average rate of progress is 4 verses per extant leaf. Those remaining to be discussed number 531, omitting John 7.53-8.11, which are missing in the Gothic Bible and apparently in its Vorlage. At the same rate, these verses would require approximately 132 leaves, which, with the 92 estimated for the first seven chapters, would make a total of 224 leaves or 56 quarto. However, the known rate of progress may be a poor index to the number of missing leaves, and there is no proof that the commentary was ever completed.
trast, the single columns of the Codex Argenteus easily accommodated 22–25 letters in a space of only 14 cm.

HISTORY OF THE CODEX

2.6. The first recorded location of the commentary leaves is the monastery of Bobbio, Liguria, which was founded by the Irish monk St. Columbanus about the year 613. From the same famous cloister, once the repository of various documents now preserved in Italy, Austria, Germany, France, and Spain, have come six other Gothic palimpsests: Cod. Ambrosiani A, B, C, D, Cod. Taurinensis (originally part of Cod. A), and Cod. Carolinus (now in Wolfenbüttel). Among the Ambrosian pages of the commentary, 114 is written over with the first ten strophes of the Carmen de synodo Ticiensi, and 310 contains only Gothic, but all the rest are covered with a part of the Acta concilii Chaledonensis; the Vatican leaves are superscribed with epistles of Leo I. It has been widely taken for granted that the rescript of the palimpsests took place in Bobbio. However, a recent study by Michiel van den Hout⁴ suggests that some of the documents may have been written over beforehand. In particular, the Latin on the commentary leaves belongs to the seventh century; yet the Bobbio library catalog of the tenth century does not mention them, and the first notice of their being in the monastery appears as item 135 in an inventory of the year 1461.⁵ Furthermore, E. A. Lowe⁶ has identified some Veronese features in the second hand of the Acta. There can be no doubt that the extant fragments of the commentary were already separated from their binding when they were palimpsested, for the order of the Latin texts is very different from that of the Gothic (2.3), and the right and left margins of the Latin columns are approxi-

⁴ “Gothic Palimpsests of Bobbio,” Scriptorium, VI (1952), 91–93. The present account gives only the briefest summary of van den Hout’s arguments, which merit separate attention.
⁵ G. Becker, Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui (Bonn.var, 1885), pp. 64 ff.; A. Peyron, “De Bibliotheca Bobiensis Commentari,” M. Tullii Ciceronis Orationum fragmenta inedita (Stuttgartiae et Tubingae, 1824), pp. 1 ff.

mately of equal width, indicating that the Latin was added after the greater part of the original inner margins had been lost. Thus, if van den Hout’s interpretation of the evidence is correct, the dismemberment of the commentary MS must have taken place before the leaves reached Bobbio. Their earlier location is still largely a matter for conjecture. Rudolf Beer⁷ believed that the oldest group of documents at Bobbio had come from the collection of Cassiodorus, but later investigations by Card. Giovanni Mercat A⁸ and M. Pierre Courcelle⁹ point rather to the Lateran and to northern Italy. Where the commentary MS originated is even more uncertain. It employs the Latin instead of the older sigma type of Gothic s, uses suspension marks for m as well as n, and has the same type of upright uncial found in the Cod. Argenteus, the Cod. Carolinus, and the Ambrosian MSS A and C. All this indicates Latin influence as exemplified in the sixteenth-century gospel text of the Cod. Brixianus by but does not exclude the Danube countries or southern France from consideration. The linguistic features of the commentary document are essentially the same as those of the other Ambrosian Gothic MSS and the Cod. Argenteus, which are generally assigned to the earlier sixth century; the supposed peculiarities in the morphology of the commentary, viz. aberrant forms of pronouns, do not occur (4.10) and so have no bearing on its date.

2.7. In 1606 Card. Federico Borromeo, the founder of the Ambrosiana, moved what are now Codd. A–D and five leaves of the commentary (I, II, V, VI, VII) to Milan, and in 1618 Pope

¹¹ On this see J. W. Marchand, “Notes on Gothic Manuscripts,” JEGP, LVI (1957), 219–222 and ref.
Paulus V transferred III, IV, VIII directly from Bobbio to the Vaticana; the separation of the two groups of leaves is in accord with the difference between their Latin texts (2.6). The Gothic texts of the Milanese palimpsests were discovered in 1817 by Msgr. (later Card.) Angelo Maj, then prefect of the Ambrosiana; the Vatican leaves of the commentary are first mentioned in his M. Corneli Frontonis et M. Aureli Imperatoris epistolae, Romae 1823. With more zeal than wisdom, Maj stained both the Ambrosian and the Vatican leaves with tincture of nutgall. Although later prefects have taken extensive precautions against further damage to the Gothic documents, the marks of age and prior abuse are largely ineradicable. In the closing years of the nineteenth century Msgr. (later Card.) Franz Ehrle\textsuperscript{16} made a detailed study of the corrosive effects produced by reagents on parchment, papyrus, and paper. At his direction the Vatican leaves of the commentary were coated with gelatin in a number of badly damaged areas. Unfortunately, neither Ehrle nor his technical advisers could foresee the use of ultraviolet radiation in the decipherment of badly faded MSS. When an ultraviolet lamp is brought near the Vatican leaves, the gelatin patches fluoresce with a bright lavender glow that makes it impossible to see the writing underneath. For the same reason ultraviolet photography of these leaves is scarcely helpful. At the present time III and VIII are joined at their inner margins by a strip of white parchment about 2 cm in width; in one place the added strip has almost wholly obscured a marginal addition to the Gothic text. About 1948–49 the prefect of the Ambrosiana, Msgr. Achille Ratti (later to become Pope Pius XI) gave the Gothic palimpsests in his library an effective cleaning, which enabled the Milanese scholar Wilhelm Braun to find eighty new readings in Codd. A–D.\textsuperscript{18} Unfortunately, Braun’s death in 1913 prevented his reexamining the Ambrosian leaves of the commentary, which he had deciphered about fifteen years earlier.

2.8. With the exception of the Cod. Gissensis, all Gothic MSS survived World War II, though for some years the sixth leaf of the commentary was missing. On three successive nights in August 1943 Milan underwent heavy air attack. Thirteen halls of the Ambrosiana were demolished, ten others damaged, and some 80,000 volumes reduced to ashes.\textsuperscript{17} The Gothic palimpsests were taken to safety and appeared to be unharmed, but at some time before 1948 Leaf VI had disappeared from its codex. In 1955 it became possible for the writer to study the commentary MS in Vatican City and Milan, and, at the same, to look for the missing leaf. With the help of Msgr. Enrico Galbiati of the Ambrosiana staff, VI was found to be misplaced in Cod. A. How it came there can only be guessed; perhaps the misplacement occurred when the MSS were moved from the library.

\textsuperscript{16} See W. Streitberg, Die gotische Bibel, I, 2nd ed. (Heidelberg, 1919), x–xi, and cf. 3.10.

\textsuperscript{17} Photographs of the damage appear in The Ambrosiana Library and Gallery, published (n.d.) by Erminio Turcotti for the Friends of the Ambrosiana, Piazza della Rosa 2, Milan.

\textsuperscript{18} Massmann, whose relations with the cardinal became strained (3.1), described the MS as being “durch Maj’s wild angewandte Galläpselinknur überaus verbräunt” (op. cit., p. 56).

\textsuperscript{19} “Über die Erhaltung und Ausbesserung alter Handschriften,” Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen, XV (1898), 17–33.
III

DECIPHERMENTS, EDITIONS, AND CRITICAL STUDIES

THE CASTIGLIONE-MASSMANN ERA

3.1. Two years after Maj's discovery of the Gothic texts in the Ambrosian palimpsests, one page of the commentary (310-VI verso) was published in an edited quasi facsimile under the heading "ex homilia quadam seu tractatu" by Count C. O. Castiglione in a volume prepared in collaboration with Maj, *Ulphilae partium ineditarum in Ambrosianis palimpsestis ab Angelo Majo reperiarum Specimen, conjunctis curis eiusdem Maji et Caroli Octavii Castilianoae editum*, Mediolani 1819, p. 24.¹ Castiglione was an excellent paleographer; his decipherment of p. 310, though not his best work, is nevertheless good as a pioneer effort. It is unfortunate that he did not edit the rest of the commentary leaves; as it is, his other readings of the codex are limited to individual words that he examined at the request of von der Gabelentz and Löbe (3.3). Maj, though less skilled in such work, was greatly interested in the texts that he had discovered. Three lines of Leaf VIII were first published in the initial volume of his *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio e Vaticanis codicibus edita*, Romae 1825. In 1833, when the eighth volume of this work was nearly ready for press, the Munich professor H. F. Massmann arrived in Italy with a commission from the crown prince Maximilian of Bavaria to decipher and edit all eight leaves of the commentary. Maj himself had intended to be the first to publish at least the Vatican fragments of the work that he had discovered, and, according to Massmann,² withheld the MS for two months on the pretext of obtaining permission to have it examined. Finally, he instructed an artist to sketch a facsimile of III, IV, VIII, and the task was completed in three days, during which time the artist was kept in his room, and the German visitor was compelled to wait, however impatiently. Whatever the circumstances, the artist proved to be hopelessly inept as a paleographer. Nevertheless, his facsimiles were reproduced in six plates at the end of the eighth volume of the *Nova collectio* in 1833. It is doubtful that Maj had seen them prior to their publication, or he would almost certainly have abandoned the plan of including them in the volume.

3.2. Massmann became at least the first scholar to decipher and edit all eight leaves. After spending "lange Wochen" in Rome and Milan, he returned to Munich to prepare his edition. It appeared with an elaborate dedication to the crown prince under the title *Skeireins aiwaggeljons pairh iohannen. Auslegung des Evangelii Johannis in gothischer Sprache. Aus römischen und mayländischen Handschriften nebst lateinischer Übersetzung, belegenden Anmerkungen, geschichtlicher Untersuchung, gothisch-lateinischem Wörterbuch und Schriftproben. Im Auftrage Seiner Königlichen Hoheit des Kronprinzen Maximilian von Bayern erlesen, erläutert und zum ersten Male herausgegeben*, München 1834.³ Massmann's choice of the noun *skeireins* 'interpretation, explanation,' which he adopted from 1 Cor. 12.10, 14.26, provided an appropriate name for the commentary, and the title has been retained. His decipherment of the text (pp. 3-34) is printed in facsimile with one MS column per page. In reading the codex, Massmann undertook one of the most difficult tasks in Gothic paleography, one in which a pioneer could scarcely

¹ The preface describes the commentary as "quidam de re sacra christianæ tractatus" (p. vi) and as "dogmaticus quidam tractatus, in quo plures evangeliorum auctoritates laudantur" (p. xviii). Page 35 reproduces four lines from Leaf II.

² Skeireins aiwaggeljons pairh iohannen (Munich, 1834), p. xi.
³ Brief extracts from this edition appeared in two anthologies of the period: F. A. Pischon’s *Denkmäler der deutschen Sprache*, I (Berlin, 1838), with a translation accompanying the sample, and J. Ochmann's *Deutsches Lesebuch zum Gebrauche bei dem Stidium der Geschichte unserer Nationalliteratur*, I (Eisenach, 1838), with an excerpt from Leaf I in facsimile.
hope to avoid mistakes. If he could have had constant access to the MS over a period of years, as Castiglione had for the Milanese leaves, the first complete decipherment undoubtedly would have been more accurate, but under the circumstances it was nevertheless an extremely valuable contribution that greatly lightened the work of his successors. Furthermore, he laid a foundation for the further study of Biblical and theological parallels. He was convinced (pp. 86 ff.) that the Skeireins had been translated originally from Greek, perhaps by Wulfila, though instances of Latin word order also suggested to him the possibility of an intervening Latin version. A review by H. C. von der Gabelentz noted some troublesome phrasings in the text and suggested corresponding corrections in Jenaische allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung (1835), no. 61.

3.3. The first separate analysis of the Skeireins, begun as a review of Massmann's 1834 edition and expanded with a better translation, was published by J. Lobe in Beiträge zur Textberichtigung und Erklärung der Skeireins (Altenburg, 1839). With the aid of Castiglione's readings of individual words, von der Gabelentz and Lobe presented an improved version in their Ulfilas, II (Leipzig, 1843–46). In varying degrees, this text was to affect all the remaining editions and studies of the era: Ernst Schulte's Gotisches Glossar (Magdeburg, 1848), which offered some incidental editorial suggestions; a second version by Massmann in his Ulfilas (Stuttgart, 1857), which shows the effect of Lobe's criticism; Friedrich Stamm's Ulfilas oder die uns erhaltenen Denkmäler der gothischen Sprache (Paderborn, 1858 ff.); and Jakob Lundgren's Skeireins avaggelions barinh Johannens (Upsala, 1860), which was also slightly influenced by Massmann's second edition. In addition to Massmann (1834 version, pp. 64 ff.), two other scholars of the period investigated the theology of the commentary: H. E. G. Paulus, "Theologische Bemerkungen zur gothischen Auslegung des Evangel. Johannes," Heidelberger Jahrbücher der Literatur, XXVIII (1835), 863–882, and W. Kraft, Die Kirchengeschichte der germanischen Völker, i (Berlin, 1854), 348–361. Kraft (352) regarded the work as being of Gothic authorship.

UPPSTROM AND THE EMENDATORS

3.4. The second scholar to examine the Skeireins leaves as a group was the Upsala professor Andreas Uppström. His decipherment was published as a line-for-line transliteration in his Fragmenta gothica selecta ad fidem codicium Ambrosianorum, Carolini, Vaticani, Upsaliae 1861, pp. 14–45. Uppström was already widely known for his diplomatic edition of the Codex Argenteus (1854, 1857), and his readings of the Skeireins were accepted as being much more accurate than those of his predecessors, even though his editing was regarded as overconservative. His study of the codex was to remain the basis of all editions for nearly forty years. There is no question that Uppström's work was in some respects an advance beyond that of Massmann, who had already laid the foundation for further examination of the MS, but the confidence with which editors accepted

4 A review by J. Grimm in GGA (1835), no. 111 (= Kleinere Schriften, V, 192–197), suggested that it would be better to leave the question open for further investigation.

5 The Gabelentz-Löbe version was reproduced by J. P. Migne, Pat. Ser. Lat. (Paris, 1848), cols. 871–878, and by I. Gauggengil, Ulfilas: Umschrift, Sprachlehre, Wörterbuch (Passau, 1848). Here and elsewhere, reviews of editions will be considered only when having a direct bearing on the history of the text. For other reviews see Fernand Mossé, "Bibliographia Gotica," MS, XII (1930), 256, 263 f.
the new decipherment far exceeded its merits. In the first place, Uppström's stay in Italy was much too brief to permit a thorough reading. In Milan he spent only two weeks in examining the ten pages of the Ambrosian group in addition to the two leaves of Cod. C, whereas Massmann had required a much longer time for the commentary pages alone, and toward the end of the century Wilhelm Braun was literally to spend years in deciphering the Ambrosian palimpsests. Furthermore, in some instances Uppström reached no definite conclusions regarding difficult readings but merely offered such remarks as "sic e conjectura potius quam e lectione damus," which could lead only to the supposition that the text was hopelessly illegible and therefore in need of editorial improvement.

3.5. With the publication of the Fragmenta began an era of excessive emendation. Editors, convinced that they were at last in possession of accurate though troublesome readings, came to the conclusion that the MS was extremely corrupt, so that there was nothing to do but to bring the text into conformity with the language of the Gothic Bible. By all odds the most enthusiastic emender of the period was Alexander Vollmer; his version, Die Bruchstücke der Skeireins (Munich, 1862), is scarcely an edition so much as a paraphrase. Of the same general persuasion,

8 Uppström, preface, p. iii: "Mediolanum profectus Gothicae gentis monumenta literaria, quae in Bibliotheca Ambrosiana custodiantur, omnia quidem vidit, sed breve tempus duarum hebdomadum, quas ultra in hac urbe morari nequiam, non permisit, ut omnia cum libris editis compararent; qui labor ut perficiat, duorum saltat, si non plurium, annorum est. Contulit igitur, quantum potuit, Matthei Evangelii duo folia et quinque folia eis libri, qui inscribunt Skeireins, sive Commentarii in Evangelium Johannis." Braun, ZDP, XXXI (1899), 450, quotes the foregoing remarks and adds, "Mir scheint es unmöglich, daß ein forscher, und wäre er auch mit den besten augen ausgestattet, in so kurzer zeit die angegebene arbeit gründlich erledigen könne, und daher ist es mir begreiflich, daß U im großen und ganzen an Massmann 1834 und konjektoren G[abel]en[st.-]L[öbel]e anlehnt." 9 O. Lücke, Absolute Particula im Gotischen (Magdeburg, 1876), p. 38: "Wenn man den hier gegebenen gothischen Text durchliest, muß man sich wahrhaft freuen über den schönen, glatt dahingleitenden Fluss der gothischen Worte; leider hat aber V. nur das Verdienst, gezeigt zu haben, in welchem Stil etwa ein heutiger Gelehrter mit Benutzung der Wüllischen Bibelübersetzung eine Erklärung des Johannesevangeliums schreiben würde, nicht wie unser Skeireins tatsächlich geschrieben hat."

10 Bernhardt, op. cit., pp. 608 f.: "Die vielfachen schäden des textes offen gelegt und ihre heilung zum teil mit glücklichem scharfsinn bewirkt zu haben ist das verdienst A. Vollmers ..., welche selbst diese erfolgten in seinen änderungen, meiner ansicht nach, viel zu weit. Bernhardt's own ideas on how far an editor should go in altering the text can be ascertained from the critical apparatus of the present edition.

11 Ibid., p. 622: "So glaub ich der Skeireins eine lesbare und verständliche gestalt gegeben zu haben und hoffe, daß man fernerhin nicht mehr die fehler eines gedankenlosen abschreibers für 'berechtigte eigentümlichkeiten' der gotischen sprache ausgegeben wird."

12 Ibid., pp. 618 f.: "Leider jedoch sind dieselben [the Skeireins leaves] durch den gedankenlosen, unwissenden in sehr verwahrlostem zustande auf uns gekommen. Mit wie wenig verständnis dieser verurteilt, zeigt zunächst seine unhörige interposition. So oft auch in den übrigen gotischen handschriften die zeichen sinnwidrig gesetzt sind, der schreiber der Skeireins leisst darin das ungläubliche. ... So trennt er das adjectiv vom nomen, ... den genetiv von seinem regens, ... das subject vom verbum, ... das object vom verbum ... u.s.w. Noch sinnstörender ist oft die falsche anwendung der großen, am rande stehenden anfangsbuchstaben. Durch solche werden vielfach (swazinagel) die citirten bibelstellen hervorgehoben; allein oft genug ist dies nicht beobachtet, oder der
literary powers was not high.\textsuperscript{13} On the other hand, Bernhardt advanced the study of patristic parallels to some extent. Like Kraft, he favored Gothic authorship with the use of Greek commentaries.\textsuperscript{14} His 1875 text was reproduced with two minor changes in a collective edition for students, \textit{Die gotische Bibel des Wulfila und die Skeireins} (Halle, 1884), which was reprinted by G. H. Balg in \textit{The First Germanic Bible} (Milwaukee, 1892).

3.6. The first protest against the unrestricted emendation of this era was the Göttingen dissertation (1876) of Otto Lücke, \textit{Absolute Participe im Gotischen und ihr Verhältnis zum griechischen Original mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Skeireins}. To support his contention that the commentary had been translated from Greek, Lücke proceeded to list the Gothic text together with its supposed Greek Vorlage, but as Bernhardt\textsuperscript{15} pointed out, the Greek of the reconstructed original was frequently intolerable. The eighth edition of Stamm's \textit{Ulfilas}, which had been continued from the third by Moritz Heyne, appeared in 1885 with comparatively few alterations for its time, but the age of improvement was to continue. Massmann's version of 1834 had already considered the substitution of \textit{ufarmunnon mitiandans} for \textit{ufar miton munandane} III c 11–12, and the same change was proposed again by A. Beets in \textit{TNTL}, IX 2 (1891), 124 ff. In \textit{BGDSL}, XV (1891), 438–440, M. H. Jellinek drew attention to a few similarities between the Skeireinist's

\begin{quote}
\textit{große buchstabe steht mitten im citat. \ldots Auch nach dem citat ist manchmal ein solcher buchstabe gesetzt, aber ohne alle consequenz. Noch auffallender ist es, wenn dadurch das adjectiv vom nomen, \ldots das object oder subject vom verbum, \ldots die apposition vom nomen, der hauptsatz vom nebensatz gerissen werden. Alles dies war nur einem rein mechanisch verfahrenden abschreiber möglich, der für den sinn dessen, was er schrieb, kein verständnus hatte.}\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{13} Ib. \textit{p. 611.}
\textsuperscript{14} Review of Lücke, \textit{ZDP}, VIII (1877), 354.

\textit{Decipherments, Editions, and Critical Studies} remarks on salvation (I b–d) and those of Irenaeus in \textit{Adversus haereses}. In the following year was published K. Marold's "Die Schrifttum der Skeireins und ihre Bedeutung für die Textgeschichte der gotischen Bibel," \textit{Festschrift des Friedrichs Kollegiums} (Königsberg, 1892). So far as the commentary is concerned, this study did little more than perpetuate a mistaken identification of the opening quotation (Rom. 3.11–12, I a 1–5), which had been correctly identified by Leo Meyer years before in \textit{Germania}, X (1865), 226 f. Like Bernhardt, Marold assumed Gothic authorship with the use of Greek commentaries.

3.7. With one slight and one marked exception, the remaining publications of the era are still of some value. The edition of H. G. van der Waals appeared in Leiden in 1892 under the title \textit{Skeireins Avaggeljons hów Johanners: Vertaling met eenige opmerkingen omtrent tekst en tekstritiek}. The most interesting feature of this work, which uses the Heyne text conservatively, is its treatment of the participial constructions, which are ascribed to the influence of Greek in introducing non-Germanic syntax into the Gothic Bible and commentary. A review of this edition by M. H. Jellinek in \textit{ADA}, XX (1894), 148–162, discussed a number of problems and is still important in the history of the text. The ninth version of the Stamm-Heyne edition was printed in 1896 but scarcely differed from the eighth; Heyne (p. xv) rejected all possibility of Wulfila's being the author of the \textit{Skeireins}. In 1897 appeared two significant articles by G. H. McKnight, both relevant to the commentary: "The Primitive Teutonic Order of Words," \textit{JEGP}, I, esp. 146–160, and "The Language of the Skeireins," \textit{MLN}, XXI, col. 205–209. From the evidence provided by word order, which Lücke had largely neglected, McKnight concluded that the extant form of the \textit{Skeireins} could not be a word-for-word translation from Greek but rather had been influenced by both Greek and Latin. Surprisingly, the most wholesale deletions ever made in any edition of the commentary came at the end of the century in the Leiden dissertation of E. H. A. Cromhout, \textit{Skeireins avaggeljons hów Johanners} (Delft, 1900). Upon examining the punctuation in
Massmann’s facsimile, especially the use of initials, which to him appeared to serve no useful purpose, Cromhout reached the conclusion that the Skeireins was not only based on a contaminated Vorlage but had also undergone two successive stages of interpolation, which he proceeded to identify and to discard. His expurgated version deletes about 940 words of the MS along with the initials and thus disposes of one problem after another.  

BRAUN, KAUFFMANN, AND THE EARLIER TWENTIETH CENTURY

3.8. All presently used complete editions are based on codex decipherments that were made at the end of the nineteenth century. In 1899 the Milanese scholar Wilhelm Braun presented the results of a long and painstaking study of Leaves I, II, V, VI, VII in “Die Mäliänder Blätter der Skeireins,” ZDP, XXXI, 429–451. At about the same time Friedrich Kauffmann made an examination of III, IV, VIII, which appeared in the textual apparatus of the Dietrich edition. Of the two palaeographers, Braun was the more skilled and responsible. No one who examines the Ambrosian leaves can fail to appreciate the value of his contributions. In many instances he succeeded in identifying letters and words that had been overlooked or given up by his predecessors. Unfortunately, he confined his study largely to those passages “welche besonders die kritik herausgefordert haben” (p. 430) and devoted his best efforts to these; there are many others that he might have succeeded in deciphering. By comparison, Kauffmann’s work is much more uneven in quality. In some instances he improved the readings of his predecessors, but many of the bleached or smudged letters that he described as missing are still discernible under ordinary lighting, and some of his other observations are not borne out by an examination of the Vatican leaves. Perhaps his eyesight was not equal to the task of decipherment, which would challenge even the best vi-

16 M. H. Jellinek, whose reviews were generally constructive and never hypercritical, remarked in the Groningen Museum, IX (1901), 107–110, that Cromhout had done more to confuse the issues than to explain them.

17 The expanded version received a number of reviews (see Mossé, op. cit., p. 264), the most important being by Jellinek, ADA, XXIX (1904), 281–292.

18 W. Streitberg, LC (1903), 1124 f., regarded Dietrich’s evidence as inconclusive. A. E. Schönbach, Österreichisches Literaturblatt, XIII (1905), 175, held the ascription to Wulfila to be “durchaus unbeweisen.” G. Ehrismann, ZDP, XXXVIII (1906), 382–395, was barely willing to concede such a possibility. Jellinek (n. 17, above) did not completely reject the idea, nor did O. Behagel (see esp. BGDSL, XXVII [1910], 565), but all five agreed that the evidence was insufficient. For a complete rejection see K. Helm, BGDSL, LXXX (1958), 204–207.

19 See also Die gotische Bibel, I, 2nd or 3rd ed. (Heidelberg, 1919, 1950), xxx.
3.10. A photographic reproduction of III, IV, VIII appeared in Codices e Vaticanis selecti phototypice expressi, VII: M. Cornetii Frontonis alias omneque reliquiae quae codice vaticano 5750 rescripto continentur, Mediolani 1906, 57–62. This source of evidence had no effect, however, upon the following editions of the Skeireins, which continued to employ Kauffmann’s readings. With the death of Heyne in 1906, the continuation of the Stamm-Heyne volume was assumed by Ferdinand Wrede, who had been assisting in the preparation of this work since 1896. The eleventh edition (1908) introduced a number of changes, including a relatively conservative presentation of the Skeireins based on the decipherments of Braun and Kauffmann; the same text of the commentary was reprinted in the twelfth edition (1913) and the thirteenth (1920). Similarly, Wilhelm Streitberg’s slightly less conservative version in Die gotische Bibel, I (Heidelberg, 1908), was reprinted in the second edition (1919), which was reprinted as a third (1950). From the extensive patristic material that had been gathered by Dietrich, Streitberg sifted the more tangible evidence, keeping “nur jene Parallelen aus der theologischen Literatur, die wörtliche Anklänge zeigen, gleichviel ob unmittelbare oder mittelbare Abhängigkeit anzunehmen ist” (I, 2nd–3rd ed., xxx). The foreword to the second edition (I, x) relates that in 1910–1911 Braun and Msgr. Achille Ratti, then prefect of the Ambrosiana, were planning a photographic reproduction of the Ambrosian Gothic codices with accompanying transcriptions, a project that had been suggested by Streitberg. Unfortunately, the project was brought to a halt by the death of Braun in 1913. Though he had found eighty new readings in Codd. A–D, he had not undertaken a second decipherment of the Skeireins leaves in the Ambrosiana. As a result, the two subsequent complete versions of the commentary have the same readings used by Dietrich: Erich Mayr, Die Skeireins (Munich, 1913), with a fairly conservative text, and Ernst A. Kock, Die Skeireins: Text nebst Übersetzung und Anmerkungen (Lund and Leipzig, [1913]). With Jellinek’s review of Kock in ADA, XXXVIII (1918), 27–35, may be compared Kock’s reply, LUÄ, IX (1919), 2–4.

3.11. Since 1913 no new editions of the commentary have appeared, though excerpts have been published in such grammars and handbooks as Wilhelm Braune’s Gotische Grammatik (Halle, revised by Karl Helm from the tenth edition and now in a fifteenth, 1956); Fernand Mosse, Manuel de la langue gotique (Paris, 1942; rev. ed., 1956); and Wolfgang Krause, Handbuch des Gotischen (Munich, 1953). With the lack of new editions has come a decline in the number of related publications. Aside from a few brief comments on individual readings and passages, almost no articles dealing with the commentary in particular were published between 1900 and 1950. One exception is Rudolf Lenk’s challenging study “Die Syntax der Skeireins,” BGDSL, XXXVI (1910), 237–306. Without denying that the syntax of the commentary may have been influenced by the style of the Antiochene school, as Dietrich believed, the article points to the Semitic Greek of the Pauline epistles as a likely model. Less convincingly, Lenk goes far beyond van der Waals in asserting that the Greek affected Gothic syntax to such an extent that the language of the Skeireins represents a form of everyday speech used as a literary vehicle, and, at the same time, a literary medium that was also spoken. This opinion, the most

---

29 Mosse’s revised text of the Skeireins (Leaves I–II) uses as many readings of the present edition as had been published up to 1954.
31 “So möchte ich auch die sprache der skeireins eine umgangssprache, die geschrieben, und eine schriftsprache, die gesprochen wird, nennen; daß dabei der theologie anders spricht als der krieger, ist selbstverständlich” (p. 305).
treme to be expressed regarding Greek influence on Gothic, has not been accepted. In 1915 Leo Wiener created a brief flurry by attempting to assign the Gothic Bible to the end of the eighth century and the Skeireins to early ninth-century Spain, but a review by Leonard Bloomfield in the following year effectively disposed of the argument. Apart from the translations that have accompanied many editions and excerpts, a separate translation was published by R. Plate in his Geschichte der gotischen Literatur (Berlin and Bonn, 1931). In listing words peculiar to the Skeireins, all currently used editions of Gothic dictionaries naturally follow the codex readings of Braun and Kaufmann: W. Streitberg, Die gotische Bibel, II: Gotisch-griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch, 2nd ed. (Heidelberg, 1928); O. Priese, Deutschgotisches Wörterbuch, 3rd ed. (Halle, 1933); F. Holthausen, Gotisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (Heidelberg, 1934); and S. Feist, Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache, 3rd ed. (Leiden, 1939). For general usefulness, whether with reference to the Skeireins or to Gothic generally, one of the most significant publications of recent years has been Fernand Mossé's “Bibliographia Gotica: A Bibliography of Writings on the Gothic Language to the End of 1949,” MS, XII (1950), 237-324, with a first supplement extending to the middle of 1953 in XV (1953), 169-183. With the untimely death of Mossé in 1956, an unfinished second supplement was completed by J. W. Marchand and appeared in XIX (1957), 174-196. In 1958 K. Helm published an article discussing the emendation of a few forms in the commentary and rejecting the possibility of Wulfilas's authorship: “Einiges über die Skeireins,” BGDSL, LXXX, 201-207.

3.12. The codex decipherment upon which the present edition is based was begun in 1948 and has continued intermittently over a period of ten years. As originally planned, the edition was to present only full-page photographs of all Skeireins leaves except VI, which was assumed to be lost. It soon became clear, however, that full-page photographs would be of little or no value in showing badly faded and smudged letters. In the long run, it became necessary to use fifty-six separate plates of individual words and characters. Almost every disputed reading proved to be a photographic problem in itself, some requiring many enlargements before the distinctive features of a given letter or letters could be made identifiable. But though the process of photographic decipherment is very slow and might well be impractical with longer texts, it has at least shown itself to be dependable. A direct examination of the leaves in 1955, together with repeated study of supplementary photographs, has required only one correction in the readings (6.34). Even in this instance, the fault did not lie in the process but in its application, the original exposure time being too short to produce a clear reproduction.


[29] Only one side of the missing leaf (p. 310) had been photographed, and then very poorly, for the frontispiece of Dietrich's 1903 text.

[30] The two pages shown in the frontispiece of the present edition are far above the average in legibility, but even so, VIII ab should be compared with Plates XXIV-XXVII and VI cd with Plates XLIX-LI.
IV

LANGUAGE

HANDWRITING

4.1. All sixteen pages of the Gothic text were written originally by a single scribe. His handwriting, which is clear and unusually firm, shows the essential features of the later, upright Gothic script (2.6). The firmness of his touch is attested by many instances in which the ink has blotted through the parchment as a result of minute punctures, especially in dotted marks of punctuation. Neat as it is, his work has neither the beauty of either hand in the Cod. Argenteus nor the grace of the scripts in Cod. Ambrosianus C and the Cod. Carolinus. In the other Gothic MSS of the Ambrosian collection, only the first hand of Cod. A shows any similarity to that of the commentary. Both have relatively thick vertical strokes, but those of the commentary are even more spatulate. Occasionally, too, the Skeireins shows a d written with the left stroke extending as high as the right, so that the top of the letter nearly resembles that of a Gothic q. Except for corrections, the marginal boundaries of the narrow columns have been observed as well as could be expected, though with a few odd syllabifications (4.4).

4.2. Despite his neatness, the original scribe made a number of errors, and there are numerous corrections in the MS. Braun¹ and Kauffmann² believed some of the corrections to be the work of a second scribe. Much evidence supports this opinion. The scribe who wrote the body of the text was a skilled craftsman, and his writing instrument (a springy reed?) was sharp. The distinction between thick vertical and thin horizontal strokes is everywhere apparent in his writing.³ The second scribe was a more exacting reader, but by no stretch of imagination could he be called a craftsman. His best writing achieves some degree of legibility, but his worst efforts suggest a schoolboy scrawl. His writing instrument (a worn-out quill?) was blunted, and his touch was so light that many of his most valuable corrections have been obscured by fading, smudging, and Latin letters. If each scribe had possessed the merits of the other, some of the most troublesome problems in deciphering the codex might have been avoided. In many instances, to be sure, a correction involves nothing more than the addition, modification, or cancellation of a single letter, so that it is hardly possible to determine which scribe is responsible for the change. As shown by the photographs in Chap. VI, however, some corrections have been made in a hand identical with that of the original text, whereas in others the letters are perceptibly different in shape, touch, uniformity of size, and interlateral spacing. It is of course possible that still other scribes made changes in the MS, but there appear to be only two handwritings. Each is reasonably consistent within itself, one being very good and the other noticeably inferior.

ABBREVIATIONS, LIGATURES, CANCELLATION, SYLLABIFICATION

4.3. The MS shows no special peculiarities in its suspension marks for m (ȝ), n (ȝ) or in its abbreviations for divine names or numerals.⁴ On kîl and los see 6.56. Ligatures and suspension marks occur only along the right side of the column, where they are used in justifying lines. The same purpose is served also by the employment of smaller letters with narrower interlateral spacing. Deleted letters are marked with superior cancellation dots (e.g., s), with cross-out strokes, or with both. There

¹ ZDP, XXXI (1899), 449.
² Dietrich, 1903 printing, p. xxvii.
³ See Fairbanks and Magoun, Speculum, XV (1940), 317 f.
⁴ For a convenient summary of differences among the MSS in such respects, see J. W. Marchand, "The Gothic Evidence for 'Euthalian Matter',' HTR, XLIX (1956), 160-166.
are very few instances of erasure, which is resorted to only where a cancellation or alteration of letters would be of no avail.

4.4. In writing the codex, the first scribe faced the problem of maintaining a straight right margin in a narrow column. This factor, together with his characteristic neatness, may well explain some of his syllabifications. To be sure, he did not separate vowel symbols belonging to the same syllable, e.g., sei|na III a 17, stau|os V c 12, but he kept an eye on the margin, hence tw|os II d 14, fa|ri|panam VIII d 12. As a rule, he carried a single consonant between vowels (or the last consonant of an intervocalic group) over to the beginning of a new line, as in afni|mib I b 4, waurs|wis V c 7, andpag|jandins VII a 3, but this practice is abandoned in tw|da|je III d 3, gareh|sna|is IV d 2, ful|hsna IV d 8, waurs|tw|a VI b 15, (mann)|ahun VII a 1, andpag|gkjandis VII a 18, and pag|reins VIII d 10. In gaag|ewe|n I c 12 and ain|shun VIII d 2, which show a similar practice in dividing syllables, the g and s at the beginnings of lines have been added as corrections. Whereas a consonant plus l or r is more commonly treated as the beginning of a postvocalic syllable except before j, as in fo|dreina, ne|blos beside sigl|jands, bro|jus, the first scribe divided b from r in wip|rus I b 3, iu|pa|ro II a 22, 25, and pa|ro VI d 24; cf. ne|los, Luke 18.25. Nonenclitic compounds, except for those noted above, are divided etymologically, e.g., pat|ain I d 24. As elsewhere in Gothic, enclitics are sometimes treated as independent syllables, e.g., suman|uh|pan VI c 18, and sometimes not, e.g., an|duh V a 23. Beside bi|sei IV c 7, which represents the usual treatment of postconsonantal enclitic -ei, we find pis | ei written as separate words in II b 7 f. Neh. 5.18 also employs pis ei where scholars have expected pis ei. The Skeireins passage in particular gives evidence that the distinction between these forms is both deliberate and meaningful (7.10).

PUNCTUATION

4.5. Though the first scribe has been blamed for various shortcomings, he has been most severely criticized for his punctuation. The criticism, beginning with Massmann's first edition of 1834 and reaching a climax in the Bernhardt version of 1875, was to continue throughout the nineteenth century. Even in 1900 Cromhout undertook to identify his presumed contaminations in the text on the basis of its supposedly meaningless punctuation. One reason for the assumption that the scribe was merely a stupid copyist is the fact that some Gothic MSS show a deceptive external similarity to the Skeireins codex in the use of initial letters and pause symbols. Thus the Carolinus, which has a stichometric arrangement of lines, employs marginal initials to mark the beginnings of capita, and the Cod. Argenteus, which is written in scripture continua, uses :: to mark the ends of sections, with :: for shorter divisions. In neither instance does the usage coincide with that of the commentary manuscript (4.6-7). Thanks in part to Braun's investigations, Dietrich was to become the first editor to understand the system according to which the Skeireins is punctuated. Dietrich's analysis of the system, though incomplete, is substantially correct; yet neither he nor any subsequent editor has retained the punctuation of the codex.

4.6. Like the Gothic Bible, the commentary appears to have been intended for ceremonious reading, though it may indeed have served other purposes also. Its notation indicates not only cadence but emphasis as well. Within the columns, cadences are expressed by the double point :: and the single point . Of the two marks, :: occurs more frequently. Its function ranges be-

---

4 As considered here, the syllable is a purely graphic device, not a unit of utterance. Marchand points out (JEGP, LXV [1957], 222-224) that the findings of E. Hermann, 'Die Silbenbildung in den idg. Sprachen' (Göttingen, 1923), pp. 287-293, throw considerable doubt on the conventional view that the written syllables of Gothic generally represent units of utterance (K. Hechtenberg-Collitz, JEGP, VI [1907], 72-91; W. Schulze, BSB, I [1908], 610-624, and ZVS, XLII [1909], 327-329).

4 Cf. 3.5, note 12.

7 "Die Lese- und Eintellungssymbole in den gotischen Handschriften der Ambrosiana in Mailand," ZDP, XXX (1898), 433-448.

tween that of a pause and that of a full stop. As all editors have recognized, the pause (or stop) is usually syntactical, serving to mark off a phrase, clause, or sentence, but it should be noted further that : is sometimes used also to indicate a rhetorical emphasis of preceding words, e.g. III b 9–10 judaiwiskom: ufarranneinim ‘the JEWISH sprinkling’ (as opposed to John’s baptism), IV b 7 fins: laiseins ‘the LORD’s teaching’ (in contrast with John’s), IV d 18–21 po afgudon haifst: saballiais jah markaillius ‘that IMPIOUS CONTENTION of Sabellius and Marcellus’ (who have dared to say that the Father and the Son are one Person). The mark · denotes a brief pause (never a full stop) or light emphasis, e.g., II d 14 twos. ‘two’ (precisely so many and no more). Both : and · may occur with abbreviations, but all abbreviations for nomina sacra and numerals are distinguished by the superior mark —— (a thin horizontal line connecting two dots), so that neither : nor · is necessary except as required by the context.

4.7. Within the margins of the commentary, punctuation is expressed by means of the mark —— and quotation dots; in three instances (I a 18, VI a 5, VII b 1) quotation dots occur also within the column. The marginal —— is usually a horizontal (but sometimes peaked or slanted) line connecting three spaced dots. It always appears above initials, frequently introduces quotation dots, and sometimes occurs at the end of a quotation, but in all instances it has only one basic function, that of drawing attention to the mark : at the end (or less commonly, the middle) of the same line. In some instances ——, when occurring above an initial, displaces a closing quotation dot. The marginal initial letters of the Skeireins are merely adjuncts to the use of : and have no independent function, a fact that has an important bearing on the interpretation of the text. On the extant leaves, an initial serves only to indicate that : occurs at the end of the preceding line, regardless of whether the : represents a pause or a full stop, e.g.:

I a 4–6 ‘ samana unbruk
  ’ jai waqrjun:
J ah ju uf dauhaus

Language

Though an initial is used only after a line-end :, a line-end : is not necessarily followed by an initial:

IV d 24–25 tan jah sunu:
  ip anjaŋ š weĩha

The completely dependent role of initials in the MS is attested by 82 of 88 original occurrences, though some are greatly obscured by marginal bleaching. Among the remaining instances, the initial letter has been lost with the inner margin in two lines (V a 11, 14), and in three others the : has been lost through extreme fading (II d 21, V c 25, V d 8). In one passage an initial appears without an : at the end of the preceding line, but the exception is only apparent:

II b 16–18 ‘ galeipan jag ga
  ’ bairaidau: sah
  U nkunnands auk

In this passage the word sah, which was first noticed by Braun, was originally omitted and has been added in the irregular hand of the second scribe.

PHONOLOGICAL AND MORPHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS

4.8. The vowel spellings in the MS show variations already familiar in other Gothic documents. u and o are not confused. As elsewhere in Gothic, the rendering of Biblical names is largely unpredictable, so that any standards, even for purposes of comparison, are necessarily arbitrary. Of the variant vowel spellings listed below, only four (pataine, pisei, swignjan, wisandin) represent native Gothic words:

ai for e neikaudaimau VIII c 17 (nekaudemus II b 6)
e for ei pataine I b 9
e for i nekaudemus II b 6 (nekaudemus John 7.50); herodes (gen.) III a 12; iohannes (gen.) III b 1, VI b 18
ei for e pisei (gen. pl.) VI c 24, VII c 4; fareisiæi (gen. pl.) VIII d 4
ei for i neikaudaimau VIII c 17
e for e swignjan VI a 21
i for ei wisandin (lem. dat. sg.) VII b 14
u for au diabulas I b 11; diabulas I b 22
Language

On the spelling of the name marcaillius* IV d 20 see 7.23.

4.9. The spelling of consonants, like that of vowels, shows the same types of variation found in other Gothic MSS:

- b for f
gadub* I c 5, 16, II c 24, III c 10; ioseba II a 7
- gkk for gk
andhgekkand- VII a 3, 18
- omission of h
ini I b 7; borjanovb IV b 11; bajamarame V d 6
- omission of intervocalic j
siub VIII c 1
- j for i
judaiviskom III b 9; judaim IV a 7; judaia VIII d 9 (juaidaim III b 2; juaidia IV b 8); jaurdanau IV a 12
- jucture assimilation of jah
jas saup I a 19; jen ni I b 17; jag ga- II b 16, IV c 11, 21, IV d 10
- n- beside -nn-
inainohn V b 18, ainohnun V c 101 (7.27)
inainohnun
- dissimilation
weitodipo VI a 24 (-dida IV c 23)

On jenah II b 4 and drausnu VII d 17 see 7.9.

4.10. The inflection in the commentary is the same as that of the Gothic Bible, the only noteworthy features being unique occurrences of the pronouns ainhabaruh*, *baubaruh*, and the uncompounded instrumental of jata, which appear respectively as dat. ainhabarammek III a 16, dat. bajamarame V d 6, and ph IV d 4. There are no aberrant forms of pronouns, as has been supposed from earlier decipherments of the codex. As the photographs in Chapter VI show, bajamarame occurs in V d 6, not *bajamarame (6.37); ina in VI c 15, not inna (6.42); ainharjanoh in VII c 18, not *ainharjamme (6.47); and masc. nom. sg. ainshun in VIII c 14 and VIII d 2, not ainshun (6.55, 57). ainshun

* Influenced by Sibers' theories, Wilhelm Braun suggested a juncture phenomenon to explain such spellings as gadub: "Ein satzphonetisches Gesetz des Gotischen mit vorwiegender Rücksicht auf die Codices Ambrosiani," GRM, V (1913), 391. According to Braun, an originally voiced spirant remains voiced in final position when followed immediately by another voiced sound in continuous context, i.e., within a colon. The form gadub occurs four times in the commentary, twice before an immediately following voiced sound (gadub nu I c 16-17, gadub swisai II c 24), once before a pause (gadub: ei I c 6), and once before a voiceless consonant (gadob jans III c 10-11).


SYNTACTICAL FEATURES

4.11. Twelve types of construction in the commentary require some attention. For the immediate purpose they will be described briefly, a more detailed analysis of some individual passages being reserved for Chapter VII. Though many of the constructions listed below have been altered in one version or another, in all but one instance (7.19) they are retained in the currently used complete editions (Dietrich, Streitberg, Wrede, Mayr, Kock).

4.12. Among various forms of inverted and disjunctive word order (anastrophe), the most persistent is a separation of a noun from its modifier, as in Rom. 7.17 so banandei in mis frawurhts no kovna wv emu aumartia12 'the dwelling-in-me sin' = 'the sin that dwells in me.' This separation occurs once or more in at least twenty-four passages but is subject to some variation, as in III a 10-11 so gareksns bi ina beside IV a 24-25 so bi ina gareksns. For the most part, the separation of noun and modifier has caused little difficulty, but one instance has proved to be troublesome, viz. III c 19-20 (7.19).

4.13. In one passage a personal pronoun is twice substituted for a reflexive: VII b 5-12 andhufen awk jainaim anahaitandam im [==sis] . anahaitandame im [==sis]. The nearest Biblical parallels are in the genitive, e.g., 1 Tim. 5.18 wairks sa wawstwa misdons is. The reverse of this substitution also occurs once, apparently through confusion of the logical subject (Christ) with the grammatical subject (Christ's power): VIII a 3-10 at weihai awk is mahai: unanasiubai unselein ise naud disskaidandein jah ni uslubhjandein four mel sik [==ina] gahaban.

4.14. In keeping with the frequent separation of noun and

12 Here and below, excerpts from the Greek are taken from Streitberg's Vorlage, Die gotische Bibel, I, 2nd-3rd ed. (Heidelberg, 1919, 1950). Though this text will serve to illustrate the constructions under consideration, it is by no means a safe criterion for the emendation of the Gothic version (see the following note).
modifier (4.12), the gender of missaleiks VI c 12 agrees with the logical subject of its clause (God the Father) rather than with the grammatical subject wei twodeins, before which eight words intervene. The logical gender in Gal. 2.16 and 1 Tim. 3.16 is only partly comparable. M. H. Jellinek, ADA, XXIX (1904), 292, suggests a model in Greek synesis.

4.15. In three instances weak feminine adjectives in -om occur without accompanying articles: II d 2-7 at raihits man us missaleikom wistim ussatiadamma: us saiwalai raihits jah leika; III b 8-13 ni panaseips judaiwiskam: ufaranneinim jah sinteinom daupeinim brukjan usdaudjaina. Jellinek, ADA, XX (1894), 153, and XXIX (1904), 282, regards these forms as serving to distinguish gender; the commentary has no corresponding feminines in -aim. However, there would appear to be at least one other possible explanation. Elsewhere in Gothic, the combination of noun and weak adjective without article occurs repeatedly in such essentially nominal expressions as ‘eternal life’ = ‘salvation,’ ‘eternal loss’ = ‘damnation,’ ‘great difficulty’ = ‘tribulation,’ and ‘beloved son’ = ‘Timothy.’ In these combinations the substantivized adjective becomes, in effect, part of a compound noun: libains aiweino (Matt. 25.46, John 6.27, 6.40, 17.2), balwein aiweinon (Matt. 25.46), managan aglons (2 Cor. 7.4), fralast aiweinon (2 Thess. 1.9), teimaupaiaw walisin barna (1 Tim. 1.2), teitaw walisin barna (Tit. 1.4). In the commentaries passages under consideration, the ‘different entities’ of which man is composed, ‘namely soul and body,’ and the Hebrew purification rite (‘Jewish sprinklings and daily ablutions’) may represent similar nominal compounds. At any rate, it is significant that in III b 11 sinteino has been corrected from sinteino (6.21). Evidently the scribe was satisfied with the weak form of the adjective, or he would have changed the ending to -aim.

4.16. Jellinek observes (ADA, XXIX, 292) that in paim swa waurpanam VI c 23 the participle is used predicatively and might be expected to appear as a strong form. This is true, but here the weak form may well reflect the proximity of the demon-strative (paim ... waurpanam). The scribe has added paim above the line but has not altered waurpanam.

4.17. In several passages a finite verb or present participle serves two successive clauses or phrases, with which it is equally congruent (zeugma), as in Matt. 25.42-43, Rom. 7.8-9, Phil. 1.21, e.g.: I b 15-19 mahais seinaiws nana ustaiknida wesi: jan ni panaseips fastaida (west) garaiteins gareksns, II c 8-12 ip nasjandos bana anawairpan dom is gisaivhans. jah (gasaiwband) patei in galabeinai peihan habaida. The same construction occurs in III c 15-22, IV a 3-4, 22-23, VI a 5-7, and probably V c 2-13 (7.28). In one instance a single infinitive is similarly used to serve two successive finite verbs, as in Mark 6.19 and 9.18, VI b 11-14 tweifjan pukta ... (tweifjan) mahata.

4.18. In at least three instances—and perhaps more (7.20, 7.28)—a finite form of ‘be’ is omitted from a phrasing standing in lieu of a clause (sceins onomatont), as in Mark 10.1, 10.32, Luke 7.2, Rom. 6.23, 1 Tim. 5.18.19 II c 8-15 nasjandos ... (was) gaskeirjandos imma swe mifjan unkunnandin, VI b 25-27 wausrwya ... (sind) gaswukunjandona; VI d 20-22 ‘audagai ... (sind) pai hrainjahairtans’. Parallel to this is one ellipse of ‘be’ as an infinitive: III a 21-24 sumai ni kunnandans huar skuldeldi maiza (wisun). This latter construction appears to have no exact counterpart in Gothic but occurs with OIcel. skulu and munu, as pointed out by Uppström.

4.19. Historical and gnomic presents appear occasionally, as

---

19 It is interesting to observe that Streitberg tolerates the omission of finite verbs in the Skeireins but shows very little hesitation in emending the same usage in the Gothic Bible, especially (though not exclusively) if it does not agree exactly with his Greek Vorlage. Thus he inserts was into Matt. 25.43, Mark 10.1 and 10.32, Luke 7.2, and Rom. 9.22; gow into Luke 8.47; zjaf into 1 Cor. 16.22; and wafl into 1 Tim. 1.14. Wrede, on the other hand, makes none of these insertions, and even Bernhardt, whose tendency toward liberal emendation has been noted (3.5), makes only one, viz. was in Luke 7.2. Accordingly, in comparing Streitberg’s Vorlage with the Gothic text, it is first of all necessary to disregard his emendations, which would indicate a number of correspondences and divergences that do not actually exist. Even if we possessed a definitive Greek prototype, the differences between Greek and Gothic usage would still be as important as the similarities.
in the Greek and Gothic Bible, e.g.: VII a 5–20 nih ist ains ak jah andraias sa ei qap ... analeiko swe filippus gasakada ... poei usbar, VIII c 11–13 rodidedun ... bigilanda.

4.20. In two quotations of John 3.4 (II b 13–17 and c 3–7), the subject of a simple sentence is coupled with two present verbs, one active indicative and followed by an infinitive, the other passive optative: II b 13–17 'ibai mag in wamba aipeins seinaizos afira gale ipjan jag gabairidau.' Dietrich (1903 printing, p. 19), observing that Biblical Gothic would appear to require gabaurans wairfan here rather than gabairidau, would ascribe this construction to an early Germanic idiom: when two parallel infinitives are to be rendered, the second being passive and indicating the result of the first, the passive infinitive is expressed by an optative. As he indicates, the OHG Tatian also employs an optative here, though of course in an auxiliary verb form (werde giboran). In any event, the fact that the first scribe wrote gabairidau in both quotations, neither of which has been corrected, would appear to indicate that this usage was accepted.

4.21. Instances of incongruence in number and gender follow a pattern characteristic of the Greek and Gothic Bible: VII c 3–7 'bigiian was pise hlaibe :ib: iainjons fullos patei afofno da; VIII c 6–9 'so managei patei ni kunnun wip baiqipanai sind'.

4.22. An abruptly changing construction producing a lack of grammatical coherence within a single sentence (anacoluthon in a narrow sense, as in Col. 3.16) occurs in two passages, viz. I b 22–c 10 and V a 5–14 (q.v.). VIII d 1–8 is not anacoluthic, as has been assumed from prior readings of the codex; IV a 5–19 is anacoluthic only if construed to form one sentence (7.20). Dietrich (1903, pp. lixiv f.) conceives anacoluthon in a much broader sense, including some constructions listed here under zeugma, sesis onomat, and participial hypotaxis.

4.23. Subordination through the use of participial constructions (participial hypotaxis) is common in the Greek and Gothic Bible, e.g., in Luke 15.18–29. In the commentary, however, this construction is decidedly frequent, occurring in more than fifty passages, and is the most salient syntactical feature. As else-

where in Gothic, the hypotactic phrasing nearly always employs the present participle; VI c 23 āaim sva waurpanam constitutes an exception. In the following examples, which are representative of forty-odd more, the participial phrasings (enclosed within [ ] ) are relevant to the subjects under discussion but may be omitted entirely without destroying the essential meaning:

I a 8–22 inuh pis qam gamains allaize nasjands: allaize frawaurhtiins afhrainjan; [ni ibna nih galeiks unsarai gariheetai: ak sibila gariheeti wisands:] ei [gasaljands sik faur un:] 'hunsl jas suqb [ga:] pisos manasedais gawaurhtedun ulsunen

II b 17–24 sah [unkunnands auk nauh wisands jah ni kunnands biuht]: jah [po leikeinon us wambai munands gabaurb] in twcfi atraus

VI b 8–14 jains auk [manniskaim waurdam weitwodjands:] twcfi-

jan [huhta]: [sunjeins wisands] āaim unkkunnandam mahta

VIII d 19–22 ih cis [ni usjulandans po gasaht] andhofun [qiandans]

In such instances the present participle, having no tense or mood of its own, reflects those of the finite verb in the essential statement. The following phrasing, for example, means essentially 'Saying this then (= when he said this), the evangelist showed ...': III a 7–9 [batuh han qiands] aiwagellista ataugiđa. Similarly, the participle may reflect the 'imperative' or 'hortative' mood of the finite verb (Dietrich, p. xlv): III b 8–16 ni ðanaseipis judaiwiskom: usfarranneinim jak sinteinom daupesinm brukjan usaudjdaina: [ak iohanne hausjandans pamma faurinnandin aiwaggeljoun]. On the other hand, when the subordinated remark demands a tense or mood different from that of the finite verb in the essential statement, the present participle may be replaced by a second finite verb. In the following examples, finite-verb constructions occurring within subordinated remarks are enclosed by ( ) : I a 22–b 3 [batu nu gasaiwandis] iohannes (po sei ustauhana habaido fram fin gareksn) miq sunjai qap. . . . Here the essential statement refers to action ('John said truly'), whereas the latter part

of the subordinated remark refers to action that was yet to occur ('the plan that was to be fulfilled by the Lord'); and similarly, with a change in mood, III a 14-24 [akès fava ἤπατα at baiophum daupjandam: jah ainhpãrammah seïna anaghãsanand daupœin:] mîp sis misso sik andrûnnûn: [sumai ni kunnandans] (bôpar skulde di maïza). The fact that participial hypotaxis occurs so frequently in the commentary is not surprising; in a work containing so many side remarks, interpolated explanations, concessions, summaries, etc., consistent subordination is a first requisite.

THE IDIOM AND THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE COMMENTARY

4.24. For the immediate purpose, an idiom is conceived to be a mode of expression that is peculiar to a language and cannot be translated literally without loss or obscuration of meaning; in dealing with the Skeireins especially, a broader definition would be of little help. Thus Bernhardt (1875 ed., p. 612) cites three expressions in the commentary that do not occur in the Gothic Bible and for which he finds no parallels in Greek or Latin: and pana laist II d 13-14 and V a 23-24, ni pe haldis IV d 4, and in allaim alamanna VIII b 16-17. In accord with his belief that the work is of native Gothic authorship, he describes all three expressions as being Gothic. Strictly speaking, no two of these phrasings belong in the same category. and pana laist makes a decidedly literal translation of κατεχεῖς 'along the track (of),' hence 'following, as a sequel'; in fact, κατεχεῖς occurs in a parallel passage from Theodorus of Heraclea (Dietrich, p. liv). ni pe haldis (OHG ni thi halt) is not limited to Gothic, and in allaim alamanna 'among all men' is neither peculiar to a single language nor obscure when rendered literally. In brief, it is expressions of the κατεχεῖς type that demand special attention. The commentary shows seven instances (not counting κατεχεῖς) in which Greek idiom has been rendered with much too literal fidelity. As with such syntactical features as anastrophe, zeugma, scesis onomatón, anaclolith, participial hypotaxis, etc., clear parallels are to be found in Greek and Gothic, but the occurrence of the idioms in the Skeireins has been overlooked in all editions. On mîpêpan as a calque see 7.26.

4.25. Some troublesome phrasings represent a literal rendering of a genitive usage that is common in New Testament Greek, viz. the construct state. Thus in VI b 17-18 insaht mannikodaus iohannes has been regularly taken to mean something like 'John's argument of humanity' (Massmann has 'argumentum humanitatis Johannis' with the note 'quod exit ex humanitate Johannis,' Bernhardt 'demonstrationem humanae naturae Johannis,' Dietrich 'die Predigt der Menschlichkeit des Johanni'). Like some other instances of the same idiom, this phrasing appears to have no clear connection with its context, which demands a contrast between the divine deeds of Christ and the merely human assertions of John the Baptist. The usage in question is illustrated by Luke 16.8 pana fauragagge inwindýpos tôn oikovnoy tis adikias, literally 'the steward of injustice' but meaning 'the unjust steward.' Similarly, 'John's argument of humanity' means 'John's human argument.' The same usage occurs in four other passages. In III b 4-5 and VII b 24-25 it offers no great difficulty, but a literal rendering of III b 23-25 and III c 11-12 would appear to be practically meaningless (7.17-18).

4.26. One phrasing has been especially troublesome because in two instances one part of speech is used in place of another (anthimeria): IV c 13-15 us airpai was jah us waurdahai wistai rodjands. For the most part, the meaning is clear (he [the Baptist] was from the earth and was speaking ——), but a literal rendering of us waurdahai wistai would be from logical nature'; Massmann has 'ex verbi natura,' Dietrich 'aus seinem Ver- nunftwesen,' Streitberg 'seiner vernünftigen Natur gemäss.' However, none of these fits the context, which deals with John's being human and teaching a human doctrine. First, it is to be noted that Gothic adjectives like waurdahai* are used repeatedly in place of nouns in conformity with Greek. Thus nisklahs ῥνηδος 'childish' occurs four times for 'child' in 1 Cor. 13.11 ('when I was a child, I spoke as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child'), and precisely the same usage occurs in
Gal. 4.1, Eph. 4.14, and Luke 10.21. Similarly, *stainakos* περιφέρεσ 'stony' occurs twice for 'stony ground' (Mark 4.5 and 4.16). Secondly, it is to be observed that in Rom. 11.24 *us wistai* renders the phrase καρα φων and means 'natural'; cf. o καρα φων αδησοi 'natural death.' In short, *us wistai* is used in place of an adjective, *wurdahai* in place of a noun. When both these instances of anthimeria are taken into account, IV c 13–15 makes sense in its context: 'he was from the earth and was speaking with a natural logic.'

4.27. For more than a century scholars have speculated as to whether the *Skeireins* represents a translation or a native composition. Massmann (3.2) believed that the work must have come originally from Greek, perhaps through an intervening Latin version. J. Grimm thought it better to leave the question open for discussion (3.2, n. 4), while Krafft (3.3), Bernhardt (3.5), and Marold (3.6) decided in favor of Gothic authorship. This opinion received unintentional support from Lücke (3.6), whose attempt to reconstruct the supposed Greek original produced a text that frequently violated idiomatic Greek, especially in word order. Van der Waals (3.7) believed the numerous present participial constructions to represent the influence of Greek in introducing non-Germanic syntax into Gothic. Through a detailed analysis of word order, McKnight (3.7) showed that the work in its present form can hardly be a word-for-word translation from Greek but rather shows the influence of both Greek and Latin. Dietrich (3.9) believed the commentary to be written by Wulfila in a learned form of Gothic modeled after New Testament Greek but also influenced by Latin word order. Jantzen (3.9) favored an East Goth. Lenk (3.11) went so far as to call the language a written form of everyday Gothic, while H. von Schubert⁴ argued in favor of a Latin original. More moderately, Ehrismann (3.9, n. 18) stressed the fact that the style of the commentary is decidedly Greek and especially like that of the Pauline epistles, regardless of whether the work was originally Greek or Gothic.

4.28. That there has been so little agreement regarding the original language of the *Skeireins* is understandable; the available evidence is almost exclusively internal, and, at first glance, apparently contradictory. On the one hand, the influence of Greek is clear. Yet Greek authorship appears to be denied by two factors: Lücke's unwitting demonstration that the commentary in its present form does not always represent a word-for-word rendering of idiomatic Greek, and McKnight's analysis of word order, which intentionally demonstrates the same point and indicates Latin influence as well. Here the argument comes close to a stalemate; the phrasing of the *Skeireins* is decidedly Greek, but its word order may also be Latin. That the Skeireinist was a polyglot Greek or Goth is possible, but it does not necessarily follow that he would write in a mixed, uneven idiom. If we suppose that he wrote in Gothic but attempted to imitate Greek, he succeeded brilliantly in some instances and failed completely in others. There is some reason, therefore, for considering another possibility. Nearly two hundred years intervened between the time of Wulfila and the scribal period. Within this interim, the Gothic version of the Scriptures did not remain unchanged. Although it had been translated originally from Greek, it was to be preserved only in later copies that had been subject to the influence of Latin. Among the changes that affected the phrasing of the Gothic Biblical texts were "alterations of the original word order in conformity with the Latin," as Friedrichsen²⁴ remarks. To judge from the types of scribal errors in the *Skeireins* document (Chapter VI), the extant leaves almost certainly belong to a copy, not to the original version, so that we have no assurance that the text has escaped alteration in phrasing. Rather, both the mixed language of the commentary and the history of the Gothic Biblical texts suggest just the opposite. If the *Skeireins*, like Wulfila's Bible, was originally translated from Greek, its Greek style is wholly understandable, and, by the same token, the later intrusion of Latin features is explicable in terms of parallel developments in the extant Gothic Biblical MSS. On the other hand, if the Skeireinist was a Goth writing for Goths, it is not easy to explain why he would use such


a strangely mixed Greek-and-Latin style. Pending the discovery of more conclusive evidence, it appears easier to believe that the commentary, like the Greek Bible, derived its Greek features from Greek and its Latin features from Latin. Assuming a Gothic original leaves most of the facts unexplained.

VOCABULARY

4.29. Roughly 99 per cent of all native morphemes in the Skeireins (and 87.5 per cent of its native words) occur likewise in the Greek Bible; the difference in vocabulary arises almost exclusively from varying combinations in word formation. Of approximately 520 words represented in the commentary, 67 do not occur elsewhere in Gothic, but if two foreign words (kussopo*, markaiius*) are excluded from consideration, there are only five or six morphemes that are not attested in the Bible, viz. wipre- ‘lamb’ I b 3, kalb- ‘heifer’ III c 2, roud- ‘red’ III c 8, -tusin- (ufrasunyandans ‘sprinkling’ III c 9), prasa- (prasadbalpin ‘contentiousness’ V b 14), and perhaps hald- (ni pe haldis ‘by no means’ IV d 4). Among these, only -tusin- appears to have no readily identifiable Germanic cognates.17 The meaning of three non-Biblical words requires separate investigation, viz. gaagweul I c 12, I d 24 (7.2); doms* II c 9, VI c 4 (7.12); and mitippan V a 23 (7.26). A supposed compound verb *uframiton ‘forget’ (beside the attested form uframunnon) has been generally believed to occur only in III c 11, but the existence of such a unique verb, which would require a completely unnecessary emendation of the text, is very doubtful (7.18). Where other supposedly unique words have been thought to occur in the Skeireins, a reexamination of the phrasing or the codex has indicated an incorrect grouping of syllables or a misdeciherment.

4.30. The choice of words in the commentary can be evaluated only in terms of their immediate context and (in about 453 instances) their use in the Gothic Bible. By these standards, at least, the wording of the Skeireins is admirably exact and consistent. Its precision is especially noticeable in the use of such near-synonyms as aijaijsjan ‘seduce’—usluteon ‘deceive,’ anasis ‘visible’—gasaibans ‘seen,’ hraunes ‘cleansing’—swikheins* ‘purification,’ maiks ‘power’—waldufini ‘authority,’ missadephs* ‘misdeed’—frawurhiks ‘sin,’ usluneins* ‘redemption’—ganists ‘salvation,’ and weiwodei ‘testimony’—weitwodeins* ‘(act of) testifying.’ The noun garehns, which is generally glossed as ‘appointed time’ for its one Biblical occurrence in Gal. 4.2, appears ten times in the commentary with the meaning ‘plan, design’ (I b 1, I b 19, I c 16, II c 25, II d 18, III a 10, III d 25, IV a 24, IV d 2, VIII c 18). Short sequences of alliteration are fairly frequent but seem to have little or no effect upon the choice of words, e.g.:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I a</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>dauhauk atdrusun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I b</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>garahteins garhehn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I d</td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>waurdam jah wairstwam jah spilla waipan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV a</td>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>siponjam seinaim jain bi swikhein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV c</td>
<td>9-15</td>
<td>jahe weheh jahe praufetus wisands... akei us airpai was jah us waardahai wistai rodjands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI b</td>
<td>25-2 c</td>
<td>weihona warstwai unandsakana wisandona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Biblical quotations may be equally alliterative, e.g. John 3.29, 31-32, 5.37, 6.9:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV a</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>fahehe meina usfullnoda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV c</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>akei ufaro allaim išt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV c</td>
<td>21-23</td>
<td>jata weitwodeip: jah bo weitwodia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI c</td>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>saei sandda dika atta. sah weitwodeip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI d</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>nih sun is gasehreb jah waurd is ni habaip wisando</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII a</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>her saei habaip .e. hlaibans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In examining similar instances in the Gothic Bible, Friedrichsen found alliteration, "as inevitable as it was accidental,"18 to be produced by stock renderings of Greek words in one passage after another and thus to be mechanically dependent upon the Vorlage. Though there is no corresponding evidence for the Skeireins, its wording appears to be governed more by the demands of lexical precision than by an attempt at verbal ornament.

17 See haldis and ufrasunyjan in S. Feist, Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache, 3rd ed. (Leiden, 1939).

SUMMARY

4.31. As the foregoing observations indicate, the language of the Skeireins does not contradict the evidence of the other Gothic records but merely provides some items of additional information. The phonology, morphology, and syntax of the commentary, together with about 99 per cent of its native morphemes, are basically the same as those of the Gothic Bible. If both works were translated originally from Greek and subsequently influenced by Latin (4.28), their common features of non-Germanic syntax, idiom, and word order have common sources as well. To be sure, Greek participial constructions are more frequent in the Skeireins, but understandably so; all fulfill a clearly definable function, and all have parallels in the Gothic Scriptures. Yet even today a feeling persists that the language of the commentary is in some way isolated from that of the Gothic Bible. This feeling is by no means accidental. In the first place, it is based on an evaluation of the text as deciphered by Braun and Kauffmann, whose readings would indicate some supposedly aberrant forms. Secondly, no edition has ever accepted the phrasing of the MS exactly at face value, though there has been a reduction in the number of emendations. Thirdly, modern punctuation has been regularly substituted for that of the codex, often with complete disregard of its implications. And lastly, the occurrence of Greek idioms has been overlooked, though the same idiomatic constructions also appear in the Gothic Bible; as a result, in some places a literal translation of the text has seemed to indicate that its phrasing is decidedly awkward or corrupt. Under these conditions, it is not surprising to find even so comparatively recent an editor as Streitberg remarking, "Der Stil ist unbeholfen, mancherlei kleinere Abweichungen vom Sprachgebrauch der gotischen Bibel fallen auf." At any rate, it is wholly possible that a different impression may be gained from reading the commentary exactly as it occurs in the MS, with no modern alterations whatever in phrasing or punctuation.

18 Tom. cit., xxx.

TEXT AND TRANSLATION

METHOD OF TRANSCRIPTION

5.1. The text of the Skeireins as given below represents a line-for-line transliteration of the Gothic letters into Roman type; each printed page corresponds to one column of the MS. The lines as reproduced contain no emendations or restorations, and the punctuation is solely that of the codex. Where letters or punctuation marks have been lost with inner margins or are no longer discernible, they are omitted in the transcription, even when attested by prior decipherments of the MS. Ligatures and suspension marks are transcribed without alteration, and abbreviations are retained as abbreviations. Interlinear additions are indicated by means of raised or lowered letters. The following procedures in transcription, which have been adopted in order to avoid unnecessary complication in printing, require special comment:

(1) Gothic words are separated, and the dieresis is omitted in transcribing the character ä. Wherever there may be a question regarding the correct division of words, the problem is discussed separately. (2) A letter that has been canceled in the MS, whether crossed out, dotted, or erased, is distinguished by means of a superior dot, e.g., ä. (3) An initial letter is transcribed as a capital, a quotation dot as '. (4) The marginal ——, which always appears above initials, is omitted when occurring in this position but is otherwise retained. (5) The columnar ——, which occurs above all abbreviations for nomina sacra and numerals, is not transcribed.

TEXTUAL ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

5.2. Decipherments, editions, and textual studies of the Skeireins, together with details regarding individual codex
readings, are indicated in the critical apparatus by means of the abbreviations and symbols listed below. The editions cited include all complete texts except identical reprints and the first to seventh and tenth to twelfth versions of Stamm's Ulfilas, which contain no emendations that are not duplicated elsewhere. Edited selections, which rarely show unique features, are represented by two versions that are exceptional in this respect, viz. those of Wackernagel and Jantzen.

cB

Codex reading according to W. Braun, "Die Maiänder Blätter der Skeireins," ZDP, XXXI (1899), 429-451.


C C. O. Castiglione, quasi facsimile of VI ed in Castiglione and Mai, Ulfilae partium incolarum . . . specimen (Milan, 1819), p. 24, with readings of individual words as reported by v.d. Gabelentz and Löbe (GL, below).

CA Codex Argenteus

CF means 'has been corrected from the codex in the earlier form ———.'

Cr original phrasing of the commentary according to E. H. A. Cromhout, Skeireins aiwaggeljons pairh Johanno. Delft, 1900.

Cr I primary textual contamination according to Cromhout.

Cr II secondary textual contamination according to Cromhout.


J M. H. Jellinek, review of van der Waals ed., ADA, XX (1894), 148-162.


J (1918) review of Kock ed., ADA, XXXVIII (1918), 27-35.


cK Fr. Kaufmann, readings of Leaves III, IV, VIII as reported by Dietrich, pp. 4-13.

Kk Ernst A. Kock, Die Skeireins. Lund and Leipzig, [1913].

L J. Löbe, Beiträge zur Textberichtigung und Erklärung der Skeireins. Altenburg, 1839.


Ik Otto Lücke, Absolute Particpia im Gotischen. Magdeburg, 1876.


CM codex facsimile of Massmann, 1834 ed., pp. 3-34


Mr Erich Mayr, Die Skeireins. Munich, 1913.

OPR means 'omitted in prior readings of the codex.'

Pl. I-LVI refer to photographic plates, Chapter VI.


S Wilhelm Streitberg, Die gotische Bibel, I. Heidelberg, 1st (1908), 2nd (1919), or 3rd (1950) ed.

Sch E. Schulze, Gothicum Glossar. Magdeburg, 1848.

U A. Uppström, Fragmenta gotica selecta. Upsala, 1861.

cU codex reading according to Uppström in 1861.

U (1864-68) ———, Codices gotici Ambrosiani. Stockholm, 1864-68.

V A. Vollmer, Die Bruchstücke der Skeireins. Munich, 1862.

W H. G. van der Waals, Skeireins aiwaggeljons pairh Johanno. Leiden, 1892.

Wg W. Wackernagel, Gotische und altsächsische Lesestücke. Basel, 1871.

Wr F. Wrede, Stamm-Heyne's Ulfílas. Paderborn, 11th (1908), 12th (1913), or 13th-14th (1920) ed.

(M), (D), etc. indicate that the editors in question suggest an emendation but do not incorporate it into the text.

| denote editorial deletions.

// denote editorial omissions.
denote editorial additions.

. . .

denote unspecified or unidentified letters.

= 

is used to mean ‘in place of.’

| represents the end of a line in the codex.

Punctuation is considered separately in the critical apparatus only when having some direct bearing on meaning. The spelling of older editions (th for p, etc.) is modernized.

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE TEXT

5.3. Translating the exact phrasing and punctuation of the codex imposes a fairly strict discipline, but this alone provides no guarantee of an accurate rendering. It is not an exaggeration to say that in some instances the Skeireinist’s remarks have been changed as much through translation as through emendation, and there always exists a danger of subjective misconstruction. For the present purpose, accordingly, it appears advisable to follow a self-imposed discipline based upon the following considerations:

(1) Unless there is evidence to the contrary, it is much safer to assume that the commentary means exactly what it says. An interpretation that appears to agree with the context but is not actually justified by the phrasing is ipso facto a guess and may be wrong. Similarly, a rendering that is dependent upon supplying a number of supposedly understood but nevertheless missing words may be regarded with suspicion, especially if a simpler explanation makes sense.

(2) Wherever possible, the assumed meaning of a word should be confirmed through reference to the Greek and Gothic Bible. Any differences in sense, whether real or apparent, require separate consideration.

(3) No two words need be construed to have precisely the same meaning; thus if ἔφαρήλ means ‘a washing’ and ὀμπείνεις means ‘immersion, baptism,’ ἔφαρήλ still means ‘a washing’ when used to designate baptism.

(4) Words occurring only in the commentary cannot be glossed with any degree of assurance in terms of their context alone. Neither do the meanings of related forms in other Old Germanic languages always provide accurate information on the signification of Gothic words. References to Greek may be highly rewarding where calques are involved, but in other instances the safest clues to Gothic meanings are generally to be found in Gothic.

(5) Salient or apparently distinctive features of phonology and morphology should be analyzed with reference to the Gothic Bible; with syntax, reference to both Greek and Gothic may be necessary. Where formal differences appear, as between ἔφαι and ἔφαι or ἔφαινε and ἔφαινεις, they should be studied in order to determine whether they represent differences in meaning.

(6) The occurrence of a Greek idiom in the commentary can be regarded as definite only when subject to three conditions: (a) the idiom can be confirmed in both Greek and Gothic; (b) a literal translation fails to make complete sense; and (c) an idiomatic rendering agrees precisely with the context.

(7) Where more than one division between words is possible, the deciding factors should be the phrasing of the passage and the credibility of the alternative readings. Thus a syllable grouping that produces a completely unique word and requires alteration of the text as well gives little assurance of being correct.

(8) When a letter or punctuation mark is attested by earlier decipherments of the MS but is now lost or no longer discernible, the testimony of the earlier readings may be accepted for the purposes of translation, but only when consonant with the regular practice of the scribes, particularly the first. Thus the presence of an initial letter in the left margin gives some evidence that : once occurred at the end of the preceding line (4.7), and a line-end : followed by ἄπαρανα leaves little doubt that ἄνπαρανα once appeared in the MS. Without such confirming evidence, however, a line-end : proves nothing with respect to the occurrence of an initial.

(9) Words should not be inserted into the translation without notice unless they have actual counterparts in the text or are
clearly justified by Gothic usage. When insertions are required for intelligibility, e.g., 'both [Christ and John] were baptizing,' they should be unmistakably in accord with the context, with the Bible, or preferably with both.

(10) The commentary should be regarded as being consistent with the Bible and with itself; any two passages that appear to contradict each other require further examination.

5.4. In the English version below, all pronouns and substantivized adjectives referring to the Deity are distinguished by initial capital letters, e.g., 'He' (Christ), 'the One' (the Father), 'the Other' (the Son). In keeping with the demands of English word order, no attempt is made to preserve the frequent separation of noun or pronoun from modifying demonstrative, adjective, phrase, or clause (4.12). Similarly, where a word-for-word rendering would serve only to obscure what the text actually says, its remarks are translated into idiomatic English. Interpretations that are still subject to dispute are listed with cross-references in the critical apparatus.

I a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I a: 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 1-5 Rom. 3.11-12 with influence of the parallel passages in the Septuagint; cf. Ps. 14.2-3, 53.2-3 — 18-19 Eph. 5.2
The possibility of saving men by an act of divine authority

I b

wairjan fram fn ga
reh san mp sunjai
qab: saa sa ist wih
rus gbs. sae afni
mip frumwak' pizos manase
dais: mahtedi swe
bahu jah inu mans
leik. waldufnja
pataine gudiska
ma. galaujan al
ans us diabulau
anamahtai: akei was
kunnands patei
swaleikamma wal
15
dufnja mahtais seinaizos
naujus ustaikinda
wesij: jai ni mana
ti seips fastaija ga
raiteins garehsa:
20
k naujai gawaurh
tedi manne ganist:
jabai auk diabulau
fram anastodel
nai nih naujai
25
din ak uslumolindi

Lord, said truly,
"Behold, This is the
Lamb of God, Who
takes away the sin of
the world." Though
He would also have
been able without hu-
mankind to free all
from the Devil's tyr-
rany by divine au-
thority alone, He was
nevertheless aware
that by such au-
thority the force of His
power would be shown,
and thenceforth the
plan of righteousness
would not be observed,
but He should accom-
plish the salvation
of men by force. For
inasmuch as the Devil
had not forced man
but had deceived him

I c

mannan: jah jairh
liugn gabatjandji
ufargagan anabus;
5
p
atuh wesi wipra pa
ta gabod: ei fa. qi
mands mahtai gudis
kai: jah waldufnja
pata ganausiedi:
10
j
ah naujai du gagu
dein gawandedi:
nei*uk puhtedai pau
in garaiteins gaag
seweis ufargagan:
15
p
o faura ju us ana
stodeinai garaido-
garehn: gabod
nu was mai sana
swesamwa wilijn
ufausjandans di
20
abulu: du ufar
gagagan anabus
25
-gbs: janzu af
tra swesamwa wil
jin gaqissans wair
pau nasiandis lai

and with a lie had
enticed him to vio-
late the commandment,
it would have been
against propriety if
the Lord, coming in
divine power, had both
freed him by authority
and had converted him
to godliness by force.
For then would He not
have seemed in the en-
forcement of righteous-
ness to violate the
plan already preor-
dained from the begin-
ing? Now for those
who had hearkened to
the Devil of their own
will so as to violate
the commandment of God,
it was more fitting to
assent a second time of
their own will to the
teaching of the Savior

I c: 1-16 [jah jairh—anabus I] [ei II] pa. qimands mahtai gudiskai: [jah II]
waldufnja pata ganausiedi: [jah naujai—gawandedi II] paatu pau wesi
wiura pata gabod: [nei auk puhtedai I] in—ufargagan I] [po—garehsn II] Cr
—2 galeatjandin] CF galeathjandin (6.8, Pl. VII); galeathjandin CM M GL Ldg
cb D S Wr Mr; galerjandin cu U Gg Bh Lk H W J Cr Kk; gagawjandin V —
3 anabus (gusis) V Cr — 4 pauj patei V — 11 nei cb (6.9, Pl. VIIII); ne
CM M GL Ldg cu U W J H Cr; ni V — 11-12 pau in] jairh V — 12 gaag-
gwein (7.2) CF gaagwein (6.10, Pl. LIII); gaagwein CM cu CB — 19
diab(a)ulau V
The need for the Saviour's incarnation

I d

seina: jah fra kunnan unsel'fī
pi' faur'piš us lutondins is:
5 I ṭ sunjons kunji du aftraanasto
delaini pize in gba
usmete gasan'ja:
I nūj piš nu jah
leik mans and
naim: ei laisareis
uns wair'pī pi
zos du gba garail
teins: swa auk
10 skulda du galei
kon seinaic frodel?

J

ah mans aftra ga
lapon waurda:
jah waurstwa?

20 jah spilla wair
jan awaggel'jīs
usmete: ḫ̄ī in
pizei nu widotis
gaaggwe ni Ḩā
ain gawandeins

I d: 1-8 [jah—ulsutondins I] [îp—gasatjan II] Cr — 3 ulsutondins GL Ldg — 4 is. OPR (6.11, Pl. IX); (īns) V — 5-8 ḫ̄ī—gasatjan (7.3) — 6 du aftraanastodeinais du aftra anastodeinais L Cr; aftra du anastodeinais V — 8 gasatjan gwaljan V — 11-25 [ei—skulda I] jah II] [mans galpon du aftra
galeikon seinai frodel I] [waardam—usmete II] [îp—gawandeinaie (= gawandeins) I] Cr — 13 du (7.4) in V — garaheitnei(a) ibis J (1918) — 15 galeikon (7.5) — 17 atfragalapom M1 — 22 (pize in gba) usmete V — 24 gaaggwei (7.2) gaaggwei(a) N1 M1 (M1) V — 25 gawandeien (6.12, Pl. X); gawandeien G; gawandeina ci ci
+(ak jah idreigai nudaijaufta ist . . .) (U); gawandjan (ak jah po us anastodeina
garaidon garehun usufljal wila, leik mans andnam jah warih uns laisareis pīzos in gba garaiteins) V; gawandeina (ak jah ganstai andstandi, in pizhu insandida gup sunu seinana) (Bh1);
gawandeina (ak jah garaheitneis garehun andsto) m, in pizhu naja in aiwaggel'jīs mereinaik skeiris brukjands wauirdis paim mnam manān qäp) (D)

II a

Christ's discourse with Nicodemus—the need for spiritual rebirth

nai galaubeinai
wairpanda ju fauf
ina balpeψ:
1 I n melai rahtis
julainais leik is
afrag julain swi
kun'baa miβ io
seba usfihans:
5 G aswikun'jandals
ei ni afwandada sik
in fauramaβlje
hotos: inuω
piš jah nasjaδs
nauh miβpo anā
stodjandus
10 taiknida jana
upa briganda
in piudangard
jai gbs wig qβhδs:
men amen qijā
pus. niba saei ga
baireda lupaβ
ro: ni mag gāsai
han piudangard
20 A

ja gbs: lupaβ

25

— [Nicodemus] becoming . . . in . . .
faith, now daires in
His behalf, namely
in the Passiontide,
together with Jo-

20-25 John 3:3

35 5 I n melai rahtis
julainais leik is
afrag julain swi
kun'baa miβ io
seba usfihans:
5 G aswikun'jandals
ei ni afwandada sik
in fauramaβlje
hotos: inuω
piš jah nasjaδs
nauh miβpo anā
stodjandus
10 taiknida jana
upa briganda
in piudangard
jai gbs wig qβhδs:
men amen qijā
pus. niba saei ga
baireda lupaβ
ro: ni mag gāsai
han piudangard
20 A

ja gbs: lupaβ

25

— [Nicodemus] becoming . . . in . . .
faith, now daires in
His behalf, namely
in the Passiontide,
together with Jo-

20-25 John 3:3
II b

ro ḫan qaḇ ḫo ṣeḏ
hon jah himinakū
don gabaurḇ an
bara ṣaiḥ ḫwalh
uṣḥralnː ḫam
muh ḫan ni ḫo ṣeḏ
kauḏemus: in ḫis
ei mīḵ ḫan frumist
hauṣīda fran laṣar
ja. inuṣ ḫis ḫāp:

above” then expressed
that holy and heavenly
birth, a second to
be undergone through
washing. Nicodemus
did not understand
this then. Because
of this, which he had
heard for the first
time from the Master,
his words are:

“How is it possible
for a man to be born
when he is old? Can
he go a second time
into his mother’s
womb and be born?”

For, being still igno-
norant and unfamiliar
with the practice, and
thinking of the cor-
Poreal birth from the
womb, he fell into
doubt. Because of
this he said, “How

II c

Water and
the Spirit
as compo-
nents of
Christian
baptism

is it possible for
a man to be born
when he is old?
Can he go a sec-
ond time into his
mother’s womb and
be born?” But the
Saviour, perceiving
his future discern-
ment, and perceiv-
ing that he was to
thrive in faith,
explained to him
as to one who was
then ignorant, say-
ning, “Amen, amen,
I say to you, un-
less a man be born
of water and the
Spirit, he cannot
enter into the king-
dom of God.” For
it was a necessity,
and it was in keep-
ing with nature to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>peinais andni</td>
<td>receive the plan of baptism, man verily being composed of different entities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man: at raithis</td>
<td>namely of soul and body, one of these being visible and the other spiritual; wherefore appropriate-ly following</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mann us missa leikom wistim ussatidamma:</td>
<td>these He designated two things as well, items proper to both in accord with the plan of baptism, namely the visible water and the envisioned Spirit, which verily the seen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U s saiwalai raih tis jah leika:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jah anjar jize anasjum wisan do: anjaruh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jah ahmein:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D uppe gatemiba and jana jize laist. jah tw os. ganannmida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waiht: swe sa bajopum du daupinais ga rehansai, jah jata raihtis anasjum jo wato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J ah jana anda pahtan amha; ei raihtis jha ta gasailleano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II d:** 1 (wato jah ahman) andniman V W; (ganiman, wato jah ahman) andniman Bh; daupinais, andniman H — 3 missaleikam (4.15) missaliek-kaim V Bh W — 4 wist(a)sim M — 6 [us II] saiwalai Cr — 9 anasjum cC cU cB; anasjumi cM M — 11 ahmein(o) Bh — 12-14 [duppe II] gatemiba [and—laist I] Cr — gatemiba and gatembi band cM M — 13-14 and jana jize laist (4.24) — 16 waiht(in’s) V Bh W Cr — 16-17 swesa bajopum du (7.14) — 16-19 [swesa—jah I] Cr — 18 garehnaiaf (6.16, Pl. XLVIII); garehnaish cM cU cB — 22 andajahlata (7.15) — 24-25 [Cr II] — 25 gasailleano o OPR (6.18, Pl. XIV); gasailleano (wato) (KK); gasailleano (magnosta (mahtedina)) (M); (mahdelti batei wailla imana frajatha andhohf) (U); (tawidi, batei sa daupinais garehns gadofs was manniskai wistaih) (D)
III b

The argument over purification and baptism

us s'ponjam ioahn
' anes miq judaism
bi swiknein:

I n pizei ju ja leikis
hraiineino inmadij
was sidus: jah so
bi gb. hraiine ana
budana was: ni ja
naselj judaiwisikzo;

5 farranneinim jah
sinteinuo daupei
nim brukjan usaud
jaina: ak ioahn
ne husjandans

10 farranneinim jah
sinteino daupei
nim brukjan usaud
jaina: ak ioahan
ne husjandans

15 jamma fauririna
in aiwaggeljion:

W asuh jahn jah fa.
jo ahmeino anne
fillands daupei

20 eijan garaizhba
warb bi swiknein
sokeins gawgigida:

U nte witoj biz un
faurewine mis

25 sadece ainaizos

ne sdece ainaizos

between some of John's disciples and the Jews
concerning purification, because now
the custom of bodily
cleansings had been
changed as well, and
this cleanliness had
been commanded by
God. No more should
they endeavor to use
the Jewish sprinklings
and daily ablations
but should hearken to
John, the precursor
of the gospel. And
at that time also the
Lord was recommending
spiritual baptism, so
that a question about
purification was
properly raised. For
the Hebrew Law pre-
scribed for a certain
unpremeditated misdeed

III c

Sprinkling, baptism of repentance, and baptism in the Holy Spirit

witoj raidda: az
gon kalbons gabra
nidaizos utana bi
baurzgenaizs:

5 A faruh jahn joh in wa
to wairpandans
hraint: jah hwsso
pon jahn wullai rau
dai ufarrusnj:

10 dans: swaswe ga
dob jahn ufar milo-
munandans:

15 ko joannes idrei
gos daupein meri
da: jah misas
de afel jahn ain
falbaha gawand
jandam gahaith:

20 frauwurhite jah
fragift wehis ah
mins: jah fragi
bands im jatei su

25 jus jh ajangand:
os wairjaina:

that the ash of a
heifer burned out-
side the camp should
be cast afterward
into clean water and
sprinkled with
hsysop and red wool,
as befitted those
who were above de-
liberate intent.

John, however, was
preaching a baptism of
repentance and
promised forgiveness
of misdeeds to
those who simply
reformed, whereas
with the Lord's
forgiveness of sins
he promised the gift of
the Holy Spirit
as well, granting
them also that they
should become chil-
dren of the Kingdom;

III d: 1–2 ḝ OP R (6.20) —— ioahan [anes] Ḟ OP R (6.20); Johannis V —— 4 ju nu V —— 4 c 1 [ju jah II] so bi gb hrai nei ana bu da was ni japase
judaïwisikum [ufarranneinim jah sinteino II] daupeinim [brukjan usaud jaina II] ak [Johanne−farrinnandin I] aiwaggeljion: wasu−gawgida I unte Moses ...
(Moses = [witoj II]) [bize−ainaizos II] witoj [ga]raidda Cr —— 4−5 leikis
hraiineino (4.25) —— 5−7 hraiineino−hraiinei (7.16) —— 8 (ei) ni (M?) (Ldg) (Bl?) W; (swae) ni V (BB?) II jz —— 9 judaiwisikum (4.15) judaiwisikum V
Bl —— 1 l sinteino (4.15) m OP R (6.21, Pl. XXXIX) sinteine(m) daupeinim G (GL) Ldg W D S Mr; sinteine daupeinim V; us daupeinim V Bl

14 hausjandans (4.23) + (sijainak) (Gg) —— 15 faw(u)rinandin V —— 16 aiwaggeljion + (galaubjaina) V, (ideigona) (Bb) H jz —— 23 witoj bu aha−
aini jz —— 23−4 bize unfaurewine (4.25, 7.17) [zibo ufuawrweiso V;]
[zibo ufuawrweiso Kk —— 24 c 1 (afet) misasede ain (all)ai[zos] witoj]
R —— 25 ainaizos raudaizos V; ainaizo J jz; ainaih Wg
1–3 John 3.25

III d 13–24
The relative merit of John's baptism

S waei sijai dau peins iohannes ana midumai twa ddje ligandei. ufarfehandei rahtis witodis —— hrainein: ḫ mi nizei fiaus ai waggeljons dau peina: inuh ṃ bairhtaba uns laiseq qh BDS: A Ṽan ik in watín ' izwis daupja: ḫ ' sa afar mis gagga ' da. swinpoza mis ' ist ḫzei ik ni im ' waip ḫanahe ' wands: andbin ' clau skaudaraip ' skohis is: sah Ṽan izwis dau ' peip in ahmin ' weihammas: so that John's baptism lies between the two, namely being superior to the cleansing of the Law but much less than the baptism of the gospel. For this reason he teaches us clearly with the words "I indeed baptize you in water, but He Who is to come after me is mightier than I, of Whom I am not worthy that I should stoop and unbind the lachet of Hisandal. He will baptize you then in the Holy Spirit." Now concerning the plan

A Ṽan so bi ina ga rehsus du leiti

III d: 1-25 [swaci—hrainein I] [j]—daupenai II] [inuh—qhanda I] [ap Ṽan—ia I] [sah I] [j]ain—II] [j]ain—II] [bi—nu II] Cr —— 2 iohannes iohannes V —— 4 ligandei c CU Ck, ligandei(?) c M —— 7 ml [nizei] (6.23, Pl. XLI); ml nizei c M CU; ml(?) nizei C —— 12 unsj ins Wg.qhanda C U Ck; iuBA C M —— 15 gagganda CU Ck; gaggida C M M —— 18 anahe wands (6.24)


IV a: 1 (andhof Ṽan iohnneses jah qa) so V —— faheps faheps W —— 1-23 so—minznan (7.20) —— 3-4 jains—minznan (4.17) —— 5 ei Ṽan M'; ei Ṽan (maudeip) V —— 5-25 ei Ṽan—nasjand II] ... [inuh—minznan I] [ap Ṽan—garehns II] Cr —— 5-6 siponja saim iain iain) siponja saiins sains Wn V Bh —— 8 sokjannds] Cj Fj sokjandans (6.25, Pl. XLI); sokjandans c M CU V Bh cK —— 9 qjandans] qjandans V Bh —— 17 unkunnands] unkunnandsans W —— 19 nasjand (garehns) V —— 22-23 jains—minznan (4.17)

1-4 John 3.29-30 —— 10-17 John 3.26 —— 22-23 John 3.30
The spread of Christ's doctrine—His glory

IV b

I am the good shepherd and the sheep know me and I know them, and they will follow me and I will bring them together and one will not be lost. useful, namely for a little while, and preparing the souls of the baptized, it permitted the preaching of the gospel. But the Lord’s teaching, beginning outside of Judea, also expanded to the entire earth, thriving everywhere until now, increasing and drawing every man to the knowledge of God. And therefore, the greatness of the Lord’s glory being clear indeed, he proclaimed the words “He Who comes from above is above all.” He would not have proclaimed Him supreme without a reason, but declared as well.

IV c

John’s human nature and human logic

dupais maht insok. jah himinakunda na: jah iupapo qumanana qjads: 5 I ḫ p sik airjakunda na: jah us airjai rodjand: in ji zei wistai manna was: jaŋje weis 10 ḫ p prauteus wisands: jag ga raibtein weitwodjand: akei us airjai was jah us wa ur jah 15 dahai wistai rodjads:

I ḫ p sa us himina qu mana: jabai in leika wisan puhta: akei ufaro allaim ist. 20 jabai gasale jag gahausida pa ta weitwodej: jah ḫo weitwodida: is ni ainshun nimpi;

25 ah pauhjai us air how vast the power of His greatness, saying Him to be born of heaven and come from above, but himself born of the earth and speaking from the earth because he was by nature a man; whether holy, whether being a prophet and testifying to righteousness, he was nevertheless from the earth and was speaking with a natural logic. But “He Who has come from heaven,” even if He seemed to be in the flesh, nevertheless “is above all, and what He has seen and heard, that He testifies, and no man receives His testimony.” And even though He

IV b: 2 bruks) bruki V — 2–21 [jah II] (duapeins Johannes) fauramanwanjadei saivalkos pize daupadade [frialalot—merencinai II] ip fraunjins laiseins anastodjandei af Judaea [jah I] and (= und I) alana midjungard gajaih [and—nu I] [jah aukandei II] [all—tiuhandei: II] (tiuhandei—tauth I) inuh pis [jah skeirs wisandi II] mikildup frawjins wulaihus kannida qjand: ’sa iupapo qjimands ufaro allaim ist: [sa wisands us airjai us airjai ist jah us airjai rodjep:] sa us himina qumanana ufaro allaim ist.*) Cr — 9 jah (7.21); [jah] M3 V (Wg) — und] and L GL M3 Ldg V Bb Wg H5 S Mr — 10 gajaih] galajai V 11 and harjanoj] and (staḥ) harjano(h) V Bh W J; and harjano(h) (M3 Ldg Cr; jah) and harjano Wg; and harjato(h) (Sch); and (and) harjano(h) (midjungardis)] J; and (dag) harjano J (1904) — 13 auk(ın)andei (jah) V — all manne] alamanne c M3 G — 15–17 inuh pis [jah skeirs wisandi] M3 GL W H Cr Ja S Wr; inuh pis jah skeirs wisands M3 Ldg U Wg D Mr Kr; inuh pis jah skeirs wisandei (Iohannes) V; skeirs wisandei, inuh pis jah Bh — 17 mikildup jai fin) s jai iin OPR (6.26, Pl. XLIII) — 18 fnis. (7.22) — 22–24 ni jatei [iupapo qumanana jah] ufaro (allaim) wisandang qjandis I sware kanniđedi Cr — 22–23 ufaro wisandan ufaro (allaim) wisan (ina) V — 25-c 1 is mikildupais maht) mikildup is mahtais Cr

20–21 John 3.31


16–17, 19–24 John 3.31–32
The Son's learning from the Father as evidence that the two Persons are distinct

himina ana *irpaj in manne gareh
snais qam: akei
ni je haldis air
jeins was nih us air
jai rodjians:
A k himinakunda
anañihands ful
hanja joel ga
sal. jag gaahasda
da at attin:
þ o nu insakana we
sun fram iohan
ne ni ia þis þatai
nei ei fins. miki
lein gakanniide
di: ak du gatarh
jan þab gaskan þo afgudon
haifst: sabail
liaus jäh markail
liaus: paiæ ai
nana anananpi
dedun qipan at
tan jah su:
iq anjar s weiha.

IV d came from heaven to
earth for the plan
concerning men, yet
He was by no means
earthly or speaking
from the earth but
born of heaven, trans-
mitting the hidden
things that He had
seen and had heard
from the Father. Now
these matters were
declared by John,
not merely that he
might proclaim the
Lord's greatness, but
to censure and re-
prove that impious
contention of Sa-
bellius and Marcel-
lus, who dared to
say that the Father
and the Son are one.
But another priest
(?)

IV d: 1 ana airiapjai CF anaairiapjai (6.27, Pl. XLIV), anaairiapjai cM Ču K — 2 garehnaisj ganistais V — 4 þehaldis M — 5 airiapjai air OPR (6.28, Pl. XLV) — 8 anañihands anduljands V — 12-25 þo-weiha II Cr — 14 inþis M — 17 ak (jah) V — 18 jah gasakan) cM Ču (6.29, Pl. XLVI); jah gasakan?(þ) k; jah gasakan W — 20 Markall{lais M' (M5) (U) V B Bh C r D Jz S Kk (7.23) — 25 þo weihaj (6.30, Pl. XLVII); weihaj a ČM; weihaj Ču ?K; s(a) weihaj U Bh H Jz S Wr Mr Kk; s(a) weihaj a... GL; s(a) weihaj (ahma) M V D (7.24)

The heresy of calling the Father and the Son one Person

ma du attin swe
ripos at allamama
waustwe ainaia
zos anabuusnaia
beidip: þþ þateil
rañitas þana fri
jondan: anþara
nuðhþan þana fri
joð:dan: anþara
na taikinjandþ:
þñarauñhan
gneikondan jai
nis waustwaam:
atu þan inso
kunnanda þi
ze anawairjane
airzein: ei ga
laisjina sik bi
þamma twa and
waipja attins
jah sunaus and
haitan: jah ñu
miþqajina: an
duh þana laist
skeriů brun

V a — of honor to the Father, He expects a single command for each deed. But knowing the heresy of those to come, He then declared this: namely that This One was loving, That Other loved, One showing, the Other imitating His deeds, that by this they should learn to acknowledge the two Persons of the Father and the Son and should then be in conformity. Employing a clear statement as a

V a: 1 (im)ma (M); (at)allamama M5 Ldg; (unte sunus bi allam)ma (U); (sunus bi waurd swesam)ma V; (allam)ma (Wg); (ei andni)ma(i) Bh; (all andnimand in)ma (D); (all andnimand im)ma (Kk) — da attin] in attins V, bi attin Bh — 2-6... [at] þateil II (anþara) rañita C — 3 (jai-
nai) vos V — 5 þateil ñþi þaþbi aïmana L (GL), (qþbi anþara) L (GL) Wg — 5-14 ñþ—insok (4.22) — 6 (anþara) þama (M5) Ldg V (Wg) Bh W H* S Kk (7.25) — 8 frijondan] CF frijos: (6.31, Pl. LIV); frijondan cM cB; frijondan cU — 10 taikinjandæ cB; taikinjanda cM cU; (þama) taikinjanda V — 11 þñarauñhanæ cM cU; Anþaraunþhanæ cB (6.32) — 13 waustwaam (qþbi) (M5) V Bh W — 14 attuh cU cB; þatuñ cM (6.32) — 14-b 1 þatuñ þan II insok [kunnandÆ miþqajina II] (anduh þan (= þana II)) qþbi cC — 19 twaandwairja M5 — 22 nü] (6.33, Pl. LVI); ni cM cU cB — 23 miþqajina (7.26) missaqajina V Bh; miþ qjajina W H; miþqutajina J —
23-24 anduh þana laist (4.24)

5-13 cf. John 5.19-20
V b

S waswe auk atta ur, jah liban gataujip; swa jah sunus pah; zei willi liban ga. 

V c

jan: sa sama mahte di: ni auk tatanei namne inmaideins twadde andwarip je anjañalekien bandweip: ak fi laus mais waurst wis ustaikeins:

---

V b: 7-16 [ci—dañaus I] [gahaitand I = gasok I] [bize—brasabalein I] [andbeitands II] Cr —— 9 galeikon[da] Wg —— 11 gauqijan[diin] K D Mr —— 12 dañaus gahaitande+ [gaqijan dañaus] L (M); dañaus (gaqijan dañaus) gahaitands V; dañaus (silha gaqijan dañaus) gahaitands Bh W; dañaus gahaitandin K D S Mr; dañaus gahaitands (gaqijan) J (1904) —— 16 gasok:] (6.34, Pl. XV) cM ML Ldg cU Cr; gasoki V Bh W H cB D S Wr Mr Kk —— 18 ain(in)ohn M ML Ldg V Wg Bh D S (7.27) —— 20 ip (jabal) V —— 20-c 8 [ip—ustaikneins II] Cr —— 20 ja[h] M1 

2-7 John 5.21 —— 16-19 John 5.22

V c: 10 stojandan (qab) V —— 13-16 [jah—sweriña I] [jah II] (anjañarun-\[han] alla Cr —— 13-17 jah—taujands (7.28) —— 14 is (ist) Bh; Jesus K D —— bi) at (L) V —— 17 taujands (ustaiknnda) V, (qab) (D); taujandan (ins) (ins) Kk (7.29) —— 20-d 25 [skulm—unbauernamna and ... gua (in leika)—laiseipl I] [jah—haidu II] —— 23 gua (attin) V —— 24-25 andsatuari sweriyna) cB (6.35, Pl. XVI) D S Mr Kk W; andsatuari sweriña cM M GL Ldg; andsatuari bauernana cU U Bh W H; alla saljan sweriña V; atbairandu wu[lu] Wg 

18-20 John 5.23
The rapid decline of John's influence

--ing, perforce
his argument became more unknown, as he himself says:
"He must increase,
but I must decrease."
Now because for a little while they seemed to believe,
to hearken to John,
but not long afterward committed to oblivion the things that concerned him. He accord-
ingly reminds them well with the words
"He was a burning and a shining light, and for a while you were willing to rejoice in his light. But I have a greater testimony than that.

VI a

The divinity of the Son—equal versus similar honor to the Father and the Son

J ah ainabaura su nau gb. gb. wisā sān kunnan: ei țan galaujjan
dans sweríja ju hrəəramme usgi baima bi warijdai unte țata qipəao E i a'lai sweràina
10 țisun swaswe swe rand attan: nis ibnon ak geleika swerīja usgiba' uns laseijs:

15 J ah silba nasjads bi siponjains bidjands du at tin qaj: ei fri jos ins swaswe
20 frijos miks:

N i ibnaleika fri jəpwa ak geleika țarir țata us taknejp: țam
mu h samia haida

and recognize the Only Begotten One, the Son of God, to be God. Believing, therefore, we should now render honor to Each according to merit, "for that all may honor the Son, even as he honors the Father" teaches us to render similar but not equal honor. And the Saviour Himself, praying for the disciples, said to the Father, "that You love them, even as You love Me."

Through this He designates similar but not equivalent love. In this same manner

V d: 1 ainabaura sunau) ainabaur sunau Sch; ainabaur sunu Wg V H W J — 2 gb) gupha V — 3-3 wisā șan gakunan] (6.36, Pl. XVII); wisandin kunnan cMc M1 GL Ldg; wisandän kunnan cCu U Wg W H Cr; wisandin gakunan M2 p. 811 (GL) V Bh; wisan anakunan cB My Mr Kk S Wr; wisan andkun

D — 5-6 ju hrəəramme] (6.37, Pl. XVIII) L GL S Mr Kk Wr; ju hrəəramme cM3 cCc Ci H W Cr cB; ankejarammeh V; ju kejarammeh M1 Ldg Wg Bh (B) D 1903, p. 20; julaəəaramme D (1900) — 7 warijdai
(cB (6.38, Pl. XIX) M2 GL Ldg V Bh3 D S Mr Wr Kk; warijdai cM3 cCu U Bh2 W H Cr — 8 qijano] cCu cB (6.38, Pl. XIX); qijc cMx M GL Ldg — 15 nasjandq țan) V Wg Bh — 25 haid a) (6.39, Pl. XX); ile ... cM; haidau (GL) cCu; ha cB; ha (bahi) M2

9-11 John 5.23 — 18-20 John 17.23
Text and Translation

VI b
ne ḷo auk waurat
wa poel aiga mis
atta el ik taujaw
ḇo ḷo waurstwa
poel ik tauja weit
wojdand bi mik; ja
tei atta mik insandi
da: jains auk ma
niskaim waurdam
weitwodjands:
tweifļan juhta:
unjeins wisands
paim unknunanda
mahta: ḷp attins
 Decompiled Word: 

VI c
being undisputed,
manifest the dis-
tinction of the Doer,
signifying clearly
that He was sent from
heaven by the Father.
For this reason He
says, "And the Father
Himself, Who has sent
Me, gives testimony
of Me." But though
the Father's testi-
fying about Him was
varied and came at
various times, partly
through the words of
prophets, partly by
a voice from heaven,
and partly through
signs, when these
things had thus come
to pass, because the
heart of those un-
believing men had
nevertheless become

The Father's testimony regarding the Son
unandsakana wi
sandona: gaswikūp
jandona ḷis waurk
jandins dom: bairh
taba gabandwjan
dona ḷatei fram at
tin insandi ḷps was
us himina: inuh
 ḷis qibīj: jah sa
10 'e sandida mik at
ta: sah weitwodeiḇ
bi mik: aḥpan mis
saleiks jah in mis
saleikaim melam:
15 A
tinis bi ḷina warp
weitwodeiṃs: su
man ḷairh praufe
te waورد: suṃa
uḥpan ḷairh stib
na us himina: su
manuḥpan ḷairh
taiknis: ḷp in ḷi
zei ḷaṃswa waṟwarpana:
20
H
dardizo ḷizei unga
laubjandane warp

1-8 John 5:36

9-12 John 5:37

Note: There are some inconsistencies in the transcription, possibly due to the nature of the text.
VI d

The Divine Vision as a reward reserved for those who submit to divine guidance

VI d: 6 gaselrub (6.43, Pl. LIT); gas C; gas(alihip) C; gas | b cM; gas | b cU cB — 13–15 unte—ist (7.32) — 13–25 [unte—(wauriia gu/)s] ni skuld ist II [jib I] [sumai—gahausidehun II] [sumai—auk I] [pan II] [qab—pairh I] Cr — 15 skuld(s) V — ist: (6.43) — 18 sumai(h) (Mf) — 20 auk [pan] aukands V — 20–22 audagai—brainjaihairtans (4.18) — 25 pairh (daupain ahman bana wethan andtimands, weitwodi|pai gu/a|zai bi fraujin andhaus-jands ni tuzwerjais) (BbI)

4–12 John 5.37–38 — 20–24 Matt. 5.8

VI d: harder, He therefore properly added the words “Neither have you ever heard His voice, nor have you seen His form, and you have not His word abiding in you, for Him Whom He has sent, in Him you do not believe.” Because amenable men must not be scorned along with them, however, some also have heard His voice; then others have seen His form; for then He said, “Blessed are the clean of heart, for they shall see God.” And henceforth... as a pledge... through

Philip and Andrew reproved for forgetting the Lord’s power—the loaves and fishes... ahun kunnan dins fins: maht jah and|jaggk jandins sik is waldufeins: nih ist ains ak jah an draias saei qap: I st magula ains, her saei habai|b)

10 e. haihans bari zeinans: jah twans fiskans: analieko swe filippus gasa kada: ni waiht mi kihais is hugjans: N ih wair|hi|dos lai sareis and|jag gk|jandins pairh bozi usbar qj pa|ndins: akei pa|ta ha ist du swa managaim: ip fa. andt|lions ize niuklahe

25 VII a: 1 (ni ain)|ahun (Mf) Mf; (ni ain|isa|han (Mf) Lab; (jatuh jah and-dawardj Filippaus niha siponeis wisan ni mundo mann)ahun (U); (ni waarai|jada ganouns nih ains)|ahun V; (ain)|ahun (Bb); (mamin|ahun Hf; (joh jah and|hast ni siponeis mundedj man)|ahun (Kk) — 1–5 [(j)ah unkunndjins fraujins maht jah (ni) and|jaggk|jandins is waldufeins II] Cr — 2 /fins/ Mf — 3 and|jaggk|jandins V — 6 ist ains] J (6.44, Pl. XXI); stains cM cU cB; Stains (= Paits) M GL Lab; Stains (ains) (U) (Bb) Hf W; Stains (pat-alien) V; ains (J) Hf; sa ains Cr — 8 ist] is(?|)t cU — 10 e.] fim M — 16 mikild|paitais| du/a OPR (6.45, Pl. LV) — 18 (sik) and|jaggk|jandins V; and|jaggk|jandins (sik) Cr

8–12, 21–23 John 6.9
The multiplication of loaves and fish

VII b

qap: 'waurkeip
' jans mans anakub
' jan: l[p] eis au hau
' ja manangamma wi
5 ' sandin im jamma
' stada: jo filus
' na anakumbjan
gatawinedun:
F
imf jusundjos
10 waire inuh qiños
' jah barna: swe
at mikilamma nah
tamate anakumbjandans:
A
ni wisandin al
15 jai waihtai ufar
' jans fíni hlaihans
' jah twans fískans
' jahesi nimands
' jah awiliudonds
' gajipidja: jah
20 swa managai gano
' jands ins waila
w iznai; ni jat
'ai nei ganauha
25 ñaurtais im fra

said, "'Make the
men sit down,' And there being
much grass in
the place, they
made the crowd
sit down"—five
thousand men,
not counting
women and chil-
dren—as if sit-
ting down to a
great supper,
there being no-
thing but the
five loaves and
two fish, which
He took, offer-
ing thanks, and
blessed. And
satisfying them
with so much
food, He gave
them not only

VII c

The feeding of the multitude

gaf: ak filaus mai
- zo: afar ñatei ma
'tida so managei bi
' gitan was ñige
5 ' hlabe ñib: tain
' jons fullos ñatei
' allifnoda: sama
' leiko ñan jah andanemun ñi
' ze fiske swa filu
10 ' swe wildeden: nih
' jan ana jalm blai
' bam ainaim seinai
' zos mahtais filus
' na ustaikindna: ak
15 ' jah in ñaim fiska:
' wa filus auk swe ga
tawaide ps ñas ñaz izc wair
' jen. swaei ainhar
' janoj swa filu
' swe wilda andni
20 man is gatawida:
' ah ni in waithai wa
' ninauj ñiz ai fi
' lusai wair ña
25 gatawida: akei

ficiency, but much
more: "After the
multitude had eaten,
there were found
twelve baskets full
of the loaves that
had been left over.
Then likewise they
also received of the
fish as much as they
wished." Nor did He
show the abundance
of His power then in
the loaves alone,
but also in the
fish, for thence
He caused them to
become as much as
He gathered of them,
so that He made
everyone receive as
much as he wished,
and by this abundance
He caused there to be
no want at all. But

VII c: 2-3 afar ñatei matida so] cu c; afar ñatei matjan so cm M1 GL Ldg; afar ñatei mahtæ matjan (ufar ñatei matja) joh j; afar jatæ matjan so M2; afar ñatei (auk swaife) matjan so V — 2-7 [afar—allifnoida I] Cr — 4 [ñige]; M1 (Bb — 5 ñib: twafl M — 8 andnemun] cu; /cm M GL Ldg cu U V Bb H W Cr — 10 wildeden (andnemun) V — 16-d 10 [swa—] andniman II
[jah—gatawida I] [akei us ñamma nauh—gamaudida I] [gaunjann II] [ñatei—foida I] Cr — 16 [swaei Bb H Cr D S Wr Kr] 16-17 gatawida ins ñapro las ñeiz] (4.64, Pl. XXII); gamaunuwa ins cm G cu U Bb H W Cr D S Kr Wr; gahabida iz e M1; garabida ins L GL Ldg; gamaulida iz M, gamaulida ins V; gamana matis c — 16-21 swa fila auk izc tawaide, swaei ainharjammeh swa filu swe wilda andnim, gamaunuwa wair[jan Gg — 18 ainharjam обеспечит 16 (4.64, Pl. XXIII) (G) GL Ldg V; ainharjammeh cm M2; ainharjano c; ainharjammeh cu U Bb H W cu Bb Cr D S Wr Kk Mr — 21 is (7.33) — is gatawida cm c; ist. tawaide cu U C; izc tawaide Gg Bb; is, tawaide H; (swaei . . . .) tawaide W H; Jesus gatawida K D — 22 ni in) in ni V — 25 filusna (7.34) — 25 gatawida] K D

Lines 23-24 span an original hole in the leaf.
7-10 John 6.11
The miracle's effect upon the disciples and the multitude

The first attempt to apprehend Jesus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII d</th>
<th>VIII a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nauh us ṣamma</td>
<td>hun uslagida anā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filu mais siphon</td>
<td>ina handuns:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jans fullafah</td>
<td>A t weihai auk is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da: jah anparas</td>
<td>mahta: una</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gamaudida gau</td>
<td>suniba unse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jah ṣatei is</td>
<td>lein ize nauh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was sa sama saei</td>
<td>diskaidandin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in aypidai...m...je</td>
<td>jah ni u slab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>re attans ize fo</td>
<td>jandein faur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, dida: ṣanu bi</td>
<td>mel sik gahaba:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣe sadai waupu:</td>
<td>G alijun ṣi ḫai and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qaṣ siponja:</td>
<td>bahtos du ḫaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣeinaim:</td>
<td>ahuumistadu gum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G alisya ḫos aṣif</td>
<td>jam jah farei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nandeins draus</td>
<td>saium: īrāh:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nos ei waithai</td>
<td>ḥeṣon du im jai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni fraqstnai:</td>
<td>jainai: duhe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣanu galesu</td>
<td>ni attaubu: ina:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jah gafullide</td>
<td>A ndhofan ḫan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dun ṣib tainjus</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gabruko: us ḫai</td>
<td>ḥeṣandans: ḫa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫe hlaibam bari</td>
<td>tei ni Ṧanun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣeinaam jah ḫ.b.</td>
<td>ni aw rodila man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥiskam: ṣatei</td>
<td>na swaswe sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


VIII a: 1 sumaŋ ᵇan iz e wiledun fahan ina. akci ni ainahun uslagida CA — 2 ina (6.49, Pl. XXIV) cm cU; na cK — 3 At (6.50, Pl. XV) cm cU; t cK — 3-10 [at—gahaban II] Cr — 4 unanasuniba unamasuniba cmJ — 7 diskaidandein] diskaidandin cmJ — 10 sik (4.13) — 11 alijun (6.51, Pl. XXVI) cm cU; alijun cmJ cK — /ban/ M — 17 du lee M — 19 Andhofun (6.51, Pl. XXVII) cm cU; ndhofun cmJ cK

1-2 John 7.44 — 1-25 John 7.45-46
The officers open admiration for Jesus' teaching

andahafts du ga  
shahti: maizuh ḫa:  
du afdomenai jai  
nai ungalaubei  
warph: andhob  
fun auk jainim  
anahaitandam im:  
In ḫizei ni aattahu  
inai: na andsitan  
dans jainaize un  
selein jize ana  
ḥaitandane im:  
A k mais sildaleik  
jandans fins. lai  
sein: wikunṣa  
ba in allaim ala  
mannam faura wi  
san rahniiedun:  
I ḫ jainai in unse  
leins seinaizos  
balpein ize ni us  
bulandans: miḥ  
hatiza andhouf  
wipra ins qipañ  
25 ——- dans: ibai jah jis  
"Are you also

became a rebuke,  
nay, a condemnation of those men's  
unbelief. For they  
answered those men  
who reprimanded  
them because they  
had not brought  
Him, not fearing  
the wickedness of  
those who were  
reprimanding them,  
but rather marveling  
at the Lord's  
teaching: among  
all men they openly reckoned it to  
to be superior. But  
those men, because  
of their wickedness  
not tolerating their  
boldness, answered  
angrily at them  
with the words

25 John 7.47

VIII c

The anger of the Pharisees
— Nicodemus' intervention in behalf of Jesus

afaizidai siu: jai  
ja uinsbun pizë  
reike gaiubide  
di imma. aipjapau  
pizë faresia:  
ajal su managei  
jaie ni kunnun  
wiopjapraṣunanai  
sind: ḩo jān  
10 miṣ bairteinā ḫwai  
rheims rodidedu:  
In ḫammei liugan  
dans bigitanda:  
ei ni ainhun reike  
aipjapau faresia  
gaiubidedi imma:  
A ḫ nekauðaimau bã  
garbaṇau gps: qī  
mandin at imma in  
naht: jahi miṭ bal  
pein faur sunja  
insakandin: jah  
qipjandin im:  
20  .seek ṭo ḫi  
manān. kti jah los man ——-? and so on.

"Does our law judge a

seduced? Behold,  
has any one of the  
rulers or of the  
Pharisees believed  
in Him? But this  
multitude, who do  
not know the Law,  
are accused."

They spoke these  
things with the  
bitterness of  
anger. Herein they  
are found to be ut-  
tering a fallacy—  
that not one of the  
rulers or Pharisees  
believed in Him—  
because Nicodemus  
(who by God's plan  
had come to Him by  
night) also argued  
boldly for the truth  
and said to them,  

VIII c: 1 afaizidai] (6.52, Pl. XXVIII) cM cU; aizidai cK ——- sik(j)up  
M₁ ——- 2 pizë] (6.53, Pl. XXXIX) cM cM; pizë(p̣) cK ——- 10-22 /miṭ bairtein  
—insakandin jah/ cMj — 10 bairteins ḫwarheins] (6.54, Pl. XXXX); bairteins  
ṛwarheins cM cU; bairteins ḫwarheins cK; bairteins ḫwarheins M₁ U V Bh  
W H D S Kk M; bairteins ḫwarhein L GL M₂ Ldg Cr —— 12-20 [in ḫammei  
II]. . . [e-i imma II] at Neikauðaimau [bį̃gips II] qipjandin—jah J Cr  
12-22 in ḫammei—insakandin (7.36) — 12 ḫammei] cU cK; ḫammei ei cM  
GL M₂ — 14 ainsbun] s Opr (6.55, Pl. XXXXI) — 17 nekauðaimau  
Neikauðaimau M₁ V —— 22-23 insakandin: jah qipjandin im /jah qipjandin  
M₁; insakandin im qipjandin M₂ — 25 kti jah los] Opr (6.56, Pl. XXXXII);  
mannam + (nibai faurhis hausel) fram imma jah ufkaninā ḫa taujai] CA V Cr;  
+(jainai) liugandans bigitanda (VIII c 12-13) Cr  
The fallacy in the argument of the Pharisees

When they said, "Not one of the rulers and Pharisees has believed," they reasoned without thinking that he was namely a Pharisee and a counselor of the Jews. Moreover, he was shown as one ruler among the "accursed" who believed in the Lord, speaking in His behalf in rebuke of their wickedness. But they, not tolerating the rebuke, answered with the words "Are you rodsjands: iba also from Galilee? Search and see that --- ---"

VI

READINGS

THE PHOTOGRAPHY OF THE CODEX

6.1. The foregoing decipherment of the MS is based on a study of its text under daylight, under ultraviolet radiation, and in photographic reproduction. The method of photography has necessarily varied in accord with the condition of the leaves. With the Ambrosian group (reproduced at a scale of about 4:5 and 2:3), the best results have been obtained under fluorescence induced in the parchment by filtered ultraviolet radiation, though white-light photographs also have been necessary in reading some passages. With the Vatican leaves, an ultraviolet lamp can be used to advantage only for those areas that are not covered by gelatin (2.7), and the only legible full-page photographs (made at a scale of approximately 6:7) have been taken under white light. In addition, individual letters and words have been rephotographed at seven-fifths, eight-fifths, or twice actual size wherever there is a question of the exact reading. In all such instances the length of exposure, development, and

---


2 At the request the Vatican made test photographs under monochromatic lighting in 1948 and again with new equipment in 1951. With ultraviolet radiation, the fluorescence of the gelatin, which has a wide frequency range, produced a darkening of the background with an 85-90 per cent loss of contrast. On the other hand, strong white light proved to be very effective. For helpful advice on the "gelatin problem" I am indebted to Dr. L. Bendikson (n. 1, above).
printing has been determined by the condition of the text,\(^8\) the contrast being increased many times for badly faded characters but comparatively little for darker letters. Marks of punctuation, on the other hand, have been reproduced separately only when having an important bearing on meaning. Photographs of individual letters and words have been required for several reasons. In the first place, very light and very dark areas often occur close together on the parchment, so that no single reproduction of a page is satisfactory for the purpose of showing both bleached and dark characters; secondly, for the present purpose it is necessary to indicate specifically which letters are under consideration; and thirdly, the legibility of difficult readings is often increased by large-scale reproduction. In some photographs the extremely high contrast that has been required to make faint characters visible has caused adjoining letters to look many times darker than they actually are, but this result could not be avoided without retouching, "burning in," "dodging," or some similar process that would spoil the value of the photographic evidence. The effectiveness of high-contrast reproduction has been widely demonstrated in police work, but it is no less effective when used in the decipherment of badly faded MSS. Thus Plate XXV, below, shows three stages in the identification of a supposedly missing letter, the initial A of VIII a 3. In Print 1 (25 seconds) this letter is still invisible, but in Print 2 (90 seconds) and Print 3 (120 seconds) both the A and its superior are identifiable.

LEAF I
(Milan, pp. 113–114)

6.2. In I a 1 all readings omit the ——, the quotation dot, and the word nist, which is written in smaller letters inserted slantwise below the line (see Plate I). The scribe pierced the parchment in making the three dots of the ——, which is accordingly confirmed by three small punctures discernible on the opposite side of the leaf (see the top of Plate II). All editors prior to 1900 assume that the first five lines of the text represent Ps. 53.2–3, and three undertake to restore the supposedly missing words (see the apparatus accompanying the text). The occurrence of nist, however, completes the quotation and shows that it represents Rom. 3.11–12, thus confirming the opinion of Meyer\(^4\) and all editors from 1900 on. Cr Kk supply nist as a conjecture.

6.3. All readings omit the quotation dots preceding I a 2–5. The first of these has pierced the leaf, causing a small puncture on the right side of the final i of unselüi in I d 2 (Plate II). The fainter dots preceding I a 3–4 have not gone through the parchment, but a small hole and blot have been produced by the heavier ' introducing I a 5 (Plate II, bottom).

6.4. stauai: I a 7

M stauai (p. 3) with a smaller i, which he reproduces without comment. His second edition has staua\(^a\) (p. 660): "Vielleicht war das kleinere i nur — oder ? / Adriaanst es nur mit Acc."

U staua: (p. 14): "Sic Cod. certo, non stauai. Quod pro i habuit Massmanus, non est nisi linea perpendicularis literae s vocabuli 'iustum,' quod secunda manus h. l. scripsit."

B stauai (p. 431): "Das i ist gleich gross wie die ubrigen buchstaben und ist keineswegs das von 'iustum'; es lässt sich links von diesem als bleicher, aber deutlicher schimmer erkennen. Die von U gesetzten zwei punkte fehlen. Da ich auch 1. Tim. 3,6 . . . klar in stauai adriaanii lese . . . so muss ich die dat. auch an dieser stelle beibehalten, er kann nach u f ebenso gut, wie nach in stehen."

The word (Plate III) shows no trace of B's full-sized final i, but the smaller i seen by M is discernible. This letter has been written XV and LV-LVI); Fine Line Developer; nos. 3–5 AZO single weight paper (for prints ranging from 5 to 120 seconds) or Eastman Kodalith A paper (for prints up to 180 seconds) with lighting of 100–160 W; and Kodak D 72 or Kodalith Fine Line Developer. Vacuum printing has been used in some instances but is not generally necessary for photographs of this size.\(^4\) Germania, X (1865), 226 f.

\(^8\) Line negatives and contact prints have been made with the following equipment: a large commercial copying camera using a Zeiss Apo-Tessar lens 1:9 (f=45 cm) mostly at f 22 and at a varying scale with exposure ranging from 20 to 180 seconds; two arc lamps using 220 V at 25 amp. (or ten flood lights drawing variable wattage); Eastman Kodalith Film, Type 2 (Type 3 for Plates
ten over an original :, and a new, correspondingly smaller : has been added (cf. the added smaller characters in Plates I, VI, VIII, XLIb, XIII, XVII, XXI, XXII, XXXI, XXXIX, XLIII, XLIV, XLV, XLVI, XLIX, LII, LI). U's assertion that M's smaller i is only the perpendicular stroke of the superscribed Latin s would be hard to substantiate. Repeated examination of the leaves has disclosed no other Latin s or ligatured st in which the perpendicular stroke extends above the horizontal kern. Furthermore, if M's i did not occur, there would be no second :.

6.5. All readings omit the quotation dot preceding huns in I a 18, though this mark is not important to the meaning of the text. More serious has been the omission of was in I b 12, which is written in the margin (Plate IV). As usual in marginal entries, those letters that are closer to the edge of the page are more bleached because they have been more exposed to the penetration of light between the leaves. V H supply was as a conjecture, and Bh indicates that this form is required.

6.6. In I b 15 all readings omit seinaisos, which is badly faded. The n and a of this word are not distinguishable in the photograph (see Plate V) and were first confirmed through a direct examination of the leaf in 1955.

6.7. All readings omit n in garehsn in I b 19.

M garehs (p. 4) without comment.
U (p. 16) has the same reading: "sic Cod.—Haec sententia me judice alundum non pendet, sed ipsa per se constat, ita ut non sit, quod garehns cum garehns, objectum cum subjecto, mutemus."
B gareh's (p. 433): "Das zeichen ~ steht bei allen übrigen stellen unserer handschrift, wo es ein abgeschlossenes n bezeichnet . . . nach dem letzten buchstaben oder über demselben; bei garehns dagegen findet es sich zwischen b und s." B (p. 448) also rejects the : read by M and U.

As Plate VI shows, M's and U's reading is merely incomplete, but B's is incorrect. The scribe first wrote gareh's; the original ~ is directly above the s. When the mistake was discovered, the ligature ns and a new : were added.

6.8. galbatjandi—I c 2

M galbatjandi—(p. 5) without comment.
U galbatjandi—(p. 16): "sic Cod., non galbatjandin, ut Massmannus ceterique habent."
B galbatjandi—(p. 434): "Die vorhandenen, ziemlich deutlichen zuge entsprechen ganz dem o, und zwar erkenne ich sowol die beiden oberen, als auch die unteren bogen. Da das wort sich nur an dieser stelle findet und da o keineswegs den got. lautgesetzten widerspricht . . . , so erscheint mir U's lesung hinfällig."

As Plate VII indicates, the word has been corrected. The crossing curves of an o are clearly discernible in the fourth letter, but so also are two lines extending upward along its sides and converging at the top to form an a. That the o represents the earlier, incorrect spelling appears to be indicated by two factors. First, the o is of normal shape and size, whereas the a is broader than usual and is curved somewhat so as to encompass the o. Secondly, the meaning of the passage agrees with the a- but not with the o-spelling: the Devil had deceived man and with a lie had enticed (galbatjandin) him to do evil. gaBtjandin, on the other hand, would represent the Devil as threatening, rebuking, or sternly charging man to commit sin, though the text states explicitly that man had sinned of his own will (swessama wilj in I c 18) and had not been forced (nike naupjandin I b 24).

6.9. ne i auk I c 11

M ne auk (p. 5): "ne steht." His second edition (p. 660) has ne(i) and refers to hvaiwa ne, etc. in 2 Cor. 3.8.
U (p. 16) also sees ne auk and attempts to justify ne in an unusually long note that is no longer pertinent because of B's reading.
B ne i auk (p. 434): "Ich lese ne, und zwar in der zeile ne uk; ne uk ist vollkommen klar, i etwas verwischt. Über der zeile findet sich ein kleineres a; es steht über u und fällt zum teil mit dem i des über-geschriebenen wortes langibardorum zusammen, seine zuge lassen sich sowol über als neben dem i deutlich erkennen."

Plate VIII confirms B's reading. The third letter from the left is an i, and the smaller a written above the line is faint but identifiable.
Readings

6.10. All readings omit the small g that has been added above the line at the beginning of I c 13 so as to correct gaag | wein to gaag | gwein (Plate LIII).

6.11. All readings omit iä = ins: at the end of I d 4 (see Plate IX). V supplies ins as a conjecture, and though no other editor ventures so far, all translations except GL Ldg have an equivalent pronoun. D, for example, supplies sic: "und verachten die Schlechtigkeit des, der sie vormals verführt hat."

6.12. gawandaina I d 25
M gawandaina(i) (p. 6): "gawandei ist klar, na nicht zu verkennen, für i (?) Raum."
U gawandainai (p. 18): "sic Cod., quamquam pallidis litteris postremis n et a, et expallida litera finali i." B (p. 430) accepts this reading without comment.

gawandains occurs; the final s (Plate X) is so clear that it is not easy to understand how M U B could read ai. In this instance, as in some others, the cleaning of the Milanese leaves (2.7) has evidently made the word more legible than it was prior to 1910-11.

LEAF II
(Milan, pp. 77-78)

6.13. leik is II a 5
M leikis (p. 7), which he alters to leik is (p. 39): "Scriptum legitur leikis, vix videndum punctum in i. Sed leik is ex Mrc. 6.29." His second edition has leik is with the remark (p. 660) "[Handschrift] leik is, also leikis is nicht corporis [leikis], sondern dem sparte [zwiekunhaba] entgegengesetzt?"
U leikis (p. 18): "sic Cod., non leik is; interpunctionis signum desideratur."
B leik is (p. 435): "Ich glaube, ebenso wie M* bemerkte, schwache punkte über dem i zu bemerken, so dass also leik is zu lesen ist. Der 3. punkt, den M* erwähnt, steht nicht."

Plate XI confirms B's reading. The dieresis is faint but very clear.

6.14. All readings omit the ligature ñô in mañô II b 11.
M mañô (p. 8): "man allein; S. 9,1 [II c 1]: manna in derselben Stelle."
U (p. 20) repeats and confirms this reading.

Readings

B mañô (p. 436); "Ich vermute, dass die silbe na wirklich am anfang der 12. zeile steht; ihre spuren finden sich zwischen p und r der ubergeschriebenen proper... Die verbesserung ruhrt ebenso wie andere von einer zweiten hand her."

There appear to be no traces of B's na between the Latin p and r at the beginning of line 12 (Plate XIIa). As Plate XIIb shows, a small ñô-ligature has been added to mañô in line 11.

6.15. ñehan habaida: II c 12
M ñeha habaida: with the first ha above the line (p. 9): "ñeha ha steht."
U ñehan habaida: (p. 20): "sic Cod., non ñeha; syllaba han supra lineam plene, non compendio adscripta est." B (p. 436) confirms this reading.

The n in question occurs directly above the first a of habaida and is partly covered by a Latin m (Plate XIII).

6.16. All readings omit the correction in II d 19.
M (p. 10): "goreksnais steht."
U (p. 22): "Cod. clarissime, vitioso autem ga reksnais." B (p. 430) accepts this reading.

A cancellation dot, now very faint, has been inserted above the final s of the word, which accordingly requires no further correction (Plate XLVIII).

6.17. The mark : might be expected to occur after wato in II d 21 inasmuch as the following line begins with an initial (4.7), but marginal fading has obliterated even the right side of the o, and there is no trace of punctuation.

6.18. All readings omit the final o of gasaïvano in II d 25 (see Plate XIV). The o is very clear, though perhaps it has been so only since the cleaning of the Milanese leaves. Assuming gasaïvano to be correct, three editors attempt to complete the passage (see the apparatus). On the other hand, Kk and Móssé (1942 ed.) adopt gasaïvano as a conjecture.

LEAF III
(Rome, pp. 59-60)

6.19. For andruñô nun III a 20 all readings have undruñô nun (M, p. 11; U, p. 23; K, p. 6). Inasmuch as the latter form fails to
make sense here (the only attested meaning of undrinnan is ‘go to, fall to one’s share’ in Luke 15.12), every editor has been forced to assign the verb a new, unattested meaning or to substitute andrunnum, which has the meaning required by the context, viz. ‘they disputed.’ As shown by Plate XXXVIII, the first letter of the word was originally a u but has been corrected by the addition of extra strokes; compare the regularly formed u of the following syllable, which can be seen approximately one inch to the right in the same photograph. In the first letter, the two vertical strokes have been extended above the line so as to meet at an acute angle, thus forming the top of a Gothic a. Moreover, the finishing “plinth” of an a has been added at the lower right side of the letter. The unusually tall left stroke of the d, which looks almost like a Gothic q, is an occasional trait of the first scribe.

6.20. All readings omit the preceding III a 24, the quotation dots introducing the next three lines, and the cancelled a at the beginning of III b 2. These marks are clear, so that they have not been photographed separately. There is no quotation dot introducing III b 3; the marginal space is occupied by the superior of the initial letter beginning the next line.

6.21. In III b 11 all readings omit the m of sisteinom (M, p. 12; U, p. 23; K, p. 6). This letter, which is badly smudged but still recognizable, has been added above the line (Plate XXXIX). G correctly surmised that an m should occur (see the apparatus).

6.22. All readings omit the cancellation dots above the letters of wito in III c 1. Inasmuch as this word occurs also in III b 23, which belongs to the same sentence, the passage has proved to be especially troublesome, and editors have introduced a variety of emendations (see the apparatus). That M U B overlooked the cancellation dots is in no way surprising; these marks are still faint under an ultraviolet lamp and are unusually difficult to photograph (Plate XL), especially those above o and h.

6.23. miti/nizei III d 7

K (p. 8) also reads miti/nizei but believes it possible that - may occur at the end of line 7.

The - occurs but has been almost entirely obliterated by marginal bleaching (Plate XL).

6.24. III d 18 originally ended with the letter i (anahei| wonds), as indicated by M (p. 14) and U (p. 26); B makes no comment on the word. The i is now bleached beyond recognition, but inasmuch as there is no doubt regarding the identity of the word, no attempt has been made to photograph it separately.

LEAF IV
(Rome, pp. 61–62)

6.25. sokjan | dam IV a 8–9

M (p. 15): “sokjandans steht (st. sokjandam), viell. durch das folgende gipandam sis verleitet.”
U (p. 26): “Cod. clare, vitiose autem sokjan | dans.” K (p. 8) repeats the same reading.

Most editors (see the apparatus) have substituted -dam for -dans. As indicated by Plate XLII, however, this emendation has been anticipated in the codex. The scribe first wrote the letters dans at the beginning of line 9, but the diagonal stroke of the original n has been replaced by the curving cross stroke of an m, and a cancellation dot has been inserted above the following s. Both this dot and the top stroke of the s are badly bleached. Cf. the similarly faded dots in Plates I, II, VI, XXIV, XXXIV, and XL.

6.26. In IV b 17 all readings omit the s of mikildups, the word jai, and the abbreviation fin, which has been crossed out. The s of mikildups has been added in the margin, where it has been all but obliterated through bleaching (see Plate XLIII). Above the s are written jai and the crossed-out abbreviation; apparently the scribe began to insert fins, then noticed that it was already written at the beginning of the next line. Strangely, no emendation of the passage (see the apparatus) adopts the simple expedient of adding an s to mikildup. The fact that this noun is feminine leaves no doubt that its modifying adjective skeirs (line 16) is an i-stem.

6.27. All readings omit the second (or third) a of ana airpai
in IV d 1. The letter in question has been inserted above the line in a very light hand (perhaps that of the second scribe) and is badly bleached (see Plate XLIV).

6.28. In IV d 5 all readings omit the letters air of the word air[pai], which have been added in the margin and are very badly bleached. In the photograph shown in Plate XLV, the a has become visible after 90 seconds of printing, whereas the i has required 110 seconds, and the outline of the r has become identifiable only after 180 seconds. It is for this reason that the a and i look much darker than the r.

6.29. All readings agree that in IV d 18 the words jah gasakan have been inserted above the line in smaller letters. Following the n of gasakan occurs an I-like mark. M (p. 18) merely reproduces the mark in facsimile, and U (p. 29) disregards it, but K (p. 10) remarks, “jah gasakan(h?) über der Zeile von zweiter Hand nachgetragen.” It is not easy to see how the mark in question can be taken to represent a Gothic k (see Plate XLVI). In the first place, this vertical line is taller and thinner than the vertical strokes of the accompanying Gothic letters; compare the vertical stroke of the k in jah, which can be seen about one inch to the left in the same photograph. Secondly, the lower part of the supposed h following gasakan is nothing but a Latin a and is twice as thick as the I-like mark over which it has been written; a Gothic k begins with a single broad vertical stroke, which is as thick at the top as it is at the bottom. Thirdly, the mark in question coincides exactly in size, shape, and location with the vertical stroke of a heavy Latin k on the opposite side of the leaf (kalendas, above IV a 18). Whether jah gasakan represents a second scribal hand, as K asserts, is another matter, but I can find no convincing evidence to substantiate this conclusion; the letters resemble those in the body of the text and are by far too neat to be the work of the second scribe, even at his best.

6.30. In IV d 25 all readings omit the cancellation of the letter s, which occurs before the word weihya. Inasmuch as the preceding lines condemn the heretics Sabellius and Marcellus for identifying God the Father with God the Son, it has been generally supposed that line 25 is intended to refer to the Holy Spirit (sa weihya ahma). Accordingly, all editors change sweihya to sa weihya by inserting the supposedly omitted a, and some add ahma. This interpretation, however, has no support in the codex. As shown by Plate XLVII, the s preceding weihya has been crossed out, and there is no trace of an a either above or below the line. If the scribe had wished the phrasing to be sa weihya ahma, he would not have cancelled the s but would have inserted an a to complete the word sa. Further, he would hardly have inserted the dot - after weihya, where such a mark of punctuation would be out of place.

LEAF V
(Milan, pp. 79–80)

6.31. The verbal form in V a 8 f. has been troublesome.

M frijonan (p. 19): “8. 9. stehen so da.”
C (Gablenz-Löbe, p. 15): “Cod. frijonan.”
U (p. 30): “librarius primum scripsit frijonan, quod cum falsum esse animadvertisset, literam n, priorem, rasit.”
B (p. 437): “Das n sollte radiert sein; ob es aber auch geschehen, oder ob der buchstabe nur verblichen ist, wage ich nicht zu entscheiden.”

Inasmuch as the passage paraphrases John 5.20 by describing God the Father as loving (frijondan) and God the Son as loved (frijoden), there can be no doubt that frijoden should occur in lines 8–9. All editions accordingly delete the first n of the reading frijonan. As Plate LIV shows, however, the letter in question is not an n but an s, which is followed by : (the : has been omitted in prior readings). The scribe first wrote frijonan, which makes sense, though not in this context. When the error was discovered, a cancellation dot was inserted above the s and the : was crossed out. Evidently the mistake was noticed immediately, for the letters dan occur directly after the canceled s in the same line and in the same handwriting. The dotted s shows no resemblance to an n, even under daylight. As B remarks, it is hard to determine whether the letter has been erased, but elsewhere on the extant leaves erasure is resorted to
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only where the use of cancellation dots, cross-out lines, or added strokes would be of no avail, as in Plates XXII and XXIII. In this instance the correction required nothing more than a cancellation dot and a cross-out line, so that no erasure was necessary. The parchment is unusually coarse in texture at this point, so that a poor absorption of ink might possibly account for the faintness of the s.

6.32. M (p. 19) and U (p. 30) state that in V a 11 only nharanukhan occurs, the initial A being lost, though B (p. 438) reports that the right stroke is still visible. Whatever the former condition of the leaf, the A is now wholly lost with the inner margin, and the same fate has overtaken the I preceding atuk in V a 14. This letter was still visible to M (p. 19) but had been lost before the time of U (p. 30) and B (p. 438).

6.33. In V a 22 both M (p. 19) and U (p. 30) see ni, which they report without comment, and this reading is accepted by B (p. 430). As shown by Plate LVI, the form that actually occurs is nū; the horizontal stroke of the u has been obscured by the superscribed Latin letters.

6.34. gasok: V b 16

M (p. 20) and U (p. 31) gasok: without comment.

B gasoki (p. 438): "Das i ist deutlich zu erkennen, dagegen fehlen die von M und U angegebenen punkte, obwohl bis zum folgenden nilr Raum dafür wäre. Der optativ ist nach ei [V b 7] ganz am Platze."

B's reading is easily understandable; a dark smudge covering the of gasok looks very much like a faded i and deceived me as well in 1948-49 (PMLA, LXV [1950], 1274 and Plate XV). However, direct examination of the leaf in 1955 reopens the question, and in 1958 a high-contrast enlargement finally yielded an unusually clear reproduction. The form is unmistakably gasok: (Plate XV of the present edition). As the context now shows, gahaitand in lines 12-13 means 'professing' (as in 1 Tim. 2.10), not 'promising,' as has been assumed.

6.35. aud satjan sweripa V c 2 f.

M aud satjan sweripa (p. 21): "and satjan durch jak ni der Kehrsseite...durchlöchert und undeutlich. sweripa sehr undeutlich (ri-
wegen zu großer Nähe oder Enge verdächtigt); und doch, was anders als sweripa? (dwimpa, was dem Auge sich geltend machte, hat keinen Sinn)."

U aud satjan bauranana (p. 32): "and satjan sic Cord., licet litera s obscura sit et cum proxima litera aliquantum perforata... bauranana sic e coniectura potius quam e lectione damus, quom Cordis hic locus, quamquam integer, adeo obscurus sit, ut quid vere continent, fortasse nemo unquam deprehendit. Massmannus, et is quoque coniectura usus, sweripa edidit, quod vocabulum cum notione opponendi, contraponendi, quae verbo andsatjan procul dubio subjecta est, hoc loco parum consentire nobis videtur. Ut de nostra lectione silentio quidquam ne praetereamus, bauranca fortasse solitia litteris, nana minoribus scriptum est. Qua tamen de re nihil pro certo affirmamus."

B aud satjan sweripa (pp. 438-439): "Wie sowol von M als auch von U hervorgehoben wird, ist die stelle sehr schwer zu lesen. Nach widerholter Untersuchung bei jeder art beleuchtung und zu verschiedenen zeiten muß ich das von U und M gesetzte andsatjan und Us bauranana ablehnen.... Mit M* lese ich sweripa, besonders deutlich pba, was vollständig Us lesung oder konjektur bauranana widerlegt: von einem beigefügten 'literis minoribus scriptum' ist nichts zu entdecken. Statt des von M und U gelesenen andsatjan glaube ich andsatjan zu erkennen, ein komposition, das sich an saljan... und gasaljan anschließt und die bedeutung von 'entgegenbringen, darbringen (offerre, tribuere)' hat."

As the foregoing comments indicate, V c 25 is one of the most difficult lines in the codex, but B's reading is an outstanding example of careful, painstaking decipherment. The third letter of line 25 (see Plate XVI) is surely an i, as read by B, rather than a t, as believed by M and U; though the dark smudge below the letter might suggest the base of a t, the acute angle formed by the two slanting strokes appears to preclude such a possibility. The following jan and sw are bleached, and the e and r of sweripa are nearly obscured by the heavy smudge covering the last five letters in the line; i, b, and a in sweripa are relatively clear, as B observes, though in the photograph they appear darker than they actually are. No: is discernible after sweripa (4.7).

6.36. No two readings of V d 3 agree.

M wisā din kunnan (p. 22): "übersaus unklar und erloschen. Lange schienen wisam* (dünner); und trotz wochenlangen Hinblicken muß ich kunnan gelten lassen."

M's second edition, however,

U wisā| dan kunnan (p. 32): "wisan|dan" sic Cod., et quidem plenis literis scriptum. Massmannus ceterique wisandin... kunnan) sic Cod., non gakunnan.

B wisā| anakunnan (pp. 438–39): "Auch kann ich weder wisandin, noch wisandan lesen, oder, wie M° angibt, ein überschriebenes ga vor kunnan entdecken... Statt wisando oder wisandan (ga)kunnan lese ich wisan anakunnan. wisan steht klar mit akkörungszeichen; auch kunnan ist klar. Was dazwischen steht, ist schwer zu entscheiden; doch glaube ich auf grund der vorhandenen spuren, daß statt des bisher angenommenen dan oder din ana zu setzen ist."

Nearly all editions in current use (see the apparatus) retain B's anakunnan in the sense of 'acknowledge, recognize'; as B himself observes, however, the only attested meaning of this verb is 'read.' As shown by Plate XVII, the first three letters in line 3 have been crossed out (cancellation dots can be seen above the second and third letters), and a smaller g and a have been added above the line. The top of the g is badly smudged, but the a is clear. Accordingly, the text at this point reads wisan gakunnan, so that there is no need to emend the phrasing or to explain away the fact that the preceding words ainabaura sunau (lines 1–2) are in the dative. The identity of the three crossed-out letters at the beginning of line 3 has produced considerable diversity of opinion; M saw din, U dan, and B ana. In the MS and in Plate XVII I see san. If this reading is correct, it explains why these three letters have been canceled; in writing wisan, the scribe made the mistake of copying the syllable san twice, once at the end of line 2 and again at the beginning of line 3. Similarly, in VIII a 16–17 he mistakenly wrote jai| Jainai for jainai, and the error was corrected by canceling the first jai.

6.37. For habaramma V d 6 all readings have habaramma.

M retains -amme without comment in his first edition (pp. 22, 46) but substitutes -amme(k) in his second (p. 661).

C (according to v. d. Gabelentz and Lübe, Grammar, p. 198): "Im Cod. steht, auch nach widerholter Vergleichung durch Castiglione habaramma."
wholly possible that the entire word *haidau* was preserved when U examined Leaf V. In VII d 3-4, for example, all readings agree on *fullafah|da*, which likewise borders on an inner margin. At the present time, however, the margin is more than a centimeter narrower at this point than it is elsewhere on the page, and only *fullafah|da* is left; there is no longer room for the *i*, which has flaked off with the inner margin. If the *i* of this word has been lost since B examined the leaves, the *u* of *haidau* also may have been lost since 1861.

**LEAF VI**

(Milan, pp. 309-310)

6.40. *minsnan* VI a 7

M *minsan* (p. 23) without comment.

U sees only *minsan* as certain (p. 34): “in ipsa linea non est scriptum nisi *minsan*; num vero supra lineam aliquid adscriptum sit, pro certo dicere non ausim.”

B *minsan* (p. 442): “Ich lese über der linie *n*; die einzelnen züge lassen sich zwischen dem *i* und dem *e* erkennen, obwohl sie fast verblichen sind.”

B’s reading is correct; the small *n* added above the line becomes especially clear in high-contrast reproduction (Plate XLIX).

6.41. *alla* VI b 16

M *all* (p. 24): “*all ufar steht.*”

U *all* (p. 35): “acc. abs., ad praedicatum enuntiationis spectat.”

B *alla* (p. 443): “Am schlüsse der zeile lese ich . . . *alla* und zwar steht das zweite *a* zwischen dem *J* und dem *h* des übergeschriebenen *Johannis* (*Iohannis*).”

Plate L confirms B’s reading. The final *a* of *alla* has been obscured by marginal bleaching and by a superscribed Latin *o* but is still discernible.

6.42. For the pronoun in VI c 15 all readings have *ināa*.

M (p. 25): “*ināa* steht.”

U (p. 36): “Cod. *inna*, deficiete tamen posteriore fulcro prioris *n*.”

B (p. 430) and C make no comment on the reading, but C (Castiglione-Maj, p. 24) substitutes *ina*.

In view of Gothic scribal practice, the reading should have been suspected from the first. The supposed ligature *nī* occurs near the middle of the line, where it could fulfill no function whatever. Gothic ligatures, when used for the purpose of justification, occur at the end of the line, not in the middle. Furthermore, the supposed ligature would convert a correct pronoun into a contextually meaningless adverb. As Plate LI shows, the first letter in question is an *i*, but it has been crossed out. The second letter is also an *i*; the comparatively smaller size, lighter impression, and slightly broader spacing of the two dots forming its diacritical suggest the hand of the second scribe, whose writing is noticeably lighter. The third letter is an *n*. Between it and the preceding *i* occurs an *o*-like mark (see the dotted line in the sketch accompanying Plate LI). This mark, which C, M, U, and B assumed to be the diagonal stroke of an *n* (hence their ligature *nī*), is only a blot caused by the *o* of the Latin abbreviation *epo* on the opposite side of the leaf. The fourth letter is an *a*. In writing the phrase *bi ina*, the scribe used three *i*’s where only two were required, but the superfluous letter has been crossed out, and the text requires no further emendation.

6.43. *gasebuś* VI d 6

C *gas* (Cast.-Maj, p. 24), which he expands to *gas[aib[i]*.

M *gas [hv* (p. 26) with *h* below the line: “*gas [hv* nur noch zu lesen, ergänzt sich aber nach Raum und Sinn . . . nicht zu gasaib[i], wie Castiglione . . . that, sondern *gasebuś*.”

U *gase [hv* (p. 37): “in linea scriptum fuit *gase* et infra lineam *huv*, quibus e literis non omnino deperditae sunt e et *u*, pr autem tota interiect.”

B (p. 444) has the same reading and remarks, “Us bemerkung ist zutreffend.”

Under ultraviolet radiation the final *ḥ* also becomes visible (Plate LII). In *gase*, which occurs at the end of the line, only the extreme left side of the *e* remains. Of the letters written below the line, *h* is more easily identified than *u*. The *u* becomes much clearer with longer exposure, development, and printing, but the following *ḥ* turns completely black, so that Plate LII neces-
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sarily represents a compromise between two extremes; cf. the re-

sults obtained with different printing times in Plate XXV. The

darkened area on the right side of Plate LII is due partly to the

browning of the parchment and partly to the long exposure and
development that have been required to make the ψ visible in

photographic reproduction. The marginal bleaching that has

affected ḫu ḩ here has likewise all but obliterated some of the

final letters of the following lines (see the frontispiece of VI cd,

right column), especially the t of ist (line 15), the b of stib|na

(line 16), and the " of ḫa" (line 20).

LEAF VII

(Milan, pp. 111–112)

6.44. In VII a 6 all readings omit the i of ist bais.

M stains (p. 27). His edited text (p. 49) has nih Stains, ak jah Andraias

with the translation "nee Petrus, sed etiam Andreas" and the note
"Patrius. Heliand (37, 18): Andreas endi Petrus."

U has the same reading (p. 38): "sic Cod.; fortasse addendum est

ais." B (p. 430) accepts the decipherment without comment.

The passage has been variously emended (see the apparatus).

In accord with a suggestion offered by Jellinek in ADA, XX

(1894), 161, all presently used complete editions change stains
to ist bais. This interpretation is not only in accord with the
context, but also with the MS. As shown by Plate XXI, a small
i has been added before stains, so that ist bais occurs.

6.45. In VII a 15–16 all readings have mi kulis, which is listed

without comment (M, p. 27; U, p. 39; B, p. 430). As a result of
this decipherment, the phrasing ni waiht mikulis hugjands has
been taken to mean something like 'not expecting anything
great' or 'who did not anticipate [recognize, sense] anything
great.' M, for example, has 'nihil magni cogitans'; Bb, 'nihil
magni sensisse'; D, 'welcher nichts Großes erwartete'; and
similarly Kk, 'der nichts Großes erwartete' (LUÄ, IX (1919),
2). But regardless of how the phrasing has been interpreted, ni
waith mikilis hugjands has remained unwieldy and obscure, apparently lending support to the assumption that the style of the work is simply clumsy (cf. 4.31). In this passage, as in many others, however, the assumption is based upon a misreading. The letters dupe have been added above the line at the beginning of VII a 16, thus correcting mikilis to mikildupais, which agrees exactly with the context. All four added letters are very badly damaged and have left nothing more than a few traces. The vestiges of the d and p are more identifiable than those of the u and a, which are bleached and smudged almost beyond recognition (Plate LV).

6.46. The most difficult reading in the leaves occurs between the syllables ga and wair in VII c 16-17.

M ga [manwida ins (p. 29): “Von hier an gänzlich erloschen. Was mir ungewiß blieb nach langen Wochen, ist ausgezeichnet [m.wi ... in are represented as uncertain]. Für gamanwida darf dem Raume nach nicht gatawida gelesen werden, es müßte denn gatawida (!) stehen.”

U (p. 40) merely repeats the same reading without mentioning its uncertainty: “sic Cod.”

B ga [mana matis (pp. 445-446): “Über keine andere stelle gehen die meiniung so auseinander wie über die vorliegende. . . . Die stelle ist sehr durchlöchert, verschwommen, und verblichen, so daß es unmöglich ist, eine unbestreitbare lesart zu geben. Ich habe sie bei jeder art beleuchtung widerholt untersucht und bin unter genauerberücksichtigung der vorhandenen spuren zu der mitgeteilten fassung gekommen.”

Line 17, up to the syllable wair, has been erased, corrected, smudged, and pierced by five holes, and the work of decipherment is complicated further by the fact that vestiges of some erased letters are still visible. As Plate XXII indicates, all prior readings omit t, a, w, and i, which are written in the left margin. The two following letters, d and a, appear to have been corrected from an original m, evidently the m of M’s ga[manwida and B’s ga[mana. Next occur a perforated i, which has been corrected from an original a, and an s. Above this s is a smaller
The form in question justifies the conjecture of GL and comes very close to substantiating C’s reading; as Plate XXIII indicates, the disputed letters are noh. Here, as in the foregoing lines, the text has been erased and corrected, and traces of the original letters are visible.

6.48. VII d 3 originally ended with the i of fullafahi | da, as attested by prior readings of the codex, but this letter has flaked away with the inner margin, which is now more than a centimeter narrower here than elsewhere on the leaf.

LEAF VIII
(Rome, pp. 57–58)

6.49. Both M (p. 31) and U (p. 41) see ina at the beginning of VIII a 2, but K (p. 14) lists only na. As a result, the i of this word is now regularly marked as a conjectural restoration. As shown by Plate XXIV, the i in question is still identifiable. It is perforated at the top and bleached along the left side, but both the diacesis and the lower right side of the vertical stroke are clear.

6.50. M (p. 31) represents the initial A of VIII a 3 as being faint, and U (p. 41) transcribes it without comment, but K (p. 14) lists it as missing. K’s reading here, as in 6.51–52, below, is not easy to understand. As Plate XXV indicates, the A occurs.

6.51. As in the foregoing instance, M (p. 31) indicates that the initial G of VIII a 11 is faded, and U (p. 42) lists it without comment, but K (p. 14) says that it is missing. Again, the letter occurs, though it is badly bleached (Plate XXVI). The same remarks apply equally to K’s inability to see the initial A of VIII a 19 (Plate XXVII). This letter has been subject to the same marginal bleaching that has affected the initials of the preceding lines.

6.52. afairsidai VIII c 1 is attested by M (p. 33) and U (p. 43), but K (pp. 14–15) dissents: “afairsidai . . . fehlt af.” This reading is difficult to understand. It is true, to be sure, that the first two letters of the word are smudged—especially the f—
but neither is missing, and the outline of the initial a is reason-
ably clear (see Plate XXVIII).

6.53. piise VIII c 2
M (p. 33) and U (p. 43) piise without comment.
K (p. 15): "piisi oder piisiil"

The interchange of e and ei is fairly common in the Skeireins, so
that either piise or piisi would be possible here; in either event,
the context makes it clear that the form is intended to be a plural
demonstrative, not a singular relative. Yet the reading is inter-
esting because it illustrates the phantom letters of the codex,
some of which are produced by lines showing through the
parchment and others by offprinting. As shown by Plate XXIX,
something resembling an i appears in the intercolumnar margin
after the e of piise. Although it is possible that this mark may be
the vestige of a faded or erased i, the evidence does not favor
such a conclusion. In the first place, the word occurs at the
center of the page, where fading is least likely, and the ac-
companying letters exhibit no unusual degree of bleaching.
Secondly, letters to be canceled are generally cross cut or
marked by superior dots, erasure being reserved for letters that
must be replaced and cannot be corrected otherwise. Thirdly,
the i-like mark coincides exactly in size, shape, and location
with the heavy vertical stroke of a canceled Gothic a on the fac-
ing page in the Vatican codex (iohan ianes III b 1-2; cf. 6.20).
Inasmuch as the two pages (58 and 59) must have been in con-
tact for a long period, the phantom i seen by K may well be an
offprint that has remained noticeable because of its occurrence
in the intercolumnar space; there is nothing on the opposite side
of Leaf VIII that would account for this mark.

6.54. baiireins fawairheins VIII c 10 f.
M baiireins fawairheins (p. 33): "baiirein am meisten erloschen oder
verschwommen. Vor fawairheins steht klar ein s. Anfangs glaubt' ich,
es sey hier schon zuvor fawairheins gestanden gewesen und
bairos darauf geschrieben, wo dann a auf in käme, das stehen
gleibene s aber fern rückte. Wochenlanges Hinblicken im gréll-
sten Sonnenlichte nöthigte endl. bey baiirein(s) stehen zu bleiben:

baitrei komt in den Paulinischen Briefen noch einmal vor." His
first edition rejects the s of baiireins.
U (p. 43) has the same reading and adopts the same emendation:
"mip baiirein sic nos cum Massm. (ed. 1) mutavimus pro Codicis
mip baiireins:"
K (p. 15): "baiireins fawairheins mit Punkten unter baiireins (baiirein
corr.)"

There appear to be no traces of K's dots below baiireins (see
Plate XXX); where cancellation dots occur, they are identifiable
by their nearly uniform size (cf. Plates XI and XL), and they
are regularly written above the line, not below it. The s of
baiireins, however, has been cut out, and the cross-out lines
have been subsequently obscured by the superscribed Latin.
With longer exposure and development, the correction becomes
somewhat clearer, but the rest of the word turns black, so that
the print shown in Plate XXX represents a compromise between
two extremes.

6.55. All readings omit the s of aïnshun VIII c 14.
M aïnshun (p. 33): "aïnshun steht nicht."
U (p. 44): "Cod. vitiose aïnshun."
K (p. 15) has the same reading without comment.
All editions supply the omitted s, but this emendation has been
anticipated in the codex. As can be seen in Plate XXXI, a small
s has been added above the line, so that no further correction is
required.

6.56. VIII c 24-25 represent the beginning of a quotation
from John 7.51, but the quotation breaks off abruptly with the
word mannan, and for the remaining nine words it is necessary
to turn to the Cod. Argenteus: nibai faurpis hauseip fram imma
jah ufkunnaii bu taujai. Though mannan occurs in the last line
of the third column, the fourth column proceeds directly to cite
John 7.48, as if the preceding quotation had been completed.
Editors generally have supposed that the scribe forgot to copy
the missing nine words, which are accordingly added in some
versions. In any event, the apparent breach in the context is
not in keeping with the stylistic character of the Skeireins. M
and K suggest that there may be traces of several letters after *mannan*, though there is certainly no room for nine additional words.

M *mannan*. (p. 33) without comment. In a note accompanying his edited text (p. 52) he remarks, "Comma fortissimun rumpit versum, qui pergilt: *Nībait faurīs hauetbīh frām imma* [etc.]." In the text of his second edition *mannan* is followed by (j. p. a.).

U adds no letters after *mannan* and says only (p. 44), "De puncto, quod hanc vocem sequitur, utrum simplex sit an duplex, quidquid pro certo dicere non possimus."

K remarks (p. 15), "Hinter *mannan* Spuren mehrerer Buchstaben?"; D (loc. cit.), like some other editors, inserts an ellipsis after *mannan*.

In high-contrast reproduction the letters following *mannan* are not only visible but also identifiable. At the lower left of Plate XXXII can be seen *k, t, l*, which slant downward to the right. The *k* is fairly dark, the *t* somewhat lighter, and the *l* faint. Apparently the three letters have been slanted in order to prevent their jutting out into the columnar margin (cf. the similar slanting in Plate I); the *l* is bisected by the vertical guide line. What the three letters may represent is of course a matter for conjecture, but it may be significant that *k t l* is the regular Greek abbreviation for 'and so forth, et cetera' (καί τὰ λοιπὰ), and that the few abbreviations used in Gothic are patterned after Greek models. If this interpretation is correct, the omission of the nine words is properly indicated by means of the abbreviation for 'et cetera.' Farther to the right in the same photograph can be seen *jah los* with an abbreviation symbol above the second form. Here again the meaning of the abbreviation raises a problem. Certainly *los* cannot represent a numeral (30+800+200) or refer to John 7.51, which belongs to the eighty-sixth section (pq) of the Eusebian canon, nor does Gothic appear to have such a word as *los*. I can suggest only that the abbreviation *los* may stand for *laibo*. In other contexts (Mark 8.8 and Rom. 9.27) the noun *laiba* means 'remnant, that which is left over,' so that *jah laibo* would be a very literal translation of καί τὰ λοιπὰ and would likewise mean 'et cetera.' If so, *jah los* is a marginal gloss explaining *k t l* and has precisely the same meaning. Both additions have been made in the wavering hand of the second scribe.

6.57. All readings omit *s* in *ainshun* VIII d 2 l. (cf. 6.55).

M (p. 34): "Es ist nicht mehr zu sehen als *ain hun*.

U (p. 44): "Litera *s* bibliopeti culpa latet."

K (p. 14) repeats the same reading without comment.

All editions accordingly restore the supposedly missing *s*. As shown by Plate XXXIII, this letter has been added at the beginning of line 3. The *s*, which is very faint, has become visible only after long exposure and development, so that the accompanying letters *hun* look many times darker than they actually are.

6.58. In VIII d 6 all readings omit *soku*-, which has been added in the margin. As a result of the omission, most editors have assumed that the phrasing of the passage is anacoluthic. The word, which is greatly obscured by the strip of parchment connecting Leaves III and VIII, is unusually difficult to photograph but becomes identifiable when reproduced with extremely high contrast at twice actual size (Plate XXXIV).

6.59. *uspuladas* VIII a 19 f.

M *usbul das* (p. 34): "Die Enden der Zeilen umgeschlagen; doch ist hier kein *a* in *usbul/an das zu sehen."

U *usbul das* (p. 43): "Sic Cod., non *usbul das*. Vestigia literae a cum signo comendiario literae n in reflexa membranae parte deteximus." K (p. 14) accepts this reading without additional comment.

The *a* in question occurs at the end of line 19 but has undergone severe marginal bleaching. This letter is shown in Plate XXXV; the complete blackening of the adjoining letters results from the overlong exposure, development, and printing required to make the *a* visible.

6.60. All prior readings omit (1) the quotation dot at the left of VIII d 13, which is too clear to require enlargement, and (2) the — quotation dots introducing VIII d 22–25 (Plate XXXVI). The same readings agree that *i* occurs as the final letter in line 22 (*ibai*) and line 24 (*ussokei*); there is no reason to
doubt this, but at present both i's are covered by the strip of parchment connecting Leaves III and VIII.

6.61. Below VIII d occurs the signature e.

M (p. 57): “Gerade wie das Wolfenbüttler Blatt 280 b ein e zum Custos (einer 5ten Lage) hat, zeigt auch unser Blatt VIII . . . ein e, welches gleichfalls eine fünfte Lage bezeichnen würde.” M’s attempt to compute the length of the entire codex has been noted in 2.4.

U (p. 45) likewise regards the e as a Gothic signature: “Infra textum dextram versus scripta est litera quaternionis E = 5, quae folium Codicis quadregesimum expletum indicat.”

K (as reported by Dietrich, p. xvii) regards the e and other supposed signatures as having no connection with the Gothic text: “[Kaufmann] bestätigte die Vermutungen Brauns hinsichtlich . . . der Bedeutungslosigkeit der Custodes für unser Fragment.”

The e in question is shown in Plate XXXVIIa; with it may be compared the letter shown in Plate XXXVIIb, which has been traced from enlargements of several Gothic e’s in the codex. In contrast with these e’s, the signature exhibits no distinction between thick vertical and thin horizontal strokes, and the central horizontal cross stroke has no terminal serif. Furthermore, the right ends of the top and bottom strokes do not curve toward each other, and the letter consists of only two continuous lines. It is not easy to see, therefore, how the e at the end of Leaf VIII could be construed to belong to the Gothic text or to have any bearing on the length of the commentary.

VII

PROBLEMS OF INTERPRETATION

7.1. PALEOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE helps to clarify a number of passages in the Skeireins, but not all. Some of the most troublesome phrasings in the codex are wholly legible and have not been corrected by either scribe. Though all currently used complete editions (Dietrich, Streitberg, Wrede, Mayr, and Kock) show a general reduction in the number of emendations, the text is still changed in various places, and the meanings of some phrasings are still obscure. For the present purpose, attention will be confined to those passages that are not explicable in terms of paleographic evidence and are either unclear or still subject to editorial alterations.

7.2. The word gaaggwei occurs only in Sk. I (c 12 and d 24) and so has no counterpart in the Gothic Bible and no known Greek equivalent. Following van der Waals, all current editions render this word as ‘restriction, limitation, Einschränkung.’ Without Biblical support, Streitberg glosses the noun as οὐσιοχρωμα, though in accord with his Greek text he uses the same glossing for aggweipa in Rom. 8.35 and 2 Cor. 6.4. With this rendering, I c 11–16 is taken to mean ‘For then would He not have seemed in the limitation of righteousness to violate the plan already preordained from the beginning?’ Dietrich, for example, translates in garaiheins gaaggwein as ‘unter Einschränkung der Gerechtigkeit’; Mossé has ‘par la limitation de la justice.’ Similarly, in I d 23–24 the phrasing witodis gaaggwei is taken to mean ‘limitation of the law’; thus Dietrich has ‘des Gesetzes Einschränkung,’ Mossé ‘la limitation de la loi.’ Dietrich, pp. 18 f., attempts to explain the two passages: in the first, if God had limited righteousness and had not allowed it a free course, the ultimate result would have been a complete neglect of righteousness; in the second, the operation of the law
was not to be restricted by Christ’s salvation of men. In no other place, however, does the commentary use such cryptic expressions. Rather, its style is characteristically explicit and to the point. Even after explanation, ‘limitation of righteousness (justice)’ and ‘limitation of the law’ are not wholly meaningful in their contexts. It appears advisable, therefore, to consider another rendering, preferably one that will not require a special explanation. As already observed, there is no direct evidence in Greek. In Gothic, the noun gaaggwei corresponds to the verb gaaggwejan ‘constrain, enforce.’ If the Gothic evidence is to be taken at face value, gaaggwei means ‘constraint, enforcement.’ This rendering fits the context and needs no separate explanation. In I bc the whole discussion revolves about the statement that the Saviour would have been able to save men by force, provided that force had been appropriate (I b 16, 20, 24, I c 9). In I c 4–10 the commentator says that it would have been improper if the Lord had converted man to godliness by force. Lines 11–16 continue this thought with a rhetorical question: ‘For then would He not have seemed in the enforcement of righteousness to violate the plan already preordained from the beginning?’ Similarly, the phrasing ‘enforcement of the law’ (I d 23–24), even though occurring in an incomplete sentence, is still meaningful in itself and requires no separate exegesis.

7.3. Nearly all interpretations of the text treat I d 5–8 (ip—gasaftjan) as the concluding part of a sentence beginning with gadob in I c 16. With this construction, I c 16-d 8 would mean ‘Now for those who had hardened to the Devil of their own will so as to violate the commandment of God, it was more fitting to assent a second time of their own will to the teaching of the Saviour, to despise the wickedness of him who had formerly deceived them, and to found a knowledge of truth for a revival of the (their) way of life in God.’

1 Cf. Dietrich, p. 5: “Geziemender war es mithin für die, welche nach freiem Willen dem Teufel gehorchten, das Gebot Gottes zu übertreten, daß sie wiederum nach freiem Willen zustimmen sollten der Lehre des Heilandes und verachten die Schlechtigkeit des, der sie vormals verführt hat, und die Erkenntnis der Wahrheit zur Wiedererneuerung des Wandels in Gott aufrichten sollten.” (1904), 287, Jellinek argues that ‘God’ is properly the subject of gasaftjan ‘establish.’ This interpretation makes much better sense. It was the specific function of the Saviour—not of men—to establish a knowledge of truth for a revival of godly ways, and, as the text explains in the next three lines, it was for this reason that the Son became incarnate (inah pis leik mans andnam). It is not necessary, however, to construe ‘God’ to be the understood subject of gasaftjan. I suggest rather that ip—gasaftjan is simply the beginning of a new sentence: ‘But to establish a knowledge of truth for a revival of the way of life in God, He therefore also assumed human form,’ etc. This interpretation agrees with the punctuation of the codex and does not ascribe the function of the Saviour to men.

7.4. In I d 11–14 the meaning of the preposition du has been decidedly troublesome: ei laisareis uns wairpai pisos du gha garaihteins ‘that for us He should become a teacher of (the) righteousness —— God.’ On the basis of the context, nearly every editor has rendered du as ‘before, vor, devant, in — coram.’ Here it should be noted that elsewhere in Gothic the phrase ‘before God’ is expressed by in andwairija ghs (Luke 1.6, 1.8, Rom. 12.17; cf. in andwairija manne ‘before men’ Luke 6.1). At first, in ADA, XXIX, 287, Jellinek argued that garaihteins is an adjectival abstract representing a verb in -jan and so is used with du as a directional preposition: ‘der hinlenkung zu Gott.’ Later, in ADA, XXXVIII (1918), 30, he suggested that garaihteins may stand for garaihteinais ‘of righteousness.’ Kock, however, appears to have found the correct solution, which is very simple, in LUÁ, IX (1919), 4: du is clearly used to mean ‘in accord with, according to’ in Gal. 2.14 ni raihtbaaggand du sunjai aiwogeljons ‘they do not walk uprightly in accord with the truth of the gospel.’

7.5. In I d 14–22 nearly all editors have taken galeikon to mean ‘conform’: ‘For to conform with His wisdom He was thus obliged, both to invite men back with words and deeds and to become a proclaimer of the gospel’s way of life.’ On the other hand, Löbe favored rendering this infinitive as ‘imitate’: ‘For
He was thus obliged to invite men back with words and deeds to imitate His wisdom,' etc. This interpretation was reasserted by Jellinek in ADA, XXXVIII (1918), 31, and subsequently accepted by Kock, LUA, IX (1919), 2. Though the order of words favors the usual translation, it would be hard to make a definite choice without further objective evidence; either rendering would fit the context, and there is no doubt that galeikon may signify either 'conform' (as in Rom. 12.2) or 'imitate, be like' (as in Matt. 6.8). In this instance, as in some others, the punctuation of the codex becomes more important than the phrasing in providing a clue to meaning. The mark : occurs after frodein (line 16) and is confirmed by an initial beginning the next line. Moreover, no further punctuation appears up to the middle of line 22 (usmete:). In terms of scribal practice, this indicates (1) that galeikon is to be connected with frodein, not with mans, and (2) that lines 17–22 are to be read as an unbroken unit: 'both to invite men back with words and deeds and to become,' etc.

7.6. The form hotos (gen. with in) II a 12 is usually translated as 'threat.' In ADA, XXXVIII, 31, Jellinek rightly points out that 'sharp speech, tirade, Scheltrden' would be more in keeping with the Biblical account of Christ's passion and burial and would agree equally well with the attested meaning of gabotjan. The Pharisees became extremely angry and even abusive with Nicodemus, but there is no mention of their threatening him; cf. the Biblical quotations and the accompanying remarks in VIII cd.

7.7. The opening lines of Leaf II refer to events that were to occur much later than Nicodemus' coming to Christ by night (John 3.1–21). Nicodemus, says the commentator, was later to defy official censure by helping Joseph of Arimathea to bury the Saviour after the crucifixion. The following words in II a 12–19 are clear except for the phrase nauh mibhan anastadjans: 'Moreover, for this reason the Saviour, designated the way leading above into the kingdom of God.' The phrase in question has been nearly always supposed to represent 'while still beginning;' though there has been no exact agreement on its meaning. Massmann, for example, has 'dum adhuc incept' with the footnote 'sermonem,' Dietrich 'gleich zu Anfang,' Mosse 'commençant alors pour la première fois.' Streitberg glosses mibhan as 'inzwischen' but does not explain why. For the most part, the phrase has been taken to be an oblique reference to the beginning of Christ's public ministry, which had occurred shortly before Nicodemus' visit, hence 'while still beginning [the public ministry].' Elsewhere, however, the style of the commentary is much too explicit to require the insertion of supposedly understood words. In the first place, it is to be noted that the Gothic form mibhan occurs only in the first three columns of Leaf II (a 14, b 8, c 14). Secondly, in each of these three instances (q.v.) this word can be replaced by pan 'then' but not by mibhan 'while,' so that mibhan would appear to be closer in meaning to pan and should not be translated as 'while.' Thirdly, the closest Biblical parallel to nauh mibhan, viz. nauh+p+h, is used three times in the Bible to mean 'even then' (Luke 1.5, 8.49, 9.42). As much evidence as is available, then, would indicate that nauh mibhan anastadjans can be rendered more accurately as 'beginning even then,' which makes sense in itself and agrees with the context. Bernhardt anticipates this translation with his phrasing 'etiamtum simul incipiens' but offers no explanation.

7.8. In II a 25-b 5 isapapro can be taken to represent either the subject or the object of qab, as noted by Jellinek, ADA, XXXVIII, 29. To judge from the dot after gabaurp in II b 3, usbulan in line 5 is to be construed as passive. In both instances, fortunately, either interpretation retains the essential meaning of the sentence.

7.9. h and l are transposed in pwalh = pwaldl II b 4. It is possible that both the first scribe and the second overlooked the lh-spelling, but in any event it is clear that neither undertook to change it. That the transposition may have occurred through metathesis is also possible, though the records of the language appear to show no parallel instances to support such an assump-
There may be some reason, therefore, for considering a third possibility. In the spelling of the Gothic codices, h is frequently omitted when occurring medially before, after, or between consonants and when standing finally after vowels, e.g., als = alks, hiuhma = hiuhma, uswaurs = uswaurths, liuteip = liuteip, pairwakands = pairwakands, barjanoh = barjanoh, haparmme = haparmme. This omission of h is too persistent and too widespread to be the result of mere coincidence. In some instances, too, scribes have inserted h into forms in which it was never pronounced, viz. waurtai = waurtai ‘root’ (OE wyr, OS wurt, OHG wurz) Rom. 11.7, gawurhtai = gawurhtai ‘rooted’ Eph. 3.18 (two MSS, Ambros. A and B), and drausnos John 6.12 = drausnos Sk. VII d 15 f. ‘droppings, fragments’; if drausnos is not related to drieisan ‘fall, drop,’ it has no known Germanic or Indo-European cognates, for the parallel forms in Greek, Latin, Welsh, Lithuanian, and Lettish make no allowance for an h in the Gothic word.2 Compare also pauh (Cod. Ambros. B) = pau (Cod. A) in 2 Cor. 13.5 and snauh = snau (or snau-un?) in 1 Thess. 2.16. Some scholars, especially Wrede,3 believe that this unpredictable omission and insertion of h may indicate a change in pronunciation from [x] to [h]. An early development of this kind after the period of the so-called breaking seems very probable. At the same time, it is hardly believable that a mere change in quality, [x] > [h], would cause the scribes to omit h where it should be written and to insert it into forms in which it had never been pronounced; even the worst scribal spelling does not show such phenomena without some reason. In short, unless [h] was being (or had been) lost in certain positions in scribal Gothic, the unpredictability of the h-spellings is simply incomprehensible. In preliterate times h had already been lost in certain consonant clusters, as in waurstw, waurstwe, waurstweigs, waurstwja < PGC. wurh-stw ‘work’ (Av. varš-tvam

---

2 See the entries under waurt(h)ts, gawur(h)ts, and drau(h)nos in S. Feist, Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache, 3rd ed. (Leiden, 1939), and F. Holthausen, Gotisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (Heidelberg, 1934).

3 “Die Sprache der Ostgoten in Italien,” QF, LXIII (1891), 175.

4 According to E. Sievers, who applies his method of Schallanalyse to the problem in BGDSL, LI (1928), 148–150, the combination of pwhal with the following word uspulan would be rhythmically irregular and accordingly incorrect. This conclusion is based, albeit tacitly, on a reconstructed fourth-century (or even Pre-Gothic) pronunciation and disregards the possibility of sound change.
sentence. First, it is to be noted that elsewhere in Gothic in pis regularly means 'because of this.' Secondly, when ei occurs as a separate word, as the MS spelling here would indicate, it means 'which, that,' as in 2 Tim. 3.8 pamma haidau ei 'in the manner which,' Luke 1.20 und pana dag ei 'until the day that.' Thirdly, the mark: after nekademus must represent a full stop for the reason that the following words in pis ei 'Because of this, which' can only begin a new sentence. Accordingly, if the codex spelling and punctuation are to be followed, the passage represents two sentences, and there are no understood but missing words to be supplied: 'Nicodemus did not understand this then. Because of this, which he had heard for the first time from the Master,' etc.

7.11. Almost without exception, biuhti in II b 20 has been taken to refer to Christ's manner of speaking, e.g., 'consuectudinem [loquendi Domini]' (Massmann, 1834), 'seine Gewohnheit (zu reden)' (Dietrich, 1900), 'sa façon [de parler]' (Mossé, 1956). Yet it is unlike the style of the commentary to be so explicit in phrasing: a specific reference to Christ, to speech, and to manner might be expected. Elsewhere in Gothic, biuhti invariably indicates a practice (Luke 1.9, 2.27, 2.42, 4.16, John 18.39). The word is never used to indicate the manner (haidus) in which something is done. If biuhti has the same meaning in the Skeireins as in the Bible, the preceding lines would indicate that the practice referred to is the washing (jwalk II b 4) through which men will undergo a spiritual rebirth, viz. baptism. Christ's allusion to this practice baffles Nicodemus because he is not familiar with it (ni kunnands biuhti). In a practical sense, Bernhardt anticipated this interpretation with a suggested emendation: anparaisos gaburpais ni kunnands biuhti.

7.12. The noun doms,* which occurs only in Sk. II c 9 and VI c 4, has been assigned a variety of meanings, but the two contexts in which it occurs give no objective clue as to which is cor-

rect. All presently used complete editions render the word as 'glory, Ruhm' in accord with van der Waals' translation 'glorie,' which was approved by Jellinek in ADA, XX (1894), 152. The main argument in favor of this rendering is the fact that cognate forms in some other Old Germanic languages sometimes have a similar connotation, e.g., in Beowulf, Havamal, and the Heliand, but the word under consideration is neither English nor Icelandic nor Saxon. If doms* means 'glory' in II c 9, it is by no means clear what the 'future glory' (anawairban dom) of Nicodemus is supposed to be. If it is not his eternal reward, it may be his courage in defending Christ (John 7.50 f.), but in either event the supposed meaning is far from being explicit. Moreover, Gothic already distinguishes sharply between two concepts of 'glory'; contrast gasainis wulfn gis 'thou shalt behold the glory [= splendor] of God' (John 11.40) with gif hauhein gis 'give glory [= honor] to God' (John 9.24).* So far as Gothic is concerned, the only objective evidence for the meaning of doms* is that provided by the corresponding verb domjan. This verb regularly expresses 'judge' (koweir), but only in the specific sense of 'discern, distinguish': 1 Cor. 10.15 domei [koware] jis patei gis 'judge [= discern, distinguishing] for yourselves what I say'; 1 Cor. 11.29 ni domjands [koware] leik fns 'not distinguishing the body of the Lord'; 2 Cor. 5.14 f. unte friapu xaus dishabaih uns domjands [kowares] pata patei ains sau fallans gasawill 'for the love of Christ moves us who have discerned this, that one has died for all'; 2 Cor. 10.12 unte ni gadaurum domjan [kowares] unsis 'for we do not dare to distinguish ourselves.' Similarly, domjan is used elsewhere to mean 'distinguish as being, discern to be' (Luke 7.29, 10.29, 16.15; Gal. 2.17; Phil. 3.8). When koweir refers to judging in the specific sense of making a formal decision, as in pronouncing a verdict or a sentence, it is regularly expressed by stefan, as in John 7.24, 7.51, 12.48. In brief, the objective evidence provided by Gothic does not favor

* Massmann, for instance, translates the word as 'intellectum (judicium, cognitionem)' in II c 9 and as 'sensus' in VI c 4, whereas Uppström prefers 'conditionem (habitum animi)' and 'facultatem (potentiam),' respectively. Bernhardt uses 'destinationem' for both occurrences.


7 Here and below, the Greek form is taken from Streitberg's Vorlage.
glossing doms* as ‘glory’ but rather suggests that the word is related in meaning to domjan, just as stava (f.) is related in meaning to stojan: Verbs—domjan ‘discern, distinguish,’ stojan ‘judge, sentence’; Nouns—doms* ‘discernment, distinction,’ stava ‘judgment, sentence.’ This glossing of doms* agrees specifically with the context of the two passages in which the word occurs. In the first (II c 8–15), Nicodemus is represented as being unable to understand or believe the statement that a man must be born again to behold the kingdom of heaven. Nevertheless, Christ foresees that this Pharisee will one day possess discernment as well as abounding faith: ‘But the Saviour, perceiving his future discernment, and perceiving that he was to thrive in faith, explained to him as to one who was then ignorant.’ In the second passage (VI b 21-c 8), the deeds of Jesus are contrasted with the mere words of John the Baptist, who is described as being only human, fallible, and capable of being misunderstood. Unlike the words of John, the deeds of Christ are not subject to dispute but rather reveal the Saviour’s distinction: ‘every statement derived from men can be changed to something different, but these holy deeds, being undisputed, manifest the distinction of the Doer, signifying clearly that He was sent from heaven by the Father.’

7.13. Nearly all translations agree at least on the meaning of II c 22-d 2: ‘For it was a necessity, and it was in keeping with nature to receive the plan of baptism’ (naudipaurfis au kw was: jah gadob wistai du garehn daupeinais andniman). However, naudipaurfis has been variously construed to be a noun (‘necessity’) or an adjective (‘necessary’), gadob as a finite verb (‘it was in keeping’) or an adjective (‘fitting’). Furthermore, Lundgren took gadob wistai to represent ‘naturally fitting (naturligen passande).’ This interpretation, reasserted by Jellinek in ADA, XXXVIII, 32, was subsequently accepted by Kock in LUÅ, IX, 2: ‘und natürlich passend zum Empfang [andniman] der Taufordnung.’ This rendering is rejected here for four reasons. First, if gadob is construed to be an adjective modifying naudipaurfis, or if both are adjectives, they do not agree in gender, though of course an incongruence is possible. Secondly, the mark : intervenes; there would be no reason for punctuating between noun and adjective or between adjective and adjective. Thirdly, in Rom. 11.24 ‘natural, naturally’ (κατά φύσιν) is expressed by us wistai, not by wistai alone. And lastly, a more literal translation not only avoids the foregoing difficulties but also agrees better with the meaning of the sentence as a whole.

7.14. Three successive words have proved to be troublesome in II d 12–19: ‘wherefore appropriately following these [the soul and the body] He designated two things as well, — — — the plan of baptism’ (dūphe gatemiba and pana pise laist. jah twos. ganamnida waihts: swesa bajopum du daupeinais garehnsai). The first word in question, swesa, usually has been taken to represent an adjective meaning ‘zukommend, angehörig’ and modifying waihts, even in more recent editions (Dietrich, Mayr; Wrede makes no commitment). Yet waihts (fem. pl.) and swesa (neut. pl. or fem. sg.) would be incongruent, and in this instance no words intervene. In IF, XVIII (1906), 402, Streitberg pointed out that swesa occurs as a noun as well as an adjective (see Luke 15.12–13, 30), so that no incongruence need be assumed. The second word, bajopum, has been generally interpreted as ‘both’ without accounting for the fact that it occurs in the dative. A parallel use of this form appears in Matt. 9.17 (bajopum gabairgada) where the Greek text has a nominative (μιᾷς γενεσεὶς ἡμᾶς της κυρίου). Though the meaning is presumably the same in each language—‘both [the wine and the wine-skins] are preserved’—the Gothic phrasing is literally ‘it is preserved [in relation] to both.’ The third word, dw, has been nearly always coupled with swesa as an adjective meaning ‘belonging,’ so that this combination has been taken to represent ‘belonging to (with),’ a rendering that finds no support in the Gothic Bible. Dietrich’s translation serves to illustrate the usual treatment of all three words in question: ‘hast . . . zwei Substanzen genannt als zukommend [swesa] beiden [bajopum] bei [dw] der Taufordnung.’ Kock, however, treats swesa as a noun and so assumes no incongruence, accounts for the dative form of bajopum, and
assigns *du* an attested Biblical meaning: ‘nannte er auch zwei Sachen [water and the Spirit], Dinge, die, der Taufordnung nach, den beiden [soul and body] angehörig waren.’ His phrasing ‘Dinge . . . angehörig,’ it will be observed, functions syntactically as a noun; on *du* ‘nach, in accord with, according to’ see 7.4. Kock’s interpretation is accordingly adopted here. In ADA, XXXVIII, 32, Jellinek would have *du daupoinais garehsmai* modify gnanaminda, though this arrangement (actually a transposition) completely disregards the punctuation: ‘Er machte für die einrichtung der taufe zwei dinge namhaft.’

7.15. *andaphis* II d 22 exhibits a variety of related meanings in the Bible, e.g., ‘discreet, prudent, moderate’ (Tit. 1.8), ‘rational, reasonable’ (Rom. 12.1), and even ‘sober’ (Tim. 3.2), so that its Greek equivalents reveal nothing more than its wide semantic scope. Consequently, more objective evidence in Gothic is required to determine the literal significance of the word and how it can be rendered most accurately. The verb *andghanjan* occurs in Luke 16.4 with *sik* (‘I have thought of what I will do’), with *sik* again in Sk. VII a 3 (‘thinking of, considering’), and without *sik* in Sk. VII a 18–19 with no perceptible difference in meaning. These usages, which are more consistent, would suggest that *andghanjan* means literally ‘think of, conceive in the mind, envision,’ though of course more objective evidence is desirable. Fortunately, in this instance the context is unusually helpful. In lines 6–11 the body is described as visible and the soul as spiritual (i.e., invisible), and in lines 12–25 the same contrast is drawn again, this time with respect to the water of baptism, which is visible, and to the Spirit, which is merely ‘thought of’ or ‘envisioned.’ That the commentator confirmed his point by equating body with water and soul with Spirit is suggested by the phrasing of the last six lines on the leaf (II a 20–25). If the following lines had been preserved, the passage might be something like ‘. . . namely the visible water and the envisioned Spirit, which verily (betoken) the seen (body and the unseen soul)’: *pata raikis anasunjo wato jah pana andaphian*

7.16. The : occurring at the end of III b 3 has been regularly transcribed as representing a stop (, or ). From the viewpoint of sentence structure, this interpretation is entirely possible, but it has also involved two assumptions: first, that the : in line 6 can be safely disregarded, and secondly, that *hraineis* (line 5) and *hrainei* (line 7) have precisely the same meaning, viz. ‘cleansing.’ Dietrich, for example, renders III b 4–16 as ‘weil bereits auch der Brauch der Leibesreinigung [leikis hraineino] abgeschafft worden [:] und die bei Gott geltende Reinigung [hrainei] geboten war, sollten sie nicht mehr sich beliebigen,’ etc. On the difference in meaning between verbal abstracts in -eins and adjectival abstracts in -ei, compare *weitwodeins* ‘(act of) testifying’ VI c 16 with *weitwodei* ‘testimony’ VI b 16, *wajamerins* ‘(act of) blaspheming’ Matt. 26.65 with *wajameri* ‘blasphemy’ John 10.33. The word *hrainei* occurs only in III b 7, but here its formal distinction from *hraineins* does not appear to be accidental. It would be entirely foreign to the commentary and its meticulous choice of words to use the forms *hraineins* ‘cleansing’ and *hrainei* ‘cleanliness’ as synonyms in the same sentence, especially when there would be no need to express ‘cleansing’ twice. The actual phrasing and punctuation make better sense if accepted at face value. The ‘cleanliness’ that ‘had been commanded by God’ was founded directly upon a divine command (Num. 15.24–31, 19.5–10, Lev. 4.12; cf. also Heb. 9.13, 9.19).

7.17. The phrasing *pisu unfauweisane missadele aimaisos* III b 23–25 has been very troublesome; for emendations, see the apparatus. Those current editions that retain this wording (Dietrich, Streitberg, Wrede, Mayr) have done so only by suffrance in accord with Jellinek’s theory that the passage represents a misunderstanding of *axovov* ‘unwilling’ as a dependent genitive (ADA, XX, 153). As Dietrich remarks, p. 21, the phrasing would mean literally ‘a certain misdeed of the unpremeditating,’ to which he would add ‘sinners.’ As observed in 4.25, however,
this instance is one of five in which the construct state appears: 'a certain misdeed of the unpremeditating' is standard Semitic New Testament Greek for 'a certain unpremeditated misdeed.'

7.18. ufar miton munandane, which has been at least as troublesome as any other phrasing in the commentary, occurs in III c 11–12. All editors except Cromhout combine ufar with miton to form a supposed compound verb meaning 'forget,' and all but Uppström change munandane to munandans. With these modifications, the meaning of III b 23-c 12 becomes 'For the Law prescribed for a certain unpremeditated misdeed that the ash of a heifer burned outside the camp should be cast afterward into clean water and sprinkled with hyssop and red wool, as be-fitted those who intended to forget.' The emendation 'those who intended to forget' supposes that persons who had unwittingly committed misdeeds would wish to forget them. However, the objections to this emendation are too strong to be disregarded. In the first place, we have no evidence that Gothic possessed such a verb as *ufarmiton ('forget' is expressed by ufar-munnun in Mark 8.14 and Phil. 2.30, 3.14). Secondly, there is no Biblical support whatever for the assumption that the sprinkling was intended to make offenders forget misdeeds; the sprinkling was simply an act of purification. Thirdly, the so-called 'misdeeds' were not sins (culpable offenses) but merely acts that produced uncleanness, e.g., touching a dead body or a grave (Num. 19.13–17). And fourthly, munandane is very clear; neither scribe has altered the word. Jellinek, ADA, XX, 155, suggests that ufar and miton are separate words meaning 'against their intention (gegen ihre absicht!)' but does not attempt to explain munandane. The noun mitons occurs in nine other contexts, in which it means 'intention, attitude, thought.' ufar, however,

8 Cf. Dietrich, pp. 7–8: "Denn das Gesetz verordnete für eine der unvorsätzlichen Misssethiten als Gebot [=the second, cancelled wido] die Asche eines außerhalb des Lagers verbrannten Kalbes; danach aber, daß man diese in reines Wasser werfen und mit Hyssop und roter Wolle bestreuen sollte, wie es sich ziemte für die, welche vergessen wollten" (italics added).
9 Matt. 9.4; Mark 7.21; Luke 2.35, 5.22, 6.8, 9.46–47; Rom. 14.1; 2 Cor. 10.15.
10 Neh. 7.2; Matt. 10.24, 10.37; Mark 6.14, 26.32, 27.45; Luke 1.33, 3.13, 4.39, 6.40, 9.1, 19.14, 19.17, 19.27; John 6.1, 6.17, 10.40, 18.1; Rom. 9.5; 1 Cor. 4.6; 2 Cor. 1.5, 2.1, 8.3, 11.5, 12.5–6, 12.13; Eph. 3.20, 4.6, 4.10, 6.16; Col. 3.14; 2 Thess. 2.4; Phil. 16; Sk. VI b 17, VII b 15.
11 Dietrich, p. 9: "Aber Johannes verkündigte die Taufe des Buße und verhieß Vergebung der Sünden denen, die sich einfältig bekehren; aber der Herr bei der Vergebung der Sünden auch die Gabe des heiligen Geistes, indem er (noch dazu) ihnen auch verlieh, daß sie Söhne des Himmelsreiches würden."
the following column (III 1 d 13–24), John admits that he himself can baptize only in water but promises that one who is mightier than he (viz. Christ) will come after him and will baptize the faithful in the Holy Spirit. In brief, it is John—not the Lord—who makes the promise. The substitution of *fratria* for *fratrins* makes it necessary to suppose that the Baptist's prophecy concerning Christ was not made by the Baptist but by Christ, even though the contrary is indicated by the Biblical passage quoted on the same page of the MS. The second type of emendation, *fratrins + duaeins* (or *laeins*), would represent the Lord's baptism (or teaching) as promising the gift of the Holy Spirit, but the same objections are still applicable. There is no reason for altering the phrasing *ip finsi. at afeta*. The use of a genitive in anticipation of the word it modifies is especially characteristic of the commentary (see 4.12); even the first page of the codex shows nine examples. If III 1 c 15–25 is accepted without alteration, it agrees with its own context as well as with the Biblical evidence: 'and [John] promised forgiveness of misdeeds to those who merely reformed, whereas with the Lord's forgiveness of sins he promised the gift of the Holy Spirit as well,' etc.

7.20. Though the meaning of IV a 5–19 has given no difficulty, the sentence construction of these lines has appeared to be extremely unwieldy. Dietrich (pp. 22–23) describes the construction as a form of anacoluthon. As conventionally analyzed, it most assuredly is, beginning with an absolute dative participial phrase (lines 5–10), then shifting to a complex-compound Biblical quotation (lines 10–17), and finally changing into a nominative (or accusative?) participial phrase, perhaps an instance of sesis onomonaton (lines 17–19).13 Even with the most

---

13 Jantzen, 3rd ed., p. 139: "Aber Johannes verkündigte die Taufe der Buße und verhiess Erlös der Vergehen; aber die Taufe des Herrn (verheißen) zu der Vergebung der Sünden auch Verleihung des heiligen Geistes, ihnen auch verliehen, daβ sie Söhne des Reiches (Gottes) werden."

14 Dietrich, p. 9, adds to the complication by including lines 19–23 as well: "Daher (sagte er) also seinen Jüngern, die über die Reinigung bei den Juden nachforschten und zu ihnen sprachen: 'Rabbi, welcher mit dir jenseits des Jordans war, für den du gezeugt hast, siehe der taucht, und alle gehen zu ihm'—daß sie noch in Unkenntnis waren in bezug auf den Heiland, deswegen beherrsch er sie mit den Worten: 'Jener soll wachsen, ich aber abnehmen.'"
Lord of glory' or 'the greatness of the glory of the Lord.' Kock, *LUA*, IX, 2, decides in favor of the latter on the basis of *Heliod* 5–6 *foilis teudo barno* 'many of the children of mankind.' This conclusion is justified by the context, but the most tangible evidence is provided by the punctuation of the codex. The dot following *ains* indicates that this word is emphasized: 'the greatness of the Lord's glory.'

7.23. Some editions delete the second *i* of *markaillius* in IV d 21 because this letter does not occur in the Greek or Latin form of the name Marcellus. It is of course possible that both scribes are in error, but inasmuch as Greek words, especially proper names, were still not naturalized into the language and fluctuated widely in scribal spelling, it would not be surprising if *markaillius* were simply a new formation based on such parallel forms as *sabaillius*, *teibairiuus*, *lusanianus*, and *punianus*, in which *-iuus* is to be expected. In short, what is correct in Greek and Latin is not ipso facto correct in Gothic.

7.24. As noted in 6.30, IV d 25 has been altered to read *ip anpar wehia*. In view of the fact that it has been corrected, this phrasing was evidently satisfactory and meaningful to the scribe. However, the leaf comes to an end with these three words, so that the rest of the sentence can only be conjectured. Here *wehia* may conceivably represent either of two verbs, an adjective, or either of two nouns; the possibility that the word might extend into the next line is precluded by the following single dot, so that a form like *wehia- ba* would appear to be out of the question. A verb meaning ‘I contend with’ might be fitted into the context but would take a dative and so would be hard to combine with the form *anpar*. A verb meaning ‘I sanctify’ would take an accusative object but is not easily associated with the preceding lines. The adjective ‘holy’ might be intelligible here, but there is no ostensible reason for inflecting it as a weak singular or as a strong plural in combination with *anpar*. A noun for ‘village’ would neither combine with *anpar* nor agree readily with the context. Among the possible meanings of *wehia*, perhaps ‘priest’ offers the least difficulty. The preceding lines refer to the priests Sabellius and Marcellus, though neither is specifically described as a priest. If *ip anpar wehia* means ‘but another priest,’ the third priest may have been one whose beliefs might be compared or contrasted with those of Sabellius, but this suggestion is necessarily conjectural and may be wholly wrong. In any event, there is nothing to be gained in disregarding the corrected phrasing, the punctuation, or the immediate context, which is concerned with the identity of the Father and the Son, not with that of the Holy Spirit (6.30).

7.25. The first thirteen lines of Leaf V, which paraphrase John 5.19–20, contrast the Father with the Son by describing one as loving and the other as loved, one as showing and the other as imitating. Inasmuch as ‘one . . . the other’ is expressed by *anparana . . . (A)naparanukhan* in V a 9–11, some scholars have concluded that *anparana* should be inserted before *pana* in line 6. It is true, to be sure, that some parallel constructions in Gothic have *anpar* as the first component, e.g., *anparai . . . sumaihkan* (Mark 8.28), *anparaijan . . . anparaijan* (Mark 6.15), but we find also *sum . . . anparanukhan* (Mark 4.5), *sumaih . . . anparai* (John 7.12), and three instances of *ains . . . anpar* (Matt. 6.24, Luke 7.41, 17.35). So far as Biblical Gothic is concerned, therefore, there would appear to be no pressing reason for changing the phrasing of line 6, which is already intelligible in its present form. Moreover, as a letter from E. A. Ebbinghaus has pointed out, there is another aspect of the problem to be considered. In each of the foregoing parallels, the first component is always an emphatic singular (‘one . . . the other’) or an indefinite plural (‘some . . . others’). As a demonstrative, on the other hand, *sa* is strongly deictic as compared with such indefinite forms as *sums* and *anpar*, so that in *pana . . . aparanukhan* it is much more emphatic, and the same is true of *pana* in line 8. This interpretation agrees precisely with the context, which lays heavy stress on the anti-Sabellian argument that the Father is one Person and the Son another: ‘This One was loving, That Other loved.’

7.26. The meaning of V a 5–23 has been greatly obscured by
the fact that the final verb *mipqipaina* does not occur elsewhere in Gothic and makes no sense when translated literally: ‘. . . He then declared this: namely that This One was loving, That Other loved, One showing, the Other imitating His deeds, that by this they should learn to acknowledge the two Persons of the Father and the Son and should then say together.’ All interpretations that have been suggested are based on the assumption that the word preceding *mipqipaina* is *ni* rather than the actual form *nu* (6.33). Massmann takes *mipqipaina* to mean ‘disputant’ or perhaps ‘blasphemarent,’ though ‘dispute’ is expressed by *sakan* (as in John 7.52) or, in a milder sense, by *sokjan* (as in Mark 1.27), while ‘blasphemy’ is regularly rendered by *wajamerjan* (as in Matt. 9.3). For emendations of the word see the apparatus. Van der Waals and Heyne suppose that in this passage *mib* must be a separate word, but inasmuch as there are no parallel usages to support this assumption, all later editors have regarded *mib* here as being the same adverbial prefix that occurs in *mipbarbaidjan, mipfaginon,* etc. Following Dietrich, all presently used complete editions gloss *mipgipan* as ‘repeat, imitate (nachspechen),’ but merely for want of a better word. Streitberg’s glossary suggests ‘mitsprechen’ as well but describes the passage as unclear. In *Annales Universitatis Saraviensis,* IV (1955), 84 f., I hazarded the guess that ‘say together’ might stand for ‘identify,’ but this is semantically forced. What should have been obvious from the first is the fact that *mipgipan* is calqued upon *owu-owu* ‘agree, assent, say yes, be in conformity.’ Both the Greek and the Gothic verbs mean literally ‘say with.’

7.27. *ainohun* (masc. acc. sg.) V b 18 is no longer altered in Wrede, Mayr, or Kock for the reason that this form is now recognized as occurring four times with *-n-* as opposed to nine times with *-nn-*. However, as pointed out in a letter from E. A. Ebbinghaus, the implications of this 9:4 ratio are materially affected by the fact that the form with *-n-* represents the invariable usage of Scribe 2 in the CA; even the correction of this word in Mark 9.8 retains *-n-*.

7.28. Löbe, Massmann (1857 ed.), Uppström, and Bernhardt regard the accusative participial phrase *anparana—waldusni* V c 9–13 as being the object of *bandweib* (line 6). As a form of zeugma, this usage would have parallels in the text (see 4.17). Lücke and Kock, on the other hand, construe the phrase to be absolute, while Lücke and Streitberg would add *jah is andnimands—taujands* (lines 13–17) as a nominative absolute. Other editors, e.g., Wrede and Mayr, remain noncommittal. Mechanically, the latter interpretation is possible, but it may be worth noting (1) that the number of clear-cut accusative absolutes in Gothic is small and (2) that neither of the two attested nominative absolutes (Mark 6.21 and John 11.44) uses a present participle. Under these conditions, the mathematical odds favoring an accusative absolute followed by a present nominative absolute are virtually non-existent; the construction would have no parallel in the language. It is at least less venturesome to regard *bandweib—anparana—waldusni* as an instance of zeugma and *jah is andnimands—taujands* as an instance of scesis onomatlon (4.18), especially since these constructions are well attested in both the Bible and the *Skeireins*.

7.29. There is no need to assume with Dietrich that *gap* is to be supplied before *ei* in V c 18. The quotation beginning with *Ei* simply completes the sentence beginning in line 13. Kauffmann’s misreading of *is* in line 14 as *is* or *is* put Dietrich at a great disadvantage. Choosing the latter form and expanding it to *Jesus,* he assumed that it would require a finite verb and therefore inserted ‘sagte’ into his translation. This in turn led him to interpret *ak filaus—waldusni* as an interrogative sentence (lines 6–13). Among all the interpretations of the commentary, there is no better example of the way in which a single misdechipherment can start a chain reaction of error for which the editor is only partly responsible.

7.30. Two infinitives occur with a finite verb in VI a 8–11 du leilitai vieilai galaubjan: *iohanne hausjan bukedun.* Some older and some current editions change one of the infinitives to a present participle, *galaubjandans or hausjandans.* In the codex,
however, the mark : has been inserted above the line and thus would indicate that the scribe was willing to accept the infinitives. The : in question, which is confirmed by two small punctures showing on the opposite side of the leaf, is too clear to require separate reproduction, but if the punctures are still visible in the frontispiece of VI d, they will be found in the right-hand column, line 10, above and slightly between the two vertical strokes of the second n: panei insandi.

7.31. The phrasing of VI b 8–14 has proved to be unusually troublesome: jains auk mannskaikaim waurdam weitwodjands: tweifjan puhta: sunjeins wisands paim unkunnandam mahta. The gist of the passage up to the last three words offers no great difficulty: John the Baptist, being only human, was incapable of expressing his testimony in such a way as to avoid causing doubt in the minds of some persons, even though his utterances were true. Though most editions agree on this much, their renderings show considerable diversity of opinion. If the wording is not changed in Gothic (see the apparatus), it is changed in translation. In ADA, XX, 160, for example, Jellinek gives only a paraphrase: 'Wenn J oh. auch wahrfert war, so konnten seine äußeren doch von denen, die dies nicht wüßten, bezweifelt werden.' Kock's version is among the more imaginative: 'denn jener, indem er mit menschlichen Worten Zeugnis ablegte, schien, trotzdem er wahrhaftig war, denen Zweifel zu erregen, welche die Dinge, die (Gott) möglich sind, nicht kannten.' A much more defensible rendering has been proposed by C. L. Wrenn in M.L.R, XXV (1930), 186 f.: 'for this man, bearing witness with [merely] human words, has seemed to cause doubt—although he spoke the truth. To the ignorant he could [seem so].' The major substance of this interpretation is adopted here, though with a completely literal translation, no interpolation of words that are not implicit in the Gothic text, and with one essential difference in the rendering of mahta: 'For that man, testifying in human words, seemed to cause doubt—being truthful with those ignorant folk, he might.' On the use of mahta for tweifjan mahta and for Biblical parallels, see 4.17.

7.32. The clause unte at paim gabvairbam frakunnan ni skuld ist VI d 13–15 has proved to be unusually difficult and has received a variety of renderings. Dietrich, for example, has 'Weil bei den Freunden [Anhängern] Missachtung nicht eintreten wird...'; Kock stays closer to the actual phrasing: 'weil man, soweit die Fügsmen in Betracht kommen, nicht verachten darf...'; and Jellinek, ADA, XXXVIII (1918), 35, prefers 'denn bei den gläubigen wird es nicht verschämmt werden...'. To consider the least complicated item first, ni skuld ist is the same neuter impersonal construction that occurs in Mark 2.26, 6.8, 10.2, Luke 15.32, John 18.31, etc.: 'is not lawful,' or more literally, 'must not be.' As all editors have recognized, gabvairbs 'amenable, tractable' is easily glossed as the antonym of un-gabvairbs Tit. 1.6, 1.10, 2 Tim. 3.2, and frakunnan takes a dative object. The troublesome word, however, is at. Among the Greek prepositions that it represents in the Bible, viz. από, πάρα, πρό (disregarding expressions of time), παρά occurs not only in the more literal sense of 'with, along with, alongside of' (e.g., John 14.23, 14.25, 18.16) but also in the transferred sense of 'with regard to, insofar as is concerned': Luke 18.27. 'The things that are impossible with men [so far as men are concerned, at mannam πάρα ἀνθρώπου] are possible with God [so far as God is concerned, at γιὰ πάρα τοῖς θεου].' It is thus possible to regard at paim gabvairbam as a prepositional phrase meaning something like 'so far as the amenable are concerned,' and it is evidently this line of reasoning that forms the basis of Kock's 'soweit die Fügsmen in Betracht kommen.' But if at paim gabvairbam is a prepositional phrase, frakunnan is left without an independent object and creates a very awkward construction. To dispose of the problem, we might suppose that paim gabvairbam is object of both preposition and verb, but there appear to be no parallel instances to support such a conclusion. As a further possibility, at might be supposed to have no function, but this is equally devoid of proof. Balg's glossary states that at has been inserted here to avoid ambiguity but neglects to stipulate which ambiguity. It is true that this word may or may not occur in phrasings
like (at) imma rodjandin (cf. Mark 5.35 and 14.43), but only in such participial constructions. It would appear, therefore, that the only remaining solution that will agree with the wording of at paim gañairbam frakunnan is to identify paim as the object of at and gañairbam as the object of frakunnan. The apparent objection that gañairbam is a weak form and so must be combined with paim is contradicted by the parallel construction paim swa waaurpanam VI c 23, in which waaurpanam is not modified by paim but is nevertheless weak (4.16). In the preceding lines (VI d 4–12) Christ has sharply rebuked the Pharisees for their unwillingness to believe. The passage under consideration then refers to the faithful, who are the very antithesis of the Pharisees: 'Because amenable men must not be scorned along with them, however, some also have heard His voice,' etc.

7.33. In VII c 18–21 is has been regularly interpreted as a nominative: ainharjanoh sua filu svas widla andniman is gatawida 'He made everyone receive as much as he wished.' As pointed out by Jellinek in ADA, XXXVIII, 30, a genitive construction is also possible, in which case the rendering would be 'He made everyone receive as much of it,' etc. Unfortunately, Jellinek simply raises the problem and leaves it unsolved. In Gothic, a personal pronoun subject is to be expected when required to avoid ambiguity, e.g., confusion of the leper with Christ, the priest, or Moses in Mark 1.44–45: jah [Christ] qab ... gudjin ... moses ... ip is [the leper].' The Gothic word order of lines 18–21 (swaei—gatawida) is as follows: 'so that everyone as much as he-wished to-receive he-made.' Without is to distinguish the second 'he' (Christ) from the first (everyone), the phrasing would be ambiguous.

7.34. As the Gothic Bible shows, filusna usually means 'abundance' or 'excess' (Neh. 5.18, 2 Cor. 12.7, 2 Tim. 3.9), but in Sk. VII b 6–8 the word is clearly used to refer to the multitude: 'they made the crowd [certainly not the abundance!] sit down.' In VII c 12–14 filusna occurs again, this time with its more usual meaning: 'the abundance of His power.' Up to this point there is no difficulty, but the third occurrence of the word on the same leaf raises a problem: VII c 22–25 ni in waihtai waninassu pisai filusnai wairpan gatawida. Here translators have taken pisai filusnai to refer to the multitude; thus Dietrich has 'nirgendes für die Menge Mangel eintrat.' To this interpretation there are three objections. First, with pisai filusnai construed to mean 'the crowd,' the phrasing is clumsy and unlike the style of the commentary: 'He caused there to be no lack at all to the crowd.' Secondly, it is not easy to believe that filusna would be used twice in the same sentence, each time with a different meaning. Thirdly, under these circumstances there would be no sense in using pisai with filusnai in VII c 23–24. When a noun first appears alone and then is repeated with an accompanying demonstrative, the demonstrative serves to express a back-reference, as in 'a man ... this [aforesaid] man'; cf. Matt. 5.25 'Be in agreement with your adversary [andastau] quicky, ... lest perhaps this adversary [sa andastau] deliver you to the judge [staun], and this judge [sa stau] deliver you to the officer.' The passage under consideration employs precisely the same type of construction: filusna (line 13) ... pisai filusnai (lines 23–24). If filusna did not have the same meaning in both of these occurrences, there could be no back-reference, and pisai would be wholly out of place. Accordingly, the regular translation of the passage is doubtful.

7.35. All editors have assumed that in VIII b 17–18 faura and wisan represent the compound verb faurawisan, which occurs in 2 Cor. 8.11. The assumption has led to some difficulty, for the only attested meaning of faurawisan is 'be forward, be ready,' which makes no sense in the passage under consideration: '... marveling at the Lord's teaching: among all men they openly reckoned it to be forward (ready).' Bernhardt recognized this fact but also felt that the context would require something like 'be superior, excel (sich auszeichnen, praestare),' a rendering that has been widely adopted. Whether right or wrong, it is still purely contextual and has not been justified in terms of Biblical Gothic. In Rom. 12.10 faura is combined with rahnjan to make a very literal rendering of προηγομένων 'regard
before’ = ‘regard as superior, prefer.’ In terms of Biblical Gothic, accordingly, fawa visan rahjan may be translated without contextual guessing as ‘reckon to be (regard as being) superior.’

7.36. As Dietrich’s corrected translation indicates (p. 30), the participial phrasing beginning with at neikaudaimau in VIII c 17 is not a new sentence but a continuation and explanation of the remark beginning in line 12: ‘Herein they [the Pharisees] are found to be uttering a fallacy—that not one of the rulers or Pharisees believed in Him—because Nicodemus . . . also argued boldly for the truth,’ etc. As in the passage discussed in 7.35, however, the editor’s interpretation must be supported by objective evidence. Dietrich’s phrase coupling, which agrees exactly with the context, makes the assumption that the dative participial phrase beginning with at neikaudaimau is used to express ‘because . . .’ or ‘since . . .’ An exact parallel occurs in Luke 3.15: at wenjandain pan allai manegain jah pagjandam allaim in hairtam seinaim bi iohannen ‘because the entire multitude supposed, and all were thinking in their hearts about John . . .’ In line 12 liugandans should not be translated as ‘lying.’ As the Skeireins remarks in the next column (VIII d 5–10), the Pharisees reasoned without thinking; when they asserted that no Pharisee or ruler believed in Christ, they failed to realize that their opponent Nicodemus was a Pharisee, a ruler, and a counselor, so that they were guilty of a fallacy but not of deliberate falsehood.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

7.37. As observed in 4.31, the phonology, morphology, and syntax of the Skeireins are basically the same as those of the Gothic Bible. There are no differences in phonetic or phonemic structure and no aberrant inflectional forms. The anastrophe, zeugma, scesis onomatcon, anakulthen, etc., of the commentary have clear parallels in the Greek and Gothic Scriptures, and the two Gothic writings show the same recurrent features of Greek syntax, Greek idiom, and mixed Greek and Latin word order.

There is an agreement of 87.5 per cent in native vocabulary and of approximately 99 per cent in native morphemes.

7.38. What is true of phonology, morphology, syntax, idiom, word order, and vocabulary is also true of word meanings and usages. In fact, it is only through comparison with parallels in the Gothic Bible that some words and passages can be interpreted objectively; to depend upon contextual analysis alone is to disregard the facts in favor of subjective preferences, which lead all too frequently to rejection of the actual phrasings and to the introduction of emendations. To be sure, even the most rigorous discipline of interpretation cannot guarantee freedom from errors, but it is at least a step in the right direction.

7.39. If the evidence presented here has been interpreted correctly, the second scribe in particular was an excellent textual critic, by far superior to any of his modern successors. When he had finished correcting the extant leaves, the 1,500 alterations that were to be introduced in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries had already become superfluous, but the great damage that the codex was to undergo was nearly to obliterate some of his most valuable corrections and to make many other parts of the text almost undecipherable. This damage, together with editorial disregard of the actual phrasing and punctuation of the codex, is responsible for the widespread conviction that the text is corrupt, badly transmitted, and clumsily written in the first place. What the text needs is not emendation but acceptance at face value.
INDEX A

SUBJECTS AND PERSONS

Abbreviations, scribal, 4.3, 6.56
Acta concilii Chalcedonensis, 2.6,
Alliteration, 4.30
Anacolouthon, 4.22
Anastrophe, 4.12
Andersson, Hugo, 6.1 (n. 1)
Anthimeria, 4.26
Apparatus, critical, 1.6, Chap. V
Balg, G. H., 3.4 (n.6), 3.5, 7.32
Beardsley, N. F., 6.1 (n. 1).
Becker, G., 2.6 (n. 7)
Beer, Rudolf, 2.6
Beets, A., 3.6
Behaghel, O., 3.9 (n. 18)
Bendikson, L., 6.1 (n. 1-2)
Bernhardt, Ernst, 3.4 (n. 7), 3.5-6,
4.5, 4.24-25, 4.27, 7.7, 7.11, 7.12
(n. 5), 7.28, 7.35
Biblioteca Ambrosiana, 2.1, 2.8
Biblioteca Vaticana, 2.1
Bloomfield, Leonard, 3.11
Bobbio monastery library, 2.6
Bormeio, Card. Federico, 2.7
Braun, W., 2.7, 3.4 (n. 8), 3.8, 3.10,
4.2, 4.5, 4.9 (n. 9), 4.31
Braune, W., 3.11
Cadence expressed by punctuation,
4.6
Calque, mishqan a, 7.26
Cancellation, scribal, 4.3
Carmen de synodo Tziennisii, 2.6
Castiglione, Count C. O. 3.1, 3.3
Cod. Ambrosianus E 147 sup., 2.1
Codd. Ambrosiani A–D, 2.6-7, 3.10
Cod. Argenteus, 2-5
Codd. Brixianus, Carolinus, Taurinen-
sis, 2.6
Cod. Gissensis, 2.8
Cod. Vaticanus lat. 5750, 2.1, 3.10
Consonants, spelling of, 4.9
Construct state, 4.25
Corrections, scribal, 1.3–5, 4.2
Courcelle, M. Pierre, 2.6
Cromhout, E. H. A., 1.2, 3.7, 4.5, 7.18
Dietrich, Ernst, 1.3, 1.7, 2.4 (n. 4,
3.9, 4.5, 4.22-23, 4.25-27, 7.2, 7.3
(n. 1), 7.7, 7.10-11, 7.14, 7.16-17,
7.18 (n. 8), 7.19 (n. 11), 7.20, 7.26,
7.29, 7.32, 7.34, 7.36
Ebbinghaus, Ernst A., 7.25, 7.27
Ehrismann, G., 3.9 (n. 18), 4.27
Ehrle, Card. Franz, 2.7
Emendations, 1.1-2, 1.4-6
Emphasis expressed by punctuation,
4.6
Enlargement, high-contrast, 6.1
Erasure in the codex, 4.3
Fairbanks, Sydney, 2.6 (n. 12), 4.2
(n. 3)
Feist, Sigmund, 3.4 (n. 6), 3.11
Format of the codex, 2.1, 2.5
Friedrichsen, G. W. S., 2.6 (n. 12),
4.28, 4.30, 7.12 (n. 6)
Gabellentz, H. C. von der, 3.2-3
Galbiati, Msgr. Enrico, 2.8
Gaugengilg, I., 3.3 (n. 5)
Gelatinized areas on the commentary
leaves, 2.7
Gering, H. 3.5
Grimm, J., 3.2 (n. 4), 4.27
Handwritings, scribal, 4.1-2; type of
script, 2.6
Hechtenberg-Collitz, K., 4.4 (n. 5)
Heinsius, J., 3.4 (n. 6)
Helm, Karl, 3.9 (n. 18), 3.11, 4.9 (n.
10-11)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index A</th>
<th>Index A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heyne, Moritz, 3.6–7, 7.26</td>
<td>Vries, Jan de, 3.10 (n. 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holthausen, F., 3.11</td>
<td>Waals, H. G. van der, 3.7, 4.27, 7.2, 7.12, 7.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hout, Michiel van den, 2.6</td>
<td>Wackernagel, Wilhelm, 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotaxis, participial, 4.23</td>
<td>Weak adjectives not accompanied by definite articles, 4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idiom, 4.24–28</td>
<td>Weak predicate participle, 4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incongruence, 4.14, 4.21</td>
<td>Wiener, Leo, 3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitives, rendering of parallel, 4.20</td>
<td>Word order, 3.7, 4.27–28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflection, 4.10</td>
<td>Words, choice of, 4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initials, 4.7</td>
<td>Wrede, Ferdinand, 1.3, 3.10, 7.8, 7.14, 7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jantzen, H., 3.9, 4.27, 7.19 (n. 12)</td>
<td>Wrenn, C. L., 3.11 (n. 23), 7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jellinek, M. H., 3.6–7, 3.9 (n. 16–17), 3.10, 3.11 (n. 23), 7.3–6, 7.8, 7.10, 7.12–14, 7.17–18, 7.31–33</td>
<td>Zeugma, 4.17, 7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krauffmann, Friedrich, 3.8–10, 4.2, 4.31, 7.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kock, Ernst, 1.3, 3.10, 3.11 (n. 23), 7.4–5, 7.10, 7.13–14, 7.21–22, 7.28, 7.31–32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krafft, W., 1.7 (n. 3), 3.3, 4.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krause, Wolfgang, 3.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of the original commentary text, 4.27–28 and ref.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaf VI, loss and recovery, 2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenk, Rudolf, 3.11, 4.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo I, Pope, 2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ligatures, 4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobe, Julius, 3.3, 7.5, 7.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowe, E. A., 2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucké, Otto, 3.5 (n. 9), 3.6, 4.27, 7.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lundgren, Jakob, 3.3, 7.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magoun, F. P., Jr., 2.6 (n. 12), 4.2 (n. 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maj, Card. Angelo, 2.7, 3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript, history of the, 2.6–8; original length, 2.4; damaged condition, 2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchand, J. W., 2.6 (n. 13), 3.11, 4.3 (n. 4), 4.4 (n. 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marold, K., 3.6, 4.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massmann, H. F., 1.7 (n. 3), 2.3–4, 2.7 (n. 14), 3.1–3, 4.5, 4.25, 4.27, 7.7, 7.11, 7.12 (n. 5), 7.26, 7.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayr, Erich, 1.3, 3.10, 7.14, 7.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKeown, G. H., 3.7, 4.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercati, Card. Giovanni, 2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer, Leo, 3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migne, J. P., 3.3 (n. 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossé, Fernand, 3.11, 7.2, 7.7, 7.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutgall tincture, corrosive reaction produced by, 2.2, 2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochmann, J., 3.2 (n. 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallels, Biblical and theological, 1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulus, H. E. G., 1.7 (n. 3), 3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulus V., Pope, 2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal pronoun in place of reflexive, 4.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peyron, A., 2.6 (n. 7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography of the codex, 1.3, 3.12, 6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pischon, F. A., 3.2 (n. 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus XI—see Ratti, Achille</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate, R., 3.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents, gnomic and historical, 4.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priese, O., 3.4 (n. 6), 3.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation, 1.5, 4.5–7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation dots, 4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratti, Msgr. Achille, 2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive in place of personal pronoun, 4.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rückert, H., 3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scesis onomatonom, 4.18, 7.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schönbach, A. E., 3.9 (n. 18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schubert, H. von, 4.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schulze, Ernst, 3.3, 3.4 (n. 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schulze, W., 4.4 (n. 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scribes, 1.3–5, 4.1–2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sievers, E., 7.9 (n. 4), 3.11 (n. 23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stierwalt, W. W., 3.4 (n. 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeireins, the name, 3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamm, Friedrich, 3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streitberg, Wilhelm, 1.3, 1.7, 3.9–11, 4.12 (n. 12), 4.18 (n. 13), 4.26, 4.31, 7.2, 7.7, 7.14, 7.17, 7.26, 7.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturtevant, A. M., 4.9 (n. 10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension marks, 4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeugma, 4.17, 7.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX B

WORDS AND ABBREVIATIONS OCCURRING ONLY IN THE COMMENTARY

Masculine, feminine, and neuter nouns are designated below by the symbols M, F, N, respectively. Both nouns and adjectives are listed according to Indo-European—not Germanic—stem classes; -raub-, for example, is classified as an o- (not a-) stem, wulda as an a- (not ð-) stem. Verbs are listed alphabetically according to root syllables rather than prefixes; thus af-hrajinjan follows hrajinjahairts. With few exceptions, the words below are easily glossed in terms of their composition (e.g., oftraanastodeins 'revival' = oftra 'again' + anastodeins 'beginning') or through comparison with closely related Gothic forms (e.g., ofdomeins 'condemnation' beside ofdomejan 'condemn').

daftomeins* Fi/a condemnation VIII b 3
aftraanastodeins Fi/a revival I d 6
ainabaur Mi unigenitus V d 1
ainfalpaba adj. simply III c 16
ainhajaru** prom. each of two of two III a 16
airpaktunds adj. o born of the earth, of earthly origin IV c 5
alaman* (—mannans?) M pl. all men, all mankind VIII b 16
analeiko advs. in like manner VII a 13
anansius adj. i visible II d 9, 21
anparulkei Fi n difference V c 5, something different VI b 23
bařjjan uk. vi. 1 be bold, dare II a 3
bibaurgeins Fi/a camp III c 3
bironains Fi beguiling III a 13
brinnan st. vb. 3 burn VI a 18
doms* M (of) discernment, distinction II c 9, VI c 4
gasagwe Fi enforcement I c 12, I d 24
gabairbs adj. o amenable VI d 13
getamiba advs. appropriately II d 12
gawandens Fi/a conversion I d 25
haldis (ni pe haldis advs. phr. by no means) IV d 4

niukladei Fi childliness VII a 25
mip-qiian st. vi. 5 agree, assent, conform V a 23
raub* adj. o red III c 8
und-redan st. vb. 7 (abl.) provide VI b 19
faur-rinnan st. vb. 3 go before, be a precursor III b 15
sabailius* prop. n. Sabellius IV d 19, V b 21
and-satjan uk. vi. 1 render V c 24
dis-skaidan st. vb. 7 (non-abl.) disperse VIII a 7
skiers adj. i (6.26) clear IV b 16, V a 25
sokeins Fi/a question (of dispute) III a 25, b 22
spilla Mn proclaimer I d 20
ufar-trusnijan uk. vi. 1 sprinkle III c 9
tweifi (Mi?) acc. sg. doubt II b 24
tweifian uk. vi. 1 cause doubt VI b 11
ufar-peihan st. vi. 1 thrive beyond, be superior to III d 5
prasabailjei* Fi contentiousness V b 14
ufaramauli Fi oblivion VI a 12
ufarraneins Fi/a sprinkling III b 10
unanasimba adv. invisibly VIII a 4
unansakans p.p. undisputed VI c 1
unandsoka* adj. (i?) indisputable III b 19
unbaurans p.p. unborn V c 24
unfauweis adj. o unpromediating VI b 23
unswikunps* adj. o unknown VI a 1
usluineins Fi/a redemption I a 21
waliawizns Fi nourishment, food VII b 22
waurdahs adj. o logical IV c 14
weitwodeins Fi/a (act of) testifying VI c 16
wiprus Mn lamb ('wether') I b 3
wulla Fǎ wool III c 8
## INDEX C

### DECIPHERMENTS AND INTERPRETATIONS

n indicates a new reading or interpretation.  
φ indicates an interpretation proposed in an article or review.  
r indicates a reaffirmed reading or interpretation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I a 1</td>
<td>' nist</td>
<td>n 6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I a 2-5</td>
<td>'</td>
<td>'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I a 7</td>
<td>staui:</td>
<td>n 6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I a 18</td>
<td>'</td>
<td>n 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I b 12</td>
<td>was</td>
<td>n 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I b 15</td>
<td>saınazos</td>
<td>n 6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I b 19</td>
<td>gareanh:</td>
<td>n 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I c 2</td>
<td>gahatjandin</td>
<td>r 6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I c 11</td>
<td>nei auk</td>
<td>r 6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I c 12</td>
<td>gaaggwein</td>
<td>n 6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I d 4</td>
<td>ina:</td>
<td>n 6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I d 5-8</td>
<td>ijb-gasatjan</td>
<td>p 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I d 13</td>
<td>du</td>
<td>p 7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I d 15</td>
<td>gakiolon</td>
<td>r 7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I d 24</td>
<td>gaaggwein</td>
<td>r 7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I d 25</td>
<td>gawandeins</td>
<td>n 6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II a 5</td>
<td>leik is</td>
<td>r 6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II a 12</td>
<td>irotos</td>
<td>p 7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II a 14</td>
<td>nauh mi靟an anastojands</td>
<td>r 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II a 25-b 5</td>
<td>iupajro-uspilean</td>
<td>r 7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II b 4</td>
<td>jwah</td>
<td>n 7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II b 7-8</td>
<td>in pis ei</td>
<td>n 7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II b 11</td>
<td>manna</td>
<td>n 6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II b 20</td>
<td>bihti</td>
<td>r 7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II c 9</td>
<td>doo</td>
<td>n 7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II c 12</td>
<td>pihanan habaida:</td>
<td>r 6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II c 22-24</td>
<td>naudlipuarts-gadob wistai</td>
<td>r 7.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II d 16-17</td>
<td>swesa bajiunum du</td>
<td>r 7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II d 18</td>
<td>garehnsai</td>
<td>n 6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II d 22</td>
<td>andajhahtan</td>
<td>n 7.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II d 25</td>
<td>gasaihano</td>
<td>n 6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III a 20</td>
<td>andrunzun</td>
<td>n 6.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III a 24-b 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III b 5</td>
<td>bhraineino</td>
<td>n 7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III b 11</td>
<td>sintoino</td>
<td>n 6.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Index C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III b 23-25</td>
<td>pize-ainaisos</td>
<td>n 7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III c 1</td>
<td>witφ</td>
<td>n 6.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III c 11-12</td>
<td>ufar miton munandane</td>
<td>n 7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III c 19</td>
<td>fins</td>
<td>n 7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III d 7</td>
<td>minnizei</td>
<td>n 6.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III d 18</td>
<td>anahne</td>
<td>n 6.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV a 5-19</td>
<td>eijn-nasjand</td>
<td>n 7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV a 8</td>
<td>sokjandam</td>
<td>n 6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV b 9</td>
<td>jah</td>
<td>r 7.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV b 17</td>
<td>mikildups jai</td>
<td>n 6.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV b 17-18</td>
<td>mikildups jai fins. wuljins</td>
<td>n 7.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV d 1</td>
<td>ana airjai</td>
<td>n 6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV d 5</td>
<td>airjai</td>
<td>n 6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV d 18</td>
<td>jah gasakan</td>
<td>r 6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV d 20</td>
<td>markailliaus</td>
<td>n 7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV d 25</td>
<td>weiba</td>
<td>n 6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V a 6</td>
<td>pana</td>
<td>p 7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V a 8</td>
<td>frijodan</td>
<td>n 6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V a 11</td>
<td>nparanuhban</td>
<td>r 6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V a 22</td>
<td>nu</td>
<td>n 6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V a 23</td>
<td>miqịjaiina</td>
<td>n 7.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V b 12</td>
<td>gahaitands</td>
<td>n 6.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V b 16</td>
<td>gasok</td>
<td>r 6.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V b 18</td>
<td>ainoheun</td>
<td>r 7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V c 9-13</td>
<td>anparana-waldufni</td>
<td>n 7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V c 18</td>
<td>ei</td>
<td>r 7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V c 24-25</td>
<td>andsjan swerijs</td>
<td>r 6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V d 2-3</td>
<td>wisan gakunnan</td>
<td>n 6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V d 6</td>
<td>leamaramme</td>
<td>n 6.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V d 7-8</td>
<td>wairjiedai...qi trắng</td>
<td>r 6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V d 25</td>
<td>haida</td>
<td>r 6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI a 7</td>
<td>minnanan</td>
<td>r 6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI a 8-11</td>
<td>du...puitreun</td>
<td>r 7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI b 11-14</td>
<td>tweifjjan-mahta</td>
<td>p 7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI b 16</td>
<td>alla</td>
<td>r 6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI c 4</td>
<td>dom</td>
<td>n 7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI c 15</td>
<td>ina</td>
<td>n 6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI d 6</td>
<td>gascrub</td>
<td>n 6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII a 6</td>
<td>ist</td>
<td>n 6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII a 15</td>
<td>ist</td>
<td>n 7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII a 16</td>
<td>mikildupsais</td>
<td>n 6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII c 16-17</td>
<td>gatawaids ça pro las ize</td>
<td>n 6.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII c 18</td>
<td>ainhranjoh</td>
<td>n 6.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII c 21</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>r 7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII c 23</td>
<td>filusna</td>
<td>n 7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII d 3</td>
<td>fullah̄da</td>
<td>n 6.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII a 2</td>
<td>ina</td>
<td>r 6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII a 3</td>
<td>At</td>
<td>r 6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII a 11</td>
<td>Galijun</td>
<td>r 6.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII a 19</td>
<td>Andhofun</td>
<td>r 6.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII b 17-18</td>
<td>faura wisan rahnidedun</td>
<td>r 7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII c 1</td>
<td>afairzidai</td>
<td>r 6.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII c 2</td>
<td>pize</td>
<td>r 6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII c 10</td>
<td>baitein</td>
<td>n 6.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII c 12</td>
<td>liugandans</td>
<td>n 7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII c 12-25</td>
<td>in—ktl</td>
<td>r 7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII c 14</td>
<td>ainshun</td>
<td>n 6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII c 25</td>
<td>ktl jah los</td>
<td>n 6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII d 2</td>
<td>ainshun</td>
<td>n 6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII d 6</td>
<td>sokun</td>
<td>n 6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII d 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>n 6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII d 19</td>
<td>usjulandans</td>
<td>r 6.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII d 22</td>
<td>iba (iba?)</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII d 22-25</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII d 24</td>
<td>ussoke (ussokei?)</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>r 6.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>