The Second Century 5:4 (1985/1986)

Harnack and Goodspeed Two Readers of Codex Parisinus Graecus 450

Peter Pilhofer

In September 1887, Adolf von Harnack made a collation of codex Parisinus graecus 450. As far as Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* is concerned—and Harnack confined himself to that work then—the codex Parisinus graecus 450 is virtually the only manuscript extant today. Harnack published his findings in 1913, informing the reader once and for all: "Eine nochmalige Collation ist nun vollkommen überflüssig, wie man sich leicht überzeugen kann."[1] In spite of this Edgar J. Goodspeed ordered on behalf of the Library of the University of Chicago a photograph of this codex, intended to be the basis for his text of Justin.[2] Goodspeed says:

> Mein Bestreben ging dahin, den Text der Pariser Handschrift im wesentlichen unverändert wiederzugeben; wo jedoch eine Korrektur im Texte unbedingt notwendig erschien, da wird man die Lesart der Handschrift im Apparat verzeichnet finden.[3]

PETER PILHOFER is a doctoral candidate working in the Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum, Wilmergasse 1-4, 4400 Münster, W. Germany.

[1]Adolf Harnack, *Judentum und Judenchristentum in Justins Dialog mit Trypho nebst einer Collation der Pariser Handschrift Nr. 450,* TU 39, 1b (Leipzig, 1913) 93. ("Any further collation is now completely superfluous as everybody can easily see.")

[2]Edgar J. Goodspeed, ed., *Die ältesten Apologeten. Texte mit kurzen Einleitungen* (Göttingen, 1914). Cf. his Vorwort, p. VIII. Goodspeed seems not to have known Harnack's collation, although this is quite strange. See further nn. 3 and 12, below.

[3]Ibid., p. VIII ("My endeavor has been to print the text of the Paris manuscript in the main without alterations; at those places where a correction in the text seemed to be absolutely necessary, the reader will find the reading of the manuscript recorded in the apparatus"). Although the preface is dated April 7, 1914, Goodspeed does not mention Harnack's collation, which had been published the year before.

Goodspeed's text has become—for what reason I do not know—the standard text, although, to be sure, it was criticized right from the beginning.[4] Even Wolfgang Schmid, who is severely critical of Goodspeed, concedes: "Seine Ausgabe ist im wesentlichen ein Abdruck der Handschrift—mit einigen, auch dem unentwegtesten Konservatismus unumgänglich erscheinenden Änderungen."[5] In a note, he goes even further: "Hier liegt in der Tat die Stärke von Goodspeeds Werk, wie ich gerade angesichts meiner Polemik gern zugeben will."[6] It may be attributed to Harnack's authority that his confidently proclaimed assertion has never been examined, as far as I know. Goodspeed's edition, on the other hand, has proved itself indispensable to such a degree that it was reprinted in 1984. The time has come, therefore, to examine Harnack's and Goodspeed's data concerning codex Parisinus graecus 450.

I

Let us first turn to Harnack's collation.[7] It will be shown to be not wholly correct.[8] Harnack made the following mistakes:

1. 50, 19 (*Dial.* 13, 8)—Instead of πεσσάλους, the codex reads πασσάλους (misprint Harnack's?).

---

[4]Very heavily, e.g., by J. Geffcken in his review in *ThLZ* (1915) coll. 368ff. Johannes Quasten, nevertheless, says without further ado: "The best edition is E. J. Goodspeed . . . " (*Patrology* I [Utrecht/Brussels, 1950] 189). although he mentions Otto (see nn. 7 and 15, below) immediately before. Everywhere Goodspeed's text is highly esteemed; sometimes Otto's edition is not even mentioned any more. There is no need to quote examples for this.

[5]Wolfgang Schmid, "Die Textüberlieferung der Apologie des Justin," *ZNW* 40 (1941): 87-138, quotation pp. 88f. ("His edition is in the main a copy of the manuscript—with some alterations which seemed necessary even for the most die-hard conservatism.") The present writer considers it a great pity that this important essay, which has become a classic, was not included by the editors in the volume of Schmid's collected works (W. Schmid, *Ausgewählte philologische Schriften,* ed. by H. Erbse and J. Küppers [Berlin/ New York, 1984]).

[6]Ibid., p. 89, n. 7 ("This is, indeed, the strong point of Goodspeed's work, as I readily admit, especially in the face of my polemic against him").

[7]Harnack used Otto's edition (J. Otto, ed., *Corpus Apologetarum saeculi secundi,* vol. II: *Iustinus Philosophus et Martyr,* tomi I pars II, ed. tertia [Jenae, 1877]). He quotes according to Otto's page and line. For convenience I shall add the chapter and paragraph, by which means Justin is usually quoted today.

[8]I have in my possession a microfilm of codex Parisinus graecus 450. For obtaining for me this microfilm from the Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris) I would like cordially to thank Ms. G. Wagner. German authors usually refer to codex Parisinus graecus by A, French authors by C instead.

2. 52, 7 (*Dial.* 14, 3)—Harnack says: in marg. ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ὃ ἀπόκειται. In the codex, however, there is no marginal note at all on this page. Harnack has probably confused p. 52 (Otto) with chapter 52 (= p. 176, Otto).
3. 154, 10 (*Dial.* 46, 4)—The codex has (*pace* Harnack) περιετέμετο (correctly read in Goodspeed's apparatus *ad loc.*).
4. 180, 11 (*Dial.* 53, 3)—The codex has (*pace* Harnack) αὐτὸς (cf. Goodspeed).
5. 196, 4 (*Dial.* 56, 17 fin.)—Harnack is mistaken; the codex does not read ἐμπέμπων, but συμπέμπων (cf. Goodspeed); a sigma like this is quite common in the codex, cf. e.g. 27, 3 fin.; 46, 7; 50, 5; 55, 1; especially 88, 8.
6. 224, 9 (read 226, 9; *Dial.* 64, 2)—Harnack's reading seems to be a combination of text and marginal note. The text of the codex is obviously: εἰ μήτι (ς manu secunda?) ἔστιν ἀπὸ τῶν κατὰ χάριν τὴν ἀπὸ κυρίου σαβαὼθ σωθῆναι δυνάμενος. In the margin we have the note: εἰ μήτι ἔστιν κτλ. δυνάμενον. The original text μήτι . . . δυνάμενος has been emended to μήτις . . . δυνάμενος. The margin's writer, however, emends, taking μήτι as his starting point, δυνάμενος to δυνάμενον. Be this as it may, Harnack does not state the data correctly.
7. 224, 14 (*Dial.* 63, 5)—Harnack is mistaken; Otto's text is perfectly right μιᾷ ψυχῇ καὶ μιᾷ συναγωγῇ.
8. 320, 4 (*Dial.* 88, 3)—Harnack overlooks the sigma. The codex's reading is correctly given by Otto: κατελθόντος.
9. 334, 3 (*Dial.* 91, 4)—Otto reads τῶν δακόντων τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ὄφεων. Against this Harnack states correctly that the codex reads τὸν δακόντων. Harnack himself, however, overlooks the fact that the codex's reading goes on τῷ Ἰσραὴλ ὄφεων.
10. 408, 20 (*Dial.* 115, 1)—Harnack is mistaken; the marginal note is not ἀθελήσατε; as he states, but ἠθελήσατε; (correctly given by Goodspeed *ad loc.*).
11. 448, 14 (*Dial.* 125, 1)—*Accuratius*, Harnack says, it is to be read σπέ ρων. *Accuratissime*, however, σπέρων. But to mention this is superfluous altogether, since accents like this are quite common in codex Parisinus graecus 450.

Besides these mistakes, there are some cases where Harnack's reading is debatable, albeit not certain.

1. 476, 22 (*Dial.* 134, 4)—Whether the codex really has τὸ τρίτον σπέρμα, is doubtful. The final ν of τρίτον can not be read with certainty. Cf. Goodspeed *ad loc.*, who conjectures that a ν has been emended to a υ.
2. 478, 26 (*Dial.* 135, 2)—Harnack's λίεον is surely possible, but I have not been able to find any ε formed like this one elsewhere in the codex. Goodspeed's proposal is ingenious indeed. He thinks a θ has been emended to a ν, but this is not certain either.

To sum up: Harnack does not justify his claim that a "nochmalige Collation" is "vollkommen überflüssig."[9] On the contrary, if one examines some pages of Otto's text, which were not criticized by Harnack, one comes to the result that his collation is not complete. For an example I have taken Otto's pages 340-352. Harnack has overlooked two mistakes of Otto:

1. 342, 16 (*Dial.* 94, 3)—Otto has σημείου in his text, but in note 7 he says, the reading of the codex is σημεῖον. This, however, is wrong. Harnack has not taken note 7 into account.
2. 348, 7 (*Dial.* 96, 2 fin.)—Otto reads πανθ' (so does Goodspeed). The codex, however, reads πάνθ'. Harnack fails to mention it.

Harnack's collation, therefore, is not only not quite trustworthy, but also incomplete. Consequently, a new collation of codex Parisinus graecus 450 is necessary.

II

Unlike Harnack's, my new collation is not confined to Justin's *Dialogue*. It covers all of Justin's genuine works, i.e. the *Apologies* and the *Dialogue*. I use Goodspeed's edition, because it is he who professes in his preface, "den Text der Pariser Handschrift im wesentlichen unverändert wiederzugeben."[10]

Before we come to the collation itself, some remarks should be made concerning Goodspeed's edition. Goodspeed concludes his preface with the wish that his edition may "den Studierenden auf beiden Seiten des atlantischen Meeres leichter zugänglich machen" the apologists.[11] Let us imagine a student

---

[9]Op. cit., p. 93.

[10]Op. cit., p. VIII, "to print the text of the Paris manuscript in the main without alterations". Goodspeed's preface should be read very thoroughly. He says on p. VII: "Die Benutzung des Index Apologeticus (sc. Goodspeed's *Index Apologeticus sive clavis Justini Martyris operum aliorumque apologetarum pristinorum* [Leipzig, 1912]) hat die Vorarbeit zur Drucklegung dieser Texte erheblich erleichtert, zumal in dem Bestreben die so lästige Ungleichförmigkeit in redaktionellem Detail zu vermeiden." The present writer, although a native German speaker, apologizes for not being able to translate this sentence, because he does not quite understand its meaning. As far as the redaktionelles Detail (editorial detail) is concerned, here are some examples: According to Goodspeed's *Index*, p. 68, the word δηλονότι occurs *Dial.* 45,3; 47,1; 64,3; 103,8; 136,3. And, to be sure, this word occurs at all quoted instances—but only in the codex! Goodspeed's text reads passim δῆλον ὅτι. Another example: Goodspeed's *Index* quotes s.v. σκύλα (p. 252) *Dial.* 13,7; 43,6; 66,3; 77,2 (twice); 77,3 (three times); 78,9 and *Apol.* I, 51,5. Goodspeed's text, however, has (in the *Dialogue*) passim σκῦλα. Why he reads σκύλα at 1 *Apol.* I, 51,5, I do not know.

[11]Ibid., p. XI, "make (sc. the apologists) more easily accessible for students on both sides of the Atlantic."

who has to work with Justin's text. If he uses Goodspeed's edition, he will find on pp. 234_4, 238_2 and 242_3 the abbreviation "Har." If our student has acquired some experience already, he will look for a list of abbreviations. On p. VI of Goodspeed's edition he will find one. There it is said: "Har(nack)." In vain our student will now look for a bibliography: Goodspeed has none. Since our student will know that Harnack was a prolific writer, he will spare no pains and read Goodspeed's preface and introduction in order to find a further hint. He will then, in due course, find quoted Harnack's *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*. It will cost him some hours to realize that in this magnum opus there is no textual criticism on *Dialogue* 117, 2; 120, 2; 123, 1. Even an expert, whom our student may ask, will not immediately be able to guess that Goodspeed has in mind Harnack's *Judentum und Judenchristentum* p. 65, 1. 2; p. 55, n. 1; p. 68, n. 1, 1. 6.[12] Harnack himself, for that matter, mentions only at the last instance that he emends the text.[13]

One further problem of Goodspeed's edition is to be mentioned here. Goodspeed uses in his text three kinds of brackets: round ( ), square [ ], and pointed ‹ ›. Unfortunately, however, the usage of the different kinds is inconsistent. So he uses round brackets on p. 91, 1. 23f. These are already to be found in the codex (similarly p. 92, 1. 12f.), although not *manu prima*. (It may be held to be irrelevant that the reader is not so informed.) It seems to be consistent, then, when Goodspeed uses square brackets on p. 93, 1. 25, to include a passage which is indeed read by the codex, but left out as a gloss by some editors. On p. 110, 1. 14f. and p. 111, 1. 17, finally, one finds pointed brackets for passages which are added by the editor (similarly p. 193, 1. 26). So far, so good. To draw the conclusion from this evidence that Goodspeed uses round brackets for passages, where these are to be found in the codex already, square ones for glosses, and pointed ones for additions by the editor, would be premature. On p. 125, 1. 25 we have [καὶ ἕτερος], although this is not a gloss at all, but an addition by the editor (for another example see p. 66, 1. 33). The pointed brackets, too, are not used throughout. At most of the passages where one would expect them, they are missing completely.

III

We now come to the collation itself. Usually I note only passages where orthography is concerned, not those concerning word division, accent, and punctuation.[14] I do not claim that my collation is complete.[15]

[12]It is puzzling that Goodspeed quotes these three of Harnack's emendations. Are these occasional Lesefrüchte? Why does he not quote this work of Harnack anywhere? Why does he not mention Harnack's collation at all?

[13]This is, to be sure, not a far-fetched example. So Goodspeed, p. 245_1, quotes "Ar."; this abbreviation is not mentioned in his list of abbreviations at all. Only if one reads his preface thoroughly can one suppose that "Ar." means Archambault.

Dial. 1,3	91,7	ἑκάστοτε; G : ἑκάστοτει cod. (*ut videtur*).
Dial. 2,5	92,31	μαθήματα G : μαθήμτα cod.[16]
Dial. 6,2	98,26	G says in n. 3 διαπαντός A. This is correct, albeit superfluous. G should have omitted it, because he does precisely this at many similar passages.
Dial. 7,2	99,13	ἐξαναγκάζει G : ἐξ ἀναγκάζει (or even ἀναγκάζει?) cod.[16]
Dial. 8,1	99,25f.	οὐκέτι G : οὐκ ἔτι cod.[16]
Dial. 9,1	100,30	οὐ κενοῖς G : οὐκ ἐν οἷς cod. (*manu prima ut videtur*).[16]
Dial. 11,3	103,3	ῃ G : ῆ̃ cod.
Dial. 14,3	106,18	τοῦτ' ἔστιν G : τουτέστιν cod. (Correctly given by Otto, third edition, p. 52.) The codex has the same reading at 18,2; 32,2 (twice); 34,2; 41,3 and elsewhere. At 10,2 init., however, the cod. reads τοῦτ' ἔστιν. Otto has realized the difference and renders it correctly. G, on the other hand, reads passim τοῦτ' ἔστιν.
Dial. 17,2	110,14f.	Read ‹καὶ τὸ καλὸν πονηρόν,›[4].
Dial. 19,3	111,31	Ἄβελ G : Ἅβελ cod. Why G does not follow the cod. here is not clear. The same is true as far as other names are concerned, e.g., Isaiah (G passim Ἡσ.; cod. passim Ἑσ.) and Jerusalem (G passim Ἰερ.; cod. passim Ἑερ.). An editor with G's philosophy should retain the spiritus of the codex.
Dial. 19,4	112,3	ῳ G : ῷ̃ cod.
Dial. 22,2	114,15	ἵνα τί G : In the apparatus *ad loc.* read ἵνα τί instead of ἵνατί (misprint). G claims that the cod. reads ἱνα τί. This is not right. The sign ˘ is always to be read as "plus," i.e., ῐ = ΐ. Therefore, the cod. has ἵνα.
Dial. 23,2	117,6	Since G remarks at 1,5; 5,1; 9,1 that the cod. has ὅ, τι (τί), consequently he should do it here, too.
Dial. 31,4	125,8	The οὐ has been inserted later; usually G mentions such alterations in the apparatus.

[14]In this I follow Goodspeed's policy, ibid., p. IX. I quote first the passage, then Goodspeed's page and line. I follow the order of the codex, i.e. *Dialogue with Trypho,* so-called *Second Apology,* so-called *First Apology* (cf. n. 24 below).

[15]Besides Goodspeed's edition I have used: H. Nolte, *Conjecturae et Emendationes* (printed as an appendix in Migne, PG VI, coll. 1709-1828); Otto's first edition (Jena, 1842-43), second edition (Jena, 1847-48), and third edition (Jena, 1876-77); for the *Dialogue* Archambault's edition (*Textes et documents pour l'étude historique du christianisme* 8 and 11 [Paris 1909]); and J.C.M. van Winden, *An Early Christian Philosopher. Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho,* Chapters 1-9 (Leiden, 1971). I use the following abbreviations:

G = Goodspeed's edition (see n. 2)
cod. = codex Parisinus graecus 450 (see n. 8)
mg. = marginal note in cod.
man. prim. = *manu prima*

For abbreviations used by other authors, see n. 8, above.

[16]Not noted by van Winden, op. cit. (n. 15), *ad loc.*

Dial. 35,2	130$_1$	Instead of πνεύματα cod. mg. has πνεύμτα.
Dial. 35,5	131,6	ἀντὶ G : ἂν τὶ cod.
Dial. 37,4	134,3	ὅρος G : ὅρος cod. This is unique. Although ὅρος occurs more than 40 times, nowhere else is ὅ and ὅ confused.
Dial. 40,4	137,26	ἐπιβαλόντες G = cod. The epsilon of ἐπι- has been emended. Originally the scribe wrote οπι-.
	137,30	βουλομένων G : βουλο | λομένων cod.
Dial. 42,3	139,15	σώματος G : σώμτος cod.
Dial. 42,4	139,23f.	μέλ | λόντων G : μελλόντων cod.
Dial. 44,3	141,25	ἔφη οὕτως· Εἶπε κτλ. G : ἔφη· οὕτως εἶπε κτλ. cod. On p. 118$_1$ G mentions a similar case. Therefore he should have mentioned this case, too.[17]
Dial. 46,4	144,5	τῆς has been inserted afterwards (man. prim.).
Dial. 47,5	146,6f.	ἁμαρτωλὸν G : ἁμαρτωλιὸν cod. (ι inserted later?).
Dial. 48,1	146,13f.	πρὸ αἰώνων G : προαιώνων cod.
Dial. 53,2	153,3	ἀπάντων G : ἅπάντων cod.
Dial. 56,21	160,2	The statement in n. 1 that the σου has been added afterwards is not confirmed by the cod.
Dial. 58,12	164,2	ῃ G : ῆ̄ cod.
Dial. 61,4	167,6	ῃ G : ῆ̄ cod.
Dial. 69,2	178,30	ὄνον G : οἶνον cod. G thinks ὄνον has been ememded to οἶνον. The marginal note militates against this because it presupposes οἶνον, not ὄνον.
Dial. 76,6	186,33f.	πνεύματα G : πνεύμτα cod.
Dial. 85,9	198,27	εἰς ἅπαξ G : εἰσάπαξ cod.[18]
Dial. 96,2	211,6	πανθ' ὅσα G : πάνθ' ὅσα cod.[19]
Dial. 97,4	212,9	λέγετε G : λέγετο cod. man. prim.; emended to λέγετε.[20]
Dial. 102,4	217,12f.	ὡς ἐγίνωσκε· καλὸν εἶναι κτλ. G : ὡς ἐγίνωσκε καλὸν εἶναι κτλ. cod.
Dial. 105,4	221,29	ὁποία G : ὁποῖα cod. This should have been noted in the apparatus in any case, because in this instance different accents convey different meanings.[21]
Dial. 106,3	223,3	ἐξελυόντων G : ἐξελυόντων cod.

[17]Goodspeed only very rarely discusses punctuation. Otto, on the other hand, has remarks to the point in some cases. For further examples, see 11,8; A 1,1 and A 5,1 (for the abbreviations see n. 24).

[18]Goodspeed, in his Index, has εἰσάπαξ. Otto has Goodspeed's reading only in his third edition.

[19]Cf. *Dial.* 131,2, where Goodspeed has it right. Otto has it right in his first and second edition.

[20]Such cases (cf. my remarks at 31,4; 40,4; 46,4, above) I have cited only selectively.

[21]Goodspeed, in his *Index*, and Otto's first edition have the reading of the codex.

Dial. 112,5	229,15	διδαγμάτων G : διδαγμῶν cod.
Dial. 113,2f.	229,31f.	ζητεῖς ὁμοίως. ἐπεὶ δὲ κτλ. G : ζητεῖς· ὁμοίως ἐπειδὴ κτλ. cod.
Dial. 115,3	232_5	The πρῶτον is perfectly all right.
Dial. 120,6	240,1	τοῦ τἀληθὲς G : τοῦτ' ἀληθὲς cod.
Dial. 125,1	245_2	G cites in his apparatus the reading of the codex as σπε΄ρων. Obviously, he wants to suggest to the reader that there is something missing between the ε and the ρ. Numerous instances, however, show that the scribe of the cod. leaves such spaces quite often; not seldom even the accent is exactly above the space. Nowhere can there be inferred that something is missing.
Dial. 131,4	253,12	The ὑμῶν has been added afterwards (squeezed in at the end of the line).
Dial. 134,4	256,34	ἀπὸ δούλων G : ἀπὸ τῶν δούλων cod.[22]
Dial. 135,6	258,19	τὸ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς G : τὸ ἀπαρχῆς cod.[23]
a[24] 5,2	82,12	It is to be read πεποιηκώς (acute).
a 6,3	83,6	πράγματος G : πράγμτος cod.
a 11,8	87,13	ὑπολαβεῖν δεῖ πάντα νουνεχῆ κτλ. G : ὑπολαβεῖν δεῖ· πάντα οὖν ἔχει κτλ. cod.
a 14,1	89,9	G reads correctly οἳ παρὰ, but he has overlooked the marginal note *ad loc.* Cf. already Nolte (col. 1736 *ad loc.*): "C, Me. ἢ παρ (abscissus hic est margo.)"; cf. also Otto *ad loc.*
a 15,3	89,24	Read μή (acute).
A 1,1	26,7f.	Παλαιστίνης, εἷς αὐτῶν, τὴν κτλ. G : παλαιστίνης εἷς, αὐτῶν τὴν κτλ. cod. Here, as in a 11,8 above, the different punctuation conveys different meanings. These cases, therefore, should have been mentioned in G's apparatus, especially if one takes into account the fact that Otto has pointed out both cases already.
A 2,3	27_1	πραγμάτων A mg G. The marginal note, however, reads πραγμῶν.

[22]This is apparently a misprint in Goodspeed's edition. All other editions I have seen, even Migne, have the correct reading of the codex.

[23]Otto has the reading of the codex in his first edition; his third edition agrees with Goodspeed's.

[24]I refer to *Apologia minor* (the so-called *Second Apology*) with a, to *Apologia maior* (the so-called *First Apology*) with A. As to the relationship of the "two" apologies, cf. Wolfgang Schmid, "Ein Inversionsphänomen und seine Bedeutung im Text der Apologie des Justin," *Forma Futuri, Studi in onore del Cardinale M. Pellegrino* (Torino, 1975) 253-281. This essay has been included in the collected works of Wolfgang Schmid, referred to above (see n. 5). See especially p. 344, n. 17 in this volume.

A 3,2	27_6	μὴ δὲ A et saepe G. Instead of this he should have written et fere passim.
A 5,1	29,4	After εἴη the cod. has no question mark, as Otto notes *ad loc.*
A 13,1	33,29	οἷς G : οἷς cod.
A 15,11	36,5	θησαύριζητε G : θησαυρίζητε cod.
A 15,15	36,16	οὖν G : οὖν cod.
A 18,6	39,5	σώματα G : σώματα cod.
A 21,3	41,1	ἀπαθανατίζεσθαι G. Above the αι somebody wrote as an alternative an ε (man. prim.?).[25]
A 22,2	41,20	δε G : δὲ cod.
A 26,1	43,7	The cod. has a gap between οὐρανὸν and προεβάλλοντο (approximately 4-5 letters). Erasure?
A 33,2	48,33	ην G : ἦν cod.
A 33,4	49,7	In the cod. συνουσιάσθη has been emended to ἐσυνουσιάσθη.
A 35,5	50_1	G's data are imprecise. Nolte is correct: "in M. *super*. C schol. δὰδ (ita semper C) καὶ τοῦτο" (emphasis mine).[26] Since G interprets the abbreviation δάδ as Δαυείδ passim, he should do this here, too. If he wants to quote the cod. precisely, however, he has to write δὰδ, not δαυεὶδ.
A 35,11	51,2	G has in his text ἐπιβεβηκὼς, and he adds in his apparatus ἐπιβεβηκὸς A. This is not correct; the cod. has ἐπιβηκὸς.
A 37,9	52,4	Read ἐστι.
A 44,3	56,28	ὦσιν G : ὦσιν cod.
A 44,9	57,14	δεδύνηται G : δεδύνηνται cod.
A 47,2	59,17	δε G : δὲ cod.
A 48,6	60,10	ἦρται G = cod. Read, however, ἦρται.[27]
	60,11	ἦρται G = cod. Read, however, ἦρται.[27]
A 50,11	61,31	ἤρθη G = cod. Read, however, ἦρθη.[27]
A 51,9	62,27	δε G : δὲ cod.
A 52,3	63_2	ἐνδύση without ι-subscriptum in the cod.
A 53,5	64,20	ἐχούσης G : ἐχουσούσης cod.
A 53,10	64,35	προεγινώσκοντο. G : προεγινώσκοντο, cod.
A 54,1	65_1	G claims that the cod. reads οὐδεμίαν. As a matter of fact, however, the cod. reads οὐδὲ μίαν.
A 54,6	65,28	αμπέλου G : ἀμπέλου cod.

[25]Cf. Otto's third edition, p. 66, n. 10. He says, however, *ab alia manu*. Cf. Otto's list of Emendanda in tomi I pars II, p. 610, where he corrects a mistake in his note ad loc.

[26]Op. cit. (see n. 15), col. 1732 ad loc.

[27]This is the reading of Goodspeed's *Index*, too. The lack of the ι-subscription seems to be due to a misprint.

A 61,1 70_2 Here one cannot talk of a marginal note. The remark is found at the very top left, at the extreme edge of the sheet. As far as I can decipher it, it reads πονηρευεσθ τι.[28]

IV

Let us finally return to the introductory remark of Harnack. "Eine nochmalige Collation," he says, "ist nun vollkommen überflüssig."[29] As far as the minutia are concerned, one may not be able to agree with him, because he missed some of them. One will say the same of Goodspeed's edition, which is not free of mistakes, after all. From another point of view, however, Harnack will prove to be right: A better Justin text is not to be obtained in this way, as my collation shows clearly. Progress can be achieved only in the way which Wolfgang Schmid has pointed out.[30]

---

[28]Not noted by Otto; Nolte, too, seems to have overlooked this remark.

[29]Op. cit. (see n. 1), p. 93.

[30]The essential works of Wolfgang Schmid are now easily accessible in his collected essays (cf. n. 5). Only his pioneering Habilitationsschrift on Justin was not included in this volume.

A critical edition of Justin is an urgent desideratum. We still have to rely, even today, on Otto's edition, after all. After almost two decades, Chadwick's observation is still valid: "It should be emphasized that the condition of the Greek text of the *Dialogue* and *Apologies* transmitted by the Paris codex . . . is bad and that there is still no adequate critical edition." (H. Chadwick, *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition. Studies in Justin, Clement, and Origen* [Oxford, 1966] 127 [10].) Can one make a more devastating criticism of Goodspeed's edition, without even mentioning the editor's name?

This article was originally written in German. For helping me with the translation into English, my thanks are due to Mr. G. Pilhofer, stud. theol.; for polishing my English, I cordially thank Ms. J. Bothe Pilhofer, B.A.