

This dissertation has been 62-2005  
microfilmed exactly as received

PORTER, Calvin Lewis, 1933-  
A TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF THE EARLIEST  
GREEK MANUSCRIPTS OF THE GOSPEL OF  
JOHN.

Duke University, Ph.D., 1961  
Religion

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

Tr. R.  
Ph. D.  
P844T  
1961

Copyright by  
Calvin Lewis Porter  
1962

A TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF THE EARLIEST GREEK MANUSCRIPTS  
OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

by

Calvin Lewis Porter

Department of Religion  
Duke University

Date: May 2, 1961

Approved:

Kenneth W. Clark

Kenneth W. Clark, Supervisor

Hugh Anderson

W. F. Steinspring

A. W. H.

Robert S. Rogers

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the degree of Doctor of  
Philosophy in the Department of Religion  
in the Graduate School of Arts and  
Sciences of Duke University

1961

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It gives me pleasure to acknowledge my indebtedness to two people whose contributions are not elsewhere recognized, but which are such that without them this study could not have been complete. To Professor Kenneth W. Clark, I express my sincere appreciation for his patience, constructive criticisms, and inspirational guidance which he expressed throughout the preparation of this dissertation. To my wife, Marilyn Pelton Porter, I express my deepest appreciation for the patience and concern with which she prepared the typescript--both the English and the Greek sections. Throughout the course of this research she has remained a devoted wife.

C. L. P.

## CONTENTS

I Ancient Manuscripts and Biblical Research . . . . .	2
II Presuppositions and Procedure . . . . .	33
III The Earliest Greek Manuscripts of the Gospel of John	55
P5 . . . . .	56
P22 . . . . .	58
P28 . . . . .	59
P39 . . . . .	60
P45 . . . . .	61
P52 . . . . .	64
P66 . . . . .	65
P75 . . . . .	71
B Codex Vaticanus . . . . .	76
S Codex Sinaiticus . . . . .	80
W Codex Washingtonianus . . . . .	83
0162 . . . . .	87
IV The Comparison of Manuscripts . . . . .	90
V Textual Variations and Theological Tendencies . . . . .	183
Appendix: The Composite Collation . . . . .	209
Bibliography . . . . .	516

A TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF THE EARLIEST GREEK MANUSCRIPTS  
OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

[1]

## Chapter I

### ANCIENT MANUSCRIPTS AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH

One of the most remarkable features of biblical studies in recent times has been the discovery of ancient manuscripts. In 1945 a Bedouin by the name of Muhammad ed-Deeb was seeking a lost goat in the region of Khirbet Qumran. Noticing a cave he threw stones into it and heard something break. Going down into the cave he found pottery jars which he broke open. In one of these was some rolled leather with writing on it. This material he took to his home and kept for two years. In 1947 he took it to a dealer in antiquities at Bethlehem.<sup>1</sup> These were part of the now famous scrolls from Qumran. Finally in that year four

---

1. For this story of discovery see William H. Brownlee, "Muhammad ed-Deeb's Own Story of His Scroll Discovery," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XVI (1957), 236-239. For a somewhat different account consult D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik (eds.), Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, vol. I: Qumran Cave I (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), p. 5.

of these came into the possession of the Syrian Orthodox Monastery of St. Mark in Jerusalem, from which they were brought to the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem for study. They were eventually purchased for Hebrew University. Others of the Qumran scrolls had earlier passed directly into the possession of Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

Outside the immediate Qumran district, but still in the general area west of the Dead Sea, other finds have been made. In the neighborhood of the Wadi Murabba'at, about ten miles south of Khirbet Qumran a number of manuscripts have been found.<sup>2</sup> These were fragments of biblical books (Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, Isaiah), a complete phylactery, several contracts in Greek, as well as two interesting letters signed by Simon ben Kosebah, who had been known from other sources as Bar Kokhba, the leader of the Second Revolt about A. D. 132 that was finally put down by the Romans in 135.

In 1952, at Khirbet Mird, a number of biblical manuscripts were found. This ruin is identified as the fortress Hyrcania which was used by the Hasmoneans and rebuilt by Herod the Great. The manuscripts include Greek fragments of Mark, John and Acts, from the fifth to the eighth centuries; and Syriac

---

2. G. L. Harding, "Khirbet Qumran and Wady Muraba'at, Fresh Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls and New Testament Discoveries in Jordan," Palestine Exploration Quarterly, LXXXIV (1952), 104-109; Frank M. Cross, Jr., "The Manuscripts of the Dead Sea Caves," Biblical Archaeologist, XVII (1954), 1-21; Frank Moore Cross, The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1958).



fragments of Matthew, Luke, Acts, and Colossians.<sup>3</sup>

It is a recognized fact that the biblical scrolls from Qumran are important for the study of the text of the Old Testament. The importance of these manuscripts for New Testament study is still a matter of debate. Writers like Dupont-Sommer and Edmund Wilson have made extreme claims for the scrolls, and even more orthodox interpreters insist that knowledge of the scrolls will revolutionize the study of the New Testament. Points of contact between the scrolls and the life and work of John the Baptist, the teachings of Jesus, the practices of the early church, and the thought of Paul and the Johannine literature are obvious. These, however, may often be better explained on the basis of common background than on the supposition of dependence.<sup>4</sup>

Another important find of recent date occurred when in 1946 some peasants, digging in the neighborhood of Nag Hammadi, a place some thirty miles northwest of Luxor, in Upper Egypt, near the site of the first monasteries founded by Pachomius in the fourth century, unearthed and broke a large jar. There

---

3. R. de Vaux, "Fouille au Khirbet Qumran," Revue Biblique, LX (1953), 83-106; J. T. Milik, "Une Inscription et une lettre en Araméen Christo-Palestinien," Revue Biblique, LX (1953), 525-539. These manuscripts are being studied by Belgian scholars, but have not yet been published.

4. See the various essays in Krister Stendahl (ed.), The Scrolls and the New Testament (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957); Oscar Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (1955), 213-226.

fell out a number of ancient but well preserved manuscripts. Unfortunately the subsequent history of these manuscripts is obscure, but it now appears that the peasants sold the lot and it eventually reached Cairo, where--after a long sequence of difficulties--twelve volumes became the property of the Coptic Museum. One volume was acquired by a Belgian antiquities dealer. This was sold in 1952 to Gilles Quispel for the Jung Institute for Analytical Psychology at Zurich.<sup>5</sup> These manuscripts were all written in Coptic, most in the Upper Egyptian dialect called Sahidic, and are probably to be dated between the middle of the third and the middle of the fourth century A. D. Most or all of these manuscripts are believed to rest on Greek originals. The thirteen codices contain some forty-four different treatises including literature of the nature of gospels, epistles, apocalypses and prayers, and discussions of cosmogony and dogmatics. In some cases the material purports to be what was divulged by Jesus to his disciples during his ministry or after his resurrection, and all of it is intended for those initiated in the doctrines of the sect to which the literature belonged, evidently a group of Egyptian Gnostics.

---

5. For a description of the find and preliminary interpretations of its significance, cf. the articles by Henri-Charles Puech, Gilles Quispel, and W. C. van Unnik in F. L. Cross (ed.), The Jung Codex (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1955); Victor Roland Gold, "The Gnostic Library of Chenoboskion," Biblical Archaeologist, XV (1952), 70-88; Floyd V. Filson, "Gnostic 'Gospel of Truth,'" Biblical Archaeologist, XX (1957), 76-78.

The historical importance of this discovery for the knowledge of post-apostolic Christianity is difficult to overestimate. These new manuscripts are important for the study of the New Testament canon and for the study of second-century Gnosticism.

On December 28, 1956, the New York Times contained an article which began with these words:

For some months reports have circulated among scholars that a magnificent Greek New Testament manuscript has been acquired by the well-known Genevan bibliophile and humanist, M. Martin Bodmer. Details have now been released and they do not disappoint expectations.<sup>6</sup>

Upon publication in 1956 it was learned that this manuscript, Papyrus Bodmer II, contains the Gospel of John, with the first fourteen chapters (with the exception of two missing leaves in chapter six) in a state of preservation unequalled among New Testament papyri. Chapters fifteen through twenty-one, published in 1958, are extremely fragmentary. In addition to this manuscript of John, the Bibliotheca Bodmeriana in Geneva has acquired and published a fourth-century Coptic manuscript containing the Gospel of John and the opening chapters of Genesis (Papyrus Bodmer III), a late third-century Greek manuscript containing the Nativity of Mary (Papyrus Bodmer V), the apocryphal correspondence of Paul addressed to the Corinthians (Papyrus Bodmer X), the eleventh Ode of Solomon (Papyrus Bodmer

---

6. New York Times, December 28, 1956, p. 8.

XI), the Epistle of Jude (Papyrus Bodmer VII), the Homily of Melito (bishop of Sardis in the latter part of the third century) on the Passover (Papyrus Bodmer XIII), a liturgical fragment (Papyrus Bodmer XII), Psalms 33 and 34 (Papyrus Bodmer IX), and the Epistles of Peter (Papyrus Bodmer VIII). Yet to be published is a third-century Greek manuscript containing portions of Luke and John (Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV). All of these are a remarkable addition to the growing number of biblical and early Christian papyrus manuscripts. Unlike the discoveries at Khirbet Qumran, Khirbet Mird, and Nag Hammadi, next to nothing is known of the source of these Bodmer Papyri. One can be sure only that they come from Egypt.

Manuscript discoveries and biblical researches have gone hand in hand. In addition to the discovery of important ancient manuscripts, there have proceeded the investigations which bear on various biblical problems. As it is indisputable that the discovery of ancient manuscripts is a characteristic feature of biblical studies in recent times, it is equally true that the investigation of biblical problems related to these manuscripts is also a characteristic feature of recent biblical studies. Evidence of this fact is the enormous amount of literature on the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran community.<sup>7</sup>

---

7. William Sanford LaSor, Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 1948-1957 ("Fuller Theological Seminary Bibliographical Series," no. 2; Pasadena, California: Fuller Theological Seminary Library, 1958); Christoph Burchard, Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer ("Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft," LXVI; Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1957. See also the "Bibliographie" in each fascicle of Revue de Qumran, I- (1959- ).

Significant treatments of the importance of the Nag Hammadi discovery are beginning to be published.<sup>8</sup> The Bodmer Papyri have so far received only cursory investigation, and this is limited almost entirely to the papyrus containing the Gospel of John.

These manuscript discoveries not only shed considerable light on a variety of questions connected with the interpretation and understanding of the biblical message, but some of them provide direct evidence, older than any before known, for the text of the books of the Bible. A number of these manuscripts are of exceedingly great interest and significance for the New Testament textual critic. The discovery of new manuscript sources renews interest in the text of the New Testament and raises some crucial questions concerning the history of the text. The judgment of F. J. A. Hort points up the value of new materials and at the same time indicates the direction in which an evaluation of new manuscripts must proceed. It is not adequate procedure simply to evaluate the new materials in the light of previously known facts. The previously known facts must also undergo revision in the light of the new materials.

---

8. Robert M. Grant and David Noel Freedman, The Secret Sayings of Jesus (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1960); Kendrick Grobel (ed. and trans.), The Gospel of Truth, A Valentinian Meditation on the Gospel (New York: Abingdon Press, 1960); Jean Doresse, The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, An Introduction to the Gnostic Coptic Manuscripts Discovered at Chenoboskion, trans. Leonard Johnston (New York: Viking Press, 1960).

The gain by the knowledge of the contents of important new documents is not to be measured by the direct evidence which they themselves contribute. Evidence is valuable only so far as it can be securely interpreted; and not the least advantage conferred by new documents is the new help which they give toward the better interpretation of old documents, and of documentary relations generally.<sup>9</sup>

The textual importance of Papyrus Bodmer II and Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV, manuscripts containing the Gospel of John, is especially notable, even in an age accustomed to startling discoveries in the biblical field.

Papyrus Bodmer II and Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV are especially significant witnesses to the text of the Fourth Gospel for at least two reasons. First, the greater age of these documents is of importance. Papyrus Bodmer II and Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV are from the era of Clement of Alexandria and Origen, who died in A. D. 212 and 245 respectively. They are, roughly speaking, a century older than Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus which have heretofore served as the basis for the text of the Gospel of John.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century the most ancient manuscript containing the text of the Gospel of John was the fourth-century Codex Vaticanus. In 1844 Tischendorf discovered the famous Codex Sinaiticus and the publication of that manuscript added greatly to the knowledge of the text of

---

9. Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek, vol. II: Introduction and Appendix (London: Macmillan and Company, 1881), p. 14.

John. The first known fragments to be dated in the third century, Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 208 (P<sup>5</sup>), were published in 1899. Successively discovered were still other fragments from the same century. The discovery of the Chester Beatty Papyri in 1930 was sensational; however, those materials contain only portions of chapters ten and eleven of the Fourth Gospel. The third-century materials heretofore known are much too fragmentary to serve as a basis for extensive study of the text.

Second, the amount of text preserved in these papyri makes them of paramount importance. No other early papyri contain so much of the Gospel of John. These two papyri now for the first time offer for parts of John two third-century witnesses. Furthermore, for some passages there are now available at least three witnesses in the third century.

These two factors combined give Papyrus Bodmer II and Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV great importance for the text of the Fourth Gospel. Victor Martin, Professor of Classical Philology at the University of Geneva and the editor of Papyrus Bodmer II, suggests that Papyrus Bodmer II "fournira une base nouvelle"<sup>10</sup> for the study of the history of the text of the Gospel of John. This is equally true of Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV, as yet unpublished. This fact provides the raison d' être of this dissertation whose purpose is to make a critical analysis of the Greek manuscript tradition of the text of the Gospel of John

---

10. Victor Martin (ed.), Papyrus Bodmer II, Évangile de Jean, Chap. 1-14 (Cologne/Genève: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1956), p. 7.

from the second through the fourth century.

Victor Martin is precisely correct in his observation that a "base nouvelle" is provided for the study of the text of the Fourth Gospel. It is not sufficient for the biblical scholar merely to perfect the so-called "Neutral" text of Westcott and Hort by a process of itemized repairs. For the most part, the critical texts commonly used today are based upon this text of Westcott and Hort. In any case, they show little change from that text. It is generally agreed that the Westcott-Hort text cannot with any veracity continue to be called The New Testament in the Original Greek. Rather it represents a text known perhaps at Alexandria not earlier than the end of the third century. The discovery of new materials and the achievements of textual critics since the publication of the Westcott-Hort theory of the history of the text in 1881, have made it impossible to place exclusive reliance on the Westcott-Hort text. But at the same time, textual critics have not known enough about the history of the text to create a critical text de novo. E. C. Colwell's lucid observation is worth quoting. "Our dilemma seems to be that we know too much to believe the old; we do not yet know enough to create the new."<sup>11</sup> Therefore, just as the early critics sought to perfect the textus receptus, textual critics since Westcott and Hort have sought to improve

---

11. E. C. Colwell, "Genealogical Method: Its Achievements and Its Limitations," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVI (1947), 133.



their 1881 text. Those who advocate such an approach to the text "improve" the text here and there without a fundamental theory of the text to guide them.<sup>12</sup> While it is true that this approach is not based upon a theory of the history of the text, it does reflect a certain presupposition about that history. It seems to assume that very early the original text was rent piecemeal and so carried to the ends of the earth where the textual critic, like lamenting Isis, must seek it by his skill-- a piece preserved in this text and a piece in that, and perhaps one or two parts to be refurnished by conjectural emendation. G. D. Kilpatrick<sup>13</sup> sets out in clarity and thoroughness a number of criteria by which the original may be elucidated. These include such factors as the author's habitual style or linguistic usage, parallel passages, liturgical usage of the Gospels, Aramaic sources, palaeography and theological motivation discernible behind variant readings. This approach is advocated by a number of notable exponents of the art and science of textual criticism. The recent works of C. H. Dodd, Rudolf Bultmann, and C. K. Barrett on the Fourth Gospel illustrate this approach and the tendency to fall back upon a "patched up" Westcott-Hort text.

Kenneth W. Clark rightly observes that "the eclectic

---

12. The Revised Standard Version and The New English Bible are based on a text determined by the eclectic principle.

13. G. D. Kilpatrick, "Western Text and the Original Text in the Gospels and Acts," Journal of Theological Studies, XLIV (1943), 24-36.

method cannot by itself create a text to displace Westcott-Hort and its offspring. It is suitable only for exploration and experimentation."<sup>14</sup> He goes on to criticize the eclectic approach and to point out the fallaciousness of the method:

A judgment is not validated merely because we like the resultant theology or even because it preserves consistency for the author, for these are elusive and subjective factors. Where variants appear, ultimate judgment must rest upon a basic theory of the primitive text. It is true that the critic has many aids besides manuscript witnesses; a choice between variant readings may be influenced by synoptic research, language, style, vocabulary, orthography, harmonization, theology, or history. But these aids represent knowledge to be gained from the true text and their influence must be kept under proper restraint if they would guide us to the true text. Furthermore, our purpose has been to learn what was originally written--even if the author or editor should be found inconsistent, or illogical, or faulty in theology or history.<sup>15</sup>

In addition to this criticism it would be well to indicate that the so-called "canons of criticism" too often seem inapplicable or even mutually antagonistic. While one textual critic supports one variant reading of the text, another as decisively rejects it. Another textual critic may relegate the reading to the margin and direct attention to its doubtfulness by a star, a dagger, or by a variety of signs.

---

14. Kenneth W. Clark, "The Effect of Recent Textual Criticism upon New Testament Studies," The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube, (Cambridge: University Press, 1956), p. 7.

15. Ibid. Note also the passage on page 36: "One notices that many variants slip in and out of the critical texts subject only, it seems, to a shift in judgment."

It is obvious that the situation with which the present-day method of establishing the New Testament text confronts the textual critic is most unsatisfactory. In the face of this situation shall textual critics lapse into complete subjectivism or a state of resignation? Both alternatives are equally dangerous and the solution to the dilemma is to be found in a third alternative.

"Textual criticism without a history of the text is not possible."<sup>16</sup> Therefore, in order to make progress in textual criticism, it is imperative that textual critics pursue the investigations into the history of the text. E. C. Colwell indicates that "the great task of textual criticism for the generation of scholars who are now beginning their work is the re-writing of the history of the text and the recreation of theory."<sup>17</sup> Bernard Botte concurs with this judgment. "L'objectif immédiat de la critique textuelle doit être de faire l'histoire du texte et, dans ce but, de classer les témoins par familles."<sup>18</sup> Only fresh critical theories will carry the

---

16. Kurt Aland, "The Present Position of New Testament Textual Criticism," Studia Evangelica, Papers Presented to the International Congress on "The Four Gospels in 1957" held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1957, ed. Kurt Aland, et. al. ("Texte und Untersuchungen," LXXIII; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959), p. 731.

17. In the Foreword of Bruce M. Metzger, Annotated Bibliography of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, 1914-1939 ("Studies and Documents," XVI; Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1955), p. viii.

18. Bernard Botte, "Le Texte du Quatrième Évangile et le Papyrus Bodmer II," Bible et Vie Chrétienne, no. 24 (Nov.-Dec., 1958), p. 98.

textual critic much beyond the Westcott-Hort text. This dissertation is committed to the pursuit of new critical theories regarding the history of the text of the New Testament.

In the pursuit of new critical theories it is necessary, at least for this dissertation, to have certain limitations. This present study is limited to a small segment of the Greek manuscript tradition of the Gospel of John. It is hoped that by so limiting the focus of this study some significant contribution might be made to the history of the text and to the creation of theory. Those Greek manuscripts which were written before the end of the fourth century, generally speaking, are the primary sources. The manuscripts included in this study are P<sup>5</sup>, P<sup>22</sup>, P<sup>28</sup>, P<sup>39</sup>, P<sup>45</sup>, P<sup>52</sup>, P<sup>66</sup>, P<sup>75</sup>, Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus, Codex Washingtonianus and 0162.<sup>19</sup> As important as are the versions and the abundant quotations from the Gospel of John in the church fathers, the Greek manuscripts are the textual critics' first resource. These provide the most direct approach for the recovery of the text.

The Greek manuscripts written before the end of the fourth century were chosen by this writer as the primary sources for this investigation because the history of the text must be written from the beginning instead of from the end. The history of the text after the fourth century cannot be properly assessed until the earlier history is known. This approach to

---

19. For a detailed description of these witnesses to the text see Chapter III.

the history of the text stands in direct contrast to that method popularized by Hort.

The nineteenth century's battle with the textus receptus fastened attention upon that text and the study of variation from it was a natural development. After A. D. 1880 the theory of genealogical method was widely accepted. The classic definition is that given by Hort:

The proper method of Genealogy consists . . . in the more or less complete recovery of the texts of successive ancestors by analysis and comparison of the varying texts of their respective descendants, each ancestral text so recovered being in its turn used, in conjunction with other similar texts, for the recovery of the text of a yet earlier common ancestor.<sup>20</sup>

Since Westcott and Hort, the genealogical method has been the canonical method of restoring the original text of the New Testament books. It certainly dominates the books on textual criticism. Frederic Kenyon, C. R. Gregory, Alexander Souter, and A. T. Robertson are a few of those who declared its excellence. Von Soden used it as Hort had used it. B. H. Streeter's theory of "local" texts is built upon the genealogical method.<sup>21</sup>

As good genealogists, textual critics started with the lowest, most recent generations, and worked their way back to the

---

20. Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek, vol. II: Introduction and Appendix (London: Macmillan and Company, 1881), p. 57.

21. Cf. E. C. Colwell, "Genealogical Method: Its Achievements and Its Limitations," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVI (1947), 109-133.

earlier stratum. But current textual theory and currently available sources from the early centuries demand a reversal of this procedure. It is not valid procedure to evaluate an early manuscript in terms of a later one. As long as such procedure continues to dominate in the evaluation of early witnesses to the text, textual critics will make little progress. Textual critics must begin with the earliest sources and work their way down to the late medieval copies, and refashion previously held concepts. It is important that the data from third century texts become available in a form that is free from labels, in order that the full weight of these important witnesses may be felt as a new hypothesis emerges for establishing the earliest possible New Testament text. The basic need is freedom from labels and categories which prevent viewing the manuscript evidence in the right perspective. A new mental attitude is required whereby knowledge and estimates of the fourth century manuscripts are set aside and, as Kenneth W. Clark suggests, "approach these earliest materials de novo."<sup>22</sup> E. C. Colwell concurs with Clark:

There is something upside down in our applying the term "mixed text" to P<sup>66</sup> as Aland, for example does. If the history were written from the beginning instead of from the end, more appropriate terms would suggest themselves to us. As a result we

---

22. Kenneth W. Clark, "The Manuscripts of the Greek New Testament," New Testament Manuscript Studies, ed. Merrill M. Parvis and Allen P. Wikgren (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950), p. 20.

would work with more clarity in the reconstruction of the history of the text.<sup>23</sup>

No study has yet been made which has undertaken to consider the text of the Fourth Gospel from any such premise. In the studies that have been made of the third-century manuscripts, the procedure has invariably been to attempt to discover the textual affinities of those manuscripts in terms of the generally accepted text-types which are based on the fourth-century and fifth-century manuscripts.

This present study of the text of the Gospel of John begins with the earliest sources available, without prejudice imposed by later witnesses which have been longer known to us. These earliest witnesses to the text are studied in their own right and they provide the data by which the previously held concepts are re-examined and refashioned to include their testimony.

This dissertation is limited to the Gospel of John for a number of reasons. While it is true that the third-century Bodmer Papyrus XIV-XV contains both Luke and John, there are enough single-gospel papyri available to demonstrate that the Gospels existed as single books for some time. Having been so transmitted, the early textual history is distinct for each of the Gospels. Each of the Gospels has its own textual phenomena. E. C. Colwell, in setting forth some imperatives for future

---

23. E. C. Colwell, "The Significance of Grouping of New Testament Manuscripts," New Testament Studies, IV (1957-58), 89.

textual studies, suggests that text types be studied in the New Testament "book by book or section by section."<sup>24</sup> Those manuscripts which demonstrate the existence of separate textual strands for separate books and parts of books indicate the importance of studying group relationships and textual history book by book or even section by section. Moreover, they demonstrate clearly the dangers involved in spot samplings characteristic of so many textual studies in recent decades.<sup>25</sup>

A second reason for limiting this present investigation to the Gospel of John is that there are now available third-century manuscripts which are not equalled in the amount of text which they contain by the manuscripts of any other Gospels. From the third century come the Chester Beatty Papyri. P45, one manuscript in the Chester Beatty collection, consists of portions of thirty leaves of a papyrus codex, which originally contained

---

24. Ibid.

25. Kirsopp Lake, R. P. Blake and Silva New, "The Caesarean Text of the Gospel of Mark," Harvard Theological Review, XXI (1928), 207-404, investigated the "Caesarean" text of Mark in only three sample chapters (1, 6 and 11). This study set the stage for a whole series of textual investigations on the basis of these sample chapters. E. J. Smothers, "Papyrus Bodmer II: An Early Codex of St. John," Theological Studies, XVIII (1957), 434-441, bases his evaluation of Papyrus Bodmer II on the basis of one chapter, chapter 10. M. -E. Boismard, "Le Papyrus Bodmer II," Revue Biblique, LXXIV (1957), 363-398, concentrates on chapters seven through nine. This device of examining text sections is helpful in uncovering clues or hypotheses. But although this type of research should be considered highly tentative, it is seldom followed up with a more comprehensive effort to check and establish the findings. Instead textual critics are inclined to assume that the findings of the partial tests have been established.



all four Gospels and Acts. Matthew and John are the least well preserved, each being represented by only two fragmentary leaves. Six leaves of Mark, seven of Luke, and thirteen of Acts remain of these books. For Matthew there are fragments from five other papyrus manuscripts, P1 (Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 2), P37 (Michigan Papyrus 137), P53 (Michigan Papyrus 6652), P64 (Magdalen College, Oxford), P67 (Barcelona Papyrus 1). For Mark the Chester Beatty Papyrus is the only third-century witness. For Luke there is one other third-century witness. That witness is the yet unpublished Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV which contains parts of chapters three through eighteen and twenty-two through twenty-four. Some of the leaves of this papyrus are extremely fragmentary while others are almost complete. However, for the Gospel of John in addition to the Chester Beatty Papyrus there are P5 (Oxyrhynchus Papyri 208 and 1781), P22 (Oxyrhynchus Papyri 1228), P66 (Papyrus Bodmer II) and P75 (Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV). Even with this material that is available there are portions of the Gospel of John for which there is no third-century evidence and yet we do possess more abundant witness to John than to any other Gospel.

In the third place, the Gospel of John has not received such attention from textual critics as have the Gospel of Mark and the Gospel of Luke. Extremely little has been done in studying and analyzing the text of the Fourth Gospel. The attention of textual critics has generally been confined to the pericope adulterae (John 7:51-8:11). The much discussed question of dislocations in the text is not strictly speaking a

problem for the textual critic but one for the literary critic. The brief survey which follows, of recent researches in the text of the Fourth Gospel, does not include those studies and investigations pertaining to the individual manuscripts which are used in this study as our primary sources, for an indication of such relevant investigations will be found in connection with the analysis of each manuscript in Chapter IV.

The recent works of C. H. Dodd, Rudolf Bultmann, and C. K. Barrett illustrate the generally accepted approach to the text of the Fourth Gospel. These "Fourth-Gospel-Critics" illustrate the present unwillingness of New Testament scholars to abide by the Westcott-Hort text and the tendency to fall back upon an eclectic text in which variant readings from the major textual types take their place.

C. H. Dodd's work<sup>26</sup> is not a commentary. His discussion of variant readings in the text is thereby limited by the objective of his investigations which is to set forth the thought of the Evangelist. Dodd makes eleven references<sup>27</sup> to textual matters, but he makes little contribution, if any, to the creation of a text to displace the Westcott-Hort text.

---

26. C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1953).

27. P. 158, note 1 (7:53-8:11); p. 164, note 2 (14:7); p. 177, note 2 (8:34); p. 203, note 4 (1:3-4); p. 259, note 1 (3:13); p. 260, note 1 (1:13); p. 311, note 1 (3:34); p. 329, note 1 (5:39); p. 349, note 2 (7:37, 38); p. 412, note 1 (14:4); p. 433, note 1 (10:29).

Rudolf Bultmann's technical commentary<sup>28</sup> is quite different from Dodd's both in approach and in the conclusions reached. On the textual problems to which Dodd refers, Bultmann often reaches similar conclusions. Since Bultmann's work is a commentary, he examines in full most of the important variants which bear on the exegesis of a passage. Bultmann emphasizes the value of exegesis as one criterion of judgment upon variant readings. No suggestions for the creation of a new textual theory are made.

C. K. Barrett's valuable work<sup>29</sup> is based upon the text of Westcott and Hort. Barrett explains that "its use implies that it is a good text, but not the belief that it is a perfect one."<sup>30</sup> His work is valuable for the textual critic in this respect: that he explicitly notes that he has as far as possible confirmed every reading from facsimile or critical edition. It is to be regretted, however, that he does not, in his introductory chapter on "The Text", provide any discussion of the textual problems of the Gospel of John as a whole. His textual notes are far from being complete and the number of

---

28. Rudolf Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes ("Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, begründet von Heinrich August-Wilhelm Meyer;" 13th ed. (4th ed.); Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1953).

29. C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text (London: Society for the Preservation of Christian Knowledge, 1955).

30. Op. cit., 120.

authorities cited for variant readings is kept to a minimum. Barrett's procedure is motivated by the desire that the student should have a thorough grasp of the principles of textual criticism. Favoring no particular manuscript or group of manuscripts, Barrett evaluates variant readings on the basis of the Evangelist's language, thought, and style.

An older commentary is that of J. H. Bernard.<sup>31</sup> This commentary is based on a text similar to that of Westcott and Hort and Bernhard Weiss, although it is not identical with either. This work does not treat the text of the Gospel of John as a whole, although it recognizes possible variants at points in the commentary.

After surveying these commentaries and numerous others it becomes apparent that little contribution is made in the standard commentaries on the Gospel of John toward the creation of a text to displace the Westcott-Hort text, or a theory of the text to displace the theory worked out by Hort.

In addition to the commentaries on the Gospel of John a number of investigations relating to the various facets of textual criticism have been undertaken. Certain textual critics advocate approaching the text by taking the evidence provided in patristic citations more seriously than has traditionally

---

31. J. H. Bernard, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John, 2 vols. ("The International Critical Commentary;" Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1928).

been done.<sup>32</sup>

In 1902, the philologist Frederich Blass published an unusual edition of the text of the Gospel of John.<sup>33</sup> This edition he based upon the Latin and Syriac versions and the citations of the fathers, especially Chrysostom and Nonnos of Pannopolis because these versions and fathers often support a shorter reading than do the Greek manuscripts. This text of the Gospel of John is quite different from the text given by the Greek manuscripts containing the continuous text. It is notably a shorter text.

M. -E. Boismard, a French scholar who has an astonishing acquaintance with the fathers, in a series of articles in Revue Biblique (1948-1952), takes very seriously the evidence provided in patristic citations of the first three centuries, even where there is little Greek manuscript support. He is apparently prepared to argue that the fathers testify to a pre-fourth-century text which is superior and prior to the one found in the Greek New Testament manuscripts. In this series of articles Boismard demonstrates that this text based upon the patristic citations is shorter, more concise and succinct in style and is in many ways preferable to the "Neutral" text

---

32. Cf. M. J. Suggs, "The Use of Patristic Evidence in the Search for a Primitive New Testament Text," New Testament Studies, IV (1958), 139-147.

33. Frederich Blass, Evangelium secundum Iohannem cum varia lectionis delectu (Leipzig: B. G. Teubneri, 1902).

which, as he puts it, is canonized in the generally accepted critical editions of the New Testament. He seeks to demonstrate his thesis in a variety of ways.

In 1948, in the article "À propos de Jean 5,39 -- Essai de critique textuelle",<sup>34</sup> Boismard deals at great length and in profound detail with a triple textual tradition which has gone practically unnoticed by textual critics. The indications in this article of the importance of patristic citations were made explicit in the article "Critique textuelle et citations patristiques,"<sup>35</sup> which outlines the thesis that there exists a textual tradition in the fathers different from the tradition in the manuscripts and almost completely unknown in the latter. A third article, "Lectio Brevior, Potior,"<sup>36</sup> presents the observation that the manuscript tradition bears traces of a concise recension, which has been largely replaced by one expanded in the interests of exegesis. He further indicates that Codex Sinaiticus is a valuable witness for this concise text. John Chrysostom, the Syriac fathers, the versions in Syriac, and Ethiopic and Old Latin and the Diatessaron of Tatian in its various forms are all seen by Boismard as witnesses to this

---

34. M. -E. Boismard, "À propos de Jean 5,39 -- Essai de critique textuelle," Revue Biblique, LV (1948), 5-34.

35. M. -E. Boismard, "Critique textuelle et citations patristiques," Revue Biblique, LVII (1950), 388-408. John 14:2; 12:32; 14:23; 17:5; 17:21; 1:12,13 are used to illustrate his thesis.

36. M. -E. Boismard, "Lectio Brevior, Potior," Revue Biblique, LVIII (1951), 161-168.

concise text. In the article, "'Dans le sein du Père' (Jo., I, 18),"<sup>37</sup> Boismard deals with a little known variant reading at John 1:18. He proposes a text based upon Codex Sinaiticus and supported by Irenaeus, Novatian, Tertullian and Tatian, which is translated, "No one hath seen God at any time except the Only-Begotten: he has led us into the Father's bosom." Boismard sums up his thesis and gives further examples in the article, "Problèmes de critique textuelle concernant le Quatrième Évangile."<sup>38</sup> It may be that Boismard's conclusions claim far too much value for the ancient fathers in establishing the original text, but yet his theory deserves the real testing of a serious hypothesis.

While Boismard investigated isolated passages in the light of patristic testimony, another line of textual investigation has been leading in the direction of clarifying the text of the Gospel of John as used by various fathers. The writings of the fathers of the first three centuries are particularly important. A classic in this area of investigation is P. M. Barnard's The Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria in the Four Gospels and

---

37. M. -E. Boismard, "'Dans le sein du Père' (Jo., I, 18)," Revue Biblique, LIX (1952), 23-39.

38. M. -E. Boismard, "Problèmes de critique textuelle concernant le Quatrième Évangile," Revue Biblique, LX (1953), 347-371. In addition to the positions already indicated, Boismard re-emphasizes that frequently one currently accepted critical reading is in fact a conflation of two earlier readings; and that this earlier tradition can be discovered only by an ample and careful use of the patristic and versional evidence. He deals with variants at John 19:34; 11:48-50; 13:10; 13:24; 6:22-24; and 6:1.

the Acts of the Apostles.<sup>39</sup> Another important work is that of William Sanday and C. H. Turner, Nouum Testamentum sancti Irenaei episcopi lugdunensis.<sup>40</sup> A more recent study is that of J. Harold Greenlee. In a monograph entitled The Gospel Text of Cyril of Jerusalem<sup>41</sup> Greenlee examines "Cyril's Text of John." Even though he points out that the determination of the Caesarean element in the text of Cyril is hampered by the lack of a clear definition of the Caesarean text for the Gospel of John, he concludes that Cyril's text in John must be considered as a good Caesarean witness. This is another instance of reliance upon former conclusions derived by faulty procedures of the past.

R. V. G. Tasker, on the basis of a detailed analysis of "The Text of the Fourth Gospel used by Origen in His Commentary on John,"<sup>42</sup> shows that, in most of the sections of the Commentary on John, Origen used a "neutral" text nearer Codex Vaticanus than Codex Sinaiticus. According to Tasker this type of

---

39. P. Mordaunt Barnard, The Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria in the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles ("Texts and Studies," V; Cambridge: At the University Press, 1899).

40. William Sanday and Cuthbert Hamilton Turner, Nouum Testamentum sancti Irenaei episcopi lugdunensis ("Old-Latin Biblical Texts", no.7; Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1923).

41. J. Harold Greenlee, The Gospel Text of Cyril of Jerusalem ("Studies and Documents," XVII; Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1955).

42. R. V. G. Tasker, "The Text of the Fourth Gospel used by Origen in His Commentary on John," Journal of Theological Studies, XXXVII (1936), 146-155.



text was used by Origen in Caesarea and therefore either was brought by him to Caesarea or else was known at Caesarea before his date. Tasker believes that the "Caesarean" text is Caesarean and not a text known at Alexandria as well. K. W. Kim has examined the Fourth Gospel quotations made by Origen in some other of his writings and draws similar conclusions.<sup>43</sup>

M. J. Suggs investigated the text of John used by Eusebius and concluded that for John the evidence points toward a type of text which lies behind the settled recensions of a later time.<sup>44</sup>

If the so-called Caesarean text is an enigma for the Synoptic Gospels, it is even more so for the Gospel of John. Kirsopp and Silva Lake defined the "Caesarean" text as the text of Mark used by Eusebius and Origen.<sup>45</sup> Is there then a "Caesarean" text in the Gospel of John? This is not the place to discuss the history and developments of the Caesarean investigations<sup>46</sup> but there is one significant study to which attention

---

43. K. W. Kim, "Origen's Text of John in His On Prayer, Commentary on Matthew, and Against Gelsus," Journal of Theological Studies, n.s. I (1950), 74-84.

44. M. J. Suggs, "Eusebius' Text of John in the 'Writings against Marcellus,'" Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXV (1956), 137-142; M. J. Suggs, "The New Testament Text of Eusebius of Caesarea" (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Duke University, 1954).

45. Kirsopp and Silva Lake, "Some Recent Discoveries," Religion in Life, V (1936), 92.

46. Cf. Bruce M. Metzger, "The Caesarean Text of the Gospels," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXIX (1945), 457-489.

is called. K. W. Kim, in a paper read in the New Testament Section of the meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, December 28 to 30, 1949, discussed the Caesarean text of the Gospel of John. After examining the quotations of Origen and Eusebius from the Gospel of John in their various works, Kim, according to the abstract of that paper,<sup>47</sup> reports that their text of John is represented by the so-called "Neutral" witnesses. The significance of this evidence is as follows:

It is inaccurate to say simply that the Gospel text of Origen and Eusebius is "Caesarean"; for they have used a different type of text in a different Gospel. We have now definite evidence that the Neutral text of John was used by Origen and Eusebius in the middle of the third century. The superiority of the Neutral text, as held by Westcott and Hort, at least in the Gospel of John, is supported by Origen and Eusebius. There is no evidence that the Neutral text was in use before Origen's time.<sup>48</sup>

The importance of this conclusion will be born out in later discussions in this dissertation. The emergence of this new appreciation of patristic evidence coincides with the growing awareness of the inadequacy of present categories in dealing with the testimony of the earliest witnesses to the text of the Gospel of John which are of recent discovery. The conventional pigeon-holes of textual criticism are no longer useful for describing these early witnesses. This fact serves to remind the

---

47. K. W. Kim, Journal of Biblical Literature, LXIX (1950), xv, xvi.

48. Ibid.

textual critic of the necessity of assembling and evaluating the evidence anew in the hope that new categories and fresh theories may eventuate.

In a number of recent textual studies, the lectionary text has been the subject of investigation. One significant monograph is Harry M. Buck's Johannine Lessons in the Greek Gospel Lectionary.<sup>49</sup> The author based his investigation on a composite collation of twenty-five lectionary manuscripts and concludes that this area of the Greek lectionary system had its origin in the fourth century, probably at Constantinople. As regards textual complexion, the Johannine portions of the lectionary appear to be more closely allied to the so-called "Caesarean" text-type than to any other. This is an enigmatic conclusion because the so-called "Caesarean" text for the Gospel of John has nowhere been defined.

In addition to those investigations mentioned in this brief survey there are a number of articles and essays treating the textual problems raised by variant readings in particular passages. These articles and essays make almost no contribution towards the writing of a history of the text. Their conclusions are generally based upon an eclectic approach to the text.

Our survey of researches on the text of the Gospel of John, even though it does not claim to be exhaustive, clearly points up the necessity of assembling and evaluating, de novo,

---

49. Harry M. Buck, The Johannine Lessons in the Greek Gospel Lectionary ("Studies in the Lectionary Text of the Greek New Testament," vol. II, no. 4; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1958).

the evidence from the Greek manuscript witnesses to the text of the Gospel of John.

By way of summary, one or two points are here reiterated in order to bring the purpose and aim of this dissertation into clear focus.

The discovery of third-century manuscripts containing the text of the Gospel of John provides, not only a new basis, but a fresh requirement for investigating the text of that Gospel. It is not adequate to assess the new third-century manuscripts in terms of later manuscripts. It is not adequate procedure to use the data from these newly discovered manuscripts to "patch up" the generally accepted critical texts. The previously known witnesses must themselves be re-evaluated in light of the recently available manuscripts. In the past, textual critics started with the most recent manuscripts and worked their way back to the earlier stratum. This present study recognizes the need to reverse the generally accepted procedure and so begins with the earliest sources--the recently discovered manuscripts of the third and fourth centuries. One purpose of this dissertation is to make such an investigation of the early manuscripts on the basis of such a premise.

Textual criticism without a history of the text is not possible. Eclectic criticism only marks time until a theory of the history of the text is written. Therefore, this dissertation is committed to the pursuit for a more accurate history of the text and to the re-creation of a more acceptable textual theory. In that pursuit this study is limited to the Greek

manuscript text of the Gospel of John through the fourth century. The specific direction in which this investigation has developed will be indicated in Chapter II.

## Chapter II

### PRESUPPOSITIONS AND PROCEDURE

If the textual critic is to discharge his tasks effectively as well as responsibly, he must operate with certain rather definite principles as to the nature, object, method, and value of the inquiry which he undertakes. While all of these matters of principle are of equal importance, that which concerns method is probably the most significant, for the method is the functional expression of a general understanding of the task and the method largely determines the validity of the results that the textual critic achieves. Like any serious pursuit of knowledge, however, textual criticism has been subject to profound revisions in method during its own history, and these revisions in method have produced marked changes as to the objective at which the textual critic has aimed, as well as the results which he has actually attained. Thus, this dissertation has been undertaken with certain presuppositions regarding the

nature, object, method and value of such an investigation. Moreover, the presupposition with which the research is approached determines the methods and procedure by which conclusions are reached.

"The object of Textual Criticism when applied to the Scriptures of the New Testament, is to determine what the Apostles and Evangelists of Christ actually wrote--the precise words they employed, and the very order of them." So wrote Edward Miller in his publication of John William Burgon's The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels.<sup>1</sup> This same statement, or one very similar to it, may be found in almost any handbook or essay on textual criticism. In 1937, Leo Vaganay defined textual criticism as "scientific research in quest of the original, or at least, of the most nearly original text."<sup>2</sup> M. -J. Lagrange declares that "un Manuel de critique textuelle pourrait n' avoir qu' un but: indiquer comment on doit procéder pour fixer le texte original aussi près que possible du manuscrit livré au public par l' auteur."<sup>3</sup> In fact, there are many New Testament critics today who still insist that the sole aim of textual criticism is to

1. John William Burgon, The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established, arranged, completed, and edited by Edward Miller (London: George Bell and Sons, 1896), p. 19.

2. Leo Vaganay, An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, trans. B. V. Miller (London: Sands and Company, Limited, 1937), p. 9.

3. M. -J. Lagrange, Introduction a l' Étude du Nouveau Testament, vol. II: Critique textuelle, part 2: La Critique rationnelle (Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1935), p. vii.

reconstruct the text of the autographs and to present their ipsissima verba. Moreover, there are those critics who will add that another aim of textual criticism is to reconstruct the history of the transmission of the text down to the invention of printing. There are few New Testament critics, however, who ask why these things are desiderata.

Why is it important to pursue the reconstruction of the texts of the lost original documents which make up the New Testament? Why is it important to be able to reconstruct the history of the transmission of the text of the New Testament? Are these the only aims of textual criticism or are these even the chief aims?

One cannot deal with these questions until he has clarified his thinking with respect to the nature and authority of the New Testament and of the Church. Not even the textual critic can divest himself of his theological context and undertake his work entirely free from presuppositions. This does not mean, however, that the textual critic presupposes the results of his inquiry. No textual investigation is without presuppositions, inasmuch as the textual critic is not a tabula rasa, but on the contrary he approaches the text with specific questions or with a specific way of raising questions and thus has a certain idea of the subject matter with which the text is concerned.<sup>4</sup>

---

4. Cf. Rudolf Bultmann, "Ist voraussetzungslose Exegese möglich?" Theologische Zeitschrift, XIII (1957), 409-17. For an English translation see Schubert M. Ogden (ed.), Existence and Faith, Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann (New York: Meridian Books, 1960), pp. 289-296. Many insights of this stimulating essay are applicable to textual criticism.



The great textual critics of the past were not mere antiquarians; they were theologians and churchmen, motivated in their textual studies by theological presuppositions and the desire for a sound biblical theology.

Following the Reformation there was among Protestants an increased emphasis upon the authority of the Scripture. Then, in the early nineteenth century, with the rise of historical criticism, emphasis was placed by many New Testament scholars upon the doctrine of the verbal inspiration of the Scripture. The theory of an unerring literal inspiration came to be widely held. Probably the most explicit statement of this doctrine is that of John William Burgon:

The Bible is none other than the voice of Him that sitteth upon the throne! Every Book of it,--every Chapter of it,--every Verse of it,--every syllable of it,--(where are we to stop?)--every letter of it,--is the utterance of the Most High! . . . The Bible is none other than the Word of God: not some part of it, more, some part of it, less; but all alike, the utterance of Him who sitteth upon the Throne;--absolute,--faultless,--unerring,--supreme!<sup>5</sup>

Even before Burgon, textual critics had demonstrated that the text "received by all"<sup>6</sup> was far from being the original text

---

5. John William Burgon, Inspiration and Interpretation (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1861), p. 89. This statement was first made on November 25, 1860, from the pulpit of Christ-Church Cathedral, Oxford.

6. This appellation first appeared in 1633 in the second edition of the Greek New Testament printed by Bonaventura and Abraham Elzevir of Leyden. In the preface to this edition they wrote: "Textum, ergo habes, nunc ab omnibus receptum; in quo nihil immutatum aut corruptum damus."

of the New Testament. This demonstration in conjunction with the belief in an absolute, faultless, unerring Scripture made inevitable the search for the pure, uncorrupted original text of the New Testament. This search reached its climax in Westcott and Hort's The New Testament in the Original Greek.<sup>7</sup>

As long as New Testament textual critics held a belief in an absolute, faultless, unerring, verbally inspired Scripture, it was essential to that belief that they should have the original words of the text of the New Testament before them. That theological presupposition, however, is not generally held by the majority of biblical scholars of this day. It is certainly not held by this present writer. Therefore, this belief cannot and does not serve as motivation for this dissertation.

The belief in an unerring Scripture, however, has not been the only theological presupposition that has motivated biblical scholars in their quest for the original text of the New Testament. With the rise of the German Universities, the impact of such thinkers as Darwin in the natural sciences, and the beginning of the religionsgeschichtliche Schule, Christianity came to be described as the result of a long period of religious evolution which reached a climax in the "religion of Jesus." After the climax, a process of devolution began. Therefore, the later

---

7. Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek (London: Macmillan and Company, Limited, 1881). In the volume containing Hort's Introduction, Hort clearly reflects this theological presupposition when he contends that the final aim of textual criticism is "virtually nothing more than the detection and rejection of error." (p.3).

writings of the New Testament had to be considered as being of minor value when compared with the Gospels. Everything which failed to correspond to the picture which was drawn of the "Jesus of history" was invalidated as a supplementary addition.

In this quest to discover what actually happened in the life of Jesus, biblical scholars were dominated by literary and textual interests, and, especially in certain centers such as the University of Chicago, by a concern to understand the matrix within which Christianity arose in all of its sociological complexity. In a manner similar to that of removing from the Gospels all the later accretions in order to return to the historical Jesus, it was necessary to remove from the text all its later accretions and variants. During this period of New Testament research, the textual criticism of the Gospels naturally took precedence over that of the other books of the New Testament and largely has remained so until today. Of the Gospels, the Synoptics were the center of interest.

Thus, it was certain theological presuppositions which determined the textual critic's justification for his insistence upon the necessity of recovering the original text of the New Testament. The emphasis of the great "liberal" scholars on analytical criticism contributed invaluablely to the understanding of the origins of Christianity. But great as were the achievements of those who sought the Jesus of history, they left much to be desired. The real danger was that each of the historical disciplines would become an end within itself. Many textual critics found the justification for their work in "art for art's sake."

The conclusions to be drawn from these observations is clear:

The work of the textual critics of the past cannot be understood except as a part of their larger conception of the nature and authority of Scripture and of the church. Even though some of them might have insisted that they were working from a completely detached and objective point of view, they were, in reality, adopting a particular theological point of view. Their conception of Scripture and the church, their conception of inspiration and revelation, and their philosophy of history were all implicit in their objective and detached attitude.<sup>8</sup>

Within the last generation the theological climate of the Western world has changed radically. At least two factors have brought about this change. In the first place, there has been the rise of neo-Protestant theology and a theological renaissance which the rise of that theology has engendered. In the second place, the vitality of nineteenth-century historical criticism has left its mark upon New Testament scholars. In recent years a number of interests have captured the attention and imagination of New Testament scholars--"the recovery of biblical theology," "the entmythologisierung Debatte," "the 'new' quest for the historical Jesus," and "the Kerygmatic theology." Recent study of the New Testament emphasizes the character of the Gospels as religious and not historical documents. It tends to decry the significance of mere facts of history, supposing they could be ascertained, and to doubt the possibility of ascertaining them. The older method of

---

8. Merrill M. Parvis, "The Nature and Tasks of New Testament Textual Criticism: An Appraisal," Journal of Religion, XXXII (1952), 170.

historical criticism, in its search for bare facts, set out to eliminate those statements in the Gospels which might be attributed to the faith or experience of the early church. In so doing, it deliberately neglected in the New Testament writings just those elements which in the eyes of their authors made them worth writing. Those authors did not write to gratify curiosity about what happened, but to bear witness to the revelation of God in Jesus Christ.<sup>9</sup> With this change in the theological climate historical criticism, including textual criticism, has become to many scholars unnecessary and distasteful. The laborious nature of the methods employed, the apparent uncertainty of the results at which one arrives, the comparative unimportance of the problems with which the textual critic deals, as contrasted with these "new" interests of New Testament scholars, all tend to deter scholars from the pursuit of textual criticism. These "new" interests do not necessarily mean that there is no longer any reason to strive to recover the original text of the New Testament documents or to reconstruct the history of the text. They do mean, on the other hand, that if the textual critic's work is to have significance and meaning it must be done within the contemporary theological framework.

Although this writer is fully aware of the dangers of oversimplification and of a lack of an adequately developed

---

9. Cf. C. H. Dodd, History and the Gospel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1938), pp. 11-14.

treatment, it is desirable here to state briefly those theological presuppositions with regard to the nature of the New Testament writings which we shall take into consideration as relevant to the method of this present inquiry into the early Greek manuscript tradition of the Gospel of John.

In the first place, the Bible is faith's testimony to revelation and not the revelation itself. God has acted with us in Christ Jesus, which is an event, a historical occurrence, but God has not given in parallel to this a written record of this event. The written record itself, which contains an interpretation of that which occurred, is a human, historically conditioned response and is not identical with the action of God. It is with this written record, however, that the textual critic deals.

In the second place, Protestants have stated the case for the primacy of Scripture in a one-sided fashion: sola scriptura. This primacy of Scripture corresponds to the primacy of faith (sola fide) since the Bible testifies that a man is justified solely by God's grace through faith. But the Bible does not stand by itself. Its meaning is not self-evident to anyone. The Christian reads the Bible in a context of interpretation; that is to say, with the aid of a tradition. The Bible cannot be separated from the Church. Within this community of faith Scripture has been preserved, treasured and interpreted. It is this community of faith which the Scripture serves.

These presuppositions find consistent application in the objective of this present study and in the methods and procedure

used. In fact, the presuppositions determine the methods and procedure by which the conclusions are attained.

The Bible as faith's testimony to revelation must be interpreted because that testimony is historically conditioned. Furthermore, man's understanding of God's revelation is transmitted through language, a faulty medium in the hands of fallible man. The supreme task of the New Testament scholar is to discover the meaning originally intended by the biblical writers. Such a task demands the most careful critical procedure. Adequate exegesis demands that scholars give serious attention to all phases of biblical research--textual criticism included. The New Testament scholar must recover, so far as possible, what the original writer actually said in his particular historical situation and what his words actually meant in the context of his own situation in history. Frequently the choice of a variant reading in the text has some bearing on interpretation. Even though the commentaries on the Gospel of John make no attempt to create a new textual theory, the authors of those commentaries insist upon the need to treat those variant readings which bear upon exegesis and interpretation. William R. Baird, Jr. insists that in many instances an important point of biblical theology depends upon a question of text.<sup>10</sup> Sherman E. Johnson suggests that "the chief practical value of textual study is that it sharpens our understanding of the writer's

---

10. William R. Baird, Jr., "Current Trends in New Testament Study," Journal of Religion, XXXIX (1959), 142.

own message and therefore of the life and thought of the early Christians."<sup>11</sup>

The pursuit of the original text of the Gospel of John is a legitimate task of textual criticism. The search is a part of the problem of interpretation and cannot be separated from interpretation. The quest of the original text is a legitimate quest, but the goal cannot be achieved in one giant step or even in two or three giant steps. The by-product of the search will produce a richer and more vital understanding, not only of the New Testament, but also of the history of the early church.

Formgeschichte raises certain problems for the textual critic and the relationship of his tasks to the problem of interpretation.<sup>12</sup> Formgeschichte, the analysis of the nature, growth, and function of forms, emphasizes that the ultimate materials of the Gospel tradition are the individual pericopes and that these materials are based on an oral tradition. This oral tradition must have taken many different forms before it was reduced to writing. Even after one form of the tradition was reduced to writing, other forms must have continued to circulate orally. Papias, bishop of Hierapolis in the

---

11. Sherman E. Johnson, "The Gospel According to St. Matthew, Introduction and Exegesis," The Interpreter's Bible, ed. George Arthur Buttrick, et. al. (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951), VII, 244.

12. Cf. Frederick C. Grant, "Where Form Criticism and Textual Criticism Overlap," Journal of Biblical Literature, LIX (1940), 11-21; Krister Stendahl, "Implications of Form-Criticism and Tradition-Criticism for Biblical Interpretation," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVII (1958), 33-38.



first half of the second century, indicates a strong preference for oral, as against the written tradition, concerning the teachings of Jesus.<sup>13</sup> The written form must have been immediately influenced by the still existent oral forms which found their way into the earliest manuscripts when they were copied. Undoubtedly different readings, all of which go back to the oral tradition, exist in the manuscripts. From one point of view the observation of D. W. Riddle is precisely correct:

The old view, that the texts of the various manuscripts descended from an original manuscript, cannot be maintained except as an academic abstraction. It is of no practical meaning when one remembers that behind even the original manuscript there was an oral repetition of the several pericopes which when the earliest gospel was written had had a long evolution and a wide geographical spread.<sup>14</sup>

From another point of view Riddle's observation must be challenged as having no validity. A number of recent Gospel studies emphasize that the Gospels are literary units from beginning to end; that they are original compositions conceived to express the author's faith in dramatic form.<sup>15</sup> Thus, the Gospel of

---

13. Eusebius, Church History III. 39. The treatise of Papias was a five-volume work entitled Interpretation of the Lord's Oracles. Only a few quotations from this treatise in the writings of Irenaeus and Eusebius are extant.

14. Donald Wayne Riddle, "Textual Criticism as a Historical Discipline" Anglican Theological Review, XVIII (1936), 223.

15. Cf. Rudolf Bultmann, Die Erforschung der synoptischen Evangelien ("Aus der Welt der Religion, N. F. 1; 3rd rev. ed.; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1960). The supplement (Nachtrag) to this edition contains, in addition to a number of bibliographical remarks, observations on the current interest in the Gospels as literary units rather than in the fragments of tradition. Curtis Beach, The Gospel of Mark, Its Making and Meaning (New

John as first composed is the author's witness to the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. If this emphasis is a valid one, then the New Testament scholar can rightly insist upon having that original text for purposes of interpreting the author's expression of faith and theology.

It is clear that the structure of the Fourth Gospel differs extensively from the Synoptic Gospels. Even though the Gospel of John has not been subjected to the form-critical procedures to the degree to which the Synoptics have been, the forms of which the Synoptic Gospels are composed are not wholly wanting in the Gospel of John. There are occasional fragments of tradition of the Synoptic type. In any case, the Gospel of John, in the past, has been approached in a fragmentary manner and therefore the preceding remarks are valid also for it. If one grants that the Gospels are literary units composed to express the author's faith, then the pursuit of the text as it was composed by the writers is a valid and necessary procedure.

The legitimate task of textual criticism is not limited to the recovery of the text of the New Testament as it was set down by the various authors. There are other goals and tasks justifiable in their own right.

---

York: Harper and Brothers, 1959) sets forth the thesis that the Gospel of Mark is presented as a document of real literary unity, achieved through its singleness of purpose, theology, and theme. Mark deserves to be recognized as an author in his own right. Hans Conzelmann, Die Mitte der Zeit, Studien Theologie des Lukas (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1954, 1957, 1960) reflects this current interest in the Gospels as literary units. This work of Conzelmann is available in English under the title The Theology of St. Luke (London: Faber and Faber, 1960).

As a historian, the textual critic approaches the documents before him in order to discern what they contribute to the construction of the original text. But one of the most important obstacles to be overcome by the textual critic is the simple fact that a large portion of the material that provides access to the original texts which he is trying to recreate is itself influenced by the context of the time in which it was copied. The bias and the competence of the scribe must be brought into question. Kirsopp Lake observes:

It is impossible to separate the history of the text from the general history of the Church. The local history of a district, the monasteries of the country, local heresies, and certainly local pronunciations and dialects with their variations at different times, all act on the text, and are influenced by it in turn.<sup>16</sup>

Thus, in a manner of speaking there are no "spurious readings." The variant readings within the manuscripts are sources for the study of the history of Christianity and of the development of Christian theology. Textual criticism is related to historical theology and to "the organic life of the Christian community."<sup>17</sup> Rendel Harris contends "that the history of the text must be read side by side with the history of the Church, and in the

---

16. K. Lake, The Text of the New Testament (6th ed. rev., Silva New; London: Rivingtons, 1928), p. 10.

17. W. F. Howard, "The Influence of Doctrine upon the Text of the New Testament," London Quarterly and Holborn Review, CLXVI (1941), 5.

light of the various parties into which the Church was divided."<sup>18</sup>

M. Karnetzki in a penetrating article, "Textgeschichte als Überlieferungsgeschichte,"<sup>19</sup> advocates that the differences among the variant New Testament texts should not be resolved and forced to yield to the corrected, ironbound, sacrosanct, primitive text. Instead, these differences should serve to be regarded principally as living tradition.

In its earliest history the text of the New Testament was affected by the formative conditions in the Church. As the Christian communities worked out their theological beliefs, the scribes in these communities were busy copying the text of the New Testament. It seems clear to this writer that it was almost inevitable that many of the variants in the text are of a theological character. Manuscripts reflect the particular theological interpretation which was in the foreground at the time and place they were produced. Textual criticism is thus related to Christian theology, yet this living relationship has been often ignored or even denied.

Much debate on this question has had its point of departure in certain statements of F. J. A. Hort which are classically set forth in his Introduction to The New Testament in the Original

18. J. Rendel Harris, "New Points of View in Textual Criticism," The Expositor, 8th series, VII (1914), 316.

19. M. Karnetzki, "Textgeschichte als Überlieferungsgeschichte," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLVII (1956), 170-81.

Greek. Hort writes:

It will not be out of place to add here a distinct expression of our belief that even among the numerous unquestionably spurious readings of the New Testament there are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for dogmatic purposes. The licence of paraphrase occasionally assumes the appearance of wilful corruption, where scribes allowed themselves to change language which they thought capable of dangerous misconstruction; or attempted to correct apparent errors which they doubtless assumed to be due to previous transcription; or embodied in explicit words a meaning which they supposed to be implied. . . . In a word, they bear witness to rashness, not to bad faith.

It is true that dogmatic preferences to a great extent determined theologians, and probably scribes, in their choice between rival readings already in existence: scientific criticism was virtually unknown, and in its absence the temptation was strong to believe and assert that a reading used by theological opponents had also been invented by them. Accusations of wilful tampering with the text are accordingly not unfrequent in Christian antiquity: but, with a single exception, wherever they can be verified they prove to be groundless, being in fact hasty and unjust inferences from mere diversities of inherited text. The one known exception is in the case of Marcion's dogmatic mutilation of the books accepted by him: and this was, strictly speaking, an adaptation for the use of his followers; nor had it apparently any influence outside the sect.<sup>20</sup>

Hort's judgment has been often repeated and by such repetition without scrutiny that judgment has become for many New Testament scholars an assumed fact. Leo Vaganay who estimates that research has revealed 150,000-250,000 textual variants,

---

20. B. F. Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek, vol. II: Introduction and Appendix (London: Macmillan and Company, Limited, 1881), pp. 282, 283. For a comprehensive treatment of the accusations of willful tampering with the text in the ancient Church see Eberhard Nestle, Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament, trans. from the 2d ed. by William Edie (London: Williams and Norgate, 1901), pp. 197-206; E. S. Buchanan, "Ancient Testimony to the Early Corruption of the Gospels," Bibliotheca Sacra, LXXIII (1916), 177-191.

emphatically insists that "there is not one affecting the substance of Christian dogma."<sup>21</sup> Sir Frederic Kenyon clearly states his position that "no fundamental doctrine of Christian faith rests on a disputed reading."<sup>22</sup> Frederick C. Grant repeats the opinion, that "of the thousands of variant readings in the manuscripts, none has turned up thus far that requires a revision of Christian doctrine."<sup>23</sup> Sherman E. Johnson, while admitting that "frequently the choice of a reading has some bearing on interpretation," insists "yet it is probably true that no fundamental question of Christian faith and morals hinges on a disputed text."<sup>24</sup>

This judgment is the corollary of a hypothesis which has been discredited. The identification of Scripture with revelation is no longer generally accepted. As long as that identification was made it was important, in the light of thousands of textual variants, to insist that "no fundamental question of Christian faith and morals hinges on a disputed text." Contrary

21. Leo Vaganay, An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, trans. B. V. Miller (London: Sands and Company, Limited, 1937), p. 12.

22. Sir Frederic Kenyon, Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts (5th rev. ed., A. W. Adams; London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1958), p. 55.

23. Frederick C. Grant, "The Greek Text of the New Testament" An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament (n.p.: The International Council of Religious Education, 1946), p. 42.

24. Sherman E. Johnson, "The Gospel According to St. Matthew, Introduction and Exegesis," The Interpreter's Bible, ed. George Arthur Buttrick, et. al. (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951), VII, 244.

to the view that God speaks propositionally in the Bible, this writer holds that the authors of the books of the New Testament give testimony to the revelation of God in Jesus Christ and interpret that revelation. Certainly the interpretation of the revelation has not always been the same. Nor is there one interpretation. To admit what is clearly true, that the manuscripts contain theologically significant variants, is not to discredit the Bible but to recognize it as a living and relevant witness to Christian faith.

Those who insist with Hort that "there are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for dogmatic purposes" impose upon the scribes a particular conception of the Scriptures which developed much later in the history of Christian theology. Rendel Harris insists that "to Hort the scribes were all angels, as far as theology was concerned."<sup>25</sup>

In challenge of the judgment of Hort and these other New Testament scholars, the present writer would raise the basic question as to the meaning of their phrases: "fundamental doctrine of Christian faith," "substance of Christian dogma," and "fundamental question of Christian faith." What is a "fundamental doctrine of Christian faith?" Is there a body of doctrine or dogma which is essential to the Christian faith? This present writer is inclined to answer negatively. Statements of doctrine and theology are faith's response to revelation. If

---

<sup>25</sup>. Rendel Harris, Sidelights on New Testament Research (London: The Kingsgate Press, 1908), pp. 1-35.

this is true, then the judgment of Hort and others cannot stand.

In opposition to this judgment, there are the demonstrations and pronouncements of Rendel Harris,<sup>26</sup> W. F. Howard,<sup>27</sup> Fred C. Conybeare,<sup>28</sup> C. S. C. Williams,<sup>29</sup> Kenneth W. Clark,<sup>30</sup> and others.

Rendel Harris sets forth his belief that:

The evangelical stream is demonstrably discolored by the media through which it passes. The Bible of any given church becomes affected by the church in which it circulates. The people who handle the text leave their finger-prints on the pages, and the trained detective can identify the criminal who made the marks.<sup>31</sup>

C. S. C. Williams clearly states his position:

The attempt is sometimes made to isolate textual criticism from 'higher criticism' as though the former had little or no bearing on the latter or as if lower criticism were a barren and dry subject that can be left to specialists. The scribes, however, of the New Testament text, whether they were orthodox or heterodox, were human; they were liable to be affected not only by carelessness but also by prejudice. The possibility that many of the variant readings of the text of our New Testament are

---

26. Rendel Harris, Sidelights on New Testament Research (London: The Kingsgate Press, 1908), pp. 1-35; "New Points of View in Textual Criticism," The Expositor, 8th series, VII (1914), 316-34.

27. W. F. Howard, "The Influence of Doctrine upon the Text of the New Testament," London Quarterly and Holborn Review, X (1941), 1-16.

28. Fred C. Conybeare, "Three Early Doctrinal Modifications of the Text of the Gospels," The Hibbert Journal, I (1902-03), 96-113.

29. C. S. C. Williams, Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1951).

30. Kenneth W. Clark, "Textual Criticism and Doctrine," Studia Paulina in Honorem Johannis de Zwaan (Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn N. V., 1953), pp. 52-65.

31. J. Rendel Harris, "Was the Diatessaron Anti-Judaic?" Harvard Theological Review, XVIII (1925), 103.



due to intentional alteration by scribes does not seem to have received the attention that it deserves. The presupposition of Westcott and Hort that doctrinal alterations of the text are not to be found has been largely responsible for the blindness of critics to this possibility.<sup>32</sup>

Granting that the pursuit of the original text of the New Testament is essential for interpretation and granting that the history of the text must be seen in the light of church history and historical theology, there is yet a clear and present danger facing the New Testament scholar. That danger is that one particular form of the text of the New Testament might be canonized as the form of the text. This is precisely what happened with the textus receptus. It occurred again with the Westcott-Hort text. L. Cerfaux clearly states his belief, that "depuis plusieurs générations, nous vivons pratiquement d' un nouveau textus receptus,--vulgarisé aujourd' hui par les éditions manuelles de Nestle, Merk, et Vogels,--remontant surtout à la grande édition de Westcott et Hort (1881)."<sup>33</sup>

The recent short studies of the nature of the text of Papyrus Bodmer II illustrate this point. The conclusion that is generally set forth is that this papyrus witnesses to the soundness and reliability of the generally accepted text of the Fourth Gospel. The use of the title "textus receptus" by the

---

32. C. S. C. Williams, Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1951), p. viii.

33. L. Cerfaux, "Remarques sur le Texte des Évangiles à Alexandrie au II<sup>e</sup> Siècle," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses, XV (1938), 674.

Elzevirs in 1633 did not support an argument for that particular type of text. The invention of a mere label, "Neutral text," in the Westcott-Hort hypothesis is not an argument in support of their text. Textual critics can not be satisfied with any "textus receptus," ancient or modern, but must continue to pursue the fugitive original text.

Paul Schubert provides a fitting conclusion to this discussion of the nature, object and tasks of New Testament textual criticism:

One of the encouraging signs of recent times is that textual criticism, one of the oldest and noblest concerns of New Testament scholarship, is no longer considered an opportunity for the indulgence in mechanical skills, in soothing routines, in statistical ingenuity, interrupted by adventurous journeys through dusty bookshops, dark attics, somnolent libraries, solemn monasteries, and spooky tombs. It should no longer be called "lower criticism," a hoary term borrowed from hoary, classical philology. . . . In the case of the New Testament the transmission of the text is a vital and exciting part of the history of early Christianity, especially so from the second to the fourth century.<sup>34</sup>

The object of textual criticism is twofold. One object is the quest for the text of the New Testament books as it was set forth by the various authors. This undertaking must begin with an investigation of the relationships of the texts represented in the manuscripts. A second object is the pursuance of the variations in the text which are the result of theological interests and the elucidation of the implications of those

---

34. Paul Schubert, "Urgent Tasks for New Testament Research," The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow, ed. Harold R. Willoughby (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1947), p. 220.

variations.

Corresponding to these aims of textual criticism, Chapter IV of this dissertation probes the relationships of the texts of the second to the fourth century in the surviving manuscripts containing the Gospel of John. The purpose of Chapter V is to expound the significance of some of those variants which emerge in the text during the first four centuries and which have theological or doctrinal implications.

In order to facilitate this twofold objective all of the manuscripts used in this investigation have been collated with the 1873 Oxford edition of the textus receptus reproduced for the use of The International New Testament Manuscript Project by the University of Chicago Press. This collation makes possible the direct comparison of each manuscript with every other one.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup>. The results of these collations are set forth, with an explanation, in the Appendix.

### Chapter III

#### THE EARLIEST GREEK MANUSCRIPTS OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

"Knowledge of documents should precede final judgment upon readings."<sup>1</sup> The application of this principle was for Hort the first step towards obtaining a sure foundation on which a choice between variant readings could be made. This chapter is devoted to some observations of an intrinsic nature upon the manuscripts used in this present investigation.<sup>2</sup> For each

---

1. Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek, vol. II: Introduction and Appendix (London: Macmillan and Company, Limited, 1881), p. 31.

2. The sigla used herein to identify the manuscripts are, with the exception of Codex Sinaiticus, those of Gregory-von Dobschütz-Eltester-Aland. Codex Sinaiticus is indicated by "S". C. R. Gregory, Textkritik des Neuen Testaments, I (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1900), p. 23, notes that Codex Sinaiticus is sometimes designated by "S" instead of the Hebrew Aleph. "S" is used by Leo Vaganay, An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, trans. B. V. Miller (London: Sands and Company, Limited, 1937), p. 27, and by a number of

manuscript there will be presented a brief description and history.

## P5

Extant fragments of P5 consist of portions of three leaves of a papyrus codex which originally contained the entire Gospel of John. The fragments are now in the British Museum in London and are catalogued as Pap. 782 and 2484. These leaves were originally published by Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt as Oxyrhynchus Papyri 208 and 1781.<sup>3</sup>

POxy 208 (21.2 x 7.5 cm.) contains portions of John 1:23-31, 33-41 and 20:11-25. The text is in a single column with twenty-four lines and only about five to eight letters at the beginning of each line remain. POxy 1781 (24.5 x 6.8 cm.), containing portions of John 16:14-30, is extant in 27 lines

---

recent studies. Otherwise "S" designates the relatively unimportant Vatican Manuscript Greek 354, a manuscript of the four Gospels written by a monk named Michael in A. D. 949.

3. Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt (eds.), The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, II (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1899), pp. 1-8 and The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, XV (1922), pp. 8-12. The transcriptions provided by Grenfell and Hunt were used for the collation. A photographic facsimile of the recto of POxy 1781 (John 16:14-22) and a brief description are given in William Henry Paine Hatch, The Principal Uncial Manuscripts of the New Testament (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), plate VIII. Cf. H. J. M. Milne, Catalogue of the Literary Papyri in the British Museum (London: The British Museum, 1927), p. 181; C. Wessely, "Les plus anciens monuments du Christianisme écrits sur papyrus," Patrologia Orientalis, IV, no. 2, (1907), 145-150 and XVIII, no. 3, (1924), pp. 499, 500.

with the right half of the lines remaining.

Even though these fragments were published at different times and in different volumes, the identical origin of the two fragments is proved by the character of the hand both in the text and in the corrections, length of lines and columns, method of punctuation by short blank spaces, occasional use of the rough breathing and the internal textual evidence. POxy 208 preserves portions of two connected leaves, still joined together. This sheet of the papyrus originally formed almost the outermost sheet of a quire which contained about twenty-five such sheets. Such an arrangement would have been rather awkward, particularly since the margin between the two columns of writing in the flattened sheet is only about two centimeters wide. This is not much to be divided between two leaves at the outside of a single quire manuscript of this size. POxy 1781 is part of one of the interior sheets of this bulky quire.

Grenfell and Hunt assign the manuscript to the third century.<sup>4</sup> The scribal hand is an upright rather heavy uncial of the semi-literary type. The letters are rather carefully spaced. The words are written continuously without separation. Initial iota and upsilon have the diaeresis. Rough breathing is occasionally used, but there are no accents. The

---

4. Kurt Aland, "Zur Liste der Neutestamentlichen Handschriften VI," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLVIII (1957), 148, surveys the opinions with respect to the date of P5: "3. (Wessely, Kenyon, Schubart, Wilcken, Soden, Hedley, Maldfeld), 250-300 (Streeter), E[nde] 3. (Grenfell/Hunt, Schofield), 3./4. (Goodspeed, Dobschütz), 4. (Gregory)."

contractions of the nomina sacra usually found in theological manuscripts are present. There are corrections and additions which have been made in a hand smaller but similar to that which produced the text.

## P22

This papyrus manuscript, Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1228, is extant in fragments from two columns of a roll containing the Gospel of John.<sup>5</sup> The fragments are now in the University Library in Glasgow, Scotland.

One fragment (5 x 3 cm.) of this manuscript contains John 15:25-16:2. Eight lines, with eight to twelve letters from the middle of the lines, are preserved. The second fragment (18.5 x 5 cm.) contains 16:21-32 and is preserved in twenty-nine lines with from three to fifteen letters extant. Thus, there is preserved only about one-third of the column in each case. In both fragments the lines have lost their beginnings and ends. The text is written on the verso, the recto of both fragments being blank. The scribal hand is an upright informal hand of medium size and is rather rough and heavy. The words are written without separation. No accents, breathings or

---

5. Grenfell and Hunt (eds.), Oxyrhynchus Papyri X (1914), pp. 14-16. The transcription of the text provided in this volume was used for the collation. A photographic facsimile of the two fragments is found in Hatch, The Principal Uncial Manuscripts, plate VII.

punctuation marks occur. The diaeresis is used with the initial upsilon. The usual contractions of nomina sacra occur. Grenfell and Hunt assign this manuscript to the end of the third century.<sup>6</sup>

## P28

P28 is extant in a single fragment (10.7 x 5.2 cm.) from the lower part of a leaf of a papyrus codex of John's Gospel. It contains 6:8-12 on the recto and 17-22 on the verso, but with the loss of slightly more than half the lines. It was found together with third and fourth-century documents at Oxyrhynchus by Grenfell and Hunt and subsequently published by them as Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1596.<sup>7</sup> The fragment is now owned by the Pacific School of Religion at Berkeley, California.

The text is contained in one column with eleven lines on the recto and thirteen lines on the verso with from eight to seventeen letters in each line remaining. The hand is a medium-sized, sloping round uncial. Only one abbreviation of nomina sacra occurs. One high stop occurs and pauses are indicated

---

6. Kurt Aland, Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLVIII (1957), 149, indicates the various judgments which have been made concerning the date of P22 "3. (Schubart, Maldfeld), E[nde] 3. (Grenfell/Hunt, Schofield), etwa 300 (Hedley), 3./4. (Dobschütz)."

7. Grenfell and Hunt (eds.), The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XIII (1919), pp. 8-10. The transcription contained in this publication was used for collation.



by slight spaces in the line. Grenfell and Hunt indicate that this papyrus probably belongs to the early or middle part of the fourth century.<sup>8</sup>

## P39

P39 is extant in a single fragment (25.6 x 8 cm.) which contains portions of John 8:14-18 on the verso and of 18-22 on the recto. The fragment was discovered at Oxyrhynchus by Grenfell and Hunt and catalogued as Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1780.<sup>9</sup> It is now in the possession of the Bucknell Library of Crozer Theological Seminary in Chester, Pennsylvania.

The leaf from P39 is complete at the top and bottom, but torn vertically so that about half of the lines of a single column of twenty-five lines are missing on both sides. The hand is a handsome specimen of the "Biblical Uncial," large and upright. It is unlikely to be later than the fourth century.<sup>10</sup> In this manuscript a pause is sometimes marked by an

---

8. Kurt Aland, Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLVIII (1957), 149, gives a survey of the dates to which P28 has been assigned by the various scholars: "A[nfang] 4. (Grenfell/Hunt, Schofield), 4. (Dobschütz, Clark, Maldfeld)."

9. Grenfell and Hunt (eds.), The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XV (1922), pp. 7, 8. The transcription of the text provided in this volume was used for the collation.

10. Kurt Aland, Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLVIII (1957), 149, surveys the opinions with respect to the date of P39: "4. (Grenfell/Hunt, Dobschütz, Schofield ?, Clark, Maldfeld)."

increase of the interval before the following letter, otherwise punctuation is absent. The contractions usually found in theological texts occur. A pagination figure appears in the upper left-hand corner of the recto.

## P45

P45 is one of a group of papyrus manuscripts which became known in 1931.<sup>11</sup> These were found and marketed by diggers and dealers in Egypt. The greater part of the collection was purchased by A. Chester Beatty, an American living then in London, while some portions of the find were acquired by the University of Michigan and by other individuals. The entire assemblage comprises no less than twelve codices, which date from the second to the fourth century and presumably represent the library of some early Christian church. The source of these papyri was probably 'Alâme on the east bank of the Nile. This, at least, was the information gained by Carl Schmidt from the dealer who says that they were found in a pot. As Schmidt says, they were probably worn-out and discarded fragments,

---

11. Frederic G. Kenyon (ed.), The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible (London: Emery Walker Limited, 1933-36). Fasciculus I is a General Introduction to the entire group of Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri in which one plate from each of the twelve manuscripts is included.

which were not destroyed because they were sacred.<sup>12</sup> The codices contain portions of nine Old Testament and fifteen New Testament books as well as the Book of Enoch and a homily of Melito of Sardis. The part of the collection with which this present investigation is concerned is a codex of the four Gospels and Acts.<sup>13</sup> This papyrus is probably to be dated in the early part of the third century.<sup>14</sup>

In its present condition P45 consists of thirty leaves, or sixty pages, of papyrus, all more or less imperfect. The codex originally consisted of about 220 leaves, measuring approximately 25.5 x 20.5 cm., with single columns of writing measuring about 19 x 15.8 cm. There were approximately thirty-nine lines of text in each column. The sheets of papyrus were arranged so that recto pages face recto and verso pages face verso throughout the manuscript. The quires were of two leaves only. These quires were then sewed together. Two pairs of holes for the thread still survive in two of the sheets. The

12. Carl Schmidt, "Die Evangelienschrift der Chester Beatty-Sammlung," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXXII (1933), 225.

13. Frederic G. Kenyon (ed.), The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible, Fasciculus II: The Gospels and Acts, Text (London: Emery Walker, Limited, 1933); Fasciculus II: The Gospels and Acts, Plates (London: Emery Walker, Limited, 1934). This photographic facsimile was used for the collation.

14. Kurt Aland, Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLVIII (1957), 149, indicates the dates to which P45 has been assigned by various scholars: "A[nfang] 3. (Kenyon, Schofield), 3. (Bell, Dobschütz, Schubart, Maldfeld), etwa 250 (Sanders), E[nde] 3. (Grenfell/Hunt)."

whole may have then been enclosed in a cover of leather like some of the early Coptic papyrus manuscripts.

The Gospel of John is extant in portions of 10:7-25, 31-11:10, 18-36 and 43-57. In John either the whole width of the column is preserved, or one side of it, so that in some cases reconstruction of the missing part of the lines can be made with some accuracy.

The codex is written throughout in a small and very clear hand. The letters are approximately square in formation with a decided slope to the right. The letters are in the form which is characteristic of the Roman period. The script as a whole reflects the work of a competent scribe.

Abbreviations are confined to the usual nomina sacra. The only other abbreviation is the horizontal stroke above a vowel at the end of a line to represent a final nu. The rough breathing occurs a few times, usually with the article and the relative pronouns. The scribe habitually used iota adscript after omega and eta, but not after alpha. The use of the final nu-movable is general. The first hand confined its punctuation to the occasional use of a high point, but further punctuation has been added by a second hand. The diaeresis is generally used over initial iota and upsilon, but over upsilon it is sometimes replaced by a horizontal line. When both of these letters occur together, three dots are placed over them.

## P52

A tiny piece of papyrus leaf with a small portion of the Gospel of John was discovered in 1935 in the John Rylands Library in Manchester, England, among papyri acquired in Egypt in 1920 by Bernard P. Grenfell. In the John Rylands Library the fragment is catalogued as Papyrus Rylands Greek 457, and among New Testament textual critics it is known as P52.<sup>15</sup>

The actual size of the fragment is 8.9 x 5.8 cm. The fragment contains only about a third of no more than seven lines of text on each side. The recto contains parts of John 18:31-33 and the verso contains portions of 18:37, 38. Thus, the fragment is almost certainly from a codex. The editor, C. H. Roberts, reasons that the codex of which this fragment is a part contained only the Gospel of John.

The text is written in dark ink on a good quality of papyrus of light color. The handwriting--a rather carefully executed literary script, heavy, round, and rather elaborate--often shows that several strokes have been used to form a single

---

15. This was first published, with facsimile, in C. H. Roberts, An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library (Manchester: John Rylands Library, 1935). This facsimile was used for the collation. It was republished, with some alterations, in C. H. Roberts "An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XK (1936), 44-55. The papyrus found a listing in C. H. Roberts (ed.), Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library, III: Theological and Literary Texts (Nos. 457-551) (Manchester: John Rylands Library, 1938), pp. 1-3. Among reviews and notices may be mentioned those of H. I. Bell, Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, XXI (1935), 226, 267; P. Benoit, Revue Biblique, XLV (1936), 269-272; and A. Merk, Biblica XVII (1936), 99-101.

letter. The scribe was fond of flourishes at the end of his strokes. Apparently, there is no punctuation or breathing, although the diaeresis is placed over an initial iota. The words appear to be slightly separated. No nomina sacra appear, so it cannot be established whether abbreviations were employed.

Unfortunately, the provenance of the papyrus cannot be exactly determined. It was one of a large number purchased for the John Rylands Library by Bernard Grenfell in 1920. The group to which it belongs consists of some literary texts and documents of the Ptolemaic and Roman periods. The entire group is stated to have come either from the Fayum or from Oxyrhynchus.

The importance of so small a fragment depends on the date to which it can be assigned. Without recapitulating the evidence cited in the original publication of the papyrus, there seems to be no reason to question the editor's dating, first half of the second century.<sup>16</sup>

#### P66

P66 is in the Bodmer Library in Geneva, Switzerland, where it is known as Papyrus Bodmer II. Victor Martin, Professor of Classical Philology at the University of Geneva, edited the

---

16. Kurt Aland, Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLVIII (1957), 149, indicates that a number of scholars concur in this judgment: "A[nfang] 2. (Roberts, Kenyon, Schubart, Bell, Schofield, Maldfeld)."

manuscript.<sup>17</sup>

Concerning the provenance of this papyrus manuscript, Professor Martin says nothing. Von Heinrich Zimmermann writes that he has learned that Martin Bodmer obtained the papyrus in 1955 from a Coptic family in Egypt:

Über den Fundort erfährt man in der Einleitung Martins nichts. Wie mir jedoch ein Sohn des Herrn Bodmer mitteilte, konnte sein Vater bei einem Aufenthalt in Ägypten im Jahre 1955 die Handschrift von einer ihm befreundeten koptischen Familie erwerben. Man wird deshalb nicht fehlgehen in der Annahme, dass der Sand Ägyptens den Papyrus so lange Zeit vor der Zerstörung bewahrt hat.<sup>18</sup>

Even this information reveals nothing of the origin of the manuscript. The view of E. J. Smothers, that the papyrus manuscript might have issued from the Catechetical School in Alexandria is mere conjecture.<sup>19</sup>

P66 originally contained the entire Gospel of John. John 1:1-14:26, with the exception of two leaves containing 6:11-35, is remarkably well preserved. The only lacunae are the loss of two or three letters at the end of not more than twenty lines scattered throughout the first fourteen chapters. The pieces

---

17. Victor Martin (ed.), Papyrus Bodmer II, Évangile de Jean, chap. 1-14 (Cologne/Genève: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1956) and Papyrus Bodmer II, Supplément, Évangile de Jean, chap. 14-21 (Cologne/Genève: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1958). These transcriptions were used in the collation.

18. Von Heinrich Zimmermann, "Papyrus Bodmer II und seine Bedeutung für die Textgeschichte des Johannes-Evangeliums," Biblische Zeitschrift, n.f. II (1958), 215.

19. E. J. Smothers, "Papyrus Bodmer II: An Early Codex of St. John," Theological Studies, XVIII (1957), 441.

containing portions of the remaining chapters are extremely fragmentary. The last bit of actual text gives portions of John 21:8, 9.

The manuscript is almost square shape; the leaves are 16.2 cm. high and 14.2 cm. wide. It is made up of quires of various sizes.<sup>20</sup> There is a blank leaf at the beginning which provides a front cover. Beginning with the first written page, the pages are numbered. These numbers are apparently in a hand which is to be distinguished from the hand that wrote the text. While the last fragment containing any text is on page 152 of the manuscript, there are two fragments containing the numbers 153 and 154. The sheets are so arranged that the pages on which the papyrus fibers run horizontally (the rectos) face pages on which the fibers also run horizontally. B. Van Regemorter, a specialist in the history of the binding of papyrus manuscripts, examined the codex and has contributed to Martin's Introduction a persuasive description of the technique probably used in binding and covering Papyrus Bodmer II. Thread holes and mending strips of parchment demonstrate the binding stitches used.

The three photographic plates given in the publication of P66 show that the handwriting is an excellent, upright, regular quadratic literary script. This handwriting is one of the most

---

20. Quires one, four and five each contain five sheets. The second quire contains four sheets. The third quire, now missing, presumably consisted of a single sheet. The sixth quire contains eight sheets. The remaining quires are too fragmentary to determine their sizes.



elegant of those found in early Christian texts. The letters are well formed and evenly placed. The lines of the single, wide column of writing are regular with ample space between them. The margins are roomy and the whole page is laid out with a discerning sense of proportion. By means of plucking at the corners the scribe set out his lines regularly and makes the successive pages match. Of the three pages for which photographic plates are included, only the first page is a little crowded. The scribe varied the number of lines on a page considerably, from fifteen to twenty-five. There is no ornamentation of any kind. The editor's experience, and that of his consultants, gives weight to their conclusion that on the basis of the paleography this manuscript is to be assigned to the beginning of the third century. Such a date is supported by other considerations--orthography, grammar and punctuation. The present writer, after studying the facsimile plates and after comparing the paleography with that of other early Greek manuscripts, can see nothing inconsistent with the cautious conclusion of Professor Martin. "Cette écriture ne peut être assignée à une époque postérieure au règne de Dioclétien. Elle pourrait bien être du tout début du III<sup>e</sup> siècle et même d'une date plus haute."<sup>21</sup>

The text in P66 is divided into rudimentary sections. The

---

21. Victor Martin (ed.), Papyrus Bodmer II, (Cologne/Genève: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1956), p. 18. Martin quotes this from Grenfell and Hunt, Oxyrhynchus Papyri, VIII (1911), p. 4, who so describe POxy 1074.

end of these sections is marked by two dots (:) and then the rest of the line is left blank. When the two dots correspond with the end of a line, the beginning of the following line (corresponding to the beginning of a new section) is begun one space to the left of the normal alignment.<sup>22</sup> The editor is of the opinion that these sections are not the result of a personal preference on the part of the scribe, but that they represent some primitive system already used in previous manuscripts. The divisions are similar to those of the later Washington Codex of the Gospels and of Codex Bezae. The divisions in P66 are not, however, as extensive as those found in these two manuscripts.

Punctuation is quite rudimentary and is by no means systematic. A dot is frequently found raised more or less above the line, but there seems to be no regularity in its use. It is used to separate elements in a series while the obvious end of a sentence will often have no punctuation at all. There are a few occurrences of the rough breathing and the accent is extremely rare. Proper names are generally followed by an apostrophe. The apostrophe is also used to separate consonants in the middle of a word. This use, particularly between consonants, seems to be, Martin suggests, the use of a technique

---

22. Major sections are indicated following 1:23; 2:10, 22; 3:21, 36; 4:54; 6:71; 10:5; 10:21; 11:52; and 12:13. Double points also occur after 2:11; 3:28; 4:54; 7:25; 8:19, 29, 50; 9:14; 11:52; 12:13; 13:1, 20. Chapters 15-21 are too fragmentary to determine where, if at all, the double points occurred.

quite new and as yet poorly established. There are no divisions between words. The diaeresis occurs frequently with initial iota and upsilon. The orthography deviates considerably from the accepted standard of the critical texts, yet almost all the examples are ordinary examples of itacism.

Nomina sacra are abbreviated in the usual manner. As is the case with punctuation, the abbreviations are also irregularly used. There are a number of instances in which a final nu at the end of a line is replaced with a line over the previous letter. Numbers are occasionally written as ciphers.

There are a great number of omissions and scribal errors in P66, but most of the defects have been corrected. Many of the corrections were no doubt made by the scribe during the course of his work. Without having access to a complete photographic facsimile, it is impossible to determine whether a given correction is that of the original scribe or that of a later hand. A careful study of the three photographic plates shows some similarity between the forms of the letters in the primary writing and that of the corrections. However, there are only a few corrections in the text included in these facsimiles. Corrections have been made in several ways. In some cases the letter or letters have been cancelled with a dot or series of dots placed over the letter or letters to be removed. The series is also enclosed within parentheses. Corrections have also been made by erasure. Additions to the text have been made by squeezing the letters into the same line or by supra-linear or marginal additions.

The early date of this manuscript, combined with its excellent state of preservation, make this papyrus a superior witness to the text of the Gospel of John.

### P75

P75, a papyrus manuscript originally containing the Gospels of Luke and John, is an acquisition of the Bodmer Library in Geneva, Switzerland, where it is known as Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV.<sup>23</sup> Even though the Johannine portion of this manuscript is not as well preserved, nor as extensive, as P66, it is an important and impressive early witness to the text of the Gospel of John.

The composition of this papyrus codex serves as a monument to ancient book making. As the manuscript arrived in the Bodmer Library, the papyrus was in a poor state of repair. There were twenty-five isolated leaves, more or less complete, with writing on both sides accompanied by numerous fragments of all dimensions. Paleographic evidence indicates that all of these leaves and fragments belong to the same manuscript, according to Professor Martin. In addition there was part of a leather binding to which several layers of some fragments of

---

23. Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV has not yet been published. A transcription of the text and a copy of the Introduction prepared by Victor Martin were made available for this investigation in advance of the projected publication. The contents of this section and the collation are based upon this unique source.

the same manuscript adhered apparently to form a sort of boarding in order to reinforce the binding.

After the fragments were identified and the original form of the manuscript reconstructed, it became apparent that fifty-one leaves, in various states of repair, were represented. The dimensions of a complete leaf are 26 x 13 cm. In the original state of the manuscript these leaves formed the two halves of a sheet measuring 26 x 26 cm. In the construction of the manuscript the sheets of papyrus were laid one upon the other with the verso (vertical fibers) on the underneath, and the recto (horizontal fibers) on the upper side and then folded in the middle to form a rather thick single-quire manuscript. In P66, and many other papyrus manuscripts, the sheets were superimposed alternately, the first with the verso on the upper side and the next with the recto side up, so that when the codex is opened the fibers on opposite pages run in the same direction. That the two halves of the sheets belong together is demonstrated not only by the continuity of the papyrus fibers, but also by other physical signs.

The results of various calculations made by Victor Martin, combined with an examination of the folios which are preserved or represented, show that the codex, when it was intact, was a single-quire manuscript containing 144 pages representing 36 sheets folded in the middle. There may have been in addition to this a blank sheet which served as cover guards at beginning and end. The lost text involves conjoint folios. The analytical reconstruction which follows shows that the lost sheets

(1-8, except folio 7; 10, 35, and 36) are those which were on the outside and in the middle of the big quire. The pages of the manuscript are not numbered.

## Analytical Reconstruction of P75

Folio		Sheet	Folio	
1	lost	1	lost	72
2	lost	2	lost	71
3	lost	3	lost	70
4	lost	4	lost	69
5	lost	5	lost	68
6	lost	6	lost	67
7*	L 3:18-22 / 3:33-4:2	7	lost	66
8	lost	8	lost	65
9*	L 4:34-42 / 43-5:10	9	J 14:8-26 / 26-15:8	*64
10	lost	10	lost	63
11*	L 5:37-6:4 / 10-15	11	J 12:33-47 / 47-13:10	*62
12	L 6:16-28 / 28-40	12	J 12:4-19 / 19-33	61
13	L 6:40-49 / 49-7:9	13	J 11:33-45 / 49-57	60
14	L 7:9-21 / 21-32	14	J 11:2-19 / 19-33	59
15	L 7:35-43 / 45-8:5	15	J 10:14-29 / 29-11:2	58
16	L 8:5-16 / 16-28	16	J 9:22-40 / 40-10:14	57
17	L 8:28-39 / 39-52	17	J 8:52-9:8 / 8-22	56
18	L 8:52-9:10 / 10-22	18	J 8:22-38 / 38-52	55
19	L 9:22-33 / 33-44	19	J 7:32-49 / 49-8:22	54
20	L 9:44-57 / 57-10:8	20	J 6:71-7:17 / 17-32	53
21	L 10:8-20 / 20-32	21	J 6:38-54 / 54-71	52
22	L 10:32-11:1 / 1-13	22	J 6:7-22 / 22-38	51
23	L 11:13-24 / 24-34	23	J 5:23-37 / 37-6:7	50
24	L 11:34-46 / 46-12:3	24	J 4:46-5:9 / 9-23	49
25	L 12:3-13 / 13-27	25	J 4:14-30 / 31-46	48
26	L 12:27-39 / 39-53	26	J 3:19-34 / 34-4:14	47
27	L 12:53-13:4 / 4-16	27	J 2:12-3:3 / 3-19	46
28	L 13:16-27 / 28-14:3	28	J 1:33-48 / 48-2:12	45
29	L 14:3-14 / 14-26	29	L 24:51-J 1:1-16 / 16-33	44
30	L 14:26-15:3 / 3-16	30	L 24:15-31 / 31-50	43
31	L 15:16-29 / 29-16:9	31	L 23:35-53 / 53-24:15	42
32	L 16:9-21 / 21-17:2	32	L 23:2-18 / 18-35	41
33	L 17:3-15 / 19-29	33	L 22:37-56 / 56-23:2	40
34	L 17:29-18:6 / 6-18	34	L 22:4-21 / 21-37	39
35	lost	35	lost	38
36	lost	36	lost	37

In the analytical chart those folios which are practically complete are underlined; the others are more or less incomplete.

The asterisk denotes those leaves which were later used in the cover.

The number of lines to a page varies from thirty-eight to forty-five. In the second half of the manuscript the number of lines to the page is consistently greater than in the first half. Apparently the scribe, approaching the end of his writing material, perceived that it was necessary to include more lines to the page in order to complete the Gospel of John. The composition of the manuscript represents an amazing feat in calculation and mechanics.

The writing is a neat, vertical uncial. It is elegant and carefully executed. It is the same type as that represented in P<sup>Oxy</sup> 2293, 2322, 3362, 2363, 2370. Until the publication of photographic facsimiles, this present writer tentatively accepts the conclusion of Victor Martin with respect to the date of the papyrus: "Une date pour la transcription de nos Evangiles située entre 175 et 225 de notre ère est la supposition la plus probable."<sup>24</sup> Such a date makes this text the earliest witness of such extent for the Gospel of John.

The subscription of the Gospel of Luke and the superscription of the Gospel of John, separated by a space of a few lines on the same page, are by the same scribal hand as the rest of the text. The arrangement of the writing on the page is excellent and the margins are sufficient. The papyrus itself

---

<sup>24</sup>. Victor Martin (ed.), Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV (Unpublished material), p. 11.

is of an average quality with the fibers rather projecting onto the surface. In some places there is evidence that the papyrus has been scraped.

The divisions in the text are indicated in a manner analogous to those in P66. In P66 the end of a section is marked by a break, often accompanied by a point; while the following line, with which begins a new section, projects a letter into the left-hand margin. The procedure employed in P75 differs only in that the break is replaced by a blank space equivalent to several letters and the new section then begins in the same line. The following line then projects in the left margin.<sup>25</sup> In several instances a division is indicated by a short line (\_\_\_\_) equal to four letters, half in the margin and half in the text. This is placed under the first complete line of the new division.<sup>26</sup> The double point (:) does not occur in P75 in the Johannine section.

Punctuation consists of abundant single points placed at different levels. While the ancient distinction between the "high" point and the "low" point is generally preserved, in many cases it is difficult to determine which was meant by the scribe. Elision is frequently used and it is accompanied by

---

25. In the Gospel of John the sections are so indicated at 1:6, 29, 35; 2:1, 23; 3:1, 22; 6:1, 59; 7:1, 37, 40; 8:12, 28, 30, 51; 9:1; 11:1; 12:30.

26. In John this occurs at 4:1; 5:1 and 10:19. The divisions or sections in the text of P75 coincide with those of P66 at 1:6; 2:23; 3:22; 4:1; 5:1; 7:1; 8:30, 51. In addition to these concurrences, the divisions differ at other places.



the use of the apostrophe. The diaeresis with initial iota and upsilon is very frequent, even where it is not required. Proper names are often indicated by a point or by an apostrophe. These, however, are not used systematically. The rough breathing, generally in the angular form, occurs occasionally, but sometimes wrongly. The smooth breathing is considerably more rare. There are no accents. Numbers are usually written in ciphers. Nu at the end of a line, even in the middle of a word, is generally written defectively. The sign (>) is used to fill in a blank space at the end of the line.

The papyrus usually abbreviates the nomina sacra. These abbreviations are not consistently used throughout the manuscript. The orthography corresponds to the standard of the critical texts remarkably well. The use of iota adscript is rare; it occurs only twice in the Lucan portion of the manuscript. The use of nu-movable is irregular and arbitrary. Corrections in the text are not numerous and those that do occur are not always by the same hand.

## B

### Codex Vaticanus

Codex Vaticanus, designated as B, is a fine parchment codex containing almost the entire Greek Bible. Genesis 1:1-46:28 and Psalms 105:27-137:6 in the Old Testament are missing. The books of the Maccabees were never included in this manuscript. The last folios containing the end of Hebrews (9:14

to the end), I and II Timothy, Titus, Philemon and possibly the Apocalypse have been lost.

Codex Vaticanus was already in the possession of the Vatican Library at Rome before a catalogue of that library was made in 1481.<sup>27</sup> For some reason which does not clearly appear, the authorities of the Vatican Library formerly set obstacles in the way of all who wished to study it in detail. A correspondent of Erasmus in 1533 sent to that scholar a number of selected readings from it. In 1669 a collation was made by Bartolocci, but it was never published and remained unknown until 1819. Napoleon carried the manuscript to Paris as a prize of war, and it remained there from 1809 until it was returned to Rome in 1815. While at Paris the manuscript was studied by Leonhard Hug, a Roman Catholic professor from Tübingen, and its great age and true value were recognized for the first time. After its return to Rome, a period of seclusion set in. In 1843 Constantine Tischendorf was able to study the manuscript in Rome, but only under very restricted circumstances, and full and accurate knowledge was not available to the scholars of the world until a complete photographic

---

27. Frederic G. Kenyon, Handbook to the Textual Criticism of The New Testament (London: Macmillan and Company, Limited, 1901), p. 77, explains an often repeated error, that this manuscript is listed in a catalogue of 1475. That catalogue does not contain a manuscript answering the description of Codex Vaticanus.

facsimile was published in Rome in 1889-1890.<sup>28</sup>

In order to facilitate the photographing of Codex Vaticanus, it was taken apart. It has not been rebound and each vellum sheet is kept flat in its individual folder.

Codex Vaticanus must have originally contained about 820 leaves of which 759 are preserved. One hundred forty-two of these leaves belong to the New Testament. The leaves measure about 27-28 cm. x 27-28 cm. and there are three narrow columns of text to the page with from forty to forty-four lines to a column. In the New Testament section there are forty-two lines to the column. Codex Vaticanus is a quarto volume arranged in quires of five sheets or ten leaves each. The writing is a small, neat uncial. Smaller letters are sometimes crowded in at the ends of lines. The words are written continuously without separation. Ruling has been done with a sharp point. On some pages the letters are written on the line and on other pages the ruled line passes between two lines of writing.<sup>29</sup> There is almost no punctuation, although initial iota and upsilon are marked with a diaeresis and nomina sacra are

28. Bibliorum Ss. graecorum Codex Vaticanus 1209 (cod. B) denuo phototypice expressus iussu et cura praesidum Bibliothecae Vaticanae (Milan: Ulricum Hoepli, 1904-1907), a photographic reproduction published by the Vatican Library, was used for this present investigation. The New Testament text of B is contained in volume III, part 2 of a series of four volumes of manuscript facsimiles published by the Vatican Library under the direction of Pius X (1903-1914).

29. For a full description of the ruling of Codex Vaticanus see C. R. Gregory, Textkritik des Neuen Testaments, I (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1900), p. 34.

abbreviated. The apostrophe is occasionally used. Old Testament quotations are indicated with a horizontal caret (>).

The codex is the work of at least two scribes, who are known as A and B. The New Testament was copied by the latter. It is quite evident that the Gospel of John was written by one scribe.

At least two correctors have made corrections in the manuscript, one being almost contemporary with the original scribes, and the other being as late as the tenth or eleventh century. The later corrector retraced the pale letters, omitting only the letters and words which he believed to be incorrect, and he also added the breathings and accents. The style of the handwriting of the original scribes and the almost complete absence of ornamentation indicate a date for Codex Vaticanus in the middle of the fourth century A. D.

The Eusebian sections do not appear in Codex Vaticanus, but in place of them there is a different division of the Gospels. Of these divisions there are eighty in the Gospel of John.

The origin and early history of Codex Vaticanus are not known. It is not within the scope of this present survey to recapitulate all of the theories concerning the provenance of Codex Vaticanus. It has been attributed by distinguished New Testament scholars to Egypt, Caesarea, South Italy, and Rome.

W. H. P. Hatch<sup>30</sup> argues that the manuscript was copied in Egypt, but not in Alexandria which has often been advocated. Hatch believes that it can be demonstrated that Codex Vaticanus was written in Upper Egypt.

## S

## Codex Sinaiticus

Codex Sinaiticus, designated as S, derives its name from Mount Sinai where it was found in the Monastery of Saint Catherine. The discoverer was Constantine Tischendorf. The story of the great discovery in his own words is as follows:

It was at the foot of Mount Sinai, in the Convent of St. Catherine, that I discovered the pearl of all my researches. In visiting the library of the monastery, in the month of May, 1844, I perceived in the middle of the great hall a large and wide basket full of old parchments; and the librarian, who was a man of information, told me that two heaps of paper like these, mouldered by time, had been already committed to the flames. What was my surprise to find amid this heap of papers a considerable number of sheets of a copy of the Old Testament in Greek, which seemed to me to be one of the most ancient that I had ever seen. The authorities of the convent allowed me to possess myself of a third of these parchments, or about forty-three sheets, all the more readily as they were destined for the fire.<sup>31</sup>

---

30. W. H. P. Hatch, "The Provenance of Codex Vaticanus," a paper read at the eighty-eighth meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis at Union Theological Seminary in New York, December 29-31, 1952. An abstract of his paper is in Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXII (1953), xviii, xix.

31. Codex Sinaiticus, The Ancient Biblical Manuscript now in The British Museum; Tischendorf's Story and Argument Related by Himself (Eighth edition; London: Lutterworth Press, 1934), pp. 23, 24.

Tischendorf was allowed to take the forty-three leaves to Leipzig where he edited them. In 1853 Tischendorf returned to Sinai but could find nothing more of the manuscript. Once again in 1859 he came back, this time with the approval of the emperor of Russia for systematic researches in the East; but still there was no trace of the great treasure. He was on the point of leaving when the steward of the convent invited him to his cell. Tischendorf relates that the monk--

took down from the corner of the room a bulky kind of volume, wrapped up in a red cloth, and laid it before me. I unrolled the cover, and discovered, to my great surprise, not only those very fragments which, fifteen years before, I had taken out of the basket, but also other parts of the Old Testament, the New Testament complete, and in addition, the Epistle of Barnabas and a part of the Pastor of Hermas.<sup>32</sup>

After complex transactions it became possible for Tischendorf to place the great manuscript in the hands of the emperor of Russia and for himself to prepare a transcriptional edition of it.<sup>33</sup>

Codex Sinaiticus remained in Leningrad until it was purchased from the Soviet government by the British Museum. When the manuscript arrived at the British Museum, December 28, 1933, its appearance was still much as when Tischendorf first saw it

32. Codex Sinaiticus, p. 26.

33. The photographic reproductions prepared by Kirsopp and Helen Lake were used in this present study: Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus, The New Testament, The Epistle of Barnabas and The Shepherd of Hermas, Preserved in the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911). Cf. Constantine Tischendorf, Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus, 4 vols. (Leipzig: Giesecke and Devrient, 1862).

at Mount Sinai. The manuscript consisted of a large pile of loose quires and leaves and lacked both beginning and end and had no covers or binding. It has since been carefully bound by the British Museum in two volumes, Old Testament and New Testament.

Codex Sinaiticus, when complete, evidently contained the whole of the Greek Bible and probably had at least 730 leaves; but only 390, including the forty-three at Leipzig, remain today--242 in the Old Testament and 148 in the New Testament. The New Testament portion is intact and includes the books known as the Shepherd of Hermas, which is incomplete, and the Epistle of Barnabas. The text is written on very thin vellum arranged in quires of eight leaves, or sixteen pages. The pages are 38.1 cm. x 33.7-35.6 cm. There is evidence that the pages have been trimmed at some time. Each page contains four narrow columns, with forty-eight lines to the column.<sup>34</sup>

The words are written continuously without separation. Ruling has been done with a sharp point and the letters are on the line. There are no accents or breathings, although high and middle points and colon are used for punctuation. Initial iota and upsilon have the diaeresis and nomina sacra are abbreviated. While the codex is the work of probably three scribes,

---

34. Since Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus are written in three and four columns respectively, it has sometimes been advocated that they are two of the fifty vellum Bibles ordered by Constantine from Eusebius of Caesarea in A. D. 332 (Eusebius: Life of Constantine, IV, 36, 37). This is possible, though there is no proof of it.

the Johannine section was written by a single scribe. Old Testament quotations are not indicated. The Eusebian sections indicated in the margin of the Gospels are in a hand evidently contemporaneous with the text.

Many corrections have been made in the manuscript not only by the original scribes, but also by a series of correctors from the fourth to the twelfth century.<sup>35</sup> The dignified simplicity of the elegant uncial letters in which the manuscript was originally written is comparable to that of Codex Vaticanus, and both manuscripts were probably written at about the same time, around A. D. 350. The place where Codex Sinaiticus was written is uncertain. In any case, there is nothing to contradict an Egyptian origin, although Caesarea, Palestine, and Italy have been advocated as possibilities.

## W

### The Washington Manuscript of the Gospels

The Washington Manuscript, or the Freer Manuscript, was purchased by Charles L. Freer in 1906 from an Arab dealer at Gizeh and it is now in the Freer Gallery of Art in Washington,

---

35. Cf. H. J. M. Milne and T. C. Skeat, Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus (London: British Museum, 1938), pp. 22, 23, 40-50. This present investigation is primarily concerned with the text of the original scribe and not the text represented in the numerous corrections.



D. C. 36

The manuscript originally contained the whole of the four gospels in the so-called "Western" order, Matthew, John, Luke, Mark. This order is also that of Codex Bezae, Codex Monacensis (X), minuscule 594, some manuscripts (a b e f ff2 q) of the Old Latin version, and the manuscripts of the Gothic Version. In the Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels there are two lacunae caused by the loss of leaves: John 14:25-16:7 and Mark 15:13-15:38. The remainder of the manuscript is so perfect that there is rarely a letter missing or indistinct.

The text is written on parchment of medium thickness and of excellent quality, but it has suffered exceedingly from age, wear and exposure. The presence of thick board covers prevented the decay from affecting anything except the edges of the leaves, so the text is everywhere legible. In the present state of the manuscript there are 187 leaves or 374 pages, of which 372 are written. There are two blank pages at the end of the Gospel of John. The pages measure 20.5-21 cm. x 13-14.5 cm. The manuscript is divided into twenty-six irregular quires. There are quire marks in the upper right-hand corner of the

---

36. Henry A. Sanders (ed.), The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection, Part I: The Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1912); and Facsimile of the Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels in the Freer Collection (Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan, 1912). This facsimile was used for the collation. Edgar J. Goodspeed, American Journal of Theology, XVII (1913), 599-613, gives a collation of the Johannine section with the text of Westcott and Hort.

first recto of each quire. The leaves in the quires are so matched that flesh side of parchment is brought opposite to flesh side, and hair side is opposite hair side.

The writing itself is in one column of thirty lines to the page. Ruling was done with a sharp point and the letters are on the line. The text is written continuously without separation. The hand is a small, clear, sloping uncial. The single dot in the middle position is not infrequent. The double dot is rarely used, and is found only six times in John. The line filler (>) occurs. In the first quire of John, which is in a different hand, the single dot in middle position is used regularly. The double dot occurs twice. A substitute for punctuation is formed by leaving a small blank space between the phrases. This occurs frequently and regularly. The rough breathing is used very rarely and no accents occur. The apostrophe is used. Initial iota is found with a diaeresis and initial upsilon occurs with a single dot. In the first quire of John the diaeresis is used over upsilon also. Paragraphs, usually shown by slightly enlarged letters projecting into the left margin, occur rather frequently. Nomina sacra are abbreviated, but there are more abbreviations in the first quire of John than in the other parts of the manuscript. Old Testament quotations are indicated. Spelling in the manuscript varies considerably from the textus receptus. Itacisms are frequent. There is a brief subscription and superscription for each gospel. The superscriptions for Matthew, Luke and Mark were written by the second hand. The writer of the superscription

of John cannot be determined with certainty.

The Washington Codex is the work of two scribes. One wrote the entire manuscript with the exception of the first quire of John (1:1-5:11), and the other copied the leaves which compose this quire. The manuscript contains a number of corrections. Some of the corrections were made by the scribe himself while others are the work of a corrector of the sixth century.

The style of writing, the infrequent punctuation, the absence of accents and of the Eusebian sections all suggest that this manuscript belongs either to the fourth or the fifth century. The editor suggests that "in determining the date of W most of the evidence thus seems to point to the fourth century, though the beginning of the fifth must still be admitted as a possibility."<sup>37</sup> Sanders also believes that the first quire of John is from approximately the same date.

The Washington Codex was found in Egypt, but the exact spot is not known, though there is evidence that it came from a monastery in the neighborhood of the pyramids. Sanders argues that the manuscript belonged in the sixth century to the Church of Saint Timothy in the Monastery of the Vinedresser. The Arab dealer says it was found in the ruins of a monastery.

---

37. Henry A. Sanders (ed.), The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection, Part I, p. 139. The manuscript was assigned to the seventh or eighth century by F. G. Kenyon and to the seventh century by W. H. P. Hatch. This difference in dating is hard to parallel in the science of paleography.

Carl Schmidt claims that it came to light in the midst of repairs on the White Monastery near Akhmim.<sup>38</sup>

0162

In 1909 Grenfell and Hunt procured in Egypt a fragment from a fourth-century vellum codex, 0162, which measures 16.2 x 14.6 cm. and which contains John 2:11-16 on the recto and 16-22 on the verso. They published the fragment as POxy 847, with a photographic facsimile of the recto and a transcription of the complete text.<sup>39</sup> The fragment is now housed in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.

The leaf of this manuscript is practically entire. The scribal hand is a medium-sized uncial, upright, square and regular. The usual theological contractions occur, but no marks of punctuation are evident. The paleographic features indicate a fourth-century date for this fragment.

By way of summary it is expedient that two observations be made. In the first place, there are no sufficient specimens of ascertained date and diverse provenance to justify any

---

38. Carl Schmidt, Theologische Literaturzeitung, XXXIII (1908), cols. 359, 360.

39. Grenfell and Hunt (eds.), Oxyrhynchus Papyri VI (1908), pp. 4, 5. The transcription contained in this volume was used for the collation. Cf. C. R. Gregory, Textkritik des Neuen Testaments, III (1909), pp. 1082, 83.

security of judgment with regard to the dates assigned to these earliest Greek manuscripts. Datings based upon paleography can only be approximate. This present writer concurs with the judgment of Kurt Aland: "Wir bedürfen einer neuen Untersuchung für viele Papyri, um einer 'Normalisierung' ihrer Zeitansetzung zu erreichen."<sup>40</sup>

In the second place, the birthplace of the majority of these earliest Greek manuscripts is a disputed issue. With regard to most of them, next to nothing is known of their history until they are found in, or drift into, a library at some date in the last four hundred years. Even with Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus, the origin and early history are almost entirely a matter of inference. With possibly one or two exceptions, it is impossible to make any geographical assertions with confidence. It is usually assumed that these earliest Greek manuscripts originated in Egypt. That assumption is probably correct, at least for the papyri. In this connection Kurt Aland suggests that "wir bedürfen einer neuen Untersuchung für alle nicht eindeutig aus Texthandschriften stammenden Papyri auf ihre Provenienz."<sup>41</sup> If the development of the various families of the text is to be traced, it is essential to fix the places of origin of the chief manuscripts representing those families.

---

<sup>40</sup>. Kurt Aland, "Neue Neutestamentliche Papyri," New Testament Studies, III (1956-57), 285.

<sup>41</sup>. Ibid.

If these two factors, the date and the provenance, were known for every manuscript without any doubt, the formulation of the history of the text of the Gospel of John in the first four centuries would be greatly simplified. Without this knowledge, one must rely upon conjecture which, at best, has some rational arguments in its support.

The following summary lists chronologically, beginning with the earliest, the manuscripts which have been described in this chapter:

P52	18:31-33, 37, 38.
P75	1:1-13:1, 8, 9; 14:8-30; 15:7, 8.
P66	1:1-6:11; 6:35-14:26, 29, 30; 15:3-25; 16:4-6, 11-21:9.
P45	10:7-25, 31-11:10, 18-36, 43-57.
P22	15:25-16:2, 21-32.
P5	1:23-31, 33-41; 16:14-30; 20:11-25.
P28	6:8-12, 17-22.
0162	2:11-22.
P39	8:14-22.
B	1:1-21:25.
S	1:1-21:25.
W	1:1-14:25; 16:7-21:25.

Chapter IV  
THE COMPARISON OF MANUSCRIPTS

The comparison of manuscripts is the foundation of all enduring textual criticism. Just as the practice of textual criticism is impossible without a basic theory concerning the history of the text, the construction of a hypothesis concerning the history of the text is impossible without a comparison of texts. The textual critic cannot hope to make progress in his work until he undertakes extensive comparisons for the purpose of relating the texts contained in the various manuscripts. Even though direct kinships cannot, in most cases, be recovered, more general kinship within larger groups of manuscripts is a real possibility. The study of this larger and looser kinship illuminates the history of the transmission of the text of the Gospel of John. The study of the relationships of one manuscript to others makes clear the habits of scribes and the characteristics of individual manuscripts. Hort perceived that

the observation of groupings is "a critical instrument by which a composite text can be to a great extent analyzed into its constituent elements."<sup>1</sup>

In 1734 J. A. Bengel published at Tübingen an edition of the New Testament. While the text is mainly that of the textus receptus, his edition is noteworthy because he was the first to attempt any classification of his authorities. As more and more manuscripts came to be known and collated by New Testament scholars, irresistibly the idea urged itself upon the critics to classify into families and groups those manuscripts with the same textual peculiarities. Bengel visualized the mass of witnesses in the image of "families, tribes, and nations." As far as the evidence was available to him, Bengel divided the authorities, both manuscripts and versions, into two main groups which he called "African natio" and "Asiatic natio." The former included the most ancient authorities and the latter, the great majority of later date. Bengel gave preference to the African group. It was thus that the ground plan of a division into Alexandrian and Byzantine families was laid down. Since Bengel's initial division until the present, textual critics have described under a variety of terms those major types of text discerned through the oldest witnesses.

In 1764 J. S. Semler adopted Bengel's classification, but

---

1. Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek, II: Introduction and Appendix (London: Macmillan and Company, Limited, 1881), p. 183.



three years later he refined this classification and for the first time used the word "recension." He divided the manuscript authorities into three recensions, Alexandrian, Eastern and Western.

Semler's theory derives special importance from its adoption and extension by his pupil, J. J. Griesbach. At the beginning of his labors Griesbach divided all the extant materials into five or six different families. In the Prolegomena to his first edition of the Greek New Testament, 1774-75, he elaborated the system of three recensions. While he followed the divisions of Semler, Griesbach gave greater fulness to them by his precise assignment of the principal individual authorities to the several families. Griesbach considered the Western recension to be the text which had been in circulation in the earliest period of the transmission of the text, and which through the errors of copyists came to require much correction. The Alexandrian recension he considered to be an attempt to revise the old corrupt text, and the Constantinopolitan he explained as emerging from the other two. It was Griesbach who applied the term "recension" to each of these three classifications.

A Roman Catholic contemporary of Griesbach, J. L. Hug (1765-1846), propounded the theory that the existing texts are editorial revisions of a deteriorated "koine ekdosis" closely resembling the Western text. This old text, replete with errors of transcribers, was, he concluded, revised into three different forms by Origen in Palestine, by Hesychius in Egypt,

and by Lucian at Antioch, about the middle of the third century. To these recensions he then ascribed the early manuscripts which were known to him. To the Hesychian recension he assigned Codex Vaticanus. The alleged evidence for this theory consists of two passages from Jerome. In the first, Jerome speaks of the textual diversity of copies of the Septuagint in different regions. Alexandria and Egypt appeal, suggests Jerome, to the authority of Hesychius; Constantinople and Antioch approve the copies of Lucian the Martyr; the intermediate provinces read the Palestinian volumes, worked out by Origen and published by Eusebius and Pamphilus; and the whole world is set at discord by this threefold difference.<sup>2</sup> Jerome is explicit in assigning to Hesychius an edition of the Greek Old Testament. This Hesychius is generally identified with the Hesychius named by Eusebius (Church History VIII, 13) among the Egyptian bishops martyred in the persecution of 308-12.

A second passage in Jerome's writings connects Hesychius with the New Testament. After saying that for the true text it is necessary to look to the Greek original, Jerome indicates

---

2. "Alexandria et Aegyptus in Septuaginta suis Hesychium laudat auctorem: Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam, Luciani martyris exemplaria probat. Mediae inter has provinciae Palaestinos codices legunt: quos ab Origene elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt: totusque orbis hac inter se trifaria varietate compugnat." Praefatio Hieronymi in librum Paralipomenon and repeated in Contra Rufinum Libros II. It is here quoted from Patrologiae Latinae (Migne), XXVIII (1890), cols. 1392, 1393.

that he passes by those volumes which bear the names of Lucian and Hesychius which are upheld by the perverse contentiousness of a few men.<sup>3</sup> Jerome implies the existence of copies of the New Testament or of the Gospels associated with the names of Lucian and Hesychius, which had undergone correction or revision. Since these appear in company with Origen's name in a similar connection in the first quotation, J. L. Hug supposed that Hesychius had made a recension of both testaments for Alexandria; Lucian, one for Antioch; and Origen, one for Palestine. Hug then proceeded to discover descendants of the supposed recensions in groups of extant manuscripts.

Since the publication in 1894 of Wilhelm Bousset's Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament,<sup>4</sup> the attribution to Hesychius of that type of New Testament text of which Codex Vaticanus is the principal representative has been rather generally accepted. While Bousset was not the first scholar to propose this theory, it was his revival of it that led to its general acceptance among textual critics.

An important advance in the classification of manuscripts

3. "Praetermitto eos codices, quos a Luciano et Hesychio nuncupatos, paucorum hominum asserit perversa contentio: quibus utique nec in Veteri Instrumento post Septuaginta interpretes emendare quid licuit, nec in Novo profuit emendasse: cum multarum gentium linguis Scriptura ante translata, doceat falsa esse quae addita sunt." Praefatio Hieronymi in Quatuor Evangelia. It is here quoted from Patrologiae Latinae (Migne), XXIX (1865), col. 559.

4. Wilhelm Bousset, Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament ("Texte und Untersuchungen," XI; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1894), pp. 74-110.

into groups for the purpose of constructing a textual theory was made by B. R. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort. In 1881, after nearly thirty years of joint labor, these Cambridge scholars published two volumes, the first containing their text of the New Testament with a brief survey of its history and resultant criticism, the second giving a detailed exposition of their critical principles. They were led by their investigation to distinguish four main types of text: a late type, originating in Syria about the year 300, which, issuing from Constantinople, became the prevailing text in later manuscripts, and corresponds essentially with the textus receptus of the early printed editions; a type originating in Alexandria, characterized by linguistic emendations; a type originating in Syria but reaching the West previous to the year 200 (hence, Western), represented essentially by the Old Latin versions on the one hand and by the Syriac on the other, and displaying all sorts of remarkable additions; and the Neutral text, which displays no sort of corruptions.

According to their theory, the Western and Neutral texts are traceable to the earliest periods for which evidence is available. Westcott and Hort believed that the Western text is a very early and yet very corrupt text due to a process of free interpolation and paraphrase. Even though the Neutral text represented chiefly by Codex Vaticanus, was a revised text, Westcott and Hort believed it to be the true text. They made, however, one major exception in their preference for the Neutral text. If the Western text omits anything, they

considered that such an omission deserves great consideration because the Western text is inclined to addition. Therefore, if the Western text omits a reading found elsewhere, the probability is that it does so because the omission is primitive.

In 1913 Hermann von Soden published his text of the New Testament with apparatus criticus (Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer aeltesten erreichbaren Textgestalt, II. Teil: Text mit Apparat). Already, from 1902-10, he had published elaborate Prolegomena (I. Teil: Untersuchungen, 1, 2, 3 Abteilungen) treating the division of the manuscripts into groups. According to his textual theory, most New Testament witnesses fall into one of three families which he called K (Koine), H (Hesychian), and I (Ierusalem). The K group is, roughly speaking, Westcott and Hort's Syrian or Antiochian text. It is suggested that K can be traced back to the fourth century and that it is the recension made by Lucian. The H group represents Westcott and Hort's Neutral and Alexandrian which von Soden does not apparently distinguish from one another. According to von Soden the H text is the recension of Hesychius. The I group corresponds, more or less, to the Western text of Westcott and Hort. This Caesarean recension von Soden connected with the names of Pamphilus and Eusebius. The I text represented, for von Soden, the best text.

In 1924 B. H. Streeter<sup>5</sup> proposed his theory of "Local

---

5. B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels (London: Macmillan and Company, Limited, 1924), pp. 27-78.

Texts;" namely, that at the great sees of antiquity there developed special characteristic texts. Streeter believed that these could be identified in the Greek manuscripts by discovering agreements with the earliest versions and with the quotations in the earliest fathers. Streeter identified five local texts: the texts used at Alexandria, Antioch, Caesarea, Italy and Gaul, and Carthage.

This brief recapitulation of the history of the attempts at grouping the manuscripts serves as a background for the analysis which follows in this chapter. Such efforts which have been made toward the systematization of the evidence were directly related to the creation of textual theory and the writing of the history of the text. Knowledge of the history of the text is impossible without an investigation of the relationships of the texts preserved in the many manuscripts.

When new manuscripts are discovered which are earlier than those heretofore known, it is necessary to begin de novo in the process of systematizing the evidence. The elucidation of the earliest stage of the textual history helps to bridge the gap between the original text and the earliest extant evidence and it affords a basis for inferences about the original text. The recovery of the original text depends upon the illumination of its history in the second and third centuries. The illumination of the history of the text in the second and third centuries is best done by the comparison of the earliest manuscripts.

A number of different methods have been employed by textual critics to compare manuscripts one with another and to determine their relationships. No method exists, however, which is absolutely foolproof in determining the relationships that exist between New Testament manuscripts, simply because the entire history of textual transmission is not yet known. Every method is based upon certain assumptions with regard to that history, and if these assumptions are shown to be inaccurate, there will be misgivings about the results.

The conventional method of studying the textual relationships of a particular manuscript is to collate the manuscript with the textus receptus in order to isolate the variations of reading which in turn are used as representative samples for an analysis of the textual affinities of the manuscript in question. The method of appraisal has generally been to calculate the agreements of other manuscripts with these samples. The underlying assumption of this method is that only the Byzantine element is the corrupting force and that until Byzantine manuscripts were produced, text-types existed in relative purity. In discarding readings which agree with the textus receptus one has also discarded many readings which might possibly have some claim to being original. Statistics of agreement based only on variants from the textus receptus are not a safe guide to group relationships. Bruce Metzger writes:

For obviously it is of slight value in determining family relationships to know only that in a certain area a given

manuscript agrees with, say B and N ten times in differing from Textus Receptus. If B and N should in addition differ from the Textus Receptus in ninety instances, the Neutral element in the given manuscript would be slight indeed.<sup>6</sup>

The weaknesses and dangers of the preceding type of analysis are forcefully demonstrated with respect to the text of P52. The text of P52 in the Gospel of John (18:31-33, 37, 38) differs from the textus receptus in five readings. Two of these variants are itacisms; one is the addition of a numeral; one is a transposition of words; and one is an omission. Thus, there are only two significant differences from the textus receptus and of these the omission has no support in any other Greek manuscript. On the basis of the single reading which has support in later Greek manuscripts it is impossible to demonstrate any textual affinities. On the other hand, on the basis of a comparison of the entire text of the fragment of P52 with the texts of other manuscripts, it is possible to project a tentative conclusion with regard to textual affinities. For example, Codex Vaticanus disagrees with the extant text of P52 only once, as compared to the disagreement of Codex Sinaiticus with the text of P52 five times. The text of P52 will be discussed more fully later, but this example illustrates the weakness of the method which defines textual relationships on the basis of variations from

---

6. Bruce M. Metzger, "The Caesarean Text," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXIV (1945), 488.



the textus receptus and suggests the greater effectiveness of a method which compares manuscript with manuscript.

Another method which has been used by textual critics in order to demonstrate textual relationships is to classify families of manuscripts by means of "common errors." Karl Lachmann is the best known exponent of this theory. His method was used, explicitly or implicitly, by nearly all subsequent editors of early texts. The basic presupposition of this method is that each scribe had only one manuscript before him when he made his copy. If this presupposition is granted, then the conclusion that community of error is certain proof of relationship, unless the error is of such nature that the two scribes could make it independently of one another, must be conceded. The basic presupposition cannot be granted as a universal fact. It is never safe to assume that a scribe did not have two or more manuscripts before him or one manuscript with the variants of another written into it. Community of error in New Testament manuscripts is not proof of a direct textual relationship though it may be indicative of such a relationship. The fact that in many manuscripts obvious scribal errors are at a minimum is a difficulty in this method. In John 7:43 Codex Vaticanus and P75 read  $\sigma\chi\iota\mu\alpha$  for  $\sigma\chi\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$ . This "common error" does not necessarily prove a textual relationship because a similar error occurs at 9:16 in the text of P66. Again John 16:15 is lacking in both the text of Codex Sinaiticus and the text of P66. This omission is probably the result of homoioteleuton and it is quite possible that the

omission in the two texts is coincidental. Nevertheless, if other evidence suggests a relationship between the text of Codex Sinaiticus and the text of P66, this "common error" may be judged to reflect such a relationship. Used in conjunction with another method this approach can be valuable.

Manuscript relationships have also been studied by the method of noting instances of peculiar agreement between the texts of manuscripts. This is probably the earliest method used to relate New Testament manuscripts. After variant readings of manuscripts began to be listed in the early critical editions, scholars such as Bengel and Griesbach began to observe that variant readings were classifiable into groups and the manuscripts into families. Through these studies it became known that certain manuscripts frequently agree with one another against all other manuscripts. These instances of peculiar agreement were interpreted as being indicative of a relationship. The degree of relationship was indicated by the extent of peculiar agreement. Basically this method is sound, but it requires detailed knowledge of the text of a large number of manuscripts.

Not entirely unrelated to the preceding method is that proposed by E. A. Hutton.<sup>7</sup> He urged the use of what he called

---

7. Edward A. Hutton, An Atlas of Textual Criticism: Being an Attempt to Show the Mutual Relationship of the Authorities for the Text of the New Testament up to about 1000 A. D. (Cambridge: University Press, 1911).

"Triple Readings." He gives a list of readings in which the "Alexandrian," "Western," and "Syrian" authorities offer mutually conflicting evidence. This list is supported by Tables which show which manuscripts support each reading. The strength of this method is that it suggests an objective method of quickly determining the text-type to which a newly found manuscript belongs. On the other hand, Hutton fails to state the criteria which determine the classification of his readings, and it is evident that he assumes the traditional types. The listing of multiple readings should begin with all cases where the evidence is divided three or more ways rather than with an a priori determination of the number of text-types and their grouping of witnesses.

Beginning with the concept suggested by Hutton's method, E. C. Colwell has freed the method from its dependence upon the work of Westcott and Hort by enlarging it to include within its scope not only those points in the New Testament text at which the three great families of witnesses disagree with one another, but all points at which the variations are three or more in number. Such variation is called "Multiple Variation," and hence, the method has been named "The Multiple Method."<sup>8</sup>

---

8. The clearest and fullest exposition of this method is that of E. C. Colwell, "Method of Locating a Newly-Discovered Manuscript within the Manuscript Tradition of the Greek New Testament," Studia Evangelica, Papers Presented to the International Congress on "The Four Gospels in 1957" Held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1957, ed. Kurt Aland, et. al. ("Texte und Untersuchungen," LXXIII; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959), pp. 757-777.

In this method the New Testament textual witnesses are compared with one another at those points of multiple variation. The witnesses which agree at these points the greatest number of times are considered to be the most closely related. The method depends for its validity upon the fact that at the points of multiple variation there are found many readings which are peculiar to a well defined group of witnesses. If a number of witnesses agree with one another frequently at the points of multiple variation, many of these agreements will be peculiar to the group. It is then assumed that manuscripts so agreeing will also agree at many other places.

There are at least two weaknesses in this method of analyzing manuscript relationships. In the first place, if the newly discovered manuscript is earlier than the previously known manuscripts, this "multiple method" defines the text of the earlier manuscript in terms of later ones. In the second place, this method assumes that there are at least three distinct text-types. If only two variant readings for any particular passage can be found, it is assumed that at least two of the existing types are in agreement. On the other hand, the value of this method is its suitability for dealing with large numbers of manuscripts in their relationships to one

---

Cf. K. W. Kim, "The Matthean Text of Origen in His Commentary on Matthew" Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVIII (1949), 125-139; Harry Merwyn Buck, Jr., The Johannine Lessons in the Greek Gospel Lectionary ("Studies in the Lectionary Text of the Greek New Testament," vol. II, no. 4; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1958).

another.

The most conclusive method of ascertaining the relationships existing between manuscripts is to compare the text of each manuscript with the text of every other known manuscript and to note the instances in which they disagree with one another. The manuscripts which disagree with one another the fewest number of times are the most closely related. E. C. Colwell himself acknowledges that if a newly found manuscript is to be compared with previously known manuscripts, "it should, ideally, be compared completely with all other manuscripts."<sup>9</sup> This is the only method with which complete accuracy can be obtained. Admittedly, it is a very laborious and time-consuming undertaking, and for this reason scholars have preferred to substitute other methods. Nevertheless, it is the method used in this present analysis of the earliest Greek manuscripts of the Gospel of John since we are dealing with a few choice witnesses to the primitive text. Since the pursuit of the original text is an essential undertaking, it is inadequate to use secondary procedures which lack the highest degree of precision.

While the method of analysis described and executed in this chapter is indebted in various ways to all the methods already described, it rests upon wholly different principles from earlier methods or any heretofore proposed. The method

---

9. E. C. Colwell, Studia Evangelica, p. 757.

of analysis used here is based not upon the calculation of agreements between manuscripts, but upon the calculation of disagreements. The computation of disagreements between the texts of various manuscripts takes into consideration the individuality of each manuscript involved.

In order to demonstrate the relationships determined by the calculation of disagreements, the method here used has a second stage. The relationships are demonstrated by the isolation of certain readings peculiar to the relationships. In other words, this phase of the investigation is concerned with the isolation of those manuscripts which more or less consistently support the same variant readings.

By collating each of the manuscripts described in Chapter III with the text of the textus receptus (Oxford, 1873), and by compiling a composite collation (see Appendix) in which each of the manuscripts is cited in every case where at least one of the manuscripts differs from the textus receptus, the comparison of any one manuscript with another is facilitated. The analysis which follows in the remainder of this chapter is based upon the composite collation for the entire Gospel of John. Only the significant readings in the composite collation are here selected. By "significant reading" this writer means those variants which involve more than itacism, nu-movable, obvious scribal errors, and minor variations in spelling. Significant readings are those variants which concern the use of conjunctions, adverbs, prepositions, articles, pronouns. They include variations in word order and the substitution of one

word for another, and also additions and omissions.

We must turn now to a textual analysis of each of our twelve manuscripts, proceeding from the earliest to the latest. P52, probably the oldest manuscript containing a portion of the text of the Gospel of John, is much too small to indicate conclusively any textual relationships. W. H. P. Hatch cautiously observes that "the fragment is so small that it is impossible to determine the character of the text."<sup>10</sup> H. I. Bell, commenting on the textual affinity of this manuscript, indicates that "this fragment, from a codex written within a half a century of the composition of the Gospel, presents us with the familiar text of our later authorities."<sup>11</sup> Georg Maldfeld concurs with Bell when he describes the text of P52 as "mit B, Sinaiticus und C."<sup>12</sup> The conclusion that the text of Codex Sinaiticus agrees with the text of P52 is not confirmed in this present analysis.

The fragment of P52 is of little value for the study of

---

10. W. H. P. Hatch, The Principal Uncial Manuscripts of the New Testament (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), plate I.

11. H. I. Bell, Review of An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library, edited by C. H. Roberts, Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, XXI (1935), 267.

12. Georg Maldfeld, "Die griechischen Handschriftenbruchstücke des Neuen Testaments auf Papyrus," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLII (1949), 243. C is the symbol for Codex Ephraemi rescriptus of the fifth century.

the text of John because there is little to be learned from the meager evidence. Nevertheless, it is this present writer's contention that the data gleaned from the text of P52 contribute some evidence for the formulation of textual history for the Gospel of John.

In the chart which follows, the limited text of P52 is compared with the text of each extant witness (P66 S B W). The comparison is made on the basis of our composite collation (see Appendix). There are in the composite collation eight textual passages where our manuscript witnesses divide (18:31,32, 32, 33, 37, 37, 37, 38).

Example: 18:38    λέγει αὐτῷ            TR P52 S B W  
                  λέγει οὐν αὐτῷ P66.

The text of P52 varies from the textus receptus in two of these passages, but in the eight places where one or more of these manuscripts (P52 P66 S B W) disagrees with the textus receptus the position of P52 is also recorded. P66, which is fragmentary at this point in the text of the Gospel of John (18:31-33, 37, 38), is cited for only six of the passages for which P52 is cited. Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus and the Washington Codex, all with complete texts in the eighteenth chapter of John, are cited in all eight of the passages where P52 is cited. In order to measure the degree of variation from P52 in the several manuscripts, we have calculated the percentage of disagreement with the text of P52 in each case.



Variation from the Text of P52,  
by Four Early Witnesses,  
in Eight Textual Passages  
drawn from the Composite Collation

Textual Passages Shared with P52	Variations from P52	Percentage of Variation from P52
P66	6	16.6%
S	8	62.5%
B	8	12.5%
W	8	37.5%

Codex Sinaiticus disagrees with the text of P52 five times in contrast with Codex Vaticanus' disagreement only once. The Washington Codex disagrees with the text of P52 in three passages. The text of P66 disagrees with the text of P52 only once. On the basis of so few readings the calculation of the percentages of variation could vary considerably one way or the other even with one less or one more disagreement. The percentage of variation between Codex Sinaiticus and P52 is indicative of a general trend in which Codex Sinaiticus is found to differ in approximately the same percentage from every manuscript used in this present study. The text of Codex Sinaiticus is discussed later, so it will suffice merely to list these percentages at this point.

Percentage of Variation from S

P5	50.7%	P66	57.3%
P22	62.5%	P75	53.5%
P28	71.4%	B	53.2%
P39	80.0%	W	57.0%
P45	55.2%	0162	47.0%
P52	62.5%		

Even though P52 contains little text, it concurs equally with those manuscripts which contain considerable text in its textual difference from Codex Sinaiticus.

Codex Vaticanus disagrees with the text of P52 only once and in this single case P52 contains a reading which is not supported in any other Greek manuscript. Codex Vaticanus appears to be closely related to the text of P52. This is also true of the text of P66 and P52. The Washington Codex lies in between Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus in its relationship to the text of P52.

Because the text contained in P52 is so small, another type of analysis is useful. In the eight passages, six in the case of P66, in which P52 is cited, Codex Vaticanus disagrees with P66 one time; with Codex Sinaiticus four times; and with the Washington Codex two times. Codex Sinaiticus, in these readings, disagrees with Codex Vaticanus four times; with P66 five times; and with the Washington Codex six times. The Washington Codex disagrees with P66 two times; with Codex Vaticanus two times; and with Codex Sinaiticus six times.

All of the evidence suggests that Codex Vaticanus is most closely related to the text of P52. If these two manuscripts contain a similar type of text, then Codex Vaticanus contains a text which was current somewhere in Egypt in the middle of the second century. A conclusion based upon only eight readings is highly tenuous. Therefore, we offer it here tentatively subject to confirmation as we turn to the analysis of our other witnesses.

Probably the oldest manuscript which contains a considerable portion of the text of the Gospel of John is P75. It is expedient that our analysis of the earliest Greek manuscripts should begin with this papyrus. In turn, this initial analysis will provide a basis for further analysis and will furnish a control for the study of the other manuscripts.

Even though the editor of P75 believes that "il appar- tiendra aux spécialistes de la critique textuelle du N. T. d'apprécier ce nouveau texte et de lui assigner sa place parmi les différentes recensions exécutées au cours des deux premiers siècles de l'ère chrétienne,"<sup>13</sup> Martin does reach a tentative conclusion:

D' une manière générale, P est rarement du côté de D là où ce ms. est seul; il semble avoir surtout de l' affinité avec B. Toutefois ces appréciations sont données sous toutes réserves; il se peut qu' une étude plus approfondie de notre texte amène les érudits à les modifier, ou en tout cas à les nuancer.<sup>14</sup>

In the chart which follows, the text of P75 is compared with the text of each extant witness.

---

13. Victor Martin (ed.), Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV, pp. 22, 23.

14. P. 27.

Variation from the Text of P75,  
by Nine Early Witnesses,  
in 1312 Textual Passages  
drawn from the Composite Collation

Textual Passages Shared with P75	Variations from P75	Percentage of Variation from P75	
P5	28	7	25.0%
P28	11	5	45.4%
P39	15	3	20.0%
P45	132	69	52.2%
P66	1253	512	40.8%
S	1312	702	53.5%
B	1312	255	19.4%
W	1312	506	38.5%
0162	34	8	23.5%

The most significant feature of this analysis is the relatively small disagreement of Codex Vaticanus with the text of P75. Victor Martin is correct in his suggestion that P75 has some affinity with Codex Vaticanus. This relationship merits further consideration.

Even a rapid survey of the composite collation shows a number of passages in which Codex Vaticanus and P75 share a reading which is opposed by all the other early Greek manuscript witnesses.

The close relationship of the texts of these two manuscripts is confirmed by an analysis of their disagreements. Codex Vaticanus disagrees with the text of P75 a total of 255 times out of 1312 readings. Forty-nine of these disagreements

pertain to the inclusion or omission of the article. In twenty-five of the forty-nine instances P75 contains the article where Codex Vaticanus does not contain it. In twenty-four instances Codex Vaticanus contains the article against the text of P75. These inclusions and omissions follow no orthographic pattern, but appear to be arbitrary variations.

Twenty-five of the 255 disagreements are variations in the order of words.<sup>15</sup> It is a well known fact that "the freedom of the Greek from artificial rules and its response to the play of the mind is never seen better than in the order of words in the sentence."<sup>16</sup> The order of words in a sentence is often contingent upon the particular emphasis that the author, or scribe, had in mind. A word is frequently removed from its usual position to an unusual one. This same love of freedom and stress of emphasis was often applied by the scribe who copied a given manuscript. It is notable that P75 often stands alone with a peculiar word order. In such cases the sense of the passage generally remains the same but the emphasis is modified. The delicacies of emphasis inherent in the order of words, like those inherent in the Greek tenses, are often difficult, if not impossible, to reproduce in English. Some of the examples of the variation between the texts of P75

---

15. See 1:18, 21, 37; 2:10, 13, 17; 3:20; 4:9, 16, 54; 5:6, 34; 6:52, 60; 7:18, 23; 9:17, 21, 22, 31; 10:7, 32, 34; 13:9; 14:19.

16. A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament (10th ed.; New York: George H. Doran Company, 1923), p. 417.

and Codex Vaticanus in word order are as follows.

1:18	πωποτε εορακεν εορακεν πωποτε	P75 P66 S B W
1:37	οι δυο αυτου μαθηται οι δυο μαθηται αυτου	P66 P75 W S B
2:10	τον καλον οινον πρωτον πρωτον τον καλον οινον	P75 P66 S B W
4:9	γυναικος ουσης σαμαριτιδος γυναικος σαμαριτιδος ουσης	P75 P66 S B W
4:54	εποιησεν δευτερον σημειον δευτερον σημειον εποιησεν δευτερον εποιησεν σημειον	P75 P66 B S W
5:34	λαμβανω την μαρτυριαν την μαρτυριαν λαμβανω	P75 P66 S B W
6:52	ουν οι ιουδαιοι προς αλληλους ουν προς αλληλους οι ιουδαιοι	P75 P66 S B W
9:22	ομολογηση αυτον χριστον αυτον ομολογηση χριστον	P66 P75 S B W

There are twenty-eight differences between the texts of P75 and Codex Vaticanus which are variations in the use of conjunctions. In twelve of these variations P75 contains a conjunction not found in the text of Codex Vaticanus.<sup>17</sup> There are eight instances where Codex Vaticanus incorporates a conjunction not present in P75.<sup>18</sup> In four instances *αλλα* is elided in P75 and written in full in Codex Vaticanus.<sup>19</sup> In

---

17. See 1:14; 3:18; 4:31, 42; 5:29; 8:15, 52, 52, 59; 9:30; 11:25, 31.

18. See 6:40; 7:40; 8:36; 9:11, 16; 11:13; 12:10, 18.

19. See 3:8, 16; 8:55; 9:31.

all four cases the initial letter of the next word is a vowel. In four instances Codex Vaticanus and P75 contain different conjunctions.<sup>20</sup> These differences which pertain to the use of conjunctions are of little significance. The scribes were apparently influenced in their copying of manuscripts by the procedure which was normal in the grammar of their own time and provenance.

A large number of the variations between the texts of P75 and Codex Vaticanus are insignificant. These insignificant variations include the inclusion and omission of unnecessary prepositions and pronouns, minor variations in the introductory statements to conversation, insignificant variations in verb tense. There are, on the other hand, a number of important variations, as follows:

1:15	ον ειπον ο ειπων omit	P66 P75 W B S
1:17	δια ιησου δια ιησου χριστου	P75 S P66 B W
1:27	ου ουκ ειμι ικανος ου ουκ ειμι εγω ικανος ου ουκ ειμι εγω αξιος ου ουκ ειμι αξιος	P66* P75 P66** B W P5 S
2:15	ως φραγγελιον φραγγελιον	P66 P75 W 0162 S B
3:31	omit επανω παντων εστιν	P75 S 1 <sup>o</sup> P66 B W
4:35	omit ετι	P75 P66 S B W
4:41	πλειον πλειους	P75 P66 S B W

---

20. See 5:13; 6:18; 8:14, 19.

- 6:5 αγορασωσιν P75  
αγορασωμεν P66 S B W
- 6:19 επι την θαλασσαν P75  
επι της θαλασσης S B W
- 7:4 αυτος P75 S  
αυτο P66 B W
- 7:17 εαν τις θελη το θελημα αυτου P75  
εαν τις θελη το θελημα αυτου ποιειν P66 S B  
εαν τις το θελημα αυτου ποιη W
- 7:39 ουπω γαρ ην πνευμα P75 S  
ουπω γαρ ην πνευμα αγιον P66 W  
ουπω γαρ ην πνευμα αγιον δεδομενον B
- 8:38 λαλειτε P75  
ποιειτε P66 S B W
- 8:46 ελεγξει P75  
ελεγχει P66 S B W
- 8:57 και αβρααμ εορακεν σε P75 S  
και αβρααμ εορακας P66  
και αβρααμ εορακες B W
- 8:40 ημας P66 P75 S W  
με B
- 9:6 επεχρισεν P66 P75 S W  
επεθηκεν B
- 9:17 περι σεαυτου P75 S  
περι αυτου P66 B W
- 9:21 omit P75 S W  
αυτον ερωτησατε P66 B
- 9:38, 39 omit P75 S W  
ο δε εφη . . . και ειπεν ιησους P66 B
- 10:7 η ποιμην P75  
η θυρα P66 S B W
- 10:8 omit P45 P75 S  
προ εμου P66 B W
- 11:12 εγερθησεται P75  
σωθησεται P66 S B W



- 11:31 δοξαζοντες P75  
δοξαντες S B W  
λεγοντες P66
- 14:17 εσται P66 P75 S  
εστιν B W
- 14:21 αγαπηθησεται υπο του πατρος μου P66 S B W  
τηρηθησεται υπο του πατρος μου P75

In this list of passages in which the texts of P75 and Codex Vaticanus disagree, the text of P75 often stands by itself. Moreover, in this list the readings of the text of P75, where it stands by itself at 10:7 and 11:12, are supported by the Egyptian versions. The reading at 10:7 is supported by the Sahidic version, and the reading at 11:12 is supported by the Coptic manuscript (Q) edited by Herbert Thompson.<sup>21</sup>

In the above list of passages in which P75 and Codex Vaticanus disagree, there are a number of instances in which P75 and Codex Sinaiticus agree. Especially significant are the readings at 1:17, 3:31, 7:39, 8:57, 9:6, 9:17, 9:21, 9:38, 39, and 10:8. This evidence suggests that there is some connection between the text of P75 and the text of Codex Sinaiticus, but that connection is a remote one because of the large number of differences between the two manuscripts. It is also to be observed that in the first eleven chapters of the Gospel of John, the chapters contained for the most part in P75, Codex Sinaiticus, and Codex Vaticanus do not agree in one significant

---

21. Herbert Thompson, The Gospel of St. John according to the Earliest Coptic Manuscript (London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt, 1924).

instance against all the other early Greek manuscripts. There are minor agreements such as the use of the article, the relative pronoun, conjunctions and pronouns. There are a few agreements in word order. There is nothing to suggest, however, that such minor agreements are not the result of fourth-century grammatical practice rather than the result of both manuscripts being derived from a common textual source. This evidence suggests that a text similar to that found in P75 stands behind both Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus. Hort's conclusion that Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus are descended through separate and divergent ancestries from a common original text which must be dated in the second century now has some additional justification.

Because of the apparent relationship of the fourth-century Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus with the text of the late second or early third-century P75, those readings which have the support of P75 and Codex Sinaiticus against Codex Vaticanus may have some claim to be the original text. If the texts of Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus represent two separate textual traditions, then in the light of the fact that P75 seems to be an earlier form of the type of text found in Codex Vaticanus, wherever these two traditions agree in supporting a variant reading in P75, that reading must be preferred as original.

In any case, P75 represents a type of text which circulated somewhere in Egypt at the beginning of the third century. This means that it is contemporary with Clement of Alexandria

and that it is probably earlier than Origen. The text of Codex Vaticanus, therefore, represents a very early text. The evidence of P75 tends to substantiate Westcott and Hort's conclusion:

B must be regarded as having preserved not only a very ancient text, but a very pure line of very ancient text, and that with comparatively small depravation either by scattered ancient corruptions otherwise attested or by individualisms of the scribe himself.<sup>22</sup>

While Hort maintains that the text of Codex Vaticanus is substantially an unrevised text, Bousset claims to have proved that it is a revised text, a local text, and therefore of no outstanding authority in comparison with its rivals.<sup>23</sup> In the last two decades the trend of opinion has been away from Hort and towards Bousset. After examining the text of the earliest period Kenyon concludes:

During the second and third centuries, a great variety of readings came into existence throughout the Christian world. In some quarters considerable licence was shown in dealing with the sacred text; in others, more respect was shown to the tradition. In Egypt this variety of texts existed, as elsewhere; but Egypt was a country with a strong tradition of scholarship and with a knowledge of textual criticism. . . . About the beginning of the fourth century, a scholar may well

---

22. Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek, vol. II: Introduction and Appendix (London: Macmillan and Company, Limited, 1881), p. 250.

23. Wilhelm Bousset, Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament ("Texte und Untersuchungen," XI; J. C. Hinrichs, 1894), pp. 74-110.

have set himself to compare the best accessible representatives of the tradition, and so have produced a text of which B is an early descendant.<sup>24</sup>

The first part of Kenyon's conclusion, that "in some quarters considerable licence was shown in dealing with the sacred text" and in others "more respect was shown to the tradition," is precisely correct. This will be born out later in this chapter in the analysis of the third century manuscripts as a group. His conclusion with regard to the text of Codex Vaticanus can no longer be maintained in the light of the text of P75, especially if P75 is as early as the end of the second century. It has now become impossible to attribute the origin of the text represented in Codex Vaticanus to a scholar (whether bishop Hesychius or another) living about A. D. 300 in any but a very limited sense.

It has often been maintained that the primitive text of the Gospels was the type of text which is called "Western." Henry A. Sanders, in an article entitled "The Egyptian Text of the Four Gospels and Acts," reconstructs what he believes to be the development of the text of the New Testament in Egypt. Sanders concludes that the evidence of the fragments of John's gospel from the third through the tenth centuries "supports the view of an original Western text gradually but incompletely corrected to the Alexandrian."<sup>25</sup> It is to be regretted that

---

24. Frederic G. Kenyon, "Hesychius and the Text of the New Testament," Mémorial Lagrange (Paris: J. Gabalda, et C<sup>ie</sup>, 1940), p. 250.

25. Henry A. Sanders, "The Egyptian Text of the Four Gospels and Acts," Harvard Theological Review, XXVI (1933), 91.

Sanders exhibits only the conclusions of an apparently enormous amount of work. He includes neither the readings which serve as evidence, nor the definition of his term "Western." There appears throughout his presentation an evident desire to prove the influence of a Western type of text in Egypt. Sanders' position is that the Western text represents the uncorrected text on the basis of which the later recensions were made. In this conclusion Sanders agrees with the theory propounded by J. L. Hug at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The text of P75, which cannot be called Western in any sense, now refutes the theory set forth by Hug and Sanders. The text of P75 clearly indicates that at the end of the second century there was in circulation in Egypt the type of text characterized by Westcott and Hort as "Neutral."

Three other early witnesses, preserved only in minor fragments, have some affinity with the text of P75. These witnesses are P5, P39 and O162. While the percentages in each of these three cases are based on a relatively small number of passages, they are suggestive of a possible relationship.

We turn now to a textual analysis of another one of the third-century manuscripts, P5. There is no unanimity of opinion as to the type of text represented by the text of P5. When they published POxy 208, one part of P5, Grenfell and Hunt concluded that "the text is a good one, and appears to have affinities with that of the Codex Sinaiticus, with which

the papyrus agrees in several readings not found elsewhere."<sup>26</sup> When POxy 1781 was later published, it was indicated that this tendency to agreement with Codex Sinaiticus is not apparent in this fragment of the same manuscript.<sup>27</sup> Henry A. Sanders classifies the text of P5 as practically a pure Western text.<sup>28</sup> Sanders cites the evidence from the text of P5 in support of his theory that the original text of the Gospels was of the Western text-type. Georg Maldfeld's description of the text of P5 is "vorhesychian., mehr westl[ich] denn neutraler text."<sup>29</sup> Contrary to these estimations, M. -J. Lagrange believes that "il serait donc encore plus neutral que B lui-même."<sup>30</sup> Hollis Huston concludes that the text of P5 is an example of one of the early papyri which antedates the textual recensions, and which was strongly influenced by Western peculiarities.<sup>31</sup> Huston uses the term "pre-recension" to describe such early

---

26. Grenfell and Hunt (eds.), The Oxyrhynchus Papyri II (1899), p. 2.

27. Grenfell and Hunt (eds.), The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XV (1922), p. 9.

28. Henry A. Sanders, "The Egyptian Text of the Four Gospels and Acts," Harvard Theological Review, XXVI (1933), 89, 90.

29. Georg Maldfeld, "Die griechischen Handschriftenbruchstücke des Neuen Testaments auf Papyrus," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLII (1949), 243.

30. M. -J. Lagrange, Introduction à l'Étude du Nouveau Testament, vol. II: Critique textuelle, part 2: La Critique rationnelle (Paris: J. Gabalda et. Cie, 1935), p. 118.

31. Hollis Wilburn Huston, "A Critical Survey and Evaluation of the Earliest Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament" (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Duke University, 1949), pp. 22, 23.

papyri. His collation with the textus receptus reveals forty-eight variants, which fall into the following groups: two transpositions, four additions, eighteen omissions, nine substitutions, seven itacisms, two additions of nu-movable, five spelling differences, and one error of the scribe. His comparison of these variants shows eighteen agreements with Codex Sinaiticus, twenty-one agreements with Codex Vaticanus, and fifteen with the Washington Codex.

P5 contains only a small portion of the text of three chapters of the Gospel of John, but it is an important fragment of evidence for the investigation of the text of the Gospel of John in the third century. In the chart which follows, the text of P5 is compared with the text of each extant witness.

Variation from the Text of P5,  
by Six Early Witnesses,  
in 63 Textual Passages  
drawn from the Composite Collation

Textual Passages Shared with P5	Variations from P5	Percentage of Variation from P5
P22	8	25.0%
P66	48	45.8%
P75	28	25.0%
S	63	50.7%
B	63	28.5%
W	63	49.2%

Codex Vaticanus disagrees with the text of P5 in only eighteen passages in contrast to the disagreement of Codex Sinaiticus in thirty-two passages. The Washington Codex also disagrees

with P5 thirty-one times. These disagreements are on the basis of the same sixty-three textual passages. P22 disagrees with P5 two times on the basis of only eight passages. P66 and P5 disagree twenty-two times out of a total of forty-eight passages shared with P5. P75 disagrees with P5 seven times out of a total of twenty-eight passages.

From these calculations of the variations between the texts of the manuscripts, it is clear that P75, P22 and Codex Vaticanus are the manuscripts most closely related to P5. The percentages of variation are especially revealing. In the analysis of the relationship between P75 and Codex Vaticanus it was noted that these two manuscripts disagree in only 19.4% of the passages. P75 and Codex Vaticanus contain enough text to warrant the conclusion that the texts of these two manuscripts are closely related. Thus, the percentage of variation between these two manuscripts serves as a basis for comparing manuscripts which are extant in only small portions of the text. The text of P5 varies from the text of P75 in 25.0% of the passages and from P22 in 25.0% of the passages. It disagrees with Codex Vaticanus in 28.5% of the passages. The differences between P5 and P22, P75 and Codex Vaticanus are primarily minor differences in word order, in the use of a personal pronoun or a conjunction. The text contained in P5 is similar in type to that of P22, P75 and Codex Vaticanus.

The text of P5 does not show a close affinity with the texts found in P66, Codex Sinaiticus and the Washington Codex. In spite of the fact that the text of Codex Sinaiticus



disagrees radically with the text of P5, there are several variant readings which are supported by only these two manuscripts among all those used in this study.

1:27	ου ουκ ειμι ικανος	P66* P75
	ου ουκ ειμι αξιος	P5 S
	ου ουκ ειμι εγω αξιος	B W
	ου ουκ ειμι εγω ικανος	P66**
1:34	ο υιος του θεου	P66 P75 B W
	ο εκλεκτος του θεου	P5 S
1:39	ερμηνευομενον	P5 S
	μεθερμηνευομενον	P66 P75 B W
16:27	παρα του θεου	W
	παρα θεου	P5 S
	παρα πατρος	B
20:24, 25	οτε ηλθεν ο ιησους ελεγον ουν αυτω οι αλλοι μαθηται	W
	οτε ουν ηλθεν ιησους ελεγον αυτω οι μαθηται	P5 S
	οτε ηλθεν ιησους ελεγον ουν αυτω οι αλλοι μαθηται	B
20:25	εν ταις χερσιν αυτου	B W
	εν ταις χερσιν	P5 S

In 1:27 the omission of the personal pronoun as subject of the verb is also supported by P66 and P75. The support of P5 for the reading in 1:34 is based upon conjecture and considerations of space left by a lacuna. The reading in 1:39 is the simple form in contrast to the compound form. The reading in 20:24, 25 differs from the reading of Codex Vaticanus and the reading of the Washington Codex in the order of words and in the omission of *οι αλλοι*. The reading of P5 and Codex Sinaiticus differs from that of Codex Vaticanus and the Washington Codex in the omission of the possessive pronoun. In the light of

the large total number of disagreements between the text of P5 and the text of Codex Sinaiticus, these agreements must be recognized as important for the history of the text in the third century.

In contrast to the above list of passages, there are several passages in P5 which find support in P75 or Codex Vaticanus and in no other of the earliest Greek manuscripts.

1:35	παλιν omit	P66 S B W P75 P5	
16:17	και ω υπαγω και οτι υπαγω και εγω υπαγω	S P5 B W	
16:19	οτι ηθελον οτι ημελλον και ηθελον οτι ημελλον	P5 B P66* P66** S W	
16:23	οτι ο αν αν τι οτι αν οτι εαν	S P5 B W P22	

It is important to note that the surviving text of P75 coincides with the surviving text of P5 only in chapter one.

Chapters sixteen and twenty are not extant for P75.

P5 and P66 agree against all other early Greek manuscripts in omitting *περι υμων* in 16:26. This omission finds support in minuscule manuscript 36, in the Coptic manuscript Q, in three manuscripts of the Old Latin version (b c e) and in the writings of Cyril of Alexandria and Augustine.

The outstanding characteristic of the text of P5 is the tendency to brevity, especially the omission of unnecessary pronouns and conjunctions. Even though Henry A. Sanders

contends that P5 is practically a pure Western text and even though Georg Maldfeld describes the text as more Western than Neutral, this present writer finds no evidence to support these contentions. M. -J. Lagrange is correct when he suggests that P5 might be more Neutral than Codex Vaticanus itself. Moreover, this present writer cannot accept Huston's description of the text of P5 as a "pre-recension" text. It has been demonstrated in the analysis of the text of P75 that Codex Vaticanus does not represent a recension in any strict sense of the word. P5 is closely related textually to both Codex Vaticanus and P75. The text of P5 gives further support to the conclusion that Codex Vaticanus does not represent a recension made about A. D. 300.

The text of P5 is similar in type to that found in P75. Both of these manuscripts belong to the third century. As was the case with the text of P75, the text of P5 also appears to have some relationship to both Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus. Nevertheless, the text of Codex Vaticanus is much more closely related to P5 and P75 than is the text of Codex Sinaiticus.

P22 contains parts of John 15:25-16:2 and 16:21-32. It is another of the third-century witnesses to the text of the Gospel of John. As to the character of the text Grenfell and Hunt suggest that P22 "shows a good and interesting text, though, as often, its affinities are not strongly marked, and

it does not agree at all consistently with any one of the chief authorities. Coincidences with the Codex Sinaiticus are frequent, but divergences are noticeable."<sup>32</sup> W. H. P. Hatch accepts this conclusion when he states that the text of P22 "does not agree consistently with any of the chief authorities."<sup>33</sup> H. A. Sanders claims that the text of P22 is Western in character.<sup>34</sup> Georg Maldfeld describes the text as "eklektisch, teils Sin<sup>corr.</sup>, teils auch D."<sup>35</sup> By taking the variations from the textus receptus as samples and by calculating the agreement of various manuscripts with these samples, Hollis Huston attempts to demonstrate that the text of P22 is related to Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Bezae.<sup>36</sup> Huston indicates that the collation with the textus receptus yields eleven variant readings: two transpositions, four omissions, two substitutions, two itacisms, and one addition of the nu-movable. He indicates that the text of P22 gives support five times to

---

32. Grenfell and Hunt (eds.), The Oxyrhynchus Papyri X (1914), p. 14.

33. W. H. P. Hatch, The Principal Uncial Manuscripts of the New Testament (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), plate VII.

34. Henry A. Sanders, "The Egyptian Text of the Four Gospels and Acts," Harvard Theological Review, XXVI (1933), 89, 90.

35. Georg Maldfeld, "Die griechischen Handschriftenbruchstücke des Neuen Testamentes auf Papyrus," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLII (1949), 246. Sin<sup>corr.</sup> is the siglum for the corrector of Codex Sinaiticus and D is the symbol for Codex Bezae.

36. Hollis W. Huston, "A Critical Survey and Evaluation of the Earliest Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament" (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Duke University, 1949), p. 25.

Codex Sinaiticus and the Washington Codex, two times to Codex Alexandrinus, and six times to Codex Vaticanus and Codex Bezae. Huston's conclusion regarding the text of P22 must be understood in the light of his method which does not take into consideration the individuality of the various manuscripts. He concludes that "it is probably true that we here again have evidence of a text which antedates the text-types, and is therefore representative of a text from which the vellum uncials are about equally removed."<sup>37</sup>

In the following chart the text of P22 is compared with the text of each extant witness.

Variation from the Text of P22,  
by Five Early Witnesses,  
in 16 Textual Passages  
drawn from the Composite Collation

Textual Passages Shared with P22	Variations from P22	Percentage of Variation from P22
P5	8	25.0%
P66	8	50.0%
S	16	62.5%
B	16	25.0%
W	14	35.7%

This analysis shows that Codex Sinaiticus varies from the text of P22 ten times and that Codex Vaticanus varies from P22 only four times. It is at once evident that the text of P22 is more

---

37. Ibid.

closely related to the text of Codex Vaticanus than it is to the text of Codex Sinaiticus. Contrary to this observation Hollis Huston believed that the text of P22 is related to the text of Codex Sinaiticus. Huston's method obscured the true relationship between P22 and Codex Sinaiticus.

The four variations between the text of P22 and the text of Codex Vaticanus include one instance of word order (16:23), one example of crasis (16:32), one instance of different prepositions (16:28) and the variation in 16:23, οτι εν (P22) against εν τι (B). Considered as a whole these differences are insignificant. Thus, the text of Codex Vaticanus is quite similar to that contained in the extant portions of P22.

The Washington Codex and P22 do not overlap as much as do Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus with P22 but, nevertheless, there are five disagreements between P22 and the Washington Codex. In two of these instances (16:23 and 16:28) the Washington Codex has an omission which is not found in P22. There is one variation in the tense of a verb (16:22), one variation in which the texts use synonyms (16:22) and one variation of word order (16:26). The Washington Codex is not as closely related textually to the text of P22 as is Codex Vaticanus.

There are only eight passages in the composite collation in which P66 and P22 are both cited. The two texts disagree in four of the eight passages. One of these differences concerns the tense of the verb (16:22). The other three (15:25; 16:25, 32) concern the omission or addition of word or words.

On the basis of these observations the conclusions of Grenfell and Hunt, and H. A. Sanders are not adequate descriptions of the text of P22. The text of P22 is not Western, as Sanders supposed, nor is it even textually related to Codex Sinaiticus.

The conclusion of this present analysis is that the texts of P5, Codex Vaticanus and the Washington Codex are the most closely related texts to that of P22. If one allows for the individuality of these manuscripts, the relationships become even more marked. The texts of Codex Sinaiticus and of P66, on the other hand, vary considerably from the text of P22.

The text of P45, another of the third-century manuscripts, has been an enigma to the New Testament textual critic because it raises more problems than it solves for the early history of the text. A wide variety of judgment concerning its textual affinities has been set forth.

Sir Frederic Kenyon, the editor of the Chester Beatty Papyri, believes that the text of P45 has no leaning toward the Byzantine recension but, at the same time, it is not decidedly Neutral. He believes that it has a significant relationship with the Western family in that it conforms in many instances with exclusively Western support, but yet it has none of the more noticeable peculiarities of the Western text. Kenyon indicates that the text of P45 has a number of readings which are either singular or have very slight support elsewhere. It betrays, according to Kenyon's analysis, a strong affinity with

the Caesarean recension, particularly in Mark. His general conclusion is that P45 is probably a witness to the existence in Egypt in the first half of the third century of a type of text distinct from that found predominantly in Codex Vaticanus and with a strong infusion of readings found in the early authorities which are grouped together as Western.<sup>38</sup>

In contrast to Kenyon's conclusions, there is the opinion of another eminent biblical scholar, M. -J. Lagrange.<sup>39</sup> Lagrange distinguishes two types of revision in the early text of the gospels. One type had for its end the production of the most primitive text and to this purpose made use of the most ancient manuscripts. The second type looked rather to the clearest and most persuasive text. Lagrange and Kenyon agree that Codex Vaticanus exemplifies the former type of recension and that Codex Bezae represents the latter type. But, whereas Kenyon places P45 in the first class, Lagrange places it in the second class. Lagrange offers a persuasive argument for his contention. For him the text of P45 proves the superiority of Codex Vaticanus, and at the same time gives support to the qualities of clearness and elegance in Codex Bezae. Lagrange considers the text of P45 to be the prototype of the Byzantine

---

38. Frederic G. Kenyon (ed.), The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible, Fasciculus II: The Gospels and Acts, Text (London: Emery Walker Limited, 1933), p. xviii.

39. M. -J. Lagrange, "Les Papyrus Chester Beatty pour les Évangiles," Revue Biblique, XLIII (1934), 5-41.



text-type.

The analysis of the text of P45 by Kenyon and Lagrange deals with the text of the Gospels and Acts, whereas R. V. G. Tasker has investigated the text of John as it is found in P45 and reports his findings in two important articles. In the first<sup>40</sup> of these two articles, Tasker considers some variant readings in John 10:7-11:57 in the light of the evidence of P45 with a view to discovering how far Codex Vaticanus appears to possess possible marks of revision, and how far P45 seems to have retained readings which have greater claims to be original. He concludes that P45 is "eclectic." It does not give readings which belong specifically to any of the usual groupings. In many cases it would not appear to have retained the reading which is intrinsically probable or which is even the best attested. On the other hand there are passages, such as 10:8, 41, and 11:25, where Tasker finds reasons for supposing that the readings of P45 may be more primitive than those of Codex Vaticanus.<sup>41</sup>

In the second article<sup>42</sup> Tasker considers the character of

---

40. R. V. G. Tasker, "The Readings of the Chester Beatty Papyrus in the Gospel of St. John," Journal of Theological Studies, XXXVI (1935), 387-391.

41. The reading of P45 in 10:8 which Tasker believes to be more primitive is now supported by P75. The other two readings find no support in either P66 or P75, our newest witnesses.

42. R. V. G. Tasker, "The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Caesarean Text of John," Harvard Theological Review, XXX (1937), 157-164. In this article Tasker provides a collation of the text of P45 with the textus receptus.

the non-Byzantine readings of the text of P45 in order to ascertain to what extent the non-Byzantine readings of the papyrus belong to the main types of text. He concludes that the text of P45 in the Gospel of John cannot be called Neutral, Alexandrian, or Western. The remarkable thing about the text of P45, Tasker suggests, is its "mixed" character.

C. C. Tarelli investigated the relationship of the text of P45 to two particular types of text. He concludes his article, "The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Caesarean Text,"<sup>43</sup> with the observation that the text which underlies P45 is a text containing the elements of all later texts. He writes:

No doubt actual mixture of different lines of transmission took place at all periods of the manuscript tradition, but it is highly probable that the fundamental cause of the 'mixed' text of which P45 is the earliest example is the fact that the original text itself was 'mixed' in this sense of combining elements found in all its descendants.<sup>44</sup>

In a second article, "The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Western and Byzantine Texts,"<sup>45</sup> Tarelli questions the meaning and significance of the term "Western text." He believes that the term has been often used in a very wide sense to include variant readings of all types which could not be related to

---

43. C. C. Tarelli, "The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Caesarean Text," Journal of Theological Studies, XL (1939), 46-55.

44. Op. cit., p. 55.

45. C. C. Tarelli, "The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Western and Byzantine Texts," Journal of Theological Studies, XLI (1949), 253-260.

any other classification. This observation is correct. Tarelli suggests that the testimony of P45 demonstrates that the Western text is a text which has departed in an unusually large number of cases from the main line of manuscript tradition. He makes an important and significant observation in this connection. Throughout the second and third centuries, he observes, there was in existence a considerable variety of readings which had not yet been crystallized into families. Is it not possible, and even not improbable, asks Tarelli, that the families which are found later were really formed by a process of crystalization, rather than by systematic recensions?

The evidence already presented above has demonstrated that Codex Vaticanus does not represent a systematic recension, unless such a recension could be assigned to the second century. However, a second-century recension is not even plausible. The earliest period of the history of the text of the Gospel of John is best described as a process, as a freely flowing stream with numerous tributaries.

This present investigation fails to show any close relationship to the text of P45 in the Gospel of John.

Variation from the Text of P45,  
by Five Early Witnesses,  
in 161 Textual Passages  
drawn from the Composite Collation

Textual Passages Shared with P45	Variations from P45	Percentage of Variation from P45
P66	161	89
P75	132	69
S	161	89

	Textual Passages Shared with P45	Variations from P45	Percentage of Variation from P45
B	161	81	50.3%
W	161	92	57.1%

This evidence stands in sharp contrast with that of the other third-century papyrus manuscripts which contain the text of the Gospel of John. P75, P5 and P22 show a rather definite affinity with one or more other manuscripts used in this study, although the affinity of the text of P66 with those manuscripts containing a major portion of the text is not as striking. As the above analysis indicates, none of the manuscripts compared with the text of P45 shows any textual affinity. The text of P45 stands by itself among the third and fourth-century manuscripts.

In spite of these calculations, there are seven passages in which the texts of P45 and P66 agree against the other four texts.

10:38	πιστευσατε πιστευετε	P45 P66 P75 S B W
11:7	ειτα επειτα	P45 P66 P75 S B W
11:21	ο αδελφος μου ουκ αν απεθανεν ουκ αν απεθανεν ο αδελφος μου	P45 P66 P75 S B W
11:29	εγειρεται ... ερχεται ηγερθη ... ηρχετο	P45 P66 P75 S B W
11:45	εωρακοτες και θεασαμενοι	P45 P66 S B W
11:52	εσκορπισμενα διεσκορπισμενα	P45 P66 S B W
11:54	διετριβεν εμεινεν	P45 P66 P75 S B W

These passages underline the complexity and strangeness of the situation in the third century. Apparently there is some special relationship between the texts of P45 and P66. What that relationship is cannot be determined from the known manuscripts.

There are four passages in which the texts of P45 and Codex Sinaiticus agree against the other four manuscripts.

10:11	διδωσιν τιθησιν	P45 S P66 P75 B W
10:22	ιεροσολυμοις τοις ιεροσολυμοις	P45 S P66 B W
10:32	εργα καλα εδειξα υμιν καλα εργα εδειξα υμιν εδειξα υμιν εργα καλα εργα εδειξα υμιν καλα εργα εδειξα υμιν	P45 S P66 P75 B W
10:40	προτερον πρωτον	P45 S P66 P75 B W

As is the case with P45 in relation to P66, there must be some affinity also between the texts of P45 and Codex Sinaiticus.

There are no passages in the composite collation where the text of P45 agrees with that of P75, Codex Vaticanus, or the Washington Codex against the rest of the witnesses.

The conclusion of our analysis of the text of P45 is that the texts of the fourth-century manuscripts do not show any evidence of being directly related to the text of P45. The fact that Codex Sinaiticus contains a few readings in which it agrees with the text of P45 may indicate that these two texts are in some way related, but that relationship is not well

defined. There are a number of passages in which P45 and P66 agree against the other early Greek manuscripts. This is perhaps indicative of some textual relationship. Thus, in the light of the extant textual witnesses, the text of P45 remains an enigma for the New Testament textual critic.

Another of the third-century manuscripts is P66. In his Introduction, Professor Martin intimates that the definitive analysis of the textual affinities of P66 will have to be undertaken by the New Testament textual critics. Nevertheless, he cautiously concludes his Introduction with the suggestion that the text of P66 does not agree consistently with any of the great ancient uncial manuscripts.

Ainsi, d' une manière générale, la position de P à l' égard de ces variantes de la tradition confirme la tendance que nous avons cru pouvoir déceler dans son texte en examinant les variantes de ce type qui lui sont propres. D' autre part, on constate que là où la tradition se diversifie, il s' accorde avec X sauf dans un cas où celui-ci est absolument isolé.<sup>46</sup>

Unfortunately the work of Professor Martin has been subject to adverse criticism.<sup>47</sup> In his attempt to correlate the text of the manuscript with the existing manuscripts he chose Souter's New Testament (2nd ed., 1947) which contains Edwin

---

46. Victor Martin (ed.), Papyrus Bodmer II, Évangile de Jean, chap. 1-14 (Cologne/Genève: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1956), p. 152.

47. See Kurt True, Review of Papyrus Bodmer II, edited by Victor Martin, Deutsche Literaturzeitung, LXXVIII (1957), cols. 290-294.

Palmer's reconstruction of the Greek text underlying the English Revised Version of 1881. J. N. Birdsall conjectures that Martin's choice was influenced by the "high prestige of Oxford Classical Texts in the sphere of Greek and Latin classical literature."<sup>48</sup> This text is not a good basis for thorough New Testament textual studies for it is incomplete in two respects. In the first place, its basic purpose is to show the textual evidence for the changes which the 1881 English Revised Version of the New Testament made as compared with the King James Version. It does not show numerous variations between manuscripts in passages where these two English versions agree. In the second place, it does not give the evidence in full even for the passages it does include. When Souter's New Testament gives no variant readings at this or that point, Professor Martin assumed that the manuscripts agree at those points. Where P66 differs from Souter's text or the variant readings shown by Souter, Martin assumed that P66 contained an absolutely new reading. Martin rectified his error later in the Supplément which contains the fragments of John 14-21.

Among the articles bearing upon P66 several are of enough importance to merit analysis here. Kurt Aland's preliminary

---

<sup>48</sup>. J. N. Birdsall, The Bodmer Papyrus of the Gospel of John (London: The Tyndale Press, 1960), p. 5.

account<sup>49</sup> of the text of the papyrus falls into three divisions. Aland first presents a critique of Victor Martin's use of Souter's Greek New Testament as a standard for collation. The second division of his article is a collation of the text of P66 with the Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament (22nd edition). Because this collation throws into relief mainly the Byzantine element of the papyrus, it is inadequate for thorough comparisons and exhaustive study of the manuscript. The third part of this preliminary account is a statistical calculation of the main agreements and disagreements with Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus, Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Ephraemi rescriptus, Codex Bezae, the Washington Codex of the Gospels, Codex Koridethi, and P45. Aland's method of analysis is like that followed by Kenyon in his analysis of the text of P45. Moreover, Aland's statistical analysis does not take into consideration the character of the Nestle-Aland text or of the vast number of additional readings in these manuscripts where they disagree with the Nestle-Aland text. Aland believes that the text of P66 differs little from the text given in the Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament, and that the number of variants corresponds on the average to that of other manuscripts with the exception of Codex Bezae. Aland concurs with Victor

---

49. Kurt Aland, "Papyrus Bodmer II. Ein erster Bericht," Theologische Literaturzeitung, LXXXII (1957), cols. 162-184. In addition to this article see "Das Johannesevangelium auf Papyrus. Zum neu veröffentlichten Papyrus Bodmer II," Forschungen und Fortschritte, XXXI (1957), 50-55.



Martin's estimation of the affinities of the text of P66.

Aland writes, "Er fügt sich nicht in die mit dem 4.

Jahrhundert beginnende Scheidung der Textformen ein, sondern repräsentiert die fluktuierende 'Variantenmengung' der Zeit davor."<sup>50</sup> In another presentation Aland's description of the text of P66 is "offenbar vor den grossen Rezensionen liegender 'Mischtext.'"<sup>51</sup>

Another important investigation of the text of P66 has been made by M.-E. Boismard.<sup>52</sup> He prefaces his discussion of the text with a résumé of his earlier researches relating to the text of the Gospel of John. According to these investigations the text of John must be discussed under five main divisions which Boismard enumerates as follows: (a) under the siglum B the text presented by Codex Vaticanus and its allies (C W L 33), by Origen in his commentary on John, by the Sahidic and Bohairic versions and by some of the Old Latin manuscripts (ff c 1 and b after 9:22); (b) the text attested by Tatian's Diatessaron in its many versions, by the Old Syriac version, by some of the Old Latin manuscripts (e a r 1 and b before 9:22), by the Georgian, Persian and Ethiopic versions, and by Chrysostom and Nonnos of Pannopolis; (c) under the siglum SD

50. Kurt Aland, "Papyrus Bodmer II," Theologische Literaturzeitung, LXXXII (1957), col. 179.

51. Kurt Aland, "Zur Liste der Neutestamentlichen Handschriften VI," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLVIII (1957), 157.

52. M.-E. Boismard, "Le Papyrus Bodmer II," Revue Biblique, LXXIV (1957), 363-398.

the text attested by Codex Bezae and Codex Sinaiticus (chapters 1-7 and sporadically thereafter) and to a degree by all the versions; (d) under the siglum C the Caesarean text which presents few original readings because it represents an eclectic text from the three preceding types of text; and (e) under the siglum A the Antiochian text derived largely from the B and SD texts.

On the basis of this analysis of text-types, Boismard proceeds to study the text of P66 in the sections John 7:36-51 and 9:1-39. He concludes that the scribe of P66 made use of two different texts, namely the B type and the SD type, following first one, then the other, in clearly defined sections. Within these two types of text, P66 is most closely akin to Codex Vaticanus when following the B text-type and to Codex Sinaiticus when following the SD text-type. This conclusion Boismard considers to be corroborated by the presence of ten readings in P66 which he believes to be clearly confections of these two text-types.<sup>53</sup>

Boismard qualifies his analysis of P66 in terms of the scribe's utilization of two types of text in two respects. In a footnote<sup>54</sup> he notes that even when the scribe adopted one of the text-types, he preserved in greater or lesser proportion traces of the other type of text. The second

---

53. See 2:11, 13; 4:15; 6:58, 61; 8:33; 10:11, 15, 28; 11:27.

54. Op. cit., p. 389, note 1.

qualification is a list of forty-nine variant readings, previously unknown in Greek manuscripts, but attested by Tatian, the versions and the fathers. This list, Boismard indicates, might be increased considerably by similar readings already known in a few minuscule manuscripts but mainly attested by Tatian and the versions. Boismard adds a brief discussion of a number of cases of triple variation which contribute, in his belief, a proof that a short primitive text has been somewhat clumsily corrected to the standard of a longer text. Boismard considers that the lectio brevior is frequently the better reading.

W. Hartke<sup>55</sup> concurs with Boismard in the suggestion that the scribe of P66 had two Vorlagen before him, but the details of the two theories are entirely different. For Hartke, the first of the two manuscripts or text-types was the archetype of the Washington Codex, originating in Alexandria, which was a mixture of Urtext and Alexandrian text. The second of the Vorlagen was another mixed text which was imported from Rome and which represented the authoritative Roman text, namely, the universal Church's rather free Latin translation which originated at the time of Zephyrinus and Callistus who were bishops of Rome (198-217 and 217-222). Hartke believes that the scribe of P66 copied the archetype of the Washington Codex quite mechanically but constantly referred to the Roman text

---

<sup>55</sup> W. Hartke, "Bemerkungen zum Papyrus Bodmer II," Forschungen und Fortschritte, XXXII (1958), 122-126.

and like all scribes of the time allowed himself many liberties. Later the scribe revised with extraordinary care what he had written, very likely because the Bishop of Alexandria had in the meantime called him to order. For this revision, Hartke suggests, the scribe used the Urtext of Codex Vaticanus. This theory, at best, is a conjecture based upon the textual phenomena of P66.

A. F. J. Klijn<sup>56</sup> approaches the text of P66 with the question of the origin of the type of text represented in Codex Vaticanus before him. He reviews the development of the so-called Egyptian text from P52 to the text of Didymus.

The question is whether we are dealing in B<sup>N</sup> with a gradual growth from Western via Caesarean or mixed text, or whether B<sup>N</sup> goes back to a pure text which was not influenced by Western and other 'wilder' texts. . . . We shall see whether P66 may be of importance for the problem of the history of the text in Egypt.<sup>57</sup>

In Klijn's seven-stage survey of the development of the text in Egypt, P66 is assigned to a position between Clement of Alexandria and Origen.

In his analysis, Klijn first studies the text of P66 in comparison with the text of P45 by taking certain types of readings as a basis of comparison. He finds that the extant text of John in P45 (10:7-25; 10:31-11:10; 11:18-36; 11:43-57) contains twelve Western readings and eight Caesarean readings

56. A. F. J. Klijn, "Papyrus Bodmer II (John i-xiv) and the Text of Egypt," New Testament Studies, III (1957), 327-334.

57. Op. cit., p. 327.

whereas P66 in the same portion of the text has but five Western readings and four Caesarean readings. He concludes that P66 is not a pure text but is a text with a history in which a Western type of text plays a part. The text of P45, he believes, is more Western than the text of P66 and only one Western-Caesarean reading is shared by the two manuscripts. He further finds in this section, where the texts of P45 and P66 overlap, a considerable number of readings in P66 attested by manuscripts of the Koine type. On the basis of this part of his investigation, Klijn concludes that the text of P66 is not to be considered of a particular type but that it is less "mixed" than the text of P45. He feels that it is unwise to speak of a gradual development in the direction of the text of Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus. Klijn suggests that it is much safer to say that there were a number of traditions in Egypt in the second, third and fourth centuries.

In the second part of his study, Klijn gives a cursory review of the text of P66 as a whole on the basis of a collation against the Nestle text. He concludes that the text of P66 often agrees with Codex Sinaiticus or its corrector and with Codex Regius (L) or Codex Ephraemi rescriptus (C) in readings where it deviates from Codex Vaticanus. These manuscripts, Klijn suggests, are "non-pure" or "less 'neutral'" than Codex Vaticanus. Thus, he calls the text of P66 "neutral in a non-pure way." The frequent corrections in the text of P66 Klijn finds to be often from a Western to a Neutral reading. This observation is supported in this present investigation.

Even a cursory survey of the composite collation reveals that the corrections in the manuscripts are generally in the direction of the type of text represented in P75 and Codex Vaticanus.

Floyd Filson's summary<sup>58</sup> of the relationship of the text of P66 to the families of the New Testament manuscripts indicates that he believes that the text of P66 does not agree consistently with any of the great uncial manuscripts. Filson indicates that it does not side with Codex Bezae in such a way that it can be called Western, nor does it consistently agree with Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus. Nevertheless he feels that there is some kinship with Codex Sinaiticus which deserves further study. In general, Filson is of the opinion that P66 proves that manuscripts in the second century had more variety and more complex kinships than the neat division by Westcott and Hort would suggest.

H. Zimmermann<sup>59</sup> has made a thorough examination of the text contained in P66 and makes a significant contribution to the knowledge about the text of P66. Zimmermann begins his study with a criticism of the methods employed by Victor Martin and Kurt Aland in their analyses of the text. He then concentrates upon two aspects of the text of P66. He makes a thorough

---

58. Floyd Filson, "A New Papyrus Manuscript of the Gospel of John," Biblical Archaeologist, XX (1957), 54-63.

59. H. Zimmermann, "Papyrus Bodmer II und seine Bedeutung für die Textgeschichte des Johannes-Evangeliums," Biblische Zeitschrift, II (1958), 214-243. Zimmermann illustrates his thesis with twenty-three pages of apparatus criticus.

investigation of the relationship between P66 and Codex Sinaiticus and then considers the corrections in P66. Zimmermann concludes that Codex Sinaiticus and P66 contain many common readings. He also believes that P66 shows substantially the same characteristics which constitute the peculiarity of Codex Sinaiticus. Zimmermann is of the opinion that the Western text existed in Egypt as early as 200 A. D. and is older than the so-called Neutral or Egyptian text which is the product of a "Rezensionsarbeit." Furthermore, Zimmermann believes that the text of P66 is basically a witness to the Egyptian text, but one which was influenced by the Western text and also by the Old Latin version.

Another important article which analyzes the text of P66 is that by I. de la Potterie.<sup>60</sup> He demonstrates that P66 differs considerably from two important early textual witnesses, Heracleon and Clement of Alexandria, and sides with the great uncial manuscripts of the fourth and fifth centuries. Thus, it follows that the Alexandrian type of text existed already in the second century, though with certain minor defects which were later corrected. A. F. J. Klijn and I. de la Potterie concur in the belief that the corrections in the text of P66 are in the direction of the type of text represented in Codex Vaticanus.

---

60. I. de la Potterie, "Een nieuwe papyrus van het vierde Evangelie, Papyrus Bodmer II," Bijdragen, XVIII (1957), 117-128. On page 128 of this article there is a summary in French.

A somewhat different approach to the text of P66 has been undertaken by J. N. Birdsall.<sup>61</sup> Birdsall's constructive analysis of the text of P66 is based on grammatical, exegetical and stylistic criteria. He concludes his eighteen page monograph with the observation that the exercise of recensio, the investigation of textual relationships, leads only to an impasse. For this reason, Birdsall's investigation has little significance for the analysis undertaken in this dissertation.

A common fault underlies the majority of these studies of the text of P66. In nearly every case the attempt is made to explain the text of this early third-century manuscript in terms of later witnesses. In the early period, the concepts of "Neutral," "Western," "Caesarean" and "Byzantine" may prove to be out of place. The utilization of such terms prefixed by "proto-" or "pre-" is not satisfactory because they do not explain how the papyrus texts came to be what they are, but only indicate that the later texts have been derived from the earlier textual materials. The attempt to describe the text of P66 in such terms as these leads to such nomenclature as Klijn's "neutral in a non-pure way" and the analysis of the text by Boismard in terms of an alternation between two text-types, thus giving an impression of a scissors-and-paste procedure.

---

61. J. N. Birdsall, The Bodmer Papyrus of the Gospel of John (London: The Tyndale Press, 1960).



To define the text of P66 in these ways is not to define it at all, for such "definitions" only emphasize what was pointed out in Chapter I of this dissertation, that the terminology and textual history based by Hort and his predecessors upon the manuscript evidence available to them is no longer suitable to describe or explain the earlier evidence which has since come to be discovered.

The present investigation results in the following calculations of the differences between the text of P66 and the other early Greek manuscripts. These figures are based upon a detailed comparison of each of the manuscripts with the text of P66.

Variation from the Text of P66,  
by Eleven Early Witnesses,  
in 1794 Textual Passages  
drawn from the Composite Collation

Textual Passages Shared with P66	Variations from P66	Percentage of Variation from P66
P5	48	45.8%
P22	8	50.0%
P28	6	16.6%
P39	15	6.6%
P45	161	55.2%
P52	6	16.6%
P75	1253	40.8%
S	1794	57.3%
B	1794	40.5%
W	1752	47.9%
0162	34	20.5%

These calculations clearly indicate that the text of Codex Vaticanus is more closely related textually to the text of P66 than is the text contained in Codex Sinaiticus. This obvious conclusion, however, needs to be modified by a number of observations which are made later in this analysis. The text of the Washington Codex stands between Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus in its agreement with P66. P66 disagrees with P75 in almost exactly the same ratio as Codex Vaticanus disagrees with P66. The variations from the texts of P5, P45 and P75 demonstrate that in the third century there was a variety of texts circulating in Egypt.

Floyd Filson, in his survey article, suggested that P66 shows some kinship with the text of Codex Sinaiticus and that that relationship deserves further study and analysis. Victor Martin prominently features in his critical notes the relation of Codex Sinaiticus and P66 and frequently refers to their similarity whenever the tradition is diversified.

Throughout the Gospel of John there are a number of passages in which the same reading is supported by P66 and Codex Sinaiticus alone among these earliest Greek manuscripts. Seventy-nine such passages exist in our composite collation.<sup>62</sup> These passages are not distributed uniformly throughout the

---

62. See 1:3, 28, 33, 45, 50, 51; 2:15; 3:25; 4:37; 5:19, 25, 35; 6:3, 5, 49, 58, 64, 66; 7:1, 3, 12, 13, 17, 23, 28, 28, 29, 29, 30, 31, 32, 32, 37, 37, 39, 40, 42, 45, 46, 50; 8:12, 14, 16, 23, 24; 9:9, 10, 17, 27, 32; 10:12, 16, 21, 25; 11:14, 19, 35, 46; 12:13, 18, 29, 32, 34, 35; 13:12, 26, 28, 37; 14:16, 17; 15:13, 14; 16:15; 18:17, 34; 19:3, 4, 6; 21:6.

entire text. It is true that the text of P66 is fragmentary in chapters 15-21, but of the seventy-nine passages, twenty-two of them occur in chapter seven. In the first six chapters there are only eighteen such passages. This evidence might indicate any number of conclusions. It might be taken as an indication that either the text of P66 or the text of Codex Sinaiticus changes in chapter seven. It might indicate that the scribes of P66 and Codex Sinaiticus followed their similar exemplars, copying more accurately in chapter seven. It might indicate that the scribe of either Codex Sinaiticus or P66 did not copy the exemplar with any uniformity. There is not enough evidence available to reach a decisive conclusion.

The relationship of Codex Sinaiticus to P66 finds further support in the omission of 16:15. Both Codex Sinaiticus and P66 omit this verse. The omission is probably the result of a scribal error. It is possible that the concurrence of these two manuscripts in this omission is coincidental. However, in the light of the other evidence, this omission tends to suggest some sort of relationship.

While it is impossible to define this relationship in exact terms, the evidence suggests that there was a common manuscript, other than the original text of the Gospel of John, in the history of Codex Sinaiticus and P66. Since P66 is from the early part of the third century and Codex Sinaiticus is from the latter part of the fourth century, the scribal relationship is not too close. Nevertheless, the text of P66 is a part of the same textual stream out of which Codex Sinaiticus flows.

According to the percentages of variation, the text of Codex Sinaiticus varies more from the text of P66 (57.3%) than it does from Codex Vaticanus (53.2%) or P75 (53.5%). Such statistical calculations make obscure the textual relationship that exists between the texts of Codex Sinaiticus and P66. While P66 and Codex Sinaiticus contain many readings in common against the other early Greek manuscripts, both of them appear to be based mainly upon a text similar to that known in P75 and Codex Vaticanus. By excluding the singular readings found in P66 and Codex Sinaiticus, the relationship of these two manuscripts comes into clearer focus. Each of these two manuscripts contains a large number of readings not supported in any other early Greek manuscript. Thus, a purely statistical analysis of the disagreements does not reveal the true affinity between the two manuscripts.

While the present writer cannot accept the detailed theory of W. Hartke with respect to the relationship of the Washington Codex and P66, he does find a significant affinity between these two manuscripts. P66 is extant only in small fragments in chapters 15-21 and the Washington Codex lacks chapter fifteen and parts of fourteen and sixteen. Yet, there are sixty-two passages in which P66 and the Washington Codex, by themselves, support the same variant reading.<sup>62</sup> This evidence

---

62. See the superscription; 1:13, 26, 36; 2:16; 4:5, 14, 39, 42, 50, 51, 53; 5:29; 6:10, 43, 45, 57; 7:4, 16, 39, 50; 8:25, 41; 9:23, 34, 35; 10:18, 32; 11:17, 18, 22, 54; 12:9, 16, 16, 16, 21, 26, 30, 31; 13:8, 18, 21, 22, 25, 26, 29, 33; 14:3, 4, 5, 11, 16, 17; 16:22; 17:11; 18:20, 20, 29, 34; 19:12, 25.

points to the fact of some textual affinity between the texts contained in P66 and the Washington Codex. As was the case with the relationship of Codex Sinaiticus and P66, it is again impossible to define the relationship in precise terms. In any case, these instances of agreement suggest that P66 and the Washington Codex are a part of the same textual tradition. When the singular readings of these two manuscripts are taken into consideration, the texts of P66 and the Washington Codex are more closely related than are the texts of Codex Vaticanus and P66. There is additional evidence which supports the conclusion that the texts of Codex Sinaiticus and the Washington Codex are related to the text of P66, even where the former two differ from one another.

In the first twelve chapters of the Gospel of John, a section for which all five of the major witnesses (P66, P75, S, B and W) are, for the most part, extant, there are only eleven passages in which P66 and Codex Vaticanus agree against the other three witnesses.<sup>63</sup> Four of these instances are agreement in the inclusion or omission of the article. Two of the instances are agreement in the tense of verbs. Two of the instances are agreement in the order of words. The other three instances of agreement are textually insignificant. If Codex Vaticanus and P66 were directly related manuscripts, one would expect a larger number of peculiar agreement between these two texts. The text of P66 is not a part of the history

---

63. See 4:17, 54; 6:51, 53; 8:14, 42; 11:24, 43, 46; 12:1, 46.

of the text found in Codex Vaticanus. The text of P66 represents a separate stream of textual transmission.

In the same twelve chapters (1-12) there are only seven passages in which P66 and P75 agree against the other early Greek manuscripts.<sup>64</sup> Of these seven agreements one is agreement in the use of the article; two are agreement in the use of conjunctions; one is agreement in tense; one is agreement in the use of a synonym for the word found in all the other manuscripts; one is agreement in word order; and the other instance is agreement in the use of the relative pronoun. The agreement in 12:9 is agreement in the use of the article. Otherwise, all of these agreements are found in the first four chapters and before the agreements of P66 and Codex Vaticanus. These instances of peculiar agreement between P66 and P75 are not necessarily indicative of a relationship. Even though P66 and P75 are probably contemporary manuscripts, there is clearly no close textual relationship between them.

The textual affinity between P66 and P45 has already been discussed. For the most part the texts of P5, P22, P28, P39, P52 and Q162 are too fragmentary to determine anything significant in a comparison of them with P66. In every case, except with P5, the percentage of variation is relatively small. This fact suggests that the basic text underlying these fragments is similar to that which underlies P66 and that since P22, P28,

---

64. See 1:15, 27; 2:13; 3:18, 28; 4:12; 12:9.

P39, P52 and 0162 are so fragmentary, the comparison of P66 with them does not disclose the peculiarities of each manuscript.

The text of P66 is not a "mixed" text. Its text is best described as one which lies in the higher reaches of the stream from which Codex Sinaiticus and the Washington Codex later derive. The stream has its origin in the original text of the Gospel of John.

A comparison of P45, P66 and P75 where these manuscripts overlap underlines the complexity and strangeness of the textual history of the third century. In the composite collation there are 131 significant passages for which all three of these witnesses are cited. These manuscripts probably range in date from the late second century to the middle of the third century with P75 the earliest and P45 the latest. All are Egyptian texts in the geographical sense of the word.

What can be learned from the evidence provided by these three papyri about the text of the Gospel of John in the early part of the third century, and about the history of its transmission?

Where the texts of P45, P66 and P75 overlap in chapters ten and eleven there are seventy-three passages in which one of the three disagrees with the reading contained in the other two. P45 disagrees with the common readings of P66 and P75 thirty-seven times. In this disagreement the reading contained in P45 is supported by either Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus or the Washington Codex, or some combination of these three,

only six times. Codex Sinaiticus supports four of the six readings; Codex Vaticanus, one; and the Washington Codex supports two of the readings. In other words, in the seventy-three readings P45 lacks support by any other early Greek manuscript thirty-one times.

P66 disagrees with the readings common to P45 and P75 twenty times. In this disagreement the reading of P66 is supported by Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus, the Washington Codex, or some combination of the three, only five times. Codex Sinaiticus supports the reading of P66 in three of the five readings. Codex Vaticanus supports two of the readings and the Washington Codex supports only one. Out of the seventy-three readings in which one of the three manuscripts (P45 P66 P75) disagrees with the other two, P66 lacks support by any other early Greek manuscript fifteen times.

P75 disagrees with the readings common to P45 and P66 sixteen times. In this disagreement the text of P75 is supported twelve times by Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus, the Washington Codex, or by some combination of the three. In all twelve of these instances P75 is supported by Codex Vaticanus. Codex Sinaiticus and the Washington Codex each supports the text of P75 six times when it disagrees with the reading of P45 and P66. In those passages in which the text of P75 disagrees with the readings of P45 and P66, it stands by itself only four times. This evidence gives added support to the conclusion that P75 and Codex Vaticanus are especially related.



A Comparison of P45, P66, and P75 in 131 Textual  
Passages drawn from the Composite Collation  
(Chapters 10 and 11)

Passages in which all three texts agree	42
Passages in which one of the three texts disagrees with the reading of the other two	73
P45 against P66 P75	37
P66 against P45 P75	20
P75 against P45 P66	16
Passages in which all three texts disagree	16

Our comparison of P45, P66 and P75 reveals sixteen passages in which each of these manuscripts contains a different text.

10:7	ειπεν αυτοις ο ιησους ειπεν ουν αυτοις ο ιησους ειπεν ουν παλιν ο ιησους ειπεν ουν παλιν ιησους ειπεν ουν αυτοις παλιν ο ιησους	P66 P45 W P75 B S
10:10	και περισσον εχωσιν omit και περισσοτερον εχωσιν	P45 S B P66 P75
10:12	τα προβατα ιδια ιατα τα προβατα τα προβατα τα ιδια	P66 S B W P45 P75
10:31	εβαστασαν ουν παλιν εβαστασαν εβαστασαν παλιν	P66 P45 P75 S B W
10:32	καλα εργα εδειξα υμιν εργα καλα εδειξα υμιν εδειξα υμιν εργα καλα εργα εδειξα υμιν καλα εργα εδειξα υμιν	P66 P45 S P75 B W
10:34	απεκριθη αυτοις ο ιησους απεκριθη αυτοις ιησους απεκριθη ιησους και ειπεν αυτοις	P75 S P45 B W P66

10:36	υιος θεου ειμι ο υιος θεου ειμι ο υιος του θεου ειμι υιος του θεου ειμι	P66 S W P45 P75 B
10:39	εζητουν ουν παλιν αυτον εζητουν δε αυτον εζητουν αυτον παλιν εζητουν παλιν αυτον εζητουν ουν αυτον εζητουν ουν αυτον παλιν	P66 P45 P75 B S W
11:4	ο υιος του θεου ο υιος αυτου ο υιος	P75 S B W P45 P66
11:6	εν ω ην τοπω επι τω τοπω ω ην τοπω	P75 S B W P45 P66
11:7	λεγει τοις μαθηταις λεγει λεγει αυτοις	P75 S B W P45 P66
11:19	προς την μαρθαν και μαριαν προς τας περι μαρθαν και μαριαν προς την μαρθαν και μαριαμ προς την μαρθαν και την μαριαν	P66 S P45 P75 B W
11:30	αλλα ην επι επι τω τοπω αλλ ην επι τω τοπω αλλ ην επι εν τω τοπω	P66 P45 P75 S B W
11:33	τους συνεληλυθοτας συν αυτη ιουδαιους κλαιοντας τους ιουδαιους κλαιοντας τους συνεληλυθοτας τους συνελθοντας αυτη ιουδαιους κλαιοντας τους συνελθοντας ιουδαιους κλαιοντας	P66 P45 P75 S B W
11:45	προς την μαριαν την μαριαν προς την μαριαμ	P45 S W P66 P75 B
11:51	του ενιαυτου omit του ενιαυτου εκεινου	P66 P45 P75 S B W

From this evidence several conclusions about the third-century text can be set forth. In the first place, the divergences of these near contemporaries demonstrate conclusively that there was not a uniform text in Egypt at the beginning of

the third century. P45, P66 and P75 represent a period in the history of the text when manuscripts presented "dazzling and kaleidoscopic permutations and combinations of readings."<sup>65</sup> This conclusion concurs with the observation of Victor Martin: "Il semble donc qu' il n' existait pas, en Egypte, au commencement du III<sup>e</sup> siècle, une recension unique des textes évangéliques faisant autorité."<sup>66</sup>

In the second place, among these three third-century manuscripts the text of P66 has its closest affinity with the text of P75, and the text of P45 also has its closest affinity with the text of P75. Since the greatest divergence occurs between P45 and P66, since the text of P45 and P66 have their closest affinities with P75, and since P75 is probably the oldest of the three papyri, the text of P75, or a similar type of text, appears to stand behind the texts of P66 and P45.

In the third place, this investigation of the third-century manuscripts supports the conclusion, already set forth, that the type of text represented by the text of Codex Vaticanus is essentially a very early text. Of the third-century texts, P75 is the one most closely followed in the fourth century, especially by Codex Vaticanus.

---

65. J. N. Birdsall, The Bodmer Papyrus of the Gospel of John (London: The Tyndale Press, 1960), p. 10.

66. Victor Martin (ed.), Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV, p. 23, note 1.

P28 is a fourth-century manuscript which contains John 6:8-12 and 17-22. Grenfell and Hunt indicate that "the text is eclectic in places, as often happens in early Biblical manuscripts."<sup>67</sup> They conclude that the text tends to support Codex Vaticanus rather than Codex Sinaiticus. Kenneth W. Clark characterizes the text as "mixed," but qualifies that characterization with the judgment that the text of P28 tends to support Codex Vaticanus.<sup>68</sup> Henry A. Sanders, who presupposed that the original text of the Gospel of John was a Western type of text, cites P28, P39 and 0162 in support of his theory. He believes that these three fourth-century fragments show the beginning of adaptation to the Alexandrian text. Sanders maintains that even in these fourth-century manuscripts more pure Western readings are found than pure Alexandrian.<sup>69</sup> Hollis W. Huston is of the opinion that "the phenomena of the text are . . . more easily explained as representing the pre-recension text than as showing the results of mixture between the text-types."<sup>70</sup>

---

67. Grenfell and Hunt (eds.), The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XIII (London, 1919), p. 8.

68. Kenneth W. Clark, A Descriptive Catalogue of Greek New Testament Manuscripts in America (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937), p. 148.

69. H. A. Sanders, "The Egyptian Text of the Four Gospels and Acts," Harvard Theological Review, XXVI (1933), 89.

70. Hollis W. Huston, "A Critical Survey and Evaluation of the Earliest Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament" (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Duke University, 1949), p. 89.

In the chart which follows, the extant text of P28 is compared with the text of each extant witness.

Variation from the Text of P28,  
by Five Early Witnesses,  
in 14 Textual Passages  
drawn from the Composite Collation

Textual Passages Shared with P28	Variations from P28	Percentage of Variation from P28	
P66	6	1	16.6%
P75	11	5	45.4%
S	14	10	71.4%
B	14	4	28.5%
W	14	4	28.5%

The evidence is too meager to permit a conclusive analysis of the textual affinities with the text of P28. P28 appears to be most closely related to the text of P66, but the percentage of variation is based upon only six passages. This evidence suggests that P28 and Codex Sinaiticus are not related manuscripts. P28 tends to agree with Codex Vaticanus in contrast to Codex Sinaiticus. There is nothing to suggest that the text of P28 is Western in character.

Another fourth-century manuscript is P39 of which there remain portions of John 8:14-18 and 18-22. New Testament textual critics are generally in agreement in concluding that the text of P39 lies very close to Codex Vaticanus. Grenfell and Hunt state that "the text shows a general agreement with Codex

Vaticanus."<sup>71</sup>

In the chart which follows, the extant text of P39 is compared with the text of each extant witness.

Variation from the Text of P39,  
by Five Early Witnesses,  
in 15 Textual Passages  
drawn from the Composite Collation

Textual Passages Shared with P39	Variations from P39	Percentage of Variation from P39	
P66	15	1	6.6%
P75	15	3	20.0%
S	15	12	80.0%
B	15	0	0.0%
W	15	3	20.0%

From these calculations it is clear, as far as these verses of John are concerned, that P39 is related textually to Codex Vaticanus. It is also related to the text of P66. The one instance of disagreement between P66 and P39 is disagreement in word order. There appears to be some affinity also with P75 and the Washington Codex. P39 and Codex Sinaiticus are definitely not related textually. The type of text found in Codex Vaticanus is supported by the text of P39. The conclusion of H. A. Sanders, that the text of P39 is basically a Western text, is not supported by this investigation.

Since all six of these witnesses are cited for fifteen

---

71. Grenfell and Hunt (eds.), The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XV (London, 1922), p. 7.

passages in the composite collation, it is of value for the purposes of comparison to examine the relationships of the manuscripts in these fifteen passages. P66 disagrees with P39 only once; with P75 four times; with Codex Sinaiticus eleven times; with Codex Vaticanus one time; and with the Washington Codex two times. P75 disagrees with P39 three times; with P66 four times; with Codex Sinaiticus thirteen times; with Codex Vaticanus three times; and with the Washington Codex three times. Codex Sinaiticus disagrees with P39 twelve times; with P66 eleven times; with P75 thirteen times; with Codex Vaticanus twelve times; and with the Washington Codex eleven times. Codex Vaticanus disagrees with P39 not a single time; with P66 one time; with P75 three times; with Codex Sinaiticus twelve times; and with the Washington Codex two times. The Washington Codex disagrees with P39 three times; with P66 two times; with P75 three times; with Codex Sinaiticus eleven times and with Codex Vaticanus three times. In these fifteen readings Codex Sinaiticus stands in contrast to the other witnesses.

Another of our fourth-century manuscripts is 0162 which is extant for John 2:11-22. C. R. Gregory indicates that the text of this manuscript is related to Codex Vaticanus.<sup>72</sup> With the exception of H. A. Sanders, who describes the text as Western, textual critics concur in the belief that the text of

---

72. C. R. Gregory, Textkritik des Neuen Testaments, III (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1909), p. 1082.

0162 is related to Codex Vaticanus.

In the chart which follows, the extant text of 0162 is compared with the text of each extant witness.

Variation from the Text of 0162,  
by Five Early Witnesses,  
in 34 Textual Passages  
drawn from the Composite Collation

Textual Passages Shared with 0162	Variations from 0162	Percentage of Variation from 0162
P66	7	20.5%
P75	8	23.5%
S	16	47.0%
B	4	11.7%
W	14	41.1%

The texts of Codex Vaticanus and of 0162 are similar in character. Codex Vaticanus' percentage of variation from 0162 is less than its percentage of variation from the text of P75. Codex Sinaiticus is least like the text of 0162. There is some affinity between 0162 and P66 and also P75.

We turn now to a consideration of the major fourth-century manuscripts (B S W) in the light of the evidence presented by the third-century texts. Over the character of the text contained in Codex Vaticanus a most embittered controversy has raged. It has been only within quite recent time that Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus have emerged from their obscurity and have become known. In the latter part of the nineteenth century these two manuscripts were the most ancient ones



known, and they differ markedly from the class of text represented by Codex Alexandrinus which up to that time was held to be the oldest and best authority in existence. Hence, there was a natural reluctance to abandon the ancient readings at the bidding of these two newcomers. This was the case after the publication of Hort's theory in 1881 which assigned to these two fourth-century manuscripts, and especially to Codex Vaticanus, a pre-eminence which is almost overwhelming. Dean Burgon fought desperately against the text of Westcott and Hort, and even went so far as to argue that these two documents owed their preservation, not to the goodness of their text, but to their depravity. They were, Burgon believed, examples of what a copy of the Scriptures ought not to be.

Many New Testament textual critics believe that Codex Vaticanus is the chief evidence for the most ancient form of the New Testament text. On the other hand, there are those who are of the opinion that it is of little value in determining the original text, or that its value is not as great as that placed upon it by Westcott and Hort.

One of the basic problems in the history of the text of the Gospel of John is the background or history of Codex Vaticanus. Does Codex Vaticanus show a gradual growth from a Western, via a Caesarean or mixed text, or does it go back to a pure text which was not influenced by the Western or other types of text? The answer to this question is important, since the type of text on which the modern critical editions have been based--whether on the original text, on a very good but

revised text, or on a very ancient text--depends upon the answer. The conclusion of this present writer is that Codex Vaticanus preserves not only a very ancient text but, of all the manuscripts containing the complete text of the Gospel of John, also preserves the text most clearly reflecting the original text.

In the chart which follows, the text of Codex Vaticanus is compared with the text of each extant witness.

Variation from the Text of B,  
by Eleven Early Witnesses,  
in 2127 Textual Passages  
drawn from the Composite Collation

Textual Passages Shared with B	Variations from B	Percentage of Variation from B
P5	63	28.5%
P22	16	25.0%
P28	14	28.5%
P39	15	0.0%
P45	161	50.3%
P52	8	12.5%
P66	1794	40.5%
P75	1312	19.4%
S	2127	53.2%
W	2051	40.3%
0162	34	11.7%

The most significant agreements of the texts represented in this chart are those of the text of Codex Vaticanus with the texts of P22, P39, P52, P75, and 0162. The most significant disagreement

which has not already been discussed is the disagreement of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus.<sup>73</sup> The multitude of variations between these two manuscripts indicates that their texts are not derived from a single near ancestor. Independent carelessness or license of two scribes copying the same exemplar cannot explain the wide divergence. This is demonstrated by the fact that many of their divergent readings find support in the earlier Greek manuscripts. The differences between Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus are much too great to admit that their common text is derived from a single exemplar as recent as the beginning of the fourth century. Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus are not "sister codices" as has commonly been assumed. Rather, they represent two textual streams which may have a common origin in the second century.

As has already been indicated, the text of Codex Vaticanus does not represent a late third or early fourth-century recension. It is an unrevised text which shows the results of a textual process. To be sure, Codex Vaticanus contains some readings which have little or no support in the other early Greek manuscripts. Yet, because it agrees consistently with the earliest text in P75, the text of Codex Vaticanus must be

---

73. On this disagreement see H. C. Hoskier, Codex B and Its Allies, 2 parts (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1914). In two volumes Hoskier examines in detail the variations between Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus in the four Gospels, for support of an argument against the Westcott-Hort reliance upon these two manuscripts.

acknowledged as a representative of the earliest Greek text of the Gospel of John which can be known from the Greek manuscripts.

The text of the Gospel of John in the fourth-century Codex Sinaiticus is characteristically shorter than the texts of many of the other manuscripts used in this investigation. It also contains numerous idiosyncrasies. For the most part the omissions do not appear to be the result of carelessness, but of intentional alteration. One feature of this shorter text is the frequent omission of the copula and other connectives. It is also a recognizable fact that, of the manuscripts written before the end of the fourth century, Codex Sinaiticus contains more singular readings than any other manuscript. For this reason especially the relationship of the text of Codex Sinaiticus does not appear to be close to the text contained in any of the other early manuscripts.

Tischendorf, in his editio octava major (1869-1872), changed his outlook and followed closely the text of Codex Sinaiticus which he had so recently discovered and edited. For the most part, the text of Codex Sinaiticus has not been adequately assessed. Hort, as well as other textual critics, recognized that Western readings are numerous in the Gospel of John.<sup>74</sup> The real issue is whether this Western element stems

---

<sup>74</sup>. B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek, vol. II: Introduction and Appendix (London: Macmillan and Company, Limited, 1881), p. 151.

from an original Western type of text, or whether it is the beginning of a later Western text as found in Codex Bezae. The present investigation supports the latter view. In the chart which follows, the text of Codex Sinaiticus is compared with the text of each extant witness.

Variation from the Text of S,  
by Eleven Early Witnesses,  
in 2127 Textual Passages  
drawn from the Composite Collation

Textual Passages Shared with S	Variations from S	Percentage of Variation from S	
P5	63	32	50.7%
P22	16	10	62.5%
P28	14	10	71.4%
P39	15	12	80.0%
P45	161	89	55.2%
P52	8	5	62.5%
P66	1794	1028	57.3%
P75	1312	702	53.5%
B	2127	1132	53.2%
W	2051	1170	57.0%
O162	34	16	47.0%

These comparisons emphasize the fact that Codex Sinaiticus contains many readings not found in any of the others of these manuscripts.

For the most part the relationship of Codex Sinaiticus to the other early Greek manuscripts has been discussed. For purposes of summary several points are here reiterated. In the

first place, Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus differ to such a degree that only a very distant relationship exists between them. Most likely, they represent two separate textual streams or textual families. In the second place, there is some affinity between Codex Sinaiticus and P66 which suggests that they are a part of the same general stream of textual transmission. This is true in spite of the large percentage of variation which exists between the texts of Codex Sinaiticus and P66. According to strictly numerical calculations, the text of Codex Sinaiticus is closer to Codex Vaticanus, the Washington Codex, and P75 than it is to the text of P66. The affinity with the Washington Codex will be further analyzed in the discussion of that manuscript. In the third place, those readings of Codex Sinaiticus which find support in P75 are very early readings and possibly represent the original text. The support of both Codex Sinaiticus and P75 for a reading, against the witness of Codex Vaticanus, is strong support for a reading. The text of P75 is an early form of the text represented in Codex Vaticanus. In general, the text-type found in P75 and Codex Vaticanus most clearly reflects the original text of the Gospel of John. However, both P75 and Codex Vaticanus contain readings which clearly are not the original reading. It is also true that Codex Sinaiticus may preserve some original readings. Since the text of Codex Sinaiticus represents a distinct stream of textual history, those readings of P75 which are not supported by Codex Vaticanus, but which are supported by Codex Sinaiticus, are probably the original text. In such

cases (e.g. 7:39; 8:57; 9:6, 17, 21; 9:38, 39; 10:8; 14:17) the text of P75 provides a link between the two textual streams represented by Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus.

The Washington Codex is the latest of the twelve manuscripts used in this investigation. Henry A. Sanders observes that the solution of the textual problem of this manuscript has been impeded by the inadequacy of the textual material in the critical editions and the impossibility of explaining its peculiarities on the basis of the text theories generally accepted. Even though the first quire of John (1-5:11) is in a different hand and on a different kind of parchment, Sanders shows that it is not textually independent. The text of the Washington Codex in the Gospel of John shows a "decided Hesychian trend."<sup>75</sup> It is the conclusion of the writer of this dissertation that there is no appreciable difference in the texts of the two parts of John.

In the chart which follows, the text of the Washington Codex is compared with the text of each extant witness.

---

75. Henry A. Sanders, The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection, Part I: The Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1912), p. 41.

Variation from the Text of W,  
by Eleven Early Witnesses,  
in 2051 Textual Passages  
drawn from the Composite Collation

Textual Passages Shared with W	Variations from W	Percentage of Variation from W
P5	63	49.2%
P22	14	35.7%
P28	14	28.5%
P39	15	20.0%
P45	161	57.1%
P52	8	37.5%
P66	1752	47.9%
P75	1312	38.5%
S	2051	57.0%
B	2051	40.3%
0162	34	41.1%

Of those manuscripts containing a considerable portion of text, the Washington Codex is most closely related to P75 and next in order to Codex Vaticanus.

The relationship of the texts of Codex Sinaiticus and the Washington Codex deserves further treatment. Only the first twelve chapters are used in this analysis because these chapters are more or less complete in the five primary manuscripts used in this investigation. The Washington Codex and Codex Sinaiticus agree fifty-four times in the first twelve chapters



against all the other early Greek manuscripts.<sup>76</sup> There is, therefore, some relationship between these two texts. The Washington Codex is not a part of the textual stream represented by P75 and Codex Vaticanus, although it does contain many readings found in these two manuscripts.

In order to confirm some of the observations made previously in this chapter, the results of another type of analysis are here set forth. For this analysis only the first twelve chapters of the Gospel of John are used for the reason already mentioned. The analysis is based upon those passages in the composite collation in which there are at least two witnesses in support of different readings. Thus, those readings which are peculiar to a single manuscript are omitted from this analysis.

In the list which follows, the agreement of pairs of manuscripts is indicated.

Manuscript pairs	Number of Passages
P75 B	148
P66 S	114
S W	95
B W	87
P66 W	81
P75 W	78
P66 B	59
S B	56
P66 P75	54
P75 S	52

---

76. See 1:6, 15, 32, 42, 45; 2:7, 11, 24; 3:22, 23, 27, 28; 4:9, 12, 25, 54; 5:1, 5, 11, 11, 14, 26; 6:12, 14, 14, 14, 18, 31, 42, 43, 51, 58; 7:6, 10, 42, 42, 52; 8:35, 41; 9:19, 40, 41; 10:16, 25, 38; 11:12, 17, 44, 44, 45, 46; 12:12, 22, 43.

Where the witness of the earliest Greek manuscripts is divided, P75 and Codex Vaticanus support the same readings more than does any other pair of manuscripts. P66 and Codex Sinaiticus support a common reading, where there are variations, a significant number of times. The above listing shows clearly how the manuscripts pair in support of readings in those passages where the witness of the earliest Greek manuscripts is divided.

### Conclusions

From the detailed comparison of manuscripts set forth in this chapter a number of conclusions come into focus concerning the history of the text of the Gospel of John in Egypt during the first four centuries. These four centuries correspond, approximately, to that period in church history when the church in Egypt was an integral part of the rest of Christendom. It was at the Council of Chalcedon in A. D. 461 that the church in Egypt became separated from the rest of Christendom. It must, of course, be made explicit that the conclusions here advanced are valid only for the text of the Gospel of John in Egypt during this period. To argue from this evidence that the same process occurred concurrently in all the Christian world would be to go beyond the available evidence. Moreover, the conclusions here advanced are based upon an investigation of only the early Greek manuscripts. The ancient fathers and the versions have not been incorporated into this study. Therefore, the conclusions which are proposed are limited by this restriction.

It is conceivable that the testimony of the fathers and versions might necessitate some modifications in the conclusions. However, the Greek manuscripts are the textual critics' first resource and they provide the most direct approach for the recovery of the text. It is the contention of this writer that any analysis of the texts of the fathers and the versions must be undertaken in the light of the evidence provided by the Greek manuscripts, rather than conversely. This methodological observation is supported by the fact that there are now available to the textual critics manuscripts whose texts give testimony to the state of the text of the Gospel of John in the late second and early third centuries.

When and how Christianity arrived in Egypt is not known with certainty. The tradition that Mark preached the Gospel in Alexandria is first mentioned by Eusebius, the fourth-century historian (Church History II. 16). When one considers how quickly the preaching of the Gospel spread to the other great cities of the Roman Empire, it would seem scarcely probable that no hint of the new faith was brought to Alexandria. It is not unreasonable to suppose that Christianity may have reached Alexandria by two ways--by way of Gentile converts to the Greek citizens, and by way of the Jewish-Christian Church in Jerusalem to the Jewish community in Alexandria. There is no certainty on this supposition, but it is worth recalling that from Alexandria came the learned and eloquent Jew, Apollos, mentioned in the eighteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles and in Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians. The famous

Codex Bezae contains the interesting reading (Acts 18:25) that Apollos, in fact, received his instruction in the Christian faith in his own fatherland--Alexandria. If any credence can be given to this reading, it does suggest that Christian teachers had reached Alexandria by the beginning of the second half of the first century, if not a few years earlier. It is significant that by A. D. 180, when the church in Alexandria appears in the full light of history, it is a flourishing institution with an organization and school of higher learning attached which must have already made its influence felt far beyond the city itself. It is very probable that Christianity rapidly spread up the Nile River and into Upper Egypt. As Christianity spread, a number of Christian communities were probably established along the Nile River. Without debating the question, it may be argued that the Gospel of John was written in Egypt at the beginning of the second century. In any case, the second and third-century papyri which contain the Gospel of John point to Egypt as a field for the very early dissemination of that gospel. P52, the oldest surviving fragment of John, is dated in the early second century. Additional evidence of the second and third-century spread of Christianity in Egypt is provided by P75, P66, P45, P22, and P5. These second and third-century papyri attest to the popularity of the Gospel of John among Egyptian Christians. It is probably more than coincidence that we possess more abundant second and third-century witness to the Gospel of John than to any other Gospel.

The texts of the twelve earliest Greek manuscripts of the

Gospel of John (P5 P22 P28 P39 P45 P52 P66 P75 S B W 0162) clearly demonstrate that during the first four centuries a great variety of readings came into existence. The evidence introduced in this chapter indicates that in the third and fourth centuries there was a variety of texts current in Egypt. It is apparent that considerable license was taken by some scribes in copying the text while more respect for the text was shown by other scribes. While most of the variations in these manuscripts are relatively insignificant, there are many variations which change substantially the sense of the passage. These earliest Greek manuscripts are a forceful demonstration that the Gospel of John was a living Word which was read and which was expounded in the Egyptian churches.

Even though the third-century papyri provide abundant witness to the text of the Gospel of John, it is a fact that there is not a single known manuscript before the fourth century which contains the entire text of that gospel. With the exception of P66 and P75, the second and third-century manuscripts are extremely fragmentary. P45 is extant for only parts of chapters ten and eleven. Yet, these fragmentary manuscripts are valuable in that they confirm conclusions reached on the basis of the more complete texts. For all practical purposes the construction of a critical text of the Gospel of John will have to begin with the more extended texts. The second-century manuscript, P52, is much too fragmentary to serve as a basis for a critical text. It is also much too fragmentary for any conclusion to be based solely upon its

textual witness. However, its affinity with Codex Vaticanus supports the conclusion, based upon the relationship of the texts of P75 and Codex Vaticanus, that Codex Vaticanus represents an early text. Therefore, the value of the texts preserved only in fragments is that they afford confirmation for theories based upon the texts preserved in extended portions.

It is the conclusion of this writer that the comparison of the texts of the third and fourth-century Greek manuscripts undertaken in this chapter reveals certain textual relationships. These textual relationships are the basis for a theory of the history of the text. Moreover, the ascertainment of the history of the text is impossible without the knowledge of textual relationships. The comparison of texts is the foundation of all enduring criticism. Even though precise "genealogical family trees" cannot be drawn, certain tendencies are clearly apparent. The most obvious of these relationships is that which exists between the texts of Codex Vaticanus and P75. There is also a textual affinity between the texts of Codex Sinaiticus and P66, although this relationship is not as apparent because there are many readings peculiar to each text. Codex Sinaiticus and the Washington Codex show some textual affinity as do also the Washington Codex and Codex Vaticanus. The analysis of the text of the Washington Codex indicates some affinity with both P66 and P75. These relationships are the most marked and, therefore, a history of the text must take them into consideration.

On the basis of these textual relationships, the history

of the text of the Gospel of John in Egypt during the second through the fourth centuries appears to be as follows. P75 and Codex Vaticanus represent one stream of textual history. Codex Vaticanus is clearly not a direct copy of P75, but both of them represent the same general type of text which is attested as early as A. D. 200. Codex Sinaiticus clearly represents a different stream of the history of the text. As early as the third century, P66 and P45 give testimony to the same general branch whence Codex Sinaiticus and the Washington Codex derive. Yet, P66, P45, the Washington Codex, and Codex Sinaiticus have separate histories. The Greek manuscripts used in this investigation represent the texts of various Christian communities along the Nile River during the third and fourth centuries.

Westcott and Hort's division of the earliest Greek manuscripts into "Neutral" and "Alexandrian" finds support in this investigation. For them the "Alexandrian" text is a variety of the "Neutral" text and, for the most part, derived from it. Hort's description of the "Alexandrian" text applies very well to the texts found in P45, P66, Codex Sinaiticus and the Washington Codex. Hort writes:

The more startling characteristics of Western corruption are almost wholly absent from the Alexandrian readings. There is no incorporation of matters extraneous to the canonical texts of the Bible, and no habitual or extreme licence of paraphrase. . . . The changes made have usually more to do with language than matter, and are marked by an effort after correctness of phrase.<sup>77</sup>

---

77. B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek, vol. II: Introduction and Appendix (London: Macmillan and Company, Limited, 1881), p. 131.

The evidence of all the manuscripts used in this present investigation supports the view that the text-type represented by P75-Codex Vaticanus is the basic text from which the other manuscripts have derived. A retrograde step is taken when the "Alexandrian" and "Neutral" manuscripts are lumped together. However, no attempt has been made in this dissertation to attach names to these textual processes. We rather counsel that it is wiser at present to refrain from such terms as "neutral," "Western," or "Alexandrian."

The earliest history of the text of the Gospel of John is best described as a process, as a freely flowing stream with numerous tributaries. There is no evidence to support the theory of an explicit editorial revision or recension. The theory of recensions advocated by J. L. Hug, Wilhelm Bousset, Hermann von Soden, and by the majority of textual critics in earlier decades is not supported by the evidence supplied in the most newly discovered manuscripts. The text of Codex Vaticanus should no longer be described as an editorial recension.

A corollary of the theory of recensions has been the belief that the type of text represented in Codex Vaticanus can have no attestation earlier than the beginning of the third century. G. D. Kilpatrick emphatically states his belief that the text of Codex Vaticanus is a revised text which "cannot be



traced back beyond the third century."<sup>78</sup> The text represented by Codex Vaticanus can now be traced back to the end of the second century (in P75) and even possibly to the middle of the second century (in P52). P75 has only recently become available and remains unpublished as yet.

While the so-called Western text has not been the object of the investigation of this dissertation, it has not been entirely ignored. The theory of a primitive "Western" text has often been advocated by textual critics. The analysis of the earliest Greek manuscripts undertaken in this chapter reveals no evidence to support such a viewpoint. While there are a number of readings in P45, P66, Codex Sinaiticus and the Washington Codex which have been called "Western," these are probably best explained as the beginnings of a process which later merged in the text represented by Codex Bezae. Many of these so-called Western readings are probably not "Western" at all in a geographical sense. Moreover, these "Western" readings appear in these earliest Egyptian manuscripts in a sporadic manner. There is little evidence to suggest that there is an underlying "Western" text.

The most valuable of the early Greek manuscripts is P75, a manuscript not yet published. This manuscript provides important information for understanding the earliest textual

---

78. G. D. Kilpatrick, "Western Text and Original Text in the Gospels and Acts," Journal of Theological Studies, XLIV (1943), 25.

history. The third-century manuscripts which have previously been known to textual critics contain texts which show a wide divergence when compared with later manuscripts. Textual critics have groped in the darkness for ways to explain the third-century manuscripts. For the most part, their searching was in vain. With the appearance of P75, however, the history of the text in the third century is much enlightened. It is no longer permissible to describe the third-century manuscripts as "mixed" or as "proto-." The text of P75 reveals the true character of manuscripts such as P45 and P66--that they are manuscripts which contain many divergences from the earliest known text. The importance of the yet unpublished P75 can hardly be overestimated. As the earliest surviving copy of the Gospel of John in Greek, in substantial extent, it has served in this chapter to provide a link between Codex Vaticanus and P52, and to distinguish the important groups of our earliest textual witnesses in Egypt.

## Chapter V

### TEXTUAL VARIATIONS AND THEOLOGICAL TENDENCIES

In the earliest Greek manuscripts of the Gospel of John there appear a number of variant readings which are the product of the vigorous church life of the first four centuries. Just as there was not one universally accepted canon of the New Testament, there was not a universally accepted theological position, not even in one region such as Egypt. There was a variety of canons and there was a variety of beliefs. The "church" had not defined the "accepted" theological position regarding the Person of Jesus Christ, the relationship of Christ to God, the Holy Spirit, the relationship of Judaism to Christianity, baptism, eschatology, ethics and many other subjects. These subjects were living issues in the early church. The earliest history of the church was a period of formulation and the history of the text of the Gospel of John provides some commentary upon that period in the history of the church. This

chapter of the dissertation is devoted to an examination of some of the more important variants which reflect this period of mental strife.

The methodology followed in this presentation needs to be made explicit. In the first place, the starting point for this analysis is the textual phenomena rather than the controversies which arose in the early history of the church. There may be many variations which have some theological implications but which do not fit into any of the known controversies. Therefore, no attempt is made to present systematically the controversies. In the second place, the emphasis in this chapter is on the theological significance of the variations in the text and not on the question of which variant reading is the original reading of the Gospel of John. The discussion, however, is not entirely devoid of indications of this author's preference--a preference based upon the conclusions set forth in Chapter IV. It is not the author's intent to recapitulate all of the textual evidence in support of the various readings which are discussed. Such a recapitulation would only detract from the primary emphasis of this chapter which is to demonstrate that the earliest Greek manuscripts of the Gospel of John reflect a period in the history of the church in which the Christian communities were attempting to formulate their beliefs, and that these manuscripts reflect the conflicts between "heretical" and "orthodox" positions.

Because the earliest extant Greek manuscripts containing the Gospel of John have a history, it is not necessarily

expected that any consistent theological bias will be found in any particular manuscript. Copyists preserved additions or subtractions or emendations without knowing the source of their readings. It may be true that Marcion thoroughly revised his Gospel so that it would coincide with his Gnostic theology. Nevertheless, in the earliest extant Greek manuscripts of the Gospel of John, there is apparently none which has undergone such thorough revision for theological purposes. The textual variants which are related to theological tendencies are scattered throughout the manuscripts. They are more subtle changes than those made by Marcion in his Gospel; but, they are changes which are the result of the freedom enjoyed by the early Christian communities to work out their own theology.

The variants included in this survey are those which appear among our earliest Greek manuscripts. Those variants in which all of the earliest Greek manuscripts agree against the textus receptus are not used. The textus receptus in such cases is a later text. Therefore, where the textus receptus varies from the early Greek manuscripts, its theological bias is a later development. Early variations in the biblical quotations found in the church fathers are not used unless they support a reading found in one of the Greek manuscripts. Thus, in John 1:13 the variation (qui . . . natus est) which introduces a reference to the virgin birth of Jesus, otherwise not expressly mentioned in the Gospel of John, and which is supported by Irenaeus and Tertullian, is not included in the present treatment because this variation does not occur in any of the

early Greek manuscripts. Likewise, the variations which occur in the versions are not used unless they support a reading found in one of the Greek manuscripts. Thus, the earliest Greek manuscripts (P5 P22 P28 P39 P45 P52 P66 P75 B S W 0162) of the Gospel of John provide the textual phenomena on which this present analysis is based.

The question, "For what purpose was the Gospel of John written?" is often answered by the quotation of John 20:30, 31: "Now Jesus did many other signs in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing may have life in his name." (RSV)<sup>1</sup> It is not always observed that these verses, important as they are, raise more questions than they answer. Merely to say that the Gospel of John was written in the interest of faith is to say nothing at all, beyond that it is a Christian book. One major problem is suggested by the textual variant (πιστευητε or πιστευσητε) which occurs in verse 31. Was the Gospel written to deepen, instruct, and confirm the faith of believers, or to convert the non-Christian? The present subjunctive (B and S), strictly interpreted, means "that you may continue to believe." The aorist (W) means "that you may here

---

1. The biblical quotations are the author's own translation unless there is an indication that they are according to the Revised Standard Version.

and now believe, that is, become Christians." This textual variant raises acutely the theological question of the purpose of the Gospel of John. Was it written to confirm the faithful, or as a missionary tract to convert the Hellenistic world?<sup>2</sup>

Throughout the Gospel of John there are numerous textual variants involving the tense of verbs. In 1:4 the phrase "in him was life" (imperfect tense) which occurs in P66, P75, and Codex Vaticanus appears as "in him is life" (present tense) in Codex Sinaiticus and it is supported by Codex Bezae, manuscripts of the Old Latin version, and by Clement of Alexandria. The Washington Codex of the Gospels does not contain any verb in the phrase. This shift in tenses would have been a natural one for one of the church fathers or one of the scribes to have made. The use of the present tense and the omission of the verb emphasizes the significance of the Logos for the present. While the essential meaning of the passage remains the same, the emphasis is shifted to make the passage more relevant to the reader's own situation.

This same phenomenon occurs again in 8:12: "Again Jesus spoke to them, saying, 'I am the light of the world; he who follows me will not walk in darkness, but will have the light of life.'" (RSV) Codex Sinaiticus and one manuscript of the

---

2. Many of the ideas in this paragraph were suggested to the writer by C. K. Barrett, The Gospel according to St. John, An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text (London: The Society for the Preservation of Christian Knowledge, 1958), pp. 114, 478, 479.

Old Latin version (e) support the reading, ". . . but has the light of life." Codex Sinaiticus with its present tense of the verb emphasizes the present fact that the follower of Jesus Christ now has the light of life. In John 14:17, the Spirit of truth "will dwell with you and will be in you," the form of the verb translated "will dwell" can be either present or future depending upon whether the accent is on the ultima (future) or upon the penult (present). The future "will be" is the reading of P66, P75 and Codex Sinaiticus. In Codex Vaticanus and the Washington Codex the present tense, "is in you," occurs.<sup>3</sup> Some of the variations in the tense of verbs may be because the scribes used the tenses inaccurately and without respect for the fine shades of meaning. Nevertheless, some of the variations can be attributed to the desire on the part of scribes to emphasize for their own time the significance of Jesus Christ for the Christian life.

In John 1:3, 4 there is the well known and much discussed problem of punctuation. The division of the textus receptus (ΧΩΡΙΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΟΥΔΕ ΕΝ Ο ΓΕΓΟΝΕΝ. ΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ ΖΩΗ ΗΥ) is followed by most of the more recent printed texts.<sup>4</sup> It is equally possible to place the full stop after ΟΥΔΕ ΕΝ. Both punctuations have received a good deal of support and there are

---

3. The original autograph about A. D. 100 probably lacked any accent at all and would therefore have been ambiguous at this point.

4. The Nestle-Aland text (24th ed., 1960) follows this punctuation. The Revised Standard Version and the New English Bible essentially follow the same punctuation.



valid arguments for both readings.

What do the earliest Greek manuscripts contribute to the support of either variation in punctuation? Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus and P66 do not support either punctuation because punctuation is entirely lacking at this point in those manuscripts. On the other hand, P75 and the Washington Codex support the latter of the two readings. The punctuation of these manuscripts, even though it is probably not a part of the original text, is the embodiment of ancient interpretation. The fact that punctuation occurs at this point in P75 is adequate reason to include this variation in the discussion of theologically significant textual variations.<sup>5</sup>

The interpretation universally accepted in the Christian tradition before the fourth century is that suggested by the punctuation found in P75 and the Washington Codex. The Old Latin (b e f; a ff<sup>2</sup> q are not punctuated), the Old Syriac and the Sahidic versions which reflect a tradition going back to at least the third or second century support a full stop after οὐδὲ ἐν. The most ancient authors who have cited these verses of the Gospel of John support this reading. In the second century the reading is supported by Irenaeus, Tatian, Theophilus of Antioch and the Egyptian Gnostics (Naasseni, Valentinus, Heracleon, Theodotus, Ptolemaeus). In the second and third

---

5. For a full discussion of the supporting evidence for each of the two punctuations, see M. -E. Boismard, Le Prologue de Saint Jean (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1953), pp. 25-28.

centuries the reading is supported by Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Tertullian. In the fourth century it is found in the writings of Eusebius of Caesarea, Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Hilary, Ambrosiaster, Augustine and Ambrose. Thus, the punctuation  $\chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\tau\omicron\ \omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\ \epsilon\upsilon.\ \omicron\ \gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\ \zeta\omega\eta\ \eta\upsilon$  is traceable from the second century through the Alexandrian, Syrian, Palestinian and Latin writers.

Probably the earliest known support for the punctuation found in the textus receptus is Alexander of Alexandria who wrote at the beginning of the fourth century.<sup>6</sup> After the time of John Chrysostom this punctuation became almost universal in the Greek church and in the later Greek manuscripts. Among the later Latin writers, Jerome supported this punctuation.

Maurice F. Wiles argues that the punctuation of the textus receptus became popular because it excluded the idea that the "all things" created through the Logos included the Holy Spirit:

John i.3 declared of the Logos that 'all things were made through Him and without Him was not anything made.' Orthodox writers emphasized the full meaning of the word 'all.' The majority of Gnostics interpreted it as referring only to the supra-cosmic Pleroma and denied any reference to our created world. . . . Irenaeus insists . . . that 'all things' must include this world of ours. Heracleon . . . allowed the reference to be to the created world, but excluded the Aeons from its scope. . . . The strength of the orthodox case,

---

6. It is Theodoret (Ecclesiastica Historia I.4) who attributed this punctuation to Alexander of Alexandria. Cf. John Mehlmann, "A Note on John i.3," The Expository Times, LXVII (1955-56), 340, 341, who argues that Alexander's text should best be omitted from the list of witnesses in favor of the reading of the textus receptus and argues that it was an early Gnostic rather than an Arian misunderstanding of the passage that prompted the change.

therefore, lay in insisting on the fullest possible meaning for the word 'all.' This Origen was prepared to do fearlessly. He avoids having to include evil and sin in that which was created through the Logos. . . . He does, however, include the Holy Spirit amongst the 'all things' created through the Logos. This assertion is regularly refuted by later writers. The horror of any suggestion of such an interpretation seems to have been largely influential in determining the punctuation finally adopted in the text of the Gospel itself. 'Without Him was not anything made that was made' seemed a better safeguard against such interpretations than the more unqualified assertion. It made clear that the passage was concerned with all created things and not with all things absolutely.<sup>7</sup>

Chrysostom who encountered the belief that the Holy Spirit was created exhorts his readers (Homily V) to relinquish the reading which puts the stop following οὐδε εἰ and to come to the recognized reading and explanation which is to make the sentence end at ο γέγονεν and to begin the next sentence with εἰ αὐτῷ. Epiphanius (Ancoratus, 75) and Ambrose (Psalmum XXXVI.35) both discuss the punctuation of this passage with direct reference to the question of heresy.

Whether the cause of the variation in punctuation was the Gnostic or the Arian use of the passage, or even some other cause, it is clear that this passage was from early times a crucial one among the Christian writers and that the variation in punctuation reflects the controversy over the various interpretations.

At least two theologically significant variants occur in 1:18, a verse for which there are a number of textual variants.

---

7. Maurice F. Wiles, The Spiritual Gospel, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1960), pp. 102, 103.

Four readings find support in the earliest Greek manuscripts:

- (1) θεον ουδεις εωρακεν πωποτε μονογενης θεος ο ων εις τον κολπον του πατρος εκεινος εξηγησατο P66 B;
- (2) θεον ουδεις πωποτε εωρακεν ο μονογενης θεος ο ων εις τον κολπον του πατρος εκεινος εξηγησατο P75;
- (3) θεον ουδεις εωρακεν πωποτε μονογενης θεος εις τον κολπον του πατρος εκεινος εξηγησατο S;
- (4) θεον ουδεις εωρακεν ει μη ο μονογενης υιος ο ων εις τον κολπον του πατρος εκεινος εξηγησατο ημιν W.

The fact that there are these four variants in the earliest Greek manuscripts demonstrates that this passage presented some difficulty in early Christian interpretation.

One of the crucial points of interpretation in this verse centers in the words *μονογενης θεος*. Detached from the biblical context, this phrase was widely used by theologians of various schools. It was an expression adopted by Arius and Eunomius as freely as it was by the more "orthodox" theologians. The Arians were quite willing to use the expression because in their view this appellation distinguished the Son from the Father who alone was God in the highest sense--unbegotten, uncaused and without beginning. The Washington Codex is the earliest Greek manuscript which contains *ο μονογενης υιος*. It is possible that the variation is the result of an unintentional scribal error; however, *υιος* probably represents an intentional change from the more difficult *θεος*. This variation has often captured the attention of textual critics, and has been widely adopted in recent English translations.

The other theologically significant variant in 1:18 has

not received the attention that it deserves. This variation is the omission in Codex Sinaiticus of the words ο ων.<sup>8</sup> In the light of the basic meaning of the verb ἐξηγησατο which is "to lead," and in light of the basic meaning of the preposition εἰς which is "into," this part of the verse is best translated "he leads into the bosom of the father" with the object "us" understood. There is an important difference between saying with reference to Jesus Christ, "he has led us into the bosom of the father" and "he who is in the bosom of the father has made him known." This rendering of the text of Codex Sinaiticus is consistent with other ideas found in the Gospel of John. In 14:6 the author has Jesus say, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no one comes to the Father, but by me." (RSV) Throughout the Gospel of John there is the recurring theme of the "descending" and "ascending" of the Son of Man. Thus, according to the text of Codex Sinaiticus, the Logos is not merely the Interpreter or Revealer of God. He is the Leader into the very presence of God. He is the one who has come down from heaven to go before us and to lead us into the presence of God.

These variations in the manuscripts at 1:18 indicate that there was a variety of Christological formulation in the first

---

8. For a full discussion of this variant reading with an indication of other ancient witnesses to this reading, see M. -E. Boismard, "'Dans le sein du Père' (Jo., I, 18)," Revue Biblique, LIX (1959), 23-39. Boismard accepts the reading of Codex Sinaiticus as the original reading.

four centuries of the church. The Gospel of John was interpreted in various ways and these interpretations have affected the text itself.

The textual variation which occurs in John 2:22 is a significant one for Christology. P66, P75, Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus and 0162 contain the passive verb *ἠγέρθη*, while the Washington Codex contains an active verb *ἀνέστη*. The active verb "he stood up" or "he rose up" is the one employed by Marcion in the formulation of his Christology. This reading suggests that the Christ "rose up" from the grave by his own power. This idea is supported by John 10:17, 18: "For this reason the Father loves me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No one takes it from me, but I lay it down of my own accord. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." (RSV) Additional support is found in John 20:9: "For as yet they did not know the scripture, that he must rise from the dead." (RSV) The passive verb records that Christ "was raised" from the dead by a power other than himself. Apparently, some scribe preferred the interpretation that Christ "rose up" or "stood up" from the grave by his own power.

The Person of Jesus Christ was of primary interest to the earliest Christian communities. Such an interest is reflected in the variant reading at 1:34. In John the Baptist's testimony, "And I have seen and have borne witness that this is the Son of God," (RSV) the text of Codex Sinaiticus supports another reading, "And I have seen and have borne witness that this is

the Chosen One of God."<sup>9</sup>

Irrespective of which reading one accepts as written by the author of the Gospel of John, it is apparent that one of the readings is the result of a theological or dogmatic tendenz. The word εκλεκτος is not used anywhere else in the Gospel of John. With reference to the Messiah the word is used in only two other passages in the New Testament. It occurs in Luke 23:35 where the rulers taunt Jesus with these words: "He saved others; let him save himself, if he is the Christ of God, his Chosen One!" (RSV) The word occurs in some manuscripts in Luke 9:35 in place of the verb form of the same stem. In the apocalyptic book of Enoch this title occurs a number of times in reference to the Messiah (39:6; 40:5, 43; 45:3-5; 49:2-4).

This theologically significant variant in John 1:34 reflects either the Ebionite movement which left its mark in the debates between Christians and Jews (of which Justin's discussion with Trypho is an outstanding example), or the adoptionist stage in early Christology. While some of the Jews would not refer to Jesus as the "Son of God" they would use the title "the Chosen One of God." Whichever reading the author of the Gospel of John used, there are good theological reasons for the alteration to the other reading.

Another theologically significant variant occurs in 3:34.

---

9. For a thorough discussion of the textual evidence see Adolph von Harnack, Studien zur Geschichte des Neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche, I: Zur Neutestamentlichen Textkritik (Berlin: Von Walter de Gruyter and Company, 1931), pp. 127-132.

In this verse Codex Vaticanus omits "the Spirit" from the text: "For he whom God has sent utters the words of God, for it is not by measure that he gives the Spirit." (RSV) The difficulty of interpretation in this verse is that the verb "gives" does not have an explicit subject unless "the Spirit" is taken as the subject, and in that case the verb would lack an object. If one were to take "the Spirit" as the subject of the sentence, he would bring alien ideas into the passage. The omission of "the Spirit" may have been to guard against the interpretation that it is the Spirit who gives the words for Jesus to speak. The theological question is whether the Spirit is the mediator between God and Christ, or whether God gives the Spirit to Jesus so that Jesus can speak the words of God. The general sense of the passage seems to be that it is because God gives the Spirit to Jesus in not measured degree, but completely, that Jesus speaks the words of God. With the omission of "the Spirit" it is impossible to make the Spirit the one who gives Jesus the words to speak. This variation reflects a time when Christians were attempting to define the inter-relationships of the Father, the Son and the Spirit.

John 4:16-24, the discussion between Jesus and the Samaritan woman, concerns the conception of true worship. In verse 24 Codex Sinaiticus contains *εν πνευματι αληθειας* in place of the text contained in P66, P75, Codex Vaticanus and the Washington Codex, *εν πνευματι και αληθεια*. Is worship to be "by means of a spirit of truth" or "in spirit and truth"? "The Spirit of truth" is a Johannine title of the Holy Spirit



(14:17, 15:26; 16:3) and so Codex Sinaiticus suggests that true worship is worship by means of the Holy Spirit. This variant reading suggests that some scribe had difficulty with the meaning of πνεύμα. Is this word as it is used here a reference to the Holy Spirit, or is it a reference to the type of worship which is spiritual? The text of Codex Sinaiticus suggests that it refers to the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of truth.

A variation which may be related to the question of eschatology occurs in the text of John 5:25. P66, P75, Codex Vaticanus and the Washington Codex contain a text which, when translated, reads: "Truly, truly, I say to you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear will live." (RSV) The omission of the phrase "and now is" in the text of Codex Sinaiticus raises a crucial issue. A misunderstanding of the sequence of thought in verses 24-29 probably caused the omission. In these verses realized and futuristic eschatology are mingled. "The hour is coming, and now is" introduces a statement about the result of the coming of the Son of God who is already present as the Revealer and Judge. The spiritually dead will now "hear the voice" of the Son of God and those who listen to that voice will receive the power to live the life which issues from the Son. This present spiritual awakening is a foretaste of that final assize when the dead will hear the voice that summons them. This is an echo of futuristic eschatology (verse 28): "For the hour is coming when all who are in the tombs will hear his voice." (RSV) The omission in the text of

Codex Sinaiticus makes the whole passage refer to the future.

John 6:64 created theological problems for some of the early scribes: "For Jesus knew from the first who those were that did not believe, and who it was that should betray him." (RSV) This is the translation of the text of P75, Codex Vaticanus, and the Washington Codex. The text of Codex Sinaiticus omits the negative so that the translation reads, "For Jesus knew from the first who those were that believe, and who it was that should betray him." The text of P66, supported by one Old Latin manuscript (e) and the Old Syriac version, omits the entire phrase "who those were that did not believe and." As the text stands in P75, Codex Vaticanus and the Washington Codex, the passage provides a remarkable instance of the author's doctrine of foreknowledge. The readings of Codex Sinaiticus and P66 may have been intended to bring out the fact that Jesus knew his own rather than those who were not his own. The omissions found in these two manuscripts indicate that some scribe did not agree with the doctrine of foreknowledge which the passage implied. In any case the variations raise the issue of foreknowledge and thus are alterations theologically motivated.

In John 7:1 the reading of P66, P75, Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus is *ου γαρ ηθελεν*. The Washington Codex, supported by two fifth-century manuscripts (a, b) of the Old Latin version and the fifth-century Curetonian manuscript of the Old Syriac version and by two fathers, Chrysostom and Augustine, reads *ου γαρ ειχεν εξουσιαν*. If the first of these

readings is accepted, the verse is translated, "After this Jesus went about in Galilee; he did not want to go about in Judea, because the Jews sought to kill him." The implication of this reading is that Jesus was avoiding the Jews because they sought to kill him. It implies that it is Jesus' own decision not to face the difficulties which staying in Judea involved. This implication apparently gave rise to the reading of the Washington Codex: "After this Jesus went about in Galilee; he did not have the right to go about in Judea, because the Jews sought to kill him." Here the implication is that the choice to stay out of Judea was not the decision of Jesus. This reading frees Jesus of any compromise on his part which the first reading might imply. This variation in the text is one example of a number of variant readings which have arisen in order to guard against any interpretation which might be used to discredit the person and work of Jesus Christ.

Another example of this concern for the proper interpretation of the person and work of Jesus occurs in 7:6-8. The text of Codex Sinaiticus in verse 6 reads ο καιρος ο εμος ου εστιν and in verse 8 εγω ουκ αναβαινω εις την εορτην ταυτην. The texts of P66, P75, Codex Vaticanus and the Washington Codex all read ο καιρος ο εμος ουπω (ουδεπω W) εστιν (παρεστιν B) in verse 6 and εγω ουπω αναβαινω εις την εορτην ταυτην in verse 8. The difficulty stems from the statement in verse 10 that after his brothers had gone up to the feast, then Jesus "also went up, not publicly but in private."

Porphyry, the Neo-Platonist of the latter half of the

third century, used the inconsistency which apparently occurs in Codex Sinaiticus in his attack upon the Gospels (Jerome, Contra Pelagium, ii.17). On the ground of οὐκ, Porphyry accused Jesus of "inconstantia et mutatio." It has generally been assumed by New Testament interpreters that it was this attack which led to the textual variant "not yet" for "not." It is significant that both P66 and P75 support the reading "not yet" in both verse 6 and verse 8. Thus, the reading "not yet" has the support of new witnesses which are at least a half century older than Porphyry who died in A. D. 304.

In view of the antiquity of the texts of P75 and P66, the natural tendency to regard "not yet" as a later corruption cannot be regarded as unchallenged. It is not certain that the reading in verse 8, "not yet," is a harmonization with the action of Jesus in verse 10 at all. The καιρος, or appointed time, in verses 6 and 8 must mean the time of Jesus' manifestation because it is mentioned in answer to his brother's demand that he manifest himself (φανερωσον σεαυτον) to the world. Yet when it is said in verse 10 that Jesus went to the feast, it states that he went "not publicly" (ου φανερωσ) but in "private." Hence, the "time" did not refer to the providential time for the visit to Jerusalem in chapter seven, but rather to the appointed season for Jesus' final and open manifestation to the world.

This explanation does not necessarily solve the textual problem. The οὐτω could still point forward to verse 10, especially since Jesus is speaking of "this feast." He would

then merely be refusing to travel with his brothers because this would involve making himself known before the proper time. Therefore, he goes secretly and alone. Or, the idea might be "I do not yet go up--that is, to this feast." Neither reading is actually less difficult than the other. The  $\text{OY}\pi\omega$  could be a harmonization with the action of Jesus in verse 10; but on the other hand, the  $\text{OY}\kappa$  could have been introduced because of the fact that the "time" really proved to be the Passover (11:55; 12:1; 13:1) and not the Feast of Tabernacles spoken of in chapter seven. The choice of readings must be based upon a theory of the history of the text. On the basis of Chapter IV this present writer prefers the reading of P66, P75, Codex Vaticanus and the Washington Codex.

In 7:39 it can hardly be doubted that the reading  $\text{OY}\pi\omega \gamma\alpha\rho \eta\nu \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ , supported by the corrector of P66 (P66\*\*), P75, and Codex Sinaiticus is the original reading. This reading is supported by Origen and by Cyril of Alexandria. In the original text of P66 (P66\*), the Washington Codex, and Codex Vaticanus the words are dignified by the addition of "Holy" to "Spirit." Besides this variation, various attempts were made to exclude the possible inference that the Spirit did not exist before the glorification of Jesus. Codex Vaticanus adds the word  $\delta\epsilon\delta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$  to explain the meaning of the statement: "The Spirit had not yet been given." Did the author of the Gospel of John intend to deny the earlier existence of the Spirit? Was the Spirit created? The question of the relationship of the Spirit to the Father and to the Son was a burning

question in the early church. The interpretation inherent in the text of Codex Vaticanus is that the Spirit was not yet given to the disciples until the close of the ministry of Jesus. Without the addition found in Codex Vaticanus it is equally possible to understand the verse to mean that "The Spirit was not yet in existence." Here is another example of a scribal addition made in the interest of interpretation and theology.

Possibly related to the issue of Christology is the omission of John 9:38, 39a, "And he said, 'I believe, Lord.' and he worshipped him. Then Jesus said." After the self-revelation of Jesus in verse 37, the blind man's response is that of faith and "worship." Was the passage omitted (P75 S W) because of the possible difficulty of the word προσεκύνησεν with Jesus as its object? Or, was the passage added (P66 B) in a spirit of adoration and reverence for the person of Jesus? The evidence of the text of P75 indicates that a copy of John's Gospel without this passage was in circulation in Egypt in the latter part of the second century. This evidence, coupled with the evidence of Codex Sinaiticus and the Washington Codex, suggests that the passage was added in the interest of reverential respect for Jesus.

In chapter 10 Jesus is pictured as the Good Shepherd and in verse 8 the statement attributed to Jesus, "All who came before me are thieves and robbers," (RSV) has caused great difficulty not only to modern commentators, but also to the ancient interpreters of this verse. The phrase "before me" is not in the texts of P75, P45, and Codex Sinaiticus. The phrase

does occur in P66 and Codex Vaticanus and the Washington Codex. This division of the earliest Greek manuscripts is indicative of the various interpretations given to this verse. According to Origen (Contra Celsum VII.9) this verse is directed against contemporary prophets. According to Chrysostom (Homily LIX) the verse is not directed against the Old Testament prophets, but is directed against false Messiahs. The Gnostic writers applied this verse to the Old Testament prophets. One of the burning issues in the second-century church was the relationship of Christianity to Judaism and the place of the Old Testament in Christianity. Here is a passage which apparently reflects such an issue. On the one hand, the phrase "before me" may have been added so that the passage might more readily be applied to the Old Testament prophets. On the other hand, the phrase may have been omitted by scribes to lessen the risk of the passage being interpreted as if it applied to the Hebrew prophets. The omission would permit a more universal interpretation of the verse. Only a textual theory can decide between the readings. The omission which is supported by the texts of P75, P45, and Codex Sinaiticus is preferred by this writer.

In 11:25 the text of P45 omits  $\kappa\alpha\iota \eta \zeta\omega\eta$ . According to Clement of Alexandria (Excerpta ex Theodoto VI.4) the Valentinians ascribed to the Lord the saying, "I am the life." The omission of the phrase in P45 may have been for the purpose of emphasizing the fulfillment of eschatology in Jesus himself. P66, P75, Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus and the Washington Codex are undoubtedly correct in reading "I am the resurrection

and the life." (RSV)

A scribal "improvement" made in reverence for the person of Jesus occurs in 11:33. The texts of P66\*, P75, Codex Vaticanus, and the Washington Codex support the reading *ενεβριμησατο τω πνευματι και εταραξεν εαυτον*. P66\*\* and P45 witness to the construction *εταραχθη τω πνευματι ως ενβριμουμενος*. It is beyond question that *εμβριμασμαι* is an expression of anger and displeasure.<sup>10</sup> The reading of the text of P45 and P66\*\* avoids the statement that Jesus *ενεβριμησατο*, "was moved with indignation." Here is another example of a change in the text made in reverence for Jesus Christ and in the interest of a proper understanding of Jesus.

In 12:32 the reading of P66 and Codex Sinaiticus, *παντα ελκυσω* gives the verse a more cosmic aspect: "I will draw all things to myself." The text of P75, Codex Vaticanus, and the Washington Codex reads *παντας ελκυσω*: "I will draw all men to myself."

One of the most interesting readings in the text of P75, at least in the Johannine portion of the text, is the reading in 14:21, *ο δε αγαπων με τηρηθησεται υπο του πατρος μου*. P66, Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus, and the Washington Codex read *αγαπηθησεται* in place of *τηρηθησεται*. The origin of the reading in the text of P75 is obscure for there is no other

---

10. William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 254.



known manuscript which contains this reading. One can conjecture that it arose during a period of persecution. The meaning of τηρεω is "to keep watch over," "to guard" or "to keep unharmed or undisturbed." In the High Priestly Prayer of Jesus for his disciples, in 17:11 Jesus prays, "Keep them in thy name." In chapters 15 and 16 Jesus tells the disciples that they are going to face persecution and tribulation. The disciples are to be hated by the world. The passage in chapter 17 is set in the context of the persecution of the disciples. Thus, the reading of the text of P75 in 14:21 may either represent the original reading since it is consistent with the Johannine thought, or it may have been introduced into the text in a period of persecution and at a time when the idea of God's preserving those who love him seemed more appropriate. Yet, the earlier τηρηθησεται may have referred to the general protection of God, in the theological sense rather than the historical.

In chapter 19 there are a number of interesting variant readings. In 19:2 the text of Codex Sinaiticus contains the singular επεθηκεν in place of the plural verb (P66 B W). The singular form suggests that it was Pilate rather than the soldiers who put the crown of thorns on Jesus' head. The text of P66 omits the words και λεγει ιδου ο ανθρωπος in verse 5. These words are also omitted in a number of Old Latin manuscripts (a e ff<sup>2</sup> r) and also by the Coptic manuscript Q. While the author of the Gospel of John, or a later interpolator, may have meant to represent Pilate as a true witness in which case the words, "Behold the Man!" point to the Ideal Man of all succeeding

Christian generations, it is possible that the author of the Gospel of John meant the statement as a rough jest. A number of theological reasons might account for the omission. A scribe may have preferred not calling Jesus a man, and so the words were removed. A scribe may have understood the statement as a jest and removed it in reverence for Jesus. The omission appears to have some motivation behind it, for it cannot be explained as an accidental error. In 19:17 the text of P66 omits the words "and bearing his own cross he went out" so that the verse reads "So they took Jesus to the place called the place of a skull," rather than "So they took Jesus, and he went out, bearing his own cross, to the place called the place of a skull." (RSV) The motivation for this omission may have been one of harmonization with the accounts found in the Synoptic Gospels. The Synoptic Gospels indicate that the cross was carried by Simon of Cyrene and do not mention that Jesus carried it himself.

There are a number of passages which can be grouped together and which possibly reflect a concern in the early church about the relationship of Christianity to Judaism. The Gospel of John treats "the Jews" as an impersonal entity. In 4:9 Codex Sinaiticus omits the statement, "For Jews do not associate with Samaritans." The Washington Codex omits "the Jews" from the statement in 10:31, "The Jews took up stones again to stone him." In 9:10 Codex Sinaiticus has "the Jews" asking the man who had been born blind the question, "Then how were your eyes opened?" (RSV) In 13:1 in place of the reading, "having loved his own who were in the world, he loved them to

the end," (RSV) the text of Codex Sinaiticus substitutes "the Jews" for "his own." These variations in the manuscripts illustrate the fact that there was some concern in the church during the first four centuries for the issue of the relationship of Jews and Christians. It is conceivable that while one scribe may have had an anti-Jewish bias, another may have had a pro-Jewish bias.

The readings discussed in this chapter are by no means the only significant variants, nor are they the only textual variations which have some bearing upon interpretation and theology. No attempt has been made in this chapter to deal with all the variants which are significant for exegesis and interpretation. The instances of textual variation which have been discussed are sufficient to demonstrate at least two conclusions.

In the first place, the variants discussed in this chapter clearly demonstrate the inadequacy of an eclectic principle in the choice between variant readings. When variant readings reflect theological biases, the original text cannot be ascertained on the basis of the resultant theology but, rather, on the basis of a textual theory.

In the second place, the textual variations which have been discussed are sufficient to demonstrate beyond any doubt that the religious movements of any time or provenance affected the text of that time or provenance. In the earliest period of the transmission of the text of the New Testament, the text of the Gospel of John was affected by the formative conditions

that prevailed in the church. This writer concurs in the judgment of W. F. Howard:

But something has been gained if we discern in many of the textual variants in our manuscript tradition signs of a keen intellectual concern for the deposit of truth. The 'faith once for all delivered to the saints' was not buried in the ground. The incessant controversies about the person of our Lord bear witness to the way in which those 'trusty bankers' of the early Church brought their treasure into the currency of the contemporary world, 'proving all things, holding fast that which was good'. The Church did not suffer from mental inertia. Some of its experiments were too adventurous and a more cautious policy was then demanded. The history of the first four centuries of Christian thought is largely a record of the tension between the liberal and conservative elements at work in the doctrinal formulation of the tradition and experience of the Church's Lord and Saviour. The history of the text of the New Testament provides small commentary upon that period of mental strife.<sup>11</sup>

We have sought here to illustrate this vivid concern by reference to explicit readings in actual manuscripts which served the church in the first centuries. All of our witnesses have been discovered in the last century, several of them in the last generation, and one of them is even yet unpublished. Those of most recent discovery go farthest back in the church's life, into the third century and even the second. They offer a renaissance in our knowledge of scribes, exegetes, and believers in the primitive church.

---

11. W. F. Howard, "The Influence of Doctrine upon the Text of the New Testament," London Quarterly and Holborn Review, X (1941), 16.

APPENDIX  
THE COMPOSITE COLLATION

APPENDIX  
THE COMPOSITE COLLATION

The following composite collation reports variations of the manuscript texts from the 1873 Oxford edition of the textus receptus. Each of our twelve manuscripts (P5 P22 P28 P39 P45 P52 P66 P75 S B W 0162) is cited for one of the readings in each passage if it contains text at the point of variation. Silence does not give consent to any reading. If a manuscript is not cited in any passage, that manuscript is either lacking at this point or there is a lacuna in the text so that the reading of the manuscript cannot be determined.

The collation includes all variants, however slight. It includes nu-movables, itacisms and obvious scribal errors. Because the papyrus manuscripts, as a rule, do not contain breathings and accents, and because breathings and accents in the vellum manuscripts are generally later additions, breathings and accents are omitted unless they are of special significance.

Capital letters, iota-subscripts and iota-adscripts are not reported.

Whenever the verse division in the textus receptus is in doubt, Tischendorf's editio octava critica maior has been followed. The first reading in each group is the reading of the textus receptus and the variations from this follow. Whenever a form occurs more than once in the same verse, the particular occurrence referred to is indicated by the number followed by the degree symbol, e.g. 1<sup>o</sup>, 2<sup>o</sup>.

Lacunae are so numerous, especially in the papyrus manuscripts, that reporting them within this composite collation would result in considerable confusion and would add very little to this collation. A lacuna is any gap in the manuscripts caused by physical loss or mutilation. Numerous variants concern words in which some letters are either lacking or are not distinguishable in one or more of the twelve manuscripts. Whenever even one letter is lacking or indistinguishable, the manuscript is cited within parentheses, e.g. (P5). In this case the reading of that particular manuscript is repeated in the footnotes with brackets inserted to indicate the extent of the loss or with dots below the letters which are indistinguishable.

The symbols adopted in this composite collation are those which are used in Chapter III and throughout the dissertation. In those passages in the manuscript where a corrector has altered the text, the scribe is indicated by one asterisk following the manuscript symbol, e.g. S\*. The first correction

is indicated by two asterisks, e.g. S\*\*, and a second correction by three asterisks, e.g. S\*\*\*. No attempt has been made to identify the correctors who have altered the texts.



ΤΟ ΚΑΤΑ ΙΩΑΝΝΗΝ ΑΓΙΟΝ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ TR  
 ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΚΑΤΑ ΙΩΑΝΝΗΝ (P66) W  
 ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΚΑΤΑ ΙΩΑΝΝΗΝ P75  
 ΚΑΤΑ ΙΩΑΝΝΗΝ S  
 ΚΑΤΑ ΙΩΑΝΝΗΝ B

1.1 θεος TR P66 P75 S B  
 ο θεος W

1.3 ουδε εν TR P75 S\*\* B W  
 ουδεν P66 S\*

1.3,4 ,ο γεγονεν. TR  
 •ο γεγονεν P75 W  
 ο γεγονεν P66 S B

1.4 εν αυτω ζωη ην TR P75\*\*\* B  
 αυτω ζωη ην (P66)  
 εν αυτω ζωην P75\*  
 εν αυτω ζωη εστιν S  
 εν αυτω ζωη W

των ανθρωπων TR P66 P75 S B\*\*\* W  
 omit B\*

1.5 σκοτια 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 S B W  
 σκοτεια P75

φαινει TR P66 P75 S B  
 φεγει W

σκοτια 2<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 S B W  
 σκοτεια P75

1.6 εγενετο TR P75 S B W  
 γενετο P66

---

ευαγγελιον κατα ιωαννην P66. 1.1 αυτω ζωη η[ν] P66.

παρα TR P66 P75 S B  
απο W

ονομα αυτω TR P66 P75 S\*\* B  
ην ονομα αυτω S\* W

ιωαννης TR P66 S W  
ιωανης P75 B

1.7 μαρτυριαν TR P66 S B W  
μαρτυριον P75

πιστευωσι TR  
πιστευωσιν P66 P75 S B W

1.8 εκεινος TR P66 P75 B  
εκινος S W

αλλ TR P75 S B W  
αλλα P66

1.9 αληθινον TR P66 P75 W  
αληθεινον S B

φωτιζει TR P66 P75 S B  
φωτιζει W

1.10 ην TR P66 S B W  
ηην P75

δι αυτου TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
δι αυτον S\*

1.11 ηλθε TR  
ηλθεν P75 S B W

1.10 P75, "η (vel ν?) et ε, fort quod super lineam legimus spiritus est asper male formatus." (Victor Martin)

ιδιοι TR P66 P75 S B  
ειδιοι W

1.12 ελαβον TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
ελαβαν B\*

γενεσθαι TR P66 P75 B  
γενεσθε S W

1.13 αιματων TR P66 P75 S B  
εματων W

ουδε εκ θεληματος σαρκος TR (P66) P75 S\*\* B\*\* W  
ουδε θεληματος σαρκος S\*  
omit B\*

αλλ TR P75 S B  
αλλα P66 W

εγεννηθησαν TR P66 S B\*\* W  
εγενηθησαν P75 B\*

1.14 ημιν TR P75 S B W  
ημειν P66

πληρης TR (P66) P75 S B  
πληρις W

χαριτος και TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
χαριτος B\*

αληθειας TR P75 B W  
αληθιας P66 S

1.15 ιωαννης TR P66 S W  
ιωανης P75 B

---

1.13 ουδε εκ θελημα[τος] σαρκος P66. 1.14 πληρη[ς] P66.

μαρτυρει TR P75 B  
μαρτυρι P66 S W

κεκραγε TR P75  
κεκραγεν P66 S B W

λεγων TR (P66) P75 S\*\* B W  
omit S\*

ουτος ην ον ειπον TR P66 P75 S\*\*\* B\*\*  
ουτος ην ο ειπων S\*\* B\*  
ουτος ην ον ειπον υμιν W  
ουτος ην S\*

ο οπισω TR P66\*\* P75 S B  
οπισω P66\*

ερχομενος TR P66 P75 S\*\* B  
ερχομενος ος S\* W

1.16 και 1<sup>ο</sup> TR W  
οτι P66 P75 S B

ημεις TR P66 P75 S B  
ημεις W

παντες TR P66 P75 S B  
παντες ζων W

1.17 μωσεως TR  
μωσεως P66 P75 S B W

η χαρις TR P75 S B  
η χαρις δε P66  
η δε χαρις W

---

1.15 λεγω[ν] P66.

η αληθεια TR P75 B  
 η αληθια S W  
 αληθια P66

δια ιησου χριστου TR P66 P75\*\* S\*\* B W  
 δια ιησου P75\* S\*

1.18 ουδεις TR P66 P75 S B  
 ουδεις W

εωρακε πωποτε TR  
 εωρακεν πωποτα P66  
 πωποτε εωρακεν P75\*  
 εωρακεν πωποτε P75\*\* B\*  
 εωρακεν πωποτε S B\*\*  
 εωρακεν πωποτε ει μη W

ο μονογενης υιος TR W  
 ο μονογενης θεος P75 S\*\*  
 μονογενης θεος P66 S\* B

ο ων TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 omit S\*

εκεινος TR P75 S B  
 εκινος P66 W

εξηγησατο TR P66 P75 S B  
 εξηγησατο ημιν W

1.19 ιωαννου TR P66 S W  
 ιωανου P75 B

απεστειλαν TR  
 απεστιλαν (P66) S W  
 απεστειλεν P75  
 απεστειλαν προς αυτον B

---

1.19 απε[σ]τιλαν P66.

Ιουδαιοι TR P66 P75 S B  
 Ιουδαιοι W

Ιερεις TR P66 P75 B  
 Ιερεις S W

Λευιτας TR  
 Λευιτας P66 P75 S B W

ερωτησωσιν TR P66 B  
 ερωτησουσιν P75 W  
 επερωτησωσιν S

συ τις ει TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 συ ς ει P66\*

1.20 ωμολογησε TR  
 ομολογησεν P66  
 ωμολογησεν P75 S B W

και ωμολογησεν TR P66 P75 B  
 ωμολογησεν W  
 omit S

οτι ουκ ειμι εγω ο χριστος TR  
 οτι εγω ουκ ειμι ο χριστος P75 B W  
 οτι εγω ουκ ειμι ο χριστος P66 S

1.21 ηρωτησαν TR (P66) P75 S\*\* B W  
 επηρωτησαν S\*

αυτον TR P66 P75 B  
 παλιν S\*  
 αυτον παλιν S\*\* W

---

1.21 ηρωτη[σα]ν P66.

τι ουν ηλιας ει συ TR  
 τις ουν συ ηλειας ει P66  
 τι ουν συ ηλειας ει P75  
 τι ουν ηλιας ει S  
 συ ουν τι ηλειας ει B  
 τι ουν συ ει ηλιας W

και 2<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 P75 B W  
 omit S

λεγει TR P75 S B  
 λεγι (P66) W

ειμι TR P66 P75 S B  
 ειμι τι ουν W

ο προφητης TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 προφητης S\*

1.22 ειπον TR P66 P75 B W  
 ειπαν S

τις ει TR P66\* S B W  
 τις συ ει P66\*\*  
 συ τις ει P75

λεγεις TR P66\*\* P75 S B  
 εγεις P66\*  
 λεγις W

1.23 εφη TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
 εφει B\*

ευθυνατε TR P75 S B W  
 ευθυναται P66

κυριου TR (P5) P66 P75 S B  
 κυριου ευθιας ποιειτε τας τριβους αυτου W

---

1.21 [λεγι] P66. 1.23 [κυριου] P5, propter spatium.

1.24 οι απεσταλμενοι TR S\*\* W  
 απεσταλμενοι P66 P75 S\* B

φαρισαιων TR P66 P75 S B  
 φαρισεων W

1.25 και ηρωτησαν αυτον TR (P5) P66 P75 B W  
 omit S

και ειπον αυτω TR S  
 και ειπαν αυτω P66 P75 B W  
 omit (P5)

βαπτιζεις TR (P5) P66 P75 S B  
 βαπτιζεις W

ει TR P5 P66 P75 S B  
 ι W

ουτε ... ουτε TR  
 ουδε ... ουδε (P5) P66 P75 S B W

ηλιας TR P66\* S W  
 ηλειας P66\*\* P75 B

1.26 ιωαννης TR (P5) P66 P75\*\* S W  
 ιωαννης P75\* B

λεγων TR P66 S B W  
 omit P75

εν υδατι TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 εν τω υδατι S\*

δε TR W  
 omit P66 P75 S B

1.25 και ηρω[τησαν αυτον] P5. 1.25 -και ειπαν αυτω P5, propter spatium. 1.25 [βα]πτιζεις P5. 1.25 [ουδε...] ουδε P5.  
 1.26 ιωανν[νης] P5.



εστηκεν TR P66 W  
 εστηκε P75  
 εστηκε S  
 εστηκε B

υμεις TR P66 P75 S B  
 υμεις W

οιδατε TR P75 S B W  
 οιδαται P66

1.27 αυτος εστιν TR  
 omit (P5) P66 P75 S B W

ο οπισω TR P66 P75 S\*\* W  
 οπισω S\* B

ος εμπροσθεν μου γεγονεν TR  
 omit P5 P66 P75 S B W

ου εγω ουκ ειμι αξιος TR  
 ου ουκ ειμι ικανος P66\* P75  
 ου ουκ ειμι εγω ικανος P66\*\*  
 ου ουκ ειμι αξιος (P5) S  
 ου ουκ ειμι εγω αξιος B  
 ου ουκ ειμι εγω αξιος W

αυτου τον ιμαντα του υποδηματος TR (P5) P75 S B W  
 τον ιμαντα του υποδηματος αυ P66\*\*  
 τον τον ιμαντα του υποδηματος αυ P66\*

1.28 εν βηθαβαρα εγενετο TR  
 εγενετο εν βηθανια P66 S\*  
 εν βηθανια εγενετο (P5) P75 B W  
 εγενετο εν βηθαβαρα S\*\*

---

1.27 -αυτος εστιν P5, propter spatium. 1.27 [ο]υ ο[υκ ειμι αξιος] P5, propter spatium. 1.27 [αυ]του τον [ιμαντα του υποδηματος] P5. 1.28 εν β[ηθανια εγενετο] P5.

ιορδανου TR (P5) P66 P75 B W  
 ιορδανου ποταμου S

ιωαννης TR  
 ο ιωαννης P66 P75 S W  
 ο ιωαννης B

1.29 βλεπει TR (P5) P66 P75 B  
 βλεπι S W

ο ιωαννης TR  
 omit P5 P66 P75 S B W

προς αυτον TR (P5) P66 P75 S B  
 omit W

λεγει TR P5 P66 P75 S B  
 λεγι W

ο αιρων TR P66 P75 B  
 ο ερων S W

την αμαρτιαν (P5) (P66) P75 S B  
 τας αμαρτιας W

1.30 εστι TR  
 εστιν P5 (P66) P75 S B W

περι TR S\*\*  
 υπερ P5 (P66) P75 S\* B W

ειπον TR (P5) P66 P75 S B  
 ειπον ημιν οτι W

---

1.28 ιο[ρδανου] P5. 1.29 [βλε]πει P5. 1.29 [πρου αυτον] P5.  
 1.29 τηναμαρ[τιαν] P5; την [α]μαρτιαν P66. 1.30 εστι[ν υ]περ  
 P66. 1.30 [ειπον] P5, propter spatium.

εμπροσθεν TR P66 P75 S B  
 ενπροσθεν W

1.31 ηδειν TR P66 P75 S B  
 ηδιν W

εν τω υδατι TR  
 εν υδατι P66 P75 S B W

βαπτιζων TR P66 P75 S B  
 βαπτιζειν W

1.32 ιωαννης TR P66 P75 S W  
 ιωανης B

λεγων TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 omit S\*

τεθεσμαι TR P66 P75 S B  
 τεθεσαμε W

καταβαινον ωσει περιστερην TR P66  
 καταβαινον ως περιστερην P75 B  
 ως περιστερην καταβαινον S  
 καταβενον ως περιστερην W

εξ ουρανου TR P66 P75 B W  
 εκ του ουρανου S

εμεινεν TR P66 P75 B  
 μενον S W

1.33 καγω TR P66 P75 B W  
 και εγω S

ηδειν TR P66 P75 S B  
 ηδιν W

βαπτιζειν TR P66\*\* P75 S B  
 βπτιζειν P66\*  
 βαπτιζειν W

εν υδατι TR P75 B W  
 εν τω υδατι P66 S

εκεινος TR P66 P75 B  
 εκινος S W

ιδης TR P75 S B  
 ειδης P66 W

καταβαινον TR P66 P75 S B  
 καταβενον W

επ αυτον TR P66 P75 S B  
 επ αυτω W

ουτος TR P66 P75 S B W\*\*  
 οτος W\*

1.34 εωρακα TR P66 S B  
 εορακα P75 W

ο υιος του θεου TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 ο εκλεκτος του θεου (P5) S\*

1.35 επαυριον TR (P5) P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 παυριον P66\*

παλιν TR P66 S B  
 παλι W  
 omit (P5) P75

ειστηκει TR B  
 ιστηκει P66  
 ειστηχει P75  
 ιστηκι S W

---

1.34 [ο εκλεκτο]ς του θεου P5, propter spatium. 1.35ε[παυριον]  
 P5. 1.35 -παλιν P5, propter spatium.

ο ιωαννης TR P66 S W  
 ιωαννης P75  
 ιωανης B

δυο TR (P5) P66 S B W  
 β P75

1.36 λεγει TR (P5) P66 P75 S B  
 λεγι W

ιδε TR P66 P75 S B  
 ειδε W

θεου TR (P5) P66\*\* P75 S B  
 το αιρων την αμαρτιαν του κοσμου (P66\*)  
 το ερων τας αμαρτίας του κοσμου W

1.37 και ηκουσαν TR (P66) P75 S\*\* B  
 ηκουσαν S\*  
 κηκουσαν W

αυτου οι δυο μαθηται TR  
 οι δυο αυτου μαθηται P66 P75 W  
 οι δυο μαθηται αυτου S B  
 οι δυο μαθηται (P5)

1.38 στραφεις TR P66 P75 S B  
 στραφικ W

δε TR (P5) P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 omit S\*

ακολουθουντας TR (P5) P75 S B W  
 ακολουθουντας αυτω P66

1.35 [δ]υο P5. 1.36 λεγε[ι] P5. 1.36 [θεου] P5, propter spatium; ο αι[ρ]ων την αμαρτιαν του κοσμου P66. 1.37 [κα]ι ηκουσαν P66. 1.37 οι δυο [μαθηται] P5, propter spatium. 1.38 [δ]ε P5. 1.38 [ακ]ολουθουντας P5.

λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
 λεγι W

αυτοις TR (P5) P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 omit S\*

1.39 ζητειτε TR (P5) P75 S B  
 ζητειται P66  
 ζητιται W

οι δε ειπον αυτω TR S  
 οι δε ειπαν αυτω P66 P75 B W  
 ειπαν αυτω (P5\*)  
 οι δε ειπαν (P5\*\*)

ραββι TR  
 ραββει P66 P75 S B W

λεγεται TR P75 S B  
 λεγετε P66 W

ερμηνευομενον TR (P5) S\*  
 μεθερμηνευομενον P66\*\* P75 S\*\* B W  
 μηθερμηνευομενον P66\*

μενεις TR (P5) P66 P75 S B  
 μενις W

1.40 λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
 λεγι W

ερχεσθε TR P75 S B  
 ερχεσθαι P66 W

ιδετε TR S  
 οψεσθαι P66 W  
 οψεσθε (P5) P75 B

---

1.38 [αυτοις] P5, propter spatium. 1.39 [ζητει]τε P5. 1.39 ειπαν αυ[τω] P5. 1.39 [ερ]μηνευομε[νον] P5. 1.39 [μεν]εις P5.  
 1.40 [οψε]σθε P5.

ηλθον TR S B\*\*  
ηλθαν P5 P66 P75 B\* W

ηλθον TR  
+ουν (P5) P66 P75 S B W

ειδον B\*\*  
ιδον S  
ειδαν P66 P75 B\* W

μηνει TR P66 P75 B  
μηνει S  
μηνι W

εμειναν TR P66 P75 B  
εμιναν S W

εκεινην TR (P5) P66 P75 S B  
εκινην W

δε TR  
omit P66 P75 S B W

1.41 ην TR P66 P75 S B  
ην δε W

σιμωνος TR P66 P75 S B  
σειμωνος W

πετρου TR P66 P75\*\* S B W  
πετρος P75\*

των ακουσαντων TR (P5) P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
ακουσαντων S\*

ιωαννου TR P66 P75 S W  
ιωανου B

---

1.40 [ουν] P5. 1.40 εξειληνη P5. 1.41 των [ακουσαντων] P5.

ακολουθησαντων TR P66 S B W  
ηκολουθησαντων P75

1.42 ευρισκει TR P66 P75 S B\*\*  
ευρεσκει B\*  
ευρισκι W

πρωτος TR S\* W  
πρωτον P66 P75 S\*\* B

λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
λεγι W

εστι TR  
εστιν P66 P75 S B W

ο χριστος TR  
χριστος P66 P75 S B W

1.43 και ηγαγεν TR W  
ηγαγεν P66\* P75 S B  
ουτος ηγαγεν P66\*\*

εμβλεψας δε TR P75  
εμβλεψας P66 S B  
και εμβλεψας W

ειπε TR  
ειπεν P66 P75 S B W

ιωνα TR B\*\*  
ιωαννου P66 P75 S W  
ιωανου B\*

ερμηνευεται TR P66 P75 S B  
ερμηνευετε W

1.44 ο ιησους TR  
omit P66 P75 S B W

εξελθειν TR P66 P75 B  
εξελθιν S W



γαλιλαιαν TR P66 P75 S  
 γαλειλαιαν B  
 γαλιδεαν W

ευρισκει TR P75 S B  
 ευρισκι P66 W

λεγει TR P75 S B  
 λεγι P66 W

αυτω TR  
 +ο ιησους P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 +ιησους S\*

ακολουθει TR P66 P75 B  
 ακολουθι S W

1.45 δε TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 omit S\*

ο φιλιππος TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B  
 φιλιππος S\* W

βηθσαιδα TR P75\*\* S\*\* B W  
 βηθσαιδαν P66 S\*  
 βηδσαιδα P75\*

εκ της πολεως TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 της πολεως S\*

1.46 ευρισκει TR P75 S B  
 ευρισκι P66 W

λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
 λεγι W

εγραψε TR  
 εγραψεν P66 (P75) S B W

---

1.45 ο φιλιππος P75. 1.46 εγραψεν P75.

μωσης TR S  
 μωσης P66 P75 B W

ΤΟΥ ΥΙΟΥ ΤΟΥ TR  
 ΥΙΟΥ ΤΟΥ P66 P75 S B  
 ΤΟΥ ΤΩ W

ιωσηφ TR P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
 ιωσηφ P66\*:

ναζαρετ TR P66 S B  
 ναζαρεθ P75 W

1.47 και ειπεν TR P66 (P75) B W  
 ειπεν S

ναζαρετ TR P66 S B  
 ναζαρεθ P75 W

δυναται TR P66 P75 S B  
 δυνατε W

τι αγαθον TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
 αγαθον τι S\*

λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
 λεγει W

φιλιππος TR P66\* S W  
 ο φιλιππος P66\*\* (P75) B

ιδε TR (P75) S B W  
 ειδε P66

1.46 ιωσηφ P75. 1.47 και ειπεν P75. 1.47 τι αγαθον P75.  
 1.47 [ο] φιλιππος P75. 1.47 ιδε P75.

1.48 ειδεν TR P66 B  
 ιδεν P75 S\*\*  
 ιδων S\*  
 ειδεν δε W

ο ιησους TR P66 P75 S W  
 ιησους B

και TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 omit S\*

λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
 λεγι W

περι αυτου TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
 περι αυτου ναθαναηλ S\*

ιδε TR P66 (P75) S B  
 ειδε W

ισραηλιτης TR W  
 ισραηλειτης P66 P75 B  
 ισδραηλειτης S

εστι TR  
 εστιν P66 P75 S B W

1.49 λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
 λεγι W

γινωσκεις TR P66 S  
 γεινωσκεις P75 B  
 γιγνωσκεις W

ο ιησους TR S  
 ιησους P66 P75 B W

φωνησαι TR P66 (P75) S B  
 φωνησε W

---

1.48 περι αυτου P75. 1.48 ιδε P75. 1.49 φωνησαι P75.

ειδον TR P66 P75 B W  
ιδον S

σε TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
σαι B\*

1.50 απεκριθη ναθαναη και λεγει αυτω TR  
απεκριθη αυτω ναθαναη P66 (P75) B W  
απεκριθη ναθαναη και ειπεν S

ραββι TR W  
ραββει P66 P75 S B

συ ει ο υιος TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
συ ει αληθως ο υιος P66\*

συ ει ο βασιλευς TR P66 S  
συ βασιλευς ει P75 B\*\* W  
συ βασιλευ ει B\*

1.51 ειπον σοι TR  
ειπον σοι οτι P66 P75 S B W

ειδον σε TR P66 P75 S B  
ειδον W

υποκατω της συκης TR P75 S B W  
υπο την συκην P66

μειζω τουτων TR B  
μειζονα τουτων P66  
μειζων τουτων P75  
μειζωνα τουτων S  
τουτων μειζω W

οψει TR  
οψη P66 P75 S B W

---

1.50 απεκριθη αυτω ναθαναη P75.

1.52 λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
 λεγι W  
 απ αρτι TR  
 omit P66 P75 S B W

οψεσθε TR P66 P75 B  
 οψεσθαι S W

ανεωγοτα TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 ηνεωγοτα S\*

αναβαινοντας TR P66 P75 S B  
 αναβενοντας W

καταβαινοντας TR P66 P75 S B  
 καταβενοντας W

2.1 τη ημερα τη τριτη TR P66 P75 S  
 τη τριτη ημερα B  
 τη ημερα τη γ W

εγενετο TR P66 P75 S B  
 εγινετο W

εν κανα TR P66 S B W  
 εν τη κανα P75

γαλιλαιας TR P66 P75 S  
 γαλειλαιας B  
 γαλιλεας W

εκει TR P66 P75 S B  
 εκι W

2.2 και 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 omit P66\*

ο ιησους TR P66 P75 S B  
 ο ιησους εκι W

2.3 και υστερησαντος οινου TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 και οινον ουκ ειχον οτι συνετελεσθη ο οινος του γαμου  
 ειτα S\*

λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
 λεγι W

οινον ουκ εχουσι TR  
 οινον ουκ εχουσιν P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
 οινος ουκ εστιν S\*

2.4 λεγει TR P75 S\* S\*\*\*  
 και λεγει P66 S\*\* B  
 και λεγι W

σοι TR P66 P75\* S B  
 σου P75\*\*  
 συ W

ηκει TR P66 P75 S B  
 ηκι W

2.5 λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
 λεγι W

ο τι αν TR B  
 ο τι εαν P66 P75 W  
 οτι ο αν S

ποιησατε TR P75 S B W  
 ποιησεται P66

2.6 εκει TR P66 (P75) S B  
 εκι W

υδριαι λιθιναι TR  
 λιθιναι υδριαι P66 P75 S B  
 υδριαε λιθινε W

---

2.3 οινον ουκ εχουσιν P75. 2.6 εκει P75.

εξ κειμεναι κατα τον καθαρισμον των Ιουδαιων TR  
 εξ κατα τον καθαρισμον των Ιουδαιων κειμεναι P66 B  
 εξ κατα τον καθαρισμον των Ιουδαιων κειμεναι W  
 εξ κατα τον καθαρισμον των Ιουδαιων κειμεναι (P75)  
 εξ κατα τον καθαρισμον των Ιουδαιων S\*  
 εξ κατα τον καθαρισμον των Ιουδαιων κειμεναι S\*\*

χωρουσαι TR P66 S B W  
 χωρησαι P75

μετρητας TR P66 S B W  
 μητρας P75

δυο η τρεις TR S B\*\*  
 δυο η τρεις P66 B\*  
 β η γ P75  
 β η τρεις W

2.7 λεγει TR P66 P75 B  
 και λεγει S  
 και λεγι W

2.8 λεγει TR P75 S B  
 λεγι P66 W

αντλησατε TR (P75) S B W  
 αντλησαται P66

φερετε TR P75 S B W  
 φερεται P66

αρχιτρικλινω TR S W  
 αρχιτρικλεινω P66 (P75) B

και ηνεγκαν TR  
 οι δε ηνεγκαν P66 (P75) S B W

---

2.6 εξ κατα τον καθαρισμον των Ιουδαιων κειμεναι P75.  
 2.8 αντλησατε P75. αρχι[τ]ρικλεινω P75. 2.8 οι δε ηνεγκαν P75.

2.9 αρχιτρικλινος 1<sup>ο</sup> TR S\*\* W  
 αρχιτρικλεινος P66 P75 B  
 αρχιτλικινος S\*

ηδει TR P66 (P75) S B  
 ηδι W

ηδεισαν TR P66\*\* (P75) S B  
 ησαν P66\*  
 ηδισαν W

φωνει TR P66 (P75) S B  
 φωνι W

αρχιτρικλινος 2<sup>ο</sup> TR (P75) S W  
 αρχιτρικλεινος P66 B

2.10 λεγει TR P66 (P75) S B  
 λεγι W

αυτω TR P66 (P75) B W  
 omit S

πρωτον τον καλον οινον TR P66 S B W  
 τον καλον οινον πρωτον (P75)

τιθησι TR W  
 τιθησιν P66 (P75) S B

μεθυσθωσι TR B  
 μεθυσθωσιν P66 P75 S W

τοτε TR S\*\*  
 omit P66 P75 S\* B W

2.9 ηδει P75. 2.9 ηδεισαν P75. 2.9 φωνει P75.  
 2.9 αρχιτρικλινος P75. 2.10 λεγει P75. 2.10 αυτω P75.  
 2.10 τον κα[λ]ον οινον πρ[ω]τον P75. 2.10 τιθησι P75.  
 2.10 μεθυσ[σ]θωσιν P75.



συ TR P66 P75 B W  
 συ δε S

εως TR P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
 ε P66\*

2.11 ταυτην εποιησε την αρχην TR  
 ταυτην πρωτην αρχην εποιησεν P66\*  
 ταυτην εποιησεν αρχην P66\*\* (P75) B  
 ταυτην εποιησεν την αρχην S W

σημειων TR P66 (P75) B\*\*  
 σημειων S B\* W

της γαλιλαιας TR (P75) P66\*\* S\*\*  
 τη γαλιλαιας P66\*  
 της γαλιλαιας πρωτην S\*  
 της γαλιλαιας B  
 της γαλιλαεας W

εφανερωσε TR  
 εφανερωσεν P66 (P75) S B W

δοξαν αυτου TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
 δοξαν S\*

εις αυτον οι μαθηται αυτου TR (P75) S\*\* B  
 οι μαθηται αυτου εις αυτον S\*  
 εις ς αυτον οι μαθηται αυτου P66  
 εις αυτον οι μαθητε αυτου W

2.12 τουτο TR P66 (P75) S B W  
 ταυτα 0162

εις καπερναουμ TR  
 εις καφαρναουμ P66 (P75) S B 0162  
 omit W

2.10 εως P75. 2.11 ταυτην επ[οιησ]εν αρχην P75.  
 2.11 σημειων P75. 2.11 της γαλιλαιας P75. 2.11 εφανερω[σεν]  
 P75. 2.11 δοξαν αυτου P75. 2.11 εις αυτον οι μαθηται αυτου[υ]  
 P75. 2.12 τουτο P75. 2.12 εις καφαρναου[μ] P75.

και η ματηρ αυτου και οι αδελφοι αυτου και οι μαθηται  
 αυτου TR  
 και η ματηρ αυτου και οι αδελφοι και οι μαθηται αυτου  
 P66 P75 B 0162  
 και η ματηρ αυτου και οι αδελφοι αυτου S  
 και οι μαθητε αυτου και η ματηρ και οι αδελφοι αυτου W

εκει TR P66 (P75) S B 0162  
 omit W

εμειναν TR P66\* (P75) B 0162  
 εμειναιν P66\*\*  
 εμιναν S W

2.13 και εγγυς TR P75 B W 0162  
 και εγγυς δε P66  
 εγγυς δε S

ιουδαιων TR P66 P75 S B 0162  
 ιουδεων W

εις ιεροσολυμα ο ιησους TR B W 0162  
 ο ιησους εις ιεροσολυμα P66 P75  
 ις ιεροσολυμα ο ιησους S

2.14 βοας και προβατα και TR P66 S\*\* B 0162  
 τας βοας και προβατα και P75  
 και τα προβατα και βοας και S\*  
 βοας και προβατακε W

κερματιστας TR P66 P75 S B 0162  
 κολλυβιστος W

2.15 και ποιησας TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W 0162  
 εποισησεν S\*

φραγγελιον TR S B  
 ως φραγγελιον P66 P75 W 0162

---

2.12 εκει P75. 2.12 εμειναν P75. 2.15 και ποιησας P75.

εκ 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 P75 S B  
 εχ W

σχολιων TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W 0162  
 σχολιων και S\*

τα τε TR P66 P75 B W 0162  
 τα S\*  
 τα και S\*\*

εξεχεε TR  
 εξεχεεν P66 P75 S B W 0162

το κερμα TR P66\* S  
 τα κερματα P66\*\* P75 B W 0162

ανεστρεψε TR  
 ανεστρεψεν P66 B W 0162  
 ανεστρεψεν P75  
 κατεστρεψεν S

2.16 τας περιστερας πωλουσιν TR P66 P75 S B 0162  
 πωλουσιν τας περιστερας W

αρατε TR P75 S B W 0162  
 αραται P66

εντευθεν TR P75 S B 0162  
 εντευθεν και P66 W

μη TR P66 P75 S B W\*\* 0162  
 μοη W\*

ποιειτε TR P75 B W 0162  
 ποιειται P66 S

οικον 2<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 S B W 0162  
 οικου P75

εμποριου TR P66 P75 S B 0162  
 ενποριου W

2.17 εμνησθησαν δε TR  
 εμνησθησαν P66 P75 S B 0162  
 και εμνησθησαν W

γεγραμμενον εστιν TR S  
 γεγραμμενον εστιν οτι P66 P75 W  
 εστιν γεγραμμενον B  
 γεγραμμενος εστιν 0162

κατεφαγε TR  
 καταφαγετε P66 W  
 καταφαγεται P75 S B 0162

με TR P66 P75 S B 0162  
 μαι W

2.18 λουδαιοι TR P66 P75 S B 0162  
 λουδαιοι W

ειπον TR S  
 ειπαν P66 P75 B W 0162

σημιον TR P75 B  
 σημιον P66 S W

δεικνυεις TR P75 B  
 δικνυεις P66 S W

ημιν TR P66 S B W 0162  
 omit P75

2.19 ο ιησους TR S  
 ιησους P66 P75 B W 0162

λυσατε TR P75 S B 0162  
 λυσαται P66 W

εν τρισιν TR P66 P75 S W (0162)  
 τρισιν B

---

2.19 [ε]ν τρισιν 0162.

ημεραις TR P66 P75 S B 0162  
 ημερες W

2.20 ειπον TR S  
 ειπαν P66 P75 B W (0162)

ιουδαιοι TR P66 P75 S B 0162  
 ιοδαιοι W

τεσσαρακοντα TR B\*\*  
 τεσσαρακοντα P66 S B\*  
 μ P75 W

εξ TR P66 P75 S B 0162  
 F W

ωκοδομηθη ο ναος ουτος TR B\*\*  
 οικοδομηθη ο ναος ουτος P66 P75 S B\* 0162  
 ο ναος ουτος οικοδομηθη W

και συ TR P66\*\* P75\*\* S B W 0162  
 και P66\*  
 και σοι P75\*

εν τρισιν TR P66 P75 B W 0162  
 τρισιν S

ημεραις TR P66 P75 S B 0162  
 ημερες W

εγερεις TR P66 P75 S B 0162  
 γιρις W

2.21 εκεινος TR P66 P75 S B 0162  
 αυτος W

ελεγε TR  
 ελεγεν P66 P75 S B W 0162

σωματος αυτου TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W 0162  
 σωματος S\*

---

2.20 [ειπ]αν 0162.

2.22 ηγερθη TR P66 P75 S B 0162  
 ηνεστη W

οι μαθηται αυτου TR P66 P75 S B  
 αυτω W

αυτοις TR  
 omit P66 P75 S B W

ω TR W  
 ον P66 (P75) S B

2.23 εν ιεροσολυμοις TR  
 εν τοις ιεροσολυμοις P66 (P75) S B W

εν τη εορτη TR P66 P75 S W  
 τη εορτη B

σημεια TR P75 B  
 σημια P66 S W

2.24 ο ιησους TR S W  
 ιησους P66 (P75) B

εαυτον TR P66 S\*\* W\*\*  
 omit P75  
 αυτον S\* B  
 ο εαυτον W\*

αυτον TR P66 (P75) B W  
 omit S

γινωσκειν TR P66 B  
 γεινωσκειν (P75)  
 γιγνωσκιν S  
 γινωσκιν W

---

2.22 ον P75. 2.23 εν τοις ιεροσολυμοις P75. 2.24  $\overline{\tau\varsigma}$  P75.  
 2.24 αυτον P75. 2.24 γεινωσκειν P75.

2.25 ου χρεϊαν TR P66\*\* (P75) B  
 ου χριαν P66\* W  
 χριαν ουκ S

του ανθρωπου TR P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
 ανθρωπου P66\*

εγινωσκε TR  
 εγινωσκεν P66 S B  
 εγεινωσκεν P75  
 εγειγνωσκεν W

τι ην εν TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
 τι ην εν τι ην εν S\*

3.1 φαρισαιων TR P66 P75 S  
 φαρισεων W  
 φαρεισαιων B

νικοδημος TR S B W  
 νεικοδημος P66 (P75)

ονομα αυτω TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
 ονοματι S\*

λουδαιων TR P66 P75 S B  
 λουδεων W

3.2 ηλθε TR  
 ηλθεν P66 P75 S B W

προς τον ιησουν νυκτος TR  
 προς αυτον νυκτος P66 (P75) B W  
 νυκτος προς αυτον S

ραββι TR  
 ραββει P66 P75 S B W

---

2.25 ου χρεϊαν P75. 2.25 [τ]ου ανου P75. 2.25 τι ην εν P75.  
 3.1 νεικοδημος P75. 3.1 ονομα αυτω P75. 3.2 προς αυτον P75.  
 νυκτος P75.

εληλυθας TR P66 P75 S B  
ελοιλεθας W

ουδεις γαρ TR P66 P75 B  
και ουδεις S  
ουδεις γαρ W

ταυτα τα σημεια δυναται TR  
δυναται ταυτα τα σημια P66 S  
δυναται ταυτα τα σημια P75 B  
δυνατε τα σημια ταυτα W

ποιειν α TR P66 P75\*\* S B W  
α ποιειν α P75\*

η TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
omit P66\*

3.3 ο ιησους TR S  
ιησους P66 P75 B W

και ειπεν αυτω TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
omit S\*

λεγω σοι TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
λεγω υμιν σοι P66\*

γεννηθη TR P66 P75\*\* S B W  
γεννηθην P75\*

δυναται TR P66 P75 S B  
δυνατε W

ιδειν TR P66 P75 S B  
ειδιν W

λεγει TR P66\*\* P75 S B  
λεγι P66\* W

ο νικοδημος TR P66 S  
νικοδημος P75 B\*\* W  
νεικοδημος B\*



δυναται ανθρωπος γεννηθηναι γερων ων TR P75 B  
 δυναται γεννηθηναι ανθρωπος γερων ων P66  
 δυναται ανθρωπος γερων ων γεννηθηναι S  
 δυνατε ανθρωπος γεννηθηγε νερων ων W

δυναται 2<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 P75 S B  
 δυνατε W

εισελθειν TR P75 B  
 εισελθιν P66 S W

γεννηθηναι 2<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 P75 S B  
 γεννηθηγε W

3.5 ο ιησους TR B  
 ιησους P66 P75 S\* S\*\*\* W  
 ιησους και ειπεν S\*\*

εαν μη τις γεννηθη εξ υδατος και πνευματος TR P66 P75 B W  
 εαν μη τις εξ υδατος και πνευματος γεννηθη S

δυναται TR P66 P75 S B  
 δυνατε W

εισελθειν TR P66 P75 B  
 εισελθιν S\*\* W  
 ειδιν S\*

βασιλειαν TR P75 B  
 βασιλιαν P66 S W

του θεου TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 των ουρανων S\*

3.6 γεγεννημενον 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P75 S B W  
 γεγεγεννημενον P66

εστι 1<sup>ο</sup> TR  
 εστιν P66 P75 S B W

εστι 2<sup>ο</sup> TR  
 εστιν P66 P75 S B W

3.7 δει TR P66 P75 B  
δι S W

γεννηθηναι TR P66 P75 S B  
γεννηθηγε W

3.8 πνευμα TR P66\* B  
πνᾶ P66\*\* P75 S W

θελει TR P66 P75 S B  
θει W

πνει TR P66 B  
πνεῖ P75  
πνι S W

αλλ TR P66 P75 S W  
αλλα B

οιδας TR P66 S B W  
οιδες P75

εστι TR  
εστιν P66 P75 S B W

γεγεννημενος TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
γενημενος P66\*

εκ του πνευματος TR P66 P75 B W  
εκ του υδατος και του πνευματος S

3.9 νικοδημος TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
νεικοδημος B\*

δυναται TR P66 P75 S B  
δυνατε W

3.10 ο ιησους TR S  
ιησους P66 P75 B W

γινωσκεις TR  
 γεινωσκεις P66 P75 B  
 γινωσκεις S  
 γιγνωσκεις W

3.11 εωρακαμεν TR P66\*\* S B  
 εωρακμεν P66\*  
 εορακαμεν P75 W

λαμβανετε TR P75 B W  
 λαμβανεται P66 S

3.12 επιγεια TR P75 B  
 επιγια P66 S W

υμιν 1ο TR P75 S B W  
 υμειν P66

πιστευετε TR P66 P75 B  
 πιστευεται S W

υμιν 2ο TR P75 S B W  
 υμειν P66

πιστευσετε TR B  
 πιστευσεται P66 S  
 πιστευετε P75  
 πιστευσηται W

3.13 ουδεις TR P75 S B  
 ουδεις P66  
 ουδεις εστιν ος W

αναβεβηκεν TR P66 P75 S B  
 ανεβη W

ο ων εν τω ουρανω TR  
 omit P66 P75 S B W

3.14 μωσης TR  
 μωυσης P66 P75 S B W

υψωσε TR  
 υψωσεν P66 P75 S B W

ουτως υψωθηναι δει TR P66 P75 B  
 ουτως ο υψωθηναι δει S\*  
 ουτως υψωθηναι δει S\*\*  
 ουτω δε υψωθηγε W

ανθρωπου TR P66 P75 S B  
 ανου W

3.15 εις αυτον TR S  
 επ αυτω P66  
 εν αυτω P75 B W

μη αποληται αλλ TR  
 omit P66 P75 S B W

ζων TR P66 P75 S B W\*\*  
 ζωη W\*

3.16 ουτω TR  
 ουτως P66 P75 S B W

υιον αυτου TR S\*\*  
 υιον P66 P75 S\* B W

εδωκεν TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 omit S\*

εις αυτον TR P66 P75\*\* S B W  
 επ αυτον P75\*

αλλ TR P66 P75 S  
 αλλα B W

3.17 απεστειλεν TR P75 B  
 απεστειλεν P66 S W

υιον αυτου TR  
 υιον P66 P75 S B W

ινα κρινη τον κοσμον TR P66\*\* P75 S W  
omit P66\*  
ινα κρεινη τον κοσμον B

3.18 πιστευων 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P75 S B W  
πιστευων P66

κρινεται TR P66 P75 S W  
κρεινεται B

ο δε μη TR P66 P75  
ο μη S B W

3.19 το φως 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
φως P66\*

ηγαπησαν οι ανθρωποι μαλλον το σκοτος TR (P75) B W  
ηγαπησαν μαλλον οι ανθρωποι το σκοτος P66  
οι ανθρωποι ηγαπησαν το σκοτος μαλλον S

πονηρα αυτων TR  
αυτων πονηρα P66 P75 S B W

3.20 μισει TR P75  
μεισι P66  
μεισει S B  
μισει W

και ουκ ερχεται προς το φως TR P66 P75 S\*\* B  
omit S\*  
και ουκ ερχετε προς το φως W

τα εργα αυτου TR S B  
τα εργα αυτου οτι πονηρα εστιν P66  
αυτου τα εργα (P75) W

3.19 ηγαπησαζ [ο]ι ανθρωποι μαλλον το σκοτος P75.  
3.20 αυτου τα εργα P75.

- 3.21 ο δε ποιων την αληθειαν ερχεται προς το φως ινα  
 φανερωθη αυτου τα εργα TR P75 B  
 ο ποιων την αληθειαν ερχεται προς το φως ινα φανερωθη  
 αυτου τα εργα P66  
 ο δε ποιων την αληθειαν ερχεται προς το φως ινα φανερωθη  
 τα εργα αυτου (S\*\*\*)  
 ο δε ποιων την αληθειαν ερχετε προς το φως ινα φανερωθη  
 αυτου τα εργα W  
 omit S\*

εστιν TR P66 P75 S B  
 εισιν W

ειργασμενα TR P75 S\*\* B  
 ηργασμενα P66  
 ειργασμενον S\*  
 ιργασμενα W

- 3.22 και οι μαθηται αυτου εις την ιουδαιαγην TR P66 P75 B  
 εις την ιουδαιαν γην και οι μαθηται αυτου S  
 και οι μαθηται αυτου ις την ιουδεαν γην W\*  
 και οι μαθηται αυτου εις την ιουδεαν γην W\*\*

και εκει TR P66 P75 B  
 κακει S  
 κακι W

διετριβε TR  
 διετριβεν P66 P75 S W  
 διετρειβεν B

- 3.23 ιωαννης TR P75 S  
 ο ιωαννης P66 W  
 ο ιωανης B

αινων TR P66 P75 S B  
 ενων W

εγγυς TR P66 P75 B  
 ενγυς S W

- 3.21 ο δε ποιων την αληθειαν ερχετα[ι] προς το φως φανερωθη τα  
 εργα αυτου S\*\*.

σαλειμ TR P66 P75 S B  
σαλιμ W

παρεγινοντο TR P75 W  
παρεγεινοντο P66 S B

3.24 ο ιωαννης TR P66 P75 S\*\* W  
ιωαννης S\*  
ιωανης B

3.25 ουν TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
δε S\*

ζητησις TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
συνζητησις S\*

ιωαννου TR P66 P75 S W  
των ιωανου B

ιουδαιων TR P66 S\*  
ιουδαιου P75 S\*\* B  
ιουδευου W

3.26 ηλθον TR P66\*\* S B\*\*  
ηλ P66\*  
ηλθαν P75 B\* W

τον ιωαννην TR P75 S W  
το ιωαννην P66  
τον ιωαννην B

ειπον TR S B\*\*  
ειπαν P66 P75 B\* W

ραββι TR  
ραββει P66 P75 S B W

ως TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
ως S\*

ιδε TR P66 P75 S B  
ειδε W

βαπτίζει TR P66 P75 B  
βαπτίζει S W

ερχονται TR P66 P75 S B  
ερχοντε W

3.27 ιωαννης TR P66 S W  
ιωανης P75 B

δυναται TR P66 P75 S B  
δυνατε W

λαμβάνειν TR P66 B\*\*  
λαμβάνει P75  
λαβιν S  
λαμβάνειν B\*  
λαμβάνιν W

ουδεν TR S W  
ουδε εν P66 P75 B

εαν TR P66 P75 S W  
αν B

ἢ TR P75 S B W  
ἢν P66

3.28 υμεις TR P66 P75 B  
υμεις S W

μοι TR P66 B W  
omit P75 S

μαρτυρειτε TR P66 P75 B  
μαρτυριται S W

ειπον TR S W  
ειπον οτι P66 P75  
ειπον εγω B

ουκ ειμι εγω TR P66 P75 S B  
ουκ ιμι W



απεσταλμενος TR P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
 απταλμενος P66\*

εκεινου TR P66 P75 S B  
 εκινου W

3.29 την νυμφην TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 τη νυμφην P66\*

και ακουων αυτου TR P66 P75 B W  
 αυτου και ακουων S

χαιρει TR P66 P75 S B  
 χαρι W

3.30 εκεινον TR P66 P75 S B  
 εκινον W

δει TR P66 P75 S B  
 δι W

αυξανειν TR P66 (P75) B W  
 αυξαντιν S

3.31 ανωθεν ερχομενος TR (P75) S B  
 ανοθερχομενος P66\*  
 ανοθεν ερχομενος P66\*\* W

ο ων TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
 ο δε ων S\*

εκ 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 επι S\*

3.28 απεσταλμενος P75. 3.31 αυξανειν P75. 3.31 ανωθεν  
 ερχομενος P75. 3.31 ο ων P75.

εκ της γης εστι και εκ της γης λαλει TR  
 εκ της γης εστιν και εκ της γης λαλει (P66\*\*) (P75) S B  
 εκ της γης εστιν P66\*  
 εκ της γης λαλει W

ο εκ του ουρανου ερχομενος TR (P75) S B W  
 ο ων εκ του ουρανου P66\*  
 ο ων εκ του ουρανου ερχομενος P66\*\*

επανω παντων εστι 2ο TR  
 επανω παντων εστιν P66 S\*\* B W  
 omit P75 S\*

3.32 και 1ο TR  
 omit P66 P75 S B W

ο εωρακε TR  
 ο εωρακεν P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 ον εωρακε S\*

ηκουσε TR S\*  
 ηκουσεν P66 P75 S\*\* B W

τουτο TR P66 (P75) B W  
 omit S

μαρτυρει TR P66 (P75) S B  
 μαρτυρι W

ουδεις TR P66 (P75) B  
 ουδεις S W

λαμβανει TR P66 (P75) S B  
 λαμβανει W

---

3.31 εκ της γης εστιν [και] εκ της γης λαλει P66; εκ της  
 γης εστιν και εκ της γης λαλει P75. 3.31 ο εκ του  
 ουρανου ερχομενος P75. 3.32 φουτο P75. 3.32 μαρτυρει P75.  
 3.32 ουδεις P75. 3.32 λαμβανει P75.

3.33 μαρτυριαν TR P66\* (P75) S B W  
μαρτυριαν ουτος P66\*

3.34 απεστειλεν TR P75 B  
απεστειλεν P66 S W

μετρου TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
μερου P66\*

διδωσιν TR B W  
διδωσι P66 (P75) S

ο θεος 2ο TR  
omit P66 P75 S B W

το πνευμα TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
omit B\*

3.35 χειρι TR P66 P75 S B  
χιρι W

3.36 εχει TR P66 P75 S B  
εχι W

δε TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
omit S\*

απειθων TR P66 P75 B  
απιθων S W

ουκ TR P66 P75 S B  
ουχ W

οψεται TR P66 P75 S\* S\*\*\* B  
εχει S\*\*  
οψετε W

---

3.33 μαρτυριαν P75. 3.34 διδωσι P75.

η οργη TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
οργη P66\*

μενει επ αυτον TR P66 P75 B  
μενι επ αυτον W  
επ αυτον μενει S

4.1 ο κυριος TR P66 P75 B W  
ο ιησους S

φαρισαιοι TR P66 P75 S  
φαρεισαιοι B  
φαρισεοι W

πλειονας TR P66 P75 S B  
πλιονας W

η TR P66 P75 S B\*\*  
omit B\* W

βαπτιζει TR P66 P75 S B  
βαπτιζει W

ιωαννης TR P66 P75 S W  
ιωανης B

4.3 αφηκε TR  
αφηκεν P66 P75 S B W

ιουδαιαν TR P66 P75 S B  
ιουδεαν W

απηλθε TR  
απηλθεν P66 P75 S B W

παλιν TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
omit B\*

γαλιλαιαν TR P66 P75 S  
γαλειλαιαν B  
γαλιλεαν W

4.4 εδει TR P66 P75 S B  
 εδι W

σαμαρειας TR P75 B  
 σαμαριας P66 S W

4.5 ερχεται ουν εις πολιν της σαμαρειας TR B  
 ερχεται ουν εις πολιν της σαμαριας P66 S\*\*  
 εερχεται P75\*  
 εερχεται ουν εις πολιν της σαμαρειας P75\*\*  
 omit S\*

δ' εδωκεν TR P75 S B  
 ου εδωκεν P66 W

ιωσηφ TR W  
 τω ιωσηφ P66 P75 S B

4.6 εκει TR P66 P75 S B  
 εκι W

ο ουν ιησους TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 ουν ιησους P66\*

οδοιποριας TR P66 P75 S B\*\*  
 οδοιπορειας B\*  
 οδηποριας W

εκαθεξετο TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 εκαθιξετο P66\*

ουτως TR P66 P75 S W  
 ουτω B

επι τη πηγη TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 επι τη γη P66\*

ωρα ην TR P66 P75 S B  
 ωρα δε ην W

ωσει TR S\*\*  
 ως P66 P75 S\* S\*\*\* B W

4.7 ερχεται TR P66 P75 S B  
και ερχαιται W

γυνη TR P66 P75 B W  
τις γυνη S

σαμαρειας TR P75 B  
σαμαριας P66 S W

αντλησαι TR P66 P75 S B  
αντλησε W

λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
λεγι W

πειν TR S\*\* B\*\* W  
πειν P66 P75 B\*  
πιν S\*

4.8 μαθηται TR P66 P75 S B  
μαθητε W

απεληλυθεισαν TR P66 P75 B  
απεληλυθισαν S W

αγορασωσι TR  
αγορασωσιν P66 P75 S B W

4.9 λεγει ουν TR P66 P75 S\*\* B  
λεγει S\*  
λεγι W

σαμαρειτις TR P75 B  
σαμαριτις P66 S W

ιουδατος TR P66 P75 S B  
ιουδεος W

παρ εμου TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
παρ μου P66\*

ΠΙΕΙΝ ΑΙΤΕΙΣ TR B\*\*  
 ΤΕΙΣ ΠΙΕΙΝ P66\*  
 ΠΙΕΙΝ ΑΙΤΕΙΣ P66\*\* P75 B\*  
 ΠΙΝ ΑΙΤΙΣ S\*  
 ΠΙΕΙΝ ΑΙΤΙΣ S\*\*  
 ΠΙΝ ΕΤΙΣ W

ΟΥΣΗΣ ΓΥΝΑΙΚΟΣ ΣΑΜΑΡΕΙΤΙΔΟΣ TR  
 ΓΥΝΑΙΚΟΣ ΣΑΜΑΡΙΤΙΔΟΣ ΟΥΣΗΣ P66 S W  
 ΓΥΝΑΙΚΟΣ ΟΥΣΗΣ ΣΑΜΑΡΕΙΤΙΔΟΣ P75  
 ΓΥΝΑΙΚΟΣ ΣΑΜΑΡΕΙΤΙΔΟΣ ΟΥΣΗΣ B

ΟΥ ΓΑΡ ΣΥΝΧΡΩΝΤΑΙ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΙ ΣΑΜΑΡΕΙΤΑΙΣ TR B\*\*  
 ΟΥ ΓΑΡ ΣΥΝΧΡΩΝΤΑΙ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΙ ΣΑΜΑΡΙΤΑΙΣ P66  
 ΟΥ ΓΑΡ ΣΥΝΧΡΩΝΤΑΙ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΙ ΣΑΜΑΡΕΙΤΑΙΣ P75 S\*\*  
 omit S\*  
 ΟΥ ΓΑΡ ΣΥΝΧΡΩΝΤΑΙ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΙΣ ΣΑΜΑΡΕΙΤΑΙΣ B\*  
 ΟΥ ΓΑΡ ΣΥΝΧΡΩΝΤΑΙ ΙΟΥΔΕΟΙ ΣΑΜΑΡΙΤΑΙΣ W

4.10 ηδεις TR P66 P75 B  
 ηδεις S W

ΠΙΕΙΝ TR S\*\* B\*\*  
 ΠΙΕΙΝ P66 P75 B\*  
 ΠΙΝ S\* W

ΑΥΤΟΝ TR P66 P75 S B W\*\*  
 ΑΥΤΑΟΝ W\*

4.11 λεγει αυτω η γυνη TR P66\*\* S\*\*  
 λεγει αυτη η γυνη P66\*  
 λεγει αυτω P75 B  
 λεγει αυτω εκεινη S\*  
 λεγι αυτω η γυνη W

ΟΥΤΕ ΑΝΤΛΗΜΑ ΕΧΕΙΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΦΡΕΑΡ ΕΣΤΙ ΒΑΘΥ TR  
 ΟΥΤΕ ΑΝΤΛΗΜΑ ΕΧΕΙΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΦΡΕΑΡ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΒΑΘΥΝ P66\*  
 ΟΥΤΕ ΑΝΤΛΗΜΑ ΕΧΕΙΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΦΡΕΑΡ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΒΑΘΥ P66\*\* (P75) S B  
 ΤΑ ΦΡΕΑΡ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΒΑΘΥ ΚΑΙ ΟΥΤΕ ΑΝΤΛΗΜΑ ΕΧΙΣ W

---

4.11 ουτε . . . βαθυ P75.

ποθεν ουν TR P66 P75 B  
 ποθεν S  
 και ποθεν W

εχεις 2<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 P75 S B  
 εστιν W

4.12 μειζων TR P66 P75 S\*\* B  
 μειζον S\*  
 μιζον W

ος εδωκεν TR B W  
 ος δεδωκεν P66 P75  
 οστις εδωκεν S

το φρεαρ TR P66 P75 S B  
 το φρεαρ το ζων W

και αυτος TR P66 P75 S\*\* W  
 αυτος και S\*

επιε TR  
 επιεν P66 P75 S B W

οι υιοι TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 υιοι P66\*

4.13 ο ιησους TR  
 ιησους P66 P75 S B W

πας TR P66 P75\*\* S B W  
 πως P75\*

πινων TR S B\*\* W  
 πεινων P66 P75 B\*

διψησει TR P66 P75 S B  
 διψησι W

4.14 ος δ αν πλη TR P66 P75 S\*\* B  
 ο δε πινων S\*  
 ος δ αν δε πλη W



διψηση TR P66 W  
 διψησει P75 S B

αλλα TR P66 S B W  
 αλλο (P75)

ο δωσω αυτω TR P66 P75 B  
 ο εγω δωσω S  
 ο εγω δωσω αυτω W

εν αυτω πηγη TR P75 S B W  
 πηγη εν αυτω P66

4.15 λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
 λεγι W

διψω TR P66\*\* P75 B W  
 διψωσω P66\*  
 δειψω S

ερχωμαι TR  
 διερχωμαι P66 S\*  
 ερχομαι S\*\*  
 διερχομαι P75 B  
 ερχωμε W

ενθαδε TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 ωδε S\*

αντλειν TR P66 P75 S B  
 αντλιν W

4.16 λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
 λεγι W

ο ιησους TR S\*\* W  
 omit P66 P75 B  
 ιησους S\*

---

4.14 αλλο P75.

υπαγε TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
καλ υπαγε S\*

τον ανδρα σου TR P66 P75 S W  
σου τον ανδρα B

4.17 και ειπεν TR S\*\* W  
και ειπεν αυτω P66 B  
και λεγει αυτω P75  
omit S\*

ουκ εχω ανδρα TR P66 P75 B W  
ανδρα ουκ εχω S

λεγει TR P66 (P75) S B  
λεγι W

ο ιησους TR P66 P75 S B  
ιησους W

ειπας TR P66 P75 B\*\* W  
ειπες S B\*

εχω 2<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 P75 B W  
εχις S

4.18 πεντε TR P66 S B  
ε P75 W

εχεις TR P66 P75 B  
εχις S W

εστι TR  
εστιν P66 P75 S B W

τουτο αληθες ειρηκας TR P66 B W  
τουτο αληθως ειρηκας S  
τουτο αληθες ειπας P75

---

4.17 λεγει P75.

4.19 λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
λεγι W

κυριε TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
omit S\*

4.20 εν τουτω τω ορει TR  
εν τω ορει τουτω P66 P75 B  
εν τω ορι τουτω S W

υμεις TR P66 P75 S B  
υμις W

λεγετε TR P75 B W  
λεγεται P66 S

ο τοπος TR P66 P75 B W  
omit S

δει προσκυνειν TR  
προσκυνειν δει P66 P75 B  
προσκυνιν δει S W

4.21 λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
λεγι W

γυναι πιστευσον μοι TR  
πιστευε μοι γυναι P66 P75 S B W

ερχεται TR P66 P75 S B  
ερχετε W

ορει TR P75 S B  
ορι P66 W

προσκυνησετε TR P75 B  
προσκυνησεται P66 S W

4.22 υμεις TR P66 P75 B  
υμις S W

προσκυνείτε TR P75 S B  
προσκυνείται P66 W

ουκ TR P66 P75 S B W\*\*  
οοκ W\*

οίδατε TR P75 S B  
οιδαται P66 W

ημεις TR P66 P75 B  
ημις S W

ιουδαιων TR P66 P75 S B  
ιουδεων W

4.23 αλλ TR  
αλλα P66 P75 S B W

ερχεται TR P66 P75 S B  
ερχετε W

προσκυνησουσι TR P75  
προσκυνησουσιν P66 S B W

αληθεια TR P75 S B  
αληθια P66 W

ζητει TR P66 P75 B  
ζητι S W

προσκυνουντας TR P66 P75 S B  
προσκυνουτας W

αυτον TR P66 P75 S\*\* B  
αυτω S\*  
αυτον εν πνευματι W

4.24 ο θεος TR P66 P75 S B  
ος W

αυτον TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
omit S\*

εν πνευματι και αληθεια TR P75 S\*\* B  
εν πνευματι και αληθεια P66 W  
εν πνευματι αληθειας S\*

δει προσκυνειν TR P66 P75 B  
προσκυνιν δει S\*  
δει προσκυνιν S\*\*  
δι προσκυνιν W

4.25 λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
λεγι W

η γυνη TR P66 P75 S W  
γυνη B

οιδα TR P66\* P75 S\* B W  
οιδαμεν P66\*\* S\*\*

μεσσιας TR P66 S B W  
μεσσειας P75

εκεινος TR P66 P75 S B  
εκινος W

αναγγελει TR P66 P75 S\*\* B  
αναγελλει S\*  
αναγελλι W

ημιν TR P75 S B W  
ημειν P66

παντα TR  
σπαντα P66 P75 S B W

4.26 λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
λεγι W

4.27 επί τουτω ηλθον TR P66 P75 S\*\* B\*\* W  
 εν τουτω επηλθαν S\*  
 επί τουτω ηλθαν B\*

εθαυμασαν TR  
 εθαυμαζον P66 P75 S B W

ελαλει TR P66 P75 S B  
 λαλει W

ουδεις TR P66 P75 S B  
 ουδισ W

μεντοι TR P66 P75 S B  
 μεντοιγε W

ειπε TR B  
 ειπεν P66 P75\*\* W  
 ειπειν P75\*  
 ειπεν αυτω S

ζητεισ TR P66 P75 B  
 ζητισ S W

λαλεισ TR P66 P75 S B  
 λαλισ W

4.28 λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
 λεγι W

4.29 ιδετε TR P75 S B  
 ιδεται P66  
 ειδετε W

ειπε μοι TR S\* B  
 ειπεν μοι P66 P75 S\*\*  
 ειπεν W

οσα TR P66 P75 W  
 α S B

4.30 εξηλθον ουν TR P66 S W  
εξηλθον P75 B

4.31 εν δε TR (P75)  
εν P66 S B  
και εν W

μεταξυ TR P75 S B W  
μετοξυ P66

μαθηται TR P66 P75 S B  
μαθηται αυτου W

ραββι TR  
ραββει P66 P75 S B W

4.32 φαγειν TR P66 P75 B  
φαγιν S W

υμεις TR P66 P75 B  
υμεις S W

οιδατε TR P66 P75 S B  
οιδαται W

4.33 ελεγον ουν TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
λεγουσιν S\*

φαγειν TR P66 P75 S B  
φαγιν W

4.34 λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
λεγι W

ποιω TR S  
ποιησω P66 P75 B W

4.31 εν δε P75.

τελειωσω TR P75 B  
 τελιωσω P66 W  
 λελιωσω S

4.35 υμεις TR P66 P75 B  
 υμις S W

λεγετε TR P75 B  
 λεγεται P66 S W

ετι TR P66 S B W  
 omit P75

τετραμηνον TR W  
 τετραμηνος P66 P75 S B

εστι TR  
 εστιν P66 P75 S B W

επαρατε TR S B W  
 επαραται P66  
 απαρατε P75

θεασασθε TR P66 P75 S B  
 θεασασθαι W

εισι TR  
 εισιν P66 P75 S B W

4.36 και 1<sup>ο</sup> TR  
 omit P66 P75 S B W

μισθον TR P75 S B W  
 μεισθον P66

λαμβανει TR P66 P75 S B  
 λαμβανει W

συναγει TR P66 P75 B  
 συναγει S W



ζωνη TR P66 P75 S B  
ζωη W

και 3<sup>ο</sup> TR S  
omit P66 P75 B W

σπειρων TR P75 B  
σπιρον P66  
σπιρων S W

χαιρη TR P66 P75\*\* S B  
χαιρων P75\*  
χερη W

ο θεριζων 2<sup>ο</sup> TR P75 S B W  
θεριζων P66

4.37 omit entire verse P75

ο αληθινος TR P66 S  
αληθινος B W

αλλος 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P66\*\* S B W  
αλος P66\*

σπειρων TR P66 B  
σπιρων S W

4.38 απεστειλα TR P75 B  
απεστιλα P66 W  
απεσταλκα S

θεριζειν TR P66 P75 S B  
θεριζιν W

δ' TR P66 P75 S B  
omit W

υμεις 1<sup>ο</sup> 2<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 P75 S B  
υμις W

ΚΕΚΟΠΙΑΚΑΤΕ TR P66 P75 S B  
 ΚΕΚΟΠΙΑΚΑΤΑΙ W

ΚΕΚΟΠΙΑΚΑΣΙ TR  
 ΚΕΚΟΠΙΑΚΑΣΙΝ P66 P75 S B W

ΕΙΣΕΛΗΛΥΘΑΤΕ TR P75 S B  
 ΕΙΣΕΛΗΛΥΘΑΤΑΙ P66 W

4.39 ΕΚΕΙΝΗΣ TR P66 P75 B  
 ΕΚΙΝΗΣ S W

ΕΙΣ ΑΥΤΟΝ TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 omit S\*

ΣΑΜΑΡΕΙΤΩΝ TR P75 B  
 ΣΑΜΑΡΙΤΩΝ P66 S W

ΜΑΡΤΥΡΟΥΣΗΣ TR P75 S B W  
 ΜΑΤΥΡΟΥΣΗΣ P66

ΕΙΠΕ TR S\*  
 ΕΙΠΕΝ P66 P75 S\*\* B W

ΟΣΑ TR P66 W  
 Α P75 S B

ΕΠΟΙΗΣΑ TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 omit P66\*

4.40 ΩΣ ΟΥΝ ΗΛΘΟΝ TR P66 P75 S W  
 ΣΥΝΗΛΘΟΝ ΟΥΝ B\*  
 ΩΣ ΟΥΝ ΣΥΝΗΛΘΟΝ B\*\*  
 ΗΛΘΟΝ ΟΥΝ B\*\*  
 ΩΣ ΗΛΘΟΝ ΟΥΝ B\*\*

ΣΑΜΑΡΕΙΤΑΙ TR P75 B  
 ΣΑΜΑΡΙΤΑΙ P66 S W

ΗΡΩΤΩΝ TR P66 P75 S B  
 ΗΡΩΤΟΥΝ W

μειναι TR (P75) S B  
 μειναι P66  
 μινε W

εμεινεν TR P66 P75 B  
 εμινεν S W

εκει δυο ημερας TR P66 B  
 εκει β ημερας P75  
 παρ αυτοις ημερας δυο S  
 εκι β ημερας W

4.41 πλειους TR P66 S B  
 πλειον P75  
 πλιους W

4.42 τη τε γυναικι ελεγον P75\*\* S\*\* B W  
 τη δε γυναικι ελεγον P66  
 τη τε γυναικι ειπαν ελεγον P75\*  
 και ελεγον τη γυναικι S\*

οτι 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 P75 S  
 omit B W

σην λαλιαν πιστευομεν TR S\*\* W  
 σην λαλειαν πιστευομεν P66  
 λαλιαν σου πιστευομεν P75 B  
 σην μαρτυριαν πιστευομεν S\*

ακηκοαμεν TR P66 P75 B W  
 ακηκοαμεν παρ αυτου S

ουτος εστιν αληθως TR P66 P75 B  
 αληθως ουτος εστιν S  
 ουτος εστιν W

ο χριστος TR  
 omit P66 P75 S B W

---

4.40 μειναι P75.

4.43 δυο TR P66 S B  
β P75 W

εκειθεν TR P66 P75 S B  
εκιθεν W

και απηλθεν TR  
omit P66 P75 S B W

γαλιλαιαν TR P66 P75 S B\*\*  
γαλειλαιαν B\*  
γαλιλεαν W

4.44 ο ιησους TR  
ιησους P66 P75 S B W

τιμην TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
τειμην B\*

εχει TR P66 P75 S B  
εχι W

4.45 οτε ουν TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
ως ουν S\*

γαλιλαιαν TR P66 P75 S B\*\*  
γαλειλαιαν B\*  
γαλιλεαν W

εδεξαντο αυτον οι γαλιλαιοι TR P66 P75 S\*\* B\*\*  
εδεξαντο αυτον οι γαλειλαιοι B\*  
εδεξαντο αυτον οι γαλιλεοι W  
omit S\*

παντα εωρακοτες α εποιησεν TR  
παντα εωρακοτες οσα εποιησεν P66 P75 S\*\* B  
οι εωρακοτες παντα α εποιησεν S\*  
παντα εωρακοτες οσα εποιησεν W

---

4.45 οτε ουν P75.

ιεροσολυμοις TR P66 P75 S B  
 τοις ιεροσολυμοις W

αυτοι TR P66 P75 S B  
 omit W

ηλθον TR P66 P75 B W  
 εληλυθισαν S

4.46 ηλθεν TR P66 P75 B W  
 ηλθαν S

ο ιησους TR  
 omit P66 P75 S B W

εις την κανα TR P66 P75 S\*\* W  
 εις την καναν S\*  
 εν κανα B

γαλιλατας TR P66 P75 S B\*\*  
 γαλειλατας B\*  
 γαλιλεας W

εποιησε TR  
 εποιησεν P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 εποιησαν S\*

και ην TR P66 P75 B W  
 ην δε S

ησθενει TR P66 P75 B  
 ησθενι S W

καπερναουμ TR  
 καφαρνουμ P66 P75 S B W

4.47 ουτος TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 omit S\*

ιησους TR P66 P75 B W  
 ο ιησους S

ηκει TR P66 P75 B  
 ηκι S  
 ηκεν W

ιουδαιας TR P66 P75 S B  
 ιουδεας (W)

γαλιλαιαν TR P66 P75 S B\*\*  
 γαλειλαιαν B\*  
 γαλιλεαν W

απηλθε TR  
 απηλθεν P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 ηλθεν ουν S\*

προς αυτον TR P66 S B W  
 omit P75

ηρωτα αυτον TR  
 ηρωτα P66 P75 S B W

ιασηται TR P66 P75\*\* S B  
 ιαση P75\*  
 ιασητε W

ημελλε TR S\*  
 ημελλεν P66 P75 S\*\* B W

αποθνησκειν TR P66 P75 S B  
 αποθνησκιν W

4.48 ειπεν ουν TR P75 S B W  
 ειπεν P66

ο ιησους TR P66 P75 S B  
 ιησους W

προς TR P75 S B W  
 προς ς P66

---

4.47 ιουδεας W.

σημεια TR P75 B  
σημια P66 S W

ιδητε TR P66 P75 S B  
ειδητε W

πιστευσητε TR P75 B  
πιστευσηται P66 S W

4.49 λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
λεγι W

αποθανειν TR P66 P75 B  
αποθανιν S W

το παιδιον TR P66 P75 B W  
τον παιδια S

4.50 λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
λεγι W

και επιστευσεν TR  
επιστευσεν P66 P75 S B W

ω ειπεν αυτω ο ιησους TR P66 W  
ον ειπεν ο ιησους P75  
του ιησου S\*  
του ιησου ον ειπεν αυτω S\*\*  
ον ειπεν αυτω ο ιησους B

4.51 καταβαινοντος TR P66 P75 S B  
καταβενοντος W

οι δουλοι αυτου απηνητησαν αυτω TR  
οι δουλοι αυτου υπηνητησαν αυτω P66 P75 B  
οι δουλοι υπηνητησαν αυτω S  
υπηνητησαν αυτω οι δουλοι αυτου W

και απηγγειλαν TR  
και απηγγιλαν P66 W  
omit P75 B  
και ηγγειλαν S

λεγοντες TR P66 P75 B\*\* W  
omit S  
λεγονταις B\*

ο παις σου TR  
ο υιος σου P66  
ο παις αυτου P75 S B W

4.52 παρ αυτων την ωραν TR  
την ωραν παρ αυτων P66 S W  
την ωραν εκεινην P75 B

κομψοτερον TR P66 P75\*\* S B W  
κοψοτερον P75\*

εσχε TR  
εσχεν P66 P75 S B W

και ειπον αυτω S  
ειπον αυτω P66\*  
ειπον ουν αυτω P66\*\* P75 B  
ειπον ουν W

χθες TR B\*\*  
εχθες P66 P75 S B\* W

εβδομην TR P66 P75 S B  
ζ W

αυτον TR P66 P75 S W  
αυτην B

4.53 ο πατηρ TR P75 S B W  
ο πατηρ αυτου P66

εν εκεινη TR P66 S\*\*  
εκεινη P75 S\* B  
εν εκινη W

ο ιησους TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
omit S\*



οτι 2ο TR W  
omit P66 P75 S\* B

4.54 τουτο παλιν TR S  
τουτο δε παλιν P66 (P75) B W

δευτερον σημειον εποιησεν TR P66 B  
εποιησεν δευτερον σημειον P75  
δευτερον εποιησεν σημειον S  
β εποιησεν σημειον W

ιουδαιας TR P66 P75 S B  
ιουδεας W

γαλιλαιαν TR P66 P75 S B\*\*  
γαλειλαιαν B\*  
γαλιλεαν W

5.1 εορτην TR P66 P75 B W  
η εορτην S

ιουδαιων TR P66 P75 S B  
ιουδεων W

ο ιησους TR S W  
ιησους P66 P75 B

5.2 εστι TR  
εστιν P66 P75 S B W

επι τη προβατικη κολυμβηθρα TR P66 P75 B W  
προβατικη κολυμβηθρα S\*  
εν τη προβατικη κολυμβηθρα S\*\*

η επιλογομενη TR P66 P75 S\*\* B  
το λεγομενον S\*  
τη επιλογομενη W

---

4.54 τουτο δε παλιν P75.

βηθεσδα TR  
 βηδσαιδαν P66\*  
 βηδσαιδα P66\*\*  
 βηθσαιδα P75 B W  
 βηθζαθα S

πεντε TR P66 S B  
 ε P75 W

5.3 κατεκειτο TR P66 P75 S B  
 κατεκιτο W

πολυ TR  
 omit P66 P75 S B W

εκδεχομενων των την του υδατος κινησιν TR  
 omit P66 P75 S B  
 εκδεχομενοι την του υδατος κινησιν W

5.4 αγγελος γαρ ... κατειχετο νοσηματι TR  
 omit P66 P75 S B W

5.5 ανθρωπος εκει TR P75 B  
 εκει ανθρωπος P66  
 ανθρωπος S  
 ανθρωπος εκι W

τριακονταοκτω ετη TR B  
 ετη λη P66\*  
 λη ετη P66\*\* P75\*\*  
 λη P75\*  
 τριακοντα και οκτω ετη S  
 λ και η ετη W

ασθενεια TR  
 ασθενεια αυτου P66 P75 B  
 ασθενια αυτου S W

5.6 ιδων TR P75 S B  
 ειδων P66 W

κατακειμενον TR P66 P75 S\*\* B  
 ανακειμενον S\*  
 κατακιμενον W

πολυν TR P66 P75\*\* S B W  
 πολλυν P75\*

ηδη χρονον εχει TR B  
 εχει χρονον P66\*  
 εχει ηδη χρονον P66\*\*  
 χρονον εχει S  
 χρονον ηδη εχει P75  
 ηδη χρονον εχι W

λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
 λεγι W

θελεις TR P66 P75 B  
 θελις S W

5.7 βαλλη TR  
 βαλη P66 P75 S B W

με TR P75 S B W  
 μαι P66

ὧ TR P66 P75 S B  
 ὄσω W

ερχομαι TR P66 P75 S B  
 ερχομε W

προ εμου TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
 προς εμου B\*

καταβαινει TR P66 P75 B  
 καταβαινι S  
 καταβενι W

5.8 λεγει TR P66 P75 S B  
 λεγι W

εγειραι TR  
 εγிரαι P66  
 εγειρε P75 S B  
 εγιρε W

κραββατον TR P75 B\*\*  
 κραβαττον P66 B\* W  
 κραβακτον S

περιπατει TR P66 P75 S B  
 περιπατι W

5.9 και ευθεως TR P66 P75 S\*\* B  
 omit S\*  
 και W

και ηρε TR B  
 και ηρεν P66 (P75) W  
 και ηγερθη και ηρε S

κραββατον TR P75 B\*\*  
 κραβαττον P66 S\*\* B\* W  
 κραβακτον S\*

περιπατει TR P66 (P75) S B  
 περιπατι W

εκεινη TR P66 P75 B  
 εκινη S W

5.10 ιουδαιοι TR P66 P75 S B  
 ιουδαιοι W

ουκ εξεστι TR  
 και ουκ εξεστιν P66 P75 S B  
 και ουκ εξεστι W

αρι TR P66 P75 S B  
 αρι W

κραββατον TR B\*\*  
 κραβαττον σου P66 P75 S\*\* W  
 κραβακτον σου S\*  
 κραβαττον B\*

---

5.9 [κ]αι ηρεν P75. 5.9 περιπατει P75.

5.11 απεκριθη αυτοις TR  
 ο δε απεκριθη αυτοις P66 P75 S\*\*  
 ο δε απεκρινατο αυτοις S\*  
 ος δε απεκριθη αυτοις B  
 ο δε απεκρινετο αυτοις W

πολησας TR P66 P75 S B  
 ποισας W

υγιη TR P66 P75 S\*\* B  
 υγιην S\* W

εκεινος TR P66 P75 S B  
 εκινος W

μοι TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 οι P66\*

αρον TR P66\*\* P75 S\*\* B W  
 αραν P66\*  
 αραι S\*

κραββατον σου TR B\*\*  
 κραβατον σου P66 P75 S\*\* B\* W  
 κραβακτον S\*

σου TR P66 P75\*\* S B W  
 σοι P75\*

περιπατει TR P66 P75 S\*\* B  
 περιπατειν S\*

5.12 omit entire verse W

ηρωτησαν ουν αυτον TR  
 ηρωτησαν αυτον P66 S B  
 ηρωτησαν ουν P75

αρον TR P66 P75 S\*\* B  
 αραι S\*

τον κραββατου σου TR  
 omit P66 P75 S B

περιπατει TR P66 P75 B  
 περιπατιν S

5.13 ιαθεις TR P66 P75 S B  
 ειαθεις W

ο γαρ ιησους TR P66 S B W  
 ο δε ιησους P75

εξενευσεν TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 ενευσεν S\*

εν τω τοπω TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 εν τω μεσω S\*

5.14 αυτον ο ιησους TR P66 P75 S\*\* W  
 ο ιησους τον τεθεραπευμενον S\*  
 αυτον ιησους B

ειπεν TR P66 P75 B W  
 λεγει S

ιδε TR P66 P75 S B  
 ειδε W

τι σοι TR S W  
 σοι τι P66 P75 B

5.15 απηλθεν TR P66 P75 S\* B  
 απηλθεν ουν S\*\*  
 απηλθεν δε W

ανηγγειλε TR  
 ανηγγιλεν P66  
 ανηγγειλεν P75 B W  
 ειπεν S

ιουδαιοις TR P66 S B  
 ιουδαιους P75  
 ιουδαιοις και ειπεν αυτοις W

υγιη TR P66 P75 S B  
 υγειη W

5.16 τον ιησουν οι ιουδαιοι TR  
 οι ιουδαιοι τον ιησουν P66 P75 S B W

και εξητουν αυτον αποκτειναι TR  
 omit P66 P75 S B W

οτι TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 τι P66\*

εποιει TR P66 S B W  
 εποιησεν P75

5.17 ο δε ιησους απεκρινατο TR P66  
 ο δε απεκρινατο P75 S  
 ο δε απεκριθη W  
 ο δε απεκρεινατο B

εργαζεται TR P66 P75 B W  
 εργαζεται S

5.18 ουν TR P66 P75 B W  
 omit S

εξητουν αυτον οι ιουδαιοι αποκτειναι TR P75 B  
 οι ιουδαιοι εξητουν αυτον αποκτειναι P66  
 εξητουν αυτον αποκτειναι οι ιουδαιοι W  
 εξητουν αυτον οι ιουδαιοι αποκτειναι S

ελεγε TR S  
 ελεγεν P66 P75 B W

5.19 απεκρινατο ουν ο ιησους και ειπεν αυτοις TR  
 απεκρινατο ουν ο ιησους και ελεγεν αυτοις P66 S\*\*  
 απεκρινατο ουν και ελεγεν αυτοις P75 B  
 ελεγεν ουν αυτοις ο ιησους S\*  
 απεκριθη ουν ο ιησους και ειπεν αυτοις W

αμην αμην TR P66 P75 S\*\* W\*\*  
 αμην S\*  
 αμη αμην W\*

ποιειν αφ εαυτου TR P66 P75\*\* S B  
 αφεαυτου ποιειν W  
 ποιειν αφ αυτου P75\*

ουδεν TR P75 S B W  
ουδε εν P66

εαν TR P66\*\* P75 S W  
εα P66\*  
αυ B

τι TR P66 P75 S B  
omit W

υ TR P66 P75 S B  
ο W

αν TR P75 B W  
εαν P66 S

ομοιως ποιει TR P66 P75 B W  
ποιει ομοιως S

5.20 φιλει TR P66\*\* P75 B W  
φιλι P66\* S

δεικνυσιν TR P66 B  
δικνυσιν P75 S W

μειζονα TR P66 P75 B W  
μιζονα S

δειξει αυτω εργα TR P66 P75 B  
εργα δειξει αυτω S  
δειξη αυτω εργα W

θαυμαζητε TR B  
θαυμαζηται P66 W  
θαυμασητε (P75)  
θαυμαζετε S

5.21 ωπερ TR P66 (P75) B W  
ως S

---

5.20 θαυμασητε P75. 5.21 ωπερ P75.



ο πατηρ εγειρει τους νεκρους TR P66 (P75) S B  
 τους νεκρους εγειρει ο πατηρ W

ουτω TR  
 ουτως P66 P75 S B W

5.22 ουδε TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 ου P66\*

κρινει TR P66 P75\*\* S B W  
 κρεινει P75\*

δεδωκε TR  
 δεδωκεν P66 (P75\*\*) S B W  
 τεδωκεν (P75\*)

5.23 τιμωσι 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 S B\*\* W  
 τιμωσιν P75  
 τελωσι B\*

τιμωσι 2<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 S B\*\*  
 τιμωσιν (P75)  
 τελωσι B\*  
 τιμωσει W

μη TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 omit P66\*

τιμων TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
 τελων B\*

τιμα TR P66 B\*\*  
 τελμα S B\* W

5.24 εχει TR P75 S B W  
 εχι P66

5.21 ο πατηρ εγειρει τους νεκρους P75. 5.22 τεδωκεν P75.  
 5.23 τιμω[σιν] P75.

εις κρισιν ουκ ερχεται TR P66 (P75) S B  
 ουκ ερχεται εις κρισιν W

5.25 υμιν TR P75 S B W  
 υμειν P66

ωρα TR P66 S B W  
 omit P75

και νυν εστιν TR P66 (P75) B W  
 omit S

ακουσονται TR  
 ακουσωσιν P66 W  
 ακουσουσιν P75 B  
 ακουσωσι S

οι ακουσαντες TR (P75) S\*\* B W  
 ακουσαντες P66 S\*

ζησονται TR  
 ζησουσιν P66 (P75) S B W

5.26 ωσπερ TR P66 P75 S\*\* B  
 ως S\* W

εχει ζωνν TR (P75) B W  
 εχι ζωνν P66  
 ζωνν εχει S

ουτως εδωκε και τω υιω ζωνν εχειν εν εαυτω TR  
 ουτως και τω υιω εδωκεν ζωνν εχειν εν εαυτω P66 (P75) B W  
 omit S\*  
 ουτως και τω υιω εδωκεν ζωνν εδωκεν εχιν εν  
 εαυτω S\*\*  
 ουτως και τω υιω εδωκεν ζωνν εχιν εν εαυτω S\*\*\*

---

5.24 [εις] κρισιν [ου]κ ερχεται P75. 5.25 και νυ[ν ε]στιν P75.  
 5.25 οι ακουσαν[τες] P75. 5.25 [[ζησ]ουσιν P75. 5.26 εχει  
 [[ζω]ην P75. 5.26 ουτως και τω υιω εδω[κεν] ζωνν εχειν εν  
 εαυτω P75.

5.27 και εξουσιαν εδωκεν αυτω και κρισιν ποιειν TR  
 και εξουσιαν εδωκεν αυτω κρισιν ποιειν P66 (P75) S\*\* BW  
 και κρισιν εδωκεν αυτω εξουσιαν ποιειν S\*

εστι TR  
 εστιν P66 (P75) S B W

5.28 θαυμαζετε TR (P75) B  
 θαυμαζεται P66 S  
 θαυμαζεται W

οι TR P66\*\* S B W  
 omit P66\*

μνημειοις TR P66 P75 B  
 μνημιοις S  
 μνημιαις W

ακουσονται TR  
 ακουσωσιν P66 S W  
 ακουσουσιν P75 B

5.29 εκπορευσονται TR P66 (P75) S B  
 εξελευσονται W

οι δε TR P75 S  
 και οι P66\* W  
 οι P66\*\* B

5.30 δυναμιαι TR P75 S B W  
 δυναομια P66

εγω ποιειν TR P66 (P75) B W  
 ποιειν εγω S

ουδεν TR P75 S B W  
 ουδε εν P66

---

5.27 και εξουσιαν [εδ]ωκεν α[υ]τω κρισιν ποιειν P75.  
 5.27 εστιν P75. 5.28 θαυμαζ[ετε] P75. 5.29 εκπορευσονται[ι]  
 P75. 5.30 εγω ποιε[ιν] P75.

κρινω TR P66 (P75) S B\*\* W  
κρεινω B\*

και TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
omit S\*

αλλα TR P66 (P75\*\*) S B W  
αλλο (P75\*)

πατρος TR  
omit P66 P75 S B W

5.32 οιδα TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
οιδαται S\*

μαρτυρει TR (P75) B  
μαρτυρι P66 S W

5.33 υμεις TR P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
υμις P66\*

απεσταλκατε TR S B W  
απεσταλκαται P66

ιωαννην TR P66 S W  
ιωανην B

μεμαρτυρηκε TR S B  
μεμαρτυρηκεν P66 W

αληθεια TR S B W  
αληθια P66

5.34 την μαρτυριαν λαμβανω TR P66 S B W  
λαμβανω την μαρτυριαν (P75)

---

5.30 κρι[νω] P75. 5.30 και P75. 5.30 α[λ]λο P75. 5.32 οιδα  
P75. 5.32 μαρτυρε[ι] P75. 5.33 υμε[ι]ς P75. 5.34 [λαμβανω]  
τη[ν μα]ρτυριαν P75.

σωθητε TR P66 P75 S B  
 σωθηται W

5.35 υμεις TR P66 B W  
 υμεις S

δε TR P66 S\*\* B W  
 omit S\*

ηθελησατε TR (P75) B W  
 ηθελησασαι P66 S

αγαλλιασθηναι προς ωραν TR (P75) B  
 αγαλλιαθηναι προς ωραν P66 S  
 προς ωραν αγαλλιαθηναι W

5.36 την μαρτυριαν TR P66 B W  
 μαρτυριαν S

μειζω TR S  
 μειζων P66 B W

ιωαννου TR P66 S W  
 ιωανου B

ἂ 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P66\*\* S B W  
 omit P66\*

εδωκε TR  
 δεδωκεν P66 S B W

τελειωσω TR B  
 τελιωσω P66 S W

αυτα 2<sup>ο</sup> TR S B W  
 ταυτα P66

5.35 [ηθε]λησα[τε] P75. 5.35 αγαλλι[ασθηναι προς ωραν] P75.

εγω 2<sup>ο</sup> TR  
omit P66 (P75) S B W

μαρτυρει TR B  
μαρτυρι P66 S  
μαρτυρουσιν W

ο πατηρ TR (P75) S B W  
πατηρ P66

με TR P66 P75 B W  
εμε S

απεσταλκε TR  
απεσταλκεν P66 S B W

5.37 αυτος TR P66  
εκεινος (P75) S B W

μεμαρτυρηκε TR  
μεμαρτυρηκεν P66 (P75) S B W

ακηκοατε πωποτε TR  
ποτε ακηκοατε P66\*  
πωποτε ακηκοατε P66\*\* (P75) S B W

ειδος αυτου TR P66 (P75) S B  
ειδος W

εωρακατε TR S B W  
εωρακαται P66  
εορακατε P75

5.38 εχετε TR P75 S B  
εχεται P66 W

---

5.36 omit εγω P75, propter spatium. 5.36 ο πατηρ P75.  
5.37 εκει[ν]ος P75. 5.37 μ[εμαρτυρη]κεν P75. 5.37 πωποι[ε  
ακηκοατε] P75. 5.37 ειδ[ο]ς αυτου P75.

μενοντα εν υμιν TR  
εν υμιν μενοντα P66 (P75) S B W

απεστειλεν TR P75 B  
απεστειλεν P66 S W

εκεινος TR P66 B W  
εκινος S

υμεις TR P66 (P75) B W  
υμεις S

πιστευετε TR P75 S B  
πιστευεται P66 W

5.39 ερευνατε TR B\*\*  
εραυναται P66  
εραυνατε S B\*  
ερευναται W

δοκειτε TR P66 B  
δοκειται S W

εχειν TR P66 P75 B W  
εχιν S

εκειναι TR P66 P75 S B  
αυται W

5.40 θελετε TR P75 S B  
φελεται P66 W

εχητε TR P75 S B  
εχηται P66 W

5.42 αλλ TR P66 S  
αλλα P75 B W

---

5.38 εν [υμιν] μεν[ο]ντα P75. 5.38 υμεις P75.

ΟΤΙ ΤΗΝ ΑΓΑΠΗΝ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΟΥΚ ΕΧΕΤΕ ΕΝ ΕΑΥΤΟΙΣ TR P66  
 (P75) S\*\* B  
 ΟΤΙ ΟΥΚ ΕΧΕΤΕ ΤΗΝ ΑΓΑΠΗΝ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΟΥΚ ΕΧΕΤΕ ΕΝ  
 ΕΑΥΤΟΙΣ S\*  
 ΟΤΙ ΤΗΝ ΑΓΑΠΗΝ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΟΥΚ ΕΧΕΤΑΙ ΕΝ ΕΑΥΤΟΙΣ W

5.43 εγω TR P75 S B W  
 εγω δε P66

ΕΝ ΤΩ ΟΝΟΜΑΤΙ TR P66 (P75) B W  
 ΤΩ ΟΝΟΜΑΤΙ S

ΛΑΜΒΑΝΕΤΕ TR P66 (P75) S B  
 ΛΑΜΒΑΝΕΤΑΙ W

ΛΗΨΕΘΕ TR  
 ΛΗΜΨΕΘΕ P66 P75 B  
 ΛΗΜΨΕΘΑΙ S W

5.44 ΔΥΝΑΣΘΕ TR P75 B  
 ΔΥΝΑΣΘΑΙ P66 S W

ΥΜΕΙΣ TR P66 B W  
 ΥΜΙΣ S

ΠΑΡΑ TR P66 S W  
 ΠΑΡ P75 B

ΤΟΥ ΜΟΝΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ TR S\*  
 ΤΟΥ ΜΟΝΟΥ P66 (P75) S\*\* B W

ΖΗΤΕΙΤΕ TR P75 B  
 ΖΗΤΙΤΑΙ P66\*  
 ΖΗΤΕΙΤΑΙ P66\*\* W  
 ΖΗΤΟΥΝΤΕΣ S\*  
 ΖΗΤΙΤΙ S\*\*

---

5.42 [ΟΤΙ] ΤΗΝ ΑΓΑΠΗΝ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΟΥΚ ΕΧΕΤΕ ΕΝ ΕΑ[Υ]ΤΟΙΣ P75.  
 5.43 ΕΝ ΤΩ ΟΝΟΜΑΤΙ P75. 5.43 ΛΑΜ[ΒΑ]ΝΕΤΕ P75. 5.44 [ΤΟ]Υ  
 ΜΟΝΟΥ P75.



5.45 δοκείτε TR P66\*\* B W  
δοκίτε P66\*  
δοκείται S

υμων 1ο TR P66 P75\*\* S B W  
υμιν P75\*

υμων 2ο TR P66 (P75) S W  
υμων προς τον πατερα B

μωσης TR  
μωυσης P66 (P75) S B W

ηλπικατε TR S B  
ηλπικαται P66  
ηλπεικατε W

5.46 επιστευετε 1ο TR (P75) S B  
επιστευεται P66 W

μωση TR  
μωυσει P66 (P75) B W  
μωσει S

επιστευετε 2ο TR P66 (P75) S B  
επιστευεται W

εγραψεν TR P66 S\*\* B W  
γεγραφεν S\*

5.47 εκεινου TR (P75) S B W  
εκινου P66

πιστευετε TR (P75) B  
πιστευεται P66 S W

5.45 [υμω]ν 2ο P75. 5.45 μωυσης P75. 5.46 επι[σ]τ[ε]υ[ε]τε  
1ο P75. 5.46 μωυσει P75. 5.46 επι[στευ]ετε 2ο P75.  
5.47 εκειν[ου] P75. 5.47 [π]ιστευετε P75.

ρημασι TR  
ρημασιν P66 S B W

πιστευσετε TR (P75\*\*) S\*  
πιστευετε P66 (P75\*) B  
πιστευσεται S\*\*  
πιστευσηται W

6.1 γαλιλαιας TR P66 S B\*\* W  
γαλειλαιας B\*

της τιβεριαδος TR P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
ης τιβερια P66\*

6.2 και ηκολουθει TR  
κολουθι δε P66\*  
ηκολουθι δε P66\*\*  
ηκολουθει δε (P75) S B W

οχλος πολυς TR P66 B W  
πολυς οχλος S

οτι εωρων (P75) S  
οτι εωρουν P66\*  
οτι εθεωρουν P66\*\* B  
θεωρουντες W

αυτου TR  
omit P66 (P75) S B W

σημεια TR S B  
σημια P66 W

επι των ασθενουντων TR P66 B W  
περι των ασθενουντων S

---

5.47 [π]ιστευετε P75. 6.1 [τη]ς τιβεριαδος P75.  
6.2 ηκολουθ[ει δε] P75. 6.2 [οτ]ι εωρω[ν] P75. 6.2 omit  
αυτου P75, propter spatium.

6.3 ανηλθε δε TR  
 ανηλθεν δε P66 (P75) S\*\* B  
 και απηλθεν S\*  
 ανηλθεν ουν W

ο ιησους TR S\*\*  
 ιησους P66 S\* B W

εκει TR P66 P75 B W  
 omit S\*  
 εκι S\*\*

εκαθητο TR (P75) B W  
 εκαθεζετο P66 S

6.5 ο ιησους τους οφθαλμους TR  
 τους οφθαλμους ο ιησους P66\*\* (P75) S\*\* B W  
 τους οφθαλμους ο ιησους P66\*  
 τους οφθαλμους ιησους S\*

πολυς οχλος TR P66\*\* (P75) B W  
 οχλος πολυς P66\* S

τον φιλιππον TR  
 φιλιππον P66 (P75) S B W

αγορασομεν TR  
 αγορασωμεν P66 S B W  
 αγορασωσιν (P75)

φαγωσιν ουτοι TR P66 (P75) B W  
 ουτοι φαγωσιν S

6.6 τουτο δε TR P66 S\*\* B W  
 τουτο γαρ S\*

---

6.3 ανη[λθεν δε] P75. 6.3 εκαθητ[ο] P75. 6.5 τους οφθαλμο[υς  
 ο ιησους] P75. 6.5 πολ[υς οχλος] P75. 6.5 φ[ιλιππον] P75.  
 6.5 [αγορασ]ωσιν P75. 6.5 φαγ[ωσιν ουτοι] P75.

ελεγε TR  
ελεγεν P66 S B W

πειραζων TR (P75) B W  
πιραζων P66 S\*

αυτος γαρ TR P66 S\*\* B W  
αυτος δε S\*

εμελλε TR S\*  
εμελλεν (P75) S\* B W  
ημελλεν P66

6.7 απεκριθη αυτω TR (P75) B W  
απεκριθη ουν αυτω P66 S\*\*  
αποκρινεται ουν S\*

φιλιππος TR (P75) B  
ο φιλιππος P66 S W

δηναριων TR P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
δηριων P66\*

αυτοις TR P66 (P75) B W  
omit S

ινα εκαστος αυτων βραχυ τι λαβη TR  
ινα εκαστος βραχυ τι λαβη P66 S W  
ινα εκαστος βραχυ λαβη (P75) B

6.9 εστι 1<sup>ο</sup> TR  
εστιν P66 P75 S B W

εν TR  
omit P66 P75 S B W

---

6.6 [π]ειραζ[ων] P75. 6.6 εμελλ[εν] P75. 6.7 [απεκριθη]  
αυτω P75. 6.7 φιλιπ[πος] P75. 6.7 [δην]αριων P75.  
6.7 [α]υτο[ις] P75. 6.7 [ι]να [εκ]αστος βραχυ λαβη P75.

δ' TR S  
 ος ς P66  
 ος B W

πεντε TR P28 P66 S B W  
 ε P75

δυο TR S B W  
 θυο P66  
 β P75

ταυτα τι εστιν TR P28 P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 τι εστιν ταυτα P66\*

6.10 ειπε δε TR W  
 ειπεν ουν P66  
 ειπεν (P75) S B

ποιησατε TR P28 P75 S B  
 ποιησαται P66 W

ανεπεσειν TR (P75) B  
 ανεπεσιν P66 S W

χορτος TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
 τοπος S\*

ανεπεσον TR  
 ανεπεσαν P66 S B W

οι ανδρες P66\*\* S B  
 ανδρες P66\* W

ωσει TR  
 ωσι P66  
 ως P75 S B W

---

6.10 [ποιησ]ατε P28. 6.10 ειπεν P75. 6.10 ανεπε[σ]ει[ν] P75.  
 6.10 [χο]ρτ[ος] P75.

πεντακισχιλιοι TR P66\* (P75) S\*\* B\*\*  
 πεντακισχειλιοι P66\*\* B\* W  
 πεντακισχιλειοι (P28)  
 τρισχιλιοι S\*

6.11 ελαβε δε TR  
 ελαβεν ουν P66 S\*\* B W  
 ελεβεν ουν (P28)  
 ελαβεν δε S\*

ευχαριστησας TR P28 P66 (P75) B W  
 ευχαριστησεν S

διεδωκε TR  
 εδωκεν (P28) P66  
 διεδωκεν (P75) B W  
 και εδωκεν S

τοις μαθηταις οι δε μαθηται TR S\*\*  
 omit P28 P66 P75 S\* B W

ανακειμενοις TR P66 B W  
 ανακειμενοις S

6.12 λεγει TR P28 (P75) B W  
 λεγι S

συναγαγετε TR B  
 συναγαγεται S W

περισσευσαντα TR S  
 περισσευοντα B  
 περισσευσαντα W

6.13 δωδεκα ... πεντε TR S B W  
 ιβ ... ε (P75)

---

6.10 [πεντακισ]χιλειοι P28; 6.10 πεντ[ακισχιλιοι] P75.  
 6.11 ελεβεν ου[ν] P28. 6.11 [ευχαρισ]τησα]ς P75. 6.11 εδω[κεν]  
 P28; 6.11 [δι]εδωκεν P75. 6.12 [λε]γει P75. 6.13 ιβ ... ε P75.

κριθινων TR (P75) S B\*\* W  
 κρειθινων B\*

επερισσευσε TR  
 επερισσευσαν (P75) B W  
 επερισσευσεν S

6.14 ιδοντες TR (P75) S B  
 ειδοντες W

δ TR S W  
 α P75 B

εποιησε TR  
 εποιησεν P75 S B W

σημειον TR S  
 σημεια (P75) B  
 σημιον W

ο ιησους TR  
 omit P75 S B W

οτι TR (P75) B  
 omit S W

ο ερχομενος εις τον κοσμον TR P75 B W  
 ο εις τον κοσμον ερχομενος S

6.15 ερχεσθαι TR P75 S W  
 ερχεσθε B

ινα ποιησωσιν αυτον βασιλεια TR  
 ινα ποιησωσιν βασιλεια (P75) S\*\* W  
 ινα ποιησωσι βασιλεια B  
 ινα αναδικνυναι βασιλεια S\*

---

6.13 [κρ]ιθινων P75. 6.13 επερισσευσαν P75. 6.14 ιδοντες P75.  
 6.14 σημεια P75. 6.14 [ο]τι P75. 6.15 ινα π[ο]ιησωσιν  
 βασιλεια P75.

ανεχωρησε παλιν εις το ορος αυτος μονος TR B  
 ανεχωρησεν παλιν εις το ορος αυτος μονος (P75) S\*\*  
 ανεχωρησεν εις το ορος αυτος μονος W  
 φευγει παλιν εις το ορος μονος αυτος S\*

6.16 οψια TR P75 S B  
 οψεια W

κατ βησαν TR  
 κατεβησαν S B W

οι μαθηται αυτου TR P75 S B  
 omit W

6.17 εμβαντες TR P75 S B  
 ενβαντες W

το πλοιον TR W  
 πλοιον P75 S B

ηρχοντο TR (P75) B W  
 ερχονται S

καπερναουμ TR  
 καφαρναουμ (P75) S B W

και σκοτια ηδη εγεγονει και ουκ εληλυθει προς αυτους  
 ο ιησους TR  
 και σκοτια ηδη εγεγονει και ου προς αυτους εληλυθει  
 ο ιησους (P28)  
 και σκοτια ηδη εγεγονει και ηδη ουπω προς αυτους  
 εγεγονει ο ιησους (P75\*)  
 κατελαβεν δε αυτους η σκοτια και ουπω εληλυθει ιησους  
 προς αυτους S  
 και σκοτια ηδη εγεγονει και ουπω προς αυτους εληλυθει  
 ο ιησους B

---

6.15 ανεχωρησεν παλιν εις το [ο]ρος αυτος μονος P75.  
 6.17 ηρχ[οντο] P75. 6.17 καφαρν[αουμ] P75. 6.17 [κ]αι σκοτια  
 ηδη εγ[ε]γ[ονει] και ου προς αυτους ε]ληλυθει ο ιησους P28,  
 propter spatium; [και] σκοτια ηδη εγεγονει και ηδη [ουπ]ω προς  
 αυτους εγεγον[ε]ι ο ιησους P75.



και σκοτια ηδη εγεγονει και ουπω εληλυθει προς αυτους  
 ο ιησους W  
 και σκοτια ηδη εγεγονει και ουπω προς αυτους εγεγονει  
 ο ιησους (P75\*\*)

6.18 τε TR P28 S B W  
 δε P75

διηγειρετο TR S W\*  
 διηγειρατο (P75)  
 διηγειριτο W\*\*  
 διεγειρετο (P28) B

6.19 ως σταδιους TR P28 (P75) S\*\* B\*\* W  
 ως σταδια S\*  
 ωσταδιους B\*

εικοσιπεντε η τριακοντα TR (P28) S B  
 κε η λ (P75) W

θεωρουσι TR P75 B  
 θεωρουσιν (P28) S W

τον ιησουν TR (P75) S B W  
 ιησουν P28

της θαλασσης TR S B W  
 την θαλασσαν (P75)

εγγυς TR (P75) S B W  
 ενγγυς P28

γινομενον TR S B\*\*  
 γεινομενον B\* W

---

6.18 διεγει[ρετο] P28; δ[ιηγειρ]ατο P75. 6.19 ως σταδιου[ς]  
 P75. 6.19 εικοσιπ[εντε η τριακοντα] P28; [κε] η λ P75.  
 6.19 [θεωρουσι]ν P28. 6.19 τ[ον ιη] P75. 6.19 την θαλασσ[αν]  
 P75. 6.19 εγγυς P75.

6.20 ο δε λεγει TR (P28) B W  
 και λεγει S

ειμι TR S B  
 ειμει W

φοβεισθε B  
 φοβεισθαι P28 W  
 φοβισθαι S

6.21 ηθειλον TR (P28) (P75) B W  
 ηλθον S

λαβειν αυτον TR (P75) B  
 λαβιν αυτον S  
 αυτον λαβιν W

το πλοιον εγενετο TR S  
 εγενετο το πλοιον (P75) B W

επι της γης TR P28 S\*\* B W  
 επι την γην S\*

υπηγον TR (P75) S\*\* B W  
 υπηνητησεν S\*

6.22 εστηκως TR (P75) B W  
 εστως S

περαν TR S B\*\* W  
 περα B\*

ιδων TR  
 ειδον (P75)  
 ιδεν P28  
 ειδεν S  
 ειδων B  
 ιδον W

---

6.20 ο δε [λεγει] P28. 6.21 ηφε[λον] P28; [ηθε]λον P75.  
 6.21 λαβειν α[υ]τον P75. 6.21 [εγεν]ετο το πλοιον P75.  
 6.21 υ[π]ηγον P75. 6.22 ε[στη]κ[ως] P75. 6.22 ειδον P75.

εκεινο εις ο ενεβησαν οι μαθηται αυτου TR  
omit P75 S\*\* B W  
κεινο εις ο ενεβησαν οι μαθηται του ιησου S\*

συνεισηλθε τοις μαθηταις αυτου TR  
συνεισηλθεν τοις μαθηταις αυτου (P75) S\*\* B W  
συνεληλυθι αυτοις S\*

πλοιαριον 2ο TR  
πλοιον (P75) S\*\* B W  
πλοιαν S\*

απηλθον TR (P75) S\*\* B W  
omit S\*

6.23 αλλα δε ηλθε πλοιαρια TR  
αλλα ηλθεν πλοια P75 B  
απελθοντων ουν των πλοιων S  
αλλα δε ηλθεν πλοια W

τιβεριαδος TR S  
της τιβεριαδος B W

εγγυς του τοπου TR P75 S\*\* B  
εγγυς ουσης S\*  
omit W

εφαγον TR (P75) S\*\* B W  
και εφαγον S\*

τον αρτον TR P75 B W  
αρτον S

6.24 οτε ουν ειδεν ο οχλος TR P75 B W  
και ιδοντες S\*  
οτε ουν ιδεν ο οχλος S\*\*

---

6.22 [συν]εισηλθεν [τοις μαθη]ταις αυ[του] P75. 6.22 πλοιο[ν]  
P75. 6.22 απηλθον P75. 6.23 [ε]φ[α]γον P75.

ΟΤΙ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΟΥΚ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΕΚΕΙ TR (P75) S\*\* B W  
 ΟΤΙ ΟΥΚ ΗΥ ΕΚΕΙ Ο ΙΗΣΟΥΣ S\*

ΟΙ ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΥ TR (P75) S\*\* B W  
 ΟΙ ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ S\*

ΕΝΕΒΗΣΑΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΙ TR  
 ΑΝΕΒΗΣΑΝ ΑΥΤΟΙ P75  
 ΑΝΕΒΗΣΑΝ S\*  
 ΕΝΕΒΗΣΑΝ ΑΥΤΟΙ S\*\* B W

ΕΙΣ ΤΑ ΠΛΟΙΑ TR  
 ΕΙΣ ΤΑ ΠΛΟΙΑΡΙΑ P75 S\*\* B W  
 ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΠΛΟΙΟΝ S\*

ΚΑΠΕΡΝΑΟΥΜ TR  
 ΚΑΦΑΡΝΑΟΥΜ (P75) S B W

ΖΗΤΟΥΝΤΕΣ TR S B\*\* W  
 ΖΗΤΟΥΝΤΑΙΣ B\*

6.25 ΚΑΙ ΕΥΡΟΝΤΕΣ TR (P75) S B\*\* W  
 ΚΑΙ ΜΗ ΕΥΡΟΝΤΕΣ B\*

ΕΙΠΟΝ TR S B  
 ΕΙΠΑΝ W

ΡΑΒΒΙ TR  
 ΡΑΒΒΕΙ S B W

ΓΕΓΟΝΑΣ TR P75 B W  
 ΗΛΘΕΣ S

6.26 Ο ΙΗΣΟΥΣ TR B W  
 ΙΗΣΟΥΣ S

---

6.24 ΟΤΙ Τ̄ς [ΟΥ]Κ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΕΚΕΙ P75. 6.24 ΟΙ ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ ΑΥΤ[ΟΥ] P75.  
 6.24 ΚΑΦ[ΑΡ]ΥΑ[ΟΥΜ] P75. 6.25 ΚΑΙ ΕΥΡΟ[ΥΝΤΕΣ] P75.

ζητείτε με TR (P75) B W  
omit S\*  
ζητίτε με S\*\*

ουχ TR P75 S B\*\* W  
ουκ B\*

ειδετε TR (P75) S B\*  
ιδετε B\*\*  
ειδεται W

σημεια TR P75 B  
σημια S W

εφαγετε TR (P75) S B  
εφαγεται W

εχορτασθητε TR S B  
εχορτασθηται W

6.27 εργαζεσθε TR P75 B  
εργαζεσθαι S W

μη την βρωσιν την απολλυμενην αλλα την βρωσιν την  
μενουσαν TR P75 B W  
βρωσιν μη την απολλυμενην αλλα την μενουσαν S

υμιν δωσει TR P75 B W  
διδωσιν υμιν S

εσφραγισεν TR P75 S\*\* B  
omit S\*  
εσφραγεισεν W

6.28 προς αυτον TR (P75) S B  
αυτω W

---

6.26 [ζητείτε με] P75. 6.26 ειδ[ε]τε P75. 6.26 [εφαγε]τε P75.  
6.27 εργαζεσθε P75. 6.27 μη [τ]ην βρωσιν [την] απολλυμενη[ν]  
αλλα την βρωσιν την μενουσαν P75. 6.28 [π]ρ[ος α]υτον P75.

ποιουμεν TR  
 ποιωμεν P75 S B  
 ποιησωμεν W

ινα εργαζωμεθα TR (P75) S\*\* B W  
 ιν εργαζωμεθα S\*

6.29 ο ιησους TR B  
 ιησους P75 S W

εστι TR  
 εστιν (P75) S B W

πιστευσητε TR  
 πιστευητε P75 B  
 πιστευηται S W

απεστειλεν TR B W  
 απεστιλεν S

6.30 τι ουν TR P75 B W  
 τι S

ποιεις συ σημειον TR (P75) B  
 ποιεις σημιον συ S  
 ποιεις σημιον W

ιδωμεν TR (P75) B\*\* W  
 ειδωμεν S B\*

6.31 εστι TR  
 εστιν P75 S B W

αρτον TR P75 S\*\* B W  
 omit S\*

εδωκεν TR P75 B  
 δεδωκεν S W

---

6.28 ινα εργαζωμεθα P75. 6.29 εστιν P75. 6.30 ποιεις συ σημειον P75. 6.30 ιδωμεν P75. 6.31 [αρτον] P75, propter spatium.

6.32 μωσης TR  
 μωσης P75 S B W

δεδωκεν TR P75 S  
 εδωκεν B W

τον αρτον εκ του ουρανου TR S B W  
 τον αρτον τον εκ του ουρανου (P75)

αληθινον TR (P75) S B  
 αληθεινον W

6.33 ο γαρ αρτος του θεου TR (P75) B W  
 ο γαρ αρτος ο του θεου S

6.34 κυριε παντοτε TR (P75) B W  
 παντοτε κυριε S

6.35 ειπε δε TR  
 ειπεν (P75) B W  
 ειπεν ουν S

ειμι TR (P75) S B  
 ειμει W

προς με TR W  
 προς εμε (P75) S B

πειναση TR B\*  
 πιναση S B\*\* W

διψηση TR B\*\*  
 διψησει P66 S B\* W

πωποτε TR S B W  
 πωποται P66

---

6.32 τον αρτον τον [εκ] του ουρα[ο]υ P75. 6.32 αληθινον P75.  
 6.33 ο [γαρ αρτο]ς του θεου P75. 6.34 κυριε παν[τοτε] P75.  
 6.35 ει[πεν] P75. 6.35 [ε]ιμι P75. 6.35 [προ]ς εμε P75.

6.36 αλλ TR P66 S B  
αλλα W

υμιν TR (P75) S B W  
υμειν P66

εωρακατε TR P66 S B  
εωρακαται W

με TR P66 (P75) B W  
omit S

πιστευετε TR (P75) B  
πιστευεται P66 S  
πιστευεται μοι W

6.37 διδωσι TR  
διδωσιν P66 (P75) S B W

προς με TR B W  
προς εμε P66 (P75) S

εξω TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
omit S\*

6.38 οτι καταβεβηκα TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
οτι ου καταβεβηκα S\*

εκ του ουρανου TR S  
απο του ουρανου P66 B W

ουχ ινα ποιω TR P66 (P75) B  
ινα ποιησω S\*  
ουχ ινα ποιησω S\*\* W

---

6.36 [υ]μιν P75. 6.36 [με] P75. 6.36 π[ιστευε]τε P75.  
6.37 [δι]δωσιν P75. 6.37 προς εμ[ε] P75. 6.37 εξ[ω] P75.  
6.38 [οτι κ]αταβεβηκα P75. 6.38 [ουχ ινα π]οιω P75.



6.39 τουτο δε εστι το θελημα του πεμψαντος με πατρος TR  
 τουτο δε εστιν το θελημα του πεμψαντος με P66 S\*\* B W  
 τουτο εστιν το θελημα του πεμψαντος με (P75)  
 omit S\* S\*\*

δεδωκε TR  
 δεδωκεν P66 S B W  
 εδωκεν P75

αυτο TR P66 P75 S B  
 αυτον W

εν τη εσχατη ημερα TR S  
 τη εσχατη ημερα P66 P75 B W

6.40 τουτο δε εστι το θελημα TR  
 omit P66\*  
 τουτο γαρ εστιν το θελημα (P66\*\*) S B W  
 τουτο εστιν το θελημα P75

του πεμψαντος με TR  
 του πατρος μου P66 P75 S B W

πιστευων TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 πιστεων P66\*

εγω TR P75 S B W  
 omit P66

τη εσχατη ημερα TR P66 P75 B W  
 εν τη εσχατη ημερα S

6.41 ειμι TR P66 P75 S B  
 ειμει W

6.42 ουχ TR P66 S W  
 ουχι P75 B

---

6.39 τουτο εστιν το θελημα του π[εμ]ψαντος με P75. 6.40 τουτο  
 γαρ ε[στιν ι]ο θελημα P66\*\*.

ημεις TR P66 P75 B W  
ημεις S

τον πατερα TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
και τον πατερα S\*

και την μητερα TR P66 P75 S\*\* B  
omit S\* W

πως ουν λεγει ουτος TR  
πως ουν λεγει P66  
πως νυν λεγει P75 B W  
πως ουν ουτος λεγει S

οτι εκ του ουρανου καταβεβηκα TR P66 P75 B W  
εγω εκ του ουρανου καταβεβηκα S

6.43 απεκριθη ουν TR S  
απεκριθη P66 (P75) B  
απεκριθη ουν W

ο ιησους TR P66 W  
ιησους (P75) S B

και ειπεν αυτοις TR P66 (P75) B W  
αυτοις και ειπεν S

γογγυζετε TR B  
γογγυζεται P66 S W

μετ αλληλων TR P66 S B\*\* W  
μετα αληλων B\*

6.44 ουδεις TR P66 P75 B  
ουδεις S W

ελθειν TR P66 P75 B W  
ελθιν S

---

6.43 απεκ[ρ]ιθη P75. 6.43 ἴς P75. 6.43 [κα]ι ειπεν αυτο[ις]  
P75.

6.44 προς με TR P66 S W  
 προς εμε B

ο πατηρ TR P75 S B W  
 ο πατηρ μου P66

αυτον 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 P75 S B  
 προς με W

κατ εγω TR  
 καγω P66 P75 S B W

τη εσχατη ημερα TR (P75) S  
 εν τη εσχατη ημερα P66 B W

6.45 εστι TR S  
 εστιν P66 (P75) B W

του θεου TR  
 θεου P66 (P75) S B W

ουν TR  
 omit P66 P75 S B W

προς με TR P66 W  
 προς εμε (P75) S B

6.46 τις εωρακεν TR  
 εωρακεν τις P66 P75 S B\*\*  
 εορακε τις B\* W

του θεου TR P66 (P75) W  
 του πατρος S  
 θεου B

---

6.44 τη εσχατη ημερ[α] P75. 6.45 [εσ]τιν P75. 6.45 [θυ] P75.  
 6.45 πρ[ος] εμε P75. 6.45 ε[ωρακεν τις] P75. 6.46 [τ]ου  
 θυ P75.

ΟΥΤΟΣ TR P66 S B  
 ΑΥΤΟΣ W

ΕΩΡΑΚΕ TR  
 ΕΩΡΑΚΕΥ P66 (P75) S B\*\*  
 ΕΟΡΑΚΕΥ B\* W

ΤΟΝ ΠΑΤΕΡΑ 2<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
 ΤΟΝ ΘΕΟΝ S\*

6.47 ΛΕΓΩ ΥΜΙΝ TR P66 B W  
 ΛΕΓΩ ΥΜΙΝ ΟΤΙ S

Ο ΠΙΣΤΕΥΩΝ ΕΙΣ ΕΜΕ TR  
 Ο ΠΙΣΤΕΥΩΝ P66 (P75) S B W

6.48 ΕΙΜΙ TR P66 P75 S B  
 ΕΙΜΕΙ W

6.49 ΤΟ ΜΑΝΝΑ ΕΝ ΤΗ ΕΡΗΜΩ TR P66 S  
 ΕΝ ΤΗ ΕΡΗΜΩ ΤΟ ΜΑΝΝΑ B W

6.50 ΑΥΤΟΥ ΘΑΓΗ TR P66 S B W  
 ΑΥΤΟΥ (P75)

ΜΗ ΑΠΟΘΑΝΗ TR P66 S W  
 ΟΥ [-----] (P75)  
 ΜΗ ΑΠΟΘΝΗΣΚΗ B

6.51 ΕΙΜΙ TR P66 S B  
 ΕΙΜΕΙ W

ΤΙΣ TR P75 S B W  
 ΤΕΙΣ P66

ΕΚ ΤΟΥΤΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΑΡΤΟΥ TR P66 B W  
 ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΕΜΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΑΡΤΟΥ S

---

6.46 ε[ωρακεν] P75. 6.46 το[ν πατερα] P75, propter spatium.  
 6.47 ο πιστε[υων] P75. 6.50 [αυτο]ν P75. 6.50 ου [-----]  
 P75.

ζησεται TR P66 B  
 ζησει S W

και ο αρτος δε ον εγω δωσω TR P66 (P75) B  
 και ο αρτος ον εγω δωσω S\*\* W  
 ο αρτος ον εγω δωσω S\*

η σαρχ μου εστιν ην εγω δωσω υπερ της του κοσμου  
 ζωης TR  
 η σαρχ μου εστιν υπερ της του κοσμου ζωης P66 (P75) B W  
 υπερ της του κοσμου ζωης η σαρχ μου εστιν S

6.52 ουν προς αλληλους οι ιουδαιοι TR P66 S B W  
 ουν οι ιουδαιοι προς αλληλους (P75)

πως δυναται ουτος ημιν δουναι την σαρκα φαγειν TR W  
 πως δυναται ουτος δουναι ημιν την σαρκαν αυτου  
 φαγειν P66  
 πως ουν δυναται ημιν ουτος δουναι την σαρκα φαγιν S  
 πως δυναται ουτος ημιν δουναι την σαρκα αυτου  
 φαγειν (P75) B

6.53 ο ιησους TR (P75) S W  
 ιησους P66 B

εαν TR P66 B W  
 αν S

μη φαγητε TR (P75) B\*\*  
 μη φαγηται P66 S B\* W\*\*  
 φαγηται W\*

την σαρκα TR (P75) S B W  
 την σαρκαν P66

6.51 [και] ο [αρτος δε ον εγω δω]σω P75. 6.51 η σαρχ μου  
 εστι]ν υπ[ερ της του κο]σμου ζωη[ς] P75. 6.51 [ουν οι  
 ιουδα]ιοι προς αλλ[ηλους] P75. 6.52 π[ως δυν]ατ[α] ου[τος  
 ημιν δουναι] την [σαρκα αυτου φ]αγειν P75. 6.53 ο ι[η]σους P75.  
 6.53 [μη φα]γητε P75. 6.53 την σαρκ[α] P75.

πιητε αυτου το αιμα TR (P75) B  
 το αιμα αυτου πιητε P66  
 πιητε το αιμα αυτου S  
 πιηται αυτου το αιμα W

ουκ εχετε ζωνη εν εαυτοις TR (P75) B  
 ουκ εχετε ζωνη αιωνιον εν εαυτοις S  
 ουκ εχεται ζωνη εν εαυτοις P66 W

6.54 ο τρωγων μου την σαρκα και πινων TR (P75+H) S B\*\* W  
 ο τρωνων P66\*  
 ο τρωγων μου τον σαρκα και πινων (P75\*)  
 ο τρωγων μο την σαρκα και πινων P66\*\*  
 ο τρωγων μου την σαρκα και πεινων B\*

και εγω TR  
 καγω P66 P75 S B W

6.55 αληθως εστι βρωσις και το αιμα μου TR  
 αληθης εστιν βρωσις και το αιμα μου P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
 omit S\*

αληθως 2ο TR S\* S\*\*\*  
 αληθης P66 P75 S\*\* B W

εστι 2ο  
 εστιν P66 (P75) S B W

ποσις TR P66 P75 S\*\* B  
 ποτον S\*  
 ποσεις W

6.56 πινων TR P66 S B\*\*  
 πεινων P75 B\* W

---

6.53 [πι]ητε αυτου το αιμα P75. 6.53 ουκ εχετε ζ[ωνη] εν  
 εαυτοις P75. 6.54 ο τρωγων μου την σαρκα κ[α]ι [πι]γων P75.  
 6.55 αληθης [ε]στιν βρωσις και το αιμα μου P75. 6.55 εστιν P75.

ΤΟ ΑΙΜΑ TR P66 P75 S B  
 ΤΟ ΑΙΜΑ ΕΧΕΙ ΖΩΗΝ ΑΙΩΝΙΟΝ ΚΑΘΩ ΑΝΑΣΤΗΣΩ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΤΗ  
 ΕΣΧΑΤΗ ΗΜΕΡΑ Η ΓΑΡ ΣΑΡΞ ΜΟΥ ΑΛΗΘΗΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΒΡΩΣΙΣ  
 ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΑΙΜΑ ΜΟΥ ΑΛΗΘΗΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΠΟΣΙΣ Ο ΤΡΩΓΩΝ ΜΟΥ  
 ΤΗΝ ΣΑΡΚΑ ΚΑΙ ΠΙΝΩΝ ΜΟΥ ΤΟ ΑΙΜΑ W

6.57 απεστειλε TR  
 απεσταλκεν P66  
 απεστειλεν P75 B  
 απεστιλεν S W

6.57 ΤΟΝ ΠΑΤΕΡΑ TR P66 S B W  
 ΤΟΝ ΠΑΤΕΡΑ ΜΟΥ P75

ζησεται TR P66 W  
 ζησει P75 S B

6.58 εκ του ουρανου TR S W  
 εκ ουρανου P66  
 εξ ουρανου P75 B

καταβας TR P66\*\* P75 S\*\* B W  
 καταβαινων P66\* S\*

εφαγον οι πατερες υμων το μαννα TR  
 εφαγον οι πατερες P66 P75 B W  
 οι πατερες εφαγον S

ο τρωγων τουτον τον αρτον ζησεται TR P66  
 ο τρωγων τουτον τον αρτον ζησει P75 S B  
 ο τρωγων τον αρτον τουτον ζηση W

6.59 συναγωγή TR P66 (P75\*\*) S\*\* B W  
 συναγω (P75\*)  
 συνναγωγή S\*

καπερναιουμ TR  
 καφαρναιουμ P66 P75 S B W

---

6.59 συναγω P75.

6.60 εκ των μαθητων αυτου TR P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
 εκ των μαθητων P66\*

σκληρος εστιν ουτος ο λογος TR (P75)  
 σκληρος εστιν ο λογος ουτος P66 S B  
 σκληρος ο λογος ουτος W

6.61 ειδως δε ο ιησους TR P66 (P75) B  
 εγνω ουν ιησους S\*  
 ιδως δε ο ιησους S\*\* W

γογγυζουσι TR  
 γογγυζουσιν P66 P75 S B W

ειπεν αυτοις TR P75 S\*\* B W  
 ειπεν αυτοις ιησους P66  
 και ειπεν αυτοις S\*

σκανδαλιζει TR P66\*\* (P75) B W  
 σκαδολιζει P66\*  
 σκανδαλιζει S

6.62 ουν TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 omit S\*

θεωρητε TR P75 B  
 θεωρησεται P66  
 θεωρηται S  
 ειδηται W

τον υιον του ανθρωπου αναβαινοντα TR P66 (P75) B W  
 αναβαινοντα τον υιον του ανθρωπου S

οπου TR (P75) S B W  
 ου P66

6.60 εκ των μαθητων αυ[του] P75. 6.60 [σ]κληρος εστ[ιν ο]υτος  
 ο λογος P75. 6.61 ειδως δε ο ιησους P75. 6.61 σκανδα[λι]ζει P75.  
 6.62 θεωρητε P75. 6.62 τον υιον τ[ου] ανθου ανα[β]αινοντα P75.  
 6.62 [ο]που P75. 6.63 τ[ο π]να P75.



6.63 το πνευμα TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
πνευμα S\*

εστι 1<sup>ο</sup> TR  
εστιν P66 S B W

τα ρηματα TR P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
ταρρημα P66\*

λαλω TR  
λελαληκα P66 S B W

εστι 2<sup>ο</sup> TR  
εστιν P66 S B W

εστιν TR P66 B W  
omit S

6.64 αλλ TR P66 S B  
αλλα W

εισιν εξ υμων τινες	TR (P75) B** W
εισιν τινες εξ υμων	P66
εξ υμων εισιν τινες	S
εσιν εξ υμων τινες	B*

πιστευουσιν TR S B W  
πιστευουσιν P66

ηιδει TR  
ηδει P66 (P75) S B W

εξ αρχης TR B W  
απ αρχης P66 S

ο ιησους TR P66 P75 B W  
ο σωτηρ S

---

6.63 τα ρηματ[α] P75. 6.64 [εισ]ιν ε[ξ υμων τιν ε]ς P75.  
6.64 ηδ[ει] P75.

ΤΙΝΕΣ ΕΙΣΙΝ ΟΙ ΜΗ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΟΝΤΕΣ ΚΑΙ TR P66\*\* P75 B W  
 omit P66\*  
 ΤΙΝΕΣ ΕΙΣΙΝ ΟΙ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΟΝΤΕΣ ΚΑΙ S

ΤΙΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ Ο ΠΑΡΑΔΩΣΩΝ ΑΥΤΟΝ TR (P75) B W  
 ΤΙΣ ΗΝ Ο ΜΕΛΛΩΝ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΠΑΡΑΔΙΔΟΝΑΙ P66 S\*\*  
 ΗΝ Ο ΜΕΛΛΩΝ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΠΑΡΑΔΙΔΟΝΑΙ S\*

6.65 ελεγε TR  
 ελεγεν P66 (P75) S B W

οτι TR P66 S B  
 omit W

ουδεις TR P66 (P75) B W  
 ουδεις S

προς με TR P66 B W  
 προς εμε S

εαν μη η δεδομενον αυτω TR S\*\* B W  
 εαν μη ην δεδομενον αυτω P66  
 εαν μη η δεδομενον S\*

του πατρος μου TR  
 του πατρος P66 S B W

6.66 εκ τουτου TR (P75) B W  
 εκ τουτου ουν P66 S

απηλθον των μαθητων αυτου TR  
 εκ των μαθητων αυτου απηλθον P66 (P75) B  
 των μαθητων απηλθον S  
 των μαθητων αυτου απηλθον W

---

6.64 τινες [εισιν οι μη πιστευοντες] και P75. 6.64 τις εστ[ιν  
 ο παραδωσω αυτον] P75. 6.65 ελεγεν P75. 6.65 [ουδ]εις P75.  
 6.66 [εκ] το[υ]του P75. [εκ των μαθητω]ν αυ[το]υ απηλθ[ον]  
 P75.

6.67 δωδεκα TR P66 S B W  
 ιβ (P75)

υμεις TR P66 (P75) B W  
 υμεις S

θελετε TR P66 B W  
 θελεται S

6.68 απεκριθη ουν αυτω TR  
 απεκριθη αυτω P66 (P75) S B W

6.69 ημεις TR P66 B W  
 ημεις S

ο χριστος ο υιος του θεου του ζωντος TR  
 ο χριστος ο αγιος του θεου P66  
 ο αγιος του θεου (P75) S B W

6.70 απεκριθη αυτοις ο ιησους TR (P75) B W  
 απεκριθη αυτοις ιησους P66  
 απεκριθη ιησους και ειπεν αυτοις S

ουκ TR P66 B W  
 ουχι S

τους δωδεκα εξελεξαμην TR S\*\* B W  
 τους ιβ εξελεξαμην P66\*\* (P75)  
 εξελεξαμην δωδεκα S\*  
 του ιβ εξελεξαμην P66\*

εξ υμων εις TR P66 (P75) B W  
 εξ υμων S\*  
 εις εξ υμων S\*\*

διαβολος TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 διαβος P66\*

6.67 ι[β] P75. 6.67 υμει[ς] P75. 6.68 απ[εκριθη] αυτω P75.  
 6.69 ο φ[γιος] του θυ P75. 6.70 απ[εκ]ριθη [αυ]τοις ο ιησους  
 P75. 6.70 τους ιβ εξελεξαμην P75. 6.70 εξ υμων εις P75.

6.71 ελεγε TR  
ελεγεν P66 P75 S B W

δε TR P66 P75 B W  
δει S

τον ιουδαν TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
ιουδαν S\*

ισκαριωτην TR  
ισκαριωτου P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
απο καρυωτου S\*

ημελλεν αυτον παραδιδοναι TR P66  
εμελλεν παραδιδοναι αυτον (P75) B W  
εμελλον αυτον παραδιδοναι S\*  
εμελλεν αυτον παραδιδοναι S\*\*

εις ων εκ των δωδεκα TR P66 S W  
εις εκ των  $\overline{\tau\beta}$  (P75)  
εις εκ των δωδεκα B

7.1 και TR (P75) S\*\* B W  
omit P66 S\* S\*\*\*

περιεπατει ο ιησους μετα ταυτα TR  
μετα ταυτα περιεπατει ο ιησους P66 (P75) S W  
μετα ταυτα περιεπατει ιησους B

γαλιλαια TR P66 S B\*\* W  
γαλειλαια B\*

ηθελεν TR P66 P75 S B  
ειχεν εξουσιαν W

---

6.71 τ[ο]ν ιουδαν P75. 6.71 ισκαριωτου P75. 6.71 εμ[ελλε]ν παραδιδοναι αυτον P75. 6.71 εις [εκ] των [ $\overline{\tau\beta}$ ] P75. 7.1 και P75. 7.1 μετα ταυτα [περι]επα[τ]ει ο ιησους P75.

αποκτειναι TR P66 (P75) B  
 αποκτιναι S W

7.3 ειπον ουν TR P75 S B  
 ειπαν ουν P66  
 και ειπον W

προς αυτον οι αδελφοι αυτου TR (P75) B W  
 οι αδελφοι αυτου προς αυτον P66 S

μεταβηθι TR P66 S B  
 μεταβηθει W

θεωρησωσι TR  
 θεωρησωσι P66  
 θεωρησουσιν (P75) S\*\* B\* W  
 θεωρουσιν S\*  
 θεωρησωσιν B\*\*

τα εργα σου TR S\*\* W  
 σου τα εργα P66 (P75) B  
 τα εργα S\*

7.4 ουδεις TR P66 P75 B W  
 ουδις S

εν κρυπτω τι ποιει TR P66 W  
 τι εν κρυπτω ποιει (P75) B  
 τι εν κρυπτω ποιων S

και TR P66 (P75) B W  
 omit S

ζητει TR P66 P75 B W  
 ζητι S

---

7.1 αποκτεινα[ι] P75. 7.3 π[ρος α]υ[τ]ον οι αδελφοι α[υτ]ου  
 P75. 7.3 θεωρησουσιν P75. 7.3 σου τ[α εργα] P75.  
 7.4 ου[δ]εις P75. 7.4 τι ε[ν] κρυπτ[ω ποιει] P75. 7.4 [κα]ι  
 P75.

αυτος TR P66\*\* (P75) S  
αυτο P66\* B W

παρησια TR P66 S B\*\* W  
παρησια B\*

ειναι TR P66\*\* S B W  
εινα P66\*

7.5 επιστευον TR P66 (P75) S B  
επιστευσαν W

7.6 λεγει ουν TR P66 P75 S\*\* B  
λεγει S\* W

ο ιησους TR P66 S\*\* B W  
ιησους S\*

ουπω TR P66 S\*\* B  
ου S\*  
ουδεπω W

εστιν TR P66 P75 S W  
παρεστιν B

7.7 ου δυναται ο κοσμος μεισειν υμας TR P66 B\*\*  
ο κοσμος ου δυναται μεισειν υμας S  
ου δυναται ο κοσμος μεισειν υμας (P75) B\*  
ου δυναται ο κοσμος μεισειν υμας W

μισει TR S B\*\*  
μεισει P66 P75 B\* W

εγω μαρτυρω TR P66 (P75) B W  
μαρτυρω S

7.4 [αυτ]ος P75. 7.5 [επιστ]ιτευον P75. 7.6 [λεγει] ουν P75.  
7.6 ου δυναται ο κ[οσμ]ος μεισειν υμας P75. 7.7 [εγω]  
μαρτυρω P75.

περι αυτου TR P66 (P75) B W  
omit S

7.8 αναβητε TR (P75) B  
αναβηται P66 S W

την εορτην ταυτην 1<sup>ο</sup> TR S\* S\*\*\*  
την εορτην P66 (P75) S\*\* B W

ουπω αναβαινω TR P66 (P75) B W  
ουκ αναβαινω S

ο καιρος ο εμος TR  
ο εμος καιρος P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
εμος καιρος S\*

ουπω 2<sup>ο</sup> TR P75 S B W  
ουδεπω P66

7.9 ταυτα δε TR P66\*\* (P75) B W  
ταυ δε P66\*  
ταυτα S

αυτοις TR P75 B  
αυτος P66 S W

εμεινεν TR P66 (P75) B W  
εμινεν S

γαλιλαια TR P66 (P75) S B\*\* W  
γαλειλαια B\*

7.10 τοτε και αυτος ανεβη εις την εορτην TR  
εις την εορτην τοτε και αυτος ανεβη P66 (P75) S B W

7.7 περι αυτου P75. 7.8 αναβητε P75. 7.8 [τ]ην εορτην P75.  
7.8 ουπω αναβαι[νω] P75. 7.8 ο εμος [καιρο]ς P75. 7.8 ουπω  
P75. 7.9 [τ]αυτα δε P75. 7.9 εμεινεν P75. 7.9 [γ]αλιλαια  
P75. 7.10 [εις] την [εο]ρτην τ[ο]τε και αυτος [ανεβη] P75.

αλλ TR S W  
αλλα P66 (P75) B

ως εν κρυπτω TR P66 (P75) B W  
εν κρυπτω S

7.11 εκεινος TR P66 P75 B W  
εκινος S

7.12 πολυς περι αυτου ην TR  
ην περι αυτου P66\*  
ην περι αυτου πολυς P66\*\*  
περι αυτου ην πολυς (P75) B W  
πολυς ην περι αυτου S

εν τοις οχλοις TR (P75) B W  
εν τω οχλω P66 S

αλλοι δε ελεγον TR (P75) B W  
αλλοι ελεγον P66 S

ου TR P66 S B W  
ουκ P75

7.13 ουδεις TR P66 (P75) B W  
ουδεις S

παρησια TR P66 S B W  
παρησια (P75)

ελαλει περι αυτου TR B W  
περι αυτου ελει P66\*  
περι αυτου ελαλει P66\*\* S  
ελαλει υπ αυτου (P75)

7.14 εορτης TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
ερτης S\*

---

7.10 αλλ[α] P75. 7.10 ως εν κρυπτω P75. 7.11 εκεινος P75.  
7.12 περι αυ[τ]ου ην πολυς P75. 7.12 εν το[ι]ς οχλοις P75.  
7.12 [αλ]λοi δε ελεγ[ο]ν P75. 7.13 ουδεις P75. 7.13 παρησ[ια]  
P75. 7.13 [ε]λαλει υπ [αυ]του P75.



μεσουσης TR (P75) S B  
 μεσαζουσης P66  
 μεσης ουσης W

ανεβη TR (P75) S B W  
 αναβη P66

ο ιησους TR W  
 ιησους P66 P75 S B

εδιδασκε TR  
 εδιδασκεν P66 S B W

7.15 και εθαυμαζον TR  
 εθαυμαζον ουν P66 (P75) S B W

οιδε TR  
 οιδεν P66 S B W

7.16 απεκριθη TR  
 απεκριθη ουν P66 (P75) S B W

ο ιησους TR P66 W  
 ιησους S B

7.17 εαν τις θελη το θελημα αυτου ποιειν TR P66 S B  
 εαν τις θελη το θελημα αυτου P75  
 εαν τις το θελημα αυτου ποιη W

του θεου TR P75 B W  
 θεου P66 S

7.18 την δοξαν την ιδιαν TR P66 S B W  
 την ιδιαν δοξαν (P75)

ζητει TR P66 P75 B W  
 ζητι S

7.14 με[σουσ]ης P75, propter spatium. 7.14 αναβη P75.  
 7.15 εθau[μ]αζον ουν P75. 7.16 [απεκ]ρ[ιθ]η [ου]ν P75.  
 7.18 [ι]ην ιδ[ι]αυ [δοξα]ν P75.

ο δε ζητων TR P66 (P75) B W  
 και ο ζητων S

του πεμψαντος TR P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
 του υψαντος P66\*

εστι TR  
 εστιν P66 P75 S B W

αδικια TR P66 P75 S B  
 αδικεια W

7.19 μωσης TR  
 μωσης P66 (P75) S B W

δεδωκεν TR P66 (P75) S W  
 εδωκεν B

ουδεις TR P66 (P75) B W  
 ουδισ S

ποιει TR (P75) S B W  
 πειει P66

ζητειτε TR P66 (P75) B  
 ζητειται S W

αποκτειναι TR P66\*\* (P75) B  
 αποκτιναι P66\* S W

7.20 ο οχλος TR P66\*\* S B W  
 ο οχος P66\*

και ειπε TR  
 omit P66 P75 S B W

---

7.18 ο δε ζητ[ων] P75. 7.18 του πεμψαντος P75. 7.19 μωσης  
 P75. 7.19 δεδωκεν P75. 7.19 ουδει[ς] P75. 7.19 ποιει P75.  
 7.19 [ζη]τειτε P75. 7.19 αποκτ[είν]αι P75.

ζητει TR P66 B  
ζητι S W

αποκτειναι TR P66 (P75) B  
αποκτιναι S W

7.21 ο ιησους TR W  
ιησους P66 P75 S B

θαυμαζετε TR P66 S B  
θαυμαζεται W

7.22 δια τουτο TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
omit S\*

μωσης TR  
μωυσης P66 (P75) B W  
ε μωυσης S

υμιν TR S B W  
υμειν P66

ουχ TR P66 (P75) S B\*\* W  
ουκ B\*

μωσεως TR S  
μωυσεως P66 B W

αλλ εκ των πατερων TR P66\*\* (P75) B W  
αλλ εκ πατερων P66\*  
αλλ οτι εκ των πατερων S

εν σαββατω TR P66 S W  
σαββατω B

περιτεμνετε TR P66 S B  
περιτεμνεται W

---

7.20 [αποκ]τειναι P75. 7.22 [δ]ια τουτο P75. 7.22 μωυσης P75.  
7.22 ουχ P75. 7.22 [αλ]λ εκ [των πατερων]ωγ P75.

7.23 λαμβανει TR P66 (P75) B W  
λαμβανι S

ανθρωπος TR P66 S W  
ο ανθρωπος B

μωσεως TR  
ο μωυσεως P66 S  
μωυσεως (P75) B W

χολατε TR (P75) B\*\* W  
χολαται P66 S B\*

ολον ανθρωπον TR P66 S B W  
ανθρωπον ολον (P75)

7.24 κρινετε TR (P75) S B\*\*  
κρινε P66  
κρεινετε B\*  
κρινεται W

κρινατε TR S  
κρινετε P66 P75 B  
κρινεται W

7.25 εκ TR P66 P75 B W  
omit S

ιεροσολυμιτων TR B\*\* W  
ιεροσολυμειτων P66 (P75) S B\*

ουχ TR P66 (P75) B W  
ουκ S

αποκτειναι TR P66\*\* (P75) B  
αποκτιναι P66\* S W

7.23 λαμβανε[ι] P75. 7.23 μωυσεως P75. 7.23 [χο]λατε P75.  
7.23 ανθρωπον [ο]λον P75. 7.24 κρινε[τ]ε P75.  
7.25 ι[ε]ροσολυμειτων P75. 7.25 [ου]χ P75.  
7.25 αποκτεινα[ι] P75.

7.26 ιδε TR P66 P75 S B  
ειδε W

λαλει TR P66 (P75) B W  
λαλι S

λεγουσι TR  
λεγουσιν P66 S B W

μηποτε TR P66\*\* (P75) B W  
μη πο P66\*  
μητι S

οι αρχοντες TR P66 B W  
οι αρχιερεις S

αληθως 2<sup>ο</sup> TR  
omit P66 P75 S B W

7.27 ο δε χριστος TR (P75) S\*\* B W  
ο χριστος δε P66  
ο χριστος οταν ελθη μη πλιονα σημια ποιησει η S\*

ερχηται TR (P75) B W  
ελθη P66  
ερχεται S

ουδεις TR P66 P75 B W  
ουδισ S

γινωσκει TR P66 B\*\*  
γεινωσκει (P75) B\*  
γιγνωσκει W  
γινωσκει αυτον S

7.28 εκραξεν ουν TR (P75) S B W  
εκραξεν δε P66

---

7.26 λαλει P75. 7.26 [μηπο]τε P75. 7.27 ο δ[ε] χριστος P75.  
7.27 ερχηται P75. 7.27 γεινωσκει P75. 7.28 εκραξεν ουν P75.

εν τω ιερω διδασκων ο ιησους και λεγων TR P66  
 εν τω ιερω διδασκων ιησους και λεγων (P75) B  
 ο ιησους εν τω ιερω διδασκων και λεγων S  
 εν τω ιερω διδασκων ιησους λεγων W

καμε TR P66 (P75) B W  
 και εμε S

οιδατε 1<sup>ο</sup> TR (P75) S B W  
 οιδαται P66

οιδατε 2<sup>ο</sup> TR (P75) S B W  
 οιδαται P66

ειμι TR P66 (P75) S B  
 ειμει W

αλλ TR P66 B W  
 αλλα S

αληθινος TR (P75) B  
 αληθης P66 S  
 αληθεινος W

οιδατε 3<sup>ο</sup> TR (P75) B W  
 οιδαται P66 S

7.29 εγω δε οιδα TR P66 S  
 εγω οιδα (P75) B W

παρ αυτου TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
 παρ αυτω S\*

ειμι TR P66 P75 S B  
 ειμει W

---

7.28 [ε]ν τω ιερω διδασκων ιησους και λεγων P75. 7.28 καμε  
 P75. 7.28 οιδατε P75. 7.28 οιδατε 2<sup>ο</sup> P75. 7.28 ειμ[ι]  
 P75. 7.28 αληθινος P75. 7.28 [ο]ιδατε 3<sup>ο</sup> P75. 7.29 εγω  
 οιδα P75. 7.29 παρ αυ[το]ν P75.

απεστειλεν TR (P75) B  
 απεσταλκεν P66 S  
 απεστιλεν W

7.30 εζητουν ουν TR P66\*\* (P75) B W  
 οι δε εζητουν P66\* S

επεβαλεν TR (P75) S B W  
 επεβαλλεν P66

την χειρα TR P66 (P75) S B  
 τας χειρας W

οτι ουπω εληλυθει η ωρα αυτου TR (P75) S B W  
 οτι ουδεπω εληλυθει η ωρα αυτου P66

7.31 πολλοι δε εκ του οχλου επιστευσαν TR  
 πολλοι δε επιστευσαν εκ του οχλου P66 S  
 εκ του οχλου δε πολλοι επιστευσαν (P75) B  
 εκ του ουν οχλου πολλοι επιστευσαν W

οτι ο χριστος TR  
 ο χριστος P66 P75 S B W

μητι TR  
 μη P66 P75 S B W

πλειονα TR P66 B W  
 πλιονα S

τουτων TR  
 omit P66 P75 S B W

ποιησει TR P66 P75 B W  
 ποιει S\*  
 εποιησεν S\*\*

---

7.29 απεστειλεν P75. 7.30 [εζ]ητουν ουν P75. 7.30 [επ]εβαλεν P75. 7.30 τη[ν χ]ειρα P75. 7.30 ο[τι ου]πω εληλυθει η ω[ρα αυτ]ου P75. 7.31 εκ τ[ου οχ]λ[ου δε] πολλοι επιστ[ευσαν] P75.

7.32 ηκουσαν TR (P75) B W  
ηκουσαν δε P66 S

φαρισαιοι 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 S B\*\* W  
φαρεισαιοι B\*

περι αυτου ταυτα TR (P75) B W  
ταυτα περι αυτου P66 S

απεστειλαν TR P75 B  
απεστιλαν P66 S W

οι φαρισαιοι και οι αρχιερεις υπηρετας TR  
υπηρετας οι αρχιερεις και οι φαρισαιοι P66  
οι αρχιερεις και οι φαρισαιοι υπηρετας (P75) B\*\* W  
τους υπηρετας οι αρχιερεις και οι φαρισαιοι S  
οι αρχιερεις και οι φαρεισαιοι υπηρετας B\*

7.33 ειπεν ουν αυτοις ο ιησους TR  
ειπεν ουν ο ιησους P66 S B W  
ειπεν ουν ιησους P75

μικρον χρονον TR  
χρονον μικρον P66 (P75) S B\*\* W  
χρονον μεικρον B\*

ειμι TR P66 (P75) S B  
ειμει W

πεμψαντα TR P66\*\* S B W  
πμψαντα P66\*  
πεμψοντα P75

7.34 ζητησετε TR P66 S B  
ζητησατε (P75)  
ζητησεται W

7.32 η κ[ου]σαν P75. 7.32 περι [αυτου] τα[υτ]α P75. 7.32 οι αρχ[ι]ερεις και οι φαρισαιοι υπηρετας P75. 7.33 χ[ρο]νον μικρον P75. 7.33 ειμι P75. 7.34 [ζ]ητησατ[ε] P75.



ευρησετε TR S  
 ευρησεται P66 W  
 ευρησετε με P75 B

ειμι TR P66 (P75) S B  
 ειμει W

υμεις TR P66 (P75) B W  
 υμεις S

δυνασθε TR P66 P75 B  
 δυνασθαυ S W

ελθειν TR P66 (P75) W  
 ελθιν S  
 ελθειν εκει B

7.35 ειπον TR (P75) S B W  
 ειπαυ P66

οι ιουδαιοι TR P66 S B W  
 οι ιδαιοι (P75)

προς εαυτους TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
 omit S\*

ουτος μελλει TR P75 S B W  
 μελλει ουτος P66

πορευεσθαι 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 (P75) B W  
 πορευεσθε S

ημεις TR P66 (P75) B W  
 omit S

πορευεσθαι 2<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 B W  
 πορευεσθε S

---

7.34 ειμι P75. 7.34 υμεις P75. 7.34 [ε]λθειν P75. 7.35 ειπον  
 P75. 7.35 οι ιδαιοι P75. 7.35 προς ε[α]υτους P75.  
 7.35 πορευεσθαι 1<sup>ο</sup> P75. 7.35 [ημε]ις P75.

διδασκειν TR P66 B  
 διδασκει (P75)  
 διδασκιν S W

7.36 τις TR P66 B W  
 τι S

ουτος ο λογος TR S  
 ο λογος ουτος P66 (P75) B W

ειπε TR S\* B  
 ειπεν οτι P66  
 ειπεν (P75) S\*\* W

ζητησετε TR (P75) S B  
 ζητησεται P66 W

ευρησετε TR S  
 ευρησεται P66 W  
 ευρησετε με (P75) B

ειμι TR P66 P75 S B  
 ειμει W

υμεις TR P75 B W  
 omit P66  
 υμεις S

δυνασθε TR P66 (P75) B  
 δυνασθαι S W

ελθειν TR P75 B W  
 ελθιν P66 S

7.37 εν δε τη εσχατη ημερα τη μεγαλη της εορτης TR P66\*\*(P75)SB  
 εν δε τη εσχατη ημερα της μεγαλης εορτης P66\*  
 εν δε τη εσχατη ημερα της εορτης W

---

7.35 [δι]δασκει P75. 7.36 [ο λογος ο]υτος P75. 7.36 ειπεν P75. 7.36 ζητησετε P75. 7.36 [ευρησετε] με P75. 7.36 δ[υνα]σθε P75. 7.37 εν δε τη εσχατη ημερα [τ]η μεγαλη της εορτης P75.

εισθηκει TR P75 B\*  
ισθηκει P66 S B\*\* W

εκραξε TR P66\*\* P75 B  
εκραξεν P66\* S  
εκραξεν W

εαν TR P66 P75 S B  
ει W

προς με TR P66\*\* S\*\* W  
omit P66\* S\*  
προς εμε (P75) B

πινετω TR P66 S B\*\*  
πεινετω (P75) B\* W

7.38 εις TR P66 (P75) S B\*\* W  
ει B\*

7.39 ειπε TR  
ελεγεν P66 S  
ειπεν (P75) B W

οδ TR P66 S W  
ο P75 B

εμελλον λαμβανειν TR P66 (P75) B  
ημελλον λαμβανειν S  
ελαβανον W

οι πιστευοντες TR S  
οι πιστευσαντες P66 B W

ουπω γαρ ην πνευμα αγιον TR P66\* W  
ουπω γαρ ην πνευμα P66\*\* P75 S  
ουπω γαρ ην πνευμα αγιον δεδομενον B

---

7.37 προς εμε P75. 7.37 πεινετω P75. 7.38 [ει]ς P75.  
7.39 [ει]πεν P75. 7.39 εμελλον λαμβανειν P75.

ο ιησους TR  
 ιησους P66 P75 S B W

ουδεπω TR P66 P75 W  
 ουπω S B

εδοξασθη TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 δεδοξαστο S\*

7.40 πολλοι TR P66\*  
 omit P66\*\* P75 S B W

ουν εκ του οχλου TR  
 εκ του οχλου ου P66\*  
 εκ του οχλου ουν P66\*\* (P75) S B W

τον λογον TR  
 αυτου των λογων τουτων P66\* S\*  
 των λογων τουτων P66\*\* (P75) S\*\* B  
 των λογων αυτου W

ουτος εστιν αληθως TR P66 (P75) W  
 αληθως ουτος εστιν S  
 οτι ουτος εστιν αληθως B

7.41 αλλοι δε ελεγον 2ο TR  
 οι δε ελεγον P66 (P75) B W  
 αλλοι ελεγον S

γαλιλαιας TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
 γαλειλαιας B\*

7.42 ουχι TR S  
 ουχ P66 (P75) B\*\*  
 ουκ B\*  
 ουχει W

---

7.40 εκ του οχλου [ου]γ P75. 7.40 των λογων τουτων P75.  
 7.40 ουτος εστιν αληθως P75. 7.41 οι δε ελεγον P75.  
 7.42 ουχ P75.

του σπερματος TR (P75) S B W  
 σπερματος P66

δαβιδ 1<sup>ο</sup> TR  
 δαυειδ P66 P75 B  
 δαδ S W

οπου ην δαβιδ TR  
 οπου δαυειδ P66\*  
 οπου ην δαυειδ P66\*\* P75 B  
 οπου ην ο δαδ S  
 οπου ην δαδ W

ο χριστος ερχεται TR P66 S  
 ερχεται ο χριστος P75 B W

7.43 σχισμα TR P66 (P75\*\*) S B\*\* W  
 σχισμα (P75\*) B\*

εν τω οχλω εγενετο TR  
 εγενετο εν τω οχλω P66 P75 S B W

7.44 ηθελον TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 ελεγον S\*

ουδεις TR P66 P75 B W  
 ουδεις S

επεβαλεν TR S W  
 επεβαλεν P66  
 εβαλεν P75 B

επ αυτον TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
 αυτω S\*

χειρας TR P66 P75 B S  
 χιρας S

7.42 του σπερματος P75. 7.44 επ αυτο[ν] P75.  
 7.43 σχισμα P75.

7.45 ηλθον TR P75 S B W  
ηλθαν P66

φαρισαίους TR P66 (P75) S B\*\* W  
φαρεισαίους B\*

ειπον TR (P75) B W  
λεγουσιν P66 S

αυτοις TR P66 (P75) S B  
αυ αυτοις W

εκεινοι TR S B W  
εκινουι P66

ηγαγετε TR (P75) S B  
ηγαγεται P66 W

7.46 απεκριθησαν οι υπηρεται TR P66 (P75) B  
οι δε υπηρεται απεκριθησαν S  
απεκριθησαν αυτοις οι υπηρεται W

ουδεποτε ουτως ελαλησεν ανθρωπος ως ουτος ο  
ανθρωπος TR  
ουδεποτε ουτως ανθρωπος ελαλησεν ως ουτος λαλει ο  
ανθρωπος P66\* S\*  
ουδεποτε ελαλησεν ουτως ανθρωπος P66\*\* S\*\* B W  
ουδεπωτε ελαλησεν ουτως ανθρωπος (P75)

7.47 απεκριθησαν ουν αυτοις TR P66 (P75) W  
απεκριθησαν αυτοις S  
απεκριθησαν ουν B

φαρισαιοι TR P66 S B\*\* W  
φαρεισαιοι B\*

---

7.45 φαρισαίους P75. 7.45 [ειπ]ον P75. 7.45 αυ[τοις] P75.  
7.45 [ηγ]αγετε P75. 7.45 απεκριθησαν ο[ι] υπηρετ[αι] P75.  
7.46 [ουδέ]πωτε ελαλησεν [ο]υτως αν[οσ] P75.  
7.47 [απε]κριθησαν ουν αυ[το]ις P75.

υμεις TR P66 (P75) B W  
υμεις S

πεπλανησθε TR (P75) B  
πεπλανησθαι P66 S W

7.48 εκ των αρχοντων TR P66 S B  
των αρχοντων W

επιστευσεν TR P66 S\*\* B W  
πιστευει S\*

φαρισαιων TR P66 S B\*\* W  
φαρεισαιων B\*

7.49 αλλ TR S  
αλλα P66 B W

γινωσκων TR P66 S B\*\* W  
γεινωσκων (P75) B\*

επικαταρατοι TR  
επαρατοι P66 S B W  
απαρατοι P75

εισι TR  
εισιν P66 P75 S B W

7.50 λεγει TR P75 B W  
ειπεν δε P66 S

νικοδημος TR P66 S B\*\* W  
νεικοδημος (P75) B\*

ο ελθων νυκτος προς αυτον TR  
ο ελθων προς αυτον το προτερον P66 W  
ο ελθων προς αυτον προτερον (P75) S\*\* B  
omit S\*

7.47 υμεις P75. 7.47 π[επλα]γησθε P75. 7.49 γεινω[σκ]ων P75.  
7.50 νεικ[ο]δημος P75.

7.51 κρινει TR P66 (P75) B W  
κρινι S

ακουση παρ αυτου προτερον TR  
ακουση πρωτον παρ αυτου P66 (P75) S\*\* B  
ακουση πρωτον S\*

7.52 απεκριθησαν TR P66 (P75) S B  
απεκρειθησαν W

ειπον TR S  
ειπαν P66 P75 B W

ερευνησον TR P66 B\*\*  
εραυνησον (P75) S B\*  
εραυνησον τας γραφας W

γαλιλαιας 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
γαλειλαιας B\*

ιδε TR P66 (P75) S B  
ειδε W

οτι προφητης εκ της γαλιλαιας TR S W  
οτι εκ της γαλιλαιας ο προφητης P66\* (P75)  
οτι ο προφητης εκ της γαλιλαιας P66\*\*  
οτι εκ της γαλειλαιας προφητης B\*  
οτι εκ της γαλιλαιας προφητης B\*\*

εγηγεραται TR  
εγιρεται P66  
εγειρεται P75 S B W

7.53 - 8.12 omit P66 P75 S B W

---

7.50 ο ελθων πρ[ος] αυτον προτερον P75. 7.51 κρινει P75.  
7.51 ακουση πρωτον παρ αυτου P75. 7.52 απεκριθησαν P75.  
7.52 εραυνησον P75. 7.52 ιδε P75. 7.52 οτι εκ της  
γαλιλα[ιας ο προ]φ[η]τη[ς] P75.



8.12 ο ιησους αυτοις ελαλησε λεγων TR  
 αυτοις ελαλησεν ο ιησους λεγων P66 S W\*\*  
 αυτοις ελαλησεν ιησους λεγων (P75) B  
 αυτοιη ελαλησεν ο ιησους και ειπεν W\*

εγω ειμι το φως TR P66 S\*\* B  
 εγω φως ειμι S\*  
 εγω ειμει το φως W

εμοι TR P66 S W  
 μοι B

περιπατησει TR  
 περιπατηση P66 (P75) S B W

σκοτια TR P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
 κοτια P66\*

εξει TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 χει S\*

8.13 φαρισαιοι TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
 φαρεισαιοι B\*

μαρτυρεις TR P75 B W  
 μαρτυρις P66 S

8.14 απεκριθη ιησους και ειπεν αυτοις TR (P39) P66 (P75) B W  
 ειπεν αυτοις ο ιησους S

εγω TR P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
 γω P66\*

αληθης εστιν η μαρτυρια μου TR P66 S  
 η μαρτυρια μου αληθης εστιν (P39) (P75) B W

---

8.12 [αυτοις ελ]αλησεν ιησους λεγων P75. 8.12 πε[ριπατη]ση P75. 8.12 σκοτια P75. 8.14 [ ... ] αυτοις P39; propter spatium; απεκριθη  $\overline{\tau\epsilon}$  και ειπεν αυτοις P75. 8.14 εγω P75. 8.14 η μαρ[τυρια μου] αληθης [εστιν] P39; η μαρτυρια μ[ου] αληθ[η]ς εστιν P75.

υμεις TR (P39) P75 B W  
 υμεις P66 S

δε TR P39 P66 (P75) B W  
 omit S

οιδατε TR (P39) (P75) B W  
 οιδαται P66 S

και που υπαγω 2<sup>ο</sup> TR P75\* S W  
 η που υπαγω (P39) P66 P75\*\* B

8.15 κατα TR P39 P66 S B\*\* W  
 κατα τα B\*

κρινετε TR (P39) P75 S B\*\*  
 κρινεται P66  
 κρεινετε B\*  
 κρεινεται W

εγω TR P39 P66 S B W  
 εγω δε P75

κρινω TR P66 (P75) S B\*\*  
 κρεινω B\* W

8.16 και εαν TR (P39) P66 P75 B  
 καν S  
 εαν W

κρινω TR (P39) P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
 κρεινω B\*

κρισις TR (P39) P66 (P75) S B  
 κρεσεις W

αληθης TR P66 S  
 αληθινη P75 B  
 αληθεινη W

---

8.14 [υ]μεις P39. 8.14 δε P75. 8.14 [οιδατ]ε P39; [ο]ιδατ[ε] P75. 8.14 η που υπα[γω] P39. 8.15 [κρ]ινετε P39.  
 8.15 κριν[ω] P75. 8.16 [Και εαν] P39, propter spatium.  
 8.16 [κ]ρινω P39. 8.16 [κρ]ισις P39; κρεισις P75.

ειμι TR (P75) S B  
 ιμι P66  
 ειμει W

πατηρ TR P39 P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 omit S\*

8.17 γεγραπται TR (P39) P66 (P75) B W  
 γεγραμμενον εστιν S

δυο TR (P39) P66 S B W  
 β̄ (P75)

8.18 ειμι TR P66 P75 S B  
 ειμει W

μαρτυρει περι εμου TR (P39) P75\*\* S B  
 μαρτυρι περι εμου P66 W  
 περι εμου μαρτυρει περι εμου P75\*

8.19 ο ιησους TR W  
 ιησους P39 P66 P75 B  
 ο ιησους και ειπεν S

ουτε TR P66 S B W  
 ουδε P75

οιδατε TR (P39) P75 B W  
 αιδαται P66  
 οιδαται S

ηδειτε 1<sup>ο</sup> TR (P75) B  
 ηδιται P66  
 ηδειται S W

πατερα μου 2<sup>ο</sup> TR (P39) P66 P75 B W  
 πατερα S

8.16 ειμι P75. 8.17 [γεγραπ]ται P39; γεγραπ[ται] P75.  
 8.17 δυ[ὸ] P39; [β̄] P75, propter spatium. 8.18 μ[αρτυρει περι]  
 εμου P39. 8.19 [οιδα]τε P39. 8.19 ηδειτε P75. 8.19 π̄ρ[α  
 μου] P39, propter spatium.

ηδείτε αν TR  
 αν ηδείτε (P39) P75 B  
 αν ηδεται P66  
 ηδεται αν S  
 αν ηδεται W

8.20 ρηματα TR (P39) (P75) S B W  
 ρητα P66

ο ιησους TR  
 omit P39 P66 P75 S B W

διδασκων εν τω ιερω TR (P39) P66 (P75) B W  
 omit S

ουδεις TR P66 P75 B W  
 ουδεις S

8.21 ειπεν ουν παλιν αυτοις ο ιησους TR P66\*\*  
 ειπεν ουν παλιν αυτοις (P39) P66\* (P75) B W  
 ελεγεν ουν αυτοις S

ζητησετε TR P39 P66 (P75) S\* B  
 ζητησεται S\*\* W

αμαρτια TR P66 S B W  
 αμαρτιαν P75

αποθανεισθε TR P75 B  
 αποθανισθαι P66 S  
 αποθανεισθαι W

υμεις TR P39 P66 B W  
 υμεις S

8.19 [αν η]δείτε P39. 8.20 [ρη]ματα P39; [ρ]ηματα P75.  
 8.20 διδασκω[ν εν τω] ιερω P39; [διδα]σκων εν τω [ιερω] P75.  
 8.21 [ειπεν] ουν πα[λιν αυτοις] P39; ει[πεν ου]ν παλιν  
 [αν]τοις P75. 8.21 [ζη]τησετε P75. 8.21 αποθαν[εισθε] P39;  
 απ[οθανε]ι[σθε] P75.

δυνασθε TR (P75) B  
δυνασθαι P66 S W

ελθειν TR P39 P66 P75 B W  
ελθιν S

8.22 οπου εγω TR P66 S\*\* B W  
οπου P75  
οπου αν εγω S\*

υμεις TR P66 P75 B W  
υμεις S

δυνασθε TR P75 B  
δυνασθαι P66 S W

ελθειν TR P66 P75 B W  
ελθιν S

8.23 και ειπεν TR  
ελεγεν ουν P66 S\* S\*\*\*  
και ελεγεν (P75) S\*\* B W

εστε 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 P75 S B  
εσται W

ειμι 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 P75 S B  
ειμει W

του κοσμου τουτου 1<sup>ο</sup> TR S  
τουτου του κοσμου P66 (P75) B W

εστε 2<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 P75 S B  
εσται W

ειμι 2<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 P75 S B  
ειμει W

---

8.21 [δυνα]σθε P75. 8.23 και ελεγεν P75. 8.23 τουτου [τ]ου  
κοσμου P75.

ΤΟΥ ΚΟΣΜΟΥ ΤΟΥΤΟΥ 20 TR P66 (P75) S B\*  
 ΤΟΥΤΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΚΟΣΜΟΥ W

8.24 ΕΙΠΟΝ ΟΥΝ ΥΜΙΝ ΟΤΙ TR P75 B\*\*  
 ΕΙΠΟΝ ΥΜΕΙΝ ΟΤΙ P66  
 ΕΙΠΟΝ ΟΥΝ ΥΜΙΝ W  
 ΕΙΠΟΝ ΟΥΝ ΥΜΕΙΝ ΟΤΙ B\*  
 ΕΙΠΟΝ ΥΜΙΝ ΟΤΙ S

ΑΠΟΘΑΝΕΙΣΘΕ 10 TR (P75) B  
 ΑΠΟΘΑΝΙΣΘΑΙ P66 S  
 ΑΠΟΘΑΝΕΙΣΘΑΙ W

ΠΙΣΤΕΥΣΗΤΕ TR B  
 ΠΙΣΤΕΥΣΗΤΑΙ P66 W  
 ΠΙΣΤΕΥΗΤΕ P75  
 ΠΙΣΤΕΥΣΗΤΑΙ ΜΟΙ S

ΕΙΜΙ TR P66 P75 S B  
 ΕΙΜΕΙ W

ΑΠΟΘΑΝΕΙΣΘΕ 20 TR P75 B  
 ΑΠΟΘΑΝΙΣΘΑΙ P66 S  
 ΑΠΟΘΑΝΕΙΣΘΑΙ W

8.25 ΕΛΕΓΟΝ ΟΥΝ ΑΥΤΩ TR P75 B  
 ΚΑΙ ΕΛΕΓΟΝ ΑΥΤΩ P66  
 ΕΛΕΓΟΝ ΑΥΤΩ S  
 ΕΙΠΟΝ ΟΥΝ ΑΥΤΩ W

ΚΑΙ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΙΣ Ο ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΤΗΝ ΑΡΧΗΝ ΟΤΙ ΚΑΙ ΛΑΛΩ  
 ΥΜΙΝ TR  
 ΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΙΣ Ο ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΤΗΝ ΑΡΧΗΝ ΟΤΙ ΚΑΙ ΛΑΛΩ ΥΜΙΝ P66\* W  
 ΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΙΣ Ο ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΕΙΠΟΝ ΥΜΙΝ ΤΗΝ ΑΡΧΗΝ ΟΤΙ ΚΑΙ ΛΑΛΩ  
 ΥΜΙΝ P66\*\*  
 ΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΙΣ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΤΗΝ ΑΡΧΗΝ ΟΤΙ ΚΑΙ ΛΑΛΩ ΥΜΙΝ (P75) B  
 ΕΙΠΕΝ ΟΥΝ ΑΥΤΟΙΣ Ο ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΤΗΝ ΑΡΧΗΝ ΟΤΙ ΚΑΙ ΕΝ ΛΑΛΩ  
 ΥΜΙΝ S\*  
 ΕΙΠΕΝ ΟΥΝ ΑΥΤΟΙΣ Ο ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΤΗΝ ΑΡΧΗΝ ΟΤΙ ΚΑΙ ΛΑΛΩ ΥΜΙΝ S\*\*

---

8.23 του κ[ο]σμου τουτου p75. 8.24 αποθανεισθε p75.  
 8.25 ειπεν αυτοις ιησους [τ]ην αρχην οτι και λαλω υμιν p75.

8.26 εχω TR (P75) S B W  
εχων P66

λαλειν TR P66 P75 B  
λαλιν S  
ειπειν W

κρινειν TR P66 P75 B\*\* W  
κρινιν S  
κρεινειν B\*

αλλ TR P66 (P75) S B  
αλλα W

ο πεμψας με TR P66 (P75) B W  
ο πεμψας με πατηρ S

εστι TR  
εστιν P66 P75 S B W

παρ αυτου TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
παρ αυτω S\*

λεγω TR  
λαλω P66 P75 S B W

8.27 ελεγεν TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
ελεγεν τον θεον S\*

8.28 ειπεν ουν αυτοις ο ιησους TR  
ειπεν ουν ο ιησους οτι P66\* B  
ειπεν ουν αυτοις ο ιησους οτι P66\*\* P75  
ειπεν ουν αυτοις ο ιησους παλιν S  
ειπεν ουν ο ιησους W

υψωσητε TR P75 S B  
υψωσηται P66 W

---

8.26 ε[χ]ω P75. 8.26 [α]λλ P75. 8.26 [ο] πεμψας με P75.

γνωσεσθε TR P66 P75 B  
γνωσεσθαι S W

ειμι TR P66 P75 S B  
ειμει W

ουδεν TR P75 S B W  
ουδε εν P66

εδιδαξε TR  
εδειξεν P66\*  
εδειδαξεν P66\*\* W  
εδιδαξεν P75 S B

με TR P75 S B W  
μει P66

ο πατηρ μου TR B  
ο πατηρ P66 P75 S  
omit W

ταυτα λαλω TR P66 P75 B W  
ουτως λαλω S

8.29 μετ εμου εστιν ουκ αφηκε με μονον TR  
μετ εμου εστιν ουκ αφηκεν με μονον P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
ουκ αφηκε με μονον μετ εμου εστιν S\*

ο πατηρ TR  
omit P66 P75 S B W

8.31 ο ιησους TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
ιησους S\*

υμεις TR P66 P75 B W  
υμεις S

μεινητε TR B  
μεινηται P66  
μενητε P75  
μινητε S  
μενηται W



μαθηται μου TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
 μαθηται S\*

εστε TR P66 P75 S B  
 εσται W

8.32 γνωσεσθε TR P66 P75 B  
 γνωσεσθαι S W

αληθεια TR P66 P75 B W  
 αληθια S

8.33 απεκριθησαν αυτω TR  
 απεκριθησαν προς αυτον P66 P75 S B W

ουδενι δεδουλευκαμεν TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 ουδενι δεδουλευκαμεν ουδενι P66\*

πως TR P75 S B W  
 και πως P66

συ TR P66 S B W  
 σοι P75

οτι TR P66 P75 S B  
 omit W

γενησεσθε TR P66 P75 S B  
 γενησεσθαι W

8.34 απεκριθη αυτοις ο ιησους TR P66 S W  
 απεκριθη ιησους P75  
 απεκριθη αυτοις ιησους B

εστι TR  
 εστιν P66 P75 S B W

---

8.31 μαθηται μου P75.

8.35 οικια TR P66 P75 S B  
οικεια W

ο υιος μενει εις τον αιωνα TR P75 B  
ο δε υιος μενει εις τον αιωνα P66  
omit S W

8.36 εαν ουν ο υιος υμας ελευθερωση TR P66 S\*\* B  
εαν ο υιος υμας ελευθερωση P75  
εαν ουν ο υιος υμας ελευθερωθη S\*  
εαν ουν υμας ελευθερωθη W

οντως TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
οτως P66\*

εσεσθε TR P75 B  
εστε P66  
εσεσθαι S\* W  
εσεσται S\*\*

8.37 εστε TR P75 S B  
εσται P66 W

ζητειτε TR P75 S B  
τιτε P66\*  
ζητιτε P66\*\*  
ζητειται W

με αποκτειναι TR P66 P75 B\*  
με αποκτιναι S W  
αποκτειναι με B\*\*

χωρει TR (P75) S B W  
χωρι P66

8.38 εγω ο εωρακα TR  
α εγω εωρακα P66 S B W  
α εγω εορακα P75

---

8.37 χωρει P75.

παρα τω πατρι μου TR S  
 παρα τω πατρι P66 P75 B  
 απο του πατρος ταυτα W

υμεις TR P66 P75 B W  
 υμεις S

ουν ο εωρακατε παρα τω πατρι υμων ποιειτε TR  
 ουν α εωρακατε παρα του πατρος ποιειτε P66  
 ουν α ηκουσατε παρα του πατρος λαλειτε (P75)  
 ουν α εωρακατε παρα του πατρος υμων ποιειται S\*  
 ουν α ηκουσαται παρα του πατρος υμων ποιειται S\*\*  
 ουν α ηκουσατε παρα του πατρος ποιειτε B  
 α ηκουσατε παρα του πατρος ποιειται W

8.39 ειπον TR W  
 ειπαν P66 P75 S B

εστι TR  
 εστιν P66 P75 S B W

λεγει αυτοις ο ιησους TR (P75) W  
 λεγει ουν αυτοις ο ιησους P66  
 απεκριθη αυτοις ο ιησους S  
 λεγει αυτοις ιησους B

ητε TR W  
 εστε P66 P75 S B

εποιειτε αν TR  
 ποιειται P66  
 εποιειται S\*  
 εποιειτε (P75) B\*\* W  
 ποιειτε B\*  
 εποιειται αν S\*\*

8.40 ζητειτε TR P66 (P75) B  
 ζητιτε S  
 ζητειται W

---

8.38 ουν α ηκουσατε παρα του πατρος λαλ[ειτε] P75. 8.39 λεγει  
 αυτ[οι]ς ο ιησους P75. 8.39 εποιειτε P75. 8.39 ζητειτε P75.

αποκτειναι TR P75 B  
 αποκτιναι P66 S W

αληθειαν TR P66 P75 B W  
 αληθιαν S

8.41 υμεις TR P66 P75 S\* B W  
 υμεις δε S\*\*

ποιειτε TR P66 P75 B  
 ποιειται S W

ειπον ουν αυτω TR  
 ειπαν ουν αυτω P66  
 ειπον αυτω P75 B  
 ειπαν αυτω S W

ημεις TR P66 P75 B W  
 ημεις S

πορνειας TR P75 B  
 πορνιαις P66 S W

ου γεγεννημεθα TR P75 S\*\*  
 ου γεγεννημεθα P66 W  
 ουκ εγεννημεθα S\*  
 ουκ εγεννηθημεν B

8.42 ειπεν ουν TR S  
 ειπεν P66 P75 B W

ο ιησους TR P75 S W  
 ιησους P66 B

πατηρ TR P66 P75 S W  
 ο πατηρ B

υμων TR P66 P75 B W  
 ημων S

εγω γαρ εκ του θεου εξηλθον TR P75 S B W  
 εκ γαρ του θεου εξεληλυθα P66

ουδε γαρ απ εμαυτου εληλυθα TR P75 S B  
 ου γαρ απ εμαυτου εληλυθα P66  
 ουδε γαρ απ εμαυτου ουκ εληλυθα W

αλλ TR P66 P75 S B  
 αλλα W

απεστειλε TR  
 απεσταλκεν P66  
 απεστειλεν P75 B  
 απεστιλεν S W

γινωσκετε TR B\*\*  
 γινωσκεται P66 S W  
 γεινωσκετε P75 B\*

8.43 δυνασθε TR P75 S B  
 δυνασθαι P66 W

8.44 εκ πατρος TR  
 εκ του πατρος P66 P75 S B W

εστε TR P66 P75 B  
 εσται S W

επιθυμιας TR P75 S B  
 επιθυμειας P66 W

θελετε TR P75 S B  
 θελεται P66 W

εκεινος TR P66 P75 B W  
 εκινος S

αληθεια 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P75 B W  
 αληθεια P66 S

ουχ εστηκεν TR P75 B\*\* W  
 ουκ εστηκεν P66 S B\*

ουκ εστιν αληθεια TR P75 B W  
 αληθεια ουκ εστιν P66  
 ουκ εστιν αληθεια S

ψευδος TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
ευδος P66\*

εστι TR  
εστιν P66 P75 S B W

8.45 αληθειαν TR P75 B W  
αληθιαν P66 S

πιστευετε TR P66 P75 S B  
πιστευεται W

8.46 ελεγχει TR P66 S B W  
ελεγξει P75

αμαρτιας TR P66 P75\*\* S B W  
αμαρτειας P75\*

δε TR  
omit P66 P75 S B W

αληθειαν TR P66 (P75) B W  
αληθιαν S

διατι TR P66 P75 S B W\*\*  
τι W\*

υμεις ου πιστευετε μοι TR P66\*\* P75 B  
υμεις ου πιστευετε P66\*  
υμεις ου πιστευεται μοι S  
ου πιστευεται μοι W

8.47 ακουετε TR P75 S B  
ακουεται P66 W

εστε TR P66 P75 S B  
εσται W

8.46 αληθειαν P75.

8.48 απεκριθησαν ουν TR  
 απεκριθησαν P66 P75 S B W

ειπον TR P66  
 ειπαν P75 S B W

λεγομεν ημεις TR P75 S B W  
 ημεις ελεγομεν P66

σαμαρειτης TR P75 B  
 σαμαριτης P66 S W

ει ου TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 ει S\*

8.49 απεκριθη ιησους TR P66 P75 B W  
 απεκριθη ιησους και ειπεν S

δαιμονιον TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 δαιμονι P66\*

τιμω TR P66 S B\*\* W  
 τειμω P75 B\*

υμεις TR P66 P75 B W  
 υμεις S

ατιμαξετε TR P66 S B\*\*  
 ατειμαξετε P75 B\*  
 ατιμαζεται W

8.50 ζητων και δρινων TR P66\*\* S B\*\* W  
 ζητων κρινων P66\*  
 ζητων και κρεινων (P75) B\*

8.51 λεγω TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 λε P66\*

---

8.50 ζητων και κρεινων P75.

τον λογον τον εμον TR P66  
 τον εμον λογον P75 S B W

τηρηση TR P66 P75 B W  
 τηρησει S

θανατον ου μη θεωρηση TR P75 B W  
 θανατον ου μη ιδη P66  
 θανατον ου μη θεωρησει S

8.52 ειπον ουν TR P75  
 ειπον P66 B W  
 ειπαν S

απεθανε TR  
 απεθανεν P66 (P75) S B W

συ λεγεις TR P66 S B W  
 συ λεγεις οτι P75

τις τον λογον μου TR (P75) S B W  
 τις μου τον λογον P66

ου μη γευσεται θανατου TR  
 ου μη γευσηται θανατου P66 (P75) S\*\* W  
 ου μη γευσηται S\*  
 θανατον ου μη θεωρηση B

8.53 μειζων TR P75 B W  
 μιζων P66 S

του πατρος ημων TR P66\*\* P75 S B  
 του πτρος ημων P66\*  
 του W

οστις απεθανε TR  
 οτι απεθανεν P66\*  
 οστις απεθανεν P66\*\* P75 S B W

---

8.51 θανατον ου μη θεωρηση P75. 8.52 απεθανεν P75. 8.52 τις τον λογον μου P75. 8.52 ου μη γευσηται θανάτου P75.



σου ποιεεις TR  
 ποιεεις P66 P75 S B W

8.54 ιησους TR P66 P75 B W  
 ο ιησους S

εαν εγω δυξαζω εμαυτον TR S\*\*  
 εαν εγω δοξασω εμαυτον P66 P75 S\* S\*\*\* B W

ο πατηρ μου TR P66 P75 S B  
 ο πατηρ W

λεγετε TR P75 B  
 λεγεται P66 S W

οτι θεος υμων εστι TR  
 οτι ο θεος ημων εστιν P66  
 οτι θεος ημων εστιν P75 B\*\* W  
 οτι θεος υμων εστιν S B\*

8.55 εγνωκατε TR P66 P75 B W  
 εγνωκαται S

και εαν ειπω TR P66  
 καν ειπω υμιν P75  
 καν ειπω S B W

εσομαι ομοιος υμων ψευστης TR S  
 εσομαι υμων ομοιος ψευστης P66  
 εσομαι ομοιος υμιν ψευστης P75 B W

αλλ TR P75 S  
 αλλα P66 B W

8.56 αβρααμ TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 αβραμ P66\*

ιδη TR P66 P75 B\*\*  
 ειδη S B\* W

ειδε TR  
 ειδεν P66 S B W  
 ιδεν P75\* P75\*\*\*  
 ιδε P75\*\*

8.57 ειπον TR P66 P75 B W  
ειπαν S

και αβρααμ εωρακας TR  
και αβρααμ εορακας P66 B\*\*  
και αβρααμ εορακεν σε P75  
και αβρααμ εωρακεν σε S  
και αβρααμ εορακες B\* W

8.58 ο ιησους TR P66 S W  
ιησους P75 B

ειμι TR P66 P75 S B  
ειμει W

8.59 ιησους δε TR P66 P75 S  
ιησους B W

διελθων δια μεσου αυτων και παρηγεν ουτως TR  
omit P66 P75 S\* B W  
και διελθων δια μεσου αυτων επορευετο και παρηγεν  
ουτως S\*\*  
και διελθων δια μεσου αυτων S\*\*\*

9.2 ραββι TR  
ραββει P66 P75 S B W

γονεις TR P66 P75 B W  
γονις S

9.3 ο ιησους TR  
ιησους P66 P75 S B W

γονεις TR P66 P75 B W  
γονις S

9.4 εμε TR S\*\*  
ημας P66 P75 S\* B W

δει TR P66 P75 S B  
δι W

με TR S\*\* B  
 ημας P66 P75 S\* W

εως TR P66 P75 S B  
 ως W

ουδεις TR P66 P75 B W  
 ουδεις S

εργαζεσθαι TR P75 S B\*\* W  
 εργαζεσθε P66 B

9.5 ὦ TR P75 S B W  
 omit P66

ειμι TR P66 P75 S B  
 ειμει W

9.6 επτυσε TR  
 επτυσεν P66 P75 S B W

χαμαι TR P66 P75 S B  
 χαμε W

εποιησε TR  
 εποιησεν P66 P75 S B W

επεχρισε TR  
 επεχρισεν P66 S W  
 επεχρεισεν P75  
 επεθηκεν B

τον πηλον ειπ τους οφθαλμους του τυφλου TR W\*\*  
 αυτου τον πηλον επι τους οφθαλμους P66 P75\*\* S B  
 αυτον τον πηλον επι τους οφθαλμους P75\*  
 τον πηλον επι τους οφθαλμους τυ τυφλου W\*

9.7 νιψαι TR P66 P75 S B  
 νειψε W

του σιλωαμ TR P66\*\* S B W  
 του σιωαμ P66\*  
 του σειλωαμ P75

ερμηνευεται TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
 ερμηνευετε B\*

ουν και ενιψατο και ηλθε TR  
 ουν και ενιψατο και ηλθεν P66 P75 S W  
 omit B

9.8 οι ουν γειτονες TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 οι ουν γειτονεις αυτου P66\*

τυφλος TR  
 προσειτης P66 W  
 προσαιτης P75 S B

εστιν TR P66 S B W  
 omit P75

προσαιτων TR P66 P75 S B\* W  
 προσσαιτων B\*\*

9.9 ' οτι ουτος εστιν TR P75 B  
 ουτος εστιν P66 S W

αλλοι δε TR  
 αλλοι ελεγον P66 P75 B W  
 αλλοι δε ελεγον S

οτι ομοιος αυτω εστιν TR  
 ουχι αλλα ομοιος αυτω εστιν P66 S W  
 ουχι αλλ ομοιος αυτω εστιν (P75) B

εκεινος ελεγεν TR P75 S\*\* B W  
 εκεινος δε ελεγεν P66 S\*

οτι εγω ειμι TR (P75) S\* B  
 εγω ειμι P66 S\*\*  
 οτι εγω ειμει W

---

9.9 ουχι αλλ ομοιος αυτω εστιν P75. 9.9 οτι εγω ε[ι]μι P75.

9.10 ελεγον ουν αυτω TR P75 S\*\* B W  
 ειπαν ουν αυτω P66  
 ελεγαν ουν οι ιουδαιοι αυτω S\*

πως TR P75 B W  
 πως ουν P66 S

ανεωχθησαν TR  
 ηνεωχθησαν P66 (P75) S B W

σου TR P66\*\* P75\*\* S B W  
 omit P66\*  
 σοι P75\*

οι οφθαλμοι TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 οι οφθαλμοι P66\*

9.11 εκεινος TR P75 S B W  
 εκινος P66

και ειπεν TR  
 omit P66 P75 S B W

ανθρωπος TR P75 W  
 ο ανθρωπος P66 S B

λεγομενος TR W  
 ο λεγομενος P66 P75 S B

εποιησε TR  
 εποιησεν P66 P75 S B W

επεχρισε TR  
 επεχρισεν P66 S B\*\* W  
 επεχρεισε P75  
 επεχρεισεν B\*

ειπε TR  
 ειπεν P66 P75 S B W

---

9.10 ηνεωχθη[σ]αν P75.

υπαγε TR P75 W  
 οτι υπαγε P66 S B

την κολυμβηθραν TR  
 omit P66 P75 S B W

του σιλωαμ TR  
 τον σειλωαμ P75 B\*  
 τον σιλωαμ P66 S B\*\* W

απελθων δε TR  
 απελθων ουν P66 P75 S B W

9.12 ειπον ουν αυτω TR  
 ειπαν ουν αυτω P66  
 και ειπον αυτω P75  
 και ειπαν αυτω S B W

9.13 φαρισαιους TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
 φαρεισαιους B\*

9.14 οτε TR  
 εν η ημερα P66 P75 S B W

ανεωξεν TR P66 P75 S B  
 ηνεωξεν W

9.15 ηρωτων TR P75 S B W  
 ηρωτουν P66

και οι φαρισαιοι TR P75 S B\*\* W  
 οι φαρισαιοι P66\*  
 οι και φαρισαιοι P66\*\*  
 και οι φαρεισαιοι B\*

επι τους οφθαλμους TR  
 μου επι τους οφθαλμους P66 (P75) S B W

---

9.15 μου επι τους οφθαλμους P75.

9.16 ελεγον TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
ελεγαν S\*

φαρισαιων TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
φαρεισαιων B\*

ουτος ο ανθρωπος ουκ εστι παρα του θεου TR  
ουκ εστιν ουτος παρα θεου ο ανθρωπος P66 P75 S B W

τηρει TR P66 P75 B W  
τηρι S

αλλοι TR P66 P75  
αλλοι δε S B W

τοιαυτα σημεια TR P66 P75 B  
τοιαυτα σημια S  
σημια τοιαυτα W

9.17 σχισμα TR P75 S B W  
σχισμα P66

λεγουσι τω τυφλω TR  
λεγουσιν ουν τω τυφλω P66 P75 B W  
λεγουσιν ουν τω ποτε τυφλω S

παλιν TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
παλιν ουν S\*

συ τι TR P75 W  
τι συ P66 S B

περι αυτου TR P66 B W  
περι σεαυτου P75 S

ηνοιξε TR  
ηνοιξεν P66 S  
ηγεωξεν P75 B W

9.18 τυφλος ην TR  
ην τυφλος P66 P75 S B W

ΟΤΟΥ TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 ΟΥ P66\*

ΕΦΩΝΗΣΑΝ TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 ΟΦΩΝΗΣΑΝ S\*

ΓΟΝΕΙΣ TR P66 P75 B W  
 ΓΟΝΙΣ S

ΤΟΥ ΑΝΑΒΛΕΨΑΝΤΟΣ TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 OMIT P66\*

9.19 ΗΡΩΤΗΣΑΝ TR P75 S B W  
 ΕΠΗΡΩΤΗΣΑΝ P66

ΛΕΓΟΝΤΕΣ TR P66 P75 S\*\* B  
 OMIT S\* W

ΟΥΤΟΣ TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 ΕΙ ΟΥΤΟΣ S\*

ΥΜΕΙΣ TR P75 S B W  
 ΥΜΙΣ P66

ΛΕΓΕΤΕ TR P66 P75 B  
 ΛΕΓΕΤΑΙ S W

ΕΓΕΝΝΗΘΗ TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 ΕΓΕΝΗΘΗ S\*

ΑΡΤΙ ΒΛΕΠΕΙ TR P66  
 ΒΛΕΠΕΙ ΑΡΤΙ P75 B W  
 ΒΛΕΠΙ ΑΡΤΙ S

9.20 ΑΠΕΚΡΙΘΗΣΑΝ ΑΥΤΟΙΣ TR  
 ΑΠΕΚΡΙΘΗΣΑΝ ΟΥΝ P66 P75 S B  
 ΑΠΕΚΡΙΘΗΣΑΝ W

ΓΟΝΕΙΣ TR P66 P75 B W  
 ΓΟΝΙΣ S



ειπον TR  
ειπαν P66 P75 S B W

9.21 ή TR P66 P75 S B W\*\*  
omit W\*

ηνοιξεν TR P66 P75 B  
ηνυξεν S  
ηνεωξεν W

αυτος ηλικιαν εχει αυτον ερωτησατε αυτος περι αυτου  
λαλησει TR  
αυτον ερωτησατε ηλικιαν εχει αυτος περι εαυτου  
λαλησει P66 S\*\* B  
αυτος ηλικιαν εχει αυτος περι εαυτου λαλησει (P75)  
αυτος ηλικιαν εχει περι εαυτου λαλησει S\*  
ηλικιαν εχει αυτος περι εαυτου λαλησει W

9.22 ειπον TR P75 B W  
ειπαν S

γονεις TR P75 B W  
γονις P66 S

γαρ TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
γα P66\*

συνετεθειντο TR P66 (P75) B  
συνετεθειντο S  
συνεθεντο W

εαν TR P66 S B  
αν P75 W

αυτον ομολογηση TR S B W  
ομολογηση αυτον P66 P75

9.23 γονεις TR P66 (P75) B W  
γονις S

9.21 αυτος ηλικιαν εχει αυτος περι εαυτου λαλησει P75.  
9.22 συνετεθειν[το] P75. 9.23 γονεις P75.

ειπον TR P66 W\*  
ειπαν P75 S B W\*\*

ηλικιαν TR P66 S B  
ηλικειαν P75 W

εχει TR P75 B W  
εχει και P66  
omit S\*  
εχι S\*\*

ερωτησατε TR  
επερωτησαται P66 S  
επερωτησατε P75 B W

9.24 εκ δευτερου τον ανθρωπον TR  
τον ανθρωπον εκ τερου P66\*  
τον ανθρωπον εκ δευτερου P66\*\* P75 S B W

ειπον TR  
ειπαν P66 P75 S B W

ημεις TR P66 P75 B W  
ημεις S

ο ανθρωπος ουτος TR  
ουτος ο ανθρωπος P66 P75 S B W

αμαρτωλος TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
ο αμαρτωλος S\*

9.25 και ειπεν TR  
omit P66 P75 S B W

ουκ οίδα TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
ου δα P66\*

εν TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
εν δε S\*

9.26 ειπον δε TR  
ειπον ουν P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
ειπαν S\*

παλιν τι TR S\*\*  
 τι παλιν P66  
 τι P75 S\* B W

εποιησε TR  
 εποιησεν P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 εποιησαν S\*

ηνοιξε TR  
 ηνεξεν P66\*  
 ηνεωξεν P66\*\* P75 W  
 ηνυξεν S  
 ηνοιξεν B

οφθαλμους TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 οφθαλμου P66\*

9.27 ουκ ηκουσατε TR P75 S B W  
 ηκουσεται P66

τι TR P66 S W  
 τι ουν P75 B

παλιν θελετε TR P75 B  
 θελετε παλιν P66  
 παλιν θελεται S W

υμεις TR P66 P75 B W  
 υμεις S

θελετε 2ο TR P75 B  
 θελεται P66 S W

αυτου μαθηται TR P75 B W  
 μαθηται αυτου P66 S

9.28 ελοιδορησαν ουν TR  
 ελοιδορησαν P66  
 και ελοιδορησαν P75 S\* B W  
 οι δε ελοιδορησαν S\*\*

ειπον TR P75 B  
 ειπαν P66 S W

ου ει μαθητης εκεινου TR  
 ου μαθητης εκεινου ει P66  
 ου μαθητης ει εκεινου P75 B W  
 ου μαθητης ει εκεινου S

δε TR P75 S B W  
 γαρ P66

του μωσεως TR B  
 μωεως P66\*  
 μωυσεως P66\*\*  
 του μωυσεως P75 S W

9.29 ημεις οιδαμεν TR P75 B W  
 ημεις δε οιδαμεν P66  
 ημεις οιδαμεν S

μωση TR  
 μωυσει P66 P75 S B W

λελαληκεν TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
 λελακεν B\*

9.30 απεκριθη ο ανθρωπος και ειπεν αυτοις TR P66\*\* P75\*\* S B W  
 απεκριθη και ειπεν ο ανθρωπος P66\*  
 απεκριθη δ ο ανθρωπος και ειπεν αυτοις P75\*

εν γαρ τουτω θαυμαστον εστιν TR  
 τουτο γαρ το θαυμαστον εστιν P66  
 εν τουτω γαρ το θαυμαστον εστι P75  
 εν τουτω γαρ το θαυμαστον εστιν S B W

οιδατε TR P75 B W  
 οιδαται P66 S

εστι TR  
 εστιν P66 P75 S B W

ανεωξε TR  
 ηνοιξεν P66 (P75) S B  
 ηνεωξεν W

---

9.30 ηνοιξεν P75.

- 9.31 δε TR W  
omit P66 P75 S B
- αμαρτων ο θεος TR P66 P75 S W  
ο θεος αμαρτων B
- αλλ TR P66 (P75) S  
αλλα B W
- η TR P75 S B W  
ην P66
- θελημα TR P66 S B W  
θελεμα P75
- 9.32 ηνοιξε TR  
ηνοιξεν P66 S  
ανεωξεν P75  
ηνεωξεν B W
- 9.33 ει μη ην ουτος παρα θεου TR (P75) S B W  
ει μη ην ουτος παρα θεου ο ανθρωπος P66
- 9.34 ειπον TR  
ειπαν P66 P75 S B W
- εν αμαρτιας TR (P75) S B W  
εν αμαρτιας P66
- εγεννηθης TR P66 S B W  
εγενηθης P75
- ο\_λος TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
ο λογος P66\*
- εξεβαλον TR P75 S B  
εξεβαλαν P66 W

---

9.31 αλλ P75. 9.33 ει μη ην ουτος παρα θεου P75.  
9.34 αμαρτιας P75.

9.35 ηκουσεν TR P66 P75 S\*\* B  
 και ηκουσεν S\*  
 ηκουσεν δε W

ο ιησους TR P66 S\*\* W  
 ιησους P75 S\* B

εξεβαλον TR P75 S B W  
 εξεβαλαν P66

εξω TR P66 P75 S B  
 omit W

αυτω TR P66 S\*\*  
 omit P75 S\* B W

τον υιον του θεου TR  
 τον υιον του ανθρωπου P66 P75 S B W

9.36 απεκριθη εκεινος και ειπε τις εστι κυριε TR  
 απεκριθη εκεινος και τις εστιν εφη κυριε P66\*  
 απεκριθη εκεινος και τις εστιν κυριε P66\*\*  
 και τις εστιν εφη κυριε (P75) B W  
 απεκριθη εκεινος και ειπεν κυριε τις εστιν S\*  
 απεκριθη εκεινος και ειπεν κυριε και τις εστιν S\*\*

9.37 ειπε δε TR  
 ειπεν P66 P75 B W  
 εφη S

ο ιησους TR P75 S B W  
 ιησους P66

εωρακας TR S B\*\*  
 εορακας P66 P75 B\* W

εκεινος TR P75 S B W  
 αυτος P66

---

9.36 και τις εστιν εφη  $\overline{\kappa\epsilon}$  P75.

9.38, 39 ο δε εφη πιστευω κυριε και προσεκυνησεν αυτω και  
ειπεν ο ιησους TR P66 B  
ο δε εφη πιστευω κυριε και προσεκυνησεν αυτω και ειπεν  
ιησους S\*\*  
omit P75 S\* W

9.39 εις τον κοσμον τουτον ηλθον TR S B W  
ηλθον εις τον κοσμον P66\*  
ηλθον εις τον κοσμον τουτον P66\*\*  
εις τον κοσμον τουτον εληλυθα P75

βλεπωσι TR  
βλεπωσιν P66\*\* P75 S B W  
πωσιν P66\*

οι βλεποντες TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
οι μη βλεποντες P66\*

9.40 και ηκουσαν TR  
ηκουσαν P66 P75 S B W

φαρισαιων TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
φαρεισαιων B\*

ταυτα TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
omit S\* S\*\*\*

οι οντες μετ αυτου TR  
οι μετ αυτου οντες P66 P75 S B W

ειπον TR P66 P75 B  
ειπαν S W

ημεις TR (P75) S B W  
υμεις P66

9.41 ο ιησους TR S W  
ιησους P66 P75 B

ειχετε TR P75 S B  
ειχεται P66 W

---

9.40 ημεις P75.

λεγετε TR P75 S B  
 λεγεται P66 W

η ουν αμαρτια υμων μενει TR  
 η αμαρτια υμων μενει P66 S\* S\*\*\* B  
 και η αμαρτια υμων μενει (P75)  
 αι αμαρτια υμων μενουσιν S\*\* W

10.1 λεγω υμιν TR P75 S W  
 λεγω υμειν P66  
 υμιν λεγω B

εστι TR  
 εστιν P66 P75 S B W

10.2 εισερχομενος TR P66 S B W  
 ερχομενος P75

ποιμην εστι TR  
 ποιμην εστιν P66 P75 S B  
 εκεινος εστιν ο ποιμην W

10.3 ο θυρωρος TR P75 S B W  
 ο θυρουρος P66

ανοιγει TR P66 (P75) B W  
 ανυγει S

προβατα 2<sup>ο</sup> TR (P75) S B W  
 προβατια P66

καλει TR  
 φωνι P66  
 φωνει P75 S B W

10.4 και 1<sup>ο</sup> TR  
 omit P66 P75 S B W

---

9.41 και η αμαρτια υμων μενει P75. 10.3 ανοιγει P75.  
 10.3 προβατια P75.



τα ιδια προβατα εκβαλη TR  
 τα ιδια εκβαλη παντα P66\*  
 τα ιδια παντα εκβαλη P66\*\* P75 S\*\* B W  
 τα ιδια εκβαλη S\* S\*\*\*

οιδασι TR P66 P75 B  
 οιδασιν S W

την φωνην αυτου TR P75 S B W  
 αυτου την φωνην P66

10.5 ακολουθησωσιν TR P66 P75 S W  
 ακολουθησουσιν B

οιδασι TR P66 P75 S B  
 οιδασιν W

10.6 εκεινοι δε ουκ εγνωσαν τινα ην α ελαλει αυτοις TR  
 P66\*\* P75 B W  
 εκεινοι δε ουκ εγνω τι ελαλει αυτοις P66\*  
 και ουκ εγνωσαν τινα ην α ελαλει αυτοις S\*  
 εκινοι δε ουκ εγνωσαν τινα ην α ελαλει αυτοις S\*\*

10.7 ειπεν ουν παλιν αυτοις ο ιησους TR  
 ειπεν αυτοις ο ιησους P66\*  
 ειπεν ουν αυτοις ο ιησους (P45) P66\*\* S\*\* W  
 ειπεν ουν παλιν ο ιησους P75  
 ειπεν ουν παλιν ιησους B  
 ειπεν ουν αυτοις παλιν ο ιησους S\* S\*\*\*

λεγω υμιν TR (P45) P66 (P75) S W  
 υμιν λεγω B

οτι TR P66 S W  
 omit P75 B

ειμι TR P66 P75 S B  
 ειμει W

---

10.7 [ειπ]ε[ν ουν] αυτοις ο ιησους P45. 10.7 [λεγ]ω υμιν P45;  
 λεγω υμιν P75.

η θυρα TR P66 S B W  
η ποιμην P75

10.8 παντες οσοι προ εμου ηλθον TR  
παντες οσοι ηλθον προ εμου P66 S\*\* B W  
παντες οσοι ηλθον (P45) P75 S\*

κλεπται TR (P45) (P75) S B W  
κλεπτε P66

εισι TR  
εισιν P45 P66 (P75) S B W

ηκουσαν TR P66 P75 S B W  
ηκουσεν (P45)

10.9 εγω TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
εγω η S\*

ειμι TR P66 P75 S B  
ειμει W

εαν TR P45 P66 S B  
αν P75 W

και εισελευσεται TR P45 P66 (P75) S B\*\*  
και εισελευσεται B\*  
omit W

εξελευσεται TR (P45) P75 S B W  
εξελευσετε P66

10.10 ο κλεπτης TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
ο κλεπης P66\*

ερχεται ει μη TR P45 P66 P75\*\* S B\*\* W  
ερχεται η μη B\*  
ερχεται τι μη P75\*

---

10.8 παντες οσοι [ηλθον] P45, propter spatium. 10.8 [κλεπτα] P45; κλεπται P75. 10.8 εισιν P75. 10.8 [η]κουσεν P45.  
10.9 και εισελευσεται P75. 10.9 εξ[ε]λ[ε]υσεται P45.

κλεψη TR P45 P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 κεψη P66\*

ζωην TR P45 P66 P75 B W  
 ζωην αιωνιον S

εχωσι TR P45  
 εχωσιν P66 P75 S B W

και περισσον εχωσιν TR P45 P66\*\* S B  
 omit P66\*  
 και περισσοτερον εχωσιν P75  
 και περισσον εχωσιν W

10.11 ειμι TR P45 P66 P75 S B  
 ειμει W

ο ποιμην ο καλος 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 (P75) S B W  
 ο καλος ποιμην (P45)

ο ποιμην ο καλος 2<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 P75 S B W  
 ο καλος ποιμην P45

τιθησιν TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 διδωσιν P45 S\*

10.12 ο μισθωτος δε TR  
 ο μισθωτος (P45) P75 B W  
 ο δε μισθωτος P66 S

εισι TR  
 εστιν P45 P66 P75 S B W

τα προβατα ιδια TR P66 S B W  
 ιδια τα προβατα P45  
 τα προβατα τα ιδια P75

θεωρει TR P66 P75 B W  
 θεωρι S

---

10.11 ο καλος πο[ιμην] P45; ο ποιμην ο καλος P75. 10.12 [ο]  
 μισθωτος P45.

αφιησι TR B  
 αφειησιν P45  
 αφιησιν P66 P75 S W

τα προβατα 30 TR  
 omit P45 P66 P75 S B W

10.13 ο δε μισθωτος φευγει TR  
 omit P45 P66 P75 S B W

οτι μισθωτος εστι TR  
 οτι μισθωτος εστιν P45 P66 (P75) S B  
 omit W

μελει TR P75 S B W  
 μελι P66

10.14 ειμι TR P45 P66 P75 S B  
 ειμει W

γινωσκω TR P66 B\*\* W  
 γεινωσκω (P45) (P75) S B\*

γινωσκομαι TR  
 γεινωσκουσι P45\* P75 S B\*  
 γεινωσκει P45\*\*  
 γινωσκουσι P66 B\*\*  
 γεινωσκουσιν W

υπο των εμων TR  
 με τα εμα P45 P66 (P75) S B W

10.15 καθως TR P66 (P75) S B W  
 και καθως P45

γινωσκει TR B\*\*  
 γεινωσκει (P45) P66 (P75) B\* W  
 γινωσκει S

10.13 οτι μισθωτος εστιν P75. 10.14 γειν[ωσκω] P45; γει[νωσκω]  
 P75. 10.14 μ[ε τα ε]μα P75. 10.15 [κα]θως P75.  
 10.15 γεινωσκει P45; γεινωσκει P75.

γινωσκω TR P66 S B\*\* W  
 γεινωσκω P45 (P75) B\*

τιθημι TR S\*\* B  
 διδωμι P45 P66 S\* W

10.16 αλλα TR P45 S B W  
 αλλα δε P66

α TR P66 P75 S B W  
 απερ P45

εκ TR P45 P66 S B  
 omit W

αυλης TR P66\*\* S B W  
 αυης P66\*

με δει TR  
 δει με P45 P66 (P75) S B W

αγαγειν TR P45 B W  
 συναγαγειν P66  
 αγαγιν S

ακουσουσι TR  
 ακουσουσιν P66 (P75) B  
 ακουσωσιν S W

γενησεται TR P66 S\*  
 γενησονται P45 S\*\* B W

10.17 ο πατηρ με TR W  
 με ο πατηρ P66 (P75) S B

τιθημι TR P45 P66 S B  
 τιθημει W

---

10.15 γειν[ωσκω] P75. 10.16 δει μ[ε] P75. 10.16 ακουσουσ[ιν]  
 P75. 10.17 με ο πατηρ P75.

μου TR P45 P66 S B W  
omit P75

αυτην TR P66 S B W\*\*  
αυτα W\*

10.18 ουδεις TR P45 P66 B W  
ουδεις S

αιρει TR  
ηρεν P45 S\* B  
ερι P66  
ερει S\*\* W

αλλ TR P66 S B W  
αλλα P45

τιθημι TR P45 P66 S B  
τιθημει W

εξουσιαν 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P45 P66 (P75) S B  
και εξουσιαν W

θειναι TR P45 S B W  
θιναι P66

εξουσιαν εχω παλιν TR P66 P75 S B W  
παλιν εξουσιαν εχω (P45)

λαβειν TR (P75) B W  
λαβιν P66 S

ταυτην την εντολην ελαβον TR P66 P75 S W  
ταυτην ελαβον εντολην (P45)  
ταυτην εντολην ελαβον B

10.18 εξουσιαν P75. 10.18 παλιν εξου[σιαν εχω] P45.  
10.18 λαβειν[ν] P75. 10.18 ταυτην ελαβον [ε]ντολην P45;  
ταυτην τ[η]ν εντολην ελαβον P75.

παρα του πατρος μου    TR (P45) P66 (P75) S B W\*\*  
 απο του πατρος μου    W\*\*

10.19 ουν    TR P66  
 omit    (P45) P75 S B W

10.20 ελεγον δε    TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
 ελεγαν ουν    S\*  
 ελεγον ουν    S\*\*\*

δαιμονιον    TR P66 (P75) S B W  
 οτι δαιμονιον    (P45)

μαινεται    TR (P45) (P75) S B W  
 μενεται    P66

αυτου    TR P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
 ατου    P66\*

ακουετε    TR B  
 ακουεται    P66 S W

10.21 αλλοι ελεγον    TR (P45) P75 B  
 αλλοι δε ελεγον    P66 S  
 ελεγον δε αλλοι    W

εστι    TR  
 εστιν    P45 P66 S B W

δυναται    TR P45 P66\*\* S B W  
 υναται    P66\*

ανοιγειν    TR  
 ανοιξαι    P66 B W  
 ανυξαι    S

10.18 [π]αρα του [πατρος μου] P45; παρ[α] του π[ατρος μου] P75.  
 10.19 omit ουν P45, propter spatium. 10.20 [ελε]γον δε P75.  
 10.20 οτι δαιμον[ιο]ν P45; [δαι]μονιο[ν] P75. 10.20 μαινε[ται]  
 P45; μα[ινε]ται P75. 10.20 αυτ[ου] P75. 10.21 [αλλ]οι ελεγον  
 P45; [α]λλοι ελεγ[ον] P75.

10.22 εγενετο δε TR S  
εγενετο τοτε P66 P75 B W

εγκαινια TR (P75) B\*\*  
ενκαινια P45 P66 B\*  
ενγαινια S  
ενκενια W

τοις ιεροσολυμοις TR P66 B W  
ιεροσολυμοις (P45) S

και χειμων TR  
χειμων δε P45  
χειμων P66 (P75) S B W

10.23 ο ιησους TR P66 S W  
ιησους B

του σολομωντος TR W  
του σολομωνος (P45) P66 B  
σολομωνος S\*  
σολομωντος S\*\*

10.24 εκυκλωσαν TR P66 (P75) S W  
εκυκλευσαν B

αυτον TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
omit S\*

αιρεις TR P66 (P75) B  
ερεις S W

ειπε TR P66 S\*\* B W  
ειπον S\* S\*\*\*

ημιν TR S B W  
ημειν P66

---

10.22 [εγενε]το τοτε P75. 10.22 [ε]γκαιν[ια] P75.  
10.22 ιεροσ[ολυμο]ις P45. 10.22 χειμων P75. 10.23 [του  
σ]ολομωνος P45, propter spatium. 10.24 εκυκλωσαν P75.  
10.24 αυτον P75. 10.24 αιρεις P75.



παρησια TR P66 S B W  
 παρησια (P75)

10.25 αυτοις TR (P45) (P75) S\*\* B W  
 omit P66 S\*

ο ιησους TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
 ιησους B\*

υμιν TR (P75) S B W  
 υμειν P66

ου πιστευετε TR (P75)  
 ου πιστευεται P66 S W  
 ουκ επιστευσατε B

εν τω ονοματι TR P66 (P75) B  
 εν ονοματι S W

μου TR P66 P75 S B  
 μου αυτα W

ταυτα TR P66 P75 S B  
 ταυτα τα εργα W

μαρτυρει TR P66 P75 B  
 μαρτυρι S  
 μαρτυρησει W

10.26 αλλ TR  
 αλλα P66 P75 S B W

υμεις TR P66 B W  
 υμεις S

---

10.24 παρη[σι]α P75. 10.25 [αυτοις] P45, propter spatium;  
 αυ[τ]οις P75. 10.25 υμιν P75. 10.25 ου πιστευετε P75.  
 10.25 εν τω ονοματι P75.

πιστευετε TR P75 S B  
πιστευεται P66 W

ου γαρ εστε TR  
οτι ουκ εστε P66 P75 B  
οτι ουκ εσται S W

καθως ειπον υμιν TR  
καθως ειπον υμιν οτι P66\*  
omit P66\*\* P75 S B W

10.27 ακουει TR (P75)  
ακουουσιν P66 S B W

καγω TR P66 P75 B W  
και S

γινωσκω TR P66 S B\*\* W  
γεινωσκω (P75) B\*

ακολουθουσι TR  
ακολουθουσιν P66 (P75) S B W

10.28 ζων αιωνιον διδωμι αυτοις TR P66\*  
διδωμι αυτοις ζων αιωνιον P66\*\* (P75) S B  
διδωμι αυτοις ζων αιωνιον W

απολωνται TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
αποληται S\*

ουχ αρπασει TR (P75) B W  
ουχ αρπαση P66  
ου μη αρπαση S

---

10.27 α[κ]ουει P75. 10.27 γεινωσκ[ω] P75.  
10.27 α[κολο]υθουσιν P75. 10.28 [διδ]ωμι αυ[τοις ζ]ων  
α[ιω]νιον P75. 10.28 απο[λω]γηται P75. 10.28 [ο]υχ  
αρπα[σει] P75.

- 10.29 ο πατηρ μου ος δεδωκε μοι μειζων παντων εστι TR  
 ο πατηρ μου ος εδωκεν μιζων παντων εστιν P66\*  
 ο πατηρ μου ος εδωκεν μοι μιζων παντων εστιν P66\*\*  
 ο πατηρ [μο]ι ος εδωκε[ν...παν]των μει[ζο]ν εστιν (P75)  
 ο πατηρ ο δεδωκεν μοι παντων μειζων εστιν S\*  
 ο πατηρ μου ο δεδωκεν μοι παντων μειζων εστιν S\*\* W  
 ο πατηρ μου ο δεδωκεν μοι παντων μειζον εστιν B\*  
 ο πατηρ μου ος δεδωκεν μοι παντων μειζον εστιν B\*\*

ουδεις TR P66 B W  
 ουδεις S

του πατρος μου TR W  
 του πατρος P66 (P75) S B

- 10.30 ο πατηρ TR P66 (P75) S B  
 ο πατηρ μου W

εβαστασαν ουν παλιν TR P66  
 εβαστασαν P45  
 εβαστασαν παλιν (P75) S B W

οι ιουδαιοι TR (P45) P66 P75 S B  
 omit W

λιθασωσιν αυτον TR (P45) (P75) S B W  
 αυτον λιθασωσιν P66

- 10.32 καλα εργα εδειξα υμιν TR  
 εργα καλα εδειξα υμιν (P45)  
 καλα εργα εδειξα υμιν P66  
 εδειξα υμιν εργα καλα (P75)  
 εργα καλα εδειξα υμιν S  
 εργα εδειξα υμιν καλα B  
 εργα εδειξα υμιν W

---

10.24 ο πατηρ [μο]ι ος εδωκε[ν...παν]των μει[ζο]ν εστιν P75.  
 10.29 του πατρο[ς] P75. 10.30 [ο πατ]ηρ P75.  
 10.31 εβαστ[ασ]αν [παλιν] P75, propter spatium. 10.31 [οι  
 ιουδ]αιοι P45; [ο]ι ιουδαιοι P75. 10.31 λιθασωσι[ν αυτον] P45;  
 λ[ιθασωσιν αυτον] P75. 10.32 [εργα κ]αλα εδειξα υμιν P45;  
 [εδειξα υ]μιγ εργα καλα P75.

του πατρος μου TR P66 (P75) S\*\* W  
του πατρος (P45) S\* B

ποιον αυτων TR (P45) (P75) S B  
ποιον ουν αυτων P66  
ποιον ουν W

λιθαζετε με TR  
λιθαζεται με P66 W  
εμε λιθαζετε (P45)  
με λιθαζετε S B

10.33 λεγοντες TR  
omit P45 P66 (P75) S B W

βλασφημιας TR (P45) S B W  
βλασφημειας P66 P75

και TR P45 P66 B W  
omit S

σεαυτον TR P45 (P75) S B W  
εαυτον P66

θεον TR P45 P66\*\* S B W  
τον θεον P66\*

10.34 απεκριθη αυτοις ο ιησους TR (P75) S  
απεκριθη αυτοις ιησους P45 B W  
απεκριθη ιησους και ειπεν αυτοις P66

εστι TR  
εστιν P45 P66 (P75) S B W

10.32 [του πατρος] P45, propter spatium; του [πατρος μου] P75, propter spatium. 10.32 ποιον αυτων P45; ποιον αυτων P75.  
10.32 εμε [λιθα]ζετε P45. 10.33 omit λεγοντες P75, propter spatium. 10.33 βλασφημιας P45; [βλ]ασημει[ας] P75.  
10.33 σε[αυτον] P75. 10.34 απεκριθη αυτοις ο ιησους P75.  
10.34 [εστ]ι; P75.

γεγραμμενον εν τω νομω υμων TR P66\*\* (P75) S\*\* B W  
 γεγραμμενον εν τη γραφη εν τω νομω (P45)  
 γεγραμμενον εν τω νομω S\*  
 γεγραμμενον ε τω νομω υμων P66\*

εγω ειπα TR  
 οτι εγω ειπα P45 P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
 οτι ειπα S\*

εστε TR P45 P66 (P75) S B  
 εσται W

10.35 ειπε TR (P75)  
 ειπεν P66 S B W

προς ους ο λογος του θεου εγενετο TR P66 (P75) S B W  
 omit P45

η γραφη TR P66 (P75) S B W  
 omit P45

10.36 ηγιασε TR  
 ηγιασεν P45 P66 S B W

απεστειλεν TR P45 P66 B  
 απεστιλεν S W

λεγετε TR P45 S B  
 λεγεται P66 W

βλασφημεις TR P45 P66 (P75) B W  
 βλασφημεις S

---

10.34 γεγραμμενον [εν τη]ι γραφηι εν τωι νομωι P45;  
 γεγραμμενον εν τω υμων P75. 10.34 οτι εγω ειπα P75.  
 10.34 εστι P75. 10.34 ε[ι]πε P75. 10.35 [προς ους ο] λογος  
 του θεου εγενε[τ]ο P75. 10.35 η γραφ[η] P75.  
 10.36 [βλασ]φημεις P75.

υιος του θεου ειμι TR P66\*\* B  
 ο υιος θεου ειμι (P45)  
 υιος θεου ειμι P66\* S  
 ο υιος του θεου ειμι (P75)  
 υιος θεου ειμει W

10.37 πιστευετε TR P45 S B  
 πιστευεται P66 W

10.38 πιστευητε TR P45 (P75) B  
 πιστευηται P66  
 πιστευεται S W

πιστευσατε TR P45  
 πιστευσαται P66  
 πιστευετε (P75) B  
 πιστευεται S W

ινα γνωτε TR P45 P66 (P75) S B  
 αναγνωτε W

πιστευσητε TR  
 γινωσκηται P66 W  
 γεινωσκητε (P45) P75 B\*  
 γινωσκητε B\*\*  
 πιστευητε S

καγω εν αυτω TR P45  
 καγω εν τω πατρι P66 (P75) S B W

10.39 εξητουν ουν παλιν αυτον TR P66  
 εξητουν δε αυτον P45  
 εξητουν αυτον παλιν (P75)  
 εξητουν ουν αυτον S\*  
 εξητουν ουν αυτον παλιν S\*\* W  
 εξητουν παλιν αυτον B

---

10.36 ο υ[ιος θεου] ειμι P45; [ο υι]ος το[υ θ̄]̄ ειμι P75, propter spatium. 10.38 πιστευητε P75. 10.38 πιστευετε P75. 10.38 ινα γνωτε P75. 10.38 [γ]εινωσκητε P45; γειν[ω]σκητε P75. 10.38 καγ[ω] εν τω η[α]τρι P75. 10.39 ε[ξητ]ουν αυ[το]ν παλιν P75.

10.40 απηλθε TR  
απηλθεν P45 P66 S B W

παλιν TR P45 (P75) S B W  
omit P66

εις τον τοπον TR P45 P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
omit S\*

οπου TR P45 P75 S B W  
ου P66

ιωαννης TR P45 P66 (P75\*\*) S W  
ιωανης (P75\*) B

πρωτον TR P66 P75 B W  
προτερον P45 S

εμεινεν TR P45 P66 P75  
εμινεν S  
εμενεν B  
εμειν W

10.41 οτι TR (P45) P66 P75 B W  
omit S

ιωαννης 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P45 P66 (P75) S W  
ιωανης B

σημειον εποισηεν TR P45 P66 (P75) B  
σημειον εποισηεν S  
εποισηεν σημειον W

ουδεν TR P66 P75 S B  
ουδε εν P45 W

10.40 [πα]λιν P75. 10.40 εις τ[ο]ν τοπο[ν] P75.  
10.40 ιωαννης P75. 10.41 [οτι] P45, propter spatium.  
10.41 ιωαννης 1<sup>ο</sup> P75. 10.41 σημειον [επο]ησιν P75.

ειπεν ιωαννης TR P66 (P75) S  
 ιωαννης ειπεν (P45)  
 ειπεν ιωαννης B  
 ειπεν W

10.42 και επιστευσαν πολλοι TR  
 και πολλοι επιστευσαν P45 P66 (P75) S B  
 πολλοι ουν επιστευσαν W

εκει εις αυτον TR  
 εις αυτον (P45)  
 εις αυτον εκει P66 (P75) S B W

11.1 βηθανιας TR P66 S B W  
 βηθανιαμ P45  
 βηθανειας (P75)

μαριας TR (P45) P66 (P75) B W  
 της μαριας S

μαρθας TR P45 P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
 μαρας P66\*

11.2 ην δε TR P66 (P75) S B W  
 ην δε αυτη η P45

μαρια TR P66 S W  
 μαριαμ B

αλειψασα TR B  
 αλιψασα P66 S W

ο αδελφος TR (P45) (P75) S B W  
 ο αδελφος ην P66

10.41 [ιωανν]ης ειπεν P45; ειπεν ιωανν[η]ς P75. 10.42 και  
 πο[λλοι επι]σ[τ]ευσαν P75. 10.42 ει[ς αυτον] P45, propter  
 spatium; εις αυτον εκε[ι] P75. 11.1 βηθανει[α]ς P75.  
 11.1 [μαριας] P45; μαρια[ς] P75. 11.1 μαρθα[ς] P75. 11.2 η[ν  
 δε] P75. 11.2 ο αδελφος P45; [ο α]δελφος P75.



λαζαρος TR P66 S B W  
λαζαρ P45

ησθενει TR (P45) P66 P75 B W  
ησθενι S

11.3 απεστειλαν TR P45 (P75) B  
απεστιλαν P66 S W

αι αδελφαι προς αυτον TR (P45) P66 P75 B W  
προς αυτον αι αδελφαι S

ιδε TR P45 P66 P75 S B  
ειδε W

ασθενει TR P66 (P75\*\*) P45 S B W  
ασθενει απεστειλαν ουν αι αδελφαι προς αυτον (P75\*)

11.4 ασθενεια TR (P45) (P75) S B  
ασφενια P66 W

εστι TR  
εστιν (P45) P66 (P75) S B W

αλλ TR P45 P66 S B  
αλλα W

ινα TR P45 P66 P75 B W  
αλλ ινα S

ο υιος του θεου TR (P75) S B W  
ο υιος αυτου (P45)  
ο υιος P66

11.2 η[σθε]νει P45; [η]σθενει P75. 11.3 α[πε]στειλαν P75.  
11.3 αι αδε[λφαι προς αυτον] P45; αι αδελ[φαι προς αυτ]ον P75.  
11.3 [ασθεν]ει απεστειλαν ουν αι αδελφ[αι προς αυτ]ον P75.  
11.4 [α]σθενεια P45; [ασθ]ενεια P75. 11.4 εσ[τ]ιν P45;  
ε[στι]ν P75. 11.4 [ο] υιος αυτου P45; ο υς [του] υν P75.

- 11.5 την αδελφην αυτης TR (P45) P66\*\* S B W  
 την αδελφην P66\*  
 της αδελφης αυτης P75
- 11.6 εμεινεν TR (P45) P66 (P75) B W  
 εμινεν S
- εν ω ην τοπω TR P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
 επι τω τοπω (P45)  
 ω ην τοπω P66\*
- 11.7 επειτα TR P75 B W  
 ειτα (P45) P66  
 επιτα S
- λεγει τοις μαθηταις TR P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
 λεγει (P45)  
 λεγει αυτοις P66\*
- αγωμεν εις την ιουδαιαν παλιν TR (P45) P66 (P75) S\*\* B W\*\*  
 αγωμεν εις την ιουδαιαν S\*  
 γωμεν εις την ιουδαιαν παλιν W\*
- 11.8 ραββι TR (P75)  
 ραββει (P45) P66 S B W
- λιθασαι TR P66 (P75) B W  
 λιθασε S
- 11.9 ο ιησους TR P45  
 ιησους P66 P75 S B W
- εισιν ωραι TR  
 ωραι εισιν P66 S B W

---

11.5 την αδελφη[ν] αυτης P45; [της] αδελφης αυτης P75.  
 11.6 [ε]μεινεν P45; [εμ]εινεν P75. 11.6 επι τω[τω] [πωι] P45;  
 εν [ω ην το]πω P75. 11.7 [ειτα] P45, propter spatium; [πει]τα  
 P75. 11.7 λεγε[ι] P45; [λε]γει τοις μαθηταις P75.  
 11.7 [αγ]ωμεν εις την ιουδα[ιαν παλιν] P45, propter spatium;  
 [αγ]ωμεν εις τ[ην ιουδαι]αν παλιν P75. 11.8 [ραβ]βει P45;  
 [ραβ]βι P75. 11.8 λιθασαι P75.

περιπατη εν τη ημερα TR P66 (P75) S B W  
 εν τη ημερα περιπατη (P45)

τουτου TR (P45) P66 P75 S\*\* B W\*\*  
 του S\*  
 omit W\*

11.10 τη νυκτι TR P66 (P75) B W  
 τη νυκτει S

προσκοπτει TR P66 P75 S B  
 προσκοπτει W

το φως TR P66 P75 S B  
 φως W

11.11 ταυτα TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
 ταυτατα B\*

ειπε TR  
 ειπεν P66 P75 S B W

ο φιλος TR P66 S B W  
 η φιλος P75

11.12 ειπον ουν οι μαθηται αυτου TR  
 ειπαν ουν οι μαθηται αυτω P66  
 ειπον ουν οι μαθηται αυτω (P75) B  
 ειπαν ουν αυτω οι μαθηται S  
 ειπον ουν αυτω οι μαθηται W

σωθησεται TR P66 S B W  
 εγερθησεται P75

11.13 ειρηκει TR P66 (P75) B W  
 ειρηκει S

11.9 [εν τη] ημερα περιπατη P45; πε[ρι]πατη εγ [τη ημερα] P75.  
 11.9 [τουτο] P45, propter spatium. 10.10 τη νυκτι P75.  
 11.12 ειπον ο[υ]ν οι μαθηται αυτω P75. 11.13 ει ρηκε[ι] P75.

περι του θανατου αυτου TR P66:\*\* S\*\* B W  
 περι της κοιμησεως αυτου P66\*  
 περι θανατου αυτου P75  
 περι του θανατου S\*

οτι TR P66 S B W  
 omit P75

11.14 τοτε ουν ειπεν TR P66 (P75) S B  
 τοτε λεγει W

ο ιησους TR P75 S\*\* B W  
 ιησους P66 S\*

παρησια TR P66 P75 S\*\* B  
 παρησια S\* W

απεθανε TR  
 απεθανεν P66 P75 S B W

11.15 ινα πιστευσητε TR (P75) S B  
 ινα πιστευσηται P66 W

εκει TR P66 B W  
 εκι S

αλλ αγωμεν TR B  
 αλλα αγωμεν P66 S W

11.16 συμμαθηταις TR (P75) B\*\*  
 συνμαθηταις P66 S B\* W

ημεις TR P66 (P75) B W  
 ημις S

11.17 ελθων ουν ο ιησους TR P66 (P75) S\* B W  
 ελθων ουν ο ιησους εις βηθανιαν S\*\*

---

11.14 τοτ[ε ο]υν ειπεν P75. 11.15 [ινα πι]στευ[σ]ητε P75.  
 11.16 συμμαθηται[ς] P75. 11.16 ημεις P75. 11.17 ελθων [ο]υν  
 ρ [τ] P75.

τεσσαρας ημερας ηδη TR W  
 ηδη τεσσαρα ημερας P66  
 τεσσαρας ηδη ημερας (P75) B  
 τεσσαρες ημερας ηδη S

εχοντα εν τω μνημειω TR (P75) B  
 εν τω μνημειω εχοντα P66  
 εχοντα εν τω μνημειω S  
 εν τω μνημειω εχοντα W

11.18 η βηθανια TR P66 S\*\* W  
 βηθανια (P75) S\* B

ως TR P66 (P75) S B W\*\*  
 omit W\*

11.19 και πολλοι TR  
 πολλοι δε (P45) P66 (P75) S B W

εληλυθεισαν TR P66 (P75) B W  
 εληλυθισαν S

προς τας περι μαρθαν και μαριαν TR (P45)  
 προς την μαρθαν και μαριαν P66 S  
 προς την μαρθαν και μαριαμ P75 B  
 προς την μαρθαν και την μαριαν W

του αδελφου αυτων TR  
 του αδελφου (P45) P66 (P75) S B W

11.20 ο ιησους TR  
 ιησους P45 P66 P75 S B W

εν τω οικω TR (P45) (P75) S B W  
 εν τω οικω εαυτης P66

---

11.17 τεσσαρας ηδη ημερας P75. 11.17 ε[χοντα εν] τω μνημειω P75. 11.18 [β]ηθα[νια] P75, propter spatium. 11.18 [ως] P75, propter spatium. 11.19 πο[λλοι δε] P45; πολλοι δ[ε] P75. 11.19 εληλυθει[σ]αγ P75. 11.19 [προς τας περ]ι μαρθαν και μ[αριαν] P45; [προς τη]ν μ[αρθα]ν και μαριαμ P75. 11.19 [τ]ου αδελφου P45; [το]ν αδελφου P75. 11.20 εν τω οικ[ω] P45; εν [τω] οικω P75.

εκαθεξετο TR P45 P66 (P75) S B  
εκαθητο W

11.21 η μαρθα TR P66 (P75) S B W  
μαρθα (P45)

τον ιησουν TR P45 P66 P75 W  
ιησουν S B

κυριε TR P45 P66 P75 S W  
omit B

ο αδελφος μου ουκ αν ετεθνηκει TR  
ο αδελφος μου ουκ αν απεθανεν (P45) P66  
ουκ αν απεθανεν ο αδελφος μου (P75) S B W

11.22 αλλα TR (P45) P66 S\*\* W  
omit P75 S\* B

οσα αν αιτηση TR B  
οσα αν αιτησης (P45) P66  
οσα εαν αιτηση (P75)  
οσα εαν αιτησει S  
οσα εαν αιτησης W

δωσει TR P45 (P75) S B W  
δωσι P66

11.24 λεγει TR P45 P66 P75 B W  
λεγι S

μαρθα TR P45 P75 S W  
η μαρθα P66 B

11.20 ε[καθε]ξει[ο] P75. 11.21 μαρθ[α] P45; η μαρθα P75.  
11.21 τ[ο]ν ιησουν P75. 11.21 κ[ε] P75. 11.21 ο α[δελ]φος μου ουκ  
αν απεθανεν P45; ουκαν απεθανεν ο [αδ]ελφος μου P75.  
11.22 αλ[λα] P45. 11.22 οσ[α] αν αιτ[η]σης P45; οσα εαν  
αιτηση P75. 11.22 δωσει P75. 11.24 λ[ε]γει P75.

ΕΝ ΤΗ ΑΝΑΣΤΑΣΕΙ TR (P45) P66 (P75) S B\*\* W  
 ΕΝ ΤΗ ΑΝΑΣΤΗΣΕΙ B\*

11.25 ΕΙΠΕΝ TR (P45) P66 S\*\* B W  
 ΕΙΠΕΥ ΟΥΝ (P75)  
 ΕΙΠΕΥ ΔΕ S\*

Ο ΙΗΣΟΥΣ TR S B W  
 ΙΗΣΟΥΣ P66

ΕΙΜΙ TR (P45) P66 P75 S B  
 ΕΙΜΕΙ W

ΚΑΙ Η ΖΩΗ TR P66 (P75) S B W  
 omit P45

11.26 ΖΗΣΕΤΑΙ TR P66 (P75) S B W  
 ΖΗΣΕΙ (P45)

ΠΙΣΤΕΥΩΝ ΕΙΣ ΕΜΕ TR P45 P66 (P75) S B  
 ΠΙΣΤΕΥΩ W

11.27 ΛΕΓΕΙ TR P45 P75 S B W  
 ΛΕΓΙ P66

ΝΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΕ TR P45 (P75) S B W  
 ΝΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΕ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΩ P66

ΕΓΩ ΠΕΠΙΣΤΕΥΚΑ TR (P45) P66 (P75) S B\*\*\* W  
 ΕΓΩ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΩ B\*  
 ΕΓΩ ΕΠΙΣΤΕΥΣΑ B\*\*

11.28 ΤΑΥΤΑ TR P66  
 ΤΟΥΤΟ (P75) S B W

---

11.24 εν τ[η] αναστα]σει P45; [ε]ν τη αναστασει P75.  
 11.25 ειπ[εν] P45; [ε]ιπεν ουν P75. 11.25 ειμ[ι] P45.  
 11.25 και η [ζωη] P75. 11.26 [ζησ]ει P45; [ζ]ησεται P75.  
 11.26 [πι]στευων εις εμε P75. 11.27 να; κυριε P75. εγω  
 π[επιστευκα] P45; εγω πεπιστευκα P75. 11.28 τουτο P75.

απηλθε TR  
απηλθεν P66 P75 S B W

εφωνησε TR  
εφωνησεν P45 P66 (P75) S B W

μαριαν TR P45 P66 S W  
μαριαμ (P75) B

ειπουσα 2<sup>ο</sup> TR S  
ειπασα οτι P66  
ειπασα B  
ειπουσα οτι W

παρεστι TR  
παρεστιν P45 P66 (P75) S B W

φωνει TR (P45) (P75) S B W  
φωνι P66

11.29 εκεινη TR  
εκεινη δε (P45) P66\*\* P75 S B W  
εκεινη δ P66\*

εγειρεται TR (P45) P66  
ηγερθη P75 S B W

ερχεται TR P45 P66  
ηρχετο (P75) S B W

εληλυθει ο ιησους TR P75 S B W  
ιησους εληλυθει P66

11.28 εφ[ωνησ]εν P75. 11.28 μαριαμ P75. 11.28 παρεστιν P75.  
11.28 φωνει P45; φωνει P75. 11.28 [εκεινη δε] P45; propter  
spatium. 11.29 [εγ]ειρεται P45. 11.29 ηρχει[ο] P75.



αλλ ην εν τω τοπω TR  
 αλλ ην επι τω τοπω (P45)  
 αλλα ην επι επι τω τοπω P66  
 αλλ ην επι εν τω τοπω (P75) S W  
 αλλ ην επι εν τω ποπω B

η μαρθα TR P66 P75 S B  
 μαρθα (P45) W

11.31 οικια TR P66 (P75) S B  
 οικεια W

την μαριαν TR P66 S W  
 την μαριαμ P75 B

ταχεως ανεστη TR (P45) (P75) S B W  
 ανεστη ταχεως P66

ηκολουθησαν TR (P45) P66 S B W  
 και ηκολουθησαν (P75)

λεγοντες TR P66  
 δοξαζοντες (P75)  
 δοξαντες S B W

οτι υπαγει εις το μνημειον TR P66 (P75) B  
 οτι εις το μνημειον υπαγει (P45)  
 οτι ιησους υπαγει εις το μνημειον S\*  
 οτι υπαγει εις το μνημειον S\*\* W

11.32 μαρια TR (P45) P66\* S W  
 μαριαμ P66\*\* (P75) B

οπου ην ο ιησους TR (P45) S\*\*  
 οπου ην ιησους P66 (P75) S\* B  
 οπου ο ιησους W

---

11.30 αλλ ην επι τ[ωι] τοπωι P45; [αλ]λ ην επι εν τω τοπω P75.  
 11.30 μ[αρ]θα P45. 11.31 οικια P75. 11.31 [ταχεως ανεσ]τη  
 P45; [ταχεως ανεσ]τη P75. 11.31 ηκολουθησ[αν] P45; και  
 ηκο[λουθησαν] P75. 11.31 δοξ[α]ζοντες P75. 11.31 [οτι εις το  
 μνημ]ειο[ν][υ]παγει P45; οτι υπ[αγει εις το μ]νημε[ιου]ν P75.  
 11.32 [μαρ]ια P45; μαριαμ P75. 11.32 [οπου] ην ο ιησους P45;  
 οπου [ην ιησους] P75.

ιδουσα TR P45 (P75) S B  
 και ιδουσα P66  
 ιδουσα δε W

εις τους ποδας αυτου TR  
 [αυτου προς το]υς ποδας (P45)  
 αυτου εις τους ποδας P66  
 αυτου [προς τους π]οδας (P75)  
 αυτου προς τους ποδας S B W

λεγουσα αυτω TR (P45) P75 S B W  
 λεγουσα P66

απεθανε μου ο αδελφος TR  
 απεθανεν μου ο αδελφος (P45)  
 μου απεθανεν ο αδελφος P66 (P75) S B W

11.33 ως TR P66 S\*\* B W  
 omit S

ειδεν TR P66 S B  
 ιδεν P75 W

τους συνελθοντας αυτη ιουδαιους κλαιοντας TR (P75) S B W\*\*  
 τους ιουδαιους κλαιοντας τους συνεληλυθοτας (P45)  
 τους συνεληλυθοτας συν αυτη ιουδαιους κλαιοντας P66  
 τους συνελθοντας ιουδαιους κλαιοντας W\*

ενεβριμησατο τω πνευματι και εταραξεν εαυτον TR  
 P66\* S\*\* B\*\* W  
 εταραχθη τω πνευματι ως ενβριμουμενος (P45)  
 εταραχθη τω πνευματι ως εμβριμωμενος P66\*\*  
 εβρειμησατο τω πνευματι και εταραξεν εαυτον (P75)  
 εβριμησατο τω πνευματι και εταραξεν εαυτον S\*  
 ενεβρειμησατο τω πνευματι και εταραξεν εαυτον B\*

---

11.32 [ιδουσα] P75, propter spatium. 11.32 [αυτου προς το]υς ποδ[ας] P45; αυτου [προς τους π]οδας P75. 11.32 λεγουσα[α αυτωι] P45; λεγουσα αυτω P75. 11.32 απ[εθανεν μου ο αδελ]φος P45; μου απεθανεν ο αδελφ[ος] P75. 11.33 [τους ιουδαιους κλαιο]ντας τους σ[υνεληλυθ]οτας P45; [του]ς συνελθοντας αυ[τη ιο]ν δ[αιους κ]λαι[οντ]ας P75. 11.33 εταρα[χθη τω πνευματι ως ενβριμ.]ουμέν[ο]ς P45; εβρειμησατο τ[ω πνευματι και ετα]ραξ[εν] εα[υτον] P75.

καὶ εἶπε TR  
καὶ εἶπεν P66 P75 S B W

11.34 τεθεικατε TR P45 (P75) B W  
τεθεικαται P66 S

κυριε ερχου καὶ ἰδε TR (P75) S B  
ερχου εἶδε P66\*  
κυριε ερχου καὶ εἶδε P66\*\* W

11.35 εδακρυσεν TR (P75) S\*\* B W  
εδρακυσεν P66  
καὶ εδακρυσεν S\*

ο ἰησους TR P66\*\* S\*\* B W  
ιησους P66\* S\*

11.36 ελεγον TR P66 S\*\* B W  
ελεγαυ S

11.37 ἰδε TR S B W  
εἶδε P66

τινες δε εἰς αυτων εἶπον TR P75 S\*\* B W  
τινες εἶπον εἰς αυτον P66  
τινες δε εἰς αυτων εἶπαν S\*

ουκ ηδυνατο TR S B\*\*  
ουκ εδυνατο P66 B\* W

ανοιξας TR P66 (P75) S W  
ανυξας B

11.38 εμβριμωμενος TR P66 B\*\*  
εμβριμουμενος S  
ενβρειμωμενος (P75) B\*  
ενβριμων W

---

11.34 [τεθεικατ]ε P75. 11.34 κ[ε] ερχου καὶ ἰδε] P75.  
11.35 [ε]δα[κ]ρ[υ]σεν] P75. 11.37 [τινες δε ε]ξ αυτων [ε]ἶπον  
P75. 11.37 [αν]οιξας P75. 11.37 [ε]μβρει[μω]μενος] P75.

ΕΝ ΕΑΥΤΩ TR S B W  
ΕΝ ΕΑΥΑΥΤΩ P66

μνημειον TR P66 B  
μνημιον S W

σπηλαιον TR P66 (P75) S B  
σπηλεον W

ΕΠ ΑΥΤΩ TR P66 S\*\* B W  
ΑΥΤΩ S\*

11.39 αρατε TR S B W  
αραται P66

λεγει TR P66 B W  
λεγι S

ΤΟΥ ΤΕΘΝΗΚΟΤΟΣ TR  
ΤΟΥ ΤΕΤΕΛΕΥΚΟΤΟΣ P66\*  
ΤΟΥ ΤΕΤΕΛΕΥΤΗΚΟΤΟΣ P66\*\* S B W

κυριε TR P75 S B W  
omit P66

ΤΕΤΑΡΤΑΙΟΣ TR P66 S B\*\*  
ΤΕΤΑΡΤΕΟΣ B\* W

ΕΣΤΙ TR  
ΕΣΤΙΝ P66 S B W

11.40 λεγει TR P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
λεγι P66\*

ο ιησους TR S B W  
ιησους P66

---

11.38 [σπη]λαιον P75. 11.40 λεγει P75.

οτι TR (P75) S B W  
omit P66

οψει TR  
οψη P66 S B W

11.41 ου ην ο τεθνηκως κειμενος TR  
omit P66 P75 S B W

ηρε TR  
ηρεν P66 (P75) S B W

τους οφθαλμους TR P66\* (P75) S B W  
τους οφθαλμους αυτου P66\*\*

ειπε TR  
ειπεν P66 (P75) S B W

11.42 ηδειν TR P66 S B W  
ηδιν W

παντοτε TR (P75) S B W  
παντοται P66

απεστειλας TR (P45) P66 B  
απεστιλας S W

11.43 εκραυγασε TR  
εκραυγασεν P66 S\*\* B  
εκραυγαζεν S\*  
εκραζεν W

λαζαρε TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
λαζαρ S\*

---

11.40 οτ[ι] P75. 11.41 [ηρ]εν P75. 11.41 τους οφθ[αλ]μους  
P75. 11.41 [ει]πεν P75. 11.42 παντοτε P75.  
11.42 [απεστ]ειλα[ς] P75. 11.43 [λ]αζαρε P75.

δευρο εξω TR P66 (P75) S B W  
 δευρο ελθε εξω (P45)

11.44 και εξηλθεν TR (P45) S W  
 εξηλθεν P66 P75 B

χειρας TR P45 P66 B W  
 χιρας S

κειριαις TR P45 B  
 κηριαις P66 P75  
 κιριαις S W

οψις TR (P45) P66 P75 S B  
 οψεις W

περιεδεδετο TR P66 P75 S B W  
 εδεδετο (P45)

λεγει αυτοις ο ιησους TR (P45) P66 S  
 λεγει ιησους αυτοις (P75) B  
 λεγει ο ιησους αυτοις W

λυσατε TR P45 (P75) S B  
 λυσαται P66 W

αφετε TR  
 αφετε αυτον (P45) P75 B  
 αφεται αυτον P66  
 αφεται S W

11.45 πολλοι ουν TR P66 (P75) B W  
 πολλοι (P45)  
 πολλοι δε S

---

11.43 δευρο ελθε εξω P45; δε[υρ]ο εξω P75. 11.44 κ[αι  
 εξηλθεν] P45; ε[ξηλθεν] P75. 11.44 [ο]ψις P45. 11.44  
 εδ[εδ]ετο P45; περιεδεδετο P75. 11.44 [λε]γει αυτοις ο ιησους  
 P45; λεγει ιησους αυ[τοις] P75. 11.44 λυσατε P75.  
 11.44 [α]φετε αυτον P45. 11.45 πολ[λο]ι P45; πο[λ]λοι ουν P75.

προς την μαριαν TR (P45) P66\*\* S W  
 την μαριαν P66\*  
 προς την μαριαμ (P75) B

και θεασαμενοι TR S B W  
 εωρακοτες (P45) P66

α εποιησεν TR (P45) S W  
 οσα ποιησεν P66\*  
 οσα εποιησεν P66\*\*  
 ο εποιησεν B

ο ιησους TR  
 omit P45 P66 B W  
 ιησους S

11.46 απηλθον TR S B W  
 απηλθαν P66

φαρισαιους TR P66 S B\*\* W  
 φαρεισαιους P45 B\*

ειπον TR P45 B W  
 ειπαν P66 S

ο ιησους TR S W  
 ιησους (P45) P66 B

11.47 φαρισαιοι TR P66 S B\*\* W  
 φαρεισαιοι P45 B\*

ελεγον TR P66 B W  
 ελεγαν S

ποιουμεν TR (P45\*\*) P66 S B W  
 ποιησομεν (P45\*)

11.45 προς [τ]ην μαριαν P45; [προς την] μαρ[ια]μ P75.  
 11.45 εωρακοτε[ς] P45. 11.45 α [ε]ποι[η]σεν P45. 11.46 [τῆ]  
 P45, propter spatium. 11.47 [π]οιησο[μεν] P45.

οτι TR P66 S B W  
omit P45

σημεια ποιεει TR  
ποιεει σημεια (P45) P66 B W  
ποιεει σημεια S

11.48 ουτω TR B  
ουτως P45 P66 S W

ΠΑΝΤΕΣ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΟΥΣΙΝ TR S\*\* B W  
ΠΑΝΤΕΣ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΩΣΙΝ P66  
ΠΑΝΤΕΣ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΟΥΣΙΝ S\*

αρουσιν TR P66 S B W  
αιρουσιν P45

ΤΟΥ ΤΟΠΟΥ TR P66\*\* S B  
ΤΟ ΤΟΠΟΥ P66\*  
ΤΗΝ ΠΟΛΙΝ W

11.49 τις TR (P45) P75 S B W  
omit P66

καταφας TR P66 S B W  
καιφας P45 (P75)

ων TR P66 P75 S B  
omit W

υμεις TR P45 P66 P75 B W  
υμεις S

οιδατε TR P45 S B W  
οιδαται P66

---

11.47 [ποιεει] σημεια P45. 11.49 [τ]ις P45. 11.49 καιφ[ας] P75.



- 11.50 διαλογιζεσθε TR  
 λογιζεσθε (P45) S B  
 λογιζεσθαι P66 W
- συμφερει ημιν TR W  
 συμφερει υμιν (P45) P66 B  
 συμφερει S
- ινα TR P45 P66\*\* S B W  
 ι P66\*
- 11.51 αλλα TR P66\*\* S B W  
 αλλ P66\*
- αρχιερευς TR (P45) P66 (P75) S B  
 αρχων W
- του ενιαυτου εκεινου TR (P75) B W  
 omit P45  
 του ενιαυτου P66  
 του ενιαυτου εκεινου S
- προεφητευσεν TR W  
 επροφητευσεν P45 P66 S B
- εμελλεν TR P66 S B\*\*  
 ημελλεν (P45) B\* W
- ο ιησους αποθνησκειν TR  
 ιησους αποθνησκειν (P45) P66 B  
 ιησους αποθνησκειν S  
 αποθνησκειν ιησους W
- 11.52 εθνους TR (P45) P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 εθνους δε S\*

---

11.50 [λογι]ζεσθε] P45, propter spatium. 11.50 [συμ]φερει  
 υμιν P45. 11.51 [αρχι]ερευ[ς] P45; [αρχιερε]υς P75.  
 11.51 του εν[ιαυτου εκεινου] P75. 11.51 ημελ[λ]εν P45.  
 11.51 ιησους [αποθνησκειν] P45. 11.52 εθνο[υς] P45; εθνο[υς]  
 P75.

αλλ TR P66 S W  
αλλα B

δισεκαρπισμενα TR S B W  
εσκαρπισμενα P45 P66

11.53 εκεινης TR S B W  
εκινης P66

συνεβουλευσαντο TR  
εβουλευσαντο P45 P66 (P75) S B W

αποκτεινωσιν TR B  
αποκτινωσιν P66 S W

11.54 ιησους ουν TR  
ο δε ιησους P66  
ο ουν ιησους (P75) S B W

παρρησια TR P66 (P75) S B\*\* W  
παρησια P45 B\*

εκειθεν TR P66 P75 S B W  
omit (P45)

της ερημου εις εφραιμ λεγομενης πολιν TR (P45) (P75) B  
της ερημου εφραιμ λεγομενην P66\*  
της ερημου εφραιμ λεγομενην πολιν P66\*\*  
της ερημου εις εφρεμ λεγομενην πολιν S W

κακει TR P45 S B  
και εκει P66 W

διετριβε TR  
διετριβεν P45 P66  
εμεινεν (P75) B W  
εμινεν S

---

11.53 εβ[ουλευσαν]το P75. 11.54 ο ουν ιησους P75. 11.54  
[π]αρρησια P75. 11.54 -εκειθεν P45, propter spatium. 11.54  
της ε[ρημου εις ε]φ[ραιμ] λεγομε[νην πολιν] P45; [της  
ε]ρ[ημου] εις ε[φ]ραιμ λ[εγομενην πολιν] P75.

των μαθητων αυτου TR  
των μαθητων (P45) P66 (P75) S B W

11.56 ελεγον TR P45 P66 B W  
ελεγον S

δοκει TR S B W  
δοκι P66

υμιν TR P75 S B W  
υμειν P66

11.57 δεδωκεισαν TR P66 (P75) B W  
δεδωκισαν S

και 1<sup>ο</sup> TR  
omit P66 P75 S B W

οι αρχιερεις TR P66 B W  
οι αρχιερις S

οι φαρισαιοι TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
οι πρεσβυτεροι (P45)  
οι φαρεισαιοι B\*

11.57 εντολην TR P66  
εντολας S B W

εστι TR  
εστιν P66 S B W

12.1 προ TR P66\*\* S B W  
προπειν P66\*

ο τεθνηκως TR P66  
omit S B W

---

11.54 εμεινεν P75. 11.54 [των μ]αθητων P45; [των μαθητων] P75, propter spatium. 11.57 δεδωκεισαν P75. 11.57 οι πρεσ[βυτεροι] P45.

ΟΝ ΗΓΕΙΡΕΝ ΕΚ ΝΕΚΡΩΝ TR  
 ΟΝ ΗΓΕΙΡΕΝ ΕΚ ΝΕΚΡΩΝ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ P66 B  
 ΟΝ ΗΓΕΙΡΕΝ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΕΚ ΝΕΚΡΩΝ S\*  
 ΟΝ ΗΓΕΙΡΕΝ Ο ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΕΚ ΝΕΚΡΩΝ S\*\*  
 ΟΝ ΗΓΕΙΡΕΝ ΕΚ ΝΕΚΡΩΝ Ο ΙΗΣΟΥΣ W

12.2 ΕΠΟΙΗΣΑΝ TR S B W  
 ΕΠΟΙΗΣΕΝ P66

ΟΥΝ TR P66\*\* S B W  
 omit P66\*

ΔΕΙΠΝΟΝ TR P66 S B  
 ΔΙΠΝΟΝ W

Η ΜΑΡΘΑ TR S B W  
 ΜΑΡΘΑ P66

ΔΙΗΚΟΝΕΙ TR P66 B  
 ΔΙΗΚΟΝΙ S  
 ΔΙΗΚΟΝΕΙ ΑΥΤΩ W

Ο ΔΕ ΛΑΖΑΡΟΣ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΤΩΝ ΣΥΝΑΝΑΚΕΙΜΕΝΩΝ ΑΥΤΩ TR W  
 Ο ΔΕ ΛΑΖΑΡΟΣ ΕΙΣ ΕΚ ΤΩΝ ΑΝΑΚΕΙΜΕΝΩΝ ΣΥΝ ΑΥΤΩ P66\*  
 Ο ΔΕ ΛΑΖΑΡΟΣ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΕΚ ΤΩΝ ΑΝΑΚΕΙΜΕΝΩΝ ΣΥΝ ΑΥΤΩ P66\*\*  
 S B

12.3 ΜΑΡΙΑ TR P66 S W  
 ΜΑΡΙΑΜ B

ΛΙΤΡΑΝ TR S B\*\* W  
 ΛΕΙΤΡΑΝ P66 B\*

ΝΑΡΔΟΥ TR P66\*\* S B W  
 omit P66\*

ΠΟΛΥΤΙΜΟΥ TR P66 S B\*\* W  
 ΠΟΛΥΤΕΙΜΟΥ B\*

ΗΛΕΙΨΕ TR  
 ΗΛΕΙΨΕΝ P66 B  
 ΗΛΙΨΕΝ S W

ΤΟΥΣ ΠΟΔΑΣ ΤΟΥ ΙΗΣΟΥ TR P66 S W  
 ΤΟΥΣ ΠΟΔΑΣ ΙΗΣΟΥ B

ΕΞΕΜΑΞΕ TR  
 ΕΞΕΜΑΞΕΝ P66 S B W

ΟΙΚΙΑ TR P66 (P75) S B  
 ΟΙΚΕΙΑ W

ΕΠΛΗΡΩΘΗ TR P66 S W  
 ΕΠΛΗΣΘΗ B

ΕΚ ΤΗΣ ΟΣΜΗΣ TR P66 (P75) S B  
 ΤΗΣ ΟΣΜΗΣ W

12.4 ΛΕΓΕΙ ΟΥΝ TR  
 ΛΕΓΕΙ ΔΕ P66 S B W

ΕΙΣ ΕΚ ΤΩΝ ΜΑΘΗΤΩΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΙΟΥΔΑΣ ΣΙΜΩΝΟΣ ΙΣΚΑΡΙΩΤΗΣ TR  
 ΙΟΥΔΑΣ Ο ΙΣΚΑΡΙΩΤΗΣ ΕΙΣ ΤΩΝ ΜΑΘΗΤΩΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ P66 (P75) B W  
 ΙΟΥΔΑΣ Ο ΙΣΚΑΡΙΩΤΗΣ ΕΙΣ ΕΚ ΤΩΝ ΜΑΘΗΤΩΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ S

12.5 ΤΟΥΤΟ TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 ΟΥΤΟ P66\*

12.6 ΕΙΠΕ TR (P75)  
 ΕΙΠΕΝ P66 S B W

ΤΟ ΓΛΩΣΣΟΚΟΜΟΝ TR P66 (P75) S B  
 ΤΟ ΓΛΩΣΣΟΚΟΜΙΟΝ W

ΕΙΧΕ ΚΑΙ TR  
 ΕΙΧΕΝ P66  
 ΕΧΩΝ (P75) S B  
 ΕΧΟΝ W

---

12.3 [οι]κια P75. 12.3 [ε]κ της οσμης P75. 12.4 [ιο]υδας ο  
 ισκαριωτης ε[ις] των [μα]θητων αυτου P75. 12.6 ε[ι]πε P75.  
 12.6 το γλωσσοκο[μ]ον P75. 12.6 εχων P75.

- 12.7 αυτην ... τετηρηκεν TR  
 αυτην ινα ... τηρηση P66 (P75) S B W
- 12.8 τους πτωχους TR P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
 τους πτω P66\*
- γαρ TR P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
 omit P66\*
- εχετε 1<sup>ο</sup> TR (P75) S B  
 εχεται P66 W
- μεθ εαυτων εμε δε ου παντοτε εχετε TR S B  
 μεθ εαυτων εμε δε ου παντοτα εχεται P66  
 omit P75  
 μεθ εαυτων εμε δε ου παντοτε εχεται W
- 12.9 ουν οχλος πολυς TR P66\* P75 B\*\*  
 ουν ο οχλος ο πολυς P66\*\* W  
 ουν ο οχλος πολυς S B\*
- εκ των ιουδαιων TR (P75) S B  
 των ιουδαιων P66 W
- εστι TR  
 εστιν P66 P75 S B W
- τον λαζαρον TR P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
 τον λαον P66\*
- ον εγειρεν εκ νεκρων TR (P75) S B  
 ον εγειρεν εκ νεκρων P66  
 ον εγειρεν W
- 12.10 εβουλευσαντο δε οι αρχιερεις TR P66 (P75) S W  
 εβουλευσαντο δε και οι αρχιερεις B

---

12.7 αυτην ινα ... [τηρησ]η P75. 12.8 τους πτωχους P75.  
 12.8 γα[ρ] P75. 12.8 [ε]γείτε P75. 12.9 εκ των [ιουδ]αιων P75.  
 12.9 τον λαζα[ρον] P75. 12.9 [ο]ν εγειρεν εκ νεκρων P75.  
 12.10 ε[βου]λευ[σαντο δε οι α]ρχιέρεις P75, propter spatium.

ΑΠΟΚΤΕΙΝΩΣΙΝ TR P66 (P75) B  
 ΑΠΟΚΤΙΝΩΣΙΝ S W

12.11 υπηγον των Ιουδαιων και επιστευον TR (P75) S B W  
 των Ιουδαιων επιστευσαν P66

12.12 οχλος πολυς ο ελθων TR S\*\* W  
 ο οχλος πολυς ο ελθων P66\* (P75) B  
 ο οχλος ο πολυς ο ελθων P66\*\*  
 οχλος πολυς ελθων S\*

ο Ιησους TR P66 P75 B  
 Ιησους S W

12.13 ελαβον TR (P75) S B W  
 ελαβαν P66

τα βαλια TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 τα βαλια P66\*

εκραζον TR  
 εκραυγασαν λεγοντες P66  
 εκραυγαζον (P75) B\*\* W  
 εκραυγαζον λεγοντες S  
 εκραυγασαν B\*

ο βασιλευς TR P66 S\*\*  
 και ο βασιλευς (P75) S\* B W

12.14 εκαθισεν TR P66 S B  
 εκαθεισεν W

εστι TR S  
 εστιν P66 B W

12.10 αποκτι[ε]ινω[σ]ιν P75. 12.11 υπηγον των [ιο]υδ[αιων και  
 επι[σ]τευον P75. 12.12 [ο οχλος π]ολυς ο ελθων P75.  
 12.13 [ελαβ]ον P75. 12.13 εκραυγαζον P75. 12.13 κα[ι ο]  
 βασιλευς P75.

- 12.15 θυγατερ TR S  
 θυγατηρ P66 B\* W  
 η φυγατηρ (P75) B\*\*
- σιων TR S W  
 σειων P66 (P75) B
- 12.16 δε TR  
 omit P66 P75 S B W
- οι μαθηται αυτου TR P66 W  
 αυτου οι μαθηται (P75) S B
- ο ιησους TR P66 W  
 ιησους P75 S B
- τοτε TR P66\*\* P75 S B  
 omit P66\* W
- ταυτα ην επ αυτω TR P66\*\* (P75) B W  
 ταυτα η επ αυτω P66\*  
 ταυτα επ αυτω ην S
- 12.17 εμαρτυρει TR P66 (P75) B  
 εμαρτυρι S W
- οτε TR S B W  
 οτι P66
- μνημειου TR P66 B  
 μνημιου S W
- 12.18 δια τουτο και υπηνητησεν αυτω ο οχλος TR P66\*\*  
 δια τουτο υπηνητησεν αυτω ο οχλος P66\* (P75\*\*)  
 δια τουτο υπηνητησεν αυτω οχλος (P75\*)  
 δια τουτο και υπηνητησεν αυτω οχλος πολυς S  
 δια τουτο υπηνητησεν αυτω και ο οχλος B\*  
 δια τουτο και υπηνητησεν αυτω και ο οχλος B\*\*  
 δια τουτο και υπηνητησεν αυτω οχλος W

---

12.15 σειων P75. 12.16 [α]ντου οι μαθηται P75. 12.16 ταυ[τα]  
 ην επ αυτω P75. 12.17 εμαρτυρει P75. 12.18 δια τ[ο]υτ[ο]  
 υπηνητησεν αυτω ο οχλος P75.



ηκουσε TR  
ηκουσαν P66 S B W

ΤΟΥΤΟ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΠΕΠΟΙΗΚΕΝΑΙ ΤΟ ΣΗΜΕΙΟΝ TR P75 B  
ΑΥΤΟΥ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΕΠΟΙΗΚΕΝΑΙ ΤΟ ΣΗΜΕΙΟΝ P66  
ΑΥΤΟΥ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΕΠΟΙΗΚΕΝΑΙ ΤΟ ΣΗΜΕΙΟΝ S  
ΤΟΥΤΟ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΠΕΠΟΙΗΚΕΝΑΙ ΤΟ ΣΗΜΕΙΟΝ W

12.19 φαρισαιοι TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
φαρεισαιοι B\*

ειπον TR W  
ειπαν P66 S B

εαυτους TR P66\*\* S B W  
αυτους P66\*

θεωρειτε TR S B  
θεωριτε P66  
θεωρειται W

ωφελειτε TR (P75) S B  
ωφελιται P66  
ωφελειται W

ιδε TR P66 (P75) B  
ειδε S W

12.20 τινες ελληνες TR  
ελληνες τινες P66 P75 S B W

των αναβαινοντων TR P66 (P75) S B  
των αναβαντων W

12.21 φιλιππω TR P66 P75 S B  
τω φιλιππω W

---

12.18 τουτ[ο α]υτον π[ε]ποιηκεναι το [σημ]ειον P75. 12.19 [ω]φελειτε P75. 12.19 ιδε P75. 12.20 ελλη[ν]εις τινες P75. 12.20 των αναβαινοντων P75.

βηθσαιδα TR (P75) S B  
βηδσαιδα P66 W

της γαλιλαιας TR P66 (P75) S B\*\* W  
της γαλειλαιας B\*

ιδειν TR P66 (P75) B W  
ιδιν S

12.22 φιλιππος 1<sup>ο</sup> TR S W  
ο φιλιππος P66 (P75) B

ανδρεα TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B W  
ανδραια S\*

και παλιν ανδρεας και φιλιππος λεγουσι TR  
και παλιν ο ανδρεας δε και φιλιππος λεγουσιν P66\*  
ανδρεας δε και φιλιππος λεγουσιν P66\*\*  
ερχεται ανδρεας και φιλιππος και λεγουσιν (P75) B  
και παλιν ερχεται ανδρεας και φιλιππος και λεγουσιν S  
και παλιν ανδρεας και ο φιλιππος λεγουσιν W

12.23 απεκρινατο TR  
αποκρινεται P66 (P75) S B\*\* W  
αποκρεινεται B\*

12.24 υμιν TR P75 S B W  
υμειν P66

σιτου TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
σειτου B\*

12.25 απολεσει TR  
απολλυει P66 (P75) S B W

μεισων TR P66 B\*\* W  
μεισων (P75) S B\*

---

12.21 βηθσαιδ[α] P75. 12.21 [της] γαλιλαιας P75. 12.21  
ιδει[ν] P75. 12.22 ο φι[λι]ππος P75. 12.22 ανδρεα P75.  
12.22 ερχεται ανδρεας [και] φιλιππος κα[ι] λεγουσιν P75.  
12.23 αποκ[ρι]νεται P75. 12.25 απολλυε[ι] P75. 12.25  
[μ]εισων P75.

εις ζωην αιωνιον φυλαξει αυτην TR P66 (P75) S\*\* B  
 εις ζωην αιωνιον S\*  
 φυλαξει αυτην εις ζωην αιωνιον W

12.26 εμοι διακονη τις TR  
 εμοι τις διακονη εμοι τις διακονη P66\*  
 εμοι τις διακονη P66\*\* P75 S B W

ακολουθειτω TR P75 B W  
 ακολουθειτω P66 S

ειμι εγω TR (P75) S B  
 εγω ειμι P66  
 εγω ειμει W

εσται TR (P75) S B W  
 εστ P66\*  
 εστε P66\*\*

και εαν TR  
 εαν P66\* (P75) S B W  
 εαν δε P66\*\*

τιμησει TR P66 P75 B W  
 σειμησει S\*  
 τειμησει S\*\*

ο πατηρ TR P66\* P75 S B W  
 ο πατηρ μου P66\*\*

12.28 πατερ TR P66 S W  
 πατηρ B

δοξασον σου το ονομα TR P66 P75 S W  
 δοξασον μου το ονομα B

---

12.25 [ε]ις [ζω]ην αιωνιον φυ[λα]ξει αυτην P75. 12.26 εμοι  
 τ[ις] διακ[ον]η P75. 12.26 [ειμι ε]γω P75. 12.26 εστα[ι]  
 P75. 12.26 εαν P75. 12.28 δοξασον σου το ονομ[α] P75.

- 12.29 ουν TR P66 S  
omit B  
δε W
- ο εστως TR P66 (P75) S B  
ο εστηκως W
- και ακουσας TR P66 (P75) B W  
ακουσας S
- ελεγε TR  
ελεγον P66  
ελεγεν (P75) S B W
- γεγονεναι TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
γεγονναι P66\*
- αλλοι ελεγον TR P66 (P75) S B  
αλλοι δε ελεγον W
- λελαληκεν TR (P75) S B W  
ελαλησεν P66
- 12.30 απεκριθη ο ιησους και ειπεν TR  
απεκριθη ιησους και ειπεν P66 W  
απεκριθη και ειπεν ιησους (P75) B  
απεκριθη ιησους S
- αυτη η φωνη TR  
η φωνη αυτη P66 P75 S B W
- γεγονεν TR (P75) S B W  
ηλθεν P66
- 12.31 κρισις TR P66 P75 S B  
κρισεις W

---

12.29 ο εστως P75. 12.29 και ακου[σας] P75. 12.29 ελεγε[ν]  
P75. 12.29 αλ[λο]; ελεγον P75. 12.29 λελαληκεν P75.  
12.30 απεκριθη [κ]αι ειπεν [τ]ε P75. 12.30 γεγονεν P75.

εστι TR  
εστιν P66 P75 S B W

του κοσμου τουτου 1ο TR P66\*\* P75 S B  
του κοσμου P66\* W

νυν ο αρχων του κοσμου τουτου TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
και S\*

εκβληθησεται TR (P75) S B W  
βληθησεται P66

12.32 εαν TR P66 P75 S W  
αν B

παντας ελκυσω TR (P75) S\*\* B W  
παντα ελκυσω P66 S\*

12.33 τουτο TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
τουτον S\*

ελεγε TR  
ελεγεν P66 S B W

ημελλεν TR P66 P75 B W  
εμελλεν S

αποθνησκειν TR P66\*\* S B W  
αποθνησειν P66\*

12.34 απεκριθη αυτω ο οχλος TR  
απεκριθη ουν αυτω ο οχλος P66 (P75) S B W

ημεις TR (P75) B W  
ημις P66 S

12.31 εκβληθησεται P75. 12.32 παντα[ς ελκυ]σω P75, propter spatium. 12.34 [απεκ]ρι[θη ο]υν αυτω ο οχλος P75. 12.34 ημεις P75.

και πως συ λεγεις TR P66  
 και πως λεγεις συ (P75) B W  
 και πως συ λεγεις S

οτι 2ο TR P66 S B W  
 omit P75

δει TR P75 S B W  
 δι P66

τις εστιν ουτος ο υιος του ανθρωπου TR P66 S B W  
 omit P75

12.35 μικρον TR P66 S B\*\* W  
 μεικρον (P75) B\*

μεθ υμων TR  
 εν υμιν P66 (P75) S B W

εστι TR  
 εστιν P66 (P75) S B W

περιπατετε TR P66 (P75) S B  
 περιπατειται W

εως το φως εχετε TR S  
 εως το φως εχεται P66  
 ως το φως εχετε (P75) B  
 ως το φως εχεται W

σκοτια TR P66 (P75) S\* B  
 η σκοτια S\*\*

καταλαβη TR P66 P75 S B  
 λαβη W

---

12.34 [κ]αι πως λεγεις [σ]υ P75. 12.35 μει[κρο]ν P75.  
 12.35 [ε]ν υμιν P75. 12.35 εστιν P75. 12.35 [περιπ]ατ[ει]τε  
 P75. 12.35 ως το φως εχετε P75. 12.35 σ[κοτια] P75.  
 12.35 καταλαβη P75.

οιδε TR  
οιδεν P66 (P75) S B W

12.36 εως το φως εχετε TR  
εως το φως εχεται P66  
ως το φως εχετε (P75) S B  
ως το φως εχεται W

πιστευετε TR (P75) B  
πιστευεται P66 S W

υιοι TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
ιοι P66\*

γενηθε TR (P75) S B  
γενηθαι P66 W

ο ιησους TR P75 S\*\* W  
ιησους P66 S\* B

12.37 τοσαυτα TR P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
ταυτα P66\*

σημεια TR P66 (P75) B  
σημια S W

επιστευον TR S B W  
επιστευσαν P66

12.38 ον ειπε TR  
ον ειπεν P66 S B W  
omit P75

επιστευσε TR  
επιστευσεν P66 (P75) S B W

---

12.35 οιδεν P75. 12.36 ως [τ]ο φ[ως] εχετε P75. 12.36  
πιστευε[τ]ε P75. 12.36 γενη[σθ]ε P75. 12.37 τοσ[α]υτα P75.  
12.37 σημει[α] P75. 12.38 επιστευσεν P75.

βραχιων TR P75 S B W  
βραχειων P66

12.39 ηδυναγτο TR P75 S B W  
εδυναγτο P66

12.40 πεπωρωκεν TR B\*\*  
επηρωσεν P66 (P75) S W  
επωρωσεν B\*

ιδωσι TR P66  
ιδωσιν (P75) S B W

και νοησωσι τη καρδια TR P66\*\* B  
και μη νοησωσι τη καρδια P66\*  
και νοησωσιν τη καρδια (P75) W  
και τη καρδια συνωσιν S

επιστραφωσι TR  
στραφωσι P66 B  
στραφωσιν (P75) S  
επιστρεψωσιν W

ιασωμαι TR  
ειασομαι P66  
ιασομαι (P75) S B W

12.41 οτε TR  
οτι P66 P75 S B  
επει W

ειδε TR  
ειδεν P66 P75 S B W

ελαλησε TR  
ελαλησεν P66 (P75) S B W

---

12.40 επηρωσεν P75. 12.40 ιδωσι[ν] P75. 12.40 [και]  
νοησω[σιν τ]η καρδια P75. 12.40 [σ]τραφω[σ]ι[ν] P75.  
12.40 ιασομαι P75. 12.41 ε[λαλ]ησεν P75.



- 12.42 και εκ των αρχοντων πολλοι TR P66 (P75) S B  
 πολλοι των αρχοντων W
- φαρισαιους TR P66 P75 S B\*\* W  
 φαρεισαιους B\*
- 12.43 μαλλον ηπερ την δοξαν του θεου TR (P75) B  
 μαλλον περ την δοξαν του θεου P66\*  
 μαλλον υπερ την δοξαν του θεου P66\*\* S W
- 12.44 ιησους δε εκραξε TR  
 ιησους δε εκραξεν P66 P75 S B  
 εκραξεν δε ο ιησους W
- αλλ TR P66  
 αλλα P75 S B W
- 12.45 τον πεμψαντα με TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 και τον πεμψαντα με P66\*
- 12.46 ινα πας ο πιστευων TR (P75) S W  
 ινα ο πιστευων P66\* B  
 ινα ο πας πιστευων P66\*\*
- μεινη TR P66 B W  
 μινη S
- 12.47 και εαν τις μου ακουση των ρηματων και μη πιστευση TR  
 και εαν τις μου ακουση των ρηματων και μη φυλαξη  
 αυτα P66\*  
 και εαν τις μου ακουση των ρηματων και φυλαξη αυτα P66\*\*  
 και εαν τις μου ακουση των ρηματων και μη φυλαξη (P75) S B  
 και εαν τις μου μη ακουση των ρηματων μη δε φυλαξη W
- κρινω 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 S B\*\* W  
 κρεινω B\*

---

12.42 και [εκ τ]ων αρχοντων πολλοι P75. 12.43 μαλλον ηπερ την  
 δοξα[ν] του θεου P75. 12.46 ινα πας ο πιστευων P75.  
 12.47 και εαν τις μου ακουση [των ρ]ημ[ατων] και μη φυλαξη P75.

κρινω 2ο TR P66 S B\*\* W  
κρεινω B\*

αλλ TR P66 S B  
αλλα W

ινα 2ο TR S B W  
εινα P66

12.48 εμε TR P66 S B W  
με P75

εχει τον κρινοντα TR P66\*\* (P75) S B\*\* W  
ε κρινοντα P66\*  
εχει τον κρεινοντα B\*

κρινει TR P66 (P75) S B\*\* W  
κρεινει B\*

εν τη εσχατη TR (P75) S B  
τη εσχατη P66  
εν εσχατη W

12.49 μοι εντολην εδωκε TR  
μοι εντολην δεδωκεν P66 S B  
εντολην μοι δεδωκεν W

12.50 λαλω εγω TR  
εγω λαλω P66 (P75) S B W

ειρηκε TR  
ειρηκεν P66 S B W

ουτω λαλω TR P66  
ουτως λαλω P75 S B W

---

12.48 εχ[ει] τον κρινοντα P75. 12.48 [κρ]ινει P75. 12.48 εν  
τ[η εσχα]τ[η] P75. 12.50 [εγω λ]αλω P75. 12.50 [ου]τως  
λαλω P75.

13.1 εληλυθεν TR  
 ηκει P66  
 ηλθεν S B W

εκ του κοσμου τουτου TR S B W  
 εκ τουτου του κοσμου P66

προς τον πατερα TR P66\*\* S B W  
 προ ν πατερα P66\*

ιδιους TR P66 S\*\* B W  
 ιουδαιους S\*

13.2 δειπνου TR B\*\*  
 διπνου P66 S B\* W

γενομενου TR S\*\*  
 γεγαμενου P66  
 γεινομενου S\* W  
 γινομενου B

του διαβολου TR S B W  
 του τε διαβολου P66

ιουδα σιμωνος ισκαριωτου ινα αυτον παραδω TR  
 ινα παραδω αυτον ιουδας σιμωνος ισκαριωτης P66  
 ινα παραδοι αυτον ιουδας σιμωνος ισκαριωτης S\* B  
 ινα παραδω αυτον ιουδας σιμωνος ισκαριωτης S\*\*  
 ινα παραδω αυτον ιδα σειμωνος ισκαριωτη W

13.3 ειδως TR P66 B W  
 ιδως S

ο ιησους TR  
 omit P66 S B W

δεδωκεν TR P66  
 εδωκεν S B W

χειρας TR P66 B W  
 χιρας S

εξηλθε TR  
εξηλθεν P66 S B W

13.4 εγειρεται TR S B W  
εγειρετε P66

δειπνου TR B  
διπνου P66 S W

τιθησι TR  
τιθησιν P66 S B W

13.5 εις τον νιπτηρα TR S B W  
εις τον ποδονιπτηρα P66

εκμασσειν TR P66 S B  
εκμασσιν W

13.6 και λεγει αυτω εκεινος κυριε συ TR W  
λεγει αυτω κυριε συ P66 B  
και λεγι αυτω συ S\*  
και λεγι αυτω εκινος κυριε συ S\*\*

νιπτεις TR P66 B  
νιπτις S W

13.7 ο εγω ποιω συ ουκ οιδας TR P66 S\*\* B  
α εγω ποιω συ ουκ οιδας S\*  
ο εγω ποιω σοι ουκ οιδας W

αρτι TR S B  
αρ P66\*  
γαρ τι P66\*\*  
τι P66\*\*\* W

μετα ταυτα TR P66 S B\*\* W  
μετ αυτα B\*

13.8 ου μη νιψης τους ποδας μου TR S  
ου μη νιψης μου τους ποδας P66 B W

απεκριθη αυτω ο ιησους TR S  
απεκριθη αυτω ιησους P66 W  
απεκριθη ιησους αυτω B

13.9 λεγει TR P75 S B W  
λεγι P66

σιμων πετρος TR P66 (P75) S  
πετρος σιμων W  
πετρος σιμων B

κυριε TR P66 S\*\* B W  
omit S\*

ποδας μου TR S B W  
ποδας P66

χειρας TR P66\*\* B W  
χει P66\*  
χιρας S

13.10 ο ιησους TR P66 S W  
ιησους B

ο λελουμενος ου χρειαν εχει η τους ποδας νιψασθαι TR  
ο λελουμενος ουκ εχει χρειαν ει μη τους ποδας μονον  
νιψασθαι P66

ο λελουμενος ουκ εχι χρειαν νιψασθαι S\*

ο λελουμενος ουκ εχει χρειαν νιψασθαι S\*\*

ο λελουμενος ουκ εχει χρειαν ει μη τους ποδας  
νιψασθαι B

ο λελουμενος ουκ εχει χριαν ει μη τους ποδας νιψασθαι W

αλλ εστι TR  
αλλ εστιν P66 B W  
αλλα εστιν S

εστε TR P66 S B  
εσται W

13.11 ηιδει TR  
ηδει P66 S B W

παραδιδοντα TR P66 S B  
παραδιδουντα W

---

13.9 [σι]μω[ν πετρος] P75.

ΕΙΠΕΝ TR S  
ΕΙΠΕΝ ΟΤΙ P66 B W

ΟΥΧΙ TR P66 S B  
ΟΥΧΕΙ W

ΕΣΤΕ TR P66 S B  
ΕΣΤΑΙ W

13.12 ΕΝΙΨΕ TR  
ΕΝΙΨΕΝ P66 S B W

ΤΟΥΣ ΠΟΔΑΣ ΑΥΤΩΝ TR P66 S\*\* B W  
ΤΟΥΣ ΠΟΔΑΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ S\*

ΚΑΙ ΕΛΑΒΕ TR  
ΕΛΑΒΕΝ P66 S  
ΚΑΙ ΕΛΑΒΕΝ B W

ΤΑ ΙΜΑΤΙΑ ΑΥΤΟΥ TR P66 S\*\* B  
ΤΑ ΙΜΑΤΙΑ ΑΥΤΩΝ S\*  
ΤΑ ΙΜΑΤΙΑ ΕΑΥΤΟΥ W

ΑΝΑΠΕΣΩΝ TR  
ΚΑΙ ΑΝΑΠΕΣΩΝ P66 S\*\*  
ΚΑΙ ΑΝΕΠΕΣΕΝ S\* B W

ΓΙΝΩΣΚΕΤΕ TR P66  
ΓΕΙΝΩΣΚΕΤΑΙ S  
ΓΙΝΩΣΚΕΤΕ B  
ΓΙΝΩΣΚΕΤΑΙ W

ΥΜΙΝ TR S B W  
ΥΜΕΙΝ P66

13.13 ΥΜΕΙΣ TR P66 B W  
ΥΜΙΣ S

ΦΩΝΕΙΤΕ TR S B  
ΦΩΝΙΤΑΙ P66  
ΦΩΝΕΙΤΑΙ W

λεγετε TR B  
λεγεται P66 S W

ειμι TR P66 S B  
ειμει W

13.14 ει ουν εγω ενιψα ... και ο διδασκαλος TR P66 S B\*\*  
B\* repeats the phrase. B\*\* omits 1<sup>o</sup>.  
ει ουν εγω ενειψα ... και ο διδασκαλος W

υμεις TR S B W  
υμεις P66

οφειλετε TR B  
οφειλεται P66 W  
οφιλεται S

αλληλων νιπτειν τους ποδας TR P66 B W  
νιπτειν αλληλων τους ποδας S\*  
νιπτειν αλληλων τους ποδας S\*\*

13.15 υποδειγμα TR B  
υποδιγμα P66 S W

γαρ TR P66\*\* S B W  
omit P66\*

εδωκα TR P66 B W  
δεδωκα S

υμιν TR S B W  
υμειν P66

υμεις TR P66 B W  
υμεις S

ποιητε TR B  
ποιηται P66 S W

13.16 εστι TR  
εστιν P66 S B W

μειζων 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 B W  
μίζων S

μειζων 2<sup>ο</sup> TR B  
omit P66\*  
μίζον P66\*\*  
μειζον W  
μίζων S

13.17 οιδατε TR S B W  
οιδαται P66

εστε TR P66 S B  
εσται W

ποιητε TR S B  
ποιηται P66 W

13.18 εγω οιδα ους εξελεξαμην TR P66 W  
εγω γαρ οιδα τινας εξελεξαμην S  
εγω οιδα τινας εξελεξαμην B

αλλ TR P66 S B  
αλλα W

ο τρωγων μετ εμου τον αρτον TR P66 S W  
ο τρωγων μου τον αρτον B

επηρεν TR P66 B  
επηρκεν S W

επ εμε TR P66\*\* S W  
εμε P66\* B

13.19 απ αρτι λεγω υμιν προ του γενεσθαι TR P66\*\* S B W  
του γενεσθαι P66\*

ινα οταν γενηται πιστευσητε TR  
ινα πιστευσηται οταν γενηται P66 S  
ινα πιστευητε οταν γενηται B  
ινα οταν γενηται πιστευσηται W



ειμι TR S B  
 μι P66  
 ειμει W

13.20 υμιν TR S B W  
 υμειν P66

εαν TR P66  
 αν S B W

λαμβάνει 2<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 B W  
 λαμβανει S

τον πεμψαντα με P66\*\* S B W  
 και τον μψαντα με P66\*

13.21 ο ιησους TR P66 W  
 ιησους S B

εμαρτυρησε TR  
 εμαρτυρησεν P66 S B W

λεγω υμιν TR P66 S W  
 υμιν λεγω B

παραδωσει TR P66 S B  
 παραδωσι W

13.22 εβλεπον ουν TR P66 S\*\* W  
 εβλεπον ουν οι ιουδαιοι S\*  
 εβλεπον B

οι μαθηται TR S B W  
 οι μαθηται αυτου P66

13.23 ην δε TR P66 S W  
 ην B

εις των μαθητων αυτου TR  
 εις εκ των μαθητων αυτου P66 S B  
 εις εκ των μαθητων W

κολπω TR P66\*\* S B W  
κοπω P66\*

του ιησου TR S B W  
του ιησους P66

ο ιησους TR P66 S W  
ιησους B

13.24 πυθεσθαι τις αν ειη περι ου λεγει TR W  
πυθεσθαι τις αν ειη περι ου ειπεν P66  
πυθεσθαι τις αν ειη περι ου ελεγεν και λεγει αυτω ειπε  
τις εστιν περι ου λεγει S  
και λεγει αυτω ειπε τις εστιν περι ου λεγει B

13.25 επιπεσων TR P66 S\* W  
αγαπιπεσων S\*\*  
αγαπεσων B

δε TR  
ουν P66 S W  
omit B

εκεινος TR S W  
εκεινος ουτως P66 B

αποκρινεται ο ιησους TR  
αποκρινεται ιησους P66 W  
αποκρινεται ο ιησους και λεγει S\*  
αποκρινεται ουν ο ιησους και λεγει S\*\*  
αποκρεινεται ουν ιησους B

ω εγω βαψας το ψωμιον επιδωσω TR P66 S  
ω εγω βαψω το ψωμιον και δωσω αυτω B  
ω εγω δωσω ενβαψας το ψωμιον W

και εμβαψας το ψωμιον διδωσιν TR P66\*\*  
και ψας το ψωμιον διδωσιν P66\*  
βαψας ουν το ψωμιον διδωσιν S\*  
βαψας ουν το ψωμιον λαμβανει και διδωσιν S\*\*  
εμβαψας ουν το ψωμιον λαμβανει και διδωσι B\*  
εμβαψας ουν το ψωμιον λαμβανει και διδωσιν B\*\*  
και ενβαψας το ψωμιον διδωσιν W

Ιουδα σιμωνος Ισκαριωτη TR P66 B W  
 Ιουδα σιμωνος Ισκαριωτου S

13.27 τότε TR P66 B W  
 omit S

ο Ιησους TR P66 S W  
 Ιησους B

Ταχιον TR B\*\* W  
 Ταχειον P66 S B\*

13.28 τουτο δε ουδεις TR P66 S  
 τουτο ουδεις B W

13.29 γαρ TR S B W  
 δε P66

επει TR B  
 επι P66 S W

γλωσσοκομον TR P66 S B  
 γλωσσοκομιον W

ο Ιουδας TR P66  
 Ιουδας S B W

ο Ιησους TR P66 W  
 Ιησους S B

Χρειαν TR P66 B W  
 Χριαν S

13.30 ευθεως εξηλθεν TR  
 εξηθεν ευθους P66 S B W

εξηλθε TR  
 εξηλθεν P66 S B W

13.31 ο Ιησους TR W  
 Ιησους P66 S B

13.32 ει ο θεος εδοξασθη εν αυτω TR S\*\*  
omit P66 S\* B W

εν εαυτω TR S\*\* W  
εν αυτω P66 S\* B

και ευθυσ δοξασει αυτον TR P66 S B  
omit W

13.33 επι μικρον TR P66 B\*\*  
επι μεικρον χρονον S  
επι μεικρον B\* W

ειμι TR P66 S B  
ειμει W

ζητησετε TR B  
ζητησεται P66 S W

ειπον TR P66 B  
ειρηκα W

οτι οπου TR S\*\* B  
οπου P66 S\* W

υπαγω εγω TR  
υπαγω P66 W  
εγω υπαγω S B

υμεις TR S B W  
υμεις P66

δυνασθε TR B  
δυνασθαι P66 S W

ελθειν TR P66 B W  
ελθιν S

υμιν TR S B W  
υμειν P66

13.33, 34 λεγω TR S B W  
λεγω· πλην αρτι P66

13.34 καινην TR P66 S B  
κενην W

ηγασθησα TR S B W  
εγω ηγασθησα P66

ινα 2<sup>ο</sup> TR P66 B W  
omit S

αγαπατε αλληλους 2<sup>ο</sup> TR S B  
αλληλους αγαπαται P66  
αγαπαται αλληλους W

13.35 οτι εμοι TR S B W  
οτι εμου P66

μαθηται εστε TR S B  
εσται αθηται P66\*  
εσται μαθηται P66\*\*  
μαθηται εσται W

εαν αγαπην εχητε εν αλληλους TR B  
εαν αγαπην εχηται εν αλληλους P66 W  
εαν αγαπην εχηται μετ αλληλων S

13.36 απεκριθη αυτω ο ιησους TR S W  
απεκριθη αυτω ιησους P66  
απεκριθη ιησους B

υπαγω TR P66 B W  
εγω υπαγω S

υστερον δε ακολουθησεις μοι TR  
ακολουθησις δε υστερον P66  
ακολουθησεις δε υστερον S B W

13.37 ο πετρος TR P66 B W  
πετρος S

κυριε TR P66 S\*\* B W  
omit S\*

δυναμαι TR B W  
δυναμε P66 S

ακολουθησαι αρτι TR S  
ακολουθησε αρτι P66  
ακολουθειν αρτι B  
νυν ακολουθησαι αρτι W

την ψυχην μου υπερ σου θησω TR B  
υπερ σου την ψυχην μου θησω P66 S W

13.38 απεκριθη αυτω ο ιησους TR  
αποκρινεται ιησους P66 S B\*\*  
αποκρεινεται ιησους B\*  
αποκρινεται ο ιησους W

φωνησει TR  
φωνηση P66 S B W

απαρνηση με TR S  
αρνηση με P66 B  
συ με απαρνηση W

τρις TR P66 S\*\* B W  
τρεις S\*

14.1 πιστευετε 1ο TR B  
πιστευεται P66 S W

πιστευετε 2ο TR S B  
πιστευεται P66 W

14.2 οικια TR P66 S B  
οικεια W

ει δε μη ειπον αν υμιν TR  
ει δε μη αν ειπον υμειν P66\*  
ει δε μη ειπον αν υμειν οτι P66\*\*  
ει δε μη ειπον υμιν οτι S W  
ει δε μη ειπον αν υμιν οτι B

πορευομαι TR S B W  
 πορευομε P66

τοπον υμιν TR S B W  
 υμειν τοπον P66

14.3 και ετοιμασω TR P66 S B  
 ετοιμασω W

υμιν τοπον TR W  
 υμειν τοπον P66  
 τοπον υμιν S B

παλιν ερχομαι TR P66\*\* S B W  
 παλιν ερχομαι παλιν ερχομαι P66\*

παραληψομαι TR  
 παραληψομαι P66 S B W

ειμι εγω TR S B  
 ιμι εγω P66  
 εγω ειμει W

υμεις ητε TR B W  
 υμεις ηται P66  
 υμεις ητε S

14.4 εγω υπαγω TR S B  
 υπαγω P66 W

οιδατε 1<sup>ο</sup> TR S B W  
 οιδαται P66

και την οδον οιδατε TR  
 και την οδον οιδαται P66\*  
 την οδον P66\*\* S B W

14.5 και πως TR S  
 πως P66 B W

δυναμεθα την οδον ειδεναι TR P66 W  
 την οδον ειδεναι δυναμεθα S  
 οιδαμεν την οδον B

14.6 ο ιησους TR B W  
ιησους P66 S

ειμι TR P66 S B  
ειμει W

αληθεια TR S B W  
αληθια P66

ουδεις TR P66 B W  
ουδισ S

14.7 ει εγνωκειτε TR B  
ει εγνωκαται P66  
ει εγνωκατε S  
ει εγνωκεται W

με TR P66 B W  
εμε S

εγνωκειτε αν TR  
γνωσεσθε P66 W  
γνωσεσθαι S  
αν ηδειτε B

και απ αρτι TR P66 S W  
απ αρτι B

γινωσκετε αυτον και εωρακατε αυτον TR  
γινωσκεται αυτον και εωρακαται αυτον P66  
γνωσεσθαι αυτον και εωρακαται αυτον S  
γεινωσκετε αυτον και εωρακατε B\*  
γινωσκετε αυτον και εωρακατε B\*\*  
γιγνωσκεται αυτον και εωρακατε αυτον W

14.8 φιλιππος TR P66 B W  
ο φιλιππος S

δειξον TR P66 S B  
δειξον W

ημιν 1<sup>ο</sup> TR S B W  
ημειν P66



ημιν 2ο TR P75 S B W  
 ημειν P66

14.9 λεγει TR P75 S B W  
 λεγι P66

ο ιησους TR (P75) S B W  
 ιησους P66

τουτουτον χρονον TR P66 S\*\* B  
 τουτουτω χρονω S\* S\*\*\* W

εμει TR P66 P75 S B  
 εμει W

εγνωκας TR P66\*\*(P75) S B W  
 εγνωκας P66\*

εμε TR P75 S B W  
 εμει P66

εωρακε TR P66 B\*\*  
 εωρακεν P75 S B\* W

και πως TR  
 πως P66 S B W

λεγεις TR P66 S\*\* B W  
 λεγεις οτι S\*

14.10 πιστευεις TR P66 S B\*\* W  
 πιστευσεις B\*

εστι TR B\*\*  
 εστιν P66 P75 S B\* W

---

14.9 ο τ[ε] P75. 14.9 εγνωκας P75.

λαλω TR P66 S W  
 λεγω (P75) B\*\*  
 omit B\*

υμιν TR S B W  
 υμειν P66

ου λαλω TR P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
 λαλω P66\*

ο δε πατηρ ο εν εμοι μενων TR S W  
 ο δε πατηρ εν εμοι μενων P66 (P75) B

αυτος ποιει τα εργα TR  
 ποιει τα εργα αυτου P66 S B  
 ποιει τα εργα αυτος (P75) W

14.11 πιστευετε 1<sup>ο</sup> TR (P75) B  
 πιστευεται P66 S W

ει δε μη TR P66 (P75) S B  
 ει δε μη γε W

δια τα εργα αυτα πιστευετε μοι TR  
 δια τα εργα αυτα πιστευεται P66 W  
 δια τα εργα αυτου πιστευετε (P75)  
 τα εργα αυτα πιστευετε S\*  
 δια τα εργα αυτα πιστευετε S\*\*  
 δια τα εργα αυτου πιστευετε μοι B

14.12 αμην αμην TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 αμην αμη P66\*

υμιν TR (P75) S B W  
 υμειν P66

14.10 λεγω P75. 14.10 ου λαλω P75. 14.10 ο δε πατηρ εν εμοι  
 μ[ενων] P75. 14.10 ποιει τα εργα αυτος P75. 14.11 πιστευετε  
 P75. 14.11 ει δε μη P75. 14.11 δια τα [εργα αυτου]  
 πιστευετε P75. 14.12 υμ[ι]ν P75.

Ο ΠΙΣΤΕΥΩΝ ΕΙΣ ΕΜΕ TR (P75) S B W  
 ΕΙΣΤΕΥΩΝ ΕΙΣ ΕΜΕ P66\*  
 Ο ΠΕΙΣΤΕΥΩΝ ΕΙΣ ΕΜΕ P66\*\*

ΠΟΙΗΣΕΙ TR P75 S B W  
 ΠΟΙΗΣΙ P66

ΚΑΙ TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 ΚΑΚΑΙ P66\*

ΜΕΙΖΟΝΑ TR P75 S B W  
 ΜΙΖΟΝΑ P66

ΤΟΥΤΩΝ TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 OMIT P66\*

ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΥΝ ΠΑΤΕΡΑ ΜΟΥ TR  
 ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΥΝ ΠΑΤΕΡΑ P66 P75 S B W

14.13 ΚΑΙ Ο ΤΙ ΑΝ ΑΙΤΗΣΗΤΕ TR S  
 ΚΑΙ Ο ΕΑΝ ΑΙΤΗΣΗΤΑΙ P66  
 ΚΑΙ Ο ΤΙ ΑΝ ΑΙΤΗΤΕ (P75)  
 ΚΑΙ Ο ΤΙ ΑΝ ΑΙΤΗΤΑΙ B  
 ΚΑΙ Ο ΤΙ ΑΝ ΑΙΤΗΣΗΤΑΙ W

14.14 ΕΑΝ ΤΙ ΑΙΤΗΣΗΤΕ TR  
 ΕΑΝ ΤΙ ΑΙΤΗΣΗΤΑΙ ΜΑΙ P66  
 ΕΑΝ ΤΙ ΑΙΤΗΣΗΤΕ ΜΕ (P75) S B  
 ΕΑΝ ΤΙ ΑΙΤΗΣΗΤΑΙ ΜΕ W

ΕΓΩ ΠΟΙΗΣΩ TR P66\* S W  
 ΤΟΥΤΟ ΕΓΩ ΠΟΙΗΣΩ P66\*\*  
 ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΗΣΩ (P75) B

14.15 ΕΑΝ ΑΓΑΠΑΤΕ ΜΕ TR S\*\* B  
 ΕΑΝ ΑΓΑΠΗΤΑΙ ΜΕ P66\*  
 ΕΑΝ ΑΓΑΠΑΤΑΙ ΜΕ P66\*\* W  
 ΕΑΝ ΑΓΑΠΑΤΕ S\*

---

14.12 ο πι[σ]τευων εις εμε P75. 14.13 και ο [τ]ι αν αιτ[η]τε] P75. 14.14 εαν τι αιτ[η]σητ]ε με P75. 14.14 τουτο ποιησ[ω] P75.

τηρησατε TR W  
 τηρησηται P66  
 τηρησητε S  
 τηρησετε B

14.16 και εγω TR W  
 καγω P66 S B

ερωτησω TR P66 P75 S\*\* B W  
 τηρησω S\*

αλλον TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
 αλλα P66\*

υμιν TR (P75) S B W  
 υμειν P66

ινα μενη μεθ υμων εις τον αιωνα TR P66 W  
 ινα μεθ υμων εις τον αιωνα η (P75) B  
 ινα μεθ υμων η εις τον αιωνα S

14.17 αληθειας TR P75 B W  
 αληθιας P66 S

δ' TR P66 P75 S\* S\*\*\* B W  
 ον S\*\*

αυτο 1ο TR P66\*\* (P75) S\* S\*\*\*\* B W  
 αυτον P66\* S\*\*

γινωσκει TR S B\*\*  
 γεινωσκει P66 (P75) B\*  
 γιγνωσκει W

αυτο 2ο TR P66\*\*  
 omit P66\* P75 S B W

14.16 υμιν P75. 14.16 ινα μεθ υμων εις τον αιωνα η P75.  
 14.17 αυτο P75. 14.17 γεινωσκει P75.

υμεις TR P66 P75 B W  
 υμεις S

δε TR  
 omit P66 P75 S B W

γινωσκετε TR (P75) B\*\*  
 γεινωσκειται P66  
 γεινωσκετε S B\*  
 γινωσκειται W

αυτο 3ο TR P66\*\* P75 S B  
 αυτου P66\* W

υμιν TR P75 S B W  
 υμειν P66

εσται TR P66 (P75) S  
 εστιν B W

14.19 μικρον TR P66 S B\*\* W  
 μεικρον (P75) B\*

δε TR P75 S B W  
 omit P66

θεωρειτε TR P75 S B  
 θεωριται P66  
 θεωρειται W

οτι εγω ζω TR P66 S B W  
 οτι ζω εγω (P75)

ζησεσθε TR P66  
 ζησετε P75 B  
 ζησεσθαι S W

14.17 γινωσκετε P75. 14.17 [εστ]αι P75. 14.19 μεικρον P75.  
 14.19 οτι ζω εγω P75.

14.20 εν εκεινη τη ημερα TR (P66) (P75) B  
 εν εκινη τη ημερα S  
 εκεινη τη ημερα W

γνωσεθε υμεις οτι TR  
 ηγνωσεθε υμεις P66  
 υμεις γνωσεθε οτι (P75) B  
 γνωσεσθαι υμεις οτι S W

υμεις 2ο TR P75 B W  
 υμεις S

14.21 αγαπηθησεται υπο του πατρος μου TR P66 S B W  
 τηρηθησεται υπο του πατρος μου (P75)

και εγω TR W  
 καγω P66 P75 S B

14.22 λεγει TR P75 S B W  
 λεγι P66

αυτω TR (P75) S B W  
 προς αυτον P66

ο ισκαριωτης TR P66 S B W  
 ισκαριωτης P75

τι λεγονεν TR P66\* P75 B  
 και τι γεγονεν P66\*\* S W

ημιν μελλεις TR (P75) S B  
 ημειν μελλεις P66  
 μελλεις ημιν W

εμφανιζειν TR P66 S B W  
 ενφανιζειν P75

---

14.20 εν εκει[νη] τη ημερα P66. εν εκεινη τη ημερα P75.  
 14.20 υμεις γνωσεθε οτι P75. 14.21 τηρηθησ[ε]τ[αι] υπο του  
 πατρος μου P75. 14.22 αυ[τω] P75. 14.22 [η]μιν μελλεις P75.

14.23 ο ιησους TR  
ιησους P66 P75 S B W

ειπεν αυτω TR P66 (P75) S\* S\*\*\* B W  
ειπεν αυτοις S\*\*

τηρησει TR P75 B W  
τηρηση S

ελευσομεθα TR P66\*\* P75 S B W  
εισελευσομεθα P66\*

ποιησομεν TR  
ποιησομεθα (P66) (P75) S B W

14.24 τους λογους TR P66\*\* (P75) S B W  
του λογους P66\*

ακουετε TR P75 B  
ακουεται (P66) S W

14.25 υμιν 1ο TR P75 S B W  
υμειν P66

υμιν 2ο TR P75 S B W  
υμειν P66

14.26 ο δε παρακλητος το πνευμα το αγιον ο πεμψει ο  
πατηρ TR P66\*B  
ο δε παρακλητος το πνευμα το αγιον ο πεμψει υμιν ο  
πατηρ P66\*\*  
ο δε παρακλητος πεμψει το πνευματο αγιον ο πατηρ S\*  
ο δε παρακλητος το πνευμα το αγιον ον πεμψει ο πατηρ S\*\*

παντα α ειπον υμιν TR S  
παντα α ειπον υμιν εγω B

14.23 ειπεν αυτω P75. 14.23 ποιησο[με]θα P66; [π]οιησομεθα P75. 14.24 ι[ους λο]γου[ς] P75. 14.24 ακου[ει]ται P66; ακουετε P75.

14.27 ου καθως ο κοσμος διδωσιν TR B  
ου καθως ο κοσμος διδωσιν υμιν S

δειλιατω TR B\*\*  
διλιατω S B\*

14.28 ειπον TR  
omit S B

οτι ο πατηρ μου TR S\*  
οτι ο πατηρ S\*\* B

εστι TR  
εστιν S B

14.29 υμιν TR S B  
υμειν (P66)

γενεσθε TR S  
γενεσθαι B

ινα οταν TR B  
ιν οταν S

14.30 του κοσμου τουτου TR  
του κοσμου S B

14.31 ενετειλατο μοι TR  
ενετειλατο μοι S  
εντολην εδωκεν μοι B

ουτω TR  
ουτως S B

15.1 εστι TR  
εστιν S B

---

14.29 [υ]μειν P66.



- 15.2 καθαρει αυτο TR B  
καθαρει αυτον S
- πλειονα καρπον TR  
καρπον πλειω S  
καρπον πλειονα B
- 15.3 ον λελαληκα υμιν TR S B  
ον λελαληκα εν υμειν (P66\*)  
ον λελαληκα υμειν (P66\*\*)
- 15.4 μεινατε TR  
μινατε S  
μενητε B
- κλημα TR P66\*\* S B  
κημα P66\*
- μεινη TR (P66)  
μενη S B
- ουτως ουδε υμεις εαν μη εν εμοι μεινητε TR  
ουτως και ο εν εμοι μενων (P66)  
ουτως ουδε υμεις εαν μη εν εμοι μενητε S  
ουτως ουδε υμεις εαν μη εν εμοι μενητε B
- 15.5 υμεις TR P66 B  
υμεις S
- δυνασθε TR P66 B  
δυνασθαι S
- ουδεν TR S  
ουδε εν B
- 15.6 εαν μη τις μεινη TR P66\*\* S\*\*  
εμη τις μενη P66\*  
εαν μη τις μενη S\* B

---

15.3 [ον λελαλη]κα εν υμειν P66. 15.4 μει[ν]η P66.  
15.4 ουτως κα[ι ο ε]ν εμοι μενων P66.

συναγουσιν αυτα TR B  
συναγουσιν αυτο S

πυρ TR  
το πυρ S B

βαλλουσι TR  
βαλλουσιν S B  
βαλλουσιν αυτα (P66)

15.7 εαν μεινητε TR S B\*\*  
εαν μη μεινητε B\*

υμιν 1<sup>ο</sup> TR (P75) S\*\* B  
υ S\*

μεινη TR (P66\*\*) B  
μενη (P66\*)  
μινη S

ο εαν θελητε TR P66  
ο αν θελητε B  
οσα εαν θελητε S

αιτησεσθε TR S  
-----σθαι (P66)  
αιτησασθε B

και γενησεται υμιν TR S B  
και γενησεται (P66)

15.8 ινα καρπον πολυν φερητε TR B  
ινα καρπον πλιονα φερηται (P66)  
ινα καρπον πολυν φερηται S

και γενησεσθε εμοι μαθηται TR  
και γενησθαι μου μαθηται (P66)  
και γενησεσθαι μοι μαθηται S  
και γενησθε εμοι μαθηται B

---

15.6 βαλλουσιν [αυ]τα P66. 15.7 [υ]μ[ι]ν P75. 15.7 [μ]ενη P66. 15.7 [αι]τησε]σθαι P66. 15.7 και γ[ε]νη]σεται P66.  
15.8 ινα κα[ρ]π[ο]ν πλιονα φερηται P66. 15.8 και γεν[η]σθαι μου μαθηται P66.

- 15.9 ηγαπησε TR  
 ηγαπησεν (P66) S B
- ηγαπησα υμας TR P66 S  
 υμας ηγαπησα B
- μεινατε TR S B  
 μειναται (P66)
- εν τη αγαπη TR (P66) S B\*\*  
 ε τη αγαπη B\*
- 15.10 εαν τας εντολας μου τηρησητε μενειτε εν τη αγαπη  
 μου TR B  
 τηρησηται μενειται εν τη αγαπη (P66\*)  
 εαν τας εντολας μου τηρησηται μενειται εν τη αγαπη  
 μου (P66\*\*) S\*  
 omit S\*  
 εαν τας εντολας μου τηρησεται μενιται εν τη αγαπη  
 τη εμη S\*\*
- εγω TR B  
 καγω S
- τας εντολας του πατρος μου TR  
 του πατρος τας εντολας (P66) B  
 του πατρος μου τας εντολας μου S\*  
 του πατρος μου τας εντολας S\*\*
- τετηρηκα TR B  
 ετηρησα S
- 15.11 εν υμιν μεινη TR S  
 εν υμιν η B

---

15.9 η[γαπ]ησεν P66. 15.9 [μει]ναται P66. 15.9 εν [τη  
 α]γαπη P66. 15.10 τηρησηται μεν[ειτ]αι εν τη αγαπη P66\*;  
 εαν τας εντολας μο[υ] τηρησηται μεν[ειτ]αι εν τη αγαπη μου  
 P66\*\*. 15.10 του πατρος τας εντολα[ς] P66.

15.12 καθως TR S B  
ως P66

15.13 ουδεις TR (P66)  
ουδεις S  
ουδε εις B

ινα τις TR S\*\* B  
ινα P66 S\*

την ψυχην αυτου TR S B  
την ψυχην την εαυτου P66

15.14 υμεις TR P66 S\*\* B  
υμεις γαρ S\*

ποιητε TR B  
ποιηται P66 S

οσα TR  
α P66 S  
ο B

15.15 ουκετι υμας λεγω δουλους TR  
ουκετι λεγω υμας δουλους P66 S B

οιδε TR  
οιδεν S B

ειρηκα TR S B  
λεγω P66

παρα του πατρος TR (P66\*\*) S B  
πρς του πατρος (P66\*)

15.16 υμεις 1<sup>ο</sup> TR B  
υμεις P66 S

---

15.13 ο[υ]δεις P66. 15.15 παρα το[υ πατρος] P66.

εξελεξασθε TR B\*\*  
 εξελεξασθαι P66 S  
 εξελεξανσθαι B\*

εθηκα υμας TR S B  
 εθηκα P66

υμεις 2<sup>ο</sup> TR (P66) B  
 υμεις S

και 2<sup>ο</sup> TR P66\*\* S B  
 και P66\*

φερητε TR B  
 φερηται P66 S

ινα ο τι αν TR P66 S\*\* B  
 ο τι αν S\*

αιτησητε TR  
 αιτησηται S  
 αιτητε B

δω υμιν TR B  
 δωσει υμιν S

15.17 ινα αγαπατε αλληλους TR (P66\*\*) S B  
 αγαπατε αλληλους (P66\*)

15.18 μισει TR B\*\*  
 εμισει σε P66\*  
 εμισει P66\*\*  
 μεισει S B\*

γινωσκετε οτι εμε πρωτον υμων TR (P66) S\*\* B\*\*  
 γεινωσκετε οτι εμε πρωτον υμων B\*  
 γινωσκετε οτι εμε πρωτον S\*

---

15.16 υμε[ις] P66. 15.17 α[γαπατε] αλληλ[ου]ς P66\*; ιν[α]  
 α[γαπατε] αλληλ[ου]ς P66\*\*. 15.18 γινωσκετε οτι εμε πρ[ωτ]ον  
 [υ]μων P66.

μεμίσθηκεν TR S\*\* B\*\*  
 μεμείσθηκεν (P66) B\*  
 ἐμίσθηκεν S\*

15.19 τὸ ἴδιον TR S B  
 τὸν ἴδιον P66

ὅτι δε ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ ἐστε TR S B  
 ὅτι δε οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ τούτου κόσμου ἐστε (P66\*)  
 ὅτι δε οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐστε (P66\*\*)

διὰ τοῦτο μίσει ὑμᾶς ὁ κόσμος TR B\*\*  
 διὰ τοῦτο ὑμᾶς μίσει ὁ κόσμος (P66)  
 διὰ τοῦτο ὁ κόσμος μίσει ὑμᾶς S  
 διὰ τοῦτο μείσει ὑμᾶς ὁ κόσμος B\*

15.20 μνημονεύετε τοῦ λόγου οὐ TR (P66) B  
 μνημονεύεται τὸν λόγον οὐ S

ἐγὼ εἶπον ὑμῖν TR (P66) B  
 ἐλάλησαι ὑμᾶς S\*  
 ἐλάλησαι ὑμῖν S\*\*

ἐστὶ TR  
 ἐστὶν S B

τήρησουσιν TR B  
 τήρησωσιν S

15.21 ποιήσουσιν ὑμῖν TR  
 ποιοῦσιν εἰς ὑμᾶς (P66)  
 ποιήσουσιν S\*  
 ποιήσουσιν εἰς ὑμᾶς S\*\* B

οἰδασι TR B  
 οἰδασὶν S

---

15.18 μ[ε]μείσθηκεν P66. 15.19 οτ[ι] δε οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ τούτου  
 κόσμου ἐστε P66. 15.19 δ[ι]α τοῦ[το] ὑμᾶς μίσει ὁ κόσμος P66.  
 15.20 μνημονεue[τε τοῦ] λόγου οὐ P66. 15.20 ἐγὼ εἶπον  
 υ[μῖ]ν P66. 15.21 ποιοῦσιν εἰς υμ[α]ς P66.

- 15.22 εἶχον TR  
εἶχουσαν (P66) S B
- νυν δε προφασιν TR S\*\* B  
νυν προφασιν S\*
- εχουσι TR  
εχουσιν (P66) S B
- της αμαρτιας αυτων TR S B  
της αμαρτιας (P66)
- 15.23 μισων TR B\*\*  
μεισων S B\*
- μισει TR P66 S B\*\*  
μεισει B\*
- 15.24 ουδεις TR B  
μηδεις (P66)  
ουδεις S
- πεποιηκεν TR  
εποιησεν (P66) S B
- ειχον TR  
ειχουσαν (P66) S B
- εωρακασι TR  
εωρακασιν P66  
εωρακασιν S B
- μεμισθηκασι TR  
μεμισθηκασιν P66 B\*  
μεμισθηκασιν S B\*\*

---

15.22 [ε]ιχουσαν P66. 15.22 ε[χ]ουσιν P66. 15.22 τη[ς  
αμ]αρτιας P66. 15.24 μηδ[εις] P66. 15.24 εποιη[σε]ν P66.  
15.24 [ε]ιχουσαν P66.

και 3ο TR S B  
omit P66

15.25 ο γεγραμμενος εν τω νομω αυτων TR  
εν τω νομω γεγραμμενος (P66\*)  
εν τω νομω γεγραμμενος αυτων (P66\*\*) S\*  
ο εν τω κοσμω αυτων γεγραμμενος S\*  
ο εν τω νομω αυτων γεγραμμενος (P22.) S\*\* B  
οτι εμισεσαν με δωρεαν TR (P66) S B\*\*  
οτι εμεισεσαν με δωρεαν B\*

15.26 οταν δε ελθη TR  
οταν ελθη P22 S B

15.27 μαρτυρειτε TR B  
μαρτυριτε S

16.1 ινα μη σκανδαλισθητε TR S\*\* B  
ινα σκανδαλισθητε S\*

16.2 αποσυναγωγους ποιησουσιν υμας TR B  
αποσυναγωγους γαρ ποιησωσιν υμας S

αλλ ερχεται TR B  
αλλα ερχεται S

αποκτεινας TR B  
αποκτινας S

υμας 2ο TR S  
omit B

λατρειαν TR B  
λατριαν S

προσφερειν TR B  
προσφερειν S

---

15.25 εν τω [ν]ομω [γεγραμμενος] P66\*; αυ[των] P66\*\*. [ο εν τω νομω αυ]των γεγραμμε[νος] P22. 15.25 οτι εμισε[σα]ν με [δωρεαν] P66.



- 16.3 ποιησουσιν TR B  
ποιησωσιν S
- υμιν TR S  
omit B
- 16.4 ινα οταν ελθη TR B  
ινα αν ελθη S\*  
ινα εαν ελθη S\*\*
- η ωρα μνημονευητε αυτων TR  
η ωρα μνημονευηται αυτων S\*  
η ωρα αυτων μνημονευηται αυτων S\*\*  
η ωρα αυτων μνημονευητε αυτων B
- οτι εγω ειπον υμιν TR S\*\* B  
οτι εγω ειπον S\*
- 16.5 υπαγω TR B  
εγω υπαγω S
- και ουδεις εξ υμων ερωτα με που υπαγεις TR B  
και ουδεις εξ υμων ερωτα με που υπαγει S\*  
και ουδεις εξ υμων ερωτα με που υπαγεις S\*\*
- 16.7 ουκ ελευσεται TR S  
ου μη ελθη B
- προς υμας TR S\*\* B  
προς ημας S\*
- εαν δε πορευθω πεμψω αυτον προς υμας TR S B W  
omit P66\*  
εαν δε πορευθω πεμψω υμας P66\*\*
- 16.9 οτι ου πιστευουσιν εις εμε TR S\*\* B W  
οτι πιστευουσιν εις εμε S\*
- 16.10 τον πατερα μου TR  
τον πατερα S B W
- θεωρειτε TR S B  
θεωριται W

16.11 κερριται TR S B  
κερριτε W

16.12 λεγειν υμιν TR W  
υμιν λεγειν S B

δυνασθε TR B  
δυνασθαι S W

αρτι TR (P66) S\*\* B W  
omit S\*

16.13 οταν δε ελθη TR S B  
οταν ελθη W

αληθειας TR B W  
αληθιας S

εις πασαν την αληθειαν TR  
εν τη αληθεια S\*  
εν τη αληθεια παση S\*\* W  
εις την αληθειαν πασαν B

αν ακουση TR  
ακουει S  
ακουσει B W

16.14 ληψεται TR  
λημψεται S B W

αναγγελει TR B W  
αναγελλει S

16.15 παντα οσα εχει ο πατηρ εμα εστι δια τουτο ειπον οτι εκ  
του εμου ληψεται και αναγγελει υμιν TR  
omit P66 S\*

---

16.12 [αρ]τι P66.

ΠΑΝΤΑ ΟΣΑ ΕΧΕΙ Ο ΠΑΤΗΡ ΕΜΑ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΕΙΠΟΝ ΥΜΙΝ  
 ΟΤΙ ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΕΜΟΥ ΛΑΜΒΑΝΕΙ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΑΓΓΕΛΕΙ ΥΜΙΝ S\*\*  
 ΠΑΝΤΑ ΟΣΑ ΕΧΕΙ Ο ΠΑΤΗΡ ΕΜΑ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΕΙΠΟΝ ΟΤΙ  
 ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΕΜΟΥ ΛΑΜΒΑΝΕΙ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΑΓΓΕΛΕΙ ΥΜΙΝ (P5) B W

16.16 μικρον 1<sup>ο</sup> TR (P66) B\*\* W  
 μεικρον S B\*

ου θεωρειτε με TR  
 ουκετι θεωριται με (P66) W  
 ουκετι θεωρειτε με S B

μικρον 2<sup>ο</sup> TR (P66) S B\*\* W  
 μεικρον B\*

οψεσθε TR P5 S B  
 οψεσθαι (P66) W

ΟΤΙ ΕΓΩ ΥΠΑΓΩ ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΝ ΠΑΤΕΡΑ TR  
 omit P5 P66 S B W

16.17 ειπον TR S  
 ειπαν P66 B W

εστι TR B  
 εστιν P5 P66 S W

ημιν TR S B W  
 ημειν P66

μικρον και ου θεωρειτε με και παλιν TR B\*\*  
 μικρον και ου θεωριται με και παλιν (P66) S\*\*  
 omit S\*  
 μεικρον και ου θεωρειτε με και παλιν (P5) B\*  
 μικρον και ουκετι θεωριται με και παλιν W

---

16.15 [παντα οσ]α εχει ο πατηρ ε[μα εστιν δια τουτο ειπο]ν  
 οτι εκ τ[ου εμου λαμβανει] και αναγγελεει υμιν P5.  
 16.16 μι[κρ]ον 1<sup>ο</sup> P66. 16.16 [ουκε]τι θεωρι[ται με] P66.  
 16.16 μι[κρ]ο[ν] 2<sup>ο</sup> P66. 16.16 οψεσ[θα]ι P66. 16.17 μι[κρ]ον  
 και ου θεωριται μ[ε κ]αι παλιν P66. 16.17 μι[κρ]ον και ου  
 θεωρει[τ]ε με και παλιν P5.

οψεσθε TR (P5) P66\*\* S B  
 οψεσ P66\*  
 οψεσθαι W

και οτι εγω υπαγω TR  
 και --- υπαγω (P66)  
 και ω υπαγω S\*  
 και οτι υπαγω (P5) S\*\* B  
 και εγω υπαγω W

16.18 ΤΟΥΤΟ ΤΙ ΕΣΤΙΝ TR  
 ΤΙ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΟΥΤΟ (P66) S W  
 ΤΙ ΕΣΤΙ ΤΟΥΤΟ B

ο λεγει το μικρον ουκ οιδαμεν τι λαλει TR  
 το μικρον ουκ οιδαμεν τι λαλει (P5) (P66) S\* W  
 ο λεγι μικρον ουκ οιδαμεν τι λαλει S\*\*  
 ο λεγει μεικρον ουκ οιδαμεν B\*  
 ο λεγι μικρον ουκ οιδαμεν B\*\*

16.19 εγνω ουν TR  
 εγνω P5 P66 S B W

ο ιησους TR S  
 ιησους P5 B W

οτι ηθελον TR P5 B  
 οτι ημελλον και ηθελον (P66\*)  
 οτι ημελλον (P66\*\*) S W

και ειπεν αυτοις TR (P5) (P66\*\*) S B W  
 ειπεν αυτοις (P66\*)

ζητειτε TR (P5) S B  
 ζητιται W

---

16.17 [οψ]εσθε P5. 16.17 και [οτ]ι [υπαγω] P5; κα[ι οτι  
 υ]παγω P66. 16.18 [τι] εσ[τιν] τουτο P66. 16.18 [το]  
 μεικρον ουκ οιδα[μεν τι λαλει] P5; [το] μικ[ρο]ν ου[κ ο]ιδαμεν  
 τι λαλει P66. 16.19 [οτι] ημελλον κ[αι η]θελον P66.  
 16.19 και ειπεν αυτ[ο]ις P5; και ειπεν α[υτ]οις P66.  
 16.19 [ζητ]ειτε P5.

μικρον 1<sup>ο</sup> TR S B\*\* W  
 μεικρον B\*

θεωρειτε TR S B  
 θεωρειται W

μικρον 2<sup>ο</sup> S B\*\* W  
 μεικρον B\*

οψεσθε TR P5 S B  
 οψεσθαι W

16.20 υμιν TR S B W  
 υμειν P5

κλαυσετε TR S B  
 κλαυσεται W

θρηνησετε TR (P5) S\*\* B  
 θρηνησητε S  
 θρηνησεται W

υμεις 1<sup>ο</sup> TR P5 B W  
 υμεις S

υμεις 2<sup>ο</sup> TR B W  
 υμεις S

δε 2<sup>ο</sup> TR S\*\* W  
 omit P5 S\* B

λυπηθησεσθε TR (P5\*\*) (P66) B  
 λυπηθησεσθαι S W  
 λουπηθησεσθε (P5\*)

16.21 λυπην TR (P5\*\*) (P22) (P66) S B W  
 λοιπην (P5\*)

16.20 [θρηνησ]ετε P5. 16.20 λουπηθη[σεσθε] P5; [λυπηθησεσ]θε P66. 16.21 λοι[πην] P5; [λ]υπην P66; λυπ[ην] P22.

οτι ηλθεν η ωρα αυτης TR (P5) S B W  
 οτι ηλθεν η ημερα αυτης (P66)

θλειψεως TR S B\*\* W  
 θλειψεως (P5) (P22) P66 B\*

ανθρωπος TR (P5) P22 (P66) S\*\* B W  
 ο ανθρωπος S\*

16.22 ουν λυπην μεν νυν TR  
 ουν νυν μεν λυπην (P5) (P22) (P66) S\*\* B W  
 νυν μεν ουν λυπην S\*

εχετε TR P22. B  
 εξεται P66 S\*\* W\*  
 εχεται S\* W\*\*

και την χαραν TR (P66\*\*) S B W  
 την χαραν (P66\*)

ουδεις TR (P5) (P22) B W  
 ουδεις S

αιρει TR P22 S  
 αιρι (P66)  
 αρει P5 B  
 αφερει W

16.23 εν εκεινη τη ημερα TR (P66) S B  
 εκεινη τη ημερα W

ουκ ερωτησετε TR (P22) B  
 ουκ ερωτησεται S  
 ουκ ερωτησεται W

---

16.21 [οτι ηλθεν] η ωρα αυτης P5; οτι ηλθεν η ημ[ερα αυ]της P66. 16.21 [θλ]ειψ[ε]ως P5; θλειψεω[ς] P22. 16.21 ανθρω[πος] P5; ανθρω[πος] P66. 16.21 ουν νυν μεν[λυπην] P5; [ουν νυν μ]εν λυπην P22; ουν [ν]υν μεν λυπ[ην] P66. 16.22 και την [χ]αραν P66. 16.22 [ου]δεις P5; [ου]δεις P22. 16.22 [α]ιρι P66. 16.23 [ε]ν εκεινη τ[η ημερα] P66. 16.23 [ου]κ ερωτησετε P22.

οτι οσα αν TR  
 οτι ο αν S  
 αν τι P5 B  
 οτι αν W  
 οτι εαν (P22)

αιτησητε TR (P5) B  
 αιτησηται S W

εν το ονοματι μου δωσει υμιν TR W  
 εν τω ονοματι μου δωσει υμειν (P5) S B  
 δωσει υμιν εν τω ονοματι μου (P22)

16.24 εως αρτι ουκ ητησατε ουδεν εν τω ονοματι μου TR (P5\*\*)B W  
 οπιτ P5\*  
 εως αρτι ουκ ητησαται ουδεν εν τω ονοματι μου (P66) S

αιτειτε TR B  
 αιτησασθαι (P66) S\* W  
 αιτιται S\*\*

ληψεσθε TR  
 λημψεσθε P5 S B  
 λημψεσθαι W

η πεπληρωμενη TR S B  
 πεπληρωμενη ην W

16.25 αλλ ερχεται TR  
 ερχεται (P5) S B W

ωρα οτε TR P5 S\*\* B W  
 οτε P66  
 ωρα οπου S\*

υμιν 2<sup>ο</sup> TR S B W  
 υμειν P5 P66

---

16.23 [ο]τι εαν P22. 16.23 αιτη[σ]ητε P5. 16.23 [δωσει υμιν]  
 εν τω ο[ν]οματι μου] P5; [εν τω ονοματι μου δωσει] υμειν P22.  
 16.24 [εως αρτι ουκ ητησατε ουδεν εν] τ[ω ονοματι μου] P5\*\*;  
 [εως αρτι ουκ ητησ]αται ουδ[εν εν τω ονοματι μου] P66.  
 16.24 [αιτ]ησασθαι P66. 16.25 [ερχεται] P5, propter spatium.

παρρησία TR S B\*\* W  
παρησία B\*

του πατρος αναγγελω υμιν TR  
του πατρος λαλησω υμειν. απαγγελω υμιν P66\*  
του πατρος απαγγελω υμιν (P5) (P22) (P66\*\*) B W  
του πατρος απαγγελλω υμιν S

16.26 εν τω ονοματι μου αιτησεσθε TR (P5) (P22) B  
εν τω ονοματι μου αιτησεσθαι (P66)  
αιτησασθαι εν τω ονοματι μου S W

περι υμων TR S B W  
omit P5 P66

16.27 εμε TR B W  
με S

οτι εγω TR (P22) S B W  
οτι P5

παρα του θεου TR W  
παρα θεου P5 S\*  
παρα πατρος S\*\* B

16.28 εξηλθον παρα του πατρος TR (P5) (P22) S  
omit W  
εξηλθον εκ του πατρος B

αφιημι TR S B  
αφιημει W

16.29 λεγουσιν αυτω οι μαθηται αυτου TR  
λεγουσιν οι μαθηται αυτω S\*  
λεγουσιν οι μαθηται αυτου S\*\* B  
λεγουσιν αυτω οι μαθηται (P5\*\*) W  
λεγουσιν οι μαθηται (P5\*)

---

16.25 του πατρος απαγγε[λω υμιν] P5; [του π̄ρ]̄ς [α]π[α]γγελω  
[υμιν] P22; [του π̄ρ]̄ς λαλησω υμειν απ[αγγελω υμιν] P66.  
16.26 [εν τω ονοματι] μου αιτησεσθε P5; [ε]ν τω ον[οματι]  
μ[ο]υ αιτη[σεσθε] P22; [ε]ν τω ονοματι μου αιτησεσθαι P66.  
16.27 οτι εγ[ω] P22. 16.28 [εξηλθον] παρα του πατρος P5;  
εξ[η]λθον παρα του π̄[ρ]̄ς P22. 16.29 [λε]γουσιν οι μ[αθηται] P5\*;  
[λε]γουσιν αυτω οι μ[αθηται] P5\*\*.



ιδε TR S B  
ειδε W

παρρησια TR S\*\*  
εν παρρησια S\* B W

16.30 χρειαν TR (P22) B W  
χρειαν S

16.31 ο ιησους TR S  
ιησους (P22) B W

16.31 πιστευετε TR (P66) B  
πιστευεται S W

16.32 ιδου ερχεται ωρα και νυν εληλυθεν ινα σκορπισθητε TR  
ερχεται ωρα και εληλυθεν ινα σκορπισθηται παντες (P66\*)  
ερχεται ωρα και εληλυθεν ινα σκορπισθηται (P66\*\*) S\*  
ιδου ερχεται ωρα και εληλυθεν η ωρα ινα σκορπισθητε S\*  
ιδου ερχεται ωρα και εληλυθεν ινα σκορπισθητε (P22) S\*\* B  
ιδου ερχεται ωρα και εληλυθεν ινα σκορπισθηται W

και εμε TR (P22) W  
καμε S B

αφητε TR S B  
αφηται W

ειμι TR S B  
ειμει W

εστι TR  
εστιν S B W

16.30 χρει[αν] P22. 16.31 τη[ς] P22. 16.31 πιστευ[ετ]ε P66.  
16.32 ερ[χε]ται ωρα και εληλυθεν [ινα σκορπισθη]ται π[αντες]  
P66; [ιδου ερχεται] ωρα [και ε]ληλυθεν [ινα σκορπισθητε]  
P22. 16.32 κα[ι] εμ[ε] P22.

16.33 ταυτα λελαληκα TR S B W  
 ταυτα δε λελαληκα (P66)

εχητε TR B  
 εχηται S W

εν τω κοσμω θλιψιν εξετε TR  
 omit P66  
 εν τω κοσμω θλιψιν εχετε S  
 εν τω κοσμω θλειψιν εχετε B  
 εν τω κοσμω θλιψιν εχεται W

θαρσειτε TR B  
 θαρσειται (P66) S W

17.1 ελαλησεν TR B  
 λελαληκεν S W

ο ιησους TR W  
 ιησους S B

επηρε TR  
 επαρας S B W

και ειπε TR  
 ειπεν S B W

και ο υιος σου TR  
 ο υιος S B W

17.2 δωση αυτοις TR S\*\*  
 δωσω αυτω S\*  
 δωσει αυτοις (P66) B  
 δωσ αυτω W

17.3 γινωσκωσι σε TR S B\*\*  
 γεινωσκωσι σε B\*  
 γινωσκουσιν W

---

16.33 [ταυτ]α δε [λελαληκα] P66. 16.33 [θαρσειτ]αι P66.  
 17.2 [δωσει α]υτοις P66.

αληθινον TR (P66) S B  
αληθεινον W

απεστειλας TR B  
απεστειλας S  
απεστειλεν W  
απεπεμψας P66

17.4 το εργον TR P66 S B  
το εργον σου W

ετελειωσα TR  
τελιωσας S W  
τελειωσας (P66) B

ο δεδωκας μοι TR (P66) S\*\* B  
ο δεδωκας με S\*  
ο εδωκας μοι W

17.5 η ειχον S\*\* B W  
ην ειχον S\*

προ του τον κοσμον ειναι παρα σοι TR (P66\*\*) S B W  
παρα σοι προ του τον κοσμον ειναι (P66\*)

17.6 δεδωκας 1<sup>ο</sup> TR  
εδωκας S B W

σοι ησαν TR S B  
σου ησαν W

και εμοι TR S W  
εαμοι B

δεδωκας 2<sup>ο</sup> TR  
εδωκας (P66) S B W

---

17.3 [α]ληθινο[ν] P66. 17.3 [απεπ]εμψας P66. 17.4 τ[ελει]ωσας P66. 17.4 [ο δ]εδωκας μοι P66. 17.5 πα[ρα σοι] προ το[ν τον κοσμ]ον ειναι P66\*; πα[ρα σοι] P66\*\*. 17.6 εδ[ωκας] P66.

ΤΕΤΗΡΗΚΑΣΙ TR  
 ΕΤΗΡΗΣΑΝ S  
 ΤΕΤΗΡΗΚΑΝ B W

17.7 ΕΓΝΩΚΑΝ TR B  
 ΕΓΝΩΝ S  
 ΕΓΝΩΚΑ W

ΔΕΔΩΚΑΣ TR S W  
 ΕΔΩΚΕΣ B

ΕΣΤΙΝ TR  
 ΕΙΣΙΝ S B W

17.8 ΔΕΔΩΚΑΣ TR S  
 ΕΔΩΚΕΣ B  
 ΕΔΩΚΑΣ W

ΔΕΔΩΚΑ TR S B  
 ΕΔΩΚΑ W

ΚΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΙ ΕΛΑΒΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΓΝΩΣΑΝ ΑΛΗΘΩΣ ΟΤΙ TR S\*\* B  
 ΚΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΙ ΕΛΑΒΟΝ ΑΛΗΘΩΣ ΟΤΙ S\*  
 ΚΑΙ ΑΥΤΟ ΕΛΑΒΟΝ ΑΛΗΘΩΣ ΟΤΙ W

ΕΠΙΣΤΕΥΣΑΝ TR (P66) S\*\* B W  
 ΕΠΙΣΤΕΥΣΑΣ S\*

ΑΠΕΣΤΕΙΛΑΣ TR B  
 ΑΠΕΣΤΙΛΑΣ S W

17.9 ΔΕΔΩΚΑΣ TR S B  
 ΕΔΩΚΑΣ W

ΕΙΣΙ TR  
 ΕΙΣΙΝ S B W

---

17.8 [ΕΠΙΣΤΕΥΣΑ]ν P66.

17.10 και τα εμα παντα σα εστι και τα σα εμα TR  
 και τα εμα παντα σα εστιν και τα σα εμα (P66) B W  
 και εμοι αυτους εδωκας S

δεδοξασμαι B W  
 τεδοξασμε P66\*  
 δεδοξασμε P66\*\* S

17.11 ειμι TR P66 S B  
 ειμει W

και ουτοι εν τω κοσμω εισι TR  
 και αυτοι εν τω κοσμω εισιν S B  
 και ουτοι εν τω κοσμω εισιν W

και εγω TR (P66) W  
 καγω S B

πατερ αγιε TR S W  
 πρ αγιε P66  
 πατηρ αγιε B

ους δεδωκας μοι TR  
 ω εδωκας μοι S W  
 ω δεδωκας μοι (P66) B

ινα ωσιν εν καθως ημεις TR S B\*\* W  
 omit P66\* (with sign of correction, but no correction)  
 ινα ωσιν εν καθως και ημεις B\*

17.12 οτε ημην TR S W  
 οτε ημεν B

εν τω κοσμω TR  
 omit P66 S B W

---

17.10 [και τα εμ]α παντ[α σα εσ]τιν κ[αι τα] σα ε[μα] P66.  
 17.11 και [εγω] P66. 17.11 ω [δεδω]κας μοι P66.

εν τω ονοματι σου TR (P66\*\*) S\*\* B W  
 εν τω ονοματι μου (P66\*)  
 εν τω ονοματικ σου S\*

ους δεδωκας μοι TR  
 omit S\*  
 ο δεδωκας μοι S\*\*  
 ω δεδωκας μοι (P66) B  
 ω εδωκας μοι W

εφυλαξα TR  
 και εφυλασσον S\*  
 και εφυλαξα S\*\* B W

ουδεις TR (P66) B W  
 ουδισ S

εξ αυτων TR (P66\*\*) S B W  
 αυτων (P66\*)

απωλειας TR B W  
 απωλιας S

17.13 εχωσι TR B  
 εχωσιν S W

πεπληρωμενην TR S\*\* B W  
 πεπληρωκενην S\*

εν αυτοις TR (P66)  
 εν εαυτοις S B W

17.14 εγω δεδωκα TR S B  
 εγω εδωκα W

εμισησεν TR S B\*\*  
 εμεισησεν B\* W

---

17.12 [εν τ]ω ονο[ματι] μου P66. 17.12 ω [δεδωκας μοι] P66.  
 17.12 [ο]υδει[ς] P66. 17.12 [αυτων] P66. 17.13 [ε]ν  
 αυτοι[ς] P66.

καθως εγω ουκ ειμι εκ του κοσμου TR S\*\* B  
 omit P66\*  
 καθως εγω εκ του κοσμου ουκ ειμι (P66\*\*)  
 καθως ουκ ειμι εκ του κοσμου S\*  
 καθως εγω ουκ ειμι εκ του κοσμου W

17.15 εκ του κοσμου αλλ ινα τηρησης αυτους TR (P66) S B\*\* W  
 omit B\*

17.16 εισι TR  
 εισιν (P66) S B W

εκ του κοσμου ουκ ειμι TR (P66)  
 ουκ ειμι εκ του κοσμου S B  
 ουκ ειμι εκ του κοσμου W

17.17 εν τη αληθεια σου TR S\*\*  
 εν τη αληθεια S\*  
 εν αληθεια B  
 εν τη αληθεια (P66) W

ο λογος ο σος αληθεια εστι TR  
 ο λογος ο σος αληθεια εστιν (P66)  
 omit S\*  
 ο λογος ο σος αληθεια εστιν S\*\*  
 ο λογος ο σος η αληθεια εστιν B W

17.18 απεστειλας TR B  
 απεστιλας P66 S W

καγω απεστειλα αυτους εις τον κοσμον TR B\*\*  
 omit P66  
 καγω απεστειλα αυτους εις τον κοσμον S W  
 καγω απεστειλα αυτους εις τον κοσμον καγω απεστειλα  
 αυτους εις τον κοσμον B\*

17.19 εγω αγιαζω εμαυτον TR B  
 αγιαζω εμαυτον (P66) S W

---

17.14 καθως εγω εκ [του κοσμου ουκ ειμι] P66. 17.15 [εκ του]ν  
 κοσμ[ου] αλλ ινα τηρηση[ς αυτου]ς P66. 17.16 ε[ι]σιν P66.  
 17.16 [εκ του] κο[σμο]υ ου[κ ειμι] P66. 17.17 εν [τη αληθεια]  
 P66, propter spatium. 17.17 [ο λ]ογος ο σος αληθ[ει]α ε[στιν]  
 P66. 17.19 [αγιαζω εμαυτον] P66.

ινα και αυτοι ωσιν ηγιασμενοι εν αληθεια TR  
 ινα ωσιν αυτοι εν αληθεια ηγιασμενοι (P66\*)  
 ινα ωσιν και αυτοι εν αληθεια ηγιασμενοι (P66\*\*\*)  
 ινα ωσιν και αυτοι ηγιασμενοι εν αληθεια S B\*  
 ινα ωσιν και αυτοι ηγιασμενοι εν αληθεια B\*\* W

17.20 ερωτω μονον TR S B  
 μονων ερωτω W

περι των πιστευοντων TR  
 περι των πιστευοντων S B  
 υπερ των πιστευοντων W

17.21 ωσι TR  
 ωσιν S B W

πατερ TR S  
 πατηρ B W

εν ημιν εν ωσιν TR S  
 εν ημειν ωσιν (P66)  
 εν ημιν ωσιν B W

πιστευση TR S\*\*  
 πιστευη (P66) S\* B W

απεστειλας TR B  
 απεστιλας P66 S W

17.22 και εγω TR  
 καγω P66 S B W

την δοξαν TR (P66) S B  
 την δοξαν μου W

δεδωκας TR S B W\*  
 εδωκας W\*\*

---

17.19 ι[να] ωσιν αυ[τοι εν αληθεια η]γιασ[μενοι] P66.  
 17.21 εν ημειν [ωσιν] P66. 17.21 [πιστε]υη P66. 17.22 [τη]ν  
 δ[οξαν] P66.



δεδωκα αυτοις TR (P66) B W  
εδωκα αυτοις S

ινα ωσιν εν καθως ημεις εν εσμεν TR S\*\*  
ινα ωσιν εν καθως ημεις εν (P66) B W  
ινα ωσιν εν καθως ημεις S\*

17.23 ωσι TR B  
ωσιν S W

τετελειωμενοι TR (P66) B  
τετελιωμενοι S W

και ινα γινωσκη TR  
και γινωσκη S W  
ινα γεινωσκη B\*  
ινα γινωσκη B\*\*

απεστειλας TR B  
απεστιλας S W

εμε ηγαπησας TR (P66) S B  
καμε ηγαπησας W

17.24 πατερ TR S W  
πατηρ B

ους δεδωκας μοι TR  
ο δεδωκας μοι S B W

ειμι TR (P66) S B  
ειμει W

εγω TR S B W  
omit P66

---

17.22 δε[δωκ]α αυτο[ις] P66. 17.22 [ι]να [ωσ]ιν εν καθως η[μει]ς εν P66. 17.23 [τε]τελειωμεν[ο]ι P66. 17.23 εμε ηγαπ[ησας] P66. 17.24 [ει]μι P66.

κακεινοι TR (P66) S B  
 και εκεινοι W

ωσι TR (P66)  
 ωσιν S B W

θεωρωσι TR B  
 θεωρωσιν S W\*\*  
 φεωρουσιν W\*

ην εδωκας TR B  
 ην δεδωκας S W

17.25 πατερ TR S W  
 πατηρ B

εγω δε σε εγνων TR S B  
 εγω δε εγνων σε W

απεστειλας TR B  
 απεστιλας S W

17.26 η αγαπη ην ηγαπησας με TR B W  
 η αγαπη ην ηγαπησας αυτους S

καγω TR S B  
 και εγω W

18.1 ο ιησους TR W  
 ιησους S B

εξηλθε TR  
 εξηλθεν S B W

τοις μαθηταις TR S\*\* B W  
 αυτοις μαθηταις S\*

---

17.24 [κα]κεινο[ι] P66. 17.24 [ω]σι P66.

χειμαρρου TR (P66\*\*) B W  
 χειμαρου (P66\*)  
 χιμαρρου S

των κεδρων TR S\*\* B  
 του κεδρου S\* W

εισηλθεν TR (P66) S B  
 εισεληλυθεν W

18.2 ιουδας TR S B W  
 omit (P66)

πολλακις TR S B  
 πολλακεις W

ο ιησους TR W  
 ιησους S B

εκει μετα των μαθητων αυτου TR (P66\*\*) S W  
 εκει μετα των μαθητων (P66\*)  
 μετα των μαθητων αυτου εκει B

18.3 και φαρισαιων TR S\*\* W  
 και εκ των φαρισαιων S\* S\*\*\*  
 και των φαρεισαιων B\*  
 και των φαρισαιων B\*\*

εκει TR B W  
 omit S\*  
 εκι S\*\*

18.4 ιησους ουν TR B  
 ιησους δε S W

ειδως TR S B  
 ιδως W

---

18.1 [χειμ]αρρου P66. 18.1 εισηλθε[ν] P66. 18.2 -ιουδας P66,  
 propter spatium. 18.2 [εκει μετα των μα]θητων αυ[του] P66.

εξελθων ειπεν αυτοις TR S W  
εξελθε και λεγει αυτοις B

18.5 λεγει αυτοις ο ιησους εγω ειμι TR  
λεγει αυτοις ιησους εγω ειμι S  
λεγει αυτοις εγω ειμι ιησους B  
λεγει αυτοις ο ιησους εγω ειμει W  
λεγει αυτοις εγω ειμι (P66)

ειστηκει TR B\*\* W  
ιστηκει (P66) S B\*

ο παραδιδους αυτον TR S B W  
omit (P66)

18.6 ως ουν ειπεν αυτοις TR S\*\* B W  
ως ουν ειπεν S\*

οτι εγω ειμι TR  
εγω ειμι S B  
εγω ειμει W

απηλθον TR  
απηλθαν S B W

επεσον TR  
επεσαν S B W

χαμαι S B  
χαμε W

18.7 παλιν ουν αυτους επηρωτησε TR  
παλιν ουν επηρωτησεν αυτους (P66) B  
παλιν ουν αυτους επηρωτησεν S W

ζητειτε TR S B  
ζητειται W

---

18.5 [λεγει αυτοις εγω ειμι] P66, propter spatium.  
18.5 ιστηκ[ει] P66. 18.5 -ο παραδιδους αυτον P66, propter spatium. 18.7 [παλιν ουν επηρ]ωτη[σεν αυτους] P66.

ειπον TR S B W  
ειπαν P66

18.8 ο ιησους TR  
ιησους S B W

υμιν TR S B W  
υμειν (P66)

ειμι TR S B  
ειμει W

ζητειτε TR S B  
ζητειται (P66) W

αφετε TR S B  
αφεται W

18.9 δεδωκας TR S B W  
εδωκας (P66)

18.10 επαισε TR B  
επεσεν S W

τον του αρχιερεως δουλον TR (P66) B W  
τον δουλον του αρχιερεως S

αυτου το ωτιον το δεξιον TR  
το ωταριον αυτου το δεξιον (P66)  
αυτου το ωταριον το δεξιον S B W

18.11 την μαχαιραν σου TR  
την μαχαιραν (P66) S B W

δεδωκε TR  
δεδωκεν P66 S B W

---

18.8 [υ]μειν P66. 18.8 [ζη]τειται P66. 18.9 εδ[ωκας] P66.  
18.10 τον [του] αρχ[ιερεως δουλον] P66. 18.10 το [ωταριον]  
αυτου [το] δεξιο[ν] P66. 18.11 την [μαχ]αιραν P66.

ο πατηρ TR S B W  
ο πατηρ μου (P66)

18.12 σπειρα TR B W  
σπιρα S

χιλιαρχος TR (P66) S B\*\*  
χειλιαρχος B\* W

οι υπηρεται TR (P66\*\*) S B W  
υπηρεται (P66\*)

18.13 απηγαγον αυτον TR  
ηγαγον (P66) S\* B W  
απηγαγον S\*\*

εκεινου TR S B W  
omit (P66)

18.14 συμβουλευσας TR S B  
συνβουλευσας W

συμφερει TR S B  
συμφερι W

απολεσθαι TR  
αποθανιν S  
αποθανειν B W

18.15 ηκολουθει TR B W  
ηκολουθι (P66) S

και ο αλλος μαθητης TR S\*\*  
και αλλος μαθητης (P66) S\* B W

---

18.11 [ο π̄ρ μου] P66. 18.12 χιλιαρχ[ος] P66. 18.12 οι  
υπηρ[εται] P66. 18.13 ηγαγ[ον] P66. 18.13 -εκεινου P66,  
propter spatium. 18.15 [ηκ]ολουθι P66. 18.15 και αλ[λος  
μαθητης] P66.

ο δε μαθητης εκεινος TR S B W  
 εκεινος (P66)

ην γνωστος τω αρχιερει και TR (P66\*\*) S  
 omit P66\*  
 γνωστος ην τω αρχιερει και B W

συνεισηλθε TR  
 συνεισηλθεν (P66) S B W

18.16 ειστηκει TR B\*\*  
 ιστηκει S B\* W

προς τη θυρα εξω TR P66 B W  
 εξω προς τη θυρα S

ο μαθητης ο αλλος TR S B W  
 ο μαθητης (P66)

ος ην γνωστος τω αρχιερει TR (P66) S W  
 ο γνωστος του αρχιερεως B

ειπε TR  
 ειπεν (P66) S B W

τη θυρωρω TR S B  
 -- θυρω (P66\*)  
 -- θυρουρω (P66\*\*) W  
 τω θυρωρω W

εισηγαγε TR B  
 εισηγαγεν (P66)  
 εισηγεγκε S W

---

18.15 [εκεινος] P66, propter spatium. 18.15 η[ν γνωσ]τος  
 τω αρχιερε[ι και] P66\*\*. 18.15 [συνει]σηλθεν P66.  
 18.16 ο μα[θητης] P66, propter spatium. 18.16 [ος] ην  
 γνωστος τ[ω αρχ]ιερε[ι] P66. 18.16 [ειπ]εν P66.  
 18.16 [--] θυρουρω P66. 18.16 εισηγαγε[ν] P66.

18.17 λεγει ουν η παιδισκη η θυρωρος τω πετρω TR (P66) S  
 λεγει ου τω πετρω η παιδισκη η θυρωρος B\*  
 λεγει ουν τω πετρω η παιδισκη η θυρωρος B\*\*  
 λεγει ουν αυτω η παιδισκη η θυρωρος τω πετρω W

ει TR S B W  
 omit P66

ειμι TR S B  
 ειμει W

18.18 ειστηκεισαν δε οι δουλοι TR B\*\*  
 ιστηκεισαν δε και οι δουλοι S  
 ιστηκεισαν δε οι δουλοι (P66) B\* W

ανθρακιαν TR B W  
 ανορακιαν S

εθερμαινοντο TR S B  
 εθερμενοντο W

ην δε μετ αυτων ο πετρος εστωσ και θερμαινομενος TR  
 ην δε και ο πετρος μετ αυτων και θερμαινομενος (P66) S B  
 ην δε και ο πετρος μετ αυτων και θερμενομενος W

18.19 ηρωτησε TR S  
 ηρωτησεν (P66) B W

18.20 απεκριθη αυτω ο ιησους TR (P66) W  
 και απεκριθη ιησους αυτω S\*  
 και απεκριθη αυτω ιησους S\*\*  
 απεκριθη αυτω ιησους B

παρησια TR S B\*\* W  
 παρησια B\*

---

18.17 λεγε[ι ο]υν η παιδισκ[η η θυρω]ρος τω πε[τρ]ω P66.  
 18.18 [ισ]τηκ[εισαν δε] οι δ[ο]υλοι P66. 18.18 [ην δε] και  
 ο π[ετρος μετ αυτων και θερμαινομ]ενος P66. 18.19 [ηρωτησ]εν  
 P66. 18.20 [απ]εκριθη α[υτω ο ιησους] P66.



ελαλησα TR (P66) W  
λελαληκα S B

παντοτε 1ο TR S B W  
παντοται (P66)

εν τη συναγωγη TR  
εν συναγωγη S B W

παντοτε 2ο TR  
παντες S B W

18.21 επερωτας TR  
ερωτας S B W

επερωτησον TR  
ερωτησον (P66) S B W

ιδε TR S B  
ειδε W

18.22 εις των υπηρετων παρεστηκως TR  
εις παρεστηκως των υπηρετων (P66) S\* B W  
εις των παρεστηκοτων υπηρετων S\*\*

εδωκε TR B  
εδωκεν (P66) S W

αποκρινη TR S B\*\* W  
αποκρεινη B\*

18.23 απεκριθη αυτω ο ιησους TR  
ο δε ιησους ειπεν αυτω S W  
απεκριθη αυτω ιησους B

ει κακως ελαλησα TR S\*\* B  
ει κακως ειπον S\* W

---

18.20 ελ[αλησα] P66. 18.20 [παν]τοται P66. 18.21  
ερω[τησον] P66. 18.22 [εις παρεστηκως των υπηρε]των P66.  
18.22 εδ[ωκεν] P66.

δερεις TR (P66) B W  
 δερικ S

18.24 απεστειλεν αυτον TR  
 απεστειλεν δε αυτον S  
 απεστειλεν ουν αυτον B  
 απεστειλεν ουν αυτον W

18.25 θερμαινομενος TR S B  
 θερμενομενος W

18.26 ειμι TR S B  
 ειμει W

συγγενης ων TR (P66) B W  
 συγγενης ων S

απεκοψε TR B  
 απεκοψεν S W

ειδον TR B W  
 ιδον S

18.27 ο πετρος TR S  
 πετρος B W

ευθεως TR S B  
 ευθυς W

18.28 πραιτωριον 1<sup>ο</sup> TR (P66) S B  
 πρετωριον W

πρωια TR  
 πρωι S B  
 πρωει W

πραιτωριον 2<sup>ο</sup> TR S B  
 πρετωριον W

---

18.23 [δ]ερεις P66. 18.26 συγγεν[ης ων] P66.  
 18.28 [πρα]ιτωριο[ν] 1<sup>ο</sup> P66.

αλλ ινα φαγωσι το πασχα TR  
 αλλα φαγωσιν το πασχα S B W

18.29 εξηλθεν ουν ο πιλατος προς αυτους και ειπε TR  
 εξηλθεν ουν προς αυτους ο πιλατος εξω και φησιν S  
 εξηλθεν ουν ο πειλατος εξω προς αυτους και φησιν B\*  
 εξηλθεν ουν ο πιλατος εξω προς αυτους και φησιν B\*\*  
 εξηλθεν ουν προς αυτους ο πειλατος εξω και φησιν (P66) W

φερετε TR S B  
 φερεται W

κατα του ανθρωπου TR (P66) S\*\* W  
 του ανθρωπου S\* B

18.30 ειπον TR W  
 ειπαν S B

κακοποιος TR  
 κακον ποιησας S\*  
 κακον ποιων S\*\* B W

ουκ αν σοι παρεδωκαμεν αυτον TR B  
 ουκ αν παρεδωκαμεν σοι αυτον (P66)  
 ουκ αν σοι παρεδωκειμεν αυτον S  
 ουκ αν σοι παραδεδωκειμεν αυτον W

18.31 ειπεν ουν αυτοις ο πιλατος TR S B\*\*  
 ειπεν ουν αυτοις ο πειλατος (P66) W  
 ειπεν ουν αυτοις πειλατος B\*

λαβετε αυτον υμεις TR B  
 λαβετε ουν αυτον υμεις (P66)  
 λαβετε αυτον υμεις S  
 λαβεται αυτον υμεις W

---

18.29 [εξηλθεν ουν προς αυτους ο πειλατος] εξω κ[αι] φησιν P66.  
 18.29 κατα το[υ] ανθ[ρω] P66. 18.30 [ο]υκ αν παρεδω[κα]μεν  
 σο[ι αυτον] P66. 18.31 [ει]πεν ουν αυτο[ις ο π]ειλατ[ος] P66.  
 18.31 [λαβετε] ουν αυ[τον υμεις] P66.

κρινατε αυτον TR B\*\*  
 κρινατε (P66) S  
 κρεινατε αυτον B\*  
 κρεινατε W

ειπον ουν TR S W  
 ειπον (P66) B

ημιν TR S B W  
 ημειν (P52)

αποκτειναι TR B  
 αποκτιναι S W

ουδενα TR P52 P66 S\*\* B W  
 ουδενα ιουδενα S\*

18.32 ινα ο λογος του ιησου πληρωθη TR (P52) (P66) S B  
 ινα πληρωθη ο λογος του ιησου W

ον ειπε TR  
 ον ειπεν (P52) (P66) S\*\* B W  
 omit S\*

αποθνησκειν TR (P52) B W  
 αποθνησκιν S

18.33 εισηλθεν TR S B W  
 ισηλθεν (P52)

εις το πραιτωριον παλιν ο πιλατος TR S  
 παλιν εις το πραιτωριον ο πειλατος (P52) (P66) B\*  
 παλιν εις το πραιτωριον ο πιλατος B\*\*  
 παλιν εις το πρετωριον ο πειλατος W

---

18.31 [κρινατε] P66, propter spatium. 18.31 [ειπον] P66, propter spatium. 18.31 ημε[ιν] P52. 18.32 ινα ο λο[γος του ιησου πληρωθη] P52; ινα ο λογος τ[ου ιησου πληρωθη] P66. 18.32 [ον ει]πεν P52; [ον ειπεν] P66, propter spatium. 18.32 [απο]θνησκειν P52. 18.33 [παλιν εις το πραιτω]ριον ο τ[ειλατος] P52; παλιν [εις το πραιτ]ωριον [ο πειλα]τος P66.

εφωνησε TR B  
εφωνησεν S W

18.34 απεκριθη αυτω TR S  
και απεκρινατο (P66) W  
απεκριθη B

ο ιησους TR S W  
ιησους P66 B

αφ εαυτου συ TR W  
απο σεαυτου (P66\*) S\*  
απο σεαυτου συ (P66\*\*) S\*\* B

λεγεις TR (P66) B W  
ειπας S\*  
λεγεις S\*\*

η αλλοι σοι ειπον περι εμου TR S  
η αλλοι ειπεν σοι περι εμου (P66)  
η αλλοι ειπον σοι περι εμου B W

18.35 ο πιλατος TR S B\*\*  
ο πειλατος B\* W

μητι εγω ιουδαιος ειμι TR S\*\* B  
μη γαρ εγω ιουδαιος ειμι (P66)  
μη εγω ιουδαιος ειμι S\*  
μη εγω ιουδαιος ειμει W

οι αρχιερεις TR (P66) S\*\* B W  
ο αρχιερευς S\*

18.36 ο ιησους TR  
ιησους P66 S B W

---

18.34 [και] απεκρινα[τ]ο P66. 18.34 απο σεαυ[του] [σ]υ P66.  
18.34 λε[γεις] P66. 18.34 [η αλ]λοι ειπεν σο[ι πε]ρι εμου P66.  
18.35 [μη] γαρ εγω ιου[δαιος ειμι] P66. 18.35 οι  
α[ρχιερεις] P66.

η βασιλεια η εμη 1<sup>ο</sup> TR (P66) B W  
η εμη βασιλεια S

εκ του κοσμου τουτου ην TR S B  
εκ τουτου του κοσμου ην (P66)  
ην εκ του κοσμου τουτου W

η βασιλεια η εμη 2<sup>ο</sup> TR B W  
η εμη βασιλεια S

οι υπηρεται TR B W  
και οι υπηρεται S

αν οι εμοι ηγωνιζοντο TR  
οι εμοι ηγωνιζοντο αν S B\*\* W  
οι εμοι ηγωνιζοντο B\*

η βασιλεια η εμη 3<sup>ο</sup> TR (P66) B W  
η εμη βασιλεια S

ο πιλατος TR S B\*\*  
ο πειλατος B\* W

18.37 ο ιησους TR S B  
ιησους W

ειμι TR (P66) S B  
ειμει W

εγω εγω TR  
εγω S B W

γεγεννημαι TR (P52) S B  
γεγεννημαι W

εις τουτο TR S B W  
omit (P52)

---

18.36 η βασ[ι]λεια η εμη] P66. 18.36 [εκ τουτου του κ]οσμου  
[ην] P66, propter spatium. 18.36 η βα[σι]λεια η εμη] P66.  
18.37 [ει]μι P66. 18.37 γ[ε]γεννημαι P52. 18.37 -εις τουτο  
P52, propter spatium.

ινα μαρτυρησω τη αληθεια TR (P66) B W  
 ινα μαρτυρηση περι της αληθειας S\*  
 ινα μαρτυρησω τη αληθεια S\*\*

ο ων εκ της αληθειας TR (P52) S\*\* B W  
 ο ων εκ της αληθειας (P66)  
 ο ων της αληθειας S\*

18.38 λεγει αυτω TR P52 S B W  
 λεγει ουν αυτω P66

ο πιλατος TR S B\*\*  
 πειλατος P66  
 ο πειλατος B\* W

τι εστιν αληθεια TR S\*\* B W  
 τι εστιν αληθεια (P66)  
 τις εστιν αληθεια S\*

εξηλθε TR  
 εξηλθεν S B W

εγω ουδεμιαν αιτιαν ευρισκω εν αυτω TR S W  
 εγω ουδεμιαν ευρισκω αιτιαν εν αυτω (P66)  
 εγω ουδεμιαν ευρισκω εν αυτω αιτιαν B

18.39 εστι TR  
 εστιν (P66) S B W

συνηθεια TR B W  
 συνηθια S

υμιν απολυσω το TR  
 απολυσω υμιν (P66) S B  
 απολυω υμιν W

---

18.37 [ινα μαρτυ]ρησω [τη] αληθεια P66. 18.37 [ο ων] εκ της  
 αληθε[ιας] P52; ο ων εκ της αληθι[ας] P66. 18.38 τι εστιν  
 αληθι[α] P66. 18.38 εγω ουδεμιαν ευ[ρισκω αιτι]αν εν  
 αυτω P66. 18.39 εστι[ν] P66. 18.39 α[πολυσω υμιν] P66.  
 18.39 [απολυσ]ω υμιν P66.

εν τω πασχα TR S W  
τω πασχα B

βουλεσθε ουν TR B  
βουλεσθε ουν ινα S  
βουλεσθαι ουν ινα W

υμιν απολυσω 2ο TR  
απολυσω υμιν (P66) S B W

18.40 εκραυγασαν ουν παλιν παντες λεγοντες TR  
εκραυγασαν ουν παλιν (P66\*)  
εκραυγασαν ουν παλιν λεγοντες (P66\*\*) S B W

18.41 βαραββαν TR S B W\*\*  
βαρραβαν W\*

19.1 τοτε ουν ελαβεν ο πιλατος τον ιησουν και εμαστιγωσε TR  
τοτε ουν λαβων ο πιλατος τον ιησουν εμαστιγωσεν S  
τοτε ουν ελαβεν ο πειλατος τον ιησουν και  
εμαστιγωσεν (P66)  
τοτε ουν ελαβεν ο πειλατος τον ιησουν και εμαστιγωσεν B\*  
τοτε ουν ελαβεν ο πιλατος τον ιησουν και εμαστιγωσεν B\*\*  
τοτε ουν λαβων ο πειλατος τον ιησουν εμαστιγωσεν W

19.2 πλεξαντες στεφανον εξ ακανθων TR S B W  
πλεξαντες εξ ακανθων στεφανος (P66)

επεθηκαν TR P66 S\*\* B W  
επεθηκεν S\*

19.3 και ελεγον TR  
και ηρχοντο προς αυτον και ελεγον (P66) S B W

ο βασιλευς TR B W  
βασιλευ P66 S

---

18.39 εκ[ραυγασαν ουν παλ]ιν λεγοντες P66. 19.1 [τοτε ουν]  
ελαβεν [ο πειλατος τον ιησουν και εμαστιγωσεν] P66.  
19.2 [πλ]εξαντες εξ [α]κανθων στε[φ]ανος P66. 19.3 και  
ηρχοντο προς αυτον και ελεγο[ν] P66.



εδιδουν TR  
 εδιδοσαν (P66\*) S B W  
 ηδιδοσαν (P66\*\*)

19.4 εξηλθεν ουν TR (P66\*\*) W  
 εξηλθεν (P66\*) S  
 και εξηλθε B

παλιν TR P66 S B  
 omit W

εξω ο πιλατος TR B\*\*  
 εξω ο πειλατος (P66) B\*  
 ο πιλατος εξω S  
 ο πειλατος εξω W

ιδε TR S B  
 ειδε W

γνωτε TR S B  
 γνωται W

εν αυτω ουδεμιαν αιτιαν ευρισκω TR  
 αιτιαν ουχ ευρισκω εν αυτω (P66)  
 αιτιαν ουκ ευρισκω S\*  
 αιτιαν ουδεμιαν ευρισκω εν αυτω S\*\*  
 ουδεμιαν αιτιαν ευρισκω εν αυτω B  
 αιτιαν εν αυτω ουχ ευρισκω W

19.5 ο ιησους TR S W  
 ιησους B

το πορφυρουν TR B W  
 πορφυρουν S

και λεγει αυτοις ιδε ο ανθρωπος TR  
 omit P66  
 και λεγει αυτοις ιδου ο ανθρωπος S W  
 και λεγει αυτοις ιδου ανθρωπος B

---

19.3 ε[δ]ιδοσαν P66. 19.4 [εξ]ηλθον P66. 19.4 εξω [ο  
 πειλατος] P66. 19.4 [αιτια]ν ουχ ευρισ[κω εν αυτω] P66.

19.5 ειδον TR (P66) B  
ιδον S W

εκραυγασαν TR S\*\* B W  
εκραξαν S\*

λεγοντες TR B W  
omit (P66) S

σταυρωσον σταυρωσον TR (P66\*\*) B W  
σταυρωσον (P66\*)  
σταυρωσον σταυρωσον αυτον S

λεγει TR P66 B W  
και λεγει S

ο πιλατος TR S B\*\*  
ο πειλατος P66 B\* W

λαβετε αυτον υμεις και σταυρωσατε TR S B  
λαβετε αυτον σταυρωσατε (P66)  
λαβεται υμεις αυτον και σταυρωσαται W

ουχ ευρισκω TR (P66) S B  
ουχι ευρισκω W

19.7 απεκριθησαν αυτω TR B  
απεκριθησαν (P66) S W

κατα τον νομον ημων TR  
κατα τον νομον P66 S B W

οφειλει TR B  
οφιλει (P66) S W

---

19.6 ε[ιδον] P66. 19.6 -λεγοντες P66, propter spatium.  
19.6 [σταυρωσον σταυρωσ]ον P66. 19.6 λαβε[τε αυτο]ν  
σταυρωσατε P66. 19.6 ουχ ευρ[ισκω] P66. 19.7 [απεκριθ]ησαν  
P66. 19.7 οφιλ[ει] P66.

αποθανειν TR (P66) B W  
αποθανιν S

οτι εαυτον υιον του θεου εποιησεν TR  
οτι υιον θεου εαυτον εποιησεν (P66) S B  
οτι υιον του θεου εαυτον εποιησεν W

19.8 ο πιλατος TR S B\*\*  
ο πειλατος (P66) B\* W

τουτον τον λογον TR (P66) B W  
τον λογον τουτον S

19.9 πραιτωριον TR (P66) S B  
πρετωριον W

παλιν TR (P66) S\*\* B W  
omit S\*

και 2<sup>ο</sup> TR (P66) S B W\*\*  
και και W\*

19.10 λεγει ουν αυτω TR (P66) S\*\* B W  
λεγει αυτω S\*

ο πιλατος TR S B\*\*  
ο πειλατος (P66) B\* W

λαλεις TR B W  
λαλις S

εξουσιαν εχω σταυρωσαι σε και εξουσιαν εχω απολυσαι  
σε TR W  
εξουσιαν εχω απολυσαι σε και εξουσιαν εχω σταυρωσαι  
σε S B

---

19.7 [α]ποθανειν P66. 19.7 οτι υιον θεου [εαυτον ε]ποιησ[ε]ν  
P66. 19.8 ο πειλ[ατ]ος P66. 19.8 [τ]ου[τον] τον λογον P66.  
19.9 πραιτω[ριον] P66. 19.9 [παλιν] P66. 19.9 [κα]ι P66.  
19.10 [λεγει]ουν αυτω P66. 19.10 ο πει[λατος] P66.

- 19.11 απεκριθη ο ιησους TR  
 απεκριθη ιησους (P66)  
 απεκριθη αυτω ο ιησους S W  
 απεκριθη αυτω ιησους B
- ουκ ειχες εξουσιαν TR B W  
 ουκ εχικς εξουσιαν S
- ουδεμιαν κατ εμου TR  
 κατ εμου ουδεμιαν (P66) S B W
- ει μη ην σοι δεδομενον ανωθεν TR  
 ει μη ην δεδομενον σοι ανωθεν S B W
- ο παραδιδους TR W  
 ο παραδους S B
- μειζονα TR S B  
 μιζονα W
- 19.12 εξητει ο πιλατος απολυσαι αυτον TR  
 ο πειλατος εξητει αυτον απολυσαι (P66)  
 ο πιλατος εξητει απολυσαι αυτον S B\*\*  
 ο πειλατος εξητει απολυσαι αυτον B\*  
 ο πειλατος εξητι αυτον απολυσαι W
- εκραζον TR S\*\*  
 ελεγον S\*  
 εκραυγασαν B  
 εκραυγαζον W  
 εκρ----- (P66)
- λεγοντες TR P66 S\*\* B W  
 omit S\*
- εαν TR P66\*\* S W  
 αν P66\* B

---

19.11 απεκρ[ιτη ιησους] P66. 19.11 κατ ε[μου ουδεμιαν] P66.  
 19.12 [ο πειλατο]ς εξητει αυ[τον απολυσαι] P66.  
 19.12 εκρ[-----] P66.

πας ο βασιλεα αυτον ποιων TR  
 πας ο βασιλεα εαυτον ποιων (P66) S B  
 πας ο βασιλεα ποιων αυτον W

19.13 ο ουν πιλατος TR S B\*\* W  
 ουν πειλατος (P66\*)  
 ο ουν πειλατος P66\*\* B\*

τουτον τον λογον TR  
 των λογων τουτων S B W

ηγαγεν εξω τον ιησουν TR (P66) S B  
 ηγαγεν τον ιησουν εξω W

εκαθισεν TR (P66) S B  
 εκαθεισεν W

επι του βηματος TR W  
 επι βηματος (P66) S B

εις τοπον λεγομενον TR (P66\*\*) S B W  
 omit P66\*

εβραιστι δε TR P66 S\*\* B W  
 εβραιστι S\*

γαββαθα TR S\*\* B W  
 γολγοθα S\*

19.14 ωρα δε ωσει εκτη TR  
 ωρα εκτη P66\*  
 ωρα ην ως εκτη P66\*\* S\* B W  
 ωρα ην ως τριτη S\*\*

λεγει TR S B  
 ελεγεν W

---

19.12 πας ο βα[σι]λεα εαυ[το]ν ποιων P66. 19.13 ουν πειλα[τ]ος P66. 19.13 ηγαγεν εξ[ω τον ιησουν] P66. 19.13 [εκα]θισεν P66. 19.13 επι βημ[ατος] P66. 19.13 εις τοπ[ον λεγομενον] P66.

ιδε TR (P66) S B  
ειδε W

19.15 οι δε εκραυγασαν TR  
εκραυγασαν ουν εκεινοι (P66) B  
οι δε ελεγον S\* W  
εκραυγασαν ουν εκινοι S\*\*

ο πιλατος TR S B\*\*  
ο πειλατος B\* W

βασιλεα TR (P66) S B  
βασειλεα W

19.16 παρεδωκεν αυτον αυτοις TR B W  
παρεδωκεν αυτοις αυτον S

παρελαβον δε τον ιησουν και απηγαγον TR  
οι δε λαβοντες τον ιησουν απηγαγον αυτον S\*  
παρελαβοντες ουν τον ιησουν απηγαγον αυτον S\*\*  
παρελαβον ουν τον ιησουν B  
οι δε παραλαβοντες τον ιησουν απηγαγον W  
παραλαβοντες δε αυτον ηγαγον (P66)

19.17 και βασταζων τον σταυρον αυτου εξηλθεν TR  
omit P66  
και βασταζων εαυτω τον σταυρον εξηλθεν (P66\*\*) S W  
και βασταζων αυτω τον σταυρον εξηλθεν B

εις τον λεγομενον κρανιου τοπον TR S B W  
εις τοπον λεγομενον κρανιου (P66)

ος λεγεται TR  
ο λεγεται P66 S B\*\* W  
ο λεγετε B\*

---

19.14 ιδ[ε] P66. 19.15 [εκ]ραυγασαν ο[υν] P66.  
19.15 [β]ασιλεα P66. 19.16 [παρ]αλ[αβοντες δε] αυτο[ν]  
ηγαγο]ν P66. 19.17 και βασταζων εαυτω [τον σταυρον εξηλ]θεν  
P66. 19.17 εις το[πον λεγ]ομεν[ον κρανι]ου P66.

εσταυρωσαν TR S B W  
σραν P66\*  
εσραν P66:†\*

19.19 εγραψε TR  
 εγραψεν S B W

ο πιλατος TR S B\*\*  
 ο πειλατος B\* W

19.20 - τουτον ουν ... 19.21 των ιουδαιων S\*

τουτον TR (P66) S\*\* B  
 τοτε W

πολλοι ανεγνωσαν TR (P66) S\*\* B  
 ανεγνωσαν πολλοι W

της πολεως ο τοπος TR S  
 ο τοπος της πολεως (P66) S\*\* B

και ην γεγραμμενον εβραιστι ελληνιστι ρωμαιστι TR  
 και ην γεγραμμενον εβραιστι ρωμαιστι ελληνιστι S\*\* B  
 και ην γεγραμμενον εβραιστι ρωμαιστι εβραιστι W

19.21 πιλατω TR S\*\* B\*\*  
 πειλατω P66 B\* W

βασιλευς ειμι των ιουδαιων TR (P66) S  
 βασιλευς των ιουδαιων ειμι B  
 βασιλευς ειμει των ιουδαιων W

19.22 ο πιλατος TR S  
 ο πειλατος P66 B\* W

---

19.20 του[τον] P66. 19.20 [πολ]λοι α[νεγνωσαν] P66.  
 19.20 [ο το]πος της πολ[εως] P66. 19.21 [βασιλε]υς ειμι των  
 ιουδαιω[ν] P66.

19.23 οτε εσταυρωσαν τον ιησουν TR (P66) B W  
 οι εσταυρωσαντες τον ιησουν S

τεσσαρα TR B W  
 τεσσερα S

και τον χιτωνα TR S\*\* B  
 omit S\*  
 και τον χειτωνα W

χιτων TR S B  
 χειτων W

αρραφος TR B  
 αραφος S W

19.24 ειπον TR B  
 ειπαν S W

προς αλληλους TR (P66) B W  
 προς αυτους S\*  
 προς εαυτους S\*\*

ινα η γραφη πληρωθη η λεγουσα TR W  
 ινα η γραφη πληρωθη S B

τα ιματια μου εαυτοις TR B  
 μου τα ιματια εαυτοις S  
 τα ιματια μου W

19.25 ειστηκεισαν TR B\*\* W  
 ιστηκεισαν S  
 ιστηκεισαν B\*

τω σταυρω του ιησου TR S B  
 τω σταυρω (P66) W

---

19.23 [οτε ε]σταυρωσαν τον ιησουν P66. 19.24 [προς]  
 αλληλους P66. 19.25 [τω σταυρω] P66.



μαρια 1<sup>ο</sup> TR B W  
μαριαμ S

μαρια 2<sup>ο</sup> TR B W  
μαριαμ S

19.26 ιησους ουν ιδων την μητερα TR B W  
omit S\*  
ιησους δε ιδων την μητερα S\*\*

παρεστωτα TR S B  
omit W

λεγει τη μητρι αυτου TR  
και λεγει τη μητρι S\*  
λεγει τη μητρι S\*\* B W

ιδου TR S W  
ιδε B

19.27 ιδου TR  
ειδε S W  
ιδε B

εκεινης TR B W  
εκινης S

αυτην ο μαθητης TR S W  
ο μαθητης αυτην B

19.28 ειδως ο ιησους TR S  
ιησους ειδως B  
ιδως ο ιησους W

οτι παντα ηδη τετελεσται TR S  
οτι ηδη παντα τετελεσται (P66) B  
οτι παντα τετελεσται W

---

19.28 [οτι η]δη παν[τη τετελεσται] P66.

ινα τελειωθη γραφη TR (P66\*\*) B  
 omit P66\*  
 ινα πληρωθη η γραφη S  
 ινα τελιωθη η γραφη W

19.29 σκενος ουν TR  
 σκενος (P66) B W  
 σκενος δε S

οι δε πλησαντες σπογγον οξους TR  
 οπογγον ουν μεστον του οξους (P66) S\*\* B W  
 σπογγον ουν μεστον οξους S\*

και υσωπω TR  
 υσωπω S B W

19.30 ελαβε TR  
 ελαβεν (P66) S B W

ο ιησους TR S\*\*  
 omit S\*  
 ιησους B W

ειπε TR  
 ειπεν S B W

κλινας TR (P66) B\*\*  
 κλεινας S B\* W

παρεδωκε TR  
 παρεδωκεν (P66) S B  
 παραδεδωκεν W

19.31 ινα μη μεινη επι του σταυρου τα σωματα εν τω σαββατω  
 επει παρασκευη ην TR  
 επει παρασκευη ην ινα μη μεινη επι του σταυρου τα  
 σωματα εν τω σαββατω B\*\*  
 επει παρασκευη ην ινα μη μεινη επι του σταυρου τα  
 σωματα εν τω σαββατω S

---

19.28 [οτι η]δη παν[τα τετελεσται] P66. 19.29 σκε[νος] P66.  
 19.29 [σπογγον ου]ν μεστ[ον του ο]ξου[ς] P66. 19.30 ελ[αβ]εν  
 P66. 19.30 κλι[νας] P66. 19.30 [παρε]δωκεν P66.

επι παρασκευη ην ινα μη μεινη επι του σταυρου τα  
σωματα εν τω σαββατω (P66) B\* W

ην γαρ μεγαλη η ημερα εκεινου του σαββατου TR B\*\*  
ην γαρ μεγαλη ημερα εκεινου του σαββατου S W  
ην γαρ μεγαλη η ημερα εκεινη του σαββατου B\*

ηρωτησαν TR S\*\* B W  
ηρωτησαν ουν S\*

τον πιλατον TR S B\*\* W  
τον πειλατον B\*

19.32 του συσταυρωθεντος TR B\*\*  
του συνσταυρωθεντος (P66) S B\* W

19.33 επι TR S B  
επει W

ως ειδον αυτον ηδη τεθνηκοτα TR  
ως ειδον ηδη αυτον τεθνηκοτα (P66) B  
ευρον αυτον ηδη τεθνηκοτα και S\*  
ως ιδον αυτον ηδη τεθνηκοτα S\*\*  
ως ιδον ηδη αυτον τεθνηκοτα W

19.34 αλλ TR S B  
αλλα W

ενυξε TR  
ενυξεν S B W

και ευθυς εξηλθεν TR  
και εξηλθεν ευθυς S B W

19.35 μεμαρτυρηκε TR B  
μεμαρτυρηκεν (P66) S W

---

19.31 [επι πα]ρα[σκευη ην ινα] μη μειν[η επι του σταυρου το  
σωματα εν τω σαββατω] P66. 19.32 [το]υ συνστ[αυρωθεντος] P66.  
19.33 [ως ειδον ηδη αυ]τον τεθνη[κοτα] P66.  
19.35 [μεμαρτυρη]κεν P66.

αληθινη TR (P66) B  
 αληθης S  
 αληθεινη W

αυτου εστιν TR S B W  
 εστιν αυτου (P66)

κακεινος TR S  
 και εκεινος B W

ινα υμεις πιστευσητε TR  
 ινα και υμεις πιστευητε S\*  
 ινα και υμεις πιστευσητε S\*\*  
 ινα και υμεις πιστευητε B  
 ινα και υμεις πιστευσηται W

19.36 αυτου TR B W  
 απ αυτου S

19.38 ηρωτησε TR  
 ηρωτησεν S B W

τον πιλατον TR S B\*\* W  
 τον πειλατον B\*

ο ιωσηφ ο απο αριμαθαιας TR  
 ιωσηφ ο απο αριμαθαιας S  
 ιωσηφ απο αρειμαθαιας B\*  
 ιωσηφ απο αριμαθαιας B\*\*  
 ιωσηφ ο απο αριμαθαιας W

μαθητης του ιησου TR S W  
 μαθητης ιησου B

το σωμα του ιησου και επετρεψεν ο πιλατος ηλθεν ουν  
 και ηρε TR  
 omit P66  
 το σωμα του ιησου και επετρεψεν ο πιλατος ηλθον ουν  
 και ηραν S\*

---

19.35 [αλ]ηθιν[η] P66. 19.35 [εστιν αυτο]ν P66.

το σωμα του ιησου και επετρεψεν ο πειλατος ηλθεν ουν  
 και ηρεν B\*  
 το σωμα του ιησου και επετρεψεν ο πειλατος ηλθεν ουν  
 και ηρεν S\*\* B\*\*  
 το σωμα του ιησου και επετρεψεν ο πειλατος ηλθον ουν  
 και ηραν W

το σωμα του ιησου 2ο TR  
 το σωμα αυτου (P66) S\*\* B  
 αυτον S\* W

19.39 ηλθε TR  
 ηλθεν S B W

νικοδημος TR S B\*\* W  
 νεικοδημος B\*

προς τον ιησουν νυκτος TR S W  
 νυκτος προς ----- (P66)  
 προς αυτον νυκτος B

φερων μιγμα TR (P66) S\*\*  
 εχων ελιγμα S\* W  
 φερων ελιγμα B

συμυρνης TR B  
 σζμυρνης S  
 ζμυρνης W

ωσει TR (P66)  
 ως S B W

λιτρας TR S B\*\* W  
 λειτρας B\*

19.40 καθως εθος εστι TR  
 καθως εθος ην S\* W  
 καθως εθος εστιν (P66) S\*\* B

---

19.38 [το σωμα α[υτου] P66. 19.39 [νυκτο]ς προ[ος----] P66.  
 19.39 [φε]ρων μ[ιγμα] P66. 19.39 [ω]σει P66. 19.40 [καθως  
 εθ]ος εσ[τιν] P66.

19.41 μνημειον TR B  
μνημιου S W

ουδεπω ουδεις ετεθη TR  
ουδεις ουδεπω ην τεθειμενος S  
ουδεπω ουδεις ην τεθειμενος B W

19.42 μνημειον TR B  
μνημιου S W

εθηκαν τον ιησουν TR (P66) S\*\* B W  
οπου εθηκαν τον ιησουν S\*

20.1 μαρια TR B  
μαριαμ S W

πρωι S B  
omit W

εις το μνημειον TR S B  
επι το μνημιου W

και TR S B  
κα W

εκ του μνημειου TR (P66) B  
απο της θυρας εκ του μνημιου S W

20.2 σιμωνα TR B W  
τον σιμωνα S

μνημειου TR B  
μνημιου S W

---

19.42 ε[θη]καν [τον ιησουν] P66. 20.1 [εκ του μνη]με[λου] P66.

20.3 και ηρχοντο εις το μνημειον TR (P66) B  
omit S\*  
και ηρχοντο εις το μνημιον S\*\* W

20.4 ετρεχον δε οι δυο ομου TR (P66) S\*\* B W  
και ετρεχον οι δυο ομου S\*

και ο αλλος μαθητης προεδραμε ταχιον του πετρου TR  
προεδραμεν δε ταχιον του πετρου S\*  
και ο αλλος μαθητης προεδραμεν ταχιον του πετρου S\*\* B\*\*W  
και ο αλλος μαθητης προεδραμεν ταχειον του πετρου B\*

και ηλθε πρωτος εις το μνημειον TR (P66) B  
και ηλθεν εις το μνημιον πρωτος S  
και ηλθεν πρωτος επι το μνημιον W

20.5 κειμενα τα οθονια TR (P66) B W  
τα οθανια κειμενα S

20.5, 6 ου μεντοι εισηλθεν ερχεται ουν σιμων πετρος  
ακολουθων αυτω και εισηλθεν εις το μνημειον και  
θεωρει τα οθονια κειμενα TR  
ου μεντοι εισηλθεν ερχεται ουν και σιμων πετρος  
ακολουθων αυτω και εισηλθεν εις το μνημειον και  
θεωρει τα οθονια κειμενα (P66) B  
omit S\*  
ου μεντοι εισηλθεν ερχεται ουν και σιμων πετρος  
ακολουθων αυτω και εισηλθεν εις το μνημιον και  
θεωρι τα οθονια κειμενα S\*\*  
ου μεντοι εισηλθεν ερχεται ουν και ο σιμων πετρος  
ακολουθων αυτω και εισηλθεν εις το μνημιον και  
θεωρει τα οθονια κειμενα W

20.8 εισηλθε TR  
εισηλθεν P66 S B W

μνημειον TR B  
μνημιον S W

---

20.3 [και ηρχ]οντο εις [το μ]νη[μειον] P66. 20.4 [ετρεχ]ον δε  
οι δ[υο ομου] P66. 20.4 [και ηλθε πρωτος εις το] μν[ημ]ειον  
P66. 20.5 κει[με]να τα οθον[ια] P66. 20.5, 6 ου μεν[τοι  
εισηλθεν ερχετ]αι ουν κα[ι σι]μων [πετρος ακολουθ]ων αυτω  
[και εισηλθεν εις το μνημ]ειον και θ[εωρει τα οθονια κειμενα]  
P66.

ειδε TR  
ειδεν (P66) S B W

20.9 ηδεισαν TR (P66) S\*\* B  
ηδει S\*  
ηδισαν W

20.10 προς εαυτους TR S\*\* W  
προς αυτους S\* B

20.11 μαρια TR P66 B W  
μαριαμ S

ειστηκει TR B  
ιστηκει S W

προς το μνημειον κλαιουσα εξω TR  
εν τω μνημειω κλαιουσα S\*  
εν τω μνημειω κλαιουσα εξω S\*\*  
προς τω μνημειω εξω κλαιουσα B  
προς τω μνημειω εξω κλαιουσα W  
----- μνημειω κλαιουσα εξω (P66)

εκλαιε TR  
εκλαιεν S B W

μνημειον 2<sup>ο</sup> TR B  
μνημιον S W

20.12 δυο αγγελους TR (P5) S\*\* B W  
αγγελους S\*

εν λευκοις καθεζομενους TR (P5) (P66) B W  
καθεζομενους εν λευκοις S

20.13 και λεγουσιν TR (P66) B W  
λεγουσιν S

---

20.8 [ει]δεν P66. 20.9 ηδε[ισαν] P66. 20.11 [προς τω  
μνη]μειω κ[λαιουσα εξω] P66. 20.12 δυο [αγγελους] P5.  
20.12 [εν λευκοις καθεζομε]νους P5; εν λευ[κοις καθεζομενου]ς  
P66. 20.13 και λ[εγουσιν] P66.



λεγει αυτοις TR S W  
και λεγει αυτοις B

εθηκαν TR (P66) S B  
τεθεικασιν W

20.14 και 1<sup>ο</sup> TR  
omit P5 P66 S B W

θεωρει TR P66 S B  
ειδεν W

ο ιησους TR  
ιησους P66 S B W

εστι TR  
εστιν P66 S B W

20.15 ο ιησους TR  
ιησους P66 S B W

εκεινη TR (P66) S\*\* B W  
εκεινη δε S\*

εστι TR  
εστιν S B W

ει συ εβαστασας αυτον TR (P66) B  
ει συ ει ο βαστασας αυτον S\*  
ει συ βαστασας αυτον S\*\*  
συ εβασταξας αυτον W

αυτον εθηκας TR  
εθηκας αυτον S B W

καγω αυτον αρω TR S B  
καγω αρω αυτον W

---

20.13 [ε]θηκαν P66. 20.15 [ε]κ[ει]νη P66. 20.15 ει συ  
[εβ]αστα[σας αυτο]ν P66.

20.16 ο ιησους TR S W  
ιησους B

μαρια TR  
μαριαμ S B W

στραφεισα εκεινη TR B W  
στραφεισα δε εκεινη S

λεγει αυτω TR  
λεγει αυτω εβραιστι (P5) (P66) S B W

ραββουνι TR S W  
ραββουνει B

ο λεγεται διδασκαλε TR S\* B W  
ο λεγεται διδασκαλε και προς εδραμεν οψασθαι αυτον S\*\*

20.17 ο ιησους TR S W  
ιησους B

μη μου απτου TR S W  
μη απτου μου B

προς τον πατερα μου 1ο TR (P66)  
προς τον πατερα S B W

πορευου δε TR S\* S\*\*\* B W  
πορευου ουν S\*\*

προς τους αδελφους μου TR (P66) S\*\* B  
προς τους αδελφους S\* W

και ειπε αυτοις αναβαινω TR (P66) B  
και ειπε αυτοις ιδου αναβαινω S  
και ειπε αυτοις αναβενω W

---

20.16 [λεγει αυτω εβραιστι] P5, propter spatium; [λε]γει αυτω [εβραιστι] P66. 20.17 [προς τον πατερα] μου P66. 20.17 [προς τους αδελ]φους μου P66. 20.17 [και ειπε αυτοις αν]αβα[ινω] P66.

20.18 μαρια TR W  
μαριαμ P66 S B

απαγγελουσα TR (P66\*\*) S\*\*  
αγγελουσα (P66\*) S\* B  
αναγγελουσα W

εωρακε TR  
εορακα P66  
εωρακα S B W

20.19 οψιας TR S B  
οψειας W

τη ημερα εκεινη τη μια των σαββατων TR  
τη ημερα εκεινη τη μια σαββατων (P66) S\*\* B  
τη ημερα εκεινη μια σαββατων S\*  
τη ημερα εκεινη μιας σαββατων W

κεκλεισμενων TR B  
κεκλισμενων S W

οπου ησαν οι μαθηται συνηγμενοι TR  
οπου ησαν οι μαθηται (P66) S B W

και λεγει αυτοις TR (P5\*\*) (P66) S\*\* B W  
λεγει αυτοις (P5\*)  
και λεγει S\*

ειρηνη TR (P66) B W  
ιρηνη S

20.20 και τουτο ειπων TR S B  
και τουτ ειπων (P5)  
και ταυτα ειπων W

---

20.18 αγ[γε]λλουσα P66. 20.19 τη ημερα εκεινη τη [μια]  
σαβ[β]ατων P66. 20.19 [οπο]ν ησαν [οι μαθηται] P66.  
20.19 και λεγει [αυτοις] P5\*\*; [και λεγει αυτο]ις P66, propter  
spatium. 20.19 ειρην[η] P66. 20.20 [και τ]ουτ ειπων P5.

εδειξεν TR W  
 εδιξεν S  
 εδειξε B

αυτοις τας χειρας και την πλευραν αυτου TR (P66)  
 τας χειρας και την πλευραν αυτοις S  
 και τας χειρας και την πλευραν αυτοις B  
 τας χειρας και την πλευραν αυτοις W

20.21 ειπεν ουν αυτοις ο ιησους παλιν TR B  
 ειπεν ουν αυτοις παλιν S\* S\*\*\*  
 και ειπεν αυτοις παλιν S\*\*  
 ειπεν ουν παλιν αυτοις W

απεσταλκε TR  
 απεσταλκεν S B W

πεμπω TR S\*\*\* B W  
 αποστελλω S\*\*  
 πεμψω S\*

20.22 ενεφουσησε TR B  
 ενεφουσησεν S W

και λεγει αυτοις TR (P66) S B  
 αυτοις και λεγει W

λαβετε TR S B  
 λαβεται W

20.23 αν τινων 1<sup>ο</sup> TR S W  
 αν τινος B

αφητε TR B W  
 αφηται S

---

20.20 [αυτοις τα]ς χειρας [και την πλευραν αυτο]ν P66.  
 20.22 [και λεγ]ει αυτ[οις] P66.

αφιενται TR B\*\* W  
 αφεθησεται S\*  
 αφεωνται S\*\*  
 αφειονται B\*

αν τινων 2<sup>ο</sup> TR (P66) S\*\* W  
 εαν δε τινων S\*  
 αν τινος B

κρατητε TR P5 S\*\* B W  
 κρατηνται S\*

20.24, 25 οτε ηλθεν ο ιησους ελεγον ουν αυτω οι αλλοι  
 μαθηται TR W  
 οτε ουν ηλθεν ιησους ελεγον αυτω οι μαθηται (P5) S\*  
 οτε ηλθεν ιησους ελεγον ουν αυτω οι αλλοι μαθηται S\*\* B

εωρακαμεν TR S B\*\*  
 εορακαμεν B\* W

ιδω TR B W  
 ειδω P66 S

εν ταις χερσιν αυτου TR S\*\* B W  
 εν ταις χερσιν (P5) S\*

τον τοπον 1<sup>ο</sup> TR S B W  
 τους τοπους (P66)

τον δακτυλον μου TR (P66) B  
 μου τον δακτυλον S W

εις τον τυπον των ηλων 2<sup>ο</sup> TR S\*\* B W  
 εις την χειραν αυτου S\*

---

20.23 [α]ν τινω[ν] P66. 20.24, 25 [οτε ουν ηλθ]εν ιησους  
 [ελεγον αυτω οι μαθηται P5. 20.25 [εν ταις χερσιν] P5,  
 propter spatium. 20.25 [τους] τοπους P66. 20.25 τον  
 δ[ακτυλον μου] P66.

την χειρα μου TR  
 μου την χειρα S B\*\*  
 μου την χειραν B\* W

20.26 μεθ ημερας TR S B  
 μετα ημερας W

οι μαθηται αυτου TR B  
 οι μαθηται S W

ο ιησους TR S B  
 ιησους W

κεκλεισμενων TR B  
 κεκλισμενων S W

ειρηνη TR B W  
 ιρηνη S

20.27 ιδε TR S B  
 ειδε W

μη γινου απιστος TR (P66) S B\*\* W  
 μη γεινου απιστος B\*

20.28 και 1ο TR  
 omit S B W

ο θωμας TR S  
 θωμας (P66) B W

20.29 λεγει TR B  
 ειπεν δε S\* W  
 λεγι S\*\*

ο ιησους TR S W  
 ιησους P66 B

---

20.27 μη γινου απ[ιστος] P66. 20.28 θω[μας] P66.

ΟΤΙ ΕΩΡΑΚΑΣ ΜΕ ΘΩΜΑ ΠΕΠΙΣΤΕΥΚΑΣ TR  
 ΟΤΙ ΕΩΡΑΚΑΣ ΜΕ ΚΑΙ ΠΕΠΙΣΤΕΥΚΑΣ S\*  
 ΟΤΙ ΕΩΡΑΚΑΣ ΜΕ ΠΕΠΙΣΤΕΥΚΑΣ S\*\* B  
 ΟΤΙ ΕΩΡΑΚΑΣ ΜΕ ΠΕΠΙΣΤΕΥΚΑΣ W

ΟΙ ΜΗ ΙΔΟΝΤΕΣ TR S\*\* B  
 ΟΙ ΜΗ ΙΔΟΝΤΕΣ ΜΕ S\*  
 ΟΙ ΜΗ ΕΙΔΟΤΕΣ W

20.30 σημεία TR S B  
 σημεία W

ΕΠΟΙΗΣΕΝ TR P66 S B  
 ΠΕΠΟΙΗΣΚΕΝ W

ΤΩΝ ΜΑΘΗΤΩΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ TR (P66) S W  
 ΤΩΝ ΜΑΘΗΤΩΝ B

ΕΣΤΙ TR  
 ΕΣΤΙΝ S B W

ΕΝ ΤΩ ΒΙΒΛΙΩ ΤΟΥΤΩ TR (P66\*\*) S B W  
 ΕΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΩ ΤΟΥΤΩ (P66\*)

20.31 ΙΝΑ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΣΗΤΕ TR S\*\*  
 ΙΝΑ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΗΤΕ S\* B  
 ΙΝΑ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΣΗΤΑΙ W

Ο ΙΗΣΟΥΣ TR  
 ΙΗΣΟΥΣ P66 S B W

ΕΣΤΙΝ Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ TR S B  
 Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ W

ΚΑΙ ΙΝΑ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΟΝΤΕΣ TR S\*\* B W  
 ΙΝΑ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΟΝΤΕΣ S\*

---

20.30 [των μαθητων α[υτ]ου P66. 20.30 [ε]ν τω βιβλ[ιω  
 τουτω] P66.

ζωνη TR B W  
ζωνη αιωνιον S\*

εχητε S B  
εχηται W

21.1 εφανερωσεν εαυτον παλιν ο ιησους TR  
εφανερωσεν παλιν εαυτον ο ιησους S  
εφανερωσεν εαυτον παλιν ιησους B  
εφανερωσεν εαυτον ο ιησους παλιν W

εφανερωσε TR  
εφανερωσεν S B W

21.2 γαλιλαιας TR S B\*\* W  
γαλειλαιας B\*

και οι του ζεβεδαιου TR (P66) B  
και οι το ζεβεδεου W  
και οι υιοι ζεβεδαιου S

21.3 εξηλθον και TR B W  
εξηλθον ουν και S

ανεβησαν TR  
ενεβησαν S B W

ευθυς TR  
omit S B W

εκεινη TR B W  
εκινη S

επιασαν ουδεν TR S\*\* B  
εκοπιασαν ουδεν S\*  
επιασαν ουδε εν W

21.4 ηδη TR S\*\* B W  
omit S\*

---

21.2 [και]οι του [ζε]βεδα[ι]ου P66.



γενομενης TR S W  
 γεινομενης B\*  
 γινομενης B\*\*

ο ιησους εις τον αιγιαλον ου μεντοι ηδεισαν οι  
 μαθηται οτι ιησους εστι TR  
 omit W

ο ιησους TR  
 ιησους S B

εις τον αιγιαλον TR B  
 επι τον αιγιαλον S

ηδεισαν TR B  
 εγνωσαν S

εστι TR  
 εστιν S B

21.5 λεγει ουν αυτοις TR S B  
 και λεγει αυτοις W

ο ιησους TR  
 ιησους S B  
 omit W

μη τι προσφαγιον εχετε TR S\*\* B  
 μη προσφαγιον εχετε S\*  
 μη προσφαγιον εχεται W

21.6 ο δε ειπεν αυτοις TR S\*\* B  
 λεγει αυτοις S\* W

βαλετε TR S B  
 βαλεται W

ευρησετε TR S B  
 ευρησεται W (P66)

---

21.6 ευρησετα[ι] P66.

ευρησετε TR S\* S\*\*\* B W  
 + οι δε ειπον δι ολης της νυκτος εκοπιασαμεν και ουδεν  
 ελαβομεν επι δε τω σω ρηματι βαλουμεν S\*\*  
 + [οι δε ειπον δι] ολης νυκτος [εκοπιασαμεν κ]αι  
 ουδε[ν] ελαβ[ομεν επι δε τω σω ο]νομ[ατι  
 βαλουμεν] P66

εβαλον ουν TR S\*\* B  
 οι δε εβαλον S\* W

ελκυσαι ισχυσαν TR  
 ιλκυσαι ισχυον S  
 ελκυσαι ισχυον B  
 ισχυσαν ελκυσαι W

21.7 εστι 1<sup>ο</sup> TR  
 εστιν S B W

εστι 2<sup>ο</sup> TR  
 εστιν S B W

21.8 τω πλοιαριω TR B  
 τω αλλω πλοιαριω S  
 τω πλοιω W

αλλ TR P66  
 αλλα S B W

πηγων TR S B  
 πηγεων W

21.9 απεβησαν TR S\*\* B  
 ανεβησαν S\* W

εις την γην TR S\* B W  
 επι την γην S\*\*

21.10 ο ιησους TR S W  
 .ησους B

ενεγκατε TR B  
 ενεγκαται S W

επλασατε TR S B  
επλασαται W

21.11 ανεβη TR  
ανεβη ουν B  
ενεβη ουν S W

ειλκυσε TR  
ειλκυσεν S B W

επι της γης TR  
εις την γην S B W

ιχθυων μεγαλων TR S B  
μεγαλων ιχθυων W

21.12 ο ιησους TR S W  
ιησους B

αριστησατε TR S B  
αρισταται W

ουδεις δε TR W  
ουδεις δε S  
ουδεις B

21.13 ερχεται ουν TR  
ερχεται S B W

ο ιησους TR S  
ιησους B W

21.14 τουτο ηδη TR B W  
τουτο δε ηδη S

ο ιησους TR S  
ιησους B  
omit W

τοις μαθηταις αυτου TR  
τοις μαθηταις S B W

21.15 σιμων ιωνα TR  
 σιμων S\*  
 σιμων ιωαννου S\*\* B  
 σιμων ιωαννου W

πλειον τουτων TR  
 πλεον τουτων S B  
 πλειον παντων τουτων W

21.16 λεγει αυτω παλιν δευτερον TR B  
 παλιν λεγει αυτω S\*  
 παλιν λεγει αυτω το β S\*\*  
 παλιν λεγει αυτω δευτερον W

σιμων ιωνα TR  
 σιμων S\*  
 σιμων ιωαννου S\*\* B  
 σιμων ιωαννου W

ναι κυριε TR S\*\* B W  
 κυριε S\*

τα προβατα TR S W  
 τα προβατια B

21.17 σιμων ιωνα TR  
 σιμων ιωαννου S W  
 σιμων ιωαννου B

φιλεις 1<sup>ο</sup> TR S B  
 αγαπας W

ελυπηθη TR S\*\* B W  
 ελυπηθη δε S\*

φιλεις 2<sup>ο</sup> TR S\*\* B W  
 και φιλεις S\*

και ειπεν αυτω κυριε TR  
 και λεγει αυτω κυριε S W  
 και ειπεν κυριε B

συ παντα οιδας TR  
 παντα συ οιδας S B W

γινωσκεις TR S B\*\*  
 γεινωσκεις B\*  
 γιγνωσκεις W

λεγει αυτω ο ιησους TR  
 και λεγει αυτω S  
 λεγει αυτω ιησους B  
 λεγει αυτω W

τα προβατα TR S W\*  
 τα προβατια B W\*\*

21.18 εκτενεις TR B W  
 εκτενις S

τας χειρας σου TR B W  
 τη χιραν σου S\*  
 τας χιρας σου S\*\*

και αλλος σε ζωσει TR  
 και αλλοι ζωσουσιν σε S  
 και αλλος ζωσει σε B  
 και αλλοι σε ζωσουσιν W

και οισει TR B  
 και ποιησουσιν σοι S\*  
 και αποισουσιν σε S\*\* W

οπου ου θελεις TR B  
 οσα ου θελις S\*  
 οπου ου θελις S\*\*  
 οπου συ ου θελεις W

21.19 ειπε TR  
 ειπεν S B  
 ελεγεν W

ακολουθει TR B W  
 ακολουθι S

21.20 επιστραφεις δε TR S  
 επιστραφεις B W

βλεπει TR B W  
βλεπι S

ακολουθουντα ος TR S\*\* B  
omit S\*  
ος W

δειπνω TR S B  
διπνω W

και ειπε TR  
και λεγει αυτω S\*  
και ειπεν αυτω S\*\* W  
και ειπεν B

21.21 τουτον TR W  
τουτον ουν S B

λεγει τω ιησου TR B  
ειπεν τω ιησου S W

κυριε TR B W  
omit S

21.22 μενειν TR B W  
μενιν S

συ ακολουθει μοι TR  
συ μοι ακολουθι S  
συ μοι ακολουθει B W

21.23 ο λογος ουτος TR  
ουτος ο λογος S B W

και ουκ ειπεν TR  
ουκ ειπεν δε S B W

εως ερχομαι τι προς σε TR S\*\* B W  
εως ερχομαι S\*

21.24 ο μαρτυρων TR S  
ο και μαρτυρων B W

και γραφας ταυτα TR S\* W  
 ο και γραφας ταυτα S\*\*  
 και ο γραφας ταυτα B

και οιδαμεν οτι αληθης εστιν η μαρτυρια αυτου TR S  
 και οιδαμεν οτι αληθης αυτου η μαρτυρια εστιν B W

21.25 omit entire verse S\*

εστι TR  
 εστιν S\*\* B W

οσα TR W  
 α S\*\* B

ουδε TR W  
 ουδ S\*\* B

χωρησαι TR W  
 χωρησειν S\*\* B

αμην TR  
 omit S\*\* B W

no subscription TR  
 ευαγγελιον κατα ιωαννην S  
 κατα ιωαννην B  
 κατα ιωαννην W

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY



SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbot, Ezra. "On the Comparative Antiquity of the Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts of the Greek Bible," Journal of the American Oriental Society, X (1880), 189-200.
- Aland, Kurt. "Das Johannesevangelium auf Papyrus. Zum neu veröffentlichten Papyrus Bodmer II," Forschungen und Fortschritte, XXXI (1957), 50-55.
- "Neue Neutestamentliche Papyri," New Testament Studies, III (1956-57), 261-86.
- "Papyrus Bodmer II. Ein erster Bericht," Theologische Literaturzeitung, LXXXII (1957), cols. 161-84.
- "The Present Position of New Testament Textual Criticism," Studia Evangelica: Papers presented to the International Congress on "The Four Gospels in 1957" held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1957. Edited by Kurt Aland, F. L. Cross, Jean Danielou, Harold Riesenfeld and W. C. van Unnik. (Texte und Untersuchungen, LXXIII.) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959, pp. 717-31.
- "Zur Liste der Neutestamentlichen Handschriften VI," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLVIII (1957), 141-91.

- Arndt, William F. and F. Wilbur Gingrich. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature: A translation and adaptation of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur, fourth revised and augmented edition, 1952. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Baird, William R., Jr. "Current Trends in New Testament Study," Journal of Religion, XXXIX (1959), 137-53.
- Barnard, P. Mordaunt. The Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria in the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. (Texts and Studies, V, no. 5.) Cambridge: At the University Press, 1899.
- Barrett, C. K. The Gospel according to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text. London: Society for the Preservation of Christian Knowledge, 1958.
- "Papyrus Bodmer II: A Preliminary Report," The Expository Times, LXVIII (1956-57), 174-77.
- Barthélemy, D. and J. T. Milik, editors. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, vol. I: Qumran Cave I. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Beach, Curtis. The Gospel of Mark: Its Making and Meaning. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.
- Bell, H. I. Recent Discoveries of Biblical Papyri. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1937.
- Review of An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library, edited by C. H. Roberts, Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, XXI (1935), 266, 67.
- Benoit, P. Review of An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library, edited by C. H. Roberts, Revue Biblique, XLV (1936), 269-72.
- Bernard, J. H. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John. Edited by A. H. McNeile. (The International Critical Commentary.) Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1928. 2 vols.
- Bibliorum Ss. graecorum Codex Vaticanus 1209 (cod. B).  
(Codices e vaticanis selecti phototypice expressi iussu Pii PP. X consilio et opera curatorum Bybliothecae Vaticanae, IV.) Milan: Ulricum Hoepfii, 1904-07. 2 parts.

Birdsall, J. N. The Bodmer Papyrus of the Gospel of John.  
London: The Tyndale Press, 1960.

----- "The Text of the Fourth Gospel: Some Current  
Questions," The Evangelical Quarterly, XXIX (1957),  
195-205.

Blass, Frederich. Evangelium secundum Iohannem cum varia  
lectionis delectu. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1902.

Boismard, M. -E. "À propos de Jean V, 39. --Essai de  
critique textuelle," Revue Biblique, LV (1948), 5-34.

----- "Critique textuelle et citations patristiques,"  
Revue Biblique, LVII (1950), 388-408.

----- "'Dans le sein du Père' (Jo. I, 18)," Revue Biblique,  
LIX (1952), 23-39.

----- "De son ventre couleront des fleuves d'eau (Jo. VII,  
38)," Revue Biblique, LXV (1958), 523-46.

----- "Lectio brevior, potior," Revue Biblique, LVIII  
(1951), 161-68.

----- "Le Papyrus Bodmer II," Revue Biblique, LXIV (1957),  
363-98.

----- "Problèmes de critique textuelle concernant le  
Quatrième Évangile," Revue Biblique, LX (1953), 347-71.

----- Le Prologue de Saint Jean. Paris: Les Éditions  
du Cerf, 1953.

Botte, Bernard. "Le Texte du Quatrième Évangile et le Papyrus  
Bodmer II," Bible et Vie Chrétienne, no. 24 (1958),  
96-107.

Bousset, Wilhelm. Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament.  
(Texte und Untersuchungen, XI.) Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs,  
1894.

Braun, F. M. "Un nouveau papyrus johannique: Le Papyrus  
Bodmer II (Jo. I, 1-XIV, 15)," Revue Thomiste, LVII (1957),  
79-84.

Brownlee, William H. "Muhammad ed-Deeb's Own Story of His  
Scroll Discovery," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XVI  
(1957), 236-39.

Buchanan, E. S. "Ancient Testimony to the Early Corruption of  
the Gospels," Bibliotheca Sacra, LXXIII (1916), 177-91.

- Buck, Harry M. The Johannine Lessons in the Greek Gospel Lectionary. (Studies in the Lectionary Text of the Greek New Testament, vol. II, no. 4.) Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. Die erforschung der synoptischen Evangelien. (Aus der Welt der Religion, n. f. I.) Third revised edition; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1960.
- Das Evangelium des Johannes. (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament begründet von Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, 13th edition.) Fourth edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1953.
- "Ist voraussetzungslose Exegese möglich?" Theologische Zeitschrift, XIII (1957), 409-17..
- Burchard, Christoph. Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer. (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LXVI.) Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1957.
- Burgon, John William. The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels. Arranged, completed and edited by Edward Miller. London: George Bell and Sons, 1896.
- Inspiration and Interpretation. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1861.
- The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established. Arranged, completed and edited by Edward Miller. London: George Bell and Sons, 1896.
- Burkitt, F. C. "The Chester Beatty Papyri," Journal of Theological Studies, XXXIV (1933), 363-69.
- Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library at Manchester. Manchester: John Rylands Library, 1911-1952. 4 vols.
- Cerfaux, L. "Remarques sur le texte des Évangiles à Alexandrie au II<sup>e</sup> siècle," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses, XV (1938), 674-82.
- Clark, A. C. The Descent of Manuscripts. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1918.
- Clark, Kenneth W. A Descriptive Catalogue of Greek New Testament Manuscripts in America. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1937.

- "The Effect of Recent Textual Criticism upon New Testament Studies," The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology. Edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube, in honor of Charles Harold Dodd. Cambridge: University Press, 1956, pp. 27-51.
- "The Manuscripts of the Greek New Testament," New Testament Manuscript Studies: The Materials and the Making of a Critical Apparatus. Edited by Merrill M. Parvis and Allen P. Wikgren. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950, pp. 1-24.
- "Textual Criticism and Doctrine," Studia Paulina in Honorem Johannis de Zwaan. Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn N. V., 1953, pp. 52-65.
- Codex Sinaiticus, The Ancient Biblical Manuscript now in the British Museum: Tischendorf's Story and Argument Related by Himself. Eighth edition; London: Lutterworth Press, 1934.
- Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus: The New Testament, The Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas. Reproduced in facsimile from photographs by Helen and Kirsopp Lake. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1911.
- Collins, John J. "A Newly Discovered Papyrus of St. John's Gospel," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XX (1958), 57, 58.
- "Papyrus Bodmer II," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XX (1958), 281-89.
- "Papyrus Bodmer II," New Testament Abstracts, II (1957-58), 130-32.
- Colwell, E. C. "Genealogical Method: Its Achievements and Its Limitations," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVI (1947), 109-33.
- "Method in Locating a Newly-Discovered Manuscript within the Manuscript Tradition of the Greek New Testament," Studia Evangelica: Papers presented to the International Congress on "The Four Gospels in 1957" held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1957. Edited by Kurt Aland, F. L. Cross, Jean Danielou, Harold Riesenfeld and W. C. van Unnik. (Texte und Untersuchungen, LXXIII.) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959, pp. 757-77.
- "Restoring the Text of the Greek New Testament," The Emory University Quarterly, VIII (1952), 146-53.

- "The Significance of Grouping of the New Testament Manuscripts," New Testament Studies, IV (1957-58), 73-92.
- Conybeare, Fred C. "Three Early Doctrinal Modifications of the Text of the Gospels," The Hibbert Journal, I (1902-03), 96-113.
- Conzelmann, Hans. Die Mitte der Zeit, Studien Theologie des Lukas. Third edition; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1960.
- Cross, F. L., editor. The Jung Codex. London: A. R. Mowbray, 1955.
- Cross, Frank Moore. The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1958.
- "The Manuscripts of the Dead Sea Caves," Biblical Archaeologist, XVII (1954), 1-21.
- Cullmann, Oscar. "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (1955), 213-26.
- Dearing, Vinton A. A Manual of Textual Analysis. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1959.
- Dodd, C. H. History and the Gospel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1938.
- The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1953.
- Doresse, Jean. Translated by Leonard Johnston. The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics: An Introduction to the Gnostic Coptic Manuscripts Discovered at Chenoboskion. New York: Viking Press, 1960.
- Duplacy, Jean. Où en est la critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament? Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1959.
- Facsimile of the Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels in the Freer Collection. With an introduction by Henry A. Sanders. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan, 1912.
- Fascher, E. Textgeschichte als hermeneutisches Problem. Halle: Niemeyer, 1953.
- Filson, Floyd V. "Gnostic 'Gospel of Truth,'" Biblical Archaeologist, XX (1957), 76-78.

- "A New Papyrus Manuscript of the Gospel of John,"  
Biblical Archaeologist, XX (1957), 54-63.
- Funk, R. W. "Papyrus Bodmer II (P66) and John 8, 25,"  
Harvard Theological Review, LI (1958), 95-100.
- Gold, Victor Roland. "The Gnostic Library of Chenoboskion,"  
Biblical Archaeologist, XV (1952), 70-88.
- Goodspeed, Edgar J. "The Freer Gospels," American Journal  
of Theology, XVII (1913), 599-613.
- Grant, Frederick C. "The Citation of Greek Manuscript  
Evidence in an Apparatus Criticus," New Testament  
Manuscript Studies: The Materials and the Making of a  
Critical Apparatus. Edited by Merrill M. Parvis and  
Allen P. Wikgren. Chicago: The University of Chicago  
Press, 1950, pp. 81-94.
- "The Greek Text of the New Testament," An  
Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New  
Testament. The International Council of Religious  
Education, 1946, pp. 37-43.
- "Where Form Criticism and Textual Criticism Overlap,"  
Journal of Biblical Literature, LIX (1940), 11-21.
- Grant, Robert M. and David Noel Freedman. The Secret Sayings  
of Jesus. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1960.
- Greenlee, J. Harold. The Gospel Text of Cyril of Jerusalem.  
(Studies and Documents, XVII.) Copenhagen: Ejnar  
Munksgaard, 1955.
- Greg, W. W. The Calculus of Variants: An Essay on Textual  
Criticism. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1927.
- Gregory, Caspar René. Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes.  
Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1900-09. 3 vols.
- Grenfell, Bernard P. and Arthur S. Hunt, editors. The  
Oxyrhynchus Papyri. London: The Egypt Exploration Fund,  
1898-1927. 17 vols.
- Grobel, Kendrick, editor. The Gospel of Truth, A Valentinian  
Meditation on the Gospel. New York: Abingdon Press,  
1960.
- Harding, G. L. "Khirbet Qumran and Wady Muraba'at: Fresh  
Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls and New Testament Discoveries  
in Jordan," Palestine Exploration Quarterly, LXXXIV (1952),  
104-09.

- von Harnack, Adolf. Studien zur Geschichte des Neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche: I. Zur Neutestamentlichen Textkritik. Berlin: Von Walter de Gruyter und Company, 1931.
- Harris, J. Rendel. "New Points of View in Textual Criticism," The Expositor, eighth series, VII (1914), 316-34.
- Side-Lights on New Testament Research. London: The Kingsgate Press, 1908.
- "Was the Diatessaron Anti-Judaic?" Harvard Theological Review, XVIII (1925), 103-09.
- Hartke, W. "Bemerkungen zu Papyrus Bodmer II," Forschungen und Fortschritte, XXXII (1958), 122-26.
- Hatch, William Henry Paine. The Principal Uncial Manuscripts of the New Testament. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939.
- "The Provenance of Codex Vaticanus," (an abstract), Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXII (1953), xviii, xix.
- The 'Western' Text of the Gospels. Evanston, Illinois: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1937.
- Hedley, P. L. "The Egyptian Texts of the Gospels and Acts," Church Quarterly Review, CXVIII (1934), 23-39, 188-230.
- Hills, Edward F. "The Inter-Relationship of the Caesarean Manuscripts," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVIII (1949), 141-60.
- "A New Approach to the Old Egyptian Text," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXIX (1950), 345-62.
- Hoskier, H. C. Codex B and Its Allies. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1914. 2 vols.
- "The New Codex 'W,'" The Expositor, eighth series, V (1913), 467-80, 515-31.
- Hoskyns, Edwyn Clement. The Fourth Gospel. Edited by Francis Noel Davey. Second edition; London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1947.
- Howard, W. F. "The Influence of Doctrine upon the Text of the New Testament," London Quarterly and Holborn Review, sixth series, X (1941), 1-16.
- Huffman, Norman. "Suggestions from the Gospel of Mark for a New Textual Theory," Journal of Biblical Literature, LVI (1937), 347-59.



- Huston, Hollis Wilburn. "A Critical Survey and Evaluation of the Earliest Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Duke University, 1949.
- Hutton, Edward A. An Atlas of Textual Criticism: Being an Attempt to show the Mutual Relationship of the Authorities for the Text of the New Testament up to about 1000 A. D. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1911.
- Johnson, Sherman E. "The Gospel according to St. Matthew, Introduction and Exegesis," The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick, et. al. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951, VII, pp. 229-625.
- Η Καινή Διαθήκη. Oxford: 1873. (Reproduced by photographic offset at the University of Chicago Press.)
- Karnetzki, Manfred. "Textgeschichte als Überlieferungsgeschichte," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLVII (1956), 170-80.
- Kenyon, Frederic G., editor. The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible. London: Emery Walker Limited, 1933-41. 8 fasciculi.
- Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. London: Macmillan and Company, 1901.
- "Hesychius and the Text of the New Testament," Mémoires Lagrange. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1940, pp. 245-50.
- Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts. Fifth edition, revised by A. W. Adams; London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1958.
- Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible. London: Oxford University Press, 1932.
- Kilpatrick, G. D. "Western Text and the Original Text in the Gospels and Acts," Journal of Theological Studies, XLIV (1943), 24-36.
- Kim, K. W. "The Caesarean Text of the Gospel of John," (an abstract), Journal of Biblical Literature, LIX (1950), xv, xvi.
- "The Matthean Text of Origen in His Commentary on Matthew," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVIII (1949), 125-40.

- "Origen's Text of John in His On Prayer, Commentary on Matthew, and Against Celsus," Journal of Theological Studies, n.s. I (1950), 74-84.
- King, Marchant A. and Richard Patterson. "Textual Studies in the Bodmer Manuscript of John," Bibliotheca Sacra, CXVII (1960), 164-71, 258-66.
- Klijn, A. F. J. "Papyrus Bodmer II (John i-xiv) and the Text of Egypt," New Testament Studies, III (1956-57), 327-34.
- Lagrange, M. -J. Introduction à l' Étude du Nouveau Testament. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1933-37. 3 vols.
- "Les Papyrus Chester Beatty pour les Évangiles," Revue Biblique, XLIII (1934), 5-41.
- "Projet de critique textuelle rationnelle du Nouveau Testament," Revue Biblique, XLII (1933), 481-98.
- Lake, Kirsopp. "The Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts and the Copies sent by Eusebius to Constantine," Harvard Theological Review, XI (1918), 32-35.
- "The Text of the Gospels in Alexandria," American Journal of Theology, VI (1902), 79-89.
- The Text of the New Testament. Sixth edition revised by Silva New; London: Rivingtons, 1928.
- Lake, Kirsopp, R. P. Blake and Silva New. "The Caesarean Text of the Gospel of Mark," Harvard Theological Review, (1928), 207-404.
- Lake, Kirsopp and Silva Lake. "The Byzantine Text of the Gospels," Mémorial Lagrange. Paris: J. Gabalda et cie, 1940, pp. 245-50.
- "Some Recent Discoveries," Religion in Life, V (1936), 89-102.
- LaSor, William Sanford. Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 1948-1957. (Fuller Theological Seminary Bibliographical Series, no. 2.) Pasadena, California: Fuller Theological Seminary Library, 1958.
- Lassere, F. "Un nouveau manuscrit de l' évangile de Jean," Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie, VII (1957), 45-57.
- Maldfeld, Georg. "Die griechischen Handschriftenbruchstücke des Neuen Testamentes auf Papyrus," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLII (1949), 228-53.

- "Ein neues Johannes-Evangelium-Fragment auf Papyrus," New Testament Studies, III (1956-57), 79-81.
- Maldfeld, Georg and Bruce M. Metzger. "Detailed List of the Greek Papyri of the New Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVIII (1949), 359-70.
- Martin, Victor, editor. Papyrus Bodmer II, Évangile de Jean, chap. 1-14. Cologne/Genève: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1956.
- Papyrus Bodmer II, Supplément, Évangile de Jean, chap. 14-21. Cologne/Genève: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1958.
- Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV. Unpublished material.
- Massaux, E. "Etat actuel de la critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament," Nouvelle Revue Théologique, LXXV (1953), 703-26.
- Mehlmann, John. "A Note on John 1. 3," The Expository Times, LXVII (1955-56), 340, 41.
- Merk, A. Review of An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library, edited by C. H. Roberts, Biblica, XVII (1936), 99-101.
- Metzger, Bruce M. Annotated Bibliography of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament 1914-1939. (Studies and Documents, XVI.) Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1955.
- "The Caesarean Text of the Gospels," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXIV (1954), 457-89.
- "Recent Discoveries and Investigations of New Testament Manuscripts," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVIII (1959), 13-20.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey. "Some Notable Readings of Papyrus Bodmer II," The Bible Translator, VIII (1957), 150-54.
- Milik, J. T. "Une Inscription et une Lettre en Araméen Christo-Palestinien," Revue Biblique, LX (1953), 525-39.
- Milne, H. J. M. Catalogue of the Literary Papyri in the British Museum. London: The British Museum, 1927.
- Milne, H. J. M. and T. C. Skeat. Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus. London: British Museum, 1938.
- Nestle, Eberhard. Translated from the second German edition by William Edie. Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament. London: Williams and Norgate, 1901.

The New York Times, December 30, 1956.

Ogden, Schubert M., editor. Existence and Faith, Shorter Writings of Rudolph Bultmann. New York: Meridian Books, 1960.

Parvis, Merrill M. "The Nature and Tasks of New Testament Textual Criticism: An Appraisal," Journal of Religion, XXXII (1952), 165-75.

Phillips, C. A. "The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri," The Expository Times, XLV (1933-34), 55-60.

de la Potterie, I. "Een nieuwe papyrus van het vierde Evangelie, Papyrus Bodmer II," Bijdragen, XVIII (1957), 117-28.

Riddle, Donald Wayne. "Textual Criticism as a Historical Discipline," Anglican Theological Review, XVIII (1936), 220-33.

Roberts, C. H., editor. An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel. Manchester: John Rylands Library, 1935.

----- "An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XX (1936), 45-55.

Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament. Tenth edition; New York: George H. Doran Company, 1923.

Salmon, George. Some Thoughts on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. London: John Murray, 1897.

Sanday, William and Cuthbert Hamilton Turner. Nouum Testamentum sancti Irenaei episcopi lugdenensis. (Old-Latin Biblical Texts, no. 7.) Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1923.

Sanders, Henry A. "The Egyptian Text of the Four Gospels and Acts," Harvard Theological Review, XXVI (1933), 79-98.

----- The Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels. (The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection, part I.) New York: The Macmillan Company, 1912.

Saunders, E. W. "Studies in Doctrinal Influence on the Byzantine Text of the Gospels," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXI (1952), 85-92.

Scharlemann, Martin H. "Papyrus Sixty-Six," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXVIII (1957), 573-78.

- Schelkle, K. H. "Eine neugefundene, nunmehr älteste Handschrift des Johannesevangeliums," Theologische Quartalschrift, CXXXVII (1957), 160-67.
- Schippers, R. "De papyruscodex van Johannes (P66)," Gereformeerd Theologisch Tijdschrift, LVII (1957), 33-45.
- "De rest van P66," Gereformeerd Theologisch Tijdschrift, LIX (1959), 80-85.
- Schmidt, Carl. "Die Evangelienhandschrift der Chester Beatty-Sammlung," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXXII (1933), 225-32.
- "Die neuen griechischen Bibelhandschriften," Theologische Literaturzeitung, XXXIII (1908), cols. 359, 60.
- Schubert, Paul. "Urgent Tasks for New Testament Research," The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow. Edited by Harold R. Willoughby. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1947, pp. 209-28.
- Shepard, William P. "Recent Theories of Textual Criticism," Modern Philology, XXVIII (1930-31), 129-41.
- Smothers, Edgar R. "Papyrus Bodmer II: An Early Codex of St. John," Theological Studies, XVIII (1957), 434-41.
- "Two Readings in Papyrus Bodmer II," Harvard Theological Review, LI (1958), 109-22.
- von Soden, Hermann Freiherr. Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1911-1913. 4 vols.
- Souter, Alexander. The Text and Canon of the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.
- Stendahl, Krister. "Implications of Form-Criticism and Tradition-Criticism for Biblical Interpretation," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVII (1958), 33-38.
- The Scrolls and the New Testament. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.
- Streeter, B. H. The Four Gospels. London: Macmillan and Company, Limited, 1924.
- Suggs, M. J. "Eusebius' Text of John in the 'Writings against Marcellus,'" Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXV (1956), 137-42.
- "The New Testament Text of Eusebius of Caesarea." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Duke University, 1949.

- "The Use of Patristic Evidence in the Search for a Primitive New Testament Text," New Testament Studies, IV (1957-58), 139-47.
- Tarelli, C. C. "The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Caesarean Text," Journal of Theological Studies, XL (1940), 46-55.
- "The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Western and Byzantine Texts," Journal of Theological Studies, XLI (1940), 253-60.
- "Historical Greek Grammar and Textual Criticism," Journal of Theological Studies, XXXVIII (1937), 238-42.
- Tasker, R. V. G. "The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Caesarean Text of John," Harvard Theological Review, XXX (1937), 157-64.
- "An Introduction to the Manuscripts of the New Testament," Harvard Theological Review, XLI (1948), 71-81.
- "The Readings of the Chester Beatty Papyrus in the Gospel of St. John," Journal of Theological Studies, XXXVI (1935), 387-91.
- "The Text of the Fourth Gospel used by Origen in His Commentary on John," Journal of Theological Studies, XXXVII (1936), 146-55.
- Teepie, Howard M. and F. Allyn Walker. "Notes on the Plates in Papyrus Bodmer II," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVIII (1959), 148-52.
- Thompson, Herbert, editor. The Gospel of St. John according to the Earliest Coptic Manuscript. London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt, 1924.
- Tischendorf, Constantine, editor. Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus. Leipzig: Giesecke et Devrient, 1862.  
4 vols.
- Novum Testamentum Graece. Editio octava critica maior; Leipzig: Giesecke et Devrient, 1869, 1872. 2 vols.
- Torrey, Charles Cutler. Our Translated Gospels. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1936.
- Tregelles, Samuel Prideaux. An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament: Remarks on Its Revision upon Critical Principles. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1854.

- Treu, Kurt. Review of Papyrus Bodmer II, edited by Victor Martin, Deutsche Literaturzeitung, LXXVIII (1957), cols. 290-94.
- Vaganay, Leo. Translated by B. V. Miller. An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. London: Sands and Company, Limited, 1937.
- de Vaux, R. "Fouille au Khirbet Qumran," Revue Biblique, LX (1953), 83-106.
- Vercellone, Caroli and Iosephi Cozza, editors. Bibliorum Sacrorum Graecus Codex Vaticanus. Rome: typis et impensis S. Congregationis de propaganda fide, 1868-81. 6 vols.
- Vogels, H. J. Handbuch der Neutestamentlichen Textkritik. Münster: Verlag der Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1923.
- Wessely, Charles. "Les plus anciens monuments du Christianisme écrits sur papyrus," Patrologia Orientalis, IV, no. 2 (1907), 95-210; XVIII, no. 3 (1924), 343-512.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss and Fenton John Anthony Hort. The New Testament in the Original Greek. London: Macmillan and Company, Limited, 1881. 2 vols.
- Wiles, Maurice F. The Spiritual Gospel: The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1960.
- Williams, C. S. C. Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1951.
- Wordsworth, W. A. "The Bodmer Papyrus and the Prologue of St. John's Gospel," Novum Testamentum, II (1958), 1-7.
- Wright, Leon E. Alterations of the Words of Jesus as quoted in the Literature of the Second Century. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.
- Zimmermann, von Heinrich. "Papyrus Bodmer II und seine Bedeutung für die Textgeschichte des Johannes-Evangeliums," Biblische Zeitschrift, II (1958), 214-43.
- Zuntz, G. The Text of the Epistles. London: The British Academy, 1953.

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Calvin Lewis Porter

I was born on September 8, 1933, in Lincoln, Illinois, the third son of Mr. and Mrs. C. R. Porter. My parents now reside in El Reno, Oklahoma where my father is the minister of the First Christian Church.

My high school education was received at the Putnam City High School, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, and in 1955 I received the Bachelor of Arts degree from Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma. I am a member of the Blue Key National Honor Fraternity. In 1958 the Bachelor of Divinity degree was granted to me by The Theological Seminary of Phillips University.

I enrolled in the Department of Religion of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Duke University, in September, 1958 and held the Ottis Green Fellowship. For the second and third years of graduate study I was awarded a James B. Duke Fellowship and a Gurney Harris Kearns Fellowship, respectively.

On January 13, 1955, I was married to Marilyn Pelton of Beloit, Kansas. In that same year I was ordained to the ministry of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ).

I belong to the National Association of Biblical Instructors and to the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis.