

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

SCRIBAL HARMONIZATION IN
GREEK MANUSCRIPTS OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS
FROM THE SECOND TO THE FIFTH CENTURY

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

PROGRAM IN NEW TESTAMENT AND EARLY CHRISTIANITY

BY

CAMBRY G. PARDEE

CHICAGO, IL

MAY 2016

ProQuest Number: 10131487

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10131487

Published by ProQuest LLC (2016). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Copyright by Cambry G. Pardee, 2016
All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to the many individuals and institutions that have contributed to the completion of this dissertation. I would especially like to thank Loyola University Chicago for the Advanced Doctoral Fellowship, the Arthur J. Schmitt Foundation for the Schmitt Fellowship in Service and Leadership, and the Christian Scholarship Foundation for the Abraham J. Malherbe Fellowship. Each of these worthy institutions provided support that enabled me to conduct the research for this project as a full time endeavor. I am also exceedingly grateful to the Loyola University Chicago library staff, especially those in the Interlibrary Loan department. Their diligence and ability to acquire obscure resources was a constant surprise and a dependable source of assistance.

Dr. Edmondo Lupieri, my director, generously supported this project with countless hours of reading and discussion. His intellectual curiosity and genuine interest in his students' work are a fine model of teaching and scholarship. I am also grateful to the members of my dissertation committee. Dr. Thomas Tobin, SJ and Dr. James Keenan provided philological advice and helpful criticism of the general argumentation of this study.

I would also like to acknowledge two individuals for their constant presence and support throughout this project, Dr. Holliday and Mrs. Darling. Finally, I could not have completed this project without the earnest support and encouragement of Heather Pardee. I thank you.

For Heather and Harmonia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
ABBREVIATIONS	ix
CHAPTER ONE: SCRIBAL HARMONIZATION	1
Scribes in the Ancient World	1
Jewish Scribal Culture	1
Greek and Roman Scribal Culture	13
Compositional Practices	18
Introduction to Scribal Harmonization	22
Harmonization among Scribal Habits	25
Intentionality	27
Frequency	36
Sources and Direction of Influence	38
Scribal Habits in the History of Scholarship	41
Westcott and Hort: Knowledge of Documents	44
Colwell and Royse: Singular Readings	47
Aland and Min: Comparative Readings	53
Elliott and Fee: Harmonization and the Synoptic Problem	58
Method of Investigation	62
Parameters: Fragmentary Greek Manuscripts of the Second to the Fifth Centuries	63
Procedure	66
CHAPTER TWO: FRAGMENTARY MANUSCRIPTS OF THE SECOND AND THIRD CENTURIES	69
The Text of the New Testament in the Second and Third Centuries	69
The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century	73
Manuscripts of Matthew	73
The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Third Century	102
Manuscripts of Matthew	103
Manuscripts of Luke	125
Manuscript 0171: A Manuscript of Matthew and Luke	139
Summary of Harmonization in Second- and Third-Century Manuscripts of the Synoptic Gospels	154
CHAPTER THREE: EXTENSIVE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE THIRD CENTURY	158
P ⁷⁵ (P.Bodmer XIV and XV): A Manuscript of Luke and John	158
P ⁷⁵ – Passages from Luke	162
Summary of Harmonization in P ⁷⁵	206
P ⁴⁵ (P.Chester Beatty I): A Manuscript of the Four Gospels and Acts	209
P ⁴⁵ – Passages from Matthew	214

P ⁴⁵ – Passages from Luke	221
P ⁴⁵ – Passages from Mark	254
Summary of Harmonization in P ⁴⁵	279
CHAPTER FOUR: FRAGMENTARY MANUSCRIPTS OF THE FOURTH CENTURY	285
The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Fourth Century	285
Manuscripts of Mark	285
Manuscripts of Matthew	298
Manuscripts of Luke	308
Summary of Harmonization in Fourth-Century Manuscripts of the Synoptic Gospels	312
CHAPTER FIVE: A MANUSCRIPT WITH THE COMPLETE TEXT OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS FROM THE FOURTH CENTURY	315
Codex Vaticanus (Cod. Vat. Gr. 1209)	315
Codex Vaticanus – Matthew	319
Codex Vaticanus – Mark	364
Codex Vaticanus – Luke	391
Summary of Harmonization in Codex Vaticanus	412
CHAPTER SIX: FRAGMENTARY MANUSCRIPTS OF THE FIFTH CENTURY	418
The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Fifth Century	418
Manuscripts of Mark	418
Manuscripts of Matthew	423
Manuscripts of Luke	426
CHAPTER SEVEN: HARMONIZATION AND GOSPEL HARMONY	455
Harmonization as a General Practice	458
Harmonization and Individual Scribes	462
Harmonization and Future Research	466
Harmonization and Gospel Harmony	468
APPENDIX A: TRANSCRIPTIONS	471
BIBLIOGRAPHY	537
VITA	568

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Sources of Harmonization in Second- and Third-Century Manuscripts of Matthew	124
Table 2. Sources of Harmonization in Third-Century Manuscripts of Luke	139
Table 3. Sources of Harmonization in the Text of Matthew in Manuscript 0171	144
Table 4. Sources of Harmonization in the Text of Luke in Manuscript 0171	153
Table 5. Quality of Harmonization in Second- and Third-Century Manuscripts of the Synoptic Gospels	154
Table 6. Harmonization in Second- and Third-Century Manuscripts of the Synoptic Gospels	156
Table 7. Quality of Harmonization in P ⁷⁵	206
Table 8. Harmonization in P ⁷⁵	208
Table 9. Sources of Harmonization in the Text of Luke in P ⁴⁵	253
Table 10. Sources of Harmonization in the Text of Mark in P ⁴⁵	279
Table 11. Quality of Harmonization in P ⁴⁵	280
Table 12. Harmonization in P ⁴⁵	282
Table 13. Sources of Harmonization in Fourth-Century Manuscripts of Mark	297
Table 14. Sources of Harmonization in Fourth-Century Manuscripts of Matthew	308
Table 15. Quality of Harmonization in Fourth-Century Manuscripts of the Synoptic Gospels	312
Table 16. Harmonization in Fourth-Century Manuscripts of the Synoptic Gospels	313
Table 17. Sources of Harmonization in the Text of Matthew in Codex Vaticanus	363

Table 18. Sources of Harmonization in the Text of Mark in Codex Vaticanus	391
Table 19. Sources of Harmonization in the Text of Luke in Codex Vaticanus	412
Table 20. Quality of Harmonization in Codex Vaticanus	413
Table 21. Harmonization in Codex Vaticanus	415
Table 22. Quality of Harmonization in Codex Guelferbytanus	452
Table 23. Harmonization in Codex Guelferbytanus	453

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
<i>Aeg</i>	<i>Aegyptus</i>
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
ANTF	Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung
<i>APF</i>	<i>Archiv für Papyrusforschung</i>
<i>AThR</i>	<i>Anglican Theological Review</i>
<i>Aug</i>	<i>Augustinianum</i>
<i>BA</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicalarum Lovaniensium
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
<i>BSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>CdE</i>	<i>Chronique d'Égypte</i>
<i>CQR</i>	<i>Church Quarterly Review</i>
<i>EBib</i>	<i>Etudes bibliques</i>
<i>EstEcl</i>	<i>Estudios eclesiásticos</i>
<i>EvQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte
<i>Gn</i>	<i>Gnomon</i>
<i>GRBS</i>	<i>Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies</i>
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HTB	Histoire du texte biblique
HThKNT	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
IBC	Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IGNTP	International Greek New Testament Project
<i>JANER</i>	<i>Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JECS</i>	<i>Journal of Early Christian Studies</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series

<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Meyer-Kommentar)
LAI	Library of Ancient Israel
NEchtB	Neue Echter Bibel
<i>Neot</i>	<i>Neotestamentica</i>
<i>NIB</i>	<i>The New Interpreter's Bible</i>
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
NTTSD	New Testament Tools, Studies, and Documents
<i>OP</i>	<i>The Oxyrhynchus Papyri</i>
PO	Patrologia Orientalis
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>REG</i>	<i>Revue des études grecques</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
RNT	Regensburger Neues Testament
SANT	Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testaments
SD	Studies and Documents
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SO	Symbolae Osloenses
SP	Sacra Pagina
THKNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>TLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
UBS ⁴	United Bible Society, 4th edition of <i>The Greek New Testament</i>
VL	Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>
<i>ZPE</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>

CHAPTER ONE
SCRIBAL HARMONIZATION
Scribes in the Ancient World

In the earliest centuries of Christianity, as the texts of the New Testament were written, dispersed, and read, scribes living throughout the Mediterranean world were entrusted with the task of copying documents that were, or would come to be, set apart as sacred. The subject of this study concerns some of the artifacts that these scribes created, the Greek manuscripts of the Synoptic Gospels. Before turning to the manuscripts themselves, it will be useful to explore the identity of the scribes with respect to their training, education, and social standing in two distinct, but not isolated, spheres of influence: Judaism and the Greco-Roman world.

Jewish Scribal Culture

During the Hellenistic and Roman periods (ca. 323 BCE–324 CE), the sacred texts of Judaism acquired an increasingly central role in Jewish religious life, especially as foreign powers threatened the cultic praxis of Jews, culminating with the destruction of the temple in 70 CE.¹ Even so, Kim Haines-Eitzen, in her study of scribes in the Greco-Roman world, does not include a comparative analysis of early Christian scribal practice with that of Judaism. In defense of this limitation, she claims that in the second and early

¹ M. D. Goodman, “Texts, Scribes and Power in Roman Judaea,” in *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*, ed. Alan K. Bowman and Greg Woolf (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 99–108, 99, states succinctly, “No ancient society was more blatantly dominated by a written text than that of Jews in the Roman periods.”

third centuries “Christianity was becoming ever more separate from Judaism and developing its mission to ‘pagans’” such that “we should suppose...that the copyists of early Christian literature were probably pagan converts who already knew how to write when they converted to Christianity.”² She asserts that even the earliest Christian scribes would have been trained in Greco-Roman rather than Jewish writing practices, but makes the qualification that “certain scribal customs may have originated in the Jewish environment of the early church.” She gives as an example the contraction of certain words common in Christian manuscripts (*nomina sacra*), which some scholars suggest parallels the special treatment of the Tetragrammaton in Jewish religious texts. It is not true, however, that by the late second and early third century any close connection between Christian and Jewish scribality had ceased to operate.

Jews were accustomed to writing in Greek as early as the third century BCE and even in later centuries it cannot be said that Jewish and Christian students of scripture ceased to communicate altogether. The composition of the Septuagint around the third century BCE is a testament to Jewish interaction with the larger Greek-speaking world, especially in Alexandria. The revisions to the Septuagint made in the second century CE by Aquila, a former Gentile Christian but later Jewish proselyte, by Theodotion, also believed by some to have converted to Judaism, and by Symmachus, who is remembered by Epiphanius as a Samaritan with Jewish inclinations and by Jerome as a Christian Ebionite, demonstrate an ongoing connection between Jews and Christians and especially between Jewish scribal practice and the Greek language of the Greco-Roman world.

² Kim Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 19–20.

Not only did some Jewish scribes speak Greek and inherit Greek writing practices, some Greek-speaking Christian scribes and scholars were aware of Jewish scholarship and could read Hebrew texts. Origen, for example, maintained friendly relations with Jews and even defended their faithfulness (cf. *Cels.*). He also consulted with learned Jews on matters of the translation and interpretation of Hebrew texts (cf. *Princ.* 1.3,4). His Hexapla included a column of Hebrew text, another of Hebrew transliterated into Greek, and columns for the Septuagint and the three revisions of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus. This remarkable document testifies to the continuing interrelation of Judaism and Christianity in the late second and early third centuries. Likewise, Jerome was taught Hebrew by a Jew who had converted to Christianity (*Epist.* 125.12), was instructed in the methods of Jewish reading and exegesis by several of the most learned Jewish teachers he could find (*Comm. Isa.* 22.17; *Epist.* 173.9), travelled to Palestine with Jewish friends (preface to *Paralipomena*), and used Hebrew manuscripts from Jewish synagogues in his work of translation (*Epist.* 36.1). These examples demonstrate that it is necessary to allow for permeable boundaries between Jewish, Greek, and Roman scribal enterprises and to look for some of the roots of Greek Christian scribality in Jewish practice. After all, Christianity inherited its text-centric religious practice from its parent religion, no matter how tenuous the relationship in later centuries. Furthermore, developments in the Jewish scribal approach to religious texts during the process of canonization of the Hebrew Bible provide a close parallel to the developments that took place in the second through fourth centuries in Christian copying of texts that were themselves in the process of becoming scripture.

Since there is very little evidence for the scribal culture of ancient Israel, several studies of scribality in Judaism have begun with comparison to Mesopotamian, Egyptian, and other Ancient Near Eastern cultures for which there is substantially more evidence.³ Concerning the fortuitous nature of the sources of information about scribes in Mesopotamia, A. Leo Oppenheim writes, “Favored by a writing material that is as ubiquitous as it is permanent, the public scribes, the notaries, the scribes of administrative centers, the poets, and the scholars left us a unique instance of an early civilization that not only knew writing but used it with an intensity paralleled in the first two or three millennia of the known history of man perhaps only by the Egyptians, who were much less fortunate in the selection of their writing material.”⁴ Where many of the sources of information about scribes in ancient Israel are lost or never existed, there are abundant sources of information about Mesopotamian scribes due in large part to the durable tablets upon which they wrote. As a result of his study of the tablets, Oppenheim divides the roles of scribes into three categories: bureaucrat, poet, and scholar.⁵ The bureaucrat-scribe, according to Oppenheim, was associated with the temples, kept records of material goods and financial transactions, and composed legal contracts and documents. The poet-scribe, as the name suggests, wrote epic poetry, but was also commissioned to

³ Christine Schams, *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period*, JSOTSup 291 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998); Philip R. Davies, *Scribes and Schools: The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures*, LAI (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998); A. Leo Oppenheim, “The Position of the Intellectual in Mesopotamian Society,” *Daedalus* 104 (1975): 37–46; Karel van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007). John Van Seters, “The Role of the Scribe in the Making of the Hebrew Bible,” *JANER* 8 (2008): 99–129, 109, urges caution in comparing Mesopotamian and Egyptian scribality to Jewish scribal practice since those cultures “are already more than two millennia older, many times larger and much more sophisticated in every respect than that of Judah, whose scribal culture only began in a rudimentary way in the late eighth century.” See also Dominique Charpin, *Reading and Writing in Babylon*, trans. Jane Marie Todd (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010).

⁴ Oppenheim, “Position of the Intellectual,” 38.

⁵ *Ibid.*, “Position of the Intellectual,” 39.

write royal inscriptions and hymns lauding the deeds of rulers. Finally, the scholar-scribe was a learned man proficient in the art of divination aided by the consultation, study, and writing of elaborate compendia of signs and omens. Common to all of these roles is the ability to read and write, while the scholar-scribe is also gifted in interpretation.

Many of the characteristics associated with the bureaucrat-scribe in Mesopotamia are typical of scribes in Egypt and elsewhere in the Ancient Near East, who functioned as local administrators in the service of the ruling class. With reference to the necessity for scribes on a commercial level, Philip Davies asserts, “Writing was first used to record economic transactions: receipts, letters, or records, and had little or no use beyond this.”⁶ Later, writing became useful in diplomacy so that “the scribe was at the same time the administrator, the ‘civil servant.’”⁷ In the earliest period, then, the bulk of scribal activity pertained to the reading and writing of everyday documents, not literature, and the scribe’s most common position was that of government administrator.

In Judah and Samaria, it is very likely that bureaucrat-scribes were in place to fulfill these everyday functions. Perhaps poet-scribes wrote down the deeds of the kings and the records of the nation in documents such as the lost *Book of the Annals of the Kings of Israel* (cf. 1 Kgs 14:19, 16:14; 2 Kgs 1:18). Perhaps it was Jewish scholar-scribes who wrote down and arranged the oral sources and epic traditions behind the Pentateuch during and after the Babylonian captivity and others who later crafted the Samaritan Pentateuch. But scribes of the bureaucratic variety would have far outnumbered those commissioned for literary productions like the *Annals* and the Pentateuch.

⁶ Davies, *Scribes and Schools*, 17.

⁷ *Ibid.*, *Scribes and Schools*, 17.

Despite the clear picture of scribes as bureaucrats and administrators whose primary role was to read and write legal documents and only occasionally to interpret texts, biblical scholars have often characterized Jewish scribes (*soferim*) as scholars and intellectuals. Emil Schürer, for instance characterizes scribes as *Schriftgelerter*, that is, Torah scholars, who were primarily *interpreters* of the Pentateuch, not writers or copiers. These men received honorary titles such as “rabbi.”⁸ This view was adopted and perpetuated by subsequent scholars, including Joachim Jeremias and Martin Hengel.⁹ Jacob Neusner describes scribes not only as scholars of Torah, working out legal codes in detail, but as predecessors of the rabbis, examining, interpreting, and teaching the Law.¹⁰ Elias Bickerman subsequently pointed out the irony of this view, remarking, “Modern scholars misrepresent the *soferim* by confusing these notaries, accountants, and legists, with the rabbis” who themselves discouraged their students from writing, never referred to themselves as *soferim*, and only used the term to designate professional writers.¹¹

Christine Schams, E. P. Sanders, and others, have demonstrated that this lofty view of scribes is untenable and almost entirely overlooks the humbler and most basic

⁸ Emil Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 3rd ed., 3 vols. (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1886–1911), II:312–328, 313, “Neben den Priestern bildete sich ein selbständiger Stand von „Schriftgelerten“, d. h. von berufmässigen Kennern des Gesetzes...Nicht mehr die Priester, sondern die Schriftgelerten waren jetzt die efrigen Hüter des Gesetzes.”

⁹ For a thorough critique of this view, see Christine Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 15–35. Recently, Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 79–82, has adapted the concept of *Schriftgelerter*: “The use of *sōpēr* with the meaning ‘scholar of scripture’...must be viewed as a particularization of the concept of the scribe as scholar.” Van der Toorn suggests that “the accomplished scribe...is an expert and a scholar” and that one scribal specialization would have been scripture.

¹⁰ Jacob Neusner, *Judaism: The Evidence of the Mishnah* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 232–234; and Idem., *Judaic Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: A Systematic Reply to Professor E. P. Sanders* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 102–103. He writes, “We know, moreover, that in time to come...the scribe would be transformed into the “rabbi.” See also pp. 182–183.

¹¹ Elias Joseph Bickerman, *Jews in the Greek Age* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988),

aspect of scribes as writers of documents. According to Schams, the faulty notion of scribes as *Schriftgelerter* is due to an extrapolation from later rabbinic texts and the texts of the New Testament, especially the Gospels, where “scribes” appear as a distinct, authoritative group alongside the Pharisees.¹² If early Jewish scribes should not be characterized as *Schriftgelerter*, how might one describe their role?

Due to the paucity of direct evidence, Schams asserts, “We cannot be certain about the functions and status of Jewish scribes during the Second-Temple period.”¹³ Even so, some aspects of their identity and function can be recovered. For example, Bickerman states, “The professional scribe, the *sofer*, was in the first place a penman.”¹⁴ As a penman, or professional writer, a *sofer* was also a notary who could be called upon to draw up “contracts, bills of divorce, and other deeds.”¹⁵ Historically, then, the role of the early Jewish scribe mirrored that of the bureaucrat-scribe in the Ancient Near East. Scribes fulfilled administrative functions that required reading and writing.

Schams notes that there is evidence that in the Persian period (ca. 539–323 BCE) Jewish scribes were associated with the palace and government, worked in the Persian administration, and communicated in Aramaic, which was “the official administrative language” as well as their native language.¹⁶ Higher-level scribes would have acquired an understanding of Persian law and could have thereby gained “a reputation as wise men

¹² For example, Schürer claims, “In der Zeit des Neuen Testaments finden wir diesen Process (away from priests toward “scribes”) schon völlig abgeschlossen vor: die Schriftgelerten bilden einen festgeschlossenen Stand.” The question of the identity of the “scribes” in the gospel accounts continues to be asked. Goodman, “Texts, Scribes and Power,” 103, has pointed out the oddity that the scribes in the New Testament are *never* depicted writing.

¹³ Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 309.

¹⁴ Bickerman, *Greek Jews in the Age*, 162.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, *Greek Jews in the Age*, 162.

¹⁶ Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 44–71, 290, 309–312.

and intellectuals.”¹⁷ Schams offers Ezra as an example of such an imperial scribe. Lower-level scribes would have served financial and administrative functions, keeping track of tithes and resources, writing genealogies, and so on. In this period, Jewish scribes had little to do with interpreting the Torah, which continued to be a priestly function.

Schams goes on to describe how during the Hellenistic period (ca. 323–37 BCE), when Palestine was under the rule of the Ptolemies, the Egyptian bureaucracy was greatly expanded and required even more scribes in the cities and outside of the urban centers. She points out that the Hebrew term *sofer*, used of Jewish scribes, was translated into Greek as *γραμματεὺς*, a term used to describe notaries, penmen, and professional writers. Therefore, Jewish scribes, the *soferim*, must have been perceived to function in this way and not as teachers (*διδάσκαλοι*) or scholars (*σχολάστικοι*). Village and rural scribes continued to serve an administrative role requiring training in reading and writing and served as representatives of the ruling elite. M. D. Goodman writes, “It was assumed in rabbinic texts that scribes (*soferim*) could be found in village markets with blank forms to record loans and sales.”¹⁸ Documentary administration persisted as an integral part of the occupation of Jewish scribes.

It was during this time, however, as the significance of written material, and so the number of scribes, increased, that scribes began to specialize in specific tasks. It appears that some remained experts in administration, while others specialized in the copying of secular and sacred books. With regard to the expansion of scribal functions, Schams writes, “It is not impossible that the development of specialization among scribes

¹⁷ Ibid., *Jewish Scribes*, 55, 310.

¹⁸ Goodman, “Texts, Scribes and Power,” 102.

in urban and rural areas combined with an increase in the importance assigned to public reading of the Scriptures in Jewish society may have led to scribes as readers and specialist copyists of sacred scrolls.”¹⁹ No longer did all scribes write daily ephemera, some began to copy literary texts. The development of specialization seems to have coincided with a change in the social status of scribes. Already, some scribes would have attained a measure of political status on the basis of their connection to the government, but scribes of literature gained intellectual status. Goodman suggests that the elevated depiction of scribes in the New Testament as authorities could be the result of scribes being perceived as religious experts because of their job copying religious texts. Just as Jewish bureaucrat-scribes in the Persian period gained expertise in Persian law, so also did Jewish scribes copying the Torah or other sacred writings gain religious expertise simply by virtue of constant exposure to religious texts.²⁰

Expertise evolved into influence and authority. According to Schams, “The function of copying sacred scrolls may have conferred some sort of authority on scribes as interpreters.”²¹ Therefore, some Jewish scribes may have come to be regarded as wise men *as a result of their primary task of copying*, but not independently of this task.²²

¹⁹ Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 316–317.

²⁰ Goodman, “Texts, Scribes and Power,” 100, posits that scribes obtained authority simply by possessing the texts of the Hebrew Scriptures, which were themselves venerated.

²¹ Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 317, makes this statement tentatively because of the silence of Second-Temple sources on the prestige that religious copyists may have derived from their task. According to Goodman, “Texts, Scribes and Power,” 108, “Those pious scholars whose expertise in producing holy copies of the sacred texts was renowned may also by definition have been treated as authorities in other aspects of religious life.”

²² Karel van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 109, characterizes scribes occupied with the transmission of Jewish religious texts in the Hellenistic and Roman periods as something more than copyists with expertise, even more than Schriftgelerter. Van der Toorn posits that with regard to the Hebrew Bible, one ought not to speak of “authors” in the traditional sense, but rather of scribes who compiled and crafted the texts. Therefore, one must “take leave of the common conception of the scribe as a mere copyist.” He

Whether scribes were regarded as copyists or scholars, a major component of their identity was transmitting the texts of the Hebrew Bible.²³

How did scribes approach the task of copying sacred texts?²⁴ In the middle of the eighth century CE, the tractate *Masseketh Sopherim* was added to the Talmud as something like an appendix. In *Sopherim*, strict and manifold regulations are enumerated for the copying of the Hebrew Scriptures, but these directions are probably too late to provide an accurate analogy for copying practices in the Roman period (37 BCE–324 CE).²⁵ Before the work of the Masoretes, begun as early as the sixth century and completed sometime around the tenth century, there does not seem to have been a systematic or controlled method for copying the texts of the Hebrew Bible. Emmanuel Tov explains, “The Masoretes, and before them the *soferim*, made their contribution at a relatively late stage in the development of the biblical text; at that time the text already contained corruptions and had been tampered with before the scribes began to treat it

writes, “Authorship and editorship were aspects of the scribal culture.” He also claims, “Scribes were not merely penmen and copyists but intellectuals” (57). Van Seters, “Role of the Scribe,” 113, is exceedingly critical of the view of scribes as “editors” and reminds van der Toorn that copying “was a major occupation of most scribes.”

²³ Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 110–115, acknowledges that transcription was part of scribal occupation, even if in its “crudest form” the scribe merely acted as an instrument, copying what was dictated. Nevertheless, “scribes, even in their most instrumental of roles, impose their style, language, and ideas on the text. Acting as secretaries and transcribers, they are not phonographs in writing.” Van der Toorn is helpful in as much as he raises the point that scribes were human and contributed to the development of the text.

²⁴ The terms “sacred text” and “scripture” are often used to refer to the same documents; however, the processes of canonization require greater clarity when referring to religious documents. In this study, “sacred text” is used of any religious text held to be significant in Judaism or Christianity (or another religion) while “scripture” is used to signify texts with the same religious value that also were deemed “canonical” in later history. Therefore, one might study a text that is sacred, but not scriptural (e.g., *Shepherd of Hermas*), but not one that is scriptural, but not sacred.

²⁵ For the text known as *Masseketh Soferim* or *Hilkoth Soferim*, see Abraham Cohen, ed., *Minor Tractates: Translated into English with Notes, Glossary, and Indices* (London: Soncino, 1984), 35a–43b. In the introduction to the text, scribes are referred to as “a class of pious and learned men who were partly or wholly engaged in copying scrolls of the Torah and other scripts used for religious purposes.”

with such reverence and before they put their meticulous principles into practice.”²⁶ The typical process of transmission would have involved copying by consultation with an exemplar or perhaps by means of dictation. Referring to the *soferim*, Van Seters writes, “It is likely that here we have to do with scribal guilds that arose at least by the Hellenistic period and who developed their own scribal conventions of bookmaking, their own orthographic styles, the production of copies and textual correction.”²⁷ These *soferim* were not scholars of the Law, nor did they intend to edit their texts or endeavor to establish a standard text of the Hebrew Scriptures; they did, however, develop methods for copying.

Unfortunately, it is unclear what efforts were made by these “scribal guilds” to produce accurate copies. Was anything like the strict oversight required in the Talmud in place so many centuries earlier? Again, only a generic picture emerges. On the minimalist end, and asserted on the basis of the lack of evidence, Goodman submits, “The onus of producing a valid text, and therefore a sacred object, presumably lay entirely with the scribes. There is no evidence that any system existed for checking texts once complete.”²⁸ He continues, “So far as is known, no-one fixed any seal on finished texts to certify their accuracy.”²⁹ This is not to say that scribes took no pains to reproduce

²⁶ Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012).

²⁷ John Van Seters, *The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the “Editor” in Biblical Criticism* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 81. More directly, he writes, “There is no evidence that the *sopherim* were anything more than a professional guild of scribes” (109).

²⁸ Goodman, “Texts, Scribes and Power,” 107.

²⁹ The quotation continues, “This is not because all copies were *assumed* accurate, for the rabbis had traditions about the activity of *soferim* (scribes) in correcting texts into which errors had crept, in a fashion similar to Hellenistic scholarship on the text of Homer. It is worth remarking that such scribal activity seems to have been accepted by the rabbis without complaint. What made a parchment scroll holy was therefore presumably the authority of the scribe who *said* that he had copied a sacred text correctly onto it” (107).

their exemplars accurately, simply that no systematic method of control was in place. On the maximalist end, Bickerman suggests that already from around 150 BCE, the *soferim* were copying and *correcting* their texts.³⁰ We may assume that scribes attempted and desired to copy accurately, but in the period of our investigation their methods for achieving those goals are opaque.

One final note regarding Jewish scribes is worth making. The initial, faulty association of scribes as *Schriftgelerter* presumed that scribes were primarily scholars and interpreters, not copyists. Scham's culling of the evidence produced a different, but not entirely opposite, result. She has discovered that more information is available for scribes as readers of scripture than as writers or copiers of it. As she notes, "Although the evidence for scribes as producers of sacred scrolls is both late and scanty, it is likely that some copied the sacred texts as professional writers."³¹ Evidence of the *soferim* copying sacred texts is implicit, not explicit. Furthermore, the scribes' association with Torah, either explicitly as readers or implicitly as copyists, perhaps contributed to higher social standing and religious authority. These observations are striking when compared to the typical characterization of Christian scribes, who are expected, especially by modern scholars, to perform nothing more than the mechanical act of copying and are awarded little intellectual esteem despite their familiarity with the texts. Indeed, many of today's textual critics expect the Christian scribes to operate silently and are surprised or affronted to find their fingerprints on the manuscripts.

³⁰ Bickerman, *Jews in the Greek Age*, 171. He appeals to certain scribal markings in the texts that are associated with textual transmission and denote activity akin to proofreading or correcting for accuracy.

³¹ Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 303.

Greek and Roman Scribal Culture

In the Greco-Roman world, substantially more evidence is available regarding the social standing, education, and practices of scribes. It should be noted that the characterization of scribal culture in Greece is quite different from that in the Levant because sources for Greek bureaucracy are not nearly as abundant. This suggests that Greece “did not develop an archiving culture. It did, however, develop a bibliothetic culture.”³² This means that many scribes in Greece served a more literary and scholastic function than administrative. That is not to say that scribes were not employed in mundane writing activities, such as drawing up contracts and recording financial transactions, only that the literary culture of Greece became important early on.

The question of scribal identity is tied up with the question of literacy in the ancient world. William Harris estimates the degree of literacy during the Hellenistic and Roman periods to be not more than 10 percent of the total population.³³ Harris’s assessment of antique evidence is sometimes overstated, but his overarching thesis that literacy in the ancient world was less than has been assumed by modern scholars is significant.³⁴ During the Archaic and Classical periods, Harris argues, literacy was largely restricted to men from the elite down to the hoplite class, around 10 percent of the male population.³⁵ He suggests that only around 5 percent or less of women were literate.³⁶

³² Davies, *Scribes and Schools*, 25–28.

³³ William V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989), 61, 114.

³⁴ See the critical review of Harris’s study by James G. Keenan in *Ancient History Bulletin* 5 (1991): 101–107. Keenan rightly calls into question the objectivity of Harris’s assessment of the evidence and critiques the loose correlation between the evidence and the percentages Harris proposes.

³⁵ Harris, *Ancient Literacy*, 102. He notes that among the elite social class illiteracy was looked down upon, though resources for avoiding the use of literacy were actively employed (pp. 248–249).

³⁶ *Ibid.*, *Ancient Literacy*, 106.

Literacy rates rose slightly during the Roman period, but probably remained close to 10 percent of the population. A higher percentage of the people would have had “signature literacy,” but nothing close to the scribal literacy necessary for reading, composing, and copying literary texts. With regard to these estimates, Harry Gamble asserts that in the Christian world there may have been somewhat higher levels of literacy given the literary nature of Christianity, but not much higher than the society in general.³⁷ Since the majority of the population was illiterate, professionals able to read and write were a necessity for everyday activities such as the writing of contracts, records, and receipts, not to mention the preservation and transmission of literature.

Although socially elite males were likely to have been literate, Kim Haines-Eitzen has called attention to several pieces of evidence indicating that among the upper class reading and writing were regarded as laborious and tiresome. She writes, “Indeed, an outward sign of one’s extensive education and socioeconomic standing was the ability to avoid reading and writing by owning or employing scribes for these tasks.”³⁸ Slaves were regularly trained to perform these responsibilities on behalf of their masters and households. She explains, “Scribes can most often be found among slaves...and lower to middle-class professionals,” and adds, “Slaves and freed scribes were most frequently the copyists of literary texts.”³⁹ Finally, she writes, “With the exception of high-level officials who held scribal titles—scribes in the Graeco-Roman world were normally slaves or

³⁷ Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995). Harris, *Ancient Literacy*, 319–320, finds it unlikely that among lay people Christians were likely to have been any more literate than the general population, but notes that Christianity did inspire literacy and scholarship among its leaders. Indeed, Harris speculates that Christianity would have had a negative impact on general literacy (310-326).

³⁸ Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters*, 7.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, *Guardians of Letters*, 7.

freedpersons.”⁴⁰ Likewise, Gamble states, “Many [scribes] were educated slaves (*servi litterati*) whose masters...had good use for them in literary or documentary work.”⁴¹

Although literacy was mostly restricted to the upper class, the majority of scribes were from the lower classes and many were, or had previously been, slaves. In addition to being slaves, most scribes were male. Although there is some evidence for female scribes, for instance the female calligraphers in the service of Origen, the majority of explicit evidence suggests that most scribes were men.⁴²

Both independent professional and private slave-scribes would have received some degree of education or training in the different specializations of the occupation. According to Haines-Eitzen, “Many, if not most, of scribe-copyists were slaves trained in the skills of writing through apprenticeship or, less commonly, more formal scribal schooling.”⁴³ Moreover, many scribes would necessarily have been bi- or tri-lingual in order to operate effectively in the multi-lingual milieu of the Mediterranean world.⁴⁴ In addition to basic training in writing, scribes could also specialize in their craft. According to Gamble:

Professional scribes were trained craftsmen, but within the craft there were varying levels and types of expertise. Some were calligraphers capable of writing a fine bookhand, others were notaries engaged mainly in documentary work, yet

⁴⁰ Ibid., *Guardians of Letters*, 44.

⁴¹ Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 90.

⁴² See Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters*, 41–52; and Ibid., “‘Girls Trained in Beautiful Writing’: Female Scribes in Roman Antiquity and Early Christianity,” *J ECS* 6 (1998): 629–646, for further discussion of the gender of scribes. Haines-Eitzen criticizes the neglect female scribes have endured in scholarship and points to several instances of their activity. The amount of evidence Haines-Eitzen uncovers is surprising, given this neglect; however, her chapter on female scribes is only eleven pages long, which is perhaps indicative of the slim amount of evidence for their activity in comparison to male scribes. She does point to two and possibly three concrete examples of female Christian scribes.

⁴³ Ibid., *Guardians of Letters*, 483.

⁴⁴ Ibid., *Guardians of Letters*, 10.

others were skilled at shorthand (typography)... Those who were free made their living by their trade, but it was not a large living, and in the Greco-Roman world the profession did not carry the social prestige that traditionally accrued to scribes in the near East.⁴⁵

The handwriting of scribes is a good test of their professional training and their education. Many scribes were retained to write and make contracts on behalf of the household and to keep track of the material goods in its possession. For this sort of activity, scribes employed an informal handwriting, known today as “documentary hand,” characterized by its cursive script. Even so, many documentary forms composed in this informal hand followed a set format and standard presentation. Other scribes were primarily assigned the copying of literary texts and were trained to use a different handwriting, known as “book hand.” This script is more formal and set out in square letters evenly spaced in reference to margins, columns, the lines above and below, and adjacent letters.⁴⁶ Scribes who exhibit book hand likely received more training than those writing in the documentary style and were probably professional, rather than private, scribes. Writers with documentary proficiency could strive to improve their style to write in book hand, but it was easier for writers with the higher proficiency to write in documentary hand as needed.

While these two styles are very different, most handwriting evidenced in the New Testament papyri falls somewhere between documentary and book hand, what Colin Roberts calls “reformed documentary hand.” This phenomenon has several implications. First, Haines-Eitzen has pointed out that most scribes in the second and third centuries

⁴⁵ Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 90.

⁴⁶ E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), 1–6, describes the qualities of “book hand,” which primarily consist of writing upright, capital letters, without ligatures of any kind.

were multi-functional. This means that a scribe in the employ of a master could typically be assigned documentary tasks, but occasionally may be required to copy a longer text. Therefore, their attempt at the more formal hand falls somewhere between the two poles. Likewise, a scribe accustomed to copying literary texts may be called upon to jot down a receipt or create a contract of some kind.

Second, that the majority of New Testament papyri exhibit reformed documentary script implies that the scribes of Christian documents were not professional book copiers. Haines-Eitzen writes, "...Christians do not appear to have hired professional scribes, nor were Christian scriptoria in existence during the second and third centuries."⁴⁷ The scribes who produced Christian texts, if they were not professional copyists, were likely producing the texts for their own use or for their household or community. Therefore, the copiers of the texts were also the users and readers of the texts. The scribes who copied Christian texts were most likely Christians themselves or slaves in the employment of Christians.

This assertion, that these particular scribes were Christians, is supported by various textual phenomena, including scribal harmonization, which will be introduced in the next section. The very fact that scribes were capable of modifying their texts to resemble more closely other Christian sources demonstrates their familiarity with those texts. Christian scribes were at least broadly aware of Christian texts aside from the one they were copying and many of them were likely to be emotionally invested in their task. Haines-Eitzen expounds on this topic, "We are forced now to recognize that ancient scribes were not simply copyists—at times (possibly even frequently) they were

⁴⁷ Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters*, 16.

interested readers, exegetes, and writers who left their mark on the copies they made.”⁴⁸

As invested readers and interpreters, the scribes left their mark in their copies of the New Testament with each alteration they made.

By the fourth century, the situation of individual Christian scribes copying texts for themselves or their communities gives way to the formalized copying procedures of scriptoria in scholarly communities where the copying process was subjected to control and oversight.

Compositional Practices

In addition to understanding the identity of the scribes, it is important to investigate briefly the common methods and procedures employed in copying. The question of compositional methods is especially pertinent to theories about textual transmission and the Synoptic Problem.⁴⁹ R. A. Derrenbacker notes that many scholars of the Synoptic Problem speak of Matthew having a copy of Mark “in front of him” or of Mark having a copy of Luke “before him.” Such phrases imply that the evangelists had ample workspace on which to spread out their sources and could navigate easily back and forth between them. As Derrenbacker shows, this imaginary workspace is exceedingly different from the typical posture and workspace of scribes in the first, second, and even as late as the eighth century.

⁴⁸ Kim Haines-Eitzen, “The Social History of Early Christian Scribes,” in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestiones*, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 2nd ed., NTTSD 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 479–495, 489.

⁴⁹ See R. A. Derrenbacker, Jr., *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem*, BETL 186 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005); F. Gerald Downing, “Compositional Conventions and the Synoptic Problem,” *JBL* 107 (1988): 69–85; and William Sanday, “The Conditions under Which the Gospels Were Written, in Their Bearing upon Some Difficulties of the Synoptic Problem,” in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem by Members of the University of Oxford*, ed. William Sanday (Oxford: Clarendon, 1911), 3–26.

Bruce Metzger elucidates the topic. He writes, “To judge from many kinds of evidence, it appears that in antiquity scribes were not accustomed to write on a table or a desk.”⁵⁰ Already one must do away with the concept of the evangelists spreading out their work in front of them. On the evidence of artistic depictions of scribes across cultures and centuries, Metzger concludes that scribes typically would stand to copy short notes on wax tablets, or, “when a scribe had a more extensive task, such as the copying of a rather lengthy manuscript, he would sit, either on the ground or on a stool or bench, and would support the scroll or codex on his knees.”⁵¹ Derrenbacker describes other possible writing scenarios, “The posture of scribes and writers in antiquity was either squatting, with one’s tunic stretched over one’s knees creating a crude but efficient writing surface, or seated, on a stool or bench with the writing surface (usually a scroll) propped up on one knee, which could be supported by a stool.”⁵²

An interesting locus for this discussion has been the furniture discovered in the “scriptorium” at Qumran. The two pieces of furniture consist of a low, bench-like structure and a taller, table-like piece. Initially, Metzger proposed that the “table,” which is really quite low, was actually used as a bench, that the “bench” was a footstool, and that the scribes continued the tradition of writing on their laps. He called this the “least unsatisfactory theory.”⁵³ Later, Kenneth Clark made a physical study that changed Metzger’s opinion. In Clark’s investigation, executed by constructing his own model of

⁵⁰ Bruce Manning Metzger, “The Furniture in the Scriptorium at Qumran,” *RevQ* 1 (1959): 509–515, 510. See also Turner, *Greek Manuscripts*, 7–8; and T. C. Skeat, “The Use of Dictation in Ancient Book Production,” in *The Collected Biblical Writings of T. C. Skeat*, ed. J. K. Elliott, NovTSup 113 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 3–32; repr. from *Proceedings of the British Academy* 42 (1956): 179–208.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, “Furniture in the Scriptorium,” 510.

⁵² Derrenbacker, *Ancient Compositional Practices*, 38.

⁵³ Metzger, “Furniture in the Scriptorium,” 515.

the furniture and attempting to use it for writing, Clark discovered that the lower surface must have been an actual bench, but that the scribes did not use the taller object as a writing surface, since it would have been uncomfortable and impractical from the seated position. Besides this, the surface of the “table” is slightly concave and uneven. Instead, the scribes wrote on their laps, according to custom, and likely used the table for writing implements and perhaps their exemplar.⁵⁴ Although Metzger was persuaded by Clark’s study, the heart of Metzger’s initial proposal—that ancient scribes typically, if not always, wrote on their laps—is unchanged.

At what point did writing practices change from writing on the lap to writing on a table? Metzger explains, “The transition from the custom of writing on one’s lap to the custom of using a desk or table must have taken place gradually.”⁵⁵ Indeed, one of the earliest depictions of a scribe working at a table comes from the fourth century, with a few more from the fifth century. There is an increase in such depictions in the late eighth and early ninth centuries and even more so in the late ninth and early tenth centuries, which suggests that this was the period when the desk or writing table came into vogue.⁵⁶

This writing posture should be taken into account when describing the practice of copying manuscripts from an exemplar or, as in the case of the Synoptic Problem, when a scribe is presumed to be working with multiple manuscripts. One particular difficulty would have been balancing an exemplar on one’s lap while also controlling and unrolling

⁵⁴ Kenneth Willis Clark, “The Posture of the Ancient Scribe,” *BA* 26 (1963): 63–72.

⁵⁵ Bruce Manning Metzger, “When Did Scribes Begin to Use Writing Desks?,” in *Historical and Literary Studies: Pagan, Jewish, and Christian*, NTTS 8 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), 123–137, 131.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, “Writing Desks,” 134, “Evidence from various artistic media indicates that, except for sporadic earlier examples, it was during the eighth and ninth centuries that more and more scribes began to use a table or desk.” The date of this innovation coincides with the writing reforms of Charlemagne in the Carolingian period, most notably the Carolingian miniscule, but there is no explicit connection between the Carolingian renaissance and the writing desk.

a new scroll, or in the case of most New Testament papyri the sheaves of a codex, in the same lap—all without the aid of a desk! One ought not to caricature the scribes as bumbling, juggling, and dropping their materials or constantly shifting to find a more efficient position—undoubtedly the scribes persisted in this posture for centuries because they had attained some degree of comfort and efficiency. Nevertheless, the challenges such a posture presents the writer, especially the copyist or redactor, are substantial. Theories about scribal habits in copying or involving complex solutions to the Synoptic Problem must account for the fact that scribes were seated on the floor or on low footstools and held their writing material in the limited space of their lap. Such a posture is not conducive to quick and accurate consultation with an exemplar or to frequent consultation of multiple sources.

This problem is mitigated in situations where copying has taken place by dictation. If a scribe is copying aurally instead of visually, he is only working with the one manuscript he is creating. In some instances, scribal errors can be easily attributed to dictation. For instance, in many cases vowels and diphthongs have been replaced by other vowels or diphthongs that sound similar. Dictation cannot solve the problem in every instance, however. Many types of error can only be explained by visual transcription (e.g. homoioteleuton). Furthermore, evidence for scriptoria where dictation would be the primary means of copying is not available before at least the fourth century.

As scribes copied texts, their social standing, education and training, religious and emotional connections to the text, and even their posture contributed to the outcome of their effort. These aspects of the scribe's world are inherently part of the history of each

manuscript, though the key to unlocking those stories can be difficult to find. It is to the continuing presence of the scribes in their manuscripts that we now turn.

Introduction to Scribal Harmonization

Bart Ehrman regards variant readings in the manuscripts as evidence elucidating the scribe's socio-historical and theological context and, therefore, claims, "The New Testament manuscripts can thus serve as a window into the social world of early Christianity."⁵⁷ Each individual scribe manifested copying habits characteristic of his education and training, his level of care in executing his task, and his assumptions about the content of the texts being copied and their meanings. One prevalent scribal habit associated with the transmission of the first three books of the New Testament in Greek is the tendency to harmonize the words of parallel accounts in the Gospels.⁵⁸

Scribal harmonization, also called assimilation, is prominent in the manuscript tradition of the Synoptic Gospels—Mark, Matthew, and Luke—due to the overlapping content and stylistic similarity of those three texts. This study endeavors to catalogue and explain instances of scribal harmonization in Greek manuscripts from the second to fifth century, to assess the proclivity of individual scribes with regard to harmonization, to identify general characteristics of harmonization, and to elucidate the role that harmonization has played in the evolution of the texts of the Synoptic Gospels. At the

⁵⁷ Bart D. Ehrman, "The Text as Window: New Testament Manuscripts and the Social History of Early Christianity," in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*, 803–830, 804; Repr. from *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, SD 46 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 361–379.

⁵⁸ See Bruce Manning Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007), 3*, 13*; Bruce Manning Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 4th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 262–263; Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*, trans. Erroll F. Rhodes, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 290–291.

heart of this study are the scribes who have performed a vital function in transmitting the New Testament.⁵⁹

Harmonization occurs in the Synoptics whenever a scribe copying the text of a particular Gospel alters his exemplar in a way, either by substitution, addition, omission, or transposition, that reflects parallel material or reduces discrepancies between the passage at hand and a parallel passage in one of the other Gospels.⁶⁰ In the field of textual criticism, this practice is usually listed as one of the typical errors made by scribes and is included under the heading of “transcriptional probabilities,” that is, readings that are the product of the scribe rather than the author.⁶¹

Take, for example, the pericope wherein Jesus redefines the nature of his true family (Mark 3:31–35//Matthew 12:46–50//Luke 8:19–21). In the Markan episode, Jesus’s mother, brothers, and possibly his sisters come to Jesus while he is teaching in a house. When they are unable to reach him, they are forced to send a message to Jesus by way of the crowd. Upon hearing the message, Jesus responds to “them” (αὐτοῖς), that is, to the crowd, with a rhetorical question: Who are my mother and my brothers? Jesus’s true family, he explains, are those who “do the will of God.”

⁵⁹ For a study of harmonization in the Hebrew Bible, see Emanuel Tov, “The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts,” *JSOT* 31 (1985): 3–29. Tov identifies helpful categories, such as harmonization to resolve “syntactical incongruities” and command-fulfillment harmonization.

⁶⁰ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 3*, writes, “Sometimes a copyist would substitute or would add what seemed to him to be a more appropriate word or form, perhaps derived from a parallel passage (called harmonization or assimilation).”

⁶¹ Metzger and Ehrman, *Text of the New Testament*, 303, list harmonization as one factor to be considered when deciding between readings: “Since scribes would frequently bring divergent passages into harmony with one another, in parallel passages...that reading is to be preferred which stands in verbal dissidence with the other.” Bernhard Weiss, *A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*, trans. A. J. K. Davidson, 2 vols. (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1889), 2:406–407, describes harmonizations as typical, yet harmful, emendations to be rejected as secondary.

Both Matthew and Luke include this episode in their own Gospels, but the plot is somewhat different, reflecting their own narrative aims. While Luke, on the one hand, tells the story with different words, the general storyline is the same: Jesus's mother and brothers are unable to reach him, a message is relayed to him, and Jesus responds to "them" (αὐτούς), the group, with a new definition of family. Matthew's version of this episode, on the other hand, largely mirrors Markan style and syntax, but the plot is different in one substantial way. Instead of the crowd or a collection of people relaying the message from Jesus's family, it is one individual from among those listening to him who delivers the news (cf. Matthew 12:47). Jesus responds, not to the crowd, as was the case in Mark and Luke, but directly "to the one speaking to him" (τῷ λέγοντι αὐτῷ).

Turning to the manuscripts, there are a number of scribal alterations to the pericope in each of the Gospels, but only one that substantially alters the narrative of Luke. In P⁷⁵, a third-century papyrus manuscript generally regarded as a trustworthy text, there is a variant reading in Luke 8:21 that probably reflects the influence of Matthew's narrative on the scribe. In P⁷⁵, when Jesus hears the message that his mother and brothers are standing outside, instead of answering "them" (i.e. the crowd who delivered the message), Jesus answers "him" (αὐτόν)—an anonymous, male individual who is not introduced in Luke's narrative, does not speak or deliver the message, and who appears to be a shadow of "the one speaking to him" from Matthew. The scribe, while copying the text of Luke, has Matthew's version of events in his memory and so has introduced an assimilating variant into his copy of Luke, even at the cost of narrative continuity.⁶²

⁶² This variant will be addressed in further detail in Chapter Three.

As this example demonstrates, it must be kept in mind from the start that even the most careful scribe occasionally made mistakes or introduced foreign material, sometimes as a result of negligence and other times as a result of fatigue or a flagging mind. We do well to heed E. C. Colwell's apt observation: "Scribes do not automatically, as scribes, copy accurately."⁶³ Therefore, because scribes cannot be expected to have copied a text perfectly in every instance, one cannot ignore the role of scribes in duplicating documents as one nowadays ignores the part played by electronic printers and Xerox machines. The scribes are by no means standing silently in the distant history of the text; their presence is inked across countless fragments of papyrus, sheaves of vellum and parchment codices, and the pages of every modern edition of the Bible.

Harmonization among Scribal Habits

The relative multitude of New Testament manuscripts from the first five centuries provides ample evidence for the habits characteristic of Christian scribes. Thanks to a renewed interest in scribal activity in the past several decades, scholars are now able to speak of standard scribal tendencies such as omission, addition, conflation, and harmonization, and may apply these categories critically when analyzing variant readings and making decisions as to which reading is likely to be earlier. Furthermore, it has become apparent that individual copyists had unique proclivities for particular types of errors and activities so that to speak of "scribal habits" in general, apart from specific examples of individual scribes and their products, can be quite misleading in the analysis of a particular scribe and document. According to F. J. A. Hort, "Scribes were moved by

⁶³ Ernest Cadman Colwell, "Hort Redivivus: A Plea and a Program," in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, NTTS 9 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), 148–171, 165; repr. from *Transitions in Biblical Scholarship*, ed. J. Coert Rylaarsdam, Essays in Divinity 6 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), 131–156.

a much greater variety of impulse than is usually supposed.” He goes on to say, “Scribes were to a certain limited extent moved by different impulses.”⁶⁴ When these “different impulses” are taken into account, the knowledge of a specific scribe’s habits, gleaned from his manuscript, can inform textual decisions about that specific manuscript and its place in textual history.

The evidence of the manuscripts shows that individual scribes may demonstrate a propensity either to add to or omit from their exemplar, to transpose the word order, or to alter spelling or misspell words. Some scribes even exhibit a penchant for making deliberate alterations on the basis of theological or ideological considerations. Conversely, some scribes demonstrate extreme care in their work and the documents they produced are characterized by a rigid fidelity to their exemplar suggestive of a conservative attitude toward their task. Each of these scribal habits is worthy of attention and should be kept in mind every time a decision regarding the “authenticity”⁶⁵ of a reading is made. This study, however, focuses on only one of these habits: harmonization.

Although harmonization has been identified as a common practice in the copying of the Synoptic Gospels since the time of the church fathers, many questions still remain.⁶⁶ Was harmonization a frequent occurrence, as many suggest, or was it more rare

⁶⁴ Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction, Appendix*, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1896), 25.

⁶⁵ James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*, NTTSD 36 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 32–37, cautions that the categories of “authenticity” and “correctness” be kept separate. Authentic readings are those that correspond to the text of the autograph; correct readings are those that correspond to the text of the *Vorlage*. Therefore, a correct reading may be inauthentic and an incorrect reading may be authentic.

⁶⁶ Both Origen and Jerome comment on harmonizing alterations present in some of their copies of biblical texts. Their comments will be discussed below.

than scholars typically assume? Which Gospel most frequently fell prey to assimilation and which Gospel served as the source of harmonizing influence most often? Did the scribes intentionally assimilate their texts to the form of another Gospel? Or, was harmonization an accidental product of scribes' intimate familiarity with the texts of other Gospels? Are there discernable patterns on the basis of temporal or geographical factors? While studies interested in scribal habits broadly conceived have proposed answers to these basic questions, none have done so on the basis of a comprehensive analysis of the manuscripts themselves with exclusive attention to harmonization.

Intentionality

In his 1889 *Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*, Bernhard Weiss correctly recognizes and discusses the possibility that textual variants could be either intentional or unintentional.⁶⁷ One must be careful when discussing the motivations and intentions of ancient and anonymous persons who are no longer able to speak on their own behalf. A scribe's circumstances while copying and his motivations were manifold and any reconstruction of these will only approximate the complex reality. To describe a reading as intentional or unintentional risks straying into the realm of psychology and prescribing on copyists a certain ethic or worldview that may be foreign to them. Indeed, one must be careful in describing scribal motivations, for "there is always the risk of reading deliberate intention into unintended error."⁶⁸ Evaluations of intentionality must be made carefully and with due respect for the ambiguity of the evidence.

⁶⁷ Weiss, *Manual*, 2:407.

⁶⁸ Ernest Cadman Colwell, "Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A Study of P⁴⁵, P⁶⁶, P⁷⁵," in *Studies in Methodology*, 106–124, 110; originally published as "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text," in *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, ed. J. Philip Hyatt (Nashville: Abingdon, 1965), 370–389.

Assessing Intentionality

In this study, intentionality is judged on the basis of two objective criteria and one additional consideration. First, harmonizing variants may be judged to be intentional if they form a consistent pattern of harmonistic alteration. A pattern of assimilation indicates deliberation on the part of the scribe while a single harmonization, or even a few, suggests that the alteration has occurred without the deliberate intent to conform the passages. If only isolated occurrences of assimilation appear in a manuscript, one may assume that the scribe was careful not to allow external material to influence his copy; alternatively, where there is a pattern of harmonization in a manuscript, one may posit either a careless copyist who approached his task freely or a scribe with an agenda who took liberties with the text—moving, as it were, from the role of copyist to editor.

Second, and related, harmonization on an extensive scale may be judged to be deliberate. In cases where the variant has no real impact on the meaning or content of the passage, no judgment can be made, but in circumstances where a substantial harmonizing alteration is present, especially when there are ramifications for interpretation, one may reasonably assume the change was made deliberately.

Finally, the scribe's intentionality in creating an assimilating variant may be judged in connection with the theological disputes of the era. When a reading arises as a result of dogmatic sympathies, that reading may be judged to be deliberate. Ehrman has established a number of incidents where dogmatic harmonization may be at play. For instance, In Mark's passion narrative, when Jesus is mocked by the soldiers and beaten, Jesus is commanded, "Prophesy." In Luke, he is commanded, "Prophesy," and is asked, "Who is it who struck you?" Several manuscripts of Mark and at least one of Luke

contain a harmonizing variant from Matthew. In these manuscripts, the soldiers say, “Prophecy to us, *Christ*.” Ehrman asserts that the appropriation of the title “Christ” from Matthew was a means for scribes to combat Gnostic and separationist Christologies and to affirm that it was indeed the Christ who was mocked, beaten, and who suffered, not just the man from Nazareth.⁶⁹ Harmonizing readings that combat or defend theological positions may be judged to have been introduced deliberately.

Intentional Harmonization

Harmonizing variants judged to be intentional should not be regarded as “errors” but as scribal amendments.⁷⁰ According to Charles Williams, “The scribes...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 due to intentional alteration by scribes does not seem to have received the attention that it deserves.”⁷¹ He continues, “Scribes familiar with parallel passages to the one that they were copying were tempted, sometimes unconsciously but more often quite consciously, to assimilate their text to its parallel.”⁷² Tjitze Baarda writes similarly, “Apart from an amount of unconscious

⁶⁹ Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 153–154.

⁷⁰ The term “amendment” is used instead of “correction” to avoid confusion with the type of activity associated with an overseer or “corrector” (διορθωτής) or another copyist in a scriptorium or similar setting. According to Metzger and Ehrman, *Text of the New Testament*, 25, “In order to ensure greater accuracy, books produced in scriptoria were commonly checked over by a corrector (διορθωτής) specially trained to rectify mistakes in copying.” Larry W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 185–189, notes that corrections made by the same or a contemporary hand show a concern for accurate copying on the syntactical level and that this concern is already present in manuscripts from the second century.

⁷¹ Charles Stephen C. Williams, *Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1951), viii.

⁷² Williams, *Alterations*, 1.

assimilation by scribes who inadvertently reproduced the text of the Gospel with which they were most familiar, and not the text of the exemplar being copied, there are certainly deliberate alterations, omissions or additions.”⁷³ The results of this study show that deliberate assimilation *does not* occur more often than accidental assimilation, and in fact occurs quite sparingly.⁷⁴ Baarda’s “unconscious assimilation” accounts for the majority of harmonizing variants. Nevertheless, it is important to explore possible causes of intentional alteration.

Intentional harmonization could take place for a number of reasons, the most basic of which is that a scribe may have found it unacceptable that “sacred texts should not be in agreement.”⁷⁵ J. K. Elliott claims, “Much deliberate alteration took place in effect to assimilate parallel texts, the commonly recognized harmonizing of Gospel parallels especially to conform Mark and Luke to the wording in Matthew being the most frequent.”⁷⁶ Elliott writes elsewhere, “Many early readers became aware that parallel passages in the gospels differed in their wording; such inconsistencies were disturbing and as a consequence copyists were tempted to eliminate discrepancies by assimilating

⁷³ Tjitze Baarda, “ΔΙΑΦΩΝΙΑ—ΣΥΜΦΩΝΙΑ: Factors in the Harmonization of the Gospels, Especially in the Diatessaron of Tatian,” in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*, ed. William L. Petersen, Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 3 (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 133–154, 138.

⁷⁴ Barbara Aland, “The Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri in Early Church History,” in *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels—The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex P⁴⁵*, ed. Charles Horton, JSNTSup 258 (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 108–121, 110, suggests that some scholars exaggerate the number and importance of intentional scribal alterations in the papyri. This is a product of the view that “document transcribers are not entitled to make changes in their exemplars.”

⁷⁵ Aland and Aland, *Text*, 290.

⁷⁶ J. K. Elliott, “Singular Readings in the Gospel Text of P⁴⁵,” in *The Earliest Gospels*, 122–131,

the parallels and harmonizing the wording.”⁷⁷ Furthermore, “Scribes’ attempts to assimilate parallels within the canonical Gospels are yet another way of attempting to avoid apparent discrepancies between different Gospel accounts of the same story or saying.”⁷⁸ Along these lines, Tjitze Baarda writes, “Textual harmonization was most probably one of the attempts to remove or neutralize the disagreements among the Gospels.”⁷⁹

In the third and fourth centuries, when multiple Gospels were consistently copied together, a concern for consistency would have been understandable. Before this, when the Gospels were still primarily being copied individually, it is less likely that this particular motivation would have been pressing. Most of the oldest manuscripts, those from the second and third centuries, are fragments from single-gospel codices. Exceptions include the late second-century P⁷⁵, which contains both Luke and John,⁸⁰ and P⁴⁵, a mid third-century manuscript of all four Gospels and Acts. P⁴⁵ is the oldest conclusive evidence of a four-gospel codex, in this case accompanied by Acts. The practice likely extends back some years.⁸¹

⁷⁷ J. K. Elliott, “The New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Challenge for the Twenty-First Century,” in *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles: Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation*, ed. J. K. Elliott, NovTSup 137 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 13–27, 17; repr. from *New Testament Textual Research Update* 8 (2000): 1–14.

⁷⁸ J. K. Elliott, “The Nature of the Evidence Available for Reconstructing the Text of the New Testament in the Second Century,” in *New Testament Textual Criticism*, 29–39, 33; repr. from *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity: Le Texte de Nouveau Testament au début du christianisme. Proceedings of the Lille Colloquium, July 2000: Actes du colloque de Lille, juillet 2000*, ed. Christian-B. Amphoux and J. K. Elliott (Lausanne: Editions du Zèbre, 2003), 9–18.

⁷⁹ Baarda, “ΔΙΑΦΩΝΙΑ—ΣΥΜΦΩΝΙΑ,” 138.

⁸⁰ T. C. Skeat, “The Origin of the Christian Codex,” in *Writings of T. C. Skeat*, 79–87, 80–81; repr. from *ZPE* 102 (1994): 263–268, argues that P⁷⁵ was originally the second quire of a two-quire, four-gospel codex from the late second century with forbears going back to the mid second century.

⁸¹ T. C. Skeat, “The Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels?,” in *Writings of T.C. Skeat*, 158–192; repr. from *NTS* 43 (1997): 1–34, presents the case that P⁶⁷, P⁶⁴, and P⁴ originally belonged to a late second-

Whether the process of canonization, which included the gathering of a four-fold Gospel, resulted in more accurate copying is a matter of debate. Before the development of the canon, it is unlikely that scribes would have been primarily concerned with the minute differences between texts simply because they differed—after all, if they regarded their text as inviolable scripture that should betray no conflicting testimonies, it would be unusual that at the same time they should have no scruples against directly modifying those very texts. Regarding the influence of non-canonical writings on the texts of what would become the canonical Gospels, Hort explains that in the second century “neither definition of the Canon of the New Testament nor veneration for the letter as distinguished from the substance of its sacred records had advanced far enough to forbid what might well seem their temperate enrichment.”⁸² So, according to Hort, even by the end of the second century, ca. 180–200 CE, the canon was not well enough established to prevent material from external sources, such as oral tradition and various “canonical” and “non-canonical” Christian legenda, from entering into the text, let alone scribal amendments and harmonizations.⁸³

Scribes may also alter their exemplars deliberately for specific theological reasons, as noted above. Hort rejected this view and was bold in his claim that “even among the numerous unquestionably spurious readings of the New Testament there are

century four-gospel codex and thus represent the oldest four-gospel manuscript, with the possible exception of P⁷⁵ if his theory summarized in the previous note is to be accepted. His arguments will be discussed in Chapter Two.

⁸² Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, 174.

⁸³ The notion of corruption brings up the related issue of inspiration. At what point did inspiration cease to operate in the minds of readers, copyists, and scholars of the New Testament texts? Would individuals identified as possessing the spiritual gift of prophecy have been authorized to make corrections or alterations to the text? Does inspiration cease with the closing of the canon?

no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for dogmatic purposes.”⁸⁴ He does admit that scribes copying the New Testament likely did *choose* between variant readings on the basis of doctrinal considerations, having no “scientific” critical system to judge between rival manuscripts, but they did not *fabricate* readings for theological purposes. Since the time of Hort the balance of opinion has shifted such that there is a reasonable consensus that scribes were not quite so innocent as Hort believed. Studies by C. S. C. Williams, Peter Head, and Bart Ehrman, among others, have shown evidence of theological modifications to passages that seemed to support unorthodox viewpoints, could be misinterpreted by heretical teachers, or were deemed unsatisfactory in an environment of theological and, especially, Christological controversy.⁸⁵ Ehrman writes, “No one would (or should) claim that theological controversies caused the majority of the hundreds of thousands of textual variants in the tradition, but they clearly engendered several hundred.”⁸⁶

Readings that exhibit intentionality, either because they form a pattern of harmonization, alter the text extensively, or demonstrate a theological agenda, can be

⁸⁴ Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, 282. Perhaps strengthening Westcott and Hort’s famous declaration, in his extensive study of six early manuscripts, Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 488, identifies only three variants, all from a single manuscript, that *might* have been theologically motivated. Léon Vaganay, *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, trans. B. V. Miller, Library of Religious Knowledge (St. Louis: Herder, 1937), 12, writes, “There is not one [textual variant] affecting the substance of Christian dogma.” Similarly, Frederic G. Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, 3rd ed. (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1897), 3–4, writes, “It is true (and it cannot be too emphatically stated) that none of the fundamental truths of Christianity rests on passages of which the genuineness is doubtful.”

⁸⁵ See, Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, for a discussion of the influence of theological controversies on the copying of the New Testament. Likewise, Peter M. Head, “Christology and Textual Transmission: Reverential Alterations in the Synoptic Gospels,” *NovT* 35 (1993): 105–129, analyzes variant readings that arose for specifically Christological reasons. Williams, *Alterations*, 5–9, also demonstrates deliberate assimilation for doctrinal reasons in eleven passages from the Synoptic Gospels. See also Kenneth W. Clark, “Textual Criticism and Doctrine,” in *Studia Paulina: In Honorem Johannis de Zwaan Septuagenarii* (Haarlem: Bohn, 1953), 52–65, 54, who writes, “Many variants are of textual-doctrinal character.”

⁸⁶ Ehrman, “Text as Window,” 808.

used as a clue to the scribe's identity and may direct us to his theological or ecclesiological perspective. Scribal amendments of this variety provide a clearer reflection of the scribe and his social and religious context than errors of other types (e.g. itacism, homoioteleuton) and become the "signature," so to speak, of the scribe. In this way, the careful analysis of documents leads to a better understanding of real people who participated in transmitting the New Testament.

"Reflexive Harmonization" and the "Horizon of Expectation"

Deliberate harmonization did occur, but was by no means more prevalent than accidental or "reflexive" harmonization. D. C. Parker writes, "In the 'Freudian slip', we have learned to recognize how the unconscious can control our spoken words. There are many places in the manuscripts of the Greek New Testament where the scribe may have changed the sense unconsciously."⁸⁷ Parker recommends avoiding the distinction between intentional and unintentional alteration and using instead the notion of "conscious or unconscious alteration."⁸⁸ With reference to harmonization, Parker explains that an alteration may be "the unconscious recollection of a perhaps better-known parallel."⁸⁹ In this study, the notion of "reflexive," "automatic," or accidental alteration conveys a similar meaning.

Weiss suggests that harmonization could occur because the passage being copied did not coincide "with the parallels passing through the mind of the copyist."⁹⁰ Likewise, Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland suggest that on many occasions "the scribe knew the text

⁸⁷ D. C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 37.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, *The Living Text*, 37.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, *The Living Text*, 41.

⁹⁰ Weiss, *Manual*, 2:407.

of the Gospels by heart, and when copying a pericope the details from a parallel passage would be suggested automatically.”⁹¹ This type of harmonization occurs as a reflex to the text. It is not that the scribe was unaware (i.e. unconscious) of what he was copying, only that the external influences at work upon him (unconsciously) were subtle so that the creation of harmonizing readings did not take place with an intent to enforce uniformity among the Gospels.

Philip Comfort describes a similar concept with the term “horizon of expectation.” He explains, “Once a Gospel was read by someone, it shaped the horizon of expectations for the reading of the next Gospel; in essence, it formed the horizon by which a scribe read another Gospel, and which prompted a multitude of changes.”⁹² Therefore, “The first Gospel they read or memorized was the standard by which they measured the next.”⁹³ In other words, a single Gospel might form “a kind of cognitive exemplar by which he [the scribe] read the other Gospels.”⁹⁴ This cognitive exemplar stood in competition with the physical exemplar and sometimes won out. Of course, a scribe’s horizon of expectation might not be the first Gospel they read, but rather the one heard, read, or copied most often. The scribe’s horizon of expectation is activated because he simultaneously copied and read the text he was working on.

⁹¹ Aland and Aland, *Text*, 290. Similarly, Metzger and Ehrman, *Text of the New Testament*, 262, write, “Monks usually knew by heart extensive portions of the Scriptures.” Burnett Hillman Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, and Dates* (London: Macmillan, 1924), 139, also suggests that scribes knew the Gospels by heart and had their memories frequently refreshed through constant copying. See Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters*, 69, for a critique of the notion that “monks” copied these texts in the second and third centuries.

⁹² Philip W. Comfort, “The Scribe as Interpreter: A New Look at New Testament Textual Criticism according to Reader Reception Theory” (PhD diss., The University of South Africa, 1996), 44.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, “Scribe as Interpreter,” 44.

⁹⁴ Philip W. Comfort, “Scribes as Readers: Looking at New Testament Textual Variants according to Reader Reception Analysis,” *Neot* 38 (2004): 28–53, 39.

Comfort describes scribes as readers. Readers simultaneously read and ask questions, consider answers, and supply information from external sources to fill gaps. Comfort writes, “Whereas readers do this gap-filling in their imaginations only, scribes sometimes took the liberty to fill unwritten gaps with written words. Scribes went beyond just imagining how the gaps should be filled and actually filled them.”⁹⁵ For some scribes, that external source might be a different Gospel—a horizon of expectation—either memorized or simply well known. Reflexive harmonization, caused by the scribe’s horizon of expectation, is the most common cause of assimilation.

Whether as a result of rote memory or their general familiarity with different versions of sayings and narratives from other Gospels, scribes accidentally altered the text at hand, aligning it with the version in their horizon. Such is likely the case in the first example given above, where Jesus redefines the nature of family. If the scribe of P⁷⁵ were intentionally conforming Luke to Matthew, one would expect him to introduce the individual to whom Jesus responds by having him deliver the message, as in Matthew. This is not the case. Instead, the scribe has reflexively assimilated the story to Matthew’s version without deliberation and has not systematically altered the rest of the episode to make room for the new character.

Frequency

While most textual critics agree that harmonization was a factor in the transmission and copying of the New Testament, there is less agreement as to the *frequency* of assimilation. In his *Textual Commentary*, Metzger makes note of each instance where the *UBS* committee discussed harmonization as a potential cause of a

⁹⁵ Ibid., “Scribes as Readers,” 31.

reading. In one such place, he remarks, “Scribal assimilation to Synoptic parallels occurs frequently.”⁹⁶ Aland and Aland seem to concur, saying that harmonizations to parallels are “particularly frequent.”⁹⁷ B. H. Streeter brands assimilation “the commonest of all forms of error”⁹⁸ and J. K. Elliott claims, “Scribes often assimilated the text in parallel passages in the gospels.”⁹⁹

Taking quite a different stance, Colwell states that harmonizing variants “are not frequent” in the three extensive papyri involved in his investigation.¹⁰⁰ He is echoed by Haines-Eitzen, who asserts that harmonization is far less prevalent than typically assumed, especially when compared to the number of instances of non-harmonization, or fidelity to the exemplar.¹⁰¹ Just this brief survey of prominent opinions shows the lack of consensus regarding the prevalence of assimilation. Unfortunately, in many cases assertions about harmonization are made on the basis of perceived scribal habits in general without consideration for individual scribes, temporal context, and geographical location.

Frequency of harmonization can be evaluated objectively. In the complete manuscript of the Gospels treated here (Codex Vaticanus) and in the extensive papyri, this task is simple. Because these artifacts contain larger portions of text, a reckoning of instances of harmonization where parallel texts exist in comparison with non-

⁹⁶ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 40.

⁹⁷ Aland and Aland, *Text*, 290.

⁹⁸ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 139.

⁹⁹ Elliott, “The New Testament Text,” 24.

¹⁰⁰ Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 113.

¹⁰¹ Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters*, 68–73.

harmonization is possible. More challenging to assess are the fragmentary manuscripts, which make up the majority of the earliest witnesses.¹⁰² Since it would be methodologically problematic to extrapolate how often a scribe introduced harmonizing variants into his text from highly lacunose and short fragments, one must qualify their statements about the frequency of harmonization in the fragmentary papyri. Because of this, the data provided by the fragmentary papyri may reveal little about particular scribes, but will nevertheless contribute to an understanding of harmonization and scribal culture in general.

Sources and Direction of Influence

As may be expected, in the New Testament harmonization occurs most frequently in the manuscripts of the Synoptic Gospels, where parallel material abounds. Harmonizing readings can also be found in quotations from the Septuagint, where scribes corrected the sometimes incomplete or incorrect quotations in their exemplar to match the version available to them or in use in their communities.¹⁰³ Such parallels to other biblical texts, either to the Old Testament or another Gospel, Colwell calls “remote parallels.”¹⁰⁴

¹⁰² Kyoung Shik Min, *Die Früheste Überlieferung des Matthäusevangeliums (bis zum 3./4. Jh.): Edition und Untersuchung*, ANTF 34 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005), 37, addresses this problem in his study by applying a method proposed by Barbara Aland in “Kriterien zur Beurteilung kleinerer Papyrusfragmente des Neuen Testaments,” in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel*, ed. A. Denaux, BETL 161 (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 1–13. Aland’s method and Min’s application of it will be discussed below.

¹⁰³ Metzger and Ehrman, *Text of the New Testament*, 303, are aware of this type of harmonization and include it in their text-critical rules: “Since scribes would frequently bring divergent passages into harmony with one another, in parallel passages (whether involving quotations from the Old Testament or different accounts of the same event or narrative) that reading is to be preferred which stands in verbal dissidence with the other.”

¹⁰⁴ Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 113.

Harmonization to remote parallels stands in contrast to harmonization to the “immediate context,” which includes scribal activities such as altering word forms and tenses to fit better the immediate context of the passage or conforming phrases to the style of the evangelist as demonstrated elsewhere in his Gospel.¹⁰⁵ While harmonization to immediate context appears to be far more prevalent, it is harmonization to remote parallels that is of interest here. In some cases, it is difficult to decide whether a scribe was influenced by the context or by a remote parallel within the same context. Some variants that might well be categorized as contextual, but involve a passage far enough removed from the one at hand, have been included in the following discussion.

It is often presumed that the Gospel of Matthew, the favorite Gospel of the early church, is the primary source of influence for harmonizing variants.¹⁰⁶ Elliott comments on this unexamined presupposition, “A common assumption in work of this kind is that scribes of Mark and of Luke tended to harmonize to Matthew. This assumption, in so far as it is applied generally, was found to be invalid in the recent survey by Wisselink.”¹⁰⁷ On the basis of his analysis of select passages in a limited number of manuscripts, Wisselink has shown, despite the common assumption, that Matthew contains the most harmonizations and that Luke was frequently the source of influence.¹⁰⁸ This study is informative and serves as a needed caution against making assumptions about

¹⁰⁵ The prevalence of harmonization to immediate context leads Colwell to describe the practice as an “addiction” of the scribes. See “Scribal Habits,” 113.

¹⁰⁶ Hurtado, *Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 20–21, shows that from the second and third centuries there are 12 extant manuscripts of Matthew, 1 of Mark, 7 of Luke, and 16 of John. He states that these numbers at least suggest a slight preference for Matthew over the other Synoptics.

¹⁰⁷ J. K. Elliott, “Printed Editions of Greek Synopses and Their Influence on the Synoptic Problem,” in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*, ed. F. Van Segbroeck et al., Vol. 1, BETL 100 (Leuven: Peeters, 1992), 337–357, 355.

¹⁰⁸ Willem Franciscus Wisselink, *Assimilation as a Criterion for the Establishment of the Text: A Comparative Study on the Basis of Passages from Matthew, Mark and Luke* (Kampen: Kok, 1989).

harmonization on the basis of the apparent popularity of given texts, but the result must be weighed by the relative dearth of manuscripts of the Second Gospel, especially in the early period, and the abundance of manuscripts containing verses from Matthew. The present study tests Wisselink's proposition and will show that Matthew did indeed form the horizon of expectation for most scribes.

Regardless, harmonization occurs in nearly every manuscript and in all three Gospels. A quick survey of Metzger's *Textual Commentary* shows a substantial number of cases where harmonization may be at work in each of the Synoptics. On the basis of his review, it can be seen that Mark was conformed to Matthew and to Luke, Matthew was assimilated to Mark and to Luke, and Luke was harmonized to Matthew and to Mark. Occasionally a reading has arisen in harmonization to the Gospel of John. Far from being predictable, assimilation occurs in all directions and in manuscripts of all three Synoptics.

The source of harmonizing influence appears to have been predicated on geographical and temporal factors, including which Gospels were in use in which regions and at what times. As the Gospels spread across the world, certain communities prized one version over the others. Eldon Epp has shown that in the Mediterranean world copies of the Gospels could travel quite swiftly across the Empire in the hands of Christian missionaries and merchants.¹⁰⁹ As Gospels from different regions became accessible, scribes corrected their regional Gospel to the new text, creating the beginning of a new

¹⁰⁹ Eldon Jay Epp, "The Significance of the Papyri for Determining the Nature of the New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission," in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*, ed. Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee, SD 45 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 274–297; repr. from *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century*, 71–103. See also Eldon Jay Epp, "The Papyrus Manuscripts of the New Testament," in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*, 2nd ed., 1–39, 12–16; repr. from *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*, 3–21.

version of the Gospel. Furthermore, scribes copying the new Gospel sometimes conformed it to their horizon of expectation. The rapid spread of texts across regions led, in part, to the diversity of text types witnessed in the manuscript tradition of the New Testament. Later, in the late third or early fourth century, this exchange of manuscripts, or at least the contamination and multiplication of variants, seems to have slowed as ecclesiastical control was exerted over textual production and the scribes producing the texts moved from private slave-scribes to scribes in the employ of the church.

Scribal Habits in the History of Scholarship

In the first four hundred years of Christianity, centuries before any well-defined rules of textual criticism had been developed, the interpreters and church fathers, who read, translated, and commented on the New Testament, had noticed peculiarities in the transmission of the text and had ascribed them to copyists.

Origen of Alexandria, for instance, one of the first textual critics of the New Testament texts, remarks about scribal errors in his commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, written sometime between 244 and 253 CE. He writes, “The differences among the manuscripts have become great, either through the negligence of some copyists or through the perverse audacity of others; they either neglect to check over what they have transcribed, or, in the process of checking, they make additions or deletions as they please.”¹¹⁰ Origen attributes the diversity of readings already abounding in the third century to unintentional negligence or indifference (*ῥαθυμίας*) on the part of some

¹¹⁰ *Comm. Matt. XV, 14 (GCS Origenes X, 387, 28–388, 7): πολλή γέγονεν ἡ τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφορά, ἢτε ἀπὸ ῥαθυμίας τινῶν γραφέων, ἢτε ἀπὸ τόλμης τινῶν μοχθηρᾶς <ἢτε ἀπὸ ἀμελούντων> τῆς διορθώσεως τῶν γραφομένων, ἢτε καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τὰ ἑαυτοῖς δοκοῦντα ἐν τῇ διορθώσει <ἢ> προστιθέντων ἢ ἀφαιρούντων.* Translation from Bruce Manning Metzger, “Explicit References in the Works of Origen to Variant Readings in New Testament Manuscripts,” in *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey*, ed. J. Neville Birdsall and Robert W. Thomson (Freiburg: Herder, 1963), 78–95.

copyists (γραφέων) and to intentional tampering on the part of scribes possessed of perverse audacity (τόλμης μοχθηρᾶς). Negligence and presumption are at the root of the problem, but copyists should still be able to fix their errors when they check over their products, a step in the process that Origen seems to take for granted as a typical part of the copying procedure. But copyists have failed to check and correct their copies and have even, when attending to this step, deliberately altered their texts through addition or omission (προστιθέντων ἢ ἀφαιρούντων), categories with which the modern critic is well acquainted. While Origen does not address the activity of harmonization directly, he is cognizant of scribal alterations and the frequent habits of addition and omission.

In the course of his impressive endeavor to revise the old Latin versions of the Bible on the basis of the Greek manuscripts available to him in the fourth century, Jerome comments specifically on the harmonizing tendencies of his predecessors and of the scribes. In a cover letter constituting a preface to his correction of the Gospels sent to Pope Damasus around the year 383 CE, Jerome explains the usefulness of Eusebius's list of pericopae in the Gospels. It is a great tool, he says, since "error has sunk into our books" (*in nostris codicibus error inolevit*).¹¹¹ He continues, "While concerning the same thing one Evangelist has said more, in another, because they thought he had said less, they added; or while another has differently expressed the same sense, whichever one of the four he had read first, he will decide to enumerate the remaining ones according to that version."¹¹² Harmonization, though he does not use this term, is one reason for the

¹¹¹ Jerome, *Praefatio ad Damasum*, according to Robert Weber and Roger Gryson, eds., *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, 5th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994).

¹¹² "...dum quod in eadem re alius evangelista plus dixit, in alio quia minus putaverint addiderunt; vel dum eundem sensum alius aliter expressit, ille qui unum e quattuor primum legerat, ad eius exemplum ceteros quoque aestimaverit emendandos."

many “diverse streams” (*diversos rivulorum*), that is, the many copies and versions, which had sprung from what Jerome calls the “fountainhead” (*de fonte*), the original Greek (*graecam originem*). It is this font to which Jerome endeavors to return.

Jerome offers a number of cursory speculations for how these corruptions entered into the text. On the one hand, errors have multiplied as a result of “faulty translators” (*vitiosis interpretibus*) and “sleepy scribes” (*librariis dormitantibus*). By this, Jerome seems to imply that negligence on the part of scribes contributed to the alterations, but he also holds presumptuous copyists accountable for deliberately tampering with their copies. Jerome stands close to Origen in this estimation of scribal error. Even if some errors may be attributed to drowsiness of the body and mind, Jerome believes that some scribes intentionally altered the text to conform it to whatever version they read first, their horizon of expectation, as the quotation above indicates. The scribe naively believes he is correcting the text of the Gospel by conforming it to other versions, but without yet recognizing the authoritative status of that Gospel as it stands. He is not interested in preserving the text of the text, but the meaning of the text.¹¹³ The result of these alterations, Jerome explains, is that the Gospels have become mixed. “In Mark are many things of Luke and of Matthew; in the other direction, in Matthew (are many things of) John and of Mark,” and so on.¹¹⁴ Jerome, as a good textual critic, if with working with rudimentary critical tools, attempts in his translation to remove the external influences from his copies of the Gospels. Unfortunately, as Hort notes, unwitting scribes of

¹¹³ Jerome had seen this happen with his own works. In a letter addressed to Lucinius (*NPNF*² 6:135), to whom he had sent some of his writings, he demurs, “If then you find errors or omissions which interfere with the sense, these you must impute not to me but to your own servants; they are due to the ignorance or carelessness of the copyists, *who write down not what they find but what they take to be the meaning...*”

¹¹⁴ “Unde accidit ut apud nos mixta sint omnia, et in Marco plura Lucae atque Matthei, rursum in Mattheo Iohannis et Marci...”

Jerome's Vulgate reintroduced many of the errors Jerome had so painstakingly weeded out.¹¹⁵

Westcott and Hort: Knowledge of Documents

The monumental edition of the Greek New Testament edited by Westcott and Hort stands among the most significant contributions to modern New Testament textual criticism. In the *Introduction* to that edition, Hort states, "The first step towards obtaining a sure foundation is consistent application of the principle that knowledge of documents should precede final judgment upon readings."¹¹⁶ In other words, to make judgments based solely on the internal criteria of intrinsic probability, that is, selecting readings because one believes they are congruous with the author's style and purpose, leaves room for subjective selection of which readings seems to "make the best sense." A focus on documents, however, takes into account the external trustworthiness of a given document in comparison with other texts. If a more difficult reading is present in a trustworthy manuscript, it may be that this variant should be accepted over against an easier reading in a less trustworthy manuscript. For Hort, part of the knowledge of a document requires placing the document in its text type or textual family, which he believes can be traced genealogically back to the "original" text, as in the title of his and Westcott's Greek New Testament, *The Text of the New Testament in the Original Greek*. Naturally, a proper knowledge of documents requires that one take into consideration the textual peculiarities of a given manuscript when deciding which readings are ultimately trustworthy and most likely to be authentic, and this, ultimately, concerns scribal behaviors.

¹¹⁵ Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, 81, "Scribes accustomed to older forms of text corrupted by unwitting reminiscence the Vulgate which they were copying; so that an appreciable part of Jerome's work had been imperceptibly undone when the Vulgate attained its final triumph."

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, *Introduction*, 31.

Hort acknowledges the presence of harmonistic readings, especially in the Western text type, which he regards as less pure and more subject to corruption than the Alexandrian text or what Westcott and Hort called the “Neutral” text, represented by Codex Vaticanus. He writes, “Another impulse of scribes abundantly exemplified in Western readings is the fondness for assimilation...But its most dangerous work is ‘harmonistic’ corruption, that is, the partial or total obliteration of differences in passages otherwise more or less resembling each other. Sometimes the assimilation is between single sentences that happen to have some matter in common; more usually however between parallel passages of greater length, such especially as have in some sense a common origin.”¹¹⁷ When he speaks of passages that have “some matter in common,” Hort includes quotations of the Old Testament, the overlapping passages of Jude and 2 Peter, and, “above all, the parallel records in the first three Gospels, and to a certain extent in all four.” Hort correctly asserts, “The harmonistic changes in the Western as in all other texts were irregular and unsystematic.”¹¹⁸ Although scribes of the Western type may have been particularly prone to harmonization, in Hort’s view, assimilations appear in all text types.

As his last statement implies, Hort acknowledges that harmonization was a factor in all of the text types, though to varying degrees. In a comparison of the Alexandrian and Western manuscripts, he writes, “The various forms of assimilation, especially harmonistic alteration and interpolation in the Gospels, recur likewise, and at times are

¹¹⁷ Ibid., *Introduction*, 124–125.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., *Introduction*, 125.

carried out in a very skilful manner.”¹¹⁹ Hort lauds the skill with which the scribes of the Alexandrian manuscripts harmonized their Gospels, but their aptitude for assimilation is in sharp contrast with the scribes of the late Syrian (Byzantine) variety. Of these, Hort says, “New interpolations...are abundant, most of them being due to harmonistic or other assimilation, fortunately capricious and incomplete.”¹²⁰ To reject harmonizing readings as secondary does not require one to disregard the skill with which some scribes altered their texts.

The characterization of the Byzantine text type as especially corrupt and full of harmonizing variants has persisted, but has been challenged in recent decades by Willem Wisselink. According to Wisselink, the Byzantine type is neither the most corrupt tradition nor the most pure. At the conclusion of his investigation, he summarizes that Codex Bezae, standing for the Western type, is especially prone to assimilation, manuscripts B and P⁷⁵, typical of the Alexandrian texts, are remarkably free of assimilation, and the manuscripts of “the Byzantine text-type stand midway between the others.”¹²¹ Wisselink’s analysis is thoughtful, though it is limited both in terms of manuscripts consulted and passages tested. He offers a helpful caution against generalizing about text types. Among manuscripts included in this study, the only thoroughly Byzantine manuscript, Codex Guelferbytanus, contains substantially more harmonizations than manuscripts of similar extent in the Alexandrian and Pre-Caesarean tradition.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., *Introduction*, 132.

¹²⁰ Ibid., *Introduction*, 135.

¹²¹ Wisselink, *Assimilation*, 78.

Hort describes “harmonistic corruptions” as *dangerous* in the sense that each emendation leads the reader away from the exemplar and even further from the autographs. This danger was of chief concern to him because his goal was not ultimately to understand the scribe and his impact on the text, as it is here, but to go behind the manuscript to the *Vorlage* and even beyond that to the autographs, the “original” Greek New Testament. In recent years, many scholars have recognized that Westcott and Hort’s goal is ultimately unattainable and have shifted their aim to understanding real manuscripts in real places at real times. Ernest Colwell is typical of this movement.

Colwell and Royse: Singular Readings

Following Hort’s trajectory, with his focus on documents, one arrives at Colwell, with his focus on scribes. It was Colwell’s conviction that textual criticism is, primarily, a *historical* enterprise. He writes, “The textual critic today in his ultimate decisions must operate as historian and theologian.”¹²² What he means by this is that textual decisions, no matter how minute or how fervently the critic appeals to objectivity, are in fact the result of careful judgment based upon knowledge of Christian history, theology, textual traditions, and individual manuscripts.

According to Colwell, the history of the New Testament can best be described as a “story of progression from a relatively uncontrolled tradition to a rigorously controlled tradition.”¹²³ In the first and second century, the texts of the New Testament were copied regularly and with little concern for style, presentation, or uniformity. As copies of

¹²² Ernest Cadman Colwell. “Biblical Criticism: Lower and Higher,” *JBL* 67 (1948): 1–12, 6. See similar comments in “Hort Redivivus,” 164–169, where Colwell discusses the fourth step in his five-step “program” for textual studies: “I, Begin with readings; II, Characterize individual scribes and manuscripts; III, Group the manuscripts; IV, Construct a historical framework; V, Make final judgment on readings.”

¹²³ Colwell, “Hort Redivivus,” 164.

manuscripts were corrected by consultation with alternative versions of the text, variants were introduced, which were then copied in their turn, thereby becoming a part of the tradition. The exponential growth of variants belongs to the first two centuries, an era which lacked editorial oversight and control. This circumstance changed in the fourth century, according to Colwell, as a result of Christianity's acceptance as a legal religion in the Roman Empire and the prevalence of greater learning in the church that manifested in ecclesial control over text production. As these developments took place, a concerted effort was made to reduce the disorder of the textual tradition by enforcing rigorous copying procedures and checking texts for accuracy before "publication." It was this localized standardization that brought about the major text types prevalent in different geographical regions.

This historical scheme summarized by Colwell must be taken into account in textual decisions and each newly discovered manuscript must either fit into this pattern of development or contribute new information to augment this sketch. The complexity of this story ensures that "no objective method can take us back through successive reconstructions to the original."¹²⁴ Although Colwell was influenced by Hort and has recommended that contemporary textual criticism might benefit from a return to some of Hort's guiding principles, he rejected Hort's genealogical method of tracing manuscripts back to an "original." For Colwell, the goal is not to reconstruct the autographs but to study the extant texts historically as evidence of the form of the text at a particular place

¹²⁴ Colwell, "Lower and Higher," 11.

and time.¹²⁵ This approach requires not just knowledge of documents and their places in the tradition, but also of scribes and their place in the history of Christianity.

Colwell suggests that the study of individual scribes must be at the heart of any analysis of textual transmission. The question, then, is how best to uncover the scribe and identify the creative work of the scribe when his exemplar is no longer available for comparison. The analysis of variants begs the question: at variance when compared to what?¹²⁶ Colwell understood the problem of selecting a “norm” against which to evaluate unique readings and had already done away with the possibility of uncovering the autograph text as a basis for comparison. In Colwell’s day, Tischendorf’s edition, *Textus Receptus*, or the edition of Westcott and Hort was often selected as a normative text. Others compared manuscripts to another given manuscript, such as Codex Vaticanus. Today, the same is certainly true of the latest editions of the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece* (NA²⁸) or the United Bible Society’s *Greek New Testament* (UBS⁵). The problem with this procedure is that even careful analysis will only ever produce relative results—relative to the manuscripts or edition selected for comparison.

Colwell abandoned the method of comparing a reading to a “normative” text. Thus, it was also necessary, in theory, to abandon categories such as omission, addition, transposition, and substitution, which tacitly assume knowledge of the original text or at least of the exemplar.¹²⁷ What Colwell desired and suggested was a way of categorizing variants without appealing to jargon used when comparing manuscripts to a normative

¹²⁵ For instance, Colwell, “Hort Redivivus”, 151, remarks, “What the textual critic offers the theologian is the text as it existed in a specific time and place.”

¹²⁶ Ernest Cadman Colwell and Ernest W. Tune, “Method in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings,” in *Studies in Methodology*, 96–105; originally published as “Variant Readings: Classification and Use,” *JBL* 83 (1964): 253–261.

¹²⁷ Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 109.

text. He preferred to classify readings in terms of *sense* and *nonsense* readings, *dislocated* readings, and *singular* readings—terms that do not presume knowledge of the exemplar.¹²⁸ It is this last category that is of most importance.

Singular readings are those readings unique to a given manuscript. Naturally, “The Singular Reading is prevented by its very nature from usefulness in establishing group relationships of manuscripts,” but this is no longer the sole aim of textual criticism. “The Singular Readings have a value in the initial appraisal of the work of the scribe in a particular manuscript.”¹²⁹ In his 1964 article, Colwell argued that singular readings were especially important because the knowledge of the habits exhibited in the singular readings would aid in making decisions in readings that were not singular, thereby further assisting in the goal of reconstructing the exemplar. In practical use, if the singular readings showed a scribal tendency toward omission, in contested non-singular readings the critic could reasonably assume that the scribe’s habit was consistent and that, therefore, the shorter reading was probably secondary. By his 1965 article, though, Colwell had seen that a significant byproduct of this methodology was the ability to characterize scribes, scribal habits, and the significant impact that scribes had in shaping the New Testament.¹³⁰

Singular readings provide the best and most certain access to the scribe and his habits in copying. Colwell applied his method of isolating singular readings in an effort to characterize the scribes of three extensive papyrus manuscripts: P⁴⁵, P⁶⁶, and P⁷⁵. He

¹²⁸ Colwell and Tune, “Variant Readings,” 101–105. In fact, this was a theoretical preference, as Colwell himself resorted to the traditional classifications in many of his works.

¹²⁹ Ibid., “Variant Readings,” 104.

¹³⁰ For an explanation of singular readings and Colwell’s application of this method see Colwell, “Scribal Habits.”

defined his collation of singular readings against the readings contained in the apparatus of Tischendorf's 8th edition and also made some unsystematic comparison to recent finds that were easy at hand. The result of his investigation and collation was a body of evidence of little use in reconstructing the original text, but exceedingly valuable for seeing into the world of the scribe. He characterized the peculiar habits of each of these scribes and was therefore able to place the manuscript and its scribe in the history of textual development. His method enables one to describe individual scribes as careful, negligent, or prone to one type of habit or another.

Gordon Fee helpfully augments the category of "singular readings" with an auxiliary group of variants, which he calls "sub-singular" readings. He defines a reading in this category as "a non-genetic, accidental agreement in variation between two MSS which are not otherwise closely related."¹³¹ He goes on to say, "It must be assumed as *possible* that an error which one scribe committed could have been committed by any other scribe as well."¹³² Therefore, some non-singular readings may very well be the creation of a scribe who has erred in the same way as another. This secondary set of readings expands the data set while still limiting the evidence to readings that are almost certainly secondary.

Colwell's initial forays into the application of this method were followed by James Royse, who admirably continued Colwell's study and has made the most

¹³¹ Gordon D. Fee, "On the Types, Classification, and Presentation of Textual Variation," in *Studies in the Theory and Method*, 62-79, 67.

¹³² Ibid., "On the Types," 67. Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 160, explained earlier that assimilation is the type of error that would have gone on independently in each local text, so that identical errors may or may not be related.

substantial contribution to our understanding of scribal culture.¹³³ In his massive study, Royse analyzes the scribal habits on display in the singular readings of six extensive early papyri (P⁴⁵, P⁴⁶, P⁴⁷, P⁶⁶, P⁷², P⁷⁵). He maintains Colwell's methodology, but expands the material base by comparing his manuscripts to the apparatus of Tischendorf as well as the editions of von Soden, Clark, Nestle-Aland 25–27, UBS 3–4, Aland's *Synopsis*, Legg, the *International Greek New Testament Project*, *Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus*, and Swanson. Because of this significant increase in comparative material, Royse's analysis is quite comprehensive and of illimitable value for our own study of the text of the Synoptics in P⁴⁵ and P⁷⁵.

Naturally, one cannot hope to uncover every reading created by a scribe. As Royse reminds us, not every scribal reading is singular and some scribal readings will not be singular because they coincide with another manuscript, not genetically, but by accident (such as Fee's sub-singular readings or other uncommon independent errors). Furthermore, not every singular reading should be immediately disqualified since it may in fact represent the authentic reading, though this is rarely the case.¹³⁴

Royse also introduces the concept of the "complex scribe."¹³⁵ Some may argue that there is ultimately no way to say conclusively that a reading, even a singular reading, was not present in the exemplar. Royse responds that a singular reading may not be the

¹³³ See Royse, *Scribal Habits*; and James R. Royse, "Scribal Tendencies in the Transmission of the Text of the New Testament," in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*, 2nd ed., 461–478; repr. from *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*, 239–252.

¹³⁴ See Royse's comments on "Singular Readings in Revelation" in *Scribal Habits*, 44–51, where he discusses Delobel's objection to Colwell's method in application to Revelation, where the manuscript tradition is uniquely scarce. See Delobel's comments in Joël Delobel, "Le texte de l'Apocalypse: Problèmes de méthode," in *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament*, ed. J. Lambrecht, BETL 53 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1980), 151–166, 161.

¹³⁵ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 51–56.

creative production of the scribe of the extant manuscript, but at some point in the history of that text, a scribe introduced the reading. Since it remains unattested elsewhere, its origins must lie with an individual scribe. So, while a certain scribe may reproduce his text exactly, including thereby a singular reading, the scribe whose manuscript he had copied, or the scribe before him, introduced the reading. In cases where a complex scribe is at work, the first copy to include the singular reading is no longer extant, making the surviving descendant of that document the only manuscript to contain the reading. So, though I will speak simply of “the scribe,” at times it may be that the variant is the creation of a “complex scribe” or “multi-person scribe.”

Aland and Min: Comparative Readings

The method of approaching the scribes through singular readings has not been without its critics. In an article published in 2002, Barbara Aland examines the problem of assessing the textual quality of fragmentary papyri. She evaluates Colwell’s method as perfectly acceptable and beneficial for use with the extensive papyri and she retains the category of singular readings alongside the other readings she compiles. Nevertheless, she points out two disadvantages. “For one thing, with the singular readings, [the method] considers only a limited part of the papyrus and leaves all the rest of the material, which could certainly also be useful for the assessment of the peculiarities of the papyrus, out of view.”¹³⁶ In another article, she writes, “The method is still useful, although it should be underscored that there are no singular readings in the strictest sense. There is no way of knowing that what we regard as singular readings were not also to be found in the great

¹³⁶ B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 1: “Zum einen erfaßt [die Methode] mit den Singulärlesarten nur einen geringen Teil des Papyrus und läßt das gesamte übrige Material außer acht, das durchaus auch für die Beurteilung der Eigenarten des Papyrus dienlich sein konnte.”

mass of manuscripts that have been lost.”¹³⁷ In this she is certainly correct, as Royse readily admits, though he suggests that she has misunderstood what the method of singular readings is intended to do. Echoing Colwell’s earlier statement, Royse writes, “The examination of singular readings was not intended to be a way to judge all the ‘Eigenarten’ of a manuscript. In particular, an examination of singular readings will do little or nothing to help us understand the unique external textual relationships possessed by the manuscript.”¹³⁸ Aland is correct in stating that for her purpose, which is to categorize the textual quality of the manuscripts, the data supplied by singular readings is far too slim and leaves out of the discussion a majority of readings that may be useful for discerning textual character.

Kyoung Min, who follows Aland’s method in his study of the early texts of Matthew in fragmentary papyri, has made the same criticism of Colwell’s method.¹³⁹ Min is critical of exclusively using Colwell’s method on the grounds that there are far more non-singular readings than singular readings. Min’s disappointment with Colwell’s method seems to spring from his desire to use the method for ends that it cannot satisfy. As does Aland, Min is attempting to classify the early fragmentary papyri according to broad categories of textual quality: fest, normal, and frei (strict, normal, and free). Royse responds to Min’s criticism by saying, “At least the primary focus of Colwell’s and my

¹³⁷ B. Aland, “The Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri,” 110 n. 12.

¹³⁸ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 61.

¹³⁹ Among his findings, Min concludes that harmonization to parallels was more common than harmonization to context. His thesis disagrees with Royse’s finding that harmonization to context is more common than harmonization to parallels because Min’s material is limited to the Gospel of Matthew while Royse’s scope includes books of the New Testament without parallel, where one would not expect to find harmonization.

work is to determine the scribal habits of the papyri studied.”¹⁴⁰ Min’s criticism does not nullify the use of singular readings in the present study since I, with Colwell and Royse, am using them to describe the peculiarities of individual scribes.

Aland’s second criticism, that “Colwell’s method is applicable only to extensive Papyri,” is also valid.¹⁴¹ The smaller papyri, due to their fragmentary nature, supply only a handful of singular readings, if any at all.¹⁴² One cannot simply ignore the remainder of the papyrus in evaluating its quality, especially since the fragmentary papyri are, on the whole, of a much earlier date and so are of much significance for dating early readings.¹⁴³ Aland suggests a procedure of her own for assessing the fragmentary papyri. First, one must assess all the variants, not just singular readings. Second, one must compare the papyrus to a hypothetical initial text (*hypothetischem Ausgangstext*), in Aland’s case, the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece*.¹⁴⁴ The next two steps involve identifying the breadth of scribal errors and then classifying the papyrus as *fest*, *normal*, or *frei*. Aland employs this method in a study of fifteen papyri of the Gospel of John and previously studied twelve early papyri of Matthew.¹⁴⁵ Setting aside the issue of comparing a

¹⁴⁰ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 61 n. 83. See also his quotation above concerning the uselessness of singular readings for determining external textual relationships.

¹⁴¹ B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 1: “Colwells Methode [ist] nur auf umfängliche Papyri anwendbar.”

¹⁴² Ibid., “Kriterien,” 1, “Alle Papyri kleineren Umfangs—, wie bekannt, die allermeisten— umfassen nur wenige Verse und damit in der Regel auch so wenige Singulärlesarten, daß sie aufgrund dessen nicht zu beurteilen sind.”

¹⁴³ Ibid., “Kriterien,” 1, “Es ist umso wichtiger, den Textwert der kleinen Papyri zu bestimmen, als man immer noch geneigt ist, eine frühe Bezeugung einer Lesart als besonders zuverlässig anzusehen.”

¹⁴⁴ For a critique of this method see Bart D. Ehrman, “A Problem of Textual Circularity: The Alands on the Classification of New Testament Manuscripts,” *Bib* 70 (1989): 377–388.

¹⁴⁵ Barbara Aland, “Das Zeugnis der frühen Papyri für den Text der Evangelien: Diskutiert am Matthäusevangelium,” in *The Four Gospels*, 325–335.

manuscript to a normative text, which Colwell had already “put to rest,”¹⁴⁶ let us look closer at the problem of evaluating fragmentary papyri.

The suggestion that Colwell’s method cannot be useful for fragmentary papyri is only partially true. In fact, the methodology has proved productive in a number of studies. Peter Head, for instance, has applied the study of singular readings to fragmentary papyri and has discovered patterns that conform to the data compiled by studies of the extensive papyri.¹⁴⁷ In his study, Royse found that scribes on the whole tended to omit rather than add to their texts; Head affirms this same tendency in the fragmentary papyri. Aland is certainly correct that a study of all of the readings of the smaller papyri is beneficial, but Colwell’s method is not less valid because it yields fewer results. Even so, it is true that unless some comparison to a “normative” text is applied, many of the small papyri will be excluded from the analysis.

Aland offers an additional argument in favor of her comparative method. She is skeptical about the results that Colwell’s method can produce. She writes, “Moreover, it is natural that what is regarded as a singular reading is always dependent on the extant manuscripts and could by new discoveries quickly no longer be a singular reading. But this argument is only partially convincing, because small variations could have come into

¹⁴⁶ Fee, “Textual Variation,” 62.

¹⁴⁷ Peter M. Head, “Observations on Early Papyri of the Synoptic Gospels, Especially on the ‘Scribal Habits,’” *Bib* 71 (1990): 240–247. In his study of 14 early papyri (P¹, P⁴, P²⁵, P³⁵, P³⁷, P⁵³, P⁶², P^{64/67}, P⁶⁹, P⁷⁰, P⁷¹, P⁷⁷, P⁸⁶, P⁸⁸), Head finds two instances of harmonization. See also his “The Habits of New Testament Copyists: Singular Readings in the Early Fragmentary Papyri of John,” *Bib* 85 (2004): 399–408, and his “Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem,” in *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2008: Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett*, ed. Paul Foster et al., BETL 239 (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 115–156.

being independently of each other.”¹⁴⁸ Just as Royse disqualified several of Colwell’s singular readings by appealing to a broader number of manuscripts and manuscripts newly published, so may any singular reading lose its privileged place with future discoveries. For Aland, since we cannot rely only on singular readings or else risk the findings being nullified, one must turn instead to a normative text on which to base one’s comparison. As Aland acknowledges, this criticism is only partly significant, since many of the singular readings will remain so and new manuscript finds are not so frequent as to negate the general principles arrived at through this methodology. Indeed, one must always work with the evidence available and adapt as new data arrives.

In truth, the two methods are not mutually exclusive and may be used in concert, as in fact Aland and Min do in their studies. Both scholars study all variety of readings, as their goals require, and note singular readings in their collations. The category of singular readings maintains its usefulness even though it cannot assist in their endeavor to profile the textual character of fragmentary papyri.

In this study, I will use Colwell’s method for the purpose it was designed, to isolate scribally created readings. Singular and sub-singular readings are used to characterize the particular harmonistic tendencies of individual scribes. Variants that appear through Aland’s comparative method are used to describe harmonization as a general practice.

¹⁴⁸ B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 1 n. 2: “Zudem ist natürlich das, was als Singulärlesart gilt, immer auch von den uns erhaltenen Handschriften abhängig und könnte bei neuen Funden bald schon keine Singulärlesart mehr sein. Doch ist dieses Argument nur teilweise zugkräftig, weil kleinere Variationen unabhängig voneinander entstanden sein können.”

Elliott and Fee: Harmonization and the Synoptic Problem

The text-critical resources available to scholars on the topic of harmonization offer conflicting voices: harmonization is said by some to be accidental and by others deliberate, it is frequent and infrequent, it occurs in favor of Matthew and it occurs in all directions. Because there is no clear understanding of this scribal tendency, many scholars proceed with their studies on the basis of unexamined presuppositions. Assumptions concerning scribal activity, and assimilation in particular, are precisely the problem and source of much ambiguity in the textual criticism of the Gospels, especially pertaining to solutions to the Synoptic problem. The interested student must examine a wide number of studies, each providing only a few pieces of the puzzle, leaving him or her to assemble their own picture of the role of scribal harmonization in the shaping of the Gospels.

In an article published in 1977, George Kilpatrick challenges scholars working on the Synoptic problem to take into consideration matters of textual criticism. In fact, his challenge is aimed at those who ignore textual variants and take for granted that the editors of the text in modern editions have already sufficiently considered the problems and have made the correct decisions for them. D. C. Parker describes this attitude as a belief “that the text chosen by the editors of the main current Greek New Testament is virtually certain, and that all variations from it, even those which the edition places at the foot of the page as significant variants, may be ignored.”¹⁴⁹ Kilpatrick points to several examples showing the need for students of the Gospels to engage in the lower criticism of the text. He writes, “We cannot study problems of the Gospels, the Synoptic Problem

¹⁴⁹ Parker, *The Living Text*, 2.

included, without taking into account how the textual variants may determine our understanding.”¹⁵⁰ While the main interest of this study is to identify the harmonistic peculiarities of given manuscripts of the Gospels and their scribes and to describe harmonization as a general practice, a clearer understanding of harmonization will benefit scholars as they make decisions about the Synoptic problem. Some scholars use their solution to the Synoptic problem to help decide between variant readings. For instance, Metzger and the UBS committee took into account Markan priority when deciding between variants.¹⁵¹ In this study, theories about the Synoptic problem are not used to decide between readings except when all other text-critical criteria fail to tilt the balance. On occasion, discussion of the ramifications of Markan priority in reference to a particular variant is included in a footnote.

No scholar has taken up Kilpatrick’s challenge more fervently than J. K. Elliott, who continues to proclaim the danger of divorcing Synoptic studies and textual criticism. Regarding this campaign, he writes:

I have attempted on several occasions to preach that decisions about the Synoptic Problem ought not to be made on the basis of the *text* in any one Synopsis but that one should make use of the alternative readings to be found in the critical apparatus and that one should not imbue the editor of any one printed text with an omniscience that enabled him to produce a definitive version of the text.¹⁵²

This statement is typical of his publications in this area.

Peter Head has also conducted research at this intersection. He explains that the relationship between the Synoptic problem and textual criticism cannot be understood as

¹⁵⁰ George Dunbar Kilpatrick, “Some Thoughts on Modern Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Gospels,” in *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays of G. D. Kilpatrick*, ed. J. K. Elliott, BETL 96 (Leuven: Peeters, 1990), 80–97, 91; repr. from *NovT* 19 (1977): 275–292.

¹⁵¹ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 13*–14*.

¹⁵² J. K. Elliott, “Printed Editions,” 338.

one of master to slave, where textual criticism simply supplies the text to be analyzed by Synoptic scholars. Instead, the relationship is interdependent. Occasionally, solutions to the Synoptic problem will come into play earlier in the process, while the text is still being decided.¹⁵³ Elliott notes that the goal of textual criticism is frustrated by the degree of “cross-fertilization” in the Synoptic Gospels in passages where parallels are present because, in general, “Scribes were prone to assimilate the gospel they were copying to a parallel text in another gospel.”¹⁵⁴ He demonstrates in several places how vital it is to make assertions concerning the Synoptic problem only in concert with extensive analysis of the textual tradition hidden in the apparatus. But even the apparatuses must be used critically. In several articles, Elliott has shown that studies of the Synoptic problem made with different editions of the GNT and different Synopses and their apparatuses can result in drastically different conclusions.¹⁵⁵ Therefore, one must not take the published editions as the final word and one ought to seek out even more readings than are provided in the standard apparatuses.

Once readings have been assembled, one must proceed carefully on the basis of tried criteria. Elliott affirms the dictum of selecting, *in general*, that reading which dissimilates parallel passages rather than the one that assimilates. Nevertheless, in some cases this rule conflicts with other text-critical principles, for instance, selecting the reading that best fits the style of a given author. He writes, “When a variant involves a

¹⁵³ Head, “Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem,” 115–117.

¹⁵⁴ J. K. Elliott, “Textual Criticism, Assimilation and the Synoptic Gospels,” *NTS* 26 (1980): 231–241, 231.

¹⁵⁵ See J. K. Elliott, “Printed Editions,” and his “Resolving the Synoptic Problem Using the Text of Printed Greek Synopses,” *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 6 (1993): 51–58. Elliott explains how the editors’ solutions to the Synoptic problem have influenced the text they have printed and even the variants they choose to include in their apparatuses. Users of these synopses who are unaware of these editorial proclivities could quickly be led astray.

choice between a reading in accord with the author's style and usage and one which reflects a different usage, then the former is likely to be original."¹⁵⁶ The criterion of style should precede the "rule of dissimilarity," that is, even in cases where a variant appears to be an assimilation, if it conforms to the author's style it may be authentic.

Gordon D. Fee, like Elliott, champions the use of textual criticism in making decisions about the relationships between the Synoptic Gospels, though he affirms Joseph Fitzmyer's opinion that the Synoptic problem is "practically insoluble."¹⁵⁷ For Fee, the Synoptic problem is unsolvable because oral tradition was an active element in the development of the texts so that the texts themselves developed in a way similar to the evolution of oral performances. Nevertheless, textual criticism does bring scholars closer to the text as it was known in the earliest centuries. Fee describes four kinds of harmonization: harmonization between Gospels, harmonization in a single Gospel (e.g. in duplications), harmonization to the Septuagint, and harmonization to well-known phrases.¹⁵⁸

Fee explains the two-fold problem of harmonization in the Synoptics quite clearly. He writes, "The problem here is especially complex, for we are dealing both with *authors* who used the text of one (or two) of the others in varying degrees of exactness

¹⁵⁶ Elliott, "Textual Criticism, Assimilation and the Synoptic Gospels," 236. For further discussion of using an author's style in textual decisions see J. K. Elliott, "The Relevance of Textual Criticism to the Synoptic Problem," in *The Interrelations of the Gospels: A Symposium Led by M.-É. Boismard, W. R. Farmer, F. Neirynck, Jerusalem 1984*, ed. David L. Dungan, BETL 95 (Leuven: Peeters, 1990), 348–359.

¹⁵⁷ Gordon D. Fee, "A Text-Critical Look at the Synoptic Problem," *NovT* 22 (1980): 12–28, 12. See also Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Priority of Mark and the 'Q' Source in Luke," in *Jesus and Man's Hope*, ed. David G. Buttrick, 2 vols. (Pittsburgh: Perspective, 1970), 131–170, 132.

¹⁵⁸ Gordon D. Fee, "Modern Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem: On the Problem of Harmonization in the Gospels," in *Studies in the Theory and Method*, 174–182; originally published as "Modern Text Criticism and the Synoptic Problem," in *J. J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies 1776–1976*, ed. Bernard Orchard and Thomas R. W. Longstaff, SNTSMS 34 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 154–169.

and with *scribes* who in a variety of ways made parallel passages conform, but who also, by intent or otherwise, could disharmonize passages.”¹⁵⁹ How is one to tell when the harmonization is original, that is, the work of the author using his source, and when it is secondary, the work of the scribe? Elliott suggests using the author’s style as a key to unlocking the source of a variant; yet, Fee argues, “one should not—indeed must not—assume authors to be consistent.”¹⁶⁰ Indeed, the scribes were the first to notice variations in style and regularly adapted the text so that it conformed more closely to the author’s style. Therefore, in some instances one will be tempted to select a reading because it conforms to the author’s style, but that impulse must be balanced in light of examples of “a scribe making an author’s text conform to his own, albeit sometimes more unusual, style.”¹⁶¹ Therefore, when style is used as a text-critical criterion, it must be applied thoughtfully and with adequate understanding of the utility of this sort of standard.

The exhortations of Elliott and Fee and their analyses of the *textual* problem in the Synoptic *problem* serve as examples for our own procedure. In this study, solutions to the Synoptic problem are seldom consulted and the language used to describe the differences between the Synoptics endeavors to reflect a neutral stance.

Method of Investigation

This history of scholarship on the topic of scribal habits and the role of scribes in the transmission of the Gospels establishes the need for further investigation into the phenomenon of harmonization. This study provides a catalogue and analysis of harmonizing readings in every fragmentary Greek manuscript of the Synoptic Gospels

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., “Modern Textual Criticism,” 174–175.

¹⁶⁰ Fee, “Modern Text Criticism,” (original publication) 159.

¹⁶¹ Fee, “Modern Textual Criticism,” 179.

from the second to fifth century and in Codex Vaticanus. The assembled readings enable an assessment of the harmonizing proclivities of individual scribes and provide a portrait of the general phenomenon of harmonization.

Parameters: Fragmentary Greek Manuscripts of the Second to the Fifth Centuries

While a comprehensive study of assimilation in the New Testament in manuscripts of all languages throughout the centuries would be a valuable tool, such a task is beyond the scope of any one project. For this reason, the scope of this investigation is limited in a number of ways. First, the study is limited to scribal harmonization in the Synoptic Gospels. Harmonizing variants do appear in the Gospel of John, for instance, and in manuscripts of Jude and 2 Peter, but these texts are not discussed here.

Second, this study will be constrained by the language of composition. It is true that the various versional texts of the New Testament in Latin, Syriac, Coptic, and Ethiopic are of great value in describing the transformation of the New Testament, but this project is limited to manuscripts written in Greek, copies of Greek exemplars.

Third, in order to sample the widest temporal range of manuscripts, this study is limited to fragmentary manuscripts. By “fragmentary” is meant any incomplete manuscript of a Gospel. Therefore, manuscripts like P⁴⁵, P⁷⁵, Codex Guelferbytanus, and Codex Borgianus, all of which are long but incomplete, are considered alongside manuscripts such as P⁷, P⁷¹, P¹⁰², 069, 0213, and 0267—all of which contain fewer than five verses.

The only exception to this limitation is the inclusion of Codex Vaticanus, which contains the complete text of all three Synoptic Gospels. This manuscript has been

included to provide perspective. A fragment of a Gospel may exhibit few or many harmonizations depending on what type of material it happens to preserve. Is the material shared with both of the other Synoptics? With just one? With neither? Do the verses contain sayings of Jesus or the evangelist's narrative? By studying a complete manuscript of all three Synoptics, we are able to see how harmonization has affected an individual scribe in all types of material and in different Gospels.

Finally, the extent of this project is restricted in terms of the time period under consideration. The second to fifth century was the period of greatest change in the text.¹⁶² Hort posits, "All the important ramifications of transmission preceded the fifth century."¹⁶³ Streeter, and Colwell after him, believes that that period could be reduced to just the first two centuries without losing any of the most important variants.¹⁶⁴ Royse agrees with Colwell that the first two centuries were the period of most variation and that the fourth century was a turning point in the transmission of the text. At this point, the texts began to take a standardized form, a development that Colwell describes as the progression towards "control."¹⁶⁵ Furthermore, during this period these texts transformed into scripture as the slow process of canonization progressed.¹⁶⁶ Additionally, in the fourth century, around the time when Constantine famously commissioned the

¹⁶² For this view, see Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 28; and Epp, "Significance of the Papyri," 101–103.

¹⁶³ Hort, *Introduction*, 93.

¹⁶⁴ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 36; and Colwell, "Lower and Higher," 7.

¹⁶⁵ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 20–24; and Colwell, "Hort Redivivus," 164–169.

¹⁶⁶ Colwell, "Hort Redivivus," 148, notes that Hort did *not* believe that canonization resulted in more accurate copying.

composition of fifty copies of the Christian scriptures,¹⁶⁷ the process of copying was subjected to ecclesial control, which attempted to enforce uniformity on the text.¹⁶⁸ The onset of this period of control in the middle of the fourth century and the beginning of the fifth serves as our rough *terminus ad quem*. Thus, manuscripts from the early period of ample variation are included along with those representing the “controlled text” of later years.

This study begins, as Colwell recommends, with the earliest artifacts and progress to the manuscripts of the fifth century. This chronological progression coincides with the trajectory moving from book rolls on papyrus and papyrus codices to vellum and parchment codices.¹⁶⁹ Several of the New Testament papyri are dated to the second century and so provide our earliest evidence and the starting point of this study. Royse has pointed out that dividing texts on the basis of their medium is a faulty procedure—indeed, “irrelevant,” at least for our purposes.¹⁷⁰ Instead, texts should be organized and addressed by their age.

In Chapter Two, I cover the fragmentary manuscripts of the second and third centuries and in Chapter Three I look at two extensive third-century manuscripts, P⁴⁵ and P⁷⁵. Manuscripts from the fourth century are analyzed in Chapter Four and the great

¹⁶⁷ See T. C. Skeat, “The Codex Sinaiticus, the Codex Vaticanus and Constantine,” in *Writings of T. C. Skeat*, 193–235; repr. from *JTS* 50 (1999): 583–625, for a discussion of whether Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are two of Constantine’s commissioned Bibles. These questions will be discussed in Chapter Five.

¹⁶⁸ Oversight is particularly evident in the hand of “correctors.” For example, Codex Sinaiticus has abundant corrections in the body of the manuscript and in the margins.

¹⁶⁹ See Hurtado, *Earliest Christian Artifacts*; and many of the articles by Skeat collected in *Writings of T. C. Skeat*, especially, “Early Christian Book Production: Papyri and Manuscripts,” 33–59; repr. from *The Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. 2: The West from the Fathers to the Reformation*, ed. G. W. H. Lampe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 54–79.

¹⁷⁰ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 15.

fourth-century Codex Vaticanus is covered in Chapter Five. In Chapter Six, I cover the fragmentary fifth-century manuscripts. Finally, in Chapter Seven, I offer conclusions regarding the general practice and significance of harmonization.

Procedure

This study of scribal assimilation begins with the collection of evidence. Each manuscript has been analyzed individually for (1) singular readings, (2) comparative readings, and (3) accepted readings that may in fact be secondary harmonizing readings. Singular and sub-singular readings have been identified by comparison with the apparatuses of the eighth edition of Tischendorf and the editions of Merk, Legg, Souter, Nestle-Aland 27–28, UBS 4, Aland’s *Synopsis*, the *International Greek New Testament Project* (IGNTP), and Swanson’s horizontal parallels. The manuscript evidence from each of these editions is provided in the footnotes of individual readings, though in most cases the evidence provided in these editions has not been re-checked.

Comparative readings have been identified by collating each manuscript against the text of Nestle-Aland 28 (NA²⁸) and, where applicable, the Luke text of IGNTTP or the Legg editions of Mark and Matthew. Although readings in this category are shared by multiple manuscripts, they may have entered the textual tradition under the influence of parallel material. During collation, critical editions of the manuscripts have been used as well as photographs and facsimiles when they have been available.

Some common readings that are accepted in modern editions of the Greek New Testament have been investigated if it has been suggested that they are in fact harmonizations. Herman Hoskier, for instance, argues that some of the readings accepted in the major editions of the Greek New Testament are actually secondary harmonizations.

Finally, Colwell recommends comparing a given text to known members of its textual family.¹⁷¹ This recommendation has been followed in some cases. For instance, P⁷⁵ and P⁴ have been studied with careful attention to the text of Codex Vaticanus. Manuscript 0171 has been analyzed against the backdrop of its possible relationship to Codex Bezae.

Every variant reading identified using these methods has been analyzed with reference to parallel passages. Variants with no relationship to a parallel have been discarded. The remaining variants have been included in this catalogue.

Individual entries for each reading have been created. The accepted text of the passage is provided and, in parenthesis, the variant of the manuscript is given along with the references for the parallel passage or passages in view. Also included in the entry are characteristics of the reading (e.g. Singular, Corrected, Lacuna). Entries have been grouped by pericope.

Each group of entries is followed by an analysis of individual readings. Text-critical criteria are used to establish whether the reading is secondary and parallel material is consulted to see if it may be the source of the variant. Readings are then categorized as very likely, likely, possibly, and unlikely a result of harmonization. Readings considered very likely are deemed so on the basis that they are not “suggested” by the text (e.g. a change in tense or form) and, barring the vicissitudes of chance, could not plausibly have arisen independent of an external influence.

¹⁷¹ Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 123.

At the conclusion of each section, the harmonizing habit of the individual scribe and manuscript is assessed. At the conclusion of each chapter, the general practice of harmonization across all the manuscripts discussed in the chapter is evaluated.

It is commonly accepted that harmonization played a major role in the transmission of the text of the Synoptic Gospels. This study clarifies what that role has been.

CHAPTER TWO

FRAGMENTARY MANUSCRIPTS OF THE SECOND AND THIRD CENTURIES

The Text of the New Testament in the Second and Third Centuries

The second and third Christian centuries were the period of greatest transformation in the texts of the New Testament and most of the variant readings peppering the manuscripts were introduced during this time.¹ B. H. Streeter attributes this state of affairs to novice copyists and amateur scribes employed by Christians or members of poor Christian communities outlawed and operating in secrecy.² This characterization of Christians and their production of texts should be modified on two fronts. First, socio-historical studies have shown that members of the early Christian communities were not exclusively impoverished and undereducated but included members of middle and high social standing with access to wealth and education.³ Second, the evidence discussed here suggests that in the second and third centuries many of the scribes copying the texts of the New Testament were competent copyists, if not professionals, who reproduced their exemplars with admirable precision. The scribes in this period were likely trained slaves or freedmen, Christians themselves or working for

¹ Colwell, "Lower and Higher," 7, writes, "The first two Christian centuries witnessed the creation of the large majority of all variations known to scholars today." Elliott, "The New Testament Text," 13, writes, "That is the century [the second Christian century] when most changes occurred to the words that had been composed the century before."

² Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 36.

³ See, for instance, Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 51–73.

Christian households, but previously employed for copying receipts, records, and possibly the occasional literary text. Helmut Koester suggests that the texts of the Gospels were fluid in the early centuries because they had not yet attained scriptural status. He claims that the harmonizing readings in the manuscripts of Matthew and Luke “demonstrate that their text was not sacrosanct and that alterations could be expected.”⁴ J. K. Elliott expresses a similar view, “Once these Christian writings were given an official status then copyists would be less inclined to introduce deliberate change into texts being promoted to holy writ.”⁵ Frederik Wisse summarizes this perspective as an “assumption that Christian scribes would have been very reluctant to tamper with the text of a canonical writing, but would have felt free to introduce changes before a text was recognized as apostolic and authoritative.”⁶ Wisse challenges this position. He asserts that if scribes were less likely to tamper with “canonical” texts, one would expect more textual variation in those texts that were not quickly accepted into the canon or regarded as scriptural. This, however, is not the case. Michael Kruger has also challenged this position by collecting evidence of early Christian opinions about the status of the texts of the New Testament. Many of the attitudes he uncovers push against Koester’s notion that the Gospels were not regarded as sacred or as scripture in the second century. He especially notes the regular appearance of warnings and curses against those who might alter the words of the text. Kruger writes, “When that testimony is considered, it is not at all clear, in spite of oft-made claims to the contrary, that textual variations in the papyri

⁴ Helmut Koester, “The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century,” in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century*, 19–37.

⁵ Elliott, “The New Testament Text,” 20.

⁶ Frederik Wisse, “The Nature and Purpose of Redactional Changes in Early Christian Texts: The Canonical Gospels,” in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century*, 39–53, 44.

demonstrate the non-scriptural status of New Testament books and a casual attitude toward their reproduction.”⁷ His conclusion is balanced; he writes, “It seems evident that two historical realities *coexisted* within early Christianity: early Christians, as a whole, valued their texts as scripture and did not view unbridled textual changes as acceptable, and, at the same time, some Christians changed the New Testament text and altered its wording (and sometimes in substantive ways).”⁸ He goes on to explain the irony that scribes were more likely to alter texts they believed were of great importance. “The text was so important that scribes wanted to make sure that it said the ‘right’ thing.”⁹

Other factors, besides the scribe’s education and training or the perceived status of the texts, contributed to the multiplicity of variants that were created in the second and third centuries. Colwell explains that Christian text production lacked oversight and control, thus allowing a good deal of variety to enter into the texts.¹⁰ In the fourth century, ecclesiastical authorities were able to standardize the process of transmission locally. Before this time, no general system of checks existed by which to ensure accuracy and fidelity in copying. Scribes were commissioned to produce texts for private use and apparently did not create large literary copies such as were manufactured in the fourth and fifth centuries for liturgical and public use. Although many spurious readings arose, it is not clear that the average Christian was even aware that different versions of sayings and stories existed in different copies of the New Testament texts.

⁷ Michael J. Kruger, “Early Christian Attitudes toward the Reproduction of Texts,” in *The Early Text of the New Testament*, ed. Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 63–80, 79.

⁸ *Ibid.*, “Early Christian Attitudes,” 79.

⁹ *Ibid.*, “Early Christian Attitudes,” 80.

¹⁰ Colwell, “Lower and Higher,” 7.

Other characteristics were distinctive of Christian texts in the earliest centuries.

Already in the second century, Christians had fully adopted the codex book form. Larry Hurtado surmises that 71 percent of Christian texts in the second century and at least 67 percent of Christian texts in the third century were codices even though the book roll continued to dominate in non-Christian book production.¹¹ Many suggestions have been proposed to account for this. Early theories revolved around pragmatic concerns, namely, that the codex is smaller and more portable or that it was cheaper to produce.¹² It has also been suggested that the desire to include a larger number of texts in a single unit or to circumscribe a specific body of texts gave rise to the codex.¹³ Hurtado's suggestion is the most convincing: Christians adopted the codex both to demarcate specific bodies of texts (initially a Pauline corpus) and also as a way of differentiating between scriptural texts and other Christian writings.¹⁴ That many Christian writings, such as letters and apologies, continued to be written on rolls while the texts that would form the New Testament were mostly produced in codex-form suggests a different valuation for the two types of book. The codex could signal scriptural status.

¹¹ Hurtado, *Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 44–49.

¹² See Colin H. Roberts and T. C. Skeat, *The Birth of the Codex* (London: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1983), 45–53, and Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 54–56, for arguments against these theories.

¹³ Skeat, “Origin of the Christian Codex,” 79–87, believes an early four-gospel codex contributed to the adoption of the codex book form. Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 58–65, suggests an early codex containing part of the Pauline corpus led to the adoption of the codex.

¹⁴ Hurtado, *Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 79–81. He writes, “On the other hand, given this general Christian preference for the codex, particularly for scriptures, plus a noteworthy readiness to use the roll for a variety of other Christian texts, it is reasonable to judge that the use of the roll to copy a text signals that the copyist and/or user for whom the copy was made did not regard that text (or at least that copy of that text) as having scriptural status.”

The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century

All three of the Synoptic Gospels were composed in the first century, but no manuscripts dating to that period exist today. The vast majority of manuscripts from the first and the second century did not survive time or the elements. In fact, only four manuscripts of any of the Synoptic Gospels are extant from before the third century and all four are copies of the Gospel of Matthew from Egypt. Of course, the Gospels of Mark and Luke were copied and read during this time, but the lack of first- and second-century manuscripts of these texts suggests that they were copied with less frequency than Matthew. Even so, the manuscripts of Matthew analyzed here demonstrate the continuing presence of the other Synoptics in the harmonizing variants their scribes introduced.

Manuscripts of Matthew¹⁵

P¹⁰⁴ (P.Oxy. 4404) – Matthew 21:34–37, 43, 45¹⁶

P¹⁰⁴ is a small papyrus fragment from a codex of Matthew found in Oxyrhynchus, Egypt. J. D. Thomas confidently dates the fragment on paleographical grounds to the second half of the second century, though others have proposed an early second-century date.¹⁷ It is the oldest manuscript of the Gospel of Matthew, though it contains only about six verses. The artifact exhibits clear, fine writing on the recto, but only one or two letters

¹⁵ Tommy Wasserman, “The Early Text of Matthew,” in *The Early Text of the New Testament*, 83–107, provides a thorough introduction to the manuscripts of Matthew from the second to the mid fourth century. His table on pp. 86–87 is particularly helpful.

¹⁶ See Appendix A for a Greek transcription of the relevant verses for each reading analyzed in this dissertation.

¹⁷ Eric W. Handley et al., eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 64, *Graeco-Roman Memoirs* 84 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1997), 7–9 and Plates I and II. Philip W. Comfort and David P. Barrett, eds., *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts: A Corrected, Enlarged Edition of ‘The Complete Text of the Earliest New Testament Manuscripts’* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 2001), 643–644, propose an early second-century date by paleographical comparison with P.Berolinensis 6845, PSI 1213, and P.Oxy. 4301. If they are correct, then P¹⁰⁴ is not only the oldest Synoptic manuscript, but also a contemporary of P⁵², the Rylands fragment of John.

are visible on the verso. The scribe has not created any singular readings, but an inferred sub-singular reading reconstructed from a lacuna may have involved harmonization.¹⁸

(1) Matthew 21:44 – □καὶ ὁ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὸν λίθον τοῦτον συνθλασθήσεται ἐφ’ ὃν δ’
 ἂν πέσῃ λικμήσει αὐτόν` (cf. Luke 20:18; Sub-singular P^{104lac} D 33;
 Lacuna)

The text on the recto, which appears to include the upper margin, begins part way through Matthew 21:34 and breaks off in the middle of v. 37. The following lines would have contained the conclusion of the parable, an exchange between Jesus and the chief priests, and a quotation of Psalm 118:22–23. The quotation of the Psalm reads, “The stone that the builders rejected has become the cornerstone. This was done by the Lord, and it is marvelous in our eyes.” The text on the verso begins in the middle of Matthew 21:43, where Jesus applies the parable to his audience. Following this verse in the standard text of Matthew is a prophetic saying about a stone that evokes Isaiah 8:14 and Daniel 3:34–45. The saying reads, “And the one who falls on this stone will be shattered; but it will crush him upon whom it might fall.”

The stone saying alluding to Isaiah does not appear in the Markan parallel. The Lukan parallel differs from Matthew in two ways. First, in Luke the quotation from the Psalm and the stone saying are connected without interruption and are logically linked by their shared topic and vocabulary regarding the stone.¹⁹ Second, Luke quotes only Psalm

¹⁸ B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 8, explains that although this papyrus does not contain many variants it is nonetheless important because its one deviation is “außerordentlich wichtig.” Wasserman, “Early Text of Matthew,” 101, classifies the textual quality as “at least normal” while Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 237–239, describes it as “strict.”

¹⁹ Craig S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 516, explains the technique. He writes, “Employing the Jewish hermeneutical technique *gezerah shewah*,

118:22 and not 118:23. This serves to strengthen the association between the quotation and the saying since Psalm 118:23 does not reference a stone. In Matthew, the quotation and the saying are awkwardly interrupted by v. 43, a definitive application of the first quotation foreshadowing the transfer of the kingdom of God from Israel to a “nation who produces its fruit” (καὶ δοθήσεται ἔθνη ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς).

Unfortunately, the ink on the verso has been almost completely worn off so that only a few letters are legible and it is not clear which verses from the conclusion of the parable the fragment contained. Only an epsilon is clear on the fifth line from the upper margin and sigma-kappa or perhaps epsilon-kappa are nearly discernable on the line above that. Thomas estimates that the papyrus originally contained approximately twenty-four letters per line and thirty-one lines per column. On the basis of these calculations, he reconstructs the text with the fixed letters in place and concludes, “No text from the preceding verses in Matthew fits well with the slight traces remaining.”²⁰

Thomas does acknowledge one scenario that matches the expected number of letters and conforms to the gap between the sigma-kappa and the epsilon. It is possible that the sigma-kappa comes from τοὺς καρπούς in v. 43 and the epsilon from ἀκούσαντες in v. 45. “This [proposal] involves the assumption that the papyrus omitted v. 44,” writes Thomas, though he urges extreme caution in using this papyrus to support the lack of this

which links verses on the basis of key terms they share, the passage develops the cornerstone idea; the prevalence of this linkage in different segments of early Christianity suggests that the image goes back to Jesus (1 Pet 2:6–8; cf. Rom 9:33).”

²⁰ Thomas, *OP*, 64:9.

verse in the autograph. Thomas's suggestion that P¹⁰⁴ did not contain Matthew 21:44 is likely correct.²¹

If it is correct that P¹⁰⁴ omitted, or perhaps better lacked, Matthew 21:44, it would not be the only manuscript to do so.²² Among the Greek witnesses, the fifth-century Codex Bezae²³ and the ninth-century miniscule 33 both lack v. 44. Additionally, several Old Latin witnesses lack the verse and some church fathers, including Eusebius and Origen, are aware of the shorter reading. Westcott and Hort categorize this sort of variant as a "Western non-interpolation," a term they use to describe ostensible omissions found mostly in texts of the Western type and which, according to Westcott and Hort, often contain the authentic reading over-against longer variants.²⁴ With P¹⁰⁴, it is reasonable to place the variant at least as early as the mid second century and possibly even earlier. Barbara Aland writes, "Because of the extremely strict and careful way of copying, one can conclude that the papyrus did not invent the variant, but found the omission of verse

²¹ Thomas, *OP*, 64:9. J. K. Elliott, "Six New Papyri of Matthew's Gospel," *NovT* 41 (1999): 105–107, also urges caution. B. Aland, "Kriterien," 8, alternatively, calls Thomas's reconstruction an "ingeniösen Lesung" and maintains its validity. Likewise, Peter M. Head, "Some Recently Published NT Papyri: An Overview and Preliminary Assessment," *TynBul* 51 (2000): 1–16, 9 n. 18, affirms Thomas's proposal.

²² Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 47, assigns this reading a value of "C," signifying that the committee regarded the verse as "an accretion to the text," but included the passage in brackets because of its early origin. Metzger writes, "Many modern scholars regard the verse as an early interpolation (from Lk 20:18) into most manuscripts of Matthew."

²³ Bezae diverges from P¹⁰⁴ orthographically with two itacisms (ι for ει in v. 34 and possibly ει for ι in v. 35). The addition of a postpositive οὖν in v. 36 is a more substantive variant.

²⁴ Westcott and Hort were of the mind that the so-called Western non-interpolations were authentic and that expanded readings were secondary. Most scholars today question the authenticity of these variants, but B. Aland upholds this reading as "eine echte Western non interpolation" (quoted by Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 237 n. 10). It is worth noting that MS 33 is typically regarded as Alexandrian, so the omission is not an exclusively Western reading.

44. Therefore, the omission has a very early date of origin.”²⁵ Consequently, it is possible that P¹⁰⁴, and therefore Codex Bezae and miniscule 33, are witnesses to the original reading.

Three primary explanations have been offered to account for the absence of the verse: (1) the scribe of P¹⁰⁴ omitted v. 44 in harmonization to Mark, (2) P¹⁰⁴ contains the original text and v. 44 entered the tradition early on as an assimilation to the Lukan parallel, or (3) v. 44 was original to Matthew and the scribe of P¹⁰⁴ omitted it by homoioarcton or homoioteleuton.

The first possibility, that the scribe omitted the verse in harmonization to the parable in Mark 12:1–12, is not very likely. In the first place, the scribe makes no effort elsewhere in this admittedly brief text to conform to Mark. In the second place, there are no manuscripts of Luke that lack the parallel verse (Luke 20:18). Such an omission would provide corroborating evidence for an impulse in early Christian communities to omit the verse. Finally, there are very few analogous examples of lengthy harmonizing omissions in the papyri from the second and third centuries.²⁶ On the whole, scribes tend to omit only one or two words at a time.

It is possible that P¹⁰⁴ contains the earliest reading, without v. 44, and that subsequent manuscripts added the second saying in harmonization to Luke 20:18.²⁷ Such

²⁵ Aland, “Kriterien,” 8: “Wegen der überaus festen und sorgfältigen Kopierweise von P¹⁰⁴ kann man schließen, daß der Papyrus die Variante nicht selbst erfunden, sondern die Auslassung von Vers 44 vorgefunden hat. Die Omission hat also ein sehr frühes Entstehungsdatum.” Similarly, Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 238, writes, “Die relative stärkere Bezeugung für den Vers...spricht hier nicht für Ursprünglichkeit der Lesart, sondern für ihr sehr frühes Entstehungsdatum.”

²⁶ Two omissions of similar extent appear in MS 0171.

²⁷ Scholars who favor 21:44 as a later interpolation from Luke include: John S. Kloppenborg, *The Tenants in the Vineyard: Ideology, Economics, and Agrarian Conflict in Jewish Palestine*, WUNT 195

an interpolation would have needed to have been adopted early and probably in a prominent intellectual center, such as Alexandria, Antioch, or Caesarea, to account for the frequency with which the verse is found in the tradition. The interpolation theory rests on only a few arguments, the most convincing of which is the ill fit of the stone saying (v. 44) following Matthew's conclusive application (v. 43) of the quotation from Psalms (v. 42).²⁸ The sequence is undeniably otiose and proponents of scribal harmonization argue that the author of Matthew could not have been so poor a writer as to create this inelegant passage.²⁹ Therefore, they argue, the second saying arrives in Matthew by the pen of a scribe, for whom one cannot have the same literary expectations.

(Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 194–196; W. D. Davies, and Dale C. Allison, Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew*, 3 vols., ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–1997), 3:186 n. 65; François Bovon, *Luke*, trans. James E. Crouch, 3 vols., Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002–2013), 3:43; John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 865 and 879–880; B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 8; Min, *Frühste Überlieferung*, 236–237; Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew*, SP 1 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991), 301–303; Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News according to Matthew*, trans. David E. Green (Atlanta: John Knox, 1975), 415; Alexander Jones, *The Gospel according to St Matthew: A Text and Commentary for Students* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1965), 241; and Wolfgang Trilling, *Das Wahre Israel: Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-Evangeliums*, SANT 10 (Munich: Kösel, 1964), 111.

²⁸ Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 430–431, admits the ungainly sequence, but provides an explanation that does not resort to harmonization. He proposes that the very awkwardness of the passage motivated the omission of v. 43 in the Western texts. Schweizer, *Matthew*, 415, summarizes the issue succinctly, “[Verse 44] should actually follow verse 42.” Likewise, Willoughby C. Allen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Matthew*, 3rd ed., ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912), 232–233, writes, “It is not very probable that after thus interpreting the parable and closing the narrative the editor would have added v. 44, which carries the thought back again to v. 42.” R. T. France, *The Gospel according to Matthew: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 310, analyzes the strong connection between the stone sayings in Christian texts, notably 1 Peter 2:4–8 and Romans 9:32–33, and agrees that the sayings should be together without interruption.

²⁹ Matthew is known to exhibit some narrative inconsistency. For example, the number of generations between the deportation to Babylon and the messiah is given as fourteen where only thirteen are listed (cf. Matthew 1:17 and 1:12–16). It is announced that John the Baptist was arrested in Matthew 4:12, but his arrest and execution are not narrated until 14:1–12. Jesus leaves “the house” in Matthew 13:1 without having entered a house. In the Markan parallel, Jesus enters the house in Mark 3:20 and in 4:1 he begins to teach outdoors by the seaside. On the basis of Markan priority, Matthew has relocated the first narrative *after* the seaside teaching (9:32–34), thereby creating the aporia.

Arguments for harmonization that appeal to the clumsiness of the passage fall short on two fronts. First, as Andreas Ennulat rightly points out, while this solution exonerates the author, “then this ‘error’ must be blamed on an interpolator.”³⁰ There is no inherent reason why a scribe should be any less aware of the clumsy construction than the author. In fact, one would expect the scribe to insert the verse just after the first quotation, as his supposed source had it, and perhaps even to omit the second verse of the quotation from Psalm 118. Second, the argument wrongly targets v. 44 when v. 43 is the problem.³¹ The connection between the two stone sayings, as they stand in Luke, makes perfect sense by appeal to catch-word association. Likewise, the first quotation followed by an application, as it stands in Matthew, also makes sense. Moreover, it is widely agreed that v. 43 is Matthew’s own redactional contribution to the parable, so its connection with the preceding verse cannot be broken. It is the presence of v. 43 *between* the sayings that disrupts the sense. If only v. 43 were the missing verse!³²

Many scholars take a third route and affirm the originality of Matthew 21:44 on the basis of its widespread testimony in the manuscripts, especially the fourth-century codices.³³ Aland and Aland write, “The external evidence is particularly strong, and it

³⁰ Andreas Ennulat, *Die “Minor Agreements”*: Untersuchungen zu einer offenen Frage des synoptischen Problems, WUNT 2/62 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 268: “da dieser ‘Fehler’ auch einem Interpolator angelastet werden müßte.”

³¹ Malcolm Lowe, “From the Parable of the Vineyard to a Pre-Synoptic Source,” *NTS* 28 (1982): 257–263, 261, attributes v. 43 to an “anti-Jewish” revision of a proto-Matthew that included a conflated version of the stone sayings.

³² Gundry, *Matthew*, 431, summarizes aptly, “Verse 44 would have fit better right after v 42 because of the common reference to a stone in the two verses. But the awkwardness of v 44 after v 43 does not argue for clumsy interpolation of v 44. Rather, it confirms the composition of v 43 by Matthew...” See also Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 47.

³³ Scholars who accept 21:44 as probably authentic include: Klyne Snodgrass, *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants: An Inquiry into Parable Interpretation*, WUNT 27 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 66–

would be conclusive if it were supported by one of the great early papyri, but unfortunately none has been preserved for this passage.”³⁴ Since Aland and Aland made this statement, the situation has changed. With the discovery of P¹⁰⁴ there is now an early papyrus with the passage, but it does not render the verse conclusively part of Matthew’s Gospel, as Aland and Aland speculated before its discovery. In fact, it reopens the question.

Proponents of the verse’s originality also point out that the quotation in Matthew 21:44 is not identical to Luke 20:18. “Interpolation from Luke would probably have resulted in a text identical with Luke’s.”³⁵ This is not an unproblematic expectation and supposes that a scribe interested in conforming the texts would have, and could have, done so exactly. There are no examples in the second or third centuries of scribes who harmonized their texts in a deliberate or systematic way. More often than not, copyists assimilated details and phrases that they remembered without consulting a manuscript of

71; Gundry, *Matthew*, 430–431; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew*, trans. James E. Crouch, 3 vols., Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001–2007), 3:36; R. T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 807–808 n. 3; Joachim Gnilka, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, 2 vols., HThKNT (Freiburg: Herder, 1986–1988), 2:224–225; Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Matthäusevangelium*, 2 vols., NEchtB (Würtzburg: Echter, 1985–1987), 2:207; Aland and Aland, *Text*, 237; Donald P. Senior, *Matthew*, ANTC (Nashville: Abingdon, 1998), 241; M. Eugene Boring, *The Gospel of Matthew: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections*, NIB 8 (Nashville: Abingdon, 1995), 414; Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, THKNT 1 (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1968), 464; Ennulat, *Minor Agreements*, 267–268; Frank Wheeler, “Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem: A Textual Commentary on the Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark” (PhD diss., Baylor University, 1985), 204–209; and Alexander Sand, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, RNT (Regensburg: Pustet, 1986), 432–433. Douglas R. A. Hare, *Matthew*, IBC (Louisville: John Knox, 1993), 250, claims, “Many now argue that it [v. 44] is an authentic part of Matthew’s Gospel, not a scribal interpolation taken from Luke 20:18.” He is certainly right that the majority of modern commentators affirm its originality, but most of these do not in fact *argue* the point.

³⁴ Aland and Aland, *Text*, 237.

³⁵ Gundry, *Matthew*, 431.

the parallel text. This particular argument against harmonization, resting as it does on “slight differences,” is not persuasive on its own.³⁶

Those who stand for the authenticity of v. 44 also suggest that the scribe has omitted the sentence by homoioarcton or homoioteleuton, that is, a scribal leap from one word, syllable, or letter to the next iteration of the same.³⁷ It is conceivable that the scribe transcribed the *καί* at the beginning of v. 44 and leapt to the next iteration of *καί* at the beginning of v. 45 (homoioteleuton).³⁸ Another possibility is that the scribe leapt from *αὐτῆς* at the end of v. 43 to *αὐτόν* at the end of v. 44 (homoioarcton). This is possible, but, as Aland and Aland note, it is not likely in this case since the words are not in fact the same.³⁹ The individual arguments *against* harmonization and *for* authenticity are not persuasive on their own, but must stand together.

The previous discussion has proceeded without assumptions as to the interdependence of the Synoptic Gospels. That is to say, the Two Document Hypothesis has not been presumed. Is it possible that a theory of Synoptic relations may provide some clarity? The theory of Matthean posteriority presumes that Matthew knew both Mark and Luke. At first glance, Matthean posteriority seems to account for the otiose order of vv. 42–44 in Matthew. If Matthew had used Luke as a source, then he might have inopportunately inserted his own redactional commentary between the two stone sayings. Unfortunately, posteriority raises more questions than it solves. Matthew could

³⁶ Gundry, *Matthew*, 430. The disagreement in wording is confined to the first clause.

³⁷ So Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 47. See also James R. Royse, “The Treatment of Scribal Leaps in Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*,” *NTS* 29 (1983): 539–551. Royse offers a thorough explanation of the phenomenon with criticism of its application in modern textual criticism.

³⁸ So Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 237.

³⁹ Aland and Aland, *Text*, 237.

not have used only Luke as a source, because Luke does not cite both verses of Psalm 118:22–23. In this scenario, Matthew would have had to have merged Mark’s full citation of the Psalm with Luke’s double stone saying. Meanwhile, despite the close attention to the sources required for this conflation, he awkwardly interrupted the narrative with his own redactional take on the parable. This seems an unlikely process of development.

None of the three proposals addressed above are completely satisfactory; an explanation is required that accounts for the connection of the two stone sayings in Luke and Matthew and explains the unity of v. 43 following the first stone saying in Matthew. J. A. Robinson takes this parable as evidence of an Ur-Mark or *Grundschrift* used by all three Synoptics.⁴⁰ Appeals to Ur-Mark as an easy remedy should not be a first suggestion, but the theory does account for the facts in this situation where it is problematic to presume harmonization. In a similar trajectory, Ennulat argues that the best explanation appeals to a deutero-Markan redaction of Mark that includes both the quotation from the Old Testament and the second stone saying.⁴¹ If Matthew derived his episode from Mark as it is known today, without the second saying, and Luke derived his narrative from an earlier or later “edition” of Mark with the second aphorism, the problem would be accounted for. Or perhaps both Matthew and Luke knew a version of Mark with both sayings or had received such a version through oral transmission. Luke copied this version correctly, but Matthew began his application of the first quotation at an

⁴⁰ J. A. T. Robinson, “The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen: A Test of Synoptic Relationships,” *NTS* 21 (1975): 443–461, 456–457. Theories depending on Ur-Markus are susceptible to circular reasoning and convenience, but this does not alter the fact that Ur-Markus *could* account for the situation and that other solutions are unsatisfactory.

⁴¹ Ennulat, *Minor Agreements*, 267–268. Luz, *Matthew*, 3:36, appears to be persuaded on this point. Many critics of “Ur-Markus” will likely find the same weaknesses with “deutero-Mark.” The point here is not in favor of Ur-Markus or deutero-Mark, but in favor of an additional source.

unfortunate place, between the two stone sayings. As Robert Gundry explains, in his “eagerness to write about the transfer of the kingdom as the ‘marvelous’ interpretation of v 22,” Matthew has awkwardly delayed v. 44.⁴²

In a slightly different direction, Albright and Mann affirm that Matthew is not dependent on Luke for this verse, but posit instead that “this kind of text, an allusive reference to OT material, is the nearest firm indication that we have of a collection of “logia” or sayings of Jesus, from which both Matthew and Luke drew.”⁴³ Along these lines, but perhaps more open-ended, Georg Strecker suggests, “It is not impossible that in the written or oral pre-Matthean Tradition, as in Luke, v. 44 followed immediately after the quotation...Matthew then inserted v. 43...”⁴⁴ It is impossible to determine whether any of these particular proposals is correct because each one appeals to a hypothetical source. Nevertheless, each proposal at its core affirms that the most satisfying solution to this textual problem involves a shared source for Matthew and Luke—whether Ur-Mark or deutero-Mark, a collection of logia, or oral or other written tradition—that was adapted in different ways by the respective evangelists.⁴⁵

⁴² Gundry, *Matthew*, 431.

⁴³ W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann, *Matthew: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, AB (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1971), 266–267. The authors go on to say that this does not explain how the verses were inserted into the narrative in the same place. The *Gospel of Thomas* may be analogous since it includes the parable of the vineyard in logion 65 followed by, and not directly connected to, a slightly modified citation of the first stone saying in logia 66.

⁴⁴ Georg Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit: Untersuchung zur Theologie Matthäus*, 2nd ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 111: “Es ist nicht unmöglich, daß in der schriftlichen oder mündlichen vormatthäischen Überlieferung wie bei Lukas V. 44 unmittelbar auf das Zitat (Mk. 12,10f.: Ps. 117,22f. LXX) folgte. Matthäus hat dann V. 43 eingeschoben, wie aus dem Vergleich mit den Seitenreferenten in jedem Fall hervorgeht.”

⁴⁵ Gnika, *Matthäusevangelium*, 2:225, supposes Matthew and Luke both used a *florilegium* of stone sayings.

To summarize, the apparent absence of Matthew 21:44 in P¹⁰⁴ *may* be a harmonizing omission to Mark, or the inclusion of Matthew 21:44 in the majority of manuscripts *may* be an early harmonizing interpolation from Luke 20:18. It is more likely, however, that Matthew and Luke independently knew a tradition with both stone sayings into which Matthew interjected his own v. 43. In this case, harmonization is not a factor and there are no assimilating variants in P¹⁰⁴. Ultimately, one must yield to Thomas's caution against hanging one's hat on this peg, since the entire theory depends on a reconstruction from two letters on the back of a very old fragmentary papyrus.

P¹⁰³ (P.Oxy. 4403) – Matthew 13:55–56; 14:3–5

P¹⁰³ is a fragment from a papyrus codex found at Oxyrhynchus. The handwriting suggests a date of origin late in the second century and shares distinctive features with P⁷⁷ (P.Oxy. 4405 [=2683]). Thomas finds it plausible that the two fragments are from the same codex. It is best to follow his example, however, in treating them separately.⁴⁶ Though the papyrus offers the earliest attestation of its text, it is not of much value text-critically because it is so fragmentary. Even so, the document does contain several unique features worth discussing.⁴⁷ There are three certain variants and potentially two more in

⁴⁶ Thomas, *OP*, 64:5–7 and Plates I and II, writes, “It seems to me safest to treat the papyri as from two different codices.” Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 609, are convinced the pages come from the same codex or that the same scribe produced both sheets. According to Comfort, “The only difference in physical appearance is that P¹⁰³ is not as bilinear as P⁷⁷, but this difference is very slight.” Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 231–232, also finds the evidence that the two papyri are from the same codex compelling. Alternatively, Head, “Recently,” 9, is not certain the papyri belong together.

⁴⁷ So B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 11. Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 226, also finds the text too small to be useful. He writes, “Der Papyrus enthält ein so kleines Fragment, dass er stark ergänzt werden muss. Die Lücken des Papyrus können jedoch nicht sicher rekonstruiert werden. Denn vor allem entspricht der Ausgangstext ihnen nicht. Deswegen ist es, wenn auch nicht ganz ausgeschlossen, doch sehr schwierig, den Papyrus textkritisch zu beurteilen.”

the lacunose edges of the papyrus.⁴⁸ In terms of harmonization, Min writes, “The papyrus may have three variants that could possibly be counted among the harmonizations.”⁴⁹

Two of these three assimilating variants occur in lacunae.

(2) Matthew 13:55 – οὐχ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ λέγεται Μαριάμ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ

Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωσήφ καὶ Σίμων καὶ Ἰούδας (Ἰωσή; //Mark 6:3)⁵⁰

(3) Matthew 13:56 – καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ οὐχὶ πᾶσαι ἄλλοις ἑστῶσι (ἄλλοις; //Mark 6:3; Singular; Lacuna)

The first relevant reading appears in the list of Jesus’s brothers in Matthew 13:55.

Matthew lists the brothers as James, Joseph, Simon, and Judas. The scribe has replaced Joseph (Ἰωσήφ) with Joses (Ἰωσή).⁵¹ Ἰωσήφ is the indeclinable Greek form of the Hebrew name Joseph (יְהוֹשֻׁעַ), while, according to Metzger, Ἰωσή “represents the Galilean pronunciation (יְהוֹשֻׁעַ) of the correct Hebrew (יְהוֹשֻׁעַ).”⁵² The scribe has replaced Matthew’s Greek form of the full Hebrew name with the Greek form of the shortened Hebrew name current in Galilee. This onomastic variant is “a common abbreviated form of a common

⁴⁸ Of the certain variants, one is a singular reading (omission of εἰσίν) that was subsequently corrected.

⁴⁹ Min, *Frühste Überlieferung*, 230: “Der Papyrus könnte drei Abweichungen haben, die möglicherweise zu den Harmonisierungen gezählt werden können.” Wasserman, “Early Text of Matthew,” 99–100, affirms Min’s characterization of the textual quality as “at least normal” and the transmission character as “very free.”

⁵⁰ P¹⁰³ K L W Y Δ Π Φ 0106 0119 f¹³ 22 28 180 205 543 565 597 1241 1243 1342 1346 1506 1582^c.

⁵¹ Manuscripts that substitute Ἰωάννης include: Ⲛ* D E F G M S* U V X Γ 2 28 213 262 280 471 472 475 476 478 481 517 565 566 579 1170 1187 1207 1424 1505 1675.

⁵² Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 28.

Jewish name.”⁵³ In Mark 6:3, the list of brothers includes James, *Joses* (Ἰωσῆτος), Judas, and Simon.⁵⁴ Ἰωσῆτος is the genitive form of Ἰωσῆς. Adela Collins notes, “Some foreign names were Hellenized with the endings -ῆς, -ῆτος following the model of certain Ionic names.”⁵⁵ Therefore, there are not three different names in the manuscripts, but full, abbreviated, and Hellenized versions of one name. Where Mark uses the less familiar Ἰωσῆτος, Matthew uses the more common Ἰωσήφ, which suits his Christological emphases by further reinforcing Jesus’s Davidic lineage through his brother’s namesake, Joseph the husband of Mary.⁵⁶ The scribe, most likely under the influence of Mark 6:3, has reverted to the Galilean form of the name.⁵⁷

In the manuscript, the remnants of one word with a clear iota, possibly εἰσίν, appear superlinearly over the word πόθεν in Matthew 13:56. Πόθεν is the first word to appear on the line due to fragmentation, but it is not the first word of the line. Perhaps a hole in the papyrus or some other irregularity forced the scribe to write one of the words above the line? It is more likely that the word εἰσίν was omitted accidentally but was

⁵³ Richard Bauckham, “Who Were the Relatives of Jesus?,” in *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church* (London: T&T Clark, 1990), 5–44, 6.

⁵⁴ Manuscripts of Mark with Ἰωσήφ include: Ⲛ 121 827. Manuscripts with Ἰωσῆ include: A C M N U W Π Σ Φ¹ 2 21 22 28 69 118 157 180 205 209 230 330 485 569 578 597 713 826^s 828^c 892 1006 1010 1071 1093 1241 1243 1292 1342 1396 1424 1505 1506 1604 ℞. One manuscript has Ἰωσῆ (K), NA²⁸ cites K in support of Ἰωσῆ.

⁵⁵ Adela Yarbo Collins, *Mark*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress: 2007), 288 n. e. Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 230, also attributes the change in P¹⁰³ to “die Hellenisierung des Semitischen Namens.”

⁵⁶ Gnllka, *Matthäusevangelium*, 2:514, writes, “Auch hier “rejudaisiert” Mt [Mark’s] Joses.”

⁵⁷ On Ἰωσῆς as the Galilean form of the name see Allen, *Matthew*, 156; Luz, *Matthew*, 2:300; and Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 28. Metzger calls the appearance of Ἰωσῆς or Ἰωσῆ in some manuscripts “an intrusion from Mk 6.3.” For assimilation as the probable explanation see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:457 n. 17; Donald L. Hagner, *Matthew*, 2 vols., WBC 33a-b (Dallas: Word Books, 1993–1995), 2:403 n. c; and Sand, *Matthäus*, 300.

subsequently corrected by insertion above the line by the same or a different scribe. The line is broken before the word *πόθεν*, but one expects approximately ten or eleven letters. The majority reading, “are with us” (*πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰσίν*), would have resulted in a twenty-nine letter line, higher than the average of twenty-six but equal to the longest line in the fragment as it is reconstructed in the *ed. pr.* With *εἰσίν* apparently written above the line, the remaining letters come to only twenty-four letters, one letter shorter than the shortest line. This variant, the (corrected) omission of *εἰσίν*, seems to have produced a third: a longer reading is required where no longer variant is witnessed in other manuscripts.

This creates the frustrating circumstance of knowing that a singular reading existed, but without concrete evidence as to what it may have been. Searching for a solution, Thomas cites David Parker’s suggestion that the scribe initially had added the word “here” (*ᾧδε*) in conformity with the reading of Mark 6:3, “And are not his sisters *here* with us (*ᾧδε πρὸς ἡμᾶς*).” The redundancy of “here” (*ᾧδε*) alongside “with us” (*πρὸς ἡμᾶς*) is typical of Mark.⁵⁸ It is possible that the scribe has added *ᾧδε* under the influence of the Markan parallel. The incorporation of the adverb would result in twenty-seven letters, one letter more than the average and two less than the longest line. If it is the case that the scribe of P¹⁰³ added *ᾧδε*, this would constitute a second variant assimilating to Mark 6:3.

(4) Matthew 14:4 – οὐκ ἔξεστίν σοι ἔχειν τὴν γυναῖκα ταύτην; //Mark 6:18;

Singular; Lacuna)

⁵⁸ On the basis of Markan priority, Allen, *Matthew*, xxiv; Gundry, *Matthew*, 284; and Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:459 comment on Matthew’s improvement of Markan redundancy in this passage.

In Matthew 14:4, during the description of John the Baptist’s opposition to Herod’s affair with his brother’s wife, John says, “It is not lawful for you to have her (αὐτήν).” In P¹⁰³, there is a lacuna at the end of the line in the middle of this sentence:⁵⁹

ουκ ἐξεστιν σοι εχ[]
την και θελων αυ[]

The letters -την- at the beginning of the lower line ostensibly belong to the word αὐτήν. If this word is supplied, however, the length of the upper line is only twenty letters, six short of the average for this fragment. A longer reading is necessary, but there are no variants known from other manuscripts that would fill the space. Min suggests the manuscript originally had, “It is not lawful for you to have *this woman* (γυναῖκα ταύτην),” instead of “to have *her*” (ἔχειν αὐτήν).⁶⁰ The longer reading brings the number of letters in the line to twenty-eight, two letters longer than the average, but within the range of possibility since the fourth line on the recto appears to have contained twenty-nine letters.

This emendation is appealing because it fills the lacuna, which is all but required since it is unrealistic that a scribe would break a line in the middle of a word and short of the margin. The reading is plausible on the basis of harmonization to Mark 6:18, “It is not lawful for you to have *the wife* (τὴν γυναῖκα) of your brother.” In Mark, Herodias is referred to as “wife” or “woman” (γυναῖκα) rather than simply as “her” (αὐτήν), though admittedly not in the phrase “this woman” (γυναῖκα ταύτην).

⁵⁹ Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 229, remarks on this and the previous harmonization, “In den Lücken scheint der Papyrus jedenfalls zwei zusätzliche Singulärlesarten gehabt zu haben, die in der gesamten neutestamentlichen Überlieferung nicht zu finden sind...”

⁶⁰ Erich Klostermann, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, HNT 4 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1971), 127, notes that the majority Matthew reading has shortened Mark’s τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου to αὐτήν. The scribe has simply restored part of the Markan reading.

Although the parallel is not exact, this is the type of harmonizing variant one would expect from a scribe. He has not created a thoroughgoing assimilation, but has allowed material from an external source to enter his copy of Matthew. Min describes the scribe's tendency aptly; he writes, "The writer seems to have made many harmonizations to Synoptic parallels. But he had little interest in harmonization per se, because he has not systematically, but only occasionally and probably unconsciously (*unbewusst*), harmonized the text."⁶¹

All three of the harmonizing variants in this manuscript have been made under the influence of Mark, exhibiting a pattern of familiarity with that Gospel, but not belying a systematic undertaking to conform Matthew to the Second Gospel. The last harmonizing reading is imaginative rather than textual. The scribe has not created an exact linguistic assimilation; rather, he has been influenced by his memory of the version of John's conversation with Herod in Mark where John speaks about the "woman" of Herod's brother.

The scribe of P¹⁰³ was quite careless, both in omitting and adding words.⁶² Unfortunately, in two out of three of the instances where harmonization may be at play, the variant must be reconstructed from a lacuna. If both of these reconstructions are correct, however, a pattern of conformity toward Mark appears.

⁶¹ Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 230: "Der Schreiber scheint also viele Harmonisierungen zu Synoptischen Parallelen hergestellt zu haben. Er hatte aber kaum Interesse an Harmonisierungen an sich, weil er den Text nicht systematisch, sondern nur gelegentlich und wahrscheinlich unbewusst harmonisiert hat."

⁶² Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 229, states, "Die Zahl der Singulärlesart ist angesichts des ganz kleinen Umfangs sehr groß. Dies passt zu der nachlässigen Schreibweise des Kopisten."

P⁷⁷ (P.Oxy. 4405=2683) – Matthew 23:30–34, 35–39

P⁷⁷ is a papyrus leaf from a late second-century codex from Oxyrhynchus containing the earliest testimony to Matthew 23:30–34 and 35–39.⁶³ The document consists of two pieces of papyrus published at different times whose shared origin was later identified. According to Comfort and Barrett, “P. Oxy. 2683 and 4405, fragments of one leaf (one fragment published in 1968 and the other in 1997), fit side by side.”⁶⁴ The break is not horizontal, but slightly diagonal, so that the second fragment completes lines that were previously partial. There are as many as ten variants in this slight fragment, with up to five singular readings. Three variants appear to be the result of assimilation.⁶⁵ When only the first fragment was available, Kurt Aland judged the manuscript to have an “at least normal text.”⁶⁶ It is clear now, in light of the second fragment, that the manuscript’s textual quality is more distinctive. Min classifies the text as “free,” given the plethora of variants.⁶⁷

⁶³ For the *ed. pr.* see L. Ingrams et al., eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 34, Graeco-Roman Memoirs 49 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1968), 1–4 and Plate I. For the second publication see Thomas, *OP*, 64:9–13 and Plates I and II. Parsons, *OP*, 34:1; and Joseph Van Haelst, *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens*, Papyrologie 1 (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1976), 137 no. 372, date the fragment to the late second century; Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 610, to the mid second century. Kurt Aland, *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri. Vol. 1: Biblische Papyri*, PTS 18 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1976), 313, prefers a second- or third-century date.

⁶⁴ Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 609.

⁶⁵ See, Head, “Recently Published,” 7–8; and Idem., “Observations,” 245, for a brief analysis and comparison with other early fragments of Matthew from Oxyrhynchus.

⁶⁶ Kurt Aland, “Der neue ‘Standard-Text’ in seinem Verhältnis zu den frühen Papyri und Majuskeln,” in *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis, Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger*, ed. Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee (Oxford: Clarendon, 1981), 257–275, 265: “mindestens Normaltext.”

⁶⁷ Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 208.

(5) Matthew 23:37a – ποσάκις ἠθέλησα⁶⁸ ἔπισυναγαγεῖν τὰ τέκνα σου

(ἔπισυνάξαι; //Luke 13:34; Singular)⁶⁹

(6) Matthew 23:37b – ὃν τρόπον ἡ ὄρνις ἐπισυνάγει τὰ νοσσία αὐτῆς ὑπὸ τὰς

πτέρυγας (ἡ ὄρνιξ; //Luke 13:34 & D W; Singular)

(7) Matthew 23:38 – ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ὁ ἔρημος (//Luke 13:35; Sub-

singular P^{77lac} B L; Lacuna)⁷⁰

In Matthew 23:37a, Jesus cries out to Jerusalem, “How often I desired to gather (ἐπισυναγαγεῖν) your children together.” The Lukan expression of the same lament differs only in the tense of the infinitive; Luke uses the first aorist ἐπισυνάξαι instead of Matthew’s second aorist ἐπισυναγαγεῖν. The scribe of P⁷⁷ has adopted the first aorist form of Luke 13:34.⁷¹

In the same verse, Jesus uses the metaphor of a hen (ὄρνις) gathering her chicks. The accepted text of the parallel, Luke 13:34, also reads ὄρνις, but several important and diverse witnesses testify to the attic reading ὄρνιξ (& D W) in Luke. These important codices are among the earliest from the Alexandrian, Western, and Pre-Caesarean text types. It is this form of the word that is found as a singular reading in the Matthew text of

⁶⁸ The scribe of P⁷⁷ writes ἠθέληκα, possibly intending a perfect form.

⁶⁹ Thomas, *OP*, 64:11, explains that the reading “ἐπισυνα[γει]ν is perhaps possible in 4405, but ἐπισυνα[ξ]αι is an easier reading.”

⁷⁰ NA²⁷ cites P⁷⁷ in favor of ἔρημος, but this is corrected in NA²⁸.

⁷¹ Despite being a singular reading, Origen and Eusebius both know this variant in Matthew. In the Luke text of 27 28 71 118* 577 579 827 892 1010 1071 1194 1220 1424 1458 2487 2613 2766 the verb corresponds to Matthew’s ἐπισυναγαγεῖν.

P⁷⁷. The alteration may reflect the assimilating influence of an important, if not ultimately persistent, variant in Luke 13:34.⁷²

Finally, Matthew 23:38 and Luke 13:35 are identical except for one word. In Matthew, Jesus laments over Jerusalem, “Behold, your house is left to you *desolate*” (ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἔρημος). Luke’s lament does not include the word “desolate” (ἔρημος).⁷³ The scribe of P⁷⁷ has created a harmonizing variant in his copy of Matthew by omitting ἔρημος, though the word falls at a broken point in the fragment. The lacuna in the middle of the line is not quite large enough for the expected Matthean reading, requiring one word to be omitted.⁷⁴ Despite its omission from Codex Vaticanus, L, and apparently P⁷⁷, Metzger upholds the authenticity of ἔρημος in Matthew and explains that the committee found it likely that scribes would have deleted the word from their texts as redundant. Metzger’s committee did consider, but ultimately dismissed, the possibility that later scribes might have added the word to Matthew in order to allude more closely to Jeremiah 22:5 LXX, which reads, “But if you do not do these words,

⁷² The apparatus of NA²⁸ cites P^{77vid} for the reading ὄρνις ἐπισυνάγει, disagreeing with the *ed. pr.* with regard to the noun and with Thomas and Comfort and Barrett with regard to the entire phrase. The note may be referring to the *order* in which the words, although different in form, appear, as Elliott, “Six New Papyri,” 107, suggests.

⁷³ Manuscripts with ἔρημος include: D E G H M N U Δ Θ Ψ f¹³ 2^c 28 33 118 157 180 205 700 892 1071 1241 1342 1346 1424 1505 1582^c. IGNTP prefers ἔρημος. Manuscripts without ἔρημος include: P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ ⑆ A B K L W Y Γ Λ Π Ω 028 047 f¹ 2* 69 565 579 597 788 1010 1292 1582* 2542. France, *Matthew*, 882 n. 2, prefers the shorter reading.

⁷⁴ Parsons, *OP*, 34:4, and Thomas following him, reconstruct the line with ἔρημος because a trace of the last letter in the lacuna is more similar to a sigma than a nu. The discovery of the second fragment makes it clear that a word must be omitted. Thomas, *OP*, 64:11, suggests ὑμῶν may have been the omitted word. Elliott, “Six New Papyri,” 107; and B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 5, concur with Thomas’s caveat. Luz, *Matthew*, 3:158, cites P⁷⁷ in support of ἔρημος. Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 611, prefer the reading with ἔρημος and without omission of any other word, creating a line a few letters too long. Their transcription of the first word in the line, ἀφίεται instead of ἀφειεται, buys them an extra letter. Head, “Recently Published,” 7–8, doubts the trace of ink belongs to a sigma, thereby reopening the question.

against which I swore by myself, says the Lord, that this house will be a desolation” (ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ποιήσητε τοὺς λόγους τούτους κατ’ ἐμαυτοῦ ὡμοσα λέγει κύριος ὅτι εἰς ἐρήμωσιν ἔσται ὁ οἶκος οὗτος).⁷⁵

With regard to the version in Luke, the evidence suggests that ἔρημος did not appear in Luke but was added by scribes in harmonization to Matthew 23:38 or, less likely, Jeremiah 22:5.⁷⁶ Especially interesting is the absence of the word in P⁷⁵, a mid third-century manuscript of Luke widely regarded as trustworthy. This early witness confirms that ἔρημος was not in the Lukan text in the mid third century. It is apparent, then, that the scribe of P⁷⁷ created a harmonizing variant in Matthew under the influence of Luke 13:35 and so, indirectly, the manuscript serves as the earliest evidence for the absence of ἔρημος in Luke.

The scribe of P⁷⁷ was prone to assimilate to the Lukan version of Jesus’s lament over Jerusalem.⁷⁷ Min explains, “He has thus, while writing this part, unconsciously (unbewusst) reproduced from memory what he had in mind.”⁷⁸ Min is convinced that these variant readings are the product of the scribe and not his exemplar, though attributing the variants to an earlier scribe does not alter the fact that they have occurred

⁷⁵ Metzger, *Text*, 50–51. See also Luz, *Matthew*, 3:158. Klostermann, *Matthäusevangelium*, 191, agrees that ἔρημος could have been added in harmonization to Jeremiah 22:5, but believes the post-70 CE perspective on the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple itself may also have contributed to the addition. Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:679 n. d, suggests both harmonization to Luke and harmonization to Jeremiah as potential sources for the omission. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:321, attribute the omission of ἔρημος in B and L to assimilation; P⁷⁷ would now be included in that list. Wasserman, “Early Text of Matthew,” 98, also suggests harmonization.

⁷⁶ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 138.

⁷⁷ See also Head, “Recently Published,” 7–8.

⁷⁸ Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 206, “Er hat also beim Schreiben zum Teil das, was er im Kopf hatte, unbewusst aus dem Gedächtnis wiedergegeben.”

through parallel influence. As with P¹⁰³, the scribe appears careless and prone to allowing external influences to alter his copy of the Gospel. Comfort and Barrett are so impressed by his penmanship that they call this copyist a trained scribe, which is odd given his regular propensity to diverge from his exemplar even in such a minute sample.⁷⁹ It is likely that if a larger sample of his work were available, alterations toward parallel passages would be even more abundant. Even so, the assimilating variants do not alter the sense or interpretation of the passages in which they are found.

It was noted earlier that many scholars have speculated that P⁷⁷ and P¹⁰³ were copied by the same scribe and belong to the same manuscript. Where recent arguments about the relationship of P⁷⁷ and P¹⁰³ have centered on physical features (e.g. size of the papyrus, shape of the letters, use of punctuation), a comparison of scribal habits can now be added to the discussion.⁸⁰ Both texts appear to have been copied by a careless scribe who manifested a propensity toward harmonization, though not wholesale or systematic assimilation. P¹⁰³ primarily betrays the influence of Mark; in P⁷⁷ harmonization to Luke is prevalent. In both cases, parallel passages are only available in the Gospel to which the scribe assimilated. The consistent pattern of permitting parallel material to influence the text in both papyri coheres with earlier evidence and further reinforces the hypothesis of a shared scribe.

⁷⁹ Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 610. Aland and Aland, *Text*, 101, more accurately describe P⁷⁷ as an “at least normal text, by a careless scribe.”

⁸⁰ Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 232, takes this approach in comparing the papyri.

**P^{64/67} (P.Magdalen Gr. 17/P.Barcelona 1) – Matthew 3:9, 15; 5:20–22, 25–28 (P⁶⁷);
Matthew 26:7–8, 10, 14–15, 22–23, 31–33 (P⁶⁴)**

In 1953, Colin Roberts published the *editio princeps* of P⁶⁴, three very small fragments of Matthew, which he dated to the late second century.⁸¹ In 1957, another group of small papyrus fragments of Matthew (P⁶⁷) was published and dated to the late second century by Ramón Roca-Puig.⁸² Both fragments share a distinctive two-column format and a script that Roberts describes as a “predecessor of biblical uncial.” By 1961, Roberts had suggested and confirmed with Roca-Puig that the two sets of fragments belong to the same scribe and manuscript.⁸³

Roberts later suggested that P^{64/67} also shares a common identity with P⁴, a fragmentary manuscript of Luke.⁸⁴ This assertion was made on the basis of similarities in handwriting, the atypical two-column format of P^{64/67} and P⁴, and similarities in size. Additionally, P⁶⁴ was purchased in Luxor, Egypt, near Coptos, where P⁴ was found.⁸⁵ Since then, there has been little to no doubt that a single scribe copied both texts, but it

⁸¹ Colin H. Roberts, “An Early Papyrus of the First Gospel,” *HTR* 46 (1953): 233–237. Aland, *Repertorium*, 293, gives a date “um 200.” See also Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 125–126 no. 336.

⁸² See the second publication in Ramón Roca-Puig, *Un Papir Grec de l’Evangeli de Sant Mateu*, 2nd ed. (Barcelona, 1962).

⁸³ For the identification of the two papyri see Ramón Roca-Puig, “Nueva publicación del papiro número uno del Barcelona,” *Helmantica* 37 (1961): 5–20; and Colin H. Roberts, “Complementary Note to the Article of Prof. Roca-Puig,” *Helmantica* 37 (1961): 123–124.

⁸⁴ For his proposal and arguments see Colin H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (London: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1979), 13, and Roberts and Skeat, *Birth of the Codex*, 40, 65–66. Charles E. Hill, “Intersections of Jewish and Christian Scribal Culture: The Original Codex Containing P4, P64, and P67 and its Implications,” in *Among Jews, Gentiles, and Christians in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, ed. Reidar Hvalvik and John Kaufman (Trondheim: Tapir Academic Press, 2011), 75–91, has put forward the most recent iteration of this argument.

⁸⁵ The provenance of P⁶⁷ is not certain, but the association of P⁶⁴ with Egypt is sure. Additionally, Roberts, “Early Papyrus,” 233, remarks that Rev. Charles Huleatt, who donated P⁶⁴ to Magdalen College, was in possession of other manuscripts at the time.

has been a matter of debate whether the two manuscripts belong to the same codex.⁸⁶ T. C. Skeat took up the theory and provided additional arguments that P^{64/67} and P⁴ were the remnants of a single-quire, four-gospel codex from the second century.⁸⁷ Skeat makes this argument by reconstructing the final leaves of Matthew and the initial pages of Luke on the basis of the later fragments of P⁶⁴ and earliest pieces of P⁴. He concludes that the Matthew text must have ended near the bottom of column two (second column on the front of a leaf) and that the following text must have begun overleaf at the top of column three. According to his calculations, the Luke text must have started at the top of column one, beginning on the front of its own leaf. Therefore, if Luke had followed Matthew, an entire page (the back of the final folio of Matthew) must have been left blank, which he deems unlikely. Thus, he concludes, another text, probably John or Mark, intervened, and since a three-gospel codex is improbable, it must have been a four-gospel codex.

It is not clear that Roberts would have concurred with Skeat that P^{64/67} + P⁴ was a four-gospel codex. Initially, Roberts had said that in order “to contain the entire Gospel of St. Matthew the book (P⁶⁴) must have run to about 150 pages; we may conclude that in all probability it contained nothing else.”⁸⁸ He later emended his estimate to 90 pages, but in order to contain all four Gospels the codex would have been at its absolute outside

⁸⁶ Skeat, “Oldest Manuscript,” 159–165, provides a detailed analysis of the script and punctuation, especially noting the characteristic formation of the kappa.

⁸⁷ Skeat, “Oldest Manuscript,” 158–192. In an earlier article, T. C. Skeat, “Irenaeus and the Four-Gospel Canon,” in *Writings of T. C. Skeat*, 73–78, had suggested on the basis of Irenaeus’s adamant defense of the four-fold Gospel that the innovation of the four-gospel codex had come into being by about 170 CE. Skeat believes the four-fold Gospel and the four-gospel codex were innovations designed to canonize the orthodox Gospels and to reject various other spurious gospel texts that had arisen in the late second century.

⁸⁸ Roberts, “Early Papyrus,” 234.

capacity.⁸⁹ Skeat estimates that the entire four-gospel codex could have been contained in 120–130 leaves (240–260 pages), a very large manuscript for one quire.⁹⁰

Skeat's arguments are persuasive to many, but recently Peter Head and S. D. Charlesworth have separately presented rebuttals to Skeat's final conclusions.⁹¹ Head's main concern is that Skeat used minimal evidence to make too precise of an argument. According to him, it is entirely reasonable to reconstruct the text in such a way that Luke could easily have followed after Matthew without an intervening text or leaving a page blank. Therefore, if the shared identity of the three papyri is permitted, this need not prove that the manuscript originally held all four Gospels. Furthermore, Head is not at all convinced that P^{64/67} and P⁴ are from the same manuscript, though he affirms that the same scribe likely copied both papyri. Some factors pointing to separate manuscripts include dissimilar practices of *ekthesis* (outdentation at the beginning of certain lines), variations in the thickness of the script, probably due to a change in pen,⁹² differences in

⁸⁹ Roberts, "Complementary Note," 123–124.

⁹⁰ Skeat, "Oldest Manuscript," 177. In Roberts and Skeat, *Birth of the Codex*, 66, the authors had suggested 144 leaves (288 pages). They admit that this would have produced a codex larger than any other known from the second century.

⁹¹ Graham N. Stanton, "The Fourfold Gospel," *NTS* 43 (1997): 317–346, fully embraced Skeat's proposal in his presidential address to the Society for New Testament Studies in 1996. Since then, Peter M. Head, "Is P⁴, P⁶⁴, and P⁶⁷ the Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels? A Response to T. C. Skeat," *NTS* 51 (2005): 450–457, has offered a systematic rebuttal to several of Skeat's claims while maintaining his appreciation for Skeat's positive accomplishments in the article.

⁹² Greek scribes typically used hard pens made out of reeds that could be split to absorb ink and sharpened as the tip became dull. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts*, 8, explains that Greek scribes would cut their reeds with a broad point. In other text-critical literature, reed pens and quills are often referred to with the generic word "stylus." Styluses used with wax tablets were commonly made of iron with one end sharpened to cut letters into the wax and the other end flattened to smooth over or "erase" the markings.

the coloration of the papyri, something Kurt Aland had noted much earlier,⁹³ and differences in provenance, since the Matthew fragments were not found in the sealed hiding place where P⁴ was discovered. Head's own conclusions are more cautious; he suggests that P^{64/67} and P⁴ were composed by the same scribe (the hands are "virtually indistinguishable"), but come from two different manuscripts with P⁴ being copied somewhat later.⁹⁴

S. D. Charlesworth critiques Skeat's proposal from a codicological perspective and shows that P⁶⁷ itself could not have been a single-quire codex on the basis of a shift in the orientation of the papyrus. The fibers of the fragments with earlier text run vertical on the front and horizontal on the back, while later fragments display the reverse orientation.⁹⁵ In fact, Roberts made a similar claim about P⁶⁴ in its initial publication. He writes, "As verso preceded recto in the second half of the Gospel it is almost certain that

⁹³ Kurt Aland, "Neue neutestamentliche Papyri," *NTS* 12 (1966): 193–210, 193. In this article, Aland appears convinced by the shared identity of P^{64/67} and P⁴, but in later publications he lists the papyri separately, implying a change of mind on the matter.

⁹⁴ Head, "Oldest Manuscript," 451, 457. See also, *Ibid.*, "The Date of the Magdalen Papyrus of Matthew (P. MAGD. GR. 17 = P64): A Response to C. P. Thiede," *TynBul* 46 (1995): 251–285, 257. Philip W. Comfort, "Exploring the Common Identification of Three New Testament Manuscripts: P⁴, P⁶⁴, and P⁶⁷," *TynBul* 46 (1995): 43–54, was also convinced that the three papyri were composed by the same scribe and that the Matthew text may have been composed somewhat earlier with a different stylus. He writes, "Thus, I cannot confidently make an absolute identification of the three manuscripts as having belonged to the same codex." After personally viewing P⁶⁴ and P⁴, however, he expresses more confidence in their shared identification and writes in *Text*, 50, "Thus, it seems very likely that all three fragments...came from the same scribe and were from the same codex."

⁹⁵ S. D. Charlesworth, "T. C. Skeat, P⁶⁴⁺⁶⁷ and P⁴, and the Problem of Fibre Orientation in Codicological Reconstruction," *NTS* 53 (2007): 582–604, 587–591, addresses several possible explanations for this phenomenon, but concludes that the easiest solution is that P⁶⁷ was initially comprised of two or more quires. Responding to Charlesworth's argument, Hill, "Original Codex," 82–84, agrees that P⁶⁷ was not a single-quire codex and that the middle of the quire that contained the two extant leaves fell at the single folio missing between the two fragments. Likewise, P⁶⁴ and P⁴ give evidence of being constructed of multiple quires. He goes on to argue that this evidence does not undermine the unity of P^{64/67} and P⁴, only its identity as a single-quire codex. Therefore, Hill posits that the texts together represent a multi-quire, four-gospel codex. He surmises that since the manuscripts are composed of multiple quires there is nothing prohibiting adding more texts to the final codex. All of Hill's arguments result in the same conclusion, that the texts share a scribe with consistent style, but none definitively prove that the texts are from the same codex.

this was not a single quire codex.”⁹⁶ It now appears likely that P^{64/67} is the remnant of a multi-quire codex of Matthew and that P⁴ is a remnant of an altogether different multi-quire codex of Luke copied by the same scribe somewhat later.⁹⁷

This discussion has been necessary in order to date P^{64/67} and P⁴ appropriately and to categorize the fragments either as individual manuscripts of Matthew and Luke, a single manuscript of Matthew and Luke (as with MS 0171), or as a four-gospel codex. It is best to accept that the same scribe copied both manuscripts, but that they originated as distinct codices. I accept the conventional dating of the papyri.⁹⁸ Roberts dates P^{64/67} to the late second century, ca. 200, and though earlier and later dates have been proposed, consensus for the late second century is firm. If the same scribe composed P⁴ somewhat later than P^{64/67}, it is best dated to the beginning of the third century.⁹⁹

With the date and extent of the manuscripts decided, the analysis can now turn to the textual character of P^{64/67}. P⁶⁴ consists of three fragments from a single papyrus leaf

⁹⁶ Roberts, “Early Papyrus,” 234.

⁹⁷ It is not impossible that one or both codices contained additional texts.

⁹⁸ It seems to me that Carsten Thiede’s controversial proposal regarding the dating of P⁶⁴ has been responsible for the large amount of attention devoted to this papyrus in comparison to other papyri of similar date and extent. Carsten Peter Thiede, “Papyrus Magdalen Greek 17 (Gregory-Aland P⁶⁴): A Reappraisal,” *TynBul* 46 (1995): 29–42; repr. from *ZPE* 105 (1995): 13–20, proposes that P⁶⁴ shares certain paleographic similarities with texts from the mid first century or earlier and so claims that the text could have been copied in the last third of the first century, sometime after 70 CE. D. C. Parker, “Was Matthew Written before 50 CE? The Magdalen Papyrus of Matthew,” *ExpTim* 107 (1995): 40–43, responds to the article with an exceedingly negative review of Thiede’s study, repeatedly describing his study as “worthless,” sparking a defensive response from Thiede in “The Magdalen Papyrus: A Reply,” *ExpTim* 107 (1996): 240–241. Meanwhile, Peter M. Head, “Date of the Magdalen Papyrus,” offers a review of Thiede’s proposal demonstrating the faults in his methodology, discounting his first century parallels, affirming Roberts’s late second-century parallels, and offering his own argument in favor of a late second-century date. Klaus Wachtel, “P^{64/67}: Fragmente des Matthäusevangeliums aus dem 1. Jahrhundert?” *ZPE* 107 (1995): 73–80, also responds to Thiede’s proposal and reaffirms the now conventional dating. Finally, Harald Vocke, “Papyrus Magdalen 17: Weitere Argumente gegen die Frühdatierung des Angeblichen Jesus-Papyrus,” *ZPE* 113 (1996): 153–157, offers an additional rebuttal. See Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 50–53, for a succinct summary and discussion of theories regarding dating.

⁹⁹ Therefore, P⁴ will be discussed first among the third-century manuscripts of Luke.

while P⁶⁷ survives in two fragments from two folios, the second in five to seven pieces.¹⁰⁰

There are exceedingly few variant readings in these fragments, which is not surprising given the limited amount of text available for analysis. P⁶⁴, for instance, contains only about one hundred and seventy-four letters representing about fifty-three words spread across ten verses. P⁶⁷ is somewhat less fragmentary, consisting of around three hundred and thirty-one letters from one hundred and one words spanning nine verses. The dearth of variants leads Kurt Aland and Min to classify the textual quality of P^{64/67} and the quality of transmission as “strict,” meaning that the scribe has introduced few intrusions into an already faithful exemplar.¹⁰¹

(8) Matthew 26:31 – πάντες ὁὔμεῖς σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ

(//Mark 14:27; Singular; Lacuna)

One assimilating variant may be lurking in the lacunose edges of P⁶⁴. In Matthew 26:31, Jesus warns his disciples, “You all (πάντες ὁὔμεῖς) will be made to stumble because of me on this night.” The Markan version of this passage is identical but for the omission of the pronoun ὁὔμεῖς. In comparison to Mark’s “all” (πάντες), Matthew’s use of the phrase “you all” (πάντες ὁὔμεῖς) emphasizes “the dire nature of Jesus’ prediction that all the disciples will be led to sin.”¹⁰² Depending on how one reconstructs this broken line in P⁶⁴, it appears that the scribe has omitted the pronoun from Matthew.

¹⁰⁰ Sebastian Bartina, “Another New Testament Papyrus (P⁶⁷),” *CBQ* 20 (1958): 290–291.

¹⁰¹ K. Aland, “Standard-Text,” 265; and Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 252. Tommy Wasserman, “A Comparative Textual Analysis of P⁴ and P⁶⁴⁺⁶⁷,” *Textual Criticism* 15 (2010): 1–26, conducted his own analysis of the papyri utilizing the methodology of B. Aland and Min, confirming their categorization of the textual and transmission quality of P^{64/67} as “strict.” He concludes the same for P⁴. See also *Ibid.*, “Early Text of Matthew,” 95–97.

¹⁰² Gundry, *Matthew*, 529.

In his transcription of P⁶⁴, Roberts does not include the pronoun, but it is unclear whether he regards it as an omission by the scribe or omits it from the transcription himself since no part of the word appears on the fragment.¹⁰³ Thiede, Skeat, and Min follow Roberts in omitting the word in their transcriptions, but Head remains undecided.¹⁰⁴ The omission is likely because if the pronoun is included the line is too long by about four letters.¹⁰⁵ If this reconstruction is correct, the best explanation for the reading is the influence of Mark 14:27.¹⁰⁶

The text of P^{64/67} is mostly free from harmonizing variants and other types of transmission errors. Even the one possible example of assimilation does not change the content much and does not alter the sense of the passage. The scribe was a careful conservator of a carefully preserved text and did not permit external influences to impact his copy of Matthew.

¹⁰³ Roberts, "Early Papyrus," 236. His practice elsewhere seems to be to exclude words that have no letters visible on the fragment. He does not include a note on this reading. In the same verse, however, he includes *νυκτι* in the transcription even though no part of the word appears in the fragment. His stance on the reading is not clear.

¹⁰⁴ Thiede, "Reappraisal," 33, 42; Head, "Date of the Magdalen Papyrus," 260–261; Skeat, "Oldest Manuscript," 171; Min, *Frühste Überlieferung*, 169. Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 70, exclude the pronoun.

¹⁰⁵ Thiede, "Reappraisal," 33, explains on the basis of the number of letters that the line *with* the pronoun would have had twenty letters while the average is sixteen. Wasserman, "Comparative Textual Analysis," 23, thinks it unwise to emend the reading given the slight irregularity in letters per line in P^{64/67}. Head, "Date of the Magdalen Papyrus," 260–261, affirms the variation in line length in P⁶⁴ and draws attention to the wider range of letters per line in P⁶⁷.

¹⁰⁶ Conversely, some scribes copying Mark have introduced a variant assimilating to Matthew by including the pronoun (D^{f3} 38 69 124 274^{mg} 330 543 579 788 1342 1346 2542). Michael Mees, "Die Bezeugung von Mt 26,20–40 auf Papyrus (P⁶⁴, P⁵³, P⁴⁵, P³⁷) und ihre Bedeutung," *Aug* 11 (1971): 409–431, 423, describes the presence of the pronoun in some Markan manuscripts as "überflüssig und pleonastisch." In his article, Mees investigates the text of the Prediction of Betrayal, Institution of the Lord's Supper, Prediction of Denial, and Gethsemane scenes. After looking at the readings contributed by four early papyri he concludes, against Sanders, that P³⁷ and P⁵³ are not so close to the Western tradition or the Alexandrian. Min, *Frühste Überlieferung*, 176, analyzes the omission but attributes it to carelessness rather than harmonization. While negligence is a culprit in many variants, and may be responsible here, harmonization is also a possibility in this case.

The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Third Century

Relative to the second century, the third century provides a veritable trove of manuscripts of the Synoptic Gospels. Six fragmentary manuscripts of Matthew survive and four of Luke. Additionally, fragments from a manuscript containing both Matthew and Luke are extant (MS 0171). There are two extensive manuscripts from this century, one containing Luke (P⁷⁵) and the other all four Gospels and Acts (P⁴⁵). These two papyri will be discussed in Chapter Three.

The absence of manuscripts of Mark is significant, especially in comparison to the sixteen manuscripts of John from the second and third centuries. The evidence suggests that Matthew and John were more popular than the other Gospels. Hurtado states, “It is rather clear that, although Mark was probably the first narrative Gospel to be written, it was not nearly so widely copied and used as any of the other canonical Gospels in the earliest centuries from which our manuscript evidence survives.”¹⁰⁷ Hurtado aptly summarizes the widely accepted view that Mark was deemed superfluous or inferior to the Gospel of Matthew. There is no reason to assume Mark was perceived negatively, as Hurtado points out, but the evidence indicates that Mark was copied, and so read, less frequently than Matthew. Even so, the scribal activity of harmonization demonstrates that Mark did not lose its relevance in the second and third centuries.

¹⁰⁷ Hurtado, *Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 30.

Manuscripts of Matthew¹⁰⁸

Parts of the Matthean Last Supper and Gethsemane narratives are witnessed in four manuscripts from the second and third centuries (P^{64/67} P⁵³ P³⁷ P⁴⁵). All four manuscripts come from Egypt: one from Coptos (P^{64/67}) and three from the Faiyum (P⁵³ P³⁷ P⁴⁵). The felicitous circumstance that Egypt should preserve four very early fragments of the same limited scene deserves some attention. Have time, the desert, and the exigencies of nature randomly produced such a coincidence, or is it possible that Egyptian Christians admired and copied the Passion Narrative more often than other portions of the Gospel? Among the early papyri, no other episode is so well attested.

P⁵³ (P.Mich.Inv. 6652) – Matthew 26:29–40; Acts 9:33–10:1

The scribe of P⁵³ transcribed his copy of Matthew and Acts very near the middle of the third century.¹⁰⁹ The two fragments that make up P⁵³, one containing portions of the

¹⁰⁸ The following manuscripts of Matthew do not contain harmonizing variants:

P¹ (P.Oxy. 2) is a late third-century fragment containing Matthew 1:1–9, 12, 14–20. For the *ed. pr.* see Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 1, Graeco-Roman Memoirs (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1898), 4–7 and Plate I. Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 62–73; and Wasserman, “Early Text of Matthew,” 88, discuss the textual variants, assess the quality of the scribe, and provide an extensive bibliography. See also Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 124 no. 332.

P¹⁰² (P.Oxy. 4402) is a late third- or early fourth-century fragment containing about forty-two letters from Matthew 4:11–12, 22–23. For the *ed. pr.* see Thomas, *OP*, 64:4–5 and Plates I and II. See Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 639–640, for a recent transcription; and Head, “Recently Published,” 8, for a brief analysis. Elliott, “Six New Papyri,” 106, writes that the fragment is “so lacunose that no reconstruction should figure in an *apparatus*.” Similarly, B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 11, surmises, “Zwar enthält der Papyrus keinerlei Abweichungen vom Novum Testamentum Graece, aber der sicher zu rekonstruierende Text umfasst nur wenige Worte, so dass eine textkritische Verwertung nicht möglich ist.” See also Wasserman, “Early Text of Matthew,” 99.

¹⁰⁹ Henry A. Sanders, “A Third Century Papyrus of Matthew and Acts,” in *Quantulacumque: Studies Presented to Kirsopp Lake by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends*, ed. Robert P. Casey, Silva Lake, and Agnes K. Lake (London: Christophers, 1937), 151–161, suggests a date of composition around 260 CE. Kenneth Willis Clark, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Greek New Testament Manuscripts in America* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1937), 340, proposes a date around 250 CE. Frederic G. Kenyon, *Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy* (London: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 1933), 33, thinks the first half of the third

Last Supper and Gethsemane episodes from Matthew 26 and the other the last half of Acts 9, were found together and belong to the same manuscript. Henry Sanders entertains the idea that the manuscript might have originally contained all four canonical Gospels and Acts, as is the case with P⁴⁵, but ultimately concludes that it is more likely to have included only Matthew and Acts.¹¹⁰ While such a combination may seem strange, Sanders believes it would not have been deemed so in a community that knew only one Gospel or did not associate the Gospel of Luke with the Book of Acts.¹¹¹ In such an environment, Acts would seem the logical continuation of the story begun in any of the four Gospels.

The text contains several variant readings, but in light of its overall faithfulness Min characterizes its transmission quality as “normal” and the quality of the exemplar as “strict.”¹¹² According to Min, “The papyrus shows no clear harmonization,” meaning that the evidence for assimilation is not conclusive.¹¹³ There are two cases where harmonization could account for the variant and a third where external influence is likely.

century is too early. Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 139 no. 380; and K. Aland, *Repertorium*, 283, date the piece generally to the third century.

¹¹⁰ Sanders, “Third Century Papyrus,” 151–153.

¹¹¹ Mikeal C. Parsons, “Hearing Acts as a Sequel to the Multiform Gospel: Historical and Hermeneutical Reflections on Acts, Luke and the *Polloi*,” in *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*, ed. Andrew F. Gregory and C. Kavin Rowe (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2010), 128–152, has demonstrated that there are echoes of Matthew and Mark in Acts that show that Acts can easily be read as a sequel to any of the three Synoptic Gospels. See also his related article, “Reading Acts as a Sequel to the Fourfold Gospel,” in *The Book of Acts*, Christian Reflection: A Series in Faith and Ethics (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2015), 19–26.

¹¹² Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 162. K. Aland, “Standard-Text,” 266, previously described the text as “mindestens Normaltext.”

¹¹³ Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 162: “Der Papyrus zeigt keine deutlichen Harmonisierung.” Although, he thinks the omission of *μου* in Matthew 26:39 may be an assimilation.

(9) Matthew 26:32 – μετὰ ὁδὲ τὸ ἐγερθῆναι με προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν

(//Mark 14:28; Singular)

In Matthew 26:32, after telling his disciples that they will all fall away from him, Jesus offers words of hope. He says, “But after (μετὰ δέ) I am raised up, I will lead you forth into Galilee.” The Markan parallel to this passage does not use the postpositive conjunction δέ, preferring instead ἀλλά. If it is correct that the scribe of P⁵³ has not included δέ, it is possible he has done so under the influence of Mark 14:28.

The omission of the conjunction in the fragment is debated. On the one hand, according to Sander’s *editio princeps*, it is the definite article τὸ that is missing, not the conjunction.¹¹⁴ Min, however, claims, “The first letter (originally it was the fourth when the papyrus was not damaged)... appears more likely to be omicron (ο) than epsilon (ε).”¹¹⁵ Min is correct. The image of the papyrus shows the bottom portion of the last letter before the word ἐγερθῆναι and it is conspicuously curved. None of the epsilons in the fragment are curved in the same way. This curved mark belongs to the omicron in τὸ; therefore, the omitted word is δέ, a singular reading. Furthermore, it seems more likely that a scribe would fail to include an unnecessary conjunction, however common, than omit a grammatically necessary article in a less common construction.¹¹⁶ Given this

¹¹⁴ Sanders, “Third Century Papyrus,” 154. He is followed by Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 371. If correct, the omission of τὸ is a singular reading.

¹¹⁵ Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 153: “Der erste Buchstabe (ursprünglich wäre es der vierte, wenn der Papyrus nicht beschädigt worden wäre)... scheint eher Omikron (ο) zu sein als Epsilon (ε).” Swanson, *Matthew*, 263, appears to follow this reconstruction.

¹¹⁶ The construction is called the “infinitive of antecedent time” and requires μετὰ τὸ plus infinitive. See Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the Greek New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 594–595. I am not suggesting the scribe was aware of the “rule,” but that he would have followed the linguistic pattern that makes the rule discernable.

reconstruction, it is at least possible that the omission has occurred under the influence of Mark 14:28, but scribal negligence or stylistic preference could just as easily account for the reading.

(10) Matthew 26:36 – καὶ λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς [†] († αὐτοῦ; //Mark 14:32; Lacuna)¹¹⁷

(11) Matthew 26:39 – πᾶτερ ^ομου εἰ δυνατόν ἐστιν παρελθάτω¹¹⁸ ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ τὸ
ποτήριον τοῦτο (//Luke 22:42; Corrected)¹¹⁹

After predicting his disciples’ desertion, Jesus takes his disciples to Gethsemane, where they sit nearby while he prays. Matthew records, “He [Jesus] says to the disciples (τοῖς μαθηταῖς)...” In the Markan version of this text, Jesus speaks to “his disciples” (τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ). This reading, with the possessive pronoun, may have appeared in P⁵³.

Unfortunately, there is a lacuna in the text at this point, but the accepted Matthean reading creates a line of only twenty letters where the average is twenty-three. This would be the shortest line in the text, though there are several lines with twenty-one letters. In order to compensate for this short line, Sanders conjectures that the text included the possessive pronoun αὐτοῦ modifying μαθηταῖς.¹²⁰ This emendation results in a line of twenty-five letters, slightly above average but within the range of the papyrus. If Sanders’s supplement is correct, it is possible the scribe added the pronoun under the influence of the parallel in Mark 14:32.

¹¹⁷ P^{53lac} ⳧ A C D W Σ f¹ 7 131 205 209 245 251 470 471 474 517 544 659 700 713 999 1012 1071 1170 1355 1391 1424 1582 1675.

¹¹⁸ P⁵³ reads παρελθέτω.

¹¹⁹ P^{53*} L Δ Σ f¹ 205 892 1582 2542.

¹²⁰ Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 371, follow this reading. Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 154–155, remains unconvinced since this part of the verse is “nicht lesbar.”

Alternatively, stylistic concerns may have motivated the scribe to add the pronoun. In narrated portions of Matthew where the disciples are referred to as a group, the term “disciples” (μαθηταῖς) appears alone in thirty instances and is modified by αὐτοῦ in twenty-two instances.¹²¹ By comparison, in Mark, the disciples are referred to as a group thirty-three times and in only four cases are they *not* referred to explicitly as *his* disciples. The pronoun in this phrase is a consistent feature of Mark’s style. Although Matthew does not consistently favor one construction over the other, it is possible the scribe was influenced by previous occurrences of the longer phrase.

If the emendation is correct in P⁵³, the possessive pronoun may have been added in assimilation to Mark 14:32. Nevertheless, one should not overstress this reading. As C. C. Tarelli points out, “The omission or addition of the pronoun in such expressions as τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ is too common a clerical error to have much significance, and the choice between omission and interpolation in the explanation of such variants is usually a matter of taste.”¹²²

Finally, in Matthew 26:39, Jesus prays, “My Father (πάτερ μου), if it is possible, let this cup pass from me.” In the Markan parallel (Mark 14:36), the initial address (πάτερ μου) is replaced with “Abba, Father” (αββα ὁ πατήρ). In Luke 22:42, Jesus addresses his “Father” (πάτερ) in the vocative case. In P⁵³, the scribe has omitted the possessive

¹²¹ There are fifty-five occurrences of μαθηταῖς referring to the disciples as a group in narration. Of these, three are more questionable than others (19:10, 27; 26:36) and are not included in the figures given above. See Donald P. Senior, *The Passion Narrative according to Matthew*, BETL 39 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1975), 14 n. 1.

¹²² C. C. Tarelli, “Omissions, Additions, and Conflations in the Chester Beatty Papyrus,” *JTS* 40 (1939): 382–387, 383. It should be noted here that the omission and addition of αὐτοῦ describing μαθηταῖς is exceedingly common. In cases where harmonization may have played a role, the reading will be discussed, but it will never be possible to be certain that a parallel motivated the alteration in any given case.

adjective *μου*. The same or a different scribe has subsequently corrected the mistake superlinearly. Despite its later correction, the initial omission may have occurred under the influence of the Lukan parallel.¹²³ Mees explains, “The influence of the parallel texts in Mark and Luke, neither of which uses the pronoun in their texts, may have played a part.”¹²⁴ Since the Markan parallel, with its Aramaic word, is not as close to Matthew as the parallel in Luke, the influence of the latter is more likely.

The scribe of P⁵³ is not terribly free in producing variants, nor is he overly strict. The three readings involving assimilation demonstrate a likely awareness of both Mark and Luke, but no systematic pattern of harmonization emerges.

P³⁷ (P.Mich.Inv. 1570) – Matthew 26:19-52¹²⁵

P³⁷ is another text of the Last Supper and Gethsemane episodes written in the late third century.¹²⁶ The papyrus was purchased in Cairo and was likely found in the Faiyum. Bover, followed by Lagrange, classifies the text as “Caesarean,” though with such a short

¹²³ Wasserman, “Early Text of Matthew,” 94, suggests harmonization or a scribal error.

¹²⁴ Mees, “Die Bezeugung,” 429: “Zudem mag der Einfluss der Paralleltex-te in Mark und Luke mitgespielt haben, die beide das Pronomen nicht in ihrem Texte führen.” This is the only variant in Matthew 26:20–40 in P⁶⁴, P⁵³, P⁴⁵, and P³⁷ that Mees suggests may have involved harmonization.

¹²⁵ Although this fragment comes from the late third century, probably later than P¹⁰¹, we discuss it here since P^{64/67} and P⁵³ cover many of the same verses. For a study of the textual relationships of P³⁷ see José M. Bover, “Dos Papiros Egipcios del N. T. Recientemente Publicados,” *EstEcl* 9 (1930): 289–320.

¹²⁶ So Henry A. Sanders, “An Early Papyrus Fragment of the Gospel of Matthew in the Michigan Collection,” *HTR* 19 (1926): 215–226, 215. See Sanders’s transcription and comments on P³⁷ in John Garrett Winter, ed., *Papyri in the University of Michigan Collection: Miscellaneous Papyri*, vol. 3 of *Michigan Papyri* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1936), 9–14. See also M.-J. Lagrange, “Un Nouveau Papyrus Évangélique: Mt. 26,19–52,” *RB* 38 (1929): 161–177; *Ibid.*, *La critique rationnelle: Introduction à l’étude du Nouveau Testament*, vol. 2 of *Critique textuelle*, 2nd ed., *EBib* (Paris: Lecoffre, 1935), 157–158; Clark, *Manuscripts in America*, 334–335; and Ellwood Mearle Schofield, “The Papyrus Fragments of the Greek New Testament” (PhD thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1936), 259. Scholars who date this papyrus to the third/fourth century include William Henry Paine Hatch, *The Principal Uncial Manuscripts of the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), Plate 13; K. Aland, *Repertorium*, 259; Head, “Observations,” 244; and Min, *Frühste Überlieferung*, 90. Kenyon, *Recent Developments*, 32, dates the fragment to the late fourth century. See also Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 138–139 no. 378.

amount of material it is difficult to assess its textual affiliations.¹²⁷ The folio comes from a papyrus codex and offers a wealth of variant readings demonstrating what Min and Aland call a “free” method of transmission.¹²⁸ Min counts thirty-one deviations from NA²⁷, two of which he tentatively attributes to harmonization to Synoptic parallels.¹²⁹ José Bover classifies fifteen variants as singular readings.¹³⁰ The variations are primarily careless omissions and substitutions, which provides evidence for Sanders’s claim that the scribe is an “educated man, but not a practiced scribe.”¹³¹

(12) Matthew 26:27 – καὶ λαβὼν ὧ ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς (ὧτό;

//Luke 22:20, 1 Corinthians 11:25)¹³²

In the Last Supper narrative, Matthew records that Jesus, after taking “a cup” (ποτήριον) and giving thanks, gave it to his disciples. In several important fourth-century manuscripts of Matthew (ⲛ B W), the noun “cup” (ποτήριον) is anarthrous.¹³³ The majority of witnesses, however, including the manuscript under discussion, include the article (τὸ ποτήριον). With impressive external evidence on both sides, the question of

¹²⁷ See Bover, “Dos Papiros,” 290–306; Lagrange, “Nouveau Papyrus,” 161–177; and Ibid., *Critique rationelle*, 157. Wasserman, “Early Text of Matthew,” remarks, “It is not possible to assign P³⁷ to any text type in Matthew.”

¹²⁸ Wasserman, “Early Text of Matthew,” 89–91, believes Min overestimates the scribe’s carelessness since several variants are shared by related manuscripts.

¹²⁹ Of his thirty-one variants, Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 102, classifies thirteen as singular. Head, “Observations,” 244, finds eleven singular readings. See also K. Aland, “Standard-Text,” 266–267. Lagrange, *Critique rationelle*, 158, comments regarding the lack of harmonizations, “L’absence d’harmonisation est encore plus en l’honneur du papyrus.”

¹³⁰ Bover, “Dos Papiros,” 294.

¹³¹ Sanders, “Early Papyrus Fragment,” 218.

¹³² P³⁷ P⁴⁵ A C D H K M S U V Y Γ Π Ω f¹³ 2 22 69 124 157 180 543 565 597 788 (1010) 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1505 1506 2542.

¹³³ Manuscripts without τὸ include: ⲛ B E F G L W Z Δ Θ Σ 074 0281 0298 f¹ 13 28 33 102 205 346 579 700 892 1006 1424 1582.

which reading is authentic turns to other criteria. The anarthrous reading is more difficult, giving it the edge of authenticity. Furthermore, as Metzger notes, “The tendency of copyists would probably have been to add rather than to delete the article.”¹³⁴ Ultimately, it seems the article is a secondary addition to the text of Matthew.

In the parallel version of this verse in Mark 14:23, the issue is less murky. A fair number of manuscripts include the article, but many manuscripts of high quality do not.¹³⁵ It would seem that the earliest reading in Mark’s version was anarthrous.¹³⁶ In Luke 22:20, the article appears without fail. Two factors have contributed to the secondary articular reading in Matthew and Mark. First, it is probable that scribes of Matthew and Mark were influenced by the construction in Luke. Second, as the reading gained popularity it became a consistent part of the Markan and Matthean textual traditions so that not every instance of its appearance in a manuscript represents a scribe influenced by the parallel. Once it entered the text of Matthew, it became the new Matthean reading. Lastly, it is possible that some scribes were influenced by 1 Corinthians 11:25, where Paul narrates the institution of the Lord’s Supper. Paul writes, “Likewise (he took) *the* cup (τὸ ποτήριον) also, after supper, saying, ‘This cup (τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον) is the new covenant in my blood.’” Paul’s words would undoubtedly have been well known in many Christian circles by the third century.

(13) Matthew 26:34a – ἔφη ἀντὶ τῷ ἰησοῦς (Τκαί; //Mark 14:30; Singular)

¹³⁴ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 54.

¹³⁵ Manuscripts with τὸ include: A E F H K M U P W Γ Π Φ 2 69 157 346 565 1071 1241 1506 ℞. Manuscripts without τὸ include: ℵ B C D L X Y Δ Θ Σ Ψ 0116 ^f13 11 22 28 71 124 131 174 238 470 472 473 506 543 700 892 1342 1424.

¹³⁶ If one adheres to the theory of Markan priority, this evidence supports the absence of the article in Matthew’s autograph.

(14) Matthew 26:34b – °έν ταύτη τῇ νυκτί πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρίς ἀπαρνήση
 με (//Mark 14:30; Sub-singular P³⁷ D)

During the last supper, Jesus reveals that Peter will deny him. Matthew introduces the prediction with the phrase, “Jesus said to him” (ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς). Matthew’s style shows a preference for sentences with conjunctions, but this clause exhibits asyndeton. In P³⁷, the scribe has added the conjunction καί to the sentence. The resultant reading, ἔφη αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, is not attested elsewhere.¹³⁷ The καί in this position is strong and implies the meaning, “Jesus *even* said to him.” It is possible the scribe added the conjunction for stylistic reasons to remove asyndeton and conform to Matthean style. Harmonization is also possible. In Mark 14:30, the evangelist narrates, “*And* Jesus says to him” (καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς). The syntax in the parallels is not exactly the same, but the appearance of καί in Mark may have influenced the scribe in his copy of Matthew.

A second harmonizing variant occurs in the same verse. Jesus says, “On this night (έν ταύτη τῇ νυκτί), before the rooster crows, you will deny me three times.” The preposition έν imbues the phrase with the sense of “during” this night. The scribe has omitted the preposition. The alteration does not necessarily disrupt the sense of the passage, since it is implicit in the dative construction. It is possible that the omission has occurred under the influence of Mark 14:30, where the preposition is absent in the best manuscripts, though not the majority.¹³⁸

¹³⁷ B. Aland, “Zeugnis,” 327, lists this and the reading at 26:41 among the singular readings of P³⁷.

¹³⁸ Manuscripts with έν include: A K M N U X Y Γ Δ Π Σ Φ 0116 2 22 28 124 157 579 1006 1071 1241 1424 1506 ℣.

(15) Matthew 26:41 – γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε ἵνα μὴ Ἦ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν

(Ἦ ἔλθητε; //Mark 14:38; Singular)

Later in the passion narrative, Jesus tells his disciples, “Stay awake and pray that you do not enter into (εἰσέλθητε εἰς) temptation.” The Markan parallel in 14:38 is identical except for the use of the simple verb form ἔλθητε instead of the compound εἰσέλθητε.¹³⁹ The scribe has adopted the simple verb, thereby assimilating to the Second Gospel. Gundry suggests that Matthew’s original intent in choosing the compound verb was to parallel the compound verb in Matthew’s unique portion of the Lord’s Prayer, “And bring us not into temptation” (καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασόν).¹⁴⁰ For Matthew, one does not *come to* temptation, one *enters into* it. Donald Senior notes, “This is the only example in the gospel where Matthew introduces the reiterated preposition in a Markan parallel.”¹⁴¹ Matthew prefers compound verbs, but it is not his habit to introduce reiterated prepositions. He has done so in this case to strengthen parallels to the Lord’s Prayer. The scribe has omitted the redundancy of the preposition and so has inadvertently

¹³⁹ The majority of Markan manuscripts have been assimilated to Matthew, chief among them: ⱼ^c A C D W.

¹⁴⁰ Gundry, *Matthew*, 534. See also Luz, *Matthew*, 3:394.

¹⁴¹ Senior, *Passion Narrative*, 110. On “reiterated prepositions” and Matthean style see Allen, *Matthew*, xxv–xxvi. Instances where Matthew has removed the redundant prefix from the Markan context or changed the preposition include: 4:13, 18; 8:32, 34; 9:1; 10:11; 12:9; 13:53; 15:29; 17:18; 18:6; 19:24; and 24:1. Allen provides the Markan references for following list of instances where Matthew retains the redundancy: 10:11, 14, 21; 12:4, 29; 15:11, 11, 17, 18, 19; 18:8, 9; 19:23; 21:10, 12, and 39. Citing the *Concordance* of Moulton and Geden, Allen shows that only one of twenty-seven instances of the paring of εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς is Matthew’s editorial contribution, the rest are from Mark or a saying, which they imply would have already included the redundancy. Of eleven occurrences of ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ, only two occur in narrative and both from Mark. Moulton and Geden give further examples of reiterated prepositions, all showing that Matthew does not generally introduce redundant prepositions in the narrative and that most other instances occur in sayings.

reduced the textual connection between Jesus's prayer in the garden and the Lord's Prayer. It is very probable that Mark 14:38 is the source of this reading.

The scribe of P³⁷ was manifestly careless, as Min and Aland note, but not every variant in the copy must be ascribed to him. It is possible that his exemplar contained variants that the scribe simply copied into his own production. For example, in Matthew 26:27, P³⁷ contains the popular version of the words of institution from Luke 22:20 or 1 Corinthians 11:25. Since this reading is widespread, it is not necessarily the creation of the scribe. The remaining readings discussed here, though, are singular or sub-singular, which means they very likely are the creation of the scribe. All three variants can be explained with reference to parallels in Mark, potentially showing the scribe's familiarity with that Gospel and demonstrating the continued presence of the Gospel of Mark in a community reading Matthew. The scribe has not taken every opportunity to conform his manuscript of Matthew to the text of Mark, nor has he assimilated to Mark in a systematic way. Instead, the evidence suggests that the Gospel of Mark served as the scribe's horizon of expectation and that he was not successful in overcoming its subtle influence.

P¹⁰¹ (P.Oxy. 4401) – Matthew 3:10–12; 3:16–4:3

P¹⁰¹ is a very small fragment of Matthew from Oxyrhynchus covering much of the baptism narrative and the opening verses of the temptation scene. The papyrus was copied in the third century and constitutes the oldest witness to these verses in Greek.¹⁴² The text contains three singular readings, all of them involving assimilation.¹⁴³ Two

¹⁴² Thomas, *OP*, 64:2 and Plates I and II. See also Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 637.

¹⁴³ So Wasserman, "Early Text of Matthew," 99.

additional variants may involve harmonization. Because of these and many other variants, Min categorizes the transmission quality of the papyrus as “free,” but postulates that the scribe’s exemplar may have been quite good.¹⁴⁴

(16) Matthew 3:11a – ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἔρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μου ἐστίν (//Luke 3:16; Singular)

(17) Matthew 3:11b – οὗ οὐκ εἰμι ἰκανὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα ἱ βασιτάσαι (ἱ κύψας λῦσαι; //Mark 1:7; Singular P^{101vid})

In Matthew 3:11, John the Baptist proclaims to the people, “The one coming after me is greater than me” (ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἔρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μου ἐστίν). In the parallel passage in Mark 1:7, John says, “One stronger than I comes after me” (ἔρχεται ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου ὀπίσω μου). Luke’s account of John’s announcement is closer to Mark’s, but he does not include the detail that the coming one will come *after* John. In Luke 3:16, John says, “One stronger than me is coming” (ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου). In the Matthew text of P¹⁰¹, the prepositional phrase ὀπίσω μου is absent. It is very likely that this singular reading has entered the text under the influence of Luke 3:16.¹⁴⁵

Other explanations may account for the omission. According to Joachim Gnilka, “The sentence preserves the reminder that Jesus once belonged to the disciples of the Baptist.”¹⁴⁶ Min wonders if the scribe was unsettled by this implication. “At this point the

¹⁴⁴ Min, *Frühste Überlieferung*, 219.

¹⁴⁵ On this singular reading, see Elliott, “Six New Papyri,” 106; Head, “Recently Published,” 8; B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 11; and Min, *Frühste Überlieferung*, 217. The prepositional phrase is added to Luke 3:16 in harmonization to Matthew 3:11 or Mark 1:7 in a handful of manuscripts, including: L 1424 1574 1604.

¹⁴⁶ Gnilka, *Matthäusevangelium*, 1:71: “Dann bewahrte der Satz die Erinnerung daran, daß Jesus einmal zum Jüngerkreis des Täufers gehört hat.”

writer could have deliberately omitted *σπισω μου* so that he could possibly avoid the misunderstanding that Jesus was a follower, that is to say, a disciple of the Baptist.”¹⁴⁷ If the memory of Jesus as a follower of John proved to be embarrassing to a Christian community, or if it affronted the personal sensibilities of an individual scribe, it would not be surprising to find it omitted. A small phrase, not vital to the passage, is easily excised. Ultimately, Min decides that the variant did not arise on dogmatic grounds, “for such a discipleship of Jesus is in the early period (in the second and third century) never the subject of dogmatic debates.”¹⁴⁸ It is possible that the scribe did not like the implication that Jesus was a disciple of John, but without evidence for this concern in the third century it is not a very likely cause for the reading. Barbara Aland concludes, as I do, that the scribe assimilated the account accidentally.¹⁴⁹ Peter Head offers an interesting suggestion, namely, that the variant “could be regarded as a smoother (non-harmonized) reading.”¹⁵⁰ The implication that the older reading in Matthew lacked *δπισω μου* and that the phrase was added early and adopted entirely in harmonization to Mark 1:7 is intriguing, but unlikely given that P¹⁰¹ is the only manuscript to survive with this reading. It is quite likely that the scribe was influenced by the version of John’s statement in Luke 3:16.

¹⁴⁷ Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 213: “An dieser Stelle könnte der Schreiber *σπισω μου* bewusst ausgelassen haben, damit er möglicherweise das Missverständnis vermeiden konnte, dass Jesus Nachfolger bzw. Jünger des Täufers wäre.”

¹⁴⁸ Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 214: “Denn eine solche Jüngerschaft Jesu ist in der Frühzeit (im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert) niemals Gegenstand von dogmatischen Debatten gewesen.”

¹⁴⁹ B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 11; and Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 213–214, 217, regard the omission as a harmonization. Nolland, *Matthew*, 132, agrees that harmonization is likely here.

¹⁵⁰ Head, “Recently Published,” 8.

The same verse contains a second harmonizing reading. John describes the coming one as someone “whose sandals I am [he is] not worthy to bear (βαστάσαι). In the parallel in Mark 1:7, John says that he is not worthy, “stooping down, to loose (κύψας λῦσαι) the strap of his [the coming one’s] sandals.”¹⁵¹ The version of this statement in Luke 3:16 is similar to Mark’s, except that Luke does not mention the act of “stooping.” John says only that he is not worthy “to loose the strap of his sandals” (λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ).¹⁵²

The text of Matthew 3:11 at this point in P¹⁰¹ is mostly obliterated, but it is possible that the scribe has replaced Matthew’s βαστάσαι with Mark’s κύψας λῦσαι or Luke’s λῦσαι. On the line in question, only traces of the last letter (ι) of the word and partial traces of the penultimate letter (α) are clear. One other letter, the fourth to last letter of the word, has also left traces, but whether the marks belong to an alpha, as required for βαστάσαι, or upsilon, for λῦσαι, is not clear. The lines look something like this, with the question mark symbolizing the indecipherable mark that may be either alpha or upsilon:

[]κανος τᾱ ὑπο[]
 []? []αι αὐτος ὑμ[]

Thomas, the first editor of P¹⁰¹, reconstructs the line with Matthew’s expected verb (βαστάσαι), but notes that the first incomplete letter on the lower line “is not easy to

¹⁵¹ Manuscripts of Mark without κύψας include: D Θ f¹³ 28* 69 124 256 346 543 565 579 788 826 828 983 1071 1220. The participle has been omitted from these manuscripts in harmonization to Luke 3:16.

¹⁵² Manuscripts of Luke with κύψας include: M X f¹³ 69 124 346 543 579 788 826 828 983 1047 1071 1220. This variant has likely arisen in harmonization to Mark 1:7.

reconcile with alpha” and that “it suits upsilon better.”¹⁵³ If the reading of Mark or Luke is a likely candidate, Thomas writes, “of the two [κύψας λύσαι] would better suit the space available.” Comfort and Barrett adopt this reading in their transcription of P¹⁰¹, as does J. K. Elliott. Min, however, takes issue with this emendation. He writes, “At this point there is only a small point to read, which could be a trace either of alpha (α) or of upsilon (υ). In my opinion it is not necessary to assume that here the singular (reading) κύψας λύσαι was written against all manuscripts (βαστασαι).”¹⁵⁴ Min’s argument is not entirely reasonable since the scribe has created two other singular readings, both of which may be explained by appeal to parallels. Thomas’s opinion that upsilon is more likely than alpha is convincing. Furthermore, the space allows for the longer reading. The number of letters per line ranges from eighteen to twenty-two and the reading with κύψας λύσαι results in two lines of twenty-two letters.¹⁵⁵

The variant is not strictly textual and appears to be of the memorial sort. In Matthew’s narrative, John does not deem himself worthy to “carry” (βαστάσαι) the sandals (ὑποδήματα) of the one coming after him. The scribe, however, recalls a different scene, the one narrated by Mark and Luke, and remembers that John did not regard himself highly enough to stoop down to untie the strap of the sandals (τὸν ἰμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων) of the coming one. The scribe begins copying the verse with Matthew’s

¹⁵³ Thomas, *OP*, 64:204.

¹⁵⁴ Min, *Frühste Überlieferung*, 210: “An dieser Stelle ist nur ein kleiner Punkt zu lesen, der eine Spur sowohl eines Alphas (α) also auch eines Ypsilons (υ) sein kann. M.E. ist es nicht nötig anzunehmen, dass hier singular geschrieben worden ist gegen alle Handschriften (βαστασαι).”

¹⁵⁵ With either reading, λύσαι or βαζ]τάσαι, the second line of this phrase amounts to twenty-two letters.

version of events in mind, making no reference to sandal straps. He then strays into a parallel version, perhaps the cognitive exemplar constituting his horizon of expectation, where a strap must be loosed.¹⁵⁶ Since he did not take care to integrate the material from the parallel into Matthew's text in a natural way, it is most likely that the assimilation was accidental. If the reconstructed line is correct, and I deem it probable, this is an instance where harmonization is very likely.¹⁵⁷

(18) Matthew 3:16 – καὶ εἶδεν τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ καταβαῖνον Ἦ ὡσεὶ περιστερᾶν

(Ἦ ὡς; //Luke 3:22, Mark 1:10; Sub-singular P¹⁰¹ D 983)

(19) Matthew 3:17 – οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός ἐν ᾧ Ἦ εὐδόκησα

(Ἦ ἠεὶ εὐδόκησα; common variant in //Mark 1:11, Luke 3:22)¹⁵⁸

A third harmonizing variant occurs in Matthew 3:16, where the adverb ὡσεὶ has been replaced with ὡς. Matthew records, “And he [Jesus] saw the spirit of God descending as (ὡσεὶ) a dove.”¹⁵⁹ There is not a substantial difference in the meaning of the

¹⁵⁶ See Gundry, *Matthew*, 48, for a discussion of Matthean redaction in this episode. The term ὑποδήματα refers to any sole bound to the foot by means of a strap and the term λύω or ὑπολύω can correctly be used for “removing” the sandal (cf. Exodus 3:5 LXX; Deuteronomy 25:9, 10 LXX; Joshua 5:15 LXX; Ruth 4:7, 8 LXX; Acts 7:33; 13:25). In the New Testament, the verb λύω is used in reference to the straps (ἰμάς) of the sandal (cf. Mark 1:7; Luke 3:16; John 1:27, all from the same words of John the Baptist).

¹⁵⁷ Elliott, “Six New Papyri,” 106, seems to imply agreement, but may simply be pointing out the parallel.

¹⁵⁸ P¹⁰¹ 8*,^{1a} C L P W Σ 118 243 251 471.

¹⁵⁹ See also Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 217–218; and B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 11. A late second- or early third-century fragment of Irenaeus (P.Oxy. 406) contains a quotation of Matthew 3:16–17 which includes the omega at the beginning of this word, but breaks off thereafter. See Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 3, Graeco-Roman Memoirs (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1903), 10–11. Unfortunately, the quotation also breaks off before ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα, where another variant reading is found in P¹⁰¹. See Eldon Jay Epp, “The New Testament Papyri at Oxyrhynchus in Their Social and Intellectual Context,” in *Sayings of Jesus: Canonical & Non-Canonical, Essays in Honour of Tjitze Baarda*, ed. William L. Petersen, Johan S. Vos, and Henk J. de Jonge, NovTSup 89 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 47–68, 66, for further discussion of this piece.

two words. The adverb *ὡς* is used far more often than *ὡσεὶ* in the New Testament, but the latter is found often in Luke and Acts. In this case, though, both Mark and Luke have the shorter adverb *ὡς*.¹⁶⁰ It is possible that harmonization to synoptic parallels has influenced the selection of the shorter adverb in P¹⁰¹, but harmonization to general New Testament usage is equally possible.

A voice from the cloud says, “This is my son, the beloved, in whom I am well-pleased (*εὐδόκησα*).” In P¹⁰¹, there is a variant in the last word resulting from a temporal augment. Instead of *εὐδόκησα*, the reading in most manuscripts, the scribe has written *ἡὐδόκησα*. It is worth noting the frequency with which the alternative spelling appears in the manuscript tradition. In Mark 1:11, the augmented form (*ἡὐδόκησα*) can be found in the majority of witnesses, including Codex Bezae and Codex Washingtonianus.¹⁶¹ Many early manuscripts of Luke 3:22 witness this form of the verb as well.¹⁶² The augmented form is also the reading in the *Gospel of the Ebionites* fragment 4.¹⁶³ Despite its popularity in other texts, only a few manuscripts of Matthew have the augmented form. In this case, it must be considered possible, given the propensity of the scribe to harmonize as well as his demonstrated awareness of Luke’s text, that this common variant in manuscripts of Luke has influenced the scribe.

¹⁶⁰ Manuscripts of Luke with *ὡσεὶ* in harmonization to Matthew include: A K M N U X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ f¹ f³ 2 28 69 157 565 700 892 1006 1071 1342 1424 1506 2542 ℣. IGNTP prefers *ὡσεὶ* in Luke, but the external attestation is largely in favor of the alternative. Manuscripts of Mark with *ὡσεὶ* include: G M P W Σ Φ f¹ f³ 28 33 157 543 565 1424.

¹⁶¹ D^c E F H V W Γ Δ Σ 2 22 28 118 157 209 248 579 1071 1424 ℣.

¹⁶² A E G H L W Γ Δ Ψ 2 28 118 157 579 1071. In fact, IGNTP and Souter prefer *ἡὐδόκησα*.

¹⁶³ For the reference, see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:341.

(20) Matthew 4:2 – καὶ νηστεύσας ^ς ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα^ς (^ς τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας;

//Mark 1:13; Singular)

In Matthew 4:2, the words “forty days” (ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα) have been transposed. The scribe of P¹⁰¹ has reversed the order of the words so that the adjective precedes the noun (τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας). It should also be noted that the scribe has used the abbreviated method of writing numbers with a horizontal stroke above the letter representing the number forty: $\bar{\mu}$ ἡμέρας. The scribe may have been induced to alter the word order by his familiarity with the version of the statement found in Mark 1:13.¹⁶⁴ The words of the second phrase, “forty nights” (νύκτας τεσσαράκοντα), have also been transposed in P¹⁰¹, so that the adjective comes before the noun ($\bar{\mu}$ νύκτας). In this instance, since there is no parallel in Mark or Luke, the reading is a result of harmonization to immediate context, that is, to the first variant. Ultimately, this reading has no impact on the meaning of the text.

The scribe of P¹⁰¹ appears to have been quite careless, both in accidental omission and addition. Despite permitting external sources to influence his copy of Matthew in several places, the scribe does not exhibit a pattern of harmonization that would suggest a deliberate attempt to assimilate the text to the other Synoptics.

¹⁶⁴ So B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 12. Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 215, 217–218, says, “Wahrscheinlicher ist aber, dass die Umstellung durch Harmonisierung zur Parallelstelle in Mk 1:13...bedingt ist.” Manuscripts with the alternative order include: A D K M U Γ Δ Θ Π Σ Φ ^f ^f ¹³ 1 2 22 28 69 118 124 131 157 209 346 543 565 700 788 1071 1582 \mathfrak{m} .

*P*⁷⁰ (P.Oxy. 2384 + PSI Inv. CNR 419, 420) – Matthew 2:13–16; 2:22–3:1; 11:26–27; 12:4–5; 24:3–6, 12–15

*P*⁷⁰ is comprised of three fragments of Matthew from Oxyrhynchus dated to the late third or early fourth century.¹⁶⁵ The first fragment to be discovered (P.Oxy. 2384) included on the verso a prayer of Jesus from Matthew 11:26–27 and on the recto Matthew 12:4–5, a Sabbath controversy episode. The other two fragments witness the end of Matthew’s infancy narrative and part of Jesus’s apocalyptic speech in Matthew 24. The text of *P*⁷⁰ includes several variant readings, many of them singular and sub-singular, but only two that may be explained with reference to parallel material. Both cases are found in the first fragment. Kurt Aland classifies the text as “strict,” though Min describes its transmission quality as “free.”¹⁶⁶

(21) Matthew 11:27 – καὶ οὐδεὶς ἴ ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ (ἴ γινώσκει;
//Luke 10:22)¹⁶⁷

In Matthew 11:27, Jesus prays, “No one knows (ἐπιγινώσκει) the son except the Father.” This passage is paralleled in Luke 10:22, where Jesus says, “No one knows (γινώσκει) who the son is except the Father.” Where Matthew uses a compound verb,

¹⁶⁵ For the *ed. pr.* of P.Oxy. 2384, see E. Lobel et al., eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 24, Graeco-Roman Memoirs 35 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1957), 4–5 and Plate XIII. For the *ed. pr.* of PSI Inv. CNR 419 and 420, see Mario Naldini, “Nuovi frammenti del vangelo di Matteo,” *Prometheus* 1 (1975): 195–200. Thomas assigns the Oxyrhynchus fragment to the third/fourth century, as does Naldini for the two other fragments. Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 133 no. 360; K. Aland, *Repertorium*, 301; and Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 473, date the manuscript to the third century.

¹⁶⁶ K. Aland, “Standard-Text,” 265–66; and Min, *Frühste Überlieferung*, 193. See also, Wasserman, “Early Text of Matthew,” 97.

¹⁶⁷ *P*⁷⁰ C Λ 71 692.

Luke uses a simple verb.¹⁶⁸ The scribe of P⁷⁰ has used Luke's form of the verb in his copy of Matthew.¹⁶⁹ This is very likely an instance of harmonization, though it does not appear to be intentional since the scribe has not adopted other features of Luke's question (i.e. "who the son is" (τίς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱός)).

(22) Matthew 12:4 – πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγον (ἔφαγεν; //Mark 2:26, Luke 6:4)¹⁷⁰

In a later verse, Matthew 12:4, the scribe has substituted the singular verb ἔφαγεν for Matthew's plural ἔφαγον. The passage is found in the story of the disciples plucking grain on the Sabbath. The Pharisees question Jesus about the legality of their actions, to which he responds with a story about David. "Have you not read what David did," he asks, "how he entered into the house of God and they ate (ἔφαγον) the bread of the presence?" The story implies that David enters the temple, retrieves the bread, and brings it outside where he and his companions eat it. The parallels in Mark 2:26 and Luke 6:4 use the singular form of the verb (ἔφαγεν), though it is clear from the context that David's men also eat. It is possible that one of these parallels has influenced the scribe's selection of the singular verb.

¹⁶⁸ On the basis of the Two Document Hypothesis, and given Matthew's preference for compound verbs, it would appear that the evangelist originally replaced the simple form of the verb found in his double-tradition source (γινώσκω) with the compound verb (ἐπιγινώσκω). Matthew is partial to ἐπιγινώσκω, which he introduces into parallel material five times. See Gundry, *Matthew*, 216, 677; and Luz, *Matthew*, 2:157. Quite a few late manuscripts of Luke 10:22 have been assimilated to Matthew's ἐπιγινώσκει, but among them only one from the fifth century or earlier (C).

¹⁶⁹ Min, *Frühste Überlieferung*, 192.

¹⁷⁰ P⁷⁰ C D E G K L M N U W Γ Δ Θ Σ Π 0233 *f*¹ *f*¹³ 2 28 33 118 157 180 205 565 579 597 700 788 892^c 1006 1010 1071 1243 1292 1342 1346 1424 1505 1506 *ℓ*. Souter and Merk prefer ἔφαγεν.

Before one can decide whether harmonization is at work, one must first ask whether the plural verb is in fact the older reading in Matthew. Indeed, although most modern editions of the Greek New Testament have ἔφαγον, only Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus, and miniscule 481 support the plural verb.¹⁷¹ By contrast, the singular verb is supported in the vast majority of manuscripts, including this papyrus from the third century and three other important and diverse manuscripts from the fifth century (C D W). In light of the textual evidence in favor of ἔφαγεν, David Turner writes, “The UBS⁴ reading of this verse (ἔφαγον; Ɀ, B, 481) may be seriously doubted” since “the reading ἔφαγεν is much more widely supported.”¹⁷²

What has led so many editors to prefer ἔφαγον?¹⁷³ Min deems it likely that scribes replaced the older plural reading with a singular verb in harmonization to immediate context, given that three nearby verbs are third-person singular.¹⁷⁴ Another possibility is that the text of Matthew has been assimilated to Mark 2:26 and Luke 6:4, where the verb is always ἔφαγεν and never ἔφαγον.¹⁷⁵ Metzger regards ἔφαγον as the more difficult reading and finds it easy to conceive of scribes harmonizing to parallels in this case.¹⁷⁶ Alternatively, it is very difficult to conceive of the scribes of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus

¹⁷¹ See further Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 189.

¹⁷² David L. Turner, *Matthew*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 311.

¹⁷³ Gnllka, *Matthäusevangelium*, 1:444 n. 5, writes, “...ἔφαγον ist mit Sinaiticus und B zu bevorzugen.”

¹⁷⁴ Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 192, mentions that harmonization to Synoptic parallels is possible, but is convinced that the nearby singular verbs were a stronger influence.

¹⁷⁵ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:309; and Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:327, cite assimilation as an explanation for the reading.

independently creating a more difficult reading. Harmonization is the best explanation for the variant.

The scribe of P⁷⁰ produced a fairly free transcription of Matthew, but he was not especially prone to harmonization. This can be seen by that fact that there are no cases of harmonization in PSI Inv. CNR 419 and 420.

Preliminary Summary of Harmonization in Manuscripts of Matthew

Before turning to the third-century manuscripts of Luke, it is important to assess the external sources that have influenced scribes copying Matthew to alter their manuscripts. It should be remembered that two manuscripts from the third century did not contain harmonizing variants (P¹ P¹⁰²). Twenty-two variants from eight other manuscripts have been analyzed, among which one was unlikely to have involved harmonization (1) and ten could only be described as possibly the result of parallel influence. In the remaining eleven cases where harmonization is likely or very likely the best explanation of the reading, the influence of both Mark and Luke can be seen.

Table 1. Sources of Harmonization in Second- and Third-Century Manuscripts of Matthew

Source of Harmonization	Total: 11	Entry Number
Mark	4	2, 15, 17, 20
Luke	5	5, 6, 11, 16, 21
Mark or Luke	1	22
Luke or 1 Corinthians	1	12

It is evident that scribes copying the Gospel of Matthew were influenced both by the Gospel of Mark and the Gospel of Luke. The notion that the Gospel of Mark lost its

¹⁷⁶ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 26.

relevance after the popularization of the Gospel of Matthew must now be qualified.¹⁷⁷ The preference for Matthew is obvious in this early period, since no stand-alone copies of Mark have survived, but Mark's continued relevance can be seen in harmonizing variants that have their source in the Second Gospel.

Manuscripts of Luke

Five manuscripts of Luke survive from the third century and the cusp of the fourth. Of these, one is quite extensive (P⁷⁵), another offers a fair amount of text (P⁴), and three are exceedingly short (P⁷, P⁶⁹, P¹¹¹). Two of these manuscripts do not contain variants that can be explained by harmonization.¹⁷⁸ P⁷⁵ is addressed in Chapter Three.

¹⁷⁷ There is simply not enough evidence about the Gospel of Mark in the second and third centuries to know its status in Christian communities.

¹⁷⁸ The following manuscripts of Luke do not contain harmonizing variants:

P¹¹¹ (P.Oxy. 4495) is a third-century fragment from Oxyrhynchus containing Luke 17:11–13, 22–23. See the *ed. pr.* in N. Gonis et al., eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 66, *Graeco-Roman Memoirs* 86 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1999), 3–5 and Plates I and II. See also Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 659–660; B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 10–11; Head, “Recently Published,” 15; J. K. Elliott, “Seven Recently Published New Testament Fragments from Oxyrhynchus,” *NovT* 42 (2000): 209–213, 209, 211; and Cornelia Römer, “Christliche Texte (1998–1999; mit einem Nachtrag aus dem Jahr 1992),” *APF* 46 (2000): 302–308, 303. See also Juan Hernández, Jr., “The Early Text of Luke,” in *The Early Text of the New Testament*, 121–139, 122.

P⁷ (Kiev, Centr. Nauč. Bibl. F. 301) is a short remnant of a patristic fragment with a direct quotation of Luke 4:1–3. Only about 139 letters remain spread across 10 lines. For the *ed. pr.* see Kurt Aland, “Neue neutestamentliche Papyri,” *NTS* 3 (1957): 261–286; repr. as “Neue neutestamentliche Papyri: P⁷, P⁶⁸, P¹¹,” in *Studien zur Überlieferung des neuen Testaments und seines Textes*, ANTF 2 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1967), 137–154. Aland tentatively dates the manuscript to the third/fourth century. See also Schofield, “Papyrus Fragments,” 126–127, who deems a fourth-century date more probable. See also Hernández, “Early Text of Luke,” 121–122.

P⁴ (BnF Suppl. Gr. 1120) – Luke 1:58–59; 1:62–2:1, 6–7; 3:8–4:2, 29–32, 34–35; 5:3–8; 5:30–6:16

The journey of this early third-century papyrus from its discovery in Egypt to its publication has been a tumultuous one.¹⁷⁹ The script gives the appearance of professional penmanship and the text shares great affinities with P⁷⁵ and Codex Vaticanus, two manuscripts of Luke from the Alexandrian type.¹⁸⁰ And yet, despite the care that went into its creation, in its time it reached the point where it was no longer regarded as useful and was replaced by a new copy of Luke. This manuscript was then recycled, as it were, by Christians using the material as stuffing for a codex of Philo's treatises. Vincent Scheil explains, "Following the forty-fourth sheet [of Philo], by way of filling, I think, and in order to fill the capacity of the cover, several fragments of sheets glued together are found."¹⁸¹ This wad of papyrus is P⁴. Many scholars assert that the wad of material was glued together as part of the binding, but Simon Gathercole has shown that this

¹⁷⁹ Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 43, date this text to the late second century with P^{64/67}. K. Aland, *Repertorium*, 219, is convinced by a third-century date. Jean Merell, who published the first full edition; Lagrange, *Critique rationnelle*, 118; and Schofield, "Papyrus Fragments," 100, accept a date in the fourth century. Vincent Scheil, "Archéologie, Varia," *RB* 1 (1892): 113–117, who published the *ed. pr.* of part of the text, originally posited a sixth-century date on paleographic grounds. Skeat, "Oldest Manuscript," 186, explains that the dating of Scheil and Merell was influenced by the expectation at the time that fragments from a codex could not be dated earlier than the fourth century. See also Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 146–147 no. 403.

¹⁸⁰ Lagrange, *Critique rationnelle*, 123–124, notes a strong affinity with Vaticanus. He writes, "L'accord avec B est tout à fait frappant." This was reaffirmed by Jean Merell, "Nouveaux Fragments du Papyrus IV," *RB* 47 (1938): 5–22, 7–8, and William F. Warren, "The Textual Relationships of P4, P45, and P75 in the Gospel of Luke" (ThD diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1983). On pp. 93–94, Warren offers two helpful tables describing the textual relationships between P⁴ and P⁴⁵, P⁷⁵, Ⱳ, B, C, D, and W. His analysis confirms that there is a close affinity between P⁴ and B and also between P⁴ and P⁷⁵.

¹⁸¹ Quoted in Merell, "Nouveaux Fragments," 6, apparently, according to Gathercole, quoting Scheil, "Deux traités de Philon," iii: "A la suite du quarante-quatrième feuillet, en guise de bourre, je pense, et pour remplir la capacité de la couverture, se trouvaient plusieurs fragments de feuillets collés ensemble..."

cannot be so since the final page of Philo is glued to the interior of the back cover.

Rather, it was inserted just short of the last page as filler.¹⁸²

Many scholars have speculated that P⁴ belonged to the same codex as P^{64/67} and that together these texts belonged to one of the earliest four-gospel codices. Part of this speculation was fueled by the discovery of a flyleaf with P⁴ containing the title “Gospel according to Matthew.”¹⁸³ These conjectures were addressed above in the discussion of P^{64/67}, where it was concluded that the same scribe penned both texts but that the fragments do not belong to the same codex. At least some time passed between the copying of the Gospel of Matthew and the penning of the text of Luke.¹⁸⁴ The text of the papyrus is very good and is typical of the Alexandrian textual type, especially P⁷⁵ and Vaticanus.¹⁸⁵ Lagrange remarks specifically on the infrequency of harmonizations in this manuscript.¹⁸⁶

(23) Luke 6:3 – ὅτε ἐπέινασεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ὄντες (//Mark 2:25,
Matthew 12:3)¹⁸⁷

(24) Luke 6:5 – κύριός ἔστιν τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου² (ἔστιν ὁ υἱὸς
τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου; //Mark 2:28; Lacuna)¹⁸⁸

¹⁸² Simon Gathercole, “The Earliest Manuscript Title of Matthew’s Gospel (BnF Suppl. gr. 1120 ii 3/P⁴),” *NovT* 54 (2012): 209–235, 221.

¹⁸³ Gathercole, “Earliest Manuscript Title,” 209–235.

¹⁸⁴ See also Carsten Peter Thiede, “Notes on P⁴ = Bibliothèque Nationale Paris, Supplementum Graece 1120/5,” *TynBul* 46 (1995): 55–57, for a few additional notes on P⁴.

¹⁸⁵ See Hernández, “Early Text of Luke,” 124–126.

¹⁸⁶ Lagrange, *Critique rationnelle*, 123. In his note on the readings of P⁴, Head, “Observations,” 124, does not ascribe any variants to harmonization.

¹⁸⁷ P⁴ ⋈ B D L W X Θ f¹ 22 33 69 118 124 131 157 205 209 213 435 579 700 788 892 1210 1241 1443 1582 2542. Tischendorf, IGNTP, Merk, and Souter include ὄντες in their editions without brackets.

Luke records that on one particular Sabbath, some Pharisees opposed Jesus because his disciples were plucking grain. Jesus reminds the Pharisees that when David and his companions were hungry, David himself transgressed some regulations. In Luke 6:3, Jesus says, “Then [David] hungered, and those who were with him” (ὅτε ἐπείνασεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ὄντες). Some manuscripts of Luke contain the participle ὄντες, but it is absent from many others.¹⁸⁹ It is unclear whether the participle existed in the autograph of Luke, but, if it is secondary, it cannot have entered the tradition by harmonization since ὄντες does not appear in the Markan and Matthean parallels.¹⁹⁰ It seems more likely that the longer reading is earlier and that the participle was omitted frequently either because it is redundant or in harmonization to Mark or Matthew.¹⁹¹ It is easier to account for its disappearance in many documents than for its appearance in a fair number of manuscripts from separate textual families.

At the end of the pericope, in Luke 6:5, Jesus says, “Lord of the Sabbath is the Son of Man” (κύριός ἐστιν τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου). In Luke, three important, early manuscripts (Ⲙ B W) place the predicate τοῦ σαββάτου before the subject ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. The vast majority of manuscripts, however, place the subject ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ

¹⁸⁸ The reading of καὶ in P⁴ is contested, but it is the transposition of the two phrases that is important here. Manuscripts with ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου before τοῦ σαββάτου include: P^{4lac} A D E H K L M U X Γ Δ Θ Λ^c Π Ψ Ω 027 0233 *f*¹³ 28 33 118 157 180 205 565 579 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 1506 2542 *m*. Tischendorf, IGNTP, and Merk prefer this order. Manuscripts with τοῦ σαββάτου before ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου include: Ⲙ B W 1241. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 117, prefers this reading. I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 233, suggests that the majority reading is an assimilation to Mark.

¹⁸⁹ Manuscripts with ὄντες include: A C K M U Γ Δ Λ Π Ψ *f*¹³ 2 28 565 1071 1424 *m*.

¹⁹⁰ In manuscripts of Mark, ὄντες appears in D. Another manuscript has ἦσαν (Δ). No manuscripts of Matthew include ὄντες.

¹⁹¹ So Marshall, *Luke*, 231. See also Lagrange, *Critique rationelle*, 122.

ἀνθρώπου before the predicate τοῦ σαββάτου. This is an easier reading, since the predicate follows the subject, and is likely secondary. Even so, it is not clear which reading is older.

The parallels of this verse are not identical to each other. In Mark 2:28, the subject ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου always comes before the predicate τοῦ σαββάτου (κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου). In Matthew 12:8, the predicate τοῦ σαββάτου comes before the subject ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.¹⁹² With reference to the variant readings in Luke, harmonization to Mark could account for one reading and harmonization to Matthew for the other. The major problem with the latter supposition is that the few manuscripts of Luke with the “Matthean” order include Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and Washingtonianus, three important early manuscripts from two text types. It is difficult to account for their independent adoption of the more difficult reading. Alternatively, it is quite easy to imagine scribes amending the more difficult reading to the easier form found in Mark.

To complicate the issue further, in P⁴ the reading is a matter of reconstructing the lines in a lacuna. The first words of Jesus’s statement appear, but the next lines are missing. In reference to the difficulty of this place in the manuscript, Jean Merell says, “The dislocation of the papyrus makes the reading of this passage particularly difficult.”¹⁹³ According to Merell, the text of Luke 6:5 in P⁴ reads, “Lord, even of the Sabbath, is the Son of Man” (κύριός ἐστιν καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), the

¹⁹² Manuscripts of Matthew with variants corresponding to the Markan text include: f¹ 33 157 788 1424.

¹⁹³ Merell, “Nouveaux Fragments,” 20: “La dislocation du pap. rend la lecture de ce passage particulièrement malaisée.”

same order found in Matthew but with Mark's emphatic *καί*. The *καί* is emended for the sake of space. The line would be somewhat too short without its addition. Skeat agrees with Merell's reconstruction, as do Comfort and Barrett, whose transcription differs only in the omission of *καί*.¹⁹⁴ Alternatively, Wasserman asserts that the reconstructed text should read: *κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου*, the Markan order with *καί*.¹⁹⁵

Ultimately, I agree with Metzger that the older reading in Luke is the more difficult one with predicate before subject. Scribes harmonized the more difficult reading to Mark's easier version and some added Mark's *καί*. Given the requirements of space, I agree that the conjunction should be included in the text of Luke in P⁴ and therefore reconstruct the remaining lines in P⁴ with Mark's text. It is unlikely that the scribe picked up Mark's *καί* but failed to adopt his order, as Merell suggests. Such a reading never appears in the manuscripts. The scribe of P⁴ was apparently influenced by Mark 2:28.

(25) Luke 6:7 – *παρηγοῦντο δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι εἰ ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ ἴθεραπεύει (ἴθεραπεύσει; //Mark 3:2)*¹⁹⁶

In Luke 6:7, the scribes and Pharisees wait to see “if [Jesus] heals (*θεραπεύει*) on the Sabbath.” The present tense verb suggests an ongoing or habitual practice. In Mark 3:2, the scribes and Pharisees watch Jesus on Sabbath days to see “if he *will heal*

¹⁹⁴ Skeat, “Oldest Manuscript,” 182; and Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 65.

¹⁹⁵ Wasserman, “Comparative Textual Analysis,” 8, 17.

¹⁹⁶ P⁴ B K M U X 033 Γ Δ Θ Λ J¹ J¹³ 2 28 33 157 579 700 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1424 1506
 Ⓜ. IGNTP and Souter prefer *θεραπεύσει*.

(θεραπεύσει).”¹⁹⁷ The future tense draws attention to this single encounter. The Matthean storyline is quite different, with the opponents asking Jesus directly “whether it is lawful to heal on the Sabbath” (εἰ ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν θεραπεῦσαι). P⁴ contains the Markan future tense *θεραπεύσει* instead of the expected Lukan present tense verb *θεραπεύει*. It is very likely that the scribe was influenced by the passage in Mark 3:2.¹⁹⁸

P⁴ is an example of a tightly managed text. It is truly remarkable that a manuscript containing about ninety verses exhibits only three harmonizing readings, one of which is hypothetical. We have already examined several far shorter manuscripts with this many harmonizing variants or more. Furthermore, in all three cases, each harmonizing reading could have existed in the scribe’s exemplar. That is to say, none is a singular reading, which accords with the scribe’s apparent discipline in copying. In each case, the variants are widely attested in other manuscripts. The scribe of P⁴ exercised great care in his transcription and rarely allowed parallel accounts to influence his copy of Luke.

P⁶⁹ (P.Oxy. 2383) – Luke 22:40–41, 45–48, 58–61

P⁶⁹ is a mid third-century fragment from Oxyrhynchus containing passages from Luke 22.¹⁹⁹ Aland and Aland describe P⁶⁹ as a “very free text” because of the number and type of variants.²⁰⁰ Kurt Aland also notes an affinity with readings corresponding to

¹⁹⁷ Manuscripts of Mark with *θεραπεύει* include: Ⲭ W Δ Σ 072 271 713 788.

¹⁹⁸ Wasserman, “Comparative Textual Analysis,” 20, recognizes this variant as a possible harmonization. He also suggests that *ρήγνυσι* instead of *ρήξει* at 5:37 might be a harmonization to Matthew 9:17, but the verb form is not the same. This would be a singular reading.

¹⁹⁹ For the *ed. pr.* see Turner, *OP*, 24:1–4 and Plate XIII. Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 154–155 no. 422; K. Aland, *Repertorium*, 300; Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 471; and Head, “Observations,” 245, concur with a third-century dating.

²⁰⁰ Aland and Aland, *Text*, 471. See also Hernández, “Early Text of Luke,” 122–124.

Codex Bezae, characterizing P⁶⁹ as an early precursor to the D-text. Four variants are considered below, the first of which is a notorious New Testament crux.

(26) Luke 22:42–44 – ἰλέγων πάτερ εἰ βούλει παρένεγκε τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἀπ’

ἐμοῦ πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω ὡφθη δὲ αὐτῷ

ἄγγελος ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτὸν καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ

ἐκτενέστερον προσηύχετο καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἰδρῶς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι

αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν` (cf. Mark 14:36, Matthew

26:39; Singular; Many MSS omit vv. 43–44²⁰¹)

(27) Luke 22:45 – εὗρεν ἰκοιμωμένους αὐτούς` (ἰαυτούς καθεύδοντας κοιμωμένους;

//Mark 14:37, Matt 26:43; Singular; Disproved)

P⁶⁹ is most notable for the absence of Luke 22:42–44 from its text, verses which include Jesus’s prayer in the garden of Gethsemane that the cup of his future suffering might pass from him, the appearance of the strengthening angel, and the sweat like drops of blood.²⁰² Only v. 42, the prayer that the cup might pass, is paralleled in Mark 14:36 and Matthew 26:39. Initially, it was believed that the first portion of 22:45 was missing from P⁶⁹ as well. On the basis of this faulty evidence, Turner suggested that the verses regarding the angel and sweat of blood (vv. 43–44) were absent from the scribe’s exemplar and that v. 42 and v. 45a were lost by homoioteleuton. According to this view, the scribe’s eye jumped from *προσηύχετο* at the end of v. 41 to *προσευχῆς* at the end of the

²⁰¹ Manuscripts without Luke 22:43–44 include: P⁷⁵ 8^c A B N R T W 13* 69 346 473 481 579 713 788 826 1071*. Manuscripts without Luke 22:43 include: 124.

²⁰² Hernández, “Early Text of Luke,” 123, remarks, “The omission has secured the tiny fragment a prominent spot in discussions of Luke’s textual history.”

first clause of v. 45.²⁰³ Christopher Tuckett regards this argument for the omission of vv. 43–44 skeptically, saying, “The evidence for the omission of precisely vv. 43–44 in the papyrus is thus somewhat indirect at best.”²⁰⁴

Since Turner’s initial publication of the fragment, Thomas Wayment has published a new transcription based on multi-spectral imaging that renders the argument for a scribal leap unnecessary.²⁰⁵ Whereas in the initial transcription no letters from v. 45a were discernable, in Wayment’s new images one can detect traces of two letters from that clause (τ and η from τῆς). If Wayment’s analysis is correct, the missing text includes only vv. 42–44 so that homoioteleuton is no longer a plausible option.²⁰⁶ Since no other mechanical error can account for the lack of these verses, one is left wondering why vv. 42–44 are absent from this Lukan textual tradition and whether harmonization has played a role.

Kurt Aland is not alone in asserting that this omission was made deliberately. There are a variety of opinions as to what might have motivated the scribe to omit the episode. For instance, it is possible that the scribe of P⁶⁹, and of the many other

²⁰³ Bart D. Ehrman and Mark A. Plunkett, “The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43–44,” *CBQ* 45 (1983): 401–416; and Head, “Observations,” 245, shared this view, though both articles were published before the new transcription of Wayment discussed below.

²⁰⁴ C. M. Tuckett, “The ‘Agony’ in the Garden and Luke’s Gospel,” in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis*, 131–144.

²⁰⁵ Thomas A. Wayment, “A New Transcription of P. Oxy. 2383 (P⁶⁹),” *NovT* 50 (2008): 350–357.

²⁰⁶ Claire Clivaz, “Some Remarks on Thomas A. Wayment, ‘A New Transcription of P. Oxy. 2383 (P⁶⁹),’” *NovT* 52 (2010): 83–87, cites Wayment’s article with approval on this point, saying, “The hypothesis of an omission of Luke 22:42–45a by *homoioteleuton* between *προσηύχεται* at the end of 22:41 and *προσευχής* in 22:45 is now definitively put aside.” Wayment is not unrealistically confident in this reading, based as it is on the traces of two letters. In Thomas A. Wayment, “P. Oxy. 2383 (P⁶⁹) One More Time,” *NovT* 54 (2012): 288–292, he writes regarding Clivaz’s support of his transcription at this point, “The certainty, is, however, somewhat premature because it is based only on three secure letters of l. 3 and faint traces of two letters in l. 4.”

manuscripts that omit vv. 43–44, cut these verses out of the text in assimilation to the Markan and Matthean Gethsemane narratives. Ehrman and Plunkett discount this possibility, writing, “...Such a procedure of omitting entire sentences for the sake of Gospel harmony has no plausible analogy.”²⁰⁷ This is not quite true. There are several examples of extensive omission that may have involved harmonization.²⁰⁸ In this instance, however, harmonization could only account for the omission of vv. 43–44, the angel and the sweat of blood, but not for the omission of v. 42, the prayer, which is paralleled in Mark and Matthew. Therefore, harmonization does not seem likely in this case.

This variant reading calls into the question the originality of the verses.²⁰⁹ Ehrman and Plunkett present a compelling argument that vv. 43–44 are an interpolation into Luke created in the second century sometime before 160 CE when Justin Martyr cites the passage (*Dial.* 103.8).²¹⁰ The situation is complicated by the fact that “it is likely that some later scribes deleted the verses in question from exemplars that had them, while

²⁰⁷ Ehrman and Plunkett, “The Angel and the Agony,” 404. They say even more directly, “Such arguments based on Synoptic harmonization really lead nowhere.”

²⁰⁸ See, for instance Luke 22:51 and 22:61a in MS 0171 or Matthew 16:2b–3 and Luke 8:43 in Codex Vaticanus. See also the lengthy variant in Mark 10:30 in Codex Sinaiticus. One cannot be certain that harmonization was the exclusive cause of these omissions, but each reading shows that extensive omission under the influence of parallel material cannot be discounted.

²⁰⁹ Among scholars who find the verses original are: Bovon, *Luke*, 3:197–198; Marshall, *Luke*, 831–832; Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave, A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*, 2 vols., ABRL (New York: Doubleday, 1994), 180–186; and Darrell L. Bock, *Luke*, 2 vols., BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994–1996), 1763–1764. Scholars who deem the verses secondary include: Ehrman and Plunkett, “The Angel and the Agony;” Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 2 vols., AB 28-28a (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981–1985), 1443–1444; and John Nolland, *Luke*, 3 vols., WBC 35a–c (Dallas, Word Books, 1993–2000), 2:1080–1081.

²¹⁰ Ehrman and Plunkett, “The Angel and the Agony,” 401–416, argue on a variety of fronts, including the absence of the verses in many manuscripts, the special marks associated with the passage in some manuscripts of Luke, and the dislocation of the verses to Matthew in some manuscripts.

other scribes added them to exemplars that did not.”²¹¹ There are theological rationales for both omission and interpolation.²¹² Therefore, Ehrman and Plunkett ask which makes sense given the theological climate of the second century. They are of the opinion that interpolation is more likely given that orthodox Christians were confronted with several manifestations of Docetic Christology in the second century. The creation and inclusion of a passage that emphasized Jesus’s emotional turmoil and human anxiety in the face of death, especially in the midst of Luke’s passion narrative, which stresses Jesus’s control, was a useful tool for combatting those who believed Jesus only *seemed* to have a human body. Ehrman and Plunkett’s argument, based on external textual evidence as well as the internal coherence of the passage with Lukan themes, shows that Luke 22:43–44 was not original to Luke but was added for dogmatic reasons. Greg Sterling concurs, stating, “The best explanation is that a second-century scribe included it to accentuate Jesus’ humanity over against those who might have used the absence of Jesus’ emotions in this text to call his humanity into question.”²¹³

This analysis accounts only for the latter two of the three verses. How has v. 42 been lost from P⁶⁹? Claire Clivaz posits that the omission of vv. 42–44 in P⁶⁹ may be a witness to a Marcionite version of Luke.²¹⁴ She writes, “P⁶⁹ is not to be treated as a witness to the inclusion or omission of vv. 43–44, but represents, in my opinion, a *third*

²¹¹ Ehrman and Plunkett, “The Angel and the Agony,” 407.

²¹² With regard to omission for doctrinal reasons, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “Papyrus Bodmer XIV: Some Features of Our Oldest Text of Luke,” *CBQ* 24 (1962): 170–179, 178, demurs, “But it is impossible to ascribe to these relatively unimportant heretics such influence on the Gospel text, that they would be responsible for the widespread omission.”

²¹³ Greg Sterling, “*Mors philosophi*: The Death of Jesus in Luke,” *HTR* 94 (2001): 383–402.

²¹⁴ Claire Clivaz, “The Angel and the Sweat Like ‘Drops of Blood’ (Lk 22:43–44): P⁶⁹ and *f*¹³,” *HTR* 98 (2005): 419–440.

and alternate view of the Lukan pericope of the Mount of Olives. That is, P⁶⁹ reflects a textual tradition that consciously omits the longer passage of Luke 22:42–45a (or Luke 22:42, 45a).²¹⁵ She goes on to show that Jesus’s request that the cup might pass from him was shocking to second-century readers who expected heroes to be valiant and stoic in the face of death. While Clivaz’s overall assessment that the omission of all three verses belongs to a Marcionite context is not entirely persuasive, her points regarding the omission of v. 42 as eliminating an easily misunderstood passage are convincing. The same impulse to omit mention of Jesus’s emotional turmoil in the “angel and agony” scene is at work removing the fear and weakness exhibited by his desire to escape his suffering.

Another important variant in P⁶⁹ is the odd version of Luke 22:45. In P⁶⁹, this verse appears to say, “Coming to the disciples he found them *sleeping sleeping* (sleepily?) from grief” (ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εὔρεν αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας κοιμωμένους). The correct reading in Luke reads, “He found them sleeping” (εὔρεν κοιμωμένους αὐτούς). Peter Head states that this singular reading “appears to be a case of harmonisation to the synoptic parallels” since both Matthew 26:40 and Mark 14:37 read *καθεύδοντας* instead of *κοιμωμένους*.²¹⁶ This was the standard explanation of this reading until Thomas Wayment provided a new transcription rendering the reading inaccurate. According to the new transcription, the line has “disciples sleeping” (μαθητὰς κοιμωμένους). Clivaz, who is mostly critical of Wayment’s interpretation and explanation of the transcription, agrees

²¹⁵ Clivaz, “The Angel and the Sweat,” 427. This article was written before Wayment’s new reconstruction. In her later article she recognizes the presence of v. 45a in P⁶⁹.

²¹⁶ Turner, *OP*, 24:3, draws attention to the Synoptic parallels in his note on the verse.

with him on this point since it makes a “coherent sentence” out of an odd double construction with synonyms for sleep.²¹⁷ In light of the new text, harmonization, which had been all but certain, is no longer necessary. Indeed, it seems that harmonization influenced Turner’s reconstruction.²¹⁸

(28) Luke 22:47 – καὶ ἤγγισεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ φιλεῖν αὐτόν` (ἔγγισας ἐφίλησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν; //Mark 14:45, Matthew 26:49; Sub-singular P⁶⁹ D)

Although the previous two readings did not ultimately involve harmonization, the variant in Luke 22:47 likely does. Luke records, “And [Judas] came near to Jesus to kiss him” (καὶ ἤγγισεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ φιλεῖν αὐτόν). Judas comes to Jesus *in order to* kiss him, but Jesus prevents him from doing so.²¹⁹ At least, if Judas was successful in kissing Jesus, it is not explicit in Luke.²²⁰ Both Mark and Matthew use a finite verb to describe Judas’s action: “And he kissed him” (καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν). In the text of Luke in P⁶⁹ the force of the verb has moved from intent, signified by the infinitival form, to action, as seen in the aorist. His account then reads, “Coming [Judas] kissed Jesus” (ἔγγισας ἐφίλησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν). This sort of harmonization is not of the strictly textual sort, since the phrase is not identical to the parallels, but the message is equivalent and amounts to an imaginative assimilation. The scene unfolding in the scribe’s horizon of expectation, where Judas

²¹⁷ Clivaz, “Some Remarks,” 84.

²¹⁸ Turner did express hesitance in his reconstruction, but eight letters of the suspect phrase are presented without the underdots that signify uncertainty.

²¹⁹ Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 783. See also Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, SP 3 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991), 352; and Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2:1450.

²²⁰ So Nolland, *Luke*, 3:1088.

does in fact kiss Jesus, is that which he copies onto his papyrus, but it is not in fact the Lukan scene.

(29) Luke 22:61 – και ὑπεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ {ῥήματος} τοῦ κυρίου (//Matthew 26:75, Mark 14:72)²²¹

In Luke 22:61, after he denies knowing Jesus, Peter remembers “the word (τοῦ λόγου) of the lord.” Under consideration is the term λόγου. The best and oldest manuscripts, including the early papyri P⁶⁹ and P⁷⁵, attest the presence of the synonym ῥήματος, which corresponds to Matthew 26:75 and Mark 14:72. In reference to the same reading in Codex Vaticanus, Herman Hoskier suggests that the reading found in the majority of manuscripts (λόγου) may in fact be older and that the alternative reading (ῥήματος) arrived later by harmonization.²²² This is certainly possible, but in this case the external evidence for the word ῥήματος in Luke is compelling so that harmonization to Synoptic parallels is not likely. The term λόγου found in the majority of manuscripts arrived by harmonization to general usage or from stylistic reasons.

P⁶⁹ offers a variety of interesting readings, but better quality images and a new transcription have shown that two of the most distinctive readings are not quite what they appeared to be. It has been demonstrated that the reading with the doubly-sleeping disciples is non-existent and the absence of verses recording Jesus’s activities in the garden is not a result of assimilation. Only one reading in P⁶⁹ can be attributed to

²²¹ Manuscripts with ῥήματος include: P⁶⁹ P⁷⁵ ⳨ B L T X 070 0124 4 5 124 213 348 577 579 892 1012 1216 1241 1579. Manuscripts with λόγου include: A D K M N U W Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ 0250 f¹ f¹³ 2 28 157 565 700 788 1006 1071 1342 1424 1506 2542 ℞. Tischendorf, IGNTP, and Merk prefer λόγου.

²²² Herman C. Hoskier, *Codex B and Its Allies: A Study and an Indictment*, 2 vols. (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1914), 1:268. See also Carlo M. Martini, *Il problema della recensionalità del codice B alla luce del papiro Bodmer XIV*, AnBib 26 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966), 131.

harmonization, and that of the imaginative rather than textual variety. This evidence supports Clivaz's call to reevaluate the classification of the text as "paraphrastic."²²³

Preliminary Summary of Harmonization in Manuscripts of Luke

Before turning to MS 0171, it is possible to summarize briefly some basic findings. In the first place, it should be recalled that two manuscripts did not exhibit any harmonizing variants (P⁷ P¹¹¹). From the remaining two manuscripts, seven variants were discussed, three of which did not involve harmonization (26, 27, 29). Another reading (24) may have involved harmonization, but since it falls in a lacuna it is not included in the following results. The remaining three readings show the influence of Mark and probably Matthew. Given the scarcity of evidence, no firm conclusions can be made regarding the external influences that caused alterations in manuscripts of Luke.

Table 2. Sources of Harmonization in Third-Century Manuscripts of Luke

Source of Harmonization	Total: 3	Entry Number
Mark	4	25
Mark or Matthew	1	23, 28

Manuscript 0171: A Manuscript of Matthew and Luke

MS 0171 is the earliest majuscule manuscript containing portions of more than one Gospel, covering verses from the Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel of Luke. The manuscript comes from Egypt and is dated by most to the late third or early fourth

²²³ Clivaz, "The Angel and the Sweat,"⁴²⁷ responding to Kurt Aland, "Alter und Entstehung des D-Textes im neuen Testament: Betrachtungen zu P⁶⁹ und 0171," in *Miscellània papirologica Ramon Roca-Puig: En el seu vuitantè aniversari*, ed. Sabastià Janeras (Barcelona: Fundació Salvador Vives Casajuana, 1987), 59–60. In particular, Aland states, "Mit der Eingliederung in die Kategorie des paraphrasierenden Textes lösen sich die Probleme, die der Text von P⁶⁹ bisher aufgeworfen hat. Der paraphrasierende Text ändert nach seinem Ermessen: durch Zufügungen, durch Kürzungen, durch Änderungen und Umstellungen in den Sätzen, wie und soweit er das für nötig hält."

century.²²⁴ The manuscript consists of two vellum leaves with text in two columns.

Comfort and Barrett describe the script as “reformed documentary” and suggest that a professional scribe copied the manuscript.²²⁵

0171 (PSI 2.124) – Matthew 10:17–23, 25–32

Kurt Treu published the *editio princeps* of the Matthew portion of the manuscript in 1966.²²⁶ The fragment contains about fifteen verses from Matthew 10.

(30) Matthew 10:17 – παραδώσουσιν γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια καὶ ἐν ταῖς

συναγωγαῖς ἃ αὐτῶν μαστιγώσουσιν ὑμᾶς (ἐἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς;

//Luke 21:12, Mark 13:9; Sub-singular 0171 D)

(31) Matthew 10:18 – καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας δὲ καὶ βασιλεῖς ἀχθήσεσθε ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ

(ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσεσθε; //Mark 13:9; Singular²²⁷)

(32) Matthew 10:19 – μὴ μεριμνήσητε ὡς ἢ τί λαλήσητε (//Mark 13:11;

Singular)

In Matthew 10:17, Jesus warns his disciples about the difficult path of discipleship ahead of them. He says, “For they will hand you over into councils and in their synagogues (ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν) they will whip you.” In the parallel verse in Mark 13:9, Jesus says the disciples will be handed over “into synagogues” (εἰς

²²⁴ Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 685. Kurt Treu, “Neue neutestamentliche Fragmente der Berliner Papyrussammlung,” *APF* 18 (1966): 23–38; and Kurt Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments: Zweite, neubearbeitete und ergänzte Auflage*, ANTF 1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), 34, date the piece “um 300.” Mario Naldini, *Documenti dell’ antichità cristiana: Papiri e pergamene greco-egizie della raccolta fiorentina* (Florence: Felice le Monnier, 1965), 16; and Lagrange, *Critique rationnelle*, 71, date MS 0171 to the 4th century. See also Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 131–132 no. 356.

²²⁵ Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 685.

²²⁶ Treu, “Neue neutestamentliche Fragmente,” 23–38.

²²⁷ The text of D and 111 is nearly identical (ἡγεμόνων σταθήσεσθε). Minuscule 485 also has σταθήσεσθε under the influence of Mark 13:9.

συναγωγάς). Similarly, in Luke 21:12, Jesus says the disciples will be delivered “into the synagogues” (εἰς τὰς συναγωγάς). The scribe of MS 0171 has substituted Mark and Luke’s preposition “into” (εἰς) and an accusative construction for Matthew’s preposition “in” (ἐν) and dative construction. Since the scribe has also adopted the direct article τὰς, harmonization to Luke’s version of the saying is most likely.²²⁸ The scribe did not intend complete assimilation because he has retained the uniquely Matthean reference to the synagogues as “their synagogues” (τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν).²²⁹

Another possibility in this case is harmonization to immediate context since Matthew uses the preposition “into” (εἰς) in reference to the “councils” (συνέδρια) of the previous phrase. It is possible the scribe was influenced by the first use of the preposition and so duplicated it in the second phrase. The preposition εἰς is compatible with the first verb, “they will hand over” (παραδώσουσιν), but not with the second verb, “they will whip” (μαστιγώσουσιν). If the scribe believed the first verb covered both the councils and the synagogues, he would have been compelled to change the preposition. In this case, instead of “for they will hand you over into councils and they will whip you in their synagogues,” the sentence would be rendered, “For they will hand you over into councils and into their synagogues. They will whip you.” If the scribe was not looking ahead to the second verb, one can easily imagine him reading the sentence in this way.

²²⁸ Manuscripts of Luke with τὰς include: ⱼ B D 157 828. Manuscripts without τὰς include: A K L M U W Γ Δ Λ Θ Ψ Π 0102 *f*¹ *f*³ 2 33 157 565 579 700 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1346 1424 1506 2542 Ɀ. IGNTP prefers the anarthrous reading, but the appearance of τὰς in Vaticanus and Sinaiticus is impressive when joined with the testimony of Bezae. The anarthrous reading is likely a harmonization to Mark. Treu, “Neue neutestamentliche Fragmente,” 28, suggests harmonization.

²²⁹ Min, *Frühste Überlieferung*, 265, “Die Übernahme von der synoptischen Parallele ist aber wahrscheinlicher.”

In Matthew 10:18, Jesus says, “And before governors and kings you will be dragged for my sake” (καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας δὲ καὶ βασιλεῖς ἀχθήσεσθε ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ). In the parallel in Mark 13:9, Jesus says, “And before governors and kings you will be *stood* for my sake” (καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσεσθε ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ). The scribe has conformed to the Markan version of this statement, both in using a genitive construction to describe the “governors and kings” and in adopting the verb “to stand” (ἵστημι).²³⁰

Jesus goes on to say in Matthew 10:19, “Do not worry about how (you will speak) or what you will say” (μὴ μεριμνήσητε πῶς ἢ τί λαλήσετε). In Mark 13:11, Jesus says, “Do not worry beforehand about what you will say” (μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε τί λαλήσετε). In terms of harmonization, it is the omission of the words “how or” (πῶς ἢ) that is of note. In MS 0171, the scribe has omitted this phrase in harmonization to Mark 13:11. Min considers it more likely that the scribe has harmonized to immediate context since the second clause of Matthew 10:19 ends with the phrase “what you will say” (τί λαλήσετε) and does not reference *how* you will speak.²³¹ Harmonization to context is plausible, but assimilation to Mark is more likely given the fact that the second clause in Matthew is not connected directly to the issue of worry, but rather with the God’s provision.

(33) Matthew 10:29 – οὐχὶ δύο στρουθία ἀσσαρίου ἴπωλεῖται (ἴπωλοῦνται; //Luke 12:6; Sub-singular 1071 D)

²³⁰ Treu, “Neue neutestamentliche Fragmente,” 28; and Nolland, *Matthew*, 421, posit harmonization.

²³¹ Min, *Frühste Überlieferung*, 265.

(34) Matthew 10:30 – ^sὕμῶν ^rδὲ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς ^tπᾶσαι ἠριθμημέναι
 εἰσὶν (^rἀλλά; ὑμῶν after κεφαλῆς; //Luke 12:6–7; Sub-singular
 0171 D)²³²

After announcing pending persecutions and trials, Jesus seeks to reassure his disciples with words of comfort. In Matthew 10:29, he says, “Are not two sparrows sold (πωλείται) for a penny?” Luke’s wording is slightly different, “Are not five sparrows sold (πωλοῦνται) for two pennies?” The scribe has changed the singular verb in Matthew to the plural verb used in Luke.²³³

In Matthew 10:30, Jesus claims, “And even the hairs of your head are all numbered” (ὕμῶν δὲ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς πᾶσαι ἠριθμημέναι εἰσιν). The scribe has assimilated this clause to Luke 12:7 in two ways.²³⁴ First, he has transposed the possessive pronoun so that it follows the noun it modifies (τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν). The movement of the pronoun creates a problem for the sentence, since δέ is a postpositive conjunction and now is forced into first position. To remedy this issue, the scribe has made a second alteration: he has substituted Luke’s conjunction ἀλλά for Matthew’s δέ.²³⁵ The reverse operation also accounts for the word order; if the scribe first replaced δέ with Luke’s ἀλλά, which takes first position, this would force the pronoun to move and there is no

²³² The scribe of Codex Regius (L) inserts ὑμῶν after κεφαλῆς, but retains the first as well.

²³³ We will see in the next chapter that the reverse operation occurs in the text of Luke in P⁴⁵.

²³⁴ The clause in Luke exhibits very few variants, but manuscripts with ἠριθμημέναι in assimilation to Matthew 10:30 include: P⁴⁵ 1242*. Additionally, manuscripts with ἠριθμημέναι εἰσὶν include: D Θ 124 1071 579 1604 2643.

²³⁵ The sigla in NA²⁸ seem to indicate that ὑμῶν δέ is *replaced* by ἀλλά and that ὑμῶν is *inserted* after κεφαλῆς. These sigla explain mechanically where the words in the variant are, but they obfuscate the reasons as to why the variation has occurred. The conjunction ἀλλά replaces only δέ and ὑμῶν has been *transposed*.

permissible place for it until after the noun it modifies. Harmonization may have been a factor in both variants, but harmonization in only one variant would force the other alteration for the sake of correct grammar. The source of this double reading is harmonization to Luke 12:7, but complete assimilation was not the goal since the final verb has not been changed. Luke has ἠριθμηγνται, but the scribe has retained Matthew's ἠριθμημένοι εἰσίν.

Preliminary Summary of Harmonization in the Text of Matthew in Manuscript 0171

Five readings from the text of Matthew have been discussed. One of these possibly entered the text as a result of parallel influence (30), but it has been excluded from the following calculations. The remaining four harmonizations reflect awareness of the Gospel of Mark and the Gospel of Luke.

Table 3. Sources of Harmonization in the Text of Matthew in Manuscript 0171

Source of Harmonization	Total: 4	Entry Number
Mark	2	31, 32
Luke	2	33, 34

The text of Matthew in MS 0171 is sporadically harmonized to Mark 13:9 and Luke 12:6–7. Min's correctly states, "Although he has made particularly many harmonizations, he has not systematically aligned the Matthean text with the Synoptic parallels. The Markan text (Mk 13.9) and the Lukan text (Lk 12.6–7) are not reproduced here, rather only a few words have occasionally been borrowed from them."²³⁶ What one finds in MS 0171 is the influence of Mark and Luke upon the scribe's copy of Matthew, but not the scribe's explicit desire or deliberate intent to create a harmonized text. The

²³⁶ Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 265: "Er hat aber, obwohl er besonders viele Harmonisierungen vorgenommen hat, den matthäischen Text keineswegs systematisch an die synoptische Parallele angeglichen. Der markinische Text (Mk 13,9) und der lukanische Text (Lk 12,6–7) sind hier nicht reproduziert, sondern nur ein paar Wörter gelegentlich von ihnen entliehen worden."

assimilations are prominent, but so also are instances of non-harmonization, where the scribe has copied the text of Matthew correctly. It is worth mentioning here, with regard to one of the few documents of the third century exhibiting a large number of assimilations in a short amount of text, that none of the assimilations alter in any way the meaning of the text and very few alter even the content. Rather, their import is in showing that in the community in which MS 0171 was produced, Mark and Luke were also available and circulating, at least among scribes and Christians commissioning manuscripts of the Gospels.

0171 (PSI 2.124) – Luke 22:44–50, 52–56, 61, 63–64

The text of Luke in MS 0171 was first published by E. Pistelli, who dated the manuscript to the fourth century.²³⁷ A late third- or early fourth-century date for the manuscript was suggested above.

(35) Luke 22:45 – ^τ ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς (^τκαί; //Mark 14:37, Matthew 26:40; Singular²³⁸)

The first verses of the fragment narrate the Gethsemene scene immediately following the appearance of the comforting angel and Jesus's sweat like blood. In Luke 22:45, Luke records, “And after rising from prayer, coming to the disciples he found them sleeping from their grief” (καὶ ἀναστὰς ἀπὸ τῆς προσευχῆς ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς εὔρεν κοιμωμένους αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης). The first clause, which explains that Jesus

²³⁷ G. Vitelli, ed., *Papiri Greci e Latini*, 11 vols., Pubblicazioni della Societa Italiana per la Ricerce dei Papiri Greci e Latini in Egitto (Florence: Enrico Ariani, 1912–1935), 1:2–3. See also Charles Wessely, “Les Plus Anciens Monuments du Christianisme Écrits sur Papyrus: Textes Édités, Traduits et Annotés II,” *PO* 18 (1924): 341–511, 452–454. José M. Bover, “Un fragmento de San Lucas (22,44–63) en un papiro (07) recientemente descubierto,” *EstEcl* 4 (1925): 293–305, reconstructs the text with special attention to the Latin witnesses.

²³⁸ IGNTP cites P^{69vid} in favor of this reading, as does the *ed. pr.* Comfort and Barrett and Wayment both omit the word in their editions.

comes to his disciples after rising from prayer, is unique to Luke and emphasizes Jesus's separation from his followers. The second clause is paralleled in Matthew 26:40 and Mark 14:37, where it is the first clause of the sentence and so begins with the conjunction *καί*. The scribe has inserted an additional *καί* into the Lukan verse between Luke's two phrases. This technically creates a reading harmonizing to either Mark or Matthew, but with such a negligible variant it is best to say only that the reading might have occurred by harmonization. Stylistic concerns could also account for the addition of the conjunction in this reading, as could an intention to emphasize the two separate actions in the narrative, rising and going, in order to highlight the distance between Jesus and the disciples.

(36) Luke 22:50 – *καὶ ἐπάταξεν εἰς τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ὁ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως τὸν δοῦλον² (ὁ τὸν δοῦλον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως; //Mark 14:47, Matthew 26:51)*²³⁹

(37) Luke 22:51 – *ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ἔατε ἕως τούτου καὶ ἀψάμενος τοῦ ὠπίου ἰάσατο αὐτόν* (cf. Mark 14:47, Matthew 26:51; Singular)²⁴⁰

(38) Luke 22:53 – *καθ' ἡμέραν*²⁴¹ ὄντος μου ἡμεῖς ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ (//Matthew 26:55; Sub-singular 0171 579 1338)

When Jesus is arrested in the Garden of Gethsemane, one of his followers attempts to intervene. In Luke 22:50, the evangelist records, “And a certain one of them struck the slave of the chief priest” (*καὶ ἐπάταξεν εἰς τις ἐξ αὐτῶν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως τὸν*

²³⁹ P⁷⁵ A D K M R S W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ Ω 0171 f¹ 2 28 124 157 565 579 700 1006 1071 1342 1424 1506 ℳ. IGNTP and Souter prefer the order of P⁷⁵ and 0171 against: ⋈ B L T f¹³ 69 346 543 788 826 828 892 983 1241 2542.

²⁴⁰ Marcion also omits this verse.

²⁴¹ 0171 (along with D) has *τό* before *καθ' ἡμέραν*.

δοῦλον). The Lukan syntax of the last phrase places the accusative object (τὸν δοῦλον) after the genitive modifier (τοῦ ἀρχιερέως). In Mark and Matthew, the phrase is reversed (τὸν δοῦλον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως). In fact, most manuscripts of Luke favor the “Markan” order, but several early and diverse witnesses have the more difficult reading (⋈ B^f¹³). Because it is the more difficult reading, is witnessed in multiple text forms, and appears early, it is probable that the reading with noun following modifier is older. The majority reading, including that found in MS 0171, arose out of harmonization to Mark 14:47 or Matthew 26:51.²⁴² The order of the words does not change the meaning of the text, though perhaps Luke’s original phrase emphasized the status of the wounded man as not just any slave, but the slave of the *chief priest*. Even if some emphasis is lost, the meaning remains the same.

One of the most significant variants in MS 0171 is the omission of the entire episode of the healing of the servant’s ear and Jesus’s command to cease fighting (22:51).²⁴³ This is a singular reading, which suggests that the scene was not a matter of controversy or embarrassment for early Christians. Even in Codex Bezae, where the text of the passage is very different, the basic elements remain the same. The omission cannot be accounted for by any of the typical mechanical scribal errors. Hedley surmises, “It is most improbable that the absence of 51 is accidental.”²⁴⁴ Why, then, has the scribe

²⁴² The manuscripts of Mark and Matthew are never harmonized to Luke in this regard.

²⁴³ See Pistelli, *Papiri Greci e Latini*, 1:203, for a discussion of this omission.

²⁴⁴ P. L. Hedley, “The Egyptian Texts of the Gospels and Acts,” *CQR* 118 (1934): 23–39, 188–230, 193–194.

omitted the episode? Harmonization is a strong candidate.²⁴⁵ Since neither Mark nor Matthew contains this episode, the scribe may have been in doubt regarding the veracity of the account, or at least its suitability in the gospel narrative.²⁴⁶ Additionally, it is possible that the scribe himself considered this episode a rebuke of the disciples. By healing the servant, Jesus effectively reverses the rash actions of his disciple and so indirectly rebukes him.²⁴⁷ Whether by harmonization or omission for reasons of embarrassment, some degree of intentionality can be postulated for this alteration. The excising of an entire scene cannot have been accidental.

After healing, or in this case not healing, the ear of the servant, Jesus claims in Luke 22:53, “Each day I was with you in the temple” (καθ’ ἡμέραν ὄντος μου μεθ’ ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ). The scribe has omitted the prepositional phrase “with you” (μεθ’ ὑμῶν), but his reason for doing so is not clear. If intentional, perhaps the scribe was endeavoring to differentiate Jesus from the religious leaders who arrested him. The likeliest explanation for the reading, though, is harmonization to Matthew 26:55, where the phrase does not occur in the earliest manuscripts.²⁴⁸ Based on the transposition of the same phrase in Codex Bezae, which contains a similar type of text as MS 0171, José Bover makes a convincing argument that the words were missing from the scribe’s exemplar.²⁴⁹ Whether

²⁴⁵ So Lagrange, *Critique rationelle*, 74.

²⁴⁶ So Lagrange, *Critique rationelle*, 73–74.

²⁴⁷ Green, *Luke*, 784.

²⁴⁸ Many manuscripts of Matthew add πρὸς ὑμᾶς in harmonization to Mark 14:49. Relevant manuscripts to this study include: A C D W.

²⁴⁹ Bover, “Fragmento de San Lucas,” 298, writes, “Por fin, la omisión de μεθ’ ὑμῶν en 07 y su inversion en D puede también explicarse por faltar esta frase en el arquetipo común...”

omitted by the scribe of MS 0171 or an earlier one, harmonization is likely the reason for the phrase's absence in this textual stream.

(39) Luke 22:54 – ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἠκολούθει ἄπο μακρόθεν (ἄπο; //Mark 14:54, Matthew 26:58)²⁵⁰

(40) Luke 22:61a – καὶ στραφεὶς ὁ κύριος ἐπέβλεψεν τῷ Πέτρῳ (cf. Mark 14:72 or Matthew 26:74; Sub-singular 0171^{lac} 544; Lacuna)

After Jesus is arrested, he is brought into the house of the high priest. In Luke 22:54, the evangelist records, “Peter was following from afar (μακρόθεν).” The Markan and Matthean parallels have the preposition “from” (ἀπό) before the adverb “from afar” (μακρόθεν).²⁵¹ The scribe of MS 0171 is one of many to have inserted ἀπό into the text of Luke, possibly by assimilation, though other factors may be at work.²⁵² In Luke, μακρόθεν is found four times (16:23; 18:13; 22:54; 23:49), but in only two instances is it accompanied by the preposition (16:23; 23:49). Lukan style does not commit to the preposition in this construction, nor does it eschew it. The word μακρόθεν is always accompanied by ἀπό in Mark (5:6; 8:3; 11:13; 14:54; 15:40) and Matthew (26:58; 27:55). The word is found only three other times in the New Testament, each time in Revelation (18:10, 15, 17) and each time accompanied by the preposition. Comparison between

²⁵⁰ 0171 D 047 063 070 0211 Λ f¹³ 27 69 71 157 174 346 472 543 544 554 579 660 692 788 826 828 983^r 1005 1009 1194 1215 1355 1365 1458 1510 2372 2613.

²⁵¹ In manuscripts of Mark, the preposition is omitted in a few manuscripts (L Δ Ψ), but none of them especially early. In manuscripts of Matthew, the preposition is omitted in quite a few texts, including Ɑ and C from the fourth and fifth centuries.

²⁵² Lagrange, *Critique rationelle*, 74, affirms harmonization as the cause of this reading.

Mark, Matthew, and Revelation demonstrates a preference for ἀπὸ μακρόθεν. So, while harmonization is possible, conformity to general usage is just as likely.

In addition to 22:51, two additional interesting omissions occur in MS 0171, each one encompassing an entire mini-scene. The first comes at Luke 22:61a, following Peter's last denial. Luke records, "And turning, the lord looked to Peter" (καὶ στραφεὶς ὁ κύριος ἐνέβλεψεν τῷ Πέτρῳ). This short scene does not occur in Mark or Matthew, which may account for its apparent omission in MS 0171.²⁵³ Perhaps the scribe omitted the text because he was unsure how to account for the discrepancy between the Gospels. The omitted reading is difficult to confirm, however, given the state of the manuscript at this point.²⁵⁴

These lines fall within a lacuna of about twenty-one lines. E. Pistelli, the first editor of this manuscript, does not attempt to reconstruct these verses. In the reconstruction of Comfort and Barrett, Luke 22:61a has been left out along with the final clause of the verse, 22:61c, where the narrator recalls the words of Jesus's prediction of Peter's denial: "How he said to him, 'Before the cock crows today, you will deny me three times'" (ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι σήμερον ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς). Pistelli tentatively reconstructs three letters from this clause, but only one is fully legible.

Birdsall presents two possible reconstructions. In each, the entirety of v. 61 is present and v. 59 is the missing piece. Comfort and Barrett, who omit 61a and 61c, include v. 59 in their reconstruction. Birdsall's argument is based on the parameters of

²⁵³ Swanson does not list 0171 as omitting any part of 22:61, except to mark the final few words as illegible in the manuscript. IGNTP lists only 544 as omitting 22:61a and does not list 0171 as omitting any part of the verse.

²⁵⁴ For a full discussion, see Cambry Pardee, "Peter's Tarnished Image: Scribal Polishing in the Gospel of Luke (Ms. 0171)," *Annali di storia dell'esegesi* 33 (2016): 151–174.

space rather than new images or physical evidence. To fit in the amount of available lines, with the number of letters falling within an acceptable range, some text must be omitted. Birdsall proposes that a scribal leap from same-to-same is likely and so chooses a phrase that is repeated in the denial episode. The scribe might have leapt from one instance of Peter's name to the next or, as in his reconstruction, from repeated instances of the phrase "Man, (I am/I know) not" (ἄνθρωπε οὐκ [εἰμί/οἶδα]). The words ἄνθρωπε οὐκ occur at the end of v. 58 and a few words into v. 60. Such an operation is plausible, but since this portion of the manuscript does not exist, Birdsall's reading cannot be proved.

It must be admitted that Comfort and Barrett's reconstruction, omitting two clauses from v. 61, is also unsure, but their proposal stands on firmer ground for two reasons. First, their suggested reading attempts to reconcile a broken line of text where three letters appear (only two are clear). Second, MS 0171 is not the only manuscript to attest to such an omission. The thirteenth century miniscule 544 also omits v. 61a. Furthermore, it will be shown that there is a resonance between the possible omission of v. 61a and the certain omissions of vv. 51 and 62. Nevertheless, certainty is impossible in this case. If vv. 61a and 61c are indeed missing, harmonization could easily account for their omission. Finally, this may be an instance of imaginative assimilation, where the scribe has copied the story as he remembered it, without the dramatic gaze of Jesus falling upon his faithless disciple.

Although it does not involve harmonization, the omission of Luke 22:62 is worth discussing briefly. This text must also be reconstructed from a lacuna, but there is wide agreement between Pistelli, Comfort and Barrett, Birdsall, Aland, Swanson, and IGNTP

that v. 62 was omitted from MS 0171.²⁵⁵ This is the only Lukan manuscript to remove completely the scene of Peter's bitter weeping: "And going outside he wept bitterly" (καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς). Pistelli and Naldini go so far as to conclude that these verses do not belong to the earliest text of Luke.²⁵⁶ There is a high degree of resonance between the omission of vv. 51 and 62 and the possible omission of v. 61a. All three instances are omissions of short clauses encompassing an entire event. In two cases the action is unique to the Gospel of Luke: the healing of the servant's ear and Jesus's gaze upon Peter. This in itself is a tangible pattern that suggests a degree of intentionality on the part of the scribe. One further observation is important. Bover shows that both v. 51 and v. 62 are omitted in many Latin versions, to which the D-text has an affinity.²⁵⁷

All three of these significant omissions deal directly or indirectly with the disciple Peter. In the latter instances, Peter's connection to the denial pericope is explicit. Peter's connection to the episode of the servant's ear is not explicit in the Synoptic Gospels, but in John 18:10 the attacker is explicitly identified as Simon Peter and it is most improbable that a scribe copying Gospels in the late third century would not have been aware of this tradition. It seems, then, that the scribe of MS 0171 favored Peter and desired to remove certain episodes that might shame the great apostle.²⁵⁸ In the first case, Jesus undoes Peter's violent action; in the second, Jesus witnesses Peter's final denial; and in the third, Peter's weakness and shame are displayed in tears. The scribe of MS

²⁵⁵ See Pistelli, *Papiri Greci e Latini*, 2:22–23, for a discussion of this omission, especially in connection to the omission of 22:51. Pistelli submits that the two omissions cannot be random.

²⁵⁶ Pistelli, *Papiri Greci e Latini*, 2:23; and Naldini, *Documenti*, 16.

²⁵⁷ Bover, "Fragmento de San Lucas," 295.

²⁵⁸ Full argumentation in support of this point is presented in Pardee, "Peter's Tarnished Image."

0171 became more than just a copyist as he altered his manuscript to protect, or restore, Peter's image.

Preliminary Summary of Harmonization in the Text of Luke in Manuscript 0171

Six readings have been discussed from the text of Luke in MS 0171. One of these (35) did not involve harmonization and two others (39, 40) may have involved harmonization but will not be included in further discussion. The three remaining readings exhibit the influence of Matthew and may demonstrate the influence of Mark.

Table 4. Sources of Harmonization in the Text of Luke in Manuscript 0171

Sources of Harmonization	Total: 3	Entry Number
Matthew	1	38
Matthew and Mark	2	36, 37

Summary of Manuscript 0171

MS 0171 is an exceedingly interesting manuscript exhibiting unique versions of passages in Matthew and Luke. Given the evidence, especially the two major omissions from Luke, it is tempting to classify the scribe as a deliberate harmonizer. Min notes, however, that the scribe has not systematically assimilated the text of Matthew or Luke to another Gospel, nor has he harmonized at every instance. The very fact that the text of Matthew contains harmonizations to Mark and Luke and that the text of Luke contains harmonizations to Matthew and Mark shows that the scribe did not deliberately favor one Gospel over another. It is clear, however, that all three Gospels were read and copied in his community.

The variants in MS 0171 also demonstrate that the text bears a close relationship to the text of Codex Bezae. In Matthew, MS 0171 agrees with Bezae in three sub-singular variants. In Luke, MS 0171 agrees with Bezae in two common harmonizing readings.

Bover has shown a connection between the two manuscripts in the text of Luke, claiming, “The Western character of [0171] is an indisputable thing.”²⁵⁹ Kurt Aland’s study of the origin of the D-text points out that instances of agreement between MS 0171 and Bezae *away* from the standard text (NA²⁶) is more than doubled in the Luke text than in the Matthew text.²⁶⁰ Aland concludes that MS 0171 (and P⁶⁹) can be regarded as a precursor of the D-text, though there is no direct relationship. He also characterizes MS 0171 as a “paraphrastic text” of little help in discovering the initial text, but interesting in its own right.²⁶¹

Summary of Harmonization in Second- and Third-Century Manuscripts of the Synoptic Gospels

Forty variant readings from eleven different manuscripts of the Synoptic Gospels have been analyzed. Five of these did not involve harmonization and another fourteen will not be included in further conclusions since harmonization is only a possible explanation for the variant. This leaves twenty-one readings that likely or very likely involved harmonization.

Table 5. Quality of Harmonization in Second- and Third-Century Manuscripts of the Synoptic Gospels

Total Number of Readings	Total: 40	Entry Number
Quality of Harmonization		
Very Likely	8	5, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 25, 31
Likely	13	2, 6, 11, 12, 20, 23, 28, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38
Possible	14	3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 18, 19, 24, 30, 39, 40
Unlikely	5	1, 26, 27, 29, 35

²⁵⁹ Bover, “Fragmento de San Lucas,” 300: “El carácter occidental de [0171] es cosa indiscutible.” See also Lagrange, *Critique rationelle*, 71–76.

²⁶⁰ K. Aland, “Alter und Entstehung,” 51, 54. Aland recognizes a connection between the two texts, but also notes places where 0171 does not witness the D reading.

²⁶¹ See Aland and Aland, *Text*, 95.

Of the twenty-one harmonizations, nine were found to be singular and four sub-singular. These readings have been used to describe the individual character of scribes and manuscripts.

In the second and third century, all three Synoptics served as the source of influence for alterations made in other Gospels. This is especially true of Mark and Luke. The reason for the imbalance in the figures is that many more of the manuscripts from this period are of Matthew than Mark or Luke.

The majority of harmonizations are substitutions. While not as innocuous as transpositions, substitutions generally leave the text intact, altering only the form of a verb or noun. It will be shown that substitution continues to be the most common form of harmonization throughout the first five centuries.

Scribes tended to create harmonizing variants in the words of Jesus more frequently than in the evangelists' narratives. This trend also continues in later centuries, likely because the words of Jesus were shared and memorized more often than the wording of the narration in any individual Gospel.

Scribes did not typically alter entire sentences or complete phrases by harmonization. In fact, most harmonizations are only one word in extent. This observation holds true in later centuries and supports the proposal that harmonization was rarely a deliberate activity, which would result in longer alterations, but is rather a reflexive habit caused by the scribe's horizon of expectation and familiarity with different versions of the material.

Verbs are far more frequently altered than any other part of speech. This pattern holds true in manuscripts from later centuries. Verbs are the most variable part of speech and take different forms often in the manuscripts. In most cases, the shift is not to a completely different verb, but to a different form of the same verb or perhaps a related compound or simple verb.

Table 6. Harmonization in Second- and Third-Century Manuscripts of the Synoptic Gospels

Frequency of Harmonization		Total: 21	Entry Number
	Singular	9	5, 6, 15, 16, 17, 20, 31, 32, 37
	Sub-singular	4	28, 33, 34, 38
	Uncommon	1	21
Sources of Harmonization			
	Matthew	1	38
	Mark	7	2, 15, 17, 20, 25, 31, 32
	Luke	7	5, 6, 11, 16, 21, 33, 34
	Matthew, Mark	4	23, 28, 36, 37
	Mark, Luke	1	22
	Misc.	1	12
Type of Harmonization			
	Substitution	12	2, 5, 6, 15, 17, 21, 22, 25, 28, 31, 33, 34
	Addition	1	12
	Omission	6	11, 16, 23, 32, 37, 38
	Transposition	2	20, 36
Context of Harmonization			
	Words of Jesus	13	5, 6, 11, 15, 21, 22, 23, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38
	Narrative	5	12, 20, 25, 28, 36
	Other Dialogue	3	2, 16, 17
Extent of Harmonization			
	One Word	12	2, 5, 6, 11, 12, 15, 17, 21, 22, 23, 25, 33
	Two Words	5	16, 20, 32, 34, 38
	Four+ Words	3	28, 31, 36
	Sentences	1	37
Part of Speech			
	Sentence	1	36
	Verb	8	5, 15, 17, 21, 22, 23, 25, 33
	Verb Phrase	2	28, 31
	Noun	1	6

	Noun Phrase	2	20, 36
	Proper Noun	1	2
	Pronoun	1	11
	Article	1	12
	Prepositional Phrase	2	16, 38
	Particle	1	32
	Misc.	1	34

In the second and third centuries, harmonization took many forms. In most cases harmonizing alterations did not significantly change the meaning or content of the text. The patterns established in these fragments from the early centuries hold true in more extensive fragments and in older manuscripts.

CHAPTER THREE

EXTENSIVE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE THIRD CENTURY

P⁷⁵ (P.Bodmer XIV and XV): A Manuscript of Luke and John

P⁷⁵ is one of the oldest, best preserved, and most comprehensive of the papyrus manuscripts of any book of the New Testament. The seventy-two extant leaves contain extensive passages from the Gospel of Luke (P.Bodmer 14) and the Gospel of John (P.Bodmer 15).¹ Scholars have speculated that the manuscript may have originally been a four-gospel codex or one volume of a two-codex collection accompanied by a codex of Matthew and Mark.² The papyrus is dated by most to the early third century, though some

¹ For the *ed. pr.* see Victor Martin and Rudolphe Kasser, eds., *Papyrus Bodmer XIV: Evangile de Luc chap. 3–24 (P⁷⁵)*, vol. 1 of *Papyrus Bodmer XIV–XV: Evangiles de Luc et Jean* (Cologny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961). Kurt Aland, “Neue neutestamentliche Papyri II,” *NTS* 11 (1964): 1–21, esp. 5–13, provides a collation of readings. Several years after his 1964 article, Aland published transcriptions of a few additional fragments in “Neue neutestamentliche Papyri III,” *NTS* 22 (1976): 375–396. Bruce Manning Metzger, “The Bodmer Papyrus of Luke and John,” *ExpTim* 73 (1962): 201–203; and Marchant A. King, “Notes on the Bodmer Manuscript of Luke,” *BSac* 122 (1965): 234–240, provide basic introductions to the manuscript. See also Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 147–148 no. 406.

² Skeat, “Origin of the Christian Codex,” 80–81, believes it possible that P⁷⁵ “is in fact the second half of a four-Gospel codex.” The first half would have consisted of a single-quire with the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. In “Oldest Manuscript,” 189, Skeat entertains the possibility that they may have been two separate volumes rather than a single two-quire codex.

have proposed the late second century as a possibility.³ While its exact place of origin is unknown, the artifact likely came from southern Egypt.⁴

The copyist has been characterized as a professional scribe because of his skillful calligraphy and the control with which he transmits his text. Martin and Kasser describe his script as “a pretty, vertical uncial, elegant and neat.”⁵ The layout of the text is consistent with wide margins. The clear handwriting, the size of the manuscript, and the presence of section divisions indicate that the codex may have been used for public reading.⁶ The text and craftsmanship are excellent, leading Sarah Edwards to propose that the scribe was working in the “renowned scriptorium at Alexandria.”⁷ The scribe has also been identified as a Christian. The substantial number of harmonizations he has created demonstrates that the scribe was well acquainted with Gospels other than Luke and John. The use of *nomina sacra* further confirms his identity as a Christian.

Martin and Kasser were the first to note that the Bodmer papyrus shares similarities in text division with Codices Bezae and Washingtonianus.⁸ Despite this shared feature, the Western and Pre-Caesarean text types are not the primary textual

³ K. Aland, *Repertorium*, 309; Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 615; and Philip W. Comfort, *Early Manuscripts & Modern Translations of the New Testament* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 1990), 63, prefer a date ca. 200. Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, 13, date the manuscript between 175 and 225 CE on paleographical grounds.

⁴ George Dunbar Kilpatrick, “The Bodmer and Mississippi Collection of Biblical and Christian Texts,” *GRBS* 4 (1963): 33–47, 34, suggests the Bodmer collection may have been composed somewhere between Panopolis and Thebes.

⁵ Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, 13: “L’écriture est une jolie onciale verticale, élégante et soignée...”

⁶ Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 503.

⁷ Sarah Alexander Edwards, “P75 under the Magnifying Glass,” *NovT* 18 (1976): 190–212, 196. Edwards’s study focuses on the John portion of the manuscript (P.Bodmer XV).

⁸ Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, 14–16.

affinity of the papyrus.⁹ As Martin and Kasser suggest, and others have confirmed, the text of P⁷⁵ is a forerunner of the Alexandrian type exhibited most definitively in Codex Vaticanus.¹⁰ Carlo Maria Martini argues that Codex Vaticanus is not a direct descendant of P⁷⁵, but he does allow that there is enough textual affinity between the two to indicate that they shared a common ancestor.¹¹ Calvin Porter concludes that claims that Codex Vaticanus represents a deliberate fourth-century recension must now be laid to rest since the type of text found in Vaticanus can now be dated at least as early as the early third century.¹² Gordon Fee states even more emphatically that the studies of Porter and Martini demonstrate that “there is no longer any possibility that B reflects a late-third/early-fourth-century recension in *any* sense of that term.”¹³

⁹ The term “Pre-Caesarean” will be defined in full in the section below on the text of Mark in P⁴⁵. For now it is enough to say that the text of this type is found especially in P⁴⁵ and W and to a much lesser degree in the other manuscripts typically identified as “Caesarean” (e.g. Θ 565).

¹⁰ See further Fitzmyer, “Papyrus Bodmer XIV,” 170–179; Ernest Cadman Colwell and Ernest W. Tune, “Method in Establishing Quantitative Relationships between Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts,” in *Studies in Methodology*, 56–62, 59–61; Martini, *Il problema*; John E. Hartley, “Textual Affinities of Papyrus Bodmer XIV (P⁷⁵),” *EvQ* 40 (1968): 97–102, who posits an equally close relationship with T; Jean Duplacy, “P⁷⁵ (*Pap. Bodmer XIV–XV*) et les formes les plus anciennes du texte de Luc,” in *L’Évangile de Luc: Problèmes littéraires et théologiques*, ed. Frans Neirynck, BETL 32 (Gembloux: Duculot, 1973), 111–128; Edwards, “Magnifying Glass,” 190–212; and Warren, “P4, P45, and P75,” 137–166.

¹¹ Martini, *Il Problema*, 148. See also Gordon D. Fee, “P⁷⁵, P⁶⁶, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria,” in *Studies in the Theory and Method*, 247–273, 251–256; Barbara Aland, “Neutestamentliche Handschriften als Interpreten des Textes? P⁷⁵ und seine Vorlagen in John 10,” in *Jesu Rede von Gott und ihre Nachgeschichte im frühen Christentum*, ed. Dietrich-Alex Koch, Gerhard Sellin, and Andreas Lindemann, 379–397, 381; and Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 617 n. 13. Barbara Aland, “New Testament Textual Research: Its Methods and Its Goals,” in *Translating the New Testament: Text, Translation, Theology*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Mark J. Boda, McMaster New Testament Studies (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 13–26, 23, states, “The text of Codex Vaticanus and of P⁷⁵ derives not from the same source but from an older, well-written text.”

¹² Calvin Porter, “Papyrus Bodmer XV (P75) and the Text of Vaticanus,” *JBL* 81 (1962): 363–376, 375. Porter’s study is restricted to the text of John in P⁷⁵, but his conclusion is applicable to the text of Luke as well.

¹³ Fee, “P⁷⁵, P⁶⁶, and Origen,” 251.

P⁷⁵ is now regarded as one of the earliest and best texts of Luke in the Alexandrian tradition. The text diverges in some striking ways from other Egyptian representatives of the Gospels. Fitzmyer, for instance, notes the lack of a close relationship between P⁷⁵ and P⁴⁵, the only other extensive pre-fourth-century papyrus containing Luke. He writes, “The fact that both P⁴⁵ and P⁷⁵ stem from Egypt in the period prior to the great parchment uncial mss., and yet do not agree in their peculiar readings, gives evidence of a fluctuating state of the text in that country in the early period.”¹⁴ In third-century Egypt there was no standardized gospel tradition or controlled process for copying the Gospels without corruption.

Even without a high level of control, it is evident that the scribe of P⁷⁵ was intentional about copying accurately. Fee describes him as “first of all a copyist, and apparently one of high integrity with respect to his exemplar.”¹⁵ According to Ernest Colwell, “In P⁷⁵ the text that is produced can be explained in all its variants as the result of a single force, namely the disciplined scribe who writes with the intention of being careful and accurate.”¹⁶ He further submits that the scribe “copies letters one by one,” which reduces the chances for common errors such as transposition.¹⁷ The scribe’s vigilant approach to his task has resulted in a text with relatively few singular readings or

¹⁴ Fitzmyer, “Papyrus Bodmer XIV,” 175.

¹⁵ Gordon D. Fee, “The Significance of Papyrus Bodmer II and Papyrus Bodmer XIV–XV for Methodology in New Testament Textual Criticism” (PhD diss., University of Southern California, 1966), 214. Similarly, J. Neville Birdsall, “Rational Eclecticism and the Oldest Manuscripts: A Comparative Study of the Bodmer and Chester Beatty Papyri of the Gospel of Luke,” in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. J. K. Elliott, NovTSup 44 (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 39–51, regards P⁷⁵ as “a relatively careful exemplar of a sound philological tradition.”

¹⁶ Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 117.

¹⁷ Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 116.

variants of any kind, leading Aland and Aland to categorize the textual quality as

“strict.”¹⁸

Despite his eminent care, the scribe did make mistakes, many of which seem to have occurred under the influence of Synoptic parallels. Royse finds only three singular and four sub-singular harmonizations in the text of Luke in P⁷⁵.¹⁹ Comfort rejects even these, claiming, “Because of his strict control, it is very difficult to see where the scribe of P⁷⁵ engaged in Gospel harmonization.”²⁰ Comfort himself finds only one instance of assimilation in a singular reading, and that in the text of John. Along these same lines, Fee claims, “When tested alone with all other witnesses in Luke 10 and 11 for variants reflecting possible harmonization to Mathew, Mark, or the LXX, P⁷⁵ and B stood alone in their ‘comparative purity.’”²¹ He counts a total of six assimilations but accepts that alternative explanations may account for these variants. It is certainly true that there are few singular and sub-singular harmonizations in the text, but there are a fair number of common assimilating variants that augment their numbers and contribute to a better grasp of harmonization as a general phenomenon.

P⁷⁵ – Passages from Luke²²

(1) Luke 3:22 – καὶ καταβῆναι ὅτὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σωματικῶς εἶδεν ὡς περιστερὰν

ἐπ’ αὐτόν (//Matthew 3:16 & B; Singular)

¹⁸ Aland and Aland, *Text*, 101. Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 839–844, provides a collation of singular readings in P⁷⁵.

¹⁹ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 690–692.

²⁰ Comfort, “Scribes as Readers,” 49.

²¹ Gordon D. Fee, “Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism—Which?,” in *Studies in the Theory and Method*, 124–140, 128.

²² P. Bodmer XIV contains Luke 3:18–22; 3:33–4:2; 4:34–5:10; 5:37–6:4; 6:10–7:32, 35–39, 41–43; 7:46–9:2; 9:4–17:15; 17:19–18:18; 22:4–24:53.

In Luke 3:22, the evangelist records, “And the holy spirit (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον) descended in bodily form as a dove upon him.” The first definite article (τό) in the phrase has dropped out of the text of Luke in P⁷⁵, which results in a unique reading in the Lukan textual tradition (πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον). The variant is not due to any mechanical scribal error. Moreover, it is apparent from the overwhelming presence of the article in all three Synoptics that the article was typical and preferred before πνεῦμα. The omission may not have been accidental, yet one is hard pressed to discern a persuasive stylistic or theological rationale.

In Mark 1:10, the spirit is identified simply as “the spirit” (τὸ πνεῦμα) and in Matthew 3:16 as “the spirit of God” (τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ). Two important manuscripts of Matthew, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus, omit both articles and so have: “a spirit of God” (πνεῦμα θεοῦ). It is possible, as Royse suggests, that the text of Matthew in Vaticanus or Sinaiticus, or more appropriately an ancestor of one of these manuscripts, has influenced the scribe of P⁷⁵.²³ Kim Haines-Eitzen disagrees and claims, “At Luke 3:22...the scribe appears to have a reading that *coincidentally* matches that found in the parallel texts in the MS \aleph .”²⁴ She does not offer a thorough argument against the identification of 3:22 as a harmonizing reading, but simply calls into question the necessity of calling it a harmonization. Neither does Royse argue his case, noting only that the reading of P⁷⁵ at 3:22 matches the reading of Matthew 3:16 in two manuscripts, the predecessors of which could easily have been known to the scribe of P⁷⁵. Haines-

²³ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 662, 691.

²⁴ Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters*, 71. Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 691 n. 393, responds to and dismisses her critique.

Eitzen focuses her objections on the coincidental nature of the omission in common with Sinaiticus, but what of Vaticanus? Given the close relationship between P⁷⁵ and Vaticanus in the text of Luke and John, it seems quite plausible, even probable, that the scribe was also aware of the text of Matthew lying behind Vaticanus and may have even copied from it if he did indeed create a companion volume with Matthew and Mark. This is not a clear case of harmonization, but it is at least possible that the scribe conformed his text of Luke to an important reading in Matthew.

(2) Luke 4:35a – φημώθητι καὶ ἐξέλθε ἄπ’ αὐτοῦ (Γ ἐξ; //Mark 1:25)²⁵

(3) Luke 4:35b – καὶ ῥίψαν αὐτὸν τὸ δαιμόνιον εἰς τὸ μέσον ἐξῆλθεν ἄπ’ αὐτοῦ
μηδὲν βλάψαν αὐτόν (Γ ἐξ; //Mark 1:26)²⁶

At Luke 4:35, two prepositions have been altered in the episode of Jesus’s exorcism in the synagogue. In the first instance, Jesus says to the demon, “Be silent and come out from (ἐξέλθε ἀπ’) him.” The passage continues, “And the demon, throwing him into the midst [of them], came out from (ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ’) him without having harmed him.” In both cases, the preposition ἀπό has been replaced with ἐκ in P⁷⁵. This reading conforms to the use of ἐκ in Mark 1:25–26. In all three Synoptics, the words most closely associated with exorcism are “to cast out” (ἐκβάλλω) and “to come out” (ἐξέρχομαι), both with the prefix ἐκ. In Mark and Matthew, whenever a preposition accompanies either of

²⁵ P⁷⁵ A C E F G H K M Q U X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ 0102 2 28 33 157 565 1071 1241 ℣. IGNTP prefers ἐξ against the combined witness of ⱼ B D W and a multitude of additional uncials and miniscules.

²⁶ P⁷⁵ M Γ 0102 0211 1071 1220 1223.

these words in an exorcism narrative, which is infrequent, that preposition is ἐκ.²⁷

Turning to Luke, there is a different stylistic preference: the verb ἐξέρχομαι is always accompanied by ἀπό and never ἐκ (e.g. Luke 4:35, 41; 8:2, 29, 33; 11:24).²⁸ Given this consistent feature of the text of Luke, it is safe to say that the scribe was not conforming to Lukan style, but was influenced rather by the exact Markan parallel or the Markan idiom of exorcism.

(4) Luke 6:33 – καὶ ὁ ἐὼν ἀγαθοποιῆτε τοὺς ἀγαθοποιούντας ὑμᾶς ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν (ὁ γάρ; cf. Matthew 5:46)²⁹

During Luke’s Sermon on the Plain, Jesus asks, “And (καὶ) if you do good for those who do good to you, what grace is there to you?” Though absent from the large majority of witnesses, the conjunction γάρ appears in a few manuscripts of early date and alters the meaning of the statement slightly. With γάρ, the verse is rendered: “For *even* if you do good (καὶ γὰρ ἐὰν ἀγαθοποιῆτε)...what grace is there to you?” Most modern editors and commentators enclose the word in brackets, signaling some doubt as to its place in the text. P⁷⁵, Codex Vaticanus, and the original reading of Codex Sinaiticus have the conjunction, offering compelling Alexandrian evidence for the reading. If the reading with γάρ is older, however, it is difficult to account for the word’s omission from the

²⁷ See, for example, Mark 1:25, 26; 9:25. Matthew 17:18, however, is accompanied by ἀπό. In Koine Greek, the preposition of a compound verb often repeats the prefix. Such reiterated prepositions are common and seem to have occurred as the prefixed verb lost the full strength of its meaning with the prefix.

²⁸ See Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke*, 5th ed., ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922), 135.

²⁹ P⁷⁵ ⋈* B 700. Tischendorf, Merk, and NA²⁸ prefer γάρ; IGNTP and Souter prefer the shorter reading.

majority of manuscripts. The opposing testimony, especially of the corrected Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Bezae, and Codex Washingtonianus, is diverse and persuasive. Furthermore, if the reading is secondary, harmonization to Matthew 5:46 is an easy and plausible solution.³⁰ In this case, the variant with γάρ can be regarded as an Alexandrian family reading that has entered the text by assimilation.

(5) Luke 6:49 – ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας καὶ μὴ ποιήσας ὁμοίος ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδομήσαντι

† οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν χωρὶς θεμελίου († τὴν; //Matthew 7:26)³¹

Jesus tells a parable about two men who build houses: one builds his house on a sturdy foundation and one does not. In Luke 6:49, Jesus says, “And the one who hears and does not do (my words) is like a man who built a house (οἰκίαν) on the ground without a foundation.” In a parallel passage in Matthew 7:26, the evangelist refers to “his house” (αὐτοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν). It is possible that the scribe of P⁷⁵ was partially influenced by the version of this statement in Matthew since he has added the article, though not the possessive pronoun, to his text of Luke.

(6) Luke 7:22 – τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν † χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται

καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται († καί;

//Matthew 11:5; Corrected)³²

John the Baptist sends his disciples to Jesus to ascertain whether Jesus is the one they have been expecting. Jesus exhorts the messengers to return to John and tell him

³⁰ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:267, lists this reading as an example of harmonization. See also Martini, *Il problema*, 130.

³¹ P⁷⁵ U Θ 66 83 115 118 158 205 209 480 577 1006 1077 1203 1247 2322 2399.

³² P^{75*} W Θ Ψ f¹³ 7 60 69 124 157 159 174 205 229^c 267 346 903 954 1195 1241 1346 1424 1542 1604 1654 1675 1685 2096 2613 2766.

what they have seen and heard, that “the blind receive sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, the dead are raised, the poor here the good news” (τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται). There are several variants in this verse in the manuscripts, among them the addition of the conjunction *καί* between various items in the list. Specifically in P⁷⁵, the scribe has added *καί* before the phrase “the lame walk.” The word was subsequently deleted. In a parallel to this passage in Matthew 11:5, *καί* appears between each part of the list except before the reference to lepers. Matthew’s preference for the conjunction between items stands in contrast to Luke’s continuous list.³³ The variant does not seem to have been created with the deliberate intent to conform the texts, for if it were, one would expect several additional conjunctions in the list. In this case, unintentional harmonization is possible, but not likely.

(7) Luke 8:5 – ὁ μὲν ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν καὶ κατεπατήθη καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατέφαγεν Ἦ αὐτό (Ἦ αὐτά; //Matthew 13:4)³⁴

(8) Luke 8:7 – καὶ ἕτερον ἔπεσεν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀκανθῶν καὶ συμφυεῖσαι αὐτὰ ἀκανθαὶ ἀπέπνιξαν Ἦ αὐτό (Ἦ αὐτά; //Matthew 13:7)³⁵

In Luke 8, Jesus tells a parable about a farmer planting seed. Jesus says, “Some (seed)” (ὁ μὲν) fell along the path and was trampled and birds of heaven devoured it (αὐτό).” Here in Luke and in Mark 4:4, the portion of seed that is sown and eaten by birds

³³ One miniscule manuscript (1424) has been harmonized completely to Matthew by the addition of the conjunction in every instance.

³⁴ P⁷⁵ B 16 21 1012 1604.

³⁵ P⁷⁵ 1 472 1009.

is grammatically singular ($\delta \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \dots \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}$), technically a collective singular of a mass noun implying a plurality of seeds. In the Matthean episode, the portion of seed that lands on the path and is devoured is grammatically plural ($\alpha \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \dots \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$). It will be seen in Chapter Five that the scribe of Codex Vaticanus completely adopts this construction in his text of Luke. The scribe of P⁷⁵, however, creates a hybrid reading. He begins the verse with the singular “some” ($\delta \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$) of Luke, but ends with the plural “it” ($\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$) of Matthew. The grammar is incorrect since the plural pronoun does not agree with its singular antecedent. Aside from being negligent or careless, one of which is certainly at play, it is possible that the scribe was influenced by Matthew 13:4. The influence of Matthew is seen more fully in the variant in Codex Vaticanus, whose scribe, if he inherited the reading of P⁷⁵, merely completed the assimilation.

In Luke 8:7 the scribe has made a nearly identical mistake. In the expected reading of Luke, Jesus explains that “other seed” ($\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$) fell in the midst of thorns, but that the thorns grew up and choked “it” ($\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}$). The scribe has replaced Luke’s singular construction ($\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu \dots \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}$) with another singular-plural hybrid ($\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu \dots \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$). He is not joined in this second variant by any of the scribes who created a hybrid reading in v. 5, but at least three additional minuscules have this reading. In Matthew 13:7, the construction is entirely plural ($\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha \dots \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$), which is the more appropriate way of discussing casting seeds. Taken with the variant in v. 5, both instances seem to have occurred under the influence of Matthew.³⁶

³⁶ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 682 n. 353, evaluates the scribe’s double use of $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$ as a matter of consistency in conformity to Matthew 13:4 and 7.

(9) Luke 8:16 – οὐδείς δὲ λύχνον ἄψας καλύπτει αὐτὸν σκεύει ἢ ὑποκάτω κλίνης

τίθησιν ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ λυχνίας τίθησιν ὅτινα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι βλέπωσιν τὸ

φῶς` (//Mark 4:21)³⁷

“No one lighting a lamp covers it with a vessel or puts it under a bed, but he puts it on a lampstand in order that those entering may see the light (ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι βλέπωσιν τὸ φῶς).” P⁷⁵ and Codex Vaticanus lack the final clause in this sentence regarding those entering and seeing the light. It is possible, as Hoskier and Martini propose, that the shared ancestor of these two manuscripts omitted the verse in harmonization to Mark 4:21.³⁸ Another possibility is that the phrase was omitted to reduce redundancy since the words are repeated in Luke 11:33.

(10) Luke 8:21 – ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν πρὸς Ἦ αὐτούς (Ἦ αὐτόν; //Matthew 12:48;

Singular)

In Luke 8:21, Jesus redefines the nature of family. Jesus’s family comes to speak with him, but they are unable to reach him because of the crowd. A message is sent to Jesus that his mother and brothers are waiting for him. Luke records, “And answering, he said to them (αὐτούς), ‘My mother and my brothers are those who hear the word of God and do it.’” Likewise, in the Markan version of this episode the message is delivered to Jesus by way of the crowd and he replies “to them” (αὐτοῖς). In Matthew 12:48, however, an unnamed character enters the story to relay the message from the family. It is to this individual, “to the one speaking to him” (τῷ λέγοντι αὐτῷ), that Jesus replies.

³⁷ P⁷⁵ B 1574.

³⁸ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:267; and Martini, *Il problema*, 130.

In P⁷⁵, the scribe has introduced the story accurately according to Luke's version of events. The verb used to describe the relaying of the message is passive, but it is implied that the report has reached Jesus by way of the crowd. Oddly, though, Jesus responds to a male individual, "to him" (αὐτόν), instead of to the crowd in general (αὐτούς). Ernest Colwell calls this reading a "logical harmonization to the general context" or a "clarifying change."³⁹ It does not really make sense for Jesus to respond to a crowd, so the scribe smoothes the narrative contextually. Actually, the innovation of the scribe introduces a narrative *aporia*. A. W. Zwiep points out that this reading "is in the Lukan context mistaken."⁴⁰ The reader is now presented with an un-introduced character who has played no part in the narrative so far. The variant is a result of harmonization, but the execution is of the imaginative rather than strictly textual sort. The scribe has apparently drifted into Matthew's story where an individual delivers the message and Jesus responds directly to him.⁴¹ Since the reading contributes to narrative confusion, it can safely be said that the harmonization has taken place without the scribe's active intent. Furthermore, the reading is not a *textual* assimilation, which is to say that the variant brought into Luke is syntactically different from the reading in Matthew. Where Matthew has "to the one speaking to him" (τῷ λέγοντι αὐτῷ), the scribe of P⁷⁵ has simply "him" (αὐτόν). Mikeal Parsons explains, "P⁷⁵ changes αὐτούς to αὐτόν, agreeing, in sense, with Matt 12:48."⁴²

³⁹ Colwell, "Scribal Habits," 118, 121, explains, "In Luke 8:21, Jesus replies, logically enough, to the questioner rather than the crowd."

⁴⁰ A. W. Zwiep, "The Text of the Ascension Narratives (Luke 24.50–3; Acts 1.1–2, 9–11)," *NTS* 42 (1996): 219–244, 232 and n. 73. Zwiep regards this reading as an example of harmonization in P⁷⁵.

⁴¹ So Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 691 n. 392. See also Comfort, "Scribe as Interpreter," 231–232.

⁴² Mikeal C. Parsons, "A Christological Tendency in P⁷⁵," *JBL* 105 (1986): 463–479, 474.

This sort of “sense” agreement, what I have called “imaginative harmonization,” occurs because at this moment the scribe is neither copying Matthew exactly, nor his exemplar of Luke, but the episode as it appears in his cognitive exemplar.

(11) Luke 8:28 – τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ Ὁ Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου (//Matthew 8:29)⁴³

In the Lukan account of Jesus’s encounter with the Garasene demoniac, the possessed man cries out to Jesus, “What is there between me and you, Jesus, son of the most high God?” This quotation is directly paralleled in Mark 5:7. In Matthew 8:29, however, the proper name “Jesus” (Ἰησοῦ) does not appear in the mouth of Legion in the earliest and best witnesses.⁴⁴ It is possible that the scribe of P⁷⁵ has omitted the name in conformity with the version of Matthew 8:29 in these manuscripts.⁴⁵ It is also possible that the scribe accidentally omitted the name by a sort of homoioteleuton if Ἰησοῦ was written as a *nomen sacrum* (ΙἩ) in his exemplar. If the *nomen sacrum* was present in his exemplar, the string of letters would look something like σοιιιυυιε, with double-iota and double-epsilon. It would not be surprising for -ιυ- to fall out the sequence and, despite having lost the letters, the name would *appear* to be in the text because the last letter of σοί and the first letter of υἱέ coincide with the missing letters.

⁴³ P⁷⁵ D R^f 69 118 205 209 472* 477 579 1005 1012 1071 1195 1200 1203 1365 1579 1582 2096 2372 2613.

⁴⁴ Manuscripts of Matthew with Ἰησοῦ include: C³ E K M S U V W X Δ Θ Π 0242 2 f¹³ 22 157 543 565 579 700 788 826 983 1006 1071 1342 1424 1582 ℞. The absence of Jesus’s name from the text of Matthew in B and ℞ supports the suggestion that the inclusion of the name is secondary in Matthew and was introduced under the influence of Mark or Luke.

⁴⁵ See further Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, 27.

(12) Luke 8:43 – και γυνή οὔσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος ἀπὸ ἐτῶν δώδεκα ἦτις ἰατροῖς

προσαναλώσασα ὅλον τὸν βίον ἵσχυσεν ἀπ’ οὐδενὸς

θεραπευθῆναι (//Matthew 9:20)⁴⁶

(13) Luke 8:52 – μὴ κλαίετε ὅτι γὰρ ἀπέθανεν ἀλλὰ καθεύδει (ὅτι οὐκ; //Mark 5:39;

Lacuna)⁴⁷

After healing the Garasene demoniac, Luke records that Jesus encountered a woman with a twelve-year illness of hemmoring “who had spent exorbitantly on physicians (her) whole living” (ἦτις ἰατροῖς προσαναλώσασα ὅλον τὸν βίον). The details of her financial expenses and the inability of physicians to heal the woman are absent in the Matthean parallel. Mark, however, does include this information, but not so concisely. The evangelist records in Mark 5:26 that the woman “had suffered much under many physicians, and had spent all that belonged to her; and did not improve, but rather grew worse” (καὶ πολλὰ παθοῦσα ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἰατρῶν καὶ δαπανήσασα τὰ παρ’ αὐτῆς πάντα καὶ μηδὲν ὠφεληθεῖσα ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ χεῖρον ἐλθοῦσα). In the text of Luke in P⁷⁵, as well as in Codex Vaticanus and Codex Bezae, the clause about the expense is absent. The question, then, is whether the longer reading is earlier and has been omitted in harmonization to Matthew 9:20, or whether it is secondary and was added under the influence of Mark 5:26.

Metzger is inclined to call the reading in Luke something like “a digest of Mk 5.26” and adds, “The question is whether anyone except Luke himself would rewrite

⁴⁶ P⁷⁵ B D 0279.

⁴⁷ P^{75lac} A E H K M R S U V Γ Λ Π 2 28 565 700 1006 1506 2542 m.

Mark in this way.”⁴⁸ On the basis of Markan priority, Metzger speculates that Luke rewrote the Markan passage so that the phrase is authentically Lukan. The passage fits with Luke’s emphases and the use of a *hapax legomenon* (προσαναλώσασα) is unsurprising for the evangelist but would be unexpected from a copyist. If the longer reading is earlier, then it is possible the scribe omitted the phrase in harmonization to Matthew 9:20.

These arguments for the authenticity of the verse notwithstanding, the textual evidence is not as clearly in favor of the longer reading as one might expect. The support for the shorter reading is early (P⁷⁵) and comes from both the Alexandrian (P⁷⁵-B) and Western (D) traditions. This evidence, along with the unstable form of the clause in the Lukan tradition, may be a compelling indicator that the phrase is a secondary gloss on Mark 5:26.⁴⁹

Ultimately, Marshall is correct to say, “A clear-cut decision is impossible.”⁵⁰ Because of its early Alexandrian (Ⲙ) and Pre-Caesarean (W) support and its overwhelming presence in the manuscripts, I tend to prefer the longer reading and account for its omission by appeal to harmonization to Matthew 9:20.

After Jesus heals the hemorrhaging woman, he arrives at a home surrounded by people mourning the recent loss of a young girl. Jesus announces, “Do not weep, for she is not dead but sleeps” (μη κλαίετε οὐ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν ἀλλὰ καθεύδει). The phrase “for she

⁴⁸ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 121. Similarly, Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:746, says the phrase “looks like a succinct condensation of Mark 5:26 such as Luke would write.” He ultimately leaves the text in brackets to signify uncertainty.

⁴⁹ The phrase appears in at least six unique forms. Nolland, *Luke*, 1:416, regards the clause as secondary. By contrast, Marshall, *Luke*, 344, believes the phrase may be original to Luke *because* the wording is different from Mark.

⁵⁰ Marshall, *Luke*, 344.

is not dead” (οὐ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν) is identical in Matthew 9:24. Mark 5:39 has a different construction: “she is not dead” (οὐκ ἀπέθανεν). Mark’s use of οὐκ is consistent in all manuscripts; οὐ γὰρ is absolutely stable in Matthew. Luke’s manuscript tradition largely favors the “Matthean” construction (οὐ γὰρ) except in a few early manuscripts.

Unfortunately, the phrase falls in a lacuna in P⁷⁵, but on the basis of the number of letters permissible in the line, Martin and Kasser argue that the shorter, “Markan” reading (οὐκ) stood in P⁷⁵.

None of the Synoptics clearly favors one form of negation over the other. The form οὐ γὰρ occurs six times in Mark, five in Matthew, and seven in Luke. Similarly, οὐκ is found in Mark sixty-five times, in Matthew ninety-three times and in Luke ninety-two times. Harmonization could account for either reading. If οὐκ is the older reading in Luke, then the few and excellent manuscripts of Luke with οὐ γὰρ have been harmonized to Matthew. This seems unlikely since the weight of Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and three fifth-century majuscules from diverse textual streams (C D W) testify to the longer reading. It is much more likely that οὐ γὰρ is the older reading and that manuscripts of Luke with οὐκ, possibly including P⁷⁵ and definitely Codex Alexandrinus (A), have been harmonized to Mark 5:39 and the more common way of negating statements.

(14) Luke 9:12 – προσελθόντες δὲ οἱ δώδεκα εἶπαν⁵¹ αὐτῷ ἀπόλυσον ἱτὸν ὄχλον¹

(ἱ τοὺς ὄχλους; //Matthew 14:15)⁵²

⁵¹ P⁷⁵ has εἶπον.

⁵² P⁷⁵ κ^c 047 28 127 157 229 300 349 407 435 472 478 565 577 669^c 1242 1424 1506 1630 2643 2766.

After Jesus feeds the crowd of five thousand, his disciples urge him, “Release the crowd (τὸν ὄχλον).” Luke uses a singular noun (τὸν ὄχλον) to describe the crowd where Matthew 14:15 has a plural noun (τοὺς ὄχλους). The plural reading of Matthew seems to have influenced the scribe of P⁷⁵, who has adopted a plural construction in his copy of Luke.

(15) Luke 9:23 – εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἔρχεσθαι ἴ ἀρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν

(ἴ ἀπαρνησάσθω; //Mark 8:34, Matthew 16:24)⁵³

In Luke 9:23, Jesus describes the cost of discipleship. He says to a would-be follower, “If someone wishes to come after me, let him deny (ἀρνησάσθω) himself.” In Mark 8:34 and Matthew 16:24, the form of the verb is intensified with a prefix so that the aspiring disciple must “utterly deny himself” (ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν).⁵⁴ The compound verb of Mark and Matthew is found in the text of P⁷⁵ and in the majority of the manuscripts of Luke. The simple verb, however, appears to be the best reading in Luke on the basis of the textually diverse evidence of the corrected reading of Codex Vaticanus and the early witness of Codices Sinaiticus, Bezae, and Alexandrinus. It does not seem likely that the compound verb was the older reading in Luke and that a few important witnesses from different text types omitted the prefix independently, thereby reducing the force of Jesus’s statement. Alternatively, it is easy to believe that a scribe would add the prefix in assimilation to Synoptic parallels.

⁵³ P⁷⁵ B* C M R U W X Γ Δ Λ Ψ f¹ 2 28 69 118 124 157 565 700 788 892 1006 1071 1241 1346 1424 1506 2542 ℣. IGNTP prefers ἀπαρνησάσθω.

⁵⁴ Though Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:787, says the compound verb “scarcely changes the meaning of the saying.”

(16) Luke 9:28a – παραλαβὼν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον² (Ἰάκωβον
καὶ Ἰωάννην; //Mark 9:2, Matthew 17:1)⁵⁵

(17) Luke 9:28b – Ἦ ανέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι (Ἦ καί; //Mark 9:2, Matthew
17:1)⁵⁶

According to Luke, only three disciples accompanied Jesus to the mountain where he was transfigured: Peter, John, and James. In Mark and Matthew, Peter is the first disciple named, followed by James, and lastly John. In many manuscripts of Luke, including two from the third century (P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵) and two from the fifth century (C^c D), the order in which the brothers are listed in Luke matches that found in the other Synoptics, possibly reflecting the influence of the parallel upon the scribe.

Luke records that after gathering his companions, Jesus “ascended the mountain in order to pray” (ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι). There is no need for an introductory conjunction in the Lukan context because the sentence begins with a participle (παραλαβὼν). In P⁷⁵, however, an introductory conjunction is included: καὶ ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι. Altogether, the sentence would be rendered, “Taking Peter and James and John *and* he ascended the mountain in order to pray.” Including a conjunction at this point in the sentence, between the participle and finite verb, disrupts the flow of the sentence. Why, then, has the scribe added καί? In both Mark and Matthew, the first clause is introduced with a finite verb (παραλαμβάνει) followed by a second clause governed by a finite verb (ἀναφέρει). It is appropriate in that context for the clauses to be linked by a

⁵⁵ P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ C^c D L M X Ξ 5 27 33 71 157 213 348 477 892 903 1071 1194 1216 1220 1342 1458 1579.

⁵⁶ P⁷⁵ G 472 716 827 2643.

conjunction. It would appear that in addition to taking over the Matthean and Markan order of the brothers, the scribe may have incorporated the structure of their sentence into his text of Luke 9:28.

(18) Luke 9:48 – ὃς ἐὰν δέξηται ⁵ τοῦτο τὸ παιδίον ² ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου ἐμὲ

δέχεται⁵⁷ (⁵ τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο; //Matthew 18:4)⁵⁸

After his transfiguration, Jesus begins to instruct his followers on the true cost of discipleship and the radical social structure of the kingdom of God. His disciples, still entrenched in the hierarchy of their own world, argue about who is greater among them. In Luke, Jesus tells them, “Whoever welcomes this child (τοῦτο τὸ παιδίον) in my name welcomes me.” In P⁷⁵, the scribe has transposed some of the words; he has τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο instead of τοῦτο τὸ παιδίον. The direct parallels in Mark 9:37 and Matthew 18:5 are not likely candidates for a source of this change since in them the disciples are exhorted to welcome “one of such children” (ἐν τῶν τοιούτων παιδίων) and “one such child” (ἐν παιδίον τοιοῦτο). In a near-parallel, Matthew 18:4, Jesus says, “Therefore, whoever will humble himself like this child (τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο), this one is greatest in the kingdom of heaven.” In this passage, the word order corresponds to what the scribe of P⁷⁵ wrote in Luke 9:48. Although it is not a direct parallel, it is possible that the wording of this verse in Matthew influenced the scribe.⁵⁹

⁵⁷ P⁷⁵ has δέχεται.

⁵⁸ P⁷⁵ D^{f1} 1 6 118 131 205 209 579 726 827 1012 1200 1319 1342 1506 1582 2766.

⁵⁹ So Zwiep, “Ascension Narratives,” 232; and Parsons, “Christological Tendency,” 473.

(19) Luke 10:7 – ἄξιός γάρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ {ἐστίν} (//Matthew 10:10)⁶⁰

There is potentially a harmonizing variant in Luke 10:7 in the midst of Jesus’s speech commissioning seventy missionaries, but whether one deems it so depends on which reading one thinks is earlier. Jesus tells his disciples, “For the worker is (ἐστίν) worthy of his reward.” The question is whether the verb ἐστίν belongs in the text of Luke. The weight of the manuscript evidence is nearly evenly split. The majority of manuscripts plus three fifth-century majuscules (A C W) contain the longer reading with the verb while the third-century P⁷⁵, both fourth-century majuscules (Ⲙ B), and an additional fifth-century manuscript (D) testify to the shorter reading. Most editors and commentators follow the shorter reading. IGNTP, however, prefers the longer reading. Gordon Fee also appears to uphold the longer reading and accounts for the omission of ἐστίν in many manuscripts by harmonization to Matthew 10:10.⁶¹ I am convinced by the Alexandrian and Western support that the shorter reading is older. The longer reading arose as an explanatory or clarifying addition, not by harmonization.

(20) Luke 10:15 – καὶ σὺ Καφαρναούμ μὴ ἕως οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθήσῃ ἕως τοῦ ἄδου

καταβιβασθήσῃ (καταβήσῃ; //Matthew 11:23)⁶²

⁶⁰ Manuscripts with ἐστίν include: A C K M R^c U W Y Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ f¹ f³ 2 28 33 124 565 1006 1071 1424 1506 2542 ℳ. Manuscripts without ἐστίν include: P⁷⁵ Ⲙ B D L R* X Ξ 157 213 248 372 544 579 700 713* 892 1241 1342.

⁶¹ Fee, “P⁷⁵, P⁶⁶, and Origen,” 271.

⁶² Manuscripts with καταβήσῃ include: P⁷⁵ B D (καταβήσει 579) 1342. Manuscripts with καταβιβασθήσῃ include: P⁴⁵ Ⲙ A C E G K L M N R U W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Ξ Π Ψ 0115 f¹ f³ 1 2 28 33 118 157 180 205 565 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1346 1424 1505 1506 1582 ℳ. Tischendorf, IGNTP, Merk, and Souter prefer καταβιβασθήσῃ.

The reading at Luke 10:15 is likewise contested. Jesus announces the dire fate of the city of Capernaum and cries out, “And you, Capernaum, will you be exalted to heaven? You will descend (*καταβιβασθήσῃ* / *καταβήσῃ*) to Hades.” Two synonyms for “descend” are found in the manuscripts. The first, *καταβιβάζω*, is supported by the greater number of manuscripts, including P⁴⁵ and several fourth- and fifth-century majuscules (Ⲙ A C W). The second, *καταβαίνω*, is supported by P⁷⁵, Codex Vaticanus, Codex Bezae, and a few minuscules. Metzger prefers the Alexandrian and Western support for the second reading.⁶³ I am persuaded by the Alexandrian (Ⲙ C) and Pre-Caesarean (P⁴⁵ W) support for the former reading (*καταβιβάζω*) and am further convinced when the parallel in Matthew is considered.

In Matthew 11:23, the same problem occurs, but the best textual evidence leans in favor of *καταβαίνω*.⁶⁴ As Metzger explains, this verb is supported “by the earliest representative of both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text.”⁶⁵ Most commentators and editors prefer *καταβαίνω*. Furthermore, the word *καταβαίνω* is used in Isaiah 14:15 LXX, to which the verse alludes, and Matthew is fond of citing the Septuagint.

⁶³ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 127. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2:855, prefers this reading and regards the other as an echo of Isaiah 14:15 (LXX): “Now you will descend to Hades and to the foundation of the earth” (*νῦν δὲ εἰς ἄδου καταβήσῃ καὶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς*).

⁶⁴ Manuscripts with *καταβήσῃ* include: B D W 372 579. Manuscripts with *καταβιβασθήσῃ* include: Ⲙ C E F G K L N Γ Δ Θ Σ f¹ f¹³ 28 33 124 157 180 205 565 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 1506 ℳ. Tischendorf prefers *καταβιβασθήσῃ*.

⁶⁵ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 25.

Given the state of affairs in Luke and Matthew, I agree with Marshall that “it is hard to see how the variants arose if both Gospels originally had the same verb.”⁶⁶ Harmonization has occurred. I am persuaded that *καταβαίνω* stood in Matthew and that *καταβιβάζω* was the earlier reading in Luke. Over time, scribes of Matthew created a reading that assimilated to Luke and scribes of Luke, including the scribe of P⁷⁵, created a variant that assimilated to Matthew or to the passage from Isaiah.

(21) Luke 10:21 – *ναὶ ὁ πατήρ ὅτι οὕτως ἔγένετο εὐδοκία ἔμπροσθέν σου*

(^ε*εὐδοκία ἐγένετο*; //Matthew 11:26)⁶⁷

Again, in Luke 10:21, which reading is older must be decided before a discussion of harmonization can begin. Jesus rejoices in the will of the father to conceal things from the wise and understanding and to reveal them to infants. He exclaims, “Yes, father, for such was well pleasing before you” (*ναὶ ὁ πατήρ ὅτι οὕτως ἐγένετο εὐδοκία ἔμπροσθέν σου*). Both readings of the middle phrase, *ἐγένετο εὐδοκία* and *εὐδοκία ἐγένετο*, are attested, but the balance of evidence falls in favor of the former. The parallel in Matthew 11:26 consistently reads *εὐδοκία ἐγένετο*. If both passages held the same reading, as NA²⁸ and UBS have it, it is difficult to comprehend how the second reading arose in so many manuscripts, including P⁴⁵ and P⁷⁵-B. Alternatively, if *ἐγένετο εὐδοκία* is the older reading

⁶⁶ Marshall, *Luke*, 426.

⁶⁷ Manuscripts with *ἐγένετο εὐδοκία* include: ⳨ A C^c D K M N U W Γ Δ Θ Λ Π 0115 *f*¹ *f*¹³ 2 28 157 565 700 1006 1071 1241 1342 1424 1506 2542 ⲙ. Manuscripts with *εὐδοκία ἐγένετο* include: P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ B C* L X Ξ Ψ 070 0124 1 33 213 579 892.

in Luke, the variant in P⁷⁵-B and elsewhere could easily be explained by harmonization to Matthew.⁶⁸

(22) Luke 11:14 – και ἦν ἐκβάλλων δαιμόνιον □ και αὐτὸ ἦν κωφόν (//Matthew 12:22)⁶⁹

(23) Luke 11:20 – εἰ δὲ ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ {ἐγώ} ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (//Matthew 12:28)⁷⁰

On one occasion when Jesus cast a demon out of a man, Luke records that “it [the demon] was deaf” (και αὐτὸ ἦν κωφόν). Many manuscripts, especially of the Alexandrian type, have omitted the words “and it was” (και αὐτὸ ἦν), so that Jesus casts out “a deaf demon” (δαιμόνιον κωφόν). It is possible that the words have been omitted in partial harmonization to the Matthean parallel where the evangelist narrates that the people brought to Jesus a “blind and deaf demoniac” (δαιμονιζόμενος τυφλὸς και κωφός), without a verbal construction. Homoioteleuton could account for the reading if the scribe’s eye leapt from the nu at the end of δαιμόνιον to the nu at the end of ἦν.

The best reading of Luke 11:20 is uncertain. Jesus is confronted by some who have seen his exorcisms and accuse him of using the power of Beelzebub to expel demons. Jesus rejects their accusation and says, “But if by the finger of God I cast out

⁶⁸ So Fee, “P⁷⁵, P⁶⁶, and Origen,” 271. Luke uses the term ἐγένετο far more often (69 times) than Mark (18) or Matthew (13). The term is typically in first position with δέ or in second position with και. It is seldom found in third position, as it stands in the Nestle-Aland text: οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο.

⁶⁹ Manuscripts without και αὐτὸ ἦν include: P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ & A* B L 0211 f¹ 1 22 33 118 131 157 205 209 788 892 1210 1241 1582* 2542. Souter prefers the shorter reading. Manuscripts with και αὐτὸ ἦν include: A^c C E F G H K M U R W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ f¹³ 2 28 69 180 565 579 700 1006 1010 1071 1243 1292 1342 1346 1424 1505 1582^c ℞.

⁷⁰ Manuscripts with ἐγώ include: P⁷⁵ &^c B C (D) L R f¹³ 33 69 124 157 346 372 543 579 788 826 827 892 983 1071 1342 1604 2766. Manuscripts without ἐγώ include: P⁴⁵ &* A K N W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ f¹ 565 700 1006 1241 1424 1506 ℞. Tischendorf and IGNTP prefer the reading without ἐγώ.

(ἐκβάλλω) the demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you.” In many manuscripts, including P⁷⁵, the personal pronoun appears as the subject of the verb (ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω). In the majority, however, the pronoun is absent. If the shorter reading is older, its appearance in P⁷⁵ and elsewhere might easily be explained by harmonization to Matthew 12:28, where ἐγὼ is a stable feature of the text.⁷¹ In this instance, though, the strong evidence of the Alexandrian witnesses (P⁷⁵-B ^κ C) and the early Western evidence of Codex Bezae in opposition to mostly Byzantine witnesses and Pre-Caesarean evidence of P⁴⁵ and Washingtonianus is compelling evidence in favor of the longer reading. The word has probably dropped out of many manuscripts because the subject is implied by the verb itself.

(24) Luke 11:24a – ὅταν ^τ τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

διέρχεται δι’ ἀνύδρων τόπων ζητοῦν ἀνάπαυσιν καὶ μὴ εὐρίσκον

(^τδέ; //Matthew 12:43)⁷²

(25) Luke 11:24b – ^τ λέγει ὑποστρέψω εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου ὅθεν ἐξῆλθον (^ττότε;

//Matthew 12:44)⁷³

After he teaches on the source of the power used in his exorcisms, Jesus goes on to explain demonic logic. In Luke 11:24, he says, “When (ὅταν) the unclean spirit goes out from the man it passes through waterless places seeking rest.” Matthew’s version of

⁷¹ So Fee, “P⁷⁵, P⁶⁶, and Origen,” 271.

⁷² P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ D U W X 0211 ^l 1 16 118 131 157 205 209 213 348 443 472 477 544 713 903 983 1005 1009 1195 1216 1241 1365 1579 1582 1604 1691 2372 2542 2613 2643.

⁷³ Manuscripts with τότε include: P⁷⁵ ^κ B L X Θ Ξ Π 070 0124 33 157 579 713 827 892 1012 1071 1241 1342 1604 2096 2643 2766. Manuscripts without τότε include: P⁴⁵ ^κ* A C D E^c G H K M U W Y Γ Δ Λ Ψ ^l ^l3 2 28 69 124 180 205 565 597 700 788 1006 1010 1243 1292 1346 1424 1505 1506 2542 [℣]. Tischendorf, IGNTP, Merk, and Souter prefer the shorter reading.

this teaching includes a postpositive $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ ($\delta\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha\nu\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$). The scribe of P⁷⁵ and many others have adopted this reading in their copies of Luke. The variant appears early in Alexandrian (P⁷⁵), Western (D), and Pre-Caesarean (P⁴⁵ W) manuscripts. Yet, several of the best Alexandrian codices (\aleph B C) and the Byzantine majority lack the conjunction, giving the impression that it is secondary. The appearance of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in many manuscripts can be attributed to the influence of Matthew 12:43, though stylistic preference for a conjunction at the beginning of sentences may also have been a factor.

After the demon is cast out and wanders in arid places, Jesus continues, “It says ($\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota$), ‘I will return to my house from where I went out.’” In Matthew 12:44, the word “then” ($\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$) appears at the beginning of this sentence. The reading with $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ is found in a fair number of manuscripts, including several important witnesses like P⁷⁵, Codex Vaticanus, and the corrected reading of Codex Sinaiticus. Metzger prefers the longer reading because of the external evidence, but encloses $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ in brackets to signify the possibility that it has entered the text by assimilation.⁷⁴ Nevertheless, the shorter reading is better given broad support from multiple textual streams. One can be confident in the secondary nature of the longer reading and may ascribe it to harmonization.⁷⁵ This is not the type of reading a scribe would add on his own and it is not suggested by the text. Hoskier jauntily calls the reading a “theft from Matt. xii. 44.”⁷⁶

⁷⁴ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 134.

⁷⁵ See Fee, “P⁷⁵, P⁶⁶, and Origen,” 271; Marshall, *Luke*, 479; and Plummer, *Luke*, 304.

⁷⁶ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:267. See also Martini, *Il problema*, 130.

(26) Luke 11:31 – βασίλισσα νότου ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν

τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακριεῖ ἡ αὐτοῦς (ἡ αὐτήν; //Matthew

12:42)⁷⁷

As Jesus’s fame and notoriety spread, crowds gathered to him seeking signs of his authority and miraculous power. Jesus condemns their requests for signs and announces the judgment awaiting such a wicked generation. In Luke 11:31, he says, “The queen of the south will be raised up in judgment in the midst of the men of this generation and she will condemn them (αὐτούς).” In Luke, it is clear from the plural pronoun αὐτούς that the *men* of the generation are to be condemned. In Matthew 12:42, the queen of the south judges “this generation” (τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης) and condemns, not the men, but “it” (αὐτήν), the generation as a collective whole. The text in P⁷⁵ is a conflation of these statements: the queen judges “the men of this generation” (τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης) but condemns “it” (αὐτήν), that is, the generation. Logically, since judgment has been passed on the men, the condemnation should also fall on them. The scribe has condemned the generation under the assimilating influence of Matthew.⁷⁸

(27) Luke 11:33 – οὐδεὶς λύχνον ἄψας εἰς κρύπτῃν τίθησιν {οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον}

ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν (//Mark 4:21, Matthew 5:15)⁷⁹

⁷⁷ P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ 245 1424.

⁷⁸ So also Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 682, 691 n. 396; Parsons, “Christological Tendency,” 473–474; and Zwiep, “Ascension Narratives,” 232. See also Fee, “P⁷⁵, P⁶⁶, and Origen,” 271, who claims in reference to this reading, “P⁷⁵ and/or B... have only one instance of sub-singular harmonization.” Birdsall, “Rational Eclecticism,” 47, believes carelessness is the best explanation for the reading.

⁷⁹ Manuscripts without οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον include: P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ L Γ Ξ 070 0124^{f1} 1 22 69 118 131 205 209 660 669 700* 788 1012 1192* 1210 1241 1582 2542. Manuscripts with οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον include: ⱼ A B C D E G H K M U W Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ^{f13} (2) 28 33 124157 180 565 579 597 700^c 892 1006 1010 1071 1243 (1292) 1342 1424 1505 1506 Ɀ.

Immediately following his annunciation of the impending judgment of the sign-seeking generation, Jesus teaches about the importance of the eye for bringing light to the body. He offers a simple illustration about a lamp in a dark room: “No one who lights a lamp puts it into a hidden place nor under the basket (οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μῶδιον), but (rather) on the lampstand.” The phrase “under the basket” (ὑπὸ τὸν μῶδιον) is found consistently in Mark 4:21 and Matthew 5:15, but it is absent from numerous manuscripts of Luke, including P⁴⁵ and P⁷⁵. The situation calls the reading into question.

Metzger notes that “since Luke preferred not to use μῶδιον in 8.16, a word that is present in the parallel in Mark (and Matthew), it may well be that the word, with its clause, was absent from the original form of the present passage also.”⁸⁰ Furthermore, if the shorter reading is older, one could easily account for the longer reading by harmonization to one of the parallels. This appears to be the solution that Gordon Fee advocates.⁸¹ Martin and Kasser also entertain the possibility that ὑπὸ τὸν μῶδιον was added secondarily, but explain the alteration as a desire to balance this phrase with the next: “in the lampstand” (ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν).⁸² All of these arguments favor the shorter reading, but even together they are not sufficient to surmount the textual evidence for the longer reading, which is attested in the best witnesses of the Alexandrian (Ⲙ B), Western (D), and Pre-Caesarean (W) types. The scattered manuscripts that lack the phrase must have lost it through the negligence of the scribe or homoioteleuton. If the scribe copied

⁸⁰ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 134. Ultimately, the committee was divided but included the text in brackets on the basis of its “weighty and diversified external evidence.”

⁸¹ Fee, “P⁷⁵, P⁶⁶, and Origen,” 271. See also F. C. Burkitt, “The Chester Beatty Papyrus,” *JTS* 34 (1993): 363–368, 365, who suggests a reviser inserted the parallel words into Ⲙ and B.

⁸² Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, 27, “...Serait-ce une adjonction postérieure destinée à balancer ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν?”

τίθησιν, the last word of a sensible phrase, and, returning to the exemplar, picked it up again following the nu in μόδιον, the phrase would be lost. Harmonization does not account for this reading.

(28) Luke 11:34 – ὅταν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ἀπλοῦς ᾖ καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου φωτεινόν
 ἐστὶν ἐπὶ δὲ ^τ πονηρὸς ᾖ καὶ τὸ σῶμά σου σκοτεινόν (P^{75c} τ ὁ
 ὀφθαλμός σου; //Matthew 6:23; Correction)⁸³

The addition of ten or so illegible letters added superlinearly in Luke 11:34 may be a harmonizing amendment. Jesus explains, “When your eye is healthy, your whole body is also full of light, but when it is evil, your body (is) also dark.” In Luke, the subject of the sentence, “your eye” (ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου), is stated only in the first clause. In the parallel in Matthew 6:23, the subject, ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου, is repeated at the beginning of the second clause. Some manuscripts of Luke also repeat the phrase in the second clause. It is not immediately clear whether P⁷⁵ belongs with these. The main text agrees with the shorter, Lukan reading, but Martin and Kasser note that above the words δὲ πονηρός there are “about ten small letters in pale ink that cannot be read.”⁸⁴ Comfort and Barrett speculate that the letters might be Coptic, though their reasons for saying so are opaque.⁸⁵ Royse disregards their suggestion. Kurt Aland seems to have been the first to suggest that the indecipherable letters might be ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου, corresponding to some versional

⁸³ {P^{75c}} X 213 343 713^c 716 1229 2487. I regard the letters as a correction and enclose the entry in curly brackets to signify that the reading is hypothetical.

⁸⁴ Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, 87, “supra δε πονηρος litterulae minutae fere decem atramento pallido scriptae legi non possunt.”

⁸⁵ Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 534.

witnesses and a handful of Greek miniscules.⁸⁶ He also attributes the letters to a later hand, rather than to the scribe himself. If Aland's suggestion is correct, a later scribe or reader of the codex has added a harmonizing amendment. Royse believes Aland's reading is possible, but prefers to describe it as a harmonization to immediate context. He explains, the addition "is meant to balance the two phrases ο οφθαλμος σου απλους η and ο οφθαλμος σου πονηρος η."⁸⁷ Royse is correct that the desire to balance the phrase could be at work, but harmonization is also plausible.

(29) Luke 11:48 – ἄρα ῥ μάρτυρές ἐστε ἠ καὶ συνευδοκεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν πατέρων
ὕμῶν (ῥ μαρτυρεῖτε; //Matthew 23:31)⁸⁸

(30) Luke 11:50 – ἵνα ἐκζητηθῆ τὸ αἷμα πάντων τῶν προφητῶν τὸ ῥ ἐκκεχυμένον
ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης (ῥ ἐκχυν(ν)όμενον;
//Matthew 23:35)⁸⁹

In a series of invectives against his opponents, Jesus claims, "Then you are witnesses (μάρτυρές ἐστε) and approve of the deeds of your fathers." Two different constructions are found in the manuscripts of Luke 11:50 to convey the notion of "witnessing." In a minority of manuscripts, the idea is represented periphrastically with a verb and noun: "you are witnesses" (μάρτυρές ἐστε). In P⁷⁵ and a variety of other

⁸⁶ K. Aland, "Neu neutestamentliche Papyri II," 8.

⁸⁷ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 646–647 n. 155.

⁸⁸ P⁷⁵ A C D K W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ f¹ f¹³ 33 565 579 700^c 1006 1342 1424 1506 ℳ. IGNTP prefers μαρτυρεῖτε. Manuscripts with μάρτυρές ἐστε include: Ⲛ B L 700* 892 1241 2542.

⁸⁹ P⁷⁵ Ⲛ A C D E G H K L M S U V W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ f¹ 1 2 28 118 124 157 489 565 579 700 892 1006 1071 1079 1219 1313 1342 1424 1506 1582* 1604 2542 ℳ. Tischendorf, IGNTP, and Souter prefer ἐκχυνόμενον against: P⁴⁵ B 0233 f¹³ 33 69 346 372 543 788 826 1241.

manuscripts the verb “you bear witness” (μαρτυρεῖτε) is used. The textual evidence in favor of the longer reading is limited, with only Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and L, all from the Alexandrian type, providing substantial support. Opposing this reading is the majority of manuscripts along with the early evidence of P⁷⁵, representing the Alexandrian tradition, Bezae, from the Western type, and Washingtonianus, representing the Pre-Caesarean tradition. The reading with μαρτυρεῖτε appears to be the better reading.

The parallel in Matthew may provide further evidence. The verbal construction is found in a near-parallel at Matthew 23:31, where Jesus says to the scribes and Pharisees, “Thus, you yourselves bear witness (μαρτυρεῖτε) that you are the murderers of the prophets.” If μάρτυρες ἐστε is the older reading in Luke, it is quite possible that the scribe has harmonized to Matthew’s μαρτυρεῖτε. Furthermore, harmonization to the verb συνευδοκεῖν in the immediate context might also have prompted a scribe to change to μαρτυρεῖτε.⁹⁰ The longer reading, μάρτυρες ἐστε, despite limited textual evidence, explains the presence of the alternative either by appeal to harmonization to Matthew or harmonization to the context.

A few verses later, in Luke 11:50, Jesus says that God’s Wisdom sent prophets and apostles into the world “in order that this generation be charged with the blood of all the prophets which has been poured out (ἐκκεχυμένον) since the foundation of the world.” Luke appears to have used the perfect participle ἐκκεχυμένον to describe the blood of the prophets that “has been poured out.” In P⁷⁵, though, the perfect participle has been replaced with the present participle ἐκχυνόμενον. The parallel of this statement in

⁹⁰ So Michael Wolter, *Das Lukasevangelium*, HNT 5 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 435, “Die Variante μαρτυρεῖτε...dürfte sie sich der Angleichung an συνευδοκεῖν verdanken.”

Matthew 23:35 also uses a present participle ἐκχυνόμενον to describe the blood “being poured out.”

The textual evidence for the two readings in Luke is split. On the one hand, many manuscripts from a variety of textual traditions support the present participle. On the other hand, the perfect participle is found in Codex Vaticanus, an important Alexandrian witness, and P⁴⁵, which in Luke is a mixture of the Alexandrian and Western traditions. Even though it is not supported as heavily in the manuscripts, the perfect reading has the added quality of being the “more difficult” form, which is more likely to be altered by a scribe. Furthermore, if the perfect reading is older, then the present tense variant is explicable on the basis of harmonization.⁹¹ For these reasons, it is best to accept the perfect participle in Luke and to attribute the variant to the influence of Matthew.

(31) Luke 12:29 – καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ ζητεῖτε τί φάγητε⁹² ἢ καὶ τί πίνητε καὶ μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε (ἢ; //Matthew 6:31)⁹³

(32) Luke 12:31 – πλὴν ζητεῖτε τὴν βασιλείαν ὁ αὐτοῦ καὶ ταῦτα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν (//Matthew 6:33 ጸ; Singular)

Jesus turns from antagonizing his opponents to instructing his disciples on the theme of worldly anxiety. He says, “And you, do not seek what you will eat and (καί) what you will drink and do not be worried.” In Luke, the pair of concerns about eating and drinking are separated by the conjunction καί. In the parallel passage in Matthew

⁹¹ So also Fee, “P⁷⁵, P⁶⁶, and Origen,” 271; and Plummer, *Luke*, 314.

⁹² P⁷⁵ has φάγησθε.

⁹³ P⁷⁵ A D H K M S U W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ f¹ f¹³ 2 28 69 124 700 788 1006 1071 1342 1506 2542
 Ⓜ. IGNTP prefers ἢ.

6:31, the disciples are told not to worry or say to themselves, “What will I eat, *or* (ἢ) what will I drink, *or* (ἢ) what will I wear?” The items in the series are connected by the conjunction ἢ. The difference is not drastic, nor does it even subtly alter the meaning of the text, yet the scribe of P⁷⁵ has used the conjunction ἢ in place of καί. Harmonization to Matthew 6:31 is possible, though in such a negligible instance it is difficult to be certain. General usage or stylistic preference may just as easily account for the reading.⁹⁴

Jesus tells his disciples to seek “his,” that is God’s, “kingdom” (βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ). P⁷⁵ alone fails to define further the kingdom in Luke. In most manuscripts of Matthew 6:33 the kingdom is identified as the “kingdom of God” (βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ), but in Codex Sinaiticus the kingdom is left unidentified. The manuscripts of both Matthew and Luke testify that it is very unusual not to define the kingdom, so it is worthwhile at least to entertain the possibility that the scribe has intentionally left out the possessive adjective αὐτοῦ. One unlikely possibility is that the scribe was influenced, not by the common reading in Matthew, but by the version of Sinaiticus. This is not to say the scribe knew that very manuscript, which postdates him, but that he could have been influenced by the same textual tradition that produced such an important Alexandrian manuscript. A more likely alternative is that the scribe has omitted the word because he deemed it

⁹⁴ Michael Mees, “Papyrus Bodmer XIV (P⁷⁵) und die Lukaszitate bei Clemens von Alexandrien,” in *Studi e Ricerche di Scienze Religiose in onore dei Santi Apostoli Pietro e Paolo nel XIX centenario del loro martirio*, Lateranum Nova Series 34 (Rome: Facultas Theologica Pontificiae Universitatis Lateranensis, 1968), 97–119, 105, discusses this reading with reference to its familiarity to Clement.

superfluous. As Colwell notes, this particular scribe has a proclivity “to omit personal pronouns.”⁹⁵

(33) Luke 12:43 – μακάριος ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος ὃν ἐλθὼν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ εὐρήσει
^ςποιοῦντα οὕτως^ς (^ςοὕτως ποιοῦντα; //Matthew 24:46)⁹⁶

In order to instruct his followers about preparedness, Jesus tells them a story about a slave whose master left him in control of his household while he himself went away on a journey. He concludes, “Blessed is that servant who, when his master comes, he will find him doing thusly (ποιοῦντα οὕτως),” that is, keeping the house in order. The order of the final two words of the sentence is uncertain. Several early and important manuscripts, including two third-century papyri (P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵) and Codex Sinaiticus reverse the order of the final two words (οὕτως ποιοῦντα). The manuscript evidence for the reversed order is not insubstantial and bears some consideration with regard to potentially having the better claim. The decision will be made easier if it can be shown that one reading explains the other.

The parallel in Matthew 24:46 does not immediately clarify the situation, since there, too, the variant word order exists. The order οὕτως ποιοῦντα is found in a fair number of manuscripts, many of them of high quality.⁹⁷ The reverse reading is found in

⁹⁵ Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 121. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 136, also takes this view. Birdsall, “Rational Eclecticism,” 48, attributes the omission to simple carelessness, but we have seen that the scribe is not prone to such mistakes.

⁹⁶ P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ Ⲙ (L) X Ψ 070 f¹³ 7 13 33 60 69 157 213 267 346 543 579 788 826 892 983 1241 1346 1506 1654 1685.

⁹⁷ Ⲙ B C D I L Θ 067 0204 0281 f¹ f¹³ 33 157 205 237 543 713 788 892 999 1293 1342 1346 1396 1515 1582.

the majority of manuscripts, but only one (W) from the fifth century or earlier.⁹⁸ In Matthew, it seems best to accept the order with adverb preceding verb (οὕτως ποιοῦντα) and to explain the alternative reading with regard to the parallel in Luke. Having decided the Matthean reading, one can return to Luke and explain the popular variant reading, with adverb before verb (οὕτως ποιοῦντα), as a variant assimilating to Matthew.

(34) Luke 13:30 – καὶ ἰδοὺ εἰσὶν ἑσχατοὶ οἳ ἔσονται πρῶτοι καὶ εἰσὶν πρῶτοι οἳ ἔσονται ἑσχατοὶ (Ἦοί; //Matthew 20:16)⁹⁹

Jesus instructs his followers on the requirements of discipleship and the hierarchy of the kingdom of God in Luke 13:30. He says, “And behold, they are last who shall be first and they are first who shall be last.” In P⁷⁵, the scribe has added the plural definite article before the word ἑσχατοὶ, with the resultant phrase: “they are *the* last who...” (εἰσὶν οἳ ἑσχατοὶ οἳ). Mark’s version of the aphorism has different syntax. Jesus says, “Now many first will be last and (many) last (will be) first” (πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἑσχατοὶ καὶ ἑσχατοὶ πρῶτοι).¹⁰⁰ The passage’s most direct parallel in the First Gospel is Matthew 19:30, but the article does not regularly appear there. In a near-parallel at Matthew 20:16, however, the article is a significant feature of the grammar. There, Jesus says, “Therefore *the* last will be first and *the* first last” (οὕτως ἔσονται οἳ ἑσχατοὶ πρῶτοι καὶ οἳ πρῶτοι ἑσχατοὶ). It would appear that the scribe of P⁷⁵, influenced by the version of the saying in

⁹⁸ K M U W Γ Δ Π Σ ῥ 2 28 118 565 579 700 1006 1071 1241 1424 1506 ℣.

⁹⁹ P⁷⁵ 179 579 2643 2757*.

¹⁰⁰ Manuscripts of Mark that omit οἳ include: Ⲛ A D K L M N V W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω* 0233 f¹ 22 28 106 124 142* 180 205 209 349 435 517 565 579 597 692 697* 700 1071 1241 1243 1278 1292 1342 1424 1505 2427 2542. This reading likely arises under the influence of Matthew 19:30.

Matthew 20:16, has brought the article into a context where it was not needed and actually makes for awkward sense.¹⁰¹

(35) Luke 13:35a – λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν οὐ μὴ ἴδητέ με² (ἴδετέ με; //Matthew 23:38)¹⁰²

(36) Luke 13:35b – ἕως ἡξεί ὅτε εἴπητε εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου (//Matthew 23:39)¹⁰³

On one occasion, during his travels toward Jerusalem, Jesus foretells the destruction of holy city and laments over its loss. The destruction will be complete, he predicts, and he will be absent from the people in their desolation. He tells his followers, “You will not see me (ἴδητέ με) until (the time) comes when (ἡξεί ὅτε) you say, ‘Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord.’” The scribe has departed from the Lukan text in several ways, two of which potentially involve assimilation. In the first case, the scribe has reversed the word order of ἴδητέ με, corresponding to the order found in Matthew 23:38. The manuscript evidence for the “Matthean” order in Luke has in its favor the early Alexandrian testimony of P⁷⁵, the Pre-Caesarean witness of P⁴⁵, and the Western witness of Codex Bezae. Alternatively, Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus, and a few witnesses of the Byzantine (A) and Pre-Caesarean (W) types lend their weight to the “Lukan” word order. In this case it would appear that the “Lukan” order is the earlier reading. The variant order may have arisen under the influence of Matthew.

¹⁰¹ So Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 660, 691.

¹⁰² Manuscripts with με ἴδητε include: P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ D E G H L N S U V X Γ Δ Λ Ψ Ω J¹ 2 28 124 157 565 579 700 892 1006 1241 1342 1424 1506 2542 M. IGNTP prefers this reading. Manuscripts with ἴδητέ με include: N A B K M R W Θ Π J¹³ 6 27 69 71 158 179 265 349 443 472 489 713 726 788 903 1009 1012 1071 1079 1195 1200 1219 1220 1229 1313 1319 1346 1355 1458 1630 2487 2613 2643 2766.

¹⁰³ P⁷⁵ B L R 892. Souter prefers ἕως εἴπητε.

The second alteration is the omission of ἤξει ὅτε. It will be shown below with P⁴⁵ that many scribes altered this phrase in various ways. The scribe of P⁷⁵ has simply omitted it. It is possible that he has done so to match more closely Matthew 23:39,¹⁰⁴ or he may have simply found the phrase odious and unnecessary.

(37) Luke 14:27 – ὅστις οὐ βαστάζει τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου οὐ δύναται εἶναι μου μαθητής (Ἐαυτοῦ; //Matthew 10:38)¹⁰⁵

Later, discussing the cost of discipleship yet again, Jesus warns his disciples, “Whoever does not bear his own cross (τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ) and come after me is not able to be my disciple.” In some manuscripts, ἑαυτοῦ is replaced by αὐτοῦ. In P⁷⁵, where, incidentally, σταυρὸν is written with a staurogram (σ̄ϣ̄ον), the reading is αὐτοῦ. Although the external support for αὐτοῦ is strong, the pronoun ἑαυτοῦ is found twice in the previous verse, tilting the balance of probability in favor of the originality of ἑαυτοῦ. Furthermore, harmonization to Matthew 10:38 readily accounts for the use of the pronoun αὐτοῦ in P⁷⁵.

(38) Luke 14:34 – καλὸν οὖν τὸ ἄλας ἐὰν δὲ ὁκαὶ τὸ ἄλας¹⁰⁶ μωρανθῇ ἐν τίνι ἀρτυθήσεται (//Mark 9:50, Matthew 5:13)¹⁰⁷

“Therefore, salt is good, but if even (ἐὰν δὲ καὶ) the salt becomes tasteless, by what will it be restored?” The parallel versions of this aphorism are similar. In Mark

¹⁰⁴ See Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 138

¹⁰⁵ Manuscripts with ἑαυτοῦ include: A B L^c M^c N W Δ Ψ 7 16 179 267 343 348 472 477 713 716 1009 1195 1216 1229 1579 1630 1654 2487 2613 2766. Manuscripts with αὐτοῦ include: P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ ⋈ D K L* U Θ Λ Π f¹ f¹³ 2^c 28 33 124 157 565 579 700 892 1006 1071 1342 1346 1424 ℳ.

¹⁰⁶ P⁷⁵ has ἄλα.

¹⁰⁷ P⁷⁵ A K M R U W Γ Δ Λ Π f¹ f¹³ 2 28 69 443 565 700 713 892 1006 1071 1342 1424 1506 2542 ℳ. IGNTP prefers the reading without καί.

9:50, Jesus says, “But if the salt becomes unsalty...” (ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ἅλας ἀναλον γένηται).

In Matthew 5:13, Jesus says, “But if the salt becomes tasteless...” (ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ἅλας μωρανθῆ). In both instances the conjunction καί, which is found following δέ in Luke, is absent. The manuscript evidence for καί in Luke is split, with P⁷⁵, Washingtonianus, and the Byzantine majority supporting the shorter reading against Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, Bezae, and a few others. In this case, the Alexandrian and Western support for the conjunction is determinative, especially because the shorter reading is explicable on the basis of harmonization to Mark or Matthew. The conjunction may also have been omitted to simplify the expression.

(39) Luke 16:30 – οὐχί πάτερ Ἀβραάμ ἀλλ’ ἐάν τις ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἴ πορευθῆ πρὸς αὐτοὺς μετανοήσουσιν (ἴ ἐγερθῆ; cf. Matthew 14:2, 27:64, 28:7; Singular)

In the uniquely Lukan parable of the rich man and Lazarus, a deceased rich man begs Abraham to send Lazarus to his living brothers to warn them of the consequences of their self-indulgent lifestyles. Abraham explains that he will not send Lazarus since the brothers have had ample opportunity to heed the exhortations of the prophets. The rich man replies, “No, father Abraham, but if someone from the dead might go (πορευθῆ) to them, they will repent.” The scribe of P⁷⁵ alone has replaced the word “might go” (πορευθῆ) with “might be raised” (ἐγερθῆ).¹⁰⁸ The text in P⁷⁵ would be rendered: “If someone from the dead *was raised* to them, they will repent.”

¹⁰⁸ See the editors’ note on this reading in Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, 26.

The sense of the passage is muddled by the scribe's alteration, but the emphasis on the theme of resurrection is heightened. Royse identifies this variant as a harmonization to context since "the discussion is of being raised from the dead" and phrases such as ἀπὸ νεκρῶν and ἐκ νεκρῶν are used in this and the following verses.¹⁰⁹ Alternatively, the scribe may have been influenced by a more remote source. The use of the word "to raise" (ἐγείρω) with the phrase "from the dead" (ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἀπὸ νεκρῶν, ἐκ νεκρῶν) is a typical Matthean idiom (cf. Matt 14:2, [17:9], 27:64, 28:7). The same is not true of Luke, where a similar formulation, one with ἐκ νεκρῶν, occurs only in Luke 9:7. The scribe of P⁷⁵ may have been influenced by Matthean style and usage.¹¹⁰

(40) Luke 17:14 – καὶ ἰδὼν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ᾠ πορευθέντες¹¹¹ ἐπιδείξατε ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς

ἱερεῦσιν (P^{75c/mg} ᾠ θέλω καθαρίσθητε κ εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθησαν;

//Matthew 8:3; Singular; Corrector)

In another story unique to Luke, the cleansing of the ten lepers, there is some text written in the margin, either a correction or a later reader's annotation, that brings the episode into harmony with the healing of the single leper in Matthew 8:3 and its parallels in Mark 1:41 and Luke 5:13. In Luke 17:14, after the healing of the ten, Luke records, "And seeing (them), he [Jesus] said to them, 'Going, show yourselves to the priests.'" A

¹⁰⁹ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 678, 693.

¹¹⁰ So Zwiép, "Ascension Narratives," 231. Parsons, "Christological Tendency," 472, discusses the passage in reference to some Western non-interpolations and the theme of resurrection.

¹¹¹ P⁷⁵ initially had ἐπορευθέντες, but was corrected with a dot above the epsilon signifying that the letter was to be deleted.

note in the margin adds two sentences: “I do will (it), be cleansed. And immediately they were cleansed” (θέλω καθαρῖσθητε κ̅ εὐθέως ἔκαθαρίσθησαν).¹¹²

The nature of this note is debated. Metzger, on the one hand, identifies the reading as a correction by a later hand.¹¹³ IGNTP and Swanson appear to agree since they list the reading as found in “P^{75c}.” The apparatus of NA²⁸ lists the reading as marginalia (P^{75mg}), which implies that the words were introduced by a later reader rather than another scribe or corrector. Fee agrees, adding that the reading “is clearly the work of a later hand.”¹¹⁴ Royse, on the other hand, is not convinced that the reading is not the product of the scribe and points out that the marks accompanying the reading are typical of such long corrections.¹¹⁵ It is impossible to decide whether the added words belong to the scribe of P⁷⁵ or a later reader, but I tend to agree with Royse. Regardless, the reading demonstrates the same harmonizing activity under examination.

In the context of the ten lepers, the insertion does not, strictly speaking, make sense. The ten lepers have said nothing about what Jesus may or may not “will” for them, nor have they spoken about cleansing, but rather *mercy* (ἐλέησον). It is sensible, but not entirely coherent, for Jesus to then respond by declaring his will to *cleanse* them. The added words belong to Matthew 8:3, an entirely different episode, though connected by the theme of leprosy. In that passage, a single leper approaches Jesus and declares, “Lord,

¹¹² The *καί* is abbreviated with κ̅.

¹¹³ Metzger, “Bodmer Papyrus,” 202. So also Parsons, “Christological Tendency,” 474; and Zwiep, “Ascension Narratives,” 231. Martin and Kasser’s original note on the reading is found in *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, 26.

¹¹⁴ Fee, “P⁷⁵, P⁶⁶, and Origen,” 260.

¹¹⁵ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 646 and n. 154. Royse opposes the labeling of the reading as marginalia. For comparison, see several long corrections written in the foot and margin of the Matthew portion of Codex Vaticanus.

if you will, you are able to cleanse me” (κύριε ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι). Jesus responds, “‘I do will (it), be cleansed.’ And immediately his leprosy was cleansed” (θέλω καθαρίσθητι καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα). This is plainly the source of the variant reading in Luke 17:14.¹¹⁶ The parallels of this episode in Mark 1:41 and Luke 5:13 do not include the second clause of the variant, so Matthew is necessarily the source of the reading. Unfortunately, the sheaf of P⁷⁵ that included Luke 5:13, Luke’s episode with the individual leper, is missing. Was the saying dislocated from there? Or, was that verse also conformed to the fuller reading from Matthew 8:3?

The scribe, or perhaps the corrector or later reader, has incorporated this detail from the leper episode in Matthew 8 into the episode of the ten lepers in Luke 17. It is unclear why the individual did not endeavor to contextualize Jesus’s response by including the leper’s request, to which Jesus, in the variant, responds. Such a large addition must certainly be considered a deliberate reflection of the near-parallel. As he copied (or corrected/read) the episode of the ten lepers, the scribe has imaginatively recalled another scenario in which a leper makes a bold declaration. He has remembered Jesus’s response, “I do wish...,” and has brought both details into his account, where they do not belong.

(41) Luke 17:24 – ὡσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπή ἀστράπτουσα ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰς τὴν ὑπ’ οὐρανὸν λάμπει οὕτως ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου [□] ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ` (//Matthew 24:27)¹¹⁷

¹¹⁶ So Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 646; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2:1154; Comfort, “Scribe as Interpreter,” 240–241.

¹¹⁷ P⁷⁵ B D 220.

Moving on from the lepers, Jesus begins to teach about the departure and return of the son of man. He says, “For as the flashing lightning lightens from one side of the heavens to the other side of the heavens, thus will the son of man be in his day (ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ).” In P⁷⁵, the phrase “in his day” (ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ) has been omitted. Metzger suggests homoioteleuton as a possible solution. The scribe may have leapt from the -που at the end of ἀνθρώπου to the -του at the end of αὐτοῦ. This is possible, and a shared archetype could explain why the reading is also found in Codex Vaticanus, but one would also need to speculate the same mistake in Codex Bezae and miniscule 220.¹¹⁸ Others take the omission in these considerable Alexandrian and Western manuscripts as cause to doubt the authenticity of the phrase.¹¹⁹ The opposing manuscript evidence, though, seems enough to counterbalance these few instances of omission. Furthermore, if the phrase did not appear in Luke originally, where did it come from and how did it gain its supremacy? There is no convincing answer. It is best to accept ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ as the earlier reading and to explain the omission as an assimilation to Matthew 24:27. In that passage, Jesus says, “Thus will be the coming of the son of man” (οὕτως ἔσται ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου). Additionally, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ does not appear in similar passages like Matthew 24:37 and 24:39b.

(42) Luke 22:18 – λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ πίω (//Matthew 26:29)¹²⁰

¹¹⁸ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 142. See also Marshall, *Luke*, 661.

¹¹⁹ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 142. Martin and Kasser discuss the reading in *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, 27.

¹²⁰ P^{75vid} B C D G L f¹ 157 205 2542. Merk prefers the shorter reading.

The omission of *ὅτι* from Luke 22:18 may be a harmonizing variant reflecting Matthew 26:29, where *ὅτι* does not appear. In such cases, with recitative *ὅτι* introducing direct speech, the conjunction is often added and omitted in the manuscripts.

(43) Luke 22:41 – *καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπεσπάσθη ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ λίθου βολὴν καὶ θεὶς τὰ γόνατα Ἦ προσηύχετο (Ἦ προσηύξατο; //Matthew 26:42, 44; Mark 14:39)¹²¹*

(44) Luke 22:43–44 – *Ἐφθῆ δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτὸν καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσηύχετο καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἰδρῶς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν` (cf. Mark 14:36–37, Matthew 26:39–40)¹²²*

When Jesus goes to the garden before his arrest, Luke narrates that Jesus withdrew from his disciples “and began to pray” (*προσηύχετο*). The scribe has here substituted the aorist verb *προσηύξατο* for Luke’s imperfect *προσηύχετο*. An aorist verb does not appear in Luke’s Gethsemane sequence, nor does it appear in the direct parallels in Mark and Matthew. In near-parallels in Mark and Matthew, however, the evangelists use an aorist verb to indicate the manner of Jesus’s praying on his second (Mark 14:39, Matthew 26:42) and third withdrawals (Matthew 26:44). It seems probable that the scribe has been influenced by Matthew’s version of this event with its repeated cycle of departure, prayer, and return, which is absent from Luke’s structure.

¹²¹ P⁷⁵ Ⲛ T Γ 72 124 579 669 892 1071 1241. P⁷⁵ and T have *προσεύξατο*

¹²² (P⁶⁹) P⁷⁵ Ⲛ^c A B N R T W 0211 13* 69 124 158 346 473 481 543 579 713 788 826 1071*. Manuscripts that omit only v. 43 include: 124. See the editors’ discussion of the reading in Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, 27.

For the full discussion of the variant in Luke 22:43–44, see the section on P⁶⁹ in Chapter Two. There it was decided that these verses arose secondarily in the late second century. Harmonization is not a factor in their omission.

(45) Luke 22:50 – *καὶ ἐπάταξεν εἰς τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἡ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως τὸν δοῦλον² (ἡ τὸν δοῦλον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως; //Mark 14:47, Matthew 26:51)*¹²³

The variant in Luke 22:50 was discussed with MS 0171 in Chapter Two. The transposition likely occurred with reference to Mark 14:47 or Matthew 26:51.

(46) Luke 22:61 – *καὶ ὑπεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ {ρήματος} τοῦ κυρίου (//Matthew 26:75, Mark 14:72)*¹²⁴

For a full discussion of the variant in Luke 22:61, see the section on P⁶⁹ in Chapter Two. Harmonization has not played a role in the creation of the variant.

(47) Luke 23:3 – *ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ αὐτῷ ἔφη σὺ λέγεις (//Matthew 27:11)*¹²⁵

After Jesus is arrested, the religious leaders drag him before Pilate seeking a sentence of execution. Pilate asks Jesus, “Are you the king of the Jews?” Luke records, “And answering him (αὐτῷ) he [Jesus] said, ‘You say (so).’” In P⁷⁵, the scribe has omitted the pronoun αὐτῷ. This scribe’s propensity to omit pronouns, which Colwell initially brought to attention, was noted above. This proclivity may well be the best explanation for the variant. Another might be harmonization to Matthew 27:11, where the

¹²³ P⁷⁵ A D K M R S W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ Ω 0171 f¹ 2 28 124 157 565 579 700 1006 1071 1342 1424 1506 ℳ. IGNTP and Souter accept the order of P⁷⁵ against: ⋈ B L T f¹³ 69 346 543 788 826 828 892 983 1241 2542.

¹²⁴ Manuscripts with *λόγου* include: A D K M N U W Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ 0250 f¹ f¹³ 2 28 157 565 700 788 1006 1071 1342 1424 1506 2542 ℳ. Manuscripts with *ρήματος* include: P⁶⁹ P⁷⁵ ⋈ B L T X 070 0124 4 5 124 213 348 577 579 892 1012 1216 1241 1579. Tischendorf, IGNTP, and Merk prefer *λόγου*.

¹²⁵ P⁷⁵ (W) 047 6 60 544 1685.

pronoun does not appear in the best manuscripts of Matthew.¹²⁶ Royse, Parsons, and Zwiap agree that harmonization is a plausible explanation for this reading.¹²⁷

(48) Luke 23:34 – διαμεριζόμενοι δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἔβαλον {κλήρους} (//Matthew 27:35, Mark 15:24)¹²⁸

After Jesus is hung on the cross, soldiers gamble for his clothes. Luke records, “Dividing his garments they cast lots (κλήρους).” Many editors prefer the plural reading κλήρους to the singular κλήρον, which is found in both Mark 15:24 and Matthew 27:35. One reason for this is that the variant can be explained as an assimilation to the parallels. The manuscript evidence actually falls heavily in favor of the singular noun in Luke, with attestation from all of the major Alexandrian witnesses (P⁷⁵-B & C), and important manuscripts of the Western (D) and Pre-Caesarean (W) types. Accepting this reading as the older one, it is difficult to explain the plural variant that is found sporadically in a number of manuscripts. It is possible that the scribes were influenced by various passages in the Old Testament, as Plummer suggests.¹²⁹

¹²⁶ Manuscripts of Matthew with αὐτῶ following the verb include: A B K W X Γ Δ Θ Π 0250 *f*¹ *f*³ 565 579 1006 1241 1342 1346 1424 1506 *℣*.

¹²⁷ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 665, 691 and n. 397; and Parsons, “Christological Tendency,” 473–474.

¹²⁸ Manuscripts with κλήρον include: P⁷⁵ & B C D F K L M Q U W Y Γ Δ Λ Π 070 0250 *f*¹³ 2 28 124 157 565 579 700 788 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1346 1424 1506 2542 *℣*.

¹²⁹ Plummer, *Luke*, 532, suggests that the change to the plural is a harmonization to usage. He gives 1 Chron 25:8; 26:13, 14; Neh 10:34; and 11:1 as examples.

(49) Luke 24:1 – τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ὄρθρου βαθέως ἐπὶ τὸ ἱμῆμα

ἦλθον¹³⁰ φέρουσαι ἃ ἡτοίμασαν ἀρώματα (ἱμνημεῖον; //Mark 16:2,

John 20:1)¹³¹

After his death and burial, some of Jesus’s female followers go to tend to his body. Luke records, “But on the first day of the week, at early dawn, they came to the tomb (ἱμῆμα) carrying what spices they had prepared.” Luke uses the term ἱμῆμα to describe Jesus’s grave, but the scribe has substituted the synonym ἱμνημεῖον, possibly in harmonization to Markan and Johannine parallels, or more likely in harmonization to immediate context since in the very next verse (Luke 24:2) the synonym is used. Luke shows a slight preference for ἱμνημεῖον, using it eight times in comparison with only three appearances of ἱμῆμα (8:27, 23:53, 24:1). Nevertheless, this inclination is offset by the fact that in two of those cases both synonyms are used in the same context (23:53–55, 24:1–2). The scribe has changed the word here, but not in 8:27 or 23:53, which suggests that he did not have an agenda to replace the word. In the final estimation, since Luke does not have a definitive preference for one term over the other, as is found in Matthew, and since the scribe does not seem to have deliberately replaced the less common synonym, it seems best to acknowledge both the influence of Mark or John and the influence of the context.

¹³⁰ P⁷⁵ has ἦλθαν.

¹³¹ P⁷⁵ & C* F X Δ 157 213 346 472 579 1005 1009 1071 1346 1365 2372. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2:1544, prefers ἱμνημεῖον. See also Joachim Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums*, KEK (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 310.

(50) Luke 24:26 – οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν

ἰδέξαν αὐτοῦ (ἰ βασιλείαν; cf. Matthean and Markan idiom;

Singular; Corrected)

After the resurrection, two men walking along the road to Emmaus encounter the mysterious, anonymous Jesus who teaches them about the prophets' message concerning the messiah. He says, "Was it not necessary for the messiah to suffer these things and to enter into his glory (τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ)?" The scribe has initially written, "...to enter into his *kingdom* (τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ)," but subsequently corrected his mistake by deleting the word and adding "glory" (δόξαν) superlinearly.¹³² It is possible that a later corrector has made the revision. The verse is not paralleled directly in Matthew or Mark, but the phrase "entering the kingdom" (εἰσέρχομαι with βασιλεία) is idiomatic in Matthew (5:20, 7:21, 18:3, 19:23, 19:24) and Mark (9:47; 10:15, 23, 24, 25). The same combination is found in Luke-Acts only in Luke 18:25 and Acts 14:22. It would seem that the scribe was initially influenced by this well-known phrase from either Markan or Matthean parlance, but caught his error and corrected it.

(51) Luke 24:46–47 – οὕτως γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ

νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ¹³³ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ

¹³² Martin and Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, 23; and Metzger, "Bodmer Papyrus," 202. Comfort, "Scribe as Interpreter," 242, attributes this variant to context since in Luke 23:42 the phrase "into your kingdom" is used.

¹³³ P⁷⁵ has ἐν.

μετάνοιαν ἢ καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (ἢ εἰς; //Mark 1:4, Matthew 26:28, Luke 3:3; cf. Acts 5:31)¹³⁴

Jesus leaves the men he met on the road to Emmaus and returns to his disciples. He says to them, “Thus it is written that the Christ is to suffer and to rise from the dead on the third day and that repentance and (καὶ) forgiveness of sins is to be proclaimed in his name to all nations.” The vast majority of manuscripts have καὶ between “forgiveness” and “sins.” Only three closely related texts, P⁷⁵, Vaticanus, and Sinaiticus, have a different reading: “...repentance *for* (εἰς) forgiveness of sins is to be proclaimed.” The question of which reading is earlier is hard to decide. Metzger explains that the external evidence for the prepositional reading is slightly better and that a scribe would be more likely to change εἰς to καὶ because another εἰς follows immediately in the next phrase.¹³⁵ Alternatively, if καὶ were original, one could account for the change to εἰς in the three manuscripts (or two if P⁷⁵ and B share an archetype), on the basis of harmonization to similar statements in Mark 1:4 and Luke 3:3, where John the Baptist proclaims “a baptism of repentance *for* forgiveness of sins” (βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν).¹³⁶ It is impossible to be certain, but I lean in favor of this latter solution on the basis of the diversified external evidence and explain the variant by harmonization.

¹³⁴ P⁷⁵ & B. IGNTP, Merk, and Souter prefer καὶ.

¹³⁵ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 161.

¹³⁶ Martini, *Il problema*, 130, notes that von Soden also suggests this parallel. Martini is not convinced that εἰς is secondary.

Summary of Harmonization in P⁷⁵

Some conclusions about the harmonistic tendencies of the scribe of P⁷⁵ can now be enumerated. Fifty-one variant readings have been analyzed, among which nine do not involve harmonization. A further twenty may have arisen by harmonization, but are excluded from the following analysis. The remaining twenty-two readings likely or very likely arose under the influence of parallel passages. These numbers confirm that this scribe did not have a proclivity to harmonize and seldom permitted external influences to alter his text.

Table 7. Quality of Harmonization in P⁷⁵

Total Number of Readings	Total: 51	Entry Number
Quality of Harmonization		
Very Likely	3	10, 25, 40
Likely	19	2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 20, 21, 26, 29, 30, 34, 37, 41, 43, 45, 50
Possible	20	1, 5, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 22, 24, 28, 31, 33, 35, 36, 38, 39, 42, 47, 51
Unlikely	9	6, 19, 23, 27, 32, 44, 46, 48, 49

Three harmonizing variants are singular readings and three are uncommon. The remaining eighteen readings were popular or shared with important manuscripts. This, again, testifies to the care with which the scribe copied his exemplar.

The influence of Matthew upon this scribe is undeniable. A. Zwiep offers several criticisms of Mikeal Parsons's appeals to harmonization, but even he states, "That harmonizations such as Luke 9.48; 11.31; 23.3 prove that the scribe of P⁷⁵ was using a copy of Matthew's gospel or was at least very familiar with it, is not the issue here."¹³⁷ In Comfort's terms, Matthew forms the horizon of expectation for this scribe. This evidence

¹³⁷ Zwiep, "Ascension Narratives," 232.

may support the view of Skeat and others that P⁷⁵, which contains Luke and John, was originally attached to a codex at least of Matthew and perhaps of Matthew and Mark. If the scribe had recently copied Matthew, his harmonization to that Gospel would be even more unsurprising.

Most of the harmonizing variants in this manuscript are substitutions. This conforms to the expectations set by the analysis of the smaller fragmentary papyri from the second and third centuries. That substitution, mostly by altering the grammatical form of words already in the Gospel, is more frequent than additions or omissions shows that in most cases harmonization does not produce a substantial alteration.

The words of Jesus have been the object of harmonization far more frequently than the evangelist's narrative context. There are two implications of this fact. First, scribes did not have scruples against altering the words of Jesus. Second, the words of Jesus may have been memorized more frequently, or were at least more familiar to scribes, than the narrative parts of the Gospels. This speaks to the oral and oral-scribal fashion in which the tradition was transmitted. The scribe was occasionally more influenced by the magnetism of what he remembered hearing or receiving regarding the teachings of Jesus than by his exemplar. This pattern was seen in the fragmentary papyri and will generally be reinforced in P⁴⁵ and the manuscripts of the fourth and fifth centuries.

P⁷⁵ also confirms the pattern previously recognized that harmonization generally involved only a single word. Occasionally, a longer harmonization occurs, but mostly in transpositions.

Finally, P⁷⁵ confirms that verbs were frequently the object of harmonization.

In the case of P⁷⁵, though, they are not the most frequent part of speech to be altered. The scribe changed pronouns most often, which further confirms Colwell's assessment concerning the scribe's use and alterations of pronouns.

Table 8. Harmonization in P⁷⁵

Frequency of Harmonization		Total: 22	Entry Number
	Singular	3	10, 40, 50
	Uncommon	3	9, 26, 34
Sources of Harmonization			
	Matthew	16	4, 7, 8, 10, 14, 20, 21, 25, 26, 29, 30, 34, 37, 40, 41, 50
	Mark	3	2, 3, 9
	Matthew and Mark	3	15, 43, 45
Type of Harmonization			
	Substitution	14	2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 20, 26, 29, 30, 37, 43, 50
	Addition	4	4, 25, 34, 40
	Omission	2	9, 41
	Transposition	2	21, 45
Context of Harmonization			
	Words of Jesus	17	2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 15, 20, 21, 25, 26, 29, 30, 34, 37, 40, 41, 50
	Narrative	4	3, 10, 43, 45
	Other Dialogue	1	14
Extent of Harmonization			
	One Word	15	2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 15, 20, 25, 26, 30, 34, 37, 43, 50
	Two Words	3	14, 21, 29
	Four+ Words	2	41, 45
	Clause	1	9
	Sentence(s)	1	40
Part of Speech			
	Sentence(s)	1	40
	Clause	1	9
	Verb	4	15, 20, 30, 43
	Verb Phrase	1	21
	Noun	2	29, 50
	Noun Phrase	2	14, 45
	Pronoun	5	7, 8, 10, 26, 37

Article	1	34
Conjunction	1	4
Preposition	2	2, 3
Prepositional Phrase	1	41
Adverb	1	25

P⁴⁵ (P.Chester Beatty I): A Manuscript of the Four Gospels and Acts¹³⁸

P⁷⁵ represents a very careful scribe working in a closely managed tradition. With P⁴⁵, the situation is quite different. P⁴⁵ is the oldest codex manuscript containing parts of all four Gospels and the book of Acts. The manuscript is dated on paleographical grounds with near consensus to the early third century.¹³⁹ The discovery of this artifact was crucial in demonstrating that already in the third century the codex book form was popular among Christians and was being used to house the four-fold Gospel.¹⁴⁰ T. C. Skeat has offered the fullest codicological analysis of P⁴⁵ and concludes that Matthew occupied about forty-nine pages, John thirty-eight, Luke forty-eight, Mark thirty-two, and Acts

¹³⁸ For the *ed. pr.* see Frederic G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible. Fasciculus 2: The Gospels and Acts, Text* (London: Emery Walker, 1933). T. C. Skeat and B. C. McGing published three additional, very small fragments in 1991. See the reprint of their article in “Notes on Chester Beatty Biblical Papyrus I (Gospels and Acts),” in *Writings of T. C. Skeat*, 135–140. Hans Gerstinger published an additional fragment in “Ein Fragment des Chester Beatty-Evangelienkodex in der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien (Pap. graec. Vindob. 31974),” *Aeg* 13 (1933): 67–72. M.-J. Lagrange, “Un Nouveau Papyrus Évangélique,” *RB* 42 (1933): 402–404, offers some brief remarks on Gerstinger’s publication. Günther Zuntz, “Reconstruction of One Leaf of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Gospels and Acts (P⁴⁵): (Matth. 25,41–26,39),” *CdE* 26 (1951): 191–211, improved upon Gerstinger’s transcription.

¹³⁹ Frederic G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible. Fasciculus 1: General Introduction, With Twelve Plates* (London: Emery Walker, 1933), 6; Frederic G. Kenyon, *Gospels and Acts*, x; Hatch, *Principal Uncial Manuscripts*, Plate IV; K. Aland, *Repertorium*, 269–272; Schofield, “Papyrus Fragments,” 303; and Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 155–157. Kenyon says that H. I. Bell, W. Schubart, and A. S. Hunt independently dated the fragment to the third century. Among these, only Hunt preferred the second half of the third century. See also Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 136–137 no. 371.

¹⁴⁰ Kenyon gives special attention to this in his *General Introduction* and his introduction to the *Gospels and Acts*. Carl Schmidt, “Die neuesten Bibelfunde aus Ägypten,” *ZNW* 30 (1931): 285–293, 289, asserts that one of the most notable contributions of the discovery of this manuscript was the corrective it provided to the then common assumption that before the fourth century the Gospels travelled independently in rolls and had not yet been collected into a single codex.

fifty-five—a total of two hundred and twenty-two pages.¹⁴¹ Unfortunately, only about thirty of the estimated one hundred and ten sheets (two-hundred and twenty pages) survive today and nearly all of them are damaged on both sides of the leaf, making reconstruction difficult in some places and impossible in others. The original order of the books seems to have been the “Western” order (Matthew, John, Luke, Mark, Acts), though this cannot be confirmed since the pieces were not all acquired together.¹⁴²

The manuscript comes from Egypt, but it is impossible to locate the text further with certainty. Given its high quality, Kenyon suspects it must have come from the ruins of an early church or monastery, possibly near the Faiyum.¹⁴³ In actuality, the fragments were found inside earthenware jars buried on top of a coffin near a monastery.¹⁴⁴ Carl Schmidt independently contacted the handler and ascertained from him that the artifact came from “a town ‘Alâme by the east bank of the Nile in the area of Atfih, the old Aphroditopolis.”¹⁴⁵

¹⁴¹ T. C. Skeat, “A Codicological Analysis of the Chester Beatty Papyrus Codex of Gospels and Acts (P45),” in *Writings of T. C. Skeat*, 141–157; repr. from *Hermathena* 155 (1993): 27–43.

¹⁴² Skeat, “Codicological Analysis,” 146–147, explains that the slanting hand of a corrector is found in Mark and Acts, but nowhere else, which strengthens Kenyon’s suspicions that at the very least Acts followed Mark. Skeat also endeavors to show that neither Mark nor Luke could have followed Matthew given the fiber orientation of the extant fragments in comparison to the fiber pattern of the entire codex.

¹⁴³ Kenyon, *General Introduction*, 5; Frederic G. Kenyon, “The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri,” *Gn* 8 (1932): 46–49; *Ibid.*, “Some Notes on the Chester Beatty Gospels and Acts,” in *Quantulacumque: Studies Presented to Kirsopp Lake by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends*, ed. Robert P. Casey, Silva Lake, and Agnes K. Lake (London: Christophers, 1937), 145–148. See also Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 157–159, for an introduction to matters of provenance.

¹⁴⁴ Charles Horton, “The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: A Find of the Greatest Importance,” in *The Earliest Gospels*, 149–160, provides an engaging account of the discovery and acquisition of the Chester Beatty manuscripts.

¹⁴⁵ Carl Schmidt, “Die Evangelienhandschrift der Chester Beatty-Sammlung,” *ZNW* 32 (1933): 225–232, 225: “...eine Ortschaft ‘Alâme auf dem Ostufer des Nils in der Gegend von Atfih, dem alten Aphroditopolis.”

In reference to the textual quality of P⁴⁵, Colwell famously asserted that the scribe copied “without any intention of exactly reproducing his source.”¹⁴⁶ Along these same lines, Comfort and Barrett describe him as “an exegete and a paraphraser.”¹⁴⁷ Given these assessments, one should expect a multitude of variants and not a slim number of singular readings. Indeed, Colwell believes the sheer number of singular readings is the most remarkable feature of P⁴⁵.¹⁴⁸ Many of these readings can be attributed to the fact that, according to Colwell, “P⁴⁵ copies phrases and clauses.”¹⁴⁹ A by-product of the scribe’s method of copying phrase-by-phrase is that the text of the Gospels in P⁴⁵ tends to be very fluid in terms of word order. The scribe “sees through the language to its idea-content, and copies that—often in words of his own choosing, or in words rearranged as to order.”¹⁵⁰ Despite the number of variants, Tommy Wasserman states, “It is striking that the many variant readings hardly affect the meaning of the text.”¹⁵¹

This description of the scribe’s procedure should not suggest that he was negligent or inept, only that he participated in an uncontrolled tradition. In other ways, he has acted deliberately as an “editor” of his exemplar. Colwell notes his commitment to conciseness as seen in the omission of many words that could be deemed superfluous. Working with Latin manuscripts, A. Dain had pointed out the tendency of scribes during

¹⁴⁶ Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 117.

¹⁴⁷ Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 160.

¹⁴⁸ Colwell and Tune, “Variant Readings,” 105.

¹⁴⁹ Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 116. As proof of this procedure, Colwell shows that in singular readings where a scribal leap is involved there is not one omission of a single letter or syllable; all such omissions are of entire words or phrases.

¹⁵⁰ Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 117.

¹⁵¹ Wasserman, “Early Text of Matthew,” 93.

this period to omit short words; the scribe of P⁴⁵ may follow such a general pattern accidentally, but in many cases there seems to be an intention about his activity.¹⁵² In recent studies, this assessment of Colwell's has been questioned and some have attempted to show that the scribe was no more prone to omission than many other scribes.

The scribe wrote with a neat hand, though not elegant, which Günther Zuntz describes as a slightly curved uncial that occasionally slips into a hand closer to cursive with occasional ligatures.¹⁵³ According to Zuntz, the scribe "aims at neatness rather than rigid uniformity."¹⁵⁴ An example of this is his care to begin lines evenly, with the first letter stacked directly under the first letter of the previous line. Yet, he does not always end the line at the same place and often stops one letter before or after the last letter of the previous line. His desire for neatness sometimes compels him to place a "filling mark" (>) at the end of a short line.¹⁵⁵

With regard to the textual quality of the whole Chester Beatty collection, Kenyon claims, "There are no important omissions or additions of passages, and no variations which affect vital facts or doctrines."¹⁵⁶ As Ernst von Dobschütz straightforwardly puts it, "Whoever expected sensational new variants from this papyrus will be disappointed."¹⁵⁷ Barbara Aland agrees with this assessment, pointing to the consistency with which the papyrus confirms readings in modern reconstructed Greek New Testaments and supports

¹⁵² Colwell references Dain's work in "Scribal Habits," 108, 112, 114, 120 and in other articles.

¹⁵³ Kenyon, *Gospels and Acts*, viii–ix; and Zuntz, "Reconstruction," 192.

¹⁵⁴ Zuntz, "Reconstruction," 192.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, "Reconstruction," 192.

¹⁵⁶ Kenyon, *General Introduction*, 15.

¹⁵⁷ Ernst von Dobschütz, [No Title], *TLZ* 58 (1933): 409–412, 410–411: "Wer von diesem Papyrus sensationelle neue Varianten erwartet hat, wird enttäuscht sein."

the readings of the great uncials. She claims, “The nature and method of copying in P⁴⁵ is both intelligent and liberal: intelligent, because the sense of the exemplar is quickly grasped and in essence precisely reproduced; and liberal, because involved expressions and repetitious words are simplified or dropped.”¹⁵⁸ This mixture of intelligence and liberality can be seen in numerous harmonizations. These readings, incidentally, convince Aland that the scribe was a Christian.¹⁵⁹ Aland and Aland classify the manuscript as a “free” text.

P⁴⁵ is not unified in terms of its textual affinities.¹⁶⁰ When Kenyon introduced the manuscript he explained that in general the text does not conform to the type characterized by Codex Vaticanus and does not follow the eccentricities of Codex Bezae.¹⁶¹ It is, in many regards, a “mixed” text with readings distinctive of the Alexandrian, Byzantine, and “Caesarean” varieties. Since its textual nature is not uniform, the affinities of each book will be discussed separately.

¹⁵⁸ B. Aland, “Chester Beatty Papyri in Early Church History,” 108–121, 112.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., “Chester Beatty Papyri in Early Church History,” 113.

¹⁶⁰ In *Gospels and Acts*, xi–xx, Kenyon provides tables that compare agreements and disagreements of P⁴⁵ with Ⱳ A B C D L W Θ and some minuscules. In “Some Notes,” 145–148, he compares the text of P⁴⁵ to four modern editions of the Greek New Testament. See also C. A. Phillips, “The Caesarean Text with Special Reference to the New Papyrus and Another Ally,” *Bulletin of the Bezan Club* 10 (1932): 5–19, 5–12; Schmidt, “Evangelienhandschrift,” 229–232; Lagrange, *Critique rationelle*, 158–163, 413–416; Teófilo Ayuso, “¿Texto cesariense o precesariense?: su realidad y su trascendencia en la crítica textual del Nuevo Testamento,” *Bib* 16 (1935): 369–415; Frank Beare, “The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri,” *CdE* 12 (1937): 81–91, 84–85; C. C. Tarelli, “The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Caesarean Text,” *JTS* 40 (1939): 46–55; Ibid., “The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Western and Byzantine Texts,” *JTS* 41 (1940): 253–260; Hatch, *Principal Uncial Manuscripts*, Plate IV; Bruce Manning Metzger, “The Caesarean Text of the Gospels,” in *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism*, ed. Bruce Manning Metzger, NTS 4 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963), 42–72, esp. 62–67; and Burkitt, “Chester Beatty Papyri,” 363–368.

¹⁶¹ Kenyon, “Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri,” 48.

P⁴⁵ – Passages from Matthew¹⁶²

The text of Matthew in P⁴⁵ is exceedingly fragmentary and only portions of about sixty-six verses survive.¹⁶³ Lagrange confirms Kenyon’s initial assessment that the text is a mix of the Alexandrian “B” text of Codex Vaticanus, and the Western “D” text of Codex Bezae.¹⁶⁴ Min finds two instances of harmonization to remote parallels in this portion of the manuscript.¹⁶⁵ I discuss these two plus seven other variants where harmonization may have occurred.

(1) Matthew 20:30 – ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς κύριε υἱὸς Δαυὶδ (Γ υἱέ; //Mark 10:47–48, Luke 18:38–39)¹⁶⁶

(2) Matthew 20:31 – οἱ δὲ Γ μείζον ἐκραξάν¹⁶⁷ λέγοντες (Γ πολλῶ; //Mark 10:48, Luke 18:39; Singular P^{45vid})

In the story of the two blind men in Matthew 20, Jesus passes through the city of Jericho and news of his presence reaches even the most desperate ears. In Matthew 20:30, two blind men cry out, “Have mercy on us, Lord, son of David (υἱὸς Δαυίδ).” Their supplication is repeated in v. 31. In the manuscripts of vv. 30 and 31, the word “son” is

¹⁶² P⁴⁵ contains Matthew 20:24–32; 21:13–19; 25:41–26:39.

¹⁶³ The text of Matthew in P⁴⁵ is very lacunose. Each point where the variant under discussion falls in a lacuna has been noted. Readers should look to Appendix A for a transcription of the relevant verses in order to see where other words in the verse fall in lacunae.

¹⁶⁴ Lagrange, *Critique rationelle*, 160. Wasserman, “Early Text of Matthew,” 94, believes the text of Matthew cannot be assigned to any established text type.

¹⁶⁵ Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 143–144.

¹⁶⁶ Manuscripts with υἱέ include: P⁴⁵ Ⲙ C D E F L N Θ Σ 085 0281 ^f1 2 13 33 69 124 157 346 543 565 579 700 788 892 983 1241 1346 1365 1424 1506. Manuscripts with υἱός include: B G H K M S U V W X Y Z Γ Δ Ω ^f13 28 118 209 1071.

¹⁶⁷ P⁴⁵ has ἐκραύγασαν.

found in both the nominative (υἰός) and in the vocative (υἰέ) cases.¹⁶⁸ Before deciding which reading is older in Matthew, it is helpful to look at the parallel passages. In Mark 10:47–48, the nominative reading appears in the majority of manuscripts, but several early and important witnesses (Ⲡ B C) support the vocative reading. In Luke 18:38 and 39, it is quite apparent that the best reading in both verses is the vocative form. Returning to Matthew 20:30, the textual evidence is evenly split with perhaps a slight, but not conclusive, preference for the vocative reading. In v. 31, where the phrase is repeated, the majority of manuscripts, as well as the early attestation of Vaticanus and Washingtonianus, support the nominative reading.¹⁶⁹ Furthermore, in the doublet episode in Matthew 9:27, Jesus is called “son of David” with “son” in the nominative case in the best manuscripts.¹⁷⁰ Since it is unlikely that two identical phrases in close proximity would not match, and given the parallel usage of the nominative phrase in the doublet, it is quite likely that the nominative reading in v. 30 is the older reading. Additionally, Metzger notes that while the vocative reflects better Greek style, the nominative echoes the standard Semitic usage typical of Matthew.¹⁷¹ The vocative reading of P⁴⁵ may be explained by the harmonizing influence of Mark or Luke.

¹⁶⁸ The *ed. pr.* has υἰέ as a *nomen sacrum* with dots under the first two letters signifying that only parts of the letters are visible (υ̣ι̣έ). Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 163, have υ̣ι̣ε̣.

¹⁶⁹ Manuscripts with υἰέ include: Ⲡ^c C D L N 085 0281 33 579 892 1241 1424. Manuscripts with υἰός include: B K M U W Z Γ Δ Θ Π ς ς³ 2^c 28 118 565 700 788 1071 1346 ⲙ.

¹⁷⁰ Manuscripts with υἰέ include: Ⲡ C D E F K L M N S Γ Δ Θ Σ Φ 0250 ς¹ ς³ 2 22 28 33 124 157 205 543 565 579 788 892 1346 1424 1506 1582 ⲙ. Manuscripts with υἰός include: B G U W Y Π 047 238 237 240 241 242 253 259 443 472 565 700 713 1071 1574. To demonstrate anecdotally just how conflicting the evidence is, Tischendorf accepts the nominative reading in 9:27 and the vocative in 20:30 and 31 while Legg’s text reads exactly the opposite, vocative in 9:27 and nominative in 20:30 and 31.

¹⁷¹ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 43. Commentators who accept the nominative reading include: Allen, *Matthew*, 218; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:107; and Luz, *Matthew*, 2:548.

The crowd following Jesus rebukes the men for their loud noise, but “they called out greater (μειζον) saying, ‘Have mercy on us, Lord, son of David.’” In P⁴⁵, the scribe has replaced the adverb μειζον with πολλῶ. Kenyon could only decipher the omega, but Comfort and Barrett find traces of the second lambda as well. This operation has occurred under the influence of either Mark 10:48 or Luke 18:39, where the blind men are said to cry out “all the more” (πολλῶ μᾶλλον).¹⁷²

(3) Matthew 26:5 – μὴ ἐν τῇ ἐορτῇ ἵνα {μὴ} θόρυβος γένηται ἐν τῷ λαῷ (//Mark 14:2; Singular P^{45vid})¹⁷³

In Matthew 26:5, the evangelist records that the chief priests, elders of the people, and Caiaphas conspired to put Jesus to death. Caiaphas warns his fellows conspirators not to accost Jesus during the feast, “in order that (ἵνα) there might not be tumult among the people.” This line of text is incomplete in P⁴⁵ and Kenyon did not endeavor to reconstruct it. Somewhat later, Hans Gerstinger published an additional fragment and was able to reconstruct the lines with the expected Matthean reading: ἵνα μὴ θόρυβος γένηται.¹⁷⁴ Later still, Zuntz critiqued Gerstinger’s transcription of the verses and offered an alternative reconstruction, μὴ θόρυβος γένηται, omitting ἵνα. Zuntz detects traces of the final three letters of the word ἐορτῇ (tau-eta-iota adscript) along with the first letter of the word μὴ or μῆποτε. With this reconstruction it is necessary to exclude ἵνα.

¹⁷² Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 92 n. 85, 173, 186, 189, believes this is one of a few instances where the scribe chooses to adopt only part of the parallel passage. See also Comfort, “Scribe as Interpreter,” 105–106; and Ibid., “Scribes as Readers,” 39. Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 141, 144, suggests that harmonization has taken place unconsciously (unbewusst). Elliott, “Singular Readings,” 127, does not mention this reading in his paragraph dealing with another singular reading in this same verse, presumably because it is not certain.

¹⁷³ L and 700 have μῆποτε in direct assimilation to Mark 14:2.

¹⁷⁴ Gerstinger, “Ein Fragment,” 70.

Following the first letter of μή or μήποτε there is a lacuna of approximately fourteen letters. On the basis of the space allotted, Royse accepts μή (“in order that there not be”), not μήποτε (“lest”) as is found in the parallel at Mark 14:2, and suggests that the omission of ἵνα has occurred by harmonization to context since μή is found in the previous clause.¹⁷⁵ Zuntz also supplies the shorter word, but he regards μή as a shortened form of the variant μήποτε found in some other manuscripts.¹⁷⁶ There are three possibilities for explaining the reading. First, it is possible that the reading is in fact μήποτε in direct harmonization to Mark 14:2 and that the letters were somewhat constricted in the space allowed. Second, Royse’s suggestion of harmonization to context is possible but need not have been the exclusive reason for the omission of ἵνα. Finally, it is possible that the reading is in fact μή and, as Zuntz believes, was intended to stand in the place of Mark’s μήποτε. With such a lacunose line, it cannot be certain what was written or why.

(4) Matthew 26:23 – ὁ δὲ ὁ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν ὁ ἐμβάψας μετ’ ἐμοῦ τὴν χεῖρα¹⁷⁷ ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ οὗτός με παραδώσει (Ἰησοῦς; //John 13:26; Lacuna)¹⁷⁸

During the last supper, Jesus announces the impending betrayal of one of his disciples. Matthew records, “And answering, he said (ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν), ‘The one who dips with me (his) hand in the bowl, this one will betray me.’” Kenyon only reconstructs a few words of this phrase. Gerstinger, who is followed by Comfort and

¹⁷⁵ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 132, 152, 191.

¹⁷⁶ Zuntz, “Reconstruction,” 200, 209. See also Min, *Frühste Überlieferung*, 114, 116.

¹⁷⁷ P⁴⁵ has τὴν χεῖρα μετ’ ἐμοῦ.

¹⁷⁸ P^{45lac} f¹³ 174 230 346 788 826 828 1689.

Barrett, restores the whole line with the traditional reading of v. 23. Zuntz, however, followed by Min, supplies the *nomen sacrum* of Jesus's name (Ἰη) after δέ. The word falls in a sizable lacuna with enough room for the addition and the variant is witnessed in several later miniscules. If the reading is correct, it is possible that the scribe was influenced by the parallel in John 13:26, where the verse begins, “Jesus answers” (ἀποκρίνεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς).¹⁷⁹

(5) Matthew 26:27 – καὶ λαβὼν ^τ ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς (^ττό;

//Luke 22:20, 1 Corinthians 11:25)¹⁸⁰

(6) Matthew 26:28 – τοῦτο ὁ γάρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης (//Mark 14:24;

Lacuna)¹⁸¹

The variant in Matthew 26:27 was discussed in full in the section on P³⁷ in Chapter Two. It is likely that the addition of the article has occurred under the influence of Luke 22:20 or 1 Corinthians 11:25.

Following the prediction of Judas's betrayal, Luke records Jesus's words of institution. Jesus says, “For (γάρ) this is my blood of the covenant.” Kenyon reconstructs only two words of this line (ἐ]στιν τό). Gerstinger later supplied the remainder of the expected reading. Zuntz, however, is not sure that the word τοῦτο and the first letters of ἐστιν could fit into the small lacuna and so proposes that the word γάρ has been omitted

¹⁷⁹ This is Royse's explanation, *Scribal Habits*, 188, though he is properly wary of being overconfident in reconstructed readings.

¹⁸⁰ P³⁷ P⁴⁵ A C D H K M S U V Y Γ Π Ω f¹³ 2 22 69 124 157 180 543 565 597 700 788 (1010) 1071 1241 1243 1292 1293 1342 1505 1506 1689 2542.

¹⁸¹ P^{45lac} C^c f^d 22 482 700 1241 1582.

in P⁴⁵, as it has been from a handful of other manuscripts.¹⁸² Min concurs with this emendation and proposes that the omission has occurred in harmonization to Mark 14:24.¹⁸³ In light of the uncertainty of this reconstruction, it seems best to say only that assimilation is possible if Zuntz's reconstruction is correct.

(7) Matthew 26:31 – πάντες ὑμεῖς σκανδαλισθήσεσθε [□] ἐν ἐμοί ἔν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ

(//Mark 14:27; Sub-singular P^{45lac} [69] 242 1093; Lacuna)

(8) Matthew 26:33 – εἰ ^Ɀ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται ἐν σοί ἐγὼ οὐδέποτε

σκανδαλισθήσομαι (Ɀκαί; //Mark 14:29; Lacuna)¹⁸⁴

After Jesus shares the cup of the new covenant with his disciples, he predicts Peter's denial and forecasts that all his disciples will stumble. He announces, "All of you will be scandalized (caused to stumble) because of me (ἐν ἐμοί) on this night." In Mark 14:27, the phrases "because of me" (ἐν ἐμοί) and "on this night" (ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ) are absent. The words fall in a lacuna in P⁴⁵, but for the sake of space it is necessary to omit several letters.¹⁸⁵ Zuntz discerns traces of the phrase "this night" (νυκτὶ ταύτῃ) and so omits the other phrase (ἐν ἐμοί).¹⁸⁶ Min ascribes this reading to homoioarcton. The scribe wrote the first ἐν and when he returned to the manuscript his eye landed on the second

¹⁸² Zuntz, "Reconstruction," 203, 211. He is followed by Min. Augustinus Merk, "Codex Evangeliorum et Actuum ex collectione papyrorum Chester Beatty," in *Miscellanea Biblica*, vol. 2 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1934), 375–406, 393, thinks γάρ probably was in the papyrus. Comfort and Barrett also reject this emendation.

¹⁸³ Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 135, 144.

¹⁸⁴ P^{45lac} Ⲭ^c C^c F K W Y Π 71 174 291 443 482 517 579 697 700 1093 1241 1279 1293 (1424).

¹⁸⁵ Gerstinger's reconstruction keeps all the words so that he ends up with a line several letters longer than those above and below it.

¹⁸⁶ He is followed by Comfort and Barrett and Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 117.

instance of the word, thereby passing over the personal pronoun. This is a perfectly plausible explanation, but the scribe's tendency to copy phrase by phrase must be kept in mind. Given his practice, one cannot be sure that the scribe would have returned to the exemplar in the middle of such a short phrase. It seems more likely that, if the reconstruction is correct, partial harmonization to Mark has motivated the alteration.¹⁸⁷

Peter responds to Jesus's prediction with a bold promise. He claims, "If (εἰ) all are scandalized (cause to stumble) because of you, I will never be scandalized (caused to stumble)." This phrase is slightly different in Mark 14:29, where the conjunction καί appears after εἰ ("even if all stumble"), the phrase "because of you" (ἐν σοί) is absent, and different words are used to express the sentiment of the final phrase. It is the addition of καί that is of interest here. In P⁴⁵, the majority of the verse falls in a lacuna. Gerstinger supplies the expected reading in his edition, which Comfort and Barrett follow in theirs. Zuntz, again, suggests an alternative reading. First, he proposes that the scribe has omitted the pronoun αὐτῷ from the phrase "answering, Peter said to him" (ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ).¹⁸⁸ Second, Zuntz posits that the scribe has added the conjunction καί following εἰ.¹⁸⁹ The phrase would then conform to Mark 14:29. Min protests this emendation, deeming it unreasonable to propose an omission in a lacuna as well as an addition equaling the same number of letters (the scribe typically writes iota-adscript).

¹⁸⁷ So also Zuntz, "Reconstruction," 205; and Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 108 n. 24, 113, 136, 144, 188.

¹⁸⁸ This variant is found in a handful of manuscripts (517 700 954 1424 1675), including the very early P³⁷.

¹⁸⁹ Zuntz, "Reconstruction," 205, 211.

Royse, on the other hand, believes Zuntz's recommendation best fits the allotted space.¹⁹⁰ I am inclined to agree with Min that the reconstruction is unnecessary, ruling out harmonization. If it is correct, though, harmonization could certainly have been a factor in the addition of the conjunction.

Preliminary Summary of Harmonization in the Text of Matthew

Before moving to the text of Luke in P⁴⁵, it is possible to make an initial assessment of harmonization in the text of Matthew. Of the eight readings analyzed above, one is unlikely to have involved harmonization and of five more it can only be said that harmonization is a possible explanation. This leaves two harmonizing variants, one (2) created in reference to Mark or Luke, the other (5) to Luke or 1 Corinthians. This low rate of harmonization in the text of Matthew could be misleading. One should keep in mind that very little of the text of Matthew is available and that what is available is highly lacunose. Furthermore, as with many other scribes, the Gospel of Matthew may have been the dominant version of the Gospel in this scribe's mind, forming his horizon of expectation. If this were the case, one would not expect as many harmonizing variants in Matthew as in Mark or Luke.

P⁴⁵ – Passages from Luke¹⁹¹

While only a very small amount of Matthew is available in P⁴⁵, much more of Luke has survived. In terms of its textual affinities, the text of Luke is somewhat close to the Alexandrian tradition, with its closest affinity being to Codex Vaticanus and L. With regard to Western readings, C. C. Tarelli notes that the text of Luke is closer to Codex

¹⁹⁰ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 132.

¹⁹¹ P⁴⁵ contains Luke 6:31–41; 6:45–7:7; 9:26–41; 9:45–10:1; 10:6–22; 10:26–11:1; 11:6–25, 28–46; 11:50–12:13; 12:18–37; 12:42–13:1; 13:6–24; 13:29–14:10; 14:17–33.

Bezae than is the text of Mark. R. V. G. Tasker has studied the “Caesarean” readings in Luke and concludes that it is difficult to speak of a “Caesarean” text of Luke at all given the lack of manuscripts of Luke from this type.¹⁹² Many variants in the text of Luke in P⁴⁵ are attributable to the influence of Synoptic parallels.

(9) Luke 9:27a – λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ἀληθῶς ὅτι († ὅτι; //Mark 9:1, Matthew 16:28)¹⁹³

(10) Luke 9:27b – εἰσὶν τινες τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἐστηκότων οἳ οὐ μὴ γεύσονται θανάτου

ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ († ὧδε; //Mark 9:1, Matthew

16:28; Lacuna)¹⁹⁴

Jesus teaches on the theme of discipleship many times in connection with his own impending doom. In Luke 9:27, Jesus begins a teaching with the phrase: “I say to you truly” (λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ἀληθῶς). The scribe has added a declarative ὅτι between the introductory statement and the second part of the verse, where Jesus teaches about the impending kingdom of God. The resultant statement would be rendered, “I say to you truly *that...*” Mark and Matthew use different syntax in this statement, using the word ἀμῆν instead of ἀληθῶς, for instance. They also use the declarative ὅτι, which the scribe certainly would have known since his copy of Mark includes the verse. The scribe has introduced ὅτι into Luke’s text either by assimilation or simply out of stylistic preference.

¹⁹² R. V. G. Tasker, “The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Caesarean Text of Luke,” *HTR* 29 (1936): 345–352. This study is primarily a list of readings collated against Textus Receptus with evidence from some “Caesarean” witnesses. With regard to the difficulty of characterizing the text, Tasker writes, “The papyrus does not give a text which can be called ‘Neutral,’ ‘Western,’ or ‘Alexandrian’ in any exclusive sense.” He also notes that the “Neutral” or Alexandrian readings overlap more often with the “Caesarean” readings in Luke than in Mark.

¹⁹³ P⁴⁵ E G K M R Y Π 6 16 27 71 265 267 346 348 349 477 489 544 726 1079 1194 1200^c 1216 1219 1220 1223 1242 1313 1319 1355 1452 1458 1510 1542 1579 2542.

¹⁹⁴ P^{45lac} A C D E F G H K M P R S U W X Y Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ Ω (†) ^f13 1 2 28 33 69 118 124 157 565 579 700 788 (892 1006 1342) 1071 1346 1424 1582 ℣. IGNTP and Souter prefer ὧδε.

Jesus goes on to say, “There are some of those standing here (αὐτοῦ) who will not taste death before they see the kingdom of God.” Mark differs from Luke in using the more common adverb, ὧδε, in place of the less common adverbial locative pronoun αὐτοῦ. The scribe copied this reading correctly in Mark, so presumably he would have been aware of the alternative reading when copying Luke. Matthew also uses the more common ὧδε along with a different form of the ἴστημι participle (εἰσὶν τινες τῶν ὧδε ἐστῶτων).

The scribe appears to have adopted this adverb from one of the parallels, but the line falls in a lacuna and so cannot be certain. Kenyon supplies the variant word apparently because the expected reading would overflow the bounds of the gap. Comfort and Barrett follow his reconstruction in their own edition. Birdsall attributes this reading both to stylistic improvement and harmonization to Matthew or Mark.

(11) Luke 9:28a – ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτῶ °καί

(//Mark 9:2, Matthew 17:1)¹⁹⁵

(12) Luke 9:28b – παραλαβὼν Πέτρον καὶ °Ιωάννην καὶ °Ἰάκωβον² ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ

ὄρος προσεύξασθαι (°Ἰάκωβον καὶ °Ιωάννην; //Mark 9:2, Matthew

17:1)¹⁹⁶

(13) Luke 9:30 – καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο Ϛ συνελάλουν αὐτῷ (Ϛ συναλοῦντες; //Mark

9:4, Matthew 17:3 [συλλαλοῦντες]; Singular)

¹⁹⁵ Manuscripts without καὶ include: P⁴⁵ N* B H 28 157 579 1338. Manuscripts with καὶ include: P⁷⁵ N^c A C D E F G K L M P R S U V W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Ξ Π Ψ f¹ f¹³ 2 69 118^c 124 565 700 788 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1346 1424 1506 2542 ℞.

¹⁹⁶ P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ C^c D L M X Ξ 5 27 33 71 157 213 348 477 892 903 1071 1194 1216 1220 1342 1458 1579.

(14) Luke 9:34 – ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ἐγένετο νεφέλη καὶ Ἦ ἐπεσκίαζεν αὐτούς (Ἦ ἐπεσκίασεν; //Matthew 17:5)¹⁹⁷

(15) Luke 9:35 – καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης ὀλέγουσα (//Mark 9:7; Sub-singular P⁴⁵ 11 700 2542)

In Luke 9:28, the evangelist records, “And it happened, about eight days after these sayings, and (καὶ) taking Peter and John and James (Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον), [Jesus] ascended the mountain to pray.” There are two variants in this passage in P⁴⁵ that may involve harmonization. In the first instance, the scribe omits the καὶ connecting the first and second phrases. Mark and Matthew also do not have a καὶ at this point, but their governing verb is in the indicative rendering one unnecessary. In fact, the καὶ is also unnecessary and awkward in Luke, which may account for its removal in several manuscripts. The alteration could have occurred for completely stylistic reasons such as this, but assimilation to Mark or Matthew is equally possible.

More significantly, the scribe alters the order in which the brothers, John and James, are mentioned. This reading was discussed in detail in reference to its appearance in P⁷⁵, where it was shown that harmonization to Mark 9:2 or Matthew 17:1 is a possible explanation.

A few verses later, in Luke 9:30, Luke writes, “And behold, two men began speaking (συνελάλουν) to him.” Mark and Matthew both have the present participle συλλαλοῦντες. The scribe of P⁴⁵ has used the participle instead of Luke’s imperfect verb

¹⁹⁷ P⁴⁵ A C D K M N P R U W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ f¹ f³ 2 28 33 69 124 565 579 700 788 892 1006 1071 1346 1424 1506 2542 m. IGNTP prefers ἐπεσκίασεν.

form, very likely under the influence of the parallel accounts in Mark or Matthew.¹⁹⁸

In his copy of Mark, he has transcribed correctly, demonstrating his awareness of the participial reading. It will be shown below how the Markan account of the transfiguration in P⁴⁵ is conformed both to Matthew and to Luke. The scribe was not endeavoring to perpetuate one version of this episode over another; rather, he created an amalgamated version from his own recollection of the episode.

As the three men talk, and the three disciples watch, Luke records that “there came a cloud and it overshadowed (ἐπεσκίαζεν) them.” In Luke 9:34, the overshadowing activity of the cloud is conveyed in the imperfect tense (ἐπεσκίαζεν) in the best Alexandrian manuscripts (P⁷⁵-B \aleph), but in the aorist (ἐπεσκίασεν) in the majority of manuscripts, in the earliest Pre-Caesarean texts (P⁴⁵ W), and in the best of the Western texts (D). The early and diverse textual evidence for the aorist reading is compelling, but other considerations tip the balance in favor of the imperfect reading. Since this variant is widespread, it is possible the reading had already become prevalent in Luke.

Alternatively, harmonization may account for the variant. In Mark 9:7, the verb is a participle (ἐπισκιάζουσα), but in Matthew 17:5, the evangelist uses the aorist verb (ἐπεσκίασεν). If the aorist reading is older, it is very difficult to explain the presence of the imperfect in a sizable number of manuscripts. Alternatively, if the imperfect verb is

¹⁹⁸ So C. C. Tarelli, “Some Linguistic Aspects of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Gospels,” *JTS* 39 (1938): 254–259, 255; Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 187, 68 n. 9; Birdsall, “Rational Eclecticism,” 46; Comfort, “Scribe as Interpreter,” 115–116; Idem., “Scribes as Readers,” 39; and Hernández, “Early Text of Luke,” 128 n. 45.

older, the aorist reading in P⁴⁵ and elsewhere can be attributed to harmonization to Matthew.¹⁹⁹

Finally, in Luke 9:35, the evangelist introduces the speech from the cloud with the phrase “and a voice came from the cloud, saying (λέγουσα)...” Luke’s verb of speech is a participle (λέγουσα). In Mark 9:7, there is no verb of speech at all. It is under the influence of the Markan reading that the scribe has omitted the participle λέγουσα from his text of Luke 9:35.

Before turning to the next readings, the number of harmonizations in this pericope should be noted. It can be seen from this pericope and several others that the scribe tended to harmonize in bursts. This suggests that certain episodes and teachings were well-known to the scribe in alternative forms.

(16) Luke 9:48a – καὶ εἶπεν ὁ αὐτοῖς (//Matthew 18:3)²⁰⁰

(17) Luke 9:48b – ὃς ἂν δέξηται τοῦτο²⁰¹ τὸ παιδίον ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου ἐμὲ δέχεται (Γ ἄν; //Mark 9:37)²⁰²

Jesus descends from the mountain of transfiguration and begins to teach his disciples lessons on true greatness and humility. Luke introduces this teaching with the phrase “and he said to them” (καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς). In the same context in Matthew 18:3, the evangelist does not include the pronoun and writes instead, “And he said” (καὶ εἶπεν).

¹⁹⁹ Birdsall, “Rational Eclecticism,” 45, suggests harmonization to context since the verb γίνομαι is in the second aorist. See also, Dobschütz, [No Title], 411. Lagrange, “Les Papyrus Chester Beatty,” 30, accepts harmonization as the best explanation.

²⁰⁰ P⁴⁵ D 157 2542.

²⁰¹ P⁴⁵ omits τοῦτο.

²⁰² P⁴⁵ D L Ξ Ψ 13 33 66^c 69 179 267* 346 472 543 788 826 828 1071 1223 1313 1346 2643.

This is the reading found in P⁴⁵, either under the influence of the Matthean parallel or the scribe's stylistic preference for omitting pronouns and other extraneous words.²⁰³

Later in the same sentence, Jesus says, “Whoever welcomes (ὅς ἐάν δέξηται) this child in my name welcomes me.” In P⁴⁵, the particle ἐάν is replaced with ἄν, which technically conforms to the reading of Mark 9:37. While it is possible that Mark's influence is at work here in P⁴⁵, Tarelli notes that this substitution is common, though not always consistent, in P⁴⁵ and forms one component of the scribe's style.²⁰⁴

(18) Luke 9:49 – ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Ἰωάννης εἶπεν Ἐπιστάτα εἶδομέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια καὶ ἐκωλύομεν αὐτόν²⁰⁵ (Ἐδιδάσκαλε; //Mark 9:38)²⁰⁶

Some of the disciples observe a stranger casting out demons in Jesus's name and, not recognizing him as a fellow disciple, stop him. John brings the news, saying, “Master (ἐπιστάτα), we saw someone casting out demons in your name and hindered him.” John addresses Jesus as “master” in Luke, but in the parallel in Mark 9:38, Jesus is referred to as “teacher” (διδάσκαλε). The scribe of P⁴⁵ has used the Markan title here, very likely under the influence of the parallel. The Markan syntax has also influenced the reading at Luke 9:33, where διδάσκαλε replaces ἐπιστάτα. Harmonization to context is also a possibility, since the word “teacher” is used in Luke 9:33 and again in 9:38.

²⁰³ See, for example, footnote 201, 203, 204, and others.

²⁰⁴ Tarelli, “Linguistic Aspects,” 257, writes, “Among orthographical variants one of the most interesting is the use of ἐάν as equivalent to the conditional particle ἄν with relatives.”

²⁰⁵ P⁴⁵ omits αὐτόν.

²⁰⁶ P⁴⁵ ⸆* C* L Ξ 157 827 892 1093 1342.

(19) Luke 10:11 – καὶ τὸν κονιορτὸν τὸν κολληθέντα ἡμῖν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως

ὑμῶν²⁰⁷ εἰς τοὺς πόδας ἀπομασσόμεθα ὑμῖν²⁰⁸ (cf. Matthew 10:14,

Luke 9:5; Singular)

In Luke 10:11, when Jesus gives instructions to seventy disciples, he tells them to say to the town that does not receive them, “Even the dust that clings (τὸν κολληθέντα) to us from your city on (our) feet we shake off against you.” Matthew formulates this sentiment somewhat differently. In Matthew 10:14, Jesus commands his disciples, “Shake off the dust of your feet” (ἐκτινάξατε τὸν κονιορτὸν τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν). The scribe of P⁴⁵ has created a variant harmonizing to Matthew by omitting the participial phrase “that clings” (τὸν κολληθέντα).²⁰⁹ The similar passage in Luke 9:5, where Jesus commissions his twelve disciples, also lacks the phrase, so harmonization to either near-parallel is possible.

(20) Luke 10:15 – καὶ σύ Καφαρναοὺμ μὴ ἕως οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθήσῃ²¹⁰ ἕως οὐρανοῦ ἄδου

καταβιβασθήσῃ (//Matthew 11:23)²¹¹

Jesus pronounces woes against the wicked cities of Chorazin, Bethsaida, Tyre, and Sidon. Against Capernaum, he says, “And you Capernaum, will you be exalted up to

²⁰⁷ P⁴⁵ omits ὑμῶν.

²⁰⁸ P⁴⁵ omits ὑμῖν.

²⁰⁹ So Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 135, 152, 187; Comfort, “Scribe as Interpreter,” 120; and Ibid., “Scribes as Readers,” 39. Tarelli, “Omissions, Additions, and Conflations,” 384, however, calls the variant an “obvious error” and Birdsall, “Rational Eclecticism,” 47, regards the omission as accidental. The latter gives this verse as an example of the scribe’s tendency toward succinctness, since he omits not only the participle but also two pronouns.

²¹⁰ P⁴⁵ adds καί.

²¹¹ P⁴⁵ ⳧^c A C D K M N R U W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Ξ Π Ψ ^f ^f ¹³ 1 2 28 33 118 565 579 700 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1346 1424 1582 2542 ℣. Tischendorf and IGTP prefer the anarthrous reading.

heaven? You will be descended unto Hades (τοῦ ἄδου).” The reading of interest here is the presence or absence of the definite article before the word “Hades.” The article does not appear in the vast majority of manuscripts, including P⁴⁵, the corrected text of Sinaiticus, and three fifth-century manuscripts (C D W). The articular reading does appear in P⁷⁵, Vaticanus, L, and a few miniscules. If the earlier reading included the article, one might account for its omission by harmonization to Matthew 11:23, where the article does not appear. It seems more probable, though, that the anarthrous reading is older, corresponding to the anarthrous “heavens” (οὐρανοῦ) of the previous phrase, and that the article was added in a few manuscripts of the Alexandrian tradition.

(21) Luke 10:21 – ναὶ ὁ πατήρ ὅτι οὕτως ^ςἐγένετο εὐδοκία^ς ἔμπροσθέν σου

(^ςεὐδοκία ἐγένετο; //Matthew 11:26)²¹²

For a full discussion of the variant in Luke 10:21, see above with reference to P⁷⁵.

There it was shown that this reading was created under the influence of Matthew 11:26.

(22) Luke 11:11 – τίνα δέ²¹³ ἐξ ὑμῶν τὸν²¹⁴ πατέρα αἰτήσῃ ὁ²¹⁵ υἱὸς ἰχθύος καὶ ἀντὶ

ἰχθύος ὄφιν ^ςαὐτῷ ἐπιδώσει^ς (^ςἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ; //Matthew 7:10)²¹⁶

(23) Luke 11:12 – ἢ καὶ²¹⁷ αἰτήσῃ Ἦ ὄν ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ σκορπίον (ἄρτον;

//Matthew 7:9; Singular)

²¹² Manuscripts with ἐγένετο εὐδοκία include: Ⲙ A C^c D K M N U W Γ Δ Θ Λ Π 0115 f¹ f¹³ 2 28 157 565 700 1006 1071 1241 1342 1424 1506 2542 ⲙ. Manuscripts with εὐδοκία ἐγένετο include: P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ B C* L X Ξ Ψ 070 0124 1 33 213 579 892.

²¹³ P⁴⁵ has γάρ.

²¹⁴ P⁴⁵ omits τόν.

²¹⁵ P⁴⁵ omits ὁ.

²¹⁶ P⁴⁵ Ⲙ A C K M U R X W Y Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ f¹ f¹³ 2 28 33 157 565 579 1006 1071 1241 1346 1424 1506 2542 ⲙ. IGNTP prefers ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ.

(24) Luke 11:13a – πόσω μᾶλλον ὁ πατήρ τ (τ ὑμῶν; //Matthew 7:11)²¹⁸

(25) Luke 11:13b – ὁ ῥέξ οὐρανοῦ (ῥ οὐράνιος; cf. Matthew 5:48; 6:14, 26, 32; 15:13; 18:35; 23:29; Sub-singular P⁴⁵ 579 1424)

(26) Luke 11:13c – δώσει πνεῦμα ῥ ἅγιον τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν (ῥ ἀγαθόν; //Matthew 7:11)²¹⁹

Another burst of harmonization has occurred in Luke 11, where Jesus teaches on prayer and the goodness of the heavenly father using the imagery of earthly fathers. In Luke, Jesus says, “What father is there among you, whose son will ask for a fish and instead of a fish he will give to him a snake? Or [whose son] will ask for an egg, and he will give to him a scorpion?” (τίνα δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν τὸν πατέρα αἰτήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς ἰχθύν καὶ ἀντὶ ἰχθύος ὄφιν αὐτῷ ἐπιδώσει ἢ καὶ αἰτήσῃ ὄν ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ σκορπίον). The Matthean parallel is similar in theme and structure, but with some different illustrations. In Matthew 7:9–10, Jesus asks, “What man is there among you, whose son will ask for bread (and he) will give him a stone? Or he will ask for a fish and he will give him a snake? (ἢ τίς ἐστὶν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος ὃν αἰτήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρτον μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ ἢ καὶ ἰχθύν αἰτήσῃ μὴ ὄφιν ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ). Matthew’s second set, a fish for a stone, corresponds to Luke’s first set, but where Luke speaks of an egg and a scorpion Matthew has bread and stone.

²¹⁷ P⁴⁵ adds ἐάν.

²¹⁸ P⁴⁵ C U 0211 f¹³ 7 157 205 229^c 267 343 346 349 579 716 827 983 1006 1012 1071 1229 1342 1424 1443 2487 2766.

²¹⁹ P⁴⁵ L 7 60 267 1093 1654 1685. Bezae has ἀγαθὸν δόμα and Θ has δόματα ἀγαθά.

There are two variant readings to be addressed here. In Luke 11:11, the phrase $\alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ appears with the words reversed in the majority of manuscripts including P⁴⁵, Sinaiticus, and Washingtonianus. In both iterations of the phrase in Matthew 7:10, the verb comes before the pronoun ($\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}$). The manuscript evidence strongly favors the “Matthean” order in Luke, but if this is the case it is difficult to understand how the variant with the “Lukan” order, with verb following pronoun, appeared. Alternatively, if the “Lukan” order is older, the alternative variant can be explained as a scribal harmonization to Matthew. Of course, in this case the reading is very common in Luke so that one should not presume every manuscript has been altered by harmonization. After the “Matthean” reading entered the Lukan tradition, it became the *de facto* text of Luke. In addition to the influence of Matthew, it is also possible that the scribe, and many others, has been influenced by general parlance since the pronoun follows more smoothly after the verb.

The second variant is found in Luke 11:12. Matthew and Luke share the snake-and-fish illustration, but Luke’s scorpion-and-egg imagery is unique and the stone-for-bread example is found only in Matthew. The scribe has replaced the New Testament *hapax legomenon* “egg” ($\acute{\omega}\nu$), found in Luke, with the Matthean object “bread” ($\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\nu$). It is very likely in this case that harmonization accounts for the singular reading.²²⁰ The variant could also be considered imaginative in nature. The scribe’s memory of the story,

²²⁰ So Merk, “Codex Evangeliorum et Actuum,” 384; Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 113; Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 187; Comfort, “Scribe as Interpreter,” 121–122; Idem., “Scribes as Readers,” 39; and Hernández, “Early Text of Luke,” 128 n. 45. In footnote 420, Royse notes Haines-Eitzen’s doubts regarding the classification of this reading as a harmonization and responds by saying, “But harmonization is typically not thorough.” Birdsall, “Rational Eclecticism,” 49, writes, “It is hard to see how the reading of the papyrus arose other than by carelessness from a (? longer) text into which the wording of Matt. 7:9 had intruded.”

his cognitive exemplar, differs from the version in his physical exemplar. He envisions a loaf rather than an egg.

Jesus goes on to say in Luke 11:13, “If then, you, being evil, know to give good gifts to your children, how much more will the father from heaven (ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ) give the holy spirit to those who ask him.” Multiple harmonizing variants are present in this passage in P⁴⁵. First, the scribe has added the possessive pronoun ὑμῶν to his description of the father (ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν), which, since it counters his tendency to omit pronouns, is quite interesting. The reading coincides with Matthew 7:11, where the father is described as “your father who is in the heavens” (ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς).²²¹ Second, the scribe has replaced Luke’s genitive construction “from heaven” (ἐξ οὐρανοῦ) with the adjective “heavenly” (ὁ οὐράνιος). This construction—ὁ πατήρ + possessive pronoun + ὁ οὐράνιος—occurs seven times in Matthew, though in Matthew 23:9 the pronoun comes first. The same construction does not appear in Luke or Acts. The scribe has assimilated Luke 11:13 to the Matthean idiom.²²²

Finally, where in Luke Jesus says that the father from heaven “will give a holy spirit (πνεῦμα ἅγιον) to those who ask him,” Jesus says in Matthew 7:11 that “he will give *good things* (ἀγαθά) to those who ask him.” The scribe has created a hybrid reading here:

²²¹ Marshall, *Luke*, 469, regards both this and the following reading as assimilations.

²²² See also Birdsall, “Rational Eclecticism,” 48, who says, “The reading of P⁴⁵ here is unlikely to be a case of direct harmonization: more probably, it has arisen out of the subvariant ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ influenced by the more familiar Matthean phrase.”

the heavenly father “will give the *good spirit* to those who ask him” (δώσει πνεῦμα ἀγαθὸν τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν).²²³

It is possible to consider the variant a harmonization to context, since in the previous clause Jesus has referred to the “*good gifts*” (δῶματα ἀγαθὰ) fathers give their sons. Now, he refers to the *good spirit*. Harmonization to Synoptic parallels is more likely. According to Metzger, “Not only is the external evidence that supports πνεῦμα ἅγιον excellent but assimilation with the first half of the verse as well as with Matthew’s ἀγαθὰ (7.11) accounts for the origin of the other readings.”²²⁴ It is very likely that this conflated reading has occurred under the influence of Matthew 7:11 and may be regarded as an imaginative harmonization rather than a purely textual one.²²⁵ Additionally, one may be quite sure the reading is accidental. If the scribe were intentionally harmonizing Luke to Matthew, he would have successfully replaced the “holy spirit” with “good things.” Because the reading arises accidentally, he retains Luke’s noun but picks up Matthew’s adjective. The scribe imagines the “good things” that the heavenly father gives at the very time he copies down that it is the “holy spirit” that is given. Undoubtedly, the fact that “good” (ἀγαθὰ) and “holy” (ἅγιον) begin with the same two letters contributed to the confusion.

²²³ Grundmann, 235, apparently thought this reading might be original, but this is unlikely.

²²⁴ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 133.

²²⁵ Birdsall, “Rational Eclecticism,” 49, says, “The reading of P⁴⁵ (πνεῦμα ἀγαθὸν) is cognate with the various intrusions of Matthaean or quasi-Matthaean forms (e.g. ἀγαθὸν δῶμα, δῶματα ἀγαθὰ cp. Matt 7:11 ἀγαθὰ.” See also, Plummer, *Luke*, 300; Elliott, “Singular Readings,” 129; Von Dobschütz, [No Title], 411; and Wolter, *Lukasevangelium*, 414.

This entire pericope, with five separate harmonizing variants, demonstrates that the scribe must have been quite familiar with Matthew's version of this teaching. The cumulative force of all five assimilations magnifies the argument that each individual reading has occurred under the influence of the First Gospel.

(27) Luke 11:14 – και ἦν ἐκβάλλων δαιμόνιον □και αὐτὸ ἦν\` κωφόν (//Matthew 12:22)²²⁶

(28) Luke 11:15 – τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν Γ εἶπον ἐν Βεελζεβοὺλ τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια (Γ ἐλάλησαν ὄχυροι λέγοντες; //Matthew 9:33; Singular)

(29) Luke 11:17 – πᾶσα βασιλεία ἔφ' ἑαυτὴν διαμερισθεῖσα ἔρημοῦται (Γ μερισθεῖσα ἐφ' ἑαυτήν; //Matthew 12:25; Sub-singular P⁴⁵ 124 1342)²²⁷

(30) Luke 11:18 – εἰ δὲ και ὁ σατανᾶς ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν Γ διεμερίσθη πῶς σταθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ (Γ μερίσθη; //Mark 3:26, Matthew 12:26; Sub-singular P⁴⁵ Γ 2487)

Again, in a pericope dealing with exorcism, the scribe's propensity to harmonize in bursts can be seen. The first variant, in Luke 11:14, was addressed above with P⁷⁵. It is possible that the omission occurred as a result of the influence of Matthew 12:22.

²²⁶ Manuscripts without και αὐτὸ ἦν include: P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ ⳧ A* B L 0211 f¹ 1 22 33 118 131 157 205 209 788 892 1210 1241 1582* 2542. Souter prefers the shorter reading. Manuscripts with και αὐτὸ ἦν include: A^c C E F G H K M U R W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ f¹³ 2 28 69 180 565 579 700 1006 1010 1071 1243 1292 1342 1346 1424 1505 1582^c m.

²²⁷ Ψ has μερισθεῖσα καθ' ἑαυτήν.

On one occasion when Jesus exorcised a demon, Luke records that “some of those [who saw] said (εἶπον), ‘By Beelzebub, the prince of demons, he casts out demons.’” P⁴⁵ contains an interesting singular reading here. The scribe has added the words: “Some among them spoke, strong ones, saying...,”²²⁸ or perhaps, “some among them spoke strongly, saying...,” or “some among them spoke, strongly saying...” (ἐλάλησαν ὄχυροὶ λέγοντες). Tarelli and Hedley, apparently independently, suggest that the alteration took place under the influence of Matthew 9:33, where it is said, “The mute spoke; and the crowd marveled, saying...” (ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι λέγοντες). According to Tarelli, “ἐλάλησεν has clearly suggested ἐλάλησαν, and the scribe, with Matthew’s words in his mind has finished with Matthew’s form.”²²⁹ The form ἐλάλησεν from Matthew becomes ἐλάλησαν in Luke in P⁴⁵ because the latter form is found a few verses earlier in Luke 11:14. Tarelli then suggests that ὄχυροὶ λέγοντες has entered the text as a mistake for Matthew’s ὄχλοι λέγοντες. Royse attests that such a shift is possible given that lambda and rho are regularly interchanged in the papyri from the Faiyum.²³⁰

The influence of the Gospel of Matthew on this reading is far from certain. The term ἐλάλησεν appears in the previous verse in Luke so that harmonization to context is more likely than harmonization to a parallel with a different form of the verb. The second part of the reading, ὄχυροὶ λέγοντες, is more difficult to account for. While Tarelli is

²²⁸ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 178, suggests “the audacious ones.” Merk, “Codex Evangeliorum et Actuum,” 385, similarly renders the sense of the passage.

²²⁹ Tarelli, “Omissions, Additions, and Conflations” 385.

²³⁰ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 178 n. 374.

correct that the phrase may have come about as a mistaken spelling of the phrase ὄχλοι λέγοντες in Matthew 9:33, this phrase occurs in a different part of the passage. In Matthew, it properly belongs after the mute speaks but before the objection of the Pharisees. In the Lukan context of P⁴⁵, the mute has already spoken, the crowd has marveled, and the narrative has already moved on to the objection. It is not obvious that this passage would have occurred to the scribe at this point or that he would have mistaken the words. It seems best to agree with Royse, “Something quite unusual has clearly happened in our scribe’s normal method of copying.”²³¹

In Luke 11:17, Jesus responds to the accusations that his power to exorcise comes from Beelzebub. He says, “Every kingdom divided against itself (ἐφ’ ἐαυτὴν διαμερισθεῖσα) becomes desolate.” Both Mark and Matthew have the simple verb μερίζω. Mark has an aorist passive subjunctive form (μερισθῆ) and Matthew has an aorist passive participle (μερισθεῖσα). Luke’s use of the compound verb διαμερίζω sets his text apart from the others. In P⁴⁵, the scribe has used Matthew’s form of the simple verb. The word order also seems to derive from Matthew, where the prepositional phrase (καθ’ ἐαυτῆς) follows the verb. The scribe has adopted Matthew’s verb and word order but has retained Luke’s preposition (ἐφ’).

Similarly, in Luke 11:18, the Lukan compound verb (διαμερίζω) has been replaced by the Markan and Matthean simple verb (μερίζω). In both Mark and Matthew, the verb is aorist passive indicative (ἐμερίσθη), while in P⁴⁵ it appears to be aorist passive

²³¹ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 178.

subjunctive (μερίσθη).²³² In both cases, harmonization to a parallel has likely influenced the reading.

(31) Luke 11:24 – ὅταν ὁ τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου διέρχεται δι' ἀνύδρων τόπων ζητοῦν ἀνάπαυσιν καὶ μὴ εὐρίσκον (ὁ δέ; //Matthew 12:43)²³³

The variant in Luke 11:24 was analyzed above in reference to its appearance in P⁷⁵. It is possible that the conjunction δέ found its way into Luke from the parallel in Matthew 12:43.

(32) Luke 11:30 – καθὼς γὰρ ἐγένετο Ἰωνᾶς τοῖς Νινευίταις σημεῖον²³⁴ οὕτως ἔσται ὁ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ (//Matthew 12:40; Sub-singular P⁴⁵ Ψ 16 131)

(33) Luke 11:31 – βασίλισσα νότου ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει²³⁵ μετὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακριεῖ ἑαυτούς (ἑαυτήν; //Matthew 12:42)²³⁶

Jesus's fame spread and crowds came to him in search of signs. Jesus disapproves of the faithlessness of the people seeking supernatural wonders and draws an analogy between his own life and death and the life of Jonah the prophet. As Jonah was a sign to Nineveh, he says, “So also (καί) will be the son of man to this generation.” In the parallel

²³² Kenyon and Comfort and Barret have μερίσθη in P⁴⁵. Swanson and IGNTP have ἐμερίσθη.

²³³ P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ D U W X 0211 f¹ 1 16 118 131 157 205 209 213 348 443 472 477 544 713 903 983 1005 1009 1195 1216 1241 1365 1579 1582 1604 1691 2372 2542 2613 2643.

²³⁴ P⁴⁵ omits σημεῖον.

²³⁵ P⁴⁵ omits ἐν τῇ κρίσει.

²³⁶ P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ 245 1424.

passage in Matthew 12:40, Jesus takes the analogy even further, drawing a comparison between Jonah's time in the stomach of the fish and the three nights the son of man will be in the earth. He says, "Thus will be the son of man..." (οὕτως ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου). The scribe has conformed the verse in Luke to the Matthean form by omitting the conjunction καί. Homoioteleuton is possible if the scribe copied ἔσται and, returning to the exemplar, saw the alpha-iota at the end of καί and resumed with the next word.²³⁷ Harmonization may be more likely since there is also an assimilating reading in the following verse, Luke 11:31, which was discussed above with P⁷⁵.²³⁸

(34) Luke 11:33 – οὐδεὶς λύχνον ἄψας εἰς κρύπτην²³⁹ τίθησιν □ οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μῶδιον ἄλλ²⁴⁰ ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν (//Mark 4:21, Matthew 5:15)²⁴¹

The variant in Luke 11:33 was discussed above with P⁷⁵. There it was shown that the longer reading with οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μῶδιον belongs in Luke so that harmonization is not a factor.

(35) Luke 11:34a – ὅταν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ἀπλοῦς ᾖ καὶ Ἦ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου φωτεινὸν ἐστὶν (Ἦ πᾶν; cf. Matthew 6:22)²⁴²

²³⁷ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 133, 145, 152, 188, recognizes this variant as a harmonization, but also wonders whether the καί has been omitted in the Matthean manuscripts by a scribal leap.

²³⁸ For further reference to this reading, see Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 172, 188; and M.-J Lagrange, "Les papyrus Chester Beatty pour les Évangiles," *RB* 43 (1934): 5–41, 27.

²³⁹ P⁴⁵ has κρύπττον.

²⁴⁰ P⁴⁵ has ἀλλά.

²⁴¹ P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ L Γ Ε 070 0124 f¹ 1 22 69 118 131 205 209 660 669 700* 788 1012 1192* 1210 1241 1582 2542. The phrase appears in: Ⲛ A B C D E G H K M U W Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ f¹³ (2) 28 33 124157 180 565 579 597 700^c 892 1006 1010 1071 1243 (1292) 1342 1424 1505 1506 ℣.

²⁴² P⁴⁵ D.

(36) Luke 11:34b – ἐπὶ δὲ πονηρὸς ἦ καὶ τὸ σῶμά σου σκοτεινόν ^τ (τ ἔσται;

//Matthew 6:22)²⁴³

When Jesus teaches that the eye is the light of the body in Luke 11:34, he explains, “When your eye is healthy, even your whole body (ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου) is full of light.” P⁴⁵ and Codex Bezae have the adjective πᾶς in the place of ὅλος. Tarelli speculates that these two manuscripts might contain the original reading of Luke and that the majority reading arose by assimilation to Matthew 6:22.²⁴⁴ Unfortunately, the manuscript evidence for ὅλος in Luke is quite strong and the appearance of a synonym in two manuscripts must be explained as a result of the idiosyncrasies of the individual scribes.

Jesus goes on to say, “But when (the eye) is wicked, so also your body (will be) in darkness” (ἐπὶ δὲ πονηρὸς ἦ καὶ τὸ σῶμά σου σκοτεινόν). The verb in the second phrase is inferred by ellipsis in Luke, but in Matthew 6:22 the verb ἔσται is explicit. P⁴⁵ has added Matthew’s verb.²⁴⁵ This is a very common reading in the miniscules, but P⁴⁵ is the earliest to witness it. If the scribe of P⁴⁵ was not the first to create this variant, he was among the earliest to perpetuate it.

(37) Luke 11:42a – ἀλλὰ οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς Φαρισαίοις ὅτι²⁴⁶ ἀποδεκατοῦτε τὸ ἠδύοσμον

καὶ τὸ ἱπὴγανον καὶ πᾶν λάχανον καὶ παρέρχεσθε τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὴν

²⁴³ P⁴⁵ K M U X Θ Π f¹³ 2^c 6 13 27 115 124 131 158 161 213 229^c 265 343 346 399^c 443 489 543 577 716 726 826 827 983 1006 1012 1079 1187^c 1194 1195 1200 1215 1219 1220 1223 1229 1241 1313 1319 1338 1355 1392 1458 1604 1630 2096 2487 2542 2613 2643 2757 2766^c.

²⁴⁴ Tarelli, “Western and Byzantine Texts,” 254.

²⁴⁵ So Birdsall, “Rational Eclecticism,” 46.

²⁴⁶ P⁴⁵ omits ὅτι.

ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ (Γ ἄνηθον; //Matthew 23:23; Sub-singular P⁴⁵
157)²⁴⁷

(38) Luke 11:42b – ταῦτα δὲ ἔδει ποιῆσαι κάκεῖνα μὴ Γ παρεῖναι (Γ ἀφεῖναι;
//Matthew 23:23)²⁴⁸

Jesus lists the demerits he holds against the Pharisees, including their tithing practices. In Luke 11:42, he accuses them of tithing “the mint, and the rue (τὸ πήγανον), and every herb.” In the place of Luke’s “rue” (πήγανον) Matthew has “dill” (ἄνηθον) and instead of the phrase “every herb” (πᾶν λάχανον) Matthew has “cumin” (κύμινον). The scribe of P⁴⁵ has retained Luke’s πᾶν λάχανον, but has replaced πήγανον with ἄνηθον in assimilation to Matthew 23:23.²⁴⁹

At the end of the same verse, the scribe has substituted Matthew’s “neglect” (ἀφίημι) for Luke’s “slacken” (παρίημι). He has not quite mimicked Matthew’s present infinitive ἀφιέναι, using instead the aorist ἀφεῖναι, but he has conformed to Matthew’s syntax. In both cases, harmonization is very likely and the fact that they appear together in the same verse makes the influence of Matthew’s version of this saying almost certain.

²⁴⁷ Manuscript family J¹³ has ἄνηθον καὶ τὸ πήγανον.

²⁴⁸ P⁴⁵ Ɀ* 57 179 892 954. Manuscripts that have ἀφιέναι in direct assimilation to Matthew include: B^c C E F G H K M S U W X Y Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ 0108 J¹ 2 28 33 69 124 157 180 205 565 579 597 1006 1010 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 1506 ℞. IGNTP prefers ἀφιέναι. Miniscule 2542 substitutes κύμινον from Matthew 23:23.

²⁴⁹ So Lagrange, “Les papyrus Chester Beatty,” 28; Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 188; Elliott, “Singular Readings,” 129; and Hernández, “Early Text of Luke,” 128 n. 47. See further Tarelli, “Omissions, Additions, and Conflations,” 385. Kenyon, *Gospels and Acts*, xv, counts this as one of the notable new readings of P⁴⁵ at the time of its publication.

(39) Luke 12:1 – προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης ἧτις ἐστὶν ὑπόκρισις τῶν

Φαρισαίων² (ἡ τῶν Φαρισαίων ἧτις ἐστὶν ὑπόκρισις; //Matthew 16:6,

Mark 8:15)²⁵⁰

In Luke 12:1, Jesus warns his disciples about “the yeast, which is the hypocrisy, of the Pharisees” (τῆς ζύμης ἧτις ἐστὶν ὑπόκρισις τῶν Φαρισαίων). A very popular variant transposes the words so that the phrase reads: “the yeast of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy” (τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων ἧτις ἐστὶν ὑπόκρισις). The scribe of P⁴⁵ may have created the reading under the influence of Mark 8:15 or Matthew 16:6, where the phrase “yeast of the Pharisees” (τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων) occurs. Matthew includes the Sadducees and Mark incriminates Herod. Neither specifies that the metaphorical yeast represents hypocrisy.

On face value, harmonization seems a likely explanation; however, the textual evidence swings strongly in favor of the popular variant. Indeed, the “Lukan” reading occurs in only four manuscripts, two of which are intimately related (P⁷⁵-B) and another is closely associated with these (L). Despite the Alexandrian support for the more complicated reading, the early and diverse evidence for the “Matthean” or “Markan” order in Luke is compelling. Harmonization is not a factor.

(40) Luke 12:2 – οὐδὲν δὲ Ἦ συγκεκαλυμμένον ἐστὶν ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται καὶ

κρυπτόν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται²⁵¹ (Ἦ κεκαλυμμένον; Matthew 10:26)²⁵²

²⁵⁰ P⁴⁵ ⋈ A C D K M U W Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ f¹ f¹³ 1 2 33 118 157 565 579 700 892 1006 1071 1342 1424 1506 1582 2542 ℣. Tischendorf, IGNTP, and Souter prefer τῶν Φαρισαίων ἧτις ἐστὶν ὑπόκρισις against P⁷⁵ B L 1241.

²⁵¹ P⁴⁵ omits καὶ κρυπτόν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται.

(41) Luke 12:4 – λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν τοῖς φίλοις μου μὴ ἴ φοβηθῆτε ἀπὸ τῶν

ἀποκτεινόντων τὸ σῶμα καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μὴ ἐχόντων περισσώτερόν τι

ποιῆσαι (ἴ πτοήθητε; cf. Luke 21:9; Sub-singular P⁴⁵ 700)

(42) Luke 12:6 – οὐχὶ πέντε στρουθία ἴ πωλοῦνται ἀσσαρίων δύο (ἴ πωλεῖται;

//Matthew 10:29)²⁵³

(43) Luke 12:7 – ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν²⁵⁴ πᾶσαι ἴ ἠριθμηταὶ

(ἴ ἠριθμημέναι; //Matthew 10:30; Sub-singular P⁴⁵ 1242*)²⁵⁵

As Jesus’s tirade against the Pharisees and their hypocrisies continues, the scribe of P⁴⁵ engages in another burst of harmonization. Jesus says to his disciples in Luke 12:2, “There is nothing covered up (συγκεκαλυμμένον) that will not be revealed.” Matthew’s version of the statement is quite similar except for the use of the simple verb (καλύπτω) instead of Luke’s compound verb (συγκαλύπτω). The scribe has adopted the simple form of the verb from Matthew 10:26.

In contrast to the Pharisees, who hide their true selves, Jesus’s disciples are supposed to proclaim boldly their allegiance to Jesus without fear of physical repercussions. He tells them, “Do not fear (μὴ φοβηθῆτε) those who kill the body and after this are not able to do something more.” Instead of the common verb for fear, φοβέω, the scribe has used the less common synonym πτοέω, which is rare in the

²⁵² P⁴⁵ & C* 1241.

²⁵³ P⁴⁵ (A) D K L M R U W X Γ Δ Λ Π 070 f¹ 2 28 33 124 157 565 579 700 1006 1342 1424 ℵ. IGNTP prefers πωλεῖται.

²⁵⁴ P⁴⁵ has ὑμῶν τῆς κεφαλῆς.

²⁵⁵ Manuscripts with ἠριθμημέναι εἰσὶν include: D Θ 40 124 259 579 1071 1604 2643.

Septuagint and occurs only twice in the New Testament (cf. Luke 21:9; 24:37). Royse suggests that the reading in Luke 21:9 has impacted this passage.²⁵⁶ In that passage, Jesus tells his disciples, “Do not fear” (μὴ πτοηθῆτε) when you hear of wars. Although this verse is not a direct parallel, its shared syntax warrants consideration. When he expresses exhortations against fear, Luke typically uses the word μὴ plus some form of φοβέω; in 21:9 he has not. It does not seem realistic that the scribe would have accidentally substituted the less common synonym, so there must have been some outside influence or remote parallel in mind. The reading is quite strange and harmonization to the later passage in Luke is probable.

Even if the disciples endure physical harm because of their commitment to Jesus, their worth to their heavenly father is immeasurable. Jesus compares the value of human souls to the market value of sparrows. In Luke 12:6, he says, “Are not five sparrows sold (πωλοῦνται) for two pennies?” Matthew relates a similar saying, but with two sparrows sold for a single penny. He uses a singular form of the verb (πωλεῖται). In fact, most manuscripts of Luke testify to the singular verb πωλεῖται, but several early texts, including P⁷⁵, Vaticanus, and Sinaiticus support the plural form πωλοῦνται, which is very likely the older reading. The scribe of P⁴⁵ has harmonized to the Matthean parallel. Tarelli recognizes the influence of the parallel, but also suggests that the reading may have arisen out of a preference of the scribe for singular verbs with neuter plurals.²⁵⁷

²⁵⁶ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 189, entertains the possibility that P⁴⁵ and 700 have preserved the older reading and that scribes have harmonized to the more common word. See also Hernández, “Early Text of Luke,” 128 n. 47. C. C. Tarelli, “Some Further Linguistic Aspects of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Gospels,” *JTS* 43 (1942): 19–25, 22, also discusses the reading.

²⁵⁷ Tarelli, “Linguistic Aspects,” 255–256. See also Birdsall, “Rational Eclecticism,” 44; and Dobschütz, [No Title], 411.

Jesus goes on to say, “Even all the hairs of your head have been counted (ἡρίθμηνται).” In Matthew 10:30, the statement is nearly the same except for the final verb. Where Luke uses the perfect passive form ἡρίθμηνται, Matthew employs a periphrastic construction with a perfect participle (ἡριθμημένοι εἰσίν). This reading has been adopted in a handful of manuscripts of Luke, including Bezae. In P⁴⁵, the scribe has partially adopted Matthew’s construction by replacing his perfect passive with Matthew’s perfect participle.²⁵⁸

As with previous pericopae, in this passage there are several harmonizations to the parallel in Matthew. At this point in the analysis, a picture has emerged of a scribe well acquainted with an alternative version of the passage he is copying, a version known from the Gospel of Matthew.

(44) Luke 12:11 – ὅταν δὲ εἰσφέρωσιν ὑμᾶς ἐπὶ τὰς συναγωγὰς καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς²⁵⁹ καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας μὴ Ἦ μεριμνήσητε πῶς ἢ τί ἀπολογήσηθε ἢ τί εἶπητε (Ἦ μεριμνᾶτε; //Mark 13:11; Lacuna)²⁶⁰

Jesus continues speaking about the dangers of discipleship and the providence of the Father. He explains that although his disciples will face persecution and be called to testify for their allegiance to him, they will not do so alone. The Holy Spirit will teach them what to say in the moment of need. In Luke 12:11, he tells them, “Do not worry (μὴ

²⁵⁸ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 164, 186 n. 412, 189. So also Birdsall, “Rational Eclecticism,” 46; Comfort, “Scribe as Interpreter,” 126; and Hernández, “Early Text of Luke,” 128 n. 47.

²⁵⁹ P⁴⁵ has ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς συναγωγὰς.

²⁶⁰ P^{45lac} A K M S U W Γ Δ Λ Π 2 28 124 157 565 1006 1342 1424 1506 ℳ. IGNTP prefers μεριμνᾶτε. Manuscripts with μεριμνήσητε include: P⁷⁵ ⋈ B L Q R X Θ Ψ 070 0191 0233 ^f1 ^f3 1 13 33 69 118 131 205 209 213 346 443 543 579 700 713 788 826 892 983 1071 1194 1215 1241 1346 1582^c 2542.

μεριμνήσητε) about how or what you should say in your defense, or what you should say.” Luke uses the subjunctive verb *μεριμνήσητε* in many manuscripts, including several early and good ones (P⁷⁵ & B). The scribe of P⁴⁵, along with the majority of manuscripts, appears to have used an imperative verb (*μεριμνᾶτε*). This portion of the line is lacunose in P⁴⁵, but both Kenyon and Comfort and Barrett have reconstructed the line with the imperative reading since it is shorter and there is a need to omit some letters to fit into the space allotted. Even though the evidence for the imperative reading is extensive in manuscripts of Luke, the variant could easily have arisen by assimilation to the form of the verb in Mark 13:11 (*προμεριμνᾶτε*). Mark uses a compound verb, but the scribe has conformed only to Mark’s imperative form without adopting his prefix. It is also possible that the scribe has conformed to context since the imperatival form is found later in Luke 12:12.

(45) Luke 12:22 – διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ᾧ τί φάγητε μηδὲ τῷ

σώματι τί ἐνδύσησθε (ᾧ ὑμῶν; //Matthew 6:25)²⁶¹

(46) Luke 12:24a – κατανοήσατε ᾧ τοὺς κόρακας ὅτι οὐ σπεύρουσιν οὐδὲ θερίζουσιν

(ᾧ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καί; //Matthew 6:26; Singular)²⁶²

(47) Luke 12:24b – οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ταμεῖον οὐδὲ ᾧ ἀποθήκη (ᾧ ἀποθήκαι; //Matthew

6:26; Sub-singular P⁴⁵ 700^{c263})

²⁶¹ P⁴⁵ K M S U X Γ Δ Λ Π Ψ Ω 070 f¹ f³ 2 28 33 565 892 1006 1241 1342 1424 (1506) 1582^c m. IGHNTP prefers ὑμῶν.

²⁶² Codex Bezae (D) replaces τοὺς κόρακας with Matthew’s τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

²⁶³ The reading of miniscule 700 is unclear. Royle, *Scribal Habits*, 171 n. 332, proposes that the first scribe wrote ἀποθήκα, but that a corrector attempted to change the final alpha to epsilon and, failing to do so, an iota was added after alpha. He cites the reading as occurring in 700^{c2}.

(48) Luke 12:24c – και ὁ θεὸς τρέφει ἑαυτοῦς (ἑαυτά; //Matthew 6:26)²⁶⁴

(49) Luke 12:25 – τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν μεριμνῶν δύναται ἐπι τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ

προσθεῖναι² πῆχυν (ἐπι προσθεῖναι ἐπι τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ; //Matthew 6:27)²⁶⁵

(50) Luke 12:31 – πλὴν ζητεῖτε τὴν βασιλείαν ἑαυτοῦ και ταῦτα προστεθήσεται

ὑμῖν (ἑαυτοῦ θεοῦ; //Matthew 6:33)²⁶⁶

Jesus does not exclusively instruct on the dangers of discipleship, he also teaches his followers about the provision of the Father. He encourages his disciples, “Do not worry about life (τῆ ψυχῆ), what you will eat.” In Matthew 6:25, Jesus personalizes the command by saying, “Do not worry about *your* life (τῆ ψυχῆ ὑμῶν).” The scribe of P⁴⁵, along with the majority of scribes, has adopted Matthew’s reading here by adding ὑμῶν.²⁶⁷ So many manuscripts adopted this reading that it became the *de facto* text of Luke in later centuries, but the earliest manuscripts from a variety of text types witness the shorter reading. The longer reading with ὑμῶν is readily explained as an assimilation.

Jesus illustrates his point about worry with an analogy from natural life. He says, “Consider the ravens (τοὺς κόρακας), that they do not sow nor reap.” In Matthew 6:26,

²⁶⁴ P⁴⁵ D^{f13} 13 69 253 346 543 788 826 903 1203 1346.

²⁶⁵ Manuscripts with προσθεῖναι ἐπι τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ include: P⁴⁵ & A D K L M Q U W Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ 070^{f1} f¹³ 2 28 33 69 157 565 700 788 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1346 1424 1506 2542 ℳ. Tischendorf and IGNTP prefer this reading. Manuscripts with ἐπι τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ προσθεῖναι include: P⁷⁵ B 579.

²⁶⁶ Manuscripts with τοῦ θεοῦ include: P⁴⁵ A D^c E G H K M N Q U W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π 070^{f1} f¹³ 2 28 33 157 180 205 565 700 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 1506 2542 ℳ. Manuscripts with αὐτοῦ include: & B D* L Ψ 579 892.

²⁶⁷ Birdsall, “Rational Eclecticism,” 46, does not discuss the possibility of harmonization in this case.

instead of ravens, Jesus points generically to “the birds of the heavens” (τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ). In P⁴⁵, the scribe has conflated these versions. He has added “the birds of heaven” from Matthew and retained the Lukan illustration of “ravens”: κατανόησατε τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τοὺς κόρακας.²⁶⁸

To compensate for this harmonizing conflation, the pronoun at the end of v. 24c referring to the birds has been transformed from the masculine plural αὐτούς, corresponding to Luke’s ravens, to the neuter plural αὐτά, reflecting Matthew’s “birds of heaven.” This variant is either a direct assimilation to Matthew 6:26 or a harmonization to the new, neuter content of the passage from the previous alteration.²⁶⁹

A third harmonization is apparent in v. 24, the replacement of Luke’s singular “barn” (ἀποθήκη) with the plural ἀποθήκαι. There is no compelling reason to add more barns to the illustration unless the scribe was influenced by an external source. This alteration reflects the plural in Matthew 6:26 (ἀποθήκας).²⁷⁰ Matthew has the term in the accusative case, since it is accompanied by the preposition “into” (εἰς); the scribe of P⁴⁵ has retained Luke’s nominative case but with Matthew’s plural noun.

In Luke 12:25, Jesus asks his followers, “Whom among you, worrying, is able to add to his lifespan a span?” (τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν μεριμνῶν δύναται ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ

²⁶⁸ See further Lagrange, “Les papyrus Chester Beatty,” 30; Merk, “Codex Evangeliorum et Actuum,” 382; Tarelli, “Omissions, Additions, and Conflations,” 385; Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 113; Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 185, 186 n. 412, 187; Birdsall, “Rational Eclecticism,” 41; Comfort, “Scribe as Interpreter,” 127–128; Idem., “Scribes as Readers,” 39; Elliott, “Singular Readings,” 126; and Hernández, “Early Text of Luke,” 127 n. 40.

²⁶⁹ So Birdsall, “Rational Eclecticism,” 41.

²⁷⁰ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 189; Comfort, “Scribe as Interpreter,” 128; Birdsall, “Rational Eclecticism,” 41; and Hernández, “Early Text of Luke,” 128 n. 47. On p. 120, Royse discusses the possibility that this is an orthographic variant, but ultimately favors harmonization to a Synoptic parallel.

προσθεῖναι πῆχυν). P⁴⁵ contains a variant here that places the verb before the prepositional phrase: προσθεῖναι ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ. In fact, this reading is better attested by far than that found in most modern critical editions. The editors' reasons for selecting the reading of P⁷⁵ and Vaticanus likely has to do with the fact that the variant can be explained as a harmonization to Matthew 6:27. Nevertheless, the evidence in favor of the “Matthean” order in Luke is convincing. The tradition behind P⁷⁵-B has created an idiosyncratic family variant. Harmonization has not been a factor in this reading.

Instead of worrying, Jesus's disciples should seek “his kingdom” (τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ). In Matthew 6:33, the kingdom belongs to *God* (τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ). The scribe of P⁴⁵, along with the majority of manuscripts, has adopted this reading from Matthew. In terms of manuscript evidence, while the reading with τοῦ θεοῦ is witnessed in the majority of manuscripts, including three from the fifth century (A D^c W), the shorter reading with αὐτοῦ is witnessed in the best manuscripts of the Alexandrian tradition (Ⲭ B) as well as an early Western manuscript (D*). Turning to transcriptional probabilities, it is difficult to conceive of a scribe reducing “of God” to the generic “his.” Furthermore, in Bezae, the same process can be seen at work, since the scribe has written αὐτοῦ, but a corrector has changed the reading to τοῦ θεοῦ.²⁷¹

(51) Luke 12:43 – μακάριος ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος ὃν ἐλθὼν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ εὐρήσει

^ςποιοῦντα οὕτως^ς (^ςοὕτως ποιοῦντα; //Matthew 24:46)²⁷²

²⁷¹ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, agrees that it is more likely for scribes to adopt the longer reading than vice versa.

²⁷² P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ Ⲭ (L) X Ψ 070 f¹³ 7 13 33 60 69 157 213 267 346 543 579 788 826 892 983 1241 1346 1506 1654 1685.

The variant in Luke 12:43 was discussed in full above with P⁷⁵. The transposition may have occurred under the influence of Matthew 24:46.

(52) Luke 12:51 – δοκεῖτε ὅτι εἰρήνην παρεγενόμην δοῦναι ἔν τῇ γῆ¹ (ἔπι τῆς γῆς; //Matthew 10:34; Singular)²⁷³

In Luke 12:51, Jesus asks, “Do you think I have come to give peace on the earth (ἐν τῇ γῆ)?” The Matthean parallel is not in the form of a question; Jesus says directly, “Do not consider that I came to bring peace on the earth (ἐπι τῆς γῆς).” The scribe of P⁴⁵ has replaced Luke’s ἐν with the preposition ἐπι, possibly under the influence of Matthew. Alteration for stylistic reasons is also possible.²⁷⁴ Tarelli provides several examples of the scribe’s preference for the preposition ἐπι.²⁷⁵

(53) Luke 13:19 – ὁμοία ἐστὶν κόκκῳ σινάπεως ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔβαλεν εἰς²⁷⁶ κῆπον ἑαυτοῦ²⁷⁷ καὶ ἠὔξησεν καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς δένδρον τ (τ μέγα; //Mark 4:32, Matthew 13:32)²⁷⁸

Jesus describes the kingdom of God as a mustard seed that was planted and “grew and became a tree” (καὶ ἠὔξησεν καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς δένδρον). This is a simple analogy about ample growth from insubstantial beginnings. In Luke, Jesus never explicitly describes the scale of the tree, but he does say that the birds of heaven are able to dwell in its branches.

²⁷³ Manuscripts with ἐπι τὴν γῆν include: 157 1093 1424.

²⁷⁴ So Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 189; and Hernández, “Early Text of Luke,” 128 n. 47.

²⁷⁵ Tarelli, “Linguistic Aspects,” 256.

²⁷⁶ P⁴⁵ adds τόν.

²⁷⁷ P⁴⁵ has αὐτοῦ.

²⁷⁸ P⁴⁵ A E F G H K M N U W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ 0233 0303 *f*¹ *f*¹³ 2 28 33 118 157 180 205 565 579 597 700 1006 1010 1071 1243 1292 1342 1346 1424 1505 1506 *ⲙ*. IGNTP prefers μέγα.

In the Markan version of this parable, Jesus says that the tree became “greater than all plants” (μείζον πάντων τῶν λαχάνων) with “great branches” (κλάδους μεγάλους). In Matthew 13:32, the evangelist says that the seed became “greater than the plants” (μείζον τῶν λαχάνων). He does not mention the branches. It is possible that the scribe of P⁴⁵ has been influenced by one of these narratives because he has described the tree, though not its branches, as “great” or “large” (δένδρον μέγα). The comparative adjective in Mark 4:32 and Matthew 13:32 has become a regular adjective in P⁴⁵. It is also possible that the second adjective in Mark describing the “large branches” accounts for the scribe’s description of a “large tree.”

(54) Luke 13:30 – καὶ ἰδοὺ εἰσὶν ἔσχατοι οἱ ἔσονται πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ εἰσὶν πρῶτοι οἱ ἔσονται ἔσχατοι (//Mark 10:31, Matthew 19:30; Sub-singular P⁴⁵ 827 1338)²⁷⁹

In Luke 13:30, Jesus says, “And behold, there are last who will be first and there are first who will be (εἰσὶν) last.” Jesus is clear that typical associations of power and preference within the kingdoms of the world are not as they shall be in the kingdom of God. In recording this aphorism, Luke uses the verb ἔσονται in both parts of the statement. Mark and Matthew record the same statement with different syntax, but each has in common that they do not repeat the verb in the second phrase—it is inferred by

²⁷⁹ Comfort and Barrett supply the word εἰσὶν in a lacuna following πρῶτοι. The word does not appear in Kenyon’s transcription and both IGNTP and Swanson mark the word as omitted in P⁴⁵.

ellipsis. The scribe of P⁴⁵ has omitted the repeated verb in his manuscript of Luke, possibly under the influence of the structure of the other Synoptics.²⁸⁰

(55) Luke 13:35a – λέγω δὲ²⁸¹ ὑμῖν οὐ μὴ ἴδητέ με² (με ἴδητε; //Matthew 23:38)²⁸²

(56) Luke 13:35b – ἕως ἥξει ὅτε¹ εἴπητε εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου (ἄν; //Matthew 23:38)²⁸³

The variant in Luke 13:35a was discussed in the section on P⁷⁵ above. It is possible that the transposition has occurred under the influence of Matthew 23:38. In its text of Luke 13:35b, the manuscript lacks the phrase “(the time) comes when” (ἥξει ὅτε). The scribe has replaced the word with the particle ἄν. The phrase ἕως ἄν is found in the parallel in Matthew 23:38. It is possible, though, that the reading is simply a matter of the scribe’s stylistic preference.²⁸⁴

(57) Luke 14:3 – καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς τοὺς νομικοὺς καὶ Φαρισαίους λέγων¹ ἔξεστιν τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεῦσαι ἢ οὐ²⁸⁵ (εἰ; cf. Matthew 12:10, 19:3, Mark 10:2, Luke 6:9)²⁸⁶

²⁸⁰ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 189; Comfort, “Scribe as Interpreter,” 130; Ibid., “Scribes as Readers,” 39; and Hernández, “Early Text of Luke,” 128 n. 47.

²⁸¹ P⁴⁵ omits δέ.

²⁸² Manuscripts with με ἴδητε include: P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ D E G H L N S U V X Γ Δ Λ Ψ Ω f¹ 2 28 124 157 565 579 700 892 1006 1241 1342 1424 1506 2542 ℳ. IGNTP prefers με ἴδητε. Manuscripts with ἴδητέ με include: ⋈ A B K M R W Θ Π f¹³ 6 27 69 71 158 179 265 349 443 472 489 713 726 788 903 1009 1012 1071 1079 1195 1200 1219 1220 1229 1313 1319 1346 1355 1458 1630 2487 2613 2643 2766.

²⁸³ P⁴⁵ ⋈ A E G H M N S U V W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Ψ Ω f¹ f¹³ 1 2 28 69 124 157 180 205 209 565 579 700 788 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1346 1424 1505 1582 2542 ℳ.

²⁸⁴ See Tarelli, “Linguistic Aspects,” 257, for a brief discussion of particles in P⁴⁵.

²⁸⁵ P⁴⁵ omits ἢ οὐ.

On more than one occasion the Pharisees observe Jesus's healing ministry and test him regarding his commitment to the Sabbath. Luke alone records a story of Jesus healing a man with dropsy. Before the miracle, Jesus turns to the lawyers and Pharisees and asks, "Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath or not?" (ἐξεστὶν τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεῦσαι ἢ οὐ). There is not an exact parallel to this episode in Mark or Matthew, but both record an analogous situation where similar questions were raised. In Matthew 12:10, it is not Jesus who asks the Pharisees about healing on the Sabbath, but the Pharisees who ask him, saying, "Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath?" (εἰ ἐξεστὶν τοῖς σάββασιν θεραπεῦσαι). The conjunction εἰ used in Matthew 12:10 is typical of indirect questions and denotes the meaning of "whether" or "if" it is lawful to heal on the Sabbath. The scribe has adopted this conjunction from the Matthean near-parallel and has put it on the lips of Jesus in the Lukan context. The questions are so similar it is not surprising for a scribe, especially one such as the scribe of P⁴⁵ who has demonstrated repeatedly his familiarity with the Gospel of Matthew, to be influenced by the syntax of the other saying.²⁸⁷ Another possibility is that the scribe has conformed to general Synoptic syntax, since the typical form of this question of legality incorporates the word εἰ (cf. Mark 10:2; Matthew 19:3; Luke 6:9).

(58) Luke 14:27 – ὅστις οὐ βαστάζει τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου οὐ

δύναται εἶναι μου μαθητῆς²⁸⁸ (Γ αὐτοῦ; //Matthew 10:38)²⁸⁹

²⁸⁶ P⁴⁵ A K M N U W X Γ Δ Λ Π f¹ f¹³ 2 28 118 124 157 565 579 700 1006 1071 1342 1346 1424 1506 m. IGTP prefers εἰ.

²⁸⁷ Tarelli, "Omissions, Additions, and Conflations," 383.

²⁸⁸ P⁴⁵ has μου εἶναι μαθητῆς.

The variant in Luke 14:27 was discussed in full with regard to P⁷⁵ and can likely be attributed to the influence of Matthew 10:38. It is interesting to note in passing that in P⁷⁵ the term “cross” (σταυρόν) was written with a staurogram (̄σ̄ϰ̄ον̄). Here the term is written as a *nomen sacrum* (̄σ̄ρ̄ν).

Preliminary Summary of Harmonization in the Text of Luke

Fifty variant readings in the text of Luke have been discussed. Seven of these likely did not involve harmonization and a further fourteen could only possibly be explained as the result of parallel influence. This leaves twenty-nine readings that likely or very likely can be attributed to harmonization.

With this evidence in view, the power of Matthew over the scribe comes into sharp relief. In the next section, when the text of Mark is under consideration, the predilection to assimilate to Matthew’s version of saying and stories will be further confirmed.

Table 9. Sources of Harmonization in the Text of Luke in P⁴⁵

Source of Harmonization		Total: 29	Entry Number
	Matthew	23	14, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 33, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 56, 57, 58
	Mark	2	15, 18
	Luke	1	41
	Mark or Matthew	3	13, 30, 54

In his analysis of the text of Luke in P⁴⁵, Lagrange concludes, “If these singular readings can enlighten us about the affinities of the papyrus, we can at least conclude a

²⁸⁹ Manuscripts with ἐαυτοῦ include: A B L^c M^c N W Δ Ψ 7 16 179 267 343 348 472 477 713 716 1009 1195 1216 1229 1579 1630 1654 2487 2613 2766. Manuscripts with αὐτοῦ include: P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ ̄ϰ̄ D K L* U Θ Λ Π f¹ f¹³ 2^c 28 33 124 157 565 579 700 892 1006 1071 1342 1346 1424 ̄.

tendency toward elegance, but not toward harmonization...²⁹⁰ He detects only a few singular harmonizations, and only three “rare” readings. This analysis has uncovered four singular and nine sub-singular harmonizations. Add to these the many common harmonizations and one is forced to conclude, opposite Lagrange, that the scribe’s tendency to harmonization in Luke, or at least the tendency of his textual tradition, is unmistakably strong.

P⁴⁵ – Passages from Mark²⁹¹

At the time of its publication, many scholars were convinced that the text of Mark in P⁴⁵ was representative of what was then called the “Caesarean” text type, typified by manuscripts like Codex Coridethianus (Θ) and miniscule 565. Codex Washingtonianus was also attached to this group.²⁹² Subsequent studies mostly confirm a strong connection between Washingtonianus and P⁴⁵, but much less between these and the remaining texts identified as “Caesarean.” Lagrange, for instance, identifies the papyrus’s textual affinities first with Codex Washingtonianus, and then, in descending order, with family 13 (f¹³) and miniscules 1, 565, and 700. He does not find a close association between P⁴⁵ and Θ.²⁹³ Likewise, Teófilo Ayuso confirms in an exhaustive study that the closest manuscripts to P⁴⁵ include Washingtonianus, f¹, miniscule 28, and f¹³. Again, Θ, the

²⁹⁰ Lagrange, “Les papyrus Chester Beatty,” 28: “Si ces singularités ne peuvent nous éclairer sur les affinités de P, nous pouvons du moins en conclure une tendance à l’élégance, mais non à l’harmonisation...”

²⁹¹ P⁴⁵ contains Mark 4:36–5:2; 5:16–26; 5:38–6:3; 6:15–25, 36–50; 7:25–8:1; 8:10–26; 8:34–9:9; 9:18–31; 11:27–12:1; 12:5–8, 13–19, 24–28.

²⁹² Kenyon, “Chester Beatty Biblical Papyrus,” 48; and Silva New, “The New Chester Beatty Papyrus,” *JBL* 51 (1932): 73–74. For a response to Kenyon’s initial assertion see Tarelli, “Caesarean Text,” 46–55. Larry W. Hurtado, “P⁴⁵ and the Textual History of the Gospel of Mark,” in *The Earliest Gospels*, 132–148, provides a helpful overview of how P⁴⁵ altered the conception of the so-called Caesarean type. See also Peter M. Head, “The Early Text of Mark,” in *The Early Text of the New Testament*, 108–120, 115.

²⁹³ Lagrange, *Critique rationelle*, 161.

standard bearer of the “Caesarean” type, is not found to be especially close. Ayuso argues that together P⁴⁵ and its associates represent a *pre-caesarean*, pre-recensional text localized in the Faiyum of Egypt, but not centralized in Alexandria like other members of the “Caesarean” text (e.g. Θ 565 700).²⁹⁴ More recently, Larry Hurtado concludes that although P⁴⁵ and Washingtonianus are very closely related, as close as any text type relationship, “there is no way that P⁴⁵ can be regarded as having any special connection with the ‘Caesarean’ text of Mark,” namely, that represented by Θ and miniscule 565.²⁹⁵ Hedley anticipated this conclusion in his 1934 study of the “Egyptian” text of the Gospels. Comparing the text of Mark 6 in P⁴⁵ with the hypothetical “Caesarean” text created by the Lakes, Hedley concludes, “There is a striking lack of agreement between P⁴⁵ and the Θ text.”²⁹⁶ Hollis Huston adds his own argument in favor of a strong connection between P⁴⁵ and Washingtonianus and affirms the conclusions of others that P⁴⁵ has little in common with the remainder of the so-called Caesarean texts. With regard to P⁴⁵ and Washingtonianus, Huston calls these texts poor members of the “Caesarean” type and asserts, “Indeed, D, which agrees with Cs [the Caesarean text] 44 times while disagreeing 47 times, would have to be ranked as a much better Caesarean witness than is P⁴⁵.”²⁹⁷

The copying habits already discovered in Matthew and Luke hold true in Mark. In this Gospel especially, Lagrange observes that the scribe “has a noticeable tendency to

²⁹⁴ Ayuso, “Cesariense o precesariense?,” 369–415.

²⁹⁵ Hurtado, “P⁴⁵ and the Textual History,” 145.

²⁹⁶ Hedley, “Egyptian Texts,” 33.

²⁹⁷ Hollis W. Huston, “Mark 6 and 11 in P⁴⁵ and in the Caesarean Text,” *JBL* 74 (1955): 262–271, 268.

harmonize, and corrects for the sake of elegance.”²⁹⁸ It has already been shown from the text of Luke that the scribe has been highly influenced by Matthew’s Gospel. It is the same in the text of Mark. Additionally, the scribe employs harmonization, perhaps without deliberation, as one means of improving Mark’s style. Furthermore, the scribe’s habit of harmonizing in bursts continues.

(59) Mark 5:21a – καὶ διαπεράσαντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ (//Luke 8:40)²⁹⁹

(60) Mark 5:21b – πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν συνήχθη ὄχλος πολὺς ἐπ’ αὐτόν (//Luke 8:40; Singular)

(61) Mark 5:22 – καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς τῶν ἀρχισυναγῶγων ὄνοματι Ἰαῖρος καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτόν πίπτει πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (ἰδοῦ; //Matthew 9:18, Luke 8:41)³⁰⁰

(62) Mark 5:42 – καὶ ἐξέστησαν εὐθύς ἐκστάσει μεγάλῃ (//Luke 8:56)³⁰¹

Immediately following the episode of the healing of the Garasene demoniac, in Mark 5:21, and serving as an introduction to the healing of Jairus’s daughter, Mark records that “after Jesus crossed over in the boat (ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ) again to the other side (εἰς τὸ πέραν), a great crowd was gathered to him.” The scribe of P⁴⁵ alone has omitted ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ and εἰς τὸ πέραν. In the parallel passage in Luke 8:40, the evangelist does not

²⁹⁸ Lagrange, *Critique rationnelle*, 160: “Il a une tendance sensible à harmoniser, et corrige dans l’intérêt de l’élégance.”

²⁹⁹ P⁴⁵vid D Θ f¹ 1 28 47 56 58 205 565 700 788 2542. The text on either side is damaged. It is almost possible, except that the *nomen sacrum* is not in the correct case, that the papyrus had the reading of W, in which the prepositional phrase (ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ τοῦ) precedes the name.

³⁰⁰ P⁴⁵ A C G^c K M N U W f¹ f¹³ Π Σ Φ 0107 2 28 33 157 565 579 700 1006 1071 1241 1424 1506 2542 ℵ.

³⁰¹ P⁴⁵ A (D) K M N U W Θ Π Σ Φ f¹ f¹³ 2 28 124 157 565 700 788 1006 1071 1241 1342 1424 1506 2542 ℵ. Manuscripts with εὐθύς include: ⋈ B C L Δ 33 579 892 2427.

mention the boat nor the return “to the other side,” though Luke had already mentioned returning in the boat (ἐμβὰς εἰς πλοῖον ὑπέστρεψεν) in v. 37. Harmonization to Luke 8:40 is possible in both cases,³⁰² but the similarity of the omissions causes one to wonder if perhaps stylistic or editorial concerns may account for the omission equally well. Adela Collins attributes the omission from manuscripts in general to scribes’ desire to remove superfluous words.³⁰³ This scribe’s characteristic conciseness may have led him to omit these prepositional phrases. Royse attributes the second omission, of the phrase εἰς τὸ πέραν, to a scribal leap from the final nu in πάλιν to the same letter at the end of πέραν.³⁰⁴

Once Jesus reaches “the other side” in Mark 5:22, Mark narrates, “And one of the rulers of the synagogue, named Jairus, comes and, seeing him, falls to his feet.” The scribe of P⁴⁵ has added the interjection ἰδοῦ between the first two words. Paul-Louis Couchoud regards the reading with ἰδοῦ as original, explaining on the basis of Markan priority that, since it is present in both Matthew 9:18 and Luke 8:41, it was most likely present in their source.³⁰⁵ Given the external testimony for the shorter reading, I prefer to

³⁰² Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 72–73, references harmonization as a possible motivation for the first omission. He states, “A minority of the Committee regarded the phrase ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ as an early scribal insertion.” Tarelli, “Omissions, Additions, and Conflations,” 383, also remarks on the reading. If brevity is the purpose of this omission, the scribe cannot be described as consistent since he copies the phrase faithfully in 6:45.

³⁰³ A. Collins, *Mark*, 5.

³⁰⁴ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 137, 142. See also Merk, “Codex Evangeliorum et Actuum,” 381.

³⁰⁵ Paul-Louis Couchoud, “Notes sur le texte de St Marc dans le Codex Chester Beatty,” *JTS* 35 (1934): 3–22, 5. In many cases, especially with regard to so-called “minor agreements,” Couchoud makes this argument when an appeal to harmonization is easier and more likely.

explain the appearance of ἰδοῦ in some manuscripts of Mark by appeal to harmonization.³⁰⁶

After Jesus heals Jairus's daughter in Mark 5:42, "immediately (εὐθύς) they [the family] were overcome by great amazement." In P⁴⁵ and the majority of manuscripts, the word "immediately" (εὐθύς) is missing. It is possible that the reading with the word is older, given Mark's attachment to it, but its position after the verb is not typical of Mark and the intrusion breaks the *figura etymologica* of the repeated roots (ἐξέστησαν ἐκστάσει). That very awkwardness leads one to suspect that its addition may have been the creation of a scribe harmonizing to the context of the previous passage, which also has εὐθύς.

Most modern editions include the phrase in their text, though some enclose the words in brackets in deference to the combined testimony of Sinaiticus and Vaticanus. If these editors are correct, its omission could easily have occurred under the influence of Luke 8:56 where the adverb is absent. Nevertheless, the external evidence is not entirely compelling since the word does not appear in the Pre-Caesarean or Western text types, not to mention the Byzantine majority.³⁰⁷ Since it is impossible to be certain, it seems best to say only that harmonization is possible if the critical text is correct and that it is equally possible that scribes have added the word in harmonization to context.

³⁰⁶ So also Lagrange, "Les Chester Beatty Papyrus," 12; and A. Collins, *Mark*, 5.

³⁰⁷ Robert H. Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 276, says the word "has good support...but the support lacks broad distribution in different textual families."

(63) Mark 6:3 – οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων ὁ υἱὸς τῆς Μαρίας (τοῦ τέκτονος ὁ υἱὸς καί; //Matthew 13:55)³⁰⁸

After Jesus heals the girl, he travels to his hometown. In the episode of Jesus's rejection at Nazareth in Mark 6:3, Mark records that the people ask each other, "Is this not the carpenter, the son of Mary?" (οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων ὁ υἱὸς τῆς Μαρίας). Matthew 13:55 is strikingly different. In that passage, the people ask, "Is this not the *son* of the carpenter?" (οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός). The reading of P⁴⁵ is broken on both sides of these words, but the final two letters of τέκτονος are clearly legible followed by the definite article (ὁ) and the first letter of the word υἱός, probably written as a *nomen sacrum*.³⁰⁹ The influence for this alteration has come from Matthew 13:55.³¹⁰

This may be a reading where proto-orthodox scribes have upheld Jesus's divinity by eliminating a passage that might be regarded as embarrassing or inappropriate when applied to a divine being. This verse was a point of embarrassment for early Christians. Celsus, for instance, apparently criticized Christians for worshipping a laborer. Origen, in response, claims that there is no reading in the New Testament that suggests that Jesus himself was a carpenter. Origen was either unaware of Mark 6:3 and knew only Matthew 13:55, or the assimilation to Matthew 13:55 had already occurred in the copies of Mark

³⁰⁸ P⁴⁵vid Σ*vid f¹³ 10 13 33^{vid} 69 124 346 472 543 565 579 700 1194 1346 1375 2542. Some of these manuscripts omit the first article, omit the second article, or omit καί. See Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 113–114, especially n. 58, for a summary of the readings of each text.

³⁰⁹ Kenyon's transcription reads τεκτων]ος ο υ[ιος. Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 166, reconstruct the line: τεκτων]ος ο υ[ζ̄.

³¹⁰ So Hedley, "Egyptian Texts," 32. A. Collins, *Mark*, 287–288, believes that either assimilation to Matthew or the same impulse at work in Matthew's redaction is the cause of this reading. Joel Marcus, *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 2 vols., Anchor Yale Bible 27–27A (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000–2009), 1:374, calls the reading in P⁴⁵ a conflation.

familiar to him.³¹¹ With reference to this reading, Peter Head comments, “The combination of avoiding embarrassment and assimilation to Matthew seems to have occurred quite frequently in Markan texts.”³¹² P⁴⁵ shows that already in the third century orthodox Christians were embarrassed to suggest that their “Lord,” “Messiah,” and “son of God” was a mere worker.³¹³ In addition to ameliorating embarrassment, the alteration may have been intended to attenuate connections between Jesus and earthly qualities.

(64) Mark 6:40 – καὶ ἀνέπεσαν πρασιαὶ πρασιαὶ [□]κατὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ κατὰ πεντήκοντα` (//Matthew 14:19, Luke 19:15, John 6:10; Singular)

(65) Mark 6:41a – καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ^οπέντε ἄρτους (//John 6:11; Singular)

(66) Mark 6:41b – καὶ τοὺς ^οδύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν (//John 6:11; Singular)

(67) Mark 6:41c – καὶ τοὺς ^οδύο ἰχθύας ἐμέρισεν πᾶσιν (//John 6:11; Singular; Lacuna)

(68) Mark 6:44 – καὶ ἦσαν οἱ φαγόντες [□]τοὺς ἄρτους` πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες (//Matthew 14:21)³¹⁴

Among Jesus’s most impressive and memorable deeds of power is the feeding of a crowd of five thousand men. Before distributing the food, Jesus requires the crowd to

³¹¹ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 75–76.

³¹² Peter Head, “Reverential Alterations,” 119.

³¹³ Indeed, if one holds to Markan priority, Matthew himself in the first century may have been the first to notice this potential point of embarrassment and rectify it by declaring that not Jesus but his father was the carpenter.

³¹⁴ P⁴⁵ & D W Θ f¹ f¹³ 1 28 118 205 209 565 700 788 2542. Manuscripts with τοὺς ἄρτους include: A B E F G H K L N U Γ Δ Π Σ 2 13 33 157 180 579 828 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 1506 2427 ℳ. Tischendorf, Legg, Merk, and Souter, prefer τοὺς ἄρτους.

sit down in groups of “hundreds and fifties” (κατὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ κατὰ πενήκοντα).

Neither Matthew, Luke, nor John records this detail. The scribe of P⁴⁵ also leaves out this detail about the seating arrangements in his text of Mark. Royse attributes this omission to a scribal leap from the kappa-alpha at the beginning of κατὰ to the same at the beginning of καὶ in the next sentence.³¹⁵ Hedley, on the other hand, suggests harmonization, which could easily account for the omission.³¹⁶

In Mark 6:41, Jesus takes the five loaves and the two fish, blesses them, and breaks and distributes them. Matthew and Luke parallel the first clause of this passage almost exactly. P⁴⁵ is the only manuscript of Mark that does not mention the number of loaves or the number of fish (nor the number of people, incidentally). It is possible that the omissions have taken place by accident or negligence, but quite unlikely given the pattern. It is more likely that the scribe regarded it as redundant to mention the number of loaves and fish since they had already been enumerated in v. 38.³¹⁷ It is also possible that the scribe has been influenced by the Johannine version of events where the number of loaves is omitted. John introduces the number of loaves and fish in 6:9 and does not repeat the figures in 6:11.

Later in the same verse, the number “two” (δύο) is probably omitted a second time, though the phrase falls in the broken edge of the papyrus. In John 6:11, the number

³¹⁵ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 137, 142. See also Merk, “Codex Evangeliorum et Actuum,” 379, who does not attribute the reading to harmonization; and Couchoud, “Notes sur le texte,” 7–8, who regards the omission as accidental.

³¹⁶ Hedley, “Egyptian Texts,” 31. See also Lagrange, “Les papyrus Chester Beatty,” 12; Comfort, “Scribe as Interpreter,” 108; and Ibid., “Scribes as Readers,” 39. Tarelli, “Omissions, Additions, and Conflations,” 384, groups this reading with other “accidental omissions.” Elliott, “Singular Readings,” also notes that the phrase is absent in the other Gospels.

³¹⁷ So B. Aland, “Chester Beatty Papyri in Early Church History,” 113. See also Elliott, “Singular Readings,” 125.

of fish is not mentioned, so harmonization is a possible explanation. Nevertheless, the scribe's propensity for conciseness is more likely the culprit.

Finally, in Mark 6:44, the evangelist records, “And those eating the bread (τοὺς ἄρτους) were five thousand men.” P⁴⁵, along with Sinaiticus, Bezae, and Washingtonianus, does not have the direct object of the verb (τοὺς ἄρτους). The question is whether the longer reading is older, so that the phrase has been omitted in harmonization to Matthew 14:21, or whether the shorter reading is older, so that the phrase has entered the text as an explanatory addition. Metzger says the witnesses are “evenly divided” between the readings, but this assessment is misleading.³¹⁸ The shorter reading has the benefit of the earliest witness (P⁴⁵) and is found in the Alexandrian, Western, and Pre-Caesarean textual families. By contrast, the longer reading is attested by Vaticanus and a host of Byzantine manuscripts. There is no clear solution to the problem, but the principle of harmonization and the degree to which intrusions from Matthew are found in this pericope may hint that the longer phrase, despite slightly inferior textual evidence, is better and that the variant omission is a result of harmonization.

(69) Mark 6:45a – καὶ εὐθὺς ἠνάγκασεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον

καὶ προάγειν □ εἰς τὸ πέραν ᾧ πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν (//Matthew 14:22;

Lacuna)³¹⁹

(70) Mark 6:45b – ἕως αὐτὸς ᾧ ἀπολύει τὸν ὄχλον (ᾧ ἀπολύση; //Matthew 14:22)³²⁰

³¹⁸ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 78.

³¹⁹ P⁴⁵lac W f¹ 1 118 205 209 1582.

³²⁰ P⁴⁵ A E^c F G H M N S U V W Π Σ Φ Ω 22 33 118 157 205 209 346 1006 1071 1346 1424 m.
Manuscripts with ἀπολύσει include: E* K Γ f³ 2 28 59 66 69 108 237 240 470 473 482 543 579 700 892^c
1241 1342 1506 1582.

After Jesus feeds the crowd, he sends his disciples by boat “to go ahead to the other side (εἰς τὸ πέραν) to Bethsaida.” In the parallel in Matthew 14:22, the disciples cross “to the other side” (εἰς τὸ πέραν), but Matthew does not specify their destination. The scribe of P⁴⁵ has apparently omitted the prepositional phrase, but this portion of the line is lacunose.³²¹ The plausibility of this reconstruction is strengthened when considered with the omission of the same phrase from Mark 5:21. F. C. Burkitt believes that the shorter reading is authentic and that the longer reading is a harmonistic addition made to conform to Matthew 14:22. The external evidence, however, is strongly in favor of the longer reading in Mark. Metzger explains the omission in P⁴⁵ and the small collection of manuscripts that agree with it as an attempt to reconcile the geographical issues, since one would not need to “cross over” to get to Bethsaida.³²²

According to Mark 6:45, Jesus does not plan to follow his disciples “until he releases (ἀπολύει) the crowd.” In Matthew 14:22, the evangelist says, “Until he releases (ἀπολύσῃ) the crowd.” A substantial number of manuscripts of Mark, including P⁴⁵, have adopted Matthew’s subjunctive ἀπολύσῃ. Tarelli regards it as unlikely that a scribe would have chosen a simple present verb if the subjunctive reading were present in their exemplar. Alternatively, he believes harmonization to Matthew accounts for the

³²¹ Kenyon did not attempt to reconstruct this portion of the text. Comfort and Barrett include the longer reading. NA²⁸ cites P^{45vid} for the omission. Swanson conjectures the omission.

³²² Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 79. Hedley, “Egyptian Texts,” 33, regards this variant as a harmonization. Gundry, *Mark*, 339, regards the variant as a harmonization or an omission for the sake of logical clarity.

subjunctive form in many manuscripts, even without the relative identifier οὗ, as it stands in P⁴⁵.³²³

(71) Mark 7:6 – ὁ δὲ Ἦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς (Ἦ ἀποκριθεὶς; //Matthew 15:3)³²⁴

After the feeding of the five thousand, Jesus is approached by scribes and Pharisees who disapprove of his disciples' practice, or lack of practice, of ritual ablutions before eating. Jesus teaches them about true defilement and the purity of the heart. Mark writes, "He said (εἶπεν) to them..." In the parallel in Matthew 15:3, the evangelist writes, "Answering, he said (ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν) to them." It is this reading that is found in the text of Mark in P⁴⁵ and in a majority of manuscripts. The scribe appears to have been influenced by the Matthean reading itself or that Gospel's well known idiom: ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν.³²⁵

(72) Mark 8:10 – καὶ εὐθὺς ἐμβὰς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἦλθεν εἰς

τὰ μέρη Γ Δαλμανουθά (Γ Μαγαδάν, Μαγεδάν, or Μαγδαλάν;

//Matthew 15:39)³²⁶

The manuscripts of Mark present a fair amount of confusion over where Jesus went after the feeding of the four thousand. Most likely the evangelist wrote that Jesus departed "to the region of Dalmanutha" (εἰς τὰ μέρη Δαλμανουθά). In Matthew 15:39,

³²³ Tarelli, "Further Linguistic Aspects," 20–21. A. Collins, *Mark*, 317, recognizes the possibility of harmonization.

³²⁴ P⁴⁵ A D K M N U W X Γ Θ Π Σ Φ f¹ f¹³ 1 2 22 28 69 118 157 372 543 565 700 788 1006 1071 1241 1424 1506 1582 2542 m.

³²⁵ So Lagrange, "Les papyrus Chester Beatty," 13.

³²⁶ P⁴⁵ may have Μαγαδά(ν), with D^c, or Μαγεδά(ν), with 28 565, or Μαγδαλά(ν) with Θ Π f¹ f¹³ 1 205 209 230 271 347 1582* 2542.

some manuscripts have Magadan (Μαγαδάν) and others have Magdalan (Μαγδαλάν).

The first reading is favored by Vaticanus and the initial reading of Sinaiticus, which was later changed to Μαγεδάν. The second reading is found in the majority of manuscripts. It is not necessary to know which was original in Matthew in order to make a decision with regard to the text of Mark in P⁴⁵, where the scribe appears to have designated Μαγαδάν, Μαγεδάν, or Μαγδαλάν as the destination. Only the final two letters of the word are visible, and even these are not clearly legible, so any of these three variants could have been present in P⁴⁵. It is very likely that the parallel passage in Matthew is the source of influence for any of the possible variants.³²⁷

(73) Mark 8:11 – καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ ἤρξαντο συζητεῖν αὐτῷ ζητοῦντες
παρ’ αὐτοῦ σημεῖον ἄπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ³²⁸ πειράζοντες αὐτόν (Ἔκ;
//Matthew 16:1)³²⁹

(74) Mark 8:12 – τί ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη ἵζητεῖ σημεῖον² (ἵσημεῖον αἰτεῖ; //Matthew 16:4,
Luke 11:29; cf. Matthew 12:39, 1 Corinthians 1:22)³³⁰

After he arrives in Dalmanutha, or rather Magadan, the Pharisees request a deed of power and express to Jesus their wish to see some “sign from heaven” (σημεῖον ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ). The parallel passage in Matthew 16:1 records the same question, but with a

³²⁷ Lagrange, “Les papyrus Chester Beatty,” 13; Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 83; Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 186–187; Comfort, “Scribe as Interpreter,” 112–113; and Idem., “Scribes as Readers,” 39.

³²⁸ P⁴⁵vid has σημεῖον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ παρ’ αὐτοῦ ζητοῦντες. No part of the last word is visible, but it must have been transposed from its original position.

³²⁹ P⁴⁵ W f¹³ 69 346 788 1346.

³³⁰ Manuscripts with this word order include: P⁴⁵ A F H K M N U W X Γ Π Σ Φ 0131 f¹³ 2 22 157 1006 1071 1342 1424 1506 ℘, though some retain the Lukan verb in the same or another form.

different preposition: *σημεῖον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*. The scribe has adopted this preposition in his text of Mark and thereby has conformed to Matthew. In his text of Luke 11:16, where a similar phrase is used, the scribe has retained Luke's preposition (*ἐκ*), which might suggest a stylistic preference for the preposition in this context. On six occasions (Mark 8:11; 11:30, 31; Luke 9:54; 10:18; 11:16) the scribe has used the preposition *ἐκ* with *οὐρανός*. By contrast, he has only used *ἀπό* once with *οὐρανός* (Acts 9:3). This variant may be the result of the parallel or the scribe's stylistic preference.

In Mark 8:12, Jesus responds, “Why does this generation seek a sign (*ζητεῖ σημεῖον*)?” The scribe, along with many others, has altered Mark's word order so that the verb comes before the noun. He has done so either under the influence of the parallels in Matthew 16:4 and Luke 11:29 or by the same stylistic impulse that led Matthew and Luke to construct their sentences differently than Mark. In Luke 11:29, the scribe has correctly transcribed the same phrase with noun coming before verb; therefore, it is possible this word order was in the mind of the scribe. The scribe has also replaced Mark's “seek” (*ζητέω*) with “ask” or “demand” (*αἰτέω*), which does not appear elsewhere in this context except in the uncorrected reading of Vaticanus at Matthew 16:4. Harmonization to 1 Corinthians 1:22 is also possible, for there the word order and syntax match. Paul writes, “Jews demand signs” (*Ἰουδαῖοι σημεῖα αἰτοῦσιν*).³³¹

³³¹ Merk, “Codex Evangeliorum et Actum,” 384; and Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 187. Comfort, “Scribe as Interpreter,” 114; and Ibid., “Scribes as Readers,” 39, says the word comes from Matthew 16:4. See also Elliott, “Singular Readings,” 128.

(75) Mark 8:16 – Ἦ καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχουσιν (Ἦ οἱ
 δέ; //Matthew 16:7)³³²

(76) Mark 8:17 – καὶ γνοὺς λέγει αὐτοῖς τί διαλογίσεσθε Ἦ ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε
 (Ἦ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ὀλιγόπιστοι; //Matthew 16:8)³³³

(77) Mark 8:18a – ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες οὐ βλέπετε καὶ ὦτα ἔχοντες οὐκ ἀκούετε Ἦ
 (Ἦ οὐπω νοεῖτε; //Matthew 16:9)³³⁴

(78) Mark 8:18b-19 – Ἦ καὶ οὐ ἂ μνημονεύετε ὅτε τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους ἔκλασα εἰς
 τοὺς³³⁵ πεντακισχιλίου (Ἦ οὐδέ; //Matthew 16:9)³³⁶

(79) Mark 8:20 – ὅτε τοὺς ἑπτὰ Ἦ εἰς τοὺς³³⁷ τετρακισχιλίου πόσων σπυρίδων
 πληρώματα κλασμάτων³³⁸ ἤρατε (Ἦ ἄρτους; //Matthew 16:10)³³⁹

Leaving the Pharisees and their request for a sign, Jesus and his disciples embark on a boat to cross the sea. Jesus warns his disciples to beware the yeast of the Pharisees and the yeast of Herod. Not sure what Jesus is talking about, and wondering whether it has anything to do with forgetting to bring bread for their boat trip, the disciples turn to each other for answers. In Mark 8:16, the evangelist records, “And (καὶ) they discussed

³³² P⁴⁵ W 565.

³³³ P⁴⁵ W f¹³ 61 826. Manuscripts that have only ἐν (ἐ)αυτοῖς include: M 330. Manuscripts that add ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις υμῶν with ὀλιγόπιστοι include: Θ Φ 28 124 271 472 565 700.

³³⁴ P⁴⁵ N Θ Σ 0143^{vid} 565 2542.

³³⁵ P⁴⁵ omits τοὺς.

³³⁶ P⁴⁵ D Θ 565 1342 2542.

³³⁷ P⁴⁵ omits τοὺς.

³³⁸ P⁴⁵ has κλασμάτων πληρώματα.

³³⁹ P^{45vid} & C M^c W Φ f¹³ 21 45 59 64 69 124 247* 346 517 713 788 827 1342 1346 1424.

with one another,” while in Matthew 16:7, the evangelist makes explicit the subject of the sentence: “*they* discussed” (οἱ δὲ διελογίζοντο). P⁴⁵ has adopted this reading from Matthew 16:7. He may also have added the word “disciples” (μαθηταί), but that word falls in a lacuna and is only emended by Comfort and Barrett for the sake of spacing. Regardless, οἱ δέ has come into Mark from Matthew.³⁴⁰

Jesus overhears the disciples’ discussion and, in Mark 8:17, inquires, “Why are you discussing that you do not have bread?” (τί διαλογίζεσθε ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε). The question is expanded in Matthew 16:8, “Why are you discussing *among yourselves*, *you of little faith*, that you do not have bread?” (τί διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ὀλιγόπιστοι ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε). Couchoud wonders if perhaps the scribe skipped over these words by some error and whether they are in fact original to Mark and preserved in Matthew. He deems them “well-suited to the context and even necessary for clarity” and suggests that Mark read a similar passage in Q and transferred them to his own Gospel.³⁴¹ Ultimately, Couchoud concludes that P⁴⁵ preserves the original reading of Mark. It is true that the words suit the context, but the syntax is Matthean. The term ὀλιγόπιστος occurs four times in Matthew (6:30; 8:26; 14:31; 16:8) but never in Mark. Instead of appealing to an unrelated passage in Matthew and Luke (Q) with the keyword ὀλιγόπιστοι, it is easier to acknowledge that the words are Matthean and have entered the Markan text of P⁴⁵ under the influence of Matthew’s narrative upon the scribe.³⁴² Matthew’s diminution of the

³⁴⁰ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 188.

³⁴¹ Couchoud, “Notes sur le texte,” 15: “Le mot ὀλιγόπιστοι convient très bien au contexte et semble même nécessaire pour l’éclairer.”

³⁴² So Lagrange, “Les papyrus Chester Beatty,” 13.

disciples' faith is brought into the Markan narrative where the disciples' failures are already a major theme.

Mark 8:18 potentially includes two separate assimilations to Matthew 16:8–9. In Mark, Jesus quotes Jeremiah 5:21 to his disciples, “Having eyes, do you not see? And having ears, do you not hear?” The Jeremiah passage is only slightly different, “They have eyes and they do not see; they have ears and they do not hear” (ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐ βλέπουσιν ὅσα αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐκ ἀκούουσιν). In P⁴⁵, the scribe has added one further question: “Do you not yet understand?” (οὐπω νοεῖτε). This question may reflect the parallel in Matthew 16:9, but it is equally possible that it is a harmonization to context, since the same question is found in Mark 8:17: “Do you not yet understand nor perceive” (οὐπω νοεῖτε οὐδε συνίετε). The scribe has simply reiterated the question that was already fresh in his mind.

The passage in Mark should continue after the quotation, “And do you not remember (καὶ οὐ μνημονεύετε) when I broke five loaves for five thousand?” In the parallel passage in Matthew 16:9 the two questions are connected to each other because the quotation from Jeremiah is absent. In that Gospel, Jesus asks, “Do you not yet understand nor remember?” (οὐπω νοεῖτε οὐδὲ μνημονεύετε). The scribe has changed the text of Mark to reflect this syntax. Mark's καὶ οὐ is replaced with Matthew's οὐδέ. It is also possible that harmonization to context is at work here since Mark had already used

the οὐπω...οὐδέ construction in v. 17. Given his demonstrated awareness of Matthew's Gospel, harmonization to the parallel may be somewhat more likely.³⁴³

In Mark 8:20, Jesus questions his disciples, “Do you not remember when I broke the five loaves for the five-thousand...or when I broke the seven for the four-thousand?” In the second clause, Jesus does not repeat the word “loaves” (ἄρτους), but refers simply to “the seven” (τοὺς ἑπτὰ). Matthew specifies the noun in both clauses (πέντε ἄρτους...ἑπτὰ ἄρτους). The scribe of P⁴⁵ has also included the noun in both clauses, possibly by harmonization. It is also possible the scribe has done so in order to mirror the first clause.

(80) Mark 8:36 – τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖ ἄνθρωπον Ἦ κερδῆσαι τὸν κόσμον ὅλον καὶ

ζημιωθῆναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ (Ἦ ἐὰν κερδήσῃ; //Matthew 16:26)³⁴⁴

(81) Mark 8:37 – τί γὰρ Ἦ δοῖ ἄνθρωπος ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ (Ἦ δώσει;

//Matthew 10:26)³⁴⁵

(82) Mark 8:38 – καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπαισχυθήσεται αὐτόν ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ

δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἦ μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἁγίων (Ἦ καί; //Luke

9:26)³⁴⁶

In Mark 8:36, Jesus asks his followers, “For what does a man benefit to gain (κερδῆσαι) the whole world and to forfeit his life?” The infinitival form of the second and

³⁴³ So Lagrange, “Les papyrus Chester Beatty,” 13; and Hedley, “Egyptian Texts,” 32. Couchoud, “Notes sur le texte,” 16, regards this reading as original to Mark and suggests that copyists found it redundant and omitted it.

³⁴⁴ P⁴⁵vid A (C) D E F G H K M S U W X Y (Γ) Δ Θ Π Σ Φ Ω f¹ f¹³ 2 (12) (28) (33) 124 157 (472) 565 (579) 700 1006 (1071) 1241 1342 1506 (2542) ℵ.

³⁴⁵ P⁴⁵ A C D K M U W X Γ Θ Π f¹ f¹³ 2 28 33 124 157 565 579 700 788 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1346 1424 1506 2542 ℵ. Merk prefers δώσει.

³⁴⁶ P⁴⁵ W 2542.

third verbs is found in Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and a handful of other manuscripts.³⁴⁷

Despite minimal textual evidence, most editors and commentators prefer this reading.

The reason for this is probably the combined witness of the two fourth-century uncials and the fact that the infinitival reading is less elegant than the subjunctive form found in the majority of texts and in Matthew 16:26 (ἐὰν...κερδήσῃ; ζημιωθῆ). P⁴⁵ contains the subjunctive reading, which became the preferred reading of Mark and entered the Markan text from Matthew.³⁴⁸

Jesus follows this question with another: “For what might a man give (δοῖ) as an exchange for his life?” Again, the majority of manuscripts of Mark have the future tense δώσει of Matthew 16:26. The subjunctive verb (δοῖ) is supported by Vaticanus, the first reading of Sinaiticus, and a miniscule.³⁴⁹ The scanty evidence should incline one to prefer δώσει, but most editors and commentators favor the evidence of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus because it is a less common form and more likely to be changed by scribes, especially if another Gospel contained an easier reading.³⁵⁰

Jesus continues to expound on discipleship and, in Mark 8:38, explains that whoever is ashamed of Jesus and his words, so will the son of man be ashamed of him “when he comes in the glory of his father with (μετά) the holy angels.” In Luke 9:26, the evangelist says that the son of man will come in his own glory and the glory of the father and the holy angels (ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων).

³⁴⁷ (L) 0214^{vid} 892 1424 2427.

³⁴⁸ A. Collins, *Mark*, attributes this reading to assimilation. So also Lagrange, “Les papyrus Chester Beatty,” 13.

³⁴⁹ 2427^{vid}.

³⁵⁰ Tarelli, “Linguistic Aspects,” 256; and Lagrange, “Les papyrus Chester Beatty,” 13.

The scribe of P⁴⁵ has copied this passage faithfully in his text of Luke. In the text of Mark, the scribe has adopted the wording of Luke.³⁵¹ In this case, the content of the passage is changed so that the son of man does not come *with* the angels, as in Mark and Matthew, but in the glory of the angels. As a sub-singular reading, this variant is of special interest in characterizing the scribe as not simply copying but also interpreting and clarifying as he writes.

(83) Mark 9:2 – και ^τ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν³⁵² (^τ ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι αὐτούς; //Luke 9:29)³⁵³

(84) Mark 9:5a – και ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦ (εἶπεν Πέτρος; //Luke 9:33)³⁵⁴

(85) Mark 9:5b – ῥαββὶ καλὸν ἐστὶν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι και ποιήσωμεν ^τ τρεῖς σκηνάς σοὶ μίαν και Μωϋσεῖ μίαν και Ἡλίου μίαν (^τ ὧδε; //Matthew 17:4)³⁵⁵

(86) Mark 9:7 – και ἐγένετο νεφέλη ἐπισκιάζουσα ἑαυτοῖς (ἑαυτούς; //Matthew 17:5, Luke 9:34)³⁵⁶

³⁵¹ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 84. Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 188 n. 424, summarizes Tasker's argument for the originality of the conjunction and the supposition that manuscripts with *μετά* have been harmonized to Matthew. See also R. V. G. Tasker, "Notes on Variant Readings," in *The Greek New Testament: Being the Text Translated in the New English Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964), 411–445, 415; and Larry W. Hurtado, *Text-Critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text: Codex W in the Gospel of Mark*, SD 43 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 64. A. Collins, *Mark*, 397, attributes the variant to either "an independent attempt to reduce the mythic-realistic apocalyptic character of this saying or from the influence of the parallel in Luke 9:26." The latter is more likely.

³⁵² P⁴⁵ adds ὁ Ἰησοῦς after μετεμορφώθη and omits ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν.

³⁵³ P^{45vid} W (Θ) f¹³ (28) 69 124 346 (472) 543 (565).

³⁵⁴ P⁴⁵ W.

³⁵⁵ P⁴⁵ C W Θ 565 1093 1342.

³⁵⁶ P^{45vid} H* U W f¹³ 28 69 108 124 238 330 472 481 517 1006 1071 1424 1506.

(87) Mark 9:8 – καὶ ἐξάπινα περιβλεψάμενοι °οὐκέτι οὐδένα εἶδον ἀλλὰ τὸν

Ἰησοῦν μόνον μεθ' ἐαυτῶν (//Matthew 17:8; Sub-singular P^{45lac} 59

225 565; Lacuna)

The transfiguration scene is another pericope in which the scribe has introduced a large number of harmonizing readings. Mark records that Jesus took three of his disciples up a high mountain where he “was transfigured before them” (καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν). Mark does not make the purpose of the ascent explicit. Luke’s record of the event contains some unique details. First, in Luke 9:29, the evangelist explains the purpose of the trip: Jesus ascends the mountain “to pray” (προσεύξασθαι). Second, Luke records that Jesus was transfigured “while he was praying” (ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι αὐτόν). The scribe would have been well aware of this detail since he copied it faithfully in his text of Luke. Even though Mark does not mention prayer as being a part of the transfiguration narrative, the text in P⁴⁵ includes this second detail in harmonization to Luke 9:29.³⁵⁷

It seems probable, though, that the scribe has not intentionally harmonized his account to Luke since he does not introduce the first detail that prayer was the purpose of the ascent. He includes the second detail, namely that Jesus was transfigured while in prayer, because of his own recollection of the event. This is precisely the type of vivid and evocative scene where one might expect the scribe’s imagination to be working

³⁵⁷ Tarelli, “Omissions, Additions, and Conflations,” 384, discusses this addition but does not mention the parallel. Lagrange, “Les papyrus Chester Beatty,” 13; Hedley, “Egyptian Texts,” 32; and B. Aland, “Chester Beatty Papyri in Early Church History,” 114, reference the parallel. A. Collins, *Mark*, 414, thinks assimilation is probable. Couchoud, “Notes sur le texte,” 17, concedes that this passage comes from Luke.

alongside his hand. He envisions Jesus at prayer when the metamorphosis takes place, and so writes what he sees in his mind rather than what he sees in the exemplar.

Peter is dumbfounded after Jesus has been transfigured and the great prophets of the past, Elijah and Moses, arrive to speak with his master. Mark records, “Answering, Peter says (ἀποκριθείς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει) to Jesus, ‘Rabbi, it is good for us to be here.’” The syntax of the introduction to Peter’s speech is slightly different in Luke, where it is recorded that “Peter said (εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος) to Jesus...” This word order, with subject following verb, and the use of the second aorist verb instead of the present, is the reading found in P⁴⁵, only without the definite article (ὁ). The scribe copied the Luke passage correctly earlier in the codex, so it is not unlikely that Luke’s version of the transfiguration would have been an influential source of material in his text of Mark’s narrative.³⁵⁸

Peter proposes that they build three tents for the three men. In Mark 9:5, he says, “Let us make three tents” (ποιήσωμεν τρεῖς σκηνάς). The phrase is identical in Luke. In Matthew 17:4, however, the evangelist has the adverb “here” and makes Peter the sole builder: “I will make *here* three tents” (ποιήσω ὧδε τρεῖς σκηνάς). The scribe of P⁴⁵ has adopted the adverb ὧδε under the influence of Matthew 17:4.³⁵⁹

Even as Peter finishes speaking, Luke records that “a cloud enveloped them (αὐτοῖς).” Mark uses the dative pronoun αὐτοῖς where both Matthew and Luke have the accusative pronoun αὐτούς. In the manuscript, only one word is visible on this line and

³⁵⁸ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 161, 188, also finds harmonization likely, but mentions that some scribes may have preferred a different word order on an individual basis. So also Lagrange, “Les papyrus Chester Beatty,” 13.

³⁵⁹ So Lagrange, “Les papyrus Chester Beatty,” 13.

only three of its letters are clear (α]ύτ[ο]ύ[ς]). Despite the lack of complete clarity, the second epsilon makes it clear that the scribe has written αὐτούς, adopting the reading from one of the parallels. It is sure from the text of Luke that the scribe copied Luke's accusative reading faithfully. The grammar of that passage probably effected his text of Mark.³⁶⁰

After the voice speaks from the crowd, the evangelist relates in Mark 9:8 that the disciples, “suddenly looking around, saw no one any longer (οὐκέτι).” Matthew narrates similarly, “And raising their eyes they saw no one” (ἐπάραντες δὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν οὐδένα εἶδον). The word “no longer” (οὐκέτι) has apparently dropped out of Mark under the influence of Matthew 17:8. In P⁴⁵, the word would have fallen in a lacuna, but the gap is too short so that it must have been omitted. Homoioarcton could also account for this variant, but given the strong inclination toward assimilation at work in this pericope, not to mention the manuscript as a whole, harmonization is somewhat more likely.³⁶¹

(88) Mark 9:19a – ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτοῖς ᾤ (ᾤ Ἰησοῦς; //Matthew 17:17, Luke 9:41)³⁶²

(89) Mark 9:19b – ἔλεγεν (ἔειπεν; //Matthew 17:17, Luke 9:41)³⁶³

(90) Mark 9:19c – ὡς γενεὰ ἄπιστος ἕως πότε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔσομαι (καὶ διεστραμμένη; //Matthew 17:17, Luke 9:41)³⁶⁴

³⁶⁰ So Lagrange, “Les papyrus Chester Beatty,” 13.

³⁶¹ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 144, 188, also points out that a scribal leap from the diphthong in οὐκέτι to the diphthong in οὐδένα could account for the omission.

³⁶² P⁴⁵ W Θ J¹³ 28 124 565.

³⁶³ P⁴⁵ Θ 73 472 565 1071.

(91) Mark 9:28a – καὶ εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ³⁶⁵ εἰς οἶκον` (//Matthew 17:19;

Singular)

(92) Mark 9:28b – ^τ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ³⁶⁶ κατ' ἰδίαν ^τ ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν³⁶⁷

(^τ προσῆλθον...αὐτῶ; //Matthew 17:19)³⁶⁸

Jesus descends the mountain of his transfiguration and immediately encounters a boy possessed by a spirit. Upon finding that his disciples have been unable to cast out the demon, Jesus expresses his exasperation at the wickedness of the generation and his disciples' failure to heal the boy. Mark records in 9:19, “And answering them he says...” (ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτοῖς λέγει). Matthew 17:17 and Luke 9:41 have a slightly different introduction: “And answering, *Jesus* said...” (ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν). It appears that the scribe of P⁴⁵ has been influenced by a parallel version of the narrative. He has inserted the name of the speaker (ὁ Ἰησοῦς) and has shifted the tense of the verb from present to the aorist εἶπεν.³⁶⁹ He has nevertheless retained the plural pronoun αὐτοῖς, referring to the spectators, despite its absence in the other Synoptics.

Jesus mourns over the “faithless generation” (γενεὰ ἄπιστος) he must endure.

Matthew and Luke both describe the generation as “faithless *and perverted*” (ἄπιστος καὶ

³⁶⁴ P⁴⁵vid W f¹³ 13 69 124 157 544 1574 2542.

³⁶⁵ P⁴⁵ has εἰσελθόντι αὐτῶι.

³⁶⁶ Kenyon's transcription does not show κατ' ἰδίαν. It seems that he believed there was not enough space for the phrase. Comfort and Barrett include κατ' ἰδίαν following μαθηταὶ and have the pronoun αὐτῶ in the place of Kenyon's αὐτοῦ.

³⁶⁷ P⁴⁵ has καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτόν λέγοντες.

³⁶⁸ P⁴⁵vid W Θ f¹³ 28 543 565 700.

³⁶⁹ Hedley, “Egyptian Texts,” 32; and Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 188.

διεστραμμένη). P⁴⁵ has adopted this longer reading from the Synoptic parallels.³⁷⁰ The line is broken, but the final three letters of the participle (-ενη-) are legible. Couchoud posits that the longer reading is original to Mark on the basis of its presence in Matthew and Luke.³⁷¹ This argument is not compelling given the external evidence for the shorter reading. It is very probable that the source of this reading in P⁴⁵ is one of the parallels.

After the exorcism, in Mark 9:28, the evangelist records that Jesus and his disciples entered a house. This detail is not included in the Matthean parallel and the change in location is passed over in Luke. In P⁴⁵, the phrase εἰς οἶκον has been omitted so that there is no mention of the house. It is likely that the scribe has assimilated his narrative to Matthew 17:19.³⁷²

In the second part of the verse, the scribe has further conformed to Matthew's episode. Matthew begins the second phrase of v. 19 with the verb προσέρχομαι: "Then the disciples, coming (προσελθόντες) to Jesus alone, said..." The scribe has brought this verb into the Markan account, albeit in the indicative (προσῆλθον) rather than participial form. Matthew's τῷ Ἰησοῦ has become αὐτῷ, which has then been transposed to follow κατ' ἰδίαν.³⁷³

³⁷⁰ Lagrange, "Les papyrus Chester Beatty," 13; and Elliott, "Singular Readings," 126. The scribe has copied the passage correctly in Luke 9:41.

³⁷¹ Couchoud, "Notes sur le texte," 17.

³⁷² Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 135, 187, concurs with this interpretation of the reading, but does not mention the influence of Matthew 17:19 on the addition of προσῆλθον because it is not a singular or sub-singular reading. Colwell, "Scribal Habits," 120, attributes this reading to the desire of the scribe to smooth out the rough spots in Mark. Couchoud, "Notes sur le texte," 18, regards this as an accidental omission.

³⁷³ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 156 n. 256, explains how this reading could have come from the text found in W Θ^f 28 565 700, but with a simple transposition.

(93) Mark 11:29 – ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ἐπερωτήσω³⁷⁴ ὑμᾶς ᾠ ἕνα λόγον καὶ

ἀποκρίθητέ μοι καὶ ἐρῶ ὑμῖν ἐν ποῖα ἐξουσία ταῦτα ποιῶ (ᾠ κάγω;

//Matthew 21:24, Luke 20:3; Lacuna)³⁷⁵

Toward the beginning of Mark’s passion narrative, the chief priests, scribes, and elders of Jerusalem test Jesus with questions and interrogate him regarding the source of his authority. Jesus responds, “I will ask you one thing (ἐπερωτήσω ὑμᾶς ἕνα λόγον), and answer me and I will tell you by what authority I am doing these things.” In the parallels in Matthew 21:24 and Luke 20:3, the crasis κάγω is found instead of καί plus the first-person pronoun, emphasizing Jesus’s part of the bargain: “*And I* will ask you...” (ἐρωτήσω ὑμᾶς κάγω). This portion of P⁴⁵ is badly damaged, but Comfort and Barrett emend the reading ὑμας κάγω in the lacuna. If this was the reading of P⁴⁵, it has very probably entered his text by way of one of the parallels.

(94) Mark 12:15 – τί με πειράζετε ᾠ (ᾠ ὑποκριταί; //Matthew 22:18)³⁷⁶

Jesus encounters more turmoil with the religious leaders in Mark 12:15, where the Pharisees and Herodians question Jesus about paying taxes to Caesar. Jesus responds, “Why do you test me?” (τί με πειράζετε). In the parallel in Matthew 22:18, Jesus calls his questioners “hypocrites” (ὑποκριταί). This word also appears in P⁴⁵. Couchoud argues that Matthew found this word already in Mark, where it was omitted by many

³⁷⁴ P⁴⁵ has ἐπερώτω.

³⁷⁵ P^{45lac} ⋈ A D G K M N W X Y Γ Θ Π Σ Φ Ω f¹ f¹³ 11 28 33 72 118 157 473 517 559 565 579 700 892 (1006) 1071 1241 1342 1424 (1506) 2542 ℣.

³⁷⁶ P⁴⁵ F G N W Θ Σ f¹ f¹³ 1 13 28 33 61 69 91 205 299 495 543 565 579 1542 2542.

manuscripts to avoid repetition.³⁷⁷ Aside from the Pre-Caesarean and Byzantine witnesses, though, the external evidence for the reading is not strong. The scribe of P⁴⁵ has created a variant that assimilates this passage to Matthew and, in so doing, has raised the invective of the encounter.³⁷⁸

Preliminary Summary of Harmonization in the Text of Mark

Thirty-six variants in the text of Mark in P⁴⁵ have been analyzed. One of these did not involve harmonization (69). Fourteen may have involved harmonization, but they have been excluded here. The remaining twenty-one readings demonstrate the strong influence of Matthew and not a negligible number of readings reflect the text of Luke. The text of Mark confirms a preference for the First Gospel in P⁴⁵.

Table 10. Sources of Harmonization in the Text of Mark in P⁴⁵

Source of Harmonization	Total: 21	Entry Number
Matthew	12	63, 70, 71, 72, 75, 76, 80, 81, 85, 91, 92, 94
Luke	3	82, 83, 84
Matthew or Luke	5	61, 86, 88, 89, 90
Synoptics	1	64

Summary of Harmonization in P⁴⁵

Lagrange believes the scribe of P⁴⁵ produced a text “with a minimum of harmonizations.”³⁷⁹ This analysis shows that quite the opposite is true. Of the ninety-four variants analyzed, thirty-seven are likely and fifteen very likely to have been created under the influence of Synoptic parallels. A further thirty-three may have arisen by harmonization, though these will be excluded from the following figures. Nine variants

³⁷⁷ Couchoud, “Notes sur le texte,” 19–20.

³⁷⁸ So also Hedley, “Egyptian Texts,” 31.

³⁷⁹ Lagrange, “Les papyrus Chester Beatty,” 40: “Avec un minimum d’harmonisations.”

did not involve harmonization. There are a total of fifty-two readings that can confidently be ascribed to harmonization. Furthermore, seven of these fifty-two are singular readings and nine more are sub-singular. The evidence gathered here proves that the scribe of P⁴⁵ was heavily influenced by parallel material and regularly allowed those external influences to alter the text he was copying.

Table 11. Quality of Harmonization in P⁴⁵

Total Number of Readings		Total: 94	Entry Number
Quality of Harmonization			
	Very Likely	15	2, 13, 23, 24, 25, 26, 37, 38, 46, 63, 72, 76, 83, 90, 94
	Likely	37	5, 14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 29, 30, 33, 36, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 47, 48, 50, 54, 56, 57, 58, 61, 64, 70, 71, 75, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 91, 92
	Possible	33	1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 22, 27, 31, 32, 44, 51, 52, 53, 55, 59, 60, 62, 65, 66, 67, 68, 73, 74, 77, 78, 79, 87, 93
	Unlikely	9	8, 17, 20, 28, 34, 35, 39, 49, 69

Beyond the singular and sub-singular harmonizations, there are four uncommon harmonizations in P⁴⁵. Three of these (75, 82, 84) are common to P⁴⁵ and a few representatives of the Pre-Caesarean text type, especially Washingtonianus, further supporting this manuscript's affinities with that type.

The scribe of P⁴⁵ often harmonized the text he was copying to one or the other of the Synoptic Gospels, especially Matthew. "One Gospel version (that of Matthew's) had especially become so much a part of his 'horizon of expectation' that he could not accommodate himself to the new wording in another version of the Gospel."³⁸⁰ This study confirms Comfort's observation: "The Gospel of Matthew was predominant in the

³⁸⁰ Comfort, "Scribes as Readers," 38–39.

scribe's thinking; it formed his horizon of expectation—a horizon by which he read all the other Gospels."³⁸¹ Whether because he had most of Matthew memorized, as Comfort suspects, or because he had recently copied Matthew, the scribe was well aware of Matthew's version of gospel material and frequently conformed Mark and Luke to the expectations set by the First Gospel.

Harmonization has mostly taken place by substitution. The scribe of P⁴⁵ further confirms what was learned with P⁷⁵ and the smaller manuscripts of the Gospels; namely, that scribes in the second and third century were more likely to substitute parallel material, especially grammatical forms, than to add or omit material with reference to parallels. This pattern will persist in the fourth and fifth centuries. Beyond substitution, the scribe was more likely to add parallel material by harmonization than to omit material absent from the parallels.

The scribe was more likely to alter words of Jesus than parts of the gospel narrative. This pattern aligns with the evidence from Chapter Two and from P⁷⁵. It seems likely that scribes more often memorized or focused on Jesus's teaching than the framework within which Jesus's words were contextualized.

About 75 percent of harmonizing variants in P⁴⁵ consist of one-word alterations. The scribe was not at all prone to longer changes. This confirms the evidence gathered from other manuscripts in the early centuries and will continue to be the case in the fourth and fifth centuries.

P⁴⁵ also further confirms that verbs and verbal phrases were more likely to be altered by parallel influence than other parts of speech. P⁴⁵ is remarkable, though, for the

³⁸¹ Comfort, "Scribes as Readers," 39.

number of harmonistic alterations that have occurred with pronouns. Colwell's assessment that the scribe was preoccupied with pronouns is affirmed. In most cases, the alterations to pronouns are substitutions and there are no harmonizing omissions of pronouns.

Table 12. Harmonization in P⁴⁵

Frequency of Harmonization	Total: 52	Entry Number
Singular	7	2, 13, 19, 23, 46, 64, 91
Sub-singular	9	15, 25, 29, 30, 37, 41, 43, 47, 54
Uncommon	4	33, 75, 82, 84
Sources of Harmonization		
Matthew	35	14, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 33, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 56, 57, 58, 63, 70, 71, 72, 75, 76, 80, 81, 85, 91, 92, 94
Mark	2	15, 18
Luke	4	41, 82, 83, 84
Matthew, Mark	3	13, 30, 54
Matthew, Luke	5	61, 86, 88, 89, 90
Mark, Luke	1	2
Matthew, Luke, John	1	64
Luke, 1 Corinthians	1	5
Type of Harmonization		
Substitution	31	2, 13, 14, 18, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 33, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 47, 48, 50, 56, 58, 63, 70, 72, 75, 80, 81, 82, 84, 86, 89
Addition	15	5, 24, 36, 45, 46, 57, 61, 71, 76, 83, 85, 88, 90, 92, 94
Omission	5	15, 19, 54, 64, 91
Transposition	1	21
Context of Harmonization		
Words of Jesus	31	19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 33, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 54, 56, 57, 58, 76, 80, 81, 82, 90, 94
Narrative	18	2, 5, 13, 14, 15, 61, 64, 70, 71, 72, 75, 83, 84, 86, 88, 89, 91, 92
Other Dialogue	2	63, 85
Narrative, Other Dialogue	1	18
Extent of Harmonization		
One Word	39	2, 5, 13, 14, 15, 18, 23, 24, 26, 30, 33, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 47, 48, 50, 54,

			56, 57, 58, 61, 70, 71, 72, 75, 80, 81, 82, 85, 86, 89, 92, 94
	Two Words	6	19, 21, 25, 88, 90, 91
	Three Words	3	29, 63, 76
	Four+ Words	4	46, 64, 83, 84
Part of Speech			
	Verb	17	13, 14, 15, 30, 36, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 54, 61, 70, 71, 80, 81, 89
	Verb Phrase	7	19, 21, 29, 83, 84, 90, 92
	Noun	5	18, 23, 37, 47, 94
	Noun Phrase	2	46, 63
	Pronoun	7	24, 33, 45, 48, 50, 58, 86
	Proper Noun (w/article)	2	72, (88)
	Article	1	5
	Preposition	1	82
	Prepositional Phrase	4	25, 64, 76, 91
	Conjunction	2	57, 75
	Adjective	1	26
	Adverb	2	2, 85
	Particle	1	56

A few other features of this scribe's procedure are now clear. For instance, the scribe exhibits a tendency to harmonize in bursts, suggesting that different versions of particular narratives were more firmly fixed in his mind than others. Perhaps the best example of this predilection is the transfiguration scene. In the text of Luke, there are five harmonizing variants within eight verses, most of them likely or very likely. Turning to Mark, there are another five assimilating readings in the transfiguration episode. The scribe conforms this episode in every direction, and with the Markan and Lukan episodes extant to compare, one can see that the scribe has not produced identical scenes. The transfiguration episode, with all of its unique details from three versions, has been dynamically reworked at each new copying. Furthermore, in the text of Mark, the scene immediately following the transfiguration exhibits five more harmonizing variants. This demonstrates that the scribe, who usually assimilates once or twice in a given pericope,

was prone to assimilate in bursts in particular scenes that were more familiar to him in alternate versions than others. Other examples include Jesus's teachings on anxiety in the double tradition pericopae of Luke 12:2–9 (four harmonizing variants) and Luke 12:22–32 (five harmonizing variants).

CHAPTER FOUR

FRAGMENTARY MANUSCRIPTS OF THE FOURTH CENTURY

The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Fourth Century

There is a relative wealth of fourth-century manuscripts of the Synoptic Gospels, even if most are fragmentary. There are four fragments of Mark, eleven of Matthew, and two of Luke. In addition, there are two great majuscule Bibles from this period, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus. Codex Vaticanus will be analyzed in Chapter Five.

Manuscripts of Mark¹

P⁸⁸ (P.Med. 69.24) – Mark 2:1–26

P⁸⁸ is the most extensive fragmentary manuscript of the Gospel of Mark from the fourth century.² The manuscript contains about twenty-six verses of Mark 2 and is the earliest manuscript to witness these verses. The script is biblical uncial and certain aspects of the paleography lead Sergio Daris to assign the manuscript to the “last years of the fourth century AD.”³ The provenance of the papyrus is unknown. Daris classifies the

¹ P.Oxy. 5073, a late third- or early fourth-century amulet of Mark 1:1–2, might have been of some interest here, but does not contain harmonizing variants. G. S. Smith and A. E. Bernhard make a convincing argument that the amulet should be considered important among the continuous text manuscripts because (1) manuscripts of Mark are rare, (2) it is quite old, and (3) it is the first manuscript of Mark to be found at Oxyrhynchus. See D. Colomo and J. Chapa, eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 76, Graeco Roman Memoirs 97 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2011), 19–23 and Plate I.

² For the *ed. pr.* see Sergio Daris, “Papiri letterari dell’Università Cattolica di Milano,” *Aeg* 52 (1972): 80–88. See also K. Aland, *Repertorium*, 322; Kurt Treu, “Christliche Papyri VI,” *APF* 26 (1978): 149–159, 154; Comfort, *Early Manuscripts*, 67–68; Head, “Observations,” 246; and K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste*, 15. See also Head, “Early Text of Mark,” 117–118.

³ Daris, “Papiri letterari,” 80: “...negli ultimi anni del secolo quarto d. C.”

text as Alexandrian, but it is too short to be certain.⁴ Most of the few variants in the text are orthographic, but some omissions occur, for which reason Daris characterizes the scribe's accuracy as poor. Aland and Aland place the text in their category III, which includes manuscripts of a free or independent character that are, nevertheless, important for establishing the text of the New Testament.⁵

(1) Mark 2:5 – καὶ ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ τέκνον

ἴ ἀφιένται σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι (Γ ἀφέωνται; //Luke 5:20)⁶

(2) Mark 2:10 – ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἴ ἀφιέναι

ἁμαρτίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς² (ἴ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας; //Matthew 9:6, Luke 5:24)⁷

In the episode of the paralytic in Mark 2:5, Jesus turns to the disabled man and says, “Child, your sins are forgiven (ἀφιένται).” In Matthew 9:2, the verb is also in the present tense, but in Luke 5:20, the verb is perfect (ἀφέωνται) and would be rendered “your sins *have been* (are) forgiven.” Matthew and Mark never use the perfect form of this verb, but it is found four times in Luke (5:20, 23; 7:47, 48). The textual evidence for the perfect reading in Mark, and to a lesser degree Matthew, is conflicting. In manuscripts of Mark, ἀφέωνται is found in the Byzantine majority, including Alexandrinus, important manuscripts of the Alexandrian (Ⲭ C) and Western (D) types,

⁴ Daris, “Papiri letterari,” 82.

⁵ Aland and Aland, *Text*, 102.

⁶ P⁸⁸ Ⲭ A C D E G H K L M U W Γ Θ Π Σ Ω 090 0130 f¹ f¹³ 22 157 180 205 346 543 579 597 700 892 1006 1071 1243 1292 1424 1505 1506 2542 ℣. Souter prefers ἀφέωνται.

⁷ P⁸⁸ Ⲭ C D H L M Δ Θ Σ 090 0130 7 33 118 205 209 270 348 349 472 517 544 579 700 892 1038 1071 1241 1342 1424 2542 ℣. Tischendorf and Souter prefer ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας.

and here in P⁸⁸. These witnesses stand against the present tense reading of Vaticanus, miniscule 33, and a few others. Even so, most commentators and editors prefer ἀφιένται. Indirect supporting evidence for the present reading may be inferred from the parallel passage in Matthew 9:2. In that context, the best witnesses have the present reading, which Matthew, on the basis of Markan Priority, would have received from Mark. Adela Collins supposes the popular variant is “an attempt to improve the Greek, possibly under the influence of the parallel in Luke 5:20.”⁸

In Mark 2:10, one must decide which reading is older before assessing the variants for harmonization. Jesus claims, “The son of man has authority to forgive sins on the earth” (ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς). The words in this verse have been transposed in several permutations in the manuscripts. The two most common iterations either have the prepositional phrase after the verb and noun (ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς), or before the verb and noun (ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας). The preposition-first reading is likely secondary, created under the influence of the parallel in either of the other Synoptics.⁹

(3) Mark 2:16 – ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (ἢ καὶ πίνει; //Luke 5:30)¹⁰

⁸ A. Collins, *Mark*, 181 n. d. See also Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 66.

⁹ On the basis of Markan priority, Matthew and Luke would have been among the first to improve upon Mark’s word order and style. Their alteration would eventually take hold in the Markan manuscript tradition.

¹⁰ P⁸⁸ A E F H K M U Γ Π J¹ 2 13 28 33 157 180 205 543 579 597 828 892 1006 1010 1292 1505 1506 2542 ℳ. Manuscripts that conform to Luke entirely or with some variation include: G Σ 124 244 349 495 517 565 700 1241 1424. Manuscripts that add ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν before or after this phrase in harmonization to Matthew 9:11 (with some variations) include: Ⲛ C L M S U V Γ Δ Π Φ J¹³ 69 248 346 348 472 579 788 827 1071 1243 1342 1346.

(4) Mark 2:17 – και ἀκούσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει ὁ αὐτοῖς (//Matthew 9:12)¹¹

Some scribes and Pharisees observe Jesus eating with sinners and tax collectors and ask his disciples, “Why does he eat with the tax collectors and sinners?” In the parallel in Luke 5:30, Jesus’s opponents ask a similar question: “Why do you eat *and drink* with the tax collectors and sinners?” (διὰ τί μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίετε καὶ πίνετε). The scribe of P⁸⁸ has adopted the additional part of the question about drinking in his copy of Mark.¹²

The scribe has also omitted the dative pronoun referring to the audience after the verb of speech in Mark 2:17. It is possible that the scribe was influenced by the Matthean parallel, where Jesus speaks, but no listener is specified (ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας εἶπεν).

(5) Mark 2:22 – ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς † († βλητέον; //Luke 5:38)¹³

In Mark 2:22, Jesus uses wineskins and new wine as an illustration. He says, “But new wine (goes) into new wineskins” (ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς). In Mark’s construction, the verb is implied by ellipsis from earlier in the verse. Luke, however, makes the action explicit by adding a verbal adjective, “But new wine *must be put* (βλητέον) into new wineskins.”¹⁴ Metzger regards the addition of βλητέον from Luke 5:38 as a scribal error that has resulted because some scribes overlooked the parenthetical nature of the comment in Mark. The verb from earlier in the verse (βάλλει) should be

¹¹ P⁸⁸ D W f¹ 28 205 209.

¹² Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 67, claims the addition is “a natural accretion inserted by copyists, perhaps under the influence of the parallel passage in Lk 5.30.”

¹³ P⁸⁸ κ^c A C E F G H K L M U Y Γ Δ Θ Π Σ Φ 074 f¹ f¹³ 2 28 33 124 157 180 205 565 579 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 1506 2542 ℞.

¹⁴ Other manuscripts adopt βάλλουσιν from Matthew 9:17.

inferred in the parenthetical part of the passage, but scribes who did not make this connection supplied a different verb from the parallels.¹⁵

The scribe of P⁸⁸ has created or perpetuated several harmonizing readings, but he does not follow a consistent pattern. In the four variants likely to have been caused by harmonization, he has added, omitted, substituted, and transposed. His text has been conformed both to Matthew and to Luke. Of the manuscripts of Mark in this period, P⁸⁸ is the only one to transmit variants that must have come from Luke (1, 3, 5) and could not have come from Matthew. It is possible that the Gospel of Luke formed the scribe's horizon of expectation instead of Matthew. The sporadic nature of the harmonizing variants suggests that he has not made a deliberate attempt to assimilate his text to another; his manuscript instead shows the pervasive influence of parallel Gospels upon the scribe.

0188 (P.Berlin 13416) – Mark 11:11–17¹⁶

A. H. Salenius initially dated parchment manuscript 0188 to the 7th century on the basis of its majuscule script and certain paleographical features, but a date in the fourth or possibly fifth century was later put forward by Kurt Treu and is more likely.¹⁷ The provenance of this manuscript is unknown, but it was purchased in Hermopolis and so likely originated somewhere in Egypt. There are a fair number of variants for so short a

¹⁵ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 67. See also A. Collins, *Mark*, 196–197 n. c.

¹⁶ For the *ed. pr.* see A. H. Salenius, “Die griechischen Handschriftenfragmente des Neuen Testaments in den Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin,” *ZNW* 26 (1927): 97–119, 100. Kurt Treu, “Zur vermeintlichen Kontraktion von ΙΕΡΟΣΟΛΥΜΑ in 0188, Berlin P. 13416,” *ZNW* 52 (1961): 278–279, offers a correction to two lines of Salenius's transcription. See also Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 143–144 no. 396.

¹⁷ Salenius, “Die griechischen Handschriftenfragmente,” 100. Kurt Treu, “Neue neutestamentliche Fragmente,” 24; and K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste*, 35, maintain a fourth-century date.

text, especially omissions. Saloniuss writes, “The fragment comprises only 41 short lines, but exhibits a text which differs considerably from that of the best majuscules.”¹⁸ Saloniuss offers some brief comments on the textual affinities of the manuscript, noting especially that the text differs from Codex Bezae in several important readings. He posits some affiliation with Codices E, G, and H, from the Byzantine type. Kirsopp Lake, Robert Blake, and Silva New regard the text as a strong supporter of the “Caesarean” type, at the time of its publication calling it “the most important new contribution to our knowledge of the witnesses for the Θ-family.”¹⁹ Writing some years later, Henry Sanders draws attention to several distinctive Western readings in the fragment and concludes that the text is a mixture of “Caesarean” and Western types with no distinctive Alexandrian readings.²⁰ Seven variants are worth attention here.

(6) Mark 11:13a – καὶ ἰδὼν συκῆν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἔχουσαν φύλλα ἦλθεν

(//Matthew 21:19; Singular)

(7) Mark 11:13b – εἰ ἄρα τι εὐρήσει²¹ ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ²² ἐλθὼν ἐπ’ αὐτήν²³ οὐδὲν εὔρειν^τ

εἰ μὴ φύλλα²⁴ (τ ἐν αὐτῇ; //Matthew 21:19; Sub-singular 0188 579)

¹⁸ Saloniuss, “Die griechischen Handschriftenfragmente,” 101: “Das Bruchstück umfaßt nur 41 kurze Zeilen, weist aber einen Text auf, der sich beträchtlich von dem der besten Majuskeln unterscheidet.”

¹⁹ Kirsopp Lake, Robert P. Blake, and Silva New, “The Caesarean Text of the Gospel of Mark,” *HTR* 21 (1928): 207–404, 212–213. See Metzger, “Caesarean Text of the Gospels,” 47–48, for a helpful review of the history of the “Caesarean” text type.

²⁰ Henry A. Sanders, “The Egyptian Text of the Four Gospels and Acts,” *HTR* 27 (1933): 77–98, 83–87.

²¹ 0188 has ὡς εὐρησῶν τι.

²² 0188 replaces καὶ with δέ after the verb.

²³ 0188 omits ἐπ’ αὐτήν.

²⁴ 0188 omits εἰ μὴ φύλλα.

(8) Mark 11:13c – ‘ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν σύκων’ (‘οὐ γὰρ ἦν καρπὸς σύκων;
//Matthew 21:19; Singular)

The scribe of MS 0188 has substantially reworked Mark’s episode of Jesus cursing the fig tree. In Mark 11:13, the evangelist records that on one occasion Jesus was hungry and, seeing a fig tree “with leaves” (ἔχουσιν φύλλα), went to it to find something to eat. Matthew’s version of this story follows the same outline, but he does not include the detail that the tree was in leaf as a motivation for Jesus to walk the distance in search of food. The scribe of this copy of Mark has omitted the same detail about the leaves under the influence of the Matthean parallel. He has also omitted mention of leaves later in the verse, though not as a result of harmonization.

In the second part of the verse, Mark says, “Coming to it he found nothing except leaves” (ἔλθων ἐπ’ αὐτήν οὐδὲν εὔρεν εἰ μὴ φύλλα). In Matthew 21:19, the evangelist records that Jesus found “nothing *on it* except leaves only” (καὶ οὐδὲν εὔρεν ἐν αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ φύλλα μόνον). The scribe of MS 0188 has adopted this construction from Matthew by adding ἐπ’ αὐτήν after εὔρεν. He has compensated for this alteration by omitting the first instance of ἐπ’ αὐτήν in the sentence. It has already been mentioned that he has also omitted mention of finding leaves.

Finally, as an editorial aside, Mark explains, “For it was not the season of figs” (ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν σύκων). This statement serves two purposes. First, it explains to the reader why there are no figs on the tree and, second, it gives the whole narrative a symbolic and eschatological dimension. The fig tree represents Israel or her leaders who

have not been “fruitful” and who will suffer the same fate as the withered tree.²⁵

Many manuscripts have a slightly different construction (οὐ γὰρ ἦν καιρὸς σύκων), but leave the meaning intact. The scribe of MS 0188 has altered this variant construction further still; instead of speaking about the “season of figs,” he has written about the “fruit of figs.” In his copy of Mark, the narrator records, “For there was no fruit of figs” (οὐ γὰρ ἦν καρπὸς σύκων). The change from καιρὸς to καρπὸς μαν simply be an orthographical mistake, or it is possible the scribe has conformed the passage to Matthew 21:19, since Matthew does not speak of the “season of figs.” When joined with the other variants in the passage, though, it looks like the scribe had a specific agenda for his alterations.

The full reading of Mark 11:13 in MS 0188 is as follows: “And seeing a fig tree from afar, he went to find something on it, but going he found nothing on it, for there was no fruit of figs.” In this version, the tree is completely barren. The scribe has twice omitted mention of leaves and has redirected attention from the *season* of figs to the *absence* of fruit. Figs are a summer fruit and ripen well after the tree has leafed.²⁶ At the beginning of the season, once the leaves have come in but before fruiting, small edible buds grow on the tree, though they were not typically eaten. Gundry argues that this is why Mark says that Jesus was looking for “*something*” (τι) on the tree, and not *fruit* or *figs*. According to Gundry, Jesus knew there would not be figs, but hoped to find

²⁵ See A. Collins, *Mark*, 522–526, for a summary of perspectives on this passage and her own analysis.

²⁶ See Gundry, *Mark*, 634–639; and William R. Telford, *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree: A Redaction-critical Analysis of the Fig-tree Pericope in Mark's Gospel and Its Relation to the Cleansing of the Temple Tradition*, JSNTSup 1 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980).

something to eat regardless.²⁷ By choosing not to say that the tree is in leaf, the scribe has implied that Jesus had no reason to expect either figs or buds, and by replacing the statement about the “season of figs” with one about the “fruit of figs” he has reinforced the idea that there was no evidence that fruit would be on the tree.

Jesus has no reason to expect anything on the tree, but nevertheless requires the tree to bear fruit. The eschatological theme fades with the omission of “the season,” but the symbolic quality of the event becomes clearer. Jesus does not care about the correct season for fruit—the purpose of a fig tree is to bear figs. Likewise, Israel has failed to bear fruit at the time when God has sent an agent to collect fruit. The following pericope of the cleansing of the temple (Mark 11:15–19) and the parable of the wicked tenants (Mark 12:1–12) demonstrate this. The Jews have not borne the expected fruit, perhaps referring to good works in general or more specifically to announcing salvation to the Gentiles, and so they will be destroyed like the fig tree and their vineyard will be entrusted to new keepers.²⁸

(9) Mark 11:15 – καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ τοὺς ἀγοράζοντας (//Matthew 21:12)²⁹

(10) Mark 11:17a – καὶ ἐδίδασκεν καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς (//Matthew 21:13, cf. Luke 19:46; Singular)

(11) Mark 11:17b – οὐ γέγραπται (//Matthew 21:13, Luke 19:46)³⁰

²⁷ Gundry, *Mark*, 635–636.

²⁸ See the remarks on the “spiritual” meaning of the fig tree in Edmondo Lupieri, “Fragments of the Historical Jesus? A Reading of *Mark* 11,11–[26],” *ASE* 28 (2011): 289–311, esp. 289–292.

²⁹ D E G H S V X Y Γ Δ Θ Φ Ψ Ω 0188 ^f ^f ³ 2 28 33 157 565 579 700 *m*.

(12) Mark 11:17c – ὅτι ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (//Matthew 21:13, Luke 19:46)³¹

Leaving the fig tree, Jesus enters Jerusalem and goes to the temple, where he begins to cast out the sellers and the buyers (τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ τοὺς ἀγοράζοντας). In Matthew 21:12, the evangelist records the same episode, but does not have a definite article before ἀγοράζοντας. The scribe has adopted this reading, but whether under the influence of Matthew or for simple stylistic reasons is difficult to decide.

After expelling the merchants, Mark records, “And he [Jesus] began to teach and say to them...” (καὶ ἐδίδασκεν καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς). In the parallel in Matthew 21:13, the words καὶ ἐδίδασκεν do not appear. Matthew simply states, “And he says to them” (καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς). Likewise, the scribe of MS 0188 has omitted the phrase in his copy of Mark. Although his syntax does not match Matthew exactly, it is possible Matthew’s version of the episode has influenced the scribe. Another plausible explanation for the variant is omission by homoiarcton. If the scribe copied the first καὶ and, returning to his exemplar, resumed copying after the second καὶ, the same omission would have occurred.

Jesus asks the crowd, “Is it not written that (οὐ γέγραπται ὅτι) my house will be called a house of prayer for all nations?” Both Matthew and Luke have a direct statement beginning with the declarative phrase “it is written” (γέγραπται). The scribe has conformed to Matthew’s or Luke’s narrative by omitting the interrogative particle and the conjunction ὅτι. This type of reading, transforming a question into a declaration, is not

³⁰ D Θ 0188 f¹ 28 69 118 205 565 579 700 1542 2542.

³¹ C D Ψ 0188 69 251 330 440 472 476 506 579 2542.

likely one that a scribe would make apart from an external influence. The scribe was motivated by the parallels to make this significant change.

Despite the short amount of text, the scribe of MS 0188 has produced a high number of harmonizing readings in contrast to fragments of similar size. One reading (6) is singular and another (7) is sub-singular. On the basis of this evidence, one can say that this scribe was prone to succumb to the external influence of parallels more often than others.

059 (P.Vindob. G 39779) + 0215 (P.Vindob. G 36112) – Mark 15:20–21, 26–27, 29–38

Manuscript 059, a parchment fragment containing a partial text of Mark 15:29–38, is dated by Carl Wessely to the fourth century.³² The manuscript's provenance is unknown. Somewhat after the publication of MS 059, Peter Sanz published a separate parchment fragment containing Mark 15:20–21 and 26–27, designated manuscript 0215.³³ The two fragments were originally part of one manuscript. The text is too short to give much inclination as to its textual affinities, though Hedley aligns it with the B text associated closely with Codex Vaticanus.³⁴ The text contains only a few variant readings, testifying to a fairly normal mode of transmission. Only one variant involves assimilation.

³² Carl Wessely, *Griechische und koptische Texte theologischen Inhalts III*, Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde 12 (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1966), 243 no. 186. See also Caspar René Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments*, vol. 1 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1900), 73–74; Guglielmo Cavallo, *Ricerche sulla maiuscola biblica*, 2 vols., Studi e testi di papirologica 2 (Florence: Le Monnier, 1967), 67 and Plates 46a–46b; Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 144 no. 397; Stanley E. Porter and Wendy J. Porter, eds., *New Testament Greek Papyri and Parchments: New Editions, Texts and Plates*, 2 vols., Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek 29 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 111–115.

³³ Peter Sanz, ed., *Griechische literarische Papyri christlichen Inhaltes I: Biblica, Väterschriften und Verwandtes*, Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien (Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer) 4 (Baden bei Wien: Rohrer, 1946), 57–58. See also Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 144 no. 397; and Porter and Porter, *Greek Papyri and Parchments*, 109–111.

³⁴ Hedley, “Egyptian Texts,” 35.

(13) Mark 15:34 – ‘ελωι ελωι` λεμα σαβαχθανι³⁵ (‘ηλι ηλι³⁶; //Matthew 27:46)³⁷

In Mark’s version of Jesus’s cry of dereliction, Jesus calls out, “Eloi, Eloi, lema sabachthani” (ελωι ελωι λεμα σαβαχθανι). Mark’s cry of dereliction represents in Greek letters the Aramaic phrase “my God” (ελωι). By contrast, Matthew’s cry represents the Hebrew phrase “my God” (ηλι). The scribe has adopted Matthew’s reading.³⁸

0214 (P.Vindob. G 29300) – Mark 8:33–34, 34–37

Manuscript 0214 is a parchment fragment containing five verses of the Gospel of Mark.³⁹ The script is an “irregular biblical majuscule.” Since it is close to the hand of Codex Sinaiticus, Porter and Porter date the manuscript to the fourth century, though the fifth century is not out of the question.⁴⁰ The text is too short to discern its affinities. In terms of transmission quality, the scribe has transmitted only two variants, one of which may be a harmonizing addition.

³⁵ 059 has λαμα σαβαχθανει.

³⁶ 059 has ηλει ηλει, an orthographic variant of ηλι.

³⁷ D Θ 059 0192 131 565.

³⁸ A. Collins, *Mark*, 730 n. d, believes the reading arose “under the direct influence of the parallel in Matt 27:46 and the indirect influence of the Hebrew of Ps 22:2.” So also Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 99. Several manuscripts of Matthew, including Codex Vaticanus, have been harmonized to Mark in this passage.

³⁹ For the *ed. pr.* see Sanz, *Griechische literarische Papyri*, 55–57. See also Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 143 no. 394.

⁴⁰ Porter and Porter, *Greek Papyri and Parchments*, 105–108.

(14) Mark 8:33 – ὁ δὲ ἐπιστραφεὶς καὶ ἰδὼν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐπετίμησεν ὁ

Πέτρῳ († τῶ; //Matthew 16:23)⁴¹

When Jesus announces his impending death in Mark 8:33, Peter confronts and rebukes him, only to be reproached in return. In many manuscripts of Mark, including MS 0214, Peter's name is articular (τῶ Πέτρῳ), "the Rock," but in the best manuscripts the article is absent. In Matthew, Peter's name is consistently articular. It is, therefore, possible that the scribe of MS 0214 was influenced by Matthew 16:23. In such negligible matters it is difficult to say that the scribe's own stylistic preferences have not intervened.

Preliminary Summary of Harmonization in Manuscripts of Mark

These four fragments of Mark provide a limited picture of harmonization in the fourth century and demonstrate the varying levels of influence the other Synoptics held over scribes copying the Second Gospel. Of the fourteen variants analyzed, nine have likely been created under the influence of parallel material. Notably, the three harmonizations that must have come from Luke all appear in a single manuscript (P⁸⁸). Outside of P⁸⁸, Matthew seems to have been the stronger influence, though Luke may have accounted for some readings.

Table 13. Sources of Harmonization in Fourth-Century Manuscripts of Mark

Source of Harmonization	Total: 9	Entry Number
Matthew	3	6, 7, 13
Luke	3	1, 3, 5
Matthew or Luke	3	2, 11, 12

⁴¹ A C K W X Γ Δ Θ Π 0214 *f*¹³ 28 33 565 579 700 892 1006 1241 1342 1424 1506 2542 ℣. Souter prefers the longer reading.

Manuscripts of Matthew⁴²

⁴² The following fourth- or fourth/fifth-century manuscripts do not contain harmonizing variants:

P¹⁹ (P.Oxy. 1170) is a fourth- or fifth-century fragment containing Matthew 10:32–40 and 10:41–11:5. For the *ed. pr.* see Arthur S. Hunt, ed., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 9, Graeco-Roman Memoirs (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1912), 7–9. See also Caspar René Gregory, “Mitteilungen: Griechische Handschriften des Neuen Testaments bis zum 1 Juli 1912,” *TLZ* 37 (1912): 477; Sanders, “Egyptian Text,” 81; Hedley, “Egyptian Texts,” 38–39; Schofield, “Papyrus Fragments,” 186–189; Jan Merell, *Papyrus: A Kritika Novozákonního Textu* (Praze: Vytiskla, 1939), 49, 109–110; Kurt Aland, “Zur Liste der Neutestamentlichen Handschriften VI,” *ZNW* 48 (1957): 141–191, 148, 152; Kurt Aland, “Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus,” in *Studien zur Überlieferung*, 91–136, 104, 113; Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 132 no. 357; K. Aland, *Repertorium*, 239; and K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste*, 30.

P²¹ (P.Oxy. 1227) is a fourth- or fifth-century fragment containing Matthew 12:24–26 and 31–33. For the *ed. pr.* see Bernard P. Grenfell, and Arthur S. Hunt, eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 10, Graeco-Roman Memoirs (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1914), 12–14. See also Sanders, “Egyptian Text,” 81; Hedley, “Egyptian Texts,” 38; Lagrange, *Critique rationnelle*, 76, 118; Schofield, “Papyrus Fragments,” 194–195; Clark, *Manuscripts in America*, 139; Merell, *Papyrus*, 50, 110; K. Aland, “Zur Liste,” 149, 152; K. Aland, “Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus,” 104, 113; Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 133 no. 361; K. Aland, *Repertorium*, 240–241; Comfort, *Early Manuscripts*, 40; and K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste*, 30.

P³⁵ (PSI I) is a fourth-century manuscript of Matthew 25:12–15 and 20–23 from Oxyrhynchus. For the *ed. pr.* see Pistelli, *Papiri greci e latini*, 1:1–2. Pistelli initially dated the fragment to the seventh century. Schofield, “Papyrus Fragments,” 253–255, dates the papyrus to the sixth century while K. Aland, *Repertorium*, 257, deems the fourth century more likely. Comfort, *Early Manuscripts*, 45; Head, “Observations,” 244; and Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 138–139, date P³⁵ to the third or fourth century. See also Sanders, “Egyptian Text,” 81; Hedley, “Egyptian Texts,” 39; Merell, *Papyrus*, 54, 115; K. Aland, “Zur Liste,” 149, 153; Naldini, *Documenti*, 16 no. 10 and Plate 10; K. Aland, “Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus,” 105, 118; Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 137–138 no. 374; K. Aland, “Standard-Text,” 266; Cavallo, *Ricerche*, 1:115–116, 2:Plate 103a; Guglielmo Cavallo and H. Maehler, *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period: AD 300–800*, Institute of Classical Studies Bulletin Supplement 47 (London: University of London, 1987), 22 and Plate 8d; K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste*, 30; B. Aland, “Das Zeugnis,” 327; Guglielmo Cavallo, *La scrittura greca e latina dei papiri. Una introduzione*, *Studia Erudita* 8 (Rome: Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2008), 102; Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 74–81; and Wasserman, “Early Text of Matthew,” 88–89.

P⁶² (P.Osl. 1661) is a fourth-century manuscript of Matthew 11:25–30 from Egypt. For the *ed. pr.* see Leiv Amundsen, “Christian Papyri from the Oslo Collection,” *SO* 24 (1945): 121–147. See also K. Aland, “Zur Liste,” 150, 155; K. Aland, “Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus,” 105, 130; Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 132–133 no. 359; K. Aland, *Repertorium*, 54, 291; Comfort, *Early Manuscripts*, 57–58; K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste*, 32; Head, “Observations,” 244; and B. Aland, “Das Zeugnis,” 328.

P⁸⁶ (P.Colon. Inv. 5516) is an early fourth-century manuscript of Matthew 5:13–16 and 22–25. For the *ed. pr.* see Ch. Charalambakis, D. Hagedorn, D. Kaimakis, and L. Thüngen, “Vier literarische Papyri der Kölner Sammlung,” *ZPE* 14 (1974): 37–40. See also Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 128 no. 342a; K. Aland, *Repertorium*, 320; Bärbel Kramer and Dieter Hagedorn, *Kölner Papyri (P.Köln)*, vol. 2, *Papyrologica Coloniensia* 7 (Köln: Westdeutscher, 1978), 88–89; Andreas Schmidt, “Zum Papyrus P. Köln II 80: Καὶ καταπατεῖσθαι oder καὶ πατεῖσθαι als Aussage des Korrektors?,” *AFP* 35 (1989): 13; Head, “Observations,” 246; B. Aland, “Das Zeugnis,” 328; and Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 615–616.

058 (P. Vindob. G 39782) is a fourth- or fifth-century parchment fragment of Matthew 18:18–19, 22–23, 25–26, and 28–29. For the *ed. pr.* see Wessely, *Griechische und koptische Texte*, 244 no. 189. See

P²⁵ (P. Berlin 16388) – Matthew 18:32–34; 19:1–3, 5–7, 9–10

The fourth-century papyrus fragment P²⁵ contains eleven verses from Matthew 18 and 19.⁴³ Otto Stegmüller, who first examined the fragment after it arrived in Berlin, believes it to be a fragment from a Greek Diatessaron because it displays some distinctive readings.⁴⁴ Kurt Aland is less definitive in his assessment. He writes, “It is perhaps a question of a text from the Greek Diatessaron.”⁴⁵ William Petersen also hesitates to classify the text as a fragment of the Diatessaron, in part because “the papyrus lacks any evidence of harmonization.”⁴⁶ I agree with Petersen that the text is better treated as a copy of Matthew than the Diatessaron. There is only one variant reading that seems to have involved harmonization.

also Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments*, 72–73; Hedley, “Egyptian Texts,” 38; Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 135 no. 366; and Porter and Porter, *Greek Papyri and Parchments*, 91–94 no. 23.

⁴³ Otto Stegmüller, “Ein Bruchstück aus dem griechischen Diatessaron (P. 16388),” *ZNW* 37 (1938): 223–229, dated the fragment to the fifth or sixth century; K. Aland accepts a fourth century date. See also Schofield, “Papyrus Fragments,” 205–214; Clark, *Manuscripts in America*, 79; Merell, *Papyrus*, 51, 111; K. Aland, “Zur Liste,” 149, 152; K. Aland, “Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus,” 104, 115; Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 135 no. 367; K. Aland, *Repertorium*, 246; Comfort, *Early Manuscripts*, 42; K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste*, 30; Head, “Observations,” 243; and Pasquale Orsini, *Manoscritti in maiuscola biblica: Materiali per un aggiornamento* (Cassino: Università degli Studi di Cassino, 2005), 52–53.

⁴⁴ See also William L. Petersen, *Tatian’s Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship*, Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 25 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 215–217.

⁴⁵ K. Aland, *Repertorium*, 246: “...es handelt sich vielleicht um eine Text aus dem griechischen Diatessaron.”

⁴⁶ Petersen, *Tatian’s Diatessaron*, 217, writes, “With the exception of Baumstarck, the papyrus has generally been ignored by Diatessaronic scholarship.” Petersen thinks the distinctive nature of the text is due to the influence of the Western text upon it.

(15) Matthew 19:9 – λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ μὴ ἐπὶ
 πορνεία καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται⁴⁷ † († ὡσαύτως καὶ ὁ γαμῶν
 ἀπολελυμένην μοιχᾶται; //Matthew 5:32b, Luke 16:18; Singular)⁴⁸

Jesus makes several different statements about divorce in the course of the Gospel of Matthew. In Matthew 19:9, he claims that anyone who divorces his wife, except on the grounds of sexual immorality, and remarries commits adultery. The parallel to this passage in Mark 10:11–12 includes the reverse statement, that any woman who divorces her husband and remarries commits adultery. Luke 16:18 has only the first of these statements, but includes an additional stipulation that whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery. Matthew 19:9 is not the only passage in the First Gospel where Jesus includes an “exception clause” to his regulations on divorce. In Matthew 5:32, Jesus says first that whoever divorces his wife *makes her* to have committed adultery (when she remarries) and, second, as in Luke 16:18, that whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery.

The text of Matthew 19:9 in P²⁵ diverges substantially from the expected Matthean reading. In the first place, instead of the verb μοιχᾶται at the end of the first clause there is μοιχευθῆναι. This suggests that the scribe has adapted Matthew 19:9a to reflect Matthew 5:32a, or perhaps has dislocated Matthew 5:32 entireley. The verse now conveys that a man who divorces his wife makes her an adulteress when she remarries, rather than that he commits adultery himself when he remarries. Second, the scribe has

⁴⁷ The first visible word on the line is μοιχευθῆναι. It is likely that this sentence, or at least the final words, reflects the syntax and grammar of Matthew 5:32a: ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι. So Stegmüller, “Ein Bruchstück,” 226.

⁴⁸ There are many similar variants in the manuscripts, but none with the exact reading of P²⁵.

inserted six words that summarize the sentiment of Matthew 5:32b and Luke 16:18b:

“Likewise, whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery” (ὡσαύτως καὶ ὁ γαμῶν ἀπολελυμένην μοιχᾶται).⁴⁹ The syntax of this phrase is close to Matthew 5:32b in the use of the indicative verb (μοιχᾶται), but is close to Luke 16:18b in the use of the masculine participle (γαμῶν). It seems likely that the scribe would be more influenced by the Matthean passage that he had presumably copied recently than the more remote parallel in Luke. Either way, the variant in this passage demonstrates the harmonizing influence of a parallel passage on the scribe.⁵⁰ The reading is not a complete *textual* assimilation; rather, the *sense* of the parallel has been dressed in new syntax.

P⁷¹ (P.Oxy. 2385) – Matthew 19:10–11, 17–18

P⁷¹ is a very small papyrus fragment from a fourth-century codex of Matthew.⁵¹ The first two verses are from a uniquely Matthean saying on divorce while the second pair come from the episode with the rich man. In terms of textual affinities, the editors say the text is “close to that of Vaticanus.”

(16) Matthew 19:18 – οὐ ρ φονεύσεις (ρ φονεύσης; //Mark 10:19, Luke 18:20; Sub-singular P⁷¹ 579)

⁴⁹ Stegmüller, “Ein Bruchstück,” 226, says, “Die Wortfolge im Fragment ist ohne Parallele.” The word order of the phrase is without parallel both in the Gospels and in the Matthean manuscript tradition, but the sentiment of the phrase is found earlier in Matthew and in Luke.

⁵⁰ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 38–39, agrees that copyists expanded the reading with reference to Matthew 5:32.

⁵¹ See *OP*, 24:5–6 and Plate XIII. See also Marcel Hombert, “Bulletin Papyrologique XXVIII (1954 à 1959),” *REG* 78 (1965): 205–316, 249; K. Aland, “Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus,” 106, 134; Kurt Treu, “Referat: Christliche Papyri 1940–1967,” *APF* 19 (1969): 169–206, 181; Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 135 no. 368; K. Aland, *Repertorium*, 302; Comfort, *Early Manuscripts*, 62; and K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste*, 13. For a discussion of this fragment’s singular readings see Head, “Observations,” 245; and B. Aland, “Das Zeugnis,” 328.

In the episode of the rich young ruler, Jesus tells the man to keep the commandments and enumerates several examples. “Do not murder” (οὐ φονεύσεις) is the first. In Matthew 19:18, the commandment is given as a future indicative verb: “You will not murder.” In Mark 10:19 and Luke 18:20, a subjunctive construction is used (μὴ φονεύσης). The reading of P⁷¹ is φονευσης and can be explained in two ways and inflected accordingly. It is possible that the scribe is following Matthew’s indicative reading but has used an alternate spelling for the final vowel sound—eta in the place of epsilon-iota—in which case the word is φονεύσης and the variant is orthographical in nature. It is also possible that the scribe has harmonized to Mark or Luke’s subjunctive construction, though he has not adopted Luke’s particle μὴ. In this case, the word would be inflected φονεύσης. The scribe has retained Matthew’s future indicative tense, and spelled it correctly, for the second commandment, “You will not commit adultery” (οὐ μοιχεύσεις). This suggests that the former explanation is correct, though it is not clear why he has spelled the inflected ending differently in the two words. This is another piece of evidence showing the variability and inconsistency of scribal activity.

P¹¹⁰ (P.Oxy. 4494) – Matthew 10:13–14, 25–27

P¹¹⁰ is a fourth-century papyrus fragment from a codex of Matthew covering about five verses.⁵² The text exhibits several singular readings that have been corrected.

These, plus additional uncorrected singular readings, suggest that the scribe was

⁵² *OP*, 66:1–3 and Plates I and II. See also Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 656–658; and Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 242, who date the fragment to the late third or early fourth century on the basis of similarities with the hand of P⁴⁵. For comments on the variants see Head, “Recently Published,” 9–10; Römer, “Christliche Texte,” 302–303; Elliott, “Seven,” 209–213; B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 3–4; J. K. Elliott, “Recently Discovered New Testament Papyri and Their Significance for Textual Criticism,” in *Reading New Testament Papyri in Context = Lire des papyrus du Nouveau Testament dans leur contexte*, ed. Claire Clivaz and Jean Zumstein, BETL 242 (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 89–108, 99; and Wasserman, “Early Text of Matthew,” 101–102.

predisposed to making careless errors. Since some of these are corrected by the same hand, it is also apparent that the scribe espoused a simultaneous and conflicting desire to copy correctly. Only two variants may involve harmonization.

(17) Matthew 10:14a – και ὃς ἂν⁵³ μὴ δέξηται ὑμᾶς μηδὲ ἀκούσῃ τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν
ἐξερχόμενοι⁵⁴ ἔξω⁵⁵ τῆς οἰκίας ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἐκεῖνης⁵⁶ (//Luke 9:5)⁵⁷

(18) Matthew 10:14b – ἐκτινάξατε τὸν κονιορτὸν τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν (τᾶπό; //Luke 9:5; Sub-singular P¹¹⁰ 1342)

As part of his instructions about missionary activity, Jesus tells his disciples in Matthew 10:14 that if someone does not welcome them or listen to their message, they are to go outside (ἐξερχόμενοι ἔξω) and shake off the dust from their feet. Matthew's sentence exhibits a reiterated prefix with an adverb matching the verb's prefix. Luke's version of the statement does not have a reiterated prefix; instead of ἔξω, Luke has ἀπό. The scribe of P¹¹⁰ has eliminated ἔξω from his copy of Matthew, either under the influence of Luke 9:5 or the stylistic impulse to reduce redundancy. The parallel influence is not overt, for, if the harmonization were intentional, one would expect the scribe to have also adopted Luke's ἀπό. Harmonization is only a possible explanation of this reading, and not necessarily the likeliest given that the structure of Luke's verse is quite different.

⁵³ P¹¹⁰ has ἐάν.

⁵⁴ P¹¹⁰ has ἐξερχομένων, forming a genitive absolute.

⁵⁵ P¹¹⁰ adds ὑμῶν.

⁵⁶ P¹¹⁰ replaces ἐκεῖνης with ἢ κώμης.

⁵⁷ P¹¹⁰ C E F K L M N P U W Δ Π f¹ f¹³ 2 28 21 28 124 543 565 579 700 788 1071 1346 1582.

In the case that a house, city, or village rejects the disciples, Jesus tells them, “Shake off the dust of your feet” (ἐκτινάξατε τὸν κονιορτὸν τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν). Luke’s version of this sentence has an extra preposition: “Shake off the dust *from* your feet” (τὸν κονιορτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν ἀποτινάσσετε). In this case, Luke has created a reiterated preposition-prefix with the addition of ἀπό. The scribe of P¹¹⁰ has added the preposition ἀπό, either for stylistic reasons or under the influence of Luke 9:5.⁵⁸

0160 (P.Berlin 9961) – Matthew 26:25–26, 34–36

Manuscript 0160 is a small, fourth-century parchment fragment of the Gospel of Matthew.⁵⁹ The provenance of the fragment is unknown. Despite the brevity of the manuscript, Hedley claims the text’s affinities align with the B text while Saloni, in agreement, groups the manuscript with Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, Ephraemi, and, oddly, Bezae. Since only five verses are available for analysis, one cannot be sure about how the text relates to the defined textual streams. There are two variant readings where harmonization may have been a factor.

(19) Matthew 26:26 – ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ᾠρτον καὶ εὐλόγησας
ἔκλασεν καὶ δούς τοῖς μαθηταῖς (ᾠτόν; //Luke 24:30; Lacuna)⁶⁰

At the institution of the Lord’s Supper in Matthew 26:26, Jesus takes bread (ἄρτον), gives thanks, breaks it, and distributes it. The parallel passages likewise speak generically of “bread.” The scribe of MS 0160, however, appears to have added the direct

⁵⁸ So B. Aland, “Das Zeugnis,” 3; Cockle, *OP*, 66:3; Head, “Recently Published,” 10; and Min, *Früheste Überlieferung*, 243.

⁵⁹ Saloni, “Die griechischen Handschriftenfragmente,” 99–100. See also Hedley, “Egyptian Texts,” 38; and Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 139 no. 379.

⁶⁰ A K M U W Γ Δ Π Σ Φ 0160^{vidlac} f¹³ 2 28 124 565 788 1006 1071 1241 1342 1346 1506 m.

article so that the object of the sentence is “*the bread*” (τὸν ἄρτον). This variant became quite popular, especially among Byzantine manuscripts. The reading falls in a lacuna, but the requirements of space and the frequency with which this variant appears support the restoration. If, however, the name of Jesus had been written in full and not as a *nomen sacrum*, then there would not be enough space for the definite article. If τόν was added, the scribe probably had in mind the ritual bread used in the Eucharist in his own time. Even though Mark and Luke do not use the article in the direct parallel, Luke speaks of “the bread” (τὸν ἄρτον) in a near-parallel in Luke 24:30, another passage with Eucharistic themes. Whether the scribe was influenced by this specific passage or the parlance of the Eucharist of his time is difficult to decide, but Luke 24:30 has played a role in the creation and promulgation of this reading in the manuscripts.

(20) Matthew 26:35 – καὶν δέη με σὺν σοὶ ἀποθανεῖν οὐ μὴ σε ἀπαρνήσομαι

ῥόμοιως¹ καὶ πάντες οἱ μαθηταὶ εἶπαν⁶¹ (ῥόμοιως δέ οἱ ῥωσάυτως;

//Mark 14:31; Lacuna)⁶²

When Jesus predicts that Peter will deny him, Peter adamantly denies the accusation. Matthew records, “And so (ὁμοίως) said all the disciples.” The Markan syntax is somewhat different: “And likewise also they all said” (ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ πάντες ἔλεγον). It is the δὲ καὶ construction that is of interest here, since the scribe of MS 0160 appears to have added the conjunction δέ before Matthew’s καί. Unfortunately, the words fall in a lacuna. This construction is not common in Matthew, where it is found only in four

⁶¹ 0160 has εἶπον.

⁶² A E F G H K M U V W Γ Δ Θ Π Σ 074 0160^{vidlac} f¹ f¹³ 2 22 28 71 118 124 157 372 543 565 579 692 697 788 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1424 1506 1582 ℵ.

verses (10:30; 24:49; 25:22, 24), nor is it common in Mark, where it is found only in two (14:31; 15:40). The construction does occur with regularity in Luke. Since this phrase is uncommon and does not conform to the evangelist's style, it seems likely that an outside stimulus has prompted the reading, probably the parallel in Mark 14:31.

Another possibility is that Matthew's *ὁμοίως* has been replaced with Mark's *ὡσαύτως* without *δέ*. This exchange would fill the space equally as well. This is a common reading in Mark and occurs in some important manuscripts (e.g. Vaticanus). Either emendation can be accounted for with reference to the parallel in Mark.

0242 (P. Cairo 71942) – Matthew 8:25–9:2; 13:32–38, 40–46

Manuscript 0242 consists of a pair of parchment leaves with parts of Matthew 8, 9, and 13. The pieces date to the second half of the fourth century and were found in Assuan in Egypt.⁶³ Ramón Roca-Puig identifies the textual character of the parchment as Alexandrian. Indeed, there are only a few variant readings in this fair amount of text. Three of these involve harmonization.

(21) Matthew 8:29 – τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί ὦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ (ⲓⲓⲛⲓⲟⲩⲟⲩ⁶⁴; //Mark 5:7, Luke 8:28; Lacuna)⁶⁵

(22) Matthew 8:32a – οἱ δὲ ἐξελθόντες ἤ ἀπῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους (Γ εἰσῆλθον; //Mark 5:13, Luke 8:33; Singular)

⁶³ Ramón Roca-Puig, "Un pergamino Griego del evangelio de San Mateo," *Emérita* 27 (1959): 59–73. See also Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 131 no. 353.

⁶⁴ Ἰησοῦ does not appear in Roca-Puig's transcription, but Nestle-Aland apparently believes there is space for it and cites 0242^{vid} among witnesses for this reading.

⁶⁵ C^c E K M S U V W X Δ Θ Π 0242^{vid} f¹³ 2 22 157 543 565 579 700 788 826 983 1006 1071 1342 1424 1582 m.

(23) Matthew 8:32b – καὶ ἰδοὺ ὥρμησεν ὅπασα ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ ἀπέθανον ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν (//Mark 5:13, Luke 8:33)⁶⁶

In the episode with Legion in Matthew 8:29, the demoniac sees Jesus and asks, “What is there between us and you, son of God?” In both Mark 5:7 and Luke 8:28, the demoniac addresses Jesus as “*Jesus*, son of God” (Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ). This reading appears in many manuscripts and may be the reading hidden in the broken portion of this line in MS 0242. If so, the scribe has added the proper noun under the influence of the parallels.

In the course of the exorcism in Matthew 8:32, Jesus sends the spirits into a nearby herd of pigs. Matthew records, “And after going out they departed (ἀπῆλθον) into the pigs.” Mark and Luke both have the synonym εἰσέρχομαι with reiterated preposition. The scribe of MS 0242 has adopted the verb from the parallels.

In the same verse, Matthew records that “the whole herd (πᾶσα ἡ ἀγέλη) rushed down the precipice into the sea and died in the water.” Mark and Luke do not use the adjective “whole” (πᾶσα) to describe the herd. The scribe of MS 0242, influenced by the parallels, has omitted the adjective from his copy of Matthew.

The text of 0242 is long enough to make an initial assessment of the scribe’s general characteristics. When it comes to harmonization, though, there is no clear pattern. Since the assimilations occur in only this pericope, one may assume that the scribe did not have an agenda to assimilate his entire text to another Gospel but that the

⁶⁶ 0242 16 348 471 477 1279 1473 1579 1588.

harmonizing readings he created in the episode with Legion were the product of the strong influence of a parallel version.

Preliminary Summary of Harmonization in Manuscripts of Matthew

Eleven fragments of Matthew have survived from the fourth century, six of which show no traces of harmonization. Although all are short, fragments of similar size regularly exhibit harmonizing variants so that the absence of the phenomenon in these is worth note. In the five texts that may have harmonizing readings, only four variants were deemed likely or very likely to have involved a parallel passage. On the basis of this evidence, it seems very likely that because Matthew was read and copied more widely than the other Synoptics in this century, Matthew served far more often as the *source* of harmonization than the recipient.

Table 14. Sources of Harmonization in Fourth-Century Manuscripts of Matthew

Source of Harmonization	Total: 4	Entry Number
Luke	1	18
Mark or Luke	2	22, 23
Matthew or Luke	1	15

Manuscripts of Luke

P⁸² (Strasbourg, National and University Library P. Gr. 2677) – Luke 7:32–34, 37–38

P⁸² is a very short fragment from a papyrus codex of Luke. J. Schwartz, the first editor of this piece, dates the fragment to the fourth or possibly fifth century. He believes the manuscript came from the region around Oxyrhynchus, but deems it imprudent to be overly certain that Oxyrhynchus itself was the place of origin.⁶⁷ The manuscript covers

⁶⁷ J. Schwartz, "Fragment d'Évangile sur Papyrus (Luc VII 32–34; 37 s.)," *ZPE* 3 (1968): 157–158. See also Kurt Treu, "Christliche Papyri IV," *APF* 22 (1973): 367–395, 372; Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 151 no. 411; K. Aland, *Repertorium*, 318; Comfort, *Early Manuscripts*, 66; and K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste*, 14.

only five verses of Luke so that there is no way to discern its textual affinities. There are only a few variant readings, and of these only one that is significant. According to Schwartz, “the most notable item is the absence, in verse 38, of τοῖς δάκρυσιν, whose place varies in the manuscript tradition.”⁶⁸

(24) Luke 7:38 – καὶ στᾶσα ὀπίσω παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ κλαίουσα □ τοῖς δάκρυσιν ἤρξατο βρέχειν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ ταῖς θριξίν τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς ἐξέμασεν καὶ κατεφίλει τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤλειφεν τῷ μύρῳ (cf. Mark 14:3, Matthew 26:7, John 12:3; Sub-singular P^{3vid} P⁸²)⁶⁹

In the anointing episode, which takes place early in the Gospel of Luke instead of in the passion narrative, where it is found in Mark and Matthew, a woman comes to Jesus with an alabaster jar of ointment. Luke records that a sinful woman who enters the room, weeps, and bathes Jesus’s feet *with her tears* (τοῖς δάκρυσιν). She then dries, kisses, and anoints Jesus’s feet with ointment. In P⁸², the scribe has retained the detail that the woman wept, but has omitted τοῖς δάκρυσιν so that there is no specific reference to the liquid with which she bathes Jesus’s feet. Schwartz and Kurt Treu suggest that this reading could be original.⁷⁰ In their estimation, the phrase τοῖς δάκρυσιν was added as a duplication of v. 44, where Jesus recapitulates the event to his host. Furthermore, they argue, that τοῖς δάκρυσιν is sometimes found in the manuscripts before the verb and sometimes after further confirms that the words are secondary. Nevertheless, the

⁶⁸ Schwartz, “Fragment d’Evangile sur Papyrus,” 158: “Mais le point le plus notable est l’absence, au verset 38, de τοῖς δάκρυσιν, dont la place varie dans la tradition manuscrite.”

⁶⁹ Swanson’s parallel suggests that the tau of τοῖς is legible, but I disagree.

⁷⁰ Schwartz, “Fragment d’Evangile sur Papyrus,” 158, says the words are “parfaitement inutile et pourrait venir simplement de verset 44.”

manuscript evidence is strongly opposed to this suggestion since the phrase is only omitted here and possibly in P³. Moreover, it is unlikely that tears would be mentioned in the summary in v. 44 if they had not already been mentioned in the narrative.

The reading with *τοῖς δάκρυσιν* is older, but why has it been omitted? It is possible that the phrase was omitted as redundant when read with v. 44, but it would be more likely for the second mention of tears to be omitted than the first. Unfortunately, the fragment cuts off at the end of v. 38, so there is no way of confirming the presence of *τοῖς δάκρυσιν* in v. 44. It seems likely that if the phrase had been omitted in v. 38, it would also have been excised from v. 44.

The influence of the other Gospels accounts admirably for the omission. In Mark, Matthew, and John there is no mention of weeping and the woman does not bathe Jesus's feet with tears, she only anoints Jesus's feet with ointment. Manuscripts, such as miniscule 157, which do not have the weeping *or* the bathing with tears, show that there was a desire among some scribes to conform the passage in Luke entirely to the others in this regard. In the case of P⁸², the scribe has retained Luke's mention of weeping, but has omitted the phrase about bathing with tears to keep the focus on the anointing, which is crucial as a preparation for burial in Mark, Matthew, and John. The scribe knew that Jesus's feet were (John) or head was (Mark and Matthew) anointed with *ointment*. This is a clever example of harmonization whereby the scribe has retained distinctive parts of Luke's narrative (weeping) while removing key words (tears) to conform the account to its parallels. By omitting "(her) tears," the scribe's text now simply says she approached Jesus, stood behind his feet, wept, began to bathe his feet—presumably with water—

dried them with her hair, kissed them, and anointed them. The logic of this harmonization suggests that the scribe has made this alteration deliberately and with some consideration.

0181 (P. Vindob. G 39778) – Luke 9:59–10:5, 10:6–14

Manuscript 0181 is a fourth- or possibly fifth-century parchment leaf containing about 18 verses of Luke 9 and 10.⁷¹ Porter and Porter characterize the script as a “regular and compactly written biblical majuscule” similar to Codex Alexandrinus, a fifth-century majuscule. Despite a fair number of variants, only one involves harmonization.

(25) Luke 10:3 – ἰδοὺ ὧ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ὡς ἄρνας ἐν μέσῳ λύκων (ὧ ἐγώ;
//Matthew 10:16)⁷²

In Luke 10:3, Jesus commissions seventy (or seventy-two) disciples to travel and preach the good news. He says to them, “Behold, I send (ἀποστέλλω) you as lambs in the midst of wolves.” This statement is also found in Matthew 10:16, only Matthew speaks of sheep instead of lambs and makes the subject of the verb explicit (ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω). The scribe of MS 0181, along with many others, has adopted this fuller reading under the influence of Matthew.

Enough text from this manuscript is available to conclude that this scribe was not particularly interested in conforming his text to another and that parallel passages did not intrude upon his task of copying Luke.

⁷¹ Wessely, *Griechische und koptische Texte*, 241–242 no. 185, suggests the early fifth century. See also Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 152–153 no. 415; and Porter and Porter, *Greek Papyri and Parchments*, 123–129.

⁷² C D K L M N U W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Ξ Π Ψ 0181 ^{f¹ f³ 2 28 33^{vid} 69 118 157 565 700 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1424 1506 2542} ⲙ. IGNTP and Souter prefer the longer reading. IGNTP cites 0181 as omitting ἐγώ.

Preliminary Summary of Harmonization in Manuscripts of Luke

Before turning to a summary of harmonization in the fragmentary manuscripts as a whole, it is important to note that too few manuscripts of Luke remain from the fourth century to ascertain a useful picture of harmonization in Luke.

Summary of Harmonization in Fourth-Century Manuscripts of the Synoptic Gospels

The general phenomenon of harmonization in fragmentary manuscripts of the Synoptic Gospels from the fourth century is now in view. Of the twenty-five readings analyzed above, nine likely and six very likely occurred under the influence of parallel material. Ten readings may have involved harmonization, but will not be discussed here. Five separate manuscripts have created singular or sub-singular harmonizations; twelve have not.

Table 15. Quality of Harmonization in Fourth-Century Manuscripts of the Synoptic Gospels

Total Number of Readings	Total: 25	Entry Number
Quality of Harmonization		
Very Likely	6	5, 7, 15, 22, 23, 24
Likely	9	1, 2, 3, 6, 11, 12, 13, 18, 25
Possible	10	4, 8, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21

Matthew remains the primary source of harmonization in the fourth century and scribes copying Matthew resisted the influence of parallel material more than the other Synoptics. No harmonizing variants can conclusively be attributed to Mark.

Unlike in previous centuries, substitution is not the most frequent type of harmonization in the fourth century. There is not enough evidence to say that a shift had taken place in the type of readings created, but on the basis of the evidence that remains it

can be said that addition and omission occurred slightly more often than substitution.

Transposition can rarely be ascribed to harmonization.

The evidence from this century confirms that harmonizing variants generally effected only one or two words. Variants of a longer extent that are attributable to parallel material occur seldom. Even of the two long harmonizations, one (2) is a simple transposition that does not add or remove material from the text.

As with the previous century, scribes continued to harmonize Jesus's words more often than the evangelists' narratives. Also aligning with previous evidence, it has been shown that verbs and nouns were harmonized more often than other parts of speech.

Table 16. Harmonization in Fourth-Century Manuscripts of the Synoptic Gospels

Frequency of Harmonization	Total: 15	Entry Number
Singular	3	6, 15, 22
Sub-singular	3	7, 18, 24
Uncommon	2	13, 23
Sources of Harmonization		
Matthew	4	6, 7, 13, 25
Luke	4	1, 3, 5, 18
Matthew, Luke	4	2, 11, 12, 15
Mark, Luke	2	22, 23
Mark, Luke, John	1	24
Type of Harmonization		
Substitution	3	1, 13, 22
Addition	6	3, 5, 7, 15, 18, 25
Omission	5	6, 11, 12, 23, 24
Transposition	1	2
Context of Harmonization		
Words of Jesus	9	1, 2, 5, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 25
Narrative	5	6, 7, 22, 23, 24
Other Dialogue	1	3
Extent of Harmonization		
One Word	8	1, 5, 11, 12, 18, 22, 23, 25
Two Words	5	3, 6, 7, 13, 24
Four+ Words	1	2
Sentence	1	15
Part of Speech		

	Sentence	1	15
	Verb	2	1, 22
	Verb Phrase	4	2, 3, 6, 7
	Noun Phrase	1	24
	Pronoun	1	25
	Proper Noun(s)	1	13
	Preposition	1	18
	Conjunction	1	12
	Adjective	2	5, 23
	Particle	1	11

CHAPTER FIVE

A MANUSCRIPT WITH THE COMPLETE TEXT OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS FROM THE FOURTH CENTURY

Codex Vaticanus (Cod. Vat. Gr. 1209)¹

Codex Vaticanus (B, 03) is arguably the most important Greek manuscript of the Bible extant today.² Vaticanus is a vellum manuscript containing most of the Septuagint and the majority of the New Testament.³ The manuscript may also have contained various extra-canonical texts, as does its contemporary, Codex Sinaiticus (Ⲙ, 01). Both codices were copied in the fourth century, making them the oldest complete Bibles in existence and perhaps among the first complete Bibles ever to be assembled. Guglielmo Cavallo

¹ In 2015, the Vatican library published excellent photographs of the manuscript online at http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.1209. For print photographs see *Novum Testamentum e Codice Vaticano Graeco 1209 (Codex B) tertia vice phototypice expressum*, Codices e Vaticanis Selecti 30 (Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1968). Another resource can be found in Jenny Read-Heimerdinger and Josep Rius-Camps, eds., *A Gospel Synopsis of the Greek Text of Matthew, Mark and Luke: A Comparison of Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus*, NTTSD 45 (Leiden: Brill, 2014).

² For a thorough introduction to Codex Vaticanus, see the essays compiled in Patrick Andrist, ed., *Le manuscrit B de la Bible (Vaticanus graecus 1209): Introduction au fac-similé, Actes du Colloque de Genève (11 juin 2001), Contributions supplémentaires*, HTB 7 (Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2009). See also Hatch, "Principal Uncial Manuscripts," Plate XIV; Skeat, "Constantine," 193–235; Ibid., "The Codex Vaticanus in the Fifteenth Century," in *Writings of T. C. Skeat*, 122–134; Lagrange, *Critique rationnelle*, 83–90, 99–107; Cavallo, *Ricerche*, 52–56, 60–61; J. Neville Birdsall, "The Codex Vaticanus: Its History and Significance," in *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text*, ed. Scot McKendrick and Orlaith A. O'Sullivan (London: The British Library; New Castle, DE: and Oak Knoll Press in association with The Scriptorium: Center for Christian Antiquities, 2003), 33–41.

³ Some missing portions of the text were added to the manuscript in the fifteenth century.

proposes that Vaticanus was copied in the middle of the fourth century, around 350 CE, and that Sinaiticus was copied about ten years later, around 360 CE.⁴

J. K. Elliott raises the point that during this period the borders of the canon were still being solidified. He proposes that codices such as these were intended as templates for the canon—their covers encompassing and embodying the canon lists being created by church leaders.⁵ Furthermore, it was toward the beginning of the fourth century that Emperor Constantine wrote to Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, commissioning the construction of fifty beautiful Bibles. There is also evidence that Emperor Constantine's son, requested Bibles from Athanasius. T. C. Skeat suggests that Vaticanus and Sinaiticus themselves are the products of these commissions, though others dismiss the possibility as speculation.⁶ Skeat supports his case with argumentation for Caesarea as the provenance of the manuscripts instead of Egypt, as had generally been accepted.⁷ By contrast, J. Neville Birdsall is unconvinced by many arguments for a Caesarean provenance and remains agnostic about the date of the manuscript and its location of origin.⁸

⁴ Cavallo, *Ricerche*, 55–59. Frederic G. Kenyon, *Text of the Greek Bible: A Students Handbook* (London: Duckworth, 1937), 75, 85, dates both Vaticanus and Sinaiticus to the early fourth century.

⁵ J. K. Elliott, "T. C. Skeat on the Dating and Origin of Codex Vaticanus," in *Writings of T. C. Skeat*, 281–294.

⁶ Skeat, "Constantine," 193–235.

⁷ See Elliott, "Dating and Origin of Codex Vaticanus," 291–293; and Ibid., "Theodore Skeat et l'origine du Codex Vaticanus," in *Le manuscrit B*, 119–133, for an assessment of Skeat's arguments. Lagrange, *Critique rationnelle*, 84, affirms Caesarean origin for Sinaiticus and Vaticanus. Cavallo, *Ricerche*, 60–61, holds to the Egyptian theory, as does Kirsopp Lake, "The Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts and the Copies sent by Eusebius to Constantine," *HTR* 11 (1918): 32–35. See also Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, "Le Vaticanus, Athanase et Alexandrie," in *Le manuscrit B*, 135–155, who concludes that Alexandria remains the likeliest place of origin. Christian-B. Amphoux, "Les circonstances de la copie du Codex Vaticanus (Vat. Gr. 1209)," in *Le manuscrit B*, 157–176, argues for Rome as the place of origin.

⁸ Birdsall, "Codex Vaticanus," 34.

The two manuscripts are linked, for Skeat, because he believes they originate from the same scriptorium, a fact that can be inferred from similarities in their script and size. Additionally, Skeat and Milne argue that there are substantial similarities between the script of scribe “A” of Vaticanus and that of scribe “D” of Sinaiticus and posit that they were penned within the same scribal tradition.⁹ The script is a paradigmatic biblical uncial, though specific characteristics of the original hand cannot be discerned since the entire manuscript was re-inked in perhaps the tenth century.¹⁰

According to Skeat, after its composition in Caesarea, Codex Vaticanus was sent to Constantinople in a consignment to the emperor. Within a few centuries the entire text needed re-inking, proving that it was still in use at that time. Subsequently, the manuscript endured neglect. Pages from the beginning and the end were lost along with the cover. Fortunately, the manuscript was restored in the fifteenth century.¹¹ At that time, occasional colorations were added to the beginning of individual books, sporadic illustrations and symbols were drawn, and an occasional enlarged or decorative initial letter was introduced. Furthermore, the missing text at the beginning and end was supplied, though with no attempt to mimic the fourth-century script of the original manuscript. Skeat suggests the purpose of this restoration was presentation to the pope at the time when the manuscript arrived in Rome from Constantinople.¹²

⁹ H. J. M. Milne and T. C. Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus* (London: British Museum, 1939), 89–90. The authors do not posit that the same individual penned both manuscripts.

¹⁰ Elliott, “Dating and Origin of Codex Vaticanus,” 293. Skeat, “Constantine,” 230–231, does not hazard an exact guess as to when the manuscript was re-inked, only that it was done between the fifth and fifteenth centuries and possibly before the ninth century when lectionaries were replacing the large tomes containing complete Bibles.

¹¹ Skeat, “Fifteenth Century,” 125–126.

¹² Skeat, “Fifteenth Century,” 124–125.

Even if the scripts and other physical features of Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are similar, the texts are unique. There are some differences in content and also in the arrangement of the books. Many divergences between the texts of the Synoptics represented in the two codices confirm that the manuscripts were not created using identical exemplars. Furthermore, one scribe has been much more freehanded than the other in making alterations.¹³

With regard to the text of the Gospels in Vaticanus, it must be remembered that Vaticanus stands very close to P⁷⁵. Their proximity should be regarded as closer to the “sibling” relationship than the “parent-child” relationship. Thus, some of the harmonizing readings discussed in Chapter Three appear here as well. Birdsall has argued that the text of P⁷⁵-B is closer to the Koine Greek one expects from older manuscripts than the contemporary P⁴⁵, which shows scribal attempts at improvement and atticized readings. The connection with P⁷⁵ proves that the text of Vaticanus was not the product of the deliberate recensional activity of a school in the fourth century; its text was already available in the second century.¹⁴ Codex Vaticanus is the monarch of the Alexandrian text type, which Westcott and Hort called the “neutral” text.¹⁵

There is not much punctuation in the text of the Synoptic Gospels, but there are regular divisions in the form of small gaps between sentences, paragraphs, and, primarily,

¹³ See further J. C. O’Neill, “The Rules Followed by the Editors of the Text Found in the Codex Vaticanus,” *NTS* 35 (1989): 219–228. O’Neill envisions the manuscript being copied in a monastery with multiple copies of each text being reproduced and speculates that rules must have been in place.

¹⁴ O’Neil, “Rules,” 227–228, accepts the connection between P⁷⁵ and B, but regards B as “the work of scholarly scribes who knew the manuscripts they were comparing were corrupt at various points.”

¹⁵ On the text of the New Testament in Vaticanus, with comments on the individual books, see Stephen Pisano, “The Vaticanus graecus 1209: A Witness to the Text of the New Testament,” in *Le manuscrit B*, 77–97.

pericopae.¹⁶ The text exhibits its own coherent pattern of breathing marks, accents, and abbreviations. In some places, text-critical sigla, such as the dieresis and obelisk, are present.¹⁷

Lagrange notes that harmonization is a special pitfall of Codex Bezae and the manuscripts associated with it and also of Codex Alexandrinus and its textual tradition, but that Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus, and their associates are “almost free from this mania.”¹⁸ He correctly claims that Vaticanus exhibits fewer harmonizing variants than Sinaiticus. Similarly, Peter Head claims there is “no observable influence from harmonization to synoptic parallels.”¹⁹ It is quite correct to say that Vaticanus is mostly free from harmonization, but one should not thereby infer that there are no harmonizing variants in the text. The scribe has been careful not to permit external influences to infiltrate his text, but several assimilating readings have arisen nonetheless.

Codex Vaticanus – Matthew

(1) Matthew 2:13a – ἀναχωρησάντων δὲ αὐτῶν ^Ɀ (Ɀ εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν;

//Matthew 2:12; Singular)

¹⁶ Although, see Christian-B. Amphoux, “Codex Vaticanus B: Les Points Diacritiques des Marges de Marc,” *JTS* 58 (2007): 440–466, for a discussion of punctuation in the text of Mark.

¹⁷ Philip B. Payne and Paul Canart, “Distigmai Matching the Original Ink of Codex Vaticanus. Do They Mark the Location of Textual Variants?,” in *Le manuscrit B*, 199–225. See also Philip B. Payne and Paul Canart, “The Originality of Text-Critical Symbols in Codex Vaticanus,” *NovT* 42 (2000): 105–113. The authors expound upon the argument that the ink used for the text-critical symbols is the same as that used for the original text. They suggest that umlauts in the text signal textual variants. These, in turn, “prove that the scribe had access to more than one manuscript.”

¹⁸ Lagrange, *Critique rationnelle*, 86: “Les passages parallèles sont l’écueil du groupe *D* et aussi, quoique beaucoup moins, du groupe *A*. On convient que le consortium *B* + *Ⲛ* est presque indemne de cette manie, et *B* encore plus que *Ⲛ*.”

¹⁹ Head, “Early Text of Mark,” 119.

(2) Matthew 2:13b – ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος κυρίου φαίνεται κατ’ ὄναρ τῷ Ἰωσήφ (κατ’ ὄναρ ἐφάνη; //Matthew 1:20; Singular)

The first harmonizing variants found in the text of Matthew in Codex Vaticanus appear in Matthew 2:13. This material is unparalleled in Mark and Luke. Each reading represents a harmonization to a previous verse in Matthew and so could be considered a harmonization to context rather than to a remote parallel. Regardless, since the readings are singular and arise under the influence of an alternate passage they warrant inclusion in the discussion here.

Matthew writes, “After they (the magi) departed, behold, an angel of the lord appeared in a dream to Joseph” (ἀναχωρησάντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος κυρίου φαίνεται κατ’ ὄναρ τῷ Ἰωσήφ). The scribe has added the phrase “to their own land” (εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν) to the first clause, recalling the identical phrase in Matthew 2:12. He has also altered the phrase “appears in a dream” (φαίνεται κατ’ ὄναρ) so that it matches the construction found in Matthew 1:20. In that passage, Matthew records that an angel of the lord “appeared in a dream” (κατ’ ὄναρ ἐφάνη). The scribe has transposed the word order and shifted to the past tense. The singular nature of these readings permits the conclusion that the scribe was motivated to establish a stylistically uniform text or was influenced by patterns of language previously copied.²⁰ It will be seen that consistency within the Gospel is important to the scribe.

²⁰ Lagrange, *Critique rationnelle*, 85, lists this among readings that improve the Greek style.

(3) Matthew 3:12 – και συνάξει τὸν σῖτον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην ^τ (τ αὐτοῦ;

//Luke 3:17)²¹

In Matthew 3:12, John the Baptist declares that the one coming after him holds his winnowing fork and is prepared to gather his grain “into the barn” (εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην). The scribe of Vaticanus has introduced the possessive pronoun αὐτοῦ to modify ἀποθήκην so that the phrase “his barn” now balances the earlier phrase “his grain.” The scribe may have been influenced by the text of Luke 3:17.

(4) Matthew 6:22 – ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματος ἐστὶν ὁ ὀφθαλμός ^τ (τ σου; //Luke 11:34;

Sub-singular B 372)

In Matthew 6:22, Jesus says, “The lamp of the body is the eye” (ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματος ἐστὶν ὁ ὀφθαλμός). In Codex Vaticanus, the word “eye” is modified by the possessive pronoun “your” (ὀφθαλμός σου). It is possible that the scribe was influenced by the parallel statement in Luke 11:34.²² According to IGNTP, the reading with the pronoun in Luke is secondary, but this is certainly incorrect. In favor of the longer reading in Luke stand two early papyri (P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵) and the best Alexandrian (Ⲭ B), Western (D), and Pre-Caesarean (W) manuscripts. Harmonization to Luke is possible, but harmonization to the immediate context could also account for the reading since the phrase ὀφθαλμός σου appears later in the same verse and again in v. 23.

²¹ B E L U W 157 242 270 348 372 659 691 892 983 1396 1424 1574 1604.

²² Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:45, identifies the reading as a harmonization.

- (5) Matthew 7:24 – πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ἀκούει μου τοὺς λόγους °τούτους καὶ ποιεῖ αὐτοὺς ὁμοιωθήσεται ἀνδρὶ φρονίμῳ ὅστις ὠκοδόμησεν αὐτοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν (//Luke 6:47)²³

In Matthew 7:24, Jesus compares those who hear and follow his words to a wise builder. He says, “Whoever hears these words of mine (μου τοὺς λόγους τούτους) and does them is like a wise man.” The parallel verse in Luke 6:47 does not include the demonstrative adjective τούτους. With Luke, the text of Matthew in Vaticanus has “my words” (μου τοὺς λόγους) instead of “these words of mine.” The scribe of Vaticanus has conformed the passage in Matthew to the form in Luke. It is also possible that the pronoun has fallen out by way of homoioteleuton. If the scribe copied λόγους and, returning to the manuscript, his eye fell upon the final three letters of τούτους, the word would be accidentally omitted. A subsequent corrector has added the word in the margin.

- (6) Matthew 8:9 – καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν † († τασσόμενος; //Luke 7:8)²⁴

- (7) Matthew 8:13 – καὶ ἰάθη ὁ παῖς °αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ (//Mark 7:30, Luke 7:10)²⁵

Jesus agrees to go with a centurion and to heal his servant, but the centurion protests that he is not worthy to have Jesus come into his house. He explains, “For I also am a man under authority (ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν).” As a centurion, he makes commands and sees

²³ B* Σ* 242 243 544 1424.

²⁴ ⋈ B 4 238 273 372 421 483. Legg prefers the longer reading.

²⁵ ⋈ B 0250 0281 ^f 1 22 33 118 205 1582*.

them executed just as a command from Jesus could cure his child from a distance. Luke includes the participle *τασσοόμενος* in his version of the sentence: “For I also am a man *set under* authority (*ὕπὸ ἐξουσίαν τασσοόμενος*).” The scribe of Vaticanus has incorporated the Lukan participle into his copy of Matthew.²⁶

Jesus, persuaded by the centurion’s audacious faith, heals the servant. It is later reported to the Centurion that “his servant” (*ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ*) was healed in that very hour. The scribe of Vaticanus has omitted the pronoun *αὐτοῦ*, thereby bringing the text closer to Mark 7:30 and Luke 7:20. In those contexts, “*the servant*” (*τὸ παιδίον*) and “*the slave*” (*τὸν δοῦλον*) are healed. Pronouns are often subject to omission or addition in the manuscripts, but harmonization may have played a role in the creation of this reading.

(8) Matthew 8:23 – *καὶ ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς ὄτὸ πλοῖον ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ* (//Luke 8:22)²⁷

Jesus and his disciples embark on a voyage across the sea. Matthew uses a definite article to describe “*the boat*” (*τὸ πλοῖον*) onto which they board, while Luke does not use an article. Harmonization to Luke 8:22 may account for the scribe’s omission of the article from the text of Matthew in Codex Vaticanus.

(9) Matthew 9:4 – *καὶ ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις αὐτῶν εἶπεν* (*Γεῖδώς*; //Mark 2:8, Luke 5:22; cf. Matthew 12:25)²⁸

²⁶ So Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:45.

²⁷ \aleph^c B C G 047 *f*¹ *f*¹³ 1 22 33 118 124 205 253 349 517 543 565 659 892 1093 1346 1375 1582. Souter prefers the shorter reading.

²⁸ B E^c M Θ Π* Σ *f*¹ 1 4 71 157 205 209 237 280 482 565 597 700 1093 1194 1216 1424 1582 2145. Legg, Merk, and Souter prefer *εἰδώς*.

(10) Matthew 9:6 – ἔγερθεὶς ἄρόν σου τὴν κλίνην καὶ ὑπάγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου

(ἔγειρε; //Mark 2:11, Luke 5:24; cf. Matthew 9:5)²⁹

During his encounter with a paralytic, Jesus is privy to the thoughts of some spectating scribes. In Matthew 9:4, Jesus is said to be “seeing” (ιδών) their thoughts. Mark and Luke use a more appropriate verb when they explain that Jesus was “knowing” or “perceiving” (ἐπιγινούς) their thoughts. The scribe of Vaticanus has replaced ιδών with εἰδώς. This scribal alteration is understandable because, as Metzger explains, “seeing” thoughts is an unusual concept.³⁰ Beyond stylistic improvement, it is possible that the use of ἐπιγινώσκω in the parallel accounts suggested the change from ιδών to εἰδώς. Finally, the scribe may also have been influenced by Matthew 12:25, where the construction “knowing their thoughts” (εἰδώς δὲ τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις αὐτῶν) occurs.

Jesus turns to the paralytic and says, “Getting up (ἐγερθεὶς), take your mat, and go to your house.” In Codex Vaticanus, Matthew’s participle ἐγερθεὶς is replaced by the imperative ἔγειρε. The new reading corresponds to the construction in Mark 2:11 and Luke 5:24.³¹ The imperative form also appears in Matthew 9:5, but in that verse the scribe of Vaticanus has used an infinitive (ἐγειῖραι) so that harmonization to the context is not possible. It is not surprising that scribes have changed the participle to an imperative given that the other verbs in the sequence are imperative (ἄρόν, ὑπάγε).

²⁹ B D 0281 372.

³⁰ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 19.

³¹ So Lagrange, *Critique rationnelle*, 86.

(11) Matthew 9:14 – διὰ τί ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύομεν ὀπολλά (//Mark 2:18)³²

(12) Matthew 9:17 – εἰ δὲ μὴ ὄγε ῥήγνυνται οἱ ἄσκοι καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται καὶ οἱ ἄσκοι ἀπόλλυνται (//Mark 2:22; Sub-singular B 301 700)

John's disciples come to Jesus and ask, "Why do we and the Pharisees fast much (πολλά), but your disciples do not fast?" A few scribes, including that of Vaticanus, have omitted the adverb πολλά. These manuscripts are of such importance that despite the rarity of the variant, many critical editions retain the word in brackets. Metzger prefers the longer reading, with some hesitation, because it is found in the majority of manuscripts and is dissimilar to Mark.³³ The variant appears to have occurred because of the scribe's familiarity with the version of the question in Mark 2:18.

To teach about fasting, Jesus uses an illustration about putting new wine into old wineskins. One should not do so, he says, "otherwise surely" (εἰ δὲ μὴ γε) the skin will burst and the wine pour out. The construction εἰ δὲ μὴ γε is found in Matthew 9:17 and in Luke 5:37, but in Mark 2:22 a shorter version is found: εἰ δὲ μὴ. The scribe of Vaticanus has adopted the shorter Markan construction in his copy of Matthew.

(13) Matthew 9:32 – προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ ὄανθρωπον κωφὸν δαιμονιζόμενον (cf. Matthew 12:22)³⁴

³² ⋈* B 0281 27 71 1194. Tischendorf and Legg prefer the shorter reading.

³³ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 20.

³⁴ ⋈ B^{f13} 71 99 124 174 692 788 892. Legg, Merk, and Souter prefer the shorter reading.

In Matthew 9:32, Jesus heals a “demon possessed deaf man” (ἄνθρωπον κωφὸν δαιμονιζόμενον). The scribe of Vaticanus has omitted the word ἄνθρωπον so that the man is referred to as a “deaf demoniac” (κωφὸν δαιμονιζόμενον). It is possible that this change occurred under the influence of the doublet of this episode in Matthew 12:22, where the possessed individual is described as “a blind and deaf demoniac” (δαιμονιζόμενος τυφλὸς καὶ κωφός).

(14) Matthew 10:13 – ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ᾖ ἀξία ἢ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν Ἦ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐπιστραφήτω
(Ἦ ἐφ’; //Luke 10:6)³⁵

In Matthew 10:13, Jesus commissions his disciples to evangelize the neighboring towns and countryside. If they find a worthy house, they are to let their peace come “upon it” (ἐπ’ αὐτήν). If the house is not worthy, he tells them, “Let your peace return to you” (ἢ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐπιστραφήτω). The scribe of Codex Vaticanus, along with a few others, repeats the first preposition, ἐπί, in the second clause in the place of πρὸς. Several possible explanations could account for this shift. First, it is most likely that the scribe conformed the phrase to the context, given the use of ἐπί shortly before. Hoskier suggests a second explanation, namely, that the scribe has a stylistic preference for pairs and so has repeated the preposition to make a pair of ἐπί phrases.³⁶ Finally, harmonization to Luke 10:6 could account for the shift. In that passage, if the disciples encounter a “son of peace” (υἱὸς εἰρήνης), they are to let their peace rest “on him” (ἐπ’ αὐτόν). If they do

³⁵ Ɀ B W 174 243 372 892 1010 1293 1604. Legg prefers ἐφ’. Miniscule 243 also adopts the verb ἀνακάμψει from Luke 10:6, strengthening the case for harmonization in that manuscript.

³⁶ Hoskier, *Codex B*, I:58. Hoskier also acknowledges the possibility of harmonization to Luke.

not, Jesus says, the blessing of peace “will return to you” (ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς ἀνακάμψει). The double use of ἐπί in Luke 10:6 could have influenced the text of Matthew in Vaticanus.

(15) Matthew 10:28a – καὶ μὴ ἴ φοβεῖσθε (ἴ φοβηθῆτε; //Luke 12:4)³⁷

(16) Matthew 10:28b – ἀπὸ τῶν ἴ ἀποκτενόντων τὸ σῶμα (ἴ ἀποκτεινόντων; //Luke 12:4)³⁸

Jesus tells his disciples, “Do not be afraid of those who kill the body” (καὶ μὴ φοβεῖσθε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτενόντων τὸ σῶμα), but cannot kill the soul. There are two harmonizing variants in this passage. In the first place, the imperative φοβεῖσθε has been altered to the subjunctive form found in Luke 12:4, φοβηθῆτε, a form standard in Attic Greek in negative commands. This is a common reading in Matthean manuscripts and became the *de facto* reading of Matthew 10:28. Even so, the subjunctive variant was born as an assimilation. The imperative reading is older and is typical of Matthean style; this form occurs seven times in comparison to just one use of the subjunctive. The scribe has copied the verb correctly in the second part of v. 28, just four lines later, and again in v. 31.

Later in Matthew 10:28, the scribe has exchanged the Matthean form of the masculine plural participle, ἀποκτενόντων, for Luke’s form of the same, ἀποκτεινόντων. There is no difference in the meaning of the verb. The presence of two variants in one verse that can be explained by the parallel in Luke 12:4 strengthens the case for harmonization.

³⁷ B D N S W Y Θ Σ Ω f¹ 1 7 22 28 33 118 124 205 245 372 440 565 892 1093 1170 1375 1424 1555 1582. Merk prefers φοβηθῆτε.

³⁸ B Φ 372 565. Legg and Souter prefer ἀποκτεινόντων.

(17) Matthew 11:19 – καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς (B^c ἔκνων;

//Luke 7:35)³⁹

Jesus claims in Matthew 11:19, “Wisdom will be justified by her works (ἔργων αὐτῆς).” In Luke 7:35, Jesus says that wisdom will be justified by “all her children” (πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς). In Vaticanus, the first scribe has copied the expected Matthean reading, ἔργων, but the word faded or was rubbed out and a corrector has supplied τέκνων in the margin. This alteration is common in manuscripts of Matthew and the reading became fully lodged in the Matthean manuscript tradition.⁴⁰ In several manuscripts that contain both Matthew and Luke, the scribes have selected one noun to use in both places. Vaticanus, Bezae, Θ, and f¹ use τέκνων in both Matthew and Luke while Sinaiticus uses ἔργων in both places.

(18) Matthew 12:22a – τότε Ἦ προσηνήχθη αὐτῷ (Ἦ προσήνεγκαν; cf. Matthew

9:32)⁴¹

(19) Matthew 12:22b – Ἦ δαιμονιζόμενος τυφλὸς καὶ κωφός Ἦ δαιμονιζόμενον

τυφλὸν καὶ κωφόν; cf. Matthew 9:32)⁴²

Matthew records, “Then a blind and deaf demoniac was brought to him” (τότε προσηνήχθη αὐτῷ δαιμονιζόμενος τυφλὸς καὶ κωφός). The demoniac is the subject of the

³⁹ B^c C D E F G K L M N S U V X Γ Δ Θ Π Σ f¹ 28 33 157 180 205 565 579 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 (1506) ℣. Manuscripts with πάντων τῶν τέκνων include: f¹³ 828 1346.

⁴⁰ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 24, believes this reading, along with the longer variant, πάντων τῶν τέκνων, can be attributed to the scribes.

⁴¹ B 0281^{vid} 1675. Legg prefers προσήνεγκαν.

⁴² B 1424 1675. Legg prefers the accusative reading.

sentence and the verb is passive. The closest parallel to this passage is its doublet in Matthew 9:32. In that context, the subjects of the sentence are those who bring the man, the verb is active, and the demoniac is referred to in the accusative case: προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ ἄνθρωπον κωφὸν δαιμονιζόμενον. Influenced by the earlier doublet, the scribe of Vaticanus has adopted the active verb form and accusative construction.

(20) Matthew 13:7 – καὶ ἀνέβησαν αἱ ἄκανθαι καὶ ἔπνιξαν αὐτά (Ἦπέπνιξαν;

//Luke 8:7)⁴³

In the parable of the sower, Jesus explains that some of the seeds were “choked” (ἔπνιξαν) by thorns that grew up around them. Where Matthew uses the simple verb πνίγω, Luke uses the compound verb ἀποπνίγω. The simple verb appears in the majority of manuscripts of Matthew, including Vaticanus. In fact, it is possible that the compound verb is the older reading in Matthew since it is attested early, widely, and in several text types. Even so, witnesses in favor of the simple verb include some of the best Alexandrian (Ⲙ), Western (D), and “Caesarean” (Θ) manuscripts.⁴⁴ Furthermore, the appearance of the compound verb in manuscripts of Matthew can be explained by harmonization to Luke 8:7.

⁴³ B C K L M N O W X Y Z Γ Δ Π Σ f¹ 2 28 33 157 579 700 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1424 1506 Ⓜ. Legg, Merk, and Souter prefer ἀπέπνιξαν.

⁴⁴ Luz, *Matthew*, 2:235 n. 1, and Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:384 n. 42, accept ἔπνιξαν and propose harmonization as an explanation for the complex verb in the majority of manuscripts.

(21) Matthew 13:13 – διὰ τοῦτο ἐν παραβολαῖς αὐτοῖς λαλῶ ὅτι βλέποντες οὐ

βλέπουντες καὶ ἀκούοντες οὐκ ἀκούουσιν οὐδὲ Ἦ συνιῶσιν (Ἦ συνιῶσιν;

//Mark 4:12, Luke 8:10)⁴⁵

In Matthew 13:13, Jesus speaks about parables and the people who cannot understand them. “Seeing they do not see and hearing they do not hear or understand (συνιῶσιν),” he says. In the best manuscripts of Matthew, the last verb is in the indicative mood. A corrector of Vaticanus has opted for the subjunctive form συνιῶσιν. The origin of this variant appears to be the allusion to Isaiah 6:9–10 in Mark 4:12 and Luke 8:10.⁴⁶ In Mark, Jesus says that everything occurs in parables so that the people, seeing, might see and not understand and, “hearing, might hear and *might not comprehend*” (ἀκούοντες ἀκούωσιν καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν). Luke’s construction is similar (καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ συνιῶσιν). It seems that the parallels have influenced the corrector without the corrector’s deliberate intention to assimilate to them because the subjunctive verb does not fit smoothly within the context of Matthew 13:13.

(22) Matthew 14:5 – καὶ θέλων αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι ἐφοβήθη τὸν ὄχλον Ἦ ὅτι ὡς

προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον (Ἦ ἐπεὶ ὡς; cf. Matthew 21:46; Sub-singular

B* 700; Corrected)

Matthew records that Herod feared the crowds on account of John the Baptist, “for they held him as a prophet” (ὅτι ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον). The scribe of Vaticanus

⁴⁵ B^c Θ^f f¹³ 1 7 13 22 33 157 174 180 230 372 543 660 788 826 828 983 1241 1346 1582* 1689.

⁴⁶ Isaiah 6:9–10 LXX: καὶ εἶπεν πορεύθητι καὶ εἶπὸν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ ἀκοῆ ἀκούετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου καὶ τοῖς ὤσιν αὐτῶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν μήποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὤσιν ἀκούσωσιν καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.

has substituted ἐπεὶ for ὅτι, a reading that corresponds to a similar construction in Matthew 21:46.⁴⁷ In that passage, it is the Pharisees who fear the crowds “because they (the people) held him (Jesus) for a prophet” (ἐπεὶ εἰς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον). A later scribe has added ὅτι in the margin of Vaticanus and ἐπεὶ has been rubbed out or permitted to fade away.

(23) Matthew 14:22a – καὶ εὐθέως ἠνάγκασεν τοὺς μαθητάς ^τ (τ^{αὐτοῦ}; //Mark 6:45, John 6:16)⁴⁸

(24) Matthew 14:22b – ἐμβῆναι εἰς ὁτὸ πλοῖον (//John 6:17)⁴⁹

After feeding the crowd of five thousand, Jesus compels “the disciples” (τοὺς μαθητάς) to get into a boat. The parallel passages in Mark 6:45 and in John 6:16 use the possessive pronoun αὐτοῦ to modify μαθητάς. Similarly, the scribe of Codex Vaticanus, and many others, has added the possessive pronoun αὐτοῦ. Harmonization is possible, but one cannot be certain in such cases since both phrases—τοὺς μαθητάς and τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ—occur frequently and are regularly altered by the scribes.

In the same verse, Matthew records that Jesus compelled the disciples to get aboard “the boat” (τὸ πλοῖον). In Vaticanus, the definite article is missing, bringing the text into agreement with John 6:17. In that passage, the disciples board “a boat” (πλοῖον). Harmonization is possible, but it is equally plausible that the scribe accidentally omitted the article.

⁴⁷ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:45, regards this reading as a harmonizing change.

⁴⁸ B E F K P X Θ Π Σ f¹³ 2 28 71 124 157 482 543 565 566 579 788 892 1006 1342 1424 1506.

⁴⁹ B Σ f¹ 4 21 22 33 124 399 485 565 700 892 1555 1582. Legg prefers the shorter reading.

(25) Matthew 15:27 – καὶ ὁ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν πιπτόντων
ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τῶν κυρίων αὐτῶν (//Mark 7:28; Singular)

Jesus bandies words with a Syrophenician woman seeking a miracle for her child. He explains that it is not right to give food meant for children to dogs. The woman retorts that even dogs eat the crumbs that fall from the table. In Matthew 15:7, the woman begins her response with the argumentative conjunction γάρ. The conjunction does not appear in Mark 7:28. In Codex Vaticanus, the scribe has omitted γάρ under the influence of the parallel.

(26) Matthew 15:31 – ὥστε τὸν ὄχλον θαυμάσαι βλέποντας⁵⁰ κωφούς Ἰλαλοῦντας
(Ἰ ἀκούοντας; //Mark 7:37)⁵¹

In Matthew 15:30–31, the evangelist records that Jesus healed the “lame, blind, crippled, and mute” (χωλοὺς τυφλοὺς κυλλοὺς κωφούς). The crowds marvel to see the formerly mute “speaking” (λαλοῦντας). In the parallel passage in Mark 7:37, Mark records that Jesus “makes the deaf to hear and the speechless to speak” (τοὺς κωφοὺς ποιεῖ ἀκούειν καὶ τοὺς ἀλάλους λαλεῖν). The word κωφός appears in both verses, but with different meanings. The term primarily means mute, but can also refer to someone who is deaf. Mark distinguishes between the meanings by speaking of two categories of disability, the deaf (κωφούς) and the speechless (ἀλάλους). Matthew speaks ambiguously of the “deaf/mute” (κωφός), but clarifies that the mute are meant when he says that the evidence of their restoration involved “speaking” (λαλοῦντας). The scribe of Vaticanus

⁵⁰ B has τοὺς ὄχλους βλέποντας θαυμάσαι.

⁵¹ B Φ 59 115 238 1071 1243 1604. N O Σ have a conflated reading: ἀκούοντας καὶ λαλοῦντας. 7 659 have ἀκούοντας καὶ ἀλάλους λαλοῦντας.

has espoused the alternative meaning of κωφός and describes the restoration of the disabled person as a matter of “hearing” (ἀκούοντας). He has either done so by independently following the alternative meaning of the word, or because he was influenced by the version of the passage in Mark’s text, though he does not adopt Mark’s grammar.

(27) Matthew 15:38 – οἱ δὲ ἐσθιοντες ἦσαν ^τ τετρακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων (^τ ὥς; //Mark 8:9)⁵²

Matthew records that Jesus miraculously fed a crowd of men that numbered “four thousand” (τετρακισχίλιοι). Mark’s estimation is approximate; he says the total was “about four thousand” (ὥς τετρακισχίλιοι). The scribe of Vaticanus has adopted the Markan particle ὥς in his text of Matthew.⁵³

(28) Matthew 16:2b–3 – [□] ὀψίας γενομένης λέγετε εὐδία πυρράζει γὰρ ὁ οὐρανός καὶ πρωῖ σήμερον χειμῶν πυρράζει γὰρ στυγνάζων ὁ οὐρανός τὸ μὲν πρόσωπον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ γινώσκετε διακρίνειν τὰ δὲ σημεῖα τῶν καιρῶν οὐ δύνασθε [\] (//Mark 8:13; cf. Matthew 12:39)⁵⁴

In response to a request by the Pharisees for a sign from heaven, Jesus explains in exasperation, “When it is evening you say, ‘Fair weather, for the heaven is red.’ And (when it is) early, ‘Bad weather today, for the heaven is red and threatening.’ You know how to interpret the face of the heavens, but the signs of the times you are not able (to

⁵² B Θ f¹³ 1 13 22 33 124 346 543 713 788 892 1293 1346 1555 1574 1582.

⁵³ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:45, regards the variant as a harmonizing addition.

⁵⁴ ⋈ B V X Y Γ Ω* 047 f¹³ 2* 13 124* 157 230 267 472 478 543* 579 788 826 828 1078 1080* 1473 1573 2430 2542.

interpret)?" This meteorological lesson is absent from many manuscripts of Matthew.

The material is also absent in the doublet at Matthew 12:39 and in the parallel account in Mark 8:13. Luke 12:54–56 has similar material, but not in the context of opponents requesting signs.

The textual evidence for the passage is not conclusive, leading some scholars to suggest that the verses are an adapted interpolation from Luke.⁵⁵ The passage is absent from both of the great Alexandrian uncials (Ⲁ B), from *f*¹³, and from several other manuscripts. The best witnesses in favor of the passage include Bezae, Washingtonianus, and L. The diversity of this evidence favors the inclusion of the passage in Matthew. Therefore, the words are not a scribal interpolation, but an adaptation of source material shared with Luke.

It is difficult to account for the omission of the passage. Scrivener and Lagrange suspect that scribes living in climates (e.g. in Egypt) where the meteorological signs Jesus points to, namely the red sky, did not announce poor weather omitted the passage.⁵⁶ Another possibility is that scribes omitted the passage in conformity with the doublet in Matthew 12. This could certainly account for some of the manuscripts, but is not an adequate solution for all the manuscripts with this reading. Finally, it is possible that scribes omitted the passage in harmonization to Mark 8:12. If a scribe were familiar with the Markan passage, he might overlook the special Matthean material and move straight into the conclusion of the speech as Mark does.

⁵⁵ See the discussion of the problem in Luz, *Matthew*, 2:347. Luz regards the passage as secondary. Nolland, *Matthew*, 646, regards the verses as authentic.

⁵⁶ According to Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 33.

(29) Matthew 16:5 – καὶ ἐλθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ εἰς τὸ πέραν ἐπελάθοντο ἅρτους

λαβεῖν² (ἅρτους λαβεῖν; //Mark 8:14)⁵⁷

After Jesus and his disciples set out across the sea, it is discovered that the disciples have forgotten “to bring bread” (ἅρτους λαβεῖν). Matthew’s word order, with noun before verb, is transposed in Codex Vaticanus. The resultant reading, λαβεῖν ἅρτους, corresponds to the reading of Mark 8:14.

(30) Matthew 16:20 – τότε ἔδισεῖλατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ εἴπωσιν ὅτι αὐτός

ἐστὶν ὁ χριστός (ἔπετίμησεν; //Mark 8:30, cf. Luke 9:21;

Corrected)⁵⁸

In Matthew 16:20, Peter confesses that Jesus is the Christ, the son of the living God. In response, Jesus “commanded the disciples” (δισεῖλατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς) not to tell anyone. Both Mark 8:30 and Luke 9:21 employ the concept of “rebuke” (ἐπιτιμᾶω) in this context instead of “command.” Mark, for instance, says, “He rebuked them” (ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς). The scribe of Vaticanus has replaced Matthew’s δισεῖλατο with Mark’s ἐπετίμησεν, but a later corrector has overwritten the word with the correct Matthean reading.⁵⁹

(31) Matthew 17:4a – ποιήσω ὡς εἶπες ἅρτους ἅρτους² (ἅρτους ἅρτους; //Luke 9:33;

Sub-singular B 0281^{vid})

⁵⁷ B K Π 348 349 474 477 489 517 579 659 892 954 1093 1219 1279 1295 1396 1424 1473 1579.

⁵⁸ B* D. Legg prefers ἐπετίμησεν.

⁵⁹ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:45, calls this reading a harmonizing change.

(32) Matthew 17:4b – σοὶ μίαν καὶ Μωϋσεῖ μίαν καὶ Ἑλίας μίαν² (ἑμίαν Ἑλίας;
//Luke 9:33)⁶⁰

In Matthew's episode of the transfiguration, Peter volunteers to build three tents (τρεις σκηνας)—for Jesus one, for Moses one, and for Elijah one (Ἑλίας μίαν). In Luke, both phrases in this sentence are different. In the first place, the words τρεις σκηνας are transposed. In the second place, the words Ἑλίας μίαν are transposed. The scribe of Vaticanus has adopted the Lukan word order in both cases. While in either reading stylistic preference could account for the change, viewed together, the variants suggest the influence of Luke 9:33 on the scribe.

(33) Matthew 17:23 – καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἔγερθήσεται (ἄναστήσεται; //Mark
9:31)⁶¹

Jesus forewarns his disciples that the son of man will be abused and killed, but offers them the hope that on the third day “he will be lifted up” (ἐγερθήσεται). Mark's version of this passage uses the synonym ἀναστήσεται. The scribe of Vaticanus has adopted this verb under the influence of Mark 9:31.

(34) Matthew 18:6 – συμφέρει αὐτῷ ἵνα κρεμασθῇ μύλος ὀνίκος {περὶ} τὸν
τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ καταποντισθῇ ἐν τῷ πελάγει τῆς θαλάσσης (cf.
Mark 9:42, Luke 17:2)⁶²

⁶⁰ B E F G H M S U V Y Γ Ω 22 28 118 205 209 565 983 1006 1071 1241 1342 2542.

⁶¹ B 047^f 118 205 245 209 443 475 543 544 788 892 1012 1346 1375 1424 1574 2145.

⁶² Manuscripts with περὶ include: Ɀ B L N O Z Σ 0281 28 33 157 482 544 579 713 892 1093 1295 1342 1391 1396 1574.

(35) Matthew 18:7 – πλὴν οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ᾧ δι’ οὗ τὸ σκάνδαλον ἔρχεται

(ᾧ ἐκείνῳ; cf. Matthew 26:24, Mark 14:21, Luke 22:22)⁶³

Hoskier regards the appearance of the preposition *περί* in the phrase “around his neck” (*περὶ τὸν τράχηλον*) in Matthew 18:6 as a harmonizing change from either *ἐπί*, as in Bezae, or *ἐν*, as in Washingtonianus, *f*¹, *f*¹³, and the Byzantine majority.⁶⁴ Most critical editions and commentators, however, prefer *περί* so that there is no need to appeal to harmonization in the case of Vaticanus.

In Matthew 18:7, Jesus teaches about temptation and the woes awaiting those through whom stumbling blocks are laid. “Woe to the man!” (*οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ*). The scribe of Vaticanus, along with most others, has used the demonstrative adjective *ἐκείνῳ* to modify *τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ*. While there is not an exact parallel to this verse in Mark and Luke, there is a passage in all three Gospels that is syntactically similar. In Matthew 26:24 and Mark 14:21, Jesus says, “Woe to *that* man (*τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ*) through whom the son of man is betrayed.”⁶⁵ It seems probable that this near-parallel influenced the scribe of Vaticanus.

(36) Matthew 18:15 – ἐὰν δὲ ἀμαρτήσῃ ἰεὶς σὲ ὁ ἀδελφός σου ὑπάγε ἔλεγξον

αὐτὸν μεταξὺ σοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ μόνου (//Luke 17:3; cf. Matthew 18:21,

Luke 17:4)⁶⁶

⁶³ B E G H K M N S U (W) Γ Δ Θ Π 0281^{vid} *f*¹³ 2 28 33 118 157 565 700 788 1006 1071 1241 1342 1346 1424 1506 ℞. Souter prefers *ἐκείνῳ*.

⁶⁴ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:45.

⁶⁵ The text of Luke 22:22 is slightly different, but the phrase in question is the same.

⁶⁶ ⋈ B 0281 *f*¹ 1 22 234* 544 579 1582*. Tischendorf, Legg, and Merk prefer the shorter reading.

Jesus teaches on sin and forgiveness in Matthew 18:15. He begins, “If your brother sins against you (εἰς σέ),” go reprove him privately. The prepositional phrase εἰς σέ does not appear in Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, or *f*¹, leading many editors to suggest that the phrase does not belong to Matthew and is rather a scribal interpolation from Luke 17:4 or an adaptation of Matthew 18:21. The evidence in favor of the phrase is actually quite strong. It includes the majority of manuscripts, early and important members of two text types (D W), and a good, if late, member of the Alexandrian type (L). The diversity of the manuscript testimony is not completely satisfactory on its own, but when joined to additional evidence, the case for its place in Matthew improves.

If the reading with εἰς σέ is older, one can imagine scribes omitting the words in order to make the aphorism applicable to sin in general, rather than to sin against a person individually. Metzger notes this possibility. He does not mention, though, that in removing the phrase the scribe would also bring the passage into harmony with Luke 17:3.⁶⁷ The harmonized passage would then be broken into two situations: in the first, a brother sins (general) and is rebuked by his fellow (Matthew 18:15; Luke 17:3). In the second, a brother sins against a person directly (particular) and is forgiven (Matthew 18:21; Luke 17:4). The intervening verses in Matthew (vv. 16–20) are referable to sin in general and are not specific to sin against an individual. This two-part scheme would not have been a feature of Matthew, but some scribes have made it so by eliminating the prepositional phrase.

⁶⁷ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 36.

(37) Matthew 19:9a – λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι (//Mark 10:11)⁶⁸

(38) Matthew 19:9b – ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ ἢ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ
γαμήσῃ ἄλλην ἢ (ἢ παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι;
cf. Matthew 5:32a)⁶⁹

(39) Matthew 19:9c – ἢ μοιχᾶται (ἢ καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσας; cf. Matthew
5:32b, Luke 16:18)

There are several variant readings in the text of Jesus’s teaching on divorce in Matthew 19:9. First, Matthew’s recitative ὅτι has been removed, bringing the passage into line with Mark 10:11. This type of omission could have been made independently of the parallel, but the two additional assimilating variants in the verse point to harmonization as the source of this alteration as well.

The second and third variants relate to the content of Jesus’s teaching.⁷⁰ In the first place, Matthew’s single sentence, “Whoever divorces his wife, except for sexual immorality, and marries another, commits adultery,” has been divided into two clauses. In Matthew 19:9b, the “exception clause” maintains that a man who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery. The scribe has changed the passage so that the man who divorces his wife, “except upon the ground of *porneia*, makes her to commit adultery” (παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι). This complete phrase comes from Matthew 5:32a.

⁶⁸ B D Z 440 517 1424.

⁶⁹ B 0233 *f*¹. Several manuscripts have only the first or only the second part of this variant.

⁷⁰ For further discussion of the divorce passages see: Michael W. Holmes, “The Text of the Matthean Divorce Passages: A Comment on the Appeal to Harmonization in Textual Decisions,” *JBL* 109 (1990): 651–664; and the chapter entitled “The Sayings on Marriage and Divorce” in Parker, *The Living Text* (pp. 75–94).

In the second place, to accommodate the change made in Matthew 19:9b, the scribe is in need of a new subject for Matthew's original verb. Therefore, the scribe has added: “*And the one who marries a divorced woman commits adultery*” (καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσας μοιχᾶται). This passage corresponds in sense, though not in syntax, to Matthew 5:32b and Luke 16:18. These variants are similar to other cases where the scribe of Vaticanus has endeavored to make doublets in the Gospel of Matthew match. On this occasion, he has conformed two versions of parallel teaching.⁷¹

(40) Matthew 19:20 – ὅ πάντα ταῦτα² ἐφύλαξα (ὅ ταῦτα πάντα; //Mark 10:20, Luke 18:21)⁷²

(41) Matthew 19:21 – καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν ἰουδαίᾳ (ἰουδαίᾳ; //Luke 18:22, cf. Mark 10:21)⁷³

(42) Matthew 19:22 – ἦν γὰρ ἔχων ἰκτήματα πολλά (ἰκτήματα; cf. Mark 10:23, Luke 18:24; Singular)

Jesus tells a rich young ruler that to enter into eternal life he must keep the commandments. The rich youth responds, “All these I kept” (ὅ πάντα ταῦτα ἐφύλαξα). In the corresponding passages in Mark 10:20 and Luke 18:21, the order of the first two

⁷¹ B E F G H K M U V Z Γ 2^c 28 118 157 180 205 209 597 700 892 1006 1071 1243 1292 1342 1506 ℳ. Manuscripts with γαμῶν instead of γαμήσας include: C* N O W Y Δ Π Σ Φ 078 0233 f¹ f¹³ 1 13 33 124 238 245 248 346 489 517 543 788 954 1010 1012 1279 1293 1346 1424 1473 1505 1574 1582 1675. Θ 565 have ἀπολυμένην instead of ἀπολελυμένην. Miniscule 579 adds ἀπὸ ἀνδρός, corresponding further to Luke 16:18.

⁷² B D H K M Γ Σ Φ f¹ f¹³ 1 28 273 440 477 517 543 544 659 788 892 1093 1293 1295 1346 1396 1402 1424 1473 1574 1579 1582 1588 1604. Legg prefers ταῦτα πάντα.

⁷³ Manuscripts with οὐρανῶ include: ⋈ E F G H K L M S U V W Z Δ Θ 0281 f¹ f¹³ 33 565 579 700 892 1006 1241 1342 1424 1506 ℳ. Tischendorf, Merk, and Souter prefer οὐρανῶ. Manuscripts with οὐρανοῖς include: B C D Γ 230 1012 1194 1295 1355* 1391 1396 1402 2145. Legg and NA²⁸ prefer οὐρανοῖς.

words is reversed (*ταῦτα πάντα*). This is the reading that appears in Vaticanus, possibly under the influence of Mark or Luke. This phrase, with pronoun before adjective, is common in the Gospels, appearing thirteen times. The reverse order, with adjective before pronoun, appears only four times. Even so, the words are transposed often in the manuscripts and the scribe need not have been influenced by the parallels to make the alteration.

The variant reading in Matthew 19:21 and its parallels is a textual tangle. There are three main alternatives. Mark 10:21 certainly has *οὐρανῶ*. In Matthew, the reading *οὐρανῶ* is found in the majority of manuscripts, but *οὐρανοῖς* appears in Vaticanus, Ephraemi, Bezae, and others. The Lukan manuscript tradition testifies to both of these readings plus a third variation, *τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* in Vaticanus and Bezae. This means that Vaticanus has three different forms in three Gospels and it is only certain that the reading of Mark 10:21 is correct.

I am inclined to prefer *οὐρανῶ* in Matthew on the basis of its broad and diverse manuscript support. The variant reading of Vaticanus (*οὐρανοῖς*) and its small company arose from the parallel passage in Luke 18:22. Luke initially had *οὐρανοῖς* or *τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*—either could have given rise to the variant in the text of Matthew in Vaticanus. It is impossible to decide between the two readings in Luke because scribes would have been just as likely to add as omit the definite article. The Lukan manuscript evidence is evenly divided, but the joint testimony of Vaticanus and Bezae tips the balance in favor of the articular reading in Luke. The majority reading in Luke (*οὐρανῶ*) is a harmonization to Mark 10:21.

Jesus tells the young man that in order to be perfect he must sell his possessions and give the proceeds to the poor. Upon hearing this, the young man goes away grieved, “For he was one with many possessions (κτῆματα).” The scribe of Vaticanus has replaced κτῆματα with χρήματα, a synonym meaning “wealth.” The exact parallel in Mark has κτῆματα, but in the following verse in Mark and Luke, which is a continuation of the same episode, the evangelists record Jesus saying, “With what difficulty those with *wealth* (χρήματα) will enter into the kingdom of God.” The close proximity and related subject matter of these verses makes it likely that the scribe of Vaticanus was influenced by their use of χρήματα.

(43) Matthew 19:24 – εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ Ἰ τρυπήματος ῥαφίδος

διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ (Ἰ τρήματος; //Luke 18:25)⁷⁴

(44) Matthew 19:29 – Ἰ ἑκατονταπλασίονα λήμψεται καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον

κληρονομήσει (Ἰ πολλαπλασίονα; //Luke 18:30)⁷⁵

Jesus tells his disciples, “It is easier for a camel⁷⁶ to go through an eye of a needle (τρυπήματος ῥαφίδος) than for the wealthy to enter into the kingdom of God.” Each of the three Synoptic evangelists uses a different synonym for “eye” in the phrase “eye of the needle.” Matthew uses τρύπημα, Mark uses τρυμαλιά, and the best manuscripts of Luke

⁷⁴ 8* B. Legg prefers τρήματος.

⁷⁵ B L 579 945 990 1010 1207 1223 1293. Tischendorf and Legg prefer πολλαπλασίονα.

⁷⁶ Some manuscripts (e.g. 579 1424) substitute the homonym κάμιλος, a nautical term for a ship’s rigging, or hawser. There is somewhat more evidence for κάμιλος in Lukan manuscripts. The variant creates an easier image—a rope passing through a needle rather than a camel.

(⌘ B D) have τῆμα. There is a great deal of variation in this verse in all three manuscripts. In this case, the scribe of Codex Vaticanus has been influenced by the version of this verse in Luke.⁷⁷

Toward the end of this teaching, Jesus promises his disciples that everyone who has left home and family for his sake will receive “a hundredfold” (ἑκατονταπλασίονα) what he has left behind. Mark also speaks of a hundredfold return. Luke, however, records that disciples will receive “manifold” (πολλαπλασίονα) or “many times” what they have given up. Several scribes, including that of Vaticanus, have conformed to the Lukan expression.⁷⁸

(45) Matthew 20:15 – ἢ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου πονηρός ἐστὶν ὅτι ἐγὼ ἀγαθός εἰμι (Γ εἰ; cf. Matthew 18:9)⁷⁹

(46) Matthew 20:16 – οὕτως ἔσονται οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι
(Many manuscripts add πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσὶν κλητοὶ ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί;
cf. Matthew 22:14)⁸⁰

In the parable of the laborers in the vineyard, some workers are upset at the owner of the vineyard for paying equal wages regardless of time worked. The owner wonders why the men are upset about his generosity and asks, “Is it not lawful for me to do what I wish with what is mine? Or is your eye evil because I am good?” (ἢ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου

⁷⁷ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:46–47, lays out the situation in all three Gospels succinctly.

⁷⁸ See Lagrange, *Critique rationnelle*, 86.

⁷⁹ B^c H S Γ f¹ f¹³ 1 13 22 28 69 108 118 124 131 157 205 209 700 1071 1241 1342 1506 1582.

⁸⁰ The additional sentence is found in: C D E F G H K N O W Γ Δ (Θ) Σ 0300 f¹ f¹³ 7 (28) 33 124 157 180 205 565 579 597 700 892^c 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243^c 1292 1505 1506 ℣. The passage is absent from: ⌘ B L Z 085 892* 1342 1424.

πονηρός ἐστὶν ὅτι ἐγὼ ἀγαθός εἰμι). The particle ἢ at the beginning of the second clause, implies by ellipsis the alternative statement in the first clause. The particle has been replaced by the conjunction εἰ in many manuscripts, including Vaticanus. It is possible that the change is purely orthographical, since the words would have sounded alike, but it is also possible that the verse has been conformed to a very similar phrase in Matthew 18:9. In that context, Jesus says, “If your eye scandalizes you, cut it out and cast it from you” (εἰ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου σκανδαλίζει σε ἔξελε αὐτὸν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ). Given the similarity of the first four words of each phrase, the scribe may have been influenced by the previously copied verse. Here again, the scribe of Vaticanus has endeavored to maintain internal harmony within the Gospel.

Jesus claims with a chiasmic structure, “Thus the last will be first and the first last.” Some manuscripts add, “For many are called but few (are) chosen” (πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσιν κλητοὶ ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί). Most editors agree that these words are an interpolation from Matthew 22:14. Hoskier, however, accepts the additional phrase as the earlier reading and regards the omission of the phrase from manuscripts like Vaticanus as a harmonization to Mark 10:31 and Luke 13:30. He writes, “The final clause...is removed by \aleph B L Z 36 892..., but only by these, as being an importation from xxii. 14.”⁸¹ In other words, he suggests that the scribes who omitted the phrase *incorrectly* regarded it as an interpolation and so removed it. In fact, the reading with the additional sentence is *not* the earlier reading.⁸² Therefore, while there is no harmonizing activity in this verse in

⁸¹ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:44.

⁸² See Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 41.

Vaticanus, the addition of the sentence in Ephraemi, Bezae, and Washingtonianus is a harmonizing addition from Matthew 22:14.

(47) Matthew 20:17a – ‘καὶ ἀναβαίνων ὁ Ἰησοῦς’ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα (‘μέλλων δὲ ἀναβαίνειν Ἰησοῦς; //Mark 10:32)⁸³

(48) Matthew 20:17b – παρέλαβεν τοὺς δώδεκα {μαθητάς} κατ’ ἰδίαν καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς (//Mark 10:32, Luke 18:31)⁸⁴

(49) Matthew 20:19 – καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ Ἦγεροθήσεται (Γ ἀναστήσεται; //Mark 10:34, Luke 18:33)⁸⁵

Hoskier regards the variant reading at the beginning of Matthew 20:17, “And being about to go up, Jesus...” (μέλλων δὲ ἀναβαίνειν Ἰησοῦς), as a harmonizing change toward the setting of Mark 10:32, where it is clear that Jesus is on the road (ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ) and not yet in Jerusalem. He calls the reading a “clear reflection of Mark x. 32.”⁸⁶ According to him, the original text of Matthew 20:17, “and Jesus, going up into Jerusalem” (καὶ ἀναβαίνων ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα), implies that Jesus is closer to Jerusalem than he is. Hoskier is correct that the variant reading of Vaticanus removes the ambiguity, but the second part of the verse already clarifies that the disciples and Jesus

⁸³ B (f¹) 1582. Legg prefers μέλλων δὲ ἀναβαίνειν Ἰησοῦς.

⁸⁴ Manuscripts with μαθητάς include: B C E F G H K M N O U W X Δ Π Σ 085 2 28* 33 69 118 124 157 180 205 565 579 700 1006 1071 1241 1243 1292 1505 ℣. Manuscripts with μαθητάς αὐτοῦ include: Γ 13 28^c 346 543 659 713 828 892^c 1010 1342 1346 1424 1574 1689. Manuscripts without μαθητάς include ℞ D L Z^{vid} Θ f¹ f¹³ 788 892*. Tischendorf and Merk prefer the shortest reading; Legg and Souter follow Vaticanus.

⁸⁵ B C^d D E G H K M S U V W X Γ Δ Θ Π Φ 085 f¹ f¹³ 2 28 33 157 565 700 788 1006 1071 1241 1342 1346 1424 ℣.

⁸⁶ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:47.

have not yet reached their destination since they are still “on the road” (ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ). In this case, Hoskier is incorrect in asserting that the variant reflects the parallel.

While on the path, Jesus gathers together either “the twelve” (τοὺς δώδεκα), as in Sinaiticus, “the twelve disciples” (τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητάς), as in Vaticanus, or “his twelve disciples” (τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητάς αὐτοῦ), as in Γ. The first two options have strong manuscript evidence in their favor. In support of the shortest reading (τοὺς δώδεκα) is the fact that, according to Metzger, “copyists often add the word *μαθηταί* to the more primitive expression *οἱ δώδεκα...*” Despite this practice, Metzger explains, “a majority of the Committee judged that the present passage was assimilated to the text of Mark (10.32) or Luke (18.31).”⁸⁷ Since a solution to the textual problem is impossible, it seems best to say that if the longer reading (τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητάς) is earlier, harmonization could have been a strong factor in its omission from Sinaiticus, Bezae, and others. Harmonization is not, however, a factor in Vaticanus.

Jesus explains to the twelve that the son of man will be delivered over and killed, but that on the third day “he will be raised up” (ἐγερθήσεται). The parallel passages in Mark and Luke use the synonym *ἀναστήσεται*, which does not appear in the Gospel of Matthew in the context of Jesus’s passion predictions or resurrection. The scribe of Codex Vaticanus, and many others, has been influenced by the parallel construction in the other Synoptics.

⁸⁷ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 41–42.

(50) Matthew 20:23a – τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἢ καὶ ἐξ εὐωνύμων (ἢ; //Mark 10:40)⁸⁸

(51) Matthew 20:23b – οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν ὁ τοῦτο δοῦναι (//Mark 10:40)⁸⁹

(52) Matthew 20:26a – οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν (ἔστιν; //Mark 10:43)⁹⁰

(53) Matthew 20:26b – ἀλλ’ ὅς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας⁹¹ γενέσθαι ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος (ἄν; //Mark 10:43)⁹²

The mother of James and John asks Jesus for the favor that her sons might sit on his right hand and left hand in his kingdom. Jesus says, “To sit at my right hand and (καί) my left hand, this is not mine to give (τοῦτο δοῦναι).” Two variant readings are worth noting here. Where Matthew speaks of “my right *and* (καί) my left hand,” Mark speaks of “my right hand *or* (ἢ) my left hand.” The scribe has adopted the Markan preposition in his text of Matthew. Such an alteration could have occurred apart from parallel influence, but in conjunction with a second harmonizing variant in the same verse, the case for harmonization improves.

The second variant brings into question whether the reading with the demonstrative pronoun τοῦτο is the older reading in Matthew. Most critical editions prefer the reading τοῦτο δοῦναι despite impressive evidence for the absence of the

⁸⁸ B L Θ ^f 1 33 1424.

⁸⁹ ⋈ B E G H K L M N O S U X Z Γ Θ Σ Ω ^f ^f ³ 1 13 28 69 118 157 180 205 565 579 700 892 1006 1071 1241 1243 1292 1424 1506 1582 ℣. Legg and Souter prefer the shorter reading.

⁹⁰ B D Z 0281. Legg prefers ἔστιν.

⁹¹ B has μέγας ἐν ὑμῖν.

⁹² B D 33 1515 2145. Legg prefers ἄν.

pronoun. The pronoun does not appear in either of the fourth-century Alexandrian uncials (Ⲭ B) or a slew of Byzantine witnesses. If *τοῦτο* belongs in the text, one might readily account for its omission by appeal to harmonization to Mark 10:40.⁹³

In Matthew 20:26a, Jesus compares the social dynamics of foreign rulers, who lord it over their subjects, to the ideals expected among his disciples. He says, “It will not be (*ἔσται*) so among you.” In the parallel in Mark 10:43, the verb is in the present tense, “But *it is* (*ἔστιν*) not so among you.” Influenced by the Markan parallel, the scribe of Vaticanus has chosen the present tense form.⁹⁴ The alteration is odd, and likely made without deliberation, because it does not correspond to the future tense used in v. 26b.

In the same sentence, Jesus says, “But whoever (*ὃς ἐάν*) wishes to be great among you will be your servant.” While Matthew uses the construction *ὃς ἐάν*, the scribe of Vaticanus follows Mark in using a shorter particle construction, *ὃς ἄν*. The scribe may have been influenced by the context, rather than the parallel, since the construction *ὃς ἄν* is used in v. 27. Furthermore, these particles are often substituted for one another so that an external influence need not have been determinative.

(54) Matthew 21:2 – *πορεύεσθε εἰς τὴν κώμην τὴν {κατέναντι} ὑμῶν* (//Mark 11:2, Luke 19:30)

⁹³ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 42, explains that the committee was persuaded for the presence of the word in Matthew by the very fact that it does *not* appear in Mark.

⁹⁴ The reverse operation, from Mark’s present tense to Matthew’s future tense, has occurred in the majority of manuscripts of Mark.

(55) Matthew 21:4 – τοῦτο δὲ ^τ γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῆ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου⁹⁵

(^τ ὄλον; cf. Matthew 1:22, 26:56)⁹⁶

(56) Matthew 21:7 – ἤγαγον τὴν ὄνον καὶ τὸν πῶλον καὶ ἐπέθηκαν {ἐπ’} αὐτῶν τὰ

ἱμάτια (//Mark 11:7, Luke 19:35)

Before entering Jerusalem, Jesus commands two of his disciples, “Go into the village before (κατέναντι) you.” An important variant in this verse in many manuscripts is the substitution of the adverb ἀπέναντι in the place of κατέναντι.⁹⁷ Aside from Codex Washingtonianus and a few Pre-Caesarean manuscripts, the evidence for this popular reading is primarily Byzantine. Hoskier believes ἀπέναντι belongs in Matthew and regards the alternative, κατέναντι, as a harmonization to Mark 11:2 or Luke 19:30.⁹⁸ While he is correct that harmonization would account for the reading, the textual evidence in favor of κατέναντι is substantial. It appears that ἀπέναντι became an important reading in later centuries, but the best manuscripts retain Matthew’s word choice.

Matthew 21:4 is a stock fulfillment phrase used often in the First Gospel: “And this happened so that might be fulfilled what was spoken through the prophet” (τοῦτο δὲ

⁹⁵ There is an error of dittography here in Vaticanus, but the offending line has been erased or rubbed out. The line ends with τὸ ῥηθὲν and the scribe begins correctly by copying διὰ τοῦ, but here falls astray by recopying πληρωθῆ τὸ ῥηθὲν before catching the error and beginning again with διὰ τοῦ. See Appendix A for a transcription.

⁹⁶ B C^c K M N O U W X Γ Δ Π Σ Φ^f ^f¹ 2 28 33 69 118 157 565 579 700 788 1006 1071 1241 1342 1346 1424 1506 1582 \aleph .

⁹⁷ E G H K M N O S U V W X Γ Δ Π Σ ^f¹ 2 565 579 1006 1071 1241 1342 1424 1506 \aleph . Souter prefers ἀπέναντι.

⁹⁸ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:47.

γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῆ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου). Several manuscripts have added the adjective ὄλον, bringing the passage closer to Matthean precedents in 1:22 and 26:56. The phrase does not appear elsewhere. This scribe’s proclivity toward internal consistency has already been noted and is on display once again.

Hoskier detected a harmonizing variant in Matthew 21:7. Matthew explains that the disciples brought the female donkey and colt and put their garments “on them” (ἐπ’ αὐτῶν). Hoskier prefers an alternative reading with a different preposition: ἐπάνω αὐτῶν.⁹⁹ If ἐπάνω is the correct reading of Matthew, the use of ἐπί in the variant ἐπ’ αὐτῶν might well be explained by harmonization to Mark 11:7 or Luke 19:35. As it is, the textual evidence in favor of ἐπ’ αὐτῶν is convincing while the presence of ἐπάνω in some manuscripts can be explained as a harmonization to context since in the very next clause Jesus is said to sit “upon them” (ἐπάνω αὐτῶν).

(57) Matthew 21:12 – καὶ εἰσῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ θεοῦ (//Mark 11:15, Luke 19:45)¹⁰⁰

Again, Hoskier suspects harmonization in Matthew 21:12, where a popular variant reading has “the temple of God” (τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ θεοῦ) rather than simply “the temple” (τὸ ἱερόν). The textual evidence is neatly balanced and additional arguments can be waged on either side. In favor of the longer reading is that, as Hoskier says, if the

⁹⁹ C K M N U W X Γ Δ Π Σ, f¹ 2 28 157 565 579 700 892^c 1006 1071 1241 1342 1424 1506 ℳ. Souter prefers ἐπάνω.

¹⁰⁰ Ɀ B L Θ 0281 vid f³ 33 700 788 826 892 1010 1012 1293 1424. Tischendorf and Souter prefer the longer reading. Manuscripts with τοῦ θεοῦ include: C D E F G H K M N S U V W X Y Γ Δ Π Σ 0233, f¹ 2 28 124 157 180 205 565 579 597 1006 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1346 1505 1506 ℳ.

original author did not write it there would be no need to add it.¹⁰¹ Against this view, Metzger thinks scribes may have added the phrase “to emphasize the profanation of the holy place.”¹⁰² Furthermore, against Hoskier’s objection, Metzger argues that Jews, though they would have no need to specify that the temple was *God’s* temple, would not have found the phrase objectionable. Metzger finds the external support for the shorter reading strong and specifically rejects the idea that scribes copying Matthew would have been led to omit the phrase by exposure to Mark and Luke, who have simply τὸ ἱερόν. Westcott and Hort call the evidence for the shorter reading “overwhelming” and Metzger calls it “strong,” but in essence it amounts to three closely related uncials (Ⲙ B L), an important “Caesarean” manuscript (Θ), and a handful of Byzantine minuscules. The diversity of evidence for the longer reading includes substantial numbers of Byzantine minuscules and uncials as well as Pre-Caesarean (W), Western (D), and Alexandrian (C) uncials. Given the diversity of the manuscript evidence and the unlikelihood that so many later scribes from different text types and geographical regions would have added τοῦ θεοῦ, I lean in favor of the longer reading and account for the shorter as a scribal harmonization to Mark 11:15 and Luke 19:45.

(58) Matthew 21:25 – οἱ δὲ διελογίζοντο ἵνα παρ’ ἑαυτοῖς (ἵνα ἐν; cf. Matthew 16:7, 8)¹⁰³

Hoskier points out another hidden harmonization, this one in Matthew 21:25. In a confrontation with the religious elite, Jesus’s opponents take a moment to discuss “with

¹⁰¹ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:23, 47, 51–52. In fact, Hoskier calls it a “gross mistake” to accept the shorter reading.

¹⁰² Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 44.

¹⁰³ Manuscripts with ἐν include: B L M^c Z 33 157 372 477 713 892 1012 1279 1295 1396 1402 1473 1579 1588. Manuscripts with παρ’ include: Ⲙ C D E F G H K M* O S U V W Δ Θ Π Σ Φ 0102^{f1} ^{f13} 2 28 69 565 579 700 788 1006 1071 1241 1342 1346 1424 1506 ⲙ. Tischendorf and Souter prefer παρ’.

one another” (*παρ’ ἑαυτοῖς*). In similar contexts, the phrase *ἐν ἑαυτοῖς* is used, and this phrase appears as a variant reading in Matthew 21:25. The construction *ἐν ἑαυτοῖς* aligns with Matthean style, since the evangelist uses the phrase six times. Alternatively, there are no occurrences of *παρ’ ἑαυτοῖς* elsewhere in the Gospels. The question, then, is whether Matthew created the less elegant phrase, which scribes, such as the scribe of Vaticanus, conformed to earlier usage, or whether Matthew wrote the more elegant passage, which was subsequently altered by a vast majority of scribes of diverse quality. Most modern editions prefer the reading *ἐν ἑαυτοῖς*, but the textual evidence is stronger for *παρ’ ἑαυτοῖς*. The reading is supported widely and across all major textual traditions. It would seem, then, that Matthew wrote *παρ’ ἑαυτοῖς* in this verse and that scribes altered the phrase in conformity with Matthean syntax in similar passages.

(59) Matthew 22:21 – λέγουσιν ὠτῶ Καίσαρος (//Luke 20:24)¹⁰⁴

In another encounter with the religious elite, Jesus asks the crowd whose inscription is on the tax coin. “They say to him, ‘Caesar’s’” (*λέγουσιν αὐτῶ Καίσαρος*). The scribe of Vaticanus has omitted the pronoun (*αὐτῶ*). The omission brings the text closer to Luke 20:24, which reads, “And they said, ‘Caesar’s’” (*οἱ δὲ εἶπαν Καίσαρος*). With the addition and omission of pronouns related to direct speech one cannot be certain that external factors played a role.

(60) Matthew 22:30 – ἀλλ’ ὡς ἄγγελοι θεοῦ ἐν τῶ οὐρανῶ εἰσιν (//Mark 12:25)¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁴ Ɱ B 1604. Tischendorf and Legg prefer the shorter reading.

¹⁰⁵ Manuscripts with *ἄγγελοι* include: B D E* 0233 205 209 700 2542. Manuscripts with *οἱ ἄγγελοι* include: Θ^f 22 1582. Manuscripts with *ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ* include: E^c F G H K M U W Γ Δ Π Φ 0102 0161 2 180 565 579 597 1006 1010 1342 1505 1506 Ɱ. Manuscripts with *ἄγγελοι θεοῦ* include: Ɱ L Σ

Hoskier finds yet another discrete harmonization in Jesus's teaching regarding the resurrection in Matthew 22:30.¹⁰⁶ In the resurrection, people “are as the angels of God (ἄγγελοι θεοῦ) in heaven.” Most critical editions and commentators prefer the shorter reading, ἄγγελοι, without τοῦ θεοῦ. Metzger, for example, is convinced by the manuscript evidence for ἄγγελοι because it includes “leading representatives of the Alexandrian and the Western types of text.” He adds that τοῦ θεοῦ is “a natural expansion.”¹⁰⁷ The evidence for the shorter reading amounts to an important Alexandrian codex (B), an important Western codex (D), and some miniscules. Competing evidence in favor of ἄγγελοι θεοῦ and the related reading, ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ, includes important Alexandrian witnesses (Ⲙ L), a high number of majuscules, and the majority of Byzantine miniscules. One of these readings gave rise to the other. With specific reference to Codex Vaticanus, it was seen above in the case of Matthew 21:12 that the scribe eliminated the words τοῦ θεοῦ from the phrase ἱερὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, a quite similar situation to 22:30. The omission of θεοῦ is a scribal harmonization to Mark 12:25.

(61) Matthew 22:39 – δευτέρα ὁδὲ ὁμοία αὐτῆ¹⁰⁸ (//Mark 12:31)¹⁰⁹

Hoskier attributes the omission of the conjunction δέ in Matthew 22:39 to harmonization to Mark 12:31.¹¹⁰ The Markan parallel has, “And this (is) a second”

f³ 4 28 33 69 124 157 213 273 399* 477 485 543 788 892 954 1071 1093 1170 1241 1243 1292 1295 1342 1346 1355 1424 1473 1555 1579 1604. Tischendorf and Merk prefer ἄγγελοι θεοῦ, as do Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:226.

¹⁰⁶ See Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:44, for his analysis.

¹⁰⁷ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 48. Luz, *Matthew*, 3:68, also prefers the shorter reading and explains the longer reading as a scribal expansion.

¹⁰⁸ B has only ὁμοίως.

¹⁰⁹ Ⲙ* B 4 157 495. Tischendorf and Legg prefer the shorter reading.

(δευτέρα αὐτή). It is true that the conjunction missing in the text of Matthew in Vaticanus does not appear in the Markan parallel, but the reading in Mark 12:31 is quite different in other ways, including the substitution of *ὁμοίως* in the place of *ὁμοία αὐτῇ*, so that harmonization is not very likely.

(62) Matthew 23:19 – ^τ τυφλοί (^τ μωροὶ καὶ; cf. Matthew 23:17)¹¹¹

In Jesus's tirade against the scribes and Pharisees in Matthew 23:19, he calls his opponents "blind ones" (τυφλοί). The scribe of Vaticanus has extended the phrase so that Jesus calls them "*foolish and blind ones*" (μωροὶ καὶ τυφλοί). The longer reading conforms to an earlier saying in Matthew 23:17.¹¹² One could call this variant a harmonization to context. It is mentioned here since this reading provides another example of the scribe's commitment to internal consistency.

(63) Matthew 23:38 – ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ὁ ἔρημος (//Luke 13:35; Sub-singular P⁷⁷ B L)

This reading was discussed in Chapter Two with reference to P⁷⁷. It is very likely that the omission of ἔρημος occurred under the influence of Luke 13:35.

(64) Matthew 24:1 – καὶ ἐξελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐπορεύετο (Γ ἐκ; //Mark 13:1)¹¹³

¹¹⁰ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:47.

¹¹¹ B C E F G H K M O U W Γ Δ Π Σ Φ 0102 0233 *f*¹³ 2 28 33 157 180 565 579 597 700 788 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1346 1424 1505 1506 1582^c *ℵ*.

¹¹² Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 50.

¹¹³ B 4 372 1093 1295 1604. Θ has ἐκ τοῦ ὄρου.

In Matthew 24:1, the evangelist narrates, “And going out from the temple (ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ), Jesus went...” Instead of the preposition ἀπό, the scribe of Vaticanus has used ἐκ. It is possible that the reading in Mark 13:1, ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, influenced the scribe’s alteration to the text of Matthew.

(65) Matthew 24:23 – μὴ Ἦ πιστεύσητε (Ἦ πιστεύετε; //Mark 13:21; Sub-singular B* 262)¹¹⁴

Jesus warns his disciples that there will be false Christs. He tells them, “Do not believe” (μὴ πιστεύσητε). Instead of an aorist subjunctive, Mark’s passage has an imperative verb (μὴ πιστεύετε). It is likely that Mark’s version of the saying influenced the scribe’s use of an imperative verb in Vaticanus.

(66) Matthew 24:36 – περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης καὶ ὥρας οὐδεὶς οἶδεν οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι τῶν οὐρανῶν {οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός} εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ μόνος (//Mark 13:32)¹¹⁵

Hoskier identifies a potential harmonization in Matthew 24:36.¹¹⁶ Jesus explains that no one knows the eschatological day or hour, not even the angels, “nor even the son” (οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός), but only the father. The majority of manuscripts, including the corrected Sinaiticus and Washingtonianus, lack the phrase οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός, leading Hoskier to assert that the words do not belong to Matthew but were added by scribes in harmonization to Mark

¹¹⁴ The reading in Vaticanus has been changed to πιστεύετε by adding an eta above the faded second epsilon.

¹¹⁵ Manuscripts with οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός include: ℵ^{*}, c² B D Θ Φ, f¹³ 28 86 124 174 443* 543 692 788 1194 1295 1346 1505 1604. Manuscripts without οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός include: ℵ^o E F G H K L M S U V W Y Γ Δ Π Σ, f¹ 2 33 69 118 157 180 205 565 579 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1424 1506 1582^c ℳ. Merk prefers the shorter reading.

¹¹⁶ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:45.

13:32. The manuscript evidence for the phrase in Matthew, however, includes several good manuscripts, Vaticanus among them. Additionally, according to Metzger, “The omission of the words because of the doctrinal difficulty they present is more probable than their addition by assimilation to Mk 13.32.”¹¹⁷ Scribes wishing to avoid the implication that Jesus was ignorant or in some way subsidiary to the “Father” could have omitted the passage.

(67) Matthew 24:40 – τότε ὅτι δύο ἔσονται ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ (ἔσονται δύο; //Luke 17:34, 35)¹¹⁸

In his eschatological discourse in Matthew 24:40, Jesus explains that “two will be (δύο ἔσονται) in the field” and that one will be taken. The order of δύο ἔσονται has been reversed in Codex Vaticanus. It is possible that the word order of Luke 17:34 and 35 played a role in the creation of this variant in Matthew.

(68) Matthew 25:40 – ἐφ’ ὅσον ἐποιήσατε ἐνὶ τούτων τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν ἐλαχίστων ἐμοὶ ἐποιήσατε (cf. Matthew 25:45)¹¹⁹

In a parable about the last judgment, Jesus describes a king who says to some sheep, “Whatever you did for one of these least brothers of mine (τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου) you did for me.” The scribe of Vaticanus has omitted the phrase “brothers of mine” (τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου). It is possible he has done so in an effort to conform to Matthew 25:45, where the phrase is repeated. It is somewhat odd, though, since one would expect the

¹¹⁷ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 52.

¹¹⁸ \aleph^* B 120 482 892 1375 1606. Tischendorf, Legg, and Merk prefer ἔσονται δύο.

¹¹⁹ B* 0128* 16 1424.

scribe to copy the sentence accurately the first time and then to add the missing phrase to v. 45. A corrector has added the missing phrase in the margin.

(69) Matthew 26:9 – ἔδύνατο γὰρ τοῦτο πραθῆναι πολλοῦ καὶ δοθῆναι πτωχοῖς
(ἤδύνατο; //Mark 14:5)¹²⁰

When Jesus is anointed at Bethany, the disciples are shocked at what they perceive to be a waste of ointment that could have been sold and the proceeds given as charity. “For this was able to be sold for much” (ἔδύνατο γὰρ τοῦτο πραθῆναι πολλοῦ), they say. Both Matthew and Mark use a passive verb, but Markan manuscripts testify to an eta-initial reading, ἤδύνατο, with a temporal augment. This is the form found in the corrected Matthew text of Vaticanus. Harmonization to Mark could possibly account for the reading, but the shift may be orthographic in nature, in which case it does not require an external source.

(70) Matthew 26:13 – ἀμὴν Ἦ λέγω ὑμῖν (Ἦδέ; //Mark 14:9; Sub-singular B^c Δ)

Jesus often begins teaching with the introduction, “Truly I say to you” (ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν). In Matthew 26:13, the postpositive conjunction δέ has entered the phrase, possibly in relation to the parallel in Mark 14:9. In contexts like this, the conjunction δέ is added and omitted often.

(71) Matthew 26:74 – καὶ Ἦ εὐθέως ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν (Ἦεὐθύς; //Mark 14:72)¹²¹

Matthew records that after Peter’s final denial, “Immediately (εὐθέως), a rooster crowed.” In Codex Vaticanus, the scribe has used Mark’s preferred synonym, and the one

¹²⁰ A B^c D M U Γ Σ Φ f¹³ 1 2 28 33 118 157 700 788 1346 1424 1582 ℳ. Souter prefers ἤδύνατο.

¹²¹ B L Θ. Legg prefers εὐθύς.

that appears in the parallel passage in Mark 14:72, εὐθύς. Matthew has a preference for εὐθέως. The Markan parallel or Markan style may have influenced the scribe.

(72) Matthew 27:6 – οὐκ ἔξεστιν βαλεῖν αὐτὰ εἰς τὸν Ἰ κορβανᾶν (Ἰ κορβᾶν; cf. Mark 7:11; Sub-singular B* 1006*)

The Pharisees are unable to put the money returned by Judas into the temple “treasury” (κορβανᾶν) and so use it to purchase a field for burial. The scribe of Codex Vaticanus initially wrote “korban” (κορβᾶν), but either he or a corrector added the missing letters, -αν, above the line. It is possible that the scribe was influenced by Mark 7:11, the only other passage in the New Testament to use the κορβᾶν word family. More likely, it was a simple error caught and corrected.

(73) Matthew 27:16 – εἶχον δὲ τότε δέσμιον ἐπίσημον λεγόμενον Ὁησοῦν Βαραββᾶν (Mark 15:7, John 18:40)¹²²

(74) Matthew 27:17 – τίνα θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν Ὁησοῦν τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἢ Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον χριστόν (cf. Mark 15:7, John 18:40)¹²³

The identity of the prisoner released by Pilate in the place of Jesus is a textual jumble. Matthew 27:16 and 17 identify the prisoner as Barabbas (Βαραββᾶν), but in some manuscripts that patronymic is accompanied by the first name Jesus (Ἰησοῦν). There can

¹²² Manuscripts with Βαραββᾶν include: Ɑ A B D E F G H K L M U W Γ Δ Π Σ f¹³ 1^c 2 33 (69) 157 180 205 565 579 597 700^c 788 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1346 1424 1505 1506 1582^c ℣. Tischendorf, Legg, Merk, and Souter prefer Βαραββᾶν. Manuscripts with Ἰησοῦν Βαραββᾶν include: Θ f¹ 1* 118 209* 241* 299* 700* 1582*.

¹²³ Manuscripts with τὸν Βαραββᾶν include: B 1010. Legg prefers τὸν Βαραββᾶν. Manuscripts with Βαραββᾶν include: Ɑ A D E F G H K L M U W Γ Δ Π Σ f¹³ (1^c) 2 33 (69) 157 180 205 565 579 597 700^c 788 892 1006 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1346 1424 1505 1506 (1582^c) ℣. Tischendorf, Merk, and Souter prefer Βαραββᾶν. Manuscripts with Ἰησοῦν τὸν Βαραββᾶν include: f¹ 1* 22* 118 209* 241* 299* 1582*. Manuscripts with Ἰησοῦν Βαραββᾶν include: Θ (579) 700*.

be no question as to which direction the textual evidence points in both verses, namely, against Ἰησοῦν Βαραββᾶν and related variants with both names. A decision in favor of the longer reading, then, becomes a matter of alternative argumentation. Metzger succinctly summarizes the theological and ecclesiological discomfort felt by early Christians that this notorious sinner should share the name of Jesus. If the name was not original to Matthew, what scribe or school would have fabricated such a reading? Indeed, the very fact that the prisoner is referred to as *the* Barabbas (τὸν Βαραββᾶν) in vv. 17 and 21 suggests that there was a need to differentiate between the prisoners beyond their shared first name. If in fact the longer reading is older in Matthew, the orthodox impulse to remove the discomfort of the passage by excising the first name would readily account for the state of the manuscripts. Harmonization to Mark 15:7 or John 18:40 could have been a part of this process, though doctrinal interests were probably more important and may have served as a rationale for excising the name.¹²⁴

(75) Matthew 27:28 – καὶ Ἦ ἐκδύσαντες αὐτὸν χλαμύδα κοκκίνην περιέθηκαν αὐτῷ
(Ἦ ἐνδύσαντες; Mark 15:17)¹²⁵

(76) Matthew 27:29 – καὶ πλέξαντες στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν Ἦ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπὶ τῆς
κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ κάλαμον ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ (Ἦ περιέθηκαν; //Mark
15:17; Sub-singular B 131)

According to Matthew 27:29, the soldiers in charge of Jesus first stripped him and then clothed him in a scarlet cloak. Mark's order of events leaves the stripping of Jesus implicit; their narrated abuses begin with *clothing* him in a purple cloth. The scribe of

¹²⁴ See further Burkitt, "Chester Beatty Papyri," 364.

¹²⁵ 8^c B D 157 348 1424.

Vaticanus has conformed the events in Matthew to those narrated by Mark by substituting ἐνδύσαντες for ἐκδύσαντες. Now, the text of Matthew begins with the clothing of Jesus with a scarlet cloth. This is not a lexical harmonization, since Mark uses the form ἐνδιδύσκουσιν, but is rather a contextual assimilation to the Markan record. The scribe records the order of events correctly in v. 31, where the soldiers strip him again and reclothe him in his own garments.

In Matthew 27:29, the evangelist reports that soldiers *put* the crown of thorns *on* (ἐπέθηκαν) Jesus's head. Mark records that the crown of thorns was *put around* Jesus's head (περιτιθέασιν). Under the influence of Mark 15:17, the scribe of Vaticanus has replaced ἐπέθηκαν with περιέθηκαν. He has adopted Mark's verb, but has retained Matthew's grammatical structure.¹²⁶

(77) Matthew 27:33 – καὶ ἐλθόντες εἰς ὃν τόπον ὃ λεγόμενον Γολγοθᾶ ὃ ἐστὶν
Κρανίου Τόπος λεγόμενος (ὃ τόν; //Luke 23:33)¹²⁷

The two additions in Matthew 27:33 can be regarded as a single unit of variation. Where Matthew describes the place of Jesus's execution as "a place called Golgotha" (τόπον λεγόμενον Γολγοθᾶ), Luke identifies it as "the place called skull" (τὸν τόπον τὸν καλούμενον Κρανίον). Luke's construction with dual articles seems to have influenced the scribe's adoption of two articles in Matthew. Hoskier calls this a "harmony in full blast."¹²⁸

¹²⁶ See Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:47.

¹²⁷ B (205) (372) 0281 1071.

¹²⁸ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:47–48

(78) Matthew 27:46a – περι δὲ τὴν ἐνάτην ὥραν ἤνεβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ

λέγων (ἤβόησεν; //Mark 15:34)¹²⁹

(79) Matthew 27:46b – ἤλι ἤλι ἡ λεμα σαβαχθάνι (ἤελωι ἐλωι¹³⁰; //Mark 15:34)¹³¹

(80) Matthew 27:49 – οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἔλεγον ἄφες ἴδωμεν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἡλίας σῶσων

αὐτόν Ἦ (Ἦ ἄλλος δὲ λαβὼν λόγχην ἔνυξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευρὰν καὶ

ἐξῆλθεν ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα; //John 19:34)¹³²

(81) Matthew 27:54 – ἀληθῶς ἰθεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν οὗτος (ἰυῖδς θεοῦ; //Mark 15:39)¹³³

Matthew records that at about the ninth hour “Jesus cried out” (ἤνεβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς). Mark records the same information, but uses a simple verb (ἐβόησεν) in the place of Matthew’s compound verb. The scribe of Vaticanus has adopted ἐβόησεν as found in Mark 15:34. It is possible that harmonization accounts for the reading.¹³⁴ Alternatively, the scribe may have lost some letters in a scribal leap from the -αν of ὥραν to the -αν of ἀνεβόησεν.

Matthew’s cry of dereliction represents the Hebrew phrase “my God” in Greek (ἤλι). By contrast, Mark’s cry of dereliction is a Greek representation of the Aramaic

¹²⁹ B L W Σ 4 33 59 69 124 174 218 273 604 700 788 828 1355 2145. Legg prefers ἐβόησεν.

¹³⁰ B has ἐλωει ἐλωει.

¹³¹ Ⲛ B 33. Legg prefers ἐλωι ἐλωι.

¹³² Ⲛ B C L U (Γ) 5 48 67 115 127* 1010 1293 (1555). Legg prefers the longer reading.

¹³³ B D 69 102.

¹³⁴ So Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:48.

phrase “my God” (ἐλωι). The scribe of Codex Vaticanus has copied the “Markan” form in his text of Matthew 27:46b. He was likely influenced by the parallel in Mark 15:34.¹³⁵

Several Alexandrian codices and some miniscules add a sentence following Matthew 27:49: “And another (soldier), taking a spear, pierced his side and water and blood came out” (ἄλλος δὲ λαβὼν λόγχην ἔνυξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευρὰν καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα). This verse does not belong to Matthew, but appears in a different form in John 19:34: “But one of the soldiers pierced his side with a spear and immediately blood and water came out” (ἀλλ’ εἷς τῶν στρατιωτῶν λόγχῃ αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευρὰν ἔνυξεν, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν εὐθὺς αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ).¹³⁶ Metzger posits that a reader of Matthew jotted down the Johannine sentence in the margin of a manuscript and that, as subsequent copies were made, the marginal note was brought into the main text. The scribe may have introduced the sentence in this place since it follows a similar scene wherein a bystander pierces a sponge on a reed and raises it up to Jesus.

The centurion in charge of the crucifixion ultimately recognizes Jesus as “God’s son” (θεοῦ υἱός). The order of these words is reversed in the Markan parallel. The transposed word order also appears in the text of Vaticanus. The scribe may have been influenced by Mark 15:39, but such a transposition could easily have occurred independently.

¹³⁵ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:48, discusses this reading and its treatment by Hort and Souter. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 58, also suggests harmonization.

¹³⁶ See Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 59; and Burkitt, “Chester Beatty Papyri,” 364.

(82) Matthew 28:1 – Ἦ Μαριάμ ἡ Μαγδαληνή (Ἦ Μαρία; //Mark 16:1)¹³⁷

Early in the morning, on the day after the Sabbath, some women go to the tomb to attend Jesus's body. In Matthew, one of the women is identified as "Mariam the Magdalene" (Μαριάμ ἡ Μαγδαληνή). In the parallel passage in Mark 16:1, the woman is called "Maria the Magdalene" (Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή). These alternative spellings of Mary's name occur throughout the New Testament and extra-canonical literature. The scribe of Vaticanus has copied the form Μαρία. It is possible that he was influenced by Mark 16:1. If the alteration were deliberate, however, it is odd that the scribe has not also used Μαρία in Matthew 27:61.

Preliminary Summary of Harmonization in Matthew

Before turning to the text of Mark in Vaticanus, it is worthwhile to pause and summarize the sources of influence evident in the Matthew portion of the manuscript. Of the eighty-two readings analyzed in Mark, nine of them are unlikely to have involved harmonization. An additional twenty-eight variants may have involved harmonization. Both categories have been excluded from further consideration, leaving forty-five viable harmonizing variants in the text of Matthew. These readings demonstrate the influence upon the scribe of material from Mark, Luke, and John as well as from other passages in Matthew.

Table 17. Sources of Harmonization in the Text of Matthew in Codex Vaticanus

Sources of Harmonization	Total: 45	Entry Number
Matthew	9	1, 2, 18, 19, 22, 38, 55, 58, 62
Mark	17	11, 12, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 33, 37, 50, 51, 52, 60, 65, 75, 76, 79

¹³⁷ A B D H* K M U W Γ Π Σ Φ^f f¹³ 1 2 28 33 69 118 124 (157) 565 579 700 788 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1346 1424 1506 ℣. Legg and Souter prefer Μαρία.

	Luke	13	6, 15, 16, 17, 20, 31, 32, 36, 41, 43, 44, 63, 77
	John	1	80
	Matthew or Luke	1	39
	Mark or Luke	3	21, 42, 49
	Synoptics	1	35

An interesting characteristic of harmonization in the text of Matthew in Vaticanus is the number of inter-gospel assimilations. Nine readings have been harmonized to other passages in Matthew or to Matthean idioms. These readings suggest that the scribe valued internal consistency. The Gospel of Matthew formed his horizon of expectation and he has created even more uniformity in several closely related passages within the Gospel.

Codex Vaticanus – Mark¹³⁸

(83) Mark 1:18 – καὶ ἰεὺθὺς ἀφέντες τὰ δίκτυα ἠκολούθησαν¹³⁹ αὐτῷ (ἰεὺθέως;

//Matthew 4:20)¹⁴⁰

Mark records that when Jesus called Simon and Andrew to discipleship they followed him “immediately” (εὺθὺς). Mark demonstrates a consistent affinity for the adverb εὺθὺς, using the synonym εὺθέως only once (Mark 7:35). Matthew, alternatively, has a strong preference for εὺθέως. Yet, in Mark 1:18, it is εὺθέως that appears in Codex Vaticanus. It is possible that the direct parallel in Matthew 4:20 influenced the scribe in the creation of this reading. It is even more likely that the variant is the residual effect of the Matthean idiom on a scribe who so recently finished copying the First Gospel. This is

¹³⁸ See James W. Voelz, “The Greek of Codex Vaticanus in the Second Gospel and Marcan Greek,” *NovT* 47 (2005): 209–249, for an analysis of the Greek of Vaticanus in Mark.

¹³⁹ B has ἠκολούθησιν.

¹⁴⁰ A B C D W Δ f¹ f³ 28 124 157 700 788 1006 1071 1342 1346 1424 1506 2427 ℘. Souter prefers εὺθέως.

only the third occurrence of εὐθύς in Mark, so it would not be surprising to find some scribes accidentally recalling the synonym used as late as Matthew 27:48.

(84) Mark 1:21 – καὶ Ἦ εὐθύς τοῖς σάββασιν εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκεν

(Ἦ εὐθέως; //Matthean idiom)¹⁴¹

See the discussion of the previous reading. This related variant occurs in close proximity to the first in Mark 1:18.

(85) Mark 1:34 – καὶ οὐκ ἤφιεν λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια¹⁴² ὅτι ἤδεισαν αὐτόν Ὁ

(Ὁ χριστόν εἶναι; //Luke 4:41)¹⁴³

Mark reports that on one occasion when Jesus performed exorcisms he did not permit the demons to speak “because they knew him” (ὅτι ἤδεισαν αὐτόν). What exactly the spirits knew about Jesus Mark leaves ambiguous. Luke’s version of this pericope specifies that the demons “knew him *to be the Christ*” (ἤδεισαν τὸν χριστόν αὐτόν εἶναι). There are several variants in the manuscripts of Mark that show that Mark’s initially vague sentence was modified in different ways, most often by adding the words from Luke 4:41.¹⁴⁴ In the case of Vaticanus, the scribe has added χριστόν εἶναι to the end of Mark’s sentence. This became a popular variant so that over time it became the *de facto* Markan reading, but at its first appearance it was the offspring of Luke.

¹⁴¹ A B C D K M U W Γ Δ Θ Π ς¹³ 2 69 124 157 788 1006 1346 1424 1506 2427 ℣. Souter prefers εὐθέως.

¹⁴² B has τὰ δαιμόνια λαλεῖν.

¹⁴³ B L W Θ Σ ς¹ 22 28 33^{vid} 205 349 565 1342 1506 2427 2542. Legg prefers χριστόν εἶναι. Some manuscripts have τὸν χριστόν αὐτόν εἶναι with some variation in word order: ℣^c C G M 0233 ς¹³ 69 124 239 472 484 517 543 700 788 892 1241 1243 1346 1424.

¹⁴⁴ So Lagrange, *Critique rationnelle*, 86; Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:105; and Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 64. A. Collins, *Mark*, 175 n. a, calls this and similar variants “clarifying changes, probably made under the influence of the parallel in Luke 4:41.”

(86) Mark 1:38 – ἄγωμεν {ἀλλαχοῦ} εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας¹⁴⁵ κωμοπόλεις (//Luke 4:43)¹⁴⁶

Hoskier suspects that there is a harmonizing reading in Mark 1:38. His assertion is based on a faulty assessment of the best text of Mark in this verse. In the passage, Jesus says, “Let us go elsewhere to the neighboring towns.” A fair number of manuscripts, including two of critical import (D W), do not include the adverb ἀλλαχοῦ. Hoskier argues that the adverb is not original to Mark and was added under the influence of Luke’s “the other cities” (ταῖς ἑτέραις πόλεσιν). Most commentators and critical editions, however, agree that ἀλλαχοῦ belongs to Mark based on the manuscript evidence. Furthermore, it is unlikely that a scribe would add a redundant adverb, but plausible that many scribes would omit the adverb to reduce Markan redundancy.

(87) Mark 1:40 – λέγων αὐτῷ ^τ ὅτι ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαι¹⁴⁷ με καθαρῖσαι (^τκύριε; //Matthew 8:2, Luke 5:12; Singular)

A leper comes to Jesus and says, “If you wish, you are able to cleanse me” (ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαι με καθαρῖσαι). Both Matthew 8:2 and Luke 5:12 have the vocative address, “Lord” (κύριε), at the beginning of the petition. Influenced by the parallels, the scribe of Vaticanus has added κύριε to his copy of Mark 1:40.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁵ B has ἐχόμενα.

¹⁴⁶ Manuscripts with ἀλλαχοῦ include: 8 B C* L 33 579 2427. Manuscripts without ἀλλαχοῦ include: A C^c D W Γ Δ Θ Π Σ Φ 090 f¹ f¹³ 69 124 700 788 892 1006 1342 1346 1424 1506 38.

¹⁴⁷ B has δύνῃ.

¹⁴⁸ See Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:106.

(88) Mark 2:8 – λέγει ὁ αὐτοῖς (//Matthew 9:4)¹⁴⁹

Some Pharisees grumble after Jesus forgives the sins of a paralytic. Matthew introduces Jesus’s response with the phrase “he says to them” (λέγει αὐτοῖς). Matthew 9:4 does not have the pronoun αὐτοῖς. This reading may have induced the scribe of Vaticanus to omit the word from his transcription of Mark 2:8.

(89) Mark 2:18 – διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τῶν Φαρισαίων
νηστεύουσιν οἱ δὲ σοὶ ὁ μαθηταὶ οὐ νηστεύουσιν (//Luke 5:33)¹⁵⁰

The disciples of John and the disciples of the Pharisees ask Jesus, “Why do your disciples (οἱ δὲ σοὶ μαθηταὶ) not fast?” The noun μαθηταὶ is not present in Vaticanus, but is inferred by ellipsis from three previous instances of μαθηταὶ in the sentence. There is no compelling reason for a scribe to omit μαθηταὶ. It is possible, though improbable, that the word fell out by homoioteleuton since σοὶ and μαθηταὶ both end with iota. The resultant reading, however, corresponds to the text of Luke 5:33, where the group associated with Jesus is identified simply as “yours” (οἱ δὲ σοὶ), meaning “your disciples.” The Lukan construction may have influenced the scribe to omit the repeated noun.

(90) Mark 2:23 – καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς σάββασις ἵ παραπορεύεσθαι διὰ τῶν
σπορίμων (ἵ διαπορεύεσθαι; //Luke 6:1)¹⁵¹

On one particular Sabbath, while Jesus “was going along (παραπορεύεσθαι) through the grain fields,” Jesus’s disciples plucked grain. The parallel passage in Luke

¹⁴⁹ B Θ 102.

¹⁵⁰ B 102 127 565 2427.

¹⁵¹ B (C) D 1342 2427. Legg and Souter prefer διαπορεύεσθαι.

6:1 has the verb *διαπορεύεσθαι*. The verb used in the text of Mark in Vaticanus is *διαπορεύεσθαι*. The influence of Luke on the scribe accounts for the variant.

(91) Mark 3:11 – *καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν*

*προσέπιπτον*¹⁵² αὐτῷ καὶ ἔκραζον ἄ λέγοντες ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ

(ἄ λέγοντα; cf. Luke 4:41)¹⁵³

Mark records that on one occasion when Jesus encountered demoniacs and cast out spirits, the unclean spirits “cried out saying” (*ἔκραζον λέγοντες*), “You are the son of God.” Chief witnesses of the Alexandrian (Ⲙ), Western (D), and Pre-Caesarean (W) types support the masculine participle *λέγοντες*, but the majority of witnesses, including many of critical value (A B C), have the neuter participle *λέγοντα*. The balance of other considerations falls in favor of the masculine participle for two reasons. First, it is grammatically incorrect since its referent is the neuter noun *πνεύματα*. Second, the popular shift to the grammatically correct neuter participle can be explained both by scribal improvement and, possibly, by harmonization, since Luke has *λέγοντα* in the near-parallel at Luke 4:41.

(92) Mark 3:14 – *καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα {οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν} (//Luke*

*6:13)*¹⁵⁴

¹⁵² B has *προσέπειπταν*.

¹⁵³ A B C E F G H L M P U (Γ) Δ Θ Π Ω ς¹ f¹³ 2 33 118 157 205 565 579 700 788 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1346 1424 2427 (2542) ℣. Legg, Merk, and Souter prefer *λέγοντα*.

¹⁵⁴ Manuscripts with *οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν* include: Ⲙ B C* W Δ Θ Φ ς¹³ 28 69 124 238 346 543 788 1346. Manuscripts without *οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν* include: A C^c D E F G H K L M P U Γ Π Σ ς¹ 2 22 33 157 180 205 565 579 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 1506 2427 2542 ℣. Tischendorf, Merk, and Souter prefer the shorter reading.

There may be a harmonizing reading in Mark 3:14 in the account of Jesus calling his disciples. The phrase “whom also he called apostles,” which I place in curly brackets since it is under discussion here, appears in several quality manuscripts and fails to appear in other high quality manuscripts and in the Byzantine majority. Most contemporary critical editions include the phrase, or include it in square brackets, signifying uncertainty, while older editions mostly reject it. Hoskier believes the reading to be secondary to Mark, brought into the text from Luke 6:13 by scribes.¹⁵⁵ Metzger recognizes the possibility of harmonization, but regards the textual evidence as too strong to warrant its rejection from the text of Mark.¹⁵⁶ I tend to agree with the latter opinion since there is no good reason for a scribe to omit the phrase. Therefore, harmonization is not a factor in Mark 3:14.

(93) Mark 3:32 – ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου □ καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαί σου ἔξω
ζητοῦσίν σε (//Matthew 12:47, Luke 8:20)¹⁵⁷

In Mark 3:32, the crowd around Jesus informs him that his mother and brothers have come to see him. A good number of manuscripts also include Jesus’s sisters among the visitors, but many manuscripts of high quality lack the phrase καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαί σου. It seems most likely that the reading with the phrase is older and was omitted because the sisters do not appear earlier in v. 31. Furthermore, Jesus does not refer to sisters in v. 34,

¹⁵⁵ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:106, discusses the notation of this reading in various editions. A. Collins, *Mark*, 214 n. a, explains the longer reading by harmonization.

¹⁵⁶ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 69.

¹⁵⁷ ⳨ B C G K L W Y Δ Θ Π Σ Φ 074 ^f ^l ³ 2 28 33 69 157 205 543 565 597 892 1006 1071 1241 1292 1342 1424 1505 (2427) 2542. Legg, Merk, and Souter prefer the reading without καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαί σου. Manuscripts with καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαί σου include: A D E F H M S U V Γ Ω 22 124 174 180 238 240 241 299 433 700 1006 1010 1243.

though he does mention “mother” and “brothers.” He does refer to “brother” and “sister” in v. 35.¹⁵⁸ If the longer reading is older, it is possible that it fell out by homoioteleuton in some cases if the scribe copied the second σου in the verse and returned to his exemplar after the third. Additionally, Jesus’s sisters may have been omitted in harmonization to Matthew 12:47 or Luke 8:20 since they are not mentioned there.

(94) Mark 4:34 – ἄχωρίς δὲ ἰ παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς (ἰ καὶ ἄχωρίς; //Matthew 13:34)¹⁵⁹

Mark explains that Jesus spoke many parables to the people and said nothing to them without parables. In Mark, these two facts are given in two sentences (v. 33 and v. 34) divided by δέ. In Matthew 13:34, the statements are found in one sentence and the individual clauses are conjoined with καί. In Vaticanus, καί has replaced δέ in Mark and the word order has been rearranged to accommodate the new preposition. Harmonization to Matthew may account for the alteration.

(95) Mark 5:23 – καὶ ἰ παρακαλεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ (ἰ παρεκάλει; //Luke 8:41)¹⁶⁰

Mark records that a leader of the synagogue fell at Jesus’s feet and “exhorted” (παρακαλεῖ) him to come and save the life of his daughter. In Vaticanus, the verb is not in the present tense (παρακαλεῖ), but in the imperfect (παρεκάλει). Such an alteration could have been made for many reasons. First, it is possible that the scribe wished to depart

¹⁵⁸ A. Collins, *Mark*, 225 n. i, regards the longer reading as an addition reflecting the presence of “sister” in v. 35.

¹⁵⁹ B Φ 700 1342.

¹⁶⁰ B K M N U W Δ Θ Π Σ Φ 0107 0132 *f*¹ *f*⁴³ 2 22 33 118 157 543 579 700 1006 1071 1342 1424 1506 2427 2542 *m*.

from, or accidentally departed from, Mark's typical use of the historical present tense.¹⁶¹

Second, the form of the verse in Luke 8:41, where the action is in the imperfect, could have influenced the use of the imperfect tense in Mark 5:23.

(96) Mark 6:20 – και ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ {ἠπόρει} (cf. Luke 9:7)¹⁶²

(97) Mark 6:22 – και εἰσελθούσης τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἡρωδιάδος και ὀρχησαμένης

{ἤρεσεν} τῷ Ἡρώδῃ και τοῖς συνανακειμένοις (//Matthew 14:6)¹⁶³

Hoskier suspects the presence of a harmonizing variant in Mark 6:20. In this verse, the question is whether ἐποίει or ἠπόρει is the better reading.¹⁶⁴ Hoskier suggests that the word ἠπόρει in Mark 6:20 is a harmonization to Luke 9:7, where the synonym διηπόρει is used. If ἠπόρει is the better reading, the statement would be rendered: “And hearing him (John), he (Herod) was greatly perplexed.” In the case of the alternative reading, with ἐποίει, the sense of the passage would be rendered: “And he heard him often” or “having heard him, he did so often” (ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ ἐποίει). This reading is supported in the majority of manuscripts. According to Collins, the former reading, “he was greatly perplexed,” is an “intrinsically appropriate and interesting reading.” Furthermore, it “may have been changed to the less interesting reading attested by the

¹⁶¹ Lagrange, *Critique rationnelle*, 85, lists this as a reading intended to improve the Greek.

¹⁶² Manuscripts with ἠπόρει include: ⋈ B L (W) Θ 2427. Manuscripts with ἐποίει include: A C D E F G H K M N U Π Σ Φ Ω f¹ f¹³ 2 (28) 33 69 157 180 205 565 579 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 1506 1582 2542 ℣.

¹⁶³ Manuscripts with ἤρεσεν include: ⋈ B C* L Δ 33 1342 2427. Manuscripts with ἀρεσάσης include: P⁴⁵ A C^o D K M N U W Y Γ Θ Π Σ Φ f¹ f¹³ 2 28 157 565 579 700 892 1071 1241 1346 1424 1506 2542 ℣.

¹⁶⁴ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:106. For a different argument, see O'Neill, “Rules,” 225. O'Neill argues that ποιέω has the Septuagintal connotation “to sacrifice” and suggests that in trying to make the passage more sensible, the scribe has followed a secondary reading.

majority of MSS in order to heighten the tendency, already present in Mark, to exonerate Herod of responsibility for the death of John.”¹⁶⁵ Additionally, the reading has compelling manuscript support. Harmonization has not played a role in this passage.

C. C. Tarelli asserts that there is a harmonizing variant in the text of Mark 6:22.¹⁶⁶ In this case, the majority of manuscripts report that Herodias’s daughter was “pleasing” (ἀρεσάσης) to Herod and his guests. Several better manuscripts have the finite verb (ἤρσεεν) instead of the participle. The second reading, though not quite as well attested, is accepted by most commentators and critical editions because it makes better sense within the context of the passage. Pleasing Herod is the *result* of the event, not simply another action in the sequence of “entering” (εἰσελθούσης) and “dancing” (ὀρχησαμένης). According to Collins, the participial variant was an attempt to improve the style of the passage while overlooking the importance of the moment.¹⁶⁷ Since the finite verb is the better reading, harmonization has not been a factor in Vaticanus.

(98) Mark 6:39 – καὶ ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἵ ἀνακλιῖναι πάντας συμπόσια συμπόσια ἐπὶ¹⁶⁸

τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ (ἵ ἀνακλιθῆναι; //Matthew 14:19)¹⁶⁹

(99) Mark 6:41 – καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς

τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν καὶ κατέκλασεν τοὺς ἄρτους καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς

¹⁶⁵ A. Collins, *Mark*, 294–295 n. k. See also, Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 76–77.

¹⁶⁶ Tarelli, “Linguistic Aspects,” 254.

¹⁶⁷ A. Collins, *Mark*, 294–295 n. m.

¹⁶⁸ B* has ἐν, but this was later corrected to ἐπὶ by changing the nu to pi and adding an iota superlinearly between the pi and the next letter.

¹⁶⁹ Ⱳ B* G (Θ) Φ 047 0149 0187^f ^f13 2 13 28 69 77 92 131 157 205 238 346 543 (565 700) 828 892^c 1071 1342 1506 2427. Merk and Souter prefer ἀνακλιθῆναι.

μαθηταῖς ὁ αὐτοῦ ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν αὐτοῖς (//Matthew 14:19, Luke 9:16)¹⁷⁰

Jesus prepares to feed a crowd of five thousand men and commands the people “to sit” (ἀνακλῖναι) in the grass. In the same context, Matthew uses a passive infinitive (ἀνακλιθῆναι). This reading became quite popular in manuscripts of Mark and is the reading found initially in Vaticanus. The parallel likely influenced the scribe.¹⁷¹ A subsequent corrector deleted the offending letters (θη) by putting dots above them and an even later corrector has either rubbed the letters out or chosen not to re-trace them in fresh ink.

In Mark 6:41, there is a question as to whether the better reading is μαθηταῖς or μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ. The former is well attested in Alexandrian manuscripts, but the longer reading is found in many witnesses from diverse text types. The omission and addition of the pronoun is a frequent variant throughout the manuscripts of the Gospels and good arguments can be made to support both readings. In this case, it is possible the reading with the pronoun is older and that scribes omitted it in conformity to Matthew 14:19 or Luke 9:16.¹⁷² Alternatively, the pronoun could have been added in a scribal attempt to conform to Markan style. One cannot be confident in this case.

¹⁷⁰ ⳨ B L Δ 0149^{vid} 0187^{vid} 33 102 517 579 892 1241 1342 2427. Tischendorf, Legg, Merk, and Souter prefer the shorter reading. Manuscripts with αὐτοῦ include: P⁴⁵ A D E F G H K M N U W Y Γ Θ Π Σ Φ Ω J^f J³ 2 22 28 157 180 205 543 565 597 700 1006 1010 1071 1243 1292 1342 1505 2542 ℣.

¹⁷¹ So A. Collins, *Mark*, 317 n. h.

¹⁷² A. Collins, *Mark*, 317 n. i, writes, “The latter [shorter] reading may be due to the influence of the parallel passages in Matt 14:19 and Luke 9:16.”

(100) Mark 6:49 – οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης περιπατοῦντα ἔδοξαν {ὅτι φάντασμα ἐστίν} (//Matthew 14:26)¹⁷³

Hoskier argues that the variant φάντασμα εἶναι in Mark 6:49 is the authentic Markan reading and that the reading ὅτι φάντασμα ἐστίν, found in several quality manuscripts (Ⲭ B), is a harmonization to Matthew 14:26.¹⁷⁴ Nearly all commentators and critical editions, however, support the latter reading in Mark so that there is no harmonizing activity. The infinitival construction may have been an attempt to improve the style of the passage in a manner similar to cases like Mark 8:27–29.

(101) Mark 7:6 – ὁ οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χεῖλεσίν με τιμᾷ (ὁ οὗτος ὁ λαὸς οὗτος; //Matthew 15:8, Isaiah 29:13 LXX)¹⁷⁵

In response to the Pharisees' devotion to tradition and ritual cleansing, Jesus quotes a passage from Isaiah that begins, "This people honors me with lips" (ὁ οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χεῖλεσίν με τιμᾷ). The first three words of the sentence appear in a different order in Matthew 15:8: ὁ λαὸς οὗτος. The arrangement in Matthew corresponds to the wording of Isaiah 29:13 in the Septuagint. The scribe of Vaticanus has transposed the words, likely influenced by the parallel in Matthew or the wording of the original passage in Isaiah.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷³ Manuscripts with ὅτι φάντασμα ἐστίν include: Ⲭ B L Δ 33 579 892 1342. Manuscripts with φάντασμα εἶναι include: A D K M N U X Γ Θ Π Σ Φ ^f13 2 22 (71 86) 118 157 (240 244) 543 565 (692) 700 1006 1071 1241 1424 1506 2427 Ⲙ. Manuscripts with the related reading φάντασμα ἔδοξαν εἶναι include: W ^f1 28 205 2542.

¹⁷⁴ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:106.

¹⁷⁵ B D 1071 2427.

¹⁷⁶ So A. Collins, *Mark*, 340 n. i.

(102) Mark 7:24 – ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἀναστὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ὄρια Τύρου ^τ (^τκαὶ Σιδῶνος;

//Matthew 15:21)¹⁷⁷

(103) Mark 7:28 – ἡ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ^τ κύριε (^τναί; //Matthew 15:27)¹⁷⁸

Mark records that after his interaction with the Pharisees over their traditions, Jesus departed to “the region of Tyre.” In the same context, Matthew says that Jesus departed to the “district of Tyre and Sidon” (τὰ μέρη Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος). In fact, the majority of manuscripts of Mark, including Codex Vaticanus, include καὶ Σιδῶνος in their texts. These words are not found in Bezae, Washingtonianus, L, and Θ. Metzger suggests that if Sidon were in the earliest text, there would have been no compelling reason to omit it. Furthermore, the shorter reading is found in early representatives of many text types. Therefore, the longer reading has entered the text under the influence of Matthew 15:21.¹⁷⁹

During his encounter with the Syrophenician woman, Jesus initially rejects the woman’s request for Jesus to heal her daughter. He uses the analogy of giving children’s food to dogs. She responds, “Lord, even the dogs under the table eat from the crumbs of the children.” In Matthew 15:27, she begins, “Yes, Lord” (ναὶ κύριε). This reading became popular in manuscripts of Mark and is found in Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and the Byzantine majority. The term does not appear in some important Western (D), Pre-Caesarean (W

¹⁷⁷ ⋈ A B E F G H K M N U X Γ Π Σ Φ ^f ^f ³ 2 33 118 124 157 180 205 579 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 1506 2427 2542 ℣. Legg, Merk, and Souter prefer the longer reading.

¹⁷⁸ ⋈ A B E F G H K L M N U Γ Δ Π Σ 0274^{vid} ^f 2 28 33 124 157 180 205 579 597 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1346 1424 1505 1506 2427 2542 ℣. Tischendorf, Legg, Merk, and Souter prefer the longer reading.

¹⁷⁹ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 82. See also A. Collins, *Mark*, 364 n. a.

P⁴⁵), and “Caesaren” (Θ) texts. Metzger supports the shorter reading in Mark and asserts that there is no compelling reason for a scribe to omit *καί* if it appeared in their exemplar. Furthermore, its presence in many manuscripts can be explained as a harmonization to Matthew 15:27.¹⁸⁰

(104) Mark 8:1 – προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητάς ὧ (ὧ αὐτοῦ; //Matthew 15:32)¹⁸¹

In Mark 8:1, the pronoun *αὐτοῦ* has been added to the phrase *τοὺς μαθητάς* in Codex Vaticanus. In this case, most commentators and editors prefer the shorter reading with Sinaiticus, Bezae, and L. Arguments for and against the addition and omission of the pronoun in this frequent phrase have been enumerated above and apply here.¹⁸² The longer reading may represent the influence of Matthew 15:32.

(105) Mark 8:21 – ὅπως συνίετε (ὅπως οὐ νοεῖτε; //Matthew 16:11; Sub-singular B 2 2427^{vid})¹⁸³

After feeding about five thousand men, Jesus asks his disciples, “Do you not yet understand?” (*ὅπως συνίετε*). The scribe of Vaticanus has adopted the Matthean form of this question: “How do you not understand?” (*ὅπως οὐ νοεῖτε*). This is an uncommon reading in manuscripts of Mark, but some scribes have altered their text of Mark in favor of Matthew 16:11 in slightly different ways. From each of these variants, it can be seen

¹⁸⁰ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 82; and A. Collins, *Mark*, 364 n. d.

¹⁸¹ A B K M U W X Γ Θ Π f⁴³ 2 22 33 118 124 157 543 565 579 700 788 1006 1071 1241 1342 1424 1506 2427 2542 ℳ. Souter prefers the longer reading.

¹⁸² A. Collins, *Mark*, 377 n. a, adds that Hellenistic Greek used more pronouns than Classical Greek so that “stylistically conscious scribes were inclined to remove unnecessary pronouns.”

¹⁸³ Manuscripts with *ὅπως οὐ* include: E F G H S V Γ Ω 22 28 157 330 569 579 700 1006 1506 2542. Manuscripts with *νοεῖτε* include: D^c 372 1207 2427.

that the Matthean form of this passage was influential in the transmission of the version in Mark.¹⁸⁴

(106) Mark 8:34 – εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἁκολουθεῖν ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν
(ἁελθεῖν; //Matthew 16:24)¹⁸⁵

Jesus tells his disciples, “If someone wishes to follow (ἁκολουθεῖν) after me, let him deny himself.” In Matthew 16:24, Jesus speaks of someone who wishes “to come” (ἁελθεῖν) after him. The scribe of Vaticanus has replaced Mark’s ἁκολουθεῖν with ἁελθεῖν. This became a popular reading in manuscripts of Mark, but the diverse testimony of P⁴⁵, C*, Bezae, and Washingtonianus is compelling evidence that ἁκολουθεῖν is the earlier reading. Scribes who opted for the simple verb were very likely influenced by the parallel passage in Matthew.

(107) Mark 9:8 – οὐκέτι οὐδένα εἶδον ἁλλά τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον μεθ’ ἑαυτῶν ᾗ (ἁμετὰ ἑαυτῶν εἰ μὴ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον; //Matthew 17:8)¹⁸⁶

After the transfiguration, the disciples look up and see no one “but Jesus only with them” (ἁλλά τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον μεθ’ ἑαυτῶν). Matthew’s construction of this sentence shows better style. In Matthew 17:8, the disciples see no one “except Jesus himself, alone” (εἰ μὴ αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον). Many scribes copying Mark have substituted

¹⁸⁴ See Lagrange, *Critique rationnelle*, 86. Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:106, mentions this passage but does not regard the variant as a harmonization.

¹⁸⁵ ⲛ A B C^c K L Γ Π Σ f¹³ 33 242 470 543 579 892 1071 1241 1342 2427 2542. Legg, Merk, and Souter prefer ἁελθεῖν. Likewise, A. Collins, *Mark*, 396 n. d, prefers ἁελθεῖν.

¹⁸⁶ ⲛ (B) D N Ψ (33) (579) 892 1093 1241 1342 1424 (2427). Manuscripts in parenthesis transpose the prepositional phrase. Souter prefers the order of ⲛ. Legg prefers the order of B.

Matthew's εἰ μὴ for ἀλλά.¹⁸⁷ The scribe of Vaticanus has made this substitution and has also transposed the word order so that the prepositional phrase (μεθ' ἑαυτῶν) comes at the beginning of the phrase.

(108) Mark 9:38 – εἶδομέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια {καὶ ἐκωλύομεν αὐτόν ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει ἡμῖν} (//Luke 9:49)¹⁸⁸

Hoskier finds a harmonizing variant in Mark 9:38. According to Mark, one of Jesus's disciples saw a strange exorcist casting out demons. The disciple reports to Jesus, “We hindered him because he was not following us” (καὶ ἐκωλύομεν αὐτόν ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει ἡμῖν). In a popular variant, the disciple reports, “We saw someone casting out demons in your name *who does not follow with us* and we hindered him because he does not follow us” (ὃς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῖν καὶ ἐκωλύσαμεν αὐτόν ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν). The variant introduces a repetition of the fact that the exorcist does not follow Jesus or Jesus's disciples. Hoskier suspects that this redundant reading is original and that it has been simplified by scribes in harmonization to Luke 9:49. After all, he remarks, “Why should nearly all the rest of the Greeks be so pleonastic if not genuine.”¹⁸⁹ He seems to envision the scribes physically checking the passage against Luke and intentionally

¹⁸⁷ A. Collins, *Mark*, 414 n. b, explains that ἀλλά could mean “except,” but that this usage was not common. “Its oddity may have given rise to the variant with εἰ μὴ.”

¹⁸⁸ Manuscripts with καὶ ἐκωλύομεν αὐτόν ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει ἡμῖν, some with minor variations, include: Ⳑ B C L Δ Θ Ψ 0274 115 579 892 1071 1342 2427. Manuscripts with ὃς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῖν καὶ ἐκωλύσαμεν αὐτόν ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν, some with minor variations, include: A D E F G H K M N U W X Γ Π Σ Φ ς¹ ς³ 2 22 28 90 118 124 157 180 205 346 543 565 597 700 1006 1010 1241 1243 1292 1346 1424 1505 1506 2542 ℳ. Tischendorf and Merk prefer the redundant reading.

¹⁸⁹ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:104. See also J. K. Elliott, “An Eclectic Textual Commentary on the Greek Text of Mark's Gospel,” in *The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark: An Edition of C. H. Turner's 'Notes on Markan Usage' Together with Other Comparable Studies*, ed. J. K. Elliott, NovTSup 71 (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 189–201, 199.

omitting the redundant information. Most commentators and editors, however, prefer the shorter reading. Metzger favors the shorter reading because of better textual attestation, but the fact that Bezae and Washingtonianus support the longer reading along with the Byzantine majority certainly balances the scales.¹⁹⁰ I suspect Hoskier is correct in his assessment. It is easier to explain the shorter reading as an intentional improvement by a closely related group of manuscripts than the longer reading as a redundancy introduced in a variety of text types.

(109) Mark 9:42 – καὶ ὃς ἂν σκανδαλίση ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων
{εἰς ἐμέ} (//Matthew 18:6)¹⁹¹

Lagrange argues that the presence of εἰς ἐμέ in Mark 9:42 is the result of harmonization to Matthew 18:6. Metzger acknowledges the possibility of harmonization, but balances this consideration with the substantial weight of the textual evidence in support of the reading in Mark.¹⁹² Indeed, the textual evidence is strong enough to support the presence of εἰς ἐμέ in the verse so that harmonization is not a factor.

(110) Mark 10:6 – ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν {αὐτούς} (//Matthew 19:4)¹⁹³

Hoskier finds another harmonization in Mark 10:6.¹⁹⁴ In Mark, Jesus quotes from Genesis, “Male and female he made them” (ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς). A very

¹⁹⁰ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 86. See A. Collins, *Mark*, 442 n. d, for a discussion of the readings.

¹⁹¹ Manuscripts with εἰς ἐμέ include: A B C^e E F G H K L M N U W X Γ Θ Π Σ Φ Ψ^f f¹³ 2 28 124 157 180 205 565 579 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 1506 2427 (2542) ℞. Manuscripts without εἰς ἐμέ include: ℞ C*^{vid} Δ. Tischendorf, Legg, and Merk prefer the shorter reading.

¹⁹² Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 86. See also A. Collins, *Mark*, 442–443 and n. f.

¹⁹³ Manuscripts with ὁ θεός or αὐτούς ὁ θεός include: A D E F G H K N W X Y Γ Θ Π Σ Φ Ψ^f f¹³ 28 86* 157 180 205 219 565 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1424 1505 1506 2542 ℞. Merk prefers αὐτούς ὁ θεός. Manuscripts without the reading include: ℞ B C L Δ 579 827 1342 2427.

popular variant adds δ $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ as the subject of the sentence and another adds δ $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ and omits $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$: “Male and female *God* made them” and “God made male and female.” Diverse textual evidence supports the reading with δ $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, and the omission of these words could be explained by harmonization to Matthew 19:4. Alternatively, one can easily imagine scribes adding the subject of the verb for clarification, especially to prevent the implication that the previously mentioned individual, Moses, is the subject of this clause.¹⁹⁵ Most commentators and editors prefer the shorter reading so that there is no harmonization here.

(111) Mark 10:13 – οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ {ἐπετίμησαν αὐτοῖς} (//Matthew 19:13, Luke 18:15)¹⁹⁶

When some parents bring their children to Jesus, the disciples intervene and “rebuke them.” Hoskier contests that this reading is actually a harmonization to the parallels in Matthew 19:13 and Luke 18:15. He asserts that the oldest reading, supported by the majority of manuscripts and the best representatives of the Western (D), Pre-Caesarean (W), and “Caesarean” (Θ) types, read: “They were rebuking those bringing (the children)” (ἐπετίμων τοῖς προσφέρουσιν).¹⁹⁷ Few commentators or editors affirm Hoskier’s assertion. Metzger suggests that the reading arose because scribes were not

¹⁹⁴ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:104.

¹⁹⁵ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 88; and A. Collins, *Mark*, 457 n. c.

¹⁹⁶ Manuscripts with ἐπετίμησαν αὐτοῖς include: \aleph B C L Δ Ψ 579 892 1342 2427. Manuscripts with ἐπετίμων τοῖς προσφέρουσιν or similar include: A D E F G H K N W X Γ Θ Π Σ f^1 f^{13} 28 118 157 180 205 255 565 597 700 828 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1424 1505 1506 2542 \aleph . Tischendorf prefers the longer reading.

¹⁹⁷ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:106–107, goes on at length criticizing editors who have chosen the “harmony,” which, he claims, is done “in very bad taste.” He concludes, “I merely make suggestions elsewhere, but I make free to demand of the next revisers that τοῖς προσφέρουσιν be restored to Mark x. 13.”

content with αὐτοῖς since the pronoun is ambiguous as to whether the disciples were rebuking children or parents.¹⁹⁸

(112) Mark 10:19 – μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσης ἢ μὴ ἀποστερήσης τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα (//Matthew 19:18, Luke 18:20; Corrected)¹⁹⁹

Jesus tells the rich young man seeking eternal life to follow the commandments. Among the commandments he lists, Jesus includes, “do not defraud” (μὴ ἀποστερήσης). This particular command is not found in Matthew 19:18 or Luke 18:20, probably because it is not found in the Ten Commandments. Many scribes have omitted the phrase from their texts of Mark, either because it is not one of the Ten Commandments or in harmonization to the other Synoptics.²⁰⁰ A corrector has restored the Markan reading.

(113) Mark 10:31 – πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ ἑσχατοὶ πρῶτοι (οἱ; cf. Matthew 20:16)²⁰¹

Jesus tells his disciples, the “last will be first.” There are two possible readings of this phrase: οἱ ἔσχατοι and ἔσχατοι. The textual evidence supports ἔσχατοι, and Metzger admits that the evidence for οἱ ἔσχατοι is “not impressive.”²⁰² Even so, nearly all editions of the Greek New Testament and most commentators accept the articular reading,

¹⁹⁸ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 89. See also A. Collins, *Mark*, 471 n. a.

¹⁹⁹ B* K W Δ Σ Ψ f¹ f¹³ 16 28 59 69* 118 205 209 229* 267 405 474 544 579 700 713 788 1010 1506 2542.

²⁰⁰ So Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:104–105; and A. Collins, *Mark*, 473–474 and n. c. See also Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 89.

²⁰¹ Manuscripts with οἱ include: B C E F G H N S U X Y Γ Σ Φ f¹³ 2 118 157 543 788 892 1006 1010 1342. Manuscripts without οἱ include: ⋈ A D K L M V W Δ Θ Π Ω* 0233 f¹ 22 28 106 124 142* 180 205 209 349 435 517 565 579 597 692 697* 700 1071 1241 1243 1278 1292 1342 1424 1505 2542.

²⁰² Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 90.

preferring to explain the alternative as a scribal harmonization to Matthew 19:30, where the article does not appear. This assessment fails to bring into consideration the almost identical parallel in Matthew 20:16: “Thus the last will be first and the first last” (οὕτως ἔσονται οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι). In this near-parallel, both categories, the last and the first, are accompanied by the definite article οἱ. Furthermore, in the Markan context, the categories are not *the first* and *the last*, but rather *many* first and, implied by ellipsis, *many* last. The article is unnecessary and disrupts the balance of the phrase as it appeared in earlier manuscripts of Mark. I suggest that the articular reading is not the best one in Mark 10:31, a conclusion the textual evidence strongly supports and the context requires, and that οἱ has been added by scribes in harmonization to Matthew 20:16.²⁰³

(114) Mark 10:35 – καὶ προσπορεύονται αὐτῷ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης οἱ ἄ υἱοὶ
Ζεβεδαίου (ἄ δύο; cf. Matthew 20:21)²⁰⁴

Mark describes James and John as “the sons of Zebedee” (οἱ υἱοὶ Ζεβεδαίου). The scribe of Vaticanus has introduced the adjective δύο to modify οἱ υἱοί. The origin of this reading in Mark 10:35 is probably the near-parallel in Matthew 20:21. In that context, the mother of James and John speaks to Jesus about “my two sons” (οἱ δύο υἱοί μου).

(115) Mark 10:46 – καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱεριχώ (//Matthew 20:29; Sub-singular B*
63; Corrected)

The scribe of Vaticanus has omitted the first sentence of Mark 10:46: “And they come into Jericho” (καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱεριχώ). There are three plausible explanations for

²⁰³ A similar reading is found in Luke 13:30 in P⁷⁵.

²⁰⁴ B C 579 1241 1342 2427. Legg prefers δύο.

the omission. In terms of transcriptional probabilities, the scribe's eye may have leapt from the *καί* of this sentence to the *καί* at the beginning of the next sentence, omitting everything in-between. In Vaticanus, *καί* falls at the beginning of a line and the whole missing sentence could have fit in one line in the exemplar. The result would be two consecutive lines beginning with *καί*, making a scribal leap easy. Second, the sentence may have been omitted to remove the odd order of events: "And Jesus comes into Jericho. And when he was leaving Jericho..."²⁰⁵ Finally, it is possible that the scribe was influenced by the absence of this sentence in Matthew 20:29. A later scribe has corrected the reading by adding the words in the margin.

(116) Mark 11:8 – *καὶ πολλοὶ τὰ ἱμάτια ἑαυτῶν ἔστρωσαν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν (ἑαυτῶν; //Matthew 21:1)*²⁰⁶

The shift between *αὐτῶν* and *ἑαυτῶν* occurs often in the manuscripts and it is nearly impossible to account for the exchange.²⁰⁷ In Mark 11:8, it is possible that the shift to the reflexive pronoun occurred under the influence of Matthew 21:8. If so, harmonization to context could account for the same exchange in Mark 11:7.

(117) Mark 12:9 – *τί οὖν ποιήσει ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος (//Matthew 21:40)*²⁰⁸

At the conclusion of his parable about wicked tenants, Jesus asks, "What, then (*τί οὖν*), will the master of the vineyard do?" Matthew introduces the question with a

²⁰⁵ A. Collins, *Mark*, 504 n. a, mentions this possibility.

²⁰⁶ B 118* 892 2427.

²⁰⁷ Voelz, "Greek of Codex Vaticanus," 213, finds a slight preference for the reflexive pronoun over the personal pronoun in the text of Mark.

²⁰⁸ B L 892* 1342 2427. Tischendorf and Legg prefer the reading without *οὖν*. Likewise, A. Collins, *Mark*, 540 n. b, regards the shorter reading as typical of Mark's style.

narrative prompt and so removes the conjunction οὖν: “When the master of the vineyard comes, what will he do to those farmers?” (ὅταν οὖν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος τί ποιήσει τοῖς γεωργοῖς ἐκείνοις). It is possible that the omission of the conjunction from the text of Mark in Vaticanus was caused by the influence of the Matthean reading upon the scribe.

(118) Mark 12:23 – ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν ἑνὸς αὐτῶν ἔσται γυνή
 (//Matthew 22:28, Luke 20:33)²⁰⁹

(119) Mark 12:26 – ἐγὼ ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Ἰακώβ
 (//Matthew 22:32 or Luke 20:37)²¹⁰

In an attempt to test Jesus, the Sadducees tell him a story about a woman widowed seven times by seven brothers. “In the resurrection, when they resurrect (ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν), of whom among them will she be the wife?” Many manuscripts from diverse traditions omit the clause ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν. In fact, on the basis of the manuscript evidence alone, one might conclude that the longer reading is a secondary expansion. Additional considerations must be brought to bear. First, the longer, somewhat repetitive reading is in keeping with Mark’s predilection for redundancy and conforms to Markan style.²¹¹ Second, what scribe would feel the need to expand upon the phrase “in the resurrection”

²⁰⁹ Ɀ B C D L W Δ Ψ 33 280 544 579 892 1342 2427. Legg and Souter prefer the shorter reading. Manuscripts with ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν include: A E F G H K M U X Y Γ Θ Π Σ Φ *f*¹ (*f*¹³) 2 22 28 (69 118) 124 (157) 180 205 (346) 565 700 1006 1010 1071 1505 1241 1243 1292 1424 2542 ℣.

²¹⁰ Manuscripts with both articles include: P^{45vid} Ɀ A C E F G H K L M U X Γ Δ Θ Π Σ Φ Ψ *f*¹ *f*¹³ 2 22 28 33 157 180 205 543 565 579 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 1506 2542 ℣. Manuscripts with neither article include: B D W. Legg, Merk, and Souter prefer the anarthrous reading.

²¹¹ A. Collins, *Mark*, 557 n. a.

with the unnecessary gloss “when they resurrect?” It would seem, then, that *ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν* is the earlier reading and was omitted by many scribes to improve the text. Adela Collins writes, “The shorter reading arose either under the influence of the parallels in Matt 22:28 and Luke 20:33 or in an analogous attempt to eliminate the redundancy.”²¹²

There is considerable doubt as to the best reading in Mark 12:26. The noun *θεός* is certainly accompanied by the definite article in the first instance, but the manuscripts are divided as to the second and third instances. The majority of manuscripts, several of them early and of high quality, have the second and third articles. These stand against the chief witnesses of the Alexandrian (B), Western (D), and Pre-Caesaren (W) text types. Both readings can be explained by harmonization. If the articular reading is earlier, then the articles may have been omitted in harmonization to Luke 20:37. If the articles are secondary, they may have been added in harmonization to Matthew 22:32. I tend to think the articular reading is earlier in Mark and that Matthew, on the basis of Markan priority, preserves the Markan reading. Luke has changed the case of the construction and, at the same time, omitted the second and third articles. With specific reference to Vaticanus, it is also possible that stylistic preference accounts for the absence of the articles. In Mark 12:30, the scribe has omitted three definite articles in a consecutive list.

(120) Mark 13:15 – *ὁ ὁδὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω* (//Matthew 24:17)²¹³

The scribe of Vaticanus has omitted the conjunction *δέ* in Mark 13:15. It is possible that the scribe was influenced by the form of this verse in Matthew 24:17.²¹⁴

²¹² A. Collins, *Mark*, 557 n. a. See also Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 93.

²¹³ B F H 238 259 1342 1424 2427 2542. Legg and Merk prefer the shorter reading.

(121) Mark 14:5 – ἡδύνατο γὰρ τοῦτο τὸ μύρον πραθῆναι ἐπάνω ἑδηναρίων
 τριακοσίων² καὶ δοθῆναι τοῖς πτωχοῖς (ἑδηναρίων τριακοσίων; //John
 12:5)²¹⁵

When a woman anoints Jesus with expensive perfume, some of the disciples complain that the ointment could have been sold for “three hundred denarii” (δηναρίων τριακοσίων) and the money given to the poor. In John 12:5, the order of the words is reversed: τριακοσίων δηναρίων. Harmonization to the Gospel of John is infrequent in Vaticanus, but this variant may have entered the text of Mark under the influence of the Fourth Gospel.

(122) Mark 14:31 – ὡσαύτως ὁδὲ καὶ πάντες ἔλεγον (//Matthew 26:35)²¹⁶

After Jesus predicts that Peter will deny him, Peter vehemently rejects the notion. Mark reports, “And likewise also all (of the disciples) began to say” (ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ πάντες ἔλεγον). Some manuscripts, including Vaticanus, lack the conjunction δέ, possibly because their scribes were influenced by the parallel passage in Matthew 26:35.

(123) Mark 14:43 – παραγίνεται Ἰούδας²¹⁷ εἰς τῶν δώδεκα καὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ὄχλος

μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων Ἰακώβου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν
 γραμματέων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων (Ἰακώβου; //Matthew 26:47; Sub-
 singular B 2427)

²¹⁴ A. Collins, *Mark*, 592 n. g, prefers the shorter reading; in which case harmonization is not a factor.

²¹⁵ A B K M U X Y Γ Δ Π Σ Φ Ψ ^f1³ 2 22 28 157 543 700 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1424 1506 2427 2542 ℳ. Souter prefers τριακοσίων δηναρίων.

²¹⁶ B ^f1 118 205 209 251 253 330 579 1506 1582.

²¹⁷ B has ὁ Ἰούδας.

Mark describes those who arrest Jesus as a crowd “from the chief priests” (παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων). The scribe of Vaticanus has replaced παρὰ with the preposition ἀπό. He may have been influenced by the text of Matthew 26:47.

(124) Mark 14:68 – [□]καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν\` (//Matthew 26:71, Luke 22:57)²¹⁸

(125) Mark 14:69 – καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ῥῆξάτο πάλιν λέγειν\` τοῖς

παρεστῶσιν ὅτι οὗτος ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐστίν (ῥεῖπεν; //Matthew 26:71,

Luke 22:58)²¹⁹

In Mark’s narrative of Peter’s denial, after Peter denies Jesus for the first time, “a rooster crowed” (καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν). Peter will deny Jesus twice more before the rooster crows for a second time in v. 72. Some important manuscripts omit the sentence, leading some editors to enclose the phrase in square brackets. If the words were not in a scribe’s exemplar, a scribe may have been motivated to add the event in order to conform to the prediction of two rooster calls in v. 30. It is more likely, though, that the words belong in Mark and have been omitted to conform to the Matthean and Lukan narratives, in which the rooster crows only once.²²⁰

Mark continues with the second denial. “And the girl, seeing him, began again to say (ῥεῖπτο πάλιν λέγειν) to those present, “This man is one of them.” Matthew and Luke record that it is a different individual who confronts Peter. According to Matthew 26:71, “Another saw him and says...” (εἶδεν αὐτὸν ἄλλη καὶ λέγει), and according to

²¹⁸ ⳧ B L W Π Ψ* 579 892 2427. Legg prefers the shorter reading.

²¹⁹ B 0276 2427.

²²⁰ So Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:105. See A. Collins, *Mark*, 697 n. h, for a survey of variants in this verse.

Luke 22:58, “Another, seeing him, said...” (ἕτερος ἰδὼν αὐτὸν ἔφη). Since the speaker has changed, these authors do not need to resume the previous character’s speech with the words “she began again to say” (ἤρξατο πάλιν λέγειν). The scribe of Vaticanus has replaced these words with εἶπεν, possibly under the influence of the parallels.²²¹

(126) Mark 15:10 – ἐγίνωσκεν γὰρ ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παραδεδώκεισαν αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς` (//Matthew 27:18)²²²

(127) Mark 15:12 – τί οὖν ὀθέλετε ποιήσω ὃν λέγετε τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων (//Matthew 27:22)²²³

According to Mark 15:10, Pilate was aware that “the chief priests” (οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς) had handed Jesus over to him because of envy. In Matthew 27:18, the chief priests are not the subject of the sentence; the evangelist says only that “they handed” (παρέδωκαν) Jesus over. The scribe of Vaticanus has omitted the reference to οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς. Hoskier suggests that something like homoioteleuton might account for the reading if the scribe’s eye jumped from ἀρχιερεῖς at the end of v. 10 to ἀρχιερεῖς only two short words later at the beginning of v. 11.²²⁴ The scribe, then, accidentally copied the beginning of v. 11, skipping the final words of v. 10. A likelier alternative is harmonization to the Matthean parallel.

²²¹ So Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:107.

²²² B f¹ 1 349 372 544 579 872 1582 2427.

²²³ Manuscripts with ὀθέλετε include: A D E G H K M N U X Y Γ Θ Π Σ^{vid} Ω 0250 2 22 28 118 124 157 180 205 209 346 (517) 565 579 597 700 872 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1346 (1424) 1505 1506 2542 ℘. Manuscripts without ὀθέλετε include: ⱼ B C W Δ Ψ f¹ f¹³ 33 40 69 543 788 892 1342 2427. Legg, Merk, and Souter prefer the shorter reading.

²²⁴ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:105, acknowledges the possibility of harmonization, but favors homoioteleuton.

There is substantial doubt as to whether the word θέλετε belongs in the text of Mark 15:12. The manuscript evidence is divided so that other considerations must tilt the balance. If the word is secondary, it may have been added to conform to Mark 15:9. Alternatively, if the word belongs to Mark, it could have been omitted to more closely match Matthew 27:22. Ultimately, it seems best to accept θέλετε on the basis of consistency with Markan style (cf. 15:9) and to explain its omission by harmonization to Matthew 27:22 or an attempt to remove repetition.²²⁵

(128) Mark 15:27 – καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ Ἦ σταυροῦσιν δύο ληστὰς (Ἦ ἐσταύρωσαν; //John 19:18)²²⁶

It is possible that the shift from the present tense σταυροῦσιν in Mark 15:27 to the aorist ἐσταύρωσαν occurred under the influence of John 19:18. In the Markan context, the two thieves are the objects of the verb; in John, Jesus himself is the object. One passage in the text of Mark in Vaticanus (Mark 14:5) where John may have been the source of a variant has already been noted. It is also possible that the scribe replaced Mark's historical present tense with a past tense form for stylistic reasons.²²⁷

(129) Mark 15:35 – καὶ τινες τῶν Ἦ παρεστηκότων ἀκούσαντες ἔλεγον (Ἦ ἐστηκότων; //Matthew 27:47)²²⁸

Some of those “standing by” (παρεστηκότων) heard Jesus cry out from the cross. In Matthew 27:47, the evangelist uses the simple verb ἐστηκότων.²²⁹ It is this form that

²²⁵ See also Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:105. A. Collins, *Mark*, 711 n. d, references this possibility.

²²⁶ B 372 565 1342 2427.

²²⁷ See Lagrange, *Critique rationnelle*, 85.

²²⁸ A B 2427.

appears in the text of Mark in Vaticanus. It seems likely that the Matthean parallel influenced the scribe's alteration.

(130) Mark 15:46a – καὶ {ἔθηκεν} αὐτόν (//Matthew 27:60, Luke 23:53)²³⁰

(131) Mark 15:46b – ἐν ῥ μνημείῳ (ῥ μνήματι; //Luke 23:53)²³¹

There are two possible readings attributable to parallel influence in Mark 15:46. In the first case, Hoskier suspects that ἔθηκεν, the reading found in the best manuscripts of Mark, is a secondary harmonization to Matthew 27:60 or Luke 23:52. The earlier reading, he asserts, was κατέθηκεν.²³² The word κατέθηκεν is found primarily in Byzantine manuscripts. All of the best manuscripts support ἔθηκεν so that no harmonization has taken place here.

In the second case, Mark's dative noun μνημείῳ has been replaced with the synonym μνήματι. This is the form found in Luke 23:53. The scribe has probably been influenced by the Lukan parallel.

Preliminary Summary of Harmonization in Mark

The external influences at work upon the scribe in his copy of Mark are now in view. Forty-nine variant readings were discussed, nine of which were found not to have involved harmonization. Twenty-one more can only be described as possibly involving

²²⁹ Voelz, "Greek of Codex Vaticanus," 212–213, has shown that, at least in Mark, the scribe prefers simple verbs to compound verbs, especially removing prefixes. This can also be seen in the text of Luke.

²³⁰ Manuscripts with ἔθηκεν include: Ɀ B C^o D L W Θ Σ Ψ 083 0112 *f*¹ *f*¹³ 29 33 71 86 118 205 517 543 565 692 892 1342 1424 2427 2542. Manuscripts with κατέθηκεν or similar include: A C* E G K M S U V X Y Γ Π 2 22 28 157 229 579 700 1006 1071 1241 1506 Ɀ. Tischendorf and Merk prefer κατέθηκεν.

²³¹ Ɀ B 1342 2427. Tischendorf and Legg prefer μνήματι.

²³² Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:107.

the influence of parallels. The remaining nineteen readings were likely or very likely caused by harmonization.

Table 18. Sources of Harmonization in the Text of Mark in Codex Vaticanus

Sources of Harmonization	Total: 19	Entry Number
Matthew	11	83, 84, 98, 102, 103, 105, 106, 107, 113, 114, 129
Luke	4	85, 89, 90, 131
Matthew or Luke	3	87, 112, 124
Misc.	1	101

The greatest external influence on the scribe in this section of Vaticanus is Matthew. This is not surprising, given the already close relationship between the texts of Mark and Matthew. Furthermore, having just completed his copy of Matthew, Matthean wording must have come easily to mind. It should also be noted that there are no inter-gospel harmonizations in the text of Mark in Vaticanus as were found in Matthew.

Codex Vaticanus – Luke

(132) Luke 2:9 – καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν ἄφρον μὲγαν ἄσφδρα; cf. Matthew 17:6, 27:54; Singular)²³³

When angels of the Lord appeared to shepherds to announce the birth of Jesus, Luke records that the shepherds “feared a great fear” or “feared greatly” (ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μὲγαν). Luke’s use of *figura etymologica* is good Greek style, but is nevertheless abandoned by the scribe of Vaticanus, who writes, “They feared exceedingly” (ἐφοβήθησαν σφδρα). The word σφδρα is not a particularly “Lukan” word, occurring only once in Luke (18:23) and once in Acts (6:7). It is, however, a distinctively Matthean term, occurring seven times in that Gospel. In two of these instances (17:6, 27:54), the

²³³ W has a conflated reading: ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μὲγαν σφδρα.

adverb is found in the phrase “they feared exceedingly” (ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα). It seems probable that the scribe was influenced by the Matthean construction, not to mention the Matthean preference for σφόδρα.

(133) Luke 2:19 – ἡ δὲ Ἰαριὰμ πάντα συνετήρει τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα²³⁴

συμβάλλουσα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς (Ἰαρία; Matthew and Mark)²³⁵

The name of Jesus’s mother regularly appears in different forms: *Μαριάμ* and *Μαρία*. Luke prefers the former, while Mark and Matthew favor the latter. The scribe of Vaticanus has substituted Matthew and Mark’s *Μαρία* for Luke’s *Μαριάμ* in Luke 2:19. While there is not an exact parallel to this verse in the Synoptics, it is possible that the scribe was influenced by the preference for *Μαρία* in the First and Second Gospels and that, although he has copied the name correctly nine times, his recent transcription of Matthew and Mark has had residual effects on his copy of Luke. The very fact that he has copied Luke faithfully in these other instances suggests an external cause in this case.

(134) Luke 4:17 – καὶ ἐπέδωκεν αὐτῷ βιβλίον τοῦ προφήτου Ἡσαΐου καὶ

ἄναπτύξας τὸ βιβλίον εὗρεν τὸν τόπον (ἄνοιξας; cf. Revelation 5)²³⁶

Jesus returns to his hometown and teaches in the synagogue. An attendant hands him the scroll of Isaiah and, “unrolling the scroll” (ἀναπτύξας τὸ βιβλίον), Jesus reads.

The verb ἀναπτύσσω is a New Testament *hapax legomenon*. Elsewhere in the New

²³⁴ B omits ταῦτα.

²³⁵ \aleph^* B D R Θ 348 372 477 544 1071 1241 1424 1654 2643. Tischendorf and Merk prefer *Μαρία*.

²³⁶ A B L W Ξ 33 440* 579 788 892 1195 1210^c 1241 2643. Merk and Souter prefer *ἀνοιξας*.

Testament, especially in the book of Revelation, the verb used with βίβλος is ἀνοίγω, “to open.” In Codex Vaticanus, this is the verb that is found in Luke 4:17 in the place of ἀναπτύσσω. The word might have been substituted in harmonization to several verses in Revelation, especially in chapter five, where the seven seals on the scroll are “opened.” Alternatively, Metzger posits that scribes accustomed to the codex book-form may have supplied the verb commonly paired with the βίβλος-codex, rather than the verb used with the βίβλος-scroll in Luke 4.²³⁷

(135) Luke 5:19 – διὰ τῶν κεράμων καθήκαν αὐτὸν σὺν τῷ κλινιδίῳ εἰς τὸ μέσον
ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (πάντων; cf. Mark 2:12; Singular)

Luke records that some men carried a paralytic and lowered him through the roof “before Jesus” (ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ). Only the scribe of Vaticanus has changed this sentence so that the man is lowered “before everyone” (ἔμπροσθεν πάντων). An explanation for the alteration is close at hand. In Mark 2:12, at the conclusion of the parallel pericope, Mark narrates that the healed paralytic got up, took his mat, and went out “before everyone” (ἔμπροσθεν πάντων). This sentence from the Second Gospel has influenced the scribe in his copy of Luke.²³⁸

(136) Luke 6:3 – ὅτε ἐπέινασεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ὄντες (//Mark 2:25,
Matthew 12:3)²³⁹

²³⁷ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 114.

²³⁸ So Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:267.

²³⁹ P⁴ ⋈ B D L W X Θ f¹ 22 33 69 11 124 131 157 205 209 213 435 579 700 788 892 1210 1241 1443 1582 2542. Tischendorf, IGNTP, Merk, and Souter prefer ὄντες.

The reading in Luke 6:3 was discussed in Chapter Two with P⁴. It is likely that ὄντες was omitted in harmonization to Mark 2:25 or Matthew 12:3.

(137) Luke 6:7 – παρατηροῦντο δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι εἰ ἐν τῷ
σαββάτῳ ἴθεραπεύει (ἴθεραπεύσει; //Mark 3:2)²⁴⁰

It is very likely that the substitution of θεραπεύσει for θεραπεύει in Luke 6:7 has occurred with reference to the parallel passage in Mark 3:2. For a full discussion, see the section on P⁴ in Chapter Two.

(138) Luke 6:15 – °καὶ Ἰάκωβον Ἀλφαίου καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν καλούμενον ζηλωτὴν
(//Matthew 10:3)²⁴¹

In Luke 6:15, the scribe has omitted the καὶ before the first name in the fifth pair of disciples, Ἰάκωβον Ἀλφαίου. The reading corresponds to Matthew 5:12, though it is not very likely that the scribe was strongly influenced by that passage since he has not omitted the καὶ before the third or fourth sets of names. A related reading will be discussed further in Chapter Six with reference to Codex Guelferbytanus. In that context, καὶ has been omitted before the first name in each pair, as in Matthew.

(139) Luke 6:23 – ἰδοὺ γὰρ ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολλὸς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ (ἴτοῖς οὐρανοῖς;
//Matthew 5:12)²⁴²

²⁴⁰ P⁴ B K M U X 033 Γ Δ Θ Λ J¹ J¹³ 2 28 33 157 579 700 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1424 1506
℣. IGNTP and Souter prefer θεραπεύσει.

²⁴¹ A B D^c K M Q U W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ J¹ 2 28 124 157 565 579 892 1006 1071 1342 1424 1506
℣. IGNTP believes the reading lacking all four conjunctions is older; however, there are a substantial number of manuscripts from diverse families that witness the longer reading in all four cases.

²⁴² B R J¹³ 2 13 21 69 346 372 399* 517* 543 579 788 826 827 828 954 983 1071 1338 1424
1675.

In the Lukan beatitudes, Jesus blesses those who are reviled and promises that their reward will be great “in heaven” (τῷ οὐρανῷ). Where Luke uses a singular construction, Matthew speaks of “the heavens” (τοῖς οὐρανοῖς). The scribe of Vaticanus has also used a plural construction. It is possible that the version of the saying in Matthew 5:12 influenced the use of the plural reading in Luke 6:23.

(140) Luke 6:33 – καὶ ^τ ἐὰν ἀγαθοποιῆτε τοὺς ἀγαθοποιούντας ὑμᾶς ποία ὑμῖν
χάρις ἐστίν (^τ γάρ; cf. Matthew 5:46)²⁴³

(141) Luke 6:36 – γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς ^οκαὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν
(//Matthew 5:48)²⁴⁴

The variant in Luke 6:33 was discussed in Chapter Three with reference to its appearance in P⁷⁵. The harmonizing influence of Matthew 5:46 likely accounts for the addition of γάρ in Vaticanus.

At the end of the sermon on the plain in Luke 6:36, Jesus tells his followers to be merciful “just as also” (καθὼς καί) your father is merciful. This passage is the counterpart to Matthew’s statement: be perfect “as” (ὡς) your heavenly father is perfect. A large number of manuscripts, including Vaticanus, lack Luke’s conjunction καί, which brings the structure of the statement closer to Matthew. In fact, there is some doubt as to whether the reading with the conjunction is older, but if the conjunction were absent there would be no compelling reason to add it. Alternatively, if the reading with the

²⁴³ P⁷⁵ ⋈* B 700. Tischendorf and NA²⁸ deem γάρ the earlier reading; IGNTP and Souter do not.

²⁴⁴ Manuscripts without καί include: P^{74vid} ⋈ B L W Ξ Ψ ^f1 118 131 205 209 262 477 579 1071 1187* 1242* 1443 1582*. Tischendorf, Merk, and Souter prefer the shorter reading. Manuscripts with καί include: A D K M P U Γ Δ Θ Λ Π ^f13 2 28 33 69 157 565 700 892 1006 1241 1342 1424 1506 1582^c 2542 ℳ.

conjunction is older, a scribe might omit it as superfluous or, possibly, in harmonization to Matthew 5:48.²⁴⁵

(142) Luke 6:38 – ὧ γὰρ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε Ἦ ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν (Ἦ μετρηθήσεται;
//Mark 4:24, Matthew 7:2)²⁴⁶

In Luke 6:38, Jesus says, “For by the measure you measure it will be measured in turn (ἀντιμετρηθήσεται) to you.” Mark and Matthew use the simple form of this verb, μετρηθήσεται. Codex Vaticanus, and a few other manuscripts, has the simple form in Luke, probably because that form of the aphorism was known from Mark 4:24 or Matthew 7:2. Additionally, in Codex Vaticanus the scribe has now copied this saying twice in a single manuscript, making harmonization to the earlier Gospels even more likely. The reading has been corrected by adding the missing letters (αντι) above the line.

(143) Luke 7:19 – σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἢ Ἦ ἄλλον προσδοκῶμεν (Ἦ ἕτερον; //Matthew
11:3)²⁴⁷

John’s disciples come and ask Jesus if he is the one to come, or if they should expect “another” (ἄλλον). In the same context in Matthew 11:3, the evangelist uses the adjective ἕτερον. Many scribes have substituted the Lukan reading for Matthew’s.

(144) Luke 8:5a – Ἦ δὲ μὲν ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν καὶ κατεπατήθη (Ἦ ἄ; //Matthew
13:4)²⁴⁸

²⁴⁵ See further Hedley, “Egyptian Texts,” 188, who describes this reading, as quoted by Clement, as an assimilation.

²⁴⁶ B* P 28 1093 2643.

²⁴⁷ Ⲛ B L R W X Ξ Ψ 7 16 28 33 60 124 157 174 209 213 267 577 579 827 892 903 954 983 1071 1083 1200 1241 1242 1338 1342 1355 1424 1506 1654 1675 1685 1689 2542.

²⁴⁸ B W 2643.

(145) Luke 8:5b – καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατέφαγεν ἡ αὐτό (Γ αὐτά; //Matthew 13:4)²⁴⁹

The variant reading in Luke 8:5a is closely related to the reading in Luke 8:5b, which was discussed in Chapter Three with reference to P⁷⁵. The partial harmonization in that papyrus is a complete harmonization in Vaticanus. Luke speaks of “some” seed that fell along the path; birds came and ate “it” (δ...αὐτό). Luke’s singular construction has been replaced with the plural construction (ἅ...αὐτά) of Matthew 13:4.

(146) Luke 8:16 – οὐδεὶς δὲ λύχνον ἄψας καλύπτει αὐτὸν σκεύει ἢ ὑποκάτω κλίνης τίθησιν ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ λυχνίας τίθησιν ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι βλέπωσιν τὸ φῶς` (//Mark 4:21)²⁵⁰

The variant reading in Luke 8:16 was discussed in Chapter Three with P⁷⁵. It is possible that harmonization has played a role in the alteration.

(147) Luke 8:43 – καὶ γυνή οὖσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος ἀπὸ ἐτῶν δώδεκα ἣτις ἰατροῖς προσαναλώσασα ὅλον τὸν βίον` οὐκ ἴσχυσεν ἀπ’ οὐδενὸς θεραπευθῆναι (//Matthew 9:20)²⁵¹

(148) Luke 8:54 – αὐτὸς δὲ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς ἡ αὐτῆς ἐφώνησεν λέγων ἡ παῖς ἔγειρε (Γ αὐτῆ; //Mark 5:41; Singular B*; Corrected)

²⁴⁹ P⁷⁵ B 16 21 1012 1604.

²⁵⁰ P⁷⁵ B 1574.

²⁵¹ P⁷⁵ B D 0279.

For a full discussion of the variant in Luke 8:43, see the section on P⁷⁵ in Chapter Three. Harmonization may have been a factor in the omission of *ιατροῖς προσαναλώσασα ὅλον τὸν βίον*.

It is possible that the variant in Luke 8:54 is a hidden harmonization.²⁵² According to Luke 8:54, “Jesus, grasping her (a dead girl’s) hand, called out saying, ‘Child, get up’” (*αὐτὸς δὲ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς ἐφώνησεν λέγων ἡ παῖς ἔγειρε*). The first scribe of Vaticanus has written *αὐτῆ* instead of *αὐτῆς*. While this appears to be a mistake, and a later corrector has caught it and added the missing sigma above the line, the resulting sentence could be rendered: “Jesus, taking the hand (of the girl), called out to her (*αὐτῆ* ἐφώνησεν) saying...” Such a rendering is similar to the account in Mark 5:41, where Jesus, grasping “the hand of the child, says to her...” (*τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ παιδίου λέγει αὐτῆ*).

(149) Luke 9:3 – *μηδὲν αἴρετε εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν μήτε ράβδον μήτε πῆραν μήτε ἄρτον μήτε ἀργύριον μήτε ὀνὰ δύο χιτῶνας ἔχειν* (//Mark 6:9, Matthew 10:10)²⁵³

When Jesus commissions his disciples to cast out demons and to heal in Luke 9:3, he gives them strict regulations regarding preparations for the journey, including that they should take along no staff, bag, bread, silver, “nor have two tunics apiece” (*μήτε ἄνὰ δύο χιτῶνας ἔχειν*). In Mark 6:9, Jesus commands his disciples indirectly that they “might not wear two tunics” (*καὶ μὴ ἐνδύσησθε δύο χιτῶνας*) and in Matthew 10:9–10 he tells them directly not to acquire two tunics for the journey (*μὴ κτήσησθε...δύο χιτῶνας*). In most

²⁵² Martini, *Il problema*, 169, lists this reading among other “overt errors” (*errori palesi*).

²⁵³ ⋈ B C* F L Ξ 070 0202 0211 254 372 579 1241 1342. Souter prefers the shorter reading.

manuscripts of Luke, the preposition *ἀνά* gives the statement a distributive sense; that is to say, Jesus bans them from taking two tunics each. In some manuscripts, however, the preposition is omitted, though the distributive sense is still implied. The scribe seems to have been influenced by the parallel passage in Mark or Matthew.

(150) Luke 9:9 – εἶπεν δὲ τῷ Ἡρώδης (τῷ δ; //Mark 6:16)²⁵⁴

In the Synoptics, Herod's name sometimes appears anarthrously and sometimes with the definite article. When it appears in the nominative without a title, Mark is the only evangelist to use consistently the article (ὁ Ἡρώδης). Matthew is less consistent, but tends to prefer the anarthrous name. Luke is also inconsistent, but tends to favor the articular construction. The manuscript evidence is sufficient to say that the anarthrous reading is probably earlier in Luke. The article was added by scribes who either wished to conform to the Lukan tendency or to the direct parallel in Matthew.

(151) Luke 9:23 – εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἔρχεσθαι ἵνα ἀρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν

(ἵνα ἀπαρνησάσθω; //Mark 8:34, Matthew 16:24)²⁵⁵

See the full discussion of this reading in Chapter Three with reference to P⁷⁵. It is likely that the use of the compound verb reflects the influence of the parallels. In Codex Vaticanus, a corrector has deleted the first two letters of the word by adding dots superlinearly, thereby restoring the Lukan reading.

²⁵⁴ B L N X Ξ Ψ f¹ 1 33 69 118 124 157 579 700 892 1241 1346 1582. IGNTP and Souter prefer ὁ against manifold and diverse witnesses.

²⁵⁵ P⁷⁵ B* C M R U W X Γ Δ Λ Ψ f¹ 2 28 69 118 124 157 565 700 788 892 1006 1071 1241 1346 1424 1506 2542 ℣. IGNTP prefers ἀπαρνησάσθω.

(152) Luke 9:28 – ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους ὥσει ἡμέραι ὀκτῶ °καὶ

παραλαβὼν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον (//Mark 9:2, Matthew 17:1)²⁵⁶

The variant in Luke 9:28 was discussed in Chapter Three with P⁴⁵. The omission of καὶ may reflect the harmonizing influence of Mark 9:2 or Matthew 17:1.

(153) Luke 9:59 – ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ἵ ἀπελθόντι πρῶτον² θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου

(ἵ πρῶτον ἀπελθόντι; //Matthew 8:21)²⁵⁷

A prospective disciple says to Jesus, “Permit me, going, first to bury my father” (ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ἀπελθόντι πρῶτον θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου). Matthew’s version of this statement is slightly different: “Permit me first to go and to bury my father” (ἐπίτρεψόν μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου). The scribe of Vaticanus has not conformed his passage to Matthew 8:21 completely because he has not adopted Matthew’s infinitive verb, but he has adopted the Matthean word order with adverb before verb. The scribe, remembering the passage from copying it previously, had already transcribed the first three words of the would-be-disciple’s request before returning to Luke’s wording.

(154) Luke 10:15 – καὶ σὺ Καφαρναούμ μὴ ἕως οὐρανοῦ²⁵⁸ ὑψωθήσῃ ἕως τοῦ ἄβδου

Ἦ καταβιβασθήσῃ (Ἦ καταβήσῃ; //Matthew 11:23)²⁵⁹

²⁵⁶ Manuscripts without καὶ include: P⁴⁵ Ⳑ* B H 28 157 579 1338. Manuscripts with καὶ include: P⁷⁵ Ⳑ^c A C D E F G K L M P R S U V W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Ξ Π Ψ f¹ f⁴³ 2 69 118^c 124 565 700 788 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1346 1424 1506 2542 ℣.

²⁵⁷ Manuscripts with adverb before verb include: Ⳑ B (D) Ψ 047 1 13 16 28 33 118 131 205 209 346 543 544 579 788 826 827 828 892 954 983 1012 1071 1220 1242 1338 1342 1346 1424 1582 1604 1675 2643 2757 2766. Tischendorf prefers πρῶτον ἀπελθόντι.

It is likely that the replacement of *καταβιβασθήση* with *καταβήση* in Luke 10:15 reflects the parallel in Matthew 11:23. For a complete discussion, see the section on P⁷⁵ in Chapter Three.

(155) Luke 10:21 – *ναὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὅτι οὕτως ἵ ἐγένετο εὐδοκία² ἔμπροσθέν σου*
(*ἵ εὐδοκία ἐγένετο; //Matthew 11:26*)²⁶⁰

The variant in Luke 10:21 was discussed with P⁷⁵ in Chapter Three. The transposition appears to have occurred under the influence of Matthew 11:26.

(156) Luke 11:14 – *καὶ ἦν ἐκβάλλων δαιμόνιον □καὶ αὐτὸ ἦν³ κωφόν* (*//Matthew 12:22*)²⁶¹

The omission in Luke 11:14 may be a harmonizing variant. See the discussion in Chapter Three with P⁷⁵.

(157) Luke 11:24 – *Ἦ λέγει ὑποστρέψω εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου ὅθεν ἐξῆλθον* (*Ἦ τότε; //Matthew 12:44*)²⁶²

²⁵⁸ B^c has τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

²⁵⁹ Manuscripts with *καταβήση* include: P⁷⁵ B D (579) 1342. Manuscripts with *καταβιβασθήση* include: P⁴⁵ ⳧ A C E G K L M N R U W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Ξ Π Ψ 0115 *f*¹ *f*¹³ 1 2 28 33 118 157 180 205 565 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1346 1424 1505 1506 1582 Ⓜ.

²⁶⁰ Manuscripts with *ἐγένετο εὐδοκία* include: ⳧ A C^c D K M N U W Γ Δ Θ Λ Π 0115 *f*¹ *f*¹³ 2 28 157 565 700 1006 1071 1241 1342 1424 1506 2542 Ⓜ. Manuscripts with *εὐδοκία ἐγένετο* include: P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ B C* L X Ξ Ψ 070 0124 1 33 213 579 892.

²⁶¹ Manuscripts without *καὶ αὐτὸ ἦν* include: P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ ⳧ A* B L 0211 *f*¹ 1 22 33 118 131 157 205 209 788 892 1210 1241 1582* 2542. Souter prefers the shorter reading. Manuscripts with *καὶ αὐτὸ ἦν* include: A^c C E F G H K M U R W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ *f*¹³ 2 28 69 180 565 579 700 1006 1010 1071 1243 1292 1342 1346 1424 1505 1582^c Ⓜ.

²⁶² Manuscripts with *τότε* include: P⁷⁵ ⳧^c B L X Θ Ξ Π 070 0124 33 157 579 713 827 892 1012 1071 1241 1342 1604 2096 2643 2766. Manuscripts without *τότε* include: P⁴⁵ ⳧* A C D E^c G H K M U W Y Γ Δ Λ Ψ *f*¹³ 2 28 69 124 180 205 565 597 700 788 1006 1010 1243 1292 1346 1424 1505 1506 2542 Ⓜ.

(158) Luke 11:25 – καὶ ἐλθὼν εὕρισκει ^τ σεσαρωμένον καὶ κεκοσμημένον

(^τσχολάζοντα; //Matthew 12:44)²⁶³

For the discussion of the variant in Luke 11:24, see the section on P⁷⁵ in Chapter Three. The addition of τότε reflects Matthew 12:44.

In Luke, Jesus explains that when a demon has gone out of a person it will sometimes return to the same individual and find it like a house “swept and arranged” (σεσαρωμένον καὶ κεκοσμημένον). Matthew adds in his Gospel that the house will be found “empty” (σχολάζοντα). This description has been added to Luke 11:25 by many scribes under the influence of Matthew. Metzger asserts that “copyists could not resist” introducing the material from Matthew 12:44. Martini agrees, saying, “The suspicion of interpolation here is very strong.” He singles out Westcott and Hort for including the words in their text, even if in square brackets.²⁶⁴

(159) Luke 12:8 – πᾶς ὃς ἂν ^Γ ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων

(^Γ ὁμολογήσει; //Matthew 10:32)²⁶⁵

Jesus promises his followers, “Everyone who confesses (ὁμολογήσῃ) in me before men, the son of man will also confess (ὁμολογήσει) in him before the angels of God.” In Matthew 10:32, the verb in the first clause is a future indicative (ὁμολογήσει), which matches the form of the verb in the second clause. In Vaticanus, the scribe has substituted

²⁶³ ^{8c} B C L R Γ Ξ Ψ ^f ¹³ 1 13 16 22 33 69 118 124 131 205 209 346 399^c 443 477 543 544 579 669 788 826 892 903 983 1012 1195 1210 1243 1342 1346 1582 1604 2096 2542.

²⁶⁴ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 134. Martini, *Il problema*, 131: “Il sospetto di interpolazione qui è assai forte.” See also Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:267–268; and Fee, “P⁷⁵, P⁶⁶, and Origen,” 271.

²⁶⁵ A B D R S Γ Δ 028 047 0211 6 13 157 472 577 (579) 726 827 903 983 1009 1194 1200 1241 1319 1342 1347 1424 1542 2372.

Matthew's *ὁμολογήσει* for Luke's *ὁμολογήση*. While this could be an orthographic variant of Luke's own reading, it is more likely that the scribe intended to conform the passage to the context of Luke's second clause or to the Matthean parallel.

(160) Luke 12:22 – *μη̄ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ τί φάγητε μηδὲ τῷ σώματι ὅτι ἐνδύσησθε (ὅτι ὑμῶν; //Matthew 6:25)*²⁶⁶

In Luke 12:22, Jesus says to his disciples, “Do not worry about the soul (τῇ ψυχῇ), what you will eat, not about the body (τῷ σώματι), what you will wear.” In Matthew 6:25, Jesus tells the disciples not to worry about “your soul” (τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν) or “your body” (τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν). Many scribes copying Luke have adopted both of Matthew's pronouns; others have adopted only one pronoun in one phrase or the other. In Vaticanus, the scribe has written τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν under the influence of Matthew 6:25.²⁶⁷

(161) Luke 12:39 – *τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκετε ὅτι εἰ ἦδει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ποία ὥρα ὁ κλέπτῃς ἔρχεται ὅτι οὐκ ἂν ἄφηκεν διορυχθῆναι τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ (ἐγγρηγόρησεν ἂν καὶ οὐκ; //Matthew 24:43)*²⁶⁸

Jesus teaches about watchfulness and uses an analogy about slaves, masters, and thieves. In Luke 12:39, Jesus claims that if a house owner had known at which hour a

²⁶⁶ B 070 0211 f¹³ 1 13 22 28 33 69 118 124 131 161 205 209^c 343 346 349 543 577 716 788 826 827 903 954 983 1005 1192 1210 1229 1365 1424 1443 1582 1630 1675 2372 2487 2757 2766. Souter prefers ὑμῶν.

²⁶⁷ See Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:268; and Martini, *Il problema*, 131. Martini does entertain the possibility that the exemplar had both pronouns and that the scribe has omitted the second one accidentally. This may be more likely than partial harmonization. He concludes that one cannot be certain why the reading has appeared.

²⁶⁸ \aleph^{*c} A B E G^{supp} H K L M N P Q S U W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ Ω 070 f¹ f¹³ 2 28 33 124 157 180 205 565 579 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 1506 2542 \aleph . Some of these manuscripts contain minor variants, but all have entered under the influence of Matthew's parallel. Against these stand: P⁷⁵ \aleph^* D. Souter and IGNTP prefer the longer reading.

thief would come, “he would not have permitted him to break into his house” (οὐκ ἂν ἀφῆκεν διορυχθῆναι τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ). This, at least, is the text as presented in many modern editions of the Greek New Testament. In fact, a longer reading is much better attested. In this alternative reading, Jesus says that if a house owner had known at which hour the thief would come, “he would have watched and would not have permitted him to break into his house” (ἐγρηγόρησεν ἂν καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν διορυχθῆναι τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ). This reading corresponds to the parallel in Matthew 24:43. If the shorter reading is older, the variant could have arisen through harmonization.²⁶⁹ Since the longer reading has the better claim on the basis of textual evidence alone, however, there is no harmonization in this verse. The shorter reading has occurred in very few manuscripts because of scribal negligence.

(162) Luke 13:32 – ἰδοὺ ἐκβάλλω δαιμόνια καὶ ἰάσεις ἀποτελῶ σήμερον καὶ αὔριον καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ [†] τελειοῦμαι ([†] ἡμέρα; cf. Synoptic parlance)²⁷⁰

Only in Luke 13:32 does Jesus call Herod a fox and tell messengers to report to Herod his words: “I will cast out demons and perform healing today and tomorrow and on the third (τῇ τρίτῃ) I (will) have completed (it).” A handful of manuscripts have added the noun “day,” with the resultant phrase “on the third *day*” (τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρα). This is a common construction in the Synoptics in passages where Jesus predicts his death and resurrection (e.g. Matthew 16:21, 17:23, 20:19; Luke 9:22, 24:7, 24:46). The scribe was

²⁶⁹ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 136, believes the longer reading is a scribal assimilation. He argues that there is no compelling argument to explain why a few scribes would delete the reading if the longer reading were older. He makes a fair point, yet the situation is really only a matter of two manuscript traditions, P⁷⁵-B and D, and one must allow for such idiosyncrasies.

²⁷⁰ B 56 346* 372 1203 1215 1346.

likely influenced by the Synoptic idiom as he copied a similar phrase and one with shared undertones.

(163) Luke 13:35 – οὐ μὴ ἴδητέ με ἕως ἴξῃ ὅτε εἴπητε εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου (//Matthew 23:39)²⁷¹

See a full discussion of the variant in Luke 13:35 in Chapter Three, where a closely related variant in P⁷⁵ was addressed. The omission of ἴξῃ ὅτε may be a harmonizing variant.

(164) Luke 15:4 – τίς ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ὑμῶν ἔχων ἑκατὸν πρόβατα καὶ ἄπολέσας ἐξ αὐτῶν ἓν οὐ καταλείπει τὰ ἐνεσθόντα ἑννέα (ἄπολέση; //Matthew 18:12)²⁷²

In the parable of the lost sheep in Luke 15:4, Jesus describes a man “who loses” (ἀπολέσας) one sheep and leaves the ninety-nine others to go and search for the lost one. In Vaticanus, the participle ἀπολέσας has been replaced by the subjunctive verb ἀπολέση. A corrector has restored the Lukan reading. Lagrange supposes the substitution occurred under the influence of the subjunctive construction of the parallel passage in Matthew 18:12.²⁷³ In that context, it is said that a sheep “wanders” (πλανηθῆ). Martini considers harmonization unlikely, and is probably correct since the contexts of the passages are so different.²⁷⁴

²⁷¹ P⁷⁵ B L R 892. Souter prefers ἕως εἴπητε.

²⁷² B* D.

²⁷³ So Lagrange, *Critique rationelle*, 86.

²⁷⁴ Martini, *Il problema*, 128.

(165) Luke 15:21 – οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἄξιος κληθῆναι υἱός σου [ⓧ] (ⓧ ποιήσόν με ὡς ἓνα τῶν μισθίων σου; cf. Luke 15:19)²⁷⁵

In Luke 15:21, the prodigal son says to his father, “I am no longer worthy to be called your son.” In several manuscripts, the son goes on to say, “Make me as one of your hired workers” (ποιήσόν με ὡς ἓνα τῶν μισθίων σου). This addition is made in harmonization to v. 19, where the son plans what he will say to his father. In his planned speech, both statements are included. The reading has been added by scribes to correspond more closely to the son’s intended petition.²⁷⁶ This type of variant can also be considered a harmonization to context, but given its length it is well to consider it with assimilations to remote parallels. Additionally, this reading reflects the scribe’s desire for internal consistency, a feature noted in his text of Matthew.

(166) Luke 17:24 – ὡσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπὴ ἀστράπτουσα ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰς τὴν ὑπ’ οὐρανὸν λάμπει οὕτως ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου [□] ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ\` (//Matthew 24:27)²⁷⁷

It is likely that the phrase ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ was omitted in harmonization to Matthew 24:27. See the discussion of the variant in the section on P⁷⁵ in Chapter Three.

(167) Luke 18:24 – ἰδὼν δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς [□] περίλυπον γερόμενον\` εἶπεν (//Mark 10:23, Matthew 19:23)²⁷⁸

²⁷⁵ ⓧ B D U X 33 180 213 348 349 443 482 577 700 983 998 1006 1195 1195 1215 1216 1241 1630 1689 2643.

²⁷⁶ So Lagrange, *Critique rationnelle*, 101; and Martini, *Il problema*, 129. See also Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 139.

²⁷⁷ P⁷⁵ B D 220.

In Luke 18:24, Jesus sees that the rich man “becomes grieved” (περίλυπον γενόμενον) when he is unable to part with his belongings. This phrase is absent from many manuscripts of Luke, including Codex Vaticanus. It is possible that the words are secondary, being a scribal expansion reflecting the grief of the young man in v. 23. Yet, the notion is Lukan and the repetition is typical of Lukan style.²⁷⁹ It is more likely that the words belong in the text and that they have been removed in harmonization to Mark and Matthew or to reduce redundancy.

(168) Luke 18:30 – ὃς οὐχὶ μὴ ἰ ἀπολάβῃ πολλαπλασίονα ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ
(Γλάβῃ; //Mark 10:30)²⁸⁰

Jesus promises his followers in Luke 18:30 that there is no one who has left family and home for the sake of the kingdom of God who will not “receive back” (ἀπολάβῃ) much more in this and the coming age. In Mark 10:30, the evangelist has used a simple verb (λάβῃ). The scribe of Vaticanus has replaced Luke’s compound verb with Mark’s simple verb.²⁸¹

(169) Luke 19:36 – πορευομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ὑπεστρώννουν τὰ ἰμάτια ἰ αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ
ὁδοῦ (ἰ εἰ αὐτῶν; //Matthew 21:8)²⁸²

²⁷⁸ ⳨ B L f¹ 1 131 157 205 209 579 1241 1582* 2542. Tischendorf, Merk, and Souter prefer the shorter reading.

²⁷⁹ See Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 143.

²⁸⁰ B D M 2 179 472 477 713 903 1009 1071 1195 1215 1223 1338 1443* 1654* 2096 2613. Merk prefers λάβῃ.

²⁸¹ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1: 268.

²⁸² A B K N R U W Θ Π Ψ f¹ 1 6 7 124 158 174 265 280 349 472 485 489 660 713 1005 1009 1079 1195 1200 1219 1220^c 1223 1242 1313 1319 1365 1582 1604 2372 2613. Merk prefers εἰ αὐτῶν.

The substitution of *ἐαυτῶν* for *αὐτῶν* and the reverse occurs regularly in the manuscripts so that it is difficult to assert with confidence that an external influence has contributed to the exchange in any particular case. Nevertheless, in Luke 19:36, it is possible that the scribe was influenced by Matthew 21:8.

(170) Luke 20:27a – *προσελθόντες δέ τινες τῶν Σαδδουκαίων οἱ ἄντιλέγοντες ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι (ἴλέγοντες; //Mark 12:18, Matthew 22:23)²⁸³*

(171) Luke 20:27b – *ἴἐπηρώτησαν αὐτόν (ἴἐπηρώτων; //Mark 12:18)²⁸⁴*

Luke describes the Sadducees as those who “say opposingly” or “say in opposition” (*ἀντιλέγοντες*) that there is no resurrection. Where in Luke 20:27a there is a compound verb, in Mark 12:18 and Matthew 22:23 the simple verb *λέγοντες* is used. This construction has been adopted in many manuscripts of Luke. Later in the same verse, Luke uses an aorist verb when he says that the Sadducees “asked” (*ἐπηρώτησαν*) Jesus about the resurrection. In the same context, Mark uses the imperfect *ἐπηρώτων*. The scribe of Vaticanus adopts Mark’s imperfect verb. That both variants in this verse can be explained with reference to a parallel passage suggests that harmonization is the correct explanation for the readings.

(172) Luke 20:44 – *Δαυὶδ οὖν ἴκύριον αὐτόν² καλεῖ (ἴαὐτόν κύριον; //Mark 12:37, Matthew 22:45)²⁸⁵*

²⁸³ ⱼ B C D L N Θ (Ψ) 0211 *f*¹ 1 7 22 33 60 118 131 205 209 213 267 372 565^c 579 660 (713) 827 892 1005 1071 1192 1210 1241 1319 1365 1582 1604 1654 1685 2372 2542 2766. Souter prefers *λέγοντες*.

²⁸⁴ B *f*¹³ 124 157 579 1071.

²⁸⁵ A B K L M Q R U Π 0211 27 33 71 115^c 158 213 265 443 472 489 983 1005 1009 1079 1194 1219 1220 (1241) 1313 1355 1365 1392 1458 2372 2613 2766. Merk prefers *αὐτόν κύριον*.

In Luke 20:44, Jesus asks his opponents, “How can they say the messiah is David’s son?” After quoting Psalm 110:1, Jesus says, “David, therefore, calls him Lord (κύριον αὐτόν); and how is (he) his son?” The scribe of Vaticanus has reversed the order of the words κύριον αὐτόν, possibly in harmonization to Matthew 22:45.

(173) Luke 21:6 – ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι ἐν αἷς οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ ^τ (^τ ὧδε;

//Mark 13:2, Matthew 24:2)²⁸⁶

Jesus tells his disciples that days will come when not one stone of the temple will be left upon another. Both Mark and Matthew have the adverb ὧδε in their version of this sentence: “A stone will not be left *here* upon a stone” (οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῆ ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον). The scribe of Vaticanus has adopted the adverb from one of the parallels; only, he has placed it at the end of the sentence.

(174) Luke 21:37 – ἦν δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ^ς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων^ς (^ς διδάσκων ἐν τῷ

ἱερῷ; cf. Luke 19:4)²⁸⁷

In Luke 21:37, the evangelist records that Jesus was daily “in the temple teaching” (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων). The scribe of Vaticanus has transposed the verb to the beginning of the phrase. While this passage does not have an exact parallel in the other Gospels, the phrase does appear in the altered order in Mark 12:35, in the context of Jesus’s disputes with the religious elite, and in John 8:20, where Jesus makes bold claims about his relationship with the father. The contexts of those passages are quite different from the present one. A more likely source of influence is Luke 19:47, where, in a very similar

²⁸⁶ ⲛ B L f³ 4 13 61^{mg} 69 124 346 543 788 826 828 892 983 1346 2542. Souter prefers ὧδε. Manuscripts that place ὧδε earlier or in a somewhat altered phrase include: D X f¹ 1 22 33 118 131 205 209 213 579 660 1005 1192 1210 1241 1365 1582 2372.

²⁸⁷ B K T (070) 0139 1215 2643.

statement, the narrator claims that Jesus was teaching each day in the temple (καὶ ἦν διδάσκων τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ). Although the syntax is not quite the same, the prepositional phrase follows the verb.

(175) Luke 22:9 – ποῦ θέλεις ἐτοιμάσωμεν [†] († σοὶ φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα; //Matthew 26:17; Sub-singular B 1365)

In Luke 22:9, the disciples ask Jesus, “Where do you wish us to prepare (for the Passover)?” The scribe of Vaticanus has added the words “for you to eat the Passover” (σοὶ φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα). These words are drawn from Matthew 26:17, where the whole sentence is found.²⁸⁸ Similar sentiments, though with different syntax, are found in Mark 14:12.

(176) Luke 22:18 – λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ πίω (//Matthew 26:29)²⁸⁹

The variant in Luke 22:18 was discussed in Chapter Three with P⁷⁵. It is likely that the omission of ὅτι was made in harmonization to Matthew 26:29.

(177) Luke 22:43–44 – ὠφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτὸν καὶ γεγόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσήχητο καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἰδρῶς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν` (cf.

Parallels in Mark and Matthew)²⁹⁰

For a complete discussion of the variant in Luke 22:43–44, see the section on P⁶⁹ in Chapter Two.

²⁸⁸ Hoskier, *Codex B*, 1:268, calls the reading “a deliberate theft.” It is a “theft” of sorts indeed, but perhaps accidental in nature. See also Martini, *Il problema*, 131.

²⁸⁹ P^{75vid} B C D G L f¹ 157 205 2542. Merk prefers the shorter reading.

²⁹⁰ (P⁶⁹) P⁷⁵ κ^c A B N R T W 0211 13* 69 124 158 346 473 481 543 579 713 788 826 1071*. Manuscripts that omit only v. 43 include: 124.

(178) Luke 22:61 – καὶ ὑπεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ {ρήματος} τοῦ κυρίου (//Matthew 26:75, Mark 14:72)²⁹¹

Hoskier suspects a harmonization in Luke 22:61. This reading was already discussed in Chapter Two with P⁶⁹, where it was shown that harmonization is not a factor.

(179) Luke 23:34 – διαμεριζόμενοι δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἔβαλον Ἦ κλήρους (Ἦ κλήρον; //Matthew 27:35 and Mark 15:24)²⁹²

This reading was discussed with P⁷⁵ in Chapter Three. It was shown there that harmonization has not been a factor in the selection of κλήρον in the place of κλήρους.

(180) Luke 24:46–47 – οὕτως γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν Ἦ καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (Ἦ εἰς; //Mark 1:4, Luke 3:3; cf. Acts 5:31)²⁹³

The substitution of εἰς for καί in Luke 22:46–47 may have occurred with reference to similar phrases in Mark 1:4, Luke 3:3, and Acts 5:31. For a complete discussion, see the section on P⁷⁵ in Chapter Three.

²⁹¹ Manuscripts with λόγου include: A D K M N U W Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ 0250 f¹ f¹³ 2 28 157 565 700 788 1006 1071 1342 1424 1506 2542 ℳ. Manuscripts with ῥήματος include: P⁶⁹ P⁷⁵ ⋈ B L T X 070 0124 4 5 124 213 348 577 579 892 1012 1216 1241 1579. Tischendorf, IGNTP, and Merk prefer λόγου.

²⁹² P⁷⁵ ⋈ B C D F K L M Q U W Y Γ Δ Λ Π 070 0250 f¹³ 2 28 124 157 565 579 700 788 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1346 1424 1506 2542 ℳ.

²⁹³ P⁷⁵ ⋈ B. IGNTP, Merk, and Souter prefer καί.

Preliminary Summary of Harmonization in Luke

Forty-nine readings have been analyzed from Luke. Eighteen of these can possibly be explained by harmonization, but will not be discussed further. Five others are unlikely to have occurred through the influence of a parallel passage. From the remaining twenty-six readings, some initial observations may be reached about the external influences working upon the scribe.

Table 19. Sources of Harmonization in the Text of Luke in Codex Vaticanus

Sources of Harmonization	Total: 26	Entry Number
Matthew	13	132, 140, 143, 144, 145, 154, 155, 157, 158, 160, 166, 175, 176
Mark	5	135, 137, 146, 168, 171
Luke	1	165
Matthew or Mark	6	136, 142, 149, 151, 170, 173
Synoptics	1	162

Once again, the pervasive influence of Matthew upon the scribe is clear. This can be attributed first and foremost to the fact that the scribe had recently copied the Gospel of Matthew. Beyond this, the First Gospel served as the horizon of expectation with which the copyist set about his task, sometimes allowing Matthean wording to infiltrate his text of Luke.

Summary of Harmonization In Codex Vaticanus

One hundred and eighty readings have been analyzed from Codex Vaticanus. Of these, twenty-three were shown not to have been created by harmonization and another sixty-seven can only possibly be attributed to harmonization. Of the remaining ninety readings, sixty-three are likely the result of harmonization. Twenty-seven readings can be attributed to harmonization with a very high degree of confidence. Two harmonizing

variants belong to a corrector (17, 21). The accumulated evidence shows that the scribe of Vaticanus was quite impressive in his fidelity to his exemplar.

Table 20. Quality of Harmonization in Codex Vaticanus

Total Number of Readings	Total: 180	Entry Number
Quality of Harmonization		
Very Likely	27	1, 2, 6, 16, 17, 27, 30, 33, 38, 39, 44, 49, 63, 76, 77, 80, 85, 87, 105, 106, 107, 137, 151, 157, 158, 165, 175
Likely	63	11, 12, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 29, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 41, 42, 43, 50, 51, 52, 55, 58, 60, 62, 65, 75, 79, 83, 84, 89, 90, 98, 101, 102, 103, 112, 113, 114, 124, 129, 131, 132, 135, 136, 140, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 149, 154, 155, 160, 162, 166, 168, 170, 171, 173, 176
Possible	67	3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 23, 24, 28, 40, 45, 53, 57, 59, 61, 64, 67, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 78, 81, 82, 88, 91, 93, 94, 95, 99, 104, 108, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 125, 127, 127, 128, 133, 134, 139, 141, 147, 148, 150, 152, 153, 156, 159, 163, 164, 167, 169, 172, 174, 180
Unlikely	23	34, 46, 47, 48, 54, 56, 66, 69, 72, 86, 92, 96, 97, 100, 109, 110, 111, 130, 138, 161, 177, 178, 179

Of the ninety harmonizations in Codex Vaticanus, twelve are uncommon, eight are sub-singular, and seven are singular. That there are only fifteen singular or sub-singular harmonizing variants in a manuscript containing the complete text of all three Synoptic Gospels demonstrates that the scribe took great care to copy the text at hand without allowing parallel texts to influence him. This can also be seen in the fact that only occasionally does more than one harmonizing variant occur within a single pericope, and even less frequent are multiple harmonizing variants within a single verse.

The scribe of Vaticanus did not often add to, omit from, or alter his copy of the Gospels, but some patterns do arise from the harmonizations that have entered the text. As has been noted, the Gospel of Matthew formed the scribe's horizon of expectation. His anticipation of Matthean wording even led him to create nine inter-gospel harmonizing alterations in his text of the First Gospel, though he has made none in Mark and only one in Luke. Beyond Matthew, the scribe was influenced by Mark and Luke at about the same amount and even allowed an entire sentence from John to enter his manuscript (80).

As is typical of all of the manuscripts studied thus far, harmonization by substitution is far more common than harmonization by addition or omission. Transpositions remain the least common type of harmonization. As with transpositions, which do not alter the content of a passage nor add or take away material, substitutions often have little effect on the content or meaning of the passage. In most cases, substitutions are a matter of word form rather than of words themselves.

The scribe shows a tendency to alter the words of Jesus more often than the narrated portions of the Gospels. This may be because the words of Jesus were shared more frequently and memorized—or remembered—in particular ways. The narrative context of Jesus's words was of less importance and so was altered less frequently.

Alterations in Codex Vaticanus confirm that harmonization was generally limited to one word. Even harmonizing variants longer than one word (e.g. 29, 31, 32, 101, 155), are often transpositions rather than alterations that introduce, remove, or alter the content of the Gospel. When it comes to the five complete sentences that have been affected by harmonization, two of them are only two words long (105, 112) and a third is only three

words long (124). The remaining two (80, 165) are the only substantial intrusions into the manuscript.

Finally, the scribe has most often altered verbs, especially verb forms. He has also made several changes to nouns, but mostly in the form of the noun already found in the text.

Table 21. Harmonization in Codex Vaticanus

Frequency of Harmonization		Total: 90	Entry Number
	Singular	7	1, 2, 25, 42, 87, 132, 135
	Sub-singular	8	12, 22, 31, 63, 65, 76, 105, 175
	Uncommon	12	6, 11, 16, 18, 19, 30, 36, 43, 77, 79, 142, 146
Sources of Harmonization			
	Matthew	33	1, 2, 18, 19, 22, 38, 55, 58, 62, 83, 84, 98, 102, 103, 105, 106, 107, 113, 114, 129, 132, 140, 143, 144, 145, 154, 155, 157, 158, 160, 166, 175, 176
	Mark	22	11, 12, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 33, 37, 50, 51, 52, 60, 65, 75, 76, 79, 135, 137, 146, 168, 171
	Luke	18	6, 15, 16, 17, 20, 31, 32, 36, 41, 43, 44, 63, 77, 85, 89, 90, 131, 165
	John	1	80
	Matthew, Mark	6	136, 142, 149, 151, 170, 173
	Matthew, Luke	4	39, 87, 112, 124
	Mark, Luke	3	21, 42, 49
	Synoptics	2	35, 162
	Misc.	1	101
Type of Harmonization			
	Substitution	46	2, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 30, 33, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 49, 50, 52, 58, 65, 75, 76, 79, 83, 84, 90, 98, 105, 106, 107, 129, 131, 132, 135, 137, 142, 143, 144, 145, 151, 154, 168, 170, 171
	Addition	23	1, 6, 27, 35, 39, 55, 62, 77, 80, 85, 87, 102, 103, 113, 114, 140, 157, 158, 160, 162, 165, 173, 175
	Omission	16	11, 12, 25, 36, 37, 51, 60, 63, 89, 112, 124, 136, 146, 149, 166, 176
	Transposition	5	29, 31, 32, 101, 155

Context of Harmonization			
	Words of Jesus	48	12, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44, 49, 50, 51, 52, 60, 62, 63, 65, 79, 101, 105, 106, 112, 113, 136, 140, 142, 144, 145, 146, 149, 151, 154, 155, 157, 158, 160, 162, 165, 166, 168, 173, 176
	Narrative	32	1, 2, 18, 19, 22, 26, 27, 29, 30, 42, 55, 58, 75, 76, 77, 80, 83, 84, 85, 90, 98, 102, 107, 114, 124, 129, 131, 132, 135, 137, 170, 171
	Other Dialogue	10	6, 11, 25, 31, 32, 87, 89, 103, 143, 175
Extent of Harmonization			
	One Word	64	6, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 30, 33, 35, 37, 41, 42, 43, 44, 49, 50, 51, 52, 55, 58, 60, 63, 65, 75, 76, 83, 84, 87, 89, 90, 98, 103, 106, 113, 114, 129, 131, 136, 137, 140, 142, 143, 144, 145, 149, 151, 154, 157, 158, 160, 162, 168, 170, 171, 173, 176
	Two Words	12	29, 31, 32, 36, 62, 77, 79, 85, 102, 132, 135, 155
	Three Words	2	2, 101
	Four + Words	6	1, 38, 39, 107, 166, 175
	Clause	1	146
	Clause, Sentence	5	80, 105, 112, 124, 165
Part of Speech			
	Sentence, Clause	6	80, 105, 112, 124, 146, 165
	Verb	27	6, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 26, 30, 33, 49, 52, 65, 75, 76, 90, 98, 106, 129, 136, 137, 142, 151, 154, 158, 168, 170, 171
	Verb Phrase	6	29, 38, 39, 85, 155, 175
	Noun	10	17, 41, 42, 43, 60, 79, 87, 89, 131, 162
	Noun Phrase	4	19, 31, 62, 101
	Proper Noun Phrase	3	32, 102, 135
	Pronoun	4	51, 144, 145, 160
	Article	2	77, 113
	Preposition	2	58, 149
	Prepositional Phrase	4	1, 2, 36, 166
	Conjunction	6	22, 25, 37, 50, 140, 176
	Adjective	6	35, 44, 55, 63, 114, 143
	Adverb	6	11, 83, 84, 132, 157, 173
	Particle	3	12, 27, 103
	Misc. Words	1	107

The scribe of Codex Vaticanus was an exceedingly careful and deliberate copyist who on only a few occasions permitted external influences to alter the text he was copying. The text produced by this cautious scribe confirms much of what has been seen about harmonization in manuscripts of the Synoptics from the fourth century and earlier.

CHAPTER SIX

FRAGMENTARY MANUSCRIPTS OF THE FIFTH CENTURY

The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Fifth Century

There is a sharp rise in the number of complete Bibles extant from the fifth century—four, compared to two in the fourth century and none surviving from before then. As the Christian book trade was established and as the use and production of the codex increased, there was a demand for codices containing more than one text. This development seems to correspond to a downtick in the number of single-gospel codices. There are only three fragmentary manuscripts of Mark, three of Matthew, and four of Luke from this period. The four fifth-century Bibles will not be discussed here.

Manuscripts of Mark¹

0274 (Kairo, Copt. Mis. 6569/6571) – Mark 6:56–7:4; 7:6–9, 13–17, 19–23, 28–29, 34–35; 8:3–4, 8–11; 9:20–22, 26–41; 9:43–10:1; 10:17–22

Uncial Manuscript 0274 comes from Nubian Egypt and is dated to the fifth century, though the sixth century is not out of the question. The piece consists of four parchment fragments with two columns on each side, in total about twenty-nine verses from Mark 6–10. According to Plumley, the codex would have been quite large and may

¹ The following fifth-century manuscript of Mark does not contain harmonizing variants:

069 (P.Oxy. 3) is a fifth- or sixth-century vellum fragment of Mark 10:50–51 and 11:11–12. For the *ed. pr.* see Grenfell and Hunt, *OP* 1:7. See also Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments*, 1:68; Henry Preserved Smith, “Biblical Manuscripts in America,” *JBL* 42 (1923): 239–250, 243; Sanders, “Egyptian Text,” 85; Hedley, “Egyptian Texts,” 35; Lagrange, *Critique rationnelle*, 142–143; Clark, *Manuscripts in America*, 272–273; and Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 143 no. 395.

have contained the Gospel of Matthew before Mark.² C. H. Roberts notes a “marked affinity with L.”³ On the whole, it is close to the great Alexandrian uncials. Despite its length, there are relatively few textual variants.⁴

(1) Mark 7:23 – °πάντα ταῦτα τὰ πονηρὰ ἔσωθεν ἐκπορεύεται καὶ κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον (/Matthew 15:20; Sub-singular L 0274 892)

At the conclusion of Jesus’s teaching on the traditions of the elders regarding ritual cleansings, Jesus lists several wicked behaviors and vices. He claims, “All these evil things (πάντα ταῦτα τὰ πονηρά) come from within and defile the man.” Jesus’s concluding statement in Matthew 15:20 shares the same sentiment, but with different syntax and grammar. He provides a shorter list of vices and concludes, “*These* things are what defile the man” (ταῦτά ἐστιν τὰ κοινοῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον). The scribe of MS 0274 has conformed the beginning of this verse to Matthew by omitting πάντα. If the scribe’s exemplar had ταῦτα πάντα instead of πάντα ταῦτα (cf. K Γ f¹³ 28 33 579 700 1424), a scribal leap from -τα at the end of ταῦτα to τὰ might account for the omission (homoioteleuton). Manuscript 0274, however, is not close to any of the manuscripts with this transposition and no Alexandrian manuscripts witness this variant order. Even with the expected reading πάντα ταῦτα, omission by accident would not be surprising. The

² J. Martin Plumley and C. H. Roberts, “An Uncial Text of St. Mark in Greek from Nubia,” *JTS* 27 (1976): 34–45, 35. Roberts believes that “the gospel would have opened on page 95 and that St. Matthew’s gospel would have occupied 94–5 pages.” This supposition is made on the basis of some pagination added by a hand later than the original scribe.

³ Plumley and Roberts, “Uncial Text of St. Mark,” 37.

⁴ Plumley and Roberts, “Uncial Text of St. Mark,” 34–45. W. H. C. Frend and I. A. Muirhead, “The Greek Manuscripts from the Cathedral of Q’asr Ibrim,” *Le Muséon* 89 (1976): 43–49, explain the circumstances of the find, but do not include the text of or commentary on the Mark fragment. Gerald M. Browne, “The Sunnarti Mark,” *ZPE* 66 (1986): 49–52, has published the text of an Old Nubian fragment of Mark 11:6–11, along with a reconstructed Greek Vorlage, found at the same location.

phrase πάντα ταῦτα τὰ πονηρά could easily confound a distracted scribe looking at an exemplar written in capital Greek letters without spaces (ΠΑΝΤΑΤΑΥΤΑΤΑΠΙΟΝΗΡΑ). This confusion would be compounded because in this manuscript capital uspsilon is shaped like a squared “U” instead of like a “Y” so that the down strokes in pi, tau, and upsilon and the horizontal strokes of pi and tau could be easily miscopied. Given these considerations, it seems safest to say only that harmonization is possible and that a simple error is more likely to explain the reading.

(2) Mark 7:28 – ἡ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὦ κύριε (ὦ ναί; //Matthew 15:27;

Lacuna)⁵

The variant in Mark 7:28 was discussed in Chapter Five with reference to Codex Vaticanus. The situation is somewhat different in MS 0274 because the variant occurs in a lacuna. Plummer and Roberts emend the reading in their transcription. The text is broken between λέγει at the end of one line and τὰ κυνάρια at the end of the next line. The expected reading, αὐτῷ $\overline{\kappa\epsilon}$, is not quite long enough to fill the lacuna unless κύριε was written in full. In the extant portions of the text, *nomina sacra* or other abbreviations are used for man (7:7, 8, 15 [3], 20 [2], 21, 31), God (7:8; 10:18), Jesus (9:26; 10:18, 21), son (9:31), father (10:19), and mother (10:19). Although κύριε does not show up in the text to prove that the scribe would have used an abbreviation, it is safe to assume that he would have done so given his frequent and consistent use of abbreviations. Furthermore, the addition of ναί from Matthew 15:27 is a common variant and would fill the space nicely.

⁵ Ɀ A B E F G H K L M N U Γ Δ Π Σ 0274^{vidlac} f¹ 2 28 33 124 157 180 205 579 597 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1346 1424 1505 1506 2427 2542 Ɀ. Tischendorf, Legg, Merk, and Souter prefer the longer reading against P⁴⁵ D W Θ f³ 69 543 565 700.

- (3) Mark 9:38 – εἶδομέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια {καὶ ἐκωλύομεν αὐτὸν ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει ἡμῖν} (//Luke 9:49)⁶

The reading in Mark 9:38 was discussed in Chapter Five with Codex Vaticanus. If the longer, redundant reading found in the majority of manuscripts is correct, then the shorter reading can be explained as a simplifying harmonization to Luke 9:49.

- (4) Mark 9:45 – καὶ ἐὰν ὁ πούς σου ἴσκανδαλίζη σε ἀπόκοψον αὐτόν (ἴσκανδαλίξει; //Matthew 18:8)⁷

- (5) Mark 9:47 – καὶ ἐὰν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ἴσκανδαλίζη σε ἔκβαλε αὐτόν (ἴσκανδαλίξει; //Matthew 18:9)⁸

Two variants in Mark 9:45 and 9:47 involve the same operation. Jesus teaches on the consequences of temptation and warns his followers to rid themselves of offending body parts that participate in sinful behavior. He says, “And if your foot causes you to stumble (σκανδαλίζη), cut it off,” and later, “And if your eye causes you to stumble (σκανδαλίζη), pluck it out.” In both cases, Mark uses a subjunctive verb. Matthew, alternatively, uses the indicative verb σκανδαλίξει twice in his parallel episode. The scribe of MS 0274 has adopted Matthew’s indicative reading in both cases. This could be a simple case of itacism. In many manuscripts, ει is used for η and vice versa. There is no evidence of this type of itacism in MS 0274, but itacism is by no means unlikely.

⁶ Manuscripts with καὶ ἐκωλύομεν αὐτόν ὅτι οὐκ ἠκολούθει ἡμῖν, some with minor variations, include: Ⳕ B C L Δ Θ Ψ 0274 115 579 892 1071 1342 2427. Manuscripts with ὅς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ’ ἡμῖν καὶ ἐκωλύσαμεν αὐτόν ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν, some with minor variations, include: A D E F G H K M N U W X Γ Π Σ Φ ς¹ ς³ 2 22 28 90 118 124 157 180 205 346 543 565 597 700 1006 1010 1241 1243 1292 1346 1424 1505 1506 2542 ℣. Tischendorf and Merk prefer the longer reading.

⁷ Ⳕ X Θ 0274 2 28 247 474 565 1342 1424.

⁸ D X Θ 0274 2 28 565 700 1424.

There is enough text in this manuscript to make some observations about the harmonizing habit of its scribe. Of the five readings discussed above, two can likely be explained as a result of parallel influence. Two likely harmonizations in about twenty-nine verses is quite a low rate. Neither of the likely harmonizations is a singular or sub-singular reading. This evidence shows that the scribe did not make any systematic effort to assimilate his copy of Mark to another Gospel and did not often allow the parallels to influence his copy. Plumley may well be correct that Matthew came before Mark in this manuscript given that both likely variants attributable to harmonization exhibit the influence of the First Gospel.

0213 (P.Vindob. G 1384) – Mark 3:2–3, 4–5

Manuscript 0213 is a fifth- or sixth-century parchment fragment from a codex of Mark.⁹ There are only two variants in this short text, one of which may have occurred under the influence of Luke. Because of its textual quality, Sanz believes that MS 0213 is a lectionary fragment. Such a theory seems unnecessary, but does not affect the usefulness of this manuscript for an investigation of harmonization.

(6) Mark 3:3 – καὶ λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ τὴν ξηρὰν χεῖρα ἔχοντι ἔγειρε εἰς τὸ μέσον (ἔξηραμμένην ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα; //Mark 3:1, Luke 6:8)¹⁰

Mark records that on a certain Sabbath Jesus encountered and spoke to a person described as “the man who has the withered hand” (τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ τὴν ξηρὰν χεῖρα ἔχοντι). The scribe of this manuscript has transposed the Markan word order so that the

⁹ Sanz, *Griechische Literarische Papyri*, 54–55. See also Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 142 no. 388; Cavallo, *Ricerche*, 2:Plate 91b. Porter and Porter, *Greek Papyri and Parchments, Texts*, 102–105 no. 25, Plates 23, 24.

¹⁰ A C^c E G K M U Γ Θ Π Σ 074 0213 *f*¹ *f*¹³ 1 2 33 118 157 237 252 259 472 543 579 700 1006 1071 1241 1342 1424 1506 1582 Ƶ.

participle ἔχοντι comes between the description of the hand—in this case the participle ἐξηραμμένην—and the noun (τὴν χεῖρα). The alteration may have been made in harmonization to context, since in Mark 3:1 the patient is described as ἄνθρωπος ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα. It is also possible the transposition, though not the change to the participle, has been made in harmonization to Luke 6:8, which has slightly different syntax but conveys the same sense: Jesus speaks τῷ ἀνδρὶ τῷ ξηρὰν ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα.¹¹ Harmonization to the parallel is possible, but harmonization to immediate context is more likely.

Manuscripts of Matthew¹²

P¹⁰⁵ (P.Oxy. 4406) – Matthew 27:62–64; 28:2–5

P¹⁰⁵ is a late fifth- or early sixth-century papyrus fragment from Oxyrhynchus containing about seven verses of the Gospel of Matthew. According to J. D. Thomas, the piece was found with a string attached to it, proving its use as an amulet.¹³ There are a

¹¹ Sans, *Griechische Literarische Papyri*, 55; and Porter and Porter, *Greek Papyri and Parchments*, 103–104, mention the possible influence of the parallel on this reading.

¹² Fifth-century manuscripts of Matthew that do not contain harmonizing variants include:

0170 (P.Oxy. 1169) is a late fifth- or early sixth-century vellum fragment of Matthew 6:5–6, 8–10, 13–15, and 17. For the *ed. pr.* see Hunt, *OP* 9:5–7. See also Sanders, “Egyptian Text,” 81; Clark, *Manuscripts in America*, 177–178; and Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 128 no. 344.

071 (P.Oxy 401) is a fifth- or sixth-century vellum fragment of Matthew 1:21–24 and 1:25–2:2 from Oxyrhynchus. For the *ed. pr.* see Grenfell and Hunt, *OP* 3:1–2. See also Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments*, 3:1061; Caspar René Gregory, *Die griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908), 38, 261, 362; Smith, “Biblical Manuscripts in America,” 243; Sanders, “Egyptian Text,” 81; Hedley, “Egyptian Texts,” 39; Clark, *Manuscripts in America*, 116–117; and Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 124–125 no. 333.

¹³ Thomas, *OP* 64:12–13 and Plate I. For the textual quality of the piece consult Elliott, “Six New Papyri,” 107; Head, “Recently Published,” 9; B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 9–10; Elliott, “Nature of the Evidence,” 29–39; and *Ibid.*, “Recently Discovered New Testament Papyri,” 97–98.

few itacisms in the text and one singular reading. Barbara Aland asserts that the text belongs to the “B-Text,” which corresponds to the Alexandrian type.

(7) Matthew 27:62 – *συνήχθησαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι πρὸς Ὑ Πιλάτον*
(Ὑτόν; //Mark 15:43; Singular)

Only Matthew records that after Jesus’s burial the Pharisees requested soldiers to guard the tomb. In this episode in P¹⁰⁵, there is a variant that may have arisen under the influence of a near-parallel in the Gospel of Mark. Matthew writes, “The chief priests and Pharisees were gathered to Pilate (Πιλάτον).” In this verse, Pilate’s name is anarthrous, but the scribe of P¹⁰⁵ has inserted the definite article τόν before the proper noun. This is the only time Pilate’s name occurs in the accusative case in Matthew, but it does so twice in Mark (15:5, 43) and in both cases the accusative article accompanies the name. It is Mark 15:43 that deserves closer attention because in that context τὸν Πιλάτον occurs with the preposition πρὸς, as in Matthew 27:62. Similarly, in Luke 23:1, Pilate is referred to in the accusative with the preposition ἐπί and the accusative article accompanies the proper noun. In Acts 13:28, the only other accusative occurrence of Pilate’s name in Luke-Acts, there is no preposition or article. In John 19:31 and 19:38 the accusative name is accompanied by the accusative article. It would seem that multiple influences may have weighed upon the scribe. First, it is clear that in New Testament Greek there is a preference for the article with Pilate’s name, and this holds true in the accusative case (the exceptions are Matthew 27:62 and Acts 13:28). General style and usage may have prompted the scribe to make this addition, but this stylistic preference was not strong

enough to cause any other scribes to create the same reading. Harmonization to Mark 15:43 provides an alternative explanation.¹⁴

Preliminary Summary of Harmonization in Manuscripts of Matthew

The fragmentary manuscripts of Matthew do not provide much positive evidence for harmonization in the fifth century. Two of the manuscripts do not exhibit any harmonizing readings, which corresponds to similar evidence in the fourth century where five manuscripts of comparable size (eleven verses or fewer) contain no harmonizing variants (P²¹, P³⁵, P⁶², P⁸⁶, 058) compared to four that do (P²⁵, P⁷¹, P¹¹⁰, 0160). This can be compared to the same figures for manuscripts of Mark. In the fifth century one manuscript of comparable size (fourteen verses or fewer) contains harmonizing variants (0213) and one does not (069). In the fourth century, all three manuscripts of comparable size contain harmonizing readings (0188, 059, 0214). The one comparable manuscript of Luke (six verses or fewer) from the fourth century contains harmonizing variants (P⁸²), but, as we will see, neither comparable manuscript from the fifth century contains harmonizing readings (0182, 0267). Recognizing the limitations of this evidence, it can at least be stated that in the fourth and fifth centuries, scribes copying Matthew were not as prone to harmonization as those copying Mark or Luke and the First Gospel served as the primary source of parallel material.

¹⁴ See Thomas, *OP* 64:13. B. Aland, "Kriterien," 9, mentions the parallel but regards the reading as an oversight.

Manuscripts of Luke¹⁵

Codex Borgianus (T) 029 = 029 + 0113 + 0125 + 0139 (Rome: Bibl. Vat., Borg. Copt. 109 Cass 7.65,2 and 18.65; Paris: Bibl. Nat. Copt. 129⁹ 49, 65; 129¹⁰ 209; 129⁹ 76; 129⁷ 35; 129⁸ 121, 122, 140, 157; New York: Pierpont Morgan Libr. M664A) – Luke 6:18–26; 18:2–16; 18:32–19:8; 21:33–22:3; 22:20–23:20; 24:25–27, 29–31

Codex Borgianus (T, 029) is a composite manuscript made up of leaves previously numbered 029, 0113, 0125, and 0139.¹⁶ Together, the fragments represent an uncial manuscript of Luke and John. Study of this document is peculiarly difficult because the fragments are dispersed between libraries in Paris, Rome, and New York and

¹⁵ Manuscripts of Luke that do not contain harmonizing variants include:

0182 (P.Vindob. G 39781) is a fifth- or sixth-century parchment fragment of a codex of Luke covering 19:17–20 and 22–24. For the *ed. pr.* see Wessely, *Griechische und koptische Texte*, 244 no. 188. See also Hedley, “Egyptian Texts,” 196, 222; Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 154 no. 420; and Porter and Porter, *Greek Papyri and Parchments, Texts*, 142–144 no. 35 and *Plates*, 30.

0267 (P.Bar. 16) is a fifth- or sixth-century parchment manuscript of the Luke 8:25–27. See Ramón Roca-Puig, “Un pergami grec de l’evangeli de Sant LLuc (Papyri Barcinonenses, Invent., n.º 16. Lc. VIII, 25–27),” in *Miscellania Carles Cardo*, Col·leció Ariel (Barcelona: Ariel, 1963), 395–399; and for a transcription see Ramón Roca-Puig, “Dos fragmentos bíblicos de la colección Papyri Barcinonenses: Papyrus Barcinonensis, Inv. n.º 16 (Lc. 8,25–27),” *Helmantica* 16 (1965): 139–144. See also Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 151 no. 414.

¹⁶ See G. Zoega, *Catalogus codicum copticorum manu scriptorum qui in Museo Borgiano Velitris adservantur* (Rome: 1810), 184, no. 65; Hermann Freiherr Von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte* (Berlin: Arthur Glaue, 1907), 1:59, 119, 126, 131, 146; 3:2137, 2141, 2164; Gregory, *Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, 34–35, 299; A. Hebbelynck, “Les manuscrits coptes-sahidiqes du Monastère Blanc: Recherches sur les fragments complémentaires de la collection Borgia,” *Le Muséon* 31 (1912): 275–362, esp. 342–346 (separate pp. 68–72); Heinrich Joseph Vogels, *Codicum Novi Testamenti specimina. Paginias 51 ex codicibus manuscriptis et 3 ex libris impressis collegit ac phototypice repraesentatas* (Bonn: Sumptibus P. Hanstein, 1929), Plate 46; Clark, *Manuscripts in America*, 161–162; Hatch, *Principal Uncial Manuscripts*, Plate 23; Cavallo, *Ricerche*, 115–117; Henrica Follieri, *Codices Graeci Bibliothecae Vaticanae selecti. Temporum locurumque ordine digesti commentariis et transcriptionibus instructi*, Fasciculus 4 of *Exempla Scripturarum* (Vatican City: Bibliothecam Vaticanam, 1969), no. 4; Van Haelst, *Catalogue*, 150 no. 409; Sever J. Voicu and Serenella D’Alisera, *I.M.A.G.E.S.: index in manuscriptorum graecorum edita specimina* (Rome: Borla, 1981), 223; and K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste*, 22. For the John portions see Amélineau and A. A. Giorgi, *Fragmentum evangelii S. Iohannis Graecum Copto-Thebaicum saeculi IV* (Rome: Fulgonius, 1789).

no complete edition has been published. Nor, to my knowledge, has an official edition of the New York fragments been published.

The pieces initially identified as 0139 and held in the Paris National Library include Luke 6:18–26 (Copt. 129⁷ f. 35), Luke 18:2–9 (129⁸ f. 121), Luke 18:42–19:8 (129⁸ f. 122), Luke 21:33–36 (129⁸ f. 140), and Luke 24:25–31 (129⁸ f. 157). A folio containing Luke 21:36–22:3 (129¹⁰ f. 209) along with some verses from John was initially numbered 0113. Amélineau published the text of these leaves.¹⁷ The pieces originally numbered 029, currently housed in the Vatican Library, cover Luke 22:21–42 and 22:45–23:20 (Copt. 109 cass 18, fasc 65,1). Balestri published the text of these leaves.¹⁸ Finally, the pieces held in the New York Pierpont Morgan Library and numbered 029 cover Luke 18:10–16 and 32–41 (Copt 664A).¹⁹ Several passages from the Gospel of John are found in 0113, 0125, and 029. Hebbelynck was the first to claim that

¹⁷ M. É. Amélineau, *Notice des manuscrits coptes de la Bibliothèque Nationale renfermant des textes bilingues du Nouveau Testament*, Tiré des notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale et autres Bibliothèques 34/2 (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1895), 369–372, 399–402, 406 (Luke). See also Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments*, 1:69–71.

¹⁸ P. J. Balestri, ed., *Sacrorum Bibliorum fragmenta copto-sahidica Musei Borgiani*, vol. 3 of *Novum Testamentum* (Rome: Ex Typographia Polyglotta s.c. De Propoganda Fide, 1904), xxxiii–xxxiv, 202–218 (Luke). See also Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments*, 1:66, 3:1025, 1363, 1452; Pius Franchi de' Cavalieri and Iohannes Lietzmann, *Specimina codicum Graecorum Vaticanorum*, Tabulae in usum scholarum 1 (Bonn: A. Marcus et E. Webber, 1910), no. 3; and Paul Canart, “Note sur le manuscrit T ou 029 du Nouveau Testament,” *Bib* 84 (2003): 274–275. Balestri dates the manuscript to the sixth century.

¹⁹ See Leo Depuydt, *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library* (Leuven: Peeters, 1993), LXX–LXXII no. 22. The only transcription of the New York fragments I have been able to find was produced by Wieland Willker, “A Textual Commentary on the Greek Gospels,” and is available online at <http://www-user.uni-bremen.de/wie/TCG/Fragmentary-Uncials.pdf>. This is the text I have consulted, though with reticence since it is unclear what access the author had to the manuscript.

the Rome and Paris fragments belong together.²⁰ Kurt Treu has also commented on the associations between the fragments.²¹

Codex Borgianus is a bilingual text from the White Monastery in Upper Egypt. The Greek text is in two columns facing a folio with the Coptic text in two columns. Tischendorf and Gregory are convinced that the scribe was a Copt, given the Coptic translation and the shape of some of the Greek letters. Hatch has identified the textual affinity of the Vatican fragments as Alexandrian. Gregory describes the quality of the text as very good; indeed, there are few variants and the text's close correspondence to Codex Vaticanus rivals or even surpasses that of P⁷⁵.²² Only three readings potentially involve harmonization, and of these only one seems truly likely.

- (1) Luke 21:37 – ἦν δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ἑν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων² (ἑ διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ;
cf. Luke 19:47, Mark 12:35, John 8:20)²³

The variant in Luke 21:37 was discussed with Codex Vaticanus in Chapter Five, where it was shown that harmonization to another Lukan passage may have been the source of this reading.

- (2) Luke 22:41 – καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπεσπάσθη ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ λίθου βολὴν καὶ θεῖς τὰ
γόνατα Ἦ προσηύχετο (Ἦ προσηύξατο; //Matthew 26:42, 44; Mark
14:39)²⁴

²⁰ Hebbelynck, "Les manuscrits coptes-sahidiques," 342–346.

²¹ Kurt Treu, "Griechisch-koptische Bilinguen des Neuen Testaments," in *Koptologische Studien in der DDR (WZ(H))*, ed. Institut für Byzantinistik der Martin-Luther-Universität (Halle-Wittenberg: Martin-Luther-Universität, 1965), 95–123, esp. 111–113.

²² Hedley, "Egyptian Texts," 199.

²³ B K T (070) 0139 1215 2643.

(3) Luke 22:43–44 – ὡφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπὸ οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτὸν καὶ
 γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσήχετο καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἰδρῶς
 αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν` (cf.
 Parallels in Mark and Matthew)²⁵

The variant in Luke 22:41 was discussed in Chapter Three with P⁷⁵. The change to *προσηύξατο* likely occurred under the influence of one of the parallel accounts. A discussion of the variant in Luke 22:43–44, the sweat of blood and the comforting angel, can be found in Chapter Two with P⁶⁹. These verses did not appear in the earliest manuscripts of Luke and arose independently in the late second century.²⁶

The text of about one hundred and thirty-eight verses of Luke is present in Codex Borgianus and yet only one variant likely attributable to harmonization emerges. This exceedingly low rate of harmonization corresponds to the comparatively low number of variants in general. In comparison to comparable manuscripts like P⁴ (about 95 verses) and the text of Luke in P⁴⁵ and P⁷⁵, the absence of harmonizing readings in Codex Borgianus is surprising. The low rate of harmonization demonstrates that the scribe carefully controlled his text. If he was familiar with Matthew and Mark, as he was undoubtedly familiar with John, he did not permit their version of gospel narratives to influence his copy of Luke.

²⁴ P⁷⁵ ⳧ T Γ 72 124 579 669 892 1071 1241. P⁷⁵ and T have *προσεύξατο*.

²⁵ (P⁶⁹) P⁷⁵ ⳧^c A B N R T W 0211 13* 69 124 158 346 473 481 543 579 713 788 826 1071*. Manuscripts that omit only v. 43 include: 124.

²⁶ This is the only distinctive reading in Codex Borgianus that Balestri notes individually.

***Codex Guelferbytanus (Q) 026 (Wolfenbüttel: Herz. Aug. Bibl., Weissenberg 64) –
Luke 4:34–5:4; 6:10–26; 12:6–43; 15:14–31; 17:34–18:15; 18:34–19:11; 19:47–20:17;
20:34–21:8; 22:27–46; 23:30–49***

Codex Guelferbytanus (Q, 026) is an uncial manuscript containing 13 folios of Luke and John. The manuscript is a palimpsest and the under-text is sometimes difficult to read. The newer writing is in Latin and contains the *Origines* of Isidore of Seville and some of his letters. Underneath these writings can be found the Greek text of parts of Luke and John (Codex Guelferbytanus) and the Gothic and Latin text of some letters of Paul (Codex Carolinus). Apparently this two-gospel codex was no longer needed in its community and was reused for more recent writings. Tischendorf transcribed the Greek text and dates it to the fifth century; he proposes a sixth century date for the other writings.²⁷

The textual quality of the manuscript is quite free, with many scribal errors and harmonizing variants. Especially frequent are transpositions of two or three words, which suggests that the scribe copied by sense line or phrase instead of word-by-word. These alterations are indicative of negligence rather than any systematic attempt to rearrange words for stylistic reasons. Along with Codex Alexandrinus, it is among the earliest truly Byzantine manuscripts, a type characterized by harmonization.²⁸ Robert Waltz urges

²⁷ For the *ed. pr.* see Constantinus Tischendorf, *Fragmenta Origenianae Octateuchi Editiones cum Fragmentis Evangeliorum Graecis Palimpsestis ex Codice Leidensi Folioque Petropolitano Quarti vel Quinti, Guelferbytano Codice Quinti, Sangallensi Octavi Fere Saeculi*, vol. 3 of *Monumenta Sacra Inedita* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1860), xxxvi–xxxix, 263–290, Plate II. See also Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments*, 1:63–64, 34; Gregory, *Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, 34; Cavallo, *Ricerche*, 1:80–81, 2:Plate 66; Voicu and D’Alisera, *I.M.A.G.E.S.*, 620; and K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste*, 22.

²⁸ Aland and Aland, *Text*, 113, place this manuscript in their category V, which is comprised of Byzantine texts. See also Robert B. Waltz, *The Encyclopedia of New Testament Textual Criticism*, 993–994, online at: https://mnheritagesongbook.files.wordpress.com/2013/07/encyclopedia_nt_tc_final.pdf.

caution in categorizing this text as Byzantine given the limited extent of the manuscript and because frequent harmonizations are not exclusive to the Byzantine text type. More than enough of this text remains, however, to make confident claims about its textual affinities. Waltz's second point, though, is worth heeding since many manuscripts from the best text types are populated with harmonizing variants (e.g. **ℵ**).

(1) Luke 4:35 – φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε ἁπ' αὐτοῦ (ἁξ; //Mark 1:25)²⁹

The variant in Luke 4:35 was discussed in Chapter Three with P⁷⁵. It is likely that the substitution of ἔξ for ἁπ' occurred under the influence of Mark 1:25.

(2) Luke 4:40a – δύνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἅπαντες ὅσοι εἶχον ἀσθενοῦντας νόσοις ποικίλαις ἤγαγον αὐτοὺς πρὸς αὐτόν (ἁ πάντες; //Mark 1:32)³⁰

(3) Luke 4:40b – ὁ δὲ ἐνὶ ἐκάστῳ αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθεὶς ἔθεράπευεν αὐτούς (ἔθεράπευσεν; //Mark 1:34, Matthew 8:16)³¹

In Luke 4:40, the evangelist records that as the sun was setting one evening, “all (*ἅπαντες*) those who had those who were sick with various diseases brought them to him.” In Mark's version of this episode, the evangelist writes, “They brought to him all who had illnesses” (*ἔφερον πρὸς αὐτόν πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας*). The appearance of *πάντας* in this verse in Guelferbytanus is peculiar. On the one hand, this reading occurs in many and diverse manuscripts, leading some editors to prefer it. On the other hand, Luke

²⁹ P⁷⁵ A C E F G H K M Q U X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ 0102 2 28 33 157 565 1071 1241 **ℵ**. IGNTP prefers ἔξ against the combined witness of **ℵ B D W** and a multitude of additional uncials and miniscules.

³⁰ **ℵ** A D K L M N Q R U W X Γ Δ Λ Ξ Π Ψ 0102 *f*¹³ 2 28 33 124 565 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1424 2542 **ℵ**. Tischendorf, IGNTP, and Souter prefer *πάντες*.

³¹ **ℵ** A C K L M N Q R U X Γ Δ Θ Λ Ξ Π Ψ^c 0102 *f*¹³ 2 28 33 124 157 565 700 788 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1424 1506 2542 **ℵ**. IGNTP and Souter prefer *ἔθεράπευσεν* against **B D W** and others.

prefers ἅπας and uses the term far more frequently than the other Gospels. The reading with the word ἅπαντες is probably older. If this is the case, it is possible that Mark's use of the accusative adjective πάντας in the Mark 1:32 has influenced the scribe's choice of the same in his copy of Luke, only in the nominative case to reflect the new context.

Later in the verse, Luke uses an imperfect verb to describe Jesus's healing activity (ἐθεράπευεν αὐτούς). In Mark 1:34 and Matthew 8:16, the verb is aorist (ἐθεράπευσεν). The vast majority of manuscripts of Luke have the aorist variant, but the imperfect reading is supported by the best manuscripts in the Alexandrian (B), Western (D), and Pre-Caesarean (W) text types. The scribe has replaced the verb under the influence of the parallel version.

(4) Luke 4:43 – ὅτι ἔπι τοῦτο ἀπεστάλην³² (εἰς; //Mark 1:38)³³

In Luke 4:43, the evangelist records that when Jesus set out to preach in the cities and villages of Galilee he explained to his disciples, “For (it is) for this I was sent” (ὅτι ἐπι τοῦτο ἀπεστάλην). In Mark's version of this saying, Jesus explains, “For (it is) for this I came” (εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξῆλθον). The pertinent difference for this study is the shift from Luke's preposition ἐπί to Mark's εἰς in Codex Guelferbytanus. The parallel material may have influenced the scribe's copy of Luke.

(5) Luke 6:10 – ὁ δὲ ἐποίησεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ὧς ἡ ἄλλη;

//Matthew 12:13)³⁴

³² Q has ἀπέσταλμαι.

³³ A C D K M Q R U X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ f¹ 2 28 33 157 565 700 1006 1071 1342 1424 1506 m.

Luke records that upon healing a man with a withered hand, “his [the man’s] hand was restored” (ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ). Many scribes add that the hand was restored “as the other” (ὡς ἡ ἄλλη). In fact, only the Alexandrian manuscripts (P⁴ & B L) stand in favor of the shorter reading and may represent a family variant from an older text. If, however, the shorter reading is better, as most commenters and editors conclude, then the longer reading entered the text under the influence of Matthew 12:13.

(6) Luke 6:14a – Σίμωνα δὲν καὶ ὠνόμασεν Πέτρον καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν

αὐτοῦ ὁ καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην (//Matthew 10:2)³⁵

(7) Luke 6:14b – ὁ καὶ Φίλιππον καὶ Βαρθολομαῖον (//Matthew 10:2)³⁶

(8) Luke 6:15a – ὁ καὶ Μαθθαῖον καὶ Θωμᾶν (//Matthew 10:3)³⁷

(9) Luke 6:15b – ὁ καὶ Ἰάκωβον³⁸ Ἀλφαίου καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν καλούμενον ζηλωτὴν

(//Matthew 10:3)³⁹

(10) Luke 6:15c – Ἰάκωβον Ἦ Ἀλφαίου (Ἦ τὸν τοῦ; //Mark 3:18)⁴⁰

(11) Luke 6:16a – καὶ Ἰούδαν Ἰσκαριώθ (Ἰσκαριώτην; //Matthew 10:4)⁴¹

³⁴ A D E K M Q S U V X Y Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ Ω f¹ 2 157 188 205 565 1506 2542. Some of these manuscripts add an article before the noun or omit the conjunction. Manuscripts with ὡς ἡ ἄλλη include: Γ f¹³ 700 (892) 1006 1241 1342 1424 ℣. IGNTP prefers the latter reading.

³⁵ A E M Q S U V X Γ Θ Λ Ψ f¹ 2 28 700 892 1006 1071 1342 1424 1506 ℣.

³⁶ A E K M Q S U V X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ f¹ f¹³ 2 28 69 124 565 579 700 892 1006 1241 1342 1424 1506 ℣.

³⁷ A E K M Q S U V X Γ Θ Λ Π Ψ f¹ 2 28 33 124 157 565 579 700 892 1006 1342 1424 1506 ℣.

³⁸ See next entry.

³⁹ A B D^c K M Q U W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ f¹ 2 28 124 157 565 579 892 1006 1071 1342 1424 1506 ℣. IGNTP prefers the shorter reading in all four of the preceding variants.

⁴⁰ A D E K M Q U Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ 2 28 124 157 565 892 1006 1071 1342 1424 1506 2542 ℣. IGNTP prefers the longer reading.

in the nominative case and the second is a declinable form. It is this form of the second name, though in the accusative case (Ἰσκαριώτην), that is found in Guelferbytanus.

Later in Luke 6:16, the scribe of Codex Guelferbytanus has added the conjunction καί. Judas is identified in Luke as the one “who became a traitor” (ὃς ἐγένετο προδότης). Mark and Matthew have different syntax, but agree in adding a conjunction to the phrase. Mark says that Judas is the one “who *also* handed him over” (ὃς καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτόν). Matthew identifies him as the Iscariot “who *also* handed him over” (ὁ καὶ παραδούς αὐτόν). The scribe has incorporated the conjunction into his copy of Luke as a result of his familiarity with the version in one of the parallel accounts. From the sheer number of harmonizing readings in these three verses one must conclude that the scribe was heavily influenced by Matthew’s version of this episode.

(13) Luke 6:18 – καὶ οἱ Ἦνοχλούμενοι ἀπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων ἐθεραπεύοντο
(Ἦοχλούμενοι; //Acts 5:16)⁴³

At the beginning of the Sermon on the Plain in Luke, the evangelist records that “those who were troubled (οἱ ἐνοχλούμενοι) by unclean spirits were healed.” In the New Testament, the compound word for “troubled” (ἐνοχλέω) is used only here and in Hebrews 12:15. The simple verb (ὀχλέω) occurs once in the New Testament, in Acts 5:16. There it is said that crowds brought many people to Jesus’s disciples to be healed, including those troubled with unclean spirits (καὶ ὀχλουμένους ὑπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων).

⁴³ D K M Q U W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ *f*¹³ 2 28 33 118 565 700 892 1071 1424 *m*. IGNTP prefers the simple verb, and may be correct, but the Alexandrian witnesses are not alone in support of the compound verb.

In Luke 6:18, the scribe of Guelferbytanus has used the simple verb, possibly under the influence of Acts 5:16, which shares similar context.

(14) Luke 6:20 – μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί ^τ (^ττῷ πνεύματι; //Matthew 5:3)⁴⁴

Luke's beatitudes tend to be more concrete than those found in Matthew. Where in Luke 6:20 Jesus blesses the poor (οἱ πτωχοί), in Matthew 5:3 he blesses the poor *in spirit* (οἱ πτωχοί τῷ πνεύματι). The Matthean version of this saying is almost certainly the source of the variant reading in this verse in Codex Guelferbytanus. Many other manuscripts of Luke testify to the expanded, harmonized reading.

(15) Luke 12:7 – μὴ ^τ φοβεῖσθε (^τοὔν; //Matthew 10:31)⁴⁵

(16) Luke 12:9 – ὁ δὲ ἀρνησάμενός με ^τ ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπαρνηθήσεται

ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ (^τἐμπροσθεν; //Luke 12:8, Matthew 10:33)⁴⁶

When Jesus teaches on worry, persecution, and the providence of God for his children in Luke 12:7, he tells his disciples, “Do not fear” (μὴ φοβεῖσθε). In Matthew 10:31, Jesus says, “Therefore, do not fear” (μὴ οὔν φοβεῖσθε). The scribe of Guelferbytanus has adopted the conjunction from the parallel under the influence of Matthew.

⁴⁴ ⳧^c Q S X Θ 028 0211 ^f1¹³ 1 4 13 16 27 33 69 71 115 118 124 131 161^c 174 205 209 213 346 348 477 517 543 544 579 713 716 788 826 828 903 954 983 1005 1009 1071 1123 1216 1424* 1458 1542 1579 1582 1604 1675 2372 2487 2542 2613 2643 2757.

⁴⁵ ⳧ A D E F G H K M Q S U W X Y Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ Ω ^f1¹³ 2 28 33 124 565 700 892 1006 1071 1342 1424 1506 ⳧. IGNTP prefers the longer reading.

⁴⁶ A K Q Θ Π 047 070 0191 158 265 348 443 489 669^c 827 892 903 983 1079 1219 1313 1355 1604 1654 2487 2643 2766. D has ἐμπροσθεν.

In Luke 12:9, Jesus says, “The one who denies me before (ἐνώπιον) men will be denied before (ἐνώπιον) the angels of God.” The preposition ἐνώπιον is used twice. In the previous verse, Luke 12:8, the related preposition ἔμπροσθεν is used twice in a similar statement: “Everyone who might confess in me before (ἔμπροσθεν) men, the son of man will also confess in him before (ἔμπροσθεν) the angels of God.” The scribe of Guelferbytanus has replaced the second preposition of v. 9 with ἔμπροσθεν, possibly under the influence of the context of the previous verse. Alternatively, it may be that the scribe was influenced by the parallel passage in Matthew 10:32–33, where ἔμπροσθεν is used in all four cases.

(17) Luke 12:25 – τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν μεριμνῶν δύναται ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ

προσθεῖναι⁴⁷ πῆχυν [†] († ἔνα; //Matthew 6:27)⁴⁸

(18) Luke 12:28 – εἰ δὲ ἐν ἀγρῷ τὸν χόρτον ὄντα σήμερον⁴⁹ καὶ αὔριον εἰς κλίβανον

βαλλόμενον ὁ θεὸς οὕτως [†] ἀμφιέζει πόσω μᾶλλον ὑμᾶς ὀλιγόπιστοι

([†] ἀμφιέννυσιν; //Matthew 6:30)⁵⁰

(19) Luke 12:31 – πλὴν ζητεῖτε τὴν βασιλείαν [†] αὐτοῦ καὶ ταῦτα προστεθήσεται

ὑμῖν ([†] τοῦ θεοῦ; //Matthew 6:33)⁵¹

⁴⁷ Q has προσθεῖναι ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ. See the discussion of this reading with regard to P⁷⁵ in Chapter Three.

⁴⁸ ⋈^e A K L M Q U W Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ 070 *f*¹ *f*¹³ 2 28 33 69 157 700 1071 565 579 700 788 892 1006 1241 1342 1346 1424 1506 2542 \mathfrak{M} . IGNTP prefers the longer reading against Alexandrian, Pre-Caesarean, and Western witnesses.

⁴⁹ Q has εἰ δὲ τὸν χόρτον σήμερον ἐν ἀγρῷ ὄντα.

⁵⁰ ⋈ A K M Q U W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ *f*¹ *f*¹³ 2 28 33 124 157 565 579 700 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1346 1424 1506 2542 \mathfrak{M} . IGNTP and Souter prefer the participle.

Jesus asks, “Who of you by worrying is able to add to his lifespan a span (πῆχυν)?”

In Matthew 6:27, Jesus asks if they are able to add “one span” (πῆχυν ἓνα). The scribe of Guelferbytanus has added the adjective in his copy of Luke. This type of expansion seems unlikely unless the scribe were influenced by external material.

In Luke 12:28, Jesus points to the fields for an illustration. He says, “And if in the field the grass, which is today and tomorrow is cast into a furnace, God clothes (ἀμφιέζει) so, how much more you, you of little faith?” Luke uses the verb ἀμφιέζω to convey the sense of clothing where Matthew, in the parallel in Matthew 6:30, uses the related verb ἀμφιέννυμι. The scribe of Guelferbytanus, along with the majority of Byzantine manuscripts, has adopted Matthew’s word choice.

The variant in Luke 12:31 was discussed in Chapter Three with P⁴⁵. It is likely that the substitution of τοῦ θεοῦ for αὐτοῦ occurred under the influence of Matthew 6:33.

(20) Luke 12:39 – τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκετε ὅτι εἰ ἴδῃ οἰκοδεσπότης ποία ὥρα ὁ

κλέπτῃς ἔρχεται ἵνα οὐκ ἂν ἀφῆκεν διορυχθῆναι τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ

(ἵνα ἐγγρηγόρησεν ἂν καὶ οὐκ ἂν; //Matthew 24:43)⁵²

See the section on Codex Vaticanus in Chapter Five for a discussion of this variant. The longer reading, corresponding to Matthew 24:43, is actually the better reading so that harmonization is not at work in this passage.

⁵¹ Manuscripts with τοῦ θεοῦ include: P⁴⁵ A D^c E G H K M N Q U W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π 070 f¹ f¹³ 2 28 33 157 180 205 565 700 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 1506 2542 ℣. Manuscripts with αὐτοῦ include: ℞ B D* L Ψ 579 892.

⁵² ℞^{*c} A B E G^{supp} H K L M N P Q S U W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ Ω 070 f¹ f¹³ 2 28 33 124 157 180 205 565 579 597 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1241 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 1506 2542 ℣. Some of these manuscripts contain minor variants, but all have entered Luke under the influence of Matthew. Against these stand: P⁷⁵ ℞* D. IGNTP and Souter prefer the longer reading.

(21) Luke 17:35a – ἔσονται δύο² ἀλθθουσαι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό (ἔδύο ἔσονται; //Matthew 24:40)⁵³

(22) Luke 17:35b – ὅη μία παραλημφθήσεται (//Matthew 24:41)⁵⁴

(23) Luke 17:35c – ἡ δὲ ἑτέρα ἀφεθήσεται (καὶ ἡ; //Matthew 24:41)⁵⁵

(24) Luke 17:37 – ὅπου τὸ σῶμα ἐκεῖ καὶ οἱ ἀετοὶ ἐπισυναχθήσονται¹

(ἐπισυναχθήσονται οἱ ἀετοί; //Matthew 24:28)⁵⁶

In Luke's version of Jesus's eschatological discourse in Luke 17:35, there are several examples of people from daily life. In the first case, Jesus claims, "There will be two (ἔσονται δύο) women grinding grain together." The first two words are transposed in Codex Guelferbytanus. In a near-parallel in Matthew 24:40, the words "there will be two" (δύο ἔσονται) appear in the same order as found in this copy of Luke. Harmonization to Matthew is a possible explanation for the variant, as is simple negligence. This reading

⁵³ A K M N Q R U W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Ψ Ω f¹ f¹³ 2 28 157 565 700 788 1424 m. IGNTP prefers the reverse order against the chief witnesses of the Alexandrian and Western types.

⁵⁴ A E G H K L M N Q U V W X Y Γ Δ Λ Π Ψ 028 047 063 0211 2 5 6 7 16 27 28 60 66 71 83 115 157 158 161 174 179 213 229 230 262 265 267 343 348 349 399 443 461 472 475 477 478 480 489 544 565 577 669 700 713 716 726 827 892 1006 1009 1010 1012 1071 1077 1079 1080 1187 1194 1195 1200 1203 1215 1219 1220 1223 1229 1242 1247 1295 1313 1319 1338 1342 1351 1355 1392 1424 1443 1452 1458 1506 1510 1542 1579 1604 1630 1654 1675 1691 2096 2322 2399 2487 2613 2643 2757 2766 m.

⁵⁵ A D K M N {Q} U W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ f¹ 2 28 157 565 700 1006 1071 1342 1424 1506 2542 m. The actual reading of Q in this verse is hard to discern: according to the apparatus of NA²⁸, Q has only ἡ; according to IGNTP, Q supports καὶ ἡ; according to Swanson, Q has ἡ δέ. Without access to images of the manuscript, and in view of the conflicting testimony, I have followed Tischendorf's original transcription (καὶ ἡ), supported by IGNTP. IGNTP prefers καὶ ἡ despite the lack of Alexandrian testimony.

⁵⁶ A D E G H K M N Q R S W X Y Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ Ω f¹ (f¹³) 2 28 124 157 565 700 1006 1342 1424 1506 m. Most of these manuscripts use a simple verb (συναχθήσονται) instead of the compound verb found in Q (ἐπισυναχθήσονται). In this regard, they are closer to Matthew. The scribe of this manuscript reflects only Matthean word order. IGNTP prefers the "Matthean" order in Luke against B and K. Swanson lists Q in agreement with the primary Alexandrian manuscripts here, but does not note the transposition.

was exceedingly popular among Byzantine manuscripts, which may suggest that the Lukan syntax was atypical.

The story continues, “The one (ἡ μία) will be taken and the other will be left.” Matthew does not use the definite article in his description of the one who will be taken (μία παραλαμβάνεται καὶ μία ἀφίεται). The scribe of Guelferbytanus has omitted this article, possibly demonstrating the influence of Matthew. He certainly was not deliberately assimilating the verse because he does not omit the second article. In the second part of the verse, the scribe has adopted Matthew’s conjunction (καὶ) in the place of Luke’s ἡ δέ. This, too, may be the result of harmonization.

The word order in Luke 17:37 has been influenced by the parallel in Matthew 24:28. Luke records, “Where the body (is), there also the eagles will be gathered” (ὅπου τὸ σῶμα ἐκεῖ καὶ οἱ ἀετοὶ ἐπισυναχθήσονται). Matthew has, “Wherever the corpse is, there will be gathered the eagles” (ὅπου ἐὰν ᾗ τὸ πτώμα ἐκεῖ συναχθήσονται οἱ ἀετοί). The scribe of Guelferbytanus has dropped the conjunction καὶ and transposed the final three words (συναχθήσονται οἱ ἀετοί) in conformity with Matthew’s version.

(25) Luke 18:35 – ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ ἐγγίξειν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱεριχῶ τυφλὸς τις ἐκάθητο
παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν Γ ἐπαιτῶν (Γ προσαιτῶν; //Mark 10:46)⁵⁷

(26) Luke 18:36 – ἀκούσας δὲ ὄχλου διαπορευομένου ἐπυνθάνετο τί Τ εἶη τοῦτο
(Τ ἄν; //Luke 15:26)⁵⁸

⁵⁷ A K M P {Q} R U W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ f¹ f¹³ 2 28 33^{vid} 565^{sup} 700 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1424 1506 2542 m. NA²⁸, IGNTP, and Swanson count Q among manuscripts reading ἐπαιτῶν. Without access to images, I have followed Tischendorf, though hesitantly. Even if Q does not read προσαιτῶν, the following discussion is applicable to Codices Alexandrinus, Washingtonianus, and others. IGNTP and Souter prefer προσαιτῶν.

(27) Luke 18:39 – καὶ οἱ προάγοντες ἐπετίμων αὐτῷ ἵνα Ἦ σιγήσῃ (Ἦ σιωπήσῃ;

//Mark 10:48, Matthew 20:31)⁵⁹

Luke describes Bartimaeus as a blind man who “sat beside the road begging (ἐπαιτῶν).” Mark describes the man as “a blind beggar” (τυφλὸς προσαίτης). Many scribes copying Luke, especially in the Byzantine tradition, have retained Luke’s participial construction but have adopted Mark’s compound word with the resulting form προσαιτῶν.

In Luke 18:36, the evangelist records that the blind man, hearing the crowd around Jesus, inquired “what was this (happening)?” (τί εἶη τοῦτο). The scribes of Codex Guelferbytanus and many other Byzantine texts have added the particle ἄν before the verb. While this phrase does not appear in the direct Synoptic parallels, it does appear earlier in Luke 15:26. In the parable of the lost son, when the older brother hears the sounds of celebration, he calls a servant to find out “what was this (happening)?” (τί ἄν εἶη τοῦτα). Having already copied the first passage correctly, it is unsurprising to find the scribe conforming the current verse to Luke’s usage and the common form of the idiom.

When the blind man hears that Jesus is passing by he cries out loudly, but the crowd shushes him “in order that he be silent” (ἵνα σιγήσῃ). In the parallel, Mark uses σιωπάω in his narrative, a synonym of Luke’s σιγάω. Matthew also uses σιωπάω, but in the plural to reflect the context of his own story, which includes two blind men. It seems

⁵⁸ D K L M Q R X Y Θ Π Ψ f¹ f¹³ 1 6 13 16 22 27 69 71 124 131 158 205 209 213 265 346 348 349 399^c 443 472 475 477 489 543 577 579 716 726 788 826 827 828 892 903 983 1005 1009 1071 1077 1079 1192 1194 1195 1200 1210 1215 1216 1219 1220 1241 1313 1319 1355 1365 1392 1443 1458 1579 1582 1604 1630 2542 2613 2766.

⁵⁹ ⋈ A K M Q R U Γ Δ Θ Λ Π f¹ f¹³ 2 28 69 565 579 700 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1424 Ⓜ. IGNTP prefers σιωπήσῃ against diverse textual witnesses.

very likely that one or the other of these parallels has impacted the reading of v. 39 in Codex Guelferbytanus.

(28) Luke 20:3 – ἐρωτήσω ὑμᾶς καὶ γὰρ ἓν λόγον (ἓνα; //Mark 11:29, Matthew 21:24)⁶⁰

(29) Luke 20:4 – τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἢ ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων (τό; //Mark 11:30, Matthew 21:25)⁶¹

(30) Luke 20:5 – διὰ τί οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ (οὐ; //Mark 11:31, Matthew 21:25)⁶²

In Jerusalem, Jesus’s religious opponents frequently put him to the test. On one such occasion, Jesus responds by posing a “question” (λόγον) of his own. In Mark 11:29 and Matthew 21:24, Jesus says that he will ask “one question” (ἓνα λόγον or λόγον ἓνα). The adjective is absent from the best manuscripts of Luke. It is a secondary addition in Codex Guelferbytanus and others. This popular reading seems to have arrived in Luke from Mark or Matthew. The scribe has also added ἓνα from the parallels in Luke 12:25.

Jesus’s question pertains to “the baptism of John” (τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου). Mark 11:30 and Matthew 21:25 have two direct articles in their constructions (τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ Ἰωάννου). The critical apparatuses do not agree on whether Codex Guelferbytanus has the

⁶⁰ C D E G H N Q U^c V Y Γ Δ Θ Λ Ψ f¹³ 2 565 579 700 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1424 1506 m. Many manuscripts, including A K M S U* Π Ω 28, transpose the words. What is important here is the addition of ἓνα. IGNTP prefers the longer reading against good Alexandrian evidence coupled with the Pre-Caesarean W.

⁶¹ ⋈ D L N {Q} R. Tischendorf’s transcription does not show τό and Swanson cites Q among manuscripts without the article. According to NA²⁸ and IGNTP, however, the article does appear in Q. Given the split evidence, I have followed the most recent critical editions, but with caution. Tischendorf prefers the longer reading.

⁶² A C D K M N Q 0233 Π f¹ 33 157 205 346 472 579 892 1071 1241 1346 1604 2542. IGNTP prefers the longer reading against substantial Alexandrian and Pre-Caesarean (W) evidence.

articular reading or not. Tischendorf did not think so, but the newer editions list Guelferbytanus in favor of the longer reading. If in fact the manuscript did have the longer reading, it could be explained by harmonization. The scribe's own grammatical or stylistic expectations have probably been a stronger influence than the remote parallel.

Jesus's opponents hesitate to say that John's baptism was from heaven, lest Jesus should ask, "Why did you not believe him?" (διὰ τί οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ). In Mark 11:31 and Matthew 21:25, the question is asked with a conjunction, "Why, *then*, did you not believe him?" (διὰ τί οὖν οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ). This conjunction appears in Codex Guelferbytanus and in many other manuscripts of Luke. It is possible that the longer reading is better. The words OYN and OYK are similar enough that it would be unsurprising to find a scribe leaping from the first to the second word. This could have been the case in some manuscripts if the longer reading were older, but the consistency with which the shorter reading is found, especially in the best manuscripts of the Alexandrian tradition and in the Pre-Caesarean Washingtonianus, suggests that the shorter reading is better. If the shorter reading is better, the longer reading can be explained by harmonization to Mark or Matthew.

(31) Luke 20:10 – οἱ δὲ γεωργοὶ ^ςἐξαπέστειλαν αὐτὸν δείραντες^ς κενόν (^ςδείραντες αὐτὸν ἐξαπέστειλαν; //Mark 12:3)⁶³

(32) Luke 20:14 – ἰδόντες δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ γεωργοὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ἄλλήλους λέγοντες οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος (ἑαυτούς; //Mark 12:7, cf. Matthew 21:38)⁶⁴

⁶³ A C D K M N Q R U W Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ *f*¹ 2 28 33 157 565 700 892 1006 1071 1342 1424 1506 2542 *ℓ*. K has *ἀπέστειλαν* and D adds a conjunction, but the words under consideration are in the same order. IGNTP and Souter prefer the alternative word order and may be correct.

In the parable of the wicked tenants, Luke records that the farmers, “Sent him [the servant], beating (him), empty” (ἐξάπέστειλαν αὐτὸν δειραντες κενόν). In Mark and Matthew, the word order is rearranged so that it is in a logical progression of events. In Mark 12:3, “They [the farmers], taking him, beat (him) and sent (him) empty” (καὶ λαβόντες αὐτὸν ἔδειραν καὶ ἀπέστειλαν κενόν). The scribe of Guelferbytanus has altered Luke’s order of events, retaining his syntax and grammar, to reflect the order of events in Mark. Since many manuscripts have the “Markan” order, it is natural to wonder whether it might be the better reading. This position cannot be held with confidence without an explanation for the less smooth word order of Luke in the Alexandrian manuscripts. How would such a reading arise out of the other? If the more difficult reading is older, the variant can be explained either as a scribal attempt to polish or as a harmonistic alteration.

When the farmers see that the vineyard owner has sent his son to them, they “discuss with one another” (διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους) in order to make a plan to secure the property for themselves. Both Mark and Matthew use the reflexive pronoun ἑαυτοῦ, which the scribe of Guelferbytanus has used in his copy of Luke. It is possible that this reading is older since it appears in the vast majority of manuscripts, but the joint witness of the Alexandrian manuscripts and Codex Bezae in support of ἀλλήλους is compelling. The variant with ἑαυτοῦ can be explained by harmonization to Mark (ἑαυτούς) or Matthew (ἑαυτοῖς).

⁶⁴ A C K M N Q U W Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ ^f3 2 28 565 700 1006 1342 1424 1506 2542 ℓ. IGNTP prefers ἑαυτούς against compelling Alexandrian evidence coupled with Codex Bezae.

(33) Luke 20:44a – Δαυὶδ οὖν ἵκύνριον αὐτὸν² καλεῖ (ἵαὐτὸν κύριον; //Mark 12:37, Matthew 22:45)⁶⁵

(34) Luke 20:44b – καὶ πῶς ἵαὐτοῦ υἱός² ἔστιν (ἵυἱός αὐτοῦ; //Matthew 22:45)⁶⁶

The first variant in this verse was discussed with Codex Vaticanus in Chapter Five, where it was shown that the transposition may have been created in harmonization to Mark or Matthew.

In the same verse, Jesus asks, “And how is (he) his son?” (καὶ πῶς αὐτοῦ υἱός ἔστιν). In Matthew, the pronoun comes after the noun (υἱός αὐτοῦ). The phrase in Guelferbytanus reflects the “Matthean” word order. In this case, important manuscripts from the Alexandrian, Western, and Pre-Caesarean types all support υἱός αὐτοῦ, against the comparatively sparse support for the pronoun-first reading. It is very likely the reading with the “Matthean” word order is older so that harmonization is not a factor here.

(35) Luke 22:30 – ἵνα ἔσθητε⁶⁷ καὶ πῖνητε ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης μου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου καὶ καθήσεσθε ἐπὶ θρόνων ἵτὰς δώδεκα φυλάς κρίνοντες² τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ (ἵκρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλάς; //Matthew 19:28)⁶⁸

Jesus promises that his faithful disciples will eat at his table in his kingdom and will sit on thrones “judging the twelve tribes of Israel” (τὰς δώδεκα φυλάς κρίνοντες τοῦ

⁶⁵ A B K L M Q R U Π 0211 27 33 71 115^c 158 213 265 443 472 489 983 1005 1009 1079 1194 1219 1220 (1241) 1313 1355 1365 1392 1458 2372 2613 2766. Merk prefers αὐτὸν κύριον.

⁶⁶ ⋈ D L P Q U W Γ Δ Λ Ψ *f*¹³ 2 33 157 565 579 700 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1424 2542 Ⓜ. IGNTP and Souter prefer υἱός αὐτοῦ.

⁶⁷ Q has ἐσθίετε.

⁶⁸ ⋈ A D K L M N Q U W Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ *f*¹³ 2 565 579 700 1006 1241 1342 1424 2542 1506 Ⓜ. Tischendorf, IGNTP, and Souter prefer κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλάς.

Ἰσραήλ). The best reading of Luke in this passage is not clear. In some Alexandrian manuscripts, T, and miniscule 892, the verb follows the object (τὰς δώδεκα φυλάς κρίνοντες). A large number of manuscripts of early and diverse character have the verb before the object (κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλάς), as it is in Matthew 19:28. If the minority reading were older, the latter variant could be explained by harmonization. In this case, though, it seems likely that the majority reading is earlier and the former is an Alexandrian aberration.

(36) Luke 22:34 – οὐ φωνήσει σήμερον ἀλέκτωρ ἕως τρίς⁶⁹ ἡ με ἀπαρνῆση⁷⁰ εἰδέναι
(^ς ἀπαρνῆση με; //Matthew 26:34)⁷⁰

In Luke 22:34, Jesus predicts that Peter will deny knowing him. He says, “The cock will not crow today until you deny knowing me (με ἀπαρνῆση εἰδέναι) three times.” The sequence of the final three words in this sentence is far from certain. The best Alexandrian manuscripts (Ⲭ B L) and some “Caesarean” texts (e.g. Θ) have με ἀπαρνῆση εἰδέναι; Washingtonianus and the Byzantine majority have ἀπαρνῆση μὴ εἰδέναι με. Still other permutations exist. The reading of Codex Guelferbytanus is ἀπαρνῆση με εἰδέναι. It is not necessary to determine which reading, between the Alexandrian and Byzantine, is oldest. It is enough to see that the reading of Guelferbytanus is not generally perceived to be the earlier reading. Where, then, has it come from? The variant may be related to the reading in Matthew 26:34 and the majority reading in Mark 14:30 where the direct object follows the verb (ἀπαρνῆση με). With reference to the reading of Guelferbytanus, με is

⁶⁹ Q has πρὶν τρεῖς.

⁷⁰ Q Ψ f¹ 1 157 205 209 (1241). There are many manuscripts with this word order that add an additional με.

the object of the verb *εἰδέναι*, but is drawn closer to its verb than it stands in the majority reading (*με ἀπαρνήση εἰδέναι*). The influence of the parallel is far from certain, but it is possible that the corresponding passage has contributed to the shift in Luke's word order.

(37) Luke 22:45 – *εὗρεν ^ςκοιμωμένους αὐτούς² ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης (^ςαὐτοῦς
κοιμωμένους; //Mark 14:37, Matthew 26:40)⁷¹*

Jesus weeps and prays in the garden and asks his disciples to stay awake and watch. Returning from his prayers, Jesus find them sleeping (*κοιμωμένους αὐτούς*). In Mark 14:37 and Matthew 26:40, Jesus finds them sleeping (*αὐτούς καθεύδοντας*), but the evangelists use a synonym. The synonym for sleep is not the variant of interest here, but rather the word order with participle following pronoun. This is the order in which the words are found in the Luke text of Guelferbytanus (*αὐτούς κοιμωμένους*). It is possible that the Markan or Matthean passage has affected the scribe's copy of Luke.

(38) Luke 23:32 – *ἤγοντο δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι ^ςκακοῦργοι δύο² σὺν αὐτῷ ἀναιρεθῆναι
(^ςδύο κακοῦργοι; Mark 15:27, Matthew 27:38)⁷²*

According to Luke, two men were crucified with Jesus. P⁷⁵, Codex Vaticanus, and Codex Sinaiticus describe the men as “two evildoers” (*κακοῦργοι δύο*); the scribe of Guelferbytanus has transposed the words. If the Alexandrian word order is older, then the variant in Guelferbytanus could be explained by harmonization to Mark 15:27 or Matthew 27:38. In those passages, the men are referred to as “two bandits” (*δύο λησταιί*,

⁷¹ A K M N Q R U W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π f¹ 124 157 565 579 700 892 1006 1071 1342 1424 1506 m. IGNTP and Souter prefer *αὐτούς κοιμωμένους* against good Alexandrian (P⁷⁵-B κ) and Western (0171 D) manuscripts.

⁷² A C D K L N P Q W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ 070 0250 f¹ f⁴³ 33 69 565 579 700 892 1006 1241 1342 1424 1506 2542 m. Tischendorf, IGNTP, and Souter prefer *δύο κακοῦργοι* against P⁷⁵-B κ.

δύο ληστές). The textual evidence, however, falls strongly in favor of the reading δύο κακούργοι in Luke, in which case, there is no harmonization.

(39) Luke 23:33 – ἐκεῖ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς κακούργους ὃν μὲν ἐκ δεξιῶν ὃν

δὲ ἐξ ἁριστερῶν (Γ εὐωνύμων; //Mark 15:27, Matthew 27:38)⁷³

(40) Luke 23:34 – διαμεριζόμενοι δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἔβαλον Γ κλήρους (Γ κλήρον;

//Matthew 27:35, Mark 15:24)⁷⁴

In Luke 23:33, one of the thieves crucified with Jesus is hung at his “right hand” (ἐκ δεξιῶν) and the other at his “left hand” (ἐξ ἁριστερῶν). Where Luke uses ἁριστερῶν for “left hand,” Mark and Matthew use the synonym εὐωνύμων. The scribe of Codex Guelferbytanus has adopted this reading from one of the parallels.

The variant in Luke 23:34 was discussed in Chapter Three, where it was shown that the reading of Codex Guelferbytanus and others, κλήρον, is probably the earlier reading so that there is no need to postulate harmonization.

(41) Luke 23:36 – Γ ἐνέπαιξαν δὲ αὐτῷ (Γ ἐνέπαιζον; //Luke 22:63)⁷⁵

(42) Luke 23:38a – ἦν δὲ καὶ ἐπιγραφὴ Τ ἐπ’ αὐτῷ (Τ ἐπιγεγραμμένη; //Mark 15:26,

Matthew 27:37, John 19:19)⁷⁶

⁷³ C* L N Q Ψ 070 0124 *f*¹³ 13 28 33 69 157 158 346 543 544 788 826 828 954 983 1242 1424 1604 1675.

⁷⁴ P⁷⁵ ⋈ B C D F K L M Q U W Y Γ Δ Λ Π 070 0250 *f*¹³ 2 28 124 157 565 579 700 788 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1346 1424 1506 2542 Ⓜ.

⁷⁵ Manuscripts with ἐνέπαιζον or another form of the imperfect verb include: A C D K M N Q W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ *f*¹³ 2 28 33 118 565 579 700 892 1006 1342 1424 1506 2542 Ⓜ. IGNTP and Souter prefer ἐνέπαιζον. Manuscripts with ἐνέπαιξαν include: P⁷⁵ ⋈ B L 070 1241.

⁷⁶ A D Q 47. Many manuscripts have the form γεγραμμένη, which may also be influenced by the parallels. This is the reading that IGNTP prefers.

(43) Luke 23:38b – (ⲧ γράμμασιν Ἑλληνικοῖς καὶ Ῥωμαϊκοῖς καὶ Ἑβραϊκοῖς`;

//John 19:20)⁷⁷

(44) Luke 23:38c – ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὗτος` (ὁ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν

Ἰουδαίων; //Matthew 27:37)⁷⁸

The best reading of Luke 23:36 is contested. The Alexandrian manuscripts (P⁷⁵-B & L) and a few others have “and they mocked him” (ἐνέπαιξαν δὲ αὐτῷ), with the verb in the aorist. A diverse majority of manuscripts, including Bezae and Washingtonianus, prefers the imperfect verb ἐνέπαιζον. It seems very likely that the aorist reading represents an Alexandrian family variant. Therefore, harmonization has not been a factor in this passage.

The text of Luke 23:38 in Codex Guelferbytanus is quite unusual. In the first place, the participle ἐπιγεγραμμένη has been added in harmonization to Mark 15:26 or Matthew 27:37. The resultant text reads, “And there was also an inscription *written* above him” instead of “and there was an inscription above him.” It is also possible that John 19:19 has influenced this reading since a participle (γεγραμμένον) is used in that context as well.

In Codex Guelferbytanus, the reader is told that the inscription above Jesus was written “in Greek and Latin and Hebrew letters” (γράμμασιν Ἑλληνικοῖς καὶ Ῥωμαϊκοῖς

⁷⁷ Ⲱ*^c A C^c D E G H K M N Q R U W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ ^f1 ^f3 2 28 33 69^c 180 205 565 579^c 700 892 1006 1010 1071 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 1506 ℳ. Some of these manuscripts leave out the conjunctions. Similar readings are found in 157 and 2542. IGNTP and Merk prefer the longer reading.

⁷⁸ A K M Q R U W Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ ^f13 2 157 565 700 892 1006 1071 1241 1342 1424 1506 2542 ℳ. D adopts Matthew’s verb, but the words are in a different order. IGNTP prefers the longer reading against many early Alexandrian manuscripts. NA²⁸ cites Q as a witness for the reading οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

καὶ Ἑβραϊκοῖς). This phrase, though not the exact sentence, comes from John 19:20, where this detail is consistently present. Although these words are found in the majority of Lukan manuscripts, they appear in a variety of forms and are absent in the best Alexandrian manuscripts. This variety suggests that the words are a gloss on John 19:20 and that there was no true reading in Luke to have provided initial stability. In his commentary, Metzger provides three arguments for the secondary nature of the variants: first, they are not in the oldest manuscripts; second, the form varies widely; third, there is no adequate explanation for its omission.⁷⁹ I concur on all points and explain the presence of the reading by harmonization to the Fourth Gospel.

In the closing phrase, Luke records the words of the inscription: “The King of the Jews (is) this” (ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὗτος). Mark does not include a pronoun. Matthew, however, includes the pronoun and a verb and places these at the beginning of the sentence, “*This is* the King of the Jews” (οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων). It may be that the longer, verb-primary reading is earlier, but the shorter reading is supported by many early manuscripts. Additionally, it is difficult to see why the verb would be omitted by a scribe who, at the same time, shifted the pronoun to the end of the sentence. The best explanation is that the shorter reading is better and that the longer reading has been created in harmonization to Matthew 27:37.

(45) Luke 23:39 – Ἦ οὐχὶ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός (Ἦ εἶ; cf. Luke 23:35, 37)⁸⁰

⁷⁹ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 154.

⁸⁰ A C^c K M N Q R U W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ f¹ f¹³ 2 28 33 69 157 565 579 700 892 1006 1071 1342 1424 1506 ℣. IGNTP prefers εἶ.

At the crucifixion, Luke records that one of the thieves crucified with Jesus asked him, “Are you not the messiah (οὐχὶ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός)? Save yourself and us.” A variant reading in this passage poses the question as a challenge, “If you are the messiah (εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός), save yourself and us.” The interrogative reading has the greater claim to being older. The secondary reading has arisen as a harmonization to the context of Luke 23:35 and, especially, 23:37, where the same challenge is found in the mouth of the soldiers.

(46) Luke 23:44 – καὶ ἤν ὁ ἤδη ὥσει ὥρα ἕκτη (//Mark 15:33, Matthew 27:45)⁸¹

The best reading of Luke 23:44 is not clear. The Alexandrian manuscripts (P⁷⁵-B L) and some others have: “and it was already about the sixth hour” (καὶ ἤν ἡδη ὥσει ὥρα ἕκτη). It is the adverb “already” (ἡδη) that is in question. If the reading with the adverb is earlier, the omission could be explained by harmonization to Mark 15:33 and Matthew 27:45. In the majority of manuscripts, however, and in several of high quality and from multiple text types (ⲛ D W), the adverb is missing. The textual evidence is far in favor of the shorter reading here so that harmonization is not a factor.

Summary of Harmonization in Codex Guelferbytanus

The scribe of Codex Guelferbytanus was prone to transmitting harmonizing variants, as can be seen from the forty-six readings discussed above. Seven of the variants were deemed unlikely to have been caused by harmonization. Fifteen variants may have arisen by harmonization, but they are not discussed here. Remarkably, none of the remaining twenty-four readings is singular, sub-singular, or even uncommon. In fact,

⁸¹ ⲛ A C* D K M Q R U W X Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ *f*¹³ 2 28 33 157 565 579 700 1006 1071 1342 1424 1506 2542 ⲙ. IGNTP prefers the shorter reading.

none of the forty-six readings analyzed qualifies as a singular, sub-singular, or even uncommon reading.

Several points should be made regarding this fact. First, because the variants are common the readings of Codex Guelferbytanus tell us very little about the scribe himself. Second, the harmonizing readings contained in this text were very popular by the fifth century. Third, even though the readings discussed are not singular, Codex Guelferbytanus may be the source of some of them given its temporal priority. Finally, although the characteristics of the individual scribe cannot be pinpointed with much detail, it would appear that he was copying in a textual stream that permitted assimilation. Few of his readings have the feel of deliberate alteration or a systematic agenda to assimilate the text; nevertheless, the sheer number of variants shows that harmonization is a pervasive trait of this textual stream.

Table 22. Quality of Harmonization in Codex Guelferbytanus

Total Number of Readings	Total: 46	Entry Number
Quality of Harmonization		
Very Likely	5	14, 18, 39, 42, 43
Likely	19	1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 19, 26, 27, 28, 30, 32, 44, 45
Possible	15	2, 4, 5, 13, 16, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 29, 31, 33, 36, 37
Unlikely	7	20, 34, 35, 38, 40, 41, 46

Eleven readings are attributable to Matthew, compared with only two to Mark. The numbers skew far in favor of the First Gospel, demonstrating once more that the Gospel of Matthew served as the horizon of expectation. Substitutions and additions account for about the same number of harmonizing alterations.

Codex Guelferbytanus is somewhat unique in exhibiting more harmonizing changes in narrative portions of the Gospel than in Jesus's words. The scribe was by no means shy about altering (or transmitting an altered version of) Jesus's words, but more variation occurs in the evangelist's narrative.

Harmonization in this codex resoundingly confirms the pattern that has emerged from previous centuries: scribes mostly created harmonizing variants one word at a time or, less frequently, two words at a time. The decrease in frequency from harmonizations of two words or fewer to three words or more is quite sharp. Many one-word alterations are changes in grammatical form rather than more consequential changes to foreign words.

In general, verbs and verbal phrases have been altered more frequently than other parts of speech, which is unsurprising given the variability in verb forms. Interestingly, the scribe of Guelferbytanus has altered conjunctions more than any other part of speech. Among the seven harmonizing variants involving conjunctions, four are omissions and three are additions, so no coherent habit emerges.

Table 23. Harmonization in Codex Guelferbytanus

		Total: 24	Entry Number
Sources of Harmonization			
	Matthew	11	6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 44
	Mark	2	1, 10
	Luke	2	26, 45
	John	1	43
	Matthew, Mark	7	3, 12, 27, 28, 30, 32, 39
	Matthew, Mark, John	1	42
Type of Harmonization			
	Substitution	10	1, 3, 11, 18, 19, 27, 32, 39, 44, 45
	Addition	10	10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 26, 28, 30, 42, 43
	Omission	4	6, 7, 8, 9
Context of Harmonization			

	Words of Jesus	8	1, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 28, 32
	Narrative	14	3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 26, 27, 39, 42, 43, 44
	Other Dialogue	2	30, 45
Extent of Harmonization			
	One Word	20	1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 19, 26, 27, 28, 30, 32, 39, 42, 45
	Two Words	2	10, 14
	Four+ Words	1	43
	Sentence	1	44
Part of Speech			
	Sentence	1	44
	Verb	4	3, 18, 27, 42
	Noun	1	39
	Noun Phrase	3	14, 19, 43
	Pronoun	1	32
	Proper Noun(s)	1	11
	Article(s)	1	10
	Preposition	1	1
	Conjunction	7	6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 15, 30
	Adjective	2	17, 28
	Particle	2	26, 45

Harmonization is not the most dominant characteristic of the scribe of Codex Guelferbytanus, but it is, nevertheless, a notable feature of the manuscript. Since none of the variants analyzed were singular, sub-singular, or even uncommon, the readings contained in the text speak more to the character of the textual stream in which the scribe produced his copy than of the scribe himself. Codex Guelferbytanus is an early representative of a tradition that was more prone to harmonization than the Alexandrian, Western, and Pre-Caesarean manuscripts.

CHAPTER SEVEN:

HARMONIZATION AND GOSPEL HARMONY

Harmonization is a result, not an intent. The evidence collected in this study shows that in the second to fifth centuries there was no general editorial agenda among scribes to harmonize one Gospel to another. No single manuscript, not even one with a comparatively high number of harmonizing readings, betrays a systematic pattern of alteration that would suggest that the scribe was endeavoring to conform the text of one Gospel to the text of another. If their intent was to bring the Gospels into accord by reducing the discrepancies between their accounts, the scribes failed resoundingly.

The many harmonizing variants in the manuscripts are in most cases not the product of scribal intent; they are a testament to the pervasive quality of gospel material upon the memories of the scribes. They are a result of the scribes' familiarity with multiple forms of a single story and their memory of different versions of the same saying.

In the first and second century, scribes received gospel material in the form of oral tradition and written texts. In oral tradition, sayings of Jesus and stories about Jesus were passed on from person to person and re-told over and over again. Each re-telling of a saying was an opportunity for slight changes to enter into the material. Different points of emphasis and detail emerged as stories were repeated. In the third century and beyond, textual transmission of gospel material increased. Scribes received sayings and stories in the form of written texts, which they heard, read, and copied. Some texts were

exclusively collections of Jesus's sayings; others contained the narrative of parts of Jesus's life. As with oral tradition, each re-writing of the text was an opportunity for changes to be made, some for deliberate reasons (e.g. stylistic improvement) and some unintentionally (e.g. homoioteleuton).

A scribe's first encounter with one form of gospel material, whether transmitted orally or textually, became familiarity with that form upon subsequent encounters. That familiarity transformed into an expectation with each new hearing, reading, or copying. That expectation of what the form of a particular story or saying would or should be, what Philip Comfort calls a "horizon of expectation" in this context, provides the best framework within which to understand the phenomenon of harmonization. Over the course of hearing, reading, and copying gospel material, a single Gospel or version of a saying or story solidified into the scribe's "cognitive exemplar," that is to say, his horizon of expectation. As a scribe copied a Gospel, his cognitive exemplar was sometimes in agreement with and sometimes in disagreement with his physical exemplar. The material in his cognitive exemplar occasionally became the source of alterations, additions, omissions, and transpositions in the copy he was making. In textual criticism, these alterations are called harmonizations.

I have called the operation by which these changes occurred "reflexive" or "automatic" alteration. As the scribe copied one Gospel, the material itself recalled parallel material latent in the scribe's horizon of expectation and in his general familiarity with alternative versions of sayings and stories. The scribe of Guelferbytanus betrays no systematic pattern of assimilation; nevertheless, when he read, "Blessed are the poor," in his exemplar of Luke 6:20, he reflexively added the words "in spirit" to his new copy of

Luke as he recalled the longer version of the same beatitude from Matthew 5:3. The physical exemplar itself activated material in his cognitive exemplar. The scribe did not intend to assimilate the passage, as can be seen from the fact that he has not introduced harmonizing readings in the remainder of Luke's beatitudes; instead, he succumbed to the influence of parallel material residing in his memory.

The recognition that harmonization is a result rather than an intent necessitates a change in the technical language associated with harmonization, at least as it is used of the fifth century and earlier. Textual critics and commentators regularly make some form of the following statements: "The scribe *sought to harmonize* divergent parallel passages," "*In order* to bring the text into harmony, scribes have substituted..." or "The scribe omitted the word *to assimilate* the passage..." These and other phrases imply that harmonization was a deliberate activity intended to eliminate the differences between parallel passages. In most cases, harmonizing variants are not *intended* to reduce discrepancies between the Gospels; they exist *because* of the differences between the Gospels and reflect the *influence* of parallel material.

Therefore, one must take care when speaking about harmonizing variants. Scribes did not create harmonizations, if by harmonizations one means a reading *intended* to reduce discrepancies between the Gospels. It is more precise to say that a scribe created a *harmonizing* omission or *harmonizing* alteration under the influence of parallel material. Furthermore, scribes did not harmonize, if by harmonize one means espouse a deliberate agenda to assimilate the Gospels. Instead, scribes were *influenced* by external material to greater or lesser degrees, and sometimes allowed parallel material to affect their copy of a

Gospel. It is better to say, then, that parallel material is the *source* of the alteration or the *source of influence* upon the scribe.

Some scholars describe harmonization in terms that suggest that scribes regularly checked their exemplar of one Gospel against a manuscript or several manuscripts of another Gospel. According to this theory, some scribes were actively seeking discrepancies and abolishing them in their manuscripts of individual Gospels. This cannot be shown to be the case in the fifth century or earlier, and I would be surprised to find any manuscript of any century that conforms to this pattern. If this were the practice of scribes, one would expect far more consistency in assimilation than actually appears. As it is, harmonization is never systematic. In a single verse, one aspect will reflect parallel material while another does not. A minor feature of one Gospel may be brought into another while a major feature in the same verse is left behind. General inconsistency in harmonization belies the notion that scribe's were checking their documents against parallel material or that they were deliberately endeavoring to assimilate the Gospels.

Harmonization as a General Practice

Harmonization to Synoptic parallels was not frequent in the first five centuries of the transmission of the New Testament. In the approximately 5,064 verses of the 45 manuscripts analyzed in this study, there are only 201 variants that are likely or very likely attributable to harmonization, and some of these occur in the same verse as others. This shows that only 4 percent of the verses studied contain a harmonizing alteration. That is not to say that the entire verse was assimilated, only that some change within the verse reflects parallel material.

Of the 45 manuscripts, a full half (22) does not contain variants likely to reflect the influence of parallel material. It should be kept in mind that many of these do contain variants that could possibly be explained by harmonization, but none likely or very likely to have entered the text from a parallel. Admittedly, the majority of these are of minimal extent and two do not contain text paralleled in other Gospels.¹

19 of the fragmentary, harmonization-free manuscripts cover 10 verses or fewer. These can be compared to 7 manuscripts of 10 verses or fewer that contain at least 1 harmonizing variant. Therefore, harmonization appears in manuscripts of limited extent about 27 percent of the time.

The situation is switched when the 13 manuscripts covering between 11 and 40 verses are compared. 10 of these exhibit harmonization and 3 of them (P¹, P¹⁹, P^{64/67}) do not. Therefore, harmonization can be found in manuscripts of modest extent about 77 percent of the time. These numbers show that in general 11 to 40 verses provide enough text to find harmonizations and that scribes typically introduced harmonizing changes at a rate of only once or twice in every 11 to 40 verses. If the shorter fragments contained only slightly more text, it is likely that harmonizations would have appeared. Even if harmonization likely occurred in most manuscripts, it was still infrequent.

Among manuscripts covering 40 or fewer verses (39), 8 contain only a single harmonization and 5 contain only 2. Added to the previous numbers, 35 of 39 manuscripts (90 percent) of 40 verses or fewer contain 2 or fewer harmonizations. This number describes a very low rate of harmonization. Only 8 manuscripts total contain more than 2 harmonizing variants, and 4 of these cover several hundred verses while 2

¹ In this study, two manuscripts (P¹, 058) contain mostly unparalleled material; four (P³⁵, P⁶², P¹¹¹, 071) contain limited paralleled material.

others cover 95 verses or more. All of these figures support the conclusion that harmonization was infrequent in the transmission of the Synoptic Gospels in the fifth century and earlier.

As a rule, manuscripts of Matthew were subject to harmonization far less frequently than manuscripts of Mark or Luke. 15 of 24 (63 percent) single-gospel manuscripts of Matthew contain no harmonizing readings. The numbers for single-gospel manuscripts of Mark are similar; four of seven (57 percent) manuscripts contain no harmonized readings. Of the 11 single-gospel manuscripts of Luke, only 4 (36 percent) have avoided harmonization. When more manuscripts of the Synoptics are uncovered, these numbers will change. The evidence available now, though, shows that Luke was the object of harmonization the most frequently and Matthew the least frequently. It is likely that Luke was the subject of harmonization more often than Mark because Mark already stands very close to Matthew and Matthew is the primary source of parallel material.

The Gospel of Matthew serves as the source of harmonizing variants more frequently than either of the other Synoptics. Matthew is the sole source of 45 percent of the harmonizing variants. In nearly 20 percent of the cases, the parallel influence may have come from Matthew or one of the other Synoptics. By contrast, Mark accounts for the parallel material approximately 15 percent of the time and Luke for another 15 percent. In the remaining cases, the material could have come from Mark or Luke, John, or some other external source.

These two facts, that Matthew was subject to harmonization the least frequently and served as the source of harmonization the most frequently, show that the Gospel of Matthew tended to be the horizon of expectation by which most scribes read and copied

the Gospels. Since Matthew was copied the most frequently, its manner of presenting gospel material became the cognitive exemplar of many scribes and the source of most reflexive harmonization in the manuscripts.

The evidence also shows that scribes had a tendency to create harmonizing alterations in certain contexts more than others. D. C. Parker writes, “It has sometimes been claimed that the words of Jesus were reproduced particularly carefully and reverently by scribes...The claim owes everything to piety, and nothing to the study of the manuscripts.”² Parker is absolutely correct. Not only did scribes introduce harmonizing variants regularly in Jesus’s words, they did so far more frequently than in the narrative portions of the Gospels.

The sayings of Jesus were an important object of oral tradition and texts like the *Gospel of Thomas*, a second-century collection of Jesus’s sayings, demonstrate that great value was laid on Jesus’s words. Jesus’s words were shared often and, at least in some cases, travelled independently of a narrative framework and so were the subject of alteration at each re-telling and re-writing. In comparison to Jesus’s words, the evangelists’ narrative contexts were less important to commit to memory and less likely to leave an impression on the scribes strong enough to affect their copies of the Gospels.

Another fact about harmonization emerges quite clearly. Scribes tended to alter their text one word at a time. Outside of transpositions, there are very few instances where several words together have been added, omitted, or altered. Most one-word alterations do not affect the meaning of the verse. Many are substitutions of grammatical forms rather than substitutions of words. These facts further support the conclusion that

² Parker, *The Living Text*, 75.

harmonization was not a practice intended to alter a manuscript in preference for another. Harmonizing readings introduce subtle, sometimes meaningless, changes to the *text* of the Gospel, but they rarely alter the meaning or character of a passage.

Because of the scarcity of manuscripts and the accidental nature of the evidence that is available, it cannot be said whether harmonization increased or decreased over the first five centuries. A correlation between the rise of multi-gospel codices and a reduction in harmonization would be convenient and logical, but not enough evidence remains. P⁴⁵, one of only two multi-gospel codices studied here that contain the same pericope in more than one Gospel, exhibits a great deal of fluidity in harmonization.³ A single pericope will be altered in one Gospel in favor of a second or third, but when the second or third version is copied, the wording of the first will affect changes upon them. Codex Vaticanus exhibits similar traits, but to a lesser degree. Preliminary research into Codex Sinaiticus shows that Mark and Luke were subject to harmonization far more frequently than the text of Matthew and that individual pericopes do not exhibit uniform harmonization. The evidence available shows that the rise of multi-gospel codices in later centuries did not result in increased uniformity between the Gospels.

Harmonization and Individual Scribes

Aspects of this general profile of harmonization apply to individual scribes in different ways. The following paragraphs describe some of the more distinctive scribal personalities uncovered in this study. Some quantitative figures and percentages are used to summarize the information. In studies such as these, percentages tend to convey an

³ Wisse, "Redactional Changes," 49, seems to support the opposing view. He writes, "It is likely that these harmonizations [specific interpolations in his study] originated after the four Gospels began to be copied together late in the second century." Unfortunately, there is no solid evidence that harmonization increased or decreased with the increase in the creation of multi-gospel codices.

overly confident or precise impression of the evidence; in this case, the percentages overestimate the degree of harmonization since they are measured by verse instead of unit of variation within each verse. For every harmonizing variant in a verse, several other variation units have not been altered.

The text of Luke in the Alexandrian tradition resisted external intrusions almost entirely. The scribe of P⁴, for instance, created only 2 harmonizing variants in about 95 verses (2 percent)! Both variants are common in the manuscripts and may not have been the creation of the scribe.

P⁷⁵, a third-century Alexandrian manuscript of Luke, contains 22 harmonizing variants in 18 of about 758 verses (2 percent). This rate of harmonization is nearly identical to P⁴ and still exceedingly low.

The scribe of Codex Borgianus (029, T), a fifth-century Alexandrian manuscript of Luke, has created only 1 harmonizing variant in 138 verses (less than 1 percent). The codex again testifies to the precise and careful copying of the Alexandrian tradition.

Codex Vaticanus, the most important of the Alexandrians, contains the entire text of the Gospel of Luke, approximately 1,151 verses, yet only 26 variants in 24 verses have occurred as a result of parallel material (2 percent). The text of Luke has been transmitted very carefully in the Alexandrian manuscripts.

In Codex Vaticanus, the text of Mark has also been transmitted carefully, with only 19 harmonizing variants in about 666 verses (3 percent). Likewise, the text of Matthew exhibits 45 assimilating readings in 38 of about 1,071 verses (4 percent). The fact that the text of Matthew displays a slightly higher rate of harmonization than the texts of Mark or Luke should not suggest that Matthew was not the scribe's horizon of

expectation. A full 9 of the 45 harmonizing variants in Matthew refer to parallel passages in the text of Matthew itself.

In contrast to these manuscripts of Luke, some manuscripts exhibit a higher rate of harmonization. Codex Borgianus, a proto-Byzantine manuscript of Luke from the fifth century, for instance, exhibits 24 harmonizing variants in 18 of 205 verses (9 percent). The 15 variants possibly attributable to harmonization in this manuscript should also be kept in mind. The harmonizing character of the manuscript is likely higher than is estimated here. Notably, none of the 39 variants in this manuscript, whether probably, likely, or very likely to have been caused by harmonization, is singular, sub-singular, or even uncommon. From the fifth-century on, these readings were popular in the Byzantine tradition and many became the *de facto* reading of Luke.

P⁸⁸, which has been characterized as Alexandrian, contains 4 harmonizing readings in about 26 verses of Mark (15 percent). The manuscript is unusual in that the scribe's cognitive exemplar seems to have been closer to Luke than Matthew. The influence in 3 of the 4 cases comes from the Third Gospel.

The scribe of MS 0171 has created 7 harmonizing variants in 37 verses (19 percent). Beyond a general predilection for allowing intrusions from parallel material, the scribe does not exhibit a pattern in his assimilating alterations.

The text of P¹⁰¹ contains 3 harmonizing variants in 2 of 8 verses (25 percent). This scribe is known to create other types of alterations as well, and so is regarded as quite careless. One of the harmonizing readings he created, the one in Matthew 3:11b, displays less negligence than intimate familiarity with Mark's version of Jesus's baptism.

There are 4 harmonizing variants in 2 of 7 verses in MS 0188 (29 percent). One of these readings is singular and another sub-singular, showing that the scribe allowed parallel material to influence his manuscript. Both of these, Mark 11:13a and 11:13b, seem to be related by an agenda to improve and clarify Mark's narrative. Even among these five manuscripts with a comparatively high rate of harmonization, harmonizing variants are relatively infrequent.

One manuscript exhibits an idiosyncratic pattern of harmonization, P⁴⁵. The scribe of P⁴⁵ tended to create harmonizing variants in bursts in his transcription of Luke and Mark. On five separate occasions, the scribe has introduced 4 or more variants attributable to parallel material in a single pericope. In Luke, the bursts occur in 11:9–13, 12:2–9, and 12:22–32. In Mark, they occur in 9:2–10 and 9:15–29. This evidence is quite significant for characterizing harmonization in P⁴⁵. In the first place, it confirms that assimilating the Gospels to one another was not the scribe's intent. One need only look at the text of a single pericope in all three Gospels, the transfiguration for instance, to see that the scribe has introduced harmonizing readings without any coherent intent to harmonize the accounts. If he had intended to assimilate his texts of the Gospels, he would have created a much more consistent text and harmonizing variants would be found evenly throughout. In the second place, this pattern confirms that harmonizing variants were the result of the scribe's familiarity with parallel material. Only those pericopes well-known to the scribe, perhaps memorized or recently copied, have been substantially altered.

Harmonization and Future Research

The evidence compiled in this catalogue can serve as the starting point for future avenues of research. In the first place, it would be useful to have a comparative study of the manuscripts analyzed here and later representatives of the same textual tradition. For instance, in this study, the characteristics of P⁴ and P⁷⁵ have been usefully compared to Codex Borgianus and, especially, Codex Vaticanus. The evidence gathered from this last manuscript has confirmed many of the conclusions about harmonization in the Alexandrian tradition hinted at in the shorter manuscripts.

Future studies should compare P⁶⁹ and MS 0171, both studied here, with the chief representative of the Western tradition, Codex Bezae (05, D), a manuscript well-known for its putative harmonizations and confections. P⁶⁹ contains only 1 variant likely attributable to a parallel in 9 verses, but betrays several other distinctive readings. Likewise, MS 0171 contains 7 harmonizing variants in about 37 verses. This is not a very high rate of harmonization, but the text contains numerous other unique readings. Based on the evidence of the two fragmentary texts, I suspect that Codex Bezae will exhibit more harmonizing readings than manuscripts from the Alexandrian, “Caesarean,” or Pre-Caesarean types, but not so many as in the Byzantine majority.

The analysis of P⁴⁵ should be compared with Codex Washingtonianus (032, W), another member of the Pre-Caesarean type. Several of the characteristics discerned from P⁴⁵, particularly the tendency to harmonize in bursts, are likely unique to the scribe of P⁴⁵. Nevertheless, several uncommon harmonizing readings in Mark were shared with Washingtonianus. I suspect that harmonization in this tradition will occur more

frequently than in the Alexandrian type, but less frequently than in the Western and Byzantine types.

Finally, Codex Guelferbytanus (026, Q) should be compared with Codex Alexandrinus, a fifth-century Byzantine manuscript of Mark, Luke, and some verses from Matthew. The text of Luke in Codex Guelferbytanus was not systematically harmonized to Matthew or Mark, but did contain more harmonizing variants relative to its size than most other manuscripts. Furthermore, many harmonizing variants possibly attributable to parallel influence are not included in the numeric assessments of the manuscript in this study. I suspect an analysis of Codex Alexandrinus will confirm that manuscripts in the Byzantine tradition contain far more harmonizing variants than any other unified textual stream.

In the second place, it will be useful to assess how scribal harmonization in the manuscripts of the Gospels relates to the editorial creation of Gospel Harmonies. Two points of departure are suggested. First, in the second century, Ammonius introduced a system of enumeration by which to identify pericopae in the Gospels. Eusebius later created a list by which these numbers could be used for quick reference and to find parallel episodes in the Gospels. This table was included as something of a preface in some manuscripts of the Gospels. It seems likely that these tools were useful for editors of harmonies, but what role did they play in scribal harmonization? It must be presumed that the enumeration of the pericopae and the creation of Eusebius's list coincided with greater awareness of differences between parallel materials. Do manuscripts with the numbers betray more harmonizing readings? Or perhaps more systematic harmonization?

Second, scribal harmonization and the creation of harmonies can be compared in terms of their posture toward the text. The scribes were fundamentally different from the editors of harmonies. Their primary goal was to copy while the editors' goal was to create. The scribes incidentally conformed the Gospels to one another, while the editors deliberately and systematically conflated them. Did the editors of harmonies regard discrepancies—*διαφωνία*—between the Gospels as a deficiency in scripture? Or the very fact that there *were* multiple gospels?⁴ Tatian, in the second century, actively sought to eliminate discrepancies and to create a replacement of the four-fold Gospel. His edition was very popular in the East for several centuries before Theodoret of Cyrrhus banned and burned many copies of the *Diatessaron*, reinstating four separate Gospels. This event brings into sharp relief the differences in perspective regarding the Gospels. For some, the variances between the Gospels, let alone the fact that there were multiple Gospels, were corruptions to be eliminated. For others, Irenaeus for instance, the diversity of the four-fold Gospel was an asset.

Harmonization and Gospel Harmony

D. C. Parker regards the presence of harmonizing readings in the manuscripts “as incontrovertible evidence that the traditions continued to live, that is, to grow.”⁵ He is right in at least two ways. First, harmonization is a testament to the continued life and relevance of the Gospels in the world of the scribe and in his Christian community. The lack of manuscripts of Mark in the early centuries conveys the impression that Mark had little or no presence in Christian life during that time, especially for those communities

⁴ Or, were they responding to criticism about the multiplicity of gospels? See Baarda, “Factors in the Harmonization of the Gospels,” 133–154.

⁵ Parker, *The Living Text*, 205.

with a copy of Matthew. Harmonization to Mark in several manuscripts of Matthew and Luke from the third century and earlier contradicts that story. Mark continued to live and influence scribes, and that influence occasionally brought new life into the texts of Matthew and Luke.

Second, as Parker points out, individual harmonizing readings do not in fact reduce the discrepancies between parallel accounts. The alteration of Luke's beatitude from "blessed are the poor" to "blessed are the poor *in spirit*" does not actually conform Luke 6:20 to Matthew 5:3. In the scribe's text of Luke, Jesus is still speaking directly *to* the poor, rather than *about* the poor, as in Matthew. The scribe has not reduced the discrepancies between the passages—he has created a new version of the beatitude. Thus, the texts of Luke and Matthew take on a new life in a new form in a new manuscript. Harmonization contributed to the ever evolving, living text of the Gospels.

In this light, harmonization is an odd term to use to describe the textual phenomenon analyzed in this dissertation. In Greek literature, *ἁρμονία* (*harmonia*) can refer to agreement or accord. In this sense, the readings discussed in this study ostensibly, or perhaps superficially, bring the Gospels into greater agreement. We have seen that this sense of harmony, as agreement or uniformity, is not the correct understanding of scribal harmonization.

Harmonia has other connotations in Greek literature, poetry, mathematics, and, especially, music. *Harmonia* is the personification of music. Her name came to signify the concordance of different sounds. One does not attend a concert to listen to a single note played by two, three, or four instruments. One does not become enraptured by the remarkable equivalence of the sound. Instead, one listens to a symphony and basks in the

concordance of different notes and sounds, celebrating the ways in which the differences complement each other and contribute to a whole. In this sense, the four-fold Gospel in all its diversity is the true *harmonia*. Scribes familiar with the entire score of the four-fold Gospel sometimes contributed their own instrumentation to the music, creating even greater harmony among the Gospels.

APPENDIX A
TRANSCRIPTIONS

P¹⁰⁴ (P.Oxy. 4404)*¹

(1) Matthew 21:34–37, 43, 45 (Recto →)
 [34στειλεν τους] δ[ο]υλου[ς] αυτου προς
 [τους γεωργους] λαβειν τους καρ
 [πους αυτου 35και] λαβοντες οι γεωρ
 [γοι τους δου]λους αυτ[ου] ον μεν
 [εδειραν] ον δε απεκτειναν ον
 [δε ελιθοβ]ολησαν 36παλιν απε
 [στειλεν α]λλους δουλους πλειο
 [νας των πρωτων και] εποιησαν
 [αυτοις ωσαυτως 37υστερον δε] απε

(Verso ↓)

[43βασιλεια του θυ και] δοθησεται
 [εθνει ποιουν]τι τ[ο]υς καρ[που]ς
 [αυτης 45και ακου]σα[ν]τες ο[ι]

P¹⁰³ (P.Oxy. 4403)*

(2–4) Matthew 13:55–56; 14:3–5 (Recto →)
 [55υιος ουχ η] μητηρ αυτου λεγεται
 [μαριαμ και ο]ι αδελφοι αυτου ιακω
 [βος και ιωσ]ης· και σιμων· και ιου
 [δας 56και αι αδ]ελφαι αυτου· ουχι πασαι
 [προς ημας] προθ[ε]ν ουν τουτω ταυ
 [τα]

(Verso ↓)

3την γυναικα φιλ[ιππου του αδελ]
 φου αυτου· 4ελ[ε]γεν [γαρ ο ιωαννης]
 ουκ εξεστιν σοι εχ[ειν αυ]
 την 5και θελων αυ[τον αποκτειναι]
 εφοβηθη τον οχλο[ν οτι ως προφη]

¹ An asterisk (*) signifies that the entire text of a papyrus is transcribed. In most cases, only the relevant verse will be given with letters of the previous and following verses when they complete the line. The transcriptions follow the text of the *ed. pr.* unless otherwise noted, but the format has been standardized (lower case, unaccented, word spacing, etc.) Occasionally, letters or words have been supplied in lacunae where the original editors did not supply the words. Bibliographic information can be found in the main text. Please note that the New Athena Unicode font has been used in these transcriptions in order to use the “combining underdot” symbol in Unicode, which appears centered under letters with only partial traces. Unfortunately, in the SBL Greek font the dot appears well to the left of the intended letter and could cause confusion. The arrow denotes direction of fibers when known.

P⁷⁷ (P.Oxy. 4405=2683)

(5–7) Matthew 23:37–39 (Recto →)

[³⁷ιερουσαλημ ιερους]αλημ· η αποκτιν
 [νυουσα τους προ]φητας και λιθοβο
 [λουσα τους απεστ]αλμενους προς α[υ]
 [τη]ν [πο]σακι[ς η]θεληκα επεισυνα
 [ξ]αι τα τεκνα σο[υ ο]ν τροπον ορνιξ
 [ε]πισυναγει τα υ[οσ]σ[ια αυ]της υπι
] και [
 τας περυγας ου[κ ηθελησατ]ε ³⁸ιδο[υ]
 αφειεται υμιν ο [οικος υμων ερημος] ³⁹λε

P^{64/67} (P.Magdalen Gr. 17/P.Barcelona 1)

(8) Matthew 26:31 (Recto →)

[³¹τοτε λεγει]
 αυτοις ο ις παν[τες]²
 σκανδαλισθη[σεσθε]
 εν εμοι εν τ[η νυκτι]
 ταυτη γεγ[ραπται]

P⁵³ (P.Mich.Inv. 6652)

(9) Matthew 26:31–33 (Verso)

[³¹τα]ι τα προβατα της ποιμνης ³²με
 [τα] δε εγερθηται με προαξω υμας
 [εις] την γαλιλαιαν ³³αποκριθεις δε

(10–11) Matthew 26:36–39 (Recto)

[³⁶τ]α[ις αυτου καθισατε] αυτου ε[ως]
 ου αν α[πελθων εκει πι]ροσευξ[ω]
 μαι ³⁷κ[αι παραλα]βων τον πετρον
 και [το]υ[ς] δ[υο] υι[ο]υ[ς] ζεβεδαιου
 ηρξατο λυπεισθαι και αδημ[ο]
 νειν ³⁸τοτε λεγει αυτοις περιλυ
 πος εστιν η ψυχη μου εως θα
 νατου μεινατε ωδε και γρηγο
 ρειτε μετ εμου ³⁹και προσελθ[ων]
 μικρον επεσεν επι προ[οσ]ω[πον]
 αυτου προσευχομενος κα[ι]
 λεγων ^{μου}περ ει δυνατον εστ[ιν]

² In Roberts's *ed. pr.*, the *nomen sacrum* is transcribed as ιη instead of ις. There is also an error in the placement of the opening bracket in the third line of this transcription, which has been corrected here.

P³⁷ (P.Mich.Inv. 1570)

(12) Matthew 26:26–28 (Recto)

[²⁶βετε φαγε]τε' τουτο' εστιν το σωμα μου' ²⁷και λαβων τ[ο ποτηριον]³
 [και ευχαρ]ιστησας' εδωκεν αυτοις' λεγων' πιετε εξ [αυτου παν]
 [τες ²⁸τουτ]ο γαρ εστιν το αιμα μου της διαθηκης τ[ο περι]

(13–14) Matthew 26:34 (Recto)

[³⁴ε]φη αυτω και ο ιης αμην λεγω σοι οτι ταυτη τη νυ
 [κ]τι πριν αλεκτορα φ[ωνησαι τρις απαρνη]ση με

(15) Matthew 25:40–42 (Verso)

[⁴⁰τε μι]αν ωραν εγρηγορησαι μετ εμου' ⁴¹εγρηγορειτε και
 [προσευ]χεσθε ινα μη ελθητε εις πειρασμον' το μεν πν[α]
 [προθυ]μον η δε σαρξ ασθενης' ⁴²παλιν εκ δευτε[ρου προ]

P¹⁰¹ (P.Oxy. 4401)

(16–17) Matthew 3:11–12 (Verso ↓)

[¹¹εγ]ω μ[εν υ]μας βαπτιζω εν
 [υ]δατι ε[ις] μετα[νοιαν ο]
 [δ]ε ερχο[μ]ενο[ς] ισχυροτε
 [ρ]ος μου ε[σ]τιν ο[υ] ουκ ειμι
 [ι]κανος τα υ[πο]δηματα κυψας⁴
 [λ]υ[σ]αι αυτος υμ[ας] βαπτισει
 [ε]ν πνι αγιω και [ι] πυρι ¹²ου το

(18–19) Matthew 3:16–17 (Recto →)

[¹⁶ειδεν τ]ο π[να] του θυ κατα⁵
 [βαινον] ως περιστ[εραν ερχο]
 [μενον ε]π αυτο[ν ¹⁷και ιδου]
 [φωνη εκ] τω[ν] ο[υ]ρα[ν]ων [λε]
 [γουσα ο]υτ[ο]ς ε[σ]τιν ο υς μ[ου]
 [ο αγαπη]τος εν ω ηυδοκ[ησα]

(20) Matthew 4:1–3 (Recto →)

[ι]ναι υπο το[υ] διαβολου ²κ[αι]
 [νηστευσα]ς μ ημερας κ[αι]
 [μ] νυκτ[ας] υστερον επε[ινα]
 [σεν ³και π]ροσελθων ο πει[ρα]

³ Sanders's *ed. pr.* does not include the second breathing mark on this line.

⁴ Thomas's *ed. pr.* has βας instead of κυψας at the end of this line and [τ]α[σ]αι at the beginning of the following line instead of [λ]υ[σ]αι. This transcription follows Comfort and Barrett.

⁵ Thomas does not reconstruct this line in his *ed. pr.* This transcription follows Comfort and Barrett.

P⁷⁰ (P.Oxy. 2384 + PSI Inv. CNR 419, 420)

(21) Matthew 11:26–27 (Verso)

²⁶προσ[θεν σου ²⁷παντα μοι παρε]
 δοθη υ[πο του πρς μου και ου]
 δεις γ[ινωσκει τον υιον ει μη]
 ο πηρ [ουδε τον πρᾶ τις επιγι]
 νωσκ[ει ει μη ο υς και ω εαν]

(22) Matthew 12:4–5 (Recto)

[⁴τον οικον του θυ και τους] αρ
 [τους της προθεσεως ε]φαγεν ο
 [ουκ εξον ην αυτω φαγ]ειν ουδε
 [τοις μετ αυτου ει μη το]ις ἱερευ
 [σιν μονοις ⁵η ουκ ανεγ]νωτε εν

P⁴ (BnF Suppl. Gr. 1120)⁶

(23–24) Luke 6:2–5 (Verso)

²βασιν· ³και αποκριθεις
 προς αυτους ειπεν ις·
 ουδε τουτο ανεγνω
 τε ο εποιησεν δαυιδ
 οτε επεινασεν αυτος
 και οι μετ αυτου· ⁴εις
 ηλθεν εις τ[ον] ο[ι]κον
 του θυ και τ[ο]υς αρτους
 της προθεσεως λα

(Recto)

βω[ν ε]φαγεν κ[αι]
 [εδωκε]ν τοις [μετ]
 [αυτου ο]υς ουκ ε[ξεστ]
 [ιν φαγ]ειν [ει μη] μο[νους]
 [του]ς ιερεις· ⁵και ελε
 [γε]ν αυτοις· κς εστι
 [ο υιος του ανθρωπου]
 [και του σαββατου]⁷

⁶ Scheil did not include underdots in his *ed. pr.* of P⁴ to denote letters with only partial traces. These have been supplied from Merell's 1938 edition.

⁷ The final two lines have been reconstructed in different ways by different editors and cannot be certain. These lines are reconstructed differently in the *ed. pr.* See discussion in the text.

(25) Luke 6:6–8 (Recto)

⁶ρα ⁷παρετηρουντο
 δε [α]υτον οι γραμμα
 τεις και οι φαρισαι
 οι ει εν τω σαββατω
 θεραπευσει ινα ευρω
 σ[ιν κα]τηγορειν αυ
 του· ⁸αυτος δε ηδει

P⁶⁹ (P.Oxy. 2383)

(26-27) Luke 22:40–45 (Recto →)

[⁴⁰εις πειρασ]μ[ον] ⁴¹κ[αι αυτος απεσ]⁸
 [πασθη απ αυτων ωσ]ει λιθου β[ολην]
 [και θεις τα γονατα προσ]ηυχετο
 [⁴⁵και αναστας απο] τη[ς προσευχης]⁹
 [ελθων προς τους μαθ]ητ[ας κοι]
 [μωμενους απο τη]ς λυπης [κ]αι

(28) Luke 22:47 (Recto →)

[⁴⁷ετι δε αυτου λαλουντος ι]δου
 [οχλος και ο λεγομενος ιου]δας Π¹⁰
 [εις των ιβ] προηρχετο α]υ[τ]ους
 [και εγγισας εφιλησε]ν τον ιην

(29) Luke 22:60–62 (Recto →)

⁶⁰εφωνησεν [αλεκτωρ ⁶¹και στρα]
 φεις ο πετρ[ος ενεβλεψεν αυ]
 τω τοτε [υπεμνησθη ο πετρος]
 του ρημ[ατος του κυ ως ειπεν]
 αυτω π[ριν αλεκτορα φωνησαι ση]
 μ[ερον απαρνηση με τρις ⁶²και]

⁸ In his *ed. pr.*, Turner detects traces of letters on this line, but does not endeavor to reconstruct the words.

⁹ The last three lines are reconstructed differently in the *ed. pr.*

¹⁰ Turner notes the curved symbol, but does not offer a suggestion as to its purpose.

0171 (PSI 2.124)

(30–32) Matthew 10:17–19 (Recto)
 [¹⁷δε απο των ανθρω]πων πα
 [ραδωσουσιν] γαρ υ̅μας
 [εις συνεδρι]α και εις
 [τας συναγ]ωγας αυτω̅
 [μαστιγω]σουσιν υ̅μας
 [¹⁸και επι η]γεμονων και
 [βασιλεω]ν σταθησεσθε
 [ενεκεν] εμου̅ εις μαρ
 [τυριον] αυτοις και τοις
 [εθνεσ]ιν ¹⁹οταν δε παρα
 [δωσιν] υ̅μας μη μεριμνη
 [σητε τι] λαλησητ[ε] δοθη
 [σεται γ]αρ υ̅μειν [εν ε]κει
 [νη τη] ωρα τι λα[λησητε]

(33–34) Matthew 10:28–31 (Verso)

²⁸ναι εν γεε[ννη ²⁹ουχι δυο]
 στρουθια ασ[σαριου πω]
 λουνται και [εν εξ αυτων]
 ου πεσειται ε[πι την γην]
 ανευ του πα[τρος υ̅]
 μων ³⁰αλλα κα[ι αι τριχες]
 της κεφαλης [υμων]
 πασαι ηριθμημ[εναι ει]
 σιν ³¹μη ουν φο[βεισθε]

0171 (PSI 2.124)

(35) Luke 22:45 (Recto)
⁴⁵και αναστας απο [της]
 προσευχης και ελ[θων]
 προς τους μαθητα[ς ευ]
 ωμ
 ρεν κοιμενους α[υ]
 τους απο της λυπ[ης]

(36-39) Luke 22:49–55 (Recto)

⁴⁹μαχα[ιρη] ⁵⁰και επαταξεν]
 εις [τις εξ αυτων του]
 (Verso)
 [δου]λον του αρχιερε
 [ως] και αφειλεν το ους
 [αυ]του το δεξιον ⁵²ειπε(ν)
 [δε] ιης προς τους παρα
 [γε]νομενους επ αυτο(ν)
 [αρ]χιρεις και στρατη
 [γο]υς του ιερου ως επ[ι]
 [ληστ]ην εξηλθετε με
 [τα μ]αχαιρων ⁵³το καθ η
 [με]ραν οντος μου εν
 [τω ι]ερω ουκ εξετεινα
 [τε τας] χειρας επ εμε [αλλα]¹¹
 [αυτη εστιν υμων η] ω[ρα]
 [και η εξου]σ[ια]
 [του σκοτους] ⁵⁴συλ]
 [λαβοντες δε αυτον η]
 [γαγον και εισηγα]
 [γον αυτον] εις [την] οικ[ια]¹²
 [του αρχιε]ρεως ο δε [πε]
 [προς ηκο]λουθει απ[ο]
 [μακροθεν]⁵⁵αψαντων δε

(40) Luke 22:60–63 (Verso)

[⁶⁰σεν αλεκτωρ ⁶¹και υπεμ]
 νησ[θη του λογου του κυ]
⁶³και ο[ι ανδ]ρε[ς οι συνεχο]¹³

P⁷⁵ (P. Bodmer XIV and XV)

(1) Luke 3:21–22 (Leaf 9 Verso)

[²¹νο]ν ²²κ[αι καταβ]ηνα[ι] π̄νᾱ το αγ̄ιο̄
 [σωματ]ικω̄ [ειδει ως περισ]τ[εραν]
 [επ αυτον]]

¹¹ Pistelli's *ed. pr.* does not have τας. This transcription follows Comfort and Barrett's emendation.

¹² Lines 14–18 on the verso are not reconstructed in the *ed. pr.* This transcription follows Comfort and Barrett except for the placement of ωρα.

¹³ These three lines are reconstructed differently in the *ed. pr.* This transcription essentially follows Comfort and Barrett, but concedes to the *ed. pr.* with regard to letters with only traces left on the manuscript.

(2–3) Luke 4:35–36 (Leaf 11 Verso)

³⁵και επ[ετιμη]σεν αυτω ο ιησ λε
γων· φ[ι]μωθητι και εξελθε εξ
αυτου και ρει[ψαν αυ]τον το δαιμο
νιον [εις] το μεσον εξ[ηλθ]εν εξ αυ
του μηδεν βλαψαν α[υ]τον· ³⁶και

(4) Luke 6:32–34 (Leaf 14 Recto)

[³²αυτου]ς αγαπωσιν· ³³και γαρ εαν [αγα]
[θοποιη]τε τους αγαθοποιουντ[ας]
[υμας πο]ια υμιν [χαρις] εστιν· κ[αι]
οι αμαρ[τω]λοι το αυ[το πο]ι[ο]υσιν· [³⁴και]

(5) Luke 6:48–7:1 (Leaf 15 Verso)

[⁴⁸θα]ι αυτην [⁴⁹ο δε α]κουσ[ας και μη]
(Recto)
[ποιησας ο]μοιος [εσ]τ[ι]ν ανθρωπω
[οι]κοδομησαντι την οικιαν επι
την γην χωρις θεμελιου· η προσ
ερρηξεν ο ποταμος και ευθυς συν
επεσεν· και εγενετο το ρηγμα τ[ης]
οικι[ας εκειν]ης μεγα· ^{7:1}επειδ[η]

(6) Luke 7:21–23 (Leaf 16 Recto)

[²¹σα]το βλεπειν· ²²και απ[ο]κρι[θεις]
[ειπεν αυτ]οις· πορευ[θεν]τ[ες απαγ]
γ[ειλατε] ιωανει α ει[δε]τε και ηκου
σατ[ε] τ[υ]φλοι αναβλ[ε]πουσιν και¹⁴
χω[λ]οι περιπατουσ[ι]ν λεπροι κα
θα[ρι]ζονται και [κω]φοι ακουουσι
ν[εκ]ροι [εγειρονται] πτωχοι ευαγ
γελιζονται ²³και μακαριος ε[στιν]¹⁵

¹⁴ The word και was later deleted by overdots.

¹⁵ Neither Martin and Kasser's *ed. pr.* nor Comfort and Barrett's edition signal where the lacuna begins in this line, but apparently it is after the verse in question here since both editions mark the nu with an underdot signaling that partial traces of the letter are legible.

- (7–8) Luke 8:4–8 (Leaf 17 Recto)
 [⁴αυτον ειπεν δια παρ]αβολης ⁵εξη[λ]
 [θεν ο σπειρων του σ]πειραι τον >
 [σπορον αυτου και εν τ̄]ω σπειρ[ει]ν
 (Leaf 18 Verso)
 αυτον ο μεν επεσεν παρα την ο
 δον και κατεπατηθη και τα πε
 τεινα του ουρανου κατεφαγεν
 αυτα· ⁶και ετερον κατεπεσεν επι
 πετραν και φυεν εξηρανθη δι
 α το μη εχειν ἴκμαδα· ⁷και ετερο̄
 επεσεν εν μεσω των ακανθων
 και συμφύισαι αι ακανθαι απεπνι
 ξαν αυτα· ⁸και ετερον επεσεν εις
- (9) Luke 8:15–17 (Leaf 18 Verso)
 [¹⁵πο]φορουσιν εν ὑπομονη· ¹⁶ουδεις
 [δε] λυχνον αφας καλυπτει αυτον
 [σκ]ευει. η ὑποκατω κλεινης τιθη
 (Recto)
 σιν αλλ' επι λυχνιας τιθησιν [¹⁷ο]ν [γαρ]
- (10) Luke 8:20–22 (Leaf 18 Recto)
 ²⁰λουντες σε· ²¹ο δε αποκριθεις ειπεν προς
 αυτον· μητηρ μου και αδελφοι μου
 ουτοι εισιν οι τον λογον του θ̄υ ακου
 οντες και ποιουντες· ²²εγενετο
- (11) Luke 8:28–29 (Leaf 18 Recto)
 ²⁸ιδων δε τον ιν ανακραξας π[ροσεπε]
 σεν αυτω· και φωνη μεγαλ[η ειπεν]
 τι εμοι και σοι ῡιε του θ̄υ τ̄ου υψιστου]
 (Leaf 19 Verso)
 δεομαι σου μη με βασανισης· ²⁹παρηχ
- (12) Luke 8:43–44 (Leaf 19 Recto)
 ⁴³κ[αι γυνη ο]υσα εν ρυσι αιματος απο ε
 τω[ν ιβ] ητις ουκ ἴσχυσεν απ ουδε
 νος θ[ερ]απειθηται· ⁴⁴προ[σε]λθουσα οπ[ι]
- (13) Luke 8:51–53 (Leaf 19 Recto)
 ⁵¹την [μητερα ⁵²εκλαιο]ν δε παντες και
 εκοπ[τοντο αυτην] ο δε ειπεν μη
 [κ]λᾱ[ιετε ουκ α]πεθα[νε]ν αλλα καθ[ε]ν
 (Leaf 20 Verso)
 δει· ⁵³και κατεγελω[ν α]υτου ειδοτες

(14) Luke 9:11–13 (Leaf 20 Recto)
¹¹θεραπειας ἰ[ατ]ο ¹²η δε η]μερα ηρξατο
 κλεινειν· προσελθόντες δε οἱ ἰβ
 ειπον αυτω· απολύσον τούς οχλους
 ἵνα πορευθεντες εις τας κυκλω κω
 μας και αγρους καταλυσωσιν· και ευ
 ρωσιν επισιτισμον ο[τι] ωδε εν ερη
 μω τοπ[ω εσ]μεν[¹³ειπεν δε προς] αυ

(15) Luke 9:22–24 (Leaf 21 Verso)
²²τριτη εγερθηναι· ²³ελε[γεν δε] προς
 παντας· ει τις θελει οπισω [μ]ου ερ
 χεσθαι απαρνησασθω εαυτον και
 αρατω τον σ̄ρον̄ αυτου καθ ημεραν
 κα[ι] ακολουθειτω μοι· ²⁴ος γαρ [εα]ν θε

(16–17) Luke 9:27–29 (Leaf 21 Verso)
²⁷του θυ· ²⁸εγενετο δε μετα τ[ους λ]ο
 [γ]ους τουτους ωσει ημεραι η [και παρα]
 λαβων πετρον και ἰακωβο[ν και ιω]
 ἀ[νην] και ανεβη εις το ορος [προσευξ]α
 σθαι· ²⁹και εγενετο εν τω πρ[οσευχ]ε

(18) Luke 9:47–49 (Leaf 22 Verso)
⁴⁷αυτο παρ εαυ[τ]ω ⁴⁸και ειπεν αυτο[ις]
 ο[ς ε]αν δεξηται τ[ο παιδιο]ν τουτο ε
 πι τω ονοματ[ι μο]υ εμε δεχηται·
 και ος δ αν εμε δεξηται· δεχεται το
 αποστειλαντα με· ο γαρ μεικροτε
 ρος εν πασιν ῡμιν ῡπαρχων· ουτος
 εστιν μεγ[ας ⁴⁹α]ποκριθεις δε ἰωανης

(19) Luke 10:7 (Leaf 22 Recto)
⁷εν αυτη δε τη οικ[ια με]ντε εσθ[ιον] ¹⁶
 τες και πεινοντε[ς τα παρ α]υτων αξι
 ος γαρ ο εργατης το[υ μισθου] αυτου·
 μη μεταβαινετε [εξ οικ]ιας εις οικιᾱ·

(20) Luke 10:14–16 (Leaf 23 Verso)
¹⁴εν τη κρισει η ῡμιν· ¹⁵και συ καφαρ
 ναουμ· μη εως ουρανου ῡψωθη
 ση· εως του αδου καταβηση· ¹⁶ο α

¹⁶ The *ed. pr.* does not include the iota in the second lacune, probably by accident. This transcription follows Comfort and Barrett.

- (21) Luke 10:20–21 (Leaf 23 Recto)
²⁰γραπτ[αι ε]ν τοις ουρανοις· ²¹εν αυτη
 τη ωρ[α ηγ]αλλιασατο τω πνι τω αγι
 ω και [ει]πεν εξομολογουμαι σοι
 πατ[ερ] κε του ουρανου και της γης
 [οτ]ι [απε]κρυψας ταυτα απο σοφων και
 [συνε]των και απεκαλυψας αυτα
 [νη]πιοις· ναι ο πατηρ οτι ουτως
 [ε]υδοκια εγενετο εμπροσθεν σου·
- (22) Luke 11:14 (Leaf 25 Verso)
¹³αιτουσιν αυτον· ¹⁴και ην εκβαλ
 λων δαιμονιον κωφον· εγενετο
 δε του δαιμονιου εξελθοντος
 ελαλησεν ο κωφος και εθαυμασαν
 οι οχλοι· ¹⁵τινες δε εξ αυτων ειπον·
- (23) Luke 11:19–21 (Leaf 25 Verso)
¹⁹υμων κριται εσονται· ²⁰ει δε εν δα
 κτυλω θυ εγω εκβαλλω τα δαι
 μονια αρα εφθασεν εφ υμας η βα
 σιλεια του θυ· ²¹οταν ο ισχυρος κα
- (24–25) Luke 11:23–25 (Leaf 25 Verso) _____
²³πισει· ²⁴οταν δε το ακαθαρτον πνα
 εξελθη απο του ανου διερχεται
 δι ανυδρων· τοπων ζητουν
 αναπαυσιν και μη ευρισκον
 (Recto)
 τοτε λεγει υποστρεψω εις τον οικον
 μου οθεν [ε]ξηλθον· ²⁵και ελθον ευρι
- (26) Luke 11:30–32 (Leaf 25 Recto)
³⁰του ανου τη γενεα ταυτη· ³¹βασιλις
 νοτου
 [[κα]] εγερθησεται εν τη κρισει μετα
 των ανδρων της γενεας ταυτης
 και κατακρινει αυτην· οτι ηλθεν
 εκ των περατων της γης ακουσαι
 την σοφιαν σολομωνος και ιδου
 πλειον σολομωνος ωδε· ³²ανδρες νι

- (27–28) Luke 11:32–35 (Leaf 25 Recto)
³²πλειονα ἴωνα ὦδε· ³³οὐδεις λυχνο̄
 αψας εις κρυπτην τιθησιν ἀλλ' ε̄
 πι την λυχνιαν ἵνα οἱ εισπο
 ρενομενοι το φως βλέπωσιν·
³⁴ο λυχνος του σωματος εστιν ο ο
 φθαλμος σου· οταν ο οφθαλμος
 σου απλους ἡ και ολον το σωμα σου
 φωτεινον εστιν επαν δε πονηρος
 (Leaf 26 Verso)
 ἡ και το σωμα σου σκοτεινον· ³⁵σκο
- (29) Luke 11:48 (Leaf 26 Recto)
⁴⁸αρα μαρτυρειτε και συνευδοκει
 τε τοις εργοις των πατερων ὑμῶ
 οτι αυτοι μεν απεκτειναν αυτους.
- (30) Luke 11:49–51 (Leaf 26 Recto)
⁴⁹διωξουσιν ⁵⁰ἵνα εκζητηθη το αιμα
 παντων των προφητων το εκ
 χυνομενον απο καταβολης κο
 σμου απο της γενεας ταυτης· ⁵¹α
- (31–32) Luke 12:28–32 (Leaf 28 Verso)
²⁸ὑμας ολιγοπιστοι· ²⁹και ὑμεις μη
 ζητειτε τι φαγησθε η τι πιητε
 και μη μετεωριζεσθε· ³⁰ταυτα γαρ
 παντα τα εθνη του κοσμου επι >
 ζητουσιν· ὑμων δε ο πατηρ οιδε̄
 οτι χρηζετε τουτων· ³¹πλην ζη
 τειτε την βασιλειαν και ταυτα >
 προστεθησεται ὑμιν· ³²μη φοβου
- (33) Luke 12:42–44 (Leaf 28 Recto)
⁴²μετρειον· ⁴³μακαριος ο δουλος εκεινος
 ὄν ελθων ο κς̄ αυτου ευρησει ουτω[ς]¹⁷
 ποιουντα· ⁴⁴αληθως λεγω ὑμιν οτι
- (34) Luke 13:29–30 (Leaf 30 Recto)
²⁹βασιλεια του θῡ· ³⁰και ἴδου εισιν οἱ [ε]¹⁸
 σχατοι οἱ εσονται πρωτοι· και ει
 σιν πρωτοι οἱ εσονται εσχατοι

¹⁷ In the manuscript, the breathing mark falls over the nu.

¹⁸ In the manuscript, the breathing mark falls over the omicron.

- (35–36) Luke 13:34–14:1 (Leaf 30 Recto)
³⁴ουκ ηθελησατε· ³⁵ιδου αφιεται υ
 μιν ο οικος υμων· λεγω δε υ>
 μιν ου μη με ιδητε εως ειπη
 τε ευλογημενος ο ερχομενος εν
 ονοματι κυ· ^{14:1}και εγενετο εν
- (37) Luke 14:26–28 (Leaf 32 Verso)
²⁶θητης· ²⁷οστις ου βασταζει τον σ̄ρον̄
 αυτου και ερχεται οπισω μου. ου
 δυναται ειναι μου μαθητης· ²⁸τις
- (38) Luke 14:33–35 (Leaf 32 Verso)
³³τας· ³⁴καλον ουν το αλας εαν δε
 το αλα μωρανθη. εν τινι αρτυθη
 σεται· ³⁵ουτε εις την γην ουτε εις
- (39) Luke 16:29–31 (Leaf 34 Recto)
²⁹τωσαν αυτων· ³⁰ο δε ειπεν ουχι πατε[ρ]
 αβρααμ' αλλ εαν τις απο νεκρων εγ[ε]ρ
 θη προς αυτους μετανοησουσιν· ³¹ει
- (40) Luke 17:13–15 (Leaf 35 Verso)
¹³επιστατα ελεησον ημας ¹⁴και ιδω̄
 ειπεν αυτοις [[ε]]πορευθεντες επῑ¹⁹
 δειξατε εαυτους τοις ιερευσι
 και εγενετο εν τω υπαγειν αυτους
 εκαθαρισθησαν ¹⁵εις δε εξ αυτων ι
- (41) Luke 17:23–25 (Leaf 35 Recto)
²³τε· ²⁴ωσπερ γαρ η αστραπη αστραπτου
 σα εκ της υπο τον ουρανον εις την
 υπ ουρανον λαμπει. ουτως εστ[αι]
 ο υιος του ανου· ²⁵πρωτον δε δει α[υ]
- (42) Luke 22:17–19 (Leaf 42 Recto)
 [¹⁷του]ς· ¹⁸λεγω [γαρ] υμιν ο[υ μη] πιω [απο του]
 [νυ]ν απο τ[ου] γενημ[ατος τ]ης α[μπε]
 λ[ο]υ [εως ου η βα]σιλει[α του] θ̄υ ε[λθη] ¹⁹και

¹⁹ Following αυτοις there is an instertion mark referring to the following words in the lower margin: θελω καθαρισθητε κ ευθεως εκαθαρισθησαν. The epsilon in επορευθεντες was deleted by an overdot.

- (43–44) Luke 22:40–45 (Leaf 43 Recto)
⁴⁰εἰσελθὲν εἰς πειρασμὸν· ⁴¹καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπεσπᾶ
 [σ]ῆθις ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ λίθου βολῆν· καὶ θεῖς
 [τ]ὰ γόνατα προσευξάτο ⁴²λεγὼν· πατέρ
 [εἰ] βούλει παρενεγ’ κε τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον
 [α]π’ ἐμοῦ· πλην μὴ τὸ θέλημα μου ἀλλ’
 [λα] τὸ σὸν γένησθω· ⁴⁵καὶ ἀναστὰς ἀπο
- (45) Luke 22:49–50 (Leaf 43 Recto)
 [⁴⁹ε]ν μαχαίρῃ· ⁵⁰καὶ ἐπάταξεν εἰς τὴν εὐ
 αὐτῶν τὸν δούλον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως
 [κ]αὶ ἀφείλεν τὸ οὖς αὐτοῦ τὸ δεξιόν·
- (46) Luke 22:61–62 (Leaf 43 Verso)
⁶¹καὶ στραφεὶς ὁ κς ἐνεβλεψεν τῷ πε
 τρῷ· καὶ ὑπεμνήσθη ὁ πέτρος τοῦ
 ῥήματος τοῦ κς ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὅτι [ι]
 πρὶν ἀλεκτορα φωνῆσαι σήμερον
 ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρεῖς· ⁶²καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐξῶ
- (47) Luke 23:2–4 (Leaf 44 Recto)
 [Ἰ]ησοῦς βασιλεὺς εἶναι· ³ὁ δὲ πειλάτος ἤρω
 [τ]ῆσεν αὐτὸν λέγων· σύ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς >
 [τ]ῶν Ἰουδαίων ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε
 [σ]υ λέγεις ⁴ὁ δὲ πειλάτος εἶπεν πρὸς τοὺς
- (48) Luke 23:33–35 (Leaf 44 Verso)
³³ἐξ ἀριστερῶν ³⁴διαμεριζόμενοι δὲ τὰ
 ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐβάλον κληρὸν· ³⁵καὶ ἴστη
- (49) Luke 24:1–2 (Leaf 45 Verso)
¹τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ὀρθρὸν βαθεῶς
 ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον ἦλθαν φερούσαι ἅ τῃ
 τοίμασαν ἀρώματα· ²εὐρον δὲ τὸν λίθον
- (50) Luke 24:26–27 (Leaf 46 Recto)
²⁶οὐχὶ ταῦτα εἶδε παθεῖν τὸν χς καὶ εἰσελ
 (δοξάν)
 θεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ· ²⁷καὶ ἀρξά
- (51) Luke 24:47–48 (Leaf 46 Verso)
⁴⁷καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ με
 τανοῖαν εἰς ἀφ᾽ ἑσθῆς ἀμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα
 τὰ ἔθνη· ἀρξάμενον ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλῆμ ⁴⁸ὑμεῖς μαρ

P⁴⁵ (P.Chester Beatty I)²⁰

(1–2) Matthew 20:30–31 (Leaf 1 Recto)

³⁰τη]ν οδον ακουσαντες [οτι
 ημα]ς κ̄ε ῡε δαυιδ ³¹ο δε ο[χλος²¹
 πολ]λω εκραυγασαν [λεγοντες²²

(3) Matthew 26:4–6 (Leaf 2 Verso)²³

[⁴το ινα τον ιη δο]λωι κ[ρα]τ[η]σω[σιν και απο]κτεινωσι[ν· ⁵ελεγον δε]
 [μη εν τη εορ]τηι μη θορυβος γενητα]ι εν τωι λαωι· ⁶τωι δε]

(4) Matthew 26:22–24 (Leaf 2 Recto)

[²²ξ]αντο λεγειν εις εκ[ατος αυ]των μητι εγω ειμ[ι κ̄ε· ²³ο δε ιη αποκρι]
 [θ]εις ειπεν ο εμβαψ[ας την χ]ειρα μετ' εμου εν τ[ωι τρυβλιωι ουτος]
 [μ]ε παραδωσει· ²⁴ο μ[εν ῡς του α]νθρωπου υπαγει κ[αθως γεγραπται]

(5–6) Matthew 26:26–29 (Leaf 2 Recto)

[²⁶μαθ]ηταις ειπεν· λαβετε φαγε]τε· του[το εστιν το σωμα μου· ²⁷και]
 [λ]αβων το ποτηριον κ[αι ευχαρισ]τησας [εδωκεν αυτοις λεγων· πι]
 [ε]τε εξ αυτου παντες [· ²⁸τουτο εσ]τιν το [αιμα μου της διαθηκης]
 [το περι πι]ολλων εκχυ[ννομενον εις αφ]εσιν [αμαρτιων· ²⁹λεγω]

(7–8) Matthew 26:30–34 (Leaf 2 Recto)

[³⁰ω]ν ³¹τοτε λεγει αυτοις ο [ιη· παντες ῡμεις σκα]νδαλ[ισθησεσθε εν τη]
 [νυκ]τι ταυτη· γεγραπ[ται γαρ παταξω τον πι]οιμε[να και διασκορπι]
 [σθ]ησεται τα προβατα τ[ης ποιμνης· ³²μετα δε το [εγερθηναι με προ]
 [α]ξω ῡμας εις την γα[λιλαιαν· ³³αποκριθεις] δε ο πι[ετρος ειπεν ει και]
 παντες σκανδαλισ[θησονται εν σοι εγω ουδεποτε σκανδαλι]
 σθησομαι· ³⁴εφη αυ[τωι ο ιη· αμην λεγω σοι οτι εν ταυτη τη νυκτι]

(9–13) Luke 9:26–31 (Leaf 10 Recto)

[²⁶του και του πρς και των αγιων αγγελων ²⁷λεγω δε ῡμιν αληθως οτι ει
 σιν τινες τω]ν ωδε εστηκοτων οι ου] μη γευσωνται θανατου εως
 αν ιδωσιν την βασι[λειαν του θυ] ²⁸εγενετο δε μετα τους λογου[ς του]
 τους ωσει ημεραι [οκ]τω πα[ραλαβ]ων πετρον και [ι]ακωβον και [ι]ω
 αννην ανεβη ει[ς] το ορος προ[οσευ]ξασθαι· ²⁹και εγενετο εν τωι [προσ]
 ευξασθαι αυτον το ειδος του προσωπου αυτου ετερον και ο ιματ[ισμος]
 αυτου λευκο[ς εξ]ασ[τρ]απτων ³⁰και ιδου ανδρες δυο συνλαλουντ[ες]
 αυτωι οιτι[νε]ς ησαν μωσης και ηλειας ³¹οι οφθεντες εν δοξηι [ελε]

²⁰ Most of the fragments of P⁴⁵ are damaged on both sides making reconstruction difficult.

²¹ Kenyon's *ed. pr.* has ῡε.

²² This transcription follows Comfort and Barrett in detecting traces of the second lambda.

²³ The lines from Matthew 26 follow Zuntz's transcription.

(14–15) Luke 9:33–36 (Leaf 10 Recto)

³³αν ηλεια μη ειδως ο λεγει· ³⁴ταυτα δε αυτου λεγοντος εγεν[ετο] νεφε[λ]η και επεσκιασεν αυτους εφοβηθησαν δε εν τω[ι ε] κεινους εισελθειν εις την νεφελην· ³⁵και φωνη εγενε[το] εκ της νεφελης ουτος εστιν ο υς μου ο εκλελεγμενος· [αυ] του ακουετε· ³⁶και εγενετο εν τωι γενεσθαι την φωνην [ευ]

(16–18) Luke 9:47–50 (Leaf 10 Verso)

[⁴⁷το π]αρ εαυτωι· ⁴⁸και ειπεν ος αν [δεξηται το παιδι]ον επι τωι ονο²⁴ [ματι] μου εμε δεχεται· και ος αν [εμε] δεξ[ηται] δεχεται τον απο [στει]λαντα με ο γαρ μεικροτε[ρος] εν πα[σιν υ]μων υπαρχων ουτος [εστ]ιν ο μεγας ⁴⁹αποκριθεις δε ιωαννης ει[ι]πεν [δι]δασκαλε ει [δομε]ν τινα εν τωι ονοματι σου εκβαλλον[τ]α δ[αιμ]ονια και εκω [λυο]μεν [ο]τι ουκ ακολουθει μεθ ημων· ⁵⁰ειπεν δε προς αυτον ο ιη

(19) Luke 10:10–12 (Leaf 11 Verso)

¹⁰πλατειας [αυτης] ειπατε ¹¹και τον κ[ο]ν[ιορτο]ν ημ[ιν εκ] της πλε ως εις του[ς] ποδας] απομασσομεθα πλην τουτο γεινωσκετε [οτι] ηγγικεν η [βασ]ιλεια του θυ ¹²λεγω υμιν οτι σοδομοις εν [τηι]

(20) Luke 10:14–16 (Leaf 11 Verso)

¹⁴και σ[ε]ι[δω]νι ανεκτοτερον εσται η υμιν· ¹⁵και συ καφαρν[α]ουμ' μη εω[ς ου]ρανου υψωθηση και εως αδου καταβιβασθηση [¹⁶ο α]κο[υ]

(21) Luke 10:20–22 (Leaf 11 Verso)

ρετε δε οτι τα ονοματα υμων εγ[ραφη ε]ν τοις ουρανοις· ²¹εν αυτ[ηι] τηι ωρα ηγαλλιασατο εν τωι π[νι και ειπε]ν εξομολογουμαι σο[ι] πρ[ο] κε του ουρανου οτι απεκ[ρυψας ταυτα απο] σοφων και συνετω και απεκαλυψας αυτα ν[ηπιοις και ουτως εγενετο ευ]δοκια ε [μ]προσθεν σου· ²²παν[τα μοι παρεδοθη] υπο του πρ[ο]ς μου και ουδεις]

(22–30) Luke 11:10–19 (Leaf 12 Recto)

¹⁰ανυγησεται· ¹¹τινα γαρ εξ υμων [πρ[ο] αι]τησει υς [ι]χθυν και αντι ιχθυος οφιν επιδωσει αυτωι· ¹²η κ[αι] εαν αιτηση αρτον επιδωσει αυτωι σκορπιον· ¹³ει ουν υμει[ς] πονηροι υπαρχοντες οιδατε αγαθα δοματα διδοναι τοις τεκν[ο]ις υμων ποσω μαλλον ο πρ[ο] υμων ο ουρανιος δωσει παν[τα] αγα[θ]ον τοις αιτου[σιν] αυτον· ¹⁴και ην εκβαλλων δαιμονιον κωφον· και εγενετο του δαιμονιου εξελθοντος ελαλησεν και εθαυμασαν [ο]ι οχλοι· ¹⁵τινες δε εξ αυτω[ν] ελαλησαν οχυροι λεγοντες· εν βεελζεβουλ' τωι αρχοντι των δα[ι]μονιων εκβαλλει τα δαιμονια· ¹⁶ετεροι δε πειραζοντες σημειον εξ ουρανου εζητουν παρ αυτου· ¹⁷αυτος δε ειδως τα διανοημ[α]τα αυτων ειπεν αυτοις· πασα βασ[ι]λεια μερισθε[ισα] εφ εαυτην ερημουται· και οικος επι οικον πιπτει· ¹⁸ει δε και ο σατανας εφ εαυτον μερισθη πως σταθησεται η βασιλεια αυτου οτι λεγετε εν βεελζεβουλ' εκβαλλει τα δαιμονια· ¹⁹ει δε εγω εν βεελζεβουλ'

²⁴ Ed pr. has [δεξηται τουτο το παιδι]ον.

(31) Luke 11:23–24 (Leaf 12 Recto)

σκορπιζει· ²⁴οταν δε το ακ[αθαρτον π̄νᾱ εξελθη απο του ανθρω] που διερχεται δι ανυδ[ρων τοπων ζητουν αναπαυσιν και μη]²⁵ εγρισκων λεγει υπ[οστρεψω εις τον οικον μου οθεν εξηλθον]

(32–33) Luke 11:29–32 (Leaf 12 Verso)

²⁹το ἴωνα ³⁰κα[θ]ως [γαρ εγενετο ἴωνας σημειον το]ις νινευε[ιται]ς ουτως εσται ο υς τ[ο]υ α[νθρωπου τη γενεα ταυτη] ³¹βασιλισσα ν[οτ]ου εγερθη σεται μετ[α] τω[ν ανδρων της γενεας τ]αυτης και κατακρινει αυ την οτι ηλ[θ]εν [ε]κ τ[ων περατων της] γης ακουσαι την σοφιαν σο λομωνος και ἴδου πλ[ειον σολομ]ωνος ωδε· ³²ανδρες νινευειται

(34–36) Luke 11:32–35 (Leaf 12 Verso)

³²ἴωνα ωδε· ³³ουδεις λυχνον α[ψ]ας εις κρυπτον τιθησιν αλλα επι την λυχνιαν ἵνα οἱ εισπορευομ[ε]νοι το φεγγος βλεπωσιν· ³⁴ο λυχνος του σωματος εστ[ι]ν ὁ οφθαλμος [σ]ου· οταν ὁ οφθαλμος σου απλους η και παν το σωμα σ[ο]υ φωτεινον εσται· επαν δε πονηρος η και το σωμα σου σκοτεινον εσται· ³⁵σκο[π]ει ουν μη το φως το εν σοι σκοτος εστιν·

(37–38) Luke 11:42–43 (Leaf 12 Verso)

⁴²αλλ ουαι ὑμιν φαρεισαιοι[ς] α]ποδεκατουτε το ηδυοσμον και το ανηθον και παν λαχαν[ον και] παρερχεσθε την κρισιν και την αγα πην του θυ· ταυτα δε εδ[ει ποιησαι] κακεινα μη αφειναι· ⁴³ουαι ὑμιν

(39–43) Luke 11:54–12:8 (Leaf 13 Verso)

^{11:54}του· ^{12:1}εν οἰς συναχθεισων των μυρ[ια]δων του λαου ωστε καταπα τειν αλληλους· ηρξατο δε λεγει[ν] π[ρ]ος τους μαθητας αυτου πρω τον προσεχετε εαυτοις απο της ζ[υ]μης των φαρεισαιων ητις ε στιν ὑποκρισις· ²ουδεν δε κεκαλ[υ]μμενον εστιν ὁ ουκ αποκα λυφθησεται· ³ανθων οσα εν τη σκ[ο]τια εαν ειπητε εν τωι φωτ[ι] ακουσθησεται· και ὁ προς το ους ελα[λ]ησατε εν τοις ταμειοις κη[ρυ] χθησεται επι των δωματων· ⁴λεγω δε ὑμιν τοις φιλοις μου μ[η] πποθητε απο των αποκτεινοντων το σωμα και μετα ταυτα μη εχοντων περισσοτερον τι ποιησαι· ⁵υποδειξω δε ὑμιν τῖνα φοβηθητε· φοβηθητε τον μετα το αποκτειναι εξουσιαν εχόντ[α] βα λειν εις την γεενναν· ναι λεγω υμιν τουτον φοβηθηται· ⁶ουχι πεντε στρουθια πωλειται ασσαριων δυο και ἓν εξ αυτων ουκ εστιν επιλελησμενον ενωπιον του θυ· ⁷αλλα και ἅι τριχες ὑμων τησ κεφαλης πασαι ηριθμημεναι μη φοβεισθε πολλων στρουθια διαφερετε· ⁸λεγω ὑμιν πας ὅς αν ομολογηση εν εμοι εμπροσθεν

(44) Luke 12:10–12 (Leaf 13 Verso)

¹⁰φεθησεται· ¹¹οταν δε εισφ[ερωσιν] υμας επι τα]ς αρχας και τας συν αγωγας και τας εξουσιαις [μη] μεριμνατε πως η τι απολογ]ησησθε η τι [ειπ]ητε ¹²το γαρ αγιον [πινα] διδαξει υμας εν αυτη τη ωρα α δ]ει ει

²⁵ Ed. pr. has ζητων.

- (45–49) Luke 12: 21–26 (Leaf 13 Recto)
²¹θησαυριζων εαυτω και μη εις θ̄ν̄ πλουτων· ²²ειπεν δε προς τους μαθ[ητας· δια τουτο λεγω υμιν] μη μεριμνατε τη ψυχη υμων τι φαγη[τε] μηδε τωι [σωματι] τι ενδυσησθε· ²³η ψυχη πλειον εστιν της τροφης και το [σωμ]α του ενδυματος· ²⁴κατανοησατε τα πετεινα του ουρανου κα[ι] τους κορακας οτι ου σπειρουσιν ουδε θεριζουσιν ο̄ις ουκ εστιν τα[μ]ειον ουδε αποθηκαι και ο θ̄ς̄ τρεφει αυτα· ποσω μαλλον ῡμεις δ[ι]αφερετε των πετεινων· ²⁵τις δε εξ υμων μεριμνων δυν[α]ται προσθειναι επι την ηλικιαν [α]υτου πηχυν· ²⁶ει ουν ουδε ελαχιστον δυνασθε τι περι των λοιπω̄
- (50) Luke 12:30–32 (Leaf 13 Recto)
³⁰ζητει· υμων δε ο π̄ρ̄ οιδεν οτ[ι] χρηζετε τουτων· ³¹πλην ζητειτε την βασιλειαν του θῡ και ταυτα προστεθησεται υμιν· ³²μη φο
- (51) Luke 12:42–44 (Leaf 14 Recto)
⁴²σιτομε[τριον] ⁴³μακαριος ο δουλος εκεινος ον ελθων ο κ̄ς̄ αυ]του ευρησει [ουτως] προ̄ιουντα· ⁴⁴αλ[ηθως] λεγω υμιν οτι επι πασιν τοις υ]παρχου
- (52) Luke 12:50–51 (Leaf 14 Recto)
⁵⁰πως συνεχομαι εως ουτου τελεσθ[η] ⁵¹δοκειτε οτι ειρηνην παρεγενομην δουναι επι της γης ουχι [λ]εγω υμιν αλλα διαμερισμον
- (53) Luke 13:18–20 (Leaf 14 Verso)
¹⁸ωσω αυτην· ¹⁹ομοια εστιν κοκ[κ]ωι σιναπεως ο̄ν λαβων ανθρωπος εβαλεν εις τον κηπον αυτου κ[αι η]υξησεν και εγενετο εις δενδρον μεγα και τα πετεινα του ουραν[ου] κατε]σκηνωσεν εν τοις κλαδοις αυτου· ²⁰και
- (54) Luke 13:29–31 (Leaf 15 Verso)
²⁹α]νακλι[θησονται εν τη βασιλεια του θῡ· ³⁰και ιδου εισιν εσχατοι οι εσον] [τ]αι πρωτοι και πρωτοι [εισιν οι εσονται εσχατοι· ³¹εν αυτη τη ωρα προσ]
- (55–56) Luke 13:34–14:1 (Leaf 15 Verso)
^{13:34}και ουκ ηθελησατε· ³⁵ιδ[ου] αφε[ιεται υμιν ο σ]ικ[ος υμων λ]εγω υμ[ιν] [ο]υ μη με ιδητε εως αν [ει]πητε ευ[λο]γημενος ο̄ ερχομενος εν ονοματι κῡ· ^{14:1}και εγενετο εν τωι ελθειν α[υ]τον εις οικον τιν[ος] των αρχον
- (57) Luke 14:2–4 (Leaf 15 Verso)
²αυτου· ³και αποκριθεις ο̄ ιη̄ς ειπεν π[ρος] τους νομικους και φαρισαιους λεγων εῑ εξεστιν τωι σαββατ[ωι] θε[ρα]πευσαι· ⁴οι δε ηουχασαν·
- (58) Luke 14:26–28 (Leaf 15 Recto)
²⁶δυναται μου ειναι μαθητ[ης] ²⁷οστις ου βασταζει τον σ̄ρν̄ αυτου και ερχεται οπισω μου ου δυνα[ται] μοῡ ειναι μαθητης ²⁸τις γαρ εξ [υ]

(59–61) Mark 5:21–22 (Leaf 3 Verso)

²¹του] ιη παλιν συ[νηχθη
θα]λασσαν²² και ιδου [ερχεται
ιαει]ροσ²² και ιδων αυ[τον

(62) Mark 5:42 (Leaf 4 Verso)

⁴²[α]νεστη το κορασιον [και
εξε]στησαν εκστασει [μεγαλη

(63) Mark 6:3 (Leaf 4 Verso)

³τεκτον]ος ο υ[ιος
ιο]υδ[α

(64–67) Mark 6:39–43 (Leaf 5 Recto)

[³⁹υ]αι συμποσια συμποσια επι χλωρωι χορτωι⁴⁰ κα[ι ανεπεσαν]
[πρασι]αι πρασιαι⁴¹ και λαβων τους αρτους και τους ιχθ[υας αναβλε]
[ψας ει]ς τον ουρανον ηυλογησεν⁴¹ και κατεκλασεν του[ς αρτους και]
[εδιδ]ου τοις μαθηταις αυτου⁴¹ ινα παραθωσιν αυτοις⁴¹ [και τους ιχθυας]
[εμε]ρισεν πασιν⁴² και εφαγον παντες και εχορτασθ[ησαν⁴³ και η]

(68–70) Mark 6:43–46 (Leaf 5 Recto)

[⁴³ων⁴⁴ κα]ι ησαν οι φαγοντες πεντακισχειλιοι ανδ[ρες⁴⁵ και ευθυς]
[ηναγκ]ασε τους μαθητας αυτου εμβηναι ει[ς το πλοιον και προαγειν εις το πε]
[ραν πρ]ος βηθσαιδαν εως αυτος απολυση [τον οχλον⁴⁶ και αποτα]

(71) Mark 7:5–7 (Leaf 5 Verso)

[εσθιουσιν τον α]ρτον⁶ ο δε αποκριθεις ειπεν αυτοις⁶ οτι καλ[ως επροφη]
[τευσεν ησαϊας] περι υμων ησαϊας των υποκριτων⁶ ως γε[γραπται]
[ουτος ο λαο]ς τοις χειλεσιν με τειμα⁶ η δε καρδια αυτ[ων]
[πορρω απεχει α]π εμου⁷ ματην δε σεβονται με⁷ διδασκον[τες]

(72–74) Mark 8:10–13 (Leaf 6 Recto)

¹⁰μαγεδ]αν¹¹ και εξη[λ]θον οι φαρισαιοι
συζητειν] αυτωι σημειον εκ του ουρανου π[αρ αυτου²⁶
πειρα]ζοντες αυτον¹² και αναστεναξας τωι [πνι
αυτ]η σημειον αιτει¹² αμην ει δοθησεται [τη
σημειο]ν¹³ και αφεις αυτους παλιν εμβας εις το πλοιο[ν

²⁶ This line follows Comfort and Barrett.

(75–79) Mark 8:15–21 (Leaf 6 Recto)

¹⁵φαρισαι]ων και της ζυμης των ηρωδιανων· ¹⁶οι δε [μαθηται
 διελογιζοντο] προς αλληλους οτι αρτους ουκ εχουσιν· ¹⁷και γν[ους
 αυτοις] τι διαλογιζεσθε εν εαυτοις ολιγοπιστοι [οτι
 ου]πω νοειτε ουδε συνειετε πεπωρωμεν[ην
 καρ]διαν υμων· ¹⁸οφθαλμους εχοντες ου βλε[πετε
 εχοντες] ουκ ακουετε· ουπω ν[ο]ειτε ουδε μνημον[ευετε
¹⁹τους ε] αρτους εκλασα εις πεντακιςχειλιους π[ο]σους
 κοφινου]ς κλασμάτων ηρατέ· λεγουσιν αυτωι ιβ· ²⁰οτε
 αρτο]υς εις τετρακιςχειλιους ποσων σπυριδων [κλασμάτων
 π]ληρωματα ηρατέ· οι δε [ε]ιπον επτα· ²¹και λεγει [αυτοις

(80–82) Mark 8:36–9:1 (Leaf 7 Recto)

^{8:36}ωφελει] ανθρωπον εαν κερδηση τον κοσμ[ον
 τ]ην ψυχην αυτου· ³⁷τι γαρ δωσει ανθρω[πος
 της ψ]υχης αυτου· ³⁸ος γαρ εαν επαισχυνθη [με
 εν τ]η γενεα τη μοιχαλιδι και αμρω[λωι
 ανθρωπου] επαισχυνθησεται αυτον οταν ελθη εν [τηι
 αυτο]υ και των αγγελων των αγιων· ^{9:1}και ελεγε[εν

(83) Mark 9:1–3 (Leaf 7 Recto)

εληλυ]θυϊαν εν δυναμει· ²και μεθ ημερα[ς
 ιης] τον πετρον και τον ιακωβον και τον ιω[αννην
 α]υτους εις ορος υψηλον καθ ιδιαν μον[ους
 προσε]υχεσθαι αυτους μετεμορφωθη ο ιης [3 και

(84–87) Mark 9:5–8 (Leaf 7 Recto)

⁵ειπ]εν πετρος τωι ιη̄ ραββει καλον [εστιν
 πο]ιησωμεν ωδε τρεις σκηνας σοι [μιαν
 ηλια] μιαν· ⁶ου γαρ ηδει τι λαλει ησαν [γαρ
⁷α]υτ[ο]υ[ς]· κ[αι
 ου]τος μ[ου εστιν ο υς ο α]γαπ[η]τος
⁸περιβλ]εψαμε[νοι ουδε]να ειδ[ον

(88–90) Mark 9:19–20 (Leaf 7 Verso)

¹⁹απο]κριθεις αυτοις ο ιη̄ ειπεν ω [γενεα
 διεστραμ]μενη· εως ποτε προς υμας εσομα[ι
 υμων] φερετε αυτον προς εμε· ²⁰και ηνεγκ[αν

(91–92) Mark 9:28–29 (Leaf 7 Verso)

²⁸και] εισελθοντι αυτωι προσηλθον [οι μαθηται
 κατ ιδιαν αυτ]ου· και ηρωτησαν αυτον λεγοντε[ς
 ηδυνηθημεν] εκβαλιν αυτο· ²⁹και ειπεν αυτοι[ς

(93) Mark 11:28–30 (Leaf 8 Verso)²⁷

[²⁸ποιεις η τις σοι τη]ν εξου[σιαν τα]υτην δεδωκεν ινα ταυτα ποιης ²⁹ο δε ιη] [ειπεν αυτοις επερ]ωτω [υμας καγω] ένα λ[ογον και αποκριθητε μοι και] [ερω υμιν εν ποια εξ]ουσια[ι τα]υτα ποιω ³⁰το βα[πτισμα το ιωαννου εξ]

(94) Mark 12:14–16 (Leaf 8 Recto)²⁸

[¹⁴σαρι δουναι η ου δω]μεν ουν η [μη δω]μεν [¹⁵ο δε ιδων αυτων την υπο] [κρισιν ειπεν αυτοις]´ τι με πειραζ[ετ]ε υποκ[ριται φερετε μοι δηνα] [ριον ινα ιδω ¹⁶οι δε η]νεγκαν´ κ[α]ι λεγ[ει αυ]τοις τινος η εικων αυτη]

P⁸⁸ (P.Med. 69.24)²⁹

(1) Mark 2:4–6 (Side A)

⁴κος κατεκειτο ⁵κ[α]ι ιδων [ο ις] την πιστιν αυτων λεγει τω παρ[α] λυτικω τεκνον αφεωνται σου αι αμαρτιαι ⁶ησαν δε [ε τι]νες των γραμ

(2) Mark 2:10–11 (Side B)

¹⁰ι[να δε] ειδητε οτ[ι] εξ[ου]σιαν [εχ]ει ο υι ος του ανου επι τη[ς] γης αφιενε α [μα]ρτιας λεγε[ι τ]ω [παρ]αλυτικω ¹¹εγ

(3–4) Mark 2:15–18 (Side C)

¹⁵και ηκολου[θουν] αυτω ¹⁶και οι γρα[μμα]τις των φαρισαιων και ιδοντ[ες ο] τι ησθ[ιεν μετα] των αμαρτωλων και των τελω[νω]ν ελεγον τοις μα[θη]ταις αυτου [οτι] μετα των τελω[νω(ν)] και των α[μαρ]τωλων [εσ]θιει κ[α]ι πι[ν]ει ¹⁷και ακουσ[ας ο] ις λεγε[ι] οτι ου χριαν εχουσιν ο[ι ισ]χυοντες ι ατρου αλλ οι κ[α]κως εχοντες ουκ ηλθον καλεσαι δ[ι]καιους αλλα αμαρτωλους ¹⁸και [η]σαν οι μαθηται ιωα(ν)

²⁷ These lines follow Comfort and Barrett.

²⁸ These lines follow Comfort and Barrett.

²⁹ In his *ed. pr.*, Daris capitalizes some letters, such as the first letter in proper nouns and at the beginning of some lines, that do not appear in my estimation to be larger than neighboring letters. They have not been capitalized in this transcription.

(5) Mark 2:21–23 (Side D)

²¹γ[ε]ται ²²και ουδ[εις βαλ]λει οινον νε
 [όν] εις ασκ[ους] παλ[αιους] ει δε μη ρηξει
 ο [οι]νος το[υς α]σκους και ο οίνος απολ
 λυται και οι ασκοι
 αλλα οινον [ν]εον εις ασκους καινους
 βλητεον ²³και εγενετο αυτον εν

0188 (P.Berlin 13416)*³⁰

(6–8) Mark 11:11–15 (Column 1)

[.....]
 [.¹¹δω]
 [δεκα] ¹²και τηι επ
 [αυ]ριον εξελθον
 [τω]ν αυτων απο
 βη<θ>αν[ια]ς επεινα
 σεν ¹³και ιδων συ
 κην απο μακ[ρ]ο
 θεν ηλθεν ως ευ
 ρησων τι εν αυτη
 ελθων δε ουδεν
 ευρεν εν αυτη·
 ου γαρ ην καρπος
 συκων· ¹⁴ο δε ιης
 ειπεν αυτη μη
 κετι μηδεις απο
 σου καρπον φα
 γοι εις τον αιωνα
 και ηκουον οι μα
 θηται αυτου ¹⁵και

³⁰ Salenius's transcription in the *ed. pr.* is in capital letters without spaces between the words. An overbar seems to have been placed incorrectly at the end of Column 2 line eight; it has been moved to line nine in this transcription.

(9–12) Mark 11:15–17 (Column 2)

¹⁵[_____]ερ
 [χονται εις ιμα] και
 [εισελ]θων εις το ιε
 [ρ]ον ηρξατ[ο εκβ]αλ
 [λ]ειν τους πωλου
 τ[ας και] αγοραζον
 τας [εν] τω ιερω
 και τας τραπεζας
 των κολλυβιστω
 και τας καθεδρας
 των πωλουντω
 τας περιστε[ρας]
 ανεστρε[ψεν ¹⁶κ]αι
 ουκ ηφιεν [διε]ν[εγ]
 κειν τινα σκευος
 δια του ιερου ¹⁷και ε
 λεγεν αυτοις γε
 γραπται ο οικ[ο]ς μου
 οικος προσευχης
 κληθησεται πασι
 τοις εθνεσιν

059 (P.Vindob. G 39779) + 0215 (P.Vindob. G 36112)

(13) Mark 15:33–35 (Hair side)

³³ενατης· ³⁴και τη ενατη ωρα
 εβοησεν ο ις φωνη μεγαλη
 ηλει ηλει· λαμα σαβα[χθα]
 νει· ο εστιν μεθε[ρμηνευο]
 μενον· ο θς ο θς μου ες τι³¹
 εγκατελιπες [μ]ε ³⁵και τινες

0214 (P.Vindob. G 29300)

(14) Mark 8:33 (Hair side)

³³δε επι[στραφεις]
 και ιδω[ν τους]
 μαθη[τας αυ]
 του επ[ετιμη]
 σεν τω [πετρω]
 και λεγ[ει υπα]
 γε οπισ[ω μου]
 σαταν[α οτι]
 ου φρο[νεις τα]
 του θυ α[λλα τα]
 των αν[θρωπων]

³¹ Wessely's *ed. pr.* has εστι as the last letters of this line. Porter and Porter's find traces of a vertical stroke compatible with iota so that the reading εις τι would be restored.

P²⁵ (P.Berlin 16388)

(15) Matthew 19:9 (Verso, Column B)

⁹μοιχευθηναι
 ωσαυτως και ο γα
 μων απολελυμε
 νην μοιχεται·

P⁷¹ (P.Oxy. 2385)

(16) Matthew 19:17–18 (Verso)

¹⁷τολας ¹⁸λεγει αυτ[ω ποιας]
 ο δε εφη το ου φ[όνευ]
 σης ου μοιχευσει[ς]

P¹¹⁰ (P.Oxy. 4494)

(17–18) Matthew 10:13–14 (Verso ↓)

¹³[εφ υμας επισ]τραφητω. ¹⁴και ος εαν μη
 [δεξηται υμα]ς μηδε ακουση τους λογους
 [υμων εξε]ρχομενων υμων της οι
 [κιας η της πο]λεως η κωμης εκ'μαξα
 [τε τον κονιορτο]ν απο των πο[δων]

0160 (P.Berlin 9961)

(19) Matthew 26:25–26 (Leaf 1, Column 1)

²⁵πας [²⁶εσθιου]
 των [δε αυτων]
 λαβω[ν ο ις τον]
 αρτο[ν και ευ]
 λο[γη]σας εκλα
 σε[ν] και δους
 τοις μαθηταις
 [ε]ιπεν λαβετε
 φαγετε του[το]

(20) Matthew 26:35 (Leaf 2, Column 2)

³⁵[λεγει αυτ]ω ο πε
 [τρος καν] δεη
 με συν σ]οι απο
 [θανειν] ου μη
 [σε απαρν]ησο
 μαι [ομοιως δε]
 και παν[τες οι]
 μαθηται [ειπον]

0242 (P.Cairo 71942)

(21) Matthew 8:28–30 (Folio A, Leaf 1, Column 2)

²⁸νης: ²⁹και ἴδου ε
 κραξαν λεγον
 τες τι ἡμιν και
 σο[ι] υἱε του θυ.
 η[λθε]ς ὡδε προ
 κ[αιρο]υ βασανι
 [σαι ημ]ας: ³⁰ην δε ³²

(22–23) Matthew 8:32–33 (Folio A, Leaf 2, Column 1)

³²ειπεν αυτοι[ς υ]
 παγετε· ὁι δε εξ[ελ]
 θοντες εισηλ
 θον εις τους χοι
 ρους· και ἴδου ωρ
 μησεν η αγελη
 κατα του κρημνου
 εις την θαλασσᾱ .
 και απεθανον ε
 τοις ὑδασιν ³³οι

P⁸² (Strasbourg, National and University Library P. Gr. 2677)

(24) Luke 7:37–38 (Verso ↓)

[³⁷βαστρον μυρου] ³⁸και σ[τα]
 [σα οπισω παρα] τους πο[δας]
 [αυτου κλαι]ουσα [ηρξα]
 [το βρεχειν] του[ς] π[ο]δας]
 [αυτου και τ]αις θρι[ξιν]
 [της κεφαλης] αυτη[ς εξ]
 [εμαξεν κα]ι κατ[εφιλει]

0181 (P. Vindob. G 39778)

(25) Luke 10:2–4 (Hair side)

²εις τον θερισμον αυτου ³ὑπαγετε
 ἴδου εγω αποστελλω υμας ὡς αρ
 νας εν μεσω λυκων ⁴μη βασταζετε

³² Roca-Puig's *ed. pr.* places an arch over ην.

Codex Vaticanus (Cod. Vat. Gr. 1209)³³

(1–2) Matthew 2:12–14 (1240, Column 3)

¹²αυτων ¹³αναχωρησα
των δε αυτων εις την
χωραν αυτων ιδου αγ
γελος κυ κατ οναρ εφα
νη τω ιωσηφ λεγων
εγερθεις παραλαβε το
παιδιον και την μητε
ρα αυτου και φευγε
εις αιγυπτον και ισθι
εκει εως αν ειπω σοι
μελλει γαρ ηρωδης ζη
τειν το παιδιον του α
πολεσαι αυτο ¹⁴ο δε ε

(3) Matthew 3:11–13 (1241, Column 3)

¹¹αγιω και πυρι ¹²ου το πτυ
ον εν τη χειρι αυτου κ
διακαθαριει την αλωνα
αυτου και συναξει τον
σειτον αυτου εις την
αποθηκην αυτου το
δε αχυρον κατακαυσει
πυρι ^σ
ασβετω ¹³τοτε πα

(4) Matthew 6:21–22 (1245, Column 3)

²¹σται η καρδια σου ²²ο λυ
χνος του σωματος ε
στιν ο οφθαλμος σου
εαν ουν η ο οφθαλμος
σου απλους ολον το σω
μα σου φωτεινον εσται

(5) Matthew 7:23–25 (1247, Column 1)

²³νοι την ανομιαν ²⁴πας
ουν οστις ακουει μου
τους λογους και ποιει ^{τουτους}³⁴
αυτους ομοιωθησε
ται ανδρι φρονιμω ος
τις ωκοδομησεν αυτου
την οικιαν επι την πε
τραν ²⁵και κατεβη η βρο

³³ This transcription does not include accents or breathing marks that occasionally appear in the manuscript. For these features, readers are directed to the excellent images available online.

³⁴ A sign appears slightly above and before και, referencing the correction in the margin.

(6) Matthew 8:9 (1247, Column 3)

⁹και γαρ εγω ανθρωπος
ειμι υπο εξουσιαν τας
σομενος εχων υπ εμαν
τον στρατιωτας και
λεγω τουτω πορευθη
τι και πορευεται και αλ
λω ερχου και ερχεται
και τω δουλω μου ποι
ησον τουτο και ποιει

(7) Matthew 8:12-13 (1247, Column 3)

¹²δοντων ¹³και ειπεν ο ις
τω εκατονταρχη υπα
γε ως επιστευσας γενη
θητω σοι και ιαθη ο
παις εν τη ωρα εκεινη

(8) Matthew 8:23-24 (1248, Column 2)

²³και εμβαντι αυτω εις
πλοιον ηκολουθησα
αυτω οι μαθηται αυ
του ²⁴και ιδου σεισμος

(9-10) Matthew 9:3-7 (1248, Column 3)

³σφημει ⁴και ειδως ο ις
τας ενθυμησεις αυτω
ειπεν ινατι ενθυμει
σθε πονηρα εν ταις
καρδιαις υμων ⁵τι γαρ
(1249, Column 1)
εστιν ευκοπωτερον
ειπειν αφιενται σου
αι αμαρτια η ειπειν ε
γειραι και περιπατει ⁶ι
να δε ειδητε οτι εξου
σιαν εχει ο υιος του αν
θρωπου επι της γης α
φιεναι αμαρτιας το
τε λεγει τω παραλυτι
κω εγειρε αρον σου τη
κλεινην και υπαγε εις
τον οικον σου ⁷και εγερ

(11) Matthew 9:13–14 (1249, Column 2)

¹³αμαρτωλους ¹⁴τοτε
προσερχονται αυτω
οι μαθηται ιωανου λε
γοντες δια τι ημεις
και οι φαρισαιοι νη
στευομεν οι δε μαθη
ται σου ου νηστευουσι

(12) Matthew 9:16–18 (1249, Column 2)

¹⁶ται ¹⁷ουδε βαλλουσιν
οινον νεον εις ασκους
παλαιους ει δε μη ρηγνυ
ται οι ασκοι και ο οινος
εκχειται και οι ασκοι
απολλυνται αλλα βαλ
λουσιν οινον νεον εις
ασκους καινους και
αμφοτεροι συντηρου
ται ¹⁸ταυτα αυτου λα

(13) Matthew 9:31–33 (1250, Column 1)

³¹νη ³²αυτων δε εξερχο
μενων ιδου προση
νεγκαν αυτω κωφο
δαιμονιζομενον ³³ς

(14) Matthew 10:12–14 (1250, Column 3)

¹²την ¹³και εαν μεν η η οι
κια αξια ελθετω η ειρη
νη υμων επ αυτην ε
αν δε μη η αξια η ειρη
νη υμων εφ υμας επι
στραφητω ¹⁴και ος αν μην δεξηται

(15–16) Matthew 10:27–29 (1251, Column 2)

²⁷δωματων ²⁸και μη φο
βηθητε απο των απο
κτεινοντων το σωμα
την δε ψυχην μη δυνα
μενων αποκτειναι φο
βεισθε δε μαλλον τον
δυναμενον και ψυχη
και σωμα απολεσαι εν
γεεννη ²⁹ουχι δυο στρου

(17) Matthew 11:18–20 (1252, Column 3)

¹⁸ον εχει ¹⁹ηλθεν ο υιος
του ανθρωπου εσθει
ων και πεινων και λε
γουσιν ιδου ανθρωπος
φαγος και οينوποτης
τελωνων φιλος και α
μαρτωλων και εδικαι
ωθη η σοφια απο τω
εργων αυτης ²⁰τοτε

(18–19) Matthew 12:21–23 (1253, Column 3)

²¹πιουσιν ²²τοτε προς
ηνεγκαν αυτω δαιμο
νιζομενον τυφλον
και κωφον και εθερα
πευσεν αυτον ωστε
τον κωφον λαλειν και
βλεπειν ²³και εξισταντο

(20) Matthew 13:6–8 (1255, Column 2)

⁶ζαν εξηρανθη ⁷αλλα
δε επεσεν επι τας ακα
θας και ανεβησαν αι α
κανθαι και απεπνιξαν αυ
τα ⁸αλλα δε επεσεν ε

(21) Matthew 13:12–14 (1255, Column 2)

¹²του ¹³δια τουτο εν παρα
βολαις αυτοις λαλω
οτι βλεποντες ου βλε
(Column 3)
πουσιν και ακουοντες
ουκ ακουουσιν ουδε
συνιουσιν³⁵ ¹⁴και αναπλη

(22) Matthew 14:4–6 (1257, Column 3)

⁴εχειν αυτην ⁵και θελω
αυτον αποκτειναι ε
φοβηθη τον οχλον
επει ως προφητην αυ
τον ειχον ⁶γενεσις

³⁵ B^c has συνιωσιν.

(23–24) Matthew 14:21–23 (1258, Column 2)

²¹και παιδιων ²²και ευθε
ως ηναγκασεν τους
μαθητας αυτου εμβη
ναι εις πλοιον και προ
αγειν αυτον εις το πε
ραν εως ου απολυση
τους οχλους ²³και απο

(25) Matthew 15:26–28 (1259, Column 3)

²⁶κυναριοις ²⁷η δε ειπεν
ναι κε και τα κυναρια ε
σθειει απο των ψειχι
ων των πειπτον τω
απο της τραπεζης τω
κυριων αυτων ²⁸τοτε

(26) Matthew 15:31–32 (1260, Column 1)

³¹ωστε τους οχλους βλε
ποντας θαυμασαι κω
φους ακουοντας κυλ
λους υγεις και χωλους
περιπατουντας και
τυφλους βλεποντας
και εδοξασαν τον θν
ισραηλ ³²ο δε ις προσκα

(27) Matthew 15:37–39 (1260, Column 2)

³⁷σπυριδας πληρεις ³⁸οι
δε εσθιοντες ησαν ως
τετρακισχειλιοι αν
δρες χωρις γυναικω
και παιδιων ³⁹και απο

(28–29) Matthew 16:2–6 (1260, Column 2)

²ο δε αποκριθεις ειπεν
αυτοις ⁴γενεα πονηρα
και μοιχαλεις σημειο
αιτει³⁶ και σημειον ου
δοθησεται αυτη ει μη
το σημειον ιωνα και
καταλιπων αυτους
απηλθεν ⁵και ελθον
τες οι μαθηται εις το
περαν επελαθοντο
λαβειν αρτους ⁶ο δε

³⁶ The word επιζητει appears in the left margin.

(30) Matthew 16:19–20 (1261, Column 1)

¹⁹ρανοῖς ²⁰τοτε ἐπετει
μησεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς
ἵνα μηδενὶ εἰπωσιν ὁ
τι αὐτος ἐστὶν ὁ $\chi\varsigma$

(31–32) Matthew 17:3–5 (1261, Column 3)

³τες μετ αὐτοῦ ⁴ἀπο
κριθεις δε ὁ πετρος εἶ
πεν τῷ ἰϋ κε καλον ε
στιν ἡμας ὡδε εἶναι
εἰ θελεις ποιησω ὡδε
σκηνας τρεις σοὶ μιᾶ
καὶ μωυσει μιαν καὶ
μιαν ἡλεια ⁵ετι αὐτοῦ

(33) Matthew 17:22–23 (1262, Column 2)

²²χειρας ἀνθρωπων ²³καὶ
ἀποκτενουσιν αὐτὸ
καὶ τῇ ^{τη}τρι ἡμερα ἀνα
στησεται καὶ ἐλυπηθη
σαν σφοδρα

(34–35) Matthew 18:5–8 (1262, Column 3)

⁵εμε δεχεται ⁶ος δ ἀν
σκανδαλιση ενα τῶν
μεικρων τουτων τῶ
πιστευοντων εἰς εμε
συμφερει αὐτῷ ἵνα
κρεμασθη μυλος ονι
κος περι τον τραχηλὸ
αὐτοῦ καὶ καταπον
(1263, Column 1)
τισθη ἐν τῷ πελαγει
τῆς θαλασσης ⁷ουαι τῷ
κοσμῷ ἀπο τῶν σκαν
δαλων ἀναγκη γαρ εἰ
θῆν τα σκανδαλα πλη
ουαι τῷ ἀνθρωπῷ ἐκει
νω δι ου το σκανδαλον
ερχεται ⁸ει δε ἡ χειρ σου

(36) Matthew 18:14–16 (1263, Column 2)

¹⁴μικρων τουτων ¹⁵ε̄ᾱ
 δε αμαρτηση ο αδελφος
 σου υπαγε ελεγξον αυ
 τον μεταξυ σου και αυ
 του μονου εαν σου ακου
 ση εκερδησας τον αδελ
 φον σου ¹⁶εαν δε μη ακου

(37–39) Matthew 19:9 (1264, Column 2)

⁹λεγω δε ῡμιν ος αν απο
 λυση την γυναικα αυτου
 παρεκτος λογου πορνει
 ας ποιει αυτην μοιχει
 θηναι και ο απολελυμε
 νην γαμησας μοιχαται

(40–43) Matthew 19:19–25 (1265, Column 1)

¹⁹ως σεαυτον ²⁰λεγει αυ
 τω ο νεανισκος ταυτα
 παντα εφυλαξα τι επι
 ῡστερω ²¹λεγει αυτω
 ο ις ει θελεις τελειος ει
 ναι υπαγε πωλησον σου
 τα υπαρχοντα και δος
 τοις πτωχοις και εξεις
 θησαυρον εν ουρανοις
 και δευρο ακολουθει μοι
²²ακουσας δε ο νεανισκος
 τον λογον τουτον α
 πηλθε λυπουμενος
 ην γαρ εχων χρηματα
 πολλα ²³ο δε ις ειπεν τοις
 μαθηταις αυτου αμη
 λεγω υμιν οτι πλουσι
 ος δυσκολως εισελευ
 σεται εις την βασιλει
 αν των ουρανων ²⁴πα
 λιν δε λεγω υμιν ευκο
 πωτερον εστιν καμη
 λον δια τρηματος ρα
 φιδος διελθειν η πλου
 σιον εισελθειν εις τη̄
 βασιλειαν του θῡ ²⁵ακου

(44) Matthew 19:28–30 (1265, Column 2)

²⁸λας του ισραηλ ²⁹και
 πας οστις αφηκεν οι
 κιας η αδελφους η αδελ
 φας η πατερα η μητερα
 η τεκνα η αγρους ενε
 κεν του εμου ονομα
 τος πολλαπλασιονα
 λημψεται και ζωην
 αιωνιον κληρονομη
 σει ³⁰πολλοι δε εσονται

(45–49) Matthew 20:14–20 (1265, Column 3)

¹⁴σοι ¹⁵ουκ εξεστιν μοι
 (1266, Column 1)
 ο θελω ποιησαι εν τοις
 εμοις η ο οφθαλμος
 σου πονηρος εστιν ο
 τι εγω αγαθος ειμι ¹⁶ου
 τως εσονται οι εσχα
 τοι πρωτοι και οι πρω
 τοι εσχατοι
¹⁷μελλων δε αναβαινειν
 ις εις ιεροσολυμα παρε
 λαβε τους δωδεκα μα
 θητας καθ ιδιαν και ε
 τη οδω ειπεν αυτοις ¹⁸ι
 δου αναβαινομεν εις
 ιεροσολυμα και ο υιος
 του ανθρωπου παραδο
 θησεται τοις αρχιερευ
 σιν και γραμματευσι
 και κατακρινουσιν αυ
 τον ¹⁹και παραδωσουσι
 αυτον τοις εθνεσιν
 εις το εμπαιξαι και μα
 στιγωσαι και σταυρω
 σαι και τη τριτη ημε
 ρα αναστησεται ²⁰τοτε

(50–51) Matthew 20:22–24 (1266, Column 1)

²²δυναμεθα ²³λεγει αυ
τοις το μεν ποτηριῶ
(Column 2)
μου πιεσθε το δε κα
θισαι εκ δεξιων μου η
εξ ευωνυμων ουκ εστι
εμον δουναι αλλ οισ η
τοιμασται υπο του πα
τρος μου ²⁴και ακουσα

(52–53) Matthew 20:25–27 (1266, Column 2)

²⁵αζουσιν αυτων ²⁶ουχ ου
τως εστιν εν υμιν αλλ ος
αν θελη μεγας εν υμι
γενεσθαι εσται υμων
διακονος ²⁷και ος αν θε

(54) Matthew 21:1–3 (1266, Column 3)

¹τας ²λεγων αυτοις πο
ρευεσθε εις την κωμη
την κατεναντι υμων
και ευθεως ευρησετε
ονον δεδεμενην και
πωλον μετ αυτης λυ
σαντες αγετε μοι ³και

(55) Matthew 21:4–5 (1266, Column 3)

⁴τουτο δε ολον γεγονε
ινα πληρωθη το ρηθε
δια του πληρωθη το
ρηθεν δια του προφη
του λεγοντος ⁵ειπατε

(56) Matthew 21:6–8 (1266, Column 3)

⁶τοις ο ις ⁷ηγαγον την ο
νον και τον πωλον κ
επεθηκαν επ αυτων
τα ιματια και επεκαθι
(1267, Column 1)
σεν επανω αυτων ⁸ο

(57) Matthew 21:11–12 (1267, Column 1)

¹¹γαλειλαιας ¹²και εισηλ
θεν ις εις το ιερον και
εξεβαλεν παντας τους
πωλουντας και αγο
ραζοντας εν τω ιερω
και τας τραπεζας τω
κολλυβιστων κατε
στρεψεν και τας κα
θεδρας των πωλουν
των τας περιστερας

(58) Matthew 21:24–26 (1267, Column 3)

²⁴τα ποιω ²⁵το βαπτισμα
το ιωανου ποθεν ην
εξ ουρανου η εξ ανθρω
πων οι δε διελογιζον
το εν εαυτοις λεγοντες
εαν ειπωμεν εξ ουρα
νου ερει ημιν δια τι ου
ουκ επιστευσατε αυ
τω ²⁶εαν δε ειπωμεν εξ

(59) Matthew 22:21–22 (1269, Column 2)

²¹λεγουσιν Καισαρος
τοτε λεγει αυτοις απο
δοτε ουν τα Καισαρος
Καισαρι και τα του θυ
τω θυ ²²και ακουσαντες

(60) Matthew 22:29–31 (1269, Column 3)

²⁹δυναμιν του θυ ³⁰εν γαρ
τη αναστασει ουτε γα
μουσιν ουτε γαμιζο
ται αλλ ως αγγελοι εν
τω ουρανω εισιν ³¹περι

(61) Matthew 22:38–40 (1270, Column 1)

³⁸λη ³⁹δευτερα ομοιως
^ε
αγαπησις τον πλησι
σου ως σεαυτον ⁴⁰εν ταυ

(62) Matthew 23:18–20 (1270, Column 3)

¹⁸φειλει ¹⁹μωροι και τυφλοι
τι γαρ μειζον το δωρο
η το θυσιαστηριον το
αγιαζον το δωρον ²⁰ο

(63) Matthew 23:37–39 (1271, Column 3)

³⁷και ουκ ηθελησατε ³⁸ιδου
αφιεται υμιν ο οικος
υμων ³⁹λεγω γαρ υμιν

(64) Matthew 24:1–2 (1271, Column 3)

¹και εξελθων ο ις εκ του
ιερου επορευετο και
προσηλθον οι μαθηται
αυτου επιδειξαι αυτω
τας οικοδομας του ι
ερου ²ο δε αποκριθεις

(65) Matthew 24:22–24 (1272, Column 2)

²²ημεραι εκειναι ²³τοτε
εαν τις υμιν ειπη ιδου
ωδε ο χς η ωδε μη πι
στευετε ²⁴εγερθησον

(66) Matthew 24:35–36 (1273, Column 1)

³⁵παρελθωσιν ³⁶περι δε
της ημερας εκεινης
και ωρας ουδεις οιδε
ουδε οι αγγελοι των
ουρανων ουδε ο υιος
ει μη ο πατηρ μονος

(67) Matthew 24:39–41 (1273, Column 2)

³⁹θρωπου ⁴⁰τοτε εσον
ται δυο εν τω αγρω εις
παραλαμβανεται και
εις αφιεται ⁴¹δυο αλη

(68) Matthew 25:39–41 (1275, Column 1)

³⁹προς σε ⁴⁰και αποκριθεις
ο βασιλευς ερει αυτοις
αμην λεγω υμιν εφ ο
σον εποιησατε ενι του
των των ελαχιστων
εμοι εποιησατε ⁴¹το

(69) Matthew 26:8–10 (1275, Column 2)

⁸τη ⁹εδυνατο γαρ τουτο
(Column 3)
πραθηναι πολλου και
δοθηναι πτωχοις ¹⁰γνους

(70) Matthew 26:12–14 (1275, Column 3)

^{δε}
¹²σεν ¹³αμην λεγω υμιν
 οπου εαν κηρυχθη το
 ευαγγελιον τουτο εν ο
 λω τω κοσμω λαληθη
 σεται και ο εποιησεν αυ
 τη εις μνημοσυνον αυ
 της ¹⁴τοτε πορευθεις

(71) Matthew 26:73–75 (1278, Column 1)

⁷³λον σε ποιει ⁷⁴τοτε ηρξα
 το καταθεματιζειν κ
 ομνυειν οτι ουκ οιδα
 τον ανθρωπον και ευ
 θυς αλεκτωρ εφωνη
 σεν ⁷⁵και εμνησθη ο πε

(72) Matthew 27:5–7 (1278, Column 2)

⁵απηγατο ⁶οι δε αρχι
 ερεις λαβοντες τα αρ
 γυρια ειπαν ουκ εξεστι
 βαλειν αυτα εις τον κορ
 βαν επει τιμη αιματος
 εστιν ⁷συμβουλιον δε

(73–74) Matthew 27:15–18 (1278, Column 3)

¹⁵ον ηθελον ¹⁶ειχον δε το
 τε δεσμιον επισημ^ο
 λεγομενον βαραββαν
¹⁷συνηγμενων ουν αυ
 των ειπεν αυτοις ο πει
 λατος τινα θελετε α
 πολυσω υμιν τον βαραβ
 βαν η ιν τον λεγομενο
 χν ¹⁸ηδει γαρ οτι δια φθο

(75–76) Matthew 27:27–30 (1279, Column 1)

²⁷ραν ²⁸και ενδυσαντες αυ
τον χλαμυδα κοκκινη
περιεθηκαν αυτω ²⁹και
πλεξαντες στεφανο
εξ ακανθων περιεθη
καν επι της κεφαλης
αυτου και καλαμον ε
τη δεξια αυτου και γο
νυπετησαντες εμ
προσθεν αυτου ενε
παιξαν αυτω λεγοντες
χαιρε βασιλευ των ιου
δαιων ³⁰και εμπτυσαν

(77) Matthew 27:32–34 (1279, Column 2)

³²ρον αυτου ³³και ελθον
τες εις τον τοπον το
λεγομενον γολγοθα
ο εστιν κраниου τοπος
λεγομενος ³⁴εδωκαν

(78–79) Matthew 27:45–46 (1279, Column 3)

^ω
⁴⁵γην ε ωρας ενατης ⁴⁶πε
ρι δε την ενατην ωραν
εβοησεν ο ις φωνη με
γαλη λεγων ελωει ελωει
λεμα σαβακτανει του
τ εστιν θεε μου θεε μου
ινατι με εγκατελιπες

(80) Matthew 27:48–50 (1279, Column 3)

⁴⁸αυτον ⁴⁹οι δε λοιποι ει
παν αφες ιδωμεν ει ερ
χεται ηλειας σωσων
αυτον αλλος δε λαβω
λογχην ενυξεν αυτου
την πλευραν και εξηλ
θεν υδωρ και αιμα ⁵⁰ο δε

- (81) Matthew 27:53–55 (1280, Column 1)
⁵³σθησαν πολλοις ⁵⁴ο δε
 εκατονταρχος και οι
 μετ αυτου τηρουντες
 τον ιν ιδοντες τον
 σεισμον και τα γεινο
 μενα εφοβηθησαν
 σφοδρα λεγοντες α
 ληθως υιος θυ ην ου
 τος ⁵⁵ησαν δε εκει γυναι
- (82) Matthew 27:66–28:1 (1280, Column 2)
⁶⁶στωδιας ¹οψε δε σαβ
 βατων τη επιφωσκου
 ση εις μιαν σαββατω
 ηλθεν μαρια η μαγδα
 ληνη και η αλλη μαρια
 θεωρησαι τον ταφον
- (83) Mark 1:17–19 (1282, Column 1)
¹⁷αλεις ανθρωπων ¹⁸και
 ευθεως αφεντες τα
 δικτυα ηκολουθουν
 αυτω ¹⁹και προβας ολι
- (84) Mark 1:21–22 (1282, Column 2)
²¹και εισπορευονται εις
 καφαρναουμ και ευθε
 ως τοις σαββασιν εισελ
 θων εις την συναγωγη
 εδιδασκεν ²²και εξεπλησ
- (85) Mark 1:33–34 (1282, Column 3)
³³ραν ³⁴και εθεραπευσεν
 πολλους κακως εχον
 τας ποικιλαις νοσοις
 και δαιμονια πολλα ε
 ξεβαλεν και ουκ ηφιε
 τα δαιμονια λαλειν ο
 τι ηδεισαν αυτον χν
 ειναι

(86) Mark 1:37–39 (1283, Column 1)

³⁷τουςιν σε ³⁸και λεγει

αυτοι αγωμεν αλλαχου
εις τας εχομενα κω
μοπολεις ινα και εκει
κηρυξω εις τουτο γαρ
εξηλθον ³⁹και ηλθεν

(87) Mark 1:40–41 (1283, Column 1)

⁴⁰και ερχεται προς αυτω
λεπρος παρακαλων αυ
τον λεγων αυτω κε ο
τι εαν θελης δυνα με
καθαρισαι ⁴¹και σπλαγ

(88) Mark 2:7–8 (1283, Column 2)

⁷ο ⁸θς και ευθυς επιγνους
ο ις τω πνευματι αυ
του οτι διαλογιζονται
εν εαυτοις λεγει τι
ταυτα διαλογιζεσθαι
εν ταις καρδιαις υμων

(89) Mark 2:17–19 (1284, Column 1)

¹⁷λους ¹⁸και ησαν οι μαθη
ται ιωανου και οι φαρει
σαιοι νηστευοντες κ
ερχονται και λεγουσι
αυτω δια τι οι μαθηται
ιωανου και οι μαθηται
των φαρεισαιων νη
στενουσιν οι δε σοι ου
νηστεουσιν ¹⁹και ει

(90) Mark 2:22–24 (1284, Column 1)

²²σκους καινους ²³και ε
γενετο αυτον εν τοις
(Column 2)
σαββασι διαπορευεσθαι
δια των σποριμων και
οι μαθηται αυτου ηρξα
το οδο ποιειν τιλλον
τες τους σταχυας ²⁴και

(91) Mark 3:10–12 (1284, Column 3)

¹⁰γὰς ¹¹καὶ τὰ πνεύματα
τὰ ἀκαθάρτα ὅταν αὐ
τὸν ἐθεώρουν προσε
πειπταν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκρά
ζον λεγόντα ὅτι σὺ εἶ
ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θ̄υ ¹²καὶ πολ

(92) Mark 3:13–15 (1285, Column 1)

¹³πρὸς αὐτὸν ¹⁴καὶ ἐποίη
σεν δώδεκα οὐς καὶ ἀ
ποστόλους ὠνομασῆ
ἵνα ὦσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ κ
ἀποστελλῆ αὐτοὺς
κηρυσσεῖν ¹⁵καὶ ἐχειν ε

(93) Mark 3:31–33 (1285, Column 3)

³¹καλοῦντες αὐτὸν ³²καὶ
ἐκαθήτο περὶ αὐτὸν
ὄχλος καὶ λεγούσιν αὐ
τῷ ἴδου ἡ μήτηρ σου
καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ σου ἐξω
ζητοῦσιν σε ³³καὶ ἀπο

(94) Mark 4:33–35 (1287, Column 1)

³³εἰν ³⁴καὶ χωρὶς παραβο
λῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς
καθ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς ἰδιοῖς
μαθηταῖς ἐπέλυεν πᾶ
τα ³⁵καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς

(95) Mark 5:22–24 (1288, Column 1)

²²τοὺς ποδας αὐτοῦ ²³κ
παρεκαλεῖ αὐτὸν πολ
λά λέγων ὅτι τὸ θυγα
τριον μου ἐσχάτως ε
χει ἵνα ἐλθῶν ἐπιθησ
τας χεῖρας αὐτῆ ἵνα σω
θῆ καὶ ζῆσῃ ²⁴καὶ ἀπηλ

(96–97) Mark 6:19–23 (1289, Column 3)

¹⁹και ουκ ηδυνατο ²⁰ο γαρ
 ηρωδης εφοβειτο τον
 ιωανην ειδως αυτον
 ανδρα δικαιον και αγιο
 συνετηρει αυτον και
 ακουσας αυτου πολλα
 ηπορει και ηδεως αυτου
 ηκουεν ²¹και γενομε
 νης ημερας ευκαιρου
 οτε ηρωδης τοις γενε
 σιοις αυτου δειπνον
 εποιησεν τοις μεγαστα
 σιν αυτου και τοις χι
 λιαρχοις και τοις πρω
 τοις της γαλιλαιας ²²κ
 σ
 ειελθουσης της θυγα
 τρος αυτου ηρωδιαδος
 και ορχησαμενης ηρε
 σεν τω ηρωδη και τοις
 συνανακειμενοις ο
 δε βασιλευς ειπεν τω κο
 ρασιω αιτησον με ο εα
 θελης και δωσω σοι ²³και

(98–99) Mark 6:38–42 (1290, Column 2)

³⁸ιχθυσ ³⁹και επεταξεν
 αυτοις ανακλειθηναι
 παντας συμποσια συμ
 ποσια εν τω χλωρω χορ
 τω ⁴⁰και ανεπασαν πρα
 σιαι πρασιαι κατα εκα
 τον και κατα πεντηκο
 τα ⁴¹και λαβων τους πεν
 τε αρτους και τους δυο
 ιχθυσ αναβλεψας εις
 τον ουρανον ευλογη
 σεν και κατεκλασεν τους
 αρτους και εδιδου τοις
 μαθητας ινα παρατι
 (Column 3)
 θωσιν αυτοις και τους
 δυο ιχθυσ εμερισεν
 πασιν ⁴²και εφαγον παν

(100) Mark 6:48–50 (1290, Column 3)

⁴⁸παρελθειν αυτους ⁴⁹οι
δε ιδοντες αυτον επι
της θαλασσης περιπα
τουντα εδοξαν οτι φα
τασμα εστιν και ανε
κραξαν ⁵⁰παντες γαρ αυ

(101) Mark 7:5–7 (1291, Column 2)

⁵τον ⁶ο δε ειπεν αυτοις
καλως επροφητευσε
ησαϊας περι υμων τω
υποκριτων ως γεγρα
πται οτι ο λαος ουτος
τοις χειλεσιν με τειμα
η δε καρδια αυτων πορ
ρω απεχει απ εμου⁷μα

(102) Mark 7:24 (1292, Column 1)

^v
²⁴εκειθε δε αναστας απηλ
θεν εις τα ορια τυρου
και σειδωνος και εις
ελθων εις οικιαν ουδε
να ηθελεν γνωναι και
ουκ ηδυνασθη λαθει

(103) Mark 7:27–29 (1292, Column 1)

²⁷λειν ²⁸η δε απεκριθη κ
λεγει αυτω ναι κε και
τα κυναρια υποκατω
(Column 2)
της τραπεζης εσθιου
σιν απο των ψιχιων τω
παιδιων ²⁹και ειπεν αυ

(104) Mark 7:37–8:2 (1292, Column 3)

³⁷λαλειν ¹εν εκειναις
ταις ημεραις παλιν πολ
λου οχλου οντος και
μη εχοντων τι φαγω
σιν προσκαλεσαμενος
τους μαθητας αυτου
λεγει αυτοις ²σπλαγχνι

(105) Mark 8:20–22 (1293, Column 2)
²⁰τω̄ επ̄τα ²¹καῑ ελεγε̄ν αῡ
 τοις̄ πω̄ς οῡ νοειτε̄ ²²κ̄

(106) Mark 8:33–35 (1293, Column 3)
³³θρω̄πων ³⁴καῑ προσκᾱ
 λεσαμε̄νος τον̄ οχλ̄ο̄
 συν̄ τοις̄ μαθηταις̄ αῡ
 (1294, Column 1)
 τοῡ ειπεν̄ αυτοις̄ εῑ τις̄
 θελεῑ οπισω̄ μοῡ ελθεῑ
 απαρνησασθω̄ εαυτο̄
 καῑ αρατω̄ τον̄ σταῡ
 ρον̄ αυτοῡ καῑ ακολοῡ
 θειτω̄ μοῑ ³⁵ος̄ γαρ̄ εαν̄

(107) Mark 9:7–9 (1294, Column 2)
⁷ακουετε̄ αυτοῡ ⁸καῑ ε̄
 ξαπινᾱ περιβλεψαμε̄
 νοῑ ουκετῑ ουδεν̄α εῑ
 δον̄ μετᾱ εαυτων̄ εῑ
 μη̄ τον̄ ῑν̄ μονον̄ ⁹καῑ

(108) Mark 9:37–39 (1295, Column 3)
³⁷τᾱ με̄ ³⁸εφη̄ αυτω̄ ο̄ ιω̄
 ανης̄ διδασκαλε̄ ειδομε̄
 τινᾱ εν̄ τω̄ ονοματῑ σοῡ
 εκβαλλοντᾱ δαιμονιᾱ
 καῑ εκωλυομε̄ν αυτο̄
 οτῑ ουκ̄ η̄κολουθεῑ η̄
 μιν̄ ³⁹ο̄ δε̄ ις̄ ειπεν̄ μη̄

(109) Mark 9:42–43 (1295, Column 3)
⁴²καῑ ος̄ αν̄ σκανδαλιση̄
 ενᾱ των̄ μεικρων̄ τοῡ
 των̄ των̄ πιστευον̄
 των̄ εις̄ εμε̄ καλον̄ ε̄
 στιν̄ αυτω̄ μαλλον̄ εῑ
 περικειταῑ μυλος̄ ονῑ
 κος̄ περῑ τον̄ τραχηλο̄
 αυτοῡ καῑ βεβληταῑ
 εις̄ την̄ θαλασσαν̄ ⁴³καῑ

(110) Mark 10:5–6 (1296, Column 2)
⁵ταυτην̄ ⁶απο̄ δε̄ αρχης̄
 κτισεω̄ς αρσεν̄ καῑ θη̄
 λῡ εποιησεν̄ αυτους̄

(111) Mark 10:13–14 (1296, Column 2)

¹³και προσεφερον αυτω
παιδια ινα αυτων αφη
ται οι δε μαθηται επε
τειμησαν αυτοις ¹⁴ιδω

(112) Mark 10:18–20 (1296, Column 3)

¹⁸ο θς ¹⁹τας εντολας οιδας
μη φονευσης μη μοι
χευσης μη κλεψης μη
ψευδομαρτυρησης μη αποστερησης
τειμα τον πατερα σου
και την μητερα ²⁰ο δε

(113) Mark 10:30–31 (1297, Column 1)

³⁰αν ³¹πολλοι δε εσονται
πρωτοι εσχατοι και
οι εσχατοι πρωτοι

(114) Mark 10:34–35 (1297, Column 2)

³⁴ναστησεται ³⁵και προς
πορευονται αυτω ια
κωβος και ιωανης οι δυο
υιοι ζεβεδαιου λεγον
τες αυτω διδασκαλε
θελομεν ινα ο εαν αιτη
σωμεν σε ποιησης ημι

(115) Mark 10:46–47 (1297, Column 3)

⁴⁶και εκτ ^κορευομενου ^κερχονται
αυτου απο ιερειχω ^κ
των μαθητων αυτου
και οχλου ικανου ο υ
ιος τειμαιου βαρτει
μαιος τυφλος προσ
αιτης εκαθητο παρα
την οδον ⁴⁷και ακουσας

(116) Mark 11:8–9 (1298, Column 2)

⁸και πολλοι τα ιματια ε
αυτων εστρωσαν εις
την οδον αλλοι δε στιβα
δας κοψαντες εκ των
αγρων ⁹και οι προαγον

- (117) Mark 12:8–10 (1299, Column 3)
⁸λωνος ⁹τι ποιησει ο $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$
του αμπελωνος ελευ
σεται και απολεσει τους
γεωργους και δωσει το
αμπελωνα αλλοις ¹⁰ου
- (118) Mark 12:22–24 (1300, Column 2)
²²νεν ²³εν τη αναστασει
τινος αυτων εσται γυ
νη οι γαρ επτα εσχον
αυτην γυναικα ²⁴εφη
- (119) Mark 12:26–27 (1300, Column 2)
²⁶περι δε των νεκρων ο
τι εγειρονται ουκ ανε
γνωτε εν τη βιβλω μω
υσεως επι του βατου
πως ειπεν αυτω ο $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$
λεγων εγω ο $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$ αβρααμ
και $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$ ισαακ και $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$ ια
κωβ ²⁷ουκ εστιν $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$ νε
- (120) Mark 13:14–16 (1301, Column 3)
¹⁴ορη ¹⁵ο επι του δωματος
μη καταβατω μηδε
εισελθετω τι αραι εκ
της οικιας αυτου ¹⁶και
- (121) Mark 14:4–6 (1302, Column 3)
⁴γεγονεν ⁵ηδυνατο γαρ
τουτο το μυρον πρα
θηναι επανω τριακο
σιων δηναριων και δο
θηναι τοις πτωχοις
και ενεβρειμωντο αυ
τη ⁶ο δε ις ειπεν αφε
- (122) Mark 14:30–32 (1303, Column 3)
³⁰με απαρνηση ³¹ο δε εκπε
ρισσως ελαλει εαν δε
η με συναποθανειν
σοι ου μη σε απαρνησο
μαι ωσαντως και πα
(1304, Column 1)
τες ελεγον ³²και ερχο

- (123) Mark 14:43–44 (1304, Column 2)
⁴³και ευθυς επι αυτου
 λαλουντος παραγει
 νεται ο ιουδας εις τω̄
 δωδεκα και μετ αυτου
 οχλος μετα μαχαιρω̄
 και ξυλων απο των αρ
 χιερων και των γραμ
 ματεων και των πρες
 βυτερων ⁴⁴δεδωκει δε
- (124–125) Mark 14:67–70 (1305, Column 2)
⁶⁷του ιῡ ⁶⁸ο δε ηρνησατο λε
 γων ουτε οίδα ουτε ε
 πισταμαι συ τι λεγεις
 και εξηλθεν εξω εις το
 προαυλιον ⁶⁹και η παιδι
 σκη ιδουσα αυτον ει
 πεν τοις παρεστωσιν
 οτι ουτος εξ αυτων ε
 στιν ⁷⁰ο δε παλιν ηρνει
- (126–127) Mark 15:9–12 (1305, Column 3)
⁹δαιων ¹⁰εγεινωσκε γαρ
 οτι δια φθονον παρα
 δεδωκεισαν αυτον
¹¹οι δε αρχιερεις ανεσει
 σαν τον οχλον ινα μαλ
 λον τον βαραββαν απο
 λυση αυτοις ¹²ο δε πει
 λατος παλιν αποκριθεις
 ελεγεν αυτοις τι ου
 ποιησω λεγετε τον
 βασιλεα των ιουδαιω̄
- (128) Mark 15:26–29 (1306, Column 2)
²⁶των ιουδαιων ²⁷και σῡ
 αυτω εσταυρωσαν δυ
 ο ληστας ενα εκ δεξι
 ων και ενα εξ ευωνυ
 μων αυτου ²⁹και οι παρα
- (129) Mark 15:34–35 (1306, Column 3)
³⁴εγκατελιπες με ³⁵και
 τινες των εστηκοτω̄
 ακουσαντες ελεγον
 ιδε ηλειαν φωνει ³⁶δρα

(130–131) Mark 15:45–47 (1307, Column 1)

⁴⁵ἰωση ⁴⁶καὶ ἀγοράσας σὶ
 δὸνα καθελῶν αὐτῶ
 ἐνείλησεν τῇ σινδο
 νι καὶ ἐθήκεν αὐτὸν
 ἐν μνηματί ὃ ἦν λε
 λατομημένον ἐκ πέ
 τρας καὶ προσεκυλι
 σεν λίθον ἐπὶ τὴν θυ
 ραν τοῦ μνημείου ⁴⁷ἦ

(132) Luke 2:8–10 (1311, Column 1)

⁸των ⁹καὶ ἀγγελὸς κῦ
 ἐπέστη αὐτοῖς καὶ
 δοξά κῦ περιελαμψε
 αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐφοβήθη
 σαν σφοδρὰ ¹⁰καὶ εἶπε

(133) Luke 2:18–19 (1311, Column 2)

¹⁸πρὸς αὐτοὺς· ¹⁹ἦ δὲ μα
 ρία πάντα συνετηρεῖ
 τὰ ῥήματα συμβαλλου
 σα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς

(134) Luke 4:16–17 (1315, Column 1)

¹⁶ἀναγνῶναι ¹⁷καὶ ἐπε
 δοθῆ αὐτῷ βιβλίον
 τοῦ προφητοῦ Ἡσαῖ
 ου καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ βιβλί
 ον εὗρεν τὸν τόπον
 οὗ ἦν γεγραμμένον

(135) Luke 5:18–20 (1317, Column 1)

¹⁸ὄν αὐτοῦ ¹⁹καὶ μὴ ευρῶ
 τες ποίας εἰσενεγκῶ
 σιν αὐτὸν διὰ τὸν ὀ
 χλὸν ἀναβάντες ἐπὶ
 τὸ δῶμα διὰ τῶν κερα
 μῶν καθῆκαν αὐτὸν
 σὺν τῷ κλεινιδίῳ εἰς
 τὸ μέσον ἐμπροσθεν
 πάντων ²⁰καὶ ἰδὼν τῇ

- (136) Luke 6:2–3 (1318, Column 1)
²τοις σαββασιν ³και απο
κριθεις προς αυτους
ειπεν ις ουδε τουτο
ανεγνωτε ο εποιησε
δαυειδ οτε επεινασε
αυτος και οι μετ αυτου
- (137) Luke 6:6–8 (1318, Column 2)
⁶για ην ξηρα ⁷παρετηρου
το δε αυτον οι γραμμα
ταις και οι φαρισαιοι
ει εν τω σαββατω θερα
πευσει ινα ευρωσιν
κατηγορειν αυτου ⁸αυ
- (138) Luke 6:14–16 (1318, Column 3)
¹⁴βαρθολομαιον ¹⁵και μαθ
θαιον και θωμαν ια
κωβον αλφαιου και σι
μωνα τον καλουμε
νον ζηλωτην ¹⁶και ιου
- (139) Luke 6:23 (1319, Column 1)
²³χαρητε εν εκεινη τη
ημερα και σκιρτησατε
ιδου γαρ ο μισθος υμω
πολυς εν τοις ουρανοις
κατα τα αυτα γαρ εποι
ουν τοις προφηταις
οι πατερες αυτων
- (140) Luke 6:32–34 (1319, Column 2)
³²αγαπωσιν ³³και γαρ εαν
αγαθοποιητε τους α
γαθοποιουντας υμας
ποια υμιν χαρις εστι
και οι αμαρτωλοι το
αυτο ποιουσιν ³⁴και ε

(141–142) Luke 6:36–39 (1319, Column 2)

³⁶γεινεσθε οικτειρμο
(Column 3)
νες καθως ο πατηρ ῡ
μων οικτιρμων εστι
³⁷και μη κρεινετε και ου
μη κριθητε και μη δικα
ζετε και ου μη δικασθη
τε απολυετε και απο
λυθησεσθε ³⁸διδοτε κ̄
δοθησεται ῡμιν μετρο̄
καλον πεπιεσμενον
σεσαλευμενον υπερ
εκχυννομενον δω
σουσιν εις τον κολπο̄
ῡμων ω γαρ μετρω με
_{αυτι}
τρειτε μετρηθησεται
υμιν ³⁹ειπεν δε και πα

(143) Luke 7:18–19 (1321, Column 1)

¹⁸ο ιωανης ¹⁹επεμψεν
προς τον κν̄ λεγων συ
ει ο ερχομενος η ετε
ρον προσδοκωμεν

(144–145) Luke 8:4–6 (1322, Column 3)

⁴παραβολης ⁵εξηλθεν
ο σπειρων του σπειραι
τον σπορον αυτου και
εν τω σπειρειν αυτο̄
α μεν επεσεν παρα τη̄
οδον και κατεπατη
θη και τα πετεινα του
ουρανου κατεφαγε̄
αυτα ⁶και ετερον κατε

(146) Luke 8:15–17 (1323, Column 1)

¹⁵μονη ¹⁶ουδεις δε λυ
χνον αφας καλυπτει
αυτον σκευει η υπο
κατω κλεινης τιθη
σιν αλλ επι λυχνιας
τιθησιν ¹⁷ου γαρ εστιν

(147) Luke 8:43–44 (1324, Column 2)

⁴³και γυνη ουσα εν ρυσει
αιματος απο ετων δω
δεκα ητις ουκ ισχυσε
απ ουδενος θεραπευ
θηναι ⁴⁴προσελθουσα

(148) Luke 8:54–55 (1324, Column 3)

⁵⁴αυτος δε κρατησας
⁵
της χειρος αυτη εφω
νησεν λεγων η παις ε
γειρε ⁵⁵και επεστρεψε

(149) Luke 9:2–4 (1325, Column 1)

²και ιασθαι ³και ειπεν
προς αυτους μηδεν
αιρετε εις την οδον
μητε ραβδον μητε πη
ραν μητε αρτον μητε
αργυριον μητε δυο
χιτωνας εχειν ⁴και εις

(150) Luke 9:8–10 (1325, Column 2)

⁸ανεστη ⁹ειπεν δε ο
ηρωδης ιωανην εγω
απεκεφαλισα τις δε
εστιν ουτος περι ου
ακουω τοιαυτα και ε
ζητει ιδειν αυτον ¹⁰και

(151) Luke 9:22–24 (1326, Column 1)

²²ναι ²³ελεγεν δε προς πα
τας ει τις θελει οπισω
μου ερχεσθαι απαρνη
σασθω εαυτον και αρα
τω τον σταυρον αυ
του καθ ημεραν και α
κολουθειτω μοι ²⁴ος

(152) Luke 9:27–28 (1326, Column 1)

²⁷του θυ ²⁸εγενετο δε
μετα τους λογους
τουτους ωσει ημεραι
οκτω παραλαβων πε
τρον και ιωανην και
ιακωβον ανεβη εις
το ορος προσευξασθαι

(153) Luke 9:58–60 (1327, Column 2)

⁵⁸κλεινη ⁵⁹ειπεν δε προς
ετερον ακολουθει
μοι ο δε ειπεν επιτρε
ψον μοι πρωτον απελ
θοντι θαψαι τον πα
τερα μου ⁶⁰ειπεν δε αυ

(154) Luke 10:14–16 (1328, Column 2)

¹⁴σει η υμιν ¹⁵και συ καφαρ
ναουμ μη εως ουρα
νου υψωση εως του
αδου καταβηση ¹⁶ο α

(155) Luke 10:20–21 (1328, Column 2)

²⁰ουρανοις ²¹εν αυτη
τη ωρα ηγαλλιασατο τω
πνευματι τω αγιω κ
ειπεν εξομολογουμαι
σοι πατερ ^{κε} του ουρα
νου και της γης οτι α
πεκρυψας ταυτα απο
σοφων και συνετων
και απεκαλυψας αυτα
νηπιοις ναι ο πατηρ ο
(Column 3)
τι ουτως ευδοκια εγε
νετο εμπροσθεν σου

(156) Luke 11:14 (1330, Column 1)

¹⁴και ην εκβαλλων δαι
μονιον κωφον εγε
νετο δε του δαιμονι
ου εξελθοντος ελα
λησεν ο κωφος και ε
θαυμασαν οι οχλοι

(157–158) Luke 11:24–26 (1330, Column 2)

²⁴οταν το ακαθαρτον
πνευμα εξελθη απο
του ανθρωπου διερχε
ται δι ανυδρων τοπω
ζητουν αναπαυσιν
και μη ευρισκον τοτε
λεγει υποστρεψω εις
τον οικον μου οθεν ε
ξηλθον ²⁵και ελθον ευ
ρισκει σχολαζοντα
σεσαρωμενον και κε
κοσμημενον ²⁶τοτε πο

(159) Luke 12:8 (1332, Column 1)

⁸λεγω δε υμιν πας ος
αν ομολογησει εν εμοι
εμπροσθεν των αν
θρωπων και ο υιος του
ανθρωπου ομολογη
σει εν αυτω εμπροσθε
των αγγελων του θυ

(160) Luke 12:22–23 (1332, Column 3)

²²ειπεν δε προς τους μα
θητας δια τουτο λεγω
υμιν μη μεριμνατε
τη ψυχη τι φαγητε
μηδε τω σωματι υμων
τι ενδυσησθε ²³η γαρ ψυ

(161) Luke 12:38–39 (1333, Column 2)

³⁸εκεινοι ³⁹τουτο δε γει
νωσκετε οτι ει ηδει
ο οικοδεσποτης ποια
ωρα ο κλεπτης ερχε
ται εγρηγορησεν αν κ
ουκ αφηκεν διορυχθη
ναι τον οικον αυτου

(162) Luke 13:31–33 (1335, Column 2)

³¹κτειναι ³²και ειπεν αυ
τοις πορευθεντες ει
πατε τη αλωπεκι ταυ
τη ιδου εκβαλλω δαι
μονια και ιασεις απο
τελω σημερον και αυ
ριον και τη τριτη ημε
(Column 3)
ρα τελειουμαι ³³πλην

(163) Luke 13:34–35 (1335, Column 3)

³⁴και ουκ ηθελησατε ³⁵ιδου α
φιεται υμιν ο οικος υμω̄
λεγω δε υμιν ου μη ῑ
δητε με εως ειπητε
ευλογημενος ο ερχο
μενος εν ονοματι κυ

(164) Luke 15:4–5 (1337, Column 2)

⁴τις ανθρωπος εξ υμω̄
εχων εκατον προβατα
και απολεση εξ αυτω̄
εν ου καταλειπει τα ε
νενηκοντα εννεα εν
τη ερημω και πορευε
ται επι το απολωλος ε
ως ευρη αυτο ⁵και ευρω

(165) Luke 15:20–22 (1338, Column 1)

²⁰φιλησεν αυτον ²¹ειπε̄
δε ο υιος αυτω πατερ
ημαρτον εις τον ουρα
νον και ενωπιον σου
ουκετι ειμι αξιος κλη̄
θηναι υιος σου ποιησο̄
με ως ενα των μισθιω̄
σου ²²ειπεν δε ο πατηρ

(166) Luke 17:23–24 (1340, Column 3)

²³ωδε μη διωξητε ²⁴ωσπερ
γαρ η αστραπη αστραπτου
σα εκ της υπο τον ουρα
νον εις την υπ ουρανο̄
λαμπει ουτως εσται
ο υιος του ανθρωπου

- (167) Luke 18:23–25 (1342, Column 1)
²³σιος σφοδρα ²⁴ιδων δε
 αυτον ις ειπεν πως δυ
 σκολως οι τα χρηματα
 εχοντες εις την βασι
 λειαν του θυ εισπορευ
 ονται ²⁵ευκοπωτερον
- (168) Luke 18:29–30 (1342, Column 1)
²⁹θυ ³⁰ος ουχι μη λαβη πολ
 λαπλασιονα εν τω και
 ρω τουτω και εν τω αι
 ωνι τω ερχομενω ζω
 ην αιωνιον
- (169) Luke 19:35–37 (1343, Column 3)
³⁵ιν ³⁶πορευομενου δε
 αυτου υπεστρωννυ
 ον τα ιματα εαυτω
 εν τη οδω ³⁷εγγιζοντος
- (170–171) Luke 20:26–28 (1345, Column 2)
²⁶εσειγησαν ²⁷προσελ
 θοντες δε τινες των
 σαδδουκαιων οι λεγο
 τες αναστασιν μη ειναι
 επηρωτων αυτον ²⁸λε
- (172) Luke 20:43–45 (1345, Column 3)
⁴³δων σου ⁴⁴δαυειδ ουν αυ
 τον κν καλει και πως αυ
 του υιος εστιν ⁴⁵ακου
- (173) Luke 21:5–7 (1346, Column 1)
⁵μηται ειπεν ⁶ταυτα α
 θεωρειτε ελευσονται
 ημεραι εν αις ουκ αφε
 θησεται λιθος επι λι
 θω ωδε ος ου καταλυ
 θησεται ⁷επηρωτη
- (174) Luke 21:36–38 (1347, Column 2)
³⁶που ³⁷ην δε τας ημερας
 διδασκων εν τω ιερω
 τας δε νυκτας εξερχο
 μενος ηυλιζετο εις το
 ορος το καλουμενον
 ελαιων ³⁸και πας ο λαος

- (175) Luke 22:9 (1347, Column 3)
⁹οι δε ειπαν αυτω που
 θελεις ετοιμασωμε
^ε
 σοι φαγιν το πασχα
- (176) Luke 22:17–19 (1347, Column 3)
¹⁷εαυτους ¹⁸λεγω γαρ υ
 μιν ου μη πιω απο του
 (1348, Column 1)
 νυν απο του γενημα
 τος της αμπελου εως
 ου η βασιλεια του θυ ελ
 θη ¹⁹και λαβων αρτον
- (177) Luke 22:42–44 (1348, Column 3)
⁴²σον γεινεσθω ⁴⁵και ανα
- (178) Luke 22:60–62 (1349, Column 2)
⁶⁰αλεκτωρ ⁶¹και στραφεις
 ο κς ενεβλεψε τω πε
 τρω και υπεμνησθη
 ο πετρος του ρηματος
 του κυ ως ειπεν αυτω
 οτι πριν η αλεκτορα φω
 νησαι σημερον απαρ
 νηση με τρις ⁶²και εξελ
- (179) Luke 23:33–34 (1351, Column 1)
³³δε εξ αριστερων ³⁴διαμε
 ριζομενοι δε τα ιματι
 α αυτου εβαλον κληρο
- (180) Luke 24:45–48 (1353, Column 2)
⁴⁵φας ⁴⁶και ειπεν αυτοις
 οτι ουτως γεγραπται
 παθειν τον χν και ανα
 στηναι εκ νεκρων τη
 τριτη ημερα ⁴⁷και κηρυ
 χθηναι επι τω ονομα
 τι αυτου μετανοιαν
 εις αφεσιν αμαρτιων
 εις παντα τα εθνη αρ
 ξαμενοι απο ιερουσα
 λημ ⁴⁸υμεις μαρτυρες

0274 (Kairo, Copt. Mis. 6569/6571)

(1) Mark 7:22–23 (Fragment 1 Verso, Column 2)

²²αφροσυνη· ²³ταυτα τα πο
νηρα εσωθεν εκπο

(2) Mark 7:28 (Fragment 2 Recto, Column 1)

²⁸[η δε απεκριθη κα]ι λεγει
[αυτω ναι κε και] τα κυνα
[ρια υποκατω τ]ης τραπε
[ζης εσθιουσι]ν απο των
[ψιχιων τω]ν παιδιων·

(3) Mark 9:38 (Fragment 3 Verso, Column 1)

³⁸εφη αυτ[ω ιωαννης]
διδασ[καλε ειδομεν τι]
να εν [τω ονοματι σου]
εκβαλ[λοντα δαιμονια]
(Fragment 3 Verso, Column 2)
[κ]αι [εκωλυομεν αυτον]
οτι ου[κ ηκολουθει ημιν]

(4–5) Mark 9:45–48 (Fragment 4 Recto, Column 1)

⁴⁵και εαν ο πους σου σκαν
δαλιζει σε αποκοψον
αυτον καλον εστιν
εισελθειν εις την ζω
ην χωλον η τους δυο
ποδας εχοντα βληθηται
εις την γεενναν
⁴⁷και εαν ο οφθαλμος σου
σκανδαλιζει σε εκβα
λε αυτον καλον σε εστι
μονοφθαλμον εις
ελθειν εις την βασιλει
αν του θυ η δυο οφθαλ
μους εχοντα βληθη[ναι]
εις την γεενναν ⁴⁸οπ[ου]

0213 (P.Vindob. G 1384)

(6) Mark 3:2–3 (Column 1, Flesh side)

²[αυ]του ³κ[αι]
[λε]γει τω α[ν]
[θρ]ωπω τω [ε]
[ξ]ηραμμεν
[η]ν εχον
[τι] την χειρα

P¹⁰⁵ (P.Oxy. 4406)

(7) Matthew 27:62 (→)

[⁶²τ]ην παρ[ασκευην]
[συνηχθησαν ο]ι αρχιερ[εις και οι]
[φαρισαιοι προς] τον πει[λατον]

Codex Borgianus (T) 029 = 029 + 0113 + 0125 + 0139 (Rome: Bibl. Vat., Borg. Copt. 109 Cass 7.65,2 and 18.65; Paris: Bibl. Nat. Copt. 129⁹ 49, 65; 129¹⁰ 209; 129⁹ 76; 129⁷ 35; 129⁸ 121, 122, 140, 157; New York: Pierpont Morgan Libr. M664A)

(1) Luke 21:37–38 (Bibl. Nat. Copt. 129⁸ f. 140, Column 2)

³⁷ην δε τας ημε
ρας διδασκων
εν τω ιερω τας
δε νυκτας εξ
ερχομενος
ηυλιζετο εις
το ορος το κα
λουμενον
ελαιων ³⁸και πας

(2–3) Luke 22:41–45 (Bibl. Vat., Borg. Copt. Copt 109 cass. 18 fasc, 65,1, Column 1)

⁴¹και αυτος απε
σπασθη απ αυ
των ωσει λι
θου βολην και
θεις τα γονατα
προσευξατο
⁴²λεγων πατερ
ει βουλει παρ
ενεγκε τουτο
το ποτηριον
απ εμου· πλην
μη το θελημα μου
αλλα το σον γι
νεσθω ⁴⁵και ανα

Codex Guelferbytanus (Q) 026 (Wolfenbüttel: Herz. Aug. Bibl., Weissenberg 64)

(1) Luke 4:35 (Column 1)

³⁵και επετιμησεν
αυτω ο ις λεγων·
φιμωθητι και εξ
ελθε εξ αυτου
και ριψαν αυτον
το δαιμονιον εις
το μεσον εξηλθε
απ αυτου μηδεν
βλαψαν αυτον·

(2-3) Luke 4:40 (Column 2)

⁴⁰δυνοντος δε του
ηλιου παντες ο
σοι ειχον ασθε
νουντας νοσοις
ποικιλαις ηγαγο
αυτους προς αυτο
ο δε ενι εκαστω αυ
των τας χειρας ε
πιτιθεις εθερα
πευσεν αυτους

(4) Luke 4:43 (Column 1)

⁴²των· ⁴³ο δε ειπεν
προς αυτους οτι
και ταις ετεραις
πολεσιν ευαγγε
λισασθαι με δει
την βασιλειαν του
θυ οτι εις τουτο
απεσταλμαι·

(5) Luke 6:10 (Column 1)

¹⁰θη η χειρ' αυτου
ως η αλλη·

(6-12) Luke 6:14-16 (Column 1)

¹⁴σιμωνα ον και ω
νομασεν πετρο
και ανδρεαν τον
αδελφον αυτου
ιακωβον·
και ιωαννην·
(Column 2)
φιλιππον·
και βαρθολομαιο
¹⁵ματθαιον·
και θωμαν·
ιακωβον τον του
αλφαιου·
και σιμωνα τον
καλουμενον ζη
λωτην·
¹⁶και ιουδαν ιακωβου
και ιουδαν ισκαρι
ωτην ος και εγε
νετο προδοτης·

(13) Luke 6:17–18 (Column 2)

¹⁷και σιδωνος· ¹⁸οι ηλ
θον ακουσαι αυ
του και ιαθηναι α
πο των νοσων
αυτων·
και οι οχλουμενοι
(Column 1)
απο πνευματων
ακαθαρτων εθε
ραπειοντο·

(14) Luke 6:20 (Column 1)

²⁰και αυτος επαρας
τους οφθαλμους
αυτου εις τους
μαθητας αυτου
ελεγεν·
μακαριοι οι πτω
χοι τω πνι οτι υ
μετερα εστιν η βα
σιλεια του θυ·

(15) Luke 12:7 (Column 1)

⁷αλλα και αι τριχες
της κεφαλης υμων
πασαι ηριθμηνται
μη ουν φοβεισθε
πολλων στρουθι
ων διαφερετε·

(16) Luke 12:8–9 (Column 1)

⁸θυ· ⁹ο δε αρνησα
μενος με εμπρο
σθεν των ανων
απαρνηθησεται
ενωπιον των
αγγελων του θυ

(17) Luke 12:25–26 (Column 1)

²⁵τις δε εξ υμων με
ριμων δυναται
προσθειναι επι τη
ηλικιαν αυτου πη
χυν ενα· ²⁶ει ουν ου

(18) Luke 12:28 (Column 1)

²⁸ἰ δε τον χορτον ση
μερον εν αγρω ον
τα και αυριον εις
κλιβανον βαλλο
μενον ο θς ουτως
αμφιεννυσιν
ποσω μαλλον υ
μας ολιγοπιστοι

(19) Luke 12:31 (Column 2)

³¹πλην ζητειτε τη
βασιλειαν του θυ
και ταυτα προστε
θησεται υμιν·

(20) Luke 12:39 (Column 2)

³⁹τουτο δε γινωσκε
ται οτι ει ηδει ο οι
κοδεσποτης ποια
ωρα ο κλεπτης ερ
χεται εγρηγορησε
αν και ουκ αν αφη
κεν διορυγηται
τον οικον αυτου

(21–24) Luke 17:35–37 (Column 1)

³⁵δυο εσονται αλη
θουσαι επι το αυ
το· μια παραλημ
φθησεται και η ε
τερα αφεθησεται
³⁷και αποκριθεντες
λεγουσιν αυτω
που κε·
ο δε ειπεν αυτοις
οπου το σωμα ε
κει επισυναχθη
σονται οι αετοι·

(25–26) Luke 18:35–37 (Column 1)

³⁵εγενετο δε εν τω
εγγιζειν αυτον
εις ιερειχω τυ
φλος τις εκαθητο
παρα την οδον προς
αιτων· ³⁶ακουσας
δε οχλου διαπορευ
ομενου επυνθα
νετο τι αν ειη του
το· ³⁷απηγγειλαν

(27) Luke 18:39 (Column 1)

³⁹και οι προαγοντες
επετιμων αυτω
ινα σιωπηση·
αυτος δε πολλω
μαλλον εκραζεν
υιε δαδ̄ ελεησον με·

(28–30) Luke 20:3–6 (Column 1)

³αποκριθεις δε ει
πεν προς αυτους
ερωτησω υμας
καγω ενα λογον
και ειπατε μοι·
⁴το βαπτισμα ιωᾱ
νου εξ ουρανου
(Column 2)
ην η εξ ανων·
⁵οι δε συνελογισ[ᾱ]
το προς εαυτους
λεγοντες· οτι ε
αν ειπωμεν εξ ο[υ]
ρανου ερει δια τι
ουν ουκ επιστε[υ]
σατε αυτω· ⁶εαν δε

(31) Luke 20:10 (Column 1)

¹⁰[κ]αι εν τω καιρω
 απεστειλεν προς
 [τ]ους γεωργους
 δουλον ινα απο
 του καρπου του
 αμπελωνος δω
 σουσιν αυτω·
 οι δε γεωργοι δει
 ραντες αυτον
 εξαπεστειλαν
 κενον·

(32) Luke 20:14 (Column 2)

¹⁴ιδοντες δε αυτο̄
 οι γεωργοι διελο
 γιζοντο προς ε
 αυτους λεγοντες
 ουτος εστιν ο
 κληρονομος α
 ποκτεινωμεν
 αυτον ινα ημω̄
 γενηται η κληρο
 νομια·

(33–34) Luke 20:43–44 (Column 2)

⁴³δων σου· ⁴⁴δᾱδ̄ ουν
 αυτον κν̄ καλει
 και πως ῡς αυτο[υ]
 εστιν·

(35) Luke 22:29–31 (Column 1)

²⁹βασιλειαν· ³⁰ινα ε
 σθητε και πινη
 τε επι της τραπε
 ζης μου εν τη βα
 σιλεια μου·
 και καθησεσθε
 επι θρονων κρι
 νοντες τας δω
 δεκα φυλας του
 ισλ̄· ³¹ειπεν δε ο

(36) Luke 22:33–34 (Column 2)

³³εσθε· ³⁴ο δε ειπεν
λεγω σοι πετρε
ου φωνησει ση
μερον αλεκτωρ
πριν τρεις απαρ
νηση με ειδεναι·

(37) Luke 22:45–46 (Column 2)

⁴⁵και αναστας απο
της προσευχης
ελθων προς τους
μαθητας ευρεν
αυτους κοιμω
μενους απο της
λυπης· ⁴⁶και ειπεν

(38–40) Luke 23:32–34 (Column 1)

³²ηγοντο δε και ε
τεροι δυο κακουρ
γοι συν αυτω αναι
ρεθηναι·

³³και οτε ηλθον ε
πι τον τοπον το
καλουμενον κρα
νιον εκει εσταυ
ρωσαν αυτον·
και τους κακουρ
γους· ον μεν εκ
δεξιων· ον δε εξ
ευωνυμων·

³⁴ο δε κς ελεγεν·
περ αφες αυτοις
ου γαρ οιδασιν τι
ποιουσιν·
διαμεριζομενοι
δε τα ιματια αυτου
εβαλον κληρον

(41) Luke 23:36–37 (Column 2)

³⁶ενεπαιζον δε αυ
τω και οι στρατι
ωται προσερχο
μενοι και οξος
προσφεροντες
αυτω ³⁷και λεγοντες

(42–45) Luke 23:38–39 (Column 2)

³⁸ην δε και επιγρα
φη επιγεγραμμε
νη επ αυτω γραμ
μασιν ελληνικοις
και ρωμαϊκοις
και εβραϊκοις·
ουτος εστιν ο βα
σιλευς των ιου
δαιων·

³⁹εις δε των κρεμα
(Column 1)
σθεντων κακουρ
γων εβλασφη
μει αυτον λεγω
ει συ ει ο χς σωσο
σεαυτον και ημας·

(46) Luke 23:44 (Column 1)

⁴⁴ην δε ωσει ωρα ε
κτη· και σκοτος
εγενετο εφ ολη
(Column 2)
την γην εως ωρας
ενατης· ⁴⁵και εσκο

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aland, Barbara. "Kriterien zur Beurteilung kleinerer Papyrusfragmente des Neuen Testaments." Pages 1–13 in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel*. Edited by A. Denaux. BETL 161. Leuven: Peeters, 2002.
- . "Neutestamentliche Handschriften als Interpreten des Textes? P⁷⁵ und seine Vorlagen in Joh 10." Pages 379–397 in *Jesu Rede von Gott und ihre Nachgeschichte im frühen Christendom*. Edited by Dietrich-Alex Koch, Gerhard Sellin, and Andreas Lindemann. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1989.
- . "New Testament Textual Research: Its Methods and Its Goals." Pages 13–26 in *Translating the New Testament: Text, Translation, Theology*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Mark J. Boda. McMaster New Testament Studies. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- . "The Significance of the Chester Beatty Papyri in Early Church History." Pages 108–121 in *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels—The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex P⁴⁵*. Edited by Charles Horton. JSNTSup 258. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- . "Das Zeugnis der frühen Papyri für den Text der Evangelien: Diskutiert am Matthäusevangelium." Pages 325–335 in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck et al. 3 vols. BETL 100. Leuven: Peeters, 1992.
- Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce Manning Metzger, eds. *The Greek New Testament*. 4th ed. United Bible Society. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft; United Bible Society, 2005.
- Aland, Kurt. "Alter und Entstehung des D-Textes im neuen Testament: Betrachtungen zu P⁶⁹ und 0171." Pages 37–61 in *Miscellània papirologica Ramón Roca-Puig: En el seu vuitantè aniversari*. Edited by Sabastià Janeras. Barcelona: Fundació Salvador Vives Casajuana, 1987.
- . *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments: Zweite, neubearbeitete und ergänzte Auflage*. ANTF 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994.

- , ed. *Materialien zur neutestamentlichen Handschriftkunde*. Vol. 1. ANTF 3. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969.
- . “Neue neutestamentliche Papyri.” *NTS* 3 (1957): 261–286. Repr. as “Neue neutestamentliche Papyri: P⁷, P⁶⁸, P¹¹.” Pages 137–154 in *Studien zur Überlieferung des neuen Testaments und seines Textes*. ANTF 2. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1967.
- . “Neue neutestamentliche Papyri.” *NTS* 12 (1966): 193–210.
- . “Neue neutestamentliche Papyri II.” *NTS* 11 (1964): 1–21.
- . “Neue neutestamentliche Papyri III.” *NTS* 22 (1976): 375–396.
- . “Der neue ‘Standard-Text’ in seinem Verhältnis zu den frühen Papyri und Majuskeln.” Pages 257–275 in *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis, Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger*. Edited by Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee. Oxford: Clarendon, 1981.
- . “Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus.” Pages 91–136 in *Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes*. ANTF 2. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1967.
- . *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri: Vol. 1, Biblische Papyri*. PTS 18. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1976.
- . *Studien zur Überlieferung des neuen Testaments und seines Textes*. ANTF 2. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1967.
- , ed. *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*. 15th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996.
- . “Zur Liste der Neutestamentlichen Handschriften VI.” *ZNW* 48 (1957): 141–191.
- Aland, Kurt, and Barbara Aland. *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
- Aland, Kurt, Barbara Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce Manning Metzger, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 27th ed. of Nestle-Aland. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.
- , eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28th ed. of Nestle-Aland. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.

- Albright, W. F., and C. S. Mann. *Matthew: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. AB. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1971.
- Allen, Willoughby C. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Matthew*. 3rd ed. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1912.
- Amélineau, M. É. *Notice des manuscrits coptes de la Bibliothèque Nationale renfermant des textes bilingues du Nouveau Testament*. Tiré des notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale et autres Bibliothèques 34/2. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1895.
- Amphoux, Christian-B. “Les circonstances de la copie du Codex Vaticanus (Vat. Gr. 1209).” Pages 157–176 in *Le manuscrit B de la Bible (Vaticanus graecus 1209): Introduction au fac-similé, Actes du Colloque de Genève (11 juin 2001), Contributions supplémentaires*. Edited by Patrick Andrist. HTB 7. Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2009.
- . “Codex Vaticanus B: Les Points Diacritiques des Marges de Marc.” *JTS* 58 (2007): 440–466.
- Amundsen, Leiv. “Christian Papyri from the Oslo Collection.” *SO* 24 (1945): 121–147.
- Andrist, Patrick, ed. *Le manuscrit B de la Bible (Vaticanus graecus 1209): Introduction au fac-similé, Actes du Colloque de Genève (11 juin 2001), Contributions supplémentaires*. HTB 7. Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2009.
- Ayuso, Teófilo. “¿Texto cesariense o precesariense?: su realidad y su trascendencia en la crítica textual del Nuevo Testamento.” *Bib* 16 (1935): 369–415.
- Baarda, Tjitze. “ΔΙΑΦΩΝΙΑ—ΣΥΜΦΩΝΙΑ: Factors in the Harmonization of the Gospels, Especially in the Diatessaron of Tatian.” Pages 133–154 in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*. Edited by William L. Petersen. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 3. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- Balestri, P. J., ed. *Novum Testamentum*. Vol. 3 of *Sacrorum Bibliorum fragmenta copto-sahidica Musei Borgiani*. Rome: Ex Typographia Polyglotta s.c. De Propoganda Fide, 1904.
- Bammel, Ernst. “P⁶⁴⁽⁶⁷⁾ and the Last Supper.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 24 (1973): 189.
- Bartina, Sebastian. “Another New Testament Papyrus (P⁶⁷).” *CBQ* 20 (1958): 290–291.

- Bauckham, Richard. *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*. London: T&T Clark, 1990.
- Beare, Frank. "The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri." *CdE* 12 (1937): 81–91.
- Bickerman, Elias Joseph. *The Jews in the Greek Age*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Birdsall, J. Neville. "The Codex Vaticanus: Its History and Significance." Pages 33–41 in *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text*. Edited by Scot McKendrick and Orlaith A. O'Sullivan. London: The British Library; New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Press in association with The Scriptorium: Center for Christian Antiquities, 2003.
- . "A Fresh Examination of the Fragments of the Gospel of St. Luke in Ms. 0171 and an Attempted Reconstruction with Special Reference to the Recto." Pages 212–227 in *Altes und Neues Testament*. Vol. 1 of *Philologia Sacra: Biblische und patristische Studien für Hermann J. Frede und Walter Thiele zu ihrem siebzigsten Geburtstag*. Edited by Roger Gryson. VL 24/1. Freiburg: Herder, 1993.
- . "Rational Eclecticism and the Oldest Manuscripts: A Comparative Study of the Bodmer and Chester Beatty Papyri of the Gospel of Luke." Pages 39–51 in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. NovTSup 44. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Luke*. BECNT. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994–1996.
- Bogaert, Pierre-Maurice. "Le Vaticanus, Athanase et Alexandrie." Pages 135–155 in *Le manuscrit B de la Bible (Vaticanus graecus 1209): Introduction au fac-similé, Actes du Colloque de Genève (11 juin 2001), Contributions supplémentaires*. Edited by Patrick Andrist. HTB 7. Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2009.
- Boring, M. Eugene. *The Gospel of Matthew: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections*. NIB 8. Nashville: Abingdon, 1995.
- Bover, José M. "Dos Papiros Egipcios del N. T. Recientemente Publicados." *EstEcl* 9 (1930): 289–320.
- . "Un fragmento de San Lucas (22,44–63) en un papiro (07) recientemente descubierto." *EstEcl* 4 (1925): 293–305.
- Bovon, François. *Luke*. Translated by James E. Crouch. 3 vols. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002–2013.

- Brown, Raymond E. *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave, A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*. 2 vols. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- Browne, Gerald M. "The Sunnarti Mark." *ZPE* 66 (1986): 49–52.
- Burkitt, F. C. "The Chester Beatty Papyri." *JTS* 34 (1993): 363–368.
- Canart, Paul. "Note sur le manuscrit T ou 029 du Nouveau Testament." *Bib* 84 (2003): 274–275.
- de' Cavalieri, Pius Franchi. *Codices graeci Chisiani et Borgiani*. Rome: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1927, 141–143.
- de' Cavalieri, Pius Franchi and Iohannes Lietzmann. *Specimina codicum Graecorum Vaticanorum*. Tabulae in usum scholarum 1. Bonn: A. Marcus et E. Webber, 1910.
- Cavallo, Guglielmo. *Ricerche sulla maiuscola biblica*. 2 vols. Studi e testi di papirologica 2. Florence: Le Monnier, 1967.
- . *La scrittura greca e latina dei papiri. Una introduzione*. Studia Erudita 8. Rome: Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2008.
- Cavallo, Guglielmo, and H. Maehler. *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period: AD 300–800*. Institute of Classical Studies Bulletin Supplement 47. London: University of London, 1987.
- Charalambakis, Ch., D. Hagedorn, D. Kaimakis, and L. Thüngen. "Vier literarische Papyri der Kölner Sammlung." *ZPE* 14 (1974): 37–40.
- Charlesworth, S. D. "T. C. Skeat, P⁶⁴⁺⁶⁷ and P⁴, and the Problem of Fibre Orientation in Codicological Reconstruction." *NTS* 53 (2007): 582–604.
- Charpin, Dominique. *Reading and Writing in Babylon*. Translated by Jane Marie Todd. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Clark, Kenneth Willis. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Greek New Testament Manuscripts in America*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1937.
- . "The Posture of the Ancient Scribe." *BA* 26 (1963): 63–72.
- . "Textual Criticism and Doctrine." Pages 52–65 in *Studia Paulina: In Honorem Johannis de Zwaan Septuagenarii*. Haarlem: Bohn, 1953.

- Clivaz, Claire. "The Angel and the Sweat Like 'Drops of Blood' (Lk 22:43–44): P⁶⁹ and f^{A3}." *HTR* 98 (2005): 419–440.
- . "Some Remarks on Thomas A. Wayment, 'A New Transcription of P.Oxy. 2383 (P⁶⁹).'" *NovT* 52 (2010): 83–87.
- Cohen, Abraham, ed. *Minor Tractates: Translated into English with Notes, Glossary, and Indices*. London: Soncino Press, 1984.
- Collins, Adela Yarbo. *Mark*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress: 2007.
- Colomo, D., and J. Chapa, eds. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 76. Graeco Roman Memoirs 97. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2011.
- Colwell, Ernest Cadman. "Biblical Criticism: Lower and Higher." *JBL* 67 (1948): 1–12.
- . "Hort Redivivus: A Plea and a Program." Pages 148–171 in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. NTTS 9. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969. Repr. from pages 131–156 in *Transitions in Biblical Scholarship*. Edited by J. Coert Rylaarsdam. Essays in Divinity 6. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- . "Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A Study of P⁴⁵, P⁶⁶, P⁷⁵." Pages 106–124 in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. NTTS 9. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969. Originally published as "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text." Pages 370–389 in *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*. Edited by J. Philip Hyatt. Nashville: Abingdon, 1965.
- . *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. NTTS 9. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969.
- Colwell, Ernest Cadman, and Ernest W. Tune. "Method in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings." Pages 96–105 in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. NTTS 9. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969. Originally published as "Variant Readings: Classification and Use." *JBL* 83 (1964): 253–261.
- . "Method in Establishing Quantitative Relationships between Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts." Pages 56–62 in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. NTTS 9. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969. Originally published as "The Quantitative Relationships between MS Text-Types." Pages 25–32 in *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey*. Edited by J. N. Birdsall and R. W. Thomson. Freiburg: Herder, 1963.

- Comfort, Philip W. *Early Manuscripts & Modern Translations of the New Testament*. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 1990.
- . “Exploring the Common Identification of Three New Testament Manuscripts: P⁴, P⁶⁴, and P⁶⁷.” *TynBul* 46 (1995): 43–54.
- . “The Scribe as Interpreter: A New Look at New Testament Textual Criticism according to Reader Reception Theory.” PhD diss., The University of South Africa, 1996.
- . “Scribes as Readers: Looking at New Testament Textual Variants according to Reader Reception Analysis.” *Neot* 38 (2004): 28–53.
- Comfort, Philip W., and David P. Barrett, eds. *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts: A Corrected, Enlarged Edition of ‘The Complete Text of the Earliest New Testament Manuscripts’*. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 2001.
- Couchoud, Paul-Louis. “Notes sur le texte de St Marc dans le Codex Chester Beatty.” *JTS* 35 (1934): 3–22.
- Daris, Sergio. “Papiri letterari dell’Università Cattolica di Milano.” *Aeg* 52 (1972): 80–88.
- Davies, Philip R. *Scribes and Schools: The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures*. LAI. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998.
- Davies, W. D., and Dale C. Allison, Jr. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew*. 3 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–1997.
- Delobel, Joël. “Le texte de l’Apocalypse: Problèmes de méthode.” Pages 151–166 in *L’Apocalypse johannique et l’Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament*. Edited by J. Lambrecht. BETL 53. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1980.
- Denaux, A., ed. *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel*. BETL 161. Leuven: Peeters, 2002.
- Depuydt, Leo. *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library*. Leuven: Peeters, 1993.
- Derrenbacker, R. A., Jr. *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem*. BETL 186. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005.
- Downing, F. Gerald. “Compositional Conventions and the Synoptic Problem.” *JBL* 107 (1988): 69–85.

- Duplacy, Jean. "P⁷⁵ (*Pap. Bodmer XIV–XV*) et les formes les plus anciennes du texte de Luc." Pages 111–128 in *L'Évangile de Luc: Problèmes littéraires et théologiques*. Edited by Frans Neirynck. BETL 32. Gembloux: Duculot, 1973.
- Edwards, Sarah Alexander. "P75 under the Magnifying Glass." *NovT* 18 (1976): 190–212.
- Ehrman, Bart D. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- . "A Problem of Textual Circularity: The Alands on the Classification of New Testament Manuscripts." *Bib* 70 (1989): 377–388.
- . "The Text as Window: New Testament Manuscripts and the Social History of Early Christianity." Pages 803–830 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestiones*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. 2nd ed. NTTSD 42. Leiden: Brill, 2013; Repr. from pages 361–379 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. SD 46. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- . "The Text of the Gospels at the End of the Second Century." Pages 71–99 in *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. NTTS 33. Leiden: Brill, 2006. Repr. from pages 95–122 in *Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunel Colloquium, June 1994*. Edited by D. C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux. NTTS 22. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Ehrman, Bart D., and Mark A. Plunkett. "The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43–44." *CBQ* 45 (1983): 401–416.
- Ehrman, Bart D., and Michael W. Holmes, eds. *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestiones*. SD 46. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- , eds. *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestiones*. 2nd ed. NTTSD 42. Leiden, Brill, 2013.
- Elliott, J. K. *A Bibliography of Greek New Testament Manuscripts*. 3rd ed. NovTSup 160. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- , ed. *The Collected Biblical Writings of T. C. Skeat*. NovTSup 113. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

- . “An Eclectic Textual Commentary on the Greek Text of Mark’s Gospel.” Pages 189–201 in *The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark: An Edition of C. H. Turner’s ‘Notes on Markan Usage’ Together with Other Comparable Studies*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. NovTSup 71. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- . “The Nature of the Evidence Available for Reconstructing the Text of the New Testament in the Second Century.” Pages 29–39 in *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles, Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. NovTSup 137. Leiden: Brill, 2010. Repr. from pages 9–18 in *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity: Le Texte de Nouveau Testament au début du christianisme. Proceedings of the Lille Colloquium, July 2000: Actes du colloque de Lille, juillet 2000*. Edited by Christian-B. Amphoux and J. K. Elliott. Lausanne: Editions du Zèbre, 2003.
- . “The New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Challenge for the Twenty-First Century.” Pages 13–27 in *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles: Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation*. NovTSup 137. Leiden: Brill, 2010. Repr. from *New Testament Textual Research Update* 8 (2000): 1–14.
- , ed. *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles, Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation*. NovTSup 137. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- . “Printed Editions of Greek Synopses and Their Influence on the Synoptic Problem.” Pages 337–357 in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck, Christopher M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden. 3 vols. BETL 100. Leuven: Peeters, 1992.
- . “Recent Oxyrhynchus Papyri.” Pages 157–174 in *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles: Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation*. NovTSup 137. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- . “Recently Discovered New Testament Papyri and Their Significance for Textual Criticism.” Pages 89–108 in *Reading New Testament Papyri in Context = Lire des papyrus du Nouveau Testament dans leur contexte*. Edited by Claire Clivaz and Jean Zumstein. BETL 242. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.
- . “The Relevance of Textual Criticism to the Synoptic Problem.” Pages 348–359 in *The Interrelations of the Gospels: A Symposium Led by M.-É. Boismard, W. R. Farmer, F. Neirynck, Jerusalem 1984*. Edited by David L. Dungan. BETL 95. Leuven: Peeters, 1990.
- . “Resolving the Synoptic Problem Using the Text of Printed Greek Synopses.” *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 6 (1993): 51–58.

- . “Seven Recently Published New Testament Fragments from Oxyrhynchus.” *NovT* 42 (2000): 209–213. Repr. as “Recent Oxyrhynchus Papyri.” Pages 157–174 in *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles, Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. NovTSup 137. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- . “Singular Readings in the Gospel Text of P⁴⁵.” Pages 122–131 in *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels, The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex P⁴⁵*. Edited by Charles Horton. JSNTSup 258. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- . “Six New Papyri of Matthew’s Gospel.” *NovT* 41 (1999): 105–107. Repr. as “Recent Oxyrhynchus Papyri.” Pages 157–174 in *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles, Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. NovTSup 137. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- , ed. *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. NovTSup 44. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- . “T. C. Skeat on the Dating and Origin of Codex Vaticanus.” Pages 281–294 in *The Collected Biblical Writings of T. C. Skeat*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. NovTSup 113. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . “Textual Criticism, Assimilation and the Synoptic Gospels.” *NTS* 26 (1980): 231–241.
- . “Theodore Skeat et l’origine du *Codex Vaticanus*.” Pages 119–133 in *Le manuscrit B de la Bible (Vaticanus graecus 1209): Introduction au fac-similé, Actes du Colloque de Genève (11 juin 2001), Contributions supplémentaires*. Edited by Patrick Andrist. HTB 7. Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2009.
- Ennulat, Andreas. *Die “Minor Agreements”: Untersuchungen zu einer offenen Frage des synoptischen Problems*. WUNT: 2/62. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. “The New Testament Papyri at Oxyrhynchus in Their Social and Intellectual Context.” Pages 47–68 in *Sayings of Jesus: Canonical & Non-Canonical, Essays in Honour of Tjitze Baarda*. Edited by William L. Petersen, Johan S. Vos, and Henk J. de Jonge. NovTSup 89. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . “The Papyrus Manuscripts of the New Testament.” Pages 1–39 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestiones*. 2nd ed. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. NTTSD 42. Leiden: Brill, 2013. Repr. from pages 3–21 in *The Text of the New Testament in*

Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. SD 46. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

———. “The Significance of the Papyri for Determining the Nature of the New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission.” Pages 274–297 in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Edited by Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee. SD 45. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993. Repr. from pages 71–103 in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*. Edited by William Lawrence Petersen. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 3. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.

———. *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*. SNTSMS 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Epp, Eldon Jay, and Gordon D. Fee, eds. *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis, Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1981.

———, eds. *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. SD 45. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.

Fee, Gordon D. “Modern Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem: On the Problem of Harmonization in the Gospels.” Pages 174–182 in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Edited by Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee. SD 45. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993. Repr. from pages 154–169 in *J. J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies, 1776–1976*. Edited by Bernard Orchard, and Thomas R. W. Longstaff. SNTSMS 34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

———. “On the Types, Classification, and Presentation of Textual Variation.” Pages 62–79 in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Edited by Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee. SD 45. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.

———. “P⁷⁵, P⁶⁶, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria.” Pages 247–273 in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Edited by Eldon Jay Epp, and Gordon D. Fee. SD 45. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993. Repr. from pages 19–45 in *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill Chapin Tenney. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974.

———. “Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism—Which?” Pages 124–140 in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Edited by Eldon Jay Epp, and Gordon D. Fee. SD 45. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993. Repr. from pages

174–197 in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. NovTSup 44. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

———. “The Significance of Papyrus Bodmer II and Papyrus Bodmer XIV–XV for Methodology in New Testament Textual Criticism.” PhD diss., University of Southern California, 1966.

———. “A Text-Critical Look at the Synoptic Problem.” *NovT* 22 (1980): 12–28.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel according to Luke*. 2 vols. AB 28–28a. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981–1985.

———. “Papyrus Bodmer XIV: Some Features of Our Oldest Text of Luke.” *CBQ* 24 (1962): 170–179.

———. “The Priority of Mark and the ‘Q’ Source in Luke.” Pages 131–170 in *Jesus and Man’s Hope*. Edited by David G. Buttrick. 2 vols. Pittsburgh: Perspective, 1970.

Follieri, Henrica. *Codices Graeci Bibliothecae Vaticanae selecti. Temporum locurumque ordine digesti commentariis et transcriptionibus instructi*. Fasciculus 4 of *Exempla Scripturarum*. Vatican City: Bibliothecam Vaticanam, 1969.

France, R. T. *The Gospel according to Matthew: An Introduction and Commentary*. TNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985.

———. *The Gospel of Matthew*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Frend, W. H. C. and I. A. Muirhead. “The Greek Manuscripts from the Cathedral of Q‘asr Ibrim.” *Le Muséon* 89 (1976): 43–49.

Gamble, Harry Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Gathercole, Simon. “The Earliest Manuscript Title of Matthew’s Gospel (BnF Suppl. gr. 1120 ii 3/P⁴).” *NovT* 54 (2012): 209–235.

Gerstinger, Hans. “Ein Fragment des Chester Beatty-Evangelienkodex in der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien (Pap. graec. Vindob. 31974).” *Aeg* 13 (1933): 67–72.

Giorgi, A. A. *Fragmentum evangelii S. Iohannis Graecum Copto-Thebaicum saeculi IV*. Rome: Fulgonius, 1789.

- Gnilka, Joachim. *Das Matthäusevangelium*. 2 vols. HThKNT. Freiburg: Herder, 1986–1988.
- Gonis, N., J Chapa, W. E. Cockle, D. Obbink, P. J. Parsons, and J. D. Thomas, eds. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 66. Graeco-Roman Memoirs 86. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1999.
- Goodman, M. D. “Texts, Scribes and Power in Roman Judaea.” Pages 99–108 in *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*. Edited by Alan K. Bowman and Greg Woolf. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Gregory, Caspar René. *Die griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908.
- . “Mitteilungen: Griechische Handschriften des Neuen Testaments bis zum 1 Juli 1912.” *TLZ* 37 (1912): 477.
- . *Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1900.
- Grenfell, Bernard P., and Arthur S. Hunt, eds. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 1. Graeco-Roman Memoirs. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1898.
- , eds. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 3. Graeco-Roman Memoirs. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1903.
- , eds. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 10. Graeco-Roman Memoirs. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1914.
- Grundmann, Walter. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. THKNT 1. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1968.
- Gundry, Robert H. *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- . *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- Hagner, Donald L. *Matthew*. 2 vols. WBC 33. Dallas: Word Books, 1993–1995.
- Haines-Eitzen, Kim. “‘Girls Trained in Beautiful Writing’: Female Scribes in Roman Antiquity and Early Christianity.” *J ECS* 6 (1998): 629–646.

- . *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . “The Social History of Early Christian Scribes.” Pages 479–495 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestiones*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. 2nd ed. NTTSD 42. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Handley, Eric W., U. Wartenburg, R. A. Coles, N. Gonis, M. W. Haslam, and J. D. Thomas, eds. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 64. Graeco-Roman Memoirs 84. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1997.
- Hare, Douglas R. A. *Matthew*. IBC. Louisville: John Knox, 1993.
- Harrington, Daniel J. *The Gospel of Matthew*. SP 1. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Harris, William V. *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- Hartley, John E. “Textual Affinities of Papyrus Bodmer XIV (P⁷⁵).” *EvQ* 40 (1968): 97–102.
- Hatch, William Henry Paine. *The Principal Uncial Manuscripts of the New Testament*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.
- Head, Peter M. “Christology and Textual Transmission: Reverential Alterations in the Synoptic Gospels.” *NovT* 35 (1993): 105–129.
- . “The Date of the Magdalen Papyrus of Matthew (P. MAGD. GR. 17 = P64): A Response to C. P. Thiede.” *TynBul* 46 (1995): 251–285.
- . “The Early Text of Mark.” Pages 108–120 in *The Early Text of the New Testament*. Edited by Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- . “The Habits of New Testament Copyists: Singular Readings in the Early Fragmentary Papyri of John.” *Bib* 85 (2004): 399–408.
- . “Is P⁴, P⁶⁴, and P⁶⁷ the Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels? A Response to T. C. Skeat.” *NTS* 51 (2005): 450–457.
- . “Observations on Early Papyri of the Synoptic Gospels, Especially on the ‘Scribal Habits.’” *Bib* 71 (1990): 240–247.

- . “Some Recently Published NT Papyri: An Overview and Preliminary Assessment.” *TynBul* 51 (2000): 1–16.
- . “Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem.” Pages 115–156 in *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2008: Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett*. Edited by Paul Foster, Andrew Gregory, John S. Kloppenborg, and Jozef Verheyden. BETL 239. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.
- Hebbelynck, A. “Les manuscrits coptes-sahidiques du Monastère Blanc: Recherches sur les fragments complémentaires de la collection Borgia.” *Le Muséon* 31 (1912): 275–362.
- Hedley, P. L. “The Egyptian Texts of the Gospels and Acts.” *CQR* 118 (1934): 23–39, 188–230.
- Hernández, Juan, Jr. “The Early Text of Luke.” Pages 121–139 in *The Early Text of the New Testament*. Edited by Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Hill, Charles E. “Intersections of Jewish and Christian Scribal Culture: The Original Codex Containing P4, P64, and P67 and its Implications.” Pages 75–91 in *Among Jews, Gentiles, and Christians in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. Edited by Reidar Hvalvik and John Kaufman. Trondheim: Tapir Academic Press, 2011.
- Hill, Charles E., and Michael J. Kruger, eds. *The Early Text of the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Holmes, Michael W. “The Text of the Matthean Divorce Passages: A Comment on the Appeal to Harmonization in Textual Decisions.” *JBL* 109 (1990): 651–664.
- Hombert, Marcel. “Bulletin Papyrologique XXVIII (1954 à 1959).” *REG* 78 (1965): 205–316.
- Horton, Charles. “The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: A Find of the Greatest Importance.” Pages 149–160 in *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels—The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex P⁴⁵*. Edited by Charles Horton. JSNTSup 258. London: T&T Clark: 2004.
- , ed. *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels—The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex P⁴⁵*. JSNTSup 258. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Hoskier, Herman C. *Codex B and Its Allies: A Study and an Indictment*. 2 vols. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1914.

- Hunt, Arthur S., ed. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 9. Graeco-Roman Memoirs. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1912.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- . “P⁴⁵ and the Textual History of the Gospel of Mark.” Pages 132–148 in *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels—The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex P⁴⁵*. Edited by Charles Horton. JSNTSup 258. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- . *Text-Critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text: Codex W in the Gospel of Mark*. SD 43. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.
- Huston, Hollis W. “Mark 6 and 11 in P⁴⁵ and in the Caesarean Text.” *JBL* 74 (1955): 262–271.
- Ingrams, L., P. Kingston, P. J. Parsons, and J. R. Rea, eds. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 34. Graeco-Roman Memoirs 49. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1968.
- International Greek New Testament Project, ed. *The Gospel according to St. Luke*. 2 vols. The New Testament in Greek 3. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984–1987.
- Janeras, Sabastià. *Miscellània papirologica Ramón Roca-Puig: En el seu vuitantè aniversari*. Barcelona: Fundació Salvador Vives Casajuana, 1987.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums*. KEK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.
- Jerome. *Praefatio ad Damasum*. In Robert Weber, and Roger Gryson, eds. *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*. 5th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Gospel of Luke*. SP 3. Collegeville: MN: Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Jones, Alexander. *The Gospel according to St Matthew: A Text and Commentary for Students*. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1965.
- Keenan, James G. Review of *Ancient Literacy*, by William V. Harris. *Ancient History Bulletin* 5 (1991): 101–107.
- Keener, Craig S. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

- Kenyon, Frederic G. *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible. Fasciculus 1: General Introduction, With Twelve Plates*. London: Emery Walker, 1933.
- . *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible. Fasciculus 2: The Gospels and Acts, Plates*. London: Emery Walker, 1934.
- . *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible. Fasciculus 2: The Gospels and Acts, Text*. London: Emery Walker, 1933.
- . “The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri.” *Gn* 8 (1932): 46–49.
- . *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*. 3rd ed. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1897.
- . *Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy*. London: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 1933.
- . “Some Notes on the Chester Beatty Gospels and Acts.” Pages 145–148 in *Quantulacumque: Studies Presented to Kirsopp Lake by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends*. Edited by Robert P. Casey, Silva Lake, and Agnes K. Lake. London: Christophers, 1937.
- . *Text of the Greek Bible: A Students Handbook*. London: Duckworth, 1937.
- Kilpatrick, George Dunbar. “The Bodmer and Mississippi Collection of Biblical and Christian Texts.” *GRBS* 4 (1963): 33–47.
- . “Some Thoughts on Modern Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Gospels.” Pages 80–97 in *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays of G. D. Kilpatrick*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. BETL 96. Leuven: Peeters, 1990. Repr. from *NovT* 19 (1977): 275–292.
- King, Marchant A. “Notes on the Bodmer Manuscript of Luke.” *BSac* 122 (1965): 234–240.
- Kloppenborg, John S. *The Tenants in the Vineyard: Ideology, Economics, and Agrarian Conflict in Jewish Palestine*. WUNT 195. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Klostermann, Erich. *Das Matthäusevangelium*. HNT 4. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1971.

- Klostermann, E., ed. *Origenes Werke, Zehnter Band: Origenes Matthäuserklärung*. Die GCS 40. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1935.
- Koester, Helmut. "The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century." Pages 19–37 in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*. Edited by William L. Petersen. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 3. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- Kramer, Bärbel, and Dieter Hagedorn, eds. *Kölner Papyri (P.Köln)*. Vol. 2. Papyrologica Coloniensia 7. Köln: Westdeutscher, 1978.
- Kruger, Michael J. "Early Christian Attitudes toward the Reproduction of Texts." Pages 63–80 in *The Early Text of the New Testament*. Edited by Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Lagrange, M.-J. *La critique rationnelle. Introduction à l'étude du Nouveau Testament*. Vol. 2 of *Critique textuelle*. 2nd ed. *EBib*. Paris: Lecoffre, 1935.
- . "Un Nouveau Papyrus Évangélique." *RB* 42 (1933): 402–404.
- . "Un Nouveau Papyrus Évangélique: Mt. 26,19–52." *RB* 38 (1929): 161–177.
- . "Les papyrus Chester Beatty pour les Évangiles." *RB* 43 (1934): 5–41.
- Lake, Kirsopp. "The Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts and the Copies sent by Eusebius to Constantine." *HTR* 11 (1918): 32–35.
- Lake, Kirsopp, Robert P. Blake, and Silva New. "The Caesarean Text of the Gospel of Mark." *HTR* 21 (1928): 207–404.
- Legg, S. C. E., ed. *Novum Testamentum Graece secundum Textum Westcotto-Hortianum: Evangelium secundum Marcum*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1935.
- , ed. *Novum Testamentum Graece secundum Textum Westcotto-Hortianum: Evangelium secundum Matthaëum*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1940.
- Lobel, E., C. H. Roberts, E. G. Turner, and J. W. B. Barns, eds. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 24. Graeco-Roman Memoirs 35. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1957.
- Lowe, Malcolm. "From the Parable of the Vineyard to a Pre-Synoptic Source." *NTS* 28 (1982): 257–263.
- Lupieri, Edmondo. "Fragments of the Historical Jesus? A Reading of *Mark* 11,11–[26]." *Annali di storia dell'esegesi* 28 (2011): 289–311.

- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew*. Translated by James E. Crouch. 3 vols. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001–2007.
- Marcus, Joel. *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. 2 vols. Anchor Yale Bible 27–27A. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000–2009.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Martin, Victor, and Rudolphe Kasser, eds. *Papyrus Bodmer XIV: Evangile de Luc chap. 3–24 (P⁷⁵)*. Vol. 1 of *Papyrus Bodmer XIV–XV: Evangiles de Luc et Jean*. Cologny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961.
- Martini, Carlo M. *Il problema della recensioalità del codice B alla luce del papiro Bodmer XIV*. AnBib 26. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966.
- Meeks, Wayne A. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Mees, Michael. “Die Bezeugung von Mt 26,20–40 auf Papyrus (P⁶⁴, P⁵³, P⁴⁵, P³⁷) und ihre Bedeutung.” *Aug* 11 (1971): 409–431.
- . “Papyrus Bodmer XIV (P⁷⁵) und die Lukaszitate bei Clemens von Alexandrien.” Pages 97–119 in *Studi e Ricerche di Scienze Religiose in onore dei Santi Apostoli Pietro e Paolo nel XIX centenario del loro martirio*. Lateranum Nova Series 34. Rome: Facultas Theologica Pontificiae Universitatis Lateranensis, 1968.
- Merell, Jan. *Papyry: A Kritika Novozákonního Textu*. Praze: Vytiskla, 1939.
- Merell, Jean. “Nouveaux Fragments du Papyrus IV.” *RB* 47 (1938): 5–22.
- Merk, Augustinus. “Codex Evangeliorum et Actuum ex collectione papyrorum Chester Beatty.” Pages 375–406 in *Miscellanea Biblica*. Vol. 2. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1934.
- , ed. *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine*. 11th ed. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1992.
- Metzger, Bruce Manning. “The Bodmer Papyrus of Luke and John.” *ExpTim* 73 (1962): 201–203.
- . “The Caesarean Text of the Gospels.” Pages 42–72 in *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Edited by Bruce Manning Metzger. NTTS 4. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963. Repr. from *JBL* 64 (1945): 457–489.

- . “Explicit References in the Works of Origen to Variant Readings in New Testament Manuscripts.” Pages 78–95 in *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey*. Edited by J. Neville Birdsall and Robert W. Thomson. Freiburg: Herder, 1963.
- . “The Furniture in the Scriptorium at Qumran.” *RevQ* 1 (1959): 509–515.
- . *Historical and Literary Studies: Pagan, Jewish, and Christian*. NTTS 8. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.
- . *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007.
- . “When Did Scribes Begin to Use Writing Desks?” Pages 123–137 in *Historical and Literary Studies: Pagan, Jewish, and Christian*. NTTS 8. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.
- Metzger, Bruce Manning, and Bart D. Ehrman. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Milne, H. J. M., and T. C. Skeat. *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus*. London: British Museum, 1939.
- Min, Kyoung Shik. *Die Früheste Überlieferung des Matthäusevangeliums (bis zum 3./4. Jh.): Edition und Untersuchung*. ANTF 34. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005.
- Naldini, Mario. *Documenti dell’antichità cristiana: Papiri e pergamene greco-egizie della raccolta fiorentina*. Florence: Felice le Monnier, 1965.
- . “Nuovi frammenti del vangelo di Matteo.” *Prometheus* 1 (1975): 195–200.
- Neusner, Jacob. *Judaic Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: A Systematic Reply to Professor E. P. Sanders*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- . *Judaism: The Evidence of the Mishnah*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- New, Silva. “The New Chester Beatty Papyrus.” *JBL* 51 (1932): 73–74.
- Nolland, John. *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- . *Luke*. 3 vols. WBC 35a–c. Dallas, Word Books, 1993–2000.

Novum Testamentum e Codice Vaticano Graeco 1209 (Codex B) tertia vice phototypice expressum. Codices e Vaticanis Selecti 30. Vatican City: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1968.

O'Neill, J. C. "The Rules Followed by the Editors of the Text Found in the Codex Vaticanus." *NTS* 35 (1989): 219–228.

Oppenheim, A. Leo. "The Position of the Intellectual in Mesopotamian Society." *Daedalus* 104 (1975): 37–46.

Orsini, Pasquale. *Manoscritti in maiuscola biblica: Materiali per un aggiornamento*. Cassino: Università degli Studi di Cassino, 2005.

Pardee, Cambry. "Peter's Tarnished Image: Scribal Polishing in the Gospel of Luke (Ms. 0171)." *Annali di storia dell'esegesi* 33 (2016).

Parker, D. C. *The Living Text of the Gospels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

———. "Was Matthew Written before 50 CE? The Magdalen Papyrus of Matthew." *ExpTim* 107 (1995): 40–43.

Parsons, Mikeal C. "A Christological Tendency in P⁷⁵." *JBL* 105 (1986): 463–479.

———. "Hearing Acts as a Sequel to the Multiform Gospel: Historical and Hermeneutical Reflections on Acts, Luke and the *Polloi*." Pages 128–152 in *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and C. Kavin Rowe. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2010.

———. "Reading Acts as a Sequel to the Fourfold Gospel." Pages 19–26 in *The Book of Acts*. Christian Reflection: A Series in Faith and Ethics. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2015.

Payne, Philip B., and Paul Canart. "Distigmai Matching the Original Ink of Codex Vaticanus. Do They Mark the Location of Textual Variants?" Pages 199–225 in *Le manuscrit B de la Bible (Vaticanus graecus 1209): Introduction au fac-similé, Actes du Colloque de Genève (11 juin 2001), Contributions supplémentaires*. Edited by Patrick Andrist. HTB 7. Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2009.

———. "The Originality of Text-Critical Symbols in Codex Vaticanus." *NovT* 42 (2000): 105–113.

- Petersen, William L., ed. *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 3. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- . *Tatian's Diatessaron: It's Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 25. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Phillips, C. A. "The Caesarean Text with Special Reference to the New Papyrus and Another Ally." *Bulletin of the Bezan Club* 10 (1932): 5–19.
- Pisano, Stephen. "The Vaticanus graecus 1209: A Witness to the Text of the New Testament." Pages 77–97 in *Le manuscrit B de la Bible (Vaticanus graecus 1209): Introduction au fac-similé, Actes du Colloque de Genève (11 juin 2001), Contributions supplémentaires*. Edited by Patrick Andrist. HTB 7. Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2009.
- Plumley, J. Martin, and C. H. Roberts. "An Uncial Text of St. Mark in Greek from Nubia." *JTS* 27 (1976): 34–45.
- Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke*. 5th ed. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922.
- Porter, Calvin. "Papyrus Bodmer XV (P75) and the Text of Vaticanus." *JBL* 81 (1962): 363–376.
- Porter, Stanley E., and Mark J. Boda, eds. *Translating the New Testament: Text, Translation, Theology*. McMaster New Testament Studies. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Porter, Stanley E., and Wendy J. Porter, eds. *New Testament Greek Papyri and Parchments: New Editions, Texts and Plates*. 2 vols. Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek 29. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- Read-Heimerdinger, Jenny, and Josep Rius-Camps, eds. *A Gospel Synopsis of the Greek Text of Matthew, Mark and Luke: A Comparison of Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus*. NTTSD 45. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Roberts, Colin H. "Complementary Note to the Article of Prof. Roca-Puig." *Helmantica* 37 (1961): 123–124.
- . "An Early Papyrus of the First Gospel." *HTR* 46 (1953): 233–237.
- . *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*. London: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1979.

- Roberts, Colin H., and T. C. Skeat. *The Birth of the Codex*. London: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1983.
- Robinson, J. A. T. "The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen: A Test of Synoptic Relationships." *NTS* 21 (1975): 443–461.
- Roca-Puig, Ramón. "Dos fragmentos bíblicos de la colección Papyri Barcinonenses: Papyrus Barcinonensis, Inv. n.º 16 (Lc. 8,25–27)." *Helmantica* 16 (1965): 139–144.
- . "Nueva publicación del papiro número uno del Barcelona." *Helmantica* 37 (1961): 5–20.
- . *Un Papiro Grec de l'Evangelí de Sant Mateu*. 2nd ed. Barcelona, 1962.
- . "Un pergami grec de l'evangelí de Sant LLuc (Papyri Barcinonenses, Invent., n.º 16. Lc. VIII, 25–27)." Pages 395–399 in *Miscellania Carles Cardo*. Col·lecció Ariel. Barcelona: Ariel, 1963.
- . "Un pergaminio Griego del evangelio de San Mateo." *Emérita* 27 (1959): 59–73.
- Römer, Cornelia. "Christliche Texte (1998–1999; mit einem Nachtrag aus dem Jahr 1992)." *APF* 46 (2000): 302–308.
- Royse, James R. *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*. NTTSD 36. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . "Scribal Tendencies in the Transmission of the Text of the New Testament." Pages 461–478 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestiones*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. 2nd ed. NTTSD 42. Leiden: Brill, 2013; Repr. from pages 239–252 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestiones*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. SD 46. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- . "The Treatment of Scribal Leaps in Metzger's Textual Commentary." *NTS* 29 (1983): 539–551.
- Salonius, A. H. "Die griechischen Handschriftenfragmente des Neuen Testaments in den Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin." *ZNW* 26 (1927): 97–119.
- Sand, Alexander. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. RNT. Regensburg: Pustet, 1986.

- Sanday, William. "The Conditions under Which the Gospels Were Written, in Their Bearing upon Some Difficulties of the Synoptic Problem." Pages 3–26 in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem by Members of the University of Oxford*. Edited by William Sanday. Oxford: Clarendon, 1911.
- Sanders, Henry A. "An Early Papyrus Fragment of the Gospel of Matthew in the Michigan Collection." *HTR* 19 (1926): 215–226.
- . "The Egyptian Text of the Four Gospels and Acts." *HTR* 27 (1933): 77–98.
- . "Recent Text Studies in the New Testament." *ATHR* 16 (1934): 266–282.
- . "A Third Century Papyrus of Matthew and Acts." Pages 151–161 in *Quantulacumque: Studies Presented to Kirsopp Lake by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends*. Edited by Robert P. Casey, Silva Lake, and Agnes K. Lake. London: Christophers, 1937.
- Sanz, Peter, ed. *Griechische literarische Papyri christlichen Inhaltes I: Biblica, Väterschriften und Verwandtes*. Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien (Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer) 4. Baden bei Wien: Rohrer, 1946.
- Schaaf, Philip, and Henry Wace, eds. *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Series 2. 10 vols. 1983. Repr. by Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Schams, Christine. *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period*. JSOTSup 291. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Scheil, Vincent. "Archéologie, Varia." *RB* 1 (1892): 113–117.
- Schmidt, Andreas. "Zum Papyrus P. Köln II 80: Καὶ καταπατεῖσθαι oder καὶ πατεῖσθαι als Aussage des Korrektors?" *APF* 35 (1989): 13.
- Schmidt, Carl. "Die Evangelienhandschrift der Chester Beatty-Sammlung." *ZNW* 32 (1933): 225–232.
- . "Die neuesten Bibelfunde aus Ägypten." *ZNW* 30 (1931): 285–293.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *Matthäusevangelium*. 2 vols. NEchtB. Würzburg: Echter, 1985–1987.
- Schofield, Ellwood Mearle. "The Papyrus Fragments of the Greek New Testament." PhD thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1936.

- Schürer, Emil. *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. 3rd ed. 3 vols. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1886–1911.
- Schwartz, J. “Fragment d’Evangile sur Papyrus (Luc VII 32–34; 37 s.)” *ZPE* 3 (1968): 157–158.
- Schweizer, Eduard. *The Good News according to Matthew*. Translated by David E. Green. Atlanta: John Knox, 1975.
- Senior, Donald P. *Matthew*. ANTC. Nashville: Abingdon, 1998.
- . *The Passion Narrative according to Matthew*. BETL 39. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1975.
- Shin, Hyeon Woo. *Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem in Historical Jesus Research: The Search for Valid Criteria*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 36. Leuven: Peeters, 2004.
- Skeat, T. C. “The Codex Sinaiticus, the Codex Vaticanus and Constantine.” Pages 193–235 in *The Collected Biblical Writings of T. C. Skeat*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. NovTSup 113. Leiden: Brill, 2004. Repr. from *JTS* 50 (1999): 583–625.
- . “The Codex Vaticanus in the Fifteenth Century.” Pages 122–134 in *The Collected Biblical Writings of T. C. Skeat*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. NovTSup 113. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . “A Codicological Analysis of the Chester Beatty Papyrus Codex of Gospels and Acts (P45).” Pages 141–157 in *The Collected Biblical Writings of T. C. Skeat*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. NovTSup 113. Leiden: Brill, 2004. Repr. from *Hermathena* 155 (1993): 27–43.
- . “Early Christian Book Production: Papyri and Manuscripts.” Pages 33–59 in *The Collected Biblical Writings of T.C. Skeat*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. NovTSup 113. Leiden: Brill, 2004. Repr. from pages 54–79 in *The West from the Fathers to the Reformation*. Vol. 2 of *The Cambridge History of the Bible*. Edited by G. W. H. Lampe. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- . “Irenaeus and the Four-Gospel Canon.” Pages 73–78 in *The Collected Biblical Writings of T. C. Skeat*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. NovTSup 113. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . “The Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels?” Pages 158–192 in *The Collected Biblical Writings of T.C. Skeat*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. NovTSup 113. Leiden: Brill, 2004. Repr. from *NTS* 43 (1997): 1–34.

- . “The Origin of the Christian Codex.” Pages 79–87 in *The Collected Biblical Writings of T.C. Skeat*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. NovTSup 113. Leiden: Brill, 2004. Repr. from *ZPE* 102 (1994): 263–268.
- . “The Use of Dictation in Ancient Book Production.” Pages 3–32 in *The Collected Biblical Writings of T. C. Skeat*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. NovTSup 113. Leiden: Brill, 2004. Repr. from *Proceedings of the British Academy* 42 (1956): 179–208.
- Skeat, T. C., and B. C. McGing. “Notes on Chester Beatty Biblical Papyrus I (Gospels and Acts).” Pages 135–140 in *The Collected Biblical Writings of T. C. Skeat*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. NovTSup 113. Leiden: Brill, 2004. Repr. from *Hermathena* 150 (1991): 21–25.
- Smith, Henry Preserved. “Biblical Manuscripts in America.” *JBL* 42 (1923): 239–250.
- Snodgrass, Klyne. *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants: An Inquiry into Parable Interpretation*. WUNT 27. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.
- Souter, Alexander, ed. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1966.
- Stanton, Graham N. “The Fourfold Gospel.” *NTS* 43 (1997): 317–346.
- Stegmüller, Otto. “Ein Bruchstück aus dem griechischen Diatessaron (P. 16388).” *ZNW* 37 (1938): 223–229.
- Sterling, Greg. “*Mors philosophi*: The Death of Jesus in Luke.” *HTR* 94 (2001): 383–402.
- Strecker, Georg. *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit: Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus*. 2nd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- Streeter, Burnett Hillman. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, and Dates*. London: Macmillan, 1924.
- Swanson, Reuben J, ed. *Luke. New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press; Pasadena, CA: William Carey International University Press, 1995.
- , ed. *Mark. New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press; Pasadena, CA: William Carey International University Press, 1996.

- , ed. *Matthew. New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press; Pasadena, CA: William Carey International University Press, 1996.
- Tarelli, C. C. “The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Caesarean Text.” *JTS* 40 (1939): 46–55.
- . “The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Western and Byzantine Texts.” *JTS* 41 (1940): 253–260.
- . “Omissions, Additions, and Conflations in the Chester Beatty Papyrus.” *JTS* 40 (1939): 382–387.
- . “Some Further Linguistic Aspects of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Gospels.” *JTS* 43 (1942): 19–25.
- . “Some Linguistic Aspects of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Gospels.” *JTS* 39 (1938): 254–259.
- Tasker, R. V. G. “The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Caesarean Text of Luke.” *HTR* 29 (1936): 345–352.
- . “Notes on Variant Readings.” Pages 411–445 in *The Greek New Testament: Being the Text Translated in the New English Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Telford, William R. *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree: A Redaction-critical Analysis of the Fig-tree Pericope in Mark’s Gospel and Its Relation to the Cleansing of the Temple Tradition*. JSNTSup 1. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980.
- Thiede, Carsten Peter. “The Magdalen Papyrus: A Reply.” *ExpTim* 107 (1996): 240–241.
- . “Notes on P⁴ = Bibliothèque Nationale Paris, Supplementum Graece 1120/5.” *TynBul* 46 (1995): 55–57.
- . “Papyrus Magdalen Greek 17 (Gregory-Aland P⁶⁴): A Reappraisal.” *TynBul* 46 (1995): 29–42. Repr. from *ZPE* 105 (1995): 13–20.
- Tischendorf, Constantinus. *Fragmenta Origenianae Octateuchi Editiones cum Fragmentis Evangeliorum Graecis Palimpsestis ex Codice Leidensi Folioque Petropolitano Quarti vel Quinti, Guelferbytano Codice Quinti, Sangallensi Octavi Fere Saeculi*. Vol. 3 of *Monumenta Sacra Inedita*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1860.

- , ed. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 8th ed. Vols. 1–2. Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869–1872. *Prologomena*. Vol 3. Written by C. R. Gregory. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1894.
- Tov, Emanuel. “The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts.” *JSOT* 31 (1985): 3–29.
- . *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 3rd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.
- Treu, Kurt. “Christliche Papyri IV.” *APF* 22 (1973): 367–395.
- . “Christliche Papyri VI.” *APF* 26 (1978): 149–159.
- . “Griechisch-koptische Bilinguen des Neuen Testaments.” Pages 95–123 in *Koptologische Studien in der DDR (WZ(H))*. Edited by Institut für Byzantinistik der Martin-Luther-Universität. Halle-Wittenberg: Martin-Luther-Universität, 1965.
- . “Neue neutestamentliche Fragmente der Berliner Papyrussammlung.” *APF* 18 (1966): 23–38.
- . “Referat: Christliche Papyri 1940–1967.” *APF* 19 (1969) 169–206.
- . “Zur vermeintlichen Kontraktion von IEΠΟΣΟΛΥΜΑ in 0188, Berlin P. 13416.” *ZNW* 52 (1961): 278–279.
- Trilling, Wolfgang. *Das Wahre Israel: Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-Evangeliums*. SANT 10. Munich: Kösel, 1964.
- Tuckett, C. M. “The ‘Agony’ in the Garden and Luke’s Gospel.” Pages 131–144 in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel*. Edited by A. Denaux. BETL 161. Leuven: Peeters, 2002.
- Turner, David L. *Matthew*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008.
- Turner, E. G. *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.
- Vaganay, Léon. *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Translated by B. V. Miller. Library of Religious Knowledge. St. Louis: Herder, 1937.
- Van Haelst, Joseph. *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens*. Papyrologie 1. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1976.

- Van Segbroeck, F., Christopher M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden. *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. 3 vols. BETL 100. Leuven: Peeters, 1992.
- Van Seters, John. *The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the "Editor" in Biblical Criticism*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- . "The Role of the Scribe in the Making of the Hebrew Bible." *JANER* 8 (2008): 99–129.
- Van der Toorn, Karel. *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Vitelli, G., ed. *Papiri Greci e Latini*. 11 vols. Pubblicazioni della Societa Italiana per la Ricerce dei Papiri Greci e Latini in Egitto. Florence: Enrico Ariani, 1912–1935.
- Vocke, Harald. "Papyrus Magdalen 17: Weitere Argumente gegen die Frühdatierung des Angeblichen Jesus-Papyrus." *ZPE* 113 (1996): 153–157.
- Voelz, James W. "The Greek of Codex Vaticanus in the Second Gospel and Marcan Greek." *NovT* 47 (2005): 209–249.
- Vogels, Heinrich Joseph. *Codicum Novi Testamenti specimina. Paginias 51 ex codicibus manuscriptis et 3 ex libris impressis collegit ac phototypice repraesentatas*. Bonn: Sumptibus P. Hanstein, 1929.
- Voicu, Sever J., and Serenella D'Alisera. *I.M.A.G.E.S.: index in manuseriptorum graecorum edita specimina*. Rome: Borla, 1981.
- Von Dobschütz, Ernst. [No Title]. *TLZ* 58 (1933): 409–412.
- Von Soden, Hermann Freiherr. *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte*. Part 1: Untersuchungen. Berlin: Arthur Glaue, 1902–1910. Part 2: *Text und Apparat*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913.
- Wachtel, Klaus. "P^{64/67}: Fragmente des Matthäusevangeliums aus dem 1. Jahrhundert?" *ZPE* 107 (1995): 73–80.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Warren, William F. "The Textual Relationships of P4, P45, and P75 in the Gospel of Luke." ThD diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1983.

- Wasserman, Tommy. "A Comparative Textual Analysis of P⁴ and P⁶⁴⁺⁶⁷." *Textual Criticism* 15 (2010): 1–26.
- . "The Early Text of Matthew." Pages 83–107 in *The Early Text of the New Testament*. Edited by Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Wayment, Thomas A. "A New Transcription of P. Oxy. 2383 (P⁶⁹)." *NovT* 50 (2008): 350–357.
- . "P.Oxy. 2383 (P⁶⁹) One More Time." *NovT* 54 (2012): 288–292.
- Weber, Robert, and Roger Gryson, eds. *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*. 5th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Weiss, Bernhard. *A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*. Translated by A. J. K. Davidson. 2 vols. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1889.
- Wessely, Carl. *Griechische und koptische Texte theologischen Inhalts III*. Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde 12. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1966.
- Wessely, Charles. "Les Plus Anciens Monuments du Christianisme Écrits sur Papyrus: Textes Édités, Traduits et Annotés II." *PO* 18 (1924): 341–511.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss, and Fenton John Anthony Hort. *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction, Appendix*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1896.
- Wheeler, Frank. "Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem: A Textual Commentary on the Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark." PhD diss., Baylor University, 1985.
- Williams, Charles Stephen C. *Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1951.
- Winter, John Garrett, ed. *Papyri in the University of Michigan Collection: Miscellaneous Papyri*. Vol. 3 of *Michigan Papyri*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1936.
- Wisse, Frederik. "The Nature and Purpose of Redactional Changes in Early Christian Texts: The Canonical Gospels." Pages 39–53 in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*. Edited by William L. Petersen. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 3. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.

Wisselink, Willem Franciscus. *Assimilation as a Criterion for the Establishment of the Text: A Comparative Study on the Basis of Passages from Matthew, Mark and Luke*. Kampen: Kok, 1989.

Wolter, Michael. *Das Lukasevangelium*. HNT 5. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Zoega, G. *Catalogus codicum copticorum manu scriptorum qui in Museo Borgiano Velitris adservantur*. Rome: 1810.

Zuntz, Günther. "Reconstruction of One Leaf of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Gospels and Acts (P⁴⁵): (Matth. 25,41–26,39)." *CdE* 26 (1951): 191–211.

Zwiep, A. W. "The Text of the Ascension Narratives (Luke 24.50–3; Acts 1.1–2, 9–11)." *NTS* 42 (1996): 219–244.

VITA

Cambry Pardee graduated *cum laude* with a Bachelor of Arts in Religion from Pepperdine University. He later attended Yale Divinity School, where he earned a Master of Divinity. Pardee enrolled in the New Testament & Early Christianity Ph.D. program at Loyola University Chicago in 2010. While at Loyola, Pardee won the Midwest Society of Biblical Literature Graduate Student Paper Award for his article, “Peter’s Tarnished Image: Scribal Polishing in the Gospel of Luke (MS 0171).”