



# THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

**Textual Stability and Fluidity**  
**Exhibited in the Earliest Greek Manuscripts of John:**  
An Analysis of the Second/Third-Century  
Fragments with Attention also to the More Extensive Papyri  
(P45, P66, P75)

Lonnie D. Bell, Jr.

Submitted in Satisfaction of the Requirements for the  
Degree of Ph.D. in the University of Edinburgh

2015

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	3
SIGNED DECLARATION	4
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	5
1. INTRODUCTION	6
1.1. Major Approaches to the Early Papyri	6
1.2. My Question and Approach	14
1.3. Rethinking Some “Free” Texts	25
2. FRAGMENTS WITHOUT FULL OVERLAP IN P66 OR P75	
2.1. P <sup>52</sup> (P. Ryl. III 457)	44
2.2. P <sup>90</sup> (P. Oxy. L 3523)	59
2.3. P <sup>107</sup> (P. Oxy. LXV 4446)	92
2.4. P <sup>108</sup> (P. Oxy. LXV 4447)	105
2.5. P <sup>109</sup> (P. Oxy. LXV 4448)	114
2.6. P <sup>121</sup> (P. Oxy. LXXI 4805)	125
2.7. P <sup>5</sup> (P. Oxy. II 208 & XV 1781)	133
2.8. P <sup>22</sup> (P. Oxy. X 1228)	167
2.9. P <sup>28</sup> (P. Oxy. XIII 1596)	177
3. FRAGMENTS WITH FULL OVERLAP IN P66 ONLY	
3.1. P <sup>95</sup> (P. Laur. inv. II/31)	191
3.2. P <sup>39</sup> (P. Oxy. XV 1780)	199

4. FRAGMENTS WITH FULL OVERLAP IN P66 AND P75	
4.1. P <sup>106</sup> (P. Oxy. LXV 4445)	213
4.2. P <sup>119</sup> (P. Oxy. LXXI 4803)	231
4.3. 0162 (P. Oxy. VI 847)	245
5. CONCLUSIONS	267
WORKS CITED	280

## ABSTRACT

This thesis is an assessment of the character of textual transmission reflected in the pre-fourth century Greek manuscripts of the Gospel of John. Since John is the most attested New Testament book among the early papyri, has the highest number of papyri that share overlapping text, and is the best attested Christian text in the second century, it serves well as a case study into the level of fluidity and stability of the New Testament text in its earliest period of transmission. The transmission of New Testament writings in this period has been characterized by a number of scholars as error-prone, free, wild and chaotic. This thesis is an inquiry into the validity of this characterization. I contend that our earliest extant manuscripts should serve as the most relevant evidence for addressing this issue, both for the period in which they were copied and for inferences about the preceding period for which we lack manuscript evidence.

My treatment of the earliest Greek manuscripts of John primarily involves a fresh and full assessment of the level of fluidity and stability exhibited in the 14 smaller fragments (P5, P22, P28, P39, P52, P90, P95, P106, P107, P108, P109, P119, P121, 0162) by identifying on the basis of internal evidence the character of variants and unique readings attested. Additionally, I compare the number, character and significance of the singular/sub-singular readings of each early fragmentary manuscript with those in the same portion of text in the major majuscule manuscripts up through the seventh century that share complete overlap. The unique readings of P66 and P75 are added to this comparison where they fully overlap with the smaller fragments. Since P45 and P66 have been particularly identified with a “free” manner of transmission, I include an extended discussion in my introductory section in which I engage with research on the character of transmission exhibited in these two witnesses.

My analysis of these early manuscripts based on the internal evidence of readings allows for a more in-depth and accurate characterization of the freedom and/or care exhibited. The comparison of singular and sub-singular readings with those of the later majuscules facilitates a diachronic comparison of the number and nature of readings most likely to have been generated at the time in which each respective manuscript was transcribed. This latter step allows us to test, by way of these passages, whether or not the manuscript tradition can be fairly characterized as freer and more prone to corruption in the second and third centuries than in subsequent centuries. From these data, and in conjunction with observations made on any relevant physical features of the manuscripts themselves, I conclude that the copying of John during the second and third centuries was characterized largely by stability and by continuity with the later period. These conclusions serve the broader purpose of providing a window on the character of New Testament textual transmission in the earliest centuries.

## SIGNED DECLARATION

I hereby affirm that I have composed this thesis and the work is my own. I have not submitted the work for any other degree or professional qualification.

---

Lonnie D. Bell, Jr.

---

Date

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are a number of key individuals to whom I owe a debt of gratitude and without whom the writing of this Ph.D. thesis would not have taken place. I begin by thanking Larry and David Jacobs for supplying the financial means necessary for acquiring a visa to study in the UK. Your generous gift made my pursuit of this degree possible and provided a smooth transition in moving between countries.

The research that follows owes an enormous debt to the wise guidance and incisive feedback provided by my supervisor, Professor Larry Hurtado. You have always modeled clarity of thought and expression, care and fairness in treating the arguments of others, and the need to stay focused on “your question,” and these are just some of the values that have been instilled into me since I stepped into your office four years ago. It has been a privilege, delight and honor to research, think and write under your supervision. Thank you for sacrificing much of your own time to meet and discuss my work. I would also like to thank Dr. Sara Parvis for being available and willing to discuss the practicalities of being a Ph.D. student. Your comments never failed to be both informative and encouraging. Thanks also to Dr. Dirk Jongkind for taking the time to look over my work and for offering some very helpful suggestions in the early stages of my program.

Thanks to all of our friends at New College, particularly Corey and Trisha Williams, Matthew and Jennifer Hoskins, and Seth and Rachel Ehorn, who have made our time in Edinburgh enjoyable and enriching. I would also like to thank Frank Dicken. Laughing with you about all sorts of things was certainly a highlight of my Ph.D. experience. I also wish to thank my church family, Charlotte Chapel, for a home away from home. Thanks especially to Paul Rees for wise counsel, prayerful support and hospitality.

I would like to thank my dad and mom, Lonnie and Irene Bell, for being a constant source of support and love. Thank you for teaching me to love the Bible and to never stop learning and thinking, and for all of your encouragement and support throughout these seemingly never-ending years of education. I also want to thank my father- and mother-in-law, Mike and Iretta Litchfield, for your support and for unforgettable trips to Malta, Italy and France. Thank you all for being there when we needed you most and for being willing to settle for Skype as you watched your grandchild start to crawl, walk and talk.

I want to thank my precious wife, Jennifer. Without your friendship, loving support, wise advice and endless patience this thesis would have been impossible. Thank you for working tirelessly to support our family while I finished my education, and I will always be indebted to you for the many sacrifices you have made. You have filled this period of my life with joy in so many ways. It is a real pleasure to dedicate this thesis to you. Thanks also to my little boy, Jacob, for being such a daily source of happiness. Playing with you and watching you grow have given me the motivation and perspective that I have needed, especially amid the tedium of text-critical research. Thank you Claire Hughes for being such a perfect nanny.

Finally, I am most grateful to the Lord, my God. Thank you for being my delight and source of wisdom and strength each day. I cannot capture with words the depth and breadth of your faithfulness and providential care.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

It has been widely claimed or accepted among New Testament textual critics that the early period of textual transmission for the documents that now comprise the New Testament was characterized by “freedom,” “fluidity,” “instability,” “laxity,” “proneness to error,” “carelessness,” “wildness,” “chaos,” “lack of control,” etc. Although these claims have differed in regards to when the text was most unstable, most agree that the period in question is that which roughly preceded the fourth century or the time of Constantine and the Council of Nicaea. This thesis is an inquiry into the validity of this characterization of the pre-fourth century text of the New Testament, particularly the Gospels, by the application of a fresh approach to the second and third century Greek manuscript witnesses to the Gospel of John, especially the 14 smaller fragments.

### 1.1. Major Approaches to the Early Papyri

Two of the most formidable textual critics of the twentieth century, Eldon Epp and Kurt Aland, have asserted the importance of the early New Testament papyri. Epp has remarked, “there is virtually unanimous agreement that the New Testament papyri not only are textual criticism’s greatest treasure but also its best hope for ‘cracking’ the textual ‘code’ and breaking through to the original text” (with “original text” being placed in inverted commas and its use critiqued and heavily nuanced in subsequent publications).<sup>1</sup> He has more recently asserted, “the early periods are of greatest interest and importance in textual criticism, for manuscripts

---

<sup>1</sup> Eldon J. Epp, “Decision Points in Past, Present, and Future New Testament Textual Criticism,” in *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays, 1962-2004* (NovTSup 116; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 281; for issues related to “original text” see, idem, “The Multivalence of the Term ‘Original Text’ in New Testament Textual Criticism,” *HTR* 92 (1999): 245-81; Michael W. Holmes, “From ‘Original Text’ to ‘Initial Text’: The Traditional Goal of New Testament Textual Criticism in Contemporary Discussion,” in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis* (2d ed., eds. B. D. Ehrman and M. W. Holmes; NTTSD 42; Leiden: Brill, 2013), 637-688.

up to around 600 are primary in isolating the earliest attainable text.”<sup>2</sup> He has pointed out that the early papyri were, however, under-utilized throughout the twentieth century because they were inconsistent with established theories, overshadowed by the later uncials, largely fragmentary, and perceived as only reflecting the text in Egypt.<sup>3</sup> In his attempt to use the papyri to identify early “textual clusters,” Epp has convincingly shown through the “dynamic” movement of people, ideas and correspondence in and around Middle Egypt that the text in Egypt can be taken as reflective of the forms and character of the New Testament text in the larger Mediterranean world.<sup>4</sup> Kurt Aland, although opposed to Epp’s idea of early text-types, has given the papyri “automatic significance” because they bring us back as far as the second century.<sup>5</sup>

Additionally, Larry Hurtado in particular has argued for the importance of the second and third century papyri as the “earliest Christian artifacts” and draws attention to certain physical features such as the use of the codex and the presence of *nomina sacra*, the staurogram, corrections and readers’ aids as important evidence for the early transmission and use of Christian texts.<sup>6</sup> The textual transmission evidenced

---

<sup>2</sup> Eldon J. Epp, “Are Early New Testament Manuscripts Truly Abundant?” in *Israel’s God and Rebecca’s Children: Christology and Community in Early Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Honor of Larry W. Hurtado and Alan F. Segal* (eds. D. B. Capes et al.; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007), 88.

<sup>3</sup> Eldon J. Epp, “The New Testament Papyrus Manuscripts in Historical Perspective,” in *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.* (eds. M. P. Horgan and P. J. Kobelski; New York: Crossroads, 1989), 274-284. See also, idem, “The Papyrus Manuscripts of the New Testament,” in Ehrman and Holmes, *The Text of the New Testament*, esp. 16-22.

<sup>4</sup> Eldon J. Epp, “New Testament Papyrus Manuscripts and Letter Carrying in Greco-Roman Times,” in *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester* (ed. B. A. Pearson, in collaboration with A. T. Kraabel, G. W. E. Nickelsburg, and N. R. Petersen; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1991), 35-56.

<sup>5</sup> Kurt Aland, *Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes* (ANTF 2; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1967) 93; idem, “The Significance of the Papyri for Progress in New Testament Research,” in *The Bible in Modern Scholarship* (ed. J. P. Hyatt; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965), 332; 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* (2d. rev. ed., trans. E. F. Rhodes; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 93: “Of special importance are the early papyri...these have an inherent significance for New Testament textual studies because they witness to a situation before the text was channelled into major text types in the fourth century.”

<sup>6</sup> Larry W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006).

in the early papyri is also the primary focus of a recent work devoted to the early New Testament text, with contributions from a wide array of experts in early New Testament papyri and related text-critical and historical topics.<sup>7</sup>

In light of their importance, there have been several major approaches to the study of the early New Testament papyri. First, Epp has emphasized the particular importance of the papyri for establishing a theory and history of the early New Testament text.<sup>8</sup> His purpose has been to argue for the quantitative comparison of these earliest witnesses, one with another and with later majuscules, in order to pinpoint the earliest recognizable text-types.<sup>9</sup> Epp has called his approach a “trajectory method” in which he uses the papyri to identify “textual clusters” or “textual groups” and then “streams” or “trajectories” running throughout the manuscript tradition.<sup>10</sup> In 1989 he attempted to classify individual papyri into one of four textual groups (A, B, C and D), each based on one or two of the major majuscules.<sup>11</sup>

Second, in a chapter-length study published in 2002, Barbara Aland expressed her desire to establish the methodological basis upon which the early fragmentary papyri can be assessed, valued and thus used in New Testament textual criticism.<sup>12</sup> In her judgment, the pressing questions include scribal habits, rate of error and any textual affinities that may be detected. Colwell’s method in which only

---

<sup>7</sup> Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger, eds., *The Early Text of the New Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012).

<sup>8</sup> Eldon J. Epp, “The Twentieth Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism,” *JBL* 93 (1974): 390-401; idem, “A Continuing Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism?” *HTR* 73 (1980): 138-51; idem, “Decision Points,” 278-82; idem, “The New Testament Papyrus Manuscripts,” 261-88; idem, “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 *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century* (ed. W. L. Petersen; CJA 3; Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 71-103.

<sup>9</sup> Epp, “The New Testament Papyrus Manuscripts,” 288.

<sup>10</sup> Epp, “Significance,” 84-100.

<sup>11</sup> Epp, “Significance,” 100. He has most recently reflected, “This A, B, C, D scheme did not find broad acceptance...though I still use it” (“Textual Clusters: Their Past and Future in New Testament Textual Criticism,” in Ehrman and Holmes, *The Text of the New Testament*, 556).

<sup>12</sup> Barbara Aland, “Kriterien zur Beurteilung kleinerer Papyrusfragmente des Neuen Testaments,” in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis. Festschrift J. Delobel* (ed. A. Denaux; BETL 161; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002).

singular readings are studied is deemed by Aland to be an insufficient approach to the smaller fragmentary papyri.<sup>13</sup> By treating only singular readings a number of other, useful readings are left out which may have been introduced by the individual scribe, and there are, in comparison with the more extensive papyri studied by Colwell, too few singular readings in the smaller fragments. Her approach involves four features:<sup>14</sup> 1) the inclusion of all variants – singulars and those shared with other witnesses; 2) a collation based on NA<sup>27</sup> as the initial text (*hypothetischer Ausgangstext*) of the manuscript tradition and a comparison of readings with co-witnesses for the purpose of identifying possible textual groups (which she finds unlikely in most cases) and discerning whether variants were inherited or created; 3) a classification as “strict,” normal,” “free” due to carelessness or “free” due to editorial interventions based on the tolerance of error reflected in the papyrus; and, 4) a consideration of the total number of variation-units in the section of text attested by the papyrus in her assessment and classification.

Aland uses her method to assess 15 recently published fragmentary papyri. She treats all variants from NA<sup>27</sup> and then tries to determine which of these are likely to have originated with the individual scribe who copied the papyrus, so that she can discuss the manner of transmission. In this process, she notes relationships with other witnesses and any textual form or group to which the papyrus may have belonged. If no pattern of affinity is apparent, then many of the readings with only slight support are said to derive from the scribe himself. In her attempt to classify each papyrus, she devotes a fair amount of space to the nature and seriousness of variants, making observations on recurring errors and intentionality. Among the fifteen manuscripts

---

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Ernest C. Colwell, “Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A Study of the Text of P45, P66, P75,” in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (NTTS 9; Leiden: Brill, 1969), 106-124.

<sup>14</sup> B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 2.

studied, two are regarded as “free,” two “normal,” and the remaining are labelled “strict.”<sup>15</sup>

Aland later applied her method, although more loosely, to all second and third century fragmentary papyri of the Gospel of John, adding P<sup>6</sup> from the fourth century and excluding the extensive P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup>.<sup>16</sup> As in her previous article, she contends that the early fragmentary papyri, unlike the extensive “great papyri,” do not supply enough data to perform a full-scale study of scribal habits, to draw precise distinctions between inherited and created readings, and to trace already known textual forms present in the majuscules back to an earlier time (as can be accomplished with P<sup>75</sup> and B). Thus, by utilizing her previously outlined method she wants to answer the question, “wozu nützt die große Menge der kleinen Papyri?”<sup>17</sup> Before providing a brief evaluation of each papyrus, she explicitly states the objective of her study: “Ziel ist es, den Wert der frühen fragmentarischen Papyri im Rahmen der Gesamtüberlieferung des Johannesevangeliums zu bestimmen.”<sup>18</sup>

For each papyrus treated in this assessment Aland lists, but not consistently, all variation-units for which the papyrus is extant and specifically addresses readings that deviate from NA<sup>27</sup>. If she cannot discern a pattern of agreement with co-witnesses in the variants of the papyrus, then she interprets them as having likely arisen from the individual copyist, or from the *Vorlage* but without connection to any kind of textual group. Accordingly, if no affinity can be determined then it appears that the manuscript as a whole, in light of all its deviations, is judged on the basis of its nearness to NA<sup>27</sup> without much further commentary or distinction regarding the origin of its variants. Where an otherwise careful papyrus contains a few careless

---

<sup>15</sup> B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 12-13.

<sup>16</sup> B. Aland, “Der textkritische und textgeschichtliche Nutzen früher Papyri, demonstriert am Johannesevangelium,” in *Recent Developments in Textual Criticism: New Testament, Other Early Christian and Jewish Literature* (eds. W. Weren and D.-A. Koch; STAR 8; Kampen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2003), 19-38.

<sup>17</sup> B. Aland, “Nutzen,” 19.

<sup>18</sup> B. Aland, “Nutzen,” 20.

mistakes, these mistakes are regarded, especially if there is moderate support from other witnesses, as inherited from the *Vorlage*. Aland, therefore, attempts to make observations about the probable origins of variants appearing in each papyrus, while also recognizing the uncertainty inherent in this endeavour. Rather than specifically labelling each papyrus as “strict,” “normal” or “free” according to its manner of transmission, as she does in her previous article, she seems here to be more concerned with drawing a general conclusion about the nearness of the papyrus to the hypothetical initial text, NA<sup>27</sup>. Her assessment of variants also includes discussion of their nature, significance and intentionality. She concludes by briefly noting the important variants covered,<sup>19</sup> the overall closeness to NA<sup>27</sup> exhibited,<sup>20</sup> and the usefulness of the *Editio Critica Maior* in future study of the papyri.

Third, Kyoung Shik Min, Aland’s former doctoral student, has utilized and extended her approach in his study of the early fragmentary papyri and one majuscule of the Gospel of Matthew up to the beginning of the fourth century.<sup>21</sup> He engages with each manuscript under three headings: 1) Text and Apparatus; 2) Analysis; and, 3) Conclusion. First, under “Text and Apparatus,” he provides a transcription of the papyrus and an accompanying apparatus based on the text of NA<sup>27</sup>. He presents the reading of the papyrus, or the lack thereof, for each variation-unit in NA<sup>27</sup>, and he adds singular, sub-singular or narrowly attested readings from the papyrus that are not treated in that apparatus. Second, under “Analysis,” he begins by supplying important palaeographical and bibliographical information. He then launches into his own text-critical analysis by statistically noting the extent to

---

<sup>19</sup> Of these seven variants Aland says, “...sind insgesamt die genannten ‘wichtigen’ Varianten (wir faßten den Begriff sehr weit) auch nur wenige angesichts des immerhin 244 Verse abdeckenden Gesamtbestandes” (“Nutzen,” 36).

<sup>20</sup> B. Aland, “Nutzen,” 37: “Der Text sämtlicher früher Johannes-Papyri beruht prinzipiell auf dem hypothetischen Ausgangstext der Überlieferung, als den wir den Text des Novum Testamentum Graece (mit allen Kautelen) ansetzen. Der Text wird mit unterschiedlicher Sorgfalt abgeschrieben, aber nie mit eindeutiger Änderungstendenz.”

<sup>21</sup> Kyoung Shik Min, *Die früheste Überlieferung des Matthäusevangeliums (bis zum 3./4. Jh.): Edition und Untersuchung* (ANTF 34; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2005).

which the papyrus deviates from the text of NA<sup>27</sup> in light of the total number of variation-units for that portion of text, and he notes the number of singular or sub-singular readings that he has added to his analysis. He then proceeds to list and discuss all deviations from NA<sup>27</sup> by classifying them twice, into two separate categories. The first includes the four formal categories of variation, and each is given with its percentage of occurrence in the papyrus: additions, omissions, transpositions, and substitutions.<sup>22</sup> The second category provides further text-critical detail about type and/or origin: corrections, orthography, nonsense readings, singular readings and harmonizations. His “Analysis” section concludes with a discussion of textual character, where he reconstructs the *Vorlage* by distinguishing between inherited and created readings, comments on textual affinity, proximity to the initial text (*Ausgangstext* = NA<sup>27</sup>), and the overall nature of deviations in terms of carelessness, intentionality, etc, and briefly classifies both the text and the individual scribe’s activity as “strict,” “normal” or “free” (or in one case “very free”). He excludes singular and sub-singular readings as well as those that are narrowly attested / nearly sub-singular from his assessment of textual character, since he judges these to have likely been creations of the scribe.

Third, under “Conclusion,” Min numerically lists the major points that constitute the fruit of his previous analysis, and he elaborates on his classifications of the papyrus with respect to the accuracy of the scribe who copied it (*Überlieferungsweise*) and the textual quality of the *Vorlage* that underlies it (*Textqualität*). He also takes this opportunity, in response to the work of Bart

---

<sup>22</sup> See Gordon D. Fee, “On the Types, Classification, and Presentation of Textual Variation,” in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (eds. E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee; SD 45; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 63: “all variation is one of four *kinds*: *addition*, *omission*, *substitution*, *transposition*.”

Ehrman,<sup>23</sup> to make note of the presence or absence of intentional, dogmatic alterations.<sup>24</sup> At the end of Min's study, all 14 manuscripts treated in his analysis are listed in a table with two classifications corresponding to his two categories of *Überlieferungsweise* and *Textqualität*.<sup>25</sup> Tommy Wasserman in his own assessment of the early papyri of Matthew and in close dialogue with Min's work, comes to similar conclusions and notes the "spectrum" exhibited: "It is evident from this survey that relatively many of these early scribes made a lot of mistakes and took some liberties in their copying. At the same time, the scribes seldom changed the meaning of the text."<sup>26</sup>

Fourth, James Royse in his meticulously researched 2008 monograph, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*, builds upon Colwell's study of the scribal habits of P<sup>45</sup>, P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup> by examining the singular readings of the six extensive early papyri in order to determine, as precisely as possible, the scribal habits behind each manuscript, and to thus refine our understanding of transcriptional probability.<sup>27</sup> Much of the literature concerning scribal habits and transcriptional probability, according to Royse, has not evidenced sufficient objectivity and methodological rigor. Similar to Colwell, but going beyond the use of Tischendorf<sup>8</sup> to verify singularity,<sup>28</sup> he attempts to offer "a carefully formulated and implemented methodology."<sup>29</sup> In his treatment of the singular readings in P<sup>45</sup>, P<sup>46</sup>, P<sup>47</sup>, P<sup>66</sup>, P<sup>72</sup> and P<sup>75</sup>, covering a range of New Testament books, he sheds light on how variants arose

---

<sup>23</sup> See Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (updated with a new afterword; New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

<sup>24</sup> Min, *Die früheste Überlieferung*, 47.

<sup>25</sup> Min, *Die früheste Überlieferung*, 272.

<sup>26</sup> Tommy Wasserman, "The Early Text of Matthew," in Hill and Kruger, *Early Text*, 103-104.

<sup>27</sup> James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (NTTSD 36; Leiden: Brill, 2008).

<sup>28</sup> Constantin von Tischendorf, ed., *Novum Testamentum Graece* (8th ed. 2 vols; Leipzig: Giesecke and Devrient, 1869) (hereafter referred to as Tischendorf<sup>8</sup>).

<sup>29</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 3.

and on scribal attitudes towards the text in the earliest period with extant manuscript evidence.

For each papyrus, he introduces the manuscript, treats corrections, and then lists orthographic and nonsense singulars before laying out “significant singulars.” The latter are listed under the categories of Omissions (including Leaps), Additions, Transpositions (including Transpositions as Corrected Leaps), Substitutions (including Prefixes, Proper names, Pronouns, Cases of Nouns), and Conflations. Where applicable, singular readings are also listed under the categories of Harmonization to Parallels, Harmonization to Context, Harmonization to General Usage, and Theological Changes. He concludes his study of each papyrus with a brief summary of its characteristic transmission features.<sup>30</sup> Royse also makes a strong case for abandoning the criterion of *lectio brevior potior*, at least for the period covered by the early papyri, by showing that these scribes were much more likely to omit than they were to add.<sup>31</sup>

## 1.2. My Question and Approach

Moving from major approaches to the papyri, we now come to the specific issue that I intend to address with the method outlined in this introduction, namely, the level of and relationship between freedom and stability in the early period of New Testament textual transmission. It is helpful to begin this introductory discussion by looking at Hort’s assessment of the early text, since many of the later arguments and descriptive terms find early expression here. At the center of Hort’s view of early New Testament transmission character was his understanding of the antiquity and near

---

<sup>30</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 197, 357, 397, 544, 614, 704.

<sup>31</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 705-36; for a discussion of this criterion and the secondary literature see, Eldon J. Epp, “Traditional ‘Canons’ of New Testament Textual Criticism: Their Value, Validity, and Viability,” in *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views in Contemporary Research* (eds. K. Wachtel and M. W. Holmes; SBLTCS 8; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 79-127.

ubiquity of the “Western” text, whose primary representative among Greek manuscripts at least for the Gospels and Acts is Codex Bezae, the characteristics of which he took to be typical of the early period.<sup>32</sup> In Hort’s judgment, this free text (markedly paraphrastic, unscrupulous, interpolated, harmonized, and intermingled with other traditions and sources)<sup>33</sup> developed early and was widespread, and thus represented the attitudes and practices associated with the reproduction of the New Testament documents that dominated the ‘Ante-Nicene’ period.<sup>34</sup> This “early Western inundation” resulted in large-scale corruption during the second and third centuries, and its text enjoyed widespread (though not exclusive) acceptance and usage outside of Alexandria, where the “Neutral” text was more carefully preserved, albeit with “Alexandrian” changes less severe than their “Western” contemporaries.<sup>35</sup> It is due to this historical reconstruction, one in which a heavily corrupted text typified the early period, that Hort is permitted to speak of “early textual laxity” or “licence in transcription” when describing the character of early textual transmission.<sup>36</sup>

Reverberations of Hort’s portrayal and language can be seen from a sampling of comments and arguments that have since been made by some leading researchers in the discipline. Colwell explains, “in the early centuries of the New Testament period accurate copying was not a common concept” and “The general nature of the text in the earliest period (to A.D. 300) has long been recognized as ‘wild,’ ‘uncontrolled,’ ‘unedited.’”<sup>37</sup> Barbara Aland affirms the general assumption that “in

---

<sup>32</sup> B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek, Vol 1: Introduction and Appendix* (Cambridge: MacMillan, 1881), 148-49.

<sup>33</sup> Hort, *Introduction*, 120-26.

<sup>34</sup> Hort, *Introduction*: “during that part of the Ante-Nicene period of which we have any direct knowledge ‘Western’ texts were at least dominant in most churches of both East and West...” (126); “The earliest readings which can be fixed chronologically belong to it. As far as we can judge from extant evidence, it was the most widely spread text of Ante-Nicene times...” (120).

<sup>35</sup> Hort, *Introduction*, 129

<sup>36</sup> Hort, *Introduction*, 7, 9.

<sup>37</sup> Ernest C. Colwell, “Hort Redivivus: A Plea and a Program,” in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (NTTS 9; Leiden: Brill, 1969), 166 n.3.

the fourth/fifth century there was a higher degree of precision in copying than was characteristic of earlier periods.”<sup>38</sup> Bart Ehrman has this notion of discontinuity between the second and third centuries and subsequent centuries in mind when he speaks of “the fluidity of the textual tradition in the early period of transmission” and “the instability of the text in the early centuries.”<sup>39</sup> Royse expresses his general acceptance of this characterization, and in the course of his summary adduces a number of supporting quotes from leading figures in New Testament textual criticism.<sup>40</sup> George D. Kilpatrick, with his emphasis on early Atticistic corruption, places the period of freedom before 200 C.E.<sup>41</sup>

Some scholars, most notably Helmut Koester, William Petersen, and David Parker have maintained that our earliest extant papyri are the product of a late second-century Alexandrian recension and thus too late to serve as indicators of previous transmission attitudes and practices.<sup>42</sup> Koester and Petersen, then, underscore textual differences between citations in early patristic writers, particularly Justin Martyr, and the readings in current critical editions based on the Greek manuscript evidence as proof of the freedom characteristic of what they regard as this pre-recensional state of transmission.<sup>43</sup> Parker explains that “the free-text form of Codex Bezae” is “as old as the second-century” and that it, in conjunction with the

---

<sup>38</sup> Barbara Aland, “The Significance of the Chester Beatty Biblical 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. C. Horton; JSNTSup 258; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 118-119 n.43.

<sup>39</sup> Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 49 n.92, 324; cf. 29, 31-33.

<sup>40</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 19-31.

<sup>41</sup> George D. Kilpatrick, “Atticism and the Text of the Greek NT,” in *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze: Festschrift für Prof. Josef Schmid zum 70. Geburtstag* (eds. J. Blinzler, O. Kuss, and F. Mussner; Regensburg: Pustet, 1963), 128.

<sup>42</sup> Helmut Koester, “The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century,” in Petersen, *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century*, 19-37; William L. Petersen, “What Text Can New Testament Textual Criticism Ultimately Reach?” in *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Early Church History* (eds. B. Aland and J. Delobel; CBET 7; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994), 136-152; idem, “The Genesis of the Gospels,” in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis. Festschrift J. Delobel* (ed. A. Denaux; BETL 161; Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2002), 33-65; idem, “Textual Traditions Examined: What the Text of the Apostolic Fathers tells us about the Text of the New Testament in the Second Century,” in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (eds. A. Gregory and C. Tuckett; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 29-46; David C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

<sup>43</sup> See esp. Koester, “The Text of the Synoptic Gospels”; Petersen, “Genesis of the Gospels.”

Old Syriac, Old Latin and early patristic sources, reflects more broadly the kind of loose and “living” transmission practiced in that period.<sup>44</sup> Yet the diversity reflected in the papyri makes improbable the claim that our earliest manuscripts (all of an Egyptian provenance) are merely the product of an Alexandrian type of text deriving from a late second century recension.<sup>45</sup>

In contrast to the viewpoint described above, other scholars such as Larry Hurtado, Michael Holmes, Tommy Wasserman, and most recently Charles Hill and Michael Kruger have drawn attention to the importance of the papyri and the inadequacy of early patristic citations for determining the nature of textual transmission in the second-century.<sup>46</sup> Holmes maintains, “Evidence regarding what the text of the Gospels looked like in the first half of the second century that we might have expected the early Christian writers to provide is simply not forthcoming. *This means that for the earliest stages of transmission, almost our only evidence will have to be whatever information we can tease out of our later manuscripts*” (emphasis mine).<sup>47</sup> He says, therefore, that with regard to “fluidity and stability” in the earliest period we must “take what we know about trends, patterns and tendencies

---

<sup>44</sup> Parker, *Living Text*, 202. Regarding the text of Codex Bezae he asks rather rhetorically, “does this remarkably free text preserve the earliest Christian attitude to the tradition?” Cf. Bart D. Ehrman, “The Text of the Gospels at the End of the Second Century,” in *Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunell Colloquium, June 1994* (eds. D. C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux; NTTS 22; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 100-102.

<sup>45</sup> For diversity among the papyri, see Epp, “Significance,” 100; K. Aland and B. Aland, *Text*, 59, 93, 95. For the likelihood that the Egyptian papyri are textually representative, see Epp, “Letter Carrying,” 35-56. For the question of an early recension, see especially Gordon D. Fee, “P75, P66 and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria,” in *New Dimensions in New Testament Study* (eds. R. N. Longenecker and M. C. Tenney; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), 19-45.

<sup>46</sup> Larry W. Hurtado, “The New Testament in the Second Century: Texts, Collections and Canon,” in *Transmission and Reception: New Testament Text-Critical and Exegetical Studies* (eds. J. W. Childers and D. C. Parker; TS III.4; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2006), 3-27; Michael W. Holmes, “Text and Transmission in the Second Century,” in *The Reliability of the New Testament: Bart Ehrman and Daniel Wallace in Dialogue* (ed. R. B. Stewart; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2011), 61-80; Tommy Wasserman, “The Implications of Textual Criticism for Understanding the ‘Original Text,’” in *Mark and Matthew: Comparative Readings: Understanding the Earliest Gospels in their First-Century Settings* (eds. E.-M. Becker and A. Runesson; WUNT 271; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 77-96; Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger, “In Search of the Earliest Text of the New Testament,” in Hill and Kruger, *Early Text*, 1-19.

<sup>47</sup> Holmes, “Text and Transmission,” 60.

from a later period for which we have evidence, project them back into the earlier period for which we lack evidence, and see what they might suggest.”<sup>48</sup>

It is at this point that my approach enters the picture. Building on the view that our earliest extant manuscripts, in spite of their own limitations, are the most relevant and direct evidence for addressing the issue of early transmission character, both for the period in which they were copied and for inferences about the preceding period for which we lack manuscript evidence, this thesis aims to contribute to this discussion by applying a fresh approach to the study of the character of textual transmission reflected in the pre-fourth century Greek manuscripts of the Gospel of John. There are some important reasons why an analysis of the early manuscripts of John serves well as a case study into the level of fluidity and stability of the Gospels and even more broadly, the New Testament text in its earliest period of transmission. John is the most represented New Testament book among the early manuscripts (17 at or before third/fourth century); it is the best-attested Christian text in the second century (P<sup>52</sup> and P<sup>90</sup>); it gives a fairly even spread of witnesses across the early period (two in the second century, most placed somewhere in the third, a few dated arguably around third/fourth), which allows us to test for trends across time; John has a unique level of overlap among its early witnesses, which is due primarily but not exclusively to P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup>; and, finally, since it was likely written towards the end of the first-century, some of its many third century manuscripts would be included in the first 150 years of transmission, which Parker puts forward as the timeframe within which the transmission of a document was supposedly at its freest.<sup>49</sup> Given Holmes’ persuasive emphasis on our earliest extant manuscripts as the basis for determining the freedom and/or stability of the earliest stages of transmission (i.e.,

---

<sup>48</sup> Holmes, “Text and Transmission,” 61.

<sup>49</sup> Parker, *Living Text*, 70: “Although the texts of the Gospels continued to develop, it seems that the most dramatic change took place in the first 150 years of their transmission. This is true of many other textual traditions – initial fluidity followed by stability.”

late first century to mid/late second century), it is difficult to find a better body of evidence from which to speak to this question than the early manuscripts of John.

My method also aims to supply direct data for answering the broader question of whether or not and to what extent we can identify differences in the attitudes and practices exhibited in the pre- versus post- 300 C.E. periods of transmission, at least with respect to the Gospel of John, a question which underlies the more specific debate over the late first to late second century text: Was the text copied differently in the early period (second and third centuries/up to ca. 300 C.E) than in the later period (fourth, fifth, sixth centuries/up to ca. 700 or 800 C.E)? As already noted, Royse provides a helpful summary of the proponents of what he regards to be the consensus view that textual transmission was fundamentally freer and less stable in the period before 300 C.E.<sup>50</sup> He concludes, “It is certainly plausible that scribal habits in the pre-300 period may have differed significantly from those of later times.”<sup>51</sup> This consensus forms a large part of the basis for Ehrman’s method of using some later manuscripts to argue for theologically motivated corruptions in the second and third centuries:

The majority of textual variants that are preserved in the surviving documents, even the documents produced in a later age, originated during the first three Christian centuries... This conviction is not based on idle speculation. In contrast to the relative stability of the New Testament text in later times, our oldest witnesses display a remarkable degree of variation. The evidence suggests that during the earliest period of its transmission the New Testament text was in a state of flux, that it came to be more or less standardized in some regions by the fourth century, and subject to fairly rigid control (by comparison) only in the Byzantine period. As a result, the period of relative creativity was early, that of strict reproduction late. Variants found in later witnesses are thus less likely to have been generated than to have been reproduced from earlier exemplars.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 19-31.

<sup>51</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 30.

<sup>52</sup> Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 32-33.

Wisse, however, notes the lack of evidence for the view that “in the pre-canonical period scribes were less hesitant to take liberties with the text,” and instead contends, “there is no basis to assume that the early, poorly attested history of the transmission of the text was governed by factors different from those operative in the canonical period.”<sup>53</sup> Kurt and Barbara Aland’s handbook of textual criticism, although often cited by those who point to or support this consensus of widespread carelessness, laxity or freedom in the early period, appears to actually argue to the contrary:

P<sup>45</sup>, P<sup>46</sup>, P<sup>66</sup>, and a whole group of other manuscripts offer a “free” text, i.e., a text dealing with the original text in a relatively free manner with no suggestion of a program of standardization...Some have gone so far as to interpret these “free” texts as typical of the early period. But this cannot be correct, as fresh collation of all the manuscripts of the early period by the Institute for New Testament Textual Research has shown. The “free” text represents only one of the varieties of the period. Beside it there is a substantial number of manuscripts representing a “normal” text, i.e., a relatively faithful tradition which departs from its exemplar only occasionally, as do New Testament manuscripts of every century. There is an equally substantial number of manuscripts representing a “strict” text, which transmit the text of an exemplar with meticulous care (e.g., P<sup>75</sup>) and depart from it only rarely. Finally, we also find a few manuscripts with a paraphrastic text, which belong in the neighborhood of the D text...The text of the early period prior to the third/fourth century was, then, in effect, a text not yet channelled into types, because until the beginning of the fourth century the churches still lacked the institutional organization required to produce one.<sup>54</sup>

It is in the context of their argument here that other language of a freely developing text should be taken, namely, in the context of their discussion of freedom from ecclesiastical recension and from the development of text types.

Before describing the method carried out in this study, it is worthwhile to briefly consider what historical situation may lie behind the seemingly unique level of attestation for the Gospel of John, that is, what does the extent of manuscript

---

<sup>53</sup> Frederik Wisse, “The Nature and Purpose of Redactional Changes in Early Christian Texts: The Canonical Gospels,” in Petersen, *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century*, 45-47.

<sup>54</sup> K. Aland and B. Aland, *Text*, 59, 64; see also 93-95.

attestation in such an early period, as noted above, indicate with respect to the place, status and readership of John's Gospel in the earliest centuries? Charles Hill comments, "Such representation is particularly impressive for a Gospel which is said by the majority of Johannine scholars to have been so unpopular among the Great Churches in the second century."<sup>55</sup> In 1967 Kurt Aland, adhering to what Charles Hill has called the Johannophobia paradigm, had noted that the prevalence of early papyri for John's Gospel found in Egypt supported Walter Bauer's identification of early Egyptian Christianity with Gnosticism.<sup>56</sup> Stephen Llewelyn, however, has pointed out that there is roughly the same frequency of papyri for John in the early (supposedly) Gnostic period as in the later (supposedly) more orthodox period. Thus, he concludes, "may the data not suggest a simple but persistent preference for the Gospel of John among the speakers of Greek in Egypt," without reference to theological affiliation.<sup>57</sup> There is also an overall lack of representation, comparatively speaking, for Gnostic documents among the early papyri, a fact which decreases the likelihood that the frequency of John indicates some kind of Gnostic preference. Finally, I should note Chapa's point that among the Egyptian papyri there are nearly as many representing Matthew as John, which cautions against drawing a special link between Gnosticism, Egyptian Christianity and the Gospel of John.<sup>58</sup> Summarizing the manuscript evidence, Hurtado writes, "The numerous copies of John in the papyri from Egypt suggest a notable popularity of this text, and the copies of other texts from the same site and approximate time period as the manuscripts of John suggest that those among whom John was so popular also

---

<sup>55</sup> Charles Hill, *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 148.

<sup>56</sup> K. Aland, *Studien*, 99. See Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* (eds. R. A. Kraft and G. Kroedel; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971).

<sup>57</sup> Stephen R. Llewelyn, ed., *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity 3* (Ancient History Documentary Centre, Macquarie University, 1994), 246.

<sup>58</sup> Juan Chapa, "The Fortunes and Misfortunes of the Gospel of John in Egypt," *VC* 64 (2010): 348.

enjoyed a panoply of texts that reflect mainstream Christian tastes and preferences.”<sup>59</sup>

Here I give only a sketch of the approach taken in the following sections. The method outlined here is more fully explained and substantiated as it is being carried out in my treatments of P<sup>52</sup> and P<sup>90</sup> (the first fragment and the first lengthy fragment respectively). My treatment of the manuscripts of John dated to the second or third century C.E. has as its main focus a fresh and full assessment of the level of fluidity and stability exhibited in each of the 14 smaller fragmentary witnesses, which include thirteen papyri (P<sup>5</sup>, P<sup>22</sup>, P<sup>28</sup>, P<sup>39</sup>, P<sup>52</sup>, P<sup>90</sup>, P<sup>95</sup>, P<sup>106</sup>, P<sup>107</sup>, P<sup>108</sup>, P<sup>109</sup>, P<sup>119</sup>, P<sup>121</sup>) and one parchment (0162).<sup>60</sup> My treatment also includes the integration of some data from P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup> in the places where one or both of them share full overlap with the smaller fragments (P<sup>39</sup>, P<sup>95</sup>, P<sup>106</sup>, P<sup>119</sup>, 0162) (see explanation of Diachronic Comparison section).

My treatment of each manuscript has two main components. First, I assess the level of fluidity and stability exhibited by analyzing all variants and unique readings on the basis of internal evidence.<sup>61</sup> This involves assessing and compiling what are judged to be the “improbable readings” of the manuscript. In contrast to the approach of B. Aland and Min described above, where readings are seen as “deviations” from a standard/working text, this method is interested in assessing fluidity via “improbable” readings, that is, vis-à-vis the other variant(s) attested at

---

<sup>59</sup> Hurtado, *Artifacts*, 30.

<sup>60</sup> I exclude P<sup>80</sup> as too late or at least too questionable for consideration. See Pasquale Orsini and Willy Clarysse, “Early New Testament Manuscripts and Their Dates: A Critique of Theological Palaeography,” *ETL* 88, 4 (2012): 471.

<sup>61</sup> For a recent treatment of criteria and the difficulties involved see especially, Epp, “Traditional ‘Canons’,” 79-127. See also, J. Keith Elliott, “Thoroughgoing Eclecticism in New Testament Textual Criticism,” in Ehrman and Holmes, *The Text of the New Testament*, 519-577; Tommy Wasserman, “Criteria for Evaluating Readings in New Testament Textual Criticism,” in Ehrman and Holmes, *The Text of the New Testament*, 579-612; Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 705-742, 775-906; K. Aland and B. Aland, *Text*, 280-316; Bruce M. Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (4th ed.; New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 250-271 and 300-315; Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (2d ed., London and New York: United Bible Societies, 1994), 12\*-14\*.

variation-units. The variation-units considered are those given in NA<sup>28, 62</sup>, with some being added from the respective papyrus (i.e., narrowly attested readings that have too much manuscript support to be considered sub-singular). Readings are thus classified as probable or improbable, and the concluding analysis will pay particular attention to the quantity/proportion, dimension, intentionality, and effect of all improbable readings.<sup>63</sup> A separate commentary will be given for variants and for unique readings, which will permit some distinction to be made (though tentatively) between the underlying text, which reflects the character of transmission that preceded the papyrus, and the transmission character at the time in which the manuscript was copied (as in Min's approach discussed above).

Second, there is the Diachronic Comparison of Created Readings section, in which I compare the number and character of singular and sub-singular readings with the same in all of the majuscules up through the seventh century that share complete overlap.<sup>64</sup> In addition to the major fourth and fifth century majuscules (01, A, B, C,

---

<sup>62</sup> Barbara Aland, et al., eds, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (28th rev. ed. of Nestle-Aland; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012) (hereafter referred to as NA28).

<sup>63</sup> For a "functional understanding of intentional changes" based on the "resultant text," see Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 337-341. For a discussion of what can accidentally go wrong in copying and a caution against identifying readings as "intentional" see Dirk Jongkind, "Singular Readings in Sinaiticus: The Possible, The Impossible, and the Nature of Copying," in *Textual Variation: Theological and Social Tendencies* (ed. H. A. G. Houghton and D. C. Parker; TS III.6; New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2008) 44-54; Cf. Michael W. Holmes, "Women and the 'Western' Text of Acts," in *The Book of Acts as Church History: Apostelgeschichte als Kirchengeschichte* (eds. T. Nicklas and M. Tilly; BZNW 120; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003) 188: "how does one determine *motive* from *effect*? ... We have a textual artifact left behind by the copyist, but the artifact is silent with regard to the copyist's motive; indeed, it is silent as to whether there even was a motive." For the argument that intentional alterations (those that are clearly "editorial," "redactional," or "exegetical" in nature) were more likely introduced by readers than copyists, see Ulrich Schmid, "Scribes and Variants – Sociology and Typology," in Houghton and Parker, *Textual Variation*, 1-23; Michael W. Holmes, "Codex Bezae as a Recension of the Gospels," in Parker and Amphoux, *Codex Bezae*, 123-160.

<sup>64</sup> For the category of "Sub-singular Reading," see Fee, "Types, Classification, and Presentation," 67: "a non-genetic, accidental agreement in variation between two MSS which are not otherwise closely related. In other words, two (or a few) MSS accidentally agree in a singular reading of the clerical error variety." Cf. brief discussion in J. Keith Elliott, "Singular Readings in the Gospel Text of P45," in Horton, *The Earliest Gospels*, 123. Singularity/sub-singularity is determined with reference to NA28; Tischendorf<sup>8</sup>; Hermann Freiherr von Soden, *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 und Ruprecht, 1913); Reuben J. Swanson, ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus: John* (Sheffield, England and Pasadena, California: Sheffield Academic Press and William Carey International University

D, and W), this allows for the treatment of W<sup>s</sup> and a couple of other manuscripts (e.g., Codex N) in a few places. Since such readings are more likely (though not necessarily) to have been introduced into the tradition by each respective copyist, they permit a diachronic comparison by offering a glimpse into the level of care / stability or freedom / fluidity in the early vs. later period of textual transmission. Although limited, this approach yields some direct evidence for answering the question: Do we see greater care and stability in copying in the later period (fourth through seventh centuries) than in the early period (second and third centuries)? Put differently, is the manuscript tradition moving in a trajectory from “free” and “wild” to careful and stable transmission attitudes and practices during this period? Although certainty with regard to origination, whether a reading came from the *Vorlage* and thus a previous period of transmission or from the copyist himself / herself and thus the period of the manuscript’s production, cannot be achieved, these unique or nearly unique readings provide one of the best means for discerning when a variant arose in the tradition.

This method works from the premise that a view of copying processes and characteristics in a given period should be based, as far as possible, on extant copies from that period, and that all readings, both singular and those shared with other witnesses, should be assessed and characterized on the basis of internal criteria as to kind of reading, intentionality (if suggested), errors made as well as errors avoided, and in conjunction with the treatment of relevant physical features of the manuscripts in which they appear (with focus on the collective results). This analysis enables the identification of trends, patterns and tendencies, which then provides the basis for

---

Press, 1995); W. J. Elliott and D. C. Parker, eds. *The New Testament in Greek IV: The Gospel according to St. John, Volume One: The Papyri* (NTTS 20; Leiden: Brill, 1995) (hereafter referred to as IGNTP I); and U. B. Schmid with W. J. Elliott and D. C. Parker, eds., *The New Testament in Greek IV: The Gospel according to St. John, Volume Two: The Majuscules* (NTTSD 37; Leiden: Brill, 2007) (hereafter referred to as IGNTP II). Cf. the approach of Peter M. Head, “The Habits of New Testament Copyists: Singular Readings in the Early Fragmentary Papyri of John,” *Bib* 85 (2004): 399-408.

judging the level of care and freedom in the copying of this specific Gospel during this earliest period with extant evidence. As indicated, by this method I also aim to bring these data to bear on the question of whether or not the preceding period of transmission, for which we lack evidence, should be characterized as “unstable,” “free,” “wild” or “chaotic.”

### 1.3. Rethinking Some “Free” Texts

In order to provide a backdrop for our study of the smaller fragmentary papyri of John, and in order to bridge the gap between the general question outlined above and the specific data to be assessed in the following sections, it is helpful to spend some time addressing what has been said regarding the character of transmission reflected in the three more extensive papyri of John’s Gospel, particularly those that have been characterized as “free.” It is most helpful to begin by tracing precisely how the language of “careless,” “free,” “controlled,” “wild,” as well as “intention” to reproduce the text are joined together in Colwell’s analysis of the scribal habits exhibited in P<sup>45</sup>, P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup>.

Throughout his article on the singular readings of these papyri, Colwell associates “carelessness” with what he variously refers to as “slips,” “leaps,” “lapses,” “nonsense,” and “obvious errors,” the prevalence of which he likens to a lack of “discipline,” “concern,” and “effectiveness.”<sup>65</sup> This is how he characterizes the transmission of P<sup>66</sup>. Three primary categories of characterization emerge from his study, including careful, free, and controlled: P<sup>45</sup> and P<sup>75</sup> are careful, P<sup>45</sup> and P<sup>66</sup> are free, and P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup> are controlled. So for Colwell, a scribe’s work can be controlled or careful and still be free because it lacks the other characteristic, since freedom is denoted by a lack of intention to reproduce the text with verbatim accuracy (i.e.

---

<sup>65</sup> Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 112-118.

control), as exhibited in P<sup>45</sup>, or by a lack of “seriousness” in carrying out one’s intention (i.e. care), as seen in P<sup>66</sup>.<sup>66</sup> The scribe of P<sup>45</sup> has the seriousness but lacks this intention,<sup>67</sup> and the scribe of P<sup>66</sup> has this intention but lacks the seriousness. The scribe of P<sup>75</sup>, by contrast, has both.<sup>68</sup> Because it lacks neither the right intention nor the right level of intentionality, P<sup>75</sup> is not “free” like the other two. The fact that Colwell attributes “wildness” and a lack of “discipline” to both P<sup>45</sup> and P<sup>66</sup> shows that he equates these words with “freedom” in general.<sup>69</sup> The idea of control is associated with “obligation,” whether it is primarily internal or external.<sup>70</sup> Internal controls are at work in both P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup>, as evidenced by the self-correcting of the former and the ingrained discipline of the latter, but only P<sup>66</sup>, seen in the extent of correcting activity, is said to fall under external controls, and so enters Colwell’s suggestion of a scriptorium.<sup>71</sup> By contrast, such an obligation is absent in the case of P<sup>45</sup>, either from his own intention to reproduce words exactly or from any form of external accountability. In sum, according to Colwell’s analysis, the scribe of P<sup>45</sup> freely follows his own preferences when copying and the scribe of P<sup>66</sup> is careless, both of whom bearing the label “free” and “wild.” Since my study is concerned with questioning the validity of the claim that early textual transmission was characteristically free and fluid, I restrict myself here to a discussion of the apparently quintessential free texts P<sup>45</sup> and P<sup>66</sup>.

---

<sup>66</sup> Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 117: P<sup>45</sup> is “free to make the order of words what he wants to make it...free of any obligation to reproduce *words* faithfully” (emphasis his), whereas in the case of P<sup>66</sup> “his freedom is failure to live up to his accepted task.”

<sup>67</sup> The scribe is “careful” in general but “careless as to word order,” with the latter referring not to “failure” (as with P<sup>66</sup>) but to disregard, which has to do with intention (see Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 116-118). Elsewhere (Ernest C. Colwell and Ernest W. Tune, “Method in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings,” in Colwell, *Studies*, 105), Colwell refers to P<sup>45</sup> as an “undisciplined text,” but the use of this word there is equated with a lack of “control” or a freedom to alter.

<sup>68</sup> In Colwell’s portrayal, while P<sup>75</sup> may have instances of P<sup>45</sup>-like editorial changes and P<sup>66</sup>-like carelessness, neither plays any significant role in its transmission (“Scribal Habits,” 115, 121).

<sup>69</sup> Colwell and Tune, “Classifying and Evaluating,” 105; Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 121.

<sup>70</sup> See Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 117-118, 121.

<sup>71</sup> See Fee, “P<sup>75</sup>, P<sup>66</sup>, and Origen,” 30, who points to the calligraphic writing style and corrections against a second *Vorlage* as evidence that P<sup>66</sup> was produced in a Scriptorium.

Kurt and Barbara Aland assigned the third-century codex of the Gospels and Acts known as P<sup>45</sup> to the category of “free” text, that is, one “dealing with the original text in a relatively free manner with no suggestion of a program of standardization.”<sup>72</sup>

Barbara Aland has since reaffirmed this judgement in various publications.<sup>73</sup> In her treatment of some of the shared variant readings in John that deviate from Nestle-Aland she concludes that the text represented by the papyrus exhibits many of the same “großzügig” characteristics associated with the scribe himself (see discussion below for scribal characteristics), but that it nevertheless remains basically in line with the *Ausgangstext*.<sup>74</sup> This means that whatever might be said about its freedom, this papyrus does not contain the type of readings that are particularly characteristic of Codex Bezae, although it does share a number of readings with that manuscript.<sup>75</sup>

Those who have commented on the character of the text of John as it is preserved in P<sup>45</sup>, which includes portions of 4:51, 54; 5:21, 24; 10:7-25; 10:30-11:10, 18-36, 42-57, have been unable to assign it to any major textual type or group on the basis of its affinities with other manuscripts and have concluded that it represents a text that stands roughly between those traditionally labelled “Neutral” or “Alexandrian” and “Western.”<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> K. Aland and B. Aland, *Text*, 59, 93, 98-99.

<sup>73</sup> Barbara Aland, “Das Zeugnis der frühen Papyri für den Text der Evangelien: Diskutiert am Matthäusevangelium,” in *The Four Gospels 1992 1* (eds. F. V. Segbroeck and C. M. Tuckett, *et al*; BETL 100; Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peters, 1992), 325-335; eadem, “Nutzen,” 27-33, 36-38; eadem, “Significance of the Chester Beatty,” in Horton, *The Earliest Gospels*, 108-121.

<sup>74</sup> B. Aland, “Nutzen,” 28, 32.

<sup>75</sup> See Frederic G. Kenyon, ed., *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri 2: The Gospels and Acts, Text* (London: Emery Walker, 1933), xiv, xvi; M.-J. Lagrange, “Les Papyrus Chester Beatty pour les Évangiles,” *RB* 43 (1934): 40 (“bien éloignée des audaces de D”); Elliott, “Singular Readings,” 125 says P<sup>45</sup> “is no aberrant text like Codex Bezae is often said to be.”

<sup>76</sup> See especially Kenyon, *Gospels and Acts, Text*, xiv, xvi (“In John...stands between the Neutral and Western families...slightly nearer to the latter), xvii; Lagrange, “Les Papyrus,” 40 (“oscillant entre un texte *B* et un texte *D*...mais suivant ordinairement la tradition *B*”); Juan Chapa, “The Early Text of John,” in Hill and Kruger, *The Early Text*, 151 (“The text of the Fourth Gospel is at a mid-way point between the ‘Alexandrian’ and the ‘Western’ MSS”). Cf. R. V. G. Tasker, “The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Caesarean Text of John,” *HTR* 30 (1967): 162; C. L. Porter, “A Textual Analysis of the Earliest Manuscripts of the Gospel of John,” (Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1961), 136; Epp “Significance,” 97.

Building on the work of Colwell,<sup>77</sup> Royse provides a thorough and meticulous analysis of the scribal habits reflected in P<sup>45</sup>. He determines based on 227 singular readings that the transmission of P<sup>45</sup> has tendencies towards omission, harmonization (especially to the immediate context) and stylistic and grammatical improvements and away from orthographic and nonsense singulars as well as corrections to his work.<sup>78</sup> The small number of nonsense and especially orthographic singulars demonstrate the scribe's care and accuracy.<sup>79</sup> P<sup>45</sup> has "by far" the highest percentage of significant singulars among the six early papyri included in his study, which suggests, as Colwell had pointed out, that the scribe copied by "idea-content" rather than syllables, letters or even individual words.<sup>80</sup> Accordingly, the number of transpositions, which he says is a "pervasive feature of our scribe's copying," and the amount of text involved in those transpositions suggest "the scribe is clearly not particularly concerned with whether or not the order of words is reproduced exactly."<sup>81</sup> Again following Colwell, the number and dimension of omissions that still retain a readable text indicate a tendency or preference towards brevity or conciseness especially through the elimination of unnecessary words.<sup>82</sup> The presence of simplifications and additions that remove asyndeton suggest for Royse the probability of some level of stylistic intentionality, as do the nature of some substitutions (but see comments below).<sup>83</sup> Perhaps shorter, readable, competent and free serve best to encapsulate Royse's characterization of this scribe's reproduction of his exemplar.<sup>84</sup>

In order to gain a clearer and more nuanced understanding of Royse's conclusions it is necessary to observe how he engages with the work of Colwell and

---

<sup>77</sup> Colwell, "Scribal Habits," especially 114-124.

<sup>78</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 197.

<sup>79</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 120, 123, 197. Cf. Colwell, "Scribal Habits," 114-116.

<sup>80</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 123-124. Cf. Colwell, "Scribal Habits," 112, 117.

<sup>81</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 153, 160. Cf. Colwell, "Scribal Habits," 117.

<sup>82</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 140, 151. Cf. Colwell, "Scribal Habits," 118-121.

<sup>83</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 130, 181. Cf. Colwell, "Scribal Habits," 119.

<sup>84</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, see especially 123-124, 197.

Min in particular. Although he accepts much of Colwell's portrayal of the scribal habits of P<sup>45</sup>, as shown above, his own analysis of the data and his largely positive reception of Min's work lead him to question some aspects. For Colwell, the scribe of P<sup>45</sup> was an editor who freely and with careful intentionality adapted the text to his own stylistic and grammatical preferences without desire or pressure to exactly reproduce the copy in front of him.<sup>85</sup> For Min, however, the scribe copied with intelligence and speed, quickly grasping and conveying the sense, but took on far too much text at a time. The scribe had no intention of changing the text, with the result that as missed words were noticed, he endeavoured to correct himself by inserting them later at an appropriate place, as evidenced by the extent of transposition.<sup>86</sup> Both Colwell and Min understand the scribe to have been intelligent and competent, but Colwell's scribe was creative and free to alter whereas Min's scribe was hasty and careful to correct.<sup>87</sup>

Royse offers a corrective or softening to two of Colwell's claims regarding intentionality: the absence of intentionality in exact reproduction and the presence of intentionality in making editorial changes (smoothing, clarifying, removing redundancy, shortening, rearranging, etc.). With respect to the former Royse thinks that Colwell's claim that the scribe "writes without any intention of exactly

---

<sup>85</sup> Colwell, "Scribal Habits," 117, and for intentionality and stylistic improvement see especially 118-121. Cf. Lagrange, "Les Papyrus," 36, 41 (en vue de l'élégance; un texte révisé); 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.

<sup>86</sup> Min, *Die früheste Überlieferung*, 134-135, 138, 143, 150-51. Cf. B. Aland, "Nutzen," 32 ("hier ein schneller und flüchtiger Kopist am Werk war...kein bewußter Änderungswille vorliegt"); eadem, "Significance of the Chester Beatty," 112. For "accidental" rather than "deliberate" see also C. Tarelli, "Some Linguistic Aspects of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Gospels," *JTS* 39 (1938): 259; idem, "Omissions, Additions, and Conflations in the Chester Beatty Papyrus," *JTS* 40 (1939): 386. See Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 160-161 for discussion of the transpositions as corrected omissions.

<sup>87</sup> See Colwell and Tune, "Method in Classifying and Evaluating," 96-105, 105 ("felt free to modify the text in matters of detail...a maverick...runs wild"). But Min, *Die früheste Überlieferung*, 130, 143 understands there to be an acceptable range of error-tolerance (Toleranzbereich) in minor elements (Geringfügigkeiten), and B. Aland, "Significance of the Chester Beatty," 112-113, 117 argues that although the scribe is "liberal," this is only with regard to "minor" and "inconsequential" things, does not jeopardize the sense or involve intentionality, and remains within the confines of certain professional and ecclesiastical expectations. It is worth noting here that Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 137-139, 142-145 attributes the larger omissions of four or more words to mechanical leaps.

reproducing his source...with great freedom” is overstated, since “in general P<sup>45</sup> certainly does reproduce his source exactly” and “this freedom is within the context of generally accurate copying.”<sup>88</sup> Regarding the latter, although Royse seems ambivalent towards Min’s insistence that there was no intentionality or conscious efforts at stylistic improvement, he does largely approve of Min’s critiques of Colwell, even though these critiques are levelled partially against his own language in his 1981 dissertation.<sup>89</sup>

Min especially challenges Colwell’s charge that the scribe of P<sup>45</sup> was consciously trying to produce a more concise text. In addition to the evidence gleaned from transpositions as corrected omissions, he points to a lack of uniqueness in the percentage of omissions in P<sup>45</sup> when compared to the other early extensive papyri and to an overall lack of consistency and regularity in omissions and additions.<sup>90</sup> Instead, the omissions are instances of “Nachlässigkeit,” having been produced “nur gelegentlich und wahrscheinlich unbewusst,” and it must be kept in mind that “Der Schreiber als ein berufmäßiger Kopist hatte grundsätzlich kaum die Absicht, den Text zu ändern.”<sup>91</sup> In response, Royse comments:

Certainly Min’s points are in general confirmed by the readings of P<sup>45</sup> that are studied here. Indeed, in retrospect I believe that Colwell and I (and no doubt others) sometimes projected onto the scribe a certain deliberateness in the creation of these readings that is not required by the facts. On the other hand, I don’t believe that we can be confident that the scribe did *not* proceed deliberately on occasion (emphasis his).<sup>92</sup>

---

<sup>88</sup> Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 117; Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 124, 171; Cf. Min, *Die früheste Überlieferung*, 138, 151, where he cites transpositions as corrected omissions as evidence for a concern over faithful reproduction.

<sup>89</sup> James R. Royse, “Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri,” (Th.D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, California, 1981), 156 (“deliberate pruning”); Cf. Min, *Die früheste Überlieferung*, 149.

<sup>90</sup> Min, *Die früheste Überlieferung*, 132-134.

<sup>91</sup> Min, *Die früheste Überlieferung*, 134, 143, 151. For comments on scribal professionalism and the nature of the copying task, see B. Aland, “Nutzen,” 28 and “Significance of the Chester Beatty.”

<sup>92</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 141, diverging significantly from Colwell, “Scribal Habits, 119, who says, “That P<sup>45</sup> attempted stylistic improvements is unquestionable.”

Although Royse retains the language of “deliberate pruning” from his dissertation,<sup>93</sup> he does so with qualification and uncertainty,<sup>94</sup> showing that it is by no means a foregone conclusion that P<sup>45</sup> reflects a scribe who played fast and loose with the text before him.

Another important point of analysis concerns whether P<sup>45</sup> was originally meant for public/liturgical or private use. While it is not at all my intention to settle this matter here, it is at least worth noting that there are a few sensible reasons to suspect private use, and that this should at least affect how we measure the impact of its freedom. Kraus makes his case for private use (or use for very few) based primarily on the small size of the letters, which he says would not have facilitated ease in public reading, and the later addition of punctuation (marked by thicker ink),<sup>95</sup> which suggests an attempt at some point to make the manuscript more user-friendly.<sup>96</sup> Charlesworth echoes these observations and adds that the scribe of P<sup>45</sup> neither implemented nor reproduced *ekthesis*, vacant line ends, spaces, or the *paragraphos*.<sup>97</sup> The uneven attestation of medial points for text-division among the books included in P<sup>45</sup> indicates that these forms of punctuation were merely carried over from the different exemplars used and should thus not be considered reflective of the scribe’s purposes. Thus the “low importance placed on signalling text division

---

<sup>93</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 197.

<sup>94</sup> For ambivalence, see Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 197 (“The scribe has a marked tendency to omit portions of text, often (as it seems) accidentally but perhaps also by deliberate pruning”), 151 (“I would concur [with Min] that the scribe could have dispensed with the words unconsciously or half-consciously, and unintentionally”) (Cf. Min, *Die früheste Überlieferung*, 133), 181 (“one may wonder whether the scribe on occasion had the intention to improve his text”), 197 (“Stylistic and grammatical improvements are sometimes attempted”).

<sup>95</sup> For these marks by a later hand, which appear only in Mark and Acts (the last two books in the codex because of the Western order of the gospels), see Kenyon, *Gospels and Acts, Text*, ix; T. C. Skeat, “A Codicological Analysis of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Gospels and Acts (P45),” *Hermathena* 155 (1993): 31-32.

<sup>96</sup> Thomas J. Kraus, “Ad Fontes: Gewinn durch die Konsultation von Originalhandschriften am Beispiel von P. Vindob. G 31974,” *Biblica* 82 (2001): 1-16 and plate, especially 12-15. He also notes the rightward slope of letters, the number of letters per line, and the high-end number of lines for a page of average height.

<sup>97</sup> Scott D. Charlesworth, “Public and Private: Second- and Third-Century Gospel Manuscripts,” in *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon* (ed. C. A. Evans and H. D. Zacharias; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2009), 165. He also cites “the unfashionable page size...and compressed layout” (166).

in P<sup>45</sup> is more indicative of a Manuscript made for ‘private’ rather than ‘public’ use.”<sup>98</sup> For Charlesworth, this evidence coheres with the paucity of corrections and the nature and extent of the singular readings and indicates an uncontrolled context of production.<sup>99</sup>

Neither Kraus nor Charlesworth rules out the possibility that P<sup>45</sup> was prepared for public use, though they both think it unlikely.<sup>100</sup> While considerations such as the overall quality of the scribal hand,<sup>101</sup> the presence of the medial points discussed above, and the potential effect of the scope of the project itself (Gospels and Acts) on line lengths and letter sizes may dictate against overconfidence on this issue,<sup>102</sup> it is reasonable to think that P<sup>45</sup> may very well have been intended for a limited readership rather than a community of Christian worshippers. This prospect should serve to limit at least to some degree the extent to which the scribal characteristics of P<sup>45</sup> act as a depiction of early Christian attitudes towards the transmission of their texts.

In sum, two major issues emerge from the scholarly discussion on P<sup>45</sup> that bear directly on our question of fluidity and/or stability in the early period, namely, intentionality and public or private use. On one end of the fluidity spectrum is the possibility that P<sup>45</sup> was filled with intentional changes and “improvements” and was produced for a Christian community for public use. If this was the case, then P<sup>45</sup> should naturally be placed in the spotlight as a clear-cut specimen of early Christian

---

<sup>98</sup> Charlesworth, “Public and Private,” 166-167.

<sup>99</sup> Charlesworth, “Public and Private,” 175 (“the same controls were not in place when gospel MSS were copied privately in casual settings”).

<sup>100</sup> Kraus, “*Ad fontes*,” 13; Charlesworth, “Public and Private,” 167.

<sup>101</sup> For the scribal competency and high quality of writing reflected in P<sup>45</sup>, see especially Kenyon, *Gospels and Acts, Text*, viii-ix; Günther Zuntz, “Reconstruction of one leaf of the Chester Beatty Papyri of the Gospels and Acts,” *Chronique d’Egypte* 26 (1951): 193; Kraus, “*Ad fontes*,” 5.

<sup>102</sup> Hurtado, *Artifacts*, 176 argues for public use, maintaining that the large amount of text involved would have naturally led to the smaller-sized letters, and that “the scribe sought to compensate for the effects of having to write somewhat smaller letters by carefully writing and spacing them for ease of reading.” He also draws a general contrast between P<sup>45</sup> and the private copy, P<sup>72</sup>. Cf. Chapa, “Early Text of John,” 150 n.52.

freedom in copying, since it would reveal that at least in this Christian community liberties were permitted in textual details and precise wording, and that scribes had some freedom to act as editors in creating a clearer or smoother rendition of the text. Yet even in this scenario, retention of the meaning and overall readability, a general faithfulness in reproducing the details of the exemplar, and the absence of any D-like eccentricity suggest a high regard for the content of the text and some measure of restraint on scribal freedom. On the other end of the spectrum is the possibility that the alterations were unintentional and that the manuscript was produced for private use. As can be seen from some of the most recent detailed analyses of the singular readings and layout of P<sup>45</sup>, this latter scenario is neither unwarranted nor improbable. It is clear that these two scenarios, setting aside for the moment those in-between (intentional changes and private use or unintentional changes and public use), result in quite different implications for the question of early fluidity. If the fundamental problem with the scribe's work was the large amount of text retained and copied at a single time combined with the speed with which the words were copied, and if it was prepared for a limited readership and not for collective worship, then the freedom often ascribed to P<sup>45</sup> is far less suggestive of early Christian transmission attitudes and practices than has been supposed.

### *P<sup>66</sup>*

As with P<sup>45</sup>, Kurt and Barbara Aland classify the well-preserved early codex of John's Gospel, P<sup>66</sup>, as a "free" text.<sup>103</sup> Although Elliott lists quite a few readings that are unique or nearly unique to P<sup>66</sup> and Codex D, he nevertheless concurs with the Alands' "free" (as opposed to a "D-type") classification, since "there are many

---

<sup>103</sup> K. Aland and B. Aland, *Text*, 59, 93, 100.

places where P<sup>66</sup> disagrees with D.”<sup>104</sup> Birdsall’s judgement based on internal evidence that P<sup>66</sup> contains a “mixture” of numerous “smoother” secondary readings with those that are more in line with Johannine style is echoed by Fee’s similar analysis of the 370 readings (excluding those that are corrected, orthographic, itacistic, and obviously erroneous) in P<sup>66</sup> that depart from the Neutral tradition.<sup>105</sup> Both find a tendency towards a less harsh and more readable text, which for Fee reflects “the kind of corruption” that would come to characterize the later Byzantine tradition.<sup>106</sup> Fee analyzes deviations from the Neutral tradition because of his conclusion that P<sup>66</sup> is “a basically Neutral text,” especially evident in chapters 1-5, and has the closest affinity with P<sup>75</sup> and Codex B within this tradition. He also concludes that it is “a mixed text” with both “Western” (chapter 6 onwards, but especially 6-7) and “Byzantine-type” (some in chapters 1-5, more in 8-21) readings. In the end, he upholds the description given previously by Klijn, that P<sup>66</sup> is “Neutral in a non-pure way.”<sup>107</sup>

The most pronounced characteristic of P<sup>66</sup> is its number of corrections,<sup>108</sup> and the fact that almost a quarter of them appear to have been made against another *Vorlage*, which is deduced from the extent of manuscript support for both the original and corrected readings.<sup>109</sup> Fee recognizes “no special proclivities” towards

---

<sup>104</sup> J. Keith Elliott, “Codex Bezae and the Earliest Greek Papyri,” in Parker and Amphoux, *Codex Bezae*, 177. Cf. brief discussion in Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 473.

<sup>105</sup> J. Neville Birdsall, *The Bodmer Papyrus of the Gospel of John* (London: The Tyndale Press, 1960), 11-18; Gordon D. Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II (P66): its Textual Relationship and Scribal Characteristics* (SD 34; Salt Lake City, University of Utah Press, 1968), 36-56.

<sup>106</sup> Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 56.

<sup>107</sup> Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 9-35, especially 35; A. F. J. Klijn, “Papyrus Bodmer II (John I – XIV) and the Text of Egypt,” *NTS* 3 (1956-1957): 333. Cf. J. Delobel, “The Bodmer Papyri of John,” in *L’Évangile de Jean: Sources, redaction, théologie* (ed. M. de Jonge; BETL 44; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1977) 317-323; Epp, “Significance,” 94 (“...although it falls short (by at least ten percentage points) of the seventy percent agreement required by current practice to demonstrate textual affinity”; “It may be a ‘wild’ member of the group, but it is a group member nonetheless”).

<sup>108</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 409 gives the total of 465. See further discussion on this issue below.

<sup>109</sup> For discussion of corrections in P<sup>66</sup>, see especially Gordon D. Fee, “The Corrections of Papyrus Bodmer II and Early Textual Transmission,” *NovT* 7 (1965): 247-257; idem., *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 57-75; E. F. Rhodes, “The Corrections of Papyrus Bodmer II,” *NTS* 14 (1967-8): 271-281; Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 409-490, 461-477 for second *Vorlage*.

or away from any manuscript or tradition in these latter corrections, having a nearly equal number of agreements and disagreements with the Neutral (Alexandrian) tradition, which indicates either that this second *Vorlage* was “mixed,” which he tentatively takes to be the case, or that corrections were made against multiple *Vorlagen*. He does, however, note greater movement “away from than toward the Western tradition.”<sup>110</sup> Royse generally agrees with these conclusions but identifies what could be regarded as “a tendency toward the Alexandrian text” once the unique readings of P<sup>66c</sup> are removed from the tally of corrections that are away from the Alexandrian tradition.<sup>111</sup> Royse’s disagreement with Fee regarding the nature and intentionality of these corrections will be discussed below.

The 128 singular readings of P<sup>66</sup>, which Royse considers after correction, reveal tendencies towards itacism, harmonization (especially to the immediate context as with the other papyri in his study) and transposition, but away from nonsense and orthographic singulars.<sup>112</sup> It has a high percentage of transpositions, second to P<sup>45</sup>, but these are relatively small in dimension.<sup>113</sup> Among Royse’s six papyri P<sup>45</sup> and P<sup>66</sup> rank best in terms of nonsense and orthographic singulars, with P<sup>66</sup> falling behind P<sup>45</sup> in the lowest frequency of orthographic singulars but having a slightly better rating than P<sup>45</sup> in nonsense readings. The presence of nonsense readings that involve syllables (and especially since many of these sorts of readings were corrected) supports Colwell’s claim that the scribe copied by syllable.<sup>114</sup> The scribe of P<sup>66</sup> has a “very slight” tendency towards omission over addition but has “by far” the lowest percentage of omissions in comparison to the other papyri. The great

---

<sup>110</sup> Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 70-71.

<sup>111</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 470-472.

<sup>112</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 544.

<sup>113</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 518-520; Cf. Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 116; Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 37.

<sup>114</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 490-495. Cf. Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 116; Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 79-80.

majority of omissions and additions consist of only one word.<sup>115</sup> The singular readings also exhibit efforts at smoothing especially when asyndeton is involved.<sup>116</sup> Royse concludes that even with the “striking deterioration” of the scribe’s accuracy as he progressed, his overall rate of error remains well below that of the other papyri besides P<sup>75</sup>.<sup>117</sup> He extols the scribe’s copying of John 1:1-6:51 as “rivaling and perhaps even surpassing P<sup>75</sup>’s record at the end of Luke,” and here in the conclusion to his study he remarks positively, “Perhaps the only surprise is the status of P<sup>66</sup>,” the final product of which he had judged to be “indeed rather careful.”<sup>118</sup> He does reiterate, however, that this perception is based on a consideration of the manuscript after correction.<sup>119</sup> It is to this point as well as some other important issues in regards to the scribal activity reflected in this manuscript that we now turn.

There are two primary issues raised in Royse’s study of P<sup>66</sup> where his point of view may be taken as a corrective to previous claims made concerning the level of freedom or fluidity exhibited in this early manuscript. First, Royse responds to Colwell’s method of treating the singular readings prior to correction and to the resultant charge that the scribe of P<sup>66</sup> was “careless.”<sup>120</sup> Colwell supports his characterization by citing the quantity of singular readings in general (482 apart from itacisms) and of nonsense and itacistic readings in particular (almost 200 (approximately 40% of singulars) and 400 respectively), the evidence of various leaps, influences from similar forms, omissions and transpositions, and even the lack

---

<sup>115</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 505, 511, 544.

<sup>116</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 510, 544. Cf. Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 121-123; Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 43-45.

<sup>117</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 495, 900-901.

<sup>118</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 901, 498.

<sup>119</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 901.

<sup>120</sup> Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 114 (“something less than disciplined attention to the basic task...evidence of carelessness”), 118 (“falling into careless errors”; “careless and ineffective”), 121-123 (“Wildness in copying is the outstanding characteristic of P<sup>66</sup>...editorializes as he does everything else – in a sloppy fashion...whimsical and careless”). See also Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 57 (“a careless and ineffective workman”).

of a guiding principle behind editorial changes/stylistic improvements.<sup>121</sup> Royse responds that the whole of the scribe's work as reflected in the final product should naturally be the basis for an accurate assessment of the quality of transmission and the scribe's attitude towards it, rather than isolating and drawing conclusions from the first task of the project.<sup>122</sup> And in fact when we turn to this final product, we see the removal of nearly all nonsense readings, efforts to compare the copy with a different *Vorlage*, and even attempts to correct corruptions in word order and itacistic spellings, all of which demonstrate that "the scribe of P<sup>66</sup> exercises great care to render a literal copy."<sup>123</sup> Thus, the quantity and character of the corrections themselves taken together with the quality of the finished product constitute strong evidence against "carelessness."<sup>124</sup>

Apparent contradiction and ambiguity have led to confusion and uncertainty about Colwell's construal of the circumstances surrounding the transmission of P<sup>66</sup>. So Royse says that Colwell contradicts himself by first saying that the scribe *did not* and then later that he *did* intend to produce a good copy, and Head comments on a lack of clarity as to why Colwell chose to treat the manuscript before correction.<sup>125</sup> Colwell's use of language is indeed confusing, especially in regards to intentionality, but I do not think he contradicts himself. Although not at all explicit, he appears to

---

<sup>121</sup> Colwell, "Scribal Habits," 114-124. He says the scribe's "care" was spent on his calligraphic style of writing (118).

<sup>122</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 495-505, especially 498. He also points out that Colwell cites many readings as nonsense that are actually orthographic in nature (494-495).

<sup>123</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 502, see also 413, 492-493, 497-498, 522. See below for discussion of correctors.

<sup>124</sup> See Hurtado, *Artifacts*, 188, who attributes this scribe's many errors to a lack of skill rather than care, and who remarks that such a scribe through "zealousness in correcting" reveals that he "too felt the obligation to make an exact copy." Cf. Kurt Aland, "Papyrus Bodmer II: Ein erster Bericht," *TLZ* 82 (1957): 181, who says the corrections were made "zwar mit offensichtlicher Sorgfalt." Whether the many mistakes of the initial task are attributable to a lack of skill/ability/mental capacity (i.e. focus) or of time (hurriedness), one cannot deny the level of conscientiousness reflected in the correcting activity. Cf. Kim Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 109.

<sup>125</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 497; Peter M. Head "Scribal Behaviour and Theological Tendencies in Singular Readings in P. Bodmer II (P66)," in Houghton and Parker, *Textual Variation*, 61.

treat two aspects of intentionality. P<sup>75</sup> and P<sup>66</sup> are guided by the same intention but to a different degree or level of intensity (one is careful and the other is careless in carrying out this intention),<sup>126</sup> whereas P<sup>75</sup> and P<sup>45</sup> have the same degree of intentionality but with different intentions (one aims for literal reproduction while the other aims to satisfy his own editorial bent).<sup>127</sup> The apparent contradiction arises because of the comment early in his discussion, “P<sup>45</sup> and P<sup>75</sup> seriously intend to produce a good copy, but it is hard to believe that this was the intention of P<sup>66</sup>,” which indeed seems to contradict everything else that he goes on to say about P<sup>45</sup> and P<sup>66</sup>.<sup>128</sup> But this comment must be viewed in the context of his previous mention of the “seriousness of intention” and of the immediately following sentences regarding “carelessness” / a lack of “discipline.” Thus, in my opinion this initial reference to “intention” pertains to level or degree (“seriousness” as he says), which is synonymous with “care” or “concern” and does not carry the same meaning as his subsequent references.

Colwell’s discussion of P<sup>66</sup> is also ambiguous regarding the identity and number of the correctors involved. He explicitly says that the scribe corrected some of his errors *in scribendo* (“If he catches a transposition while he is writing...”), but he is vague with respect to who is involved in the second stage (“If the transposition is caught later....”).<sup>129</sup> He goes on to comment that the scribe is “under the control of some other person, or second standard, so that the corrections which are made are usually corrections to a reading read by a number of other witnesses.”<sup>130</sup> The fact that he says “or second standard” seems to imply that the task could still belong to the scribe. He then notes that almost all nonsense readings (nine out of ten) and most

---

<sup>126</sup> Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 117-118.

<sup>127</sup> This is why he later says of the scribes of P<sup>45</sup> and P<sup>75</sup> that they are “careful workmen” but “according to their own standards” (Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 118). In contrast to P<sup>45</sup>, any “editorial” work that may have played a role in P<sup>66</sup> is overshadowed by the scribe’s all-pervasive “sloppiness” (123).

<sup>128</sup> Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 114 compared with 117-118.

<sup>129</sup> Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 117.

<sup>130</sup> Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 118.

of the singular readings in general (two out of three) were corrected, before concluding: “In short, P<sup>66</sup> gives the impression of being the product of a scriptorium, i.e., a publishing house. It shows the *supervision of* a foreman, or *of* a scribe turned proofreader” (emphasis mine).<sup>131</sup>

The use of the word “supervision” (rather than “revision,” for example)<sup>132</sup> and the fact that the two individuals mentioned modify that word suggest that in both cases he means someone other than the scribe. It makes little sense to say that the scribe “supervised” his own work, even if he has switched roles and is effectively serving in an entirely new capacity (i.e. as a “proofreader”). Colwell’s distinction, then, between “foreman” and “scribe turned proofreader” likely pertains to what kind of individual would be overseeing the scribe’s work in this hypothetical “scriptorium,” rather than whether it is the scribe himself or someone else doing the correcting. Moreover, a major concern in the two preceding paragraphs is to argue that neither P<sup>75</sup> nor P<sup>45</sup> shows evidence of involvement from “anyone else” or “a second party.”<sup>133</sup> That he now intends to emphasize that this is not the case for P<sup>66</sup> makes the most sense in the context of his discussion. Therefore, although the proportion of corrections that Colwell thinks to be from the scribe himself is left unclear,<sup>134</sup> the difference of approach between Colwell and Royse, as to whether to assess the singular readings before or after correction, does appear to be the result of significantly different views on the level of external involvement in the corrections.

Royse is adamant that “Whatever may be the doubts about specific places, there is no doubt that the text was subjected to very frequent correction, and that in at least most places the scribe himself was the corrector.”<sup>135</sup> He says this is the

---

<sup>131</sup> Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 118.

<sup>132</sup> The word he uses previously for a general “check” (Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 117).

<sup>133</sup> Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 117.

<sup>134</sup> At least some of the transpositions, as quoted above.

<sup>135</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 413. He goes on to cite 13:19a as the one exception and concedes that no one can be certain about the deletions (414).

consensus view and in the course of his discussion cites the judgements of Martin, K. Aland, Fee and Parker as support.<sup>136</sup> Others have considered greater external involvement more likely but have nonetheless left open the possibility that the scribe himself was chiefly responsible.<sup>137</sup> By contrast, Comfort and Barrett argue for three distinct correctors based on differences in the appearance of some letters.<sup>138</sup> Fee and Royse, however, maintain that such differences should probably be attributed to the nature of the correcting task or variation in the scribe's style of writing.<sup>139</sup>

Regardless of whether or not Royse's view, which does enjoy wider support among those scholars who have studied these corrections, is truer to the circumstances than that of Comfort and Barrett, there are still good reasons why his approach remains more reasonable and suggestive than Colwell's. First, even if Comfort and Barrett are entirely correct, the original scribe is still responsible for over 200 corrections, is identified with correcting nonsense, and has even corrected a number of itacisms.<sup>140</sup> This point is important because we are still left with a scribe who exhibits a significant amount of concern over his mistakes and because it is nonsense readings that factor most heavily into Colwell's characterization of the

---

<sup>136</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 413-421. See Victor Martin, ed. *Papyrus Bodmer II* (Cologny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1956), 31-32; K. Aland, "Papyrus Bodmer II," 161; Fee, "Corrections of Papyrus Bodmer II and Early Textual Transmission," 248; idem, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 58-60, 70, 74, who affirms but softens the comment in his previous article, ascribes 13:19 to a second hand, and argues in favor of the first hand for deletions except for a few of a particular supralinear dot variety; IGNTP I, 6 ("only two second hand corrections that consist of letters have been identified in P<sup>66</sup>," citing 13:19 and 14:22.

<sup>137</sup> See Rhodes, "Corrections," who posits three stages (*in scribendo*, first review, second review with another exemplar) (280-281), notes the "attractive" possibility of a "different hand" for a number of corrections made afterwards (273), but concludes, "while it may be true that several hands have been at work here, it seems equally possible that the whole... is the work of a single scribe" (271); Chapa, "Early Text of John," 144 n. 13, 146.

<sup>138</sup> Philip W. Comfort and David P. Barrett, eds., *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts* (Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House, 2001), 386-387, drawing on Karyn Berner's unpublished master's thesis, use "c<sup>1</sup>" for the scribe himself who made mostly corrections to nonsense in the course of copying and who deleted by scraping; "c<sup>2</sup>" for an "official *diorthōtēs*" who made "grammatical and substantive" corrections as well as those against another manuscript, deleted with supralinear dots and hooks, and was the paginator for pages 1-99; and "c<sup>3</sup>" for "another scribe" or "*diorthōtēs*" responsible mostly for corrections in chapter 13 and the pagination of 100 onwards.

<sup>139</sup> Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 59; Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 420-421.

<sup>140</sup> I count 205 places where c<sup>1</sup> is cited as the corrector, and more than a few of these involve itacism: 1:25, 1:35, 2:25, 3:4, 4:9a, 4:9b, 4:29, 5:20, 5:33, 5:44, 5:45, 6:10, 6:40, 7:19, 7:25, 7:34, 10:41, 11:40, 12:29, 15:7, 15:18 (Comfort and Barrett, *The Complete Text*, 388 ff.).

scribe as “careless.”<sup>141</sup> Second, whatever proportion of corrections are to be attributed to the scribe, the process itself that gave rise to this manuscript, irrespective of how many scribes/correctors/foremen were involved at the time of its production, resulted in a good, carefully corrected copy. Whatever we are to make of the individual scribe who copied P<sup>66</sup> (his devotion, attitudes, conscientiousness, skill, etc.), it seems that this latter evidence is far more suggestive of how Christians at large thought and behaved regarding the transmission of their texts.

A second potential corrective offered by Royse comes in his response to Fee concerning the intention behind the scribe’s corrections against a second *Vorlage*.<sup>142</sup> As Fee explains it, when deciding between readings at places where his copy of the original *Vorlage* differed from the second, the scribe chose in accordance with an objective to produce a “smoother,” “fuller,” “easier,” “readable,” “more intelligible” text rather than a preserved Johannine text or text-critically “best” text.<sup>143</sup> This “recensional activity” was “without apparent controls” rather than “scholarly” and reveals early Byzantine-like tendencies, thus pointing away from any supposed Alexandrian-type recension.<sup>144</sup> Royse responds that the scribe was fundamentally not choosing to “produce” or “add” text or a specific kind of text, as Fee describes the situation, but to *reproduce* text from a manuscript copy of John, and in this respect Fee’s portrayal perverts the nature of the scribe’s activity. To look at corrections in terms of the text that is now present (e.g., a conjunction, pronoun, article) and to draw conclusions from this information about what kind of text the scribe intends to make is to look at the evidence in reverse. Royse contends that whether it was restoration of what was mistakenly omitted or transmission of a reading from the

---

<sup>141</sup> Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 114-118.

<sup>142</sup> See Fee, “Corrections of Papyrus Bodmer II and Early Textual Transmission,” 247-257; idem, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 57-75; idem, “P<sup>75</sup>, P<sup>66</sup>, and Origen,” 30-31; Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 472-473, 477-484.

<sup>143</sup> Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 73-75. This is the scribe’s “principle of choice,” (idem, “Corrections of Papyrus Bodmer II and Early Textual Transmission,” 256).

<sup>144</sup> Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 75, 81-83; idem, “P<sup>75</sup>, P<sup>66</sup>, and Origen,” 31.

second manuscript, the intention of the corrections is reproduction of the manuscript at hand rather than to produce an “easier” or “fuller” text. So in response to Fee’s conclusions, he says,

I do not see that Fee produces any evidence that indicates that the scribe was not seeking to preserve the original text...It is true that the scribe makes errors, and that he transmits readings that may be described as smoother and fuller. In these respects he is like most scribes, I suppose. But I see no reason to doubt that in choosing, say, to follow the ‘fuller’ reading...the scribe believed that he was transmitting what John wrote.”<sup>145</sup>

Royse also points out that some of the corrections Fee includes were quite possibly corrections to mistakes made while copying the first *Vorlage*, and agreement with the original reading by other manuscripts in such cases is only coincidental. This applies especially where the reading of P<sup>66\*</sup> is narrowly attested but also in some places, given the presence of similar tendencies, where there is greater manuscript support. These corrections, then, would demonstrate nothing other than a desire to reproduce the first *Vorlage*. In such cases, Fee misrepresents the data by citing corrections of what may be scribally created omissions as “additions” and thus evidence for recensional activity towards an “easier and “fuller” text. Finally, Royse appears to favor viewing the scribe as generally following the second *Vorlage* instead of selecting on a case-by-case basis whether to keep the readings from the first *Vorlage* or to change to those in the second. He says, for example, it may be “misleading in such places to speak of recensional activity. For the choice of the scribe may be, not to follow an exemplar because it has the article, but rather to follow a particular exemplar, which as it happens has the article.”<sup>146</sup> I should add that instead of demonstrating a high degree of selectivity on the part of the scribe, Fee assumes that this is inherent to the activity of correcting against another *Vorlage* and then from this assumption seeks to show on what basis these

---

<sup>145</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 503-504.

<sup>146</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 483.

selections were made.<sup>147</sup> In short, Royse here provides, as he did in response to Colwell, sound reasons for questioning Fee’s overall portrayal of a “scribe-turned-recensor” who cares little to reproduce or preserve and for whom the Gospel of John “was not ‘canonical scripture.’”<sup>148</sup>

The following study of the character of transmission exhibited in the 14 smaller fragmentary papyri of the Gospel of John is divided into three sections based solely on the level of integration of P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup> for the Diachronic Comparison of Created Readings section. Otherwise, there is no difference in the method applied to each manuscript. In Section 2, I will treat the papyri for which neither P<sup>66</sup> nor P<sup>75</sup> *completely* overlaps. In each case, the Diachronic Comparison section will involve only a comparison of the respective papyrus with the later majuscules that completely overlap for the portion of text covered. In section 3, I will treat the two papyri with which P<sup>66</sup> completely overlaps. This enables us to compare the quantity and character of (likely) created readings from two manuscripts of the early period with several manuscripts from subsequent centuries. In Section 4, the comparison will include both P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup>, since the three manuscripts covered in this section are fully overlapped by both of those extensive papyri. Within each section manuscripts are treated in chronological order from earliest to latest, or, where dating is the same or unclear, successively by papyrus number.

---

<sup>147</sup> See Fee, “Corrections of Papyrus Bodmer II and Early Textual Transmission,” 248; idem, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 60-61, 70-75. The fact that these corrections are towards a “mixed,” but basically Alexandrian kind of text (Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 70-71, but especially Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 470-472) supports the idea that the scribe simply followed the second *Vorlage*, which itself was similar in quality and textual complexion to the one he had just copied.

<sup>148</sup> On this final point about canonical status see Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 75 and Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 503-504.

## 2. FRAGMENTS WITHOUT FULL OVERLAP IN P66 OR P75

### 2.1. P<sup>52</sup> (P. Ryl. III 457)

#### Introduction

P<sup>52</sup> is, as Elliott puts it, “arguably the most famous, certainly the most familiar, Biblical manuscript.”<sup>149</sup> It consists of one fragment from the upper part of a leaf of a papyrus codex from the Fayum or Oxyrhynchus, Egypt, containing portions of John 18:31-33 on the recto (side with horizontal fibers) and 18:37-38 on the verso (vertical fibers).<sup>150</sup> This papyrus shares extant text with two others from the second or third centuries, P<sup>66</sup> (overlapping for portions of all verses) and P<sup>90</sup> (overlapping for portions of vv. 37-38). It was acquired in 1920 by Bernard P. Grenfell for the John Rylands Library. The fragment measures 6 cm. in width and 8.9 cm. in height and preserves portions of 7 lines of text on each side. The space covered by the text itself measures 5.8 cm in width and 6.4 cm. in height. The reconstructed page contained 18 lines of text in one column and measured 20 cm. wide and 21 cm. high.<sup>151</sup> The upper margin, measuring over 2 cm., and part of the inner margin are preserved. Roberts estimated the average number of letters per line at 33 for the recto and 29/30 for the verso, with the latter having shorter lines because they were written toward the fold

---

<sup>149</sup> J. Keith Elliott, “The Biblical Manuscripts of the John Ryland’s University Library of Manchester,” *BJRL* 81, no. 2 (Summer 1999): 8.

<sup>150</sup> For this and further information see especially C. H. Roberts, *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library* (Manchester: MUP, 1935), reprinted with minor changes as “An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library,” *BJRL* 20 (1936): 45-55 (referred to as *editio princeps* 1936 for the remainder of this chapter), and again with a much briefer introduction as “457. St. John’s Gospel, xviii,” in *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library III* (Manchester: MUP, 1938), 1-3 (referred to as *editio princeps* 1938 for the remainder of this chapter); Kurt Aland, *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri, I: Biblische Papyri, Altes Testament, Neues Testament, Varia, Apokryphen* (PTS 18; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1976), 282; idem, *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (2d ed.; ANTF 1; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), 10; Leuven Database of Ancient Books, Leuven University: <http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/text.php?tm=61624> (hereafter referred to as LDAB).

<sup>151</sup> Eric G. Turner, *The Typology of the Early Codex* (reprint; Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 1977), 18 puts the reconstructed page at 18 cm. wide and 21.3 cm. high and places it in his Group 5 Aberrant.

at the inner margin, with a range of 28 to 35 letters per line.<sup>152</sup> Roberts estimated that the text of John's Gospel would have taken up 130 pages, or 66 leaves. He thinks it "highly unlikely" that this codex contained all four Gospels, since it would have needed 576 pages, or 288 leaves. He remarks, "to judge from the spacing and the size of the hand, it is unlikely that the format was affected by considerations of economy."<sup>153</sup>

There are two issues that have given rise to debate in the study of P<sup>52</sup>, namely, dating and the use of *nomina sacra*, both of which merit some extended discussion here. As regards dating, P<sup>52</sup> is listed in Appendix I of NA<sup>28</sup> as one of four New Testament papyri, along with P<sup>90</sup>, P<sup>98</sup>, and P<sup>104</sup>, dated to the second century and one of three papyri of the Gospel of John, along with P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>90</sup>, dated at or before ca. 200 C.E. (and with partial overlap).<sup>154</sup> Roberts' attitude towards assigning P<sup>52</sup> to the early second century was one of confidence and caution. Before beginning his assessment of the evidence he cautioned the reader, "Any exact dating of book hands is, of course, out of the question," acknowledging the limitations inherent in the comparison of scripts and individual letterforms.<sup>155</sup> He described the characteristics of the hand of P<sup>52</sup> as follows:

"the scribe writes in a heavy, rounded and rather elaborate hand, often uses several strokes to form a single letter (cf. the eta and particularly the sigma in Recto, l. 3) with a rather clumsy effect and is fond of adding a small flourish or hook to the end of his strokes (cf. the omega, the iota and the upsilon); among particular letters the epsilon with its cross stroke a little above the centre, the delta, the upsilon and the mu may be noted...his orthography, apart from a couple of itacisms, is good and his writing, if not that of a practised scribe, is painstaking and regular...P. Ryl. Gk. 457 [like P. Egerton

---

<sup>152</sup> *Editio princeps* 1936, 50, but see discussion below on *nomina sacra*.

<sup>153</sup> *Editio princeps* 1936, 52. Cf. Larry W. Hurtado, "P52 (P. Rylands Gk. 457) and the Nomina Sacra: Method and Probability," *TynBul* 54 (2003): 3.

<sup>154</sup> Hence their treatment in Kurt Aland, "Der Text des Johannesevangeliums im 2. Jahrhundert," in *Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments* (ed. W. Schrage; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986), 1-10.

<sup>155</sup> *Editio princeps* 1936, 46.

2] also has a somewhat 'informal air' about it and with no claims to fine writing is yet a careful piece of work."<sup>156</sup>

He then went on to mention the literary texts used for his judgments about the dating of P<sup>52</sup>, citing two "to which it bears a striking resemblance."<sup>157</sup> First, there is Schubart's *Berolinenses* 19, a portion of a roll containing part of the Iliad (originally dated late first/early second century, but later assigned by the editor to the late first). This text he said, despite some differences such as an earlier form of alpha, is "the closest parallel to our text that I have been able to find," a view that he said is shared by Frederick Kenyon. Second, there is P. Egerton 2 although "written in a lighter and less laboured hand" (dated by its editors to the mid-second century, erring "if at all, on the side of caution"). Here he observed similarities with P<sup>52</sup> in the writing of the letters upsilon, mu, and delta and in many other features "though in a less accentuated form."

As for dated documentary papyri, he saw the most affinity with P<sup>52</sup> in P. Fayum 110 dated A.D. 94, having two forms of the letter alpha, and, to a lesser degree, P. Lond. 2078 from the time of Domitian.<sup>158</sup> Others that share similarities in the writing of certain letters include P. Oslo 22 dated A.D. 127 (eta, mu, iota) and Schubart's Abb. 34 dated before A.D. 117. So as "to exemplify the need of caution," Roberts also noted Kenyon's judgment that P<sup>52</sup>, although likely from the first half of the second century, does share some features with the cursive P. Flor. 1 dated A.D. 153. Roberts remarked, however, that these similarities are only partial (upsilon, omega, sometimes alpha), and that there are substantial differences in other

---

<sup>156</sup> *Editio princeps* 1936, 46, 48. In *editio princeps* 1938, 1: "The handwriting is good and careful and, while not calligraphic, is not that of an amateur." To Roberts' description Hurtado, "P52," 3, 11 adds that it is a "readable copy, with clearly-formed letters" and "the scribe was certainly aiming at careful, clear presentation of the text being copied... was not capable of a formal book-hand style... but nevertheless clearly did his or her best to produce an easy-to-use copy." Yet this was accompanied by "a certain irregularity and clumsiness in forming some letters."

<sup>157</sup> *Editio princeps* 1936, 46. For his discussion of these comparator texts and the quotations cited below, see 46-7.

<sup>158</sup> For this discussion, see *editio princeps* 1936, 47.

particulars and in general. Based on these data he reached the following conclusion: "On the whole we may accept with some confidence the first half of the second century as the period in which P. Ryl. Gk. 457 was most probably written – a judgment I should be much more loth to pronounce were it not supported by Sir Frederick Kenyon, Dr. W. Schubart and Dr. H. I. Bell who have seen photographs of the text and whose experience and authority in these matters are unrivalled."<sup>159</sup>

The International Greek New Testament Project (IGNTP) volume on the papyri of John's Gospel places P<sup>52</sup> in the second century, while noting that it is variously dated within that century.<sup>160</sup> In 1977, over forty years after the initial publication of P<sup>52</sup>, Turner commented, "I have no evidence to invalidate the first editor's dating to the first half of the second century. But I should echo his warning about the need for caution." He proceeds to highlight some affinity between P<sup>52</sup> and the petition, P. Amh. II 78 dated A.D. 184 but nevertheless repeats his conclusion, "The Rylands papyrus may be accepted as of the first half of the second century."<sup>161</sup> A turning point that sparked a reassessment of the dating of P<sup>52</sup> came in 1987 with the publication of P. Köln 255, an additional fragment of P. Egerton 2, attesting an apostrophe between two consonants (also found in P<sup>66</sup>), a feature which Turner had associated more with the third than the second century.<sup>162</sup>

The move to reassign P. Egerton 2 from mid-second century to late second/early third (ca. 200 C.E.) in light of this new evidence has been regarded as

---

<sup>159</sup> *Editio princeps* 1936, 47.

<sup>160</sup> IGNTP I, 17. For early second: *editio princeps*; K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste*, 10; Turner, *Typology*, 100. For mid second: G. Cavallo, *Il Calamo e il Papiro* (Florence: Edizioni Gonnelli, 2005), 183, 198. For late second: Andreas Schmidt, "Zwei Anmerkungen zu P. Ryl. III 457," *APF* 35 (1989): 11-12.

<sup>161</sup> Turner, *Typology*, 100.

<sup>162</sup> Michael Gronewald, "Unbekanntes Evangelium oder Evangelienharmonie (Fragment aus dem 'Evangelium Egerton')," in *Kölner Papyri (P. Köln), Vol. VI* (eds. Michael Gronewald et al.; Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1987), 136-145. For discussion see S. R. Pickering, "The Egerton Gospel and New Testament Textual Transmission," in *The New Testament in Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Lille Colloquium, July 2000* (eds. C. -B. Amphoux and J. K. Elliott; Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2003), esp. 229-233; Paul Foster, "Bold Claims, Wishful Thinking, and Lessons about Dating Manuscripts from Papyrus Egerton 2," in *The World of Jesus and the Early Church: Identity and Interpretation in Early Communities of Faith* (ed. C. A. Evans; Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2011), esp. 201ff.

applicable to P<sup>52</sup>, since P. Egerton 2 was one of the principal manuscripts used in determining its date.<sup>163</sup> In the context of this fresh discussion some, emphasizing the overall limitations and lack of precision involved in the paleographical dating of book hands, have more readily entertained the prospect of a third century date for P<sup>52</sup>.<sup>164</sup> On the opposite end of the spectrum, Comfort proposes a date in the “first quarter of the second century.”<sup>165</sup> The most recent treatment of the issue by paleographers comes from Orsini and Clarysse, who, on the basis of a detailed treatment of graphic types, favor assigning P<sup>52</sup> to the second century, but likely to the second half, and identifying it with the “Alexandrian stylistic class.”<sup>166</sup> Recognizing the lack of precision in paleographical dating and the fact that some may wish to leave open the possibility that P<sup>52</sup> was copied sometime in the early third century, I have nevertheless considered it generally, along with P<sup>90</sup>, to be a second century witness to the text of John.

Playing at least a supportive role in Roberts’ dating of P<sup>52</sup> to the first half of the second century was his judgment that it lacks *nomina sacra*, indicating, according to the scholarly opinion in his day on the emergence of this scribal practice, a date earlier than the very similar P. Egerton 2 which had been dated to the middle of the century.<sup>167</sup> This brings us to the second major issue concerning this manuscript. Although none of the words that were typically written as *nomina sacra* survive, there are two instances of  $\text{I}\eta\sigma\upsilon\varsigma$  that fall in a lacuna:  $\text{I}\eta\sigma\upsilon$  at 18:32, recto 2 and

---

<sup>163</sup> See for example, Hurtado, “P52,” 7 n.20; Foster, “Bold Claims,” 203. Regarding the date of P. Egerton 2, Pickering, “The Egerton Gospel,” 231 explains, “A re-dating to the second / third century (or third century?) does not rule out completely the possibility of a mid-second century date for the copying of the Egerton text, but it does draw the papyrus further away from the first century.”

<sup>164</sup> Brent Nongbri, “The Use and Abuse of P52: Papyrological Pitfalls in the Dating of the Fourth Gospel,” *HTR* 98.1 (2005): 23-48 adduces some third century comparator texts and leaves the question open; likewise, Don Barker, “The Dating of New Testament Papyri,” *NTS* 57 (2011): 573-75, who concludes “that a date of II or III could be assigned to P. Ryl. 457” (575); LDAB gives the range “AD 150 – 224.” See also Roger S. Bagnall, *Early Christian Books in Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 1-24, esp. 10-12.

<sup>165</sup> See Philip Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2005), 139, 142-143.

<sup>166</sup> Orsini and Clarysse, “Manuscripts and Their Dates,” esp. 458-72.

<sup>167</sup> *Editio princeps* 1936, 48, 49. See discussion in Hurtado, “P52,” 7.

Ἰησοῦν at 18:33, recto 5. Based on his calculations for the number of letters per line, Roberts finds it unlikely that the *nomen sacrum* was used in line 5 (and thus not in line 2 either), since with the two-letter suspended form (ιη), which he takes to be the earliest and thus most likely to be used due to its use in P. Egerton 2, the line would be 28 letters long (if the line read Πιλατος instead of Πειλατος), falling five letters below the average of 33 for the recto and seven letters below the 35 reconstructed for line 1.<sup>168</sup> He finds it unlikely that the three-letter conflated form (ιην) was used, since he takes it to be later than the suspended form (ιη) found in P. Egerton 2. In the end Roberts cautions that “such calculations may be misleading, and in the absence of further evidence the question whether or not the scribe employed the usual contractions of the *nomina sacra* must remain open.”<sup>169</sup> His later remarks on the ubiquitous attestation of *nomina sacra* in the earliest Christian manuscripts appear to evidence a subsequent change of mind after the time of his assessment of P<sup>52</sup>,<sup>170</sup> although he does not revisit his conclusions on this manuscript specifically. In a much more recent treatment, Tuckett essentially reaffirms Roberts’ initial argument based on the average number of letters per line on the recto and adds two additional points: that the καὶ coming after Ἰησοῦν would have been placed on line 5 instead of line 6 had Ἰησοῦν been written as a *nomen sacrum*, since at a mere 28 or 29 letters line 5 would have been excessively short; and, that without the *nomen sacrum* forms the regularity of letters per line in the recto (in terms of range from most to least) would fit better with that in the verso.<sup>171</sup> Tuckett’s assessment leads him to the

---

<sup>168</sup> For his discussion, see *editio princeps* 1936, 48-9.

<sup>169</sup> *Editio princeps* 1938, 1. Cf. *editio princeps* 1936, 49.

<sup>170</sup> C. H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*, Schweich Lectures 1977 (London: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1979), 38 referring to Ἰησοῦς states, “...there is no certain instance of the name in its sacral sense being left uncontracted in any text of the New Testament or indeed in any book as distinct from occasional and private papers.” See further discussion in Hurtado, “P<sup>52</sup>,” 6-8.

<sup>171</sup> Christopher M. Tuckett, “P<sup>52</sup> and *Nomina Sacra*,” *NTS* 47 (2001): 544-48.

following conclusion: “This may then cast some doubt on how regular the practice of abbreviating *nomina sacra* in early Christianity really was.”<sup>172</sup>

In response to Tuckett’s treatment, Hill, whose major points I summarize below, offers a more detailed and nuanced, and therefore more convincing, analysis of spacing.<sup>173</sup> Hill shows that the extent of attestation of the three-letter conflated form, or what he calls “long contracted form,” of this *nomen sacrum* (ιην) among early papyri, particularly those of John, increases the probability that it was used here instead of a two-letter suspended (so Roberts) or contracted (so Tuckett) form, which would serve to make the line a bit longer than Roberts and Tuckett surmise. Moreover, if ερωνησεν were read with a final nu and the name of Pilate with the longer πειλατος spelling, both of which Hill thinks more likely, then line 5 would be 30 letters long, rendering it less out of step with the other lines on the recto. The extra space typically used before and after a *nomen sacrum* would serve to add yet another space to line 5, bringing the space used to the equivalent of roughly 31 letters, making it less likely that και would have been placed on line 5, as Tuckett argues. With respect to line 2, Hill shows that the lacuna surrounding Ιησου would likely have been too full had Ιησου been written out, especially since its initial iota would probably have had a diaeresis and thus taken up more space, as can be seen from the usage of the diaeresis over initial iota elsewhere in P<sup>52</sup>. Hill also provides a more accurate portrayal of “letter spaces” by factoring in the smaller amount of space used for an iota and an epsilon and iota combination, which would account for the unusually greater number of letters in line 1 and permit less room for a written out Ιησου in line 2. He concludes, “I regard the case for the presence of the *nomina sacra* abbreviations in P<sup>52</sup> to be at least as good as the alternative and even slightly

---

<sup>172</sup> Tuckett, “P<sup>52</sup>,” 548.

<sup>173</sup> Charles E. Hill, “Did the Scribe of P52 Use the *Nomina Sacra*? Another Look,” *NTS* 48 (2002): 587-92.

better,” especially in light of the evidence for its usage in other early New Testament papyri.<sup>174</sup>

In a longer treatment of the issue Hurtado reiterates a number of Hill’s points on spacing and adds the critique that Tuckett errs primarily on methodological grounds by not giving due attention to all of the physical features of the papyrus and by not adhering to a proper historical method in establishing probabilities.<sup>175</sup> Regarding the former, Hurtado shows that a more comprehensive assessment of the scribal hand of P<sup>52</sup> reveals a certain level of irregularity in the size, shape and spacing of letters, a fact which should prompt hesitation in drawing conclusions from the number of letters presumed to be in lacunae. Regarding historical method, he says, “surely the right procedure is to reason from the known to the unknown in making inferences about the lacunae,” with “the known” being “the pervasive preference for *nomina sacra* by Christian scribes of the second century and thereafter,” especially for *Ἰησους*.<sup>176</sup>

Considering other noteworthy features of P<sup>52</sup>, it has two extant cases of itacism including *ἡμεῖν* (18:31, recto 1) and *ἰσηλθεν* (18:33, recto 4).<sup>177</sup> Although not employing punctuation, breathing marks or numeration, the scribe appears to use diaeresis over initial iota on three occasions, involving *ἰουδαιοι* (18:31, recto 1)<sup>178</sup> and *ἰνα* (18:32, recto 2; 18:37, verso 2). Hurtado draws attention to four places in P<sup>52</sup> where there is a greater amount of space between words (*ἰουδαιοι\_\_ἡμεῖν* (18:31, recto 1);<sup>179</sup> *ουδενα\_\_ἰνα* (18:31-32; recto 2); *ειπεν\_\_σημαινων* (18:32; recto 3); *κοσμον\_\_ἰνα* (18:37; verso 2)) and points out that they correspond with places of

---

<sup>174</sup> Hill, “Scribe,” 592.

<sup>175</sup> Hurtado, “P52.”

<sup>176</sup> Hurtado, “P52,” 13.

<sup>177</sup> Head, “Habits,” 401 notes that both are singular readings.

<sup>178</sup> *Editio princeps* 1936, 55 says it could also be the iota of *ἰουδαιοι* extending above the line. Hurtado, “P52,” 12 favors seeing it as a diaeresis.

<sup>179</sup> In *Editio princeps* 1936, 55, Roberts states, “It is clear that the scribe did not adopt the common practice...of indicating either the beginning or the end of a speech by leaving a small blank space.” Hurtado, “P52,” 12 says, however, that such a space is likely attested here.

punctuation in modern editions. He explains that the “slightly wider spaces between words at certain points raise the intriguing possibility that they may be intended to mark off clauses and to signal the reader to make a slight pause.”<sup>180</sup> P<sup>52</sup> gives the overall impression of being user-friendly. It reflects “a desire to produce an easily-readable manuscript,” as demonstrated by the larger size of its margins and spacing, the use of diaeresis, and the clarity of its letters.<sup>181</sup> The Alands have classified P<sup>52</sup> as one of their “normal” texts, and B. Aland concludes that it is “Ein guter Text, der auf A beruht.”<sup>182</sup> Epp places it in his “B” group.<sup>183</sup> P<sup>52</sup> is currently housed at the John Rylands University Library, Manchester.

#### Variation-Unit Represented<sup>184</sup>

Variation-Unit	Variants	P <sup>52</sup> Transcribed
18:33 παλιν εις το πραιτωριον	<p>παλιν εις το πραιτωριον P<sup>66vid</sup> B C* D<sup>s</sup> L W Δ 0109 f<sup>13</sup> 579. (I 844) latt</p> <p>εις το πραιτωριον παλιν P<sup>60vid</sup> 01 A C<sup>2</sup> K Γ Θ 087 f<sup>1</sup> 565. 700. 892<sup>s</sup>. 1241. 1424 (N Ψ) <i>Maj</i>.</p> <p>εις το πραιτωριον 33</p>	παλιν εις το πραιτω]   ριον (recto 4-5) <sup>185</sup>

#### Unique Reading

Place of Variation	Reading	P <sup>52</sup> Transcribed
18:37 εις τουτο (2 <sup>nd</sup> occurrence)	<p>εις τουτο <i>rell</i></p> <p>– P<sup>52vid</sup></p>	[ – ] (verso 2) <sup>186</sup>

<sup>180</sup> Hurtado, *Artifacts*, 179, n.82.

<sup>181</sup> Hurtado, “P52,” 11.

<sup>182</sup> K. Aland and B. Aland, *Text*, 95, 99; B. Aland, “Nutzen,” 22.

<sup>183</sup> Epp, “Significance,” 100.

<sup>184</sup> Among the variation-units identified in NA28, I subtract from my treatment here those for which the basis of variation is a singular or sub-singular reading: 18:33 om. ο Πιλατος... τον Ιησουν in P<sup>60</sup>; 18:38 λεγει ουν and om. ο in P<sup>66</sup> (the latter is also lacunose in P<sup>52</sup> (verso 5)). The addition of ουν in P<sup>66</sup> will factor into the comparison of agreements between overlapping early papyri below.

<sup>185</sup> P<sup>52</sup> apparently has παλιν before but definitely not after the prepositional phrase εις το πραιτωριον (*editio princeps* 1936, 55).

--	--	--

### Commentary on Variant

18:33 *παλιν εις το πραιτωριον*: The two places in John where there is dialogue between Jesus and Pilate are 18:33-38 and 19:9-11. The introductory words in 18:33 and 19:9, in addition to being in close proximity to one another, are nearly identical: *εισηλθεν ουν παλιν εις το πραιτωριον / εις το πραιτωριον παλιν* (18:33) and *και εισηλθεν εις το πραιτωριον παλιν* (19:9; *παλιν om.* in 01\*). It is probable that the variant *εις το πραιτωριον παλιν* in our verse reflects harmonization to the same wording in 19:9. P<sup>52</sup> attests the reading that is not harmonized to the near context.

### Commentary on Unique Reading

18:37 *om. εις τουτο* [2]: This reading is found in Jesus' response to Pilate's continued questioning about his royal status. In clarifying the nature of his otherworldly kingship, which he affirmed in v. 36, Jesus says *εγω εις τουτο γεγεννημαι και εις τουτο εληλυθα εις τον κοσμον, ινα μαρτυρησω τη αληθεια*. Bultmann comments that the stress is being placed on the "doubly occurring" *εις τουτο*,<sup>187</sup> and Barrett notes that *γεγεννημαι* and *εληλυθα εις τον κοσμον*, both of which are preceded by *εις τουτο*, are functioning synonymously.<sup>188</sup> Thus, while the duplication of *εις τουτο* has a particular rhetorical function in John, it could be perceived as redundant or simply skipped over in the process of copying.<sup>189</sup> This

<sup>186</sup> *Editio princeps* 1936, 55: "If the full text is supplied in this line [verso 2], we are left with 38 letters to the line in place of the average 29/30; consequently it is fairly certain that our text represents a shorter version. Most probably we should reckon with the omission of the repeated *εις τουτο...*" See also IGNTP I, 72, 384; Head, "Habits," 401-402; Hurtado, "P52," 3 n.6: "I do not judge this to be a conclusive argument, but it is certainly plausible."

<sup>187</sup> Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (trans. George R. Beasley-Murray, et al.; Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), 655.

<sup>188</sup> C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (2d; London: SPCK, 1978), 537.

<sup>189</sup> Head, "Habits," 402: "a singular omission of two arguably redundant words."

omission may also reflect a leap from one epsilon to another (και εις τουτο εληλυθα).<sup>190</sup> P<sup>52</sup> attests the omission of a seemingly redundant prepositional phrase.

#### Analysis of Manuscript based on Readings

P<sup>52</sup> provides only one variant and one apparent singular reading for our analysis. The one variation-unit represented (18:33 παλιν εις το πραιτωριον) appears to derive from harmonization, in which case P<sup>52</sup> does not attest the word order that is harmonized to the nearby context (19:9). Consequently, where the character of the text underlying P<sup>52</sup> can be assessed, it gives testimony to the internally more probable variant in the tradition. There does, however, appear to be one singular omission (the second occurrence of εις τουτο in 18:37), which may reflect an attempt to refine away a redundant prepositional phrase. It is equally plausible that such redundancy was lost inadvertently as the sense of the text was being processed and a jump was made to the following verb (εγω εις τουτο γεγεννημαι και εληλυθα instead of εγω εις τουτο γεγεννημαι και εις τουτο εληλυθα). And again, the possibility remains that this omission is nothing more than a leap between epsilons. In short, intentionality is uncertain and the sense is unaltered.

Among other second and third century witnesses, P<sup>52</sup> shares extant text with P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>90</sup>, which are also fragmentary. Based on what is extant or can be plausibly reconstructed,<sup>191</sup> and leaving aside orthographic readings, P<sup>52</sup> agrees with P<sup>66</sup> one out of three times:<sup>192</sup> agreement (18:33 παλιν εις το πραιτωριον); disagreements (P<sup>52</sup> reading listed first) (18:37 om. εις τουτο [2] (lac.) | εις τουτο (lac.); 18:38 λεγει | λεγει ουν). If singular readings are removed, then P<sup>52</sup> (minus 18:37 om. εις τουτο [2])

---

<sup>190</sup> Cf. Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 732 n.115. For examples of “leap from same to same” see his discussion of omissions under each of the early extensive papyri. For evidence of this particular type of leap, see note under discussion of variation-unit 18:38 ευρισκω εν αυτω αιτιαν in my treatment of P<sup>90</sup>.

<sup>191</sup> In order to account for lacunae, I place “lac.” in parentheses where the reading listed can only be determined by considerations of spacing.

<sup>192</sup> These comparisons are based on variation-units covered in NA28 as well as additional places where these manuscripts differ from one another.

agrees with P<sup>66</sup> (minus 18:38 λεγει ουν) in the one variation-unit for which they overlap. The only point of comparison for P<sup>52</sup> and P<sup>90</sup> is the one place where P<sup>52</sup> apparently has a singular reading (18:37 om. εις τουτο [2] (lac.) | εις τουτο (lac.)).

### Diachronic Comparison of Created Readings

Among manuscripts up through the seventh century, the portion of text covered by P<sup>52</sup> is fully preserved in 01, A, B, N and W. Listed below are the singular/sub-singular readings of each witness for the portion of text covered by P<sup>52</sup>, which will most likely approximate to the readings created by each respective scribe.<sup>193</sup> Any unique orthographic readings (besides those such as itacisms and moveable nu), while not included in the main lists, are provided in a footnote.

#### P<sup>52</sup>:

18:37 εις τουτο [2]] om. P<sup>52</sup> (omission of redundant prepositional phrase or leap from same to same (εις...εληλυθα))

#### 01:<sup>194</sup>

18:31 ουδενα] ουδενα ιουδενα<sup>195</sup> 01\* (nonsense resulting from dittography)

18:32 ον ειπεν] om. 01\* 238 (omission of unnecessary syntax including relative pronoun and finite verb)

---

<sup>193</sup> As noted in the Introduction, the Greek manuscript support for each of these readings is based on what is presented in NA28; Tischendorf<sup>8</sup>; von Soden, *Die Schriften*; Swanson, *John*; and IGNTP I and II.

<sup>194</sup> 18:37 μαρτυρηση in 01\* is lacunose in P<sup>52</sup> at verso 3 (and it was corrected contemporaneously (cf. IGNTP II, 505, 7)). 18:38 τις for τι in 01\* also falls in a lacuna.

<sup>195</sup> This reading is listed as ουδεναι ουδενα in IGNTP II, 501 and as ουδενα ιουδενα in Swanson, 248. In the facsimile the supralinear dots meant to denote an erasure by a later corrector appear over each letter of ιουδενα, which, in favor of Swanson's transcription, indicates that a dittography has occurred involving the final iota of αποκτειναι (αποκτειναι ουδενα ιουδενα), in which the letters ι-ο-υ-δ-ε-ν-α have been repeated.

18:37 τη αληθεια] περι της αληθιας<sup>196</sup> 01\* sa (harmonized syntax, to general usage in John (μαρτυρεω + περι))

18:37 εκ] om. 01\* (omission of superfluous preposition)

A:<sup>197</sup>

18:33 αυτω] αυτοις<sup>198</sup> A (harmonized substitution, to plural in immediate and near context)

18:37 γεγεννημαι] και γεγεννημαι A (addition that affirms Jesus' kingship; intentional?)

B (none)

N:

18:33 παλιν ο Πιλατος] ο Πιλατος παλιν N Ψ (69) (transposition resulting from a corrected leap (πραιτωριοϋ παλιν))<sup>199</sup>

W:

18:32 ο λογος του Ιησου πληρωθη] πληρωθη ο λογος του Ιησου W 1170 (harmonized transposition, to near context (18:9))

---

<sup>196</sup> This reading is in a lacuna in P<sup>52</sup> (verso 3), but both the size of the lacuna and the average and range of letters per line on the verso (29/30; 28-31) almost certainly rule out the extra five letters needed to read with 01 (line would have 35).

<sup>197</sup> 18:32 ποι for ποιω in A falls in a lacuna in P<sup>52</sup> (recto 3).

<sup>198</sup> The reader should note that I include this reading hesitantly, since it falls in a lacuna in P<sup>52</sup> (recto 6) and the spacing does not appear to preclude αυτοις. For the uncertainties of spacing in the recto, see discussion above on *nomina sacra*.

<sup>199</sup> For discussion of this type of variation, see my treatment of 18:38 ευρισκω εν αυτω αιτιαν in P<sup>90</sup>.

Although this is a very small section of text, there are nevertheless a few observations that can be made. In terms of the quantity of readings likely introduced, there are four in 01, at least prior to its correction at a later time either in the fifth or seventh century,<sup>200</sup> two in A (or one if *αυτοις* is excluded as going beyond what is represented by P<sup>52</sup>), one in N and W, and none in B. In having one, P<sup>52</sup> coheres with what we find in the majority of these later manuscripts, showing correspondence with the number found in A, N and W. 01 has four times as many as P<sup>52</sup> and appears to exhibit a unique level of freedom or susceptibility to corruption when compared with all of the other witnesses. Only B, one out of five of these later majuscules, can be said to fare better than P<sup>52</sup> when it comes to the creation of readings.

In terms of the character and significance of these alterations, the one omission in P<sup>52</sup> corresponds with the same types of readings observed in 01 (18:32 om. *ον ειπεν*; 18:37 om. *εκ*), in which unnecessary or superfluous words or phrases have been skipped over. If the omission of *εις τουτο* in P<sup>52</sup> is understood as a leap, we also see evidence for the same sorts of blunders in 01 (18:31 *ουδενα ιουδενα*) and N (18:33 *ο Πιλατος παλιν*). Furthermore, P<sup>52</sup> does not attest the addition of words, in contrast to what we find in both 01 (18:37 *περι της αληθιας*) and A (18:37 *και γεγεννημαι*, which may be a conscious attempt to explicitly affirm that Jesus indeed has come as king). Thus, in terms of both the quantity and the character of readings, this comparison shows greater continuity than discontinuity in transmission between the early and later periods, and it does not support the notion that a greater level of freedom was present behind the copying of this second century witness.

### Conclusions on Stability and/or Fluidity

---

<sup>200</sup> IGNTP II, 7: All corrections to the 01\* readings are listed as Cca in IGNTP II, unless otherwise noted. For date of this corrector see H. J. M. Milne and T. C. Skeat, including contributions by Douglas Cockerell, *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus* (London: British Museum, 1938), 65; K. Aland and B. Aland, *Text*, 108.

The data that can be extracted from P<sup>52</sup> regarding its character of transmission certainly do not give the impression that a unique or high level of fluidity existed at the time in which P<sup>52</sup> was copied. To the contrary, in the one place of disagreement among witnesses in the tradition, P<sup>52</sup> attests the non-harmonized reading. Its one singular reading may very well reflect an accidental oversight or a mechanical leap between two occurrences of the same letter. Finally, when this second century fragmentary papyrus is compared with the fourth, fifth and sixth century majuscules sharing the same section of text, a picture of continuity rather than discontinuity emerges, and, even more, we are able to observe what may be instances of freedom in the later manuscripts that are not mirrored in this early witness.

## 2.2. P<sup>90</sup> (P. Oxy. L 3523)

### Introduction

P<sup>90</sup> is a fragment of a papyrus codex from Oxyrhynchus, Egypt containing portions of John 18:36-19:7 on the front and back of one leaf of a papyrus codex.<sup>201</sup> The recto covers 18:36-19:1 and the verso covers 19:2-7. It shares extant text with two other papyri from the second and third centuries, P<sup>52</sup> (overlapping in portions of 18:37-38) and P<sup>66</sup> (overlapping in portions of 18:36-19:7). P<sup>90</sup> was edited and published in 1983 by T. C. Skeat and dated to the second century primarily based on its similarity to P. Egerton 2 and even more to Genesis IV 656, which in 1935 was confidently assigned to the second rather than third century by Bell, Skeat and Kenyon.<sup>202</sup> The script of P<sup>90</sup> is, as Skeat describes it, “a well-formed small rounded capital, basically bilinear [and]...in common with that of other examples of the period, is characterized by the addition of small serifs or curls at the ends of strokes.”<sup>203</sup> Orsini and Clarysse classify the hand of P<sup>90</sup> as well as P<sup>52</sup> as belonging to the “Alexandrian stylistic

---

<sup>201</sup> For this and further introductory information see especially T. C. Skeat, ed., “Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 3523,” in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri L* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1983) 3-8, plate I and II (referred to as *editio princeps* for the remainder of this chapter); K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste*, 33; Handschriftenliste by the Institute for Text-Critical Research, University of Münster: <http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/liste> (hereafter referred to as INTF *Liste*); LDAB: <http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/>.

<sup>202</sup> For a caution as well as detailed discussion and bibliography on the issues involved in dating P<sup>90</sup> see especially S. R. Pickering, *Recently Published New Testament Papyri: P89-P95* (Sydney: Macquarie University, 1991), 12-14. He contends that there is good reason to question the dating of the primary manuscripts used to date P<sup>90</sup> and to thus be cautious about dating this manuscript to the second century. He cites the publication of the fragment P. Köln VI, dated ca. 200, which belongs to P. Egerton 2 previously dated mid-second century, and P. Oxy. IV 656, which has been variously dated to the third (Grenfell and Hunt), second (Bell and Skeat, Kenyon), and second/third (Turner, Cavallo) centuries. He also notes the general difficulties and disagreements involved in the paleographical dating of hands, and concludes, “In view of the various differences of opinion, ‘II?’ is given above for P<sup>90</sup>.” Skeat comments that although Grenfell and Hunt saw more affinity with the second than the third century for P. Oxy. IV 656, “Nevertheless they assigned it, rather illogically, to the [early] third century” (*editio princeps*, 3). Skeat also mentions the similarity between the hands of P<sup>90</sup> and the Homeric papyrus edited by T. W. Mackay, which, he says, Cavallo dated “to the third quarter of the second century.” IGNTP I, 18 places P<sup>90</sup> in century “II” without further notation or comment, taking that to be the consensus view. As noted in my discussion of P<sup>52</sup>, Orsini and Clarysse, “Manuscripts and Their Dates,” 458-72 assign P<sup>90</sup> and P<sup>52</sup> to the second century (probably latter part).

<sup>203</sup> *Editio princeps*, 3.

class.”<sup>204</sup> The fragment itself measures 15 cm. in height and 5.6 cm. in width and preserves a portion of all 24 lines on the recto and 23 on the verso. The reconstructed text, in one column, was 12.4 cm in height and 9.5 cm in width on the recto and 8.5 cm in width on the verso. The size of the page would have been approximately 16 cm high and 12 cm wide, placing it into Turner’s Group 9 Aberrant I.<sup>205</sup> This fragment preserves part of the upper, lower, and inner margins. Skeat notes that the number of letters per line “varies from 20 to 28, but is mostly remarkably regular at around 24 to 26.”<sup>206</sup> He estimates that the text of John’s Gospel would have taken up 120 pages, or 60 leaves, and thinks it “very unlikely” that this codex contained all four Gospels, since it would have needed 534 pages, or 267 leaves.

P<sup>90</sup> has three extant cases of itacism involving *πειλατος* (18:37, recto 5; 19:1, recto 24) and *υμειν* (18:39, recto 18).<sup>207</sup> Based on the fact that *-ασαν* begins recto 21 Skeat suggests that the papyrus probably had the orthographic reading *εκραυασαν* for *εκραυγασαν* at 18:40 with L and M, since otherwise the syllable would have been divided between two lines.<sup>208</sup> There is one instance of a *nomen sacrum* in 19:5 at verso 36/12. While Skeat and the IGNTP editors transcribe a partially extant iota followed by sigma, Hill through his own examination of the manuscript with a high-powered microscope has recently noticed that the “left hand stroke of an eta” is present, rendering the form *iota-eta-sigma* instead of *iota-sigma*. Hill writes, “the text of 90 represents the earliest text of John 19:5 we have...and quite possibly gives us our earliest *nomen sacrum* in a text of the Gospel according to John.”<sup>209</sup> Abbreviated

---

<sup>204</sup> Orsini and Clarysse, “Manuscripts and Their Dates,” 458, 460.

<sup>205</sup> Turner, *Typology*, 22.

<sup>206</sup> *Editio princeps*, 4.

<sup>207</sup> Head, “Habits,” 402 notes that the latter is a singular reading.

<sup>208</sup> *Editio princeps*, 7. See Francis T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods, Vol 1: Phonology* (Milan: Instituto Editoriale Cisalpino-La Goliardica, 1975-1981), 74 (hereafter referred to as Gignac I).

<sup>209</sup> Charles E. Hill, “A Notice of Corrections in Standard Editions of Two Johannine Manuscripts,” *TC3* 7 (2002).

forms / *nomina sacra* are not used for *ανθρωπος* (19:5, verso 39/15), *σταυρωσατε* (19:6, verso 44/20; *contra* P<sup>66</sup>), and *σταυρωσον* (19:6, verso 42/18; *contra* P<sup>66</sup>).

In terms of punctuation, Skeat notes “a possible trace of a filling-mark” in 19:5 verso 36/12.<sup>210</sup> There is the inconsistent placement of a diaeresis over initial iota and upsilon, and there is an empty space measuring the width of two letters before a shift in speaker in 18:37 in recto 6 (*ειπεν ουν αυτω ο Πειλατος ουκουν βασιλευς συ ει \_ απεκριθη ο Ιησους...*). Hurtado observes similar spaces in P<sup>52</sup>.<sup>211</sup> Skeat notes that recto 5, 11, 21 and 24 begin with letters that “project into the margin, indicating some form of punctuation in the preceding line,” a feature that is also attested in P<sup>4</sup>, P<sup>66</sup>, and P<sup>67</sup>.<sup>212</sup> Roberts, commenting on this feature known as ekthesis, explains that it is meant to mark the first full line of a new section.<sup>213</sup> These instances of punctuation indicate that P<sup>90</sup> was probably used in a liturgical setting where such readers’ aids were necessary for the public reading of the text.<sup>214</sup> Rodgers surmises based on these data that “P<sup>90</sup> is probably the product of a scriptorium.”<sup>215</sup> The transmission reflected in P<sup>90</sup> has been understood to belong in the Aland’s “Normal” category, based on Barbara Aland’s description of its proximity to the hypothetical *Ausgangstext* and of the general accuracy of its scribe.<sup>216</sup> Comfort labels P<sup>90</sup> as proto-Alexandrian and categorizes its transmission as “fairly reliable.”<sup>217</sup> This fragment is currently housed at the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

---

<sup>210</sup> *Editio princeps*, 4, 6.

<sup>211</sup> Hurtado, *Artifacts*, 179, n. 82; “P52,” 12. See my discussion of that manuscript above.

<sup>212</sup> *Editio princeps*, 4.

<sup>213</sup> Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief*, 17.

<sup>214</sup> Scott D. Charlesworth, “Indicators of ‘Catholicity’ in Early Gospel Manuscripts” in Hill and Kruger, *The Early Text*, 43.

<sup>215</sup> Peter R. Rodgers, “The Text of the New Testament and Its Witnesses before 200 A.D.: Observations on P90 (P. Oxy. 3523),” in Amphoux and Elliott, *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity*, 84.

<sup>216</sup> See B. Aland, “Nutzen,” 23-24, 37. Hill and Kruger, “In Search of the Earliest Text,” 10-11 and Chapa, “Early Text of John,” 141 place P<sup>90</sup> in the “Normal” category based on Aland’s comments.

<sup>217</sup> Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, 270, 310. In the surrounding discussion he considers it among the “most reliable texts” (268) and to be one of the “extremely good copies of the Gospels” (271).

Variation-Units Represented<sup>218</sup>

Variation-Unit	Variants	P <sup>90</sup> Transcribed
18:36 βασιλεια η εμη (2 <sup>nd</sup> occurrence)	βασιλεια η εμη εμη βασιλεια 01 D <sup>s</sup> N Θ	βασ]ιλεια η εμ[η (recto 1)
18:36 οι εμοι ηγωνιζοντο αν	οι εμοι ηγωνιζοντο αν P <sup>60vid</sup> 01 B <sup>2</sup> L W Ψ 0109 f <sup>13</sup> 1. 33. 579. I 844; Or  αν οι εμοι ηγωνιζοντο (ηγωνισαντο 1424) A D <sup>s</sup> K N Γ Δ Θ 565. 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424 Maj. q  οι εμοι ηγωνιζοντο <sup>219</sup> P <sup>66vid</sup> B* 713	οι εμοι   ηγ]ωνιζοντο α[v (recto 1-2) <sup>220</sup>
18:37 ειμι <sup>221</sup>	ειμι P <sup>60vid</sup> 01 B D <sup>s</sup> L W Ψ f <sup>1.13</sup> 33. I 844 it  ειμι εγω A K N Γ Δ Θ 0109. 565. 579. 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424 Maj. lat	[ειμι] (recto 7) <sup>222</sup>
18:38 ευρισκω εν αυτω αιτιαν	ευρισκω εν αυτω αιτιαν B L 0109. 579 lat  αιτιαν ευρισκω εν αυτω 01 A K	ευρ]ισκω εν αυτ[ω αιτιαν (recto 16) <sup>223</sup>

<sup>218</sup> The following variation-units are excluded from this treatment as based on a singular or sub-singular reading: 18:36 εμη βασιλεια [3] (01); 18:38 λεγει ουν (P<sup>66</sup>); 18:38 om. ο (P<sup>66</sup>); 18:39 om. εν (B 0109\*); 18:40 om. λεγοντες (P<sup>66\*</sup> 251. 397. it sa<sup>ms</sup> ly (cf. Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 463 n.350, 469-470 for probability of coincidental agreement in error rather than two *Vorlagen*); 19:2 εξ ακανθων στεφανον (P<sup>66</sup>); 19:5 om. ο [1] (B); 19:5 om. και λεγει αυτοις ιδου ο ανθρωπος (P<sup>66\*</sup> it ly) (cf. Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 459-460, 514 n.614); 19:5 om. ο [2] (B). However, the singular readings in P<sup>66</sup> (considered after correction) will be factored into the percentages of agreement between P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>90</sup> and those in the Majuscules will be treated in the Diachronic Comparison section. I have added the variation-unit concerned with 18:39 ουν ινα, which is read by P<sup>90</sup> and some other witnesses. All transcriptions in the tables are based on the *editio princeps* unless otherwise noted.

<sup>219</sup> It is clear from what is extant that P<sup>66</sup> did not read αν before οι (cf. Victor Martin and John W. B. Barns, eds., *Papyrus Bodmer II, Supplément (Nouvelle édition augmentée et corrigée)*; Coligny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1962), 32 and IGNTF I, 383), but the rest of line 10 is lacunose (οι ε[...]). Based on plate 128, the lacuna between the extant epsilon and the end of line 10 is approximately 7 ½ cm. The last 7 ½ cm of the almost entirely extant lines 1 and 2 of this page contain 18 letters (ο ις απο σεαυτου τουτο and -οι ειπεν σοι περι εμου respectively). This is the same number of letters in the lacuna of line 10 without αν (-μοι ηγωνιζοντο ινα μη). These observations, along with the width of the letter nu on this page, make the inclusion of αν in this lacuna rather unlikely. Since there is ultimately no certainty about what was in the lacuna, however, the possibility must be kept in mind that ινα or μη was omitted instead; but this is much less likely given their syntactical necessity and the lack of variation in the tradition.

<sup>220</sup> Cf. *editio princeps*, 5, Plate I: 3523 recto for the bottom left portion of an alpha, *contra* IGNTF I, 116.

<sup>221</sup> The variation-unit concerning the article with Ιησους in 18:37 is lacunose in P<sup>90</sup> (recto 6).

<sup>222</sup> *Editio princeps*, 7: "It seems virtually certain that the papyrus had εγω once only [i.e. at the beginning of the next sentence and not the additional one in question here], since even so the line contains 26 letters."

	N W Γ Δ Θ Ψ $f^{1.13}$ 33. 565. 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424. <i>I 844 Maj.</i> q v <sub>g</sub> <sup>ms</sup>  αιτιαν εν αυτω ευρισκω D <sup>s</sup>  ευρισκω αιτιαν εν αυτω P <sup>66vid</sup> f	
18:39 απολυσω υμιν <sup>224</sup> (1 <sup>st</sup> occurrence)	απολυσω υμιν P <sup>66vid</sup> 01 B D <sup>s</sup> K L (W) Δ 0109(*) $f^{1.13}$ 33. 565. 579. <i>I 844 lat</i>  υμιν απολυσω A N Γ Θ $f^{13}$ 700. (892 <sup>s</sup> ). 1241. 1424 <i>Maj.</i>  απολυσω Ψ 1689 c ff <sup>2</sup>	απο   λυ]σω υμειν (recto 17-18)
18:39 ουν	ουν  ουν ινα 01 K U W 041 054	ουν ινα (recto 19)
19:1 ελαβεν ο Πιλατος τον Ιησουν και <sup>225</sup>	ελαβεν ο Πιλατος τον Ιησουν και A B D <sup>s</sup> K Γ Δ Θ $f^{1.13}$ 565. 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424. <i>I 844 Maj.</i> lat  ο Πιλατος ελαβεν τον Ιησουν και P <sup>66vid</sup> Ψ  ελαβεν τον Ιησουν ο Πιλατος και N  λαβων ο Πιλατος τον Ιησουν 01 W (L 33. 579)	λαβων ο Πειλ[ατος τον $\overline{\text{την}}$ (recto 24) <sup>226</sup>
19:3 και ηρχοντο προς αυτον	και ηρχοντο προς αυτον P <sup>66</sup> 01 B L N W Θ $f^{13}$ 33. 565. 579. 700. <i>I 844 lat sy<sup>h</sup> co</i>  – A D <sup>s</sup> K Γ Δ Ψ $f^1$ 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> f q sy <sup>p</sup>	και ηρ]χ[ο]ντο προς αυ   [τον (verso 29-30/5-6)

<sup>223</sup> Here I follow IGNTP, I, 116 in the placement of dots and brackets.

<sup>224</sup> See Diachronic Comparison section for απολυω υμιν in W.

<sup>225</sup> P<sup>90</sup> is lacunose for the variation unit 18:40 παλιν on recto 21. It preserves only the initial letter pi with the remainder of the line in a lacuna. *Editio princeps*, 7 comments that the reading “could be either παλιν...or παντες... [but] in any case there is not room for παλιν παντες,” which Martin and Barns, *Papyrus Bodmer II, Supplément*, 33 and Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 459 take to be the reading of P<sup>66</sup>. However, in agreement with International Greek New Testament Project, The Gospel according to John, IGNTP transcripts (<http://www.iohannes.com/XML/start.xml>) (hereafter referred to as IGNTP online), there is not enough space on line 12 of this page of P<sup>66</sup> for ουν to read after εκραυγασαν (cf. Martin and Barns, *Papyrus Bodmer II, Supplément*, plate 129), meaning that it was likely read with παντες in the lacuna at the beginning of line 13, thus leaving too little room for παλιν (cf. NA28). I do not, therefore, include this reading in the tally of disagreements between P<sup>90</sup> and P<sup>66</sup>.

<sup>226</sup> I substitute  $\overline{\text{την}}$  in the reconstructed portion in light of Hill’s observations noted in the introduction.

19:3 ο βασιλευς <sup>227</sup>	ο βασιλευς βασιλευ P <sup>66</sup> 01	ο βασιλευ[ς (verso 30/6)
19:4 εξω ο Πιλατος <sup>228</sup>	εξω ο Πιλατος P <sup>66</sup> A B D <sup>s</sup> K N Γ Δ Θ Ψ f <sup>1</sup> 33. 565. 700. (1424) <i>Maj.</i> ο Πιλατος (+ προς αυτους 1844) εξω 01 L W f <sup>13</sup> 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1 844 ο Πιλατος 0138 28. 477. 482. 544. 579. 1170. e	[ο Πειλατος] (verso 33/9) <sup>229</sup>
19:4 ουδεμιαν αιτιαν ευρισκω εν αυτω	ουδεμιαν αιτιαν ευρισκω εν αυτω B f <sup>1</sup> 33. 565. 1844 vg <sup>ms</sup> εν αυτω ουδεμιαν αιτιαν ευρισκω D <sup>s</sup> K N Γ Δ Θ 700. 1241. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> vg <sup>st,ww</sup> sy <sup>h</sup> αιτιαν ουδεμιαν ευρισκω εν αυτω 01 <sup>1</sup> αιτιαν εν αυτω ουδεμιαν ευρισκω L ουδεμιαν εν αυτω αιτιαν ευρισκω A ουδεμιαν αιτιαν εν αυτω ευρισκω Ψ 892 <sup>s</sup> aur (+ αυτω 579) αιτιαν ουχ ευρισκω 01* 579 r <sup>1</sup> αιτιαν εν αυτω ουχ ευρισκω P <sup>66vid</sup> W (f <sup>13</sup> )	αιτιαν ε]γ αυ[τω] ουχ ευρισ   [κω (verso 35-36/11-12)
19:5 φορων <sup>230</sup>	φορων εχων P <sup>66</sup> 1. 565. 1582* 2193 it	φο   [ρων (verso 36-37/12-13)

<sup>227</sup> Due to agreement between P<sup>66</sup> and 01 I have not removed βασιλευ from consideration as a sub-singular reading.

<sup>228</sup> I exclude the variation-unit 19:4 και εξηλθεν because P<sup>90</sup> (verso 32/8) is insufficiently extant. *Editio princeps*, 8: “και εξηλθεν...cannot be entirely ruled out, but considerations of space make it unlikely.” In fact, the number of letters permitted in spaces of the same size that run parallel to this lacuna (to the left of ξ, verso 32/8) do not appear to necessarily favor the absence of και. Since it is clear that P<sup>90</sup> “did not have εξηλθεν ουν” with P<sup>66c</sup>, this difference will be factored into the percentages of agreement between these two papyri.

<sup>229</sup> NA28 marks the omission of εξω as a *vid* reading. *Editio princeps*, 8 reconstructs the reading as ο πειλατος and says, “There does not seem to be room for either εξω ο πειλατος...or ο πειλατος εξω.” πειλατος is reconstructed with the ει instead of ι spelling presumably because this is the spelling in 19:1. IGNTP I, 387 determines that there are 16 spaces between παλιν and αυτοις, whereas the reading with εξω would amount to 20 spaces (εξω ο Πειλατος και λεγει); Comfort and Barrett, *The Text*, 621 also omit εξω in their reconstruction.

19:6 λεγοντες <sup>231</sup>	λεγοντες – 01 054. 91. it sa <sup>ms</sup> bo <sup>mss</sup>	λ[εγον   τες (verso 41-42/17-18) <sup>232</sup>
19:6 αυτον υμεις <sup>233</sup>	αυτον υμεις υμεις αυτον P <sup>66vid</sup> D <sup>s</sup> L W Ψ I 844 e q r <sup>1</sup>	ϋμεις   [αυτον (verso 43-44/19-20)
19:7 αυτω	αυτω – P <sup>66</sup> 01 W f <sup>1</sup> 565. 579 it ly pbo bo <sup>ms</sup> ; Or	[ – ] (verso 46/22) <sup>234</sup>

### Unique Readings

Place of Variation	Readings	P <sup>90</sup> Transcribed
18:37 ει συ	ει συ <i>rell</i> συ ει P <sup>90</sup>	συ ει (recto 6)
19:6 εκραυγασαν	εκραυγασαν (εκραυασαν L M) <i>rell</i> εκραυγαζον 1188 εκραξαν 01* εκραζαν P <sup>90</sup>	εκραζαν (verso 41/17)
19:6 σταυρωσον σταυρωσον	σταυρωσον σταυρωσον P <sup>66c</sup> B L W Ψ f <sup>1</sup> I 844 aur vg <sup>st.ww</sup> σταυρωσον σταυρωσον αυτον 01 A D <sup>s</sup> K N Γ Δ Θ f <sup>13</sup> 33. 565. 579. 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> it vg <sup>cl</sup> sy	[σταυρωσον α]υ[τον] (verso 42/18) <sup>235</sup>

<sup>230</sup> Given the number of supporting Greek witnesses plus support from the Old Latin tradition, I have not removed εχων as sub-singular in P<sup>66</sup>.

<sup>231</sup> Although the support is slight for the omission of λεγοντες and it could have emerged independently in 01, I have not removed it from consideration here on account of the two other Greek witnesses plus ample versional support.

<sup>232</sup> *Editio princeps*, 6, 8.

<sup>233</sup> The two variation-units involving a second σταυρωσον and the presence of αυτον in 19:6 are treated as one variation-unit that resulted from harmonization (see my commentary on this reading). Since the reading in P<sup>90vid</sup> is sub-singular, I have listed this variation-unit in the table of unique readings below. As for the αυτον υμεις variation-unit treated here, I exclude the singular omission of και in P<sup>66</sup> as a separate reading (cf. Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 829).

<sup>234</sup> *Editio princeps*, 6, 8; IGNTP I, 388.

	σταυρωσον αυτον P <sup>90vid</sup> 1010 a σταυρωσον P <sup>66*</sup> 713 e αρον αρον σταυρωσον αυτον 1071	
--	--	--

### Commentary on Variants

18:36 βασιλεια η εμη: P<sup>90</sup> places the possessive adjective, attributive pronoun εμος in the post-position, with the pronoun and a second article coming after the noun (βασιλεια η εμη), rather than in the pre-position (η εμη βασιλεια). Turner notes the preponderance of εμος in post-position throughout the Gospel of John, a unique feature not appearing in the Synoptic Gospels.<sup>236</sup> See, for example, 3:29; 5:30; 6:38; 7:6; 8:16, 31, 37, 43, 56; 10:26, 27; 12:26; 14:15; 15:9, 11, 12; 17:13, 24; 18:36 (οι υπηρεται οι εμοι)). In terms of adjective placement in general, the Semitic Greek of the LXX favors post-position in contrast to the Koine papyri from the first and

<sup>235</sup> P<sup>90</sup> is almost entirely lacunose for the text between λεγοντες and λεγει (σταυρωσον (σταυρωσον) (αυτον)), but NA28 lists P<sup>90vid</sup> for the absence of the second σταυρωσον and the presence of αυτον. The *editio princeps*, 6 reconstructs the relevant lines (verso 41-42/17-18) as follows:

[και οι υπηρεται] εκραζαν λ[εγον-  
[τες σταυρωσον α]υ[τον] λεγε[ι αυ-]

IGNTP agrees except for the epsilon of αυτον, which is taken as fully extant and without need of a sublinear dot, whose view I accept on the basis of the photographs (cf. IGNTPI, 118, plate 47 (b); *editio princeps*, plate 2 (3523 verso)). Concerning line 42/18, *editio princeps*, 8 says, “there is certainly not space in the papyrus for the double σταυρωσον, but with the single σταυρωσον the line is only 19 letters long. Probably therefore the papyrus added αυτον after σταυρωσον.” *editio princeps*, 4 notes that the number of letters per line “varies from 20 to 28, but is mostly remarkably regular at around 24 to 26.” IGNTPI brackets 10 to 11 and 3 for the available spaces in the lacunae at the beginning of the line: [10-11]υ[3]. Working from these data, one is still faced with the possibility that the scribe wrote both occurrences of σταυρωσον as a staurogram as in P<sup>66</sup> (the second added as a supralinear correction). This becomes unlikely, however, when one observes that the scribe of P<sup>90</sup> does not write a staurogram in place of σταυρωσατε later in v. 6 (verso 44/20). Another possibility is that the lacuna at the beginning of line 42/18 could be reconstructed as [τες σταυρωσον στα]υ[ρωσον]. However, this would place too many letters in the second lacuna following the epsilon and it would result in a line of 28 letters, which is at the highest end of the editor’s range. Therefore, we can be confident that σταυρωσον was not written as a staurogram and that the epsilon does not belong to σταυρωσον, meaning that σταυρωσον was not written twice and the epsilon must belong to another word. On this basis, I have chosen to accept σταυρωσον αυτον as the reading for P<sup>90</sup>, which will be reflected in all further analysis (see commentary for why I treat this as one reading).

<sup>236</sup> Nigel Turner, [James Hope Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*,] Vol. 3: *Syntax* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), 191.

second centuries B.C.E. where pre-position is overwhelmingly dominant.<sup>237</sup> It is likely that this Semitic and Johannine stylistic feature was altered due to influence from broader Koine usage. P<sup>90</sup> attests the more intrinsically probable reading that matches the syntactical usage and Semitic character of John’s Gospel.

18:36 οἱ ἐμοὶ ἠγωνίζοντο ἄν: This variation-unit concerns the presence and placement of ἄν in the apodosis of a contrary-to-fact conditional.<sup>238</sup> In the eight other instances in John of a contrary-to-fact conditional with εἰ in the protasis and an imperfect verb in the apodosis, four are with ἄν (5:46; 8:42; 15:19; 9:41 (om. D K Y Θ pc)) and four are without (15:22, 24; 19:11; 9:33 (add 1321 1093)). Upon closer inspection, however, one finds that unlike our verse all of the cases without ἄν involve negation, which is in both the protasis and the apodosis. The presence of ἄν in this variation-unit, therefore, receives intrinsic support from all other contrary-to-fact conditionals without negation and with an imperfect verb in the apodosis.<sup>239</sup> Moreover, all of the remaining contrary-to-fact conditionals – those that have an aorist or pluperfect verb in the apodosis (4:10; 8:19; 11:21, 32; 14:2, 28; 18:30) – also include ἄν (8:19 (om. D); 14:2 (om. 01 W X\*)). In terms of transcriptional probability, the singular, sub-singular or narrowly attested variation noted for 8:19, 9:41 and 14:2, similar in degree to what we have here with P<sup>66</sup> and B\*, indicate a temptation to omit the unnecessary particle ἄν.<sup>240</sup> It is more difficult to make a judgment about word order on the basis of internal evidence. Regarding New Testament usage in general, BDF comments, “The position of ἄν is as near the

---

<sup>237</sup> Turner, *Syntax*, 349.

<sup>238</sup> For discussion, see James Hope Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. 1: Prolegomena*, 3rd ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908), 199-201; Friedrich Blass and Albert Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (trans. and ed. R. W. Funk; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), sec. 360 (hereafter referred to as BDF).

<sup>239</sup> 9:41 is negated in the apodosis (οὐκ ἄν εἰχετε ἀμαρτίαν) but not in the protasis (εἰ τυφλοὶ ἦτε).

<sup>240</sup> Unnecessary because “the addition of ἄν to the apodosis is no longer obligatory,” (BDF, sec. 360).

beginning of the clause as possible (often οὐκ ἄν).”<sup>241</sup> Although this does seem to hold true for John in the cases cited above,<sup>242</sup> only in 15:19 (εἰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἦτε ὁ κόσμος ἂν τὸ ἴδιον ἐφίλει), with its third person subject in the apodosis and lack of negation – and therefore without the typical negated word order that begins the clause (οὐκ ἂν), do we have anything close to a syntactical parallel to our variation-unit (...οἱ ὑπηρεταὶ [ἂν] οἱ ἐμοὶ ἠγωνίζοντο [ἂν]) by which to discern intrinsic probability. Thus the placement of ἂν is deemed inconclusive and will not be treated in the analysis below. P<sup>90</sup> attests the reading without the deletion of an unnecessary particle.

18:37 εἰμι: Among the four places in John where the word order εἰμι ἐγὼ is read in Jesus’ speech either without or with very slight variation, none are similar to our verse, since they all appear in the phrase οἴου εἰμι ἐγὼ (7:34, 36; 14:3; 17:24). This would at least make βασιλεὺς εἰμι ἐγὼ unique in comparison with John’s usage elsewhere. Moreover, the indirect speech of Pilate reported here by Jesus, σὺ λέγεις ὅτι βασιλεὺς εἰμι [ἐγὼ], is most similar to a statement by the chief priests in 19:21 concerning the appropriate title to be placed on Jesus’ cross, ἐκεῖνος εἶπεν βασιλεὺς εἰμι τῶν Ἰουδαίων (εἰμι and τῶν Ἰουδαίων inverted in B L Ψ 33), in which ἐγὼ is not attested. Neither of these observations is definitive, but taken together they suggest that the inclusion of ἐγὼ is intrinsically less probable. On the one hand, the addition of ἐγὼ may reflect influence from general usage, since in the vast majority of places where εἰμι occurs in John it reads with the personal pronoun ἐγὼ. On the other hand, the inverted word order and lack of harmonization to any particular place, may suggest that it was inserted here for clarity or emphasis. P<sup>90</sup> does not attest the addition of the intrinsically improbable pronoun that may reflect some influence from general usage.

---

<sup>241</sup> BDF, sec. 360.

<sup>242</sup> ἂν is before the verb unless the verb is the first word of the clause (i.e. 5:46; 8:42; 14:2, 28).

18:38 *ευρισκω εν αυτω αιτιαν*: One cause of variation in word order lies in what Royse labels “transpositions of corrected leaps.”<sup>243</sup> Colwell had previously provided an explanation of this phenomenon: “By a leap the scribe jumps over a word, copies the following word, looks back at his exemplar, catches his error, and writes in the omitted word out of order.”<sup>244</sup> Our variation-unit here is preceded by the word *ουδεμιαν*, which shares its last three letters with *αιτιαν*, one of the words positioned variously among the manuscripts. It is most likely that *αιτιαν* followed *ουδεμιαν*, and that copyists due to the identical ending of these words (*ουδεμιαν αιτιαν ευρισκω εν αυτω*), leaped over *αιτιαν* to the next word(s) before recognizing and correcting their error by inserting it in a later position. This scribal activity is reflected in the word order of both *ευρισκω αιτιαν εν αυτω* and *ευρισκω εν αυτω αιτιαν*. In the former the recognition and correction is immediate (after *ευρισκω*) while in the latter it is delayed (after *ευρισκω εν αυτω*). The fourth variant, *αιτιαν εν αυτω ευρισκω*, sub-singularly read by D<sup>s</sup>, probably reflects the same phenomenon but this time from the first letter of one word to that of another (*αιτιαν ευρισκω εν αυτω*).<sup>245</sup> Thus, the variant *αιτιαν ευρισκω εν αυτω* is demonstrably prior to the other three and can account for their origination. P<sup>90</sup> attests a transposition that resulted from a corrected leap.

18:39 *απολυσω υμιν*: The omission of *υμιν* is very narrowly attested in three of the five cases in the Gospels where Pilate uses *απολυσω υμιν* in reference to releasing Jesus (Mk 15:9 (D ff<sup>2</sup>); Jn 18:39a (Ψ 0250 *pc* it); Jn 18:39b (Θ)), and in each case the pronoun could be regarded as superfluous. These data taken together indicate that the omission of the pronoun in such cases was somewhat tempting, making each of these readings transcriptionally less probable. Here, *υμιν* could have

<sup>243</sup> For discussion and examples see Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 157-161, 300-302, 381, 520-523, 594, 672, 755-756.

<sup>244</sup> Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” 116.

<sup>245</sup> Similar examples can be found in Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 300, 381, 521, and 594 in his treatments of Rom 15:18 and 2 Cor 7:3 in P<sup>46</sup>; Rev 15:1 in P<sup>47</sup>; Jn 20:15 in P<sup>66</sup>; 1 Pet 1:25 in P<sup>72</sup>.

been omitted as redundant in light of its previous occurrence (εστιν δε συνηθεια υμιν), where the recipient of Pilate’s act of releasing a prisoner is already implied. The most probable word order of απολυσω and υμιν is more difficult to determine on the basis of internal criteria. The order “απολυσω υμιν” matches what we find in parallels (Matt 27:17, 21 and Mk 15:9), which may initially make it a less difficult reading. The extent of variation here and at the second occurrence of απολυσω and υμιν together later in the verse make it somewhat likely that the word order differed at these two places and that copyists were thus led to introduce harmonizing variants in each of them. Even if this were the case, it is unclear on internal grounds which word order would belong in each place. I have, therefore, considered the word order in this reading to be inconclusive on the basis of internal evidence and excluded it from my conclusions below. Although it can be concluded that P<sup>90</sup> does not attest the omission of a superfluous and apparently redundant pronoun, I exclude this aspect of the reading from consideration as well, since the omission of υμιν is a sub-singular reading (Ψ 1689 c ff<sup>2</sup>). It makes little sense to characterize the reading of P<sup>90</sup> vis-à-vis a unique reading of Ψ.

18:39 ουν ινα: Pilate has just stated, “εστιν δε συνηθεια υμιν ινα ενα απολυσω υμιν εν τω πασχα,” before asking the question, “βουλεσθε ουν (ινα) απολυσω υμιν τον βασιλεια των Ιουδαιων. This second use of ινα following βουλεσθε ουν in Pilate’s question is probably a harmonization to the ινα following συνηθεια υμιν in Pilate’s statement of intent. P<sup>90</sup> attests this harmonization to the immediate context.

19:1 λαβων ο Πιλατος τον Ιησουν: The variants that differ from P<sup>90</sup> involve parataxis, whereas this manuscript attests a hypotactic construction with a participle and indicative without co-ordination. Although John attests the nominative participle of a λαμβανω verb four times in similar sentences (12:3 (v.l. D); 13:4, 30; 18:3), the

preference for the co-ordination of indicatives over the use of participles is a characteristic feature of John's Semitic style,<sup>246</sup> which at least makes the reading with the participle marginally less probable.<sup>247</sup> In these four occurrences of the participle there is almost no attestation of alteration to the indicative (only D in 12:3), which makes it less likely that this has happened here. Moreover, two of these examples (12:3; 18:3) can be classified as a particular stylistic feature in John (Proper name joined with *ouv* + Participle + Finite Verb), and should thus not be included as internal evidence for judging this variation-unit.<sup>248</sup> In the three remaining, similar instances of a *λαμβάνω* verb the Gospel has a finite verb-form with parataxis (12:13; 18:12; 19:40). It is most reasonable to conclude that P<sup>90</sup> attests what may be a conscious change away from Semitic syntax.

19:3 *καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτον*: The preceding clause ends with *αὐτον*, so that the omission of this clause is probably the result of a leap from the same to the same (*αὐτον...αὐτον* / *αὐτον καὶ...αὐτον καὶ*). "The words might well seem superfluous, but in fact they contribute to a vivid picture of the mocking approach of the soldiers pretending to do reverence to the king."<sup>249</sup> Perhaps this omission occurred because the words did in fact "seem superfluous," or it may merely be the result of a leap. It

---

<sup>246</sup> Turner, *Style*, 71: "Biblical Greek will often disguise the parataxis by making one of the verbs a participle...but John prefers the co-ordination." BDF, sec. 419 says that co-ordination with *καὶ* "corresponds exactly to the Hebrew model."

<sup>247</sup> See criterion 11 in Epp, "Traditional 'Canons'," 119: "A variant that conforms to Semitic forms of expression." See also G. D. Kilpatrick, "Literary Fashions and the Transmission of Texts in the Graeco-Roman World," in *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism*, 63-72 (ed. J. K. Elliott; BETL 96; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990), 65-66, who provides an example of "stylistic variations of general character" as opposed to Atticism: "if we have two readings, one of which consists of two main verbs joined by *καὶ* and the other consists of a participle and a main verb without *καὶ*, other things being equal, the reading with hypotaxis appears likely to be a stylistic improvement of the reading with parataxis. It seems, however, to be an improvement that could be made at any time and not, for example, to be an instance of Atticism." But for the argument that scribes may have been more tempted to alter the text in favor of the "less Greek," Semitic idiom than vice versa, see Gordon D. Fee, "Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism – Which?" in Epp and Fee, *Studies in the Theory and Method*, 131-136.

<sup>248</sup> Eugen Ruckstuhl and Peter Dschulnigg, *Stilkritik und Verfasserfrage im Johannesevangelium: Die johanneischen Sprachmerkmale auf dem Hintergrund des NT und des zeitgenössischen hellenistischen Schrifttums* (NTOA 17; Freiburg [Switz]: Paulus; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 70, 164: This characteristic is listed as number 6 in Group A in their list of the stylistic features in John.

<sup>249</sup> Barrett, *The Gospel according to John*, 540.

is also worth noting in support of the clause that its inclusion in the mocking scene is commensurate with the tradition reflected in Mark and Matthew, but with wording distinct enough to exclude the possibility of harmonization (και ηρξαντο ασπαζεσθαι αυτον... (Mk 15:18); και γονυπετησαντες εμπροσθεν αυτου ενεπαιξαν αυτω λεγοντες... (Matt 27:29); και ηρχοντο προς αυτον και ελεγον...(Jn 19:3)). P<sup>90</sup> attests the reading that is not omitted probably due to a leap.

19:3 ο βασιλευς: P<sup>90</sup> reads the nominative against the vocative βασιλευ. The vocative is a harmonization to the parallel passages in Mk 15:18 and Matt 27:29.<sup>250</sup> P<sup>90</sup> attests a reading that is not harmonized to Gospel parallels.

19:4 ο Πιλατος: A search for the frequency of εξω in the New Testament reveals that it occurs more in the Gospel of John than any other book. Of the 13 occurrences in John (if one includes our variation-unit), 8 of them are with compound verbs, including εκβαλλω (6:37; 9:34; 9:35; 12:31; 15:6) and εξερχομαι (18:29; 19:4a; 19:5). The three occurrences with εξερχομαι, including ours, appear in Jesus' trial before Pilate where John uses ερχομαι and εξω together to describe Pilate (or Jesus in 19:5) going *outside* to the Jews, who had refused to enter the Praetorium for fear of being defiled during the Passover (19:28). These data show that the use of εξω in our verse fits nicely in its context and into the framework of John's overall usage. The pattern of weak manuscript support for the omission of εξω in the four occurrences that have variation (6:37 (01\* D pc a b e sy<sup>s,c</sup>); 9:35 (om. D); 18:29 (om. A C<sup>3</sup> D<sup>s</sup> Θ Ψ 0250 Maj. q sy<sup>s</sup>); 19:4a (P<sup>90</sup> al), taken together with the fact that εξω is redundant when used with εξερχομαι, indicate the presence of a temptation to omit εξω, whether consciously or unconsciously, when its sense is already implied by the compound verb. The use of εξω later in 19:4b (ιδε αγω υμιν αυτον εξω) makes its use here even more redundant. The fact that John does not use εξω with εξερχομαι in

---

<sup>250</sup> Some witnesses harmonize to John in these places.

18:38 in one of Pilate’s trips outside to speak to Jesus’ accusers demonstrates that its use in our verse could be regarded as unnecessary. It is also worth noting that there is no attempt to add εἰς in 18:38, despite its abundant use in the near and immediate context, which makes it unlikely that this has happened in our verse. P<sup>90</sup> attests the reading with the elimination of a superfluous and redundant adverb.<sup>251</sup>

19:4 αἰτιαν ἐν αὐτῷ οὐχ εὐρισκῶ: There are essentially two discernible groups of variants at this variation-unit, one with οὐδεμιαν and the other with οὐχ. Since the manuscript tradition agrees in the placement of οὐδεμιαν at the beginning of the analogous variation-unit in 18:38, I concluded there that the most difficult or transcriptionally tempting reading was that in which αἰτιαν was read immediately after οὐδεμιαν as in οὐδεμιαν αἰτιαν εὐρισκῶ ἐν αὐτῷ (see discussion above). If my conclusion on that variation-unit is correct, then the same wording here in 19:4 should be regarded as potentially harmonized to 18:38. Accordingly, the reading presented in B, οὐδεμιαν αἰτιαν εὐρισκῶ ἐν αὐτῷ, becomes the least difficult because it is the most harmonized. Most of the remaining variants would then reflect various transpositions of this harmonized reading, each one deriving either from the initial harmonization itself or from one of its transposed offshoots. The other set of readings involving οὐχ could likewise be the result of harmonization, but in this case to 19:6 οὐχ εὐρισκῶ ἐν αὐτῷ αἰτιαν. However, although the variants in 19:4 attest the same words found in 19:6, they do not read them in the same order: ἐν αὐτῷ οὐχ εὐρισκῶ αἰτιαν (f<sup>13</sup> 788 1346), αἰτιαν ἐν αὐτῷ οὐχ εὐρισκῶ (P<sup>66vid.90</sup> W), (αὐτῷ) αἰτιαν οὐχ εὐρισκῶ (01\* 579). Thus, if we can be reasonably confident in identifying the initial cause of variation with harmonization to one of these two verses in the near/immediate context, it seems slightly more likely that the οὐδεμιαν variants derive from harmonization to 18:38 than that the οὐχ variants harmonize with 19:6.

---

<sup>251</sup> B. Aland, “Nutzen” 23 says εἰς is omitted “wegen der ohnehin schon gegebenen Doppelung.”

Although these observations lead to the conclusion that *αιτιαν εν αυτω ουχ ευρισκω* is marginally more difficult and thus more probable on transcriptional grounds, both *ουδεμιαν* and *ουχ* are commensurate with John's style, evidenced by their use in 18:38 and 19:6 respectively. Since little more can be said on the basis of internal criteria, I have considered this reading inconclusive for the purposes of my analysis below.

19:5 *φορων*: The verb *φορεω* is used only four other times in the New Testament, two of which pertain to "wearing" clothing (Matt. 11:8; Jam. 2:3). It is used in Sirach for wearing a crown or wreath (*εφορεσεν διαδημα*, 11:5; *φορουντος...στεφανον*, 40:4) and in Josephus for wearing a purple garment (*πορφυραν εσθητα φορειν*).<sup>252</sup> Thus, in commenting on this word Bultmann observes that it "corresponds to Greek usage."<sup>253</sup> Given its paucity of use in the New Testament, it is difficult to imagine a substitution in that direction here. It is more probable that a somewhat obscure word was changed to one more common, especially since *εχων* is used in the New Testament to denote "wearing" (Matt 3:4; 22:12; 1 Cor 11:4; Rev 9:9, 17).<sup>254</sup> Interestingly, in Rev 14:14 the Son of Man seated upon the clouds is described as *εχων επι της κεφαλης αυτου στεφανον χρυσουν*. In John 18:10 Peter is said to be "wearing a sword" (*εχων μαχαιραν*). These uses provide evidence for a synonymous relationship between these two words in such contexts and may account for the substitution of *εχων* for *φορων* as read in P<sup>66</sup> and a few other witnesses. P<sup>90</sup> attests the less familiar reading.

19:6 *λεγοντες*: The omission of *λεγοντες* probably reflects harmonization to Mark 15:13, 14. This variant as well as others in this passage, such as those

---

<sup>252</sup> Walter A. Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed. rev. (trans. and ed. W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, and F. W. Danker; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000), 1063 (hereafter referred to as BDAG); Flavius Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* (ed. B. Niese, *Flavii Iosephi opera*, 4 vols.; Berlin: Weidmann, 1877-82; repr. 1955), 10.235.

<sup>253</sup> Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 659.

<sup>254</sup> For other references, see BDAG, 421.

associated with *εκραυγασαν* and *σταυρωσον*, indicate the presence of difficulty at this point in avoiding influence from other texts. Although quite possibly harmonized to Mark in these other two places, here P<sup>90</sup> attests the reading that is not harmonized to parallels.

19:6 *υμεις αυτον*: Twice during Jesus' trial before Pilate, here and in 18:31, Pilate tells Jesus' accusers to take and try/punish him themselves (*λαβετε αυτον υμεις / υμεις αυτον*). In 18:31, with a nearly identical context and syntax, the text reads *ειπεν ουν αυτοις ο Πιλατος λαβετε αυτον υμεις...*, where *αυτον* precedes *υμεις* without variation in the manuscript tradition. Manuscripts are divided in our verse, however, with P<sup>66</sup> D<sup>s</sup> L W Ψ 1844 e q r<sup>1</sup> and P<sup>90</sup> reading the *υμεις αυτον* word order while the rest of the tradition reads *αυτον υμεις* as in 18:31. With respect to the criterion of dissimilarity, *υμεις αυτον* is a more difficult reading than *αυτον υμεις*, since the latter could reflect assimilation to the previous and identical use in the near context. This is further likely since there are a large number of variation-units resulting from harmonization throughout this trial narrative, and since the surrounding syntax is nearly identical. Seen from a different angle, however, 18:31 offers internal support for *αυτον υμεις*, especially in light of the similarity in context. Barrett takes the pronoun *υμεις* here and in 18:31 to be emphatic, and commenting on *λαβετε αυτον υμεις* in 18:31 he says, "The last word is emphatic."<sup>255</sup> Bultmann also sees the pronoun as emphatic and notes, "the correspondence of the two clauses [*λαβετε αυτον υμεις και σταυρωσατε* and *εγω γαρ ουχ ευρισκω εν αυτω αιτιαν*] shows that *ὑμεῖς* and *ἐγώ* are emphasized."<sup>256</sup> The important question, then, is how necessary is the placement of *υμεις* after *αυτον* to its emphatic character? Regarding the relationship between word order and emphasis, BDF notes, "Any emphasis on an

---

<sup>255</sup> Barrett, *The Gospel according to John*, 533.

<sup>256</sup> Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 659.

element in the sentence causes that element to be moved forward,”<sup>257</sup> and Turner’s list of examples of first and second person nominative personal pronouns used emphatically in the New Testament largely confirms that statement.<sup>258</sup> Moreover, the New Testament yields examples where second-person imperative verbs are immediately followed by emphatic nominative pronouns as in λαβετε υμεις αυτον (e.g. ουτως ουν προσευχεσθε υμεις (Matt 6:9); θεσθε υμεις εις τα ωτα υμων τους λογους τουτους (Lk 9:44); δεηθητε υμεις υπερ εμου προς τον κυριον (Ac 8:24)), although the syntactical elements in these examples vary. Thus, it appears that the emphatic pronoun does not demand the word order λαβετε αυτον υμεις.<sup>259</sup> There is a Synoptic usage, however, that is syntactically parallel to our sentence, δοτε αυτοις υμεις φαγειν (Matt 14:16; Mk 6:37; Lk 9:13), which lends some support to αυτον υμεις.

Since there appears to be no reason why emphasis would disqualify either word order, transcriptional probability suggests that the more dissimilar reading be regarded as more probable, unless it can be demonstrated from the study of singular readings that scribes tend towards transpositions that move pronouns forward or closer to the verb. No such tendency emerges from an examination of the transpositions that are neither leaps nor harmonizations in Royse’s study.<sup>260</sup> The possibility nevertheless remains that υμεις αυτον is a simple transposition without explanation, as with many of Royse’s examples. Since a determination one way or the other on internal grounds appears tenuous, primarily given the conflict between intrinsic and transcriptional probabilities in relation to 18:31, it is most reasonable to regard this reading as inconclusive for the purposes of our analysis below.

---

<sup>257</sup> BDF, sec. 472.

<sup>258</sup> Turner, *Syntax*, 37.

<sup>259</sup> Pickering, *Recently Published New Testament Papyri*, 17 comments, “The sense is not essentially different.”

<sup>260</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 153-57; 298-300; 380-81; 518-19; 593-94; 670-71.

19:7 om. αυτω: In the other occurrence of these words, απεκριθησαν αυτω οι Ιουδαιοι in 10:33, there is no attempt to omit αυτω, leaving us with one undisputed instance where John attests this clause with the pronoun and none where the pronoun is absent. The amount of space separating these occurrences coupled with the differing contexts make it unlikely that the inclusion of αυτω in 19:7 is a harmonization to the same wording in 10:33. In terms of the context for our variation-unit, from 18:28, where Jesus is first brought to Pilate, until 19:22, where Pilate speaks for the last time in the Gospel, there are 8 occurrences of αποκρινομαι, excluding 18:30 where ειπαν is also used. In six places, four of which precede our variation-unit, αποκρινομαι is used without an indirect object pronoun (απεκριθη Ιησους (18:34 (v.l.));<sup>261</sup> απεκριθη ο Πιλατος (18:35 (+ αυτω pc)); απεκριθη Ιησους (18:36); απεκριθη ο Ιησους (18:37 (+ αυτω K pc)); απεκριθησαν οι αρχιερεις (19:15); απεκριθη ο Πιλατος (19:22 (+ αυτοις f<sup>13</sup> 157)), but in two places, including our variation-unit, αυτω is omitted by more than a few witnesses (απεκριθησαν (αυτω) οι Ιουδαιοι (19:7); απεκριθη (αυτω) Ιησους (19:11)). It is most probable, then, that αυτω was omitted in 19:7 and 19:11 as a harmonization to the immediate context in which there is a heavy concentration of uses without the pronoun. Overall, the pronoun is both present and absent when used with αποκρινομαι throughout John's Gospel, making the use of αυτω in these two cases commensurate with John's overall style. It is possible that the omission here in 19:7 specifically resulted from harmonization to 19:15, since 19:6-7 shares similar structure and in some cases identical wording, since there is already evidence for possible harmonization to 19:15 as discussed below with σταυρωσον, and since οι αρχιερεις are in view in both

---

<sup>261</sup> 01 C<sup>3</sup> K Γ Δ f<sup>13</sup> 892<sup>s</sup>. 1424 Maj. c sy<sup>p</sup> sa<sup>ms</sup> bo<sup>ms</sup> add αυτω in 18:34, which appears to be a harmonization to the two previous uses in the near context (απεκριθη αυτω Ιησους (18:20, 23)).

contexts. P<sup>90</sup> here attests an omission that is harmonized to the surrounding context.<sup>262</sup>

### Commentary on Unique Readings

18:37 *συ ει*: The second person, singular, nominative pronoun *συ* and the second-person present indicative *ει* are read side-by-side frequently in John's Gospel. The word order is *συ ει* at the beginning of a clause (1:42, 49; 3:10; 6:69; 10:24; 11:27; 18:33) and *ει συ* at the end (1:21 (*συ ει* 04<sup>C2</sup>); 4:19; 8:48; 18:37; 19:9), regardless of syntax.<sup>263</sup> Here and in 18:33 Pilate asks Jesus about his royal status (*συ ει ο βασιλευς των Ιουδαιων*, 18:33; *ουκουν βασιλευς ει συ*, 18:37). Given the close proximity of these similarly stated questions, it is reasonable to conclude that the placement of *συ* before *ει* in P<sup>90</sup> in v. 37 is the result of harmonization to the previous usage in v. 33. Similarly, although not identified as a harmonization by Royse, in 19:9 (*ποθεν ει συ*), where Pilate continues in his questioning of Jesus, P<sup>66</sup> singularly reads the *συ ει* word order.<sup>264</sup> P<sup>90</sup> attests a reading that is harmonized to the immediate context.

19:6 *εκραζαν*: Head says this is “probably a nonsense reading for *εκραξαν*,” which is read singularly by 01<sup>\*</sup>.<sup>265</sup> The copying of *εκραζαν* by the scribe of P<sup>90</sup> could, as he proposes, have *εκραξαν* in view, which would make it a harmonization to Mark 15:13, 14. It could, however, also be the result of harmonization to the parallel in

---

<sup>262</sup> Without attention to the prospect of harmonization, B. Aland, “Nutzen,” 23 says that this omission and that of *σταυρωσον* in 19:6 resulted “wohl aus Flüchtigkeit.” Acknowledging these as harmonizations may weaken her generalization that the errors in P<sup>90</sup> stem from the speed of transcription (“im schnellen Fluß der Arbeit”).

<sup>263</sup> I thus find curious the claim of Rodgers, “The Text of the New Testament and its Witnesses Before 200 A.D.,” 85-6, that the “usual Johannine usage is *συ ει* as against *ει συ*,” leading him to the conclusion, “I suspect that P<sup>90</sup> preserves the original reading.” In more than one place, his discussion of variant readings exhibits an inattentiveness to the phenomenon of harmonization and/or a lack of engagement with the details of the intrinsic and transcriptional evidence (e.g. 18:37 *συ ει* in P<sup>90</sup>; 18:38 *εγω ουδεμιαν ευρισκω εν αυτω αιτιαν* in P<sup>90</sup>; 19:2 *εξ ακανθων στεφανων* in P<sup>66</sup>; 19:5 *ιδου* in P<sup>90</sup>), in favor of general and unsubstantiated appeals to stylistic improvement.

<sup>264</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 518, 829.

<sup>265</sup> Head, “Habits,” 402. For some evidence of interchange between *ξ* and *ζ* in the papyri, likely to be “purely orthographic,” see Gignac I, 141.

Matthew 27:23 (εκραζον λεγοντες σταυρωθητω). It shares the verb itself with Matthew and Mark, the imperfect verbal stem with Matthew (εκραζ-), and the aorist suffix with Mark (-αν), making it a nonsense reading that could be taken as a harmonization to Matthew or Mark. The reading σταυρωσον αυτον later in the verse (see below) may tip the balance in favor of Mark, unless that reflects harmonization to John 19:15. When we look for variation in Matthew and Mark at this unit, we see that harmonization runs in both directions, from Mark to Matthew (εκραζον in Mk. 15:13 (pc), 14 (A D G K M P Π)) and vice versa (εκαξαν in Matt 27:23 (D)). Interestingly, the same nonsense form that we have here in P<sup>90</sup> (εκραζαν) is also found in Δ in Mk 15:14 as a variant for εκραξαν, which, once again, could reflect a simple misspelling of εκραξαν or a failed attempt at harmonization to εκραζον in Matthew 27:23 (as was accomplished in A and D in Mk 15:13). As for the verb κραυγαζω, it is used four times in this pericope, two attesting interchange with κραζω (here; 19:12 01<sup>2</sup> *Maj.* sy<sup>h</sup>) and two attesting no variation in that direction (18:40; 19:15), which lends it some intrinsic support. In light of the possibilities noted above and given the fact that εκραξαν itself is singular in 01\*, the reading of P<sup>90</sup> is interpreted as an independent substitution away from εκραυγασαν, which I take to be the reading in the *Vorlage*, rather than a simple misspelling of εκραξαν. P<sup>90</sup>, then, attests a singular nonsense reading resulting from a misspelled harmonization to parallels.

19:6 σταυρωσον αυτον: The most similar New Testament passages are απον απον σταυρωσον αυτον (Jn 19:15); σταυρωσον αυτον (Mk 15:13, 14); and σταυρου σταυρου αυτον (Lk 23:21). Given the difference in verbal tense, it is unlikely that the double σταυρωσον in our verse is a harmonization to Luke's usage. Rather, it appears almost certain that σταυρωσον αυτον reflects harmonization either to the same words later in John or to the parallel verses in Mark. The insertion of αυτον

attested by a number of early majuscules and the Majority Text would have been especially tempting, since the pronoun was read in all three of these parallels. In attesting both the omission of *σταυρωσον* and the addition of *αυτον*, the reading of P<sup>90</sup> represents harmonization to the immediate context in John or parallel verses in Mark. On the one hand the greater tendency among copyists to harmonize to the immediate context than to parallels, as demonstrated in Royse's study,<sup>266</sup> as well as what appears from the numerical distribution of extant manuscripts to be a greater familiarity with John than Mark in the early period,<sup>267</sup> favor seeing this as a harmonization to John 19:15. Further, the words immediately after *αυτον* are identical in v. 6 and v.15 (*λεγει αυτοις ο Πιλατος*). Indeed, we know that at least one manuscript (1071) harmonized to John 19:15 rather than Mark. On the other hand, the combination of this reading with *εκραζαν* (discussed above) provides strong evidence that it is Mark's wording that has exercised influence. Either of these options is valid given the evidence. Since *σταυρωσον αυτον* is evidently one harmonized substitution, it will be treated as one reading rather than two separate readings in the analysis below. Head points out that this is a singular reading if the two variants treated in NA28 are combined into one,<sup>268</sup> so I will treat them as such in the following analysis.

#### Analysis of Manuscript based on Readings

I exclude from the following assessment three places in which the identification of readings proves inconclusive on the basis of internal evidence (18:39 *απολυσω υμιν*; 19:4 *αιτιαν εν αυτω ουχ ευρισκω*; 19:6 *υμεις αυτον*). These readings have, however, been factored into the percentages of agreement between early witnesses to be

<sup>266</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 737.

<sup>267</sup> Hurtado, *Artifacts*, 30: "The numerous copies of John in the papyri from Egypt suggest a notable popularity of this text...But 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."

<sup>268</sup> Head, "Habits," 402.

treated at the end of this section. P<sup>90</sup>, therefore, supplies 15 readings for analysis from those treated in the tables and commentary above, comprised of three singular or sub-singular readings and 12 readings shared with other witnesses in the tradition. Of the 12 shared readings, four are in variation-units where the reason for variation appears to be some form of harmonization. In two of them, P<sup>90</sup> attests the non-harmonized reading, and in both cases this involves parallels in other Gospels: 19:3 ο βασιλευς is not harmonized to the vocative βασιλευ in Matt 27:29 or Mark 15:18; 19:6 λεγοντες is not harmonized to Mark 15:13,14. In the remaining two cases, P<sup>90</sup> has a harmonized reading: 18:39 ουν ινα in which ινα has been added due to assimilation to its use earlier in the verse; 19:7 omission of the pronoun αυτω which reflects harmonization to its absence in similar verses in the surrounding context.

Six of these 12 shared readings are in variation-units associated with stylistic or syntactical changes where the variants involved can be regarded as more or less difficult. In these cases variation pertains to the smoothing of rough or abrupt syntax, the deletion of superfluous or redundant elements, the substitution of familiar words or syntax for less familiar, obscure or antiquated forms or syntax, or the clarification of something deemed ambiguous. Just as the readings of P<sup>90</sup> from the previous category can be identified as harmonized or non-harmonized, here each reading can be identified as syntactically less or more difficult. Syntactically less difficult readings are those, for example, that result in a text that is smoother, without superfluous or redundant elements, or generally less obscure, while syntactically more difficult readings are those that are rougher / more abrupt, superfluous / redundant, obscure / antiquated, or ambiguous. The latter sorts of readings are termed “more difficult” in so far as they are, as Metzger notes, ““more difficult to the scribe,’ who would be tempted to make an emendation.”<sup>269</sup> I use this category,

---

<sup>269</sup> Metzger, *Commentary*, 13\*.

however, with reference to the *effect* of the reading on the text more than the *motive* behind it.<sup>270</sup>

In four of these variation-units P<sup>90</sup> attests the more difficult reading: 18:36 βασιλεια η εμη exhibits syntax not influenced by broader Koine and New Testament usage; 18:36 οι εμοι ηγωνιζοντο αν does not attest the omission of the unnecessary particle; 18:37 ειμι does not have the addition of the emphatic and familiar εγω; 19:5 φορων does not read with the more familiar εχων. In two of these six variation-units, however, P<sup>90</sup> attests the less difficult reading: 19:1 λαβων ο Πιλατος τον Ιησουν εμαστιγωσεν reads with a hypotactic construction instead of the more Semitic and Johannine paratactic construction; 19:4 ο Πιλατος reads without the superfluous and redundant adverb εξω.

The remaining two variation-units represented by P<sup>90</sup> concern mechanical alteration or obvious scribal slips. In one of these P<sup>90</sup> attests an intact reading: 19:3 και ηρχοντο προς αυτον where the clause is not omitted through a leap. Its omission could also be regarded as the elimination of superfluous syntax, but this is less likely given the clear evidence for a mechanical leap (and it could be a combination of the two). At the other variation-unit, P<sup>90</sup> attests a faulty reading: 18:38 ευρισκω εν αυτω αιτιαν where the correction of a leap has altered the word order.

To summarize, in these 12 variation-units for which the fragmentary papyrus P<sup>90</sup> is extant or can be reasonably reconstructed, setting aside for the moment its singular and sub-singular readings, seven or 58% of its readings are intrinsically and/or transcriptionally more probable than the alternative(s). In each case the process of transmission underlying the text of P<sup>90</sup> exhibits an avoidance of the harmonizations, stylistic / syntactical alterations or mechanical errors attested in other Greek manuscript witnesses throughout the tradition. In five or 42% of these

---

<sup>270</sup> Cf. Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 337-341; Holmes, "Women and the 'Western' Text," 188.

variation-units, however, P<sup>90</sup> reads with the intrinsically and/or transcriptionally less probable reading. Although consisting of nearly half of the shared readings in P<sup>90</sup>, the latter are deemed less consequential when one considers the minute dimension and insignificance (in terms of intentionality and effect) of four out of five of them. First, we have the addition of *ινα* before the second occurrence of the subjunctive *απολυσω* in 18:39, almost certainly influenced by its use before the first *απολυσω* earlier in the verse (*εστιν δε συνηθεια υμιν ινα ενα απολυσω υμιν εν τω πασχα βουλεσθε ουν ινα απολυσω υμιν...*). Second, we find the omission of the third-person pronoun *αυτω* (*απεκριθησαν αυτω οι Ιουδαιοι (19:7)*), probably influenced by the six occurrences of *αποκρινομαι* used without an indirect object pronoun in the immediate and near context. Third, in 19:4 there is the omission of the superfluous and redundant adverb *εξω*, the sense of which already being conveyed by the verb *εξηλθεν*. Fourth, we see a leap from the same to the same (*ουδεμιαν αιτιαν*) in 18:38, which was subsequently corrected resulting in a different word order (*ουδεμιαν ευρισκω εν αυτω αιτιαν* in place of *ουδεμιαν αιτιαν ευρισκω εν αυτω*).

These four variants do not extend beyond a single word, do not have an impact on the meaning of the text, and offer no evidence that they were anything other than accidental or unconscious slips. In none of them does the evidence demand or even favor intentionality or some kind of improvement. The one significant variant, significant for our purposes because it may very well reflect some level of editorial intervention or conscious stylistic alteration, is the change from parataxis to hypotaxis in 19:1 *λαβων ο Πιλατος τον Ιησουν*. The change from the augmented stem plus change in suffix taken together with the omission of *και* suggest some level of intentionality, unless the change from finite verb to participle occurred unconsciously and then the *και* was omitted to adjust to the new syntax. Regardless, the sense of the passage remains unaffected. This one stylistic change,

likely intentional yet not meaningful, constitutes the evidence for freedom or creativity in the tradition that lies behind this second-century papyrus.

When we come to an assessment of the readings that the copyist of P<sup>90</sup> is most likely to have introduced into the tradition, we find three of these singular or sub-singular readings. First, in 18:37 the word order  $\epsilon\iota\ \sigma\upsilon$  is substituted with  $\sigma\upsilon\ \epsilon\iota$ , a transposition that very likely resulted from harmonization to the immediate context in 18:33 ( $\sigma\upsilon\ \epsilon\iota$  ο βασιλευς των Ιουδαιων) influenced by  $\epsilon\iota\ \sigma\upsilon$  ( $\sigma\upsilon\ \epsilon\iota$  ο βασιλευς των Ιουδαιων). Second, in 19:6 there is the substitution of  $\epsilon\kappa\rho\alpha\zeta\alpha\nu$  for  $\epsilon\kappa\rho\alpha\nu\gamma\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$ , resulting from a misspelled harmonization to parallels (either to Matt 27:23 ( $\epsilon\kappa\rho\alpha\zeta\omicron\nu$ ) or Mark 15:13, 14 ( $\epsilon\kappa\rho\alpha\zeta\alpha\nu$ )). Finally, in 19:6  $\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\omega\sigma\omicron\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$  is read in place of  $\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\omega\sigma\omicron\nu\ \sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\omega\sigma\omicron\nu$ , which is a harmonization either to the immediate context in 19:15 or to parallel verses in Mark 15:13, 14. It is perhaps more likely that these last two readings,  $\epsilon\kappa\rho\alpha\zeta\alpha\nu$  and  $\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\omega\sigma\omicron\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$ , are harmonizations to Mark 15:13, 14 ( $\epsilon\kappa\rho\alpha\zeta\alpha\nu\ \sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\omega\sigma\omicron\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$ ). The fact that  $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ , which is not read in Mark, separates  $\epsilon\kappa\rho\alpha\zeta\alpha\nu$  and  $\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\omega\sigma\omicron\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$  in P<sup>90</sup> suggests that these were two separate and probably unconscious mental slips rather than one intentional effort to bring this portion of text into conformity with Mark.

For singular / sub-singular readings, then, there are two closely related harmonizations to parallels and one harmonization to the immediate context. Similar to the underlying tradition, the variations unique to P<sup>90</sup> are limited to one word (whether transposed or substituted), do not affect the sense of the text and could easily be explained as accidental. There is minimal evidence for scribal incompetency, as with the one nonsense spelling  $\epsilon\kappa\rho\alpha\zeta\alpha\nu$ , and sufficient evidence to suggest familiarity with at least one other Gospel. Among the eight internally improbable readings attested in P<sup>90</sup>, the leading reason for alteration is micro-level,

accidental harmonization (five cases), especially to the immediate context (three cases).

P<sup>90</sup> shares extant text with two other witnesses from the second and third centuries, P<sup>52</sup> and P<sup>66</sup>, both of which are also fragmentary for this portion of text.<sup>271</sup> Based on what is extant or can be confidently reconstructed,<sup>272</sup> and leaving aside orthographic readings, P<sup>90</sup> agrees with P<sup>66</sup> six out of 23 times (26%): agreements (18:39 απολυσω υμιν [1] (lac. P<sup>66</sup>); 19:3 και ηρχοντο προς αυτον; 19:4 αιτιαν εν αυτω ουχ ευρισκω; 19:6 λεγοντες (lac. P<sup>66</sup>); 19:6 υμεις αυτον (lac. P<sup>90</sup>); 19:7 om. αυτω (lac. P<sup>90</sup>)); disagreements (P<sup>90</sup> reading listed first) (18:36 αν | om. αν (lac.); 18:37 Ιησους (lac.) | Ιησους και ειπεν; 18:38 λεγει [1] | λεγει ουν; 18:38 ο | om. ο; 18:38 ευρισκω εν αυτω αιτιαν | ευρισκω αιτιαν εν αυτω; 18:39 ουν ινα | ουν (lac.); 19:1 λαβων ο πιλατος | ο πιλατος ελαβεν (lac.) (word order); 19:1 λαβων... | ελαβεν...και; 19:2 στεφανον εξ ακανθων | εξ ακανθων στεφανον; 19:3 ο βασιλευς | βασιλευ; 19:4 (και) εξηλθεν | εξηλθεν ουν; 19:4 om. εξω (lac.) | εξω; 19:5 φορων | εχων; 19:6 εκραζαν | εκραυγασαν (lac.); 19:6 σταυρωσον αυτον (lac.) | σταυρωσον σταυρωσον; 19:6 αυτοις (lac.) | om. αυτοις; 19:6 και [2] (lac.) | om. και). If singular/sub-singular readings are removed, then P<sup>90</sup> (minus 19:6 εκραζαν; 19:6 σταυρωσον αυτον) agrees with P<sup>66</sup> (minus 18:37 Ιησους και ειπεν; 18:38 λεγει ουν; 18:38 om. ο; 18:38 ευρισκω αιτιαν εν αυτω; 19:2 εξ ακανθων στεφανον; 19:6 om. αυτοις; 19:6 om. και) six out of 14 times (43%). P<sup>90</sup> and P<sup>52</sup> disagree at the one place where P<sup>52</sup> likely had a singular reading (18:37 εις τουτο [2] (lac.) | om. εις τουτο (lac.)). Otherwise, there are no variation-units identified in NA28 (aside from the 18:38 λεγει ουν singular reading of P<sup>66</sup>) for the small amount of text shared by these two papyri.

---

<sup>271</sup> The comparisons to follow are after contemporaneous correction.

<sup>272</sup> As in P<sup>52</sup>, “lac.” is placed in parentheses where the reading listed can only be determined by considerations of spacing.

## Diachronic Comparison of Created Readings

Among manuscripts up through the seventh century, the portion of text covered by P<sup>90</sup> is fully preserved in 01, A, B, N and W. Listed below are the readings deemed likely to have been created by each respective scribe. Orthographic readings other than itacism and the moveable nu, while not included in the following list and analysis, have been provided in a footnote for each manuscript for the sake of completeness and the reader's convenience.

### P<sup>90</sup>:<sup>273</sup>

18:37 ει συ] συ ει P<sup>90</sup> (harmonized transposition of pronoun, to immediate context (18:33))

19:6 εκραυγασαν] εκραζαν P<sup>90</sup> (misspelled harmonized substitution, to parallels (Matt 27:23 or Mark 15:13,14))

19:6 σταυρωσον σταυρωσον] σταυρωσον αυτον P<sup>90</sup> 1010 a (harmonized substitution, to near context (19:15) or parallel (Mark 15))

### 01:<sup>274</sup>

18:36 οι υπηρεται] και οι υπηρεται<sup>275</sup> 01 (addition of connective adverb (“also”) resulting in smoother and clearer link in syntax)

---

<sup>273</sup> As mentioned above, *editio princeps* posits εκραυασαν for εκραυγασαν at 18:40 in P<sup>90</sup> with L and M.

<sup>274</sup> I exclude 18:37 μαρτυρηση in 01\* because it was corrected contemporaneously by the Scriptorium hand (cf. IGNTP II, 505, 7). The following 01 or 01\* readings are excluded from this list as lacunose in P<sup>90</sup>: 18:38 τις for τι; 19:4 τι for οτι.

<sup>275</sup> This reading falls in a lacuna in P<sup>90</sup> (recto 1), but with και the line would have 31 letters, which is 3 beyond the high end of the range (28) and at least 5 beyond the average (24-26).

18:36 βασιλεια η εμη [3]] εμη βασιλεια 01 (substitution in favor of more familiar Koine and New Testament syntax (see commentary above on the second occurrence in 18:36))

18:37 τη αληθεια] περι της αληθιας 01\* sa (harmonized substitution of syntax, to general usage that is ubiquitous in John (μαρτυρεω + περι...))

18:37 εκ] om.<sup>276</sup> 01\* (omission of inessential preposition)

19:5 το πορφυρουν] πορφυρουν<sup>277</sup> 01 (harmonized omission of article, to immediate context (19:2))

19:6 εκραυγασαν] εκραξαν 01\* (harmonized substitution of verb, to parallel (Mk. 15:13, 14))

19:6 λεγει] και λεγει 01 (harmonized addition of conjunction, to immediate context (19:5))

### A:

18:37 γεγεννημαι] και γεγεννημαι<sup>278</sup> A (addition resulting in affirmation that Jesus is “also” king, as well as one who testifies to the truth)

---

<sup>276</sup> This reading falls in a lacuna in P<sup>90</sup> (recto 10). This is one of four lines that precede a line with ekthesis, whose letters per line are: 24 (recto 4), 22 (recto 10, if without εκ), 23 (recto 20), 24 (recto 23). Without εκ this line, which at 22 is already shorter than most, would have only 20 letters, 4 less than any of the surrounding lines (from lines 5 to 15: 26, 27/28, 26, 26, 24, 22, 25, 25, 25, 24, 25).

<sup>277</sup> This reading is in a lacuna in P<sup>90</sup> (verso 38/14). Through a comparison of the same size lacunae above and below this line we get the following number of letters: 10 to the left of the θ in line 37/13; 11 to the left of the omicron in line 38/14; 12 to the left of the delta in line 39/15; and 12 to the left of the upsilon in line 40/16. It appears that without το there would not be enough to fill the lacuna at the beginning of line 38/14 (line 37/13 has only 10 letters probably because it has the wider omega and lacks the narrower iota).

19:4 ουδεμιαν αιτιαν εν αυτω ευρισκω] ουδεμιαν εν αυτω αιτιαν ευρισκω<sup>279</sup> A  
(transposition resulting from a corrected leap (ουδεμιαν αιτιαν) (see table and commentary above for other variants and some discussion on this variation-unit))

**B:**

18:39 εν] om.<sup>280</sup> B 0109\* (leap from same to same (υμιν εν))

19:5 ο Ιησους] Ιησους B (omission of unnecessary article; possibly harmonized to near context (cf. related v.l. throughout Jn 18))

19:5 ο ανθρωπος] ανθρωπος B (omission of inessential article)<sup>281</sup>

**N:**<sup>282</sup>

19:1 ο Πιλατος τον Ιησουν] τον Ιησουν ο Πιλατος N (transposition potentially influenced by placement of direct object immediately after same verb in surrounding context (λαβετε αυτον read in 18:31 and 19:6))

---

<sup>278</sup> This reading is in a lacuna in P<sup>90</sup> (recto 7). With και line 7 would have 29 letters, extending beyond the high end of the range and thus making it the longest line in the papyrus.

<sup>279</sup> In light of the word order of εν αυτω and ευρισκω, I take the reading of the *Vorlage* to most likely be that read by Ψ 892<sup>s</sup> aur.

<sup>280</sup> This reading falls in a lacuna in P<sup>90</sup> (recto 18). Without εν the line would be 21 letters long, making it shorter than all of the surrounding lines (lines 15 to 24: 25, 24, 24, 23, 24, 23/24, 22/23, 23, 24, 23). Even more, a comparison of what is extant or reconstructed to the right of the letters directly above the nu of υμειν in this line shows the following number of letters: 16 to the right of κα in line 13; 15 to the right of πρ in line 14; 14 to the right of αυτ in line 15; 15 to the right of εν in line 16). Without εν line 18 would have only 12 letters in this same amount of space.

<sup>281</sup> See Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 110-111 for the hypothesis that this reading existed earlier and represented a stumbling block to proto-orthodox scribes (e.g. P<sup>66\*</sup>). It is noteworthy, however, that B also reads alone in omitting the article before Ιησους previously in the same verse, making it likely that both reflect mere slips of this one scribe.

<sup>282</sup> I exclude the substitution of Πιλατος for Ιησους at 19:5 in N\* because it was corrected by the first hand (cf. IGNTP II, 509, 4). I also exclude the addition of ο Πιλατος after λεγει αυτοις in 19:5, since the fact that it was inserted as a correction by the first hand along with the accompanying support (64. 1321 sy bo) suggest that it was the reading in the scribe's *Vorlage* rather than his independent creation. P<sup>90</sup> is lacunose for the substitution of υμων for υμιν [1] at 18:39 in L N.

19:4 γνωτε] επιγνωτε N (substitution towards compound verb with no obvious cause (slight possibility of influence from similar context and word usage in Ac 22:24 (επιγνω...αιτιαν) and 23:28 (επιγνωσαι...αιτιαν))

W:<sup>283</sup>

18:39 απολυσω υμιν [1]] απολυω υμιν W (harmonized substitution of verbal tense, to immediate context (18:39))

19:4 παλιν] om.<sup>284</sup> W 258\* 346. 1346. b ff<sup>2</sup> (harmonized omission of adverb, to immediate context (19:5 (maybe also 18:29); possibly leap from same to same (ου̅ν παλι̅ν))

Looking first at the quantity of readings likely introduced, there are seven in 01, at least prior to its later correction (with four remaining even afterwards),<sup>285</sup> three in B and two each in A, N and W. With a total of three, P<sup>90</sup> has less than half of the number in 01 (one less than 01 after correction), shares the same amount with B, and has one more than A, N and W. In terms of quantity, then, P<sup>90</sup> is well situated among these later witnesses, exhibiting no particular propensity towards the creation of readings.

Second, in terms of character and significance, the alterations that we find in P<sup>90</sup> correspond with the same kinds of changes observed in the later majuscules. As with the 18:37 συ ει transposition harmonized to the immediate context in P<sup>90</sup> (and possibly the 19:6 substitution σταυρωσον αυτον), the omission of παλιν in 19:4 and

---

<sup>283</sup> 19:6 ου̅χι for ου̅χ in W falls in a lacuna in P<sup>90</sup>.

<sup>284</sup> This reading is included as likely to have emerged independently in W because the Greek manuscript support is narrow and late, versional support is minimal, and the nature of the variation makes coincidental agreement likely.

<sup>285</sup> IGNTP II, 7: All corrections to the 01\* readings treated here are listed as Cca in IGNTP II.

the substituted *απολυω* in 18:39 in W as well as three of the readings in 01 (18:37 *περι της αληθιας*; 19:5 *πορφυρουν*; 19:6 *και λεγει*) likewise show the effect of influence from other portions of text within the Gospel of John. To these can potentially be added 19:5 *Ιησους* in B and 19:1 *τον Ιησουν ο Πιλατος* in N. The remaining two readings of P<sup>90</sup>, in which it attests influence from usage in other New Testament documents (19:6 *εκραζαν*; 19:6 *σταυρωσον αυτον* if taken to be a harmonization to Mark), also find correspondence among the later majuscules, in 01 (18:36 *εμη βασιλεια*; 19:6 *εκραζαν*) and possibly N (19:4 *επιγνωτε*). The only type of reading unique to P<sup>90</sup> that emerges from these comparisons is the nonsense *εκραζαν*, which I take to be a misspelled harmonization to either Matthew or Mark.

Third, there are a few notable types of readings that we see in the later majuscules that are not attested in P<sup>90</sup>. We do not see the addition of conjunctions or connectives in P<sup>90</sup> as we do in 01 (18:36 *και οι υπηρεται*; 19:6 *και λεγει*) and A (18:37 *και γεγεννημαι*), nor the sorts of rearrangements / substitutions of syntax observed in 01 (18:36 *εμη βασιλεια*; 18:37 *περι της αληθιας*). The insertion of *και* at 18:37 in A may reflect a conscious attempt to explicitly affirm that Jesus indeed has come as king, in addition to being one who testifies to the truth. The omission of inessential words, which we see in 01 (18:37 om. *εκ*) and B (19:5 *Ιησους*; 19:5 *ανθρωπος*), and leaps between letters (or transpositions resulting from them), which are attested in A (19:4 *ουδεμιαν εν αυτω αιτιαν ευρισκω*) and B (18:39 om. *εν*), are also absent from P<sup>90</sup>. In short, the number and character of the readings likely generated by the scribe of P<sup>90</sup> suggest overall continuity with transmission attitudes and practices in subsequent centuries. The evidence gathered here does not indicate the presence of greater freedom or fluidity behind the copying of this early witness.

### Conclusions on Stability and/or Fluidity

P<sup>90</sup> presents a picture of stability and continuity rather than fluidity and discontinuity. For conscious alteration or a free attitude towards transcribing the text, we have only as evidence the one variant that reflects change from parataxis to hypotaxis, which does not affect the sense of the passage.<sup>286</sup> Otherwise, the internally improbable readings in this manuscript, those from the underlying tradition as well as those likely to have been created by the scribe, appear to be nothing more than the occasional and unconscious slip of the eye or the mind. The character and quantity of created readings are commensurate with what we find at later points in the tradition. Among these manuscripts only 01 stands out as having a unique level of what may be called “freedom” or susceptibility to corruption when compared with the others.<sup>287</sup> The evidence presented by this second-century witness, therefore, does not support the view that there was a difference, let alone a fundamental or radical difference, in the nature or quality of transmission practices in the early period.

---

<sup>286</sup> B. Aland, “Nutzen” 23 comments generally on the character of the alterations in P<sup>90</sup>, “An keiner der variierten Stellen ändert der Schreiber den Sinn der Vorlage. Die Varianten bestehen aus nicht sehr schwerwiegenden Umstellungen mit einer glatteren Umformung eines finiten Verbs in ein Partizip...”

<sup>287</sup> There is a similarity in quantity here between 01 and P<sup>66</sup> (even after contemporaneous correction), but the latter is not treated in the diachronic comparison above because it is only partially extant for the section of text preserved in P<sup>90</sup>. However, Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 495, 900-901 points out that P<sup>66</sup> has far fewer singular readings in the early chapters of John compared to the later ones, and thus growing fatigue in copying probably explains the number of singular readings here. By contrast, 01 seems to maintain a consistently high number of singular readings throughout the Gospel. For an illustration of this see my chapter on 0162, which covers a portion of John 2.

### 2.3. P<sup>107</sup> (P. Oxy. LXV 4446)

#### Introduction

P<sup>107</sup> is a small fragment from a leaf of a papyrus codex from Oxyrhynchus, Egypt, which contains portions of John 17:1-2 on the verso and 17:11 on the recto.<sup>288</sup> Among second and third century witnesses, it shares some extant text with P<sup>66</sup> (overlapping for portions of all three verses). W.E.H. Cockle published P<sup>107</sup> in 1998 and assigned it to the third century,<sup>289</sup> a dating that has since been affirmed by the INTF and Orsini and Clarysse.<sup>290</sup> It is described by its editor as “written in carbon ink in a semi-cursive script, which is largely bilinear. It has a slight tendency to slope to the right. It is written without excessive speed and very clearly.”<sup>291</sup> As with P<sup>75</sup> Orsini and Clarysse categorize P<sup>107</sup> as belonging to the “severe style.”<sup>292</sup>

The fragment itself measures 4.4 x 4.4 cm. and preserves remnants of seven lines on the verso and six lines on the recto that were written in one column, although Cockle’s transcription consists of eight lines on each side based on some additional traces of ink.<sup>293</sup> With no margins preserved, Cockle does not give an estimation of the page size. Chapa, however, gives a reconstruction of 10.5 x 23 cm. for P<sup>107</sup>, while Charlesworth puts the page at 12 x 22.5-24 cm., in Turner’s Group 8.2.<sup>294</sup> Working from the average of 23 letters per line, Cockle reconstructs the number of lines per page at 33.

---

<sup>288</sup> For this and further introductory information, see W. E. H. Cockle, ed., “Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 4446,” in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Volume LXV*, Graeco-Roman Memoirs 85 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1998) 14-16, plate IV-V (referred to as *editio princeps* for the remainder of this chapter); INTF *Liste*; LDAB: <http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/text.php?tm=61632>.

<sup>289</sup> See brief discussion in *editio princeps*, 14.

<sup>290</sup> Orsini and Clarysse, “Manuscripts and Their Dates,” 471. Cf. Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 648, who prefer early third century / ca. 200.

<sup>291</sup> *Editio princeps*, 14.

<sup>292</sup> Orsini and Clarysse, “Manuscripts and Their Dates,” 457.

<sup>293</sup> *Editio princeps*, 15.

<sup>294</sup> Chapa, “Early Text of John,” 141; Charlesworth, “Public and Private,” 155. Cf. Turner, *Typology*, 21.

There are no itacisms or orthographic readings in P<sup>107</sup>. What is preserved of this fragment suggests the use of *nomina sacra* for the nouns *πατηρ* and *υιος*. Cockle thinks it likely that *πατερ* was read at 17:11, recto 4 and was rendered as a *nomen sacrum*, although there are only two slight traces of ink that remain,<sup>295</sup> and he tentatively reconstructs with  $\overline{\pi\epsilon\rho}$  at 17:1, verso 2. He is confident that  $\overline{\upsilon\varsigma}$  was given for *υιος* in the lacuna in the middle of verso 4 at 17:1,<sup>296</sup> and, presumably based on that conclusion, he reconstructs with  $\overline{\upsilon\nu}$  for *υιον* earlier in the line. It nonetheless remains the case that no instances of *nomina sacra* are actually extant in P<sup>107</sup>.<sup>297</sup> Cockle regards it as “almost certain” that *ουρανου* at 17:1, verso 2 in P<sup>107</sup> was written *in pleno*, in light of the lack of early attestation of abbreviations for this word elsewhere.<sup>298</sup>

P<sup>107</sup> attests two cases of diaeresis, both of which involve the iota in *ἴνα* (17:1, verso 4; 17:2, verso 6), and, concerning *εν* at 17:11, recto 7, “a bar over the nu which may well be the remains of a rough breathing.”<sup>299</sup> B. Aland describes P<sup>107</sup> as reflecting a “normal” transmission of a broadly “Western” sort of text, with the latter being inferred from the agreement with D (a c e) *r*<sup>1</sup> in the long addition after *ερχομαι* at 17:11.<sup>300</sup> Elliott comments that agreements with W are “noteworthy,” which can be observed in *δως* and *αυτω* at 17:2 and *ω εδωκας* at 17:11.<sup>301</sup> Both Comfort and Charlesworth think it likely that P<sup>107</sup> was produced for private use, based at least partly on its semi-cursive handwriting.<sup>302</sup> This fragment is currently housed at the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

<sup>295</sup> *Editio princeps*, 16.

<sup>296</sup> *Editio princeps*, 16.

<sup>297</sup> As noted explicitly by Peter M. Head, “Some Recently Published New Testament Papyri from Oxyrhynchus: An Overview and Preliminary Assessment,” *TynBul* 51 (2000): 5.

<sup>298</sup> *Editio princeps*, 16. See also note below under 17:1 *επαρας...ειπεν*.

<sup>299</sup> *Editio princeps*, 15, 16.

<sup>300</sup> B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 9, 13 (“dem Einflußbereich des sog. westlichen Textes”). Cf. Chapa, “Early Text of John,” 153.

<sup>301</sup> J. Keith Elliott, “Five New Papyri of the New Testament” *NovT* 41, 3 (1999): 211. This is also noted by Head, “Recently Published,” 12 n.27; Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, 76.

<sup>302</sup> Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, 49; Charlesworth, ““Catholicity,”” 44.

Variation-Units Represented<sup>303</sup>

Variation-Units	Variants	P <sup>107</sup> Transcribed
17:1 <i>επαρας...ειπεν</i> <sup>304</sup>	<i>επαρας...ειπεν</i> <i>επηρην...και ειπεν</i> A C <sup>3</sup> K N Γ Δ Ψ 209. 700. 1844 <i>pm</i>	<i>επ[αρας...   [...ειπεν]</i> (verso 1-2) <sup>305</sup>
17:1 ο υιος	ο υιος 01 B C* W 0109*. 0301 d e ff <sup>2</sup> pbo; Or <sup>pt</sup>  ο υιος σου A D Θ 1. 579. 1844 lat sy sa ly bo  και ο (- K) υιος σου <sup>306</sup> C <sup>3</sup> K L N Γ Δ Ψ f <sup>13</sup> 33. 565 <sup>s</sup> . 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424 <i>Maj</i> . q v g <sup>mss</sup> ; Or <sup>pt</sup>  και ο υιος C <sup>2</sup> 0109 <sup>c</sup> 0211	κ[αι ο υς] (verso 4) <sup>307</sup>
17:2 δωση αυτοις	δωση αυτοις 01 <sup>2</sup> A C K 33 ( <i>incert.</i> Θ)  δωσει αυτοις (αυτω 1) B N Γ Δ Ψ 0301 f <sup>13</sup> 1. 565 <sup>s</sup> . 579. 700.	δως α[υ]τω (verso 7)

<sup>303</sup> Among the variation-units identified in NA28 that are represented by P<sup>107</sup>, I exclude from this treatment the following that are based on singular readings: 17:11 add. και οτε ημην μετ αυτων (+ εν τω κοσμω D<sup>1</sup>) εγω ετηρουν αυτους εν τω ονοματι σου (D); 17:11 om. ινα ωσιν εν καθως ημεις (P<sup>66\*</sup> it ly) (see Roysse, *Scribal Habits*, 450-451, 514 n. 614, 873). The former will be treated in the Diachronic Comparison section below. All transcriptions are based on *editio princeps* unless otherwise noted.

<sup>304</sup> I treat this as one variation-unit concerning hypotaxis vs. parataxis.

<sup>305</sup> Although Cockle begins his discussion of this reading with a note of uncertainty because he is unsure whether abbreviated forms / *nomina sacra* were read for ουρανον and πατερ in the lacunae, I have chosen to include the reading based on his subsequent comments. After considering an overall lack of early evidence for the abbreviation of ουρανος, he concludes, "It is therefore almost certain that ουρανος was written in full; in which case there would hardly have been room to add και before ειπεν, whether or not πατερ was abbreviated" (*editio princeps*, 15-16).

<sup>306</sup> There is a slight discrepancy among editions here regarding the correctors of Codex C. NA28 agrees with Tischendorf in attributing και to C<sup>2</sup> and the further insertion of σου to C<sup>3</sup>, which are listed as ca. 6<sup>th</sup> century and ca. 9<sup>th</sup> century respectively in K. Aland and B. Aland, *Text*, 108. IGNTP similarly divides the inclusion of these words between two correctors, but it ascribes the text without σου to the "04<sup>C1</sup>" corrector and the text with σου to "04<sup>C2</sup>" (479), which are listed as "contemporary with the first hand" and "generally dated to about the sixth century" respectively" (9). IGNTP makes no mention of a C<sup>3</sup> corrector or one dating to the 9<sup>th</sup> century. Regardless of when the first correction was made (and I have simply followed the NA28 *siglum* C<sup>2</sup>), the first corrector left the text as it apparently reads in P<sup>107</sup> (και ο υιος) (see following note).

<sup>307</sup> Cockle remarks, "kappa and the spacing thereafter guarantee that this was the reading of the papyrus," and he notes that this particular wording (presumably he means only the presence of και plus absence of σου, since the ending of δωξαση comes in the next lacuna and seems indeterminate) is apparently only found in P<sup>107</sup> (*editio princeps*, 16). Cf. Head, "Habits," 403 (but with ου erroneously written for ο) and B. Aland, "Kriterien," 9. None of these authors mention C<sup>2</sup> as also having this reading (see previous note) or 0109<sup>c</sup> (cf. IGNTP II, 125) and 0211, both of which also read και ο υιος (with δωξασει rather than δωξαση, which is not extant in P<sup>107</sup> (δ[ο]ξ[α]ση)). On account of these supporting witnesses, I have not considered this reading unique to P<sup>107</sup>.

	892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424. <i>I 844 Maj.</i> δωσω αυτω (αυτοις 0109) 01* 0109 δως αυτω (αυτοις L) L W εχη D	
17:11 ερχομαι	ερχομαι ερχομαι ουκετι ειμι εν τω κοσμω, και εν τω κοσμω ειμι D (a c e) r <sup>1</sup>	ερχ[ομαι   ουκετι ειμι ε]ν τω [κοσμω   και εν] τω [κοσμω ει]μι (recto 2-4) <sup>308</sup>
17:11 ω δεδωκας	ω δεδωκας P <sup>60</sup> A B C K Γ Δ Θ Ψ F <sup>13</sup> 1. 565. 700. 1241 <i>Maj.</i> ο δεδωκας D* X U 157. 1424 ους δεδωκας (εδωκας N) D <sup>1</sup> N 69. 209. 892 <sup>s</sup> aur f q vg sa <sup>mss</sup> ω εδωκας <sup>309</sup> 01 L W 579. <i>I 844</i>	ω εδωκας (recto 6)
17:11 καθως ημεις	καθως ημεις καθως και ημεις B Θ 579. 700. <i>I</i> 844 aur f vg sy <sup>h</sup>	καθως και η[μεις (recto 7)

### Commentary on Variants

17:1 επαρας...ειπεν: The variant επηρεν...και ειπεν seems to reflect influence from ηρεν...και ειπεν in 11:41, which is the one other place in the Gospel where Jesus is said to “lift up his eyes” and address the Father with the vocative πατερ. This

<sup>308</sup> Concerning this reading Cockle comments, “Since the reading in line 2 of the papyrus is clear, as is τη]ρησον in line 5, it is certain that the papyrus had some addition at this point. So little survives, however, and the traces in line 4 are so meager, that the reading offered in the text is far from certain” (*editio princeps*, 16). IGNTP online gives the same reconstruction and NA28 lists P<sup>107vid</sup> for this reading that is shared with D. I have also followed Cockle’s suggested reconstruction as the basis for my analysis, although its tentative nature should be kept in mind. This is not included as a created reading in P<sup>107</sup> or D in the Diachronic Comparison section below primarily because of the unlikelihood of coincidental agreement in such a reading (see also B. Aland, “Nutzen,” 35 (“Die Entstehung dieser Variante geschieht gewiß nicht unabhängig”).

<sup>309</sup> I do not include P<sup>66</sup> as a witness for this reading, since it is unclear from what is extant whether it read δεδωκας (Martin and Barns, *Papyrus Bodmer II, Supplément*, 22; IGNTP online; Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 454) or εδωκας (NA28; B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 9) after ω (cf. Martin and Barns, *Papyrus Bodmer II, Supplément*, plate 118). Cockle cites no more than ω[ ]κας for the reading in P<sup>66</sup> (*editio princeps*, 16). I have, therefore, only included ω in the percentages of agreement between P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>107</sup>.

conclusion is supported by the similar context and syntax and by other attested readings that may suggest harmonization between these verses, such as the additions of αυτου (P<sup>66c</sup> D 33. 1241. 1424 ff<sup>2</sup> r<sup>1</sup> sy<sup>p,h</sup>) and αυτου εις τον ουρανον (K 892<sup>s</sup> (I 2211<sup>c</sup> b π) sy<sup>s,hmg</sup>) after τους οφθαλμους in 11:41 (see also omission of αυτου in 17:1 noted in Diachronic Comparison section). P<sup>107</sup> appears to attest the reading that is not harmonized to usage elsewhere in the Gospel.

17:1 και ο υιος: Local genealogical priority and transcriptional probability favor the shortest reading, ο υιος. The presence of και and σου appear to be assimilations independent of one another, to general usage in the case of και (cf. ινα και in 7:3; 11:37, 52; 12:9, 10; 13:34; 17:21; 19:35) and to the immediate context in the case of σου (cf. σου τον υιον immediately before the ινα clause). The reading with both και and σου probably reflects a later conflation of these two other readings, which is supported by the fact that it is not attested among any of the witnesses prior to the sixth century. και may also be the result of assimilation to the frequent use of “also” in the near context (cf. 17:19, 21, 24, and see 17:11 καθως και ημεις discussed below). In having και P<sup>107</sup> attests a reading that is likely harmonized to general usage or the near context.

17:2 δωσ αυτω: The readings other than δωση αυτοις can be rather easily explained as harmonizations to text elsewhere in the Gospel. Jesus consistently refers to himself in the third-person in the immediate context, 17:1-3, so that δωσω probably reflects influence from the surrounding context where he speaks in the first person (16:32-33; 17:4 ff.). The second-person δωσ was likely affected by second-person uses of διδωμι in the immediately preceding context (εδωκας and δεδωκας) or, more generally, by the heavy concentration of such uses throughout chapter 17. εχη, read in D, is undoubtedly harmonized to general usage (3:15, 16, 36; 5:24; 6:40, 47, 54), especially 3:15, 16 and 6:40 where there are a number of syntactical

parallels (τινα clause, πας, and especially ζων αιωνιον). δωσει also seems to be harmonized to general usage (6:27; 11:22; 14:16; 16:23) but is most similar to 6:27, where υιος and ζων αιωνιον are likewise the subject and object respectively. By contrast, δωση is a transcriptionally more difficult reading, as it is found nowhere else in the New Testament and it best accounts for the emergence of the others, including the subjunctive εχη in D. The attestation of αυτω instead of αυτοις probably reflects assimilation either to the singular παν or the use of αυτω after δεδωκας. P<sup>107</sup> attests a reading that is harmonized to the immediate context.

17:11 ερχομαι ουκετι ειμι εν τω κοσμω και εν τω κοσμω ειμι: This additional text after ερχομαι, at least as it appears in D, is largely a repetition of syntax from the first two clauses of v. 11. It differs in that it does not include και from the first clause or αυτοι from the second (or ουτοι as in D), and the second clause reads with the first-person verb ειμι rather than εισιν. The additional text also reads without τουτω, which was read in the first clause in D. In Old Latin Codex a the first clause is moved to the third position and *et in hoc mundo sunt* is added before *Pater*, and *et iam non sum in hoc mundo* is added before *Pater* in c. Only r<sup>1</sup> and e agree with D in adding the text “but I am in the world” after “no longer am I in the world,” with the latter adding *et in saeculo sum* after the first clause and the former adding both clauses, as in D. In short, all of these witnesses attest the addition of at least one clause at this point but with very little agreement between them as to what is added and where.

In trying to account for this reading, at least as we have it in D r<sup>1</sup> and apparently P<sup>107</sup>, some have highlighted the repetitive nature of the addition, with B. Aland attributing it to a desire to reemphasize a weighty idea in the context and Barrett characterizing it as an “accidental repetition of the first two clauses of the

verse.”<sup>310</sup> Brown comments, “The addition seems to unite the statement in 11 that precedes “I am coming to you” with the statement in 13 that follows “I am coming to you.””<sup>311</sup> Schnackenburg portrays it as a sort of clarification or correction that resulted from reading “I am no longer in the world” without due consideration of the other two clauses with which it must be read and understood.<sup>312</sup> Though the exact reading remains uncertain, P<sup>107</sup> appears to attest this expansion of the text that involves some measure of repetition and clarification/reemphasis.

17:11 ω εδωκας: The context surrounding this variation-unit indicates that ω, which reflects attraction to the dative case of its antecedent ονοματι, is a transcriptionally more difficult reading than ο or ους. Concerning ο, in each of the three cases where attraction is attested in this chapter, whether in εν τω ονοματι σου ω δεδωκας μοι in vv. 11 and 12 or in τη δοξη η ειχον in v. 5, we see narrow support for a change towards the accusative (ην in 01\* 579 (17:5); ο in D\* 1424 a1 (17:11); ο in 01<sup>2</sup> (17:12)). This indicates that the attraction of the relative pronoun was a stumbling block to copyists who were expecting the accusative, especially since there is a heavy concentration of relative clauses with an accusative relative pronoun in and around chapter 17. As for ους, the context is saturated with references to Jesus’ followers, those whom the Father has given to the Son. In the most immediate context of vv. 11-12 we find language such as αυτοι (ουτοι), αυτους, ινα ωσιν εν, μετ’ αυτων, ετηρουν αυτους, ουδεις εξ αυτων, and in the preceding verses we see δωση αυτοις (v. 2), τοις ανθρωποις ους εδωκας (δεδωκας) (v. 6), αυτους εδωκας (δεδωκας) (v. 6), δεδωκα αυτοις (v. 8), περι ων δεδωκας μοι (v. 9), εν αυτοις (v. 10). In such a context ους is certainly not a more difficult reading. Accordingly, some

<sup>310</sup> B. Aland, “Nutzen,” 35; Barrett, *The Gospel according to John*, 507.

<sup>311</sup> Raymond Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, vol. 2, xiii-xxi (AB 29-29A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1970), 759.

<sup>312</sup> Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John*, vol. 3 (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 179 n.39.

commentators have regarded ους as a “correction,” which Barrett says “introduces again the notion that the disciples were given by God to Jesus (cf. vv. 2, 6, 9).”<sup>313</sup>

Reaching a confident conclusion from internal probabilities regarding εδωκας/δεδωκας, on the other hand, is more difficult, especially since there is variation between these two forms wherever one or the other is read in the surrounding context (cf. 17:2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 22, 24; 18:9). If we proceed, then, to treat the relative pronoun as a variation-unit in its own right and to set aside εδωκας/δεδωκας as inconclusive, P<sup>107</sup> attests the more difficult reading that is not influenced by the immediate context.

17:11 καθως και ημεις: The reading with και is transcriptionally less difficult because it further clarifies/fills out the syntax and could have easily been affected by other uses of και for “also” with pronouns throughout chapter 17 (cf. ινα ωσιν και αυτοι ηγιασμενοι (v. 19); ινα και αυτοι εν ημιν [εν] ωσιν (v. 21); ινα οπου ειμι εγω κακεινοι ωσιν μετ’ εμου (v. 24)). The sub-singular insertion of και by 047 before ημεις in 17:22 provides some additional transcriptional support for this conclusion. P<sup>107</sup> attests the smoother and contextually influenced reading.

#### Analysis of Manuscript based on Readings

P<sup>107</sup> supplies six variants for analysis but no clear singular or sub-singular readings (but see Diachronic Comparison section below for the possible omission of αυτου in 17:1). While all six of the variation-units listed above seem to concern influence from text within the Gospel, five of them are classified here as deriving from assimilation. In two of these variation-units P<sup>107</sup> has the non-harmonized reading: 17:1 επαρας ειπεν is not harmonized to similar prayer language in chapter 11, and 17:11 ω is not assimilated to syntax in the immediate and surrounding context

---

<sup>313</sup> Barrett, *The Gospel according to John*, 508. Cf. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 503; Metzger, *Commentary*, 213, who also points to possible influence from 18:9.

(setting aside δεδωκαϛ/εδωκαϛ as inconclusive on the basis of internal evidence). In three of these five variation-units, however, P<sup>107</sup> attests the harmonized reading, and in each case this is to usage (at least partly) in the immediate or near context: 17:1 και ο υιος, 17:2 δωϛ αυτω, and 17:11 καθωϛ και ημειϛ. The remaining variation-unit can be assessed according to stylistic/syntactical difficulty. In this case P<sup>107</sup> has the less difficult variant that consists of a two-clause interpolation involving repetition and clarification of the surrounding themes and syntax.

In summary, out of the six variation-units represented by P<sup>107</sup> only two or 33% of its variants are internally more probable than the alternative(s). Thus, in four or 67% of these variation-units, P<sup>107</sup> reads with the internally less probable reading. On the one hand, this high percentage of improbable variants certainly gives the impression of some measure of freedom or fluidity in the text inherited by the copyist of P<sup>107</sup>. This is accentuated by the fact that among these variants we find the rather lengthy addition of ουκετι εμι εν τω κοϛμω και εν τω κοϛμω εμι in 17:11, which, particularly on account of what is read in the second clause as well as the overall size of the addition, would be hard to explain as anything other than an intentional change. On the other hand, we notice that all but one of these improbable variants are small-scale, consisting of one or two words, and demand no explanation beyond unconscious influence: the addition of και in 17:1 and 17:11 probably due to the repetition of “also” in similar clauses throughout chapter 17 (and the use of ινα και throughout the Gospel, in the case of και ο υιος); the substitution towards the second-person form of the verb and the singular indirect object pronoun reflected in δωϛ αυτω in 17:2 showing clear signs of assimilation to the immediately preceding syntax. As for the interpolation in 17:11, the fact that there are a few different forms of repetition attested among the Old Latin witnesses at this point gives some credence to Barrett’s conclusion that we are dealing fundamentally with a repetition,

as opposed to some kind of editing or correction to the text. Finally, following Holmes' analysis regarding the origin of intentional changes, it may be more likely that this longer addition in 17:11 originated with the activity of readers than copyists.<sup>314</sup>

P<sup>107</sup> shares extant text with one other witness from the second and third centuries, P<sup>66</sup>. Since both of these papyri are highly fragmentary, some of the agreements and disagreements to follow are only partial, with the remaining portion of the respective variation-unit being lacunose. Based on what is extant or can be confidently reconstructed,<sup>315</sup> P<sup>107</sup> agrees with P<sup>66</sup> (after correction) two out of four times (50%): agreements (17:1 *επαρας...ειπεν* (lac. P<sup>107</sup>); 17:11 *ω*); disagreements (P<sup>107</sup> reading listed first) (17:2 *αυτω* [3] | *αυτοις*; 17:11 add. *ουκετι...ειμι* | no add.).<sup>316</sup>

#### Diachronic Comparison of Created Readings

Among manuscripts up through the seventh century, the portion of text covered by P<sup>107</sup> is fully preserved in 01, B, D, N and W.<sup>317</sup> Listed below are the readings deemed likely to have been created by each respective scribe. I do not include 17:2 *δως αυτω* as a created reading of P<sup>107</sup> or W due to what appears to be some affinity between these two manuscripts (see comments in introduction).

P<sup>107</sup>.<sup>318</sup>

---

<sup>314</sup> Holmes, "Codex Bezae as a Recension," 123-160.

<sup>315</sup> See note under P<sup>107</sup> in Diachronic Comparison section below for some uncertainty and disagreement regarding the reconstruction of P<sup>66</sup> in 17:1. The omission of the text from *ινα* to *ημεις* in 17:11 in P<sup>66</sup> was apparently corrected by an addition in the lower margin, which has not survived, as indicated by an insertion symbol after *μοι* (cf. IGNTP I, 365; Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 873). It is thus unknown whether or not P<sup>66</sup> agreed with P<sup>107</sup> in having *και* before *ημεις*.

<sup>316</sup> But see below for the possibility that *αυτου* was omitted at 17:1 in P<sup>107</sup>.

<sup>317</sup> Codices C and to a lesser degree A have lacunae at 17:1 and 17:11 respectively and are thus excluded from this comparison.

<sup>318</sup> See notes above in the table concerning my exclusion of *και ο υιος* in 17:1 and the long addition after *ερχομαι* in 17:11 from this comparison of created readings.

17:1 αυτου] om.<sup>319</sup> P<sup>107</sup>? 1321 (aur b e vg) (harmonized omission, to parallel usage in John (11:41) (see also discussion of 17:1 *επαρας...ειπεν* in commentary above)

**01:**

17:2 δωση αυτοις] δωσω αυτω<sup>320</sup> 01\* (harmonized substitution, to use of first person in surrounding context (in the case of δωσω) (see commentary on this variation-unit above for discussion of δωσω and αυτω))

**B (none)**<sup>321</sup>

**D:**

17:2 δωση αυτοις] εχη D (harmonized substitution, to general usage (see commentary on this variation-unit above))

17:11-12 πατερ αγιε τηρησον αυτους εν τω ονοματι σου ο δεδωκας μοι ινα ωσιν εν καθως ημεις οτε ημην μετ αυτων εγω ετηρουν αυτους εν τω ονοματι σου ους δεδωκας μοι] πατερ αγιε τηρησον αυτους εν τω ονοματι σου (ινα clause inserted then omitted by second hand) και οτε ημην μετ αυτων (+ εν τω κοσμω D<sup>1</sup>) εγω ετηρουν αυτους εν τω ονοματι σου ο δεδωκας μοι ινα ωσιν εν καθως ημεις οτε ημην μετ αυτων εγω ετηρουν αυτους εν τω ονοματι σου ους δεδωκας μοι<sup>322</sup> D (a complex

---

<sup>319</sup> Although he retains it in his reconstruction, Cockle raises the possibility, based on the fact that aur b e vg omit *suos*, that P<sup>107</sup> did not read αυτου after οφθαλμους at 17:1, since otherwise verso 1 “seems to be too long” (*editio princeps*, 15; cf. Elliott, “Five New Papyri,” 211). This is lacunose and uncertain but I have noted it here as a possibility (cf. IGNTP online for the suggestion that αυτου was omitted in this highly lacunose portion of P<sup>66</sup>, which is not the view of Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 453 (IGNTP online appears to accidentally omit the next line in its transcription of P<sup>66</sup>, as evidenced by a comparison with IGNTP I, 361)).

<sup>320</sup> δωσω is a sub-singular reading of 01\*, being shared with 0109, and the combination of δωσω and αυτω is singular.

<sup>321</sup> Both B and N (with *nomen sacrum*) have πατηρ in 17:11, but “no more than two spots of ink survive” after ειμι in P<sup>107</sup> (recto 4) (*editio princeps*, 16), making it impossible to be certain whether πατερ or πατηρ was read.

<sup>322</sup> See IGNTP online transcription for D. This is a complex singular reading that appears to be interpreted differently in IGNTP and NA28, at least in terms of how the units of variation are

singular reading involving what appears to be a leap from same to same plus addition of conjunction plus backwards leap from same to same (see note))

N:<sup>323</sup>

17:11 ονοματι] ονονοματι<sup>324</sup> N (dittography involving the syllable –vo-)

### W (none)

Regarding the quantity of these readings in the later majuscules, we find two in D, one in 01 (prior to later correction) and N, and none in B and W. If Cockle's proposal is accepted that αυτου in 17:1 may have been omitted in P<sup>107</sup>, and if we take it as having been created by the copyist, then P<sup>107</sup> sits right at the average of these five later witnesses, having either the same amount as or less than three of them. Similarly, the one harmonization in P<sup>107</sup> offers nothing unique, being matched by the harmonizations in 01 (17:2 δωσω αυτω) and D (17:2 εχη). Scribal blunders such as that found in N (17:11 ονονοματι) or complex/multi-layered singulars as in D (see 17:11-12) are absent from P<sup>107</sup>. These data do not support seeing greater freedom or

---

rendered. NA28 notes this as an addition of και οτε ημιν...εν τω ονοματι σου following τηρησον αυτους εν τω ονοματι σου in 17:11. IGNTP notes the omission of ο δεδωκας through ημεις at the end of 17:11 and the addition of ινα...μοι before εφυλαξα in 17:12. It appears that ο δεδωκας...ημεις in 17:11 was omitted due to a leap from same to same (ο δεδωκας...οτε), but that και was added before οτε was written either to smooth the transition or on account of influence from the repetition of και in the preceding context. The scribe then proceeded to copy the words following οτε until a backwards leap between the εν τω ονοματι σου of v.12 to that in v. 11 occurred. This final mistake led to the subsequent writing of what had been previously omitted at the end of v.11 as well as the rewriting of the beginning of v. 12. This multilayered reading is certainly not shared by P<sup>107</sup> (*editio princeps*, 16).

<sup>323</sup> The ου in 17:11 is corrected to ους by the first hand (IGNTP II, 483, 4). N has πτηρ in 17:1 and in 17:11 (B has πατηρ in the latter; see note above), but both of these places are lacunose in P<sup>107</sup> (verso 2 and recto 4). I relegate 17:11 ους εδωκας (a singular reading when taken together) to a footnote because neither of these words is singular and because εδωκας/δεδωκας is inconclusive on the basis of internal evidence (see commentary above).

<sup>324</sup> This reading is lacunose in P<sup>107</sup> (recto 5-6), but comparison of the lacunae at the end of recto 5 and beginning of recto 6 with what is reconstructed for similarly sized lacunae in the other recto lines indicates that there is not space for an extra syllable in either lacuna (cf. *editio princeps*, plate V).

textual laxity behind the copying of this third century witness than behind that of the later ones.

#### Conclusions on Stability and/or Fluidity

The fact that two-thirds of its variants are improbable seems to support characterizing P<sup>107</sup> as free and fluid, and yet an analysis of those variants shows that all but one are micro-level, one-word assimilations to very pronounced syntactical features in the context of Jesus' prayer in chapter 17. The one large addition suggests freedom to alter or expand the text, but its significance must be interpreted in light of its (partially) repetitious character taken together with the diversity of repetitious variants attested at this point, as well as the possibility that readers were responsible for its emergence. Finally, whatever might be said about the tradition leading up to P<sup>107</sup>, the comparison of created readings above indicates that no particular level of freedom marked the activity of its scribe. Here we find evidence for continuity in transmission between the third century and subsequent centuries.

## 2.4. P<sup>108</sup> (P. Oxy. LXV 4447)

### Introduction

P<sup>108</sup> is a fragment of the lower portion of a leaf from a papyrus codex from Oxyrhynchus, Egypt that partially preserves John 17:23-24 on the verso and 18:1-5 on the recto.<sup>325</sup> Among other second and third century Greek manuscripts, it shares extant text with P<sup>66</sup> (extant for every verse but with many lacunae). W.E.H. Cockle published P<sup>108</sup> in 1998 and assigned it to the third century, noting among other factors the use of metallic ink, which would not be expected prior to this time.<sup>326</sup> The INTF and Orsini and Clarysse have upheld this general third century timeframe.<sup>327</sup> Cockle describes the hand as a “handsome, medium-size, upright capital,” which he says is “a practised hand” with letters that are “firmly bilinear.”<sup>328</sup> Along with P<sup>5</sup> and P<sup>22</sup>, other early papyri of John, Orsini and Clarysse categorize the script of P<sup>108</sup> as belonging generally to the “Alexandrian stylistic class” but without “the loops and ornamental serifs.”<sup>329</sup>

The fragment itself is 6.2 cm. wide and 10.5 cm. high. The verso preserves part of 12 lines, one of which having only a partially extant nu and a slight trace of ink (verso 1) and one being entirely lacunose with some traces of ink (verso 2), and the recto preserves a portion of 13 lines. A lower margin of 2.5 cm. is extant as well as part of a side margin that measures 1.4 cm. on the left-hand side of the verso. Cockle reconstructs the page as 14.5 cm. wide and 18.5 cm. high, putting P<sup>108</sup> into

---

<sup>325</sup> For this and other basic introductory information, see W. E. H. Cockle, ed., “Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 4447,” in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Volume LXV*, Graeco-Roman Memoirs 85 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1998) 16-18, plate IV-V (referred to as *editio princeps* for the remainder of this chapter); INTF *Liste*; LDAB: <http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/text.php?tm=61633>.

<sup>326</sup> *Editio princeps*, 16-17.

<sup>327</sup> INTF *Liste*; Orsini and Clarysse, “Manuscripts and Their Dates,” 472. Cf. Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 651 for “late second/early third century (ca. 200).”

<sup>328</sup> *Editio princeps*, 16-17.

<sup>329</sup> Orsini and Clarysse, “Manuscripts and Their Dates,” 458.

Turner’s Group 9 Aberrant I,<sup>330</sup> and he notes that the written area likely measured 11.5 x 14 cm with 23 lines of text in one column. The number of letters per line ranges from 21 to 27 with an average of 23/24.<sup>331</sup>

P<sup>108</sup> has one itacism involving γενωσκη for γνωσκη in 17:23, verso 5, which is also read in B D Θ.<sup>332</sup> *Nomina sacra* are extant for Ιησους in the forms  $\overline{\eta\varsigma}$  (18:4, recto 9) and  $\overline{\eta\nu}$  (18:5, recto 12), but it is uncertain how 17:24 πατερ was written on verso 7. There are two cases of diaeresis involving  $\overline{\nu\alpha}$  (17:24, verso 10) and  $\overline{\upsilon\pi\eta\rho\epsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma}$  (18:3, recto 7), but no signs of punctuation are attested. According to B. Aland, P<sup>108</sup> is a strictly transmitted representative of an early Byzantine textual form, which she infers from the pattern of supporting witnesses that emerges among its deviations from the *Ausgangstext*.<sup>333</sup> Comfort gives P<sup>108</sup> the label of “fairly reliable” and notes some affinity with 01.<sup>334</sup> Both Comfort and Charlesworth consider it likely that P<sup>108</sup> was prepared for liturgical use based on the semi-literary character of its writing.<sup>335</sup> This manuscript fragment is currently housed at the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

#### Variation-Units Represented<sup>336</sup>

Variation-Unit	Variants	P <sup>108</sup> Transcribed
17:24 δεδωκας <sup>337</sup> (2 <sup>nd</sup> occurrence)	δεδωκας εδωκας B K N Γ Θ 209; C1	εδ[ωκας (verso 11) <sup>338</sup>

<sup>330</sup> Turner, *Typology*, 22.

<sup>331</sup> For the above information, see *editio princeps*, 17.

<sup>332</sup> It is listed as a singular reading of P<sup>108</sup> in Head, “Habits,” 403.

<sup>333</sup> B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 6, 12.

<sup>334</sup> Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, 76, 270.

<sup>335</sup> Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, 49; Charlesworth, “‘Catholicity’,” 43

<sup>336</sup> I exclude from this section of my analysis two variation-units of NA28 that are based on singular/sub-singular readings: 17:24 om. την εμην in D sy<sup>s</sup>; 18:2 μετα των μαθητων αυτου εκει in B (544). However, both of these readings are included in the Diachronic Comparison section below. All transcriptions in the following table are based on *editio princeps* unless otherwise noted.

<sup>337</sup> The reading of P<sup>108</sup> is lacunose and uncertain for ηγαπησας [1] at 17:23, verso 6; πατερ at 17:24, verso 7; ο at 17:24, verso 7 (see comments in *editio princeps*, 18). 17:23 ινα is lacunose in P<sup>108</sup> on verso 4 and is also excluded from this list of variation-units. Cockle comments, “After εις εν the MSS are divided between ινα, και, and και ινα; the last would probably make the line too long, but the papyrus could have read either ινα or και” (*editio princeps*, 18).

18:3 εκ των φαρισαιων <sup>339</sup> (2 <sup>nd</sup> occurrence)	εκ των φαρισαιων 01*. <sup>2b</sup> D L 579 a aur  των φαρισαιων B  φαρισαιων 01 <sup>2a</sup> A C K N W Γ Δ Θ Ψ f <sup>1.13</sup> 33. 565. 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424 <i>Maj.</i>	[φαρισαιω]ν (recto 7) <sup>340</sup>
18:4 ουν	ουν P <sup>60vid</sup> A B C K N Γ Δ Θ Ψ 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> aur <sup>c</sup> e vg sy <sup>h</sup>  δε 01 D L W f <sup>1.(13)</sup> 33. 565 it sy <sup>p</sup> co  – 579	δε (recto 9)
18:4 εξηλθεν και λεγει <sup>341</sup>	εξηλθεν και λεγει B C* D f <sup>1</sup> 565 lat  εξελθων ειπεν P <sup>66vid</sup> 01 A C <sup>3</sup> K L N W Γ Δ Θ Ψ f <sup>13</sup> 33. 579. 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424 <i>Maj.</i>  εξηλθεν εξω και λεγει P <sup>60vid</sup>	εξελθων ειπε]ν (recto 11) <sup>342</sup>

### Commentary on Variants

17:24 εδωκας: On account of the interchange of εδωκας and δεδωκας throughout this chapter and the fact that every occurrence of one attests variation towards the other (cf. 17:2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12; 18:9; especially 17:22 with parallel wording), I have excluded this reading as inconclusive on the basis of internal evidence. See also discussion of 17:11 ω εδωκας in P<sup>107</sup>.

<sup>338</sup> ην immediately precedes the extant εδ[ (see *editio princeps*, 17, plate IV).

<sup>339</sup> The reading of P<sup>108</sup> concerning what, if anything, preceded Ιησους at 18:2 is lacunose on recto 4 and uncertain based on spacing. Cockle says that the reading with the article before Ιησους, as opposed to και ο or no article, “suits the space available...the best,” but he concludes, “neither of the others can be ruled out” (*editio princeps*, 18).

<sup>340</sup> Cockle renders the beginning of this line as [και φαρισαιω]ν and later comments “spacing very strongly suggests that the papyrus did not read και εκ των φαρισαιων...nor και των φαρισαιων” (*editio princeps*, 18).

<sup>341</sup> Only the final nu is partially extant for the next variation-unit at 18:5 Ναζωραιον on recto 13 in P<sup>108</sup>.

<sup>342</sup> Cockle remarks, “The reading of the papyrus is more or less guaranteed by the spacing and the surviving nu” (*editio princeps*, 18).

18:3 φαρισαιων: The relatively frequent occurrence of φαρισαιος in the prepositional phrase εκ των φαρισαιων in the Gospel of John (1:24; 3:1; 7:48; 9:16, 40) as well as the εκ των before αρχιερεων in our verse come together to make the inclusion of εκ των (or των) in this variation-unit a transcriptionally easier reading. While there is little in the way of intrinsic evidence by which to assess this variation-unit, the prepositional phrase in 7:45 is worth noting. There we find the υπηρεται coming προς τους αρχιερεις και φαρισαιους, in which neither the preposition nor the article is repeated for the second noun. P<sup>108</sup> attests the reading that is not influenced by the immediate context and general usage.

18:4 δε: This variation-unit is situated in the introduction to the first words that Jesus speaks in the garden during his betrayal and arrest. Here and in Mark (14:48) these words are directed to the group of people who have come to take him away, while in Matthew (26:50) and Luke (22:48) they are spoken to Judas. Some of the witnesses in Mark (D a ff<sup>2</sup> q), Luke (A D N W Θ *Maj.*), and here in John (*f*<sup>13</sup> 69. 124. 788. 1346) attest a variant at this point that harmonizes to the ο δε Ιησους wording in Matthew. This evidence for assimilation to Matthew, even in Mark and John where the dialogue in question is not with Judas but with the crowd, taken together with the Ιησους δε reading in Luke (see also 22:52), should lead us to regard δε as suspicious and ουν as transcriptionally more probable for our variation-unit. P<sup>108</sup> attests the reading that is likely harmonized to Gospel parallels.

18:4 εξελθων ειπεν: Although Kilpatrick points out that copyists were generally more likely to alter the text in favor of hypotaxis,<sup>343</sup> the evidence supplied by the επηρεν...και ειπεν/επαρας...ειπεν variation-unit at 17:1 (see treatment of P<sup>107</sup>), for example, shows that one should be cautious about too quickly applying this explanation at any given variation-unit. In that case we have a clear parallel in John

---

<sup>343</sup> See discussion and references for 19:1 λαβων ο Πιλατος τον Ιησουν in P<sup>90</sup>.

from which harmonization can be deduced to explain the paratactic construction. While no such parallel is present in this case, there is yet enough evidence to suggest that a change towards ἐξηλθεν και λεγει occurred through harmonization to the near context. The second aorist indicative form, ἐξηλθεν occurs frequently in John, and nowhere more so than in chapters 18 and 19. In fact, we find two occurrences of ἐξηλθεν...και λεγει αυτοις in the near context, where Jesus' trial before Pilate is described (18:38; 19:4 (cf. also 19:5)). The addition of ἐξω attested in P<sup>60vid</sup> further supports seeing influence from those later verses, as that reading is probably affected by the repeated use of ἐξω with ἐξηλθεν in the upcoming trial narrative (18:29; 19:4, 5). In light of these observations it is reasonable to conclude that P<sup>108</sup> attests the reading that is not harmonized to wording found in the near context.

#### Analysis of Manuscript based on Readings

After the exclusion of 17:24 ἐδωκας, P<sup>108</sup> supplies three variants for analysis and no singular or sub-singular readings. All of these are in variation-units probably resulting from some form of harmonization. In two of them P<sup>108</sup> attests the non-harmonized reading: 18:3 φαρισαιων is not harmonized to the use of εκ των φαρισαιων in a number of places throughout the Gospel or to εκ των in the immediate context, and 18:4 εξελθων ειπεν is not influenced by verb usage or similar syntax from the near context. In one of these three variation-units, however, P<sup>108</sup> has a harmonized reading: 18:4 δε, which is harmonized to syntax in the Lucan and/or Matthean accounts of Jesus' arrest. In two-thirds of these variation-units represented, therefore, P<sup>108</sup> reads with the internally more probable reading. The one improbable variant is a one-word substitution of δε for ουν that is likely attributable to unconscious influence from familiar text. Similarly, if ἐδωκας in 17:24 were deemed improbable, it would likely reflect nothing more than unconscious assimilation to

one of the many occurrences attested by at least some witnesses in the immediate and near context.

P<sup>108</sup> shares extant text with P<sup>66</sup>, both of which are highly fragmentary. Based on what is extant or can be confidently reconstructed, and leaving aside itacisms and other orthographic readings, P<sup>108</sup> agrees with P<sup>66</sup> (after correction) in one of the two places where they overlap (50%): agreement (18:4 ἐξελθων ειπεν (lac. in both));<sup>344</sup> disagreement (P<sup>108</sup> reading listed first) (17:24 ειμι εγω | εγω ειμι (lac.)).<sup>345</sup> If the singular transposition of εγω and ειμι in P<sup>66</sup> is removed from consideration, then the two manuscripts agree in the one variation-unit for which they overlap.

### Diachronic Comparison of Created Readings

Among manuscripts up through the seventh century, the portion of text covered by P<sup>108</sup> is fully preserved in 01, A, B, C, D, N and W. Listed below are the readings deemed likely to have been created by each respective scribe.

#### **P<sup>108</sup> (none)**

#### **01:**

18:3 εκει] om.<sup>346</sup> 01\* (harmonized omission of adverb, to parallels (Matt 26:55; Mk 14:48; Lk 22:52))

---

<sup>344</sup> P<sup>66</sup> is very fragmentary for this section of text, but the top portion of what appears to be an ω after θ suggests that P<sup>66</sup> read ἐξελθων and thus agreed with P<sup>108</sup>, as reflected in IGNTP online and Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 456, but *contra* Martin and Barns, *Papyrus Bodmer II, Supplément*, 26, who transcribe ε]ξ[ηλ]θην. Cf. Martin and Barns, *Papyrus Bodmer II, Supplément*, plate 122.

<sup>345</sup> Only the μ of ειμι is extant at the end of the line in P<sup>66</sup>. The reading is taken as ειμι with the omission of εγω by Martin and Barns, *Papyrus Bodmer II, Supplément*, 24, IGNTP I, 369, and Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 455. However, based on spacing I concur with Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 518 n.633, 828, Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 39, 103, and IGNTP online that P<sup>66</sup> read εγω ειμι.

<sup>346</sup> This word falls in a lacuna on recto 8 in P<sup>108</sup>. However, for the unlikelihood that εκει was absent from this lacuna see the notes for 18:3 εκ των in the table (concerning the lacuna directly above) (cf. same sized spaces on recto lines 9-13). Spacing is even easier to determine in this case because we have the beginning of the word going into the lacuna and a trace of the end of the word coming out of it: ερχε | [ται εκει μετ]α (*editio princeps*, 18).

**A:**

17:24 δεδωκας [1]] εδωκας A 251 1355 (harmonized substitution to aorist, to usage in immediate or near context)<sup>347</sup>

**B:**

18:2 εκει μετα των μαθητων αυτου] μετα των μαθητων αυτου εκει<sup>348</sup> B (544)  
(transposition likely resulting from corrected omission of the adverb)

18:3 φαρισαιων] των φαρισαιων<sup>349</sup> B 0141 (harmonized addition of article, to immediate context/general usage (see commentary on this variation-unit above))

**C (none)**<sup>350</sup>

**D:**<sup>351</sup>

17:23 εμε] συ με D a d (harmonized addition of nominative pronoun, to συ με απεστειλας in immediate context (17:23))

---

<sup>347</sup> I make this judgment based primarily on its sub-singularity, since making a confident assessment of the direction and nature of variation between εδωκας and δεδωκας in this chapter is difficult (see comments on 17:1 ω εδωκας in P<sup>107</sup> and 17:24 εδωκας above).

<sup>348</sup> P<sup>108</sup> only has μαθη from μαθητων extant at the end of recto 4, but based on the placement of this word and nearby spacing Cockle remarks, "It is certain that the papyrus did not follow B" (*editio princeps*, 18).

<sup>349</sup> P<sup>108</sup> is lacunose for this reading (recto 7), but see note in table above regarding spacing for the 18:3 εκ των variation-unit.

<sup>350</sup> 17:23 εις εις was corrected to εις. The original reading is not considered here because it is unclear whether or not the corrector was contemporaneous with the first hand (see IGNTP II, 487, 9 for 04<sup>C</sup>).

<sup>351</sup> 17:23 εις το and 18:2 εκει ο Ιησους in D are excluded from consideration as lacunose in P<sup>108</sup> (verso 4 and recto 4 respectively). 17:23 συ εν εμοι καγω εν αυτοις is also excluded because the placement of the extant εν at the beginning of verso 3 and ωσι[v at the beginning of verso 4 do not preclude this reading in P<sup>108</sup>, since the εν could belong to εν εμοι or εν αυτοις. In addition to the readings listed below, D attests one case of a thematic instead of athematic verbal ending (18:2 παραδιδων).

17:24 την εμην] om. D sy<sup>s</sup> (harmonized omission of possessive pronoun with article, to use of την δοξαν ην... in immediate context (17:22))

N:

18:3 φανων και λαμπαδων] λαμπαδων και φανων N (transposition without apparent cause (perhaps affected by greater frequency of λαμπας than φανος in the New Testament (9 to 1)))

W:<sup>352</sup>

17:23 εμε] καμε W it (addition of και influenced by uses of “also” in surrounding context (17:19, 21, 24) (see also discussion of 17:11 καθως και ημεις in P<sup>107</sup>))

Among these eight witnesses, and at least as far as this small portion of text is concerned, P<sup>108</sup> and C project the greatest stability, with no singular or sub-singular readings. There is one each in 01, A, N and W and two each in B and D. While little can be said by way of comparison, it is noteworthy that the large majority of these readings are small-scale and probably unconscious harmonizations, just as we find in the one (possibly two) improbable variant attested in the underlying tradition of P<sup>108</sup>. This means that the one piece of evidence for freedom or fluidity attested by this third-century manuscript finds correspondence in the singular/sub-singular readings of manuscripts copied in later centuries. In sum, the similar quantity (some with none, most with one, some with two) and character of the readings listed above do not give an impression of diachronic discontinuity.

### Conclusions on Stability and/or Fluidity

---

<sup>352</sup> 17:24 θεωρουσιν in W\* and P<sup>60</sup> is not considered here because it was corrected to θεωρωσιν by the first hand (see IGNTP II, 487, 4).

P<sup>108</sup> represents a clearly written and carefully copied third-century manuscript of the Gospel of John. There is no evidence for readings created by its copyist and only the slightest evidence for improbable variants in its underlying transmission (one harmonistic substitution of δε for ουν with the possibility of one other one-word harmonization to the immediate/near context). The body of data covered in this chapter gives no indication that a greater proneness to error existed in the third-century than in subsequent centuries.

## 2.5. P<sup>109</sup> (P. Oxy. LXV 4448)

### Introduction

P<sup>109</sup> is a fragment from a leaf of a papyrus codex from Oxyrhynchus, Egypt that preserves text from John 21, with portions of vv. 18-20 on the recto and of vv. 23-25 on the verso.<sup>353</sup> This is the earliest manuscript witness to these verses and the only witness extant prior to the fourth century (P<sup>66</sup> preserves text from vv. 1-9 in this chapter). P<sup>109</sup> was published by W.E.H. Cockle in 1998 and dated to the third century, showing some similarities with P<sup>66</sup>.<sup>354</sup> The INTF and Orsini and Clarysse have also assigned it to the third century.<sup>355</sup> Cockle describes P<sup>109</sup> as “written in carbon ink in a very plain, upright, unligatured round hand 4 mm high; letters sometimes touch but there is no linkage.” He goes on to say that the “hand is an inept one of literary pretensions fashioned with a blunt pen.”<sup>356</sup> Orsini and Clarysse place its script generally in the “Alexandrian stylistic class” but “with contrast between narrow and wide letters.”<sup>357</sup>

The fragment known as P<sup>109</sup> measures 4.1 cm. wide and 7.9 cm. high. It preserves text from nine lines on the recto and ten on the verso (but with the sixth line on each side being entirely lacunose), which were in one column. Part of a margin is extant on the right side of the recto and left side of the verso. Cockle puts the reconstructed page at 12 cm. wide and 24 cm. high, placing it into Turner’s

---

<sup>353</sup> For this and further introductory information, see W. E. H. Cockle, ed., “Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 4448,” in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Volume LXV*, Graeco-Roman Memoirs 85 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1998) 19-20, plate IV-V (referred to as *editio princeps* for the remainder of this chapter); INTF *Liste*; LDAB: <http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/text.php?tm=61634>.

<sup>354</sup> *Editio princeps*, 19.

<sup>355</sup> *Liste*; Orsini and Clarysse, “Manuscripts and Their Dates,” 472. Cf. Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 653, who propose a date of “middle to late second century” based on their dating of P<sup>66</sup>.

<sup>356</sup> *Editio princeps*, 19.

<sup>357</sup> Orsini and Clarysse, “Manuscripts and Their Dates,” 458.

Group 8, and the lines per page at 26.<sup>358</sup> Based on his reconstruction, the average number of letters per line is 19, with a range of 18 to 22.

There are no itacisms or other orthographic readings in P<sup>109</sup>, and no signs of punctuation. Although *nomina sacra* are not preserved,  $\overline{\theta\nu}$  at 21:19, recto 6 and  $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$  at 21:25, verso 8 are reconstructed in the lacunae. There are two strokes of ink after  $\delta\epsilon$  at the end of recto 4 in 21:19, about which Cockle comments, “They look like parts of two uprights and it would be easy to read nu, which, however, is nonsensical. This ink cannot be part of  $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\nu$  [which he reconstructs at the beginning of the next line] and may be just an error which the writer then cancelled.”<sup>359</sup> He does not mention anything unusual in the spacing of the following line, which may be why he entertains the possibility of a quickly corrected mistake.

B. Aland classifies P<sup>109</sup> as having a “strict” transmission, with its small number of deviations from the *Ausgangstext* likely having been inherited from the *Vorlage*.<sup>360</sup> When it comes to classifying P<sup>109</sup> in terms of its textual character and reliability, Comfort considers the fragment “too small to determine.”<sup>361</sup> Charlesworth cites its non-literary and unprofessional hand and a lack of text-division punctuation as evidence that P<sup>109</sup> was produced in an uncontrolled setting for private use.<sup>362</sup> Comfort, on the other hand, puts it among manuscripts in which the size and calligraphic quality of letters (although less so than in P<sup>39</sup>, for example) indicate liturgical use.<sup>363</sup> P<sup>109</sup> currently resides at the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

---

<sup>358</sup> *Editio princeps*, 19. Turner, *Typology*, 20.

<sup>359</sup> *Editio princeps*, 20; cf. plate IV.

<sup>360</sup> B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 10; eadem, “Nutzen,” 36.

<sup>361</sup> Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, 76, 270.

<sup>362</sup> Charlesworth, “‘Catholicity,’” 44.

<sup>363</sup> Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, 49. Among papyri of John he also puts P<sup>5</sup>, P<sup>90</sup>, P<sup>95</sup> and P<sup>108</sup> in this group. Comfort elsewhere mentions that P<sup>109</sup> attests the feature of an enlarged letter at the beginning of the line, but he gives no specific reference as to where (27). In Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 653, the handwriting of P<sup>109</sup> is categorized as “reformed documentary.”

Variation-Units Represented<sup>364</sup>

Variation-Unit	Variants	P <sup>109</sup> Transcribed
21:18 αλλος + singular verbs <sup>365</sup>	αλλος + singular verbs A B C* <sup>vid</sup> K N Γ Δ Θ Ψ f <sup>13</sup> 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424. 1844 <i>Maj.</i> lat sy <sup>h</sup>  αλλοι + plural verbs P <sup>59vid</sup> 01 C <sup>2</sup> D W 1. 33. 565 sy <sup>hmg</sup>	αλλοι   [ c. 12 ]ουσιγ (recto 2-3)
21:20 επιστραφεις	επιστραφεις A B C W 33 lat sy <sup>s</sup> sa  επιστραφεις δε P <sup>59vid</sup> 01 D K N Γ Δ Θ Ψ f <sup>1.13</sup> 565. 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424. 1844 <i>Maj.</i> f sy <sup>h</sup> pbo bo	επιστραφ]εις (recto 8) <sup>366</sup>
21:23 τι προς σε	τι προς σε 01 <sup>1</sup> A B C* K W Γ Δ Θ Ψ f <sup>13</sup> 33. 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> lat sy <sup>p.h</sup>  προς σε D  – 01* C <sup>2vid</sup> 1. 565. 1582* a e sy <sup>s</sup>	τι]   προς σ[ε (verso 1-2) <sup>367</sup>
21:24 ο μαρτυρων	ο μαρτυρων  ο και μαρτυρων B C W; Or	[ο και μαρτυρων] (verso 3) <sup>368</sup>

<sup>364</sup> On account of its singularity the omission of v. 25 in 01\* is not treated here as a variation-unit (see also note under 01 in Diachronic Comparison concerning the corrector). All transcriptions in the table follow *editio princeps* unless otherwise noted.

<sup>365</sup> Following Elliott, “Five New Papyri,” 212, I have reshaped the variation-unit to fit what can be determined from the papyrus. NA28 gives αλλος σε ζωσει and οισει οπου, which are separated by και, as two separate variation-units in v. 18. Cockle’s reconstruction of the relevant text on recto lines 2-4 is as follows: αλλοι | [ c. 12 ]ουσιγ σε | [οπου ου θελεις τ]ουτο (*editio princeps*, 19). Commenting on the text that covers these two variation-units, he explains, “All that we can be certain of is that the papyrus did not read αλλος...but αλλοι” (20). Aside from the inference that plural verbs followed αλλοι, which can also be seen from the extant ουσιγ ending on recto 3, little else is clear. He adds that none of the variants in the tradition corresponds with the size of the lacuna, and as a result he very tentatively offers the possibility of the singular reading, αλλοι [ζωσουσιγ και οισ]ουσιγ σε (20). Although I do not include a separate table entry for a specific singular reading in this case, due to the extent of uncertainty involved, Cockle’s suggestion that something unique existed in the lacuna will be factored into my analysis below. See Head, “Habits,” 403, who notes Cockle’s suggestion but says, “There is no certain singular reading” (cf. B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 10).

<sup>366</sup> εις is followed by ο (see transcription, comment and photograph in *editio princeps*, 19, 20, plate IV).

<sup>367</sup> Cockle takes this as the reading but gives no further comment on how spacing supports the inclusion of τι at the end of verso 1 (*editio princeps*, 20). Nearly all the lines on the verso are reconstructed with 18 or 19 letters, with the exception being the higher number of 20 letters for lines 6 and 9. If τι were absent on verso 1, the line would be unusually short, with 16 letters. See also the number of letters reconstructed for parallel spaces directly beneath this lacuna on lines 2-4, which likewise support reconstructing with τι (cf. *editio princeps*, 19, plate V).

<sup>368</sup> Cockle comments, “spacing suggests that this was the reading of the papyrus” (*editio princeps*, 20). This is also the reconstruction given in IGNTF online, but Comfort and Barrett, *Text*,

21:24 αυτου η μαρτυρια εστιν <sup>369</sup>	αυτου η μαρτυρια εστιν B C* W εστιν η μαρτυρια αυτου 01 A C <sup>3</sup> K Γ Δ Θ Ψ f <sup>1.13</sup> 565. 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> εστιν αυτου η μαρτυρια D I 2211 αυτου εστιν η μαρτυρια 33	[αυτου η μαρτυρια]   εσ[τιν (verso 6-7) <sup>370</sup>
--	--	---

### Commentary on Variants

21:18 αλλοι + plural verbs: The language used for Peter’s martyrdom in v. 18 suggests crucifixion, although this has been debated.<sup>371</sup> Keener remarks, “whether the specific picture of crucifixion is present here or not (it probably is), Peter’s martyrdom certainly follows Jesus.”<sup>372</sup> It is thus worthwhile, in trying to ascertain the direction of variation at this point (from singular to plural or vice versa), to place this variation-unit against the backdrop of Jesus’ Passion narratives. Beasley-Murray, noting the variant αλλοι, comments generally that “the plural is read by some MSS...presumably on the assumption that several will engage in the task,”<sup>373</sup> and Morris similarly notes, “For any form of martyrdom one would expect a plural, for

---

653 reconstruct without και. See related note above for 21:23 τι προς σε concerning τι on verso 1 (just as verso 1 would have only 16 letters without τι, so too would verso 3 without και).

<sup>369</sup> I exclude 21:24 και ο as lacunose in P<sup>109</sup> (verso 4), since Cockle remarks that και ο, και, or ο και “could have been the reading of the papyrus” (*editio princeps*, 20). It is at least worth mentioning, in accordance with spacing observations made in previous notes, that the reading without the article would put the line at 17 letters, which is slightly below what appears to be the norm. The variation-unit at 21:25 α is also excluded as lacunose in P<sup>109</sup> (verso 8), as Cockle notes that either α or οσα could have been in the lacuna (*editio princeps*, 20).

<sup>370</sup> As with most of the text represented by this fragment, the lines involved here are almost entirely lacunose. Nevertheless, Cockle explains, “if the restorations suggested correctly indicate the line length, the papyrus must have had this order of words” (*editio princeps*, 20).

<sup>371</sup> See Oscar Cullmann, *Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr: A Historical and Theological Study* (2nd ed., trans. F. V. Filson; London: SCM, 1962), 88; Barrett, *The Gospel according to John*, 585.

<sup>372</sup> Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, vol. 2 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 1238.

<sup>373</sup> George R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (WBC 36; Waco Texas: Word, 1987), 394.

several people would be involved.<sup>374</sup> Indeed, the Passion predictions (see especially Mk 9:31; Lk 18:33) and narratives (see Matt 27:31, 35-36; Mk 15:1, 20, 24-25; Lk 23:1, 26, 33-34; Jn 18:28; 19:18, 23-24) in the Gospels clearly depict a plurality of executioners, and nowhere is this more explicit than in John, where we find reference to four individual στρατιωται (19:23-24). Although not definitive, these observations serve to tip the balance in favor of seeing the singular αλλος as a more difficult reading that could have been a stumbling block to those familiar with the plurality of individuals involved in Jesus' crucifixion. Evidence for such influence on our variation-unit can be seen in the attestation of απαγουσιν or the απο prefix by some witnesses (01<sup>c</sup> D W Π f<sup>1</sup> 33. 565), which suggests influence from the frequent occurrence of απαγω in and around the Passion passages noted above. Moreover, Jesus' Passion is evoked by language found in the context, such as σημαινων ποιω θανατω and δοξασει τον θεον as well as ακολουθει μοι (cf. Jn 12:33; 13:31-32; also Matt 10:38).<sup>375</sup> In attesting the plural, therefore, P<sup>109</sup> has the less difficult reading that is probably affected to some degree by Gospel Passion narratives.

21:20 επιστραφεις: Sentences beginning with a participle followed immediately by δε are very infrequent in Mark and John when compared with the other two Gospels and Acts. Where such occurrences vary in Mark as to syntax and the subject of the verb (cf. 6:16; 9:25; 10:14; 15:36, 39; 16:9), John's usage is uniform: participle + δε + ο + Ιησους (cf. 1:38 (v.l.); 6:61 (v.l.); 11:4; 12:14). This would appear to make the use of δε in our variation-unit unique in so far as the subject is ο Πετρος rather than ο Ιησους. In terms of transcriptional probability, there are a number of possible explanations for why it would be tempting to add δε here: the similarity of syntax with the construction noted above, the syntactical and contextual parallels with στραφεις δε ο Ιησους at the beginning of the Gospel (1:38),

<sup>374</sup> Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to John: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (rev. ed.; NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 876.

<sup>375</sup> Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 1238.

the abrupt transition and change of subject, and/or perhaps the use of δε at the beginning of two of the three previous sentences in vv. 18-19. P<sup>109</sup> attests the rougher reading with asyndeton.

21:23: τι προς σε: It is difficult to reach a conclusion on this variant based solely on internal evidence. The fact that these words are couched within a verbatim repetition of a large portion of v. 22 (εαν αυτον θελω μενειν εως ερχομαι τι προς σε) could be taken as support for their inclusion as intrinsically probable *or* as evidence for harmonization to the immediate context. The absence of these words may indicate their omission as unnecessarily repetitious, or, as Beasley-Murray suggests, “may be due to the desire of copyists to emphasize the main element in the sentence.”<sup>376</sup> Since these words do not constitute the “main element,” accidental oversight of superfluous syntax also remains a possible explanation. In light of the uncertainty involved, I have excluded this variation-unit as inconclusive for the purposes of the analysis below (but see Diachronic Comparison section for προς σε in D).

21:24 ο και μαρτυρων: Two factors serve to make the presence of και a transcriptionally more difficult and thus more probable reading than its absence. First, after noting that και in this case would carry the meaning “also” rather than “both,” Abbott explains, “Καί would naturally be omitted by scribes before μαρτυρῶν because it would seem to them, if genuine, intended to mean “both”: and this it could not mean.”<sup>377</sup> The omission of και, then, would be the elimination of what appeared to be an incorrectly written correlative construction (και...και), that is, in relation to the και before γραψας later in the sentence. Second, the nominative construction involving article plus noun plus article plus participle, as in ο μαθητης ο

---

<sup>376</sup> Beasley-Murray, *John*, 395.

<sup>377</sup> Edwin A. Abbott, *Johannine Grammar* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1906), 149 n.3.

μαρτυρων, occurs almost twice as frequently (aside from Revelation) in John than in any other New Testament book. It would not be surprising if after writing this construction nearly thirty times copyists stumbled over a unique occurrence with a και situated between the second article and the participle. Thus, whether it reflects a conscious desire to “correct” the syntax, as in Abbott’s explanation, or an accidental oversight of an unexpected word in a familiar construction, the absence of και is transcriptionally suspect. P<sup>109</sup> appears to have the reading not affected by general usage or the refinement of syntax.

21:24 αυτου η μαρτυρια εστιν: Among these word order variants, αυτου η μαρτυρια εστιν is the least similar to parallel wording elsewhere in the Gospel. There are several verses that contain some form of these words centered on μαρτυρια and αληθης/αληθινη (5:31, 32; 8:13, 14, 17; 19:35), but 5:32 (αληθης εστιν η μαρτυρια) and 19:35 (αληθινη αυτου εστιν (εστιν αυτου) η μαρτυρια (a few with αληθινη εστιν η μαρτυρια αυτου) are the closest parallels to our verse. The former, with αλλος εστιν ο μαρτυρων περι..., οιδα οτι, and αληθης, is the most syntactically parallel, and the latter, with the emphasis on conveying eyewitness testimony, is the most contextually parallel. Each of the readings in our variation-unit other than αυτου η μαρτυρια εστιν reflects the word order found in one of these two parallel verses (or, in the case of 19:35, one of the major variants in that verse). P<sup>109</sup> attests a reading that is not harmonized to parallel language within the Gospel.

#### Analysis of Manuscript based on Readings

Setting aside 21:23 τι προς σε as inconclusive, P<sup>109</sup> supplies four variants for analysis and no clearly identifiable singular or sub-singular readings (but see discussion in next section regarding αλλοι... in 21:18). Two of these are in variation-units that probably derive from harmonization, and in both cases P<sup>109</sup> attests the non-

harmonized reading: 21:24 ο και μαρτυρων is not influenced by familiar syntax involving noun plus participle used frequently throughout the Gospel, and 21:24 αυτου η μαρτυρια εστιν is not harmonized to parallel wording in John involving μαρτυρια and αληθης/αληθινη. The other two variation-units can be assessed according to stylistic/syntactical difficulty, and in 21:20 επιστραφεις we have the more difficult reading with asyndeton. 21:18 αλλοι + plural verbs, however, is a less difficult reading in which the more intuitive plural, with multiple executioners in view, replaces the singular. To summarize, in three out of four of these variation-units P<sup>109</sup> has the internally more probable/more difficult reading. Its one improbable variant concerning αλλοι and the following verbs appears to be a “correction” towards an easier text. It is reasonable to posit some level of influence from Gospel Passion narratives at this point, but the fact that the alteration includes two verbs along with the adjective indicates conscious editorial activity as opposed to unconscious influence.

#### Diachronic Comparison of Created Readings

Among manuscripts up through the seventh century, the portion of text covered by P<sup>109</sup> is fully preserved in 01, A, B, D, and W. Due to the level of uncertainty about what exactly was read in P<sup>109</sup> after the extant αλλοι in v. 18, but accepting Cockle’s suggestion that the papyrus probably contained some sort of unique reading (see note in table above), I wish to make one general observation before setting aside this section of text to explore the evidence from the remaining text covered by the papyrus. Three of these five majuscules with which P<sup>109</sup> is compared also attest a singular reading in some portion of the text between αλλοι and οπου: the unique

readings of 01\* (ποιησουσιν σοι οσα)<sup>378</sup> and A (οισει σε οπου)<sup>379</sup> were clearly not read in P<sup>109</sup>, and, going just beyond what is extant in that papyrus, D has two unique readings (ζωσουσει and απαγουσιν). Although agreement between B and C\* throughout this section of text makes it unlikely that the reading emerged independently, it is at least worth noting that ζωσει σε (i.e., these words in this order) appears to be unique to these two witnesses. The creation of readings in this section, therefore, appears to have been a problem for most of these witnesses, which means that, at least for our purposes, these readings practically serve to cancel out one another. If we now proceed to set them aside, we are left with the following evidence:

**P<sup>109</sup> (none)**

**01 (none)**<sup>380</sup>

**A (none)**

**B (none)**

**D:**<sup>381</sup>

---

<sup>378</sup> Both the beginning of the verb and οσα/οπου are lacunose in P<sup>109</sup> on recto lines 3 and 4 respectively, but the σε at the end of line 3 suggests that whatever was read in P<sup>109</sup>, it was not this singular reading of 01\*.

<sup>379</sup> From the ουσιν verbal ending before σε on recto 3 (and from what is implied already by αλλοι) it is clear that P<sup>109</sup> did not have this reading found in A c ff<sup>2</sup>. The singularity lies in οισει and σε together, neither of which being singular on its own.

<sup>380</sup> 21:18 την χιραν in 01\* falls in a lacuna in P<sup>109</sup> (recto 2) and is thus excluded. The large omission of v. 25 (εστιν...βιβλια) in 01\* is also excluded because it was corrected contemporaneously by the Scriptorium hand (IGNTP online).

<sup>381</sup> 21:18 συ for ου (or συ without ου) in D\* falls in a lacuna in P<sup>109</sup> (recto 4) as does 21:24 οτος for ουτος (verso 2) (and the latter was corrected by the first hand (IGNTP II, 552, 4)). I also exclude the addition of χρις before ιης in D at 21:25 as lacunose in P<sup>109</sup> (verso 8) due to the flexibility of spacing reflected in Cockle's comments regarding α / οσα on the same line (see note under table).

21:19 τουτο] ταυτα<sup>382</sup> D (harmonized substitution, to general usage (e.g. 6:59; 7:9; 9:22; 11:11; 12:41))

21:23 τι προς σε] προς σε<sup>383</sup> D (harmonized omission, to general usage (cf. 14:18, 28; 17:11, 13))

21:24 αυτου η μαρτυρια εστιν/εστιν η μαρτυρια αυτου] εστιν αυτου η μαρτυρια<sup>384</sup> D /2211 (harmonized transposition, to usage elsewhere in John (19:35 (v.l.); cf. also 5:32))

### **W (none)**<sup>385</sup>

The only observation to make here is the uniqueness of D: three singular/sub-singular readings for this small portion of text compared to none in the other five manuscripts.

### Conclusions on Stability and/or Fluidity

The change from singular to plural for the substantive adjective *αλλοι* and its accompanying verbs constitutes the only clear evidence for freedom or fluidity in the transmission represented by P<sup>109</sup>. In the one place where we probably have a unique reading, we see singular/sub-singular readings also attested in most of the later majuscules used in this comparison. This observation coupled with the low

---

<sup>382</sup> τ]ουτο is transcribed for P<sup>109</sup> on recto 4 (*editio princeps*, 19; cf. plate IV).

<sup>383</sup> τι falls in a lacuna in P<sup>109</sup> at the end of verso 1, but see note on spacing for the 21:23 τι προς σε variation-unit in the table.

<sup>384</sup> Only εσ of εστιν at the beginning of verso 7 is extant in P<sup>109</sup>, but see note on this variation-unit in the table above.

<sup>385</sup> On account of agreement between D<sup>C</sup> W Θ it, I have not included 21:18 συ ου as an independent creation of the scribe of W (agreement between W and Θ (and a few others) in 21:19 ελεγεν for ειπεν, which falls in a lacuna in P<sup>109</sup> (recto 5), supports this exclusion).

proportion of internally improbable readings (one in four) support characterizing P<sup>109</sup> as a testimony to stability and continuity in transmission.

## 2.6. P<sup>121</sup> (P. Oxy. LXXI 4805)

### Introduction

P<sup>121</sup> is a rather small fragment from the lower portion of a leaf from a papyrus codex from Oxyrhynchus, Egypt preserving some of John 19:17-18 on the recto and 19:25-26 on the verso.<sup>386</sup> Among Greek manuscripts dated to the second and third centuries, it shares extant text only with P<sup>66</sup> (overlapping for portions of all four verses). P<sup>121</sup> was published in 2007 by Juan Chapa and dated to the third century, which has been subsequently reaffirmed by Orsini and Clarysse as reflected in the Leuven Database.<sup>387</sup> Chapa remarks, “The text is written with a narrow pen in a right-sloping and mostly bilinear rapid script close to the ‘Severe Style’.”<sup>388</sup>

This papyrus fragment is 3.3 cm. wide and 4.5 cm. high and preserves parts of the last four lines of the page on both the recto (practically only three lines) and the verso. There is a 2.5 cm. margin at the bottom of the fragment, but no other margins are preserved. Chapa estimates that the page was 12 cm. wide and 28 cm. high with one column of text measuring 10 x 24 cm. He calculates 37 lines per page with an average of 23-24 letters per line, noting that the verso has an average of 22-23 letters but that the reconstruction for the recto, with only one estimable line of 27 letters, is more difficult to determine. The codex of John’s Gospel represented by this small fragment would have consisted of approximately 82 pages. In the end he cautions, “It must be noted however that, considering the size of the fragment, all

---

<sup>386</sup> For this and further introductory information, see Juan Chapa, ed., “Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 4805,” in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Volume LXXI*, Graeco-Roman Memoirs 91 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2007) 9-11, plate I (referred to as *editio princeps* for the remainder of this chapter); INTF *Liste*; LDAB: <http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/text.php?tm=112360>.

<sup>387</sup> See *editio princeps*, 9; LDAB.

<sup>388</sup> *Editio princeps*, 9. Cf. LDAB.

these figures are very tentative.”<sup>389</sup> Chapa’s reconstruction of the page size places P<sup>121</sup> into Turner’s Group 8.<sup>390</sup>

Chapa comments concerning what is extant for the name Κλωπα at 19:25 verso 1, “at the beginning of the line, a curving trace suggests ο rather than ω.”<sup>391</sup> He interprets this to mean either that phonetic interchange has occurred between ο and ω,<sup>392</sup> or that Κλεοπα from Κλεοπας was possibly written. Elliott points out that Η Ψ Ω 69 have the spelling Κλωπα here, implying that there is no need or basis for postulating a substitution to Κλεοπα.<sup>393</sup> The *nomen sacrum*  $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$  is read for Ιησους at 19:26 verso 2, which is also attested in P<sup>66</sup>.  $\overline{\mu\rho\alpha}$  for μητερα is reconstructed in the lacuna at 19:26 verso 2 based on spacing,<sup>394</sup> which appears to be written *in pleno* in P<sup>66</sup>.<sup>395</sup> The very small remnant of a stroke at the end of verso 4 in 19:26 immediately after  $\overline{\mu\rho}$  raises questions for Chapa, who says, “after rho there is only a tiny trace of an oblique stroke at the base of the line, which does not suit iota, but rather alpha.”<sup>396</sup> He suggests that the iota of  $\overline{\mu\rho\iota}$  could have been accidentally omitted and that αυτου may have been read afterwards, as in A Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> *Maj*. Elliott makes no mention of this conjecture in his discussion presumably because he does not judge that what remains of the stroke necessarily precludes iota.<sup>397</sup> Based on spacing and the absence of a supralinear bar over the extant mu P<sup>66</sup> appears to write μητρι *in pleno*.<sup>398</sup> Only the last letter nu and an accompanying supralinear bar are extant for what was probably a staurogram for εσταυρωσαν at 19:18 recto 3, as it is rendered in P<sup>66c</sup>.<sup>399</sup>

---

<sup>389</sup> *Editio princeps*, 10.

<sup>390</sup> *Editio princeps*, 10. Cf. Turner, *Typology*, 95.

<sup>391</sup> *Editio princeps*, 11.

<sup>392</sup> Cf. Gignac I, 276.

<sup>393</sup> J. Keith Elliott, “Four New Papyri Containing the Fourth Gospel and their Relevance for the Apparatus Criticus,” *JTS* 59 (2008): 677.

<sup>394</sup> *Editio princeps*, 11.

<sup>395</sup> Cf. Martin and Barns, *Papyrus Bodmer II, Supplément*, 39, plate 135.

<sup>396</sup> *Editio princeps*, 11. Cf. plate I.

<sup>397</sup> Elliott, “Four New Papyri,” 677.

<sup>398</sup> Cf. Martin and Barns, *Papyrus Bodmer II, Supplément*, 39, plate 135.

<sup>399</sup> *Editio princeps*, 10, plate I; Elliott, “Four New Papyri,” 677.

P<sup>121</sup> has two instances of diaeresis, one over the iota in εβραΐστι at 19:17 recto 2, and the other with the iota in ἰδων at 19:26 verso 2. There is a space before ις at the beginning of 19:26 verso 2, which Chapa says, “probably serves as punctuation.”<sup>400</sup> Based on its conventional size, semi-literary script, and the use of a space for punctuation, Charlesworth tentatively places P<sup>121</sup> in his list of “Public” Gospel Manuscripts.<sup>401</sup> This fragment is currently housed at the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

#### Variation-Unit Represented<sup>402</sup>

Variation-Unit	Variants	P <sup>121</sup> Transcribed
19:17 ο λεγεται Εβραΐστι <sup>403</sup>	ο λεγεται Εβραΐστι P <sup>66</sup> 01 A B K W 579. 1844 it  ος λεγεται Εβραΐστι D <sup>s</sup> N Γ Θ f <sup>1.13</sup> 565. 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424 Maj. e  Εβραΐστι δε L X Ψ 33. 249 vg <sup>cl</sup> sa bo <sup>pt</sup> (b vg <sup>st,ww</sup> ly)	...λεγε   ται ε]βραΐστι (recto 1-2) <sup>404</sup>

#### Unique Reading

Place of Variation	Readings	P <sup>121</sup> Transcribed
19:18 αλλους δυο εντευθεν και εντευθεν	αλλους δυο εντευθεν και εντευθεν (om. δυο 2145) <i>rell</i>  δυο αλλους τευθεν και εντευθεν D <sup>s</sup>  αλλους δυο ληστας εντευθεν και εντευθεν 1071 (ενθεν 1321)	[ ]α εντευ[θεν (recto 4) <sup>405</sup>

<sup>400</sup> *Editio princeps*, 10. Cf. plate I.

<sup>401</sup> Charlesworth, “Catholicity,” 43.

<sup>402</sup> Transcriptions are based on *editio princeps*.

<sup>403</sup> This is the only variation-unit treated in NA28 that is represented (and only partially) by P<sup>121</sup> (see following note). It is insufficiently extant for 19:17 Γολγοθα and 19:25 Μαρια [2] (cf. *editio princeps*, 10, 11).

<sup>404</sup> It can only be determined from what is extant that δε is not read after Εβραΐστι, which is followed by a gamma presumably belonging to Γολγοθα (*editio princeps*, 10, plate I). Cf. Elliott, “Four New Papyri,” 677.

	<p>αλλους δυο εντευθεν ενα και εντευθεν ενα 348. 1579</p> <p>αλλους δυο εντευθεν και ενα εντευθεν 579</p> <p>...α εντευθεν [1]... P<sup>121</sup></p>	
--	---	--

#### Commentary on Variant

19:17 ...λεγεται Εβραϊστι: It is clear from what is extant that P<sup>121</sup> does not support the variant with δε after Εβραϊστι. The syntax in our verse is very similar to that in 19:13 where Εβραϊστι δε Γαββαθα is read. Furthermore, there are other readings in 19:17 that similarly suggest influence from that verse, including τοπον λεγομενον P<sup>66vid</sup> Γ f<sup>13</sup> 700. 892<sup>s</sup>. 1424 *pm* it sa<sup>mss</sup> bo and Γαββαθα X. Thus, in so far as it does not read with Εβραϊστι δε, P<sup>121</sup> does not attest the reading that is harmonized to the immediate context.

#### Commentary on Unique Reading

19:18 ...α εντευθεν [1]...: Both ληστας (1071. 1321) and ενα (348. 579. 1579) from Mark are read by some witnesses at this section of text in John.<sup>406</sup> These readings, especially that in 579 where ενα precedes one of the occurrences of εντευθεν, lend support to Chapa's proposal that ενα in Mark's Gospel may have exercised influence on what was written in P<sup>121</sup>. The attestation of ενα with εντευθεν in these other witnesses, though different in terms of placement, gives plausibility to Chapa's

<sup>405</sup> What should be reconstructed for recto lines 3 and 4 is unclear in light of the lack of space for εντευθεν in the lacuna at the beginning of line 4 and the presence of the alpha that falls between the lacuna and the εντευθεν that is partially extant. Chapa says spacing precludes reconstructing with εντευθεν κ]α (with an omitted iota) preceding εντευ[θεν. He remarks, "it is very difficult to think of a good restoration with an ending in alpha. [εν]α εντευ[θεν και ενα εντευθεν would be a remote possibility." He adduces the text in Mark 15:27 with ενα εκ δεξιων και ενα εξ εωνουμων αυτου for comparison, implying the possibility of harmonization to this parallel account (*editio princeps*, 11). Elliott, on the other hand, is less willing to postulate what may have preceded the extant alpha, commenting, "No plausible restoration presents itself for what could have been read here" ("Four New Papyri," 677). See further discussion in analysis to follow.

<sup>406</sup> Neither Chapa nor Elliott mentions these readings.

proposed interpretation of the extant alpha immediately before what is presumably the first occurrence of εντευθεν. It can thus be reasonably concluded, though tentatively, that P<sup>121</sup> likely attested a harmonization to Mark 15:27.

#### Analysis of Manuscript based on Readings

This small fragment supplies only one variant and one potential singular reading for our analysis. The one variation-unit represented by P<sup>121</sup> is in 19:17 and concerns harmonization, at least as it pertains to the presence or absence of δε after Εβραϊστι. P<sup>121</sup> attests the variant that is not harmonized to the use of δε after Εβραϊστι in the immediate and preceding context. Thus, P<sup>121</sup> reads with the internally more probable variant in the one instance where it provides testimony.

As discussed above, it appears that P<sup>121</sup> read singularly in placing ενα before εντευθεν in 19:18, although it is possible that the extant alpha belonged to another word. Very little can be said about this hypothetical reading, but two points are worth noting. First, it is indeterminable whether or not ενα was read before both instances of εντευθεν. Just as 579 places ενα only before the second εντευθεν, the scribe of P<sup>121</sup> could have done the same before the first (assuming of course that the extant εντευθεν is in fact the first one, as Chapa proposes). Two occurrences of ενα would probably imply some level of conscious editorial activity to bring the text into conformity with that of Mark or to simply provide clarification. On the other hand, one instance of ενα, as we have in 579, would neither demand nor imply intentionality, since the word could have slipped in due to unconscious influence. Second, if the latter were the case, the letters ε-v at the beginning of εντευθεν, in addition to familiarity with the text of Mark, could have played a role in prompting its insertion. This means that even if we accept Chapa's restoration based on the

extant alpha that precedes εντευθεν, we may have nothing more than a one-word harmonization prompted by unconscious influence.

Among other second and third century witnesses, P<sup>121</sup> shares extant text with P<sup>66</sup>, which itself is fragmentary for this portion of John 19. Leaving aside orthographic readings, P<sup>121</sup> agrees with P<sup>66</sup> one out of two times (50%): agreement (19:17 Εβραῖστι not followed by δε (although it is unknown whether or not they agreed in reading ο λεγεται)); disagreement (P<sup>121</sup> reading listed first) (19:18 ...α εντευθεν [1] | δυο εντευθεν (although the nature and extent of disagreement is impossible to determine with confidence)). If the latter reading, which is unique to P<sup>121</sup>, is removed from this comparison, then these two papyri agree in the one variation-unit for which they overlap.

#### Diachronic Comparison of Created Readings

Among manuscripts up through the seventh century, the portion of text covered by P<sup>121</sup> is fully preserved in 01, A, B, N, and W. Listed below are the readings deemed likely to have been created by each respective scribe:

#### P<sup>121</sup>:

19:18 αλλους δυο εντευθεν...] αλλους δυο ενα εντευθεν...?<sup>407</sup> P<sup>121</sup> (harmonized addition, to parallel (Mark 15:27))

#### 01 (none)<sup>408</sup>

---

<sup>407</sup> See comments and notes above regarding the tentative nature of this reading.

<sup>408</sup> I exclude the 01\* omission of the text from Ιησους το μητερα (corrected to ις δε ἴδων την μρᾱ) and the addition of και before λεγει, both in 19:26, because they were corrected contemporaneously by the Scriptorium hand (S1) (cf. IGNTP II, 520, 7). I have also chosen to exclude δε in 01<sup>S1</sup> it sy<sup>p</sup> sa bo from this comparison, since the extent of versional support taken together with the fact that it is a corrected reading suggest that it was inherited rather than created.

A (none)

B (none)<sup>409</sup>

N (none)

W:

19:26 παρεστωτα] om.<sup>410</sup> W Λ\* (omission prompted by anticipation of the relative clause (ον ηγαπα) modifying μαθητην / influence from general usage (cf. 20:2; 21:7, 20))

Our papyrus and Codex W, which together constitute one third of the manuscripts used in this comparison, each attests a single unique reading, while the others have none. This hardly paints a picture of numerical discontinuity. In terms of the character of readings, it should be reiterated that there is only evidence (and even this is tentative) for the insertion of one ενα in P<sup>121</sup>, with there being no need to postulate a second insertion in the portion of text that is beyond the range of what is preserved on the recto.<sup>411</sup> We thus find correspondence between the reading of P<sup>121</sup> and that of W. Each involves one word and reflects influence from familiar text, whether from within the Gospel of John (19:26 om. παρεστωτα by W) or from another Gospel (19:18 add. ενα by P<sup>121</sup>). Although the data here are extremely limited, we can observe that neither in terms of quantity nor in terms of character does the reading of P<sup>121</sup> give the impression of discontinuity.

---

<sup>409</sup> As already noted, 19:17 Γολγοθ in B sa<sup>mss</sup> falls in a lacuna in P<sup>121</sup> (recto 2).

<sup>410</sup> The π is partially extant in P<sup>121</sup> at verso 3 and is transcribed with a sublinear dot (see *editio princeps*, 10, plate I).

<sup>411</sup> Cf. the reading of 579 above.

### Conclusions on Stability and/or Fluidity

This is a very small body of evidence and provides little data from which to draw conclusions. Nevertheless, the notion that a high level of fluidity or freedom existed at the time in which P<sup>121</sup> was copied does not receive support from what is available here. It reads with a transcriptionally more probable reading in the one place where its variants can be assessed, and its one hypothetical singular reading may very well reflect a minor and accidental harmonization. No marked difference emerges when its transmission is compared with that of the later majuscules.

## 2.7. P<sup>5</sup> (P. Oxy. II 208 & XV 1781)

### Introduction

P<sup>5</sup> constitutes two fragments from a papyrus codex of approximately 25 sheets in a single quire found at Oxyrhynchus, Egypt.<sup>412</sup> The first fragment (P. Oxy. 208) is 7.5 cm wide and 21.2 cm. high and consists of two leaves comprising the first and the sixth page on the verso with John 1:23-31 and 20:19-25 respectively, and the second and fifth page on the recto with 1:33-40 and 20:11-17 respectively. The second fragment (P. Oxy. 1781) is 6.8 cm wide and 24.5 cm. high, and consists of one leaf comprising the third page on the recto with 16:14-22 and the fourth page on the verso with 16:22-30. The outer edges of the first fragment are not extant, and the first leaf is lacking three lines at the bottom while the second leaf is lacunose in the middle and at the end. Turner puts the reconstructed page size at 12.5 cm. wide and 25 cm. high.<sup>413</sup> There were approximately 27 lines per page with a range of 21 to 33 letters per line.

Grenfell and Hunt dated P<sup>5</sup> to the third century and noted that it was likely from the second half of that century.<sup>414</sup> The INTF and Orsini and Clarysse have assigned it to the third century generally.<sup>415</sup> The editors describe the hand as a “round upright uncial of medium size” that is of “an informal semi-literary type.”<sup>416</sup> P<sup>5</sup> belongs to the “Alexandrian stylistic class,” but without “the loops and ornamental

---

<sup>412</sup> For the following introductory information see especially Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, eds, “Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 208,” in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part II* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1899) 1-8 (hereafter referred to as *editio princeps* 1899); idem, eds., “Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1781,” in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XV* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1922) 8-12 (hereafter referred to as *editio princeps* 1922); K. Aland, *Repertorium I*, 221; LDAB: <http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/text.php?quick=2780>.

<sup>413</sup> Turner, *Typology*, 145. He places it in his Group 8 (20).

<sup>414</sup> See *editio princeps* 1922, 8-9; for range of dates proposed, see IGNTP I, 17.

<sup>415</sup> K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste*, 3; Orsini and Clarysse, “Manuscripts and Their Dates,” 469.

<sup>416</sup> *Editio princeps* 1899, 2.

serifs,” along with P<sup>22</sup> and P<sup>108</sup>.<sup>417</sup> It attests diaeresis over initial iota and upsilon, the use of a supralinear bar for final nu, *nomina sacra* for θεος, Ιησους, Χριστος, and Πνευμα (with the latter three having the conflated form),<sup>418</sup> short blank spaces for pauses, two cases of rough breathing marks, and a number of corrections by either the first hand or a contemporary *diorthotes* (I list the corrections in the following paragraph).<sup>419</sup> This manuscript overlaps in places with P<sup>22</sup> (16:22-30), P<sup>66</sup> (1:23-31; 33-40; 16:14-30; 20:11-16, 19-20, 22-23, 25), P<sup>75</sup> (1:23-31; 33-40), P<sup>106</sup> (1:29-31, 40) and P<sup>119</sup> (23-28, 38-40). Grenfell and Hunt noted an affinity with 01 in their publication of the first fragment, but no such affinity was detected in the second fragment.<sup>420</sup> Epp places the manuscript in his D-Group.<sup>421</sup> Grenfell and Hunt identify in both fragments a “tendency to brevity,”<sup>422</sup> and the Alands categorize P<sup>5</sup> as a “normal” text.<sup>423</sup> It is currently housed at the British Library in London, England.

P<sup>5</sup> attests the following corrections: 1:38 οι δε is added supralinearly and erasure dots are placed over αυτω (recto 15-16; 2.1);<sup>424</sup> 20:19 και between μεσον and λεγει was originally omitted but then corrected via supralinear insertion (verso 2; 6.1); 16:19 ο is added supralinearly before Ιησους (recto 13; 3.2); 16:24 first sentence is omitted due to a leap between occurrences of εν τω ονοματι μου, which is corrected with an insertion at the bottom of the page (verso 35/8);<sup>425</sup> 16:29 the αυτω after λεγουσιν is added supralinearly. There are also the following orthographic corrections: 16:20 λυπηθησεσθε (recto 20; 3.2) from λουπηθησεσθε by striking through the omicron and changing iota to upsilon; 16:21 λυπην (recto 22; 3.2) after

<sup>417</sup> Orsini and Clarysse, “Manuscripts and Their Dates,” 458.

<sup>418</sup> Given the amount of extant text, I do not list each of them here, but see K. Aland, *Repertorium I*, 221.

<sup>419</sup> See *editio princeps* 1922, 9; Head, “Habits,” 404-405.

<sup>420</sup> *Editio princeps* 1899, 2; 1922, 9.

<sup>421</sup> Epp, “Significance,” 100.

<sup>422</sup> *Editio princeps* 1922, 9.

<sup>423</sup> K. Aland and B. Aland, *Text*, 95-96.

<sup>424</sup> “2.1” indicates “second page, first fragment” as given in IGNTP I.

<sup>425</sup> Cf. construal of what occurred in *editio princeps*, 12 and Head, “Habits,” 404.

correction of λουπην by insertion of υ over οι. I take the readings of the manuscript to be those after correction.

### Variation-Units Represented<sup>426</sup>

Variation-Unit	Variants	P <sup>5c</sup> Transcribed
1:25 και ειπαν αυτω <sup>427</sup>	και ειπαν (ειπον) αυτω – P <sup>119vid</sup> T 251 l	[ – ] (verso 5; 1.1) <sup>428</sup>
1:27 ο οπισω <sup>429</sup>	ο οπισω (– ο 01* B) P <sup>66.75.119vid.120</sup> 01 B C* L T W <sup>s</sup> Θ 083 f <sup>1</sup> 33. 579. 1241 a sy <sup>s,c</sup>  αυτος (ουτος Ψ) εστιν ο οπισω A C <sup>3</sup> K N <sup>vid</sup> Γ Δ Ψ f <sup>13</sup> 565. 700. 892. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> lat sy <sup>p,h</sup>	[ο οπισω] (verso 10; 1.1) <sup>430</sup>
1:27 ερχομενος	ερχομενος P <sup>66.75.119vid</sup> 01 B C* L N* T W <sup>s</sup> Ψ 083 f <sup>1</sup> 33. 579. 1241 b l sy <sup>s,c</sup> co  ερχομενος ος (– Θ) εμπροσθεν μου γεγονεν A C <sup>3</sup> K N <sup>c</sup> Γ Δ Θ f <sup>13</sup> 565. 700. 892. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> lat sy <sup>(p),h</sup> bo <sup>mss</sup>	ερχομε   ν]ος (verso 10-11; 1.1) <sup>431</sup>

<sup>426</sup> Some variation-units are excluded from consideration as based on singular/sub-singular readings: 1:25 om. και ηρωτησαν αυτον 01; 1:38 τινα Θ; 1:39 εκτη A; 20:12 om. δυο 01\*; 20:12 om. εν λευκοις καθεζομενους D<sup>s</sup> and καθεζομενους εν λευκοις 01; 16:19 επερωτησαι περι τουτου D and περι τουτου ερωταν Θ; 16:19 ουκετι Θ; 16:21 λυπησ D; 16:18 τι λαλει is excluded since it is unclear whether P<sup>5</sup> had τι λαλει or ο λεγει (recto 13; 3.2), and its omission is a sub-singular reading of B (some of these readings are treated in the Diachronic Comparison section). Some variation-units are added based on the readings of P<sup>5</sup>: 1:25 om. και ειπαν αυτω; 20:24 ουν ηλθεν; 20:25 om. αλλοι; 20:25 om. αυτου. Brackets and sublinear dots in the transcriptions follow IGNTP I unless otherwise noted, and numbers listed after the line number represent the page and fragment respectively (e.g., 2.1 = second page, first fragment). See comment in Diachronic Comparison section for why I do not consider the several P<sup>5</sup> and 01 agreements to be sub-singular.

<sup>427</sup> The presence or absence of οτ in 1:24 is excluded as lacunose (verso 3).

<sup>428</sup> There is “evidently no room in this line” for this clause (*editio princeps* 1899, 6). Cf. IGNTP I, 28, 130 (ηρω[ 15-20 ] / πτιζεις). I am reluctant to consider this omission a sub-singular reading on account of the number of supporting witnesses and the fact that it is (apparently) read by two early papyri. This reading has thus not been included under P<sup>5</sup> (or P<sup>119</sup> in that treatment) in the Diachronic Comparison of singular/sub-singular readings below.

<sup>429</sup> The text between Ιωαννης and υδατι in 1:26 is lacunose in P<sup>5</sup> (verso 8), with the result that the variation-units concerning λεγων and μεν (as well as υμας, which appears to be read in P<sup>119</sup> (see discussion under treatment of that manuscript)) are excluded from consideration. δε after μεσοσ and εστηκεν in 1:26 are also excluded as lacunose (verso 9).

<sup>430</sup> “There can be no doubt” that it read without αυτος/ουτος εστιν (*editio princeps* 1899, 6). Cf. IGNTP I, 130 (οιδα[ 16-21 / 1 ]ος). I have reshaped the variation-unit to exclude consideration of the presence or absence of the article, which is too lacunose for a determination.

<sup>431</sup> This is immediately followed by [ο]υ ο[υκ].

1:27 ουκ ειμι εγω	ουκ ειμι εγω P <sup>66c.119</sup> B N T W <sup>s</sup> Ψ 083. 579  ουκ ειμι P <sup>66*.75.120</sup> 01 C L f <sup>13</sup> 33. 565 aug* q  εγω ουκ ειμι A K Γ Δ Θ f <sup>1</sup> 700. 892. 1241. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> lat	ο[υκ ειμι (verso 11; 1.1) <sup>432</sup>
1:27 υποδηματος <sup>433</sup>	υποδηματος  υποδηματος αυτος (εκεινος E F G H 2*) υμας βαπτισει εν πνευματι αγιω και πυρι E F G H N 2*	[υποδηματος] (verso 12; 1.1) <sup>434</sup>
1:28 εν βηθανια εγενετο <sup>435</sup>	εν βηθανια εγενετο  εγενετο εν βηθανια P <sup>66</sup> 01* it	εν β[ηθανια εγενετο (verso 13; 1.1)
1:30 υπερ <sup>436</sup>	υπερ P <sup>5.66.75.106vid</sup> 01* B C* W <sup>s</sup>  περι 01 <sup>2</sup> A C <sup>3</sup> K L N P Γ Δ Θ Ψ 0101 f <sup>1.13</sup> 33. 565. 579. 700. 892. 1241. 1424. 12211 <i>Maj.</i> ; Eriph	ϋπερ (verso 19; 1.1)
1:33 εν πνευματι αγιω <sup>437</sup>	εν πνευματι αγιω  εν πνευματι αγιω και πυρι P <sup>75cvid</sup> C* sa	εν π[ν̄ι α   γιω] (recto 5-6; 2.1) <sup>438</sup>
1:35 παλιν <sup>439</sup>	παλιν  – P <sup>75</sup> Γ Ψ b e r <sup>1</sup> sy <sup>s.c.p</sup> bo <sup>ms</sup>	[ – ] (recto 8; 2.1) <sup>440</sup>

<sup>432</sup> Grenfell and Hunt comment, “εγω was certainly not read by the papyrus before ουκ ... and probably not after ειμι...for its insertion would make the line longer than any other in this column” (*editio princeps* 1899, 6).

<sup>433</sup> 1:27 αζιος is excluded as lacunose (verso 11).

<sup>434</sup> See transcription of verso lines 12-13 in *editio princeps* 1899, 3.

<sup>435</sup> The variation-unit concerning βηθανια is excluded as lacunose.

<sup>436</sup> The presence or absence of the article before Ιωαννης in 1:28 is excluded as lacunose (verso 14).

<sup>437</sup> I exclude the variation-unit in 1:33 regarding τω before υδατι as lacunose and indeterminate based on spacing (recto 2).

<sup>438</sup> *Editio princeps*, 6 notes, regarding another point, that the line already seems slightly long.

<sup>439</sup> The reading of P<sup>5</sup> at 1:34 ο υιοσ/εκλεκτοσ is lacunose (recto 7). *Contra* Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, 337, it is not clear whether the partially extant sigma belonged to υιοσ or εκλεκτοσ, since it cannot be determined with certainty whether or not υιοσ was written *in pleno*, and since an alignment of the letters from recto lines 5-6 and 8-9 with the omicron of του on recto 7 suggests that either υιοσ or εκλεκτοσ would fill the space to the left (i.e., either 18 or 22 letters compared with 18, 21, 20, 17 on lines 5-6, 8-9 in roughly the same-sized space; cf. IGNTP I, plate 3) (see *editio princeps* 1899, 4, 7 for εκλεκτοσ and IGNTP I, 29 for υιοσ).

1:36 θεου <sup>441</sup>	θεου θεου ο αιρων την αμαρτιαν (τας αμαρτιας W <sup>s</sup> ) του κοσμου P <sup>66*</sup> C* W <sup>s</sup> 892*. 1241 a aur ff <sup>2</sup>	[ θ̄υ ] (recto 11; 2.1) <sup>442</sup>
1:38 στραφεις δε <sup>443</sup>	στραφεις δε στραφεις 01* Γ 083	στραφεις δ]ε (recto 13; 2.1) <sup>444</sup>
1:39 οψεσθε <sup>445</sup>	οψεσθε P <sup>66,75</sup> B C* L W <sup>s</sup> Ψ <sup>c</sup> 083 f <sup>1</sup> 33. 579 sa <sup>mss</sup> ; Or <sup>pt</sup> ιδετε 01 A C <sup>3</sup> K N P Γ Δ Θ f <sup>13</sup> 565. 700. 892. 1241. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> latt sa <sup>mss</sup> bo; Or <sup>pt</sup>	οψε]σθε (recto 18; 2.1)
20:16 και προσεδραμεν αψασθαι αυτου <sup>446</sup>	και προσεδραμεν αψασθαι (αψεσθαι f <sup>13</sup> ) αυτου 01 <sup>2a</sup> Θ Ψ f <sup>13</sup> vg <sup>mss</sup> sy <sup>(s),h</sup> —	[ – ] (recto 19-20; 5.1) <sup>447</sup>
20:24 ηλθεν <sup>448</sup>	ηλθεν ουν ηλθεν 01*	[ουν ηλθ]εν (verso 14; 6.1) <sup>449</sup>

<sup>440</sup> There is not space for this word between the ε of *επαυριον* on the previous line and *νης* of *ιωαννης* on this line (IGNTP I, 133 allows 15-20 letter spaces, and 19-20 (depending on *ειστηκει*) are already reconstructed without *παλιν*).

<sup>441</sup> 1:35 ο before *Ιωαννης* is excluded as lacunose (recto 8).

<sup>442</sup> There is obviously no room for this addition per the extant text at the end of the line.

<sup>443</sup> 1:37 *και* is excluded as lacunose (recto 11), and *οι δυο μαθηται αυτου* is treated below in the table of unique readings.

<sup>444</sup> ο ης και θε is extant on this line after the epsilon (*editio princeps* 1899, 4).

<sup>445</sup> Determining whether or not *αυτω* was read after *ακολουθουντας* (1:38) in the lacuna on recto 15 is complicated by the fact that *αυτοις* on the same line was omitted in 01\*. I have excluded both from consideration. Spacing seems inconclusive regarding whether or not *μεθ* was attached to *ερμηνευομενον* on recto 16, despite Grenfell and Hunt's comments favoring *ερμηνευομενον* (*editio princeps* 1899, 7; cf. IGNTP I, plate 3 for the alignment of letters immediately after lacunae on surrounding lines). I likewise exclude the presence or absence of *ουν* in 1:39 (recto 19). The same-sized lacunae in the two preceding lines (one with 18 and the other with 19 letters) do not appear to necessarily favor either the presence of *ουν* (resulting in 20 letters) or its absence (17 letters) in the lacuna on this line.

<sup>446</sup> I present this variation-unit in this way so as to set it apart from the *διδασκαλε/κυριε* unit of variation just before (see table of unique readings below). The following variation-units are excluded from consideration as too lacunose to make a determination: 20:11 *εξω κλαιουσα* (recto 1); 20:14 *ταυτα* (recto 9-10); 20:15 article before *Ιησους* (recto 12); 20:16 article before *Ιησους, Μαριαμ, δε* after *στραφεισα* (recto 17-18); 20:16 *ραββουσι* (recto 18-19); 20:17 ο before *Ιησους* and *μη μου απτου* (recto 19-20).

<sup>447</sup> The placement of μ and τ at the beginning of lines 20 and 21 respectively appear to preclude the additional clause. See related discussion concerning 20:16 *διδασκαλε/κυριε* in the table of unique readings below.

<sup>448</sup> 20:19 ο before *Ιησους* (verso 1-2), 20:23 *τινων* (two occurrences) (verso 10-11), and 20:23 *αφεωνται* (verso 11) are excluded as lacunose. Since it is unclear whether or not *και* was read after *εδειξεν* (verso 4) and whether *αυτου* or *αυτοις* came after *πλευραν* (verso 5) in 20:20, which in

20:24 Ιησους	Ιησους 01 B D ο Ιησους Α Κ Λ W Γ Δ Θ Ψ 050. 078 <i>f</i> <sup>1.13</sup> 33. 565. 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424. 1844 <i>Maj</i> .	της (verso 14; 6.1)
20:25 αλλοι	αλλοι – 01* 122 bo sy <sup>p</sup>	[ – ] (verso 15; 6.1) <sup>450</sup>
20:25 αυτου <sup>451</sup> (1 <sup>st</sup> occurrence)	αυτου – 01*	[ – ] (verso 17; 6.1) <sup>452</sup>
16:15 παντα οσα...αναγγελει υμιν	παντα οσα...αναγγελει υμιν – P <sup>66</sup> 01* sa <sup>ms</sup> bo <sup>mss</sup>	παντα ος]α...[αναγ]γγελει υμι (recto 2-4; 3.2) <sup>453</sup>
16:15 ειπον	ειπον ειπον υμιν 01 <sup>2</sup> L N Θ it sy <sup>s.p.h**</sup> sa <sup>ms</sup> ly bo <sup>pt</sup>	ειπο]ν (recto 3; 3.2) <sup>454</sup>
16:16 με <sup>455</sup>	με P <sup>66</sup> 01 B D L W it sa ly bo <sup>pt</sup> με οτι (+ εγω 892 <sup>s</sup> ) υπαγω προς τον πατερα Α Κ Ν Γ Δ Θ 068 <i>f</i> <sup>1.13</sup> 565. 579. 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1424. 1 844 <i>Maj</i> . lat sy pbo bo <sup>pt</sup> με και οτι (εγω 33) υπαγω προς τον πατερα Ψ 33. 1241	[με] (recto 6; 3.2)
16:17 ου	ου	[ου] (recto 9; 3.2) <sup>456</sup>

each case makes characterizing the reading of P<sup>5</sup> difficult, these entire variation-units are excluded as lacunose.

<sup>449</sup> *Editio princeps* 1899, 6, 8, IGNTF I, 35, and Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 78 agree in reconstructing with ουν before ηλθεν in 20:24 on verso 14 (rather than after ελεγον in 20:25 on verso 15) and without αλλοι before μαθηται in 20:25 on verso 15. Grenfell and Hunt regard this as “clear,” since otherwise line 14 would be “considerably too short” and line 15 “impossibly long” (8). The IGNTF editors note that with a space after αυτων plus the presence of ουν the lacuna on line 14 would be “adequately filled,” and that the 21-22 letters permitted before ]ρακα on line 15 do not leave space for ουν or αλλοι (see 35, 407, 408).

<sup>450</sup> See note above for 20:24 ηλθεν.

<sup>451</sup> 20:25 τον τυπον is excluded as lacunose (verso 17) because it is impossible to know whether P<sup>5</sup> read with τυπον or τοπον.

<sup>452</sup> Based on a comparison with the same-sized lacuna of the previous line, Grenfell and Hunt note that “there can be little doubt” that the papyrus read without αυτου after χειρων (*editio princeps* 1899, 8). See also IGNTF I, 408 which allows for 21-22 letters on verso 17 before the ]πρω of τυπον (or τοπον), whereas 27 letter-spaces would be needed to accommodate αυτου.

<sup>453</sup> See transcription in IGNTF I, 30.

<sup>454</sup> *Editio princeps* 1922, 11 notes that “to read ειπον υμι]ν... would overload the lacuna.”

<sup>455</sup> 16:16 ουκετι is lacunose (recto 5).

	ουκετι D W Ψ 33	
16:17 υπαγω	υπαγω P <sup>66vid</sup> 01 A B L N Ψ F <sup>13</sup> 33. 118. 209. 565. 579. 700. I 844 lat pbo  εγω υπαγω D K W Γ Δ Θ F <sup>1</sup> 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> (f) sy <sup>h</sup> sa ly bo	[υπαγω] (recto 11; 3.2) <sup>457</sup>
16:18 ελεγον ουν	ελεγον ουν – D* it sy <sup>s</sup>	ελεγον ουν (recto 11; 3.2)
16:18 ο λεγει <sup>458</sup>	ο λεγει 01 <sup>2</sup> A B D <sup>2</sup> K L N Γ Δ Θ Ψ 068. 33. 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424. (I844) <i>Maj.</i> lat sy ly bo; Or  – P <sup>66</sup> 01* D* W F <sup>13</sup> 1. 565. 579 it sa pbo	[ – ] (recto 12; 3.2) <sup>459</sup>
16:19 ο	ο 01 D 1. 33. 565  ουν ο A K N Γ Δ Ψ F <sup>13</sup> 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424 <i>Maj.</i>  δε ο Θ 579. I844  – B L W	ο (recto 13; 3.2) <sup>460</sup>
16:19 ηθελον	ηθελον ημελλον P <sup>66(✱).c</sup> 01 W 579 c ff <sup>2</sup>	η[θ]ελον (recto 13; 3.2)
16:20 υμεις	υμεις 01* B D 1 it sy <sup>s</sup> sa <sup>mss</sup> ly bo  υμεις δε 01 <sup>2</sup> A K L N W Γ Δ Θ Ψ F <sup>13</sup> 33. 565. 579. 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424. I844 <i>Maj.</i> aur vg sy <sup>h</sup> sa <sup>mss</sup> bo <sup>mss</sup>	υμεις (recto 20; 3.2)
16:21 ωρα	ωρα ημερα P <sup>66</sup> D it sy <sup>s,p</sup> ly	ωρα (recto 23; 3.2)

<sup>456</sup> At 29 or 30 letters with ου, this line is already longer than most of those above and below (cf. IGNTF I, 30; *editio princeps* 1922, 9).

<sup>457</sup> “The lacuna would not admit of εγω υπαγω” (*editio princeps* 1922, 11).

<sup>458</sup> τι εστιν τουτο and το in 16:18 are lacunose (recto 12).

<sup>459</sup> *Editio princeps* 1922, 11 says, “for τουτο ο λεγει...there is clearly no room.”

<sup>460</sup> This is the reading of P<sup>5</sup> after correction. IGNTF I, 30, 31 points out the supralinear insertion of ο, which is not reflected in *editio princeps*, 9 (cf. IGNTF I, plate 4).

16:22 ουν νυν μεν λυπην	<p>ουν νυν μεν λυπην P<sup>22vid.66</sup> 01<sup>2</sup> B C* D L W Ψ 1. 33. 565. I 844 lat</p> <p>νυν μεν ουν λυπην 01*</p> <p>ουν λυπην μεν νυν A C<sup>3</sup> K N Γ Δ Θ (700). 892<sup>s</sup>. 1241 <i>Maj</i>.</p> <p>μεν ουν λυπην νυν f<sup>13</sup></p> <p>λυπην μεν 579</p> <p>ουν λυπην 1424</p>	ουν   νυν μεν [λυπην (recto 27; 3.2 – verso 28/1; 4.2)
16:22 αιρει <sup>461</sup>	<p>αιρει</p> <p>αιρει B D* Γ it vg<sup>cl.wv</sup> sa ly bo</p> <p>αφαιρει W</p>	αιρει (verso 31/4; 4.2)
16:23 αν τι	<p>αν τι B C L lat; Or</p> <p>οτι ο (ε)αν 01 Θ 33. 1241. I 844</p> <p>ο τι (οτι ?) (ε)αν P<sup>22vid</sup> A W</p> <p>ο εαν N</p> <p>οτι οσα (ε)αν K Γ Δ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565. 579. 700. 892<sup>s</sup>. 1424 <i>Maj</i>.</p> <p>(+ οτι D<sup>2</sup>) εαν τι D Ψ</p>	αν τι (verso 34/7; 4.2)
16:23 εν τω ονοματι μου δωσει υμιν	<p>εν τω ονοματι μου δωσει υμιν P<sup>22vid</sup> A C<sup>3</sup> D K N W Γ Θ Ψ f<sup>13</sup> 1. (δωη 33). 565. 579. 700. 892<sup>s</sup>. 1241. 1424 <i>Maj</i>. lat(t) sy pbo bo</p> <p>δωσει υμιν εν τω ονοματι μου 01 B C* L Δ I 844 sa ly</p> <p>δωσει υμιν 118</p>	δωσει υμειν]   εν τω ον[ομ]ατ[ι μου (verso 34-35/7-8; 4.2)
16:25 ερχεται <sup>462</sup>	<p>ερχεται 01 B C* D* L W 1. 33. 579 lat sa pbo bo; Or</p> <p>(+ ταυτα 892<sup>s</sup>) αλλα ερχεται A C<sup>3</sup> D<sup>2</sup> K N Γ Δ Θ Ψ f<sup>13</sup> 565. 700. 892<sup>s</sup>. 1241. 1424. I 844 <i>Maj</i>. c f q r<sup>1</sup> sy<sup>h</sup> ly</p>	[ερχεται] (recto 38/11; 4.2) <sup>463</sup>

<sup>461</sup> 16:22 εχετε is lacunose (verso 28/1).

<sup>462</sup> 16:24 αιτειτε is lacunose (verso 35/8).

<sup>463</sup> “The line is sufficiently filled without αλλα...before ερχεται, especially as a short blank space may well have been left after υμειν” (*editio princeps* 1922, 12).

16:25 απαγγελω	απαγγελω P <sup>66c</sup> A B C* D K L W Θ 33. 579 <sup>c</sup> . I 844  αναγγελω C <sup>2</sup> N Γ Δ Ψ f <sup>1.13</sup> 565. 579*. 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1424 Maj.  αναγγελλω 1241  απαγγελλω 01  λαλησω P <sup>66*</sup>	απαγγε[λω (verso 41/14; 4.2)] <sup>464</sup>
16:26 περι υμων	περι υμων – P <sup>66vid</sup> 36 b c e ly	[ – ] (verso 44/17; 4.2) <sup>465</sup>
16:27 του θεου	του θεου C <sup>3</sup> K W Γ Δ Ψ f <sup>1.13</sup> 565. 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424 Maj.  θεου 01*. <sup>2b</sup> A N Θ 33. 579  του (– 01 <sup>2a</sup> ) πατρος 01 <sup>2a</sup> B C* D L I 844 (ff <sup>2</sup> ) co	θ̄υ (verso 47/20; 4.2)
16:28 εξηλθον παρα του πατρος	εξηλθον παρα του πατρος – D W b ff <sup>2</sup> sy <sup>s</sup> ly pbo	εξηλθον]   παρα του π̄ρς (verso 47-48/20-21; 4.2)
16:28 παρα	παρα P <sup>22</sup> 01 A C <sup>2</sup> K N Γ Δ Θ f <sup>1.13</sup> 565. 579. 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424. I 844 Maj.  εκ B C* L Ψ 33	παρα (verso 48/21; 4.2)
16:29 λεγουσιν <sup>466</sup>	λεγουσιν 01 <sup>2</sup> B C* N Θ Ψ 1. 565 e q vg <sup>mss</sup> sy <sup>h</sup>  λεγουσιν αυτω (01*) A C <sup>3</sup> D K L W Γ Δ f <sup>13</sup> 33. 579. 700. 892 <sup>s</sup> . 1241. 1424. I 844 Maj. lat sy <sup>s.p.hmg</sup> co	λε]   γουσιν αυτω (verso 50-51/23-24; 4.2) <sup>467</sup>

### Unique Readings<sup>468</sup>

<sup>464</sup> *Editio princeps* 1922, 10 reads απαγ'γε[λω. While απαγγελω, which is a singular reading of 01, cannot be ruled out, it is clear that P<sup>5</sup> did not read αναγγελω.

<sup>465</sup> See *editio princeps* 1922, 12 and IGNTP I, 358 (ερωτησ[ 9-16 / 1 ]αρ). For P<sup>66</sup> see Martin and Barns, *Papyrus Bodmer II, Supplément*, 19, plate 115.

<sup>466</sup> 16:29 εν is lacunose (verso 51/24).

<sup>467</sup> This is the reading after correction, which involved the supralinear insertion of αυτω (cf. IGNTP I, 33, 359 (listed as a first hand correction – P<sup>5\*</sup>C); *editio princeps*, 12).

Place of Variation	Readings	P <sup>5c</sup> Transcribed
1:37 οι δυο μαθηται αυτου	<p>οι δυο μαθηται αυτου P<sup>55.120vid</sup> 01 B (892) b</p> <p>οι δυο αυτου μαθηται P<sup>66.75</sup> C* L W<sup>s</sup> Ψ 083. 33. 579</p> <p>αυτου οι (-οι 1346) δυο μαθηται A C<sup>3</sup> K N P Γ Δ Θ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565. 700. 1241. 1346. 1424 Maj. lat sy<sup>h</sup></p> <p>αυτου οι δυο μαθηται αυτου 28 (69)</p> <p>οι δυο μαθηται P<sup>5vid</sup> 157</p>	οι δυο [μαθηται (recto 11-12; 2.1) <sup>469</sup>
1:38 ειπαν αυτω	<p>ειπαν (ειπον) αυτω <i>rell</i></p> <p>ειπαν P<sup>5c</sup> 251. 1424</p>	ειπαν αυ[τῶ (recto 15-16; 2.1) <sup>470</sup>
1:40 Πετρου	<p>Πετρου <i>rell</i></p> <p>– P<sup>5vid</sup></p>	[ – ] (recto 22; 2.1) <sup>471</sup>
20:16 διδασκαλε	<p>διδασκαλε <i>rell</i></p> <p>κυριε διδασκαλε D d (magister domine ff<sup>2*</sup>) (magister et domine e)</p> <p>κυριε P<sup>5vid</sup> a r<sup>1</sup></p>	[ κε ] (recto 19; 5.1) <sup>472</sup>

<sup>468</sup> In 16:17 something unusual seems to have been present between what appears to be the nu of ειπαν at the end of recto 6 (3.2) and the alpha of μαθητων on recto 7 (Head, “Habits,” 405 points out that the partially extant nu supports reconstructing ειπαν at the end of line 6 (as in *editio princeps*, 9) instead of at the beginning of line 7 (IGNTP I, 30). Otherwise, there would be only nine letters, [ουν εκ των μ], in a space that calls for 12-17 (see IGNTP I, 353).

<sup>469</sup> There is no space for αυτου, as “it is impossible to get twenty-five letters into the lacuna of this line [recto 12]” (*editio princeps* 1899, 7).

<sup>470</sup> See *editio princeps*, 4 for transcription. P<sup>5c</sup> apparently attests the erasure of αυτω by means of supralinear dots presumably in conjunction with the supralinear insertion of οι δε (*editio princeps* 1899, 7 says οι δε was added “by the original scribe,” whereas IGNTP I, 29, 134 notes it generally as a correction potentially by another hand (P<sup>5c</sup> rather than P<sup>5\*c</sup> (see page 6))).

<sup>471</sup> The text with αδελφος Σιμωνος Πετρου εις εκ των δυο “is considerably too long for the space here available” (*editio princeps* 1899, 7). Although Grenfell and Hunt ultimately preferred the “safer” option of seeing των as omitted in the lacuna, which has other manuscript support in the tradition, their reasoning and evidence adduced from the lacuna on the next line (which indicates that 22 letters were present in the lacuna on our line) support an omission that matches the length of Πετρου (5, 7). The IGNTP I editors think that the size of the lacuna necessitates seeing a longer omission than that of των, thus concluding that Πετρου was omitted (29, 135 (α / [18-24]σο)). There would be 25 letters in the lacuna if των were omitted instead of Πετρου. Cf. brief comment in favor of the omission of Πετρου by Juan Chapa, ed., “Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 4803,” in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Volume LXXI*, Graeco-Roman Memoirs 91 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2007) 5.

<sup>472</sup> For transcription see IGNTP I, 34. For recto lines 19-21 only β at the beginning of line 19, μ at the beginning of 20, and τ at the beginning of 21 are extant. Grenfell and Hunt comment that the reading with ραββουνη ο λεγεται διδασκαλε λεγει αυτη [ο] Ἰης “produces a line of at least thirty-four

16:27 εγω	εγω <i>rell</i> – P <sup>5</sup>	– (verso 47/20; 4.2)
-----------	-------------------------------------	----------------------

### Commentary on Variants

1:25 om. και ειπαν αυτω: Grenfell and Hunt comment that because there is manuscript support for the absence of both και ηρωτησαν αυτον and και ειπαν αυτω, the longer reading with both of them was likely a conflation.<sup>473</sup> On the other hand, the text with both clauses coheres with John’s frequent use of parataxis (“and they answered him and said to him”),<sup>474</sup> so that it might be supposed that the omission of each clause reflects different attempts to smooth out redundancy when the sense is clear with only one of them.<sup>475</sup> However, neither of these explanations does justice to the immediate context. The letters surrounding και ηρωτησαν αυτον (see under 01 in Diachronic Comparison section below) strongly suggest that ηρωτησαν αυτον και (a more accurate way of depicting the unit of variation)<sup>476</sup> was omitted by a leap from the same to the same (Φαρισαιων και ηρωτησαν αυτον και, or simply from και to και). As for και ειπαν αυτω, we see that the last occurrence of και ηρωτησαν αυτον, which is in v. 21, is written alone, without και ειπαν αυτω or any other words. This indicates that in v. 25 copyists were likely influenced by the και ηρωτησαν αυτον written just a few verses before and thus inadvertently skipped over the second verbal clause straight to the dialogue. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that in both cases the dialogue begins with τι ουν (except for in a few witnesses in v. 21).

---

letters, which is obviously too long” (*editio princeps* 1899, 7). Based on this observation, along with the other readings that are attested at this point, they propose that  $\overline{\kappa\epsilon}$  was read instead of διδασκαλε. The IGNTP editors express their agreement with this judgment (34, 405). The curious reconstruction of line 19 supplied by Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 77 (β[ρουνι  $\overline{\kappa\epsilon}$  μου λεγει αυτη της μη), which leaves the line at 24 letters, does not cohere with the lengths of the ten previous lines.

<sup>473</sup> *Editio princeps* 1899, 6.

<sup>474</sup> Turner, *Style*, 71.

<sup>475</sup> See Metzger, *Commentary*, 13\*.

<sup>476</sup> So IGNTP II, 197.

With the absence of *και επαν αυτω*, therefore, P<sup>5</sup> attests a reading that is probably influenced by the immediate context.

1:27 ο οπισω: [ο] οπισω μου with *ερχομαι* is used three times in the opening chapter of John to describe Jesus, with *ερχομενος* here and in v. 15 and with *ερχεται* in v. 30. In the two other verses besides our own it is preceded by syntax that includes the demonstrative pronoun *ουτος*. Although the syntax differs, the other three Gospels refer to Jesus with *αυτος* in this context (Matt 3:11; Mk 1:8; Lk 3:16). The variant reading with *αυτος εστιν* in our verse shares the *αυτος* with Gospel parallels, the use of *εστιν* after the demonstrative with v. 30 (see also vv. 33, 34), and the overall syntax with v. 15. While some form of assimilation in this scenario is very likely, no specific harmonization presents itself in the variant *αυτος εστιν*. In light of Metzger's general description that "scribes would sometimes...add pronouns, conjunctions, and expletives to make a smoother text,"<sup>477</sup> the additional words may have served to explain and smooth out the syntax by clarifying the nominative subject. P<sup>5</sup> does not attest this smoother and generally assimilated reading.

1:27 *ερχομενος*: The additional text after *ερχομενος* is almost certainly drawn from the exact same wording in vv. 15 (but with *ος* in only a few witnesses) and 30. There is the slight possibility that a leap has occurred (*ος εμπροσθεν μου γεγονεν ου*), but the evidence for assimilation in a number of variation-units in this section of text makes this explanation less probable (see particularly the *αυτος εστιν* addition just discussed, which has very similar supporting witnesses). P<sup>5</sup> attests the reading that is not harmonized to the surrounding context.

1:27 *ουκ εμυ*: This variation-unit falls in a relative clause from the mouth of John the Baptist that appears in exactly the same form in each of the Synoptic

---

<sup>477</sup> Metzger, *Commentary*, 13\*.

Gospels, ου ουκ ειμι ικανος (Matt 3:11; Mk 1:7; Lk 3:16). This makes it very likely that the omission of εγω here reflects harmonization to the wording in those Gospels (cf. the related change from αξιος to ικανος below). P<sup>5</sup> attests the reading that is likely harmonized to Gospel parallels.

1:27 υποδηματος: The additional sentence after υποδηματος is an identical harmonization to Matthew 3:11 and Luke 3:16. P<sup>5</sup> attests the reading not harmonized to Gospel parallels.

1:28 εν βηθανια εγενετο: The fact that ταυτα and βηθανια both end in alpha suggests that the word order εγενετο εν βηθανια reflects a transposition caused by a corrected leap (ταυτα εν βηθανια εγενετο), in which εν βηθανια was initially skipped and then subsequently added out of place. P<sup>5</sup> does not attest this reading.

1:30 υπερ: This preposition appears in the speech of John the Baptist (ουτος εστιν υπερ ου εγω ειπον). περι appears frequently in the immediate to near context (1:7, 8, 15, 22, 47), and its occurrence in our variation-unit probably reflects harmonization to the nearly parallel content in 1:15. Here P<sup>5</sup> attests the non-harmonized reading.

1:33 εν πνευματι αγιω: The inclusion of και πυρι after αγιω is undoubtedly a harmonization to Matthew 3:11 and Luke 3:16. P<sup>5</sup> attests the reading that is not harmonized to Gospel parallels.

1:35 om. παλιν: There are two other occurrences of τη επαυριον... in the immediate context, one before our verse (1:29) and one after (1:43), and in both places the verb follows immediately after επαυριον without interruption. This suggests that influence from the immediate context may have resulted in the omission of παλιν here. It is also possible that it was omitted due to a leap from same to same (τη επαυριουν παλινν). P<sup>5</sup> attests an omission prompted by assimilation to the immediate context or a leap from one nu to another.

1:36 θεου: The addition of the clause ἰδε ο ἀμνος του θεου in the mouth of John the Baptist in this verse stems from a harmonization to the identical wording in the immediate context (1:29). P<sup>5</sup> attests the reading that is not harmonized to the immediate context.

1:38 στραφεις δε: In this pericope where the recruitment of Jesus' first disciples is described, both asyndeton and the use of connectives are used, so that, *contra* Bultmann, δε is a valid reading.<sup>478</sup> The introduction of dialogue from a new “dramatis personae” in the narrative,<sup>479</sup> especially as this is the entryway into the first words of Jesus in the Gospel, and the contrasting/challenging nature of Jesus' response to the disciples' act of following him,<sup>480</sup> show δε to be perfectly in line with the context. There also appears to be a pattern of usage involving participle + δε + ο + Ιησους in the Gospel (cf. 1:38 (v.l.); 6:61 (v.l.); 11:4; 12:14). Just as the presence of δε after the participle εμβλεψας in 1:42 is likely influenced by the use of δε here, the omission of δε in our verse may have been affected by that verse (cf. also 1:36). It is also possible that the reading επιστραφεις without δε in 21:20 in a similar context has influenced the reading here (see treatment of P<sup>109</sup>). We may also simply have the omission of a minor or inessential word.<sup>481</sup> P<sup>5</sup> does not attest the omission of δε that may be influenced by nearby or parallel usage.

1:39 οψεσθε: In terms of transcriptional probability, it is much easier to see how a scribe would change the mood of the verb from indicative to imperative, placing it into conformity with the preceding ερχεσθε, than vice versa. Thus P<sup>5</sup> attests the more difficult reading that is not harmonized to verb usage in the immediate context.

---

<sup>478</sup> Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 99.

<sup>479</sup> BDAG, 213

<sup>480</sup> Barrett, *Gospel according to John*, 180.

<sup>481</sup> See Dirk Jongkind, *Scribal Habits in Codex Sinaiticus* (TS III.5; Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2007), 143, who employs the term *verba minora* for such syntactical elements.

20:16 without και προσεδραμεν αφασθαι αυτου: This additional sentence states explicitly what is implied by the immediately following words of Jesus, μη μου απτου, that is, that she attempted to touch him. P<sup>5</sup> does not attest this interpolation that serves to fill out the context and smooth the transition.

20:24 ουν ηλθεν: οτε ουν at the beginning of a new sentence is rather frequent in John (2:22; 4:45; 6:24; 13:12, 31; 19:6, 8, 30; 21:15), which suggests that the οτε may have prompted the premature insertion of ουν, which belongs at the beginning of the following sentence after ελεγον. This harmonization to general usage has altered the sentence structure by removing the temporal clause (οτε ηλθεν Ιησους) from the end of the previous sentence, which now ends ...ην μετ αυτων, and placing it at the beginning of a new sentence, which renders little sense the further one reads into v. 25. P<sup>5</sup> attests a likely harmonization to general usage that involves a transposition and change in sentence structure.

20:24 Ιησους: Fee offers a thorough analysis of the use of the article with proper names in this Gospel and concludes that “in the nominative when it immediately follows the verb in certain kinds of subordinate clauses (οτι, οτε, sometimes οπου)” the proper name tends to be anarthrous.<sup>482</sup> The presence of the article quite possibly reflects influence from its frequent use with Ιησους in the immediate context (20:19, 21, 26, 29, 30, which are themselves not without variation). P<sup>5</sup> attests the intrinsically more probable reading that was not influenced by usage in the immediate context.

20:25 om. αλλοι: The context supports the use of αλλοι, as Thomas, the one being addressed, is the only one among the Disciples absent at this post-resurrection appearance of Jesus. It is not *the Disciples* who are speaking but rather the Disciples *other than* Thomas, since in the previous verse he is referred to as εις εκ των δωδεκα.

---

<sup>482</sup> Gordon D. Fee, “The Use of the Definite Article with Personal Names in the Gospel of John,” *NTS* 17 (1970-71): 213.

The occurrence with Peter in 21:8 supports the manner of expression here. It is likely that *ἄλλοι* was omitted by a leap (*οἱ ἄλλοι μαθηται*). It is not entirely clear whether or not the transposition of *οὖν* from the beginning of v. 25 to the end of v. 24 (after *οὔτε*) has affected this reading (see 20:24 *οὖν ἦλθεν* above). It seems reasonable to conclude that P<sup>5</sup> attests the omitted reading probably caused by a leap from same to same.

20:25 om. *αὐτοῦ* [1]: The absence of the possessive pronoun here after *ἐν ταῖς χερσίν* likely reflects harmonization to its absence after *τας χεῖρας* in the immediately preceding context. P<sup>5</sup> attests the reading that is harmonized to the immediate context.

16:15 *παντα οσα...αναγγελει υμιν*: The omission of this text stems from homoioteleuton, which has facilitated a jump from the *υμιν* before *παντα* to the *υμιν* before *μικρον*. P<sup>5</sup> does not attest this mechanical leap.

16:15 *ειπον*: The insertion of *υμιν* after a verb of speaking in the context of the Farewell Discourse would certainly be tempting given its prominence throughout this section. The five uses of the verb *λεγω* prior to our verse read with *υμιν* (15:20; 16:4 (twice), 7, 12), as do most of the nearby occurrences of *λαλεω* (16:1, 4, 6). These observations suggest that its presence here is likely assimilated. P<sup>5</sup> attests the reading that is not harmonized to the use of the indirect object pronoun in the immediate/near context.

16:16 *με*: The additional text after *με* is a harmonization to the end of v. 17. Jesus' words in v. 16 are identical to those reported in v. 17, with the exception of *ουκετι* and the text in question, where, to no surprise, there is variation in the tradition. P<sup>5</sup> does not attest this interpolation that is harmonized to the immediate context.

16:17 ου: Based on external evidence, ουκετι probably reflects harmonization to v. 16, but given the interchange and variation for ου/ουκετι in vv. 16 and 17, I consider this variant inconclusive on the basis of internal evidence.

16:17 υπαγω: υπαγω occurs with and without εγω throughout the Gospel, many of which with variant readings. The interpolation of these words at the end of v. 16 (see 16:16 με above) attests both εγω υπαγω and υπαγω. The fact that v. 10, which has content that is very similar to v. 17, does not read with εγω raises the possibility that its absence here is harmonized to that verse. However, especially due to the apparent interchange of use between υπαγω with and without the pronoun, I have regarded this reading as inconclusive on the basis of internal evidence.

16:18 ελεγον ουν: In 16:17 the narrator enters with “ειπαν ουν...” to introduce the reaction of the disciples to what Jesus has just stated in v. 16 as well as what he has been saying concerning his departure to the Father (v. 5, 10). Their first response is, “What is this that he is saying to us, ‘a little while and you do not see me, and again a little while and you will see me’?” (v.16). Then και and οτι are inserted to indicate that Jesus’ statement about his departure to the Father is an additional piece of information eliciting their reaction. At this point it seems improbable that the author, on the heels of introducing this second piece of quotation, would immediately return to the idea of “a little while” (μικρον) and repeat the same question as before “What is this (that he is saying).” The intervening ελεγον ουν (“So they were saying”), in contrast, fits well in the context by breaking up the syntax and allowing the evangelist to hone in on the penultimate idea, μικρον. Besides, in terms of transcriptional probability, if ελεγον ουν were a later insertion, either through assimilation to the previous verse or to smooth the text, one might expect a simple repetition of ειπαν ουν rather than a shift to the imperfect, especially since the imperfect is nowhere in the vicinity. In the context of the ongoing speech of

the Disciples, it is more likely that ελεγον ουν was either overlooked or eliminated as inessential syntax situated in the middle of this reported speech. P<sup>5</sup> does not attest this omission.

16:18 without ο λεγει: The presence of ο λεγει brings the text into conformity with the previous verse and is thus transcriptionally suspect. The fact that variation surrounds both ο λεγει and the το before μικρον (whose absence and presence, respectively, bring the text out of conformity with the wording in the previous verse) suggests a temptation to harmonize at this point and provides support for regarding the dissimilar variant in each case as more probable. The word order of τι εστιν τουτο is less clear, since a transposition resulting from a corrected leap could have given rise to the word order τουτο τι εστιν (ουν τι εστιν τουτο). P<sup>5</sup> does not attest this addition that is likely harmonized to the immediate context.

16:19 ο: In this verb-plus-nominative Ιησους construction (εγνω [ο] Ιησους) in the Gospel of John, Fee shows that there are nine undisputed cases where Ιησους has the article and seven additional cases with only one dissenting manuscript, while there are practically no undisputed instances of the anarthrous usage. He says, however, that there is some external evidence to suggest that this may not be the case for verbs reflecting “mental processes.”<sup>483</sup> The presence of ουν and δε in our variation-unit appear to be separate responses to the abrupt transition caused by asyndeton, and ουν is probably influenced by its use at the beginning of vv. 17 and 18. In not attesting these connectives, P<sup>5</sup> has the more difficult reading that retains asyndeton.

16:19 ηθελον: Here the issue is which helper verb to take with the infinitive ερωταν. P<sup>5</sup> reads, “Jesus knew that *they were wanting* to ask him” instead of “...that *they were about* to ask him.” The Disciples’ reluctance to question Jesus as described

---

<sup>483</sup> Fee, “The Use of the Definite Article,” 180-81; although he uses the uncorrected P<sup>5</sup> as evidence in his evaluation.

in 4:27, for example, takes some support away from ημελλον, at least in terms of John's way of characterizing how the Disciples relate to Jesus, since that word implies that they fully intend to question him. However, there are places in John where individual disciples do not seem hesitant about asking Jesus for clarification (14:5, 22). It is possible that the similar syntax in 6:15 (Ιησους ουν γνους οτι μελλουσιν ερχεσθαι και αρπαζειν αυτον) has exercised influence, although this is less than satisfying given the lack of proximity and contextual relatedness. I have regarded this reading as inconclusive on the basis of internal evidence.<sup>484</sup>

16:20 υμεις: It appears that δε was inserted on account of what appeared to be a contrast between one statement (υμεις λυπηθησεσθε) and that preceding it (ο δε κοσμος χαρησεται). Although the one topic of Jesus' going away and coming again is being treated, there are nonetheless two separate sentences with their own internal contrasts at work in v. 20. The first sentence indicates this by δε in its second clause (αμην αμην λεγω υμιν οτι κλαυσετε και θρηνησετε υμεις, ο δε κοσμος χαρησεται); and the second sentence indicates this by αλλα in its second clause (υμεις λυπηθησεσθε, αλλ' η λυπη υμων εις χαραν γενησεται). It appears that δε was inserted to show contrast between the end of the first sentence ("but the world will rejoice") and the beginning of the second ("δε you will grieve"). P<sup>5</sup> attests the more difficult reading.

16:21 ωρα: ωρα is used consistently throughout this portion of the Farewell Discourse (16:2, 4, 25, 32), and Jesus specifically uses it in v. 25 for the time of joy, knowledge and access to the Father that corresponds with the after-effect of the woman's birth described here. ημερα seems to reflect influence from vv. 23 and 26 (εν εκεινη τη ημερα), where a clear connection is drawn (via Jesus' explanation of the metaphor in v. 22) between the time of joy after a woman's birth and the time

---

<sup>484</sup> See Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 456 for discussion of the conflated reading in P<sup>66\*</sup>.

described as “in that day.” Thus, this substitution likely resulted from reading the nearby *ἡμερα* back into the metaphor. P<sup>5</sup> attests the non-harmonized reading.

16:22 *οὐν νουν μεν λυπην*: I have considered this reading inconclusive for the purposes of my analysis, especially with respect to the two major word order variants. Corrected and uncorrected omissions or leaps appear to be at the root of this variation-unit, given that all of these words end in the letter nu, the first three words are of the same length, and the first two words share the last two letters and result in a similar sound. It is thus no surprise that omissions and rearrangements of these words occurred.

16:22 *απει*: P<sup>5</sup> attests the future rather than present tense of *αιρω*. Since the two previous verbs *οψομαι* and *χαρησεται* are in the future tense, it is highly probable that the future in this variation-unit is assimilated to those occurrences. It is, by contrast, hard to see what would prompt a shift to the present tense. P<sup>5</sup> attests a reading that is harmonized to the immediate context.

16:23 *αν τι*: In the end, “The thought of the clause is expressed with virtually identical meaning in four slightly different readings.”<sup>485</sup> It is important to begin by observing that this variation-unit concerns what comes directly after Jesus’ opening proclamation *αμην αμην λεγω υμιν*. In the 24 other cases of the “truly, truly” construction in John, there are no occurrences of *εαν* or *αν* after *οτι* but five occurrences of *εαν* without this discourse marker, making the variants here that begin with *οτι* less akin to John’s style. Another necessary observation is that this variation-unit is the beginning of the reoccurring formula, “whatever you ask in my name,” which we find written as *ο τι (ε)αν* (14:13 (except P<sup>66</sup> 1. 565 *pc*); 15:16) and *εαν τι* (14:14) elsewhere in John. This indicates that harmonization lies behind the variants in our variation-unit with that same wording. Likewise, the reading with *οσα*

---

<sup>485</sup> Metzger, *Commentary*, 211.

probably reflects harmonization to John 11:22 or Matthew 21:22. By contrast, *αν τι* does not correspond to any of these parallel passages either in or outside of John. P<sup>5</sup> attests a more difficult reading that is not harmonized to parallel usage elsewhere in the Gospel.

16:23 *δωσει υμιν εν τω ονοματι μου*: The absence of *εν τω ονοματι* in a few witnesses does not fit the context, as it results in a disjuncture with v. 24a. The placement of *δωσει υμιν* before the prepositional phrase alters the focus from praying in Jesus' name to the Father giving in Jesus' name, but as Metzger argues, "the context has to do with prayer, which the evangelist elsewhere links with the name of Jesus (14.13, 14; 16.15, 24, 26)."<sup>486</sup> In accounting for the word order represented by P<sup>5</sup>, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the frequency of *πατηρ* as the subject of *διδωμι* throughout the Gospel may have caused the anticipation and thus premature writing of *δωσει υμιν*. In other words, "whatever you ask the Father" naturally anticipates "he will give to you." In his discussion of P<sup>45</sup>, Royse comments on the likelihood that many of the transpositions represent corrected omissions, even where evidence for a mechanical leap is lacking.<sup>487</sup> The potential harmonization to 14:16 involved in the omission of *περι υμων* in 16:26 discussed below may suggest some influence from *δωσει υμιν* in 14:16 in this case (i.e., resulting in an initial omission of *εν τω ονοματι μου*). P<sup>5</sup> attests the transposed reading that is intrinsically less probable, which possibly reflects an initial oversight influenced by usage elsewhere in John.

16:25 *ερχεται*: There is an *αλλα* later in the verse, and it is not at all characteristic of John to duplicate this adversative in the same sentence. In light of the contrast between "These things I have spoken to you in figures" and "An hour is coming when I will no longer speak to you in figures" (v. 25 a, b), it is easy to see

---

<sup>486</sup> Metzger, *Commentary*, 211.

<sup>487</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 106.

why one would be tempted to insert it. But the contrast between speaking in figures (*εν παροιμιας*) and speaking plainly (*παρρησια*) is fully satisfied by the *αλλα* later in the verse. It is probable that “The abruptness of the shorter reading...was alleviated by copyists”<sup>488</sup> with the addition of *αλλα*. The heavy concentration of uses of *αλλα* in the preceding context (15:19, 21, 25; 16:2, 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, 20) may also have contributed to its insertion here. P<sup>5</sup> attests the rougher reading that does not smooth the transition or clarify the contrast.

16:25 *απαγγελ(λ)ω*: As already noted, P<sup>5</sup> may have read with the future *απαγγελω* or the present *απαγγελλω*, but it does not attest the potentially synonymous *αναγγελω*.<sup>489</sup> Since *αναγγελω* appears three times in the near to immediate context (16:13, 14, 15), and since *απαγγελω* does not appear elsewhere in John, the latter is clearly the transcriptionally more difficult of the two readings. P<sup>5</sup> does not attest this substitution that is harmonized to the near/immediate context.

16:26 om. *περι υμων*: The absence of *περι υμων* after *εγω ερωτησω τον πατερα* seems to reflect influence from a parallel statement of Jesus in 14:16, *καγω ερωτησω τον πατερα*. This conclusion is reinforced by the similarity of context that concerns praying in Jesus’ name (“whatever you ask...in my name...” (14:13-14; 16:23-24, 26)). P<sup>5</sup> attests the reading that is likely harmonized to parallel usage within the Gospel.

16:27 *θεου*: There is a frequent occurrence of *πατηρ* leading up to this variation-unit in v. 27 (16:3, 10, 15, 17, 23, 25, 26, 27), and it comes at the beginning of v. 28 as a repetition of the idea under discussion (*εξηλθον παρα του πατρος*), all of which causes one to suspect its influence here. *θεος*, on the other hand, does not appear between vv. 2 and 30, and the manner of its use in the latter (*απο θεου εξηλθε*) lends intrinsic support to its use here. It is more likely that *πατρος* is

---

<sup>488</sup> Metzger, *Commentary*, 212.

<sup>489</sup> For its interchange with *απαγγελω*, see BDAG, 59.

harmonized to the immediate context than that θεου is influenced by v. 30. As for the article, there are two firm (or nearly so) instances of παρα του θεου (6:46; 8:40) and three of παρα θεου (1:6; 9:16; 9:33) in John, and this preposition almost always comes with the article when used with πατηρ. It is difficult to say on internal grounds whether the presence or absence of the article with θεου is more probable. It could reflect influence from v. 28 (παρα του πατρος), or, in support of its priority, it could have been the catalyst for the change from του θεου to του πατρος. In not having πατρος, we can at least conclude that P<sup>5</sup> attests the reading that is not harmonized to the immediate context.

16:28 εξηλθον παρα του πατρος: This clause is a repetition of the previously stated idea, “I came from God” (here, “the Father”). Especially since the clause is followed by και, its omission could have occurred accidentally due to a mental leap over what had already been covered (“...because you have loved me and have believed that I came from God (omission of “I came from the Father”) και I have come into the world...”).<sup>490</sup> It is difficult, in contrast, to see why a scribe would insert it, especially with different word order and usage. The use of παρα του πατρος here also seems to be the primary basis for the harmonization towards πατρος at the end of the previous verse. P<sup>5</sup> attests the more difficult reading that retains the repetitious clause.

16:28 παρα: At first glance a change from εκ to παρα seems easier given the latter’s use immediately before and its greater frequency with πατρος in the Gospel of John. In this specific case, however, εκ “seems to have arisen through assimilation to the compound verbs in the context,”<sup>491</sup> as the preposition is preceded by two occurrences of εξηλθον. Furthermore, we see its antonym εις in εις τον κοσμον in the next clause, which could have also contributed to a change from παρα to εκ. Thus,

---

<sup>490</sup> Described as accidental in Metzger, *Commentary*, 212.

<sup>491</sup> Metzger, *Commentary*, 212.

while both readings are candidates for harmonization, the immediate context taken together with the Johannine preference for παρα [του] πατρος favor seeing εκ as the harmonized reading. P<sup>5</sup> does not attest the preposition that reflects influence from the compound verbs in the immediate context.

16:29 λεγουσιν αυτω: This is the reading of P<sup>5</sup> after correction. When λεγω is used similarly in the Gospel of John to introduce speech directed towards Jesus by his “Disciples,” or by one from among them, the presence of the indirect object pronoun appears to be the norm (cf. 6:8; 11:8; 11:12). It is possible, however, that αυτω was inserted here to smooth out the otherwise abrupt transition away from Jesus’ speech to that of the Disciples. In the end, I regard this reading as inconclusive on the basis of internal evidence.

#### Commentary on Unique Readings

1:37 οι δυο μαθηται: The reading of miniscule 28, in which αυτου is read before and after οι δυο μαθηται, highlights the difficulty involved in how to understand αυτου. If αυτου is taken as the object of ηκουσαν (“The two disciples heard *him* speaking”) rather than as a genitive of relationship modifying μαθηται (“The two disciples *of him* heard the one speaking”),<sup>492</sup> then it could have been omitted as an unnecessary object next to λαλουντος. Similarly, if αυτου is taken with μαθηται, as the word order in P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup> suggests (οι δυο αυτου μαθηται), then it could have been omitted as repetitious and superfluous, since these two disciples have already been identified in relation to John the Baptist with the use of αυτου in v. 35 (εκ των μαθητων αυτου δυο). P<sup>5</sup> attests the elimination or oversight of an inessential or seemingly repetitious pronoun.

---

<sup>492</sup> Against the latter, cf. BDF, sec. 413 for the use of the article with substantive participles.

1:38 ειπαν: P<sup>5</sup> attests the omission of αυτω after correction. There are two contexts in the Gospel of John in which Jesus asks “what/whom do you (pl) seek?” including our verse and 18:4, 7. The very similar syntax (τι ζητειτε οι δε ειπαν αυτω ραββι (1:38) compared with τινα ζητειτε οι δε ειπαν Ιησουν (1:38)) as well as the possible evidence for assimilation in the shift from τι to τινα by a few witnesses in 1:38, raise the possibility that the absence of αυτω after οι δε ειπαν in 18:7 has played a role in its deletion from our verse. When discussing the corrections in P<sup>66</sup>, Royse points out that in over half of the corrections that result in singular/sub-singular readings the copyist is actually attempting to correct a singular reading.<sup>493</sup> For some reason (perhaps related to 18:7 as noted above) the insertion of οι δε via correction (originally omitted by a leap ζητειτε οι δε ειπαν or on account of the heavy concentration of asyndetic uses of the verb in the near, especially later context) appears to have also prompted the deletion of αυτω. In the end, we can say little more than that P<sup>5</sup> corrects towards a singular omission of an indirect object pronoun.

1:40 om. Πετρον: If we are to take this as the reading of P<sup>5</sup> based on the spacing considerations noted above, then it probably reflects assimilation to the use of the name “Simon” without “Peter” in the following verse (1:41). P<sup>5</sup> may attest an omission that harmonizes to the immediate context.

20:16 κυριε: Following the spacing considerations noted above, P<sup>5</sup> appears to substitute κυριε for διδασκαλε. If this was indeed the reading of P<sup>5</sup>, it should probably be interpreted as an assimilation to uses of κυριος in the immediate context: Mary refers to Jesus as κυριον in vv. 13 and 18 and she addresses him, whom she thinks to be the gardener, as κυριε in v. 15. P<sup>5</sup> apparently attests a substitution that is harmonized to the immediate context.

---

<sup>493</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 486.

16:27 om. εγω: This omission almost certainly stems from the fact that the beginning of the next sentence practically repeats this clause but without the personal pronoun (εξηλθον παρα του πατρος). P<sup>5</sup> attests an omission harmonized to syntax in the immediate context.

#### Analysis of Manuscript based on Readings

I exclude from the following assessment five places in which the identification of readings is inconclusive on the basis of internal evidence (16:17 ου; 16:17 υπαγω; 16:19 ηθειλον; 16:22 ουν νυν μεν λυπην; 16:29 λεγουσιν αυτω). P<sup>5</sup>, then, supplies 39 readings for analysis, which consists of 34 variants from the tradition and five singular/sub-singular readings (see note at table heading that concerns not including the agreements of P<sup>5</sup> and 01 as sub-singular). A total of 22 of the 34 variants are in variation-units where some form of harmonization/assimilation/textual influence appears to have given rise to variation. In sixteen of these variation-units P<sup>5</sup> attests the non-harmonized reading, whether to the immediate/near context (1:27 ερχομενος; 1:30 υπερ; 1:36 θεου; 1:39 οψεσθε; 20:24 Ιησους; 16:15 ειπον; 16:16 με; 16:18 without ο λεγει; 16:21 ωρα; 16:25 απαγγελω; 16:27 θεου; 16:28 παρα), to parallel usage in John (1:38 στραφεις δε (or near context); 16:23 αν τι), or to parallel text in other Gospels (1:27 υποδηματος; 1:33 εν πνευματι αγιω). In six of these variation-units, however, P<sup>5</sup> attests the harmonized reading, which involves influence from the immediate context (1:25 om. και ειπαν αυτω; 20:25 om. αυτου; 16:22 αρει), or from general usage or parallel text in John (20:24 ουν ηλθεν; 16:26 om. περι υμων), or from parallel text in the Synoptic Gospels (1:27 ουκ ειμι).

A total of seven of the 34 variation-units can be assessed according to stylistic/syntactical difficulty. In all seven of them P<sup>5</sup> reads with the more difficult or rougher reading, where the addition of smoothing or clarifying text is not attested

(1:27 ο οπισω; 20:16 without και προσεδραμεν αφασθαι αυτου; 16:19 ο; 16:20 υμεις; 16:25 ερχεται), or where superfluous or repetitious syntax has been retained (16:18 ελεγον ουν; 16:28 εξηλθον παρα του πατρος). When these variants are taken in their individual contexts, they show themselves to be transcriptionally more difficult than the alternative(s).

Four of the 34 variation-units represented by P<sup>5</sup> indicate that the presence of variation in the tradition may have derived from a mechanical error of some kind. In two of these variation-units P<sup>5</sup> attests the intact or non-altered reading, including one that does not have the transposed word order resulting from a corrected leap (1:28 εν βηθανια εγενετο) and one without the large omission involving a leap (16:15 παντα οσα...αναγγελει υμιν). In two of these variation-units, however, P<sup>5</sup> attests the faulty reading, which in both cases involves a leap from same to same (1:35 om. παλιν (but maybe harmonized); 20:25 om. αλλοι (but maybe affected by transposition of ουν from v. 25 to v. 24). Finally, there is an additional variation-unit that does not fit into these general categories (16:23 δωσει υμιν εν τω ονοματι μου), and in this case P<sup>5</sup> attests the intrinsically improbable transposition that may reflect a corrected omission.

In summary, in these 34 variation-units for which P<sup>5</sup> is extant or can be reasonably reconstructed, 25 or 74% of its variants are internally more probable than the alternative(s). This means that in only nine or 26% of these variation-units do we find an intrinsically and/or transcriptionally less probable reading attested in P<sup>5</sup>. At least five of these nine readings can be easily explained as unconscious assimilations to similar or nearby text: 1:25 om. και ειπαν αυτω is influenced by the absence of this clause with verbatim syntax used in the immediate context (και ηρωτησαν αυτον τι ουν in v. 21); 1:27 ουκ εμυ is affected by the absence of εγω in the same wording of all three of the Synoptic Gospels; 20:25 om. αυτου is assimilated to the absence of

the possessive pronoun with the same noun in the immediately preceding context; 16:22 ἀρει is influenced by the repeated use of the future tense in the immediate context; 16:26 om. περι υμων appears to be harmonized to the absence of these words in a parallel statement elsewhere in the Farewell Discourse (14:16). None of these variants demands an explanation other than unconscious influence from nearby or familiar text. To these can be added the omission of παλιν in 1:35, which points either to a leap or to an assimilation to the two uses of τη επαυριον followed immediately by the verb in the surrounding context (1:29, 43).

We are thus left with three improbable variants. The placement of ουν before ηλθεν in 20:24 and the omission of αλλοι in 20:25, if related, may indicate some form of conscious editorial activity. However, given the frequency of οτε ουν in John (suggesting that οτε ουν ηλθεν is assimilated), the fact that the transposition of ουν practically results in nonsense in the context (suggesting an accidental change), and since the omission of αλλοι can be explained as a leap (οι αλλοι) (suggesting that the two readings may be unrelated), there is little reason to suspect intentionality behind these variants. If this assessment is correct, then we can account for the relatively few improbable variants in P<sup>5</sup> as either scribal slips or unconscious assimilations. The one remaining improbable variant is the intrinsically less probable transposition 16:23 δωσει υμιν εν τω ονοματι μου, which, corresponding to our assessment of the other eight variants discussed above, may reflect a transposition resulting from a corrected omission that was possibly influenced by the use of δωσει υμιν alone in 14:16 (see commentary above).

There are five singular/sub-singular readings. Three of these involve one-word harmonizations: 1:40 om. Πετρου is likely affected by the use of “Simon” without “Peter” in the following verse; 20:16 κυριε demands no explanation beyond assimilation to one of the three occurrences of κυριος in the surrounding context (vv.

13, 15, 18); 16:27 om. εγω appears to be influenced by the repetition of the clause immediately afterwards in which the pronoun is not attested. The remaining two unique readings involve the omission of pronouns, one potentially skipped over as superfluous (1:37 om. of αυτου with οι δυο μαθηται) and one omitted due perhaps to confusion while correcting (1:38 αυτω omitted with supralinear erasure dots).<sup>494</sup> All of these singular/sub-singular readings concern a single word.

P<sup>5</sup> overlaps with P<sup>22</sup>, P<sup>106</sup> and P<sup>119</sup> among the smaller fragments and with P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup> among the more extensive papyri (though P<sup>66</sup> is also fragmentary in chapters 16 and 20). Here I list agreements and disagreements after correction and aside from orthographic differences. P<sup>5</sup> agrees with P<sup>22</sup> 3 out of 7 times (43%): agreements (16:22 ουν νυν μεν λυπην; 16:28 εξηλθον παρα του πατρος; 16:28 παρα); disagreements (P<sup>5</sup> reading is written first in all disagreements listed below) (16:22 αρει | αιρει; 16:23 αν τι | ο τι εαν; 16:23 δωσει υμιν εν τω ονοματι μου | εν τω ονοματι μου δωσει υμιν; 16:27 om. εγω | εγω). If the P<sup>5</sup> singular reading 16:27 om. εγω is removed, then P<sup>5</sup> agrees with P<sup>22</sup> in 3 out of the 6 variation-units for which they overlap (50%).

P<sup>5</sup> agrees with P<sup>106</sup> 1 out of 3 times (33%): agreement (1:30 υπερ); disagreements (1:31 ηλθον εγω (lac.) | εγω ηλθον (this variation-unit was added to my treatment of P<sup>106</sup>); 1:40 ακολουθησαντων (lac.) | ηκολουθησαν). If the last disagreement, which involves a unique reading of P<sup>106</sup>, is removed, then P<sup>5</sup> and P<sup>106</sup> agree in 1 of the 2 variation-units for which they overlap (50%). P<sup>5</sup> agrees with P<sup>119</sup> 4 out of 6 times (67%): agreements (1:25 om. και ειπαν αυτω (both lac.); 1:27 ο οπισω (both lac.); 1:27 ερχομενος (lac. P<sup>119</sup>); 1:27 υποδηματος (both lac.)); disagreements (1:27 ουκ ειμι (lac.) | ουκ ειμι εγω; 1:40 om. Πετρου (lac.) | Πετρου). If the singular

---

<sup>494</sup> Barbara Aland ascribes the omissions of P<sup>5</sup> to a hurried transcription without any intention to change the text: "Aus ihrer Eigenart läßt sich schließen, daß der Schreiber durchaus nicht bewußt ändern wollte, sondern im eiligen Fluß der Abschrift und im vollen Verständnis der Vorlage halb-bewußt Umständliches vereinfachte und Überflüssiges wegstrich" ("Nutzen," 26).

reading 1:40 om. Πετρου of P<sup>5</sup> is removed from consideration, then P<sup>5</sup> agrees with P<sup>119</sup> 4 out of 5 times (80%).

P<sup>5</sup> agrees with P<sup>66</sup> 17 out of 31 times (55%): agreements (1:27 ο οπισω (lac. P<sup>5</sup>); 1:27 ερχομενος; 1:27 υποδηματος; 1:30 υπερ; 1:33 εν πνευματι αγιω; 1:36 θεου (lac. P<sup>5</sup>); 1:38 στραφεις δε; 1:39 οψεσθε; 16:16 με (lac. P<sup>5</sup>); 16:17 ου (lac. P<sup>5</sup>); 16:17 υπαγω (lac. P<sup>5</sup>); 16:18 ελεγον ουν; 16:18 om. ο λεγει (lac. P<sup>5</sup>); 16:22 ουν νυν μεν λυπην; 16:25 απαγγελω (lac. P<sup>5</sup>); 16:26 om. περι υμων (both lac.); 16:28 εξηλθον παρα του πατρος (lac. P<sup>66</sup>)); disagreements in variation-units (1:25 om. και ειπαν αυτω | και ειπαν αυτω; 1:27 ουκ ειμι (lac.) | ουκ ειμι εγω; 1:28 εν βηθανια εγενετο | εγενετο εν βηθανια; 1:35 om. παλιν | παλιν; 16:15 παντα οσα...αναγγελει υμιν | om.; 16:19 ηθειλον | ημελλον; 16:21 ωρα | ημερα; 16:22 αρει | αιρει); disagreements from unique readings of P<sup>5</sup> (1:37 οι δυο μαθηται (lac.) | οι δυο αυτου μαθηται; 1:38 ειπαν | ειπαν αυτω; 1:40 om. Πετρου (lac.) | Πετρου; 16:27 om. εγω | εγω (lac.)); disagreements from unique readings of P<sup>66</sup> (1:27 λυσω αυτου...υποδηματος | λυσω...υποδηματος αυτου; 20:15 αυτον αρω (lac.) | αρω αυτον). If unique readings are removed, then P<sup>5</sup> agrees with P<sup>66</sup> 17 out of 25 times (68%).

P<sup>5</sup> agrees with P<sup>75</sup> 10 out of 16 times (63%): agreements (1:27 ο οπισω (lac. P<sup>5</sup>); 1:27 ερχομενος; 1:27 ουκ ειμι (lac. P<sup>5</sup>); 1:27 υποδηματος (lac. P<sup>5</sup>); 1:28 εν βηθανια εγενετο; 1:30 υπερ; 1:35 om. παλιν (lac. P<sup>5</sup>); 1:36 θεου (lac. P<sup>5</sup>); 1:38 στραφεις δε (1:38); 1:39 οψεσθε) disagreements (P<sup>5</sup> reading listed first) (1:25 om. και ειπαν αυτω | και ειπαν αυτω; 1:33 εν πνευματι αγιω | εν πνευματι αγιω και πυρι; 1:37 οι δυο μαθηται (lac.) | οι δυο αυτου μαθηται; 1:38 ειπαν | ειπαν αυτω; 1:40 om. Πετρου (lac.) | Πετρου; 1:40 ακολουθησαντων (lac.) | ηκολουθησαντων). If the unique readings of both manuscripts are removed, then P<sup>5</sup> (minus 1:37 οι δυο μαθηται; 1:38 ειπαν; 1:40 om. Πετρου) agrees with P<sup>75</sup> (minus 1:40 ηκολουθησαντων) in 10 of the 12 variation-units for which they overlap (83%).

### Diachronic Comparison of Created Readings

The portion of text covered by P<sup>5</sup> is fully preserved in the majuscules 01, A and B. Setting aside orthographic readings and considering each manuscript after contemporaneous correction, I list below the singular/sub-singular readings of each witness. As already noted, since there are a few readings in which P<sup>5</sup> and 01 agree either alone or with very narrow support from other witnesses (see table above), I have not included those readings as sub-singular in either manuscript.

#### P<sup>5</sup>:

1:37 οι δυο μαθηται αυτου] οι δυο μαθηται P<sup>5vid</sup> 157 (omission of inessential / seemingly repetitious pronoun)

1:38 ειπαν αυτω] ειπαν P<sup>5c</sup> 251. 1424 (omission via correction of unnecessary indirect object pronoun)

1:40 Πετρου] om. P<sup>5vid</sup> (harmonized omission, to use of name in immediate context (1:41))

20:16 διδασκαλε] κυριε P<sup>5vid</sup> a r<sup>1</sup> (harmonized substitution, to immediate context (20:13, 15, 18))

16:27 εγω] om. P<sup>5</sup> (harmonized omission, to syntax in immediate context (the repetition of the clause in 16:28))

01.<sup>495</sup>

1:25 ηρωτησαν αυτον και] om. 01 a (e) sy<sup>c</sup> (leap from same to same (Φαρισαιων και ηρωτησαν αυτον και, or simply και...και))

1:28 Ιορδανου] Ιορδανου ποταμου<sup>496</sup> 01 sy<sup>c</sup> (harmonized addition, to parallels (Matt 3:6; Mk 1:5))

1:40 των [2]] om. 01\* 713 (omission of inessential article)

20:12 δυο] om. 01\* e (omission without obvious cause; possibly somehow affected by νεανισκον from Mark 16:5 or αγγελος...κυριου of Matthew 28:2 (cf. ανδρες δυο in Luke 24:4))

20:23 κρατητε] κρατηνται 01\* (substitution affected by the following verb form in the immediate context (κεκρατηνται))

16:17 μικρον και ου θεωρειτε με και παλιν] om. 01\* (omission caused by leap from same to same (μικρον και...παλιν μικρον))

16:17 οτι] ω 01\* (substitution apparently to an interjection without obvious cause)<sup>497</sup>

16:22 ουν νυν μεν λυπην] νυν μεν ουν λυπην 01\* (transposition probably resulting from a corrected omission of ουν likely caused by the similar sound/form of words)

---

<sup>495</sup> The following unique readings of 01 are excluded as lacunose in P<sup>5</sup>: 1:26 τω υδατι; 1:26 εστηκει; 1:38 om. αυτοις; 20:12 καθεζομενους εν λευκοις; 20:15 εκεινη δε; 20:15 ει ο βασιτας; 20:19 om. αυτοις; 20:23 αφεθησεται; 20:23 εαν δε; 16:25 απαγγελω; 16:29 αυτω for αυτου.

<sup>496</sup> This is lacunose in P<sup>5</sup> (verso 14; 1.1), but see relevant spacing note for 1:27 ουκ ειμι.

<sup>497</sup> See discussion in BDF, sec. 146.

16:25 στε] οπου 01\* (substitution without obvious cause; possibly affected by uses of οπου in the Farewell Discourse (cf. 13:36; 14:13; 17:24) and written here with reference to a new circumstance?)<sup>498</sup>

A:<sup>499</sup>

16:18 ο] το A (substitution affected by το after λεγει (το λεγει το instead of ο λεγει το))

16:19 αυτοις] om. αυτοις A (omission of unnecessary indirect object pronoun, potentially influenced by the speaking verbs in the previous verse without an indirect object (ελεγον...λεγει...λαλει (at least as the text read in A))

B:<sup>500</sup>

16:18 τι λαλει] om.<sup>501</sup> B 213 (omission of superfluous and repetitious syntax)

Looking first at the quantity of readings, there are nine in 01 (prior to later correction), two in A, and one in B. This is compared to 5 in P<sup>5</sup>. At least in terms of the number of readings created (that were not corrected by the scribe or a contemporary figure), P<sup>5</sup> stands roughly half-way between what we find in A and B on the one hand and 01 on the other. The types of readings generated in P<sup>5</sup> are not unique: the omission of unnecessary words in P<sup>5</sup> (1:37 om. αυτου; 1:38 om. αυτω) is like that observed in 01 (1:40 om. των), A (16:19 om. αυτοις), and B (16:18 om. τι λαλει). The one-word assimilations to nearby vocabulary and syntax in P<sup>5</sup> (1:40 om.

---

<sup>498</sup> See entry in BDAG, 717.

<sup>499</sup> The following unique readings of A fall in a lacuna in P<sup>5</sup>: 1:33 αυτος; 1:39 εκτη; 16:15 λημψεται.

<sup>500</sup> 1:28 ο Ιωαννης, 20:17 απτου μου, 20:23 τινος (twice), and 20:23 αφειονται are lacunose in P<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>501</sup> This falls in a lacuna in P<sup>5</sup> (recto 13; 3.2), but *editio princeps* 1922, 11 comments, “Either τι λαλει or ο λεγει (D\*) is required in the lacuna.”

Πετρού; 20:16 κυριε; 16:27 om. εγω) correspond with activity reflected in 01 (20:23 κρατηνται) and A (16:18 το). It is noteworthy that we do not find unique readings in P<sup>5</sup> where there is not a readily identifiable origin or cause of variation, as we have in 01 (16:17 ω; 16:25 σπου). These data do not suggest a peculiar level of freedom behind this third century copy of John.

### Conclusions on Stability and/or Fluidity

No particularly high level of freedom *or* care presents itself when the unique readings of P<sup>5</sup> are compared with those from the later majuscules (so that the Alands' "normal" seems fitting, at least if the reproduction of its *Vorlage* is in view).<sup>502</sup> Yet the size (all one-word) and apparent lack of intentionality point away from a free and fluid attitude towards copying. Most striking is the small proportion of improbable variants from the underlying tradition. Despite the supposed affinity with Codex D,<sup>503</sup> and the apparent "tendency to brevity,"<sup>504</sup> the underlying text of P<sup>5</sup> shows itself to be nothing less than a representative of stable transmission practices. In short, this third century papyrus does not offer its support for the view that laxity, carelessness or willingness/openness to change the text marked the early centuries of transmission.

---

<sup>502</sup> K. Aland and B. Aland, *Text*, 95-96.

<sup>503</sup> Epp, "Significance," 100; Petersen, "What Text," 139. This characterization is not supported by the level of agreement between P<sup>5</sup> and P<sup>75</sup> where they overlap in John 1 (or P<sup>66</sup>).

<sup>504</sup> *Editio princeps* 1922, 9.

## 2.8. P<sup>22</sup> (P. Oxy. X 1228)

### Introduction

P<sup>22</sup> consists of two fragments representing two columns from a re-used papyrus roll from Oxyrhynchus, Egypt. It contains portions of text from John 15:25-16:2 on the first fragment and 16:21-32 on the second fragment.<sup>505</sup> It shares extant text with two other Greek manuscripts from the second and third centuries, including P<sup>5</sup> (overlapping for some of vv. 22-30) and P<sup>66</sup> (overlapping for portions of 15:25-26; 16:21-32). P<sup>22</sup> was published in 1914 by Grenfell and Hunt and dated to the latter part of the third century.<sup>506</sup> The *Liste* gives a general date of third century and Orsini and Clarysse have assigned it to the latter half of that century (250 – 300 C.E.).<sup>507</sup> It is described by its editors as “written in an upright informal hand of medium size,” with a bent towards cursive.<sup>508</sup> Schofield says that it reflects “the work of a poor scribe.”<sup>509</sup> The script of P<sup>22</sup> belongs to the “Alexandrian stylistic class,” but, as with P<sup>5</sup> and P<sup>108</sup>, without “the loops and ornamental serifs.”<sup>510</sup>

Both fragments contain written text on the verso, with no text present on the recto. The fragment of one column measures 3.5 cm. wide and 5 cm. high and preserves a portion of eight lines of text. The larger fragment from the next column is 5 cm. wide and 18.5 cm. high and offers text from 29 lines, but with lines 12-14 being indiscernible. No outer or lower margins survive, but both fragments preserve

---

<sup>505</sup> For this and further introductory information, see Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, eds., “Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1228,” in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part X* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1914) 14-16 (referred to as *editio princeps* for the remainder of this chapter); K. Aland, *Repertorium I*, 242-243; idem, *Kurzgefasste Liste*, 5; LDAB: <http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/text.php?quick=2779>.

<sup>506</sup> See brief discussion in *editio princeps*, 14. For dates proposed see especially K. Aland, *Repertorium I*, 242-243; IGNTPI, 17.

<sup>507</sup> K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste*, 5; Orsini and Clarysse, “Manuscripts and Their Dates,” 469.

<sup>508</sup> *Editio princeps*, 14. It is noted as being in the direction of a documentary/cursive hand and placed in the private/uncontrolled category in Charlesworth, “Public and Private,” 156.

<sup>509</sup> Schofield, “Papyrus Fragments,” 197.

<sup>510</sup> Orsini and Clarysse, “Manuscripts and Their Dates,” 458.

some of the top margin. The height of the roll was approximately 30 cm. with each column probably measuring 10 cm. in width and 25-26 cm. in height and having 47-48 lines of text. IGNTP puts the range of letters per line at 31-39, and, as Grenfell and Hunt comment, “the spacing in the papyrus is not very regular.”<sup>511</sup> Since the beginning and end of lines are not extant and the lines are quite lengthy, text divisions cannot be established. As the editors present only a minimal amount of supplemental text to support what is extant and give almost no comment regarding what is not, I have drawn very little from the lacunose portions of the papyrus in my compilation of its readings.

P<sup>22</sup> attests itacisms in θλειψεως at 16:21 (line 3; 2)<sup>512</sup> and υμειν at 16:23 (line 10; 2). The following *nomina sacra* are given: ιης at 16:31 (27; 2); πρς at 15:26 (3, 4; 1), 16:25 (15; 2), 16:28 (20; 2); πηρ at 16:27 (18; 2); πρᾱ at 16:26 (17; 2), and ᾠνος at 16:21 (4; 2). Where they are extant, P<sup>5</sup> and P<sup>66</sup> agree except in the following places: 16:27 πρ in P<sup>5</sup>; 16:21 ανθρωπος and 16:31 ις in P<sup>66</sup>. A diaeresis is used with upsilon in υμεις at 15:27 (5; 1) and 16:27 (18; 2); υμων at 16:22 (6; 2); υμειν at 16:24 (10; 2); υμας at 16:27 (18; 2). No punctuation is evident in P<sup>22</sup>. The Aland’s label P<sup>22</sup> “At least normal,” and B. Aland says that “er nahezu immer den hypothetischen Ausgangstext wiedergibt.”<sup>513</sup> It has generally not been identified with any particular textual group or tradition.<sup>514</sup> P<sup>22</sup> is currently housed at the Glasgow University Library in Glasgow, Scotland.

#### Variation-Units Represented<sup>515</sup>

Variation-Unit	Variants	P <sup>22</sup> Transcribed
----------------	----------	-----------------------------

<sup>511</sup> IGNTP I, 41; *Editio princeps*, 15.

<sup>512</sup> The second number represents the fragment/column.

<sup>513</sup> K. Aland and B. Aland, *Text*, 97; B. Aland, “Nutzen,” 20. It is labeled “fairly reliable” in Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, 269.

<sup>514</sup> Schofield, “Papyrus Fragments,” 198; Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, 62.

<sup>515</sup> For transcriptional purposes the brackets, sub-linear dots and supplemental text are taken from IGNTP I, 41-42 unless otherwise noted. The sub-singular λυπης for θλειψεως at 16:21 in D is reserved for the Diachronic Comparison section.

15:25 εν τῷ νομῷ αὐτῶν γεγραμμένος	<p>εν τῷ νομῷ αὐτῶν γεγραμμένος P<sup>66vid</sup> 01<sup>(*)2</sup> B D L Ψ 1. 33. 565. 579. 1844 latt</p> <p>γεγραμμένος εν τῷ νομῷ αὐτῶν A K Γ Δ Θ f<sup>13</sup> 700. 892<sup>s</sup>. 1241. 1424 <i>Maj.</i></p> <p>εν τῷ νομῷ γεγραμμένος P<sup>66*</sup>vid</p>	...αυ]τῶν γεγραμμ[ενος (line 1; 1) <sup>516</sup>
15:26 οταν	<p>οταν 01 B Δ 579. 12211 e l sa<sup>mss</sup> ly bo<sup>pt</sup>; EpiPh</p> <p>οταν δε A D K L Γ Θ Ψ f<sup>1.13</sup> 33. 565. 700. 892<sup>s</sup>. 1241. 1424. 1844 <i>Maj.</i> (it) sy sa<sup>mss</sup> pbo bo<sup>pt</sup></p>	οταν (line 2; 1)
16:22 ουν νυν μεν λυπην <sup>517</sup>	<p>ουν νυν μεν λυπην P<sup>5.66</sup> 01<sup>2</sup> B C* D L W Ψ 1. 33. 565. 1844 lat</p> <p>νυν μεν ουν λυπην 01*</p> <p>ουν λυπην μεν νυν A C<sup>3</sup> K N Γ Δ Θ (700). 892<sup>s</sup>. 1241 <i>Maj.</i></p> <p>μεν ουν λυπην νυν f<sup>13</sup></p> <p>λυπην μεν 579</p> <p>ουν λυπην 1424</p>	ουν νυν μ]εν λυπην (line 5; 2)
16:22 εχετε	<p>εχετε 01* B C K W<sup>v.l</sup> Γ Δ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565. 579. 700. 892<sup>s</sup>. 1241. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> lat</p> <p>εξετε P<sup>66</sup> 01<sup>2</sup> A D L N W<sup>txt</sup> Θ Ψ 33. 1844 it vg<sup>mss</sup></p>	εχετε (line 5; 2)
16:22 αιρει	<p>αιρει</p> <p>αιρει P<sup>5</sup> B D* Γ it vg<sup>cl.ww</sup> sa ly bo</p> <p>αφαιρει W</p>	αιρει (line 7; 2)
16:23 αν τι	<p>αν τι P<sup>5</sup> B C L lat; Or</p> <p>οτι ο (ε)αν 01 Θ 33. 1241. 1844</p> <p>ο τι (οτι ?) (ε)αν A W</p> <p>ο εαν N</p>	ο] τι εαν (line 9; 2)

<sup>516</sup> The second number represents which of the two fragments/columns is in view.

<sup>517</sup> The variation-units at 15:26 πεμψῶ (line 2; 1), 16:1 μῆ (line 6; 1) and 16:21 ὄρα (line 1; 2) are lacunose in P<sup>22</sup>.

	<p>οτι οσα (ε)αν Κ Γ Δ <math>f^{1.13}</math> 565. 579. 700. 892<sup>s</sup>. 1424 <i>Maj.</i></p> <p>(+ οτι D<sup>2</sup>) εαν τι D Ψ</p>	
16:23 εν τω ονοματι μου δωσει υμιν	<p>εν τω ονοματι μου δωσει υμιν A C<sup>3</sup> D K N W Γ Θ Ψ <math>f^{1.13}</math> 1. (δωη 33). 565. 579. 700. 892<sup>s</sup>. 1241. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> lat(t) sy pbo bo</p> <p>δωσει υμιν εν τω ονοματι μου P<sup>5vid</sup> 01 B C* L Δ I 844 sa ly</p> <p>δωσει υμιν 118</p>	εν τω ονοματι μου δωσει] υμειν (lines 9-10; 2) <sup>518</sup>
16:28 εξηλθον παρα του πατρος <sup>519</sup>	<p>εξηλθον παρα του πατρος P<sup>5</sup></p> <p>– D W b ff<sup>2</sup> sy<sup>s</sup> ly pbo</p>	ε[ξ]η[λθο]ν παρα [τ]ου π[ρ]ς (line 20; 2)
16:28 παρα	<p>παρα P<sup>5</sup> 01 A C<sup>2</sup> K N Γ Δ Θ <math>f^{1.13}</math> 565. 579. 700. 892<sup>s</sup>. 1241. 1424. I 844 <i>Maj.</i></p> <p>εκ B C* L Ψ 33</p>	παρα (line 20; 2)
16:31 Ιησους <sup>520</sup>	<p>Ιησους P<sup>66</sup> B C W Θ 0109</p> <p>ο Ιησους 01 A D K L N Γ Δ Ψ <math>f^{1.13}</math> 33. 565. 579. 700. 892<sup>s</sup>. 1241. 1424. I 844 <i>Maj.</i></p>	Ιη[ς] (line 27; 2) <sup>521</sup>
16:32 εληλυθεν	<p>εληλυθεν P<sup>66</sup> 01<sup>2</sup> A B C* D* L W 0109. 33 sy<sup>s</sup> sa ly<sup>vid</sup> bo</p> <p>νυν εληλυθεν C<sup>3</sup> D<sup>2</sup> K N Γ Δ Θ Ψ <math>f^{1.13}</math> 565. 579. 700. 892<sup>s</sup>. 1241. 1424. I 844 <i>Maj.</i> f q sy<sup>p,h</sup> (pbo)</p>	ε]ληλυθεν (line 28; 2) <sup>522</sup>

<sup>518</sup> This text is followed by εω[ς αρ]τι.

<sup>519</sup> 16:24 αιτειτε (line 11; 2), 16:25 αλλα before ερχεται (falls in three-line lacuna, 12-14; 2), 16:25 απαγγελω (line 15; 2), 16:26 περι υμων (line 17; 2); 16:27 του θεου (line 19; 2) are excluded as lacunose in P<sup>22</sup>.

<sup>520</sup> 16:29 αυτω (line 22; 2) and εν (line 23; 2) are excluded as lacunose in P<sup>22</sup>.

<sup>521</sup> This text is preceded by the fully extant αυτοις.

<sup>522</sup> It is clear that the preceding lacuna (ωρα [και ε]ληλυθεν) does not leave room for νυν (see IGNTF I, 360). I exclude the unique addition of η ωρα in 01\* from consideration as lacunose in P<sup>22</sup>. The unique addition of παντες in P<sup>66\*vid</sup> in 16:32 also falls in a lacuna (line 28/29; 2). Since the κα[ι] εμ[ι] (IGNTF I, 42; *editio princeps*, 15) in 16:32 does not appear to rule out καμε (with the next word likely being μονον), I do not factor this reading into my analysis (but perhaps the size of the lacunose portion would favor ι over μ).

## Commentary on Variants

15:25 εν τω νομω αυτων γεγραμμενος: There is little to say regarding internal evidence besides the probability that γεγραμμενος was brought forward to read immediately after the nominative article (ο λογος ο γεγραμμενος εν τω νομω αυτων). It is difficult to see why a scribe would, conversely, move the nominative participle further from the article. It is most likely that ο λογος ο γεγραμμενος reflects assimilation to the frequent occurrence in John of an arthrous nominative noun followed immediately by an arthrous participle (see discussion of ο μαθητης ο μαρτυρων at 21:24 in my treatment of P<sup>109</sup>).<sup>523</sup> P<sup>22</sup> attests the reading that is not influenced by general usage in John.

15:26 οταν: Wescott notes that there is a “pause” after v. 25,<sup>524</sup> and Beasley-Murray comments, “The Paraclete saying in 15:26-27 is the clearest example in the Last Discourses of the interruption of the flow of thought by the insertion of a previously existing saying of the Spirit.”<sup>525</sup> My interest is with this recognizably abrupt shift, one that may have prompted the insertion of δε. There is also a strong possibility, given the similarity of syntax and context, that δε was influenced by 16:13 (οταν δε ελθη εκεινος). P<sup>22</sup> attests a syntactically rougher reading that does not reflect possible influence from a parallel text in the near context.

16:22 ουν νυν μεν λυπην: I regard this reading as inconclusive on the basis of internal evidence. See brief note in treatment of P<sup>5</sup>.

16:22 εχετε: In v. 20 the future tense is repeated as Jesus tells his disciples, “You will weep and lament...you will be grieved, but your grief will become joy” (κλαυσετε και θρηνησετε υμεις...λυπηθησεσθε υμεις, αλλ’ η λυπη υμων εις χαραν γενησεται). Jesus goes on in v. 21 to give the analogy of a mother’s grief being

---

<sup>523</sup> Cf. BDF, sec. 270, and see discussion under 18:36 βασιλεια η εμη in treatment of P<sup>90</sup> for the post-position of the attributive as a Johannine feature.

<sup>524</sup> Brooke F. Westcott, *The Gospel according to St. John: the Greek text with introduction and notes* (London: J. Murray, 1908), 213.

<sup>525</sup> Beasley-Murray, *John*, 270.

turned into joy after her child is born. Then v. 22 begins, “so you also now εχετε/εξετε grief.” The verbs coming directly after this reading are also in the future (οψομαι and χαρησεται) and appear to have affected the transmission of αιρει (treated below). It is most probable that these surrounding verbs have exercised influence on our variation-unit.<sup>526</sup> P<sup>22</sup> attests a reading not harmonized to the verb tense from the immediate context.

16:22 αιρει: See analysis under P<sup>5</sup>. P<sup>22</sup> attests a reading that is not harmonized to a recurring verb tense in the immediate context.

16:23 ο τι εαν: See treatment under P<sup>5</sup>. P<sup>22</sup> attests a harmonization to parallel usage elsewhere in the Gospel.

16:23 εν τω ονοματι μου δωσει υμιν: See P<sup>5</sup> for discussion of this variation-unit. P<sup>22</sup> does not attest the intrinsically improbable transposed reading.

16:28 εξηλθον παρα του πατρος: See P<sup>5</sup> for discussion. P<sup>22</sup> attests the more difficult reading that retains the repetitious clause.

16:28 παρα: See P<sup>5</sup> for treatment of this variation-unit. P<sup>22</sup> does not attest the alternative preposition that is influenced by verb use in the immediate context.

16:31 Ιησους: Although the evidence is strongly in favor of an anarthrous text in the απεκριθη Ιησους και ειπεν αυτω and απεκριθη Ιησους patterns, as Fee notes, the evidence is much less certain where απεκριθη and Ιησους are separated by a personal pronoun, as in this case (απεκριθη αυτοις (ο) Ιησους). On the one hand, the nearly certain anarthrous usage with Ναθαναηλ in 1:49, the widespread attestation of an anarthrous text in P<sup>66</sup> and B, and the occasional absence of the article with other non-neutral witnesses may suggest that the presence of the article in such cases reflects later scribal insertion. On the other hand, other major witnesses besides P<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>526</sup> Beasley-Murray, *John*, 268; Metzger, *Commentary*, 211.

and B do favor the article.<sup>527</sup> He concludes that one should “consider the article to be the Johannine pattern, as in most cases, except where there is early and somewhat wide-spread support for an anarthrous text,” and he then gives this verse as an example.<sup>528</sup> In light of the uncertainty involved, I consider this reading inconclusive for the purposes of the following analysis.

16:32 εληλυθεν: The idea of “the hour is coming” is prominent in John with approximately 13 cases of ερχομαι used with ωρα. Twice in the Gospel we read, “The hour is coming and now is” (ερχεται ωρα και νυν εστιν) (4:23; 5:25). The same idea, albeit in a slightly different form, appears here in v. 32: ερχεται ωρα και εληλυθεν. The first three words are exactly the same, which is likely to have evoked the familiar form with the νυν. The concentrated use of νυν in the dialogue leading up to this verse (16:5, 22, 29, 30) also supports its influence here. P<sup>22</sup> attests the reading not harmonized to the immediate context or parallel usage in John.

#### Analysis of Manuscript based on Readings

Setting aside the two variation-units deemed inconclusive on the basis of internal evidence (16:22 ουν νυν μεν λυπην; 16:31 Ιησους), we are left with nine variation-units represented by P<sup>22</sup> and no singular/sub-singular readings. Six of these nine variation-units appear to derive from some type of harmonization or textual influence, and in five of them P<sup>22</sup> reads with the non-harmonized reading: 15:25 εν τω νομω αυτων γεγραμμενος has the syntax that is not influenced by general usage in John; 16:22 εχετε and αιρει are not assimilated to future tense verbs in the immediate context; 16:28 παρα does not attest the preposition that is influenced by compound verb use in the immediate context; 16:32 εληλυθεν is not harmonized to the use of νυν in the immediately preceding context or in parallels in John (4:23;

---

<sup>527</sup> Fee, “The Use of the Definite Article,” 175-76.

<sup>528</sup> Fee, “The Use of the Definite Article,” 176-77.

5:25). P<sup>22</sup> has the harmonized reading in only one of these six variation-units: 16:23 ο τι εαν, which is harmonized to parallel usage in John (14:13; 15:16).

In two of the variation-units represented by P<sup>22</sup> it can be observed that variants are either stylistically/syntactically rougher or easier. In both cases, P<sup>22</sup> attests the more difficult and thus more probable variant: 15:26 οταν does not read with the connective that results in a smoother transition (nor is it harmonized to a parallel in 16:13); 16:28 εξηλθον παρα του πατρος retains the repetitious clause. There is one additional variation-unit represented by P<sup>22</sup> that does not fit neatly into either of these broad categories, and in this case P<sup>22</sup> likewise attests the more difficult and intrinsically more probable variant without the transposition: 16:23 εν τω ονοματι μου δωσει υμιν.

In sum, among the nine variation-units represented by P<sup>22</sup>, it reads with the internally more probable reading in eight or 89% of them. This means that only one or 11% of the variants read in P<sup>22</sup> appear to be improbable on the basis of internal evidence. This one variant (ο τι εαν instead of the more probable αν τι) is a small-scale harmonization easily explained by unconscious influence from two synonymous parallels elsewhere in the Gospel.

P<sup>22</sup> shares extant text with two other witnesses from the second and third centuries, P<sup>5</sup> and P<sup>66</sup>, both of which are also fragmentary for this portion of text. Based on what is extant or can be confidently reconstructed and leaving aside orthographic readings, P<sup>22</sup> agrees with P<sup>66</sup> (after correction) 6 out of 7 times (86%): agreements (15:25 εν τω νομω αυτων γεγραμμενος; 16:22 ουν νυν μεν λυπην; 16:22 αιρει (lac. P<sup>66</sup>); 16:28 εξηλθον παρα του πατρος (lac. P<sup>66</sup>); 16:31 Ιησους; 16:32 εληλυθεν); disagreement (16:22 εχετε | εξετε). There are no disagreements based on singular readings in the text shared by these witnesses. See treatment of P<sup>5</sup> for agreements and disagreements between that papyrus and P<sup>22</sup>.

## Diachronic Comparison of Created Readings

The portion of text covered by P<sup>22</sup> is fully extant in 01, A, B and D. Leaving aside orthographic readings, I list here the singular and sub-singular readings for each manuscript.

### P<sup>22</sup> (none)

#### 01:<sup>529</sup>

16:22 ουν νυν μεν λυπην] νυν μεν ουν λυπην 01\* (transposition probably resulting from a corrected omission of ουν likely caused by the similar sound/form of words)

16:29 οι μαθηται αυτου] οι μαθηται αυτω 01\* (substitution of indirect object pronoun to go with λεγουσιν in place of superfluous possessive pronoun)

### A (none):<sup>530</sup>

### B (none):

#### D:<sup>531</sup>

15:26 πατρος [2]] πατρος μου D a b c sy<sup>p</sup> (harmonized addition, to immediate context (15:24))

---

<sup>529</sup> The following readings of 01 are not considered because they fall in a lacuna in P<sup>22</sup>: 16:1 om. μη; 16:2 add. γαρ; 16:25 οπου; 16:25 απαγγελω; 16:32 add. η ωρα. ο before ανθρωπος at 16:21 is corrected by the Scriptorium hand (IGNTP II, 474).

<sup>530</sup> 16:24 ητησασθαι in A is lacunose in P<sup>22</sup>.

<sup>531</sup> 15:26 πεμπω, 15:27 om. δε, 16:25 εν παρησια, 16:26 πατερα μου, 16:28 ηλθον, 16:30 παρα are excluded from consideration as lacunose in P<sup>22</sup>. 15:26 πατερα was corrected to πατρος by the first hand (IGNTP II, 465).

16:21 θλιψεως] λυπης D 579 c (harmonized substitution, to use of word earlier in the verse)

Little can be said in this diachronic comparison, since P<sup>22</sup> attests no singular readings. This is in agreement with A and B but in contrast to 01 and D, which have two each (although the versional support for 15:26 πατρος μου may suggest that this reading was inherited by D).

#### Conclusions on Stability and/or Fluidity

Evidence for anything other than stable transmission is minimal in P<sup>22</sup>. There are no singular readings and only one improbable variant among the nine places where it gives testimony to the transmission activity that it inherited. Both the transmission leading up to the copying of P<sup>22</sup> and the activity of its copyist give testimony to the existence of stable transmission attitudes and practices in the third century. This evidence does not support the claim that transmission practices were freer or more fluid in the period prior to the fourth century.

## 2.9. P<sup>28</sup> (P. Oxy. XIII 1596)

### Introduction

P<sup>28</sup> is a fragment of the lower portion of a leaf from a papyrus codex from Oxyrhynchus, Egypt containing portions of John 6:8-12 on the recto and 6:17-22 on the verso.<sup>532</sup> Among manuscript witnesses dated to the second and third centuries, it shares extant text with P<sup>66</sup> (overlapping for portions of 6:8-11) and P<sup>75</sup> (overlapping for portions of all verses covered). Since its publication in 1919 by Grenfell and Hunt, P<sup>28</sup> has been variously dated to the third and fourth centuries.<sup>533</sup> More recently, Orsini and Clarysse have assigned it broadly to the period between 250 and 350.<sup>534</sup> Although P<sup>28</sup> may have been copied in the fourth rather than third century, I have nevertheless retained it in this study as a text generally regarded to be from the time at or before the turn of the fourth century C.E. Its script is a “medium-sized semiuncial,”<sup>535</sup> and it is clearly in the direction of a documentary/cursive hand.<sup>536</sup> Orsini and Clarysse classify P<sup>28</sup> under the severe style with the added feature that “thick and thin strokes alternate, but not on a regular basis.”<sup>537</sup>

The fragment known as P<sup>28</sup> measures 5.2 cm. in width and 10.7 cm. in height and preserves a portion of the last 11 lines on the recto and 12 (nearly 13) on the verso. It has a lower margin measuring 2 cm. and some of the outer margin can be

---

<sup>532</sup> For this and further introductory information, see especially Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, eds., “Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1596,” in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XIII* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1919) 8-10 (referred to as *editio princeps* for the remainder of this chapter); K. Aland, *Repertorium I*, 249; idem, *Kurzgefasste Liste*, 6; LDAB: <http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/text.php?tm=61635>.

<sup>533</sup> For fourth century, see *editio princeps*, 8 (“It was found together with third-fourth century documents, and probably belongs to the early or middle part of the fourth century;” they regard it as “probably older” than 0162 (see my discussion on that manuscript below)); Joseph van Haelst, *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens* (Série papyrologie 1; Paris: Sorbonne, 1976) no. 444. For third century, see Turner, *Typology*, 147; K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste*, 6.

<sup>534</sup> Orsini and Clarysse, “Manuscripts and Their Dates,” 469. It is listed as third/fourth century in Chapa, “Early Text of John,” 141; Hurtado, *Artifacts*, 219.

<sup>535</sup> *Editio princeps*, 8. Cf. Schofield, “Papyrus Fragments,” 223 (“a medium sized sloping round uncial, rather irregular”).

<sup>536</sup> Charlesworth, “‘Catholicity’,” 44. Cf. Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 122.

<sup>537</sup> Orsini and Clarysse, “Manuscripts and Their Dates,” 457.

seen on the verso. The size of the page would have been approximately 22-23 cm high and 13 cm wide.<sup>538</sup> Turner reconstructs the page at 20.5 cm. in height and 12/13 cm. in width, placing it into his Group 7 Aberrant 1, and he thinks the column of written text measured 17 cm. high and 10 cm. wide.<sup>539</sup> Aland lists the number of lines as 25-26 with 28-38 letters per line, but Grenfell and Hunt reconstruct 24 letters for recto 24, putting the range at 24-38.<sup>540</sup>

P<sup>28</sup> preserves three singular cases of itacism, including πεντακισχιλιοι (6:10, recto 21), φοβεισθαι (6:20, verso 47/22), and ιδεν (6:22, verso 51/26) as well as two additional orthographic readings, ελεβεν (6:11, recto 21)<sup>541</sup> and ενγυς (6:19, verso 45/20),<sup>542</sup> with ενγυς having support from D 063.<sup>543</sup> Such readings led Grenfell and Hunt to comment that P<sup>28</sup> was “not very correctly spelled.”<sup>544</sup> A *nomen sacrum* is used for Ιησους, which includes the forms ις (6:17, verso 41/16; agrees with P<sup>75</sup>) and ιν (6:19, verso 44/19; with P<sup>75vid</sup>), but ανθρωπους is written *in pleno* (6:10, recto 18; *contra* P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup>). P<sup>28</sup> does not have abbreviations for the numbers that are extant, which consist of πεντε (6:9, recto 16; with P<sup>66</sup>, *contra* P<sup>75</sup>), πεντακισχιλιοι (6:10, recto 21; with P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup>), and εικοσι πεντε (6:19, verso 43/18; *contra* P<sup>75vid</sup>).

P<sup>28</sup> attests one instance of diaeresis over the iota of ιδεν (6:22, verso 51/26). There is one high point after ις at the end of 6:17 (verso 41/16). IGNTP points out a space between γης and εις in 6:21 (verso 49/24), and Grenfell and Hunt note “a slight space” after εφοβηθησαν between vv. 19 and 20 (verso 46/21) and think it probable that there was also “a larger space in the lacuna” before τη επαυριον at the beginning

<sup>538</sup> K. Aland, *Repertorium I*, 249; cf. van Haelst, *Catalogue*, no. 444 who gives 22 x 15.

<sup>539</sup> Turner, *Typology*, 147, 19.

<sup>540</sup> K. Aland, *Repertorium I*, 249; *editio princeps*, 9.

<sup>541</sup> For frequent interchange of α and ε in “various...phonetic conditions,” see Gignac I, 278-282.

<sup>542</sup> Gignac I, 170-171 gives this spelling as an example of an unassimilated nu before a velar stop, which, though not widespread, does appear among the Roman and Byzantine papyri.

<sup>543</sup> Cf. Head, “Habits,” 406.

<sup>544</sup> *Editio princeps*, 8.

of v. 22 (verso 49/24).<sup>545</sup> The Alands classify P<sup>28</sup> as a “Normal” text,<sup>546</sup> and Epp places it in his “‘B’ group.”<sup>547</sup> This manuscript fragment is currently housed in the Pacific School of Religion, Palestine Institute in Berkeley, California.

### Variation-Units Represented<sup>548</sup>

Variation-Unit	Variants	P <sup>28</sup> Transcribed
6:9 παιδαριον	παιδαριον  παιδαριον εν Α Κ Γ Δ Θ 579. 700. 1424. <i>Maj.</i> lat sy <sup>s.p.h</sup>	[παιδαριον] (recto 16) <sup>549</sup>
6:10 ειπεν	ειπεν P <sup>75vid</sup> 01 B L a sy <sup>s.c.p</sup> sa <sup>mss</sup> ly pbo  ειπεν δε Α Κ Ν W Γ Δ Θ Ψ f <sup>1.13</sup> 33. 565. 579. 700. 892. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> b q sy <sup>h</sup>  ειπεν ουν P <sup>66</sup> D G 1241 lat	[ειπεν] (recto 18) <sup>550</sup>
6:10 ως πεντακισχιλιοι <sup>551</sup>	ως πεντακισχιλιοι (τρισχιλιοι 01*) P <sup>75</sup> 01 <sup>2</sup> B D L N W Ψ 579. 892.  ωσει πεντακισχιλιοι P <sup>66</sup> Α Κ Γ Δ Θ f <sup>1.13</sup> 33. 565. 700. 1241. 1424 <i>Maj.</i>	[ωσει πεντακισ]χιλιει[ο]ι (recto 21) <sup>552</sup>

<sup>545</sup> IGNTP I, 45; *editio princeps*, 8-10. Cf. Charlesworth, “‘Catholicity’,” 44, who curiously lists no form of punctuation for text division in P<sup>28</sup>.

<sup>546</sup> K. Aland and B. Aland, *Text*, 95, 97. Cf. B. Aland, “Nutzen,” 21, 37.

<sup>547</sup> Epp, “Significance,” 100.

<sup>548</sup> I have not included the pre-corrected and sub-singular transposition τῆ ἐστιν ταῦτα in P<sup>66\*</sup> and the singular omission of τῆ by D\* in 6:9 in this list of variation-units. The omission of τῆ in D, however, will be treated in the Diachronic Comparison section below (see there for note on corrector).

<sup>549</sup> The reconstructions for recto lines 16-18 are already “quite long enough, even allowing for the slope of the column towards the left, which is noticeable on the verso,” making the presence of εν here “very improbable” (*editio princeps*, 9).

<sup>550</sup> As with εν in 6:9, the presence of δε here (and thus ουν by inference) “is very improbable” (*editio princeps*, 9).

<sup>551</sup> I have excluded 6:10 οἱ from this list of variation-units. The portion of text between τοῦ and ἀνδρες in 6:10 is lacunose in P<sup>28</sup> (recto 20) and is quite variegated among the MSS: some read ἀνεπεσα(ο)ν ουν οἱ ἀνδρες (P<sup>66c</sup> 01 B U Θ Λ Π f<sup>13</sup> 124. 700), some are without οἱ (P<sup>66\*.75</sup> D L N W Ψ f<sup>1</sup> 33. 565. 579. 892. 1241), some lack ουν (M S Δ Ω 2. 28. *Maj.*), and some include ἀνθρωποι (contracted to ανοι) before ἀνδρες (A K Y Π\*). *Editio princeps*, 9 reconstructs the text as ἀνεπεσαν ουν οἱ ἀνδρες, but, in light of the variation in the tradition and the possibility that a combination of these readings could have fitted in the lacuna, does not exclude alternative reconstructions.

<sup>552</sup> I follow IGNTP I, 44 for the sublinear dots and brackets (cf. Plate 11). Grenfell and Hunt comment, “ωσει...suits the length of the lacuna better than ως,” which also makes τρισχιλιοι unlikely (*editio princeps*, 9). Cf. NA28.

6:11 ευχαριστησας διεδωκεν	ευχαριστησας διεδωκεν ευχαριστησεν και εδωκεν 01 D it sy <sup>c.(p)</sup> ευχαριστησας εδωκεν P <sup>66</sup> N Γ 69. 579	ευχαριστησας εδω[   κεν (recto 22-23) <sup>553</sup>
6:11 τοις ανακειμενοις	τοις ανακειμενοις P <sup>66.75</sup> 01* A B L N W f <sup>1</sup> 33. 565. 579. 1241 lat sy <sup>c.p.h</sup> sa pbo bo τοις μαθηταις (+ αυτου 892. 1424) οι δε μαθηται τοις ανακειμενοις 01 <sup>2</sup> D K Γ Δ Θ Ψ f <sup>13</sup> 700. 892. 1424 Maj. b e j ly bo <sup>mss</sup>	[τοις ανακειμ]ενοις (recto 23) <sup>554</sup>
6:17 και σκοτια ηδη εγεγονει	και σκοτια ηδη εγεγονει κατελαβεν δε αυτους η σκοτια 01 D	κα]ι σκοτια ηδη ε[γε]χ[ονει (verso 40/15) <sup>555</sup>
6:17 ουπω εληλυθει προς αυτους ο Ιησους	ουπω (ουκ A K Γ <sup>vid</sup> Δ Θ f <sup>1</sup> 565. 700. 892. 1424 Maj. lat sy sa ly) εληλυθει προς αυτους ο (- L) Ιησους (+ εις το πλοιον K f <sup>13</sup> ) A K L W Γ <sup>vid</sup> Δ Θ f <sup>1.13</sup> 33. 565. 700. 892. 1241. 1424 Maj. it lat sy sa ly pbo bo ουπω εληλυθει ο (- 01) Ιησους προς αυτους 01 D a ουπω (ου P <sup>28vid</sup> ) προς αυτους εληλυθει (εγεγονει P <sup>75</sup> ) ο Ιησους P <sup>75</sup> B N Ψ 579	ου προς αυτους   ε]ληλυθει ο Īς (verso 40-41/15-16) <sup>556</sup>

<sup>553</sup> I follow the placement of sublinear dots in IGNTP I, 44 (cf. plate 11).

<sup>554</sup> There is not room for this additional text between εδωκεν and τοις ανακειμενοις (cf. IGNTP I, 193: εδω[ / 12-15 ]ενοις).

<sup>555</sup> For the placement of the sublinear dots and the brackets see IGNTP I, 45 (cf. Plate 12).

<sup>556</sup> This variation-unit concerns word order, but the ου in P<sup>28vid</sup> is treated in the Unique Readings below. I follow the transcription of *editio princeps*, 9 and Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 123. Head notes that the transcriptions of *editio princeps* and IGNTP agree that a singular reading was read in the lacuna on verso 40/15, since otherwise the line would be excessively long, but that they disagree as to what was read (“Habits,” 406). *Editio princeps*, 9, 10 reconstructs with the substitution of ου for ουπω, commenting that “There is not room for ουπω here,” whereas IGNTP I, 45, 195 reconstructs without the prepositional phrase, προς αυτους. Head leaves the question open. Three observations lend support to the reconstruction of *editio princeps*.

First, the fact that the omission is listed in IGNTP without qualification (either on p. 45 or p. 195), that is, without any note on spacing, may suggest that some form of error or oversight has occurred in the IGNTP transcription. Given the number of letters involved (10!) and the fact that a singular reading is being posited, one would expect the editor to substantiate this conclusion with the usual procedure of placing the number of letter-spaces in brackets. Moreover, it is unclear why IGNTP allows up to 20 spaces in the lacuna on verso 43/18 (to the right of the pi in πέντε – see p. 196) but reconstructs with only 10 in the same-sized lacuna on verso 40/15 (to the right of the partially extant second gamma of εγεγονει, which is directly above the pi). Second, according to the

6:19 σταδιους	σταδιους σταδια 01* D 0211	σταδιους (verso 43/18)
6:21 της γης <sup>557</sup>	της γης την γην 01* f <sup>13</sup> 579. 1424; Or	της γης (verso 49/24)
6:22 ειδον	ειδον P <sup>75</sup> A B L N W Θ 33. 579 it sy <sup>p,h</sup>  ιδων Κ Γ Δ Ψ f <sup>1,13</sup> 565. 700. 892. 1241. 1424 <i>Maj.</i>  ειδεν 01 D lat	ἴδεν (verso 51/26)

### Unique Readings

Place of Variation	Readings	P <sup>28</sup> Transcribed

reconstruction of IGNTP the verso lines 15-25 (40-50 in *editio princeps*) have the following number of letter-spaces: 26, 31, 34, 37, 31, 29, 31, 31, 35, 26, 34. This makes line 15, with 26 letters, unusually short when compared with the others, except in the case of line 24, which also has 26 letters. However, concerning the brevity of the latter line (49/24), *editio princeps*, 10 explains that “there may well have been a considerable space before τη επαυριον, which begins a new section,” which would be in addition to the blank space between γης and εις that is roughly the size of one letter (noted in IGNTP, 45; see plate 12). By contrast, if the reconstruction of *editio princeps* is accepted, the length of the line would match more closely with the others: 35, 31, 34, 37, 31, 29, 31, 31, 35, 26, 34.

Thirdly, when one counts the number of letter-spaces reconstructed to the right of the letters directly beneath the partially extant epsilon after ηδη (the initial epsilon of εγεγονει) on verso 40/15, the number of letters including those extant or reconstructed for this portion of lines 41-46/16-21 are as follows: 19, 22, 24, 21, 18, 21. The 13 letters reconstructed for the same-sized space on line 40/15 in IGNTP would be significantly out of place, whereas the 22 letters reconstructed by *editio princeps* fits well with the other lines. Although the singular reading posited by *editio princeps* is, therefore, more likely than that adduced by IGNTP, the former is by no means certain. *Editio princeps* reconstructs verso lines 40-50/15-25 with the following number of letters: 35, 31, 34, 37, 31, 29, 31, 31, 35, 26, 34. The letters reconstructed to the right of the partially extant epsilon mentioned above and to the right of the letters beneath it for lines 40-46/15-21 are: 22, 19, 22, 24, 21, 18, 21. If ουπω, instead of ου, is allowed on verso 40/15, then both the line (at 37 letters) and the mostly lacunose space discussed above (at 24 letters) would be identical to verso 43/18. It is noteworthy that *editio princeps* questions the length of that line as well, conjecturing that the text “possibly” read singularly in substituting ορωσιν for θεωρουσιν (with -σιν placed on the next line). IGNTP I, however, accepts the length of verso 43/18 as reconstructed with θεωρου- by allowing for up to 20 spaces in the lacuna (see p. 196). One wonders if perhaps each of these two lines could serve to validate the length of the other, especially since the only means of accounting for their apparently excessive length is to conjecture singular readings in lacunae! In sum, the above analysis suggests that having both ουπω and προς αυτους in the lacuna on verso 40/15 is at least possible. Nevertheless, I have chosen, though tentatively and in light of the above discussion, to include the singular substitution of ου for ουπω posited by the *editio princeps*. This will be reflected in the analysis that follows.

<sup>557</sup> P<sup>28</sup> is lacunose for 6:19 της θαλασσης (verso 44/19) and 6:21 εγενετο το πλοιον (verso 48/23).

6:17 ουπω	ουπω P <sup>75vid</sup> 01 B D L N W Ψ f <sup>13</sup> 33. 579. 1241 it pbo bo  ουκ A K Γ <sup>vid</sup> Δ Θ f <sup>1</sup> 565. 700. 892. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> lat sy sa ly  ου P <sup>28vid</sup>	[ου] (verso 40/15) <sup>558</sup>
6:19 τον Ιησουν	τον Ιησουν <i>rell</i>  Ιησουν P <sup>28vid</sup>	iv̄ (verso 44/19) <sup>559</sup>

### Commentary on Variants

6:9 παιδαριον: The other numbers in the context seem to have prompted the writing of the number “one” with the child. If εν is read, then we are left with παιδαριον εν...πεντε αρτους...δυο οψαρια. The less explicit and dissimilar text is the more difficult reading. P<sup>28</sup> attests the reading that is not assimilated to the use of numbers in the immediate context.

6:10 ειπεν: The same command that Jesus gives “to have the people sit down,” is introduced in Luke 9:14 with ειπεν δε. Since ουν and δε are attested among the witnesses in the tradition, we are likely dealing with two different reactions to the asyndeton. This verse also marks a shift towards Jesus as speaker and serves as the beginning of the account of Jesus’ miraculous activity (as a kind of preamble to what begins in v. 11). In not having either conjunction, P<sup>28</sup> attests the rougher reading with asyndeton.

<sup>558</sup> See discussion of this highly tentative reading in the preceding note.

<sup>559</sup> *Editio princeps*, 9, IGNTI I, 45, and Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 123 reconstruct the text without τον before iv̄ on verso 44/19. Head notes this as a singular reading in P<sup>28</sup> (“Habits,” 406). There is an extant nu before iv̄, but it is transcribed as belonging to the end of θεωρουσιν, which, as reconstructed, began on the previous line. Both IGNTI I, 196 and *editio princeps*, 10 exclude the possibility that the previous line could be any longer than it already is, as it is reconstructed ending in θεωρου- (for discussion see note above on 6:17 ουπω...). This means that its final syllable (-σιν) would need to be read at the beginning of line 44/19. In regards to the small lacuna that precedes the extant nu at the beginning of 44/19, IGNTI I, 196 allows for only two letter-spaces and *editio princeps* says, “there is certainly not room for [το]ν here,” that is, in addition to σιν (10).

6:10 ωσει πεντακισχιλιοι: Here the number of men fed in Jesus' miraculous multiplication of the loaves and fishes is said to be "about five thousand." The reading ωσει appears to be harmonized to Synoptic parallels in Matthew 14:21 (ωσει πεντακισχιλιοι) and Luke 9:14 (ωσει ανδρες πεντακισχιλιοι). P<sup>28</sup> attests the reading that is likely harmonized to Gospel parallels.

6:11 ευχαριστησας εδωκεν: Parallels in Matthew 15:36 and Mark 8:6 attest διδωμι (ευχαριστησας...εδιδου). Perhaps a more relevant point to make, since our variants attest the aorist form of the verb, is that Jesus' act of praying over and then distributing bread would naturally evoke imagery from the Last Supper. And indeed, here it appears that copyists have harmonized to those parallels, since ευχαριστησας and εδωκεν are used together in all three Synoptic accounts of the Last Supper (Matt 26:27; Mk 14:23; Lk 22:19). Moreover, διαδιδωμι is only used four times in the New Testament, and only here in John, which supports seeing it as less familiar and thus more difficult. P<sup>28</sup> attests a reading that is likely harmonized to parallels in other Gospels.

6:11 τοις ανακειμενοις: The longer reading clarifies that it is Jesus' disciples rather than Jesus himself who distributes the food to those in the crowd. It appears to be an interpolation not only because it further clarifies or explains the manner of distribution, and is thus an easier reading, but especially because this is the description given in Synoptic parallels (Matt 14:19, 15:36; Mk 6:41; Lk 9:16). P<sup>28</sup> does not attest this rather lengthy harmonization to Synoptic parallels.

6:17 και σκοτια ηδη εγεγονει: The alternative syntax and vocabulary involved in κατελαβεν δε αυτους η σκοτια is less difficult because it appears to be influenced to some degree by the previous occurrence of σκοτια in the Gospel: η σκοτια αυτο ου κατελαβεν (1:5). One could speculate about the motives behind this change, and whether it was initiated by readers or copyists, but for our purposes it is

sufficient to conclude that P<sup>28</sup> does not attest what seems to be an intentional substitution of syntax likely drawn from or affected by previous usage in the Gospel.

6:17 ου προς αυτους εληλυθει ο Ιησους: When assessing these word order variants, we notice that ουπω εληλυθει has some frequency in John (7:30; 8:20; 11:30), which may suggest influence on the word order here. On the other hand, the fact that all occurrences of ουπω in the Gospel are followed by the verb (or conjunction then verb) gives some intrinsic support to the variants with that word order here. I have set this variant aside as inconclusive on the basis of internal evidence.

6:19 σταδιους: BDF notes that the plural σταδια is an Attic form.<sup>560</sup> P<sup>28</sup> does not attest what appears to be an Atticistic reading.

6:21 της γης: The use of the preposition επι with γη in 17:4 (επι της γης) gives some intrinsic support to the genitive. The substitution from επι της θαλασσης to the accusative in P<sup>75</sup> in 6:19, which is almost certainly harmonized to επι την θαλασσαν in 6:16, may be similar to what has occurred here. It seems most likely that the accusative την γην has been affected by the accusative relative pronoun just afterwards, for which it functions as the antecedent (επι την γην εις ην). P<sup>28</sup> does not attest the reading likely influenced by syntax in the immediate context.

6:22 ειδεν: When the collective singular noun οχλος is the subject, John favors introducing the action with a singular verb and then placing any additional verb in the plural (cf. 6:2, 24; 12:9, 18),<sup>561</sup> which supports reading a plural verb here: ο οχλος ο εστηκως...ειδον. The immediate context indicates that the use of the singular ειδεν with ο οχλος in v. 24 has exercised influence on our variation-unit. P<sup>28</sup> attests a reading that is likely harmonized to the immediate context.

---

<sup>560</sup> BDF, sec. 49.3.

<sup>561</sup> For *constructio ad sensum*, see BDF, sec. 134.

## Commentary on Unique Readings

6:17 ου: Even though this reading is uncertain (see extensive discussion in note under table), I have included it here as a possible unique reading of P<sup>28</sup>. Little more can be said beyond the likelihood that this is a minor substitution from ουκ.

6:19 Ιησου: There is no reason to doubt that the omission of the article was caused by a leap from one nu to another (θεωρουσιν τον Ιησου). P<sup>28</sup> attests a leap from same to same resulting in a one-word omission.

## Analysis of Manuscript based on Readings

I exclude from this assessment one variation-unit where the identification of readings is inconclusive on the basis of internal evidence (6:17 ουπω προς αυτους εληλυθει). P<sup>28</sup> offers 11 readings for analysis, which consist of nine variants from the tradition and two singular readings. Six of the nine variants are in variation-units where some form of harmonization appears to have played a role in variation. In three of these variation-units P<sup>28</sup> attests the non-harmonized reading, whether it concerns parallel text from another Gospel (6:11 τοις ανακειμενοις does not attest the lengthy addition of syntax that conforms the text to Synoptic parallels (Matt 14:19; 15:36; Mk 6:41; Lk 9:16) or vocabulary and syntax within the Gospel of John (6:9 παιδαριον is not influenced by the use of numbers with the other nouns in the verse; 6:21 της γης is not assimilated to the relative pronoun in the immediate context). In three of these six variation-units, however, P<sup>28</sup> has the harmonized reading, either to Synoptic parallels (6:10 ωσει πεντακιςχιλιοι attests a harmonized substitution for ως influenced by Matthew 14:21 and Luke 9:14; 6:11 ευχαριστησας εδωκεν is harmonized to Synoptic accounts of the feeding of the five thousand (Matt 15:36; Mk 8:6) or, more likely, accounts of the Last Supper (Matt 26:27; Mk 14:23; Lk

22:19)) or to the immediate context (6:22 εἶδεν is harmonized to the use of this verb in the singular in v. 24).

The remaining three variation-units can be assessed according to stylistic/syntactical difficulty. In all three of them P<sup>28</sup> reads with the more difficult or rougher reading: 6:10 εἶπεν attests the asyndeton without any sign of smoothing; 6:17 καὶ σκοτία ἤδη ἐγγυοῦναι does not read the multi-layered substitution that is drawing on/reminiscent of previous usage surrounding σκοτία; 6:19 σταδίους does not read with the Attic form of the plural. Thus, in these three places the papyrus has the asyndetic, non-editorialized, and non-Attic reading respectively.

To summarize, in these 9 variation-units for which P<sup>28</sup> testifies, 6 or 67% appear to be internally more probable than the alternative(s). This means that in three or one-third of these variation-units do we find an intrinsically and/or transcriptionally less probable reading. All of these involve only one word and call for no explanation beyond unconscious assimilation to nearby (εἶδεν instead of εἶδον) or parallel (ὡσει instead of ὡς and ἐδωκεν for διεδωκεν) vocabulary. They are entirely inconsequential with regard to the sense of the text. The two singular/sub-singular readings, those which were most likely introduced by the copyist of P<sup>28</sup>, are even less consequential: a substitution of οὐ for οὐκ (or οὐπω) (but this is highly tentative) and the omission of the article τοῦ before Ἰησοῦν, probably to be explained as a leap from the nu of θεωρουσιν to that of τοῦ.

P<sup>28</sup> shares extant text with two other witnesses from the second and third centuries, P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup>, both of which are also fragmentary for this portion of text. Based on what is extant or can be confidently reconstructed and leaving aside orthographic readings, P<sup>28</sup> agrees with P<sup>66</sup> (after correction) (extant only for portions of vv. 8-11) 4 out of 5 times (80%): agreements (6:9 παιδαριον (lac. P<sup>28</sup>); 6:10 ὡσει πεντακισχίλιοι (lac. P<sup>28</sup>); 6:11 εὐχαριστήσας ἐδωκεν; 6:11 τοὺς ἀνακειμένοις (lac.

P<sup>28</sup>)); disagreements (P<sup>28</sup> reading listed first) (6:10 ειπεν (lac.) | ειπεν ουν). P<sup>28</sup> agrees with P<sup>75</sup> 6 out of 13 times (46%): agreements (6:9 παιδαριον (lac. P<sup>28</sup>); 6:10 ειπεν (lac. P<sup>28</sup>); 6:11 τοις ανακειμενοις (lac. P<sup>28</sup>); 6:17 και σκοτια ηδη εγεγονει; 6:17 ουπω εληλυθει προς αυτους ο Ιησους (word order); 6:19 σταδιους); disagreements (6:10 ωσει πεντακιςχιλιοι (lac.) | ως πεντακιςχιλιοι; 6:11 ευχαριστησας εδωκεν | ευχαριστησας διεδωκεν; 6:17 ου (lac.) | ουπω; 6:17 εληλυθει | εγεγονει; 6:18 τε | δε;<sup>562</sup> 6:19 Ιησουν | τον Ιησουν; 6:22 ειδεν | ειδον). If singular readings are removed, then P<sup>28</sup> (minus 6:17 ου; 6:19 Ιησουν) agrees with P<sup>75</sup> (minus 6:17 εγεγονει) 6 out of 10 times (60%) and there is no change in relation to P<sup>66</sup>.

### Diachronic Comparison of Created Readings

Among majuscules up through the seventh century, the portion of text covered by P<sup>28</sup> is fully preserved in 01, A, B, D, N and W. Listed below are the readings deemed likely to have been created by each respective scribe:

#### P<sup>28</sup>.<sup>563</sup>

6:17 ουκ/ουπω] ου P<sup>28vid</sup>? (minor substitution of negation)

6:19 τον Ιησουν] Ιησουν P<sup>28vid</sup> (leap from same to same (θεωρουσιν τον Ιησουν))

#### 01.<sup>564</sup>

6:17 ο Ιησους] Ιησους 01 L 80 (omission of unnecessary article)

6:20 ο δε] και 01 (harmonized substitution, to parallel (Mk 6:50))

<sup>562</sup> δε is also read by D N 579.

<sup>563</sup> As noted in the introduction, P<sup>28</sup> has one orthographic singular reading involving ε/α interchange, 6:11 ελεβεν (cf. Gignac I, 278-282), and at 6:19 it reads ενγυς with D 063 (cf. Gignac I, 170-171).

<sup>564</sup> The following readings of 01 or 01\* fall in a lacuna in P<sup>28</sup> and are thus excluded: 6:10 τοπος and τρισχιλιοι; 6:21 υπηνητησεν (cf. *editio princeps*, 10); 6:22 εστως (verso 50/25).

6:21 ηθελον] ηλθον 01 (substitution likely caused by similar sound/spelling of words)

A:

6:10 χορτος πολυς] πολυς χορτος A b (likely harmonized transposition, to word order in immediate context (πολυς οχλος in 6:5))

B (none)

D:<sup>565</sup>

6:9 τι] om.<sup>566</sup> D\* (omission of interrogative pronoun that changes the sentence from a question to a statement)

6:11 αρτους] πεντε αρτους<sup>567</sup> D 59 1604 (harmonized addition, to immediate context (6:9))

6:19 ωσει σταδιους] σταδια ωσει D (transposition without apparent cause)

N:

6:10 ανδρες τον αριθμον] τον αριθμον ανδρες N (likely harmonized transposition, to placement of ανδρες in Matt 14:21)

---

<sup>565</sup> εγενηθη at 6:21 in D is in a lacuna in P<sup>28</sup>. In the text covered by P<sup>28</sup>, D has one orthographic singular reading involving the temporal augment, 6:11 ηυχαριστησεν (cf. BDF, sec. 67), and it agrees with P<sup>28</sup> and 063 in reading ενγυς at 6:19 (see note for P<sup>28</sup>).

<sup>566</sup> Corrected by H corrector in late fifth century: cf. IGNTP II, 9-10, 287.

<sup>567</sup> This reading is in a lacuna in P<sup>28</sup> (recto 22), but there appears to be no room for πεντε when comparing the letter-spaces reconstructed for this line to the left of the ι in και (15) with those reconstructed for the roughly same-sized lacuna in lines directly above and below (recto 20 to the left α in ανδρες (13); recto 21 to the left of χ in πεντακιςχιλειοι (12); recto 23 to the left of the second ε in ανακειμενοις (14)).

## W (none)<sup>568</sup>

In terms of quantity, there are three of these unique readings in 01 and D, one in A and N, and none in B and W. With two or perhaps one, P<sup>28</sup> has either a little below or a little above the average of the other witnesses combined. The type(s) of reading(s) generated in the copying of P<sup>28</sup> correspond with those attested in the later witnesses. If we take 6:17 ου for ουκ/ουπω as the reading of P<sup>28</sup> then we find a similar substitution in 01 (6:21 ηλθον). If we regard it generally as a minor change without an obvious explanation then it is like a reading in D (6:19 σταδια ωσει). The accidental leap at 6:19 Ιησουν also corresponds to seemingly accidental errors found in 01 (6:21 ηλθον) and D (6:9 om. τι). If this reading is understood simply with regard to effect (omission of an unnecessary article), then we find the same type of reading in 01 (6:17 Ιησους). In short, nothing from this comparison points to a greater level of freedom in transmission at work in this late third or third/fourth century witness when compared with the later majuscules.

### Conclusions on Stability and/or Fluidity

In addition to its relatively high proportion of probable variants (67%), our study of P<sup>28</sup> has provided evidence for the rather mundane and insignificant nature of its improbable variants. They are insignificant in regards to origin and effect. The proximity or familiarity of similar text would account for the emergence of each of them. All three of the Synoptic Gospels have this parallel pericope concerning Jesus' miraculous multiplication of the loaves and fishes for the five thousand (plus), so that harmonization is not surprising. A comparison of the number and character of its

---

<sup>568</sup> βαλιυ at 6:21 in W is in a lacuna in P<sup>28</sup> (verso 47/22) and is thus excluded from this comparison.

singular readings with those of the later manuscripts points to diachronic continuity over discontinuity.

### 3. FRAGMENTS WITH FULL OVERLAP IN P66 ONLY

#### 3.1. P<sup>95</sup> (P. Laur. inv. II/31)

##### Introduction

P<sup>95</sup> is a fragment of a leaf from a papyrus codex from Egypt containing portions of John 5:26-29 on the recto and 5:36-38 on the verso.<sup>569</sup> Among manuscript witnesses dated to the second and third centuries, P<sup>95</sup> shares extant text with P<sup>66</sup> (providing full overlap) and P<sup>75</sup> (overlapping for portions of all verses covered). It was published in 1985 by Jean Lenaerts and dated to the early third century.<sup>570</sup> The *Liste* places P<sup>95</sup> in the third century generally, but Orsini and Clarysse agree with the editor in specifying an early third-century dating (200-225 C.E.).<sup>571</sup> Along with P<sup>39</sup>, P<sup>95</sup> is an early representative of the Biblical Majuscule script.<sup>572</sup>

This papyrus fragment measures 3.5 cm. in width and 4.3 cm. in height. It preserves some of the middle portion of nine lines on the recto and eight lines on the verso, which were written in one column measuring roughly 8/9 cm. wide and 17.5 cm. high, but preserves no margins. The size of the page was approximately 12 cm. in width and 24/25 cm. in height, placing it into Turner's Group 8,<sup>573</sup> and the page probably had 35 lines of text. Based on Lenaerts' reconstruction, the average number of letters per line is 21.5 with a range of 19 to 26 letters.<sup>574</sup>

P<sup>95</sup> preserves no itacisms or orthographic readings. No *nomina sacra* are extant, although Lenaerts favors  $\overline{\pi\rho}$  for  $\pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho$  in 5:36, verso 2 and 5:37, verso 4

---

<sup>569</sup> For this and further introductory information, see especially Jean Lenaerts, "Un papyrus de l'Évangile de Jean: PL II/31," *Chronique d'Égypte* LX (1985): 117-120 (referred to as *editio princeps* for the remainder of this chapter); K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste*, 16; LDAB: <http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/text.php?quick=2801>.

<sup>570</sup> See *editio princeps*, 117-118 for brief discussion.

<sup>571</sup> K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste*, 16; Orsini and Clarysse, "Manuscripts and Their Dates," 471. For "ca. 200," see Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, 186.

<sup>572</sup> Thus, Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, 49 and Charlesworth, "Catholicity," 43 comment that it was probably made for public use.

<sup>573</sup> Cf. Turner, *Typology*, 20.

<sup>574</sup> But see *editio princeps*, 119 and IGNTF I, 120 for differences (and see notes below).

based on the size of the lacunae. υιος with ανθρωπου at 5:27, recto 3 is written *in pleno* (contra P<sup>66</sup> with υς; υιος written *in pleno* in P<sup>75</sup> but with ανου for ανθρωπου), and this is the only case of diaeresis. No instances of punctuation are extant. Aland cites the “relativ viele Fehler” in P<sup>95</sup>, which she thinks were likely created independently by the scribe, for such a small portion of text as evidence that it was transmitted with greater freedom/inaccuracy (see below for a discussion of the readings offered by the papyrus). She thus places its quality of transmission alongside of P<sup>45</sup> rather than P<sup>39</sup> on the other end of her spectrum.<sup>575</sup> This papyrus is currently held at the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana in Florence, Italy.

#### Variation-Units Represented

Variation-Unit	Variants	P <sup>95</sup> Transcribed
5:36 αυτα <sup>576</sup> (2 <sup>nd</sup> occurrence)	αυτα ταυτα P <sup>66*</sup> – G 0211 33. 713. 1241	– (verso 1) <sup>577</sup>
5:37 εκεινος	εκεινος P <sup>75</sup> 01 B L W 892. (1241) a ff <sup>2</sup> j αυτος P <sup>66</sup> A K N Γ Δ Θ Ψ f <sup>1.13</sup> 33. 565. 579. 700. 1424 <i>Maj. lat</i> εκεινος αυτος D	ε]κεινος (verso 4)

#### Unique Reading<sup>578</sup>

<sup>575</sup> B. Aland, “Nutzen,” 24, 37. Errors are made “im schnellen Schreibfluß” with little effect on the sense of the text, which is characteristic of the “reformed documentary style” (24).

<sup>576</sup> See below under Unique Readings for treatment of the 5:28 ακουσουσιν variation-unit. In light of the uncertainty involved in reconstructing what was in the lacunae at the beginning of recto 2 and 3 (see note below), I exclude the variation-unit concerned with the presence or absence of και before κρισιν in 5:27, recto 3 as lacunose.

<sup>577</sup> For transcription of the (presumably) first αυτα and subsequent τα see *editio princeps*, 119 (αυτα τ[α]) and IGNTP I, 120 (αυτα τ[α]).

<sup>578</sup> The extra space between κα[ι and εξ]ουσιαν in the lacuna at the beginning of recto 2 seems to require seeing some form of unique reading at the beginning of 5:27. IGNTP I, 182 puts the space on this line before ]ουσιαν at 11-12 letters, and *editio princeps*, 120 says, “une dizaine de

Place of Variation	Readings	P <sup>95</sup> Transcribed
5:28 ακουσουσιν	<p>ακουσουσιν P<sup>75</sup> B 070 157</p> <p>ακουσωσιν P<sup>66</sup> 01 L N W Δ 33. 579</p> <p>ακουσονται A D K Γ (Θ) Ψ f<sup>1.13</sup> 565. 700. 892. 1241. 1424. I 2211 <i>Maj.</i></p> <p>ακουσαντες P<sup>95vid</sup></p>	ακουσαντ]ες (recto 7) <sup>579</sup>

### Commentary on Variants

5:36 om. αυτα [2]: Although this reading could have been independently created by the scribe of P<sup>95</sup>, as B. Aland suggests,<sup>580</sup> I have placed it here as having too many supporting witnesses to treat as a sub-singular reading. There is no reason to doubt the explanation given by Lenaerts, namely, that the twice-written αυτα has led to the omission of one of them in a case of haplography.<sup>581</sup> P<sup>95</sup> attests an omission caused by a leap from same to same.

5:37 εκεινος: The conflated reading of D is treated below in the Diachronic Comparison section. Both intrinsic and transcriptional probability favor αυτος over εκεινος. The context supports αυτος because the emphasis is on the testimony of the Father *himself*, in contrast to that of a mere man, even if it is John the Baptist (vv. 35-36). Other intensive uses of αυτος with πατηρ give support to the manner and context in which it is used here (5:20; 12:49; 16:27). εκεινος could be explained as one of three forms of assimilation. First, it could reflect influence from its use a few

---

lettres” filled the space “Entre καί et ἐξουσίαν.” Proposals regarding what might have been read here include a possible dittography involving εν εαυτω και (*editio princeps*, 120), an addition of αυτω τω υιω (IGNTP I, 120), or some kind of “complex transposition” (noted as a possibility by Head, “Habits,” 402). What occurred here may also be related to the possible absence of αυτω on the following line (5:27, recto 3) (as reconstructed in IGNTP I, 120, 182), especially if a transposition is involved. Head, however, noting that *editio princeps* reconstructs with αυτω on that line, thinks its presence or absence remains unclear (403).

<sup>579</sup> Cf. *editio princeps*, 119, 120; IGNTP I, 120; Head, “Habits,” 402.

<sup>580</sup> B. Aland, “Nutzen,” 24.

<sup>581</sup> *Editio princeps*, 120.

verses earlier in reference to John (v. 35), especially since the Father’s testimony is being compared with that of John. Second, it could be harmonized to its use in the next verse in reference to the Father (v. 38). Third, *εκεινος* is used many times throughout the Gospel, and often resumptively as it appears here (e.g., 1:18, 33; 5:11; 14:21, 26).<sup>582</sup> While it is also possible that *αυτος* is harmonized to 12:49, given the identical syntax (*ο πεμψας με πατηρ αυτος*), the proximity of *εκεινος* makes its influence somewhat more likely. P<sup>95</sup> attests the reading that is likely harmonized to the immediate context.

#### Commentary on Unique Reading

5:28 *ακουσαντες*: As Lenaerts suggests, it is likely that what appears to be a participial form of the verb was harmonized to *ακουσαντες* in v. 25.<sup>583</sup> These verses share the same content, which concerns the dead hearing the voice of the Son of God. P<sup>95</sup> seems to attest a harmonization to a verb form in the immediate context.

#### Analysis of Manuscript based on Readings

P<sup>95</sup> supplies two variants and one clear singular reading for analysis. In both of the variation-units represented, this papyrus reads with a less probable variant. One of these involves haplography (5:36 om. *αυτα*), and the other is a substitution of one pronoun for another that was probably influenced by usage in the immediate context (5:37 *εκεινος*). The one clear singular reading (5:28 *ακουσαντες*) is a harmonization to a participial form in the immediate context and, in light of the fact that it results in syntax “*qui ne donne pas un sens satisfaisant*,”<sup>584</sup> was almost certainly accidental. The additional space between *και* and *εξουσιαν* in 5:27 points to some form of singular reading, but, as noted already, it is difficult to determine not only what was

---

<sup>582</sup> BDF, sec. 291 notes frequency of *εκεινος* in John.

<sup>583</sup> *Editio princeps*, 120. He also points to *οι τα αγαθα ποιησαντες* in v. 29.

<sup>584</sup> *Editio princeps*, 120.

read in the papyrus but also the general nature of that reading. Given the repetitive nature of the passage, a repetition of certain elements from the neighboring syntax (see such proposals in the note above) would likely have occurred accidentally (as in Lenaerts' suggestion of a dittography).

P<sup>95</sup> shares all of its text with P<sup>66</sup> but only partial overlap with P<sup>75</sup>. Based on what is extant or can be confidently reconstructed, leaving aside itacisms and other orthographic readings, and treating manuscripts after correction, P<sup>95</sup> has no agreements with P<sup>66</sup>. They disagree in the two variation-units for which they overlap (P<sup>95</sup> reading listed first) (5:36 om. αυτα [2] | αυτα; 5:37 εκεινος | αυτος) and in 5:28 where P<sup>95</sup> singularly attests what appears to be the participle ακουσαντες. P<sup>95</sup> agrees with P<sup>75</sup> 1 out of 3 times: agreement (5:37 εκεινος); disagreements (5:28 ακουσαντες | ακουσουσιν; 5:36 om. αυτα [2] | αυτα (lac.)). If the P<sup>95</sup> singular ακουσαντες is removed from the comparison, then these two papyri agree in 1 of the 2 variation-units for which they overlap (50%).

#### Diachronic Comparison of Created Readings

Among manuscripts up through the seventh century, the portion of text covered by P<sup>95</sup> is fully preserved in P<sup>66</sup>, 01, A, B, D, N and W. Considered after contemporaneous correction and apart from orthographic readings, I list below the readings likely to have been created by each scribe.

#### P<sup>95</sup>:

5:27 some form of unique reading possibly involving a 12-letter addition of nearby text (see comments above)

5:28 ακουσουσιν/-ωσιν/-ονται] ακουσαντες P<sup>95</sup> (harmonized substitution, to participial form in immediate context (5:25))

**P<sup>66</sup> (none)**<sup>585</sup>

**01:**<sup>586</sup>

5:27 εξουσιαν...κρισιν] κρισιν...εξουσιαν 01\* (transposition probably affected by use of κρισιν before δεδωκεν in the immediate context (5:22))

**A (none)**

**B (none)**

**D:**<sup>587</sup>

5:37 εκεινος] εκεινος αυτος D d (conflated reading)

5:37 μεμαρτυρηκεν] μαρτυρι (ει)<sup>588</sup> D 1242\* it sy<sup>c</sup> (harmonized substitution, to present tense use of the verb in the immediate context (5:36))

**N:**<sup>589</sup>

---

<sup>585</sup> The singular omission of ο before the second occurrence of πατηρ at 5:36 in P<sup>66</sup> falls in a lacuna in P<sup>95</sup> (verso 2) and is thus excluded from this comparison. There are no other singular readings for this portion of text attested in P<sup>66</sup> after correction. I do not include the following readings because they were corrected by the first hand (or possibly by another hand likely contemporary with the scribe) (see entry for each in Royse, *Scribal Habits*; IGNTP I): 5:28 σοι; 5:28 τη ερημω; 5:29 εκπορευσονται; 5:36 ταυτα; 5:36 απεασταλκεν; 5:37 ποτε.

<sup>586</sup> εμε for με in 01\* at 5:36 falls in a lacuna in P<sup>95</sup> (verso 2).

<sup>587</sup> I am reluctant to include εξελουσονται for εκπορευσονται in 5:29 because it is read in D and W. However, these majuscules do not appear to be textually related in John, which may justify including this reading as a sub-singular of each (see Metzger, *Commentary*, 15\*).

<sup>588</sup> But the versional support indicates that this reading may very well have been inherited.

<sup>589</sup> 5:28 θαυμαζε for θαυμαζετε in N\* was corrected by the first hand (IGNTP online).

5:28 της φωνης αυτου] της φωνης του υιου του θεου<sup>590</sup> N 33 (harmonized substitution/addition, to exact wording in immediate context (5:25))

W:<sup>591</sup>

5:36 μαρτυρει] μαρτυρουσιν W (substitution in favor of plural verb affected by or conformed to plural subject (αυτα τα εργα α ποιω))<sup>592</sup>

5:37 αυτου [2]] om. W b (omission of potentially redundant pronoun)

There are two readings in D and W, one in 01 (before later correction) and N, and none in A and B. With two readings, P<sup>95</sup> is placed alongside of D and W. Thus, although it has an above average number of singular/sub-singular readings, it shares the same amount with two of the later majuscules. If we consider P<sup>66</sup> after correction, then it agrees with A and B in having no unique readings for the portion of text covered by P<sup>95</sup>. When it comes to the character and significance of these readings, P<sup>95</sup> offers nothing unique. Its substitution that is assimilated to nearby usage (5:28 ακουσαντες) is like that found in D (5:37 μαρτυρει) and W (5:36 μαρτυρουσιν). Even its apparent long addition in 5:27 finds correspondence in the sixth century majuscule N (5:28 της φωνης του υιου του θεου). In both places, certainly in N, text has likely been added on account of influence from the immediate context. Likewise, if we are instead dealing with some sort of transposition at this point in P<sup>95</sup>, then we see similar activity (and in roughly the same place) in 01 (5:27 κρισιν...εξουσιαν). Whatever conclusions one may draw about the freedom exhibited in P<sup>95</sup>, this

---

<sup>590</sup> της φωνης του θεου in 1579 213 sy<sup>c</sup>. See Tischendorf<sup>8</sup> for versional support of various readings with θεου. There is clearly no room for this amount of text in the lacunose portion of P<sup>95</sup> (recto 8).

<sup>591</sup> See note under D regarding εξελουσονται in 5:29.

<sup>592</sup> See BDF, sec. 133 for discussion of neuter plural subject with singular verb (esp. 133.3).

comparison suggests that no particularly unique level of freedom or fluidity was present behind the copying of this early third century Greek manuscript.

#### Conclusions on Stability and/or Fluidity

In P<sup>95</sup> we are confronted with a rather small portion of text that attests one singular harmonization, one apparent singular reading that involves an approximately twelve-letter addition or rearrangement, and no internally probable variants. This naturally calls for the judgment that here we are looking at an instance of free and fluid transmission (as noted above for B. Aland). Yet this conclusion would need to be balanced with the evidence suggesting that all of its improbable variants and singular readings were made accidentally (haplography, harmonization to pronoun in immediate context, harmonization to participle that results in awkward syntax, possibly some form of dittography), and with the fact that a comparison with the later majuscules does not reveal anything peculiar about its transmission character. Instead, the data from this comparison, as it relates to both P<sup>95</sup> and P<sup>66</sup>, supports seeing greater continuity than discontinuity of transmission practices between the early third century and subsequent centuries.

### 3.2. P<sup>39</sup> (P. Oxy. XV 1780)

#### Introduction

P<sup>39</sup> is a fragment of the outer part of a leaf from a papyrus codex from Oxyrhynchus, Egypt that partially preserves John 8:14-22, with portions of vv. 14-18 on the verso and of vv. 18-22 on the recto in one column of text.<sup>593</sup> Among Greek manuscripts also dated to the second and third centuries, it shares extant text with P<sup>66</sup> (overlapping fully) and P<sup>75</sup> (overlapping for all verses covered but with some small lacunae). Grenfell and Hunt published P<sup>39</sup> in 1922 and dated it to the fourth century,<sup>594</sup> but it has since been judged by a number of scholars to be from sometime in the third century.<sup>595</sup> Orsini and Clarysse have recently upheld the third century dating, opting for the range of 275-300.<sup>596</sup> One of the outstanding features of P<sup>39</sup> is the high quality of its Biblical Majuscule script. Schofield describes it rather thoroughly as “written in a beautiful hand of the ‘biblical’ type, large, upright, with very heavy strokes well shaded, and with letters carefully made and spaced...the work of a master scribe.”<sup>597</sup> As Schofield indicates, these characteristics have naturally led to the conclusions that the scribe of P<sup>39</sup> was a trained professional and that the purpose and use of the manuscript were liturgical.<sup>598</sup>

---

<sup>593</sup> For this and further introductory information, see especially Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, eds., “Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1780,” in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XV* (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1922) 7-8 (referred to as *editio princeps* for the remainder of this chapter); K. Aland, *Repertorium I*, 262; idem, *Kurzgefaste Liste*, 7; LDAB: <http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/text.php?tm=61638>.

<sup>594</sup> *Editio princeps*, 7. Cf. van Haelst, *Catalogue*, no. 448.

<sup>595</sup> For first half of the third century, see K. Aland’s citation of the judgements of Roberts and Skeat in his *Studien*, 105 n.4; B. Aland, “Nutzen,” 21; Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 147. For third century generally, see K. Aland, *Kurzgefaste Liste*, 7. For late third, see Turner, *Typology*, 147; Chapa, “Early Text of John,” 154 n.73. For the possibility of a late second century date for P<sup>39</sup>, see Don Barker, “How Long and Old is the Codex of which P.Oxy. 1353 is a leaf?” in Evans and Zacharias, *Jewish and Christian Scripture*, 197-198.

<sup>596</sup> Orsini and Clarysse, “Manuscripts and Their Dates,” 470.

<sup>597</sup> Schofield, “Papyrus Fragments,” 273.

<sup>598</sup> See, for example, Barker, “How Long and Old,” 193 n.3, 198, who considers it one of the early “deluxe editions” written by “highly trained scribes,” which he associates with “careful block lettering and bilinearity;” AnneMarie Luijendijk, “Sacred Scriptures as Trash: Biblical Papyri from

The fragment itself measures 25.6 cm. in height and 8 cm. in width and preserves a portion of all 25 lines on both verso and recto. Only the outer half of the page is preserved, which includes part of the outer margin. The height of the page is almost entirely preserved, including 1.5 cm. of an upper margin and a 2 cm. lower margin. The reconstructed page was 26 cm. high and 16 cm. wide, and Turner places it in his Group 6 Aberrant.<sup>599</sup> Following Grenfell and Hunt’s transcription, the number of letters per line ranges from 11-15.<sup>600</sup> The page number οδ (74) is given on the left side of the upper margin on the recto. Since no page number is similarly given next to the outer margin on the verso, Grenfell and Hunt concluded, “either that the pages were numbered alternately [by even numbers]...or that they were numbered consecutively at the top left corner.”<sup>601</sup> This pagination indicates that the codex represented by P<sup>39</sup> consisted only of the Gospel of John.<sup>602</sup>

There are no itacisms or other orthographic readings in P<sup>39</sup>. A horizontal line over the previous letter to denote a final nu occurs once (τῆ̄ in 8:15, end of verso 10). *Nomina sacra* are attested for πατηρ, involving three instances of πῆρ (8:16, verso 18; 8:18, recto 28/3; 8:19 [1], recto 30/5) and one of πρᾶ (8:19 [3], recto 34/9), and Ἰησους, which is given in the conflated form ἱς (8:19, recto 31/6). P<sup>66</sup> gives the same *nomina sacra* for πατηρ, whereas P<sup>75</sup> writes each of them *in pleno*. Both P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup> give the *nomen sacrum* for Ἰησους but with the contracted ἱς. P<sup>39</sup> also appears from spacing to give the shortened ανων for ανθρωπων (8:17, verso 22), with P<sup>75</sup> but

---

Oxyrhynchus,” *VC* 64 (2010): 247-248, who notes the “exquisite professional handwriting” and says that it was “well-suited and intended for public reading.”

<sup>599</sup> Turner, *Typology*, 18. He gives the measurement as 16 x 25.6, which equates the height of the reconstructed page with that of the fragment.

<sup>600</sup> Cf. K. Aland, *Repertorium I*, 262.

<sup>601</sup> *Editio princeps*, 7.

<sup>602</sup> Cf. K. Aland, *Repertorium I*, 262. Working from the pagination and the regularity of the script, Comfort expresses greater certainty than Aland that P<sup>39</sup> did not contain the *Pericope Adulterae* (*Encountering the Manuscripts*, 353-354).

*contra* P<sup>66</sup>.<sup>603</sup> No abbreviation is attested for the number  $\delta\upsilon\omicron$  in P<sup>39</sup> (8:17, verso 21-22) or in the other two early co-witnesses (P<sup>75vid</sup>).

P<sup>39</sup> attests one instance of diaeresis involving  $\imath\epsilon\rho\omega$  (8:20, recto 39/14).

Grenfell and Hunt comment, “A pause is sometimes marked by an increase of the interval before the following letter, otherwise punctuation is absent.”<sup>604</sup> These pauses can be seen between  $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$  and  $\epsilon\gamma\omega$  at the end of 8:17 (verso 23);  $\overline{\pi\eta\rho}$  and  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu$  at the end of 8:18 (recto 28/3);  $\overline{\imath\eta\varsigma}$  and  $\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon$  in 8:19 (recto 31/6); and  $\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\iota\nu$  and  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu$  at the end of 8:21 (recto 50/25).<sup>605</sup> P<sup>39</sup> is classified by the Alands as a “Strict” text, and Barbara Aland adds, “Sehr genau gibt P<sup>39</sup> seine A-Vorlage wieder die von hervorragender Qualität gewesen sein muß.”<sup>606</sup> Similarly, Comfort considers it among the “most reliable texts.”<sup>607</sup> Epp lists P<sup>39</sup> as a member of the “‘B’ group,”<sup>608</sup> and Schofield referred to it as “wholly Alexandrian.”<sup>609</sup> This manuscript fragment was formerly housed at the Ambrose Swasey Library, Colgate Rochester Divinity School in Rochester, New York.<sup>610</sup>

#### Variation-Units Represented<sup>611</sup>

Variation-Unit	Variants	P <sup>39</sup> Transcribed
8:14 $\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\eta\varsigma$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ $\eta$ $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\rho\iota\alpha$ $\mu\omicron\upsilon$	$\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\eta\varsigma$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ $\eta$ $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\rho\iota\alpha$ $\mu\omicron\upsilon$ $\eta$ $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\rho\iota\alpha$ $\mu\omicron\upsilon$ $\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\eta\varsigma$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ P <sup>75</sup> B W 1424 b; E <sup>ri</sup> ph $\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\nu\eta$ $\mu\omicron\upsilon$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ $\eta$ $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\rho\epsilon\iota\alpha$ D	$\eta$ $\mu\alpha\rho$   [ $\tau\upsilon\rho\iota\alpha$ $\mu\omicron\upsilon$ ] $\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\eta\varsigma$   [ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ (verso 3-5)] <sup>612</sup>

<sup>603</sup> Cf. *editio princeps*, 8 and IGNTP I, 50.

<sup>604</sup> *Editio princeps*, 7.

<sup>605</sup> See transcriptions and/or notes in *editio princeps*, 7-8 and IGNTP I, 50-51 (cf. IGNTP I, plate 14.(a) and 14.(b)).

<sup>606</sup> K. Aland and B. Aland, *Text*, 95, 98; B. Aland, “Nutzen,” 37.

<sup>607</sup> Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, 268.

<sup>608</sup> Epp, “Significance,” 100.

<sup>609</sup> Schofield, “Papyrus Fragments,” 274.

<sup>610</sup> Head, “Habits,” 406 says that it was sold in 2003 and that its current location is unknown. Luijendijk, “Sacred Scriptures as Trash,” 247 n.105 mentions an auction held in 2008 by Sotheby’s in London in which no buyer was found.

<sup>611</sup> I have excluded the variation-unit concerned with the singular substitution of  $\gamma\epsilon\rho\alpha\mu\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$   $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$  for  $\gamma\epsilon\rho\alpha\pi\tau\alpha\iota$  at 8:17 in 01, but this reading will be treated in the Diachronic Comparison section below.

8:14 δε	δε – 01 F H K Y <sup>c</sup> 17. 127. 131 a/a sa <sup>mss</sup> bo <sup>pt</sup>	δε (verso 7)
8:14 η	η P <sup>66,75c</sup> B D K N Γ Ψ 070 f <sup>1</sup> l 844. l2211 lat sy <sup>h</sup> sa bo  και P <sup>75*</sup> 01 L W Γ Δ Θ f <sup>13</sup> 565. 700. 892. 1241 <i>Maj.</i> it ly pbo bo <sup>ms</sup>	η (verso 9) <sup>613</sup>
8:15 εγω <sup>614</sup>	εγω  εγω δε P <sup>75</sup> 238. 253. 472 d f sa <sup>mss</sup> pbo bo	εγω (verso 11) <sup>615</sup>
8:16 πατηρ <sup>616</sup>	πατηρ – 01* D sy <sup>s,c</sup>	πατηρ (verso 18)
8:21 αυτοις <sup>617</sup>	αυτοις P <sup>66*,75</sup> 01 B D L T W b (e) ly pbo  αυτοις ο Ιησους P <sup>66c</sup> K N Γ Δ Θ Ψ 070 f <sup>1,13</sup> 33. 565. 579. 700. 892. 1241. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> lat sy sa bo	[αυτοις] (recto 43/18) <sup>618</sup>

<sup>612</sup> I agree with IGNTP I, 50 in placing the sublinear dot under the partially extant alpha of αληθης.

<sup>613</sup> Only the right edge of the letter is preserved. *Editio princeps*, 7, 8, Swanson, *John*, 110, and Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 147 read η or η here, *contra* IGNTP I, 50, which reconstructs with και and places a sublinear dot under what is thought to be an iota (ερχομαι κα|ι). The number of letters reconstructed for the approximately same-sized spaces in the lines below (cf. verso 11, 12, 13, 14) do not favor reading και after ερχομαι in this lacuna.

<sup>614</sup> In light of support from multiple versions and more than one or two other Greek manuscripts I have not removed this variation-unit as based on a sub-singular reading of P<sup>75</sup>.

<sup>615</sup> There is a lacuna after εγω at the beginning of the next line (verso 12), in which there does not appear to be room for two additional letters. Cf. IGNTP I, plate 14.(a) for the alignment of letters immediately after parallel lacunae on verso lines 9, 11, 13, 14. Also note the number of letters reconstructed for the lacuna at line 14 which presumably also contained the particularly wide letter omega (see transcription in *editio princeps*, 7). For doubt on this matter, but based only on line lengths in general, see Maurice A. Robinson “Review of P. W. Comfort and D. P. Barrett, eds. *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts*,” *TC* 6 (2001): 43: <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/vol07/vol07-toc.html>.

<sup>616</sup> I have excluded 8:16 αληθινη as a variation-unit because it is not extant in P<sup>39</sup> (verso 15) and spacing is inconclusive. *Editio princeps*, 8: “Considerations of space are indecisive between αληθινη... and αληθης.” Given the affinity between 01 and D in this portion of John, the omission of πατηρ here in 8:16 is not considered a sub-singular reading and removed from consideration.

<sup>617</sup> P<sup>39</sup> is too lacunose on recto 30/5 to determine the presence or absence of the article with Ιησους in 8:19 (cf. *editio princeps*, 8 for comments on the flexibility of spacing in similar lacunae on recto 42/17 and 47/22).

<sup>618</sup> *Editio princeps*, 8; cf. IGNTP I, 237.

## Commentary on Variants

8:14 η μαρτυρια μου αληθης εστιν: There are a couple straightforward ways of explaining the word order variation between the two well-supported readings. One possibility is that η μαρτυρια μου αληθης εστιν is harmonized either to the immediate or (somewhat) near context. The wording in 5:31 that leads up to η μαρτυρια μου ουκ εστιν αληθης is practically identical to what precedes our variation-unit. It is also possible that η μαρτυρια σου ουκ εστιν αληθης in 8:13 has exercised influence, given its close proximity, or maybe even δυο ανθρωπων η μαρτυρια αληθης εστιν nearby in 8:17. Perhaps the most likely candidate is 8:13 on account of its nearness, but there is enough dissimilarity to weaken the argument that it has caused disruption in our variation-unit, such as the second person pronoun, negation, and especially a different word order for εστιν and αληθης. This different word order is also found in 5:31, and 8:17 has the genitive noun prior to η μαρτυρια. A better explanation to account for this variation-unit is that a transposition resulting from a corrected leap has led to the word order αληθης εστιν η μαρτυρια μου. When confronted with the text περι εμαυτου η μαρτυρια μου αληθης εστιν, the copyist leaped from εμαυτου to μου, thus writing εμαυτου αληθης εστιν, before realizing the error and inserting the skipped-over η μαρτυρια μου out of place. The internal evidence supports this explanation, since in other places involving μαρτυρια and αληθης the latter is fronted only when it comes after οτι (5:32; 21:24 (v.l.)). The substitution read by D could reflect influence from αληθινη in 8:16, or both the substitution and the word order were somehow affected by αληθινη αυτου εστιν η μαρτυρια in 19:35.<sup>619</sup> P<sup>39</sup> does not attest the word order evidently caused by a corrected leap.

---

<sup>619</sup> There are variant readings for these words in 19:35 but this portion of D is not preserved.

8:14 δε: There are many places in John where the personal pronoun υμεις is followed immediately by a negative particle and verb, which include: υμεις ου δυνασθε (7:34, 36 (v.l. om. υμεις); 8:21, 22; 13:33), υμεις ου πιστευετε (5:38; 8:46 (v.l. om. υμεις); 10:26), υμεις ουκ ακουετε (8:47), and υμεις ουκ οιδατε (1:26; 4:32; 7:28; 9:30; 11:49). The last of these is most relevant to our variation-unit where the issue is the presence or absence of δε between υμεις and ουκ οιδατε.<sup>620</sup> It is noteworthy that the greatest concentration of this frequent υμεις + ου/ουκ + verb construction is in chapters seven and eight, which forms the larger context for our verse.<sup>621</sup> Moreover, as is the case here in 8:14 a number of these are found in discussions surrounding Jesus' provenance, identity or destination (1:26; 5:38; 7:28, 34, 36; 8:21, 22; 9:30; 13:33). These observations increase the probability that δε was omitted due to influence from general usage, as the copyist was anticipating the negative particle and verb to go with the υμεις just written. P<sup>39</sup> attests the reading that is not harmonized to general usage.

8:14 η: If και is read at this variation-unit, the syntax of the previous clause (ποθεν ηλθον και που υπαγω) practically mirrors what we have here (ποθεν ερχομαι και που υπαγω). This suggests that και was the product of influence from the preceding clause and it makes η a more difficult reading. P<sup>39</sup> attests the reading that is not harmonized to the immediate context.

8:15 εγω: The presence of δε after εγω is an easier reading because it removes asyndeton. John attests similar υμεις...εγω contrasts with asyndeton in 7:8 (υμεις αναβητε εις την εορτην εγω ουκ αναβαινω εις την εορτην), 8:23b (υμεις εκ των κατω εστε εγω εκ των ανω ειμι) (δε after εγω D f q sy<sup>c</sup> sa bo; και before εγω 157), and 8:23c (υμεις εκ τουτου του κοσμου εστε εγω ουκ ειμι εκ του κοσμου

---

<sup>620</sup> For υμεις ουκ οιδατε as a feature of John's style, see Ruckstuhl and Dschulnigg, *Stilkritik*, 93 (listed as B 4).

<sup>621</sup> See Raymond Brown, *An Introduction to the Gospel of John* (ed. F. J. Moloney; New Haven: Yale University, 2003), 302.

τουτου), which lend support to the asyndeton here. This contrast regarding judgment (υμεις...κρινετε vs. εγω ου κρινω) follows on the heels of the contrast in 8:14 regarding knowledge (οιδα vs. υμεις δε ουκ οιδατε), in which δε is used (see treatment above). It seems likely, therefore, that the attestation of δε in our variation-unit reflects an insertion that was influenced by its use in the preceding contrast. P<sup>39</sup> attests the reading that is not harmonized to the immediate context.

8:16 πατηρ: The participial phrase ο πεμψας με is frequently used in the Gospel of John, sometimes attributively with πατηρ (5:37 (om. πατηρ f<sup>13</sup>); 6:44 (om. πατηρ A); 8:18; 12:49) and in other places substantivally without it (1:33 (from John the Baptist); 7:28; 8:26 (add. πατηρ 01 1170), 29 (add. πατηρ L)), setting aside our verse for the moment. An analysis and comparison of these places yields two results that bear on our variation-unit. First, in terms of content, in both places where the one who sent Jesus is being discussed in his capacity as a witness, as in our verse, πατηρ is included (ο πεμψας με πατηρ...μεμαρτυρηκεν περι εμου (5:37); μαρτυρει περι εμου ο πεμψας με πατηρ (8:18)). Secondly, if we look at similarity of syntax, four of the eight places mentioned above are in a clause that begins with αλλα, as in our verse, and three of these have ο πεμψας με without πατηρ (1:33; 7:28; 8:26). Thus, there is a superficial similarity between our clause and most of those that do not contain πατηρ (i.e., they begin with αλλα) and a more substantive similarity with half of those that do have πατηρ (i.e., they center on μαρτυρω). These observations make the reading with πατηρ intrinsically more probable, while at the same time increasing the likelihood that the reading without πατηρ was influenced by these other places in the Gospel that begin with αλλα.<sup>622</sup> In fact, two of these occurrences with αλλα are part of the larger context for our verse (7:28; 8:26). In having πατηρ P<sup>39</sup> does not attest the reading that is influenced by general usage or the near context.

---

<sup>622</sup> These two points taken together are more convincing than ascribing the presence of πατηρ to influence from v. 18, as Metzger, *Commentary*, 190 notes was the explanation given by a minority on the committee.

8:21 αὐτοῖς: It is difficult to determine which reading is more probable based solely on internal evidence. The absence of ο Ἰησοῦς could simply reflect a leap from the same to the same (αὐτοῖς ο Ἰησοῦς). Its presence could be the result of assimilation to the ubiquitous occurrence in John of ο Ἰησοῦς to introduce discourse, even though it is difficult to pinpoint any particular candidate (cf. 7:6; 8:25, 28, 39, 42, 58 from the near context). On the other hand, the fact that ο Ἰησοῦς is so frequently included when Jesus' discourse is introduced gives some intrinsic support to its presence here. Based on variation in similar places, it appears from the variants with very slight support that the temptation was present to add (e.g. 5:6 (G); 6:20 (59 111 sy<sup>c</sup>); 21:6 (X); 21:15 [2] (D U 19\* sy<sup>c</sup>)) and to omit (e.g. 4:53 (01\* N\*); 11:14 (33 157 892<sup>s</sup> a e r<sup>1</sup>); 11:44 (157); 21:5 (Λ<sup>\*vid</sup> W a sy<sup>s</sup>)). The fact that v. 21 begins a new sub-unit may suggest that αὐτοῖς ο Ἰησοῦς is a less difficult reading because copyists might be tempted to reintroduce the subject explicitly.<sup>623</sup> Since the application of internal criteria gives little confidence one way or the other, I have considered this reading inconclusive for the purposes of my analysis below.

#### Analysis of Manuscript based on Readings

As already noted, 8:21 αὐτοῖς is excluded from the following analysis as inconclusive based on internal criteria, but it is included in the percentages of agreement with P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup>. P<sup>39</sup>, therefore, supplies a total of five variants for analysis and no singular or sub-singular readings. Four out of five of the variation-units represented by P<sup>39</sup> probably derive from some form of harmonization or influence from other portions of text within the Gospel of John, and in every case P<sup>39</sup> has the non-harmonized reading. Two of them pertain to general usage (8:14 δε is not influenced by the prevalent ὑμεῖς + ου/ουκ + verb construction; 8:16 πατηρ is not

---

<sup>623</sup> For structural break, see Keener, *Gospel of John*, vol. 1, xvi, 743.

influenced by occurrences of ο πεμψας με in clauses beginning with αλλα), and two are concerned with the immediate context (8:14 η is not harmonized to the use of και in the previous, nearly identical clause; 8:15 εγω is not influenced by the use of δε in the previous contrast). The one remaining variation-unit involves mechanical alteration, and P<sup>39</sup> does not attest the transposition resulting from a corrected leap (8:14 η μαρτυρια μου αληθης εστιν). In sum, P<sup>39</sup> reads with the intrinsically and/or transcriptionally more probable reading in all five of these variation-units represented, and it attests no unique readings.

P<sup>39</sup> shares extant text with two other witnesses from the second and third centuries, P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup>. P<sup>66</sup> is entirely preserved for this portion of text, whereas P<sup>75</sup> is largely preserved with some lacunae. Based on what is extant or can be confidently reconstructed and leaving aside orthographic readings, P<sup>39</sup> agrees with P<sup>66</sup> 4 out of 7 times (57%): agreements (8:14 δε; 8:14 η; 8:15 εγω; 8:16 πατηρ); disagreements (P<sup>39</sup> reading listed first) (8:14 η μαρτυρια μου αληθης εστιν | αληθης εστιν η μαρτυρια μου; 8:20 ρηματα | ρητα; 8:21 αυτοις (lac.) | αυτοις ο Ιησους). P<sup>39</sup> agrees with P<sup>75</sup> 5 out of 7 times (71%): agreements (8:14 η μαρτυρια μου αληθης εστιν; 8:14 δε; 8:14 η; 8:16 πατηρ; 8:21 αυτοις); disagreements (8:15 εγω | εγω δε; 8:17 αληθης εστιν | εστιν αληθης). If singular readings are removed, then P<sup>39</sup> agrees with P<sup>66</sup> (minus 8:20 ρητα) 4 out of 6 times (67%) and with P<sup>75</sup> (minus 8:17 εστιν αληθης) 5 out of 6 times (83%).

#### Diachronic Comparison of Created Readings

Among manuscripts up through the seventh century, the portion of text covered by P<sup>39</sup> is fully preserved in P<sup>66</sup> 01, B, D, N, 029 and W. Listed below are the readings deemed likely to have been created by each respective scribe:

## P<sup>39</sup> (none)

### P<sup>66,624</sup>

8:20 ρηματα] ρητα P<sup>66</sup> (omission of second syllable resulting in substitution of noun (ρητον for ρημα); likely a slip caused by similar sounds (μα-τα or ταυτα τα ρηματα))<sup>625</sup>

### 01:<sup>626</sup>

8:14 απεκριθη [ο] Ιησους και ειπεν αυτοις] ειπεν αυτοις ο ις<sup>627</sup> 01 (omission of 17-18 letters possibly caused by skipping a line in the *Vorlage* plus the addition of ο Ιησους after αυτοις that resulted in a transposed word order;<sup>628</sup> the addition may reflect a partial correction to the omission or influence from general usage / near context (cf. 8:25, 28; 8:42))

8:16 και εαν] καν<sup>629</sup> 01 (harmonized substitution, to immediate context (8:14))

8:17 γεγραπται] γεγραμμενον εστιν 01 (harmonized substitution, to general usage in John (2:17; 6:31, 45; 10:34; 12:14))<sup>630</sup>

---

<sup>624</sup> I have excluded two readings that were corrected by the first hand: 8:14 καν γε corrected to καν εγω; 8:17 αλληθης corrected to αληθης.

<sup>625</sup> Cf. Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 527/528 n.682 (“Of course, there can be no doubt that at John 8:20 P<sup>66</sup> has simply blundered”); Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 58 (included with “simple scribal errors”).

<sup>626</sup> I have not included the 01 reading 8:21 ελεγεν for ειπεν because this portion of text is lacunose in P<sup>39</sup> (recto 42/17) and, according to *editio princeps*, 8, is uncertain on grounds of spacing.

<sup>627</sup> The extant αυτοις at the end of verso 1 is preceded and followed by lacunae in P<sup>39</sup> (αυτοις is the first word preserved for this manuscript), but there is not enough space in the lacuna at the beginning of verso 2 for ης to come after αυτοις (cf. spacing in verso lines 3-8). Thus it is the placement of Ιησους after αυτοις (i.e. at the end of the clause) that is listed as singular here in 01. It is unknown whether the article was read before Ιησους in P<sup>39</sup>, as it is in 01 D N and a number of other witnesses.

<sup>628</sup> Cf. what was probably the omission of  $\bar{\tau}\varsigma$  ουν ἴδων την μητερα in 01\* at 19:26 (see my treatment of P<sup>121</sup>), which likewise consists of 18 letters and shows no sign of a leap from same to same.

<sup>629</sup> P<sup>39</sup> is lacunose at this point (beginning of verso 13). *Editio princeps*, 8: “It is clear that the papyrus did not read καν’ with 01. Cf. parallel spaces in verso lines 9, 11, 12, 14.

8:19 μου [2]] om.<sup>631</sup> 01 1424 (omission of inessential, already implied possessive pronoun)

8:20 διδασκων εν τω ιερω] om. 01 (leap from same to same (γαζοφυλακιω διδασκων εν τω ιερω))

8:21 παλιν] om. 01 (both ελεγεν and the omission of παλιν reflect harmonization to the surrounding context (cf. 8:19, 22, 23, 31 in 01; especially vv. 19, 23)<sup>632</sup>)

**B:**

8:15 κατα την σαρκα] κατα τα την σαρκα<sup>633</sup> B (dittography of letters τ-α)

**D:**<sup>634</sup>

8:14 αληθης εστιν η μαρτυρια μου] αληθεινη μου εστιν η μαρτυρεια D (harmonized substitution, to immediate context (D has αληθινη in 8:16) plus transposition (see discussion in commentary above for word order variants); or, more likely, harmonization to 19:35 including substitution and transposition)

---

<sup>630</sup> Tischendorf<sup>8</sup> interprets this evidence to the opposite effect and places γεγραμμενον εστιν in the main text as intrinsically more probable. However, γεγραπται is transcriptionally more difficult and yet not foreign to John's usage (cf. 20:31).

<sup>631</sup> P<sup>39</sup> is lacunose for this word (recto 34/9). *Editio princeps*, 8: "The omission of μου with [01] would make the line unduly short." Cf. parallel spaces in recto lines 36-39/11-14.

<sup>632</sup> The nu of ουν is replaced with a horizontal line in 01, which precludes explaining the omission of παλιν as a leap from same to same.

<sup>633</sup> Swanson, *John*, 110 erroneously transcribes τα after κατα for P<sup>39</sup>. Cf. verso 10 in IGNTP I, plate 14.(a).

<sup>634</sup> Since I take the readings of each manuscript to be those after contemporaneous corrections, I have excluded from my considerations two D\* readings that were corrected by the first hand (C\*): 8:14 οικ for οιδατε and 8:17 ανθρωπων for ανθρωπων. See IGNTP II, 4, 341, 342.

8:16 ουκ εμι] εγω ουκ εμι<sup>635</sup> D (ουκ εμι εγω 1093) sa (harmonized addition of pronoun, to immediate and surrounding context (a proliferation of uses of εγω in 8:12-30, two of which in v. 16; cf. especially vv. 12, 18, 23b, 24, 28 in D))

8:19 και ειπεν ουτε [1]] και ειπεν αυτοις ουτε<sup>636</sup> D b sa (harmonized addition of dative pronoun, to immediate and surrounding context (cf. 8:12, 14, 21, 23, 25 in D; note especially the parallel with v. 14 in the exchange of dialogue, as well as its proximity, and the similar punctuation used in D for these portions of vv. 14 and 19))

8:19 αν ηδειτε] ηδειτε<sup>637</sup> D 209 b e ff<sup>2</sup> (an omission influenced by immediate context (previous ηδειτε in 8:19), or simply an omission of the inessential particle αν)

8:21 ζητησετε] ζησετε<sup>638</sup> D\* (leap from same to same (ζητησετε))

## N:

8:16 και εαν κρινω δε] εαν δε κρινω<sup>639</sup> N 71. 185. 1194 (omission plus transposition resulting in what may be a harmonized substitution of εαν δε for και εαν, to usage elsewhere in John (11:10; 12:24; 16:7))

---

<sup>635</sup> P<sup>39</sup> is lacunose before ουκ (beginning of verso 16), but according to *editio princeps*, 8, “There would be no room for εγω.” Cf. parallel spaces in verso lines 11-15.

<sup>636</sup> Since 01 D and some other witnesses have και ειπεν before ουτε, this was probably the reading of D’s *Vorlage*. The singular reading treated here is the addition of αυτοις after ειπεν.

<sup>637</sup> P<sup>39</sup> is lacunose at the end of recto 34/9 leading up to η / ]δειτε, but spacing indicates that αν was read in the lacuna: cf. related note above on the 01 omission of μου [2] in 8:19, which falls in the same lacuna.

<sup>638</sup> Corrected by E corrector in late fifth century. See IGNTP II, 9-10, 344; David C. Parker, *Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and Its Text* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 39: “datable to the second part, and probably to the third quarter, of the fifth century.”

<sup>639</sup> This reading is included as likely to have emerged independently in N. The support is narrow and late, and the nature of the variation makes coincidental agreement likely. I treat this reading as distinct from the simple omission of και (see below for this omission in W 1170) because here we have both the omission of και and the moving forward of δε in the sentence, thus taking on the character of a substitution.

8:21 και ουχ ευρησετε με] και ουκ ευρησετε με<sup>640</sup> N (harmonized substitution, to immediate context (use of ουκ in 8:13, 14, 16, 23, 27, 29))

**029:**

8:14 οιδατε] οιδαταδε<sup>641</sup> 029 (nonsense apparently due to a mixture of dittography and confusion of similar sounds)<sup>642</sup>

8:19 ουτε[2]] ουδε 029 (substitution that should probably be considered an orthographic reading given the phonetic interchange noted above in the nonsense reading at 8:14)

**W:**

8:16 και [1]] om.<sup>643</sup> W 1170 (omission possibly influenced by contextually parallel verses in John (cf. 5:31; 8:14))<sup>644</sup>

Looking first at the quantity of singular or sub-singular readings, there are six in 01, five in D, two in N and 029 (or one, if ουδε is taken as an orthographic reading), and one in B and W. Concerning the second and third century witnesses, P<sup>66</sup> has one and P<sup>39</sup> has none. Based on this body of data, P<sup>39</sup> exhibits the greatest accuracy, followed closely by P<sup>66</sup>, B, and W, and then by N and 029. Both 01 and D stand out among these eight witnesses, having three or four more readings than the next closest manuscript, while P<sup>39</sup> and P<sup>66</sup> are at the other end of the spectrum,

---

<sup>640</sup> N f<sup>1</sup> 22. 565. 700. 1194. 2193. *al* have the words και ουχ ευρησετε (+ με) after ζητησετε με (cf. 7:34, 36), but the form ουκ is unique to N.

<sup>641</sup> P<sup>39</sup> is lacunose at the beginning of verso 8 (ουκ οιδατ[ε]), but see related note on spacing under the 8:14 η variation-unit above (verso 9).

<sup>642</sup> Cf. Gignac I, 82-83.

<sup>643</sup> See note above on this lacunose portion of P<sup>39</sup> (verso 13) under the 01 singular reading 8:16 καν, which likewise results in three letters instead of six (εαν or καν instead of και εαν). See also note under N for omission of και plus transposition of δε.

<sup>644</sup> Also, for apparent difficulty with και...δε among copyists, see for example v.l. in Lk 2:35; Jn 15:27; Ac 22:29.

having the least and average number respectively (the average, that is, among the six manuscripts other than 01 and D). These numbers demonstrate continuity between the earlier and later centuries, with the only exception being the peculiarity of 01 and D.

In terms of character and significance, the one reading that is attested in the earlier manuscripts, the omission of a syllable in P<sup>66</sup>, finds correspondence among the later witnesses. Obvious errors such as this one are also attested in 01 (8:20 om. διδασκων εν τω ιερω), B (8:15 κατα τα την σαρκα), D (8:21 ζησετε), and 029 (8:14 οιδαταδε). Aside from a number of other types of readings listed above, it is especially worth noting that neither of the two earlier witnesses attests multi-layered readings that consist of separate changes, as we see in 01 (8:14 ειπεν αυτοις ο Ιησους), D (8:14 αληθεινη μου εστιν η μαρτυρεια), and N (8:16 εαν δε κρινω). Each of these readings involves a string of words in which there is more than one formal type of variation (omission, addition, substitution, transposition) and is less easily assessed in terms of origin or influencing factors.

#### Conclusions on Stability and/or Fluidity

With no internally improbable variants or singular / sub-singular readings, P<sup>39</sup> establishes itself as a paradigmatic representative of stability in transmission. Where there is discontinuity, it is due to the far greater accuracy exhibited in the copying of P<sup>39</sup> than in two of the later witnesses, and slightly greater accuracy than in all other manuscripts preserved for this portion of John 8 up through the seventh century. The one singular reading treated in the fully overlapping portion from P<sup>66</sup> falls in the same category of scribal slips that we see represented by four of the later majuscules. From these data we certainly do not find support for the notion that greater freedom or fluidity was present behind the copying of manuscripts prior to the fourth century.

## 4. FRAGMENTS WITH FULL OVERLAP IN P66 AND P75

### 4.1. P<sup>106</sup> (P. Oxy. LXV 4445)

#### Introduction

P<sup>106</sup> is a stained fragment from a leaf of a papyrus codex from Oxyrhynchus, Egypt, which contains portions of John 1:29-35 on the verso and 1:40-46 on the recto.<sup>645</sup> It shares extant text with four other early papyri, including P<sup>5</sup>, P<sup>66</sup>, P<sup>75</sup> and P<sup>119</sup>. It is overlapped partially by P<sup>5</sup> in vv. 29-31, 40 and by P<sup>119</sup> in 40-44. P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup> offer full overlap for the portion of text covered by the papyrus. W.E.H. Cockle published P<sup>106</sup> in 1998 and assigned it to the third century, “more probably the first half.”<sup>646</sup> The INTF and Orsini and Clarysse have listed it with the general date of third century.<sup>647</sup> Cockle describes P<sup>106</sup> as “written in a carbon ink with a narrow pen in an upright, plain script,” with letters that are “largely bilinear.”<sup>648</sup> Orsini and Clarysse note its similarity to the Alexandrian stylistic class but that it lacks “chancery shapes.”<sup>649</sup>

The fragment itself is 8.8 cm. wide and 13 cm. high. It preserves a portion of 20 lines on the verso and 21 lines on the recto that were written in one column. 1.5 cm. of a top margin survives, and 1.3 cm. of an outside margin is clearly visible on the left side of the recto. The page was approximately 12.6 cm. wide and 23.5 cm. high, putting it into Turner’s Group 8, with a written area of 10 x 20 cm.<sup>650</sup> There were about 36 lines per page, and Cockle’s reconstruction results in an average of 24/25 letters per line and a range of 21 or 22-31 letters.

---

<sup>645</sup> For this and further introductory information, see W. E. H. Cockle, ed., “Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 4445,” in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Volume LXV*, Graeco-Roman Memoirs 85 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1998) 11-14, plate IV-V (referred to as *editio princeps* for the remainder of this chapter); INTF *Liste*; LDAB: <http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/text.php?tm=61631>.

<sup>646</sup> See brief discussion in *editio princeps*, 11.

<sup>647</sup> Online *Liste*; Orsini and Clarysse, “Manuscripts and Their Dates,” 471.

<sup>648</sup> *Editio princeps*, 11.

<sup>649</sup> Orsini and Clarysse, “Manuscripts and Their Dates,” 458.

<sup>650</sup> See calculations in *editio princeps*, 11-12; cf. Turner, *Typology*, 20

The following *nomina sacra* are attested in P<sup>106</sup>:  $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$  (1:29, verso 2; 1:34, verso 20);  $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$  (1:42, recto 9; 1:43, recto 14);  $\overline{\iota\eta\nu}$  (1:45, recto 20);  $\overline{\pi\nu\alpha}$  (1:32, verso 11; 1:33, verso 16);  $\overline{\pi\nu\iota}$  (1:33, verso 18);  $\overline{\chi\rho\varsigma}$  (1:41, recto 8). *Nomina sacra* are attested for all of these words in P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup>, but with the contracted forms  $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$ ,  $\overline{\iota\nu}$  and  $\overline{\chi\varsigma}$ .  $\upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$  in reference to Peter (1:42, recto 10) and  $\upsilon\iota\omicron\nu$  in reference to Jesus (1:45, recto 20),  $\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\omicron\upsilon$  (1:32, verso 12), and  $\iota\varsigma\rho\alpha\eta\lambda$  (1:31, verso 8) are all written *in pleno* in P<sup>106</sup>. P<sup>75</sup> has  $\overline{\iota\eta\lambda}$  and writes the others *in pleno* whereas P<sup>66</sup> contracts both occurrences of  $\upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$  and writes the others *in pleno*.

Along with other manuscript witnesses, P<sup>106</sup> attests  $\epsilon\omicron\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha$  rather than  $\epsilon\omega\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha$  (1:34, verso 19),<sup>651</sup> and it has the spelling  $\text{Ναζαρεθ}$  instead of  $\text{Ναζαρετ}$  (1:45, recto 21; 1:46, recto 22).<sup>652</sup> Instances of diaeresis in P<sup>106</sup> include  $\dot{\iota}\omega\alpha\nu\nu\omicron\upsilon$  (1:40, recto 3; 1:42, recto 10),  $\text{Βηθ'σαιδα}$  (1:44, recto 15),  $\upsilon\dot{\iota}\omicron\nu$  (1:45, recto 20) and  $\dot{\iota}\omega\sigma\eta\phi$  (1:45, recto 20). An apostrophe is used after  $\iota\varsigma\rho\alpha\eta\lambda$  (1:31, verso 8) and in the  $\text{Βηθ'σαιδα}$  noted above. Cockle points out that the iota of  $\dot{\iota}\delta\epsilon$  at the beginning of the line, in  $\dot{\iota}\delta\epsilon \omicron \alpha\mu\nu\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \overline{\theta\upsilon}$  (1:29, verso 2), appears to be enlarged.<sup>653</sup> The pagination given in the middle of the top margin, which includes a gamma (page three) on the verso and a delta (page four) on the recto, indicates that the codex contained only John or that John was the first book included.<sup>654</sup>

Based on what she regards as a small number of relatively minor mistakes (deviations from the *Ausgangstext*), most of which she thinks were inherited from the *Vorlage*, B. Aland notes the “Zuverlässigkeit” of the transmission reflected in P<sup>106</sup> and says that it represents a “relativ fester Überlieferungsstruktur.”<sup>655</sup> Some have

<sup>651</sup> See BDF, sec. 68 for discussion concerning Atticism.

<sup>652</sup> See BDF, sec. 39.2 for fluctuation between the two spellings.

<sup>653</sup> *Editio princeps*, 11.

<sup>654</sup> *Editio princeps*, 11.

<sup>655</sup> B. Aland, “Kriterien,” 7; eadem, “Nutzen,” 33, 36. Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, 268 puts P<sup>106</sup> among the “most reliable texts.”

noted its basic Alexandrian character, citing affinities with P<sup>66</sup>, P<sup>75</sup>, 01 and B.<sup>656</sup>

Based at least partly on its placement towards the documentary rather than literary end of the spectrum, some have posited a private rather than public use for this manuscript.<sup>657</sup> P<sup>106</sup> is currently housed at the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

#### Variation-Units Represented<sup>658</sup>

Variation-Unit	Variants	P <sup>106</sup> Transcribed
1:30 υπερ	υπερ P <sup>5,66,75</sup> 01* B C* W <sup>s</sup>  περι 01 <sup>2</sup> A C <sup>3</sup> K N P Γ Δ Θ Ψ 0101 f <sup>1,13</sup> 33. 565.579. 700. 892. 1241. 1424. 12211 <i>Maj</i> ; Eriph	[υ]περ (verso 4)
1:31 ηλθον εγω	ηλθον εγω  εγω ηλθον C* 157 700 1241 b bo	εγω ηλθον (verso 8)
1:32 λεγων <sup>659</sup>	λεγων  – 01* e	– (verso 10)
1:32 καταβαινον ως περιστεραν	καταβαινον ως περιστεραν  ως περιστεραν καταβαινον 01  καταβαινον ωσει περιστεραν P <sup>66</sup> K P Δ 0101 f <sup>1,13</sup> 700. 892. 1241. 1424. 12211 <i>pm</i>	καταβαιν[ο]ν ως περιστε   ραν (verso 11-12)
1:33 υδατι	υδατι  τω υδατι P <sup>66</sup> 01 f <sup>1</sup> sa <sup>mss</sup> ; Or <sup>pt</sup>	τω]   υδατι (verso 14-15) <sup>660</sup>
1:33 εν πνευματι αγιω	εν πνευματι αγιω	[ε]ν π̄νι αγιω (verso 18) <sup>661</sup>

<sup>656</sup> See comments in Elliott, “Five New Papyri,” 211; Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, 75. But for the non-Alexandrian character of 01 in John chapter one, see Gordon D. Fee, “Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John: A Contribution to Methodology in Establishing Textual Relationships,” *NTS* 15 (1968-69): 23-44.

<sup>657</sup> Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, 49; Charlesworth, “Catholicity,” 44.

<sup>658</sup> The following variation-units are added to those treated in NA28, based on what is read in P<sup>106</sup>: 1:31 ηλθον εγω; 1:32 λεγων.

<sup>659</sup> The presence or absence of τω before υδατι in 1:31 is excluded as lacunose (verso 8-9) (see comment in *editio princeps*, 13).

<sup>660</sup> *Editio princeps*, 13: “spacing strongly suggests that this was the reading of the papyrus.”

	εν πνευματι αγιω και πυρι P <sup>75cvid</sup> C* sa	
1:34 ο υιος	ο υιος ο εκλεκτος 01* 77 218 b e ff <sup>2*</sup> sy <sup>s,c</sup> electus filius (a) ff <sup>2c</sup> sa	ο [ε]κλεκ[τος (verso 20)] <sup>662</sup>
1:42 ηγαγεν <sup>663</sup>	ηγαγεν P <sup>66*.75.119vid</sup> 01 B L b sa <sup>mss</sup> και ηγαγεν A K W <sup>s</sup> Γ Δ Θ Ψ f <sup>13</sup> 33. 565. 700. 892. 1241. 1424 Maj. lat sy sa <sup>mss</sup> ουτος ηγαγεν P <sup>66c</sup> f <sup>1</sup> G bo; Eriph ηγαγεν δε 579	ηγαγεν (recto 8)
1:42 εμβλεψας	εμβλεψας P <sup>66</sup> 01 A B K L Γ Ψ f <sup>1</sup> 565. 579 <sup>vid</sup> . 700 pm sy <sup>s</sup> εμβλεψας δε P <sup>75</sup> Δ Θ f <sup>13</sup> 33. 892. 1241. 1424 pm lat sy <sup>h</sup> sa <sup>mss</sup> bo και εμβλεψας W <sup>s</sup> a e q sy <sup>c,p</sup>	[εμβλε]   ψας (recto 8-9) <sup>664</sup>
1:42 Ιωαννου	Ιωαννου P <sup>66.75</sup> 01 B* L W <sup>s</sup> 33 it co Ιωνα A B <sup>2</sup> K Γ Δ Ψ f <sup>1,13</sup> 565. 579. 700. 892. 1424 Maj. c q vg <sup>cl</sup> sy bo <sup>ms</sup> ; Eriph Ιωαννα Θ 1241 vg	ϊωαννου (recto 10)
1:45 υιον	υιον P <sup>66.75.106</sup> 01 B 33. 579. I 2211; Or <sup>pt</sup> τον υιον A K L Γ Δ Θ Ψ f <sup>1,13</sup> 565. 700. 892. 1241. 1424. Maj.; Or <sup>pt</sup>	υιο[v] (recto 20)

<sup>661</sup> *Editio princeps*, 13: “There is certainly no room for this addition.”

<sup>662</sup> Although it is uncertain, since the beginning and end of the word are lacunose and the middle letters are hardly clear, Cockle says that P<sup>106</sup> appears to read εκλεκτος (*editio princeps*, 13).

<sup>663</sup> 1:41 πρωτον is excluded as lacunose because it is impossible to know whether πρωτος or πρωτον was read (πρω | το[v] on recto 4-5).

<sup>664</sup> There is no room for και in the lacuna at the end of line 8: η[v εμβλε] (cf. *editio princeps*, 12, plate V).

1:46 και <sup>665</sup>	και – 01 71 a b e sy <sup>s-p</sup>	κα̅ι (recto 21)
-------------------------	--	-----------------

### Unique Readings<sup>666</sup>

Place of Variation	Readings	P <sup>106</sup> Transcribed
1:33 αν	αν <i>rell</i> εαν P <sup>106</sup>	εαν (verso 16) <sup>667</sup>
1:40 ακολουθησαντων	ακολουθησαντων <i>rell</i> ηκολουθησαντων P <sup>75</sup> ηκολουθησαν	η   κ̅ολ̅[ουθη]σαν (recto 3-4) <sup>668</sup>
1:41 ουτος	ουτος <i>rell</i> – e b	– (recto 4)
1:42 τον Ιησουν	τον Ιησουν <i>rell</i> Ιησουν	τη[v (recto 8)]

### Commentary on Variants

1:30 υπερ: See discussion of this variation-unit under treatment of P<sup>5</sup>. P<sup>106</sup> attests the reading that is not harmonized to the immediate or near context.

<sup>665</sup> I have retained this variation-unit, although the omission of και may have occurred independently in 01.

<sup>666</sup> Cockle expresses some uncertainty regarding εκ της πολεως at 1:44, recto 15-16 but gives no alternative suggestion as to what might have been read here: “it is very difficult to read [πο]λεως in the papyrus; it is particularly hard to make the traces fit the expected omega” (*editio princeps*, 14).

<sup>667</sup> *Editio princeps*, 13: “there is a horizontal stroke at the left of the alpha, which could only be part of epsilon.”

<sup>668</sup> This is the transcription provided in Cockle’s note on recto lines 3-4. He proposes ηκολουθησαν, commenting that perhaps “κολ̅” is represented by the traces of ink at the beginning of line 4, which is then followed by a space of possibly four letters (see *editio princeps*, 13).

1:31 εγω ηλθον: The use of εγω ειπον in the preceding verse suggests that this word order in our variation-unit is probably harmonized. P<sup>106</sup> attests the reading that is likely harmonized to word order in the immediate context.

1:32 om. λεγων: This reading in P<sup>106</sup> may very well reflect an independent creation of the copyist,<sup>669</sup> but since there are other narrowly attested readings shared by P<sup>106</sup> and 01, I have not counted it as a sub-singular reading of either manuscript. The immediate context contains instances of a finite verb used with οτι and without λεγων for direct discourse: ωμολογησεν οτι (1:20) and μεμαρτυρηκα οτι (1:34). It is conceivable that these uses exercised some influence on the reading of εμαρτυρησεν...οτι without λεγων in this variation-unit. Among the approximately eight occurrences of λεγων in John, only here is it followed by οτι, which supports seeing the presence of λεγων as a more difficult reading (cf. λεγοντες οτι at 4:51). P<sup>106</sup> attests the omission of a superfluous and Semitic element of syntax that may reflect influence from the immediate to near context.<sup>670</sup>

1:32 καταβαινον ως περιστεραν: The alternative word order ως περιστεραν καταβαινον is identical to Mark 1:10, and the alternative reading with ωσει, which has no firm occurrence in John, reads with Matthew 3:16 (καταβαινον ωσει περιστεραν). P<sup>106</sup> attests the reading that is not harmonized to Gospel parallels.

1:33 τω υδατι: Two observations serve to make the absence of the article marginally more probable than its presence. First, the narrow support for most of the εν τω variants in John, whether with υδατι or πνευματι, come together to suggest a scribal inclination to add the article into this prepositional phrase (cf. 1:26 and our variation-unit for υδατι; 1:33 and 4:23 for πνευματι). Second, the variant εν τω υδατι attested by some witnesses in 1:26, 31, 33 may reflect harmonization to 1 John 5:6, where twice Jesus is said to come εν τω υδατι. There are other elements of 1 John 5:6

---

<sup>669</sup> Especially since it was corrected in 01 by the Scriptorium hand (IGNTP II, 200).

<sup>670</sup> For its Semitic character, see BDF, sec. 420.

that are similar to the syntax and content of this portion of John 1, including the use of μαρτυρεω, the specific activity of το πνευμα in bearing witness, and ουτος εστιν ο ελθων in reference to Jesus. P<sup>106</sup> attests a reading that is probably harmonized to the distant context of 1 John.

1:33 εν πνευματι αγιω: See discussion of this variation-unit under treatment of P<sup>5</sup>. P<sup>106</sup> does not attest the two-word addition that reflects harmonization to Gospel parallels.

1:34 ο εκλεκτος: Ehrman contends for the priority of εκλεκτος based on the prospect that “Son of God” arose as a proto-orthodox alteration to guard against Adoptionism.<sup>671</sup> Arguing for υιος, B. Aland highlights Luke 23:35 (του θεου ο εκλεκτος) and 9:35 (ουτος εστιν ο υιος μου ο εκλελεγμενος) as possible sources for harmonization to the “weiteren Kontext.” In response to Ehrman’s approach, she remarks that easy explanations are to be preferred, even if ο εκλεκτος is prior to ο υιος, “und Harmonisierung (Konformation) mit dem Kontext ist eine einfache Erklärung.”<sup>672</sup>

Quek makes a convincing case for the probability of εκλεκτος, concluding that υιος likely reflects harmonization either to general usage in John or to Synoptic baptismal accounts, both of which he finds more likely than a distant harmonization to the Transfiguration or Passion narratives of Luke as suggested by Aland.<sup>673</sup> In support of his conclusion he cites, among other evidence, the conflated *electus filius* as an indication of the priority of εκλεκτος, the diversity of messianic titles used at the beginning of John and the climactic nature of the confession “Son of God” in 1:49, and the likelihood that a harmonization to Isaiah 42:1 (to account for ο εκλεκτος) would involve ο αγαπητος. He agrees with Aland that a simple

---

<sup>671</sup> Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 115.

<sup>672</sup> B. Aland, “Nutzen,” 34.

<sup>673</sup> Tze-Ming Quek, “A Text-Critical Study of John 1.34,” *NTS* 55, 1 (2009): 22-34.

explanation such as harmonization is far more probable than that adduced by Ehrman.<sup>674</sup>

While εκλεκτος does not appear elsewhere in John, υιος appears approximately 25 times, a number of which with the genitive θεου as we have here (1:49; 3:18; 5:25; 10:36; 11:4; 11:27; 19:7; 20:31). The exact wording (ο υιος του θεου) is found in the confession of Nathaniel in the near context at 1:49 (συ ει ο υιος του θεου). In the Synoptic Gospels (Mk 1:11; Matt 3:17; Lk 3:23) the voice from heaven refers to Jesus as ο υιος μου at his baptism. Given the frequency of ο υιος in John and the proximity of ο υιος του θεου in 1:49, I find it most reasonable to conclude that P<sup>106</sup> attests the reading that is not harmonized to the near context or general usage.

1:42 ηγαγεν: The other variants include the presence of και, ουτος, or δε at the beginning of the sentence, which indicate three different attempts among copyists, whether consciously or unconsciously, to smooth away the asyndeton. The variant with only ηγαγεν is abrupt and easily accounts for the emergence of the others in which a smoother transition between sentences is supplied. The insertion of ουτος, as in P<sup>66c</sup> and some other witnesses, probably shows influence from the ουτος subject of the previous verse. P<sup>106</sup> attests the rougher text without the elimination of asyndeton.

1:42 εμβλεψας: και and δε smooth the transition between sentences by removing asyndeton. The only other use of εμβλεψας in John appears in the immediate context (1:36), where it is preceded by και, which almost certainly indicates harmonization in the case of και here in 1:42. Likewise, στραφεις δε in 1:38 (see discussion of that variation-unit under P<sup>5</sup>), which also has Jesus as its subject and is the last occurrence of a nominative participle at the beginning of a sentence

---

<sup>674</sup> Quek, "John 1.34," 31.

before 1:42, is probably responsible to some degree for the presence of δε in our variation unit. P<sup>106</sup> attests the rougher reading that is not influenced by nearby usage.

1:42 Ιωαννου: Here Jesus says to Peter, “συ ει Σιμων ο υιος Ιωαννου” (cf. 21:15-17). Ιωνα is probably a harmonization to Matthew 16:17 which reads, “Blessed are you Simon βαριωνα.”<sup>675</sup> The other attested reading Ιωαννα is a female name mentioned in Luke 8:3 and 24:10.<sup>676</sup> P<sup>106</sup> attests the non-harmonized reading.

1:45 υιον: It is possible that τον was simply omitted by a leap (Ιησουυ του υιον), although in this case there are a few reasons to suspect that the presence of the article reflects assimilation. We see the use of the article with υιος in the immediately preceding context at 1:42 (συ ει Σιμων ο υιος Ιωαννου). The article is also attested where Jesus is similarly referred to as the son of Joseph in 6:42 (Ιησους ο υιος Ιωσηφ). In other words, in both the nearest occurrence of “son of” and in the only other place in the Gospel where Jesus is referred to as the “son of Joseph,” we find the article used before υιος. Offering support for this conclusion is the omission of του before Ιωσηφ by some witnesses, which likewise suggests influence from these other occurrences in which the second name is not preceded by an article. These observations make the absence of the article in our variation-unit a more difficult reading. P<sup>106</sup> attests that reading that is not harmonized to the immediate context or parallel usage in the Gospel.

1:46 και: The variant ειπεν αυτω Ναθαναηλ (not preceded by και) at the beginning of 1:46 is probably influenced by the asyndetic λεγει αυτω Ναθαναηλ at the beginning of 1:48. In conjunction with this observation is the fact that there is the frequent occurrence of asyndeton in this section describing Jesus’ interaction with his earliest followers (1:39a; 1:40a; 1:42a; 1:42a, b; 1:45a; 1:46b; 1:47a; 1:48a (most of which with a variant reading)). Despite creating a rougher asyndetic reading, the

---

<sup>675</sup> See BDF, sec. 53.2.

<sup>676</sup> Metzger, *Commentary*, 172.

absence of και in this particular context is a transcriptionally easier reading that probably reflects assimilation. P<sup>106</sup> attests the reading that is not harmonized to the immediate context.

#### Commentary on Unique Readings

1:33 εαν: Since εαν “appears very frequently instead of ἄν after relatives” in the New Testament,<sup>677</sup> and since the former is used twice as frequently in John as the latter, it would not be surprising if this singular substitution to εαν after a relative pronoun in the Gospel of John were influenced by general usage. P<sup>106</sup> attests the substitution of an interchanging particle that was potentially affected by general usage.

1:40 ηκολουθησαν: This same indicative form appears in 1:37 on the heels of very similar vocabulary to what we have here (και ηκουσαν οι δυο μαθηται αυτου λαλουντος και ηκολουθησαν τω Ιησου) (cf. harmonized addition of Ιησου at the end of 1:40 in G Λ). Here P<sup>106</sup> attests a harmonization to a verb form in the immediate context.

1:41 om. ουτος: Although two followers of Jesus are in view at this point in the narrative, the subject in this verse is abundantly clear from the emphasis on Andrew in the previous verse. Thus, as Head remarks, this reading does appear to be a “singular omission of a potentially redundant term.”<sup>678</sup> ουτος is prevalent in the first chapter of John, appearing seven times in reference to the Word, John or Jesus, and three of those occurrences are attested in P<sup>106</sup> (1:30, 33, 34). Since no attempt is made to omit the resumptive use of ουτος in 1:33, we are probably not looking at a conscious effort to smooth away unnecessary syntax here in 1:41. Moreover, just as the addition of ουτος at the beginning of the next verse with ηγαγεν was probably due to influence from this verse, it is also possible that the omission of ουτος here

---

<sup>677</sup> BDF, sec. 107.

<sup>678</sup> Head, “Habits,” 403.

with εὑρισκει was influenced by the absence of a nominative there. The fact that these are the only two verses in the context in which Andrew is the subject gives some support to this scenario. P<sup>106</sup> attests what is probably an unconscious omission of an inessential pronoun that could have been affected by the syntax of the following verse.

1:42 Ἰησοῦν: John nearly always uses the article in prepositional phrases with πρὸς and a noun (exceptions include 13:6; 18:13, 24; 20:2). It is also more characteristic of John to use the article with Ἰησοῦν throughout the Gospel. Nothing from the context presents itself to explain the omission, so that it is best to simply conclude that P<sup>106</sup> attests the omission of an unnecessary article.

#### Analysis of Manuscript based on Readings

P<sup>106</sup> offers 16 readings for analysis, which consists of 12 variants from the tradition and four singular or sub-singular readings. Nine of the twelve variants are in variation-units where some form of harmonization appears to have played a role in giving rise to variation. In seven of these variation-units P<sup>106</sup> attests the non-harmonized reading, whether it concerns parallel text from another Gospel (1:32 καταβαινον ὡς περισσεραν is not harmonized to word order or vocabulary from Synoptic descriptions of Jesus' baptism; 1:33 ἐν πνευματι αγιω does not attest the additional words from Matthew and Luke; 1:42 Ἰωαννου does not attest a name/ form of the name used in other Gospels) or vocabulary and syntax within the Gospel of John (1:30 ὑπερ does not assimilate to uses of περι in the immediate to near context; 1:34 ὁ εκλεκτος does not attest the more familiar word from the near context and general usage; 1:45 υιον is not harmonized to a nearby and/or a parallel use of the article; 1:46 και is not influenced by syntax in the immediate context). In two of these nine variation-units, however, P<sup>106</sup> has the harmonized reading: 1:31 ἐγὼ ηλθον

is assimilated to the word order of this pronoun with another verb in the previous verse; 1:33 τῷ ὕδατι suggests influence from the use of the article in the same prepositional phrase in 1 John.

The remaining three variation-units can be assessed according to stylistic/syntactical difficulty. In two of these P<sup>106</sup> reads with the more difficult or rougher reading: 1:42 ἠγάγευ and 1:42 ἐμβλεψας, which do not evidence the smoothing of asyndeton. In one of them, however, P<sup>106</sup> attests the easier reading: 1:32 omission of the superfluous and Semitic participle λεγῶν. However, as noted in the commentary above, assimilation to nearby text may likewise be at the root of these variation-units.

In summary, in these 12 variation-units for which P<sup>106</sup> is extant or can be reasonably reconstructed, nine or 75% of its variants are internally more probable than the alternative(s). This means that in only three or 25% of these variation-units do we find an intrinsically and/or transcriptionally less probable reading. These involve the transposition of ἐγὼ and ἦλθον, the addition of the article to the prepositional phrase ἐν ὕδατι, and the omission of λεγῶν from the syntax between a finite verb and the discourse marker. These variants are entirely insignificant in regards to size and impact on the sense and probably arose through unconscious influence from parallel and neighboring text.

When we come to the four singular/sub-singular readings, those most likely to have been created by the copyist of P<sup>106</sup>, two or three of them suggest some form of assimilation: 1:33 εἰν for αὐν is possibly affected by the much greater frequency of εἰν in John; 1:40 ἠκολούθησαν is harmonized to a verb in the immediately preceding context; 1:41 om. οὗτος is potentially influenced by syntax in the next verse. The remaining reading, 1:42 Ἰησοῦν, is the omission of an unnecessary article in the prepositional phrase πρὸς τοὺς Ἰησοῦν. As with the variants discussed above, these are

micro-level alterations that can be almost entirely attributed to unconscious changes prompted by influence from other usage in the Gospel.

As already noted, P<sup>106</sup> shares overlapping text with four other manuscripts from the second and third centuries. Leaving aside orthographic readings and considering each manuscript after correction, P<sup>106</sup> agrees with P<sup>66</sup> 7 out of 16 times (44%): agreements (1:30 υπερ; 1:33 τω υδατι; 1:33 εν πνευματι αγιω; 1:42 εμβλεψας; 1:42 Ιωαννου; 1:45 υιον; 1:46 και); disagreements (P<sup>106</sup> reading listed first): 1:31 εγω ηλθον | ηλθον εγω; 1:32 om. λεγων | λεγων; 1:32 καταβαινον ως περιστεραν | καταβαινον ωσει περιστεραν; 1:33 εαν | αν; 1:34 ο εκλεκτος | ο υιος; 1:40 ηκολουθησαν | ακολουθησαντων; 1:41 om. ουτος | ουτος; 1:42 ηγαγεν | ουτος ηγαγεν; 1:42 Ιησουν | τον Ιησουν). P<sup>106</sup> agrees with P<sup>75</sup> 6 out of 16 times: agreements (1:30 υπερ; 1:32 καταβαινον ως περιστεραν; 1:42 ηγαγεν; 1:42 Ιωαννου; 1:45 υιον; 1:46 και); disagreements (1:31 εγω ηλθον | ηλθον εγω; 1:32 om. λεγων | λεγων; 1:33 τω υδατι | υδατι; 1:33 εαν | αν; 1:33 εν πνευματι αγιω | εν πνευματι αγιω και πυρι; 1:34 ο εκλεκτος | ο υιος; 1:40 ηκολουθησαν | ηκολουθησαντων; 1:41 om. ουτος | ουτος; 1:42 Ιησουν | τον Ιησουν; 1:42 εμβλεψας | εμβλεψας δε). If unique readings are removed from this comparison, then P<sup>106</sup> (minus 1:33 εαν; 1:40 ηκολουθησαν; 1:41 om. ουτος; 1:42 Ιησουν) agrees with P<sup>66</sup> 7 out of 12 times (58%) and with P<sup>75</sup> (minus 1:40 ηκολουθησαντων) 6 out of 12 times (50%).

P<sup>106</sup> also shares overlap with two early fragments, P<sup>5</sup> and P<sup>119</sup> (see treatment of P<sup>5</sup> for comparison of P<sup>5</sup> and P<sup>106</sup>). P<sup>106</sup> agrees with P<sup>119</sup> 1 out of 3 times (33%): agreement (1:42 ηγαγεν (lac. P<sup>119</sup>)); disagreements (1:41 om. ουτος | ουτος; 1:42 αυτω ο Ιησους ειπεν | ο Ιησους ειπεν αυτω (lac.)). Since the disagreements involve unique readings (one from each manuscript), these two papyri agree in the one variation-unit that is mutually represented.

## Diachronic Comparison of Created Readings

Among manuscripts up through the seventh century, the portion of text covered by P<sup>106</sup> is fully preserved in P<sup>66</sup>, P<sup>75</sup>, 01, A, B and W<sup>s</sup>. Listed below are the readings that were likely created by the copyist of each manuscript, although the versional support for a few of them may indicate that they were inherited rather than created.

### P<sup>106</sup>:

1:33 αν] εαν P<sup>106</sup> (substitution involving interchanging particles, possibly affected by general usage)

1:40 ακολουθησαντων] ηκολουθησαν P<sup>106</sup> (harmonized substitution, to verb use in immediate context (1:37))

1:41 ουτος] om. P<sup>106</sup> e b (omission of redundant pronoun, possibly influenced by the syntax of the following verse)

1:42 τον Ιησουν] Ιησουν P<sup>106</sup> (omission of unnecessary article)

### P<sup>66</sup> (none)<sup>679</sup>

### P<sup>75</sup><sup>680</sup>

1:40 ακολουθησαντων] ηκολουθησαντων P<sup>75</sup> (substitution involving addition of augment to a participle,<sup>681</sup> probably affected by ηκολουθησαν in 1:37 (as with P<sup>106</sup>))

### 01<sup>682</sup>

---

<sup>679</sup> 1:33 βπτιζειν, 1:33 παυριον, and 1:45 ισηφ were corrected by the first hand.

<sup>680</sup> πετρος was corrected to πετρου in 1:40 by the first hand.

<sup>681</sup> See Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 164 n.292.

1:32 καταβαινον ως περιστεραν] ως περιστεραν καταβαινον 01 a b e r<sup>1</sup> sy<sup>c</sup>  
(harmonized transposition, to parallels (Mk 1:10))

1:33 καγω] και εγω 01 (substitution away from crasis, possibly influenced by  
frequent independent uses of εγω in the preceding verses)

1:40 των [2]] om. 01\* 713 (omission of inessential article)

1:43 αυτω ο Ιησους] αυτω Ιησους 01\* (omission of inessential article)

1:44 εκ] om. 01\* c f vg (omission of unnecessary and repetitious preposition)

**A**:

1:33 ουτος] αυτος A 1424 1675 b e q sy<sup>s.c.</sup> (harmonized substitution, to parallels  
(Matt 3:11; Mk 1:8; Lk 3:16))

1:42 ο] ος A (substitution in favor of the masculine form of the relative pronoun,  
influenced by or conformed to the masculine antecedent (Κηφας...Πετρος))

**B (none)**:<sup>683</sup>

**W**<sup>s,684</sup>:

1:29 την αμαρτιαν] τας αμαρτιας W<sup>s</sup> (substitution to the plural affected by the sense  
of the verse and/or plural usage elsewhere in the New Testament)<sup>685</sup>

---

<sup>682</sup> The omission of δε in 1:44 by 01\* is lacunose in P<sup>106</sup> (recto 14).

<sup>683</sup> Orthographic singulars include 1:40, 42 Ιωανου and 1:41 ευρεσκει (B\*).

<sup>684</sup> W<sup>s</sup> reads ενπροσθεν for εμπροσθεν at 1:30 and γαλιδεαν for γαλιλαιαν at 1:43. 1:33 ουτος for ουτος is corrected.

1:30 ειπον (υμιν) οπισω] ειπον υμιν οτι οπισω<sup>686</sup> W<sup>s</sup> 213 X sy<sup>p</sup> (addition of syntax for clearer/smoothen/fuller text and/or due to influence from general usage (see note))

1:31 βαπτιζων] βαπτιζιν (-ειν) W<sup>s</sup> q (harmonized substitution, to immediate context (infinitive in 1:33))

1:33 αυτον [2]] αυτω W<sup>s</sup> (substitution to dative without apparent cause)<sup>687</sup>

1:42 εμβλεψας] και εμβλεψας W<sup>s</sup> 1093 a e q sy<sup>c-p</sup> (harmonized addition of conjunction, to use with εμβλεψας in immediate/near context (1:36))

1:45 υιον του Ιωσηφ] τω Ιωσηφ W<sup>s</sup> (substitution of syntax without apparent cause; results in the elimination of explicit reference to Jesus as Joseph's "son")<sup>688</sup>

In terms of the quantity of these unique readings, there are six in W<sup>s</sup>, five in 01 (prior to later correction), two in A and none in B (with a few of these majuscule readings possibly having emerged earlier, based on the slight support attested). Among the three early papyri, there are four in P<sup>106</sup>, one in P<sup>75</sup> and none in P<sup>66</sup>. While P<sup>106</sup> is situated closer to the transmission reflected in 01 and W<sup>s</sup>, P<sup>75</sup> and P<sup>66</sup> are similar to A and B, resulting in a comparable spread between the earlier and later

---

<sup>685</sup> Von Soden suggests Heb 10:11, but see also 1 John 2:2; 3:5; Matt 1:21, 9:6 among many others.

<sup>686</sup> W<sup>s</sup> appears to be alone in reading with both υμιν (read also by f<sup>13</sup>) and οτι (in 213 X sy<sup>p</sup>). ειπον υμιν is very frequent in John, and "I say/said υμιν οτι" is very frequent throughout the New Testament.

<sup>687</sup> Regarding the use of επι with the dative, BDF, sec. 235 remarks: "The gen. and acc. predominate in the local sense, but a sharp division between them and the dat. cannot be carried through."

<sup>688</sup> For the dative, cf. Luke 7:12 as well as 1 Sam 16:18; 2 Sam 9:3; 15:36 from LXX.

periods. No unique level of freedom or fluidity in the early period emerges from this comparison.

Every type of reading introduced by the earlier witnesses is also found among the singular/sub-singular readings of the later manuscripts. The likely harmonized/textually influenced substitutions in P<sup>106</sup> (1:33 εαν; 1:40 ηκολουθησαν) and P<sup>75</sup> (1:40 ηκολουθησαντων) are like those found in 01 (1:33 και εγω), A (1:33 αυτος; 1:42 ος) and W<sup>s</sup> (1:29 τας αμαρτιας; 1:31 βαπτιζειν). The omission of a redundant and/or unnecessary word as attested in P<sup>106</sup> (1:41 om. ουτος; 1:42 om. τον before Ιησουν) is also observed at a few places in 01 (1:40 om. των; 1:43 om. ο before Ιησους; 1:44 om. εκ). The addition of potentially clarifying, smoothing words (1:30 add. (υμιν) οτι) and the substitution of syntax without discernible cause (theologically motivated?) (1:45 τω Ιωσηφ), such as we find in W<sup>s</sup>, are not observed in the early witnesses. As with the quantity of these singular/sub-singular readings, this evidence concerning the nature of variation presents a picture of consistency and continuity between the second/third and subsequent centuries.

#### Conclusions on Stability and/or Fluidity

Both the number and nature of the improbable variants attested in P<sup>106</sup> point to the stability of transmission that preceded this early third century copy of John's Gospel. The fact that there are four singular/sub-singular readings may on the surface indicate a certain level of freedom or carelessness in transmission. However, this conclusion becomes less warranted when we observe the small dimension (dealing with one word) and benign nature (likely reflecting unconscious influence or oversight of superfluous elements) of all of these readings. Moreover, since two of the four majuscules used in the comparison above attest a greater number of singular/sub-singular readings than P<sup>106</sup>, and since the types of readings found in that

papyrus are also found among the unique readings of the later witnesses, we are certainly not dealing with anything unique in this early witness. The diachronic data presented above, gleaned from a comparison of three copies from ca. 200 to 250 with four copies from sometime in or after the fourth century, run contrary to the claim that a freer or more fluid approach to copying characterized the early period.

## 4.2. P<sup>119</sup> (P. Oxy. LXXI 4803)

### Introduction

P<sup>119</sup> is a fragment of the lower part of a leaf from a papyrus codex from Oxyrhynchus, Egypt preserving some of John 1:21-28 on the verso and 1:38-44 on the recto.<sup>689</sup> It shares extant text with four other Greek manuscript witnesses from the second and third centuries, including partial overlap from P<sup>5</sup> in vv. 23-28, 38-40 and from P<sup>106</sup> in vv. 40-44, and full overlap from P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup>. P<sup>119</sup> was published in 2007 by Juan Chapa and dated to the third century, being associated with “the upright branch of Turner’s ‘Formal mixed’ group.”<sup>690</sup> This dating has been accepted or reaffirmed by the INTF in the online *Liste* and by Orsini and Clarysse in the Leuven Database. Chapa remarks, “The script is that of an expert scribe,” and he comments that it is without ligatures and has letters “loosely placed with generous space before and after.”<sup>691</sup> LDAB classifies its script as belonging to the “severe style.”

This papyrus fragment measures 2.7 cm. in width and 11 cm. in height and preserves parts of 16 lines on the verso and 17 on the recto (although recto 1 gives only indiscernible traces of ink). It preserves 1 cm. of a lower margin. Chapa estimates the page size as “at least” 14 x 25 cm., placing it into Turner’s Group 8, and the written area of the one column as 12 x 23.5 cm.<sup>692</sup> There were around 40 lines per page with an average of 33 letters per line, with the number of reconstructed and extant letters per line ranging from 30 to 38 on this fragment. The Gospel of John would have taken up roughly 55 pages, but based on the probability that it

---

<sup>689</sup> For this and further introductory information, see Chapa, ed., “Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 4803,” 2-6, plate I (referred to as *editio princeps* for the remainder of this chapter); INTF *Liste*; LDAB: <http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/text.php?tm=112358>.

<sup>690</sup> *Editio princeps*, 2.

<sup>691</sup> *Editio princeps*, 2.

<sup>692</sup> For this information, see *editio princeps*, 3. Cf. Turner, *Typology*, 95.

began in the middle of a page, Chapa thinks it likely that John was not the only book contained in the codex.

There are no itacisms or other orthographic readings attested in P<sup>119</sup>. No *nomina sacra* are extant, but the forms that are reconstructed in lacunae include  $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$  (1:23, verso 7),  $\overline{\chi\varsigma}$  (1:25, verso 10; 1:41, recto 10),  $\overline{\tau\nu}$  (1:42, recto 11) and  $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$  (1:43, recto 16).<sup>693</sup> A diaeresis is used with Ησαΐας (1:23, verso 7), ὕδατι (1:26, verso 12), ὑποδηματος (1:27, verso 15), and Ἰωαννου (1:40, recto 7). There is a smudge of ink above the epsilon of εστιν at 1:41, recto 10 that was likely accidental.<sup>694</sup>

Charlesworth thinks that P<sup>119</sup> was probably prepared for private use due to its “unconventional” size (but he is unique in placing it into Turner’s Group 5), “informal” hand and lack of punctuation for text division.<sup>695</sup> P<sup>119</sup> is currently held by the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

#### Variation-Units Represented<sup>696</sup>

Variation-Unit	Variants	P <sup>119</sup> Transcribed
1:22 τις <sup>697</sup>	τις συ τις P <sup>66c.75</sup> E 157 (c r <sup>1</sup> )	[τις] (verso 4) <sup>698</sup>
1:25 και ειπαν αυτω <sup>699</sup>	και ειπαν (ειπον) αυτω – P <sup>5vid</sup> T 251 I	– (verso 9) <sup>700</sup>

<sup>693</sup> *Nomina sacra* are “assumed for κυριος, ιησους, and χριστος in the lost parts of the text” (*editio princeps*, 3).

<sup>694</sup> *Editio princeps*, 5.

<sup>695</sup> Charlesworth, “Catholicity,” 42, 44.

<sup>696</sup> I have excluded from this treatment two NA28 variation-units that are based on singular readings: 1:39 εκτη for δεκατη in A, and the omission of και ηρωτησαν αυτον (or ηρωτησαν αυτον και) in 1:25 in 01 a e sy<sup>c</sup> (both of which are treated in the Diachronic Comparison section below). I have added the variation-units concerned with και ειπαν αυτω in 1:25 and υμας after βαπτιζω in 1:26 on account of what is read in P<sup>119</sup>. All transcriptions follow *editio princeps* unless otherwise noted.

<sup>697</sup> Given the number of variation-units between ηρωτησαν and λεγει in 1:21 (including αυτον/αυτον παλιν, τι ουν συ Ηλιας ει, and και) and the fact that it is almost entirely lacunose in P<sup>119</sup> (verso 1-2), Chapa remarks, “it is not possible to determine on the grounds of spacing what the papyrus might have read” (*editio princeps*, 4).

<sup>698</sup> “Spacing suggests that the papyrus probably did not read συ before τις” (*editio princeps*, 4).

<sup>699</sup> The variation-unit concerning the presence of οι before απεσταλμενοι in 1:24 is lacunose and uncertain in P<sup>119</sup> (verso 8): “spacing is indecisive” (*editio princeps*, 4).

1:26 λεγων	λεγων – P <sup>75.120</sup> f <sup>1</sup> 124 e	[λεγων] (verso 11) <sup>701</sup>
1:26 εγω	εγω εγω μεν 063 f <sup>13</sup> 1093 it sa <sup>mss</sup> bo <sup>pt</sup>	[εγω μεν] (verso 12) <sup>702</sup>
1:26 βαπτιζω	βαπτιζω βαπτιζω υμας P <sup>120vid</sup> N Δ Θ 063 086 <sup>vid</sup> 565 1424 ff <sup>2</sup>	[βαπτιζω υμας] (verso 12) <sup>703</sup>
1:26 μεσος	μεσος P <sup>59.66.75.120</sup> 01 B C* L 083 bo <sup>mss</sup> μεσος δε A C <sup>2</sup> K N W <sup>s</sup> Γ Δ Θ Ψ f <sup>1.13</sup> 33. 565. 579. 700. 892. 1241. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> latt sy sa bo	[μεσος δε] (verso 12) <sup>704</sup>
1:27 ο οπισω <sup>705</sup>	ο οπισω (– ο 01* B) P <sup>5vid.66.75.120</sup> 01 B C* L T W <sup>s</sup> Θ 083 f <sup>1</sup> 33. 579. 1241 a sy <sup>s,c</sup> αυτος (ουτος Ψ) εστιν ο οπισω A C <sup>3</sup> K N <sup>vid</sup> Γ Δ Ψ f <sup>13</sup> 565. 700. 892. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> lat sy <sup>p,h</sup>	[ο οπισω] (verso 13) <sup>706</sup>
1:27 ερχομενος	ερχομενος P <sup>5.66.75</sup> 01 B C* L N* T W <sup>s</sup> Ψ 083 f <sup>1</sup> 33. 579. 1241 b l sy <sup>s,c</sup> co ερχομενος ος (– Θ) εμπροσθεν μου γεγονεν A C <sup>3</sup> K N <sup>c</sup> Γ Δ Θ f <sup>13</sup> 565. 700. 892. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> lat	[ερχομενος] (verso 14) <sup>707</sup>

<sup>700</sup> The extant nu followed by τι ουν (transcribed as και ηρωτησαν αυτο]ν τι ουν (*editio princeps*, 3)) indicates the presence of και ηρωτησαν αυτον and the absence of και ειπαν αυτω, as Chapa comments, “The papyrus probably omitted και ειπαν αυτω” (4).

<sup>701</sup> The text between Ιωανν[ης and ε]ν υδατι on verso 11-12 is lacunose in P<sup>119</sup>, and Chapa states that λεγων εγω βαπτιζω is “too short for the space” (*editio princeps*, 5). Based on what is reconstructed for parallel spaces on verso lines 5-10, spacing suggests that somewhere between 7 and 10 letters (but probably 7 or 8, since the only exception is 10 on verso 9) were present after the second nu of Ιωαννης on verso 11. Moreover, the number of letters reconstructed for same-sized spaces on verso lines 3-5 and 8-11 suggest that 17 to 19 letters were in the lacuna before the nu of εν on verso 12 (cf. 3, plate I). These observations reinforce the probability of Chapa’s reconstruction in which the variants λεγων, μεν and υμας were all read in this lacunose portion of the papyrus (see pages 3 and 5 for transcription and comment).

<sup>702</sup> See note on spacing under 1:26 λεγων.

<sup>703</sup> See note under 1:26 λεγων. (cf. Elliott, “Four New Papyri,” 675.)

<sup>704</sup> “Spacing suggests that the papyrus must have read μεσος δε” (*editio princeps*, 5).

<sup>705</sup> The variation-unit at 1:26 εστηκεν is excluded as lacunose (verso 13).

<sup>706</sup> Chapa renders the end of the line as ο]υκ οιδατ[ε ο οπισω] and later comments, “Spacing guarantees that the papyrus did not read αυτος (ουτος) εστιν before ο οπισω μου” (*editio princeps*, 4, 5). The presence or absence of the article is too lacunose for consideration.

	sy <sup>(p).h</sup> bo <sup>mss</sup>	
1:27 ουκ ειμι εγω	ουκ ειμι εγω P <sup>66c</sup> B N T W <sup>s</sup> Ψ 083. 579  ουκ ειμι P <sup>5vid.66*.75.120</sup> 01 C L f <sup>13</sup> 33. 565 aur* q  εγω ουκ ειμι A K Γ Δ Θ f <sup>1</sup> 700. 892. 1241. 1424 <i>Maj. lat</i>	ουκ ει]μι εγω (verso 14)
1:27 αξιος <sup>708</sup>	αξιος  ικανος P <sup>66.75</sup> 472	α[ξιος (verso 14) <sup>709</sup>
1:27 υποδηματος <sup>710</sup>	υποδηματος  υποδηματος αυτος (εκεινος E F G H 2*) υμας βαπτισει εν πνευματι αγιω και πυρι E F G H N 2*	υπο[δηματος (verso 15) <sup>711</sup>
1:42 ηγαγεν <sup>712</sup>	ηγαγεν P <sup>66*.75.106</sup> 01 B L b sa <sup>mss</sup>  και ηγαγεν A K W <sup>s</sup> Γ Δ Θ Ψ f <sup>13</sup> 33. 565. 700. 892. 1241. 1424 <i>Maj. lat</i> sy sa <sup>mss</sup>  ουτος ηγαγεν P <sup>66c</sup> f <sup>1</sup> G bo; Eriph  ηγαγεν δε 579	[ηγαγεν] (recto 11) <sup>713</sup>

<sup>707</sup> There is clearly no room for these additional words after ερχομενος (see comment in *editio princeps*, 5).

<sup>708</sup> Due to the textual relatedness of P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup>, I have not excluded this variation-unit as based on a sub-singular reading (see especially Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 11-18, 35). The reading ικανος, therefore, will not be treated as a scribal creation of either manuscript in the Diachronic Comparison section below.

<sup>709</sup> “The alpha in the papyrus is damaged, but the remains of a curve rule out iota” (*editio princeps*, 5).

<sup>710</sup> Although Chapa favors reconstructing with Βηθανια over Βηθαβαρα or Βηθαραβα in the lacuna on verso 16 for 1:28, I regard that variation-unit as too uncertain to include (a one letter difference in a fairly large lacuna). The word order of εν βηθανια εγενετο is also lacunose.

<sup>711</sup> The partially extant words περιαν τ[ου on the following line show a lack of space for the additional sentence after υποδηματος (see *editio princeps*, 4).

<sup>712</sup> There are a number of variation-units that fall in lacunae on the recto and are too uncertain to treat in our analysis. These include οψεσθε and ουν in 1:39, recto 3 (see note in *editio princeps*, 5) and πρωτον in 1:41, recto 8. Due to a lack of clarity regarding the lacunose portion surrounding 1:42 εμβλεψας on recto 11-12, I have excluded that variation-unit from consideration. For the text following περιρος τον ιην/ιν up to συ ει [Σιμων Chapa considers “the most tempting restoration” to be εμβλεψας δε ο ιης/ις ειπεν αυτ]ω (*editio princeps*, 5). In light of the spacing considerations reflected in Chapa’s proposed restoration, and especially in light of the extant omega (presumably belonging to αυτω) before συ ει on recto 12, I have included below under the unique readings of P<sup>119</sup> what appears to be a transposition of αυτω and ο Ιησους ειπεν (though keeping in mind its highly tentative nature). The variation-unit at 1:42 Ιωαννου is also excluded as lacunose in

## Unique Reading

Place of Variation	Readings	P <sup>119</sup> Transcribed
1:42 αυτω ο Ιησους ειπεν	αυτω ο Ιησους ειπεν ο Ιησους ειπεν αυτω P <sup>119</sup>	ο̄ ιη̄ς (ο̄ρ ις̄) ειπεν αυτ]ω (proposed (restoration (recto 11-12)) <sup>714</sup> )

### Commentary on Variants

1:22 τις: The presence of συ in the question συ τις ει asked by the priests and Levites who come to see John’s baptism is almost certainly influenced by the repeated use of this pronoun in the preceding verses. More specifically, it probably reflects harmonization to the wording of the same question as described by the narrator in v. 19. P<sup>119</sup> appears to attest the reading that is not harmonized to the immediate context.

1:25 om. και ειπαν αυτω: See treatment of this variation-unit under P<sup>5</sup>. P<sup>119</sup> attests a reading that is probably influenced by the immediate context (1:21).

1:26 λεγων: In a context where a number of readings are harmonized to parallels, the fact that both Mark 1:7 and Luke 3:16 attest λεγων at a similar point in their respective accounts immediately raises suspicion about the presence of that word in our verse. This suspicion is further supported by what appears to be a harmonization to Luke in the change from απεκριθη to απεκρινατο read by a few witnesses. λεγων also appears twice in the immediate to near context (1:15, 32), with both having John as the subject. Furthermore, the fact that the Gospel of John is

---

P<sup>119</sup> (recto 12). Although spacing favors Ιωαννου rather than Ιωνα, as Chapa notes (*editio princeps*, 6), it does not appear to rule out the variant Ιωαννα.

<sup>713</sup> “The length of the restored line does not support the addition of και before ηγαγεν... Unlikely for the same reason would be ουτος ηγαγεν” (*editio princeps*, 5).

<sup>714</sup> This is the restoration supplied in Chapa’s comments (*editio princeps*, 5), as the reconstruction given in the transcription is left blank for this portion of text (4). For further discussion, see note under 1:42 ηγαγεν in the table above, where the exclusion of the variation-unit 1:42 εμβλεψας is discussed.

replete with instances of ἀπεκριθη plus the indirect object pronoun plus the nominative, without any additional verbs (e.g. 5:7; 6:68; 8:34; 10:25, 32; 12:34; 13:36; 16:31; 18:20; 19:11) gives intrinsic support to the variant without λεγων. On the other hand, this latter point may suggest that the absence of λεγων reflects harmonization to general usage, and, although perhaps less significant, it is at least worth mentioning that the previous occurrence of ἀπεκριθη (1:21) is used without any additional verbs, which could have prompted the omission of λεγων here. Moreover, the fact that all three occurrences of λεγων in this section of John attest slight support for its absence (1:15 om. 01\* D b; 1:26 om. P<sup>75.120</sup> f<sup>1</sup> 124 e; 1:32 om. P<sup>106</sup> 01\* e) provides some transcriptional evidence for seeing a propensity towards its omission. On account of the uncertainty involved, I have chosen to exclude this variation-unit from the analysis to follow as inconclusive on the basis of internal evidence.

1:26 εγω μεν: μεν is firmly attested in Matthew 3:11 and Luke 3:16, so that its inclusion here in John by some witnesses is very likely to be the result of influence from those parallel accounts (so too in Mark 1:8). P<sup>119</sup> appears to have the reading that is harmonized to Gospel parallels.

1:26 βαπτιζω υμας: υμας is read as the direct object of βαπτιζω in the parallel accounts of Matthew 3:11 and Luke 3:16. It is also read with εβαπτισα in Mark 1:8, which means that all three parallel Gospel accounts contain the pronoun. P<sup>119</sup> appears, then, to attest the less difficult reading that is harmonized to these parallels.

1:26 μεσος δε: Both Matthew 3:11 and Luke 3:16 read with the correlative construction μεν ... δε. The presence of δε without the previous μεν, as is read by the majority of witnesses in the tradition, suggests influence from Mark 1:8 but could have equally been affected by Matthew and Luke. The text with δε is a transcriptionally easier reading both because of its similarity to parallels and because

it results in clearer, smoother syntax that further emphasizes the contrast involved in the context. P<sup>119</sup> seems to attest this syntactically easier reading that appears to be influenced by parallels.

1:27 ο οπισω: See discussion in treatment of P<sup>5</sup>. P<sup>119</sup> does not attest the smoother and generally assimilated reading.

1:27 ερχομενος: See treatment in P<sup>5</sup>. P<sup>119</sup> attests the reading that is not harmonized to the surrounding context.

1:27 ουκ εμι εγω: See treatment in P<sup>5</sup>. P<sup>119</sup> attests the reading that is not harmonized to Gospel parallels.

1:27 αξιος: As noted in my discussion of εγω from the previous variation-unit, the Synoptic Gospels agree in reading ικανος. P<sup>119</sup> attests the reading that is not harmonized to the wording in those parallels (Matt 3:11; Mk 1:7; Lk 3:16)

1:27 υποδηματος: See comment on this variation-unit under P<sup>5</sup>. P<sup>119</sup> attests the reading not harmonized to Gospel parallels.

1:42 ηγαγεν: See discussion of this variation-unit under treatment of P<sup>106</sup>. P<sup>119</sup> attests the rougher text without the elimination of asyndeton.

#### Commentary on Unique Reading

1:42 ο Ιησους ειπεν αυτω: Although little can be said with confidence about what exactly was read in P<sup>119</sup> at this point, the extant omega before συ ει (along with Chapa's spacing comments noted above) does suggest a transposition of αυτω from after εμβλεψας to after ειπεν. Just as the variants και εμβλεψας and εμβλεψας δε in the previous variation-unit appear to be influenced by the immediate context (cf. 1:36 και εμβλεψας and 1:38 στραφεις δε respectively), so too does this transposed word order in P<sup>119</sup>. ειπεν αυτω occurs frequently in the Gospel of John, and prior to chapter three it occurs three times, each of which being in this section of narrative

concerning Jesus and his earliest followers (1:46, 48, 50). P<sup>119</sup> appears to attest a reading that has been affected by the immediate context and general usage.

#### Analysis of Manuscript based on Readings

I exclude from this assessment one variation-unit where the identification of readings is inconclusive on the basis of internal evidence (1:26 λεγων). P<sup>119</sup> thus supplies 12 readings for analysis, including 11 variants and one singular reading. Nine of the 11 variants are in variation-units where some form of harmonization/assimilation/textual influence can be identified as the cause of variation. In five of these variation-units P<sup>119</sup> reads with the non-harmonized reading, whether it pertains to the immediate context (1:22 τις is not harmonized to the use of the pronoun especially as used in v. 19; 1:27 ερχομενος does not attest the lengthy addition that is assimilated to vv. 15 and 30) or to Synoptic parallels (1:27 ουκ ειμι εγω is not harmonized to the absence of εγω in Matthew 3:11, Mark 1:7 and Luke 3:16; 1:27 αξιος does not attest the assimilated ικανος from all three Synoptic Gospels; 1:27 υποδηματος does not attest the lengthy harmonized addition). However, in four of these variation-units P<sup>119</sup> has the harmonized variant, one to the immediate context (1:25 ομ. και ειπαν αυτω is likely affected by the absence of this clause with και ηρωτησαν αυτον in v. 21) and three to parallels in other Gospels (1:26 εγω μεν, βαπτιζω υμας, and μεσος δε each involving the addition of one word).

The remaining two variation-units can be characterized with respect to stylistic/syntactical difficulty. It should be noted, however, that both of these variation-units also show some signs that assimilation/textual influence lies at the root of variation. In both cases P<sup>119</sup> attests the more difficult or rougher reading vis-à-vis the alternative(s): 1:27 ο οπισω does not attest the smoother text with the addition of αυτος εστιν (likely influenced by vv. 15, 30 and/or Matt 3:11; Mk 1:8; Lk

3:16); 1:42 *ηγαγεν* retains the asyndeton (with *ουτος* probably harmonized to the previous verse).

In these 11 variation-units that are represented by P<sup>119</sup> (or that are plausibly reconstructed by its editor), seven or 64% of its variants can be viewed as more probable on internal grounds. This leaves four or 36% that are regarded as improbable. All four of these readings are harmonizations situated in a repetitious portion of the Gospel describing the ministry of John the Baptist, and one that finds parallels in all three Synoptic Gospels. Three of these harmonizations are to Synoptic accounts and involve the addition of a single word, whether a particle (*μεν*), a conjunction (*δε*) or a pronoun (*υμας*). Since *μεν* and *δε* could have entered the tradition separately (many manuscripts have *δε* without *μεν*, perhaps influenced by Mark 1:8) it is not necessary to posit editorial activity or a conscious act of *conforming* the text to Matthew and Luke (both with *μεν...δε*). Rather, each of these variants suggests small-scale, unconscious influence from familiar text. The remaining improbable variant, om. *και ειπεν αυτω*, seems on the surface to be somewhat significant, since it consists of a three-word omission without evidence for a mechanical leap and could potentially be taken as an elimination of superfluous syntax (after *και ηρωτησαν αυτον*). However, the context strongly indicates that syntax from just a few verses earlier has caused an inadvertent omission: *και ηρωτησαν αυτον* without *και ειπεν αυτω* and followed by the same words as we have here (i.e., *και ηρωτησαν αυτον τι ουν* from v. 21 has affected the transmission of *και ηρωτησαν αυτον και ειπεν αυτω τι ουν* in v. 25). None of these variants demands intentionality.

The one singular reading of P<sup>119</sup> is unclear (1:42 *ο Ιησους ειπεν αυτω*), but it appears to involve a transposition of *αυτω* that could be explained by the frequent occurrence of *ειπεν αυτω* in the immediate/near context and throughout the Gospel.

It is also possible that εμβλεψας αυτω was read, and αυτω was repeated after ειπεν (so a harmonized addition rather than transposition). Chapa's spacing comments (see note above under table) do not appear to preclude this explanation, since if the shorter *nomen sacrum* is read, and if δε is not present in the lacuna, only one letter more than his restoration is needed. Either way, this apparent singular reading probably amounts to nothing more than a general assimilation involving an indirect object pronoun.

P<sup>119</sup> shares overlapping text with four other manuscripts from the second and third centuries (P<sup>5</sup>, P<sup>66</sup>, P<sup>75</sup>, P<sup>106</sup>). For comparisons of P<sup>119</sup> with P<sup>5</sup> and P<sup>106</sup> see my treatment of each of those papyri. Based on what is extant or has been confidently reconstructed by the editor (with a number of the readings listed below being lacunose in P<sup>119</sup>) and leaving aside orthographic readings, P<sup>119</sup> agrees with P<sup>66</sup> 5 out of 14 times (36%): agreements (1:26 λεγων (lac. P<sup>119</sup>); 1:27 ο οπισω (lac. P<sup>119</sup>); 1:27 ερχομενος (lac. P<sup>119</sup>); 1:27 ουκ ειμι εγω; 1:27 υποδηματος (lac. P<sup>119</sup>); disagreements (P<sup>119</sup> reading listed first) 1:22 τις (lac.) | συ τις; 1:25 om. και ειπαν αυτω (lac.) | και ειπαν αυτω; 1:26 εγω μεν (lac.) | εγω; 1:26 βαπτιζω υμας (lac.) | βαπτιζω; 1:26 μεσος δε (lac.) | μεσος; 1:27 αξιος | ικανος; 1:27 αυτου τον ιμαντα του υποδηματος (lac.) | τον ιμαντα του υποδηματος αυτου; 1:42 ηγαγεν (lac.) | ουτος ηγαγεν; 1:42 ο Ιησους ειπεν αυτω | αυτω ο Ιησους ειπεν). If unique readings are removed, then P<sup>119</sup> (minus 1:42 ο Ιησους ειπεν αυτω) agrees with P<sup>66</sup> (minus 1:27 τον ιμαντα του υποδηματος αυτου) 5 out of 12 times (42%).

P<sup>119</sup> agrees with P<sup>75</sup> 4 out of 13 times (31%): agreements (1:27 ο οπισω (lac. P<sup>119</sup>); 1:27 ερχομενος (lac. P<sup>119</sup>); 1:27 υποδηματος (lac. P<sup>119</sup>); 1:42 ηγαγεν (lac. P<sup>119</sup>); disagreements (1:22 τις (lac.) | συ τις; 1:25 om. και ειπαν αυτω (lac.) | και ειπαν αυτω; 1:26 λεγων (lac.) | om. λεγων; 1:26 εγω μεν (lac.) | εγω; 1:26 βαπτιζω υμας (lac.) | βαπτιζω; 1:26 μεσος δε (lac.) | μεσος; 1:27 ουκ ειμι εγω | ουκ ειμι; 1:27 αξιος

| ικανος; 1:42 ο Ιησους ειπεν αυτω | αυτω ο Ιησους ειπεν). If unique readings are removed, then P<sup>119</sup> (minus 1:42 ο Ιησους ειπεν αυτω) agrees with P<sup>75</sup> 4 out of 12 times (33%).

### Diachronic Comparison of Created Readings

Among manuscripts up through the seventh century, the portion of text covered by P<sup>119</sup> is fully preserved in P<sup>66</sup>, P<sup>75</sup>, 01, A, B and W<sup>s</sup>. Listed below are the readings deemed likely to have been created by each respective scribe.

#### P<sup>119</sup>:

1:42 αυτω ο Ιησους ειπεν] ο Ιησους ειπεν αυτω P<sup>119</sup> (harmonized transposition (or addition?), to ειπεν αυτω in immediate context (1:46, 48, 50) (or to general usage))

#### P<sup>66</sup>.<sup>715</sup>

1:27 αυτου τον ιμαντα του υποδηματος] τον ιμαντα του υποδηματος αυτου<sup>716</sup> P<sup>66c</sup>  
185 a b f q r<sup>1</sup> (harmonized transposition, to parallels (Mk 1:7; Lk 3:16))

#### P<sup>75</sup> (none)<sup>717</sup>

#### 01:<sup>718</sup>

---

<sup>715</sup> 1:21 τις for τι in P<sup>66</sup> is excluded from this comparison because it is lacunose in P<sup>119</sup> (see notes below for other readings that fall in lacunae between και [1] and λεγ[ει on verso 1-2). εγεις in 1:22 and the addition of τον after λωσω in 1:27 are excluded because they were corrected contemporaneously (and they fall in lacunae).

<sup>716</sup> Only το]υ υπο[δηματος is extant on verso 15 in P<sup>119</sup>, but Chapa comments, “The lacuna suggests that the papyrus did not read with P<sup>66</sup>\*C,” (*editio princeps*, 5).

<sup>717</sup> 1:26 ιστηκει and 1:40 ηκολουθησαντων in P<sup>75</sup> are excluded as lacunose in P<sup>119</sup> (verso 13 and recto 7 respectively). See Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 627 for the implausibility of the interpretation reflected in IGNTF I, 129 that περι was corrected to υπερ in 1:22.

<sup>718</sup> There are many singular / sub-singular readings that are attested in 01 or 01\* for this portion of text but that fall in a lacuna in P<sup>119</sup> and are indeterminate based on spacing: 1:21 επηρωτησαν for ηρωτησαν (verso 1) (which is also corrected by the Scriptorium hand (IGNTF II, 195, 7)); om. αυτον, συ [1], και [2], and ο in 1:21 (verso 1-2); 1:26 εστηκει (verso 13); 1:28 add. ποταμου after Ιορδανου (verso 16); 1:43 om. ο [2] (recto 15-16). The addition of τω before υδατι in

1:25 ηρωτησαν αυτον και] om. 01 a (e) sy<sup>c</sup> (leap from same to same (Φαρισαιων και ηρωτησαν αυτον και, or simply και...και))

1:40 των [2]] om.<sup>719</sup> 01\* 713 (omission of inessential article)

1:44 δε] om.<sup>720</sup> 01\* (omission of connective, probably harmonized to syntax in

1:40)<sup>721</sup>

1:44 εκ] om. 01\* c f vg (omission of unnecessary and repetitious preposition)

**A:**<sup>722</sup>

1:39 δεκατη] εκτη A (harmonized substitution, to general usage in John (ωρα ην ως εκτη in 4:6; 19:14))

**B (none)**<sup>723</sup>

**W<sup>s</sup>:**<sup>724</sup>

1:21 ουκ ειμι] ουκ ειμι τι ουν<sup>725</sup> W<sup>s</sup> it (harmonized addition, to τι ουν in immediate context (previously in 1:21))

---

1:26 in 01\* is excluded because it was corrected contemporaneously by the Scriptorium hand (IGNTP II, 197).

<sup>719</sup> This word falls in a lacuna in P<sup>119</sup> (recto 6). According to Chapa's reconstruction, however, the line is already one of the shortest on the recto (30 letters along with line 16), which makes the absence of another three letters (των) very unlikely. This is further supported by the number of letters reconstructed in the same-sized lacunae directly above on lines 4 and 5 (cf. *editio princeps*, 4, plate I).

<sup>720</sup> This reading is lacunose in P<sup>119</sup> (recto 16), but see related note above on the omission of των [2] in 01\* in 1:40.

<sup>721</sup> δε and ο are absent in 01\*, but the absence of the article, which has other manuscript support, may have been inherited from the *Vorlage*.

<sup>722</sup> 1:42 ος ερμηνευεται in A is excluded as lacunose in P<sup>119</sup> (recto 13).

<sup>723</sup> The following unique readings of B are excluded from consideration as too lacunose in P<sup>119</sup>: 1:21 ου ουν τι (verso 2); 1:40, 42 Ιωανου (recto 7, 12); 1:41 ευρεσκει (recto 8).

<sup>724</sup> The following readings of W are excluded as lacunose in P<sup>119</sup>: 1:21 ει Ηλιας (verso 2); 1:42 και εμβλεψας (recto 11); 1:43 Γαλιδεαν (recto 14).

In terms of quantity, there are four in 01 (prior to later correction), one in A and W<sup>s</sup>, and none in B. With one in P<sup>119</sup> and P<sup>66</sup> and none in P<sup>75</sup>, the early manuscripts show themselves to be perfectly in line with what we see from the later majuscules. The only unique element in this comparison is the number of readings likely introduced by the copyist of 01. Otherwise, the manner of transmission seems constant, and we certainly do not find any indication that the earlier witnesses were produced in a climate of greater freedom in copying. The two harmonized transpositions in the earlier witnesses P<sup>119</sup> (1:42 ο Ιησους ειπεν αυτω) and P<sup>66</sup> (1:27 τον ιμαντα του υποδηματος αυτου) are matched by similar micro-level harmonizations in 01 (1:44 ομ. δε), A (1:39 εκτη) and W<sup>s</sup> (1:21 ουκ ειμι τι ουν). These data support seeing continuity between the earlier and later centuries.

#### Conclusions on Stability and/or Fluidity

P<sup>119</sup> provides very little evidence for unstable transmission attitudes and practices. We see an inadvertent omission of three words influenced by the verbatim syntax of a previous verse and four one-word additions (or a transposition for one of them), all of which suggesting some form of harmonization/textual influence without any need to suppose conscious editorial activity. In the majority of variation-units represented (64%), P<sup>119</sup> reads with a more probable reading than the other(s) attested. The number and character of unique readings in the three early witnesses used in the comparison above practically mirror those found among the later majuscules. This suggests greater continuity than discontinuity between earlier and later centuries. For peculiarity we have only the number of singular/sub-singular readings in 01. In short, the data gathered and analyzed above do not indicate that a free and fluid attitude

---

<sup>725</sup> This portion of text is lacunose in P<sup>119</sup> at the end of verso 2 and beginning of verso 3, but the spacing observations noted under 1:26 λεγων in the table above make five additional letters unlikely in these lacunae.

towards copying was present in the tradition leading up to P<sup>119</sup> or in the activity of its own copyist.

### 4.3. 0162 (P. Oxy. VI 847)

#### Introduction

0162 is a well-preserved one-leaf fragment of a parchment codex found in Oxyrhynchus, Egypt, containing John 2:11-22 with some small lacunae throughout.<sup>726</sup> The extant text runs from vv. 11-16 on the recto and vv. 16-22 on the verso, all of which is preserved in P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup>. Since its publication in 1908 by Grenfell and Hunt, it has been variously dated to the third/fourth and fourth century.<sup>727</sup> The third/fourth century dating is printed in NA28 and is accepted or upheld in some of the more recent treatments or discussions.<sup>728</sup> Orsini and Clarysse, however, in agreement with Grenfell and Hunt give the range of 300 to 400.<sup>729</sup> Parker expresses some reserve about assigning 0162 to the earlier third/fourth century date, but he points out that it is not written in Biblical Majuscule and says that it belongs “with those papyri in the period before the production of monumental calligraphic codices,” that is, before the “Age of Constantine and Beyond.”<sup>730</sup> Although 0162 may very well have been written in the fourth century, I have nonetheless retained it in my study as a likely representative of the outward lying boundary of the period in question.

Grenfell and Hunt comment that 0162 is written in a “rather large calligraphic script...closely related to the sloping oval type of the third and fourth centuries,”<sup>731</sup>

---

<sup>726</sup> For this and further introductory information see especially Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, eds., “Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 847,” in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part VI* (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1908) 4-5 (referred to as *editio princeps* for the remainder of this chapter); K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste*, 33; LDAB: <http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/>.

<sup>727</sup> For fourth century dating, see *editio princeps* 4; van Haelst, *Catalogue*, no. 436; Turner, *Typology*, 157. For third/fourth century, see K. Aland and B. Aland, *Text*, 104 (“from the third/fourth century (formerly assigned to the fourth century)”).

<sup>728</sup> NA28, 806. Cf. IGNTP II, 34 (dates given reflect “consensus of opinion”); Chapa, “Early Text of John,” 141, 142; Epp, “Papyrus Manuscripts,” 7, 10; Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 683 (ca. 300).

<sup>729</sup> Orsini and Clarysse, “Manuscripts and Their Dates,” 472.

<sup>730</sup> David C. Parker, “The Majuscule Manuscripts of the New Testament,” in Ehrman and Holmes, *The Text of the New Testament*, 51. But see discussion and references in my chapter on P<sup>39</sup>, which gives early evidence of this high level of calligraphy.

<sup>731</sup> *Editio princeps*, 4.

and Orsini and Clarysse assign it to “the transitional phase from sloping severe style to sloping ogival majuscule.”<sup>732</sup> The page, which is almost entirely intact, measures 16.2 cm in height and 14.6 cm in width, putting its dimension in Turner’s Group X for parchment codices.<sup>733</sup> On each side it presents 19 lines of text in one column measuring 11 x 11 cm.<sup>734</sup> Based on my own count the range of letters per line is 20 to 26, with the vast majority of lines having between 21 and 24.

In terms of orthography, 0162 attests the augmented form  $\omega\kappa\omicron\delta\omicron\mu\eta\theta\eta$  rather than  $\omicron\kappa\omicron\delta\omicron\mu\eta\theta\eta$  in 2:20 (verso 34/15) with other manuscripts in the tradition but against P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup>,<sup>735</sup> and it reads singularly with  $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$  for  $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron$  in 2:17 (verso 25/6).<sup>736</sup> For *nomina sacra* 0162 reads with  $\overline{\pi\rho\varsigma}$  (2:16, verso 22/3) for  $\overline{\pi\alpha\tau\rho\varsigma}$  and both  $\overline{\iota\eta\varsigma}$  (2:13, recto 9) and  $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$  (2:19, verso 30/11) for  $\overline{\iota\eta\sigma\upsilon\omicron\varsigma}$ . In 2:12,  $\overline{\mu\eta\tau\eta\rho}$  is written *in pleno* (recto 4). At the three places where 0162 has a *nomen sacrum*, P<sup>75</sup> reads  $\overline{\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma}$  (2:16) and  $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$  (2:13, 19) and P<sup>66</sup> reads  $\overline{\pi\alpha\tau\rho\varsigma}$  (2:16) and  $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$  (2:13, 19). At 2:20 0162 (verso 33/14) and P<sup>75</sup>, but not P<sup>66</sup>, abbreviate  $\tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\epsilon\rho\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$  with  $\overline{\mu}$ .<sup>737</sup> Reflecting both literary and documentary styles, numbers are written out and rendered as numerals inconsistently in the earliest Christian manuscripts, with, for example, frequent use of numerals in P<sup>75</sup> but not P<sup>45</sup> and P<sup>66</sup>.<sup>738</sup>

0162 attests a diaeresis at the following places:  $\overline{\iota\omicron\upsilon\delta\alpha\iota\omega\nu}$  (2:13, recto 8),  $\overline{\iota\epsilon\rho\omega}$  (2:14, recto 10),  $\overline{\iota\epsilon\rho\upsilon}$  (2:15, recto 16),  $\overline{\iota\omicron\upsilon\delta\alpha\iota\omicron\iota}$  (2:18, verso 27/8; 2:20, verso

<sup>732</sup> Orsini and Clarysse, “Manuscripts and Their Dates,” 457.

<sup>733</sup> Turner, *Typology*, 28.

<sup>734</sup> Turner, *Typology*, 157.

<sup>735</sup> For the Atticistic character of this reading see comments in BDF, sec. 67. See also Gignac II, 239; Westcott and Hort, *Appendix*, 161.

<sup>736</sup> I follow *editio princeps*, 4 in reading  $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$  instead of  $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron$  in IGNTP II, 132 (cf. IGNTP II, plate 15). For interchange of final sigma and nu, see Gignac I, 131.

<sup>737</sup> For abbreviations of cardinal numbers see James H. Moulton and Wilbert F. Howard, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. 2: Accidence and Word-Formation* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1929), 167-168.

<sup>738</sup> Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters*, 66. For further discussion, Eric G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (2nd rev. ed., ed. P. J. Parsons; London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1987), 15; Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief*, 18-19, who says that among literary works these abbreviations are unique to Christian texts and are not a feature of Jewish or pagan texts.

33/14). It is clear that “stops in the middle position are freely used,”<sup>739</sup> and it is evident from the plates that these stops occur frequently throughout and are sometimes but not always accompanied by a space before the next word.<sup>740</sup> Such punctuation as well as the literary hand suggest liturgical use.<sup>741</sup> The Alands classify this manuscript as “At least normal,”<sup>742</sup> and Grenfell and Hunt note its textual affinity with B.<sup>743</sup> 0162 is currently housed in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Department of Egyptian Art, New York City.

#### Variation-Units Represented<sup>744</sup>

Variation-Unit	Variants	0162 Transcribed
2:12 μετα τουτο	μετα τουτο μετα ταυτα M 0211. 124. 954. (1093.) 1293 b f ff <sup>2</sup> q	μετα   ταυτα (recto 2-3)
2:12 [αυτου] και οι μαθηται αυτου	αυτου και οι μαθηται αυτου P <sup>66c</sup> A N Γ Δ Θ f <sup>1.13</sup> 33. 565. 700. 892. 1424. (K W <sup>s</sup> ) <i>Maj.</i> lat sy sa bo και οι μαθηται αυτου P <sup>66*.75</sup> B Ψ (579) c αυτου 01 74* 89* 234* 245. 249. 440 a b e ff <sup>2</sup> l q ly και οι μαθηται L; Or <sup>s</sup>	και οι μαθη   ται αυτου (recto 5-6)
2:12 εμειναν	εμειναν εμεινεν P <sup>66c</sup> A f <sup>1</sup> 565. (εμενεν 1241) b sa <sup>mss</sup> ly bo	εμειναν (recto 6)

<sup>739</sup> *Editio princeps*, 4.

<sup>740</sup> Cf. IGNTP II, plates 14 and 15.

<sup>741</sup> See Charlesworth, “Public and Private,” 156.

<sup>742</sup> K. Aland and B. Aland, *Text*, 123. Chapa, “Early Text of John,” 141 lists it as “Normal.”

<sup>743</sup> *Editio princeps*, 4.

<sup>744</sup> Among the variation-units identified in NA28 that are represented by 0162, I exclude from my treatment here those for which the basis of variation is a singular or sub-singular reading: 2:13 εγγυς δε ((P<sup>66\*</sup>) 01); 2:14 πολουντας τας βοας (P<sup>75</sup> 213 1346); 2:19 om. εν (B); 2:22 ηνεστη (W<sup>s</sup>). These readings will, however, be included in the Diachronic Comparison section below. I have added the variation-unit concerned with 2:12 μετα ταυτα, which is read by 0162 and some other witnesses.

2:13 εις Ιεροσολυμα ο Ιησους	εις Ιεροσολυμα ο Ιησους εις Ιεροσολυμα $f^{13}$ ο Ιησους εις Ιεροσολυμα P <sup>66.75</sup> (A) L N 1241. 1424 b j r <sup>1</sup> vg <sup>cl</sup>	εις Ιεροσολυμα ο Ιης (recto 9)
2:15 φραγελλιον	φραγελλιον 01 A B K P Γ Δ Θ Ψ $f^{13}$ 579. 700. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> l sy co; Or  ως φραγελλιον P <sup>66.75</sup> L N W <sup>s</sup> $f^1$ 33. 565. 892. 1241 lat; Or <sup>s</sup>	ως φραγελλιον (recto 14)
2:15 το κερμα	το κερμα P <sup>66*</sup> 01 A K N P Γ Δ Θ Ψ $f^{13}$ 700. 892. 1241. 1424. ( $f^1$ 565) <i>Maj.</i> sy  τα κερματα P <sup>66c.75</sup> B L W <sup>s</sup> 083. 33. 579 b q; Or <sup>s</sup>	τα κερματα (recto 18)
2:15 ανετρεψεν	ανετρεψεν P <sup>66</sup> B W <sup>s</sup> Θ  ανεστρεψεν P <sup>75</sup> A K L N P Γ Δ Ψ $f^1$ 33. 565. 579. 700. 892. 1241. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> ; Or <sup>s</sup>  κατεστρεψεν P <sup>59vid</sup> 01 0233 $f^{13}$ 69 <sup>c</sup> 157. 1346	ανετρεψεν (recto 19) <sup>745</sup>
2:16 μη	μη P <sup>75</sup> 01 B K L N P Γ Δ Ψ 579. 892. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> lat; Or <sup>s</sup>  και μη P <sup>66</sup> A W <sup>s</sup> Θ $f^{1.13}$ 33. 565. 700. 1241 it vg <sup>cl</sup> sy bo <sup>ms</sup>	μη (verso 21/2)
2:17 εμνησθησαν	εμνησθησαν P <sup>66.75</sup> 01 B L Ψ 579 co  εμνησθησαν δε A K N P Γ Δ Θ 050 $f^{1.13}$ 33. 565. 700. 892. 1241. 1424 <i>Maj.</i> c r <sup>1</sup> vg sy <sup>h</sup>  και εμνησθησαν W <sup>s</sup> 1293 it bo <sup>ms</sup>	εμνη   σθησαν (verso 23-24/4-5)
2:17 ο ζηλος <sup>746</sup>	ο ζηλος  οτι ο ζηλος P <sup>66.75</sup> W <sup>s</sup> 050	ο ζηλος (verso 25/6) <sup>747</sup>

<sup>745</sup> I read ανετρεψεν with *editio princeps*, 5 (cf. NA<sup>28</sup>) instead of ανεστρεψεν in IGNTP II, 131, which is clearly incorrect based on the photograph (cf. IGNTP II, plate 14).

<sup>746</sup> At 2:17 (verso 26/7) IGNTP II, 132 erroneously transcribes κατεφαγεται in place of καταφαγεται (cf. IGNTP II, plate 15 and *editio princeps*, 5). IGNTP I, 145 incorrectly lists κατεφαγετε as the reading for P<sup>66</sup> instead of καταφαγετε (corrected in IGNTP online transcription).

2:18 ημιν <sup>748</sup>	ημιν – P <sup>75</sup> L 083	ημιν (verso 29/10)
--------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------

### Unique Reading

Place of Variation	Readings	0162 Transcribed
2:15 εξεβαλεν	εξεβαλεν (εξεβελεν 1071) <i>rell</i> εξεβαλετο 0162	εξεβαλετο (recto 15) <sup>749</sup>

### Commentary on Variants

2:12 μετα ταυτα: Throughout the Gospel, μετα τουτο is used after a specific action within a narrative unit (11:7, 11; 19:28 (very slight support for ταυτα in each), whereas μετα ταυτα comes at the beginning of a new narrative unit and separates it from the previous one (3:22 (τουτο v.l. 1200); 5:1; 6:1; 7:1; 19:38; 21:1).<sup>750</sup> The variation unit in 2:12 is more ambiguous because although the prepositional phrase appears to come after and not within the narrative unit (the wedding at Cana), the brief mention of Jesus' sojourn ου πολλας ημερας in Capernaum after the prepositional phrase can hardly be taken as a separate unit in its own right. Instead, the new narrative unit begins in v. 13 when Jesus goes to Jerusalem for the Passover. Thus, along with v. 11 (clearly *the* concluding statement for this first sign), it is best to view v. 12, where Jesus spends time with his family and disciples, as the conclusion to what began with this inner circle in vv. 1-2,<sup>751</sup> and as a transition to

<sup>747</sup> I follow the placement of sublinear dots in IGNTP II, 132 (cf. plate 15).

<sup>748</sup> On account of the agreement between P<sup>75</sup> and L, I have not removed this variation-unit as one that is based on a sub-singular reading.

<sup>749</sup> Instead of εξεβαλε[ν in *editio princeps*, 5, I follow IGNTP II, 131 in reading εξεβαλετο, which is clear from the photograph (cf. IGNTP II, plate 14).

<sup>750</sup> The use in 5:14 is less clear but does not contradict my assessment.

<sup>751</sup> See structural treatment in Barrett, *Gospel according to John*, 188; Bultmann, *The*

Jesus' appearance in Jerusalem.<sup>752</sup> The use of *μετα τουτο* would, therefore, be more in line with Johannine style, and it is understandable that a scribe would be drawn to the plural on account of the shift away from the wedding narrative itself in v.11.

0162 contains the intrinsically less probable and transcriptionally less difficult plural *ταυτα*, potentially influenced by general usage.

2:12 *και οι μαθηται αυτου*: Here and in similar places in the New Testament involving mention of Jesus' mother and brothers together, there is much variation regarding the presence or absence of pronouns (see especially Matt 12:46; Mk 3:31; Lk 8:19; also Mk 3:33; Lk 8:20). In terms of the immediate context of our verse, since there is barely any support for the absence of *αυτου* after *μαθηται* (*L pc; Or<sup>s</sup>*), and since 01 and some other witnesses attest the omission of the entire phrase *και οι μαθηται αυτου* (probably due to a leap) and not just *αυτου*, it is likely that both the preceding *μητηρ* and the following *μαθηται* were read with the genitive pronoun. Metzger notes the likelihood that the longest reading with *αυτου* after *οι αδελφοι* gave rise to the others (though he places *αυτου* in brackets because of uncertainty from external evidence), but he gives no further explanation on internal grounds.<sup>753</sup> The evidence for this local genealogical priority of variant 1 (as listed in the table above) might be expressed as follows: variants 2 and 4 reflect omission of one or more elements of the three-fold pronoun repetition, and variant 3 represents a leap from the same to the same coming off of variant 1. It is possible that copyists smoothed away or inadvertently omitted an element of what could have been perceived as an unnecessary and clunky three-fold repetition of *αυτου*, or that *αυτου* was inserted for clarity and to conform to its usage in the nearby context (with *μητηρ* and *μαθηται*) or in other Gospels (as noted above). Given the local genealogical

---

*Gospel of John*, 111; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 32.

<sup>752</sup> For explicit treatment as a transition between 2:1-11 and 2:13-22, see Keener, *The Gospel of John*, vol. 1, 517; Brown, *Introduction to the Gospel of John*, 301.

<sup>753</sup> Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 173.

priority of the longest variant, however, the weight of the evidence leans towards seeing the absence of *αυτου* after *αδελφοι*, as reflected in 0162, as the omission of a superfluous and repetitious pronoun.

2:12 *εμειναν*: The sentence began with the singular verb *κατεβη* for the compound subject (the intensive *αυτος* for Jesus and then *η μητηρ, οι αδελφοι, and οι μαθηται*). This sort of compound subject with a singular verb is common in the New Testament if the verb falls before or between the subjects (e.g., Mk 8:27; Lk 8:22; Jn 2:2; 3:22; 4:36; 18:15; 20:3; Ac 11:14; 16:31), especially when Jesus is mentioned with his disciples and the stress is on him.<sup>754</sup> Although we can account grammatically for the use of the singular for *καταβαινω*, the context calls for the plural in the case of *μενω* (with analogous syntax in Jn 20:3). The singular *εμεινεν* is also a less difficult reading because of the high probability that it was affected by the two singular verbs in the immediate context, especially *κατεβη* before but also *ανεβη* afterwards.<sup>755</sup> 0162 has the reading that is not influenced by the immediate context.

2:13 *εις Ιεροσολυμα ο Ιησους*: In other similar cases in John where *Ιησους* is used with an *εις* prepositional phrase, the word order is consistent: verb + Jesus (with or without the article) + *εις* prepositional phrase (especially 5:1 and 7:14 where *ανεβη* is also used; 11:30 and 12:12 (v.l. order of verb and *Ιησους*); 21:4 (v.l. *εις*)) (cf. also 6:22). This may suggest that *ανεβη εις Ιεροσολυμα ο Ιησους*, as in 0162, is uncharacteristic of John and thus intrinsically improbable. However, in 2:13 we find the continuation of Jesus' activity in the next sentence (*και ευρεν...*), instead of a shift in subject (7:14; 12:12; 21:4) or an explanatory comment from the narrator (5:1; 11:30). This is also the case in 6:3 where the prepositional phrase likewise comes before *Ιησους* (v.l. U\* and some versional witnesses). This small difference may

---

<sup>754</sup> Daniel Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 401. Cf. BDF, sec. 135.

<sup>755</sup> Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St. John*, vol. 1, 343; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 33.

account for the shift in word order, and, at the very least, militates against equating it with a corruption out of line with John's style. This departure from the normal word order then becomes a more difficult reading, since copyists would be more tempted to bring the order into and not out of conformity with general usage. Such familiarity with this construction is not improbable, given its frequency and its significance in commenting on Jesus' movement throughout the Gospel. 0162 attests the reading that is not influenced by familiar usage.

2:15 *ως φραγελλιον*: With this particle the text reads, "And having made [something] like a whip out of cords" instead of "And having made a whip out of cords." The particle *ως* is used in John with a similar comparative meaning in 1:14 (*δοξαν ως μονογενουσ παρα πατρος*), 1:32 (*καταβαινον ως περιστεραν* (v.l. *ωσει*)), and 15:6 (*εβληθη εξω ως το κλημα*). Although recognizing *ως* to be in the earliest witnesses, Metzger and the committee give a {B} rating to the reading without it, since, it is reckoned, "there is no good reason that would account for its having been omitted from the other witnesses," and "it is probable that copyists introduced the word in order to soften somewhat the bald statement that Jesus made a whip of cords."<sup>756</sup> There are, however, more than a few reasons from internal evidence to conclude that the reading with *ως* is more probable. First, beginning with the simplest explanation, since the preceding *ποιησας* also ends with a sigma, *ως* could have been omitted accidentally due to a leap.<sup>757</sup> Second, the context makes clear that this *φραγελλιον* is not a whip *per se*, but rather one that is improvised, made spontaneously for a specific purpose and from available resources (*εκ σχοινωων*), indeed, "something like a whip." Third, the presence of *ως* renders a rougher, more difficult syntax, as there is no preceding noun from which the comparison can be

---

<sup>756</sup> Metzger, *Commentary*, 173; see also Kenneth W. Clark, "The Theological Relevance of Textual Variation in Current Criticism of the Greek New Testament," *JBL* 85 (1966): 3; Mikeal C. Parsons, "A Christological Tendency in P75," *JBL* 105 (1986): 474-75; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 38.

<sup>757</sup> N. Clayton Croy, "The Messianic Whippersnapper: Did Jesus Use a Whip on People in The Temple (John 2:15)?" *JBL* 128.3 (2009): 557.

made. This raises the likelihood of its being omitted by scribes as awkward or unnecessary.<sup>758</sup> Fourth, recent studies of singular readings confirm that conjunctions, pronouns and particles tended to be omitted far more than added.<sup>759</sup> For these reasons, it seems dubious to claim on internal grounds, and on such a vaguely substantiated premise that may have more to do with modern than ancient sensibilities, that this particle represents the intentional softening of Jesus' activity in the temple. Moreover, had a scribe wanted to soften the action of Jesus, a number of other changes with greater effect could have been made, such as changing the word φραγελλιον altogether. Besides, Barrett points out that a φραγελλιον (from the Latin *flagellum*) could also have been used for an animal whip,<sup>760</sup> which is further strengthened by the presence of regulations against visitors having weapons in the temple.<sup>761</sup> In this light it becomes even less likely that the context would have elicited some kind of need or desire to soften the fact that Jesus used a φραγελλιον. 0162 attests the more difficult reading that is not omitted due to a leap from the same to the same or the elimination of unnecessary syntax.

2:15 τα κερματα: This is the only place where this word occurs in the New Testament. The singular can refer to a coin/piece of money or, as a collective singular, to coins. The mention of the plural in the *Onomasticon* of Pollux, the second century grammarian/lexicographer and proponent of Atticism, indicates that τα κερματα is an Attic form.<sup>762</sup> Bultmann comments that “B’s, and Origen’s reading of τὰ κέρματα instead of the non-Attic τὸ κέρμα of other authorities is perhaps a correction.”<sup>763</sup> Classical authors, moreover, often use the plural to denote copper

---

<sup>758</sup> For comments that it is unnecessary, see Philip W. Comfort, *New Testament Text and Translation Commentary: Commentary on the Variant Readings of the Ancient New Testament Manuscripts and How They Relate to the Major English Translations* (Carol Stream, Illinois: Tyndale House, 2008), 262.

<sup>759</sup> See generally Royse, *Scribal Habits*.

<sup>760</sup> Barrett, *Gospel according to John*, 197.

<sup>761</sup> Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St. John*, 346; Keener, *Gospel of John*, 521.

<sup>762</sup> BDAG, 541.

<sup>763</sup> Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, 123.

money.<sup>764</sup> While it may be more probable that the collective singular was changed to this more Attic plural form than vice versa, which is the interpretation accepted here, this conclusion is by no means certain.<sup>765</sup> We can simply conclude that 0162 contains the plural form of the noun more in line with Attic usage.

2:15 ανετρεψεν: The attestation of κατεστρεψεν reflects a harmonization to the parallel account in Matthew 21:12 and Mark 11:15, which is likely related to ανεστρεψω, the same verb with a different preposition.<sup>766</sup> In the case of the latter, copyists could have been influenced both by the verbal form being copied (ανετρεψεν), hence the preposition ανα, and the verbal form in Synoptic parallels (κατεστρεψεν), hence the root στρεψω. Also, from a different angle, it is difficult to account for an alteration to the verb ανατρεπω, especially since it occurs nowhere else in John and only twice elsewhere in the New Testament (2 Tim 2:18; Tit 1:11). 0162 attests the reading that is not harmonized to Gospel parallels.

2:16 μη: In the preceding context, beginning at v. 13, και is used to introduce every new independent clause with a finite verb (και εγγυς ην...και ανεβη...και ευρεν...και ποιησας ως φραγελλιον εκ σχοιניων παντας εξεβαλεν... και των κολλυβιστων εξεχεεν...και τας τραπεζας ανετρεψεν...και τοις τας περιστερας πωλουσιν ειπεν). Then the direct speech after ειπεν reads with two commands: αρατε ταυτα εντευθεν followed by (και) μη ποιειτε τον οικον του πατρος μου οικον εμποριου. Our variation-unit concerns whether or not these two commands are separated by asyndeton or the conjunction και. The frequent and concentrated use of και before each clause in the preceding context taken together with the abruptness

---

<sup>764</sup> See entry in Henry G. Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (9th ed. rev H. S. Jones; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), 943.

<sup>765</sup> For data on Atticism in the New Testament and caution against automatically taking the Attic form as a later corruption, see Chrys C. Caragounis, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission* (WUNT 167; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 137, 480: "The possibility, too, must be considered that the author wrote down the Attic form and that a scribe altered it to the popular form to bring it in line with popular feeling." For difficulties and debate in assessing Atticism, see Epp, "Traditional 'Canons'," 119-22.

<sup>766</sup> See Barrett, *Gospel according to John*, 198.

caused by the asyndeton probably influenced copyists to insert *καί* here. 0162 attests the rougher, more difficult reading with no attempt to smooth away asyndeton.

2:17 *εμνησθησαν*: As described in our analysis of the previous variant, the context abounds with independent clauses coordinated by *καί*. The conjunction is used seven times in the narration of Jesus' activity in the preceding context and with every other occurrence of an indicative verb. Thus, the insertion rather than omission of a conjunction with *εμνησθησαν* here would be more tempting. The variety of conjoining particles attested in the manuscript tradition at this variation-unit (*δε*, *καί* and *τοτε*) suggests discrete attempts at smoothing out this abrupt transition from Jesus' speech to the narrator's comment about the disciples' recollection. The rougher and characteristic use of asyndeton, therefore, best explains the origin of the other three variants.<sup>767</sup> Once again, 0162 shows no attempt to eliminate the asyndeton.

2:17 ο *ζηλος*: John has by far the most occurrences of *οτι* among the New Testament documents, a couple of which precede similar citation formulae (10:34 (v.l.); 15:25). Especially due to its proximity, it seems most likely that the *οτι* before the citation formula has exercised influence here (*εμνησθησαν οι μαθηται αυτου οτι γεγραμμενον εστιν οτι*). 0162 attests the reading that is not influenced by the immediate context.

2:18 *ημιν*: The presence of *ημιν* fits the context of the sentence and the Gospel as a whole, since "the Jews," those who contest and reject Jesus, are seeking a sign *for themselves*.<sup>768</sup> There is no mechanical reason for this pronoun's omission, but it could have been skipped over as superfluous. It is absent in only a few witnesses (P<sup>75</sup> L 083), the earliest of which showing a tendency towards one-word

---

<sup>767</sup> See Poythress, "The Use of the Intersentence Conjunctions *de*, *oun*, *kai* and asyndeton in the Gospel of John," *NovT* 26 (1984): 324-331, for discussion of asyndeton as the more frequent, "default" usage in John in comparison with other New Testament books.

<sup>768</sup> See 4:48, 6:26 and especially 6:30: "And they said to him, "What sign, then, do you do, in order that *we might also believe* in you."

omissions among its singular readings, a number of them being pronouns.<sup>769</sup> Such evidence gives some transcriptional support to seeing the absence of ημιν as a secondary omission, even though textual affinity between P<sup>75</sup> and L may support seeing this reading as inherited from the *Vorlage* of P<sup>75</sup>. 0162 does not attest the omission of an apparently superfluous indirect object pronoun.

#### Commentary on Unique Reading

2:15 ἐξεβαλετο: The only occurrence of ἐκβαλλω in the middle voice in the New Testament is as a participle in Acts 27:38. This verb is used in all four Gospel accounts of Jesus' cleansing of the Temple. Here and in Matthew there is the indicative ἐξεβαλεν, but in Mark and Luke the verb is rendered as a complementary infinitive with the middle helper verb αρχομαι (ηρξατο εκβαλλειν). The use of a middle verb in helping to convey the same idea in two of the three parallels to our passage makes it likely that this has exercised influence on the substitution towards the middle voice here in 0162. The fact that 0162 does not read with the middle voice for the other two verbs describing Jesus' activity (εξεχεεν and ανετρεψεν) makes it unlikely that any kind of improvement or conscious editorial activity lies behind this substitution. In writing ἐξεβαλετο for ἐξεβαλεν, therefore, 0162 attests a partial harmonization to verbal usage in parallels.

#### Analysis of Manuscript based on Readings

0162 supplies 12 readings for analysis from those treated in the tables and commentary above, consisting of one singular reading and 11 that are shared with other witnesses in the tradition. Among the 11 shared readings, five are in variation-

---

<sup>769</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 704, 662 says of P<sup>75</sup>: "The scribe has a low frequency of addition, and omits more than three times as often as he adds," with 32.1% of significant singulars being omissions, which is above average for the six early extensive papyri.

units associated with harmonization. In four of them, 0162 attests the non-harmonized reading, whether to the immediate context (2:12 *εμειναν* is not harmonized to the singular tense of surrounding verbs; 2:17 *ο ζηλος* is not influenced by the preceding *οτι* before the citation formula) or to general usage (2:13 *εις Ιεροσολυμα ο Ιησους* is not harmonized to typical word order) or to parallels in other Gospels (2:15 *ανετρεψεν* avoids harmonization to the verb used in Matthew 21:12 and Mark 11:15). In only one of these five variation-units does 0162 attest the harmonized reading: 2:12 *μετα ταυτα* which conforms to the more frequently occurring use of the plural demonstrative pronoun in this prepositional phrase.

Six of these shared readings are in variation-units in which we can make a judgment as to which reading is stylistically or syntactically more difficult. In four of them, 0162 has the more difficult reading: 2:16 *μη* and 2:17 *εμνησθησαν* show no effort at adding conjunctions or connectives that smooth away asyndeton; 2:15 *ως φραγγελιον* does not attest the omission of an unnecessary or slightly awkward particle (or a leap from same to same); 2:18 *ημιν* avoids the omission of a superfluous indirect object pronoun. In two of these six variation-units, however, 0162 reads with the less difficult reading: 2:12 *και οι μαθηται αυτου* attests the omission of a superfluous and rather repetitious pronoun; 2:15 *τα κερματα* attests the plural instead of the singular form of the noun, which may reflect Atticism.

In summary, in these 11 variation-units represented by 0162, eight or 73% of its readings are intrinsically and/or transcriptionally more probable than the alternative(s). This means that only 3 or 27% of its readings are internally less probable. This rather low percentage of improbable variants is deemed even less consequential when one considers the small size and insignificance of two of them. First, we have the substitution of the plural *ταυτα* for the singular *τουτο* in 2:12 *μετα ταυτα*, readily explained both by the effect of the context and by the prevalence of

the former over the latter in John and the rest of the New Testament. In other words, both the movement away from the Wedding at Cana (if the sense of the passage was being mentally processed as the text was copied) and an inevitably greater exposure to μετα ταυτα than μετα τουτο would serve as viable explanations for the cause of this substitution. Second, in 2:12 και οι μαθηται αυτου we see the omission of the second occurrence of αυτου in the series η μητηρ αυτου και οι αδελφοι αυτου και οι μαθηται αυτου. Because the sense of the pronoun with αδελφοι is already implied by its previous use with μητηρ, its repetition here carried a high risk of being overlooked.<sup>770</sup> Neither of these small alterations affects the overall sense of the text or indicates intentionality. The only potentially significant variant represented by 0162 is 2:15 τα κερματα (assuming from its Atticistic character that it emerged subsequent to το κερμα), since the shift to the more Attic means of expression could reflect intentional efforts at stylistic improvement. However, it is also conceivable that the substitution was accidentally or unconsciously induced on account of the sense evoked by the passage, where various pieces of money are being poured out and scattered on the ground, or simply on account of greater familiarity with the plural form of this noun.

Apart from the orthographic γεγραμμενος noted in my introductory comments on this manuscript, 0162 has only one singular reading: 2:15 εξεβαλετο. Here we have a middle form of the verb instead of the active εξεβαλεν, which appears to be influenced by the use of the middle voice in parallel passages in Mark and Luke (ηρξατο εκβαλλειν). There is little reason to suspect conscious editorial activity on the part of the scribe, especially since there is no change of voice in the other two verbs for Jesus' actions that accompany εξεβαλετο.

---

<sup>770</sup> Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 735 notes “The frequency of omissions by scribal leaps and of omissions of certain inessential words such as pronouns.”

0162 shares extant text with two other witnesses from the second and third centuries, P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup>, both of which are entirely preserved for this portion of text (with a sprinkling of tiny, one- or two-letter lacunae and some dotted letters in the latter). Leaving aside orthographic readings, 0162 agrees with P<sup>66</sup> 5 out of 12 times (42%): agreements (2:15 ως φραγελλιον; 2:15 τα κερματα; 2:15 ανετρεψεν; 2:17 εμνησθησαν; 2:18 ημιν); disagreements (0162 reading listed first) (2:12 μετα ταυτα | μετα τουτο; 2:12 και οι μαθηται αυτου | αυτου και οι μαθηται αυτου; 2:12 εμειναν | εμεινεν; 2:13 εις Ιεροσολυμα ο Ιησους | ο Ιησους εις Ιεροσολυμα; 2:15 εξεβαλετο | εξεβαλεν; 2:16 μη | και μη; 2:17 ο ζηλος | οτι ο ζηλος). 0162 agrees with P<sup>75</sup> 6 out of 14 times (43%): agreements (2:12 και οι μαθηται αυτου; 2:12 εμειναν; 2:15 ως φραγελλιον; 2:15 τα κερματα; 2:16 μη; 2:17 εμνησθησαν); disagreements (2:12 μετα ταυτα | μετα τουτο; 2:13 εις Ιεροσολυμα ο Ιησους | ο Ιησους εις Ιεροσολυμα; 2:14 πωλουντας βοας | πωλουντας τας βοας; 2:15 εξεβαλετο | εξεβαλεν; 2:15 ανετρεψεν | ανεστρεψεν; 2:16 οικον | οικου; 2:17 ο ζηλος | οτι ο ζηλος; 2:18 ημιν | om.). If singular/sub-singular readings are removed, then 0162 (minus 2:15 εξεβαλετο) agrees with P<sup>66</sup> 5 out of 11 times (45%) and with P<sup>75</sup> (minus 2:14 πωλουντας τας βοας; 2:16 οικον) 6 out of 11 times (55%).

#### Diachronic Comparison of Created Readings

Among manuscripts up through the seventh century, the portion of text covered by 0162 is fully preserved in P<sup>66</sup>, P<sup>75</sup>, 01, A, B, N, and W<sup>s</sup>. Listed below are the readings deemed likely to have been created by each respective scribe. Orthographic readings other than itacism and the moveable nu, while not included in the following list and analysis, have been provided in a footnote for each manuscript for the sake of completeness and the reader's convenience.

**0162:**<sup>771</sup>

2:15 εξεβαλεν] εξεβαλετο 0162 (harmonized substitution of voice, to parallels (Mk 11:15; Lk 19:45))

**P<sup>66</sup> (none):**<sup>772</sup>

**P<sup>75</sup>:**<sup>773</sup>

2:14 πωλουντας βοας] πωλουντας τας βοας P<sup>75</sup> 213 1346 (dittography associated with ending of previous word (πωλουντας τας))

2:16 οικον [2]] οικου P<sup>75</sup> (nonsense in context influenced by surrounding uses of genitive)

**01:**

2:11 αυτου[1]] om. 01\* (omission of inessential pronoun; cf. 01 at 2:21)

2:11 εις αυτον οι μαθηται αυτου] οι μαθηται αυτου εις αυτον 01\* (transposition resulting from a corrected leap (επιστευσαν εις αυτουν))

2:13 και εγγυς] εγγυς δε 01 (και εγγυς δε P<sup>66\*</sup>) (harmonized substitution, to general usage (6:4; 7:2; 11:55))

---

<sup>771</sup> As already noted, 0162 has one orthographic singular involving final ν/ς interchange: 2:17 γεγραμμενος.

<sup>772</sup> A number of readings from P<sup>66</sup> are not considered here because they were corrected either by the scribe or some contemporary figure serving as a *diorthōtēs* (for the correctors of P<sup>66</sup> see introductory discussion on the extensive papyri): 2:11 εις αυτον corrected to εις αυτου; 2:12 μ[ε(?)]αθηται to μαθηται; 2:13 και εγγυς δε to και εγγυς; 2:15 και τα to τα τε; 2:20 om. ου to ου. There are no singular readings in this portion of P<sup>66</sup> after correction

<sup>773</sup> I exclude 2:20 σοι, which was corrected to ου by the first hand.

2:14 βοας και προβατα] και τα προβατα και βοας 01\* (same word order a f q)  
(transposition resulting from a corrected leap (πωλουντας βοας) plus harmonized  
addition of article from immediate context (2:15))

2:15 και ποιησας...παντας εξεβαλεν] εποιησεν...και παντας εξεβαλεν 01\* (και  
παντας 579) a b e ff<sup>2</sup> l q (omission of και that created asyndeton plus change from  
hypotaxis to parataxis; possibly affected by punctuation separating περιστερας and  
και in 01 at 2:14)

2:15 τε] και<sup>774</sup> 01<sup>S1.Cca</sup> (om. 01\*<sup>Ccb2</sup>) (both the omission and substitution are  
influenced by the 01 reading in the immediate context (2:14))

2:20 εν] om. 01 a c (omission of unnecessary preposition; for transcriptional  
temptation see also v.l. and support in Matt 27:40; Mk 15:29; Jn 2:19)

2:21 αυτου] om.<sup>775</sup> 01\* 47. 63. 253. (omission of inessential pronoun; cf. 01 at 2:11)

### A:

2:13 ο Ιησους εις Ιεροσολυμα] ο Ιησους εις Ιεροσολυμα Ιησους<sup>776</sup> A (a conflation of  
two word order variants, possibly prompted by a misunderstood or overlooked note  
or correction in the *Vorlage*)

---

<sup>774</sup> For the various corrections and correctors involved see IGNTP II, 216, 7. Here I consider the last reading that was contemporaneous with the initial production of the manuscript, i.e. that left by the Scriptorium hand.

<sup>775</sup> This reading is included as likely to have emerged independently in 01 because the support is narrow and late, and the nature of the variation makes coincidental agreement likely.

<sup>776</sup> Treated here is the addition of Ιησους. The words comprising the larger variation-unit εις Ιεροσολυμα ο Ιης are extant and run to the end of recto 9 in 0162, and the next line begins with a lacuna ([και ευ]ρεν...) that leaves no space for an additional *nomen sacrum* of Ιησους (cf. *editio princeps*, 5 and IGNTP II, plate 14).

**B:**

2:17 γεγραμμενον εστιν] εστιν γεγραμμενον B 1241 (harmonized word order, to general usage (6:31, 45; 10:34; 12:14))

2:19 εν] om.<sup>777</sup> B (omission of unnecessary preposition; for evidence of a transcriptional temptation see also v.l. and support in Matt 27:40; Mk 15:29; Jn 2:20)

**N (none):**

**W<sup>s</sup>.**<sup>778</sup>

2:12 εις Καφαρναουμ] om. W<sup>s</sup> (omission of prepositional phrase possibly in anticipation of the third-person, singular subject of the verb (κατεβη...αυτος) (see note below on 2:12 om. εκει)

2:12 η μητηρ αυτου και οι αδελφοι αυτου και οι μαθηται αυτου] οι μαθητε αυτου και η μητηρ και οι αδελφοι αυτου<sup>779</sup> W<sup>s</sup> (transposition resulting from a corrected leap (αυτος και η μητηρ...και οι μαθηται plus omission of superfluous pronoun (αυτου after μητηρ))

---

<sup>777</sup> This reading falls in a lacuna in 0162 starting at the end of verso 31/12 and extending a few letters into verso 32/13 ([και / εν τ]ρισιν...), but it is unlikely that anything other than εν filled the space at the beginning of 32/13: "To read [και] in place of [εν] would leave l. 31 too short" (*editio princeps*, 5).

<sup>778</sup> I exclude 2:20 γιρις in W<sup>s</sup> because only the last three letters of the word are extant in 0162 (verso 36/17). Here I follow the transcription of Comfort and Barrett, *Text*, 684 (εγερ]εις) (cf. IGNTP II, plate 15). I exclude 2:16 και μονη in W<sup>s\*</sup> as corrected by the first hand (cf. James R. Royse, "The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex," in *The Freer Biblical Manuscripts: Fresh Studies of an American Treasure Trove* (ed. Larry W. Hurtado; SBLTCS 6; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 211. W has one orthographic singular for this portion of text involving an unassimilated nu before a labial stop: 2:16 ενποριου for εμποριου (Gignac I, 168-169).

<sup>779</sup> This singular reading involves both the word order (μαθηται...μητηρ...αδελφοι) and the omission of αυτου after μητηρ.

2:12 εκει] om. W<sup>s</sup> 047. 280 (leap from same to same (και εκει or εκει εμειναν) or conscious elimination of adverb due to previous omission of the referent (εις Καφαρναουμ))

2:14 κερματιστας] κολλυβιστας W<sup>s</sup> (harmonized substitution, to immediate context (2:15) (possibly influenced also by parallels (Matt 21:12; Mk 11:15))

2:16 τας περιστερας πωλουσιν] πωλουσιν τας περιστερας W<sup>s</sup> (transposition resulting from a corrected leap (τοις τας περιστερας))

2:20 οικοδομηθη ο ναος ουτος] ο ναος ουτος οικοδομηθη W<sup>s</sup> (transposition resulting from a corrected leap (οικοδομηθη ο))

2:21 εκεινος] αυτος W<sup>s</sup> (harmonized substitution, to near context (2:12) (possibly influenced also by immediate context (2:24, 25))

2:22 ηγερθη] ηνεστη W<sup>s</sup> (harmonized substitution, to parallels/general New Testament usage (especially where Jesus similarly predicts his own resurrection as in Mk 8:31; 9:9, 10, 31; 10:34; Lk 18:33; 24:7)).

If we first examine the quantity of readings likely introduced, there are eight each in 01 (three, if considered after later correction) and W<sup>s</sup>, two in B, one in A, and none in N. Among the earlier witnesses, there are two in P<sup>75</sup>, one in 0162 and none in P<sup>66</sup>. These three witnesses correspond with the three majuscules that have the least number of created readings: P<sup>75</sup> and B have two, 0162 and A have one, and P<sup>66</sup> and N have none. Only in 01 and W<sup>s</sup> do we find what may be regarded as a tendency

towards the creation of readings. In terms of quantity, therefore, our second and third century witnesses for this portion of text show continuity rather than discontinuity with subsequent centuries, with the only discontinuity being from greater variation in some later witnesses.

In terms of character and significance, each of the readings found in the early witnesses accord with those in the later majuscules. The obvious scribal errors or blunders observed in P<sup>75</sup>, including the dittography in 2:14 πωλουντας τας βοας and the nonsense genitive influenced by the immediate context in 2:16 οικου, find correspondence in the confusion exhibited in the conflated reading of A (2:13 ο Ιησους εις Ιεροσολυμα Ιησους) as well as the transpositions originating from leaps found in 01 (2:11 οι μαθηται αυτου εις αυτον; 2:14 και τα προβατα και βοας) and W<sup>s</sup> (2:12 οι μαθητε...η μητηρ...οι αδελφοι; 2:16 πωλουσιν τας περιστερας; 2:20 ο ναος ουτος οικοδομηθη). To these may also be added the omission of εκει at 2:12 in W<sup>s</sup>, although another possible explanation for this reading will be noted below. Corresponding to the 2:15 εξεβαλετο harmonized substitution to parallels in 0162, there are 2:22 ηνεστη and possibly 2:14 κολλυβιστας in W<sup>s</sup>.

Finally, there are a few notable types of readings attested in the later majuscules that are not found in P<sup>66</sup>, P<sup>75</sup> or 0162. We do not see larger omissions without obvious cause as in W<sup>s</sup> (2:12 om. εις Καφαρναουμ) or multi-layered singular readings involving separate changes as in 01 (2:14 και τα προβατα και βοας; 2:15 εποιησεν...και παντας εξεβαλεν) and W<sup>s</sup> (2:12 οι μαθητε αυτου και η μητηρ και οι αδελφοι αυτου). When interpreted in light of the previous omission of εις Καφαρναουμ, the omission of 2:12 εκει in W<sup>s</sup>, as indicated in the list above, may reflect a conscious attempt to remove an adverb whose referent had been previously omitted. The paucity of corrections in W<sup>s</sup>, and the fact that all of them involve no

more than a couple letters,<sup>780</sup> taken together with the number of transpositions resulting from corrected leaps (as many as three attested in this portion of text alone) may suggest a conscious avoidance of defacing the manuscript with what are regarded as inessential corrections. It is at least possible, therefore, that the scribe of W<sup>s</sup> realized he had omitted the prepositional phrase when it was no longer possible to insert it in another place (perhaps after the *καί* that comes before *εκει*), and rather than make a marginal or supralinear correction (as are so prevalent in P<sup>66</sup>, for example), decided to remedy the situation by also eliminating *εκει*.

On the other hand, the proliferation of singular readings attested in W<sup>s</sup> for v. 12 (four separate changes if the omission of *αυτου* after *μητηρ* is included) may suggest some kind of disturbance or distraction at work in the background that led to both omissions. Yet one finds it highly coincidental that a scribe would omit a place reference and then also happen to accidentally omit the adverb referring to that place. Nothing of this sort is found in the earlier witnesses. In short, the number and character of the readings that were likely created by the copyist of 0162 and by the copyists of its two early co-witnesses who share full overlap for this portion of text suggest overall continuity with transmission attitudes and practices in later centuries. As far as these data are concerned, there is no indication that greater freedom or fluidity was present behind the copying of the earlier witnesses.

#### Conclusions on Stability and/or Fluidity

0162 sits squarely on the side of textual stability and diachronic continuity. Two noteworthy features include a very low proportion of improbable readings and a slight tendency towards Atticism in the underlying tradition. The latter conclusion may be supported by 2:12 *τα κερματα* and the orthographic reading 2:20 *ωκοδομηθη*.

---

<sup>780</sup> See Royse, "Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex," 211-213. He lists eleven corrections in the supplemental quire and concludes, "The corrections made in W<sup>s</sup> are exclusively of minor slips of the scribe of that quire" (216).

The few improbable readings are trivial, small-scale and almost certainly due to unconscious oversight or textual influence. Based on the portion of John's Gospel represented by 0162, no distinctive level of textual laxity presents itself when the created readings of these three early witnesses are compared with those from subsequent centuries.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

I began this study by focusing on the general claim that the early centuries (up to ca. 300) of New Testament textual transmission were characteristically free and fluid, or, at the very least, more free and fluid than in subsequent centuries. In my discussion of the more extensive papyri of John's Gospel, I looked at how language such as "careless," "free," "wild," "uncontrolled," "no intention to reproduce," "intention to improve" have functioned in the characterization of a given manuscript, at least in regards to Colwell's portrayal of P<sup>45</sup>, P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup>. My time spent discussing the relevant literature on P<sup>45</sup> and P<sup>66</sup> served to show how others have employed these categories in assessing the characteristics of these two early witnesses. With these various categories and discussions acting as a backdrop, I then proceeded to apply a fresh approach to assessing the character of transmission exhibited in the second and third century fragmentary manuscripts of the Gospel of John. This included an analysis and characterization of each variant and unique reading on the basis of internal evidence and a diachronic comparison of the number and character of readings (likely) generated with the copying of each witness.

We are now able to ask questions regarding both the transmission reflected at the time in which each witness was copied (as with Min's "Überlieferungsweise") and the character of transmission that likely preceded these early witnesses (as with Min's "Textqualität"):<sup>781</sup> How does each manuscript compare with the later witnesses in its Diachronic Comparison section? Do the early manuscripts with a higher number of singular/sub-singular readings show a propensity towards large, conscious, or sense-altering readings, i.e., even if many are produced, how significant are they? How do the early witnesses as a group fare when compared with

---

<sup>781</sup> See Min, *Die früheste Überlieferung*, 40.

the later manuscripts in the Diachronic Comparisons in sections three and four? What is the percentage of improbable variants in each manuscript? What types of variants are attested, and to what extent do they demand or suggest intentionality?

The conclusions gleaned from the singular/subsingular readings are here presented against the background of the following claims. Colwell stated, “The general nature of the text in the earliest period (to A.D. 300) has long been recognized as “wild,” “uncontrolled,” “unedited”...manuscripts from this period and the manuscripts which present the text of this period have an unusually large number of singular or subsingular readings, most of which are corruptions.”<sup>782</sup> Similarly, Ehrman maintains:

Fourth- and fifth-century manuscripts differ significantly both from one another and from later Byzantine witnesses. Go back even further and things become relatively uncontrolled and hectic. The early papyri are in a different textual universe...The conclusion seems inescapable that as a rule, earlier scribes were not as well trained as later ones, not as skilled, not as assiduous, not as interested in accuracy, or not working in a comparably controlled environment, or some combination of these factors...<sup>783</sup>

Ehrman goes on to identify “the period of the wildest variation” as that “prior to the fourth century.”<sup>784</sup> Although our second and third century manuscripts can only speak indirectly to transmission attitudes and practices prior to the mid/late second century (which will be explored below), they are able to speak directly to these claims.<sup>785</sup> I will now seek to answer the questions noted above concerning the character of transmission reflected in the scribal activity of these early witnesses.

Here I list each papyrus with its number of singular/sub-singular readings followed by the number of those in the majuscules with which it is compared:

---

<sup>782</sup> Colwell, “Hort Redivivus,” 166 n.3.

<sup>783</sup> Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 342-343.

<sup>784</sup> Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 343.

<sup>785</sup> See the other sources cited in my Introduction, and see especially Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 19-31 for a number of references.

P<sup>52</sup> (1 vs. 4, 2, 1, 1, 0)  
 P<sup>90</sup> (3 vs. 7, 3, 2, 2, 2)  
 P<sup>107</sup> (1? vs. 2, 1, 1, 0, 0)  
 P<sup>108</sup> (0 vs. 2, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0)  
 P<sup>109</sup> (0 vs. 3, 0, 0, 0, 0)  
 P<sup>121</sup> (1 vs. 1, 0, 0, 0, 0)  
 P<sup>5</sup> (5 vs. 9, 2, 1)  
 P<sup>22</sup> (0 vs. 2, 2, 0, 0)  
 P<sup>28</sup> (2 vs. 3, 3, 1, 1, 0, 0)  
 P<sup>95</sup> (2 vs. 2, 2, 1, 1, 0, 0)  
 P<sup>39</sup> (0 vs. 6, 5, 2, 2, 1, 1)  
 P<sup>106</sup> (4 vs. 6, 5, 2, 0)  
 P<sup>119</sup> (1 vs. 4, 1, 1, 0)  
 0162 (1 vs. 8, 8, 2, 1, 0)

These data certainly do not support the view articulated by Colwell and Ehrman. Four of these manuscripts have no singular/sub-singular readings (P<sup>108</sup>, P<sup>109</sup>, P<sup>22</sup>, P<sup>39</sup>) (but see discussion of P<sup>109</sup>), and five of them have only one (P<sup>52</sup>, P<sup>107</sup>, P<sup>121</sup>, P<sup>119</sup>, 0162). Both P<sup>52</sup> and 0162 have four later manuscripts with either the same amount or more, and both P<sup>107</sup> and P<sup>119</sup> have three later manuscripts with the same amount or more. P<sup>95</sup> and P<sup>28</sup> have two, but this places each of them in harmony with the later manuscripts. In both cases there are at least two manuscripts that have the same number (as with P<sup>95</sup>) or more (as with P<sup>28</sup>). Not one of these manuscripts reveals anything other than continuity in transmission between the period in which it was copied and that of subsequent centuries.

The remaining manuscripts have three (P<sup>90</sup>), four (P<sup>106</sup>) and five (P<sup>5</sup>) respectively, but it is important to note that these are among the larger fragments treated in this study. Moreover, none of these papyri has the greatest number of singular/sub-singular readings when compared to the later manuscripts, and only P<sup>5</sup> stands at a distance from the majority of other manuscripts with which it is compared (5 vs. 2, 1). As noted in my Introduction and throughout this study, some of the readings in the later majuscules may very well have emerged at an earlier time. Especially where there is Old Latin or Old Syriac support with readings in D or in 01 in John 1-8, there may be good reason to suspect that such readings originated earlier. Yet the removal of some of these readings (and even if quite a few are taken away from the tally of 01 and D) will not dramatically affect these results, namely, that the early witnesses give testimony to roughly the same amount of singular/sub-singular readings as the overlapping witnesses from the following centuries. Furthermore, if some of the readings ascribed to the majuscules arose earlier, this will also be true for some of the readings listed for the early witnesses. In sum, there is no indication from this set of data that the copyists of the second and third centuries were, as Ehrman puts it, “not as skilled, not as assiduous, not as interested in accuracy.”<sup>786</sup>

Below I list all of the singular/sub-singular readings for each witness along with a brief characterization (arranged highest to lowest amount):

**P<sup>5</sup>:**

1:37 om. αὐτου (omission of inessential / seemingly repetitious pronoun)

1:38 om. αὐτω (omission via correction of unnecessary pronoun)

1:40 om. Πετροῦ (harmonized omission, to use of name in immediate context)

---

<sup>786</sup> Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 343.

20:16 κυριε (harmonized substitution, to immediate context)

16:27 om. εγω (harmonized omission, to immediate context)

**P<sup>106</sup>:**

1:33 εαν (substitution involving interchanging particles, affected by general usage?)

1:40 ηκολουθησαν (harmonized substitution, to immediate context)

1:41 om. ουτος (omission of redundant pronoun; influenced by syntax of following verse?)

1:42 om. τον (omission of unnecessary article)

**P<sup>90</sup>:**

18:37 trans. συ (harmonized transposition, to immediate context)

19:6 εκραζαν (misspelled harmonized substitution, to parallels)

19:6 σταυρωσον αυτον (harmonized substitution, to near context or parallel)

**P<sup>28</sup>:**

6:17 ου (minor substitution of negation)

6:19 om. τον (leap)

**P<sup>95</sup>:**

5:27 some form of unique reading possibly involving a 12-letter addition of nearby text

5:28 ακουσαντες (harmonized substitution, to immediate context)

**P<sup>52</sup>:**

18:37 om. εις τουτο (leap or omission of redundant prepositional phrase)

P<sup>107</sup>:

17:1 om. αυτου (harmonized omission, to parallel in John)

P<sup>121</sup>:

19:18 add. ενα? (harmonized addition, to parallel)

P<sup>119</sup>:

1:42 ο Ιησους ειπεν αυτω? (harmonized transposition (or addition?) of pronoun, to immediate/near context or general usage)

0162:

2:15 εξεβαλετο 0162 (harmonized substitution, to parallels)

P<sup>108</sup> (none)

P<sup>109</sup> (none)

P<sup>22</sup> (none)

P<sup>39</sup> (none)

There are three types of readings represented in the above lists that can plausibly be regarded as accidental or unconscious: leaps, micro-level assimilation to nearby or syntactically/contextually parallel text,<sup>787</sup> and the omission of minor and/or

---

<sup>787</sup> It may be difficult to determine when a harmonized/assimilated reading is conscious or unconscious (see brief comments in Holmes, "Codex Bezae as a Recension," 138; Emanuel Tov, "The

superfluous words.<sup>788</sup> If these types of readings are removed, then only two out of the twenty-one readings listed above remain:

P<sup>28</sup>:

6:17 ov (minor substitution of negation)

P<sup>95</sup>:

5:27 some form of unique reading possibly involving a 12-letter addition of nearby text

The reading in P<sup>28</sup>, aside from being entirely inconsequential, may not have existed in the papyrus at all (see discussion in treatment of that manuscript). The reading of P<sup>95</sup> is very unclear (see treatment above), and the editor suggests a mere dittography caused by the repetitious nature of the surrounding text.<sup>789</sup> All of the readings in P<sup>5</sup>, P<sup>106</sup>, and P<sup>90</sup>, the three manuscripts with the most singular/sub-singular readings, can be characterized either as micro-level assimilations through unconscious influence or as one-word omissions of superfluous elements easily explained by oversight. One wonders how such a scenario could in any way contribute to a characterization of “uncontrolled and hectic.”<sup>790</sup>

The latter two sections of this study offered a unique opportunity to compare the number and character of singular/sub-singular readings in two or three early

---

Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts, *JSOT* 31 (1985): 5), but a small-scale assimilation to familiar or nearby text does not seem to demand any level of intentionality.

<sup>788</sup> Such as Jongkind’s *verba minora* (*Scribal Habits*, 143) and Moisés Silva’s “empty words” (“Internal Evidence in the Text-Critical Use of the LXX,” in *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea* (ed. N. F. Marcos; Textos y Estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” 34; Madrid: CSIC Press, 1985), 159). See comment by J. K. Elliott, “Thoroughgoing Eclecticism,” 756-757: “To shorten a text is frequently accidental and a fault to which a careless or tired scribe may be prone.”

<sup>789</sup> Lenaerts, “Un papyrus,” 120.

<sup>790</sup> Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 342.

witnesses with those from the later majuscules. Here I list the data gleaned from those studies (which involves some repetition of the data presented above):

P<sup>95</sup> and P<sup>66</sup> (2, 0 vs. 2, 2, 1, 1, 0, 0)

P<sup>39</sup> and P<sup>66</sup> (0, 1 vs. 6, 5, 2, 2, 1, 1)

P<sup>106</sup>, P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup> (4, 0, 1 vs. 6, 5, 2, 0)

P<sup>119</sup>, P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup> (1, 1, 0 vs. 4, 1, 1, 0)

0162, P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup> (1, 0, 2 vs. 8, 8, 2, 1, 0)

The impression given from the previous analysis is here only made stronger, since the transmission of these sections of P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup> is of a particularly high quality.

When it comes to characterizing the transmission of the period prior to our earliest extant witnesses, I return to Holmes' suggestion noted in my Introduction that we "take what we know about trends, patterns and tendencies from a later period for which we have evidence, project them back into the earlier period for which we lack evidence, and see what they might suggest."<sup>791</sup> Here I list each manuscript with its percentage of improbable variants. There are three manuscripts for which only one or two variation-units are represented, which I have listed separately.

At least three variation-units represented:

P<sup>107</sup> (4/6 67%)

P<sup>90</sup> (5/12 42%)

P<sup>119</sup> (4/11 36%)

P<sup>108</sup> (1/3 33%)

P<sup>28</sup> (3/9 33%)

---

<sup>791</sup> Holmes, "Text and Transmission," 61.

0162 (3/11 27%)

P<sup>5</sup> (9/34 26%)

P<sup>109</sup> (1/4 25%)

P<sup>106</sup> (3/12 25%)

P<sup>22</sup> (1/9 11%)

P<sup>39</sup> (0/5 0%)

Only one or two variation-units represented:

P<sup>95</sup> (2/2 100%)

P<sup>52</sup> (0/1 0%)

P<sup>121</sup> (0/1 0%)

It is noteworthy that only two of these fourteen fragments attest a higher proportion of improbable than probable variants (P<sup>95</sup>, P<sup>107</sup>). Aside from P<sup>90</sup>, with a little under half of its variants being improbable, most of the manuscripts appear to be around 1/3 or 1/4. Two papyri have a particularly low proportion of improbable variants (P<sup>22</sup>, P<sup>39</sup>) and two attest a probable variant in the one variation-unit represented (P<sup>52</sup>, P<sup>121</sup>). Thus, only in P<sup>95</sup> or P<sup>107</sup> do we find anything that might approximate to a less stable transmission character, at least as far as quantity is concerned. In order to make a judgment about the character and significance of the improbable variants of each witness, I list them here:

P<sup>95</sup>:

5:36 om. αυτα (leap)

5:37 εκεινος (harmonized substitution, to immediate context)

**P<sup>107</sup>:**

17:1 add. και (harmonized addition, to immediate/near context or general usage)

17:2 δως αυτω (harmonized substitution, to immediately preceding context)

17:11 add. και (harmonized addition, to immediate/near context)

17:11 add. ουκετι ειμι εν τω κοσμω και εν τω κοσμω ειμι (two-clause repetitive and/or clarifying interpolation)

**P<sup>90</sup>:**

18:38 trans. αιτιαν (transposition resulting from corrected leap)

18:39 add. ινα (harmonized addition, to immediately preceding context)

19:4 om. εξω (omission of redundant adverb)

19:7 om. αυτω (harmonized omission, to immediate/surrounding context)

19:1 λαβων ο Πιλατος τον Ιησουν (substitution of syntax, from parataxis to hypotaxis)

**P<sup>119</sup>:**

1:25 om. και ειπαν αυτω (harmonized omission, to immediately preceding context)

1:26 add. μεν (harmonized addition, to Synoptic parallels)

1:26 add. υμας (harmonized addition, to Synoptic parallels)

1:26 add. δε (harmonized addition, to Synoptic parallels)

**P<sup>108</sup>:**

18:4 δε (harmonized substitution, to Synoptic parallels)

**P<sup>28</sup>:**

6:10 ωσει (harmonized substitution, to Synoptic parallels)

6:11 εδωκεν (harmonized substitution, to Synoptic parallels)

6:22 ειδεν (harmonized substitution, to immediate context)

**0162:**

2:12 ταυτα (harmonized substitution, to general usage (and/or contextually influenced))

2:12 om. αυτου (omission of superfluous and repetitious pronoun)

2:15 τα κερματα (substitution towards Attic)

**P<sup>5</sup>:**

1:25 om. και ειπαν αυτω (harmonized omission, to the immediately preceding context)

1:27 om. εγω (harmonized omission, to Synoptic parallels)

1:35 om. παλιν (harmonized omission, to surrounding context; or leap)

20:25 om. αυτου (harmonized omission, to immediately preceding context)

16:22 αρει (harmonized substitution, to immediate context)

16:26 om. περι υμων (harmonized omission, to parallel in John)

20:24 trans./add. ουν (harmonized to general usage)

20:25 om. αλλοι (leap)

16:23 trans. δωσει υμιν (no clear explanation but see discussion above)

**P<sup>109</sup>:**

21:18 αλλοι + plural verbs (“correction” to an easier/more intuitive text)

**P<sup>106</sup>:**

1:31 trans. εγω (harmonized transposition, to immediately preceding context)

1:32 om. λεγων (omission of superfluous word or harmonization to near/immediate context)

1:33 add. τω (harmonized addition, to remote usage in 1 John)

P<sup>22</sup>:

16:23 ο τι εαν (harmonized substitution, to general/parallel usage in John)

P<sup>39</sup> (none)

P<sup>52</sup> (none)

P<sup>121</sup> (none)

If we remove leaps (and transpositions that probably resulted from the correction of them), micro-level assimilations, and the omission of minor, superfluous words, then we are left with only four variants that may be regarded as significant due to dimension, effect, and/or intentionality. These involve one Atticism, one two-clause interpolation, one change from parataxis to hypotaxis, and one potential “correction” to an easier text. This small group of variants certainly does not give the impression of freedom or fluidity:

2:15 τα κερματα (Atticism) in 0162

17:11 ουκετι ειμι εν τω κοσμω και εν τω κοσμω ειμι (two-clause interpolation) in P<sup>107</sup>

19:1 λαβων ο Πιλατος τον Ιησουν (hypotaxis for parataxis) in P<sup>90</sup>

21:18 αλλοι + plural verbs (easier/“corrected” text) in P<sup>109</sup>

In this thesis I have attempted to test the validity of the claim that the textual transmission of the second and third centuries was fundamentally freer and more fluid than that of subsequent centuries. The evidence gleaned from this fresh and full analysis of the readings attested in each of the smaller fragmentary witnesses of the best-attested New Testament book from this early period does not support this claim. The data assessed in this study point to stability rather than fluidity and to continuity with the later period rather than discontinuity.

## WORKS CITED

- Abbott, Edwin A. *Johannine Grammar*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1906.
- Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28th rev. ed. of Nestle-Aland. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.
- Aland, Barbara. "Das Zeugnis der frühen Papyri für den Text der Evangelien: Diskutiert am Matthäusevangelium." In *The Four Gospels 1992 1*, edited by F. Van Segbroeck, C. M. Tuckett, et al, 325-335. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 100. Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peters, 1992.
- . "Der textkritische und textgeschichtliche Nutzen früher Papyri, demonstriert am Johannesevangelium." In *Recent Developments in Textual Criticism: New Testament, Other Early Christian and Jewish Literature*, edited by Wim Weren and Dietrich-Alex Koch, 19-38. Studies in Theology and Religion 8. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2003.
- . "Kriterien zur Beurteilung kleinerer Papyrusfragmente des Neuen Testaments." In *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis. Festschrift J. Delobel*, edited by A. Denaux, 1-13. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 161. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002.
- . "The Significance of the Chester Beatty Biblical 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*, edited by Charles Horton, 108-121. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 258. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Aland, Kurt. "Der Text des Johannes-evangeliums im 2. Jahrhundert." In *Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments*, edited by W. Schrage, 1-10. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1986.
- . *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*. 2nd revised and enlarged edition. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung 1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994.
- . "Papyrus Bodmer II: Ein erster Bericht." *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 82 (1957): 161-184.
- . *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri, I: Biblische Papyri, Altes Testament, Neues Testament, Varia, Apokryphen*. Patristische Texte und Studien 18. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1976.
- . *Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes*, edited by Kurt Aland, 91-136. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung 2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1967.
- . "The Significance of the Papyri for Progress in New Testament Research." In *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, edited by J. Philip Hyatt, 334-337. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965.
- 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*. 2nd rev. ed. translated by E. F. Rhodes. Leiden/Grand Rapids: Brill/Eerdmans, 1989.
- Bagnall, Roger S. *Early Christian Books in Egypt*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Barker, Don. "How Long and Old is the Codex of which P.Oxy. 1353 is a leaf?" In *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon*, edited by C. A. Evans and H. D. Zacharias, 192-202. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2009.

- . “The Dating of New Testament Papyri.” *New Testament Studies* 57 (2011): 571-82.
- Barrett, C. K. *The Gospel according to John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. 2nd ed. London: SPCK, 1978.
- Bauer, Walter. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. revised. Translated and edited by William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- . *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Edited by R. A. Kraft and G. Kroedel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- Beasley-Murray, George R. *John*. Word Biblical Commentary 36. Waco, Texas: Word, 1987.
- Birdsall, J. Neville. “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*, edited by J. K. Elliott, 39-51. *Novum Testamentum, Supplements* 44. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- . *The Bodmer Papyrus of the Gospel of John*. London: The Tyndale Press, 1960.
- Blass, Friedrich, and Albert Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated and edited by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Brown, Raymond E. *An Introduction to the Gospel of John*. Edited by Francis J. Moloney, S.D.B. The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 2003.
- . *The Gospel according to John*. 2 vols. Anchor Bible 29–29A. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1966–1970.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Translated by George R. Beasley-Murray. Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.
- Caragounis, Chrys C. *The Development of Greek and the NT: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission*. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 167. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Cavallo, G. *Il Calamo e il Papiro*. Florence: Edizioni Gonnelli, 2005.
- Chapa, Juan, ed. “Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 4803.” In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part LXXI*. *Graeco-Roman Memoirs* 91, 1-6. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2007.
- , ed. “Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 4805.” In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part LXXI*. *Graeco-Roman Memoirs*, 91, 1-14. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2007.
- . “The Early Text of John.” In *The Early Text of the New Testament*, edited by Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger, 140-156. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- . “The Fortunes and Misfortunes of the Gospel of John in Egypt,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 64 (2010): 327–52.
- Charlesworth, Scott D. “Indicators of ‘Catholicity in Early Gospel Manuscripts.’” In *The Early Text of the New Testament*, edited by Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger, 37-48. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- . “Public and Private: Second- and Third-Century Gospel Manuscripts.” In *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon*, edited by C. A. Evans and H. D. Zacharias, 148-175. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2009.

- Clark, Kenneth W. "The Theological Relevance of Textual Variation in Current Criticism of the Greek New Testament." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 85 (1966): 1-16.
- Cockle, W. E. H., ed. "Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 4445." In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part LXV*, 11-14. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1998.
- , ed. "Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 4446." In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part LXV*, 14-16. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1998.
- , ed. "Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 4447." In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part LXV*, 16-18. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1998.
- , ed. "Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 4448." In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part LXV*, 19-20. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1998.
- Colwell, Ernest C. "Hort Redivivus: A Plea and a Program." In *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, 148-171. New Testament Tools and Studies 9. Leiden: Brill, 1969.
- . "Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A Study of the Text of P45, P66, P75." In *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, 106-124. New Testament Tools and Studies 9. Leiden: Brill, 1969.
- Colwell, Ernest C., and Ernest W. Tune. "Method in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings." In *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, 96-105. New Testament Tools and Studies 9. Leiden: Brill, 1969.
- Comfort, Philip W. *Encountering the Manuscripts: An Introduction to New Testament Paleography and Textual Criticism*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2005.
- . *New Testament Text and Translation Commentary: Commentary on the Variant Readings of the Ancient New Testament Manuscripts and How They Relate to the Major English Translations*. Carol Stream, Illinois: Tyndale House, 2008.
- Comfort, Philip W., and David P. Barrett, eds. *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts*. Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House, 2001.
- Croy, N. Clayton. "The Messianic Whippersnapper: Did Jesus Use a Whip on People in The Temple (John 2:15)?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 128.3 (2009): 553-66.
- Cullmann, Oscar. *Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr: A Historical and Theological Study*. 2nd ed. Translated by F. V. Filson. London: SCM, 1962.
- Delobel, J. "The Bodmer Papyri of John." In *L'Évangile de Jean: Sources, rédaction, théologie*, edited by M. de Jonge, 317-23. *Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium* 44. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1977.
- Ehrman, Bart D. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. 2nd edition updated and with a new afterword. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- . "The Text of the Gospels at the End of the Second Century." In *Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunell Colloquium, June 1994*, edited by D.C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux, 95-122. New Testament Tools and Studies 22. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Elliott, J. Keith. "Codex Bezae and the Earliest Greek Papyri." In *Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunell Colloquium, June 1994*, edited by D.C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux, 161-182. New Testament Tools and Studies 22. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- . "Five New Papyri of the New Testament." *Novum Testamentum* 41, issue 3 (1999): 209-213.

- . “Four New Papyri Containing the Fourth Gospel and their Relevance for the Apparatus Criticus.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 59 (2008): 674-8.
- . “Singular Readings in the Gospel Text of P45.” 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, 122-31. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series* 258. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- . “The Biblical Manuscripts of the John Ryland’s University Library of Manchester.” *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 81, no. 2 (Summer 1999): 3-50.
- . “Thoroughgoing Eclecticism in New Testament Textual Criticism.” In *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, 2nd ed., edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 745-770. *New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents* 42. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Elliott, W. J., and D. C. Parker, eds. *The New Testament in Greek IV: The Gospel according to St. John, Volume One: The Papyri*. *New Testament Tools and Studies* 20. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Epp, Eldon J. “A Continuing Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism?” *Harvard Theological Review* 73 (1980): 131-51.
- . “Are Early New Testament Manuscripts Truly Abundant?” In *Israel’s God and Rebecca’s Children: Christology and Community in Early Judaism and Christianity*, edited by David B. Capes et al., 77-117. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- . “Decision Points in Past, Present, and Future New Testament Textual Criticism.” In *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays, 1962-2004*, 227-284. *Novum Testamentum, Supplements* 116. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- . “New Testament Papyrus Manuscripts and Letter Carrying in Greco-Roman Times.” In *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*, edited by Birger A. Pearson, 35-56. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- . “Textual Clusters: Their Past and Future in New Testament Textual Criticism.” In *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. 2nd ed., edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 519-577. *New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents* 42. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- . “The Multivalence of the Term ‘Original Text’ in New Testament Textual Criticism.” *Harvard Theological Review* 92 (1999): 245-81.
- . “The New Testament Papyrus Manuscripts in Historical Perspective.” In *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.*, edited by Maurya P. Horgan and Paul J. Kobelski, 261-288. New York: Crossroads, 1989.
- . “The Papyrus Manuscripts of the New Testament.” In *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. 2nd ed., edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 1-39. *New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents* 42. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- . “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 *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*, edited by William L. Petersen, 71-103.

- Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 3. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- . “The Twentieth Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93 (1974): 386-414.
- . “Traditional ‘Canons’ of New Testament Textual Criticism: Their Value, Validity, and Viability.” In *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views in Contemporary Research*, edited by Klaus Wachtel and Michael W. Holmes, 79-127. Society of Biblical Literature: Text-Critical Studies 8. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- Fee, Gordon D. “Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John. A Contribution to Methodology in Establishing Textual Relationships.” *New Testament Studies* 15 (1968-69): 23-44.
- . “On the Types, Classification, and Presentation of Textual Variation.” In *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*, edited by Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee, 62-79. Studies and Documents 45. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- . “P75, P66 and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria.” In *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, edited by R. N. Longenecker and M. C. Tenney, 19-45. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974.
- . *Papyrus Bodmer II (P66): its Textual Relationship and Scribal Characteristics*. Studies and Documents 34. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968.
- . “Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism – Which?” In *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*, edited by Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee, 124-40. Studies and Documents 45. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- . “The Corrections of Papyrus Bodmer II and Early Textual Transmission.” *Novum Testamentum* 7 (1965): 247-57.
- . “The Use of the Definite Article with Personal Names in the Gospel of John.” *New Testament Studies* 17 (1970-1971): 168-183.
- Foster, Paul. “Bold Claims, Wishful Thinking, and Lessons about Dating Manuscripts from Papyrus Egerton 2.” In *The World of Jesus and the Early Church: Identity and Interpretation in Early Communities of Faith*, edited by Craig A. Evans, 193-212. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2011.
- Gignac, Francis Thomas. *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*. Vol. 1: *Phonology*. Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino-La Goliardica, 1975-1981.
- Grenfell, Bernard P., and Arthur S. Hunt, eds. “Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 208.” In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part II*, 1-8. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1899.
- , eds. “Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 847.” In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part VI*. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1908.
- , eds. “Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1228.” In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part X*, 14-16. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1914.
- , eds. “Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1596.” In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XIII*, 8-10. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1919.
- , eds. “Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1780.” In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XV*, 7-8. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1922.
- , eds. “Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1781.” In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XV*, 8-12. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1922.
- Gronewald, Michael. “Johannes-evangelium, Kap. 19, 8-11. 13-15. 18-20. 23-24, Kölner Papyri 5.” *Papyrologica coloniensi* 7 (1985): 73-76, 296-298.

- . “Unbekanntes Evangelium oder Evangelienharmonie (Fragment aus dem ‘Evangelium Egerton’).” In *Kölner Papyri (P. Köln)*, Vol. VI, edited by Michael Gronewald et al., 136-145. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1987.
- Haelst, Joseph van. *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens*. Série papyrologie 1. Paris: Sorbonne, 1976.
- Haines-Eitzen, Kim. *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmission of Early Christian Literature*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Handschriftenliste by the Institute for Text-Critical Research, University of Münster: <http://intf.uni-muenster.de/vmr/NTVMR/ListeHandschriften.php>
- Head, Peter M. “Scribal Behaviour and Theological Tendencies in Singular Readings in P. Bodmer II (P66).” In *Textual Variation: Theological and Social Tendencies?*, edited by H. A. G. Houghton and D. C. Parker, 55-74. Texts and Studies Third Series 6. New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2008.
- . “Some Recently Published New Testament Papyri from Oxyrhynchus: An Overview and Preliminary Assessment.” *Tyndale Bulletin* 51 (2000): 1-16.
- . “The Habits of New Testament Copyists: Singular Readings in the Early Fragmentary Papyri of John.” *Biblica* 85, no 3 (2004): 399-408.
- Hill, Charles E., and Michael J. Kruger, eds., *The Early Text of the New Testament*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- . “In Search of the Earliest Text of the New Testament.” In *The Early Text of the New Testament*, edited by Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger, 1-19. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Hill, Charles E. “A Notice of Corrections in Standard Editions of Two Johannine Manuscripts.” *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 3, 7 (2002).
- . “Did the Scribe of P52 Use the *Nomina Sacra*? Another Look.” *New Testament Studies* 48 (2002): 587-592.
- . *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Holmes, Michael W. “Codex Bezae as a Recension of the Gospels.” In *Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunell Colloquium, June 1994*, edited by D.C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux, 123-160. New Testament Tools and Studies 22. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- . “From ‘Original Text’ to ‘Initial Text’: The Traditional Goal of New Testament Textual Criticism in Contemporary Discussion.” In *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, 2nd ed., edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 637-688. New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents 42. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- . “Text and Transmission in the Second Century.” In *The Reliability of the New Testament: Bart Ehrman and Daniel Wallace in Dialogue*, edited by Robert B. Stewart, 61-80. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2011.
- . “Women and the ‘Western’ Text of Acts.” In *The Book of Acts as Church History. Apostelgeschichte als Kirchengeschichte*, edited by T. Nicklas and M. Tilly, 183-203. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 120. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003.
- Hurtado, Larry W. “P52 (P.Rylands Gk. 457) and the *Nomina Sacra*: Method and Probability.” *Tyndale Bulletin* 54 (2003): 1-14.
- . *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- . “The New Testament in the Second Century: Texts, Collections and Canon.” In *Transmission and Reception: New Testament Text-Critical and*

- Exegetical Studies*, edited by J. W. Childers and D. C. Parker, 3-27. Texts and Studies Third Series 4. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2006.
- International Greek New Testament Project, The Gospel according to John, IGNTP transcripts: <http://www.iohannes.com/XML/start.xml>
- Jongkind, Dirk. *Scribal Habits in Codex Sinaiticus*. Texts and Studies Third Series 5. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2007.
- . “Singular Readings in Sinaiticus: The Possible, The Impossible, and the Nature of Copying.” In *Textual Variation: Theological and Social Tendencies*, edited by H. A. G. Houghton and D. C. Parker, 35-54. Texts and Studies Third Series 6. New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2008.
- Josephus, Flavius. *Jewish Antiquities*. Edited by B. Niese, *Flavii Iosephi opera*, 4 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1877-82; repr. 1955.
- Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. 2 vols. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2003.
- Kenyon, Frederic G., ed. *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. 2: The Gospels and Acts, Text*. London: Emery Walker, 1933.
- , ed. *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. 2: The Gospels and Acts, Plates*. London: Emery Walker, 1934.
- Kilpatrick, George D. “Atticism and the Text of the Greek NT.” In *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze: Festschrift für Prof. Josef Schmid zum 70. Geburtstag*, edited by J. Blinzler, O. Kuss, and F. Mussner, 125-37. Regensburg: Pustet, 1963.
- . “Literary Fashions and the Transmission of Texts in the Graeco-Roman World.” In *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays of G. D. Kilpatrick*, edited by J. K. Elliott, 63-72. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 96. Louvain: Louvain University Press and Peeters, 1990.
- Klijn, A. F. J. “Papyrus Bodmer II (John I – XIV) and the Text of Egypt.” *New Testament Studies* 3 (1956-1957): 327-334.
- Koester, Helmut. “The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century.” In *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*, edited by William L. Petersen, 19-37. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 3. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- Kraus, Thomas J. “Ad Fontes: Gewinn durch die Konsultation von Originalhandschriften am Beispiel von P. Vindob. G 31974.” *Biblica* 82 (2001): 1-16 and one plate.
- Lagrange, M.-J. “Les Papyrus Chester Beatty pour les Évangiles.” *Revue biblique* 43 (1934): 4-41.
- Lenaerts, J. “Un papyrus de l'évangile de Jean PL II/31.” *Chronique d'Égypte* LX (1985): 117-20.
- Leuven Database of Ancient Books (LDAB): <http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/>.
- Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed., revised by Henry Stuart Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. *A Supplement*. Edited by E. A. Barber. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Llewelyn, Stephen R., ed. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* 3, 242-8. Ancient History Documentary Centre, Macquarie University, 1994.
- Luijendijk, AnneMarie. “Sacred Scriptures as Trash: Biblical Papyri from Oxyrhynchus.” *Vigiliae christianae* 64 (2010): 247.
- Martin, Victor, and John W. B. Barns, eds. *Papyrus Bodmer II, Supplément, Nouvelle édition augmentée et corrigée*. Cologny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1962.

- Martin, Victor, ed. *Papyrus Bodmer II*. Cologny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1956.
- , ed. *Papyrus Bodmer II, Supplément*. Cologny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1958.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. London and New York: United Bible Societies, 1994.
- Metzger, Bruce M., and Bart D. Ehrman. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 4th ed. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Milne, H. J. M. and T. C. Skeat, including contributions by Douglas Cockerell. *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus*. London: British Museum, 1938.
- Min, Kyoung Shik. *Die früheste Überlieferung des Matthäusevangeliums (bis zum 3./4. Jh.): Edition und Untersuchung*. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung 34. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2005.
- Morris, Leon. *The Gospel according to John: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. rev. ed. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Moulton, James Hope. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol. 1: *Prolegomena*. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1908.
- Moulton, James Hope, and Wilbert Francis Howard. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol. 2: *Accidence and Word-Formation*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1929.
- Nicklas, Tobias. “Reconstructing Fragmentary Manuscripts – Chances and Limitations.” In *Early Christian Manuscripts: Examples of Applied Method and Approach*, edited by Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas, 1-38. Texts and Editions for New Testament Study 5. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Nongbri, Brent. “The Use and Abuse of P52: Papyrological Pitfalls in the Dating of the Fourth Gospel.” *Harvard Theological Review* 98.1 (2005): 23-48.
- Orsini, Pasquale, and Willy Clarysse. “Early New Testament Manuscripts and Their Dates: A Critique of Theological Palaeography.” *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 88, no. 4 (2012): 443-74.
- Parker, David C. *Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and Its Text*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- . *The Living Text of the Gospels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- . “The Majuscule Manuscripts of the New Testament,” In *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. 2nd ed., edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 41-68. New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents 42. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Parsons, Mikeal C. “A Christological Tendency in P75.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105 (1986): 463-79.
- Petersen, William L. “Textual Traditions Examined: What the Text of the Apostolic Fathers tells us about the Text of the New Testament in the Second Century.” In *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, edited by Andrew Gregory and Christopher Tuckett, 29-46. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- . “The Genesis of the Gospels.” In *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis. Festschrift J. Delobel*, edited by A. Denaux, 33-65. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 161. Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2002.

- . “What Text Can New Testament Textual Criticism Ultimately Reach?” In *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Early Church History*, edited by Barbara Aland and Joël Delobel, 136-52. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 7. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994.
- Pickering, S. R. “The Egerton Gospel and New Testament Textual Transmission.” In *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity / Le texte du Nouveau Testament au début du christianisme: Proceedings of the Lille Colloquium, July 2000*, edited by Christian-B. Amphoux and J. Keith Elliott, 215-233. Histoire du texte biblique 6. Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2003.
- . *Recently Published New Testament Papyri: P89-P95*. Papyrology and Historical Perspectives 2. Sydney: Ancient History Documentary Research Center, Macquarie University, 1991.
- Porter, Calvin L. “A Textual Analysis of the Earliest Manuscripts of the Gospel of John.” Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1961.
- Poythress, Vern S. “The Use of the Intersentence Conjunctions *de*, *oun*, *kai* and *asyndeton* in the Gospel of John.” *Novum Testamentum* 26 (1984), 312-40.
- Quek, Tze-Ming. “A Text-Critical Study of John 1.34.” *New Testament Studies* 55 (2009): 22-34.
- Rhodes, Erroll F. “The Corrections of Papyrus Bodmer II.” *New Testament Studies* 14 (1967-8): 271-81.
- Roberts, C. H. *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library*. Manchester: MUP, 1935.
- . “An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library.” *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 20 (1936): 45-55.
- . *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*. Schweich Lectures 1977. London: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1979.
- . “457. St. John’s Gospel, xviii,” in *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library III*. Manchester: MUP, 1938.
- Robinson, Maurice A. “Review of P.W. Comfort and D.P. Barrett, eds. *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts*.” *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 6 (2001): 39-50: <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/vol07/vol07-toc.html>.
- Rodgers, Peter R. “The Text of the New Testament and Its Witnesses before 200 A.D.: Observations on P90 (P. Oxy. 3523).” In *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity / Le texte du Nouveau Testament au début du christianisme: Proceedings of the Lille Colloquium, July 2000*, edited by Christian-B. Amphoux and J. Keith Elliott, 83-91. Histoire du texte biblique 6. Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2003.
- Royse, James R. *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*. New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents 36. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . “Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri.” Th.D. Dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, California, 1981.
- . “The Corrections in the Freer Gospels Codex.” In *The Freer Biblical Manuscripts: Fresh Studies of an American Treasure Trove*, edited by Larry W. Hurtado, 185-226. Society of Biblical Literature: Text-Critical Studies 6. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Ruckstuhl, Eugen and Peter Dschulnigg. *Stilkritik und Verfasserfrage im Johannesevangelium: Die johanneischen Sprachmerkmale auf dem Hintergrund des NT und des zeitgenössischen hellenistischen Schrifttums*. Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 17. Freiburg [Switz]: Paulus; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.

- Schmid, U. B with W. J. Elliott and D. C. Parker, eds. *The New Testament in Greek IV: The Gospel according to St. John, Volume Two: The Majuscules*. New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents 37. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Schmid, Ulrich. "Scribes and Variants—Sociology and Typology." In *Textual Variation: Theological and Social Tendencies?*, edited by D. C. Parker and H. A. G. Houghton, 1-23. Texts and Studies Third Series 5. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2008.
- Schmidt, Andreas. "Zwei Anmerkungen zu P. Ryl. III 457." *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 35 (1989): 11-12.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel according to St. John*. 3 vols. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- Schofield, Ellwood M. "The Papyrus Fragments of the Greek New Testament." Ph.D. Dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 1936.
- Silva, Moisés. "Internal Evidence in the Text-Critical Use of the LXX." In *La Septuaginta en la investigacion contemporanea: V Congreso de la IOSCS*, edited by N. Fernández Marcos, 151-167. Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 34. Madrid: C.S.I.C. Press, 1985.
- Skeat, T. C. "A Codicological Analysis of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Gospels and Acts (P45)." *Hermathena* 155 (1993): 27-43.
- , ed. "Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 3523." In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part L*, 3-8. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1983.
- Swanson, Reuben J., ed. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus: John*. Sheffield, England and Pasadena, California: Sheffield Academic Press and William Carey International University Press, 1995-1998.
- Tarelli, C. C. "Omissions, Additions, and Conflations in the Chester Beatty Papyrus." *Journal of Theological Studies* 40 (1939): 382-387.
- . "Some Linguistic Aspects of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Gospels." *Journal of Theological Studies* 39 (1938): 254-259.
- Tasker, R. V. G. "The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Caesarean Text of John." *Harvard Theological Review* 30 (1967): 157-64.
- Tischendorf, Constantin von, ed. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 8th ed. 2 vols. Leipzig: Giesecke and Devrient, 1869-1872.
- Tov, Emanuel. "The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 31 (1985): 3-29.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. "P<sup>52</sup> and *Nomina Sacra*." *New Testament Studies* 47 (2001): 544-48.
- Turner, Eric G. *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*. Edited by P. J Parsons. 2nd rev. ed. London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1987.
- . *The Typology of the Early Codex*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 1977.
- Turner, Nigel. [James Hope Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*,] Vol. 3: *Syntax*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1963.
- . [James Hope Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*.] Vol. 4: *Style*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1975.
- 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 und Ruprecht, 1913.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1996.

- Wasserman, Tommy. "Criteria for Evaluating Readings in New Testament Textual Criticism." In *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 579-612. New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents 42. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- . "The Early Text of Matthew." In *The Early Text of the New Testament*, edited by Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger, 83-107. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- . "The Implications of Textual Criticism for Understanding the 'Original Text'." In *Mark and Matthew I: Comparative Readings: Understanding the Earliest Gospels in their First-Century Settings*, edited by Eve-Marie Becker and Anders Runesson, 77-96. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 271. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Westcott, Brooke F. *The Gospel according to St. John: the Greek text with introduction and notes*. London: J. Murray, 1908.
- Westcott, B. F., and F. J. A. Hort. *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction, Appendix*. Cambridge: Macmillan, 1881-1882.
- Wisse, Frederik. "The Nature and Purpose of Redactional Changes in Early Christian Texts: The Canonical Gospels." In *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*, edited by William L. Petersen, 39-53. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 3. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- Zuntz, Günther. "Reconstruction of one leaf of the Chester Beatty Papyri of the Gospels and Acts." *Chronique d'Égypte* 26 (1951): 191-211.