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Abstract: In a 1997 article T. C. Skeat suggested that \(\Psi^4 \) comes from the same four-gospel codex as \(\Psi^{64+67} \). Subsequently, Peter Head and Scott Charlesworth have argued against this identification, mainly on the basis of codicological data. However, it is still possible that the same scribe copied them yet no one has made a comparative textual analysis of these papyri. In his original publication, Skeat included a brief analysis of the text of \(\Psi^4 \), providing “some basic facts.” Unfortunately his analysis is unsatisfactory in two ways: it concerns only \(\Psi^4 \) and it is based only on deviations from the Textus Receptus. This article presents a new textual analysis of \(\Psi^4 \) and \(\Psi^{64+67} \) using a method devised by Kurt and Barbara Aland and subsequently developed by Kyoung Shik Min, in order to examine the textual quality, transmission character, and the nature of the readings in these papyri. The result shows that both \(\Psi^4 \) and \(\Psi^{64+67} \) have a “strict” textual quality and a “strict” transmission character. The concern for careful copying reflected by the textual quality and transmission character of \(\Psi^4 \) and \(\Psi^{64+67} \) correlates with their external features, which Roberts regarded as indicative of a “thoroughgoing literary production.”

Introduction

In 1966, Kurt Aland reported and discussed an observation made by Peter Weigandt, an associate of the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung, that \(\Psi^4 \) might come from the same four-gospel codex as \(\Psi^{64+67} \). About a decade later, Joseph van Haelst reiterated the suspicion, whereas C. H. Roberts had no doubt about the common identification. However, the MSS had not yet been subject to any detailed codicological and palaeographic analysis.

In 1997 T. C. Skeat published an extensive analysis arguing that the papyri indeed came from what could be the oldest known MS of the four gospels, rivaled only by one other candidate, \(\Psi^{75} \). Subsequently, Peter Head and Scott Charlesworth have argued against this identification, mainly on the basis of codicological data. However, they still seem to accept the result

---


of Skeat’s palaeographic assessment, that the same scribe copied the fragments. The similarity of the hands of \(\Psi^4\) and \(\Psi^{64+67}\) is striking, but there are other differences like, for example, the amount of projection into the left margin of the ekthesis.

Unlike these earlier studies, this article will focus on a textual analysis of the MSS, and I should emphasize at the outset that a difference in textual character between the two papyri does not exclude the possibility that they come from the same codex, nor that the same scribe copied them. However, one would not expect their texts to be too different, especially not in terms of transmission character as reflected, for example, in the number of singular readings and errors.

**Earlier research on the text of \(\Psi^4\) and \(\Psi^{64+67}\)**

To my knowledge, Hermann von Soden, who had access only to the first fragments of \(\Psi^4\) published by Scheil, was the first to characterize its text, and he labeled it as “guter H-text” (H = Hesychian), i.e., basically a good representative of the traditional Neutral or Alexandrian text. Several other scholars confirmed this judgment in the decades to follow. For example, Marie-Joseph Lagrange drew attention to the textual similarity of \(\Psi^4\) and Codex Vaticanus. Similarly, Schofield stated that the papyrus “has a very good Alexandrian text, following B quite closely, often in opposition to Aleph, which frequently joins with D.” Sanders, who examined \(\Psi^4\) in sixty textual variants which he had previously assigned to four different text types, agreed that the papyrus was mainly Alexandrian but he also identified a strong admixture of Western and Caesarean readings and a slight admixture of Antiochian (Byzantine) readings.

---

4 Peter Head, “Is \(\Psi^4\), \(\Psi^{64}\) and \(\Psi^{67}\) the Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels? A Response to T. C. Skeat,” *NTS* 51 (2005), 451, states, “Skeat made a strong case for the identity of the script of \(\Psi^{64}\) and \(\Psi^{67}\) with that of \(\Psi^4\): in letter formation and in text layout they are virtually indistinguishable. The case can never be completely conclusive, since however close the scripts, the possibility remains that the same scribe could have written two (separate) manuscripts;” Scott Charlesworth, “T. C. Skeat, \(\Psi^{64+67}\) and \(\Psi^4\), and the Problem of Fibre Orientation in Codicological Reconstruction,” *NTS* 53 (2007): 584-85, says, “According to Skeat, the script of \(\Psi^{64+67}\) is identical to that of \(\Psi^4\), and this assessment is almost certainly correct. It is by no means unusual for two or more papyri to be traced back to a single scribe.”

5 I restrict myself to a brief comment on one small detail which has surfaced in this discussion: One of the common features of the different parts which Charlesworth appeals to is that “[f]inal ν is written as a supralinear stroke” (“Fibre Orientation,” 585). However, this feature, also listed in Aland, *Repertorium*, 293, and included in transcriptions by Skeat, “Four Gospels,” 12-13 and P. W. Comfort and D. P. Barrett, *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts* (Wheaton: Tyndale House Publishers, 2001), 67-71, does not occur in the extant part of \(\Psi^{64+67}\), but seems to be based on reconstruction. On the contrary, I have found three cases where an extant line ends with a ν, but it is never written as a supralinear stroke. At the same time, the habit of writing final ν as a supralinear stroke in \(\Psi^4\) is irregular, and the scribe of \(\Psi^4\) and \(\Psi^{64+67}\) has not attempted to justify the lines, so this piece of evidence weighs little against the common identification.


9 Henry A. Sanders, “The Egyptian Text of the Four Gospels and Acts,” *HTR* 26 (1933): 88. Sanders examined \(\Psi^4\) in 60 textual variants of which he assigned 23 to the Alexandrian text, 18 to the West-
Jean Merell, who published further fragments of $\text{𝔓}^4$ in 1938, did not attempt to classify the text but confirmed Lagrange’s observation of the proximity of $\text{𝔓}^4$ and Codex Vaticanus; however, at the same time he noted some sixteen divergent readings apart from orthographic differences.\(^{10}\)

The *editiones principes* of $\text{𝔓}^{64}$ and $\text{𝔓}^{67}$ were published in 1953 and 1962, respectively. These are considerably smaller fragments than $\text{𝔓}^4$. As for textual affiliation, C. H. Roberts, who edited $\text{𝔓}^{64}$, simply noted that the papyrus showed divergence from the two other Matthean papyri, $\text{𝔓}^{37}$ and $\text{𝔓}^{65}$.\(^{11}\) R. Roca-Puig, who edited $\text{𝔓}^{67}$, noted that it exhibits close affiliation to Codex Sinaiticus.\(^{12}\)

As we have noted, Kurt Aland discussed the possibility that $\text{𝔓}^4$ belonged to the same codex as $\text{𝔓}^{64+67}$ as observed by one of his colleagues in Münster in the 1960s. However, he was not entirely convinced that this was the case, and held on to diverging dates (3d cent. and ca. 200, respectively).\(^{13}\) When Kurt and Barbara Aland later listed the papyri in their handbook, they retained the distinct dating and characterized $\text{𝔓}^4$ as a “normal text,” whereas $\text{𝔓}^{64+67}$ appeared as a “strict text.”\(^{14}\)

In Skeat’s subsequent study he included a brief analysis of the text of $\text{𝔓}^4$, providing “some basic facts,” whereas $\text{𝔓}^{64+67}$ were too small to analyze. Unfortunately his analysis of $\text{𝔓}^4$ is unsatisfactory, since it is based only on deviations from the *Textus Receptus*. Skeat found that $\text{𝔓}^4$ differed from the TR in 107 places. He then compared $\text{𝔓}^4$ with other MSS in these 107 places. Table 1 shows the agreements and disagreements relative to other MSS.

### Table 1 Textual comparison in 107 deviations from the TR (Skeat)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreements of $\text{𝔓}^4$</th>
<th>Disagreements of $\text{𝔓}^4$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With $\text{ℵ}^67$</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With B</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With A</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With D</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With L</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With $\text{W}^62$</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With $\text{Θ}^{22}$</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Skeat also found considerable agreement with $\text{𝔓}^{75}$, which, however, was defective in most of the places. In sum, Skeat concluded:

---


Now that the whole theory of localised text-forms has been virtually abandoned, the most that can be said, if any label is to be attached, is to describe the text [of \(P^4\)] as ‘Alexandrian’ in inverted commas.\(^{15}\)

At the 1998 SBL Annual Meeting, William Warren presented a quantitative analysis, in which he compared the text of \(P^4\) to a number of control witnesses representing a spectrum of different texts in 120 genealogically significant variation-units.\(^{16}\) He calculated the following quantitative relationships of \(P^4\), presented in Table 2 in descending order:

Table 2 Quantitative analysis of \(P^4\) (Warren)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Agreements %</th>
<th>Agreements/total #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>112/120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P^{75})</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>26/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>94/120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Xi)</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>86/120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>77/118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>70/120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>59/120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>58/120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>53/120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>47/119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>47/120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Theta)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>42/120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Psi)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39/120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39/120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35/120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Omega)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34/120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32/120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31/120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidently, some of the control witnesses were not extant in all of the variation-units. Nevertheless, Warren was able to show that \(P^4\) was affiliated to witnesses traditionally assigned to the Alexandrian text-type, in particular Codex Vaticanus and \(P^{75}\).

More recently, Kyoung Shik Min has analyzed \(P^{64\text{+}67}\) and other early Matthean papyri applying a different method, which was first devised by Kurt Aland and subsequently developed by Min’s doctoral supervisor in Münster, Barbara Aland, and Min himself.\(^{17}\) According to the

---
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In the following I will apply this method to $\Psi^4$ and $\Psi^{64+67}$, respectively, in order to see whether the results and classifications of the Alands and Min are reproducible and valid according to its own standards. The method admittedly involves an element of subjectivity, since the judgments are based on a comparison with the hypothetically reconstructed initial text in NA$^{27}$, which in turn is close to the text of the fourth-century codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus.$^{22}$ Further, the distinction between textual quality and transmission character should be made with caution, especially in regard to small fragments, in this case particularly $\Psi^{64+67}$.

Numbers and percentages are more important than the corresponding labels like “free,” “normal,” and “strict,” but the validity of the results ultimately depends on the size of the sample and the specific nature and pattern of textual variation—variants should be weighed as well as counted.

Obvious errors, singular readings and orthographic variants can more confidently be attributed to the scribe, especially if there is a discernible pattern. Such variation should primarily affect the evaluation of transmission character—not the textual quality, which mainly refers to the underlying exemplar. On the other hand, non-singular readings may also be creations of the scribe, and agreement with other witnesses coincidental. In cases where there is a closer genealogical connection between witnesses, their shared readings are more likely to have been present in the exemplars.

Finally, it should be noted that this method of evaluation is based on variation-units included in the NA$^{27}$ apparatus, supplemented with variation-units where each MS differs from $\Psi^4$ weist auf mittlere Fehleranfälligkeit (38 Abweichungen). Da der Textbereich von $\Psi^4$ nicht gering ist ... ist die Fehlerzahl auch nicht als allzu hoch einzuschätzen. Wir können $\Psi^4$ also der ‘normalen’ Überlieferungsweise zuschreiben.”

the printed text. If one were to include all known textual variation in the comparison, the MSS under consideration would appear closer to the initial text.

Table 3 gives an overview of the MSS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gr.-Al. Location, shelfmark, and editio princeps</th>
<th>Date33 Provenance Reconstructed size (W x H)</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Textual quality</th>
<th>Transmission character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In the following I will examine each witness and offer notes on the respective texts and transcriptions. My transcription is in accordance with the relevant editio princeps, unless otherwise noted.27 After this follows a textual apparatus in which I indicate the variation-units of the respective MSS. In a final section I analyze this data and conclude with a classification of the textual quality and transmission character of each MS.

**Greg.-Aland Ψ4 (Paris Suppl. Gr. 1120)**

**Corrections to transcription in editio princeps (Merell)**

Fr. A, recto, col. 1
ll. 29-30 (1:64): Read η[νεωχθη] on l. 29-30 for [ανεωχθη] on l. 31.28

---


25 Ψ64 was purchased in Luxor, Egypt.


27 I will offer corrections to the transcriptions mainly as they affect the variation-units or the assessment of scribal habits.

28 Merell has calculated the lines differently at an earlier point, where he has not reconstructed the
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Fr. B, recto, col. 1
l. 13 (3:11): Read Β for δύναθο. 29

Fr. B, recto, col. 2
l. 23 (3:17): There is most likely a colon after ασβεστω marking the end of a section.
l. 26 (3:18): Read a colon after λαον, marking the end of a section.

Fr. B, verso, col. 1
ll. 1-2 (3:20-21): Read a colon after φυλακη, followed by ekthesis where το is projected into the left margin of l. 2 and surmounted by a paragraphos.
l. 2 (3:21): Read βαπτισθη for βαπτισθ.
l. 14 (3:22): Read a colon, marking the end of a section, after ευδοκησα (not a stop).
l. 16 (3:23): Read Λ· for Λ. 30
l. 33 (3:29): Read [ιυτου ιησου του · for ιησου του. 31

Fr. B, verso, col. 2
ll. 2-3 (3:30): Read ελιακε[μ] for ελια[κεμ]·. 32
ll. 4-5 (3:31): Read [ματ]τα[μι· τον ναθαν· for [μετ]τα· τον ναθαν·.
l. 7 (3:32): The papyrus seems to read του βα[...] , not του β[οου], but the reading is uncertain.
l. 9 (3:33): Read του [αδ] Aynı· του· for του αμ[ιαδαμ· του].
l. 16 (3:35): Read σερου[χ· του ραγαυ·] for σερου[χ· του ραγαυ·].
l. 18 (3:36): Read και [ναμ·] for και [ναμ·].
ll. 26-27 (3:38-4:1): Line 27 begins with paragraphos and ekthesis marking a new section from 4:1. (Thus, there must also have been a colon on l. 26 after θεου.)

Fr. C, recto, col. 1

Fr. C, verso, col. 2
ll. 3-4 (5:3): Read γειν ο[λιγον δε καθι·σα] for γειν ο[λιγον δε καθι·σα]. 33

---

missing text, but rather indicated three lost lines (ll. 10-12).

29 The scribe consistently writes numbers as numerals preceded and followed by a space with a dot. The spaces and one dot are still visible here; Comfort and Barrett, The Text, 58, transcribe the numeral but without the dots.

30 The scribe consistently uses two points in median position in abbreviated numerals. Cf. Skeat, “Four Gospels,” 6. (Skeat corrects Merell as to the position of the “stop,” but does not note in this context that two points in median position are used with the abbreviation.)

31 There are two visible traces of a correction suggesting that ησου was first written as a nomen sacrum. First, there is still a trace of the upsilon in the left vertical stroke of what is now an eta. Secondly, the omicron in ησου, which is very awkward and looks more like a rho, may possibly have been the upsilon in του, that was then corrected to a raised omicron—a letterform which this scribe does not normally use. Maybe there was a nomen sacrum in the exemplar which the scribe copied at first but then realized that Ἰησοῦς here in the genealogy refers to “Joshua” and therefore made a correction in scribendo.

32 Merell’s transcription is clearly erroneous, probably due to a confusion because some text from another sheet has left an impression at this point (in reverse script).

33 Skeat thinks the reading δε καθισας is very doubtful and says “[t]he papyrus is in very bad condition here” (“Four Gospels,” 23). However, the reading is perfectly clear in the high-resolution image I have accessed.
Fr. D, verso, col. 1

l. 12 (5:33): Read νηστευου for ληστευου.

l. 13 (5:33): Read σιν πυκνα και δεη for σιν πυκνα και δεη.

l. 27 (5:35): Read ο νυμφιος τοτε νη for ο νυμφιος τοτε νη.

ll. 33-34 (5:36): Read απο ιματιου for απο ιματιου.

Fr. D, verso, col. 2

ll. 17-18 (5:39-6:1): Read a colon, marking the end of a section after εστιν on l. 17. The next line begins with paragraphos and ekthesis marking a new section from 6:1 (εγενετο).

Fr. D, recto, col. 1


ll. 7-8 (6:5): Read ους και του σαββατου ους ανθρωπου for και του σαββατου ους.

Fr. D, recto, col. 2

ll. 12 (6:12): Read εις το for εις το.

ll. 24 (6:14): Read ον και ωνομασεν for ον και ωνομασεν.

Apparatus

The base text to the left in the apparatus is NA27 (= txt). All variation-units in NA27 are noted in the apparatus for the stretch of text (verses) covered by the respective papyri. Lacunae in these units are indicated thus: lac. Further variation-units, not recorded in the NA27 apparatus, are included when the papyrus deviates from the printed text; letter addresses for these units are in italics.

Some textually insignificant variation-units are noted under orthography (= O). Here, this category includes spelling, itacism, and confusion of the endings of the first and second aorist forms. Nu-movables are not noted. The orthographic variants are not included in the textual analysis, except in cases where they make up variation-units in NA27 (normally relating to the spelling of proper names).

Luke 1:59

a: lac

1:60

a: lac

34 The scribe corrected παλαιου to καινου.

35 Merell indicates a line break between και (l. 1) and εδωκεν (l. 2). However, a delta and part of an omega are visible at the beginning of l. 2. This means Ψ4 most likely supports the printed text of NA27 (no information is indicated for Ψ4 in this variation-unit in the apparatus).

36 Comfort and Barrett follow Merell, except that they omit a και in their reconstruction of l. 7. Skeat, “Four Gospels,” 24, however, points out that “the και is required by the demands of space,” and indicates και του σαββατου in his textual apparatus (against the text of B). Apparently, Merell (followed by Comfort and Barrett), could see του ανθρωπου rather clearly. I can see the words too, but on the previous line! Moreover, the omicron in υιος at the beginning of l. 7 is also rather clear. Thus, Skeat is correct about the presence of και, but, like Merell, he places it in the wrong (and rather unique) position, because it is apparent that Merell has confused the lines (this error is repeated by Comfort and Barrett). The IGNTP apparatus supports my transcription. Ψ4 follows other Alexandrian witnesses in harmonizing the text to Mark 2:28.
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1:61
a: lac

1:63
a: λέγων | om D pc e sy° bo
b: ὄνομα | to ὄνομα Ν A B* C D W Θ Ψ f\(^{1-13} \) 33 ™ // tnt \( \Psi^4 \) B* L Ε 565 579 700 / 2211 pc; Or
c (vss 63-64; cf. Mark 7:35): καὶ ἐθαύμασαν πάντες. ἀνεφθῇ δὲ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ παραχρῆμα καὶ
η γλῶσσα | // καὶ ἐθαύμασαν πάντες. ἀνεφθῇ δὲ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ παραχρῆμα καὶ ἐλύθη ὁ
dεσμὸς τῆς γλώσσης f° pc // καὶ παραχρῆμα ἐλύθη ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐθαύμασαν πάντες·
ἀνεφθῇ δὲ τὸ στόμα D a b vg° (sy°) // καὶ ἐθαύμασαν πάντες. ἀνεφθῇ παραχρῆμα τὸ
στόμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα \( \Psi^{4υδ} \) (ἡνεφθῇ) 213 472
O: πινακίδιον | πινακείδιον \( \Psi^4 \)

1:64
O: ἀνεφθῇ | ἦνεφθῇ \( \Psi^4 \) 205 983

1:65
a: φόβος | add τοὺς ἄκοιμοντας ταῦτα καὶ Θ arm
b: τῆς Ἰουδαίας | add καί Ν\* W 1675 b c e
c: διελαλεῖτο | ἐλαλεῖτο \( \Psi^4 \) 1675 b c e // διά Ν\*°
d: πάντα | om \( \Psi^* \) L 1241 1424 pc sy° bo°

1:66
a: αὐτῶν | ἑαυτῶν \( \Psi^4 \) B
b: γάρ | om A C* Θ 0130 f\(^{11-13} \) 33 ™ sy°h // tnt \( \Psi^4 \) B C* D L W Ψ 565 pc latt sy°hmg co
c: ἦν | om D it vg° sy°

1:67
a: ἐπροφήτευσεν λέγων | εἶπεν D

1:68
a: κύριος | om \( \Psi^4 \) W it vg° sy° sa°ms; Cyp

1:69
a: οἶκῳ | τῷ οἶκῳ A Θ Ψ 0130 ™ // tnt \( \Psi^4 \) B C D L W f\(^{1-13} \) 33 565 579 700 892 1241 / 844 / 2211 pc

1:70
a: τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ᾿ αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ | ἁγίων τῶν ἀπ᾿ αἰῶνος D it; Ir° //
tῶν ἁγίων ἀπ᾿ αἰῶνος αὐτοῦ προφητῶν \( \Psi^4 \) W; Eus // τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἀπ᾿ αἰῶνος προφητῶν
αὐτοῦ A C Θ Ψ f° ™ // tnt \( \Psi^4 \) B L Δ 0130 f\(^{13} \) 33 579 / 844 pc vg

1:74
a: lac

1:75
a: πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας | πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας Ν A C D Θ Ψ 0130 0177 f\(^{1-13} \) 33 ™; Ir° Or // tnt \( \Psi^{4υδ} \)
B L W 565 579 pc Or°
b: ἡμέρας | add τῆς ζωῆς Γ Θ f\(^{1-13} \) 1424 2542 / 844 / 2211 pm sy°; Or
1:76
a: ἐνώπιον | πρὸ προσώπου A C D L Θ Ψ 0130 f 133 33 Ἑ λ sy; Ir lat // txt Ψ⁴ Ν B W 0177 pc; Or b: κυρίου | τού κυρίου Ψ⁴

1:77
a: lac

1:78
a: lac

1:79
a: ἐπιφάναι | φῶς D // txt Ψ⁴vid rell

2:6
a: lac

2:7
a: τὸν πρωτότοκον | om W
b-c: lac

3:8
a-b: lac

3:9
a: καρπὸν καλὸν | καρπὸν Ψ⁴ lat; Or // καρποὺς καλοὺς D syac-p (cf. Matt 7:17-18)
O: ἀξίην | ἀξείη Ψ⁴ B D Θ

3:10
a: ποιήσωμεν | ποιήσωμεν ἵνα σωθῶμεν D sa²miss (cf. Acts 16:30) // ποιήσωμεν ἵνα ζῶμεν b q
vgmiss sa²miss

3:11
a: lac

3:12
a: βαπτισθῆναι | ὁμοίως βαπτισθῆναι D a
b: ποιήσωμεν | ποιήσωμεν ἵνα σωθῶμεν D
O: εἶπαν | εἶπον Ψ⁴ rell // txt C* D W Ψ

3:14
a: τι ποιήσωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς | καὶ ἡμεῖς τί ποιήσωμεν A C Θ Ψ 33 Ἑ a syb (pm ποιήσωμεν) // τί ποιήσωμεν ἵνα σωθῶμεν D // txt Ψ⁴ Ν B C* L W Ξ f¹¹ 33 579 892 1241 pc lat syac-p

38 Ψ⁴ is partly lacunose, αὐ[...] , but supports either αὐτῶν (txt) or, less likely, αὐτοῦ (W 0177 565 pc), but not ἡμῶν (A C Ψ f 579 / 844 al vgmiss).
39 NA27 indicates “Ψ⁴vid” in this unit, but the papyrus undoubtedly omits καλὸν.
40 Ψ⁴ is partly lacunose, (ἐξετι), but does not support λέγει (A C D Θ Ψ Ἑ). It probably reads ἔλεγεν (txt N B C* L N f¹¹ 33 579 700 892 1241 / 844 pc), since εἶπεν is a singular reading (W).
41 Ψ⁴ reads τι ποιήσωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς supporting txt, which is not indicated in NA27.
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b: \( \text{αὐτοῖς} \) | \( \text{πρὸς αὐτοὺς} \) A C W \( \Psi \) f13 \( \mathcal{M} \) syb // txt \( \Psi^4 \) B C* D L \( \Theta \) Ξ 1 33 700 892 2542 pc

c: \( \text{μηδὲ} \) | \( \text{μηδένα} \) \( \Psi^4 \) H (\( \text{f}^{1241} \)) 2542 pc syacp

3:15
a: \( \text{περὶ τοῦ Ἰωάννου} \) | om 131 syc
O: Ιωάννου | \( \Psi^4 \) B D

3:16
a: \( \text{ἀπεκρίνατο λέγων ἵνα} \) \( \text{πρὸς αὐτούς} \) \( \text{καὶ διακαθάραι} \) . . . \( \text{συναγαγεῖν} \) \( \text{καὶ διακαθάραν...} \) . . . \( \text{συνάξει} \) A C (D) L W \( \Theta \) Ξ 33 \( \mathcal{M} \) lat sy saams borp // txt \( \Psi^\text{4nd} \) \( \Psi^4 \) B pc (a) e saams borp; \( \text{I}_{\text{lat}} \) (\( \text{sed:} \) f συνάξει)

b: \( \text{τὸν σῖτον} \) | \( \text{τὸν μὲν σῖτον} \) D G \( \Theta \) f13 pc

c: \( \text{αὐτοῦ} \) | om \( \Psi^4 \) D pc e borp; \( \text{I}_{\text{lat}} \)

3:18
a: \( \text{παρακαλῶν} \)

3:19
a: \( \text{τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ} \) | Φιλίππου \( \text{τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ} \) A C K W 33 565 579 1424 2542 al syph saams bo

3:20
a: lac

3:22
a: \( \text{ὡς} \) | \( \text{ὡσεὶ} \) A \( \Theta \) \( \Psi \) f13 \( \mathcal{M} \) // txt \( \Psi^4 \) B D L W 070 33 579 1241 pc

b: \( \text{ἐπ᾿ αὐτόν} \) | \( \text{εἰς αὐτόν} \) D

c: \( \text{σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα} \) | \( \text{ὑἱός μου εἶ σύ ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε} \) D it; Ju (Cl) Meth Hil Aug (cf. LXX Ps 2:7) // \( \text{σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός ἐν} \) \( \text{ψ} \) \( \text{ἐυδόκησα} \) X pc f borp (cf. Matt 3:17) // \( \text{οὗτός ἐστιν} \) \( \text{ὁ υἱός} \) \( \text{μου} \) \( \text{ὁ ἀγαπητός} \) \( \text{ἐν} \) \( \text{ψ} \) \( \text{ἐυδόκησα} \) 1574 pc (cf. Matt 3:17)

3:23-31
a: \( \text{A major rewriting in D (and d) with the genealogy of Matt 1:6-16 (in reverse order)} \)

---

\(^{42}\) NA indicates some uncertainty ("\( \Psi^{4\text{nd}p} \)"), but the papyrus clearly supports the printed reading.

\(^{43}\) This variation-unit is divided into two separate units in NA. However, the units are textually related and, hence, counted as one in this analysis.

\(^{44}\) In the variation-units in Luke 3:23-31, D is consequently omitted from consideration unless otherwise noted.
A Comparative Textual Analysis of $\Psi^4$ and $\Psi^{64+67}$

3:23b-38

a: At this point there is an error in $\text{NA}^{27}$ where W and 579 are cited for the omission of vv. 23-38 with 579 enclosed in parenthesis instead of W. The editors have been notified and they confirm that this will be changed in the next edition. Further, a minor omission in v. 23 of τοῦ Ἠλὶ τοῦ Μαθθάτ in a Latin MS (c) is treated in the same variation-unit in $\text{NA}^{27}$. I do not include this unit in the analysis because it is attested only in a single Latin MS.

b: Codex D has the addition within the major rewriting.

c: The doubling of consonants in Μαθθ- and Ματθ- appears in transliterated Semitic words (BDF §40). However, I am not aware of any MS with the spelling Μαθθάτ (as printed in $\text{NA}^{27}$) in this particular verse. On the other hand, several MSS including $\Psi^4$ have this spelling in 3:29 (cf. Matt 1:15 where $\text{NA}^{27}$ has the spelling Μαθθάν).
3:30
O: Ἐλιακίμ | Ἐλιακείμ Π\textsuperscript{vid}

3:31
a: τοῦ Μεννά | om A
b (orthographic variation-unit): Ναθάμ | Ναθάν Π\textsuperscript{4} Λ Θ Ψ ƒ\textsuperscript{1.13} \textsuperscript{33} sy bo // txt Π\textsuperscript{4} \textsuperscript{*} B pc it O: Δαυίδ | Δαυείδ Π\textsuperscript{4} \textsuperscript{*} Λ \textsuperscript{75}

3:32
a (orthographic variation-unit): Ἰωβήδ | Ἰωβήλ Π\textsuperscript{4} B Θ L ƒ\textsuperscript{1.13} \textsuperscript{33} \textsuperscript{33} \textsuperscript{892} 1241 1424 al c
b: lac
c: Ἀδμίν | Ἀδμείν Π\textsuperscript{4} B L

3:33
a: τοῦ Ἀμιναδὰβ τοῦ Ἀδμὶν τοῦ Ἀρνὶ τοῦ Ἀράμ Π\textsuperscript{75} Π\textsuperscript{4} τοῦ Ἀδὰμ τοῦ Ἀδμὶ τοῦ Ἀρνί
b: τοῦ Φάρες | om A
O: Ἀδμίν | Ἀδμείν Π\textsuperscript{4} B L

3:35
a (orthographic variation-unit): Σερούχ | Σερούκ Π\textsuperscript{75} rell
b: lac

3:36
a: τοῦ | om Π\textsuperscript{75}\textsuperscript{vid} D
O: lac (Καϊνάμ/Καϊνάν)

3:37
a (orthographic variation-unit): Ἰάρετ | Ἰάρεθ Π\textsuperscript{75} \textsuperscript{75} B D L ƒ\textsuperscript{1.13} \textsuperscript{33} \textsuperscript{2542} \textsuperscript{1211} \textsuperscript{1211} \textsuperscript{1241} pc et v.l. al // txt \textsuperscript{75} \textsuperscript{75} Λ Χ (Γ) f\textsuperscript{10} pc bo
b (orthographic variation-unit): Μαλελεὴλ | Μελελεὴλ Π\textsuperscript{75} A Π\textsuperscript{75} \textsuperscript{75} B \textsuperscript{1} bo // txt \textsuperscript{75} \textsuperscript{75} \textsuperscript{75} rell

c: lac (Καϊνάμ/Καϊνάν)

4:2
a: διαβόλου | σατανᾶ \textsuperscript{cf. Mark 1:13) (B D L W 579 892 1241 pc it
b: οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲν | οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲν οὐδὲ ἐπιέειν f\textsuperscript{10} pc

49 Many MSS have the nomen sacrum δαδ here (e.g., Π\textsuperscript{4} 33 700 1424).
50 The variation-unit in NA\textsuperscript{27} also involves the textual variation of the name Καϊνάμ/Καϊνάν, but this part is illegible in Π\textsuperscript{4}.

50 NA\textsuperscript{27} indicates Π\textsuperscript{4} \textsuperscript{vid} (txt), but according to my transcription Π\textsuperscript{4} clearly supports txt.
4:29  a: ὥστε | εἰς τὸ A C Ψ (1424) // txt Ψ4 vid N B D L W Θ f1-13 33 579 700 892 1241 2542 pc; Or

4:31 a (orthographic variation-unit): Καφαρναούμ | Καπερναούμ A C L Θ (Ψ) 0102 f1-13 M q // txt Ψ4 N B D W 33 579 / 844 / 2211 pc lat; Mcion. A Or
b: Γαλιλαίας | Γαλιλαίας τὴν παραθαλασσίον ἐν ὧρίοις Ζαβουλων καὶ Νεφθαλίμ D (cf. Matt 4:13)

4:33 a: lac

4:34 a: lac
b: ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς | ἡμᾶς ὧδε ἀπολέσαι D // txt Ψ4 vid rell

4:35 a-d: lac

5:3 a: lac
b: ὄλιγον | ὄσον ὄσον D
c: καθίσας δὲ | καὶ καθίσας A C Θ Ψ f1-13 33 vid 1424 M lat syh // δὲ καθίσας Ψ4
d: ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου | ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ N D e sa // ἀπὸ τοῦ πλοίου f1-13
e: ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου ἐδίδασκεν | ἐδίδασκαν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου Ψ4 A C L Q W Θ Ψ (f1-13) 33 579 M al // txt (N) B (D) 1424 d e pc

5:4 a: χαλάσατε | χαλάσαι Ψ4 vid

5:5 a: lac
b: εἶπεν | εἶπεν αὐτῷ A C D L W Θ Ψ f1-13 33 M lat sy sa // txt Ψ4 vid 25 N B 700 2542 pc e bo
c: ἐπιστάτα | διδάσκαλε D
d-e: lac

5:6 a: τὰ δίκτυα | τὸ δίκτυον A C Ψ f1-13 33 M b vg syph

5:7 a: ἐν τῷ ἑτέρῳ | τοῖς ἐν τῷ ἑτέρῳ A C Θ Ψ f1-13 33 M lat sa // txt Ψ4 vid 75 N B D L W Ψ 579 700 pc a
b: συλλαβέσθαι | βοηθεῖν D
c: ᾧστε | ὥστε παρὰ ti D c e r1 vg el syph hmg // ᾧστε ἤδη C // txt Ψ4 vid rell

---

51 In this unit NA27 does not indicate any information for Ψ4, although it clearly supports txt, καὶ ψαλαρνοῦμ.
52 Variation-units c-d are treated as one variation-unit in NA27.
53 NA27 does not give any information for Ψ4, but there is not enough space for αὐτῷ (IGNTP indicates Ψ4 vid for εἶπεν).
54 This is for the part of the variation-unit in NA27 where Ψ4 is extant.
5:8
a: ἰδὼν δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος | ἰδὼν δὲ ο Ἴσιμων W f 892 1241 pc a b e r' sy\textsuperscript{ang} // ὁ δὲ Σίμων D // txt \textsuperscript{vid} [ἰδὼν δὲ σιμ'ων \textsuperscript{tr}os] \textsuperscript{rell}

b: τοῖς γόνασιν Ἰησοῦ | τοῖς γόνασιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ A C L Θ Ψ f\textsuperscript{113} 33 579 1241 1424 // 844 // 2211 al

c: ἐξελθε | παρακαλῶ ἐξελθε D

5:30
a-b: lac

O: πίνετε | πείνετε \textsuperscript{P4} B

5:31
a: ὁ Ἰησοῦς | Ἰησοῦς \textsuperscript{P4} B // om W 1241

b: πρὸς αὐτούς | πρὸς αὐτὸν \textsuperscript{P4\textsuperscript{vid}} // αὐτοῖς L Ξ 33

5:32
a: ἁμαρτωλούς | ἀσεβεῖς \textsuperscript{N*}

5:33
a: οἱ μαθηταὶ | διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταὶ \textsuperscript{N* 2} A C D Θ Ψ f\textsuperscript{113} \textsuperscript{M} latt sy bo\textsuperscript{pt} (cf. Matt 9:14) // txt \textsuperscript{P4} \textsuperscript{N} B L W Ξ 33 892* 1241 pc sa bo\textsuperscript{pt}

b: νηστεύουσιν πυκνά καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων | καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τῶν φαρισαίων νηστεύουσιν πυκνά καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται D (it)

c: σοὶ ἐσθίουσι καὶ πίνουσιν | μαθηταὶ σου οὐδὲν τούτων ποιοῦσιν D e

O: Ιωάννου | Ιωάννου \textsuperscript{P4} B D

O: φαρισαίων | φαρεισαίων \textsuperscript{P4} B

O: πίνουσιν | πείνουσιν \textsuperscript{P4} B

5:34
a: ὁ Ἰησοῦς | om A Θ Ψ \textsuperscript{M} latt sy bo\textsuperscript{pt} // txt \textsuperscript{P4} \textsuperscript{N} B C D L W Ξ f\textsuperscript{113} 33 579 892 1241 2542 // 844 / 2211 al f sy\textsuperscript{ang} co

b-d: lac

5:36
a: τὸ ἐπίβληματο ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ | τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ ἐπίβλημα D // τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ A Ψ \textsuperscript{M} // txt \textsuperscript{P4\textsuperscript{corrvid}} \textsuperscript{N} B C L W Θ f\textsuperscript{113} 33 579 700 892 1241 1424 2542 // 844 // 2211 al lat sy // τὸ ἐπίβλημα τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ παλαιοῦ txt \textsuperscript{P4\textsuperscript{vid}}

5:37
a: ῥήξει | ῥήγνυσι \textsuperscript{P4} // ῥήσσει C Γ Λ pc b f l q

5:38
a: βλητέον | βάλλουσιν \textsuperscript{N* D it sy\textsuperscript{6}; Mcion\textsuperscript{A}} (cf. Matt 9:17) // βάλληται W

b: \textsuperscript{55} βλητέον | add καὶ ἀμφότεροι συντηροῦνται A C (D) Θ Ψ f\textsuperscript{113} \textsuperscript{M} latt sy (bo\textsuperscript{mas}); Mcion\textsuperscript{A} (cf. Matt 9:17) // txt \textsuperscript{P4\textsuperscript{75}} \textsuperscript{N} B L W f\textsuperscript{3} 33 579 700 1241 2542 pc co

\textsuperscript{55} NA\textsuperscript{27} indicates that the addition seems to be absent in \textsuperscript{P75}, but with the publication of a new fragment this is now certain. See Marie-Luise Lakmann, “Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV (\textsuperscript{P75}) Neue Fragmente,” Museum Helveticum 64 (2007): 27. (The new fragment contains Luke 5:37-6:3.)
6:1

a: ὡς πῶς ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν | om D it; Eus
b: ὡς [καὶ] | om Ψ⁴ 757 700 892 1241 // txt roll
c: ὑπὲρ | ὥπως Θ

6:2

a: πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς | ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν
b: καὶ ἤσθιον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ | οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο τίλλειν

c: ὅτε | ὁπότε A Θ

6:3

a: καὶ οὐδεὶς πιὸν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν | om D it; Eus
b: καὶ οὐδεὶς πιὸν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν | om D it; Eus

5:39

a: [καὶ] οὐδεὶς πιὸν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν | om D it; Eus
b: [καὶ] | om Ψ⁴ 757 700 892 1241 // txt roll
c: ὑπὲρ | ὥπως Θ

c: ἐν σαββάτῳ δευτεροπρώτῳ A C D Θ Ψ // τί ποιεῖτε ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν
b: καὶ ἤσθιον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ | οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο τίλλειν

c: ὅτε | ὁπότε A Θ

5:39

a: καὶ οὐδεὶς πιὸν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν | om D it; Eus
b: καὶ οὐδεὶς πιὸν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν | om D it; Eus

5:39

a: καὶ οὐδεὶς πιὸν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν | om D it; Eus
b: καὶ οὐδεὶς πιὸν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν | om D it; Eus

5:39

a: καὶ οὐδεὶς πιὸν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν | om D it; Eus
b: καὶ οὐδεὶς πιὸν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν | om D it; Eus

5:39

a: καὶ οὐδεὶς πιὸν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν | om D it; Eus
b: καὶ οὐδεὶς πιὸν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν | om D it; Eus

5:39

a: καὶ οὐδεὶς πιὸν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν | om D it; Eus
b: καὶ οὐδεὶς πιὸν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν | om D it; Eus

5:39

a: καὶ οὐδεὶς πιὸν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν | om D it; Eus
b: καὶ οὐδεὶς πιὸν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν | om D it; Eus

5:39

a: καὶ οὐδεὶς πιὸν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν | om D it; Eus
b: καὶ οὐδεὶς πιὸν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν | om D it; Eus

5:39

a: καὶ οὐδεὶς πιὸν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν | om D it; Eus
b: καὶ οὐδεὶς πιὸν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστιν | om D it; Eus

5:39

The new fragment of Ψ⁴ supports the printed reading.
d: ἔρεις | add τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ θεασάμενος τῶν σαββάτων εἶπεν αὐτῷ. Ἀνθρωπε, εἰ μὲν οἶδας τί ποιεῖς, μακάριος εἰ· εἰ δὲ μὴ οἶδας, ἐπικατάρατος καὶ παραβάτης εἰ τοῦ νόμου.

6:5
a: transposition of v. 5 after v. 10 in D
b: ἐλέγεν αὐτοῖς | ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῆς Α D L Ψ f13 33 M latt // txt Ψ4 Ψ* B W f5 579 700 pc
c: τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου | ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου Ψ intertwined Α D L Θ Ψ f13 33 M latt sybo // Mcionε (cf. Mark 2:28) // txt B W 1241 sybo

6:6
a: ἔγενετο δὲ ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτόν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν καὶ διδάσκειν. καὶ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖ καὶ ἡ χεῖρ αὐτοῦ ἦν ἰσχιαῖν. | Καὶ εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ πάλιν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν σαββάτῳ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖν ξηρὰν ἔχουσαν τὴν χεῖρα D

6:7
a: αὐτὸν | om A Θ Ψ f5 M latt bo // txt Ψ4 Ψ* B D L W f5 33 579 892 1241 1424 pc sy co
c: εὐρώσων κατηγορεῖν | εὐρώσων κατηγοριάν Α L W f5 33 M q shs // εὐρωσίων κατηγορήσασθαι D // κατηγορήσωσιν Ψ (2542) pc bo // Mcionε (cf. 1.12:10; Mark 3:2) // txt Ψ4vid Ψ* B Θ f5 1241 al sa
d: αὐτού | κατ’ αὐτοῦ Κ L W 33 565 579 892 1424 al
O: φαρεσαίοι | φαρεσαίοι Ψ4 B

6:8
a: ἦδει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν, εἶπεν δὲ | γινώσκων τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν λέγει D b f
c: δὲ | καὶ | ὁ δὲ Α K Γ Δ f5 565 M sh

6:9
a: ὁ Ἰησοῦς | Ιησοῦς Ψ4 B
c: ἔπερωτο | ἐπερωτήθησαν A D Θ Ψ f(v13) 33 M it sa // bo // txt Ψ4 Ψ* B L W bo
c: τι A Θ Ψ f13 33 M q shs // txt Ψ4 Ψ* B D L W f5 33 579 892 1241 pc lat co; Mcionε
d: ἀπολέσαι | ἀποκτείναι A Θ M e sh (cf. Mark 3:4) // txt Ψ4 Ψ* B D L W Ψ f(v13) 579 892 1241 2542 pc lat shs; Mcionε
e: ἀπολέσαι | add om δὲ ἐσώπων D Α λ (boε) (cf. Mark 3:4)

6:10
a: ἔλεγεν | ἔλεγεν (λέγει D) D X Θ Λ f(v13) 2542 al // it sh
b: ἐποίησεν | ἐξέτασεν Ν D (W) f13 1424 2542 pc latt shs co
b: καὶ | ἄλλη A (D) K Q Δ Θ Ψ f5 565 2542 al it sh (and in D add v. 5 here) // ὡς ὃς ἢ ἄλλη f5 M (cf. Matt 12:13) // ὡς ὃς Ψ 579 bo // txt Ψ4 Ψ* B L 33 pc lat sa bo? O: ἀπεκατέστη | ἀποκατεστάθη Ψ4 B D U Y Θ Π 565 700 // ἀποκατέστη f5 // ἀπεκατέστη Ψ*
6:11
a: διελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους τί ἂν ποιήσαιεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ | διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους πῶς ἀπολέσωσιν αὐτόν D (cf. Mark 11:18, 31; Luke 20:14)


6:12
a: τοὺς θεοὺ ] om D

6:13
a: lac

6:14
a: lac
b: καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Φίλιππον ] Ιάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννη Φίλιππον A Q Ψ f: Μ lat sy\(^b\) sa\(^{mas}\) bo\(^p\); Eus // txt \( \Psi^{75} \) B D L W (f\(^\alpha\)) 33 (565 579 1241) 2542 al it sy\(^p\)

c: Ἰωάννην | add τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, οὗς ἐπωνόμασεν βοανηργές, δ ἐστιν υἱοὶ βροντῆς D (cf. Mark 3:17) // τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου sy

O: Ἰωάννην | Ἰωάνην \( \Psi^4 \) B D

6:15
a: καὶ | om A Q Ψ f\(^\alpha\) 33 Μ lat sy\(^b\) sa\(^{mas}\) bo\(^p\) // txt \( \Psi^4 \) Ν B D L W f\(^\alpha\) 1241 2542 pc it sy\(^p\); Eus
b: Θωμάν | add τὸν ἐπικαλούμενον Δίδυμον D (cf. John 11:16)
c: καὶ | om A B D\(^*\) Q W Ψ f\(^\alpha\) Μ lat sy\(^b\) sa\(^{mas}\) bo\(^p\) // txt \( \Psi^4 \) Ν D\(^*\) L f\(^\alpha\) 33 700 1241 2542 pc it sy\(^p\)

6:16
a: καὶ | om A Q Ψ f\(^\alpha\) 33 Μ e f q v\(^{g\alpha\omega\omega\omega}\) sy\(^b\) // txt \( \Psi^{75} \) Ν B D L Q W f\(^\alpha\) 892 1241 2542 pc it v\(^g\) sy\(^p\)
b: Ἰσκαριώθ | Ἰσκαριώτην Ν\(^2\) A Q W Ψ f\(^\alpha\) Μ v\(^g\) (co); Mcion\(^E\) // Σκαριώθ D lat // txt \( \Psi^4 \) Ν\(^*\) Μ\(^*\) L 33 579 pc d

Textual variation of \( \Psi^4 \)
The textual variation of \( \Psi^4 \) as compared to the initial text (NA\(^{27}\)) is indicated in Table 4 as follows: addition (A); omission (O); substitution (SUB); transposition of word order (W/O). Orthographic changes are not included unless otherwise is noted.

Table 4 Textual variation of \( \Psi^4 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Variation-units in NA(^{27})</th>
<th>Lacunose variation-units</th>
<th>Additional variation-units where ( \Psi^4 ) deviates from NA(^{27})</th>
<th>Ratio of deviation</th>
<th>Type of deviation</th>
<th>Singular readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luke 1:58-59; 62-2:1; 6-7; 3:8-4:2; 29-35; 5:3-8; 30-6:16</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26/134</td>
<td>3 x A</td>
<td>2 x A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are 155 variation-units in NA\(^{27}\) for this stretch of text. However, in two cases I have treated an individual variation-unit as two separate units containing genealogically unrelated textual variation (5:3c-d; 6:3a-b). On the other hand, in one case I have treated two variation-
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units in NA²⁵ as one unit, since they contain genealogically related textual variation (3:17a). Thus, my analysis includes 156 variation-units. 𝔃⁴ is lacunose in thirty-three of these units, which leaves us with 123 selected units reflecting the most significant variants in the textual tradition. In this sample 𝔃⁴ agrees with the reconstructed initial text in 108 units (87.8%) and deviates in fifteen units (12.2%). In addition to this sample, 𝔃⁴ deviates from the printed text in eleven other variation-units giving a total of twenty-six deviations in 134 variation-units (19.4%). However, if we were to include all variation-units in the textual tradition then the relative agreement between 𝔃⁴ and the printed text would be significantly higher. This is because the number of deviations (twenty-six) would remain constant, whereas the number of variation-units would increase dramatically. In the following I will discuss the textual variants in more detail.

**Additions (x3)**

The papyrus attests to the following three additions: καί post Ἰουδαίας (1:65b); the definite article in τοῦ κυρίου (1:76b), which is a singular reading; and a non-sensical οὐ in τοῦ οὐ Ῥησαῦ (3:27a), which is clearly scribal error. Several other witnesses (W 1675 b c e) attest to the first addition (1:65b), most of which also replace the following word διελαλεῖτο with ἐλαλεῖτο (𝔓⁴ 1675 b c e). I therefore think that this addition was already in the exemplar of 𝔃⁴ whereas the other two unique readings, one clearly an error, are most likely the work of the scribe.

**Omissions (x8)**

In relation to the printed text, 𝔃⁴ contains the following eight omissions: κύριος (1:68a); καλόν (3:9a); the definite article in ὁ Ἰησοῦς (5:31a; 6:3b; 6:9a); [καί] (5:39b); [ὀντες] (6:3d); [ὡς] (6:4a). Two of these omissions may reflect haplography due to homoioteleuton: κύριος (written with nomina sacra) could easily have been omitted in the sequence Εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεός (1:68); whereas καλόν comes after καρπόν (3:9).

As for the three omissions of the definite article in ὁ Ἰησοῦς, interestingly, B shares all of them. I think these omissions were already in the exemplar. Note that one of the singular readings of 𝔃⁴, which is more likely the work of this scribe, is the addition of a definite article in 1:76. The other three omissions concern words printed within square brackets in NA²⁷ and the omissions are attested by other textually related witnesses (B shares all three). Thus, the words were likely already absent from the exemplar of 𝔃⁴.

**Transpositions (x4)**

𝔓⁴ contains the following four transpositions: ἀνεῴχθη δὲ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ παραχρῆμα καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα | ἀνεῴχθη παραχρῆμα τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα (1:63c); καθίσας δὲ [δὲ] καθίσας (5:3c); ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου ἐδίδασκεν [ἐδίδασκεν] ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου (5:3e); τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου [ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου (6:5c).

The first transposition (1:63c) is a sub-singular reading shared by only two minuscules. The second transposition (5:3c) is a singular reading, which may represent a scribal error. On the other hand, the position of δὲ before καθίσας is syntactically possible if the concluding word of the previous sentence, the adverb ὅλιγον (“a little way” from the shore), is instead taken as the opening word of a new sentence, ὅλιγον δὲ καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου τοὺς ὀχλους (“Then he sat down for a short while and taught the crowds from the boat.”). There is no punctuation in 𝔃⁴ that would prevent such a division of the sentences. The third and fourth transpositions (5:3e; 6:5c) are attested by some other Alexandrian witnesses and probably reflect the exemplar, whereas the other two poorly attested transpositions are more likely the work of the scribe.

---

⁶⁸ On the selection of variants in NA²⁷, see “Introduction,” 46°.
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Substitutions (x11)

In relation to NA\(^{27} \), there are eleven substitutions in \( \Psi^4 \): ἐλαλεῖτο for διελαλεῖτο (1:65c); ἕαυτῶν for αὐτῶν (1:66a); πνεύματι (πνι) for σωματικῷ (3:22d); Ἐλμασάμ for Ἐλμαδάμ (3:28a); ἱσθήκη for ἱσθήδη (3:32a); τοῦ Ἀδὰμ for τοῦ Ἀμιναδὰβ (3:33a); χαλάσει for χαλάσατε (5:4a); πρὸς αὐτόν for πρὸς αὐτούς (5:31b); ῥήγνυσι for ῥήξει (5:37a); θεραπεύσει for θεραπεύει (6:7b); ἑάλαλου for διελάλου (6:11b).

In five cases we have to do with alternative verb forms. The scribe apparently twice preferred the simple λαλέω (“talk”) to διαλαλέω, often with reciprocal meaning (“discuss”), which the scribe may have perceived as redundant, especially in Luke 6:11 where the verb is followed by the prepositional phrase expressing reciprocity, πρὸς ἀλλήλους (“with one another”). In another case the scribe replaced χαλάσει with χαλάσατε (5:4a); a harmonization to the context where the preceding ἐπανάγαγε is also in the second person singular. The substitution of ῥήγνυσι for ῥήξει (5:37a), respectively derived from ῥήγνυμι and its by-form ῥήσσω, possibly represents a harmonization to the parallel in Matt 9:17, where the alternative verb form ῥήγνυμι is used. The choice of the future tense θεραπεύσει over the present θεραπεύει (6:7b) in the conditional clause has little effect on the meaning; it may reflect a harmonization to the parallel in Mark 3:2 where all but a few MSS read θεραπεύει.

The reflexive and personal pronoun in the genitive, ἑαυτῶν/αὐτῶν, are interchangeable; in fact the latter may also be reflexive depending on the breathing (breathing marks are often lacking in the early papyri). In two cases of singular readings (3:28a; 3:32a), the scribe has confused the consonants in proper names (σ/δ; τ/δ). The substitution of αὐτόν for αὐτούς (5:31b) results in a more difficult reading in the context where Jesus replies to the Pharisees and their scribes. Nevertheless, being singular, this reading is probably a mistake on the part of the scribe.

The substitution of πνεύματι for σωματικῷ in Luke 3:22 is interpreted by Bart Ehrman as an “orthodox corruption.” When “the Spirit is said to descend upon Jesus in ‘spiritual’ (πνευματικός) rather than ‘bodily’ form,” Ehrman says, it “undercuts a potentially Gnostic construal of the text because there is now no ‘real’ or ‘bodily’ descent of a divine being upon Jesus.”\(^{69} \) The problem with Ehrman’s explanation is that one would then expect the adjective πνευματικός (“spiritual”), being the opposite of σωματικός (“bodily”), and not the noun πνεύματι, which results in a rough syntax.\(^{70} \) The alternative is to regard πνι simply as a scribal error, perhaps a kind of dittography occasioned by the presence of πνα on the same line.\(^{71} \) The scribe apparently created one other non-sensical dittography copying τοῦ ὦ ὸροσαφ (3:27) (there is a line break after τοῦ) and made another mistake in 5:36 where he or she first substituted παλαιοῦ for καινοῦ but then corrected the mistake—both adjectives occur several times in the context.

The substitution of τοῦ Ἀδὰμ for τοῦ Ἀμιναδὰβ (3:33a) occurs at a point in the Lukan genealogy where there is major textual variation and the substitution is shared by \( \Psi^* \) 1241 and some other witnesses.

Corrections (x2)

Merell did not indicate any corrections at all in \( \Psi^4 \). Skeat, however, identified a correction in 5:36 where the scribe first wrote παλαιοῦ but then corrected the text to καινοῦ. According to


\(^{70} \) In 1 Cor 15:46-47 various forms of πνευματικός (πνικος/πνικας) are written with nomina sacra in \( \Psi^4 \) (curiously not in 1 Cor 15:44). Similarly, the adjective is written with nomina sacra in 1 Pet 2:5 (πνιτακος/πνιτακας) in \( \Psi^4 \).

\(^{71} \) So Merell (ed. pr.), “Nouveaux fragments,” 14 n. 22. The main problems of this explanation is the presence of the intervening words τὸ ἅγιον and the distinct forms of πνα and πνι.
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Skeat, the distinctive shape of the kappa shows that the original scribe made the correction.\(^7^2\) I have found another correction in 3:29 where the scribe seems to have first written ιησου with *nomen sacrum* but then to have made a correction in *scribendo*, probably after realizing that in this instance it designates “Joshua” and not Jesus (Christ).

**Orthography**

Two of the variation-units (substitutions) included in the analysis involve orthography, specifically the confusion of consonants: 'Ελμασάμ (3:28a); Ἰωβήτ (3:32a). Apart from these two units, which are included in NA\(^6^c\), I have decided not to include any further orthographic variants in the textual analysis because I consider their genealogical significance to be of uncertain value. (This has to be judged on a case by case basis).\(^7^3\) Nevertheless, it is striking that \( \Psi^4 \) in particular agrees with Vaticanus in many cases of spelling and itacism.

\( \Psi^4 \) contains the following itacisms: πινακείδιον (1:63); ἀξείνη (3:9); ἀπεκρείνατο (3:16); Ἡλεί (3:23); Λευεί (3:24); Μελχεί (3:24); Νηρεί (3:28); Μελχεί (3:28); Λευεί (3:29); ΄Ελικείμ (3:30); Δαυείδ (3:31); Ἰωρείμ (3:34); φαρεισαίων (5:33; 6:2); πείνουσιν (5:33); Λευεί (3:29); ΄Ελιάζερ (3:29); Ἱωβήτ (3:32); Ιωάνην (6:14). In four cases, \( \Psi^4 \) attests to alternative verb forms: ἠνεῴχθη (1:64); εἶπον (3:12; 6:2); ἀποκατεστάθη (6:10).

Further, \( \Psi^4 \) deviates in the spelling of proper names in these cases (which exclude itacisms): Ιωάνου (3:15; 5:33); Μαθθάθ (3:24); Ἐσλαί (3:25); Μάατ (3:26); Σεμεεΐν (3:26); Ῥησαῦ (3:27); Ἐλμασάμ (3:28); Ἐλιάζερ (3:29); Ἰωβήτ (3:32); Ιωάνην (6:14). In four cases, \( \Psi^4 \) attests to alternative verb forms: ἠνεῴχθη (1:64); εἶπον (3:12; 6:2); ἀποκατεστάθη (6:10).

**Singular readings (x8)**

The papyrus contains eight singular readings: two additions (1:76b; 3:27a), one of which is a dittography (3:27a); one omission, possibly through aplography (3:9a); one transposition (5:3c); and four substitutions (3:22d; 5:4a; 5:31b; 5:37a), one of which may be through dittography (3:22d).

Jean Merell (ed. pr.) characterized four of these singular readings (3:22d; 5:3c; 5:4a; 5:37a) as “scribal errors.”\(^7^4\) Although it is possible that several or all singular readings are errors of the scribe, only one or two readings are certain errors (3:27a; 3:22d) — the other readings make more or less sense in their contexts.

In addition, the analysis includes two orthographic singular readings that concern the spelling of proper names (3:28a; 3:32a). Then there are three other orthographic singular readings which were not included in the analysis, and which also concern the spelling of proper names (3:25; 3:27; 3:30).

Furthermore, there are nine other readings in \( \Psi^4 \) which are shared by only one or two other Greek MSS (1:63c; 1:65b; 1:65c; 1:66a; 1:66b; 1:68a; 5:31a; 6:3b; 6:4a; 6:9a). In five of these cases B attests to the same reading (1:66a; 5:31a; 6:3b; 6:4a; 6:9a).

**Harmonizations**

In one reading (5:4a) the verb χαλάσαι is adapted to the immediate context; three readings reflect harmonization to synoptic parallels: χαλάσαι (5:37a/Matt 9:17); ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου (6:5c/Mark 2:28); θεραπεύσει (6:7b/Mark 3:2). Two of these harmonizations are singular readings and probably the work of the scribe (5:4a; 5:37a). Three of the four possible harmonizations relate to the choice of verb forms.

---


\(^{73}\) Cf. Min, *Überlieferung*, 70 n. 12.

\(^{74}\) Merell, “Nouveaux fragments,” 8, “Quelques divergences du Codex Vaticanus ne peuvent être que des erreurs de copistes.”
Textual quality

The ratio of deviation from NA27 is 19.4% (26/134 variation-units), which, in comparison with Min's overall analysis of fourteen other MSS, must be considered as a “strict” text in terms of textual quality by the standards of this method. In fact, Min indicates that𝔓64+67 is a “strict” text based upon five deviations in sixteen extant units, which is equal to 31.2%.

Transmission character

An assessment of the transmission character according to this method is based on the character of the deviations, i.e., whether it is likely that they are creations of the scribe. I have found eight singular readings which were probably not in the exemplar. Two of the singular readings involve orthography. Only one of the singular readings is a certain error, τοῦ οὐ Ψηφαὐ in Luke 3:27. The substitution of πνεύματι (πνι) for σωματικῷ in Luke 3:22 may be an error (a dittography occasioned by the presence of πνα on the same line). Two of the singular readings represent harmonizations, one to the immediate context (5:4a) and another to a synoptic parallel (5:37a).

There are nine other readings in𝔓4 which are shared by only one or two other Greek MSS. However, in five of these cases the closely related Codex B attests to the same reading. In two other cases the sub-singular readings occur in the same verse (1:65b, c) where Ψ4 shares them with a similar combination of witnesses 1675 b c e. The two remaining readings may represent errors: the omission of κύριος in 1:68 (possible haplography) and the transposition in 1:63 shared by two unrelated minuscules. Moreover, the scribe made two other mistakes, which he or she corrected in scribendo.

In sum, this scribe made very few positive errors. Most of the singular readings make sense in the context. Practically none of the textual variants affect the meaning except the substitution of πνεύματi (πνι) for σωματικῷ in Luke 3:22 which is interpreted by Bart Ehrman as an “orthodox corruption” but which I think is more likely a scribal error, perhaps influenced by the occurrence of πνα on the same line. In my opinion, some ten readings out of 134 (7.5%) are likely creations of the scribe. Thus, the transmission character is definitely to be classified as “strict.”

Greg.-Aland Ψ64+67 (Oxford, Magdalen College, Gr. 17; Barcelona, Fundaciòn San Lucas Evangelista, P. Barc. 1)

Notes on transcription

Fr. C of Ψ64, verso, col. 2
l. 2 (26:14): Roberts (ed. pr.) transcribes ιβ ὁ λεγομενος. Several other scholars have followed Carsten P. Thiede who thinks there is no space for the omicron and transcribes ιβ λεγομενος—a singular reading which is syntactically difficult. It is more likely that the scribe wrote a smaller omicron placed above the line.7 The reading is uncertain and excluded from my textual analysis.

75 Note also that three of the omissions involve words, which are included in square brackets in NA27.
76 Two other orthographic variants, which were not included in the analysis, are most probably also errors: Ἐσλαί (3:25); Ἡσαὶ (3:27).
78 On the recto, l. 2, of this fragment there is another small omicron. Cfr. Ψ4 (probably by the same scribe), fr. D, recto, col. 2, l. 26 (Luke 6:14), αυτου.
A Comparative Textual Analysis of \( \Psi^4 \) and \( \Psi^{64+67} \)

Fr. C of \( \Psi^64 \), recto, col. 1

1. 26:22: Thiede transcribes τοσαυτων μητεγω, implying that \( \Psi^64 \) read εις οικαστος αυτων with \( \Psi^{37} \) vid \( \Psi^{45} \) vid D Θ f70 rc. However, I think Roberts’ transcription (ed. pr.), αυτω μητεγω, is more accurate. Thus, \( \Psi^64 \) read either λεγειν εις οικαστος αυτω (so Comfort and Barrett), or εις οικαστος λεγειν αυτω, or λεγειν (οικαστος) αυτω—in any case a singular reading involving an omission or transposition.

Fr. A of \( \Psi^64 \), recto, col. 2

2. 26:31: Roberts (ed. pr.) erroneously transcribes αυτοις ο ιναις παντες σκανδαλισθησετε, but corrects the nomen sacrum to ις in a later publication. Moreover, Roberts’ transcription, which omits ομειεις, is followed by Thiede, Skeat and Min. The omission would be a singular reading—possibly a harmonization to Mark 14:27. However, this reconstruction of l. 2 is based on the assumption that there is not enough room for ομειεις. This is far from certain, considering the general irregularity of the lines in \( \Psi^{64+67} \), also apparent in \( \Psi^4 \). As Wachtel points out, it is best in this case to leave the question open; I have not counted this possible omission in my analysis.

Fr. B of \( \Psi^64 \), recto, col. 2

1. 26:33: Roberts (ed. pr.) transcribes γαλειλαιαν, followed by Thiede, Wachtel, Min and Charlesworth; however Skeat, followed by Comfort and Barrett, transcribes γαλειλαιαν (itacism). The latter itacistic reading shared by the closely related Codex B is easier to assume than an error—especially with this careful scribe.

Apparatus

Matt 3:9

a: εν εαυτοις ] om b c f g' sy; Chr // txt \( \Psi^{67} \) vid rell

3:15

a: \( \Psi^6 \) B f13 | \( \Psi^{84} \) 2211 pc // om 0250 sa ms bo ms // txt \( \Psi^{67} \) R C D L W 0233 f3 33 M

b: lac

5:20

a: om vs 20 D // txt \( \Psi^{67} \) rell

---

81 Thiede, “Papyrus Magdalen 17,” 15; Skeat, “Four Gospels,” 13; Min, \( Überlieferung \), 169. However Comfort and Barrett, \( The Text \), 70, include the pronoun.
82 Wachtel, “Fragmente,” 76.
83 Thiede, “Papyrus Magdalen 17,” 15; Wachtel, “Fragmente,” 76; Min, \( Überlieferung \), 170; Charlesworth, “T. C. Skeat, \( \Psi^{64+67} \) and \( \Psi^4 \),” 585; Skeat, “Four Gospels,” 13; Comfort and Barrett, \( The Text \), 70 (γαλειλανα). Apparently, a small horizontal smudge seems to have been impressed on the papyrus later making the iota look a bit like a compressed gamma. However, there are two similar strokes on the next line where it is obvious that they do not belong to the original writing.
84 The papyrus is consistently cited as \( \Psi^64 \) in \( NA^{27} \), whereas I distinguish here between the two parts as \( \Psi^64 \) and as \( \Psi^67 \).
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5:22
a: αὐτοῦ | add εἰκῇ \(\Psi^4\) D L W Θ 0233 f\(^{13}\) 33 \(\mathfrak{M}\) it sy co; Ir\(^{lat}\) Or\(^{mas}\) Cyp Cyr // txt \(\Psi_{67}\) rell
b-c: lac

5:25
a: lac
b: καὶ ὁ κριτὴς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ | om sy\(^4\) // txt \(\Psi_{67}\) rell
c: ὁ κριτὴς | om sy\(^4\) // txt \(\Psi_{67}\) rell

5:26
a: ἐως ἄν | ἐως οὗ L (0233) 1424 al // ἐως 33 pc // txt \(\Psi_{67}\) rell

5:27
a: ὅτι ἐρρέθη | ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις L Δ Θ 0233 f\(^{13}\) 33 579 892 pm lat sy\(^{e-ph}\); Ir\(^{lat}\) Or\(^{lat}\) Eus // txt \(\Psi_{67}\) rell

5:28
a: αὐτήν | om \(\Psi_{67}\) \(\mathfrak{N}\)* pc; Tert Cl // txt B D L W Θ 0233 f\(^{13}\) 33 \(\mathfrak{M}\) Ir\(^{lat}\)vid

26:7
a-c: lac

26:8
a: μαθηταὶ | add αὐτοῦ A W f\(^{1}\) \(\mathfrak{M}\) c f q sy sa\(^{mas}\) // txt \(\Psi^{45v.i.d.64}\) \(\Psi\) B D L Θ 0293 f\(^{13}\) 33 700 892 / 844 pc lat co

26:14
a: lac

26:15
a: εἶπεν | καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς D latt (sa\(^{mas}\) bo) // txt \(\Psi^{4vid}\) rell
b: lac

26:22
a-b\(^{85}\): λέγειν αὐτῷ εἰς ἐκαστὸς | λέγειν εἰς ἐκαστὸς αὐτῶν \(\Psi^{37v.i.d.45}\) D Θ f\(^{13}\) pc sy\(^4\) // λέγειν αὐτῷ ἐκαστὸς αὐτῶν \(\Psi^{45v.i.d.64}\) D Θ f\(^{13}\) pc sy\(^4\) // λέγειν αὐτῷ ἐς ἐκαστὸς αὐτῶν M 157 // λέγειν ἐκαστὸς αὐτῶν 700 // λέγειν 1424 // txt \(\Psi\) B L Z 0281 33 892 1071 pc
\(\Psi^4\) is partly lacunose in these two variation-units (which could be regarded as one variation-unit); I therefore count the lacuna in one variation-unit. It read either λέγειν εἰς ἐκαστὸς αὐτῷ or εἰς ἐκαστὸς λέγειν αὐτῷ, or λέγειν ἐκαστὸς αὐτῶν; in any case, this is a singular reading involving a transposition (and possibly an omission).

26:23
a: μετ’ ἐμοῦ τὴν χεῖρα ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ | τὴν χεῖρα μετ’ ἐμοῦ ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ \(\Psi^{37v.i.d.45}\) (D) Θ 700

\(^{85}\) Since the NA\(^{49}\) apparatus indicates \(\Psi^{37v.i.d.}\) for the omission of αὐτῷ in Matt 26:22, \(\Psi^{37v.i.d.}\) should probably be included in the attestation for the following reading, εἰς ἐκαστὸς αὐτῶν, since there is clearly space for one of the two words αὐτῷ or εἰς.
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\[ 2211 \] // \( \muετ’ \) \( \epsilon\muοδ \) \( \epsilonν \) \( τ\omega \ τρυβλίω \) \( \tau\iotaν \) \( χε\iotaρα \) \( C \) \( W \) \( f^{1-3} \) \( M \) // \( τ\omega \ τρυβλίω \) \( \muετ’ \) \( \epsilon\muοδ \) \( \tau\iotaν \) \( χε\iotaρα \) \( 579 \) // \( \text{txt} \) \( \Psi^{64+67} \) \( \text{vid} \) \( \mathbf{N} \) \( \text{A B L Z 0281 33 892 1424} \) \( 844 \) \( \text{pc lat; Cyr} \)

26:31
a: lac

26:33
a-b: lac

Textual variation of \( \Psi^{64+67} \)

The textual variation of \( \Psi^{64+67} \) as compared to the initial text (NA\(^{27}\)) is indicated in Table 5 as follows: omission (O); transposition of word order (W/O).

Table 5 Textual variation of \( \Psi^{64+67} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Variation-units in NA(^{27})</th>
<th>Lacunose variation-units</th>
<th>Additional variation-units where ( \Psi^{64+67} ) deviates from NA(^{27})</th>
<th>Ratio of deviation</th>
<th>Type of deviation</th>
<th>Singular readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matt 3:9, 15; 5:20-22, 25-28; 26:7-8, 10, 14-15, 22-23, 31-33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2/13 (15.4%)</td>
<td>1 x O</td>
<td>1 x W/O / O / O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are twenty-six variation-units in NA\(^{27}\) for this stretch of text, thirteen in which \( \Psi^{64+67} \) is extant. The MS agrees with the reconstructed initial text in eleven variation-units (84.6%), whereas it deviates twice from the initial text (15.4%): one omission and one transposition (possibly involving an omission).

Omissions (x1)

\( \alphaυτήν \) (Matt 5:28a)

Transpositions (x1)

There is probably a transposition in 26:22a-b where \( \Psi^4 \) read either \( \lambdaέγειν \) \( \epsilonις \) \( \epsilonκαστος \) \( \alphaυτφ \), or \( \epsilonις \) \( \epsilonκαστος \) \( \lambdaέγειν \) \( \alphaυτφ \), or, possibly \( \lambdaέγειν \) \( \epsilonκαστος \) \( \alphaυτφ \).

Singular readings (x1)

The transposition in 26:22a-b is a singular reading.

Textual quality

The MS has two deviations in thirteen variation-units (15.4%). Thus, I agree with K. S. Min, who classifies \( \Psi^{64+67} \) as a “strict” text. The Alands, who do not distinguish between textual quality and transmission character, also classify \( \Psi^{64+67} \) as “strict.” As we have noted, however, Min counted five deviations in sixteen variation-units, i.e., an even higher ratio of deviation (31.2%).

Firstly, Min includes two uncertain readings which I have not counted: (1) the omission of a definite article in 26:14, which would be a singular reading and syntactical difficulty (see above). I have counted this unit as lacunose, although I actually think the article was there; (2) the omission of \( \upsilon\emaiz \) in 26:31, which is based on an uncertain reconstruction.

Secondly, Min transcribes fr. C, recto, col. 2, l. 1 (Matt 26:33) as \( \gamma\alphaλεγ\lambdaαι\alphaν \) with Roberts. In my opinion, Skeat is clearly correct in transcribing \( \gamma\alphaλεγ\lambdaαι\alphaν \) (itacism). The itacism, shared
by the closely related Codex B, is easier to assume than a scribal error—especially with this careful scribe. Moreover, there are some impressions in this area of the papyrus. I think in this particular case, on such impresssion has been misinterpreted as the horizontal stroke of a gamma.

Transmission character

The omission of αὐτήν in Matt 5:28 is shared by some witnesses, including ℅*, Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria, and accepted as original by Westcott and Hort. This omission was likely in the exemplar. In addition, there is one transposition, which is a singular reading. Thus, one of thirteen readings (7.7%) seems to be the creation of the scribe. There are no nonsense readings. Min classified the transmission character as “normal” but he counted four singular readings instead of one. In my opinion, the transmission should definitely be characterized as “strict.”

Conclusion

I have analyzed \(\text{𝔓}^4\) and \(\text{𝔓}^{64+67}\) using a method devised by the Alands and subsequently developed by Min. I have found that both have a “strict” textual quality with a 19.4% and 15.4% ratio of deviation from NA\(^2\), respectively. Moreover, both papyri, in my opinion, reflect a “strict” transmission character. In \(\text{𝔓}^4\) approximately ten readings in 134 variation-units (7.5%) should probably be assigned to the scribe, whereas in \(\text{𝔓}^{64+67}\) one reading in thirteen variation-units (7.7%) should so assigned.\(^{86}\)

This textual analysis further confirms the palaeographic evidence that we have to do with the same scribe, who took great care to copy the respective exemplars. There are very few positive errors to be found in \(\text{𝔓}^4\) and none in \(\text{𝔓}^{64+67}\). In two cases in \(\text{𝔓}^4\) the scribe made corrections, one of which involved particular attention to the context when the scribe decided to write out the name Joshua (Ἰησοῦς) in Luke 3:29, initially abbreviated with a nomen sacrum.

C. H. Roberts rightly characterized these papyri, which he assigned to the same codex, as a “thoroughgoing literary production.”\(^{87}\) They are written in two columns in a literary book hand supplied with lectional aids. The reconstructed codex format ca. 13 x 18 cm is typical of some of the earliest NT codices (Turner’s Group 9.1).\(^{88}\) My analysis of the textual quality and transmission character correlates well with these other features in pointing towards a controlled production.\(^{89}\)

---

\(^{86}\) It should be noted that the sample for \(\text{𝔓}^{64+67}\) is considerably smaller.

\(^{87}\) C. H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (Hollowbrook: Oxford, 1979), 23: “In the first, no. 8 [𝔓\(^4\), \(\text{𝔓}^{64+67}\)], the text is divided into sections on a system also found in the Bodmer codex of Luke and John that recurs in some of the great fourth-century codices and was clearly not personal to this scribe. . . . In its handsome script as well as in its organization ... it is a thoroughgoing literary production.”


\(^{89}\) For a recent discussion of controlled and uncontrolled production of early Gospel MSS intended for public or private use, see Charlesworth, “Public and Private,” 148-75.