

A Comparative Textual Analysis of P⁴ and P⁶⁴⁺⁶⁷

Tommy Wasserman

Abstract: In a 1997 article T. C. Skeat suggested that P⁴ comes from the same four-gospel codex as P⁶⁴⁺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 P⁴, providing “some basic facts.” Unfortunately his analysis is unsatisfactory in two ways: it concerns only P⁴ and it is based only on deviations from the *Textus Receptus*. This article presents a new textual analysis of P⁴ and P⁶⁴⁺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 P⁴ and P⁶⁴⁺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 P⁴ and P⁶⁴⁺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 P⁴ might come from the same four-gospel codex as P⁶⁴⁺⁶⁷.¹ About a decade later, Joseph van Haelst reiterated the suspicion, whereas C. H. Roberts had no doubt about the common identification.² 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, P⁷⁵.³ 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

¹ Kurt Aland, “Neue neutestamentliche Papyri II,” *NTS* 12 (1965/66): 193 n. 1. Cf. Kurt Aland, *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri. Band I. Biblische Papyri: Altes Testament, Neues Testament, Varia, Apokryphen* (Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 1976), 293: “vgl dazu P⁴ der eventuell mit P⁶⁴ u P⁶⁷ zusammengehört.”

² C. H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (Schweich Lectures, 1977; London: Oxford University Press, 1979), 13; cf. J. van Haelst, *Catalogue des Papyrus Littéraires Juifs et Chrétiens* (Série Papyrologie 1; Paris: Sorbonne, 1976), 125-26 (no. 336: “Peut-être le même codex que celui du fragment Suppl. Gr. 1120 de la Bi[b]liothèque Nationale de Paris = 403.”); 146-47 (no 403: “Probablement le même codex que celui du 336.”)

³ T. C. Skeat, “The Oldest Manuscript of the Four Gospels?” *NTS* 43 (1997): 1-34 (Skeat gave an affirmative answer to the query in the title on p. 30).

of Skeat's palaeographic assessment, that the same scribe copied the fragments.⁴ The similarity of the hands of \mathfrak{P}^4 and \mathfrak{P}^{64+67} is striking, but there are other differences like, for example, the amount of projection into the left margin of the *ekthesis*.⁵

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 \mathfrak{P}^4 and \mathfrak{P}^{64+67}

To my knowledge, Hermann von Soden, who had access only to the first fragments of \mathfrak{P}^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.⁶ Several other scholars confirmed this judgment in the decades to follow. For example, Marie-Joseph Lagrange drew attention to the textual similarity of \mathfrak{P}^4 and Codex Vaticanus.⁷ 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."⁸ Sanders, who examined \mathfrak{P}^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.⁹

⁴ Peter Head, "Is \mathfrak{P}^4 , \mathfrak{P}^{64} and \mathfrak{P}^{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 \mathfrak{P}^{64} and \mathfrak{P}^{67} with that of \mathfrak{P}^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, \mathfrak{P}^{64+67} and \mathfrak{P}^4 , and the Problem of Fibre Orientation in Codicological Reconstruction," *NTS* 53 (2007): 584-85, says, "According to Skeat, the script of \mathfrak{P}^{64+67} is identical to that of \mathfrak{P}^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 \mathfrak{P}^{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 \mathfrak{P}^4 is irregular, and the scribe of \mathfrak{P}^4 and \mathfrak{P}^{64+67} has not attempted to justify the lines, so this piece of evidence weighs little against the common identification.

⁶ Hermann von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte* (2 vols. in 4 parts; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902-1913): 1: 998 (no. 34).

⁷ Marie-Joseph Lagrange, *Critique textuelle II, La critique rationnelle* (2d ed. EtB; Paris: Gabalda, 1935), 119-23, esp. 123.

⁸ E. M. Schofield, "The Papyrus Fragments of the Greek New Testament" (PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1936), 103.

⁹ Henry A. Sanders, "The Egyptian Text of the Four Gospels and Acts," *HTR* 26 (1933): 88. Sanders examined \mathfrak{P}^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 \mathfrak{P}^4 in 1938, did not attempt to classify the text but confirmed Lagrange's observation of the proximity of \mathfrak{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 \mathfrak{P}^{64} and \mathfrak{P}^{67} were published in 1953 and 1962, respectively. These are considerably smaller fragments than \mathfrak{P}^4 . As for textual affiliation, C. H. Roberts, who edited \mathfrak{P}^{64} , simply noted that the papyrus showed divergence from the two other Matthean papyri, \mathfrak{P}^{37} and \mathfrak{P}^{45} .¹¹ R. Roca-Puig, who edited \mathfrak{P}^{67} , noted that it exhibits close affiliation to Codex Sinaiticus.¹²

As we have noted, Kurt Aland discussed the possibility that \mathfrak{P}^4 belonged to the same codex as \mathfrak{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 \mathfrak{P}^4 as a "normal text," whereas \mathfrak{P}^{64+67} appeared as a "strict text."¹⁴ I should point out again that the different textual character does not preclude the possibility that the MSS come from the same codex, but, nevertheless, the difference is interesting.

In Skeat's subsequent study he included a brief analysis of the text of \mathfrak{P}^4 , providing "some basic facts," whereas \mathfrak{P}^{64+67} were too small to analyze. Unfortunately his analysis of \mathfrak{P}^4 is unsatisfactory, since it is based only on deviations from the *Textus Receptus*. Skeat found that \mathfrak{P}^4 differed from the TR in 107 places. He then compared \mathfrak{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)

	Agreements of \mathfrak{P}^4	Disagreements of \mathfrak{P}^4
With \aleph	67	40
With B	84	23
With A	13	94
With D	41	66
With L	65	42
With W	62	45
With Θ	22	85

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

ern, 16 to the Caesarean, and 3 to the Antiochian. Sanders based his examination on previously defined text-types, stating that the Antiochian (Byzantine) and Alexandrian types were in general well defined whereas the Western, and especially the Caesarean, were less well defined (*ibid.*, 8).

¹⁰ Jean Merell, "Nouveaux fragments du papyrus 4," *RB* 47 (1938): 7-8.

¹¹ C. H. Roberts, "An Early Papyrus of the First Gospel," *HTR* 46 (1953): 237.

¹² R. Roca-Puig, *Un Papiro Griego del Evangelio de San Mateo* (Barcelona: Grafos S.A., 1962), 51.

¹³ Aland, "Neue neutestamentliche Papyri II," 193-94; cf. Bagnall, *Early Christian Books in Egypt* (Princeton-Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2009), 33. Bagnall seems to misunderstand the Alands' concept of "text types."

¹⁴ Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (trans. E. F. Rhodes; 2d ed; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill, 1989): 96 (\mathfrak{P}^4), 100 (\mathfrak{P}^{64+67}).

[N]ow 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 \mathfrak{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 \mathfrak{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 \mathfrak{P}^4 , presented in Table 2 in descending order:

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

MS	Agreements %	Agreements/total #
B	93%	112/120
\mathfrak{P}^{75}	93%	26/28
L	78%	94/120
\aleph	72%	86/120
W	65%	77/118
33	58%	70/120
1	49%	59/120
700	48%	58/120
157	44%	53/120
C	41%	29/70
D	39%	47/119
13	39%	47/120
Θ	35%	42/120
Ψ	33%	39/120
565	33%	39/120
P	29%	35/120
Ω	28%	34/120
A	27%	32/120
TR	26%	31/120

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

More recently, Kyoung Shik Min has analyzed \mathfrak{P}^{64+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

¹⁵ Skeat, "Four Gospels," 24.

¹⁶ William F. Jr. Warren, "P⁴ and the P⁷⁵-B Text in Luke" (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Orlando, 22 November, 1998). Cf. idem, "The Textual Relationships of P⁴, P⁴⁵, and P⁷⁵ in the Gospel of Luke" (Unpublished Th.D. diss.; New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1983). The SBL presentation was based on a corrected and expanded analysis.

¹⁷ Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (trans. E. F. Rhodes; 2d ed; Grand

current version of this method, a manuscript is classified in two ways: firstly, according to its general textual quality, i.e., the degree of correspondence with the reconstructed initial text, which in this case is equal to the printed text of NA²⁷; and, secondly, according to its transmission character, i.e., how well each scribe copied the exemplar. Three main categories are used for these classifications of textual quality or transmission character: “strict,” “normal” and “free”.¹⁸

As we have seen, Kurt and Barbara Aland classified \mathfrak{P}^4 as a “normal text” and \mathfrak{P}^{64+67} as a “strict text,” and they did not make any clear distinction between textual quality and transmission character.¹⁹ In his more detailed analysis, Min suggests that \mathfrak{P}^{64+67} has a “strict” text but at the same time reflects a “normal” transmission character.²⁰ Min’s study is devoted to Matthean papyri, but he nevertheless briefly comments in a footnote to his chapter on \mathfrak{P}^{64+67} that \mathfrak{P}^4 has a medium error rate (he counts thirty-eight deviations from the NA²⁷), and, thus, he characterizes it as a “normal transmission” without commenting on the textual quality.²¹

Textual analysis of \mathfrak{P}^4 and \mathfrak{P}^{64+67}

In the following I will apply this method to \mathfrak{P}^4 and \mathfrak{P}^{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 NA²⁷, 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 \mathfrak{P}^{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 NA²⁷ apparatus, supplemented with variation-units where each MS differs from

Rapids: Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill, 1989), 96-101; Barbara Aland, “Kriterien zur Beurteilung kleinerer Papyrusfragmente des Neuen Testaments,” in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel* (BETL 161; ed. A. Denaux; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 1-13; Kyoung Shik Min, *Die früheste Überlieferung des Matthäusevangeliums (bis zum 3./4. Jh.)* (ANTF 34; Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 2005), 37-41 (method); 165-82 (\mathfrak{P}^{64+67}).

¹⁸ The Alands and Min also use sub-categories like “at least normal” or “very free” (cf. Aland and Aland, *The Text*, 95, 100 (\mathfrak{P}^{69}); Min, *Überlieferung*, 252).

¹⁹ Aland and Aland, *The Text*, 96, 100.

²⁰ Min, *Überlieferung*, 165-182.

²¹ Min, *Überlieferung*, 182 n. 37, states: “ \mathfrak{P}^4 weist auf mittlere Fehleranfälligkeit (38 Abweichungen). Da der Textbereich von \mathfrak{P}^4 nicht gering ist . . . ist die Fehlerzahl auch nicht als allzu hoch einzuschätzen. Wir können \mathfrak{P}^4 also der ‘normalen’ Überlieferungsweise zuschreiben.”

²² Cf. Bart D. Ehrman, “A Problem of Textual Circularity: The Alands on the Classification of New Testament Manuscripts,” *Biblica* 70 (1989): 377-88.

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 3 Overview of \mathfrak{P}^4 and \mathfrak{P}^{64+67}

Gr.-Al. no.	Location, shelfmark, and <i>editio princeps</i>	Date ²³	Provenance	Reconstructed size (W x H)	Contents	Textual quality	Transmission character
\mathfrak{P}^4	Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale Suppl. Gr. 1120; Jean Merell, "Nouveaux fragments du papyrus 4," <i>RB</i> 47 (1938): 5-22. ²⁴	3d cent.	Coptos	ca. 13,5 x 17 cm	Luke 1:58-59; 62-2:1; 6-7; 3:8-4:2; 29-35; 5:3-8; 30-6:16	"strict"	"strict" (Aland and Aland: "normal")
\mathfrak{P}^{64+67}	Oxford, Magdalen College, Gr. 18B (\mathfrak{P}^{64}); C. H. Roberts, "An Early Papyrus of the First Gospel," <i>HTR</i> 46 (1953): 233-37; Montserrat, Abadia de Montserrat II 1 (\mathfrak{P}^{67}); R. Roca-Puig, <i>Un Papiro Griego del Evangelio de San Mateo</i> (Barcelona: Grafos S.A., 1962).	ca. 200	Luxor (Coptos?) ²⁵	ca. 13,5 x 17-18,5 cm ²⁶	Matthew 3:9, 15; 5:20-22, 25-28; 26:7-8, 10, 14-15, 22-23, 31-33	"strict"	"strict" (Aland and Aland: "strict"; Min: "normal")

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 \mathfrak{P}^4 (Paris Suppl. Gr. 1120)

Corrections to transcription in *editio princeps* (Merell)

Fr. A, recto, col. 1

ll. 29-30 (1:64): Read $\eta[\nu\epsilon\omega\chi\theta\eta]$ on l. 29-30 for $[\alpha\nu\epsilon\omega\chi\theta\eta]$ on l. 31.²⁸

²³ Date according to Kurt Aland et al., eds., *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (2d rev. and enl. ed. Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 1994). The *Liste* is now digital. Cited 27 January 2010. Online: <http://intf.uni-muenster.de/vmr/NTVMR/ListeHandschriften.php>. Note, however, that in the digital version the dating of \mathfrak{P}^{64+67} is now changed to 3d century. Recently, Roger Bagnall has questioned the dating of the New Testament papyri to the second century. See Bagnall, *Early Christian Books*, 1-24. Cf. Larry Hurtado, review of Roger S. Bagnall, *Early Christian Books in Egypt*, RBL [<http://www.bookreviews.org>] (2010).

²⁴ Earlier incomplete editions of \mathfrak{P}^4 had been published earlier: Vincent Scheil in "Archéologie, Varia," *RB* 1 (1892): 113-15; and idem, "Fragment d'Évangile," *MMAF* 9.2 (1893): 216.

²⁵ \mathfrak{P}^{64} was purchased in Luxor, Egypt.

²⁶ Here I follow Scott Charlesworth's reconstruction (13,5 x 17-18,5 cm). See Scott Charlesworth, "T. C. Skeat, \mathfrak{P}^{64+67} and \mathfrak{P}^4 , and the Problem of Fibre Orientation in Codicological Reconstruction," *NTS* 53 (2007): 587 n. 29.

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

Fr. B, recto, col. 1

l. 13 (3:11): Read $\overline{\beta}$ for $\delta\nu\eta$.²⁹

Fr. B, recto, col. 2

l. 23 (3:17): There is most likely a colon after $[\alpha]\sigma\beta\epsilon\sigma\tau\omega$ marking the end of a section.

l. 26 (3:18): Read a colon after $\lambda\alpha\omicron\nu$, marking the end of a section.

Fr. B, verso, col. 1

ll. 1-2 (3:20-21): Read a colon after $\phi\upsilon\lambda\alpha\kappa\eta$, followed by *ekthesis* where $\tau\omicron$ is projected into the left margin of l. 2 and surmounted by a *paragraphos*.

l. 2 (3:21): Read $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\theta\eta$ for $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\theta$.

l. 14 (3:22): Read a colon, marking the end of a section, after $\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\kappa\eta\sigma\alpha$ (not a stop).

l. 16 (3:23): Read $\cdot\overline{\lambda}\cdot$ for $\overline{\lambda}$.³⁰

l. 33 (3:29): Read $[[\overline{\omega}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon]]$ $\eta\eta\sigma\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\cdot$ for $\eta\eta\sigma\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon$.³¹

Fr. B, verso, col. 2

ll. 2-3 (3:30): Read $\epsilon\lambda\iota\alpha\kappa\epsilon[\iota\mu]$ for $\epsilon\lambda\iota\alpha[\kappa\epsilon\mu]\iota$.³²

ll. 4-5 (3:31): Read $[\mu\alpha\tau]\tau\alpha\theta\alpha\cdot\ \tau[\omicron\upsilon]\ \nu\alpha\theta\alpha\mu\cdot$ for $[\mu\epsilon\tau]\tau[\alpha\theta\alpha\cdot\ \tau\omicron\upsilon]\ \nu\alpha\delta\alpha\mu\cdot$.

l. 7 (3:32): The papyrus seems to read $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \beta\alpha[\dots]$, not $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \beta[\omicron\omicron\sigma]$, but the reading is uncertain.

l. 9 (3:33): Read $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ [\alpha\delta]\alpha\mu\cdot\ [\tau\omicron\upsilon]$ for $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\mu[\iota\nu\alpha\delta\alpha\beta\cdot\ \tau\omicron\upsilon]$.

l. 16 (3:35): Read $\sigma\epsilon\rho\upsilon[\chi\cdot\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \rho\alpha\gamma\alpha\upsilon\cdot]$ for $\sigma\epsilon\rho\upsilon[\chi\cdot\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \rho\alpha\gamma\alpha\upsilon\cdot]$.

l. 18 (3:36): Read $\kappa\alpha\iota\nu[\alpha\mu\cdot]$ for $\kappa\alpha[\iota]\nu\cdot$.

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 $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$.)

Fr. C, recto, col. 1

l. 9 (4:31): Read $[\epsilon\iota\varsigma]\ [\kappa\alpha]\phi\alpha[\rho\nu\alpha\omicron\upsilon\mu\ \rho\omicron\lambda\iota\nu]$ for $[\epsilon\iota\varsigma]\ [\kappa\alpha]\phi\alpha\rho\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\ \rho\omicron\lambda\iota$.

Fr. C, verso, col. 2

ll. 3-4 (5:3): Read $[\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu\ \omicron]\lambda\iota\gamma\omicron\nu\ \delta\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\theta\iota[\sigma\alpha\varsigma]$ for $\gamma[\epsilon\iota\nu\ \omicron]\lambda\iota\gamma\omicron\nu\ \delta\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\theta\iota[\sigma\alpha\varsigma]$.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 $\eta\eta\sigma\upsilon\upsilon$ 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 $\eta\eta\sigma\upsilon\upsilon$, which is very awkward and looks more like a *rho*, may possibly have been the *upsilon* in $\tau\omicron\upsilon$, 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 $\delta\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\theta\iota\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ 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 [σι]γ πυκνα και δεη for [σιν πυκνα και δεη].

l. 27 (5:35): Read ο γυμφ[ι]ος τοτε νη for ο γυμφ[ι]ος τοτε νη.

ll. 33-34 (5:36): Read απο ματιου [[παλαιου]] καινου.³⁴

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. 1-2 (6:4): Read κ[αι ε]δω[κε]ν τρι[ς μετ] for κ[αι εδωκε]ν τρις [μετ].³⁵

ll. 7-8 (6:5): Read ο υ[ιος] του ανθρωπου [και] τ[ο]υ [σ]αββα[τ]ου for [και του σαββατου ο υιος] του ανθρωπου.³⁶

Fr. D, recto, col. 2

l. 12 (6:12): Read εις τ[ο] for εις τ[ο].

l. 24 (6:14): Read ο[ν] και ωνομασεν].³⁷

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 \mathfrak{P}^4 most likely supports the printed text of NA²⁷ (no information is indicated for \mathfrak{P}^4 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 a 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. \mathfrak{P}^4 follows other Alexandrian witnesses in harmonizing the text to Mark 2:28.

³⁷ Merell does not transcribe this line. Cf. Skeat, "Four Gospels," 7 n. 4.

1:61

a: lac

1:63

a: λέγων] om D *pc* e *sy^s* *bo^{ms}*

b: ὄνομα] τὸ ὄνομα \mathfrak{N} A B² C D W Θ Ψ *f*¹⁻¹³ 33 \mathfrak{M} // *txt* \mathfrak{P}^4 B* L Ξ 565 579 700 / 2211 *pc*; Or
 c (*vss* 63-64; cf. Mark 7:35): καὶ ἐθαύμασαν πάντες. ἀνεώχθη δὲ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ παραχρῆμα καὶ
 ἡ γλῶσσα] // καὶ ἐθαύμασαν πάντες. ἀνεώχθη δὲ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ παραχρῆμα καὶ ἐλύθη ὁ
 δεσμὸς τῆς γλώσσης *f*¹ *pc* // καὶ παραχρῆμα ἐλύθη ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐθαύμασαν πάντες.
 ἀνεώχθη δὲ τὸ στόμα D a b *vg^{ms}* (*sy^s*) // καὶ ἐθαύμασαν πάντες. ἀνεώχθη παραχρῆμα τὸ
 στόμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα \mathfrak{P}^{4vid} (ἠνεώχθη) 213 472

O: πινακίδιον] πινακείδιον \mathfrak{P}^4

1:64

O: ἀνεώχθη] ἠνεώχθη \mathfrak{P}^4 205 983

1:65

a: φόβος] add τοὺς ἀκούοντας ταῦτα καὶ Θ *arm*b: τῆς Ἰουδαίας] add καὶ \mathfrak{P}^4 W 1675 b c ec: διελαλεῖτο] ἐλαλεῖτο \mathfrak{P}^4 1675 b c e // διὰ \mathfrak{N}^* d: πάντα] om \mathfrak{N}^* L 1241 1424 *pc sy^{s,p}* *bo^{mss}*

1:66

a: αὐτῶν] ἐαυτῶν \mathfrak{P}^4 Bb: γάρ] om A C² Θ 0130 *f*¹⁻¹³ 33 \mathfrak{M} *sy^{p,h}* // *txt* \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N} B C* D L W Ψ 565 *pc latt sy^{hmg}* *co*c: ἦν] om D *it vg^{ms}* *sy^s*

1:67

a: ἐπροφήτευσεν λέγων] εἶπεν D

1:68

a: κύριος] om \mathfrak{P}^4 W *it vgst* *sy^s* *sa^{mss}*; Cyp

1:69

a: οἶκω] τῷ οἶκω A Θ Ψ 0130 \mathfrak{M} // *txt* \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N} B C D L W *f*¹⁻¹³ 33 565 579 700 892 1241 / 844 / 2211 *pc*

1:70

a: τῶν ἀγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ] ἀγίων προφητῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος D *it*; Ir^{lat} //
 τῶν ἀγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος αὐτοῦ προφητῶν \mathfrak{N} W; Eus // τῶν ἀγίων τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν
 αὐτοῦ A C Θ Ψ *f*¹ \mathfrak{M} // *txt* \mathfrak{P}^4 B L Δ 0130 *f*¹³ 33 579 / 844 *pc vg*

1:74

a: lac

1:75

a: πάσαις ταῖς ἡμέραις] πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας \mathfrak{N} A C D Θ Ψ 0130 0177 *f*¹⁻¹³ 33 \mathfrak{M} ; Ir^{lat} Or // *txt* \mathfrak{P}^{4vid}
 B L W 565 579 *pc Or^{lat}*

b: ἡμέραις] add τῆς ζῆς Γ Θ *f*¹⁻¹³ 1424 2542 / 844 / 2211 *pm sy^s*; Or

1:76

a: ἐνώπιον] πρὸ προσώπου A C D L Θ Ψ 0130 f^{1-13} 33 \mathfrak{M} sy; Ir^{lat} // *txt* \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N} B W 0177 *pc*; Or
 b: κυρίου] τοῦ κυρίου \mathfrak{P}^4

1:77

a:³⁸ lac

1:78

a: lac

1:79

a: ἐπιφᾶναι] φῶς D // *txt* \mathfrak{P}^{4vid} *rell*

2:6

a: lac

2:7

a: τὸν πρωτότοκον] om W

b-c: lac

3:8

a-b: lac

3:9

a:³⁹ καρπὸν καλόν] καρπὸν \mathfrak{P}^4 lat; Or // καρπούς καλοῦς D sy^{s.c.p} (cf. Matt 7:17-18)O: ἀξίνη] ἀξείνη \mathfrak{P}^4 B D Θ

3:10

a: ποιήσωμεν] ποιήσωμεν ἵνα σωθῶμεν D sa^{mss} (cf. Acts 16:30) // ποιήσωμεν ἵνα ζῶμεν b q
 vg^{mss} sa^{mss}

3:11

a:⁴⁰ lac

3:12

a: βαπτισθῆναι] ὁμοίως βαπτισθῆναι D a

b: ποιήσωμεν] ποιήσωμεν ἵνα σωθῶμεν D

O: εἶπαν] εἶπον \mathfrak{P}^4 *rell* // *txt* C* D W Ψ

3:14

a:⁴¹ τί ποιήσωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς] καὶ ἡμεῖς τί ποιήσωμεν A C³ Θ Ψ 33 \mathfrak{M} a sy^h (*pm* ποιήσομεν) // τί
 ποιήσωμεν ἵνα σωθῶμεν D // *txt* \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N} B C* L W Ξ f^{1-13} 579 892 1241 *pc* lat sy^{s.c.p}

³⁸ \mathfrak{P}^4 is partly lacunose, αυ[...], but supports either αὐτῶν (*txt*) or, less likely, αὐτοῦ (W 0177 565 *pc*), but not ἡμῶν (A C Θ Ψ f^1 579 l 844 *al* vg^{mss}).

³⁹ NA²⁷ indicates “ \mathfrak{P}^{4vid} ” in this unit, but the papyrus undoubtedly omits καλόν.

⁴⁰ \mathfrak{P}^4 is partly lacunose, (]εν), but does not support λέγει (A C² D Θ Ψ \mathfrak{M}). It probably reads ἔλεγεν (*txt* \mathfrak{N} B C* L N f^{1-13} 33 579 700 892 1241 l 844 *pc*), since εἶπεν is a singular reading (W).

⁴¹ \mathfrak{P}^4 reads τι ποιη[σω]μεν και ημεεις supporting *txt*, which is not indicated in NA²⁷.

b:⁴² αὐτοῖς] πρὸς αὐτούς \mathfrak{N}^2 A C³ W Ψ f¹³ \mathfrak{M} sy^h// txt \mathfrak{P}^4 B C* D L Θ Ξ 1 33 700 892 2542 pc
c: μηδέ] μηδένα \mathfrak{N}^2 H (^f1241) 2542 pc sy^{s.c.p}

3:15

a: περὶ τοῦ Ἰωάννου] om 131 sy^c

O: Ἰωάννου] Ἰωάνου \mathfrak{P}^4 B D

3:16

a: ἀπεκρίνατο λέγων πᾶσιν ὁ Ἰωάννης] ἐπιγνοὺς τὰ διανοήματα αὐτῶν εἶπεν D

b: ὑμᾶς] ὑμᾶς εἰς μετόπισθεν C D 892 1424 pc it vg^{mss} (cf. Matt 3:11)

c: ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου] ὁ δὲ ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μου ἔστιν D 1 (cf. Matt 3:11)

d: ἀγίω] om 64; Tert

O: ἀπεκρίνατο] ἀπεκρίνατο \mathfrak{P}^4 B Θ

(Note also that \mathfrak{P}^4 is inconsistent in the spelling of the name Ἰωάννης.)

3:17

a:⁴³ διακαθᾶραι . . . συναγαγεῖν] καὶ διακαθαριεῖ . . . συνάξει \mathfrak{N}^2 A C (D) L W Θ Ξ Ψ f¹ f¹³ 33 \mathfrak{M}
lat sy sa^{ms} bo^{pt} // txt \mathfrak{P}^{4vid} \mathfrak{N}^2 B pc (a) e sa^{mss} bo^{pt}; Ir^{lat} (sed: ^Fσυνάξει)

b: τὸν σῖτον] τὸν μὲν σῖτον (D) G Θ f¹³ pc

c: αὐτοῦ] om \mathfrak{N}^2 D pc e bo^{pt}; Ir^{lat}

3:18

a: παρακαλῶν] παραινῶν D

3:19

a: τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ] Φιλίππου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ A C K W Ψ 33 565 579 1424 2542 al sy^{p.h} sa^{mss} bo

3:20

a: lac

3:22

a: ὡς] ὡσεὶ A Θ Ψ f^{1,13} \mathfrak{M} // txt \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N}^2 B D L W 070 33 579 1241 pc

b: ἐπ' αὐτόν] εἰς αὐτόν D

c: σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα] υἱός μου εἶ σὺ ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε

D it; Ju (Cl) Meth Hil Aug (cf. LXX Ps 2:7) // σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα

X pc f bo^{pt} (cf. Matt 3:17) // οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα 1574 pc (cf.

Matt 3:17)

d: σωματικῶ] πνεύματι (πνι) \mathfrak{P}^4

3:23-31

a:⁴⁴ A major rewriting in D (and d) with the genealogy of Matt 1:6-16 (in reverse order)

⁴² NA²⁷ indicates some uncertainty (“ \mathfrak{P}^{4vid} ”), but the papyrus clearly supports the printed reading.

⁴³ This variation-unit is divided into two separate units in NA²⁷. 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.

3:23b-38

a:⁴⁵ om vss 23-38 W [vss 23b-38] 579

3:23

a: ἀρχόμενος] ἐρχόμενος 700 // om 1555 pc e f sy^{s,p} sab: υἱός ὡς ἐνομιζέτο] ὡς ἐνομιζέτο υἱός A Θ 0102 f¹³ 33 \mathfrak{M} sy^h // txt \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N} B L W Ψ 070 f¹ 892
1241 / 2211 pcc:⁴⁶ Ἰωσήφ] Ἰωσήφ τοῦ Ἰακώβ (D) N^c Θ pcO: Ἥλι] Ἥλει \mathfrak{P}^{4vid} \mathfrak{N} A B Θ Ψ f^{1,13} 700 1424 \mathfrak{M}

3:24

O:⁴⁷ Μαθθάτ] Μαθθάθ \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N}^1 // Μαεθάθ \mathfrak{N}^* // Μαθθάν D // Ματθάτ A B Θ Ψ \mathfrak{M} // Ματθάν L
f^{1,13} 700 1424 alO: Λευί] Λευεί \mathfrak{P}^{4vid} \mathfrak{N} B^c Θ f^{1,13} 1424 al // Ἥλει B^{*}O: Μελχί] Μελχει \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N} A B L Θ f^{1,13} 1424 al

3:25

O: Ἐσλί] Ἐσλαί \mathfrak{P}^4 // Ἐσλεί \mathfrak{N} A B Θ f¹ al // Ἐσσαι f¹³ pc // Ἐσλίμ Ψ pc // Ἐσλείμ 1424 pc

3:26

O: Μάαθ] Μάατ \mathfrak{P}^4 Θ f¹³ 1424 pcO: Σεμεῖν] Σεμεεῖν \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N} B L Θ // Σεμεεῖ A Ψ f^{1,13} \mathfrak{M} // Σεμεῖ 33 700 1424 pc

3:27

a: τοῦ Ῥησά] τοῦ οὐ Ῥησαῦ \mathfrak{P}^4 O: Ῥησά] Ῥησαῦ \mathfrak{P}^4 // Ῥασά f¹³

3:28

a (orthographic variation-unit): Ελμαδάμ] Ἐλμωδάμ A (Γ) Θ Ψ 0102 f^{1,(13)}} \mathfrak{M} aur // Ἐλμασάμ
 \mathfrak{P}^4 // txt \mathfrak{N} B L N^{vid} (070) 33 1424 pc latO: Νηρί] Νηρεί \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N} A B L Θ f^{1,13} 1424 \mathfrak{M} O: Μελχί] Μελχει \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N} A B L Θ f^{1,13} 1424 \mathfrak{M} O: Ἄδδί] Ἀδδει \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N} A B Θ f¹ 1424 \mathfrak{M} // Ἄνδι L // Ἰαδδί 700

3:29

O: Ἐλιέζερ] Ἐλιαίζερ \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N}^* // Ἐλαιίζερ \mathfrak{N}^1 // Ἐλεέζερ f¹³O: Ἰωρίμ] Ἰωρείμ \mathfrak{P}^4 A B L Θ Ψ 1424 pc // Ἰωραίμ f¹ // Ἰωρέμ f¹³O: Λευί] Λευεί \mathfrak{P}^{4vid} \mathfrak{N} A B L Θ f¹ al // om 1424

⁴⁵ At this point there is an error in NA²⁷ 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 Ἥλι τοῦ Μαθθάτ in a Latin MS (c) is treated in the same variation-unit in NA²⁷. I do not include this unit in the analysis because it is attested only in a single Latin MS.

⁴⁶ Codex D has the addition within the major rewriting.

⁴⁷ 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 NA²⁷) in this particular verse. On the other hand, several MSS including \mathfrak{P}^4 have this spelling in 3:29 (cf. Matt 1:15 where NA²⁷ has the spelling Ματθάν).

3:30

O: Ἐλιακίμ] Ἐλιακείμ $\mathfrak{P}^{4\text{vid}}$

3:31

a: τοῦ Μεννά] om A

b (orthographic variation-unit): Ναθάμ] Ναθάν \mathfrak{N}^2 A L Θ Ψ $f^{1.13}$ 33 \mathfrak{M} sy bo // txt \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N}^* B pc it
O:⁴⁸ Δαυίδ] Δαυείδ $\mathfrak{P}^{4\text{vid}}$ A B D Θ L f^1 pc

3:32

a (orthographic variation-unit): Ἰωβήδ] Ἰωβήλ \mathfrak{N}^* B sy^s // Ἰωβήτ \mathfrak{P}^4 // Ὠβήλ D^c // Ὠβήδ D^c Θ
 f^1 \mathfrak{M} lat sy^{ph} // txt \mathfrak{N}^2 A L Γ Δ Ψ f^{13} 33 892 1241 1424 al c

b: lac

c: Σαλά] Σαλαμών \mathfrak{N}^2 A D L Θ Ψ 0102 ($f^{1.13}$) 33 \mathfrak{M} latt sy^{ph} bo (cf. Matt 1:4) // txt \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N}^* B sy^s sa bo^{mss}

3:33

a: τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ τοῦ Ἀδμίν τοῦ Ἀρνί] τοῦ Ἀδμίν τοῦ Ἀρνί B // τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ τοῦ Ἀράμ A D 33
565 (1424) l 2211 pm lat sy^p (cf. Matt 1:3-4) // τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ τοῦ Ἀράμ τοῦ Ἰωράμ K Δ Ψ 700
(^s892) 2542 pm b e (sy^h) // τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ τοῦ Ἀράμ τοῦ Ἀδμί τοῦ Ἀρνί (N) Θ (0102 1) pc //
τοῦ Ἀδάμ τοῦ Ἀδμίν τοῦ Ἀρνί $\mathfrak{P}^{4\text{vid}}$ \mathfrak{N}^* 1241 pc sa et v.l. al // txt \mathfrak{N}^2 L X (Γ) f^{13} pc bo

b: τοῦ Φάρες] om A

O: Ἀδμίν] Ἀδμείν \mathfrak{P}^4 B L

3:35

a (orthographic variation-unit): Σερούχ] Σερούκ D // txt $\mathfrak{P}^{4\text{vid}}$ rell

b: lac

3:36

a:⁴⁹ τοῦ¹] om $\mathfrak{P}^{75\text{vid}}$ D

O: lac (Καϊνάμ/Καϊνάν)

3:37

a (orthographic variation-unit): Ἰάρετ] Ἰάρεδ B² D L $f^{1.13}$ 33 \mathfrak{M} vg sy sa^{mss} bo^{pt} // Ἰάρεθ A K Θ Ψ
pc b c r¹ bo^{pt} // txt $\mathfrak{P}^{4\text{vid}.75\text{vid}}$ \mathfrak{N}^* B^{*} a aur l qb (orthographic variation-unit): Μαλελεήλ] Μελελεήλ \mathfrak{N}^* A N f^{13} l 2211 pc sa^{mss} bo^{pt} // txt $\mathfrak{P}^{4\text{vid}}$ rell

c: lac (Καϊνάμ/Καϊνάν)

4:1

a:⁵⁰ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ] εἰς τὴν ἔρημον A Θ Ξ 0102 $f^{1.13}$ 33 \mathfrak{M} lat (cf. Matt 4:1; Mark 1:12) // txt $\mathfrak{P}^{4.7.75}$
 \mathfrak{N}^* B D L W 579 892 1241 pc it

4:2

a: διαβόλου] σατανᾶ D pc e sy^s (cf. Mark 1:13)b: οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲν] οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲν οὐδὲ ἔπιεν f^{13} pc⁴⁸ Many MSS have the *nomen sacrum* δαδ here (e.g., \mathfrak{N}^* Ψ f^{13} 33 700 1424).⁴⁹ The variation-unit in NA²⁷ also involves the textual variation of the name Καϊνάμ/Καϊνάν, but this part is illegible in \mathfrak{P}^4 .⁵⁰ NA²⁷ indicates $\mathfrak{P}^{4\text{vid}}$ (txt), but according to my transcription \mathfrak{P}^4 clearly supports txt.

4:29

a: ὥστε] εἰς τό A C Ψ (1424) \mathfrak{M} // *txt* $\mathfrak{P}^{4\text{vid}}$ \mathfrak{N} B D L W Θ $f^{1.13}$ 33 579 700 892 1241 2542 *pc*; Or

4:31

a (orthographic variation-unit):⁵¹ Καφαρναούμ] Καπερναούμ A C L Θ (Ψ) 0102 $f^{1.13}$ \mathfrak{M} q // *txt* \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N} B D W 33 579 / 844 / 2211 *pc* lat; $\text{Mcion}^{\text{T,A}}$ Or

b: Γαλιλαίας] Γαλιλαίας τήν παραθαλασσίον ἐν ὀρίοις Ζαβουλῶν καὶ Νεφθαλίμ D (cf. Matt 4:13)

4:33

a: lac

4:34

a: lac

b: ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς] ἡμᾶς ὧδε ἀπολέσαι D // *txt* $\mathfrak{P}^{4\text{vid}}$ *rell*

4:35

a-d: lac

5:3

a: lac

b: ὀλίγον] ὅσον ὅσον D

c:⁵² καθίσας δέ] καὶ καθίσας A C Θ Ψ $f^{1.13}$ 33^{vid} 1424 \mathfrak{M} lat sy^h // δὲ καθίσας \mathfrak{P}^4 d: ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου] ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ \mathfrak{N} D e sa // ἀπὸ τοῦ πλοίου $f^{1.13}$ e: ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου ἐδίδασκεν] ἐδίδασκεν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου \mathfrak{P}^4 A C L Q W Θ Ψ ($f^{1.13}$) 33 579 \mathfrak{M} al // *txt* (\mathfrak{N}) B (D) 1424 d e *pc*

5:4

a: χαλάσατε] χαλάσαι $\mathfrak{P}^{4\text{vid}}$

5:5

a: lac

b:⁵³ εἶπεν] εἶπεν αὐτῷ A C D L W Θ Ψ $f^{1.13}$ 33 \mathfrak{M} lat sy sa // *txt* $\mathfrak{P}^{4\text{vid}.75}$ \mathfrak{N} B 700 2542 *pc* e bo

c: ἐπιστάτα] διδάσκαλε D

d-e: lac

5:6

a:⁵⁴ τὰ δίκτυα] τὸ δίκτυον A C Ψ f^{13} 33 \mathfrak{M} b vg sy^{p,h}

5:7

a: ἐν τῷ ἐτέρῳ] τοῖς ἐν τῷ ἐτέρῳ A C Θ $f^{1.13}$ 33 \mathfrak{M} lat sa // *txt* $\mathfrak{P}^{4\text{vid}.75}$ \mathfrak{N} B D L W Ψ 579 700 *pc* a

b: συλλαβέσθαι] βοηθεῖν D

c: ὥστε] ὥστε παρά τι D c e r¹ vg^{cl} sy^{s,p,hmg} // ὥστε ἤδη C // *txt* $\mathfrak{P}^{4\text{vid}}$ *rell*

⁵¹ In this unit NA²⁷ does not indicate any information for \mathfrak{P}^4 , although it clearly supports *txt*, κα]φα[ρναουμ.

⁵² Variation-units c-d are treated as one variation-unit in NA²⁷.

⁵³ NA²⁷ does not give any information for \mathfrak{P}^4 , but there is not enough space for αὐτῷ (IGNTP indicates $\mathfrak{P}^{4\text{vid}}$ for εἶπεν).

⁵⁴ This is for the part of the variation-unit in NA²⁷ where \mathfrak{P}^4 is extant .

5:8

a: ἰδὼν δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος] ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Σίμων W f^{13} 892 1241 *pc a b e r¹ sy^{hmg}* // ὁ δὲ Σίμων D // *txt*
 $\mathfrak{P}^{4\text{vid}}$ [ιδων δε σιμ]ων πε[τρος] *rell*

b: τοῖς γόνασιν Ἰησοῦ] τοῖς γόνασιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ A C L Θ Ψ $f^{1,13}$ 33 579 1241 1424
 l 844 l 2211 *al*

c: ἔξελθε] παρακαλῶ ἔξελθε D

5:30

a-b: lac

O: πίνετε] πείνετε \mathfrak{P}^4 B

5:31

a: ὁ Ἰησοῦς] Ἰησοῦς \mathfrak{P}^4 B // om W 1241b: πρὸς αὐτούς] πρὸς αὐτόν $\mathfrak{P}^{4\text{vid}}$ // αὐτοῖς L Ξ 33

5:32

a: ἀμαρτωλούς] ἀσεβεῖς \mathfrak{N}^*

5:33

a: οἱ μαθηταί] διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταί \mathfrak{N}^{*-2} A C D Θ Ψ $f^{1,13}$ \mathfrak{M} latt sy bo^{pt} (cf. Matt 9:14) // *txt* \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N}^1 B
 L W Ξ 33 892* 1241 *pc sa bo^{pt}*

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

c: σοὶ ἐσθίουσιν καὶ πίνουσιν] μαθηταὶ σου οὐδὲν τούτων ποιοῦσιν D e

O: Ἰωάννου] Ἰωάνου \mathfrak{P}^4 B DO: φαρισαίων] φαρεισαίων \mathfrak{P}^4 BO: πίνουσιν] πείνουσιν \mathfrak{P}^4 B

5:34

a: Ἰησοῦς] om A Θ Ψ \mathfrak{M} latt sy bo^{pt} // *txt* \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N} B C D L W Ξ $f^{1,13}$ 33 579 892 1241 2542 l 844 l
 2211 *al f sy^{hmg} co*

b-d: lac

5:36

a: τὸ ἐπίβληματὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ] τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ ἐπίβλημα D // τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ A Ψ
 \mathfrak{M} // *txt* $\mathfrak{P}^{4\text{corrvid}}$ \mathfrak{N} B C L W Θ $f^{1,13}$ 33 579 700 892 1241 1424 2542 l 844 l 2211 *al lat sy* // τὸ
 ἐπίβλημα τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ παλαιοῦ *txt* $\mathfrak{P}^{4*\text{vid}}$

5:37

a: ῥήξει] ῥήγνυσι \mathfrak{P}^4 // ῥήσσει C Γ Λ *pc b fl q*

5:38

a: βλητέον] βάλλουσιν \mathfrak{N}^* D it sy^p; Mcion^A (cf. Matt 9:17) // βάλλεται W

b:⁵⁵ βλητέον] add καὶ ἀμφοτέροι συντηροῦνται A C (D) Θ Ψ $f^{1,13}$ \mathfrak{M} latt sy (bo^{mss}); Mcion^A (cf.
 Matt 9:17) // *txt* $\mathfrak{P}^{4,75}$ \mathfrak{N} B L W f^1 33 579 700 1241 2542 *pc co*

⁵⁵ NA²⁷ indicates that the addition seems to be absent in \mathfrak{P}^{75} , but with the publication of a new fragment this is now certain. See Marie-Luise Lakmann, "Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV (\mathfrak{P}^{75}) Neue Fragmente," *Museum Helveticum* 64 (2007): 27. (The new fragment contains Luke 5:37-6:3.)

5:39

a: [καί] οὐδείς πίων παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστίν] om D it; Eus
 b:⁵⁶ [καί]] om $\mathfrak{P}^{4.75\text{vid}}$ \mathfrak{N}^2 B C* 579 700 892 1241 // *txt* *rell*
 c:⁵⁷ θέλει] εὐθέως θέλει A C² Θ Ψ f^{13} 33 \mathfrak{M} *latt sy* // *txt* $\mathfrak{P}^{4.75\text{vid}}$ \mathfrak{N} B C* L W f^1 579 1241 *pc co*
 d:⁵⁸ χρηστός] χρηστότερος A C Θ Ψ $f^{1.13}$ 33 \mathfrak{M} *lat sy^h* // *txt* $\mathfrak{P}^{4.75\text{vid}}$ \mathfrak{N} B C* L W f^1 579 1241
pc co

6:1

a:⁵⁹ ἐν σαββάτῳ] ἐν σαββάτῳ δευτεροπρώτῳ A C D Θ Ψ (f^{13}) \mathfrak{M} *lat sy^h*; Eriph // *sabbato mane*
e // *txt* $\mathfrak{P}^{4.75\text{vid}}$ \mathfrak{N} B L W f^1 33 579 1241 2542 *pc it sy^{p,hmg} sa bo^{pt}*
 b: καὶ ἔτιλλον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ] οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο τίλλειν D
 c:⁶⁰ καὶ ἥσθιον τοὺς στάχυας ψώχοντες ταῖς χερσίν] τοὺς στάχυας καὶ ψώχοντες ταῖς χερσίν
 ἥσθιον D (e) *f syr* // τοὺς στάχυας καὶ ἥσθιον ψώχοντες ταῖς χερσίν (\mathfrak{N}) A C³ W Θ Ψ $f^{1.13}$ 33
 \mathfrak{M} *lat sy^h* // *txt* $\mathfrak{P}^{4.75\text{vid}}$ B (C*) L (579) 700 892 1241 2542 *pc*

6:2

a:⁶¹ τί ποιεῖτε ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν] Ἐιδέ, τί ποιοῦσιν οἱ μαθηταὶ σου τοῖς σάββασιν ὃ
 οὐκ ἔξεστι D (cf. Matt 12:2) // τί ποιεῖτε ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ποιεῖν τοῖς σάββασιν (\mathfrak{N}) A C (L) Θ
 (Ψ) $f^{1.13}$ (33) \mathfrak{M} *q sy^{(p).h} bo^{pt}* // *txt* $\mathfrak{P}^{4.75\text{vid}}$ B 700 *pc lat sa bo^{pt}*
 O: εἶπαν] εἶπον \mathfrak{P}^4 A B \mathfrak{N} C L Θ Ψ $f^{1.13}$ 33 \mathfrak{M} *al* // *txt* W X // (ἔλεγον D 579 it)
 O: φαρισαίων] φαρεισαίων \mathfrak{P}^4 B Θ

6:3

a: πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς] ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν \mathfrak{N} L W Θ Ψ *al vg sy^h* // ὁ Ἰησοῦς
 εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς A C³ (D) K $f^{(1).13}$ 565 892 1241 *al it sy^p* // πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν 700
 2542 *pc* // *txt* (\mathfrak{P}^4) (B) $\mathfrak{P}^{75\text{vid}}$ C* \mathfrak{M}
 b:⁶² ὁ Ἰησοῦς] Ἰησοῦς \mathfrak{P}^4 B
 c: ὅτε] ὁπότε A Θ f^{13} \mathfrak{M} // *txt* \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N} B C D L W Δ Ψ f^1 579 892 1241 1424 2542 *al*
 d: [ὄντες]] om \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N} B D L W Θ f^1 33 579 700 892 1241 2542 *pc* // *txt* A C Ψ f^{13} \mathfrak{M}

6:4

a: [ὥς]] πῶς \mathfrak{N}^2 L Θ $f^{1.13}$ 33 700 1241 1424 *pc co* // om \mathfrak{P}^4 B D *sy^p* // *txt* \mathfrak{N}^* A C W Ψ \mathfrak{M}
 b:⁶³ λαβών] ἔλαβεν καὶ A C³ Ψ \mathfrak{M} // om \mathfrak{N} D K W $f^{1.13}$ 565 579 700 1241 2542 *al*; Ir^{lat} (cf. Matt
 12:4) // *txt* \mathfrak{P}^4 B C* L Θ 892 *pc*
 c:⁶⁴ ἔδωκεν] ἔδωκεν καὶ \mathfrak{N} A D Θ f^{13} 33 \mathfrak{M} *sy^h bo* // *txt* $\mathfrak{P}^{4\text{vid}}$ B C* L Θ 892 *pc*

⁵⁶ The new fragment of \mathfrak{P}^{75} increases the likelihood that the papyrus omits καί, but it is not absolutely certain.

⁵⁷ The new fragment makes the reading of \mathfrak{P}^{75} without εὐθέως (*txt*) almost certain.

⁵⁸ NA²⁷ does not give information for \mathfrak{P}^{75} , but the new fragment makes it likely that \mathfrak{P}^{75} attests to the printed reading.

⁵⁹ While NA²⁷ does not give information for \mathfrak{P}^{75} , the new fragment makes it likely that \mathfrak{P}^{75} attests to the printed reading.

⁶⁰ As for the preceding note.

⁶¹ The new fragment of \mathfrak{P}^{75} makes it practically certain that it agrees with *txt*.

⁶² Variation-units a-b are treated as one variation-unit in NA²⁷.

⁶³ NA²⁷ indicates $\mathfrak{P}^{4\text{vid}}$ (*txt*), but according to my transcription (and the *ed. pr.*), \mathfrak{P}^4 clearly supports the printed reading.

⁶⁴ NA²⁷ does not give the reading of \mathfrak{P}^4 ; however, according to my transcription, it seems that \mathfrak{P}^4 supports the printed reading.

d: ἱερεῖς] add τῆ αὐτῆ ἡμέρα θεασάμενός τινα ἐργαζόμενον τῷ σαββάτῳ εἶπεν αὐτῷ. Ἄνθρωπε, εἰ μὲν οἶδας τί ποιεῖς, μακάριος εἶ· εἰ δὲ μὴ οἶδας, ἐπικατάρατος καὶ παραβάτης εἶ τοῦ νόμου.
D

6:5

a: transposition of v. 5 after v. 10 in D

b:⁶⁵ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς] ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι \mathfrak{N}^2 A D L Θ Ψ f^{13} 33 \mathfrak{M} latt // txt \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N}^* B W f^1 579 700 pc

c:⁶⁶ τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου] ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου \mathfrak{P}^{4vid} A D L Θ Ψ f^{13} 33 \mathfrak{M} lat sy^h sa bo^{pt}; Mcion^E (cf. Mark 2:28) // txt \mathfrak{N}^2 B W 1241 sy^p bo^{pt}

6:6

a: Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν καὶ διδάσκειν. καὶ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖ καὶ ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ἡ δεξιὰ ἦν ξηρά.] Καὶ εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ πάλιν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν σαββάτῳ ἐν ἧ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ξηρὰν ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα D

6:7

a: αὐτόν] om A Θ Ψ f^1 \mathfrak{M} lat bo^{mss} // txt \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N}^2 B D L W f^{13} 33 579 892 1241 1424 pc sy co

b: θεραπεύει] θεραπεύσει \mathfrak{P}^4 B Θ f^1 (f^{13} 33) \mathfrak{M} bo (cf. Mark 3:2) // txt \mathfrak{N}^2 A D L W Ψ 565 579 2542 pc

c: εὗρωσιν κατηγορεῖν] εὗρωσιν κατηγορίαν \mathfrak{N}^2 A L W f^{13} 33 \mathfrak{M} r¹ sy^{hmg} bo // εὗρωσιν κατηγορήσαι D // κατηγορήσωσιν Ψ (2542) pc bo^{mss} (cf. Matt 12:10; Mark 3:2) // txt \mathfrak{P}^{4vid} \mathfrak{N}^* B Θ f^1 1241 al sa

d: αὐτοῦ] κατ' αὐτοῦ \mathfrak{N}^2 K L W 33 565 579 892 1424 al

O: φαρισαῖοι] φαρισαῖοι \mathfrak{P}^4 B

6:8

a: ἦδει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν, εἶπεν δὲ] γινώσκων τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν λέγει D b f

b: καὶ] ὁ δέ A K Γ Δ f^{13} 565 \mathfrak{M} sy^h

6:9

a: ὁ Ἰησοῦς] Ἰησοῦς \mathfrak{P}^4 B

b: ἐπερωτῶ] ἐπερωτήσω A D Θ Ψ $f^{(1).13}$ 33 \mathfrak{M} it sa bo^{ms} // txt \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N}^2 B L W bo

c: εἰ] τί A Θ Ψ f^{13} 33 \mathfrak{M} q r¹ sy // txt \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N}^2 B D L W 579 892 1241 pc lat co; Mcion^T

d: ἀπολέσαι] ἀποκτεῖναι A Θ \mathfrak{M} e sy^h (cf. Mark 3:4) // txt \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N}^2 B D L W Ψ f^{13} 579 892 1241 2542 pc lat sy^{p,hmg}; Mcion^T

e: ἀπολέσαι] add οἱ δὲ ἐσιώπων D Λ al (bo^{pt}) (cf. Mark 3:4)

6:10

a: εἶπεν] ἐν ὀργῇ εἶπεν (λέγει D) D X Θ Λ $f^{(1).13}$ (2542) al it sy^h

b: ἐποίησεν] ἐξέτεινεν \mathfrak{N}^2 D (W) f^{13} 1424 2542 pc latt sy^{p,hmg} co

c: αὐτοῦ] add ὡς ἡ ἄλλη A (D) K Q Δ Θ Ψ $f^{(1)}$ 565 2542 al it sy^h (and in D add v. 5 here) // ὑγιής ὡς ἡ ἄλλη f^{13} \mathfrak{M} (cf. Matt 12:13) // ὑγιής W 579 bo? // txt \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N}^2 B L 33 pc lat sa bo?

O: ἀπεκατεστάθη] ἀποκατεστάθη \mathfrak{P}^4 B D U Y Θ Π 565 700 // ἀποκατέστη f^1 // ἀπεκατέστη \mathfrak{N}^*

⁶⁵ NA²⁷ has \mathfrak{P}^{4vid} (txt) but according to my transcription (and the *ed. pr.*) it is clear that \mathfrak{P}^4 supports the printed reading.

⁶⁶ No information is given in NA²⁷. Merell, Skeat, and Comfort and Barrett, reconstruct the text differently (see above).

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)

b:⁶⁷ διελάλουν] ἐλάλουν \mathfrak{P}^4 K U Π Ψ 157 565 // συνελάλουν 33 // *txt* $\mathfrak{P}^{75\text{vid}}$ \mathfrak{N} A B L W Θ $f^{1,13}$ 33 579 700 1424 \mathfrak{M}

6:12

a: τοῦ θεοῦ] om D

6:13

a: lac

6:14

a: lac

b: καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Φίλιππον] Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην Φίλιππον A Q Θ Ψ f^1 \mathfrak{M} lat sy^h sa^{mss} bo^{pt}; (Eus) // *txt* $\mathfrak{P}^{4,75}$ \mathfrak{N} B D L W (f^{13}) 33 (565 579 1241) 2542 *al* it sy^{s,p}

c: Ἰωάννην] add τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, οὓς ἐπωνόμασεν βοανηργές, ὃ ἐστὶν υἱοὶ βροντῆς D (cf. Mark 3:17) // τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου sy^s

O: Ἰωάννην] Ἰωάννην \mathfrak{P}^4 B D

6:15

a: καὶ] om A Q Θ Ψ f^1 33 \mathfrak{M} lat sy^h sa^{mss} bo^{mss} // *txt* \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N} B D L W f^{13} 1241 2542 *pc* it sy^{s,p}; Eus

b: Θωμᾶν] add τὸν ἐπικαλούμενον Δίδυμον D (cf. John 11:16)

c: καὶ] om A B D² Q W Θ Ψ f^1 \mathfrak{M} lat sy^h sa^{mss} bo^{pt} // *txt* \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N} D* L f^{13} 33 700 1241 2542 *pc* it sy^{s,p}

6:16

a: καὶ] om A Θ Ψ f^1 33 \mathfrak{M} e f q vg^{st,ww} sy^h // *txt* $\mathfrak{P}^{4,75}$ \mathfrak{N} B D L Q W f^{13} 892 1241 2542 *pc* it vg^{cl} sy^{s,p}

b: Ἰσκαριώθ] Ἰσκαριώτην \mathfrak{N}^2 A Q W Θ Ψ $f^{1,13}$ \mathfrak{M} vg^{cl} (co): Mcion^E // Σκαριώθ D lat // *txt* \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N}^* B L 33 579 *pc* d

Textual variation of \mathfrak{P}^4

The textual variation of \mathfrak{P}^4 as compared to the initial text (NA²⁷) 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 \mathfrak{P}^4

Text	Variation-units in NA ²⁷	Lacunose variation-units	Additional variation-units where \mathfrak{P}^4 deviates from NA ²⁷	Ratio of deviation	Type of deviation	Singular readings
Luke 1:58-59; 62-2:1; 6-7; 3:8-4:2; 29-35; 5:3-8; 30-6:16	156 (155)	33	11	26/134 (19.4%)	3 x A 8 x O 4 x W/O 11 x SUB	2 x A 1 x O 1 x W/O 4 x SUB

There are 155 variation-units in NA²⁷ 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-

⁶⁷ Cf. Luke 1:65 where \mathfrak{P}^4 substitutes ἐλαλεῖτο for διελαλεῖτο.

units in NA²⁷ as one unit, since they contain genealogically related textual variation (3:17a). Thus, my analysis includes 156 variation-units. \mathfrak{P}^4 is lacunose in thirty-three of these units, which leaves us with 123 selected units reflecting the most significant variants in the textual tradition.⁶⁸ In this sample \mathfrak{P}^4 agrees with the reconstructed initial text in 108 units (87.8%) and deviates in fifteen units (12.2%).

In addition to this sample, \mathfrak{P}^4 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 \mathfrak{P}^4 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* (1:65*b*); the definite article in *τοῦ κυρίου* (1:76*b*), which is a singular reading; and a non-sensical *οὐ* in *τοῦ οὐ Ῥησαῦ* (3:27*a*), which is clearly a scribal error. Several other witnesses (W 1675 b c e) attest to the first addition (1:65*b*), most of which also replace the following word *διελαλεῖτο* with *ἐλαλεῖτο* (\mathfrak{P}^4 1675 b c e). I therefore think that this addition was already in the exemplar of \mathfrak{P}^4 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, \mathfrak{P}^4 contains the following eight omissions: *κύριος* (1:68*a*); *καλόν* (3:9*a*); the definite article in *ὁ Ἰησοῦς* (5:31*a*; 6:3*b*; 6:9*a*); [*καί*] (5:39*b*); [*ὄντες*] (6:3*d*); [*ὡς*] (6:4*a*).

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 *καρπὸν* (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 \mathfrak{P}^4 , which is more likely the work of this scribe, is the addition of a definitive 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 \mathfrak{P}^4 .

Transpositions (x4)

\mathfrak{P}^4 contains the following four transpositions: *ἀνεψῆθη δὲ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ παραχρῆμα καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα*] *ἀνεψῆθη παραχρῆμα τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα* (1:63*c*); *καθίσας δέ*] *δὲ καθίσας* (5:3*c*); *ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου ἐδίδασκεν*] *ἐδίδασκεν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου* (5:3*e*); *τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*] *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου* (6:5*c*).

The first transposition (1:63*c*) is a sub-singular reading shared by only two minuscules. The second transposition (5:3*c*) 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 *ὀλιγόν* (“a little way” from the shore), is instead taken as the opening word of a new sentence, *ὀλιγόν δὲ καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου τοὺς ὄχλους* (“Then he sat down for a short while and taught the crowds from the boat.”). There is no punctuation in \mathfrak{P}^4 that would prevent such a division of the sentences. The third and fourth transpositions (5:3*e*; 6:5*c*) 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*.

Substitutions (x11)

In relation to NA²⁷ there are eleven substitutions in \mathfrak{P}^4 : ἐλαλεῖτο for διελαλεῖτο (1:65c); ἐαυτῶν for αὐτῶν (1:66a); πνεύματι (πνι) for σωματικῶ (3:22d); Ἐλμασάμ for Ἐλμαδάμ (3:28a); Ἰωβήτ for Ἰωβήδ (3:32a); τοῦ Ἀδάμ for τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ (3:33a); χαλάσαι for χαλάσατε (5:4a); πρὸς αὐτόν for πρὸς αὐτούς (5:31b); ῥήγνυσι for ῥήξει (5:37a); θεραπεύσει for θεραπεύει (6:7b); ἐλάλουν for διελάλουν (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 χαλάσατε with χαλάσαι (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 θεραπεύσει.

The reflexive and personal pronoun in the genitive, ἐαυτῶν/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 σωματικῶ in Luke 3:22 is interpreted by Bart Ehrman as an “orthodox corruption.” When “the Spirit is said to descend upon Jesus in ‘spiritual’ (πνεύματι εἶδει) 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 πνευματικῶ (“spiritual”), being the opposite of σωματικῶ (“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 οὐ Ῥησαῦ in 3:27 (there is a line break after τοῦ) and made another mistake in 5:36 where he or she first substituted παλαιου for καινου but then corrected the mistake—both adjectives occur several times in the context.

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

Corrections (x2)

Merell did not indicate any corrections at all in \mathfrak{P}^4 . Skeat, however, identified a correction in 5:36 where the scribe first wrote παλαιου but then corrected the text to καινου. According to

⁶⁹ Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 143.

⁷⁰ In 1 Cor 15:46-47 various forms of πνευματικός (πνκος/πνκον) are written with *nomina sacra* in \mathfrak{P}^{46} (curiously not in 1 Cor 15:44). Similarly, the adjective is written with *nomina sacra* in 1 Pet 2:5 (πνατικός/πνατικός) in \mathfrak{P}^{72} .

⁷¹ So Merell (*ed. pr.*), “Nouveaux fragments,” 14 n. 22. The main problems of this explanation is the presence of the intervening words τὸ ἄγιον and the distinct forms of πνα and πνι.

Skeat, the distinctive shape of the kappa shows that the original scribe made the correction.⁷² I have found another correction in 3:29 where the scribe seems to have first written *ἠσοῦ* 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: Ἐλμασάμ (3:28a); Ἰωβήτ (3:32a). Apart from these two units, which are included in NA²⁷, 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).⁷³ Nevertheless, it is striking that \mathfrak{P}^4 in particular agrees with Vaticanus in many cases of spelling and itacism.

\mathfrak{P}^4 contains the following itacisms: πινακείδιον (1:63); ἀξείνη (3:9); ἀπεκρέινατο (3:16); Ἡλεί (3:23); Λευεί (3:24); Μελχεί (3:24); Νηρεί (3:28); Μελχεί (3:28); Αδδεί (3:28); Ἰωρείμ (3:29); Λευεί (3:29); Ἐλιακείμ (3:30); Δαυείδ (3:31); Ἄδμείν (3:34); φαρεισαίων (5:33; 6:2); πείνουσιν (5:33); φαρεισαῖοι (6:7).

Further, \mathfrak{P}^4 deviates in the spelling of proper names in these cases (which exclude itacisms): Ἰωάνου (3:15; 5:33); Μαθθάθ (3:24); Ἐσλαί (3:25); Μάατ (3:26); Σεμεεῖν (3:26); Ῥησαῦ (3:27); Ἐλμασάμ (3:28); Ἐλιάζερ (3:29); Ἰωβήτ (3:32); Ἰωάνην (6:14). In four cases, \mathfrak{P}^4 attests to alternative verb forms: ἠνεώχθη (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.”⁷⁴ 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 \mathfrak{P}^4 which are shared by only one or two other Greek MSS (1:63c; 1:65b; 1:65c; 1:66a; 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: ῥήγνυσι (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.

⁷² Skeat, “Four Gospels,” 7.

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.⁷⁵ In fact, Min indicates that \mathfrak{P}^{64+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.⁷⁶ Only one of the singular readings is a certain error, τοῦ οὐ Ῥησαῦ in Luke 3:27. The substitution of πνεύματι (πνι) for σωματικῶ 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 in \mathfrak{P}^4 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 \mathfrak{P}^4 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 πνεύματι for σωματικῶ 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 \mathfrak{P}^{64+67} (Oxford, Magdalen College, Gr. 17; Barcelona, Fundaciòn San Lucas Evangelista, P. Barc. 1)

Notes on transcription

Fr. C of \mathfrak{P}^{64} , verso, col. 2

- l. 2 (26:14): Roberts (*ed. pr.*) transcribes ι]β [ο] λεγομ[ενος. Several other scholars have followed Carsten P. Thiede who thinks there is no space for the *omicron* and transcribes ι]β λεγομ[ενος—a singular reading which is syntactically difficult.⁷⁷ It is more likely that the scribe wrote a smaller omicron placed above the line.⁷⁸ 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: Ἑσλαί (3:25); Ῥησαῦ (3:27).

⁷⁷ C. P. Thiede, "Papyrus Magdalen 17 (Gregory-Aland \mathfrak{P}^{64}): A Reappraisal," *ZPE* 105 (1995): 14; Klaus Wachtel, " $\mathfrak{P}^{64/67}$: Fragmente des Matthäusevangeliums aus dem 1. Jahrhundert?," *ZPE* 107 (1995), 76; Min, *Überlieferung*, 168 n. 1; Comfort and Barrett, *The Text*, 68; "T. C. Skeat, \mathfrak{P}^{64+67} and \mathfrak{P}^4 ," 585.

⁷⁸ On the recto, l. 2, of this fragment there is another small *omicron*. Cf. \mathfrak{P}^4 (probably by the same scribe), fr. D, recto, col. 2, l. 26 (Luke 6:14), αυ]του.

Fr. C of P⁶⁴, recto, col. 1

l. 1 (26:22): Thiede transcribes τσσαυ]των[μητιεγω, implying that P⁶⁴ read εἰς ἕκαστος αὐτῶν with P^{37vid} P^{45vid} D Θ f¹³ pc.⁷⁹ However, I think Roberts' transcription (*ed. pr.*), αυ]τω· μ[ητι, is more accurate. Thus, P⁶⁴ read either λέγειν εἰς ἕκαστος αὐτῶ (so Comfort and Barrett), or εἰς ἕκαστος λέγειν αὐτῶ, or λέγειν (ἕκαστος) αὐτῶ—in any case a singular reading involving an omission or transposition.

Fr. A of P⁶⁴, recto, col. 2

ll. 2-3 (26:31): Roberts (*ed. pr.*) erroneously transcribes αυτοις ο η παν[τες] σκανδα[λισθησεσθε, but corrects the *nomen sacrum* to ις in a later publication.⁸⁰ Moreover, Roberts' transcription, which omits ὑμεῖς, is followed by Thiede, Skeat and Min.⁸¹ 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 ὑμεῖς. This is far from certain, considering the general irregularity of the lines in P⁶⁴⁺⁶⁷, also apparent in P⁴. 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.⁸²

Fr. B of P⁶⁴, recto, col. 2

l. 1 (26:33): Roberts (*ed. pr.*) transcribes γαλεγλαιαν, followed by Thiede, Wachtel, Min and Charlesworth; however Skeat, followed by Comfort and Barrett, transcribes γαλειλαιαν (itacism).⁸³ 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: ἐν ἑαυτοῖς] om b c f g¹ sy^s; Chr // txt P^{67vid} *rell*

3:15

a:⁸⁴ πρὸς αὐτόν] αὐτῶ P⁹⁶ B f¹³ / 844 l 2211 pc // om 0250 sa^{ms} bo^{ms} // txt P^{67vid} ⚡ C D^s L W 0233
f¹ 33 M

b: lac

5:20

a: om vs 20 D] // txt P⁶⁷ *rell*

⁷⁹ C. P. Thiede, "Papyrus Magdalen 17 (Gregory-Aland P⁶⁴): A Reappraisal," *ZPE* 105 (1995): 15. See further Klaus Wachtel, "P^{64/67}: Fragmente des Matthäusevangeliums aus dem 1. Jahrhundert?," *ZPE* 107 (1995): 76, who agrees with Roberts.

⁸⁰ See C. H. Roberts' "Complementary Note," in Roca-Puig, *Un Papiro Griego*, 59-60. Cf. Skeat, "Four Gospels," 13; Comfort and Barrett, *The Text*, 70.

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, P⁶⁴⁺⁶⁷ and P⁴," 585; Skeat, "Four Gospels," 13; Comfort and Barrett, *The Text*, 70 (γαλειλαιαν). 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 P⁶⁴ in NA²⁷, whereas I distinguish here between the two parts as P⁶⁴ and as P⁶⁷.

5:22

a: αὐτοῦ¹] add εἰκῆ \mathfrak{N}^2 D L W Θ 0233 $f^{1.13}$ 33 \mathfrak{M} it sy co; Ir^{lat} Or^{mss} Cyp Cyr // *txt* \mathfrak{P}^{67} *rell*
 b-c: lac

5:25

a: lac

b: καὶ ὁ κριτῆς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ] om sy^s // *txt* \mathfrak{P}^{67} *rell*

c: ὁ κριτῆς] ὁ κριτῆς σε παραδῶ (D) L W Θ 0233 33 \mathfrak{M} lat sy^{c.p.h} co // *txt* $\mathfrak{P}^{67\text{vid}}$ \mathfrak{N} B 0275 $f^{1.13}$ 892
 pc k; Cl

5:26

a: ἕως ἄν] ἕως οὗ L W (0233) 1424 *al* // ἕως 33 *pc* // *txt* \mathfrak{P}^{67} *rell*

5:27

a: ὅτι ἐρρέθη] ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις L Δ Θ 0233 f^{13} 33 579 892 *pm* lat sy^{c.h**}; Ir^{lat} Or^{lat} Eus //
txt \mathfrak{P}^{67} *rell*

5:28

a: αὐτήν] om \mathfrak{P}^{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: μαθηταί] add αὐτοῦ A W f^1 \mathfrak{M} c f q sy sa^{ms} // *txt* $\mathfrak{P}^{45\text{vid}.64}$ \mathfrak{N} 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^{ms} bo) // *txt* $\mathfrak{P}^{64\text{vid}}$ *rell*
 b: lac

26:22

a-b:⁸⁵ λέγειν αὐτῷ εἰς ἕκαστος] λέγειν εἰς ἕκαστος αὐτῶν $\mathfrak{P}^{37\text{vid}.45}$ D Θ f^{13} *pc* sy^s // λέγειν αὐτῷ
 ἕκαστος αὐτῶν A W Δ Π 074 f^1 \mathfrak{M} sy^h Eus // λέγειν αὐτῷ εἰς ἕκαστος αὐτῶν M 157 // λέγειν
 ἕκαστος αὐτῶν 700 // λέγειν 1424 // *txt* \mathfrak{N} B L Z 0281 33 892 1071 *pc*

\mathfrak{P}^{64} 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 ἕκαστος αὐτῷ or εἰς ἕκαστος λέγειν αὐτῷ, or λέγειν ἕκαστος αὐτῷ; 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 $\mathfrak{P}^{37\text{vid}.45}$ (D) Θ 700

⁸⁵ Since the NA²⁷ apparatus indicates $\mathfrak{P}^{37\text{vid}}$ for the omission of αὐτῷ in Matt 26:22, $\mathfrak{P}^{37\text{vid}}$ should probably be included in the attestation for the following reading, εἰς ἕκαστος αὐτῶν, since there is clearly space for one of the two words αὐτῷ or εἰς.

l 2211 // μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ τὴν χεῖρα C W f^{1+13} \mathfrak{M} // τῷ τρυβλίῳ μετ' ἐμοῦ τὴν χεῖρα
579 // *txt* $\mathfrak{P}^{64\text{vid}}$ \aleph A B L Z 0281 33 892 1424 l 844 *pc lat*; Cyr

26:31

a: lac

26:33

a-b: lac

Textual variation of \mathfrak{P}^{64+67}

The textual variation of \mathfrak{P}^{64+67} as compared to the initial text (NA²⁷) is indicated in Table 5 as follows: omission (O); transposition of word order (W/O).

Table 5 Textual variation of \mathfrak{P}^{64+67}

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

There are twenty-six variation-units in NA²⁷ for this stretch of text, thirteen in which \mathfrak{P}^{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 (x_1)

αὐτήν (Matt 5:28a)

Transpositions (x_1)

There is probably a transposition in 26:22a-b where \mathfrak{P}^{64} read either λέγειν εἰς ἕκαστος αὐτῶ, or εἰς ἕκαστος λέγειν αὐτῶ, or, possibly λέγειν ἕκαστος αὐτῶ.

Singular readings (x_1)

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 \mathfrak{P}^{64+67} as a “strict” text. The Alands, who do not distinguish between textual quality and transmission character, also classify \mathfrak{P}^{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 ὑμεῖς in 26:31, which is based on an uncertain reconstruction.

Secondly, Min transcribes fr. C, recto, col. 2, l. 1 (Matt 26:33) as γαλεγλαιαν with Roberts. In my opinion, Skeat is clearly correct in transcribing γαλειλαιαν (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 impression has been misinterpreted as the horizontal stroke of a *gamma*.

Transmission character

The omission of ἀτῆν in Matt 5:28 is shared by some witnesses, including \aleph^* , 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 P⁴ and P⁶⁴⁺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 NA²⁷, respectively. Moreover, both papyri, in my opinion, reflect a “strict” transmission character. In P⁴ approximately ten readings in 134 variation-units (7.5%) should probably be assigned to the scribe, whereas in P⁶⁴⁺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 P⁴ and none in P⁶⁴⁺⁶⁷. In two cases in P⁴ 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 P⁶⁴⁺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 [P⁴, P⁶⁴⁺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.”

⁸⁸ E. G. Turner, *The Typology of the Codex* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977), 25, regards this subclass (Group 9, aberrant 1), “in which B:H roughly corresponds to 2:3” as competing with Group 8 for the distinction of being the earliest format of the papyrus codex. His judgment is confirmed by Scott Charlesworth’s recent overview of NT papyrus codices, where Group 9.1 is preponderant in the second or second/third centuries. See Scott Charlesworth, “Public and Private—Second- and Third-Century Gospel Manuscripts,” in *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon* (eds. C. A. Evans and H. D. Zacharias; London-New York: T & T Clark, 2009), 155 (table 1).

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.