Abstract: The scribal habits in $\mathfrak{P}^{127}$ confirm James R. Royse’s findings that early New Testament scribes omit more than they add. Although $\mathfrak{P}^{127}$ reflects more omissions than additions, the scribe’s habits are nevertheless strikingly different than Royse’s scribes. Royse also wonders if scribal conventions may have changed, becoming more fixed in post-Constantine Christianity. Such a question would require an investigation of many later manuscripts. $\mathfrak{P}^{127}$, however, does not represent a fixed, more stable text. Rather, the opposite is true: $\mathfrak{P}^{127}$ displays a high degree of textual variance. More studies of this type are needed to determine if $\mathfrak{P}^{127}$ is indicative of the fifth century or if other fifth-century witnesses exhibit textual fixity.

James R. Royse, in his 2008 *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*, calls upon New Testament text critics to reexamine New Testament witnesses according to what he calls the “Colwell method.” This method was pioneered and popularized by Ernest C. Colwell in a groundbreaking study from 1969. Colwell’s method analyzes the singular readings of a manuscript—readings which exist in only one manuscript. It is then assumed that a singular reading is the invention of the copyist of the manuscript. Royse calls upon text critics to assist in this work, saying

Ideally, of course, all the major witnesses to the text of the New Testament—that is, the continuous-text Greek manuscripts, the lectionaries, the versional manuscripts, and the Fathers—would be studied in detail in order to provide this same kind of information concerning scribal

---

1 Ernest C. Colwell, “Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A Study of $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$,” in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism*, NTTS 9 (Leiden: Brill, 1969), 108: “this study is restricted to singular readings (readings without other manuscript support) on the assumption that these readings are the creation of the scribe. The restriction of this study to singular readings can be made with confidence in view of the wealth of manuscript attestation for the Greek New Testament. A singular reading has been defined as a reading which has no Greek support in the critical apparatus of Tischendorf’s 8th edition.”

2 James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*, NTTSD 36 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 39: “[Colwell’s] view is that the singular readings of a manuscript are the textual creations of the scribe, and thus that an analysis of the patterns found within these singular readings will reveal the habits of the scribe.”
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habits, translational tendencies, and so on. One’s assertions could then be based on empirical evidence about the witnesses.³

He then entreats text critics to systematically and methodically reanalyze all of the witnesses of the New Testament with respect to singular readings in order to ascertain each scribe’s tendencies.⁴ He invites his fellow text critics to perform the same type of analysis of the witnesses as the study he performed on the six extensive early Greek papyri. To Royse, such an undertaking is imperative in order to determine the very foundational principles of textual criticism.⁵ Royse attempts to move away from previous general assumptions in order to base text-critical decisions on known data. Royse’s massive work attempted to overturn, at least with respect to the six early papyri which he analyzed, the long-held text-critical maxim lectio brevior potior. In its place Royse concludes that, ceteris paribus, the early New Testament scribes who he studied tended to omit rather than to add.⁶ Therefore, if a canon is to be set in place, it should be lectio longior potior.⁷ Royse is cautious, however, to warn against any categorical canon because it is likely that some scribes acted one way and others acted another. Therefore, because broad generalizations from some scribes should not be projected onto the habits of other scribes, a methodical study of the habits of each scribe must be carried out. Only after we understand each scribe’s tendencies can we then use these data to assist in evaluating readings.

Royse’s Reception

Royse’s theory has been widely accepted by text critics, and many have used this method in similar studies.⁸ Juan Hernández Jr. applauds Royse’s work: “I do think that Royse has not only fulfilled Colwell’s wish for a commentary on the singular readings, but that he has sur-

---


⁴ The need for these studies is emphasized by Royse, Scribal Habits, 4: “The general habits serve, then, as the basis of our knowledge of transcriptional probability (and improbability): what sorts of alterations scribes are likely (or unlikely) to have made in the text.” Quoting Colwell, Royse urges text critics to “begin at the beginning” and “commence with the oldest witnesses and work down the stream of tradition” (Royse, Scribal Habits, 14). Here he quotes Ernest C. Colwell, “Hort Redivivus,” in Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament, 159. Again, Royse reemphasizes, “The scribal (and translational) peculiarities of all the major sources for the New Testament should be catalogued” (Royse, Scribal Habits, 738).

⁵ “We wish to find a way to characterize the habits of scribes that will avoid, as far as is possible, both any question-begging assumptions about scribal behavior and any controversial presuppositions about the history of the text. Some presuppositions are, as we shall see, necessary; but they should be as limited as possible in order that the results attained can be used with confidence in deciding textual issues” (Royse, Scribal Habits, 31).


⁷ Royse, Scribal Habits, 734.

passed it by producing a veritable encyclopedia on them—an encyclopedia that deserves to take its rightful place as the canonical standard for any study of scribal habits for generations to come.”\(^9\) Hernández’s own study of the scribal habits in witnesses of the book of Revelation supports Royse’s findings: “On the basis of careful study of the singular readings of each MS, it is clear that the scribes of these MSS tended to omit far more often than they added to their texts.”\(^10\)

Peter M. Head, after conducting his own study of early papyri, comments that his findings agree with Royse’s and that “most fundamental is the support given to the conclusion that omission is more common than addition.”\(^11\) Head then performed a second study of this same type with the same results saying that “in general, omission was more common than addition…. Broadly speaking these results serve to confirm the picture presented in our previous study of the early manuscripts of the synoptic gospels, and thus serve as further confirmation of the much fuller study of Royse.”\(^12\) Lastly, Head reaffirms that “once again it seems that the evidence suggests that most early scribes are more likely to omit than to add material.”\(^13\)

David C. Parker voices two questions concerning the singular readings method. First, due to incomplete collations, some supposed singular readings may not in fact be singular.\(^14\) Second, singular readings are only singular readings until another manuscript is found which contains the same reading. In such a case, the reading is no longer singular.\(^15\) Parker accepts,

---


15 Parker, review of *Scribal Habits*, 256. Such is the case in my analysis of 𝔓\(^{127}\). Many readings which were previously singular readings in Codex Bezae (05) are no longer singular because of their support by 𝔓\(^{127}\). Examples are Acts 10:33: παρακαλων ελθειν προς ημας; Acts 10:33: εν ταχει; Acts 10:33: ιδου; Acts 10:41: συνανεστραφημεν; Acts 10:41: ημερας; Acts 11:2: ποιουμενος δια των
however, that such difficulties may not be fatal and that "it has to be acknowledged that such tendencies do emerge, and with them evidence about the way in which scribes went about their work."16 Parker questions Royse’s conclusion that lectio brevior be reversed in favor of the longer reading on a grand scale but accepts Royse’s findings with respect to the early papyri. Parker wants to be sure that Royse’s findings are not expanded outside of their proper time frame unless further research is conducted.

My recent dissertation at the University of Birmingham analyzed manuscripts for which a known exemplar exists.17 I analyzed these manuscripts both by their actual scribal habits—how accurately the scribes copied the known exemplar—but also by their singular readings. In this way, the analysis served as a way to check Royse’s method by comparing actual habits against habits found using Royse’s singular readings method. I found that his method identified about 93 percent of one scribe’s total variants but only about 56 percent of another scribe’s total variants. Additionally, there was no constant rate at which Royse’s method fell short so I was unable to apply a coefficient to determine actual error rates using the singular reading method. I was, however, with respect to the scribes studied in my study, able to confirm Royse’s rejection of lectio brevior. None of the scribes I studied added words on the whole. But I could not confirm Royse’s lectio longior. Some of the scribes I studied neither added nor omitted while some did omit as did Royse’s scribes. So, while I could confirm Royse’s rejection of lectio brevior, with respect to the scribes I studied, I was not able to confirm Royse’s lectio longior.

Elijah Hixson has recently completed a PhD at the University of Edinburgh.18 His dissertation, among other things, asked many of the same questions as mine but used a different procedure to check Royse’s method. Instead of finding manuscripts with a known exemplar as I did, Hixson found a group of sixth-century sibling manuscripts—manuscripts which were all copied from the same exemplar but whose exemplar no longer survives. Using these three sibling manuscripts, 022, 023, and 042, Hixson could confidently reconstruct what the exemplar most likely read. He also analyzed the scribe’s habits according to actual scribal habits and their habits according to Royse’s singular reading method and, like me, found that Royse’s method falls short, saying: "It is clear that with respect to the three manuscripts of this study, the singular readings method fails to reveal the tendencies of a manuscript’s scribe."19 But Hixson is careful not to throw Royse’s method away entirely, writing:

Even if the singular readings method fails with respect to the sixth-century Greek purple Gospel manuscripts, it is entirely possible that it could provide a sufficiently accurate assessment of the scribes of earlier manuscripts.20

Another problem with Royse’s method is that it necessitates the use of hypothetical and reconstructed exemplars since his method must reconstruct hypothetically what the exemplar of the manuscript in question may have said. Royse concedes that the method is not perfect and that

16 Parker, review of Scribal Habits, 256–57.
not all scribally created readings will be found among the singular readings. Additionally, there is no way to know if a singular reading is indeed scribally created or if the scribe inherited the reading from a now lost exemplar. Royse's method is indeed one of the best and most fruitful methods available but it is not without its flaws. It remains, nonetheless, perhaps the best method for determining scribal habits when the exemplar of a manuscript is not known.

𝔓127

Although 𝔖127 is a fifth-century fragmentary witness of Acts, a study analyzing its scribal habits and its singular readings will still be useful and should follow Royse's method in order to compare the resulting statistics to those of Royse's scribes. Additionally, Peter Head has used Royse's method on a manuscript as small and fragmentary as 𝔖127. D. C. Parker and S. R. Pickering explicitly state that such a study is needed: “A number of these [distinctive] readings were previously singulars in Codex Bezae. The task of analysing the differences between them in these distinctive readings will be an important task in the re-examination of the tradition.” 𝔖127 is especially deserving of such an analysis because it has received the high praise that it is “the most significant new addition to the Greek evidence since the publication in 1927 of P.Mich.inv.1571, containing 18:27–19.6, 19:12–16 (Gregory–Aland 𝔖38).” Lastly, Georg Gäbel comments that Acts is “among the most fascinating problems of New Testament textual scholarship. Every fresh piece of evidence that allows us to gain new insight into this problem will therefore be most welcome.”

The resulting data of this analysis will be used to determine whether the scribe of this fifth-century manuscript tended to add or omit and to determine the other general tendencies of this scribe (see the appendix for the complete compilation of the singular readings of 𝔖127). More analyses on other fifth-century witnesses will be needed in order to determine whether the habits of the scribe of 𝔖127 represents most fifth-century witnesses or if 𝔖127 is an anomaly.

---

21 Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 42.
22 Royse counters this problem by discussing the concept of a complex scribe where all the variants from potential lost exemplars can be grouped under the single scribe in question. Royse also appeals to Ockham’s razor so as to not unnecessarily multiply potential lost exemplars. See Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 50–55. Royse’s discussion of the complex scribe is confusing and overly complicated. Royse states himself that “there is one respect in which the existence of a complex scribe could perhaps skew our conclusions. This is the judgment, in some absolute terms, of the accuracy of the scribe” (Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 54). We are mostly concerned with the accuracy of the individual scribe, and therefore Royse’s notion of a “complex scribe” is not useful for our purposes. We want to know, inasmuch is possible, exactly how accurately the single scribe themselves copied the text from their exemplar.
Methodology

On the whole, I follow Royse’s method as closely as possible. For the transcription of this papyrus I rely wholly on Parker and Pickering’s transcription without questioning their reading of the papyrus or their reconstruction of the text. I will follow the methodology outlined by Royse for determining singular readings; specifically, I will restrict collation to continuous-text Greek manuscripts. For the purposes of this paper I will compile statistics for all singular readings as found in the editio princeps. Even if a singular reading is found in a lacuna, I will trust the reconstructed transcription by the editors. Diverging slightly from Royse’s model, this study has omitted “asterisked readings” because, for the purposes of this paper, I am interested only in actual singular readings.

The Manuscript

𝔓127 (P.Oxy. 74.4968) is the “remains of eight leaves from two gatherings of a papyrus codex.” It contains Acts 10–12, 15–17 and is dated to the fifth century. Although the codex is fragmentary it is still quite extensive and fits within Eric G. Turner’s aberrants of group six. The manuscript employs seven nomina sacra to abbreviate the following nouns: θεός, πνεύμα, πατήρ, κύριος, Ἰησοῦς, Χριστός, and ἄνθρωπος. The hand is a relaxed biblical majuscule with brown ink and generally follows Maas’s law to a slight degree in that the text of the page slants down and to the left. The folia survive in varying degrees of preservation; most of the beginning is highly lacunose, but then it is better preserved toward the end of the manuscript. Ψ127 is notable because it is one of only seven extant New Testament papyri to be written in two columns. Folio 7a displays a page number (ριβ = 112) which suggests that the manuscript contained only Acts. The manuscript also retains the remnants of binding ties and binding holes. In addition, our fragment contains some of the most interesting passages in Acts: Cornelius’s baptism, James of Zebedee’s death by Herod, Peter’s miraculous escape from prison, the end of the Jerusalem council, Paul’s separation from Barnabas, a “we” passage, and, the best-preserved passage in this manuscript, Paul and Silas’s seismic escape from jail.

Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 73.
Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 93.
Royse explains the importance of asterisked readings to determine a possible Vorlage and related mss: “Readings that are singular according to the evidence in Tischendorf, but find support from other sources consulted, are removed from consideration by being prefixed with ‘**’. These readings, while not properly part of our investigation, are nevertheless of interest since the support is usually slender and, I believe, often likely to be coincidental. Thus I have attempted to indicate the origin of these readings as with the singular readings, and have cited them as supplementary evidence” (Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 94, emphasis added). See also Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 67. Unlike the papyri studied by Royse, Ψ127 shares a very large number of readings with other mss (to a very high degree with Codex Bezae [05] but also to a lower degree with Vaticanus [03]), as noted by Parker and Pickering, “4968,” 13. Perhaps a future study would analyze readings shared with manuscripts other than Bezae. For the purposes of this paper, we are only concerned with singular readings.

Parker and Pickering, “4968,” 2.
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Corrections

A total of twelve corrections can be seen in ℶ127 (at 12:2; 12:3b; 16:13a; 16:16d; 16:16e; 16:16f; 16:30; 16:38c; 16:40; 17:1; 17:4d; 17:7c). None of the corrections is an in scribendo correction, and Hand 1 made only one of the corrections (Acts 12:3b). Therefore only this one correction will concern us. Royse argues that when the original scribe corrects an original reading, the final reading is evaluated. Since our aim is to get an idea of the original scribe’s habits, if they correct their own mistake then that is part of their own habit and the correction is the text that will stand. However, if the text is corrected by a different, later hand then the text of the first hand will stand. In sum, the latest version of the text as written by the original scribe will be the text that is evaluated for a singular reading. Royse explains: “I have decided to treat all corrections by someone other than the scribe simply as corrections by a later hand, and have thus ignored them when considering the habits of the scribe. In fact, such corrections should be treated simply as another manuscript.” Therefore, we will only discuss corrections made by the first hand in this section. We will however discuss singular readings that were not corrected by Hand 1 in the “Accuracy and Copying Technique” section.

Corrections to a Singular Reading

There are no places in our papyrus where the original scribe corrects one of their singular readings to a nonsingular reading. One possible correction is found in the insertion of κ(αι) at 16:13a. However, due to the thickness of the reed, the darkness of the ink, and the ductus (the bottom angled stroke of the κ attaches to the hasta whereas most of the time our scribe writes a κ with the final angled stroke touching the first angled stroke) this correction was most likely.

35 Throughout this paper I will employ the gender-neutral singular “they” pronoun when referring to a scribe whose preferred personal gender pronoun is unknown since ancient scribes were not in all cases male. This may sound awkward at times, but I will not assume that all scribes in this study were male. On the use of the singular “they,” see Amy Warendra, “They,” Writing Across the Curriculum 4 (1993): 99 and Julie Foertsch and Morton Ann Gernsbacher, “In Search of Gender Neutrality: Is Singular They a Cognitively Efficient Substitute for Generic He?, ” Psychological Science 8.2 (1997): 106. On female scribes see Kim Haines-Eitzen, “Girls Trained in Beautiful Writing: Female Scribes in Roman Antiquity and Early Christianity,” JECS 6 (1998): 629–46. The fact that it is a possibility that a woman was a scribe should be tempered by the fact that most scribes were indeed men. See, for example, Georgi Parpulov’s statement: “All but a few scribes were men, yet Hagiopeptrites had a daughter who inherited the profession.” Georgi R. Parpulov, “The Bibles of the Christian East,” in From 600–1450, vol. 2 of The New Cambridge History of the Bible, ed. Richard Marsden and E. Ann Matter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 313.

36 Royse, Scribal Habits, 77. Also, “Colwell in fact examines the readings of his manuscripts before correction, and thus includes as singular readings many errors that the scribes themselves corrected. However, in my opinion this practice is unjustified, and may give a very misleading impression of a scribe’s activity” (Royse, Scribal Habits, 74, emphasis in original). Lastly, Larry W. Hurtado, The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 186: “It is important to distinguish between corrections made by the original scribe, corrections made by another scribe but in a contemporary hand, and corrections that appear to be from a later hand. The last sort of corrections may offer important indications of how readers later than the time of the original scribe read a given text, and what sorts of readings they preferred. Corrections in the hand of the original scribe, however, tell us more about the attitude of that scribe toward the task of copying, and how concerned the scribe was to produce a satisfactory copy.”
not performed by the original scribe. Therefore, although this is the original scribe’s best candidate for a correction, I believe this is a correction by a later hand.

**Attempted Corrections to a Singular Reading**

One singular reading exists at Acts 12:3b where the original scribe “corrected” from a singular to another singular reading. Hand 1 expunges (with expunging dots placed above the characters) προς in προς[λ]αβεθαι and replaces the prefix with c[υλ] resulting in c[υλλ]αβεθαι. This changes the word from προς[λ]αβεθαι, a singular reading, to c[υλλ]αβεθαι which is also a singular reading. The references below constitute readings that are found only in Ψ127 and in no other known Greek manuscript. See the appendix for a full apparatus of each singular reading.

**Insignificant Singulars**

Royse classifies orthographic singulars and nonsense singulars as insignificant singular variants. When a distinction is made between significant and insignificant singular readings the significant singular readings are the total number of singular readings without the orthographic and nonsense singular readings.37

**Orthographic Singulars**

Out of a total of 209 singular variants found in Ψ127, a total of two orthographic singular readings are found, which are divided into two parts: proper names and all others. Two orthographic variants exist for proper names at 16:25b and 16:29b (which will be tabulated under substitutions; see below, “Proper Names”). Concerning orthographic singular variants, Royse states: “In order to reduce the material involved in the present study to a more manageable level, I have decided to ignore certain common orthographic variations throughout the collation: interchanges of ει / ι, αι / ε, and οι / υ, presence or absence of movable ν … ”38 Ignoring common orthographic variations is also important because most printed editions correct common orthographic variants with the result that in order to determine a true orthographic variant, one must consult each manuscript itself individually rather than an edition of the manuscript. The other orthographic singular readings are at 15:38a and 16:19a. The two orthographic singular variants are calculated as a group of their own and not as a substitution and constitute 1 percent of all singular readings.

**Other Orthographic Singular Variants**

15:38a  ηβο[υλε]το  ε→η 39
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16:19a \([\epsilon i]d\o\{v}\) \(\rightarrow o^{40}\)

**Nonsense Singulars**

Four nonsense singular readings are found in this manuscript at 16:24e; 16:37b; 17:4d; and 17:7c. Hand 2 corrected two of the nonsense singulars; one at 17:4d and the other at 17:7c. The other two remain uncorrected. Nonsense singular readings are counted as a group of their own and not as substitutions and constitute 1.9 percent of the total singular readings.

**Nonsense Singular Readings**

16:24e \(\tau\i\n\phi\u\lambda\a\k\i\n\tau\i\n\v\i\o\\w\)\(^{42}\)
16:37b \(\alpha\k\a\ta\i\a\ta\i\a\ta\z\o\u\sigma\tau\o\v\i\z\t\o\v\i\z\t\o\v\i\z\)\(^{43}\)
17:4d \(\o\l\i\a\i\)\(^{43}\)
17:7c \(\pi\r\a\a\c\c\o\)\(^{43}\)

**Proper Names**

Four times our scribe has a singular reading of a proper name (16:2b; 16:25b; 16:29b; 17:10b); three of which refer to Silas.\(^{44}\) The proper name singular readings are divided into two groups: orthographic singular variants (16:25b; 16:29b; [both referring to Silas], which are counted in the substitution variants category so that they will be counted as significant following Eldon J. Epp’s suggestion) and other proper name singular variants (16:2b and 17:10b, which are calculated as substitutions).

In each case of the proper name orthographic singulars, which all refer to Silas, our scribe adds \(\epsilon\) after \(\lambda\): \(\z\i\l\e\a\c\). In each case the scribe maintained the proper case ending (except

\(^{40}\) This orthographic singular variant is only orthographically different from the irregular reading in 05: \(\epsilon\i\o\d\alpha\). Codex Bezae is the only text to read \(\epsilon\i\o\d\alpha\) here (08 and 81 read \(\epsilon\i\o\d\o\)\(\nu\c\)). \(\Psi^{127}\) is orthographically singular but only when compared against 05. \(\Psi^{127}\) actually has a more morphologically correct reading than 05. If 05 had not written \(\epsilon\i\o\d\alpha\) here then \(\Psi^{127}\) would be a substitution instead of an orthographic variant. Concerning the common substitution of \(\alpha\nu\) second aorist indicative active first person singular and third person plural endings with \(\alpha\nu\) (borrowing from the first aorist), see Gignac, *Grammar*, 2:335–36: “The endings of the first aorist are very frequently substituted for those of the second aorist. This phenomenon, paralleled throughout the Koine, led to the fusion of these two aorist inflections in the Modern Greek universal aorist paradigm…. The first aorist endings most frequently used are those of the first person singular, first person plural and third person plural.” See also BDF §80–81; Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 161 n. 282.

\(^{41}\) Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 90.

\(^{42}\) Nonsense because the dative ending does not match its accusative article.

\(^{43}\) Nonsense because \(\alpha\k\a\ta\i\a\ta\i\a\ta\z\o\u\) is not a word.

\(^{44}\) Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 82, 96. I include proper name singular variants in order to follow Royse’s methodology but also to heed Eldon J. Epp’s advice. After discussing the uselessness of mere orthographic differences, he comments: “There is, however, a genuine area of exception, and that concerns the spelling of proper nouns; some classical text-critical and historical problems turn on the forms of names for persons or places, and both experience and prudence suggests that, other things being equal, these particular orthographic differences be preserved in the critical apparatus and as part of the ‘significant’ data of textual criticism.” Eldon J. Epp, “Toward the Clarification of the ‘Textual Variant,’” in *Studies in New Testament Text and Language: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick*, ed. J. K. Elliott (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 169.
for 17:10b which will be treated as a substitution below). Only two other times in all extant witnesses of the book of Acts is Сиλαц spelled with ε following the λ, and these two times are both in 05.\textsuperscript{45} Also, no extant Greek text (according to the TLG, which may not include all orthographic variants) uses this spelling either. An alternate spelling of Сиλαц exists in the form of Сειλαц, which is quite common but Сиλαц is extraordinarily rare outside of Ψ\textsuperscript{127}. Friedrich Blass, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk posit that this form comes from “perhaps Gre-cized and Latinized forms of the same Semitic name.”\textsuperscript{46}

Proper Name Orthographic but Significant Singular Variants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16:25b</td>
<td>Си̣λεα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:29b</td>
<td>Си̣λεα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the proper name orthographic singular variants, two other proper name substitution singular variants are found in Ψ\textsuperscript{127}. At 16:2b, Ψ\textsuperscript{127} reads [Λυ]τρη where all others read Λύτρον (except 330 which reads Λυτροφ). Perhaps a better reading here in Ψ\textsuperscript{127} would be Λύтρη. Since most early manuscripts, including Ψ\textsuperscript{127}, did not employ iota adscription or subscript or accents, the dative singular and the nominative singular are identical. Therefore, similarly to 330, perhaps our scribe changed the text to a dative singular rather than a dative plural.\textsuperscript{47}

At 17:10b we find another example of a singular reading of the name Silas. However, in this occasion, although it is an orthographic variant, it will be counted instead as a substitution in order to follow Epp’s suggestion. In addition to including the same aberrant orthography as discussed above, in this verse Ψ\textsuperscript{127} also changes the case of the name Silas from Сиλαц (accusative) to Си̣λεα (dative). Such a substantive change qualifies as a substitution rather than simply an orthographic variant. Additionally, since it is a proper name it will be counted as a substitution.

Proper Name Other Singular Variants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16:2b</td>
<td>[Λυ]тρη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:10b</td>
<td>Си̣λεα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accuracy and Copying Technique

Addition

There are 35 significant singular additions which constitute 17.2 percent of the total significant singular readings. A total of 56 words were added resulting in an average of 1.6 words per addition.

\textsuperscript{45} The fact that no other manuscript has this orthography is according to Swanson, who is careful to include all orthographic variants. These two instances are at 15:34 in 05 (Сεйлεα) and a correction at 17:4 in the margin of 05 (Си̣λεα).

\textsuperscript{46} BDF §125.2. See also BDF §52.2.

\textsuperscript{47} Because the dative form of Λύτρα is only properly extant in the plural, any attempt to change it to the singular is difficult. 330 substitutes Λυτροφ whereas, if I am correct, Ψ\textsuperscript{127} substitutes Λυτρη. Λυτροφ would be another possible option for the dative singular as found in Epiphanius, Index discipulorum, 124.18; John Chrysostom, Homilies on the First Epistle to Timothy, 62.501, 556; John Chrysostom, Homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews, 63.184. Neither Λυτροφ nor Λυτρη is found in any extant Greek literature (according to the TLG). For the declension of Λυτρα, see BDF §57.
Omission

There are 62 significant singular omissions which comprise 30.5 percent of the significant singular readings. A total of 104 words were omitted with an average of 1.68 words per omission. When compared with the additions and substitutions we find a net loss of 50 words.

Transposition

There are 32 significant singular transpositions representing 15.8 percent of the significant singular readings.

Substitution

There are 74 significant singular substitutions which account for 36.5 percent of all significant singular readings. Concerning Royse’s precise criteria of what qualifies as a substitution and how it differs from an addition or omission, Royse comments: “It is often observed in the literature on linguistic errors that substitutions tend to be of the same grammatical category; e.g., a noun is substituted for a noun, not for a preposition.”48 I have followed this practice. Unlike Royse, however, I will include the total numbers of words lost or gained into the statistics of net words lost. Ψ127 substitutes often and erratically with 74 substitutions and a net loss of two words.

Table 1. Ψ127’s Omissions and Additions in Comparison with Other Studies49

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Significant Singulars</th>
<th>Words in Additions</th>
<th>Average Words</th>
<th>Omissions</th>
<th>Words in Omissions</th>
<th>Average Words</th>
<th>Words in Omissions / Words in Additions</th>
<th>Substitutions</th>
<th>Net Words gained / Lost in Substitutions</th>
<th>Net Words Lost</th>
<th>Net Words Lost Per Significant Singular Transpositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ψ45</td>
<td>210 29 (13.8%)</td>
<td>36 1.2</td>
<td>60 (29%)</td>
<td>126 2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>73 (35%)</td>
<td>90 .43</td>
<td>48 (23%)</td>
<td>245 .54</td>
<td>35 (7.7%)</td>
<td>16 .15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψ46</td>
<td>452 52 (11.5%)</td>
<td>54 1.04</td>
<td>161 (36%)</td>
<td>298 1.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>195 (43%)</td>
<td>245 .54</td>
<td>35 (7.7%)</td>
<td>29 .55</td>
<td>2 (3.8%)</td>
<td>16 .15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψ47</td>
<td>53 6 (12%)</td>
<td>6 1.5</td>
<td>15 (28%)</td>
<td>37 2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>28 (53%)</td>
<td>29 .55</td>
<td>2 (3.8%)</td>
<td>16 .15</td>
<td>18 (6.5%)</td>
<td>16 .15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψ48</td>
<td>109 16 (15%)</td>
<td>18 1.1</td>
<td>20 (18%)</td>
<td>36 1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>54 (50%)</td>
<td>16 .15</td>
<td>18 (6.5%)</td>
<td>26 .35</td>
<td>7 (9.5%)</td>
<td>16 .15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψ47</td>
<td>74 14 (18.9%)</td>
<td>17 1.2</td>
<td>22 (30%)</td>
<td>44 2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>30 (41%)</td>
<td>26 .35</td>
<td>7 (9.5%)</td>
<td>32 .30</td>
<td>11 (10.4%)</td>
<td>26 .35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψ127</td>
<td>106 11 (10.4%)</td>
<td>12 1.1</td>
<td>34 (32%)</td>
<td>44 1.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>49 (46%)</td>
<td>32 .30</td>
<td>11 (10.4%)</td>
<td>50 .32</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>50 .32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelation 01</td>
<td>158 40 (25.3%)</td>
<td>66 1.65</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>116 2.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>50 .32</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>50 .32</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>50 .32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelation 02</td>
<td>60 12 (20%)</td>
<td>13 1.08</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21 .35</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>21 .35</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>21 .35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelation 04</td>
<td>43 5 (11.6%)</td>
<td>6 1.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30 1.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>24 .56</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>24 .56</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>24 .56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48 Royse, Scribal Habits, 94 n. 95.
50 See Hernández, Scribal Habits, 154 for his figures for this table.
### Table 2. \(\Psi^{127}\)'s Orthographic Phenomena in Comparison with Other Studies\(^5\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Singulars</th>
<th>Orthographic Singulars</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Orth. Sings./NA Page</th>
<th>Orth. Sings./1,000 Words</th>
<th>Nonsense Singulars</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Nons. Sings./NA Page</th>
<th>Nons. Sings./1,000 Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\Psi^{45})</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Psi^{46})</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>11.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Psi^{47})</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>13.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Psi^{48})</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>7.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Psi^{49})</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Psi^{50})</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelation 01</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.45%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>11.94%</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>11.94%</td>
<td>14.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelation 02</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.81%</td>
<td>11.94%</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>11.94%</td>
<td>14.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelation 04</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.58%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>14.81%</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>14.81%</td>
<td>18.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Psi^{127})</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>183.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. \(\Psi^{127}\)'s Error Rate in Relation to Other Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NA Lines</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Adjustment Factor</th>
<th>Singulars</th>
<th>Singulars/NA Page</th>
<th>Singulars/1,000 Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\Psi^{45})</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Psi^{46})</td>
<td>3592</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Psi^{47})</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Psi^{48})</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Psi^{49})</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Psi^{50})</td>
<td>2683</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Psi^{127})</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>1.00(^\dagger)</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>33.93</td>
<td>183.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^5\) See Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 885, 902 for a model for this table. I have copied his data from this same source.

\(^\dagger\) Royse does not provide this figure.

\(^\dagger\) See Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, for figures for this table.

\(^\dagger\) While Royse has attempted to calculate an "adjustment factor" in his study, I have not done so. As stated above, I rely entirely on the transcription by the editors. The editors have reconstructed, to the best of their ability, the full text of the fragments. That is to say that with the reconstruction by the editors there are no lacunae in the continuous sections of \(\Psi^{127}\). Royse admits that his method is not perfect: “Since the papyri … are more or less lacunose, we need to adjust the number of line to reflect the fragmentary nature of the texts. This is admittedly problematic. An orthographic variation could occur at any letter or pair of letters, and so we could only get an estimate of how many such singular readings existed in the lacunae by counting extant letters and missing letters; I have not done that. On the other hand, some kinds of variation, transpositions for example, might be detectable even if only a few letters were extant. What I have done is to estimate adjustment factors for the papyri or even for sections of the papyri, which are meant to represent how many of the once existing singular readings are now visible. I can but hope that the many arbitrarinesses in such an undertaking will skew the figures for all the papyri more or less equitably, so that the results will still allow reasonable comparisons. Finally, in order to have more manageable figures, I have arbitrarily considered twenty-five NA lines to be one ‘NA page,’ and calculated the rates of error per NA page” Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 899. The editors of \(\Psi^{127}\) have reconstructed numerous singular readings. In short, since I am treating the reconstruction with full confidence, I have not felt the need to follow Royse’s arbitrary method.
𝔓127 contains 209 singular readings. Ψ127’s overall error rate of 33.93 singular readings per NA page is extremely high when compared to the error rates for the scribes studied by Royse.⁵⁶ His scribes ranged from 1.8 to 7.9.

Many of Ψ127’s singular readings are an attempt to explain the text in order to aid reading and comprehension. One example can be seen in Acts 10:44b which reads: “While Peter was still speaking, the Holy Spirit fell upon all who heard the word.” Our scribe singularly substituted “them” in place of “all who heard the word” likely because the scribe felt that this phrase is obvious and redundant. Another example can be seen at Acts 10:34 which reads literally “And Peter, after opening his mouth, said …” The scribe of Ψ127 instead writes “And Peter answering said …” In both of these examples there is hardly any change in meaning but less words are used and the text is perhaps even more intelligible. In the same way, sometimes our scribe will make explicit prepositions that are implied by the case of the noun. For example, Acts 12:2 reads that Herod had James killed “with the sword” using a single word in the dative case to indicate the entire phrase reading simply μαχαίρῃ. Our scribe, however, wrote [ἐν] μα[χαιρᾷ] in order to make the preposition explicit.

Parker and Pickering comment about our scribe’s “extreme tendency to abbreviate.”⁵⁷ Our scribe surely loses more words than they gain (see table 1). Parker and Pickering also posit that Ψ127 displays two offsetting characteristics: “against expansions similar to those found in Codex Bezae … may be set a habit of tersely summarizing whole phrases.”⁵⁸ Concerning the main question at hand, whether or not the scribe omits more than they add, we can conclude that, on the whole, this scribe does indeed omit more than they add. In total, Ψ127 lost 50 words omitting 8.12 words per NA page.

Royse also wondered if perhaps witnesses from later centuries (e.g., post-Constantine) would become much more regular and uniform. We can conclusively say that Ψ127 does not exhibit a uniform or strict text. In fact, Ψ127 seems to be a narrative rewriting of Acts. That is to say that the types of singular variants in Ψ127 do not seem to be theological changes but rather changes made in order to aid the story. Parker and Pickering note that many of Ψ127’s distinctive readings “contain strong echoes”⁶⁰ from other parts of the book of Acts. This scribe exhibits drastic textual differences from any other Greek witness. Parker and Pickering have shown that this papyrus agrees with Bezae (05) often.⁶¹ This is true for the most part but there are many readings (209 of them at least) where our scribe does not agree with Bezae or any other known manuscript. It has long been assumed that Acts was transmitted basically as two texts: a shorter text represented by Codex Vaticanus (03) and a longer form represented by Codex

⁵⁶ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 900. See also table 3.
⁵⁷ Parker and Pickering, “4968,” 42.
⁵⁸ Parker and Pickering, “4968,” 8. They later restate that here we have an “expanding free text that has a strong tendency to omit. That this is a common feature in manuscripts is undeniable. That it is especially marked in Ψ is evident. This makes a striking contrast with Codex Bezae, which rarely omits” (Parker and Pickering, “4968,” 12).
⁵⁹ Gäbel: “A more detailed, more realistic, more logical rendering of events, additional information about times and places, thoughts and emotions, verbatim rendering of quotations instead of abbreviations that presuppose the author’s and readers’ perspective, the resolution of ambiguities in the text and generally increased narrative coherence—all these changes may be best described in terms of narrative criticism” (Gäbel, “Text of Ψ127,” 148).
⁶¹ “A number of these readings were previously singulars in Codex Bezae” (Parker and Pickering, “4968,” 13). See n. 15 above for a list of some of the previously singular readings of 05 that were shown by the discovery of Ψ127 not to be singular readings.
Bezae. But Parker and Pickering point out that \( \Psi^{127} \) "offers a strong challenge to this view, leading rather to the recognition that if a text could exist in one free version, it could exist in many. The fact is that \( \Psi \) offers a new free version. Although it differs greatly from Codex Vaticanus, it also presents a strikingly different version from that found in Codex Bezae."\(^{62}\) They conclude that "it is hard to see how the bipolar concept of a two-text form of Acts can continue to be maintained."\(^{63}\) Concerning the relationship between Codex Bezae and \( \Psi^{127} \), they comment: "Like Codex Bezae, \([\Psi^{127}]\) is somewhat longer than Codex Vaticanus, and like Codex Bezae its wording often varies from Codex Vaticanus. But its variations from it are by no means identical with those of Codex Bezae."\(^{64}\)

Conclusions

One surprising conclusion to this study is how matter of fact many of the singular readings are. Most of the singular readings are a word here and a word there with no significant change to meaning but rather to smooth out the text.

At first glance the statistics concerning the scribal habits of \( \Psi^{127} \) seem to imply that the scribe of \( \Psi^{127} \) acted very similarly to the scribes studied by Royse. In table 1 we see that \( \Psi^{127} \) had 203 significant singular readings with 35 additions and 62 omissions. These statistics look strikingly similar to those of \( \Psi^{45} \)'s scribe who had 210 significant singular readings with 29 additions and 60 omissions. Indeed, all of Royse's scribes' additions were about 10–20 percent of their total significant singular readings—just like \( \Psi^{127} \)'s 17 percent. Similarly, their omissions constituted about 30 percent of their significant singular readings just like \( \Psi^{45} \)'s 30.5 percent. So there appear to be striking similarities between Royse's scribes and the scribe of \( \Psi^{127} \). But upon closer examination we find that \( \Psi^{45} \) made these 210 significant singular readings over 1,894 NA lines or about 75 NA pages (table 3). Additionally, \( \Psi^{46} \) made 452 significant singular readings over 3,592 NA lines or about 143 NA pages. The scribe of \( \Psi^{127} \) made their 203 significant singular readings over just six NA pages. So, while the scribe of \( \Psi^{127} \) acted similarly to Royse's scribes in relation to the ratio of additions, omissions, and substitutions, they did so much more often. Put another way, we see in table 3 that \( \Psi^{127} \)'s error rate was more than four times greater than the next closest scribe's error rate in \( \Psi^{2} \) and is more than six times greater than the error rates in \( \Psi^{45}, \Psi^{46}, \) and \( \Psi^{127} \). \( \Psi^{127} \) created a singular reading thirty–three times per NA page. Royse estimates that an NA page is about twenty–five lines on average.\(^{65}\) \( \Psi^{127} \), therefore, created a significant singular reading more than once per line of NA text. \( \Psi^{127} \) did act similarly to Royse's scribes but to a very extreme degree.

But it is notable that \( \Psi^{127} \)'s text did not win out—the free expansions found in \( \Psi^{127} \) and 05 are not carried on. These manuscripts have such a high number of singular readings because no other manuscript copied the singular readings. They did not win out. The fact that one scribe, patron, or reader created such an aberrant text means nothing for the overall transmission of the New Testament. That these readings were not carried on is actually further evidence of the strict transmission of the New Testament.

But the blame for a text with such an extreme degree of variation as seen in \( \Psi^{127} \) should not be placed upon the scribe of \( \Psi^{127} \) alone. While Royse's method posits that singular readings are the creation of the scribe, I am not so sure. It is possible that many of these singular readings stood in \( \Psi^{127} \)'s Vorlage and that \( \Psi^{127} \) copied the text with close fidelity. We simply have

\(^{63}\) Parker and Pickering, “4968,” 8.
\(^{64}\) Parker and Pickering, “4968,” 6.
\(^{65}\) Royse, Scribal Habits, 899.
no reliable means of determining exactly what text stood in \( \Psi^{127} \)'s Vorlage at certain places of variation. That the scribe of \( \Psi^{127} \) was not the creator of many of these variants is underscored when compared to the similar textual tradition in 05.\(^{66}\) That is to say, since 05 has many of these same types of variants, it is certain that the scribe of \( \Psi^{127} \) was not the originator of these types of expansive variants.

We must also recognize that a patron may have instructed the scribe—either of \( \Psi^{127} \) or of its antecedents—to create an explanatory text. Above we quoted Parker and Pickering who wrote that \( \Psi^{127} \) both summarizes and expands material. Gäbel has shown that “many variants shared by \( \Psi^{127} \) and D05 show an interest in a more elaborate, smoother, more coherent text.” Also, it is possible that the explanatory variants found in \( \Psi^{127} \) were explanatory glosses in the margin of the Vorlage of \( \Psi^{127} \) made by a reader of the Vorlage. These glosses obscured the text to the point where it was difficult to read the text in the manuscript and the intended explanation (see Acts 12:3b). In light of this study we must accept that it is possible that a high degree of \( \Psi^{127} \)'s substantive variants were the result of a patron who desired an explanatory text. Likewise, it is also possible that some of \( \Psi^{127} \)'s substantive variants were the result of explanatory glosses in the Vorlage made by a reader and then incorporated by the scribe of \( \Psi^{127} \) as has been seen in \( \Psi^{75} \). Larry Hurtado has written that “we should view most intentional changes to the text as more likely made by readers, not copyists.”\(^{70}\)

Of importance is that this study has reinforced Royse’s findings concerning lectio brevior. The scribe of \( \Psi^{127} \) does indeed omit more than they add and their habits are within the same range of omission as Royse’s scribes. The text as contained in \( \Psi^{127} \), however, does not depict a greater level of fixity. In fact, with respect to \( \Psi^{127} \) only, \( \Psi^{127} \) suggests that the opposite is true since we see much greater textual variation in this late witness. Since conclusions concerning fifth-century scribal habits as a whole cannot be made based on one manuscript, further analysis of contemporary manuscripts is needed. We can only hope that more data sets will be available to us when more papyri from the fifth century are found and analyzed.

---

66 Georg Gäbel, “‘Western Text,’ ‘D-Text Cluster,’ ‘Bezan Trajectory,’ Or What Else?—A Preliminary Study,” in Novum Testamentum Graecum Editio Critica Maior, ed. Holger Strutwolf, Georg Gäbel, Annette Hüffmeier, Gerd Mink and Klaus Wachtel, vol. 3.3 (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2017), 92: “These two manuscripts [05 and \( \Psi^{127} \)] may be derived from an earlier free form of text, therefore showing many differences between each other beside obvious agreements.”


68 Gäbel, “Text of \( \Psi^{127} \),” 146.

69 Schmid provides an example from \( \Psi^{55} \) that an addition is made by a reader rather than a scribe due to the documentary hand used as opposed to a literary book hand. He shows that these types of readers’ notes could be incorporated into a copy as part of the actual text. Schmid concludes: “Not everything we find in our manuscripts is the product of scribes. Some material is derived from readers and has been at times clumsily picked up by a scribe, thereby entering part of the tradition…. What actually reaches us is a complex editorial decision mediated by the scribes but not inaugurated by them in the course of the copying process.” Ulrich Schmid, “Scribes and Variants—Sociology and Typology,” in Textual Variation: Theological and Social Tendencies? Papers from the Fifth Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, ed. H. A. G. Houghton and David C. Parker, TS 3.5 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2008), 23.

Appendix: List of Singular Readings of ψ\textsuperscript{127}

10:33a κυ τε NA\textsuperscript{28} | [και] κυ ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Sub] | κυ δε 05 044 323
10:33b παραγενομενος NA\textsuperscript{28} | om. ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Om]
10:33c νυν NA\textsuperscript{28} | και ν[ν] ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Add]
10:33d αυνοιας NA\textsuperscript{28} | απ[π][ο][κριθα] [ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Sub]
10:33e το στομα NA\textsuperscript{28} | om. ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Om[-2]]
10:39 εδωκεν NA\textsuperscript{28} | [εποιησεν ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Sub]
10:41a λαω NA\textsuperscript{28} | [κοιμω] ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Sub]
10:41b μαρτυριν NA\textsuperscript{28} | om. ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Om]
10:41c συνεπιομεν αυτω NA\textsuperscript{28} | συνεπιομεν α[υτω] και ευν[ανε] ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Add]
10:41d νεκρων NA\textsuperscript{28} | [νεκρων] μ [ημερα] ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Tr] | νεκρων ημερας μ 05
10:42a τω λαω και διαμαρτυρασθαι NA\textsuperscript{28} | και δια[μαρτυρασθα] [ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Tr]
10:42b υπο NA\textsuperscript{28} | om. ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Om]
10:42c του NA\textsuperscript{28} | τη βολη και [προγνωσει του] ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Add [+4]]
10:43 δουντο παντες NA\textsuperscript{28} | om. ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Om[-2]]
10:44a επεπεσεν το πνευμα το αγιον NA\textsuperscript{28} | [το] π[να το αγιον επεπ] ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Tr]
10:44b τους ακουντας τον λογον NA\textsuperscript{28} | αυ[τους] ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Sub[-3]]
11:2 περιτομη NA\textsuperscript{28} | [περιτομη] [ομ. ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Add]
11:3a εισηλθες NA\textsuperscript{28} | [εισελθον] ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Sub]
11:3b και NA\textsuperscript{28} | om. ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Om]
11:3c αυτοις NA\textsuperscript{28} | με[τα αυτων] ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Sub [+1]] | συν αυτοις 05* | αυτοις 05*
11:4a αρξαμενος NA\textsuperscript{28} | [αρξαμενος] ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Sub]
11:4b λεγων NA\textsuperscript{28} | om. ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Om]
11:5 πολει NA\textsuperscript{28} | om. ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Om]
12:2 μαχαρη NA\textsuperscript{28} | [εν] μα [χαρα] ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Add] | μαχαρη 05* (man 2) 05* 08 020 044 18 323 424 614 945 1241 1505 1739
12:3a προσεβεζω NA\textsuperscript{28} | ηθε[λης] εν ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Sub]
12:3b συλλαβειν και πετρον NA\textsuperscript{28} | και τον [πε][τρον προς[λαβεθαι] ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Sub, Add] | και τον [πε][τρον εν] [προς[λαβεθαι] ψ\textsuperscript{127} (man 2)
12:5 υπο της εκκλησιας προς τον θεον περι αυτου NA\textsuperscript{28} | [προς] τον [υν] περι αυτου] υπ[το της εκκλησιας] ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Tr]
12:7a φως NA\textsuperscript{28} | το [φως] ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Add]
12:7b του Πετρου NA\textsuperscript{28} | om. ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Om[-2]]
12:7c ηγειρεν αυτον NA\textsuperscript{28} | [αυτου] [ηγειρεν] ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Sub, Tr]
12:7d ταξι και NA\textsuperscript{28} | τα[χει και ιδιου] ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Add]
12:7e εξεπέσαν αυτου αι αλυσεις εκ των χειρων NA\textsuperscript{28} | αι αλυσεις εικ των [χειρων αυ][του] [εξεπεθα] ν ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Tr]
12:8a προς αυτον NA\textsuperscript{28} | [τον Πετρου] [ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Sub]
12:8b σανδαλη NA\textsuperscript{28} | υπο[δηματα] ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Sub]
12:8c εποιησεν δε αυτως NA\textsuperscript{28} | om. ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Om[-3]]
12:8d λεγει αυτω NA\textsuperscript{28} | om. ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Om[-2]]
12:8e και ακολουθει NA\textsuperscript{28} | [και λαβομενος τον Πετρου] προ[ηγαγεν ειδα] αι [ολοθει] ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Add [+4]]
12:8f περιβαλον NA\textsuperscript{28} | και [αι] [περιβαλον] ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Add]
12:9a και εξελθον NA\textsuperscript{28} | om. ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Om[-2]]
12:9b ηκολουθει NA\textsuperscript{28} | [ο] δε πετρος [η] κωλουθει ψ\textsuperscript{127} [Add [+3]]
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16:15b εβαπτισθη η τις [εβαπτις] η τις \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Add]
16:15c τω κυριω ΝΑ 28 | om. \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Om[-2]] | τω θεω 05
16:16a εγενετο ΝΑ 28 | om. \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Om]
16:16b δε πορευουμενων ΝΑ 28 | [π]ορευουμενων \( \delta \varepsilon \) \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Tr]
16:16c ει την προευκηθη ΝΑ 28 | εν τη προευκηθη \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Sub]
16:16d παιδικην ΝΑ 28 | om. \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Om] | παιδικη \( \Psi ^{127} \) 81
16:16e πυθωνα ΝΑ 28 | om. \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Om] | πυθωνος \( \Psi ^{127} \)
16:16f τινα ΝΑ 28 | ητις \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Sub] | τις \( \Psi ^{127} \)
16:16g υπαντησαι ημιν ΝΑ 28 οι τις οι τις 04 08 044 33 81 1175 | om. \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Om[-2]] | απαντησαι ημιν οι τις οι τις 02 09 025 020 049 095 1 18 68 88 104 226 323 330 424 440 547 614 618 927 945 1241 1243 1245 1270 1505 1611 1646 1739 1828 1837 1854 1891 2147 2412 2492 2495 | απαντησαι ημιν οι τις οι τις 01* | υπαντησαι ημιν 2344
16:16h ητις εργασιων πολλην ΝΑ 28 | ητις πολ[λα]ην εργα[σ]αν \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Tr]
16:17a Παυλου και ημιν ΝΑ 28 | πολ[λα]ημω \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Sub[-1]]
16:17b αυτη κατακολουθουσα ΝΑ 28 | κατακολουθουσα \( \psi \)α τη η[τη] \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Tr]
16:18a τουτο δε ΝΑ 28 | καται τουτο \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Tr, Sub]
16:18b επι πολλαι ημεραι ΝΑ 28 | ημεραι εκαναι \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Tr, Sub[-1]] | om. 2492
16:18c και εξεβληθεν ΝΑ 28 | om. \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Om[-2]]
16:19a ιδοντες δε ΝΑ 28 | δε ειδο[ν] \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Orth] | δε ειδαν 05
16:19b ελθοντας ΝΑ 28 | om. \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Om[-3]]
16:20a προσαχονται ΝΑ 28 | ενεργα[ο]ν \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Sub]
16:20b επαινεται ΝΑ 28 | λεγο[ντε]ν \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Sub]
16:20c ουτοι οι ανθρωποί ΝΑ 28 | οτι οι \( \alpha \gamma [\alpha] \) ουτοι \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Add, Tr]
16:20d εκταρακουσσαν ΝΑ 28 | ταρα[ε]σκε[ν] \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Sugg]
16:21 εξεβληθεν ημιν ΝΑ 28 | [η]μιν \( \varepsilon εβληθη \) \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Tr]
16:22a και αυτων ΝΑ 28 | και αυτων \( \varepsilon [\iota] \) επικρατησσε \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Sub] | και αυτων κραζοντες 05
16:22b περιρκαντες αυτων τα ματα ΝΑ 28 | [τα ματα] τα περιρκαντες \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Om, Tr]
16:23a πολλας τε ΝΑ 28 | και \( \pi \) πολλας \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Tr, Sub] | πολλας 81 1175
16:23b αυτους ΝΑ 28 | om. \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Om]
16:23c αυτους ΝΑ 28 | om. \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Om]
16:24a ος ΝΑ 28 | ος δε δειμορφο\[ν\] και \( \varepsilon \) \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Add] | ος δε 05
16:24b παραγγελιαν ταυτην ΝΑ 28 | om. \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Om[-2]]
16:24c λαβον ΝΑ 28 | \( \pi \) \[\alpha \] λαβω \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Sub]
16:24d εβαλεν αυτους ΝΑ 28 | [α]υτους εβαλεν \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Tr]
16:24e την εις ουτεραν φυλακαν ΝΑ 28 | την φυλακαν την εις ουτεραν \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Add, Tr, Sub, Nons]
16:24f το ΝΑ 28 | om. \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Om]
16:25a μεσουνταν ΝΑ 28 οτι | μεσην νυκτα \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Sub] | μεσην της νυκτος 05*
16:25b Κυλας ΝΑ 28 | [Σιλας \( \Psi ^{127} \) [PropName] | Κυλας 03
16:25c δειμοι ΝΑ 28 οτι | δειμωτα ι ι \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Sub] | δειμοι οτι*
16:26a αφαι δε ΝΑ 28 | [ι] \( \varepsilon \) \[επαθα] \[ν] \( \psi \)κα ΝΑ 28 [Tr, Sub]
16:26b εις ημερα \( \psi \)κα ΝΑ 28 | [εγε]νετο \( \psi \)και \( \varepsilon \) \[χος] \[α]ν \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Tr] | εις ημερα εγενετο 01 02 08 614 1175
16:26c και εις ημερα \( \psi \)κα ΝΑ 28 | και \( \varepsilon \) \[χος] \[α]ν \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Add, Sub]
16:26d του δειμωριων ΝΑ 28 | om. \( \Psi ^{127} \) [Om[-2]]
16:26f δε NA28 | om. Ψ227 {Om} | τε 04 014 020 P 044 049 056 226* 323 330 440 547 618 1241 1243 1245 1270 1646 1828 1854 2492
16:27a επασαμενος NA28 | πας [c]πασαμενος Ψ27 {Add}
16:27b ημελεν NA28 | ηθελεν [v] Ψ227 {Sub} | εμελελεν 05 014 049 056 133 69 88 945 104 226 323 330 440 614 618 927 1241 1243 1245 1270 1505 1611 1646 1739 1828 1837 1854 1891 2147 2412 2492 2495
16:27c αναφειν NA28 81c | κατακ [ _ ]αι Ψ227 {Sub} | ανελειν 04* | ανεφειν 04* 81* 1243 1646 | ανεφειν 08
16:28a μεγαλη φωη NA28 | αυτου Ψ227 {Sub}
16:28b μηδεν παραξει NA28 | μη παρασα Ψ227 {Sub}
16:28c σεαυτω κακον NA28 | om. Ψ227 {Om[-2]}
16:29a προσεπεθεν NA28 | επιπεθεν Ψ227 {Sub}
16:29b Σιλα NA28 | Σιλα Ψ227 {PropName} | Σιλα 03
16:30a και NA28 | om. Ψ227 {Om}
16:30b εξω NA28 | εξω τους λοιπους ασφαλισα Ψ227 {Sub} | εξω τους λοιπους ασφαλισαμενος 05
16:30c εφη NA28 | προελθων εφη Ψ227 {Add}
16:31 πιστευον NA28 | [αυ]τω πιστευον Ψ27 {Add}
16:32a αυτω NA28 | αυτωι Ψ227 {Sub}
16:32b ευν πασιν NA28 | om. Ψ227 {Om[-2]}
16:32c τη οικια NA28 | om. Ψ227 {Om[-2]}
16:33a παραλαβον αυτου εν εκεινη τη φω NA28 | εκεινη τη [ω]ρα παραλαβοντες αυτου Ψ227 {Sub, Tr}
16:33b οι αυτου παντες παραχρημα NA28 | παντες οι παρ αυτου Ψ227 {Sub, Tr}
16:35a ημερας αυτου ΝΔ28 | γενομενης ημερας Ψ227 {Tr}
16:35b ραβδουχους NA28 | αποστελ[λ]ους τους ραβδουχους Ψ227 {Sub} | απεστειλαν τους ραβδουχους 05
16:35c στρατηγου NA28 | στρατηγου ει [το]ι εις την αγορα Ψ227 {Sub} | εις την αγορα και αναφεινεν τοις αυτοις 05
16:35d λεγοντες NA28 | λεγοντες τω δεισιοφυλακι Ψ227 {Add [+2]}
16:36a τους λογους NA28 | om. Ψ227 {Om[-2]}
16:36b τον Παυλον NA28 | om. Ψ227 {Om[-2]} | τον Παυλον 044
16:36c οτα NA28 | αυτους τοι Ψ227 {Add}
16:36d στρατηγου ινα απολυθητε NA28 | στρατηγου απολυθηται εις απολυθηται Ψ227 {Sub [+1]}
16:36e γαν ΝΔ28 | om. Ψ227 {Om}
16:36f εξελθοντες πορευεθε NA28 | om. Ψ227 {Om[-2]}
16:37a εφη προς αυτους NA28 | προς αυτους επεβεβη Ψ227 {Tr, Sub}
16:37b δειαντες NA28 | δειαντες δειαν [το]ι εις Ψ227 {Sub, Nons} | αναπεισαν δειαντες 05
16:37c φυλακην NA28 | την φυλακη Ψ227 {Add}
16:37d αυτοι NA28 | ουν αυτοι Ψ227 {Add}
16:37e ημας εξαγαγοντως ΝΔ28 | εξαγαγονται εις απολυθηται Ψ227 {Sub, Tr}
16:38a ρηματα NA28 | ρηθεντα Ψ227 {Sub}
16:38b τοις στρατηγους NA28 | τοις του Παυλου τοις στρατηγους Ψ227 {Add [+3]}
16:38c Ρωμαιοι NA28 | Ρωμαιος Ψ227* {Sub} | Ρωμαιος Ψ227c
16:38d εις του NA28 | αυτους απεκαλουν Ψ227 {Sub [+1]}
16:39a και ελθοντες παρεκαλεσαν NA28 | παραγενομενοι τε μετα ικανον φιλων εις την φυλακη Ψ227 {Sub, Tr} | και παραγενομενοι μετα φιλων πολλων εις την φυλακη παρεκαλεσαν 05
16:39b της πολεως NA\textsuperscript{28} | ταυτης δε πολεως Ψ\textsuperscript{127} \{Add, Tr\} | της πολεως ταυτης 05  
16:40a εξελθοντες NA\textsuperscript{28} | απολυθεντες Ψ\textsuperscript{127} \{Sub\}  
16:40b απο της φυλακης NA\textsuperscript{28} οι 03 345 1739 1891 | om. Ψ\textsuperscript{127} \{Om[-3]\} | εκ της φυλακης Ψ\textsuperscript{74} Λο\textsuperscript{2}  
05 08 014 020 025 044 049 056 1 33 69 81 104 226 323 330 440 547 614 618 927 1175 1241 1243 1245 1270 1505 1611 1646 1828 1854 2147 2412 2492 2495 | εκ της πολεως 1837  
16:40c εξηλθαν ΝΑ\textsuperscript{28} 01 05 | εξησιαν Ψ\textsuperscript{127} \{Sub\} | εξηλθον Ψ\textsuperscript{74} 02 03 08 014 020 025 044 049 056 1 33 69 81 104 226 323 330 440 547 618 927 1175 1245 1270 1505 1611 1646 1828 1854 2147 2412 2492 2495  
17:1a διοδευσαντες δε ΝΑ\textsuperscript{28} | om. Ψ\textsuperscript{127} \{Om[-2]\}  
17:1b την Αμφιπολιν NA\textsuperscript{28} | om. Ψ\textsuperscript{127} \{Om[-2]\}  
17:1c εις ΝΑ\textsuperscript{28} | εκειθεν δε εις Ψ\textsuperscript{127} \{Add, Sub\} | κακειθεν εις 05  
17:1d οπου ην συναγωγη ΝΑ\textsuperscript{28} | om. Ψ\textsuperscript{127} \{Om[-3]\}  
17:1e Ιουδαιων NA\textsuperscript{28} | om. Ψ\textsuperscript{127} \{Om\}  
17:2a τω Παυλω ΝΑ\textsuperscript{28} | Παυλος Ψ\textsuperscript{127} \{Om\} | ο Παυλος 05  
17:2b προς αυτους και NA\textsuperscript{28} | ειπεθεν εις την συναγωγη των Ιουδαιων \{Sub[+3]\} | προς αυτους 05  
17:2c διελεξατο NA\textsuperscript{28} 01 02 03 33 81 88 945 1739 1891 | δια[λεγομενος Ψ\textsuperscript{127} \{Sub\} | διελεγξατο 1175 | διελεξθη 05 08 044 1505 1611 2495 | διελεγξητο 014 020 025 049 056 1 69 104 226 323 330 440 547 618 927 1241 1243 1245 1270 1646 1828 1837 1854 2147  | διηλεξθη 614 2412  
17:3a διανοιγων NA\textsuperscript{28} | και διανοιγων \{Add\}  
17:3b εκ νεκρων NA\textsuperscript{28} | om. Ψ\textsuperscript{127}\textsuperscript{vid} \{Om[-2]\}  
17:4a εις NA\textsuperscript{28} | om. Ψ\textsuperscript{127}\textsuperscript{vid} \{Om\}  
17:4b τω Παυλω και NA\textsuperscript{28} | om. Ψ\textsuperscript{127}\textsuperscript{vid} \{Om[-3]\}  
17:4c Κυλα NA\textsuperscript{28} | om. Ψ\textsuperscript{127}\textsuperscript{vid} \{Om\} | Κυλα 03  
17:4d ολιγαι NA\textsuperscript{28} | ολιγαι Ψ\textsuperscript{127}+ \{Nons\} | ολιγαι Ψ\textsuperscript{127c}  
17:5 πονηρους ΝΑ\textsuperscript{28} | \{pol\}λους Ψ\textsuperscript{127} \{Sub\}  
17:6 αναστατωσαντες NA\textsuperscript{28} | \{av\}αναστατουντες Ψ\textsuperscript{127} \{Sub\}  
17:7a υποδεδεκται ΝΑ\textsuperscript{28} Ψ\textsuperscript{74} 01 02 03 05 014 020 025 044 056 1 69 81 88 104 226 323 330 440 547 614 945 1175 1241 1245 1270 1505 1611 1739 1828 1837 1854 1891 2147 2344 2412 2492 2495 | υποδε[δ]εδεκται 1646* | υποδεδεκτε 08 1646* | αποδεδεκται 618  
17:7b Ιακων NA\textsuperscript{28} | ο Ιακων Ψ\textsuperscript{127} \{Add\}  
17:7c πρασσου εις NA\textsuperscript{28} | πρασσε Ψ\textsuperscript{127}+ \{Nons\} | πρασσουν Ψ\textsuperscript{127c}  
17:7d βασιλεα NA\textsuperscript{28} | \{ω\}ς βασιλεα Ψ\textsuperscript{127} \{Add\}  
17:7e ετερον NA\textsuperscript{28} | om. Ψ\textsuperscript{127} \{Om\}  
17:7f ειναι NA\textsuperscript{28} | om. Ψ\textsuperscript{127} \{Om\}  
17:7g Ιησουν NA\textsuperscript{28} | τινα ποτε ιν Ψ\textsuperscript{127} \{Add[+2]\}  
17:8 εταραξαν δε ΝΑ\textsuperscript{28} | ενεπλησαν τε θυμου Ψ\textsuperscript{127} \{Sub[+1]\}  
17:9a και λαβοντες το ικανον NA\textsuperscript{28} | οι μεν ουν πι[ολι]ταρχαι ικανου λαβοντες \{Add[+4], Om[-2], Tr\}  
17:9b αυτους NA\textsuperscript{28} | om. Ψ\textsuperscript{127} \{Om\}  
17:10a ευθεως NA\textsuperscript{28} | απελευον Ψ\textsuperscript{127} \{Sub\}  
17:10b και τον Κυλα ΝΑ\textsuperscript{28} | cu[v] τω Κυλα Ψ\textsuperscript{127} \{PropName\} | και τον Κυλα Ψ\textsuperscript{45} 03 05