

The following table displays Maurice Robinson’s “Textual Commentary of the Greek New Testament,” on the left, against Bruce Metzger’s “A Textual Commentary of the Greek New Testament” for four variant sets in each of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and Acts. This is a randomly picked sample (subject to both authors having commented on the verses in question) to give the reader an opportunity to see two different approaches to weighing the external and internal evidence of the manuscript data. The reader needs to understand that Dr. Metzger is a champion of the Alexandrian manuscripts for presuppositional reasons, while Dr. Robinson is that for the Byzantine manuscripts based on the evidence. Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, Second Edition, © 1994 Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart. Used by permission; Maurice Robinson, *Textual Commentary of the Greek New Testament*, © 2018 by Maurice Robinson. Used by permission.

Compiled by Timothy Friberg, June 2018

ROBINSON TEXTUAL COMMENTARY GNT	METZGER TEXTUAL COMMENTARY GNT
MATTHEW 5.44¹ και προσευχεσθε υπερ των txt = Ⲱ B f¹ pc k sy^{s,c} sa bo^{pt} Theoph Ir^{lat} vid Or Cyp 2ⲓⲙ = ευλογειτε τους καταρωμενους υμας, καλως ποιειτε τους μισουσιν υμας, και προσευχεσθε υπερ των επηρεαζοντων υμας και NA: But I myself say to ^pyou, ^plove ^pyour enemies; and ^ppray on behalf of the ones persecuting ^pyou. ⲓⲙ: But I myself say to ^pyou, ^plove ^pyour enemies; ^pbless the ones cursing ^pyou; ^pdo nobly to the ones hating ^pyou; and ^ppray on behalf of the ones despitefully using ^pyou and persecuting ^pyou. The NA²⁷ reading obviously presents a far shorter rendering of the passage than appears in the ⲓⲙ text. The primary question has to be whether it is more likely that such a substantial amount of material was <i>omitted</i> (either accidentally or intentionally), or whether a significant amount of material was deliberately <i>inserted</i> into the narrative. The parallel Lk 6.27-28 ⲓⲙ offers little help, since the order of the various elements differ dramatically when compared with what appears in the Matthean 5:44 ⲓⲙ reading (identical words underlined, even when the order differs): Mt = εγω δε <u>λεγω υμιν</u> αγαπατε τους εχθρους υμων, Lk = <u>αλλ υμιν λεγω</u> τοις ακουουσιν, <u>αγαπατε τους εχθρους υμων</u>, Mt = <u>ευλογειτε τους καταρωμενους υμας, καλως ποιειτε τοις μισουσιν υμας, και</u>	MATTHEW <u>5.44</u> (bis) ὑμῶν καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς {A} Later witnesses enrich the text by incorporating clauses from the parallel account in Lk 6.27-28. If the clauses were originally present in Matthew’s account of the Sermon on the Mount, their omission in early representatives of the Alexandrian (Ⲱ B), Western (it^k Irenaeus^{lat} Cyprian), Eastern (syr^{c,s}), and Egyptian (cop^{sa,bo}) witnesses would be entirely unaccountable. The divergence of readings among the added clauses likewise speaks against their originality.

¹ Several minority support variations of the lengthy ⲓⲙ reading exist. These include the following: ευλογειτε τους καταρωμενους υμιν, καλως ποιειτε τους μισουσιν υμας, και προσευχεσθε υπερ των επηρεαζοντων και D* pc; ευλογειτε τους καταρωμενους υμας, καλως ποιειτε τους μισουσιν υμας, και προσευχεσθε υπερ των επηρεαζοντων και D^c pc Eus^{pt}; καλως ποιειτε τους μισουσιν υμας, και προσευχεσθε υπερ των επηρεαζοντων υμας και 1230 1242* pc lat Eus^{pt}; ευλογειτε τους καταρωμενους υμας, και προσευχεσθε υπερ των επηρεαζοντων υμας και 1071 pc Cl Eus^{pt}; and ευλογειτε τους καταρωμενους υμας, καλως ποιειτε τους μισουσιν υμας, προσευχεσθε υπερ των επηρεαζοντων υμας και W Eus^{pt}.

² Any text enclosed in square brackets [] reflects the designation of such word(s) within the NA/UBS main text.

Lk = <u>καλως ποιειτε τοιςμισουσιν υμας, ευλογειτε τους καταρωμενους υμιν,</u> Mt = <u>προσευχεσθε υπερ των επηρεαζοντων υμας και διωκοντων υμας.</u> Lk = <u>προσευχεσθε υπερ των επηρεαζοντων υμας.</u> Aside from the differing introductions of each passage, that in Matthew not only has an opposite order of the second and third clauses from that of Luke, but other subtle differences (υμας for υμιν in the καταρωμενους clause; a και preceding the προσευχεσθε clause that is not present in Lk; and the major inclusion of και διωκοντων υμας, not even present in Lk). Had the NA²⁷ text been original and the ℣ reading a harmonization, one would have expected the order of clauses to be identical, and without the minor alterations and major expansion found in the Matthean portion. In comparison, the overall NA²⁷ main text reading appears to be a deliberate abridgment, totally removing the καταρωμενους and μισουσιν clauses, and from the final portion eliminating the επηρεαζοντων clause (omissions indicated by brackets): Mt = εγω δε λεγω υμιν· αγαπατε τους εχθρους υμων, [. . .] και προσευχεσθε υπερ των διωκοντων υμας [. . .]. It is not very likely that all these omissions could have resulted from accidental scribal error.³ Equally, it is unlikely that the scribes involved with the ℣ reading would have intentionally harmonized in a quite <i>non-parallel</i> manner. Thus, a primary conclusion would appear to be intentional editorial alteration by the scribes or the scribal archetypes of the three named MSS primarily responsible for the NA²⁷ main text reading (℣ B f¹). Given that a certain degree of versional support (primarily Syriac and Coptic) also exists for the NA²⁷ reading, this suggests that any such editorial alteration might relate to the time when recensional activity related to the production of such versions was active; this particularly when the same reading also appears in a very limited number of Greek and Latin fathers. Overall, there really is no good reason to reject the ℣ reading in this variant as an interpolation or harmonization, particularly in view of the extremely limited support among all other Greek MSS for the NA²⁷ main text reading.	
MATTHEW 8.28⁴ Γαδαρηνων ℣ = Γεργεσηνων txt = B C Θ al sy^{s,p,h} Epiph	MATTHEW 8.28 Γαδαρηνῶν {C} The healing of the demoniacs is recounted by all three Synoptic Gospels, and in each account there are three

³ One could suggest that (perhaps!) the archetype underlying the NA²⁷ main text *may* have had the καταρωμενους and μισουσιν clauses in the *Lukan* order — in which case accidental omission of both clauses by haplography of καλως ∩ και might have occurred. Such would not, however, account for the omission of the επηρεαζοντων clause later in the verse.

⁴ Other readings include the harmonizing Γερασηνων, in 892^c latt sy^{hmg} sa mae; and Γαδαρηνων, in Δ.

NA: And he having come into the other side, into the region of the Gadarenes, two demon-possessed ones met him, exiting out of the tombs, exceedingly fierce so that no one had strength to pass by through that road.

℣: And he having come into the other side, into the region of the Gergesenes, two demon-possessed ones met him, exiting out of the tombs, exceedingly fierce so that no one had strength to pass by through that road.

The present unit and its Synoptic parallels reflects great confusion in relation to the name of the people and/or region involved. Even in the present unit, further differentiations of the term occur in isolated MSS. In fact, the situation becomes far more complicated when the main texts of NA²⁷ and ℣ in the present unit are considered in relation to their parallel accounts elsewhere. The details can be shown clearly in the following table:

PARALLEL LOCATION TABLE WITH VARIANTS

Reference	NA ²⁷ /WH	℣	Variants	Misspellings
Mt 8.28	Γαδαρηνων	Γεργεσηνων	Γερασηνων	Γαζαρηνων κ'
Witnesses:	B C Θ <i>al</i> sys,p,h Epiph	℣ κ ² L W f ¹ f ¹³ (sy ^{hmg}) bo Epiph ^{mss}	892c latt sy ^{hmg} sa mae	Γαραδηνων Δ
Mk 5.1	Γερασηνων	Γαδαρηνων	Γεργεσηνων	Γεργυστηνων W
Witnesses:	κ* B D [2427 ^{vid}] latt sa	℣ A C f ¹³ sy ^{p,h}	κ ² L Δ Θ f ¹ 28 33 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 2542 <i>al</i> sy* bo	
Lk 8.26	Γερασηνων	Γαδαρηνων	Γεργεσηνων	
Witnesses:	℣ ⁷⁵ B D latt sy ^{hmg} (sa)	℣ A W Ψ f ¹³ sy	κ L Θ Ξ f ¹ 33 579 700* 1241 <i>pc</i> (bo) Epiph	
Lk 8.37	Γερασηνων	Γαδαρηνων	Γεργεσηνων	Γεργασηνων C ²
Witnesses:	℣ ⁷⁵ B C* D 0279 579 <i>pc</i> latt (sa)	℣ κ ² A W Ψ sy	κ*,c L P Θ f ¹ f ¹³ 33 700* 1241 <i>al</i> (bo)	

Obviously, matters would be far simpler were the ℣ reading “Gadarenes” present in each case (although not so here in Mt) and if the NA²⁷ reading were “Gerasenes” in each case (but again, not here in Mt). It should further be observed that the *dominant* Alexandrian/Caesarean reading in Mark and Luke is actually “Gergesenes” (paralleling the ℣ reading in Mt) — but the critical editors followed Westcott and Hort in giving primary preference to B in those parallels.

The shifting of support for the NA²⁷ reading in each instance also should be considered: such is a sign of general textual instability among the MSS supporting the critical text. Not only is B the *only* witness common to all four units in the critical text, but the level of support for the critical text readings is only 3 MSS in Mt, Mk, and the first

principal variant readings referring to the place at which the miracle occurred: Γαδαρηνων, Γερασηνων, and Γεργεσηνων. The evidence of the chief witnesses for the three accounts is as follows:

	Γαδαρηνων	Γερασηνων
Mt 8.28	(κ*) B C ^{txt} (Δ) Θ sy ^{r,s,p,h}	it vg cop ^{sa} sy ^{r,hmg} 2
Mk 5.1	A C K f ¹³ sy ^{r,p,h}	κ* B D it vg cop ^{sa}
Lk 8.26	A K W Δ ^{gr} Ψ f ¹³ sy ^{r,c,s,p,h}	℣ ⁷⁵ B D it vg cop ^{sa}

Gerasa was a city of the Decapolis (modern Jerash in Transjordan) located more than thirty miles to the southeast of the Sea of Galilee and, as Origen perceived (*Commentary on John*, v, 41 (24)), is the least likely of the three places. Another Decapoltan city was Gadara, about five miles southeast of the Sea of Galilee (modern Um Qeis). Although Origen also objected to Gadara (which, he says, was read by a few manuscripts) because neither lake nor overhanging banks were there, Josephus (*Life*, IX, 42) refers to Gadara as possessing territory “which lay on the frontiers of Tiberias” (= the Sea of Galilee). That this territory reached to the Sea may be inferred from the fact that ancient coins bearing the name Gadara often portray a ship. Origen prefers Gergesa, not because it occurs in manuscripts – he is silent about this – but on the dubious basis of local tradition (it is the place “from which, it is pointed out, the swine were cast down by the demons”) and of the still more dubious basis of etymology (“the meaning of Gergesa is ‘dwelling of those that have driven away,’” and thus the name “contains a prophetic reference to the conduct shown the Savior by the citizens of those places, who ‘besought him to depart out of their territory’”).

Of the several variant readings the Committee preferred Γαδαρηνων on the basis of (a) what was taken to be superior external attestation ((κ*) B C^{txt} (Δ) Θ sy^{r,s,p,h} geo¹ mss known to Origen *al*), and (b) the probability that Γεργεσηνων is a correction, perhaps proposed originally by Origen,¹⁷ and that Γερασηνων (which is supported only by versional evidence) is a scribal assimilation to the prevailing text of Mark ([5.1](#)) and/or Luke ([8.26](#), [37](#)).

occurrence in Lk (the second Lukan occurrence garnered support from 6 named MSS somewhat mysteriously, since the additional witnesses themselves vary from their testimony in the other related parallels).

Given that the proper names involved are somewhat similar (a factor that readily could cause scribal confusion), the inconcinnity between what appears in Mt as opposed to the general unanimity in Mk and Lk (whether one follows $\mathfrak{N}$, the NA²⁷ main text, or the dominant Alexandrian/Caesarean variants) remains problematic, not only for interpretation but also in regard to questions involving textual transmission. The one certain element is that the distinctive reading in Mt (regardless of text followed) differs from the readings that distinguish the parallel accounts of Mk and Lk. Why such occurred remains a mystery, but from a text-critical standpoint (as opposed to interpretative or exegetical), the distinctions remain solid within the respective forms of text involved.

As for the geographical locations cited within the Decapolis territory, the following data appear to be secure:

Gerasa is a city about 30-35 miles southeast of the Sea of Galilee. It is unlikely that its territory ($\chi\omega\rho\alpha$, Mt 8.28; Mk 5.1; Lk 8.26) would have extended to the Sea itself.

Gadara is a city about 6 miles southeast of the Sea of Galilee, and its territory did likely extend to the Sea itself, since boats have been depicted on its coins.

Gergesa, while technically an unknown location, may well be identified with modern El Kursi, somewhat northward on the east shore of the Sea of Galilee, in an area where a steep bank, cliffs, and caves are present.

Aside from more the radical form-critical assumptions of an “original” story originally set well inland and later modified to a seaside location, the Gergesene and Gadarene locations appear far more likely to represent the correct site of the event, with those specific readings also being those occurring in $\mathfrak{N}$ as well as in the more dominant Alexandrian/Caesarean witnesses. These considerations severely call into question the extremely limited support for the alternative forms that appear in the critical text (again due primarily to an undue reliance on Codex Vaticanus, the only common link for all the critical text readings, as noted above).

Should one enquire as to why the MSS supporting the critical text would have favored the “more difficult” and well-nigh impossible reading involving the distant inland Gerasa, the answer is simple: Gerasa was a well-known city within the Decapolis, and a small number of scribes — who may have been unfamiliar with actual geography but were unaware of any “Gergesene” location — could easily have altered the text in Mt from “Gergesenes” to “Gadarenes” and (perhaps due to similarity of sound) altered the Mk/Lk “Gadarenes” into “Gerasenes.” Regardless of possibilities, the $\mathfrak{N}$ reading is commended as best on both external MS support as well as internal geographical grounds, with the Alexandrian/Caesarean dominant reading holding a clear second place and the NA²⁷ critical text reading being by far the least likely.

Put simply, there really is no reason to follow the fluctuating slim support for the NA²⁷ reading in any of these three variant units. Yet one cannot presume a threefold accidental omission of the same word in the same phrase. Either the exclusion was original to Matthew, was intentional in all three variant units, or was based upon some sort of accidental error.

In view of the frequent occurrence elsewhere of the fuller expression ὦτα ἀκούειν (Mk 4.9, 23; 7.16; Lk 8.8; 14.35), it was to be expected that copyists would add the infinitive here (and in 13.9 and 43). If the word had been present in the original text, there is no reason why it should have been deleted in such important witnesses as B D 700 *al.*

Had the phrase without $\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$ been original to Matthew, one would have expected to see far more MSS and versional witnesses supporting the exclusionary phrasing rather than the limited and fluctuating support present among the existing data, perhaps also with patristic comment regarding the difference between Matthew and the parallel Synoptic narratives. To presume that all remaining witnesses deliberately chose to harmonize the Matthean phrasing to what appears in Mark and Luke would be to ignore the known “tenacity” of scribes in preserving the text that lay before them, to ignore the *lack* of scribal harmonization in numerous other places where similar differences occur in parallel accounts, and to ignore the fact of Matthew being the most popular Synoptic Gospel in the early church, which would suggest the Markan and Lukan accounts would have been more likely to have been harmonized to the Matthean form than *vice versa*.

On the other hand, had there been an intentional editorial decision to remove ἀκουεῖν — and that only in Matthew — the overriding question would be why such might have been done. Exclusion neither adds nor subtracts anything significant from the general expression, and it would be quite unlikely that the omission of ἀκουεῖν from the similar phrasing in Revelation would have exercised any real influence on the matter. In addition, had this been a deliberate editorial decision on the part of some archetypal Alexandrian or Western scribe or scribes, one then is hard pressed to establish why the parallels in Mark and Luke remained untouched. So this scenario is really highly unlikely to have occurred.

Alternatively, it is possible that ἀκούειν was omitted accidentally in one of the three Matthean units (likely in an earlier archetype) due to a skip in the common portion of text from ἀκούειν to ἀκουετω. If such occurred in a single Matthean location by accident, it could be possible that a subsequent scribe or editor could have presumed such as a “Matthean norm,” and thereby would intentionally “correct” the remaining two occurrences in that book by similar exclusion. In any case, the paucity and fluctuation of support for the NA²⁷ main text reading in the three units under consideration weighs strongly against the originality of that phrasing, and continues to support the originality of the $\mathfrak{M}$ reading in each instance.

MATTHEW

11.19⁶ των εργαων txt = **N** B* W pc sy^{p,h} sa^{ms} bo Jer^{mss}
 M̃ = των τεκνων

NA: The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say, 'Behold, a man gluttonous and a wine drinker; a friend of tax collectors and of sinners.' And the wisdom was justified from her works.

¶: The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say, ‘Behold, a man gluttonous and a wine drinker; a friend of tax collectors and of sinners.’ And the wisdom was justified from her children.

	MATTHEW
--	----------------

11.19 ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων {B}

The Committee regarded the reading τέκνων (widely supported by B² C D K L X Δ Θ Π and most minuscules) as having originated in scribal harmonization with the Lukan parallel (7.35).²⁰ The readings with πάντων represent further assimilation to the passage in Luke.

⁵ NA²⁷ omits the entire sentence, following $\aleph B L \Delta^* 0274 28 [2427] sa^{mss} bo^{pt}$.

⁶ Another reading is πάντων των έργων, in f¹³ pc (k).

Obviously the variant terms <i>εργων</i> and <i>τεκνων</i> do not resemble each other except for the genitive plural ending. In addition, there is no close connection to either word in any form in the near context: forms of <i>τεκνον</i> only appear many verses earlier and later (Mt 10.21; 15.26), and the closest context for any form of <i>εργον</i> occurs only at Mt 11.2, but not in a pertinent passage.⁷ On the other hand, the actual parallel, Lk 7.35, does read <i>τεκνων</i> as with the <i>ℳ</i> reading in Mt, and the NA²⁷ apparatus in Mt suggests harmonization to the Lukan parallel.⁸ Yet, had harmonization on the part of <i>ℳ</i> occurred in relation to <i>τεκνων</i>, one would expect a similar assimilation of the Lukan <i>παντων</i>⁹ — but such is notably absent in Matthew. The Lukan parallel reads in <i>ℳ</i> <i>απο των τεκνων αυτης παντων</i> (with differing variants that harmonize to varying degrees with Mt). That parallel thus remains distinctly different from the Matthean <i>ℳ</i> reading.¹⁰ Had harmonization actually occurred, the absence of <i>παντων</i> in Mt would be quite peculiar. Were the MSS somewhat evenly divided, it would seem that the principle favoring the <i>non</i>-harmonizing reading would apply — but in fact, the NA²⁷ text actually represents the “easier” reading since it makes <i>explicit</i> (wisdom justified by its <i>works</i>) that which is only <i>implicit</i> and in fact <i>figurative</i> in the <i>ℳ</i> text (wisdom justified by its <i>children</i>). Additionally, scribes — and only three named MSS are involved at this point¹¹ — familiar with the emphasis in James regarding faith demonstrated by works could well have altered the reading in Matthew on that basis; in particular the comments of Jas 2.21, 25 “was not Abraham/Rahab justified by works?” (<i>ουκ εξ εργαων εδικαιωθη</i>;) in both verses of which <i>εδικαιωθη</i> is utilized in a connection favorable to <i>εργων</i>.¹² That the same three scribes did not alter the Lukan parallel is not significant, given their known inconsistencies as well as the tendency to alter the more popular Matthew in such matters.¹³	

⁷ Beyond these data, the NA²⁷ phrase *απο των εργαων* elsewhere occurs only at Heb 4.10 in a totally different context, while the *ℳ* phrase *απο των τεκνων* occurs only at the Lk 7.35 parallel.

⁸ Variations of word order exist in the Lukan parallel unit, but *τεκνων* remains present in each transpositional instance except for *ℳ*², which transposes with *εργων*.

⁹ Although NA²⁷ in Lk 7.35 places *παντων* before *των τεκνων αυτης* while *ℳ* reads *των τεκνων αυτης παντων*, this does not affect the issue of non-harmonization regarding *παντων* in Matthew. The Lukan unit also has several minor variants that harmonize to varying degrees with Matthew, but these are not relevant to the present situation.

¹⁰ Some witnesses in Lk partially agree with the Matthean semi-harmonizing reading in *ℓ*¹³ (*παντων των εργαων*).

¹¹ Two MSS (*ℳ* B) are Alexandrian, deriving from a common ancestral archetype; the third MS (*W*) is usually Byzantine in Matthew, but departs from that Textform in the present instance.

¹² That the passages from James might appear to contradict Rom 4.2 where the same terms appear within a hypothetical conditional phrase in a different context (*ει γαρ Αβρααμ εξ εργαων εδικαιωθη* *εξχει καυχημα*) is not a primary issue at this point.

¹³ One can also compare the more remote parallels where forms of *εργον* and *δικαιω* appear together: Rom 3.20,28; 4.2; Gal 2.16; Jas 2.24. Cf. also the LXX, only Sirach 16.27 (*και ουκ εξελιπον απο των εργαων αυτων*) and Sirach 32.22 (*και απο των τεκνων σου φυλαξαι*). Neither *εκ των εργαων* nor *εκ των τεκνων* occur in the LXX.

MARK 1.4¹⁴ [ο] βαπτίζων txt = ℣ L Δ pc bo ℣ = βαπτίζων NA: John came to be <u>[the one] baptizing</u> in the wilderness and proclaiming a baptism of repentance with reference to the remission of sins. ℣: John came to be <u>baptizing</u> in the wilderness and proclaiming a baptism of repentance with reference to the remission of sins. The inclusion of the definite article here affects translation somewhat. The article preceding βαπτίζων elsewhere occurs only twice: Mk 6.14, where Ιωαννης ο βαπτίζων links the name with his function, “John, the one baptizing”; and Jn 1.33, where Jesus is denoted by function as ο βαπτίζων εν πνευματι αγιω). Had a title been intended, the phrase Ιωαννης ο βαπτιστης would have been more suitable (cf. Mt 3.1; 14.2; Lk 7.20, 33) — but such does not occur at all in Mark. Further, βαπτίζων without a preceding article occurs nowhere else in Mark, and only 4x in the remainder of the NT —all Johannine and in a context referencing or quoting John the Baptist (Jn 1.28, 31; 3.23; 10.40). Beyond this, the Mk 1.4 construction with εγενετο preceding the participle appears awkward in context, and is otherwise unparalleled in the NT. It appears far more likely in the present variant unit that the 3 named MSS (perhaps reflecting a common archetype) were influenced by the direct parallel passage in Mt 3.1, παραγινεται Ιωαννης ο βαπτιστης, which includes the article before the noun title. This is more particularly the case when the remaining Alexandrian MSS as well as all other MSS of other texttypes do not include the article in the Markan unit. The article in the present unit is superfluous, not reflective of Synoptic style, and weakly supported; there is no reason in the present unit to reject the ℣ reading.	MARK 1.4 [ὁ] βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ {C} In view of the predominant usage in the Synoptic Gospels of referring to John as “the Baptist” (ὁ βαπτιστής occurs in Mk 6.25 and 8.28, as well as seven times in Matthew and three times in Luke), it is easier to account for the addition than for the deletion of the definite article before βαπτίζων. The omission of καί in a few Alexandrian witnesses is the result of taking ὁ βαπτίζων as a title.
MARK 2:15-16¹⁵ οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων txt = B W 28 pc ℣ = οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι NA: And it occurs, while he reclined in his house, also many tax collectors and sinners were reclining together with Jesus and his disciples; for they were many and they were following him. And <u>the scribes of the Pharisees</u> . . . ℣: And it occurred, while he reclined in his house, also many tax collectors and sinners were reclining together with Jesus and his disciples, for they were many; and they followed him. And <u>the scribes and the Pharisees</u> . . .	MARK 2.15-16 αὐτῷ. (16) καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων ἰδόντες {C} The more unusual expression οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων is to be preferred, since the tendency of scribes would have been to insert καί after οἱ γραμματεῖς under the influence of the common expression “the scribes and the Pharisees.” Since in the Gospels the verb

¹⁴ Also including ο ante βαπτίζων within the longer variant unit cited in the NA²⁷ apparatus, B 33 [2427].

¹⁵ Other readings include οἱ δε γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, in Σ 700 a c e ff² sa^{mss}; καὶ εἶδεν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, in D r¹; καὶ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ, in **℣** L 33 pc b bo^{mss}; οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ, in Δ [2427]; and καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ, in ℣^{88vid}.

The issue here is translational as well as exegetical. Does Mark mention two groups (the scribes and the Pharisees) or a specific subgroup (the scribes belonging to the Pharisee party)? Certainly, the NA²⁷ type of reading occurs nowhere else, thus reflecting a *hapax* phraseology and a more difficult reading. The difficulty of such, however, should not be considered determinative, particularly when the reading in question is attested by only three named MSS reflecting the Alexandrian and Caesarean types — but *without* the support of the remaining MSS pertaining to those types.

More significantly, even in $\mathfrak{N}$ the otherwise common linkage of scribes and Pharisees is wholly unique within Mark; beyond this, the $\mathfrak{N}$ phrase reflects the *less* frequent (5x) *articular* form of both terms¹⁶ (the more common *non-articular* linkage of the two terms is found elsewhere 11x *only* in Matthew and Luke).¹⁷

Although the major parties within normative Judaism of that era (Pharisees and Sadducees) each might have scribes pertinent to their group — responsible not merely for copying the scriptures but to provide biblical interpretation in accord with the specific beliefs of their particular party — such distinction is not otherwise claimed or maintained within the NT. Rather, the scribes and Pharisees tend to be grouped together in clear opposition to Christ's claims and teachings without further distinction (in certain situations¹⁸ such as the rejection of resurrection concepts Sadducees are specifically cited, but scribes of any type are not particularly associated with their position). Further, the context involving meal fellowship with tax-collectors and sinners could have offended either leading party of Judaism, so it would appear unlikely that scribes belonging to the Pharisaic party would be singled out specifically.

Of greater text-critical importance, Mk 2.18 associates two disparate groups (the disciples of John the Baptist and those of the Pharisees) in regard to an unrelated question about fasting. One rightly could presume that if two such groups with little otherwise in common are linked in Mark, the previous incident could reflect a similar situation. There thus is no need for the scribes of Mk 2.16 particularly to be associated with the Pharisaic party. Rather, the articular distinction in Mk 2.18 (οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων), occurring twice in that verse, quite likely provided an impetus by attraction to the immediate context for the 3 named MSS in the present unit to read οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων.

Once more, it appears that the 3 named MSS supporting the NA²⁷ main text of the present variant unit reflect a secondary scribal development, here based on a primitive or archetypal scribal error tied to the close-context influence of the twofold τῶν Φαρισαίων that appears in the incident immediately following.

ἀκολουθεῖν is used of Jesus' disciples, never of those who were hostile to him, a full stop should follow αὐτῷ. Unmindful of this usage, copyists transferred the stop to follow πολλοί and inserted καί before ἰδόντες.

¹⁶ The articular linkage of scribes and Pharisees occurs elsewhere *only* at Mt 23.2; Lk 5.21; 6.7; 11.53; Jn 8.3.

¹⁷ The non-articular linkage of scribes and Pharisees occurs at Mt 5.20; 12.38; 15.1; 23.13, 14, 15, 23, 25, 27, 29; and Lk 11.44.

¹⁸ Mk 12.18 represents the only occurrence of Sadducees in that book, specifically in relation to their rejection of the resurrection concept (so also in the parallels Mt 22.23; Lk 20.27).

MARK 2:16¹⁹ εσθιει txt = B D W pc it [2427] ℣ = εσθιει και πινει NA: . . .having seen that he eats with the sinners and tax collectors, were saying to his disciples that, “With the tax collectors and sinners <u>he eats?</u>” ℣: . . .having seen him eating with the tax collectors and sinners, were saying to his disciples, “Why is it that with the tax collectors and sinners <u>he eats and he drinks?</u>” Continuing the same verse, the specifics of the scribal/Pharisaic complaint are made clear: while the NA²⁷ main text relates that Jesus <i>eats</i> with the tax collectors and sinners, the ℣ text shows the complaint extended to involve <i>drinking</i> with those rejected groups. Yet earlier in the verse it was noted only that they had seen Jesus <i>eating</i> with them, with no mention of drinking at that point. This alone could provide sufficient motivation for the three named MSS to exclude the ℣ phrase και πινει from their text, assuming deliberate excision (the alternative would have been to insert και πινει in the earlier portion of the verse — but it would be far easier to align the two statements by simple omission rather than creative addition). On the other hand, the longer ℣ reading at the close of the verse also could have been omitted by haplography of -ει ∩ -ει, which may be a more likely situation, given that the 3 named MSS are somewhat disparate in regard to texttype (Alexandrian and Caesarean). Significantly, the parallel Mt 9.11 in both NA²⁷ and ℣ shows the complaint to involve only eating (δια τι μετα των τελωνων και αμαρτωλων εσθιει ο διδασκαλος υμων), which also may have served as an impetus toward the shorter reading in order to harmonize to the Matthean account.²⁰	MARK 2.16 ἐσθίει {B} The addition of καὶ πίνει is a natural accretion inserted by copyists, perhaps under the influence of the parallel passage in Lk 5.30. The shorter reading, which is strongly supported by B D W al, was followed by Matthew, who added ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν (Mt 9.11), an expression that, in turn, was adopted in Mk 2.16 by the scribes of C L Δ f¹³ al.
MARK 2:22²¹ απολλυται και οι ασκοι txt = ℣⁸⁸ B 892 [2427] ℣ = εκχειται και οι ασκοι απολουνται NA: And no one throws new wine into old wineskins; but if not, the wine will burst the wineskins, and the wine <u>is destroyed and the wineskins</u>. But new wine is into current wineskins. ℣: And no one throws new wine into old wineskins; but if not, the new wine bursts the wineskins, and the wine <u>is poured out and the wineskins will be destroyed</u>. But new wine has a throwing into current wineskins.	MARK 2.22 ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἄσκοί {C} The reading which best explains the origin of the others is that preserved in B 892 cop^{bo}. Since the pendant καὶ οἱ ἄσκοί seems to require a verb, most witnesses moved ἀπόλλυται (making it plural) after οἱ ἄσκοί. Furthermore, under the influence of the parallels in Mt 9.17 and Lk 5.37, copyists introduced the verb ἐκχεῖται as more appropriate than ἀπόλλυται to describe what happens to wine.

¹⁹ Other readings include ησθιεν, in ℣⁸⁸ x D 892 c bo^{pt}; εσθιον (!), in Θ; also within extended transpositions relating to the longer variant unit: ~ εσθιοντα post αμαρτωλων, in A; ~ εσθιει post τελωνων, in 579.

²⁰ The remaining NA²⁷/℣ parallel in Lk 5.30 retains *both* terms in the complaint, but the *tense* differs from what appears in Mark (δια τι μετα των τελωνων και αμαρτωλων εσθιετε και πινετε). Additionally, in Matthew εσθιει is expanded by και πινει in some less significant MSS (346 565 1506) and rephrased to harmonize with Luke in sy^s as εσθιετε και πινετε.

²¹ Other readings include και οι ασκοι απολουνται, in D it; εκχειται και οι ασκοι, in L; , εκχειται και οι ασκοι απολλυνται, in W; and εκχειται και οι ασκοι απολυνται, in Θ.

This variant unit involves two issues, the presence or absence of <u>εκχειται</u> and the tense and location of <u>απολλομι</u>. The $\mathfrak{M}$ reading is more complex and also more difficult, particularly in regard to the use of the future tense <u>απολουνται</u> in regard to the wineskins that had already burst. Had the NA²⁷ reading been original, one is hard pressed to determine why the quite acceptable present passive <u>απολλυται</u> would have been deliberately changed to a peculiar future tense as part of the editorial alteration in $\mathfrak{M}$. On the other hand, if the $\mathfrak{M}$ reading were original, the simplification is quite natural: eliminate the problematic twofold statement by dropping <u>εκχειται</u> and replacing it with <u>απολλομι</u> repositioned and with tense altered to that originally present in the now-displaced $\mathfrak{M}$ reading. Also pertinent are the parallel passages in Mt and Lk — both of which support the $\mathfrak{M}$ reading in Mk, but with no evidence that would suggest harmonization by $\mathfrak{M}$ in Mark: Mk 2.22b $\mathfrak{M}$ και ο οινος <u>εκχειται</u> και οι ασκοι <u>απολουνται</u> Mt 9.17b και ο οινος <u>εκχειται</u> και οι ασκοι <u>απολλυνται</u> Lk 5.37b και αυτος <u>εκχυθησεται</u> και οι ασκοι <u>απολουνται</u> In fact, if the entire passage is compared in all three Synoptic Gospels, the level of non-harmonizing variance among them is significantly high, regardless of whether the $\mathfrak{M}$ or NA²⁷ text is followed. Yet when considering the $\mathfrak{M}$ text in Mark, the common element appearing in relation to the present variant unit in the three parallels is that each has some form of pouring out (<u>εκχεω</u>) relating to the wine followed by some form of destruction (<u>απολλομι</u>) relating to the wineskins — and this without either parallel retaining identical wording. Such in itself strongly suggests originality of the Markan $\mathfrak{M}$ reading rather than any attempt at harmonizing to those Matthean and Lukan parallels from a presumed “original” NA²⁷ main text reading. A further consideration involves the three named MSS supporting the NA²⁷ main text reading: although these witnesses all reflect a portion of the localized Alexandrian texttype, it is more significant that the remainder of the Alexandrian MSS do not concur with that reading, but instead support the reading of $\mathfrak{M}$ — another point strongly in favor of $\mathfrak{M}$ originality here, since it would be quite out of character for those remaining Alexandrian MSS to increase the length of the reading as well as to complicate such by not harmonizing to one or the other of the Synoptic parallels in the process. Once again, the weight of evidence points to $\mathfrak{M}$ originality in the present variant unit.	
LUKE 3.32²² Σαλα $\mathfrak{M}$ = Σαλμων txt = $\mathfrak{P}^4$ $\mathfrak{N}^*$ B sy^s sa bo^{mss}	LUKE <u>3.32</u> Σαλά {B}

²² Another reading is Σαλμων, in f¹ f¹³.

NA: of Jesse of Obed of Boaz of <u>Sala</u> of Nahshon ℣: of Jesse of Obed of Boaz of <u>Salmon</u> of Nahshon In the LXX (Rahlfs), Ruth 4.20-21, reads Σαλμ<u>α</u>ν twice (so also the variant spelling of f¹ f¹³ in the present unit), while Codex Alexandrinus in Ruth reads Σαλμ<u>ω</u>ν.²³ Yet in 1Chr 2.11, the LXX (Rahlfs) has Σαλμ<u>ω</u>ν twice, while Codex Alexandrinus there reads Σαλμ<u>α</u>ν.²⁴ More importantly, the phrasing in Chronicles is a near-duplicate of the Matthean genealogical statement (LXX και <u>Ναασσων</u> <u>εγεννησεν τον Σαλμων</u> και <u>Σαλμων</u> <u>εγεννησεν τον</u> Βοος; Mt 1.4-5 <u>Ναασσων</u> <u>δε</u> <u>εγεννησεν τον Σαλμων</u>· <u>Σαλμων</u> <u>δε</u> <u>εγεννησεν τον</u> Βοες/Βοοζ). Overall, the spelling of Σαλμ<u>ω</u>ν, appearing in Mt in NA²⁷/℣ without stated variant, coupled with the strong evidence of the LXX, strongly supports the ℣ spelling of Σαλμ<u>ω</u>ν in the present Lk 3.32 unit as opposed to the mongrelized Σαλα of NA²⁷ and the three named MSS supporting such.	The original reading appears to be Σαλά (℣⁴ ℣* B syr^s, pal cop^{sa}, bomss eth), which copyists later assimilated to Σαλμ<u>ω</u>ν, the reading of both the Matthean parallel (Mt 1.4-5) and the Septuagint of 1 Chr 2.11, or to Σαλμ<u>α</u>ν, the reading of ms. B at Ru 4.20 f. (Σαλμ<u>ω</u>ν, ms. A). In view of the early tradition that Luke was a Syrian of Antioch it is perhaps significant that the form Σαλά appears to embody a Syriac tradition (the Peshitta version of Ru 4.20 f. reads).
LUKE 10.38²⁵ αὐτον txt = ℣⁴⁵ ℣⁷⁵ B sa ℣ = αὐτον εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς NA: But as they proceeded, he himself entered into a certain village. But a certain woman, by name Martha, welcomed <u>him</u>. ℣: But it happened as they proceeded, even he himself entered into a certain village. But a certain woman, by name Martha, welcomed <u>him into her house</u>. Critical text advocates likely would consider the ℣ inclusion of the final phrase in this variant unit as an explanatory clarification, since without that phrase the passage seems to indicate only that Martha welcomed Jesus to the village, and perhaps the food preparation and serving might take place in an outdoor venue (not that this should matter in the overall context). The precise form ὑπεδέξατο otherwise occurs only at Lk 19.5 in the NT in relation to Zacchaeus. That phrase has no direct mention of a house, although the previous verse records Jesus saying σημερον γαρ <u>εν τω οικω σου</u> δει με μειναι. Elsewhere in the NT the verb υποδεχομαι occurs 2x elsewhere: Ac 17.7 and Jas 2.25 — both without mention of any house. Regarding the phrase εἰς τὸν οἶκον, it occurs 15x elsewhere in Lk and 5x in Ac. Of these, the phrase <i>immediately</i> follows the finite verb 11x in Lk and 3x in Ac, while a pronoun (in each case αὐτον, as in the present unit)	LUKE 10.38 αὐτόν {B} No motive is apparent for the deletion of the phrase “[received him] <i>into her house</i>” if it were present in the text originally. On the other hand, the bold and bare ὑπεδέξατο αὐτόν seems to call for some appropriate addition, which copyists supplied in various forms, some introducing οἰκίαν, others οἶκον, and each with or without αὐτῆς, ἐαυτῆς, or αὐτοῖς.

²³ The Cambridge LXX in Ruth shows as minor readings the Σααλμων and Σαλμω, as well as the Latin *Salam*. More significantly, that apparatus shows the LXX main text Σαλμαν as read by B and two other LXX MSS; the majority read Σαλμων (!), even though that spelling is not preferred by the editors.

²⁴ The Cambridge LXX in 1Chr also shows Σαλαμαν as a minor reading.

²⁵ Other readings include εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτῆς, in ℣¹ C²; and εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, in ℣^{3vid} ℣ C L Ξ 33 579 pc.

appears between the verb and εἰς τὸν οἶκον <i>only</i> at Lk 16.27; 22.54. This at least suggests a Lukan stylistic possibility, even while the more frequent Lukan usage might not include a pronoun. Had the NA²⁷ main text reading been original, a question would remain as to why such an unnecessary explanatory phrase would be thought necessary, particularly when the text without the phrase obviously was quite sensible (as witness the critical text acceptance of such). On the other hand, had the ℣ reading been original, even though exact haplographic omission due to a same beginning or ending may not have occurred, line skippage based on the similarity of αὐτον and αὐτης very well may have been the proximate cause of omission (the 16 letters involved are easily within a possible line length, as shown by the hypothetical setting below):²⁶ upedexato<u>auton</u> eistonoikona<u>utou</u> kaithdehnadelfh Added to this consideration is the further issue regarding external evidence, since even the remainder of the Alexandrian witnesses (ℙ^{3vid} Ⲭ C L Ξ 33 579 <i>pc</i>)²⁷ read the ℣ variant εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν; such argues very strongly against any originality of the omitted phrase. Given that only the three named MSS omit the phrase, it remains far more likely that accidental omission as described above (either independently or due to a common archetype) is the most likely reason for the reading of the NA²⁷ main text, particularly when there was no compelling need to the phrase to be added (even in differing form) by the remaining majority of witnesses.²⁸	
LUKE 11.11²⁹ καὶ ἀντί ℣ = μη ἀντί txt = ℙ⁴⁵ ℙ⁷⁵ B <i>pc</i> Mcion^E NA: But whom of you^p being the father, the son will ask for a fish, <u>and instead of</u> a fish he will give over to him a serpent? ℣: But whom of you^p being the father, the son will ask for bread, he will not give over to him a stone? or even a fish, <u>not instead of</u> a fish he will give over to him a serpent? As a whole this verse has significant differences throughout between the NA²⁷ main text and that of ℣. The present variant unit merely happens to be the only location within this verse where the NA²⁷ text is supported	LUKE <u>11.11</u> καὶ ἀντὶ ἰχθύος {C} The reading with καὶ (ℙ^{45, 75} B cop^{sa} a/) preserves a Semitism that most copyists replaced with μή, the usual Greek interrogative particle

²⁶ Many other arrangements could be postulated with similar results.

²⁷ Note that the earliest of these witnesses is the 4th-century Ⲭ and *not* ℙ³ (dated VI/VII in NA²⁷).

²⁸ Also to be noted in this verse are the other differences between ℣ and NA²⁷: ℣ ἐγένετο δε ἐν; NA²⁷ ἐν δε (11 MSS support); and ℣ καὶ αὐτος; NA²⁷ αὐτος (7 MSS support). In each case the NA²⁷ main text also has the support of the same 3 MSS as in the present unit.

²⁹ Another reading is the conflation μη καὶ ἀντί, in Γ *pc*.

by only three named MSS, while the remaining units possess additional levels of support.³⁰ To put all into perspective, the complete verse according to each edition reads as follows, with the differences underlined:³¹

NA²⁷: τίνα δε εξ υμων τον πατερα αιτησει ο υιος

℣: τίνα δε υμων τον πατερα αιτησει ο υιος αρτον, μη λιθον επιδωσει αυτω;

NA²⁷: ιχθουν, και αντι ιχθυος οφιν αυτω επιδωσει;

℣: η και ιχθουν, μη αντι ιχθυος οφιν επιδωσει αυτω;

Compared to the more significant variants in this verse, the και αντι versus μη αντι of the present unit appears almost minor. The parallel in Mt 7.10 offers little assistance, since the clause in question lacks αντι in the context (μη οφιν επιδωσει αυτω). In addition, neither και αντι nor μη αντι otherwise appear in the NT, nor is any major point of syntax at issue since either reading could be acceptable. It is quite possible that accidental omission of the lengthy 28-letter phrase (αρτον μη λιθον επιδωσει αυτω η και) could have occurred by line skippage as shown below, followed by the NA²⁷ και replacing μη as a matter of later damage repair:

!p!raaithseiouios
artonmhliqonep
idwseiautwhkai
ixqunmhantiixqu
os

If such accidental omission did occur, it then becomes important that the lengthy omission occurs in only 4 named MSS (ℱ⁴⁵ ℱ⁷⁵ B 1241 *pc*), the primary 3 of which are those involved in the present unit's minor adjustment of μη versus και. It thus seems clear that the Alexandrian archetype of the 3 named MSS was involved in an erroneous omission, with slight contextual repair to smooth out the resultant reading. This scenario appears even stronger when one notes that other key Alexandrian witnesses (℞ C L 33 Ψ) — even with minor variation — read with ℣ at this point. There thus is no reason to depart from a presumed originality of the ℣ reading in the present unit, nor in regard to the longer omission (which is discussed similarly under the 4 named MSS category).

LUKE

13.27³² ερει λεγων υμιν,
℣ = ερει, Λεγω υμιν

txt = ℱ^{75c} B 892 *pc*

LUKE

13.27 ἐρεῖ λέγων ὑμῖν {C}

³⁰ Other variant units involved in this verse are supported respectively by 4 and 6 named MSS, and these will be dealt with under their respective categories.

³¹ The presence of εξ in NA²⁷ but not in ℣ is not mentioned in the NA²⁷ apparatus for that unit; rather, the NA²⁷ main text reading — with εξ present — is claimed to be that of undivided ℣. Von Soden's apparatus, however, *specifically* states that the *absence* of εξ is the Byzantine (bold K) reading; also, Tischendorf⁷ says εξ is included by ABCDKLMRX *al*⁵⁰, but excluded by EFGHSUVTΔΛ *al pl* — a situation that suggests at least a divided Byzantine reading and likely a majority that omit εξ.

³² Other readings include ερει υμιν, in ℞ 579 *pc* lat sy^p sa bo^{pt}; and ερει *solus*, in 1195 *pc* bo^{pt}.

NA: And <u>he will utter, saying to you^p</u>, “I do not know [you^p], from where you^p are. ^pStand apart from me, all workers of unrighteousness. ℣: And <u>he will utter, “I say to you^p</u>, I do not know you^p, from where you^p are. ^pStand apart from me, all the workers of the unrighteousness. The NA²⁷ main text reading here is not merely a solecism, but so grammatically problematic as to be well-nigh impossible.³³ This is more clearly evidenced by the fact that other Alexandrian MSS either read with ℣ (L Ψ) or simply omit the problematic λεγων (Ⲭ 579) — the latter further bolstered by similar omissions in the Latin and Coptic versions. Most likely in an archetype of ⲡ⁷⁵ B 892 the final Nu of λεγων was unintentionally added to λεγω due to attraction from the following ομιλ, with the initial ℣ reading of ⲡ^{75*} representing that scribe’s unintentional failure to represent that archetype, with correction following. This particular reading of NA²⁷ exemplifies the principle that even when the “more difficult” reading is to be preferred, sometimes the difficulty of a reading is so great that such could not have been original.³⁴ It would appear that almost any research unencumbered by an undue preference for Codex Vaticanus should have no difficulty in rejecting this ungrammatical solecism as the product of scribal error. The ℣ reading on all counts is clearly original in the present unit.³⁵	The reading adopted by the Committee, though narrowly attested, seems to account best for the origin of the other readings. The awkwardness of the participle λέγων (which probably represents the construction of the Hebrew infinitive absolute: “he will <i>indeed</i> say to you”) would have prompted copyists either to alter it to the indicative (λέγω) or to omit it as superfluous.
JOHN 6.14³⁶ ὁ ἐποίησεν σημεῖον ℣ = ὁ ἐποίησεν σημεῖον ὁ Ἰησοῦς txt = Ⲭ D W pc it vgst sy^{s,c} cop Did^{lem} NA: Therefore the men, having seen <u>what sign he did</u>, were saying, “This is truly the Prophet, the one coming into the world.” ℣: Therefore the men, having seen <u>what sign Jesus did</u>, were saying, “This is truly the Prophet, the one coming into the world.”	JOHN <u>6.14</u> ὁ ἐποίησεν σημεῖον {B} Although the combination of ⲡ B it^a in support of ἃ ... σημεῖα is impressive, the plural seemed to the Committee to have arisen from scribal assimilation to 2.23 and 6.2. The addition of ὁ Ἰησοῦς was made by copyists in the interest of clarity.

³³ Appeals in various textual and other commentaries to a presumed Lukan semitism intended to represent the Hebrew infinitive absolute appear extremely strained, particularly since such otherwise does not occur in either the Lukan writings or the remainder of the NT.

³⁴ In this regard, cf. the NIV which — despite following the NA²⁷ text (cf. Mounce’s NIV Interlinear) — makes no attempt to render the problematic phrase, but instead reads “But he will reply, ‘I don’t know you or where you come from.’” Similarly, Schwandt’s ESV Interlinear presents the NA²⁷ reading, but translates the passage as though it read like ℣, “But he will say, ‘I tell you, I do not know where you come from.’”

³⁵ Such also appears to be the judgment of I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 566-567: “It may simply be due to a scribal error for λεγων”; so also Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996), 1241-1242, who “by a slight margin” prefers the ℣ reading since it “could be favored by internal evidence.” So also Martin M. Culy, Mikeal C. Parsons, and Joshua J. Stigall, *Luke: A Handbook on the Greek Text*, BHGNT (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2010), 467: “Given the overwhelming textual support for the [℣] reading . . . , however, we are likely dealing with an early scribal error.”

³⁶ Other readings include ἃ ἐποίησεν σημεῖα, in ⲡ⁷⁵ B 091 pc a; and ὁ ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς σημεῖον, in 1424.

The issue here involves whether Jesus as the clausal subject is specifically identified. The meaning is conveyed identically in either variation, and Jesus clearly remains the referent. As a point of detail, the 3 named MSS that here underlie the NA²⁷ main text are further supported in regard to the specific omission of ο Ιησους by Ɔ⁷⁵ B 091 *pc a*; their actual differences involving the wording of the preceding three-word phrase. The NA²⁷ omission of ο Ιησους in the present unit, there fore, is in actuality a matter of support by 6 named MSS rather than 3 named MSS. The present commentary deals with the number of supporting MSS for the *entire* phraseology involved in a particular NA²⁷ variant unit, thus making the present unit with 3 named MSS the basis for categorization, even though when broken down into component parts the two-word exclusion of ο Ιησους actually has 6 named MSS in support.

As an initial observation specific to the preceding phrase, occurrences of ὁ ἐποίησεν are rare, whether accompanied by a clausal subject or not. The phrase with a subject present occurs at Lk 6.3 (ὁ ἐποίησεν Δαυιδ) and Ac 14.11 (ὁ ἐποίησεν ο Παυλος); the phrase without a subject occurs *only* in the parallels Mt 26.13/Mk 14.9 (ὁ ἐποίησεν αὐτη).

If the plural phrase ἃ ἐποίησεν is considered (the Alexandrian alternative of Ɔ⁷⁵ B 091 in the present unit), such occurs 3x in Ɔ in John (Jn 4.45; 11.45, 46) and elsewhere only at Mt 21.15. Of these, a stated subject appears only at Jn 11.45, 46, with that subject in fact being ο Ιησους. NA²⁷ has one additional occurrence of ἃ ἐποίησεν at Jn 21.25, again with the stated subject being ο Ιησους.

Extending the inquiry to *any* finite verb following the singular relative ὁ, the expression with a stated subject (articular or anarthrous) following the verb occurs at Mt 8.4 (ὁ προσεταξεν Μωσης); Jn 4.5 (ὁ εδωκεν Ιακωβ); 6.22 (ὁ ἐνεβησαν οἱ μαθηται); 14.26 (ὁ πεμψει ο πατηρ); Ac 5.32 (ὁ εδωκεν ο θεος); and Ac 10.37 (ὁ ἐκηρυξεν Ιωαννης). Yet in contrast, 83 other NT occurrences find the singular relative ὁ followed by a finite verb but lacking a stated subject — this by far being the more familiar expression. The latter also is more frequent even in John, with 12 additional occurrences of the relative ὁ plus finite verb but lacking a subject.³⁷

Similarly, extending the inquiry to any finite verb following the plural relative ἃ, a stated subject (articular or anarthrous) elsewhere follows the verb at 1Cor 2.9 (ο θεος); 10.20 (τα εθνη); Col .3.6 (η οργη του θεου); and Re 10.4 (αι επιτα βρονται). Yet, again in contrast, the plural relative ἃ followed by a finite verb but lacking a stated subject occurs 50 other times in the NT — once more making the relative clause without a stated subject the far more common and more familiar form of expression.

It thus well could be the case that the exclusion of ο Ιησους may have been due either to (1) accidental omission of the short 3-letter *nomen sacrum* phrase (**ΟΙC2**), just as with many other short words or phrases; or (2) scribal omission based on the more frequent and thus more familiar construction in which a relative clause followed

³⁷ Jn 3.11 (2x), 32; 4.14, 22; 6.39; 8.38 (2x); 13.27; 16.17, 18; 17.2, 4; 19.22. Also cf. Jn 6.37 (ὁ διδωσιν μοι ο πατηρ) and Jn 18.11 (ὁ δεδωκεν μοι ο πατηρ), both with an intervening dative pronoun.

by a finite verb lacks a stated subject; or (3) intentional omission with a design of textual or syntactical smoothing by eliminating otherwise obvious and therefore unnecessary terms. Although one cannot determine particular scribal motivation, the fact that only 3 named MSS (plus an additional 3 subsidiary MSS) omit ο Ιησους in the present unit while all other Greek manuscript witnesses include the proper name strongly suggests the originality of the proper name in this location; this is particularly the case when the text without the presence of the proper name is neither ambiguous nor confusing in regard to the person referenced.

The investigation of this particular type of variant unit is not complete, however, since the identical unit recurs numerous times in the Gospels. In several Johannine instances, ο Ιησους is present in ℣ but absent in NA²⁷, demonstrated by the following chart that helps to shed further light on the situation regarding this particular type of unit (instances involving εποιησεν or possible haplography of **-ΟΙC** ∩ **ΟΙC**² are specifically noted in the second column):³⁸

Reference	ο Ιησους (℣)	omit (NA ²⁷)
Jn 4.16	℣	℣ ⁶⁶ ℣ ⁷⁵ B C* 33 ^{vid} <i>pc</i> a sa ^{mss} ac ² bo ^{mss} (5 MSS)
Jn 4.46	℣	℣ ⁶⁶ ℣ ⁷⁵ ℵ B C D L W ^s 086 33 1241 <i>al</i> lat sy ^c (11 MSS)
Jn 6.14	℣	(℣ ⁷⁵) ℵ (B) D W (091) <i>pc</i> it vg st sy ^{s,c} cop Did ^{lem} (a) (6 MSS)
Jn 8.20	℣	(not in NA ²⁷ apparatus)
Jn 8.21	ΑΥΤΟΙC ΟΙC²	℣ ^{39vid} ℣ ^{66*} ℣ ⁷⁵ ℵ B D L T W <i>pc</i> b (e) ac ² pbo (9 MSS)
Jn 11.45	Α ΕΠΟΙΗCΕΝ ΟΙC²	(not in NA ²⁷ apparatus)
Jn 13.3	℣	℣ ⁶⁶ ℣ ⁷⁵ ℵ B D L W 1241 <i>pc</i> lat pbo (8 MSS)
Jn 18.5	ΑΥΤΟΙC ΟΙC²	℣ ⁶⁰ B D <i>pc</i> it sy ^s pbo (3 MSS)

Nor is this specific variant unit exclusive to John, but the identical unit also appears frequently in the remaining Gospels, almost exclusively with ℣ reading ο Ιησους and NA²⁷ omitting such from its main text, often without mention in its apparatus:³⁹

Reference	ο Ιησους (℣)	omit (NA ²⁷)
Mt 4.12	℣	ℵ B C* ^{vid} D Z 33 700 1241 <i>pc</i> ff ¹ k vg st sy ^s sa mae bo ^{pt} Or (8 MSS)
Mt 4.23	℣	B (k) sy ^c sa mae (1 MS)
Mt 8.3	℣	ℵ B C* f ¹ f ¹³ 33 892 <i>al</i> k sa ^{mss} bo Cyr (7 MSS)

³⁸ A similar occurrence in Jn 8.9 (μονος ο Ιησους, ο Ιησους μονος, or ο Ιησους *solus*), where NA²⁷ follows D 1 892 *pc* c vgst in reading only μονος, is *not* included in the chart; this because the NA²⁷ text of the *pericope adulterae* is double bracketed by its editors as non-Johannine, and also because the NA²⁷ apparatus is extremely limited and restricted when compared with the present writer's full collation data for that pericope. Similar related but non-identical variant units in John that are not cited in the chart include the following: Jn 19.38, where ℣ reads ο Ιησους and NA²⁷ reads αυτου; and Jn 19.39, where ℣ reads τον ιησουν and NA²⁷ reads αυτον (so also Lk 22.63).

³⁹ Elsewhere one finds omission of an anarthrous Ιησους at Mt 9.12; 15.16; 16.20; 17.11; 17.20; 22.37; omission of anarthrous Ιησου at Mt 8.29; omission of Ιησους from ο δε Ιησους at Mt 24.2; Mk 7.27; replacement of ο δε Ιησους by και *solus* at Mk 1.41; Mk 5.19 (the latter not in the NA²⁷ apparatus); τω Ιησου replaced by αυτω at Mk 10.52; omission of a phrase containing ο Ιησους at Mt 13.51.

Mt 12.25	ⲙⲓ	Ⲭ ^{*,2} B sa (ⲡ ²¹ Ⲭ ¹ D 892* [k] sys,c bo) (5 MSS)		
Mt 14.14	ⲙⲓ	Ⲭ B D Θ f ¹ f ¹³ 33 700 892* <i>pc</i> lat cop (a b ff ² sys,c) (9 MSS)		
Mt 14.22	ⲙⲓ	(not in NA ²⁷ apparatus)		
Mt 14.25	ⲙⲓ	(not in NA ²⁷ apparatus)		
Mt 18.2	ⲙⲓ	Ⲭ B L Z 078* 0281 f ¹ 700 892* 1241 bo (10 MSS)		
Mt 26.38	Ⲡⲩⲧⲟⲓⲥⲟⲓⲥ ²	(not in NA ²⁷ apparatus)		
Mk 5.13	ⲙⲓ	Ⲭ B C L W Δ f ¹ 28 (579) 892* 2542 [2427] (11 MSS)		
Mk 6.34	ⲙⲓ	(not in NA ²⁷ apparatus)		
Mk 8.1	ⲙⲓ	(not in NA ²⁷ apparatus)		
Mk 8.17	ⲙⲓ	Ⲭ ¹ B Δ 892* [2427] aur i sa ^{mss} bo (4 MSS)		
Mk 11.14	ⲙⲓ	(not in NA ²⁷ apparatus)		
Mk 11.15	ⲙⲓ	(not in NA ²⁷ apparatus)		
Mk 12.41	ⲙⲓ	Ⲭ B L Δ Ψ 892 <i>pc</i> [2427] a k sa ^{ms} bo (6 MSS)		
Mk 14.22	ⲙⲓ	Ⲭ ¹ B D W f ¹³ 565 [2427] it sy ^s sa (6 MSS)		
Lk 7.22	ⲙⲓ	(not in NA ²⁷ apparatus)		
Lk 8.38	ⲙⲓ	(not in NA ²⁷ apparatus)		
Lk 9.43	ⲟⲓⲥ ⲉⲧⲧⲟⲓⲥⲉⲛ ⲟⲓⲥ ²	ⲡ ⁷⁵ Ⲭ B D L Ξ f ¹ 579 700 1241 2542 <i>pc</i> lat sy ^{s,c} cop (11 MSS)		
Lk 9.60	ⲙⲓ	(not in NA ²⁷ apparatus)		
Lk 10.21	ⲙⲓ	ⲡ ⁴⁵ ⲡ ⁷⁵ Ⲭ B D Ξ 1241 <i>pc</i> lat sy ^{s,c} sa bo ^{pt} (7 MSS)		
Lk 13.2	ⲙⲓ	ⲡ ⁷⁵ Ⲭ B L 070 1241 <i>pc</i> lat sa ^{mss} bo ^{pt} (6 MSS)		
Lk 23.43	ⲙⲓ	ⲡ ⁷⁵ (Ⲭ) B (C) L sa ^{mss} bo ^{pt} (5 MSS)		
Lk 24.36	ⲙⲓ	ⲡ ⁷⁵ Ⲭ B D L 1241 it sy ^{s,c} sa bo ^{mss} (6 MSS)		

Additional instances similar to the above recurring variant unit involve omission of titles such as ο κυριος, ο θεος, as well as omission of additional other articular or anarthrous proper names; these are not cited in relation to the present discussion.

In contrast, it should be noted that NA²⁷ adds Ιησους at Mk 16.19 (double-bracketed and therefore rejected),⁴⁰ and also at Lk 5.34.⁴¹ Such addition is obviously the exception and not the usual practice of the predominantly Alexandrian scribes in such situations.

Noteworthy in all these is the fact that, had the ⲙⲓ scribes added ο Ιησους or Ιησους as a deliberate and systematic alteration, far more such additions should have appeared than presently might be claimed to exist.

⁴⁰ The rejected inclusion of Ιησους is supported by C* K L Δ f¹ f¹³ 33 565 579 892c 1241 1424 ℓ-844 ℓ-2211 *al* [2427] it vg^{cl} sy cop Ir^{lat}.

⁴¹ The inclusion there is supported by ⲡ⁴ Ⲭ B C D L W Ξ f¹ f¹³ 33 579 892 1241 2542 ℓ-844 ℓ-2211 *al* f sy^{hmg} cop.

In contrast, sporadic omission of ο Ἰησοῦς by a small minority of scribes, either accidentally (involving only a 3-letter <i>nomen sacrum</i>) or intentionally (for stylistic smoothing) easily could represent typical Alexandrian editorial practice. In essence, all the above-mentioned variant units reflect the identical internal considerations that affect the present unit, and their respective minority external support does not actually impact the overall situation; thus, each of the listed variants can be considered to have been addressed within the discussion of the present variant unit.	
JOHN 12.4⁴² Ἰουδας ο Ἰσκαριωτης εἷς [εκ] των μαθητων αυτου ℣ = εἷς εκ των μαθητων αυτου Ἰουδας Σιμωνος Ἰσκαριωτης NA: But says <u>Judas the Iscariot, one [out of] his disciples</u>, the one being about to betray him . . . ℣: Therefore says <u>one out of his disciples, Judas of Simon Iscariot</u>, the one being about to betray him . . . The present variant unit involves transposition, whether the name Judas the Iscariot precedes or follows the descriptive phrase “one of his disciples,” as well as whether the patronymic “of Simon” or the definite article should also accompany the name. Although the reading of the main NA²⁷ text represents the editors’ preference,⁴³ the apparatus reading omitting [εκ] is more clearly representative of the Alexandrian archetype (supported by Ɔ⁶⁶ Ɔ^{75vid} B L W 33 579 <i>pc</i>) and theoretically should have been the reading followed by the NA²⁷ editors. In view of that more obvious Alexandrian archetype reading (supported by 7 named MSS) without εκ present, the 3 named MSS that support εκ in the present NA²⁷ main text either reflect an unconscious carry-over from the ℣ reading or an intentional alteration to the Alexandrian archetype for the purpose of stylistic smoothing. Apart from this factor, the remaining readings cited in the NA²⁷ apparatus represent a variety that differs from both the NA²⁷ main text and ℣. Nevertheless, the primary issues in this unit remain the basic phrase transposition and the matter of Σιμωνος versus the definite article ο.	JOHN 12.4 Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης εἷς [ἐκ] τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ The identification of Judas as Σίμωνος (A K X Δ Θ Π Ψ 065 <i>f</i>¹³ 28 <i>Byz</i>) or as Σίμων (1195 1242* 1344 2148 <i>a</i>) is a scribal accretion derived from 6.71. These same witnesses also smooth the sequence by placing the name after the indefinite εἷς ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ and before ὁ μέλλων αὐτὸν παραδιδόναι. It was thought best to retain the words εἷς ἐκ, an expression that occurs in eleven other passages in the Fourth Gospel, but in view of the absence of ἐκ in such early and noteworthy witnesses as Ɔ⁶⁶, 75^{vid} B L W 33, to enclose it within square brackets. (For the reading of D, see the comments on 6.71 and Mt 10.4.)

⁴² Other readings include *Ιουδας ο Ισκαριωτης εις των μαθητων αυτου* (omit εκ) in $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{75\text{vid}}$ B L W 33 579 pc; εκ των μαθητων αυτου Ιουδας Σιμωνος Ισκαριωτης, (omit εις) in K; εις των μαθητων αυτου Ιουδας Σιμωνος Ισκαριωτης (omit εκ) in Q; εις εκ των μαθητων αυτου Ιουδας ο Ισκαριωτης (omit Σιμωνος) in f¹ 565; εις εκ των μαθητων αυτου Ιουδας Σιμωνος Ισκαριωτου, in Ψ; εις εκ των μαθητων αυτου Ιουδας απο Καρωτου, in D (omit Σιμωνος); and εις εκ των μαθητων αυτου Ιουδας Ισκαριωτης, (omit Σιμωνος), in vg. Immediately preceding is a variant unit in which MS 1241 and ℓ -844 (as a consistently cited witness of the second order, here included in $\mathfrak{M}$) depart. If both units are considered together, the overall level of support drops to only the single MS $\mathfrak{N}$.

⁴³ NA²⁷ Introduction, 6*

In regard to the latter issue, in both NA²⁷ and $\mathfrak{M}$ the 3 remaining occurrences of Judas Iscariot in John (Jn 6.71; 13.2, 26)⁴⁴ include Σιμωνος; therefore one would expect such to appear in the present unit, especially since there would be no good reason for departure from Johannine style at this point. The Alexandrian archetype (represented by the 7 other Alexandrian MSS cited above as well as the 3 named MSS that underlie the NA²⁷ main text) easily could have omitted Σιμωνος by haplography (-ς ∩ -ς), the deficiency being repaired by insertion of the article preceding Ισκαριωτης. Yet elsewhere in John the definite article follows Ιουδας *only* in the phrase ουκ ο Ισκαριωτης (Jn 14.22) or in relation to the descriptive phrase ο παραδιδους (Jn 18.2, 5); such makes the NA²⁷ reading in the present unit incongruous with other Johannine usage.

Also, when εἷς is present, John often places the proper name first (as with the NA²⁷ text of the present unit):⁴⁵

Jn 1.40 Ανδρεας ο αδελφος Σιμωνος Πετρου, εἷς εκ των δυο
Jn 6.71 Ιουδαν Σιμωνος Ισχαριωτην, . . . εἷς ων εκ των δωδεκα
Jn 7.50 Νικοδημος . . . εἷς ων εξ αυτων
Jn 12.2 ο δε Λαζαρος, εἷς ην των ανακειμενων
Jn 20.24 Θωμας δε, εἷς εκ των δωδεκα

Most notably, Jn 6.71 also refers to Judas Iscariot, the construction being quite similar to that of the present unit. The structure of that prior occurrence well may have influenced the framers of the Alexandrian archetype in regard to the present Jn 12.4 unit.⁴⁶ Thus, in regard to both the question of transposition and the replacement of Σιμωνος with the definite article, the case for the $\mathfrak{M}$ reading appears far stronger than that for the present NA²⁷ main text or even the more strongly supported Alexandrian archetype reading.

⁴⁴ “Judas not Iscariot” occurs in Jn 14.22, while “Judas” meaning the Iscariot but without that term occurs at Jn 13.29; 18.2, 3, 5.

⁴⁵ In John the practice is reversed at three points: Jn 6.8 (εἷς εκ των μαθητων αυτου, Ανδρεας ο αδελφος Σιμωνος Πετρου); Jn 13.23 (εἷς των μαθητων . . . ον ηγαπα ο Ιησους); Jn 18.26 (εἷς εκ των δουλων του αρχιερεως, συγγενης ων).

⁴⁶ Without εἷς present, the descriptive phrase precedes or follows the proper names of characters or locations equally. A proper name preceding the description appears at Jn 19.38 (Ιωσηφ ο απο Αριμαθειας, ων μαθητης του Ιησου); Jn 19.39 (Νικοδημος ο ελθων προς τον Ιησουν νυκτος); Jn 11.2 (ην δε Μαρια η αλειψασα τον κυριον μυρω); Jn 11.49 (Καιαφας, αρχιερευς ων του ενιαυτου εκεινου); while the description precedes the proper name at Jn 1.6 (εγενετο ανθρωπος . . . ονομα αυτω Ιωαννης); Jn 1.41 (τον αδελφον τον ιδιον Σιμωνα); Jn 3.1 (ανθρωπος εκ των Φαρισαιων, Νικοδημος ονομα αυτου); Jn 4.5 (πολιν της Σαμαρειας λεγομενην Συχαρ).

JOHN

13.26⁴⁷ βαψω το ψιμιον και δωσω αυτω

txt = B C 1241 *pc* Or

℣ = βαψας το ψιμιον επιδωσω

NA: Jesus answers, "That one he is to whom I myself will dip the morsel, and I will give to him." Having dipped therefore the morsel, [he takes and] he gives to Judas of Simon Iscariot.

℣: Jesus answers, "That one he is to whom I myself, having dipped the morsel, I will give upon." And having dipped in the morsel, he gives to Judas Iscariot, of Simon.

Among the 5 variant units cited in the NA²⁷ apparatus within this verse (with numerous alternative readings among them), the present unit involves four issues: (1) the specific form of βαπτω, aorist participle or future active indicative; (2) the presence or absence of και following ψιμιον; (3) the simple or compound form of the future tense of διδωμι; and (4) the presence or absence of αυτω. At various points the remaining alternative readings found in the apparatus lend partial support: (1) βαψας in 33, βαψω in L; (2) και present in L; absent in A D K W f¹ f¹³ 33 565 *pc*; (3) δωσω in W; επιδωσω in A D K f¹ f¹³ 33 565 *pc*; and (4) αυτω present in L 33; absent in A D K W f¹ f¹³ 565 *pc*. The NA²⁷ main text reading, however, is limited to the three named MSS plus whatever *pc* here might entail, as cited above.

Regarding each of the main points:

1. The verb βαπτω (not to be confused with βαπτιζω, occurring 80x in the NT) only occurs 3x in the NT, with differing forms found in the remaining occurrences.⁴⁸ Whether the future indicative or the aorist participle occurs at this point perhaps might be a judgment call, except for the fact that in the very next sentence the same participial form in the compounded εμβαψας occurs (so also in Mt 26.23; cf. Mk 14.20, ο εμβαπτομενος).⁴⁹ Such would imply a similar participial form in the previous occurrence of the same verb.

Secondly, it is quite possible that the 3 named MSS underlying the NA²⁷ main text were influenced by the occurrence of other future active indicative forms in close context. In John the future active indicative occurs frequently (100x in ℣; 108x in NA²⁷), with approximately half of these within the Upper Room discourse (51x in ℣; 52x in NA²⁷).⁵⁰ Noteworthy in this regard are the future active indicatives that appear in the present Jn 13 chapter, not only in the present verse 26 (℣ επιδωσω, NA²⁷ δωσω), but also in verses 21 (παραδωσει), 32 (δοξασει 2x), 33 (ζητησετε), 36 (ακολουθησεις), 37 (θησω), 38 (θησεις). Of further note, the specific FAI-1S occurs 16x in the Upper Room discourse, with most of these appearing in chapters 13 and 14. These include επιδωσω/δωσω of the present verse as well as Jn 13.37 (θησω); 14.3 (ετοιμασω); 14.13 (ποιησω); 14 (ποιησω); 14.16 (ερωτησω); 14.18 (αφησω); 14.21 (αγαπησω, εμφαινισω); 14.30 (λαλησω). Such also readily could influence the scribes of the 3 named MSS

JOHN

13.26 βαψω τὸ ψωμίον καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ {C}

It is more likely that scribal alteration went from the simple (δώσω) to the compound verb (ἐπιδώσω), which John uses nowhere else. Furthermore, the Semitic, paratactic style of two finite verbs connected by καί is typically Johannine, whereas the omission of the conjunction and the hypotactic construction involving a participle (βάψας) has the appearance of being a stylistic modification introduced by copyists in the interest of elegance. Likewise, the redundant αὐτῷ after δώσω, so characteristic of a primitive, Semitic style, would almost certainly be deleted by copyists. See also the comment on the following variant reading.

13.26 βάψας οὖν τὸ ψωμίον [λαμβάνει καὶ] δίδωσιν {C}

It is difficult to decide whether the words λαμβάνει καὶ were added by copyists to recall Jesus' deliberate action at the Last Supper in *taking bread* (Mt 26.26; Mk 14.22; Lk 22.19; 1 Cor 11.23), or whether the words were omitted as irrelevant and unnecessary. In order to reflect the balance of both external attestation and transcriptional probabilities, a majority of the Committee decided to retain the words enclosed within square brackets.

underlying the NA²⁷ main text or of an earlier archetype to adjust the parsing from an aorist participle to a FAI-1S in order to reflect a more dominant form of expression in this segment of text.

2. In regard to the inclusion or exclusion of *καί*, much depends on the first point noted above. If the aorist participle *βαψας* is present, the conjunction (though remotely sensible) is superfluous; whereas if the future *βαψω* is present, the conjunction becomes necessary in context for clear comprehension. It also is possible that the *επι-* prefix may have been misunderstood as a wrongly placed preposition, thereby provoking replacement with *καί*; this, however, appears highly unlikely.

3. Regarding the simple versus compounded form of *διδωμι*, where the future active indicative is not otherwise in question, the NA²⁷ form *δωσω* occurs elsewhere in John at Jn 4.14 (2x); 6.51 (2x *ℳ*; 1x NA²⁷). In contrast, the *ℳ* form *επιδωσω* occurs nowhere else in the NT, although forms of *επιδιδωμι* occur elsewhere in the NT 10x (7x in the Gospels).⁵¹ Yet the compounded *επιδωσω* (“I will hand over, deliver”) carries a more specific and more appropriate meaning in a food-related context (here in regard to the morsel, *το ψωμιον*) than the simpler *δωσω* (“I will give”). A food-related context similarly appears in occurrences of the future tense of *επιδιδωμι* elsewhere, where *επιδωσει* is used to reflect whether a father would hand over to his son a stone, snake, or scorpion rather than bread, fish or an egg (Mt 7.9-10; Lk 11.11, 12); so also Lk 24.30, where Jesus, having taken the bread and broken it, hands it over (*επεδιδου*) to the two he met on the road to Emmaus; Lk 24.42, where the disciples hand over (*επεδωκαν*) to Jesus a piece of broiled fish.⁵²

Symbolically, the use of the compound also would appear more appropriate by delivering (*επιδιδωμι*) the morsel to the one who will betray (*ο παραδιδους*), particularly when the *only* occurrences of *παραδιδωμι* within the Upper Room discourse occur in the close context of Jn 13.2, 11, 21. Thus in both these areas (food-related context and symbolism) the *ℳ* reading has far more to commend it than the uncompounded *δωσω* of the three named MSS underlying the NA²⁷ main text.

Transcriptionally, the *επι-* prefix of *επιδωσω* easily could have been lost in the 3 named MSS (4 including W) by haplography of *ι ι*, assuming inclusion of the conjunction (*καὶ επιδωσω*), the skip occurring either independently in the MSS involved or due to a common archetype. Such likely explains the NA²⁷ main text reading in this situation.

⁴⁷ Other readings include *εμβαψας* το ψιμιον επιδωσω, in A D K f¹³ 565 *pc*; *βαψας* το ψιμιον επιδωσω αυτω, in 33; *δωσω* ενβαψας το ψιμιον, in W; and *βαψω* το ψιμιον και δω αυτω, in L.

⁴⁸ *Βαψη* occurs in Lk 16.24 and *βεβαμμενον* in Rev 19.13.

⁴⁹ Again, not to be confused with *εβαπτιζοντο* (from *βαπτιζω*).

⁵⁰ The designation “Upper Room discourse” is considered here to encompass Jn 13-17, with the statements of Jesus commencing in that location, but with a process of journeying to Gethsemane beginning at the end of Jn 15 (*εγειρεσθε, αγωμεν εντευθεν*), culminating at Jn 18.1.

⁵¹ Mt 7.9, 10; Lk 4.17; 11.11 (2x), 12; 24.30, 42; Ac 15.30; 27.15. Of these, the future active indicative *επιδωσει* occurs at Mt 7.9, 10; Lk 11.11 (2x), 12.

⁵² The remaining NT occurrences of *επιδιδωμι* relate to handing over a scroll (Lk 4.17) or a letter (Ac 15.30) or as a nautical term, giving way to the wind (Ac 27.15).

4. As to whether the indirect object (αὐτῷ) should be present or absent, had αὐτῷ originally been present, such theoretically might have been omitted by haplography of -ω ∩ -ω in the phrase (ἐπι)δωσῶ αὐτῷ. On the other hand, were the indirect object originally absent, it would be no surprise to find a limited number of scribes adding such to the phrasing, since the indirect object naturally might be expected. Of the remaining occurrences of ἐπιδίδωμι, the indirect object is αὐτῷ at Mt 7.9, 10; Lk 4.17; 11.11 (2x), 12; 24.42; and αὐτοῖς at Lk 24.30, even while ἐπιδίδωμι appears without an indirect object at Ac 15.30; 27.15. Yet haplography is not of primary concern in the present instance, even though a similar instance of haplography was a point of appeal at the conclusion of the preceding point: the transmissional issue here is quite different, and of such importance that it should not be neglected (although often it is by modern textual critics): <i>Textual omission due to haplography is more likely to have occurred when such is found in a limited number of MSS. When claimed to have occurred in an extremely large number of MSS, haplography is extremely unlikely, since a reasonable level of scribal correction of such an egregious error readily would be expected, thus resulting in the non-perpetuation and elimination of the error from the primary lines of transmission. Merely because some Byzantine readings have been claimed by adverse critics to have resulted from various forms of haplography (homoioteleuton, homioarcton, or homoiomeson), such claims are unlikely on their face in view of overall transcriptional and transmissional processes as well as in view of known scribal proclivities. In contrast, omissions that could be due to haplography that appear in the critical text, supported only by a small number of preferred MSS, remain highly suspect as due to scribal error (individual or archetypal) in each instance.</i> In each of the four areas involved in the present variant unit, the ℣ reading has been shown in each case to have a better claim to originality than the reading found in the 3 named MSS underlying the NA²⁷ main text (even with fluctuating minor support from alternative reading witnesses). Given also that the 3 named witnesses all reflect the same textual tradition and likely stem from a common archetype, it is likely that the reading of all four issues as noted above derive from that archetype rather than from independent alteration.	
JOHN 14.15⁵³ τηρήσετε ℣ = τηρήσατε txt = B L Ψ pc cop Epiph NA: If you^p should love me, <u>you^p will keep</u> my commands. ℣: If you^p should love me, <u>keep</u> my commands.	JOHN <u>14.15</u> τηρήσετε {C} A majority of the Committee preferred the future tense τηρήσετε, read by B L Ψ 1010 1071 1195* 2148 <i>a</i>/ (and perhaps supported indirectly by witnesses that read the aorist subjunctive τηρήσητε, ℣⁶⁶ Ⲭ 060 33 <i>a</i>/), instead of the imperative τηρήσατε, which, though rather well

⁵³ Another reading is τηρήσητε (V-AAS-2P), in ℣⁶⁶ Ⲭ 060 33 579 *pc*.

Given that a third-class condition is involved (introduced by εαν), the verb αγαπατε in the protasis (the “if-clause”) is understood as a present active subjunctive, although in other contexts different parsings could result.⁵⁴ The present unit involves orthographic fluctuation in the apodosis (the “then-clause”), with three readings existing among the MS base. Thus, the verb tense can be future (τηρησετε, FAI-2P, “you^p will keep”), as in NA²⁷; an imperative (τηρησθε, AAM-2P, “keep”), as in ℣; or, as found in a minor alternate variant with substantial Alexandrian support, a subjunctive (τηρησητε, AAS-2P, “you^p should keep”). Notably, all three readings in this variant unit differ by only a single letter — a fact that suggests accidental error on the part of various scribes or their ultimate archetypes. Elsewhere within John, the verb τηρεω occurs 18x, with 11x of these occurring in various forms within the Upper Room discourse (Jn 13-17). Of these, 2x are FAI (Jn 14.23 τηρησει; Jn 15.20^b τηρησουσιν) and 1x is AAM (Jn 17.11 τηρησον).⁵⁵ Although these occurrences do not duplicate the readings of the present unit (one other instance, Jn 15.10^a τηρησητε (AAS-2P), duplicates the alternate variant reading found in the apparatus of the present unit), it is important to recognize the similarities of parsing, since the presence of such forms theoretically <i>could</i> have influenced various scribes in relation to the present unit. Even so, erroneous scribal alteration of single letters appears to represent a more proximate cause.⁵⁶ The three other 3rd-class conditions that appear in the immediate context offer an informing insight: in each instance, the apodosis verb is FAI:⁵⁷ Jn 14.3 (εαν πορευθω, ετοιμασω); Jn 14.14 (εαν τι αιτησητε [με] εν τω ονοματι μου, εγω ποιησω); and Jn 14.23 (εαν τις αγαπα με, τον λογον μου τηρησει). Most definitely, these close-context occurrences easily could have influenced a small number of scribes to conform the parsing of the apodosis in the present unit to a FAI form, particularly since the command form (AAM) does not otherwise occur within the Upper Room discourse, nor apparently anywhere else in the apodosis of a 3rd-class conditional clause introduced by εαν. Thus the ℣ reading not only represents the rarer and therefore more difficult reading, but also the 3 named MSS underlying the NA²⁷ main text readily could have made the single-letter alteration of parsing to FAI due to attraction to the other FAI occurrences in the immediate context of this chapter within the Upper Room discourse. Once again, the ℣ reading is to be preferred on multiple counts.	supported (A D K W X Δ Θ Π f¹ f¹³ 28 565 700 892 Byz), accords less well with ἐρωτήσω in the following verse.
--	--

⁵⁴ Depending on context, αγαπατε could represent either PAI-2P, PAM-2P or PAS-2P.

⁵⁵ Other forms of τηρεω within the Upper Room discourse represent non-relevant parsings: Jn 14.21 τηρων (PAP-NSM); 14.24 τηρει (PAI-3S); 15.10^a τηρησητε (AAS-2P); 15.10^b τετηρηκα (RAI-1S); 15.20^a ετηρησαν (AAI-3P); 17.6 τετηρηκασιν (RAI-3P); 17.12 ετηρουν (IAI-1S); 17.15 τηρησης (AAS-2S).

⁵⁶ The minor apparatus variant τηρησητε may have been influenced by the two preceding verses, in each of which αιτησητε occurs. Such does not account, however, for the specific primary difference between NA²⁷ and ℣ in the present unit.

⁵⁷ Εαν occurs 61x in John and 17x in the Upper Room discourse, but many of these are not within an if-then conditional context.

ACTS

1.5⁵⁸ ἐν πνεύματι βαπτισθήσεσθε ἁγίῳ
 ᾤ = βαπτισθήσεσθε ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ

txt = **N*** B 81 *pc*

NA: Because John indeed baptized with water, but you^p yourselves will be baptized with the Holy Spirit not after these many days.

ᾤ: Because John indeed baptized with water, but you^p yourselves will be baptized with the Holy Spirit not after these many days.

The NA²⁷ Greek text as it appears in the present unit is awkward and problematic, as demonstrated in the overly literal English rendering given above. In contrast, the ᾤ reading follows the more usual Greek order, with the resultant text reading quite smoothly. Even modern translations that utilize the critical text avoid the difficulty by rendering the passage in a manner similar to ᾤ (“you^p will be baptized with the Holy Spirit”).⁵⁹ That the NA²⁷ form of the passage is unusual is clearly seen by a wildcard search sequence in the Gospels and Acts, locating any form of πνεῦμα, followed by any non-articular intervening word, and followed by a form of ἅγιος. Such occurs only 2x in the NT, and in each instance the intervening word is a form of εἰμι (Mt 1.20, ἐκ πνεύματος ἐστὶν ἁγίου; Lk 2.25, καὶ πνεῦμα ἦν ἅγιον ἐπ’ αὐτόν).⁶⁰

In contrast, the ᾤ reading represents by far the more usual structure, occurring in an identical construction when preceded by a form of βαπτίζω as follows:

Mt 3.11	βαπτίσει	ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ
Mk 1.8	βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς	ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ
Lk 3.16	βαπτίσει	ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ
Jn 1.33	ὁ βαπτίζων	ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ
Ac 11.16	βαπτισθήσεσθε	ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ

Similarly, the phrase in question also occurs in numerous contexts *without* any form of βαπτίζω present:

Mk 12.36	εἶπεν ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ
Ro 9.1	συμμετρουμένη μοι . . . ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ
Ro 14.17	εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ
Ro 15.16	ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ
1Co 12.3	εἰ μὴ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ
2Co 6.6	ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ
1Th 1.5	καὶ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ
1Pe 1.12	τῶν εὐαγγελισμένων ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ
Jude 1.20	ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι

ACTS

1.5 ἐν πνεύματι βαπτισθήσεσθε ἁγίῳ

The great majority of witnesses read Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι, ὑμεῖς δὲ βαπτισθήσεσθε ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. Several important witnesses have a different order of words, involving chiasmus: thus **N*** B 81 915 Didymus read...ἐν πνεύματι βαπτισθήσεσθε ἁγίῳ, and D Hilary Augustine read ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ βαπτισθήσεσθε. The chiastic order of words does not seem to be merely an Alexandrian refinement, for it is not confined to the Alexandrian text.

The less elegant order in the great bulk of witnesses can be explained as a harmonization with the sequence of words in the parallel reported in the Synoptic Gospels, all of which place ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ after the word *baptize* ([Mt 3.11](#); [Mk 1.8](#); [Lk 3.16](#)).

The envelope construction of the Alexandrian text (placing the verb between the noun and the adjective) may be an editorial refinement, or it may reproduce an emphasis intended by the author. A majority of the Committee preferred the Alexandrian text, considering the weight of **N*** B 81 915 Didymus to be superior to that of D (the evidence of Latin Fathers does not count for much on a point concerned with the presence or absence of the envelope construction in Greek).

seem specifically 5000. Apparently due to the joint testimony of B and D, the NA²⁷ editors chose not to follow the dominant Alexandrian omission in their main text — even though such joint testimony was *not* considered as strong a factor a few words previously when those same two MSS — even joined by **ℵ** — similarly excluded the bracketed [ο] preceding ἀριθμός apart from the more dominant Alexandrian support.⁶²

Had the omission of a term of approximation been original, one might suspect the addition of such in order to mollify the level of precision stated. As an example, at Mt 15.38, NA²⁷ and **℞** read “those eating were 4000 males,” even while various other witnesses add terms of approximation (ως B Θ f¹³ 33 892 ℓ-2211, or ωσει **ℵ** 579 1241 *pc*). Similarly, at Mk 6.44 (cited in *SQE* but not in the NA²⁷ apparatus), NA²⁷ and **℞** read “those eating the bread were 5000 males,” while ως is added by **ℵ** Θ 565 700 2542 and ωσει by f¹ 205 *pc*. There is no reason to suppose that a similar statement of precision necessarily should occur in Lk-Ac, particularly when the remaining 12 occurrences in those two books approximate by utilizing either ως (5x) or ωσει (7x).⁶³

Lk 2.37	ως	“about 84 years”)
Lk 8.42	ως	(“about 12 years”)
Ac 1.15	ως	(“about 120”)
Ac 13.20	ως	(“about 450 years”)
Ac 19.34	ως	(“about upon 2 hours”)

Lk 1.56	ωσει	(“about 3 months”)
Lk 3.23	ωσει	(“about 30 years”)
Lk 9.14	ωσει	(“about 5000”) ⁶⁴
Lk 9.28	ωσει	(“about 8 days”)
Lk 22.59	ωσει	(“about 1 hour”)
Ac 5.36	ωσει	(“about 400”)
Ac 19.7	ωσει	(“about 12”)

This list makes it clear that Luke uses either ως or ωσει to indicate approximation in about equal proportion, with slightly more occurrences of ως in Acts and of ωσει in Lk (but not enough to establish any pattern; the same applies elsewhere in the NT).⁶⁵

To reflect the dubiety in the interpretation of the evidence the Committee preferred to retain ὥς, which is supported by B and D, but to enclose the word within square brackets.

⁶² The [ο] *ante* ἀριθμός is cited in the NA²⁷ apparatus as omitted by **ℵ** B (D), where D merely alters the word order. All other witnesses include the article, including the same dominant group of Alexandrian MSS as in the present unit.

⁶³ Additional instances of ως or ωσει with various numerals do not imply approximation; these include examples such as ως ἐν τούτων (Mt 6.29; Lk 12.27); ως εἶς των προφητων (Mk 6.15); ως ενα των μισθων (Lk 15.19); and ως ενα εκαστον (1Th 2.11).

⁶⁴ At Lk 9.14, ως is read only by D, while it-q, sy^{sc} bo omit either ωσει or ως entirely (NA²⁷ and **℞** jointly read ωσει at this point).

⁶⁵ Non-Lukan instances include Mt 14.21 (ωσει, “about 5000”); Mk 8.9 (ως, “about 4000”); Jn 6.10 (ωσει **℞**/ως NA²⁷, “about 5000”); Jn 6.19 (ως, “about 25 or 30 stadia”); Jn 11.18 (ως, “about from 15 stadia”); Jn 19.39 (ως, “about 100 pounds”); and 2Pe 3.8 (ως, “about 1000 years . . . about 1 day”). There also exists a variant reading in B using ως at Ac 27.37 (“about 76”) where most MSS read “were 276.”

Although not involved in the present unit, $\mathfrak{M}$ at the beginning of this reads $\theta\epsilon\alpha\sigma\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ — a rare form otherwise occurring only at Jn 1.38; 6.5 — while NA²⁷ reads the far more common $\iota\delta\omega\nu$ (62x elsewhere in the NT in $\mathfrak{M}$, 58x in NA²⁷). Amazingly, this significant case of synonym substitution is not at all cited in the NA²⁷ apparatus.

Also of interest in relation to the present unit, a reverse parallel occurs at Lk 10.21, where NA²⁷ reads the full title $\tau\omega\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\ \tau\omega\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omega$ and $\mathfrak{M}$ only $\tau\omega\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$.⁶⁶

The concern in the present unit is whether the Holy Spirit should be identified by the full title or whether “Spirit” alone would suffice in the present context. Of the 70 occurrences of $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ in Acts (with differing case forms here and elsewhere), $\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is associated 41x. More pertinently, in the immediate context to the current unit, “Holy Spirit” ($\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$) also appears at Ac 8.15, 17, 19 — the sole difference in the present unit is that the phrase is articular ($\tau\omicron\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$), reflecting a point of specificity. Yet throughout Acts, the *non-articular* $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$ occurs 19x (17x NA²⁷), while the articular $\tau\omicron\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$ occurs 15x (16x in NA²⁷); thus no real judgment can be made from usage alone.⁶⁷ In Luke, both terms occur, but with far less frequency: $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$ 7x, and $\tau\omicron\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$ 2x (NA²⁷ 3x).⁶⁸

More significantly, in both Luke and Acts $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ (in various cases) appears *without* $\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ being associated with equal frequency (in Luke 25x $\mathfrak{M}$; 28x NA²⁷ and elsewhere in Acts 27x in both NA²⁷ and $\mathfrak{M}$). Such therefore indicates the most common Lukan usage. Restricting the phrase to *only* the articular $\tau\omicron\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ without $\tau\omicron\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$ following (as NA²⁷ in the present unit), that phrase occurs 3x in Luke (9x in NA²⁷) and 11x elsewhere in Acts (21x in NA²⁷); it thus appears that the predominantly Alexandrian critical text of Acts reflects a greater proclivity to read $\tau\omicron\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ *solus* than does $\mathfrak{M}$. This therefore may help explain the NA²⁷ reading in the present unit as likely part of an intentional and systematic stylistic revision, with specific alteration intended to maintain an articular $\tau\omicron\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ without the modifying $\tau\omicron\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$. This appears far more plausible than any suggestion involving transcriptional accident on the part of the 3 named MSS involved.⁶⁹

Given that only the 3 named MSS ($\mathfrak{N}$ A^c B) or, more likely, their common archetype omit $\tau\omicron\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$, while all remaining MSS of all other texttypes include the phrase (so also $\mathfrak{P}$ ⁴⁵ and the remaining Alexandrian witnesses A* C Ψ 33 1739), and also that a pattern of stylistic revision appears to be involved for both Luke and Acts in situations where the articular $\tau\omicron\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ is involved — it strongly appears that the exclusion of the phrase in

⁶⁶ The surrounding context in Lk 10.21 has other significant differences (underlined) between $\mathfrak{M}$ and NA²⁷ that may impact that particular unit: $\mathfrak{M}$ reads $\eta\gamma\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota\alpha\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron\ \tau\omega\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\ \underline{\omicron\ \iota\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma}\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\nu$ while NA²⁷ reads $\eta\gamma\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota\alpha\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron\ [\epsilon\chi]\ \tau\omega\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\ \underline{\tau\omega\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omega}\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\nu$. The NA²⁷ apparatus divides this phrase into two separate units with differing levels of support; when both are combined, the overall support for the NA²⁷ main text regarding the entire phrase is $\mathfrak{N}\ D\ \Xi\ 1241\ pc$.

⁶⁷ The phrase $\tau\omicron\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\nu\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ occurs 7x in Acts, but this has no impact on the present unit.

⁶⁸ The phrase $\tau\omicron\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\nu\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ in Luke occurs only at Lk 12.10.

⁶⁹ Theoretically, accidental omission could have occurred by semi-haplography of $\tau\ \cap\ \pi$ in the phrase $\tau\omicron\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\nu\ \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\eta\nu\epsilon\gamma\kappa\epsilon\nu$ due to the similarity of the uncial letter forms **Τ** and **Π**. In view of the strong Alexandrian preference for reading the articular $\tau\omicron\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ standing alone, however, accidental error appears highly unlikely.

the present unit is the result of limited revision within one branch of the Alexandrian texttype, and nothing more. In view of all these factors, the $\mathfrak{M}$ reading continues to be preferred.