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ABSTRACT

Jared Anderson: An Analysis of the Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen
(Under the direction of Bart Ehrman)

This thesis provides an analysis of the text of the Gospel of John in the writings of Origen of Alexandria (ca. 185-254). Two types of textual analyses, Quantitative and Group Profile, make up the core of this study. Such methods enable scholars to trace the history of transmission of the NT text, and this study confirms that Origen’s text of John is a strong representative of the “Primary Alexandrian” text type, the purest form of the New Testament text. This thesis also provides a history of research of Origen’s text of the New Testament, refines the critical methods used, and models the use of computer programs that increase the accuracy and efficiency of such studies. Finally, the conclusion places these data into historical context and answers several important questions, such as whether Origen changed his manuscripts of John upon relocation from Alexandria to Caesarea in 231.
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Chapter I

ORIGEN’S LIFE AND LITERATURE

In the history of New Testament textual criticism, Patristic citations have occupied an awkward and paradoxical place. On one hand, their witness is earlier and can be located more precisely than Greek manuscripts or New Testament translations. On the other hand, the task of accessing their texts is fraught with factors that imperil accuracy, and many scholars have been daunted in this quest, leading to neglect of these important witnesses to the early New Testament text. Fortunately, advances in methodology of the past decades have enabled scholars to access these valuable witnesses with unprecedented accuracy, illuminating vistas along the convoluted transmission of the New Testament writings.¹

Champion among the Church Fathers stands Origen of Alexandria, the most prolific and arguably the most brilliant of early Christian writers. The aim of the present study is to provide an analysis of the text of the Fourth Gospel in the writings of Origen, elucidating Origen’s textual alignments and exploring the historical significance of these conclusions.²


² See the Acknowledgements for the somewhat complicated background of this study.
This first chapter will provide background for an investigation of Origen’s textual affinities—a brief biography, focusing on his writings and approach to scripture, as well as an overview of the manuscripts that will be used in this study. Chapter two provides a history of research into Origen’s text of the New Testament that contextualizes the two chapters of analysis that make up the heart of this work. Chapter three uses Quantitative Analysis to explore the contours of agreement between representative witnesses from differing textual traditions in order to discern where Origen’s own textual affinities lie. Chapter four then uses the Group Profiles developed by Bart Ehrman to clarify more precisely those affinities. Finally, the conclusion summarizes the findings and contributions of this study, discusses key historical points relating to these data, especially where Origen fits within the Alexandrian textual tradition of John, and suggests directions for further research. Two substantial appendices conclude the work, which present in efficient form all the textual variants among the representative witnesses and Origen, as well as patterns among those variants.

**A Literary Life**

Origen was born around 185 C.E. and was raised in the midst of one of the greatest cultural centers of the ancient world, Alexandria. His intellectual skills manifested themselves early; he became the chief instructor in the catechetical school in Alexandria at the tender age of 18, after the martyrdom of his father about a year earlier. Origen was a controversial figure in the church both during his life and especially after his death, and tensions with the bishop Demetrius eventually led to his relocation to Caesarea around 233

---

3 *TFGWO*, 3-4.
He lived here and produced most of his works during this period, until his death some time after 251.\footnote{This is the date given by Nautin, \textit{Origène}, 412, but Ehrman noted that the date of Origen’s death is debated, ranging from about 251 to 255. \textit{TFGWO}, 9n23.}

One of the most prolific writers of all time, Origen likely produced over a thousand volumes of works relating to scripture and other topics.\footnote{Cate, “Text of the Catholic Epistles and Revelation,” 7-13 discusses Origen’s literary legacy. The numbers given by Jerome (around 2,000, \textit{adv. Ruf.} 2.22) and by Epiphanius (around 6,000, \textit{Panarion} 64.63 and \textit{Haer.} lxiv. 3), are likely exaggerations, but catalogues do exist that give named works by Origen in the hundreds. Jerome lists the works he knows to be located in the Library of Caesarea—120 New Testament commentaries, even more on the Old Testament, with over 300 homilies and longer works. These lists do not even include Origen’s \textit{magnum opus}, his six-column edition of the Old Testament, the Hexapla. This must have approximated 50 volumes and likely was never copied in its entirety. Crouzel, Origen, 37-50 gives a detailed listing of these catalogues of Origen’s works. These catalogues are found in book 6 of Eusebius’ \textit{Ecclesiastical History} and letter 33 of Jerome (see also Nautin, \textit{Origène}, 225-260, for a more detailed discussion of these sources). It is from these lists that a relatively chronology of Origen’s works can be reconstructed.} This unprecedented productivity was made possible by the support of Ambrose, whom Origen was instrumental in converting to Christianity. In addition to financing all of Origen’s endeavors, Ambrose provided Origen with trained copyists and other resources.\footnote{Crouzel, \textit{Origen}, 13; Nautin, \textit{Origène}, 410.}

Tragically, most of these works have not survived. Origen’s condemnation as a heretic in the sixth century led to the destruction of most of his writings. According to the calculations of Johannes Quasten, “only 20 of Origen’s 574 homilies and 16 of his 291 commentary volumes—those on Matthew and John—are extant in Greek.”\footnote{Johannes Quasten, \textit{Patrology}, vol.2: \textit{The Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus} (Westminster, Md: Newman, 1953), 46-51. See pages 43-75 for further information regarding Origen’s works. Cited in Cate, “Text of the Catholic Epistles and Revelation,” 11n41.} Most of the writings we still have came down to us only in the Latin translations of Origen’s work by Jerome and Rufinus.\footnote{\textit{TFGWO}, 19.} And although Gustav Bardy has vindicated Rufinus’ translation to a
degree,\textsuperscript{10} obviously only the works that survive in Greek prove useful for reconstructing Origen’s text of the New Testament. Bart Ehrman gives an overview of these works in the predecessor of this study.\textsuperscript{11} These consist of portions of nine books of his Commentary on John (written literally over the course of most of his life—Books 1 and 2, written in Alexandria and Books 6, 10, 13, 19, 20, 28 and 32, penned in Caesarea), eight books of his Commentary on Matthew, the\textit{Contra Celsum}, twenty homilies on the book of Jeremiah and one on 1 Samuel 28. We also have works such as the\textit{Disputatio cum Heraclide}, \textit{De Oratio}, and the \textit{Exhortatio ad Martyrium}. Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzus produced an anthology of Origen’s writings, the\textit{Philocalia}, which preserves fragments of others of Origen’s writings, such as \textit{De Principiis}. The Greek catenae of the Middle Ages and Latin translations of Origen’s works referred to above are of less text-critical use.\textsuperscript{12} Fortunately, most of these works are available in modern critical editions.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{10} G. Bardy, “Les citations bibliques d’Origène dans le\textit{De principiis}”\textit{ RBib} 16 (1919), 106-135. Fee accepts Bardy’s evaluation that Rufinus’ translation occasionally transmits Origen’s text closely enough to allow textual judgments; “Origen’s Text of the NT and the Text of Egypt,”\textit{NTS} 28 (1982), 348. In most instances, however, the labors of Rufinus and Jerome fail to achieve the precision necessary for text-critical analysis. As Ehrman noted, “the peculiar circumstances surrounding the Latin renditions of Origen virtually annul any text-critical value they might otherwise be expected to have.” (\textit{TFGWO}, 19. He also points to the study by Karen Jo Torjesen that further delineates the general lack of precision in Rufinus’ translation technique, \textit{Hermeneutical Procedure and Theological Method in Origen’s Exegesis} [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986, 12-18]).

\textsuperscript{11} \textit{TFGWO}, 18-20. The following description follows this list rather closely, as there are only so many ways you can list literary works.

\textsuperscript{13} These critical editions have been published mostly in the series\textit{Sources Chretiennes} (SC) and \textit{Die griechische christliche Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte} (GCS). See \textit{TFGWO}, 31-35 for a listing of these editions. The exceptions are those works available only in Migne’s Patrologia graeca, as follows:\textit{Commentary on Colossians} (in Pamphilus, \textit{Apologia pro Origene}, PG17); the catenae fragments of the Song of Songs (PG 17), Deuteronomy (PG 12), Exodus (PG 12); Numbers (PG 12); Ezekiel (PG 13); Genesis (PG 12); Job (PG 17); Proverbs and Psalms (PG 17, 13, 12, 17). The Homilies on the Psalms come from Migne (PG 12), as well as the\textit{Commentary on Romans} (PG 14), and the\textit{Commentary on Galatians} (PG 17). I list these because one must exercise especial care with these older volumes, as their text is often uncritical. As Fee noted, it is not coincidental that that the “vast majority of Byzantine variants from Origen’s usual Neutral text of John are found in citations where Migne is the best edition available!” (Fee, “The Text of John in Origen and Cyril,” 305). Since scribes have corrected Origen’s text toward the Byzantine text, if the writings of Origen himself have not been critically sifted, there is little hope that we can accurately analyze his text of the New Testament. Note that some catenae fragments of Genesis have been published in\textit{Le Muséon} 92 (1979) and of John and
Because one goal of this study is to determine whether Origen’s text changed over time, especially after his relocation to Caesarea, a chronological listing of Origen’s works will be of value.14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>222-229</td>
<td>Commentary on Psalms 1-25</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stromates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De Resurrectione</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commentary on Lamentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De Naturis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue with Candidus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229-230</td>
<td>First Volumes on Genesis</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De Principiis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Books 1-4 of the Commentary On John</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 231-32</td>
<td>Book 5 of Commentary on John</td>
<td>Antioch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 232</td>
<td>Beginning of book 6 On John</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Book 6 Commentary on John</td>
<td>Caesarea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last volumes On Genesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scholia on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235-238</td>
<td>On Martyrdom; Books 7-21 on John15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238-244</td>
<td>Books 22-32 on John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jeremiah in GCS 6 and 10, as well as of Job in Analecta Sacra 2 (1884). Analecta Sacra also published catena fragments of the Psalms (2, 3, 23), and Source Chretiennes also published other catena fragments of the Psalms (SC 189).

14 This is taken with slight adaptation from Nautin, 409-412. Oddly, he does not list the dates of Books

15 Oddly, Nautin does not give the dates of these books of Origen’s commentary, though logic demands that they be written during this period.
Since Origen’s Commentary on the Gospel of John figures so centrally in this analysis, I will also provide a review of which chapters of John receive treatment in which books of Origen’s commentary. Origen cites varied sections of John throughout his works including his Commentary on John, but I have included what seem to be the main treatments of the chapters based on the frequency of his quotations. Obviously, Origen’s commentary is more topical discussion than a chapter by chapter walkthrough of the gospel, but it does seem that Origen did organize his commentary roughly according to the gospel order.
Roughly, the correspondence breaks down as follows:

**Table 1: Correspondence between Books of the Gospel of John and Origen’s Commentary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Commentary Book</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Commentary Book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10, 19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13, 20</td>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>28?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19, 20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Origen’s Citation of Scripture**

Students of Origen’s text have come to different estimations of the carefulness of his citation habits, from emphasizing his occasional insouciance in citing scripture, to suggesting that he applied his classically trained mind to production of a critical edition of the New Testament.¹⁶ This range is understandable, as Origen’s approach to scripture seems somewhat contradictory at first. He comments upon textual variation in the New Testament more than any other Church Father, but despite his obvious text critical skills honed by his work on the *Hexapla* (which amounted to a critical edition of the Old Testament), Origen never focused his critical acumen on the New Testament.

In his discussion of Origen’s explicit references to textual variations in the New Testament, Bruce Metzger noted that Origen did make reference to variant readings in

¹⁶ See the discussion in chapter two. These options are not mutually exclusive, but the impression scholars have given is that Origen inclined either one way or the other.
manuscripts at his disposal, as well as a general indication of their distribution—whether variants under discussion were found in “few” “other” “certain” “many” “most” or “almost all” of the MSS at his disposal. He occasionally gave value judgments regarding these, stating that one manuscript is “more accurate” than another. Even so, Metzger concluded, though Origen “was an acute observer of textual phenomena [he] was quite uncritical in his evaluation of their significance.” Instead, he remained content to note textual differences, without indicating preference as to which was better.17 We do not know the cause of disparity in Origen’s textual approaches between the Testaments; Metzger suggests that perhaps it was because there was “no convenient norm by which to determine the validity of variant readings in the New Testament documents,” as opposed to the Old Testament, where one could compare the Septuagint to its Hebrew original.18

In the rare cases where Origen did indicate a inclination for one reading over another, that preference is based not on principles with which modern textual critics would resonate, but from “various more or less inconsequential and irrelevant considerations” such as etymological, theological, or harmonizing concerns.19 Gordon Fee noted that rather than Origen manifesting the type of care that would result in a critical edition of the New

---


18 Ibid.,” 93. It is interesting to speculate on the reason for this contrast between the testaments, whether it was a lack of standard as Metzger suggests, or perhaps the more fluid state of the New Testament text and canon in the time of Origen.

19 Ibid.,” 93-94.
Testament, he edited his manuscripts away from Alexandrian text in manner similar to Byzantine scribes.\textsuperscript{20}

Though Origen’s magisterial work on the textual criticism of the Old Testament and tantalizing references to early textual variations in the New could lead us to wish he had done more with his New Testament text, his citation habits are more careful than any of his peers among the Church Fathers. In the memorable words of Gordon Fee, “in comparison with other Fathers, his citing of John makes theirs look like the work of a backwoods preacher who never consults his text.”\textsuperscript{21} His writings therefore constitute one of the most valuable sources for information regarding the New Testament text of the early third century and merit the investigation that has gone into sifting them critically.

The methodology of Gordon Fee and the reconstructed text of John produced by Fee, Bart Ehrman, and Michael Holmes give us unprecedented access to large portions of Origen’s text of the Fourth Gospel. In this study I will establish that Origen’s text of John is indeed one of the most valuable textual witnesses to this work available, comparable in purity with our best early manuscripts of this gospel.

\textbf{Manuscripts Used in this Study}

The best way to determine the textual alignment of an unknown witness, whether the text be found on papyrus or in quotations, involves comparison of that text with representative manuscripts from the textual families that have been proven to bear close genealogical relationships. Though debate continues concerning the appropriateness of the


\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 257n12.
geographically-based names of the text types, the most common nomenclature refers to the following text types: “Alexandrian,” which has been divided into “Primary” and “Secondary” strands;22 “Western,” “Byzantine,” and “Caesarean”.23 Though it is true these names for the text types are problematic,24 I will continue to use them for convenience and ease of comprehension. To anticipate the conclusion of this study, I will demonstrate that Origen’s text confirms the existence of a specific text type in Alexandria, while dissipating the concept of a specific “Caesarean” text in John.25

A brief discussion of the twenty-nine26 representative manuscripts used in this study will contextualize the constant references made to them throughout this work.27 I have

22 Ehrman established this wording rather than the former terminology “Early” and “Late” Alexandrian. See Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels (NTGF 1; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 258-261. John Brogan built upon Ehrman’s further suggestion that there is no “Secondary” Alexandrian text, but that different Alexandrian scribes corrupted the relatively pure “Primary” Alexandrian text to different degrees. Brogan, “The Text of the Gospels in the Writings of Athanasius,” (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1997), 209-303. Thus we can talk of a distinctive “Alexandrian” textual tradition that is preserved in relative purity in the “Primary” Alexandrian witnesses, and contained with lesser purity in the “Secondary” Alexandrian witnesses. This issue will be taken up again in the conclusion.

23 The terms “Alexandrian”, “Western”, and “Byzantine” are largely accepted, and one also comes across “Neutral” for Alexandrian” and “Koine” for Byzantine. The Alands divide manuscripts into five categories, based on their usefulness in determining the original text: “I” corresponding to the Primary Alexandrian text type; “II”, Secondary Alexandrian; III, which includes f1 and f13; IV, which corresponds roughly to Western, and V, Byzantine. For a cogent critique of these classifications, see Ehrman, “A Problem of Textual Circularity: The Alands on the Classification of New Testament Manuscripts” first published in Biblica 70 (1989), pp. 377-399 and now pages 57-70 in his volume STCNT.

24 See the valuable and nuanced discussion of these textual classifications in Eldon Epp, “The Significance of the Papyri for Determining the Nature of the New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission,” pages 283-295 in Epp and Fee, Studies; repr. from Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission (ed. William L. Petersen; Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity, 3; Notre Dame, In.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 1-32. He proposes calling these text types textual “clusters” and naming them A, B, C, D. Though challenging the traditional names of these textual groups provides a valuable service, at this point such new terminology would merely require translation into familiar terms. Additionally, there is evidence, including the data presented in this paper, that the textual groups really do correspond roughly to geographically-based traditions (i.e., the Alexandrian text really was used in Egypt, the Western text in Africa and Europe, etc).

25 See note 51 below on the use of “Caesarean” witnesses in this study.

26 Or thirty, if Sinaiticus is divided according to its dual textual grouping, as I have done for the analyses.
included information about the entire text of the New Testament rather than for John only to provide a basis of comparison and contextualization for the data presented in this study regarding their alignment in the fourth gospel.

**Primary Alexandrian:** P$^{66}$ P$^{75}$ Π (8:39-21:25) B UBS

P$^{66}$ contains one of the oldest significant portions of the Gospel of John, comprising the text of John 1:1-6:11 and 6:35b-14:15. Victor Martin, who published this text in 1956, dates it to about 200 C.E.$^{28}$ Fragments of 46 more leaves were later classified as belonging to this codex, but due to their fragmentary nature they contain only a small amount of John 14-21.$^{29}$ Bruce Metzger classifies this text as “mixed, with elements that are typically Alexandrian and Western.” The scribe seems to have been plagued by carelessness, as this manuscript contains about 400 corrections written in the margins, between lines, and over erased text. Metzger stated that most of these appear to be from the scribe correcting his work.

P$^{75}$ is, simply put, one of the most important witnesses to the text of Luke and John. Dated to about 175-225 C.E., it contains “a form of text very similar to that of Vaticanus.”$^{30}$

---


30 Metzger and Ehrman, *Text*, 59. The Alands go even further, reflecting upon the fact that P$^{75}$ is so close to Vaticanus “that it could even be suspected of being its exemplar.” (Aland and Aland, *Text of the New Testament*, 57)
It is our earliest copy of Luke and with P^{66} the oldest significant portion of John.\textsuperscript{31} The value of its text cannot be overestimated, given its close agreement with B, which is considered the most accurate copy of the New Testament, at least in the gospels.\textsuperscript{32} The value of this text is increased by the tight discipline of the scribe, who may have been a professional. Ernest Colwell noted, “In P^{75} the text that is produced can be explained in all its variants as the result of a single force, namely the disciplined scribe who writes with the intention of being careful and accurate.”\textsuperscript{33}

Sinaiticus is our oldest complete copy of the New Testament, dating to the fourth century.\textsuperscript{34} This manuscript is especially important to the study of the text of John, as it is a leading witness both of the Alexandrian and Western textual traditions.\textsuperscript{35} Though scholars have identified up to nine correctors of Sinaiticus, only two are usually noted in critical editions. \(\text{\textit{\textsuperscript{\text{v}}}}\) is contemporary with Sinaiticus, and likely worked in the scriptorium where aleph was produced. \(\text{\textit{\textsuperscript{\text{v}}}}\) represents a group of scribes in sixth or seventh

\begin{footnotes}
\item[31] Second only to the scrap P^{52}, dated to about 125.
\item[32] Metzger calls Vaticanus “one of the most valuable of all the manuscripts of the Greek Bible. (Metzger and Ehrman, \textit{Text of the New Testament}, 67). Hort’s fondness of this text has become axiomatic in textual criticism.
\item[34] The story of Constantine von Tischendorf’s rescue of this priceless manuscript from the trash fires of St. Catherine’s monastery on Mt. Sinai gives us one of the greatest adventure stories in the history of the Bible. This narrative is recounted in detail in Metzger and Ehrman, \textit{Text of the New Testament}, 62-67.
\item[35] Earlier scholars such as Hort had noted the Western elements in Sinaiticus, but Gordon Fee was the one to systematically specify the contours of this important manuscript. See Gordon Fee, “Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John: A Contribution to Methodology in Establishing Textual Relationships, 221-244, repr. from \textit{NTS} (1968/69), 23-34. In the present study the Alexandrian portion of Sinaiticus is referred to both as \(\text{\textit{\textsuperscript{\text{v}}}}\) (8:39-21:25) and as \(\text{\textit{\textsuperscript{\text{v}}}}\), indicating it is the latter half of this manuscript and distinguishing it from \(\text{\textit{\textsuperscript{\text{v}}}}\) (8:39-21:25), which I also call \(\text{\textit{\textsuperscript{\text{v}}}}\).
\end{footnotes}
century Caesarea who worked to bring Sinaiticus into closer conformity with the Byzantine text.36 The different correctors are not distinguished in the data used for this study; all correctors are identified as א.37

**B**, or Vaticanus, is often considered the single most valuable manuscript of the Greek New Testament. In the gospels it is the leading representative of the Primary Alexandrian text type, considered closest to the original. It dates to the mid-fourth century; in fact, some scholars believe it is somehow connected to the 50 copies of the Bible commissioned by Emperor Constantine.38 The work of this scribe is excellent, carried out with “rote fidelity”.39

**UBS.** This refers to the text of the United Bible Society’s critical edition of the New Testament. Between the time that the data for this study were first produced and this writing, the UBS has been updated from the third to the fourth edition. This makes no difference to the data, however, as the texts of the two editions are exactly the same.40 Arguments can be made against and for the inclusion of modern editions in a study such as this. On one hand, they stand out conspicuously as the creations of modern scholars rather than ancient manuscripts used in the life of the Church. On the other hand, I have included these editions for two reasons. First, the UBS and TR are used in virtually all textual studies as prime representatives of the Primary Alexandrian and Byzantine text respectively. Second, these

---

36 Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, 78.

37 *TFGWO*, 27: “Multiple correctors are not distinguished from one another.”


editions serve to even out the idiosyncrasies of the members of their respective families, clarifying analyses of textual alignments. In those few instances where these editions threw off the patterns of textual groupings, I felt free to remove them from the tabulation. For example, in cases where all ancient members of the Alexandrian family agree, it would be senseless to allow the UBS committee’s editorial decision to depart from those manuscripts to disqualify such a reading as unanimous Alexandrian.

Secondary Alexandrian C L W Ψ 33 579 892 1241

C, the palimpsest Codex Ephremi, is a fifth-century manuscript of sections of every New Testament book save 2 Thessalonians and 2 John. This text was painstakingly restored from beneath a 12\textsuperscript{th} century collection of sermons of St. Ephrem, the fourth-century Syrian Church Father. Metzger noted that the text is not as valuable as one would think, as its mostly Secondary Alexandrian text also sometimes agrees with the later Byzantine text type. It is interesting to note that, despite this, C ranks very close to Origen and the other Primary Alexandrian witnesses in this study.\textsuperscript{42} Two or three correctors adjusted this manuscript, one living in sixth-century Palestine and the other in ninth century Constantinople.\textsuperscript{43}

L, Codex Regius, is an eighth-century codex of the gospels. Despite a scribe who made frequent errors, the text agrees frequently with Vaticanus.

W, the Freer Codex, dates to late fourth or early fifth century. Metzger classified it as “among the more important majuscule manuscripts discovered during the twentieth century.”

\textsuperscript{41} Except where otherwise noted, descriptions of these MSS are adapted from Metzger and Ehrman, \textit{Text of the New Testament}, 69-90.

\textsuperscript{42} See the percentages of agreement in Chapter Three’s Quantitative Analysis. Profile four on table X (fix this) in particular indicates that C is a relatively pure witness to the Primary Alexandrian text type in John.

\textsuperscript{43} Metzger lists two correctors, Comfort adds a third, contemporary with the scribe of C (Comfort, \textit{Encountering the Manuscripts}, 81)
He also noted that “the text is curiously variegated, as though copied from several manuscripts of different families of text.” The text of John contains block mixture, Alexandrian in John 5:12-21:25 and mixed Alexandrian with some Western readings in John 1:1-5:11, due to this quire being added in the seventh century in order to replace one that was damaged.

Ψ, Codex Athous Laurae, dates to the ninth or tenth centuries. Kirsopp Lake judged its text in Mark to be Alexandrian and Western, related to the group Ξ Κ Λ Δ. Metzger classified this codex as “predominantly Byzantine, with a somewhat larger proportion of Alexandrian readings than in Δ.”44 The results of the present study justify its placement among the Secondary Alexandrian witnesses in the gospel of John, however.

33. Called “the queen of cursives,” this ninth-century minuscule is a strong representative of the Alexandrian text, though the Byzantine influence is stronger in Acts and the Pauline epistles.45

579. Though this manuscript is relatively late, dating to the 13th century, it preserves “an extremely good Alexandrian text that often agrees with B, Ξ, and L” in the gospels of Mark, Luke, and John.46 In this study 579 did not distinguish itself for its Alexandrian affinities, however, falling among the weaker representatives of the Secondary Alexandrian group.47

---

46 Ibid., 89.
47 See table XX (give number). 579 ranks thirteenth place in comparison with B and eighth place in comparison with the Alexandrian portion of Ξ. The latter data is not included in the table, but 579 agrees in 247/358 instances with Ξ (8:39-21:25), 69%.
892. This ninth century gospel codex appears to preserve carefully the text of its exemplar, and contains many early Alexandrian readings.48

1241. This twelfth-century manuscript agrees in places with C L Δ Ψ 33. Its text of Matthew and Mark manifest a greater degree of Byzantine readings than in Luke and John. Though the editors of volume 1 express doubt as to whether this manuscript belongs among the Secondary Alexandrian cadre,49 the results of my analyses were ambiguous. More study would be required to determine the precise placement of this manuscript.

Caesarean P45 Θ f1 f13 565 70050

P45. This fragmentary manuscript dated to the first half of the third century preserves a Caesarean text in Mark. Metzger quantifies the text of the other gospels and Acts as “intermediate between Alexandrian and Western.” In this study P45 was grouped among the Caesarean witnesses, though the editors of volume 1 expressed doubt as to the “Caesarean” character of this manuscript, doubt that the analyses of this study vindicates.51

Θ. Codex Koridethi, dated to the ninth century, is considered the leading witness of the Caesarean text in Mark, containing a text “akin to the type of text that Origen and Eusebius used in the third and fourth centuries at Caesarea.” Metzger noted that in Matthew, Luke, and John it is typically Byzantine.

48 Ibid., 90.

49 TFGWO, 29 and the references cited in n. 25, especially Ehrman, Didymus, 192-93, 205, 218-219.

50 Descriptions were adapted from Metzger and Ehrman, Text of the New Testament, 54, 83, 86-89. On the use of the Caesarean witnesses, I follow the plan of volume 1 as expressed by Ehrman: “As we will examine in volume two, there is considerable question concerning the existence of a distinctively ‘Caesarean’ text. At the same time, as the demonstration of this text’s existence or non-existence is one of the goals of this study, it will be important for us not to prejudge the issue by ignoring these traditional classifications.” TFGWO, 29n23. See the discussion in Chapter 2 and the Conclusion regarding the important question of whether we can call this a text-type per se.

51 TFGWO, 29. See the discussion of P45 at the end of chapter three.
Family 1 is shorthand for a group of four closely related miniscules dating from the 12th to the 14th centuries—1, 118, 131, and 209. The text of Mark agrees closely with that of Θ and seems to go back to the Caesarean text of the third and fourth centuries. 1582 has recently been added to this group in Matthew. Especially pertinent to this study is a fascinating essay by Kwang-won Kim that argued that 1582 agrees so closely with Origen in Matthew that it could have been constructed from his text, in a way similar to 1739. Kim also suggests that 1582 could be the exemplar of 1.

Family 13. Also containing affinities with the Θ-f1 type of text, this “Ferrar group” of about twelve miniscules from the 11th to the 15th centuries includes manuscripts 13, 69, 124, 346 565. Metzger called this 9th century manuscript “one of the most beautiful of all known manuscripts,” referring its deluxe presentation of gold letters on purple vellum. 565 is an ally of Θ in Mark, and the Alands noted that the text of Mark in this MS is better than that of Matthew and Luke, though they did not delineate its textual alignments in John in their introduction to textual criticism.

565. Metzger called this 9th century manuscript “one of the most beautiful of all known manuscripts,” referring its deluxe presentation of gold letters on purple vellum. 565 is an ally of Θ in Mark, and the Alands noted that the text of Mark in this MS is better than that of Matthew and Luke, though they did not delineate its textual alignments in John in their introduction to textual criticism.

700. An 11th century manuscript of the gospels.

Western: Ξ (1:1-8:38) D a b e

Ξ (1:1-8:38). Gordon Fee published a study in which he demonstrated conclusively that this first portion of John in Sinaiticus is a leading representative not of the Alexandrian

---

52 For the most thorough discussion of this important manuscript and its place in family 1, see Amy Anderson, The Textual Tradition of the Gospels: Family 1 in Matthew (Leiden: Brill, 2004).


54 See the Quantitative Analysis information for 565 and 700 in Chapter 3.
tradition, but of the Western. This discovery is tremendously valuable, as it adds another
precious Greek voice to the solitary text of Bezae.

D. This 5th century bilingual Greek-Latin codex presents the leading example of the
Western text of the gospels and Acts, along with a fragment of 3 John. In addition to its
valuable Western text, Bezae contains numerous idiosyncratic readings. Its text of Acts is
fascinating, nearly 10% longer than the received text.

a. Codex Vercellensis is probably the oldest European manuscript of the gospels.
Tradition holds that it dates to before 371.

b. Codex Veronensis is a beautiful 5th century manuscript of the gospels on purple
parchment written with silver and gold ink. F. C. Burkitt holds that it represents the type of
text on which Jerome based the Vulgate.

e. Codex Palatinus is the only manuscript of these three that preserves the older
African rather than European Western text. Dating to the 5th century, this is also a purple
manuscript written in silver ink. Though its text is African, it has been corrected toward the
European Latin tradition. Metzger holds that Augustine used a text such as that of e before
400 C.E.

Byzantine A E Ε Π Ω TR

A. 5th century Codex Alexandrinus preserves the oldest form of the Byzantine text in
the gospels. Elsewhere in the NT it witnesses a strong form of the Alexandrian text with B
and \( \Psi \).

55 Fee, “Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John.”

56 David Parker has written the definitive codicological study of this manuscript. David C. Parker, Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and its Text (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

57 Information on the Latin witnesses is found in Metzger and Ehrman, Text of the New Testament, 102-103.
E. Codex Basiliensis is an eighth-century gospel manuscript preserving a Byzantine text.

Δ. Codex Sangallensis is a ninth-century intra-linear Greek-Latin edition of the gospels. In Mark its text is Secondary Alexandrian, close to L; it is Byzantine in the other gospels.

II. Ninth-century Codex Petropolitanus heads a subgroup of the Byzantine text that is “akin to, but not descended from, Alexandrinus.”

Ω. Codex Athous Dionysiou, also a ninth-century gospel codex, presents the earliest variety of the Byzantine text according to Von Soden.

TR. Stands for the Textus Receptus, the text that stems ultimately from Erasmus’ Greek New Testament, and underlies English Translations until the end of the 19th century.59

These descriptions familiarize the reader with those players that coordinate to trace the lines of textual affinity in Origen’s writings and between one another. Their patterns of agreement of readings create distinct puzzle pieces that combine to present a vivid picture of the web of relationships between these textual groups. Fortunately, the patterns of agreement between these witnesses and Origen’s text of John are comparatively distinct and striking, enabling a classification of Origen’s text of John as an impressively pure example of the Primary Alexandrian text type.


Chapter II
THE TRACKING OF ORIGEN’S TEXTS AND TRAVELS

Having discussed in the previous chapter pertinent details regarding Origen’s biography and approach to the biblical text, as providing an overview of his literary works, I turn now to the analysis of Origen’s New Testament text over the past few centuries. This textual history aims to walk a middle road between overextension and scholarly myopia. On one hand, it is selective, comprehensive neither in the areas of textual criticism as a whole\(^1\) or Origenian studies.\(^2\) On the other hand, it treats topics beyond the specific subject of Origen’s text of the Gospel of John which is, after all, the title of this thesis. I have done so for several reasons. Most important, an analysis of Origen’s text of the fourth gospel will be of little value without context, an understanding of Origen’s text of the three remaining gospels and other books of the New Testament. This contextualization clarifies the picture of the textual history of which Origen’s witness is a valuable part. Further, several key subjects in textual criticism intersect at the crossroads of Origenian studies—the fact he lived first in Alexandria and then Caesarea, the supposed origin of two of the major families of the New Testament


\(^{2}\) Henri Crouzel has published bibliographies that list virtually all studies relating to Origen up to 1982. *Bibliographie critique d’Origène*. (Instrumenta Patristica VIII; Stenbrugis, Belgium; Abbatia Sancti Petri, 1971) and a *Supplement* in 1982. These bibliographies list most works that even mention Origen, with brief annotation. For Origen’s text of the New Testament refer to works under the index heading “Nouveau Testament, texte origénien.”
text, merits touching upon the history of investigation of these textual types. I have tried, therefore, to cover most works that specifically treat the text of Origen’s New Testament.

I have focused this textual history around “turning points” in theories or methodology, which often parallel advances in textual criticism as a whole. Special attention has been paid to the work of Kim-won Kim, who applied his advisor Ernest Colwell’s crucial methodology of determining textual relationships to the work of Origen, and to the studies of Gordon Fee, who perhaps more than any other scholar has improved our access to the critical text types of early leaders of the Church, whose texts often predate most of our manuscripts of the New Testament.

From Johann Griesbach to B. H. Streeter

Though previous textual critics had taken Origen’s writings into account, at the close of the eighteenth century, scholar Johann Jacob Griesbach inaugurated modern research of Origen’s text of the New Testament. He first set forth criteria for sifting Origen’s quotations in his Habilitationsschrift in 1771, and put these into practice in his Commentarius Criticus and Symbolae Criticae.

---

3 Johann Jacob Griesbach, Dissertatio Critica De Codicibus Quatuor Evangeliorum Origenianis. (Halle: Litteris Hendelianis, 1771); repr., J. J. Griesbach, Opuscula Academica (ed. J. P. Gabler, vol. I, Hena, 1824), 226-317. Griesbach exhibited awareness of the complexities of establishing a Father’s text such as the difficulty of determining which passage they are quoting. As J. M. Bebb noted, his work modeled the approach that the “evidence of patristic quotations merits the severest scrutiny before it is thrown in to the balance on one side or the other.” J. M. Bebb, “The Evidence of the Early Versions and Patristic Quotations on the Text of the Books of the New Testament,” StudBib 2 (1890): 195-240.

4 Commentarius Criticus in Textum Graecum Novi Testamenti (2 vols; Jena: Goepferdt, 1798, 1811).

5 Symbolae Criticae Ad Supplendas Et Corrigendas Variarum N.T. Lectionum Collectiones (2 vols.; Halle, 1785, 1793).
Later investigators of Origen’s text focused on several important contributions made by Griesbach. Scholars from Westcott and Hort⁶ to Bruce Metzger confirmed Griesbach’s conclusion that Origen did not produce a critical edition of the New Testament to match his magisterial Hexapla,⁷ contrary to suggestions such as those made by J. L. Hug, that Origen did consciously produce such an edition.⁸ More important, Griesbach’s detailed analysis of Origen’s text set the stage for all further studies, which build upon and often confirm Griesbach’s general findings. He suggested that Origen used Alexandrian manuscripts (B C L) for his Commentary on John, and that in Matthew, he used a Western text resembling D f¹ f¹³ 28 69.⁹ Finally, Griesbach set the foundation for the studies on Mark by later scholars¹⁰

---


⁹ Symbolae Criticae II, according to Bebb, “Evidence,” 230 and Roderic Mullin, The New Testament Text of Cyril of Jerusalem (SBLNTGF 7; ed. Bart Ehrman; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 31. Gordon Fee commented, “Griesbach had suggested that the change in his citations of Mark was due not so much to a shift in geography as to a shift in textual character in his copy of Mark itself, such as one now finds in Codex W.” (“Origen's Text of the New Testament and the Text of Egypt,” NTS 28 [1982], 35).
when he proposed that Origen in his *Commentary on John* used an Alexandrian text of Mark for Mark 1-11 and a mixed text for the remainder, and a Western text of Mark in his *Commentary on Matthew* and *Exhortation to Martyrdom*, both composed during the Caesarean period.\(^\text{11}\)

In the decades framing the turn of the twentieth century, several works addressed Origen’s quotations and text type. Westcott and Hort treated the Fathers only lightly in their ground-breaking 1881 *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek*,\(^\text{12}\) though Hort used Origen’s lack of Syrian readings as one weapon to overthrow the reign of that late text.\(^\text{13}\)

Jules Martin’s lengthy 1885 article on Origen and textual criticism\(^\text{14}\) is remarkable only for the completely maverick position he espoused—that the uncialis \(A\ B\ C\ D\) are not ordinary copies of the received text of the Church, but rather recensions using the texts of church Fathers, especially the works of Origen. He was pleased with his theory, opining that it reversed and obliterated (\(\text{anéantir}\)) in one blow “tous les principes critiques formulés par

---


\(^{11}\) Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 92. Other scholars have taken up and adapted this idea; see below on the studies by R. V. Tasker, Kwang-Won Kim, and Gordon Fee.

\(^{12}\) In Hort’s discussion of the Fathers, he only stated that Origen’s text can be reconstructed, rather than indicating the alignment of that text (Hort, *Introduction*, 161).

\(^{13}\) Hort, *Introduction*, 114. Tasker’s evaluation that one of Hort’s “chief arguments” to the superiority of the \(B\) text was it was the text used by Origen (“The Text of the Fourth Gospel Used by Origen in his Commentary on John,” *JTS* 37 [1936]: 146) overstated the case.

bon nombre de savants moderns.”

Ernest Hautsch tersely proclaimed Martin’s thesis untenable and noted that it had not been taken up by other scholars.

Hautsch surveyed several other works at the beginning of his examination of Origen’s citations from the gospels. Paul Koetschau’s article “Bibelcitate Bei Origenes” analyzed Origen’s citations, both from the Old and New Testaments, and discusses the textual history of Origen’s writings, as well the biblical text within those writings. Koetschau emphasized Origen’s tendency to quote freely from his biblical text, especially in the case of gospel parallels, where he would cite one verse, yet the wording of the verse presupposed another passage.

Edwin Preuschen emphasized the methodological principle that Origen’s text within the body of the commentaries, rather than the lemmata, more likely represent Origen’s actual text.

Erich Klostermann refuted Preuschen’s clever reason for the unreliability of lemmata, namely that Origen let his scribes find in their own exemplars texts to which he referred, but critics have confirmed the greater reliability of Origen’s text outside lemmata, since later scribes would be more likely to conform those long passages to their own (later) texts.

Preuschen also echoed Koetschau’s discomfiting discovery that Origen gives us a less

---

15 Martin, Origène Et La Critique Textuelle,” 53. He explicitly boasted that his theory pushed aside the editions of Tischendorf, Tregelles, Lachman, and Westcott and Hort!

16 Hautsch, Evangelienzitate, 3.


18 Hautsch, Evangelienzitate, 3.

19 Cited in Hautsch, Evangelienzitate, 3.

reliable text than we would like—Origen bound himself to no specific form of the text, but followed sometimes one authority, sometimes another.\footnote{Hautsch, \textit{Evangelienzitate}, 3; citing Edwin Preuschen, ed. \textit{Der Johanneskommentar} (GCS 10; OW 4; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1903), xci.}

To anticipate later research, despite these early scholars’ pessimism, as Patristic citations go, Origen’s text is about as good as it gets.\footnote{As Fee has memorably stated, “in comparison with other Fathers, [Origen’s] citing of John makes [the citations of other Fathers] look like the work of a backwoods preacher who never consults his text.” Fee, “P75, P66, and Origen,” 257n12.} Thanks to improved methodology, in many cases readers enjoy a near certain grasp of Origen’s biblical text. Yet in 1909, Ernst Hautsch added his voice to the cautionary choir, noting that his research confirmed Preuschen’s observations that Origen’s interpretations of a passage often demand a different text from that provided in the earlier lemmata. He too referred to Origen’s habit of freely quoting from memory, mixing parallel passages not only in allusions, but even in quotations of his biblical text.\footnote{Hautsch, \textit{Evangelienzitate}, 139. My appreciation goes to Dr. Thomas Spencer, now faculty at Brigham Young University, for reviewing my German translations of some of these works.}

After these introductions to Origen’s text and textual habits, scholars continued to endeavor to pin down Origen’s textual affinities. Hermann Von Soden sought to demonstrate with painstaking analysis that Origen’s text is affiliated with a unified “I-H-K text”, whose creators were contemporaneous with Origen.\footnote{Hermann Freiherr von Soden, \textit{Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt} (3 vols; Berlin: A. Glaue); 2.1513-14.} In current terminology this does not seem to be saying more than Origen manifests a “mixed” text, since for von Soden “I” represents a Eusebian Jerusalem text created in 300; “H” the Heschyan recension, Westcott and Hort’s Neutral and Alexandrian texts; and “K” stands for the “Koine” or Syrian text.\footnote{Kieffer, \textit{Au Delà Des Recensions}, 18-19.} After a 1915
article in which F. C. Burkitt suggested that Origen restored a primitive text of the New Testament based on old manuscripts he unearthed, we begin to enter the territory of substantial research on Origen’s text, with which scholars have engaged ever since. These include the study by Kirsopp Lake, Robert Blake, and Sylvia New on the Caesarean text of Mark and the works of B. H. Streeter and R. V. Tasker.

In 1928, Kirsopp Lake, Robert Blake, and Silva New published a book-length article in the *Harvard Theological Review*, “The Caesarean Text of Mark.” They analyzed Origen’s Markan text in *De Principiis* and that of his *Commentary on John*, divided into three sections—books 1-5, written in Alexandria, books 6-10, and the rest of the commentary. They also examined Markan references in Origen’s *Commentary on Matthew* and *Exhortation to Martyrdom*. This study established firmly that Origen changed his text of Mark after book 10 of his commentary on John. This change corresponds to somewhere in Mark 12 before verse 41. Significantly, in his later *Commentary on Matthew*, Origen uses a Caesarean text of Mark throughout.

The authors then made a claim that challenges the assumptions of other textual critics, namely that the “Caesarean” text was used in Alexandria by Origen (and then brought by him

26 Burkitt is prompted in his questions by the overall inferiority of the Western text combined with readings preserved only in texts aligned with Θ. Further, he noted that many readings which “approve themselves as genuine on internal grounds, cannot be traced further back than the days of Origen.” Burkitt concludes that these facts give “clear indication that somebody in the third century really did have access to a very pure line of transmission,” i.e. an old MS, and asks the rhetorical question “who else could this somebody be but Origen?” “W and Θ: Studies in the Western Text of St. Mark,” *JTS* 17 (1916), 20.


28 Lake, Blake and New, “Caesarean Text,” 268. Among others, this proposition has been accepted by Fee, *Text of John in Origen and Cyril,* 303.

29 Lake, Blake and New, “Caesarean Text,” 270. See the refinements of this conclusion developed by Kwang-Won Kim, discussed below.
to Palestine), and that the “Neutral” text was “not used in Alexandria but in Caesarea”!

Lake and his partners conclude with the following “clear” points: 1) Origen used Neutral texts in books of the *Commentary on John* which he wrote soon after his arrival in Caesarea; 2) in his later writings he used a text related to that of family Θ; 3) “it is certain that he used the Neutral text during his first years in Caesarea, and it is quite doubtful whether he ever had used it before” and the “possibility cannot be entirely excluded” that he used text similar to that of family Θ in Alexandria. Therefore, although usage of Origen and Eusebius justifies calling the text Caesarean, “it may be only because Origen brought it to Caesarea, not because he found it there; in that case the text which he found in Caesarea was the Neutral text. As will be seen later in this history of research, scholars have accepted this conclusion about the Origen’s text in the Gospel of Mark, though Gordon Fee has “laid to rest” their geographical “curious conclusions” in his study of Origen’s text of John. Fee underscores the flimsiness of the textual evidence for this theory: “Had Lake taken the time to look at all the NT citations from Books 1 and 2 of the *Commentary*, he would never have allowed himself the luxury of this totally spurious speculation.”

Lake’s views on the geography and Origen’s text of the Gospel of Mark represented a combination of the theories of Griesbach and Burnett Hillman Streeter. In addition to

30 Ibid., 277.

31 Ibid.

32 Gordon Fee, *Text of Origen and Text of Egypt*, 352. Lake and his co-authors themselves admitted the tenuous nature of the evidence: “It would be absurd to base any certain conclusion on such slight evidence as this, but so far as it goes it suggests that the text of family Θ, rather than that of 8B, was used by Origen in Alexandria.” (Lake, Blake, and New, “Caesarean Text,” 263).

33 Lake, Blake, and New, “Caesarean Text,” 270. This is another theory that Fee challenges in his 1982 article—he suggested that there is a simple explanation for Origen’s shift in his Markan text—it has to do with how Mark corresponds to John (Mark 11=John 2). (Fee, *Text of Origen*, 352).
discussing Origen’s text in his seminal work *The Four Gospels*, Streeter wrote two brief articles treating the text of Origen. Streeter is known for his theory that Origen’s move to Caesarea from Alexandria lead to his adoption of a different text type. Specifically, he proposed that while Origen was in Alexandria he used the B text of Mark, but in later books (*Commentary on Matthew* and *Exhortation to Martyrdom*), he used a “text practically identical with that of fam. Θ” Based on his research, Streeter concluded that Origen continued to use his Alexandrian manuscripts of the Fourth Gospel as long as he was working on his commentary on John and “in the main” for Matthew as well. For Mark or Luke, however, “at some point or other he seems to have changed his MS of Luke, as well as that of Mark, for one of the type of fam. Θ.” Streeter found the alignments with Θ striking and strengthened those agreements rhetorically with the argument that scribes assimilated Origen’s text toward the Byzantine, so it would have originally been even closer to this Caesarean text. Streeter weighed in on other subjects as well—for him, Θ represented the old text of Caesarea; Origen did not bring it there. Finally, Streeter concludes that Origen did

---

34 Streeter, *The Four Gospels*. His first edition was printed in 1924.


38 R. V. Tasker adds the detail that Origen’s text is closer to Θ than to Θ. “The Text of the Fourth Gospel Used by Origen in his Commentary on John.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 37 (1936), 155


not attempt to restore the New Testament text as he did the Old, taking as his strongest argument Origen’s own admission in *Comm. Matt* 15.14 that he did not dare to do so.\(^{41}\)

Streeter and R. V. Tasker engaged with each other on the topic of the Caesarean element of Origen’s text over the course of several articles published from 1935 to 1937 in the *Journal of Theological Studies* and *Harvard Theological Review*.\(^{42}\) Tasker confirmed Streeter’s view that Origen used a text of fam Θ for the whole of Mark while writing *Exhortation to Martyrdom*, but doubted the presence of a Caesarean element in the gospels of Matthew and Luke. In these gospels, Tasker noted, a text closer to δ B predominated.\(^{43}\) Streeter responded that Origen is not using a Neutral text, but that his readings in Luke are Western. He again bolstered his argument with the observation that disagreements with family Θ emerged through revisions toward the Byzantine text; “only those variants of Fam. Θ which differ from the Byzantine text…are worth quoting at all.” He concluded that the text used by Origen is what Hort would have called a mixture of Neutral, Western, and

---

\(^{41}\) Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 100. Origen gives an account of the efforts he made to restore the text of the Septuagint, but adds that he had not dared to do the same thing for the text of the New Testament: “In exemplaribus autem Novi Testamenti hoc ipsum me posse facere sine periculo non putavi.” Though these words are only in our Latin version, Streeter noted that first, the Greek MSS of *Commentary on Matthew* “ultimately all go back to a single much mutilated, and possibly intentionally abbreviated archetype.” Additionally, Streeter noted that this clause seems essential to Origen’s point in the context.


\(^{43}\) Tasker, “Quotations from the Synoptic Gospels”, 64. Tasker noted that analysis of Origen’s text of Matthew presents more complications than that of Mark, since the text of the first gospel has been assimilated more heavily toward the Byzantine text type due to its popularity. Because later scribes would know Matthew better than the other gospels, early texts of Matthew became vulnerable to having the earlier text replaced by the current text known to the scribe copying the manuscript.
Alexandrian. He therefore concludes “beyond reasonable doubt” that “Origen in Matthew and Luke as well as in Mark, used the Caesarean text.”

Tasker conceded a few of Streeter’s points in later studies—that family Θ has been revised toward Byzantine and that nature of Caesarean text is more a pattern of Neutral, Alexandrian, and Western texts rather than specific variants. Further, Tasker incorporated Streeter’s suggestions before the publication of his 1936 article “The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Caesarean Text of Luke.” Finally, Tasker shifted his view towards Streeter’s in his evaluation of Origen’s text of Matthew, concluding that Origen used a text aligned with family Θ while writing at least part of this commentary.

Regarding the Gospel of John, Tasker found that Origen used a Neutral text both in Alexandria and Caesarea. He made the intriguing claim that Origen shifted to a Caesarean text for Book 28 of the commentary, switching back to a Neutral text in books 29-31. This finding, however, most likely stems from Tasker’s inadequate methodology and small sample of variants.

---

44 Streeter, “Origen, K, and the Caesarean text,” 179-180


46 Metzger also highlights a note that indicates that Streeter Won this contest—on 345n1 of Tasker’s “Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Caesarean Text of Luke,” HTR 29 (1936) that indicates Streeter read through a draft of Tasker’s article and made suggestions, which Tasker then incorporated. Metzger, “Caesarean Text,” 58. Tasker also stated this in his article written in July of 1937: Tasker, “The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Caesarean Text of John, HTR (1937): 161

47 Tasker, “Text of St. Matthew,” 64.


49 Gordon Fee, “The Text of Origen,” 353. See 364 n17 for Fee’s detailed critique of Tasker, which relates primarily to inadequate critical sifting of Origen’s citations before analysis.
K. W. Kim to Gordon Fee

Though only ten years passed between Tasker’s studies and those of the next scholar to examine Origen’s text systematically, these years were marked by significant methodological improvements in the analysis of Patristic citations. Ernest Colwell was the one to make the important break from collating a given text with the *Textus Receptus*, which then took into account only departures from the TR. He instead devised an improved “method of Multiple Attestation,” one that for the first time took into account all supporting witnesses of a text. Even more significantly, he developed the method of textual analysis that has become the standard way to locate a manuscript within the stream of textual tradition—the Quantitative method.

Kwang-won Kim, one of Ernest Colwell’s students, applied Colwell’s methodologies to Origen’s biblical quotations. First in his 1946 dissertation and then in several articles, Kim examined the alignment of Origen’s quotations in *On Prayer*, *Commentary on Matthew*, and


51 Colwell does not call his method by this term, and specifically corrects Metzger’s title of “method of Multiple Readings,” but does not coin a title for this method per se. He rejected that term because it was only the first of three steps in his method. He defined a “Multiple Reading” as one “in which the minimum support for each of at least three variant forms of the text” comes from either major strands of the tradition, one of the ancient versions, or a distinctive manuscript such as D. Support from “a representative group of witnesses” is then brought into play. Colwell, “Locating a Manuscript,” 28. He summarized the full method as follows: “Step One is to find related groups through the use of Multiple Readings, and Step Two is to demonstrate the relationship through the use of Distinctive Group Readings, [and] Step Three is to confirm the relationship through the determination of the quantity of agreement.” Ibid., 31. In other words, Colwell suggested that the most helpful variants to examine (his “Multiple Readings”) were those where the textual tradition divides into at least three strands, with distinctive support for each strand. These readings are then analyzed by checking them for distinctiveness and ranking support for them by representative witnesses.

Kim’s article on Origen’s Matthean text in his commentary on that gospel both applied and confirmed Colwell’s “Multiple Method”. This study was significant primarily because it clarified the exact makeup of Origen’s text of Matthew—namely, one with the closest relatives being 1 and 1582. Kim listed several factors supporting his conclusion that Origen and these two manuscripts “form a distinct text type, including the significant sharing of distinctive readings.” The fact that Origen used this type of text “not only in his Commentary on Matthew, but also in his Exhortation to Martyrdom, Homilies on Jeremiah, Homilies on Luke, [and] Against Celsus” demonstrates that Kim’s studies have identified the textual complexion of Origen’s exemplar of the Gospel of Matthew, a significant accomplishment.

Kim’s research also played an important role in complicating the category of “Caesarean” text, a text-type in which the study of Origen’s quotations had played a key role. In this chapter we have reviewed Streeter’s groundbreaking theory that Origen used the Neutral text in Egypt and the Caesarean text in Palestine and his arguments with Tasker on the extent of this text in other gospels. This article by Kim settled this debate, as the Matthean text of Origen is neither Neutral nor Caesarean but a distinct text type apart.


54 Kim, “The Matthean Text of Origen in His Commentary on Matthew,” JTS 68 (1949): 130-131. Out of 120 variations, 1582 agreed with Origen in 92 instances (76.7%), and 1 agreed in 88 (73.3%).

55 Ibid., 132.

56 Ibid., 135.


58 Ibid., 138
noted that $P^{45}$, dated to about 200-250 C.E., aligns in the gospels with the “Caesarean” text.\footnote{Ibid., 136}

This led Lake to devise question-begging classifications such as “true Caesarean,” “pre-Caesarean,” “pre-Origenian,” and so forth.\footnote{Ibid., 136-137.} Thus even in Kim’s day it became increasingly difficult to speak of a “Caesarean text” proper. It seems rather that, as James Baikie has suggested and others have confirmed, the Caesarean text is “one of influences rather than origin…a textual process.”\footnote{Metzger, “Caesarean Text of the Gospels,” 58-59, citing, James E. McA. Baikie “The Caesarean Text Inter Pares,” (M.Litt. thesis, Cambridge University, 1936). Concerning this work, Metzger commented, “Both Streeter and Tasker—as well as other textual critics—overlooked what is without doubt a most significant analysis of the textual complexion of the Caesarean text.” Even in 1945 Metzger could state “at present the Caesarean text is disintegrating. There still remain several families…each of which exhibits certain characteristic features. But it is no longer possible to gather all these several families and individual manuscripts under one vinculum such as the Caesarean text.” Metzger, “Caesarean Text,” 67. Though it relates directly neither to Origen nor to the gospel of John, an important work relating to both the Caesarean text and the methodology of assigning witnesses to textual types is the revised dissertation by Larry Hurtado, originally completed under the supervision of Eldon Epp: Larry Hurtado, Text-critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text: Codex W in the Gospel of Mark (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1981). Hurtado concludes that the term “pre-Caesarean” should not be applied to W or $P^{45}$. He also concluded that many relationships between the “Caesarean” family relate to Western or Byzantine elements in those manuscripts. See the review by Carroll Osburn published in \textit{JBL} 102 (1983), 504-506.} In other words, though all textual types are by definition created through “textual processes,” the similarities between members of the “Caesarean” family stem not primarily from common archetypes, but from readings copied between these later manuscripts and from common scribal tendencies.

As Lake, Blake, and New demonstrated that Origen’s text of Mark is closest to family $\Theta$, so Kim established the close affinity in Origen’s text of Matthew to manuscripts 1 and 1582. In a 1950 article, Kim parted the curtains of history in a fascinating manner, providing a gratifying amount of detail regarding these manuscripts so close to Origen’s text.\footnote{Kim made a fascinating inference regarding the relationship between the latter two manuscripts, that Codex 1 was copied from 1582, or that at the very least they were derived from a common archetype. Kim, “Codices 1582, 1739, and Origen,” 169. Reuben Swanson added supporting evidence, having reached the same...} Codex...
1582, the closest witness to Origen in Matthew’s gospel, is connected to two other manuscripts, all bearing the name of the scribe Ephraim, who lived in the mid-tenth century.63 The colophon of 1739 indicates several important facts about this witness—it was copied from a fifth-century manuscript whose scribe had access to the writings of Ireneus, Clement, Origen, Eusebius, and Basil as well as New Testament manuscripts. In fact, for the Epistle to the Romans, the scribe seems to have reconstructed his text from the lemmata of Origen’s commentary. We may therefore conclude, Kim stated, “that the text of Romans in Codex 1739 is that which Origen used.”64 Kim links the similarities of these manuscripts, and especially their relationship to Origen, to deduce that “the same Ephraim…wrote the Venice Aristotle, Codex 1739, and Codex 1582.” With only a little speculation, one may go even further. Given the fact that these manuscripts are paleographically identical and share the name of the same scribe identical critical noted, they may have emerged from the same scriptorium in Caesarea. Or they possibly share the ultimate connection—1582 may be the gospel portion of the 1739!65 This reuniting of paleographical siblings pays off tremendously in task of accessing Origen’s text of the New Testament. Kim felt that the text of 1582 is so close to Origen’s text that it might have been born of the same process that produced 1739—

conclusion, that cursive 1582 “was the exemplar for the scribe who copied Cursive 1.” Further evidence includes a shared rare orthographic variant (δαί for δέ) in Mt. 7:3; 21:28; Lk. 6:41; 12:57, numerous unusual orthographical similarities, and unusual variant readings (compare a long homoioteleuton in Lk. 6:32-33). Swanson, New Testament Greek Manuscripts: John (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), x.

63 Kim, “Codices 1582, 1739, and Origen,” 168.

64 Kim, “Codices 1582, 1739, and Origen,” 168. Kim noted that he compared Origen’s text of Romans to that of 1739 and found it identical. He does not seem to be aware of Gunther Zuntz’s 1946 Schweich Lectures, where Zuntz came to a similar conclusion, and extrapolated it further. Zuntz noted that the text of 1739 “proved to agree, against contemporary texts, with he wording quoted or presupposed in the writings of Origen,” which explains the high level of Alexandrian agreement in this text. See Günther Zuntz, The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition Upon the Corpus Paulinum (Schweich Lectures, 1946; London: Oxford University Press, 1953), 68-84.

65 Kim, “Codices 1582, 1739, and Origen,” 175.
“the scribe of Ephraim’s exemplar reconstructed his texts from Origen’s writings.” If accurate, this conclusion carries great significance to the study of Origen’s text of the New Testament—in 1582 we have one of our earliest windows to Origen’s text, at least that of Matthew.

If this high-stakes detective work leaves the reader exhilarated, the next article proves something of a disappointment. It is difficult to understand why Kim, after demonstrating the effectiveness of the Multiple Method in his dissertation and ensuing article on Origen’s text of Matthew, regressed to collation against the TR in his analysis of the text of John in three of Origen’s Caesarean writings. In this analysis of Origen’s text of the Fourth Gospel, Kim concluded that Origen changed his text of John over the course of his life. The text of John in his *Commentary on Matthew* seems to be again closest to manuscripts 1 and 1582, so Kim suggested that Origen “may probably have used sometimes the same type of text for John while he was composing the *Commentary*. It seems probable that, while he was at work on the *Commentary*, at some point or other he changed his text of John for one of the type of the ‘Caesarean’ text.” According to Kim’s data Origen must have changed his text back to that of Egypt, because in *On Prayer* and *Against Celsus*, Origen’s text is “definitely ‘Neutral’.” After all this, Kim confusingly agrees with Streeter’s view that Origen used the Neutral text

---

66 Ibid., 168.

67 Kim clearly stated that this was his method, with no mention of Colwell’s improved methodology for which he argued at length in his previous studies: “I list below the readings of Origen which depart from the Textus Receptus.” Kim, “Origen’s Text of John in His *On Prayer, Commentary on Matthew, and Against Celsus*.” *JTS* n.s. 1 (1950): 76.

68 Ibid., 79.

69 Ibid., 81
all his life.\(^{70}\) In a final article, Kim again emphasized the relationship between Origen and manuscripts 1 and 1582 in the text of Matthew in *Against Celsus*, noting also that Origen seems to have used a different text in the preface than in the rest of the work.\(^{71}\)

As Kim’s research represents a sort of “half-way point” in the history of investigation into Origen’s text, a recap to this point might be useful. To summarize Kim’s findings regarding the Gospel of John: In the *Commentary on Matthew*, Origen’s text of John “though not very definite”, is still classified by Kim as closest to manuscripts 1 and 1582. His text of John in *On Prayer* and *Against Celsus* is “definitely ‘neutral’.” Regarding the more complicated situation relating to the *Commentary on John*, Kim followed Streeter in saying that Origen used his Alexandrian text for John as long as he was working on the commentary.\(^{72}\)

In reference to Mark, Kim agreed with Streeter regarding that Origen changed his text when he moved to Caesarea from Alexandria in A.D. 231 and changed his ‘Neutral’ text to one aligning with family Θ.\(^{73}\) Most of Kim’s work was done on Matthew, and it is there that his findings prove clearest and most convincing—Origen used the ‘Neutral’ text in his *Commentary on John* and *On Prayer*, then changed it to a manuscripts 1 and 1582 type of text. This was the text used for Origen’s *Homilies on Jeremiah, Commentary on Matthew*,

\(^{70}\) “As for the text of John, it seems probable that he used the ‘neutral’ text throughout his life.” Ibid., 82.

\(^{71}\) Kim, Origen's Text of Matthew in his *Against Celsus*,” *JTS* 4 (1953): 47

\(^{72}\) Streeter also noted that where Β differs, Origen’s text is closer to Β. Kim, “Origen's Text of Matthew in his *Against Celsus*,” 82; Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 96.

\(^{73}\) The change took place in book 11 of commentary, “and he continued to use the fam. Θ type of text in all of his works completed in Caesarea” (Kim, “Origen's Text of Matthew in his *Against Celsus*,” 82). The text of Mark in first five books of Commentary is not clear, but books 6-10 are clearly Neutral. Thus Origen used a Neutral text for a while in Caesarea, and then changed to another textual type. Kim implies first that Origen switched when he moved (following Streeter), but this statement presupposes that Origen continued to use the Neutral text for a time as Lake, Blake, and New suggested.
and Against Celsus. Kim did not study Origen’s text of the Gospel of Luke but suggested that it is ‘Neutral.’ The picture clearly emerging by this point is one of complicated textual preference. Though he supports some families better than others, Origen does not witness to one form of the New Testament text, but a variety. In addition to Origen changing his text after his relocation to Caesarea in most instances, he used different textual forms in different books of the New Testament. Unfortunately, we cannot discern why he chose one text over another, or whether it was a matter of preference at all, or mere convenience. But though intentions remain forever beyond our grasp, Kim’s research clarified the contours of Origen’s witness to the history of the New Testament text.

Gordon Fee

If Kim (following Colwell) represents the beginning of an improved analysis of Patristic citations, this improvement flourishes fully in the work of Gordon Fee. There can be little doubt that credit for the greatest contribution toward studies of Origen’s text goes to Fee. Over the course of more than thirty years, Fee has fine-tuned methodology for establishing the text of a given Father and presented several studies in which he applies these methods to analysis of Origen’s text. Fee was responsible for collecting and evaluating Origen’s citations for the monumental International Greek New Testament Project and authored a number of important studies regarding Origen’s NT text.

In an article first published in 1971, Fee set out his methodology for redeeming patristic citations from improper or minimal use in textual criticism and then applied it to

74 Kim, “Origen’s Text of Matthew in his Against Celsus,” 82.

John chapter 4.\textsuperscript{76} This methodology tackles a two-fold task: 1) to attempt a critical reconstruction of a Father’s biblical text by collecting, evaluating, and presenting citations, and 2) to place that Father’s text in the context of the history of the New Testament text.

Stressing the importance of full presentation of the textual data in a Father’s writings, Fee noted that previous studies listed only variants and statistics without showing the work that went into producing them, limiting the usefulness of such research.\textsuperscript{77} Previous scholars had highlighted the varied forms of the biblical quests quoted by Church Fathers and stopped there. Fee emphasized the fact that with proper methodology, in many cases the actual form of a Father’s text can be pinpointed. Even so, Fee noted that ideally studies should present both a complete list of a Father’s biblical citations and then the reconstructed text the editor feels best represents that used by the Father himself.

In his modeling of this method, Fee suggested the following format: First, provide the running text of the Father, as far as it can be reconstructed. Then the scholar should list three apparatuses, which: 1) give citations/adaptations available only in translation (not used in reconstruction); 2) provide references to all citations, with the text of those citations; and 3) list, and frequently discuss, all variations, including MS variations to a single citation and any variations in the Father’s citing of a passage.\textsuperscript{78}

\textsuperscript{76} Fee, “The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Methodology in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations,” Epp and Fee, Studies, 301-334; repr. from Biblica 52 (1971), 357-394. Fee noted the ambivalence Patristic citations have always held for textual scholars—on one hand their witnesses are earlier than almost all of our manuscripts; on the other hand, their citations are notoriously difficult to analyze. Fee’s contribution in devising methodology to reclaim the use of Patristic citations is therefore of tremendous import. This method is tedious, but worth the effort. Relatedly, see Ronald Heine, “Can the Catena Fragments of Origen’s Commentary on John Be Trusted?” Vigiliae christianae 40 (1986): 118-34.

\textsuperscript{77} Fee, “The Text of John,” 302.

\textsuperscript{78} Fee, “The Text of John,” 304.
Fee then supplied specific definitions for “allusions,” “adaptations,” and “citations,” with the latter falling into categories of either “strict” or “loose”. Excavating a Father’s text of the New Testament constitutes a dual layer process, since the Father’s text has its own history that must be critically unraveled before the biblical citations within can be mined for readings. Finally, as if the vagaries of transmission were not daunting enough, human choice plays a role, since Fathers cite the bible differently in different types of works.

After successfully completing the painstaking process of reconstructing a Father’s text, scholars must cross a second meticulous hurdle—collating a Father’s text not just with the TR, but with a series of “control” manuscripts, “selected to give a broad cross-section of the various textual traditions.”

Groundwork established, Fee then presented the fruits of the sifting of quotations and collations, a table illustrating the textual affinities of Origen in John 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P75</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P66*</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P66c</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψ</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In brief, “Allusions” are references “so remote as to offer no value” for textual reconstruction; “Adaptations,” as the word indicates, are instances where clear verbal correspondence exists to a NT passage, but the wording has been adapted by the Father; and citations are “those places where a Father is consciously trying to cite, either from memory or by copying the very words of the biblical text.” Fee, “The Text of John,” 304.

Fee, “The Text of John,” 305. As Fee noted, it is no accident that the “vast majority of Byzantine variants from Origen’s usual Neutral text of John are found in citations where Migne is the best edition available!” In other words, where Origen’s text has not been critically reconstructed, the millennia of scribal transmission have shifted his Alexandrian text toward the Byzantine texts familiar to later scribes.

Fee, “The Text of John,” 307. Fee acknowledged that “[w]ith slight modifications, this is essentially the method worked out by Colwell and Tune 1963.” Fee also pointed out the harsh truth that “[t]his methodological failure [collating only against the TR] renders almost valueless a large portion of several of the unpublished dissertations on Father’s texts” (Ibid., 306n15).

Fee, “The Text of John,” 309. The columns contain the witnesses followed by the percentage of agreement of that witness with Origen’s text of John 4.
Origen is clearly shown to be a “strong Neutral witness.” In order to highlight further the textual distinctions, however, Fee classified variants based on text type, dividing them into Neutral, Western, Byzantine, etc. Using this method, Fee presented his findings regarding Origen’s text. John 4, written in Caesarea, represents a “primary” Neutral text type, the predominant text in Alexandria of Origen’s time.

In addition to general treatments of Patristic textual analysis, Fee authored three additional studies on Origen’s biblical text, two addressing details of textual history, the third offering a valuable overview of Origen’s place in the history of the Alexandrian text of the Gospels. Fee’s demonstration that the lemma at the beginning of book 10 of Origen’s Commentary on John bears interesting implications for the history of the Alexandrian and Caesarean text of the Gospels. Though this inserted text aligns with the Early Egyptian witnesses, especially P66, P75, and Origen, it did not originate in Egypt. Fee felt it was highly probable “that the lemma was added in Caesarea and represents a text of John available in

---

83 Fee’s use of the term “Neutral” is curious, given its problematic nature.

84 He breaks down three levels of Neutral, six of Western, one Caesarean and then has the combinations “NW” 1-3; “NB” 1-2; NWB and Misc, with the lower numbers representing greater support. Fee, “The Text of John,” 310.

85 Ibid., 311, 313.

that city in the second half of the third century.”87 This means that there was an early Alexandrian witness to John available in Caesarea, in addition to any brought by Origen.88

In his 1974 article “P75, P66, and Origen: Myth of Textual Recension in Alexandria,” Fee first surveyed theories of an Egyptian textual recension of the New Testament, often connected with Origen. Fee could note that at the time of writing his article, “the recensional nature of B has become a byword in NT textual criticism.”89 The discovery of the late second/early third century manuscript P75 disintegrated this opinion of Vaticanus: “The discovery of P75 now makes it certain that the text of B existed in the second century across two separate textual histories both in its main features and in most of its particulars. If the Egyptian text-type is a recension in either sense of that term, it is not a recension of the late third/early fourth century.”90 But this alone does not resolve the question of recension; it simply pushes it back further into the fogs of antiquity, as Fee stated. Fee then mobilized Origen as a point of investigating whether this P75/B tradition of which he is a part is recensional at all. Fee examines Origen and P66 for hints of “recensional activity necessary to have created the text of P75 B,” and finds no such indications. Origen “did not have the kind of concern for the NT text that would make him representative of the ‘philological mind’ necessary for such a recension.”91 Though Origen cited his NT text with “remarkable precision,” he seems not to have felt anxiety over whether that text was ‘pure’ or not.

87 Fee, “Lemma,” 81. Perhaps even by Pamphilus, Eusebius’ mentor. Eusebius only had access to 22 out of 39 books of Origen’s commentary on John, thus these portions must have been lost between 253 and 307.

88 Unless Origen brought an Alexandrian MS of John that he himself did not use.


90 Fee, “P75, P66, and Origen,” 256.

91 Ibid., 256.
discussed in the previous chapter, sometimes he changed his texts, but mostly he did not, and even where he made changes, his concerns were not primarily textual or historical. Therefore, Fee concluded that P75 was not recensional, but rather a careful preservation of earlier tradition. But if this is the case, one questions why Origen exchanged the manuscripts of his other copies of the gospels. Did they wear out? Get lost? Did Origen maintain his text of John only because those were his noted for his current project? I will attempt to address these questions in the conclusion of this study.

In this article Fee also touches upon a few other points germane to this study: The fact that Origen’s citations of the Gospel of John do not change when he moves to Caesarea indicate “in all probability, that he carried such a text with him when he moved. This indeed might indicate his preference for this text as over against others.”

Fee’s 1982 article “Origen’s Text of the New Testament and the Text of Egypt” provides a critical overview of Origen’s New Testament text within the framework of the Egyptian text type. Fee then fills in a lacuna of textual analysis, analyzing Origen’s text of Luke in On Prayer and Commentary on John. He gave the following summary as the state of research on Origen’s gospel text as of 1982:

Fee accepted the presumption that Origen used an Egyptian text “for all four Gospels during his residence in Alexandria.”

1. For Matthew: He used an Egyptian text for at least the first three years of his residence in Caesarea (Books 6-32 of Commentary on John and On Prayer);

---

92 Fee, “P75, P66, and Origen,” 256.

93 NTS 28 (1982): 348-64.
thereafter, beginning with *Martyrdom* through *Contra Celsum* and including the Matthew commentary, he used a text similar to Codices 1 and 1582.

2. For *Mark*: He used his Egyptian text through Book 10 of *Commentary on John*. Beginning with Book 13, and at least by Book 20, he used a Caesarean text, very much like Codex Θ, which he also used in the *Commentary on Matthew*.

3. For *Luke*: He used the Egyptian text for Books 1-13 of the *Commentary on John* and for *On Prayer*. In Books 20-32 the text takes on a decidedly different character, with a considerable mixture of Western readings.

4. For *John*: Used only the Egyptian text all his life.

As I will comment below, not only did Gordon Fee pioneer efforts in textual analysis of Patristic citations, but it is a commentary on his work that for better or worse, this state of the question on Origen’s text of the gospels still describes where scholarship stands over twenty years later.

**Scholarship Since Fee**

Bart Ehrman rounded out our methodological toolset to its present state, and virtually all succeeding scholars of Patristic citations have taken up his method. In his 1985 dissertation, “Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels,” Ehrman crafted the template which subsequent dissertations and studies have followed. Each of these studies

---

94 To analyze Origen’s text of Luke, Fee collated the Majority text with NA26 where Origen has text, listed variants where Origen departs from the common texts (TR and NA26) tabulated these data, and noted variants where Origen fails to support significant MSS or groups when they depart from common text. Fee, “Origen’s Text of the New Testament,” 354-355.

95 Ibid., 354.

establishing a given Father’s text is significant, because it plots another solid point to which we can connect the others, enabling us to write a more complete and accurate history of the transmission of the New Testament text, one of the primary aims of Textual Criticism.97

I will describe Ehrman’s improvements only generally at this point, since they are both adequately familiar and will be discussed in detail and put into practice in later chapters of this study. Ehrman built on Fee’s technique of reconstructing patristic texts, and then offered several improvements in the area of analysis. After listing the quantitative relationships between manuscripts, Ehrman presented the data by textual group in a more intuitive manner than Fee’s categories.98 Ehrman’s final methodological milestone, a “Group Profiles Analysis,” serves further to illuminate a Father’s textual affinities, specifically to confirm and refine the findings offered by Quantitative Analysis. Ehrman proposed three additional profiles that serve to cast a Father’s textual alignment into (relatively) sharp relief: 1) “Inter-Group Readings” profile, which “ascertains the extent and strength of a reading’s attestation among previously isolated textual groups”; 2) “Intra-Group Readings” profile, which examines those readings supported by all or at least two-thirds of representative witnesses of a group; and 3) a profile that combines these two readings by tabulating support “for readings found uniformly or predominantly among group members, but among no or

---

97 The other primary goal being of course to establish the oldest attainable text. This more nuanced goal is preferable to the more traditional but also problematic “original text.” See Eldon Epp’s excellent discussion of this issue in his chapter, “The Multivalence of the Term ‘Original Text’ in New Testament Textual Criticism,” Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays, 1962-2004 (SuppNovTest 166; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 551-593.

98 By listing in tables witnesses ranked both by proportional agreement to the Father and by textual group, rather than Fee’s N1, N2, N3, etc.
few other witnesses." This method both incorporates and improves upon earlier studies which noted “distinctive readings” or otherwise attempted to compare patristic texts to family readings in our NT manuscripts.

After Fee, Ehrman, and others paved the way for the analysis of Patristic texts, most work on Origen has taken the form of dissertations on select sections of Origen’s New Testament. Though some are executed better than others, these represent the most substantial and helpful research to date, and enable us to summarize with reasonable confidence Origen’s standing in the line of New Testament textual transmission.

In 1988 William Petersen offered a brief but substantive study, “The Text of the Gospels in Origen's Commentaries on John and Matthew.” Criticizing previous studies for their small samplings of a Father’s text, Petersen’s analysis rests upon complete collations of large portions of commentaries (books 1-5 of the Commentary on John [written in Alexandria, 226-229 CE]; Books 10-11 of Commentary on Matthew [composed in the Caesarean period, about 244 CE]). This sampling offers 379 variants, and Petersen presents agreements, disagreements, and singular agreements between Origen and other witnesses.

From the Commentary on John, Petersen tabulated 34 variants in 148 quotations. Strikingly, Petersen found the fewest disagreements and most singular agreements with the


100 Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy (ed. C. Kannegiesser and W. L. Petersen; South Bend, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988), 34-47.

101 Ibid., 39.

102 Ibid., 41. Petersen critiques earlier studies such as those of Kim for examining only agreements with a textual family, as disagreements are also revealing.
Western text, rather than the Alexandrian.\textsuperscript{103} In the Commentary on Matthew (62 points of variation in 231 quotations), Petersen found the agreements with the Caesarean text to be significantly higher than that with the other textual families.\textsuperscript{104} Petersen’s conclusion seems ambitious given the limited base of his data: “While in Alexandria, there is no discernable tendency to favour one text type over another...It may well be that this most ancient form, the Western text, was a (the?) major manifestation of the gospel text in Alexandria at the time Origen wrote there, and that what scholars now call the ‘Alexandrian’ text is indeed what Peter Corsson, professor at Berlin, called it in 1892,”\textsuperscript{105} a reflection of an arbitrarily established recension of the fourth century. According to Petersen, his findings serve to remind scholars of “the evolving nature of the Biblical text, and the dangers of imposing the arbitrary boundaries of modern text types on the subtle eclecticism of the gospel text used by second and third century writers.”\textsuperscript{106}

Petersen’s methodology of noting disagreements and singular readings is helpful, but the greatest weakness of this study is that he lumps all of the gospels together, rather than treating them individually. The studies surveyed in this history of research confirm the fact that Origen’s text of each gospel bears differing textual affinities, and so each must be examined on its own. Other studies confirm the general impression gained by Petersen’s study, that the “Caesarean” element in the gospels increased after Origen relocated to Palestine, but from Petersen’s presentation the reader cannot tell that the Gospel of John is an

\textsuperscript{103} Ibid., 42.

\textsuperscript{104} The Caesarean agreements are 47 vs. 31 Alexandrian and Western and 34 Byzantine; disagreements are 28 Caesarean vs. 39 Alexandrian, 38 Western and 36 Byzantine. Origen agrees with 2 Alexandrian Caesarean readings, 5 Western, 1 Byzantine, and 8 Caesarean! Ibid., 43.

\textsuperscript{105} Ibid., 45-46.

\textsuperscript{106} Ibid., 46.
exception to this tendency. Further, though Petersen’s cautionary noted remain valuable, his limited investigation proves inadequate to make sweeping statements about the nature of the “gospel text” in Alexandria or Caesarea. His opinion that the Alexandrian text might be a fourth-century recension is especially surprising, a view easily dismantled by one study by Gordon Fee in particular.107

A study by Bart Ehrman in 1993 may explain some of these Western influences in Origen’s *Commentary on John*. According to Ehrman’s article “Heracleon, Origen, and the Text of the Fourth Gospel,”108 Origen preserves Heracleon’s text 49 times in his *Commentary on John*. In eleven of these, Ehrman finds, “Heracleon appears to attest a different form of the text from that known to Origen.”109 In a study the next year110 Ehrman provided the text and analyses of Heracleon’s text embedded in Origen’s writings, and this study confirms that even in the small amount of Heracleon’s writings preserved by Origen, his text aligns with Western witnesses.111 An accurate analysis of Origen’s text must take into account these times when Origen is citing Heracleon.

1997 was a good year for Origenian textual studies, marking three substantial studies on different sections of Origen’s New Testament Text. Jeffrey Cate wrote his dissertation on the Catholic Epistles and Revelation, and Darrell Hannah’s analysis of 1 Corinthians was

107 Gordon Fee, “P75, P66, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria,” in Epp and Fee, *Studies*, 247-273. Though this study was published before Petersen wrote his article, he shows no knowledge of it.


111 Ibid., 298.
published in the series *The New Testament in the Greek Fathers*. Though Roderic Mullen’s
dissertation, also published this year, centered on Cyril of Jerusalem rather than Origen, he
offered detailed analyses of Origen’s text in his exemplary history of research.

Mullen’s contributions to topics pertaining to Origen’s text are two-fold. First, he
provides a thorough history of research relating to the so-called Caesarean text of the
Gospels. If Metzger’s 1945 survey was the “death knell” of the Caesarean text, Mullen’s
review presides at its funeral. As Mullen noted, Mark Dunn’s 1990 dissertation showed
that so called “Caesarean” MSS are usually just weak Byzantine witnesses, and all studies
indicate that “Mark is the only Gospel in which a distinctive text-type might be a candidate
for linkage with Caesarea.”

Even in his history of research, Mullen makes an original contribution—he includes
findings presented at a 1991 meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature analyzing the
Markan text in Origen’s *Commentary on John*. Mullen finds that “Origen’s text agrees at a
high level with Group Θ manuscripts and at a somewhat lower level with Western

---

112 Darrell Hannah, *The Text of I Corinthians in the Writings of Origen* (SBLNTGF 4; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997). This volume constitutes a revised version of Hannah’s M.Th. thesis at Regent College under Gordon Fee.


114 The term is Ehrman’s, speaking of the failure of collation against the TR and the resultant skewing of data relating to the “Caesarean text.” Ehrman, “Methodological Developments,” 21.

115 First, Mullen’s excellent history of research chronicles the disintegration of the Caesarean text type, and his own work on the text of Cyril of Jerusalem confirms the lack of a “Caesarean text” per se. He writes, “group Θ seems to have originated as scribes, who were subject to influences similar to those which produced the Western text-type, attempted to improve the quality of their manuscripts by adding details and clarifying the sense of particular readings…It [seems] unlikely that Group Θ attests a textual tradition of equal antiquity with, say, the Alexandrian or Western text-types.” Mullen, 40-43, quoted in Sylvie Taconnet Raquel, “The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Writings of Origen.” (Ph.D. diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 2002), See further the discussion of her work below.

The differences between textual types even in this brief study confirm these affinities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Support (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Θ (Θ, 565, 700)</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western (D, a, b, k)</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group W (W)</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantine (A, f¹, TR)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 13/28 (f¹³, 28)</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandrian (א, B)</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though this survey has focused on Origen’s text of the gospels, it is also helpful to know what manuscripts Origen had access to in the rest of the New Testament. Darryl Hannah’s book *The Text of I Corinthians in the Writings of Origen* began as his Master’s thesis supervised by Gordon Fee. 118 After critically reconstructing Origen’s text of 1 Corinthians, Hannah provided a Quantitative Analysis that demonstrates that Origen used Alexandrian manuscripts for this book. In 191 units of variation, Codex Ephremi (C) agrees 80.5% of the time with Origen, followed closely by B at 79.6%, Θ at 77.7%, with the rest of the Alexandrian witnesses evaluated never more than 2.7% apart. 119 Origen’s text of 1 Corinthians falls neatly along Colwell’s 70%/10% guideline. 120 Support by Alexandrian witnesses averages at 75.2%, 121 and a clean “9.4% gap separates the Alexandrians from the

---

117 Ibid., 45.

118 Hannah, *Text of 1 Corinthians*, xi.

119 Ibid., 269.

120 A fact not lost on Hannah, who exclaimed, “One could conclude that Colwell and Tune had considered these very data when writing their canons for determining relationships between witnesses!” Ibid., 269.

121 Ibid., 271. The breakdown is 77% for Primary Alexandrian (B א 1739 P⁴⁶) and 73.8% for Secondary Alexandrian (C A 1175 1881 33).
Byzantines and another 7.8% gap separates the Byzantines from the Western witnesses.\textsuperscript{122}

While the Quantitative Analysis demonstrates a model breakdown among textual families, the results of the Group Profiles are not so clear. This analysis confirms what we already knew from the Quantitative Analysis, namely that Origen is a strong representative of the Alexandrian Text type. But due to its small number of readings, this analysis could not securely indicate whether Origen stands as a better witness to the Primary or Secondary stream of Alexandrian tradition, though evidence indicates that Origen stands in the primary textual stream in this book as he does in others.\textsuperscript{123} Origen supports predominant Alexandrian readings which are also distinctive, exclusive or primary 66.6% of the time, far better than his support of Western readings of the same category (7.7%) or Byzantine (33.3%),\textsuperscript{124} but less than seven other Alexandrian witnesses and above only P46 and 1881!\textsuperscript{125} But again, the impact of a small sample (21 readings) must be taken into account—the 10% gap between Origen and א and A represents only two readings.\textsuperscript{126} Hannah confirms Origen’s staunch Alexandrian character thusly: “When the nine Alexandrian witnesses chosen for this study all unite, Origen is almost always with them, both when the reading includes MSS from other

\textsuperscript{122} Ibid., 269.

\textsuperscript{123} Hannah noted that the Secondary Alexandrians are only 3.2% farther than the Primary Alexandrians, and that if miniscules 33 and 1881 are dropped, which “fall below the largest gap within the Alexandrian group, the proximity of the primary Alexandrians falls to only 0.7% above that of the remaining secondary Alexandrians.” Ibid., 271-272.

\textsuperscript{124} Hannah noted that there are so many Byzantine readings because of those Alexandrian readings taken over in the later Byzantine text.

\textsuperscript{125} The witnesses “ranked according to support of Predominant Distinctive, Exclusive, or Primary Alexandrian Readings on 1 Corinthians” are as follows: 1739 (95.2%); B (90.5%); 33 (90%); 1175 (81%); C (76.5%); A (76.2%); aleph (76.2%); \textbf{Origen} (66.6%); P46 (65%); 1881 (52.4%); D (28.6%); 876 (4.8%) 1780 (4.8%). F G 223 and the Majority Text all are at 0%. It must be remembered, however, how small this sampling is, only 21 readings. Ibid., 289.

\textsuperscript{126} Ibid., 290.
groups and when it is uniquely Alexandrian. Only once under these circumstances does Origen defect.”

Hannah, having vouched for Origen’s witness to the Alexandrian text, then discussed the implications on the history of the Alexandrian text of the New Testament. He noted that in 1 Corinthians, there is no indication that Origen used a different text type in Caesarea than in Alexandria. Thus we have another NT book in the same category as John, against the other gospels, where Origen’s text does change, sometimes significantly. As would be expected, Hannah’s study of Origen confirms the non-existence of the Byzantine text during this period, a conclusion accepted since Hort established its secondary character. Hannah’s dissertation does not shed as much light on the mystery of the Western text, why it shows up in Egypt of the third and fourth centuries in papyri such as P29, P38, P48, P69 and the first half of John in Codex Β, but is weakly attested in witnesses such as Origen and Didymus. Hannah asks whether the Western text was present in Egypt only in some copies of the Gospels and Acts. Finally, though Hannah studied only 1 Corinthians, he felt that “it is not likely that Origen’s text of 1 Corinthians will vary greatly from that of the rest of the [Pauline] corpus.” This claim, though not unreasonable, remains to be confirmed by studies of the rest of Paul’s letters in the text of Origen.

127 Ibid.
128 Ibid., 291-292.
129 Hannah, 292. As discussed above, where the Western text is present in Origen’s works, it emerges in those works written after Origen’s relocation to Caesarea.
130 Ibid., 293.
Jeffrey Cate’s 1997 dissertation on the Catholic Epistles and Revelation\(^{131}\) tackled Origen’s text in these writings. This was no simple feat, since varied complicating factors play a role—the different textual character in each book, the lack of a definitive “Western” text in the Catholic epistles paralleling one in the gospels, and the vagaries of the transmission of the Book of Revelation.\(^{132}\) Despite these complexities, Cate employed sound methodology and was able to determine that Origen attests to an Alexandrian text in these New Testament writings, though the contours of that Alexandrian witness varies with each book.

For the Johannine Epistles, Cate followed Larry Richard’s finding that there are three textual groups in these letters—Alexandrian, Byzantine, and a “mixed” group that share group readings and “have considerably more readings against the TR than Byzantine manuscripts but not nearly as many as the Alexandrian manuscripts.”\(^{133}\) Cate said that they warrant inclusion in his analysis, but fall short of a text type. He provides analysis only of 1 John, determining that Origen’s text gives a weak Alexandrian witness.\(^{134}\)

For 1 Peter, Cate found Origen’s text to be more clearly Alexandrian, agreeing 82.6% of the time with the representative texts in that family.\(^{135}\) Origen only quotes four verses of Jude with six units of variation, but Cate analyzed these and placed this book in the

---


\(^{132}\) See especially Cate’s discussion on pages 18, 206-209.

\(^{133}\) Cate, *Text of the Catholic Epistles and Revelation*, 46.

\(^{134}\) Ibid. In 1 John there are 26 verses extant in Origen with 37 units of variation. There is a weak majority for Alexandrian readings. Cate divided Alexandrian witnesses into four somewhat confusing subgroups: 1 (206 1799 2412); 2 (Ψ 8 C B A); 3 (1739 1243); and “n.a.” (UBS 33). Group 2 has 71.4% agreement, with a 68.3% overall agreement, with Byzantine following with 68%, then Misc, 66.8, then Western, 55.4

\(^{135}\) Ibid., 177. 1 Peter in Origen has 19 verses with 35 units of variation.
Alexandrian camp with the others. Looking at the Catholic Epistles overall, Cate noted that “Origen displays his closest relationships with Alexandrian witnesses…seven of Origen’s eight strongest allies are Alexandrian witnesses”; the only agreements greater than 80% are P72, UBS, and Vaticanus.136

Though there are more than a hundred variation units, analysis of Origen’s text of Revelation suffers from the fact that Origen cites disproportionately three sections of this book—7:2-5; 14:1-5; 19:11-16.137 Even so, Cate could reach the conclusion that “[a]s early as the third century, Origen exhibits definitively Alexandrian readings in the Catholic Epistles, a group of writings that were rarely quoted by his contemporaries.”138 He also confirmed Josef Schmid’s distinguishing of a Origen-Sinaiticus-P47 group, and stated that Origen “has an intriguingly close relationship with manuscript 1678.”139 More work remains to be done on this section of Origen’s New Testament, but Cate has moved scholars solidly forward.

It is deeply unfortunate that the most recent and extensive study on Origen’s text of the gospels is also the most flawed. To those familiar with the history of research outlined in this chapter, the title of Sylvie Taconnet Raquel’s 2002 dissertation, “The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Writings of Origen”140 promises to update the fascinating findings by Kwang-won Kim on Matthew and Gordon Fee on Luke, as well as the several important

136 Ibid., 197. On page 203 he presents a table showing that Origen’s text of the Catholic Epistles agrees 77.8% of the time with Alexandrian witnesses, 69.8 Byzantine; 68.1 Mixed, and 62.9 Western.

137 Ibid., 213. 14 units of variation come from 7:2-5; 32 from 14:1-5; and 20 from 19:11-16.

138 Ibid., 221.

139 Ibid., 220.

140 Sylvie Taconnet Raquel, “The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Writings of Origen” (Ph.D. diss; New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 2002).
studies on Mark. The synoptic gospels present significant opportunities for further research and clarification, as previous studies have demonstrated conclusively that Origen shifted his text of these gospels when he moved from Alexandria to Caesarea. Clearly, these gospels offer rich information to be mined for a greater understanding of the history of the New Testament Text.

The first and perhaps greatest shortcoming of Raquel’s work is that she demonstrates little or no awareness of the critical studies on the very topic of her dissertation. As discussed above, Kwang-Won Kim wrote his own dissertation and an article on Origen’s text of Matthew, both of which presented evidence that Origen’s text of the first gospel parallels the text of manuscripts 1 and 1582. After critically reviewing Kim’s work, Fee accepted his analysis of Matthew and added to our understanding of Origen’s text of Luke.

Staggeringly, none of these works made it into Raquel’s bibliography. She demonstrated no knowledge of Kim’s research, apart from dismissing it because it “did not work with all of Origen’s works on the Gospels of Matthew and John.” Other disconnects mar Raquel’s history of research—she included peripheral topics such as a survey of Christian scribal habits, but lacked a review of the history of the Alexandrian text. Even her research on the Caesarean text, which she did cover in adequate detail, neglected several crucial studies.

141 See above, pp. 31-37 (check pages)

142 Fee, “Origen’s Text,” 353.


144 Raquel listed a series of important works in the field, but did not discuss them. Her most notable lack of even a mention is Bruce Metzger’s survey of the breakdown of the Caesarean text, “The Caesarean Text of the
Supported by this fragile research, Raquel’s reaction to her data is understandable. She seemed surprised at the “unusually low” witness of Θ to Origen (65.2%) compared to “a much higher Or-f1 agreement percentage.” On page 507 she suggested that the relationship between Origen and f1 (which includes both manuscripts 1 and 1582, the focus of Kim’s research) “warrants more study.” Her conclusion that her study underscores “the existence of a text-type that differs from the Alexandrian type, to which f1 belongs and of which Origen seems to be a strong witness” merely reiterates what Kim established over fifty years earlier! Finally, her conclusion is somewhat confusing—her research “confirms the lack of cohesiveness of the so-called Caesarean group,” as well as refuting the “assessment that the Gospel of Mark is the only Gospel that can be linked to the Caesarean text-type.” She first said that there is not really a Caesarean text-type, and then she contracted herself by claiming that not only Origen’s text of Mark belongs to this questionable text type, but Matthew does also.

Raquel’s study therefore delivered less than it promised. She stated that her dissertation evaluated the Synoptic Gospels, yet she discussed only the text of Matthew. And even that gospel only partially—she claimed she would employ Ehrman’s group profile


146 Ibid., 507.

147 Ibid., 510.

148 Kim, “The Matthean Text of Origen in his *Commentary on Matthew*,” *JTS* 68 (1949): 135. “The Matthean text of Origen is neither ‘Caesarean’ nor ‘Neutral’; it is a distinct text-type which is represented by Codex 1 and 1582. Origen used this type of text not only in his *Commentary on Matthew*, but also in his *Exhortation to Martyrdom, Homilies on Jeremiah, Homilies on Luke, Against Celsius*.”

149 Raquel called f1 a “distinctive text-type,” but she seems to count it as Caesarean as well.
method, yet she stopped with the Quantitative Analysis. And even this preliminary analysis served only to confirm what Kim established half a century earlier! Sadly, further research on the text of the Synoptic Gospels in Origen should therefore take up not Raquel’s research, but the earlier work of Kim and Fee.

Raquel does reconstruct Origen’s text of the Synoptic Gospels in her dissertation, and that could potentially be useful, though she offers an apparatus of collated variants only for Matthew. In short, the work of this dissertation needs to be redone, though Raquel’s reconstructed texts would provide one tool in that endeavor. The quality of the rest of her research might discourage one from relying on her text, however.

I will review one study out of its chronological sequence, because the volume in question directly leads to the present work. In 1992 Bart Ehrman, Gordon Fee, and Michael Holmes presented *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen*. Simply put, this volume includes all applicable data relevant to Origen’s text of the Gospel of John. After a brief survey of Origen’s life and studies of his text, the bulk of the volume provides Origen’s quotations and allusions drawn from his Greek commentaries and treatises. Accompanying these is a critical apparatus that “indicates variant readings attested among a range of textual witnesses” for every portion of the Fourth Gospel for which Origen’s text

---

150 “The present study uses the method that has been adopted by the NTGF, with slight modifications.” Raquel, “Text of the Synoptic Gospels,” 14.


152 These textual witnesses were drawn from the accepted textual groupings (*TFGWO*, 30):
- Primary Alexandrian: P66 P75 8 (8:39-21:25) B UBS
- Secondary Alexandrian: C L W Ψ 33 579 892 1241
- Caesarean: P45 Θ f f3 565 700
- Western: א (1:1-8:38) D a b e
- Byzantine: A E Δ Π Ω TR

Ehrman included a caveat regarding the existence of the ‘Caesarean’ text on p. 29 n. 23: “As we will emphasize in volume two, there is considerable question concerning the existence of a distinctively ‘Caesarean’ text. At the
can be determined.”¹⁵³ A critically reconstructed text of Origen’s text of John follows this list of reliable citations and allusions, and Chapter Four of this work presents this reconstruction as a running text. Six appendices round out the work: the first two listing the material in Origen’s works too problematic to assist with reconstructing his text—namely catena fragments, Latin references, and indeterminable references. The final four offer corrections to Origen and Heracleon in the two major editions of the New Testament, the UBS and NA²⁶.¹⁵⁴ This study anticipated an ensuing second volume which would comprise “an evaluation of these data and a discussion of their historical significance.”¹⁵⁵ Many of the data from volume one were analyzed, but this analysis has thus far not been published.¹⁵⁶

To summarize the results of this bicentennial ride through research on Origen’s text, we find that as far as the gospels are concerned, students of Origen’s text still stand much where Fee left us twenty years ago. The work of Hannah and Cate has illuminated sections of the latter half of the New Testament. Hannah showed that Origen’s text of 1 Corinthians was strongly Alexandrian, probably Primary rather than Secondary, and that he likely kept this Alexandrian text throughout his life. Cate illustrated the complex situation prevailing among the texts of the Catholic Epistles and Revelation in Origen, but can still say that Origen here represents an Alexandrian text in these books as well.

¹⁵³ *TFGWO*, 25.

¹⁵⁴ Of course, now the UBS and NA²⁷ are available, but these share the same text as their previous editions. To my knowledge neither of these editions incorporates the suggestions provided in this work, however.

¹⁵⁵ *TFGWO*, 21.

¹⁵⁶ These data were tabulated in part by Bruce Morrill, as noted in the Acknowledgments.
As noted, Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes have provided the foundation for a detailed study of Origen’s text of the Fourth Gospel with their critical text and thorough critical apparatus. With this information, it is possible to subject these data to Quantitative and Group Profile Analyses to determine the precise contours of Origen’s text. The rest of this study will undertake exactly this task.
Chapter III

ORIGEN’S TEXT OF JOHN: QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

Establishing the relationship between the thousands of Greek manuscripts of the New Testament \(^1\) proves essential to the primary and secondary goals of textual criticism. First scholars must determine, insofar as possible, the most original text \(^2\) of the New Testament. It then falls upon them to ascertain the origin of all variation from that text, to write a history of the text’s meandering path away from the wording of the autographs. From the midst of this daunting plurality \(^3\) the methodological exigency stares us in the face—how can we determine the genetic bonds linking all these witnesses? The obvious ideal would be to compare every manuscript at every point of variation, but as Gordon Fee among others has noted, this ideal remains unattainable until computers can better relieve scholars of the time-consuming burden of collation.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) One of the most recent introductions to Textual Criticism gives the number 5735 as of 2003: 116 papyri, 310 majuscules, 2877 minuscules, and 2432 lectionaries (Metzger and Ehrman, *Text of the New Testament*, 50).

\(^2\) Perhaps “oldest attainable text” would be more appropriate. Traditionally textual critics have used the term “original text” casually, but the problematic nature of this term has increasingly been highlighted. Again, see the excellent discussion in Epp, “The Multivalence of the Term ‘Original Text’ in New Testament Textual Criticism,” *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism*, 551-594.

\(^3\) This of course is the blessing and curse of New Testament textual criticism—classical scholars often are forced to rely on a handful of late manuscripts at most, while New Testament scholars confront the opposite challenge of determining the relationship between the staggering abundance of manuscripts.

\(^4\) He noted helpfully, however, that “by careful controls one should be able to derive results which would approximate those of the ideal.” Fee, “Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John,” 223.
Until such complete computer collation becomes possible, the most effective method of manuscript comparison remains the Colwell-Tune method of representative comparison, as it has been refined by other scholars. Rather than striving for comprehensive comparison, this approach compares only representative manuscripts from each of the major textual families. This method compares those manuscripts at every point, however, avoiding the pitfalls of other tactics which attempt to save time through the use of “test passages.”

Counting only genetically significant variations shared by at least two members of a given

---


6 Traditionally, the “Alexandrian”, “Caesarean”, “Byzantine”, and “Western” textual groups. Ehrman’s dissertation led to the correction of the terms “Early” and “Late” Alexandrian to the more accurate “Primary” and “Secondary” Alexandrian, with the Secondary Alexandrian group representing more a corruption of its Primary companion rather than a distinct family in and of itself (Ehrman, Didymus, 262-267). Though these titles have been challenged, there does seem to historical support for these geographically based names (e.g., the Alexandrian text really was used in Alexandria), and they are much clearer than the Aland’s Categories I-V of “loose text” “strict text” and so forth. Even so, it goes without saying that whenever these titles are used, “so-called” can be assumed without repeating it in every instance. The family relationships between these manuscripts have been demonstrated in previous studies; see TFGWO, 29-30 as well the discussion in chapter 1 and the conclusion of this study.


8 Genetically significant variants are those most likely to indicate genealogical relationships between manuscripts rather than instances of accidental agreement. The standard non-significant readings include οὐτο/οὖτος, moveable μυ, nonsense readings, most instances of itacism, and other minor differences in spelling. The presence, absence, or substitution of introductory conjunctions prove suspect in the quotations of Church Fathers, given the peculiarities of citing habits as opposed to written copies. See TFGWO, 26. In addition, singular readings cannot be used to determine genealogical relationships, as there is no way to
family further reduces the textual chaff to be sifted and assures results that are as accurate as possible.

Numerous studies have employed and established this method of representative analysis, and therefore its history needs to be sketched only briefly. As evidenced in the preceding history of research, until the middle of the twentieth century the default technique to determine consanguinity involved comparing various manuscripts’ deviations from the *Textus Receptus*. Though this system affords a general sense of similarity or difference between MSS and still furnishes the most efficient approach to manuscript collation, it proves far too blunt and misleading a tool to trace accurately the contours of textual transmission. The shortcomings of this method have been enumerated in multiple studies and do not need to be repeated here. Chief among the flaws of this method is the fact that in comparing only variations from the TR, all the ancient elements present in this later text are discounted. Patterns of agreement as well as disagreement must be factored into textual analysis. On the other hand, comparison of bare similarities or differences risks lending too much weight to coincidental agreements.\(^9\)

The Quantitative Analysis carried out in this chapter follows that developed by Bart Ehrman in his analysis of the gospel text of Didymus the Blind, which builds upon the

---

\(^9\) This degree of usefulness is seen in the fact that the monumental *International Greek New Testament Project* continues to use the TR as a base of collation. Other options are being explored such as the use of the NA\(^{27}\), but that would merely replace an older *Textus Receptus* with one newer. See D. C. Parker, "The Principio Project: A Reconstruction of the Johannine Tradition," *FgNT* 13 (2000), 111-118. Cited in Cosaert, "The Text of the Gospels in the Writings of Clement," 70n17. Collating against the TR is efficient because most manuscripts are late and therefore strongly Byzantine, and therefore differences from the TR are minor. If the collation base were the Nestle-Aland, for example, the apparatus would be glutted by differences shared by virtually all medieval manuscripts.

\(^{10}\) See Ehrman, “Methodological Developments,” 21-22.
Colwell-Tune method as further refined by Gordon Fee. This method involves taking a witness of unknown character and comparing it at every significant point of variation against manuscripts whose textual alignment has been previously established, manuscripts that have proven to be the strongest representative witnesses of the various textual families, Alexandrian, Caesarean, Western, and Byzantine.\textsuperscript{11} The points of agreement and disagreement in significant variations are then tabulated and converted to percentages of agreement. When these percentages are compared, ideally they will fall into patterns that enable scholars to determine the new witness’ affinities with the various textual families.\textsuperscript{12} Fortunately, this is the case with Origen—the following Quantitative Analysis highlights Origen’s fidelity to the purest Alexandrian textual tradition, the “Primary Alexandrian”.

As mentioned in the first chapter, our collation base includes thirty\textsuperscript{13} witnesses: five Primary Alexandrian (P\textsuperscript{66} P\textsuperscript{75} Ω [8:39-21:25] B UBS), eight Secondary Alexandrian (C L W Ψ 33 579 892 1241), six “Caesarean” (P\textsuperscript{45} Θ f\textsuperscript{1} f\textsuperscript{13} 565 700), five Western (Ω [1:1-8:38] D a b e), and six Byzantine (A E Δ Π Ω TR).\textsuperscript{14} In addition to these witnesses, I have included data

\textsuperscript{11} See above on page 10 for a discussion of this nomenclature. As noted, the “Caesarean” witnesses are included in this study precisely to ascertain whether we can speak of a “Caesarean” text in John.

\textsuperscript{12} A review of the applications of Quantitative Analysis demonstrates that at times its conclusions are relatively clear, but often require further refinement, as Ehrman discovered in his examination of Didymus the Blind (Ehrman, Didymus, 218-222). To give another example of the shortcomings of Quantitative Analysis, in John Brogan’s examination of the text of Athanasius, the Primary Alexandrian, Secondary Alexandrian, Caesarean, and Byzantine groups only differed by a total of 2.9%! John Brogan, “The Text of the Gospels in the Writings of Athanasius,” (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1997), 221-222.

\textsuperscript{13} Counting Sinaiticus as two witnesses, because it supports Western readings in 1:1-8:39 and Primary Alexandrian in 8:39-21:25.

\textsuperscript{14} See TFGWO 29-30 regarding selection of these witnesses. As noted in chapter 1, arguments can easily be made against counting the modern TR and UBS along with ancient manuscripts, as they are scholarly creations, but the fact that 1) they serve as “ideal” representatives of the Byzantine and Primary Alexandrian text types and 2) that they are included in all studies of textual groupings merits their inclusion. At times the inclusion of these modern texts throws off patterns of agreement unnecessarily, and I will note those.
from the correctors to $P^{66}$ $\text{X}$ and $C$,\textsuperscript{15} as well from the three Fathers for whom analysis of the text of John was available—Clement, Didymus, and Athanasius, all of Alexandria.\textsuperscript{16}

Percentage tables prove convenient in that they illustrate rough textual affinities at a glance, but the differing number of variant readings available in the various witnesses must also be taken into account. For example, though $P^{45}$ and $f^{13}$ both agree with Origen about 64%, the fact that the manuscripts of $f^{13}$ are extant in all 815 points of variation available in Origen makes its 65.3% agreement more reliable than the 63.5% agreement of $P^{45}$ with Origen, as this papyrus is extant in only 52 points of variation. The column titled “error correction” factors in the differing sizes of data samples. Thus a more precise description would be that the manuscripts of $f^{13}$ agree with Origen 65.3% ± 3.3%, so somewhere between 62 and 68.6%. Taking $P^{45}$’s fragmentary nature into account, one would say that this papyrus agrees with Origen 63.5% ± 13.5%, so between 50 and 77%! This range spans most of our data sample, from about Secondary Alexandrian $\Psi$ in sixth place (78% agreement) to Western D (49.6%) in dead last. And as manuscripts often differ only by a few points and families are determined by about ten, ±3 percentage points is significant.

Fortunately, this error correction does not mean that we are hopelessly lost in respect to where $P^{45}$ stands in relation to Origen.\textsuperscript{17} Neither does this inclusion of error correction

\textsuperscript{15} The critical apparatus in Volume 1 included data for the correctors to $P^{66}$ $p^{75}$ $B$ $C$ $\Psi$ 892 $\Theta$ $P^{45}$ D $A$ $E$ $\Delta$ $\Pi$ (see \textit{TFGWO}, 27). In this analysis I included only the correctors to $P^{66}$ $\text{X}$ and $C$, as those were the most significant. The data for the others are as follows, with the first number standing for corrections that increased agreement with Origen, the second for corrections that decreased agreement with Origen, and the third representing corrections against Origen that did not agree with him in the original witness, thereby effecting no change: $P^{45c}$: +1/-2/0; $B^c$: +7/-2/2; $\Psi^c$: +1/-0/0; 892c: +0/-1/1; $\Theta^c$: +0/-3/0; $P^{45c}$: +1/-0/0; $D^c$: +8/-6/2; $A^c$: +1/-1/1; $E^c$: +2/-0/0; $\Delta^c$: +1/-1; $\Pi^c$: +6/-8/2.

\textsuperscript{16} These data are available in the dissertations of Carl Cosaert, Bart Ehrman, and John Brogan. As an analysis of Origen’s text was not available at the time to Ehrman he did not calculate Origen’s percentage of agreement with Didymus, but I included the data for Didymus in my other tables. Those rankings give a general sense of the comparison between Didymus’ text and that of Origen without the fresh collation required to provide the comparison between the two Fathers’ texts.
invalidate the previous studies that failed to take this statistical factor into account. It serves rather as a helpful reminder that these percentages are more approximations than the precise numbers might indicate. As Carl Cosaret stated in his study of the gospel quotations of Clement of Alexandria, “The inclusion of error correction along with the proportional results helps to counter any sense of false accuracy that the results might imply.”

Fortunately, error correction is most pertinent when the data samples have about fifty units of comparison or less. The 815 units of variation in Origen’s text of John allow a high degree of confidence in the following rankings. Note for example that the difference in error correction between P75 and B is a mere 0.5%, even though B is present in all 815 units of variation and P75 falls short of that number by almost 300!

Error correction of a few points may not seem to merit the complexity of the formulas required to produce it, but as all textual analyses should take this statistical nuancing into account, I will explain how this number is derived.

The formula for factoring in error due to sample size follows, where “\( \sigma_p \) represents the standard deviation of the percentage distribution, \( p \) is the percentage of agreement reached by quantitative analysis, \( n \) is the size of the sample, and \( t \) represents the standard normal value at a

---

17 Though the fragmentary nature makes it a good example of the need for error correction, the questionable textual alignment of P45 renders its use in this example problematic. The editors of volume 1 express their doubts concerning the place P45 among the “Caesarean” witnesses (TFGWO, 29), and the preliminary investigation of this witness below confirms these suspicions. Nevertheless, for most witnesses the error correction plays a relatively minor role.


19 The application of error correction to the analysis of the Church Fathers is relatively recent—Jean-François Racine’s 2000 dissertation on the writings of Basil of Caesarea (Published as The Text of Matthew in the Writings of Basil of Caesarea [SBLNTGF 5; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2004]) was the first to include error correction in his Quantitative Analysis, and Carl Cosart’s 2005 dissertation treating the gospel text of Clement of Alexandria followed suit. Sylvie Raquel’s 2002 dissertation on the Synoptic Gospels in Origen should have included this statistical data but did not, producing one of the lesser failings of that study.
95% confidence interval.”20 Note that the second half of the equation, \((t_{0.05n})\), is not part of the standard deviation, but indicates that once standard deviation is calculated, you multiply that number by \(t_{0.05,n}\) to find the value of the error correction. This “t” refers to the “t-score,” a standardized value in statistics found in a t-chart, with differing values depending on the confidence interval. The 0.05 represents a t-score of 95%, one of the most commonly used confidence levels, and n the size of the sample. This confidence level indicates that there is a 95% certainty that were both manuscripts compared in full (rather than in extant or sample passages only), the actual level of agreement would fall within the parameters of the error correction.21

\[
\sigma_p = \sqrt{\frac{p(100 - p)}{n - 1}} \cdot t_{0.05,n}
\]

For clarification, I will determine the error correction between UBS and Origen using this formula. UBS and Origen agree 86.6% with 815 units of variation. Therefore

\[
\sigma_p = \sqrt{\frac{86.6(100 - 86.6)}{815 - 1}} = \frac{86.6(100 - 86.6)}{815 - 1} = \sqrt{\frac{86.6(13.4)}{814}} = 1.19\%
\]


21 Any confidence level can be chosen and lowering the confidence level decreases the error correction, but it also increases the possibility of inaccuracy. It is more helpful to say you are 95% sure P75 agrees with Origen 82.4-88.4% than that you are 25% sure P75 agrees with Origen 84.4-84.6%. This small example also demonstrates, however, that even drastic changes to the confidence level make only small changes to the error correction. These changes would make much more difference in a smaller sample size, of course. Racine gives data for the “z-table” as well as the t-table (Racine, The Text of Matthew in the Writings of Basil, 242n7), but z-tables are really only helpful in data samples smaller than 30. See the discussion in Cosaert, “The Text of the Gospels in the Writings of Clement,” 236-237.
Now that we have the standard deviation, the error correction can be determined by multiplying 1.19% by the formula ($t_{0.05n}$), in other words, multiply the t-value determined by the size of the sample (n). Here n=815. The t-value fluctuates according to the sample size, but changes significantly only when the sample size is less than about 50. Once it hits 50, it evens out to be approximately 1.96 in every instance.

Having determined the standard deviation to be 1.19%, we can calculate the error correction: $1.19 \times 1.96322 = 2.33\%$. Thus UBS agrees with Origen 86.6% ± 2.3%. Through the marvels of technology, Microsoft Excel can complete all these calculations. Because this is by far the easiest and most accurate way to complete this entire process, it merits demonstrating here.

Below is a sample Excel sheet, with the witness in column A, number of agreements between the witness and Origen in B, number of disagreements between the witness and Origen in C, total variants in D, percentage of agreement in E, the standard deviation in F, t-value in G, and the resultant error correction in H. The truly marvelous thing is that once you have the formulas described below in place, you can instantly calculate these data for all following witnesses, saving a tremendous amount of time and effort. I cannot overemphasize the benefit of using Excel to calculate values. This program, and others even more suited to statistical analysis, can do in seconds with perfect accuracy what it would take a person countless hours to accomplish with unavoidable error.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>UBS</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
<td>1.963</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>P75</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
<td>1.965</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 The t-value with a sample size of 815 (or “large”) can be either found in statistics manuals or online, or Microsoft Excel can determine it, as will be discussed in a moment.
Formulas in Excel are produced by using column and row numbers. So if you wanted to enter the Agreements and Disagreements and calculate the Total Variants, you could click on the cell D1 and type “=B1+C1”. Conversely, if you have Agreements and Total and want Disagreements, click on the cell C1 and type “=D1-B1”. Pressing enter will give you the result. You can then apply this formula to the next witness by copying the cell with the formula (which now has the result) and pasting into the next row. Excel will copy the formula, not the result, and so by pasting you will repeat all the required calculations! Alternatively, you can select the + that will appear in the corner of the cell and drag it, and Excel will apply the formula to all squares. To determine percentage of agreement in our example, you would click on cell E1 and type “=B1/D1”.

We can now move to the more complex parts of our formula. To provide Standard Deviation, convert the formula above into the following format:

=SQRT((E3*(1-E3))/(D3-1)), where E is the percentage of agreement (p from our formula above) and D = the Total Variation. Excel contains built-in t charts, so to determine T-value you need only to select cell G1 and type “=TINV(0.05,D3-1), where the 0.05 represents our 95% confidence level and D is again the Total Variation. Finally, to come up with the error correction you need merely to multiply the Standard Deviation by the t-value by clicking on cell H1 and entering “=F1*G1”.

As noted, the best part of this process is that once you have written these formulas, you could enter all your witnesses, agreements and disagreements (or totals) and then copy

---

23 Without the quotation marks. The equals sign is what makes the information a formula. A full tutorial on Excel is obviously beyond the scope of this study, but suffice it to say it can do almost anything one could want.

24 This will give you a decimal value. If you want Excel to list the number in percentages, right-click on the column in question and select “Format cells.” Under “Category” select “Percentage.” You can also choose how many decimal places to show.
your data in row 1 and paste into all the following rows, and Excel will do all calculations for you.

At last we come to the actual Quantitative Analysis of Origen’s text of John. The first two tables present the witnesses in order of percentage agreement with Origen. Table 2 lists all witnesses in descending order of agreement; the second separates the witnesses into their respective families. Tables 4-5 reverse the comparison, ranking all witnesses according to their agreement with those manuscripts closest to and farthest from Origen in Table 1. These tables as well as Table 6 also provide data for manuscripts of a questionable nature—1241 in the Alexandrians, N (1:1-8:39) for the Westerns, and the Caesarean manuscripts as a whole.

**TABLE 2:**

**WITNESSES RANKED ACCORDING TO PROPORTIONAL AGREEMENT WITH ORIGEN IN GENETICALLY SIGNIFICANT VARIATIONS IN JOHN (815 UNITS OF VARIATION)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Witness</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total Ag.</th>
<th>Total Var.</th>
<th>% Ag</th>
<th>Err. Corr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>UBS</td>
<td>Prim. Alex</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Prim. Alex</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Prim. Alex</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sec. Alex</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Sec. Alex</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Ψ</td>
<td>Sec. Alex</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Athanasius</td>
<td>Sec. Alex</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

25 I have laid out the somewhat intricate history of these data in my Acknowledgments. In regards to the Quantitative Analysis data, I began with the Quantitative Analyses calculated by Bruce Morrill, and then adjusted those analyses after answering some unresolved questions he passed on to me. I also used the master document of textual variation in John, also given to me by Morrill, to calculate the data involving correctors, which were not included in Morrill’s Quantitative Analysis.

26 That Sinaiticus is Western in this section has been amply demonstrated, but I wanted to show that Origen’s data also confirms Fee’s findings.

27 These are rounded to the nearest tenth. When it appears levels of agreement are the same, dividing the agreement with Origen by the total variation units shows there is a difference, though only a few hundredths of a percent. Given the degree of error correction, there is no need to show data to the hundredth place. The inclusion of decimal places does not make claims concerning the precision of these data, but rather given for ease of comparing the witnesses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Collation</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Sec. Alex</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>P66</td>
<td>Sec. Alex</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Sec. Alex</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Ks (8:39-21:25)</td>
<td>Prim. Alex</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>Sec. Alex</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Tl</td>
<td>Caesarean</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>P66</td>
<td>Prim. Alex</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Ks (8:39-21:25)</td>
<td>Prim. Alex</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Π</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>Caesarean</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>Sec. Alex</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Κs (1:1-8:38)</td>
<td>Prim. Alex</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>Caesarean</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>Sec. Alex</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Clement</td>
<td>Prim. Alex.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Θ</td>
<td>Caesarean</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Tl13</td>
<td>Caesarean</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>P65</td>
<td>Caesarean</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Ks (1:1-8:38)</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When ranked according to agreement with Origen, the general pattern of witnesses gratifyingly falls into place as one would expect. Even before Group Profiles further refine the results of this Quantitative Analysis, Origen’s Alexandrian affinities shine through the murkiness of manuscript multiplicity. With the exception of Tl in 14th place, Alexandrian witnesses monopolize the top 15 ranks. It is significant that, again with one exception, every Alexandrian witness stands in the top half of this chart.²⁸

²⁸ The exception is Secondary Alexandrian 1241, and the place of this MS in the Secondary Alexandrian fold has been questioned. See Gordon Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II (P66): Its Textual Relationships and Scribal*
Correspondingly, the lowest MSS demonstrate the distinct distance between Origen and the Western witnesses—they fall to the very bottom of our chart, the five witnesses in the bottom seven places, accompanied only by two Caesarean MSS. The leading Primary Alexandrian witnesses P75 and B and the leading Western witness D frame this portrait of Origen’s textual affinities.

As noted above, Alexandrian witnesses dominate the top of the Table. Three out of five of the Primary Alexandrian witnesses come first, averaging an impressive 85.5% agreement with Origen. Eight Secondary Alexandrian witnesses then follow among ranks 4-13. The corrector to C is properly categorized Byzantine, which explains why the scribe consistently moved away from Origen’s text toward Byzantine readings. The corrections are few enough, however, that C’s strong Alexandrian affinities shine through the Byzantine tint.

All the Byzantine manuscripts fall into ranks 14-29, accompanied by Caesarean and Secondary Alexandrian witnesses. The placement of several MSS deserves further discussion—א², P66, אb, the corrector to אa, 1241, and Clement.

It is interesting to note that family 1 ranks higher in agreement with Origen than the Alexandrian manuscripts P66, אb, and 1241. Of course, the closeness in percentage cautions us from making too much of this ranking; these manuscripts all fall within 1.2% of each

---

29 Brogan concluded that Athanasius is best classified as a Secondary Alexandrian witnesses, especially in the Gospel of John (Brogan, “The Text of the Gospels in the Writings of Athanasius,” 257).

30 Both correctors to C worked within the Byzantine tradition, the first in 6th century Palestine and the second in 9th century Constantinople. (Metzger and Ehrman, Text of the New Testament, 70). The correctors of C changed the text 13 times toward agreement with Origen, and 43 times away, with an additional 4 instances of non-agreement that did not change the percentage of agreement with Origen.
other. Once the ± 3-4% error correction is factored in, they become statistically equivalent.

As discussed in the last chapter, Kwang-Won Kim wrote a stimulating article that demonstrated the close relationship between 1582, 1739, and Origen in Matthew.\textsuperscript{31} This connection prompted me to examine the connection between these manuscripts in John. Despite the seemingly high agreement between $f^1$ and Origen, however, there does not seem to be a significant relationship with family 1 in particular. As can be seen in Table 6 below, Origen’s agreement with the three primary Caesarean witnesses ranges from 72% with $f^1$ (16\textsuperscript{th} place), 68.1% with $\Theta$ (18\textsuperscript{th} place), and 65.3% with $f^{13}$. The 72% agreement of $f^1$ with Origen would be significant were there more distance between Origen and other witnesses, but currently $f^1$ is merely lost in the crowd.

$\text{P}^{66}$ falls 12.6% below $B$ in agreement with Origen and 3.5% below its corrector. This is mostly likely due to two factors—the slightly mixed nature of this text and the carelessness of the scribe, as opposed to the relative purity of $\text{P}^{75}$ $B$ and their disciplined copyists.\textsuperscript{32} The reason the corrector of $\text{א}$ (1:1-8:38) ranks 10% higher in agreement with Origen is simple; in removing many of the Western idiosyncrasies of this manuscript, the scribe also moved the readings closer to Origen. Though it clearly belongs in the Primary Alexandrian family,

\begin{itemize}
  \item Kim, “Codices 1582, 1739, and Origen,” JBL 69 (1950): 167-175.
  \item Somewhat ironically, $\text{P}^{66}$ and at least one set of corrections to $\text{P}^{66}$ could come from the same hand! Metzger stated, “Most [changes] appear to be the scribes corrections of his own hasty blunders, though others seem to imply the use of a different exemplar.” Metzger and Ehrman, Text of the New Testament, 57. Philip Comfort proposed another option, that the first corrector to $\text{P}^{66}$ was the diorthotes in a scriptorium. Philip Comfort, Encountering the Manuscripts: An Introduction to New Testament Paleography & Textual Criticism (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2005), 70.
\end{itemize}
further investigation of the nature of \(\text{N} \) (8:39-21:25) would be necessary to determine why it falls almost 15% below the model Primary Alexandrian couple \(\text{P}^{75} \text{B}^{33}\).

The placement of 1241 in these rankings at first seems surprising, but it must be noted that the eight Secondary Alexandrian witnesses span 16 percentage points in agreement with Origen, and 1241 is only 2.3% behind 579. Because the editors expressed their doubt regarding this manuscript’s placement among the Secondary Alexandrian witnesses, however, I will examine it further in this chapter and the next. Carl Cosaert classified Clement’s text of John as a “rather impure representative of the Primary Alexandrian family,”\(^34\) but it is striking that in the preceding rankings of agreement with Origen, Clement falls below all Secondary Alexandrian witnesses! Of course, the fact that Clement ranks 28\(^{th}\) of only 36 witnesses needs to be balanced by the observation that most of the middle witnesses are separated only by a few percentage points, and that Clement falls only 3.8% below \(\text{P}^{66}\).

This straightforward listing of agreement with Origen reveals his basic textual alignment, and separating the manuscripts into textual families clarifies the picture even further, as is demonstrated in Table 3 below.

---

\(^{33}\) Fee’s article “Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John,” while tremendously enlightening regarding the Western portion of John, gives less information on the Alexandrian section of this manuscript. Interestingly, \(\text{P}^{75}\) agrees with \(\text{N}\) 10 points higher than \(\text{B}\) does (82.8% vs. 70.8%).

\(^{34}\) Cosaert, “The Text of the Gospels in the Writings of Clement,” 341.
TABLE 3

PROPORTIONAL AGREEMENT WITH ORIGEN IN JOHN ARRANGED BY TEXTUAL GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UBS</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p75</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p66</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ξ(8:39-1:24)</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Prim.</td>
<td>2640</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2640/3270)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals (-UBS)</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψ</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>892</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1241</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4169</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2nd Alex.</td>
<td>4169</td>
<td>5539</td>
<td>(4169/5539)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Π</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3275</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3275/4721)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Caesarean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f^4</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θ</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f^3^3</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p^4^5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2775</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Western

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χ(1:1-8:38)</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Western</td>
<td>2095</td>
<td>3460</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In his discussion of textual families, Ernest Colwell suggested that families should agree 70% with one another, with a distance of 10% between families. Bart Ehrman cautioned against such an arbitrary assignment of difference, suggesting that “different textual groups must be allowed to set their own levels of agreements—and these will vary.”

Even with some room for fluctuation, however, the principle still holds that manuscript families should be close to members of their own families and farther from those of others; otherwise the usefulness of these categories breaks down. Further, due to the complexity of ascertaining the text of Patristic citations, more leeway should be given to determining the


36 Ehrman, Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels, 189.
textual alignments of Church Fathers. Ehrman suggested that 65% agreement is sufficient for determining textual groups in Patristic citations, with at least 6-8% between groups.\(^{37}\)

Origen’s 77.7% agreement with the Alexandrian witnesses clears the 70% hurdle with ease, and the 20.2% gap between Primary Alexandrian and Western witnesses bears testimony to his distance from this tradition. Although the gaps between Origen’s agreement with the various families fall short of the 10% suggested by Colwell, they fall cleanly within the 65% agreement 6-8% separation range. 7.9% separates the Alexandrian and Byzantine families; counting from the Primary Alexandrian witnesses widens the gap to a respectable 11.3%. The Byzantines stand 8.9% closer to Origen than the Western witnesses, and even the Primary and Secondary Alexandrian witnesses manifest a gap of 5.4%, which is significant in light of the close streams of tradition shared by these subfamilies.

The one exception to these distinctions begs a question already at hand—whether one can distinguish a Caesarean text in John. A scant 0.6% separates the Byzantine witnesses from the Caesarean, and error correction obliterates even this distinction. All the Byzantine witnesses would fall comfortably within the range of agreements demonstrated by the Caesarean MSS. The Byzantines are somewhat closer to Origen as a whole, but this is to be expected given the conflated nature of this text. Even this first analysis casts long shadows of doubt concerning the existence of a Caesarean text in John, and I will return to this question in the discussion of Table 6 below.

The preceding two tables of data set forth a picture of Origen’s textual affinities, demonstrating clearly that Origen belongs among our strongest witnesses to the Primary Alexandrian text. The following tables serve to authenticate Origen’s Alexandrian alignment,

\(^{37}\) Ibid., 222, with the argument for this position on 195-202.
as well as to address specific questions regarding manuscripts 1241, \( P^{45} \), and \( \Psi \). In addition, I will begin to address the question of a cohesive Caesarean text type in John.

Tables 5 and 6 rank our representative witnesses against those MSS closest to Origen—Alexandrian \( P^{75} \) B C, and those farthest from him—Western D b a. In this manner, we can see whether Origen stands as close to or far from these witnesses as they do to him in terms of ranking of course, not percentage. Tautologically, the percentage of agreement between a witness and Origen and Origen and that witness is the same. But saying there is a fifteen-foot distance between two people in a line is different than saying there are four or ten people between them standing in that fifteen feet of space. For comparative purposes I have paired 1241 with the Alexandrian witnesses, as well as \( \Psi a \) (1:1-8:39) with the Western witnesses. \( P^{45} \) stands with the Caesarean witnesses \( \Theta \) \( f^1 \) \( f^{13} \)—a questioned member of a questioned family!

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( P^{75} )</th>
<th></th>
<th>( B )</th>
<th></th>
<th>( C )</th>
<th></th>
<th>( 1241 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. UBS</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>1. UBS</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>1. UBS</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>1. 1241</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. B</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>2. P75</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>2. B</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>2. 892</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Or</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>3. C</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>3. P75</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>3. 700</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. C</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>4. Or</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>4. Or</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>4. ( \Pi )</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 01b</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>5. L</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>5. L</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>5. TR</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. L</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>6. P66</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>6. 33</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>6. ( \Omega )</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. W</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>7. ( \Psi )</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>7. ( \Psi )</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>7. ( E )</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ( \Psi )</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>8. W</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>8. 892</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>8. ( \Delta )</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. P45</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>9. 33</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>9. P66</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>9. ( \Psi )</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 33</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>10. 892</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>10. W</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>10. ( f^1 )</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. P66</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>11. 01b</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>11. 579</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>11. 33</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 892</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>12. P45</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>12. 1241</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>12. ( \Delta )</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 579</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>13. 579</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>13. ( \Pi )</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>13. ( L )</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. ( \Delta )</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>14. Ath</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>14. ( \Psi )</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>14. 565</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. ( \Pi )</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>15. A</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>15. P45</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>15. ( C )</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. ( f^1 )</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>16. ( f^1 )</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>16. ( f^1 )</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>16. ( \Theta )</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 showcases the impressive solidarity of the Alexandrian witnesses, as well as Origen’s status in this cadre. The consistency of alignment between these manuscripts is striking—bracketing modern UBS for the moment, these manuscripts cluster at the top of each table, with Origen among the strongest witnesses to each member of the Primary Alexandrian group—following only B to P75, and third to B and C. Origen’s percentage of agreement with these Alexandrian pillars remains consistent between 84.2% with C and 85.5% with B. As they do with Origen, the Western witnesses fall to the bottom when compared with P75 B C, with D bringing up the rear in every case. This chart also confirms Fee’s characterization of Sinaiticus’ dual nature, as א ranks relatively high among the Primary Alexandrian witnesses (with 82.8% agreement with P75, 70.8% agreement with B, but only 65.2% agreement with Secondary Alexandrian C) and א ranks down with the Western witnesses in each case (57.4% with P75, 58% with B, and 61.3% with C). These data could lead to further fruitful analysis, but Origen’s place among these Alexandrian representatives requires little further discussion.
Regarding 1241, we saw above that it shows the least agreement with Origen among the Secondary Alexandrian witnesses—only 68.%. This remains close to 70% however, and the eight Secondary Alexandrian witnesses range widely in agreement with Origen even without 1241—from 70.4% to 84.2%. Quantitative Analysis fails to confirm or disqualify 1241 from the Secondary Alexandrian family, so we will need to look at the patterns of agreement in the next chapter.

**TABLE 5**

**PROPORTIONAL AGREEMENT WITH LEADING WESTERN WITNESSES (AND NA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>70.0%</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>74.2%</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>74.3%</th>
<th>K (1:1-8:38)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>K (1:1-8:38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>2. a 62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>01b</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>01b</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>3. e 61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>01a</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>4. UBS 61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>P45</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>P66</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>5. C 61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>Ψ</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>UBS</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>6. Or 59.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Π</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>UBS</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>7. P66 58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Clem</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>P66</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>8. B 58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>UBS</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>9. D 57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>fl</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>10. P75 57.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>11. Did 55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>P66</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>Or</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>Π</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>12. Ψ 55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>Π</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>P75</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>13. L 54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Θ</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>14. 33 54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Ψ</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>P45</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>15. Ath 53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>Ψ</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>16. E 53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>P75</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>17. Θ 53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>Θ</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>18. A 52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>19. fl 52.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>20. Π 52.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>f13</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>21.</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>21. Clem 52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>22.</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>22. Δ 52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>23.</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>Or</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>23. Δ 52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>24.</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>24. 579 52.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>25.</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>f13</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>25. 892 51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>26.</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>P45</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>26. 700 51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Ath</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>27.</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>27. TR 51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>28.</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>f13</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>28. 565 50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Or</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>29.</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>01a</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>29. f13 48.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Western witnesses have been noted for their lack of agreement even with each other, but their textual affinities emerge relatively clearly in this Quantitative Analysis. The Latin manuscripts rise to the top in all four instances; D and b are particularly close to each other, sharing about 70% agreement. Origen keeps his distance from these witnesses as they do to him; he is closest to b, at 65.9% agreement, followed by a at 64.4%, Θ at 59.7%, and finally D at 49.6%. This comparison confirms Fee’s conclusion that “Codex Sinaiticus is a leading Greek representative of the Western textual tradition in John 1:1-8:38.”

The previous tables have more or less confirmed our expectations regarding Origen’s textual alignment, and the Group Profiles of the next chapter will clarify these alignments even more dramatically. I return now to a peripheral issue, namely the question of the presence of a Caesarean text in the Gospel of John. As noted in the history of research, while studies by Lake and others have demonstrated a Caesarean text in Mark, other studies have seriously called into question the coherence of this text type. Fee remarks that a Caesarean text has “never been defined in John.” What does insight does our initial Quantitative Analysis lend to this question? As noted above, the blending of the Caesarean and Byzantine texts’ agreement with Origen gives one pause. In the final table, I have organized the witnesses according to agreement with three Caesarean witnesses, Θ, f⁴, and f¹³. I have also

---


39 Ibid., 226.
included P45 in order to address the question of whether this manuscript belongs with the other Caesarean witnesses, assuming these witnesses comprise a family at all in John. For illustrative purposes I have put the Caesarean witnesses in our sample in bold.

**Table 6**

**Proportional Agreement with Leading Caesarean Witnesses (and P45)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(\Theta)</th>
<th>(f^1)</th>
<th>(f^{13})</th>
<th></th>
<th>(P^{45})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>(\Pi)</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>(\Pi)</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>(\Omega)</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>(\Delta)</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>(\Theta)</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>(f^{13})</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>(\Delta)</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>(f^1)</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>(\Psi)</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>(\Psi)</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>(\Theta)</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>(f^{13})</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>UBS</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Ath</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Orig</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>P75</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>UBS</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Orig</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>18.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Ath</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>P75</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>21.</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>(P^{45})</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>22.</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>23.</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>24.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>25.</td>
<td>(\eta)</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>26.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>P66</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Did</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>01b</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>28.</td>
<td>P66</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Clem</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Did</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>30.</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Clem</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>31.</td>
<td>(P^{45})</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>01a</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>32.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>33.</td>
<td>(\eta)</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{40}\) This 100% agreement is merely a fluke, as P45 and 892 share only 3 readings available for analysis.
The Caesarean witnesses do seem to cluster in ranking with reference to Θ, considered the lead representative of this group. 700 f\textsuperscript{13} f\textsuperscript{1} and 565 huddle between ranks 7-12, with P\textsuperscript{45} trailing ten places and eight percentage points behind. Note, however, that five out of six of the highest agreements with Θ are Byzantine, though these top 12 ranks are separated by only 5.1 percentage points. It is interesting to note that 892 ranks high among all of these Caesarean witnesses. In families 1 and 13 the Caesarean witnesses are spread out even more among the rankings, though the proximity of the percentages renders firm conclusions difficult. It cannot be contested that these manuscripts share common readings; 565 shows considerable agreement with f\textsuperscript{1}, 88.2% which is almost 10% higher than the next witness, and 700 with f\textsuperscript{13} at 79.1%. But again, the question is how distinctive these Caesarean witnesses are from their Byzantine counterparts. This issue will be examined further in the remaining chapters. This preliminary investigation does cast serious doubt on the place of P\textsuperscript{45} in this group, however. P\textsuperscript{45} agrees more with six Alexandrian witnesses than it does with Θ!

The other Caesarean manuscripts fall in 17\textsuperscript{th}, 23\textsuperscript{rd}, and 29\textsuperscript{th} places. These rankings hint that P\textsuperscript{45} may be aligned more with the Alexandrian witnesses than with the Byzantine or Caesarean ones, but more investigation would be required to reach such a conclusion. Even so, Origen agrees with P\textsuperscript{45} even less than with the other Caesarean witnesses.

The Quantitative Analysis carried out in this chapter has confirmed some conclusions, such as Origen’s Alexandrian affinities and distance from the Western tradition, has cast into doubt the existence of the Caesarean text, and has failed to resolve some issues, such as the place of 1241 in the Alexandrian tradition. Quantitative Analysis is helpful but limited, and studies that end with this preliminary analysis remain incomplete, and risk misleading.
readers. To these bare statistical agreements must be added examination of patterns of readings, which can be very telling regarding textual affinities. In the following chapter, I will embark upon analysis of these Group Profiles.
Chapter IV

**ORIGEN’S TEXT OF JOHN: GROUP PROFILES**

Following the method devised by Colwell and Tune and refined by other scholars, the Quantitative Analysis of the previous chapter demonstrated that Origen supports the Primary Alexandrian text. It is fortunate that in the case of Origen, even this pattern of overall manuscript agreements and disagreements confirms my thesis. This is not always the case however, and further methodology is needed to determine accurately the affinities of a Church Father’s text. Bart Ehrman developed just such a method for his examination of the textual alignments of the gospel text of Didymus the Blind.¹ As this method has been widely accepted, I will not review its development in detail here.² But as it is also somewhat complicated, I will walk through the manner in which one carries out these analyses.

These group profiles constitute the core of the present study. Instead of registering flat percentages of overall agreement, the following profiles examine *patterns of readings*. As will be seen, this shift makes a tremendous difference and leads to conclusive results. Whereas a close percentage of agreement in manuscripts gives an indication of general relatedness, patterns of agreement of the variants point out “family traits” in readings shared by the representative manuscripts. The succinctness of the Group Profile Tables belies the pain-staking labor required to produce them, but the rich yield of data provided by these Profiles justifies this effort. Examining patterns of agreement among variation units as well

---

as among manuscripts produces the most conclusive portrait of textual alignment possible. Additionally, once organized properly, these data provide a valuable resource for further research.

I will take this opportunity to explain the extensive Appendices that concludes this work. Appendix 1, “Textual Variation in John”, lists every instance of significant variation in the gospel of John. All representative witnesses are listed by textual family with the variant that they attest, which is represented by a number. Finally, all textual families are included with a classification of that reading as Uniform or Predominant. Appendix 2, “Key to Textual Variation in John,” completes the information presented in Appendix 1, as it provides the full text of the variants represented by numbers in the first table. Organizing the data in this manner enables the investigator to take in the patterns of variation at a glance, a convenience unequalled in any apparatus of the New Testament.3 Were such a person so inclined, even someone without knowledge of Greek or textual criticism could understand these data. I will show how this table and its key work by choosing a variant at random and explaining it.

---

3 Reuben Swanson’s volumes of parallel manuscripts come close in that they allow access to the full text of important NT manuscripts, but you cannot see textual alignments in a glance as you can with this information. See Reuben J. Swanson, ed. New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus (4 vols; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995). I cannot take full credit for this organization. As I stated in the Acknowledgments, Bruce Morrill sent me these data in an Excel file, and I formatted it and organized it for greater clarity, and used it to produce the data in this chapter. He also emailed me an earlier form of the Key to Variants located in the Appendix. Much of the credit for this organization therefore goes to him. The remainder of this thesis will demonstrate the tremendous usefulness of this organization, which allows the data to be analyzed efficiently in a multitude of ways.
This example shows the variant 1:21-13. 4 This variant is located in the key of textual variants, which follows this table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Codices Supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:21-13</td>
<td>τι ουν ηλιας ει(1) συ(1)</td>
<td>Origen P75 C* Ψ 33 UBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>τι ουν συ ηλιας ει</td>
<td>P66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>τι ουν ει συ ηλιας ει</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>τι ουν ηλιας ει</td>
<td>01 L a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>συ ουν τι ηλιας ει</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ηλιας ει συ</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* /Missing/

P45 D W

This variation unit contains six different readings. The first reading, τι ουν ηλιας ει συ, is that attested by all manuscripts not otherwise shown here, and constitutes the reading “0”. If the reader consults this variant in Appendix 1 (p. XXX), he or she can see clearly that reading “0” is attested by Secondary Alexandrians 579 892 1241, as well as by all extant Caesarean and Byzantine witnesses. Origen agrees with three 5 Primary Alexandrian witnesses and three Secondary Alexandrian witnesses in reading “2”, τις ουν συ ηλιας ει. Reading “4”, τι ουν ηλιας ει, is attested by 01 and L. This agreement is likely coincidental, which is why these analyses include readings only when they are attested by at least two members of the same textual group. Two singular readings round out the sample—reading “3”, τι ουν ει συ ηλιας ει, attested by manuscript e; and

4 “13” is the variant number. Thus the 1:21-13 means Chapter 1, verse 21, variant number 13. These number are random, however; the 13 does not indicate that there are 13 variants. I don’t know if there is a mysterious computer reason why these variants are random, but I did not think that the small increase in clarity merited renumbering the thousands of variants.

5 P 66 is also listed as supporting variant 2 because the only difference between the two readings is τι and τις.
“6”, ἡλιας ει συ, copied by the scribe of b. The asterisk indicates that manuscripts P45 D W are lacunose here. I have not included the listings of the classifications here, but Appendix 1 notes that the pattern of readings is as follows: Predominant in Primary Alexandrian (reading 2), Uniform in Byzantine (reading 0), Uniform*6 in Caesarean (reading 0), and no category for Secondary and overall Alexandrian. In other words, three out of five Primary Alexandrians line up with reading 2; all Byzantines and Caesareans agree in reading 0, and Secondary and Alexandrian groups fall short of distinctive patterns of agreement.

Having explained the presentation of data, I can describe the makeup and execution of the profiles. 7 Profile One, the “Inter-Group” profile, examines the most significant variants—those shared by only members of one group (Distinctive and Exclusive) and those that have greater group than non-group support (Primary readings). It will be noted that these categories are organized from most to least significant. The name “Inter-Group” refers to the fact that the categories are affected by the readings of all members of a group, not just one.

Distinctive Readings
Readings supported by more than half of one textual group and no others. 8

Exclusive Readings
Readings supported by at least two members of one textual group and no others. 9

6 Uniform with an asterisk indicates those places where all extant members of a family attest a reading. In most cases it is clear that the missing MS would have agreed with its family members (when 4/5 Primary Alexandrians agree, or 7/8 Secondary Alexandrians unite. I have nuanced this category because it seems foolish to allow vagaries of preservation to skew our research more than absolutely necessary.

7 See Ehrman, Didymus, 223-253 as well as his article “The Use of Group Profiles for the Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence,” STCNT, 9-32; repr. from JBL 106 (1987), 465-86. Finally, the dissertations and NTGF volumes discuss this method; for example Brogan, “Text of the Gospels in the Writings of Athanasius,” 225-258.

8 In this study the following numbers are required for a reading to be Distinctive: Primary Alexandrian 3; Secondary Alexandrian 5; Alexandrian 7; Caesarean 4, Byzantine 4, Western 3.

9 But obviously that are not Distinctive.
Primary Readings
Readings that have greater group than non-group support.\textsuperscript{10}

Profile Two, the “Intra-Group profile,” tabulates the strength of a specific group's reading, regardless of whether or not other groups also attest that reading. There are two categories in this profile:

Uniform Readings
All members of a group support a given variant

Predominant Readings
At least two-thirds of a group’s members support a given variant\textsuperscript{11}

The third group profile combines the first two, with dramatic results, as will be seen below. It tabulates those readings that are both Distinctive or Primary and Uniform or Predominant.\textsuperscript{12}

As will be seen in these portraits of variation agreements, significance in variation units stems from distinctiveness either in character or distribution. A character of a variant can be either so distinctive that there is no way its attestation by multiple manuscripts is coincidental, or the pattern of agreement can be so distinctive that genealogical relationship

\textsuperscript{10} I counted readings that have exactly 50% support rather than greater than 50% in two instances: 1) when all members of the group attested the variant (so if all 4 Primary Alexandrian witnesses attested a reading and 4 non-Alexandrains also contained that reading); 2) where more than 10 variants are involved.

\textsuperscript{11} The numbers required for a reading to be Predominant in this study are the same as those for Distinctive above, except for Alexandrian, where 8 agreements are necessary for a reading to be predominant. I counted 3/5 agreement as Predominant in the Primary Alexandrian and Western groups when they have 5 members, even though it is 60% agreement, rather than 66% agreement, because this is still a clear majority and is closer to 66% than requiring 4/5 agreement, or 80%.

\textsuperscript{12} All previous studies titled this profile “Uniform Predominant Readings that are also Distinctive, Exclusive, or Primary.” Including “Exclusive” in this list, however, is not only unnecessary but also illogical, as it is mathematically impossible for a reading to be both Predominant (Two-thirds of witnesses in a group attest a reading) and Exclusive (at least two but less than half of the members of a family attest a reading). The two categories are mutually exclusive. I have therefore removed “Exclusive” from the title.
is assured, however minor that variation may be. Examples of both of these categories will be seen in the profile below. I have first listed the profiles, followed by a discussion and concluding with a list of the verses in each category.

The method by which these data were counted merits explanation, as counting hundreds of points of agreement and disagreement has by far been the most difficult and tedious step of these analyses of Patristic texts. At first I used a combination of Microsoft Word and Excel, but I learned subsequently that Excel can calculate efficiently any counting that is necessary.

Though statistical computer programs can deal with such data even more effectively than Excel, given the wide distribution of the latter program, I will explain methods using Excel. The combination of two Excel commands, preceded by sorting if needed, allows for quick and effective counting. To determine Uniform and Predominant readings, I first sorted out all the Uniform and Predominant readings, copied the names of all the manuscripts, and then in the first cell after those numbers typed “=IF($AF2=B2,1,0)” In this instance, column B2 represented manuscript a and AF2 listed whether there was a Primary Alexandrian Uniform (or Predominant) reading for that variant. This formula tells Excel to return a “1” if the two columns are equal, and a “0” if they are not. The “$” anchors the formula to one cell instead of shifting it according to relative cells. You can drag this formula across all the listings of manuscripts then down all the listing of variants, and once you calculate the sum of the columns, Excel calculates the totals! Another tremendously useful formula is

13 I put the reading of Origen in a column besides the given “Uniform” or “Predominant” reading in the table, and then used the command “=CONCATENATE(A2,B2)” if I wanted to combine those two cells into one column. I then pasted column by column into Microsoft Word and used the “find” and “replace” functions to count these—for example, replacing “22, Predom” would find all those instances where Origen agreed with a Predominant reading in a given family in reading variant number 2. Though this saves a great deal of time, using only Excel is even more effective and accurate.
“=COUNTIF(A2:A91, "=*")”, with the asterisk standing for the value you want to isolate. This formula tells Excel to calculate the total instances of “*” in the range of A2 and A91. Since asterisks represent places where manuscripts are lacunose, this formula allows calculation of the denominators for the various profiles. No further Excel lessons are necessary, but it suffices to say that if a researcher can think of a way to manipulate the data, Excel can probably calculate it. The value of using Excel is tremendous, as it simultaneously saves countless hours of tedious labor and minimizes the human error that is inevitable in calculations by hand. A final benefit of this method is that sharing these Excel files allows these analyses to be duplicated and checked, a prohibitively complex task when the information exists only on paper. We now turn to the analyses themselves.

TABLE 7

GROUP PROFILE ANALYSIS

Profile One, Inter Group Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distinctive</th>
<th>Exclusive</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex.</td>
<td>15/16 (93.8%)</td>
<td>26/83 (31.3%)</td>
<td>195/286 (68.2%)</td>
<td>236/385 (60.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prim. Alex.</td>
<td>1/1 (100%)</td>
<td>4/14 (28.6%)</td>
<td>40/60 (66.7%)</td>
<td>45/75 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Alex</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>2/18 (11.1%)</td>
<td>21/52 (40.4%)</td>
<td>23/70 (32.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesarean</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>0/18 (0%)</td>
<td>2/22 (9%)</td>
<td>2/40 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantine</td>
<td>0/0 (0%)</td>
<td>1/5 (20%)</td>
<td>0/41 (0%)</td>
<td>1/46 (2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>0/62 (0%)</td>
<td>0/93 (0%)</td>
<td>2/74 (2.7%)</td>
<td>2/229 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 Origen’s sole break from the Alexandrian Distinctive readings occurs in 19:41. Origen reads ετεθη with the majority of manuscripts against ης τεθειμενος, which is supported by three Primary and two Secondary Alexandrian witnesses (P36 Ν B W 579 UBS). There is no reason to doubt the genetic significance of this variant.

15 What is this sole Distinctive Primary Alexandrian reading? It is an example of significance by distribution rather than by character—it is only the reading αυτω rather than εαυτω. Before it is discounted, however, note that it is attested by every extant Primary Alexandrian MS. Therefore a genealogical relationship is highly likely, despite the synonymous character of the variant.
Profile Two, Intra-Group Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Uniform</th>
<th>Predominant</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex.</td>
<td>141/148 (95.3%)</td>
<td>389/460 (84.6%)</td>
<td>530/608 (87.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prim. Alex</td>
<td>410/456 (89.9%)</td>
<td>195/264 (73.9%)</td>
<td>605/720 (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Alex</td>
<td>224/254 (88.2%)</td>
<td>301/381 (79%)</td>
<td>525/635 (82.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantine</td>
<td>498/584 (85.3%)</td>
<td>109/195 (55.9%)</td>
<td>607/779 (77.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesarean</td>
<td>294/394 (74.6%)</td>
<td>160/223 (71.7%)</td>
<td>454/617 (73.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>82/149 (55%)</td>
<td>134/259 (51.7%)</td>
<td>216/408 (52.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Profile Three, Uniform and Predominant Readings that are also Distinctive or Primary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Uniform</th>
<th>Predominant</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex.</td>
<td>6/6 (100%)</td>
<td>94/108 (87%)</td>
<td>100/114 (87.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prim. Alex</td>
<td>31/38 (81.2%)</td>
<td>12/23 (52.2%)</td>
<td>43/61 (70.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. Alex</td>
<td>3/3 (100%)</td>
<td>9/14 (64.3%)</td>
<td>12/17 (70.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesarean</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantine</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>0/15 (0%)</td>
<td>0/39 (0%)</td>
<td>0/54 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comparison of “distinctive family traits” of the manuscript families confirms the findings of the Quantitative Analysis of the last chapter and reveals Origen’s textual affinities even more clearly. The first glance at the percentages supports the thesis that Origen is a strong witness to the Primary Alexandrian tradition—he agrees 60.6% with the distinctive

---

16 For a breakdown of these readings see the detailed table in Appendix I. In 27 instances, Origen’s reading is listed as “9”, indicating that he attests two readings. In all but one instance, Origen reads with the first two variant options—variant 0 and 2 (except for 12:13-46 and 17:5-22 where the readings are listed as 0 and 3). As these readings cancel each other out, I did not include them. The exception is 8:39-43, where Origen reads with variant numbers 10 and 11. 10 is a Predominant Reading for the Primary Alexandrian and Western groups; Origen supports the reading εποιειτε with P55 R* B* D E W a e UBS as well as ποιειτε with P66 B* 700. In this instance I counted his support in those two categories. It is interesting to note that the Primary Alexandrians are perfectly split between these two readings (bracketing UBS) and Origen attests them both.

17 This category includes both Uniform and Uniform* (all extant witnesses attest the reading, missing only one). See the end of this chapter for a listing and selective discussion of variant readings in all categories.

18 The information for the Uniform* category: Primary Alexandrian 6/7; Secondary Alexandrian 1/1; Alexandrian 6/6; Byzantine 0/0; Caesarean 0/1; Western 0/4

19 Though the Secondary Alexandrian readings are technically 0.1 higher than the Primary Alexandrian, the larger amount of data lends greater significance to the Primary Alexandrian agreements, as adding back in error correction demonstrates: The Primary Alexandrian data have an error correction of 11.8%, and the error correction for Secondary Alexandrian readings is more than double that of its Primary counterpart—24.1%!  

--
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Alexandrian readings and those of Primary Alexandrian witnesses. His support of the Secondary Alexandrian witnesses is significantly lower, but still far higher than his agreement with the Byzantine, 20 Caesarean, and Western distinctive readings, which fall almost to zero. This dramatic difference in the families validates the importance of these Group Profiles. Instead of differences of a few degrees between manuscript families seen in the Quantitative Analysis, the groups are separated by over thirty points, something Ernest Colwell would be pleased to see.

As impressive as these percentages are, a close examination of the distribution of these readings increases appreciation for the value of this method. Origen’s agreement with the Exclusive Alexandrian readings is still higher than his agreement with the other manuscript families, but is far lower than his agreement with those readings shared by at least half of the Alexandrian witnesses. This disparity reflects the idiosyncratic nature of Exclusive readings—because only two manuscripts need to agree to create an Exclusive reading, accidental agreement is more likely than in the case of Distinctive or Primary readings.

It is highly significant that Origen agrees with the sole Distinctive Primary Alexandrian reading and all but one of the sixteen instances where over half of the Primary Alexandrians agree against all other manuscripts. This agreement demonstrates that in those instances where our best New Testament witnesses agree against all others, Origen stands with them virtually every time. 21 It is also interesting to note that the Byzantine agreement

20 This lack of Byzantine support confirms the editors’ choice to limit the number of Byzantine witnesses in these profiles, which would otherwise have served “only to inflate the statistical relations of all other witnesses both in relation to one another and to Origen.” (TFGWO, 29)

21 The early and influential nature of the Alexandrian text explains why Distinctive Alexandrian readings are not more common.
with Origen drops from 69.4% in the Quantitative Analysis to almost zero in the Group Profiles. This dramatic shift of the later text confirms the value that these Group Profiles hold for accurately determining a Church Father’s textual affinities. The significance and clarity of these data therefore relegate to the category of incomplete all studies that do not include these profiles.

I will return to the question of the Caesarean text in the next chapter, but it is useful to note here the lack of distinctive Caesarean readings. There are only about half as many Primary readings among the Caesarean witnesses as the already low Byzantine agreements. It is true that there are more Exclusive readings, but again this could be either accidental agreement or the agreement of just two or three members of the Caesarean manuscripts. These data have supported the thesis that though there are clearly relationships between the individual manuscripts of the “Caesarean” group, it does not attain the distinctiveness of a textual grouping on a par with the Alexandrian or Western groups.

While tabulation of those instances where all or two-thirds of a family members agree (“Uniform” and “Predominant” readings) confirms Origen’s Alexandrian alignment generally, the results are almost disappointing after the clarity of the last profile. Origen’s agreement with the Alexandrian witnesses in these readings surpasses the Byzantine and Caesarean readings by almost 10%, and cleanly separates Origen from the Western witnesses with a gap of over 30%. But compared to the distinctiveness of the results from the Inter-Group profile, these results are less impressive. On the other hand, Origen’s agreement with Uniform Alexandrian readings is worthy of note. Origen’s place among the Alexandrian family is confirmed by the fact that in those 148 instances where every one of these 12 or 13 witnesses agree, Origen supports them 95.3% of the time. His support of the Primary
Alexandrian Uniform readings is not much lower—just under 90%. Though this profile is more ambiguous than the others, this breakdown of Uniform readings still demonstrates the firm support attested by Origen for the Alexandrian text—Origen’s agreement with Uniform Primary Alexandrian readings is 15.3% higher than his support of Caesarean readings and 34.9% higher than the Western Uniform readings. The gap increases when the unified witness of the Alexandrians are taken as a body—20.7% for the Uniform Caesarean readings and 45.7% for the Western.

The difference between these two profiles is the inclusion of non-distinctive readings in these statistics. The simple removal from these agreements those instances where multiple families share the same reading would change the numbers dramatically. And the Third Group Profile, ranking Origen’s agreement with readings that are Uniform or Predominant and also Distinctive or Primary, accomplishes exactly this.

The increase in lucidity from the second profile to the third is stunning. This profile filters out all ambiguous data, leaving a clear view of Origen’s textual affinities. Examining the Intra-Group Profile data is like seeing a cathedral first when it is covered in snow after a storm—you can clearly tell it is a church and count the towers, but can make out details only vaguely. The removal of readings shared by other groups is like the wind that blows away all the snow, revealing the exquisite details of moldings and stained glass.

To change the analogy, this profile brings the Alexandrian melody to a crescendo, sealing the thesis that Origen is an impressively faithful witness to the Primary Alexandrian text. This combination of readings reduces the Byzantine and Caesarean elements literally to zero, and the Western witness even lower, were that possible. Only the Alexandrian support is left, standing as a monument to Origen’s alignment with this purest of textual types. And
though Origen’s percentage of agreement with each strand of the Alexandrian tradition is virtually identical, the fact that Origen shares over three times as many Primary as Secondary Alexandrian readings in this specialized third category confirms yet again that Origen belongs among these pillars of relative textual purity. This third profile also vindicates the separate tabulation of the Alexandrian data in addition to Primary and Secondary, as Origen’s agreement with the readings shared by the majority of all the Alexandrian witnesses is seventeen percent higher than that shared with either stream of this tradition.

The fact that Origen shares not one of the dominant Western readings is also significant. This absolute void becomes especially important for the investigation of Heracleon’s text, as has been undertaken by Bart Ehrman and will be addressed in the next chapter. Origen’s preservation of a text so unlike his own and attested by his opponent speaks a great deal about his attention to detail and faithfulness in scriptural citation. We can thus have even greater confidence in these data.

The Third Profile leaves little doubt that Origen belongs among the Primary rather than the Secondary Alexandrian witnesses. This chapter will conclude with a final confirmation of this fact. One way to establish the degree of affinity with the Primary versus the Secondary Alexandrian text is to rank all witnesses according to agreement with those readings that are Uniform and Predominant among the Primary Alexandrian witnesses. Comparing all witnesses with those places where all or most of our best manuscripts agree

---

provides a quick calibration for the purity of their texts.\textsuperscript{23} We can therefore see where Origen falls in this ranking.

**Profile Four, Alexandrian Affinities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Witness</th>
<th>Uniform Rank</th>
<th>Proportional Agreement</th>
<th>Uniform and Predominant Rank</th>
<th>Proportional Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. UBS</td>
<td>(456/456)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1. UBS</td>
<td>(710/718)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. B</td>
<td>(456/456)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2. B</td>
<td>(686/718)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. P66</td>
<td>(441/441)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3. P75</td>
<td>(465/494)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. P75</td>
<td>(350/350)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4. C</td>
<td>(356/397)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 01b</td>
<td>(173/173)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5. 01b</td>
<td>(298/341)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. C</td>
<td>(229/248)</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>6. L</td>
<td>(602/706)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Origen</td>
<td>(498/498)</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>7. Origen</td>
<td>(610/718)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. L</td>
<td>(405/456)</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>8. P66</td>
<td>(545/653)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. W</td>
<td>(234/276)</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>9. Ψ</td>
<td>(578/718)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ψ</td>
<td>(384/456)</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>10. W</td>
<td>(382/479)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 892</td>
<td>(293/367)</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>11. 33</td>
<td>(549/696)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 33</td>
<td>(351/440)</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>12. 892</td>
<td>(410/526)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. P45</td>
<td>(25/32)</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>13. 700</td>
<td>(504/677)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 579</td>
<td>(349/449)</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>14. A</td>
<td>(437/587)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. A</td>
<td>(287/372)</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>15. f1</td>
<td>(523/717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. f1</td>
<td>(342/455)</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>16. Π</td>
<td>(522/717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Π</td>
<td>(337/455)</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>17. 579</td>
<td>(510/708)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. 565</td>
<td>(298/407)</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>18. 565</td>
<td>(451/637)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 700</td>
<td>(331/456)</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>19. E</td>
<td>(506/718)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Α</td>
<td>(327/451)</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>20. Θ</td>
<td>(505/717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. E</td>
<td>(330/456)</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>21. 700</td>
<td>(499/710)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. 1241</td>
<td>(317/443)</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>22. TR</td>
<td>(501/718)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Θ</td>
<td>(326/456)</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>23. Δ</td>
<td>(498/713)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. TR</td>
<td>(324/456)</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>24. 1241</td>
<td>(484/700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Ω</td>
<td>(322/455)</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>25. Π45</td>
<td>(35/51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. f13</td>
<td>(299/456)</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>26. f13</td>
<td>(462/718)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. 01a</td>
<td>(180/283)</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>27. 01a</td>
<td>(228/373)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. D</td>
<td>(193/356)</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>28. b</td>
<td>(282/503)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. a</td>
<td>(184/447)</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>29. D</td>
<td>(302/581)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{23} Though Ehrman used this profile in his revised dissertation (\textit{Didymus}, 243-253), Cosaert and Brogan’s dissertations do not include this final step, though they include the Group Profiles analyses, unlike Sylvie Raquel’s study of the Synoptic Gospels in Origen. Raquel’s neglect of these critical profiles represents perhaps the greatest failing of her study.

\textsuperscript{24} This drastic reduction in percentage comes from the fact that P66 has a shockingly low agreement with the Predominant Alexandrian readings—only 49.1%, lower than any other witness! (and yes, I checked my work)
While the preceding Group Profiles clearly confirmed Origen’s Primary Alexandrian affinities, the results of the Fourth Profile at first seem somewhat to confuse these conclusions. Because this profile is designed specifically to determine the strength of the Primary Alexandrian element in a given witness, Origen should rise above all but that group, leaving considerable gap between him and the closest competitor to Alexandrian purity. Instead, we get the results above. Tabulation of Uniform readings is not so bad—bracketing the Primary Alexandrian MSS, Origen finishes in a respectable second, though according to this, manuscript C should perhaps belong in the Primary Alexandrian group!

The second ranking, witnesses measured compared to the combination of Uniform and Predominant Primary Alexandrian witnesses, presents a similar picture. P66 and L switch sides of Origen, so leaving out the Primary Alexandrians puts Origen in third place after C and L. Origen’s 75% agreement remains respectable, however, and he remains 4.5% above the next highest witness in the table.

Based on these data alone, one might conclude that Origen belongs among these “inferior” Alexandrian witnesses, though the previous analyses have vindicated Origen’s place among the Primary Alexandrian witnesses. To explain these results preemptively, the nature of Origen’s reconstructed text must again be emphasized. Even with the advances in methodology that bring us closer than ever before to a Father’s actual text, we are dealing not with those manuscripts cited in millennia past, but quotations and allusions written down and having suffered their own tragedies of transmission. The data in this study indicate that were

25 Though it is true C is the purest witness grouped among the Secondary Alexandrians, it is also not superior to Origen’s text. This at least has been the opinion of the standard text criticism handbooks.
Origen’s actual manuscripts available to us, they would fall among our best Primary Alexandrian witnesses. But such is not the case, and we can only work with what we have.

These group profiles conclusively confirm Origen’s place as a strong and important witness of the Primary Alexandrian text—one of our oldest, second only to the earliest papyri of John such as P\textsuperscript{52}, P\textsuperscript{66}, and P\textsuperscript{75}, earlier than any Alexandrian Father save Clement,\textsuperscript{26} and approaches the textual purity of our very best witnesses, P\textsuperscript{75} and B. And unlike P\textsuperscript{75} and the other manuscripts, we know exactly where and when Origen lived and wrote, allowing us to locate this text with pinpoint accuracy. On top of all of this, Origen cites his text of the Bible more accurately than any other church father. These factors made the reconstruction and evaluation of his text of utmost importance. In a way, in their reconstructing of Origen’s text, Bart Ehrman, Gordon Fee, and Michael Holmes have given us an Alexandrian witness equal to the most precious of early manuscript finds.

\textsuperscript{26} Carl Cosaert classified Clement as a weak Secondary Alexandrian witness (Cosaert, “The Text of the Gospels in the Writings of Clement,” 341).
Breakdowns of Verses for Profiles One and Three

To this chapter I have appended verse-by-verse information for the Distinctive, Exclusive, and Primary readings tabulated in Profile One and the combination readings in Profile Three. Usually such eye-glazing lists of verses are rightly relegated to footnotes, but I have included them in the text so that I could append footnotes explaining select readings. For a listing of the Uniform and Predominant readings, please see Appendix 1 as discussed above.

* : Uniform with one missing witness
** : Origen attests a double reading
+ : 50% agreement with Uniformity and/or 10+ variants
† : Greater Proportional Attestation between Primary and Secondary Alexandrians

Profile One: Distinctive, Exclusive, and Primary Readings

Distinctive, Primary Alexandrian
Origen: 13:32
Against: none

Exclusive, Primary Alexandrian
Origen: 4:42; 7:37**27; 12:1528; 13:29

27 Origen reads both με with most MSS and εμε with P75 and B.
28 There are two variants at play here, the presence or absence of the definite article η and the spelling of “daughter”—Origen, like P75 B, reads θυγατηρ, while all others end with –ερ. This does not show up on the variant list as a distinctive reading because θυγατηρ without the article is variant “0”, θυγατηρ without the article (attested by Origen) is variant “1”, and η θυγατηρ is variant “2”.
29 Here Heracleon agrees with P66* and P75 in reading ουκ ειμι ικανος; Origen and most other witnesses read αξιος.
30 I did not count this as Exclusive because though P66 and P75 are the only MSS to note the number 38 λη′ instead of writing it out as τριακονταοκτω, it is impossible to determine whither this variant is genealogical.
This double reading is the opposite of what is expected; Origen agrees with the Caesarea text while in Alexandria, and vice versa! See the discussion of Origen’s double readings in the next chapter.

For variant 2:12-22 I counted Origen for and against because though he does not have ἀυτοῦ with P66* P75 B Ψ, he agrees with them in reading οἱ αδελφοὶ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ against the longer οἱ αδελφοὶ αυτοῦ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αυτοῦ. Of course, as these variants are virtually interchangeable, we cannot be assured of genetic relationship.

The 4/4 Primary Alexandrian omission of ὑμῶν with 3/8 Secondary Alexandrian witnesses and Χ is half, not more than half, but I counted ½ as Primary when Uniform readings are involved, as noted above.

3/4 Primary Alexandrian witnesses and 4/8 Secondary Alexandrian witnesses attest to this variant. So even though in number there are more Secondary Alexandrian witnesses, proportionally the Primary Alexandrian witness is stronger.

Again, Χ is the only odd manuscript out, a sole western witness on a Primary Alexandrian lineup. Even with these examples, however, it seems unlikely that the Primary Alexandrian second half of Χ could have influenced the first half. Even so, it is striking that Χ could agree by chance with these Primary Alexandrians and Origen in something as minor as writing ἐρευνησον rather than ἐραυνησον. It would be interesting to see how 01 aligns with the Alexandrian MSS in other instances.

Primary Alexandrian has all four witnesses, against 2 Secondary Alexandrian and 1 each Caesarean and Western.

Origen attests both to the strongly Primary Alexandrian reading ἔστε and the more common ἦτε. Michael Holmes comments, “It is only with some hesitation that we have allowed the ἦτε and ἐποίετε variants to stand as alternatives in the reconstructed text. Since the data in Io.Com 20 are overwhelmingly in support of ἐστε and ποιεῖτε, there is no question that this is the reading of Origen’s text of John. The question is, did he also know the other tradition…or has his text been altered during the course of transmission? We do not know. Thus while he may have known ἦτε/ἐποίετε, he certainly knew ἔστε/ποιεῖτε.” (TFGWO, 207n12). Given the fact Origen reads the less popular reading with more certainty, the unusual clarity of this reading (being attested by all Primary Alexandrians and few others), and the doubt of the editors, I have counted Origen as agreeing with this reading, nuancing it with this explanation. It seems more likely that Origen’s text was simply corrupted by later scribes, as the editors of TFGWO suspect.

This is a very muddy variant situation. ἐποίειτε is attested by P75 Χ UBS2 W Θ D a e, and ποιεῖτε by P66 B* 700. Origen quotes both of these forms, but under the same circumstances as the variant discuss in note N above—the editors are very hesitant as to whether Origen knew the more common form, while they state he certainly knew this one.

5/5 Primary Alexandrians, 4/8 Secondary, and ℓε lack the definite article in this verse.

The unanimity (and Distinctiveness) of the Alexandrian readings here is impressive. Origen reads ἐμείνεν with all Primary Alexandrians and 4/8 Secondary Alexandrians against all other witnesses, which have διετρίβε.
Primary, Primary Alexandrian (cont’)

SECONDARY ALEXANDRIAN

Exclusive, Secondary Alexandrian
Origen: 1:26; 17:20;

Primary, Secondary Alexandrian

41 All extant Primary Alexandrians agree with Origen in the addition of εκ, and only Secondary Alexandrian L prevents this from being Distinctive and Uniform.

42 The variation in this verse is simple and minor, but significant due to its clear division along group lines. The differences are between ο, attested by all 4 Westerns, 3 Caesarean, and 1 each Primary and Secondary Alexandrian; και ο, a Distinctive Alexandrian reading, witnessed by 4/5 Primary and 4/8 Secondary Alexandrians. All Byzantines and 2 Caesareans (f3 and 700) have nothing here. Origen cites both the ο (Western/Caesarean) and the και ο (Alexandrian) in his writings penned in Caesarea.

43 Counting the UBS as Primary Alexandrian is usually helpful, but this unit of variation demonstrates the weaknesses of this inclusion. Here all 4 ancient Primary Alexandrians agree in the spelling of Judas’ name—Ιουδας σιμωνος ισκαριωτης against other varied forms of the name. UBS does not follow its adopted family members, but accompanies 3 Secondary Alexandrians with the spelling Ιουδας σιμωνος ισκαριωτου.

44 See the discussion of this variant in the next chapter.

45 P66 P75 01 B C UBS all add the definite article.

46 This variant involves minor word order—most MSS have εδωκε και τω υιω ζωην εχειν; P66 P75 01 B L 579 UBS have και τω τω εδωκεν θωην εχειν and Origen and W have και τω τω ζην ηδονεν εχειν.

47 Origen attests to two readings in this verse, πιστευσετε and πιστευσητε, but not πιστευετε with P66 P75 B here.

48 MSS 33 and 1241 share the distinct omission, εαν γαρ μη πιστευσητε στι εγω ειμι αποθανεισθε εν ταις αμαρτιαις υμων, suggesting a relationship closer even than membership in the same group.

49 Origen appears to have known both the Primary Secondary reading οιδαμεν as well as the more popular οιδα.

50 The tradition divides in two—most manuscripts read μετ εμου here, but 5 Alexandrian witnesses (B UBS C L 892) read only μου. Holmes noted that both forms are “solidly established” in his commentary; he quotes each form twice in book 32 of his John Commentary, written in Caesarea. (TFGWO, 280n6)

51 This run of Secondary Alexandrian agreement with Origen is striking. First, the purity of the Alexandrian link with Origen is remarkably strong here—in this verse alone there is 1 Distinctive, 4 Exclusive, and 3
Primary, Secondary Alexandrian (con’t)

Alexandrian

Distinctive, Alexandrian

Primary Alexandrian readings! In 7/8 of these readings, the Secondary Alexandrian influence is stronger than Primary, which is the reverse of the usual pattern in this analysis. Note also, however, that none of these readings are even Predominant Secondary Alexandrian, so this majority could be primarily a factor of the greater number of Secondary Alexandrian witnesses.

52 The reordering of the Byzantine αν οι εμοι ηγωνιζοντο to οι εμοι ηγωνιζοντο αν is strongly supported by Alexandrians (all extant Primary Alexandrians and 5/8 Secondary). It is hard to tell whether Primary or Secondary elements are stronger, as both strains of the tradition are missing two manuscripts here. Only 2/6 Caesareans side with the Alexandrians here, and the entire Western group does not apply, as D is missing and Latins are N/A.

53 This is an interesting variant where ο αιρων την αμαρτιαν του κοσμου is added to θεου by Primary Alexandrian P66*, Secondary Alexandrian C 892 1241, and Western a.

54 This variant provides one clear example of Origen’s Primary Alexandrian affinities, because here the two streams of tradition diverge considerably (considerable on the scale of variants, that is). The Uniform Byzantine reading is διελθων δια μεσου αυτων και παρηγεν αυτως. 7/8 Secondary Alexandrians and Ξ expand and move the words slightly: και διελθων δια μεσου αυτων επορευετο και παρηγεν ουτος, while all 5 Primary Alexandrians (with W, Θ, and all Westerns) omit the phrase.

55 All five Primary Alexandrians attest εβουλευσαντο instead of the Byzantine/Secondary Alexandrian συνεβουλευσαντο, as well as 1 Secondary Alexandrian, 3 Caesareans, and D (the Latins cannot weigh in on this variant). Though it is only 50% and not more, the Uniformity of the Primary Alexandrian reading and paucity of outside attestation justify it being counted here.

56 6/12 Alexandrians agree here, which is only half and not more than half, but following my “10+ variants involved” guideline, I counted this as distinctive rather than exclusive. This 6/12 consensus is at least as impressive as a 3/5 agreement in a smaller group such as Westerns, for example.

57 Only ½ of the Alexandrians read εξ rather than εκ του, but the fact that even this number are in agreement against all other witnesses merits classifying this reading as Distinctive.

58 The agreement on the transposition of the phrase ο χριστος ερχεται to ερχεται ο χριστος (an otherwise unremarkable variation) by 9/12 of the Alexandrian witnesses and no others is striking. I am not factoring in Ν in this analysis, but even if I were, it is Secondary Alexandrian, and so would too add its voice to the Alexandrian unison.

59 This is attested by only half of Alexandrians, but I am counting it as distinctive because it does reach that 50% mark and includes all Primary Alexandrians. This six member attestation is at least as impressive as the presence of every MS in other groups.

60 Even 6/12 Alexandrian support of this reading is impressive given the fact that 2 Primary and 3 Secondary Alexandrian witnesses are missing here.
Distinctive, Alexandrian (con’t)
Against: 19:41+

Exclusive, Alexandrian


Primary, Alexandrian

61 This could easily have been Distinctive, but unfortunately Aleph P66 P75 are all missing, as well as L 579 892. Interestingly, א was attested though Aleph* was not. As this is Secondary Alexandrian, that also tips it over to Distinctive, but I counted it as Exclusive, because I have not been counting correctors into these analyses.

62 This refers to the reading θεος rather than υιος, which is a Primary Alexandrian reading.

63 Usually I would not have a problem counting this as Primary, since there are 16 variants, of which Alexandrian variants make up half (4 Primary, 4 Secondary, 8 non Alexandrian). But more caution needs to be used in this case, because the difference involves only the presence or absence of the definite article. That combined with the ease of an Alexandrian witness being primary weakens the impact of this attestation.

64 This omission of εν is borderline primary, attested by 4 Primary Alexandrians, 5 Second, 3 Caesareans, and all 5 Western.

65 Origen witnesses both to the Alexandrian/Western omission of ην εγω δωσω (4/4 Primary Alexandrian, 6/8 Secondary Alexandrian, and 5/5 Western), and to the Byzantine/Caesarean (5/6 of each) inclusion of those words.

66 Regarding this minor distinction between καγω and και εγω, Origen attests the contracted form with all Primary Alexandrians, 6/8 Secondary Alexandrians, Byzantine Π and Caesarean Ι and Θ. He also knows the unlinked form witnessed by 4/6 Byzantine, 3/6 Caesarean, and Western Χ and D.

67 αληθης rather than αλψθως is attested by 7 Secondary Alexandrian witnesses and 7 non-Alexandrian witnesses. That combined with the fact there 33 is missing here could have impelled me to count this as a Primary, Secondary Alexandrian. Because all four Primary Alexandrian witnesses also attest this reading, I felt “Primary, Alexandrian” was a more accurate category than “Primary, Secondary Alexandrian”. The only reason this reading has more Secondary than Primary support is the simple fact there are more Secondary Alexandrian witnesses. The same situation pertains to the next variant as well.
Primary Alexandrian with Origen (cont)


68 Here the “proportional Alexandrian agreement” guideline applies. The 6 Secondary Alexandrian witnesses to ζησι rather than ζησεται balance the three Primary Alexandrian and one each Byzantine, Caesarean, and Western readings. But because the Primary and Secondary Alexandrian groups are each missing only one, I counted this as only Primary, Alexandrian.

69 3/4 Primary Alexandrian and 7/8 Secondary read ζησι against ζησεται; according to Proportional Agreement, I counted this as Primary, Alexandrian.

70 The omission of ως ουτος ο ανθρωπος is interesting for several reasons. First, it is long enough that genetic relationship is assured, and that its attestation occurs only in Alexandrian witnesses (P66, P75 and B in Primary—every ancient Primary Alexandrian witness, lacking only UBS—and L and W on the Secondary team). Ξ is the only outsider, which is Western here, but Primary Alexandrian post 8:38.

71 P75 B W and b read η μαρτυρια μου αληθης εστιν against the dominant αληθς εστιν η μαρτυρια μου. Origen attests to both.

72 9/12 Alexandrians attest αληθινη vs. αληθης (3/4 Primary, 5/8 Secondary, making both Predominant). Origen demonstrates knowledge of both readings.

73 This Primary, Alexandrian “omission” of ο Ιησους attested by all Primary Alexandrian, 3/8 Secondary Alexandrian, Θ, Π, and 5/5 Western witnesses is likely a Byzantine/Caesarean addition of the name.

74 This is borderline Primary, Primary Alexandrian, because all extant Primary Alexandrian MSS read ακουουσιν with Origen, 4 Secondary and 4 Caesarean MSS. If it were only a matter of 4 against 4 or the missing manuscript I would count this, but since it is both, I haven’t.

75 This is very close to a Uniform Alexandrian reading, as all extant Alexandrian MSS read ακουει rather than ακουουσιν. But because not one but two Secondary Alexandrian MSS are missing here, I did not count it.

76 This reading is almost Distinctive Alexandrian; Origen agrees with 5/5 Primary Alexandrian witnesses and 6/8 Secondary, and only 2 Byzantine MSS follow suit.

77 This is a borderline Primary, as 3/5 Primary and 2/8 Secondary Alexandrian MSS have ημιν rather than υμιν (attested by all Byzantine, 4/8 Secondary Alexandrian, and 5/6 Caesarean witnesses). All Westerns and 1 Caesarean also read υμιν.

78 Not a very impressive Primary reading, barely worth including—all five Primary Alexandrian witnesses and 5/8 Secondary omit the κοινα against 2/6 Byzantines, 1 Caesarean, and D (so it is probably an addition rather than an omission. P45 C 892 are missing).

79 Were it not Π reading αν instead of εαν, this reading would be both Distinctive and Uniform Alexandrian—All 8 Secondary Alexandrians read αν instead of εαν, and 4/5 Primary Alexandrians agree (P75 is lacunose here). This could either be accidental agreement or, given the other agreements of Π with Alexandrian MSS, a slightly closer relationship between Π and the Alexandrian text than that held by other Byzantine MSS. On the textual affinities of Π in John see Jacob Geerlings, Family Pi in John (Studies and Documents, xxii; Salt Lake
Primary Alexandrian with Origen (cont)


Primary Alexandrian Against Origen

6:51; 6:52; 6:54*; 7:41; 8:14; 8:16; 8:19; 8:31; 8:38; [8:39]; 8:44; 8:48; 8:52; 8:59; 9:4;

80 It must be admitted this is a case where counting the reading of εκ rather than εις as Primary, Alexandrian results from the sheer number of Alexandrian MSS. εις is found only in half of the Caesarean or Byzantine witnesses; the 20 remaining extant witnesses read εκ.

81 Here as in 13:20 Π is flanked by Alexandrian witnesses (all extant Primary and 5 Secondary).

82 This and the next variant were borderline cases for the Primary Alexandrian category, as all extant Primary Alexandrian MSS agree with Origen. P75 is missing however, and even if it were present that would only balance the 4 Secondary Alexandrian and 1 Western witness. These are obviously very strong Alexandrian readings even so.

83 The data on this variant are not clear enough to count, but indications are that it would be Primary, Alexandrian in agreement with Origen were P66 and P75 extant. In this reading and the next, we finally have the breakdown in a double reading by Origen that we would expect—while in Alexandria he agrees with an Alexandrian reading, and while in Caesarea he agrees with a Caesarean reading. The data are not nearly so clear, unfortunately. First, this variant consists only of the omission of και, and the breakdown is not as distinct as one would like. As often happens in these data, the groups divide between Primary Alexandrian and Western (a combination pointing to great antiquity if not originality) and Byzantine and Caesarean. και is attested by 4 Secondary Alexandrians, 3 Caesareans, and 5 Byzantines. It is omitted by 3 Primary Alexandrians (the only ones extant here), 3 Secondary Alexandrians, 1 Byzantine, 2 Caesareans, and all Westerns. As noted, in Alexandria Origen omits the και and in Caesarea he includes it. The same pattern applies to the next variant in this verse, even more clearly.

84 This reading is almost Distinctive Alexandrian. All extant Primary Alexandrian MSS and 5/8 Secondary (C 892 are missing here) all read ευθεως εξηλθεν εξηλθεν rather than ευθυς εξηλθεν εξηλθεν. Latin witnesses a b are the only ones that disrupt the Alexandrian harmony here and versional support of word order cannot be relied upon with certainty.

85 Origen’s double reading here is slightly less clear and significant than the citations in 17:1, but still may hold significance. Origen has και εκείνος in book 10 of his commentary on John, written shortly after his move to Caesarea, and in Celsus, one of his last writings, he has και εκείνος. The unconnected form is Alexandrian (P66 B UBS W 579) with secondary Caesarean support (Θ f1). Again, these data is unfortunately not as clear and/or impactful as we would like, but remains worth noting.

86 Origen includes and omits μου 3 times each: omit (Io.Com6, Io.Com 10, and Heracl 8), include (Io.Com 6, Mat.Com 17, Orat 23). The editors feel that “In view of Origen’s habits of citation” they are “inclined to the view that his text included it.” (TFGWO, 335n2). The omission is supported by aleph B UBS4 W D b e

87 Only UBS tips the scales in the direction of a Primary, Alexandrian reading (B and D also agree with Origen in reading και o rather than και alone).

Primary Alexandrian Against Origen (con’t)

CAESAREAN

Exclusive, Caesarean

88 Here Origen again attests two readings—he knows both the Alexandrian order ἐλθον προ εμου (3/5 Primary Alexandrians, 6/8 Secondary, with only Π f13 and 700 representing Caesareans reading this order), as well as the mixed Caesarean/Byzantine (3 MS each) προ εμου ἐλθον. But again, Origen’s witnesses are in the opposite direction one would expect! While in Alexandria he reads with the Caesarean/Byzantine, and while in Caesarean he agrees with the Alexandrian. Scribal harmonization may be the best way to explain this phenomenon—Origen read the Alexandrian order, but scribes changed it to the one more familiar. ἐλθον tout seul is also a reading here (P45 vid Π E Δ Ω a b e), but between the two “Byzantine” readings it makes sense a scribe would move words rather than remove them if he had the same three before him, only in a different order.

89 Not strong enough to count as Primary, Primary Alexandrian, the Primary Alexandrian support is quite stronger than the Secondary—all extant Primary Alexandrians (P75 is missing here) read επροφητευσεν with only 2 Secondary Alexandrians, 2 Caesareans, and D.

90 Origen here witnesses ειπε with all Byzantines, 5/6 Caesareans, and e, against 3/5 Primary Alexandrians and 5/8 Secondary Alexandrians, and a b.

91 Though this is technically Primary, Alexandrian, I did not count it. This is a good example of how muddy “Primary, Alexandrian” readings can be, and the need for the further refinement of the other Profiles. It is true this is Primary for Alexandrian witnesses, but barely. The omission of the definite article is witnessed by all MSS save P45 (missing) and the TR. But the way the numbers break down, that makes this Primary, Alexandrian (5/5 Primary Alexandrian, 7/8 Secondary, 5/6 Byzantine, 3/6 Caesarean, and 1/4 Western). But were the variant different, the result would likely also change (if the Latins could come into play, for example).

92 This is another example of a Primary, Alexandrian reading by chance only. The omission of the definite article is supported by 10 Primary Alexandrians and 7 others, but it is only found in Ω TR D, as well as Origen! The Latin witnesses are non-applicable here, and P45 P89 892 e are missing.

93 This is one of the more significant “Caesarean” agreements—θ and f13 both add και εξηλθεν εκ της χειρος αυτων.

94 Another Exclusive Caesarean addition more significant than sporadic definite articles: f1 and 565 add και ουχ ευρησετε to με; and while 700 lacks the με, it also reads και ουχ ευρησετε.
Primary, Caesarean
Origen: 14:2695; 18:896

Western

Distinctive, Western
Origen: None
8:19; 8:19; 8:39; 8:45; 8:58; 10:36; 11:11; 11:47; 11:47; 11:52; 13:9; 13:12; 14:26; 16:12;
17:14; 18:28101; 21:23

Exclusive, Western
Origen: None

---

95 Here Origen and Θ f1 565 a b read σοσα against all other MSS which contain α.

96 It is safe to assume that the addition of αυτοις το απεκριθη in f1 f13 565 is genetic, given the close relationship of these manuscripts. This is also a very logical addition to add, however, and so it is impossible to say whether Origen and D had this addition in their exemplar or whether they added it on their own. The paucity of Origen’s singular readings and his careful citation habits, however, nudge probability in the direction of Origen’s text having this addition.

97 This degree of Caesarean agreement and relative distinctiveness may be significant. It consists only in the addition of δε, but 4/6 Caesarean readings agree here (P95 is missing), with only 892 and b outside the Caesarean fold (and Origen).

98 Both of the Exclusive Western variants in this verse have the addition of “παλιν” in common, producing a Distinctive reading.

99 Here we have the interesting variant where Western witnesses read εκλεκτος against υιος.

100 This distinctive (shared by all Western witnesses) omission of ου γαρ συγχρωνται ιουδαιοι σαμαρειταις is interesting. N had this omission, and then a scribe added the longer text.

101 All witnesses but a b e read καιφαφα rather than καιφα (kaipha in Latin?), so this is likely an idiosyncrasy of the transliteration into Latin rather than true textual variation (though the similar spelling of the Latins could be related).
Exclusive, Western Against Origen (con’t)

Primary, Western
Origen: 4:29\(^{*}^{103}\); 6:11; 18:5

BYZANTINE

Distinctive, Byzantine
None

Exclusive, Byzantine
Origen: 12:13\(^{106}\)
Against: 3:22; 13:3; 13:31; 17:11

Primary, Byzantine

\(^{102}\)This is an interesting variant shared by D and a:
καθως εν εμοι ο πατηρ καγω εν τω πατρι αμην αμην λεγω υμειν εαν μη λαβητε το σωμα του υιου του
ανθρωπου ως τον αρτον της ζωης ουκ εχετε ζωην εν αυτω

\(^{103}\)It is unfortunate that P66 and P75 are missing here, as that would balance out the Primary Alexandrian and
Western support for the omission of ο ιησου. As it is, Origen agrees with B UBS

\(^{104}\)This reading is right on the edge—N and D read ουδεν against ουδε εν, as well as P\(^{66}\) and f\(^{i}\). I counted it as
a borderline case because of several factors—the fact it did have 50%, combined with the fact that the Latins
here are non-applicable, and the fact that Heracleon, also a Western witness, attests this reading.

\(^{105}\)Here all four Westerns agree against Ν B f\(^{i}\) and UBS. Bracketing the fact that without UBS Westerns would
be Primary anyway, 50% is adequate because the Western witness literally could not be stronger, and should
therefore tip the categorization to Primary.

\(^{106}\)Here Origen agrees with A and Π in reading απαντησιν rather than υπαντησιν. It is impossible to know
for certain whether this is independent chance changes or scribal corruption of Origen’s text. As no other textual
strand has this reading and these manuscripts are centuries later than Origen, it is unlikely that Origen gets this
reading from one of his manuscripts.
Profile Three: Distinctive or Primary and Uniform or Predominant

Distinctive, Primary Alexandrian

Uniform: 13:32*\(^{109}\)

Primary, Primary Alexandrian

Uniform:

Predominant, Primary Alexandrian

Against:

Primary, Secondary Alexandrian

Uniform, with Origen: 1:31*; 8:51
Uniform, against Origen: None
Predominant, with Origen: 6:51; 13:2; 13:2; 13:8; 13:18; 18:36+\(^{113}\)

---

\(^{107}\) All Byzantine MSS read ιησους ουν with 3 Caesarean, 2 Secondary Alexandrian, and 1 Western against the Predominant Alexandrian reading ο ουν ιησους (4/5 Primary Alexandrian, 4/8 Secondary Alexandrian, 2/6 Caesarean).

\(^{108}\) This is a Primary Byzantine reading, as 6/6 Byzantines read δεδωκεν with P66, 3/6 Caesareans, and D against 5 Alexandrians (3 Primary, 2 Secondary) and f1. The predominance is weakened, however, by the fact that P\(^{13}\) C P\(^{15}\) C are all missing, most of which would likely read with the Byzantines here.

\(^{109}\) And what is this sole Distinctive Primary Alexandrian reading you ask? It is an example of significance by distribution rather than by character—reading αυτω rather than εαυτω. Before it is discounted, note that it is attested by every extant Primary Alexandrian MS. Therefore a genealogical relationship is highly likely, despite the synonymous character of the variant. (change this to "see note XXX")

\(^{110}\) This variant involves the addition of the definite article.

\(^{111}\) All extant Primary Alexandrians agree with Origen in the addition of εκ, and only Secondary Alexandrian L prevents this from being Distinctive and Uniform.

\(^{112}\) Another addition of the article.

\(^{113}\) The reordering of the Byzantine αν οι εμοι ηγονιζοντο to οι εμοι ηγονιζοντο αν is strongly supported by Alexandrians (all extant Primary Alexandrians and 5/8 Secondary). It is hard to tell whether Primary or Secondary elements are stronger, as both strains of the tradition are missing two manuscripts here. Only 2/6 Caesareans side with the Alexandrians here, and the entire Western group does not apply, as D is missing and Latins are N/A.

108
Primary, Secondary Alexandrian (con’t)
Predominant, against Origen: 4:15+; 8:59114; 17:3

Primary, Alexandrian
Uniform, with Origen: 1:31*; 4:20*; 4:45*
Predominant, against Origen:

CAESAREAN

Primary, Caesarean
Origen: None
Against, Uniform: 2:16116
Against, Predominant: 4:16; 7:41; 8:49

WESTERN

Distinctive, Western

Primary, Byzantine
Uniform, Against Origen: 6:46; 10:26; 11:53; 11:54

---

114 This variant provides one clear example of Origen’s Primary Alexandrian affinities, because here the two streams of tradition diverge considerably (considerable on the scale of variants, that is). The Uniform Byzantine reading is διέλθων διά μέσου αὐτῶν καὶ παρῆγγεν αὐτῶς. 7/8 Secondary Alexandrians and aleph expand and move the words slightly: καὶ διέλθων διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν επορευετο καὶ παρῆγγεν αὐτῶς, while all 5 Primary Alexandrians (with W, Θ, and all Westerns) omit the phrase.

115 Only 7/8 variants of the Alexandrians agree here, but they agree against only 1 variant!! Thus it is clearly “Predominant”

116 All extant Caesarean witnesses (P45 is lacunose) add καὶ with 33 1241 A a b e (D is also missing)
Chapter V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Before engaging with several questions raised by the preceding chapters, it would be helpful to summarize the salient points of this investigation, as well as to highlight the contributions specific to this study.

Chapter one contextualized the data regarding Origen’s text of the Fourth Gospel by outlining the timeline of Origen’s literary activity. The most important events of his life for this specific study are his relocation from Alexandria to Caesarea in 231 and his lifelong work on his commentary on the Gospel of John. His citations, though affected by normal human fallacy, prove to be more accurate than those of any other Church Father. A survey of the manuscripts followed, introducing those witnesses that act as canons of comparison against which Origen’s textual affinities can be deduced.

Chapter two traced the explorations into the nature of Origen’s text of the New Testament, and especially the gospels. The first significant steps were taken by Johann Griestbach, and methodological leaps moved forward the investigation of Origen’s text of the gospels. These advances centered in the work of Kwang-Won Kim, who applied his adviser’s Multiple Readings Method to the writings of Origen; to Gordon Fee, who anchored the reconstruction of a Father’s text in sound methodology; and finally Bart Ehrman, who has devised the most effective means of determining a witness’ place in the textual tradition. These studies predicated that though Origen changes his text of Matthew, Mark, and Luke
upon relocation to Caesarea, for John it appears he retained his Alexandrian manuscripts throughout his life; this study vindicates these predictions.

The primary contribution of this thesis dwells in the data and their analysis that have combined to seal Origen’s status as the purest transmitter of the Primary Alexandrian tradition among the Church Fathers, and a strong representative of that tradition worthy to stand among our best manuscripts of the Gospel of John. This is confirmed both by the Quantitative Analysis and especially by the Group Profiles, where all other patterns melted away, leaving only the Alexandrian nature of Origen’s text to shine through.

Computer programs, including simple ones such as Microsoft Excel, bear the potential to increase the efficiency and accuracy of painstaking methodological analysis. To draw from a comparison especially appropriate to textual criticism, it is not an exaggeration to say that using a computer program to calculate these data is similar to the advancement of using a printing press rather than copying manuscripts by hand. This thesis is one of the first studies to take advantage systematically of such computer programs, and is the very first actually to show the work required to complete these analyses. The walk-through I have provided has the potential to save future researches from unnecessary trial and error.

I have also nuanced the categories and definitions in Ehrman’s Group Profiles. In addition to removing contradictory terms in the title of the Third Profile,¹ I have counted the data in ways that I feel best approximate the historical realities of textual complexion. For example, as noted in chapter four, I counted readings as Uniform when one of a family of

---

¹ By removing “Exclusive” from the name of the profile “Uniform Predominant Readings that are also Distinctive, Exclusive, or Primary” as it is impossible for a reading to be both Predominant and Exclusive. See 87n12.
manuscripts was missing, as that manuscript would most probably agree with its close allies were it present.\textsuperscript{2}

The manner in which I have organized the data serves as an additional contribution. As can be seen in Appendix 1, the patterns of textual variation in John can be taken in at a glance, and thus this table serves as a unique apparatus. Even more helpful is what can be done with the electronic form of this table. Once the data are organized in this manner, it is easy to calculate various comparisons.\textsuperscript{3} This presentation also allows for replication and checking of the detailed data in this study, a task that would be prohibitively time-consuming without the data in electronic format. It might be helpful to organize the data this way for other sections of the New Testament text. For example, organizing the variants in the writings of Clement, Athanasius, and Didymus and adding this information to Origen’s data would enable effective investigation into the history of the Alexandrian text, because scholars could efficiently compare these Fathers’ texts at every point of variation.

Returning to the issue of Origen’s place among the Primary Alexandrian witnesses, it would be useful to see how Origen compares in agreement with the dream team of the Alexandrian tradition, P\textsuperscript{75} and B. Not only are both of these manuscripts the best we have, but they agree remarkably with one another. How does Origen measure up to these united witnesses?

\textsuperscript{2} In addition to the Uniform* nuance, I counted readings as Primary at instead of above 50\% when Uniformity or ten or more variants were involved, as well as counting the balance between Primary and Secondary Alexandrians proportionately. I am not claiming grand significance for these small changes, but I felt they were helpful as I categorized readings.

\textsuperscript{3} This presentation has minimized the most tedious and potentially error-filled part of these profiles, namely the counting by hand of hundreds of readings. It is obvious that Excel can do all of the math instantly, but it is the combination of Microsoft Word and Excel, using the “Find/Replace” feature to isolate patterns of readings, that time is saved and accuracy is increased most dramatically. Perhaps there is an even better way to do it, but that is the one I found. ((Talk in the body probably about how Excel can count and do even more, and then there are statistical software, need to talk to Bruce, etc.)
This significant agreement between these strongest members of the purest form of the Alexandrian text illustrates the fact that Origen’s text of John is comparable to these manuscripts in strength of attestation of our best form of the Alexandrian text of John.

Having confirmed conclusively the nature of Origen’s text of John, which was the primary purpose of this investigation, I will conclude by addressing some peripheral questions—whether there is the slightest sign that Origen’s manuscripts of John were affected by his move to Caesarea, how Heracleon’s text compares to the text of Origen, and what this study can tell us about the history of the Alexandrian text of John.

**Origen’s Manuscripts of John**

Ignited by Griesbach’s pioneering studies, scholars of Origen’s New Testament have quested to discern whether Origen’s move from Egypt to Palestine affected the text type he referenced. As reviewed in the survey of chapter two, previous scholarship has established that Origen changed his text of Mark, Luke, and Matthew. Thus the rule seems to be that Origen did utilize different texts in Caesarea than he did in Alexandria. Without looking at Origen’s text of John, one might assume that he would manifest a different textual form in the fourth gospel, as he does in the first three. Previous research into Origen’s text of John shows no instance of change, however, and has suggested rather that Origen held to his Alexandrian manuscripts of John throughout his life. Thanks to the data presented in Volume 1 and the analyses of the current study, we can now conclusively confirm that in contrast to his treatment of the other gospels, Origen remained faithful to his Alexandrian manuscripts of the Fourth Gospel.
Two ways to confirm the consistency of Origen’s text of John are to look first at the double readings in John, and then to compare the results of the entire gospel with Gordon Fee’s study of John 4. Both of these investigations demonstrate that Origen stays with his Primary Alexandrian manuscripts throughout his life.

In order to compare systematically Origen’s text in Alexandria and Caesarea, the ideal would be to have multiple examples of instances where his text differs in his Alexandrian writings from those penned in Caesarea. It would be even more helpful if those instances occurred in places with distinctive readings that fall along family lines. These “double readings” tease scholars with their potential ability to part the veil of the past and reveal the state of Origen’s manuscripts. We have an instance here, however, where the absence of conclusive evidence is in itself a conclusion. In the available data, there is not a single instance in which Origen’s preference of one reading over another can be traced conclusively to his use of a different manuscript in Caesarea than he did in Alexandria. There are a handful of potential examples, but the weakness of these “best” illustrations only confirms the remarkable consistency of Origen’s fidelity to the Primary Alexandrian text of John throughout his life.

As Origen’s form of John is reconstructed by Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes, among all the varied forms in which Origen cites scripture, in only 30 instances does Origen preserve two significant forms of the Johannine text.4 I have divided these “double readings” into the following four groups. I will give the data for the less significant Indeterminate and Textual

---

4 As is seen in volume 1, Origen cites his text of John in a diversity of forms. One of the significant contributions of this work is that the editors have sifted these references to restore the most likely form of Origen’s text. So it is in only 30 instances that Origen’s reconstructed text falls on both sides of a textual variation. To contextualize these data, note that Origen cites 441/879 verses of John. 248 of these references come from the Alexandrian period, and 1895 come from the Caesarean period.
categories, in footnotes, and will then discuss the most pertinent examples, those instances where Origen cites a different text in Caesarea than he did in Alexandria.

Indeterminate: The readings in this category have everything going against them—they come from the same geographical location and lack textual distinctiveness. Also belonging to this category are those instances where the editors were unsure about Origen’s readings.5

Textual: In this category, both of Origen’s readings occur in writings penned in Caesarea or less commonly Alexandria, but they also both agree with a number of the representative manuscripts in a distinctive manner.6

5 Indeterminate (11, all from Caesarean period): 4:16-10 (3 quotes of σου τον ανδρα with B and 3 of τον ανδρα σου with everything else); 4:35-25 (quotes verse 27 times, 4 times has στι only with P25 D L Π*, 7 times adds ετι with rest of witnesses); 4:42-55 (οστυς εστιν ἁληθος ὁ σοτηρ with majority and ἁληθος ουτος εστιν ὁ σοτηρ with τι); 5:44-13 (ἀνθρωπον with Δ 1241, ἀληθείαν with rest); 7:30-13 (Origen reads once επεβαλλεν with P66 and once επεβαλεν with most [besides a e which read εβαλεν]); 7:37-34 (Origen reads με with P25 and also με with most); 7:39-40 (ουπω with א b D Θ and ουδεπω with the rest); 8:14-25 (all from Ιο. Com 19, μαρτυρία μου ἁληθης εστιν with P25 B W b and then ἁληθης εστιν η μαρτυρία μου with majority); 17:5-22 (Origen agrees with P66 a and also the rest in matter of word order; 6 7 1 2 3 4 5 against 1 2 3 4 5 6 7); 20:17-16 (In regards to this verse, Holmes noted that the “variations among the citations are baffling and reveal no apparent pattern” [TFGWO, 335n1]. Origen includes and omits μου 3 times each: omit (Ιο. Com in books 6 and 10, and Ηερακλ. 8), include (Ιο. Com 6, Ματ. Com 17, Ορατ 23). After taking into account Origen’s habits of citation, the editors were “inclined to the view that his text included it.” [Ibid., 335n2]. The omission is supported by Alexandrian and Western witnesses—κ B UBS W D b e); 20:17-22 (In a simple difference Origen omits δε with A and includes it with most MSS. This is likely a coincidental omission)

6 Textual (11, all in Caesarea): 4:29-16 (Origen has α 3 times with Western κ a e and Alexandrian Β C*; and οσα twice with the remaining witnesses, all in book 13 of Ιο. Com); 5:44-40 (5 quotes, omits θεος twice with several important Alexandrians Ρ66 Ρ25 Β W and Western α; he also includes it with most witnesses; 5:47-16 (Reads πιστευσατε with 4/6 Caesarean witnesses and several others: D W Δ Θ π* τ65 565 579 1241, as well as πιστευσετε with most witnesses); 6:51-49 (Origen quotes the variant in question 4 times. Two times he reads υπερ εστιν with the Alexandrian/Western combination that attests to antiquity—Ρ66 Ρ25 Κ B D L W Ψ 33 579 a b e UBS, and twice adds την εγω δωσω with the remaining witnesses. This seems to be a case where Origen does know two separate textual traditions representing differing streams of transmission. This is a significant point we attempt to imagine how Origen drew upon textual traditions. In the first volume Ehrman noted that “we are obligated to suppose that Origen was familiar with two different forms of the text when he penned these works [Ορατ. and Ιο. Com.] in Caesarea,” demonstrated by the fact that Origen quotes the addition twice in Ορατιονες and lacks it twice in his commentary on John [TFGWO, 173n3]; 6:54-40 (και with all Primary Alexandrians and 6/8 Secondary Alexandrians, as well as και εις with most of the remaining witnesses, one quote each); 8:16-22 (αληθηνη with a slight majority of Alexandrian witnesses, Ρ25 Β D L W 33 892 1241 UBS, and αληθης with most others); 8:39-40 (Origen’s text is slightly uncertain in this verse. The editors are sure that Origen read εστε with all Primary Alexandrians and D L, as he quotes this form in 9/11 instances, but
Geographical: In this category Origen attests a different reading in Alexandria than he does in Caesarea, but both readings fall short of textual distinctiveness, as they do not line up with any of the textual families.7

Geographical and Textual: This category contains the most potentially helpful variants. These are instances where Origen attests one reading when in Alexandria and another reading in Caesarea, and both variants line up with readings distinctive to textual families.8

Turning now to the more significant categories, there are eight instances where we can determine that Origen knew of and used a different textual tradition in Alexandria than in Caesarea. Three of these are geographically but not textually distinctive, and five more are distinctive in both categories. This class of double readings grants insight into Origen’s use of his manuscripts, and lends further weight to the conclusion that Origen consciously chose to retain his Alexandrian manuscripts of John over the course of his life. When examining these readings, we must remember the compounded complexities inherent in analyzing Patristic citations. It is possible that several of these readings might stem from scribal

---

7 These are 1:26-46, 4:25-4, 21:25-31. See discussion below.

8 These are 1:45-33, 10:8-13, 17:1-34, 17:1-37, and 19:35-28; see the following discussion of these variants.
changes, not Origen’s awareness of multiple forms of the Johannine text. Keeping these
cautions in mind, we can now review this category of double readings.

In 1:26-46 Origen attests στηκει with Heracleon B L f1 a b e and εστηκεν with
majority of witnesses. So we have a clear breakdown in quotation patterns, but this variant is
not distinctive as far as groups go. In reference to this variant, Ehman noted, “Origen used
the perfect tense early in his career (John Commentary, Books 1-6), the present tense late
(Book 32, and the Contra Celsum). This appears then to be an instance in which he continued
using an Alexandrian MS during his early residence in Caesarea, before changing MSS
later.”9 In 4:25-4 Origen reads οιδα twice in Alexandria (Io.Com 1) and once in Caesarea
(with most witnesses), and οιδαμεν once in Alexandria (with L f13 33 1241 and the
correctors to P66 and Α). Finally, in 21:25-31 Origen knows both the χωρησαι majority
reading and χωρησειν, contained in Αc B C*. But even though χωρησειν has better
Alexandrian attestation, in the two Alexandrian quotes Origen reads χωρησαι!

Finally, we come now to what are potentially the most significant readings. I have
ranked these from weakest to strongest in support of the idea that Origen knew a different
textual form in Alexandria than he did in Caesarea. In only four instances does Origen
support textually distinctive yet different readings both in Alexandria and Caesarea. A
variant in 19:35 provides an additional though borderline case, as Origen’s readings come
from early (Io.Com X) and late (Celsus) in his Palestinian period.

The first two double readings in this category actually play out opposite of what the
reader would expect—when in Alexandria Origen agrees with the Caesarean reading, and
when in Caesarea Origen supports the Alexandrian reading! Though the instance in 1:45

---

9 TFGWO, 69n16.
(variant 33) involves only the presence or absence of the article ([τον] υιον), the division is strikingly clear. All witnesses contain the article except for P66 P75 Ρ B 33 579 UBS—in other words, all of the primary Alexandrians and two Secondary Alexandrians, with only Sinaiticus preventing an Alexandrian sweep of this reading! Theories could be devised to solve this counterintuitive riddle, but the answer most likely is simple coincidence. Although the absence of the article is clearly a pure Alexandrian characteristic, Origen or a later scribe could have independently added that article. Further, since Origen’s reconstructed text relies on a single quotation from each location (Io.Com 1,5,31 and Io.Com. 10,44,313), not much can be made of this example.

The example from 10:8 (variant 13) also falls into a weak category of variance—a simple transposition of words.10 We have one citation from Alexandria (Io.Com 1,37,274) where Origen copied προ εμου ηλθον with three “Caesarean” witnesses (Θ f1 565) and TR. In two late quotations (Cels 7,70; Mat.Com 10,14) Origen has ηλθον προ εμου with most of the representative witnesses. The relationship between Θ f1 565 tips probability in the direction of genealogical relationship for this variant, but the same is not necessarily true of Origen’s reading. Again, it is difficult to know whether Origen himself transposed one word here or whether he knew the tradition of the words in the alternate order. In any case, Origen is the earliest witness to this reading, so it is difficult to know which direction any influence pertains, or whether this is another case of coincidental agreement.

In the next two examples the patterns of variation do align with Origen’s relocation, but the evidence remains ambiguous. In 17:1 the witnesses fluctuate in their addition of κοι

---

to ινα. The addition of καὶ represents a later addition in most of the representative witnesses. Origen has it in his *Orat.* 13,1 quotation, and in the Alexandrian-penned first book of his John commentary he lacks καὶ with all extant Primary Alexandrian witnesses, 3/8 Secondary Alexandrians, all Westerns, as well as theta f1 and A. But again, several factors weaken this example—the fact that Origen’s text is reconstructed from only one quotation in each area, that the grouping of witnesses is not especially distinctive, and most of all, the fact that the presence or absence of καὶ has a high chance of agreeing coincidentally.

As mentioned above, 19:35 contains another potentially distinctive variation. This example suffers from the weaknesses of several others I am addressing—Origen’s text comes from two citations, and the distinction of the variants is extremely small—καὶ εκεῖνος versus its contracted form—it also is not technically distinctive on geographical grounds either. But because the quotations come from early (*Io.Com.* 10,16,95) and late (*Cels* 2,36) in Origen’s time in Caesarea, this textual variation could potentially stem from differing manuscripts used by Origen. The unconnected form is Alexandrian (P66 B UBS W 579) with secondary Caesarean support (Θ f\(^3\)); the remaining representative witnesses read κακεῖνος. Not much can be made of this example, but I included it for the sake of completeness.

From among these most helpful (comparatively speaking) references, in which Origen’s Alexandrian text differs from his Caesarean text, I will conclude with the strongest example. In John 17:1, the humble inclusion or omission of the pronoun σου gives us the clearest distinction of Origen’s textual variation based on location. We have two quotations from this verse, one in Alexandria (*Io.Com* 1.21.28) and one in Caesarea (*Orat.* 13.1). In

---

11 Ν A B C* D W Θ f\(^3\) 579 a b e UBS. Unfortunately, P66 and P75 are lacking here.
Alexandria he omits the σου with all extant Primary Alexandrians (p66 p75 are lacunose here), 2 Secondary Alexandrians, and e. His Caesarean quote includes the σου with all Byzantine and Western witnesses as well as 6/8 Secondary Alexandrians and all extant Caesareans (p45 is missing). This is about as good as it gets, and this example clearly cannot bear much historical weight. As previously noted, all of these examples are uninspiring. But somewhat paradoxically, these ambiguous results actually confirm this thesis that Origen used a single textual type of the Gospel of John throughout his life.

Even these most distinctive examples are weak, unable to bear firm conclusions. It seems that in most if not all of these cases, what we have here is parallel textual variation—Origen reads with certain manuscripts not because he is dependent on them, but because his changes were guided by the same adaptive principles that led to the changing of the text types themselves.12

Comparison of the part to whole can provide further confirmation of the homogeneity of Origen’s Johannine text. In 1971 Gordon Fee published an analysis of Origen’s quotations in John chapter 4. He concludes that Origen is a strong representative of the Primary Alexandrian text, and that Origen’s move to Caesarea “has scarcely affected it.” He qualified his statement that this was true of John 4, but added “further judgments must wait until this study is completed for the whole of John.”13 Taking this opportunity to compare Fee’s findings in John 4 and the results of the current investigation will bolster both studies while also demonstrating the consistency of Origen’s text of John.

12 Gordon Fee, “P75, P66, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria,” In Epp and Fee, Studies, 256-258: “where editorializing may be shown to exist, he does not edit toward the text of P75 B on the basis of Alexandrian philological know-how, but rather away from that text on principles later to be found in the Byzantine tradition.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>John 4</th>
<th></th>
<th>John 1-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>P⁷⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>P⁷⁵</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>P⁶⁶c</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Ψ</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>Ψ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Cyr</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>f¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>P⁶⁶c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>Π</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Θ</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>Ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>1241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>Θ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>f¹³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Χ</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interestingly, the text of John 4 appears more distinctive than the gospel as a whole—highest and lowest manuscripts are ranked more dramatically, and there is greater agreement with Alexandrian MSS. One option could be that these numbers come from the fact we have smaller data pool; another could be the precision of Fee’s methodology. Even so, the rankings and percentages end up on par overall. Certainly there is not enough evidence to demonstrate that Origen knew a textual tradition that varied even in a minor way.

It is difficult if not impossible to discern why Origen kept some of his Alexandrian manuscripts, while switching out others. As discussed in chapter two, Origen changed his text of Matthew for one aligned with manuscripts 1 and 1582, replaced his text of Mark with one similar to Θ, and shifted his text of Luke to a witness with Western leanings. Of the Gospels, only in John does he stand firm, retaining the text of his youth. Of course, as Darrell Hannah demonstrated, Origen also kept his Alexandrian text of 1 Corinthians throughout his life, and likely preserved Alexandrian texts of the other Catholic Epistles.

If nothing else, Origen’s textual collection demonstrates the variety of texts current in Caesarea. Regarding Origen’s form of John, perhaps it is significant that Origen was working on his Commentary on John throughout this adult life. He even is said to have remarked he would have to complete it in paradise. It could be that his consistent travail on this gospel over the course of his life inclined him to retain those manuscripts used in the beginning of this project.

**Origen and Heracleon’s Text of John**

Given Origen’s firm Alexandrian affinities in John, it is striking that beneath this Egyptian stratum we can uncover the text of his opponent, Heracleon, a Valentinian who lived
in mid-second century Rome. The editors of *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen* promised that the ensuing volume would include a discussion of Heracleon’s text. In the meantime, however, Bart Ehrman has written two articles that have pretty much given the final word on this subject, and so I will simply summarize the results of his research here.

The fortunate fact that Origen gives “clear indications that [he] occasionally cites Heracleon with pin-point accuracy, even with respect to his quotations of the gospel” allows for detailed textual analysis. Ehrman first provided a valuable reconstruction of Heracleon’s text accompanied by an apparatus, followed by a Quantitative Analysis for Heracleon and Origen. The result of these preliminary rankings prove paradoxical—the closest witnesses to Heracleon are from the two families that share between themselves the least readings—the Alexandrian and Western! A clue is provided by the fact that reversing the comparison and ranking the witnesses according to agreement with Origen places Heracleon toward the bottom of the list, along with the Western witnesses.

---

14 He was active around 170, and close to Valentinus. See Ehrman, “Heracleon, Origen, and the Text of the Fourth Gospel,” *STCNT*, 267.

15 *TFGWO*, 29-29.

16 “Heracleon, Origen, and the Text of the Fourth Gospel,” *STCNT*, 267-280; idem., “Heracleon and the ‘Western’ Textual Tradition,” *STCNT*, 281-299. The raw data are as follows: Origen preserves Heracleon’s text of John 49 times, and in 11 of these Heracleon’s text differs from Origen. In the following of Heracleon’s verses the textual tradition is invariant: John 1:6, 23, 29; 2:12; 4:11, 22, 26, 36, 48, 50, 53; 5:45; 8:21, 22. Variation is found in the following: John 1:17, 28; 2:14, 15, 17, 19; 4:14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 24, 27, 30, 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 47, 49, 51; 8:43, 44. (Ehrman, “Heracleon, Origen, and the Text of the Fourth Gospel,” 269 and 269n16.)

17 The rest of the references in this section come from Ehrman, “Heracleon and the ‘Western’ Textual Tradition,” 282.

18 Pages 285-291 provide the apparatus, 292-293 the Quantitative Analysis.
Application of the Group Profile method to these readings unravels this mystery of manuscripts, once again confirming the importance of this approach that compares patterns of readings in addition to percentages of agreement between MSS.

Ehrman stacked blocks of agreement that build a firm case for Heracleon’s strong Western affinities. In the 46 instances where 2 or more witnesses agree against others, 20 preserve Uniform Alexandrian readings. Heracleon supports 13/20 (65%) of these. The disagreements illuminate Heracleon’s true character—those seven departures from Alexandrian unanimity agree with leading Western witnesses! And when Heracleon is lined up with the 13 Uniform Western readings, he proves an exceptional follower of this tradition—sharing 11/13 (84%) of these.¹⁹ Most impressively, Heracleon shows his Western colors in the two times when the Western witnesses combine in the most powerful group attestation possible—readings that are Distinctive and Uniform—where a variant is supported by all members of a group and no others!²⁰

Heracleon also manifests an impressive support of Western pairings. His text agrees with Codices Sinaiticus and Bezae in 13/18 instances (72.22%). Ehrman affixed the capstone of his argument for Heracleon’s western affinities by showing that, in the seven instances in which Sinaiticus and Bezae stand alone against all or virtually all other Greek MSS, “Heracleon supports their combined reading in all but one instance.”²¹

These data amply support Ehrman’s elucidation of Heracleon’s apparently paradoxical agreement with opposing text types: “Heracleon used a form of the text that bore

---

¹⁹ The Distinctive and Exclusive readings also paint Heracleon a Western hue—he agrees with only 1/4 (25%) of Alexandrian readings, and over double that (7/11, 63.64%) with Western.

²⁰ In John 1:4 and the final variant of 4:17.

²¹ Ehrman, “Heracleon and the ‘Western’ Textual Tradition,” 298.
a close resemblance to the kind of ‘Western’ tradition jointly attested by aleph and D; in an
indeterminate number of instances, Origen consciously or inadvertently modified this text
when reproducing Heracleon’s exposition.”

Ehrman’s textual excavation brings to light a truly ancient witness to the Western
text—from mid-second century Rome—preserved later in Codices Sinaiticus and Bezae.
Such reconstruction of Patristic citations thus carry a far greater value than the number of
verses preserved in their texts—they confirm the antiquity of the text-type preserved in later,
fuller manuscripts.

**Origen and the “Caesarean Text” in John**

Though more examination will be necessary to put the question completely to rest,
this study has cast serious doubt on the existence of a “Caesarean Text” in the Gospel of
John. At minimum, we can say that the burden of proof lies on those attempting to prove its
existence. This study joins with others that have determined that one cannot speak of a
Caesarean text outside the Gospel of Mark. Though the manuscripts called Caesarean do
share common readings and are related at some level, they lack the distinction required to
call them a family on par with the other major text-types.

From each chapter of this investigation evidence unites to dismantle the idea of the
Caesarean text. After reviewing studies such as those of Mark Dunn and Roderic Mullen,
which demonstrate that “Caesarean” manuscripts are better categorized as weak Byzantine,23
Quantitative Analysis revealed virtual uniformity in agreement with Origen between the
Byzantine and Caesarean groups. In contrast to the adequate distance of about 8-9% between

22 Ibid.

23 See Chapter Two, page 48 above.
the Alexandrian, Western, and the Byzantine/Caesarean groups taken together, the Byzantine and Caesarean families blurred together with a miniscule difference of less than one percent. Table 6 (page 80) showed that the Caesarean witnesses shared roughly agreement with Byzantine manuscripts as they do with each other. In the Group Profiles as well as the Quantitative Analysis, the Caesarean witnesses acted in accordance with their Byzantine counterparts, rather than creating their own textual imprint. In short, the Caesarean witnesses acted so much like the Byzantine manuscripts in this study that they might as well be in the same group. The “Caesarean” text outside of Mark rightly should be considered a sub-group of the Byzantine family, rather than its own textual type.

Origen and the History of the Alexandrian Text

What can these data tell us about the Alexandrian text of John in the first half of the 3rd century? First of all, we know that Origen took with him to Caesarea manuscripts of obvious antiquity and value, as is made manifest in the remarkable text type that he preserves. Yet we know he had access to other texts, given the varying forms that he adopts in the other gospels.

It would be useful to apply these data of Origen to the question of the nature of the Secondary Alexandrian text. Bart Ehrman and John Brogan have both challenged the assumption that the Secondary Alexandrian text is a coherent text type like the Primary Alexandrian or Western traditions, underscoring the point that it is more likely that there was only one form of the Alexandrian text—that preserved by P75 and B—and that the

24 See the Group Profiles in Chapter Four.

25 Both the Byzantine and Caesarean groups lacked Distinctive readings, and the Caesarean group had only half as many Primary readings as the Byzantine manuscripts. In the third profile both the Byzantine and Caesarean each only had a single reading that was Uniform or Predominant as well as Distinctive or Primary.
“Secondary Alexandrian” witnesses are those that preserved this text is less purity.26 This study confirms repeatedly the reality that Origen witnesses a form of the Alexandrian text that was indeed transmitted with utmost care. At the same time, we know that other witnesses from Clement to Didymus manifest a form of the tradition that was somewhat more fluid.

It is true that, in the data of this study, the lack of Secondary Alexandrian Distinctive Readings (0) and Exclusive (only 18, even with 8 manuscripts with chances to agree at every point) is striking. Of course, the Byzantine manuscripts have fewer, but that is because they contain elements of all the text types, so by definition would not be distinctive. Only three readings are both Uniform and Primary, and the high number of Secondary Manuscripts increases the likelihood of this combination and therefore decreases its significance. The next step would be to examine patterns of readings, but we already know that in no instance does a majority of Secondary Alexandrians read against the others.27

In summary, this study has established with reasonable certainty that Origen preserves a text of the Gospel of John that is most valuable, closely aligned with the P75-B tradition. Origen’s careful refutation of Heracleon’s text of John provides early evidence for a Western text in Europe in the early second century. It is also with confidence that we can conclude that there is no apparent evidence for a Caesarean text in the Gospel of John. And though the evidence is not as clear, it appears that the data concerning the Gospel of John

---

26 Ehrman, Didymus, 264, “There was but one type of text in Alexandria, with Alexandrian witnesses preserving it in varying levels of purity.” Brogan stated that while Athanasius demonstrated Secondary Alexandrian readings, “there are not enough of these shared readings to make the Secondary Alexandrian witness a distinct text type.” (pp. 300-301)

27 One interesting example of unique agreement among Secondary Alexandrian witnesses occurs in 8:24: MSS 33 and 1241 share the distinct omission, εαν γαρ µη πιστευσητε στι εγω ειμι αποθανεισθε εν ταις αμαρτιαις υμων, suggesting a relationship closer even than membership in the same group. But agreement between two manuscripts does not a family make.
support the idea that the Secondary Alexandrian text is not a distinct text type, but a less-
strictly controlled form of the more-carefully strand preserved in Origen’s text of the Fourth
Gospel. Significantly, however, in the midst of textual categories falling by the wayside, this
study does vindicate the category of “Alexandrian text”—Origen’s textual affinity confirms
that there was indeed a carefully preserved textual tradition current in second- and third-
century Egypt. Thus the categories “Alexandrian”, “Western”, and “Byzantine” remain
helpful, against those who would replace these titles with geographically neutral terms.

This study has classified the text of Origen, but leaves as yet unanswered provocative
questions raised in its predecessor, concerning the activity of Origen’s scribes:

At this stage of our study we can at least express our expectation that we will find that
Origen himself was less likely to change his text than were the scribes who produced
the MSS he used. We know beyond any doubt that scribes frequently modified the
texts they inherited, and that they sometimes did so conscientiously for discernible
reasons: e.g. to harmonize one text with another, or to improve the grammar of a
passage, or to “correct” what the text said to conform with what it was already known
to mean…Origen, on the other hand, celebrated precisely the kinds of textual
differences that troubled so many scribes, in part because these literary and
theological tensions demonstrated the need to move beyond the literal interpretation
to the allegorical. As a result, we might expect that Origen was not at all concerned to
transform the “surface” meaning of a text into conformity with its “real” meaning.
For him, any form of the text proved amenable, even variant readings that he found
scattered throughout the MS tradition.

If this expectation is in fact realized in the analysis of our second volume, we will be
in the fortunate position of having uncovered in Origen’s citations the actual state of
the text of the Fourth Gospel in Alexandrian and Caesarea in the early third century
(since Origen himself would not have modified that text for his exposition);
moreover, we will thereby be enabled to ascertain how that text had been modified by
scribes during the first century and a half of its transmission. (TFGWO, 17)

This study has established the character of Origen’s text of John; the treatment of that
text by later scribes invites another.
## Appendix 1: Textual Variation in John

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table above represents the textual variation in John among different manuscripts (MS) and codices (A-Z).*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Prim. Alex</th>
<th>Secondary Alex</th>
<th>Alex</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>XYG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

130
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:16-10</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 * 0 0 0 0 0 * 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0, Predom 0, Unif* 0, Predom 0, Unif 0, Predom 0, Unif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:17-10</td>
<td>2 2 0 0 0 0 2 2 2 2 2 0 * 0 2 0 2 2 * 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 2, Unif - 2, Predom 0, Unif* 0, Predom 0, ... 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0, Unif 0, Predom 0, Predom 0, Unif* 0, Unif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:39-16</td>
<td>4 0 4 0 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 * 0 0 0 0 0 * 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0, Unif 0, Predom 0, Predom - 0, Unif 4, Predom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:39-58</td>
<td>0 2 2 0 2 2 0 2 2 2 2 2 * 0 0 0 0 0 * 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2, Predom 0, Predom - 0, Unif* 0, Unif 2, Predom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:40-04</td>
<td>3 0 4 0 0 0 0 0 5 0 0 0 * 0 0 0 0 7 * 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0, Predom 0, Predom 0, Predom 0, Unif* 0, Unif 0, Predom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:41-10</td>
<td>* 0 2 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 * 0 0 0 0 0 * 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0, Predom 0, Unif* 0, Predom 0, Unif* 0, Unif 0, Predom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:41-13</td>
<td>0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 * 0 0 0 2 2 * 2 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0, Unif 0, Predom 0, Predom - 0, Unif 0, Predom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:42-04</td>
<td>9 11 10 2 11 2 2 0 0 0 0 0 * 0 0 0 0 0 * 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0, Predom 0, Unif* 0, Predom 0, Unif* 0, Predom -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:42-19</td>
<td>0 3 0 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 0 * 0 0 0 0 0 * 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0, Predom 0, Unif* 0, Predom 0, Unif* 0, Unif 0, Predom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:42-28</td>
<td>9 9 9 0 0 2 0 2 2 0 0 0 * 0 0 0 0 0 * 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 - 0, Unif* 0, Predom 0, Unif - 0, Unif -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

132
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16:13-40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:14-16*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:16-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:18-10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:19-37*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:23-22*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:23-31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:33-28*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:01-07</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:01-10*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:01-13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:05-13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:11-31*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:14-19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:20-19*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:20-25*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:21-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:01-43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:01-64*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:03-10*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:03-31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:04-13*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:04-34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:05-13*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:05-25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:06-25*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:07-07*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:07-49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:14-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:28-16*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:31-67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:35-25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:36-46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Key to Textual Variation in John

1:3 παντα δι αυτου(1) εγενετο(1) και χωρις αυτου(2) εγενετο(2) ουδε εν ο γεγονεν

1:3-13 ουδε εν
2 ουδεν
   Heracleon P66 01* D fl
9 /NA/
   a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W

1:4 εν αυτο ζωη(1) ην(1) και η ζωη(2) ην(2) το φως των ανθρωπων

1:4-7 ην(1)
2 εστιν
   Heracleon 01 D a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W

1:5 και(1) το φως εν τη σκοτια(1) φαινει και(2) η σκοτια(2) αυτο ου κατελαβεν

1:5-4 εν τη σκοτια(1) φαινει
2 φαινει εν τη σκοτια
   b e
* /Missing/
P45 W

1:5-13 αυτο
2 αυτον
   a e
* /Missing/
P45 W

1:6 εγενετο ανθρωπος απεσταλμενος παρα θεου ονομα αυτω ιωαννης

1:6-10 θεου
2 + ην
   01* D*
9 /NA/
   a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W

1:12 οσοι δε ελαβον αυτον εδωκεν αυτοις εξουσιαν τεκνα θεου γενεσθαι
tois πιστεουσιν eis to onoma autou

1:12-4 δε
2 OM
   D e
οι ουκ εξ αιματων ουδε(1) εκ(1) θεληματος(1) σαρκος ουδε(2) εκ(2) θεληματος(2) ανδρος αλλ εκ(3) θεου εγεννηθησαν

οι ουδε(2) εκ(2) θεληματος(2) ανδρος

εγενηθησαν

ιωαννης μαρτυρει περι αυτου και κεκραγε λεγων ουτος ην(1) ον ειπον ο οπισω μου(1) ερχομενος εμπροσθεν μου(2) γεγονεν οτι πρωτος μου(3) ην(2)

λεγων

ην(1)

ον ειπον

Origen 01c B* C*
καὶ(1) εκ τοῦ πληρωματος αὐτοῦ ημείς παντες ἐλαβομεν καὶ(2) χαριν ἀντι χαριτος

καὶ(1)

οτι

Origen P66 P75 01 B C* D L 33 579 a b e UBS3

χαρις

χαρις δε

P66 a b e

θεον ουδεις εωρακε πωποτε ο(1) μονογενης υιος ο(2) ον εις τον κολπον του πατρος εκεινος εξηγησατο

πωποτε

ει μη

ο(1) μονογενης υιος

ο μονογενης θεος

μονογενης θεος

ο(2) ον

ο(1) μονογενης υιος

ο μονογενης θεος

μονογενης θεος

ο(2) ον

καὶ(1) αυτη εστιν η μαρτυρια του ιωαννου οτε απεστειλαν οι ιουδαιοι εξ ιεροσολυμων ιερεις καὶ(2) λευιταις ινα ερωτησωσιν αυτον συ τις ει
του
1:19-7
ΩM
Π* fl
1
/NA/
9
a be
*/Missing/
P45 D W

απεστειλαν
1:19-16
+ προς αυτον
Β C* 33 892c a b UBS3
*/Missing/
P45 D W

λευιτας
1:19-34
+ προς αυτον
P66c vid A Θ Π Ψ fl3 579 e
*/Missing/
P45 D W

ερωτησωσιν
1:19-37
ερωτησωσιν
ερωτησουσιν
P75 L Δ 33 579
9
/NA/
9
a be
d */Missing/
P45 D W

και(1) ωμολογησε και(2) ουκ(1) ηρνησατο και(3) ωμολογησεν οτι
1:20-10
και ουκ ηρνησατο ωμολογησεν
Cc L fl 33 b
και ουκ ηρνησατο
01 e
4
/OM
579
*/Missing/
P45 D W

ουκ(2) ειμι εγω
1:20-22
ουκ(2) ειμι εγω
~ 3,1,2 (εγω ουκ ειμι)
Origen P66 P75 01 A B C* L Δ Ψ 33 579 a b e UBS3
*/Missing/
P45 D W

και(1) ηρωτησαν αυτον τι ουν ηλιας ει(1) συ(1) και(2) λεγει ουκ
1:21
και(1) λεγει ουκ ειμι ο προφητης ει(2) συ(2) και(3) απεκρηθη ου

αυτον
1:21-7
+ παλιν
01c a
και εἶπον αὐτῷ

+ καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ
1241

+ πάλιν λεγοντες
b e

5 πάλιν
01*
* /Missing/
P45 D W

1:21-13 τι οὖν ἡλιας εἰ(1) σὺ(1)
2 τι οὖν σὺ ἡλιας εἰ
Origen P75 C* Ψ 33 UBS3
2 τις οὖν σὺ ἡλιας εἰ
P66
3 τι οὖν εἰ σὺ ἡλιας εἰ
e
4 τι οὖν ἡλιας εἰ
01 L a
5 σὺ οὖν τι ἡλιας εἰ
B
6 ἡλιας εἰ σὺ
b
* /Missing/
P45 D W

1:21-28 καὶ(2)
2 ΟΜ
01 a b
* /Missing/
P45 D W 565

1:21-37 εἰμι
2 + τι οὖν
a b
3 + απεκριθησαν
e
* /Missing/
P45 D W 565

1:22 εἰπον οὖν αὐτῷ τις εἰ ινα αποκρισιν δώμεν τοις πεμψασιν ημᾶς τι λέγεις περὶ σεαυτοῦ

1:22-10 αὐτῶ
2 ΟΜ
b e
3 αὐτῶ σὺ
P66c P75 E*
* /Missing/
P45 D W

1:24 καὶ οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι ήσαν εκ τῶν φαρισαίων

1:24-4 οἱ
2 ΟΜ
Origen P66 P75 01* A* B C* L Ψ UBS3
καὶ(1) ἠρωτήσαν αὐτὸν καὶ(2) εἶπον αὐτῷ τι ὁ αὐτὸς βαπτίζεις εἰ(1) σὺ ὁ εἰ(2) ο(1) χριστὸς οὔτε(1) ἡλίας οὔτε(2) ο(2) προφήτης καὶ(2) εἶπαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες

οὔτε(1) ἡλίας οὔτε(2) οὐδὲ οὔτε οὐδὲ ηλίας οὐδὲ

απεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγων ἐγὼ βαπτίζω ἐν υδάτι μεσὸς δὲ ὑμῶν ἐστῆκεν οὐ ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε
λεγον

εγω

βαπτιζω

υδατι

dε

esτηκεν

αυτος εστιν ο οπισω μου(1) ερχομενος ος εμπροσθεν μου(2) γεγονεν ου εγω ουκ ειμι αξιος ινα λυσω αυτου τον ιμαντα του υποδηματος

αυτος εστιν ο οπισω

οι στηκει
3 οπίσω
   Origen 01* B
*
   /Missing/
   P45 D W

1:27-16 ος εμπροσθεν μου(2) γεγονεν
2 OM
   Origen P66 P75 01 B C* L Ψ f1 33 579 1241 b UBS3
*
   /Missing/
   P45 D W

1:27-31 εγω ουκ ειμι αξιος
2 ~ 2,3,1,4 (ουκ ειμι εγω αξιος)
   Origen B Ψ f13 579 UBS3
3 ~ 2,3,4,1 (ουκ ειμι αξιος εγω)
   1241 a
4 ουκ ειμι αξιος
   01 C L 33 565
5 ουκ ειμι εγω ικανος
   P66c
6 ουκ ειμι ικανος
   Heracleon P66* P75
*
   /Missing/
   P45 D W

1:27-40 αυτου τον ιμαντα του υποδηματος
2 τον ιμαντα του υποδηματος αυτου
   P66 a b e
*
   /Missing/
   P45 D W

1:28 ταυτα εν βηθαβαρα εγενετο περαν του ιορδανου οπου ην ιωαννης
   βαπτιζον

1:28-7 εν βηθαβαρα εγενετο
2 εγενετο εν βηθανια
   P66 01* a b e
*
   /Missing/
   P45 D W

1:28-10 βηθαβαρα
3 βηθαραβα
   01c 892c
5 βηθανια
   Heracleon Origen P66 P75 01* A B C* E L Δ Θ Ψ*
   Ω 565 579 700 892* 1241 a b e UBS3
*
   /Missing/
   P45 D W

1:28-22 ην
2 + ο
   P66 P75 01 B C UBS3
9 /NA/
   a b e
*
   /Missing/
1:28-28 Ἰωάννης
2 + το πρῶτον
C f13 1241
* /Missing/
P45 D W

1:29 τῇ επαυριόν βλέπει ὁ(1) Ἰωάννης τὸν ἱησοῦν ερχομένον πρὸς αυτὸν
καὶ λέγει ἰδὲ ὁ(2) αμνὸς τοῦ(1) θεοῦ ὁ(3) αἱρὼν τὴν αμαρτίαν
tου(2) κόσμου

1:29-7 ὁ(1) Ἰωάννης
2 OM
Origen P66 P75 01 A B C* L Δ Θ* Π Ψ f1 33 565
579 700 892 1241 a UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 D W

1:29-19 θεοῦ
2 + ἰδὲ
a b
* /Missing/
P45 D W

1:30 οὗτος εστὶ περὶ ὦ εἰπὼν ὅπισώ μου(1) εἰρχεται ανὴρ ὁς
εμπροσθεῖν μου(2) γεγονέν αὐτὸς πρῶτος μου(3) ἦν

1:30-10 περὶ
2 ὑπερ
Origen P66 P75 01* B C* UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 D W

1:31 καὶ ὅσοι ἦδειν αὐτὸν ἀλλὰ ἵνα φανερωθῇ τῷ(1) ἵσραήλ διὰ τοῦτο
ηλθόν εἰς τῷ(2) ὕδατι βαπτίζων

1:31-13 ἡλθὼν εἰς
2 ~ 2,1 (εἰς ἡλθὼν)
C* 700 1241 b
* /Missing/
P45 D W

1:31-19 τῷ(2)
2 OM
Origen P66 P75 01 B C L Δ Θ Ψ f1 33 579 892 1241 UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 D W

1:32 καὶ(1) εἰμαρτυρήσειν Ἰωάννης λέγων ὅτι τεθέαμαι τὸ πνεῦμα
καταβαίνον ὑπερὶ περιστέραν εἰς οὐρανοῦ καὶ(2) εμείνεν ἐπὶ αὐτῶν
1:32-10 Ἰωάννης
2 ο Ἰωάννης
Origen Cc
9 /NA/
  a b e
* /Missing/
  P45 D W

1:32-13 λέγων
2 ΟΜ
  01* e
* /Missing/
  P45 D W

1:32-20 καταβαινον ὡσεὶ περιστεραν
3 ~ ὡς ,31 (ὡς περιστεραν καταβαινον)
  01 a b e
* /Missing/
  P45 D W

1:32-28 ὡσεὶ
2 ὡς
Origen P75 01 A B C E L Ω 33 565 579 UBS3
9 /NA/
  a b e
* /Missing/
  P45 D W

1:32-31 ἐξ
2 ἐκ τοῦ
  01 f1
9 /NA/
  a b e
* /Missing/
  P45 D W

1:32-34 εμείνεν
3 εμείνεν
  1241
4 μένον
  01 b e
* /Missing/
  P45 D W

1:33 καγὼ οὐκ ἔδειν αὐτὸν(1) ἀλλ. ο(1) πέμψας με βαπτίζειν εν(1)
  ὑδάτι εκεῖνος μοι εἰπεν εφ ὕν αν ἰδῆς το πνεῦμα καταβαινον καὶ
  μένον επ αὐτὸν(2) οὕτος εστὶν ο(2) βαπτίζων εν(2) πνεῦματι ἁγιω

1:33-7 καγὼ
2 καὶ εγώ
  01
9 [καγὼ /.:./ καὶ εγώ]
  a b e*
10 καὶ
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:33-16</td>
<td>ἐν(1) + τῷ Origen P66 01 f1 /NA/ a b e * /Missing/ P45 D W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:33-37</td>
<td>οὗτος αὐτὸς A b e * /Missing/ P45 D W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:33-40</td>
<td>πνεῦματι ἁγίῳ τῷ πνεῦματι τῷ ἁγίῳ L 33 579 /NA/ a b e * /Missing/ P45 D W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:34</td>
<td>καὶ γεωργακα καὶ μεμαρτυρηκα ότι οὗτος εστιν ὁ υἱὸς του θεοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:34-10</td>
<td>ὁ υἱὸς ὁ εκλεκτὸς 01 a b e 3 /NA/ a * /Missing/ P45 D W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:35</td>
<td>τῇ επαύριον πάλιν ειστηκε ο ἰωάννης καὶ εκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δυο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:35-4</td>
<td>πάλιν ειστηκε 2 ειστηκε πάλιν 579 5 ειστηκε P75 Ψ 6 δὲ ειστηκε e 7 δὲ b * /Missing/ P45 D W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:35-13</td>
<td>ὁ 2 OM P75 B L /NA/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1:35-19 ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο
2 αἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ δύο
b e * /Missing/
P45 D W

1:36 καὶ εμβλεψας τῷ ιησοῦ περιπατοῦντι λέγει ἵδε ὁ αμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ

1:36-10 θεοῦ
2 ὁ αἰρὼν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου
P66* C* 892 1241 a *
* /Missing/
P45 D W

1:38 στραφεῖς δὲ(1) ο(1) ἱησοῦς καὶ θεασάμενος αὐτοῦς ἀκολουθοῦντας
λέγει αὐτοῖς τι ζητεῖτε τι δέ(2) εἰπὸν αὐτῷ ῥαββὶ ο(2) λέγεται
ερμηνευομενον διδασκάλε ποι μενεις

1:38-4 στραφεῖς δὲ(1)
3 στραφεῖς
01* E Ω
4 καὶ στραφεῖς
e *
* /Missing/
P45 D W

1:38-13 ἀκολουθοῦντας
2 + autw
P66 C* 1241 a b e *
* /Missing/
P45 D W

1:38-19 τι
2 τίνα
Θ f13
3 τι θέλειτε η τίνα
e *
* /Missing/
P45 D W

1:38-34 λέγεται ερμηνευομενον
3 λέγεται μεθερμηνευομενον
Origen P66 P75 01c A B C L Ψ 33 579 892 UBS3
9 [λέγεται ερμηνευομενον / ./ λέγεται μεθερμηνευομενον]
a
10 ερμηνευεται
f1 b e *
* /Missing/
P45 D W
λέγει αυτοίς ερχεσθε καὶ(1) ἰδετε ἡλθον καὶ(2) εἶδον που μενεὶ
καὶ(3) παρ’ αυτῷ εμείναν τὴν ἡμέραν εκείνην ὥρα δὲ τὴν ἕως δεκατη

ιδετε

τὴν ἡμέραν εκείνην

ην ανδρεάς ο αδελφὸς σιμώνος πέτρου εἰς εκ τῶν(1) δυο τῶν(2)
ακούσαντον παρὰ ἰωάννου καὶ ακολουθήσαντων αὐτῶ

tον(2)

ευρίσκει αὐτοῖς πρῶτος τὸν(1) αδελφόν τὸν(2) ἰδίον σιμώνα καὶ
λέγει αὐτῷ εὐρηκαμεν τὸν(3) μεσσιάν ο(1) εστὶ μεθερμηνευομεν
ο(2) χριστὸς

μεθερμηνευομενον

ο(2) χριστὸς

τη επαυριον ηθελησεν ο ιησους εξελθειν εις την γαλιλαιαν καὶ(1)
eυρισκει φιλιππον καὶ(2) λεγει αυτω ακολουθει μοι

ο ιησους

1:45 ευρίσκει φίλιππος τον(1) ναθαναηλ καὶ(1) λέγει αὐτῷ οὖν
gεγραμμένης εἰς τὸ νόμον καὶ(2) οἱ προφῆται ευρήκαμεν ἢςουν τὸν(2)
υἱὸν τοῦ ιωσήφ τὸν(3) απὸ ναζαρετ

1:45-33 τὸν(2) υἱὸν
2 υἱὸν
P66 P75 01 B 33 579 UBS3
9 [τὸν υἱὸν / . . . υἱὸν]
Origen
9 /NA/
    a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C D W

1:45-39 τοῦ
2 ΟΜ
    Λ Δ Π* 33
9 /NA/
    a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C D W

1:51 καὶ(1) λέγει αὐτῷ αμὴν(1) αμὴν(2) λέγω Ϝμῖν αὐτῷ οὕνεις
τὸν(1) οὐρανὸν ανεωγοτα καὶ(2) τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ(1) θεοῦ
ἀναβάινοντας καὶ(3) καταβάινοντας εἰπ ὑμῖν(2) υἱὸν(2)
ἀνθρωποῦ

1:51-16 αὐτῷ
2 ΟΜ
    Origen P66 P75 01 B L 579 a b UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 C D W

2:1 καὶ(1) τῇ(1) ἡμέρᾳ τῇ(2) τρίτῃ γαμὸς ἐγενέτο ἐν κανὰ τῆς
γαλιλαίας καὶ(2) ἦν ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ ιησοῦ εκεῖ

2:1-7 τῇ(1) ἡμέρᾳ τῇ(2) τρίτῃ
2 τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ
    B Θ f13 b e
* /Missing/
P45 C D W

2:6 ἦσαν δὲ εκεῖ υδραία λιθίναι εξ οἰκείων κατὰ τὸν καθαρισμὸν τῶν
ιουδαίων χωρουσαί ανά μέρηνς δύο τρεῖς

2:6-16 οἰκείων
2 ΟΜ
    01 a e
* /Missing/
P45 C D W
2:11 ταυτην εποιησε την(1) αρχην των σημειων ο ιησους εν κανα της γαλιλαιας και(1) εφανερωσε την(2) δοξαν αυτου(1) και(2) επιστευσαν εις αυτον οι μαθηται αυτου(2)

2:11-16 την(1) αρχην
2 αρχην
Origen P66c P75 A B L Θ Ψ f1 33 565 579 UBS3
9 [την αρχην / ∴ αρχην]
10 πρωτην αρχην
P66* a b
* /Missing/
P45 C D W

2:12 μετα τουτο κατεβη εις καπερναουμ αυτος και(1) η μητηρ αυτου(1)
και(2) οι(1) αδελφοι αυτου(2) και(3) οι(2) μαθηται αυτου(3)
και(4) εκει εμειναν ου πολλας ημερας

2:12-22 οι(1) αδελφοι αυτου(2) και(3) οι(2) μαθηται αυτου(3)
2 οι αδελφοι και οι μαθηται
Origen L
3 οι αδελφοι και οι μαθηται αυτου
P66* P75 B Ψ
4 οι αδελφοι αυτου
01 b e
5 οι αδελφοι
a
6 οι μαθηται αυτου
579
7 οι μαθηται αυτου και οι αδελφοι αυτου
Π* 1241
* /Missing/
P45 C D W

2:12-31 εμειναν
2 εμεινεν
P66c A f1 565 1241 b
* /Missing/
P45 C D W

2:13 και(1) εγγυς ην το πασχα των ιουδαιων και(2) ανεβη εις ιεροσολυμα ο ιησους

2:13-13 εις ιεροσολυμα ο ιησους
2 ~ 3,4,1,2 (ο ιησους εις ιεροσολυμα)
P66 P75 L 1241 b e
3 εις ιεροσολυμα
f13
6 ο ιησους εις ιεροσολυμα ιησους
A
* /Missing/
P45 C D W
και(1) ευρεν εν τω ιερω τους(1) πωλουντας βοας και(2) προβατα και(3) περιστερας και(4) τους(2) κερματιστας καθημενους

βοας και(2) προβατα και τα προβατα και βοας

και(1) ποιησας φραγελλιον εκ(1) σχοινιων παντας εξεβαλεν εκ(2) του ιερου τα τε προβατα και(2) τους βοας και(3) των κολλυβιστων εξεχεε το κερμα και(4) τας τραπεζας ανεστρεψε

και(1) ποιησας φραγελλιον εκ(1) σχοινιων εποιησεν φραγελλιον εκ σχοινιων και

ποιησας

τα τε τα και τα

το κερμα τα κερματα

τραπεζας

ανεστρεψε
και τοις τας περιστερας πωλουσιν ειπεν αρατε ταυτα εντευθεν μη ποιειτε τον οικον(1) του πατρος μου οικον(2) εμποριου

εντευθεν

εμνησθησαν δε οι μαθηται αυτου οτι γεγραμμενον εστιν ο ζηλος του οικου σου κατεφαγε με

γεγραμμενον εστιν

κατεφαγε

απεκριθησαν ουν οι ιουδαιοι και ειπον αυτω τι σημειο δεικνυεις ημιν οτι ταυτα ποιεις

απεκριθη ο ιησους και(1) ειπεν αυτοις λυσατε τον ναον τουτον και(2) εν τρισιν ημεραις εγερω αυτον
2:19-13  ο
2  OM
   Origen P66 P75 Α Β Ε Λ Δ Θ Ψ 700 892 1241 UBS3
9  /NA/
   a b e
* /Missing/
   P45 C D W

2:20  εἰπον οὖν οἱ Ἑβραῖοι τεσσαράκοντα καὶ(1) εξ ἔτεσιν ἀκοδομήθη ὁ
   ναὸς αὐτὸς καὶ(2) σὺ εν τρισίν ἡμέραις ἐγερεῖς αὐτὸν

2:20-4  εἰπον οὖν οἱ Ἑβραῖοι
2  καὶ οἱ Ἑβραῖοι εἶπαν
4  εἰπαν οὖν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἑβραῖοι
33  θ 33
* /Missing/
   P45 C D W

2:20-25  εν
2  OM
   01 a
* /Missing/
   P45 C D W

2:20-31  ἐγερεῖς
2  ἐγερεῖς
33  b e
* /Missing/
   P45 C D W

2:22  οὖτε οὖν ἤκρηκεν εἰς νεκρῶν ἐμνησθῆσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι τούτῳ
   ἔλησαν αὐτοῖς καὶ(1) εἰπε τῷ λόγῳ ὁ εἶπεν
   ὁ Ἰησοῦς

2:22-22  αὐτοῖς
2  OM
   Origen P66 P75 01 Α Β Ε Λ Δ Θ Ψ f1 f13 33 579 700
   892 1241 a b e UBS3
* /Missing/
   P45 C D W

2:22-28  ὁ
2  o
1241
3  ον
   Origen P66 P75 01 Β Λ UBS3
9  /NA/
   a b e
* /Missing/
   P45 C D W
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2:23 ος δὲ ην εν (1) ιεροσολυμοις εν (2) τω πασχα εν (3) τη εορτη
πολλοι επιστευσαν εις το ονομα αυτου (1) θεωρουντες αυτου (2) τα
σημεια α επουε

2:23-10 εν (1)
2 + τοις
Origen P66 P75 01 A B E L Δ Θ Π Ω f1 f13 579
700 892 UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C D W

2:23-19 αυτου (2) τα σημεια
2 ~ 2,3,1 (τα σημεια αυτου)
892 1241
3 τα σημεια
fl a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C D W

2:24 αυτος δε ο ιησους ουκ επιστευεν εαυτον αυτοις δια το αυτον
γινωσκειν παντας

2:24-7 ο ιησους
2 ιησους
Origen P66 P75 B L 1241 UBS3
9 [ο ιησους /∴/ ιησους]
a b
10 OM
e
* /Missing/
P45 C D W

2:24-13 εαυτον
2 αυτον
01* A* B L 700 UBS3
9 [εαυτον /∴/ αυτον]
a b e
10 OM
P75 579
* /Missing/
P45 C D W

2:24-16 αυτοις
2 εαυτοις
A* 33
* /Missing/
P45 C D W

2:24-22 αυτον
2 OM
01 a b
* /Missing/
P45 C D W
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2:24-28 παντας
   2 παντα
   Ε f13
* /Missing/  
P45 C D W

2:25 και οι συ χρειαν ειχεν ινα τις μαρτυρησι περι του ανθρωπου
    αυτου γαρ εγινοσκε τι ην εν τω ανθρωπω

2:25-22 του ανθρωπου
   2 ανθρωπου
   Origen P66
   9 [του ανθρωπου / ∴/ ανθρωπου]
   a e
   10 αυτου
   b
* /Missing/  
P45 C D W

3:2 ουτος ηλθε προς τον ιησουν νυκτος και ειπεν αυτω ραββι οιδαμεν
    οτι απο θεου εληλυ θας διδασκαλος ουδεις γαρ ταυτα τα σημεια
    δυναται ποιειν α συ ποιεις εαν μη η ο θεος μετ αυτου

3:2-22 ουδεις γαρ
   2 και ουδεις
   01 e
* /Missing/  
P45 C D W

3:2-25 ταυτα τα σημεια δυναται
   3 ~ 4,1,2,3 (δυναται ταυτα τα σημεια)
   P66 P75 01 A B L Ψ 33 579 892 1241 a b e UBS3
   3 δυναται τα σημεια ταυτα
   Origen
* /Missing/  
P45 C D W

3:2-34 ποιειν
   2 ποιησαι
   fl 565
   9 /NA/  
a b e
* /Missing/  
P45 C D W

3:2-37 α συ ποιεις
   2 OM
   fl 565
* /Missing/  
P45 C D W
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3:2-46 η ο θεος
1 ο θεος η
    a
3 ο θεος P66* L
* /Missing/
P45 C D W

3:14 και καθως μιωσης υψωσε τον(1) οφιν εν τη ερημω ουτως υψωθηναι
dei ton(2) ουιον του ανθρωπου

3:14-19 υψωθηναι dei ton(2) ουιον του ανθρωπου
2 dei ton ουιον του ανθρωπου υψωθηναι
    33
3 dei υψωθηναι ουιον του ανθρωπου
A a
* /Missing/
P45 C D W

3:20 πας γαρ ο φαυλα πρασσων μισει το(1) φως(1) και ουκ ερχεται προς
to(2) φως(2) ινα μη ελεγχθη τα εργα αυτου

3:20-13 και ουκ ερχεται προς to(2) φως(2)
2 OM
    01* 579
* /Missing/
P45 C D W

3:22 μετα ταυτα ηλθεν ο ιησους και(1) οι μαθηται αυτου εις την
ιουδαιαν γην και(2) εκει διετριβε μετ αυτων και(3) εβαπτιζεν

3:22-7 ηλθεν
2 απηλθεν
    33 a b
* /Missing/
P45 C D W

3:22-10 o
2 OM
    A Π
9 /NA/
    a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C D W

3:23 ην(1) δε και(1) ιωαννης βαπτιζων εν αινων εγγυς του σαλειμ οτι
υδατα πολλα ην(2) εκει και(2) παρεγινοντο και(3) εβαπτιζοντο

3:23-4 και(1)
2 OM
    a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C D W
καὶ εἰς τήν

οὐπώ γαρ ἦν βεβλημένος εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν ὁ Ἰωάννης

εἰς τῶν μαθητῶν Ἰωάννου μετὰ Ἰουδαίων περὶ καθαρισμοῦ

καὶ ἠλθὼν πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάννην καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ ραββί οὗ ἦν μετὰ σου περὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ὡς σὺ μεμαρτυρήσας ἵνα αὐτὸς βαπτίζῃ καὶ πάντες ερχόνται πρὸς αὐτόν

τὸν
3:26-31  ἴδε
2  ἴδου
   D f1 565
9  /NA/
   a b e
*  /Missing/
   P45 C W

3:31  ο(1) ανωθεν ερχομενος(1) επανω(1) παντων(1) εστιν ο(2) αν εκ(1)
   της(1) γης(1) εκ(2) της(2) γης(2) εστι(1) και εκ(3) της(3)
   γης(3) λαλει ο(3) εκ(4) του ουρανου ερχομενος(2) επανω(2)
   παντων(2) εστι(2)

3:31-19  εκ(1)
2  apo
   D Θ f13 b
3  eΠ
   01* a e
*  /Missing/
   P45 C W 1241

3:31-34  o(3)
2  + δε
   b e
3  + αν
   P66*
*  /Missing/
   P45 C W 579

3:31-43  επανω(2) παντων(2) εστι(2)
2  OM
   P75 01* D f1 565 a b e
*  /Missing/
   P45 C W 579

3:32  και(1) ο εωρακε και(2) ηκουσε τουτο
   και(3) την
   μαρτυριαν αυτου ουδεις λαμβανει

3:32-4  και(1) ο
2  o
   Origen P66 P75 01c B D E L Ψ f1 33 565 579 a b e UBS3
3  αν
   01*
*  /Missing/
   P45 C W

3:32-19  τουτο
2  OM
   01 D f1 565 a b e
*  /Missing/
   P45 C W

4:1  ὡς ουν εγνω ο κυριος στι(1) ηκουσαν οι φαρισαιοι στι(2) ιησους
    πλειονας μαθητας ποιει και βαπτιζει η ιωαννης
4:1-40 η
5 OM
   A B* L Ψ 579 892
9 /NA/
   a b e
* /Missing/
   P45 W

4:3 οφίκε την(1) ιουδαιαν και απήλθε παλιν εις την(2) γαλιλαιαν

4:3-13 ιουδαιαν
2 + γην
   D Θ f1 f13 565 a b e
* /Missing/
   P45 W

4:5 ερχεται ουν εις πολιν της σαμαρειας λεγομενην συχαιρ πλησιον του
   χωριου ο εδωκεν ιακωβ ιωσηφ τω υιω αυτου

4:5-55 ο
2 ου
   P66 C* D L Θ Ω f1 33 565 700 1241
9 /NA/
   a b e
* /Missing/
   P45 W

4:5-67 ιωσηφ τω υιω αυτου
2 τω ιωσηφ [τω υιω αυτου]
   Origen
2 τω ιωσηφ τω υιω αυτου
   P66 P75 01 B UBS3
9 [ιωσηφ /∴/ τω υιω αυτου]
   ου
10 ~ 2,3,4,1 (τω υιω αυτου ιωσηφ)
   a e
* /Missing/
   P45 W

4:6 ην(1) δε εκει πηγη(1) του ιακωβ ο υιω ιησους κεκοπιακως εκ της
   οδοιποριας εκαθεζετο ουτος επι τη πηγη(2) εφα ην(2) οσει εκτη

4:6-31 τη πηγη(2)
2 την πηγην
   L
9 [τη πηγη /∴/ την πηγην]
   a b e
10 τη γη
   P66* 1241
* /Missing/
   P45 W
4:9 λέγει οὖν αὐτῷ ἡ(1) γυνὴ ἡ(2) σαμαρείτις πῶς σὺ ιουδαίος ὁν παρ
ἐμουσίειν αἰτεῖς υσῆς γυναίκος σαμαρειτιδός σοι γαρ συγχρονται
ιουδαῖοι σαμαρείταις

4:9-58 οὖ γαρ συγχρονται ιουδαιοι σαμαρειταις

2 ΟΜ
01* D a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:10 απεκρίθη ἤσσος καὶ(1) εἰπεν αὐτῇ εἰ ἡδεὶς τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ(2) τις ἔστιν ὁ λέγων σοι(1) δος μοι πιεῖν σὺ αν(1) ἡτήςας αὐτὸν καὶ(3) εἴδωκεν αν(2) σοι(2) ύδωρ ζων

4:10-31 μοι
2 + ύδωρ
700 1241
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:10-55 αν(2)
2 ΟΜ
L Ω
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:11 λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ γυνὴ κυρίε οὔτε ἀντλημα εχεῖς(1) καὶ το(1) φρεαρ ἐστι βαθὺ ποθὲν οὖν εχεῖς(2) τὸ(2) ύδωρ τὸ(3) ζων

4:11-4 λέγει
2 καὶ λέγει
Origen e
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:11-7 η γυνη
2 ΟΜ
P75 B
3 εκεῖνη
01*
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:11-40 οὖν
2 ΟΜ
01 D a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:12 μὴ σοι μείζων εἰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν ἰακωβ οὐς εἴδωκεν ἡμῖν τὸ φρεαρ καὶ(1) αὐτὸς εξ αὐτοῦ(1) επει καὶ(2) οἱ ὁμο αὐτοῦ(2) καὶ(3) τὰ ἁρεματα αὐτοῦ(3)
4:12-22 ος
3 οστις
01 Θ
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:12-28 εδώκεν
2 δεδώκεν
Origen P66 P75 C f13
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:12-40 φρεάρ
2 + τουτο
f13 a b vid e
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:12-55 οι
2 OM
P66 579
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:14 ος δ αν πιη εκ του υδάτος(1) ου(1) εγώ δώσω(1) αυτω(1) ου(2) μη
dιψήση εις(1) τον αιωνα αλλα το υδωρ ο δώσω(2) αυτω(2)
genησεται εν αυτω(3) πηγη υδατος(2) αλλομενου εις(2) ζωην
αιωνιον

4:14-7 ος δ αν πιη
2 ο δε πινων
01* D
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:14-55 εν αυτω(3) πηγη
2 πηγη εν αυτω
Origen P66
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:15 λέγει προς αυτον η γυνη κυριε δος μοι τουτο το υδωρ ινα μη διψω
μηδε ερχομαι ενθαδε αντλειν

4:15-22 διψω
2 διψησω
P66* D
9 /NA/
4:15-28 ἐρχομαι
2 ἐρχομαι
01c Ε Λ Θ Ψ f13 33 700 892 1241
9 [ἐρχομαι | ἐρχομαι]
  a b e
10 διερχομαι
P75 B
11 διερχομαι
Heracleon Origen P66 01* UBS3
* /Missing/
  P45 W

4:16 λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὑπαγε φωνῆσον τὸν ἀνδρά σου καὶ ελθε ἐνθάδε

4:16-4 ὁ Ἰησοῦς
2 Ἰησοῦς
01* Α Θ Π f1 f13
9 [ὁ Ἰησοῦς | Ἰησοῦς]
  b e
10 OM
  Origen P66 P75 B C* a UBS3
* /Missing/
  P45 W 33

4:16-10 τον ἀνδρά σου
2 ~ 3,1,2 (σου τὸν ἀνδρά)
  B
9 [σου τὸν ἀνδρά | τὸν ἀνδρά σου]
  Heracleon Origen
* /Missing/
  P45 W

4:17 απεκρίθη ἡ γυνὴ καὶ εἰπεν οὐκ(1) εχω(1) ἀνδρα(1) λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς καλώς εἶπας ὅτι ἀνδρα(2) οὐκ(2) εχω(2)

4:17-10 εἰπεν
2 + αυτῷ
  P66 P75 B C E 33 892 1241 a b UBS3
* /Missing/
  P45 W

4:17-13 οὐκ(1) εχω(1) ἀνδρα(1)
2 ~ 3,1,2 (ἀνδρα οὐκ εχω)
  01 C* D L 1241
* /Missing/
  P45 W 33

4:17-46 εχω(2)
2 εχεῖς
  Heracleon 01 D b e
* /Missing/
4:18 πεντε γαρ ανδρας εσχες και ναν ον εχεις ουκ εστι σου ανηρ τουτο αληθες ειρηκας

4:18-31 αληθες
2 αληθας
01 E
9 /NA/
 a b e
* /Missing/ P45 W

4:19 λεγει αυτω η γυνη κυριε θεωρω οτι προφητης ει συ

4:19-16 συ
2 OM
 D a b e
* /Missing/ P45 W

4:20 οι πατερες ημων εν τουτω τω ορει προσεκυνησαν και υμεις λεγετε οτι εν(2) ιεροσολυμοις εστιν ο τοπος οπου δει προσκυνειν

4:20-10 τουτω τω ορει
2 ~ 2,3,1 (τω ορει τουτω)
 Heracleon Origen P66 P75 01 A B C D E L ∆ Θ Π Ψ
 Ω f1 f13 33 579 700 892 1241 UBS3
* /Missing/ P45 W

4:20-49 δει προσκυνειν
2 ~ 2,1 (προσκυνειν δει)
 Origen P66 P75 01 A B C* D L Ψ 33 892 b UBS3
* /Missing/ P45 W

4:21 λεγει αυτη ο ιησους γυναι πιστευσον μοι οτι ερχεται ωρα οτε ουτε(1) εν(1) τω(1) ορει ουτε(2) εν(2) ιεροσολυμοις προσκυνησετε τοι(2) πατρι

4:21-13 γυναι πιστευσον μοι
4 γυναι πιστευσον
Δ
5 πιστευε μοι γυναι
 Heracleon Origen P66 P75 01 B C L Ψ 892 1241 b UBS3
* /Missing/ P45 W

4:21-19 πιστευσον
2 πιστευε
 Heracleon Origen P66 P75 01 B C* D L f1 f13 565 1241 UBS3
9 /NA/
 a b e
* /Missing/
4:21-37  οτε
2  οτι
   A Θ 579 892
*  /Missing/
P45 W

4:21-52  τω(1) ορει τουτω
3  τουτω τω ορει
   D a b e
5  τω κοσμω τουτω
   P66*
*  /Missing/
P45 W

4:23  αλλ` ερχεται ώρα και(1) νυν εστιν οτι οι αληθινοι προσκυνηται
   προσκυνησουσι τω πατρι εν πνευματι και(2) αληθεια και(3) γαρ ο
   πατηρ τοιουτους ζητει τους προσκυνουντας αυτον

4:23-58  αυτον
2  αυτω
   P66* 01*
9  /NA/
   a b e
*  /Missing/
P45 W

4:23-61  αυτον
2  + εν πνευματι
   a b
*  /Missing/
P45 W

4:24  πνευμα ο θεος και(1) τους προσκυνουντας αυτον εν πνευματι
   και(2) αληθεια δει προσκυνειν

4:24-10  αυτον
3  ΟΜ
   Heracleon 01* D*
*  /Missing/
P45 W

4:24-19  δει προσκυνειν
2  προσκυνειν δει
   01* D
3  δει
   e
*  /Missing/
P45 W

4:25  λεγει αυτω η γυνη οιδα οτι μεσσιας ερχεται ο λεγομενος χριστος
   οταν ελθη εκεινος αναγινει ημιν παντα
οιδα
οιδαμεν

οταν
+ ουν
b e

αναγγέλει
αναγγέλει
01* D

παντα
απαντα

και(1) επι τουτω ηλθον οι μαθηται αυτου και(2) εθαυμασαν στι

και(1) επι τουτω ηλθον οι μαθηται αυτου και(2) εθαυμασαν στι

επι τουτο

ηλθον

εθαυμασαν

ελαλει
2 λαλεῖ
Θ 579 a b
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:27-43 εἶπε
2 + αὐτῷ
01 D a b
3 + τῇ γυναικὶ
e
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:28 αφῆκεν οὖν τὴν(1) υδρίαν αὐτῆς η γυνη καὶ(1) απῆλθεν εἰς τὴν(2) πόλιν καὶ(2) λέγει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις

4:28-4 αφῆκεν οὖν τὴν(1) υδρίαν αὐτῆς η γυνη
2 αφῆκεν οὖν τὴν γυνὴν τὴν υδρίαν αὐτῆς
D b
3 η γυνη οὖν αφεῖσα τῆς υδρίας
e
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:28-37 λέγει
2 εἶπεν
1241 a b
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:29 δεῦτε ἴδετε ἀνθρώπον ὁς εἶπε μοι πάντα οὐσα εποίησα μητὶ οὕτως εστιν ο ἁριστός

4:29-16 οὐσα
2 α
01 B C* a e
9 [α /./ / οὐσα]
Origen
10 + α
579
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:30 εξῆλθον οὖν εκ τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἠρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν

4:30-7 εξῆλθον
2 εξῆρχοντο
L 1241
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:31 εν δὲ τῷ μεταξὺ ἡρωτῶν αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ λέγοντες ῥαββί φαγε
4:31-22 αυτον
   3 OM
   Δ a
   * /Missing/
P45 W

4:31-25 οι μαθηται
   2 OM
   1241
   3 + αυτου
   Θ Πε Ω 33 e
   * /Missing/
P45 W

4:32 ο δε ειπεν αυτοις εγω βρωσιν εχω φαγειν ην υμεις ουκ οιδατε

4:32-7 ο δε
   3 OM
   a e
   4 επι τουτω
   b
   * /Missing/
P45 W

4:33 ελεγον ουν οι μαθηται προς αλληλους μη τις ηνεγκεν αυτω φαγειν

4:33-7 ελεγον
   3 λεγουσι
   * /Missing/
P45 W

4:33-10 ουν
   2 δε
   D a b
   3 OM
   * /Missing/
P45 W

4:33-13 οι μαθηται προς αλληλους
   2 ~ 3,4,1,2 (προς αλληλους οι μαθηται)
f13
   3 οι μαθηται αυτου προς αλληλους
   a b e
   4 οι μαθηται
   579
   5 προς αλληλους
   1241
   6 εν εαυτοις οι μαθηται
   D
   * /Missing/
P45 W
4:34 λέγει αυτοῖς ὁ ἴησος ὑμῶν βρῶμα εστὶν ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ(1) θέλημα του πεμψάντος με καὶ τελείοσω αὐτοῦ τὸ(2) εργόν

4:34-25 ποιῶ
2 ποιησῶ
Heracleon Origen P66 P75 B C D L Θ Π Ψ f1 33 565 579
UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:35 οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετε στὶ(1) ετι τετραμηνὸν ἐστὶ καὶ(1) ὁ θερισμὸς ερχεται ἢδου λέγω υμῖν επαρατε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς υμῶν καὶ(2) θεασασθε τας χωρας στὶ(2) λευκαι εἰσι πρὸς θερισμὸν ἡδη

4:35-25 ετι
2 OM
P75 D L Π* f13 1241
9 [OM / eti]
Origen
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:35-37 ιδοὺ λέγω υμῖν
2 OM
f1 565 1241
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:36 καὶ(1) ὁ(1) θεριζων(1) μισθὸν λαμβάνει καὶ(2) συναγει καρπὸν εἰς ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἵνα καὶ(3) ὁ(2) σπειρὼν ὁμοῦ χαῖρῃ καὶ(4) ὁ(3) θεριζων(2)

4:36-7 καὶ(1)
2 OM
Origen P66 P75 01 B C* D L Ψ 33 a b e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:36-34 καὶ(3)
2 OM
Heracleon Origen P66 P75 B C L Ψ f1 33 565 892 1241 e
UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:36-40 ὁμοῦ χαίρῃ καὶ(4) ὁ(3) θεριζων(2)
2 ὁμοῦ χαίρῃ καὶ θεριζων
P66 Θ
3 καὶ ο θεριζων ὁμοῦ χαρη
D
4 ὁμοῦ χαίρῃ μετὰ τοῦ θεριζόντος
e
* /Missing/
4:37 εν γὰρ τούτῳ ὁ λόγος εστὶν (1) ἀληθινὸς οτι ἀλλος (2) σπειρων καὶ ἀλλος (2) θεριζων

4:37-10 ο (1) λόγος εστὶν (1)
2 ~ 3,1,2 (εστὶν ο λόγος)
* /Missing/
P45 P75 W

4:37-22 ο (2) ἀληθινὸς
2 ἀληθινὸς
Heraclion Origen B C* L Δ Π* Ψ 33 565 700 1241 UBS3
3 ἀληθῆς
fl 579
4 ἀληθείας
a
* /Missing/
P45 P75 W

4:38 εγὼ απέστειλα υμᾶς θεριζεῖν ο ουχ υμεῖς (1) κεκοπιακατε αλλοι κεκοπιακασι και υμεῖς (2) εις τον κοπον αυτων εισελήλυθατε

4:38-7 απεστειλα
2 απεσταλκα
01 D
9 /NA/
ab e
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:38-13 ο
4 OM
D* L e
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:39 εκ δε της (1) πόλεως εκεινης πολλοι επιστευσαν εις αυτον των σαμαρειτων δια τον λογον της (2) γυναικος μαρτυρουσης οτι ειπε μοι παντα οσα εποιησα

4:39-16 εις αυτον των σαμαρειτων
2 ~ 3,4,1,2 (των σαμαρειτων εις αυτον)
fl
4 των σαμαρειτων
01* a e
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:39-58 οσα
2 α
Origen P75 01 B C* L b e UBS3
* /Missing/
4:40 ος ουν ἠλθὸν προς αὐτόν(1) οἱ σαμαρειται ἠρωτῶν αὐτόν(2) μεναι
pαρ αὐτοῖς καὶ εμεῖνεν ἐκεί δυο ἡμέρας

4:40-4 ος ουν ἠλθὸν προς αὐτόν(1)
2 ος ουν συνηλθὸν προς αὐτόν
Be
3 ος ἠλθὼν ουν προς αὐτόν
Be2 a
4 ἠλθὼν ουν προς αὐτόν
e
5 συνηλθὸν ουν προς αὐτόν
B*
7 ος ουν ἦκουσαν
1241
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:41 καὶ πολλῷ πλεῖους επιστεύσαν διὰ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ

4:41-10 πλεῖους
2 πλεῖον
P75 e
* /Missing/
P45 W a

4:41-13 επιστεύσαν
2 + εἰς αὐτὸν
Θ f13 892 1241 b
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:42 τῇ τῇ γυναίκι εἶλεγον στὶ(1) οὐκετὶ διὰ τὴν σην λαλιάν
πιστεύομεν αὐτοὶ γαρ ακηκοαμεν καὶ οἰδαμεν στὶ(2) οὐτος ἐστὶν
ἀληθῶς ο(1) σωτήρ του κοσμου ο(2) χριστός

4:42-4 τῇ τῇ γυναίκι εἶλεγον
2 τῇ δε γυναίκι εἶλεγον
Origen P66 D E
9 τῇ [τῇ /··/ δὲ] γυναίκι εἶλεγον
a
10 εἶλεγον δε τῇ γυναίκι
e
11 καὶ εἶλεγον τῇ γυναίκι
01* b
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:42-19 στὶ(1)
3 ΟΜ
Origen B b
* /Missing/
P45 W
σην λαλιαν
λαλιαν σου

Origen P75 B
/NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W

μαρτυριαν

Heracleon 01* D b
* /Missing/
P45 W

αυτοι
αυτου

D a
* /Missing/
P45 W

ακηκοαμεν

+ παρ αυτου
01 Πc f1 f13
* /Missing/
P45 W

ουτος εστιν αληθως ο(1) σωτηρ
αληθως ουτος εστιν ο σωτηρ
ο1

/ /ουτος εστιν αληθως / /αληθως ουτος εστιν / /ο σωτηρ
Origen
ουτος αληθως ο σωτηρ εστιν
e
ουτος εστιν ο σωτηρ
Heracleon Π1241
* /Missing/
P45 W

ο(2) χριστος

OM
Origen P66 P75 01 B C* a b UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 W

μετα δε τας δυο ημερας εξηλθεν εκειθεν και απηλθεν εις την γαλιλαιαν

και απηλθεν

OM
Origen P66 P75 01 B C D f13 892 1241 b e UBS3
και ηλθεν
L
* /Missing/
P45 W a
4:44 αυτος γαρ ο ιησους εμαρτυρησεν στις προφητης εν τη ιδια πατριδι
τιμην ουκ εχε

4:44-10 ο ιησους
2 ιησους
Origen P66 P75 01 A B C D E Δ Θ Π* fl 33 579 892
9 [ο ιησους / ./ ιησους]
a b e
10 OM
Ψ
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:45 στε ουν ηλθεν εις(1) την(1) γαλιλαιαν εδεξαντο αυτον οι
γαλιλαιοι παντα εωρακοτες α εποιησεν εν(1) ιεροσολυμοις εν(2)
tη εορτη και αυτοι γαρ ηλθον εις(2) την(2) εορτην

4:45-4 στε
2 ος
01* D e
9 /NA/
a b
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:45-37 παντα εωρακοτες
2 οι εωρακοτες παντα
01* a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:45-40 παντα
2 παντες
a e
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:45-49 a
2 οσα
Origen P66 P75 01c A B C L Θ Πε Ψ fl f13 33 565 579
892 1241 a b e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:45-64 εν(2)
2 OM
D e
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:45-73 ηλθον
4 εληλυθεισαν
01 a b e
* /Missing/
4:46 ηλθεν ουν ο(1) ιησους παλιν εις την κανα της γαλιλαιας οπου
εποιησε το υδωρ οινον και ην τις βασιλικος ου ο(2) υιος ησθενει
εν καπερναουμ

4:46-16 ο(1) ιησους παλιν
3 παλιν
Origen P66 P75 01 B C D L 33 1241 a b e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:46-58 και ην
2 ην δε
01 D L 33 892 1241 b e
3 ην
a
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:46-61 ην
2 + εκει
a e
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:46-67 βασιλικος
3 βασιλισκος
D a
9 /NA/
b e
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:47 ουτος ακουσας στι ιησους ηκει εκ της ιουδαιας εις την γαλιλαιαν
απηλθε προς αυτον(1) και(1) ηρωτα αυτον(2) ινα καταβη και(2)
ιασηται αυτου τον υιον ημελλε γαρ αποθηνησκειν

4:47-19 εκ
2 απο
f13 33 1241
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:47-43 αυτον(2)
2 ΟΜ
Origen P66 P75 01 B C D L 33 892 1241 a e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:49 λεγει προς αυτον ο βασιλικος κυριε καταβηθι πριν αποθανειν το
παιδιον μου
πριν

το παιδίον

το παιδία

τον υιόν

μου

ηδή δὲ αὐτοῦ(1) καταβαινόντος οἱ δουλοὶ αὐτοῦ(2) ἀπήντησαν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀπηγγέιλαν λέγοντες ὅτι οἱ παῖς σου ζῆν

οἱ δουλοὶ αὐτοῦ(2) ἀπήντησαν

υπηντῆσαν οἱ δουλοὶ

ἀπήντησαν

λέγοντες

παις σου
4:54 τούτο πάλιν δεύτερον σημειον εποιησεν ο ιησους ελθων εκ της ιουδαιας εις την γαλιλαιαν

4:54-4 τούτο
2 + δε
Origen P66 P75 B C P13 1241 UBS3
3 + ουν
579 e
* /Missing/
P45 W

4:54-10 δευτερον σημειον εποιησεν ο ιησους
2 σημειον δευτερον εποιησεν ο ιησους
Ω
3 δευτερον εποιησεν ο ιησους σημειον
a b
4 δευτερον εποιησεν σημειον ο ιησους
01
5 εποιησεν δευτερον σημειον ο ιησους
P75
* /Missing/
P45 W

5:1 μετα ταυτα ην εορτη των ιουδαιων και ανεβη ο ιησους εις ιεροσολυμα

5:1-7 ην
2 + η
01 C E L Δ Π Ψ f1 33 892e
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W

5:1-16 ο
2 OM
P66 P75 A B D L Π Ψ UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W

5:5 ην δε τις ανθρωπος εκει τριακονταοκτω ετη εχον εν τη ασθενεια

5:5-10 τριακονταοκτω
2 τριακοντα και οκτω
01 A C D E L Δ Ψ f1 33 565 579 700 1241 b e UBS3
9 lh/
P66 P75
* /Missing/
P45 W
ετη

ο(1) ιησους και(1) ειπεν αυτοις αμην(1) αμην(2)

λεγω υμιν ου δυναται ο(2) υιος(1) ποιειν αφ εαυτου ουδεν εαν μη

τι βλεπη τον πατερα ποιουντα α γαρ αν εκεινος ποιη ταυτα και(2)

ο(3) υιος(2) ομοιως ποιει

υιος(1)

+ του ανθρωπου

αφ εαυτου ουδεν

αφ εαυτου ουδε εν

αφ εαυτου ουδεν

αφ εαυτου ουδεν

εαν

αφ εαυτου ουδεν

αφ εαυτου ουδεν

αφ εαυτου ουδεν

αφ εαυτου ουδεν

αφ εαυτου ουδεν

αφ εαυτου ουδεν

αφ εαυτου ουδεν

τι βλεπη

σα

σα

σα

σα

σα
5:19-70
αν
3 εαν
Origen P66
9 [αν / ∴/ εαν]
   a b
10 OM
   A D L Π 1241 e
* /Missing/
P45 C

5:19-73
εκείνος ποίη
3 ποίη ο πατήρ
Origen e
* /Missing/
P45 C

5:19-82
ομοιως ποιεί
2 ~ 2,1 (ποιεί ομοιως)
   01 D a b
3 ποιεί
e
* /Missing/
P45 C

5:22
ουδὲ γαρ ο πατήρ κρίνει ουδένα ἀλλὰ τὴν κρίσιν πάσαν δεῖθηκε τῷ
υἱῷ

5:22-4
ουδὲ
2 οὐ
   P66* 1241
* /Missing/
P45 C

5:26
οὕσπερ γαρ ο πατήρ εχεί ζωῆν(1) εν(1) εαυτῶ(1) οὕτως ἔδωκε καὶ
τῷ υἱῷ ζωῆν(2) εχεῖν εν(2) εαυτῶ(2)

5:26-4
οὕσπερ
2 ὡς
   01* D W
9 [οὕσπερ / ∴/ ὡς]
   a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C

5:26-10
εχεί ζωῆν(1)
2 ζωῆν εχεί
   01 579
* /Missing/
P45 C

5:26-13
οὕτως ἔδωκε καὶ τῷ υἱῷ ζωῆν(2) εχεῖν εν(2) εαυτῶ(2)
2 OM
εδωκε και τῷ υἱῷ ζωὴν(2) εχεῖν
και τῷ υἱῷ εδωκεν εχειν ζωην
και τῷ υἱῷ εδωκεν ζωην εχειν
και τῷ υἱῷ εδωκεν εχειν ζωην
και τῷ υἱῷ εδωκεν εχειν ζωην εχειν
και(1) εξουσιαν εδωκεν αυτῳ και(2) κρισιν ποιειν οτι υιος ανθρωπου εστι
και(2)
ου(1) δυναμαι εγω ποιειν απ εμαυτου ουδεν καθως ακουω κρινω και η(1) κρισις η(2) εμη δικαια εστιν οτι ου(2) ζητω το(1) θελημα(1) το(2) εμον αλλα το(3) θελημα(2) του πεμψαντος με πατρος
εγω ποιειν απ εμαυτου
ου(1) δυναμαι εγω ποιειν απ εμαυτου ουδεν καθως ακουω κρινω και η(1) κρισις η(2) εμη δικαια εστιν οτι ου(2) ζητω το(1) θελημα(1) το(2) εμον αλλα το(3) θελημα(2) του πεμψαντος με πατρος
πατρος
ερευνατε τας γραφας οτι υμεις δοκειτε εν αυταις ζωην αιωνιον εχειν και εκειναι εισιν αι μαρτυρουσαι περι εμου
ερευνατε
5:39-7
οτι
εν αις
η P45 C

5:39-22
εκειναι
αυται
W b e

5:41
δοξαν παρα ανθρωπων ου λαμβανο

5:41-4
ανθρωπων
Α Π 565

5:44
πως δυνασθε υμεις πιστευσαι δοξαν(1) παρα(1) αλληλων
λαμβανοντες και την(1) δοξαν(2) την(2) παρα(2) του μονου θεου
ου ζητειτε

5:44-7
υμεις
ΩM L 892

5:44-10
πιστευσαι
L L f1 33 579 892

5:44-13
παρα(1) αλληλων
Δ 1241

5:44-40
θεου
P66 P75 B W a

Origen

Origen

Origen
ζητείτε
ζητούντες

εί δὲ τοις(1) εκείνου γραμμασιν οὐ πιστευετε πως τοις(2) εμοις

πιστευετε

εστὶ παιδαριον εν ωδε ο εχει πεντε αρτους κριθινους και δυο

οψαρια ἀλλα ταῦτα τι ἐστιν εις τοσουτους

εφανε δὲ(1) τους αρτους το ιησους και(1) ευχαριστησας διεδωκε

ευχαριστησας

dοκε敢κε(1) και(1) ευχαριστησας διεδωκε
dοκεη(1) και(1) ευχαριστησας διεδωκε

dοκε

dοκε

/NA/

/missing/
τοις(1) μαθηταίς οι δὲ(2) μαθηταί

ιησοῦς οὖν γνως οτι μελλοῦσιν ερχεσθαι και αρπαξειν αυτον(1)

ινα ποιησωσιν αυτον(2) βασιλεα ανεχορησε παλιν εις το ορος

αυτος μονος

ερχεσθαι

ινα ποιησωσιν αυτον(2) βασιλεα ανεχορησε παλιν εις το ορος

αυτος μονος

ανεχορησε

ανεχωρησε

παλιν

ανεχωρησε

ανεχωρησε

σημεια

σημεια

σημεια

σημεια

σημεια
την(1) βρωσιν(1) την(2) απολλυμενην αλλα την(3) βρωσιν(2) την(4) μενουσαν εις ζωην αιωνιον η ν ο(1) υιος του ανθρωπου υμιν δωσει τουτον γαρ ο(2) πατηρ εσφραγισεν ο(3) θεος

μη την(1) βρωσιν(1)
2 βρωσιν μη
01 b
* /Missing/
P45 P66 C

την(3) βρωσιν(2)
2 OM
01 E
* /Missing/
P45 P66 C

υμιν δωσει
2 ~ 2,1 (dwsei umin)
01 D fi3 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 C

dωσει
2 διδωσιν
01 D e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 C

ειπον ουν προς αυτον τι ποιουμεν ινα εργαζωμεθα τα εργα του θεου

ποιουμεν
2 ποιωμεν
Origen P75 01 A B E L Δ Π Ω fi 33 700 892 1241
UBS3
3 ποιησωμεν
D W Θ fi3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 C

απεκριθη ο ιησους και ειπεν αυτοις τουτο εστι το εργον του θεου ινα πιστευσητε εις ον απεστειλεν εκεινος

ο
2 OM
P75 01 E W Δ Ψ Ω 565 700 892 1241
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 C

πιστευσητε
2 πιστευτη
εἴπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ(1) Ἰησοῦς αμὴν(1) αμὴν(2) λέγω ὑμῖν(1) οὐ

μώσης δεδοκεν ὑμῖν(2) τον(1) αρτον(1) εκ(1) του(1) οὐρανου(1)

αλλ ο(2) πατὴρ μου διδωσιν ὑμῖν(3) τον(2) αρτον(2) εκ(2) του(2)

οὐρανου(2) τον(3) αληθινον

δεδοκεν

εδοκεν

αληθινον

ο(1) γαρ αρτος του(1) θεου εστιν ο(2) καταβαινων εκ του(2)

ουρανου και ζωην διδους τω κοσμω

αρτος

θεου

ουρανου

ζωην διδους

ειπε δε αυτοῖς ὁ(1) ιησοῦς εγω ειμι ο(2) αρτος της ζωης ο(3)

erχομενος προς με ου(1) μη(1) πειναση και ο(4) πιστευων εις εμε

ου(2) μη(2) διψηση πωποτε

με
ουδεὶς δύναται ελθεῖν πρὸς με(1) εαν μη ο(1) πατηρ ο(2) πεμψας με(2) ἐλκυσθή αυτον(1) καὶ εγὼ ἀναστήσω αυτον(2) τῇ ἐσχατῇ ἡμέρᾳ

6:44-13 με(1)
   1 εμε
      B E Δ Θ
   9 /NA/
   a b e
   * /Missing/
      P45 P75

6:45 εστι γεγραμμενον εν τοις προφηταις και(1) εσονται παντες διδακτοι του(1) θεου πας ουν ο ακουσας παρα του(2) πατρος και(2) μαθων ερχεται προς με

6:45-25 ακουσας
   2 ακουων
      D E Δ Ω 700
   9 /NA/
   a b e
   * /Missing/
      P45

6:45-37 με
   2 εμε
      P75 01 B Θ UBS3
   9 /NA/
   a b e
   * /Missing/
      P45 P75

6:46 ουχ οτι τον(1) πατερα(1) τις εωρακεν ει μη ο ων παρα του θεου ουτος εωρακε τον(2) πατερα(2)

6:46-7 τις εωρακεν
   2 εωρακεν τις
      Origen P66 01 B C D L W Θ Ψ 33 579 1241 a b e UBS3
   * /Missing/
      P45 P75

6:46-22 τοι θεου
   1 θεου
      B
   4 το πατρι
      Origen 01
   * /Missing/
      P45
6:46-31 πατερα(2)  
   2 θεον  
      01* D a b e  
* /Missing/  
   P45 P75 33

6:49 οι πατερες υμων εφαγον το μαννα εν τη ερημω και απεθανον

6:49-13 εφαγον  
   2 + τον αρτον  
      D a b e  
* /Missing/  
   P45 P75

6:50 ουτος εστιν ο(1) αρτος ο(2) εκ του ουρανου καταβαινον ινα τις  
   εξ αυτου φαγη και μη αποθανη

6:50-13 τις εξ αυτου φαγη και  
   2 εαν τις εξ αυτου φαγη  
      Dc a b  
* /Missing/  
   P45 A

6:51 εγω(1) ειμι ο(1) αρτος(1) ο(2) ζων ο(3) εκ(1) του(1) ουρανου  
      καταβας εαν τις φαγη εκ(2) τουτου του(2) αρτου ζησεται εις τον  
      αιωνα και ο(4) αρτος(2) δε ον εγω(2) δωσω(1) η σαρξ μου εστιν  
      ην εγω(3) δωσω(2) υπερ της του(3) κοσμου ζωης

6:51-7 ο(2) ζων  
   2 της ζωης  
      565 a  
* /Missing/  
   P45 A 33

6:51-19 τουτου του(2) αρτου  
   2 ~ 2,3,1 (του αρτου τουτου)  
      D 579  
   3 του εμου αρτου  
      01 a e  
* /Missing/  
   P45 P75 A

6:51-25 ζησεται  
   2 ζησει  
      Origen 01 D L W Θ Ψ 33 579 1241 UBS3  
      9 /NA/  
      a b e  
* /Missing/  
   P45 P75 A

6:51-28 και  
   2 OM  
      01* a b e  
* /Missing/
6:51-31 δὲ
2 OM
01 D W a b
* /Missing/
P45 P75 A

6:51-49 ην εγω(3) δωσω(2)
2 OM
P66 P75 01 B C D L W Ψ 33 579 a b e UBS3
9 [ην εγω δωσω / / OM]
Origen
* /Missing/
P45 A

6:52 εμαχοντο ουν προς αλληλους οι ιουδαιοι λεγοντες πως δυναται ουτος ημιν δουναι την σαρκα φαγειν

6:52-10 προς αλληλους οι ιουδαιοι
2 ~ 3,4,1,2 (οι ιουδαιοι προς αλληλους)
P75 C D Θ f1 f13 33 565 579 1241 a e
* /Missing/
P45 A

6:52-25 ουτος ημιν δουναι την σαρκα
2 ~ 1,3,2,4,5 (ουτος δουναι ημιν την σαρκα)
P66c 579 1241
3 ~ 1,2,4,5,3 (ουτος ημιν την σαρκα δουναι)
D Θ Π f13 a e
4 ~ 2,1,3,4,5 (ημιν ουτος δουναι την σαρκα)
Origen 01 C f1 565
5 ουτος δουναι την σαρκα
P66*
* /Missing/
P45 P75 A

6:52-46 σαρκα
P75 πιδ
2 + αυτου
P66 B 892 a b e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 A

6:53 ειπεν ουν αυτοις ο ιησους αμην(1) αμην(2) λεγω υμιν εαν μη φαγητε την σαρκα του(1) υιου του(2) ανθρωπου και πιητε αυτου το αιμα ουκ εχετε ζωην εν εαυτοις

6:53-19 φαγητε
2 λαβητε
D a
* /Missing/
P45 A
6:53-31 πιητε αυτου το αιμα
2 ~ 3,4,2,1 (το αιμα αυτου πιητε)
P66 D a
3 ~ 1,3,4,2 (πιητε το αιμα αυτου)
01 b e
* /Missing/
P45 A

6:54 ο τρωγων μου(1) την σαρκα και(1) πινων μου(2) το αιμα εχει ζωην αιωνιον και(2) εγω αναστησω αυτον τη εσχατη ημερα

6:54-13 μου(1) την σαρκα και(1) πινων μου(2)
2 αυτου την σαρκα και πινων αυτου
D e
* /Missing/
P45 A 33

6:54-16 μου(1) την σαρκα
2 την σαρκα μου
Δ* b e
* /Missing/
P45 A 33

6:54-28 μου(2) το αιμα
2 το αιμα μου
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A 33

6:54-40 και(2) εγω αναστησω
2 καγω αναστησω
P66 P75 01 B C D L W Θ Π fl 579 892 1241 UBS3
9 [καγω / / και εγω] αναστησω
Origen a b e
10 και αναστησω εγω
Ψ
* /Missing/
P45 A 33

6:54-49 αυτον
2 + εν
Origen C Δ Π Ω fl3 700 892 1241 b
* /Missing/
P45 A 33

6:55 η γαρ σαρξ μου(1) αληθως(1) εστι(1) βρωσις και το αιμα μου(2) αληθως(2) εστι(2) ποσις

6:55-7 γαρ
2 OM
565 700 b e
* /Missing/
P45 A 33
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6:55-10 Αληθώς(1)
2 Αληθῆς
Origen P66c P75 01c B C L W Ψ f1 13 565 579 892 1241
UBS3
9 /NA/
  a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A 33

6:55-31 Αληθώς(2)
2 Αληθῆς
Origen P66c P75 B C L W Ψ f1 13 565 579 892 1241 UBS3
9 /NA/
  a b e
* /Missing/
P45 01* A D 33

6:56 Ο τρωγών μου(1) την σαρκά και πίνων μου(2) το αίμα εν(1) εμοί
  μενει καγώ εν(2) αυτώ

6:56-19 Αυτώ
2 + καθώς εν εμοί ο πατήρ καγώ εν τῷ πατρί αμήν αμήν λέγω
  εις μή λαβήτε το σώμα του υιού του ανθρώπου ως τὸν αρτόν τῆς
  ζωῆς οὐκ εχέτε ζωῆν εν αὐτῷ
D a
* /Missing/
P45 A

6:57 Καθώς απεστείλε με(1) ο(1) ζων πατήρ καγώ ζω διὰ τον πατέρα και
  ο(2) τρωγών με(2) κακείνος ζησεται δι εμε

6:57-7 Απεστείλε
2 Απεσταλκέν
P66 D Π f13 579 1241
9 /NA/
  a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A

6:57-16 Πατέρα
2 + μου
* /Missing/
P75 Cc
P45 A

6:57-34 Ζησεται
2 Ζησει
Origen P75 01 B C L Θ Π Ψ f13 33 579 1241 UBS3
3 Ζη
  D
9 /NA/
  a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A
6:58 ουτος εστιν ο(1) αρτος ο(2) εκ του ουρανου καταβας ου καθως εφαγον οι πατερες υμων το μαννα και απεθανον ο(3) τρωγον τουτον τον(1) αρτον ζησεται εις τον(2) αιωνα

6:58-7 εκ του
2 ex
  P75 B C 892 1241 UBS3
9 /NA/
  a b e
* /Missing/
  P45 A

6:58-10 καταβας
2 καταβαινων
P66* 01*
9 /NA/
  a b e
* /Missing/
  P45 A

6:58-22 υμων το μαννα
3 υμων
D 33 e
4 OM
Origen P66 P75 01 B C L W UBS3
* /Missing/
  P45 A

6:58-40 τουτον τον(1) αρτον
2 ~ 2,3,1 (τον αρτον τουτον)
W e
* /Missing/
  P45 A

6:58-46 ζησεται
2 ζησει
Origen P75 01 B C E L W Δ Ψ f1 33 579 892 UBS3
9 /NA/
  a b e
* /Missing/
  P45 A

7:25 ελεγον ουν τινες εκ των ιεροσολυμιτων ουχ ουτος εστιν αν ζητουσιν αποκτειναι

7:25-10 εκ
2 OM
  01 a
* /Missing/
  P45 A C

7:26 και(1) ιδε παρρησια λαλει και(2) ουδεν αυτω λεγουσι μηποτε αληθως(1) εγνωσαν οι αρχοντες οτι ουτος εστιν αληθως(2) ο χριστος
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7:26-4 και(1)
2 OM
   L f13 a
* /Missing/
   P45 P75 A C 33 1241

7:26-19 μηποτε
2 μητι
   01 D
9 /NA/
   a b e
* /Missing/
   P45 A C 1241

7:26-31 αρχοντες
2 αρχιερεις
   01 a
* /Missing/
   P45 P75 A C 33

7:26-37 αληθως(2)
2 OM
   Origen P66 P75 01 B D L W Θ Π Ψ f1 f13 565 892 1241
   a b e UBS3
* /Missing/
   P45 A C 33

7:27 αλλα τουτον οιδαμεν ποθεν(1) εστιν(1) ο δε χριστος οταν ερχηται
      ουδεις γινωσκει ποθεν(2) εστιν(2)

7:27-10 ο δε χριστος
2 ο χριστος δε
   P66
3 ο χριστος
   01 e
* /Missing/
   P45 A C 565

7:27-16 ερχηται
2 ερχεται
   01 Δ* Θ f13
9 [ερχηται /:/ ερχεται]
   33
9 /NA/
   a b e
10 elqh
   P66
* /Missing/
   P45 A C 565

7:28 εκραξεν ουν εν τω ιερω διδασκων ο(1) ιησους και(1) λεγων καμε
      οιδατε(1) και(2) οιδατε(2) ποθεν ειμι και(3) απ εμαυτ ου ουκ(1)
      εληλυθα αλλ εστιν αληθινος ο(2) πεμψας με ον υμεις ουκ(2)
      οιδατε(3)
7:28-19 καὶ εμε
2 καὶ εμε
01
9 [καὶ / . . / καὶ εμε]
a b e
10 εμε
   P66* vid
* /Missing/
   P45 A C 33

7:28-31 αληθινος
2 αληθης
   P66 01
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
   P45 A C 33

7:29 εγω δε αιδα αυτον στι παρ αυτου ειμι κακεινος με απεστειλεν

7:29-4 δε
2 OM
   Origen P75 B E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f13 579 700 892
   a e UBS3
* /Missing/
   P45 A C

7:29-10 αυτου
2 αυτω
01* Θ e
* /Missing/
   P45 A C

7:29-16 απεστειλεν
2 απεσταλκεν
   P66 01 D
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
   P45 A C

7:30 εζητουν ουν αυτον(1) πιασαι και ουδεις επεβαλεν επ αυτον(2) την χειρα οτι ουπω εληλυθει η ωρα αυτου

7:30-4 εζητουν ουν
2 οι δε εζητουν
   P66* 01
* /Missing/
   P45 A C

7:30-10 πιασαι
2 + και εξηλθεν εκ της χειρος αυτων
   Θ f13
* /Missing/
   P45 A C
7:30-13 επεβαλεν
2 επεβαλλεν
P66
9 [επεβαλεν /::/ επεβαλλεν]
Origen b
ten χειρα
2 τας χειρας
W f1 565 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A C

7:37 en de tη(1) εσχατη ημερα tη(2) μεγαλη της εορτης ειστηκει o
ησους και(1) εκραξε λεγων ean tis διψα ερχεσθω προς με και(2)
pineto

7:37-19 εκραξε
1 + ν
Origen
2 εκραξεν
P66* vid 01 D Θ fl f13
9 /NA/
 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A C

7:37-22 λεγων
2 OM
 a e
* /Missing/
P45 A C

7:37-31 προς με
2 OM
P66* 01* D b e
* /Missing/
P45 A C

7:37-34 με
2 εμε
P75 B
9 [εμε /::/ εμε]
Origen
9 /NA/
 a
* /Missing/
P45 P66* 01* A C D b e
7:39 τούτο δὲ εἰπεν περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος ὅν εμελλὼν λαμβάνειν οἱ
πιστευόντες εἰς αὐτὸν οὐπώ γαρ ἡν πνεῦμα αγίων ότι ὁ Ἰησοῦς
οὐδὲπὼ εὖδοξασθῇ

7:39-25 γαρ
2 δὲ
Θ α ε
* /Missing/
P45 A C

7:39-31 πνεῦμα αγίων
3 πνεῦμα
Origen P66c P75 01 Θ Π Ψ UBS3
4 πνεῦμα δεδομενον
a b
5 πνεῦμα αγίων δεδομενον
B e
7 το πνεῦμα το αγίων επ αὐτοὺς
D
* /Missing/
P45 A C

7:39-40 οὔδεπὼ
2 οὔπω
01 B D Θ
9 [οὔδεπὼ /::/ οὔπω]
Origen a b e
10 οὔδεποτε
L
* /Missing/
P45 A C

7:39-43 εὖδοξασθη
2 δεδοξαστὸ
01*
9 [εὖδοξασθη /::/ δεδοξαστὸ]
a b e
10 εβαπτισθῇ
700*
* /Missing/
P45 A C

7:41 ἀλλοι(1) εἰλεγον(1) οὗτος εστιν ο(1) χριστος(1) ἀλλοι(2) δὲ
εἰλεγον(2) μη γαρ εκ τῆς γαλιλαίας ο(2) χριστος(2) ερχεται

7:41-10 ἀλλοι(1)
2 + δὲ
Origen Θ f1 f13 565 892 b
* /Missing/
P45 A C 579

7:41-13 εἰλεγον(1)
2 + οτι
D L W 1241
7:41-25 ἀλλοι(2) δὲ
2 οἱ δὲ
Origen P66c P75 B L Θ f1 33 565 1241 UBS3
9 [ἀλλοι δὲ / ./ οἱ δὲ]
a
10 ἀλλοι
P66* 01 D E Δ Π Ψ Ω f13 700 892
* /Missing/
P45 A C 579 b

7:41-31 γαρ
2 ΟΜ
a e
* /Missing/
P45 A C

7:42 οὐχὶ ἡ γραφὴ εἶπεν ὦτι ἐκ τοῦ σπερματὸς δαβιδ(1) καὶ ἀπὸ βηθλεὲμ τῆς κωμῆς ὅπου ἦν δαβιδ(2) ὁ χριστὸς ἐρχέται

7:42-7 οὐχὶ
2 οὐχ
Origen P66 P75 B L Θ Ψ UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A C

7:42-10 εἶπεν
2 λέγει
D a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A C

7:42-16 τοῦ
2 ΟΜ
P66 D f1 f13 565 1241
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A C

7:42-43 ὁ χριστὸς ἐρχέται
2 ~ 3,1,2 (ἐρχέται ὁ χριστὸς)
Origen P75 B L W Ψ 33 UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 A C e

7:43 σχίσμα οὖν ἐν τῷ ὀχλῷ ἐγενέτο διὰ αὐτῶν

7:43-13 ἐν τῷ ὀχλῷ ἐγενέτο
2 ~ 4,1,2,3 (ἐγενέτο ἐν τῷ ὀχλῷ)
Origen P66 P75 01 B L W Θ Ψ 33 1241 a b e UBS3
2 εγένετο εἰς τὸν οἶχλον
D
* /Missing/
P45 A C

7:46 απεκρίθησαν οἱ υπηρεταὶ οὐδὲποτε οὕτως ἐλάλησεν ἄνθρωπος(1) ὡς οὕτως ο ἄνθρωπος(2)

7:46-4 απεκρίθησαν οἱ υπηρεταὶ
2 απεκρίθησαν αὐτοῖς οἱ υπηρεταὶ
W 892
3 απεκρίθησαν δὲ οἱ υπηρεταὶ
D
4 οἱ δὲ υπηρεταὶ απεκρίθησαν
01
* /Missing/
P45 A C b

7:46-16 υπηρεταὶ
2 + λεγοντες
a e
* /Missing/
P45 A C b

7:46-25 οὕτως ἐλάλησεν ἄνθρωπος(1)
2 ὡς 2,1,3 (ἐλάλησεν οὕτως ἄνθρωπος)
Origen P66c P75 01c B L W Ψ 33 1241 UBS3
3 οὕτως ἄνθρωπος ἐλάλησεν
P66* 01* D
4 ἄνθρωπος οὕτως ἐλάλησεν
a e
6 ἐλάλησεν
01c1
7 ἐλάλησεν ἄνθρωπος
700
* /Missing/
P45 A C b

7:46-40 ὡς οὕτως ο ἄνθρωπος(2)
2 OM
Origen P66c P75 01c B L W
* /Missing/
P45 A C b

7:48 μὴ τις ἐκ(1) τῶν(1) αρχιερέων επίστευσεν εἰς αὐτὸν ἡ ἐκ(2)
tῶν(2) φαρισαίων

7:48-4 ἐκ(1)
2 OM
W f13
* /Missing/
P45 P75 A C b

7:48-13 επίστευσεν
7:49 ἀλλ. α(1) οὐχὶς αὐτὸς α(2) μὴ γινωσκον τὸν νομὸν επικαταρατοι ἐσι

7:49-31 επικαταρατοι
2 επαρατοι
Origen P66 P75 01 B W Θ f1 33 565 UBS3
9 /NA/
a e
* /Missing/
P45 A C b

7:51 μη(1) ο νομὸς ἡμῶν κρίνει τὸν ἀνθρώπον εαν μη(2) ακουσῃ παρ
αὐτοῦ προτέρων καὶ γινω τι ποιεῖ

7:51-13 παρ αὐτοῦ προτερῶν
1 παρ αὐτοῦ πρωτῶν
Π Ψ f1 f13 892
2 ἐκ πρωτῶν, 1, 2 (πρωτών παρ αὐτοῦ)
Origen P66 P75 01c B D L W Θ 33 a UBS3
3 πρωτῶν
01*
4 παρ αὐτοῦ
e
* /Missing/
P45 A C b

7:51-16 προτέρων
2 πρωτῶν
Origen P66 P75 01* 01c B D L W Θ Π Ψ f1 f13 33 892 a
UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 A C b e

7:52 απεκρίθησαν καὶ(1) εἰπὸν αὐτῷ μὴ καὶ(2) συ ἐκ(1) τῆς(1)
γαλιλαίας(1) εἰ ερευνήσῃν καὶ(3) ἵδε στὶ προφήτης ἐκ(2) τῆς(2)
γαλιλαίας(2) οὐκ ἐγηγερται

7:52-19 ερευνήσῃν
2 ερευνήσῃν
Origen P75 01 B UBS3
9 /NA/
a e
* /Missing/
P45 A C b

7:52-22 καὶ(3) ἵδε
2 τὰς γραφὰς καὶ(3) ἵδε
D W a e
* /Missing/
7:52-25 προφητής εκ(2) της(2) γαλιλαίας(2)
2 ~ 2,3,4,1 (εκ της γαλιλαίας προφήτης)
Origen P66* P75 B L Ψ 892 UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 A C b

7:52-37 εγείρεται
4 εγειρεται
Origen P66 P75 01 B D Θ Ψ 33 565 UBS3
9 /NA/
a e
* /Missing/
P45 A C b

8:12 παλιν ουν ο(1) ιησους αυτοις ελαλησε λεγων εγω ειμι το(1)
φως(1) του κοσμου ο(2) ακολουθων εμοι ου μη περιπατησει εν τη
σκοτια αλλ εξει το(2) φως(2) της ζωης

8:12-44 εμοι
2 μοι
Origen B
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 A C

8:12-56 εξει
2 εχει
01* b
* /Missing/
P45 A C

8:14 απεκριθη ηςους και(1) ειπεν αυτοις και εγω μαρτυρω περι
εμαυτου αληθης εστιν η μαρτυρια μου οτι οιδα ποθεν(1) ηλθον
και(2) που(1) υπαγω(1) ημεις δε οικ οιδατε ποθεν(2) ερχομαι
και(3) που(2) υπαγω(2)

8:14-13 απεκριθη
2 + o
Origen 01 D Θ f13 1241
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A C

8:14-25 αληθης εστιν η μαρτυρια μου
2 η μαρτυρια μου αληθης εστιν
P75 B W b
9 [αληθης εστιν η μαρτυρια μου / : : η μαρτυρια μου αληθης εστιν] Origen
10 αληθινη μου εστιν η μαρτυρια D
καὶ(1) εὰν κρίνω δὲ εγὼ(1) η(1) κρίσις η(2) εμὴ αλήθης εστίν
οτι μονὸς οὐκ εἰμὶ ἀλλ. εγὼ(2) καὶ(2) ο πεμψας με πατήρ

8:16-22
αλήθης

οτι μονὸς οὐκ εἰμὶ αλλ ἡ(2) κρισις η(2) εμη αληθης εστιν
οτι μονος ουκ ειμι αλλ εγω(2) και(2) ο πεμψας με πατηρ

8:16-34
πατὴρ

ελεγον ουν αυτω που εστιν ο(1) πατηρ σου απεκριθη ο(2) ιησους
ουτε(1) εμε(1) οιδατε ουτε(2) τον(1) πατερα(1) μου(1) ει εμε(2)
ηδειτε(1) και τον(2) πατερα(2) μου(2) ηδειτε(2) αν

8:19-16
ο(2)

ελεγον ουν αυτω που εστιν ο(1) πατηρ σου απεκριθη ο(2) ιησους
ουτε(1) εμε(1) οιδατε ουτε(2) τον(1) πατερα(1) μου(1) ει εμε(2)
ηδειτε(1) και τον(2) πατερα(2) μου(2) ηδειτε(2) αν

8:19-19
ιησους

ελεγον ουν αυτω που εστιν ο(1) πατηρ σου απεκριθη ο(2) ιησους
ουτε(1) εμε(1) οιδατε ουτε(2) τον(1) πατερα(1) μου(1) ει εμε(2)
ηδειτε(1) και τον(2) πατερα(2) μου(2) ηδειτε(2) αν

8:19-43
ηδειτε(2) αν

ελεγον ουν αυτω που εστιν ο(1) πατηρ σου απεκριθη ο(2) ιησους
ουτε(1) εμε(1) οιδατε ουτε(2) τον(1) πατερα(1) μου(1) ει εμε(2)
ηδειτε(1) και τον(2) πατερα(2) μου(2) ηδειτε(2) αν

8:20
ταυτα τα ρηματα ελαλησεν ο ιησους εν(1) τω(1) γαζοφυλακιω
διδασκων εν(2) τω(2) ιερω και ουδεις επιασεν αυτον οτι ουπω
εληλυθει η ωρα αυτου
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8:20-13 ο ιησους
3 OM
Origen P66 P75 01 B D L W Θ Π Ψ a b e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 A C

8:21 ειπεν ουν παλιν αυτοις ο ιησους εγω(1) υπαγω(1) και(1) ζητησετε
με και(2) εν τη αμαρτια υμων αποθανεισθε οπου εγω(2) υπαγω(2)
υμεις ου δυνασθε ελθειν

8:21-16 αυτοις
2 OM
1241 a e
* /Missing/
P45 A C

8:21-19 ο ιησους
2 OM
Origen P66* P75 01 B D L W b e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 A C

8:21-25 με
3 + και ουχ ευρησετε με
f1 565
4 + και ουχ ευρησετε
700
* /Missing/
P45 A C

8:21-34 αποθανεισθε
2 + και
f1 f13 565
* /Missing/
P45 A C

8:22 ελεγον ουν οι ιουδαιοι μητι αποκτηνει εαυτον οτι λεγει οπου εγω
υπαγω υμεις ου δυνασθε ελθειν

8:22-13 εαυτον
2 αυτον
D 1241
9 /NA/
ab e
* /Missing/
P45 A C

8:23 και ειπεν αυτοις υμεις(1) εκ(1) τον(1) κατω εστε(1) εγω(1)
εκ(2) τον(2) ανω ειμι(1) υμεις(2) εκ(3) του(1) κοσμου(1)
tουτου(1) εστε(2) εγω(2) ουκ ειμι(2) εκ(4) του(2) κοσμου(2)
tουτου(2)

8:23-4 και ειπεν
καὶ εἶλεγεν
Origen P75 01c B D L W Θ f13 892 1241 UBS3

εἶλεγεν οὖν
P66 01*

/NA/
  a b e
* /Missing/
  P45 A C

8:23-25 τοῦ(1) κόσμου(1) τούτου(1)
2 ~ 3,1,2 (τοῦτου τοῦ κόσμου)
Origen P66 P75 B W 892 UBS3

/NA/
  a b e
* /Missing/
  P45 A C 565

8:23-34 οὐκ εἰμὶ(2) ἐκ(4) τοῦ(2) κόσμου(2) τοῦτου(2)
2 οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐκ τοῦ τοῦ κόσμου
W Θ f13 33
3 ~ 3,4,5,6,1,2 (ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτου οὐκ εἰμὶ)
1241

/NA/
  a b e
* /Missing/
  P45 A C

8:24 εἰπον οὖν ὑμῖν ὅτι(1) ἀποθανεῖσθε(1) ἐν(1) ταῖς(1) ἁμαρτίαις(1)
       ὑμῶν(1) εαν γὰρ μὴ πιστεύσητε ὅτι(2) εγώ εἰμι ἀποθανεῖσθε(2)
       ἐν(2) ταῖς(2) ἁμαρτίαις(2) ὑμῶν(2)

8:24-4 οὖν
2 OM
  P66 01 a e
* /Missing/
  P45 A C

8:24-22 εαν γὰρ μὴ πιστεύσητε ὅτι(2) εγώ εἰμι ἀποθανεῖσθε(2) ἐν(2)
        ταῖς(2) ἁμαρτίαις(2) ὑμῶν(2)
2 OM
  33 1241
* /Missing/
  P45 A C

8:24-31 πιστεύσητε
2 + μοι
  01 D Θ f13 e
* /Missing/
  P45 A C 33 1241

8:31 εἶλεγεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς τοὺς πεπιστευκότας αὐτῷ Ἰουδαίους εαν
       ὑμεῖς μεῖνητε ἐν τῷ(1) λόγῳ τοῦ(2) εμοῦ ἀληθῶς μαθήται μου εστε

8:31-25 μεῖνητε
2 μενητε
8:34 απεκρίθη αυτοίς ὁ(1) Ἰησοῦς ἀμην(1) ἀμην(2) λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πας ὁ(2) ποιητὸν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν δούλος εστὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας

8:34-22 τῆς ἁμαρτίας
2 OM
D b
* /Missing/
P45 A C

8:38 εγὼ ὁ(1) εορακα παρα(1) τῷ(1) πατρὶ(1) μου λαλῶ καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ὁ(2) εορακάτε παρα(2) τῷ(2) πατρὶ(2) ὑμῶν ποιεῖτε

8:38-7 εγὼ ὁ(1)
2 ὁ εγὼ
f1
3 ἀ εγὼ
Origen P66 P75 01 B C W 565 UBS3
4 εγὼ α
D L Θ Π 579 892
6 εγὼ δὲ α
f13
* /Missing/
P45 A 1241

8:38-25 μου
2 OM
Origen P66 P75 B C L W UBS3
3 ημῶν
579
* /Missing/
P45 A 1241

8:38-28 μου
2 + ταυτα
D W 33 892 b
* /Missing/
P45 A 1241

8:38-40 ο(2)
2 α
Origen P66 P75 01* B C D W Θ Π f1 f13 33 565 579 b e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 A 1241

8:38-43 εορακάτε
2 ηκούσατε
Origen P75 01c B C L W Θ Π f1 f13 33 565 892 UBS3
* /Missing/
8:38-49 το(2) πατρι(2)
2 του πατρος
Origen P66 P75 01 B C L W Θ Π f1 f13 33 565 892 UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 A 1241

8:38-52 υμων
2 OM
Origen P66 P75 B L W UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 A 1241

8:39 απεκριθησαν και ειπον αυτω ο(1) πατηρ ημων αβρααμ(1) εστι λεγει
αυτους ο(2) ιησους ει τεκνα του(1) αβρααμ(2) ητε τα εργα του(2)
αβρααμ(3) εποιειτε αν

8:39-13 και ειπον αυτω
2 αυτω και ειπον
Θ f13
* /Missing/
P45 A 1241

8:39-25 λεγει
2 ειπεν
D b e
3 απεκριθη
01
* /Missing/
P45 A 1241

8:39-28 λεγει
2 + ουν
P66 D b e
* /Missing/
P45 A 1241

8:39-31 αυτους
2 OM
D e
* /Missing/
P45 A 1241

8:39-40 ητε
2 εστε
P66 P75 01 B D L UBS3
9 [ητε /::/ εστε]
Origen
* /Missing/
P45 A 1241

8:39-43 εποιειτε αν
10 εποιειτε
P75 01* Bc D E W Θ a e UBS3
8:40 νυν δὲ ζητεῖτε μὲ αποκτείναι ἄνθρωπον ὡς τὴν αλήθειαν υμῖν
λελαλήκα τὴν ἡκούσα παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦτο αβραάμ οὐκ ἐποίησεν

8:40-19 υμῖν λελαλήκα
2 ~ 2,1 (λελαλήκα υμῖν)
D Θ f13 a b
3 υμῖν λελαλήκαν
P66* e
* /Missing/
P45 A

8:40-28 ἡκούσα
2 ἡκούσεν
D e
* /Missing/
P45 A

8:40-31 θεοῦ
2 πατρὸς μου
Θ f13 1241
* /Missing/
P45 A

8:41 υμεῖς ποιεῖτε τα ἐργα τοῦ πατρὸς υμῶν εἰπὼν οὐν αὐτῶ ημεῖς εἰκ
πορνείας οὐ γεγεννημέθα ἐνα πατέρα εχομεν τον θεον

8:41-4 υμεῖς
2 + δὲ
01e D f1 565 b e
* /Missing/
P45 A

8:41-16 οὖν
2 OM
Origen 01 B L W f1 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A

8:41-31 οὐ γεγεννημέθα
2 οὐ γεγεννημέθα
P66 W f13 565
3 οὐκ γεγεννημέθα
01* L
4 οὐκ γεγεννηθήμεν
B D*
9 /NA/
ab e
* /Missing/
8:41-43 πατέρα εχομεν  
2 ~ 2,1 (εχομεν πατέρα)  
Θ a  
* /Missing/  
P45 A

8:42 ειπεν ουν αυτοις ο(1) υιοις ει ο(2) θεος πατηρ υμων ην ημαπατε  
an εμε εγω γαρ(1) εκ του θεου εξηλθον και ηκο ουδε γαρ(2) απ  
εμαυτου εληλυθα αλλ εκεινος με απεστειλε  

8:42-7 ουν  
2 OM  
Origen P66 P75 B C E L W Θ Π Ψ f1 33 565 1241 a b e  
UBS3  
* /Missing/  
P45 A

8:42-13 ο(1)  
2 OM  
P66 B  
9 /NA/  
a b e  
* /Missing/  
P45 A

8:42-34 ουδε  
2 ου  
P66 D Θ e  
* /Missing/  
P45 A

8:43 διετη την(1) λαλιαν την(2) εμην ου(1) γινωσκετε οτι ου(2)  
dυνασθε ακουειν τον(1) λογον τον(2) εμον  

8:43-25 τον(1) λογον τον(2) εμον  
2 τον εμον λογον  
Θ f13  
9 [τον λογον τον εμον /.:/ τον εμον λογον]  
a b e  
10 τον λογον τον εμον  
700  
* /Missing/  
P45 A

8:44 υμεις εκ(1) πατρος(1) του(1) διαβολου εστε και(1) τας επιθυμιας  
tου(2) πατρος(2) υμων θελετε ποιειν εκεινος ανθρωποκτονος ην απ  
αρχης και(2) εν(1) τη αληθεια(1) ουχ εστηκεν οτι(1) ουκ εστιν  
αληθεια(2) εν(2) αυτω οταν λαλη το ψευδος εκ( 2) των ιδιων λαλει  
οτι(2) ψευστης εστι και(3) ο πατηρ αυτου  

8:44-4 πατρος(1)  
2 του πατρος
8:44-52 οὐχ 2 οὐκ  
P66 01 B* C D L W Δ Θ Π Ψ f13 33 892 1241 UBS3

8:44-58 οὐκ εστὶν αληθεία(2) 2 αληθεία οὐκ εστὶν  
P66 D b

8:44-88 εστὶ 2 + καθώς

8:45 εγὼ δὲ οτι τὴν αληθείαν λέγω οὐ πιστευετε μοι

8:45-4 δὲ 2  

8:45-16 λέγω 2 + υμίν

8:46 τις εξ υμων ελέγχει με περὶ αμαρτίας ει δὲ αληθειαν λέγω διατι υμεις οὐ πιστευετε μοι

8:46-7 ελέγχει 2 ελεγχεὶ  
P75 Ψ 1241 a b e

214
δε

υμείς

ο ων εκ(1) του(1) θεου(1) τα ρηματα του(2) θεου(2) ακουει δια
touto υμεις ουκ(1) ακουετε οτι εκ(2) του(3) θεου(3) ουκ(2) εστε

οτι εκ(2) του(3) θεου(3) ουκ(2) εστε

απεκριθησαν οιν οι ιουδαιοι και(1) ειπον αυτω οιν σαμαρειτης ει συ και(2) δαιμονιον εχεις

ουν

λεγομεν ημεις

συ

απεκριθη ιησους εγω δαιμονιον ουκ εχω αλλα τιμω τον πατερα μου
και υμεις ατιμαζετε με
8:49-10 ἤσσους
2 + καὶ εἶπεν
01 Θ fl f13 565
* /Missing/
P45 A

8:50 εγὼ δὲ οὐ ζήτω τὴν δοξὰν μου ἐστὶν ο ζήτων καὶ κρίνων

8:50-7 μου
2 τὴν εμὴν
fl 565
9 /NA/
 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A

8:51 ἀμὴν(1) ἀμὴν(2) λέγω ὑμῖν εὰν τις τὸν(1) λόγον τὸν(2) εμὸν
τηρήσῃ θανατὸν οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ εἰς τὸν(3) αἰῶνα

8:51-13 λόγον τὸν(2) εμὸν
2 εμὸν λόγον
Origen P75 01 B C D L W Ψ 33 579 892 1241 UBS3
9 /NA/
 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A

8:52 εἰπον οὖν αὐτῷ οἱ(1) ιουδαῖοι νῦν ενώκαμεν ὅτι δαιμόνιον εχέις
αβραάμ ἀπεθάνε καὶ(1) οἱ(2) προφῆται καὶ(2) σὺ λέγεις εὰν τις
tὸν(1) λόγον μου τηρήσῃ οὐ μὴ γευστείς θανατὸν εἰς τὸν(2) αἰῶνα

8:52-7 οὖν
2 OM
Origen P66 01 B C W Θ 579 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A

8:52-34 τίς τὸν(1) λόγον μου
2 ~ 1,2,emon,3 (τίς τὸν εμὸν λόγον)
Origen 33
3 ~ 1,4,2,3 (τίς μου τὸν λόγον)
P66 L
4 ~ 4,1,2,3 (μου τίς τὸν λόγον)
D
9 /NA/
 a b e
* /Missing/
P45

8:52-43 οὐ μὴ γευστείς θανατοῦ
5 θανάτων οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ
   B 579 e
* /Missing/
P45

8:52-52 εἰς τὸν(2) αἰῶνα
2 OM
   D b
* /Missing/
P45

8:53 μη σὺ(1) μειξών εἰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν αβρααμ οστὶς απέθανε καὶ οἱ
   προφήται απέθανον τινα σεαυτον σὺ(2) ποιεῖς

8:53-9 πατρὸς ἡμῶν
2 OM
   D W a b e
* /Missing/
P45

8:53-15 οστὶς
2 στὶ
   P66* D a
* /Missing/
P45 e

8:53-24 προφήται
2 + καὶ
   fl3 e
* /Missing/
P45

8:53-39 σὺ(2)
2 OM
   Origen P66 P75 01 A B C D L W Δ Θ Π Ψ fl fl3 33
   579 892 1241 a b e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45

8:54 απεκρίθη ἡμῖν εἰς εἰς ὅιος ὁμοίων ἡ ὁμοία μου(1) οὐδὲν
   εστὶν(1) εστὶν(2) ο(1) πατὴρ μου(2) ο(2) ὁμοίων με ὁν ὑμεῖς
   λέγετε οτι θεὸς ὑμῶν εστι

8:54-7 απεκρίθη
2 + ὁ
   01 D Δ Θ Πε fl3
9 /NA/
   a b e
* /Missing/
P45

8:54-13 ὁμοίως
2 ὁμοίως
   Origen P66c P75 01* B C* D E W Θ fl fl3 579 a e UBS3
* /Missing/
8:54-34 μου(2)
2 OM
Origen W
* /Missing/
P45

8:58 εἰπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς αμην(1) αμην(2) λέγω υμῖν πρὶν αβρααμ γενεσθαι εγώ εἰμι

8:58-19 γενεσθαι
2 OM
D a b e
* /Missing/
P45

8:59 ἦραν οὖν λίθους ἵνα βαλῶσιν εἰς αὐτον Ἰησοῦς δὲ εκρυβῆ καὶ(1) εξῆλθεν εκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ διελθόν διὰ μεσοῦ αυτῶν καὶ(2) παρῆγεν οὕτως

8:59-34 διελθόν διὰ μεσοῦ αυτῶν καὶ(2) παρῆγεν οὕτως
2 καὶ διελθόν διὰ μεσοῦ αὐτῶν επορευετο καὶ παρῆγεν οὕτως
01e C L Ψ 33 579 892 1241
3 OM
Origen P66 P75 01* B D W Θ* a b e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45

9:1 καὶ παραγωγον εἰδὲν ἀνθρώπον τυφλὸν εἰκ γενετῆς

9:1-7 παραγωγον
2 + ὁ Ἰησοῦς
Θ Ω f13 1241
* /Missing/
P45

9:1-13 γενετῆς
2 γεννητῆς
Ε Π f1 f13 579 892
6 γεννητοῖς
1241
9 /NA/
ab e
* /Missing/
P45

9:4 εμε δει εργαζεσθαι(1) τα εργα του πεμψαντος με εως ημερα εστιν ερχεται νυς στε ουδεις δυναται εργαζεσθαι(2)

9:4-28 εως
2 ως
C* L W 33 b
* /Missing/
P45
9:5  οταν εν τω κοσμω ω φως ειμι του κοσμου

9:5-7  εν τω κοσμω ω
2  ~ 4,1,2,3 (ω εν τω κοσμω)
   D L Θ fl 33
9  /NA/
   a b e
* /Missing/
P45

9:30  απεκριθη ο ανθρωπος και(1) ειπεν αυτοις εν γαρ τουτω θαυμαστον
      εστιν οτι υμεις ουκ οιδατε ποθεν εστι και(2) ανεωξε μου τους
      οφθαλμους

9:30-28  θαυμαστον εστιν
2  το θαυμαστον εστιν
   Origen P66 P75 01 B L Ψ fl 33 1241 UBS3
3  εθαυμαζον
   579
9  /NA/
   a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C

9:39  και(1) ειπεν ο ιησους εις(1) κριμα εγω εις(2) τον κοσμον τουτον
      ηλθον ινα οι(1) μη βλεποντες(1) βλεπωσι και(2) οι(2)
      βλεποντες(2) τυφλοι γενωνται

9:39-19  εις(2) τον κοσμον τουτον ηλθον
2  εις τον κοσμον ηλθον
   1241
3  ~ 5,1,2,3,4 (ηλθον εις τον κοσμον τουτον)
   P66c D a b
4  ~ 5,1,2,3 (ηλθον εις τον κοσμον)
   P66*
* /Missing/
P45 C

9:39-28  ηλθον
2  εληλυθα
   P75 579 892
* /Missing/
P45 C

10:8  παντες οσοι προ εμου ηλθον κλεπται εισι και λησται αλλ ουκ
      ηκουσαν αυτων τα προβατα

10:8-7  παντες
2  OM
   D b
* /Missing/
   C 892
10:8-13 προ εμου ηλθον
2 ~ 3,1,2 (ηλθον προ εμου)
P66 01c A B D L W Π Ψ f13 33 579 700 1241 UBS3
9 [προ εμου ηλθον / ../ ηλθον προ εμου]
Origen
10 ηλθον
P45 vid P75 01* E Δ Ω a b e
* /Missing/
C 892

10:8-43 ηκουσαν
2 ηκουσεν
Origen P45 L
* /Missing/
C 892

10:10 ο κλεπτης ουκ ερχεται ει μη ινα(1) κλεψη και(1) θυση και(2)
apολεση εγω ηλθον ινα(2) ζωην εχωσι και(3) περισσον εχωσιν

10:10-19 και(1) θυση
2 OM
a e
* /Missing/
C 892

10:16 και(1) αλλα προβατα εχω α ουκ εστιν εκ της(1) αυλης ταυτης
cακεινα με δει αγαγειν και(2) της(2) φωνης μο υ ακουσουσι και(3)
γενησεται μια ποιμνη εις ποιμην

10:16-40 γενησεται
4 γενησονται
Origen P45 01c B D L W Θ Ψ f1 33 565 UBS3
* /Missing/
P75 C 892

10:18 ουδεις αιρει αυτην(1) απ(1) εμου αλλ. εγω τιθημι αυτην(2) απ(2)
εμαυτου εξουσιαν(1) εχω(1) θειναι αυτην(3) και εξουσιαν(2)
εχω(2) παλιν λαβειν αυτην(4) ταυτην την εντολην ελαβον παρα του
πατρος μου

10:18-7 αιρει
2 ηρεν
P45 01* B
* /Missing/
P75 C 892

10:18-52 εξουσιαν(2) εχω(2) παλιν
2 παλιν εξουσιαν εχω
Origen P45
3 εξουσιαν εχω
e
* /Missing/
C 892
10:21 αλλοι ελεγον ταυτα τα ρηματα ουκ εστι δαιμονιζομενου μη δαιμονιον δυναται τυφλων οφθαλμους ανοιγειν

10:21-31 τυφλων οφθαλμους
2 ~ 2,1 (οφθαλμους τυφλων)
D e
* /Missing/
C 892

10:21-40 ανοιγειν
2 ανοιξαι
Origen P66 01 B L W Θ f1 13 33 565 579 UBS3
9 /NA/
 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 892

10:26 all υμεις ου(1) πιστευετε ου(2) γαρ εστε εκ των(1) προβατων των(2) εμων καθως ειπον υμιν

10:26-22 ου(2) γαρ
2 οτι ουκ
Origen P66 P75 01 B D L W Θ Ψ f1 13 33 565 579 1241
b UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 C 892

10:27 τα(1) προβατα τα(2) εμα της φωνης μου ακουει καγω γινωσκω αυτα και ακολουθουσι μοι

10:27-19 ακουει
2 ακουουσιν
Origen P66 01 B L W Θ f13 33 1241 UBS3
3 ακουσωσιν
579
9 /NA/
 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C 892

10:30 εγω και ο πατηρ εν εσμεν

10:30-4 πατηρ
2 + μου
W Δ e
* /Missing/
P45 C 892

10:33 απεκριθησαν αυτω οι ιουδαιοι λεγοντες περι(1) καλου εργου ου λιθαζομεν σε αλλα περι(2) βλασφημιας και οτι συ ανθρωπος ον ποιεις σεαυτον θεον

10:33-34 συ
2 OM
10:33-40 σεαυτον
e  εαυτον
f13 1241
* /Missing/
P75 C 892

10:36 ον ο πατηρ ηγιαζε και απεσταλεν εις τον κοσμον υμεις λεγετε
οτι(1) βλασφημεις οτι(2) ειπον υιος του θεου ειμι

10:36-49 βλασφημεις
2 βλασφημει
 a b e
* /Missing/
P75 C 892 1241

10:36-67 του
P45 vid
2 OM
P66* 01 D E W
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P75 C 892

11:11 ταυτα ειπε και μετα τουτο λεγει αυτοις λαζαρος ο φιλος ημων
κεκοιμηται αλλα πορευομαι ινα εξυπνισω αυτον

11:11-16 κεκοιμηται
3 κοιμηται
D a b e
* /Missing/
P45 892

11:39 λεγει(1) ο ιησους αρατε τον λιθον λεγει(2) αυτω η αδελφη του
tεθνηκοτος μαρθα κυριε ηδη οζει τεταρταιος γαρ εστι

11:39-4 λεγει(1)
2 + ouv
Θ
3 + αυτη
A 579
* /Missing/
P45 565 892

11:39-7 o
2 OM
A D Π* 9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 565 892
11:39-16 η αδελφή του τεθνηκοτος
2 η αδελφή του τετελευτηκοτος
Origen P66 P75 vid 01 A B C D L W Ψ 33 1241 UBS3
3 h
Θ a b e
* /Missing/
P45 565 892

11:40 λεγει αυτη ο ιησους ουκ ειπον σοι στι εαν πιστευσης ους την
doξαν του θεου

11:40-10 πιστευσης
2 πιστευςης
Ω 700
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 565 892

11:41 ηραν ουν τον λιθον ου ην ο(1) τεθνηκως κειμενος ο(2) δε ιησους
ηρε τους οφθαλμους ανω και ειπε πατερ ευχαριστω σοι στι ηκουσας
mu

11:41-13 ου ητην ο(1) τεθνηκος κειμενος
2 ου ην
Α Π fl 579
3 OM
Origen P66 P75 01 B C* D L W Ψ 33 1241 a b e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 565 892

11:41-34 ο(2) δε
2 και o
D
3 ο ην
Θ fl fl3
4 o
e
* /Missing/
P45 565 892

11:41-46 οφθαλμους
2 + αυτου
P66c D 33 1241 e
3 + αυτου εις τον ουρανον
b
4 + εις τον ουρανον
Π a
* /Missing/
P45 565 892

11:41-49 ανω
2 OM
εγώ δε ηδειν οτι(1) παντοτε μου ακουεις αλλα δια τον(1) οχλον
tον(2) περιεστωτα ειπον ινα πιστευσωσιν οτι(2) συ με απεστειλας

και ταυτα ειπων φωνη μεγαλη εκραυγασε λαξαρε δευρο εξω

και εξηλθεν ο(1) τεθνηκως δεδεμενος τους ποδας και(2) τας
χειρας κειριαις και(3) η οψις αυτου σουδαριω περιεδεδετο λεγει

αυτοις ο(2) ιησους λυσατε αυτον και(4) αφετε υπαγειν
11:44-43 το ιησους
2 ιησους
   Origen P75 B C*
9 /NA/
   a b e
* /Missing/ 565 892

11:44-52 ο(2) ιησους
2 ιησους
   Origen P75 B C*
9 /NA/
   a b e
* /Missing/ 565 892

11:45 πολλοι ουν εκ των ιουδαιων οι ελθοντες προς την μαριαν και θεασαμενοι α εποιησεν ο ιησους επιστευσαν εις αυτον

11:45-7 εκ
2 OM
   D f1
* /Missing/ 565 892

11:45-28 και θεασαμενοι
3 ευαγγελια
   P45 P66 D a b
* /Missing/ P75 565 892

11:45-31 α
   P66* vid
2 ο
   Ac B C D f1 e
3 οσα
   P66c
* /Missing/ P75 565 892

11:45-34 το ιησους
2 ιησους
   01
3 OM
   Origen P45 P66 A B C* L W Θ f1 b e UBS3
* /Missing/
τινες δε εξ αυτων απηλθον προς τους φαρισαιους και ειπον αυτοις ησους
 α εποιησεν ο να ιησους

συνηγαγον ουν οι αρχιερεις και οι φαρισαιοι συνεδριον και ελεγον τι ποιουμεν οτι ο ανθρωπος πολλα σημεια ποιει

συνεδριον κατα του ιησου

οτι ο ανθρωπος ουτος

πολλα τοιαυτα
εαν αφωμαν αυτον(1) ουτω παντες πιστευσουσιν εις αυτον(2) και(1) ελευσονται οι ρωμαιοι και(2) αρουσιν ημον και(3) τον τοπον και(4) το εθνος

πιστευσουσιν

εις δε τις εξ αυτων καιαφας αρχιερευς ων του ενιαυτου εκεινου ειπεν αυτοις υμεις ουκ οιδατε ουδεν

καιαφας
καιαφας
+ ονοματι
καιαφας
ονοματι καιαφας

διαλογιζεσθε οτι συμφερει ημιν ινα εις ανθρωπος αποθανη υπερ του λαου και μη ολον το εθνος αποληται

dιαλογιζεσθε

ημιν
υμιν

του(1) ενιαυτου εκεινου προεφητευσεν οτι εμελλεν ο ιησους αποθανην υπερ του(2) εθνους

tου(1) ενιαυτου εκεινου

προεφητευσεν

εμελλεν ο ιησους αποθηνησειν
1241 b
3 ημελλεν ιησους αποθνησκειν
   P45 vid P66 A B L Δ f1
3 ημελλεν ο ιησους αποθνησκειν
   Θ 33
4 ημελλεν αποθνησκειν ιησους
   W
4 ημελλεν αποθνησκειν ο ιησους
   579
5 ιησους ημελλεν αποθνησκειν
   D
9 /NA/
   e
* /Missing/
   P75 C 892

11:51-34 ο
2 OM
   Origen P45 P66 01 A B D E L W Δ Π* Ω f1 565 700
   UBS3
9 /NA/
   a b e
* /Missing/
   P75 C 892

11:52 και(1) συχ υπερ του(1) εθνους μονον αλλ ινα και(2) τα(1) τεκνα
tου(2) θεου τα(2) διεσκορπισμενα συναγαγη εις εν

11:52-7 εθνους
2 + δε
   01c Ψ 33 579
* /Missing/
   C 892

11:52-22 διεσκορπισμενα
3 εσκορπισμενα
   P45 P66 D 700
9 /NA/
   a b e
* /Missing/
   P75 C 892

11:52-25 συναγαγη εις εν
2 εις εν συναγαγη
   D a e
* /Missing/
   C 892

11:53 απ εκεινης ουν της ημερας συνεβουλευσαντο ινα αποκτεινωσιν
daυτον

11:53-7 ημερας
2 ορας
   L 1241
* /Missing/
11:53-10 συνεβουλευσαντο
2 εβουλευσαντο
P45 P66 P75 vid 01 B D W Θ f13 UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
C 892

11:53-13 συνεβουλευσαντο
2 οι ιουδαιοι
1241 e
* /Missing/
C 892

11:54 ιησους ουν ουκ ετι παρρησια περιεπατει εν τοις ιουδαιοις αλλα
απηλθεν εκειν εις(1) την χωραν εγγυς της ερημου εις(2) εφραιμ
λεγομενην πολιν κακει διετριβε μετα των μαθητων αυτου

11:54-4 ιησους ουν
2 ο ουν ιησους
Origen P75 01 B L W f1 565 579 1241 UBS3
2 ο ουν ο ιησους
Θ
3 ο δε ιησους
P66
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C 892

11:54-25 εκεινεν
2 OM
P45 vid D 579 a b e
* /Missing/
C 892

11:54-28 την
2 OM
Θ f1 565
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
C 892

11:54-43 κακει
2 και εκει
Origen P66 L W Θ f13 33 1241
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P75 C 892

11:54-46 διετριβε
3 εμείνεν
Origen P66* P75 01 B L W 579 1241 UBS3
* /Missing/
C 892

11:54-49 τον μαθητάν αυτού
2 τον μαθητάν
Origen P45 P66 01 B D L W Δ Ψ 565 UBS3
3 αυτον και εβαπτιζεν
33 * /Missing/
P75 C 892

11:55 ην δὲ εγγυς το πασχα(1) τον ιουδαιον και ανεβησαν πολλοι εις
ιεροσολυμα εκ της χωρας προ του πασχα(2) ινα αγνισωσιν εαυτους

11:55-13 και ανεβησαν
2 ανεβησαν ουν
D b
* /Missing/
C 892

11:56 εξητουν ουν τον ιησουν και ελεγον μετ αλληλων εν τω ιερω
εστηκοτες τι δοκει υμιν οτι ου μη ελθη εις την εορτην

11:56-19 εν τω ιερω εστηκοτες
2 εστηκοτες εν τω ιερω
L Θ f13 1241
4 εν τω ιερω εστιτες
D
9 /NA/
    a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C 892

11:57 δεδωκεισαν δε και(1) οι(1) αρχιερεις και(2) οι(2) φαρισαιοι
εντολην ινα εαν τις γνω που εστι μηνυση οπως πιασωσιν αυτον

11:57-7 και(1)
2 OM
Origen P66 P75 01 A B L W Δ Θ Π Ψ f1 f13 579 700
1241 a b e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 C 892

11:57-16 εντολην
2 εντολας
Origen 01 B W f1 565 579 UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 892

12:1 ο(1) ουν ηησους προ εξ ημερων του πασχα ηλθεν εις βηθανιαν οπου
ην λαζαρος ο(2) τεθηκηκος ον ηησεν εκ νεκρων
12:1-28  ο(2) τεθνηκως
   2  OM  
   Origen 01 B L W a e UBS3
*  /Missing/
   P45 P75 C 892

12:2  εποιησαν ουν αυτω(1) δειπνον εκει και η μαρθα διηκονει ο δε
       λαζαρος εις ην των συνανακειμενων αυτω(2)

12:2-16  δειπνον εκει
   2  εκει δειπνον  
       Θ f13  
   4  δειπνον  
       a e  
*  /Missing/
   P45 P75 C 892

12:2-22  η
   2  OM  
   P66 D Θ  
   9  /NA/  
       a b e  
*  /Missing/
   P45 P75 C 892

12:2-25  μαρθα διηκονει
   2  dihkonei marqa  
       D Θ  
*  /Missing/
   P45 P75 C 892

12:2-40  ην
   2  + εκ  
   Origen P66 01 B L UBS3  
   9  /NA/  
       a b e  
*  /Missing/
   P45 P75 C 892

12:2-46  συνανακειμενων
   2  ανακειμενων συν  
   Origen P66 01 A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f1 f13 579 700 1241 UBS3  
   9  /NA/  
       a b e  
*  /Missing/
   P45 P75 C 892

12:6  ειπε δε τουτο ουχ οτι(1) περι των πτωχων εμελεν αυτω αλλ οτι(2)
      κλεπτης ην και(1) το γλωσσοκομον ειχε και(2) τα βαλλομενα
      εβασταξεν

12:6-43  ειχε και(2)
   2  εχων και  
       f1  
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εχων
Origen P75 01 B D L 33 UBS3
εχον
W Θ 579
/ /Missing/
P45 C 892

12:12  τη επαυριον οχλος πολλος ο(1) ελθων εις(1) την εορτην ακουσαντες
       οτι ερχεται ο(2) ιησους εις(2) ιεροσολυμα

12:12-10  επαυριον
2  + ouv
       Θ b
* / /Missing/
P45 C 892

12:12-13  οχλος
2  ο οχλος
       P66* B L f13 UBS3
3  ο οχλος ο
       P66c Θ
9  /NA/
       a b e
* / /Missing/
P45 P75 C 892

12:12-19  ο(1)
2  OM
       01* Δ 565
9  /NA/
       a b e
* / /Missing/
P45 C 892

12:12-31  ερχεται ο(2) ιησους
1  ερχεται ιησους
       Origen 01 D E W Δ Π Ψ f1 700
1  ερχεται [ο / . / OM] ιησους
  b
2  ιησους ερχεται
       A L 33 1241
2  [ο / . / OM] ιησους ερχεται
  a e
3  ερχεται
       565
* / /Missing/
P45 C 892

12:12-37  ο(2)
2  OM
       Origen 01 A D E L W Δ Π Ψ f1 33 700 1241
9  /NA/
       a b e
* / /Missing/
P45 C 565 892
12:13 ἐλαβόν τα βαία των φοινικών καὶ(1) εξήλθον εἰς υπαντήσιν αὐτῷ καὶ(2) εκραζόν ὁσαννα εὐλογημένος ο(1) ερχομένος εν ονοματί κυρίου ο(2) βασιλέως τοῦ ισραήλ.

12:13-19 υπαντήσιν
2 ἀπαντήσιν
Origen Α Π
3 συναντήσιν
D L f13 1241
9 /NA/
  a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C 892

12:13-25 εκραζόν
2 εκραυγάζον
P75 01 Be D L W Ω 579 UBS3
3 εκραυγασαν
P66 B*
9 /NA/
  a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C 892

12:13-28 εκραζόν
2 + λεγοντες
P66 01 A D Π f1 f13 565 a
* /Missing/
P45 C 892

12:13-46 ο(2)
3 καὶ ο
P75 vid 01* B L W Ψ 579 UBS3
9 [ο /... καὶ ο] Origen
10 OM
  Α Ε Δ Ω f13 700 1241
* /Missing/
P45 C 33 892

12:14 ευρων δὲ ο Ἰησοῦς οναριον εκαθίσεν επ αὐτῷ καθὼς εστί γεγραμμένον

12:14-10 αὐτῷ
2 αὐτῷ
Δ Θ Π
9 /NA/
  a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C 892

12:15 μὴ φοβοῦ θυγατέρ σιων ἵδου ο βασιλεὺς σου ερχεται καθημένος επὶ παλαν ονου
12:15-4 θυγατήρ
1 θυγατήρ
Origen
2 η θυγατήρ
P75 Bc
9 /NA/
 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C 892

12:15-19 ερχεται
2 + σοι
565 e
* /Missing/
P45 C 892

12:15-22 πωλον
2 πωλου
P66* Ω f13
9 /NA/
 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C 892

12:16 ταυτα(1) δε ουκ εγνωσαν οι μαθηται αυτου το πρωτον αλλ οτε εδοξασθη ο ιησους τοτε εμνησθησαν οτι ταυτα(2) ην επ αυτω(1) γεγραμμενα και ταυτα(3) εποιησαν αυτω(2)

12:16-4 ταυτα(1) δε
2 και ταυτα
579
3 ταυτα
P66 01 B L W Θ b e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 892

12:16-10 εγνωσαν
2 ενοησαν
D Θ
9 /NA/
 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 892

12:16-13 οι μαθηται αυτου
2 ~ 3,1,2 (αυτου οι μαθηται)
P75 01 B Θ 579 UBS3
9 [οι μαθηται αυτου /::: αυτου οι μαθηται]
 a b e
10 οι μαθηται
Π
* /Missing/
P45 C 892

12:16-22 πρωτον
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12:26 εαν(1) εμοι(1) διακονη(1) τις(1) εμοι(2) ακολουθειτο και(1) οπου ειμι εγω εκει και(2) ο(1) διακονος ο(2) εμος εσται και(3) εαν(2) τις(2) εμοι(3) διακονη(2) τιμησει αυτον ο(3) πατηρ

12:26-19 ειμι εγω
2 ~ 2,1 (εγω ειμι)
P66 D W a b e

12:26-31 εσται
2 εστιν
P66*
3 εστω
f13
4 OM
L e

12:31 νυν(1) κρισις εστι του(1) κοσμου(1) τουτου(1) νυν(2) ο αρχων του(2) κοσμου(2) τουτου(2) εκβληθησεται εξω

12:31-22 εκβληθησεται
2 βληθησεται
P66 D Θ
9 /NA/
a b e

12:31-25 εξω
2 κατω
Θ b e

12:32 καγω εαν υψωθω εκ της γης παντας ελκυσω προς εμαυτον

12:32-7 εαν
2 αν
B
3 οταν
1241 a e

12:32-13 εκ
12:32-19 παντας

12:35 εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ(1) ἡσσους ἐτι μικρὸν χρόνον το(1) φῶς(1) μεθ

12:35-25 μεθ υμον

12:45 καὶ ο θεωρων εμε θεωρει τον πεμψαντα με

13:1 πρὸ δὲ τῆς εορτῆς τοῦ(1) πασχα εἰδὼς ὁ ἡσσους ότι ἐληλυθὲν

13:1-4 εἰδὼς

13:1-7 εληλυθὲν
και δειπνούν γενομένου του διαβόλου ήδη βεβληκότος εἰς τὴν καρδίαν Ἰουδαίον καὶ Ἰσκαριώτην ἵνα αὐτὸν παραδώ

13:2-7 γενομένου
3 γενομένου
Origen 01* B L W Ψ 579 1241 UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 565

13:2-10 τοῦ
2 + τε
P66 A
9 /NA/
  a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 565

13:2-22 Ἰουδαίον καὶ Ἰσκαριώτης ἵνα αὐτὸν παραδώ
3 Ἰουδαίον καὶ Ἰσκαριώτης ἵνα παραδώ αὐτὸν
D 579
15 ἵνα παραδῷ αὐτὸν Ἰουδαίον καὶ Ἰσκαριώτης UBS3
15 ἵνα παραδῷ αὐτὸν Ἰουδαίον καὶ Ἰσκαριώτης
01* B
15 ἵνα παραδῷ αὐτὸν Ἰουδαίον καὶ Ἰσκαριώτης
L Ψ 1241
15 ἵνα παραδῷ αὐτὸν Ἰουδαίον καὶ Ἰσκαριώτης
Origen P66 01c W
15 ἵνα [παραδῷ /··/ παραδῷ] αὐτὸν Ἰουδαίον καὶ Ἰσκαριώτης
b
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 565

13:2-25 Ἰουδαίον καὶ Ἰσκαριώτης
2 Ἰουδαίον καὶ Ἰσκαριώτης
Origen P66 01* 01c B W b
3 Ἰουδαίον καὶ Ἰσκαριώτης
L Ψ 1241 UBS3
4 Ἰσκαριώτης
f13
5 Ἰουδαίον καὶ Ἰσκαριώτης δὲ
6 Ἰουδαίον καὶ Ἰσκαριώτης
579
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 565

13:2-37 αὐτὸν παραδῷ
10 παραδῷ αὐτὸν
13:3 ειδώς ο(1) ιησους οτι(1) παντα δεδωκεν αυτω ο(2) πατηρ εις τας χειρας και(1) οτι(2) απο θεου εξηλθε και(2) προς τον θεον υπαγει

13:3-10 ο(1) ιησους
3 δε ο ιησους
Ω f13 b
4 OM
Origen P66 01 B D L W 1241 a e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 565

13:3-13 δεδωκεν
2 εδωκεν
Origen 01 B L W f1 579 UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 565

13:3-28 τον θεον
2 θεον
Π Ω
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 565

13:4 εγειρεται εκ του δειπνου και(1) τιθησι τα ιματια και(2) λαβων λεντιον διεζωσεν εαυτον

13:4-16 ιματια
2 + αυτον
D 579 a
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 565

13:5 ειτα βαλλει υδωρ εις τον νιπτηρα και(1) ηρξατο νιπτειν τους ποδας των μαθητων και(2) εκμασσειν τω λεντιω ων διεζωσμενος

13:5-7 βαλλει υδωρ
3 λαβων υδωρ βαλλει
D f13
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 565

13:5-25 μαθητων
2 + αυτον
ερχεται ουν προς σιμωνα πετρον και λεγει αυτω εκεινος κυριε συ μου νυπτεις τους ποδας

και
και
και
και
και
και
και
και
και
13:8-10 νιψής τους ποδάς μου
2 νιψής μου τους ποδάς
Origen P66 B C L W Ψ 892 e UBS3
4 μου νιψής τους ποδάς
D fi fi3 1241
6 νιψής μου
b
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565 579

13:8-22 αυτω(2) ο ιησους
1 αυτω ιησους
P66 E W Θ Ω a
3 ιησους αυτω
Origen A B C L UBS3
5 ιησους
Cc D Ψ 1241 b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 33 565 579

13:8-28 ο
2 OM
Origen P66 A B C D E L W Θ Ψ Ω 1241 UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565 579

13:8-31 σε
3 τουV podaV sou
a e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:9 λεγει αυτω σιμων πετρος κυριε μη τους ποδας μου μονον αλλα και(1) τας χειρας και(2) την κεφαλην

13:9-4 σιμων πετρος
2 ~ 2,1 (πετρος σιμων)
B W
3 πετρος
D
* /Missing/
P45 565

13:9-7 κυριε
2 OM
Origen 01*
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:9-10 τους ποδας μου μονον
2 ~ 4,1,2 (μονον τους ποδας)
D a b
13:9-13

μου

2 OM

P66 D E a b e

* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:10

λέγει αυτῷ ο(1) ιησους ο(2) λελουμένος ου χρειαν εχει η τους ποδας νιψασθαι αλλ(1) εστι καθαρος όλος και ημεις καθαροι εστε αλλ(2) ουχι παντες

13:10-7

λελουμένος

2 λελουμένος

E f13

9 /NA/

a b e

* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:10-10

ου χρειαν εχει

2 ουκ εχει χρειαν

Origen P66 01 A B C* W Ψ UBS3

9 /NA/

a b e

* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:10-19

η τους ποδας νιψασθαι

3 ει μη τους ποδας νιψασθαι

B C* L W Π Ψ f13 33 892 a b e UBS3

4 ει μη τους ποδας μονον νιψασθαι

P66 Θ

6 την κεφαλην νιψασθαι ει μη τους ποδας μονον

D

7 νιψασθαι

Origen 01

8 OM

579

* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:11

ηδει γαρ τον παραδιδοντα αυτον δια τουτο ειπεν ουχι παντες καθαροι εστε

13:11-22

ειπεν

2 + στι

P66 B C L W Ψ 33 a b UBS3

* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:12

οτε συν ενισχε τους ποδας αυτων και ελαβε τα ιματια αυτου αναπεσον παλιν ειπεν αυτοις γινοσκετε τι πεποιηκα υμιν
13:12-16 καὶ
2 OM
   P66 01 A Cc L Ψ 33 1241 a b
* /Missing/
   P45 P75 565

13:12-25 αὐτοῦ
2 εαυτοῦ
   W
3 OM
   D b e
* /Missing/
   P45 P75 565

13:12-28 αναπέσαν
2 καὶ αναπέσαν
   P66 01c Ac L Ψ 33 1241 b
4 καὶ ανεπέσεν
   Origen 01* B C* W 579 a e UBS3
* /Missing/
   P45 P75 A* 565

13:13 υμεῖς φωνεῖτε με ο(1) διδασκάλος καὶ(1) ο(2) κυρίος καὶ(2) κάλλος λέγεστε εἰμι γαρ

13:13-10 διδασκάλος καὶ(1) ο(2) κυρίος
2 ~ 4,2,3,1 (κυρίος καὶ ο διδασκάλος)
   Cc E f 33 892 1241
* /Missing/
   P45 P75 565

13:14 εἰ οὖν εγὼ ενίσχυμα υμῶν τοὺς(1) ποδας(1) ο(1) κυρίος καὶ(1) ο(2) διδασκάλος καὶ(2) υμεῖς οφείλετε αλλήλοις νιπτεῖν τοὺς(2) ποδας(2)

13:14-10 υμὸν τοὺς(1) ποδας(1)
2 ~ 2,3,1 (touV podaV umwn)
   D II 579 a e
* /Missing/
   P45 P75 565

13:14-22 διδασκάλος
2 + ποσὸ μαλλὸν
   D Θ a
* /Missing/
   P45 P75 565

13:15 υποδείγμα γαρ εἴδοκα υμῖν(1) ἵνα καθὼς εγὼ εποίησα υμῖν(2) καὶ υμεῖς ποιήστε

13:15-7 γαρ
2 OM
   P66* 700
* /Missing/
   P45 P75 565
13:15-10 εδωκα
2 δεδωκα
P66 01 Α Π Ψ f1 f13 33 700 892 1241
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:15-16 εγω
2 OM
33 1241
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:16 αμην(1) αμην(2) λεγω υμιν ουκ εστι δουλος μειζων(1) του(1) κυριου αυτου ουδε αποστολος μειζων(2) του(2) πεμψαντος αυτον

13:16-16 μειζων(2)
2 μειζων
P66c W 579
3 OM
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 Θ 565

13:18 ου περι παντων υμων λεγω εγω οιδα ους εξελεξαμην αλλ ινα η γραφη πληρωθη ο τρωγων μετ εμου τον αρτον επη ρεν επ εμε την πτερναν αυτου

13:18-13 εγω
2 + γαρ
01 A Π f13
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:18-19 ους
2 τινας
Origen 01 B C L 33 892 1241 UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:18-25 η γραφη πληρωθη
2 ~ 3,1,2 (πληρωθη η γραφη)
D b
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:18-34 μετ εμου
2 μου
B C L 892 UBS3
9 [μετ εμου /.../ μου]
Origen
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:18-40 επηρεν
2 επηρκεν
01 Α W Θ Π
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:18-43 επ
2 OM
P66* B
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:19 απ αρτι λεγω υμιν προ του γενεσθαι ινα οταν γενηται πιστευσητε
οτι εγω ειμι

13:19-19 οταν γενηται πιστευσητε
1 οταν γενηται πιστευσητε
C
3 ~ 3,1,2 (πιστευσητε οταν γενηται)
P66 01 L 579 a b e UBS3
3 πιστευσητε οταν γενηται
Origen B
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:19-25 πιστευσητε
2 πιστευσητε
Origen B C
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:20 αμην(1) αμην(2) λεγω υμιν ο(1) λαμβανον(1) εαν τινα πεμψω
εμε(1) λαμβανει(1) ο(2) δε εμε(2) λαμβανον(2) λαμβανει(2) τον
πεμψαινα με

13:20-16 εαν
2 αν
P66* 01 B C L W Π Ψ 33 579 892 1241 UBS3
3 α
A
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:20-31 ο(2) δε εμε(2) λαμβανον(2)
2 και ο εμε λαμβανον
D 33 e
13:20-40 πεμψαντα
2 αποστειλαντα
f1 892
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:21 ταυτα ειπων ο ιησους εταραχθη τω πνευματι και(1) εμαρτυρησε και(2) ειπεν αμην(1) αμην(2) λεγω υμιν στι εις εξ υμων παραδοσει με

13:21-4  
2 ο
2 OM
P66* 01 B L
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:22 εβλεπον ουν εις αλληλους οι μαθηται απορουμενοι περι τινος λεγει

13:22-10 ουν
2 δε
a
3 OM
Origen 01c B C Ψ e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:22-19 μαθηται
2 + αυτου
P66 f13 1241 a
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:22-22 απορουμενοι
2 απορουντες
D f13
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:23 ην δε ανακειμενος εις των μαθητων αυτου εν τω κολπω του ιησου ον ηματα ο ιησους

13:23-4 ην δε
2 ην
Origen B C* L Ψ 892 UBS3
3 ην ουν
και ην

13:23-10 εις
2 + εκ
Origen P66 01 A B C D L W Δ Π Ψ f13 33 579 892 1241
a b e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:23-25 ον
2 + και
D a
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:23-31 ο ιησους
2 ιησους
P66* B
9 [ο ιησους / . . . ιησους]
a b
10 OM
e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565

13:24 νευει ουν τοιτω σιμων πετρος πυθεσθαι τις αν ειη περι ου λεγει

13:24-16 πυθεσθαι τις αν ειη
3 πυθεσθαι τις αν ειη ουτος
D
4 πυθεσθαι αυτοι τι αν ειη
579
5 πυθεσθαι
Ψ e
6 και λεγει αυτω ειπε τις εστιν
Origen B C L 33 892 a b
7 πυθεσθαι τις αν ειη περι ου ελεγεν και λεγει αυτω ειπε τις εστιν
01
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75

13:25 επιπεσων δε εκεινος επι το στηθος του ιησου λεγει αυτω κυριε τις εστιν

13:25-7 επιπεσων
2 αναπεσων
Origen P66* 01c B C L Π* Ψ 33 892 UBS3
3 οτι πεσων
579
13:25-10 δὲ  

2 οὖν  
P66 01 D L W Δ f1 f13 33 565 579 892 1241 a b UBS3  
3 ΟΜ  
Origen B C e  
* /Missing/  
P45 P75  

13:25-13 ἐκεῖνος  

2 + οὕτως  
P66 B C E L Δ Ω f13 33 UBS3  
* /Missing/  
P45 P75  

13:26 ἀποκρινεται ο Ἰησοῦς ἐκεῖνος ἐστιν ὁ εὗρο βάψας το(1) ψωμίν(1) επίθεσο καὶ εμβάψας το(2) ψωμίν(2) διδόσθεν ιοῦδα σιμώνος ἵσκαρισθη  

13:26-7 ἀποκρινεται  

2 + οὖν  
Origen 01c B C* L 892 a  
3 + αὐτῷ  
D f13 e  
* /Missing/  
P45 P75  

13:26-10 ὁ  

2 ΟΜ  
P66 B W  
9 /NA/  
 a b e  
* /Missing/  
P45 P75  

13:26-13 Ἰησοῦς  

2 + καὶ λέγει  
01 D f13  
3 + καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ  
892  
4 + καὶ εἶπεν  
1241  
* /Missing/  
P45 P75  

13:26-19 ὁ  
4 ὁ ἀν  
D f1 565  
9 /NA/  
 a b e  
* /Missing/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 13:26-22 | εγὼ | 2 OM 579 b e
| | | * /Missing/ P45 P75 |
| 13:26-28 | βαψας | 2 βαψο Origen B C L 1241 UBS3
| | | 3 εμβαψας A D W Π f1 f13 565
| | | * /Missing/ P45 P75 |
| 13:26-43 | επιδώσω | 2 δωσω W
| | | 3 και δωσω αυτω Origen B C L 1241 UBS3
| | | * /Missing/ P45 P75 579 |
| 13:26-46 | επιδώσω | 2 + αυτω Origen B C L 33 1241 UBS3
| | | * /Missing/ P45 P75 579 |
| 13:26-52 | και εμβαψας | 2 και εμβαψας ουν Πε
| | | 3 και βαψας D
| | | 4 βαψας ουν Origen 01 B C L 33 892 1241 a UBS3
| | | * /Missing/ P45 P75 579 |
| 13:26-67 | ψωμιον(2) | 2 + λαμβανει και Origen 01c B C L 33 892 1241 UBS3
| | | * /Missing/ P45 P75 579 |
| 13:26-79 | σιμωνος | 2 σιμωνι fl13 b
| | | 3 OM a e
| | | * /Missing/ P45 P75 |
| 13:26-82 | ἰσκαριωτη | |
και μετὰ τὸ ψωμίον τότε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς εκείνον ο(1) σατάνας λέγει
οὖν αὐτῷ ο(2) Ἰησοῦς ο(3) ποιεῖς ποιησον ταχίον

και μετα το ψωμιον τοτε
και τοτε
μετα
το λαβειν
ο(1)
και λεγει
λεγει
ο(2)
13:28 τοῦτο δὲ οὐδεὶς εγνώ τῶν ανακειμένων πρὸς τι εἶπεν αὐτῷ

13:28-10 δὲ
3 OM
B W Ψ 579
* /Missing/
P45 P75

13:29 τίνες γαρ ἐδοκοῦν ἐπει τὸ γλωσσοκομοῦν εἶχεν ο(1) Ἰουδας οτι λέγει αὐτῷ ο(2) Ἰησοῦς ἀγορασον ον χρεῖαν εἴχομεν εἰς τὴν εορτὴν ἡ τοῖς πτωχοῖς ἢν τι δῶ

13:29-28 ο(1) Ιησοῦς
2 OM
Origen 01 A B L W f1 f13 33 565 579 700 892 UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75

13:29-34 ο(2) Ἰησοῦς
2 ihsouV
Origen 01 B
9 [ο Ἰησοῦς /···/ Ἰησοῦς]
a b
10 OM
f1 565 e
* /Missing/
P45 P75

13:30 λαβὼν οὖν τὸ ψωμῖν εἰκεῖνος εὐθεῶς εξῆλθεν ἡν δὲ νυξ

13:30-10 το ψωμῖν εἰκεῖνος
2 εἰκεῖνος το ψωμῖν
33 a
3 το ψωμῖν
b
6 /Ιουδας/
e
* /Missing/
P45 P75

13:30-19 εὐθεῶς εξῆλθεν
2 ~ 2,1 (εξῆλθεν εὐθεῶς)
Π Ψ f13 33
2 εξῆλθεν εὐθεῶς
Origen P66 01 B C D L W 579 UBS3
2 εξῆλθεν [εὐθεῶς /···/ εὐθεῶς]
b
5 εξῆλθεν
e
* /Missing/
13:30-22 ευθεως
2 ευθυς
Origen P66 01 B C D L W 579 UBS3
3 OM  
9 /NA/  
ab  * /Missing/  
P45 P75

13:31 οτε ουν εξηλθε λεγει ο(1) ιησους νυν εδοξασθη(1) ο(2) υιος του 
ανθρωπου και ο(3) θεος εδοξασθη(2) εν αυτω

13:31-7 ουν
2 OM  
Α E Δ  * /Missing/  
P45 P75 Π

13:31-19 ο(1) ιησους
2 ιησους
Origen P66 01 B L Δ UBS3
9 /NA/  
ab e  * /Missing/  
P45 P75 1241

13:32 ει ο(1) θεος(1) εδοξασθη εν(1) αυτω και(1) ο(2) θεος(2) 
δοξασει(1) αυτον(1) εν(2) εαυτω και(2) ευθυς δοξασει(2) 
αυτον(2)

13:32-4 ει ο(1) θεος(1) εδοξασθη εν(1) αυτω
2 OM  
P66 01* B C* D L W Π* f1 579 a b  * /Missing/  
P45 P75

13:32-13 εαυτω
2 αυτω
Origen P66 01* B UBS3  * /Missing/  
P45 P75 C 579

13:33 τεκνια ετι μικρον μεθ υμων ειμι ζητησετε με και(1) καθως ειπον 
τοις ιουδαιοις οτι οπου υπαγω εγω υμεις ου δυνασθε ελθειν 
και(2) υμιν λεγω αρτι

13:33-10 μικρον
3 + χρονον  
01 L Θ Ψ f13 892  * /Missing/  
P45 P75
13:33-31 οτι
2 και
1241
3 ΟΜ
   P66 01* D W 579 b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75

13:33-34 υπαγω εγω
2 ~ 2,1 (εγω υπαγω)
   Origen 01 A B C D L Θ Π f1 f13 33 1241 a UBS3
3 υπαγω
   P66 W 579
4 εγω ειμι
e
* /Missing/
P45 P75

13:33-49 λεγω αρτι
3 λεγω πλην αρτι
   P66
4 λεγω αρτι πλην
   f1 565
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75

13:36 λεγει αυτω(1) σιμων πετρος κυριε που υπαγεις απεκριθη αυτω(2) ο
ησους οπου υπαγω ου δυνασαι μοι(1) νυν ακολουθησαι υστερον δε
ακολουθησεις αρτι

13:36-16 οπου
2 + εγω
   Origen 01 D Ψ f13 33 700 1241
* /Missing/
P45 P75

13:36-28 μοι(1)
3 ΟΜ
   565 e
* /Missing/
P45 P75

13:36-31 νυν ακολουθησαι
3 ακολουθησαι
   Δ
5 συνακολουθησαι αρτι
   D* e
6 συ νυν ακολουθησαι αρτι
   De
7 αρτι ακολουθησαι
   b
* /Missing/
P45 P75
13:36-37  υστερον δὲ ακολουθήσεις μοι(2)
2  υστερον δὲ μοι ακολουθήσεις
   D
3  υστερον δὲ ακολουθήσεις
   Α   Θ 892*
4  ακολουθήσεις δὲ υστερον
   Origen P66 01 B C* L W fl 33 565 579 a e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75

13:38  απεκριθή αυτῷ ο ιησους την ψυχην σου υπερ εμου θησεις αμην(1)
      αμην(2) λεγω σοι ου(1) μη αλεκτωρ φωνησει εως ου(2) απαρνηση με
      τρις

13:38-25  αλεκτωρ φωνησει
2  φωνησει αλεκτωρ
   Origen b
* /Missing/
P45 P75

13:38-34  απαρνηση με τρις
1  αρνηση με τρις
   Origen P66 B D L fl 565 b e UBS3
2  μαι απαρνησει τρεις
   579
4  ~ 3,απαρνησει,2 (τρις απαρνησει με)
   fl3
5  συ με απαρνηση τρις
   W
* /Missing/
P45 P75

13:38-37  απαρνηση
2  αρνηση
   Origen P66 B D L fl 565 b e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75

14:9  λεγει αυτω ο(1) ιησους τοσουτον χρονον μεθ υμων ειμι και(1) ουκ
      εγνωκας με φιλιππε ο(2) εωρακως εμε εωρακε τον(1) πατερα(1)
      και(2) πως συ λεγεις δειξον ημιν τον(2) πατερα(2)

14:9-7  τοσουτον χρονον
2  τοσουτω χρονω
   Origen 01* D L W UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C

14:9-28  εωρακε
2  + και
   P75 a b
14:11 πιστευετε(1) μοι(1) οτι εγω εν(1) τω πατρι και ο πατηρ εν(2) εμοι ει δε μη δια τα εργα αυτα πιστευετε(2) μοι(2)

14:11-10 εγω εν(1) τω πατρι και ο πατηρ εν(2) εμοι
2 ο πατηρ εν εμοι καγω εν τω πατρι
Origen D
* /Missing/
P45 C

14:23 απεκριθη(1) ιησους και(1) ειπεν αυτω(1) εαν τις αγαπα με τον λογον μου(1) τηρησει και(2) ο(2) πατηρ μου(2) αγαπησει αυτον(1) και(3) προς αυτον(2) ελευσομεθα και(4) μονην παρ αυτω(2) ποιησομεν

14:23-4 αυτο(1)
2 ΟΜ
P66 P75 01 A B D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω f1 33 579 700 892 1241 UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C

14:23-10 αυτο(1)
2 αυτοις
Origen Ω
9 /NA/
ea
* /Missing/
P45 C

14:23-31 προς
2 παρ
P66* e
* /Missing/
P45 C 892

14:23-34 ελευσομεθα
2 ειςελευσομεθα
P66*
4 ελευσομαι
D e
* /Missing/
P45 C 892

14:23-40 ποιησομεν
2 ποιησομεθα
Origen P66 P75 01 B L W f1 f13 33 565 579 UBS3
9 [ποιησομεν /::/ ποιησομεθα]
a b
10 ποιησομαι
D e
ο(1) δε παρακλητος το(1) πνευμα το(2) αγιον ο(2) πεμψει ο(3) πατηρ εν τω ονοματι μου εκεινος υμας(1) διδαξει παντα(1) και υπομνησει υμας(2) παντα(2) α ειπον υμιν

α

οσα

Origen Θ fl 565 a b

ειπον

αν ειπω

D Π a b e

υμιν

OM

B L UBS3

υμιν

+ εγω

B L UBS3

ηκουσατε οτι(1) ειπον(1) υμιν υπαγω και ερχομαι προς(1) υμας ει ηγαπατε με εχαρητε αν οτι(2) ειπον(2) πορευομαι προς(2) τον πατερα οτι(3) ο πατηρ μου(1) μειζων μου(2 ) εστι

ηγαπατε

αγαπατε

D L Fl 33 579

ηγαπατε / ∴ / αγαπατε

ειπον(2)

+ εγω

fI3 e

Οριγενη 01 A B D L Θ Ψ fl 33 565 579 1241 a b UBS3

μου(1)

OM

01c A B D* L Ψ fl 33 565 b e UBS3

ο πεμψας με
ουκ(1) ετι πολλα λαλησω μεθ υμων ερχεται γαρ ο του κοσμου
tου τουτου αρχων και εν εμοι ουκ(2) εχει ουδεν

14:30-13    του κοσμου τουτου αρχων
4    του κοσμου αρχων
01 A B D E L Δ Θ Π Ω 33 565 700 1241 UBS3
9  [του κοσμου αρχων /··/ του κοσμου τουτου αρχων]
P66
10    αρχων του κοσμου τουτου
Origen f1 f13 579 e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C W 892

14:30-25    ουδεν
2    + ευρειν
    D a
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C W 892

15:1    εγω ειμι η(1) αμπελος η(2) αληθινη και ο(1) πατηρ μου ο(2)
γεωργος εστι

15:1-16    ο(2)
2    OM
    D Δ
9  /NA/
    a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C W 892

15:15    ουκετι υμας(1) λεγω δουλους οτι(1) ο(2) δουλος ουκ οιδε τι
ποιει αυτου ο(2) κυριος υμας(2) δε ειρηκα φιλ ους οτι(2) παντα α
ηκουσα παρα του πατρος μου εγνωρισα υμιν

15:15-4    υμας(1) λεγω
2    ~ 2,1 (λεγω υμας)
P66 01 A B L Ψ 33 579 a b e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C W 892

15:19    ει εκ(1) του(1) κοσμου(1) ητε ο(1) κοσμος(1) αν το ιδιον εφιλει
οτι δε εκ(2) του(2) κοσμου(2) ουκ εστε αλλ ηκω εξελεξαμην
υμας(1) εκ(3) του(3) κοσμου(3) δια τουτο μισε υμας(2) ο(2)
κοσμος(2)

15:19-10   το
2    τον
P66 1241
9  /NA/
    a b e
15:22 ἐι μὴ ἠλθον καὶ ἐλάλησα αὐτοῖς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ(1) ἔχον νῦν δὲ πρόφασιν οὐκ(2) ἔχουσι περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν

15:22-13 ἔχον
3 ἔχοσαν
Origen P66 01 B L Πε fl 33 UBS3
9 /NA/
   a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C W 892

15:22-16 δὲ
2 OM
   01* e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C W 892

15:22-28 αὐτῶν
2 OM
   P66* e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C W 892

16:12 ἐτι πολλὰ ἔχω λέγειν υμῖν ἀλλ. οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἀρτί

16:12-4 ἔχω λέγειν υμῖν
2 ἔχω υμῖν λέγειν
   Origen 01 B L Ψ 33 b e UBS3
3 λέγειν ἔχω υμῖν
   579
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 892

16:12-22 δύνασθε
2 + αὐτὰ
   D a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 892

16:13 ὅταν δὲ ἐλήθη εἰκόνος τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας ὀδηγήσει υμᾶς εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀληθείαν οὐ γαρ λαλήση(1) αφ ἑαυτοῦ ἀλλ. ὦσα αν ἀκουσῆ λαλήση(2) καὶ τα ερχόμενα ἀναγγέλει υμῖν

16:13-4 δὲ
2 OM
   D W 579
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 892

16:13-16 ὀδηγήσει υμᾶς
3 εἰκόνος υμᾶς ὀδηγήσει
   D a
16:13-22 εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀληθείαν
2 εἰς τὴν ἀληθείαν πᾶσαν
Origen A B e
4 εν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πᾶσῃ
01e D L W f1 33 565 579 b UBS3
6 εν πᾶσῃ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ
Θ
7 εν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ
01*
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 892

16:13-40 αν ακούσῃ
3 αν ακούσει
De E Θ
4 αν ακούει
33
5 ακούσει
Origen B D* W Ψ f1 579 UBS3
6 ακουει
01 L b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 892

16:14 εκείνος εἰς δοξάσει οτι εκ του εμου λήψεται και αναγγέλει υμιν

16:14-16 λήψεται
5 λαμβάνει
Ω f13 e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 579 892 1241

16:16 μικρὸν(1) καὶ(1) οὐ θεωρεῖτε με(1) καὶ(2) πάλιν μικρὸν(2)
καὶ(3) οἴνεσθε με(2) οτι εγώ υπαγὼ προς τον πατέρα

16:16-10 οὐ
2 οὐκέτι
Origen P66 vid 01 B D L W Θ Ψ f1 33 b UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 892

16:18 εἶλεγον οὖν τοῦτο τι(1) εστίν ο λέγει τὸ μικρὸν οὐκ οἶδαμεν
τι(2) λαλεῖ

16:18-10 τοῦτο τι(1) εστίν
2 ~ 2,3,1 (τι εστίν τοῦτο)
Origen P66 01 B D* L W Ψ f1 f13 33 565 579 UBS3
9 /NA/
ab e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 892
εγνώ οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι(1) ἠθέλον αὐτὸν ἐρωταν καὶ(1) εἶπεν
αὐτοῖς περὶ τούτου ζητείτε μετὰ ἀλλήλων ὅτι(2) εἶπον μικρὸν(1)
καὶ(2) οὐ θεωρεῖτε με(1) καὶ(3) παλιν μικρὸν(2) καὶ(4) ούσεσθε
με(2)

ὁ λέγει
2 τὸ λέγει
A
3 OM
P66 01* D* W f1 f13 565 579 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 892

το
2 OM
Origen 01c B L Ψ 33
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 892

τι(2) λαλεῖ
2 τι λέγει
Θ
3 ο λέγει
D* a
4 OM
B
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 892

ηθέλον
2 ημελλόν
P66c 01 W 579
4 ημελλόν καὶ ηθέλον
P66*
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 892

ἐρωταν
2 + περὶ τούτου
D Θ
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 892

οὐ
16:18-22

16:18-28

16:18-37

16:19-7

16:19-13

16:19-16

16:19-37
ουκετι

Ω 565

* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 892

16:20 αμην(1) αμην(2) λέγω υμῖν οτι κλαυσετε και θρηνησετε υμεῖς(1) ο
δε(1) κοσμος χαρησεται υμεῖς(2) δε(2) λυπηθησεσθε αλλ η λυπη
υμων εις χαραν γενησεται

16:20-19 δε(2)

2 OM

01* B D f1 a b e UBS3

* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 892

16:23 και εν(1) εκεινη τη ημερα εμε ουκ ερωτησετε ουδεν αμην(1)
αμην(2) λέγω υμῖν(1) οτι οσα αν αιτησητε τον πατερα εν(2) το
ονοματι μου δωσει υμῖν(2)

16:23-22 οτι οσα αν

2 οτι ο αν

01

2 οτι ο εαν

Θ Π 33 1241

3 οτι αν

A De W

5 οτι εαν τι

ψ

7 αν τι

Origen B C L UBS3

7 εαν τι

D*

9 /NA/

a b e

* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 892

16:23-31 εν(2) τω ονοματι μου δωσει υμῖν(2)

2 δωσει υμῖν εν τω ονοματι μου

Origen 01 B C* L Δ

* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 892

16:24 εως αρτι ουκ ητησατε ουδεν εν τω ονοματι μου αιτητε και
ληψεσθε ἵνα η(1) χαρα υμων η(2) πεπληρωμενη

16:24-10 αιτητε

2 αιτησασθε

P66 01 W 579

9 /NA/

a b e

* /Missing/
P45 P75 892
16:25 ταύτα εὐν(1) παροιμιαί(1) λελαλήκα ήμιν(1) αλλ. ερχέται ορά στέ
ουκ ετι εὐν(2) παροιμιαί(2) λαλήσω ήμιν(2) αλλά παρρησία περί
tου πατρός αναγγέλω ήμιν(3)

16:25-16 αλλ.
2 OM
Origen P66 01 B C* D* L W Pc fl 33 579 a b e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 892

16:33 ταυτα λελαληκα ήμιν ινα ευν(1) ειρήνην εχητε ευν(2) το ποσίμο
Θλιψίν εξετε αλλα θαρσείτε εγώ νενικηκα τον ποσίμον

16:33-19 ευν(2) το ποσίμο Θλιψίν εξετε
2 OM
P66 vid Δ
* /Missing/
P45 P75 892

16:33-28 εξετε
2 εξετε
Origen 01 A B C E L W Θ Π Ψ 33 579 700 UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 Δ 892

17:1 ταυτα ελαλησεν ο(1) ιησους και(1) επηρε τους οφθαλμους αυτου
εις τον(1) ουρανον και(2) ειπε πατερ εληλυθεν η ωρα δοξασον
σου(1) τον(2) ιουν ινα και(3) ο(2) υιος σου(2) δοξαση σε

17:1-7 ελαλησεν
2 λελαληκεν
01 W 579
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 892

17:1-10 ο(1)
2 OM
01 B Θ UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 892

17:1-13 επηρε
3 επαρας
Origen P66 vid 01 B C D L W Θ fl fl3 33 565 579 1241 a
b UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 892

17:1-34 και(3)
2 OM
01 A B C* D W Θ fl 579 a b e UBS3
17:1-37 σου(2)
2 OM
01 B C* W e UBS3
9 [σου /∴/ OM]
Origen
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 892

17:3 αυτή δὲ εστίν ἡ αἰωνίας ζωή ἵνα γινώσκωσί σε τὸν μονὸν ἀληθινὸν θεὸν καὶ ὁν ἀπεστείλας ἦσουν χριστὸν

17:3-13 γινώσκωσι
4 γινώσκουσιν
Α Δ Λ W Δ 33 579 1241
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 892

17:5 καὶ νῦν δοξάσον με σὺ πατέρα(1) σεαυτῷ τῇ δόξῃ ἡ εἰχόν πρὸ τοῦ τον κόσμον εἰναι παρὰ(2) σοὶ

17:5-13 ἡ
2 ἡν
01* 579
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 892

17:5-22 πρὸ τοῦ τον κόσμον εἰναι παρὰ(2) σοὶ
3 ~ 6,7,1,2,3,4,5 (παρὰ σοὶ πρὸ τοῦ τον κόσμον εἰναι)
P66 a
9 [πρὸ τοῦ τον κόσμον εἰναι παρὰ σοὶ /∴/ παρὰ σοὶ πρὸ τοῦ τον κόσμον εἰναι]
Origen
11 παρὰ σοὶ πρὸ τοῦ γενεσθαι τὸν κόσμον
D
* /Missing/
P45 P75 892

17:11 καὶ(1) οὐκ εἶτι εἰμὶ εν(1) τῷ(1) κόσμῳ(1) καὶ(2) οὕτω εν(2)
tο(2) κόσμῳ(2) εἰσι καὶ(3) εγὼ πρὸς σε ερχόμαι πατέρα ἀγίῳ
tθηρήσαν αὐτούς εν(3) τῷ(3) ονοματί σου οὐς δεδοκάς μοι ἵνα ῥωσὶν
εν(4) καθὼς ἡμεῖς

17:11-13 εἰμί εν(1) τῷ(1) κόσμῳ(1)
2 ~ 2,3,4,1 (εν τῷ κόσμῳ εἰμί)
Α Π
* /Missing/
P45 P75 892
και(3) εγώ
καγώ
Origen 01 B C* D L Ψ f1 33 UBS3

εγώ(1) δεδεκα αυτούς τον λόγον σου και ο κόσμος εμισήσεν αυτούς
οτι ουκ(1) εισιν εκ(1) του(1) κόσμου(1) καθως εγώ(2) ουκ(2)
ειμι εκ(2) του(2) κόσμου(2)

εμισήσεν
μισει
D a e

ου περι(1) τουτών δε ερωτε μονον αλλα και περι(2) των
πιστευσώντων δια τον λόγον αυτών εις εμε

περι(2)
υπερ
Origen W 579

πιστευσώντων
πιστευοντων
Origen 01 A B C D* E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ f1 f13 33 579
700 1241 b UBS3

ινα(1) παντες εν(1) ωσι καθως συ(1) πατερ εν(2) εμοι καγω εν(3)
σοι ινα(2) και αυτοι εν(4) ημιν εν(5) ωσιν ινα(3) ο κόσμος
πιστευση οτι συ(2) με απεστειλας

εν(2)

OM

πιστευη
πιστευη
P66 01* B C* W UBS3
18:1 ταυτα ειπων ο ιησους εξηλθε συν τοις μαθηταις αυτου(1) περαν του χειμαρρου των κεδρων σου την κηπος εις ον εισηλθεν αυτος και οι μαθηται αυτου(2)

18:1-43 των κεδρων
2 του κεδρον
Α Δ e UBS3
3 του κεδρου
01* D W a b
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 892

18:1-64 εισηλθεν
2 εισηλθον
E e
3 εξηλθεν
579
4 εισεληλυθεν
W
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 892

18:3 ο ουν ιουδας λαβων την σπειραν και(1) εκ των αρχιερεων και(2) φαρισαιων υπηρετας ερχεται εκει μετα φανων και(3) λαμπαδων και(4) οπλων

18:3-10 λαβων
2 παραλαβων
f1 565
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 892

18:3-31 και(2)
2 + των
B
3 + εκ των
01* D L 579 a UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 892

18:4 ιησους ουν ειδως παντα τα ερχομενα επ αυτον εξηλθον ειπεν αυτοις τινα ζητειτε

18:4-13 ειδως
2 ιδον
D Ψ f13
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 892

18:4-34 εξηλθον ειπεν
απεκρίθησαν αυτῶν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραίον λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ(1) Ἰησοῦς
ἐγὼ εἰμί εἰστήκει δὲ καὶ Ιουδας ὁ(2) παραδίδουσα αὐτὸν μετ’ αὐτῶν

ναζωραίον

ο(1) Ἰησοῦς

εἰμι

ως οὖν εἶπεν αὐτῶν σι ἐγὼ εἰμί απῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω καὶ ἐπεσον χάμαι

οτί

ουν

ναζωραίον

ουν
18:8 απεκρίθη ο Ιησούς ευπόν υμῖν ὅτι εγὼ έιμι εἰ σοι ἐμε ζητεῖτε ἀφετέ τούτοις ὑπαγείν

18:8-7 απεκρίθη
P66 vid
2 + αυτοίς
Origen D f1 f13 565
* /Missing/
P45 P75 892

18:8-10 ο
2 OM
01 A B C E L W Δ Θ Π* Ψ Ω 33 579 700 1241
UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 892

18:13 καὶ ἀπηγαγὸν αὐτὸν πρὸς αὖναν πρωτὸν ἦν(1) γαρ πενθερὸς του(1) καὶ αἰφα ος ἦν(2) αρχιερεὺς του(2) ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου

18:13-7 ἀπηγαγὸν
2 ἦγαγον
P66 01* B D W 579 a UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 892 e

18:13-10 αὐτὸν
2 OM
Origen P66 vid 01 B C* D W Δ 33 579 a UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 892 e

18:14 ἦν δὲ καὶ αἰφα ο ὁ συμβουλεύσας τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὅτι συμφερεῖ ἐνα ἀνθρώπων ἀπολεῖσθαι υπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ

18:14-25 ἀπολεῖσθαι
2 αποθάναιν
Origen P66 vid 01 B C* L W Θ f1 f13 33 565 579 a b UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 75 Δ Ω 892 e

18:28 αγουσίν υἷν τὸν ἦσσον απὸ τοῦ καὶ αἰφα εἰς(1) το(1) πραιτόριῳ(1) ἦν δὲ πρεσβὴ καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰς ἔπεσαν εἰς(2) το(2) πραιτόριῳ(2) ἦν(1) μὴ μισθωθεὶν ἀλλὰ ἦν(2) φαγὼσι το(3) πασχα

18:28-16 καὶ αἰφα
2 καὶ αἰφα
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 D 892
18:31 εἶπεν οὖν(1) αὐτοῖς ὁ πιλάτος λαβετε αὐτὸν(1) ὑμείς καὶ κατα
tὸν νόμον ὑμῶν κρίνατε αὐτὸν(2) εἶπον οὖν(2) αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰουδαῖοι
ημῖν οὐκ ἔξεστιν αποκτεῖναι οὐδὲνα

18:31-67 ἀποκτεῖναι οὐδὲνα
P66 vid
2 ~ 2,1 (οὐδένα ἀποκτεῖναι)
* /Missing/
P45 P75 D 892

18:35 ἀπεκρίθη ὁ πιλάτος μητὶ εἰς Ἰουδαίους εἰμὶ το(1) εθνὸς τὸ(2) σον
καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς παρέδωκαν σε εμοὶ τι εποίησας

18:35-13 μητὶ
2 μη
01* W fl 565
3 μη γαρ
P66
* /Missing/
P45 P75 D 892

18:35-25 οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς παρέδωκαν
2 οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς παρέδωκαν
01* b
3 οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς παρέδωκαν
e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 D 892

18:36 ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς η(1) βασιλεία(1) η(2) εἰμ(1) οὐκ(1) εστίν(1)
eκ(1) τοῦ(1) κόσμου(1) τουτοῦ(1) εἰ εκ(2) τοῦ(2) κόσμου(2)
tουτοῦ(2) ἡ(3) βασιλεία(2) η(4) εἰμ(2) οἱ(1) υπηρέται αν
οἱ(2) εμοὶ ἡγώνιζοντο ἵνα μη τοπαθήθω τοις Ἰουδαίοις νῦν δὲ
ἡ(5) βασιλεία(3) η(6) εἰμ(3) οὐκ(2) εστίν(2) εντευθέν

18:36-46 η(3) βασιλεία(2) η(4) εἰμ(2)
2 η εἰμὶ βασιλεία
01 Θ
9 /NA/
ab e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C D 892

18:36-64 αν οἱ(2) εμοὶ ἡγώνιζοντο
2 ~ 2,3,4,1 (οἱ εμοὶ ἡγώνιζοντο αν)
Origen 01 Be L W Ψ fl f13 33 579 UBS3
4 οἱ εμοὶ ἡγώνιζοντο
B*
9 /NA/
ab e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C D 892
εκραυγασαν ουν παλιν παντες λεγοντες μη τουτον αλλα τον

βαραββαν ην δε ο βαραββας ληστης

απεκριθησαν αυτω οι ιουδαιοι ημεις νομον(1) εχομεν και κατα τον

νομον(2) ημον οφειλει αποθανειν οτι εαυτον υιον του θεου

εποιησεν

αυτω

οι ιουδαιοι ημεις νομον(1) εχομεν και κατα τον

νομον(2) ημων οφειλει αποθανειν οτι εαυτον υιον του θεου

εποιησεν

εαυτον υιον του θεου

του θεου

του θεου

εκ τουτου εζητει ο(1) πιλατος απολυσαι αυτον(1) οι δε ιουδαιοι

εκραζον λεγοντες εαν τουτον απολυσης ουκ ει φιλος του καισαρος

πας ο(2) βασιλεα αυτον(2) ποιων αντιλεγει τω καισαρι
19:12-31 ἐκραζον
579 vid
2 ἑκραυγασαν
P66 vid B Ψ 33 700 UBS3
3 ἑκραυγαζον
Origen Α Λ W Θ Π f1 f13 565 1241
8 ἔλεγον
01*
9 /NA/
  a b e
* /Missing/
  P45 P75 C D 892

19:12-34 λεγοντες
2 OM
  01 579
* /Missing/
  P45 P75 C D 892

19:12-40 εαν
2 αν
P66* B
9 /NA/
  a b e
* /Missing/
  P45 P75 C D 892

19:12-64 αυτον(2) ποιων
2 εαυτον ποιων
Origen P66 01 Α Β Ε Λ Δ Θ Π Ψ f1 f13 33 565 700
  1241 UBS3
3 ποιων εαυτον
W 579
9 /NA/
  a b e
* /Missing/
  P45 P75 C D 892

19:15 οι(1) δε ἑκραυγασαν ἄρον(1) ἄρον(2) σταυρωσον αὐτον λεγει
αυτοις ο πιλατος τον βασιλεα(1) υμων σταυρωσω απεκριθησαν οι(2)
arχιερεις ουκ εχομεν βασιλεα(2) ει μη καισαρα

19:15-7 εκραυγασαν
2 εκραυγασαν
A
3 εκραγαζον
Θ Π 1241
4 ἔλεγον
P66* vid 01* W 579
9 /NA/
  a b e
* /Missing/
  P45 P75 C D 892

19:15-10 εκραυγασαν
καὶ βασταζὼν τὸν(1) σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ εξῆλθεν εἰς τὸν(2) λεγομένον κρανίον τοπὸν ὡς λέγεται εβραίστι γολγοθὰ.

ιησοῦς οὖν ἴδου τὴν μητέρα καὶ τὸν μαθητὴν παρεστώτα αὐτὸν γιναι ἴδου ὁ υἱὸς σου.

ηλθὸν οὖν οἱ στρατιώται καὶ(1) τοῦ(1) πρῶτος κατεαξάν τὰ σκέλη καὶ(2) τοῦ(2) αὐτοῦ τοὺς συσταυρωθέντος αὐτῶ.

eπὶ δὲ τὸν ιησοῦν ἐλθοῦν ἐλθοντες ὡς ἴδου αὐτὸν ἥδη τεθνηκοτα οὐ κατεαξάν αὐτὸν τὰ σκέλη.

ἀλλ. εἰς τὸν στρατιωτῶν λόγη αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευρὰν εὐθὺς καὶ(1) εὐθὺς ἐξῆλθεν αἷμα καὶ(2) ὕδωρ.
19:34-13  αυτού την πλευράν
     2 την πλευράν αυτού
     Origen 579
     /NA/
     a b e
* /Missing/
     P45 P75 C D Δ 892

19:34-22 ευθυς εξηλθεν
     1 ευθεως εξηλθεν
     f13 700 1241
     2 ~ 2,1 (εξηλθεν ευθυς)
     Origen P66 01 B L W Ψ 33 579 a b UBS3
     5 εξηλθεν
e* /Missing/
P45 P75 C D Δ 892

19:34-25 ευθυς
     2 ευθεως
     f13 700 1241
     /NA/
     a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C D Δ 892

19:34-28 αιμα και(2) υδωρ
     2 υδωρ και αιμα
     579 b
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C D Δ 892

19:35 και(1) ο εωρακως μεμαρτυρηκε και(2) αληθινη αυτου εστιν η μαρτυρια κακεινος οιδεν οτι αληθη λεγει ινα υ μεις πιστευσητε

19:35-19 αυτου εστιν η μαρτυρια
     2 εστιν η μαρτυρια αυτου
     579 1241 a b
     3 εστιν αυτου η μαρτυρια
     P66 E Ω 700
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C D Δ 892 e

19:35-28 κακεινος
     2 και εκεινος
     P66 vid B W Θ f1 579 UBS3
     9 [κακεινος /·:/ και εκεινος]
     Origen
     /NA/
     a b
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C D Δ 892 e

19:35-43 ινα
2 + και
Origen P66 01 A B L W Θ Π Ψ f1 f13 33 565 579 1241 a
b UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C D 892 e

19:35-49 πιστευσήτε
3 πιστευσήτε
Origen 01* B Ψ
9 /NA/
a b
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C D 892 e

19:36 εγενέτο γαρ ταύτα ινα η γραφή πληρωθη οστουν ου συντριβήσηται
αυτου

19:36-4 γαρ
2 δε
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C D 892

19:36-16 συντριβήσηται
2 + ap
01 Ω 33 1241 a b
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C D 892

19:41 ην δε ev(1) τω(1) τοπω οπου εσταυρωθη κηπος και ev(2) τω(2)
κηπω μνημειον καινον εν(3) ουδεπω ουδεις ετεθη

19:41-40 ετεθη
2 ην τεθειμενος
P66 01 B W 579 UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C D 892

20:17 λεγει αυτη ο ιησους μη μου(1) απτου ουπω γαρ αναβεβηκα προς(1)
tov(1) πατερα(1) mou(2) πορευου δε προς(2) τους αδελφους mou(3)
και(1) ειπε αυτοις αναβαινον προς(3) tov(2) πατερα(2) mou(4)
kai(2) πατερα(3) mou(5) kai(3) theon(1) mou(5) kai(4) theon(2)
u mou(2)

20:17-16 πατερα(1) mou(2)
2 πατερα
01 B D W b e UBS3
9 [πατερα mou /.:./ πατερα]
Origen
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 579 892
20:17-22 δε
2 OM
Δ
9 [δε / ∴/ OM]
Origen
10 ουν
01c D L
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 579 892

20:17-25 αδελφος μου(3)
2 αδελφος
01* D W e
9 [αδελφος μου / ∴/ αδελφος]
Origen
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 579 892

20:23 αν(1) τινων(1) αφιτε τας αμαρτιας αφιεναι αυτοις αν(2)
tινων(2) κρατητε κεκρατηναι

20:23-4 αν(1)
2 εαν
A D
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 579 892

20:23-7 τινων(1)
2 τινος
B a e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 579 892

20:23-13 αφιεναι
2 αφιονται
B* ψ
4 αφεονται
01c A D L f1 f13 33 vid 565 UBS3
6 αφθησεται
01*
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 579 892

20:23-16 αν(2)
2 εαν
01* A D
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 579 892
20:23-19 αν(2)
2 + δε
 01* b
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 579 892

20:23-22 τινων(2)
2 τινος
  B a e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 579 892

20:25 ελεγον ουν αυτω οι α’λλοι μαθηται εωρακαμεν τον(1) κυριον ο δε ειπεν αυτοις εαν μη(1) ιδω εν ταις χερσιν αυτου(1) τον(2) τυπον(1) των(1) ηλων(1) και(1) βαλω(1) τον(3) δακτυλον μου(1) εις(1) τον(4) τυπον(2) των(2) ηλων(2) και(2) βαλω(2) την(1) χειρα μου(2) εις(2) την(2) πλευραν αυτου(2) ου μη(2) πιστευσω

20:25-31 τον(2) τυπον(1) των(1) ηλων(1)
2 τον τοπον των ηλων
  A Θ a b
3 την χειραν αυτου
  01*
4 OM
e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 579 892

20:26 και(1) μεθ ημερας οκτω παλιν ησαν εσω οι μαθηται αυτου και(2) θωμας μετ αυτων ερχεται ο ιησους των θυρων κε κλεισμενω και(3) εστη εις το μεσον και(4) ειπεν ειρηνη υμιν

20:26-13 αυτου
2 OM
  01 W f1 565 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 579 892

20:26-22 ερχεται
2 + ουν
  D f1 565
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 579 892

20:29 λεγει αυτω ο ιησους στι εωρακας με θωμα πεπιστευκας μακαριοι οι μη ιδοντες και πιστευσαντες

20:29-19 ιδοντες
3 ειδοτες
  W 1241
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 579 892
20:29-22 ἰδοντες
2 + με
01* f13
* /Missing/
P45 P75 579 892

21:18 αμην(1) αμην(2) λέγω σοι οτε ης νεωτερος εξωννυες σεαυτον
και(1) περιπετεις οπου(1) ηθέλες οταν δε γηρασης εκτενεις τας
χειρας σου και(2) αλλος σε ζωσει και(3) οισει οπου(2) ου θελεις

21:18-31 αλλος σε ζωσει
2 αλλοι σε ζωσουσιν
D W Π fl 33 565
3 αλλος ζωσει σε
B C* vid
4 αλλοι ζωσουσιν σε
01 Ce
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L 579 892

21:18-40 οισει οπου(2)
2 οισει σε οπου
A a
3 οισουσιν οπου
Cc
4 αποισουσιν οπου
Π fl
5 αποισουσιν σε οπου
01c W 33 565
6 απαγουσιν σε οπου
D
7 ποιησουσιν σοι οσα
01*
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L 579 892

21:18-46 οπου(2)
2 + συ
D W Θ
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L 579 892

21:19 τουτο(1) δε ειπε σημαινον ποιω θανατο δοξασει τον θεον και
τουτο(2) ειπων λεγει αυτω ακολουθει μοι

21:19-13 ειπε
2 ελεγεν
W Θ fl 565
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L 579 892 1241
επιστραφεὶς δὲ ο(1) πέτρος βλέπει τον μαθητὴν ὃν ἦγατα ο(2)
ἰησοῦς ἀκολουθοῦντας καὶ(1) ἀνέπεσεν ἐν τῷ δείπνῳ ἐπὶ τὸ
στήθος αὐτοῦ καὶ(2) εἶπεν κυρίῳ τὸς εστὶν ο(3) παραδίδους σε

ακολουθοῦντα

OM

* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L 579 892

αὐτοῦ

tου ἴησου

* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L 579 892

eἶπε

+ αὐτῷ

01 C D W 33

* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L 579 892

tουτόν ἰδὼν ο ἰδίως λέγει τῷ ἴησου κύριε οὗτος δὲ τι

tουτόν

+ οὐν

Origen 01 B C D 33 b UBS3

* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L 579 892 a e

λέγει

eἶπεν

01 W

* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L 579 892 e

λέγει αὐτῷ ο ἴησοῦς εάν αὐτὸν θέλω μενεῖν εἰς ερχομαι τι προς
σε σὺ ακολουθεῖ μοι

μενεῖν

+ οὗτος

D b

* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L Ω 579 892 a

ακολουθεῖ μοι

~ 2,1 (μοι ακολουθεῖ)

Origen 01 A B C* D W f1 33 a b e UBS3

* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L Ω 579 892
εξηλθεν ουν ο(1) λογος ουτος εις τους αδελφους στι(1) ο(2)
μαθητης εκεινος ουκ(1) αποθνησκει(1) και ουκ(2) ειπεν αυτω ο(3)
ηεσου στι(2) ουκ(3) αποθνησκει(2) αλλ εαν αυτον θελω μενειν
εως ερχομαι τι προς σε

ο(1) λογος ουτος
2 ~ 3,1,2 (ουτος ο λογος)
01 B C D W f1 33 a b e UBS3
3 ο λογος
Origen
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L Ω 579 892

και ουκ(2) ειπεν
2 ~ 2,3,de (ουκ ειπεν δε)
Origen 01 B C W 33 UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L Ω 579 892

αυτω
2 αυτο
D
3 OM
f13 1241 a
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L Ω 579 892

οτι(2)
2 OM
D a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L Ω 579 892

αποθνησκει(2)
2 αποθνησκεις
D e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L Ω 579 892

τι προς σε
2 προς σε
D
3 OM
01* f1 565 a e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L Ω 579 892

ουτος εστιν(1) ο(1) μαθητης ο(2) μαρτυρων περι τουτων και(1)
γραψας ταυτα και(2) οιδαμεν οτι αληθης εστιν(2) η μαρτυρια
αυτου

ο(2)
2 + και
Origen B C W
21:24-10 τούτων
2 ιησου
 a e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L Ω 579 892

21:24-16 καὶ(1)
2 καὶ o
01c Θ f13 33
2 καὶ o
Origen B D UBS3
9 /NA/
 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L Ω 579 892

21:25 εστὶ δὲ καὶ ἀλλὰ πολλὰ ὅσα ἐποίησεν ο ιησους ατινα εαν γραφηται
καθ ἐν οὐδὲ αυτὸν οἰμαὶ τὸν κόσμον χωρῆσαι τὰ γραφομένα βιβλία
αμην

21:25-13 ὅσα
2 α
Origen 01c B C* Ψ 33 UBS3
9 /NA/
 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 01* L Ω 579 892

21:25-31 χωρῆσαι
3 χωρῆσειν
01c B C*
9 [χωρῆσειν /::/ χωρῆσαι]
Origen
9 /NA/
 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 01* L Ω 579 892