

AN ANALYSIS OF THE TEXT OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL
IN THE WRITINGS OF ORIGEN

Jared Anderson

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of Religious Studies.

Chapel Hill
2008

Approved by:

Bart Ehrman

Joel Marcus

Zlatko Plese

© 2008
Jared Anderson
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

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.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

All academic enterprises build up on previous scholarly endeavors, but this principle holds true in regard to this project to an unusual degree. This thesis represents one stop along a scholarly journey that has already spanned twenty years. In 1992, Bart Ehrman, Gordon Fee, and Michael Holmes published their reconstruction of Origen's text of the Fourth Gospel.¹ At that time, they anticipated a "forthcoming second volume" that would "provide a detailed analysis and evaluation of these data" (p. ix). In the subsequent years, Ehrman began research for the second volume and Bruce Morrill of Kansas State University ran the Quantitative Analysis as well as organizing the data in the first volume.

Such represented the state of the project when Bart Ehrman and I discussed possibilities for my Master's thesis. I am deeply indebted to each of these scholars' work, which literally made this study possible. Immersing myself in the work of Gordon Fee, Eldon Epp, Bart Ehrman and others who have gone before me has provided a pleasurable and valuable training, and I hope to be able to continue their scholarly legacy to the extent I am able.

Bruce Morrill provided me the material that I have revised into what are now the appendices. I have incorporated those changes affecting the analyses. I appreciate Bruce's help in explaining these data, as well as emailing me information at a crucial time. The significance of his role cannot be overstated, as the format in which he sent me the data made all the analysis I did possible.

¹ *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen* (New Testament in the Greek Fathers 3; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).

One contribution of this study is the manner in which I was able to use Microsoft Excel to reduce dramatically the time and effort required to count agreements between manuscripts, as well as reducing the human error involved in such an endeavor. I am grateful again to Bruce for these documents, to Douglas Criger and especially to Arnie Aldridge, who answered my questions regarding the mysteries of Excel and the world of statistics. Computers hold the key to the future of all studies such as this, and I am thankful to them for teaching me some basics and opening my eyes to the beginning of what is possible.

I would like to express my appreciation to my advisor Bart Ehrman, who trusted me with this project and who has provided a helpful balance of guidance and confidence in my ability to finish it. I have learned much from his example of scholarship that manages to be simultaneously meticulous and engaging. I am grateful also to my readers Zlatko Plese and Joel Marcus, whose feedback not only improved this thesis, but also provided an important learning opportunity and saved me from numerous errors. Joel's comments in particular not only improved my writing and pushed me to greater clarity of expression and precision of language, but provided a template I hope to follow in giving written feedback.

Finally, I am grateful for the support of my wife Katrina, who has believed in my ability to finish this project. She also proofread several chapters, converted fonts to Greek in Appendix 2, and acted as a sounding board, learning more than should be expected about textual criticism and Group Profiles in the process. The journey of completing this project has been immeasurably more enjoyable because she has been with me.

To my father, Kim Anderson—
For what might have been,
For what finally was,
For what he passed on to me

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables.....	ix
Chapter	
I. Origen’s Life and Literature.....	1
A Literary Life.....	2
Origen’s Citation of Scripture.....	7
Manuscripts Used in this Study.....	9
II. The Tracking of Origen’s Texts and Travels.....	20
From Johann Griesbach to B. H. Streeter.....	21
K. W. Kim to Gordon Fee.....	30
Gordon Fee.....	37
Scholarship since Fee.....	43
III. Origen’s Text of John: Quantitative Analysis.....	59
IV. Origen’s Text of John: Group Profiles	83
Breakdown of Verses for Profiles One and Three.....	98
V. Summary and Conclusions.....	110
Origen’s Manuscripts of John.....	113
Origen and Heracleon’s Text of John.....	122
Origen and the “Caesarean Text” in John.....	125
Origen and the History of the Alexandrian Text.....	126

Appendix 1: Textual Variation in John.....	129
Appendix 2: Key to Textual Variation in John.....	145
Bibliography.....	280

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1. Correspondence between Books of the Gospel of John and Origen's Commentary.....	7
2. Witnesses Ranked According to Proportional Agreement with Origen in Genetically Significant Variations in John.....	68
3. Witnesses Ranked According to Proportional Agreement with Origen in John Arranged by Textual Group	73
4. Proportional Agreement with Leading Alexandrian Witnesses (and 1241).....	76
5. Proportional Agreement with Leading Western Witnesses (and 8a).....	78
6. Proportional Agreement with Leading "Caesarean" Witnesses (and P ⁴⁵).....	80
7. Group Profiles Analysis.....	90
8. Witnesses Ranked According to Proportional Agreement with the Uniform and Predominant Early Alexandrian Text in John.....	95
9. Comparative Percentages of Agreement with Origen in John 4 and 1-21.....	121

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

¹ Gordon Fee has accomplished the greatest advancement in analyzing Patristic citations, shaping their study over the past decades. The volume of his essays collected with those of Eldon Epp (*Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. [Studies and Documents 45; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1993]) is the most convenient source for these studies; see the three chapters categorized under "Method and Use of Patristic Evidence," 299-359: "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Methodology in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations"; "The Text of John in *The Jerusalem Bible*: A Critique of the Use of Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism"; and especially "The Use of Greek Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism: The State of the Question;" repr. from *ANRW* II.26.1, 246-65.

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.³ 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.

C.E.⁴ He lived here and produced most of his works during this period, until his death some time after 251.⁵

One of the most prolific writers of all time, Origen likely produced over a thousand volumes of works relating to scripture and other topics.⁶ 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.⁷

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."⁸ Most of the writings we still have come down to us only in the Latin translations of Origen's work by Jerome and Rufinus.⁹ And although Gustav Bardy has vindicated Rufinus' translation to a

⁴ Ibid., 8-9.

⁵ This is the date given by Nautin, *Origène*, 412, but Ehrman noted that the date of Origen's death is debated, ranging from about 251 to 255. *TFGWO*, 9n23.

⁶ Cate, "Text of the Catholic Epistles and Revelation," 7-13 discusses Origen's literary legacy. The numbers given by Jerome (around 2,000, *adv. Ruf.* 2.22) and by Epiphanius (around 6,000, *Panarion* 64.63 and *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 *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' *Ecclesiastical History* and letter 33 of Jerome (see also Nautin, *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.

⁷ Crouzel, *Origen*, 13; Nautin, *Origène*, 410.

⁸ Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, vol.2: *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.

⁹ *TFGWO*, 19.

degree,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.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 *Contra Celsum*, twenty homilies on the book of Jeremiah and one on 1 Samuel 28. We also have works such as the *Disputatio cum Heraclide*, *De Oratio*, and the *Exhortatio ad Martyrium*. Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzus produced an anthology of Origen's writings, the *Philocalia*, which preserves fragments of others of Origen's writings, such as *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.¹² Fortunately, most of these works are available in modern critical editions.¹³

¹⁰ G. Bardy, "Les citations bibliques d'Origène dans le De principiis" *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," *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." (*TFGWO*, 19. He also points to the study by Karen Jo Torjesen that further delineates the general lack of precision in Rufinus' translation technique, *Hermeneutical Procedure and Theological Method in Origen's Exegesis* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986, 12-18]).

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

¹³ These critical editions have been published mostly in the series *Sources Chretiennes* (SC) and *Die griechische christliche Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte* (GCS). See *TFGWO*, 31-35 for a listing of these editions. The exceptions are those works available only in Migne's *Patrologia graeca*, as follows: *Commentary on Colossians* (in Pamphilus, *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 *Commentary on Romans* (PG 14), and the *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 *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

<u>Date Range</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Location</u>
222-229	<i>Commentary on Psalms 1-25</i> <i>Stromates</i> <i>De Resurrectione</i> <i>Commentary on Lamentations</i> <i>De Naturis</i> <i>Dialogue with Candidus</i>	Alexandria
229-230	<i>First Volumes on Genesis</i> <i>De Principiis</i>	Alexandria
231	Books 1-4 of the <i>Commentary on John</i>	
Winter 231-32	Book 5 of <i>Commentary on John</i>	Antioch
Spring 232	Beginning of book 6 <i>On John</i>	Alexandria
234	Book 6 <i>Commentary on John</i> Last volumes <i>On Genesis</i> Scholia on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy	Caesarea
235-238	<i>On Martyrdom</i> ; Books 7-21 on John ¹⁵	
238-244	Books 22-32 on John	
239-242	Homilies on Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel; Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 1 Samuel (the last in Jerusalem) Homilies on Luke, (John?), Matt. 1-2 Corinthians, Galatians, Thessalonians, Titus, Hebrews, Acts	

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.

243	Volumes on the Apostle	
244	Volumes and scholia on Isaiah, first volumes on Ezekiel	
245	Discourse on Thanksgiving	(second voyage to Athens)
	Final volumes on Ezekiel Books 1-5 on Song of Songs	
245 or 246		In Greece or Caesarea
	Volumes on the Minor Prophets	
246-247	Final volumes on Song of Songs Large commentary on the Psalter Volumes on Proverbs Scholia on Ecclesiastes	
248	Letters Volume 32 of Commentary on John Scholia on John	in Nicomedia with Ambrose
249	Contra Celsum, Commentary on Luke, Commentary on Matthew, Scholia on the Psalter	at Caesarea, or Tyr
Sept 249-June 251	Origen imprisoned and tortured	
Died after 251		

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

Chapter	Commentary Book	Chapter	Commentary Book
1	1, 2, 6	10	20
2	10	11	28
3	10, 19	12	10
4	13	13	32
5	13, 20	14-17	?
6	?	18-19	28?
7	19	20	?
8	19, 20	21	32?
9	?		

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

¹⁷ Bruce Metzger, “Explicit References in the Works of Origen to Variant Readings in New Testament Manuscripts,” *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey* (J. Neville Birdsall and Robert W. Thomson, eds. New York: Herder, 1963), 93.

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.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."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.

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

²⁰ Gordon Fee, "P⁷⁵, P⁶⁶, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria," in Epp and Fee, *Studies*, 247-273; repr. from *New Dimensions in New Testament*. (ed. Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenney; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), 19-45.

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: P⁶⁶ P⁷⁵ Ⳑ (8:39-21:25) B UBS

P⁶⁶ 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 14-21²⁹. 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.

P⁷⁵ 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

²⁷ I have drawn information for this section from the following sources: Bruce Metzger and Bart Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (4th ed.; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005); Kurt and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1987); and Philip Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts: An Introduction to New Testament Paleography & Textual Criticism* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2005). Though it is a convenient compilation of data and bibliography, Comfort’s volume must be used critically due to the author’s tendency to make mistakes and tendentious judgments. See William Petersen’s scathing critique of another of Comfort’s works, his *The Quest for the Original Text of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992). The review is found in *JBL* 113 (1994): 529-531.

²⁸ For further bibliography see the literature referenced in the works in the footnote above, as well as J. K. Elliott, *A Bibliography of Greek New Testament Manuscripts* (2nd ed.; Cambridge: 2000).

²⁹ The Alands list the contents as 14:26, 29-30; 15:2-26; 16:2-4, 6-7; 16:10-20:20, 22-23; 20:25-21:9 (p. 100).

³⁰ Metzger and Ehrman, *Text*, 59. The Alands go even further, reflecting upon the fact that P⁷⁵ 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 P⁶⁶ the oldest significant portion of John.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.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 P⁷⁵ 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.”³³

Ⲙ (8:39-21:25). Sinaiticus is our oldest complete copy of the New Testament, dating to the fourth century.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.³⁵ Though scholars have identified up to nine correctors of Sinaiticus, only two are usually noted in critical editions. Ⲙ¹ is contemporary with Sinaiticus, and likely worked in the scriptorium where aleph was produced. Ⲙ² represents a group of scribes in sixth or seventh

³¹ Second only to the scrap P⁵², dated to about 125.

³² Metzger calls Vaticanus “one of the most valuable of all the manuscripts of the Greek Bible. (Metzger and Ehrman, *Text of the New Testament*, 67). Hort’s fondness of this text has become axiomatic in textual criticism.

³³ Ernest Colwell, “Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A Study of P⁴⁵, P⁶⁶, P⁷⁵,” *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. (New Testament Tools and Studies 9. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969), 106-24; cited in Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, 72-73.

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, *Text of the New Testament*, 62-67.

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 *NTS* (1968/69), 23-34. In the present study the Alexandrian portion of Sinaiticus is referred to both as Ⲙ (8:39-21:25) and as Ⲙb, indicating it is the latter half of this manuscript and distinguishing it from Ⲙ (8:39-21:25), which I also call Ⲙa.

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 \aleph^c .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.”

³⁸ Metzger and Ehrman, *Text of the New Testament*, 68.

³⁹ Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts*, 80.

⁴⁰ Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren, eds., *The Greek New Testament* (4th rev. ed.; Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1993). (UBS⁴). In the Preface to the Fourth Edition the editors state, “The text of the edition has remained unchanged. (p. vi). The changes to the edition involved primarily improvements to the apparatus.

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 1241⁴¹

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 12th 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.⁴² Two or three correctors adjusted this manuscript, one living in sixth-century Palestine and the other in ninth century Constantinople.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.”

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

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.

⁴³ Metzger lists two correctors, Comfort adds a third, contemporary with the scribe of C (Comfort, *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 Ⲛ C L 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 miniscule 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, Ⲛ, 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

⁴⁴ Metzger and Ehrman, *Text of the New Testament*, 84-85.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 87-88.

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 Ⲛ. The latter data is not included in the table, but 579 agrees in 247/358 instances with Ⲛ (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.

f¹. 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.⁵² 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 1.⁵³

f¹³. 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.⁵⁴

700. An 11th century manuscript of the gospels.

Western: **κ** (1:1-8:38) D a b e

κ (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).

⁵³ Kwang-Won Kim, “Codices 1582, 1739, and Origen.” *JBL* 69 (1950): 167-175.

⁵⁴ See the Quantitative Analysis information for 565 and 700 in Chapter 3.

tradition, but of the Western.⁵⁵ 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.⁵⁶

a. Codex Vercellensis is probably the oldest European manuscript of the gospels. Tradition holds that it dates to before 371.⁵⁷

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 Δ 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 Ⲙ.⁵⁸

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.

Π. 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.

⁵⁸ H. Nordberg found that Alexandrinus agrees with the text preserved in the writings of Athanasius (“The Bible Text of St. Athanasius,” *Arctos, acta philologica Fennica*, n.s. iii [1962], pp. 119-41). Cited in Metzger and Ehrman, *Text of the New Testament*, 67n25.

⁵⁹ Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ (Oxford, 1873; repr. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, n.d.)

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 whole¹ 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

¹ For these see, *inter alia*, the revised version of Metzger's classic introduction to textual criticism updated by Bart Ehrman (*The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* [4th ed.; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005]) and bibliography there, as well as the ANRW essay by Neville Birdsall, "The Recent History of New Testament Textual Criticism (from Westcott and Hort, 1881, to the present)," ANRW II.26.1 (ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992), 99-197.

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 1771,³ and put these into practice in his *Commentarius Criticus*⁴ and *Symbolae Criticae*.⁵

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 f³ 28 69.⁹ Finally, Griesbach set the foundation for the studies on Mark by later scholars¹⁰

⁶ Fenton John Anthony Hort and Brook Foss Westcott, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. Vol. II, *Introduction and Appendix* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1882); repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1988.

⁷ Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, 182; Metzger and Ehrman, *Text of the New Testament*, 200. See especially Gordon Fee's article that conclusively ended this debate: "P⁷⁵, P⁶⁶, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria," Pages 247-273 in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (ed. Eldon Epp and Gordon Fee; Studies & Documents 45; Grand Rapids, Mich., 1993); repr. from *New Dimensions in New Testament* (ed. Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenney; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), 19-45. According to Ernst Hautsch, Griesbach took a middle ground on the question of a critical edition of the New Testament by Origen—he did not produce such an edition, but he did create a διόρθωσις of his exemplar through a comparison of other texts (*Die Evangelienzitate des Origenes* [Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1909], 2). Hautsch also noted, however, that according to Griesbach's editor he later gave up the notion of a unified text of Origen. See further note 40 below. (CHECK NOTE)

⁸ Johann Leonhard Hug, *Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (4th ed.; Stuttgart: J.G. Cotta, 1847). According to Hug, Origen's recension included A K M, sy^{philox} 42 106 114 116 253. See René Kieffer, *Au delà des recensions? L'évolution de la tradition textuelle dans Jean VI, 52-71* (Coniectanea Biblica: New Testament Series; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1968), 13. Surprisingly, one sees the occasional reference to an Origenian recension even in more recent works. Kwang-Won Kim wondered if "the variation in [Origen's] text of the gospels may be due to his own recension of them," though he admitted there is no evidence of such a revision ("Origen's Text of John in His *On Prayer, Commentary on Matthew, and Against Celsus*." *JTS* ns1 [1950]: 83). Also, Frank Pack suggested that Origen took similar attitudes toward textual problems in both the Old and New Testaments because of his view of the "unity of scripture." ("Origen's Evaluation of Textual Variants in the Greek Bible" *ResQ* 4 [1960]: 140)

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.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*,¹² though Hort used Origen's lack of Syrian readings as one weapon to overthrow the reign of that late text.¹³

Jules Martin's lengthy 1885 article on Origen and textual criticism¹⁴ is remarkable only for the completely maverick position he espoused—that the uncials 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 (anéantir) in one blow “tous les principes critiques formulés par

¹⁰ Such as Burnett Hillman Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: MacMillan, 1936) and Kirsopp Lake, Robert Blake, and Silva New, “The Caesarean Text of Mark,” *HTR* 21 (1928): 207-404.

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.

¹⁴ Jules Martin, “Origène et la critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament” *Revue des questions historiques* 37 (1885): 5-62.

bon nombre de savants modernes.”¹⁵ Ernest Hautsch tersely proclaimed Martin’s thesis untenable and noted that it had not been taken up by other scholars.¹⁶

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”¹⁷ 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.¹⁸ 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.¹⁹ 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.²⁰ 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.

¹⁷ Paul Koetschau, “Bibelcitate Bei Origenes.” *ZWT* 42 (1900): 321-78.

¹⁸ Hautsch, *Evangelienzitate*, 3.

¹⁹ Cited in Hautsch, *Evangelienzitate*, 3.

²⁰ See the guidelines laid out by Gordon Fee, “The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Methodology in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations,” *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. (Studies and Documents 45; Eldon Epp and Gordon Fee, eds. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1993), 301-334; repr. from *Biblica* 52 (1971): 357-94.

reliable text than we would like—Origen bound himself to no specific form of the text, but followed sometimes one authority, sometimes another.²¹

To anticipate later research, despite these early scholars' pessimism, as Patristic citations go, Origen's text is about as good as it gets.²² 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.²³

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.²⁴ 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 Heschyian recension, Westcott and Hort's Neutral and Alexandrian texts; and "K" stands for the "Koine" or Syrian text.²⁵ After a 1915

²¹ Hautsch, *Evangelienzitate*, 3; citing Edwin Preuschen, ed. *Der Johanneskommentar* (GCS 10; OW 4; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1903), xci.

²² 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.

²³ Hautsch, *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.

²⁴ Hermann Freiherr von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt* (3 vols; Berlin: A. Glaue); 2.1513-14.

²⁵ Kieffer, *Au Delà Des Recensions*, 18-19.

article in which F. C. Burkitt suggested that Origen restored a primitive text of the New Testament based on old manuscripts he unearthed,²⁶ 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."²⁷ 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.²⁸ 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.²⁹

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.

²⁷ Kirsopp Lake, Robert Blake, and Silva New, "The Caesarean Text of Mark." *HTR* 21 (1928): 207-404.

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”!³⁰ 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.”³¹ 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.”³²

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.³³ 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 ⋈ B, 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*,³⁴ Streeter wrote two brief articles treating the text of Origen.³⁵ Streeter is known for his theory that Origen’s move to Caesarea from Alexandria led to his adoption of a different text type.³⁶ 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*”³⁷ 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 John³⁸ 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*.”³⁹ 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.⁴⁰ Finally, Streeter concludes that Origen did

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

³⁵ “The Caesarean Text of Matthew and Luke,” *HTR* 28 (1935): 231-235 and “Origen, &, and the Caesarean Text,” *JTS* 36 (1935): 178-180.

³⁶ For example, this idea is mentioned in Lake, Blake, and New, “Caesarean Text,” 269; Randolph V. Tasker, “The Quotations from the Synoptic Gospels in Origen’s Exhortation to Martyrdom,” *JTS* 36 (1935): 61; Kwang-Won Kim, “Origen’s Text of John in His *On Prayer, Commentary on Matthew, and Against Celsus*,” *JTS* n.s. 1 (1950): 82; David S. Wallace-Hadrill, “Eusebius and the Gospel Text of Caesarea,” *HTR* 49 (1956): 109; Bruce Metzger, “The Caesarean Text of the Gospels,” *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1963), 54-55; Fee, *Text of Origen and Text of Egypt*, 252; Mullen, *Text of Cyril*, 34.

³⁷ Lake, Blake, and New, “Caesarean Text,” quoting Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 78.

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

³⁹ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 96.

⁴⁰ Contrary to Lake, Blake, and New, “Caesarean Text.” Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 100.

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 κ 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.

⁴² For Streeter's works, see note 34 above. R. V. G. Tasker, "The Quotations from the Synoptic Gospels in Origen's Exhortation to Martyrdom." *JTS* 36 (1935): 60-65; idem., "The Text of the Fourth Gospel Used by Origen in his Commentary on John." *JTS* 37 (1936): 146-55; idem., "The Text of St. Matthew Used by Origen in his Commentary on St. Matthew," *JTS* 38 (1937): 60-64.

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.”⁴⁴

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.⁴⁵ Further, Tasker incorporated Streeter’s suggestions before the publication of his 1936 article “The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Caesarean Text of Luke.”⁴⁶ 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.⁴⁷

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 29-31.⁴⁸ This finding, however, most likely stems from Tasker’s inadequate methodology and small sample of variants.⁴⁹

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

⁴⁵ Tasker “The Text of the Fourth Gospel Used by Origen in his Commentary on John,” 148.

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.

⁴⁸ Tasker, “The Text of the Fourth Gospel,” 153.

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.⁵⁰ He instead devised an improved “method of Multiple Attestation,”⁵¹ one that for the first time took into account all supporting witnesses of a text.⁵² 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

⁵⁰ Colwell has several articles that outline his method, all collected in his volume *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (NTTS IX; Leiden: Brill, 1969). See especially chapters 1-5: “Method in Grouping New Testament Manuscripts,” “Method in Locating a Newly-Discovered Manuscript,” “Method in Establishing the Nature of Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts” (with Ernest Tune), and “Genealogical Method: Its Achievements and its Limitations.” See also Bart Ehrman’s evaluation of and improvements to the Colwell-Tune method, “Methodological Developments in the Analysis and Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence” *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), hereafter *STCNT*, 9-32, repr. from *NovTest* 29 (1987), 22-45; and “The Use of Group Profiles for the Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence,” *STCNT*, 33-56, repr. from *JBL* 106 (1987), 465-86.

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.

⁵² Ehrman, “Methodological Developments,” 22-23.

Against Celsus.⁵³ 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 1582.⁵⁴ 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."⁵⁵ 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*⁵⁶" 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.⁵⁷ 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.⁵⁸ Kim

⁵³ Kwang-Won Kim, "The Matthean Text of Origen in His Commentary on Matthew." (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1946); idem., "The Matthean Text of Origen in His *Commentary on Matthew*," *JTS* 68 (1949): 125-39; idem., "Origen's Text of John in his *On Prayer*, *Commentary on Matthew*, and *Against Celsus*." *JTS* n.s. 1 (1950): 74-84; idem., "Codices 1582, 1739, and Origen." *JBL* 69 (1950): 167-175; and Ibid., "Origen's Text of Matthew in his *Against Celsus*." *JTS* 4 (1953): 42-49.

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.

⁵⁷ See Kim's discussion of Streeter in "The Matthean Text of Origen," 137-138.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 138

noted that P⁴⁵, dated to about 200-250 C.E., aligns in the gospels with the “Caesarean” text.⁵⁹ This led Lake to devise question-begging classifications such as “true Caesarean,” “pre-Caesarean,” “pre-Origenian,” and so forth.⁶⁰ 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.”⁶¹ 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 Θ, 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.⁶² Codex

⁵⁹ Ibid., 136

⁶⁰ Ibid., 136-137.

⁶¹ 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 P⁴⁵. 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 *JBL* 102 (1983), 504-506.

⁶² 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

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 the 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.”⁶⁶ 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.⁶⁷ 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.”⁶⁸ 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’.”⁶⁹ 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 ⋈ B differ, Origen's text is closer to B. 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*.⁷⁴ Kim did not study Origen's text of the Gospel of Luke but suggested that it is 'Neutral.'⁷⁵ 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.

⁷⁵ Fee corrects this view in his article, "Origen's Text of the New Testament and the Text of Egypt." *NTS* 28 (1982): 348-64; see discussion below.

John chapter 4.⁷⁶ 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.⁷⁷ Previous scholars had highlighted the varied forms of the biblical quotes 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.⁷⁸

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.

⁷⁷ Fee, "The Text of John," 302.

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”.⁷⁹ 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.⁸⁰ 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.”⁸¹

Groundwork established, Fee then presented the fruits of the sifting of quotations and collations, a table illustrating the textual affinities of Origen in John 4.⁸²

B	91.7%
C	85.7%
P ⁷⁵	84.5%
P ^{66*}	83.3%
P ^{66c}	80.6%
Ψ	73.6%

579	65.3%
892	65.3%
e	65.0%
E	62.5%
G	62.5%
1241	59.2%

⁷⁹ 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.

⁸⁰ 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.

⁸¹ Fee, “The Text of John,” 307. Fee acknowledged that “[w]ith slight modifications, this is essentially the method worked out by Colwell and Tunc 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).

⁸² 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.

Cyr	71.4%
W	70.8%
L	69.4%
33	69.4%
A	66.7%
Δ	66.7%
1	66.7%

Θ	58.9%
b	58.8%
Ω	56.9%
TR	56.9%
13	54.2%
κ	45.8%
D	38.9%

Origen is clearly shown to be a “strong Neutral witness.”⁸³ In order to highlight further the textual distinctions, however, Fee classified variants based on text type, dividing them into Neutral, Western, Byzantine, etc.⁸⁴ 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.⁸⁵

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.⁸⁶ 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.

⁸⁶ Gordon Fee, “The *Lemma* of Origen’s *Commentary on John*, Book X—An Independent Witness to the Egyptian Textual Tradition?” *New Testament Studies* 20 (1973): 78-81; “P⁷⁵, P⁶⁶, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria,” Epp and Fee, *Studies*, 247-273; and *idem*, “Origen’s Text of the New Testament and the Text of Egypt,” 348-64.

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. As

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.

⁸⁹ Fee, “Origen’s Text of the New Testament,” 250-51.

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."⁹²

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.⁹³ 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*:⁹⁴ 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.⁹⁵

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.⁹⁶ 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.

⁹⁶ Ehrman's dissertation was later published as the pioneering volume of *The New Testament in the Greek Fathers* series. Bart D. Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels* (NTGF 1; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986). To date, there are 7 volumes of this series. Volumes 2-7 are: James a Brooks, *The New Testament Text of Gregory of Nyssa* (NTGF 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991); Ehrman, Fee, and Michael Holmes, *The Text*

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

of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen (NTGF 3; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992); Darrell Hannah, *The Text of I Corinthians in the Writings of Origen* (NTGF 4; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997); Jean-François Racine, *The Text of Matthew in the Writings of Basil of Caesarea* (NTGF 5; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2004); Carroll Osburn, *The Text of the Apostolos in Epiphanius of Salamis* (NTGF 6; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2004); and Roderic Mullen, *The New Testament Text of Cyril of Jerusalem* (NTGF 7; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997)

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.”⁹⁹ 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.”¹⁰⁰ 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]).¹⁰¹ This sampling offers 379 variants, and Petersen presents agreements, disagreements, and singular agreements between Origen and other witnesses.¹⁰²

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

⁹⁹ The most accessible source of these data is Ehrman’s article, “The Use of Group Profiles for the Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence,” *STCNT*, 9-32, repr. from *JBL* 106 (1987), 465-86.

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.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.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,"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."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

¹⁰³ Ibid., 42.

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.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 45-46.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 46.

exception to this tendency. Further, though Petersen's cautionary notes 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.

¹⁰⁸ Ehrman, *STCNT*, 267-280; repr. from *VC* 47 (1993), 105-118.

¹⁰⁹ Ehrman, "Heracleon," 269.

¹¹⁰ "Heracleon and the 'Western' Textual Tradition," *STCNT*, 281-299; repr. from *NTS* 40 (1994), 161-179.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 298.

published in the series *The New Testament in the Greek Fathers*.¹¹² 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.¹¹³

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,¹¹⁴ Mullen's review presides at its funeral.¹¹⁵ 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."¹¹⁶

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.

¹¹³ Roderick Mullen, *The New Testament Text of Cyril of Jerusalem*. (SBLNTGF 7; Bart Ehrman, ed; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1997). Pages 31-52 deal most directly with Origen.

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.

¹¹⁶ Mullen, *Text of Cyril*, 39.

witnesses.”¹¹⁷ The differences between textual types even in this brief study confirm these affinities:

Group Θ (Θ, 565, 700)	83.3%
Western (D, a, b, k)	62.5%
Group W (W)	55%
Byzantine (A, f ¹ , TR)	40%
Group 13/28 (f ¹³ , 28)	32%
Alexandrian (Ⲁ, B)	23.5%

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 I 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%, Ⲁ at 77.7%, with the rest of the Alexandrian witnesses evaluated never more than 2.7% apart.¹¹⁹ Origen’s text of I 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 I 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 Ⲁ 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.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.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%),¹²⁴ but less than seven other Alexandrian witnesses and above only P46 and 1881!¹²⁵ But again, the impact of a small sample (21 readings) must be taken into account—the 10% gap between Origen and \aleph and A represents only two readings.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

¹²² Ibid., 269.

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.

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

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%); **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.

¹²⁶ Ibid., 290.

groups and when it is uniquely Alexandrian. Only *once* under these circumstances does Origen defect.”¹²⁷

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.¹²⁸ 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 \aleph , 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.¹²⁹ 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.”¹³⁰ 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 Revelation¹³¹ 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

¹³¹ James Jeffrey Cate, *The Text of the Catholic Epistles and the Revelation in the Writings of Origen* (Ph.D. diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1997).

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 κ 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 1582.¹⁴¹ After critically reviewing Kim's work, Fee accepted his analysis of Matthew and added to our understanding of Origen's text of Luke.¹⁴²

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."¹⁴³ 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.¹⁴⁴

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

¹⁴² Fee, "Origen's Text," 353.

¹⁴³ Raquel, "Text of the Synoptic Gospels," 9. Note 48 on page 9 lists three of Kim's articles, but she missed his article "Codices 1582, 1739, and Origen." Neither did she demonstrate knowledge of Fee's crucial 1982 article, "Origen's Text of the New Testament and the Text of Egypt."

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-f^l agreement percentage."¹⁴⁵ On page 507 she suggested that the relationship between Origen and f^l (which includes both manuscripts 1 and 1582, the focus of Kim's research) "warrants more study."¹⁴⁶ Her conclusion that her study underscores "the existence of a text-type that differs from the Alexandrian type, to which f^l belongs and of which Origen seems to be a strong witness"¹⁴⁷ merely reiterates what Kim established over fifty years earlier!¹⁴⁸ 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.¹⁴⁹

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

Gospels," *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism* (NTTS 4; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1963), 42-72.

¹⁴⁵ Raquel, "Text of the Synoptic Gospels," 504.

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 Celsus*."

¹⁴⁹ Raquel called f^l a "distinctive text-type," but she seems to count it as Caesarean as well.

method,¹⁵⁰ 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*.¹⁵¹ 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 witnesses¹⁵² 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.

¹⁵¹ Bart Ehrman, Gordon Fee, and Michael Holmes, *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen* (NTGF 3; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993).

¹⁵² These textual witnesses were drawn from the accepted textual groupings (*TFGWO*, 30):

Primary Alexandrian: P66 P75 ⋈ (8:39-21:25) B UBS

Secondary Alexandrian: C L W Ψ 33 579 892 1241

Caesarean: P45 Θ f¹ f¹³ 565 700

Western: ⋈ (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.

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.”

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 Testament¹ proves essential to the primary and secondary goals of textual criticism. First scholars must determine, insofar as possible, the most original text² 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 plurality³ 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.⁵ Rather than striving for comprehensive comparison, this approach compares only representative manuscripts from each of the major textual families.⁶ 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.”⁷ Counting only genetically significant⁸ variations shared by at least two members of a given

⁵ See E.C. Colwell, “Method in Locating a Newly-Discovered Manuscript within the Manuscript Tradition of the Greek New Testament,” *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1969), 26-44; repr. from *TU LXXIII* (1959): 757-77; idem, with Ernest W. Tune, “The Quantitative Relationships Between MS Text-Types,” *Studies in Methodology*, 56-62; repr. from *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey* (ed. J.N. Birdsall and R.W. Thomson; Freiburg: Herder, 1963), 25-32; See these and the further references in Carl Cosaert, “The Text of the Gospels in the Writings of Clement of Alexandria,” (Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2005). The method was further refined by Larry Hurtado, *Text-Critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981); by Gordon Fee, “Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John: A Contribution to Methodology in Establishing Textual Relationships,” *Studies*, 221-244; repr. from *NTS* (1968/69): 23-34; and especially by Bart Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels*. For an overview of these methods as well as an exposition of Ehrman’s refinements, see his “The Use of Group Profiles for the Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence,” *STCNT*, 9-32; repr. from *JBL* 106 (1987): 465-86. As Ehrman’s refinements form the core of this study, they will be discussed further in the next chapter. See also Cosaert, “Text of the Gospels in the Writings of Clement,” 269 for a list of the principal methods that focus on group readings developed in the past century.

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 be historical support for these geographically based names (e.g., the Alexandrian text really was used in Alexandria), and they are much clearer than the Alands’ 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.

⁷ See Ehrman’s discussion of the Alands’ use of “Test Passages” (Teststellen) as well as the weaknesses of their categorization methods in his “A Problem of Textual Circularity: The Alands on the Classification of New Testament Manuscripts,” *STCNT*, 57-70; repr. from *Biblica* 70 (1989), 377-88.

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 οὐτω/οὕτως, moveable *nu*, 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,⁹ 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.¹⁰

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

determine whether such readings stem from a scribe's exemplar or their own individual alterations, accidental or intentional.

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 NA²⁷, 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.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.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 thirty¹³ witnesses: five Primary Alexandrian (P⁶⁶ P⁷⁵ ⋈ [8:39-21:25] B UBS), eight Secondary Alexandrian (C L W Ψ 33 579 892 1241), six "Caesarean" (P⁴⁵ Θ f¹ f¹³ 565 700), five Western (⋈ [1:1-8:38] D a b e), and six Byzantine (A E Δ Π Ω TR).¹⁴ In addition to these witnesses, I have included data

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.

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.

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

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 P⁶⁶ Ⲙ and C,¹⁵ as well from the three Fathers for whom analysis of the text of John was available—Clement, Didymus, and Athanasius, all of Alexandria.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 P⁴⁵ and f¹³ both agree with Origen about 64%, the fact that the manuscripts of f¹³ are extant in all 815 points of variation available in Origen makes its 65.3% agreement more reliable than the 63.5% agreement of P⁴⁵ 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 f¹³ agree with Origen 65.3% ± 3.3%, so somewhere between 62 and 68.6%. Taking P⁴⁵’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 Ψ 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 P⁴⁵ stands in relation to Origen.¹⁷ Neither does this inclusion of error correction

¹⁵ The critical apparatus in Volume 1 included data for the correctors to P⁶⁶ P⁷⁵ Ⲙ B C Ψ 892 Θ P⁴⁵ D A E Δ Π (see *TFGWO*, 27). In this analysis I included only the correctors to P⁶⁶ Ⲙ 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: P⁷⁵: +1/-2/0; B^c: +7/-2/2; Ψ^c: +1/-0/0; 892^c: +0/-1/1; Θ^c: +0/-3/0; P^{45c}: +1/-0/0; D^c: +8/-6/2; A^c: +1/-1/1; E^c: +2/-0/0; Δ^c: +1/-1; Π^c: +6/-8/2.

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 Cosart 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.”¹⁸

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.¹⁹

The formula for factoring in error due to sample size follows, where “ σ_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.

¹⁸ Cosaert, “The Text of the Gospels in the Writings of Clements,” 234.

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, ($t_{0.05,n}$), 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

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

²⁰ Cosaert, “The Text of the Gospels in the Writings of Clement,” 235.

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: $1.19 * 1.963^{22} = 2.33\%$. Thus UBS agrees with Origen $86.6\% \pm 2.3\%$. 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.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	Witness	Agr.	Disagr.	Total	% Agr.	St. Dev.	t-value	Er. Cor.
1	UBS	706	109	815	86.6%	1.19%	1.963	2.3%
2	P75	444	76	520	85.4%	1.55%	1.965	3.0%

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”.²³ 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”.²⁴

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.²⁵ 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, Ⲙ (1:1-8:39)²⁶ 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)

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Witness</u>	<u>Group</u>	<u>Total Ag.</u>	<u>Total Var.</u>	<u>% Ag.²⁷</u>	<u>Err. Corr.</u>
1.	UBS	Prim. Alex	706	815	86.6%	2.3%
2.	P ⁷⁵	Prim. Alex	444	520	85.4%	3.0%
3.	B	Prim. Alex	689	815	84.5%	2.5%
4.	C	Sec. Alex	383	455	84.2%	3.4%
5.	L	Sec. Alex	645	793	81.3%	2.7%
6.	Ψ	Sec. Alex	636	815	78.0%	2.8%
7.	Athanasius	Sec. Alex	53	68	77.9%	10.1%
8.	C ^c	Byzantine	353	455	77.6%	3.8%

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.

9.	33	Sec. Alex	598	791	75.6%	3.0%
10.	P66 ^c		537	712	75.4%	3.2%
11.	W	Sec. Alex	411	557	73.8%	3.7%
12.	κ ^c (8:39- 21:25)		299	408	73.3%	4.3%
13.	892	Sec. Alex	422	577	73.1%	3.6%
14.	f ^l	Caesarean	586	814	72.0%	3.1%
15.	P ⁶⁶	Prim. Alex	512	712	71.9%	3.3%
16.	κ (8:39- 21:25)	Prim. Alex			70.8%	4.4%
17.	Π	Byzantine	576	814	70.8%	3.1%
18.	565	Caesarean	510	723	70.5%	3.3%
19.	579	Sec. Alex	533	757	70.4%	3.3%
20.	A	Byzantine	472	673	70.1%	3.5%
21.	κ ^c (1:1-8:38)		280	402	69.7%	4.5%
22.	Δ	Byzantine	556	804	69.2%	3.2%
23.	E	Byzantine	563	815	69.1%	3.2%
24.	TR	Byzantine	561	815	68.8%	3.2%
25.	700	Caesarean	560	815	68.7%	3.2%
26.	Ω	Byzantine	547	800	68.4%	3.2%
27.	1241	Sec. Alex	541	794	68.1%	3.2%
28.	Clement	Prim. Alex.	32	47	68.1%	13.8%
29.	Θ	Caesarean	554	814	68.1%	3.2%
30.	b	Western	526	798	65.9%	3.3%
31.	f ¹³	Caesarean	532	815	65.3%	3.3%
32.	a	Western	518	803	64.5%	3.3%
33.	P ⁴⁵	Caesarean	33	52	63.5%	13.5%
34.	e	Western	485	800	60.6%	3.4%
35.	κ (1:1-8:38)	Western	240	402	59.7%	4.8%
36.	D	Western	326	657	49.6%	3.8%

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 f^l 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 4-13.²⁹ The corrector to C is properly categorized Byzantine, which explains why the scribe consistently moved away from Origen’s text toward Byzantine readings.³⁰ 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—f¹, P⁶⁶, \aleph b, the corrector to \aleph a, 1241, and Clement.

It is interesting to note that family 1 ranks higher in agreement with Origen than the Alexandrian manuscripts P⁶⁶, \aleph b, 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

Characteristics (SD 34; Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968), 79-80 and Ehrman, *Didymus*, 192-193, 205, 218-219 (cited in *TFGWO*, 29n25). See also the discussion following Table 4 below.

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 $\pm 3\text{-}4\%$ 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.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 (16th place), 68.1% with Θ (18th 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.

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 P^{75} B and their disciplined copyists.³² The reason the corrector of \aleph (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,

³¹ Kim, “Codices 1582, 1739, and Origen,” *JBL* 69 (1950): 167-175.

³² Somewhat ironically, P^{66} and at least one set of corrections to 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 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.

further investigation of the nature of \aleph (8:39-21:25) would be necessary to determine why it falls almost 15% below the model Primary Alexandrian couple P⁷⁵ 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 28th 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 P⁶⁶.

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, P⁷⁵ agrees with \aleph b 10 points higher than 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

Primary Alexandrian

<u>Witness</u>	<u>Agreements</u>	<u>Disagreements</u>	<u>% Agreements</u>	<u>Err. Corr.</u>
UBS	706	109	86.6%	2.3%
P ⁷⁵	444	76	85.4%	3.0%
B	689	126	84.5%	2.5%
P ⁶⁶	512	200	71.9%	3.3%
ⲛ(8:39-1:24)	289	119	70.8%	4.4%
Total Prim.	2640	630	80.7%	
Alex			(2640/3270)	1.4%
Totals (-UBS)	1934	521	78.8%	
			(1934/2455)	1.6%

Secondary Alexandrian

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

Total Alexandrian (with UBS)

	6809	8809	77.3%	
			(6809/8809)	0.9%

Byzantine

<u>Witness</u>	<u>Agreements</u>	<u>Disagreements</u>	<u>% Agreements</u>	<u>Err. Corr.</u>
Π	576	238	70.8%	3.1%
A	472	201	70.1%	3.5%
Δ	556	248	69.2%	3.2%
E	563	252	69.1%	3.2%
TR	561	254	68.8%	3.2%
Ω	547	253	68.4%	3.2%
Total	3275	1446	69.4%	
Byzantine			(3275/4721)	1.3%

Caesarean

<u>Witness</u>	<u>Agreements</u>	<u>Disagreements</u>	<u>% Agreements</u>	<u>Err. Corr.</u>
f ^l	586	228	72.0%	3.1%
565	510	213	70.5%	3.3%
700	560	255	68.7%	3.2%
Θ	554	260	68.1%	3.2%
f ^{l3}	532	283	65.3%	3.3%
p ⁴⁵	33	19	63.5%	13.5%
Total	2775	1258	68.8%	
Caesarean			(2775/4033)	1.4%

Western

<u>Witness</u>	<u>Agreements</u>	<u>Disagreements</u>	<u>% Agreements</u>	<u>Err. Corr.</u>
b	526	798	65.9%	3.3%
a	518	803	64.5%	3.3%
e	485	800	60.6%	3.4%
κ(1:1-8:38)	240	402	59.7%	4.8%
D	326	657	49.6%	3.8%
	2095	3460	60.5%	
Total Western			(2095/3460)	1.6%

In his discussion of textual families, Ernest Colwell suggested that families should agree 70% with one another, with a distance of 10% between families.³⁵ 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.”³⁶ 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

³⁵ Colwell and Tune, “Quantitative Relationships,” 29.

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, P⁴⁵, and \aleph . 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 P⁷⁵ 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 \aleph a (1:1-8:39) with the Western witnesses. P⁴⁵ stands with the Caesarean witnesses Θ f¹ f¹³—a questioned member of a questioned family!

TABLE 4

PROPORTIONAL AGREEMENT WITH LEADING ALEXANDRIAN WITNESSES (AND 1241)

<u>P⁷⁵</u>		<u>B</u>		<u>C</u>		<u>1241</u>		
1.	UBS	90.6%	1.	UBS	90.4%	1.	1241	78.7%
2.	B	88.7%	2.	P75	88.7%	2.	892	78.1%
3.	Or	85.4%	3.	C	85.5%	3.	700	77.0%
4.	C	85.4%	4.	Or	84.5%	4.	Π	76.3%
5.	01b	82.8%	5.	L	80.2%	5.	TR	76.0%
6.	L	81.2%	6.	P66	74.4%	6.	Ω	75.7%
7.	W	79.1%	7.	Ψ	73.9%	7.	E	75.4%
8.	Ψ	79.0%	8.	W	71.8%	8.	Δ	75.2%
9.	P45	77.4%	9.	33	71.6%	9.	Ψ	74.9%
10.	33	76.4%	10.	892	71.4%	10.	f13	74.6%
11.	P66	75.2%	11.	01b	70.8%	11.	33	73.8%
12.	892	75.1%	12.	P45	69.2%	12.	A	72.3%
13.	579	74.0%	13.	579	67.9%	13.	L	72.2%
14.	A	72.9%	14.	Ath	67.4%	14.	565	71.4%
15.	Π	71.7%	15.	A	66.3%	15.	C	69.9%
16.	f1	70.5%	16.	f1	65.6%	16.	Θ	69.2%

17. E	70.4%	17. Π	65.6%	17. 565	68.8%	17. f1	69.1%
18. Δ	69.4%	18. b	65.5%	18. Δ	68.3%	18. UBS	68.8%
19. 565	69.1%	19. a	65.0%	19. E	68.1%	19. P75	68.4%
20. 1241	68.8%	20. Clem	64.6%	20. Ω	68.0%	20. 579	68.1%
21. 700	68.7%	21. Θ	64.1%	21. Clem	68.0%	21. Or	65.6%
22. Ω	68.5%	22. E	63.6%	22. 700	67.7%	22. Ath	64.7%
23. Θ	68.3%	23. Δ	63.6%	23. TR	67.5%	23. b	63.8%
24. TR	67.9%	24. Did	63.3%	24. Θ	67.4%	24. a	63.7%
25. Ath	66.7%	25. 565	63.2%	25. Did	66.7%	25. W	62.1%
26. a	65.8%	26. 700	63.1%	26. Ath	66.7%	26. Did	62.0%
27. Clem	64.0%	27. TR	62.3%	27. 01b	65.2%	27. B	61.8%
28. f13	63.3%	28. Ω	62.3%	28. f13	63.5%	28. P66	58.5%
29. b	63.2%	29. 1241	62.0%	29. b	62.4%	29. 01b	58.2%
30. Did	59.6%	30. e	60.1%	30. a	62.1%	30. e	50.5%
31. e	57.5%	31. 01a	58.0%	31. 01a	61.3%	31. D	47.6%
32. 01a	57.4%	32. f13	57.7%	32. e	56.5%	32. 01a	39.2%
33. D	51.4%	33. D	47.2%	33. D	48.9%	33. P45	NA

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 \aleph a 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 \aleph a 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)

<u>D</u>		<u>b</u>		<u>a</u>		<u>κ</u> (1:1-8:38)		
1.	b	70.0%	1.	a	74.2%	1.	b	63.0%
2.	a	66.5%	2.	e	71.1%	2.	e	62.8%
3.	e	65.7%	3.	01b	71.0%	3.	01b	61.7%
4.	01a	57.7%	4.	W	70.7%	4.	W	61.4%
5.	P45	55.8%	5.	D	69.9%	5.	P66	61.3%
6.	f1	53.8%	6.	Ψ	68.0%	6.	UBS	59.7%
7.	Π	53.7%	7.	UBS	67.5%	7.	33	58.6%
8.	Clem	53.4%	8.	P66	67.2%	8.	D	58.0%
9.	UBS	53.1%	9.	33	67.2%	9.	f1	57.7%
10.	L	53.1%	10.	f1	66.9%	10.	565	57.4%
11.	33	52.8%	11.	L	66.0%	11.	TR	55.6%
12.	P66	52.6%	12.	Or	65.9%	12.	Π	55.2%
13.	TR	52.4%	13.	565	65.6%	13.	P75	54.2%
14.	Θ	52.1%	14.	TR	65.5%	14.	Δ	54.1%
15.	Ψ	51.9%	15.	B	65.4%	15.	P45	53.8%
16.	W	51.6%	16.	Δ	65.2%	16.	Ψ	53.7%
17.	P75	51.4%	17.	E	64.9%	17.	E	53.5%
18.	A	51.3%	18.	1241	64.9%	18.	Θ	52.8%
19.	E	51.1%	19.	579	64.7%	19.	Ω	52.7%
20.	565	51.1%	20.	Ω	64.6%	20.	B	52.7%
21.	f13	50.8%	21.	Θ	64.6%	21.	A	52.6%
22.	1241	50.5%	22.	A	64.6%	22.	892	52.2%
23.	Δ	50.5%	23.	700	64.5%	23.	Or	52.2%
24.	579	50.3%	24.	Π	64.2%	24.	700	52.0%
25.	700	50.2%	25.	f13	64.0%	25.	L	51.7%
26.	892	50.2%	26.	P45	63.5%	26.	579	51.7%
27.	Ath	50.0%	27.	892	63.4%	27.	1241	51.7%
28.	Ω	49.7%	28.	P75	63.2%	28.	f13	50.4%
29.	Or	49.6%	29.	01a	63.0%	29.	01a	48.3%

30.	C	48.9%	30.	C	62.4%	30.	C	62.1%	30.	1241	47.6%
31.	01b	48.6%	31.	Did	50.0%	31.	Did	48.5%	31.	W	47.2%
32.	B	47.2%	32.	Ath	49.1%	32.	Ath	46.8%	32.	P45	NA
33.	Did	45.3%	33.	Clem	37.9%	33.	Clem	43.1%	33.	01b	NA

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%, \aleph a 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.”³⁸ This discovery is tremendously valuable, as it adds part of Sinaiticus to D’s lone Greek witness to the Western text.

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.”³⁹ 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 , f^1 , and f^{13} . I have also

³⁸ Fee, “Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John,” 243.

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)

<u>Θ</u>		<u>f¹</u>		<u>f¹³</u>		<u>P⁴⁵</u>		
1.	Π	78.5%	1. 565	88.2%	1. TR	79.6%	1. 892	100% ⁴⁰
2.	TR	77.8%	2. Π	78.8%	2. 700	79.1%	2. P75	77.4%
3.	A	77.7%	3. 892	78.3%	3. Ω	79.0%	3. UBS	71.2%
4.	E	77.5%	4. TR	78.0%	4. Π	78.6%	4. P66	69.2%
5.	Ω	76.6%	5. E	77.4%	5. E	78.5%	5. B	69.2%
6.	892	76.6%	6. 700	77.3%	6. Δ	77.5%	6. C	69.2%
7.	700	76.5%	7. A	76.8%	7. 892	76.1%	7. L	67.3%
8.	Δ	76.5%	8. Ω	76.0%	8. 565	76.1%	8. Θ	65.4%
9.	f¹³	75.8%	9. Δ	75.8%	9. Θ	75.8%	9. a	65.4%
10.	f¹	74.9%	10. 33	75.8%	10. 1241	74.9%	10. Ath	65.0%
11.	Ψ	74.1%	11. Ψ	74.9%	11. A	74.6%	11. Orig	63.5%
12.	565	73.4%	12. Θ	74.9%	12. f¹	74.1%	12. 01b	63.5%
13.	33	72.0%	13. f¹³	74.1%	13. Ψ	72.8%	13. b	63.5%
14.	UBS	70.0%	14. Ath	72.5%	14. 33	70.4%	14. Ψ	61.5%
15.	1241	69.7%	15. 579	72.5%	15. 579	68.2%	15. A	61.5%
16.	579	68.9%	16. Orig	72.0%	16. Ath	67.9%	16. Δ	61.5%
17.	P75	68.3%	17. UBS	71.7%	17. Orig	65.3%	17. 565	60.0%
18.	Orig	68.1%	18. L	70.6%	18. Did	64.8%	18. 33	59.6%
19.	Ath	67.4%	19. P75	70.5%	19. UBS	64.7%	19. Ω	59.6%
20.	C	67.4%	20. C	69.2%	20. L	64.2%	20. W	57.7%
21.	L	66.3%	21. 1241	69.1%	21. b	64.2%	21. E	57.7%
22.	P⁴⁵	65.4%	22. W	68.5%	22. C	63.5%	22. fl	55.8%
23.	a	65.2%	23. b	66.9%	23. P75	63.3%	23. 700	55.8%
24.	b	64.7%	24. a	66.5%	24. a	63.0%	24. D	55.8%
25.	W	63.8%	25. sb	66.2%	25. W	60.1%	25. e	55.8%
26.	B	62.9%	26. B	65.6%	26. 01b	58.6%	26. Π	55.8%
27.	P66	61.6%	27. Did	64.1%	27. e	58.4%	27. TR	55.8%
28.	01b	60.2%	28. P66	63.9%	28. P66	58.3%	28. 579	53.8%
29.	e	59.8%	29. Clem	61.7%	29. B	57.7%	29. f¹³	51.9%
30.	Did	59.4%	30. e	61.5%	30. Clem	52.4%	30. Clem	50.0%
31.	Clem	56.8%	31. P⁴⁵	55.8%	31. P⁴⁵	51.9%	31. 1241	39.2%
32.	01a	53.5%	32. D	53.8%	32. D	50.8%	32. 01a	NA
33.	D	52.1%	33. Na	52.7%	33. 01a	48.3%	33. Did	NA

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^{l3} f^l and 565 huddle between ranks 7-12, with P^{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^l , 88.2% which is almost 10% higher than the next witness, and 700 with f^{l3} 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^{45} in this group, however. P^{45} agrees more with six Alexandrian witnesses than it does with Θ ! The other Caesarean manuscripts fall in 17th, 23rd, and 29th places. These rankings hint that P^{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^{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

¹ Bart D. Ehrman, *Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels* (NTGF 1; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).

This example shows the variant 1:21-13.⁴ This variant is located in the key of textual variants, which follows this table:

1:21-13	τι ουν ηλιας ει(1) συ(1)
2	τι ουν συ ηλιας ει Origen P75 C* Ψ 33 UBS
2	τις ουν συ ηλιας ει P66
3	τι ουν ει συ ηλιας ει e
4	τι ουν ηλιας ει 01 L a
5	συ ουν τι ηλιας ει B
6	ηλιας ει συ b
*	/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 three⁵ Primary Alexandrian witnesses and three Secondary Alexandrian witnesses in reading “2”, τι[ς] 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 P⁶⁶ is also listed as supporting variant 2 because the only difference between the two readings is τι and τις.

“6”, ηλιας 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.¹⁰

Profile Two, the “Intra-Group profile,” tabulates the strength of a specific groups 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 variant¹¹

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.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

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-Alexandrians also contained that reading); 2) where more than 10 variants are involved.

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%.

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,¹³ 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

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

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 (P⁶⁶ & 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 αρω rather than εαρω. 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 Relationships¹⁶

	<u>Uniform¹⁷</u>	<u>Predominant</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Alex.	141/148 (95.3%)	389/460 (84.6%)	530/608 (87.2%)
Prim. Alex	410/456 (89.9%)	195/264 (73.9%)	605/720 (84%)
Sec. Alex	224/254 (88.2%)	301/381 (79%)	525/635 (82.7%)
Byzantine	498/584 (85.3%)	109/195 (55.9%)	607/779 (77.9%)
Caesarean	294/394 (74.6%)	160/223 (71.7%)	454/617 (73.6%)
Western	82/149 (55%)	134/259 (51.7%)	216/408 (52.9%)

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

	<u>Uniform¹⁸</u>	<u>Predominant</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Alex.	6/6 (100%)	94/108 (87%)	100/114 (87.7%)
Prim. Alex.	31/38 (81.2%)	12/23 (52.2%)	43/61 (70.5%)
Sec. Alex.	3/3 (100%)	9/14 (64.3%)	12/17 (70.6%) ¹⁹
Caesarean	0/1	0/0	0/1
Byzantine	0/0	0/1	0/1
Western	0/15 (0%)	0/39 (0%)	0/54 (0%)

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 $\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ with P⁷⁵ κ^* B^c D E W Θ a e UBS as well as $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ 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%!

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 Ehrman²² 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

²² See Bart Ehrman, "Heracleon, Origen, and the Text of the Fourth Gospel," *STCNT*, 267-280; repr. from *VC* 47 (1993), 105-118; as well as idem., "Heracleon and the 'Western' Textual Tradition," *STCNT*, 281-299; repr. from *NTS* 40 (1994), 161-179.

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

Profile Four, Alexandrian Affinities

TABLE 7
WITNESSES RANKED ACCORDING TO PROPORTIONAL AGREEMENT WITH THE UNIFORM AND
PREDOMINANT EARLY ALEXANDRIAN TEXT IN JOHN

Uniform				Uniform and Predominant			
1.	<i>UBS</i>	(456/456)	100.0%	1.	<i>UBS</i>	(710/718)	98.90%
2.	<i>B</i>	(456/456)	100.0%	2.	<i>B</i>	(686/718)	95.50%
3.	<i>P66</i>	(441/441)	100.0%	3.	<i>P75</i>	(465/494)	94.10%
4.	<i>P75</i>	(350/350)	100.0%	4.	<i>C</i>	(356/397)	89.70%
5.	<i>01b</i>	(173/173)	100.0%	5.	<i>01b</i>	(298/341)	87.40%
6.	<i>C</i>	(229/248)	92.3%	6.	<i>L</i>	(602/706)	85.30%
7.	Origen	(409/456)	89.7%	7.	Origen	(610/718)	85.00%
8.	<i>L</i>	(405/456)	88.8%	8.	<i>P66</i>	(545/653)	83.5% ²⁴
9.	<i>W</i>	(234/276)	84.8%	9.	Ψ	(578/718)	80.50%
10.	Ψ	(384/456)	84.2%	10.	<i>W</i>	(382/479)	79.70%
11.	892	(293/367)	79.8%	11.	33	(549/696)	78.90%
12.	33	(351/440)	79.8%	12.	892	(410/526)	77.90%
13.	P45	(25/32)	78.1%	13.	700	(504/677)	74.40%
14.	579	(349/449)	77.7%	14.	<i>A</i>	(437/587)	74.40%
15.	<i>A</i>	(287/372)	77.2%	15.	f1	(523/717)	72.90%
16.	f1	(342/455)	75.2%	16.	Π	(522/717)	72.80%
17.	Π	(337/455)	74.1%	17.	579	(510/708)	72.00%
18.	565	(298/407)	73.2%	18.	565	(451/637)	70.80%
19.	700	(331/456)	72.6%	19.	<i>E</i>	(506/718)	70.50%
20.	Δ	(327/451)	72.5%	20.	Θ	(505/717)	70.40%
21.	<i>E</i>	(330/456)	72.4%	21.	700	(499/710)	70.30%
22.	1241	(317/443)	71.6%	22.	TR	(501/718)	69.80%
23.	Θ	(326/456)	71.5%	23.	Δ	(498/713)	69.80%
24.	TR	(324/456)	71.1%	24.	1241	(484/700)	69.10%
25.	Ω	(322/455)	70.8%	25.	P45	(35/51)	68.60%
26.	f13	(299/456)	65.6%	26.	f13	(462/718)	64.30%
27.	01a	(180/283)	63.6%	27.	01a	(228/373)	61.10%
28.	<i>D</i>	(193/356)	54.2%	28.	<i>b</i>	(282/503)	56.10%
29.	<i>a</i>	(184/447)	41.2%	29.	<i>D</i>	(302/581)	52.00%

²³ Though Ehrman used this profile in his revised dissertation (*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.

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)

30.	b	(182/445)	40.9%	30.	a	(240/505)	47.50%
31.	e	(162/450)	36.0%	31.	e	(240/513)	46.80%

While the preceding Group Profiles clearly confirmed Origen’s Primary Alexandrian affinities, the results of the Fourth Profile at first seems 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!²⁵

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 P⁵², P⁶⁶, and P⁷⁵, earlier than any Alexandrian Father save Clement,²⁶ and approaches the textual purity of our very best witnesses, P⁷⁵ and B. And unlike P⁷⁵ 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.

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
Against: 1:27²⁹; 2:17; 4:11; 4:42; [5:5]³⁰; 7:37**; 8:42; 12:13; 13:18; 13:23; 19:12

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 θυγατερ 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 P^{66*} 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 whether this variant is genealogical.

Primary, Primary Alexandrian

Origen: 1:18*; 1:18; 1:24+; 1:26; 1:30; 1:45**³¹; 2:12*³²; 2:15; 2:22; 2:24; 4:5*; 4:16; 4:25*; 4:42*; 4:54; 5:44*; 6:58+³³; 7:42; 7:42†³⁴; 7:52³⁵; 7:52; 8:23; 8:38³⁶; 8:38; 8:38; 8:39*³⁷; 8:39³⁸; 9:30³⁹; 11:54⁴⁰; 12:2⁴¹; 12:6; 12:13**†⁴²; 13:2; 13:2⁴³; 13:6+; 13:10*; 13:31; 17:1**⁴⁴; 19:33; 19:35

³¹ 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.

³² For variant 2:12-22 I counted Origen for and against because though he does not have αυτου with P66* P75 B Ψ, he agrees with them in reading οι αδελφοι και οι μαθηται against the longer οι αδελφοι αυτου και οι μαθηται αυτου. Of course, as these variants are virtually interchangeable, we cannot be assured of genetic relationship.

³³ The 4/4 Primary Alexandrian omission of υμων with 3/8 Secondary Alexandrian witnesses and **ℵ** is half, not more than half, but I counted ½ as Primary when Uniform readings are involved, as noted above.

³⁴ 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.

³⁵ Again, **ℵ** 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 **ℵ** could have influenced the first half. Even so, it is striking that **ℵ** could agree by chance with these Primary Alexandrians and Origen in something as minor as writing εραυνησον rather than ερευνησον. It would be interesting to see how 01 aligns with the Alexandrian MSS in other instances.

³⁶ Primary Alexandrian has all four witnesses, against 2 Secondary Alexandrian and 1 each Caesarean and Western.

³⁷ Origen attests both to the strongly Primary Alexandrian reading εστε and the more common ητε. Michael Holmes comments, "It is only with some hesitation that we have allowed the ητε and εποιειτε variants to stand as alternatives in the reconstructed text. Since the data in Io.Com 20 are overwhelmingly in support of εστε and ποιειτε, 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 ητε/εποιειτε, he *certainly* knew εστε/ποιειτε." (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.

³⁸ This is a very muddy variant situation. εποιειτε is attested by P⁷⁵ **ℵ** UBS2 W E Θ D a e, and ποιειτε 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.

³⁹ 5/5 Primary Alexandrians, 4/8 Secondary, and f^d lack the definite article in this verse.

⁴⁰ The unanimity (and Distinctiveness) of the Alexandrian readings here is impressive. Origen reads εμεινεν with all Primary Alexandrians and 4/8 Secondary Alexandrians against all other witnesses, which have διετριβε.

Primary, Primary Alexandrian (cont')

Against: 1:28⁴⁵; 1:35; 1:45**; 2:12; 3:23; 5:26⁴⁶; 5:39; 5:44*; 5:47*⁴⁷; 6:35; 6:45; [8:39]; [8:39]; 10:18; 11:53+*; 12:12; 13:2; 13:21; 14:26; 17:1; 17:1**; 19:41

SECONDARY ALEXANDRIAN

Exclusive, Secondary Alexandrian

Origen: 1:26; 17:20;

Against: 1:33; 1:41; 2:23; 4:30; 5:44; 7:46; 8:24⁴⁸; 11:43; 11:44; 11:47; 11:53; 13:1; 13:2; 13:2; 13:15; 20:29;

Primary, Secondary Alexandrian

Origen: 1:21; 1:31*; 4:25⁴⁹; 6:51; 8:51; 11:54; 13:2; 13:2; 13:8; 13:18**; 13:18†⁵⁰; 13:23; 13:24; 13:26; 13:26; 13:26; 13:26; 13:26⁵¹; 16:18; 18:36+⁵²; 21:24

⁴¹ All extant Primary Alexandrians agree with Origen in the addition of $\epsilon\kappa$, 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 \omicron , attested by all 4 Westerns, 3 Caesarean, and 1 each Primary and Secondary Alexandrian; $\kappa\alpha\iota \omicron$, a Distinctive Alexandrian reading, witnessed by 4/5 Primary and 4/8 Secondary Alexandrians. All Byzantines and 2 Caesareans (f¹³ and 700) have nothing here. Origen cites both the \omicron (Western/Caesarean) and the $\kappa\alpha\iota \omicron$ (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— $\text{Ιουδας σιμωνος ισκαριωτης}$ against other varied forms of the name. UBS does not follow its adopted family members, but accompanies 3 Secondary Alexandrians with the spelling $\text{Ιουδας σιμωνος ισκαριωτου}$.

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 $\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon \kappa\alpha\iota \tau\omega \upsilon\omega \zeta\omega\eta\nu \epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$; P⁶⁶ P⁷⁵ 01 B L 579 UBS have $\kappa\alpha\iota \tau\omega \upsilon\omega \epsilon\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu \theta\omega\eta\nu \epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$ and Origen and W have $\kappa\alpha\iota \tau\omega \upsilon\omega \zeta\eta\nu \epsilon\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu \epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$.

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

⁴⁸ MSS 33 and 1241 share the distinct omission , $\epsilon\alpha\nu \gamma\alpha\rho \mu\eta \text{πιστευσητε} \omicron\tau\iota \epsilon\gamma\omega \epsilon\iota\mu\iota \text{αποθανεισθε} \epsilon\nu \tau\alpha\iota\varsigma \alpha\mu\alpha\rho\tau\iota\alpha\iota\varsigma \upsilon\mu\omega\nu$, 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 $\text{μετ} \epsilon\mu\omicron\upsilon$ 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)

Against: 1:19; 1:27; 1:28; 1: 36⁵³; 3:32; 4:1; 4:15*; 4:17; 4:47; 5:44; 6:52; 7:41; 8:38; 8:48; 8:59⁵⁴; 9:4; 9:39; 11:44; 11:47; 11:53+⁵⁵; 12:12; 13:16; 13:18**; 13:28; 13:33; 14:28; 16:13; 16:19; 17:1; 17:3; 21:20

ALEXANDRIAN

Distinctive, Alexandrian

Origen: 2:24⁵⁶; : 6:58+⁵⁷; 7:42; 7:46⁵⁸; 7:52; 8:23⁵⁹; 8:38; 8:38; 11:54; 13:2; 13:2; 13:18; 13:23+; 13:32; 21:23+⁶⁰

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 το 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 P^{66*}, 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 \aleph expand and move the words slightly: *και διελθων δια μεσου αυτων επορευετο και παρηγεν ουτως*, 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 *συμβουλευσαντο*, 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 το ερχεται ο χριστος* (an otherwise unremarkable variation) by 9/12 of the Alexandrian witnesses and no others is striking. I am not factoring in \aleph^c 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

Origen: 1:21; 1:26; 2:12; 2:18; 4:42; 7:37; 12:2; 12:15; 13:2; 13:18†; 13:19; 13:26; 13:26; 13:26; 13:26; 13:29; 16:18; 16:23; 17:5; 17:20; 19:26; 19:33; 19:35; 21:24; 21:24⁶¹; 21:24**

Against: 1:27; 1:33; 1:35; 1:35; 1:41; 2:12; 2:17; 2:23; 2:24; 3:2; 4:11; 4:12; 4:15; 4:30; 4:42; 5:5; 5:22; 5:44; 7:46; 8:24; 8:42; 8:41; 8:52; 9:39; 11:43; 11:44; 11:47; 11:49; 11:52; 11:53; 12:13; 12:15; 13:1; 13:9; 13:15; 13:18†; 13:21; 13:23; 13:26; 13:27; 13:28; 13:33; 15:19; 16:19; 16:19; 16:24; 17:1; 17:21; 19:12; 19:12; 19:15; 20:23; 20:29; 21:18; 21:20; 21:21; 21:24**

Primary, Alexandrian

Origen: 1:15; 1:16; 1:18*⁶²; 1:18; 1:20; 1:21; 1:24; 1:25; 1:26; 1:27; 1:27*; 1:28+; 1:29; 1:30; 1:31; 1:32; 1:38; 1:39; 1:41; 1:45*; 1:51; 2:11; 2:12*; 2:15; 2:17; 2:19; 2:22; 2:24; 3:32*⁶³; 4:5; 4:12; 4:15; 4:16; 4:20; 4:20; 4:21; 4:21; 4:25; 4:27; 4:34; 4:35**; 4:36; 4:36; 4:37; 4:39; 4:42; 4:43; 4:45; 4:46; 4:54; 5:27; 5:44*; 6:9*⁶⁴; 6:9; 6:11; 6:15; 6:28; 6:29; 6:46; 6:51; 6:51*⁶⁵; 6:54**⁶⁶; 6:55*⁶⁷; 6:55; 6:57*⁶⁸; 6:58; 6:58; 6:58†⁶⁹; 7:26; 7:29; 7:39;

⁶¹ This could easily have been Distinctive, but unfortunately aleph P⁶⁶ P⁷⁵ are all missing, as well as L 579 892. Interestingly, ⲛ^c 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 κγω and και εγω, Origen attests the contracted form with all Primary Alexandrians, 6/8 Secondary Alexandrians, Byzantine Π and Caesarean f¹ and Θ. He also knows the unlinked form witnessed by 4/6 Byzantine, 3/6 Caesarean, and Western ⲛ D.

⁶⁷ αληθης rather than αληθως 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)

7:41; 7:42; 7:42†; 7:43; 7:46⁷⁰; 7:49; 7:51; 7:51; 7:52; 7:52; 8:14⁷¹; 8:16⁷²; 8:19; 8:20⁷³; 8:21; 8:23; 8:38; 8:38; 8:38; 8:39**⁷⁴; 8:39; 8:42; 8:44; 8:46; 8:48; 8:51; 8:52; 8:53; 8:54; 8:59; 9:30; 10:8; 10:16; 10:21⁷⁴; 10:26⁷⁵; 10:27; 11:39⁷⁶; 11:41; 11:44; 11:44; 11:44; 11:44; 11:45; 11:47; 11:48; 11:50; 11:50⁷⁷; 11:54; 11:54; 11:54; 11:57+⁷⁸; 11:57; 11:57; 12:6; 12:13; 12:35; 13:1; 13:2; 13:2; 13:3; 13:3; 13:6; 13:6; 13:8; 13:8; 13:8; 13:8; 13:10; 13:12; 13:18; 13:18; 13:20⁷⁹; 13:22; 13:23⁸⁰; 13:24; 13:25⁸¹; 13:25+; 13:26; 13:26; 13:26; 13:26; 13:26; 13:28; 13:29; 13:30⁸²; 13:30; 13:31; 13:33; 13:36; 13:36; 14:9; 14:23; 14:28; 15:22;

⁶⁸ Here the “proportional Alexandrian agreement” guideline applies. The 6 Secondary Alexandrian witnesses to ζῆσει rather than ζῆσεται 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 ζῆσει against ζῆσεται; according to Proportional Agreement, I counted this as Primary, Alexandrian.

⁷⁰ The omission of ὡς οὗτος ὁ ἀνθρώπος 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). Ⲙ is the only outsider, which is Western here, but Primary Alexandrian post 8:38.

⁷¹ P75 B W and b read ἡ μαρτυρία μου ἀληθῆς ἐστὶν against the dominant ἀλητῆς ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία μου. Origen attests to both.

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

⁷³ This Primary, Alexandrian “omission” of ὁ Ἰησοῦς 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 ἀνοιξαὶ 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 ἀκουουσιν rather than ἀκουει. 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 ὑμῖν rather than ἡμῖν (attested by all Byzantine, 4/8 Secondary Alexandrian, and 5/6 Caesarean witnesses). All Westerns and 1 Caesarean also read ὑμῖν.

⁷⁸ Not a very impressive Primary reading, barely worth including—all five Primary Alexandrian witnesses and 5/8 Secondary omit the καὶ, 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 ἀν instead of εἰν, this reading would be both Distinctive and Uniform Alexandrian—All 8 Secondary Alexandrians read ἀν instead of εἰν, 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)

16:12; 16:13; 16:16; 16:18; 16:23; 16:25; 16:33; 17:1; [17:1]⁸³; 17:1**⁸⁴; 17:11; 17:20*+; 18:8; 18:13; 18:14; 18:36; 19:7; 19:12; 19:17; 19:33; 19:34⁸⁴; 19:35**⁸⁵; 19:35; 20:17**⁸⁶; 21:21; 21:22+; 21:24⁸⁷; 21:24

Primary Alexandrian Against Origen

1:18; 1:19; 1:19; 1:22; 1:27; 1:28; 1:28; 1:35; 1:36; 1:45; 2:12; 2:13; 2:18; 3:2; 3:23; 3:25; 3:32; 4:1; 4:15*; 4:17; 4:25; 4:35**⁸⁴; 4:47; 4:51; 5:1; 5:26; 5:39; 5:44; 5:47; 6:32; 6:35; 6:45; 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;

City, UT, 1962), cited in Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. (4th ed.; New York: Oxford, 2005), 84n46.

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 rather than ευθους 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 εκεινος 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 καικεινος. 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.Com17, 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 ο rather than και alone).

Primary Alexandrian Against Origen (con't)

9:39; 10:8⁸⁸; 10:18; 10:36; 11:44; 11:46; 11:47; 11:51⁸⁹; 11:53+*; 12:2; 12:12; 12:12; 12:13; 12:16; 12:16; 13:2; 13:10; 13:11⁹⁰; 13:12; 13:12; 13:15; 13:16; 13:18; 13:19; 13:30; 13:25; 13:26; 13:28; 13:32; [13:33]⁹¹; 14:23; 14:26; 14:28; 14:28; 15:15; 16:13; 16:19; 17:1; 17:1**; 17:3; 17:21; 18:3; [18:8]⁹²; 18:13; 19:12; 19:35**; 19:41; 20:17**; 21:18; 21:20

CAESAREAN

Exclusive, Caesarean

Against: 1:38; 3:2; 7:30⁹³; 8:21⁹⁴; 8:21; 8:39; 8:43; 8:50; 11:41; 11:47; 11:48; 11:54; 12:2; 13:33; 16:19; 18:3; 18:40; 19:15

⁸⁸ Here Origen again attests two readings—he knows both the Alexandrian order ηλθον 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 ηλθον. 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. ηλθον tout seul is also a reading here (P⁴⁵ vid P⁷⁵ & 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 P⁷⁵ 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 ευρησατε το με; and while 700 lacks the με, it also reads και ουχ ευρησατε.

Primary, Caesarean

Origen: 14:26⁹⁵; 18:8⁹⁶

Against: 2:16; 3:24; 4:16; 4:35; 4:42; 4:49; 5:19; 5:41; 7:41⁹⁷; 8:40; 8:48; 8:49; 13:26; 13:29; 19:17; 19:34; 19:34; 19:35; 20:26; 21:19

WESTERN

Distinctive, Western

Origen: None

Against: 1:4; 1:15; 1:15; 1:16; 1:18; 1:21⁹⁸; 1:21; 1:32; 1:32; 1:34⁹⁹; 2:6; 2:12; 2:15; 2:15; 2:24; 3:23; 3:31; 4:9¹⁰⁰; 4:11; 4:17; 4:19; 4:21; 4:27; 4:33; 4:33; 4:37; 4:39; 4:42; 4:45; 4:45; 4:45; 5:19; 6:11; 6:26; 6:27; 6:27; 6:46; 6:49; 6:50; 6:51; 6:51; 6:51; 6:53; 7:37; 7:42; 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

Against: 1:5; 1:5; 1:6; 1:12; 1:13; 1:13; 1:18 ; 1:20; 1:21; 1:21; 1:21; 1:22; 1:24; 1:25; 1:25; 1:26; 1:29; 1:32; 1:35; 2:14; 2:15; 2:20; 2:25; 3:2; 3:31; 4:5; 4:14; 4:23; 4:24; 4:24; 4:25; 4:25; 4:27; 4:27; 4:28; 4:32; 4:33; 4:33; 4:38; 4:42; 4:42; 4:45; 4:45; 4:46; 4:46; 4:54; 5:19

⁹⁵ Here Origen and Θ f¹ 565 a b read σσα 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 (P⁴⁵ 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. X had this omission, and then a scribe added the longer text.

¹⁰¹ All witnesses but a b e read καιοφα 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)

5:39; 5:44; 6:15; 6:27; 6:32; 6:53; 6:54; 6:56¹⁰²; 7:25; 7:27; 7:30; 7:37; 7:39; 7:41; 7:46;
7:46; 8:12; 8:16; 8:34; 8:39; 8:45; 8:52; 10:8; 10:10; 10:21; 11:41; 11:48; 11:55; 12:2; 13:6;
13:8; 13:18; 13:23; 13:27; 13:27; 13:27; 13:36; 14:23; 14:23; 14:30; 16:13; 16:18; 18:5;
21:22; 21:23; 21:24

Primary, Western

Origen: 4:29**; 6:11; 18:5¹⁰³

Against: 1:3*¹⁰⁴; 1:17; 1:21; 1:27; 1:28; 1:33; 1:38; 1:39; 2:11; 2:20; 3:22; 3:31; 3:32; 4:12;
4:28; 4:29*; 5:19; 5:26; 5:30; 5:39; 6:33; 6:52; 6:53; 6:54; 6:58; 7:26; 7:26; 7:29; 7:29; 7:39;
7:46; 7:48; 7:52; 8:21; 8:24; 8:24; 8:39; 8:39; 8:40; 8:40; 8:44; 8:44; 8:53; 8:53; 9:39; 11:39;
11:42; 11:45; 11:46; 11:49; 11:49; 11:54; 12:26; 12:31; 12:32; 12:32; 13:4; 13:8; 13:9;
13:14; 13:14; 13:20; 13:26; 13:26; 13:27; 13:33; 14:9; 14:26; 16:20+¹⁰⁵; 18:1; 20:23; 20:23

BYZANTINE

Distinctive, Byzantine

None

Exclusive, Byzantine

Origen: 12:13¹⁰⁶

Against: 3:22; 13:3; 13:31; 17:11

Primary, Byzantine

1:38; 1:45; 4:45; 6:9; 6:29; 6:46; 6:55; 6:55; 7:26; 7:49; 7:51; 7:51; 8:38; 8:38; 8:48; 8:54;
8:59; 10:21; 10:26; 10:27; 11:39; 11:39; 11:41; 11:53; 11:54+¹⁰⁷; 12:13; 12:14; 12:35; 13:1;
13:2; 13:3¹⁰⁸; 13:8; 13:29; 13:30; 13:38; 16:18; 16:25; 17:1; 18:14; 18:36; 19:7

¹⁰²This 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 ιησους. As it is, Origen agrees with B UBS

¹⁰⁴ This reading is right on the edge— \aleph and D read ουδεν against ουδε εν, as well as P⁶⁶ and f^l. 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 \aleph B f^l 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:

(With Origen) 1:18; 1:26; 1:30; 1:45; 2:22; 2:24; 4:5; 4:16; 4:25; 4:42; 4:54; 5:44; 6:58; 7:42; 7:52; 8:23; 8:38; 8:38; 8:38; 8:39; 9:30; 11:54; 12:2*; 13:2*; 13:6*; 13:10*; 13:31*; 13:32*; 17:1*

(Against): 1:28;¹¹⁰ 1:45**; 5:26; 11:53+; 12:2*¹¹¹; 12:13¹¹²; 12:16; 19:41*

Predominant, Primary Alexandrian

Origen: 2:12*; 2:15; 5:44**; 7:42†; 7:52; 8:39; 11:44; 11:54; 12:6; 12:13**†; 13:6; 17:1*.**; 19:33

Against:

2:12; 3:23; 5:39; 5:44**; 5:47*; 6:35; 6:45; 12:12; 13:2; 13:21; 17:1; 17:1*.**

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 *τησους ουν* with 3 Caesarean, 2 Secondary Alexandrian, and 1 Western against the Predominant Alexandrian reading *ο ουν ηησους* (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 P⁷⁵ C P⁴⁵ 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 ηγωνιζοντο το 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.

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, with Origen: 7:46; 11:54; 13:2; 13:2; 13:18; 1:16; 1:20; 1:25; 1:27; 1:28; 1:29; 1:32; 1:38; 1:39; 1:41; 2:11; 2:19; 3:32*; 4:20; 4:21; 4:21; 4:27; 4:34; 4:36; 4:36; 4:46; 4:47; 5:27; 6:9*; 6:9; 6:11; 6:15; 6:29*; 6:46; 6:51*; 6:54**; 6:55*; 6:55; 6:57*; 6:58*; 7:26; 7:29; 7:43; 7:46; 7:51; 8:16; 8:19; 8:19; 8:20; 8:38; 8:38; 8:42; 8:44; 8:46; 8:48; 8:51; 8:53; 8:54; 9:30; 10:8**; 10:16; 10:21; 10:26; 10:27; 11:39; 11:41; 11:44*¹¹⁵; 11:44; 11:47; 11:54; 11:54; 11:57+12:13**; 12:35; 13:1; 13:8; 13:8; 13:12; 13:18; 13:23; 13:25; 13:26; 13:26; 13:26; 13:29; 13:30; 13:30; 13:36; 14:23; 14:28; 16:16; 16:18; 16:23; 16:25; 16:33; 17:1; 17:20*+; 18:13; 18:14; 18:36; 19:7; 19:34; 19:35**

Predominant, against Origen:

Against: 1:27; 3:2; 3:25; 3:32; 4:17; 4:51; 8:19; 8:44; 10:8**; 12:13**; 13:10; 13:11; 13:25; 13:32; 15:15

CAESAREAN

Primary, Caesarean

Origen: None

Against, Uniform:: 2:16¹¹⁶

Against, Predominant: 4:16; 7:41; 8:49

WESTERN

Distinctive, Western

Against, Uniform: 1:4; 1:21; 1:21; 1:32; 4:11; 4:17; 6:11; 6:46; 11:11; 16:12; 21:23

Against, Predominant: 1:15; 1:15; 1:16; 1:18; 1:21

Primary, Byzantine

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

Predominant, Against Origen: 4:45; 6:9; 6:29; 6:55; 6:55; 7:26; 8:38; 11:41; 12:13; 12:35; 13:1.

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 *διελθων δια μεσου αυτων και παρηγεν αυτως*. 7/8 Secondary Alexandrians and aleph expand and move the words slightly: *και διελθων δια μεσου αυτων επορευετο και παρηγεν ουτως*, 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 *και* 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 Griesbach, 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.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.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, P⁷⁵ 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?

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.

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.)

P ⁷⁵ -B (460/520)	88.5%
P ⁷⁵ -Or (421/520)	81%
B-Or (608/815)	74.6%
P ⁷⁵ -B-Or (397/520)	76.3%

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 οτι only with P⁷⁵ D L Π*, 7 times adds ετι with rest of witnesses); 4:42-55; (ουτος εστιν αληθως ο σωτηρ with majority and αληθως αυτος εστιν ο σωτηρ with κ); 5:44-13 (ανθρωπων with Δ 1241, αλληλων 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 εμε with P⁷⁵ and also με with most); 7:39-40 (ουπω with κ b D Θ and ουδεπω with the rest); 8:14-25 (all from *Io.Com.* 19, μαρτυρια μου αληθης εστιν with P⁷⁵ B W b and then αληθης εστιν η μαρτυρια 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 (*Io.Com.* in books 6 and 10, and *Heracl.* 8), include (*Io.Com.* 6, *Mat.Com.* 17, *Orat.* 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 B C*; and οσα twice with the remaining witnesses, all in book 13 of *Io.Comm.*); 5:44-40 (5 quotes, omits θεου twice with several important Alexandrians P⁶⁶ P⁷⁵ B W and Western a; he also includes it with most witnesses); 5:47-16 (Reads πιστευσητε with 4/6 Caesarean witnesses and several others: D W Δ Θ f¹ f¹³ 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—P⁶⁶ P⁷⁵ κ B C D L W Ψ 33 579 a b e UBS, and twice adds ην 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 as 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 [*Orat.* and *Io.Com.*] in Caesarea,” demonstrated by the fact that Origen quotes the addition twice in *Orationes* and lacks it twice in his commentary on John [*TFGWO*, 173n3]; 6:54-40 (καγω with all Primary Alexandrians and 6/8 Secondary Alexandrians, as well as και εγω with most of the remaining witnesses, one quote each); 8:16-22 (αληθινη with a slight majority of Alexandrian witnesses, P⁷⁵ B 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

are not sure if he also read ητε with most other witnesses, as he has this form only twice [*TFGWO*, 207n12]); 8:39-43 (As with the last example, the editors are sure Origen knew ποιειτε with P⁶⁶ B but are not sure that he also knew εποιετε with P⁷⁵ & D E W Θ a e UBS. Since the Alexandrians are divided here, the uncertainty does not make a significant difference. Note that the reading that Origen surely had is an Exclusive Primary Alexandrian); 12:13-46 (The variation in this verse is simple and minor, but significant due to its clear division along group lines. The three variations are: 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; and nothing, attested by all Byzantines and 2 Caesareans (f¹³ and 700). Origen cites both the Western/Caesarean ο and the Alexandrian και ο); 13:18-34 (Origen knows both Exclusive Alexandrian μου with B C L 892 UBS and μετ' εμου with the other witnesses); 20:17-16 (Most witnesses have πατερα μου; & B D W b e lack μου. Origen attests both readings).

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 $\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\epsilon\iota$ with Heracleon B L f^l a b e and $\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu$ 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 $\omicron\iota\delta\alpha$ twice in Alexandria (*Io.Com* 1) and once in Caesarea (with most witnesses), and $\omicron\iota\delta\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu$ once in Alexandria (with L f^{l3} 33 1241 and the correctors to P⁶⁶ and \aleph). Finally, in 21:25-31 Origen knows both the $\chi\omega\rho\eta\sigma\alpha\iota$ majority reading and $\chi\omega\rho\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu$, contained in \aleph^c B C*. But even though $\chi\omega\rho\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu$ has better Alexandrian attestation, in the two Alexandrian quotes Origen reads $\chi\omega\rho\eta\sigma\alpha\iota$!

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 & 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 και

¹⁰ The weighing of agreements and disagreements is a step often neglected in studies of textual alignment. See the suggestions and method modeled in Gordon Fee, “The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Methodology in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations,” *Studies*, 301-334.

to $\iota\nu\alpha$. The addition of $\kappa\alpha\iota$ 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 $\kappa\alpha\iota$ with all extant Primary Alexandrian witnesses, 3/8 Secondary Alexandrians, all Westerns, as well as θ f1 and A.¹¹ 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 $\kappa\alpha\iota$ 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— $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$ 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 uncontracted form is Alexandrian (P⁶⁶ B UBS W 579) with secondary Caesarean support (Θ f¹); the remaining representative witnesses read $\kappa\alpha\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$. 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 $\sigma\upsilon$ 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 \aleph A B C* D W Θ f¹ 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."

¹³ Gordon Fee, "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril," 309.

TABLE 9

COMPARATIVE PERCENTAGES OF AGREEMENT WITH ORIGEN IN JOHN 4 AND 1-21

John 4			John 1-21		
1.	B	91.7%	1.	P ⁷⁵	85.4%
2.	C	85.7%	2.	B	84.5
3.	P ⁷⁵	84.5%	3.	C	84.2
4.	P ^{66*}	83.3%	4.	L	81.3
5.	P ^{66c}	80.6%	5.	Ψ	78.0%
6.	Ψ	73.6%	6.	33	75.6%
7.	Cyr	71.4%	7.	P66 ^c	75.4%
8.	W	70.8%	8.	W	73.8%
9.	L	69.4%	9.	892	73.1%
10.	33	69.4%	10.	f ^l	72.0%
11.	A	66.7%	11.	P ⁶⁶	71.9%
12.	Δ	66.7%	12.	⋈ (8:39-21:25)	70.8%
13.	l	66.7%	13.	Π	70.8%
14.	579	65.3%	14.	565	70.5%
15.	892	65.3%	15.	579	70.4%
16.	e	65.0%	16.	A	70.1%
17.	E	62.5%	17.	Δ	69.2%
18.	G	62.5%	18.	E	69.1%
19.	1241	59.2%	19.	TR	68.8%
20.	Θ	58.9%	20.	700	68.7%
21.	b	58.8%	21.	Ω	68.4%
22.	Ω	56.9%	22.	1241	68.1%
23.	TR	56.9%	23.	Θ	68.1%
24.	13	54.2%	24.	b	65.9%
25.	⋈	45.8%	25.	f ^{l3}	65.3%
26.	D	38.9%	26.	a	64.5%
			27.	P ⁴⁵	63.5%
			28.	e	60.6%
			29.	Θ	68.1%
			30.	b	65.9%
				f ^{l3}	65.3%
				a	64.5%
				D	49.6%

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.¹⁴ 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.¹⁵ 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.¹⁶

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”¹⁷ 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.¹⁸ 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, 50. 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.”²²

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.²⁴ 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.²⁵ 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 οτι 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 Alexandria 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.

	a	b	e	D	01	Or	P66	P75	B	UBS3	C	L	W	Psl	33	579	892	1241	P45	Q	f1	f13	565	700	A	E	A	Pi	Q	TR	Prim. Alex	Sec. Alex	Alex	Caes	Byz	West	
21:23-19*	3	0	0	2	0	0	*	*	0	0	0	0	0	*	*	*	*	3	*	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Unif*	-
21:23-25*	2	2	2	2	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	Unif*	2, Unif
21:23-28*	0	0	2	2	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	Unif*	-
21:23-43	3	0	3	2	3	0	*	*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	*	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Unif*	-
21:24-07	0	0	0	0	0	2	*	2	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	Unif*	0, Unif
21:24-10*	2	0	2	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	Unif*	-
21:24-16	2	2	2	2	0	2	*	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	*	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Unif*	2, Unif
21:25-13	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	0	0	0	0	Unif*	-
21:25-31	9	9	9	0	0	9	*	0	3	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	Unif*	-

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 f1
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 W
- 1:4 εν αυτω 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
 τοις πιστευουσιν εις το ονομα αυτου
- 1:12-4 δε
 2 OM
 D e

- * /Missing/
P45 W
- 1:13 οι ουκ εξ αιματων ουδε(1) εκ(1) θεληματος(1) σαρκος ουδε(2)
εκ(2) θεληματος(2) ανδρος αλλ εκ(3) θεου εγεννηθησαν
- 1:13-4 οι
2 OM
D a
3 ος
b
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 1:13-13 ουδε(2) εκ(2) θεληματος(2) ανδρος
2 OM
B*
3 ουδε θεληματος ανδρος
01* D*
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 1:13-25 εγεννηθησαν
2 εγεννηθησαν
P75 A B* Δ Θ Ω
3 εγεννηθη
b
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 1:15 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)
- 1:15-16 λεγων
2 OM
01* D b
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 1:15-22 ην(1)
2 εστιν
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 1:15-25 ον ειπον
2 ον ελεγον
Cc
9 [ον ειπον /./ ον ελεγον]
a b e
10 ο ειπων
Origen 01c B* C*
11 OM
01*

- * /Missing/
P45 W
- 1:16 και(1) εκ του πληρωματος αυτου ημεις παντες ελαβομεν και(2)
χαριν αντι χαριτος
- 1:16-4 και(1)
2 οτι
Origen P66 P75 01 B C* D L 33 579 a b e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 1:16-13 και(2)
2 OM
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:17 οτι ο νομος δια(1) μωσεως εδοθη η(1) χαρις και η(2) αληθεια
δια(2) ιησου χριστου εγενετο
- 1:17-13 χαρις
2 χαρις δε
P66 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:18 θεον ουδεις εωρακε πωποτε ο(1) μονογενης υιος ο(2) ων εις τον
κολπον του πατρος εκεινος εξηγησατο
- 1:18-13 πωποτε
2 + ει μη
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:18-16 ο(1) μονογενης υιος
4 ο μονογενης θεος
Origen P75 01c 33
5 μονογενης θεος
Heracleon P66 01* B C* L UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:18-22 ο(2) ων
2 OM
Heracleon 01* a
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:19 και(1) αυτη εστιν η μαρτυρια του ιωαννου οτε απεστειλαν οι
ιουδαιοι εξ ιεροσολυμων ιερεις και(2) λευιτας ινα ερωτησωσιν
αυτον συ τις ει

- 1:19-7 του
2 OM
Π* f1
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:19-16 απεστειλαν
2 + προς αυτον
B C* 33 892c a b UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:19-34 λευιτας
2 + προς αυτον
P66c vid A Θ Π Ψ f13 579 e
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:19-37 ερωτησωσιν
2 επερωτησωσιν
01
3 ερωτησουσιν
P75 L Δ 33 579
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:20 και(1) ωμολογησε και(2) ουκ(1) ηρνησατο και(3) ωμολογησεν οτι
ουκ(2) ειμι εγω ο χριστος
- 1:20-10 και(2) ουκ(1) ηρνησατο και(3) ωμολογησεν
2 και ουκ ηρνησατο ωμολογησεν
Cc L f1 33 b
3 και ουκ ηρνησατο
01 e
4 OM
579
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:20-22 ουκ(2) ειμι εγω
2 ~ 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
- 1:21 και(1) ηρωτησαν αυτον τι ουν ηλιας ει(1) συ(1) και(2) λεγει ουκ
ειμι ο προφητης ει(2) συ(2) και(3) απεκριθη ου
- 1:21-7 αυτον
2 + παλιν
01c a

- 3 + και ειπον αυτω
1241
- 4 + παλιν λεγοντες
b e
- 5 παλιν
01*
- * /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:21-13 τι ουν ηλιας ει(1) συ(1)
- 2 τι ουν συ ηλιας ει
Origen P75 C* Ψ 33 UBS3
- 2 τις ουν συ ηλιας ει
P66
- 3 τι ουν ει συ ηλιας ει
e
- 4 τι ουν ηλιας ει
01 L a
- 5 συ ουν τι ηλιας ει
B
- 6 ηλιας ει συ
b
- * /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:21-28 και(2)
- 2 OM
01 a b
- * /Missing/
P45 D W 565
- 1:21-37 ειμι
- 2 + τι ουν
a b
- 3 + απεκριθησαν
e
- * /Missing/
P45 D W 565
- 1:22 ειπον ουν αυτω τις ει ινα αποκρισιν δωμεν τοις πεμψασιν ημας τι
 λεγεις περι σεαυτου
- 1:22-10 αυτω
- 2 OM
b e
- 3 αυτω συ
P66c P75 E*
- * /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:24 και οι απεσταλμενοι ησαν εκ των φαρισαιων
- 1:24-4 οι
- 2 OM
Origen P66 P75 01* A* B C* L Ψ UBS3

- 9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:24-10 εκ
2 + των λευιτων και
a e
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:25 και(1) ηρωτησαν αυτον και(2) ειπον αυτω τι ουν βαπτιζεις ει(1)
συ ουκ ει(2) ο(1) χριστος ουτε(1) ηλιας ουτε(2) ο(2) προφητης
- 1:25-4 και(1) ηρωτησαν αυτον
2 OM
01 e
3 ινα ερωτησωσιν αυτον
b
4 μαθηται και λευιται
a
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:25-13 και(2) ειπον αυτω
3 ειπαν αυτω
a b
4 λεγοντες
e
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:25-25 ουτε(1) ηλιας ουτε(2)
2 ουδε ηλιας ουδε
Origen P66 P75 01 A B C L Ψ fl 33 579 UBS3
3 ουδε ηλιας ουτε
Θ
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:25-28 ο(2)
2 OM
C Δ
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:26 απεκριθη αυτοις ο ιωαννης λεγων εγω βαπτιζω εν υδατι μεσος δε
υμων εστηκεν ον υμεις ουκ οιδατε
- 1:26-7 απεκριθη
2 και απεκριθη

- e
 3 απεκρινατο
 Origen L 33 579
 4 αποκριθεις
 a
 * /Missing/
 P45 D W
- 1:26-16 λεγων
 2 OM
 P75 fl e
 * /Missing/
 P45 D W
- 1:26-19 εγω
 2 + μεν
 f13 b
 * /Missing/
 P45 D W
- 1:26-25 βαπτιζω
 2 + υμας
 Δ Θ a b
 * /Missing/
 P45 D W
- 1:26-31 υδατι
 2 + εις μετανοιαν
 a b
 * /Missing/
 P45 D W
- 1:26-37 δε
 2 OM
 Origen P66 P75 01 B C* L UBS3
 * /Missing/
 P45 D W
- 1:26-46 εστηκεν
 2 στηκει
 Heracleon B L fl a b e
 9 [εστηκεν /./ στηκει]
 Origen
 10 ειστηκει
 P75 01
 * /Missing/
 P45 D W
- 1:27 αυτος εστιν ο οπισω μου(1) ερχομενος ος εμπροσθεν μου(2)
 γεγονεν ου εγω ουκ ειμι αξιος ινα λυσω αυτου τον ιμαντα του
 υποδηματος
- 1:27-4 αυτος εστιν ο οπισω
 2 ο οπισω
 P66 P75 01c C* L Θ fl 33 579 1241 a UBS3

- 3 οπισω
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
βαπτιζων
- 1:28-7 εν βηθαβαρα εγενετο
2 εγενετο εν βηθανια
P66 01* a b e
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:28-10 βηθαβαρα
3 βηθαβαρα
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/

- P45 D W
- 1:28-28 ιωαννης
2 + το πρωτον
C f13 1241
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:29 τη επαυριον βλεπει ο(1) ιωαννης τον ιησουν ερχομενον προς αυτον
και λεγει ιδε ο(2) αμνος του(1) θεου ο(3) αιρων την αμαρτιαν
του(2) κοσμου
- 1:29-7 ο(1) ιωαννης
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 θεου
2 + ιδε
a b
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:30 ουτος εστι περι ου εγω ειπον οπισω μου(1) ερχεται ανηρ ος
εμπροσθεν μου(2) γεγονεν οτι πρωτος μου(3) ην
- 1:30-10 περι
2 υπερ
Origen P66 P75 01* B C* UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:31 καγω ουκ ηδεν αυτον αλλ ινα φανερωθη τω(1) ισραηλ δια τουτο
ηλθον εγω εν τω(2) υδατι βαπτιζων
- 1:31-13 ηλθον εγω
2 ~ 2,1 (εγω ηλθον)
C* 700 1241 b
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:31-19 τω(2)
2 OM
Origen P66 P75 01 B C L Θ Ψ f1 33 579 892 1241 UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:32 και(1) εμαρτυρησεν ιωαννης λεγων οτι τεθεαμαι το πνευμα
καταβαινον ωσει περιστεραν εξ ουρανου και(2) εμεινεν επ αυτον

- 1:32-10 ιωαννης
2 ο ιωαννης
Origen Cc
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:32-13 λεγων
2 OM
01* e
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:32-22 καταβαινον ωσει περιστεραν
3 ~ ως ,3,1 (ως περιστεραν καταβαινον)
01 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:32-28 ωσει
2 ως
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 εξ
2 εκ του
01 fl
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:32-34 εμεινεν
3 εμενεν
1241
4 μενον
01 b e
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:33 καγω ουκ ηδειν αυτον(1) αλλ ο(1) πεμψας με βαπτιζειν εν(1)
υδατι εκεινος μοι ειπεν εφ ον αν ιδης το πνευμα καταβαινον και
μενον επ αυτον(2) ουτος εστιν ο(2) βαπτιζων εν(2) πνευματι αγιω
- 1:33-7 καγω
2 και εγω
01
9 [καγω / ./ και εγω]
a b e*
10 και

- ec
 * /Missing/
 P45 D W 579
- 1:33-16 εν(1)
 2 + τω
 Origen P66 01 f1
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 D W
- 1:33-37 ουτος
 2 αυτος
 A b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 D W
- 1:33-40 πνευματι αγιω
 2 τω πνευματι τω αγιω
 L 33 579
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 D W
- 1:34 καγω εωρακα και μεμαρτυρηκα οτι ουτος εστιν ο υιος του θεου
- 1:34-10 ο υιος
 2 ο εκλεκτος
 01* b e
 3 ο εκλεκτος υιος
 a
 * /Missing/
 P45 D W
- 1:35 τη επαυριον παλιν εισηκει ο ιωαννης και εκ των μαθητων αυτου
 δυο
- 1:35-4 παλιν εισηκει
 2 εισηκει παλιν
 579
 5 εισηκει
 P75 Ψ
 6 δε εισηκει
 e
 7 δε
 b
 * /Missing/
 P45 D W
- 1:35-13 ο
 2 OM
 P75 B L
 9 /NA/

- a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 D W
- 1:35-19 εκ των μαθητων αυτου δυο
 2 αι μαθηται αυτου δυο
 b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 D W
- 1:36 και εμβλεψας τω ιησου περιπατουντι λεγει ιδε ο αμνος του θεου
- 1:36-10 θεου
 2 + ο αιρων την αμαρτιαν του κοσμου
 P66* C* 892 1241 a
 * /Missing/
 P45 D W
- 1:38 στραφεις δε(1) ο(1) ιησους και θεασαμενος αυτους ακολουθοντας
 λεγει αυτοις τι ζητειτε οι δε(2) ειπον αυτω ραββι ο(2) λεγεται
 ερμηνευομενον διδασκαλε που μενεις
- 1:38-4 στραφεις δε(1)
 3 στραφεις
 01* E Ω
 4 και στραφεις
 e
 * /Missing/
 P45 D W
- 1:38-13 ακολουθοντας
 2 + autw
 P66 C* 1241 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 D W
- 1:38-19 τι
 2 τινα
 Θ f13
 3 τι θελειτε η τινα
 e
 * /Missing/
 P45 D W
- 1:38-34 λεγεται ερμηνευομενον
 3 λεγεται μεθερμηνευομενον
 Origen P66 P75 01c A B C L Ψ 33 579 892 UBS3
 9 [λεγεται ερμηνευομενον /./ λεγεται μεθερμηνευομενον]
 a
 10 ερμηνευεται
 f1 b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 D W

- 1:39 λέγει αυτοις ερχεσθε και(1) ιδετε ηλθον και(2) ειδον που μνει και(3) παρ αυτω εμειναν την ημεραν εκεινην ωρα δε ην ως δεκατη
- 1:39-10 ιδετε
2 οψεσθε
Origen P66 P75 B C* L Ψ f1 33 579 UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:39-28 την ημεραν εκεινην
2 ~ 3,1,2 (εκεινην την ημεραν)
f13 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:40 ην ανδρεας ο αδελφος σιμωνος πετρου εις εκ των(1) δυο των(2) ακουσαντων παρα ιωαννου και ακολουθησαντων αυτω
- 1:40-13 των(2)
2 OM
01* C
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 D W
- 1:41 ευρισκει ουτος πρωτος τον(1) αδελφον τον(2) ιδιον σιμωνα και λεγει αυτω ευρηκαμεν τον(3) μεσσιαν ο(1) εστι μεθερμηνευομενον ο(2) χριστος
- 1:41-40 μεθερμηνευομενον
2 μεθερμηνευομενος
L 1241
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C D W
- 1:41-43 ο(2) χριστος
2 χριστος
Origen P66 P75 01 A B E L Δ Θ Π Ω f1 f13 33
579 700 892 1241 UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C D W
- 1:43 τη επαυριον ηθελησεν ο ιησους εξελθειν εις την γαλιλαιαν και(1) ευρισκει φιλιππον και(2) λεγει αυτω ακολουθει μοι
- 1:43-7 ο ιησους
2 OM
Origen P66 P75 01(κ) A B E L Δ Θ* Π f1 33 565 579 700
892 a b e UBS3

- * /Missing/
P45 C D W
- 1:45 ευρισκει φιλιππος τον(1) ναθαναηλ και(1) λεγει αυτω ον
εγραψεμωσης εν τω νομω και(2) οι προφηται ευρηκαμεν ιησουν τον(2)
υιον του ιωσηφ τον(3) απο ναζαρετ
- 1:45-33 τον(2) υιον
2 υιον
P66 P75 01 B 33 579 UBS3
9 [τον υιον / ./ υιον]
Origen
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C D W
- 1:45-39 του
2 OM
A Δ Π* 33
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C D W
- 1:51 και(1) λεγει αυτω αμην(1) αμην(2) λεγω υμιν απ αρτι οψεσθε
τον(1) ουρανον ανεωγοτα και(2) τους αγγελους του(1) θεου
αναβαινοντας και(3) καταβαινοντας επι τον(2) υιον του(2)
ανθρωπου
- 1:51-16 απ αρτι
2 OM
Origen P66 P75 01 B L 579 a b UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 C D W
- 2:1 και(1) τη(1) ημερα τη(2) τριτη γαμος εγενετο εν κανα της
γαλιλαιας και(2) ην η μητηρ του ιησου εκει
- 2:1-7 τη(1) ημερα τη(2) τριτη
2 τη τριτη ημερα
B Θ f13 b e
* /Missing/
P45 C D W
- 2:6 ησαν δε εκει υδριαι λιθιναι εξ κειμεναι κατα τον καθαρισμον των
ιουδαιων χωρουσαι ανα μετρητας δυο η τρεις
- 2:6-16 κειμεναι
2 OM
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 Π Ψ f1 33 565 579 UBS3
9 [την αρχην /:./ αρχην]
e
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

- 2:14 και(1) ευρεν εν τω ιερω τους(1) παλουντας βοας και(2) προβατα
και(3) περιστερας και(4) τους(2) κερματιστας καθημενους
- 2:14-10 βοας και(2) προβατα
2 και τα προβατα και βοας
01* a
* /Missing/
P45 C D W
- 2:15 και(1) ποιησας φραγελλιον εκ(1) σχοινων 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
- 2:15-4 και(1) ποιησας φραγελλιον εκ(1) σχοινων
2 εποιησεν φραγελλιον εκ σχοινων και
01* a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C D W
- 2:15-7 ποιησας
2 + ως
P66 P75 L f1 33 565 892 1241 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C D W
- 2:15-25 τα τε
2 τα
01* a e
3 και τα
P66*
4 τα και
01c
* /Missing/
P45 C D W
- 2:15-40 το κερμα
2 τα κερματα
Origen P66c P75 B L 33 579 b
* /Missing/
P45 C D W e
- 2:15-43 τραπεζας
2 + autwn
a b
* /Missing/
P45 C D W
- 2:15-46 ανεστρεψε
3 ανετρεψεν
Origen P66 B Θ Πc UBS3
5 κατεστρεψεν
01 f13
9 /NA/
a b e

- * /Missing/
P45 C D W
- 2:16 και τοις τας περιστερας παλουσιν ειπεν αρατε ταυτα εντευθεν μη ποιειτε τον οικον(1) του πατρος μου οικον(2) εμποριου
- 2:16-19 εντευθεν
2 + και
P66 A Θ f1 f13 33 565 700 1241 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C D W
- 2:17 εμνησθησαν δε οι μαθηται αυτου οτι γεγραμμενον εστιν ο ζηλος του οικου σου κατεφαγε με
- 2:17-13 γεγραμμενον εστιν
2 ~ 2,1 (εστιν γεγραμμενον)
B 1241
* /Missing/
P45 C D W
- 2:17-19 εστιν
2 + οτι
P66 P75
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C D W
- 2:17-31 κατεφαγε
3 καταφαγεται
Heracleon Origen P66 P75 01 A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ
Ω f1 f13 33 579 700 892 1241 UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C D W
- 2:18 απεκριθησαν ουν οι ιουδαιοι και ειπον αυτω τι σημειον δεικνυεις ημιν οτι ταυτα ποιεις
- 2:18-4 ουν
2 OM
f13 33 579 1241 b e
* /Missing/
P45 C D W
- 2:18-16 ημιν
2 OM
Origen P75 L
* /Missing/
P45 C D W
- 2:19 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 A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ 700 892 1241 UBS3
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 C D W
- 2:20 ειπον ουν οι ιουδαιοι τεσσαρακοντα και(1) εξ ετεσιν ωκοδομηθη ο
 ναος ουτος και(2) συ εν τρισιν ημεραις εγερεις αυτον
- 2:20-4 ειπον ουν οι ιουδαιοι
 2 και οι ιουδαιοι ειπαν
 e
 4 ειπαν ουν αυτω οι ιουδαιοι
 Θ 33
 * /Missing/
 P45 C D W
- 2:20-25 εν
 2 OM
 01 a
 * /Missing/
 P45 C D W
- 2:20-31 εγερεις
 2 εγειρεις
 33 b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 C D W
- 2:22 οτε ουν ηγερθη εκ νεκρων εμνησθησαν οι μαθηται αυτου οτι τουτο
 ελεγεν αυτοις και(1) επιστευσαν τη γραφη και(2) τω λογω ω ειπεν
 ο ιησους
- 2:22-22 αυτοις
 2 OM
 Origen P66 P75 01 A B E L Δ Θ Ψ fl f13 33 579 700
 892 1241 a b e UBS3
 * /Missing/
 P45 C D W
- 2:22-28 ω
 2 ο
 1241
 3 ον
 Origen P66 P75 01 B L UBS3
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 C D W

- 2:23 ως δε 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 εποιει
- 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
f1 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C D W
- 2:24 αυτος δε ο ιησους ουκ επιστευεν εαυτον αυτοις δια το αυτον
γνωσκειν 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

- 2:24-28 παντας
 2 παντα
 E f13
 * /Missing/
 P45 C D W
- 2:25 και οτι ου χρειαν ειχεν ινα τις μαρτυρηση περι του ανθρωπου
 αυτος γαρ εγινωσκε 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 εληλυθας 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
 f1 565
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 C D W
- 3:2-37 α συ ποιεις
 2 OM
 f1 565
 * /Missing/
 P45 C D W

- 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 μωσης υψωσε τον(1) οφιν εν τη ερημω ουτως υψωθηναι
 δει τον(2) υιον του ανθρωπου
- 3:14-19 υψωθηναι δει τον(2) υιον του ανθρωπου
 2 δει τον υιον του ανθρωπου υψωθηναι
 33
 3 δει υψωθηναι τον υιον του ανθρωπου
 A a
 * /Missing/
 P45 C D W
- 3:20 πας γαρ ο φαυλα πρασων μισει το(1) φως(1) και ουκ ερχεται προς
 το(2) φως(2) ινα μη ελεγχθη τα εργα αυτου
- 3:20-13 και ουκ ερχεται προς το(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 ο
 2 OM
 A Π
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 C D W
- 3:23 ην(1) δε και(1) ιωαννης βαπτιζων εν αιωνων 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

- 3:23-7 και(1)
 2 + ο
 P66 B Θ UBS3
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 C D W
- 3:23-28 παρεγινοντο
 4 + προς αυτον
 Θ e
 * /Missing/
 P45 C D W
- 3:24 ουπω γαρ ην βεβλημενος εις την φυλακην ο ιωαννης
- 3:24-7 την
 2 OM
 E* Θ fl
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 C D W
- 3:24-10 ο
 2 OM
 01* B
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 C D W
- 3:25 εγενετο συν ζητησις εκ των μαθητων ιωαννου μετα ιουδαιων περι
 καθαρισμου
- 3:25-25 ιουδαιων
 1 ιουδαιον
 Ω
 2 ιουδαιου
 P75 01c A B E L Δ Π Ψ 33 579 700 892 1241 UBS3
 * /Missing/
 P45 C D W
- 3:26 και(1) ηλθον προς(1) τον ιωαννην και(2) ειπον αυτω ραββι ος ην
 μετα σου περαν του ιορδανου ω συ μεμαρτυρηκας ιδε ουτος
 βαπτιζει και(3) παντες ερχονται προς(2) αυτον
- 3:26-7 τον
 2 OM
 fl 33
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 C W

- 3:26-31 ιδε
2 ιδου
 D fl 565
9 /NA/
 a b e
* /Missing/
 P45 C W
- 3:31 ο(1) ανωθεν ερχομενος(1) επανω(1) παντων(1) εστιν ο(2) ων 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 fl3 b
3 eΠ
 01* a e
* /Missing/
 P45 C W 1241
- 3:31-34 ο(3)
2 + δε
 b e
3 + ων
 P66*
* /Missing/
 P45 C W 579
- 3:31-43 επανω(2) παντων(2) εστι(2)
2 OM
 P75 01* D fl 565 a b e
* /Missing/
 P45 C W 579
- 3:32 και(1) ο εωρακε και(2) ηκουσε τουτο μαρτυρει και(3) την
 μαρτυριαν αυτου ουδεις λαμβανει
- 3:32-4 και(1) ο
2 ο
 Origen P66 P75 01c B D E L Ψ fl 33 565 579 a b e UBS3
3 ον
 01*
* /Missing/
 P45 C W
- 3:32-19 τουτο
2 OM
 01 D fl 565 a b e
* /Missing/
 P45 C W
- 4:1 ως ουν εγνω ο κυριος οτι(1) ηκουσαν οι φαρισαιοι οτι(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 αφηκε την(1) ιουδαιαν και απηλθε 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 συχαρ 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 ιωσηφ] τω υιω αυτου
 b
 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 ουν ιησους κεκοπιακως εκ της
 οδοιποριας εκαθεζετο ουτως επι τη πηγη(2) ωρα ην(2) ωσει 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 ουν αυτω η(1) γυνη η(2) σαμαρειτις πως συ ιουδαιος ων παρ
εμουπιειν αιτεις ουσης γυναικος σαμαρειτιδος ου γαρ συγχρωνται
ιουδαιοι σαμαρειταις
- 4:9-58 ου γαρ συγχρωνται ιουδαιοι σαμαρειταις
2 OM
01* D a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:10 απεκριθη ιησους και(1) ειπεν αυτη ει ηδεις την δωρεαν του θεου
και(2) τις εστιν ο λεγων σοι(1)δος μοι πιειν συ αν(1) ητησας
αυτον και(3) εδωκεν αν(2) σοι(2) υδωρ ζων
- 4:10-31 μοι
2 + υδωρ
700 1241
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:10-55 αν(2)
2 OM
L Ω
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:11 λεγει αυτω η γυνη κυριε ουτε αντλημα εχεις(1) και το(1) φρεαρ
εστι βαθου ποθεν ουν εχεις(2) το(2) υδωρ το(3) ζων
- 4:11-4 λεγει
2 και λεγει
Origen e
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:11-7 η γυνη
2 OM
P75 B
3 εκεινη
01*
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:11-40 ουν
2 OM
01 D a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:12 μη συ μειζων ει του πατρος ημων ιακωβ ος εδωκεν ημιν το φρεαρ
και(1) αυτος εξ αυτου(1) επιε και(2) οι υιοι αυτου(2) και(3) τα
θρεμματα αυτου(3)

- 4:12-22 ος
 3 οστις
 01 Θ
 * /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:12-28 εδωκεν
 2 δεδωκεν
 Origen P66 P75 C f13
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:12-40 φρεαρ
 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 υδατος(1) ου(1) εγω δωσω(1) αυτω(1) ου(2) μη
 διψηση εις(1) τον αιωνα αλλα το υδωρ ο δωσω(2) αυτω(2)
 γενησεται 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 λεγει προς αυτον η γυνη κυριε δος μοι τουτο το υδωρ ινα μη διψω
 μηδε ερχωμαι ενθαδε αντλειν
- 4:15-22 διψω
 2 διψησω
 P66* D
 9 /NA/

- a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:15-28 ερχομαι
 2 ερχομαι
 01c E L Θ Ψ f13 33 700 892 1241
 9 [ερχομαι /:./ ερχομαι]
 a b e
 10 διερχομαι
 P75 B
 11 διερχομαι
 Heracleon Origen P66 01* UBS3
 * /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:16 λεγει αυτη ο ιησους υπαγε φωνησον τον ανδρα σου και ελθε ενθαδε
- 4:16-4 ο ιησους
 2 ιησους
 01* A Θ Π* f1 f13
 9 [ο ιησους /:./ ιησους]
 b e
 10 OM
 Origen P66 P75 B C* a UBS3
 * /Missing/
 P45 W 33
- 4:16-10 τον ανδρα σου
 2 ~ 3,1,2 (σου τον ανδρα)
 B
 9 [σου τον ανδρα /:./ τον ανδρα σου]
 Heracleon Origen
 * /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:17 απεκριθη η γυνη και ειπεν ουκ(1) εχω(1) ανδρα(1) λεγει αυτη ο
 ιησους καλωσ ειπας οτι ανδρα(2) ουκ(2) εχω(2)
- 4:17-10 ειπεν
 2 + αυτω
 P66 P75 B C E 33 892 1241 a b UBS3
 * /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:17-13 ουκ(1) εχω(1) ανδρα(1)
 2 ~ 3,1,2 (ανδρα ουκ εχω)
 01 C* D L 1241
 * /Missing/
 P45 W 33
- 4:17-46 εχω(2)
 2 εχεις
 Heracleon 01 D b e
 * /Missing/

- P45 W a
- 4:18 πεντε γαρ ανδρας εσχες και νυν ον εχεις ουκ εστι σου ανηρ τουτο
αληθες ειρηκας
- 4:18-31 αληθες
2 αληθως
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(1) 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 Δ 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 τουτω ουτε(2) εν(2) ιεροσολυμοις
προσκυνησετε τω(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/

P45 W 33

- 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 ωρα και(1) νυν εστιν οτε 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 OM
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 αναγγειλει ημιν παντα

- 4:25-4 οίδα
 2 οίδαμεν
 P66c 01c L f13 33 1241
 9 [οίδα /:./ οίδαμεν]
 Origen
 * /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:25-25 οταν
 2 + ουν
 b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:25-34 αναγγελοι
 4 αναγγελλει
 01* D
 * /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:25-43 παντα
 2 απαντα
 Origen P66 P75 01 B C* f1 565 UBS3
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:27 και(1) επι τουτω ηλθον οι μαθηται αυτου και(2) εθαυμασαν οτι
 μετα γυναικος ελαλει ουδεις μεντοι ειπε τι(1) ζητεις η τι(2)
 λαλεις μετ αυτης
- 4:27-4 επι τουτω
 2 επι τουτο
 E f13
 3 εν τουτω
 01* D
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:27-13 ηλθον
 4 επηλθον
 01* e
 * /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:27-19 εθαυμασαν
 2 εθαυμαζον
 Origen P66 P75 01 A B C D L Θ Π Ψ f1 33 579 892 UBS3
 * /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:27-28 ελαλει

- 2 λαλει
Θ 579 a b
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:27-43 ειπε
2 + αυτω
01 D a b
3 + τη γυναικι
e
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:28 αφηκεν ουν την(1) υδριαν αυτης η γυνη και(1) απηλθεν εις την(2)
πολιν και(2) λεγει τοις ανθρωποις
- 4:28-4 αφηκεν ουν την(1) υδριαν αυτης η γυνη
2 αφηκεν ουν η γυνη την υδριαν εαυτης
D b
3 η γυνη ουν αφεισα της υδριας
e
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:28-37 λεγει
2 ειπεν
1241 a b
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:29 δευτε ιδετε ανθρωπον ος ειπε μοι παντα οσα εποιησα μητι ουτος
εστιν ο χριστος
- 4:29-16 οσα
2 α
01 B C* a e
9 [α / ./ / οσα]
Origen
10 + α
579
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:30 εξηλθον ουν εκ της πολεως και ηρχοντο προς αυτον
- 4:30-7 εξηλθον
2 εξηρχοντο
L 1241
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:31 εν δε τω μεταξυ ηρωτων αυτων οι μαθηται λεγοντες ραββι φαγε

- 4:31-22 αυτον
 3 OM
 Δ a
 * /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:31-25 οι μαθηται
 2 OM
 1241
 3 + αυτου
 Θ Πc 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
 01* b
 * /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:33-10 ουν
 2 δε
 D a b
 3 OM
 01* e
 * /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 αυτοις ο ιησους εμον βρωμα εστιν ινα ποιω το(1) θελημα του πεμψαντος με και τελειωσω αυτου το(2) εργον
- 4:34-25 ποιω
2 ποιησω
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 ουχ υμεις λεγετε οτι(1) ετι τετραμηνον εστι και(1) ο θερισμος ερχεται ιδου λεγω υμιν επαρατε τους οφθαλμους υμων και(2) θεασασθε τας χωρας οτι(2) λευκαι εισι προς θερισμον ηδη
- 4:35-25 ετι
2 OM
P75 D L Π* f13 1241
9 [OM /V eti]
Origen
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:35-37 ιδου λεγω υμιν
2 OM
f1 565 1241
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:36 και(1) ο(1) θεριζων(1) μισθον λαμβανει και(2) συναγει καρπον εις ζων αιωνιον ινα και(3) ο(2) σπειρων ομου χαιρη και(4) ο(3) θεριζων(2)
- 4:36-7 και(1)
2 OM
Origen P66 P75 01 B C* D L Ψ 33 a b e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:36-34 και(3)
2 OM
Heracleon Origen P66 P75 B C L Ψ f1 33 565 892 1241 e
UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:36-40 ομου χαιρη και(4) ο(3) θεριζων(2)
2 ομου χαιρη και θεριζων
P66 Θ
3 και ο θεριζων ομου χαιρη
D
4 ομου χαιρη μετα του θεριζοντος
e
* /Missing/

P45 W

- 4:37 εν γαρ τουτω ο(1) λογος εστιν(1) ο(2) αληθινος οτι αλλος(1)
εστιν(2) ο(3) σπειρων και αλλος(2) ο(4) θεριζων
- 4:37-10 ο(1) λογος εστιν(1)
2 ~ 3,1,2 (εστιν ο λογος)
Heracleon D a b
* /Missing/
P45 P75 W
- 4:37-22 ο(2) αληθινος
2 αληθινος
Heracleon Origen B C* L Δ Π* Ψ 33 565 700 1241 UBS3
3 αληθης
f1 579
4 αληθειας
a
* /Missing/
P45 P75 W
- 4:38 εγω απεστειλα υμας θεριζειν ο ουχ υμεις(1) κεκοπιακατε αλλοι
κεκοπιακασι και υμεις(2) εις τον κοπον αυτων εισεληλυθατε
- 4:38-7 απεστειλα
2 απεσταλκα
01 D
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:38-13 ο
4 OM
D* L e
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:39 εκ δε της(1) πολεως 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)
f1
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/

P45 W

- 4:40 ως ουν ηλθον προς αυτον(1) οι σαμαρειται ηρωτων αυτον(2) μειναι
παρ αυτοις και εμεινεν εκει δυο ημερας
- 4:40-4 ως ουν ηλθον προς αυτον(1)
2 ως ουν συνηλθον προς αυτον
Bc
3 ως ηλθον ουν προς αυτον
Bc2 a
4 ηλθον ουν προς αυτον
e
5 συνηλθον ουν προς αυτον
B*
7 ως ουν ηκουσαν
1241
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:41 και πολλω πλειους επιστευσαν δια τον λογον αυτου
- 4:41-10 πλειους
2 πλειον
P75 e
* /Missing/
P45 W a
- 4:41-13 επιστευσαν
2 + εις αυτον
Θ f13 892 1241 b
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:42 τη τε γυναικι ελεγον οτι(1) ουκετι δια την σην λαλιαν
πιστευομεν αυτοι γαρ ακηκοαμεν και οιδαμεν οτι(2) ουτος εστιν
αληθως ο(1) σωτηρ του κοσμου ο(2) χριστος
- 4:42-4 τη τε γυναικι ελεγον
2 τη δε γυναικι ελεγον
Origen P66 D E
9 τη [τε /.: / δε] γυναικι ελεγον
a
10 ελεγον δε τη γυναικι
e
11 και ελεγον τη γυναικι
01* b
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:42-19 οτι(1)
3 OM
Origen B b
* /Missing/
P45 W

- 4:42-28 σην λαλιαν
2 λαλιαν σου
 Origen P75 B
9 /NA/
 a b e
* /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:42-31 λαλιαν
2 μαρτυριαν
 Heracleon 01* D b
* /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:42-40 αυτοι
2 αυτου
 D a
* /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:42-46 ακηκοαμεν
2 + παρ αυτου
 01 Pc f1 f13
* /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:42-55 ουτος εστιν αληθως ο(1) σωτηρ
2 αληθως ουτος εστιν ο σωτηρ
 01
9 [ουτος εστιν αληθως /./ αληθως ουτος εστιν] ο σωτηρ
 Origen
10 ουτος αληθως ο σωτηρ εστιν
 e
11 ουτος εστιν ο σωτηρ
 Heracleon Π 1241
* /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:42-70 ο(2) χριστος
2 OM
 Origen P66 P75 01 B C* a b UBS3
* /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:43 μετα δε τας δυο ημερας εξηλθεν εκειθεν και απηλθεν εις την
 γαλιλαιαν
- 4:43-28 και απηλθεν
2 OM
 Origen P66 P75 01 B C D f13 892 1241 b e UBS3
3 και ηλθεν
 L
* /Missing/
 P45 W a

- 4:44 αυτος γαρ ο ιησους εμαρτυρησεν οτι προφητης εν τη ιδια πατριδι
τιμην ουκ εχει
- 4:44-10 ο ιησους
2 ιησους
 Origen P66 P75 01 A B C D E Δ Θ Π* f1 33 579 892
9 [ο ιησους /./ ιησους]
 a b e
10 OM
 Ψ
* /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:45 οτε ουν ηλθεν εις(1) την(1) γαλιλαιαν εδεξαντο αυτον οι
γαλιλαιοι παντα εωρακοτες α εποιησεν εν(1) ιεροσολυμοις εν(2)
τη εορτη και αυτοι γαρ ηλθον εις(2) την(2) εορτην
- 4:45-4 οτε
2 ως
 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 Πc Ψ f1 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/

P45 W

- 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 βασιλικοσ
D a
9 /NA/
b e
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:47 ουτος ακουσας οτι 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 αποθνησκειν
- 4:47-19 εκ
2 απο
f13 33 1241
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:47-43 αυτον(2)
2 OM
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

- 4:49-10 πριν
 2 + η
 Θ Πc 579
 9 /NA/
 b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 W a
- 4:49-19 το παιδιον
 2 τον παιδα
 01
 9 [το παιδιον /./ τον παιδα]
 b e
 10 τον υιον
 A f13
 * /Missing/
 P45 W a
- 4:49-25 μου
 2 OM
 D f1 565 b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 W a
- 4:51 ηδη δε αυτου(1) καταβαινοντος οι δουλοι αυτου(2) απηνητησαν αυτω
 και απηγγειλαν λεγοντες οτι ο παις σου ζη
- 4:51-22 οι δουλοι αυτου(2) απηνητησαν
 2 υπηνητησαν οι δουλοι
 D e
 * /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:51-31 απηνητησαν
 2 υπηνητησαν
 P66 P75 01 B C D L Θ Ψ f1 f13 33 565 579 892 1241
 UBS3
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:51-49 λεγοντες
 2 OM
 01 D b
 * /Missing/
 P45 W
- 4:51-55 παις σου
 2 παις αυτου
 P66* P75 01 A B C UBS3
 3 υιος σου
 P66c D L Π 33 579 892 1241 a b e
 5 παις σου ο υιος αυτου

- f13
* /Missing/
P45 W
- 4:54 τουτο παλιν δευτερον σημειον εποιησεν ο ιησους ελθων εκ της
 ιουδαιας εις την γαλιλαιαν
- 4:54-4 τουτο
2 + δε
 Origen P66 P75 B C* f13 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 892c
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 εχων εν τη ασθενεια
- 5:5-10 τριακονταοκτω
2 τριακοντα και οκτω
 01 A C D E L Δ Ψ f1 f13 33 565 579 700 1241 b e UBS3
9 lh//
 P66 P75
* /Missing/
 P45 W

- 5:5-13 ετη
 2 OM
 P75* 579
 * /Missing/
 P45 W
- 5:19 απεκρινατο ουν 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
- 5:19-25 υιος(1)
 2 + του ανθρωπου
 D f13
 * /Missing/
 P45 C
- 5:19-28 ποιειν αφ εαυτου
 2 ~ 2,3,1 (αφ εαυτου ποιειν)
 W f13 579 a b
 * /Missing/
 P45 C
- 5:19-34 αφ εαυτου ουδεν
 2 αφ εαυτου ουδε εν
 P66 f1 565
 9 αφ εαυτου [ουδεν /./ ουδε εν]
 a b
 10 τι αφ εαυτου
 D e
 * /Missing/
 P45 C
- 5:19-49 εαν
 2 an
 01 B
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 C
- 5:19-52 τι βλεπη
 3 βλεπη
 W a e
 * /Missing/
 P45 C
- 5:19-64 α
 2 οσα
 a b
 3 ο
 W
 4 OM
 579

- * /Missing/
P45 C
- 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 εκεινος ποιη
3 ποιη ο πατηρ
 Origen e
* /Missing/
 P45 C
- 5:19-82 ομοιως ποιει
2 ~ 2,1 (ποιει ομοιως)
 01 D a b
3 ποιει
 e
* /Missing/
 P45 C
- 5:22 ουδε γαρ ο πατηρ κρινει ουδενα αλλα την κρισιν πασαν δεδωκε τω
 υιω
- 5:22-4 ουδε
2 ου
 P66* 1241
* /Missing/
 P45 C
- 5:26 ωσπερ γαρ ο πατηρ εχει ζωνη(1) εν(1) εαυτω(1) ουτως εδωκε και
 τω υιω ζωνη(2) εχειν εν(2) εαυτω(2)
- 5:26-4 ωσπερ
2 ως
 01* D W
9 [ωσπερ /./ ως]
 a b e
* /Missing/
 P45 C
- 5:26-10 εχει ζωνη(1)
2 ζωνη εχει
 01 579
* /Missing/
 P45 C
- 5:26-13 ουτως εδωκε και τω υιω ζωνη(2) εχειν εν(2) εαυτω(2)
2 OM

- 01* f1
 * /Missing/
 P45 C
- 5:26-16 εδωκε και τω υιω ζωνη(2) εχειν
 2 εδωκεν και τω υιω εχειν ζωνη
 a e
 3 ~ 2,3,4,1,5,6 (και τω υιω εδωκεν ζωνη εχειν)
 P66 P75 01c B L 579 UBS3
 4 και τω υιω εδωκεν εχειν ζωνη
 b
 5 ~ 2,3,4,5,1,6 (kai tw uiw zwhn edwken echein)
 Origen W
 * /Missing/
 P45 01* C f1
- 5:27 και(1) εξουσιαν εδωκεν αυτω και(2) κρισιν ποιειν οτι υιος
 ανθρωπου εστι
- 5:27-10 και(2)
 2 OM
 Origen P66 P75 01 A B L W Ψ 33 579 b e UBS3
 * /Missing/
 P45 C a
- 5:30 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
- 5:30-10 εγω ποιειν απ εμαυτου
 2 εγω απ εμαυτου ποιειν
 D 579 b e
 3 ποιειν εγω απ εμαυτου
 01 33
 * /Missing/
 P45 C a
- 5:30-52 πατρος
 2 OM
 Origen P66 P75 01 A B D L W Δ Π Ψ f1 33 565 a e UBS3
 * /Missing/
 P45 C
- 5:39 ερευνατε τας γραφας οτι υμεις δοκειτε εν αυταις ζωνη αιωνιον
 εχειν και εκειναι εισιν αι μαρτυρουσαι περι εμου
- 5:39-4 ερευνατε
 2 εραυνατε
 P66 01 B* UBS3
 9 [ερευνατε /.:./ εραυνατε]
 a b
 10 ερευναμεν
 e

- * /Missing/
P45 P75 C
- 5:39-7 οτι
2 εν αις
 b e
* /Missing/
 P45 C
- 5:39-22 εκειναι
2 αυται
 W b e
* /Missing/
 P45 C
- 5:41 δοξαν παρα ανθρωπων ου λαμβανω
- 5:41-4 ανθρωπων
2 ανθρωπου
 A Π 565
* /Missing/
 P45 C
- 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
2 OM
 L 892
* /Missing/
 P45 C
- 5:44-10 πιστευσαι
2 πιστευειν
 A L fl 33 579 892
9 /NA/
 a b e
* /Missing/
 P45 C
- 5:44-13 παρα(1) αλληλων
2 παρα ανθρωπων
 Δ 1241
9 [παρ αλληλων /./ παρα ανθρωπων]
 Origen
* /Missing/
 P45 C
- 5:44-40 θεου
2 OM
 P66 P75 B W a
9 [θεου /./ OM]
 Origen
9 /NA/

- b
* /Missing/
P45 C
- 5:44-43 ζητειτε
3 ζητουντες
01 e
* /Missing/
P45 C
- 5:47 ει δε τοις(1) εκεινου γραμμασιν ου πιστευετε πως τοις(2) εμοις
ρημασι πιστευσετε
- 5:47-16 πιστευσετε
2 πιστευσητε
D W Δ Θ f1 f13 565 579 1241
9 [πιστευσετε /./ πιστευσητε]
Origen
9 /NA/
a b e
10 πιστευετε
P66 P75* B Π*
* /Missing/
P45 C
- 6:9 εστι παιδαριον εν ωδε ο εχει πεντε αρτους κριθινους και δυο
οψαρια αλλα ταυτα τι εστιν εις τοσουτους
- 6:9-13 εν
2 OM
Origen P66 P75 01 B D L W Π* Ψ f1 f13 565 892 1241 a b e
UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 C 33
- 6:9-16 ο
2 ος
Origen P66 A B D* W Ψ 579 700 892 1241 UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 33
- 6:11 ελαβε δε(1) τους αρτους ο ιησους και(1) ευχαριστησας διεδωκε
τοις(1) μαθηταις οι δε(2) μαθηται τοις(2) ανακειμενοις ομοιως
και(2) εκ των οψαριων οσον ηθελον
- 6:11-10 ευχαριστησας
2 ευχαριστησεν και
01 D a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C
- 6:11-13 διεδωκε
4 εδωκε

- Origen P66 01 D 579 1241 b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 C
- 6:11-16 τοις(1) μαθηταις οι δε(2) μαθηται
 2 OM
 Origen P66 P75 01* A B L W Π f1 33 565 579 1241 a UBS3
 * /Missing/
 P45 C
- 6:15 ιησους ουν γνους οτι μελλουσιν ερχεσθαι και αρπαζειν αυτον(1)
 ινα ποιησωσιν αυτον(2) βασιλεια ανεχωρησε παλιν εις το ορος
 αυτος μονος
- 6:15-16 ερχεσθαι
 2 + οι οχλοι
 f13 b
 * /Missing/
 P45 P66 C
- 6:15-31 αυτον(2)
 2 OM
 Origen P75 01 A B L W f1 33 565 579 892 1241 UBS3
 3 εαυτοις αυτον
 α
 * /Missing/
 P45 P66 C
- 6:15-37 ανεχωρησε
 1 + v
 Origen
 2 φευγει
 01* a
 * /Missing/
 P45 P66 C
- 6:15-40 παλιν
 2 OM
 Origen E W Δ Ψ Ω f13
 * /Missing/
 P45 P66 C a
- 6:26 απεκριθη αυτοις ο ιησους και(1) ειπεν αμην(1) αμην(2) λεγω υμιν
 ζητειτε με ουχ οτι(1) ειδετε σημεια αλλ οτι(2) εφαγετε εκ των
 αρτων και(2) εχορτασθητε
- 6:26-40 σημεια
 2 + και τερατα
 D a b
 * /Missing/
 P45 P66 C

- 6:27 εργαζεσθε μη την(1) βρωσιν(1) την(2) απολλυμενην αλλα την(3)
βρωσιν(2) την(4) μενουσαν εις ζωνη αιωνιον ην ο(1) υιος του
ανθρωπου υμιν δωσει τουτον γαρ ο(2) πατηρ εσφραγισεν ο(3) θεος
- 6:27-7 μη την(1) βρωσιν(1)
2 βρωσιν μη
01 b
* /Missing/
P45 P66 C
- 6:27-13 την(3) βρωσιν(2)
2 OM
01 E
* /Missing/
P45 P66 C
- 6:27-22 υμιν δωσει
2 ~ 2,1 (dwsei umin)
01 D f13 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 C
- 6:27-28 δωσει
2 διδωσιν
01 D e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 C
- 6:28 ειπον ουν προς αυτον τι ποιουμεν ινα εργαζωμεθα τα εργα του
θεου
- 6:28-13 ποιουμεν
2 ποιουμεν
Origen P75 01 A B E L Δ Π Ω f1 33 700 892 1241
UBS3
3 ποιησωμεν
D W Θ f13
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 C
- 6:29 απεκριθη ο ιησους και ειπεν αυτοις τουτο εστι το εργον του θεου
ινα πιστευσητε εις ον απεστειλεν εκεινος
- 6:29-7 ο
2 OM
P75 01 E W Δ Ψ Ω 565 700 892 1241
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 C
- 6:29-22 πιστευσητε
2 πιστευητε

Origen P75 01 A B L Θ Ψ fl 33 579 UBS3

- 9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 C
- 6:32 ειπεν ουν αυτοις ο(1) ιησους αμην(1) αμην(2) λεγω υμιν(1) ου
μωσης δεδωκεν υμιν(2) τον(1) αρτον(1) εκ(1) του(1) ουρανου(1)
αλλ ο(2) πατηρ μου διδωσιν υμιν(3) τον(2) αρτον(2) εκ(2) του(2)
ουρανου(2) τον(3) αληθινον
- 6:32-22 δεδωκεν
2 εδωκεν
B D L W
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 C
- 6:32-52 αληθινον
2 + αρτον
a b
* /Missing/
P45 P66 C
- 6:33 ο(1) γαρ αρτος του(1) θεου εστιν ο(2) καταβαινων εκ του(2)
ουρανου και ζωην διδους τω κοσμω
- 6:33-4 αρτος
2 + ο
01 D Θ
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 C
- 6:33-7 θεου
2 ουρανου
579 e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 C
- 6:33-16 ζωνν διδους
2 ~ 2,1 (didouV zwhn)
A Π 33 579
3 διδους
fl
* /Missing/
P45 P66 C
- 6:35 ειπε δε αυτοις ο(1) ιησους εγω ειμι ο(2) αρτος της ζωης ο(3)
ερχομενος προς με ου(1) μη(1) πειναση και ο(4) πιστευων εις εμε
ου(2) μη(2) διψηση πωποτε
- 6:35-13 με

- 2 εμε
P75 01 B UBS3
- 9 /NA/
a b e
- * /Missing/
P45 P66 C
- 6:44 ουδεις δυναται ελθειν προς με(1) εαν μη ο(1) πατηρ ο(2) πεμψας
με(2) ελκυση αυτον(1) και εγω αναστησω αυτον(2) τη εσχατη ημερα
- 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 33
- 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 του θεου
- 1 θεου
B
- 4 τω 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 καταβαινων 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 artou toutou)
 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/

P45 A

- 6:51-31 δε
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 ζωνη
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 f1 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 f13 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

- 6:55-10 αληθως(1)
 2 αληθης
 Origen P66c P75 01c B C L W Π Ψ f1 f13 565 579 892 1241
 UBS3
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 A 33
- 6:55-31 αληθως(2)
 2 αληθης
 Origen P66c P75 B C L W Π Ψ f1 565 579 892 1241 UBS3
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 01* A D 33
- 6:56 ο τρωγων μου(1) την σαρκα και πινων μου(2) το αιμα εν(1) εμοι
 μενει καγω εν(2) αυτω
- 6:56-19 αυτω
 2 + 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
 D a
 * /Missing/
 P45 A
- 6:57 καθως απεστειλε με(1) ο(1) ζων πατηρ καγω ζω δια τον πατερα και
 ο(2) τρωγων με(2) κακεινος ζησεται δι εμε
- 6:57-7 απεστειλε
 2 απεσταλκεν
 P66 D Π f13 579 1241
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 A
- 6:57-16 πατερα
 2 + μου
 P75 Cc
 * /Missing/
 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) τραγων 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 Θ 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 ον
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

- 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 εμαυτου ουκ(1)
 εληλυθα αλλ εστιν αληθινος ο(2) πεμψας με ον υμεις ουκ(2)
 οιδατε(3)

- 7:28-19 καμε
 2 και εμε
 01
 9 [καμε /./ και 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 οιδα αυτον οτι 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 εξητουν ουν αυτον(1) πιασαι και ουδεις επεβαλεν επ αυτον(2) την
 χειρα οτι ουπω εληλυθει η ωρα αυτου
- 7:30-4 εξητουν ουν
 2 οι δε εξητουν
 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
 10 ebalen
 a e
 * /Missing/
 P45 A C
- 7:30-16 την χειρα
 2 τας χειρας
 W fl 565 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 A C
- 7:37 εν δε τη(1) εσχατη ημερα τη(2) μεγαλη της εορτης ειστηκει ο
 ιησους και(1) εκραξε λεγων εαν τις διψα ερχεσθω προς με και(2)
 πινετω
- 7:37-19 εκραξε
 1 + v
 Origen
 2 εκραζεν
 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 [με /./ εμε]
 Origen
 9 /NA/
 a
 * /Missing/
 P45 P66* 01* A C D b e

- 7:39 τουτο δε ειπε περι του πνευματος ου εμελλον λαμβανειν οι
 πιστευοντες εις αυτον ουπω γαρ ην πνευμα αγιον οτι ο ιησους
 ουδεπω εδοξασθη
- 7:39-25 γαρ
 2 δε
 Θ a e
 * /Missing/
 P45 A C
- 7:39-31 πνευμα αγιον
 3 πνευμα
 Origen P66c P75 01 Θ Π Ψ UBS3
 4 πνευμα δεδομενον
 a b
 5 πνευμα αγιον δεδομενον
 B e
 7 το πνευμα το αγιον επ αυτους
 D
 * /Missing/
 P45 A C
- 7:39-40 ουδεπω
 2 ουπω
 01 B D Θ
 9 [ουδεπω /./ ουπω]
 Origen a b e
 10 ουδεποτε
 L
 * /Missing/
 P45 A C
- 7:39-43 εδοξασθη
 2 δεδοξαστο
 01*
 9 [εδοξασθη /./ δεδοξαστο]
 a b e
 10 εβαπτισθη
 700*
 * /Missing/
 P45 A C
- 7:41 αλλοι(1) ελεγον(1) ουτος εστιν ο(1) χριστος(1) αλλοι(2) δε
 ελεγον(2) μη γαρ εκ της γαλιλαιας ο(2) χριστος(2) ερχεται
- 7:41-10 αλλοι(1)
 2 + δε
 Origen Θ fl f13 565 892 b
 * /Missing/
 P45 A C 579
- 7:41-13 ελεγον(1)
 2 + οτι
 D L W 1241

- * /Missing/
P45 A C 579 b
- 7:41-25 αλλοι(2) δε
2 οι δε
Origen P66c P75 B L W Θ f1 33 565 1241 UBS3
9 [αλλοι δε / ./ οι δε]
a
10 αλλοι
P66* 01 D E Δ Π Ψ Ω f13 700 892
* /Missing/
P45 A C 579 b
- 7:41-31 γαρ
2 OM
a e
* /Missing/
P45 A C
- 7:42 ουχι η γραφη ειπεν οτι εκ του σπερματος δαβιδ(1) και απο
βηθλεεμ της κωμης οπου ην δαβιδ(2) ο χριστος ερχεται
- 7:42-7 ουχι
2 ουχ
Origen P66 P75 B L Θ Ψ UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A C
- 7:42-10 ειπεν
2 λεγει
D a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A C
- 7:42-16 του
2 OM
P66 D f1 f13 565 1241
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A C
- 7:42-43 ο χριστος ερχεται
2 ~ 3,1,2 (ερχεται ο χριστος)
Origen P75 B L W Ψ 33 UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 A C e
- 7:43 σχισμα ουν εν τω οχλω εγενετο δι αυτον
- 7:43-13 εν τω οχλω εγενετο
2 ~ 4,1,2,3 (εγενετο εν τω οχλω)
Origen P66 P75 01 B L W Θ Ψ 33 1241 a b e UBS3

- 2 εγενετο εις τον οχλον
D
* /Missing/
P45 A C
- 7:46 απεκριθησαν οι υπηρεται ουδεποτε ουτως ελαλησεν ανθρωπος(1) ως
ουτος ο ανθρωπος(2)
- 7:46-4 απεκριθησαν οι υπηρεται
2 απεκριθησαν αυτοις οι υπηρεται
W 892
3 απεκριθησαν δε οι υπηρεται
D
4 οι δε υπηρεται απεκριθησαν
01
* /Missing/
P45 A C b
- 7:46-16 υπηρεται
2 + λεγοντες
a e
* /Missing/
P45 A C b
- 7:46-25 ουτως ελαλησεν ανθρωπος(1)
2 ~ 2,1,3 (ελαλησεν ουτως ανθρωπος)
Origen P66c P75 01c B L W Ψ 33 1241 UBS3
3 ουτως ανθρωπος ελαλησεν
P66* 01* D
4 ανθρωπος ουτως ελαλησεν
a e
6 ελαλησεν
01c1
7 ελαλησεν ανθρωπος
700
* /Missing/
P45 A C b
- 7:46-40 ως ουτος ο ανθρωπος(2)
2 OM
Origen P66c P75 01c B L W
* /Missing/
P45 A C b
- 7:48 μη τις εκ(1) των(1) αρχοντων επιστευσεν εις αυτον η εκ(2)
των(2) φαρισαιων
- 7:48-4 εκ(1)
2 OM
W f13
* /Missing/
P45 P75 A C b
- 7:48-13 επιστευσεν

- 2 πιστευει
01* D Θ
* /Missing/
P45 P75 A C b
- 7:49 αλλ ο(1) οχλος ουτος ο(2) μη γνωσκων τον νομον επικαταρατοι
εισι
- 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 νομος ημων κρινει τον ανθρωπον εαν μη(2) ακουση παρ
αυτου προτερον και γνω τι ποιει
- 7:51-13 παρ αυτου προτερον
1 παρ αυτου πρωτον
Π Ψ f1 f13 892
2 ~ πρωτον,1,2 (πρωτον παρ αυτου)
Origen P66 P75 01c B D L W Θ 33 a UBS3
3 πρωτον
01*
4 παρ αυτου
e
* /Missing/
P45 A C b
- 7:51-16 προτερον
2 πρωτον
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 απεκριθησαν και(1) ειπον αυτω μη και(2) συ εκ(1) της(1)
γαλιλαιας(1) ει ερευνησον και(3) ιδε οτι προφητης εκ(2) της(2)
γαλιλαιας(2) ουκ εγηγεραται
- 7:52-19 ερευνησον
2 εραυνησον
Origen P75 01 B UBS3
9 /NA/
a e
* /Missing/
P45 A C b
- 7:52-22 και(3) ιδε
2 τας γραφας και(3) ιδε
D W a e
* /Missing/

P45 A C b

- 7:52-25 προφητης εκ(2) της(2) γαλιλαιας(2)
2 ~ 2,3,4,1 (εκ της γαλιλαιας προφητης)
Origen P66* P75 B L Ψ 892 UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 A C b
- 7:52-37 εγχεεται
4 εγειρεται
Origen P66 P75 01 B D Δ Θ Π 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 ιησους και(1) ειπεν αυτοις καν εγω μαρτυρω περι
εμαυτου αληθης εστιν η μαρτυρια μου οτι οιδα ποθεν(1) ηλθον
και(2) που(1) υπαγω(1) υμεις δε ουκ οιδατε ποθεν(2) ερχομαι
και(3) που(2) υπαγω(2)
- 8:14-13 απεκριθη
2 + ο
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

- * /Missing/
P45 A C
- 8:16 και(1) εαν κρινω δε εγω(1) η(1) κρισις η(2) εμη αληθης εστιν
οτι μονος ουκ ειμι αλλ εγω(2) και(2) ο πεμπας με πατηρ
- 8:16-22 αληθης
2 αληθινη
P75 B D L W 33 892 1241 UBS3
9 [αληθης /:./ αληθινη]
Origen
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A C
- 8:16-34 πατηρ
2 OM
01* D
* /Missing/
P45 A C
- 8:19 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)
2 OM
P66 P75 B D E L Δ Ψ f1 565 579 700 892 UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A C
- 8:19-19 ιησους
2 + και ειπεν
01 700 1241
3 + και ειπεν αυτοις
D b e
* /Missing/
P45 A C
- 8:19-43 ηδειτε(2) αν
2 ~ 2,1 (αν ηδειτε)
Origen P66 P75 B L W Ψ f1 33 892 UBS3
9 [ηδειτε αν /:./ αν ηδειτε]
a
10 ηδειτε
D b e
* /Missing/
P45 A C
- 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

- 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
 fl 565
 4 + και ουχ ευρησετε
 700
 * /Missing/
 P45 A C
- 8:21-34 αποθανεισθε
 2 + και
 fl fl3 565
 * /Missing/
 P45 A C
- 8:22 ελεγον ουν οι ιουδαιοι μητι αποκτενει εαυτον οτι λεγει οπου εγω
 υπαγω υμεις ου δυνασθε ελθειν
- 8:22-13 εαυτον
 2 αυτον
 D 1241
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 A C
- 8:23 και ειπεν αυτοις υμεις(1) εκ(1) των(1) κατω εστε(1) εγω(1)
 εκ(2) των(2) ανω ειμι(1) υμεις(2) εκ(3) του(1) κοσμου(1)
 τουτου(1) εστε(2) εγω(2) ουκ ειμι(2) εκ(4) του(2) κοσμου(2)
 τουτου(2)
- 8:23-4 και ειπεν

- 2 και ελεγεν
Origen P75 01c B D L W Θ f13 892 1241 UBS3
- 3 ελεγεν ουν
P66 01*
- 9 /NA/
a b e
- * /Missing/
P45 A C
- 8:23-25 του(1) κοσμου(1) τουτου(1)
- 2 ~ 3,1,2 (τουτου του κοσμου)
Origen P66 P75 B W 892 UBS3
- 9 /NA/
a b e
- * /Missing/
P45 A C 565
- 8:23-34 ουκ ειμι(2) εκ(4) του(2) κοσμου(2) τουτου(2)
- 2 ουκ ειμι εκ τουτου του κοσμου
W Θ f13 33
- 3 ~ 3,4,5,6,1,2 (εκ του κοσμου τουτου ουκ ειμι)
1241
- 9 /NA/
a b e
- * /Missing/
P45 A C
- 8:24 ειπον ουν υμιν οτι(1) αποθανεισθε(1) εν(1) ταις(1) αμαρτιας(1)
υμων(1) εαν γαρ μη πιστευσητε οτι(2) εγω ειμι αποθανεισθε(2)
εν(2) ταις(2) αμαρτιας(2) υμων(2)
- 8:24-4 ουν
- 2 OM
P66 01 a e
- * /Missing/
P45 A C
- 8:24-22 εαν γαρ μη πιστευσητε οτι(2) εγω ειμι αποθανεισθε(2) εν(2)
ταις(2) αμαρτιας(2) υμων(2)
- 2 OM
33 1241
- * /Missing/
P45 A C
- 8:24-31 πιστευσητε
- 2 + μοι
01 D Θ f13 e
- * /Missing/
P45 A C 33 1241
- 8:31 ελεγεν ουν ο ιησους προς τους πεπιστευκοτας αυτω ιουδαιους εαν
υμεις μεινητε εν τω(1) λογω τω(2) εμω αληθως μαθηται μου εστε
- 8:31-25 μεινητε
- 2 μεινητε

- P75 W Δ
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 A C
- 8:34 απεκριθη αυτοις ο(1) ιησους αμην(1) αμην(2) λεγω υμιν οτι πας
 ο(2) ποιων την αμαρτιαν δουλος εστι της αμαρτιας
- 8:34-22 της αμαρτιας
 2 OM
 D b
 * /Missing/
 P45 A
- 8:38 εγω ο(1) εωρακα παρα(1) τω(1) πατρι(1) μου λαλω και υμεις ουν
 ο(2) εωρακατε παρα(2) τω(2) πατρι(2) υμων ποιειτε
- 8:38-7 εγω ο(1)
 2 ο εγω
 f1
 3 α εγω
 Origen P66 P75 01 B C W 565 UBS3
 4 εγω α
 D L Θ Π 579 892
 6 εγω δε α
 f13
 * /Missing/
 P45 A 1241
- 8:38-25 μου
 2 OM
 Origen P66 P75 B C L W UBS3
 3 ημων
 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 a
 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 εωρακατε
 2 ηκουσατε
 Origen P75 01c B C L W Θ Π f1 f13 33 565 892 UBS3
 * /Missing/

P45 A 1241

- 8:38-49 τω(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
αυτοις 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 αυτοις
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

- 11 ποιειτε
P66 B* 700
- 9 [εποιειτε /./ ποιειτε]
Origen
* /Missing/
P45 A 1241
- 8:40 νυν δε ζητειτε με αποκτειναι ανθρωπον ος την αληθειαν υμιν
λελαληκα ην ηκουσα παρα του θεου τουτο αβρααμ ουκ εποιησεν
- 8:40-19 υμιν λελαληκα
2 ~ 2,1 (λελαληκα υμιν)
D Θ f13 a b
3 υμιν λελαληκεν
P66* e
* /Missing/
P45 A
- 8:40-28 ηκουσα
2 ηκουσεν
D e
* /Missing/
P45 A
- 8:40-31 θεου
2 πατρος μου
Θ f13 1241
* /Missing/
P45 A
- 8:41 υμεις ποιειτε τα εργα του πατρος υμων ειπον ουν αυτω ημεις εκ
πορνειας ου γεγεννημεθα ενα πατερα εχομεν τον θεον
- 8:41-4 υμεις
2 + δε
01c D fl 565 b e
* /Missing/
P45 A
- 8:41-16 ουν
2 OM
Origen 01 B L W fl a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A
- 8:41-31 ου γεγεννημεθα
2 ου γεγεννημεθα
P66 W f13 565
3 ουκ εγεννημεθα
01* L
4 ουκ εγεννηθημεν
B D*
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/

P45 A

- 8:41-43 πατερα εχομεν
2 ~ 2,1 (εχομεν πατερα)
Θ a
* /Missing/
P45 A
- 8:42 ειπεν ουν αυτοις ο(1) ιησους ει ο(2) θεος πατηρ υμων ην ηγαπατε
αν εμε εγω γαρ(1) εκ του θεου εξηλθον και ηκω 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 διατι την(1) λαλιαν την(2) εμην ου(1) γινωσκετε οτι ου(2)
δυνασθε 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 των λογων των εμων
700
* /Missing/
P45 A
- 8:44 υμεις εκ(1) πατρος(1) του(1) διαβολου εστε και(1) τας επιθυμιας
του(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

Heracleon Origen P66 P75 01 B C D E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ
Ω f1 f13 33 579 700 1241 UBS3

- 9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A
- 8:44-52 ουχ
2 ουκ
P66 01 B* C D L W Δ Θ Π Ψ f13 33 892 1241 UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A 579
- 8:44-58 ουκ εστιν αληθεια(2)
2 αληθεια ουκ εστιν
P66 D b
* /Missing/
P45 A 579
- 8:44-88 εστι
2 + καθως
Ψ a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A
- 8:45 εγω δε οτι την αληθειαν λεγω ου πιστευετε μοι
- 8:45-4 δε
2 OM
D a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A
- 8:45-13 λεγω
2 λαλω
D e
* /Missing/
P45 A
- 8:45-16 λεγω
2 + υμιν
C* f13 1241 b
* /Missing/
P45 A
- 8:46 τις εξ υμων ελεγχει με περι αμαρτιας ει δε αληθειαν λεγω διατι
υμεις ου πιστευετε μοι
- 8:46-7 ελεγχει
2 ελεγξει
P75 Ψ 1241 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A D

- 8:46-10 δε
 2 OM
 Origen P66 P75 01 B C L W Θ Ψ f1 f13 33 565 579 1241
 a b e UBS3
 * /Missing/
 P45 A D
- 8:46-19 υμεις
 2 OM
 W a
 * /Missing/
 P45 A D
- 8:47 ο ων εκ(1) του(1) θεου(1) τα ρηματα του(2) θεου(2) ακουει δια
 τουτο υμεις ουκ(1) ακουετε οτι εκ(2) του(3) θεου(3) ουκ(2) εστε
- 8:47-13 οτι εκ(2) του(3) θεου(3) ουκ(2) εστε
 2 OM
 D 579
 * /Missing/
 P45 A
- 8:48 απεκριθησαν ουν οι ιουδαιοι και(1) ειπον αυτω ου καλως λεγομεν
 ημεις οτι σαμαρειτης ει συ και(2) δαιμονιον εχεις
- 8:48-7 ουν
 2 OM
 Origen P66 P75 01 B C D E L W Θ f1 f13 33 565 579 892
 1241 a b e UBS3
 * /Missing/
 P45 A
- 8:48-22 λεγομεν ημεις
 2 ~ 2,1 (ημεις λεγομεν)
 P66c D L 892 1241
 9 [λεγομεν ημεις /:./ ημεις λεγομεν]
 a e
 10 ημεις ελεγομεν
 P66* vid
 * /Missing/
 P45 A
- 8:48-34 συ
 2 OM
 01* f1 f13
 * /Missing/
 P45 A
- 8:49 απεκριθη ιησους εγω δαιμονιον ουκ εχω αλλα τιμω τον πατερα μου
 και υμεις ατιμαζετε με
- 8:49-7 απεκριθη
 2 + ο
 D Θ f13 579

- 9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A
- 8:49-10 ιησους
2 + και ειπεν
01 Θ fl f13 565
* /Missing/
P45 A
- 8:50 εγω δε ου ζητω την δοξαν μου εστιν ο ζητων και κρινων
- 8:50-7 μου
2 την εμην
fl 565
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A
- 8:51 αμην(1) αμην(2) λεγω υμιν εαν τις τον(1) λογον τον(2) εμον
τηρηση θανατον ου μη θεωρηση εις τον(3) αιωνα
- 8:51-13 λογον τον(2) εμον
2 εμον λογον
Origen P75 01 B C D L W Ψ 33 579 892 1241 UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A
- 8:52 ειπον ουν αυτω οι(1) ιουδαιοι νυν εγνωκαμεν οτι δαιμονιον εχεις
αβρααμ απεθανε και(1) οι(2) προφηται και(2) συ λεγεις εαν τις
τον(1) λογον μου τηρηση ου μη γευσεται θανατου εις τον(2) αιωνα
- 8:52-7 ουν
2 OM
Origen P66 01 B C W Θ 579 a b e
* /Missing/
P45 A
- 8:52-34 τις τον(1) λογον μου
2 ~ 1,2,εμον,3 (τις τον εμον λογον)
Origen 33
3 ~ 1,4,2,3 (τις μου τον λογον)
P66 L
4 ~ 4,1,2,3 (μου τις τον λογον)
D
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45
- 8:52-43 ου μη γευσεται θανατου

- 5 θανατον ου μη θεωρηση
B 579 e
* /Missing/
P45
- 8:52-52 εις τον(2) αιωνα
2 OM
D b
* /Missing/
P45
- 8:53 μη συ(1) μειζων ει του πατρος ημων αβρααμ οστις απεθανε και οι
προφηται απεθανον τινα σεαυτον συ(2) ποιεις
- 8:53-9 πατρος ημων
2 OM
D W a b e
* /Missing/
P45
- 8:53-15 οστις
2 οτι
P66* D a
* /Missing/
P45 e
- 8:53-24 προφηται
2 + και
f13 e
* /Missing/
P45
- 8:53-39 συ(2)
2 OM
Origen P66 P75 01 A B C D L W Δ Θ Π Ψ f1 f13 33
579 892 1241 a b e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45
- 8:54 απεκριθη ιησους εαν εγω δοξαζω εμαυτον η δοξα μου(1) ουδεν
εστιν(1) εστιν(2) ο(1) πατηρ μου(2) ο(2) δοξαζων με ον υμεις
λεγετε οτι θεος υμων εστι
- 8:54-7 απεκριθη
2 + ο
01 D Δ Θ Πc f13
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45
- 8:54-13 δοξαζω
2 δοξασω
Origen P66c P75 01* B C* D E W Θ f1 f13 579 a e UBS3
* /Missing/

P45

- 8:54-34 μου(2)
2 OM
Origen W
* /Missing/
P45
- 8:58 ειπεν αυτοις ο ιησους αμην(1) αμην(2) λεγω υμιν πριν αβρααμ
γενεσθαι εγω ειμι
- 8:58-19 γενεσθαι
2 OM
D a b e
* /Missing/
P45
- 8:59 ηραν ουν λιθους ινα βαλωσιν επ αυτον ιησους δε εκρυβη και(1)
εξηλθεν εκ του ιερου διελθων δια μεσου αυτων και(2) παρηγεν
ουτως
- 8:59-34 διελθων δια μεσου αυτων και(2) παρηγεν ουτως
2 και διελθων δια μεσου αυτων επορευετο και παρηγεν ουτως
01c 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 και παραγων ειδεν ανθρωπον τυφλον εκ γενετης
- 9:1-7 παραγων
2 + ο ιησους
Θ Ω f13 1241
* /Missing/
P45
- 9:1-13 γενετης
2 γεννητης
E Π f1 f13 579 892
6 γεννητοις
1241
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45
- 9:4 εμε δει εργαζεσθαι(1) τα εργα του πεμψαντος με εως ημερα εστιν
ερχεται νυξ οτε 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 f1 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 f1 33 1241 UBS3
 3 εθαυμαζων
 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)
 απολεση 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
 κακεινα με δει αγαγειν και(2) της(2) φωνης μου ακουσουσι και(3)
 γενησεται μια ποιμνη εις ποιμνην
- 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 f13 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 f13 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 ων
ποιεις σεαυτον θεον
- 10:33-34 συ
2 OM

- D Π 1241 e
 * /Missing/
 P75 C 892
- 10:33-40 σεαυτον
 2 εαυτον
 f13 1241
 * /Missing/
 C 892
- 10:36 ον ο πατηρ ηγιασε και απεστειλεν 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/
 C 892 1241
- 10:36-67 του
 P45 vid
 2 OM
 P66* 01 D E W
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 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) αυτα η αδελφη του
 τεθνηκοτος μαρθα κυριε ηδη οζει τεταρταιος γαρ εστι
- 11:39-4 λεγει(1)
 2 + ουν
 Θ
 3 + αυτη
 Δ 579
 * /Missing/
 P45 565 892
- 11:39-7 ο
 2 OM
 A D Π*
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 565 892

- 11:39-16 η αδελφη του τεθνηκοτος
 2 η αδελφη του τετελευτηκοτος
 Origen P66 P75 vid 01 A B C D L W Π Ψ 33 1241 UBS3
 3 h
 Θ a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 565 892
- 11:40 λεγει αυτη ο ιησους ουκ ειπον σοι οτι εαν πιστευσης οψει την
 δοξαν του θεου
- 11:40-10 πιστευσης
 2 πιστευης
 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 οτι ηκουσας
 μου
- 11:41-13 ου ην ο(1) τεθνηκως κειμενος
 2 ου ην
 A Π f1 579
 3 OM
 Origen P66 P75 01 B C* D L W Θ 33 1241 a b e UBS3
 * /Missing/
 P45 565 892
- 11:41-34 ο(2) δε
 2 και ο
 D
 3 ο ουν
 Θ f1 f13
 4 ο
 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

- b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 565 892
- 11:42 εγω δε ηδεν οτι(1) παντοτε μου ακουεις αλλα δια τον(1) οχλον
 τον(2) περιεστωτα ειπον ινα πιστευσωσιν οτι(2) συ με απεστειλας
- 11:42-4 εγω δε
 2 καγω
 f13 a b e
 3 εγω
 D
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 565 892
- 11:43 και ταυτα ειπων φωνη μεγαλη εκραυγασε λαζαρε δευρο εξω
- 11:43-7 φωνη μεγαλη εκραυγασε
 2 φωνη μεγαλη εκραυγαζεν
 01*
 3 φωνη μεγαλη εκραξεν
 C W
 4 εκραυγασεν φωνη μεγαλη
 Θ e
 9 /NA/
 a b
 9 [φωνη μεγαλη εκραυγαζεν /./ φωνη μεγαλη εκραυγασεν]
 P45
 * /Missing/
 P75 565 892
- 11:44 και(1) εξηλθεν ο(1) τεθνηκως δεδεμενος τους ποδας και(2) τας
 χειρας κειριαις και(3) η οπισ αυτου σουδαριω περιεδεδετο λεγει
 αυτοις ο(2) ιησους λυσατε αυτον και(4) αφετε υπαγειν
- 11:44-4 και(1)
 2 OM
 Origen P45 P66 P75 B C* L Ψ UBS3
 3 και ευθυς
 D
 * /Missing/
 565 892
- 11:44-13 δεδεμενος τους ποδας και(2) τας χειρας
 2 δεδεμενος τας χειρας και τους ποδας
 A 579 1241
 * /Missing/
 565 892
- 11:44-40 αυτοις ο(2) ιησους
 1 αυτοις ιησους
 b
 2 ο ιησους αυτοις
 L W

- 2 ιησους αυτοις
Origen P75 B C*
- 3 ο ιησους
700
- 3 ιησους
a
- 5 ιησους μαθηταις αυτου
e
- * /Missing/
565 892
- 11:44-43 ο(2) ιησους
2 ιησους
Origen P75 B C*
- 9 /NA/
a b e
- * /Missing/
565 892
- 11:44-52 αφετε
2 + αυτον
Origen P45 P66 P75 B C* L Θ 33 579 UBS3
- * /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 fl
- * /Missing/
565 892
- 11:45-28 και θεασαμενοι
3 εωρακοτες
P45 P66 D a b
- * /Missing/
P75 565 892
- 11:45-31 α
P66* vid
- 2 ο
Ac B C D fl e
- 3 οσα
P66c
- * /Missing/
P75 565 892
- 11:45-34 ο ιησους
2 ιησους
01
- 3 OM
Origen P45 P66 A B C* L W Θ fl b e UBS3
- * /Missing/

P75 565 892

11:46 τινες δε εξ αυτων απηλθον προς τους φαρισαιους και ειπον αυτοις
α εποιησεν ο ιησους

11:46-25 α

2 ο
C D b e

3 οσα
A Π f13

* /Missing/
P45 P75 565 579 892

11:46-28 ο

2 OM
P66 B C D L UBS3

9 /NA/
a b e

* /Missing/
P45 P75 565 579 892

11:47 συνηγαγον ουν οι(1) αρχιερεις και(1) οι(2) φαρισαιοι συνεδριον
και(2) ελεγον τι ποιουμεν οτι ουτος ο ανθρωπος πολλα σημεια
ποιει

11:47-19 συνεδριον

2 + κατα του ιησου
f13 700

* /Missing/
P75 C 565 892

11:47-28 ποιουμεν

2 ποιωμεν
Ω 33 579

4 ποιησομεν
P45* a b e

* /Missing/
P75 C 565 892

11:47-34 οτι

2 OM
P45 D

* /Missing/
P75 C 565 892

11:47-37 ουτος ο ανθρωπος

2 ο ανθρωπος ουτος
33 1241

9 /NA/
a b e

* /Missing/
P75 C 565 892

11:47-43 πολλα

2 τοιαυτα

- D b e
 * /Missing/
 P75 C 565 892
- 11:47-46 σημεια ποιει
 2 ~ 2,1 (ποιει σημεια)
 Origen P45 vid P66 01 A B L W Θ Ψ 33 579 UBS3
 * /Missing/
 P75 C 565 892
- 11:48 εαν αφωμεν αυτον(1) ουτω παντες πιστευσουσιν εις αυτον(2)
 και(1) ελευσονται οι ρωμαιοι και(2) αρουσιν ημων και(3) τον
 τοπον και(4) το εθνος
- 11:48-13 πιστευσουσιν
 2 πιστευουσιν
 01*
 3 πιστευσωσιν
 Origen P66 L Δ Ω f1 f13 33 579 700 1241
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 C 565 892
- 11:48-25 αρουσιν
 2 αιρουσιν
 P45 Θ
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P75 C 565 892
- 11:48-28 ημων και(3) τον τοπον
 2 ημων τον τοπον
 Θ Π f13 1241 a b
 4 τον τοπον ημων
 D e
 5 ημων και την πολιν
 W
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 C 565 892
- 11:49 εις δε τις εξ αυτων καιαφας αρχιερευς ων του ενιαυτου εκεινου
 ειπεν αυτοις υμεις ουκ οιδατε ουδεν
- 11:49-4 τις
 2 OM
 P66 1241
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 C 892
- 11:49-13 καιαφας
 2 καιφας

- P45 P75 vid D a b e
 * /Missing/
 C 892
- 11:49-16 καιαφας
 2 + ονοματι
 Θ
 3 ονοματι καιαφας
 fl 565 a b e
 * /Missing/
 C 892
- 11:50 ουδε διαλογιζεσθε οτι συμφερει ημιν ινα εις ανθρωπος αποθανη
 υπερ του λαου και μη ολον το εθνος αποληται
- 11:50-4 διαλογιζεσθε
 2 λογιζεσθε
 Origen P66 01 A B D L W Θ fl UBS3
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 C 892
- 11:50-13 ημιν
 2 υμιν
 P45 P66 B D L 1241 a b e UBS3
 3 OM
 01
 * /Missing/
 P75 C 892
- 11:51 τουτο δε αφ εαυτου ουκ ειπεν αλλα αρχιερευς ων του(1) ενιαυτου
 εκεινου προεφητευσεν οτι εμελλεν ο ιησους αποθνησκειν υπερ
 του(2) εθνους
- 11:51-10 του(1) ενιαυτου εκεινου
 2 του ενιαυτου
 P66 D
 3 OM
 P45 e
 * /Missing/
 C 892
- 11:51-16 προεφητευσεν
 2 επροφητευσεν
 P45 P66 01 B D L Θ 33 UBS3
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P75 C 892
- 11:51-22 εμελλεν ο ιησους αποθνησκειν
 1 εμελλεν ιησους αποθνησκειν
 Origen 01 E Π* Ω 565 700 UBS3
 2 μελλει ο ιησους αποθνησκειν

- 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) ουχ υπερ του(1) εθνους μονον αλλ ινα και(2) τα(1) τεκνα
 του(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
 αυτον
- 11:53-7 ημερας
 2 ωρας
 L 1241
 * /Missing/

C 892

- 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 περιπατει εν τοις ιουδαιοις αλλα
 απηλθεν εκειθεν 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 εκειθεν
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 εμεινεν
Origen P66* P75 01 B L W 579 1241 UBS3
* /Missing/
C 892
- 11:54-49 των μαθητων αυτου
2 των μαθητων
Origen P45 P66 01 B D L W Δ Ψ 565 UBS3
3 αυτων και εβαπτιζεν
33
* /Missing/
P75 C 892
- 11:55 ην δε εγγυς το πασχα(1) των ιουδαιων 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 εστωτες
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 ιησους προ εξ ημερων του πασχα ηλθεν εις βηθανιαν οπου
ην λαζαρος ο(2) τεθνηκως ον ηγειρεν 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 εποησαν 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
 εβασταζεν
- 12:6-43 ειχε και(2)
 2 εχων και
 f1

- 3 εχων
Origen P75 01 B D L 33 UBS3
- 4 εχων
W Θ 579
- * /Missing/
P45 C 892
- 12:12 τη επαυριον οχλος πολυς ο(1) ελθων εις(1) την εορτην ακουσαντες
οτι ερχεται ο(2) ιησους εις(2) ιεροσολυμα
- 12:12-10 επαυριον
2 + ουν
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 ελαβον τα βαια των φοινικων και(1) εξηλθον εις υπαντησιν αυτω
και(2) εκραζον ωσαννα ευλογημενος ο(1) ερχομενος εν ονοματι
κυριου ο(2) βασιλευς του ισραηλ
- 12:13-19 υπαντησιν
2 απαντησιν
Origen A Π
3 συναντησιν
D L f13 1241
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C 892
- 12:13-25 εκραζον
2 εκραυαζον
P75 01 Bc D L W Ω 579 UBS3
3 εκραυασαν
P66 B*
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C 892
- 12:13-28 εκραζον
2 + λεγοντες
P66 01 A D Π f1 f13 565 a
* /Missing/
P45 C 892
- 12:13-46 ο(2)
3 και ο
P75 vid 01* B L W Ψ 579 UBS3
9 [ο /:./ και ο]
Origen
10 OM
A E Δ Ω f13 700 1241
* /Missing/
P45 C 33 892
- 12:14 ευρων δε ο ιησους οναριον εκαθισεν επ αυτο καθως εστι
γεγραμμενον
- 12:14-10 αυτο
2 αυτω
Δ Θ Π
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C 892
- 12:15 μη φοβου θυγατερ σιων ιδου ο βασιλευς σου ερχεται καθημενος επι
πωλον ονου

- 12:15-4 θυγατερ
1 θυγατηρ
 Origen
2 η θυγατηρ
 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

- 2 προτερον
Origen Ψ
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 C 892
- 12:26 εαν(1) εμοι(1) διακονη(1) τις(1) εμοι(2) ακολουθειτω 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
* /Missing/
P45 C
- 12:26-31 εσται
2 εστιν
P66*
3 εστω
f13
4 OM
L e
* /Missing/
P45 C
- 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
* /Missing/
P45 C
- 12:31-25 εξω
2 κατω
Θ b e
* /Missing/
P45 C
- 12:32 καγω εαν υψωθω εκ της γης παντας ελκυσω προς εμαυτον
- 12:32-7 εαν
2 αν
B
3 οταν
1241 a e
* /Missing/
P45 C
- 12:32-13 εκ

- 2 απο
D L
- 9 /NA/
a b e
- * /Missing/
P45 C
- 12:32-19 παντας
2 παντα
P66 01* D a b e
- * /Missing/
P45 P75 C
- 12:35 ειπεν ουν αυτοις ο(1) ιησους ετι μικρον χρονον το(1) φως(1) μεθ
υμων εστι περιπατειτε εως το(2) φως(2) εχετε ινα μη σκοτια(1)
υμας καταλαβη και ο(2) περιπατων εν τη σκοτια(2) ουκ οιδε που
υπαγει
- 12:35-25 μεθ υμων
2 εν υμιν
Origen P66 P75 01 B D L W Θ Π Ψ f1 f13 33 565 579
892 1241 a b e UBS3
- * /Missing/
P45 C
- 12:45 και ο θεωρων εμε θεωρει τον πεμψαντα με
- 12:45-16 θεωρει
2 + και
P66* e
- * /Missing/
P45 C 579 b
- 13:1 προ δε της εορτης του(1) πασχα ειδως ο ιησους οτι εληλυθεν
αυτου η ωρα ινα μεταβη εκ του(2) κοσμου τουτου προς τον πατερα
αγαπησας τους(1) ιδιους τους(2) εν τω κοσμω εις τελος ηγαπησεν
αυτους
- 13:1-4 ειδως
2 ιδων
33 579
- 9 /NA/
a b e
- * /Missing/
P45 C
- 13:1-7 εληλυθεν
2 ηλθεν
Origen 01 A B L W Θ Π Ψ f1 f13 33 565 579 892 1241
UBS3
- 3 ηκει
P66
- 4 παρην
D

- 9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C
- 13:2 και δειπνου γενομενου του διαβολου ηδη βεβληκοτος εις την
καρδιαν ιουδα σιμωνος ισκαριωτου ινα αυτον παραδω
- 13:2-7 γενομενου
3 γινομενου
Origen 01* B L W Ψ 579 1241 UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 565
- 13:2-10 του
2 + τε
P66 A
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 565
- 13:2-22 ιουδα σιμωνος ισκαριωτου ινα αυτον παραδω
3 ιουδας σιμων ο ισκαριωτης ινα παραδω αυτον
D 579
15 ινα παραδοι αυτον ιουδας σιμωνος ισκαριωτου
UBS3
15 ινα παραδοι αυτον ιουδας σιμωνος ισκαριωτης
01* B
15 ινα παραδω αυτον ιουδας σιμωνος ισκαριωτου
L Ψ 1241
15 ινα παραδω αυτον ιουδας σιμωνος ισκαριωτης
Origen P66 01c W
15 ινα [παραδω /./ παραδοι] αυτον ιουδας σιμωνος ισκαριωτης
b
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 565
- 13:2-25 ιουδα σιμωνος ισκαριωτου
2 ιουδας σιμωνος ισκαριωτης
Origen P66 01* 01c B W b
3 ιουδας σιμωνος ισκαριωτου
L Ψ 1241 UBS3
4 σιμωνος ισκαριωτου
f13
5 ιουδα σιμωνος απο καρυωτου
D e
6 ιουδας σιμων ο ισκαριωτης
579
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 565
- 13:2-37 αυτον παραδω
10 παραδω αυτον

- Origen P66 01c L W Ψ 579 1241
- 11 παραδοι αυτον
01* B D UBS3
- 19 [παραδω αυτον /:./ παραδοι αυτον]
b
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 565
- 13:3 ειδως 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 + αυτου
D 579 a
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 565
- 13:5 ειτα βαλλει υδωρ εις τον νιπηρα και(1) ηρξατο νιπτειν τους
ποδας των μαθητων και(2) εκμασσειν τω λεντιω ω ην διεζωσμενος
- 13:5-7 βαλλει υδωρ
3 λαβων υδωρ βαλλει
D f13
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 565
- 13:5-25 μαθητων
2 + αυτου

- D 1241
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 C 565
- 13:6 ερχεται ουν προς σιμωνα πετρον και λεγει αυτω εκεινος κυριε συ
 μου νιπτεις τους ποδας
- 13:6-13 σιμωνα πετρον
 3 τον πετρον σιμωνα
 D a
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 C 565
- 13:6-16 και
 2 OM
 Origen P66 B D L e UBS3
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 C 565
- 13:6-22 εκεινος
 2 OM
 Origen P66 01* B b UBS3
 4 πετρος
 a e
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 C 565
- 13:7 απεκριθη ιησους και ειπεν αυτω ο εγω ποιω συ ουκ οιδας αρτι
 γνωση δε μετα ταυτα
- 13:7-4 απεκριθη
 2 + ο
 Δ f13 33 579
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 C 565
- 13:8 λεγει αυτω(1) πετρος ου μη(1) νιψης τους ποδας μου εις τον
 αιωνα απεκριθη αυτω(2) ο ιησους εαν μη(2) νιψω σε ουκ εχεις
 μερος μετ εμου
- 13:8-4 πετρος
 2 ο πετρος
 Origen L Δ f13 892 1241
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 565 579
- 13:8-7 πετρος
 2 + κυριε
 D Θ Πc
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 565 579

- 13:8-10 νιψης τους ποδας μου
 2 νιψης μου τους ποδας
 Origen P66 B C L W Ψ 892 e UBS3
 4 μου νιψης τους ποδας
 D f1 f13 1241
 6 νιψης 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

- * /Missing/
P45 P75 565
- 13:9-13 μου
2 OM
P66 D E a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 565
- 13:10 λεγει αυτω ο(1) ιησους ο(2) λελουμενος ου χρειαν εχει η τους
ποδας νιψασθαι αλλ(1) εστι καθαρος ολος και υμεις καθαροι εστε
αλλ(2) ουχι παντες
- 13:10-7 λελουμενος
2 λελουσμενος
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 + οτι
P66 B C L W Ψ 33 a b UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 D 565
- 13:12 οτε ουν ενιψε τους ποδας αυτων και ελαβε τα ιματια αυτου
αναπεσων παλιν ειπεν αυτοις γνωσκετε τι πεποιηκα υμιν

- 13:12-16 και
 2 OM
 P66 01 A Cc L Ψ 33 1241 a b
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 565
- 13:12-25 αυτου
 2 εαυτου
 W
 3 OM
 D b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 565
- 13:12-28 αναπεσων
 2 και αναπεσων
 P66 01c Ac L Ψ 33 1241 b
 4 και ανεπεσεν
 Origen 01* B C* W 579 a e UBS3
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 A* 565
- 13:13 υμεις φωνειτε με ο(1) διδασκαλος και(1) ο(2) κυριος και(2)
 καλως λεγετε ειμι γαρ
- 13:13-10 διδασκαλος και(1) ο(2) κυριος
 2 ~ 4,2,3,1 (κυριος και ο διδασκαλος)
 Cc E f13 33 892 1241
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 565
- 13:14 ει ουν εγω ενιψα υμων τους(1) ποδας(1) ο(1) κυριος και(1) ο(2)
 διδασκαλος και(2) υμεις οφειλετε αλληλων νιπτειν τους(2)
 ποδας(2)
- 13:14-10 υμων τους(1) ποδας(1)
 2 ~ 2,3,1 (touV podaV umwn)
 D Π 579 a e
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 565
- 13:14-22 διδασκαλος
 2 + ποσω μαλλον
 D Θ a
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 565
- 13:15 υποδειγμα γαρ εδωκα υμιν(1) ινα καθως εγω εποησα υμιν(2) και
 υμεις ποιητε
- 13:15-7 γαρ
 2 OM
 P66* 700
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 565

- 13:15-10 εδωκα
 2 δεδωκα
 P66 01 A 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 μειζον
 P66c W 579
 3 OM
 P66*
 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 επηρεν 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 A 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 πιστευητε
 C
3 ~ 3,1,2 (πιστευσητε οταν γενηται)
 P66 01 L 579 a b e UBS3
3 πιστευητε οταν γενηται
 Origen B
* /Missing/
 P45 P75 565
- 13:19-25 πιστευσητε
2 πιστευητε
 Origen B C
* /Missing/
 P45 P75 565
- 13:20 αμην(1) αμην(2) λεγω υμιν ο(1) λαμβανων(1) εαν τινα πεμψω
 εμε(1) λαμβανει(1) ο(2) δε εμε(2) λαμβανων(2) λαμβανει(2) τον
 πεμψαντα 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) λαμβανων(2)
2 και ο εμε λαμβανων
 D 33 e

- * /Missing/
P45 P75 565 a
- 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 οτι εις εξ υμων
παραδωσει με
- 13:21-4 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 ηγαπα ο ιησους
- 13:23-4 ην δε
2 ην
Origen B C* L Ψ 892 UBS3
3 ην ουν

- b
 4 και ην
 e
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 565
- 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 τουτω 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 σθηθος 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

- 9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75
- 13:25-10 δε
2 ουν
P66 01 D L W Δ f1 f13 33 565 579 892 1241 a b UBS3
3 OM
Origen B C e
* /Missing/
P45 P75
- 13:25-13 εκεινος
2 + ουτως
P66 B C E L Δ Ω f13 33 UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75
- 13:26 αποκρινεται ο ιησους εκεινος εστιν ω εγω βαψας το(1) ψωμιον(1)
επιδωσω και εμβαψας το(2) ψωμιον(2) διδωσιν ιουδα σιμωνος
ισκαριωτη
- 13:26-7 αποκρινεται
2 + ουν
Origen 01c B C* L 892 a
3 + αυτω
D f13 e
* /Missing/
P45 P75
- 13:26-10 ο
2 OM
P66 B W
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75
- 13:26-13 ιησους
2 + και λεγει
01 D f13
3 + και λεγει αυτω
892
4 + και ειπεν
1241
* /Missing/
P45 P75
- 13:26-19 ω
4 ω αν
D f1 565
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/

P45 P75

- 13:26-22 εγω
2 OM
579 b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75
- 13:26-28 βαψας
2 βαψω
Origen B C L 1241 UBS3
3 εμβαψας
A D W Π f1 f13 565
* /Missing/
P45 P75
- 13:26-43 επιδωσω
2 δωσω
W
3 και δωσω αυτω
Origen B C L 1241 UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 579
- 13:26-46 επιδωσω
2 + αυτω
Origen B C L 33 1241 UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 579
- 13:26-52 και εμβαψας
2 και εμβαψας ουν
Πc
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
f13 b
3 OM
a e
* /Missing/
P45 P75
- 13:26-82 ισκαριωτη

- 2 ισκαριωτου
Origen 01 B C L Θ Πc Ψ 33 UBS3
- 3 ισκαριωτης
579
- 4 απο καρυωτου
D
- 6 /Σχαριστη/
a e
- 7 /Σχαρισταε/
b
- * /Missing/
P45 P75

13:27 και μετα το ψωμιον τοτε εισηλθεν εις εκεινον ο(1) σατανας λεγει
ουν αυτω ο(2) ιησους ο(3) ποιεις ποιησον ταχιον

13:27-7 και μετα το ψωμιον τοτε
3 και τοτε
D e
* /Missing/
P45 P75

13:27-13 μετα
2 + το λαβειν
a b
* /Missing/
P45 P75 D e

13:27-19 τοτε
2 OM
01 D L 565 579 a b
* /Missing/
P45 P75

13:27-31 ο(1)
2 OM
D Δ
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75

13:27-34 λεγει ουν
2 και λεγει
D e
3 λεγει
a
* /Missing/
P45 P75

13:27-40 ο(2)
2 OM
B L
9 /NA/
a b e

- * /Missing/
P45 P75
- 13:28 τουτο δε ουδεις εγνω των ανακειμενων προς τι ειπεν αυτω
- 13:28-10 δε
3 OM
B W Ψ 579
* /Missing/
P45 P75
- 13:29 τινες γαρ εδοκουν επει το γλωσσοκομον ειχεν ο(1) ιουδας οτι
 λεγει αυτω ο(2) ιησους αγορασον ων χρειαν εχομεν εις την εορτην
 η τοις πτωχοις ινα τι δω
- 13:29-28 ο(1)
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) ιησους
2 ihsouV
Origen 01 B
9 [ο ιησους /./ ιησους]
a b
10 OM
f1 565 e
* /Missing/
P45 P75
- 13:30 λαβων ουν το ψωμιον εκεινος ευθεως εξηλθεν ην δε νυξ
- 13:30-10 το ψωμιον εκεινος
2 εκεινος το ψωμιον
33 a
3 το ψωμιον
b
6 /Ιυδασ/
e
* /Missing/
P45 P75
- 13:30-19 ευθεως εξηλθεν
2 ~ 2,1 (εξηλθεν ευθεως)
Π Ψ f13 33
2 εξηλθεν ευθυς
Origen P66 01 B C D L W 579 UBS3
2 εξηλθεν [ευθυς /./ ευθεως]
b
5 εξηλθεν
e
* /Missing/

P45 P75

- 13:30-22 ευθεως
2 ευθυς
Origen P66 01 B C D L W 579 UBS3
3 OM
e
9 /NA/
a b
* /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
A E Δ
* /Missing/
P45 P75 Π
- 13:31-19 ο(1) ιησους
2 ιησους
Origen P66 01 B L Δ UBS3
9 /NA/
a b 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 OM
 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 fl 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
 ιησους οπου υπαγω ου δυνασαι μοι(1) νυν ακολουθησαι υστερον δε
 ακολουθησεις μοι(2)
- 13:36-16 οπου
2 + εγω
 Origen 01 D Ψ f13 33 700 1241
* /Missing/
 P45 P75
- 13:36-28 μοι(1)
3 OM
 565 e
* /Missing/
 P45 P75
- 13:36-31 νυν ακολουθησαι
3 ακολουθησαι
 Δ
5 συνακολουθησαι αρτι
 D* e
6 συ νυν ακολουθησαι αρτι
 Dc
7 αρτι ακολουθησαι
 b
* /Missing/
 P45 P75

- 13:36-37 υστερον δε ακολουθησεις μοι(2)
 2 υστερον δε μοι ακολουθησεις
 D
 3 υστερον δε ακολουθησεις
 A Θ 892*
 4 ακολουθησεις δε υστερον
 Origen P66 01 B C* L W f1 33 565 579 a e UBS3
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75
- 13:38 απεκριθη αυτω 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 f1 565 b e UBS3
 2 μαι απαρνησει τρεις
 579
 4 ~ 3,απαρνησει,2 (τρις απαρνησει με)
 f13
 5 συ με απαρνηση τρις
 W
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75
- 13:38-37 απαρνηση
 2 αρνηση
 Origen P66 B D L f1 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

- * /Missing/
P45 C
- 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 ο(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 ο(1)
2 OM
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 αυτω(1)
2 αυτοις
Origen Ω
9 /NA/
e
* /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

- * /Missing/
P45 C 892
- 14:26 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
- 14:26-43 α
2 οσα
Origen Θ fl 565 a b
* /Missing/
P45 C W 892
- 14:26-49 ειπον
3 αν ειπω
D Π a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C W 892
- 14:26-52 υμιν
2 OM
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C W 892
- 14:26-55 υμιν
2 + εγω
B L UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C W 892
- 14:28 ηκουσατε οτι(1) εγω 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
- 14:28-19 ηγαπατε
2 αγαπατε
D L fl3 33 579
9 [ηγαπατε /./ αγαπατε]
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C W 892
- 14:28-25 ειπον(2)
3 + εγω
fl3 e
4 OM
Origen 01 A B D L Θ Π Ψ fl 33 565 579 1241 a b UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C W 892
- 14:28-37 μου(1)
2 OM
01c A B D* L Ψ fl 33 565 b e UBS3
2 ο πεμψας με

- Origen
 * /Missing/
 P45 P66 P75 C W 892
- 14:30 ουκ(1) ετι πολλα λαλησω μεθ υμων ερχεται γαρ ο του κοσμου
 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 fl 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 P66 P75 C W 892
- 15:15 ουκετι υμας(1) λεγω δουλους οτι(1) ο(1) δουλος ουκ οιδε τι
 ποιει αυτου ο(2) κυριος υμας(2) δε ειρηκα φιλους 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 εγω εξελεξαμην
 υμας(1) εκ(3) του(3) κοσμου(3) δια τουτο μισει υμας(2) ο(2)
 κοσμος(2)
- 15:19-10 το
 2 τον
 P66 1241
 9 /NA/
 a b e

- * /Missing/
P45 P75 C W 892
- 15:22 ει μη ηλθον και ελαλησα αυτοις αμαρτιαν ουκ(1) ειχον νυν δε
προφασιν ουκ(2) εχουσι περι της αμαρτιας αυτων
- 15:22-13 ειχον
3 ειχουσαν
Origen P66 01 B L Πc fl 33 UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C W 892
- 15:22-16 δε
2 OM
01* e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C W 892
- 15:22-28 αυτων
2 OM
P66* e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C W 892
- 16:12 ετι πολλα εχω λεγειν υμιν αλλ ου δυνασθε βασταζειν αρτι
- 16:12-4 εχω λεγειν υμιν
2 εχω υμιν λεγειν
Origen 01 B L Ψ 33 b e UBS3
3 λεγειν εχω υμιν
579
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 892
- 16:12-22 δυνασθε
2 + αυτα
D a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 892
- 16:13 οταν δε ελθη εκεινος το πνευμα της αληθειας οδηγησει υμας εις
πασαν την αληθειαν ου γαρ λαλησει(1) αφ εαυτου αλλ οσα αν
ακουση λαλησει(2) και τα ερχομενα αναγγελει υμιν
- 16:13-4 δε
2 OM
D W 579
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 892
- 16:13-16 οδηγησει υμας
3 εκεινος υμας οδηγησει
D a

- * /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 892
- 16:13-22 εις πασαν την αληθειαν
2 εις την αληθειαν πασαν
Origen A B e
4 εν τη αληθεια παση
01c D L W fl 33 565 579 b UBS3
6 εν παση τη αληθεια
Θ
7 εν τη αληθεια
01*
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 892
- 16:13-40 αν ακουση
3 αν ακουσει
Dc E Θ
4 αν ακουει
33
5 ακουσει
Origen B D* W Ψ fl 579 UBS3
6 ακουει
01 L b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 892
- 16:14 εκεινος εμε δοξασει οτι εκ του εμου ληψεται και αναγγελοι υμιν
- 16:14-16 ληψεται
5 λαμβανει
Ω fl 3 e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 579 892 1241
- 16:16 μικρον(1) και(1) ου θεωρειτε με(1) και(2) παλιν μικρον(2)
και(3) οψεσθε με(2) οτι εγω υπαγω προς τον πατερα
- 16:16-10 ου
2 ουκει
Origen P66 vid 01 B D L W Θ Ψ fl 33 b UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 892
- 16:18 ελεγον ουν τουτο τι(1) εστιν ο λεγει το μικρον ουκ οιδαμεν
τι(2) λαλει
- 16:18-10 τουτο τι(1) εστιν
2 ~ 2,3,1 (τι εστιν τουτο)
Origen P66 01 B D* L W Ψ fl fl 33 565 579 UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 892

- 16:18-22 ο λεγει
 2 το λεγει
 A
 3 OM
 P66 01* D* W f1 f13 565 579 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 C 892
- 16:18-28 το
 2 OM
 Origen 01c B L Ψ 33
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 P66 P75 C 892
- 16:18-37 τι(2) λαλει
 2 τι λεγει
 Θ
 3 ο λεγει
 D* a
 4 OM
 B
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 C 892
- 16:19 εγνω ουν ο ιησους οτι(1) ηθελον αυτον ερωταν και(1) ειπεν
 αυτοις περι τουτου ζητειτε μετ αλληλων οτι(2) ειπον μικρον(1)
 και(2) ου θεωρειτε με(1) και(3) παλιν μικρον(2) και(4) οψεσθε
 με(2)
- 16:19-7 ο
 2 OM
 B L W
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 P66 P75 C 892
- 16:19-13 ηθελον
 2 ημελλον
 P66c 01 W 579
 4 ημελλον και ηθελον
 P66*
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 C 892
- 16:19-16 ερωταν
 2 + περι τουτου
 D Θ
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 C 892
- 16:19-37 ου

- 2 ουκετι
Θ 565
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C 892
- 16:20 αμην(1) αμην(2) λεγω υμιν οτι κλαυσετε και θρηνησετε υμεις(1) ο
δε(1) κοσμος χαρησεται υμεις(2) δε(2) λυπηθησεσθε αλλ η λυπη
υμων εις χαραν γενησεται
- 16:20-19 δε(2)
2 OM
01* B D fl 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) λεγω υμιν(1) οτι οσα αν αιτησητε τον πατερα εν(2) τω
ονοματι μου δωσει υμιν(2)
- 16:23-22 οτι οσα αν
2 οτι ο αν
01
2 οτι ο εαν
Θ Π 33 1241
3 οτι αν
A Dc 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 υμιν(2)
2 δωσει υμιν 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 αιτειτε και
ληψεσθε ινα η(1) χαρα υμων η(2) πεπληρωμενη
- 16:24-10 αιτειτε
2 αιτησασθε
P66 01 W 579
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 892

- 16:25 ταυτα εν(1) παροιμιας(1) λελαληκα υμιν(1) αλλ ερχεται ωρα οτε
ουκ ετι εν(2) παροιμιας(2) λαλησω υμιν(2) αλλα παρρησια περι
του πατρος αναγγελω υμιν(3)
- 16:25-16 αλλ
2 OM
Origen P66 01 B C* D* L W Πc f1 33 579 a b e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 892
- 16:33 ταυτα λελαληκα υμιν ινα εν(1) εμοι ειρηνην εχητε εν(2) τω κοσμω
θλιψιν εξετε αλλα θαρσειτε εγω νενικηκα τον κοσμον
- 16:33-19 εν(2) τω κοσμω θλιψιν εξετε
2 OM
P66 vid Δ
* /Missing/
P45 P75 892
- 16:33-28 εξετε
2 εχετε
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) υιον 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 f1 f13 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 f1 579 a b e UBS3

- 9 [και /./ OM]
Origen
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 892
- 17:1-37 σου(2)
2 OM
01 B C* W e UBS3
9 [σου /./ OM]
Origen
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 892
- 17:3 αυτη δε εστιν η αιωνιος ζωη ινα γινωσκωσι σε τον μονον αληθινον
θεον και ον απεστειλας ιησουν χριστον
- 17:3-13 γινωσκωσι
4 γινωσκουσιν
A D L W Δ 33 579 1241
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 892
- 17:5 και νυν δοξασον με συ πατερ παρα(1) σεαυτω τη δοξη η ειχον προ
του τον κοσμον ειναι παρα(2) σοι
- 17:5-13 η
2 ην
01* 579
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 892
- 17:5-22 προ του τον κοσμον ειναι παρα(2) σοι
3 ~ 6,7,1,2,3,4,5 (παρα σοι προ του τον κοσμον ειναι)
P66 a
9 [προ του τον κοσμον ειναι παρα σοι /./ παρα σοι προ του τον
κοσμον ειναι]
Origen
11 παρα σοι προ του γενεσθαι τον κοσμον
D
* /Missing/
P45 P75 892
- 17:11 και(1) ουκ ετι ειμι εν(1) τω(1) κοσμω(1) και(2) ουτοι εν(2)
τω(2) κοσμω(2) εισι και(3) εγω προς σε ερχομαι πατερ αγιε
τηρησον αυτους εν(3) τω(3) ονοματι σου ους δεδωκας μοι ινα ωσιν
εν(4) καθως ημεις
- 17:11-13 ειμι εν(1) τω(1) κοσμω(1)
2 ~ 2,3,4,1 (εν τω κοσμω ειμι)
A Π
* /Missing/
P45 P75 892

- 17:11-31 και(3) εγω
 2 καγω
 Origen 01 B C* D L Ψ f1 33 UBS3
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 P66 P75 892
- 17:14 εγω(1) δεδωκα αυτοις τον λογον σου και ο κοσμος εμισησεν αυτους
 οτι ουκ(1) εισιν εκ(1) του(1) κοσμου(1) καθως εγω(2) ουκ(2)
 ειμι εκ(2) του(2) κοσμου(2)
- 17:14-19 εμισησεν
 7 μισει
 D a e
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 892
- 17:20 ου περι(1) τουτων δε ερωτω μονον αλλα και περι(2) των
 πιστευσοντων δια του λογου αυτων εις εμε
- 17:20-19 περι(2)
 2 υπερ
 Origen W 579
 * /Missing/
 P45 P66 P75 892
- 17:20-25 πιστευσοντων
 2 πιστευοντων
 Origen 01 A B C D* E L W Δ Θ Π Ψ f1 f13 33 579
 700 1241 b UBS3
 * /Missing/
 P45 P66 P75 892
- 17:21 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 κοσμος
 πιστευση οτι συ(2) με απεστειλας
- 17:21-25 εν(2)
 2 OM
 P66 vid B C* D W a b e UBS3
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 892
- 17:21-40 πιστευση
 2 πιστευη
 P66 01* B C* W UBS3
 9 /NA/
 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 892

- 18:1 ταυτα ειπων ο ιησους εξηλθε συν τοις μαθηταις αυτου(1) περαν
του χειμαρρου των κεδρων οπου ην κηπος εις ον εισηλθεν αυτος
και οι μαθηται αυτου(2)
- 18:1-43 των κεδρων
2 του κεδρων
A 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 εξελθων ειπεν
αυτοις τινα ζητειτε
- 18:4-13 ειδως
2 ιδων
D Ψ f13
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 892
- 18:4-34 εξελθων ειπεν

- P66 vid
 2 εξηλθε και λεγει
 Origen B C* D fl 565 a b e UBS3
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 892
- 18:5 απεκριθησαν αυτω ιησουν τον ναζωραιον λεγει αυτοις ο(1) ιησους
 εγω ειμι ειστηκει δε και ιουδας ο(2) παραδιδους αυτον μετ αυτων
- 18:5-13 ναζωραιον
 2 ναζαρηνον
 D a
 * /Missing/
 P45 P66 P75 892
- 18:5-25 ο(1) ιησους
 2 ιησους
 01
 4 OM
 Origen B D a b e UBS3
 * /Missing/
 P45 P66 P75 892
- 18:5-31 ειμι
 2 + ιησους
 B a
 * /Missing/
 P45 P66 P75 892
- 18:6 ως ουν ειπεν αυτοις οτι εγω ειμι απηλθον εις τα οπισω και
 επεσον χαμαι
- 18:6-25 οτι
 2 OM
 Origen 01 A B D L W Θ Π Ψ fl 33 565 a b e UBS3
 * /Missing/
 P45 P66 P75 892
- 18:7 παλιν ουν αυτους επηρωτησε τινα ζητειτε οι δε ειπον ιησουν τον
 ναζωραιον
- 18:7-7 ουν
 3 OM
 1241 a e
 * /Missing/
 P45 P66 P75 892
- 18:7-49 ναζωραιον
 3 ναζαραιον
 Ω
 4 /Ναζαρενυμ/
 a e
 * /Missing/
 P45 P66 P75 892

- 18:8 απεκριθη ο ιησους ειπον υμιν οτι εγω ειμι ει ουν εμε ζητειτε
αφετε τουτους υπαγειν
- 18:8-7 απεκριθη
P66 vid
2 + αυτους
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 και απηγαγον αυτον προς ανναν πρωτον ην(1) γαρ πενθερος του(1)
καιαφα ος ην(2) αρχιερευς του(2) ενιαυτου εκεινου
- 18:13-7 απηγαγον
2 ηγαγον
P66 01* B D W 579 a UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 892 e
- 18:13-10 αυτον
2 OM
Origen P66 vid 01 B C* D W Δ 33 579 a UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 892 e
- 18:14 ην δε καιαφας ο συμβουλευσας τοις ιουδαιοις οτι συμφερει ενα
ανθρωπον απολεσθαι υπερ του λαου
- 18:14-25 απολεσθαι
2 αποθανειν
Origen P66 vid 01 B C* L W Θ f1 f13 33 565 579 a b UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 D Ω 892 e
- 18:28 αγουσιν ουν τον ιησουν απο του καιαφα εις(1) το(1)
πραιτωριον(1) ην δε πρωια και αυτοι ουκ εισηλθον εις(2) το(2)
πραιτωριον(2) ινα(1) μη μιανθωσιν αλλ ινα(2) φαγωσι το(3) πασχα
- 18:28-16 καιαφα
2 καιφα
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 D 892

- 18:31 ειπεν ουν(1) αυτοις ο πιλατος λαβετε αυτον(1) υμεις και κατα τον νομον υμων κρινατε αυτον(2) ειπον ουν(2) αυτω οι ιουδαιοι ημιν ουκ εξεστιν αποκτειναι ουδενα
- 18:31-67 αποκτειναι ουδενα
P66 vid
2 ~ 2,1 (ουδενα αποκτειναι)
fl a
* /Missing/
P45 P75 D 892
- 18:35 απεκριθη ο πιλατος μητι εγω ιουδαιος ειμι το(1) εθνος το(2) στον και οι αρχιερεις παρεδωκαν σε εμοι τι εποιησας
- 18:35-13 μητι
2 μη
01* W fl 565
3 μη γαρ
P66
* /Missing/
P45 P75 D 892
- 18:35-25 οι αρχιερεις παρεδωκαν
2 ο αρχιερευς παρεδωκαν
01* b
3 ο αρχιερευς παρεδωκεν
e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 D 892
- 18:36 απεκριθη ο ιησους η(1) βασιλεια(1) η(2) εμη(1) ουκ(1) εστιν(1) εκ(1) του(1) κοσμου(1) τουτου(1) ει εκ(2) του(2) κοσμου(2) τουτου(2) ην η(3) βασιλεια(2) η(4) εμη(2) οι(1) υπηρεται αν οι(2) εμοι ηγωνιζοντο ινα μη παραδοθω τοις ιουδαιοις νυν δε η(5) βασιλεια(3) η(6) εμη(3) ουκ(2) εστιν(2) εντευθεν
- 18:36-46 η(3) βασιλεια(2) η(4) εμη(2)
2 η εμη βασιλεια
01 Θ
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C D 892
- 18:36-64 αν οι(2) εμοι ηγωνιζοντο
2 ~ 2,3,4,1 (οι εμοι ηγωνιζοντο αν)
Origen 01 Bc L W Ψ fl f13 33 579 UBS3
4 οι εμοι ηγωνιζοντο
B*
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C D 892

- 18:40 εκραυγασαν ουν παλιν παντες λεγοντες μη τουτον αλλα τον
βαραββαν ην δε ο βαραββας ληστης
- 18:40-37 βαραββας
2 + ουτος
Θ f1
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C D 892
- 19:7 απεκριθησαν αυτω οι ιουδαιοι ημεις νομον(1) εχομεν και κατα τον
νομον(2) ημων οφειλει αποθανειν οτι εαυτον υιον του θεου
εποιησεν
- 19:7-7 αυτω
2 OM
Origen P66 01 W f1 565 579 a b e
4 ουν αυτω
700
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C D Ω 892
- 19:7-28 ημων
3 OM
Origen P66 vid 01 B L W Δ Ψ 579 a b e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C D 892
- 19:7-34 εαυτον υιον του θεου
1 εαυτον υιον θεου
A E Θ Π
2 ~ 1,4,2 (εαυτον θεου υιον)
Δ 700
10 ~ 2,3,4,1 (υιον του θεου εαυτον)
W
11 ~ 2,4,1 (υιον θεου εαυτον)
Origen P66 01 B L Ψ f1 f13 33 565 579 UBS3
19 υιον [θεου / ./ / του θεου] εαυτον
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C D 892
- 19:7-40 του θεου
2 θεου
Origen P66 01 A B E L Δ Θ Π Ψ f1 f13 33 565 579
700 UBS3
9 [του θεου / ./ / θεου]
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C D 892
- 19:12 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 εκραζον
579 vid
2 εκραυγασαν
P66 vid B Ψ 33 700 UBS3
3 εκραυγαζον
Origen A L W Θ Π f1 f13 565 1241
8 ελεγον
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 A B E L 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 εκραυγασαν αρων(1) αρων(2) σταυρωσον αυτον λεγει
αυτοις ο πιλατος τον βασιλεα(1) υμων σταυρωσω απεκριθησαν οι(2)
αρχιερεις ουκ εχομεν βασιλεα(2) ει μη καισαρα
- 19:15-7 εκραυγασαν
2 εκραυγασον
A
3 εκραυγαζον
Θ Π 1241
4 ελεγον
P66* vid 01* W 579
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C D 892
- 19:15-10 εκραυγασαν

- 2 + λεγοντες
f13 700
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C D 892
- 19:17 και βασταζων τον(1) σταυρον αυτου εξηλθεν εις τον(2) λεγομενον
κρανιου τοπον ος λεγεται εβραιστι γολγοθα
- 19:17-13 αυτου
2 εαυτου
A Θ 700
5 OM
f13
10 εαυτω
Origen P66c 01 L W Π Ψ f1 565 UBS3
11 αυτω
B 33 579
19 [εαυτω ././ αυτω]
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66* P75 C D Δ 892
- 19:26 ιησους ουν ιδων την μητερα και τον μαθητην παρεστωτα ον ηγαπα
λεγει τη μητρι αυτου γυναι ιδου ο υιος σου
- 19:26-34 ιδου
2 ιδε
Origen B 579 1241 UBS3
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C D Δ 892
- 19:32 ηλθον ουν οι στρατιωται και(1) του(1) μεν πρωτου κατεαξαν τα
σκελη και(2) του(2) αλλου του(3) συσταυρωθεντος αυτω
- 19:32-28 αλλου
P66 vid
2 + ομοιως
Θ a
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C D Δ 892
- 19:33 επι δε τον ιησουν ελθοντες ως ειδον αυτον ηδη τεθνηκοτα ου
κατεαξαν αυτου τα σκελη
- 19:33-13 αυτον ηδη
2 ~ 2,1 (ηδη αυτον)
Origen P66 B L W UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C D Δ 892
- 19:34 αλλ εις των στρατιωτων λογχη αυτου την πλευραν ενυξε και(1)
ευθυς εξηλθεν αιμα και(2) υδωρ

- 19:34-13 αυτου την πλευραν
2 την πλευραν αυτου
Origen 579
9 /NA/
a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C D Δ 892
- 19:34-22 ευθως εξηλθεν
1 ευθεως εξηλθεν
f13 700 1241
2 ~ 2,1 (εξηλθεν ευθως)
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 ευθως
2 ευθεως
f13 700 1241
9 /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 υμεις 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
9 /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 πιστευσητε
3 πιστευητε
Origen 01* B Ψ
9 /NA/
a b
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C D 892 e
- 19:36 εγενετο γαρ ταυτα ινα η γραφη πληρωθη οστων ου συντριβησεται
αυτου
- 19:36-4 γαρ
2 δε
Ψ e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C D 892
- 19:36-16 συντριβησεται
2 + ap
01 Ω 33 1241 a b
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 C D 892
- 19:41 ην δε εν(1) τω(1) τοπω οπου εσταυρωθη κηπος και εν(2) τω(2)
κηπω μνημειον καινον εν(3) ω 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)
τον(1) πατερα(1) μου(2) πορευου δε προς(2) τους αδελφους μου(3)
και(1) ειπε αυτοις αναβαινω προς(3) τον(2) πατερα(2) μου(4)
και(2) πατερα(3) υμων(1) και(3) θεον(1) μου(5) και(4) θεον(2)
υμων(2)
- 20:17-16 πατερα(1) μου(2)
2 πατερα
01 B D W b e UBS3
9 [πατερα μου / ./ πατερα]
Origen
* /Missing/
P45 P75 C 579 892

- 20:17-22 δε
 2 OM
 A
 9 [δε / ./ / OM]
 Origen
 10 ουν
 01c D L
 * /Missing/
 P45 P66 P75 C 579 892
- 20:17-25 αδελφους μου(3)
 2 αδελφους
 01* D W e
 9 [αδελφους μου / ./ / αδελφους]
 Origen
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 C 579 892
- 20:23 αν(1) τινων(1) αφητε τας αμαρτιας αφιενται αυτοις αν(2)
 τινων(2) κρατητε κεκρατηνται
- 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 αφιενται
 2 αφιονται
 B* Ψ
 4 αφεωνται
 01c A D L fl f13 33 vid 565 UBS3
 6 αφεθησεται
 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 αλλοι 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 κεκλεισμενων και(3)
 εστη εις το μεσον και(4) ειπεν ειρηνη υμιν
- 20:26-13 αυτου
 2 OM
 01 W fl 565 a b e
 * /Missing/
 P45 P66 P75 579 892
- 20:26-22 ερχεται
 2 + ουν
 D fl 565
 * /Missing/
 P45 P66 P75 579 892
- 20:29 λεγει αυτω ο ιησους οτι 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 ιδοντες
 2 + με
 01* f13
 * /Missing/
 P45 P75 579 892
- 21:18 αμην(1) αμην(2) λεγω σοι οτε ης νεωτερος εξωννυες σεαυτον
 και(1) περιπαταις οπου(1) ηθελες 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 Cc
 * /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 σημαινων ποιω θανατω 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

- 21:20 επιστραφεις δε ο(1) πετρος βλεπει τον μαθητην ον ηγαπα ο(2)
ιησους ακολουθουντα ος και(1) ανεπεσεν εν τω δειπνω επι το
στηθος αυτου και(2) ειπε κυριε τις εστιν ο(3) παραδιδους σε
- 21:20-19 ακολουθουντα
2 OM
01* W
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L 579 892
- 21:20-34 αυτου
2 του ιησου
C vid a
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L 579 892
- 21:20-40 ειπε
2 + αυτω
01 C D W 33
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L 579 892
- 21:21 τουτον ιδων ο πετρος λεγει τω ιησου κυριε ουτος δε τι
- 21:21-10 τουτον
2 + ουν
Origen 01 B C D 33 b UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L 579 892 a e
- 21:21-16 λεγει
2 ειπεν
01 W
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L 579 892 e
- 21:22 λεγει αυτω ο ιησους εαν αυτον θελω μενειν εως ερχομαι τι προς
σε συ ακολουθει μοι
- 21:22-10 μενειν
2 + ουτως
D b
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L Ω 579 892 a
- 21:22-25 ακολουθει μοι
2 ~ 2,1 (μοι ακολουθει)
Origen 01 A B C* D W fl 33 a b e UBS3
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L Ω 579 892

- 21:23 εξηλθεν ουν ο(1) λογος ουτος εις τους αδελφους οτι(1) ο(2)
μαθητης εκεινος ουκ(1) αποθνησκει(1) και ουκ(2) ειπεν αυτω ο(3)
ιησους οτι(2) ουκ(3) αποθνησκει(2) αλλ εαν αυτον θελω μενειν
εως ερχομαι τι προς σε
- 21:23-4 ο(1) λογος ουτος
2 ~ 3,1,2 (ουτος ο λογος)
01 B C D W fl 33 a b e UBS3
3 ο λογος
Origen
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L Ω 579 892
- 21:23-16 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
- 21:23-19 αυτω
2 αυτο
D
3 OM
f13 1241 a
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L Ω 579 892
- 21:23-25 οτι(2)
2 OM
D a b e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L Ω 579 892
- 21:23-28 αποθνησκει(2)
2 αποθνησκεις
D e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L Ω 579 892
- 21:23-43 τι προς σε
2 προς σε
D
3 OM
01* fl 565 a e
* /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L Ω 579 892
- 21:24 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
- 21:24-7 ο(2)
2 + και
Origen B C W

- * /Missing/
P45 P66 P75 L Ω 579 892
- 21:24-10 τουτων
2 ιησου
 a e
* /Missing/
 P45 P66 P75 L Ω 579 892
- 21:24-16 και(1)
2 ο και
 01c Θ f13 33
2 και ο
 Origen B D UBS3
9 /NA/
 a b e
* /Missing/
 P45 P66 P75 L Ω 579 892
- 21:25 εστι δε και αλλα πολλα οσα εποιησεν ο ιησους ατινα εαν γραφηται
 καθ εν ουδε αυτον οιμαι τον κοσμον χωρησαι τα γραφομενα βιβλια
 αμην
- 21:25-13 οσα
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 χωρησαι
3 χωρησειν
 01c B C*
9 [χωρησειν /./ χωρησαι]
 Origen
9 /NA/
 a b e
* /Missing/
 P45 P66 P75 01* L Ω 579 892